UMBRICIUS AND JUVENAL THREE

Given its magnitude and central position, and especially its structural integrity and thematic comprehensiveness, one must assume that Juvenal considered Satire Three the most important poem of his first book.[1] The piece is unique among all the sixteen Satires in other ways less often commented upon. Nowhere else does Juvenal identify himself as the speaker in a particular passage, while at the same time carefully distinguishing himself, Juvenal the satirist, from the *persona* that is dominant throughout the remainder of the satire. And Three is the only one of the Satires in which more than ninety per cent of the lines are spoken by a named character.[2] Audience attention is immediately and purposefully drawn toward this figure, whom Juvenal in the prologue's opening verse labels an *amicus vetus*. The poet briefly suggests his personal reaction to the character's destined withdrawal from Rome (1—9), and then, dramatically establishing the proper setting for a last farewell (10—20), he finally introduces the *amicus* by name: *hic tunc Umbricius. . .* (21).

---

[1] Three is the longest of the five poems in Book One, and with its 322 lines is approximately equivalent to Satires One and Two combined (341 lines) and to Four and Five combined (327 lines); there seems little doubt that the balance was intentional. Some of the poem's thematic and structural features are discussed below. I am indebted to my wife, Laura, for her patience, to my friend and colleague, Joseph Gibaldi, for reading a draft of this paper and offering several valuable suggestions (whatever infelicities remain are the result of my own obstinacy), and to William Nethercut, for his constant encouragement.

[2] Umbricius delivers 302 of the 322 lines (93.8%); he is set apart from Juvenal by being named (21), by the poet's dramatic introduction (1—21), by his own language and character (as developed throughout 21—322, and to be discussed below), and by his parting words to Juvenal, addressed as author of the *Saturae* (321f). Elsewhere in the Satires even the nameless *persona* must properly be distinguished from the poet's own character, as in Six, for example. A closer analogy is Satire Nine, where the dominant speaker, Naevolus, is again clearly distinct from Juvenal. Nine is ordinarily called Juvenal's only dialogue, but broadly speaking, and by comparison with the second book of Horace's *Sermones*, Three also qualifies as dialogue. As Herbert Musurillo has observed (*Symbol and Myth in Ancient Poetry* [New York: 1961] 170), „In his third satire . . . Juvenal retains a relic of the ancient dialogue form of the *satura*. . . ." This and other characteristics shared by Three with Nine, and to a lesser degree with Six, are examined toward the end of this paper.

The Satires are, of course, replete with personal names and allusions.[3] Juvenal's characters are usually historical figures, although some are almost certainly fictional and others are simply unknown. Of the real persons who are named, some were perhaps still living when Juvenal wrote and published, particularly where the reference is flattering or at least not conspicuously antagonistic; most, however, were drawn from the past. The names are sometimes used topically, sometimes proverbially. Juvenal often chose a name, especially in the case of an invented character, for its aural or metrical qualities, or its literary or etymological connotations. The prosopography of the Satires is a complex matter, and many questions necessarily remain unanswered. This latter circumstance is unfortunate, since wherever Juvenal's reasons for the selection of a particular name are recognized, one can see that they were generally quite deliberate and meaningful. Accordingly, the proper evaluation of a phrase, a line, a passage, or even an entire poem, may depend upon the audience's understanding of a personal name and the character represented by it.

While Juvenal's characters often seem hardly more than names, mute and briefly mentioned, some are permitted to dominate. This is the case in the third, fourth, and fifth satires of Book One. The part of Domitian and his councillors is central to Satire Four: how hopelessly confused and inadequate would our interpretation of this little tragicomedy be in the absence of external historical accounts of these very real players and the events in which they were involved.[4] Trebius and Virro, on the other hand, guest and host in Satire Five, can not be certainly identified and may be fictional.[5] Nonetheless, a reasonable as-

[3] The first book alone is populated by more than 150 different persons and families, who are either named or specifically alluded to; of these about two-thirds are more or less certainly identifiable with known, historical figures (for details see my unpublished Duke University dissertation, „A Prosopographical Commentary on Juvenal, Book One", Durham, N. C.: 1973). Although fifteen or twenty of these real persons may have been living when the book was published, none can be proven to have been alive after A. D. 104, and most of them probably were dead: this category, in any case, includes only individuals who were either 1) not named maliciously, 2) merely alluded to (i.e., not named at all), or 3) politically impotent by reason of low social status, exile, or the decline of their influence following the assassination of Domitian. Thus Juvenal seems essentially to have adhered to his statement of intent in 1.170f. Of the remaining eighty or so known characters, a majority (roughly two-thirds) are introduced as exempla or types and employed in a proverbial rather than a topical sense. Regarding the approximately fifty „unkowns" there is of course considerable uncertainty. Most were probably real persons; several of the names seem to have been selected, or invented, as etymological puns; few can properly be regarded as entirely casual fictions („John Does": perhaps only Sextus, 2.21, and Titius and Seius, 4.13).

[4] A good deal of study has been devoted to Juvenal Four and the „Fish Councillors": a useful article published recently is John G. Griffith „Juvenal, Statius and the Flavian Establishment", *G and R* 2nd ser. 16 (1969) 134—50.

[5] The commentators have generally assumed that Virro, Trebius, and Mygale, the latter's wife, are fictional characters. *Virro* appears later in Nine, again for a niggardly patron, who there exhibits his homosexual inclinations. Syme has connected him with the *gens Vibidia*, „Personal Names in Annals I—VI", *JRS* 39 (1949) 17; but the name may rather (or additionally) be a pun on *vir*, „Mr. Manly Bigman",

sessment of the poem's meaning requires that one at least attempt to understand the nature of these two characters and the relationship so inseparably binding them to one another.

Likewise it should be difficult for even the most casual reader to proceed far into Satire Three without becoming curious over the identity of Umbricius. Is he a historical figure? If so, what is known of his actual relationship with Juvenal? Or was he another of the satirist's many fictional characters? And in that case, what factors infuenced Juvenal's selection of the name *Umbricius*? Finally, whether fictional or historical, what reaction was the character intended to provioke in Juvenal's audience? In responding to these queries, one would not of course expect the critical reader, familiar with the Roman satiric tradition and the irony peculiar to Juvenal's method in characterization and caricature, to restrict his investigation of the Umbricius character to line 1 and the tag *vetus amicus*. Yet most commentators have been content to do just that, offering only the perfunctory observation that Umbricius was Juvenal's „dear old friend". Among those scholars who have inquired more rigorously into Umbricius' identity, there still remains a general failure of consensus.

I.

Proceeding on the assumption that Juvenal's Umbricius actually existed, a few scholars have directed their attention to the literary and epigraphic resources at their disposal with the purpose of ascertaining his identity. The investigation, however, was not always thorough, and some of the conclusions advanced by turn-of-the century commentators in the absence of the more complete and accessible materials available to modern research need to be reconsidered.

The search for a historical Umbricius ought to begin with the name itself, and a complete survey of the *gens Umbricia*. The form, a *nomen gentilicium* attested as early as the second century B. C. and common during the principate, is related to the nomina *Umbrius*, *Umbrenus*, and *Umbrilius*, and to the cognomina *Umber*, *Umbrianus*, and *Umbrinus*.[6] Although an ordinary degree of cross-derivation doubt-

ironically appropriate for the homosexual *patronus*. Mygale, „Ms. Mouse" (μυγαλῆ) is unknown, but the name properly suggests a woman of the lower classes. Peter Green has casually suggested that Trebius may be Trebius Sergianus, cos. A. D. 132 (*PIR*[1]T244, *RE* „Trebius" no. 7), p. 124, n. 1, of his Penguin translation, *Juvenal: The Sixteen Satires* (Baltimore: 1967): „it is pleasant to think that this might conceivably be the same man, and that Fortune, after his early humiliations, smiled on him in his later years." Employing such criteria Green might also have mentioned C. Trebius Maximus, cos. 122 (*CIL* 16.81 and 169), or L. Trebius Germanus, cos. suff. probably under Hadrian (*PIR*[1]T241, *RE* „Trebius" no. 3). However none of these identifications can be confidently accepted, and it may be that all three principals in Satire Five are products of Juvenal's imagination.

[6] Among the earliest epigraphic sources for the name are *CIL* 1.1910 (=9.5170, Q VMBRICIVS Q, from Truentum in Picenum: Münzer, *RE* „Umbricius" no. 2, labels him „quaestor", but as the inscription seems to have broken off immediately after the second „Q", the abbreviation might have denoted filiation rather than a

less took place (so that, for example, *Umbrianus* and *Umbricius* may in some instances have derived immediately from *Umbrius*), the entire family of names seems initially to have been ethnic, denoting Umbrian origin.[7] *Umbricius* itself appears more than one hundred times in inscriptions scattered through Italy and the provinces, although it is rare in South Italy and Campania (the destination of Juvenal's character) and occurs most often in Etruria and Rome.[8]

Despite the frequency of the name, the family was hardly distinguished by Roman standards: the Umbricii were of no political importance in the republican age,[9] and of very little more by Juvenal's time. Of the four men catalogued in Pauly-Wissowa and the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, only one, Umbricius Melior, has attracted the attention of scholars dealing with Juvenal Three.[10] Melior, author of a treatise *de Etrusca disciplina* and himself probably an Etruscan, is described by the elder Pliny as *haruspicum in nostro aevo peritissimus*; Tacitus and Plutarch report that he forewarned Galba of imminent

---

magistracy), and 2236 and 2245 (M. Umbricius M. f., Magister Mercurii Apollinis Neptuni, Delos, late second century B. C.: see *RE* no. 1 and cf. Dessau's notes on *ILS* 9237); cf. *CIL* 1.1991 (*ILS* 3217, Falerii: . . .MPRICIVS C F, in a dedication to Apollo).

[7] This conclusion, likely enough in itself, gains additional support from the distribution of the names among extant inscriptions: see I. Kajanto *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki: 1965) esp. 49f and 188, also 159, 163. *Umbricius* is especially frequent in inscriptions from adjacent Etruria (see n. 8), and the name is considered Etruscan by K. O. Müller and W. Deecke *Die Etrusker* (Stuttgart: 1877, repr. 1965) 494, W. Schulze *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin: 1904) 245, 258, 518, 523, and most recently by Mauriz Schuster *RE* „Umbricius" no. 3 (1961). Cf. also the adj. *Umbricus* („Umbrian") in Grattius Faliscus 194 (Duff) and elsewhere (see Lewis and Short).

[8] The name appears more than two dozen times in *CIL* 6 (Rome): see M. Bang's *index nominum* to this volume, and esp. 29414-29423; the majority of these inscriptions are funerary. In *CIL* 11 *Umbricius* is found over a dozen times (chiefly in Etruria—twice each in Aemilia and Umbria), as well as about thirty times on Arretine vase fragments (see esp. 6700.791-820, and, for *vasa Arretina* found in Rome, *CIL* 15.5768-86): as in Rome, many of the cognomina suggest servile origin. Elsewhere instances of the name are less numerous, particularly in South Italy, except at Pompeii, where I count it thirty times, nearly all for a family engaged in the commercial manufacture of *garum* and *liquamen* (e. g., *CIL* 4.5670—76, 5700ff: perhaps freedmen of A. Umbricius A. f. Scaurus, duumvir at Pompeii, *CIL* 10.1024).

[9] None appears in Broughton's *Magistrates*; cf. *RE* „Umbricius" nos. 1 and 2 (above, n. 6).

[10] Besides Melior (*PIR*[1]U592, *RE* „Umbricius" no. 4), Juvenal's Umbricius (*PIR*[1]U591, *RE* no. 3), and M. and Q. Umbricius (*RE* nos. 1, 2: above no. 6), there are Q. Umbricius Proculus, legate, Hispania citerior, second century (*PIR*[1] U593: *RE* suppl. 9, no. 5), and, an ancestor perhaps, Q. Umbricius Pal. Proculus (*AE* 1951 no. 181). Additionally, two ladies appear in *PIR*[1], an Umbricia who was issued a *relegatio in quinquennium* for cruelly mistreating her maidservants (U594; *RE* suppl. 9, no. 6), and Umbricia Bassa, wife of the procurator T. Aelius Antipater, second or third century (U595; *RE* suppl. 9, no. 7: cf. *CIL* 6.29418). To these I would add Οὐμβρίκιος Καπιτωλεῖνος *epistrat. Thebaid.*, A.D. 133 (*Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten* 6, no. 9312 [Wiesbaden: 1963]; cf H. Pflaum *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres*, p. 1091 [Paris: 1961]): the man's probable age and position prohibit identification with our Umbricius.

disaster in A. D. 69.[11] While several early commentators were tempted to identify Juvenal's Umbricius with this haruspex,[12] most have concurred with Müller in flatly rejecting the idea, principally on the basis of Umbricius' own statement in Juvenal 3. 44f: *ranarum viscera numquam / / inspexi.*[13] Umbricius' denial must disallow the identification, I agree. Yet it seems very likely that Juvenal did have Melior in mind, if not when first selecting the name for his character, at least in connection with a joking allusion at 44f, by which the speaker himself may be suggesting, „I am certainly not *that* sort of Umbricius — the kind who can make a name for himself inspecting innards."[14]

In 1849 Otto Keller argued that the *vetus amicus* of Juvenal Three was one A. Umbricius Magnus; Friedländer, Schuster, and most recently Green have found the conjecture enticing.[15] However, the funerary inscription which is our sole evidence for Magnus is scarcely illuminating (*CIL* 10. 3142):

D . M
VMBRICIAE . AFILIAE
IVSTAE . VIXIT . AN XV
MENS . VII . DIES . DECE
A . VMBRICIVS . MAGNVS
ET . CLODIA . FELICITAS . PA
RENTES . FILIAE . INCOMPARAB
QVOD . FIA . PARENTIBVS FACERE
DEBVIT MORS . INTERCESSIT
FILIAE FECERVNT . PARENTES

In fact, the only support for Keller's thesis is that the inscription was discovered at Puteoli, near Cumae, Umbricius' announced destination (Juvenal 3. 2, 321), an area where the name is infrequent. But two A. Umbricii Lupi (father and son) are also known from Puteoli, and they as well as Magnus are more probably related to that established family

[11] Plin. *NH* 10.7.19, and cf. 1.10f; Tac. *Hist.* 1.27; Plut. *Galb.* 24.2f. This testimony lends some support to the view that *Umbricius* is an Etruscan name (above, n. 7). One C. Umbricius Melior appears in an inscription from Rome (*CIL* 6.37791): if not the haruspex himself, this is perhaps a relative or a freedman from his family.

[12] So William Gifford (trans., London: 1802), G. A. Ruperti (ed., Leipzig: 1820), *et. al.*; most recently Green (above, n. 5) admits the possibility in his note on 3.21.

[13] Müller-Deecke (above, n. 7) p. 13 n. 49 and p. 34; cf. C.F. Hermann *Spicilegium Annotationum ad Juvenalis Satiram III* (Marburg: 1839) 15—17; Fran. Strauch *De personis Iuvenalianis* (Göttingen: 1869) 60. *Ranarum viscera* seems almost certainly a reference to haruspicy, although it has been suggested that Juvenal was thinking of poisonings or magic: cf. Hermann p. 15 and the notes of J. D. Duff (ed., Cambridge: 1925), H. L. Wilson (ed., New York: 1903), and Green, *ad loc.*

[14] Cf. B. Baldwin, „Three Characters in Juvenal", *CW* 66 (1972) 101.

[15] Keller, „Zu Juvenalis", *NJbb* 149 (1894) 48; L. Friedländer (ed., Leipig: 1895) *ad loc*; Schuster (above, n. 7); Green (above, n. 5) *ad loc.*; cf. Gilbert Highet *Juvenal the Satirist* (Oxford: 1954) 253 n. 7.

of Umbricii residing in nearby Pompeii, among whom the praenomen *Aulus* was especially common.[16]

Thus, none of the Umbricii presently known to us may be confidently identified with Juvenal's Roman emigrant. And if *Umbricius* is a pseudonym for some historical figure, we are likewise without evidence of his true identity.[17] Of those persons known to us who bore a related name such as *Umbrius* or *Umbrenus*, not one represents a feasible candidate.[18] Although Juvenal could have used the name *Umbricius* to hint that his character (or the character's family) hailed from Umbria,[19] no well-known Umbrian seems to have been our man; furthermore, Umbricius himself claims to have been raised, if not born, in the city of Rome (84f).[20] Gilbert Highet has already rejected on adequate grounds the suggestion that Umbricius might have been a disguise for the epigrammatist Martial.[21] In short, on the basis of evidence presently available, nothing at all positive can be said of Umbricius' identity.

II.

It may very well be a mistake, however, to insist that Juvenal ever meant Umbricius to represent a specific individual. Unqestionably, some of Juvenal's characters are fictional,[22] including perhaps even the

[16] In fact *Aulus* is the only praenomen attested for this family among the extant inscriptions; for the frequency of *Umbricius* in the epigraphic remains at Pompeii (*CIL* 4 and 10), see above, n. 8. It is difficult to see why Keller and subsequent commentators have ignored the Pompeiian Umbricii and especially the family of Umbricius Lupus at Puteoli (*CIL* 10.3141: D.M / A.VMBRICI / LVPO.QVI / VIX.ANN.XX / DIEB.X.L.VI.SA / LLVSTIA RESTV / TA.ET.LVPVS.FILIO / B M FEC).

[17] For the use of pseudonyms or „cover-names" in the Satires, see Highet (above, n. 15) 290 f, and B. Baldwin, „Cover-names and Dead Victims in Juvenal", *Athenaeum* 45 (1967) 304—12. While the case for pseudonyms in the Satires resists proof, one can hardly deny the possibility that Juvenal sometimes employed this technique, which was well-known among Latin poets (especially the elegists); but I think that Professor Highet too far exceeds the limits of our evidence in applying his theory to particular characters.

[18] With the remotely possible exception of Umber, Martial's *poeta malus*, discussed below.

[19] As *Cluvienus* or *Cluvianus* (the more likely form) at 1.80 probably refers to Helvidius Priscus the Younger, whose father moved to Rome from Cluviae: so L. A. MacKay, „Notes on Juvenal", *CPh* 53 (1958) 236—40; and cf. L. Herrmann, „Cluviaenus", *Latomus* 25 (1966) 258—64; Baldwin (above, n. 14) 103f; and my „Juvenal 1.80: *Cluvianus*?", *RPh* 60 (1976) 79—84.

[20] *. . .nostra infantia caelum / hausit Aventini baca nutrita Sabina. Nutritus* will admit either meaning, „born" or „raised"; against Duff's note on 3.117 (above n. 13: he considers the latter sense unnatural) is Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.41: *Romae nutriri mihi contigit.* Juvenal may even echo this line from Horace (unconsciously?) in 84f, as there are several reminiscences of *Ep.* 2.2 elsewhere in Satire Three.

[21] Highet (above, n. 15) 253 no. 6; cf. Baldwin (above, n. 14) 101.

[22] Though just how many is, of course, open to dispute: see n. 3. Friedländer, in his chapter „Über die Personennamen bei Juvenal" (p. 99—106 of the intro. to his ed., cited above, no. 15: or see J. R. C. Martyn, transl., *Friedländer's Essays on Juvenal* [Amsterdam: 1969] 63—68), argued that nearly all the characters named

addressees of his later satires and Naevolus, Umbricius' counterpart as chief participant in the dialogue of Satire Nine.[23] Yet even in the case of invented characters, the names are rarely selected so casually as to be mere equivalents of „John Doe". If Umbricius is only an invention, some sort of type-character, one still ought to inquire into the poet's choice of that particular name from the thousands available to him. Countless others might fit the meter as neatly as *Umbricius*, and in the single line where it occurs (21) aural quality can hardly have been a determining factor. The one chance remains that Juvenal may have selected *Umbricius* for its etymological, or pseudo-etymological, connotations. Although Juvenal's use of significant names is not always recognized and still requires systematic treatment, the technique was by no means foreign either to the satirist himself or to his audience.[24] The possibility that Juvenal had in mind one of the several connotations

---

in the Satires were real; cf. Wilson, p. xxiif of his intro. (ed. cited above, n. 13): „On the whole, it seems likely that those names which cannot be connected with persons known to history are, at least in many instances, purely fictitious and were taken at random to represent certain more or less clearly defined types." Wilson sees *Matho*, for example, in 1.32, 7.129, and 11.34, as a name used for three different fictional persons or types (Friedländer had argued that a single historical individual was meant); but, characteristically, he tells the reader nothing else about the name or Juvenal's possible motives for selecting it.

[23] None of these addressees has been certainly identified, and there is a consensus amon the commentators that they are fictitious and included only for conventional purposes: so even Duff (above, n. 13: p. xxiii), who in general agrees with Friedländer that nearly all Juvenal's characters are real; cf. Lewis, on 3.1 (ed., London: 1873), „Umbricius, like Calvinus xiii 5, and Fuscinus xiv 1, may be anybody." Naevolus may have been borrowed from Mart. 3.71 and 95, where the name is employed in similar contexts.

[24] Cf. Cora Lutz, „Any Resemblance... is Purely Coincidental", *CJ* 46 (1950) 115—20, 126, esp. 116f; Professor Lutz insisted that „Juvenal did not employ this means of identifying his characters", mistakenly advancing the „absence of comparable humorous type-names among the writers of the Flavian period" as the satirist's reason. But use of significant names was not in Latin literature „a fad... popular for a very limited time": among Flavian authors, one thinks immediately of Martial, whose work had such an indelible influence on the Satires (see Jane Marie Giegengack, „Significant Names in Martial", unpub. Yale diss. [New Haven: 1969]. esp. ch. 2—3). Greeks and Romans alike were extremely fond of etymologizing, and the very best authors catered to this taste: for Lucretius and Vergil, see the remarks of David West *The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius* (Edinburgh: 1969) 97, 132. Punning on the etymologies of personal names (and other proper nouns) was especially popular: see, for example, James N. Truesdale *A Comic Prosopographia Graeca* (Menasha, Wisconsin: 1940—publ. Duke Univ. diss.); Roman authors who engaged in such name-play include Plautus, Catullus, Horace (Niall Rudd, „The Names in Horace's Satires", *CQ* new ser. 10 [1960] 161—78, esp. 168—70), Seneca, Martial, and Petronius (Gareth Schmeling, „The Literary Use of Names in Petronius *Satyricon*", *RSC* 17 [1969] 3—8, esp. 6f). For Juvenal see Highet's comments on *Hispo* in 2.50 (above, n. 15: p. 292); Rolfe Humphries' translation (Bloomington, Indiana: 1958) luxuriates in the technique (to a greater extent, I think, than Juvenal intended). *Possible* examples from the first book of the Satires include Tigillinus (1.155), Peribomius (2.16), Varillus (2.22), Latronia (ms. variant at 2.36), Taedia (2.49), Hipso (2.50), Pollitta and Fabulla (2.68), Haemus (3.99), Chione (3.136), Corbulo (3.251), Armillatus (4.53), Cerdo (4.153), Lamia (4.154), Virro (5.39).

of the root *umbr-* in choosing the name for his Rome-fugitive needs to be carefully examined.

As pointed out earlier, there seems no reason to argue that Juvenal intended any ethnic allusion in his selection of *Umbricius*, despite the name's obvious link with the toponym *Umbria*. However, the name could also easily suggest *umbra* and related shade/shadow-words to a Roman audience typically fond of etymologizing and name-play.[25] Certainly the metaphorical sense of *umbra*, meaning „ghost" or „phantom", was known to Juvenal.[26] But extended allegory was alien to the poet and his age, so that I find it difficult to agree with the assessment of Professors Motto and Clark that Umbricius was meant to represent „the shade or *umbra*" of Golden Age Rome herself, schizophrenically withdrawing with all her glorious traditions „from the broken satiric world of corrupted men."[27] Other possibilities exist, but the most likely is to be found in the pastoral associations of *umbra*.[28]

Juvenal Three is characterized by certain unmistakable pastoral elements, as Charles Witke has demonstrated in his essay, „Satire Three: An Eclogue for the Urban Poor."[29] The poem's central motif of urban flight is, of course, itself essentially pastoral. And for one who sought refuge from Rome's anxious turmoil, the Italian countryside could be said to offer an *umbra* of leisurely retirement and seclusion. This metaphorical usage of the word „shade" (which survives even in

---

[25] Cf. Plautus' pun on *umbra* in the double sense of „shade" and „Umbrian woman", *Most.* 770. The toponym *Umbria* may itself have originated as an adjective from *umbra*, *umbria* (sc. *terra*), „the land of shade *or* shadows" (cf. Gell. 3.2.6, and see Walde-Hofmann, s. v.); *ambra* may be related to Sanskrit *andhas* („darkness"), as my colleague Prof. Jared Klein has suggested to me.

[26] See 1.9, 2.157, 7.207, 8.65, 10.258, and 13.52.

[27] „*Per iter tenebricosum*: The Mythos of Juvenal 3", *TAPA* 96 (1965) 267—76, esp. 275f; recently S.C. Fredericks is attracted to this view, in Ramage, Sigsbee, and Fredericks *Roman Satirists and Their Satire* (Park Ridge, New Jersey: 1974) 147f, though cf. below, n. 77. The strongest argument in favor of the Motto and Clark thesis is the undoubted supernatural associations of the Cumae district and the Lago d'Averno in myth and literature; but this seems to me incidental in Juvenal Three, and not enough to regard Umbricius as a Dickensian „Ghost of Roma Past".

[28] Besides *umbra* = *manes* (Lewis and Short I.B.2), cf. *umbra* = *simulacrum* (II.A: e.g. Juv. 14.109). Juvenal might conceivably have thought of *umbra* = σκιά, *parasitus*, „an uninvited guest" (I.B.3), in the sense of Hor. *Serm.* 2.8.22 (*quos Maecenas adduxerat umbras*) and *Ep.* 1.5.28 (*locus est et pluribus umbris*), which could suit Umbricius' present state of alienation from his *patronus*. Musurillo considered, then abandoned as unlikely, „a connection with *umbra* = 'shadow,' as though Umbricius were Juvenal's shadow-self" (cited above, n. 2: p. 212 n. 7); cf. Fredericks (n. 27) 147f.

[29] Pages 128—51 of his *Latin Satire: The Structure of Persuasion* (Leiden: 1970), esp. 133f, or see *Hermes* 90 (1962) 244—48. Cf. D. Joly, „Juvénal et les 'Géorgiques'", *Hommages à Jean Bayet* (Brussels: 1964) 127—96. But these pastoral yearnings are not entirely serious; there is intentional parody, designed for humorous effect as well as partially to illuminate the folly of Umbricius' program: cf. on 321f, below and n. 101.

modern English) appears frequently in Latin literature.[30] Significantly, the word appears in this general sense in a line that Juvenal has imitated elsewhere and within a poem that was unquestionably among his models for Satire Three: Horace *Epistulae* 2.2.

One division of Horace's Epistle that must have influenced Juvenal describes the endless difficulties encountered by poets attempting to ply their trade in the midst of all Rome's distractions and anxieties (verses 65—86), *inter tot curas totque labores* (66), *fluctibus in mediis et tempestatibus urbis* (85). There are considerable similarities in the accounts of specific urban evils presented by the two satirists.[31] Moreover, just as the complaints in this poem anticipate those of Umbricius in Satire Three, so too does the solution, a pastorally inspired flight from the city (*Epistulae* 2.2.77f):

> scriptorum chorus omnis amat nemus et fugit urbem,
> rite cliens Bacchi somno gaudentis et umbra.

It would be hard to deny that Juvenal knew this poem and particularly these lines. Verse 78 he imitates at 7. 105, in describing another class of litterateurs, Rome's historians: *sed genus ignavum, quod lecto gaudet et umbra.*[32]

Certainly Juvenal was familiar with this special sense of „shade", for pastoral seclusion. It is not impossible, therefore, to conclude that the satirist, thinking of this well-known connotation of *umbra* and perhaps even of Horace's Epistle, may have selected *Umbricius* as a personal name approximately equivalent to Horace's *gaudens umbra* and having the sense of the adjectives *umbraticus* and *umbratilis*, „one who delights in the shade." The name would in that sense be etymologically appropriate to Juvenal's city-shunning devotee of pastoral escape, and all the more so if Umbricius was actually designed to represent the sort of *chorus scriptorum* that Horace gently mocks, a possibility to be explored later in this paper.

III.

Many others have been attracted to the notion that Umbricius was fictional, and they have traditionally viewed the character as a Ju-

[30] Lewis and Short „umbra" II. C; and cf. esp. the adjectives *umbraticus* (Quint. 1.2.18) and *umbratilis* (Cic. *Tusc.* 2.11.27), the latter often with a negative sense.

[31] With *Ep.*2.2.73, 74, and 78f, cf., respectively, Juvenal 3.246, 256, and 232—42. To be sure, both satirists are describing the same city, and their complaints are to some extent commonplace; but the verbal parallels together with our understanding of Juvenal's close familiarity with Horace suggest that the likeness of these two poems is more than coincidental. According to the data in Paul Schwartz's index, *Ep.* 2.2 is among the five of Horace's poems most frequently imitated by Juvenal (p. 32—36 of his *De Juvenale Horatii imitatore*, diss., Halle: 1882); Highet also (above, n. 15: p. 251 n. 1) lists it among Juvenal's principal sources for this satire.

[32] So Schwartz, p. 15f. Cf. also 7.8 (*Pieria. . . in umbra*) and 173 (*rhetorica. . . ab umbra*).

venalian alter-ego. This interpretation finds its typical expression in the comments of Pearson and Strong:

> The third Satire appears by internal evidence to be a conversation in which the poet himself, designated as Umbricius and assumed to be emigating from Rome to Cumae, lectures the other Juvenal, who was still lingering in the metropolis and canvassing wealthy patrons that he might get promotion.[33]

This characteristic explanation of the satire's plan, fully amplified by Gilbert Highet's biographical approach,[34] has been most recently restated by Barry Baldwin: „There is nothing un-Juvenalian about Umbricius' diatribe, and he might have been invented simply as a dramatic variant from the satirist's own spleen in the first poem."[35]

But Umbricius *is* „un Juvenalian" in at least one obvious respect: there is no evidence, and even less probability, that Juvenal ever voluntarily undertook a permanent withdrawal from the city that provided the rich *farrago* of his Satires. Three is one of the earliest of the poems — clearly, as even Professor Highet admits, Juvenal long remained in Rome to draw material from its eternal medley of life.[36] Pearson and Strong are also constrained to allow that, „powerful as the poem is," it is the work of one who is „unconvinced" and „only points the moral that you ought to be a rich man in order to enjoy Rome."[37] It is conceivable, however, that Umbricius' invective is unconvincing *by design*. If one can sense that his speech „displays no real sympathy with country life,"[38] may it not be that Juvenal intentionally fashioned Umbricius as a vain and unreasoning creature? Can Umbricius have been meant to function as Naevolus does in Juvenal's other dialogue, Satire Nine, or as Catius does in Horace *Sermones* 2.4, both of whom are given the pulpit and permitted through their own speeches to expose themselves and their distorted rationales to the criticism and even ridicule of the satirist's audience? It seems to me less than certain that Juvenal inven-

---

[33] C. H. Pearson and H. A. Strong (ed., Oxford: 1892) 29; cf. most recently Fredericks (above, n. 27) 147f.

[34] Cited above, n. 15; see ch. 9, esp. p. 69: „the voice is clearly the voice of Juvenal". But even Highet is compelled to notice certain „details" that serve to distinguish Umbricius from Juvenal: p. 68f and 254 n. 12.

[35] Cited above, n. 14: p. 101.

[36] See Part One of his *Juvenal the Satirist* (above, n. 15) and p. 68, where Highet attributes Juvenal's invention of Umbricius to the fact that „it would have been absurd for a satirist to stay in Rome and recite a dozen reasons for leaving." But it would have been even more absurd for Juvenal actually to have had those reasons, to have felt so deeply distressed, and still to have remained. Yet he did stay: the explanation may be that the complaints are in fact not his own, but the grumblings of an imagined Umbricius.

[37] Cited above, n. 33: p. 29.

[38] *Ibid.*

ted Umbricius to represent the totally sympathetic figure later generations of critics have so regularly taken him to be.[39]

In conceiving and planning a satiric dialogue, even an extremely single-sided one like Satire Three, Juvenal must have recalled, reexamined, and been influenced by the dialogues of Horace *Sermones* 2, as he was by the *Sermones*, the *Epistulae*, and the *Epodes* throughout his sixteen Satires.[40] As in the case of Juvenal Three, the dialogues of *Sermones* 2 normally are staged between the satirist himself and some named, usually fictitious character. These characters are ordinarily given a brief introduction by Horace and then permitted to expound upon their philosphical *praecepta* or their newly resolved *proposita vitae*, in much the same manner as Umbricius. But the fine precepts and propositions of Horace's speakers in nearly every instance prove unacceptable to Horace himself — despite his characteristic reticence in these poems — and they are unquestionably meant to be rejected by his audience.

Perhaps the best example of this method is *Sermones* 2. 3, a satire almost identical in length to Juvenal Three.[41] Damasippus' misfortunes are, like Umbricius', economic.[42] The man is bankrupt and, like Umbricius again, in search of a new life-style (verses 18—26). Umbricius' recourse is flight to the shade of Cumae, motivated by his new pastoral philosophy; Damasippus takes refuge in philosophy itself. Damasippus delivers in 314 of the poem's 326 lines (Umbricius monopolizes 302 of 322) a Stoic diatribe whose effect is to alienate both Horace and the audience from himself and the unyielding orthodoxy of his brand of Stoicism, an effect carefully planned by the poet. Offering only a perfunctory response to this „interminable" harangue, „the satirist suffers the unreason of another without trying to correct

---

[39] While our views of Umbricius do not coincide in every respect, it was Professor L. Richardson Jr. who first suggested to me in a seminar at Duke University in 1970 that Umbricius may have been designed as an unsympathetic grumbler. Having approached the problems of the third satire in a more traditional way some years earlier, I must admit that my initial reaction to this notion was essentially negative; yet every reexamination of the poem has seemed to strengthen the case for an anti-Umbrician stance.

[40] Again, there may be objections to labelling Satire Three a dialogue, when Umbricius delivers nearly 94% of the lines, without so much as an interruption or even a concluding response from Juvenal. But the talk is little more one-sided than *Serm.* 2.3 and 2.4 (to be discussed below), where Damasippus and Catius control respectively 96.3% and 85.8% of the conversation, with only the briefest and most perfunctory replies from Horace. See above, n. 2, and Musurillo's remark quoted there. Note Highet's qualification of his statement that „The poem is a monologue" (cited above, n. 15: p. 68). For Horace's influence on the Satires and his shift from monologue to dialogue in *Serm.* 2, see William Anderson, „*Venusina lucerna*: the Horatian Model for Juvenal", *TAPA* 92 (1961) 1—12; also Schwartz (above, n. 31), and Highet, „Juvenal's Bookcase", *AJP* 72 (1951) 369—94, esp. 388f. A. J. MacLeane (ed., London: 1867, p. 43) has commented upon the markedly Horatian quality of portions of Juvenal Three.

[41] 2.3, with its 326 lines, is the longest of all the *Sermones*, just as Satire Three (322 lines) is the longest poem of Juvenal's first book.

[42] For Umbricius' *paupertas* see line 10 and *passim*, also below and n. 138.

him."[43] Davus, as spokesman for Crispinus, performs an identical function in Sermones 2.7.[44] The technique was well-known to Juvenal and his audience. And it was employed by Juvenal now and again in the Satires (one thinks of Laronia in 2. 37—63), or Naevolus in Nine), though never on so extensive a scale or in so similar a manner as here, I would suggest, in Satire Three.

An immediate objection to the idea that Umbricius was designed as an unsympathetic character in the Horatian tradition might be that the satirist himself calls Umbricius his „friend" at the very outset of the poem. But many sorts of *amici* are known to have stalked the Subura, and most who paraded through the Satires were distinctly *un*-friendly. Juvenal nearly always uses the terms *amicus* and *amicitia* ironically, with the implication that genuine friendship was virtually extinct in his day.[45] According to traditional interpretations, the one most striking exception is in 3. 1.[46] One must question whether this instance does in fact represent an exception: is Umbricius really meant to be viewed as Juvenal's friend, in the truest sense of the word, or may he be, like most other *amici* in the Satires, something less?

Once again it is tempting, and I think legitimate, to look to Horace for a possible answer. Similarities between Umbricius and Damasippus or Davus have already been noticed. Umbricius, however more sophisticated and subtly drawn, is also much like Catius, student of

---

[43] So William Anderson, at p. 33 of his remarkably intuitive essay „The Roman Socrates: Horace and his Satires", in *Satire: Critical Essays on Roman Literature*, ed. J. P. Sullivan (Bloomington, Indiana: 1968) 1—37. Anderson's words could be just as correctly applied to Juvenal's position with regard to Umbricius, whose diatribe is nearly identical in length, temperament, and „unreason".

[44] The technique really is continued through the entire book. Trebatius' advice in 2.1 is not entirely commendable or practical (cf. Anderson, cited in n. 43: p. 31f); in 2.4, discussed below, „friend" Catius is clearly an unsympathetic character; the *modus operandi* proposed by *doctor* Tiresias in 2.5 is patently absurd; and Fundanius' behavior in 2.8 is blemished at the very least by bad taste. 2.6 (also to be discussed below) involves a similarly ironic and unsound recommendation regarding the alternative of country living, defective advice that is imperfectly followed by Umbricius in Juvenal Three. Even Satire Two, probably the earliest piece composed for the second *Sermones* and one that reveals only vestiges of the dialogue form more fully developed throughout the rest of the book, bears this same kind of double edge: here Horace permits Ofellus to discourse on the virtues of simple living, but „it soon becomes apparent that neither he [the satirist] nor we can fully accept the harsh ways of Ofellus. This homespun philosopher sets out to harangue us on the merits of living modestly, and especially on the value of simple food. No sensible man would object to that purpose. However, in arguing his point Ofellus treats the gourmet with such contempt that we might, and should, feel his zeal excessive." Again, Anderson here (p. 32) might just as well be speaking of Umbricius and his intemperate attack on life in the city, so much in imitation of Horace is the method of Juvenal Three.

[45] I am very grateful to Professor Chauncey Finch, editor of *The Classical Bulletin*, for his kind permission to reproduce here some of the arguments employed in my article „*Amicus* and *Amicitia* in Juvenal", *CB* 51 (1975) 54—58.

[46] Another is in Satire Twelve. But if the speaker (Juvenal?) is truly a friend to Catullus (lines 15f., 29), still there is the detractor who suspects his motives (92—97). See also my „*Amicus*" article, p. 56f.

gourmandise *par excellence*, who is permitted to consume eighty-five per cent of *Sermones* 2. 4 in lecturing upon his favorite and tastiest subjects. At verses 88f Horace emphatically swears by the man's friendship:

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

It would be perverse to deny the humorous irony of these lines. Catius is no more the dearest of friends than Damasippus or Davus; nor is his thesis more reasonable. Nonetheless, Horace does not openly condemn. His audience, like Juvenal's, must determine its own reaction.

Catius („Mr. Sagacity") is a man whose feet and tongue seem to work more rapidly than his mind. Like Umbricius, he is a man in a hurry: *Unde et que Catius?*, begins Horace (line 1), and Catius replies (1—3),

> „Non est mihi tempus aventi
> ponere signa novis praeceptis, qualia vincent
> Pythagoran Anytique reum doctumque Platona."

The poem also bears some resemblance to Juvenal Three structurally, for after a brief exchange (1—10), Catius proceeds with a discourse on culinary delights that continues uninterrupted for the next seventy-seven lines (11—87). A distinction is that here (as in *Sermones* 2. 3 and 2. 7) the satirist allows himself the final word, a brief, sardonic response that parodies Catius' Epicurean tone and temperament (88—95). The distinction is only structural, however, since the dead silence that follows Umbricius' harangue and self-invitation may be no less derisive. Catius, like Umbricius, seems quite serious about his subject and steadfast, for the moment at least, in his convictions. Yet, while much that he says is accurate, interesting, and some of it even tantalizing, the audience can not refrain from smiling with Horace in simple amusement over the character's naive motivations, his excessive enthusiasm, his inappropriately epic tone, and his myopic *vitae praecepta beatae* (95).[47]

For William Anderson, Catius (and each of the other principals in *Sermones* 2. 1—4, Trebatius, Ofellus, and Damasippus) is *doctor ineptus*, „a teacher who fails to grasp the implications of his own precepts and thus ends as a figure of fun."[48] Umbricius, I would argue, functions identically in Juvenal Three. Assuming a secondary role throughout the dialogue, neither satirist makes „a clear comment in

[47] Cf. Anderson (n. 43) 33f: „Scholars have convincingly shown that the recipes and dishes recommended by this didactic 'philosopher' do not violate good taste: they are not extravagant or exotic. Indeed, the reasonable satirist would be likely himself to partake of such food. However, because Catius exaggerates the value of preparing the ideal dinner into the proportions of an ethical philosophy, he exposes himself to criticism. But unless we ourselves have already determined the dramatic irony, the satirist's final remarks are lost on us". Interpretations of Juvenal Three have suffered from just the sort of failure to sense its „dramatic irony" that Anderson warns against here.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

opposition" to the *doctor* or his program. Instead, both poems depend entirely for their success upon the audience's „poetic and rational insights" in properly assessing the satirist's ironic posture.[49] It is apposite to note that, although audiences have usually reacted to Damasippus and Catius in the manner Horace intended, the relationship of the satirist to Trebatius (*Sermones* 2. 1) and Ofellus (2. 2) has not always been analyzed so perceptibly as in Anderson's study.[50] Thus the general misunderstanding of Juvenal's stance in Satire Three has, like the method he was employing, ample precedent.

The „friendship" between Horace and Catius is at best defective. How then are we to interpret the *amicitia* of Umbricius and Juvenal? Like Catius, Umbricius never calls the satirist *amicus*. Indeed, the relationship is never even suggested by Umbricius, except in his parting plea for an invitation to Juvenal's country home (318—322). The bond is directly mentioned only once, at the very beginning of the satire (1—3):

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

Amici is set at line's end for emphasis. But what sort of emphasis? Juvenal may have intended to stress the warmth of his friendship for Umbricius. Yet, with a hint of mockery in his voice, the poet could easily have given his audience an altogether opposite impression. Unhappily, we must proceed without any opportunity of hearing the ancient poets recite their own work in the precise manner they deemed appropriately dramatic and evincing. Whatever his other aims, the ancient poet — particularly the satirist — was an entertainer who, we know, would exploit the „body language" of gesture, intonation, facial expression, and eye contact, that the rhetorical schools taught could be so valuable to orator and poet alike.[51] But lacking entirely this potential-

---

[49] The quotations are again from Anderson's remarks on *Sermones* 2; but they suit well what I believe to be the correct approach to Umbricius and Juvenal Three.

[50] Both Trebatius and Ofellus have often been taken quite seriously and in total sympathy: see, e.g., A. Y. Campbell *Horace* (London: 1924) 174f, 178f, and E. H. Haight *Horace and his Art of Enjoyment* (New York: 1925) 11f, 57—62.

[51] Cicero, Vergil, Quintilian, and Juvenal would have agreed on the importance of proper delivery. Roman satire is defined from the beginning by its dramatic qualities and an aim to entertain as well as to instruct. Without the entertainment, in fact, (as without that bit of Lucretian honey) the instruction might not take: it might not anyway, given the realities of the world, so that entertainment must always have been a prime concern of the satirist.The satiric poet will have been constantly reshaping his posture, his voice, his gestures and facial expressions in order to suit the character speaking at the moment, whether an unnamed interlocutor or the more fully defined participant in an extended dialogue. Almost literally the satirist dons a mask, the *persona* for his character. This method, I should think, could be especially effective when practiced by the poet intensively trained and experienced in rhetoric, as Juvenal was; and the typical Roman audience, educated in the same schools, must have been keenly receptive, to every refineement of such a technique.

ly quite expressive feature of the satiric *recitatio*, the critic's only recourse is to internal evidence and reasoned hypothesis.

The sense of *amicus* and *amicitia* elsewhere in the Satires, particularly the twenty-one instances in Book One, may provide the best evidence for Juvenal's intention here in Three. Rarely do the words bear an interpretation of honest friendship: in the overwhelming majority of cases the relationship implied is an unfriendly bond between men in one way or another unequal. Very often throughout the sixteen Satires Juvenal has in mind the perverted state of the patron-client relationship. The noun *amicus* occurs three times in the first two poems (in each case in final line position), for a powerful associate victimized by a „friendly" *delator* (1. 33), a crowd of hostile clients (1.146), and a homosexual „bride" (2. 134). Up to this point at least, it would appear that Juvenal's *amici* fall a trifle short of the Ciceronian ideal.[52]

The next *amicus* in Book One is, of course, Umbricius, fugitive from the slings and arrows of an outrageous, barbaric, and altogether ungrateful Roma. If Juvenal has not already defined *amicus* for his audience through its use in One and Two, he will do so now in the lines that follow in Satire Three, where the noun appears eight more times.[53] It may be useful to reproduce these lines:

tanti tibi non sit opaci
omnis harena Tagi quodque in mare volvitur aurum,
ut somno careas ponendaque praemia sumas
tristis et a magno semper timearis *amico*.
. . . . . .
quid quod adulandi gens prudentissima laudat
sermonem indocti, faciem deformis *amici*,
. . . . . .
natio comoeda est. rides, maiore cachinno
concutitur; flet, si lacrimas conspexit *amici*,
nec dolet; igniculum brumae si tempore poscas,
accipit endromiden; si dixeris „aestuo," sudat.
non sumus ergo pares: melior, qui semper et omni
nocte dieque potest aliena sumere vultum
a facie, iactare manus laudare paratus,
si bene ructavit, si rectum minxit *amicus*,
si trulla inverso crepitum dedit aurea fundo.
praeterea sanctum nihil † aut † ab inguine tutum,
non matrona laris, non filia virgo, nec ipse
sponsus levis adhuc, non filius ante pudicus.
horum si nihil est, aviam resupinat *amici*.
[scire volunt secreta domus atque inde timeri.]
et quoniam coepit Graecorum mentio, transi
gymnasia atque audi facinus maioris abollae.
Stoicus occidit Baream delator *amicum*
discipulumque senex ripa nutritus in illa
ad quam Gorgonei delapsa est pinna caballi.

[52] The theme of hostile friendship is continued emphatically through the rest of Book One: *magna amicitia* is the expression used to describe the vicious relationships between Domitian and his councillors (4.74f) and Virro and Trebius (5.14).

[53] Excluding the feminine noun *amica*, which is also employed irreverently (3.12: see below and n. 81). The text following is Clausen's (ed., Oxford: 1966), except for the use of italics and consontal *v*.

non est Romano cuiquam hic, ubi regnat
Protogenes aliquis vel Diphilus aut Hermarchus,
qui gentis vitio 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.
. . . . . .
ebrius ac petulans, qui nullum forte cecidit,
dat poenas, noctem patitur lugentis *amicum*
Pelidae, cubat in faciem, mox deinde supinus.

The first of the *faux amis* after Umbricius is another *magnus amicus* (the same expression is used in 1. 33),[54] whose guilt makes him the timorous victim of his „friend's" blackmail (57). *Amicus* here seems to mean „patron", as it does elsewhere in Juvenal and other authors, especially from the Augustan Age onward. The word is certainly equivalent to *patronus* at 87, 101, 107, 112, 116, and 121.[55] Umbricius is occupied in the passage where these lines occur (58—125) with venting his prejudice against Rome's ubiqitous, usurping Greek population: These Greeks! They flatter their „friends" and play every role like ccomplished actors (86—100); they feign tears and laughter and admiration (100—108); they debauch their „friends'" women (109—113). At 114—118 the passage reaches its climax with the ultimate perversion of *amicitia*: these thankless Greeks, repeating the crime of Egnatius against his patron Barea Soranus,[56] even murder their „friends". One can not fail to notice that forms of *amicus* appear six times here within only thirty-five lines (87—121: once every four lines within 101—121) and always at line's end. The visual effect of this repetition is itself striking — the effect upon Juvenal's listening audience must have been even more dramatic.

Revealingly, Umbricius' final complaint against the Greeks concerns not what they do to their friends, but the fact that *they never share one* (119—122). It is clearly not the Greek's hostility, immorality, or criminality that Umbricius objects to so much as his success at the expense, not of the patron-friend, but of Umbricius himself (122—125):

> For when the Greek has dropped a bit of his natural
> poison into an easy ear, I am booted out, and all
> my years of service have gone to waste: nowhere
> is the rejection of a client treated so lightly.

Umbricius is a client, or rather a *cliens eiectus*. And all those Greeks were clients, more successful than he. All their *amici* were patrons. Juvenal knew well this technical usage of *amicus* for both *cliens* and *patronus*, but he also sensed the irony of it as applied to the often im-

[54] *Magnus* in both passages is equivalent to *potens*: see „*Amicus*" (n. 45) p. 57 n. 3.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 57 n. 7.

[56] Here, as in 1.33, an *amicus* falls victim to his „friend", a *delator*.

personal and sometimes openly hostile patronage system of his day.[57] It is in order to stress this irony that the word always occupies final position in Satire Three.[58]

Again and again Juvenal means to define *amicitia* in terms of unfriendly patron-client relationships. Umbricius is himself very clearly defined as a frustrated client whose own patrons have been less than amicable. Nowhere else in Satire Three does *amicus* have its simple, unqualified meaning. Thus I am prompted to suggest that even in line 1 Juvenal intends primarily to hint at Umbricius' social position and not to profess his heartfelt frendship for the man, whose only relationship to the satirist may parallel that between Horace and Catius. Employing the basic meaning of *vetus* (Umbricius is *senex*),[59] a usage of *confundo* familiar to Juvenal's audience,[60] and the sense of *amicus* prevalent throughout the Satires and Three in particular, I should translate *Quamvis digressu veteris confusus amici* (1), not with the usual „Though upset by the departure of my old friend," but „Though puzzeled by the departure of this aging client-friend."[61]

It actually is puzzling that a dependent of Umbricius' age should suddenly choose to alter his way of life in a manner apparently so radical. One explanation, however, is to appear in Umbricius' indignant confession of his utter failure as a client. Umbricius is the *cliens exclusus*, whose bitter lament is plainly stated in line 123: *limine summoveor*! More will be said of the character's motives later, but for the moment it is enough to observe that his emigration is in a very real sense involuntary, compelled at least as much by Roman society's rejection of Umbricius as by Umbricius' rejection of Rome. Umbricius is the fox out-foxed, and Rome his cluster of grapes.

[57] For *amicus* as the equivalent of *cliens* in Juvenal, see „*Amicus*" (n. 45) p. 57 n. 11.

[58] Even the last appearance of the noun in Three is ironic (lines 278—80, quoted above): the implication is that the bully has no friend. And there is perhaps a slight suggestion, in the incongruity of Juvenal's comparison, that such epic friendship as that of Achilles for Patroclus is not to be found in Rome. It may only be coincidental that *amici* is the last word of line 1, at the beginning of Juvenal's prologue, while *amico* is the last word of line 57, at the conclusion of Umbricius' plologue, and *clientis* is the last word of line 125, which closes the anti-Greek harangue (where *amicus* again occurs six times in final position); the coincidence, nevertheless, serves to underscore Juvenal's primary emphasis in these passages.

[59] For *vetus* as the equivalent of *senex*, rather than in the secondary sense of „long-standing", see Lewis and Short „vetus" I.A. A. Weidner, in his note on 3.1 (ed., Leipzig: 1889), rightly compares *veteres lassique clientes* (1.132) and *ille excludatur amicus | iam senior* (6. 214f), thus also implicitly equating *amicus* with *cliens* and *vetus* with *senex*. For Umbricius' age see verses 25—28, esp. *senectus* in 26.

[60] Cf. Pearson and Strong (above, n. 33) *ad loc.*: „*confundo* has in Pliny, Seneca and Juvenal a weaker meaning than it bore in Vergil's time". But they also compare *Aen.* 3.482, *Nec minus Andromache digressu maesta supremo* (so too I. Gehlen *De Iuvenale Vergilii imitatore* [diss., Göttingen: 1886] 18). Juvenal uses the participle only here; it seems to connote confusion that is more intellectual than emotional: cf. Livy 1.7.6, 6.6.7, and Quint. 1.1.28.

[61] Or, „. . . aging fellow-client": Juvenal's own social station is, as always, elusive. The fact that Umbricius is a client does not, in any case, guarantee for him Juvenal's sympathy: cf. the poet's attitude toward Trebius in Satire Five.

Juvenal's curiosity over the old client's withdrawal from the capital (a curiosity he expects his audience to share) comes not only from the abruptness and eccentricity of Umbricius' action, but also from the fact that it was so final. It was commonplace, to be sure, for Rome's intellectuals (and a good many others besides) to express their natural attraction to the simple life in a pastoral setting, as Vergil did in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, or Horace, however much tongue in cheek, in *Sermones* 2. 2 and 2. 6. But Vergil, Horace, and Juvenal, despite their provincial origins, had matured as urban sophisticates. Not one of them, I expect, could ever be so sympathetic with Umbricius' program as to follow him into permanent self-exile from the city. The same would be true of their audiences. Many would have reacted to Umbricius and Juvenal Three as Anderson does toward Horace's *persona* in *Sermones* 2. 6: the satire „serves as an ironic recommendation of rural contentment," bearing the moral that „'a delightful forgetfulness of the anxious life' (62). . . cannot be achieved by flight alone, but primarily by an attitude of mind and heart. In itself the country does not guarantee peace of mind...." „That charming oblivion that he associates with the rural landscape" can in reality only be found once a man „has controlled his acquisitive desires and his ambition... ."[62] Umbricius seems to lack the necessary imagination and the proper „attitude of mind and heart," and he certainly offers no real evidence of leaving his acquisitiveness and ambition behind in Rome.

Many in the audience would have shared the more Roman and, I believe, more Juvenalian sentiment implicit in the eleventh satire: life in the city has its difficulties and annoyances, without question, but there are compensating pleasures and attractions. This blend of good and ill is simply a reality likely to characterize any setting. The teeming streets of Rome were the satirist's *farrago*, providing a stage for *quidquid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas, / gaudia, discursus*... (1. 85f). And so, unlike Umbricius, the aging Juvenal remained. Indeed, to withdraw permanently from those city streets, to abandon Rome altogether for the country, seemed often to be the refuge of delinquents or fools (11. 47—53). On the other hand, Juvenal might, like Horace, take himself away from the madding crowd when it seemed necessary to his sanity (11. 179—206): the need for a vacation's change of pace was only natural. One could visit the country for a time, as Umbricius expected the poet to be doing now and then (3. 318—321). Or one might even stay at home, as Juvenal does in Satire Eleven, enjoying within his own urban apartment the uncomplicated delights

[62] Anderson (above, n. 43) 36. The poem concludes with the Fable of the City Mouse and the Country Mouse. Like Umbricius, the fastidious city mouse who scurries off to the country to test its simple hospitality, is labelled *vetus amicus* (line 81): Is Umbricius Juvenal's *mus urbanus*, who, once he has sampled life away from Rome, will learn that the grass is not always greener?

of a holiday — yet the satirist would not indulge in even so modest a retreat for very long (206—208):

> facere hoc non possis quinque diebus
> continuis, quia sunt talis quoque taedia vitae
> magna: voluptates commendat rarior usus.

For Umbricius, however, the retreat was permanent.

The emigrant's destination is a bit puzzling too: *vacuis. . . sedem figere Cumis / destinet atque unum civem donare Sibyllae. / ianua Baiarum est et gratum litus amoeni / secessus* (2—5). Umbricius' plan to settle at Cumae must be considered in the context of the emotional proclamation he issues at the opening of his invective (58—61):

> quae nunc divitibus gens acceptissima nostris
> et quos praecipue fugiam, properabo fateri
> nec pudor obstabit. non possum ferre, Quirites,
> Graecam urbem.[63]

Cumae is a most peculiar refuge for a man so thoroughly prejudiced as Umbricius, and Juvenal's audience would have sensed this peculiarity. The man who sought escape from Greeks could have found many towns eminently better suited. Why not settle *Volsiniis aut simplicibus Gabiis*, pleasant locations according to Umbricius (191f)?[64] Why Cumae, of all places, famous — or, for Umbricius, infamous — as the oldest Greek city in Italy, situated in the very heart of the region that remained the most thoroughly Hellenized in the country? Why does Umbricius wrest himself from a Graecified *Subura* only to surrender himself and his pure *Romanitas* to the Greek *Sibylla*?[65] If Rome has become *Graeca urbs*, as Umbricius complains, South Italy and Campania nonetheless remain *Magna Graecia*, land of the fictional frolics of Encolpius and Ascyltus and the vulgar materialism of Trimalchio.[66] The inescapable Greek associations of Cumae are actually suggested by Umbricius himself, when he describes his destination (in a recollection of Vergil) as the city *fatigatas ubi Daedalus exuit alas* (25). Despite this allusion, however, Umbricius in his haste seems to have forgotten Cumae's Greekness. He seems to have overlooked the fact that she still supported a large Greek population, which must have

---

[63] Enjambement and elision contribute nicely to the emphasis in line 61.

[64] Umbricius nostalgically mentions several other small towns in Latium, including Praeneste (190), Tibur (192), Sora (223), Fabrateria and Frusino (224), and Juvenal's own Aquinum (319). Yet, quite curiously, he bypasses all these quiet and more Italian retreats to plunge himself into the core of *Magna Graecia*.

[65] Juvenal neatly contrasts Greek with Roman by placing the assonant *Sibyllae* and *Suburae* as the final words in lines 3 and 5.

[66] Most of the grotesque escapades of the *Satyricon* are staged in Campania; the setting of the *cena Trimalchionis* may even be Cumae or nearby Puteoli (certainly some place on the Bay of Naples). Significantly, of the personal names in Petronius, 77% are Greek (so Schmeling, above, n. 24: p. 3). Trimalchio would, no doubt, have offered Umbricius a meal.

included Greek *clientes* to compete with the immigrant Umbricius for the patronage of the area's wealthy villa owners.[67]

If it was the vice and the crime and the helter-skelter of urban life that Umbricius hoped to avoid, Cumae was again a peculiar choice over the many quiet Latin towns he himself mentions. Juvenal means to imply this when he describes Cumae as *ianua Baiarum*, „the very doorway to Baiae", a resort described by Seneca as *deversorium vitiorum* and a favorite retreat of the satirist's vampire-emperor, Domitian.[68] The place was *amoenus*, Juvenal recalls (3f), but as Seneca had warned in his epistle on the immorality of Baiae, *effeminat animos amoenitas nimia*.[69] Juvenal had certainly read Seneca, and he may even have had the essay on Baiae in mind when composing 3. 3f. One might compare Umbricius' plan with Seneca's advice (*Epistulae* 51. 2f):

> Regio quoque est, quam sapiens vir aut ad sapientiam tendens declinet tamquam alienam bonis moribus. Itaque de secessu cogitans numquam Canopum eliget... ne Baias quidem.[70]

The satirist shared Seneca's opinion of Canopus (compare 6. 84 and 15. 46), and I suspect he felt the same about Baiae too. Juvenal's only other reference to the town comes in a passage from the eleventh satire, mentioned earlier, where he is criticizing men who, like Umbricius, having failed economically in Rome, abandon the city and „run off to Baiae and oysters" (Humphries' translation):

> conducta pecunia Romae
> et coram dominis consumitur; inde, ubi paulum
> nescio quid superest et pallet fenoris auctor,
> qui vertere solum, Baias et ad ostrea currunt.
> cedere namque foro iam non est deterius quam
> Esquilias a ferventi migrare Subura.
> ille dolor solus patriam fugientibus, illa
> maestitia est, caruisse anno circensibus uno.

[67] For the continuing *Graecitas* of Cumae, see John D'Arms *Romans on the Bay of Naples* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1970) *passim*, and for Campania in general see esp. 165—67. Greek names are plentiful in Cumaean inscriptions (*CIL* 10.3682—3713, *IG*²14.860—72).

[68] Cf. Hor *Ep.* 1.15.11f: „*Quo tendis? non mihi Cumas/est iter aut Baias.* The expression *ianua Baiarum* is even more vivid if Juvenal was thinking of the recently constructed Arco Felice, through which, as Professors L. Richardson Jr. and J. Rufus Fears have suggested in conversation and correspondence, ancient travellers from Cumae to Baiae must almost certainly have passed. On the attitudes of Seneca and Domitian toward Baiae, see D'Arms (above, n. 67) 102f and 119f; regarding the town's general reputation for immorality see below and cf. D'Arms' index under the entry „Baiae, notoriety".

[69] *Ep.* 51.10; regarding *amoenitas* on the Bay of Naples in the imperial age, see D'Arms, p. 132f. Cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.83, *Baiis... amoenis*, and Sen. *Ep.* 51.1, *locum ob hoc devitandum cum quasdam naturales dotes, quia illum sibi celebrandum luxuria desumpsit.* Seneca's scorn for Baiae extended to Campania in general (*Ep.* 51.5). Cf. also Varro *Sat. Men.* 44 (Büch.); Prop. 1.11, esp. line 27: *corruptas... Baias.*

[70] Later Seneca's *ebrii* (*Ep.* 51.4) and *nocturna convicia* (51.12) remind one of Umbricius' description of the perils and annoyances of Roman nightlife (232—308, esp. 237 and 278).

Regarding the local crime rate, we can see from Umbricius' own remarks (305—308) that the countryside and forests around Cumae abounded in *grassatores*. Thus, by Seneca's definition, Umbricius would appear to be bordering on *insipientia*. Members of Juvenal's audience, intentionally reminded by him of Cumae's proximity to Baiae (*ianua Baiarum*) and familiar with the scandalous reputation of the neighborhood, might have been inclined to agree.

If the district to which Umbricius fled could not offer perfect sanctuary from crime and immorality, perhaps at least the „ghost town of Cumae" (verse 2, Humphries) would provide privacy and complete freedom from the other bothers of city life. Or would it? The seventeenth century translator and commentator Barten Holyday was also puzzled that the same town could be described as both „gateway to Baiae" and *vacuae*.[71] The adjective translates „deserted", hence Humpries' „ghost town," or at least „quiet."[72] Cumae had perhaps seen better and more populous days, yet one wonders how seriously Juvenal expected his audience to take his expression *vacuis Cumis*, when they knew not only of nearby Baiae but also of the new coastal higway, the *via Domitiana*, completed in A. D. 95 and passing directly through Cumae's forum.[73] Ignoring the usual implications and effects of such a construction project, scholars have taken Juvenal's *vacuis Cumis* together with Statius' phrase *quieta Cyme* (*Silvae* 4. 3. 65) as proof that Cumae was nothing more than a desolate village in the early second century.[74] In such matters, of course, it is dangerous to read any satirist, especially Juvenal, too literally. And Statius, who was writing in praise of the very recent construction, did not live to witness whatever effects upon Cumae's life and economy the new highway might have had (he died within a year of the project's completion, a full generation before Juvenal's death).

---

[71] Holyday, trans. (Oxford: 1673) *ad loc.*

[72] Gifford (above, n. 12) is „inclined to think... that the poet (still speaking with the warranted license of a satirist) meant to insinuate that Cumae was really deserted" (*ad loc.*). Cf. Lewis (above, n. 23), *ad loc.*, „The meaning here is 'deserted', as at x 102, *vacuis aedilis Ulubris*". Cf. Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.81: *vacuas. . .Athenas*, another Greek town („quiet" rather than „deserted"), in the context a retreat for poets, whose seclusion the satirist finds unattractive. Also Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.45, *sed vacuum Tibur placet*, „quiet Tibur"; Verg. *G.* 2.225, *vacuae Acerrae*.

[73] On the *via Domitiana* see A. G. McKay *Naples and Campania* (Hamilton, Ontario: 1962) 198f and 249f, where there is a discussion along with text and translation of relevant portions of *Silv.* 4.3; cf. D'Arms (above, n. 67) 102f, 134, 159, 163.

[74] For the general view of Cumae's decline and the town's desolation by Juvenal's day, see Salmon in *OCD*², s.v.; McKay (above, n. 73) 63—70, esp. 70; D'Arms (n.67) 163: „After ninety-five, Cumae was located upon the major highway between Rome and Puteoli; yet *lines of Juvenal's* reveal that early in the second century her population had dwindled and that the city was in decline (Juv. 3.1—3)" [italics mine]. *Caveat lector*: „we should never take Juvenal literally" (so H. A. Mason, p. 98 of „Is Juvenal a Classic?", in Sullivan *Satire* [above, n. 43] 93—176). „Never" is a strong word, but it points the right direction to those who would glean history — social, political, or economic—from the irony-infected lines of Juvenal's *Saturae*. Regarding such specifics as the „quietude of Cumae", D'Arms himself admits that „the quantity of Campanian evidence after the Flavian period is too small, and its quality too uneven, to permit other than tentative conclusions" (159).

Yet that same line from Statius' poem, describing the town's astonishment over the bustle of construction, seems almost provident of what the new road would bring: *miratur sonitum quieta Cyme*. For now Professor Fears' recent analysis of the excavations at Cumae corroborates my own suspicions: in association with and in part probably subsequent to construction of the *via Domitiana*, an ambitious program of new building and renovation was sponsored at Cumae.[75] According to Fears, „In addition to the complete renovation of the Capitolium, the end of the first century A. D. witnessed a spate of building activity, including the erection of a temple to the Deified Vespasian, and the monumental arch [the Arco Felice] through nearby Monte Grillo."[76] A second period of vigorous activity dates to the latter half of the second century, and archeological and epigraphic evidence suggest the city's vitality extended into the third century and even later.

When Juvenal wrote and published his third satire, some ten to twenty years after completion of the *via Domitiana*, Cumae was in fact alive and energetic. The city was not „deserted," not a „ghost town", surely not even „quiet" any longer with the new coastal highway running through her forum. Juvenal knew all this. And so did his audience. In this light *vacuis Cumis* becomes another typically Juvenalian irony, by which the satirist aims to rouse his audience's curiosity over Umbricius and his *propositum*: the fugitive from Rome's perils and annoyances blindly rushes off to live in a city that must have seemed in many ways a noisy and bustling microcosm of the capital itself, at least in comparison to the many smaller towns he might have chosen.

The paradox of Umbricius' pastoral „escape" to Cumae, a thriving urban center in the heartland of *Magna Graecia*, doorway to the Italian Sodom and Gomorrah, and center of a district whose forests are — by Umbricius' own admission — infested with brigands, perhaps explains why Juvenal is *confusus*. The alert audience would share his perplexity, sensing the unreasonableness of Umbricius' flight and the absurdity of his destination in the context of the attitudes he later expresses. S. C. Fredericks, reflecting on Cumae's connection with Hades and the Sibyl (a connection recalled by Juvenal in line 3), has argued that Umbricius is leaving one Hell „only to find another. . . . His desire for a simple, rural existence in contradistinction to the evils of the metropolis is founded, as Mircea Eliade would say, on his fear of complexity and change since his Cumae is a nostalgic vision of Rome's noble past rather than a provincial Greek town viewed realistically in the present."[77] Umbricius' vision is unreal, and, if a product of „nos-

[75] J. Rufus Fears, „Cumae in the Roman Imperial Age", a report first delivered before the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, in Cleveland, Ohio, 3 April, 1975, and now published in *Vergilius* 21 (1975) 1—21.

[76] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[77] „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."

talgic" yearnings, it is nostalgia of an extreme and quite obfuscating sort. Modern audiences might be inclined to sympathize with the poor, unhappy emigrant. Roman audiences, however, would have been more freely amused, except perhaps those who for a moment perceived in Umbricius some of their own frailties and remembered Horace's warning, *mutato nomine de te / fabula narratur* (*Sermones* 1. 1. 69f).

IV.

Following the announcement of Umbricius' destination, Juvenal's prologue continues another sixteen lines (5—20):

> ego vel Prochytam praepono Suburae;
> nam quid tam miserum, tam solum vidimus, ut non
> deterius credas horrere incendia, lapsus
> tectorum adsiduos ac mille pericula saevae
> urbis et Augusto recitantes mense poetas?
> sed dum tota domus raeda componitur una,
> substitit ad veteres arcus madidamque Capenam.
> hic, ubi nocturnae Numa constituebat amicae
> (nunc sacri fontis nemus et delubra locantur
> Iudaeis, quorum cophinus fenumque supellex;
> omnis enim populo mercedem pendere iussa est
> arbor et eiectis mendicat silva Camenis),
> in vallem Egeriae descendimus et speluncas
> dissimiles veris. quanto praesentius esset
> numen aquis, viridi si margine cluderet undas
> herba nec ingenuum violarent marmora tofum.

It has been recognized that this portion of the satirist's introduction is meant to foreshadow many of the complaints Umbricius will voice in his invective against the infernal city: conditions in the Subura (5, compare 243—301), general wretchedness (6, 190—314),[78] fire (7, 197—222), decrepit buildings (7, 190—196), and the „thousand other perils of the savage city" (8f, 232—308 and *passim*). Line 10 first suggests the *paupertas* of which Umbricius is so bitterly to complain (*passim*, especially 126—189), and in 13—16 the *Camenae eiectae*, native Italian muses expelled from their sacred dwelling by Jewish beggars, anticipate Umbricius' displacement from Roman society by Greeks

---

Fredericks' unsympathetic attitude toward Umbricius and his flight to Cumae is reasonable and attractive, but recently he has taken a more traditional stance: see p. 147f of his chapter, „Juvenal: A Return to Invective", in *Roman Satirists* (above, n. 27), where Umbricius becomes once more „an *alter ego* for Juvenal and all righteous men who appear throughout this book." For Anderson's views regarding the Cumaean paradox, see p. 60—63 and 67 of his „Studies in Book I of Juvenal", *YCS* 15 (1957) 33—90. Describing Cumae as „the beachhead of the Greeks, whence they swarmed over the city of Rome", Anderson argues that the capital has become even more Greek than Cumae, and that Cumae therefore represents the lesser of two evils. But this interpretation still fails to respond directly to the problem of why Umbricius should have considered Cumae at all and not some more quiet and remote Latin town.

[78] For the thematic *miserum* see Anderson (above, n. 77) 60—68.

and other eastern immigrants (58—125). Finally, the aesthetics of 18—20 may look forward to 173.[79]

But the often severe tone that characterizes Umbricius' diatribe is not so marked in Juvenal's prologue.[80] The satirist provides comic relief with the reference to poets in line 9 and with his nasalized, almost scandalously irreverent allusion to Numa and Egeria, one of the Camenae: „where Numa used to date his girl of the night" (12).[81] On the other hand, when Umbricius speaks of the priest-king Numa, he uses only the most reverent and solemn langugage (137—139) — one of several features of the poem that serve to distinguish Juvenal from his *doctor ineptus*.

Another interesting though unnoticed feature of Juvenal's prologue is the neatly constructed link between Umbricius and Egeria. It can hardly be an accident that Egeria is first alluded to as Numa's *amica* (verse 12) and later named (17), in precisely the same way that Umbricius was first labelled *amicus* (1) and only afterwards introduced by name (21).[82] Juvenal carefully relates that where Nuna once met with his *amica* to share in her secrets, now he himself passes with this *amicus*, who will espouse his philosophy of emigration. Just as *Suburae* at the end of line 5 was designed to echo and serve as a contrast to *Sibyllae* at the end of 3, so the placement of *amicae* as the last word in 12 seems intentionally to recall *amici*, the final ironic word of line 1.[83] Through his emphasis on the expression *nocturna amica*, the satirist successfully perverts the tradition of Numa's relationship with Egeria; perhaps he meant to imply that there was something equally perverted in his use of the term *amicus* for Umbricius, who was in fact,

---

[79] So Fredericks, p. 64f of „The Function of the Prologue (1—20) in the Organization of Juvenal's Third Satire", *Phoenix* 27 (1973) 62—67; this article provides some fresh insights as well as a partial summary of work done on these lines. Mason is less convinced of the anticipatory function of 18—20: „The remark of an aesthete, or evidence of a feeling for 'nature'? We cannot tell. All we can say for certain is that the germ of a theme suggested here is not developed: Juvenal does not make it a main charge against Roman life that it is sophisticated or unnatural" (above, n. 74: p. 127f). But *Juvenal* does make this charge, in 18—20; it is *Umbricius* who fails to demonstrate an intense „feeling for 'nature'", despite the slight echo Fredericks has noticed in verses 172—74.

[80] Despite Anderson: see below, n. 86.

[81] *Amica* regularly bears a sexual connotation: note Juvenal's use of even the adj. *amica* in 7.82. Livy more modestly labels Egeria *coniunx* (1.21). Cf. *nocturnus adulter* 8.144, and Juvenal's description of Juno as *virguncula* at 13.40 (Thirteen is another poem in which the satirist is less than entirely serious, and where his attack is again intentionally inverted: see below and n. 111). For this sense of *constituo* Duff compares 6.487 (above, n. 13: *ad loc.*).

[82] Cf. J. E. B. Mayor, ed. (London: 1886), *ad loc.* Line 12 foreshadows *Egeriae* in line 17 in the typically Juvenalian manner discussed by B. Ullman, „Psychological Foreshadowing in the Satires of Horace and Juvenal", *AJP* 71 (1950) 408—16, esp. 415f. It is also characteristic of Juvenal to delay naming a principal character in order to achieve some degree of climax; cf. the postponement of *Trebius* (19) and *Virro* (enjambed after the assonant *berullo*, 38f) in Satire Five.

[83] Juvenal is playing with line-endings throughout this passage to good effect: note *amici/amoeni/amicae* (1, 4, 12), *Sibyllae/Suburae* (3, 5: see n. 65), *una/Capenam/Camenis* (10, 11, 16), *-uncas/undas* (17, 19).

as argued earlier, not exactly Juvenal's „friend." The poet's linking of Umbricius and Egeria is further developed in the digression at 13—16, where, it has already been noted, the displacement of Egeria and her fellow Camenae by the Jews from the very place where Juvenal stood with Umbricius foreshadows the latter's expulsion from Rome by a horde of usurping easterners.

This delicate connection between Egeria and Umbricius is of some importance to a proper understanding of Satire Three. For Juvenal seems to be hinting at what he will later make clear: Egeria *amica* is a patroness of poetry, and Umbricius *amicus* is, her client in a sense, a poet. In this quite economical introduction,[84] the appearance of Egeria and the Camenae can not be merely incidental and digressive. The Camenae are native Italian muses — through them Juvenal purposefully reintroduces the theme of poetry and of the poet ejected.[85]

I say „reintroduces," of course, because the subject of unappreciated poets has already been pointedly raised in the prologue (8f):

> ac mille pericula saevae
> urbis et Augusto recitantes mense poetas?

In analyzing Juvenal's prologue, critics have usually either ignored line 9 altogether or dismissed it is a mere „sardonic detail" that contributes nothing to the satire's thematic or structural integrity.[86] Certainly the effect is sardonic: as the concluding item in the satirist's preview of „the thousand perils of the savage city," *Augusto recitan-*

[84] Cf. the judgement of Fredericks (above, n. 79) 62, and others cited by him in n. 2.

[85] Cf. Juv. 7.2: *tristes. . . Camenas.* The Camenae (whose name is probably to be connected with *carmen*) were identified with the Muses from the time of Livius Andronicus: cf. the opening line of Homer's Odyssey („Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, μοῦσα, πολύτροπον. . .) with line 1 of Andronicus' translation, *Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum.* Cf. also Naev. *Var.* 4 (Warmington), *flerent divae Camenae Naevium poetam*; Verg. *Ecl.* 3.59; Hor. *Carm.* 2.16.38; Pers. 5.21; Mart. 4.14.10 and, for Egeria (*Numae coniunx*), the Camenae (as poetic Muses), and their sacred grove, in a single context, as here in Juv. 3.12—18, cf. Mart. 5.47; for numerous others see *TLL* Suppl. 2 (Onomasticon). 117.9—55. The name *Camena/ -ae* is often employed by metonymy for *poesis*, *poema/carmen*, or *poeta*, as in Juv. 3.16 the *eiectae Camenae* suggest *eiecti poetae*: see *TLL* Suppl. 2.117.55—118.18, and cf. esp. Mart. 7.68.1 (*Camenae = carmina*) and 12.94.5 (*Calabrae Camenae* = Horace). Interesting for its joint reference to the Camenae and Juvenal is Rutil. Namat. 1.603f (of the otherwise unknown late 4th c. satirist Lucillus): *huius vulnificis satira ludente Camenis / nec Turnus potior nec Iuvenalis erit.*

[86] See, for example, Fredericks (above, n. 79), who, despite his summary arguments for the „structural effectiveness" of the poem and this prologue, completely ignores line 9; Witke alone (above, n. 29: p. 129, 131) senses the connection between lines 9 and 16, but he fails to investigate the full significance of this connection. Citing Stegemann, Anderson (above, n. 77: p. 59) notes that „with the exception of the final sardonic detail about the *recitationes*, the satirist has here announced the main subjects of Umbricius' speech." Despite his recognition of the undercutting effect of line 9 (p. 60), Anderson persists, quite incorrectly I think, in speaking of the „violence" of the satirist in this prologue, as against Umbricius' *virtus* and „self-control". The truth seems to be just the opposite: Juvenal's prologue is gentler and much more sportive than the blustery invective that follows.

tes mense poetas provides an anticlimax that is strikingly *para prosdokian*. With this the wryly smiling Juvenal intended to belie *saevae* and to undercut the severity of preceding lines. „The total effect," as H. A. Mason has observed,

> . . . is to diminish our concern for the reality of what he is saying. By placing in a scale of dreads, poverty and isolation at the bottom, death in the middle and literary boredom at the climax, we are, it is true, shaken out of our usual responses, and each receives thereby a slight momentary heightening, but surely, when we settle down, we are left only with the pleasure of verbal play and not with a feeling that the situation is too poignant for any but flippant treatment.[87]

There is no doubt that lines 6—8 were meant to anticipate some of Umbricius' grumblings, but nowhere among his complaints can we find „poets reciting in the heat of August" (9). Rather, I suggest, the detail represents a Juvenalian aside (an editor might enclose *et. . . poetas* in parentheses), a pointed expression of one of the satirist's own pet peeves that is especially apposite to what will follow in lines 21—322. „Yes, city life has its difficulties — particularly life in the Subura; what place could ever be so wretched, so desolate that you would not prefer it to Rome's urban horrors: fires, slums, and the thousand other perils of our savage city (*especially* poets reciting in the heat of August!)?"

The sentiment purposefully recalls another prologue, the opening lines of the first satire, program to Book One (1—18):

> Semper ego auditor tantum? numquamne reponam
> vexatus totiens rauci Theseide Cordi?
> inpune ergo mihi recitaverit ille togatas,
> hic elegos? inpune diem consumpserit ingens
> Telephus aut summi plena iam margine libri
> scriptus et in tergo necdum finitus Orestes?
> nota magis nulli domus est sua quam mihi lucus
> Martis et Aeoliis vicinum rupibus antrum
> Vulcani; quid agant venti, quas torqueat umbras
> Aeacus, unde alius furtivae devehat aurum
> pelliculae, quantas iaculetur Monychus ornos,
> Frontonis platani convolsaque marmora clamant
> semper et adsiduo ruptae lectore columnae.
> expectes eadem a summo minimoque poeta.
> et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus, et nos

[87] *Op. cit.* (above, n. 74) 127: it is a difficult sentence, but Mason's point seems clear. The same critic continues, „by this device we are prevented from gauging how bad Juvenal considered the situation was. . . .Our minds stop short of the ironic climax: the theme dissolves into a number of points: points, as it were, that do not make up a line, for nothing comes of the point made here. The poets, we find, have put in their last appearance in the poem". But perhaps the *poetae recitantes* do reappear, one of them at least, in the person of Umbricius himself; another may be Cordus in 203—11, discussed below. For a similar anticlimax in a partially analogous context, see 8.211—21, where Juvenal concludes a list of Nero's misdeeds with the observation, *in scena numquam cantavit Orestes, / Troica non scripsit.*

> consilium dedimus Sullae, privatus ut altum
> dormiret. stulta est clementia, cum tot ubique
> vatibus occurras, perituraе parcere chartae.[88]

While the satirist's *indignatio* is characteristically exaggerated here, one could hardly question that Juvenal was at the very least annoyed by the long-winded poetasters of his day, especially those who dabbled in epic. In fact, this must have been a very special grievance for Juvenal to announce it at the beginning of his program satire. One might expect the complaint to appear again, and so it does, of course, not just explicitly, as in 3. 9 or 8. 220f, but implicitly in the absurdly inflated style and pompous tone so often employed in the Satires to parody these latter-day Homers and Vergils. The satirist's scorn for Rome's third-rate versifiers, which is expressed at such length in 1. 1—18 and startlingly echoed at the center of his prologue to Satire Three, is not taken up by Umbricius in his wholesale condemnation of the city because he was himself very likely introduced by Juvenal to represent that *umbratilis chorus scriptorum*, which even Horace had mocked.

As Juvenal has attempted to reveal, however subtly, Umbricius was quite sympathetic toward the very men criticized by the satirist in his indictment of contemporary poetasters. I refer to that unforgettable character who is the first to be named and scolded in the Satires, the bawling epic author Cordus (see the text of 1. 1f above). Cordus is unknown outside Juvenal and may be fictitious. But it is difficult to deny that he is the same character who reappears in Three at 203—211:

> lectus erat Cordo Procula minor, urceoli sex
> ornamentum abaci, nec non et parvulus infra
> cantharus et recubans sub eodem marmore Chiron, 205
> iamque vetus Graecos servabat cista libellos
> et divina opici rodebant carmina mures.
> nil habuit Cordus, quis enim negat? et tamen illud
> perdidit infelix totum nihil. ultimus autem
> aerumnae cumulus, quod nudum et frusta rogantem 210
> nemo cibo, nemo hospitio tectoque iuvabit.[89]

---

[88] Portions of this prologue, just as parts of Satire Three, show influence from Hor. *Ep.* 2.2: see below and n. 134.

[89] There has been considerable controversy over the textual and interpretative problems involving this name (*Cordus* or *Codrus*?) in both passages. Early editors read *Codr-* throughout. Jahn (Berlin: 1851), the first of Juvenal's editors to place a special value on P, preferred *Cordi* at 1.2, supposing that the reference in 3.203—11 was to some other, equally unknown litterateur named Codrus. P actually has *co dri* at 1.2, but apparently in a later hand: proceeding on the often acceptable principle that where P has been „corrected" the result is an inferior reading, Duff argued that in Satire One „the true form of the name is *Cordi*, and that it was originally found in P, before the corrector erased the *r* and changed *i* to *ri*. . . , haunted by the recollection of *Codrus* in Sat III.203ff" (p. xlv of the intro. to his ed., cited above, n. 13). Duff and other editors subsequent to Jahn have accepted his text; and so, most recently, has Barry Baldwin (above, n. 14: p. 102f; also Highet, n. 15 above, p. 300). *Cordi* is surely right in 1.2. But in 1940 Ulrich Knoche accepted *Cord-* in Satire Three as well (*Handschriftliche Grundlagen des Juvenaltextes*, *Philologus* Suppl. 33.1, p.

Cordus, a „poor poet in every sense," as Lewis Evans has described him,[90] spent his nights tucked into a tiny cot, at bedside his little Greek source-books, which as he slept were gnawed by barbaric Roman mice; days he passed making himself hoarse through endless recitations of his rehashed epic verse. While the character represents for Juvenal a well-known type of nuisance and hence a source for satiric amusement, Umbricius regards him with a total, almost anguished sympathy (a distinction that recalls the difference of attitude toward Numa discussed earlier). What some have regarded as an inconsistency in the attitude of Juvenal toward Cordus ceases to appear so once it is recognized that Umbricius also is a „figure of fun." For in Satire Three it is the wretched Umbricius, probably a poetaster himself, who commiserates with his poor poet-friend Cordus, a fellow bore: the two seem to typify that mutual admiration society of petty versifiers that Horace had ridiculed in *Epistulae* 2. 2. Juvenal's own attitude toward Cordus in the third satire, and the reaction which he hoped to elicit in his audience, remians essentially the same as that expressed more directly in One, where — it is most important to remember — the

---

303f), and later incorporated *Cordo* and *Cordus* at 3.203 and 208 in his Munich text (1950). Likewise John Griffith, in a thorough survey of the evidence („Varia Iuvenaliana", *CR* N.S. 1 [1951] 138f), has demonstrated clearly the reasons why *Cord-* is most likely correct in both passages; and now Clausen reads *Cord-* throughout in his Oxford text (1959). Griffith offers two possible explanations of the corruptions in the tradition: „either at an early stage in the transmission an intrusive *r* worked its way in.. . as we see in Vind. in iii.208 [*cordrus*], and then the wrong *r* was deleted by a corrector [at 1.2, i.e., P may originally have read *cordri*], or in 1.2 the proximity of the Greek names Theseis, Telephus, and Orestes facilitated the interpolation." *Codrus* is, of course, Greek (which explains why the name „does not appear in I. Kajanto's *The Latin Cognomina*. . . at all" [Baldwin, p. 102 n. 16]: Kajanto catalogues principally Roman cognomina „of Latin origin", p. 9), and would thus be out of place in One and esp. Three, where we certainly should not expect Umbricius to be so sympathetic toward anyone with a Greek name. I have very little doubt that Knoche, Griffith, and Clausen are right (despite Baldwin, who ignores Knoche entirely in his erroneous remark that at 3.203 and 208 „only Clausen finds a place for Cordus": p. 102). And it seems most likely that Juvenal was thinking of the same person or type in both passages, given the recurring idea of the character's literary interests. Thus I find myself in agreement with the scholiast (on 3.203, referring to 1.2: *pauper poeta, cuius et supra meminit*) and F. Strauch (above, n. 13: p. 36 n. 4), who had defended *Cord-* in One and Three seventy years before Knoche; see also Ecco Epkema *Prosopographiae Juvenalis pars prior* (Amsterdam: 1864) 20f. Examination of the prosopography for *Cordus* in *RE*, *PIR*, *TLL Onomasticon*, and the *CIL* indices, reveals no likely candidate for identification with Juvenal's poet, although the cognomen is attested for several political figures of the early empire and for the historian A. Cremutius Cordus (the suggestion of Pearson and Strong [above, n. 33] that Juvenal's Cordus was „possibly a descendent" of Cremutius is unfounded). Identification with Martial's Cordus, though rejected by Friedländer, Wilson, and Stein (see *PIR*^{2} 1235 and 1291—92), appears the only possibility, and this character (if indeed Martial means to refer to a single person in these several places), who is portrayed as an ostentatious man (2.57, 5.23 and 26), with some literary interests (3.83), and of less than equestrian status (5.23, 3.15: *pauper*), may be fictional (cf. Baldwin, 102f).

[96] Evans, trans. (London: 1852) n. on 1.2.

poet's aim was to preview and in some measure to illuminate the themes and characters of Satires Two through Five.

The present interpretation depends upon the view that Umbricius was a poet. This is something Juvenal never says, never announces directly. But of course the Satires often have their greatest impact in what is only suggested; irony and indirection, with a generous sprinkling of wit, are what distinguish satire, Juvenalian satire in particular, from moral essay, diatribe, or sermon. If Juvenal had no sense for the dramatic, he would never have introduced the Umbricius character at all. As it is, Juvenal at line 21, and for the poem's remaining 301 lines, relinquishes the pulpit to Umbricius, who then commences his lengthy *recitatio* with a summary statement of *propositum* and motive (21—29): he is withdrawing from Rome because the city has refused her patronage, *quando artibus... honestis / nullus in urbe locus, nulla emolumenta laborum* (21f). Umbricius himself fails to identify explicitly the nature of these *labores* for which he had expected compensation; he does not define the *ars* at which he has proven so unsuccessful that he is compelled to retreat. But he will furnish the audience with clues, as Juvenal had already in the prologue with his reference to the horrors of *poetae recitantes* and the Umbricius/Egeria analogy.

Umbricius may be providing a slight hint in the opening of his own prologue. Having lambasted some of the city's more lucrative (and to us generally acceptable) professions, Umbricius asks (41), *Quid Romae faciam*? He proceeds immediately to answer his own question in terms of what he can not or will not do (41—48):

> mentiri nescio: librum,
> si malus est, nequeo laudare et poscere; motus
> astrorum ignoro; funus promittere patris
> nec volo nec possum; ranarum viscera numquam
> inspexi; ferre ad nuptam quae mittit adulter,
> quae mandat, norunt alii; me nemo ministro
> fur erit, atque ideo nulli comes exeo tamquam
> mancus et extinctae corpus non utile dextrae.

This list ranges from flattery to homicide, with the opening statement signalling Umbricius' interest in literature. The lines (41f) recall an epigram published earlier by Martial (7. 90):

> Iactat inaequalem Matho me fecisse libellum:
> si verum est, laudat carmina nostra Matho.
> aequales scribit libros Calvinus et Umber:
> aequalis liber est, Cretice, qui malus est.

By implication, Matho is the sort of critic who, unlike Umbricius, will praise bad books of verse, the kind a Calvinus or an Umber might write. Although the chance that Umbricius should be connected with Umber is tantalizing, the verbal similarities are too prosaic to prove

that Juvenal had this epigram in mind when composing 3. 41f.[91] However, the parallel language suggests at least that Umbricius had a critic's interest, if not an author's, in poetry.

The notion that Umbricius may be some type of litterateur is not entirely new. Charles Witke labels him „a well-trained rhetorician," whose speech demonstrates his „education and polish." Umbricius, like Daedalus, Witke suggests, „must flee from an audience hostile to his workmanship. (The poets recite, we were told by Juvenal, line 9, but the Muses are not with them, having been driven out, *eiectis Camenis*, 16)": Umbricius is one of these poets and Satire Three, concludes Witke, „is an evocation of the hard life of Rome's poverty-ridden intelligentsia."[92] Though he ultimately concedes to the traditional view that Umbricius is a mask for Juvenal himself, Professor Witke still has seen more perceptively than any other critic that Umbricius was designed to represent the Roman poet class. What he fails to see is that the wholly negative sentiment of verse 9 disallows our identifyng Umbricius with Juvenal.

Umbricius' attitude toward the poetaster Cordus, which we have already discussed, and perhaps even certain characteristics of his language, to be considered shortly, may provide additional clues to the character's profession. Hovever, the final and nearly unequivocal clarification of Umbricius' profitless *ars*, taken with the several hints supplied earlier, was intended to come only at the satire's conclusion, where it would produce a neat and appropriately ironic climax. As Umbricius is at last compelled by the lateness of the hour to terminate what has begun to seem an interminable harangue, he closes with a promise to visit Juvenal whenever the satirist may be vacationing at cool Aquinum. Further, he announces (321f),

> saturarum ego (ni pudet illas)
> adiutor gelidos veniam caligatus in agros.

[91] 7.90 is, however, as likely as any of the Epigrams to have caught Juvenal's attention, since it directly precedes one of Martial's three poems mentioning the satirist himself (7.91, 7.24, and 12.18, on which see Highet, n. 15 above, p. 17—19). For Martial's extensive influence on Juvenal (and on Satire Three in particular), see Mason (above, n. 74) esp. p. 124 („This third poem of Juvenal's. . . is the one where Martial is most present and is most frequently drawn on."); also the basic bibliography in n. 3, p. 403, and p. 418f of R.E. Colton's „Echoes of Martial in Juvenal's Third Satire", *Traditio* 22 (1966) 403—19: a useful summary, though I should not be inclined to see deliberate imitation at work as often as Colton does. With Juv. 3.41f Colton compares Mart. 12.40.1, *recitas mala carmina, laudo* (also 2.27, 10.10). Though one must not casually equate characters of the same name in Martial and Juvenal, some of the named persons or types in the first book of the Satires who are possibly inspired by the Epigrams include Chione (Juv. 3.135f, cf. esp. Mart. 3.30.4), Catulla (2.49, 10.322, cf. Mart. 8.53 and see my „Catullus and Catulla in Juvenal", *RPh* 48 [1974] 71f), Crispinus (1.27, 4.1ff, cf. Mart. 8.48), Matho (1.32, 7.129, 11.34, cf. Mart. 4.79, 7.10), Galla (1.125, cf. Mart. 7.58, 10.75, 11.19), Seneca and Piso (5.109, cf. Mart. 12.36).

[92] *Op. cit.* (above, n. 29) 131. William Anderson labels Umbricius „the ideal orator", p. 42 of his „Juvenal and Quintilian", *YCS* 17 (1961) 3—93. The implication of Mason's remarks on Umbricius' style is that the Rome-fugitive is either a rhetorician or a poet: like Witke, however, Mason finally would identify him with Juvenal (*op. cit.*, n. 74 above, p. 135).

A majority of the twentieth century editions of Juvenal, however, including Housman's (1930) and most recently Clausen's Oxford text (1959), read *auditor*, which has the probable authority of P (the ninth century *codex Montepessulanus*).[93] But the vulgate *adiutor*, favored by most early editors, among whom Jahn (1851: despite his considerable respect for P), Bücheler (1893), and Friedländer (1895), has been defended in the last generation by Helm (1943), Knoche, who incorporates the reading in his authoritative text (1950), and Schuster (1961).[94] In what has seemed to both sides in this debate an absence of compelling manuscript evidence, judgements have generally been subjective: while Duff remarks that „It is hard to see how Umbr. could help the satires except by listening to them", Magariños observes, „Un argumento a favor de nuestra lectura sería la expresión *ni pudet illas* (321), que resultaría exagerada si se la aplícara a un simple oyente."[95]

I am attracted to Knoche's text here for two reasons. First, *adiutor* is certainly the *lectio difficilior*;[96] a copyist could easily have been tempted to substitute the more familiar *auditor* (most memorable for its use in 1. 1). Secondly, the idea implicit in the reading *adiutor saturarum* would complete the image of Umbricius' *ars* that the satirist has very delicately developed throughout the poem: Umbricius is a poet of sorts who now even offers assistance to Juvenal. The pretentious offer is meant to come as a complete surprise, an effect intentionally underscored by the emphatic placement of *adiutor* as first word in the final verse of the satire. Polstorff's argument that „non adiutorem optant poetae, sed auditorem" may be correct in itself, but as an objec-

---

[93] P may originally have read *auditor*: the present reading *adiutor* appears in rasura, in a later hand. See esp. the notes of Duff and Wilson *ad loc.*, and the *apparatus* in Jahn, Bücheler, and Knoche. Among the editors approving *auditor* besides Duff, Wilson, Housman, and Clausen, are Hardy (1891), Pearson and Strong (1892), Wright (1901). Leo (1910), Ramsay (1918), and Labriolle and Villeneuve (1921); so also Vollmer *RE* „Iunius (Iuvenalis)" no. 87 (1917); Gertrude Mary Hirst „Notes on Juvenal, I, III, VI, X", *AJP* 45 (1924) 280; Highet (above, n. 15) 256 n. 23.

[94] Bücheler shifted from Jahn's *adiutor* to *auditor* in 1886, but back to *adiutor* again in his 1893 ed. (the 1910 ed. followed Bücheler's death by two years, and I assume that Leo was responsible for the reversion to *auditor*). Other early editors and translators favoring *adiutor* include Mancinelli (1497), Schrevelius (1671), Henninius (1781), Heinrich (1839), Stocker (1839), MacLeane (1867), Lewis (1873), and Weidner (1889). And as mentioned in the text, Rudolf Helm, „Römischer Satiriker: 1936—1940", Bursian *JAW* 282 (1943) 32; Knoche, ed. (Munich: 1950); Schuster *op. cit.* (above, n. 7). For others see below, n. 95 and 100.

[95] Duff (above, n. 13) *ad loc.*; G. Magariños *Juvenal y su tercera satira* (Madrid: 1956) 119 n. 69.

[96] This is also Wilson's judgement (above, n. 13) „Notes" p. 44 n. 1. But the reading is not *nimis difficilis*; the syntax, *adiutor* with an objective genitive of the matter assisted in, is well attested among authors from the 2nd c. through Juvenal's day: cf. Ter. *Ad.* 144, *si adiutor sim eius iracundiae*; Cic. *Off.* 3.116, *adiutor. . . sententiae*; Tac. *Ann.* 4.7, *imperii. . . adiutor*; Plin. *Ep.* 6.9.2, *precum. . . adiutor*; for others see *TLL* 1.714.64ff, where Juv. 3.321f is cited as an instance of this construction. Juvenal has a distinct fondness for nouns of agent in *-tor*: e.g., *auditor* (1.1 and 166), *spoliator* (1.46), *signator* (1.67), *grassator* (3.305), *induperator* (4.29), etc.

tion to *adiutor* here it is invalid.[97] For, in the drama of Satire Three, Juvenal has not had an *auditor* for these 302 lines, but once again, alas, has *been* one, a circumstance that immediately calls to mind the programmatic protest of 1. 1: *Semper ego auditor tantum*?

If *saturarum. . . / adiutor* is to be accepted as the original reading at 321f and Umbricius did envision himself as a potential *adiutor* to Juvenal, the phrase must mean „an assistant in the writing of your Satires." Schuster supposes that Umbricius' aid was limited to offering an occasional thought or some moral support, since none of his poetry survives and we lack further notice of his poetic abilities or accomplishments.[98] Other minor poets, however, have doubtless been entirely lost to us, and we know the names of many whose work survives only in the barest fragments or not at all. And, again, Umbricius may be fictional. In any case, the assistance implied in *adiutor* (which is simply the equivalent of *is qui adiuvat*) is often more substantial than that suggested by Schuster.[99] Here, given the earlier clues to the emigrant's unappreciated calling and Juvenal's careful emphasis on *adiutor* in 322, Umbricius seems to be offering a good deal more than moral support.

I am reminded of the bore's offer in Horace *Sermones* 1.9.45—48:

> haberes 45
> magnum adiutorem, posset qui ferre secundas,
> hunc hominem velles si tradere; dispeream, ni
> summosses omnis.

Like Umbricius in Juvenal 3.322, the parasite of *Sermones* 1.9 is just the sort of „assistant" the satirist would as happily do without. Both characters invite themselves, without encouragement, into the satirist's company: Horace's bore — also a poet (23f) — aspires to admission into the literary circle of Maecenas, while Juvenal's Umbricius aspires to assist in the satirist's literary production.

Umbricius' aspiration seems to confirm the view that he was, or fancied himself to be, a fellow poet:

> saturarum ego (ni pudet illas)
> adiutor gelidos veniam caligatus in agros.
>
> As to your Satires, I—unless it shames them—I shall come, clodhopping into the chilly fields, to *help you write them*![100]

---

[97] H. Polstorff *In Iuvenalis satiras observationes criticae* (Güstrow: 1896), as cited by Wilson (*ibid.*); I have been unable to obtain a copy of this monograph in the United States.

[98] Schuster (cited above, n. 7): „. . . wie diese Satire selbst zeigt, gab U. schon durch sein Denken und Tun dem befreundeten Dichter Beiträge zu dessen poetischem Schaffen; und er wird wohl auch durch Anerkennung und Bewunderung zum Förderer der Iuvenalischen Satiren geworden sein. An eigene dichterische Beiträge des U., von dessen poetischer Beschäftigung überhaupt keine Kunde besteht, darf man keinesfalls denken."

[99] See *TLL* 1.714.16ff; cf. Quint. 2.5.3; Suet. *Iul.* 12, *Aug.* 10.2.

[100] Cf. the trans. of Dryden (1697), „Then, to assist your Satyrs, I will come: / And add new Venom, when you write of *Rome*", and Lewis (1873), „I will come,

And so Umbricius ends, with a conclusion as abrupt and surprising as his harangue had been tedious. The effect is almost ludicrous: through the galloping dactylic rhythm of his closing line (the rhythm is dactylic after the emphatic opening spondee in *adiutor*) Juvenal accents this comic picture of the bumpkin-booted poetaster hastening, uninvited, to offer his literary services to the satirist. The only response Juvenal finds suitable is silence, though perhaps in his mind — and the audience's — was the thought, *Pudet quidem illas*! J. R. C. Martyn has suggested that in 321f the satirist „neatly parodies... Vergil's embarassment over 'fimus'" in *Georgics* 1.80f: *ne* saturare *fimo pingui* pudeat *sola neve / effetos cinerem immundum iactare* per agros.[101] If Martyn is right (and there seems little doubt), the allusion can not reflect flatteringly upon Umbricius, who, appropriately clad in his *caligae* is the unwitting victim of his creator's scatological aspersions. Juvenal could hardly have demonstrated more dramatically or more humorously the horrific perils of *Augusto recitantes mense poetas.*[102]

V.

The poet's essential skill is his diction. If verse 9, like the other lines of Juvenal's prologue, was intended to foreshadow some element that would appear later in the satire, it could have been not only Umbricius' declaration of his poetic readiness (321f) but even the *elocutio* he demonstrates throughout his lengthy and often bombastic recitation. Of course, Juvenalian satire in general is highly rhetorical, a quality always noticed and sometimes criticized.[103] But, it has been observed, of all the Satires none seems more thoroughly saturated in the *genus grande* than Three, far the greatest part of which is Umbricius' speech. In her indispensable study, „The Grand Style

---

in my hobnailed shoes, to that cool country to assist you in your Satires, if they be not ashamed *of my aid.*" Gifford's trans. (1817) reflects the earlier metaphorical interpretation (now generally abandoned in this context) of *adiutor* in the more technical sense of „military adjutant", with *caligatus* referring to special, coarse military boots: „For your bleak hills my Cumae I'll resign / And (if you blush not at such aid as mine) / Come well equipp'd, to wage, in angry rhymes, / Fierce war, with you, on follies and on crimes." But cf. Schuster (above, n. 7): „Bei *caligatus* hat man an derbe, aus ungegerbten Leder hergestellte Stiefel zu denken, wie sie bei Hirten und Bauern in Gebrauch waren: . . .'Ich komme zu dir in das kühle Gelände (Aquinums), wenn sich die Satiren nicht eines bäurischen Gehilfen. . . schämen."

[101] Martyn, „False Modesty in Vergil", *Vergilius* 15 (1969) 53f.

[102] Pearson and Strong (above, n. 33: *ad loc.*) suggest that *gelidos* in 322 is to be contrasted with the heat of *Augusto mense* (so also Hirst, n. 93 above, p. 280 — of course, farther north and inland from Cumae, Aquinum does have a cooler climate). If this contrast was intentional, Juvenal is one last time calling attention to the thematic importance of line 9 and the link between Umbricius and the *poetae recitantes*. Notice that when Umbricius finally concludes his *recitatio* it is sunset (*sol inclinat*: 316): another pastoral touch, but one that also implies Umbricius' long-windedness.

[103] See esp. J. de Decker *Juvenalis declamans* (Gand: 1913); more tolerant studies of Juvenal's style include Inez G. Scott (Ryberg), „The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal", *Smith College Classical Studies* 8 (1927), and Anderson „Juvenal and Quintilian" (above, n. 92).

in the Satires of Juvenal", Inez Scott has dealt at length with *amplificatio*, the stylistic „luxuriance" that the rhetorical schools considered so effective in emotional appeals and the development of commonplaces.[104] Satire Three, viewed by Professor Scott as a development of the topos „complaints against life in Rome", is adduced as her prime example of grandiloquence in Juvenal. In discussing the poet's use of such devices as hyperbole, contrast, accumulation, climax, asyndeton, anaphora, and repetition, she concludes that „The entire satire consists in amplification."[105] Later critics, while not always agreeing on particulars, have ordinarily concurred with Professor Scott's general estimate of the poem's intensely rhetorical quality.[106]

For William Anderson, Umbricius is a Juvenalian *persona* representing „the ideal orator, *vir bonus atque Romanus*."[107] Yet, even with considerations of his character and his *Romanitas* aside, Umbricius seems something less than an „ideal orator." By ancient literary standards the sublimity befitting the *genus grande* depended as much upon „appropriate external expression" as upon emotionality.[108] An appeal to the emotions (anger and indignation in the case of Umbricius) may fall short of this critical „sublimity" if it is incongruous, insincere, or utterly irrational, or if its expression is overblown or otherwise inappropriate. By these standards there is nothing sublime in Umbricius' impassioned rhetoric. And if Three is the most profuse of the Satires, it is not impossible that Juvenal intended his audiences to blame the excess on Umbricius.[109]

Indeed, one of the satirist's chief aims in this poem may well have been to poke fun at Umbricius' fustian *poesis*. H. A. Mason has seen this more clearly than others. In his discussion of the satire's grandiosity, Mason has suggested that the declamatory quality of 3.21—322 may itself be among Juvenal's targets, that the satirist here is „laughing... at the attempt by contemporary writers of solemn hexameters to take themselves seriously", and that the point of the poem's tone and struc-

[104] *Amplificatio*, that is, in the broader sense, „implying the lofty tone and sonorousness of language of the style as well as the specific devices of ornamentation": Scott, p. 37.

[105] Ibid., p. 38 and esp. 41—43; and cf. Decker (above, n. 103) 37f and *passim*.

[106] Cf. F. Gauger *Zeitschilderung und Topik bei Juvenal* (Bottrop: 1936), esp. 20—25; Highet (above, n. 15) ch. 9 and notes; Anderson (n. 92) 38—51; Witke (n. 29) 147; and Mason, whose views are discussed below.

[107] *Op. cit.* (n. 92) 42.

[108] See Scott's discussion (above, n. 103) 18—20, and Longinus *On the Sublime* 2—8.

[109] Lucretius, well-known to Juvenal and himself an important figure in the satiric tradition, at times employed this same technique of imitating a particular character's style in order to mock it; for the satiric elements in Lucretius, see the concise discussion and bibliography in E. J. Kenney, ed., *Lucretius: De rerum natura*, Book III (Cambridge: 1971) 14—20. Cf. David West (above, n. 24) 26—28 and 73, esp. 26: „Lucretius has often suffered because commentators have failed to notice his trick of putting words on the lips of his opponents. Being merciless and often unfair in controversy, he regularly mimics their style of speech" — some instances are 1.643f, 5.110—13, 6.850—53.

ture might thus be „literary not social criticism."[110] Mason, I am convinced, has correctly identified an important motive for the peculiar design of Three — but one ought not to discard the satire's social purposes altogether. As always in Juvenal, the attack is double-edged: surely the poet expected his audience to agree with much of what Umbricius had to say, as audiences have done these nineteen-hundred years. On the other hand, Juvenal did not mean his listeners to admire wholeheartedly the emigrant's motives, his prejudices, his actions and unreasoned reactions, or the distortions of his excessively rhetorical versifying. While Umbricius is made to employ the same familiar devices that appear in the other satires, Juvenal deliberately inflates his style to such a degree that the speaker and his arguments can only appear ridiculous. Through the language which Juvenal has given him and through the satirist's dramatic delivery of his harangue, Umbricius *amicus* more and more resembles Damasippus, Davus, and „friend" Catius from Horace's *Sermones*. But one need look no further than the Satires themselves for a demonstration of the sort of inverted attack Juvenal employs in Three. In Satire Thirteen for example, as Mark Morford has recently made clear, Juvenal „satirizes the genre itself [*consolatio*] and Calvinus [his addressee]"; and, significantly, a very similar intent is evident in parts of the program piece, Satire One, which will be discussed shortly.[111]

Now it is without question a delicate operation to distinguish between a „typical" Juvenalian style and the style of Umbricius, inasmuch as both the character and his language are Juvenal's own creations. Often no distinction can be made and, admittedly, every element of Umbricius' diction can be found elsewhere in the Satires. But, as observed earlier, critics of Satire Three like Scott and Mason have been

---

[110] *Op. cit.* (above, n. 74) 126, 135: Mason, however, goes on to suggest that Juvenal may be laughing at *himself* as well, „recalling in verse the recitations he had so often delivered in prose"; I find this notion less persuasive.

[111] Morford, „Juvenal's Thirteenth Satire", *AJP* 94 (1973) 26—36. This poem has been misunderstood until recently in much the same way as Three: Juvenal was again taken far too seriosly and Thirteen was regarded as a most grave, if sometimes confused, *consolatio*. But it is a *mock* consolation (besides Morford, see Pryor's 1962 paper, cited by Morford, n. 2; also Lowell Edmunds, „Juvenal's Thirteenth Satire", *RhM* 115 [1972] 59—73). Morford concludes (p. 36): „Juvenal's genius has taken the well-worn material and has fashioned it into subtle and ironic satire in which popular philosophers, the literary genre of *consolationes*, and the recipient of the consolation himself, are all deflated." Professor Morford is surely correct; my only objection is to his implication that this sort of inverted technique is absent from the earlier books: „Juvenal himself, now preferring irony to *indignatio*, remains concealed behind the satirist's *persona*. . ." (p. 36). But the *indignatio* of Book One is itself a sham, a stock element in the rhetorician's handbook (as Juvenal and his audiences recognized), and in its most exaggerated form Juvenal always gives the emotion to his characters, like Laronia and Umbricius, or, in the later books, Naevolus and even Calvinus. There is no absolute shift from indignation to irony: both elements are always present to some degree in the Satires. Juvenal's fierce *indignatio* (Umbricius' in Three) — like the emotional consolation in Thirteen or Damasippus' rigidly orthodox diatribe in Hor. *Serm.* 2.3 — is itself an object of the satirist's ironic appeal to his audience's common sense and sense of humor.

careful to point out that, in overall effect, the poem's highly rhetorical quality is inordinate — even for Juvenal. Allowing this, the reader will perhaps be content with the discussion of a few passages that do illustrate the remarkable stylistic impropriety and inflation designed by Juvenal with the possible aim of making Umbricius a ludicrous and unpersuasive character.

In what serves as the prologue to his invective, Umbricius identifies his *propositum vitae* and the motives for it with characteristic bombast (21—29):

> quando artibus . . . honestis
> nullus in urbe locus, nulla emolumenta laborum,
> res hodie minor est here quam fuit atque eadem cras
> deteret exiguis aliquid, proponimus illuc
> ire, fatigatas ubi Daedalus exuit alas,
> dum nova canities, dum prima et recta senectus,
> dum superest Lachesi quod torqueat et pedibus me
> porto meis nullo dextram subeunte bacillo.
> cedamus patria.

The anaphora and asyndeton of 22—24 are typical (compare 26—28) and so especially is the *antonomasia* by which Umbricius identifies his destination (24f), a device considered by the ancients appropriate only to the *genus grande* and to poetry rather than oratory.[112] Longinus warned that the use of periphrasis in general is „a hazardous business, more so than any other figure, unless it is used with a certain sense of proportion. For it quickly lapses into insipidity, akin to empty chatter and dullness of wit."[113] No doubt Longinus would have criticized the pretentiousness of 3. 84f,

> usque adeo nihil est quod nostra infantia caelum
> hausit Aventini baca nutrita Sabina,

where Umbricius deems *baca Sabina* necessary for *oliva*. The critic would also have shuddered at the grotesque circumlocution in 90f:

> miratur vocem angustam, qua deterius nec
> ille sonat quo mordetur gallina marito.

Ille. . . marito, Umbricius' absurd construct for *gallus*, is just the sort of stylistic monstrosity that serves to distinguish the Rome-fugitive's language from Juvenal's own.

Juvenal himself was fully aware of the hazards inherent in the improper use of periphrasis (indeed, his sense of style often coincides with that of his contemporary, Longinus). He began his first satire — which, again it must be remembered, functioned as the program to Book One by introducing many of the themes, characters, and even *techniques* that would appear in Satires Two through Five — with a

---

[112] For Juvenal's use of *antonomasia*, see Anderson (n. 92) 71—73, and Scott (n. 103) 30, 70—73, 80—82, 87. Cf. Quint. 8.6.59—61. For *proponere*/*propositio*, used quasi-technically in verse 24, see Cic. *Or.* 40.137, *Brut.* 60.217.

[113] *On the Subtime* 29.1, trans. by T.S. Dorsch (Baltimore: 1965).

candid expression of his aversion for the poets of his day, particularly those who dabbled in the grand style of epic. In reproducing a selection of their rehashed epic themes, Juvenal employs this very device (an *antonomasia* for Colchis, Jason and the golden fleece) in order to ridicule the poetasters who so frequently musused it, through a parody of their contorted diction (1. 10—14):[114]

> *unde alius furtivae devehat aurum* 10
> *pelliculae*, quantas iaculetur Monychus ornos,
> Frontonis platani convolsaque marmora clamant
> semper et adsiduo ruptae lectore columnae.
> expectes eadem a summo minimoque poeta.

The ludicrousness of the figure is further underscored through enjambement of the contemptuous diminutive *pelliculae*. Juvenal then goes on to reject the profession of epic poet for himself with a promise to explain his preference for satire (1. 19—21).

Later in his program satire, in a passage where he repeats his rejection of epic, Juvenal again uses — or rather, mususes — *antonomasia* in a way that not only „illustrates the satirist's contempt for poetic subjects,"[115] but shows his distaste for stylistic impropriety as well (1. 52—54):

> haec ego non agitem? sed quid magis? Heracleas
> aut Diomedeas aut mugitum labyrinthi
> et mare percussum puero fabrumque volantem.

Juvenal is here demonstrating on a slighter scale the very techniques that pervade so much of Umbricius' *recitatio* in Three. The satirist's jab at *poetae recitantes* in 3. 9 was almost certainly meant to recall these important passages in One, where he derides the epic poets of his day for their effete themes and overblown language. The distinction is that in the Cumae/Daedalus periphrasis of 3. 24f, as elsewhere in his recitation, Umbricius is not ridiculing these poetasters — he *is* one. He represents just the kind of versifier and just the kind of style that Juvenal insists in Satire One, and reminds us in 3. 9, he can not abide.

Moreover, it seems probable that the Cumae/Daedalus *antonomasia* in 3. 24f was intentionally devised to call to mind the parodied circumlocution of 1. 53f, where *mugitum. . . volantem* is also an allusion to the Daedalus myth.[116] Significantly, at Daedalus' third and final appearance in the Satire, he is again, as in 1. 54, not named, but alluded to through *antonomasia* (3. 79f):

> in summa non Maurus erat neque Sarmata nec Thrax
> qui sumpsit pinnas, mediis sed natus Athenis. 80

[114] The entire passage, 1.1—18, is quoted and discussed in the preceding section of this paper. For Lucretius' similar parodic use of periphrasis, see West (above, n. 24) 28; cf. Scott, as cited in n. 112.

[115] Anderson (above, n. 92) 71.

[116] One should perhaps say rather that 1.53f was designed to foreshadow and clarify the intent of 3.24f, since Satire One, as program to the first book, was most likely composed later than Satire Three.

Pinnas here, used by synecdoche for „wings", recalls *alas* in 3. 25. The two Daedalus passages in Satire Three serve by design to illustrate the inconsistencies of Umbricius' rhetoric. For while the reference in 3. 25 is obviously sympathetic, in 3. 79f Daedalus represents for Umbricius the wily and too inventive Greek. S. C. Fredericks has rightly concluded that „the ambivalent uses of Daedalus are a signal that the contradiction lies within Umbricius himself, both with his sizing up of the problem of evil and with his strategy for a solution."[117] While Umbricius' verbosity and his constant allusion to Greek myth, first exemplified in 3. 25, suggest that he is the sort of Daedalus-poet scorned by Juvenal in 1. 52—54, the incongruities of his mythologizing help reduce his passion to what Longinus would call „empty chatter and dullness of wit."

Umbricius' reference to Daedalus and Greek myth in 3.24f and his choice of *Lachesis* in verse 27 rather than a native Latin word for the Fates point up another feature of his language, its *Graecitas*. Greek words and allusions occur again and again, and, although sometimes employed to ridicule Hellenes and Hellenophiles, they give the impression that Umbricius has himself, in a way so typical of his age, been thoroughly Hellenized in his thought and speech. Gilbert Highet has remarked that „Juvenal is here very like Cato: for although he detests the Greeks for their unscrupulousness, he still uses a lot of Greek words, and perforce recognizes the achievement of Greek artists and savants."[118] The analogy is valid, except that it should be applied to *Umbricius*, not to the satirist himself. Thus even Umbricius' language seems to suggest, what was true even for old Cato, that escape from the *orbis Graecorum* was a virtual impossibility.

Umbricius will attempt to escape nonetheless. And by his tone the fugitive implies that his exile is marked by a grandeur and pathos of epic proportions. An epic tone certainly prevails throughout the opening lines of Umbricius' prologue which we have been discussing, where he develops the Daedalus analogy with its suggestions of flight, weariness, and long suffering (25—28), the theme of *honestas* and *labores* unrewarded (21f),[119] and the allusion to the role of Lachesis in his life (27). The passage brings to mind the prologue to the *Aeneid*, where Vergil introduces the themes of flight from the fatherland and

---

[117] *Op. cit.* (above, n. 77) 13; Anderson takes a different and less persuasive view of this change of attitude toward Daedalus, *op. cit.* (above, n. 77) 66f. Neither critic notes that these two references in Three have been intentionally forshadowed by 1.52—54.

[118] Highet (above, n. 15) 255 n. 18. On Juvenal's use of Graecisms elsewhere see Anderson (above, n. 92) 54—57, and the bibliography in his notes; for Greek words and names in Umbricius' invective, see lines 25, 27, 64, 66—68 (discussed below), 76f, 83, 103, 115, 142, 173, 175, 205, 266, 288, 296.

[119] Umbricius is able to identify with Daedalus not only because both men were expatriates, but also because Daedalus' flight to Cumae came as a result of Minos' failure to appreciate his *artes honestae* (Deadalus, the inventor *par excellence*, had devised a mechanical cow that enabled Minos' wife Pasiphae to seduce an old bull-friend).

destiny's role (*fato profugus*: 2), and of labors (*tot adire labores*: 10) and long suffering (*multa . . . passus*: 5) despite goodness (*insignem pietate*: 10). But when the aging hero of Juvenal Three makes his extravagantly rhetorical appeal for our sympathy in 25—28, where he states in three lines and four different ways what could have been said in two words, he only betrays his pretentiousness and prolixity.[120] Whatever his own opinion, Umbricius is no Aeneas, nor is his plan—the antithesis of the Trojan's — so noble.

Let us consider in detail one other passage, the opening lines (58—78) of Umbricius' blustery „Invective Against Greeklings" (58—125), an important division constituting nearly one quarter of his entire speech:

quae nunc divitibus gens acceptissima nostris
et quos praecipue fugiam, properabo fateri,
nec pudor obstabit. non possum ferre, Quirites,
Graecam urbem. quamvis quota portio faecis Achaei?
iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes
et linguam et mores et cum tibicine chordas
obliquas nec non gentilia tympana secum
vexit et ad circum iussas prostare puellas.
ite, quibus grata est picta lupa barbara mitra.
rusticus ille tuus sumit trechedipna, Quirine,
et ceromatico fert niceteria collo.
hic alta Sicyone, ast hic Amydone relicta,
hic Andro, ille Samo, hic Trallibus aut Alabandis,
Esquilias dictumque petunt a vimine collem,
viscera magnarum domuum dominique futuri.
ingenium velox, audacia perdita, sermo
promptus et Isaeo torrentior. ede quid illum
esse putes. quemvis hominem secum attulit ad nos:
grammaticus, rhetor, geometres, pictor, aliptes,
augur, schoenobates, medicus, magus, omnia novit
Graeculus esuriens: in caelum iusseris, ibit.

The attack begins abruptly with a clear and „unashamed" statement of theme (58—61). Umbricius seems momentarily to forget that he is conversing with his „dear friend" Juvenal in the vale of Egeria: fired with indignation and transported by his own eloquence, Umbricius imagines himself for an instant in the midst of an audience of native Romans (*Quirites*: 60), delivering one of his magniloquent recitations. His diatribe bears all the marks of the *genus grande*: 60f contains a probable echo of Lucan *Bellum Civile* 7.404f (*nulloque frequentem | cive suo Romam sed mundi faece repletam*);[121] the rhetorical questin at 61 is followed by five others later in 81—95, which do not arouse our own indignation, as Umbricius would like, but only our

[120] The effect is accomplished through the overuse of anaphora, asyndeton, and accumulation, devices proper to the *genus grande*. While „Juvenal often carries. . . cumulative amplification to the point of redundancy, frequently using several illustrations or comparisons where one would be more effective" (Scott, above n. 103, p. 41), the effect is nowhere more diffuse than in 3.26—28. Similar accumulations appear in Umbricius' speech at 31—33, 69f, 76f, 120, 137—39, 216—20.

[121] The parallel is noted by Highet (above, n. 40) 380.

laughter, because of the drollery of the context and the speaker's language;[122] the metaphor in 62—65, which recalls Vergil's technique in *Aeneid* 8.728, and the climactic accumulation and polysyndeton in 63—65, are equally characteristic of Umbricius' diffuse *elocutio*.[123]

After the emphatic apostrophe to Quirinus and the garble of Greek words in 66—68, the epic tenor continues.[124] The hiatus in verse 70 (*Samo, // hic*) may intentionally recall *Aeneid* 1.16, *posthabita coluisse Samo: / hic illius arma*.[125] 71 contains another typically Umbrician *antonomasia*,[126] and 72 is marked by its metaphorical language, the foreboding alliteration of *-m-* (especially *-om-*, *-um-*) that Vergil was so fond of,[127] and another possible echo of *Bellum Civile* 7.[128] 69 and 70 together are reminiscent of *Aeneid* 2.28—30:

> litusque relictum:
> hic Dolopum manus, hic saevus tendebat Achilles,
> classibus hic locus, hic acie certare solebant.[129] 30

Although the similarities may only be accidental, comparison of the two passages reveals the epic texture of Umbricius' speech. Besides

---

[122] Other rhetorical questions appear in Umbricius' speech at 38, 41, 49f, 126—30, 147—51, 160—62, 183—85, 190—92, 208, 234f, 249, 259f, 291f, 309. Cf. Decker (above, n. 103) 177—86, and Scott (n. 103) 24f, 111.

[123] On 3.62 cf. Scott (n. 103) 32 and esp. 99: „Juvenal personifies the river to represent the people, as does Virgil, Aen. VIII, 728: indomitique Dahae, et pontem indignatus Araxes." On the *amplificatio* in 63—65 see Scott, p. 42. R.E. Colton, „Juvenal and Propertius", *Traditio* 23 (1967) 444, compares Prop. 2.23.21f.

[124] Note the continued use of the plural in *ite* (66). For the use and effect of apostrophe elsewhere in the Satires, see Scott (above, n. 103) 25f, 111. Note also the assonance of *Quirine* at the end of 67 with *Quirites* at the end of 60, and the juxtapositions, *Quirites, / Graecam* and *trechedipna, Quirine*: the Graecisms provide a striking antithesis to the venerable Latin names. While the Greek words in these lines (*mitra, trechedipna, ceromatico, niceteria*) may „act as the sign and object" of Umbricius' indignation (or Juvenal's as Anderson would say — above, n. 118, esp. p. 55), the result is still rhetorical excess.

[125] So Gehlen (above, n. 60) 25f (and see p. 27f and 39 for other possible reminiscences of Vergil in Juvenal Three): „Vergilius enim Samum, ubi Iunoni templum erat constructum, pulcherrimam ac copiosissimam urbem depingit propemodum mirans posthabitam esse a Iunone aliis urbibus magnificis. Idem exprimit Iuvenalis. Complures urbes opulentas ac magnificas nominatim affert, imprimis Samum, quae omnia vitae urbanae commoda praeberet, licet multi homines scelesti inde Romam peterent, ubi vitae incommoda innumerabilia essent. Sed non solum Iuvenalis Vergilii cogitationem suam reddidit assumpto Sami nomine, verum etiam ex eius auctoritate hiatum 'Samo hic' admisit. . . ." Also Scott (n. 103) 96; Highet (n. 40) 388.

[126] „The periphrasis, in order to avoid the unmetrical *Viminalis*, should be noticed": so Duff (above, n. 13) *ad loc*. But Juvenal was not so often the slave of his meter as its master. Periphrasis and antonomasia are among the satirist's favorite stylistic devices, often exploited with intentionally ludicrous results, as here in Umbricius' invective: see n. 112 and the earlier descussion of 1.10—14 and 52—54, and 3.24f, 79f, 84f, 90f, and cf. 83, 117f.

[127] E.g., *Aen*. 2.20, *uterumque armato milite complent*, and esp. 199, *hic aliud maius miseris multoque tremendum*. Cf. L.P. Wilkinson *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge: 1963) 79f.

[128] Luc 7.579, noted by Highet (above, n. 40) 383.

[129] The Vergil passage also bears a slight resemblance to Prop. 1.20.21f: *hic manus heroum, placidis ut constitit oris / mollia composita litora fronde tegit*.

parallels in the asyndeton, the anaphora of *hic*, and the echo *relictum/ relicta*,[130] there is the secondary allusion to Vergil in the hiatus of *Samo, // hic* already mentioned.[131] There is a .likeness too, if again only coincidental, in the contexts of the passages. For Vergil means to express the relief and even elation of the Trojans over the Greeks' apparent abandonment of Troy and return to their homeland, while Umbricius, in direct contrast, expresses his outrage that the Greeks have now abandoned their homeland and invaded Rome. In Umbricius' heroic imagination, this can easily constitute a latter-day and equally pernicious assault on the *Troiugenae*.[132]

There are also several striking parallels between Juvenal 3.69—71 and Horace *Epistulae* 2.2.65—69, which has a similarly mock heroic tone:

> Praeter cetera me Romaene poemata censes 65
> scribere posse inter tot curas totque labores?
> hic sponsum vocat, hic auditum scripta, relictis
> omnibus officiis; cubat hic in colle Quirini,
> hic extremo in Aventino, visendus uterque.

---

[130] The anaphora and asyndeton are noted by Scott (n. 103) 42. *Hic* is pronominal in one passage, adverbial in the other, but the sound effect of the repetition in connection with *relictum/-a* is strikingly similar: notice that the word bears the ictus throughout the *Aen.* passage, and in three of the four positions in Juvenal. *Hic* (adv., adj., and pron.) is a word frequently found in anaphora, as a glance at concordances of the Latin poets will show, and a regular attribute of the repetition is asyndeton.

One example, in fact, is in *Aen.* 1.16f, the passage Juvenal echoes in the hiatus of 3.70 (*posthabita coluisse Samo: hic illius arma, / hic currus fuit.*) But repetition of the word four times within two consecutive lines, as here in Juv. 3.69f and *Aen.* 2.29f, is not common (among the few instances are Verg. *Ecl.* 10.42f, *hic gelidi fontes, hic mollia prata, Lycori, /hic nemus: hic ipso tecum consumerer aevo*, and Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.226f, *Theb.* 7.385f); nor does this particular anaphora appear again in the Satires (though cf. 3.180—82 and 216—20). Such heavy repetition of any word (i.e., four times in two lines) is not a common feature of even Juvenal's highly rhetorical language (for a rare example cf. 7.94f, *quis* four times; also 10.220—25, *quot* seven times). A partial listing of anaphora in Juvenal appears in Decker (above, n. 103) 193—97; cf. Anderson's remarks (above, n. 92) 81—84 and esp. n. 142; Scott (n. 103) 26f; and see above on 3.22 and 26f.

[131] Imitations „blended from two or more" passages (of the same or different authors) are not rare in the Satires: so Highet (above, n. 40) 381f. A prime example cited by Highet is Juvenal 10.168f, with which cf. Luc. 3.233f, 6.63, 10.456; 8.270 seems to combine two passages from Vergil, *Aen.* 3.234 and 8.535 (Gehlen, n. 60 above, p. 21, and Highet); see also 12.110, and cf. *Aen.* 10.427 and 737 (Friedländer, n. 15 above, *ad loc.* and Highet); in Satire Three cf. 162f with *Aen.* 8.595 and *Ecl.* 9.4 (Gehlen, p. 21); and for others see Highet's list, p. 383—85.

[132] For the many adaptations and parodies of Vergil in the Satires, see Gehlen (n. 60), Scott (n. 103: *passim*), and Highet (n. 40: esp. 387f). A certain parodic allusion to *Aen.* 2 in Umbricius' harangue is at 3.198f (*iam poscit aquam, iam frivola transfert / Ucalegon*; cf. *Aen.* 2.311f: *iam proximus ardet / Ucalegon*): so Gehlen, p. 39, *et al.* The theme of the suffering Trojan, victimized by the Greek, is also recalled in Umbricius' comparison of the street bully to Achilles (3.278—80): „The epic battles of antiquity have become drunken street brawls between respectable Romans who play Hector to swaggering foreigners" (Musurillo, n. 2 above, p. 172). But again Umbricius is unduly heroicizing his situation: in fact, the bully himself seems to be a native Roman, who mistakes *Umbricius* for an easterner (*in qua te quaero proseucha?* 296)! For Umbricius this is the ultimate insult, but only because he is as fiercely prejudiced as the street brawler himself.

Again the pronoun *hic* appears four times, bearing the ictus in each instance, and *relictis* is set at the end of the verse. In addition, Horace's *in colle Quirini* may be echoed in the similar periphrasis *a vimine collem* (3.71) and *Quirine* (3.67). These same lines from Horace are imitated by Juvenal elsewhere in Book One: *officium cras / primo sole mihi peragendum in valle Quirini* (2.132f).[133] Following this rather Umbrician complaint against the many cares and *labores* of urban life, Horace proceeds to describe the wearisome recitations of Rome's mutual admiration society of poetasters (*Epistulae* 2.2.87—108), an account that Juvenal almost certainly had in mind when he composed his prologue to Satire One[134] and when he reintroduced the theme in 3.9. It is Horace's description of these shade-seeking bards in their flight from Rome that may have provided Juvenal with the inspiration for his Umbricius character and Satire Three, as suggested earlier in this paper. In view of this likelihood and the other close resemblances between the third satire and Horace's Epistle, it my be that the similarity of Juvenal 3.69—71 to *Epistulae* 2.2.65—69 is not merely fortuitous.[135]

Umbricius continues in the high style at 73f and 76f, where the use of asyndeton and accumulation serve to emphasize his envious indignation over the Greeklings' versatility. The passage reaches its climax in the hyperbole of verse 78, which, Mason is right to say, helps to establish the intended atmosphere of „unreality".[136]

> A quick wit, a villain's nerve, speech ever ready and flowing, and flowing. Just say what you think him to be. Whatever profession one wants, he is: Grammarian, Painter, Geometrician—Augur, Anointer, Sly Rhetorician, Rope-walker, Doctor, or even Magician. The lean Greekling knows everything: if it's flying you want, he'll take wing! (73—78)

Sermo / promptus et Isaeo torrentior (73f): one thinks of Umbricius himself.

Yet the grand torrent of 21—29 and 58—78 is not sustained throughout Satire Three, but instead occurs only sporadically.[137] Between his moments of heroic elation, Umbricius' language descends abruptly to the coarse and even the obscene. This constant shifting and especially what it reveals of Umbricius' thought contribute to the final seriocomic effect. In their incongruity the more florid passages

---

[133] So Schwartz (above. n. 31) 12 and 30.

[134] The thought is similar and there are noticeable verbal echoes: with *hic elegos* and *obturem patulas impune legentibus auris*, *Ep.* 2.2.91 and 105, cf. Juv. 1.3f, *impune ergo mihi recitaverit ille togatas / hic elegos*. The prologue is discussed above in section IV.

[135] For other parallels between *Epistluae* 2.2 and Juvenal Three see above and notes 20, 31, 72, and 136.

[136] Mason (above, n. 74) 128. With verses 74—78 cf. Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.7f: *litterulis Graecis imbutus, idoneus arti / cuilibet*. The disparaging allusion to Daedalus in 79f and the account of the Greeklings' success with their *amici* (81—125) have already been discussed.

[137] Chief among Umbricius' other heroic flights is the fire passage, 197—222.

may perhaps be best described as mock-epic, but only so long as we recognize that the mockery is Juvenal's and that its object is Umbricius himself, the character, his ideas, and even his manner of speaking.

VI.

Perhaps our best understanding of the Umbricius type emerges from an analysis of the character's motives, about which much has already been said or suggested. Umbricius' own explanation, offered at the very outset of his denunciation of city life, is remarkably straightforward (21—24);

> artibus . . . honestis
> nullus in urbe locus, nulla emolumenta laborum,
> res hodie minor est here quam fuit atque eadem cras
> deteret exiguis aliquid . . .

The man has been a client, a dependent of the wealthy (124f, 188f). But in this position he has never been so prosperous as his own estimate of his needs demanded. Because his own *ars honesta* (poetry?) has failed him, Umbricius concludes that there is „no place in the city for honorable skills." Umbricius has suffered *iactura clientis* and counters by rejecting the city. His repudiation of Rome, however, is hardly aesthetic or intellectual in motive: born in the city, Umbricius has lived there for many years, participating actively in the urban bustle that he now so bitterly condemns. Rather his motivation is economic, plainly and simply, a fact that is evident from his opening statement through to the very end of his invective. What Umbricius suffers is not *indigentia*, though, but *paupertas*:[138] he can not live quite so comfortably in Rome as he feels he should, despite his *ars* (21), despite his knowing all the tricks (92), and despite his customary willingness to join in the hubbub (243). One must remember that the emigrant's entire denunciation of the city is from the viewpoint neither of the well-to-do nor of the pitiably poor, but of the less than completely successful dependent, whose circumstances are humbler than suit his liking, and whose only apparent talent, poetastery, makes him the victim of a buyer's market. As Professor Highet has observed of Umbricius and Juvenal's other „paupers", „their chief struggle is not to keep from starving but to avoid the degradation of having to work."[139]

It is because of his own unhappy economic situation that Umbricius has come to resent all who enjoy financial success. His hostility is directed, on the one hand, against native Italians and Roman citizens, such as Artorius and Catulus, who have been elevated (at least in some cases for their genuine talent) from their obscure origins to

---

[138] Cf. Labriolle and Villeneuve (trans., Paris: 1921) xiii: „propriétaire d'une maison à Cumes, s'il n'a pas assez de revenu pour vivre largement à Rome, il n'est pas pour cela un indigent."

[139] Highet (above, n. 15) 68.

positions of wealth and security — this complaint despite the obscurity of Umbricius' own family—and, on the other hand, against immigrants, Greeks especially, as typified by Protogenes, Diphilus, and Hermarchus, who have attained to favorable circumstances in the city.[140] The native Italians who, unlike Umbricius, have succeeded in rising socially and economically must be dishonest, insists the long-suffering hero of 21—57; the Greeklings are far too ambitious, hypocritical, and devious (58—125). But again the source of this unrestrained enmity in the *cliens eiectus* is economic. He has competed for profitable employment with Romans of ignoble lineage like his own, and failed. He has competed with men of non-Italian origin for the patronage of some rich *amicus*, and failed. With regard to this immigrant class (whose ranks Umbricius in a sense now joins by his expedition into *Magna Graecia*), the Rome-fugitive's principal complaint (119—122) both recalls and further illuminates his opening remarks (21f: *artibus . . . honestis / nullus in urbe locus*):

> non est Romano cuiquam locus hic, ubi regnat
> Protogenes aliquis vel Diphilus aut Hermarchus, 120
> qui gentis vitio numquam partitur amicum,
> solus habet.

As suggested earlier, Umbricius objects not so much to the Greek's alleged immorality or criminality as to his success; nor is he at all concerned for the „victimized" patron, but only for the victimized Umbricius. It is easy enough to discern from the entire satire, and particularly from 21—125, that the „vice" of those who remain in Rome is that they have played the game and won, while the virtue

[140] For possible identifications of Artorius and Catulus (29f), see my „Artorius and Catulus in Juvenal", *RSC* 22 (1974) 3—7: there may be some grounds for Umbricius' anger in the case of Catulus, if, as I suggest, he is the Volusenus Catulus of Quint. 10.1.24; the only crime of Artorius Primus is that he was a successful freedman. I have to agree with Highet that „It is strange to see how bitterly he [Umbricius] despises transactions which we should think honourable and creditable, and which many of the Romans themselves must have approved" (above, n. 15: p. 70); regarding lines 41—75 Highet observes, „This part of the speech is weakened by its assumption that a career means dependency, leaning on someone rich and powerful whom you must flatter or deceive (41—45) or assist in his vices and crimes (45—57)" (p. 255 n. 15). A psychologist might call Umbricius' charges „projection". The three names in line 120 I think Juvenal has selected as typical of genuinely talented Greeks: the most famous Diphilus was the author of New Comedy; to the Roman audience *Hermarchus*, a relatively rare name, would probably recall the successor of Epicurus; the best known Protogenes was the late 4th c. painter and sculptor from Caunus, celebrated in Pliny's *Natural History*. The indefinite *aliquis* should perhaps suggest the trans., „Men like Protogenes or Diphilus or Hermarchus", i.e., as Strauch concludes (above. n. 13: p. 49), „artifices et docti homines". Thus, not even the best, most talented Greeks will escape Umbricius' indiscriminate attack; cf. Highet, as quoted above and n. 18. Musurillo (above, n. 2: p. 173), although he regards Umbricius as essentially a mask for Juvenal, senses the flawed pattern in Umbricius' attitude toward the Greeks: „Inability to assimilate the foreigner is in itself a sympton of internal degeneration." If Juvenal's „implied theme" here strikes „at the very source of all human inability to achieve", as Musurillo suggests, then Umbricius is the symbol of that Roman, and quite human, failure.

of the disappointed Umbricius is that he has played the game—just as frantically, just as avariciously--and lost. As H. A. Mason has remarked in his discussion of the *Graeculi* passage and its obscenity in particular (96f, 109—112), „Umbricius may be giving us a Roman, but surely not a noble Roman attitude."[141]

It seems at least possible that Umbricius' failure to secure satisfactory patronage was intended by Juvenal to reflect upon his inadequacies as a Cordus-like *poeta recitans*. What is certain is that the character's status as *cliens pauper et eiectus* motivates his rhetoric as well as his action. His destined flight into Great Greece seems puzzling and extremely ill-considered in the context of his espoused likes and dislikes. Action, motivation, and rhetoric, viewed together, betray a character blemished at times by unreason, hypocrisy, prejudice, bombast, and an unduly inflated self-image. The audience need not despise Umbricius, but surely they are not expected to idolize him either, or to heed his words in awestruck credulity. Umbricius is no hero, nor is his situation heroic. He is simply human, like the urban organism he so unconscionably renounces. If the world Umbricius describes is flawed, so is he. And it is the universal human failings of both individual and society that together are the object of Juvenal's dramatic satire.

The client-friend Umbricius, it might be noted in conclusion, faces a critical turning point in his life comparable in many ways to that of two similarly unsympathetic characters from the Satires, Ursidius Postumus in Six[142] and Naevolus in Nine. In Satire Six, which is ostensibly aimed solely at women and marriage, all the men who are incidentally portrayed also turn out to be distinctly unadmirable figures, including even the bridegroom Postumus.[143] As in Satire Three, Juvenal opens Six with a prologue of twenty lines spoken in what is essentially his own character, where he develops the *locus communis*, „The Chaste and Untainted Golden Age of Man". Always irreverent, Juvenal introduces his acorn-belching caveman here for much the same reason as the allusion to Numa's midnight jousts with Egeria in Three, that is to diminish the severe tone that might otherwise be generated. Postumus' name, like Umbricius', is announced in 21, the first of four lines forming a transition from the Golden Age through the Silver to the criminal Age of Iron. At verse 25 Juvenal allows the poem's dominant *persona* to take over. The speaker is a friendly advisor who sympathizes with Postumus and then, like Umbricius, proceeds with his denuneiation, nearly forgetting the comrade with whom he is conversing.[144] But Juvenal himself has no sympathy for Postumus,

[141] *Op. cit.* (above, n. 74) 129.

[142] I think that Anderson is mistaken in distinguishing two characters here, an Ursidius and a Postumus (above, n. 92: p. 40 n. 63).

[143] This is entirely by design; a similar technique is employed in Satire Two: while the satirist's ostensible target in Two is men (particularly hypocrites and homosexuals) and in Six women, Juvenal portrays the crimes and foibles of both sexes in each satire.

[144] After line 42 Postumus is addressed by name only once again, at 377.

for it is clear that he regards adultery as degenerate and criminal (6.21—24), and Postumus is *moechorum notissimus olim* (42) as well as a paederast (34—37, 377f). In fact, Juvenal is no more to be identified narrowly with the „friendly advisor" *persona* of Six than he is with Umbricius *amicus*, the principal character of Three.[145]

Naevolus, the protagonist in Nine, is like Postumus an adulterer (9.25: *notior Aufidio moechus*)[146] and a homosexual (25f: *solebas, / quodque taces, ipsos etiam inclinare maritos*); the distinction is that Naevolus' sexuality is his *ars*. In the context of the two satires, each man is being advised by an apparently sympathetic friend. Naevolus, Postumus, and Umbricius share the lot of having to face an abrupt change in life-style.

But Satires Three and Nine are more alike: the analogy between Naevolus and Umbricius, especially the similarity of crisis, motivation, and reaction, is remarkably close. Both Three and Nine are, broadly speaking, dialogues, in each of which the character considering a new *propositum vitae* dominates, while his „friendly" associate figures chiefly in the prologue (3.1—20, 9.1—25). The difference in technique lies essentially in the degree of subtlety employed by the poet. In Three the reading audience has only slight clues to the true attitude of the satirist-friend, and Umbricius must be largely responsible for the exhibition of his own defects; in Nine the irony of the satirist-friend's sympathy becomes progressively clearer throughout the poem (90f, 102—123, 130—134a), to the audience at least, if not to Naevolus himself.[147] Still, the flaws of Naevolus' character are impressed upon the audience, as are Umbricius', principally through his own speech.

H. A. Mason has noticed the kinship of these two poems: „There is a light connecting thread in that this satire [Nine] parodies one of Juvenal's favorite forms for satire, the exposition of a *propositum vitae*."[148] However, interpreting Nine as parody, Mason maintains that

---

[145] Any chum of Postumus who considers the label *moechorum notissimus olim* a praiseworthy distinction must himself, I should thin, be a fellow *moechus*. Again Juvenal does not expect a totally credulous and sympathetic audience for his „friendly advisor", any more than Swift did for his paedophage in „A Modest Proposal". Like the modest proposal, the succession of vignettes presented by Juvenal's Postumus-advisor is at once shocking and grotesquely humorous: but neither represents a vision or a program to be received seriously. Nor does Juvenal deserve the personal reputation he has sometimes been burdened with on account of this satire, any more than Swift should have been hung for cannibalism.

[146] Both men are for the moment non-practicing adulterers: for Postumus cf. *olim* in 6.42 (above) — Naevolus, of course, has been terminated.

[147] By the end of the prologue the audience has a fair estimate of the sort of character Naevolus represents, and the complete success of Juvenal's wit in what follows depends upon this understanding. Naevolus continues quite undiscerningly to regard his advisor as an *amicus*, though not perhaps a particularly helpful one, to the very end of the poem: the intended result is that the reprobate appears even more foolish to the audience.

[148] Op. *cit.* (above, n. 74) 100f; cf. p. 96: Mason describes Nine as „one poem in which all the real qualities of Juvenal seem ... strikingly present", contending (and with this I could not more completely agree) that „what holds good of the ninth

„nobody could seriously put Naevolus on a par with the Umbricius of the third satire."[149] Yet in light of the preceding discussion, I believe it can be said that even Professor Mason takes Three — and Umbricius—too seriously: Nine is too much like Three in spirit to be called its parody, and Umbricius is more on a level with Naevolus than Mason supposes.

Both men seem *flexisse... / propositum et vitae contrarius ire priori* (9.21) at a time when they no longer are young.[150] The reprobate's first and most revealing complaint is identical to Umbricius' —each man's labors have gone unrewarded:

> nulla emolumenta laborum. (3.22)

> at mihi nullum
> inde operae pretium. (9.27f)

The two are rejected clients.[151] Both lament, in similar fashion, the gross indignities of *paupertas*, including the poor man's miserable clothing:

> si foeda et scissa lacerna,
> si toga sordidula est et rupta calceus alter
> pelle patet, vel si consuto volnere crassum
> atque recens linum ostendit non una cicatrix? (3.148—151)

> pingues aliquando lacernas,
> munimenta togae, duri crassique coloris
> et male percussas textoris pectine Galli
> accipimus... (9.28—31)

Umbricius is withdrawing from Rome to seek the shade of retirement at Cumae; Naevolus would be delighted to do the same (9.56—60):

> te Trifolinus ager fecundis vitibus implet
> suspectumque iugum Cumis et Gaurus inanis—
> nam quis plura linit victuro dolia musto? —
> quantum erat exhausti lumbos donare clientis
> iugeribus paucis!

But in the end we see that what we sense to be true of Umbricius' motivation unquestionably applies to Naevolus'. If the client's materialism could be but „modestly" satisfied—with a savings account, fine

---

satire is true of the third, the sixth and the tenth, the satires which seem to offer the best support for the account of Juvenal I shall attempt to discredit" (namely, that Juvenal was a severe, superficial, straightforward and undramatic satirist).

[149] *Ibid.*, p. 101: „The only serious part of the *propositum* is that which refers to Juvenal's and Martial's perennial personal predicament, the state of *paupertas* or genteel poverty. Naevolus is something like a music-hall comic whose 'character' is flexible enough to act a support for a repertoire of unconnected jokes and disparate social reflections." Much the same, I believe, can be correctly said of the Umbricius character.

[150] Cf. 3.24f: *proponimus... ire*. For Umbricius' age see esp. 3.26-28, discussed earlier; cf. 9.9 (*tot rugae*), 129 (*obrepit non intellecta senectus*), and perhaps 16.

[151] For Umbricius see the above discussion; for Naevolus, *passim*, esp. 9.59f and 71f. Cf. Highet (above, n. 15) 121.

silver, additional slaves, a sedan chair with bearers, and craftsmen in his employ—*then* he would be entirely content to remain in Rome, to participate in and even enjoy the turmoil, and hence to continue in a financially improved version of his former *modus vivendi* (9.135—150).

The satirist has no response for Naevolus' final self-revelation, a perfect parallel to the chilly silence that follows Umbricius' closing remarks. „Oh, I could add more and different reasons for packing my bags," the emigrant insists, but, pressed by the hour and the impatience of his train (315—318), Umbricius must abbreviate his harangue and bid Juvenal farewell (318—322):

> ergo vale nostri memor, et quotiens te
> Roma tuo refici properantem reddet Aquino,
> me quoque ad Helvinam Cererem vestramque Dianam
> converte a Cumis. saturarum ego (ni pudet illas)
> adiutor gelidos veniam caligatus in agros.

These last five lines of the satire are unabashedly egocentric: note the use of *nostri* (318: not „I'll remember you", but „You remember me!"), the emphatic position of *me* (320), and the boastful *ego* (321). „So—good-bye: keep me in mind! And as often as you are in the country, vacationing from Rome, you *must* invite me over from Cumae": so Umbricius insists, sounding rather like the dependent he has always been than an intimate companion. One should expect 320f to offer an invitation from Umbricius, not the opposite; the intentional surprise of the client's self-invitation is more dramatically effected by the emphatic positioning of *me* and *converte* as the first words respectively of 320 and 321. Umbricius hastily replies to his own overture (321f):

> As to your Satires, I—unless it shames them—I
> shall come, clodhopping into the chilly fields, to
> *help you write them*!

Again, Juvenal's only response is silence.

Umbricius is probably fictional: perhaps his name was meant to suggest the character who flees urban life in search of a pastoral shade of seclusion and freedom from anxiety. Certainly he is not to be narrowly equated with Juvenal—this the satirist could hardly make clearer. Nowhere is the distinction between poet and *persona* more precisely defined. Indeed, the character seems intended to function in the same manner as Horace's „friend" Catius, or Davus or Damasippus, or even Juvenal's own, more grotesque Naevolus, each the vocal but unsympathetic *doctor ineptus* within a satiric dialogue. There is sufficient internal evidence to suggest that Umbricius was meant as a litterateur of some sort, a petty poet most likely who, like his comrade-in-spirit Cordus, will never hesitate to recite his copious hexameters all day long, whatever the season. While Juvenal and his audience could take interest in and even sympathize with the essence

of many of Umbricius' complaints about the familiar ills of the city, they would nonetheless find his rhetoric often tedious in its bombast, sometimes laughable for its incongruity, rarely sublime or heroic, and never entirely convincing. They would find his reactions, especially the proposed self-exile, peculiar, puzzling, scarcely commendable; they would find his motives explicable, but hardly noble, and his circumstances and consequent disgruntlement quite commonplace, and hence without appeal to their sense of the tragic. Audiences have always esteemed Satire Three: the reason is to be discovered not only in the colorful and entertaining caricature of Rome presented in the poem, but in Juvenal's humorous and dramatic exploitation of the Umbricius-type as well.

University of Georgia. *R. A. LaFleur.*

ΠΩΣ ΔΕΙ ΣΥΝΙΣΤΑΣΘΑΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΜΥΘΟΥΣ ΕΙ ΜΕΛΛΕΙ ΚΑΛΟΣ ΕΞΕΙΝ Η ΠΟΙΗΣΙΣ

Naslov ove moje beleške uzet je ne slučajno iz prve rečenice Aristotelove Poetike koja u celosti glasi: Περὶ ποιητικῆς αὐτῆς τε καὶ τῶν εἰδῶν αὐτῆς, ἥν τινα δύναμιν ἕκαστον ἔχει, καὶ πῶς δεῖ συνίστασθαι τοὺς μύθους εἰ μέλλει καλῶς ἕξειν ἡ ποίησις, ἔτι δὲ ἐκ πόσων καὶ ποίων ἐστὶ μορίων, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσα τῆς αὐτῆς ἐστι μεθόδου, λέγωμεν ἀρξάμενοι κατὰ φύσιν πρῶτον ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων. Smatram da je osnovna želja i namera Aristotelova bila da u Poetici iznese upravo to, kako treba sastavljati fabule (priče) da bi poezija uspela — da bi se svidela ljudima od ukusa. Izraz συνίστασθαι τοὺς μύθους je u najtešnjoj vezi sa njegovim tehničkim terminom σύστασις τῶν πραγμάτων o kojem smo raspravljali naročito u IV godištu našega časopisa (str. 209—250). Za Aristotela je μῦθος = πραγμάτων σύστασις najvažniji deo tragedije (μέγιστον, μέγιστον ἁπάντων, πρῶτον καὶ μέγιστον τῆς τραγῳδίας, ἀρχὴ... καὶ οἷον ψυχὴ τῆς τραγῳδίας itd.). Mi smo u toj našoj raspravi pokazali da je taj izraz πραγμάτων σύστασις, a ne παθημάτων κάθαρσις, bio upotrebljen u njegovoj definiciji tragedije, ali nismo onda nigde spomenuli da je Aristotel sastav događaja odn. sastavljanje priča (kompoziciju fabule) istakao na samome početku Poetike. Koliko je važan taj deo u tragediji, može se najbolje videti iz same Poetike: