

PETRONIUS, *P. OXY.* 3010, AND MENIPPEAN SATIRE

RAYMOND ASTBURY

A PAPYRUS fragment (*P. Oxy.* 3010), first published by Peter Parsons in 1971,¹ contains some fifty lines of a Greek prosimetric novel, a speech of twenty Sotadean lines sandwiched between passages of prose narrative. The subject is not entirely clear, but it is concerned with someone who has been instructed in the rites of Cybele and become a *gallus*, apparently on the advice of his friend Nicon; the *gallus* addresses a certain Iolaus in verse, saying that he has undergone his initiation in order to help Iolaus, whose past history he then recalls—"the story is a sensational one of bastardy, lamentation and intended amours" (Parsons, p. 60). The fragment ends with a tag from Euripides on the value of friendship. In his introductory paragraph (p. 53) Parsons commented: "The verbal interpretation of the text offers considerable difficulties; still more difficult to assign the whole thing to its literary context. I set out the material I have collected, and the speculations which have occurred to me, as a beginning only; the conclusions are intended not as truths but as provocations." R. Merkelbach² has been provoked into further examination of the verbal interpretation, but, so far as I am aware, no one has yet been goaded into further speculations on the literary implications of the fragment. But, as Parsons has said, "something must be done with it" (p. 66). Clearly the new papyrus will have an effect on our picture of the Greek novel and its development; however, in this article my aim is not to explore the full extent of the fragment's literary implications, but to sketch³ one line of argument which it makes possible—that the *Satyricon* of Petronius has nothing to do with Menippean satire.

I must first make it clear that by Menippean satire I mean the *Saturae Menippeae* of Varro and the *Apocolocyntosis* of Seneca. What we find in Varro is not the continuation in Latin of a genre which had been written in Greek by Menippus⁴ but rather something new, created by Varro through

1. "A Greek Satyricon?" *BICS* 18 (1971): 53–68 and pl. 7.

2. "Fragment eines satirischen Romans: Aufforderung zur Beichte," *ZPE* 11 (1973): 81–100.

3. Almost every stage of the argument involves matters on which there has been scholarly dispute; I do not propose to re-examine each of these questions but shall be content to state the position I hold on the particular points at issue and to direct the reader to those places where fuller discussions may be found.

4. I incline to emphasize Varro's originality in his relationship with Menippus, but the argument of this article would not be affected if it were preferred to attach Varro more closely to Menippus, since we know so little about the Greek Cynic. On him, see E. Wildenow, *De Menippo Cynico* (Diss. Halle, 1881); R. Helm, s.v. "Menippus (10)," *RE* 15 (1931): 888–93; D. R. Dudley, *A History of Cynicism* (London, 1937), pp. 69–74; and H. Piot, *Un personnage de Lucien—Ménippe* (Rennes, 1914), pp. 164–90. I cannot accept the views on the literary relationship of Lucian to Menippus expressed by Helm in his *Lucian und Menipp* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1906), and followed by J. Geffcken, "Studien zur griechischen Satire," *NJA* 27 (1911): 469–83, and A. Scherbantini, *Satura Menippeae: Die Geschichte eines Genos* (Diss. Graz, 1951), pp. 25 ff. For the arguments against the Helmian hypothesis, see B. P. McCarthy, "Lucian and Menippus," *YCIS* 4 (1934): 3–55, and J. Bompaiere, *Lucien écrivain* (Paris, 1958), pp. 550–62; the most we can learn about Menippus from Lucian is a general notion of some of the themes used by the the Cynic.

the amalgamation of *prosimetrum* with the subject matter, literary techniques, and purpose of both Greek *σπουδαιογέλοιον*⁵ and Latin *satura*. Varro's description of his works as *Saturae Menippeae*⁶ had the effect of relating them in two different directions; the use of the word *satura* enabled the reader to associate them with the *Satires* of Lucilius, with which they share a common purpose and similar methods, while *Menippeae* provided a connection with Menippus. I believe that this latter connection is to be understood in both a specific and a general way; specifically, it refers to his borrowing of the mixture of prose and verse from Menippus,⁷ and generally it is to be understood in much the same way as Horace's description of his *Satires* as *Bionei sermones*.⁸ Horace did not use the phrase to indicate a close dependence on Bion either as a philosopher or as a writer; Bion's name is used simply as a symbol of *τὸ σπουδαιογέλοιον*, to suggest the influence which that type of literature had on Horace's *Satires*. In the same way Varro described his satires as Menippean both to indicate that they were a Latin version of Greek popular philosophy and to acknowledge the source of his mixture of prose and verse.

It is part of the conventional wisdom of classical scholarship that the *Satyricon* has a more or less close connection with Menippean satire.⁹ Yet there has been little detailed discussion of the precise nature of this connection and the belief in its existence has taken various forms; at the one extreme are those who speak of Varro, Seneca, and Petronius as representatives of the genre "Menippean satire," while at the other are those who reluctantly accept that Petronius' *prosimetrum* comes from Varro but regard other literary forms as much more significant in their influence upon the *Satyricon*. Thus, if my attempt to divorce the *Satyricon* from Menippean satire is to succeed, it will be necessary to examine those aspects in which the influence of Varro, or Seneca, or both, upon Petronius either actually has been suggested or appears possible.

A comparison of the language of the three authors produces an extremely meager harvest of instances in which the possibility exists that Petronius

5. For Menippus as *σπουδογέλοιος*, see Strabo 16. 2. 29 and Steph. Byz. s.v. *Γάδαρα*; cf. also Marcus Aurelius 6. 47 and Lucian *Bis acc.* 33. The comment of Diog. Laert. 6. 99, that Menippus *φέρει μὲν οὖν σπουδαῖον οὐδέν· τὰ δὲ βιβλία αὐτοῦ πολλοῦ καταγέλωτος γέμει*, does not stand up to examination; for example the work of Menippus of which we know most, the *Διογένους πρᾶσις* (see Helm, *Lucian und Menipp.*, pp. 237-53), is clearly *σπουδογέλοιος* in that the attractive and amusing story of Diogenes' capture by pirates and sale as slave-tutor to the children of Xeniades of Corinth serves as a vehicle for the exposition of the Cynic doctrines of *ἀπάθεια*, *αὐτάρκεια*, and *παρρησία*; of the favorite Cynic comparison between the expertise of the craftsman and the expert way in which men conduct their everyday lives; and of ideal Cynic methods of education.

6. Gell. 2. 18. 7.

7. I see no reason to dispute the statement of Probus *ad Verg. Ecl.* 6. 31 that Menippus used *prosimetrum*, though the matter has been much discussed; a summary of opinions will be found in Scherbantín, *Satura Menippeae*, pp. 48-53.

8. *Epist.* 2. 2. 60.

9. Nearly all the scholars whose writings will be cited in later footnotes believe in the influence of Menippean satire on Petronius; see also virtually any literary history of Rome, study of Roman satire, or book on Petronius.

may have borrowed from his predecessors.¹⁰ The proverb *longe fugit qui suos fugit*, which Varro uses as a title, reappears (with *quisquis* for *qui*) in *Satyricon* 43. 5 and is found nowhere else. In fragment 419 Bücheler, Varro has *barbato rostro*, while Petronius has *rostrum barbatum* (*Sat.* 75. 10); and Varro's *dicite labda*¹¹ (frag. 48) may be reflected in *laecasin dico* (*Sat.* 42. 2). Lastly, those who accept Bücheler's *domusioni* in fragment 517 may be prepared to believe that Petronius' use of the word *domusio* (*Sat.* 46. 7, 48. 4) is an echo of Varro; however, I should prefer to follow Vahlen in emending the MSS *dumusioni* to *cum usioni* in Varro fragment 517.¹² A similar paucity of convincing parallels results from the comparison of Seneca and Petronius; of those which have been adduced only four appear to me to suggest the possibility that Petronius echoes Senecan language. The two authors have in common the phrase *animam ebullire*¹³ (*Apoc.* 4. 2; *Sat.* 42. 3, 62. 10), the proverb *manus manum lavat*¹⁴ (*Apoc.* 9. 6; *Sat.* 45. 13), the Greek noun *alogia* (*Apoc.* 7. 1; *Sat.* 58. 7), and the similar expressions *non semper Saturnalia erunt* (*Apoc.* 12. 2) and *semper Saturnalia agunt* (*Sat.* 44. 3). I do not imagine that anyone will claim that these parallels provide anything approaching proof of use of Varro or Seneca by Petronius.

Equally unconvincing are the attempts which have been made to find significant parallels in subject matter between Varro's *Menippeans* and the *Satyricon*.¹⁵ P. G. Walsh, after an account of the main themes of the *Menippeans*, comments that "these Varronian discussions on morality, literature and philosophy have many echoes in the *Satyricon*." He does not, however,

10. For suggested parallels between Petronius and Varro, see A. Collignon, *Étude sur Pétrone* (Paris, 1892), pp. 284–86, and M. Rosenblüth, *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde von Petrons Satiren* (Berlin, 1909), pp. 30–32; for Petronius and Seneca, see G. Bagnani, *Arbiter of Elegance: A Study of the Life & Works of C. Petronius* (Toronto, 1954), pp. 80–82, following earlier attempts by Collignon, *Étude sur Pétrone*, pp. 309–311, and Rosenblüth, *Quellenkunde*, p. 31. I have listed all the instances which I find at all cogent; for the rest let a couple of examples suffice. Collignon finds a parallel between Varro *Men.* 143 ("... in ianuam 'cave canem' inscribi iubeo") and Petron. *Sat.* 29. 1 ("ad sinistram enim intransibis non longe ab ostiarii cella canis ingens, catena vinctus, in pariete erat pictus superque quadrata littera scriptum 'cave canem'"). In view of the evidence for such inscriptions in Roman houses, it is gratuitous to suggest that Petronius was "following" Varro here. Equally, when Rosenblüth seeks to link Varro *Men.* 146 ("omnes me bilem atram agitare clamitantis") with Petron. *Sat.* 90. 6 ("si eiuras hodiernam bilem"), he will, I think, persuade few that Petronius wrote with the Varronian passage in mind.

11. The MSS have *labdae*; *labda* is Bücheler's correction (in the apparatus to the fragment in his 1871 edition of the *Menippeans*); others have preferred *labdae* (taken as a vocative) with Scaliger. For the phrase *labda dicere*, cf. Mart. 11. 58. 11–12 "mentula . . . λαικάζειν cupidae dicet avaritiae"; *Anth. Pal.* 12. 187. 6 (Strato) . . . τοῖς φθονεροῖς Λάμβδα καὶ Ἄλφα λέγε (cf. P. G. Maxwell-Stuart, "Further Notes on Strato's *Musa Puerilis*," *Hermes* 103 [1975]: 379–80); and see W. Heraeus, "Προσέειν," *RhM* 70 (1915): 38, n. 1; and E. Degani, "Laecasin = λαικάζειν," *RCCM* 4 (1962): 362–65.

12. The lemma under which Nonius cites the frag. on p. 231M reads, "Usus generis masculini . . . Feminino . . ."

13. On the phrase, see A. Treloar, "Animae ebullitio," *Glotta* 47 (1969): 264–65.

14. The proverb has Greek predecessors; cf. A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig, 1890), p. 210.

15. Very few scholars have been tempted into this area of speculation; the most important are Collignon, *Étude sur Pétrone*, pp. 20–26 (though he concludes that there are few, if any, such parallels); Rosenblüth, *Quellenkunde*, pp. 22–30; and P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 18 ff.

provide the reader with a list of these echoes,¹⁶ and we are driven to seek them ourselves with the help of the list of "inhaltliche Übereinstimmungen" provided by Martin Rosenblüth. I can find nothing in the *Satyricon* which remotely resembles the Varronian discussions of philosophy. The passages which Rosenblüth cites in this connection are: 88. 7, where philosophy is mentioned (together with dialectic, astronomy, and eloquence) as an art which is dying out because of avarice; 84. 1-3, a similar passage, though the main contrast is between literature and avarice; 104. 3, where Eumolpus tries to dissuade Lichas and Tryphaena from believing their dreams by referring to Epicurus' opinions on the subject; 128. 7, in which Giton compares his relations (or rather lack of them) with Encolpius to Socrates' treatment of Alcibiades; 140. 14, an anecdote of obscure significance about Socrates; and 119, where Rosenblüth finds "Kynische Lehren," though I can see only commonplace moralizing with no Cynic overtones. In this context I should mention also Oskar Raith's attempt to demonstrate that Petronius was an Epicurean;¹⁷ he does not in my view make his case, though I would not deny that he does find occasional passages (often in fragments of doubtful authenticity) in which Petronius employs certain Epicurean attitudes and ideas. But all these references to philosophers and philosophy amount to little in comparison with the role played by philosophy in Varro's *Menippeans*, where we find "multa admixta ex intima philosophia."¹⁸ What there is of philosophy in the *Satyricon* simply reflects the fact that the educated Roman was familiar with the tenets of the main philosophical schools and was able to use his knowledge appositely in appropriate contexts.

No one would deny that on occasion Petronius places moralizing comments into the mouths of his characters. Since the vices which are attacked (luxury, avarice, impiety, etc.) are also among the objects of Varro's criticism, it is hardly surprising that general similarities may be found between these passages of the *Satyricon* and the fragments of the *Menippeans*. But the same general similarities would emerge if we compared Petronius to other writers who show a moralizing tendency, be it the hexameter satirists, or Seneca (in the *Epistulae morales* and *Dialogi*), or others.¹⁹ There is nothing in the relevant parts of Petronius which can be shown to be specifically Varronian in language or ideas. It can therefore be only an assumption that such passages echo those on similar themes in Varro, an assumption apparently based solely on the belief that Petronius took the form of his work from Varro—and on the consequent desire to link as much as possible of what is found in the *Satyricon* to Varro. This is not to deny the essential truth of Walsh's comment that there is considerable ironic humor produced by placing "stern Varronian moralizing" in the mouths of disreputable

16. But occasional comments in the later part of the work, e.g., pp. 41, 88, 103, 112, 127, provide some indications.

17. Petronius, *ein Epikureer* (Nuremberg, 1963).

18. Cic. *Acad.* 1. 8. On philosophy in Varro's *Menippeans*, see B. Mosca, "Satira filosofica e politica nelle *Menippeae* di Varrone," *ASNP*, 1937, pp. 41-77; and K. Mras, "Varros *Menippeische Satiren* und die Philosophie," *NJA* 33 (1914): 390-420.

19. It is to be noted that J. P. Sullivan, *The "Satyricon" of Petronius: A Literary Study* (London, 1968), pp. 193-210, argues that parody of Seneca is to be found in some of these moralizing passages.

characters. But this remains true if we delete "Varronian"; there seems to me to be no justification for including the word.

The third area in which Walsh believes that Petronius echoes Varro is in the introduction of discussions of literary matters. Here, too, it cannot be denied that Varro introduced such discussions into his satires, but there appears to be no thematic connection between the literary topics discussed by Varro and the debate on contemporary education engaged in by Encolpius and Agamemnon or Eumolpus' reflections on tragedy, epic, and literature in general. We may grant that "the adoption of the Varronian [I should say 'prosimetric'] form for his experiment in fiction . . . allowed easier entry to Petronius' literary discussions"; and it could be argued that Petronius echoes Varro in this respect, in that he saw how his predecessor had used the form for literary discussion and extended the Menippean convention so as to include longer poetic compositions, such as the *Halqsis Troiae* and *De bello civili*, as an element in his literary criticism. But this approach brings us back to the basic question of the source of Petronius' *prosimetrum*; the inherent potential of the form exists independently of whether Petronius took it from Varro or from elsewhere. It is also a potential which has two aspects: first, the general looseness of structure,²⁰ which permits the introduction of topics not directly concerned with the plot; and second, the mixture of prose and verse which permits the introduction of verse wherever the writer thinks it appropriate. Now the looseness of structure is not something intrinsic only to Menippean satire; it is also characteristic of the novel form—"of all the recognized literary forms, the romance, or novel, is by nature the most unbounded and the least confined in the range of what it may include."²¹ Thus there is nothing to surprise us in the fact that Petronius, having introduced a *rhetor* as one of the characters in his novel, should have been prepared to go a step further and make this *rhetor* discuss rhetoric and contemporary education with one of the other characters; equally, by making another character a poet he opened the way to discussion of poetic matters. We can see this as an exploitation of the novel form just as easily as we can describe it as an echo of the literary discussions found in Varro's *Menippeans*. The fact that *prosimetrum* is also exploited in this area is a separate matter; I shall argue below that this too is something which did not necessarily come to Petronius from Menippean satire.

"Even more striking," says Walsh, "are the parallels between scenes in Petronius' novel and the situations in the satires of Varro." On closer examination, the three examples which Walsh uses to illustrate this comment will, I think, prove to be somewhat less cogent than he suggests. First we have "the theme of the conversational journey," found in Lucilian satire (Lucilius' *Iter Siculum* in his third book and Horace *Serm.* 1. 5), in Menippean satire (Varro's *Marci por*) and in Petronius (presumably the journey to Croton in *Sat.* 116 ff., though Walsh does not specifically say so). Leaving aside the question of a relationship between Horace and Petronius here

20. On this, see Sullivan, *The "Satyricon" of Petronius*, pp. 89-91, 267.

21. B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967), p. 29.

(about which I am skeptical), I can find no justification for associating Varro's *Marcipor* either with the poems of Lucilius and Horace or with the passage of the *Satyricon*. While fragment 276 of the Varronian satire ("hic in ambivio navem conscendimus palustrem, quam nautici equisones per ulvam ducerent loro") reflects a situation similar to Horace *Sermones* 1. 5. 11 ff., it is to be emphasized that the *Marcipor* is preserved in nineteen fragments and that no estimation of its theme can be formed without an examination of all the fragments. There is nothing in the other eighteen fragments to support the notion that it described a "conversational journey,"²² and nothing in any of the extant fragments which suggests any similarity to "the journey [to Croton] . . . conventionally lightened by an entertainment."²³

The second example is Varro's *Eumenides*, which "is set in a school like the first extant scene of Petronius." Walsh quotes in support of his view fragment 144: "et ceteri scholastici saturis auribus scholica dape atque ebris sophisticæ aperantologia consurgimus ieiunis oculis"; he might have added fragment 142: "cum in eo essem occupatus atque in schola curarer, ut scribit Scantius, 'horno per Dionysia.'" But these fragments, taken together with the others which survive of this satire, do not show that the satire was set in a school; the setting appears rather to have been a meal (cf. frag. 143: "quod ea die mea erat praeбитio, in ianuam 'cave canem' inscribi iubeo") attended by students of philosophy (that *scholastici* is to be so understood is suggested by the fact that the satire deals with a philosophic theme, the nature of madness) at Athens.²⁴ Thus the parallel suggested by Walsh would appear to be tenuous.

Finally Walsh suggests that the funeral feast in Varro's *Ταφή Μενίππου* recalls the "maudlin finale of the *Cena Trimalchionis*, where the host pronounces his own panegyric." I do not think that there is to be found here anything but the most general similarity. Varro's satire had as its setting a visit to the tomb of Menippus followed by a meal during which took place the discussion which appears to have formed the main part of the satire.²⁵

22. So far as I am aware, of the scholars who have studied the Varronian satire, none has found in it a "conversational journey," though of course the parallel between frag. 276 and Hor. *Serm.* 1. 5. 11 ff. has often been noted. Discussions of the satire may be found in the editions of Varro's *Menippeans* by A. Riese (Leipzig, 1865), E. Bolisani (Padua, 1936), and F. Della Corte (Genoa, 1953); and in O. Ribbeck, "Ueber Varronische Satiren," *RhM* 14 (1859): 120; E. Norden, "In Varronis *Saturas Menippeas* observationes selectae," *JA*, suppl. 18 (1892): 265-72; P. Lejay (ed.), *Oeuvres d'Horace: "Satires"* (Paris, 1911), p. 140.

23. Walsh, *The Roman Novel*, p. 104.

24. The most important attempts to reconstruct the satire, in whole or in part, are those of A. Popma (Franeker, 1589), Riese, Bolisani, and Della Corte in their editions of the *Menippeans*; and J. Vahlen, in *M. Terentii Varronis "Saturarum Menippearum" reliquias coniectanea* (Leipzig, 1858), pp. 168-90; O. Ribbeck, "Ueber Varronische Satiren," pp. 104-113; C. L. Kayser, rev. of Vahlen, *Heidelb. Jahrb. d. Lit.* 53 (1860): 246-48; G. Boissier, *Étude sur la vie et les ouvrages de M. T. Varron* (Paris, 1861), pp. 86-90; T. Roeper, *M. Terentii Varronis "Eumenidum" reliquiae*, pt. 3 (Danzig, 1862), p. 41; F. Bücheler, "Ueber Varros Satiren," *RhM* 20 (1865): 427-28; L. Havet, "Observations critiques sur les *Ménippées* de Varron," *RPh* 6 (1882): 54-60; Mosca, "Satira filosofica," pp. 55-59.

25. Those who have directed their efforts to producing an outline of the satire have, generally speaking, come to similar results: see the editions of Riese, Bolisani, and Della Corte; and also Vahlen, *Coniectanea*, pp. 147-65 (cf. Kayser, rev. of Vahlen, pp. 245-46); Ribbeck, "Ueber Varro-

This was not, I suggest, a funeral feast; *ταφή* has usually been interpreted as "funeral," but there are cogent reasons for not accepting this view. Clearly some, at least, of the participants in the discussion were Romans and Roman topics were discussed (frags. 527–30, 537); it is hard to imagine that Varro would have represented Romans as present at the funeral of Menippus at Thebes in the third century B.C. It is therefore preferable to suppose that *ταφή* has here its less common significance of "tomb," "grave," and that the setting of the satire was a visit to the tomb of Menippus paid by Romans of Varro's day. It will be seen that there is very little in common between the setting of Varro's satire and Trimalchio's reading of his will, his instructions for his tomb, and his later mock funeral; certainly there is nothing which would suggest that Petronius had the Varronian satire in mind when he wrote the concluding part of the *Cena Trimalchionis*. It has now been shown that it is not possible to demonstrate convincingly borrowings by Petronius of the language or ideas of Menippean satire;²⁶ thus the discussion of their relationship must be extended to other, more general areas of possible influence, namely form, structure, plot, and purpose.

The *Satyricon* is an extended episodic narrative in the first person.²⁷ Varro employed narrative, both in the first and third persons, in certain of his satires,²⁸ and the *Apocolocyntosis* takes the form of a third-person narrative. Since there was thus available to Petronius a form of satirical fiction, it is possible to argue that the *Satyricon* is an extended Menippean satire. However, when we consider the remarkable length of the *Satyricon* and its manifest similarity in many respects to the Greek romance, it will appear preferable to look for the source of its structure in the romance, "the sole type of extended episodic fiction in Greek for which any evidence exists before Petronius; there is no other Greek genre which can be proposed with confidence as having inspired the developed structure of the *Satyricon*."²⁹ The fact that Menippean satire presents a form of satirical fiction, whereas the romance has fiction without satire, is not a matter of any significance; given the availability of the form, the question whether it is used in a satiri-

nische Satiren," pp. 126–28; Havet, "Observations critiques," pp. 64–68; L. Riccomagno, *Studio sulle "Satire Menippee" di Marco Terenzio Varrone Reatino* (Alba, 1931), pp. 149–50; Mosca, "Satira filosofica," pp. 69–70, Della Corte, *La poesia di Varrone Reatino ricostruita* (= *MAT* 69.2 [1939]), pp. 41–43; and W. A. Krenkel, "Varroniana III," *WZRoStock* 22 (1973): 165–71. Note too that Sullivan, *The "Satyricon" of Petronius*, pp. 131–32, has pointed out that close parallels to the relevant parts of the *Satyricon* may be found in Sen. *Epist.* 12. 8 and *Brev. vit.* 20. 3; and indeed Walsh himself, *The Roman Novel*, p. 137, cites these passages with the comment: "It seems impossible that the close of Trimalchio's banquet was not inspired by this celebrated exemplar." I do not know how this can be reconciled with his earlier suggestion of Varronian influence.

26. Collignon, *Étude sur Pétrone*, p. 23, compares frags. 370–72 and 375 of Varro's *Papia Papae* with the description of Circe in *Sat.* 126, but it is more likely that the Petronian passage reflects the descriptions of the heroine in the Greek romances; cf. Walsh, *The Roman Novel*, pp. 106–7.

27. Cf. Rosenblüth, *Quellenkunde*, p. 19; P. Veyne, "Le 'je' dans le *Satyricon*," *REL* 42 (1964): 301–324; Perry, *The Ancient Romances*, pp. 325–29.

28. See B. P. McCarthy, "The Form of Varro's Menippean Satires," in R. P. Robinson (ed.), *Philological Studies in Honor of W. Miller*, University of Missouri Studies, vol. 9, no. 3 (Columbia, 1936), pp. 95–107.

29. Walsh, *The Roman Novel*, p. 8.

cal way is one which depends on the conscious choice of the individual author and no precedent is required.

As regards plot, insofar as it is useful to look for predecessors in a sphere in which the author's own imagination must play a large part, I can find no connection between Petronius and Varro³⁰ or Petronius and Seneca, and it is unnecessary to look further than epic³¹ and romance³² as sources for the combination of the *gravis ira Priapi*³³ and the adventures of the homosexual lovers. Of course, other sources come into play for individual episodes and scenes, but it is only epic and romance which affect the overall plot.

Varro's *Menippeans* combined a moral and satirical purpose; he dealt, generally speaking, with what can broadly be described as ethical themes, treating them both positively, in that he attempted to inculcate in his readers the recipe for a better way of life, and negatively, in that he satirized the vices which ruin men's lives and the men who represented views different to his own. Seneca's purpose was also satirical, but his attack on the dead Claudius shows none of the positive moral concern of Varro. On the other hand Petronius, notwithstanding recent attempts to turn him into a serious moralist or satirist,³⁴ is a comic writer:³⁵ he aims to provoke laughter, not contempt, anger, or even pity. Like most comic literature, the *Satyricon* contains potential satiric targets, but they are not converted into

30. Varro's *Sesquialixes* has a not entirely clear relationship with the *Odyssey*, but there is no apparent connection between this and the exploitation of epic motifs by Petronius.

31. Cf. E. Klebs, "Zur Composition von Petronius' *Satirae*," *Philologus* 47 (1889): 623-35; Sullivan, *The "Satyricon" of Petronius*, pp. 92-98; A. M. Cameron, "Myth and Meaning in Petronius: Some Modern Comparisons," *Latomus* 29 (1970): 397-425.

32. For various views on the relationship between Petronius and the romance, see K. Bürger, "Der antike Roman vor Petronius," *Hermes* 27 (1892): 345-58; R. Heinze, "Petron und der griechische Roman," *Hermes* 34 (1899): 494-519; E. Thomas, "Pétrone et le roman grec," *RIB* 43 (1900): 157-64; F. F. Abbott, "The Origin of the Realistic Romance among the Romans," *CP* 6 (1911): 257-70; C. W. Mendell, "Petronius and the Greek Romance," *CP* 12 (1917): 158-72; B. E. Perry, "Petronius and the Comic Romance," *CP* 20 (1925): 31-49 and *The Ancient Romances*, pp. 186-210; E. Courtney, "Parody and Literary Allusion in Menippean Satire," *Philologus* 106 (1962): 92 ff.; F. Wehrli, "Einheit und Vorgeschichte der griechisch-römischen Romanliteratur," *MusHelv* 22 (1965): 133-54; A. Scobie, *Aspects of the Ancient Romance and Its Heritage* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1969), pp. 83-90; Walsh, *The Roman Novel*, pp. 7-18.

33. *Sat.* 139. 2. I am not convinced by the recent attempt of B. Baldwin, "*Ira Priapi*," *CP* 68 (1973): 294-96, to limit the importance of the *offensum numen* motif in the *Satyricon*.

34. G. Highet, "Petronius the Moralizer," *TAPA* 72 (1941): 176-94; H. H. Bacon, "The Sibyl in the Bottle," *Virginia Quarterly Review* 34 (1958): 262-76; A. F. Sochatoff, "The Purpose of Petronius' *Bellum Civile*: A Re-Examination," *TAPA* 93 (1962): 449-58; W. Ehlers in K. Müller and W. Ehlers (eds.), *Petronius: "Satyricon"* (Munich, 1965), pp. 440-41; W. Arrowsmith, "Luxury and Death in the *Satyricon*," *Arion* 5 (1966): 304-331; W. R. Nethercut, "Petronius, Epicurean and Moralizer," *CB* 43 (1966-67): 53-55; G. Sandy, "Satire in the *Satyricon*," *AJP* 90 (1969): 293-303; Cameron, "Myth and Meaning in Petronius," pp. 397-425; F. I. Zeitlin, "Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity," *TAPA* 102 (1971): 631-84 and "*Romanus Petronius*: A Study of the *Troiae Halosis* and the *Bellum Civile*," *Latomus* 30 (1971): 56-82.

35. See esp. Perry, "Petronius and the Comic Romance," pp. 34-35 and *The Ancient Romances*, pp. 200-201; E. T. Sage (ed.), *Petronius: The "Satyricon"*² (New York, 1969), pp. 215-19; O. Weinreich, *Römische Satiren*² (Zurich, 1962), p. lxxx; J. P. Sullivan, "Petronius: Artist or Moralizer?" *Arion* 6 (1967): 71-88 and *The "Satyricon" of Petronius*, pp. 115-57, 214-31, 255-59; G. Schmeling, "Petronius: Satirist, Moralizer, Epicurean, Artist," *CB* 45 (1968-69): 49-50, 64; Walsh, *The Roman Novel*, pp. 80-110 and "Was Petronius a Moralizer?" *G&R* 21 (1974): 181-90; H. C. Schnur, "Petronius: Sense and Nonsense," *CW* 66 (1972-73): 13-20, esp. 14-15.

actual objects of attack. The influence of Latin hexameter satire is demonstrable in the *Cena Trimalchionis*³⁶ and probable in the *captatio* episode at Croton,³⁷ but the tone in these sections of the work is humorous rather than satirical. Thus Petronius' purpose in the work is quite different from that of Varro and Seneca.

At this stage it is appropriate to give some attention to a recent discussion³⁸ in which it is contended that "the *Satyricon* is not only in its frame and many of its episodes a parody of the novel, but . . . within this Petronius intended a whole series of parodies of the most diverse works." Thus far I raise no objection; but a little further on we read that "to suit his purpose he chose the form which allowed him to switch from sublime to sordid, from pathos to laughter, from high-flown to relaxed, that of the Menippean satire." Then E. Courtney goes on to discuss the role of parody and literary allusion in Varro, Seneca, and Petronius.³⁹ This is not the place to attempt a detailed refutation, but a general comment will serve to indicate my reservations. I grant that the prosimetric form offers scope for parody, and that Seneca and Petronius make considerable use of it. But I do not think that the fragments of Varro's *Menippeans* provide adequate evidence for a similar situation there; I do not deny that parody and literary allusion occur on occasion (what ancient author does not indulge in literary allusion?), but they do not seem to me to be intrinsic to what Varro was doing in the *Menippeans*. I would suggest that the use of parody is something which is personal rather than generic, dependent on the individual choice of each author rather than imposed by a particular form. Thus I prefer to suppose that Seneca exploited the inherent possibilities of Menippean satire for parody, while Petronius saw the similar potential of the prosimetric novel; no predecessor is required for the impulse to parody.

The arguments presented so far, if accepted, leave us at last with the use of *prosimetrum* as the only remaining link between Petronius and Menippean satire, and many scholars in the past have reluctantly accepted this matter of external form as the extent of Petronius' debt to Varro and Seneca. Some, it is true, have attempted to break the link by suggesting that other literary influences inspired Petronius' use of *prosimetrum*, such as the Milesian tale⁴⁰ and the mime.⁴¹ However, the evidence for the mixture of prose and

36. Cf. J. Révay, "Horaz und Petron," *CP* 17 (1922): 202-212; L. R. Shero, "The *Cena* in Roman Satire," *CP* 18 (1923): 126-43; Sullivan, *The "Satyricon" of Petronius*, pp. 126-28.

37. Cf. D. Schmid, *Der Erbschleicher in der antiken Satire* (Diss. Tübingen, 1951).

38. E. Courtney, "Parody and Literary Allusion," pp. 86-100.

39. Parody is one of the links between Petronius and Varro suggested by Rosenblüth, *Quellenkunde*, pp. 21-22. On parody in Varro, Seneca, and Petronius, see also J.-P. Cèbe, *La caricature et la parodie dans le monde romain antique des origines à Juvénal* (Paris, 1966).

40. On the possibility of *prosimetrum* in the Milesian tales, see E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*³ (Leipzig, 1915; repr. Darmstadt, 1958), 2: 756; Perry, "Petronius and the Comic Romance," p. 38, n. 2.

41. On mime as one of the formative influences on Petronius, see Rosenblüth, *Quellenkunde*, pp. 36-55; K. Preston, "Some Sources of Comic Effect in Petronius," *CP* 10 (1915): 260-69; Sullivan, *The "Satyricon" of Petronius*, pp. 219-25; Walsh, *The Roman Novel*, pp. 24-27; G. N. Sandy, "Scaenica Petroniana," *TAPA* 104 (1974): 329-46. For *prosimetrum* in the mime, see K. J. Grysar, "Der römische Mimus," *SAWW* 12 (1854): 237-337, esp. 263; H. Reich, *Der Mimus* (Berlin, 1903), pp. 570-74; Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*³, vol. 2: "Nachträge," pp. 11-12; Scherbantin, *Satura Menippeae*,

verse in these forms is slight, and suggestions based on it have not carried conviction. Ulrich Knoche,⁴² with his usual percipience, commented: "Der Form nach kann man und muss man wahrscheinlich Petrons Roman mit der Menippeischen Satire verbinden, obwohl auch im hellenistischen Roman wahrscheinlich schon hie und da die Erzählung auch ausserhalb der Reden in Verse übergehen konnte. Wir sehen das z.B. im Alexanderroman, in der *Historia Apollonii*, auch ein Vorläufer Charitons hat es vielleicht so gehalten."⁴³ The new papyrus enormously strengthens the case for believing that *prosimetrum* was not alien to the Greek romance. It is of the second century after Christ, so it is necessary to hypothesize from it the use of *prosimetrum* in romances earlier than Petronius. This does not appear to be an insuperable obstacle, especially if we recall that, when Richard Heinze first suggested the romance as an influence on Petronius, he was unaware of the evidence for the existence of the romance before Petronius' time; it was only when his article was in the proof stage that he learned of the discovery of the Ninos romance which supported his hypothesis.⁴⁴ If we are prepared to accept that *prosimetrum* was probably found in Greek romances before Petronius, we are then faced with two possible sources for the use of the form by Petronius—the romance and Menippean satire. I suggest that, at the very least, it is more economical to find the source in the romance, which, it is clear, influenced Petronius in other respects, than in Menippean satire, with which he has nothing in common other than *prosimetrum*.

University College, Dublin

pp. 71 ff.; Sandy, "Scaenica Petroniana," p. 343, n. 34. On the possible implications of this for the *Satyricon*, see Wilamowitz, *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1905), p. 192; Abbott, "Realistic Romance," p. 270; Sandy, "Scaenica Petroniana," pp. 341–43.

42. *Die römische Satire*³ (Göttingen, 1971), p. 74.

43. Cf. also H. Stubbe, *Die Verseinlagen im Petron*, *Philologus*, suppl. 25 (Leipzig, 1933), pp. 4–6; E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*³ (Leipzig, 1914; repr. Darmstadt, 1960), pp. 434–35, 622.

44. "Petron und der griechische Roman," p. 509, n. 1.