

The Fury's flogging compels Tantalus to enter the central door of the *scaenae frons*. *Introitus* (103), plural for singular as often, means *Eintritt*,⁴ *coming in*,⁵ rather than *approach*⁶ or *advent*.⁷ compare *Troades* 216 "Mysiae ferocis introitus" (crossing the border into Mysia) and in prose Seneca *De beneficiis* 6. 34. 1 and Cicero *Pro Caecina* 39. The Fury remains on stage during the brief absence of Tantalus. The disputed *sequor* (100) does not mean "Lead on, I follow,"⁸ but rather "I comply with your command": it requires no action by the Fury. Compare *Oedipus* 698 "facitis exemplum; sequor." I neither with Bentley delete the verb nor with Leo postulate a lacuna.⁹ Seneca imitates here as elsewhere the Virgilian unfinished line.¹⁰ The specter need simply cross the threshold and the pollution is effected. A harsh command (for intensifying *abunde* compare *Thy.* 279, 889) recalls the ghost. As Tantalus emerges, he is ordered to return to Hell, obeys in silence, and both actors *exeunt* stage right (121), Tantalus preceding the Fury. After the parodos the actors would in the Greek manner reenter as Atreus and the Satellite.

Therefore, I render:¹¹

Fury (*lashing Tantalus*): This, this madness dispense in all the palace! So, so may its inhabitants be borne along and enraged may thirst for each other's blood. (*Tantalus enters palace*) The palace feels your entering and recoils, all of it, at your loathsome touch. (*Pause*) Enough! That will more than do! (*Tantalus emerges*) Return to the infernal cave and the stream you know.

WILLIAM M. CALDER III
University of Colorado,
Boulder

4. T. Thomann, *Seneca Sämtliche Tragödien*, vol. 2 (Zürich and Stuttgart, 1969), p. 113.

5. So Jasper Heywood: see "Thyestes": *Lucius Annaeus Seneca Translated by Jasper Heywood (1560)*, ed. J. Daalder (London and New York, 1982), p. 29. I recommend the valuable introduction and extensive notes, often as helpful for Seneca as for Heywood.

6. F. J. Miller, *Seneca's Tragedies*, vol. 2 (London and New York, 1929), p. 99: "Thy house feels thy near approach."

7. M. Hadas, *Seneca: "Thyestes"* (New York, 1957), p. 5: "The house senses your advent." Hadas and Miller strain *introitus* because they do not wish that Tantalus exit before verse 121. I prefer with Leo *sentit* (E) to the *lectio faciliior, sensit* (A).

8. E. F. Watling, *Seneca: Four Tragedies and "Octavia"* (Harmondsworth, 1974), p. 49. His translation and what follows require that the Fury and Tantalus remain on stage while cursing the palace. Tantalus touches the façade but does not enter. Hadas, "Thyestes", p. 100, rightly renders *sequor* as "I yield."

9. See Leo, *Tragoediae*, 2: 243: "fort. interciderunt aliquot versus pleni furoris."

10. So Thomann, *Sämtliche Tragödien*, 2: 453: "Affektiv-demonstrativ abgebrochener Vers wie Tr 1103, Pha 60, Phoen 319."

11. For the correct staging, see F. Stoessl, *RE* 23 (1959): 2426. 25–39.

ON THE ORIGIN OF "MENIPPEAN SATIRE" AS THE NAME OF A LITERARY GENRE

I should like here to correct a mistaken notion about the nomenclature of Roman satire which has found currency in all modern works and handbooks on the subject. We read in Duff, Knoche, Ramage, Witke, Coffey, and others that the Romans considered Menippean satire to be an "alternate convention" of

Roman satire, as opposed to verse satire.¹ This view, however, is based upon a misinterpretation of Quintilian 10. 1. 95:

alterum illud etiam prius saturae genus, sed non solum carminum varietate mixtum, condidit Terentius Varro . . .

As M. Winterbottom points out, by the phrase *alterum genus* Quintilian refers to the Ennian form of satire in which a number of different meters were mixed together,² and *condidit* means "wrote," not "founded." Quintilian evidently believed that the mixture of prose and verse in Varro's *Saturae Menippeae* represented merely a variation on this Ennian model, and did not constitute a separate genre of Roman satire. The motives behind Quintilian's judgment will remain obscure, but we may suspect that he was eager to disguise any debt which a Roman satirist might have had to a Greek source.³ We must admit in any event that Quintilian is not here claiming that Varro is a literary innovator who brought a new genre of satire to Rome. Modern critics reach this conclusion, and rightly, without the aid of Quintilian.⁴

Quintilian therefore does not refer to a *genre* known as Menippean satire. Furthermore, there is no specific ancient reference to any such genre. In his discussion of satire, Diomedes (*GL* 1. 485. 30 ff.) mentions only the hexameter and mixed meter types, ignoring Varro's *Menippeans* altogether. "Probus" (*In Verg. Buc.* 6. 31) and others testify to the use of "Menippeus" as a nickname for Varro, but only when referring to or quoting from his *Menippeans*;⁵ this may indicate the popularity of these works, but it cannot support any argument that there was theoretical recognition of a Menippean genre fathered by Varro in Rome. In short, ancient literary theory does not admit to the existence of a genre of "Menippean satire," but only to the 150 works of Varro entitled *Saturae Menippeae*; nor does any ancient critic suggest that other authors were formally or thematically dependent on the *Menippeans*. That such a genre existed is evident from the lines of influence and tradition that can be traced in Varro, Seneca, Petronius, and others, but antiquity does not acknowledge the genre which modern literary acumen has uncovered and named on its own.

1. J. W. Duff, *Roman Satire: Its Outlook on Social Life* (Berkeley, 1936), p. 84; U. Knoche, *Roman Satire*, trans. E. S. Ramage (Bloomington, 1975), p. 4; E. S. Ramage, D. L. Sigsbee, and S. C. Fredericks, *Roman Satirists and Their Satire* (Park Ridge, N.J., 1974), pp. 1-2; C. Witke, *Latin Satire, The Structure of Persuasion* (Leyden, 1970), pp. 46-47; M. Coffey, *Roman Satire* (New York, 1976), p. 4.

2. *Problems in Quintilian*, BICS Suppl. 25 (London, 1970), p. 191, who translates: "The other well-known type of satire—one that arose even before Lucilius (i.e. the Ennian satire of varied metre)—was exploited by Varro, but now with a variety given not merely by metrical changes (but by an admixture of prose to the verse)."

3. Cf. H. Rahn, ed., *Marcus Fabius Quintilianus: Ausbildung des Redners*, Texte zur Forschung, vol. 2 (Darmstadt, 1975), p. 469, n. 63: "Es ist offenbar der Nationalstolz, der Quintilian zu dieser gewundenen Formulierung drängt. . . ."

4. Nevertheless, a number of critics try to interpret *condidit* in two senses, as both "wrote" and "created something new by writing"; cf. Rahn, *Quintilianus*, who translates as "den Grund gelegt"; M. Puelma-Piwonka, *Lucilius und Kallimachos* (Frankfurt am Main, 1949), p. 173 and n. 4, who takes the word to mean "ausarbeiten"; and E. Pasoli, "'Satura' drammatica e 'Satura' letteraria," *Vichiana* 1. 2 (1964): 17-29 (unavailable to me, but according to L. Alfonsi, "Le 'Menippeae' di Varrone," *ANRW* 3 [1973], p. 31, Pasoli takes *condere* as equivalent to "organizzare").

5. Cf. Ath. 4. 160C; Arn. *Adv. gent.* 6. 23; Charisius, *GL* 1. 118. 8; Diomedes, *GL* 1. 371. 23-26; Eutyches, *GL* 5. 467-68.

I have been able to find no generic use of the term "Menippean satire" prior to 1581, the date of publication of Lipsius' *Somnium*, whose title in fuller form reads *Lipsi Satyra Menippea. Somnium. Lusus in nostri aevi criticos*.⁶ Lipsius' heavenly tribunal is modeled directly on Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*: Lipsius must have thought therefore that Seneca's work belonged to Varro's tradition; and he was thus the first to assert the generic significance of "Menippean satire." In 1612, Petrus Cunaeus followed Lipsius' lead when he wrote a similar satire on contemporary critics which also took the *Apocolocyntosis* as its model: the *Sardi Venales. Satyra Menippea in huius seculi homines plerosque inepte eruditos*.⁷ From this point on, the use of the term to designate the Latin works of Varro's successors seems established.

Lipsius' influence, however, was not immediately felt. In 1594 came the French work *La vertu du catholicon*, known in its later editions as the *Satyre Ménippée*.⁸ The printer of this work, in his *deuxième advis*, defended the novelty of this title and gave no indication that the French were aware of Lipsius' *Somnium*.⁹ The great classicist Pierre Pithou, however, was one of the collaborators in the *Ménippée*, and we may suspect that there is an unacknowledged debt to Lipsius in this work; but the form of the *Ménippée* is completely unlike that of the *Apocolocyntosis*, and the possibility of independent development of the generic term cannot at this time be ruled out. More importantly, there appeared in 1605 Casaubon's famous *De satyrica Graecorum poesi et Romanorum satira*, which used the term "Varronian satire" to name the genre of Latin works written on the model of Varro;¹⁰ he excluded Greek authors from the genre, while the printer of the *Satyre Ménippée*, with truly modern literary taste, was willing to admit Lucian and Rabelais into the fold.¹¹ Further investigation into neo-Latin satire may modify my contentions that Lipsius was the first to use "Menippean satire" as a generic term and that the use of this term was hardly uniform in its early stages, but the current opinion in this field holds that Menippean satire, so called, existed as a genre in Rome.¹²

To conclude: modern criticism has filled in a gap in ancient literary nomenclature by naming a genre "Menippean satire," just as it has done with the name "epyllion." Quintilian's misleading contention that Varro's work was merely a type of Roman satire should not cause us to ignore the Greek origins of the form. That uniquely Roman word in Varro's title, *Saturae*, reflects only the meaning "medley"; and the most characteristic mixture within the *Menippeans*,

6. I quote the title as given in the most recent edition by C. Matheeussen and C. L. Heesakkers, *Two Neo-Latin Menippean Satires*, Textus Minores, vol. 54 (Leyden, 1980).

7. Also edited by Matheeussen and Heesakkers in the volume mentioned above, n. 6.

8. Cf. M. Ch. Read, ed., *La satyre Ménippée; ou, La vertu du catholicon* (Paris, 1876), pp. xvij-xviii and n. 1, for the history of the title; cf. also p. 9 of the printer's *deuxième advis* and Read's note there.

9. *La satyre Ménippée*, pp. 11 ff.

10. (Paris: 1605; repr. New York, 1973), pp. 256 ff. Casaubon seems to have been the first critic to give the now traditional list of Roman Menippean satirists in his discussion of Varro's imitators, pp. 268-70: Seneca, Petronius, Martianus Capella, and Boethius. Only Fulgentius is left out.

11. P. 13: "Et Varron, à son [sc. Menippus] imitation, en fit de mesme en prose, comme depuis fit Petronius Arbiter, et Lucien en la langue grecque, et après luy Apulée; et, de notre temps, le bon Rabelais. . . ."

12. Cf. Matheeussen and Heesakkers, *Two Neo-Latin Menippean Satires*, pp. 1-2, and the bibliography given there.

that of prose and verse, is owed directly to the influence of the Greek Menippus. Varro's title contains the paradoxical promise of *Greek satire*,¹³ just as Petronius' *Satyricon* does;¹⁴ and of course Lucian and Julian contributed to the genre as well. Neither the name of the genre nor its history can justify the current limitation of the study of Menippean satire to the handbooks on Roman satire.¹⁵

JOEL C. RELIHAN
University of Wisconsin,
Madison

13. Cf. C. A. van Rooy, *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory* (Leyden, 1969), p. 56.

14. Cf. P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel: The "Satyricon" of Petronius and the "Metamorphoses" of Apuleius* (Cambridge, 1970), p. 72 and n. 2.

15. I should like to thank the anonymous reviewers of this article for numerous valuable suggestions.

A NOTE ON JUVENAL 16. 18

"iustissima centurionum
cognitio est †igitur† de milite, nec mihi derit
ultio, si iustae defertur causa querelae"

igitur] *exigitur* Bücheler: *inquis* vel *inquit*
vel *sed enim* Housman: *agitur* Kilpatrick

Housman's suggestions here are as weak as any Clausen has seen fit to introduce into his apparatus; like Persius, Juvenal frequently omits verbs of saying from clear instances of an imaginary objector's words; cf., e.g., 1. 160 ff.; 2. 70, 132, 134; 5. 135, 166; 6. 136, 142, 161; 13. 174. If anything, Juvenal seems slightly to prefer this dramatic abruptness. I would therefore defend strongly R. S. Kilpatrick's emendation *agitur*, taken impersonally ("Two Notes on the Text of Juvenal: *Sat.* 12. 32 and 16. 18," *CP* 66 [1971]: 114–15), with the additional and paleographically plausible modification of *est* to *etsi*. We should therefore read:

"iustissima centurionum
cognitio, etsi agitur de milite, nec mihi derit
ultio, si iustae defertur causa querelae . . ."

There is another double elision later in the poem (line 35, *alia atque alia*). Some additional references may buttress the case. *Cognitio* is properly an investigation, and it is quite reasonably expanded by *etsi agitur*, meaning that the investigation will be fair, even though the matter concerns a soldier defending himself in an action brought by a civilian. Centurions might be appointed by the camp prefect (cf., e.g., *Fontes iuris Romani anteiustiniani* 3, nos. 64, 100, 170, 86, and *PFamTebt.*, no. 24) to decide quarrels between soldiers, but they were not limited to these.

J. P. SULLIVAN
University of California,
Santa Barbara