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CHAPTER I
ORIGIN AND BACKGROUND OF THE FOREIGN POPULATION IN IMPERIAL
ROME

Early Rome was a rugged Rome. Her people were born and
bred on the soil and they dwelt close to it for the rest of
their lives. The early Roman went from the plow to the senate
chamber, from the plow to the battlefield; and when the duties
of state were cared for and the hostile invader thrust back or
new kingdoms conquered he returned to the plow. Cincinnatus
himself, we are told, was working his four acre plot when the
senators came to salute him dictator. The highest praise the
Roman would give his fellow citizen was to call him a good
farmer and a good tiller of the soil. He thought and even
spoke in terms of the soil. He called the wealthy man
"locupletes," his money, "pecunia," the public revenues,"
"pascua." His tastes were simple; his wants were few. His
virtues were those of the soil, the gravitas, constantia, and
pietas of which so much is written in Roman literature. His
patrimony was modest, never exceeding seven acres. He thought
it well not to allow it to exceed his capacity to cultivate it,
and even considered that man dangerous who wanted more. Self-
sufficiency was his ideal. With a small plot of ground the
Roman family could be self sufficient and would need little
little outside help. The materfamilias could do the work of the household. A slave or two of Italian birth could assist on the farm. The trades, considered beneath the dignity of the landowner, were in the hands of the plebeians who for the most part were forced to resort to them as a means of livelihood. They were the flute players, the blacksmiths, the bootmakers, the curriers, and the bronze workers.

As long as the Roman led this simple life and retained this simplicity of outlook, Roman culture remained intact and the identity of the Roman nationality was preserved. Unfortunately, however, Rome did not long retain her native simplicity. The Romans besides being tillers of the soil were also warriors and a steadily increasing portion of their lives was devoted to warfare. Whether they were forced to lead a life of warfare because of hostile neighbors or because of their own thirst for expansion we do not wish to discuss here. The point we wish to make is one of which history gives eloquent testimony—they were successful warriors. And warfare to the successful warrior is not without its compensations. What it demands in time and sacrifice it repays in plunder. At Rome, the warrior who deserted his farm for the battlefield returned to the latifundia. Each new victory saw a larger Rome, each new victory a wealthier Rome until having conquered the then known world and having
drained its wealth into her coffers she became the imperial city of the Mediterranean.

The compensations of warfare, however, are not always an unmixed good. A larger and wealthier Rome created problems, of which involved the loss of Roman identity. The paterfamilias who had cared for the small farm could not hope to cope with the latifundia, especially when so much of his time was spent on the battlefield. War, growth and expansion put the care of farm beyond him. Wealth, moreover, had vitiated his simple tastes and multiplied his wants. In brief, the equilibrium of the Roman family was upset. It was no longer self-sufficient. War, wealth, and expansion created needs and desires which it alone could not satisfy. To satisfy them it was necessary to introduce into Rome a large foreign population ----a policy which ultimately effected the loss of Roman nationality and the destruction of the old Roman spirit.

When Rome conquered, she not only plundered the wealth and appropriated the land of her victims; she also enslaved them. Such a course of action, while taking care of the complete subjugation of the enemy, also solved the problem of labor and the increasing demands of wealth at Rome. The victory, then, which saw a wealthier and more expansive Rome, saw also a changing Rome. It introduced into the city a new influence in the
form of a shipload of slaves. Hardly had the battle subsided when the "mangones" swooped down upon the field with for their prey. The West first paid its toll. From Sicily, Sardinia, and Spain slaves poured into Rome, a stream ever widening as it approached the city. Caesar later enslaved whole peoples in Gaul, taking at one time as many as 63,000. And if we are able to believe Appian and Plutarch he took 1,000,000 slaves before he conquered Gaul. The East and the South also made their contributions to Rome's foreign population. When Aemilius Paullus, one of the most humane of the Romans, was laying waste the Macedonian kingdom, all northern Greece paid a heavy tribute. In Epirus alone 150,000 were taken into slavery. Lucullus took so many in Pontus that a slave was just a little more expensive than a steer. Everywhere the Roman army entering the field carried away with it the elite of the population. From the East came Syrians, Cilicians, Phrygians, Lydians, Cappadocians, Bythinians, Carians; from beyond, Persians, Arabians, Parthians; from the South came Alexandrians, Egyptians, and Ethiopians.

Nor was conquest the only source of slavery. The aftermath of conquest—piracy—played an important role in supplying slaves. Rome conquered the Mediterranean but made little effort to control it after the conquest. It was sufficient
for her that there remained no other nation to conquer it, and she willingly allowed it to slip onto the hands of pirates. Before long the pirate controlled the Mediterranean and, encouraged both by Rome's laxity and her growing desire for luxury, they built up a lucrative business in slave dealing. They ravaged the coasts of the Mediterranean and combed its cities. Since they could supply a higher class slave than that found on the battlefield their trade was quite profitable and grew to overwhelming proportions. In fact slave trading became so attractive that it drew to its ranks even the equites comprising some of the noblest families of Rome. To realize the proportions of the trade we need only recall that the market at Delos (one of the larger markets where slaves were bought and sold) could handle 10,000 slaves a day. It is said that at one time these pirates controlled 400 cities along the coast of the Mediterranean and from these supplied Rome with an almost unlimited number of slaves.

We must not get the impression that all these slaves taken in conquest and piracy were kept in Rome. In general, captives from the West were impressed into military service and sent to the East. It was largely from the East and South that Rome drew its foreign slave population. What the number of these poor unfortunates torn from home and country came to
we can give no definite figure. Estimates vary from a number as low as 200,000 to as high as 800,000 but not one of them can be taken as conclusive or accurate. From the figures we have given, however, we can say without fear of contradiction that it was by no means small. In fact the number seems to have become somewhat alarming. The Senate, out of sheer fright rejected a proposal to differentiate between the dress of the slave and that of the free man. They feared lest such a common dress for the slaves would make them conscious of their superiority in numbers thus endangering the lives of the free men. It seemed to be a common thing for the more wealthy families to have a couple hundred slaves.

The infiltration of such large number of foreigners into Rome was bound to affect seriously her civilization. As Juvenal says: "the Syrian Orontes has flown into the Tiber bringing with it its lingo and its customs." He might have said with more truth that the whole Mediterranean had flown into the Tiber bringing with it varied languages and customs. And just as the identity of the Tiber would be lost if the Mediterranean were to flow into it, so the identity of the Roman people would be lost with the influx of such a large foreign element. We, Americans, might be inclined to be sceptical on this point.

Looking at our own slave population of pre-Civil War days and
its failure to affect in any marked way our own culture, we might be tempted to minimize the influence of Rome's foreign population on her culture. We must remember, however, that we can hardly draw an analogy between the two countries in this regard. The Roman slave, as we shall see in our next paragraph, was no blackamoor. He was cultured and intelligent. He was a skilled artisan, a doctor, a tutor, an actor, or a tradesman, and as such he was in most cases superior to his master. Consider, too, the fact that education in Rome was largely in the hands of slaves. Occuping such positions foreign slaves in Rome could not help influencing the social, religious, and moral life of the Romans.

To understand just what the nature of this influence was we must, before concluding this chapter, say something concerning the character of this Oriental who became so ubiquitous in Rome. The Eastern World, we must remember, had already been conquered once by Alexander. Greek manners had spread over Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. As a result the citizen of these countries partook of the heritage of the Greeks. He was usually intelligent and cultured, and had through long years of experience gained an aptitude for business unsurpassed by any other race of his day. As Duff tells us, however, "long ages of despotism had rendered Hellenistic peoples patient and servile."
They were as a result possessed of many of the undesirable qualities of a servile people. The Egyptians of the coast were "most shrewd and astute" and very often crafty and deceitful. Those of the interior were, on the other hand, ignorant, quarrelsome, and superstitious.

The Syrians were sharp witted, a characteristic they shared with the rest of the East. They were satirists, their speech was graceful, and as dancers and flute players they were quite talented. They were, however, notoriously fickle and villainous. Cassius Dio speaks of the "rascality of the Syrians" as if it were a specialty of theirs.

The Greek, of course, surpassed all others in versatility. Whatever he put his hand to proved a success. As doctor or artist, as teacher or actor, as copyist or secretary the Greek was supreme. Unfortunately, however, the Greek with whom Rome came into contact was the product of a decadent culture. He combined all the intellectual keenness of his ancestry with his own astuteness and immorality. Even in his best days the Greek was clever, crafty, and sly. He practised himself in these qualities, considering them intellectual. Such they were, but the qualities of an unbridled intellect, an intellect not subjected to the proper norms. The Greek, then,
for all his intellectual qualities would have an influence by no means salutary on the Roman. His unscrupulosity and complete lack of morals prove fatal to the old Roman character.

The Jews did not absorb the general servile character of the East. They imbibed something of Greek culture and education and were possessed of that shrewdness in business which has been theirs perennially. But these talents, which might have made them good and useful slaves, were offset by theocratic ambitions which made them extremely unpopular.

Such then were the races whose representatives swelled the stream of slaves pouring into Rome. They were cultured races, but races whose culture was diseased and decadent. Long years of servility had perverted the manners and culture they inherited from the Greeks. Obedience degenerated into obsequiousness. Intelligence was corrupted by craft and a total lack of moral character. Versatility was undone by complete unscrupulousness. The mingling of such races with Romans almost intoxicated with new wealth could hardly hope to produce a vigorous or healthy culture. The foreigner in Rome had, indeed, an unfortunate background but his misfortune was to be accentuated by the social position which he was to assume among the Romans. The product of a decadent civilization is corrupt
enough even in ideal surroundings. But to tear such a one from home and country and degrade him in his early youth to the status of a slave in a foreign country was to accelerate the process of corruption. The foreign immigrant to Rome would have provided an influence unhealthy enough; the foreign slave was to provide an influence fatal to whatever good the Roman civilization had produced.


3. "Hinc et locupletes dicebant loci, hoc est, agri plenos; pecunia ipsa a pecore appellabatur. Etiam tunc in tabulis censoriis pascua dicuntur omnia ex quibus populus reeditur habet, quia diu hoc solum vectigal fuerat. Pliny, op. cit. 18.3.2.

4. In earlier days two acres were thought sufficient. "Binaque tunc jugera populo romano satis erant. Pliny, 18.2.1. For the seven acre limit see 4.3.

5. "Imbecillioram agrum quam agricolam esse debere. Cato, De re rustica, 1.3.9.

6. Manius Curius, conqueror of the Samnites, made this statement. Pliny, 18.3.

7. Senatu necato, reliquos vendidit sub corona. Caesar, De bello gallico, 3.16.

8. Sectionem hujus oppidi universam Caesar vendidit. Ab his qui emerant, capitum numerus ad eum relatus est millium LXIII. Ibid. 2.4.


10. "Ut centum milia capitum humanorum abducerentur." Livy, 45.34.


13. Beloch estimates the number at 280,000: Marquard at 900,000: Kahrstedt at 200,000.

14. Tacitus, Annals, 4.27, 6.11.

15. Barrow, Slavery in the Roman Empire, p.25.

20. Dio, 77.10 to panourgon twv Sypwv.
    Grammaticus, rhetor, geometres, pictor, aliptes
    Augur, schoenobates, medicus, magus.
CHAPTER II

THE FOREIGN POPULATION IN ROME IN THE TIME OF JUVENAL

Rome had already for more than two centuries been subject to the constant and ever increasing flow of foreign immigration when Juvenal first began to raise his voice in indignation and to castigate the vice of the Roman. The foreigner had invaded every field of Roman activity and his influence had permeated every phase of Roman life. Imperial Rome was, in fact, built around its foreign population and the imperial Roman was utterly dependent upon the foreigner. As Pliny tells us:

alienis pedibus ambulamus; alienis oculis agnoscimus; aliena memoria salutamus; aliena vivimus opera. 1

This foreign population fell into three main classes: the slave class, the freed class, and the peregrini. The peregrini were never very numerous in comparison with the other two classes and hence are not of too great importance. The slave class and freed class, however, constituted in large part the population of Rome in imperial days and their influence can hardly be overestimated. The slave population consisted of private and public slaves. The private slaves, of course, belonged to private citizens whereas the public slaves were the
property of the government. The freedmen were either dependent upon their old masters, independent of all ties, or imperial. In the remainder of this chapter we shall try to discuss the position of these different classes of foreigners and their influence on Roman society in Juvenal's day.

In the private household the same slave originally served his master both in the city and in the country. As the holding of the master increased and slavery developed, however, customs changed and two distinct families arose—the familia urbana and the familia rusticana. Moreover, within the individual families, due to the almost unlimited supply of slaves and the equally unlimited demands of wealth and luxury, labor became more and more divided. Boissier, in speaking of the divisions of labor tells us:

elle n'a jamais poussee plus loin qu'a Rome.

The Roman following the advice of Demosthenes used his slaves like the members of his body, "one for each purpose," so that in Juvenal's day he had as many slaves as his ancestors had gods.

The bailiff (villicus) and his wife (villica) headed the familia rusticana. Under them in imperial days ranged a whole troupe of farm officials. There was first of all the sub-bail-
o (subvillicus) then a group of supervisors (monitores), the caretakers of forest and fields (saltuarii, circitores) and the foremen (magistri operum). The common laborers were classified according to the different crops and the different kinds of livestock they cared for. The best were chosen to care for the vineyards; the more robust for the cultivation of olives and farm crops. Then there were slaves to take care of the preparation of the different products and slaves a toute faire called mediastini. Sometimes a single slave could take care of a crop or of a particular kind of livestock but more often they were arranged in groups of ten (decuries) under a decurion.

The rural household also employed a sizeable personnel. There were millers and bakers; slaves employed in the preparation of food (pulmentarii, focarii); weavers and spinners (textores, lenificae); doctors and infirmarians (valetudinarii); and various other kinds of help depending largely upon the size of the farm. Add to all these slaves employed to chastise their fellow slaves (ergastularii, lorarii) and a host of artisans of all kinds to manufacture all the needs of the farm and we have a picture of the latifundia of Juvenal's day. It was a self sufficient community. As Boissier tells us:

Il était de règle que, dans une maison bien ordonnée, le maitre n'achète rien au dehors.
The old Roman idea of self sufficiency was preserved no matter what costs it entailed. And though it led to wasteful duplication of effort the pride of the old Roman clung to it steadfastly.

The size of the familia rusticana was limited more or less by the nature of its functions. The familia urbana, however, multiplied almost without limit. Just as on the farm and in the country villa, there was a procurator (dispensator), and under him slaves in charge of carriages, clothes, etc. Then came the long list of different kinds of service. There was first of all domestic service. In the early days a knocker sufficed to let the master know of the approach of a stranger. Then a dog chained to the door post served the same purpose. Finally, in imperial days, slaves, more numerous than dogs, were used, but more majorum were still chained like the dogs to the door post. Next came the guardians of the hall (atrienses) the ushers (atriarii), those who introduced the visitors (admissionales), those who raised the portal veil (velarii), and numerous valets (cubicularii, diaetarii, etc.).

The service of the table, that all-important Roman institution, demanded a whole galaxy of slaves. There were the maître d’hôtel (condus promus), butlers (cellarii) caterers
(penarii), and the hierarchy of the kitchen: chief cooks (archimagiri), cooks (coci), firemen (focarii) and bakers. In the dining room were the slaves in charge of invitations (vocatores), the slave in charge of the dining room (tricliniarcha), those who set the table (lectisterniatores), those who prepared the table (structores), a carver (scissor), those who distributed bread and the various dishes (diribitores), and those who tasted the food before offering it to the guests (praegustatores). During the meal young slaves, the flos asiae, sat at the feet of the master to carry out his orders. They poured the wine and perfumed the heads of the guests. They were picked for their beauty, clad in indecent costume, and subjected to the worst outrages. Numerous other slaves also provided entertainment and color at the meal. For this task rare slaves, black Gaetulians, Moors, Phrygians, and Greeks were chosen.

The Roman also required slaves to accompany him and provide service when out of doors. He had slaves to walk before and behind him (anteambulones, pedisequi) when he went to the forum; slaves to carry the torches; distributores to go through the crowd and hand out money; and nomenclatores to whisper in his ear the names of those he met on the way. Then, too, there was the service of the bath and health. The Roman bought slaves to attend him in his bath and toilet (balneatores, aliptes,
unctores, tonsores), and doctors of every kind to care for his health.

Riches and Greek influence added new branches of private service to those already mentioned. The Roman wished to be cultured and lettered. He would have a library and staff it with slaves. For the old family education he would substitute foreign education. He bought teachers and paedagogs of every sort for his children. Moreover, when he, himself, was uneducated, as was most usual, he tried to buy erudition. The rich Sabinus, we are told, bought one slave who knew Homer, one who knew Hesiod, and nine others who were acquainted with the lyric poets. According to Seneca:

Ille in ea opinione erat ut putaret se scire quod quisquam in domo sua sciret. 6

Besides all these private services the Roman master bought all kinds of artisans and tradesmen to provide the material needs of the household, and at times, forbidden by prejudice to engage in business of any kind, he even set up slaves in business and reaped the profit therefrom.

The public slaves were employed on the aqueducts, in the mines and quarries, and on the roads. Many, also, were employed in office and clerical work for the government. The
free born considered the government worthy of his endeavors but scorned any clerical work connected with it. Such work he relegated to the slave. Some slaves were even attached to the magistrates themselves. Others served as messengers, prison guards, and executioners. Many also fulfilled certain religious functions, though these were generally reserved to the free born.

Thus we see the Roman in both public and private life completely dependent upon the foreign slave. His dependence before long debilitated him in body and mind. The Roman of the Empire did nothing for himself, but let his slaves supply all his wants. He, himself, became utterly helpless. In the words of Boissier he "becomes tired, effeminate and sleepy. Of all the furniture in the house his bed is that which he uses most willingly. He lies down to sleep; he lies down to eat; he lies down to read and to think." He became harsh and cruel also. The complete jurisdiction which he had over his slaves destroyed all regard he might have had for life, happiness, or moral value. The slave before the law was not regarded as a human being. He was a res and to be used as the other things of the household----to satisfy the whims of the master. The Roman, then, could make any demands he wished upon his slaves. "Nec turpe est quod dominus vult." Only self interest, a poor
restraint indeed in times of great passion and desire, could set a limit to his demands. Thus we see him sending into the arena to their death hundreds of slaves merely to provide himself with entertainment. Barrow in his work on Roman slavery describes for us very well the effects of such a system.

"Absolute control leads to the satisfaction of every bodily whim, and creates a despotic and irresponsible temper insensible to the happiness of others and blind to all moral values. To depend upon others is to give them power which in turn is to be feared; irresponsible power joined with fear causes the bluntness of feeling which increases into hideous cruelty; the circle turns and cruelty inflicted brings haunting terror of revenge to come; insensibility swings back to debauchery and vice." 8

Thus we see how one vice leads to another. Despotism brings fear of reprisals. Together they bring terrible sanctions. One Roman is said to have put four hundred slaves to death because one plotted against his life. The consequence of such extremes is a disgusting servility. The slave practises the worst kind of obsequiousness and uses all available means to worm his way into the good graces of his master. He becomes the dreaded sychophant, an object at once of hatred and fear. He turns all to his own advantage regardless of the consequences to another. He has no moral standards. His only virtue, if it can be called such, is obedience prompted by fear. Indeed, obedience is all that could be expected of him. Torn
from home and country in his youth he was deprived for the rest of his life of all social and family life, and of all ancestral worship; of everything that could act as a moral tie, or as a restraining influence upon his vicious instincts. In Rome, he was destitute of all moral and social development. A delicate conscience in such a person would indeed seem an exotic growth.

Most masters frequently found it wise, however, to allow their subjects to acquire property in the form of small earnings. Such indulgence generally insured good behavior and industry. Most slaves also made desperate efforts to save their earnings since it could obtain for them what they all hoped for—freedom from their bondage. Their allowance in food was never liberal but many of them tried to save some and sell it for a profit. Seneca tells us of the slave who "cheated his stomach" to increase the amount of food he had for sale. Less miserly means however also yielded savings. A servant, for instance, might sell what ever remained from a banquet. Moreover, since a social stigma fell on merchants and industrialists in general, wealthy citizens often put slaves in business on terms according to which both would profit. It is easy to see how under these circumstances slaves might build up a sizeable peculium, as their savings were called. The slave with these savings could buy his manumission, a process by which he could raise his
status from that of a slave to that of a freedman.

Manumission, however, was not always purchased. It was often a free gift of the master to his slave prompted either by self interest or benevolence. The Roman, as we know, felt constrained to have a large clientele among the poorer citizens, and to manumit a few slaves was an easy way of swelling his retinue. It pleased his vanity to have a large throng welcome and accompany him to the city every morning. Many masters also profited by manumission. They could still demand the service of the freedman but they no longer were burdened with his support. But very often, masters freed their slaves out of altruistic motives. Great respect grew up in the relations of many slaves to their masters, and out of benevolence or gratitude such a master would often free his slave. Vernaes in particular, slaves born in the household, won their freedom in large numbers.

However they were secured, manumissions were so common and so frequent that in the first century of the empire the freed population of Rome reached alarming proportions. As we have seen, slavery is not the best school in which to train for a healthy social life and the Roman became justly alarmed as it kept pouring its representatives into the civilian population.
Augustus several times attempted to check manumissions but without much success. The supply of slaves was so abundant and the reasons for manumissions so manifold that nothing could check them and the civilian body in the days of Juvenal consisted largely of enfranchised foreign slaves and their descendants.

After manumission the freedman was not always entirely independent. His relation to his patron remained somewhat akin to that of a father to a son. He owed his patron obsequium and officium while the patron owed him in return protection. The freedman would, more often than not, occupy the same position he held before manumission. In general, however, it might be said that freedmen occupied higher positions than slaves. In the household freedmen were usually the procurators, the head cooks, the amanuenses, the doctors, the bankers, and the pedagogues. On the farm they often became proprietors. Sometimes their masters on freeing them gave them small farms to work. If a master had set up his slave in business he would continue in that business, but on better terms, as a freedman. Finally if he were no employed in the household, on the farm, or in business, the freedman became a client of his master thereby swelling the retinue of his admirers.

But many freedmen either immediately upon manumission or upon the death of their master went forth into the world without
a proprietor and without obligations. They became completely independent and took their places among the free born armed with their ability and whatever capital they managed to save from their peculium. They were prejudiced neither against manual labor nor against trade. Consequently, it was largely these freedmen and their descendants who supplied the Romans of Juvenal's time with their amusements, their articles of daily use and consumption, and their professional service.

As actors, charioteers, and gladiators freedmen dominated the stage, circus, and arena. On the stage Paris, Pylades, and Apolaustus, imperial freedmen, were the most famous actors of the time. Many lesser actors also earned a luxurious living by hiring themselves out to independent companies. But if he had no taste or ability for drama a freedman might enter the circus or arena. Here also, as charioteers and gladiators they won popular favor and piled up great wealth in the rewards which successful gamblers heaped upon them.

They were also pre-eminent in industry. The patrician class in Rome had always looked with disfavor upon manual labor or commerce of any kind. Agriculture and direct service of the state were in their opinion the only occupations fit for a gentleman. This prejudice arose in the times when Rome was constantly at war and patriotism was at a premium. It amazed
good patricians in those times when Rome sorely needed her citizenry to see a class whose trade did not allow it time to take an interest in public affairs. Moreover, agriculture, not trade and commerce, produced the warriors necessary to the service of the state. Toil in stuffy workshops made a man unfit for military service. Such work should be left to the lower classes; it was not for the high minded patrician. And so it was in the early days. The plebians took care of trade and commerce. With the coming of slavery, however, even they began to look with disdain upon their former means of livelihood. They came to despise manual labor and all those who participated in it. In their minds it was less disgraceful to depend idly upon the state or a patrician for their subsistence than to earn it by sordid labor.

The Greeks and hellenized peoples of the East, themselves, were at one time as antipathetic to manual labor as the Romans. With the extinction of political independence, however, and the loss of self government, politics, the object of Greek endeavor, lost its ascendancy and the Greeks turned to trade and industry. When they arrived in Rome, therefore, unlike the Romans they were without prejudice. With such forces at play it was no wonder that the foreign element dominated industry.

To show the proportion in numbers of slaves and freedmen
to the free born in industry, A.M. Duff has compiled statistics from the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. We cannot hope, nor is it necessary, in a work of this kind to quote all the statistics upon the subject. To illustrate our point, though, we shall quote the statistics he gathered for the clay lamp and pipe industries. Out of 204 inscriptions, 171 names are of servile origin and only 33 ingenuous Latin. In other words, more than 85% of the workers in this industry were freedmen or their descendants. Similar percentages were also found in the other industries and commercial enterprises. The makers of pottery, and bricks, goldsmiths and jewellers were all of Greek extraction. Glass manufacturing was chiefly in the hands of Orientals. The liberal professions, too, fell into their hands. In all the professions, they, together with the peregrini, were in the ascendancy.

Thus monopolizing to a great extent amusements, commerce, and industry, and participating in no small way in the liberal arts, many freedmen rose to considerable wealth. It was in commerce and banking that many of the fortunes were made. "I buy wisely; I sell wisely," says Trimalchio, the type of successful freedman. The wealth of freedmen was so widespread that it became proverbial. Many even became multimillionaires. But with this wealth went a certain amount of boorish
ignorance and vulgar display characteristic of the nouveaux riches. The men of culture spoke with scorn of the "wealth and brains of freedmen."

In public life, just as in private life, freedmen were scorned and handicapped by their background. The highest positions of state were closed to them. In the lower ranks, though, they, together with the slaves, kept the wheels of government moving. In the religious offices of the state they were excluded from the College of Augurs and from the various priesthoods of the old Roman deities. But they could attain to the priesthood of the foreign gods. They also were allowed to serve as attendants to priests and superintendents of religious worship. In the other state offices they served as superintendents of streets, secretaries and servants of magistrates.

But perhaps the most important of all the freedmen were those in the employ of the emperor. It was here, as is to be expected, that freedmen were most numerous and the division of labor most irrational. It is said, for instance, that there was one freedman whose sole duty it was to look after the white robe the emperor wore in triumphal processions. To other individual freedmen was the care of his dress for other occasions. A whole bureau administered the purchase of clothes.
Another large staff took care of the imperial treasures.

The chamberlains were the most important and influential of the imperial freedmen. Often a man chances of being admitted to the emperor depended upon him. The chamberlains thus had many opportunities of piling up wealth by selling admissions and rumors about the emperors moods. They were naturally, as we shall see later, constant rivals of the secretaries. Parthenius and Sigerus, chamberlains of Domitian, rose to great heights by their soaring ambition in these positions.

Next, perhaps, in importance were the actors and concubines. At one time or another most of the imperial personages of the empire were under their influence. Mnestor was a lover of Messalina. Nero was under the influence at one time of the actor, Paris, at another, of the concubine, Acte. Vespasian was under the sway of Caenis and even Antoninus allowed a concubine to cast her spell over him.

Finally came those freedmen employed in civil service. During the first century of the Empire and up to the reign of Hadrian they dominated the secretariates. They were denied the Senate but, in reality, they held more influential positions as secretaries to the emperors. They were the secretaries a libellis---in charge of petitions and grievances;
ab epistulis—in charge of general secretarial work (secretary of state); a rationibus—in charge of finances. Other important secretariates were also in their charge. The libertus a studiis was chief librarian and literary advisor of the emperor. The libertus a cognitionibus was Caesar's private legal secretary. In the republic these secretaries might not have been of such great importance. In the empire, however, where the emperor was a virtual dictator they were of the utmost importance. Since they were responsible to no one but the emperor it is clear how influential they were even under a monarch of average strength and vigilance. But when the monarch was such as were most of those of the first century of the empire they became absolute and omnipotent. The financial secretary could easily juggle the accounts; the secretary a libellis could suit himself as to the grievances or petitions he would hand on; the secretary of state could make or ruin a man in civil or military service; the secretary a cognitionibus could sell justice at his own price; and on the favor of the libertus a studiis would depend the prospects of an author's patronage. Each of these secretariates, moreover, was staffed with clerks and accountants who, under an unwary secretary were able to carry on a vast illicit traffic, and who under an unscrupulous secretary were able to make vast sums through blackmail. Freedmen were
also in charge of the two most important treasuries of the empire—the fiscus, containing all the state possessions of Caesar, and the patrimonium, containing all his private property. They were denied military posts as a rule but they climbed up the ladder of preferment as administrators in several departments of public utility, such as, the food and water supply, the imperial mint, and the public libraries. Here again, each had staffs largely recruited from his own class.

Imperial freedmen first came into prominence in the reign of Caligula. Callistus dates his rise from this time. Josephus tells us that he "wielded a power nothing short of absolute in his vast possessions and the general fear with which he was regarded." The court of Claudius was also dominated by freedmen. The two most famous were Pallas and Narcissus who, along with Callistus, held the three most important sacra-
tariates. By dishonest means they acquired enormous wealth, Pallas 300 million sesterces, Narcissus 400 million. They formed the most powerful triumvirate of Roman history. In the name of the emperor they distributed all offices, commands, pardons, and punishments.

The reign of Nero saw no lessening in the power of freedmen. It was during his reign that Paris came into prominence. Another of his freedmen, Polyclitus, was actually
employed as senator and knight. A third, Halius, was left in charge of the city when he made his theatrical tour of Greece. He and Polyclitus played the brigands without the slightest interference. They could even confiscate and execute at will. Halius and Polyclitus were condemned to death during the reign of Galba, but Holatus, Nero's worst freedman, was presented with a procuratorship. Galba's own Icelus gained power over his master and repeated some of the worst excesses of Nero's reign. Otho executed him but put his own freedman, Moschus, in charge of the fleet, an office never before delegated to freedmen. He put upon him also the duty of spying upon the upper classes. Vitellius was dominated by the unscrupulous Asiaticus. Vespasian and Titus were more scrupulous and checked the activities of their freedmen, but even they gave high and influential positions to them. Trajan and Hadrian also repressed speculation on their part but Hadrian weakened before his freedman, Antinous. Most of these freedmen exercised over their masters an influence which neither their office nor their industry warranted. The emperors themselves were of such weak character that they were easily swayed by gracious and winning manners. The favorites of Galba and Vitellius even owed their power to the homosexual tendencies they aroused in their master. In such disgraceful ways the imperial freedmen gained an ascend-
ancy unparalleled by an class of upstarts in history.

Considering the foreigner in Rome in Juvenal's time, then, we have seen that he was ubiquitous and omnipotent. The Roman depended upon him to perform the meanest office in the household and the highest function in the state. He was indispensable in the household, on the farm, in trade and commerce and in the government. Unfortunately, however, his influence, as we have seen, could have been for the most part only for evil. As a slave his social and moral life were completely neglected. Whatever little he had when he entered the city atrophied in an environment hostile to any virtue except obedience. Certainly most of the foreigners were corrupt enough when they came to Rome, but when conditioned by slavery they became wholly degenerate. Their outlook on life was completely distorted and they were obsessed with the grossest kind of ambition. Their only desire was the wealth and ease which their masters possessed and when they achieved it they outdid him in vulgarity. When freed their influence was even more pronounced and they did not hesitate to inject the decadent customs and manners of their native soil into Roman society. In a household filled with such people, under such nurses and pedagogues, generation after generation of Roman was raised. And the outcome was a Rome corrupted by the decadent customs, man-
ners and morality of the foreigner.
2. Peregrini were foreign immigrants who came to Rome for a livelihood. Since the field of industry and the liberal arts at Rome was crowded with slaves and freedmen who had a decided advantage, the number of peregrini was never very large. Only when they possessed advantages which placed them above competition would they migrate to Rome.


4. Ibid., p. 309.

5. Juv., 5.56.


7. Boissier, op. cit., p. 314. De tous les meubles dans sa maison, le lit est celui dont il use le plus volontiers. Il se couche pour dormir, pour manger, il se couche pour lire et pour réfléchir.

8. Barrow, Slavery in the Roman Empire, p. 22-23.


12. Mart. 5.13.6, libertinas opes.

13. Sen. Ep. 27.5 patrimonium et ingenium libertini.

CHAPTER THREE

JUVENAL AND THE FOREIGNER

We have shown in our first two chapters how the foreign population of Rome, drawn in large numbers from every country of the Mediterranean and introduced into the city, for the most part as a servile class, gradually effected a revolution in her whole economic and social structure. We have seen the foreigner, handicapped neither by prejudice nor morality, enter into every field of endeavor and provide the amusements, the labor, the trade, the professional service, and the culture of Rome. He was in every household and on every farm; he dominated industry and was well represented in the liberal professions. He made a complete conquest over the Roman, and though he entered the city a slave he soon rose to wealth and power as a freedman so that in imperial Rome he formed a new nobility whose only title to its position was wealth. But, as we have seen, this new nobility carried with it all the vulgarity of newly acquired and often ill-gotten riches together with the customs, manners, and morality of a decadent civilization, and its influence upon Roman society was as a result by no means salutary.

Simultaneous with this rise of the parvenu class went the decline of the patricians. Warfare, rich in plunder, had been responsible for their position and had allowed them a luxurious
living. They maintained huge households, built expensive villas, baths, and porticoes, sponsored costly gladiatorial games, and in general spent their money in outlandish display with the same ease and rapidity with which they acquired it. The cessation of warfare, however, wrought their destruction. They were able, it is true, to plunder the provinces for some time after actual fighting ceased, but a prolonged peace ultimately dried up the source of their income so that by Juvenal's day they found themselves without income in a world where wealth was the key to position and power. Many of them became impoverished and were forced to resort to the state for help or to add themselves to the number of some patron's dependents. Others kicked over the traces of custom and precedent and took to the despised trades and professions. They became artisans of all kinds, set themselves up in business, turned actors, and even entered the arena as gladiators. They were willing to subordinate everything, even long standing prejudices, to the one supreme desire of maintaining the lives of ease and comfort to which they were accustomed.

These changes were naturally revolting to those who still clung to the mos majorum. They could not brook the rise of the foreigner and the infiltration of foreign customs, and they viewed with alarm the consequent fall of the patrician and destruction of the old Roman ideal. The writers of the period give
eloquent voice to the antipathy which these people felt toward the foreigner. Tacitus, Suetonius, Martial, Pliny, and Petronius all complain of the intrusion of the foreigner. But no one of them, perhaps, was more articulate or more vehement in chastising the foreigner and inveighing against foreign customs than Juvenal. He lashes these favorites of fortune, as he calls them, with an unmerciful tongue and criticizes bitterly the Rome which has allowed herself to fall into the hands of the very people she has conquered. In the remainder of the chapter we shall try to collect these grievances which Juvenal harbored against the foreigners in Rome.

In his introductory satire Juvenal tells us that he will not follow the course of the common run of poet of the day. He has been bored too often by poets hashing and rehashing the myths of the Homeric cycle. He knows the groves of Mars better than his own home, and he suspects that everyone else does also. And besides, what does it avail a poet to write on such academic topics? What good will it do to repeat again the story of the golden fleece? He prefers to follow the course of the nursling of Aurunca, Lucilius, and write satire. And, indeed, how can one refrain from writing satire? How can one occupy himself with an interminable Telephus or Orestes when he sees a fellow who used to shave him as a youth come into possession of one villa after another and challenge with his wealth the whole nobility. Or again, when a guttersnipe of the Nile, Cris-
pinus—a slave-born of Canopus—can hitch a Tyrian cloak to his shoulder and wear on his sweating finger a summer ring, how can a man waste his time on academic subjects? At Rome a barber who but recently came to the city with his feet chalk-marked can become a knight. A Crispinus, slave born even in his own country, can with his wealth acquire the same dignity. Born at Canopus, a town in Egypt noted for its lascivious manners and dances, he came to Rome and awaited in the salt rich of his native country. In a short time, however, he rose to power, was knighted, and became a member of Domitian's privy council, so that he could wear a Tyrian cloak—one made with the most expensive dye—and sport a summer ring of gold, the symbol of knighthood. When such things are possible it is difficult not to write satire. And even if natural ability were wanting indignation would supplement nature to cry out against such dignities being cast before swine.

It is upon the Greek that Juvenal pours most of his hatred and contempt. Nor was he the first to vent his spleen on the despised Greekling. The prejudice against him was old and strong, and Juvenal does no more than give expression to long and deep-rooted grievances. Cato of old was so opposed to the Greeks, their suspected philosophy, and their deceptive rhetoric that he even refused to learn the Greek alphabet. Even those writers who borrowed from the Greeks, and admired and copied
their works felt constrained to insult them. Plautus who in his own works imitated Greek comedy does not hesitate to maltreat them. He pictures them for the most part as debauchers and intriguers. Virgil, also, perhaps the most benign and gentle of the Roman writers, does not mince words when dealing with the Greeks. When he is about to unveil the treachery of Sinon, for instance, he puts into Aeneas mouth the following words:

Accipe nunc Danaum insidias et crimine ab uno disce omnes. (6)

The Romans even coined a number of naive expressions which testified to their dislike for the Greeks. The Latin for 'debauch' is 'praegræecari' and 'bad faith' in the Latin is 'graecafides.' All this disdain, however, did not prevent the Greek from making a conquest of Rome and imposing on her his customs, his manners, and even his amusements. In fact, as Juvenal tells us, the Greeks were 'most dear' to the wealthy Roman and prized for the very qualities with which Juvenal was to find fault.

"I can't bear a city of Greeks," he tells us, "and I am particularly careful to avoid them." Yet Rome is full of them. They have come from lofty Sicyon, from Amydon or Andros, from Samos, Tralles or Alabanda, and have settled on the Aventine and the Viminal, all ready to worm their way into the houses of the great. There they learn the secrets of the household, be-
come heirs through flattery and treachery, and end up masters. They are quick of wit, of undounded impudence, as ready in speech as Isaeus, and even more violent. Just let your Greek know your desires and he will accommodate you. He has brought with him all faculties. He can be grammarian, painter, orator, geometrician, trainer, pardonet, augur, doctor, or astrologer. He will do anything you ask him. To please you he will even take to wings. If you don't believe it, who was it that flew from the Minoan kingdom to Cumae? It was neither a Moor, a Sarmatian, or a Thracian, but Daedalus, a man born in the heart of Athens. Do you blame him, Juvenal asks regarding himself, if he flees this purple clad gentry and becomes irritated with it? Can a man be tolerant or silent when foreigners who have been carried to Rome by the same wind as the figs and the damsons sign their names before him in attesting marriage deeds and wills, and even occupy a higher seat at table? The true born Roman whose infancy has drunk in the air of the Aventine and was nurtured on the Sabine berry must yield place to such as these. At Rome birth means nothing. Flattery is the key to popularity and preferment. And these people are expert in flattery. They will praise to the skies the speech of an illiterate or go into raptures over the beauties of a friend even though he may be as ugly and deformed as can be. They will even compare the long, scrawny neck of a weakling to that of Hercules when holding up Antaeus from the earth, or become ecstatic over
a squeaky voice that sounds like that of a cock pecking at his hen. They completely outdo the Romans in the art of flattery. The simple honesty of the Roman prevents him from competing on a fair basis. If the Roman tries to flatter he is not believed. The Romans are no actors. The Greeks, on the contrary, are a nation of play actors, and even the poorest of them are successful at Rome. Antiochus, Stratocles, or the delicate Haemus, who have risen high in Roman circles, would not even be applauded in their own country. The Greek can take his cue from another man's expression and adapt himself perfectly. If a friend smiles, he will respond with a hee-haw. If he drops a tear, the Greek will weep bitterly even without grief. If his friend is cold, the Greek will shiver and put on his own coat, and if he complains of the heat, he will break out into a sweat. The Roman is no match for such versatility, so the Greek always has the best of it and as a result is preferred in the houses of the great. But the Greeks are lustful and untrustworthy. No one is safe with them. They first seek the confidence of their victims and having once made themselves familiar with the family secrets they are feared. Your Greek will inform against anyone, friend or enemy. He refuses, too, to share a friend. When he has succeeded in gaining the good graces of a patron he monopolizes him and will even inform against his competitors, especially if they be Romans. So, years of service mean nothing and the Roman client is ejected on the word of these liars.
So distrustful is Juvenal of the Greeks that he even casts doubt on the veracity of their history. When speaking of the Grecian account of the great love of Menoeceus for Thebes, he adds in passing "si graecia vera." Also, when relating Herodotus' account of the invasion of Xerxes he uses the impersonal "creditur" as if to exclude himself from belief in all that the "mendax Graecia audet in historia." Thus, in Juvenal's mind the history of the Greeks is no more trustworthy than the testimony of the Greek slave or freedman.

But it is not the Greek alone who has corrupted Rome. Syria has done her part. The Syrian Orontes has flown into the Tiber bringing with it its language and its manners, its flutes and its slanting harp strings; bringing, too, its timbrels and its strumpets who ply their wares at the circuses. Jews, too, are corrupting the city. They are defiling by their very presence the valley of Egeria whither they have thronged in great numbers. The muses have been ejected from the grove and every tree has been rented out to a tenant. These people are spreading their superstitious beliefs and practices, and are teaching Romans to revere the Sabbath and to worship nothing but the clouds. Romans, accepting their customs, are now abstaining from swine's flesh considering it as sacred as that of a human being. They even take to circumcision, flouting the laws and beliefs of the Romans, and respecting the Jewish law and all that Moses taught and did.
The class which suffers most at the hands of the haughty and insolent foreigner is that of the free born client. As dependents, these clients were subject to insult and disdain at the hands of their patron's slaves and freedmen. Especially when they made their daily 'salutatio' were they subject to abuse. When they arrived at the patron's door the crier would ordinarily call them up in order, for such were the times that even praetors and tribunes became clients. Naturally those holding the sacred offices should have been called first. But the boldness of the freedman was such that he demanded first place. He had respect neither for office nor convention. "I was here first," he cries. Why, then, he inquires boldly, should he be afraid or hesitate to keep his place. He is even audacious enough to admit that he was born in some town of the Euphrates. But then he points out with pride and confidence that he is the owner of five shops which bring him four hundred thousand sesterces annually---enough to win for him the coveted knighthood. What difference does the accident of birth make if one has money? As a matter of fact, what good is nobility if Corvinus, a descendant of the great race of Valerius Corvinus, is reduced by poverty to shepherding for a daily wage. He himself possesses more wealth than Pallas, the freedman favorite of Claudius. So, and here we can almost feel the bitterness in Juvenal's heart, let blood give way to wealth, let the sacred
office stand by and let the praetor await his turn while one who came to the city but yesterday takes his place.

And this is not all. The free born Roman has to put up with even greater indignities when he gets his meal. The jealousy and contempt with which the free born and the freedmen view each other give rise to friction and culminate in a battle. Saguntine crockery flies back and forth between them, and the meal, poor enough as it is, is spoiled. The free born goes away with no other use for his napkin than to staunch the wounds received in the fray. If a client is fortunate enough to receive a meal in peace and quiet, he has to put up with further abuse from both master and slave. A black, deformed Gaetulian noted for his villainy, or a Moor with long, black, scrawny hands, whom he would even hesitate to pass on the street, waits on him. The "flos Asiae" bought for more gold than all the chattels of the Roman kings stands before the master and spurns the client. He does not know how to mix a drink for a poor man, and even refuses to listen to a request for hot or cold water. It is beneath him to wait on an old dependent and he becomes indignant that he should be asked for anything. Another slave grumbles when he passes you a piece of bread that you cannot even get your teeth into. And if a client dare touch the delicate loaf preserved for the master, a third slave will admonish him to fill himself from his own tray and to learn the
color of his own bread. Nor are these just isolated incidents of impudent slaves. "All the houses of the great are filled with saucy slaves." It is for such treatment that the client must leave his family and hurry to his patron's house to greet him and accompany him in splendor to the forum. The Quirites, rather than put up with such outrages, should long ago have departed from Rome in a body.

But Juvenal's satires are not entirely negative and destructive. In contrast to the great homes of the wealthy peopled with slaves and freedman from every part of the world, he pictures his own household. There you will find no Phrygian or Lycian youth noted for his beauty and bought at a great price. One of his slaves is the son of a hardy shepherd; another, the son of a cattleman. They are all dressed alike in modest and decent costume. Their hair is cut short, uncurled, and only combed when visitors are present. When you want anything, you will ask for it not in Greek but in Latin. If you ask for wine, his youths will hand you wine bottled in the very hills they were born in and in which they used to play—for wine and servant have one and the same fatherland. Nor will there any troop of Spanish maidens to entertain during the meal with immodest dance and song. Juvenal's home will be free from all foreigners and their customs, and will resemble in its simplicity that of the early Roman.
These foreigners will do anything for money. They will turn black into white, and even contract to construct temples and harbors, to cleanse drains, or to carry corpses to the pyre. And what fools the Romans are. They have allowed them to become wealthy in the very offices which they, themselves, spurn and consider beneath their dignity. Men who were once hornblowers, who made the circuit of every provincial show, and whose puffed cheeks were known in every town have risen to such wealth that they now give shows of their own for the mob and become popular by putting to death with a turn of the thumb the people's choice. If you wish to know how wealthy these people become, set on one side the fortunes of a hundred pleaders and on the other that of a single jockey. You will find, no doubt, that the jockey will be worth more than all the others put together. Take Crispinus, too, whose wealth rivals that of Pallas. This paragon of wickedness, who has not even one redeeming quality, could afford to pay as much as 6000 sesterces for a six pound mullet—extravagance which for any other man would have merited the censor's lash. And to make the crime worse, he bought it for himself. Yet he used to hawk his fellow countrymen, sprats, in the markets of Rome. Now he can afford to pay more for a fish than he would have to pay for the fisherman himself.

It is to such people as these that the Romans have entrusted their most sacred duties. Is it any wonder that their
children are ambitious only for wealth when skinny old nurses
din into their ears long before they learn their ABC's that
money is all important and that they must possess it no matter
how.

The free born in Rome must also give the wall to some
rich man's slave. He will be ejected from the first four-
teen rows in the theater, too, to make room for the sons of
panders, auctioneers, trainers, and gladiators. And in the
forum only a purple, foreign robe will find clients, and so
important has foreign education become that even the rhetori-
cian must go to Gaul or Africa. Most disgraceful of all,
perhaps, is the fact that even men of letters are utterly de-
pendent upon foreigners. If Statius, for instance, does not
sell his "Agave" to Paris he will soon starve. For it is Paris
who appoints men to military commands, Paris who approves of
the poet after six months of service. Things have come to
such a pass that the poet must go to a foreign stage actor for
patronage.

Such in substance are Juvenal's grievances against the for-
eigner. We have tried to paraphrase them and to juxtapose those
of a similar nature so as to give a running account of them in
a form as close to the original as possible. In our next chap-
ter we shall attempt to examine into the background of these
grievances to determine just what prompted them.
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CHAPTER IV

REASONS FOR JUVENAL'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE FOREIGNER

We cannot hope to explain an author's attitude or reaction to his environment unless we first acquaint ourselves with his life, his opinions, and his doctrines. Such an acquaintance is particularly necessary when dealing with a satirist. As Boissier advises us:

"Toutes les fois qu'un homme s'arrogate le droit de faire le proces à son temps, il convient de le traiter comme on fait d'un témoin en justice: pour savoir ce que vaut sa parole, il faut chercher ce qu'a été sa vie." (1)

This does not mean, as Boissier at times seems to think, that we must question a man's character. Good character is not necessarily linked with good satire. It is true, of course, that the satire of a man who is himself guilty of the very faults he reprehends in others will hardly be taken seriously. The common run of people, it seems, are too wedded to their vices to dissociate criticism from the critic. But to say that satire as such demands high moral qualities in the satirist is a little extreme. Our investigation into the life of Juvenal, therefore, is not to be concerned with his character except in so far as it affects his reliability. It is to be concerned chiefly with the conditions of his life. Was he, for instance, disposed either by birth or age to judge harshly of the for-
eigner? Or was he, under pretext of defending the cause of virtue, morality, or patriotism, avenging his own grievances? Some authors, as we shall see, answer both these questions in the affirmative. We shall try to decide whether they do so correctly, and thus discover just what was responsible for Juvenal's attitude toward the foreigner.

Unfortunately, the life of Juvenal is almost a closed book. Several biographies have been written but they are all very sketchy and conflicting. The most we can glean from them, together with an inscription found at the place of his birth, is that Juvenal was born at Aquinum, the son or foster son (alumnus) of a freedman. Apparently, he was brought to Rome, where he received his education, at a very early age. "Ad mediam fere aetatem" he had written no satire and confined himself solely to the declamation of the schools. It seems that in his later years he was banished from Rome in consequence of an attack in one of his satires on actors, but we have no further knowledge of the date of his banishment. Even the satires reveal very little of their author. They allow us to place his birth somewhere close to the middle of the first century and his death no later than 130 A. D. They also picture him as a dependent (client) and give us the impression that he was a man of moderate means. Beyond these few hints, though, they give us little else.
Such a biography, vague and short, gives us little clue as to the outlook and sentiments of the poet. It is useful to know, however, that his life paralleled in time the reign of the worst and most corrupt Caesars up to and including Domitian, and coincides with one of the most violent periods of Roman history. For nearly fifty years Juvenal witnessed the folly of despotism and the moral decay of the people both in public and in private life. He witnessed also, as we have seen, the rapid rise of the foreigner to power. Apparently, not daring to write satire during these years of servitude he noted in silence the viciousness of his times and spent his talents in declamation. Only when reasonable princes, Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian, came into power did he dare turn to satire and give vent to his real feelings. He lived in circumstances similar to those of Tacitus and seemed, as Tacitus, to have stored up his grievances. The grievances of Tacitus, however, were chiefly political and were related in a vein of melancholy. Juvenal let loose his tongue against the social manners of his time with a violence typical of the declaimer of the period.

In explaining Juvenal, many commentators have focused on two facts of his life and have exaggerated their importance beyond all measure. By so doing, of course, they attempt to minimize the value of his criticism of the times. Let us con-
sider these facts to see just how much they influenced or perhaps prejudiced him in his treatment of the foreigner.

Some of Juvenal's critics tend to overemphasize the length of time he spent in declamation. They maintain that this practice prevented him from giving us an accurate picture of the times. For, according to them, his tendency toward declamation and his inclination toward rhetoric would naturally lead him to overdraw and exaggerate the conditions of his age. One of them even goes further and makes this observation:

"Juvenal sometimes leaves a sceptical reader in doubt whether he is more angered at the wickedness of his times or obliged to it for giving him such admirable subjects for his great eloquence and extraordinary power of composing hexameters." (2)

From this we would be inclined to think that Juvenal revelled in the vice and crime of his day, not indeed because he himself indulged in it, but because it provided matter for his pen. Yet, if we take the word of Juvenal himself, it was indignation which prompted his verse. And no one can read the first satire without noting the ring of sincerity dominant throughout. If an occasional tendency toward rhetoric and declamation is noticed, it is traceable to his past rather than to any attempt at rhetoric for its own sake. He makes it clear at the beginning of his work that he is disgusted with declamation and merc
rhetoric, and that he prefers to follow the course of Lucilius. When Juvenal rails at the foreigner, therefore, it is not merely to be rhetorical but to give vent to definite grievances. Nor, as we shall see later, does he give us an overdrawn picture of the times. If we make necessary allowances for the demands of satire, we shall find a true picture of the foreigner in Rome. As Vidal tells us:

"Affablaizse par la pensée quelques éclats de sa voix, adoucissez dans certains de ses tableaux quelques couleurs trop chargées, et vous serez constamment dans le vrai." (3)

Unfortunately, all do not agree with us in this opinion. Some still maintain that Juvenal is not to be trusted. Nettleship, for instance, holds that 'the position of Juvenal will, if studied historically, appear to be a peculiar and a personal one--------to represent the partial and exaggerated views natural is such circumstances.' We are not to put too much confidence in a writer 'honest indeed but soured by poverty and disappointed ambition who gives an exaggerated view of a peculiar phase of Roman life.' We find the same opinion expressed in Rose who sees in Juvenal the 'natural bitterness of a poor and unsuccessful man against the rich and fortunate--------who could comfort himself by giving to his feeling a moral tone.' Thus, according to these two men, Juvenal's works give us no true picture of the times but only of his own
soured disposition. When we look at the foreigner through his eyes, we do not see him as he actually was but merely as he appeared to a very prejudiced observer. How much confidence can we put in this criticism? Not too much, I believe. Even Boissier who does his best to whitewash the first century of the empire admits that Juvenal's grievances are at least those of a class and not purely personal. These two men have focused on the fact that Juvenal was a dependent and from this have reasoned that he must have been a poor and, therefore, discontented man. But, as Boissier shows, Juvenal was not an impoverished man, as many authors would have us believe. It is true that he was a dependent. but as Boissier says:

"Il n'eut pas besoin de mendier pour vivre." 6

He bases this statement on a passage in Satire XI where Juvenal describes a dinner he is giving to his friends. 'From his farm at Tibur would come a plump kid that has more of milk in him than blood------some wild asparagus gathered up by the bailiff's wife, eggs, grapes, and pears gathered up from Segnia and Syria, and fresh smelling apples.' The service also is convenient. He has two slave boys, the one the son of a shepherd, the other of the cattleman. Certainly, says Boissier, a poor man could not provide such a banquet and such service. Only a man of moderate means would be equal to it. Juvenal even compares it to the banquets of the senators of old.
Boissier, too, reminds us that Horace received his guests on less.

Juvenal, then, could not have been a very poor man. But let us suppose for the sake of argument that he was poor. Does it follow that he was therefore discontented. Certainly not! Poverty as such does not make people discontented. It is 'ambitiosa paupertas,' as Juvenal reminds us, which is the cause of unhappiness. In other words, it is not poverty, but a frustrated desire for wealth which brings misery to mankind. But Juvenal, far from desiring wealth, actually preaches poverty as the only source of happiness. Now certainly, if his own experiences with poverty were unpleasant, he would hardly recommend it to others as a means of happiness. The position of Nettleship and Rose, therefore, seems to be untenable.

But is Boissier's opinion any more acceptable? Are Juvenal's grievances merely those of a class? Or are they based on true, objective facts? Let us see what Boissier has to say on the subject.

"C'est la satire des petits gens. Nous sommes avec lui——chez tous ceux qui vivent des privations ou aventures, qui frappe le matin à la porte des riches———Juvenal parle pour eux, il est leur défenseur et leur interprète." (8)

So, to Boissier, Juvenal is the defender of that large class of
Romans, commonly known as clients, who lived off the rich.
And it is under their influence and as their representative
that he lashes the foreigner. To put the charge in Boissier's
own words——

"Un des passages les plus curieux en ce
genre et ou le poète a le plus subi l'in-
fluence de son entourage, c'est celui ou
il attaque si vigoureusement les Grecs. On
est tente d'abord d'y voir l'expression
de plus ardent patriotisme. Aussi que de
critiques s'y sont trompés! Ils ont pris
ces empotements au serieux et se représen-
tant Juvenal comme un des derniers defenseurs
de la nationalité romaine. C'est un er-
reur profonde! Le motif qui le fait gro-
der est moins élève qu'on ne pense, et il
n'y a au fond de cette colère qu'une rivali-
té de parasites. Le vieux romain client
qui s'est habitué à vivre de la générosité
des riches, ne peut pas supporter l'idée
qu'un étranger va prendre sa place.——" (9)

It is no lofty motive, then which in Boissier's opinion is
responsible for Juvenal's hatred of the foreigner. Nothing but
prejudice born of unsuccessful competition has provoked it. If
Juvenal's motives were really worthy and patriotic he would have
found fault with the methods of the Greeks. But, according to
Boissier:

"En réalité ce ne sont pas les moyens em-
ployés par les Grecs qui lui repugnent;
il essayerait volontiers de s'en servir,
s'il pensait le faire avec succès." (10)

Mayor becomes very sarcastic in dealing with this observation.
"If a fifth form boy," he tells us, "rose from a study of the satires with no truer concept of their drift, his master would mark him down for the modern side." Let us consider this opinion of Boissier to see what can be said for it. He seems to argue that since Juvenal found no fault with the methods of the Greeks jealousy alone was responsible for his hostility. But what grounds has he for stating that Juvenal condoned the methods of the Greeks? As proof he cites a line from the third satire which, if taken out of context, might allow such an interpretation. We shall consider the line in question ourselves to discover whether Boissier's interpretation is the correct one.

In the passage in question, Umbricius, a friend of Juvenal, is explaining to him just why he is leaving Rome. His main reason seems to be that Rome is filled with foreigners. He states specifically that he finds it impossible to compete with these foreigners because of the methods they use.

"Quid Romae faciam? mentiri nescio; librum Si malus est, nequeo laudare et poscere; motus Astrorum ignoro; funus promittere patrum Nec volo nec possum; ranarum viscera nunquam Inspexi. Ferre ad nuptam quae mittit adulter Quae mandat, norunt alii. Me nemo ministro Fur erit." (12)

He continues in this satirical mood and then in bitter complaint says,
Boissier misinterprets this statement and understands from it that Juvenal has no fault to find with the methods of the Greeks. His only complaint is that he is not as expert in the servile arts. This is, in my opinion, an interpretation which the context will not at all substantiate. It seems to me that if there is any one impression clearly produced by the passage in question, it is one of utter disgust with the degrading practices of the Greeks in seeking the favor of their patrons. This is clear even from the passage quoted above. What is implied in the line quoted by Boissier is meant to reflect rather the degenerate mentality of the Roman than any compromising attitude on Juvenal's part. The point which he wishes to make is that the wealthy Roman was so completely awed by anything Greek that even if the Roman client were to resort to the same practices the Greek would still be preferred. There is no implication that he would actually use these methods. By nature, he recoils from the dishonesty and obsequiousness of the Greek. His very nature, therefore, prevents him from competing on equal terms with the crafty Greek. It is always the struggle between the principled and the unprincipled, and the Greek, with absolutely no moral inhibitions, always wins out.

Why does Boissier try to impute to Juvenal other than pat-
riotic and moral motives for his opposition to the foreigner? Here, it seems, we have nothing but an application of his general indictment against Juvenal.

"Il était, comme je fait voir, de ces gens aigris par la vie, que le sort a placés dans les situations irrégulières, qui, trompés dans leurs espérances, blessés dans leur orgueil, ont perdu l'équité. ------Il représentait un caractére plutôt qu'une opinion, il avait plus de passions que de principes, et aucun parti ne peut se prévaloir son nom, si ce n'est ceux qui n'ont d'autre parti que d'être toujours mécontents." (14)

This judgment is based, of course, on the fact that Juvenal belonged to the class of dependents and was therefore a malcontent. The logic of the argument is, then, that such a person is not properly motivated and hence cannot serve as a trustworthy critic of his contemporaries. We have already, I believe, given this argument adequate treatment. We have shown that Juvenal, though a dependent, was a man of moderate, if not greater, means. It is true, perhaps, that such a man might still be envious of a wealthier class. Yet we find that in Juvenal's case the opposite is true. Rather than envy the wealthy, he actually preaches poverty and moderation, and maintains that happiness and freedom from anxiety are within the grasp only of the man of modest circumstances. Such a man could hardly be accused of being motivated by envy or discontent. Nor, in the opinion of Vidal, is he. Here are his ex-
"Juvenal n'est pas------un écrivain attrabilaire qui voit la corruption romaine à travers les nouages trompeurs d'un esprit mécontent et pessimiste; non, il n'invente rien, il ne ment pas, il ne calomnie pas; il parle de la dépravation de son temps absolument comme l'histoire en a parlé." (15)

Here Vidal strikes a note which will give us the key to the ultimate explanation of Boissier's treatment of Juvenal. It is because of what he considers a conflict between Juvenal and the historians of his day that Boissier is forced to explain away Juvenal psychologically. Pliny and Tacitus, according to him, give an entirely different view of the times. The question is: Who is to be believed?

"qui trompe la posterité, qui nous a menti, de l'histoire qui dit tant de bien de cette époque, ou du poète, qui en a laisse des tableaux si repoussants?" (16)

Boissier prefers to believe the historians, and then to vindicate his own choice he attempts a psychological explanation of Juvenal. Let us examine this so-called conflict to see if it will survive test.

Pliny, I feel, can be treated summarily with a quotation from Dill.

"Pliny was a charitable, good-natured
an aristocrat living among the elite with an assured position, and easy fortune—a man who, as he admits himself, was inclined to idealize his friends (Ep. VII, 28). He probably shut his eyes to their moral faults just as he felt bound in honor to extol their third rate literary efforts." (17)

From this quotation, based on the testimony of Pliny himself, it can be readily seen that Pliny was in no position to be a judge of his age and that even if he were, his disposition would prevent him from recognizing its faults. He could not, consequently, give us an accurate picture of the times and, as a result, he cannot be used as a very reliable authority.

But what can be said of Tacitus? His testimony is undoubtedly more reliable than that of Pliny, but, if anything, Tacitus supports rather than contradicts Juvenal. He does not, as Boissier would have us believe, belie in any way the testimony of Juvenal. Most critics see a striking similarity between the accounts of the two men. Here, for instance, is what Mackail says:

"From the name of Tacitus that of Juvenal is inseparable. The picture drawn of the empire by the historian and the satirist are in such striking accordance that they create a greater plausibility for the common view they hold than could be given by any single representation; and while Juvenal lends additional weight and
color to the Tacitean presentment of the imperial legend, he acquires from him in turn an importance which could hardly otherwise be sustained by his exaggerated and glaring rhetoric." (18)

And Fowler:

"Juvenal can hardly be separated from Tacitus. Both depict the life of Rome in the same lurid light, and the picture presented by each agrees with that of the other. Juvenal's diatribes seem to illustrate the statements of Tacitus, and Tacitus shows that Juvenal's violence is justified by the facts." (19)

How does it happen that two such eminent authorities are so diametrically opposed to the opinion of Boissier? Undoubtedly, the reason is that there is greater evidence for their view than that of Boissier. But how did it happen then that Boissier took the viewpoint he did? It seems to me that he centered his attention too much on the introduction to the Agricola where Tacitus, rejoicing at his release from the tyranny of Domitian, speaks in glowing terms and with great enthusiasm of the reign of Nerva and the freedom it brought. Here were the "grands éloges" of the age which Boissier found it hard to reconcile with the bitter complaints of Juvenal. But we must remember that any rule would seem mild after that of Domitian, and Boissier himself admits that——

"même sous Trajan la sécurité et la
liberté des citoyens n'avaient pas assez de garanties." (20)

However, he continues with the following criticism of Juvenal:

"il est allé plus loin; il n'est pas contente de temperer ses éloges par des restrictions, il a impitoyablement refusé de donner aucun éloge; c'est là que commence l'injustice." (21)

At last we have come to the end of Boissier's line of reasoning. And what do we find? He is naive enough to expect eulogies from a satirist. Certainly, we agree with him, if it is the duty of a satirist to eulogize, Juvenal has given us a very one-sided picture. But since when is a satirist obliged to write eulogies? The satirist has a definite field—the foibles and follies of his age—and everybody recognizes this fact. He does no injustice to his age if he pays no respect to its virtues. Besides, Jvenal did not deal with his age from a political viewpoint but from a social one, and a change in the political system is not necessarily accompanied by a social or moral reform. Finally, the very fact that Juvenal was able to write his satire at this time is a sufficient indication of the return of political freedom and a silent tribute to the rulers of the period. It seems, then, that Boissier's general indictment of Juvenal, if tracked down, will prove unfounded, and that, therefore, his explanation of Juvenal's attitude
toward the foreigner, which ultimately stems from it, is entirely unwarranted.

In summary, then, we have considered thus far various explanations of Juvenal's hostility toward the foreigner. Some, as we have seen, have denied that his indignation was genuine and have tried to reduce his work to mere rhetoric. Others have recognized it as genuine but have tried to explain it through prejudice rising from envy and jealousy. Both groups of critics concluded, of course, that the picture which Juvenal furnishes us of the foreigner is untrustworthy. In response we have shown that Juvenal's diatribes are not mere rhetorical flourishes. We have shown too that they cannot be laid solely either to personal or to class prejudice. They must, therefore, have been prompted by real objective facts. That they were is sufficiently evident from the account which we have already given of the background of the foreigner and his position in Rome in Juvenal's time. We saw that the foreigner was already a despicable character when the Roman first contacted him. We saw also that his vices were accentuated by the condition of slavery into which he was forced. Yet, he was educated and intelligent, and by cunning and natural ability succeeded in working up into the most prominent positions in Rome where he was a power only for evil. The picture which Juvenal gives us of him is, therefore, quite accurate. We may account for some of his
exaggerations by his leanings toward declamation; we may ascribe some of his bitterness to the so-called 'rivalite' which existed between himself and the foreigner; but we must admit that the picture which he gives us of the foreigner is the true one. And if we are to look for the real reason behind Juvenal's hostility we will not find it in any petty rivalry between clients. We must look into loftier and more remote regions. Juvenal had an ideal which lay in the remote past. His idols were the men of early Rome, of whom we spoke in our earlier chapter. In the words of Dill:

"Juvenal's idols lay in that mythical past when a Curius, thrice consul, strode homeward from the hills, mattock on shoulders, to a meal of home-grown herbs." (22)

These were the men Juvenal looked up to, men who went from the plow to the field of battle or the senate chamber, and afterwards returned again. He saw how the Roman of his day had departed from this ideal. He was grieved at the loss of the old Roman virtues, and for all this he blamed the Greek and the foreigner in general. It was when the foreigner entered the city that the Roman began to lose his taste for the simple, virtuous life of his ancestors. It was the foreigner who corrupted the Roman. Juvenal believed that as long as this foreign influence was prevalent, the Roman would never again appreciate the life which his fathers had led. As Crutwell puts it:
"While the Greek leads fashion the old Roman virtues can never be restored. If only men could be disabused of their reverence for all that is Greek, society might be restored." (23)

Here was the real reason behind Juvenal's dislike of the foreigner. Whether it was really the foreigner who was at fault or the Roman who willingly allowed him to corrupt Roman society is a question beyond the scope of our paper. What we have been interested in showing is that it was not an unworthy motive which caused such indignation and antipathy, but a patriotic and a moral one.
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