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quae nunc divitibus gens acceptissima nostris
et quos praecepue fugiam, properabo fateri,
nec pudor obstabit. non possum ferre, Quirites,
Graecam urbem. quamvis quota portio faecis Achaei?¹

Juvenal’s famous attack on Greeks in his third Satire shows that he was acutely aware of foreigners in Rome, and implies a tendency to adopt a particular attitude to a given ethnic group. For further initial evidence of racial feeling in Juvenal, cf. I 129–131, VI 157–60, XV 1f and I 103–5. Even these few quotations show a writer prepared to categorize a person or group primarily by nationality, and to generalize about one nationality as a whole. What in fact is the real nature of Juvenal’s racism? I use ‘race’ to refer both to groups differing physically and to culturally or linguistically distinguishable populations. I am asking what Juvenal thought about non-Romans.

Inevitably the question of ‘sincerity’ arises. Especially since W. S. Anderson’s ‘Anger in Juvenal and Seneca’,² it has been recognized anew how dangerous it is to take literally anything a satirist claims. In A Modest Proposal, Swift hardly meant to suggest seriously the fattening of Irish infants for the English meat-markets of 1729 – or even, if we allow for slow communications in those days, of 1730. Did Horace have an erotic dream on his trip to Brundisium (Sat. I v 82–5)? Were poets reciting in August the real climax of the initial list of horrors in Juvenal’s attack on Rome (III 9)? Exaggeration, basic to satire, demands of the reader a whole salt-cellar. How can we judge Juvenal’s sincerity on a given point, least of all on those autobiographical details of which so much has been so bravely made? Is a mask worn when he says ‘ego ipse’ (XV 45) or not? In Satire III after all it is Umbricius, not Juvenal, who is protesting. The comments of Juvenal the poet need not coincide with the sentiments of Juvenal the man. By Juvenal’s attitude, I mean perfecr what appears on papyrus. Much though we crave more biographica, we must be content to analyse the stated views, which may well reflect the feelings typical of literate

¹ Juv. III 58–61. This article is an altered version of a paper read to the Classical Association of South Africa in January 1975. I am grateful to members of that conference, especially to Dr D. B. Saddington, whose ‘Roman Attitudes to the “Externae Gentes” of the North’, Acta Classica 4, 1961, 90–102 has much of interest, partly because my present paper largely excludes the Northern barbarians. I am also grateful to Mr P. Murgatroyd for his comments and suggestions.

first-century free citizens in Rome. (In fact, if the views are not wholly Juvenal's, they presumably would record, even if they satirized, his readers' attitudes.)

This paper will first treat Juvenal's general views on racial and cultural differences, seen abstractly. I shall then consider the practical limits to his geographical and anthropological knowledge, and the effects of schooling on his racial feelings. Next I shall discuss his attitude, explicit and implicit, to two very different groups of non-Romans: Greeks and Jews. Finally I shall try to answer the question: how racially prejudiced was Juvenal?

**Juvenal’s general views on racial and cultural differences**

The satirist undoubtedly grouped mankind into three categories:

\[
\text{Romanus Gaiusque et barbarus induperator erexit. (X 137–9)}
\]

This tripartite division was common Roman practice and does not indicate that Juvenal was an original theoretical sociologist; Cicero had used the scheme long before our poet was born. 3

For one given nationality, a tripartite division was also customary in discussion. Juvenal himself complains

\[
\text{iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes et linguam et mores et cum tibicinc chordas obliquas nec non gentilia tympana secum vexit et ad circum iussas prostare puellas. ite, quibus grata est picta lupa barbara mitra. (III 62ff).}
\]

He dislikes the foreign language, the first thing a writer would notice; he also dislikes the customs, especially the noisy bizarre street-processions. Evidently he thought foreigners easy to spot from their physical appearance: here, the girl's Oriental turban gives her away, while at I 103–5 pierced ears mark an Eastern freedman.

Discussion under the three headings of physique, language and customs is found in such predecessors of Juvenal as Strabo and Cicero, and again in the *Germania* and *Agricola*, as Sherwin-White shows. 4 Probably, therefore, educated Romans from their reading unconsciously centred their prejudices against foreigners on these three aspects, singly or in combination.

---


Though no theorist, Juvenal seems vaguely aware of one common hypothesis of antiquity, which sought to explain racial differences in climatic terms. Writers as diverse as Hippocrates, Polybius, Aristotle, Strabo and Vitruvius give evidence of how widespread this theory was. So Juvenal writes, 'vervecum in patria crassoque sub aëre nasci' (X 50). Similarly, Horace (Epist. II i 244) talks of the Boeotians' 'crasso aëre', while Abdera (birthplace of Democritus of whom Juvenal is here speaking) was famous for its blockheads (Martial X xxv 4). As usual, the fairness or strict accuracy of Juvenal's statement is not at stake. His casual inclusion of this denigrating detail during a complimentary passage on Democritus warns us not to expect careful exposition or even logical use of anthropological theory. Democritus' humble origin would be apposite in Satire VIII; here it is not very relevant.

Our poet has something to say, as we have seen, on all three aspects of a foreign nationality. Of language, he says curiously little. Serafini, basing his study on the earlier work of Thiel and Kappelmacher, tries to explain the presence of 710 Greek words and graecisms in Juvenal – a large number in comparison with the practice of Horace and Persius – not as evidence of the hellenization of Juvenal's Latin, but as evidence of his detestation of all things Greek. Serafini demonstrates that Juvenal almost always uses a Greek word in a disapproving context. Serafini proceeds to interpret this as proof of Juvenal's deep and sincere conviction. He illustrates from many authors his thesis – which surely is indisputable – that many Romans over the centuries disliked Greeks. I should prefer to emphasize Juvenal's graecophobia as an inherited locus communis. Serafini is correct, however, in arguing that for Juvenal Greek words are objectionable because they apply to the cultural activities of which he disapproves. Language cannot be separated from its culture. If you don't like Greeks, you'll sneer at their language. Modern parallels come to mind.

Many of Juvenal's Greek expressions occur in Satires III and VI where he criticizes modern Rome. The attack on Greek largely relates, then, to the hellenization of Rome. Juvenal tolerates Greek in Athens or Alabanda. The absence of comment on other foreign languages presumably reflects their unimportance in Rome; only Greek spread wide enough to rouse the poet's ire. We shall in the rest of this paper see constant evidence that Rome was our poet's obsession, and that with one exception his racial comments closely

5. Hippoc. On Airs, Waters, Places, 12, 24, 17–23; On Regimen 2.37 apparently originates the climatic theory of diverse physique, character and society. Polybius 4.20f has the same idea, also found Arist. De gen. anim. 5.3.782b and Strabo 2.3.7 and especially 3.34.7f, and Vitruvius 6.1.3f (cf. Strabo 15.1.24) and other writers. Cf. F. M. Snowden, Blacks in Antiquity Cambridge Mass., 1970, 172ff, hereafter cited as SNOWDEN.
7. Serafini, op. cit., 371, remarks that only at XI 27 is a Greek expression used approvingly; contrast IX 37. Relicta (III 61) is important.
relate to his ‘romanocentrism’. As Cicero said, ‘Ita multa Romae geruntur ut vix ea quae fiunt in provincis audiantur’.8

With regard to physique, Juvenal does think in racial types. He calls a Moor ‘niger’ (V 53) and, oddly enough, considers an Indian ‘Mauro obscurior’ (XI 125). He mentions German blue eyes and blond hair (XIII 164f). The Moesi are ‘fortes’ (IX 142f). Other racial types: bushy-haired Spaniards, slender Africans, a greasy Syrophoenician, trousered Senones, oversize Cimbri, mammoth-breasted Egyptiennes (VIII 116–20, 160, 234, 251f, XIII 163). For Juvenal, the physical appearance of the decolor heres, the half-black illegitimate baby, is a giveaway, but the wrath is aimed at its Roman mother’s infidelity (VI 600). (The sceptical might argue that Juvenal’s real advice to the woman is at least to find a white lover.)

F. M. Snowden in Blacks in Antiquity finds evidence that the ancient Greeks and Romans were sometimes repelled by a dark skin and concomitant features, sometimes positively attracted. References to racially mixed persons show that Romans were well aware of physical differences; but they do not seem to have concluded that innate and indelible cultural and psychological differences necessarily accompanied the physical ones.9 Climate could simultaneously account for physical, cultural and psychological varieties, but transplanting or other factors permitted, if not guaranteed, change. Interestingly, and amusingly, Juvenal complains that an African smells awful, but the reason is that Boccar uses a cheap nasty oil from his homeland (V 90). He can help it. This summarizes in an oil-flask the ancient attitude: racial differences exist, they can cause irritation, but they can be modified, perhaps eliminated. Particularly with Northern barbarians, Strabo and Caesar show that Romanization was quite possible and effective even over a short period.10

The third aspect, culture (including language) is over one or two generations subject to even faster change than is physique. Gauls could remain blue-eyed and blond even while they learnt Latin, dressed in togas and followed a Roman political system. Juvenal is far more preoccupied with cultural than with physical differences. This strong cultural preoccupation seems typical of the ancients.

The sources of Juvenal’s racial descriptions: reading or observation?

Let us consider the sources of Juvenal’s information. What, for example, was the extent of the geographical area on which he drew in commenting on non-Romans? By his youth, under Vespasian, the Empire stretched from Morocco and Spain to Asia Minor and from coastal Germany to upper Egypt. First-century additions included Mauretania, Britain, Thrace, Moesia,

10. Sherwin-White, op. cit., 12f, 28f, 30f.
Cappadocia, and around AD 100 Armenia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Arabia Petraea. Juvenal speaks of some of these. He says (IV 111f) that (Cornelius) Fuscus died in the Dacian Wars, i.e. AD 88. He mentions the capture of Orkney (AD 84) and Armenia (II 159–165, VI 398–412); the second reference concerns the uneasy relations between Rome and Armenia, culminating in 114 in the temporary annexation of that territory. Our poet is conscious of the whole contemporary Empire and of modifications in its boundaries during his lifetime. He refers to other far-flung places such as Russia (XV 115, IV 42), the Nile (VI 83, X 149, XIII 27, XV 123), the land of the Moors (X 148) and in one breath mentions Egypt, the Jews, Jerusalem, Armenia, Hammon and Commagene (VI 527–556) as well as speaking of Gaul, Spain and Illyria (VII 148, VIII 116f, XV 111). Friedlaender's edition lists Juvenal's impressively wide geographical references. 11

Whence this knowledge? Let us postpone discussion of Juvenal’s possible exile to Egypt. Probably some of these peoples and places were only names to him from oral or written reports. The woman interested in geography and politics, for instance, mentions the Chinese, while elsewhere Juvenal mentions the Indians and their tigers. We do not conclude thereby that Juvenal was an ancient Marco Polo. 12 His apparent inaccuracy about the relative colour of Indians and Moors hardly suggests first-hand acquaintance in situ. Even Pliny notes that Indians are not burnt as black as Ethiopians, while Lucan calls the Moor and Indian “concolor”. 13

One simple explanation, probably the best, is that reading and open-eyed observation in Rome taught Juvenal much of what he knew or thought he knew of various nationalities. Since Augustus' reign there had been in the Via Lata a portico with a map begun by M. Vipsanius Agrippa and completed by the Emperor. 14 Strabo's geographical writings, still extant, are only part

11. L. Friedlaender, D. Junii Juvenalis Saturarum Libri V (repr. Amsterdam 1962). Register, 5–8. At XIV 196 Juvenal advises a father with military ambitions for his son to send him to serve in Morocco or Yorkshire. Hadrian's wall was built in 121, and in 117 he had to deal with trouble in Morocco: cf. J. D. Duff-M. Coffey (ed.) D. Junii Juvenalis Sature XIV, Cambridge, 1970, ad loc. The Chatti, mentioned IV 147, engaged the Romans AD 82–3. The Moesi came from an area in conflict with Rome AD 68–107: they were to provide Naevulos with litter-bearers (IX 143). At XV 122–45 Juvenal sweeps the lands in and beyond the Empire for something worse than the cannibalism he describes there.

12. VI 403, 337, 466; IV 165. Nor had Juvenal been to Thyle, Rumania or Poland (XV 112, 122ff). However, if Juvenal were the soldier of the Aquinum inscription (CIL 10.5382 and 5426) he might well have visited some of the places he mentions. If he went to Egypt, he could have known other parts of the Orient. G. Highet, Juvenal the Satirist, Oxford, 1954, 28 (hereinafter HIGHET) claims, 'The only places of which Juvenal seems to speak from personal knowledge are Italy and North Africa. All his references to other parts of the world are vague, hearsay or hyperbolical'.

13. Pliny NH 6.22. 70; Lucan IV 678; Juv. XI 125. Cf. SNOWDEN 2ff and relevant footnotes, and 277–9, n. 1.

of a great volume of geographical and anthropological writings now lost. Seneca wrote on India and Egypt. Pomponius Mela wrote a general world geography. Ti. Claudius Balbillus, prefect in Egypt, produced a geography of that country. Antistius Vetus, governor of Germania Superior AD 55–8, wrote on that area. Sebosus penned an odd work incorporating details on Africa and India. Trebius Niger wrote on Spain. Livy’s son apparently compiled a universal geography. Many of these works were consulted by the elder Pliny, whose surviving corpus is filled with very wide geographical references. And even non-technical literature such as Tibullus’ elegies (e.g. I vii) or Lucan’s Pharsalia might contain many topographical allusions thanks to the ancient taste for erudition.

Within Rome itself Juvenal could encounter an astonishingly motley array of physiognomies, languages and customs. The number of inhabitants themselves born outside Italy (let alone outside Rome), or whose parents were immigrants, was undoubtedly huge, even if incalculable then or now. Their presence was due above all to the slave system of antiquity, which drew slaves from outside the community, and, in the case of Rome even well before Juvenal’s lifetime, from outside Italy. Even vernaes, whom I discount, though they may have formed a gradually increasing proportion of the total number of slaves, might well retain the customs, not to mention the physical appearance, of their parents. So numerous were the slaves and freedmen of first-century Rome that Tenney Frank calculated that by late in the first century AD, a large majority of the inhabitants of Rome had some slave blood, i.e. generally non-Italian blood, in their veins.

He also maintained that fully 70 per cent of names on gravestones within Rome were Greek, and that this indicates that a good majority of slaves were therefore of Oriental, rather than Western or Northern, origin. Some later

19. Pliny, NH VI 201, IX 46.
20. Pliny, NH IX 89, 93. Schanz-Hosius, ib., II 785 para. 5.
23. ‘Race Mixture in the Roman Empire’, Amer. Hist. Rev. 21, 1916, 689–708. Cf. his Economic History of Rome, London, 1927, ch. XII (itself a monument to racism), also G. La Piana, ‘Foreign Groups in Rome during the first centuries of the Empire’, Harv. Theol. Rev. 20, 1927, 183–403 [sic]. La Piana discusses immigration, associations, religious cults, romanizing and orientalizing, and Jews. His main purpose is to relate the growth of Christianity in Rome to the influential presence of foreigners, as well as to local influences. Frank, in his Aspects of Social Behavior in Ancient Rome repr. N.Y. 1959, 41, claims, ‘A census of names on the epitaphs near Rome has shown that in Hadrian’s day less than
studies have questioned this interpretation. M. L. Gordon, however, even after her critical examination, did not deny that occasional and isolated examples occur of ethnica from almost every part of the empire and beyond: Gallus, Germanus, Baeticus, Afer, Maurus, Ponticus, Phryx, Lydus, Cilix, Araps, Parthus, Persicus and others, showing that the slave population was an epitome of the empire, or even of the known world. 24

If anything, Gordon emphasizes my simple point even more than Frank: the incredibly varied background of slaves in Rome. A. M. Duff is less critical of Frank’s Oriental theory, but he does remind us of some important factors. 25 In particular, the odd incident, such as the fall of Jerusalem in AD 70, could bring a temporary influx of slaves of one nationality; note that Juvenal mentions Jews several times, and Jerusalem and Moses once each. 26 Kidnapping, which survived suppression, brought some very odd fish into the Roman vivaria. 27

fifteen per cent of those recorded reveal a pure Roman ancestry . . . ‘ Cf. his ch. II as a whole, e.g. pp. 45ff on Jews in Rome, 47ff on Isis, 48f on Cybele, 49f on Mithras. La Piana, 213f, points out that even certain areas of Rome, e.g. the Aventine, were favoured by certain foreign groups. Egyptians and their cults preferred the Campus Martius. Cf. 213–221 generally.

24. ‘The Nationality of Slaves under the Early Roman Empire’, JRS 14, 1924, 98. Juvenal calls two slaves Phryx and Lucius (XI 147): hints of origin, or mere names? In Gallus textor, Gallus could be a proper noun or an adjective, as could Maurus at V 53. Cilix (IV 121) is a typical gladiator’s name but could indicate provenance. (Cf. Hor. Sat. II vi 44 Thraex and Syrus.)


26. Slave-sources are discussed by W. L. Westermann, The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity, Philadelphia, 1955, 84–90. He considers credible Josephus’ figure of 97 000 Jewish slaves from the wars of Vespasian’s reign. Yet more Jews were enslaved under Hadrian, in the period when Juvenal’s last Satires would have appeared (AD 132–5). Egyptian papyri confirm that infant exposure continued as a common slave-source (Westermann, 86); Asia Minor was similar (Pliny, Epp. X 65f). But section 67 of the Gnomon of the Idios Logos, prohibiting with severe fines the export of vernae born to slaves of Egyptian nationality, suggests that such export was common rather than rare. But we cannot know what proportion of the unfortunates went to Rome.

27. Namenforschung as a basis for general social studies has provoked controversy ever since Frank’s 1916 article. M. L. Gordon (art. cit.) pointed out ways in which a slave’s name could bear no relation to his origin. A whole journal now deals with name-studies: Beiträge zur Namenforschung. Heikki Solin, in vol. 5, 1970, 276–300, has an up-to-date discussion of the ‘Probleme der römischen Namenforschung: die griechischen Personennamen in Rom’; cf. especially 292ff and the articles mentioned in notes 40, 45, 46, 48, 49, and Solin’s conclusions, 299f. He is sceptical about the value of the etymology of cognomina in statistical social studies. Opposing him, I. Kajanto, ‘The Significance of Non-Latin Cognomina’, Latomus 27, 1968, 517–534, has a sensible and useful discussion of this critical part of nomenclature. He argues persuasively that a person’s ‘social and ethnic origin’ (534) is definitely reflected in his cognomen, and shows (updating the studies of L. R. Taylor, H. Thylander and T. Frank) that Greek cognomina form a markedly higher percentage in Rome than in provincial Italy. L. R. Taylor, ‘Freedmen and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of
Therefore, although Juvenal's racial descriptions do seem commonplace and stereotyped, must we assume that they are not partly based on his daily observation in Rome? Study of his brief racial pictures could show that he is unoriginal; it cannot prove that he is generally operating at second-hand. And if he wears a mask, perhaps he even deliberately records the misconceptions typical of Romans who attitude he adopts.

Rome was an amazing amalgam of foreign customs and cults blending or coexisting with the official, hellenized state cults, and with what remained of the old Latin religion. Barring political involvements, the Romans were officially very tolerant of imported cults in the city. Best proof is the periodic expulsion of certain cults only when they grew too large or bold; Tiberius banned 4,000 Jews and Egyptians, apparently freedmen, because of their offensive 'sacris' and 'superstitione'. Tenney Frank thinks that the urban authorities actually 'humored' large foreign groups resident in Rome, by certain gestures toward their deities. Juvenal himself mentions different Eastern cults whose shrines in Rome Naevolus the gigolo once haunted: the temple of Isis, a Ganymede-shrine seemingly inserted into the temple of Peace, and the secret retreats of the advocae Matris (as well as the local Ceres' temple). Non-Olympic deities in Juvenal include Anubis (VI 534), Cotyto (II 92), Cybele (II 111, III 138, XI 194, XIV 263), Io (VI 526), Isis (VI 529, XII 28, XIII 93), Osiris (VI 541, VIII 29). In some cases Juvenal speaks of these cults as practised abroad, but a passage in Satire VI shows a superstitious Roman matron, apparently converted to an Oriental cult, making a pilgrimage to Egypt on the instruction of Io, who operates from her Roman subsidiary branch. The satirist's complaints about Oriental cults invading Rome make

Imperial Rome', AJP 82, 1961, 113-132, demonstrates the general eagerness of freedmen parents to shed servile-sounding names in favour of Latin cognomina; I find it most improbable that non-Roman names (mainly cognomina) should ever have been applied to many local free Romans or Italians. In any case, I am not so much concerned with the relative proportions of various foreign nationalities and their descendants in Rome as with (1) the high proportion of all foreign groups en masse, and (2) their extremely varied background.

28. Serafini, op. cit., 254ff, feels that Oriental cults were objectional to Juvenal more for their debilitating effect on old Latin domestic cults than on state cults. Cf. Tac. Ann. XIV 43f on the mixture of foreign cults in Rome.

29. Tac. Ann. II 85. W. A. Heidel, AJP 41, 1920, 38-47 illustrates how modern research supplements and adapts ancient explanations. Our concern is with the large number of Jews, and with the alleged (and presumably plausible at the time) reason for their banishment: evidence, respectively, of tolerance and prejudice.


31. VI 489, IX 22f: from the context, the temples are clearly in Rome.

32. VI 534 in Egypt; II 92 in Athens; II 111 apparently in Rome; III 138 definitely in Rome, where the Magna Mater arrived 204 BC; XI 194 refers to her official games at Rome; VI 526 in Rome; VI 529 Egypt; XII 28 Rome; VI 541 Egypt, VIII 29 Egypt.

33. HIGHET, op. cit., 242f, mentions J. De Decker's article, 'Le culte d'Isis à Méroé en Ethiopie', RIB 54, 1911, 293–310, recording an inscription found at Meroë, probably of a Roman lady who went there. Juv. VI 508–541.
it clear that his primary impressions of, and his primary objections to, these cults and their votives are derived from their presence in Rome. As usual, Rome is the centre of interest.  

The vexed question of Juvenal's possible exile in Egypt must now be considered. The evidence, tenuous and complex, is outlined by Highet. Obviously, if the poet was banished to Egypt before writing, or publishing, these poems, the special odium of the country and its people is not surprising. Precisely on the basis of Juvenal's treatment of Egyptians, Crispinus especially, Highet inclines to accept the exile story. Juvenal, it is true, shows a most unusually and unpredictably detailed knowledge of Egypt. However, we cannot be sure that it was gained in Egypt. Realistic details were obtainable from handbooks in circulation: Lucan consulted herpetological works for his description of North Africa. Mosaics with Nile scenes show the Romans' fascination with Egypt. But short of some personal misfortune connected with Egypt or Egyptians, it is hard to explain Juvenal's violent hostility. As a freedman, Crispinus was hardly worse than Narcissus or Pallas; Juvenal's rage at him indicates something more than the usual post-Cleopatra Egyptophobia. Highet argues persuasively that no other Roman has left a record of loathing equal to Juvenal's hatred for Egypt.

Education and racial stereotyping

How would Juvenal's education have developed or reinforced those racial concepts already being absorbed from daily experience in Rome? Admittedly, great literature, in treating different races and cultures, tends to avoid facile and often unjust generalizations typical of lesser writings. Herodotus is outstanding in this respect. Homer had a bad Greek Thersites and many good

34. Evidence on foreign cults in Rome. Juv. III 296 mentions a Jewish 'proseucha'. J. Ferguson, The Religions of the Roman Empire, London, 1970, 292 index s.v. ROME for page refs., esp. 25 Isis, 27 Cybele, 27 Sarapis, 74 Isis (Domitian restored her temple). J. Colin, 'Les vendanges dionysiaques et la l'gende de Messaline,' LEC XXIV, 1956, 25-39, maintains that Juvenal at X 331ff (cf. II 117ff) refers in a garbled and hostile way to the mystery cult of Dionysus which would have been practised by respectable Romans especially in Mark Antony's family since his Egyptian sojourn. T. Frank, Aspects of Social Behavior, op. cit., ch. II, does not confine his remarks to the city of Rome. He claims that most worshippers in these cults in the West were immigrants (p. 53), rather than converts. By immigrants apparently he means slaves and soldiers. He also argues that the Eastern mystery cults differed from Christianity in their 'national limitations' (63). That is (for our purposes), these cults specifically relate to the massive presence of foreigners in Rome. R. Turcan, 'Séneque et les religions orientales', Coll. Latomus XCI, 1967, 10f has many references to primary sources.

35. HIGHET, 28-31 and notes 18-28.

36. E.g. the site of Tentyra and Ombi (XV 35), the existence of Meroe, an island in upper Egypt, where women supposedly had outside breasts (a fact not recorded elsewhere in antiquity) (XIII 163, VI 528); the gods of Egypt and the fact that certain vegetables were 'sacred' (XV 99).

37. Ib., 151 and loc. cit., my note 35.
Trojans. Still, even Vergil has Greek caricatures such as 'wily Ulysses' and the treacherous Sinon. Stereotypes like 'wily Ulysses' are too common to require comment here. Much more significant evidence of racial caricature is visible in low-level handbooks 'in usum scholarum', i.e. to supply pupils – and mature rhetoricians – with ready illustrations. I refer specifically to Valerius Maximus' dull but informative and neglected collation of *exempla* in which we shall now see a constant and insidious stereotyping of one race or another.38

The Carthaginians, especially Hannibal, provide ample evidence of racial stereotyping.39 Hannibal's cruelty was so proverbial that Valerius can say of Sulla, 'Dum quaerit victorias, Scipionem [se] populo Romano, dum exercet, Hannibalem representavit' (IX ii 1). We also read, 'Eorum dux Hannibal, cuius maiore ex parte virtus saevitia constabat . . .' with two examples (IX iiE 2). But Hannibal was not unique in this cruelty. Regulus on his return had his eyelids cut off and was put into an Iron Maiden (IX iiE 1). The Carthaginians collectively are called 'crudeles', being possessed of 'Punicam feritatem' (I i 14, VII vi 2, IX iE 1).

Equally proverbial were Hannibal's *calliditas* and *astutia*, admired at one point; but elsewhere 'Punica calliditas' is termed 'infamis' (VII iii 7, iv 4). At VII iii 8 Fabius' *pietas* is contrasted with Hannibal's 'vafri mores'. Treachery was in this Roman textbook the worst Carthaginian characteristic: Hannibal made "fallacia promissa' and took pleasure in "mendaciis et fallacia quasi praeclaris artibus" (III vii 1, IX viE 2). Punic fortitude was based on 'dolis et insidiis et fallacia'; the Romans had been 'decepti magis quam victi' (VII ivE 2). The Carthaginians, the 'fons perfidiae', specialized in spying, though sometimes Roman virtue triumphed (IX viE 1, III vii 1).

The Carthaginians were also proud (separate baths for the senate, IV iv 6) and guilty of excess (Hannibal after Cannae refused to speak directly to anyone, III vii 1). Carthage's 'insolentissimae opes' are a contrast with Regulus' 'paupertas'. Carthaginian wealth was proverbial (IV iv 6, III vii 1). These people were thought greedy and unscrupulous. Even the women supposedly went into business outside a certain temple to build up their dowry (II vi I5).

Carthaginians were also guilty of credulity and temerity. Hamilcar failed to

38. VM divides into two subsections, 'Romanorum' and 'Externorum', 636 to 320 *exempla* respectively. *Externi* are omitted from 23 chapters; only Roman anecdotes illustrate 'Games' and 'Wills', whereas only foreigners are seen invading a (Roman) family, significantly in view of Juvenal's complaints about *captatio* (II iv, VII vii-viii, IX xv; Juv. III 72). Frequently foreign illustrations simply preserve symmetry or tradition: e.g. 'Attingam igitur externa . . . auctoritatis minus habent'. (I viE 1).

39. I use Carthaginians rather than Greeks because VM inherited from the Greeks a body of *exempla* containing an abnormally high proportion of admirable figures. Greeks would tend not to criticize themselves, and so the real extent of Roman hostility to contemporary Greeks would be inaccurately reflected. However, with Carthaginian *exempla* Roman writers had far more opportunity to mirror their prejudices. The Jews are referred to once (with disapproval) in Paris' epitome of VM, I i 4.
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see the implications of a dream (I vii E 8). The senate was subject to surprise and fickleness, and was grossly ungrateful to Hannibal (VII iv E 1, V iii E 1). He himself, however, was temerarius, trux and saevus, killing his own helmsman for sailing, as he imagined, too near the shore (IX viii E 1). 'Acerrimus' though the army was, and 'vigilantissimus' its commander, Carthaginians were a prey to the luxuries of Campania (IX i E 1).

They had some virtues. Hanno, and Hasdrubal's wife, were remarkably brave (V i 2, III ii E 8). Carthaginian persistence reduced besieged towns to dire straits, though the Punic cause in itself was unjust (VI vi E 1–2, VII vi 2, V i 1). Otherwise Valerius damns well with faint praise. Mago prepares a trap and can only be called less treacherous than the Roman traitor Flavius (I vi 8). The locus classicus: 'Ergo humanitatis dulcedo etiam in efferata barbarorum ingenia penetrat, torvosque et truces hostium mollit oculos, ac victoriae insolentissimos spiritus flecit'. This commonplace continues for lines (V i E 6). Valerius' gracious allowance of exceptions proves the rule.

Admittedly, Hannibal's conquests were graven particularly deep in the Roman collective memory. Nonetheless, Valerius offers much additional evidence of national stereotyping, as in the ambivalent attitude to Greeks. The story of the historical Volumnius' fidelity to Lucullus is contrasted with the myth about Theseus and Pirithous. 'Vani est istud narrare, stulti credere. Mixtum cruorem amicorum et vulneribus innexa vulnera mortique inharentem mortem videre, haec sunt vera Romanae amicitiae indicia, illa gentis ad fingendum paratae monstrum similia mendacia' (IV vii 4, cf. Juv. X 174, XIV 240). Greeks were fanciful at best, at worst liars. They were impractical, irreligious or rash (IV iii 6; I i 12; IX iii E 1). Where virtues are granted, the tone can be patronizing (VI i E 1, VIII vii E 1).

A few brief examples of other national stereotypes in Valerius. Xerxes the Persian is subject to fear (I vi E 1), extreme pride (IX v E 2), luxury (IX i E 3), emotionalism (IX xiii E 1). The Persians are odd (II vi 16), luxurious (IX v E 1), and speak a strange but learnable language (VIII viii E 15).40 They are subservient (VII iii E 11). The Spaniards are 'horridi et bellicosi' (IX i 5), yet faithful in marriage (V iv E 3). Indians are plain-living (II vi 14, cf. i viii E 10); their women practise suttee out of conjugal devotion (III iii E 6). Egyptians, interestingly, are treacherous (V i 19), effete (IX i E 6) and mysterious (VIII vii E 3): an attitude which Valerius formed without ever visiting Egypt, to our knowledge.41 The Gauls were superstitious, but Valerius reminds us that Pythagoreans shared their belief in immortality (II vi 10).

Conversely a Roman character was subject to idealization. This occurs so often in Roman literature that it hardly requires illustration here. Again,

40. But on subservience, contrast Sen. Epp. 33.
41. VM had however been to Asia and Athens: R. Helm ap. Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyclopädie, op. cit., VIII A (= XXXII) 1, Stuttgart, 1955, 239.
great literature such as the *Aeneid* might produce in its hero a complex charac-
ter, certainly not over-idealized; school hand-books were another matter. 42

Further research might well show in much greater detail the effects of various
other classes of literature in various periods of Roman history on the racial
attitudes of readers who had attained one or another level of education; my
concern has been merely to demonstrate how in one author illustrating one
small but significant part of the rhetorical curriculum stereotypes, however
casual and unsystematic, relentlessly recur. 43

**Romanocentrism**

Before an examination of Juvenal's attitude to Greeks and Jews in some
detail, an important general factor observed by Sherwin-White must be
mentioned. During the first century AD, Roman writers began to adopt a more
rhetorical and conventional attitude than their predecessors had shown toward
non-Romans, particularly the Northern barbarians. Velleius Paterculus and the
*Germania* both illustrate this, and the *Germania* also idealizes, even if not
romanticizing, certain aspects of German life, especially in contrast to the
corruptions of first-century Rome. 44 This idealization seems to reflect the
overriding fact about Juvenal's racism, that Rome is the central subject, so
that interest in and accuracy about other peoples and places are relatively
unimportant. Juvenal being so much a creature of his times, we expect him to
exhibit signs of all these tendencies: obsession with Rome accompanied by
inaccuracies (sometimes idealizing inaccuracies) about foreigners.

The tenth *Satire* begins, 'Omnibus in terris', and likewise in the first *Satire*
(85) 'quidquid agunt homines' suggests a universal outlook and international
interests. But the occasional discussion of conditions in the empire outside
Rome stands out as exceptional (VIII 94–130, XV passim). Presumably, since
Rome monopolizes Juvenal's interest, his attitude to any foreign group will be
determined by its relation to, or presence in, that city. It has already been
suggested that this is so in our discussion of Juvenal's attitude to the Greek
language.

As for inaccuracy, Juvenal has already been caught out calling an Indian
darker than a Moor. If this is not a slip of the stylus, as Juvenal wishes a man

---

42. The *chria*, a school exercise, greatly aided individual stereotypes such as Cato and
1966, II 23.

43. How is VM relevant to Juvenal? The satirist's style indicates lengthy rhetorical
training, for which handbooks like VM's were designed. Other such collections (e.g. by
Nepos, Julius Hyginus) were in circulation. Whether or not read by Juvenal specifically,
VM illustrates the sort of socializing influences operative in rhetorical schools. Naturally
his reading extended far wider than this.

to be allowed to make occasionally (VI 456), and if we are not misinterpreting, then Juvenal seems indifferent to accuracy. Indian or Moor: he does not care which is darker. This indifference itself is revealing, for it implies that the poet felt no special hostility to any one non-Italian group, except perhaps the Egyptians. (It could also mean that he disliked them all equally.)

But Juvenal's xenophobia is not undiscriminating. For instance, the important passage in Satire VIII (112ff) shows some provincials sharply distinguished from others.

```
forsitan inbellis Rhodios unctamque Corinthon
despicias merito: quid resinata iuventus
cruaque totius facient tibi levia gentis?
horrida vitanda est Hispania, Gallicus axis
Illyricamque latus; parce et messoribus illis
qui saturant urbem circo scaenaeque vacantem.45
```

Here is the conventional contrast between effeminate Orientals and rugged Northerners: Martial similarly contrasts himself, a hairy Spaniard, with a delicate Corinthian (X 1xv 6). Even the use or avoidance of depilatories by various nationalities is thus a commonplace (cf. Juv. II 11ff, IX 12ff). But this commonplace seems based on fact, for Occidental slaves reaching Rome even in this century tended still to be less educated and refined than the 'flos Asiae', the expensive, delicate slave-boy who catches Juvenal's eye (V 56). The poet's impressions of these nationalities, note again, were gained in Rome, though the closing lines of the quotation might appear to refer to some ethnic groups at home. It is, however, the Roman's reaction to these people (despicias, vitanda) that concerns Juvenal. His character Naevolus (who, incidentally, has abandoned the depilatories he once used, IX 12ff) wishes to buy a brace of 'fortes Moesi' to carry his sedan-chair: he only knows that they are a suitable nationality because he has heard and seen them intra pomeria, his exclusive haunt (IX 11).

At VIII 119ff different nationalities suffer prejudice and idealization in the same passage. Greeks and Orientals are effeminate, but Spaniards, Gauls and Illyrians have their virtues, as do the African farmers on whom the city's annona depends. However, significantly, the Africans are of interest only to the extent that they feed Rome, and the Northern barbarians only insofar as they pose a military challenge to the capital. That is, initially the poet simply desires to contrast manly with effeminate nationalities; but the industrious

African (including Egyptian!) peasants are contrasted with the lazy inhabitants of Rome. Again, clear proof of Juvenal's obsession with Rome: he seeks not to compliment these peasants, but to condemn the Romans. Immediately hereafter he pictures the North Africans stripped bare by the greedy Roman Marius Priscus, but our attention is directed not to their plight, but to his unjustly luxurious 'exile'.

The nature of Juvenal's idealization of some nationalities is again visible at the end of Satire II. Here the poet admits (quidem 159) that the Romans’ prowess at arms has got them to Ireland, Orkney and Britain; ‘sed quae nunc fiunt victoris in urbe / non faciunt illi quos vicimus’ (162f). The hypocrisy and sexual corruption of Rome is naturally Juvenal's theme: hence the concentration on Rome, not Britain. Even this negative idealization of barbarians however is dampened by the following exemplum, 163–170, q.v. Here the barbarians are not seen as magically exempt from corruption any more than they are necessarily bad by nature. Zalaces was certainly corrupt but was unique among Armenians; and his corruption occurs predictably in Rome, at the hands of a tribune. (His arrival not as a slave but as a hostage reminds us of the multiplicity of reasons why foreigners came to Rome.) Juvenal continues. The trade goes both ways: Rome imports foreign youths, then re-exports them suitably corrupted. Again a foreign nationality is idealized only as a fragrant foil for rancid Rome, and not out of real enthusiasm.

Juvenal on two specific groups

What has Juvenal to say of the Greeks and Jews? But first, why these two groups in particular? Greek speakers, from all the East, far outnumbered any other foreign group in Rome, and attracted Juvenal's attention in proportion. Also, Greece had so special a cultural relationship with Rome that her writers and artists could never be disregarded, whether it was resentment or admiration that a given Roman felt more strongly. The Jews, on the contrary, differed remarkably from the Romans in culture, and though far less numerous in Rome than the Greeks, were well represented there especially after Jerusalem fell in Juvenal's youth. Sherwin-White interestingly contrasts the official Roman attitude to these two groups (especially abroad).66 Though differing far more from the Romans than the Greeks did, the Jews did not antagonize their rulers so regularly. This anomaly is explained in economic and social terms. The Jews rarely competed with gentiles in Rome for jobs, power and influence, whereas the Greeks were seen, with good reason, to be rivals of free-born middle-class Romans socially and economically in two areas of special concern to those Romans: the civil service and the client-patron system. Therefore, despite occasional, and mild, anti-semitic measures, the

Romans were remarkably tolerant of the Jews, and were unsympathetic to the Greeks when those two groups clashed in the Eastern cities. So much for the official attitude; but what about Juvenal? My study is based both on his general remarks about either nationality, and on his use of historical figures, especially in the case of the Greeks, whom he adduces to illustrate his arguments. I shall, that is, use explicit and implicit evidence.

Sherwin-White's analysis of Juvenal's general attitude to the Greeks permits of some expansion. The satirist's attack is aimed at 'professionals', ranging from tightrope-walkers to doctors. Fear of their competition causes dislike and prejudice. Greek vices, to Juvenal, all concern competition: slyness, ambition, histrionic ability, hypocrisy, misplaced ingenuity, the capacity to root out, twist and use personal information to ruin another.

But, says Sherwin-White, there is also cultural prejudice not based on economic competition: hence the attacks on gymnasias and gymnastic dress (III 115, 67ff). The Syrian prostitute is apparently Greek-speaking, but Juvenal surely does not mean that she is bad for the business of her Roman sisters. He can distinguish 'Achaei' from Oriental Greeks, but his ensuing attack on Greek speakers aims indiscriminately at both groups as one. Complaints about 'linguam et mores' constitute real prejudice, as do references to certain types of music and to a penchant for prostitution, murder and seduction (III 63, 109–112, 116). It is easy to progress from justifiable complaints about foreigners' economic competition to complaints about their basic nature and then to criticisms of their language (e.g. VI 184ff) and hairdos. Indirectly, Pliny the Younger substantiates Juvenal's comments. Himself financially secure, Pliny could afford more tolerance than Juvenal felt for visiting Greek rhetoricians and philosophers, even while disapproving of some Greek mores. Pliny's famous Epistle VIII 24 however pinpoints one important aspect of his attitude: contemporary Greeks, while inferior to their illustrious ancestors, deserve tactful treatment because of their retrospective pride. Tacitus, equally well educated, politically active and widely travelled, attacks Greeks for licentia and desidia and appears to disapprove of their entertainments and philosophers. He and Pliny both object to paying honour to ex-slaves, and thus they inevitably attack the prominence of Greek-speaking imperial freedmen. Traditional complaints about Greeks are conveniently listed by Serafini.

Juvenal's attitude to the Greeks was, however, not unmixed; we must define

47. Ibid., 7ff.
49. Hist. III 47.2; Ann. XIV 14.1 (where Nero outdoes the Greeks); Agr. 4.4, Hist. III 81.1.
50. Pliny Epp. III 14, VII 29.3; Tac. Ann. XII 53.3; Sherwin-White, op. cit., 84f has more discussion and references.
the limits of his prejudice. Examining individual Greek historical *exempla*, we find that his hostility is by no means universal. What is true is that an actually favourable attitude is adopted only toward a cultural, as opposed to political, figure. I have treated this variation in context in more detail elsewhere, but should like now to illustrate.52

Chrysippus, Thales and Socrates exemplify philosophical benevolence and mildness: Thales has a *mite ingenium*, while Socrates' name is replaced by a periphrasis implying his 'sweet' nature (XIII 184). At II 5ff, Chrysippus, Aristotle, Pittacus and Cleanthes are busts in the house of a hypocritical sham philosopher. Was this man a Roman or contemporary Greek? We do not know; what is implied, is that the Greeks of the past were the real thing, unlike their modern 'followers' of whatever nationality. Solon (sage and poet as well as politician) is just, wise and sober, in contrast with the power-hungry Croesus (X 274). Democritus and Heraclitus are both respected as 'sapientes' (X 28), sensible and natural men laughing or crying at vice and affectation, not emulating it. Juvenal here implies that fifth-century Greece had its share of vice and folly too, but he adds significantly that modern Rome far outdoes old Greece. Epicurus is mentioned with approval for his abstemiousness, with Socrates' pupils (XIV 311). Pythagoras' gentleness and vegetarianism earn some praise, as does Zeno (XV 172-4, 107).

In literature, Homer wins some approval as a great writer. He is favourably contrasted with a modern Roman rival (VII 38) and is indirectly a standard of comparison for Vergil (VI 436f). He belonged to a noble period long dead (XV 69), even if his story is not always literally truthful (X 246).

Groups of artists appear in what seems a favourable light. One series of names includes artists whose works were once Greek household decorations until plundering Romans arrived (VIII 102-4). The contrast between Roman avarice and Greek taste is obvious. Similarly it is Greeks who created the objets d'art raked in by the wealthy Roman city-dweller after the fire which he is suspected of having started.53

Sometimes, where enthusiasm for a Greek figure cited is replaced by indifference, a neutral context is appropriate. The near-Greek Croesus' proverbial fortune (XIV 328ff) is mentioned only as Juvenal attacks modern Roman avarice, his real subject. The much later Narcissus, fabulously rich, is scarcely any worse in this context than Claudius or Messalina: the indulgent emperor is subject to the whims of a greedy, over-powerful freedman who orders the death of an immoral empress. Other neutral cases include Theodorus, rhetorical writer and Tiberius' teacher (VII 177); and Ptolemy Lagus, builder at Alexandria, not himself attacked (VI 83f). Archigenes, the archetypal doctor,

53. III 221f. Conceivably this probable arsonist could be of non-Greek origin, but Juvenal does not say so.
and Mithridates, the archetypal taker of prophylactic antidotes, do not merit Juvenal’s attention, for he is really concerned with the greedy Roman son’s efforts to dispose of his father (XIV 252). Pyrrhus (with Hannibal) is mentioned predictably in a locus de elephantis (XII 108). Sophocles’ name becomes adjectival as Juvenal describes his own style, but the subject, evil stepmothers, has little to do with Sophocles, who is neutral (VI 636).

Demosthenes, in Satire X, is a more complicated, interesting case. Certainly his context is bad in that with Cicero he illustrates the folly of aspiring to political power through eloquence. Yet he did achieve fama and eloquium (114) and was admired and fascinating (127f). He was hardly to blame for his bad natal horoscope (129). If anyone, his father was to blame for sending him to the rhetor. As a Greek, and as a fourth-century man, Demosthenes seems morally neutral.

Alexander the Great, another Greek from the Roman viewpoint, though used by Juvenal in a negative context, seems not to earn personal condemnation. His itching ambition (X 168ff) may be accounted to his ingenium, and at any event not to his Greekness, a neutral factor. Satire X, incidentally, is remarkably free of xenophobia compared with Satire III: significantly, for Juvenal’s xenophobia comes out most when he writes of Rome, and fades when he turns to the whole world.

Many Greeks earn Juvenal’s relative disapproval, but such a generalization needs careful qualification. Sometimes the disapproval is quite mild, as where Alexander’s ambition contrasts with Diogenes’ asceticism; even here it is one Greek who is unfavourably contrasted with another Greek (XIV 311). Similarly Croesus (associated with the Greeks), over-ambitious man of action, is contrasted with the wise Greek Solon (X 274f). Also contrasted here with Solon is the semi-Greek Mithridates of five centuries later. Juvenal here almost implies that a wise Greek can (or could) usually be found to counterbalance a foolish but also Greek non-philosopher: by juxtaposition, Solon is even contrasted here with Roman Marius and Pompey, who follow in the poem.54

There are really unadmirable Greeks. Phalaris, a cruel tyrant, was a stock figure, and even in the context here his nationality is not significant (VIII 81). The brief feline swipe at Philip as ‘callidus emtor Olynthi’ sounds more like Juvenal’s view of contemporary greedy Greeks but was hardly an original thought (XII 47, cf. Hor. Carm. III xvi 13ff). Pyrrhus is called immanis; but although the ‘populus Romanus’ got little reward for their fight against him, that was hardly his fault.55 Ladas, a fifth-century Greek runner, is imagined to be venal enough to exchange his physical prowess for cash. But the prowess itself is not denigrated; Ladas’ name was proverbial for a runner; and nothing

54. Readers considering that Juvenal contrasts a ‘straight’ Greek with what is strictly not a Greek (Croesus, Mithridates) would demonstrate thereby Juvenal’s relative approval of ‘pure’ Greeks.
is made of his being a Greek. Juvenal (again) is interested only in contem­
porary Rome.

Only to post-Augustan Greeks as Greeks can Juvenal be shown, as some­
times positively hostile. Real xenophobia marks lines I 103ff where Claudius’
freedman (but in company with Licinus, a Gallic favourite of Caesar and
Augustus) is said to be inferior in wealth to the Oriental with pierced ears
whom we met earlier. The element of economic competition from foreigners is
emphasized here:

cur timeam dubitemve locum defendere, quamvis
natus ad Euphraten, molles quod in aure fenestrae
arguerint, licet ipse negem? sed quinque tabernae
quadraginta parant. quid confert purpura maior
optandum, si Laurenti custodit in agro
conductas Corvinus ovis, ego possideo plus
Pallante et Licinis?

Bitterness here is directed both against an Oriental Greek-speaker and a
Gallic ‘barbarian’ not only because of their foreign strangeness, but mainly
because they compete with native Romans – successfully. Licinus notably
belongs to the late first century BC and Pallas to the period of Juvenal’s birth,
just when foreign freedmen began to slip into public office or at least the
imperial administration. Posides, another Claudian freedman, is actually
said by Juvenal to have conquered the Capitoline Hill:

ut spado vincebat Capitolia nostra Posides:

conquered by building on it, that is. Spado is not complimentary, but is also
found in Suetonius. Posides’ Capitoline mansion seems to have impressed
Juvenal, for although his buildings at Baiae are mentioned elsewhere, and
although Seneca complains of balnea libertorum in Rome, no one parallels
Juvenal’s specific protest.

Actors, whose precise origin is usually uncertain, naturally have Greek
names. Actors, in Juvenal’s eyes, are predictably disreputable. Inevitably, then,
Greekanamed actors earn his disapproval. Bathyllus is mollis. He rouses Roman
matrons to a frenzy, but it is these women who are Juvenal’s subject, and the

55. XIV 160ff. Cf. VM I iE 1, II vii 15, IV iii 14, V iE 3: a mixed characteriation of
Pyrrhus.
56. XIII 97. Cf. Catullus 55.25, Ad Heren. IV 3, Mart. II 86.8, X 100.5.
both Pallas’ wealth and his arrogance.
58. XIV 91; Suet. Claud. 28; Sen. Epp. LXXXVI 7, Pliny NH XXXI 5.
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main blame is theirs for attending the theatre. The prejudice against a foreigner again is present but incidental. We cannot be sure whether there was a contemporary Bathyllos or not; one such is known in Augustus' time. Similarly the name Themison could refer to a famous first-century BC doctor, in which case Juvenal would be using the name generically for a contemporary (as we could speak of a modern Florence Nightingale). Possibly one or more contemporary professionals adopted the same famous name. It is interesting to note that such caricatures usually seem to receive a Greek name: to Juvenal, a doctor or dancer is almost automatically conceived of as Greek. This agrees with his motley list in III which includes both medicus and schoenobates. Often Juvenal uses a Greek name for a practiser of some low or disreputable activity: the actress Thymele (I 36, VIII 197, cf. Mart. I iv 5), the harpist Glapyrus (VII 145), the fraudulent businessman Basilus (X 222, at VII 145 an indifferent lawyer), and various actors, only some known from other sources. Tiberius' astrologer is mentioned during Juvenal's attack on superstitious (Roman) wives. Remmius Palaemon, a poor grammaticus, apparently earns some sympathy from our poet, who may himself have taught (VI 452, VII 215f).

Other less humble bearers of Greek names generally are not admired. Narcissus and Pallas, Claudius' freedmen, have already been mentioned. As for Pegasus, a Domitianic courtier, the scholia suggest he was a self-made man and immensely learned. As an 'optimus atque sanctissimus interpres legum' he does seem somewhat pitied by Juvenal (IV 78f). The later Isaeus, a famous rhetorician, is praised by Pliny, but to Juvenal is verbose and so typically Greek (III 74, cf. Plin. Epp. II ii). Atticus at XI I may be a type-name, but Bartolommeo Borghi suspected that this could be Ti. Claudius Atticus, son of Herodes Atticus, twice consul and once Asian proconsul, a man of great

60. Juv. X 221, cf. Mayor ad loc.
61. Machaera (VII 9), Themison (X 221), Hamillus (X 224). Note that Oppia (X 220 is a Roman name. Some of these names seem to be significant: machaera is a dagger; Themison was a tyrant of Eretria, and basileus means king (Greeks domesticate Romans); Maura is 'dark' (swarthy, foreign), while hamilla means contest or rivalry (Greeks rival Romans). But there are many disreputables with Roman names, e.g. Gillo (I 40) – the name of Pliny's father-in-law (Epp. IX xiii 13) – Eppia (= Attica?) (VI 82f, X 220, cf. Mart. V xxiv 10), Calvina (III 133), Procula (III 205), Hispulla (XII 11). Some of these, like Eppia, belong to the wealthy upper class, however; it is their morals, not their birth, that are rotten. Eppia had a chance to be reputable; Thymele, foreign in name and origin, and an actress, could never have had social pretensions. But the actors Paris and Narcissus did have social pretensions and for a while succeeded.
wealth. Note that the wealthy gourmet has a Greek name, while an Italian name, Rutilus, is applied to the poorer man whose attempts at elegance fall flat. The Parthenius of XII 44 could be the ‘caelator’ of the scholia, but Friedlaender suggests that this is Domitian’s chamberlain, implicated in the emperor’s murder (Suet. 16.2, 17.2).

In summary, we have seen evidence of real racial prejudice against language and customs. Greeks are typically associated, when the poet speaks of contemporaries, with gymnasia and the stage, or with honest but lowly callings such as teaching and medicine. They did pursue these. However, the context for a Greek figure is as often favourable or neutral as it is unfavourable, and even in an unfavourable setting, a Greek is rarely attacked explicitly as a Greek. Figures from the past posed no threat to Juvenal and his kind; only those later figures that did, men like Pallas and Narcissus, or those traditional figures of mockery like doctors and actors, are attacked or ridiculed. The generalized attack in Satire III on Greeks is only partially reflected elsewhere. Another nationality playing the same rôle would have suffered the same attack; unless inherited Greek culture made the Greeks even more galling to their masters. But Greeks were not innately bad: else why so many great Greeks in the past? Again, the attack is on Greeks encountered by the poet in Rome. And Juvenal and Lucian agree that some Romans were scarcely improvements on their Greek neighbours.

One final illustration will crystallize our analysis. Paris, Juvenal’s contemporary, was possibly implicated in the satirist’s exile, if it occurred. Whatever the truth of this banishment, Paris is, for Juvenal, the butt par excellence of his anti-Hellenism, as a Greek at the pinnacle of power under loathsome Domitian: such is his influence that he can dispense patronage to a native Italian writer like Statius. Examining Satire VII 86–92, the reader encounters slashing rage. Insofar as Agave is the title of a drama, Paris is a literary patron; insofar as she is a woman, he is a pimp. Juvenal’s anti-Greek remarks focus here on this ballet-dancer with the hated national characteristics: dubious sexual activities, itching ambition, pleasure in wielding power mainly to humiliate native Italians, and above all successful invasion of the imperial administration. That Paris fell grievously from glory and paid with his life for dallying with Domitia does not mitigate his odium.

What now of Juvenal’s attitude to the Jews, that resolutely separate and easily identifiable minority, so different from the mixed bag of cosmopolitan

---

64. Oeuvres Complètes, Paris, 1862-97, V 532f; ref. in Friedlaender, ed. cit., ad loc.
65. Lucian, Nigrimus and De Mercede Conductis, passim, as Sherwin-White, op. cit., 63ff, remarks.
66. As even J. D. Duff notes ad loc.
67. But Paris’ grave was honoured by many (Dio LXVII 3) and Martial XI xiii 3 praises him. Juvenal does not mention Paris’ Egyptian origin: a curious omission.
Greeks? Jews appear in three Satires, III, VI and XIV. In III 13–16, they are poor immigrants to Rome, merely part of the tide of foreigners that have made the city unrecognizable. They have appropriated a grove formerly associated with Numa’s religious activities and turned it into a bazaar and begging-quarter. Juvenal seems to experience contemptuous amusement, as he does later in the poem (296) when a drunken bully accuses an innocent passing weakling of frequenting a ‘proseucha’ or synagogue, i.e. of being a Jewish proselyte. Jewish conversions were common in the first century,68 but since this taunt comes from a disgusting tough, we cannot be sure of Juvenal’s view of such conversions.

A Jewish beggar reappears at VI 542ff. This shaking Jewess is only one of several nationalities of fortune-tellers but (plus ça change) Juvenal specifies that she offers cheap rates. Jews are again very humble in Rome. This Jewess is

\[
\text{interpres legum Solymarum et magna sacerdos}
\]
\[
\text{arboris ac summi fida internuntia caeli} \quad (VI \ 544f).
\]

Here, Jewish religion, confounded with fortune-telling, is obviously considered superstitious. The gentiles imagined that with a non-anthropomorphic god, the Jews worshipped the sky, and hence the attribution of astrology to the Jewess.69 Simultaneously reflected are popular prejudice and economic reality.

On returning to Jewish beliefs in Satire XIV, Juvenal claims that Jews worship only clouds and the divine sky. He refers to kosher food, circumcision, extreme respect for Mosaic law, and Judaic exclusiveness. That is, in a few lines Juvenal summarizes a surprising amount of information about the more visible aspects of Judaism; only Tacitus rivals him.70 But the context is negative: we are hearing how bad customs are passed from father to son by domestic example. Jewish practice is an apt example, relying as it does on the family unit, but the disapproval is clear. ‘Caeli numen’ may be a Latin equivalent of the Hebrew periphrasis ‘shamayim’ for God, but Juvenal misses the point of a purely spiritual deity.71 Similarly he cannot imagine the point of abstention from pork, or of circumcision. The latter so offends him that after complaints about Jewish disregard of Roman in favour of Jewish law, he protests that Jews are so exclusive that they will help only verpos, a derisive term for the circumcised.72 The Law is preserved in Moses’ ‘arcano volumine’. Finally the Sabbath is attacked as a mere excuse for laziness.

71. Cf. HIGHET, loc. cit. (my note 69).
In summary, Juvenal is well aware of the externals of Judaism, but cannot conceive of their inner significance. He has only contempt for the Jews, though nowhere does he suggest persecution. He pictures Jews as cheap, mean, superstitious, lazy, foreign down-and-outs; what peeves him is not their competitiveness but their refusal to integrate. The Jewish self-imposed apart­heid, symbolized by their abstention from even perfunctory participation in the Emperor’s cult, was a constant thorn in the easy-going Roman’s syncretistic flesh.

Was Juvenal unreasonably prejudiced?

Juvenal—though given to hyperbole—favours in effect the Golden Mean, if an Immigration Policy must be adopted. If a group like the Jews is too exclusive and wishes to extract converts on its own terms, our poet blames it for not integrating; but if a nationality like the Greeks is only too ready to infiltrate Roman institutions in order to dominate both by force of numbers and by cleverness, he blames them for integrating too much. Roman converts to Judaism, though syphoned out of Roman society, are after all voluntary; the far more numerous Roman victims of Greek imperialism—estranged, dis­affected, alienated—are unwilling exiles in a familiar land. Thus Jews and Greeks are both divisive, but open Jewish proselytism cannot match the scale of the Greek fifth column’s operations.

Perhaps, to the Jew, integration meant disintegration of Judaism; but to the Roman, Greek integration meant the disintegration of the Roman nos maiorum. Immigrants to Rome like the Gauls, who were (a) not obviously numerous (b) inconspicuous (c) spoke Latin (d) accepted but did not appear to invade Roman institutions, might amuse but could not anger the satirist. Thus it is largely prejudice which leads Juvenal to dislike the Jews and wish them either less visible or (preferably) elsewhere. It is not pure prejudice which causes his dislike and resentment of the Greeks; moreover, he excepts from criticism Greek cultural figures long dead, and is often as much revolted by degenerate Roman contemporaries as by Greek parvenus. At any rate, satirists are by definition negative, and one looks far, if not in vain, before finding a good word that Juvenal has to say for anyone.

73. Robert Turcan, art. cit. (my note 34), 23 feels that ‘L’anti-judaïsme de Sénèque n’est donc pas instinctif, passionnel et intéressé comme celui de Juvénal’. As Juvenal misunderstands the features of Judaism, so Seneca cannot comprehend Egyptian frenzy and blood sacrifices and penance, but he shows [as Juvenal perhaps does] ‘un mélange de dénigrement et d’intérêt’ toward Egypt (ib., 51).
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