

Amicitia and the Unity of Juvenal's First Book

RICHARD A. LAFLEUR

The theme of treacherous friendship recurs throughout all sixteen of Juvenal's Satires.¹ *Amicitia* and the adjective *amicus* are in every instance used by the satirist ironically; and only in a very few of as many as thirty-nine occurrences does the noun *amicus* bear an interpretation of honest camaraderie. Among the "friends" of Books Two through Five there are niggardly patrons, avaricious, self-serving clients, sexual degenerates and eunuchs, thieves, and others we might call at best fair-weather friends. The alliance depicted is nearly always in fact an unfriendly bond between men somehow unequal. Most often Juvenal has in mind the miserably eroded state of the patronage system; he employs the term *amicus* for both *cliens* and *patronus*, but he always underscores the paradox of applying this traditional label to the frequently impersonal and sometimes overtly antagonistic patron-client relationship. Through all the later books Juvenal's picture of friendship in general, and of patronage in particular, is consistently dismal.

The unhappy idea is first introduced, however, and most thoroughly developed in the five satires of Book One, where friend/friendship words are more numerous than in the other four books combined.² "It's difficult

¹ For a briefer, more general treatment of the friendship theme in Juvenal's five books, see my "Amicus and Amicitia in Juvenal," *CB* 51 (1975), 54-58; a useful discussion of *amicitia* as it applies to the patron-client relationship appears in Peter Green's introduction to his Penguin translation, *Juvenal: The Sixteen Satires* (Baltimore, 1967), 30-32, and *passim*.

² *Amicus* (noun) appears twenty times in Book One, at 1.33 and 146; 2.134; 3.1, 57, 87, 101, 107, 112, 116, 121, and 279; 4.88; 5.32, 108, 113, 134, 140 (regarded by some editors as an interpolation), 146, and 173; *amicitia* occurs at 4.75 and 5.14; *amica* (noun) at 1.62, 3.12, and 4.20; and *amicos* (adjective) should be read for *acutos* in 5.41, as I have argued in "Juvenal's 'Friendly Fingernails,'" *WS* 88 (1975), 230-235. In Books Two through Five the words are far less frequent; *amicus* (noun) appears eighteen times, in a fairly even distribution.

not to write satire," Juvenal insists in his program poem, and to prove his point he parades before us a scurrilous band of knaves and villains certain to rouse any audience's indignation. Following the betrothed eunuch, the bare-breasted, pig-sticking huntress, Crispinus and the other millionaire parvenus, there menacingly appears the *magni delator amici* (1.33-36):

. . . magni delator amici
 et cito rapturus de nobilitate comesa
 quod superest, quem Massa timet, quem munere palpat 35
 Carus et a trepido Thymele summissa Latino.

Although the *delator* cannot be certainly identified,³ it is clear that the *magnus amicus* against whom he informed was no very dear comrade. Here, as often, *magnus* is equivalent to *potens*: the "great friend" is some powerful associate, doubtless the informer's *patronus*, like the other *magni amici* of Book One. This reference to dangerous friendships, and the introduction of Crispinus, Massa, Carus, and several other Domitianic figures in this section of the poem (verses 22-50) are intentionally programmatic, designed by Juvenal to foreshadow themes, characters, and situations that will be more attentively explored later on, particularly in Satire Four.⁴

The audience is permitted a second glimpse at Roman amicability in this opening poem, when the satirist describes the frustrations of a group of clients at their patron's less than generous treatment (132-146):

vestibulis abeunt veteres lassique clientes
 votaue deponunt, quamquam longissima cenae
 spes homini; caulis miseris atque ignis emendus.
 optima silvarum interea pelagique vorabit 135

³ There is little to recommend the recent suggestion that Juvenal refers to Publicius Certus' role in the prosecution of Helvidius Priscus, made by Léon Herrmann, "Cluiviaenus," *Latomus* 25 (1966), 258-264. The context seems to demand a Domitianic figure who could have been involved with the other characters in 35 f. Several commentators have favored M. Aquilius Regulus (*PIR*² A1005): see, e.g., J. E. B. Mayor (ed., London, 1886), *ad loc.* See below, n. 11.

⁴ As can be seen from a glance at the commentaries, the several identifiable figures in 22-50 are associated with the reign of Domitian. Juvenal's purpose here is, not only to justify his interest in satire, as he says he will do in 19-21, but also to give a specimen of his objects and his techniques. He will name names, but only of those who are dead (like Massa and Carus) or otherwise politically impotent (like the exile Marius: 49): thus the satirist demonstrates by example what he will explicitly announce later, in 150-171, where he discusses the dangers of *onomasti konodein*. He will in this book attack characters drawn primarily from the Domitianic period: thus he anticipates Satires Two and in particular Four, which are most critical of the *ultimus Flavius* and his regime. On the naming techniques employed in 1.22-80 and their programmatic function, see John G. Griffith, "Juvenal, Statius and the Flavian Establishment," *G&R*, 2nd ser., 16 (1969), 147 f., and my "Juvenal 1.80: *Cluivianus?*," *RPh* 50 (1976), 79-84.

rex horum vacuisque toris tantum ipse iacebit.
 nam de tot pulchris et latis orbibus et tam
 antiquis una comedunt patrimonia mensa.
 nullus iam parasitus erit. sed quis ferat istas
 luxuriae sordes? quanta est gula quae sibi totos 140
 ponit apros, animal propter convivia natum!
 poena tamen praesens, cum tu deponis amictus
 turgidus et crudum pavonem in balnea portas.
 hinc subitae mortes atque intestata senectus.
 it nova nec tristis per cunctas fabula cenas; 145
 ducitur iratis plaudendum funus amicis.

The gluttonous patron is called *ipse* and *rex*, like Virro, the stingy *patronus* of Satires Five and Nine, and like his lordship Domitian in Four. The personified *gula* of verse 140 anticipates *gula saevit* and *plorante gula* in 5.94 and 158, while *comedunt patrimonia* (138) recalls the *nobilitas comesa* metaphor of line 34 in the earlier *amicus* passage.⁵ The patron's hungry friends are, again like Virro's, his aging, tired dependents. After years of grudging abuse, the *clientes* are now dealt one final disappointment—the old man has died intestate! It is with this scene that the satirist aptly completes his re-creation of a typical day in the city (the topic of 127–146). The afternoon closes with a funeral, an event to be applauded by the deceased's angry retainers. Here, too, concludes the satirist's diatribe on the corrupting effects of avarice, a major theme of 87–146 (Juvenal's epilogue on the perils of *onomasti komodein* follows with the transition at 147–150). *Amicis* is the satirist's last word; and it is delayed, like *amici* in verse 33 and *amicus* throughout Book One, to final position in the line, where the *para prosdokian* is specially accentuated.⁶ As William Anderson has remarked, the "epigrammatic statement [of 146] punctuates this section decisively."⁷

It can hardly be construed as accidental that this dramatic closing scene of the program poem neatly prefigures the closing poem of the book, with its description of Virro's demeaning dinner for his client-friends and its sardonic portrayal of *amicitia* (Satire Five, like the *cena* passage in One, ends abruptly with a form of the word *amicus*). But, like the earlier allusion

⁵ If the *comedere* echo is intentional, Juvenal looks forward to the association of gluttony and other vices which he establishes later in Satire Four. For *ipse* and *rex* in Four and Five, see below. *Gula* does not occur again until the Fourth Book, though compare the related *gluttisse* in 4.28 (of Domitian).

⁶ Throughout the sixteen satires *amicus* occupies final position (the single exception is in 6.510). The deliberate positioning seems to reflect, not merely considerations of metrical convenience, but also Juvenal's wish to emphasize the word's nearly always ironic sense.

⁷ Page 41 of his "Studies in Book I of Juvenal," *YCS* 15 (1957), 33–90. Cf. E. Courtney, "Some thought-patterns in Juvenal," *Hermathena* 98 (1974), 15–21, esp. 20; Courtney detects the use of ring-composition in 87–149.

to a "great friendship" (line 33), the patron's feast in 1.132-146 also foreshadows Satire Four, where both Crispinus and Domitian are, as we shall see, a nearly perfect match for this cormorant who, excluding his *amici*, "devours the choicest foods of the sea" (135) and gorges alone on a huge creature "born for a banquet" (141).

In Satire Two we meet a single *amicus*; he, as might be expected in this poem, is a pervert (134 f.):

quae causa officii? "quid quaeris? nubit amicus
nec multos adhibet."

135

"Why so busy?" says one. "You ask?" quips the other, "It's a special friend—he's going to be a bride—and only a few are invited!" In this one exchange may be seen the essence of the satire: business has become buggery, man has become woman, friendship has become farce.

Up to this point Juvenal's *amici* fall a trifle short of the Ciceronian ideal. But the next friend in the book is none other than Satire Three's Umbricius, fugitive from the slings and arrows of a corrupt and thankless Rome. Most students of Umbricius take him to be a purposely sympathetic figure, an actual friend of the poet or perhaps a Juvenalian alter-ego.⁸ The satirist himself, however, is admittedly *confusus* (3.1-3):

quamvis digressu veteris confusus amici
laudo tamen, vacuis quod sedem figere Cumis
destinet atque unum civem donare Sibyllae.

A curious, enigmatic preface. *Confusus*, usually rendered "upset" or "saddened," can suggest intellectual rather than emotional confusion, and hence might be translated "puzzled." Indeed, though Umbricius' sentiments are frequently close to those which Juvenal expresses elsewhere, there is much in his program that seems paradoxical and un-Juvenalian, not least of all the proposed exile to the not so idyllic *umbra* of Cumae. No longer *quieta* (as Statius had called her: *Silvae* 4.3.65) since completion, more than a decade earlier, of the *via Domitiana*, which passed directly through her forum, and oldest of the Greek cities in Italy, Cumae was a doubly peculiar retreat for the xenophobic pastoralist Umbricius, who should have preferred the rustic simplicity of Gabii or some sleepier Latin

⁸ Barry Baldwin's recent discussion of Umbricius, if it can be said to take a position, is traditionalist ("There is nothing un-Juvenalian about Umbricius' diatribe..."): "Three Characters in Juvenal," *CW* 66 (1972), 101. My own view of the character's intended function, suggested below, is more fully defended in "Umbricius and Juvenal Three," *ZAnt* 26 (1976), 383-431.

town.⁹ Juvenal himself would hardly have considered permanent withdrawal from the city that provided the *farrago* for his satire; indeed he seems almost certainly to have remained in Rome throughout his literary career.¹⁰

We should take a clue to Juvenal's real intention for the Umbricius character from the meaning of *amicus* and *amicitia* elsewhere in the Satires, especially in Book One. In the Third Satire itself *amicus* appears eight more times. The first friend after Umbricius is another *magnus amicus*, a rich patron whose guilt makes him the timorous victim of an amicable blackmailer (*a magno semper timearis amico*: 57); the obvious irony recalls the "great friend" of 1.33. In the space of thirty-five lines (87-121: part of the invective in *Graeculos*) the word occurs six times, always for uncaring patrons like the one who has rejected Umbricius. The Greek parasites who have succeeded in wooing these *patroni* are, Umbricius protests, flatterers, debauchees, faithless villains. At worst, repeating the crime of Egnatius against his patron Barea Soranus, they will even murder their "friends": *occidit . . . delator amicum* (116, at line's end) is unquestionably meant to echo *magni delator amici* in the program poem (1.33, also at line's end).¹¹

⁹ Umbricius complains, "*Non possum ferre, Quirites, | Graecam urbem*" (60 f.), and later speaks nostalgically of Praeneste, Volsinii, Gabii, Tibur (190-192), Sora, Fabrateria, Frusino (223 f.), and Juvenal's own Aquinum (319), all (except Volsinii) in Latium. If Umbricius is to be narrowly identified with Juvenal, why does he not retire to Aquinum or one of those other towns nearby? Why Cumae of all places, a city so Greek in its associations? Not, certainly, to escape crime and vice: as the *ianua Baiarum* (4), Cumae was gateway to the Roman Sodom, and, by Umbricius' own admission, the neighborhood was infested with brigands (305-308). Nor for solitude, since the new coastal highway had brought visitors, money, and a flurry of new construction: see J. Rufus Fears, "Cumae in the Roman Imperial Age," *Vergilius* 21 (1975), 1-21.

¹⁰ Even if the uncertain tradition of Juvenal's exile to Egypt is accepted, Umbricius' flight from Rome is no parallel. The Egyptian exile was by all accounts involuntary, and would likely have antedated Juvenal's literary career in any case, as Gilbert Highet contends in *Juvenal the Satirist* (Oxford, 1954), 26 f. The poems furnish no evidence of any violent disruption in his lifestyle; in the later satires Juvenal seldom retreats farther than into the comfort of his own urban apartment.

¹¹ The scholiast on 1.33 sees the *delator amici* reference as an allusion to the same incident touched upon here in 3.116, Egnatius Celer's appearance as a witness against his friend and patron Marcus Barea Soranus in A.D. 66 (*Tac. Ann.* 16.32). Against this identification is the fact that the context of 1.33-35 is Domitianic (above, n. 3), while Celer's activities date to Nero's reign (he was exiled in 69). Still, the undoubtedly intentional echo links the two poems thematically through the similar depiction of comparable events. Soranus (who is mentioned again favorably in 7.91) and his daughter were condemned to death for their anti-Neronian sympathies along with Thrasea Paetus (for Thrasea in Juvenal 5.36, see below and n. 39).

Amicus, even at its final appearance later in the poem (278–280), becomes ironic through the satirist's incongruous analogy:

ebrius ac petulans, qui nullum forte cecidit,
dat poenas, noctem patitur lugentis amicum
Pelidae, cubat in faciem, mox deinde supinus. 280

The drunken bully has no friend, Juvenal implies; nor is such epic friendship as that of Achilles for Patroclus to be found in the seething cosmopolis.

Umbricius' place in all of this is that of the *exclusus amicus* at his patron's threshold, resenting the orientals who have displaced him, not so much for their alleged treachery toward the patron-friend as because they refuse to share him. Umbricius' last complaint is the most revealing (121–125):

. . . numquam partitur amicum,
solus habet. nam cum facilem stillavit in aurem
exiguum de naturae patriaeque veneno,
limine summoveor, perierunt tempora longi
servitii; nusquam minor est iactura clientis. 125

When Juvenal labels this frustrated client *vetus amicus* in line 1, he may only mean to recall the *veteres lassique clientes* of the program satire: like them Umbricius is old (3.26–28), tired (25: he likens himself to Daedalus, who put off his *fatigatas . . . alas* at Cumae), and disappointed at his patron's door (3.124, 1.132 f.). Umbricius is also close to the mistreated *amicus* of Five, Virro's client Trebius (5.64: *veteri . . . clienti*), and especially to Naevolus, the parasite discarded by Virro in Juvenal's only other dialogue, Satire Nine.¹² A more patently unsympathetic figure, Naevolus, aging, tattered and torn, like Umbricius, and rejected by his patron, even considers abandoning Rome and settling at Cumae.¹³ The correspondences are too striking not to have been intended.

Both characters function very like Catus and Horace's other interlocutors in *Sermones* Two: each represents the *doctor ineptus* type, to use Anderson's expression, the "teacher who fails to grasp the implications

¹² H. A. Mason has noticed the kinship of Three and Nine, pp. 100 f. of his study, "Is Juvenal a Classic?," in J. P. Sullivan, ed., *Satire: Critical Essays on Roman Literature* (Bloomington, 1968), 93–176; like most readers, however, Mason takes Umbricius too seriously and fails to notice the numerous similarities between him and Naevolus. In an article not available to me when I wrote "Umbricius and Juvenal Three" (above, n. 8), Franco Bellandi has drawn attention to many of the characteristics shared by Umbricius, Trebius, and Naevolus: see "Naevolus cliens," *Maia* 26 (1974), 279–299.

¹³ Cf. 3.24 f. with 9.21 (their *proposita*); 3.22 with 9.27 f. (their labors unrewarded); 3.26–28 with 9.9, 129 (their age); 3.125 with 9.59 f., 71 f. (the two as rejected clients); 3.148–151 with 9.28–31 (tattered clothing as evidence of their *paupertas*); 3.2, 24 f. with 9.56–60 (their interest in Cumae).

of his own precepts and thus ends as a figure of fun."¹⁴ Catus, "Mr. Shrewd," lectures Horace and his audience on *delicatessen* in *Sermones* 2.4.¹⁵ The piece concludes with some good-natured humor at the expense of the Epicureans and with Horace's swearing, sarcastically of course, by Catus' friendship (88 f.):

docte Cati, per amicitiam divosque rogatus,
ducere me auditum, perges quocumque, memento.

Introduced by the satirist near the beginning of the poem, given the pulpit and allowed to dominate the satiric dialogue,¹⁶ friend Catus proceeds to expose himself and his *praecepta vitae beatae* to ridicule, not so much on account of his basic principles (his culinary advice is essentially sound, as Anderson remarks) as for the absurd, un-Roman extremes to which he would carry them, and the grandiose tone in which he offers his expert advice. Umbricius may be just such a "friendly advisor," meant more to provoke than to persuade. Certainly Juvenal meant to draw attention to the problems of life in Rome, a topic that was commonplace, but he also expected his audience to question Umbricius' motives and his irrational, unproductive solution to those problems.¹⁷

¹⁴ William S. Anderson, "The Roman Socrates: Horace and his Satires," in Sullivan, *Satire*, 34, and see also 29-37.

¹⁵ *Catus* I take to be a significant name, a device common in satire. For other etymologically appropriate names in Horace, see Niall Rudd's "The Names in Horace's Satires," *CQ*, n.s., 10 (1960), 168-170. *Umbricius* may also have been chosen for its etymology. Anna Lydia Motto and John R. Clark suggest an intended connection with *umbra*, in the sense of "ghost," and view Umbricius as a kind of Spirit of Rome Past, withdrawing from the corrupt reality of the present to the supernatural world of Cumae and Avernus: "*Per iter tenebricosum*: The Mythos of Juvenal 3," *TAPA* 96 (1965), 267-276; cf. Baldwin, 101, and pp. 147 f. of S. C. Fredericks' chapter, "Juvenal: A Return to Invective," in E. S. Ramage, D. L. Sigsbee, and Fredericks, *Roman Satirists and Their Satire* (Park Ridge, New Jersey, 1974). Perhaps more likely is the possibility that *Umbricius* was meant to suggest the adjectives *umbraticus* and the sometimes pejorative *umbratilis*, "fond of the shade," (*umbra* in the sense of leisure and retirement: cf. Juvenal 7.8 and 173), in which case the name would be quite appropriate to the character's *propositum* of abandoning Rome for the idyllic seclusion of Cumae. For other pastoral elements in *Satire* Three, see Charles Witke, pp. 128-151 of his *Latin Satire: The Structure of Persuasion* (Leiden, 1970), esp. 133 f. Similarly Naevolus' name, "Master Wart" (perhaps borrowed from Martial 3.71 and 95), suits his ugly disposition.

¹⁶ Catus is given about 86 percent of the lines in Horace's satire, while Umbricius has 94 percent; Damasippus, in *Serm.* 2.3, controls 96 percent of the conversation.

¹⁷ Thus the satire cuts in two directions, like many of Juvenal's later poems; cf. David S. Wiesen on *Satire* Seven, p. 482 of his "Juvenal and the Intellectuals," *Hermes* 101 (1973), 464-483: "This counterpoint of two opposite and conflicting themes, one of which

The Third Satire is in scope the most comprehensive poem of Book One, and the longest. With its 322 lines, in fact, the piece is nearly identical in length to Satires One and Two combined (341 lines), and to Four and Five combined (327 lines). Probably later in composition than both Two and Four (which are more concerned with Domitian), Satire Three is given the position that befits both its own importance and the structural balance of the book as a whole.¹⁸ Viewed in this way, the two poems that follow constitute an equivalent third part of the volume. And indeed there is reason to believe that Juvenal intended his readers to perceive Satires Four and Five as a cohesive unit, an inseparable, because complementary, pair. It is the prominence of the *amicitia* theme that, beside establishing a link with the preceding satires and responding to the program poem in particular, provides the remarkable parallelism between Four and Five themselves.

On the surface the two satires appear unlike: one burlesques an imperial *concilium*, while the other describes an ungenerous patron's dinner party for his miserable *clientes*. Four begins with a prologue that reintroduces the Domitianic rogue Crispinus (1-27).¹⁹ Juvenal touches first on the man's foppishness (hinted at in the program, 1.26-29) and his gross sexual vices, and then concentrates on a more trivial aspect of his general degradation, his gluttony. There is a single illustration: Crispinus, once a fishmonger himself in his native Egypt, had recently purchased an enormous mullet for 6,000 sesterces. "The fisherman himself could have been

questions the validity of the other, is an essential but little noticed characteristic of Juvenalian satire." Similarly, in the mock consolation of Thirteen, Juvenal "satirizes the genre itself [*consolatio*] and Calvinus [his addressee]": so Mark Morford, "Juvenal's Thirteenth Satire," *AJP* 94 (1973), 26-36. Only a few scholars have detected the anti-Umbrian aspect of Juvenal Three, and none have sufficiently discussed the matter: see Mason, 126, 135; Anderson, "*Lascivia* vs. *ira*: Martial and Juvenal," *GSCA* 3 (1970), 29; and S. C. Fredericks, "Daedalus in Juvenal's Third Satire," *CB* 49 (1972), 11-13, esp. 13: "Umbrius' personal solution to the evils he sees around him is merely to escape and to leave the city behind him no better for his departure. Like the disgruntled members of our own society who flee the Inner City for a more pleasant life in the suburban fringes, Umbrius has merely contributed to the problem, not to the solution." Fredericks takes a more traditional stand in his chapter for *Roman Satirists*, but even there comments on the similarity of Umbrius to the unsympathetic Trebius.

¹⁸ Cf. Hight, 89: "Satire Three, long and finely constructed, is placed in the middle for the maximum effect." See further p. 366 of W. Heilmann's valuable study, "Zur Komposition der vierten Satire und des ersten Satirenbuches Juvenals," *RhM* 110 (1967), 358-370.

¹⁹ For Crispinus, who is otherwise known only from Martial 7.99 and 8.48, see Peter White, "*Ecce Iterum Crispinus*," *AJP* 95 (1974), 377-382.

bought for less," the satirist complains. But far worse than the extravagant price was the fact that Crispinus had acquired the fish, not as a gift for some childless old man aimed at securing a place in his will, nor for some "powerful woman-friend" in order to win her favor, but solely for his own palate (18-22):

consilium laudo artificis, si munere tanto
 praecipuam in tabulis ceram senis abstulit orbi;
 est ratio ulterior, magnae si misit amicae, 20
 quae vehitur cluso latis specularibus antro.
 nil tale expectes: emit sibi.

Crispinus' gluttony recalls the *cena* of 1.132-146, while *munere* and *magnae . . . amicae* echo *magni . . . amici* and *munere* in 1.33-35. The hypothetical great lady is the third "powerful friend" of the Satires: the first is betrayed (1.33), the second is intimidated (3.57), the last is the prospective victim of *ratio ulterior*.

In a transitional passage of nine lines (28-36) Juvenal shifts our attention toward Domitian. When a scoundrel like Crispinus can rise to such luxury in the imperial palace, belching up thousands at a single course, what should we expect of his model, the emperor himself? Vice loves vice—this is Juvenal's point here and throughout the satire. A man of influence, whether an emperor, a bureaucrat, or a wealthy patron, will surround himself with associates who are his moral equals from the start or who will rise or (more easily) descend to his level.

The major division of the poem (37-149) is a seriocomic burlesque, mock epic in tone, of an emergency meeting of Domitian's council. A fisherman from Picenum has taken a huge turbot in his nets. Fearful that Domitian's agents would confiscate the fish, claiming it as imperial property, the *piscator* determined to profit in grace at least, by delivering his catch personally to the emperor. While Domitian's *amici* look on from the doorway, fish and fisher are admitted to the royal chambers (*exclusi spectant admissa obsonia patres*: 64), and the gift is ceremoniously presented: "Rejoice, accept and consume this fish, too great for a private oven. Preserved by the gods until your generation, it insisted on being caught . . . for thee!" No one loved flattery more than Domitian, and so he accepted all the fisherman offered. But then an unnerving discovery was made—the palace cupboard lacked a platter large enough to hold the emperor's new fish. Straightaway the *amici principis* were summoned into special session.

Verses 72-149 caricature the councillors, eleven men closely associated

with the Flavian regime, most of them known to us from other sources.²⁰ Although the satire contains little in the way of direct criticism of Domitian himself, we are nonetheless, as Hightet observes (page 82), "conscious of his power, and of his brooding incalculable dangerous character, silent and unpredictable like a snake." The emperor is seen most clearly as a reflection of those men who come under his influence. Earlier in the poem intimations of Domitian's character were to be gleaned from the behavior of Crispinus and the fisherman; but the most damning insight is provided in the depiction of the advisors as they hasten into the meeting-room (72-75):

vocantur
ergo in consilium proceres, quos oderat ille,
in quorum facie miserae magnaequē sedebat
pallor amicitiae.

75

Once more we are reminded of the "great friendships" of One and Three; and we may even recall the *magna amica* of 4.20, and thus see the theme of perverted *amicitia* as yet another link between the prologue and the narrative of this poem, whose structure has been so frequently criticized.²¹ In the lines that follow, the behavior of the councillors ranges from timorous reticence to gross adulation. The group, in which Crispinus makes his final appearance, includes adulterers, informers, murderers, and others, like Crispus and Acilius, whose worst crime was submissiveness. The relationship with Domitian shared by all of them, Juvenal suggests, was quite literally appalling. It parallels almost exactly the dread friendships of the earlier satires: here the emperor is the ultimate patron, while the

²⁰ See Griffith (above, n. 4); Ronald Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), 5 f., 636; John Crook, *Consilium Principis* (Cambridge, 1955), 49-51.

²¹ Green has remarked (pp. 46 f.) that Four "is a broken-backed affair which has defied even the most ingenious attempts to unify its parts"; and Michael Coffey concludes that the poem "remains obstinately in two parts," in his "Juvenal Report for the Years 1941-1961," *Lustrum* 8 (1963), 206; cf. E. J. Kenney, "The First Satire of Juvenal," *PCPhS* 8 (1962), 30 f. The work of Stegemann, Helmbold and O'Neil, and Anderson should have saved the poem from this criticism. The first cogent defense of the satire's unity was offered by W. Stegemann, who pointed to the essentially chiasmic structure (Crispinus' *scelera*, 1-10; his *facta leviora*, 11-27; Domitian's *nugae*, 37-150; his *scelera*, 150-154): *De Juvenalis dispositione* (Weyda, 1913), 30-34, esp. 33. W. C. Helmbold and E. N. O'Neil build upon Stegemann's work in "The Structure of Juvenal IV," *AJP* 77 (1956), 68-73; William Anderson has contributed other important insights, "Studies," 68-80; cf. Heilmann, 359-365; Ross S. Kilpatrick, "Juvenal's 'Patchwork' Satires: 4 and 7," *YCS* 23 (1973), 230-235.

frightened and frightening advisors are his gloomy *clientes*.²² Their terror is wholly justified, for, as the satirist remarks (86–88):

. . . quid violentius aure tyranni,
cum quo de pluviis aut aestibus aut nimbo
vere locuturi fatum pendebat amici?

Friendship, Juvenal repeats, can be fatal.

In the end the counsel of mountainous Montanus prevails (his culinary expertise was apparent from the fact that his belly had arrived at the meeting before him: 107). The fish would not be carved into plate-size portions, but rather, with suitably epic flair, a mammoth platter would be fashioned for it, and royal potters would be appointed to meet similar crises in the future. The *amici principis* are abruptly dismissed, like the client-friends of 1.132; and Domitian, as Helmbold and O'Neil rightly suppose (page 72), prepares to glut himself alone on the monstrous scaly beast.

If the fish is a symbol "of the Empire and what Domitian has done to it," as Professor Anderson has argued,²³ then the emperor is more ghoul than glutton. Although Anderson does not make the point, this is precisely the image Juvenal wished to convey in his epilogue (150–154):

atque utinam his potius nugis tota illa dedisset 150
tempora saevitiae, claras quibus abstulit urbi
inlustresque animas inpune et vindice nullo.
sed periiit postquam Cerdonibus esse timendus
coeperat: hoc nocuit Lamiarum caede madenti.

Cerdonibus in 153, rightly construed by Mayor and Knoche as a cognomen (rather than a common noun), is used as a generic plural.²⁴ Through his

²² Green's observation is apropos (p. 30): Juvenal "saw the feudal relationship everywhere: between master and slave, between patron and client, between the jobber of army commissions and the hopeful military careerist. Roman society formed a vast pyramid, with the Emperor—the most powerful patron of all—at the top, and the rabble roaring for bread and circuses at the bottom; in between came an interlinked series of lesser pyramids, where one man might play both roles, patronizing his inferiors and toadying to those above him."

²³ Anderson, "Studies," 78: "The physical enormity of the *rhombus* . . . ideally symbolizes the sensual and moral enormity of the court, for both suffer the violence of Domitian, and the court is a microcosm of the Empire."

²⁴ The word is capitalized by both Mayor (see his note, *ad loc.*) and Ulrich Knoche (ed., Munich, 1950); both likewise capitalize in 8.181 f., *quae | turpia Cerdoni Volesos Brutumque decebunt*, with which cf. 4.13 f., *nam, quod turpe bonis Titio Sciiioque, decebat | Crispinum*. In both Four and Eight *Cerdo* is a type-name (like *Titius* and *Sciius*) for the lower classes, in contrast to the *Lamiae*, the *Volesi*, and the *Bruti*, despite those who persist in reading *cerdo* as a common noun (including Hight, 82; the *OLD*; W. V. Clausen, ed.,

selection of this Greek name ("Mr. Craft"), common in Italy only among slaves and freedmen, Juvenal is reminding us that Domitian was assassinated, partly at the instigation of his wife Domitia Longina, by a gang of palace menials and *libertini* who felt themselves threatened by the emperor (hence *timendus*).²⁵ *Cerdonibus* is neatly balanced by the plural cognomen *Lamiarum*, which occurs in the same metrical position in the following line. The allusion in 154 illustrates by example the general statement of 151 f., for the Aelii Lamiae, a family praised by Horace and Tacitus, were among the innocent victims of Domitian's scourge. As commentators have generally noted, Juvenal's audience would think in particular of L. Aelius Lamia Plautius Aelianus, consul suffect in A.D. 80: Domitian first stole his wife Domitia (who would subsequently participate in the plot against the emperor's life) and then had him murdered about twelve years later.²⁶ But *Lamiarum*, like so many of Juvenal's personal names, contains a double meaning. Besides alluding specifically to Aelius Lamia and to the failure of the senatorial class in general, however severely abused, to remove Domitian from power, the name conveys a final intimation of the emperor's bestiality. The last two words of the poem, *caede madenti*, the careful juxtaposition *Lamiarum caede madenti*, would conjure up for the ancient audience a vision of the Lamiae of myth and Märchen, the carnivorous, bloodsucking death-demons who victimized poor innocents asleep in their

Oxford, 1959). The name is related to Greek κέρδος, and thus connotes profiteering and cunning; for its use as a cognomen, esp. for slaves, see *RE* Suppl. 1 and 3, s.v., the *Onomastica* in *TLL* and Forcellini, and the indexes to F. Preisigke, *Namenbuch* (Heidelberg, 1922) and D. Foraboschi, *Onomasticon Alterum* (Milan, 1971). Cf. Martial's *sutor* (*PIR*² C662), 3.16.1; 3.59.1; 3.99.1; the merchant in *Apul. Met.* 2.13 f. (*PIR*² C663); *Petr.* 60.8: *aiebat autem unum Cerdonem, alterum Felicionem, tertium Lucrionem vocari.*

²⁵ Suet. *Dom.* 17 numbers among the actual assassins Stephanus *Domitillae procurator*, Clodianus *cornicularius*, Maximus *Partheni libertus*, Satur *decurio cubiculariorum*, and an unnamed man *e gladiatorio ludo*; Juvenal's *timendus* may be explained either by the fact that Stephanus had recently been charged with embezzlement (a crime possibly hinted at in the name *Cerdo*: cf. K. H. Waters, "Juvenal and the Reign of Trajan," *Antichthon* 4 [1970], 70 and n. 33), or by Dio's testimony (67.15) that the conspirators included chiefly men whom Domitian held suspect and had designated for execution, a fact of which they were apprised by Domitia. Cf. Dio 67.16–18.

²⁶ The cognomen *Lamia* is common only to the *gens Aelia*; for the family, see *Hor. Carm.* 1.26.8; 1.36.7, and esp. 3.17; and *Tac. Ann.* 6.27 (where the Aelii Lamiae are described as a *gens decorum*). For Domitian's abuse of Lamia Aelianus (*PIR*² A205), see Suet. *Dom.* 1 and 10, where the man's death is connected with the executions of Thrasea Paetus and Acilius Glabrio (the councillor of Juvenal 4.95), and with the exile of Helvidius Priscus (on Paetus and Priscus, see below, n. 39).

beds.²⁷ If Domitian does not actually devour his prodigious turbot before our eyes, Juvenal nonetheless leaves us with the ghastly spectre of Rome's most literally monstrous emperor *Lamiarum caede madenti*, "dripping wet with vampires' gore," fresh from feasting upon the state's nobility—once more an image foreshadowed in the program poem by the *nobilitas comesa* of 1.34.

This grisly fusion of gluttony and murder, besides recalling the cannibalism metaphor of Satire One, glances back at the opening lines of Four itself.²⁸ In fact, the entire epilogue serves a dual purpose. First, it enhances the satire's unity: the closing vision of Domitian's monstrous bloodfeast brings to mind the prologue's depiction of Crispinus, his gluttonous consumption of an enormous fish (as in Domitian's case, implied, not described), and his characterization as an irredeemably vicious monster (*monstrum*: a word conspicuously repeated throughout the poem).²⁹ As readers have seen with increasing clarity, Crispinus and Domitian reflect one another;³⁰ their actions here, which, it is emphasized, comprise every kind and degree of vice, are mirrored in the poem's opening and conclusion. And the behavior of both men, it is equally important to realize, is intentionally prefigured by the poet in the two *amicus* passages of Satire One. Secondly, while focusing most sharply on the emperor, the epilogue affords the satirist one last gibe at those men who are equally his target, the *amici principis* like Crispinus and Acilius, and others of the *nobilitas comesa*, like the Lamiae, who were either too terrified or too corrupt themselves to exorcise Rome of her demonic possessor: men "on whose faces had settled the pallor of a great and miserable friendship."

²⁷ Though I was independently attracted to this interpretation, the double sense of *Lamiarum* has already been noticed by R. J. Rowland, Jr., in "Juvenal's *Lamiae*: Note on *Sat.* 4.154," *CB* 40 (1964), 75; Rowland's suggestion appears to have been ignored in all subsequent studies of the poem. The double entendre develops from the possibility of reading *Lamiarum* as both objective and subjective genitive.

²⁸ See above, on *nobilitas comesa* and *comedunt patrimonia*, 1.34 and 138. In the prologue to Four gluttony is emphasized as just one aspect of a more general degradation. Murder and gluttony coalesce in cannibalism, subject of the metaphor at 1.34 and the vampire image it foreshadows in 4.154. Juvenal's interest in a more literal cannibalism surfaces in Satire Fifteen.

²⁹ *Monstrum* is applied to Crispinus (2), to the turbot (45), and (in 115) to Catullus, not, as Anderson supposes ("Studies," 78), to Veiento (the relative clause and all of 114–122 describe Catullus). This Catullus, the *grande monstrum* (the *quoque* of 115 is meant to recall Juvenal's similar labelling of Crispinus and the fish) and *caecus adulator* (116), is to be identified with L. Valerius Catullus Messalinus (*PIR*¹ V41), consul with Domitian in 73. For his actual blindness see Pliny *Ep.* 4.22.5 f.; but *basia* (118) and *qui numquam visae flagrabat amore puellae* (114) are designed to evoke the *caecus amator*, Messalinus' relative and namesake, the republican poet Catullus: see my "Catullus and Catulla in Juvenal," *RPh* 48 (1974), 71–74.

³⁰ Esp. Helmbold and O'Neil, 70; 73; Anderson, "Studies," 70.

The principal theme of Juvenal Five is likewise *magna amicitia*. As Peter Green has commented in comparing this poem to the Fourth Satire, "it is the same story, but the props have been changed."³¹ Again the relationship is an unfriendly one, between the sadistic Virro and his grovelling client Trebius; again, whatever "greatness" may exist in the partnership derives merely from the patron's wealth and status. The noun *amicus* appears seven times in this satire, more frequently than in any other, and always in the emphatic final position; significantly, *amico* is the last word of the poem (and of the book).³² In each case the term is equivalent to either *cliens* or *patronus*: the union between patron and client has become, Juvenal once more suggests, venal, contemptuous, even hostile.

Like Satire Four, the poem opens with a brief prologue and a transitional section (1-11, 12-23), in which theme and context are established, the client-friend introduced, and the posture of the satirist indicated. Trebius is here a fitting counterpart to Crispinus in the prologue to Four. Both *amici* are of undistinguished origin; both have become shameless dependents; the two differ more in degree than in quality.³³ Crispinus is ridiculed as Domitian's court dandy (*deliciae*: 4.4), while Trebius (5.3 f.) is scornfully compared to Augustus' palace jesters, Gabba and Sarmenus (whom Plutarch similarly labels *δηλίκια*).³⁴ The kinship between Five and the preceding poem is most clearly revealed, however, by the echo of *magna amicitia* from 4.74 f. which we hear in the cynical pronouncement of verse 14: *fructus amicitiae magnae cibus*.³⁵ "The only profit from this great

³¹ Page 32; Green further compares Four, Five, and Nine as treatments of "Juvenal's favourite theme, the corruption of personal relationships," (48) and comments on the double-edged attack in each of these three poems (32 f.). What he does not point out is that the double-edge slices at all the "friends" of Satires One, Two, and Three as well.

³² Line references are given above, n. 2.

³³ Juvenal alludes to Crispinus' base origin; see also White (n. 19, above). Neither Trebius nor his wife Mygale (or Mycale) bears a distinguished name; they and their host are likely fictitious, though for some attempts at identification see my "Umbricius," 384 f. n. 5.

³⁴ Sarmenus (*PIR¹ S144*) is almost certainly the *scurra* named in Hor. *Serm.* 1.5.51-70; once the property of Maecenas, Plutarch says of him, *ὁ δὲ Σάρμενος ἦν τῶν Καίσαρος παιγνίων παιδάριον, ἃ δηλίκια Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν* (*Ant.* 59: 32 B.C.). Quintilian mentions both Sarmenus and Gabba (*PIR² G1*) as wits (6.3.58; 62). The two Augustan buffoons are a proper match for Trebius, who provides the *comœdia* (157) for his unpleasant host.

³⁵ The phrase, in the genitive case at both 4.74 f. and 5.14, appears nowhere else in the Satires (though cf. 6.558 f.); we are meant, of course, to recall the *magni amici* of One and Three. We may here cite a valuable study of the structural and thematic interrelations of Horace's Satires (which so profoundly influenced Juvenal), C. A. van Rooy's "Arrangement and Structure of Satires in Horace, *Sermones*, Book I, with More Special Reference to Satires 1-4," *AClass* 11 (1968), 38-72. Commenting on Horace's pairing of intentionally complementary poems, van Rooy affirms the principle that, beyond the

friendship is . . . food”: the sort of parasite typified by Trebius will do anything for a free meal, and so, quite appropriately, this is all he will get. But even dinner invitations are rare, continues the satirist-advisor, and they are always carefully recorded by the grudging patron in his account of services rendered (15–23).

The following 146 lines (24–169) illustrate in detail the inferior drink, food, and service that Trebius will endure at Virro’s board while his lordship, looking on with a cruel haughtiness, dines in the grandest style. Even this division of the poem bears striking resemblances to the narrative in Satire Four. In both the context is culinary. In both the imperious patron and his submissive *amici* are gathered about a table (somewhat like the friends of the program poem who cheered the funeral of their niggardly *patronus*).³⁶

Whereas the *concilium* in Four dealt with the matter of how to serve the emperor’s marvelous fish, the longest section of Five (80–106, at the poem’s center) describes the seafood actually served at Virro’s *cena*. Trebius gets an eel that looks like a snake, or a pike fat from the sewers, and a single prawn. The biggest fish, as in Satire Four, goes to the host: Virro dines on a richly garnished lobster, a huge lamprey (*muraena . . . maxima*: 99), and, most significantly, an expensive mullet, just like Crispinus’ in the prologue to the earlier poem. Compare in particular 5.92; 97 f.,

mullus erit domini . . .

.
instruit ergo focum provincia, sumitur illinc
quod captator emat Laenas, Aurelia vendat³⁷

mere repetition of a theme, “repeated use of a particular word, or name, or of a special phrase, will be found to be even more significant in proving that the author, usually in a most subtle manner, deliberately wrote or edited two satires to form a pair” (p. 41).

³⁶ In One, the patron actually dines alone (136; 138: *mensa*), but we later find his *irati amici* at table (145); cf. 5.4, 145. In Four, the “host” and his councillors are seated (76: *sedit*; 144: *surgitur*), and the topic of conversation recalls the traditional symposium; foremost among the “guests” is the plump gourmand Montanus (130–143). The word *cena* recurs through all three poems: 1.133, 145; 4.30; 5.9, 24, 85, 117. Heilmann (367) rightly compares *longissima cenae* | *spes* (1.133 f.) with *votorum summa* (5.18) and *spes bene cenandi* (5.166): the client-friends of the program and Trebius are alike in having as their highest aspiration the hope for a meal. Witke’s reaction to the *irati amici* in this regard is just what Juvenal must have intended: “Here Juvenal by a brief touch puts these wretches into proportion: they have sunk so low that their most far-reaching expectation is free dinner. He states it aphoristically, with no overt condemnation” (p. 122).

³⁷ Laenas is unknown (though see Highet, 293); Aurelia is meant for a woman of position, perhaps to be identified with the victim of Regulus’ *captatio* known from Plin. *Ep.* 2.20.10 f. Heilmann (368) also compares the two mullet passages.

with 4.15; 18-21,

mullum sex milibus emit 15

.....
 consilium laudo artificis, si munere tanto
 praecipuam in tabulis ceram senis abstulit orbi;
 est ratio ulterior, magnae si misit amicae, 20
 quae vehitur cluso latis specularibus antro.

Thus Juvenal deliberately employs in both passages the example of a costly fish, a mullet in either instance, whose value is ironically computed in terms of its worth to a *captator* as a present for some influential woman. Trebius' "great friend," like Domitian and Crispinus and the nameless patron in One, will devour the extravagant treat without sharing it. Moreover, just as the patron of Satire One is served—besides seafood (135)—an entire boar, so is Virro (5.116); Trebius, on the other hand, eats cabbage (5.87), and so do the *irati amici* of the program poem (1.134).

When he first mentions Virro's mullet, Juvenal calls it the "master's" fish (*mullus . . . domini*: 92). The epithet *dominus* had been a favorite of Domitian's, of course, and the satirist applies it to him twice in Satire Four, once in a comment about his fish (*piscem | . . . elapsum veterem ad dominum debere reverti*: 50-52), and again in describing the emperor's savage abuse of his *amici* (*mors tam saeva . . . | et domini gladiis tam festinata*: 95 f.). Virro likewise is master to both fish and friends: Juvenal titles him *dominus* again at 71, 81, 137, and 147. And, like the gluttonous Domitian of 4.28 f. (*qualis tunc epulas ipsum glutisse putamus | induperatorem*) and the selfish patron of 1.136 (*vacuis . . . toris tantum ipse iacebit*), Virro is five times referred to with the lordly *ipse* (30, 37, 56, 86, 114). When Virro is dubbed *rex* (14, 130, 137, 161), we are once more reminded both of the greedy patron-king of the program (*optima silvarum interea pelagique vorabit | rex horum*: 1.135 f.) and of Domitian, whom Juvenal had compared with Tarquinius Superbus (4.103) and sardonically labeled *induperator* (29), *Caesar* (51, 135), *Atrides* (65), and *dux magnus* (145). The intent of these several correspondences should be obvious: Virro (like Crispinus) is a reflection of *der Führer*. Both *patroni* are cruel, voracious tyrants who take sadistic pleasure in sneering at and intimidating their "friends." And all three men, Virro, Domitian, and Crispinus, are prefigured by the vile potentate of Satire One, whose malicious perversion of friendship was specifically designed to foreshadow the *magna amicitia* of Four and Five.

What could otherwise have been a wholly apolitical satire, is intentionally politicized—and thus brought nearer to Four—through the parallelism of theme and setting, and this association of Virro with Domitian. Political comment is interjected in other ways. At the outset Trebius is

compared with abused palace clowns, a slur at the imperial wit (3 f.). When Juvenal describes the wine served Virro (which he refuses to share with a friend: 32), it is said to be of the vintage that Thrasea and Helvidius used to quaff when toasting the birthdays of the republican heroes, Cassius and the Bruti (32-37):³⁸ Thrasea Paetus, a friend of Juvenal's predecessor Persius, had been executed by Nero for his republican sympathies; his son-in-law Helvidius Priscus, exiled by Nero, had been executed by Vespasian; and Domitian himself had ordered the deaths of Junius Rusticus, biographer of the two men, and Helvidius' son, the younger Priscus (a satirist of sorts, possibly alluded to in Satire One).³⁹ Virro's luxuriousness is likened to the opulence of Rome's kings (56-59); and when Juvenal contrasts his stinginess toward his clients with the generosity of kinder patrons, he again selects the names of men condemned for their antimonarchical activities, Piso and Seneca (108-111).⁴⁰ In a last taunt at Roman royalty, the mushrooms offered Trebius and his fellow clients are compared to those served Claudius by Agrippina (146-148):

vilibus ancipites fungi ponentur amicis,
boletus domino, sed quales Claudius edit
ante illum uxoris, post quem nihil amplius edit.

A political undercurrent flows throughout the satire, linking the degeneracy of Rome's social institutions, the patronage system in particular, with the degeneracy of her emperors.

The epilogues of Four and Five are also similar. While in the concluding line of each poem there is a final thrust at the odious lord (*Lamiarum caede madenti*, 4.154; *tali . . . amico*, 5.173), his compliant friends are rebuked as well. In Four, as we have seen, Juvenal condemns Domitian's councillors and the aristocracy in general for submitting to his reign of terror. Here

³⁸ Audiences might think not only of the conspirators M. and D. Junius Brutus, but also of L. Brutus, Tarquin's nemesis, to whom Juvenal had earlier alluded in a gibe at Domitian (4.102 f.).

³⁹ For Thrasea, see *PIR*² C 1187; for the Helvidii, *PIR*² H 59-60; our principal sources are Tac. *Ann.* 16.21-35 and Suet. *Dom.* 10. The Helvidii were from the Samnite town of Cluviae, and it has been suggested that the younger Priscus is the *Cluuienus* (or *Cluvianus*) of Satire One: see L. A. MacKay, "Notes on Juvenal," *CPh* 53 (1958), 236-240, and my "Juvenal 1.80." Cossutianus Capito had compared Thrasea to Cassius and the Bruti in an accusatory speech to Nero; Juvenal may have this speech, or Tacitus' account of it (*Ann.* 16.22), in mind here.

⁴⁰ The two Neronian suicides appear together again as men of unexampled generosity in Mart. 12.36.8. With them Juvenal also names a Cotta, probably the same as the patron of 7.95, and perhaps to be identified with M. Aurelius Cotta Maximus, son of Messala Corvinus and younger friend of Ovid (*Pont.* 1.5 and 9, 2.3 and 8).

in Five the satirist reproaches Trebius for shamelessly enduring Virro's tyranny (170-173):

ille sapit, qui te sic utitur. omnia ferre 170
 si potes, et debes. pulsandum vertice raso
 praebebis quandoque caput nec dura timebis
 flagra pati, his epulis et tali dignus amico.

Just as Rome herself was envisioned in the earlier poem as a slave to the "bald Nero" (*calvo serviret Roma Neroni*: 4.38), so here Trebius plays the willing *servus* to Virro's *dominus*. The *amici* in both poems, because of their servility, are no less guilty than their masters. The two epilogues even perform a comparable structural function. In the same way that Domitian's bloody feast, at the end of Four, evokes the more literal gluttony of the *monstrum* Crispinus at the beginning, Juvenal's cold stricture against Trebius, in the closing lines of Five, is carefully designed to recall his opening criticism: in both prologue and epilogue Trebius is pictured as a slave, and the emphatic condition *omnia ferre | si potes* in 170 f. (with *pati*, 173) is a shrill echo of *si potes illa pati*, in verse 3.⁴¹

Thus in their form, characterizations, and setting Satires Four and Five are markedly alike; in both *magna amicitia* is the dominant theme. Virro, with Trebius and the other *amici* gathered at his dinner table, are intended to mirror Domitian, with Crispinus and his fellow *amici* gathered about the conference table. The correspondences constitute far more than artistic nicety. Juvenal unquestionably meant to suggest that corruption had insinuated itself into every stratum of Roman society. In modelling Virro after Domitian he may further have wished to imply that a leader sets the moral tone, not only for his own close associates, but for the citizenry at large, ultimately influencing, for better or for worse, men of every station.

There can be little doubt that Juvenal published his sixteen satires, not individually, but in five separate volumes.⁴² Moreover, as modern scholarship has become increasingly aware, the poet was quite naturally

⁴¹ Juvenal underscores the reproof in both 3 and 171 through his use of short, choppy words, the repeated dentals and labials, and through the clash of ictus and accent in 171, with the caesura at full stop in the center of three spondees. Cf. Highet, 263 n. 4, who also observes that "*quis enim tam nudus?* (163) recalls lines 6-11." Thus the arrangement of the opening eleven lines and the closing eleven lines is to an extent chiasmic, another feature of the poem's structure paralleling Four. For comparable structural parallelism in the *Sermones*, see van Rooy, esp. 41-56, and David Armstrong, "Horace, Satires I, 1-3: A Structural Study," *Arion* 3 (1964), 86-96.

⁴² Note Juvenal's own words, *nostris farrago libelli* (1.86); the five books as we have them from about 500 mss. are certainly arranged in chronological order (cf. Highet, 10-16, 45); early references to the Satires include book numbers (Highet, 192; J. D. Duff, ed. [Cambridge, 1925], xv).

concerned with the formal and thematic integrity of each volume as a published unit. Each of Juvenal's books open with a program poem, written or at least revised last, which looks forward to material that will be developed in the following satires.⁴³ This is especially true of Book One, a carefully organized, finely balanced whole, whose construction reveals the author's extensive rhetorical training. The first satire is broadly, sometimes minutely programmatic, introducing not only themes, but even techniques, and some of the specific characters and situations to be employed later in the book. The remaining four poems have been edited and arranged, not chronologically, but in accordance with thematic and structural aims.

While there are important ancillary topics, such as avarice and hypocrisy, it is the predominant theme of corrupted *amicitia* and the general disintegration of personal relationships that contributes most to the book's unity. "Juvenal's programme-satire hinges round the caricature of a patron-client relationship," as Green has remarked (page 30), and indeed most of the *amici* of Book One are clients and patrons. The friendship theme was first introduced early in Satire One with the appearance of the treacherous *magni delator amici*, and then brought up again toward the end of the same poem, in the more detailed scenario of the greedy *patronus* and his angry dependents. The Second Satire, concerned primarily with sexual degeneracy, touches upon another perversion of *amicitia*.

In Satire Three the character who so bitterly denounces Rome is himself a rejected dependent. Is Umbricius the lone true friend of Book One, Juvenal's "old comrade"? Or, when interpreted in light of the book's other four poems, should this *vetus amicus* be seen only as another aging client, prefigured by the anonymous *veteres lassique clientes* of the program satire, and himself anticipating Trebius, the more openly criticized *vetus cliens* of Five? It may not be, as Highet supposes, that the client-friends of this book, sympathetic in the earlier satires, become suddenly "disgusting" in the closing poem, but rather that Juvenal's own position, through a favorite device of Roman satire, is only very gradually revealed.⁴⁴ As the

⁴³ The exception is Book Two, with its single, long Satire Six. See William S. Anderson, "The Programs of Juvenal's Later Books," *CPh* 57 (1962), 145-160, esp. 145: "the initial satire in every book, while less obviously than Satire 1, serves a programmatic purpose in its particular book." Regarding the unity of each volume, Highet comments (45), "when Juvenal published a book of them he designed it as a group, knowing what was in it and what collective effect it would produce."

⁴⁴ Highet (85) is "sorry" for the "middle-class parasites" of Satire One and shares "their wry humiliations" in Three. But Juvenal certainly did not mean us to sympathize with the *magni delator amici* of 1.33 nor his counterpart in 3.116 (*occidit . . . delator amicum*),

poet's "friend" in a satiric dialogue, Umbricius calls to mind methods employed in *Sermones* Two, and in particular the ironic friendship of Horace and Catus; and while, as an abused client, Umbricius invites comparison with Trebius, he is not coincidentally a close match for Virro's other dependent, Naevolus, the discarded homosexual companion in Juvenal's later, more Horatian dialogue, Satire Nine. Whether or not we are to feel as little sympathy for Umbricius as we do for Naevolus, Satire Three's other *amici* all continue the pessimism of the preceding poems.

Set at the end of the *libellus*, equal in length to Satires One and Two, and following the central, more comprehensive Third Satire, Four and Five together neatly balance the collection. In juxtaposing the two poems he had made so alike structurally and thematically, Juvenal intended to draw attention to their affinity, and thus develop to completion an idea that had been introduced in the program poem and given increasingly sharper focus. Both poems respond directly, and at times in detail, to the *amicitia* passages of Satire One. Four takes up especially the theme of dangerous friendships and extends the *nobilitas comesa* metaphor. Five not only mirrors the preceding poem, but—most appropriately, since it concludes the book—it develops notions implicit in the patron-client scene at the conclusion of the program satire. Perverts and princes, the old nobility and the nouveaux riches, and even—the Fifth Satire would emphasize—the poor and the dependent, all are equally to blame for the social corruption in Rome and the dissolution of traditionally sacred bonds. Gilbert Highet calls Satire Five "the climax of the entire book."⁴⁵ It is indeed, both in the sense that Highet proposes, and in the fact that it at once fully clarifies and confirms the book's dominant theme. *Magna amicitia*, in every sense and at every level of society, is extinct.

University of Georgia

both of whom are client-friends; and, once we consider the book as a whole, we need to reassess our sympathy for the dinner-grubbing *irati amici*, and all the other *veteres clientes* and *amici* of One and Three.

⁴⁵ Highet (85) sees the Fifth Satire as climactic in its final revelation of the character of the Roman upper class; but it is equally true that Juvenal's attitude toward the client class, increasingly direct, is here most completely revealed.