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We hear from Cicero that by the middle of the first century B.C. there was a large and influential body of Jews at Rome. It is estimated that in the time of Augustus there must have been fifty thousand Jews in the city. For classical Latin writers, then, Jews were part of the contemporary Roman scene. This paper seeks to examine the language of Augustan and Silver Latin poets, with a view to determining how familiar they and their audiences were with Jews and Jewish institutions.

There are four features of language and style which would indicate acquaintance with things Jewish.

The clearest indication of intimacy with anything foreign is the adoption of its foreign technical name into Latin. Latin writers, poets included, were extremely chary of using foreign technical terms, and remarkably few were in common literary use. The literary success of any Jewish name would obviously indicate familiarity with that particular Jewish institution.

Another stylistic feature which could suggest familiarity with a foreign institution is the use of periphrasis. Quintilian defines periphrasis in the following terms: 'Pluribus autem verbis cum id, quod uno aut pauci­­ioribus certe dici potest, explicatur, περιφράσκων vocant, circuitum quendam eloquendi...' (8.6.59). He goes on to say that it is useful in circumventing undesirable language (8.6.59), or can be used solely to confer 'ornatus', particularly in poets (cf. Isid. 1.37.15: 'hic autem tropus geminus est: nam aut veritatem splendide producit, aut foeditatem circuitu evitat'). Jews were generally despised, and their words might well be regarded as candidates for 'circuitus'. At best, Jewish technical terms were foreign and likely to be circumvented for that reason. Such periphrasis would tell us nothing about contemporary familiarity with Jewish institutions. It would merely indicate an author's negative attitude to a Jewish term, whether for social or literary reasons. We are here concerned with periphrasis solely for decorative effect. Such periphrasis would only be possible if the Jewish term thus circumvented was so familiar as to be the 'proprium verbum' in Latin. It would have to be a stylistically acceptable term which the poet
might conceivably have used, and which his audience would understand as lying behind the circumlocution. This will only occur where institution and term have been thoroughly assimilated into Roman consciousness.

Allied to this use of periphrasis is the use of descriptive or allusive language. Allusions have to be understood by a poet’s audience. Allusion assumes familiarity. The author takes the audience into his confidence in a kind of conspiracy. He flatters them by taking it for granted that they share his experience and frame of reference. The knowledge implied need not be precise on either side (indeed, many Jewish practices were misinterpreted by the Romans), but misconceptions must be commonly held. Conversely, where an author reflects Jewish custom accurately, it can be assumed that his audience had a similar grasp of fact.

A Roman writer could also respond to Jews and things Jewish at a lower stylistic level. He could employ terms of abuse. These are likely to appear sparingly in epic, for, as Longinus says, lowness of diction destroys grandeur, and a descent from the sublime to the filthy and contemptible should only be contemplated when absolutely necessary (Subl. 43.1.5). But as Longinus himself concedes, phrases verging on the vulgar are expressive (31.2), and Quintilian grants a place to low and vulgar words in Old Comedy and iambic verse (10.1.9). We should not be surprised, therefore, to find terms of abuse applied to familiar Jewish institutions in epigram and satire. Horace, after all, places his satires in the tradition of Eupolis, Cratinus and Aristophanes (Sat. 1.4.1ff., cf. Pers. 1.123).

Obscenities and scatological expressions, however, would not imply real understanding of Jews or Jewish customs. They would represent revulsion, and contempt for some practice, physical or moral characteristic, or aspect of outward appearance which would mark Jews out as un-Roman, and hence despicable. Terms of abuse would reflect a negative reaction to superficial racial differences and to the mere physical presence of Jews at Rome. They imply an attitude rather than real knowledge. However, they could cast light on what characteristics or practices Romans regarded as synonymous with Jews and Judaism.

The institution most commonly associated with the Jews is the observance of the Sabbath. It is proof of widespread contact with the Jewish sabbath that the Hebrew word ‘sabbata’ found its way into common Latin parlance, and is widely used without awkwardness by poets and prose writers alike. Poets may have nothing good to say about the Sabbath. They may regard its observance as a deplorable waste of time, but nonetheless the word ‘sabbata’ appears in Horace’s Satires, Ovid (Rem. Am. 219f.), Persius (5.184), a verse fragment of Petronius (Sat. fr. 37 [Buecheler]), and twice in Juvenal as a regular Latin word. So familiar was ‘sabbata’ that Martial could coin a word ‘sabbataria’ — ‘a female Sabbath-keeper’ (4.4.7) — for satirical purposes.
Remarkably few non-Greek words enjoy such success.

Periphrasis is also used by the poets, another indication of acquaintance with the Sabbath and the term 'sabbata'. In Ovid we find 'septima sacra' ( Ars Am. 1.76) and 'septima festa' ( Ars Am. 1.416), and in Juvenal 'septima lux' (14.105). Persius (5.180) mentions 'Herodis dies', probably to be interpreted as the Sabbath. Tibullus has a variation 'dies Saturni' (1.3.18), a reflection of the fact that the Jewish cycle of seven days came to be merged with the astrological week of seven days, named after the sun, the moon and five planets. The Sabbath coincided with the 'day of Saturn'. It led to erroneous assumptions that the Jews had some connection with the Roman god Saturn, or concern with the heavenly bodies (see Tac. Hist. 5.4.4 with Heubner's notes).

It is clear that the poets had actually observed Jews and their sabbatical paraphernalia and practices at first hand, and assumed that their audience had too. Persius refers to the lighting of lamps (5.181), a custom attacked by Seneca ( Ep. 95.47), and to the habit of eating fish at the Friday evening meal (5.183), in allusive language which would be clear only to a reader familiar with these practices. Juvenal twice alludes to the hay-basket ('cophinus fenumque') as standard Jewish 'supellex' (3.14; 6.542). It may well be, of course, that Juvenal misunderstood the function of the haybox, to keep food warm for the Sabbath. Greek and Roman writers, including Juvenal's contemporary, Martial (4.4.7) commonly associate fasting with the Sabbath. Nonetheless, for Juvenal, as for Sidonius later, Jews were known by their 'cophinus', just as barbarian kings were known by their diadems.

Alongside Sabbath observance as a distinguishing characteristic of Jews went circumcision. The practice was well-known, and polite words for it existed. But it was so despised that Latin satirical poets could have a field day with terms of abuse. In some verse of Petronius and in Juvenal quite explicit descriptions occur, but generally in satirical works we find derisory nouns and adjectives, whose implications were obviously clear to the audience. 'Recutitus', probably a low class coinage from 'cutis' — 'skin', and meaning 'circumcised', appears in Persius as a transferred epithet applied to the Sabbath (5.184), and in Martial (7.30.5). Horace, in a contemptuous tone, refers to 'cutis Judaeis' ( Sat. 1.9.70). 'Curtus' is elsewhere used of castrated horses and mules (Prop. 4.1.20; Hor. Sat. 1.6.104). This unusual usage elicits elaboration from the scholiasts, but the allusion must have been obvious to Horace's readers. A derogatory term 'verpus' referring to Jews is found in Martial (7.82.6; 11.94.2,4,6) and Juvenal (14.104). This was a term of abuse not confined to Jews — Catullus applies it as an adjective to Priapus (by whom he probably means Piso). But given its derivation from 'verpa' — 'a penis with foreskin drawn back', it was aptly applied to circumcised Jews.
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Although it now seems likely that Jews did not actively proselytize during the period of the classical poets,26 Jewish communities attracted pagan sympathizers of various types who related to the community at various levels.27 The terms γιρὲ σαμαγιμ, θεοσβετις, φοβούμενοι τὸν θέον occur in Greek and rabbinic literature, in Acts, and in inscriptions,28 and have been taken to apply to such Gentile supporters. Whatever they meant to the Jewish communities,29 it seems that Persius, Petronius and Juvenal at least, knew of their use in a Jewish context.

Expressions such as 'metuens' (Juv. 14.96),30 'tremet' (Petron. Sat. fr. 37 [Buecheler]), and even 'palles' (Pers. 5.184) (all with 'sabbata' as object) may be seen as rendering per translationem the Greek φοβούμενος. 'Colens' too (Juv. 14.103) may reflect the same Greek term.31 While it is true that a term such as 'metuens' may be used of the pious observers of any cult, the satirical tone of the passages above suggests that a Jewish technical term is perhaps being mocked. Juvenal particularly appears to be parodying biblical and Jewish language, especially at 14.101: 'Iudaicum ediscunt et servant ac metuunt ius' (with Courtney's note).

Expressions such as φοβούμενος and θεοσβετις may well have been so common in a Jewish context as to make them the worthy butt of a joke. For the rest, we are largely concerned with Juvenal.

In Satire 3, Juvenal provides evidence both for the prevalence of Jewish synagogues in Rome, and for the common Jewish term for them. 'In qua te quaero proseucha?' challenges the thug, spoiling for a fight (3.296). What is a 'proseucha'? Clearly there are several in Rome ('in qua?'). It is not a word which appears elsewhere in extant Latin literature, though significantly it occurs in a Jewish inscription in Latin from Rome.32 It is in fact a transcription of the Greek word προσευχή. The thug means the word to be abusive. The full import of the term becomes clear when we remember that Greek was the language of the Jews in the lands of the Hellenistic diaspora, and in Rome itself.33 Outside of Palestine προσευχή was a common word for a prayer-house,34 as Juvenal and his audience clearly knew. The Greek term would suggest 'synagogue' to Roman readers without the necessity for further qualification. This is testimony both to the prevalence of Judaism at Rome and to the use of Greek by Jews there.

In Satire 6, 'mero pede' (6.159) is enough to recall the fact that Jews removed their shoes on holy ground.

In Palestine, says Juvenal in the next line, pigs are mercifully allowed to attain a ripe old age (6.160), clearly a reference to Jewish abstinence from pork. (He refers again, more overtly, to this practice at 14.98f.) The idiosyncracies of Jewish eating habits must have been well-known,35 and abstinence from pork a commonplace. In the late Republic Cicero could joke at the expense of a suspected judaizer, asking him why he involved himself in a case concerning Verres (a pig) (Plut. Cic. 7.5). Nonetheless, it
appears from Petronius (Sat. fr. 37 [Buecheler]: ‘Judaeus licet et porcinum numen adoret’) that abstinence from pork led to the belief that the Jews worshipped the pig. Acquaintance with an institution did not necessarily mean understanding of its significance.

A troublesome allusion in Satire 6 remains. What does Juvenal mean by ‘magna sacerdos arboris’ (6.544ff.) — ‘great priestess of the tree’ —, a reference to a palsied Jewess clairvoyant? Various unsatisfactory interpretations of this expression have been suggested. For example, some have seen a connection with the trees of the mendicant Jews in the grove of Egeria, mentioned in Satire 3. Others detect a reference to a grape vine design adorning a gateway of the Temple in Jerusalem. The fact is that, though the significance of the expression ‘magna sacerdos arboris’ may be lost to us, Juvenal’s audience would have understood the allusion. It seems most likely that the ‘arbor’ refers to some object or symbol commonly associated with the Jews in Rome. It may be, as Wiesen argues, that Romans were familiar with the branching candlestick or menorah so commonly depicted in Jewish catacombs. If Juvenal knew about the haybox, he may well have been acquainted with the menorah.

Juvenal Satire 14 contains ten lines full of allusions to Jewish customs (96–106). Some not previously mentioned deserve comment.

In Hellenistic and later Hebrew literature the proper name, Yahweh, is avoided and ‘Heaven’ (οὐρανός in Greek) appears as a synonym for it. Juvenal’s ‘nil praeter nubes et caeli numen adorant’ (14.97, cf. 6.545) satirically reflects this usage. ‘Caelum’ translates ‘Heaven’. Some doubtless believed that Jews actually did worship the sky (cf. Strab. 16.2.35, p.761), and this belief may well have been reinforced by the common equation of Jehovah with Zeus/Jupiter. But Juvenal is playing with language, and some part of his audience at least, would have known about the Yahweh–Heaven equation. What is more, this usage is not unique to Juvenal. In Petronius, too, a Jew is called upon ‘caeli summas advocet auriculas’ (fr. 37 [Buecheler]). In this passage, as in Juvenal 6.545, ‘summas’ may also reflect, for the cognoscenti, the Greek adjective οὐράνιος applied to Yahweh, perhaps because of his conflation with Ζεύς ὃς ἄνωθεν (cf. Strab. 16.2.35, p.761).

Taking 14.102: ‘tradidit arcano quodcumque volumine Moyses’ in conjunction with 6.544: ‘interpres legum Solymarum’, we see that Juvenal knew something of Jewish law, its enshrinement in a sacred book, and its connection with Moses. Juvenal’s information may appear a little vague and misguided. Elsewhere, in Satire 6.543–7, Jews dabble in the occult, and ‘arcano volumine’ may have pejorative overtones, associating Judaism with some occult mystery religion. The use of the pronoun ‘quodcumque’ implies lack of clarity or some dispute about what was written in the Book of Moses. Juvenal however rightly recognises a link between Moses and Jewish law. In other writers Moses is a generally misunderstood and
malign Figure. At best he is styled ‘rex Judaeorum’ (Just. Epit. 36.2.3, 16; Pseudo-Acro at Hor. Sat. 1.9.70), at worst a magician (Plin. HN 32.11; Apul. Apol. 90). Whatever Juvenal’s prejudices and whatever he knew of the Pentateuch and its contents, or of Moses, there is nothing in Juvenal’s line which his audience would find obscure. Secret books were to be expected of a people who jealously protected their religion and despised other gods. Whatever is noteworthy, however, is the appearance of the name ‘Moses’ without any qualification or explanation. Clearly Moses had become a familiar figure at Rome, in whatever guise he was viewed. Quintilian can even allude to him without mentioning his name (3.7.21, where he is styled ‘Iudaicae superstitionis auctor’).

At 14.104: ‘ad fontem’, some readers might understand ‘fons’ simply as water, a common right given by nature to all men, which Jews denied to the uninitiated. It is possible, however, that Juvenal was alluding to baptism, the main initiatory rite, with circumcision, in becoming a Jew. Certainly there are sufficient references in Juvenal to justify Highet’s statement that ‘Juvenal knew quite a lot about the Jews and their faith’. But the fact remains that Juvenal’s knowledge could not have been unique or extraordinary. His language is allusive, and it would only have been possible to use such language if he was assured that his audience understood the references.

But what is it that he and his audience actually know? How much of what he and other poets allude to can be attributed to personal interest in Jews in the Subura? Many of the details of Jewish observance referred to by the poets would be accessible to any passer-by looking in at windows—the hay basket, the menorah, the Sabbath lighting of lamps and eating of fish in Persius. Avoidance of pork and observation of the Sabbath had long been synonymous with Jews. It is hardly surprising that the term ‘Sabbata’ had become common coin when the institution was so well-known, or that it could be ingeniously paraphrased for poetic ‘ornatus’. Innovative terms of abuse for circumcised Jews merely reflect an entrenched social prejudice, and aversion for a long-despised ethnic practice.

It is Juvenal 14.96–106 which deserves our attention, where content and language suggest more intimate knowledge of Jewish beliefs and practices, on the part of poet and audience. Here we have references unattested in other poets: to the fact that Jews removed their shoes on holy ground, to Moses the lawgiver and his ‘secret book’, to denial of ‘fons’ to the uninitiated. Closer examination reveals that Juvenal and his audience encountered these phenomena not in the synagogues of Rome, but in literary sources.

Moses was a familiar figure in ethnographic accounts of the Jews, both Greek and Roman. He enjoyed a literary reputation as a lawgiver, and he appears thus, too, in Tacitus’ near-contemporary excursus on the Jews
Juvenal, as we have seen, is deliberately vague about the nature and content of the Book of Moses — the attitude of a man distancing himself from, rather than vaunting his personal knowledge of Jewish religion.

The exclusivity of the Jews and their anti-social behaviour towards the uninitiated is likewise a literary topos, surfacing also in Tacitus (Hist. 5.5.1). It may even be that Juvenal’s reference to Jewish kings celebrating festival days barefoot (6.159) is a literary allusion to Josephus BJ 2.212–3, where Berenice (named by Juvenal three lines earlier) is described as discharging a vow barefoot.

Juvenal’s echoes of Jewish religious language (6.545; 14.96, 97, 101) may similarly reflect literary rather than first-hand acquaintance. It is noteworthy that the relevant phrases can be paralleled in Josephus. Juvenal is entering into a conspiracy with his audience on the basis of literary erudition, rather than assumed familiarity with the language of the synagogue. Only the use of ‘proseucha’ for a prayer house in Rome could reflect contemporary Jewish usage.

In short, Roman poets do not display any real interest in the finer points of Jewish belief and practice, but rather deal in ethnic stereotypes and literary parody. They allude to social and literary commonplaces for the amusement of their educated audience, rather than accurately reflecting the state of contemporary knowledge of Jews. Jews were topical, and the language of the poets simply mirrors the fact.

**NOTES**

5. On the cautious treatment of foreign words see Bell (above, n.3) 30–1.
6. Just. *Epit.* 36.2.14; Sen. *Ep.* 96.47; Plin. *HN* 31.24 (the ultimate in Sabbath observation — a river in Judaea which dries up every Sabbath); Schol. at Juv. 6.542; Suet. *Aug.* 76.2; *Th.* 32.2. Only Trogus/Justin explains the term and couches it in explanatory language (36.2.14: ‘septimum diem more gentis Sabbata appellatum’). This is probably due to his ethnographic concerns rather than the awkwardness of the term. He is here explaining the origin of the institution, and it was appropriate to emphasize that ‘sabbata’ was the Jews’ own name for it.
sabbata, inutiliter eos facere adfirmans quod per illos singulos septenis interpositos
dies septimam fere partem aetatis suae perdant vacando...'. See M. Whittaker,

8. Juv. Sat. 1.9.69: 'hodie tricensima, sabbata'. 'Tricensima' probably refers to the
celebration of the new moon by the Jews. See Lejay *ad loc.;* E. Schürer, *The History
of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)* 3.1 rev. and
Juifs dans l'empire Romain* 1, Paris 1914, 365 n.1. For other possible interpretations
see M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* 1, Jerusalem 1974,
326. It seems at least feasible that if Tacitus, and perhaps Suetonius, knew of
the Sabbatical year, 'Shemitta', (Tac. Hist. 5.4.3: 'septimus annus' [with Heubner's
note]; Suet. Tib. 32.2 [see A.M.A. Hospers-Jansen, *Tacitus over de Joden: Hist. 5,
2-13*, Groningen 1949, 129f.]), Horace may have known something of the numerical
designation of Sabbaths. Possibly he is here mocking the convention. (See Stern
loc. cit.).

9. Hor. Sat. 1.9.69: 'hodie tricensima, sabbata'. 'Tricensima' probably refers to the
celebration of the new moon by the Jews. See Lejay *ad loc.;* E. Schürer, *The History
of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)* 3.1 rev. and
Juifs dans l'empire Romain* 1, Paris 1914, 365 n.1. For other possible interpretations
see M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* 1, Jerusalem 1974,
326. It seems at least feasible that if Tacitus, and perhaps Suetonius, knew of
the Sabbatical year, 'Shemitta', (Tac. Hist. 5.4.3: 'septimus annus' [with Heubner's
note]; Suet. Tib. 32.2 [see A.M.A. Hospers-Jansen, *Tacitus over de Joden: Hist. 5,
2-13*, Groningen 1949, 129f.]), Horace may have known something of the numerical
designation of Sabbaths. Possibly he is here mocking the convention. (See Stern
loc. cit.).

10. Juv. 6.159 (where it seems to denote any Jewish festival day. See Courtney *ad loc.;*)
14.96.

11. cf. Tac. Hist. 5.43: 'septimus dies'. Juvenal's 'septima lux' is clearly prompted by
a need for 'varietas': 'sabbata' appears eight lines earlier (14.96).

12. See Stern (above, n.9) 436; Whittaker (above, n.7) 71.


15. See Stern (above, n.9) 437.

16. Most commentators interpret Juvenal's 'cophinus fenumque' as the haybox (e.g.
Friedlaender, Marache, Courtney). Alternatively, given the context of Jews as beg-
gars (cf. also Mart. 12.57.13), the 'cophinus' may be a basket for scraps (cf. TLL
s.v. 'cophinus' l. 38-40), and the hay, bedding material (Duff at Juv. 3.14).

Saturni
die frigidos cibos esse';
Schol. at Juv. 6.542.

18. cf. Strab. 16.2.40, p.763; Just. Epit. 36.2.14; Petron. Sat. fr. 37 (Buecheler);

19. Sid. Apoll. Epist. 7.6. For other explanations of 'cophinus' in this passage see
Courtney at Juv. 3.14; TLL s.v. 'cophinus' l. 37-8.

20. The polite literary word for 'circumcise' was 'circumcidere' (Petron. Sat. 102.14;
Tac. Hist. 5.5.2), or more rarely, 'circumsecare' (Suet. Dom. 12.2), paralleling the
Greek κτερπέων (Hdt. 2.36.3; Diod. 1.28.2). For terms used in Greek and Latin
see J. Juster (above, n.9) 263 n.5.

nudatum solverit arte caput'; Juv. 14.99: 'praeputia ponunt'.

22. Mart. 7.30.5: 'nec recutitorum fugis inguina Iudaeorum', cf. 7.35.4: 'Iudaeum nuda
sub cute pondus habet'. Cf. Petron. Sat. 68: 'duo tamen vitia habet — recutitus
est et stertit'.

23. Pseudo-Acro: 'ideo curtis quia Moyses rex Judaorum cuius legibus reguntur ne-
legentia medici talis effectus et ne solus esset notabilis omnes circumcildi voluit';
Porphyrio: 'curtos Iudaeos dixit quia virile membrum velut decurtatum habet,
recisa inde pellicula'.
25. On this meaning of 'verpa' see Adams (above, n.24) 13.  
29. The interpretation of these terms has been much debated. Earlier scholars (e.g. Juster 1 [above, n.9] 274ff.) identify these 'god-fearers' with 'proselytes of the gate', a category of partial proselyte which occurs in rabbinic writings. Other scholars argue that the Jews did not recognize different categories of proselytes, only accepting converts who adopted all Jewish rites. Θεοσεβείται and φοβούμενοι are then non-technical terms of praise for pious god-fearing Jews (e.g. Leon [above, n.2] 253; L.H. Feldman, 'Jewish Sympathizers in Classical Literature and Inscriptions', *TAPhA* 81 [1950] 200; Sevenster [above, n.18] 198). More recently, A.T. Kraabel, 'The Disappearance of the Godfearers', *Numen* 28 (1981) 113–26, supporting a non-technical sense for these terms, argues that, at least for the Roman diaspora, there is insufficient evidence for a specific class of Gentile adherents termed 'Godfearers'. For bibliography debating this question see Overman (above, n.27) 24 n.5, who argues for their existence. He defines them as uncircumcised Jewish sympathizers who enjoyed 'a degree of respect and honour from the Jewish community for their piety and faith' (17). Cohen (above, n.27) 31–33, while believing that the terms apply to sympathetic gentiles, argues for a broader interpretation, given the diversity of circumstances in Jewish communities (cf. Kraemer [above, n.27] 36f.).  
30. 'Metuens' appears in funerary inscriptions: *CIL* 6. 29759, 29760, 29763, 31839 (from Rome); *CIL* 5, 88 = P.-J.B. Frey, *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum a saec. III ante Christum ad saec. VII post Christum* 1, Rome 1936 (New York 1975) (CII) 642: 'religioni(s) Iud(a)eicae metuenti' refers specifically to a Jewess.  

34. This is the term used in the oldest inscriptions concerning Jewish meeting places — from Ptolemaic Egypt (H.C. Kee, 'The Transformation of the Synagogue after 70 C.E.: Its Import for Early Christianity', *NTS* 36 [1990], 4f.). For its use of diasporic meeting places in papyri and Greek literature from the first century A.D. to the time of Diocletian see Kee, *op. cit.* 5f.. In Palestine προσευχή denoted the Temple in Jerusalem and συναγωγή a prayer-house. Elsewhere συναγωγή, formerly denoting the Jewish community, came to be used in the sense of ‘prayer-house’ around the second century A.D. (A.R.C. Leaney, *The Jewish and the Christian World — 200 B.C. to A.D. 200*, Cambridge 1984, 146). On the terms for prayer-houses in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek see S. Krauss, *Synagogale Antiquität*, Berlin 1922, 2–27; on Greek and Roman terms see Juster (*above, n.9*) 1, 456b–58; Schürer (*above, n.33*) 439f..

35. For literary references to food laws see Whittaker (*above, n.7*) 73–80. Persius, as we have seen, mentions the eating of fish at the Friday evening meal (5.183). It is noteworthy that Tacitus is the first non-Jew to mention unleavened bread, which he describes as ‘panis Иудеicus nullo fermento’ (*Hist.* 5.4.3 with Heubner’s note). See Hospers-Jansen (*above, n.9*) 128.

36. See Courtney *ad loc*..


39. cf. also *Tac. Hist.* 5.5.4 (with Heubner’s note).


44. cf. *[Longinus]*, *Sublim.* 9.9.


47. Hecataeus *ap. Diod.* 40.3.3; Alex. Polyh. *ap. Suda* A1129; Diod. 1.94.1; *[Longinus]* *Subl.* 9; *Joseph. Ap.* 2. 145.


49. See Courtney *ad loc*.


51. It is noteworthy that Jews feature prominently in poems of the Neronian era (Petronius, Persius) when the emperor’s wife, Poppea Sabina was an active pro-Jewish
sympathizer (Joseph. AJ 20.185). M.H. Williams, 'Domitian, the Jews and "Ju
daizers" — a Simple Matter of Cupiditas and Maiestas?' Historia 39 (1990) 197f.,
205-6, argues that hostile references in Martial and Quintilian reflect Domitian's
virtual persecution of Jews.
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