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. 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. “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; amico (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, 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.

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
votaque 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, “Cluviae-nus,” *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 *onomastikonondein*. 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: *Cluvianus,*” *RPh* 50 (1976), 79-84.
rex horum vacuisse 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 ponit apros, animal propter convivia natum! poena tamen praesens, cum tu deonis amicus turgidus et crudum pavonem in balnea portas. hinc subitae mortes atque intestata senectus. it nova nec tristis per cunctas fabula cenas; 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. 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). Amicus 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. As William Anderson has remarked, the “epigrammatic statement [of 146] punctuates this section decisively.”

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.

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.):

\[
\text{quae causa officii? "quid quaecis? nubit amicus}
\text{nec multos adhibet."} \hspace{1cm} 135
\]

"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):

\[
\text{quamvis digressu veteris confusus amici}
\text{laudo tamen, vacuis quod sedem figere Cumis}
\text{destinet atque unum civem donare Sibyllae.}
\]

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 sleeper 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. 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.

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).

9 Umbricius complains, "Non possum ferre, Quirites, | Graecam urbem" (60 f.), and late 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 Marciius 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:

ebrious ac petulans, qui nullum forte cecidit,
dat poenas, nocem 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):

\[\text{... numquam partitur amicum,} \\
\text{solus habet. nam cum facilem stillavit in aurem} \\
\text{exiguum de naturae patriaeque veneno,} \\
\text{limine summmoveor, perierunt tempora longi} \\
\text{servitii; nusquam minor est iactura clientis.}\] 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 Catius 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."\(^{14}\) Catius, "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 Catius' friendship (88 f.):

\[\text{docte Cati, per amicitiam divosque rogatus,} \\
\text{ducere me auditum, perges quocumque, memento.}\]

Introduced by the satirist near the beginning of the poem, given the pulpit and allowed to dominate the satiric dialogue,\(^ {16}\) friend Catius proceeds to expose himself and his *praeceta 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.\(^ {17}\)


\(^{15}\) Catius 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 Cumea and Avemus: "*Per iter tenbrociosum*: 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 *umbraequs* 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 *propositem of abandoning Rome for the idyllic seclusion of Cumea. 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 Naccolus' name, "Master Wart" (perhaps borrowed from Martial 3.71 and 95), suits his ugly disposition.

\(^{16}\) Catius 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. Wieson 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. 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 unalike: 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). 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 Juvenal satirical 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-Umbrician aspect of Juvenal Three, and none have sufficiently discussed the matter: see Mason, 126, 135; Anderson, “Lascivio vs. ira: Martial and Juvenal,” CSCA 3 (1970), 29; and S. C. Fredericks, “Daedalus in Juvenal’s Third Satire,” CB 49 (1972), 11–13, esp. 13: “Umbricius’ 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, Umbricius 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 Umbricius to the unsympathetic Trebius.


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
praecipuum in tabulis ceram senis abstulit orbi;
est ratio ulterior, magnae si misit amicae,
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 Highet 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):

\[ \text{ergo in consilium proceres, quos oderat ille,} \\
\text{in quorum facie miserae magnaque sedebat} \\
\text{pallor amicitiae.} \]

Once more we are reminded of the “great friendships” of One and Three; and we may even recall the \textit{magna amica} of 4.20, and thus see the theme of perverted \textit{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


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

\[ \ldots quid violentissimae tuus tyrannus, \\
\text{cum quo de plueviis aut aestibus aut nimboso} \\
\text{vere locuturi fatum pendebat amici?} \]

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, 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):

\[
\text{atque utinam his potius nugas tota illa dedisset} \quad 150 \\
\text{tempora saevitiae, claras quibus abstitit urbi} \\
\text{inlustresque animas inpune et vindice nullo.} \\
\text{sed perit postquam Cerdonibus esse timendus} \\
\text{cooperat: hoc nocuit Lamiarum caede madenti.} \\
\]

*Cerdonibus* in 153, rightly construed by Mayor and Knoche as a cognomen (rather than a common noun), is used as a generic plural. 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., *quaes | turpis Cerdoni Volesos Bruttumque decebunt,* with which cf. 4.13 f., *nam, quod turpe bonis Titio Seiioque, decebat | Grispinum.* In both Four and Eight *Cerdo* is a type-name (like *Titius* and *Seiius*) for the lower classes, in contrast to the Lamiæ, the Volesi, and the Bruti, despite those who persist in reading *cerdo* as a common noun (including Highet, 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 Marchen, the carnivorous, bloodsucking death-demons who victimized poor innocents asleep in their

25 Suet. Dom. 17 numbers among the actual assassins Stephanus Domitillae procurator, Clodianus cornicularius, Maximus Partheni libertus, Satur decuria 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 genus decorum). For Domitian's abuse of Lamia Aelianus (PIR² A205), see Suet. Dom. 1 and 10, where the man's death is connected with the executions of Thrasea Paetus and Aelius Glabrio (the councillor of Juvenal 4.95), and with the exile of Helvidius Priscus (on Paetus and Priscus, see below, n. 39).
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. 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). As readers have seen with increasing clarity, Crispinus and Domitian reflect one another; 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 comedit patrimoniam, 1.34 and 1.38. 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 cannibalistic 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 V 41), consul with Domitian in 73. For his actual blindness see Pliny Ep. 4.22.5 f.; but basia (118) and qui nunc quam visae flagrabit 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.

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." 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). In each case the term is equivalent to either *clientes* 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. 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 Sarmentus (whom Plutarch similarly labels *δηλικία*). 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*. "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 Sarmentus (*PIR¹* St 144) is almost certainly the *scurrus* named in Hor. *Serm.* 1.5.51–70; once the property of Maecenas, Plutarch says of him, ὁ δὲ Σάρμεντος ἡν τῶν Καλάσαρος παιγνίων παιδίων, ἐ τῆς ἰδικία Ῥωμαίω καλόδαυν (Ant. 59: 32 b.c.). Quintilian mentions both Sarmentus and Gabba (*PIR²* G1) as wits (6.3.58; 62). The two Augustan buffoons are a proper match for Trebius, who provides the *comedia* (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, *Sermo's, 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 ff.,

\[ \text{mullus erit domini . . .} \]
\[ \text{instruct ergo focum provincia, sumitur illinc} \]
\[ \text{quod captator emat Laenas, Aurelia vendat}^{37} \]

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: surgitum), 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 vitorum 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 Hight, 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 (968) also compares the two mullet passages.
with 4.15; 18-21,

mullum sex milibus emit

.................................

consilium laudo artificis, si munere tanto
praecipuam in tabulis ceram senis abstulit orbi;
est ratio ulterior, magnae si misit amicae,

quae vehit 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 etdulas 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 toasted 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):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vilibus ancipites fungi ponentur amicis,} \\
\text{boletus domino, sed quales Claudius edit} \\
\text{ante illum uxoris, post quem nihil amplius edit.}
\end{align*}
\]

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 PIR² C 187; for the Helvidii, PIR² H 59–60; our principal sources are Tac. Ann. 16.21–35 and Suet. Dom. 10. The Helvidii were from the Samnite town of Cluvia, and it has been suggested that the younger Priscus is the Cluvienus (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):

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

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 iictus 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 chiastic, 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, nostri 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 Hight 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, Hight 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 Hight (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 or 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 Catius; 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." 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.
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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.