1998.

# THE CHARACTERISTICS OF MENIPPEAN SATIRE IN SENECA, LUCIANUS AND ERASMUS

Dayanath de Silva
Pro gradu -tutkielma
Toukokuu 1999

Jyväskylän yliopisto
Romaanisten ja klassisten kielten laitos

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

| | |
|---|---|
| Tiedekunta<br>HUMANISTINEN | Laitos<br>Romaanisten ja klassisten kielten laitos |
| Tekijä<br>DE SILVA, Dayanath | |
| Työn nimi<br>Characteristics of Menippean Satire in Seneca, Lucianus and Erasmus | |
| Oppiaine<br>Latina | Työn laji<br>Pro Gradu |
| Aika<br>Toukokuu 1999 | Sivumäärä<br>107 |


Tiivistelmä - Abstract

Tämän pro gradu -tutkielman tarkoitus oli selvittää kreikkalais-roomalaisen menippolaisen satiirin lajityypilliset piirteet neljän esimerkkiteoksen (kahden laitinankielisen ja kahden kreikankielisen) sekä muiden asiaaan vaikuttavien dokumenttien pohjalta. Tutkimusmateriaalina olivat Senecan (4-65 jKr.) menippolaissatiiri *Apocolocyntosis,* Erasmus Rotterdamilaisen (1469-1536) *Julius exclusus e coelis* sekä kreikaksi kirjoittaneen Lukianoksen (120-180) satiirit *Ikaromenippos* ja *Nekyomanteia.* Seneca kuvaa keisari Claudiuksen kohtaloa hänen saavuttuaan kuolemansa jälkeen taivaan portille, Erasmus paavi Julius II:a, joka joutui taivaassa tekemään Pyhälle Pietarille tiliä toimistaa maan päällä. Lukianoksen satiiriset dialogit, joissa hän on jäljitellyt Menippos Gadaralaista ja saanut tältä monia aiheita, ovat välttämätön vertailumateriaali siksi, että ne ovat säilyneet, kun sen sijaan Menippokselta itseltään on vain joitakin fragmentteja. Senecan, Lukianoksen ja Erasmuksen välillä on sekä aiheen valinnassa että käsittelytavassa pitkälle meneviä yhtäläisyyksiä. Tarkotus on ollut selvittää, miten yhteiset piirteet on ymmärrettävä.

Koska Keisari Claudiuksen toiminta on Senecan menippolaissatiirin keskeinen aihe, keisarin elämänvaiheet on esitelty keskeisten primäärilähteiden (Tacitus, Dio, Seneca, Suetonius) perusteella. Lukianoksen laajasta tuotannosta hänen *Nekyomanteia* ja *Ikaromenippos* -satiirinsa valittiin tarkasteltaviksi, koska ne edustavat ja kuvaavat samoja teemoja ja samanlaisia piirteitä kuin Senecan *Apocolocyntosis* ja Erasmuksen *Julius exclusus e coelis.* Tutkielman lopussa on tiivis katsaus menippolaista satiiria käsitteleviin moderneihin tutkimuksiin, joista tarkkaan analysoidaan Mihail Bahtinin (1895-1975) ja Northrop Frye'n (1912-1991) teokset.



| | |
|---|---|
| Asiasanat | Menippolaissatiiri, Seneca, Lukianos, Erasmus |
| Säilytyspaikka | |
| Muita tietoja | |

## CONTENTS

# 1. Introduction

It is after some deliberation that I have chosen the word 'characteristic' to describe the title instead of using the word 'genre'. This is not to deny the acceptance of Menippean satire as a literary genre, far from it, but the *discussion* of Menippean satire based upon an idea of genre has only been of recent origin relegating this to the pursuit of modern scholarship. Van Rooy, in the volume entitled 'Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory' lists three main factors or procedures which either separately or in conjunction lead to the origin of what modern scholarship nowadays call a 'genre'. A simple summary of these would be: a) Firstly, there should be material, whether literary or non-literary, which finally leads to the inception of a new kind of literary work. This material leads finally to the antecedents of a genre, which in the light of subsequent development by other authors, and by the acceptance of society, manifests itself in the said work. b) secondly, the starting point is the author, who in producing a concrete literary work, becomes the *auctor* or originator of a genre. The personality and the individuality of the author will be the most determining factors in which the antecedents of his work are elaborated and his own special interests actualised in an *opus*, which is also the first actualisation of a new genre. Of equal importance, with reference to the development of the genre, is the personality or individuality of subsequent authors in that genre. He is the living source of his work, and in accordance with his own talents and convictions, he will reshape and recast these antecedents as well as adding to them. The author is not only an individual, he is also a member of a community. And since literature is a form of human activity, it only emanates from a living being but is written for human beings. Being a part of a community, the author is bound to take into consideration the interests of the community, or at any rate those of a considerable or important section of his community. Thus if his presentation does not win acceptance, it will not be perpetuated by subsequent authors: they will either reject it or develop it along different lines. c) thirdly, perhaps the most important determining factor in the origin of a genre is, therefore, the community. Even if the author finds himself in strong opposition to the conduct and ideals of his society, his work is none the less determined by the actual circumstances in which, and the controversies among which, he lives. Only when his work has won recognition, whether with strong approval or with strong reservation, and only when such recognition has been manifested by the

development of his work by subsequent authors, can we say that his *opus* marked the birth of a new genre. (op. cit. pp. 30-31).

The 'deans' of the study of modern Menippean satire are Northrop Frye and Mikhail Bakhtin. Bakhtin traced the development of Menippean satire in classical literature from its Greco-Roman beginnings to its continuation during the Middle Ages. In his book entitled the Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, he listed fourteen items which he considered to contain elements of Menippean satire. Northrop Frye in his book entitled Anatomy of Criticism ; four essays published in 1957 distinguished four types of prose fiction and divided them into four categories with the genre of Menippean satire being one of them. Both of these authors will be discussed in some detail in the penultimate chapter of this study.

In view of the above factors, I prefer to entitle this study as characteristics, or even one of its synonyms, e.g., features, of Menippean satire than entitling it the genre of Menippean satire. As soon as one talks about a particular genre, one gets involved with its multiplicity of interpretations which fall beyond the purpose of this study. The primary purpose of this study is to lay a basic foundation for a 'pro-gradu', a foundation which, if accepted, can be later used for deeper and more detailed research. This factor alone has tilted the choice of the word 'characteristics' in its favour. As a concluding remark for this introduction, I quote verbatim a passage by Dr. Blanchard, who in his recent book Scholar's Bedlam : Menippean Satire in the Renaissance, states: 'Menippean satire is among the most elusive of genres to define. The scholars of the Renaissance, who edited and imitated the ancient Menippeans, share considerable frustration with their modern successors in delineating this literary form's generic contours. Pierre Pithou in a preface to a Petronius edition of 1587 wrote 'Vainly, others try to reduce all such works to the standards of poetics'. Pithou's remark acknowledges the difficulty of categorising Menippean satire, but also implicitly criticises the human compulsion to impose well-defined boundaries upon our aesthetic experiences... (op. cit. p. 11).

The satires chosen for discussion and analysis are a) the Apocolocyntosis of Seneca b) the Icaromenippus and Nekyomantia of Lucianus and c) the Julius exclusus of Erasmus. Although Lucianus wrote in Greek, one has no choice but to include him in any discussion of Menippean satire. He can be considered to be a 'mirror' on the works of Menippus, the great advantage being that his satirical dialogues, inter alia, have survived. The same, unfortunately, cannot be said of the works of Menippus, since only a few fragmental lines of his works survive, thus compelling any study of Menippean satire to use the

satirical dialogues of Lucianus. The only other Roman satirist, who is considered to be a forerunner of Menippean satire, is Varro, noted for his *Saturae Menippeae*. Unfortunately, just as in the case of Menippus' satires, only fragments of Varro's *Saturae Menippeae* survive, thus making any conclusions based upon the existing fragments of Varro purely conjectural.

I have used the following Latin/Greek texts as primary references for the above-mentioned authors. For Seneca, the Apocolocyntosis, ed. P.T. Eden. Cambridge University Press ; For Lucianus, Lucian, trans. A.M. Harmon . 8 vols. Loeb Classical Library ; and for Erasmus, Collected works of Erasmus : Literary and Educational Writings. Ed. A.H.T. Levi. University of Toronto Press. The numbered lines quoted for translation are from these Latin/Greek texts. If a translation is rendered verbatim, it will be so mentioned.

## 2. The definition and origins of Satire

At the very outset it should be mentioned that Menippean Satire is not an ancient generic term. As mentioned in the introduction, discussion about Menippean satire as a literary genre is a comparatively modern phenomenon. Menippean satire is not used as a generic name until 1581, when Justus Lipsius's work appeared, with its three-fold title: *Satyra Menippea. Somnium. Lusus in nostri aevi criticos'*. This work is cited by Hannu Riikonen in an article entitled: Menippean Satire as a Literary Genre (p. 14). The *Satire Menippée*, a political pamphlet consisting of parts in prose and work was published in 1594. The work was , like the famous collection *Epistulae obscurorum virorum,* a result of team work, written by a certain Jean Leroy, assisted by others, among them, Pierre Pithou, whose name I have already mentioned in the introduction to this study. Diomedes, a the grammarian of the fourth century, listed four possible origins of satire preserved from antiquity and this sub-heading will take its inception with the definitions given by Diomedes.

### 2.1. The definition of satire

In his *Ars Grammatica III*, Diomedes defined satire as follows: '*Satura dicitur carmen apud nos Romanos, nunc quidem maledicum et ad carpenda hominum vitia archaeae commoediae charactere compositum, quale scripserunt Lucilius et Horatius et Persius; sed olim quod ex variis poematibus constabat satura vocabatur, quale scripserunt Pacuvius et Ennius.*'
Satire was called a verse form among the Romans which has been in recent times abusive and composed to censure the vices of men in the manner of ancient comedy, as was written by Lucilius, Horace and Persius; but formerly satire was a name given to a verse form made up of a variety of smaller pieces of poetry such as was written by Pacuvius and Ennius.

One comment I make on this is that while the definition is valid in that it describes the essential quality of the Lucilian tradition, and also the primitive stage of Roman satire, it is defective in its omission of the Menippean tradition, which Quintilian calls 'alterum genus', which is an indirect allusion to the

Menippean satires, although Quintilian was referring to Terentius Varro in this instance.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica's definition is : An aristic form, chiefly literary and dramatic, in which human or individual vices, follies, abuses or shortcomings are held up to censure by means of ridicule, derision, burlesque, irony, or other methods, sometimes with an intent to bring about improvement. (p. 476). The Oxford New English Dictionary renders it thus: In early use a discursive composition in verse treating of a variety of subjects; in classical use a poem in which prevalent follies or vices are assailed with ridicule or with serious denunciation.' One of most erudite English scholars, Dr. Johnson called satire: 'a poem in which wickedness or folly is censured.' These definitions place English satire in a direct line of descent from Latin satire, because it assigns to it a meaning consonant with that which Lucilius attached to it and which was taken over, with modifications, by Horace and later by Juvenal.

## 2.2. The origins of satire

Diomedes offered four alternatives of the derivation and origin of *satura*. If he had offered only one definition, modern, or for that matter, ancient scholarship would have been spared the abundance of articles and interpretations written on the subject. For example, Michael Coffey: Roman Satire ; Charles Witke: Latin satire : the structure of persuasion ; deal quite exhaustively with the pros and cons of the four alternatives offered by Diomedes. To add fuel to fire, Quintilian in the tenth book of *Institutio oratoria*, his famous treatise on rhetoric and education, wrote ' *satura quidem tota nostra est'* (X.1.93). This shall be discussed in the following sub-heading.

Diomedes is a late source, and though he has been criticised for serious shortcomings, his work is valuable in that it is the most important discussion in antiquity of the meaning of the work. F. Leo in an article entitled *'Varro und die Satire'* (cited by Van Rooy. pp. 2-4) has argued that both the definitions of literary *'satura'* and the four derivations given by Diomedes go back through an intermediate source to Varro, and the majority of modern scholars have accepted this source to be Suetonius. Be this as it may, the four alternatives given by Diomedes are as follows:

a) *'satura autem dicta sive a Satyris, quod similiter in hoc carmine ridiculae res pudendaeque dicuntur, quae velut a Satyris proferuntur et fiunt...'*

Satura is derived either from satyrs, because in this verse comical and shameless things are said which are produced and made as if by satyrs...

b) *'sive satura a lance quae referta variis multisque primitiis in sacro apud priscos dis inferebatur et a copia ac saturitate rei satura vocabatur; cuius generis lancium et Vergilius in georigicis meminit, cum hoc modo dicit,*

*lancibus et pandis fumantia reddimus exta*

*et*

*lancesque et liba feremus*

(or from a full dish which was packed with many varied first fruits and offered among primitive people to the gods in a ritual and called *satura* from the abundance and fullness of the material. Virgil also makes mention of this kind of dish in his Georgics, when he writes as follows:

and we offer steaming entrails on bulged platters

also

and platters and cakes we shall bear

c) *'sive a quodam genere farciminis, quod multis rebus refertum saturam dicit Varro vocitatum, est autem hoc positum in secundo libro Plautinarm quaestionum `satura est uva passa et polenta et nuclei pini ex mulso consparsi' . ad haec alii addunt et de malo punico grana'*

or from a kind of sausage which was filled with many ingredients and according to Varro called *satura.* This is stated in the second book of the Plautine Questions: 'satura is raisins, pearl barley, pine kernels covered with honey wine to which others also add pomegranate seeds.)

d*) 'alii autem dictam putant a lege satura, quae uno rogatu multa simul comprehendat, quod scilicet et satura carmine multa simul poemata comprehenduntur. cuius saturae legis Lucilius meminit in primo,*

*per saturam aedilem factum qui legibus solvat,*

*et Sallustius in Iugurtha, 'deinde quasi per saturam sententiis exquisitis in deditionem accipitur*

others think it was called 'satura' from a law which includes many provisions at once in a single bill, on the argument that in the verse form 'satura' many small poems are combined together. Lucilius mentions this compendious law in his first book:

'who might absolve from the law an aedile elected by a compendious measure'

and Sallust in Jugurtha, 'then his surrender is accepted as if by a compendious law with precise provisions.

All four explanations of the derivation and origin of 'satura' seem plausible enough. Non-classical scholars, knowing as they do of the enormous influence Greek literature and culture had on Roman culture and literature, the 'romantic' image created by these tipsy and frolicsome creatures of Greek myth and drama, the 'Satyrs', known for their ribaldry and obscenity, easily find a parallel to the derision and bawdiness of satire. However, on deeper examination, one finds weighty objections. Firstly, such a background of unbridled jocularity and boisterous lechery is unsuited to the 'mild' satires of Ennius and presupposes the vituperative satires of Lucilius and his republican successors. The first theory, however, has been rejected by most scholars, although it might have found acceptance in the fourth century. First of all, there is a linguistic difficulty. The Greek adjective 'connected with satyrs' is 'satyrikos' which would become 'satyricus' in Latin. Etymologically and philologically there is no connection between satyr and satire. One has also to point out that actors of satyr plays are rarely called 'saturi' in Latin but 'ludiones' or 'histriones' The turning point in the rejection of this theory is the famous essay written on 1605 by Isaac Casaubon entitled 'De Satyrica Graecorum Poesi et Romanorum Satira Libri Duo'. This source is cited by Wight Duff in his book Roman Satire as well as by Charles Witke in his Latin Satire. I quote a relevant passage from Duff:

'The supposed connection with the Satyrs of Greek mythology, countenanced by ancient grammarians, but exploded by Casaubon's famous essay of 1605, led in the past to a good deal of confused thinking and fanciful speculation; it died all the more slowly in England because the old spelling of 'satire' was 'satyr' - Dryden's form, in fact, spelt and pronounced indistinguishably from the English form of the Greek word with which it has no kindred. It is noteworthy that the derivative adjectives 'satiric' from 'satire' and 'Satyric' from 'Satyr' still sound exactly alike to the ear.' (p. 3)

Diomedes' second derivation relates 'satura' to 'lanx satura' (lanx = plate, platter or flat dish), the cult dish offered to the gods with various edibles. The 'lanx satura' here referred to most probably constituted a harvest home fruit plate of sorts. Thus etymologically this connects the variety of topics covered in satire with the variety of ingredients in this dish. In substantiation, Diomedes quotes two passages from Virgil's Georgics (2. 194, 394). The chief objection to this, pioneered by C.P. Ullmann in an article entitled: The present status of the Satura question (Studies in Philology. vol. 17. pp. 380 -381) is that Virgil does not **call** the platters 'saturae' and it is pointed out that Diomedes' example here illustrate 'lanx' and not 'satura'. In deriving 'satura' from 'lanx satura' Diomedes quotes no evidence for this phrase. The 'testimonia' of other Latin grammarians such as Isidore and Festus derive either from Diomedes and

do not offer any independent evidence. There is an exception to this, namely, Isidore, bishop of Seville, who stated: '*satietas ex uno cibo dici potest, pro eo quod satis est; saturitas autem a satura nomen accepit, quod est vario alimentorum adparatu compositum*
satiety that is caused by one kind of food from sufficiency and a repletion that takes its name from 'satura', that is something obtained from a varied provision of things to eat.

Thus 'satura' contains the notion of the variegated and of a miscellany. (Coffee, p. 17, 210). Van Rooy (pp. 5-13) gives a very exhaustive analysis on this, his analysis on 'lanx' alone lasting over eight pages! It is not my intention here to detail what the 'lanx' contained or should not contain, or whether 'lances et liba' of Virgil accords strictly with the description of the 'lanx' which was 'referta variisque multisque primitiis' or whether 'exta' strictly speaks only of the 'nobler' parts of the entrails whilst 'viscera' refers to other parts. To me what is more important is that this explanation refers to the notion of mixture or medley found in satire. This is aptly expressed by Juvenal when describing the variety of subject matter of satire, he calls it 'nostri farrago libelli' (hotchpotch or medley of my booklet).

The third alternative offered by Diomedes is that 'satura' takes its name from a kind of 'stuffing'. The word 'farcimen' can be used either of the stuffing i.e. the filling of the sausage, or the thing that is stuffed i.e. the sausage itself. Not only does Diomedes quote Varro as authority, but also the recipe from Varro's Plautine Questions. That 'sausage' was one of the meanings of 'farcimen' is not disputed. Thus the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae gives the meaning of 'farcimen' as 'intestinum fartum' i.e. stuffed intestine (6, 1). Isiodore in his Etymologia (20, 2, 8) has this to say: ' *farcimen caro concisa est minuta, quod ea intestinum farciatur, hoc est inpleatur, cum aliarum rerum commixtione'*
farcimen is meat cut up in small pieces, for guts are stuffed by it, that is, filled up, together with a mixture of other ingredients.
This collaborates Isidorus' earlier citation, quoted in the preceding paragraph, *vario alimentorum adparatu compositum'*. This third alternative, namely the theory of 'satura' as by origin a food offered to the gods has found most favour in modern times.

The fourth alternative offered by Diomedes is that 'satura' is a literary title derived from legal terminology, a law which contained many miscellaneous proposals, just as satire treats many different subjects. This is quite interesting in its own way, but generally scholars have found it unacceptable. There is no evidence for the phrase 'lex satura' only of 'lex per saturam' or 'in saturam'. Coffey (p. 211) records a citation from the 'Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta'

referring to a speech against Tiberius Gracchus by T. Annius Lusus (frag. 106) which refers to a 'lex per saturam' with the meaning of a law with compendious or mixed provisions. Cicero (Dom. 53) attests that this law was formally forbidden in 98 B.C. by the Lex Caecilia Didia. Thus the general consensus is that Diomedes, in offering this alternative, was misled by the use of the legal phrase 'per saturam' and that he came to the wrong postulation, viz. 'satura=lex'.

Because of the multiplicity of the explanations offered by the Diomedes, and taking into consideration the arguments given in the preceding paragraphs, some scholars have looked elsewhere for an etymology with an Etruscan word 'satir' or 'satre' which was supposed to mean to 'speak' or 'declare'. This suggestion has its own difficulties. It is difficult to accept the borrowing of an Etruscan loan-word, rather than, as was customary, a Greek loan-word for the title of a genre that contained so much Greek material in its subject matter and presentation, even though Greek literature offers no parallel to Roman satire, and no word which means 'satura'?

To add to this, there is another important piece of ancient evidence narrated by Livy (7, 2, 4-10) where he states that after various attempts to rid Rome of the plague had failed, stage shows were introduced for the first time in 364 B.C. as a means of averting divine anger. At the very outset, I must mention that statements made by Livy, as was the case with his Greek counterpart, Herodotus, has to be taken 'cum grano salis', to quote a Latin phrase. However, one cannot ignore Livy's statement. Furthermore, there is a resemblance , though not a complete parallelism, to the poetic account of the evolution of Latin drama in the Epistles of Horace (II. 1. 139-169). Livy offers an account of the development of drama in Rome in five chronological stages. a) *sine carmine ullo, sine imitandorum carminum actu ludiones ex Etruria acciti ad tibicinis modos saltantes haud indecoros motus more Tusco dabant...'*
Players were called in from Etruria who danced to the music of the pipes without any verses or miming that corresponded to verses and produced graceful movements in the Etruscan manner... b) *Imitari deinde eos iuventus, simul inconditis inter se iocularia fundentes versibus, coepere; nec absoni a voce motus erant.*
Later Romans began to imitate them, at the same time exchanging jests in improvised verse suiting gestures to the words c) *...qui non, sicut ante, Fescenino versu similem incompositum temere ac rudem alternis iaciebant sed impletas modis saturas descriptio iam ad tibicinem cantu motuque congruenti peragebant...*

These did not, as had been the former practice, engage in an exchange of disorganised and uncouth verse like Fescennines, but enacted fully musical 'revues' which what was by now a set vocal line with pipe accompaniment and appropriate miming... *d) Livius post aliquot annis, qui ab saturis ausus est primus argumento fabulam serere, idem scilicet - id quod omnes tum erant - suorum carminum actor, dicitur, cum saepius revocatus vocem obtudisset...*
After some years Livius, who was the first to depart from the 'revues' and compose a dramatic plot, and, according to the general custom of the times, was the actor of his of his own pieces, cracked his voice as a result of too many encores.. e) *Inde ad manum cantari histrionibus coeptum diverbiaque tantum ipsorum voci relicta'*
As a result the practice was instituted for actors to have lyrics sung near to them as accompaniment of their gestures and to reserve the dialogue alone for their own voices) (transl. Coffey, p. 18).

Many scholars are sceptical regarding the authenticity of Livy. The most serious one being that one of the fundamental facts of Roman literary history is that Livius Andronicus introduced translations of Greek plays and that it was from these that Roman drama originated. Livy's omission of this fact as well as the absence of any mention of Greek influence discredits Livy's statement. It is also established that Andronicus produced his first play in Rome in 240 B.C. Livy does not refute nor confirm this fact, but rather is content with his unspecified ' post aliquis annis'. In his second book of 'sermones', Horace mentions 'satura' twice. In the first line of his second book he says *sunt quibus in satura videor nimis acer* (there are some people who think of me too cutting in satire) and also again in the same book (II. vi. 17) where he asks *quid prius illustrem saturis musaque pedestri?* (on what should I preferably throw light in the satires of my prosaic muse?). Livy began writing his history about 27 B.C. and was engaged on his seventh book roughly around 20 B.C. i.e. ten years after Horace's 'sermones' appeared. Not that one expects Livy to mention all authors who used 'satura' but it is strange that no mention is made between a dramatic satura and a literary satire. In this context, I can only say that Roman satire, as it has come down to us, excluded dancing and became a literary form, not intended for dramatic performance. In conclusion to this chapter, one can only say that unless some new literary or epigraphical evidence appears, the **metaphorical** meaning in the alternatives provided by Diomedes as contained in the second and third, namely in b) and c) is the most reasonable to accept, albeit with some reservations.

## 3. 'Satura quidem tota nostra est'

*Satura quidem tota nostra est, in qua primus insignem laudem adeptus Lucilius...*
Satire at any rate is wholly our own in which the first to obtain famous renown was Lucilius...

This famous statement by Quintilian appears in the tenth book of his Institutio oratoria (10,1,93) and has really to be interpreted in its correct perspective. This claim must be understood in its Roman form. The spirit of personal invective had already found expression in the lampoons of Greek satire, e.g., in the iambics of Archilochus as well as in the Old Comedy at Athens. The claim made by Quintilian springs from the consciousness that Satire was pre-eminently the national organ of public opinion at Rome. One should remember that it was the only form of literature that enjoyed a continuous development , extending as it did from the most flourishing era of the Commonwealth into the second century of the Empire. The tenth book contains his famous treatise on rhetoric and rhetorical education and Quintilian proceeds to describe the history of Greek and Roman literature in relation to education. In comparing the achievements of the Roman authors with those of the Greek, Quintilian considers a specific 'genre'. Thus in comparing Virgil with Homer, he has this to say : *omnium eius generis poetarum Graecorum nostrorumque haud dubie proximus (10, 85)* and describing elegy: *elegia quoque Graecos provocamus (10, 93)*. If one were to tabulate sections 46-84 of this book where Quintilian deals with the **Greek** representatives of the various genres and sections 85-131 where **Latin** literature is examined, the following 'table' would summarise the different genres as follows:

| **Greek** (sections 46-84) | **Latin** (sections 85-131) |
|---|---|
| epic poetry | epic poetry |
| elegy | elegy |
| --- | satire |
| iambic poetry | iambic poetry |
| lyric poetry | lyric poetry |
| Old Comedy | --- |
| tragedy | tragedy |
| New Comedy | comedy |

| | |
|---|---|
| history | history |
| oratory | oratory |
| philosophy | philosophy |

This shows that while Quintilian could find no parallel for Old Greek Comedy in Latin literature, the same applies for Latin satire in Greek literature. Horace, referring to Lucilius in the fourth satire of the first book (Sat. 1,4, 1-13) acknowledges his role although referring to him as careless and verbose, more interested in the quantity than in the quality of his work. Thus both these remarks state the truth, and both taken without qualification or explanation are incorrect. All Roman satire, owed a great deal to the Greeks and Lucilius was indebted to many Greek sources other than the comic drama. The Greeks used for satiric purpose their gifts of parody and irony, their iambi, their mocking comedies etc. etc. but the fact remains that there did not exist in Greece a separate form of literature which could be called 'satire' in the sense that nowadays we speak of the 'satires of Lucilius', the 'satires of Horace' or the 'satires of Juvenal'. One can never overlook the Athenian Old Comedy of Aristophanes and the New Comedy of Menander. The only difference is that they are 'modal' satire and only offer evidence of a growing satirical spirit. One has also to make mention of popular philosophers, e.g. Bion (c. 400-300 B.C.), who was a kind of street-corner orator, who developed a witty and satirical type of popular lectures which were called 'diatribes' originally meaning 'pastime' or 'leisure hours' but which later came down to mean a bitter and sharply abusive denunciation. The Bionean diatribe, attractive in its variety and freedom, is generally considered as a very good example of *spoudogeloion* which in Greek means the 'jocular-earnest' or 'serio-comic' as it is often called, and which is the pervading spirit of the satires discussed in this study.

The purpose of this study is not to trace the history of Roman satire, nor to trace 'satiric elements' among Greek writers. However, there is one particular parody, or burlesque, as the case may be, which deserves mention here. I refer to the *battle of the Frogs and the mice* (Batrachomyomachia), which sometimes has been wrongly assigned to Homer. Perhaps it belonged to the Hesiodic period, and about three hundred hexametres of it are extant. It is an amusing travesty portraying the deliberations of Zeus and Athene about the divine part to be played in the coming war between frogs and mice and amusing in its details of the mock-epic struggle. One important characteristic of this is the idea of a Council in heaven, a typical characteristic of Menippean satire, and this is evident in Lucianus as well as in the Apocolocyntosis of Seneca. This motif even finds its appearance in Lucilius' 'Concilium Deorum'.

## 4. The Lucillian tradition

In the annals of Roman satire, the name of Lucilius will stand as 'primus inter pares'. This is not to underestimate the role of Ennius since in a formal sense Ennius was the first creator of a literary form 'satura' in that this was the name he gave to some of his minor poems, but it was Lucilius who was the first to use themes which fit in with our modern concept of satire, namely, themes critical of contemporary life and its concomitant vices. Thus Lucilius was the first who devoted to this one genre the whole of his creative activity. His influence on the subsequent form of satire was decisive. His language was based on the everyday speech of Rome and after early experiments with various metres in the manner of Ennius, he chose for all his later poems the dactylic hexameter, which became the medium accepted by later satirists. Some later critics described his 'saturae', in contrast to those of Ennius, as *carmen maledicum* and the epithet *iambicus*, which belonged to Archilocus was applied to him as well. In the time of Tacitus there were Roman readers who declared him to be their favourite among all poets and even preferred him to Horace. Even Horace tacitly admits Lucilius' role in the first satire of his second book when he calls him: *nostrum melioris utroque* (Sat. 2,1,30-34) and considered him to be the inventor of satire: *...melius quod scribere possem, inventore minor* (Sat. 1,10,47-48).

Lucilius has been mentioned here for the simple reason that he represented the 'mainstream' of Roman satirists, as opposed to the 'alterum genus' mentioned by Quintilian, which will be discussed in the following paragraphs. The testimony of both Quintilian and Horace substantiates the role of Lucilius as 'inventor' of Roman satire. The loss of his works leaves a great blank in the literary history of Rome and the surviving fragments of Lucilius which number about 1300-1400 lines or scraps of lines, and thus a very imperfect representation of his total work, which consisted of thirty books. Be this as it may, since one can discern two 'branches' of Roman satire, namely, the 'mainstream' satirists as e.g. Ennius, Horatius, Persius and Juvenal, and those representing the 'alterum genus', e.g. Varro, Seneca, Petronius. Lucilius has been mentioned to enable the reader to have a broader perspective of Roman satire as a whole, but it is not the purpose of this study to trace the history of Roman satire, since each of the satirists mentioned above would form the subject of a separate study.

## 5. Menippus of Gadara and his heritage

The date of his birth is considered to be around 300 B.C. but knowledge of Menippus is scarce and indirect and much of his attitude to life comes indirectly through the Syrian satirist, Lucianus of Samosata, who often imitated him and introduced him as a figure in several of his dialogues. In his notable study, entitled *Lucian und Menipp*, Rudlof Helm has shown, inter alia, that some aspect of the Menippean attitude can be gained by grouping together the 'Hades' scenes appearing in Lucianus. The little facts that one can glean about the life of Menippus is that he began his life as a slave in Gadara, east of the river Jordan, Palestine, earned his freedom and became a citizen of Thebes and was a pupil of the Cynic Metrocles. Lucianus portrays him as a jester in a Cynic's cloak and he was described by various sources as a barking Cynic who bit and jested at the same time, and as a philosopher who combined the serious and the frivilous. He left about thirteen books although only fragments remain. Joel Relihan, a prolific contributor on Menippean satire, in his book entitled A History of Menippean Satire to A.D. 524 (p. 39) mentions a work entitled 'the Life of Menippus' by Diogenes Laertius (6,99-101) which concludes with a list of Menippus' works. However, Relihan points out that this list should be viewed with caution since Laertius himself quotes elsewhere from a work not on his list. His '*Nekyia*' is given priority in the list. The *Nekyia* is not a new invention since both Homer and Aristophanes also wrote a 'Nekyia', but Menippus had a satiric intention, unlike Homer, for example, where Odysseus' journey had its roots in myth and ritual.

### 5.1. The characteristics of Menippean satire

One of the most obvious **formal** characteristic of Menippean satire, is the device of mingling prose and verse. This particular feature has often been over-emphasised. As Riikonen has correctly pointed out this form in Antiquity was not a specifically Greek or Roman literary convention and cites Otto Immisch, who in his article entitled 'Ûber eine volkstûmliche Darstellungsform in der antiken Lieratur', has shown that in Oriental literature many kinds of equivalents are to be found. (p. 11). Relihan in his book entitled cites Perry whose book 'the Ancient Romances' relates 'prosimetrum' to the Arabic

'*maqamat*'. (p. 17). These are interesting aspects but they need not to unduly exaggerated. The mere fact that Menippus hails from Gadara and Lucianus from Samosata, a town on the banks of Euphrates, does not necessarily emphasize eastern influences in their works. If this is so, one can as well say that both Seneca and Quintilian, are of Spanish origin, and this has influenced their works. However tempting this line of thought may be, it would have to be a study which would involve many other aspects, both social and cultural, other than an author's country of origin.

In my view, this particular characteristic of 'prosimetrum' is not a 'sine qua non'. Classical scholars have tended to over-emphasize this particular form and it is this consideration alone which has led Duff to the following conclusion which I quote: The other great fictitious narrative in Latin prose, the *Metamorphoses,* or *Golden Ass,* of Apuleius lies outside our chronological limits and contains too little verse to be strictly Menippean. (p. 104). This definition alone is obviously inadequate, for it tended to group together works of vastly different scopes and purposes into a common genre when often they had nothing more in common than this superficial point of stylistic similarity. The danger lies in the fact that once such a definition has been put forward, it had to be applied to all subsequent works which contained a mixture of prose and verse, and if this definition is not fulfilled, then a particular work cannot be categorized as Menippean satire. Erasmus' 'Julius exclusus' would thus be excluded, although it is my intention to show in this study that features of Menippean satire are found in it. If we were to adhere to this strict definition alone, then we would have to omit some satirical dialogues of Lucianus, inter alia, his 'Philosophies for sale', a work which has been generally accepted by scholars as having received its inspiration directly from Menippus's 'Sale of Diogenes', on the grounds that it does not contain verse! Thus the more logical approach would be to look for a number of characteristics, which when taken 'in toto' can be considered as Menippean satire irrespective of the fact that one element is missing. This is not to deny the advantages of the uses of the prosimetric form, as will be subsequently shown, for example, in the effective use of it by Seneca in his Apocolocyntosis, but it gives the leeway to regard it not as a 'sine qua non' but as a characteristic or a feature which has played an important role in the tradition of Menippean satire. Personally, I consider the substantive 'prosimetrum' to be a modern coinage, which is not explained in dictionaries nor encyclopaedias. To sum up the question of 'prosimetrum', I conclude the examination of this aspect by quoting Relihan on prosimetrum: 'What is crucial to Menippean satire is the creation of characters who do not merely quote but actually speak in verse, and of a narrative whose action is advanced through separate verse passages. When verse ceases to be illustration and becomes integral to the progress of a plot, it transcends the diatribe to

create a genre of fiction that is unclassified by ancient standards, which insists of fairly rigid boundaries between prose and verse genres. The author, who usually begs to be identified with his narrator, makes fun of his own standards of literary tastes by writing in this bizarre fashion. Impropriety of form is closely linked to themes of the inadequacy of preaching and of truth, for speaking in verse is itself a parody of the conventions of rational and civilised discourse.' (p. 18).

As far as other underlying characteristics of Menippean satire are concerned, characteristics which will be dealt with as this study progresses, one can briefly summarize them as follows: The underlying theme is that the world is replete of men and women with questionable values. Delusion as well as illusion are rampant, in other words, nothing is what it seems to be and appearances seem to have triumphed over reality. Menippean satire often offers a solution, though it is never an attempt to be 'didactic' in its purpose, but a solution, subtle as it may be, namely, that the simple, natural, ordinary common life is the best and finally, the only solution. Menippean satires are frequently dialogues which occur spontaneously in ordinary situations and sometimes in 'extraordinary' situations, as e.g. in other worlds. The characters portrayed in Menippean satire are often few, sometimes just one or two, who will dominate the dialogue to the virtual exclusion of other participants, who function just as 'asides' in a theatre or a play. The language used in Menippean satire is straightforward, conversational and humourous and it is often used for the purposes of parody with its numerous references and allusions to other literary works. The prosimetric form, when used, generally emphasizes the contrast between the concrete and the abstract, between illusion and reality.

The 'background spirit' of Menippean satire is the spirit of the Cynic philosophers and just like the Cynics, the writers of Menippean satire ridicule or rather, scoff at, institutions, philosophers, intellectuals, material goods and worldly aspirations. The Cynics defied convention with a rude arrogance, snarling just like dogs would , thus earning them the 'nickname' Dog. In this respect Menippus the 'Dog' is one of the central figures of Lucianus' 'Dialogues of the Dead' where, in one of them, Diogenes requests Pollio to send Menippus to Hades in order that the philosopher can laugh endlessly there particularly on seeing the rich people, satraps and tyrants in a humble and contemptible state. It emphasizes the Cynic position that since death is the great leveller, the only way of life is that of the common, ordinary human being being, who has neither possessions, nor really cares for them, for that matter. This particular position of death being the great leveller is often seen in the 'underworld' scenes of the writers of Menippean satire, and Lucianus, with his

brilliant humour, shows the likeness of all ghosts and the difficulty of distinguishing a beggar from a king, or a cook from Agamemnon!

Thus there is also a serious aspect, though the stress is on the comic and it is this which led Strabo (16,.2.29. 759) to call Menippus 'σπουδογελαιον' which accords with evidence to think of him as a Cynic nihilist who borrowed freely from comedy and parody to write his humorous works. It is unfortunate that many things about Menippus remain unclear because of the paucity of evidence., but knowledge about Menippean satire would have been scantier if not for the satires of Lucianus.

# 6. Followers of the Menippean tradition in Roman satire. The 'alterum genus'.

'*Alterum illud etiam prius satirae genus, sed non sola carminum varietate mixtum condidit Terentium Varro, vir Romanorum eruditissumus.*'
There is, however, another and older type of satire which derives its variety not merely from verse, but from an admixture of prose as well. Such were the satires composed by Terrentius Varro, the most learned of all Romans.

This statement by Quintilian is really a continuation of his 'satura quidem tota nostra est' (10,1,95). There were three exponents of it in the Roman classical period: M. Terentius Varro of Reate, sometimes called 'Reatinus' to distinguish him from his Gallic namesake Varro 'Atacinus'; secondly, Seneca (who will be discussed separately), and thirdly Petronius, Nero's master of ceremonies.

## 6.1. M. Terentius Varro (116 - 27 B.C.)

Varro belonged to the Sullan and Ciceronian period, and it was not for nothing that he was called ' the most learned of the Romans' by Quintilian. He was one of the most prolific of writers, and his literary output exceeded even that of Pliny the elder. Of all the classical writers whose works have been called Menippean satire by later critics, only Varro actually gave that title to any of his own works. According to Coffey (p. 153) the ancient catalogue of Varro's writings preserved by St. Jerome lists 150 books entitled 'Saturae Menippeae'. No satire is preserved complete and what remains is some 600 fragments, usually of about a dozen words. This makes it very difficult to reconstruct individual Menippean satires, and the recpnstruction is largely dependent on plot lines known from authors like Lucianus. The loss of his Menippeans is a great handicap on the study of Seneca, or for that matter, of Petronius and the late Roman authors. The researcher on Varro is more or less forced to reason either backwards from the early successors of Varro, a research made all the more frustrating by the very scanty evidence available on Menippus himself, or to go forwards to later successors of Varro to define the nature of the source. One criticism levelled at the late Romans is that they often confused two distinct Varros, the satirist and the encyclopedist. Two authors have come

to our rescue. One is Cicero and the other is Aulus Gellius. In the proem to the 'Academica', Cicero makes Varro, the first main speaker in the dialogue, to state as follows:
*'...et tamen in illis veteribus nostris, quae Menippum imitati non interpretati quadam hilaritate conspersimus, multa admixta ex intima philosophia, multa dicta dialectice, quae quo facilius minus docti intellegerent, iucunditate quadam ad legendum invitati. (Cic. Ac. 1,8).*
'Yet in those works I wrote years ago as adaptations, not translations, of Menippus, which I diversified with merriment of a sort, many items of technical philosophy were included and many were expressed in the manner of a logician. In order that men of no great education might understand them more easily they were induced to read by a certain attractiveness of presentation'. (transl. Coffey. p. 151).

This at least seem to indicate that Varro added philosophy and humour to the model offered by Menippus, perhaps in an attempt to create his own variety of *spoudogeloion.* Cicero's reply to this as seen in the following section (1.9) is interesting:
'You have brought much light to our poets and to Latin literature and language as well, and have yourself made a multiform and elegant poetic work in nearly every metre, and have in many places embarked upon philosophical topics, sufficient for inspiring your readers, but insufficient for their instruction..'

In my opinion, whether Varro really intended the doctrinal matter of his Menippeans to be instructive or didactic in any real sense, is a matter of conjecture although the underlying theme of his satires stresses the simple, ordinary life without pretence, which he found in his Roman ancestors.

Further enlightening references are by Aulus Gellius in his Attic Nights, (Noct. Att. 13). First of all, Gellius also reiterates and confirms Cicero's account that Varro *imitated* but did not *copy* Menippus. He provides three discussions of varying length and detail, of parts of the Menippeans giving his views on Varro's sense of humour. The most important of these is a satire by Varro entitled *Nescis quid vesper serus vehat* (You don't know what late evening may bring) which he himself called a most witty work (lepidissimus liber) (13.11.1) which contained a sort of code for dinner parties, the correct number of guests etc. and another, *Cibi peregrini et lautitiae,* where Varro stigmatizes the hunt for luxurious foods all over the world with this reproof 'if you've given a twelfth of the attention to philosophy which you've devoted to getting your baker to bake good bread, you'd have been a good man yourself long ago'. Another interesting reference by Gellius is a satire by Varro called 'the Water-Dog' (Υδροκυων) where the main character, a braggart, who

claims to be the only one who could interpret the Menippeans, when asked what 'prandium' in that passage means, replies, ' talia ego gratis non doceo!'. Thus Gellius and his friends, after some discussion, came to the conclusion that a 'dog's lunch' in fact meant a lunch without any wine! Other similar titles like Horse-Dog , Dog-Teacher , Dog-Speaker as well as the Latinized Cynicus, testify to explain the term 'Cynicae' applied to Varro's satires. A similar interest in Cynicism, which symbolizes the snarling, dog-in-the-manger philosophy is seen in one of Varro's works, entitled ταφη Μενιππου, the Grave or perhaps, the Burial of Menippus where those present praise the dead Cynic in these words: *ille nobilis quondam canis'*. This is the only attested title where the name of Menippus appears.

The fragments have survived chiefly through the *De Compendiosa Doctrina* of the fourth century grammarian Nonius Marcellus. In this work Nonius was more interested on points of grammar and vocabulary, and cannot, therefore, be considered much of a guidance to Varro's 'Saturae Menippeae'.

An interesting feature in his Menippean satires are their titles and many of the ninety titles attested have subtitles, more or less explanatory, the second part of which is not a true alternative title, but a Greek title with 'peri' and an abstract noun or general expression stating, as in philosophical dialogues, the subject of the satire. Thus one part, is for eye-catching entertainment, and the other, for information, with the titles epitomizing the dual purpose of the works. Since the fragments of Varro usually contain about a dozen words, the double titles have been used as a better guidance than the fragments themselves. Thus, for example, one gets *caprinum proelium* (The battle of the goats) concerning pleasure, or *Papiapapae* the Latin equivalent of a Greek expression of surprise or disapproval, has a more explicit sub-title, in this case, concerning speeches of eulogy.

Like Lucilius, Varro is addressed by name in his own works, either formally as Varro or by the *praenomen* Marcus. Thus we have *Marcopolis ; Marcipor ; Bimarcus.* Then there are frivolous titles (Triple Phallus), a title found both in Naevius as well as in Aristophanes, as well as 'mythological' titles, e.g. Aiax Stramenticius (The Ajax of Straw) ; Eumenides ; Pseudaeneas ; Hercules Socraticus ; Sesculixes.

Altogether his hundred and fifty books of Menippean satires, distinct from four other books of satires, reflected the life of the age, the social vices, its philosophical disputes and its literary interests and Varro used these satires to attack social sins and foibles. His Eumenides, a satire which has forty-nine surviving fragments, recreates a dinner held by a Cynic, who hangs over his

door a placard reading 'cave canem' when he is expecting guests. It is interesting to note that in Petronius's *Cena*, Trimalchio also had a similar notice (29,1). Perhaps Varro himself is the Cynic concerned, but during the banquet philosophers wrangle over who is insane, attempting to find an answer from Serapis and Cybele, and finding the truth under the leadership of the Cynic Diogenes. The theme is the insanity of contemporary life. The chief character is taken for a madman by others until he believes it himself, but in the end he is declared sane by a tribunal of advocates (forenses) and this satire expresses the Cynic pronouncement on the quarrelling schools of thought: 'No sick man's monstrous dream can be so wild that some philosopher won't say its true'( quoted by Duff, p. 120)

Generally scholars agree that his satires were among his early works, and that the Saturae Menippeae were composed between 87 and 69 B.C. Irrespective of the fact that some satires may have been written later, e.g. Sexagesis seems a personal allusion to his sixtieth year, where a Rip van Winkle effect is given of a man who awakes after fifty years to find that Rome was not what it had been when he fell asleep. Broadly speaking his model was Menippus but he was also influenced by Plautus in his choice of language. This can be found in his use of Plautian diminutives and the choice of Greek words. He often uses dialogue presentation and a wide range of different metres. He was mostly concerned with a practical sort of philosophy, based on a simple style of life. Scholars agree that he used a conversational style more enhanced by his use of the first and second person.

In conclusion one can say that although Varro's satires covered a wide variety of topics, the recurring theme is the Cynic ideal of the simple life without extravagance or luxury, but unlike the Cynics, Varro stresses the importance of traditional religion and moral values and finds his Cynic ideal in the Rome of his ancestors. But because of the fragmentary evidence available, it is very difficult to come to any conclusion about Varro's place in the Menippean tradition, except to say that Varro's Menippeans are the primary source of Roman Menippean literature and that he can be considered the 'auctor' of Roman Menippean satire.

## 6.2. Petronius Arbiter (? - 66 A.D.)

Mention of Petronius, or rather his Satyricon, has been made in this study only with the purpose of tracing a continuation of the heritage of Menippean satire. Thus it is not my purpose to discuss in detail the merits or the demerits of the Satyricon as a Menippean satire since it is beyond the scope of this study.

The date of Petronius' birth is uncertain but he is generally identified with Nero's adviser on social etiquette, his *arbiter elegentairum* whose career and suicide in 66 A.D. is described by Tacitus in his *Annales* (16, 18-19). Tacitus assigns two chapters to him and states quite succinctly that 'energy made some men's reputation, but idling had made his'. One can glean that, devotee of luxury as he was, Petronius when governor of Bithyania had shown himself alert and businesslike, but his natural bent was idleness and was such a master of civilized dissipation that Nero became completely dependant on his judgement as consultant on refined luxury. As one of the close intimates of Nero he incurred the jealousy of the praetorian prefect Tigellinus, as a result of which false accusations were brought against him and his death was demanded. He ended his own life at Cumae spending his last hours in a spirit of nonchalance. It is interesting to note that within a space of two years, 65-66 A.D. there were three notable suicides, his, and in the previous years, Seneca's and Lucan's, all committing suicide in contrasting fashion. Seneca's death was in many ways an imitation of that of Socrates, being a model of philosophical correctness and fortitude. Lucan, on the other hand, died reciting his own heroic poetry and that of his father Mela. While Petronius, instead of leaving a will flattering and enriching Nero and his favourite Tigellinus, as was done by Seneca and Lucan respectively, prepared a detailed catalogue of the Emperor's debaucheries with the names of his partners and despatched it to the palace.

The title of the work is generally accepted to have been 'satyricon', in form a Greek genitive plural with 'libri' understood. This is a convention similar to such titles as *Milesiaka*, the collection of short tales associated with Aristidis of Miletus around 100 B.C. and translated into Latin and adapted by the historian Sisenna. Satyrica properly means things concerning Satyrs, as in the title of the Greek work on the Marsyas story. But the work of Petronius has nothing to do with the satyrs of Greek mythology, although the title is appropriate for a tale about lecherous rogues. Of the Satyricon, which is a work of considerable length, only fragments survive, but one part of the original, the *Cena Trimalchionis* of book 15, seems to be more or less intact, with the exception of some lacunae.

In my introduction, I have mentioned that 'prosimetrum' should never be considered a 'sine qua non' for Menippean satire, since so many other characteristics have also to be taken into consideration. The converse, of course, is also true. The mere fact that a work comprises of a mixture of prose and work does not **automatically** qualify it to be categorized as a Menippean satire. Where the 'Satyricon' is concerned, modern scholarship has tended to

consider a generic label of Menippean satire for it unnecessary, and in fact, misleading. It is in fact called the first 'picaresque novel'. The Webster's dictionary defines picaresque as follows: '... a form of prose fiction in which the adventures of an engagingly roguish hero are described in a series of usually humorous or satiric episodes that often depict, in realistic detail, the everyday life of the common people...' (p. 1088). In the Finnish language, 'veijariromaani' seems to describe it aptly. As examples of this, we have the legendary characters 'Don Quixote' of Cervantes or 'Falstaff' of Shakespeare.

Recent researchers have their defendants of the idea stated in the preceding chapter in Slater, whose book 'On reading Petronius' is cited by Relihan (p. 91). Slater's conclusion is that the Satyricon can hardly be called a Menippean satire merely by virtue of its prose and verse. This is not incorrect,. I have already mentioned that the 'Metamorphoses' or the 'Golden Ass' of Apuleius was considered outside the limits of Menippean satire simply because it contained too little verse to be strictly Menippean (Duff. p. 104). A more conservative judgement is given by Van Rooy (p. 154) when he states that the Satyricon cannot be called a Menippean 'satura' in the original Varronian sense (i.e. a medley of prose and verse *with strong moral function).* However, I personally feel that and the presence of 'prosimetrum' or the lack of it should not be over-exaggerated .

Calling the 'Satyricon' a picaresque novel has its points, but one has to admit that the thematic interests of the Satyricon are really typical of the ends of Menippean satire. It can definitely be considered to be in the lineage of Menippean satire, only it has less philosophy but more gaiety. This is not to say that it lacks in critical dimension which is a typical feature of Menippean satire. For example, in the Cena, Trimalchio's amusing blunders are a parody of literary knowledge - he seems to have every imaginable vice and loves to moralize about contemporary degeneration and boasts about his learning which obviously is so shallow that it is almost transparent, so much so that the reader's sympathy is with him and not with those hypocritical scholars who eat his food and laugh behind his back. Finally, as Coffey correctly states (p. 200) the *Cena* is a 'completely negative symposium at which nothing of cultural significance is said.'

The following chapters will deal with the main authors of this study in chronological order. In a work of this nature, which primarily deals with authors who wrote in Latin, Lucianus might seem a 'square peg in a round role' since he wrote in Greek, which might be considered as out of context, but where this study is concerned, Lucianus is indispensable for the simple

reason that the scant knowledge we have of Menippean satire would have been scantier if not for the extant satires of Lucianus.

## 7. The Emperor Claudius

Exaggeration and caricature are part and parcel of satire and since the character of Claudius is the alpha and omega of the Apocolocyntosis, it is fitting to detail a more objective picture of him. This is not to say that the Apocolocyntosis contains a falsified picture of Claudius, but Seneca has simply used the characteristics of Claudius which suited his particular purposes. The main literary sources for Claudius' reign are: Tac. Ann. 11-12; Dio 59. 1-60; Seneca, Apocolocyntosis and Suet. Claudius.

Ti. Claudius Nero Germanicus was born on 1 August 10 B.C. at Lugdunum in Gaul and was to become the third emperor of the Julio-Claudian dynasty. He was the son of Drusus Claudius Nero, the son of Augustus' wife Livia, and Antonia, the daughter of Marc Anthony. His uncle Tiberius became emperor in 14 A.D. and his brother Germanicus was marked out for succession when in 4 A.D. he was adopted by Tiberius. Claudius was unfortunate to be born with defects. According to Suetonius (Claud., 1-2) he limped, drooled, stammered and was constantly ill. Thus his own family considered this to be a sign of mental infirmity and generally kept him out of public eye. Suetonius records the comments of Antonia, his mother, and Livia, his grandmother, which were very harsh in their assessment of the young Claudius. In fact Suetonius reports that Antonia used to call him 'a half-formed monster' and berated fools as 'more stupid than my son Claudius'! However, a more balanced view is given later (Cl, 4) from Augustus' correspondence where it emerged that Augustus suspected that there was more to this 'idiot' than met the eye. When Claudius assumed the *toga virilis*, he was carried to the Capitol in a litter at night, when the practice was to be led into the Forum by one's father or guardian in full public view. Claudius, however, read voraciously and became a scholar of considerable ability and composed works on all subjects in the liberal arts, especially history. According to Suetonius, he was the last person known at that time who could read Etruscan. Claudius composed works in Greek and Latin and although none of his works survive, he is supposed to have written, inter alia, 43 books of Roman history, 21 books on Etruscan history and 8 on Carthaginian as well as an autobiography in 8 books. Hence, one can objectively say that these skills, and the knowledge of governmental institutions he acquired from studying history, were to become useful to him when he came to power. His brother Germanicus died under suspicious

circumstances in 19 A.D. and with Caligula assuming power in 37 A.D. his fortunes changed. Caligula promoted him to suffect consulship in 37 A.D. and at the age of 46, this was Claudius' first public office. Such were his circumstances when the dramatic events in 41 A.D. overtook him.

Caligula was attending a theatre near the palace and Claudius was present as well. When they adjourned, Caligula was surrounded and cut down by discontented members of his own bodyguard in an isolated corridor. In the panic and rampage that followed, tradition goes on to say that some guards found Claudius cowering behind a curtain and he was declared as the emperor on the spot and carried off to their camp. In the negotiations that followed between the Senate and the Guard, the Senate realized that it was powerless in the presence of several thousand armed men supporting Claudius' candidacy, he was after all, the only surviving mature member of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, and the final outcome was that in January 41 A.D. Claudius was formally invested with all the powers of the *princeps* becoming T. Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus. Claudius, of course, had no legal claim to the appearance of 'Caesar' in his imperial name, and this paved the way for the transmutation from a family name to a title denoting ruler. Caligula was the first Roman emperor to be openly murdered and Claudius' accession marks the first overt and large-scale intrusion of the military into post-Augustan politics. The emperor's position ultimately rested not on consensus but on the swords of the soldiers who paid him homage, and this became a common feature in the future.

The very next year saw preparations being made for a major military expedition into Britain. It is not my intention here to go into details of the invasion itself, as enough material has been written about it, but suffice it to say, that the initiation of the conquest of Britain was the most spectacular event of Claudius' reign. After an absence of six months, of which only sixteen days was actually spent in Britain, Claudius reached Rome in 44 A.D. to celebrate his triumph. These military credentials are supposed to be in an inscription from his (lost) triumphal arch, now in a courtyard of the Musei Capitolini in Rome.

The sources on Claudius are united in portraying him as a dupe to his imperial freedman advisors. Whatever the reasons may be, Claudius' reign is the first era of the great imperial freedmen, thus giving rise to powerful individuals like Narcissus and Polybius. He was also portrayed as a dupe to his wives and his fourth wife was Agrippina the Younger, the daughter of Claudius' brother Germanicus and a sister of Caligula, which necessitated a change in the law to allow uncles to marry their brothers' daughters. She already had a son, who

was later to become the future emperor, Nero, and Agrippina's ambitions for this son proved to be the undoing of Claudius. The general opinion is that Claudius was poisoned with a treated mushroom and had to be poisoned a second time which finally caused his death on 13 October 54 A.D. and at noon on the same day, the sixteen year old Nero was acclaimed emperor.

I have already mentioned that the invasion of Britain was the most significant event in Claudius' reign, but several other issues also deserve attention. First of all, the very nature of his succession soured his relationship with the Senate. Where Claudius was concerned the Senate was faced with a 'fait accompli' and although there was the idea of restoring the Republic and dispensing with the emperors altogether, there was disagreement among the Senators themselves and finally the Senate realized that it was powerless in the presence of several thousand armed men supporting Claudius' candidacy. Thus from the very start Claudius had ample reason to distrust the Senate and perhaps this is what impelled Claudius to elevate the role of his freedmen. In the last analysis, the figures speak for themselves: 35 senators and several hundred Knights were driven to suicide or executed during his reign. Claudius revived and held the censorship in 47-48 and the emperor-censor only succeeded in provoking more hatred.

Claudius is also remembered for being very liberal in dispensing grants of Roman citizenship to provincials; in fact he even admitted Gauls into the senatorial order (Tac. Ann, 11, 23-25) thus arousing the displeasure of the aristocrats. Objectively, one can say that these practices demonstrate Claudius' concern for fair play and good government for the provinces, but it is a moot point whether this is too modern an approach. Anyway, Claudius preferred direct administration over client kingship and under him the kingdoms of Mauritania, Lycia and Thrace were converted into provinces, although the more stable kingdoms such as Bosporous and Cilicia were left untouched.

One feature of Claudius' reign for which he is quite rightly critisized is his handling of judicial matters. In this, the criticism levelled at him in the Apocolocyntosis is correct. Claudius is supposed to have heard cases even during festal days and he is accused of interfering unduly with cases, of not listening to both sides of the case, and of hearing delicate cases in closed-door private sessions with only his advisors present. The most celebrated of such a case is that of Valerius Asiaticus, the Gallic ex-consul and once a friend of Claudius, who fell from favour in 47 A.D. and whose case was heard in the emperor's bedroom with the final result of his being forced to commit suicide. Thus it is in this light that one has to understand the Apocolocyntosis, which ends with a courtroom scene with Claudius as the accused, not being allowed

to make his defence, but convicted and finally condemned to a powerless courtroom clerk.

The picture portrayed by Robert Graves in his 'I, Claudius' as a benign man with a keen intelligence is a fictional characterization, written for a different purpose. Close study of Claudius shows that in addition to his scholarly nature, there was a cruel and tyrannical streak in him. He was addicted to gladiatorial games and was fond of watching his defeated opponents executed (Suet. Claud, 34). He conducted closed-door trials of leading citizens that frequently resulted in their ruin or deaths. He had his wife Messalina executed and abandoned his own son Britannicus to his fate and favoured the advancement of Nero as his successor. While Claudius cannot be blamed for the disastrous way Nero's rule turned out, he must take some responsibility for putting a very unsuitable youth on the throne. At the same time, his reign was marked by some notable successes, namely, the invasion of Britain, good government in the provinces and successful management of client kingdoms. This makes one to think that Augustus' suspicion that there was more to the idiot Claudius than met the eye was completely well-founded.

## 8. Lucius Annaeus Seneca

In his own lifetime Seneca's moral and political behaviour won him both admirers as well as critics. Miriam Griffin in her article entitled 'imago vitae suae' subscribed to the series Greek and Latin Studies, cites W.S. Landor who had this harsh criticism to label Seneca: 'In his books a philosopher, fawning while praising liberty, extorting while praising poverty, is one of literature's great hypocrites.' In defence of Seneca, one can only quote his own statement, where as a stylist, he adopted the maxim *'talis hominibus oratio qualis vita'* and as a moralist the rule *concordet sermo cum vita*, (epist. 114,1, 75.4). Personally, I would venture to coin a more compromising, and perhaps, even a facetious phrase, and describe Seneca as a person ' whom you love to hate'.

Lucius Annaeus Seneca was born either on 1 B.C. or 4 A.D. and like Quintilian, born a generation later, was of Spanish origin. His birthplace was the Roman colony of Corduba in Baetica, a rich Spanish province . He was the second son of a family of three, Annaeus Novatus, the first while his younger brother was M. Annaeus Mela, father of the famous poet Lucan. To avoid confusion, his father was called the 'Elder' or sometimes 'Rhetor'. Although of Spanish origin, he spent most of his life at Rome. As related in the 'Controversiae' of Seneca the Elder, the three sons were very interested in the declamatory skills of the earlier generation, and especially in the 'sententiae' uttered by the declaimers. Sententiae are concisely formulated generalities *'tamquam quae de fortuna, de credulitate, de saeculo, de divitiis dicuntur' (Contr. 1 praed. 23)* and this familiarity with the declaimers seems to have had a tremendous influence in the prose style of the younger Seneca.

Seneca held his first major political office under Tiberius (A.D. 33) when he was quaestor and was a famous orator by the time Caligula succeeded to the throne (A.D. 37). According to an anecdote mentioned by Cassius Dio, his brilliancy as an orator aroused the jealousy of Caligula who would have executed him, had he not believed that Seneca would not survive very long because of his ill-health. Seneca apparently suffered from consumption. When Claudius became emperor, Seneca was seen as a dangerous figure by Claudius' first wife, Messalina, and was exiled to Corsica in 41 A.D. on a charge of adultery with the princess Julia Livilla, the Emperor's niece. With the downfall of Messalina and with Claudius' remarriage to Agrippina, he was

recalled to Rome in 49 and this saw the continuation of his political career with him been appointed as praetor for 50. He married Pompeia Paulina, a wealthy woman, built up a powerful group of friends, including the new prefect of the guard, Sextus Afranius Burrus. Agrippina was responsible for his appointment as tutor to her son, Domitius Ahenobarbus, adopted by Claudius as Nero Claudius Drusus Germanicus (Tac. Ann. 12,8). From this time onwards Seneca was associated with the interests of Agrippina and Nero, and on Claudius' death in 54, it was Seneca who composed Nero's 'laudatio' of the dead Emperor, which, according to Tacitus, was his least successful work (Ann. 13.3) and the brilliantly funny satire on the official ritual of deification, the 'Apocolocyntosis' or 'Pumpkinification' of Claudius. Seneca and Burrus were Nero's favourites, and Seneca became suffect consul in 56. However, with Nero's increasing irresponsibility, and after the death of Burrus in 62, Seneca received permission to retire and even surrendered his wealth for the Emperor's use. During these years of retirement Seneca wrote some of his best philosophical works. In 65, Seneca's enemies denounced him as having been a party to the conspiracy of Piso and he was ordered to commit suicide, which he did with fortitude and composure (Tac. Ann. 15, 60-65).

One really does not have to quote modern scholars as critics of Seneca since criticism was evident even in the first century A.D. Quintilian was the leading rhetorician of the Flavian period and in his prose work called 'Institutio Oratoria' was responsible for critisizing the literary innovations of Seneca, Lucan and their contemporaries, among others. His book was really a survey of Greek and Roman authors, classified by genres. Only in his very last paragraph of his work (Ins. Orat. 10.1, 125-131) does he mention Seneca at all. It is very revealing and therefore it is not out of place to quote some excerpts since it gives a clear picture of what Quintilian thought of Seneca.

*Ex industria Senecam in omni genere eloquentiae distuli propter vulgatam falso de me opinionem, qua damnare eum et invisum quoque habere sum creditus'*
In treating such a genre of literature I have deliberately postponed discussion of Seneca owing to the fact that there is a general, though false, impression that I condemn him, and even that I detest him'
'*Tum autem solus his fere in manibus adolescentium fuit. Quem non equidem omnino conabar excutere, sed potioribus praeferri non sinebam..*'
At that time Seneca's works were in the hands of every young man, and my aim was not to ban his reading altogether, but neither was I about to let him be preferred to his betters...
*Amabant autem eum magis quam imitabantur tantumque ab eo defluebant, quantum ille ab antiquis descenderant..*

The young did not so much imitate him as love him and fell as far below him as he fell below the ancients).
*...sed in eloquendo corrupta pleraque eo perniciossima, quod abundant dulcibus vitiis*
his style is for the most part corrupt and exceedingly dangerous because it abounds in attractive vices.

An enlightening source is Tacitus, who was a child when Seneca died. In his Annales one can at least get a definitive account of Seneca's period of power under Nero. On the whole Tacitus was ambivalent on Seneca's place in history (Ann. 13,3.). Thus the historical tradition about him was formed by his own younger contemporaries. Juvenal portrays Seneca as a advisor of a tyrant who will not listen, whilst Martial, who had come to Seneca as a poor client from his own native province, also expressed his gratitude thirty years after the death of Seneca. Suetonius, on the other hand, made no attempt to escape the current prejudice (Nero, p. 52). It can be said, however, that his views on monarchy and its duties contributed to the humane and liberal temper of later generations. The spread of Stoicism kept his philosophy alive and it was even conjectured to have Christian affinities. There was a belief that he knew St. Paul and a spurious collection of letters were used to substantiate it. The fact remains that he was studied by Augustine and Jerome and that his works consoled Boethius in prison. In the Middle Ages, his thoughts were known to Dante, Chaucer and Petrarch and his moral treatises were edited by Erasmus

# 9. The Apocolocyntosis of Seneca

With Seneca's Apocolocyntosis we come to the earliest Menippean satire which exists virtually complete and this provides the researcher with a surer basis for discussion than do the titles of Menippus and the fragments of Varro. Its importance lies in its 'three-tiered' structure, namely, the framework of the council of the heavenly gods, the journey to earth and to hell, and the judgement of the infernal gods, a framework which is familiar to anyone acquainted with Lucianus' 'Icaromenippus', Downward journey (kataplous) and the Nekyomanteia. I shall elaborate this point as this study progresses. It is, however, interesting to note, that Witke (p. 156) is of the view that the Menippean satires of Varro preserve in their fragmentary state more details of the genre 'satura' than the Apocolocyntosis of Seneca. This has its own points, but due to the fragmentary evidence available, I personally consider Seneca's satire giving a surer basis for discussion. Doctoral dissertations on the fragments of Varro and their 'Menippean' characteristics are available for any researcher interested in this particular subject.

## 9.1. The outline of the satire

The work relates the events that took place in heaven and in the underworld on 13th October (54 A.D.). Released by the Fates from his mortal life, Claudius follows the route to heaven previously taken by Augustus and Tiberius. He arrives outside the assembly of the gods, and at first his misshapen appearance and uncouth voice terrify Hercules, who really feels that his thirteenth labour is at hand!! Claudius' true origin is revealed by the goddess Febris (Fever) who alone has accompanied Claudius on his journey. Hercules, thus reassured, threatens Claudius who turns from bluster to flattery. There is a lacuna which must have described Claudius's entry into the council of gods. When the text resumes, a god (one does not know who) derides Claudius' claim to divinity. After being called to order by Jupiter, the gods give their judgement. Although Janus speaks against accepting Claudius into heaven, Diespiter (Italian sky-god) argues in his favour and this view seems to prevail, till the deified Augustus, speaking for the first time in the divine assembly, indicts the conduct of Claudius for his misdeeds with such fervour that finally Claudius is expelled and dispatched to the underworld under the escort of Mercury. On the way

down, Claudius admires the sights and sounds of his own funeral procession. In the underworld, he is surrounded by the men and women he had killed and is brought to trial before the tribunal of Aeacus. After a one-sided trial, the very kind which he himself presided over as Emperor, he is at first condemned to play his favourite game of dice with a bottomless box. The Emperor Caligula suddenly appears and successfully demands the enslavement of Claudius. So, Claudius, having been the dupe of freedmen in his lifetime, now is forced to become the slave of a freedman in the underworld and is compelled to work as a lawyer's clerk. Thus the degradation of Claudius is complete.

## 9.2 Authorship and the title

The question of authorship arises partly from the fact the title Apocolocyntosis is not found in the manuscript tradition which often alludes to the title as 'Apotheosis' or 'Ludus de Morte Claudii' and partly from the belief that a philosopher with the fame of Seneca would not or could not have been capable of writing a satire of this nature. The article contributed by Rose appearing in the Oxford Classical Dictionary (p. 828) or the 'Handbook of Latin literature p. 359) is typical for those who consider that the great exponent and popularizer of Stoicism could not have demeaned himself to write a satire of this nature! Gilbert Bagnani in his book on Petronius entitled 'Arbiter of elegeance' has even gone to the extent of attributing the authorship of the 'Apocolocyntosis' to Petronius. The main argument is that the contrast between the vicious jibes against the dead Claudius in the Apocolocyntosis and the flattery of the living Claudius in the Consolatio ad Polybium is such that the same person could not have composed both works. This is completely missing the point. This argument forgets one of the main points of satire., the idea of 'spoudogeloion'. Moreover, another important factor has to be taken into account. In 43 A.D., during the time of the 'Consolatio', Seneca had already spent two years in exile in Corsica, and was desperate for recall and reinstatement. In 54 A.D., after the death of the emperor who had refused to grant them, Seneca's 'wheel of fortune' had changed and he was now in a position of power and authority which practically made him the virtual ruler of the Roman world for the next five years. The mere fact that Seneca himself never mentions this work, nor his reputation as a serious philosopher cannot be adduced as a criteria for his not writing this satire. The authorship is proved beyond doubt by the comparison of lexical, metrical and stylistic affinities with his tragedies, especially the 'Hercules Furens'. According to Suetonius, (Cl. 38.3), when Claudius reiterated that he had feigned stupidity in order to survive the reign of Caligula, a book appeared entitled 'The Resurrection or Elevation of Fools' whose point

down, Claudius admires the sights and sounds of his own funeral procession. In the underworld, he is surrounded by the men and women he had killed and is brought to trial before the tribunal of Aeacus. After a one-sided trial, the very kind which he himself presided over as Emperor, he is at first condemned to play his favourite game of dice with a bottomless box. The Emperor Caligula suddenly appears and successfully demands the enslavement of Claudius. So, Claudius, having been the dupe of freedmen in his lifetime, now is forced to become the slave of a freedman in the underworld and is compelled to work as a lawyer's clerk. Thus the degradation of Claudius is complete.

## 9.2 Authorship and the title

The question of authorship arises partly from the fact the title Apocolocyntosis is not found in the manuscript tradition which often alludes to the title as 'Apotheosis' or 'Ludus de Morte Claudii' and partly from the belief that a philosopher with the fame of Seneca would not or could not have been capable of writing a satire of this nature. The article contributed by Rose appearing in the Oxford Classical Dictionary (p. 828) or the 'Handbook of Latin literature p. 359) is typical for those who consider that the great exponent and popularizer of Stoicism could not have demeaned himself to write a satire of this nature! Gilbert Bagnani in his book on Petronius entitled 'Arbiter of elegeance' has even gone to the extent of attributing the authorship of the 'Apocolocyntosis' to Petronius. The main argument is that the contrast between the vicious jibes against the dead Claudius in the Apocolocyntosis and the flattery of the living Claudius in the Consolatio ad Polybium is such that the same person could not have composed both works. This is completely missing the point. This argument forgets one of the main points of satire., the idea of 'spoudogeloion'. Moreover, another important factor has to be taken into account. In 43 A.D., during the time of the 'Consolatio', Seneca had already spent two years in exile in Corsica, and was desperate for recall and reinstatement. In 54 A.D., after the death of the emperor who had refused to grant them, Seneca's 'wheel of fortune' had changed and he was now in a position of power and authority which practically made him the virtual ruler of the Roman world for the next five years. The mere fact that Seneca himself never mentions this work, nor his reputation as a serious philosopher cannot be adduced as a criteria for his not writing this satire. The authorship is proved beyond doubt by the comparison of lexical, metrical and stylistic affinities with his tragedies, especially the 'Hercules Furens'. According to Suetonius, (Cl. 38.3), when Claudius reiterated that he had feigned stupidity in order to survive the reign of Caligula, a book appeared entitled 'The Resurrection or Elevation of Fools' whose point

was that stupidity could not be affected, showing that similar types of works did exist during the times of the early empire.

The title of this satire has also given rise to many conjectures among scholars. First of all, the title 'Apocolocyntosis' is only mentioned by Cassius Dio, c. 150-235 A.D., the author of a 'Roman history' in Greek, comprising of eighty books of which twenty-six survive. The epitomator of Dio, Xiphilinus, mentions a work written by Dio with the title 'Apocolocyntosis' with the comment 'ωσπερ τινα απαθανατισιν' (as a sort of deification). Thus this is the sole extant occurrence of the word in antiquity. Various arguments have been put forward to the exact meaning or connotation of 'Apocolocyntosis' and in this respect one is grateful for Michael Coffey for his excellent article, 'Seneca, Apocolocyntosis 1922-1958' which appeared in the journal 'Lustrum' (6, 71). All the bibliographies and articles written during this time about this satire had been listed by him, and this excellent research is similar to Eugene P. Kirk's invaluable book, 'Menippean Satire: An Annotated Catalogue of Texts and Criticism.'

Κολοκυντη is the general and generic term for a gourd or pumpkin, Latin *cucurbita.* The botanical facts about the order *cucurcitaceae* can be easily found in any good encyclopaedia as e.g. in the Britannica where it is stated that two main 'genera', namely, 'cucurbita maxima', a large round gourd which can weigh up to 100 kgs, and 'lagenaria' or bottle gourds, which resemble a flask with one bulbous end, comprise the species. It is generally supposed that the vegetable referred to in Seneca's 'Apocolocyntosis' is the larger and the emptier, namely, the 'cucurbita maxima'. One of the more common Greek nouns with the prefix απο- and the suffix -ωσις is 'αποθεωσις' meaning 'deification'. Coffey, in the article quoted above divides the suffix into four categories (p. 249). a) transformation into: e.g. αποθεωσις. Cic. (Att. 1,16,13). b) change into something resembling: απογυναικωσις (make womanish) c) separation: αποδοντωσις (cleaning of teeth) and d) use of the instrument: αποραφανιδωσις. All of this is true. But one has to remember that a word used for the purpose of parody cannot be assigned to any category when the possibilities are so limited. To come to the conclusion or even infer it, as Coffey does, that the last possibility, which too has a vegetable basis, namely, a horseradish, is too far-fetched. It was a term indicating a Greek punishment for adultery in which a horseradish was thrust into the adulterer's body *per anum.* As far as I am concerned, Seneca for the purpose of this satire has simply used the prefix απο- and the suffix -ωσις and substituted -κολοκυντ- for -θε, making the parody complete. The answer lies

in the metaphorical association of this particular vegetable in the context of this satire and any deduction from the formation of the word must be treated with caution. The English can be rendered as 'gourdification' or 'pumpkinification', although I prefer the latter epithet, since the almost homonymous 'gourd' and 'god' would lose some part of the humour contained in the title. Be this as it may, the title should not be interpreted as 'transformation into a pumpkin' since Claudius is neither turned into a pumpkin nor is there any mention made of this particular vegetable in the text.

Various vegetables of the order *'cucurbitaceae'*, whether *cucurbita maxima* (the large round gourds) or *lagenaria* (bottle gourd) were used in antiquity as food and as storage vessels. The gourd was also associated with stupidity. In the Metamorphoses of Apuleius, cucurbita is obviously used of a silly, empty head *nos cucurbitae caput non habemus ut pro te moriamur..*(Met. 1,15,2.). The implication here is that the head like a gourd is void of sense. In the 'Cena' of Petronius, Trimalchio, explaining the kind of people born under each sign of the Zodiac, says: *in aquario (sc. nascuntur) copones et cucurbitae..*
under the sign of Aquarius, the Water Carrier, are born innkeepers and numskulls. (Cena 39.12.
Here cucurbitae imply that their heads are empty as dried gourds. This association with vacuity is borne by the fact that at whatever stage of growth the cucurbita is plucked, the watery pulp inside soon decomposes leaving nothing but the pips and the hard outer smooth outer rind. However, it is not the assertion here that the **only** association of the vegetable gourd is vacuity and stupidity. It happens to be one of them. According to Coffey (Roman Satire. p. 167), the Greek κολοκυντη is not associated with stupidity but with health. One possibility is that Seneca chose the pumpkin as the means of ridiculing Claudius' divinity on the grounds that it would be difficult to think of anything more lacking in positive characteristics than a pumpkin. Whether or not the pumpkin had connotations with stupidity, the replacement of the image of divinity with that of a pumpkin is by no means flattering and whatever Claudius may or may not turn into, it is evident that what he wants and expects to is to become a god, and it is just this attempt which Seneca makes ludicrous. The senate, by honorific decree, had made Claudius into a god, but Seneca, the satirist, makes him into a 'metaphorical' gourd.

## 9.3. The analysis of the text

Sections of the texts will be translated and analyzed so far as it throws light upon the essential characteristics of Menippean satire and the means Seneca

uses to highlight this satire. The Apocolocyntosis can be conveniently divided into fifteen sections (1-15):

Introduction:

'*Quid actum sit in caelo ante diem III idus Octobris anno novo, initio saeculi felicissimi, volo memoriae tradere. Nihil nec offensae nec gratiae dabitur. Haec ita vera. Si quis quaesiverit unde sciam, primum, si noluero, non respondebo. Quis coacturus est? Ego scio me liberum factum, ex quo suum diem obiit ille, qui verum proverbium fecerat, aut regem aut fatuum nasci oportere. Si libuerit respondere , dicam quod mihi in buccam venerit. Quis umquam ab historico iuratores exegit*?...'

What transpired in heaven on the thirteenth day of October in the new year, the dawn of a most prosperous era, I wish to put on record. Nothing will be given neither for offence nor for favour. Such is this truth. If anyone were to ask the source of my information, first, if I do not wish, I shall not reply. Who is going to compel me? I know that I have the freedom ever since that person departed who gave truth to the proverb that one should be born either a king or a fool. If it does please me answer, I'll say whatever comes into my mouth. Whoever demanded sworn witnesses from a historian?...

The opening chapter is structured on the conventional framework of the preface of historians, namely, a statement of the subject-matter, an assurance of impartiality and truthfulness. 'Quid actum sit' is the typical language of official business, but with Seneca's surprise location 'in caelo', the comical effect is highlighted and already a 'concilium deorum' is predicted. The 13th of October is the date given by both Tacitus and Suetonius for Claudius' death, namely 54 A.D. Protestations of impartiality are regular features of historians, hence the use 'nihil nec offensae nec gratiae dabitur'. Thus Tacitus in his 'Histories' also states ' nec beneficio nec inuria neque amore...et sine odio (Hist. 1,1). Seneca parodies this with scintillating humour. The point of the sting here is that Claudius also considered himself a historian. It pretends to be a 'vera historia' in the style of Lucianus. In his satire entitled 'True Story', the narrator states that he is anxious to bequeath something to posterity, but at the same time admits that he is compounding prevarications and that only one thing what he says will be true, namely, that he is a liar!. In the same way, Seneca's narrator, wishes to record something for posterity, the events which happened on October 13th, 54 A.D. He claims the impartiality of the historian but does not want the story subjected to any verification. In the text, Seneca uses 'iuratores' to the best possible linguistic advantage. Iuratores were minor civil servants responsible for collecting the returns of the taxable assets of

individuals and their other commitments at a 'census' and the whole idea that a reader would only accept a historian's word if the source of his testimony was under oath is quite amusing, to say the least! Thus the narrator in Seneca's does not want to have the story subject to any verification. Nevertheless, he is happy to produce a witness, one who finally happens to be completely untrustworthy! The historical facts prove it: The apotheosis of Drusilla was really a scandal. She was the sister and lover of Caligula, which makes it incest, but she received divine honours only after Livius Geminius attested to her ascent to heaven. In Seneca's 'Apocolocyntosis', this very same person vouches for Claudius' journey to heaven! So, finally, as in the case of Lucianus, in his satire 'True Story', this prologue proclaims that all that follows is a lie. It professes to say the truth yet at the same time declares he will say what first come to his mouth *dicam quod mihi in buccam venerit.* Another important factor to note is that Tiberius was never granted divine honours. Thus the narrator is not quite in control of his Roman history. In this respect he is like one of Varro's narrator's. The whole irony of this introduction is that in heaven there is already Drusilla, who did not deserve such honours, and Tiberius, who never gained them, and here is Claudius applying for divinity in a heaven occupied by characters who are quite unworthy of their presence there.

Seneca continues with the proverb *Qui verum prouerbium fecerat, aut regem aut fatuum nasci oportere.* This is a Latin derivation of a Greek proverb: 'μωρωι και βασιλει νομος αγραφος (for a fool and a king the law is unwritten). This equated Roman emperors and idiots; later in a speech before the divine assembly, Augustus will refer to one of Claudius's victims as *Crassum uero tam fatuum ut etiam regnare posset* (11,2). Thus the Roman heaven of the Apocolocyntosis is corrupt, already occupied by Tiberius and Drusilla, and its next candidate Claudius, who was considered by his own mother, to be a born fool (Suet. Cl. 3,2.) is applying for divine honours! These three stand in opposition to Augustus, whose divinity was deserved and whose characterization in this satire is more or less respectful, but the mere fact that Augustus is also occupying this corrupt and comic heaven is the sting in this satire. Proverbs which are frequent in this work were the stock-in-trade of Menippean satire, especially used by Varro and Lucianus. Seneca continues with his malicious wit when describing Claudius' journey to heaven.

*Tamen si necesse fuerit auctorem producere, quaerito ab eo qui Drusillam euntem in caelum vidit: idem Claudium vidisse se dicet iter facientem 'non passibus aequis'.*

But if it is necessary to produce the author, question him who saw Drusilla on her way to heaven: he will say he saw Claudius making the same journey 'with unequal steps'. (1. 8-11)

Virgil in describing the son of Aeneas, Iulus, following his father also used the phrase 'non passibus aequis' (Aen. 2, 723). Seneca's brilliant wit lies in this. Iulus' steps were unequal to his father's because he was too small ; Caludius' steps were unequal to each other!

The times of year and day:

After this humorous skit on historians' professions, Seneca now satirizes, with ironic imitation, the times of year and day which were used by poets. Seneca now uses the hexameter, (the transition from prose to verse was a typical feature of Menippean satire) in keeping with the solemnity of the mock-heroic. The bombastic verses parody the conventions of epic poetry in the Menippean fashion:

> *Iam Phoebus breviore via contraxerat arcum*
> *lucis et obscuri crescebant tempora Somni..*
>
> Phoebus had already drawn the arc of light with a shorter path,
> and the periods of dark Sleep were growing...(2, 1-2)

After this solemn high-style, e.g. 'tempora Somni' a phrase used both by Homer and Virgil, Seneca drops into plain prose statement:

*Puto magis intellegi si dixero: mensis erat October, dies III idus Octobris, horam non possum certam tibi dicere (facilius inter philosophos quam inter horologia conveniet) tamen inter sextam et septimam erat.*

I think it is better understood if I say: the month was October, the day the thirteenth. I cannot tell you the exact hour (an easier agreement will be there among philosophers than among clocks) however it was between the sixth and seventh hour.' (2, 7-11).

Here the philosophers are pictured as being second only to clocks for their inability to agree. The introduction therefore presents a narrator who is distorting historical facts and thus is unreliable. This is similar to the Menippean tradition of Varro. But underlying the humour, there is a seriousness also. The references to the apotheoses of Drusilla and Tiberius suggest that Claudius is not the only unqualified applicant to divine honours

and this seriousness shifts the satire from personal invective of Claudius to the whole conception of apotheosis.

Prelude in heaven:

With no formal indication of a change of scenery, Mercury appears to conduct Claudius' released soul to its destination. His request to Clotho, one of the three Fates, abounds in malice.

> *dede neci, melior vacua sine regnet in aula*
>
> give him to be killed, let the better reign in the empty court (3, 10)

A similarity is seen in the Georgics of Virgil (4, 90) where mock-heroic instructions are given to the bee-keeper on what to do with the 'king' bee who has lost the battle.

The eulogy of Nero and the death of Claudius:

The course of events in this section is now given by divine powers, and as is common in epic, the narration continues in epic hexameters. In this passage the inauguration of a Golden Age is prophetically forecast of Nero, just as Virgil did of Augustus in the Aeneid. Nero is identified with Apollo in looks and grace as well as in voice and song.

> *'Ille mihi similis vultu similisque decore*
> *nec canta nec voce minor...* (4, 22-23)

In describing the death of Claudius, however, Seneca resorts to prose, 'vulgar' prose at that.

*'Et ille quidem animum ebulliit, et ex eo desiit vivere videri. Expiravit autem dum comoedos audit, ut scias me non sine causa illos timere. Ultima vox eius haec inter homines audita est, cum maiorem sonitum emisisset illa parte, qua facilius loquebatur: 'Vae me, puto, concacavi me.' Quod an facerit, nescio; omnia certe concacavit.'*

And he indeed did gurgle his life out and from then he ceased to seem to exist. However, he expired while he was listening to comic actors, so you know that it is not without reason I am afraid of them. This was the last utterance of his heard among mankind, when he had let out a louder sound from that part,

through which he spoke more easily. 'Alas! I think I have shit myself.' I do not know whether he did. Certainly he shat up everything else. (4, 36-41)

*Animam ebulliit* 'is a slang vulgarism, used also by Petronius. Seneca is at his most malicious in describing the 'ultima vox' of Claudius. The famous last words are extremely common in biographical history. Practically every Roman emperor was credited with some. Nero when about to die was supposed to have uttered *'Qualis artifex pereo*!' (What an artist dies in me.!). Vespasian, the first of the Flavian emperors, is credited with the famous last joke on earth: *Vae! puto deus* fio (Seut. Vesp. 23,4). Thus since Claudius had failed to oblige with a 'ultima vox', Seneca, most graciously, supplies him with one! According to Suetonius, Claudius was said to have contemplated an edict to allow 'farting' at the table! (Cl. 32).

Claudius at the gates of heaven:

In this passage one finds Seneca at this best. His humour is scintillating.

*Nuntiatur Iovi venisse quendam bonae staturae, bene canum; nescio quid illum minari, assidue enim caput movere; pedem dextrum trahere. Quaesisse se cuius nationis esset: respondisse nescio quid perturbato sono et voce confusa; non intellegere se linguam eius nec Graecum esse nec Romanum nec ullius gentis notae. Tum Iuppiter Herculem, qui totum orbem terrarum pererraverat et nosse videbatur omnes nationes, iubet ire et explorare quorum hominum esset. Tum Hercules primo aspectu sane perturbatus est, ut qui etiam non omnia monstra timuerit. Ut vidit novi generis faciem, insolitum incessum, vocem nullius terrestris animalis sed qualis esse marinis beluis solet, raucam et implicatam, putavit sibi tertium decimum laborem venisse.*

It was announced to Jupiter that someone had arrived of good build and quite white-haired; he was making some kind of a threat, for he was wagging his head vigorously; he was dragging his right foot. (The messenger said) that he had inquired his nationality; that he had made some reply with a confused sound and in an unintelligible voice; that he did not understand his language; that he was neither Greek nor Roman nor of any known race. Then Jupiter ordered Hercules, who had wandered over the whole earth, and seemed to have known all nations, to go and find out what manner of men he was. Then at first sight, Hercules was really shocked, as one who did not fear all monsters. When he saw the shape of novel kind, the unusual gait, the voice of no land animal but as such was of sea-beasts, he thought that his thirteenth labour had arrived. (5, 5-16)

Even Hercules does not escape Seneca's humour. He appears in one of his comic guises, a much-travelled, monster-slaying Greekling (Graeculus) which is a contemptuous diminutive. Here he has much in common with the Hercules as presented by Aristophanes in his 'Frogs' as the 'averter of evil' (αλεξικακος). Seneca exaggerates the physical deformities of Claudius to highlight his satire. This was accepted in the Roman society. Cicero's 'in Pisonem' is a good example of the ancient tradition of invective which allowed malicious representation of an enemy's physical characteristics. Moreover, Seneca's presentation of Claudius as a slobbering and infirm dolt is supported by Suetonius' biography of Claudius.

In the senate of heaven:

Seneca took the overall idea of a council of the gods, and the special feature of the admission, the judgement and expulsion of the gods of dubious worth, from the tradition of the Greek Menippean Satire. Menippus' methods of satirizing can only be guessed by retro-reference from a number of Lucianus' works including Icaromenippus and Deorum concilium. There have been precedents in Roman literature where meetings of the gods have been presented, e.g. Naevius, Ennius and Virgil, but Seneca seems to have gone further in the detailed equation of the council with the Roman senate. The Roman senate, at Agrippina's instigation, had decreed deification, not an automatic honour, for Claudius. Seneca, the satirist, passes his judgement by creating a senate of gods, using identical formal procedure, to reject Claudius' claim to godhead.

Claudius's trial shows that the afterlife is not really competent to judge him. Before the formal debate on his apotheosis, a god whose identity is unknown, (at the beginning of chapter eight there is a lacuna) asks Hercules what sort of a god he wants Claudius to be and then various possibilities are rejected by him. Firstly, Claudius's possibility of becoming an Epicurean or Stoic divinity is rejected and then Claudius as a moralist is considered: Claudius had his prospective son-in-law Silanus killed after accusing him of incest with his sister. Two points of interest arise here. Drusilla herself had an incestuous relation with Caligula, but she attained divine honours. Secondly, it is also an obvious insult to Jupiter's relationship with Juno. *illum deum <induci> ab Ioue, quem, quantum quidem in illo fuit, damnauit incesti!* (Can he be deified by Jupiter, who, as far as he could, Claudius convicted of incest?). In the same vein this unknown god continues. *hic nobis curva corriget*? (Shall this one make our crooked paths correct?) This is a tacit admission that the heaven needs correction by referring to Jupiter's incest, and by reference to the murder of Silanus on framed charges. Thus the whole irony is that this is the type of Roman heaven that Claudius is aspiring to! Seneca continues twisting the

dagger. Jupiter realizes that the course of this speech is becoming embarrassing to himself and thus says: *'ego' inquit, 'p.c., interrogare uobis permiseram, uos mera mapalia fecistis. uolo ut seruetis disciplinam curiae. his, qualiscumque est, quid de nobis existimauit?'*
I gave you permission to ask questions, honourable members' he said, 'but you have made a complete mess of things. I require you to keep the rules of procedure of the senate-house. What opinion has this man formed of us, whatever his status

It is interesting to note here that for Seneca, as well as for Lucianus, who will be discussed in the following chapters, the gods are depicted as useless creatures who exercise no real power. This is a typical characteristic of Menippean satire. If one were to consider how the gods have been depicted up to this present point in this satire, certain observations can be made: In section 4, Apollos' only role is to sing a song in praise of Nero ; in sections 5 and 6, Jupiter is at a loss to understand Claudius and despatches Hercules, who himself is portrayed by the contemptuous diminutive 'Greaculus', and who would have been tricked by Claudius were it not for Fever's intruding herself into the proceedings. Jupiter proceeds to ask the opinion of Janus and Diespiter, but finally, a former mortal, Augustus, whose proposition to send Claudius to the underworld, wins the day. So the proceedings continue.

Claudius is removed from the council chamber and it is the turn of Janus. The crucial point of Janus's speech is: *'olim', inquit, 'magna res erat deum fieri: iam Fabam mimum fecisti*
Once it was a great thing to me made a God: now you have made it a 'Bean' farce.

However, his objections are only theoretical. Janus says nothing very specific in his statement and refuses to discuss Claudius personally. Relihan (p. 245) cites Weinreich 'Senecas Apocolocyntosis' where he compares Janus's speech and that of Momus, the mocker of gods, in Lucianus's Deorum Concilium. Janus would therefore allow Claudius's deification but wishes to preserve the dignity of this Roman heaven by not publisizing its shortcomings through the rejection of even an unworthy applicant like Claudius.

The next god to speak, Diespiter, takes a similar approach. Claudius by being related to the divine Augustus, has the right connections. Ironically, Claudius' great intelligence, is thus ironically expressed: *longeque omnes mortales sapientia antecellat sitque e re publica esse aliquem qui cum Romulo possit feruentia rapa vorare*

and since he far surpasses all men in wisdom, and since it is in accordance with the interests of the state for there to be someone who can 'gobble steaming turnips' with Romulus...

These qualifications make Claudius eligible to be made a god, *ita uti ante eum quis optimo iure factus sit* (just as anyone else who was made a god before him in perfect accordance with the law) (9,5). This is extremely humorous. Seneca's description of these characters is beyond description. Janus is one who avoids commitment, so he is depicted as an equivocator: *homo, quantum uia sua fert, qui semper videt* αμα προσσω και οπισσω (a person with simultaneous foresight and hindsight, as far as his own street goes). Diespiter is a usurer and a seller of citizenship perks *nummulariolus. hos quaestu se sustinebat: vendere ciuitatulas solebat* (a small-time money lender. He used to maintain himself with a livelihood by selling citizenship perks). Both these diminutives are disparaging and the coinage is a characteristic of the *sermo plebeius*. As attested by Dio, trafficking in grants of citizenship was a notorious occupation of Claudius and his entourage and here is present Dispieter, who has made a career of it! Romulus is presented not as the great founder of Rome but a country bumpkin who eats boiled beets! The humour is that even in heaven Romulus eats boiled beets! This is followed by Augstus's indictment.

In the divine senate, Augustus delivers his maiden speech with fervour. Although Seneca does not treat Augustus in a disrespectful caricature, he cannot help but parody Augustus' style, which is very often reminiscent of the phraseology of the official language of the *Res Gestae*. e.g. *In hoc terra marique pacem peperi?* (Did I achieve peace in land and sea for this?). The speech of Augustus is the longest in the debate and it is very effective. Here the indictment of Claudius is not for his being a harmless pedant, or a fool, but for being an arbitrary judicial murderer. This speech brings a new seriousness and stature to the debate.

Many scholars consider Augustus' long speech to be the centrepiece of the Apocolocyntosis. August indignantly details the outrages, most of which touch on his own family, which were committed by Claudius, and according to him, this fact alone makes Claudius' deification and insult to heaven. Augustus' criticism is justified but between the lines there is an subtle inference made by Seneca, namely, that Augustus' self-absorption is with this family and not the Roman state. Augustus does not mention any other faults or vices of Claudius, except for the above. The situation is not lacking in irony either. Augustus is a deified **mortal** whose own right to heaven can be questionable through its association with that of Tiberius and Livia. This is well expressed by Relihan:

'According to divine standards, Claudius should be divine; according to mortal standards, he should be banished from heaven: the most elevated view of divinity is put in the mouth of an ex-mortal while the basest view is that of gods who have always been in heaven.'(p. 85-86). Augustus finally makes the point: *hunc deum quis colet? quis credet? dum tales deos facitis, nemo vos deos esse credet.* (Who will worship this man as a god. Who will believe in him? While you create gods of this sort nobody will believe that you are gods). The speech of Augustus wins the day and Claudius is banished from heaven and despatched to the underworld.

The funeral and lament for Claudius:

Since Homer, trips to the underworld were a common feature in ancient literature. Menippus himself was credited with a work entitled Nekuia from which perhaps both Lucianus and Seneca as well as Varro derived their settings and themes. And some themes of this chapter, namely, the public rejoicing over the death of a tyrant and the mourners singing a dirge can be found in Lucianus as well. There are also parallels between the funeral procession and the dirge that takes place on earth prior to Claudius' entrance to the underworld to the scenes in Lucianus' 'Dialogues of the Dead' where the passengers are being loaded into Charon's boat for their journey across the Styx. In both works one gets the 'double exposure' whereby the dead are aware of their own funeral rites as they make their trip to the nether world.

The situation in which Claudius meets his own funeral procession is intrinsically comic and the mock solemnity of the dirge discredits him through ironical praise. Claudius fails to realize that the cheering and praise signifies their happiness at his demise, but instead: *delectabatur laudibus suis Claudius et cupiebat diutius spectare...* (Caludius was delighted with the praises heaped upon him and wanted to watch longer...). The nenia of the funeral dirge is a parody, as it pretends to be a tragic chorus, but is filled with mock solemnity with deeds never completed as e.g. the scattering of the Parthians *ille rebelles fundere Parthos leuibusque sequi Persida telis* and comments ironically on his handicaps (he could outrun the swift) and his questionable legal procedures described below.

*deflete virum, quo non alius*
*potius citius discere causas,*
*una tantum parte audita,*
*saepe neutra, quis nunc iudex*
*toto lites audiet anno?*
*tibi iam cedet sede relicta,*

*qui dat populo iura silenti,*
*Cretaea tenens oppida centum.*
*caedite maestis pectora palmis,*
*o causidici, venale genus*

Weep for the hero, than whom no other could more quickly learn his briefs, after hearing only one side of the case, and often neither. What judge today will hear cases throughout the year. He who gives judgements to the people of silence, ruling a hundred townships of Crete, will now yield to you vacating his seat. Beat your breasts with hands of sorrow, you barristers, a venal tribe. (12, 33-42)

Most of the verses in this satire are in the hexametre, but in keeping with the mock-solemnity of this dirge (nenia), Seneca uses the anapaestic dimeter ∪∪ — ∪∪ —, which is Seneca's favourite choral metre in his tragedies.

In the underworld: Claudius' punishment

The satire now moves to an end in short, simple sentences. The judicial procedure of the underworld is thoroughly Romanized. The presiding judge, praetor, is Aeacus, and not the traditional judges - Minos and Rhadamanthus. Seneca's satirical brilliance is clearly seen in the condemnation of Claudius.

*Incipit patronus velle respondere. Aeacus, homo iustissimus, vetat et illum, altera tantum parte audita, condemnat. Ingens silentium factum est. Stupebant omnes novitate rei attoniti, negabant hoc umquam factum. Claudio magis iniquum videbatur quam novum.*

The defence-counsel showed signs of wanting to reply. Aeacus, a most just man, forbade him and with only one side of the case heard, condemned him. There was a deafening silence. Everybody was astonished, shattered by the novelty of the ruling, never done before. Claudius thought it more unfair than novel. (14, 9-12)

Claudius is condemned as he condemned others, namely by hearing only one side of the story. The biblical concept of 'an eye for an eye and tooth for a tooth' can be considered by some as poetic justice, but one has to remember that it is not justice in the way it should be meted. Two wrongs, after all, will never make one right! Herein lies the seriousness of this satire. Seneca shows this very clearly when he portraits Aeacus who is called '*homo justissimus*', acting unjustly to secure justice. Even the inhabitants of the nether world are shocked at this decision: '*ingens silentium factum est. stupebant omnes*

*nouitate rei attoniti, negabant hoc umquam factum. Claudio magis iniquum uidebatur quam nouum.'*
A deafening silence followed. Everybody was struck dumb, shattered by the unprecedented ruling and said that this had never been done before. Claudius thought it unfair rather than unprecedented.
Thus the reader's sympathy is really with Claudius both because his trial has been unfair and Seneca implies that Claudius himself realizes his own guilt in such matters, namely, unfair, because it now applied to him, not unprecedented, because he himself had practised it.

The punishment meted to Claudius is by no means lacking in humour and irony but at the same time it reveals the division between corrupt, divine sentiments and upright mortal ones. Playing his favourite game of dice with a bottomless box has the same features of unending frustration as that of Tantalus and Sisyphus. Dice-playing, after all, was a special addiction of Claudius. If Seneca had concluded this satire at this point, then one could have thought that this whole satire was a personal invective against Claudius and nothing else. But it is obviously far more than that. Seneca had his personal reasons to dislike Claudius, his eight years of exile is ample proof of that. But the satire continues with a surprising twist. After a brief spell at his dice cup, Claudius becomes a contested piece of property instead of being a condemned sinner. He is claimed as a slave by Caligula, the very Caligula, who had often beaten him in the world above. Aeacus then hands over Claudius to Caligula's custody who finally hands him over to his freedman Menander to serve as his law clerk. Thus Claudius' final fate is to be a mere clerical slave, endlessly involved in others' litigations, as he had been in life, but no longer with the executive power he once possessed. Claudius' degradation is complete.

One of the most common characteristics of Menippean satire is that the world is 'topsy-turvy' and things are not as what they should be. Seneca has already shown that in the world above the Gods are incapable of delivering a fair judgement, and finally it is a deified mortal, Augustus, whose speech turns the sway against Claudius. Moreover, this very heaven is inhabited by Drusilla, whose apotheosis was itself a scandal, receiving divine honours only after Livius Geminius attested to her ascent to heaven, this very same person who is now asserting Claudius' ascent to heaven, as seen in the opening chapters of this satire. There is also the presence of Tiberius, who was never granted divine honours. Thus, in the world above, things are not what they should be, in other words, topsy-turvy. This is the same in the nether world as well. If there was any emperor in the Roman Empire, who deserved the title 'terrible' it is Caligula. He was, both in his character and cruelty, the worst of the Roman emperors. And here he is, Caligula, colluding with Aeacus, 'homo

iustissimus', in meting out 'justice' to Claudius. Seneca, by showing this collusion as well as by showing that how a 'just' judge of Aeacus' character operates by unjust means, suggests that justice is not being served.

Thus Claudius is unworthy of heaven, and so too is he unworthy of hell. He is a 'square peg in a round hole'. The divine apparatus has been shown to be completely incapable of handling his case. This shifts the emphasis from Claudius himself towards the very system that allowed the apotheosis of such a fool. And this is the apotheosis which was practised and approved by Roman political convention. Claudius the fool reveals the foolishness of the two worlds, both the upper and the lower, that have taken upon itself the role of judging him. Scholars have referred to the Apocolocyntosis as a Saturnalian and that it was a work designed to be read at the feast of the Saturnalia, where Claudius is presented as a Saturnalian lord of misrule whose rule has come to an end so that Augustus' Golden Age may return in Nero. This has its points, but it is not the sole purpose of the Apocolocyntosis.

The language which Seneca uses to enhance his satire is characteristic of Menippean satire judging by the subsequent works of Lucianus. First of all, there is the conversational quality which is so typical of Lucianus. The narrator in Seneca's satires uses a constant easy-going conversational tone, first with himself in the opening lines of the work and then with the reader. This is very much similar to the narrator in Lucianus' 'True Story' whose part like in the Apocolocyntosis, is written in the first person and includes comments specifically addressed to the reader. Another characteristic is Seneca's use of colloquial and proverbial language, e.g.: one must be born either a king or a fool in section 1 and : what he did to others may he suffer, that justice may be straight' in section 14. Colloquialisms and examples from vulgar usage abound e.g. the usage of *pauculos* for a handful of people and *capsulam* for the box or container which Clotho's spindles lie in. Seneca refers to Diespiter as a *nummulariosus* who sold *civitatulas*. Even in his prose writing, Seneca was noted for his relative infrequency of the usage of the third person. The 'I' 'Thou' relationshiop is very frequent in his prose works. In this satire, Seneca uses it to great advantage. For example, in section 6, Fever (Febris) is attempting to convince a somewhat obtuse Hercules of Claudius' foolishness. This chapter has only fifteen prose lines, but a simple analysis of it is enough to show Seneca's effective use of the language to enhance a point. It starts thus: *...et imposuerat Herculi minime vafro, nisi fuisse illic Febris...* (...and he would have tricked Hercules, whose mind is far from sharp, if Fever had not been there... The usage of *impono* generally means to impose on someone, but in this context it becomes a slang or colloquial form of 'tricking somebody', is a colloquialism found in Cicero's letters. The indicative here in place of the

usual subjunctive *imposuisset*, is rhetorical exaggeration according to Eden (p.86), whereby what might have happened is vividly presented as a fact. Hercules is decried as *minime vafro* thus leading to the redundancy of the 'I' 'Thou' relationship. Within five lines, Seenca uses, *ego tibi dico*; *quod tibi narro*; *ego tibi recipio.* All this simply enhances the *minime vafro* of Hercules. Finally in a fit of anger Claudius orders Fever's head to be chopped off, employing the verb *decollare* thus also implying the meaning of 'removing a burden from the neck'. Thus we can see how Seneca's use of language contributes to humorous characterization as well as to heighten the attack on Claudius.

Seneca also uses parody for different purposes. The parody on the title itself has already been discussed in the earlier chapters, Also in the beginning of the satire, Seneca has parodied the historian's introduction with its claim to veracity and impartiality in terms used by writers such as Tacitus. By applying Virgil's 'non passibus aequis' to Claudius, Seneca parodies not only Claudius' lameleness but also parodies the concluding judgement in Hades. This judgement is a parody of his own unfair courtroom procedures and his passion for rendering judgement after only one side of the case had been heard. According to Suetonius, Claudius used this practice especially if one party was absent. It is also interesting to note that Seneca also uses quotations from other authors, not using the quotations to parody the authors themselves, but the person quoting them or their intended victim. Examples of this is found in the exchange between Claudius and Hercules. Hercules uses a familiar line from the Odyssey (Od. 1,170) 'τις ποθεν εις ανδρων, ποιη πολις ηδε τοκηες; (Who are you? Where are your city and parents?) (Apoc. 5,19) This naturally delights Claudius who responds with another line from the Odysseus (9, 39): Blown from Ilion by a wind I was brought to the Cicones (5, 24) which the narrator states that this should have been followed by the very next line: and there I sacked a city and wreaked havoc on all (Od. 9,40). This is no parody on Homer but Seneca makes fun of Claudius' penchant for speaking Greek and freely quoting Homer. There is another aspect to this. Seneca seems to be parodying his own tragedies, in this case, the Hercules Furens. In this play, one gets the line *hoc ne peremptus spiculo cecidit puer* (1296) whilst in the satire a similar line in the iambic is quoted by Hercules: *hoc ne peremptus stipite ad terram accidas* (Apoc. 12, 5). The parody in the nenia of the funeral dirge in chap. xii has already been referred to.

The final characteristic of Seneca's language is his effective use of the prosimetric form. The effective use of the prosimetric form achieves one of the salient characteristics of Menippean satire, namely, the contrast of the colloquial, narrative prose with the more heroic mode of poetry, thus pitting the

abstract against the concrete. For one of the features of Menippean satire is to emphasize that what really matters is the concrete and the real. There are four poetic passages, spoken by the narrator (Apoc. section 2 and 4), Apollo (section 6), Hercules (section 7) and a chorus (section 12 ). As has already been shown, the funeral dirge has to be read ironically.
The entire nenia is seemingly profound but what it states is literally not the truth. It begins by asking the people to mourn publicly, but the reader is aware that Claudius' subjects are simply doing the opposite. It portraits Claudius as a man of wisdom, courage and speed, but again we are made to realize that these are the very qualities lacking in Claudius! To me personally, Seneca uses the prosimetirc form for a simple purpose, and uses it effectively. He puts into sharper focus the difference between the way things are and the way they ought to be and pits the abstract against the concrete with an effective use of the hexameter and the iambic trimeter as the occasion and circumstances demand.

The Apocolocyntosis can be considered as one of the most complicated of the Menippean satires. The structure is 'three-storied' and thus represents many Menippean possibilities rolled into one, as it were. Thus it is a pure example of Menippean satire, in fact, the only example of this genre which remains extant as a whole in Latin literature. The combination of a voyage to heaven and a voyage to hell is rare in ancient literature. We have in literature Plato's Er, who sees both heaven and hell as well as Alexander the Great, who flies towards heaven and later descends to the depths of Ocean, wandering in the regions of eternal night but is cheated of the chance to drink the waters of eternal life as is related in the second book of the *Romance.* This Menippean 'setting' is found in Seneca's Apocolocyntosis 'in toto', as it were, whilst the subsequent satires of Lucianus, e.g. his Icaromenippus (with its voyage to heaven) and the Nekyomantia (with its voyage to hell) do not consider the same settings in one unless these two works are viewed as a diptych . In his satire 'True History', which I have referred to briefly in the earlier chapters, when dealing with the 'unreliable source' of the narrator in the prologue of the satire, the sailors in this satire spend seven months at the islands of the blessed and later visit the Island of the Damned where one of their own members is punished. Subsequent examples of a similar structure are rare unless one quotes the early Christian version of *visio Pauli* in which the soul is taken on a guided tour of heaven and hell. Thus this tripartite structure of Seneca's 'Apocolocyntosis' contains one of the main characteristics of Menippean satire.

To assign a single function to the above satire as an exclusive explanation of its contents is to miss the many-sided subtleties of a work in which personal invectives pass smoothly into the criticism of a statesman. Thus it is very

difficult to separate the personal invective of the aggrieved subject, in this case, Seneca himself, from the political criticisms of Claudius. Just as the tripartite structure mentioned in the above paragraph, the function of the Apocolocyntosis can be considered 'tripartite' as well. Even at the expense of a slight digression, the whole structure of the Apocolocyntosis is a superb example of similar repetitions. For example, Claudius is first led from earth to heaven, then returns to earth to witness his own funeral proceedings, and then is finally led to hell. In the satire itself, a third is devoted to the fates and the decision concerning the life-span of Claudius, a third is related to the ascent to heaven and the hearing among the gods, whilst the final third is addressed to the decent to the Underworld and the trial there! Thus this satire can be interpreted from three different aspects, namely, a) the title itself with its references to deification b) the political interpretations and c) the personal motives.

As regards the first point, scholars vary in their interpretations. Some regard this satire as a personal attack of the deification of Claudius, even to have it rescinded. Whilst some interpret the work as a satirical attack on the conventions of imperial apotheosis in general. Coffey, in his article entitled 'Seneca, Apocolyntosis 1922-1958' has catalogued all bibliographical and general studies written on it during the years mentioned. This is an extremely informative and important secondary reference, and is very similar to the compilation made by Eugene P. Kirk, entitled 'Menippean Satire: An Annotated catalogue of Texts and Criticism'. However, certain observations have to be made on these divergent views. Deification of the living and the immediately dead might have given rise to sneering and ribaldry, as e.g. the ultima vox of Vespasian 'Vae, puto deus fio'. Mockery was rife at Claudius'death, and even though the mourning was pretended and had an atmosphere of ridicule and contempt (Tac. Ann,13,3), it was accepted all the same. In this context, Coffey's comment is very pertinent: ' It would be possible to quote from more modern times the funeral oration spoken by a head of state over his predecessor in which it is difficult to distinguish between excessive adulation and implicit ridicule' (op. cit. p. 257). As regards deification, Augustus' attitude in his lifetime was two-fold. He was worshipped in the East as a god in his lifetime, and although he refused divine recognition in the West, he did receive various honours which separated him from the rest of mortals. Tiberius' attitude was also ambiguous. Before the senate he had a mortal's lot, but there was a vague worship of him in Laconia (Ann, 4,48). In his lifetime Claudius also permitted worship of himself. Both Seneca, in his satire, *parum est quod templum in Britannia habet, quod hunc barbari colunt et ut deum orant...* (8. 16-17) as well as Tacitus (Ann, 14,31) attest to this. But in the Apocolocyntosis it has to be remembered that while the mention of

Claudius' temple among the barbarian Britons can evoke ridicule, Seneca's attack is really against Claudius the man, his character and policy and not his deification as such. Even in lifetime, this tendency of emperors being treated as both a human and superhuman was evident. Hence Claudius' formal deification after his death would not have appeared to contemporaries as a departure either from previous tradition or the prevailing trend of his times. I personally cannot see that it was Seneca's intention to undermine the apotheosis of the Caesars, which, after all, was a useful political instrument, especially for Roman control of the East. It is thus difficult to agree with Duff's conclusion that the Apcolocyntosis was a moral and philosophical attack on emperor worship in general. This, naturally, does not mean that apotheosis could not be used to evoke some humour or even be treated as a joke especially when associated with an individual of Claudius' characteristics!

Suetonius presents Claudius as a misshapen, cruel person who murdered knights and senators, debased the citizenship and was ruled by ambitious wives and insolent freedmen. All of these characteristics, except for the wives perhaps, are evident in Seneca's Apocolocyntosis. Suetonius's judgement on Claudius is also evident in Dio as well as in the incomplete accounts of Tacitus. Coffey in the compilation quoted above (p. 257) cites an article written by M.P. Charlesworth for the Cambridge Ancient History, entitled Gaius and Claudius, where the author has assembled documentary evidence from papyri and inscriptions to reassess the reign of Claudius which seem to indicate a forceful and efficient government by Claudius. This has led to scholars to a reassess their points of view. While admitting Claudius' vicious policy towards the knights and senators and Claudius' acceptance of the corruption of his entourage of freedmen, Claudius, nonetheless, is represented as an emperor who had an ideal of justice who used lessons from history to justify a fundamental change of policy where the needs of the empire demanded. Even Suetonius states (Cl. 38) that Claudius admitted in a number of works that he affected stupidity in order to survive the terrible reign of Caligula. Claudius, naturally, was not believed and as proof a work with a Greek title μωρων επαναστασις or 'The Elevation of Fools' whose point was that stupidity could not be affected, was quoted. Be this as it may, a political function in the Apocolocyntosis can be seen in the attack on Claudius for executing thirty-five senators and 221 knights (14, 3-5), for extending the franchise to provincials *constituerat enim omnes Graecos, Gallos, Hispanos, Britannos togatos videre*, for travesties of the law-court procedure (vide section 12), and for failing to control arrogant freedmen *putares omnes illius esse libertos: adeo illum nemo curabat*). These attacks are confirmed in detail by Suetonius. That Seneca should attack the killing of senators and knights is not very surprising for he himself escaped the threat of execution in 41 A.D.

Whether Seneca saw these killings as a depletion of the governing class is a moot point. In attacking Claudius' extension of franchise as seen in section 3, one gets the impression that Roman citizenship, with the privileges it conferred, had been devalued by a wholesale gift. Seneca no doubt reflected the view of his contemporaries who saw dangers in such a policy. Personally I consider that Claudius should be commended for it, but my view can easily reflect a modern point of view. Where travesties of law-court procedure are concerned, Claudius did arrogate for himself judicial functions which belonged elsewhere and made a mockery of justice through his caprices, making a profit for corrupt barristers (12.2). Thus it is in this light that one can view Nero's promise (Tac. Ann, 13,4 and Suetonius. Nero 10,1.) in his speech to the senate that such abuses would cease. It is facetiously stated that Nero regretted his inability to read and write when he had to sign a death warrant! Nero promised to rule 'ex Augusti praescripto' and the senate and the princeps were to revert to the division of powers established by Augustus. Nero would not himself sit in judgement on all matters. Nero's inaugural address to the senate was not the result of any enlightenment on his part, but Seneca had written the speech for him (Tac. Ann, 14,11,4). Seneca held enormous power during these times, and the policy statements which Nero detailed were really his and thus he practically framed Nero's programme which was culminated by addressing to Nero his De clementia. In this serious treatise to Nero, Seneca makes an urgent plea for due process in law, for toleration and for clemency as concerns the *princeps'* treatment of his peoples. This has it's connection to the dawn of the Golden age which Seneca predicted in his Apocolocyntosis: *talis Caesar adest, talem iam Roma Neronem*

*aspiciet...* (4,30-31)

However, one should realize the danger of attaching a didactic purpose to the Apocolocyntosis. If a didactic purpose is inferred, I would say that this is very remote and secondary. For this is based on the theory that the main function of satire in general is to teach, and thus whatever is being taught ought to be clearly presented and obvious to the average reader. Those who hold such a view are determined to find the 'message' of any given satire and usually expect all satires to be like those of Juvenal's. One has to remember that the 'De clementia' was a treatise instructing the young emperor in merciful rule, and thus one does not need to delve into the Apocolocyntosis to find didactic 'messages'. This is not to say, however, that there is nothing to be learned from such a satire, but that instruction, if it is the aim of the satirist at all, may very well be only one aim among many and may be veiled in subtle ways.

In addition to these political criticisms, however, Seneca had his personal reasons as well. At the beginning of Claudius' reign he had been banished to Corsica on the charge of having slept with Julia Livilla, the Emperor's niece in

41 A.D. Most probably, this was a trumped up charge. Thus during his years of exile, in spite of his adulation of Claudius in the *Consolatio* dedicated to the imperial freedman Polybius, he would hardly have felt any affection for Claudius. One of Seneca's motives in writing this satire was to gain some vengeance on the person who had deprived him of life in Rome for many of his best years. The satire is bitterly malicious but it is understandably so for Seneca had a legitimate reason for revenge. Scholars like Weinrich and Wight Duff jump the gun, as it were, in associating Seneca's vindictiveness with his Spanish blood. Moreover, some scholars are of the view that Seneca was of Italian or near-Italian stock, possibly Etruscan or Illyrian. Miriam Griffin claims that Seneca was of Italian immigrant stock, 'Hispaniensis' not Hispanus'. Be this as it may, the evocation of Spain is too facile an explanation, and quoting 'Spanish blood' has almost become a cliché. As Coffey quite rightly points out, Spain is too often associated by the modern reader with the Inquisition, melodramatic drama and bull-fights!

## 10. Lucianus of Samosata

Branham in his interesting book entitled *Unruly influence : Lucian and the Comedy of Traditions (p. 11)* quite appropriately cites Erasmus' preface to his translation of Lucianus' *Cock* as an epigraph. In this introduction, Erasmus states: As Horace wrote, the author who combines pleasure with utility has achieved true perfection. In my opinion, if anyone has accomplished this, it is our Lucian.

Modern scholarship has been greatly influenced by Rudolf Helm's famous book *Lucian und Menipp* where Helm, after a detailed analysis of Lucianus' satiric dialogues came to a conclusion that Lucianus was a slavish imitator of Menippus, often epitomizing Menippean originals or expanding single scenes from them. One of the most spirited articles in defence of Lucianus to Helm's book is to be found in Barbara McCarthy's article entitled *Lucian and Menippus* where she proves that Lucianus was no slavish imitator of Menippus and that the 'comic-dialogue' was an invention of Lucianus himslef. The purpose of this study is neither to refute or defend Helm's claim of Lucianus slavish imitator of Menippus, but there is one observation to be made. From time immemorial the use themes and ideas written by others has been accepted as long as they were not direct plagiarisms. This is one of the most common and accepted features of classical music, where for example, composers used themes of their predecessors as variations (muunnelmat). Thus we have Bach, Brahms or even the modern composer Lloyd Webber whose variations on themes of Vivaldi, Haydn and Paganini do not by any means suggest plagiarism, but, on the contrary, show their originality and individuality in their presentations of these themes. It is in this light that I prefer to consider the satires of Lucianus vis-à-vis those of Menippus. The ancients did not look on literary imitation in the same light as the moderns do. To borrow ideas from the common treasury of past literature was a perfectly legitimate procedure as long as they were apt. However, there is no gainsaying the fact that Helm's is a very important and major work. In his article on Menippean satire as a literary genre (p. 18), Riikonen admits that almost every one of the characteristics attributed by Bakhtin to Menippean satire is to be found in some form or another in Helm's study but considers that Bakhtin's great achievement was that he gathered together dispersed observations made by classical philologists and gave them a more coherent format.

Lucianus was born at Samosata, Syria, now the village of Samsat in Turkey shortly before 117 A.D.. Of the 80 prose works traditionally attributed to him, about 10 are considered spurious. His writings are famous for their mordant and malicious wit, often the criticism being levelled at the shams and follies of the literature, philosophy and intellectual life of his day. He satirized almost every aspect of human behaviour and one of his favourite topics was man's failure to realize the transience of greatness and wealth. This Cynic theme permeates throughout his Dialogues. He also regarded those philosophers who failed to practice what they preached to be the worst charlatans. Thus in his satire the Banquet, he gives an amusing account of an imaginary wedding feast given by a patron of the arts. Among the guests are representatives of every philosophical school, who all behave outrageously and finally end up being so drunk that they start fighting over delicacies to take home when the party comes to as end! Another common theme of Lucianus was the folly of bargaining with gods by sacrifices and the love of telling or listening to strange tales. A superb example of this is his Vera Historia, which starts by warning the reader that its events are completely untrue and impossible and then goes on to describe a voyage that starts on the sea, continues in the skies, and includes visits to the belly of a whale and to the Elysian fields. The tale is a satirical parody of all those fantastic travellers' tales that strain human credulity. The First Men in the Moon by H.G. Wells can be considered to be remote descendant of the Vera Historia and thus one can even say that Lucianus was even a fore-runner of modern science fiction! Be this as it may, the Vera Historia was one of the satires which aroused the Christian wrath, since it was considered to be a malicious parody of the Jonah tale. Thus it is in this light the following excerpt from the earliest surviving biography of Lucianus in a tenth-century encyclopaedia, cited by Paul Turner in his book entitled 'Satirical sketches' (p. 1) has to be taken:

Lucian of Samosata, otherwise known as Lucian the Blasphemer, or the Slanderer, or, more accurately, the Atheist, because in his dialogues he even makes fun of religion...The filthy brute attacks Christianity and blasphemes Christ himself. So he was adequately punished in this world, and in the next he will inherit eternal fire with Satan.

As prolific a writer as he was, there is practically no mention of him by his contemporaries, nor was the age in which he lived an age of erudite scholarship. Thus the scholar is forced to glean the meagre facts about him from his own works. In his short autobiographical piece, *The Dream*, Lucianus contrasts his present success with his humble origin as a person who finally rose to fame through the mastery of rhetorical skills. The recurrent word he uses here is the powers of παιδεια (education, learning). Branham (p. 28) considers this dream which Lucianus 'remembers' to be a comic

transfiguration of the famous Choice of Heracles as mentioned by Xenophon in his *Anabasis.* Lucianus, in his own humorous style ends this piece by imagining someone in the audience exclaiming: What a long-winded dream this is! Does he take us for dream interpreters? (l. 17). Also, in the *Bis Accusatus* mentioned later in more detail, Lucianus is referred to as the 'Syrian' as well as the misunderstood literary innovator.

The second-century A.D. was the age of the 'Second Sophistic' which produced rhetoricians and philosophers but whose lectures were often trivial and looked back to the fifth and fourth century Greece for their themes and characters. The doctrine of Imitation took priority over others. This was one of the main features of the politics and culture in the Greek world of the first three centuries A.D, where the words and deeds of Classical Greece were much emphasized. The importance of philosophy during this period was enhanced by the Stoic Emperor, Marcus Aurelius, Plato's prescription for an ideal government as given in his Republic had been dispensed and a philosopher was king. Aurelius established Chairs of Phiolosophy throughout the Empire for the four chief schools, the Stoics, the Epicureans, the Academics and the Peripatetics, but the three others, the Pythagoreans, the Sceptics and the Cynics were immensely active, although receiving no state patronage. Simon Swain explores all this in his book entitled Hellenism and Empire : Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250. In this book he handles many of the major Greek authors of the second sophistic. In his biography of Alexander, Lucianus refers to Aurelius as 'his late majesty Marcus Aurelius' so his own death must have occurred after 180 A.D.

The works of Lucianus range from biography and essay to dialogue and narrative. Thus, on the one hand, we find such non-satirical works as his encomia, introductory lectures, rhetorical exercises and biographies. Perhaps his most serious work is an essay entitled How to Write History which is didactic in tone. However, the dialogues of Lucianus are by far the largest group of his writings, although the subjects can be multiple and varied, as e.g. friendship, athletics, or a descent into Hades. Thus the dialogues have been considered the most important of Lucianus' works, not only from a literary standpoint, but also as examples of Menippean satire. Firstly, several of Lucianus' dialogues bear names similar to those of Menippus' works, secondly, it is in the dialogues that we find that combination of prose and verse which scholars considered to be the hallmark of Menippean satire in antiquity since Quintilian mentioned it as a characteristic of Varro's Menippean satires, and thirdly, his dialogues, more than his other works, possess the same Cynic philosophy associated with Menippus. The majority of the dialogues present us with only two speakers, but the participants in the dialogue vary from gods,

men, and even abstractions like philosophy. The dialogues can take place anywhere - on earth, beneath it or above it, although the exact setting is seldom specified. It is interesting to note that Lucianus himself rarely appears in these dialogues, with the exception of perhaps, Bis Accusatus, a character by the name of Lycinus appears in a number them and scholars more or less agree that Lycinus shares the same mentality as Lucianus.

Lucianus's Bis Accusatus or the Double Indictment has been considered one of the *loci classici* for Lucianus's debt to Menippus. In the Dialogue, Rhetoric and Dialogue both bring suit against the Syrian, alias Lucianus, for desertion and ill-treatment. Dialogue finally brings forward the charge for being forced to play the comedian. As he states: Then he unceremoniously penned me with Jest and Satire and Cynicism and Eupolis and Aristophanes, terrible men for mocking all that is holy and scoffing for all that is right. At last he even dug and thrust in upon me Menippus, a prehistoric dog with a very loud bark and sharp fangs, a really dreadful dog who bites unexpectedly because he grins when he bites...What is most monstrous of all, I have been turned into a surprising blend that is neither prose nor verse...a strange phenomenon made up of different elements like a Centaur (Bis. Acc. 33. transl. Harmon, Lucian (Loeb ed.), 3, 147). Lucianus fully agrees that he has adopted Dialogue for his own purposes, but only in order to make Dialogue more attractive and agreeable to the public. Implied here is a typical Lucianic attack on philosophical dialogue which does not see the ordinary realities.

As one reads through the dialogues of Lucianus, several themes catch the reader's attention because of their constant repetition: the pettiness and uselessness of the gods; the current charlatanism of philosophers and the hopelessness of ever achieving any useful knowledge through philosophy; the folly of man in pursuing wealth and power, pursuits which cannot lead to happiness in this life and which must be given up in the next. All of the Lucianic dialogues which treat of the underworld emphasize this theme over and over again and Lucianus never tires in presenting the reader with disillusioned men who are forced to leave wealth and power all behind. Of all his dialogues, the Dialogues of the Dead are most critical and satirical. These thirty works are short and deal with a variety of themes, but all use the setting of the underworld and its reductions of human beings to the same penniless, powerless state thus pointing out the folly of accumulating material possessions while still on earth. The Cynic philosopher Menippus appears in more than one-third of these dialogues and in every case he is the example of the Cynic philosophy of simple life. But what is interesting to note in the Dialogues of the Dead is that Menippus is sent on a voyage to a comic underworld from which he shall not return and in which his Cynic wisdom ultimately does him very

little good. If, as Helm tries to make out in his Lucian und Menipp, Lucianus was just a slavish imitator of Menippus, he would hardly have been presented in this light. Six other dialogues take up another favourite Lucianic and Cynic theme, namely, the worthlessness and charlatanism of philosophers. In all these dialogues, Lucianus does not attack philosophy as such or philosophers of the past, but those philosophers of his day who pretend to follow in the footsteps of their mentors but who do not practice what they preach. In this respect, Lucianus is not unlike Juvenal, who some fifty years earlier was satirizing this same sort of hypocrisy in Rome. The second satire of Juvenal is a good example of such castigation.

After this general introduction to Lucianus, it is my intention to analyze two of his satires, entitled the Necyomantia and Icaromenippus which are commonly regarded as bearing the closest relation of any of Lucianus' work to a work of Menippus; the model being Menippus' Nekyia. Forming the trilogy is the Cataplous, or the Downward Journey, which also was deeply influenced by the Nekyia of Menippus. The former is really entitled Μενιππος η Νεκυομαντεια (Menippus, or the Consultation of the Dead) and the latter, Ικαρομενιππος η Υπερνεφελος (Menippus the New Icarus, or Over the rainbow). The Icaromenippus is generally considered to be an independent reworking of the motifs of the Nekyia, the difference here is that the setting is transferred to a heavenly voyage. It is common to consider these two satires as a diphtyh. I have chosen these two satires for the simple reason that I consider them to represent and illustrate similar themes and features found in both Seneca's Apocolocyntosis and Erasmus' Julius Exclusus.

Both these satires are a fantastic narration delivered by a comic and questionable character to a stolid interlocutor who is slow to grasp the meaning of what he hears. One is immediately reminded of Seneca's Apococyntosis where the narrator is also unreliable and what he states is questionable. The unreliable narrator is a common characteristic in Lucianic satire, and the Vera Historia mentioned above also bears this point out. In both these satires, Menippus has recently returned from a fantastic voyage, from Hades in the former and Olympus in the latter. In the Nekyomantia, the Cynic, Menippus, who has just returned from Hades is still wearing the costume of his καταβασις or descent - Odysseus' cap, Orpheus' lyre and the lion skin of Hercules, and is still so dazed by his return to the light and by his recent association with the great poets in Hades, that he can talk nothing but verse. He explains this as a natural consequence of just having seen Homer and Euripides. Thus metrical speech has taken control over him. As regards to the attire, Relihan (p. 45) mentions the fragment *Suda* (φαιος) which says that he went about pretending to be an emissary from the underworld as an observer of

human sins to be later reported to the authorities below. He is said to have dressed like a figure from tragedy, a grey ankle-length coat with a purple belt around it; an Arcadian cap with twelve signs of the Zodiac woven into it on his head; tragic boots; an immense beard and an ashen staff in his hand... Thus both the dress and the speech establish the narrator as absurd. One is almost reminded of the Apocolocyntosis, where Hercules, on seeing Claudius thought that his thirteenth labour was at hand, such was the shock the physical appearance of Claudius gave him (Apoc. 5, 15-29). To add to the humour, Hercules also addresses him in metrical style.

In the Icaromenippus, Menippus is a comic lost in thought, mumbling about interplanetary distances. Here again the interlocutor is shown as obtuse and slow on the uptake. He thinks that Menippus is relating a dream and mocks him asking him whether he was a new Ganymede and where he got such a long ladder! In both works , Menippus is about to explain what he has learned in the other world but first is persuaded to give the preliminary details. This appeal to detail with the corroboration of a fantastic story, has its precedence in Seneca's Apocolocyntosis as well in the detailed description of a fantastic trip as related by the narrator at the beginning of the satire. In Lucianus, we are presented with a character who is both naive and simple. Although Menippus is searching for the truth and at the beginning, as is seen in both these satires, asks the correct questions, he is easily side-tracked and forgets what he started the search for in the first place. As he himself states in the Nekyomantia (19, 3-5) he had lost sight of his true purpose. Thus he returns to earth with no real answer to his original questions and from the standpoint of the reader, what he brings back is nothing of any importance. According to Harmon (Loeb ed. p. 268), that is why Menippus is compared with Icarus and not Daedalus in the title.

In both satires intellectual dissatisfaction with the world and the philosophers' contradictory views of it lead to a desire to arrive at the truth. This is one of the most characteristic features of Menippean satire: that things in the world are not as what they really should be, in other words, that the world is topsy-turvy. By effective use of the 'other-world' setting, both Seneca and Erasmus drive home this point. The motives and the presentation of each author can be different, but this is one of the underlying themes of all the three authors examined in this study.

In the Necyomantia, Menippus perplexed by the poets' stories about the gods, goes on to the philosophers to find out how to live. Their disagreements convince him that the life of the ordinary person is best. As he very succinctly states: ωστε μοι ταχιστα χρυσουν απεδειξαν ουτοι τον των ιδιωτων

τουτον βιον - so that they speedily convinced me that the ordinary man's way of life is golden (4, 10-11). He also finds that they do not practise what they preach and finally realizing his ignorance decides to go to Babylon to find a magus who can take him to the underworld. There follows a description of the sacred rights and ceremonies by which the magician, Mithrobarzanes, prepared him for his journey, and the disguise Menippus dons for his trip, the cap of Odysseus, the lion skin of Heracles and the lyre of Orpheus, has some similarity to Dionysus' use of Heracles' lion-skin in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes.

What Menippus finally sees in Hades is an interesting feature of this satire. Harmon, in his introduction to the Loeb edition (p. 71) considers that the unity of the dialogue is madly marred because of Lucianus' usage of a 'double-point' as he calls it, where the thrust is aimed at not only the philosophers but at the rich. I do not necessarily agree with this point. As has been shown, Menippus gets easily side-tracked, and often digresses forgetting his real purposes. As in seen in section 19 of the *Nekyomanteia*, Menippus admits that he had lost sight of the object of his narration. Indictment against the uses and abuses of power and wealth as well as their worthlessness is a typical feature of Menippean satire, and Lucianus time and again repeats it. Both Seneca and Erasmus, have also shown this in their personification of Claudius and Julius in their satires. Thus Lucianus simply uses the situation to emphasize this. One must remember that this was a typical theme of the Cynics. Logically one would have expected, in accordance with the introduction, that Menippus would find the philosophers being punished for their quackness and disease. But it does not happen that way. It is the wealthy and the powerful, the informers, tax-collectors, and money-lenders, who are on trial, not the philosophers. Menippus in his tale reports that Minos dealt most harshly with those who were endowed with power and wealth, and stripped them naked of their money, their families and power. Kings and satraps are reduced to abject poverty, to selling salt fish and teaching the alphabet. Philip of Macedon cobbles shoes and the Xerxeses and Dariuses of history are begging at the cross-roads. What is interesting to note is that here there is a touch to the conclusion which we have seen in Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis.* One sinner is finally reprieved. Dionysius, the tyrant of Sicily, is saved from being remanded to the custody of the Chimaera by Aristippus the Cyrenaic philosopher, who points out that Dinoysius had been kind to philosophers for a fee. So does Claudius finally get a reprieve from the original punishments suggested and finally ends up being the 'court-clerk' to one of his freedmen! Thus the point here is that again justice, even in Hades, is in shambles, and no true justice is meted, the moral order of Hades, to which Menippus turns for guidance, is topsy-turvy. It also shows the influence the philosophers wielded in the world above, where even the tyrant of Sicily finally receives a mitigation in Hades.

Menippus next proceeds to the place of punishment where people of all walks of life are tortured for their failings and then proceeds to the Acheronian Plain where the heroes lie, but Lucianus with his brilliant humour describes Menippus' obeservation as follows: So, with many skeletons lying together, all alike staring horridly and vacuously and baring their teeth, I questioned myself how I could distinguish Thersites from handsome Nireus, or the mendicant Irus from the King of Phaeacians, or the cook Pyrrhias from Agamemnon. (Nek. ch. 15. transl. Harmon). Naturally the point of Lucianus is to show the *illusory* nature of all distinctions between men. This is made more poignant in the very next scene (ch. 16) where Lucianus uses a theatrical simile in which the goddess Τυχη determines the roles: So as I looked at them it seemed to me that human life is like a long pageant, and that all its trappings are supplied and distributed by Fortune, who arrays the participants in various costumes of many colours. Taking one person...she attires him royally, placing a tiara upon his head; but upon another she puts the costume of a slave...Again, she makes up one person so that he is handsome, but causes another to be ugly and ridiculous... . The irony here is that the stage metaphor is thrown into highlight considering the costume Menippus himself is wearing This universal error of self-delusion is a typical theme of Menippean satire and it is shown in different degrees in all the satires which are mentioned in this study. This particular aspect is emphasized in Teiresias' advice to Menippus, namely, that the life of the ordinary man is the best.!. Thus although Harmon from a modern and logical point of view was correct in stating that this 'double-point' has marred the unity of the dialogue, I do not necessarily agree with this, because Lucianus, being imbued with the Cynic philosophy, is simply killing 'two birds with one stone'.!

In the Icaromenippus, he takes an eagle's wing for his right arm and vulture's wing for his left and proceeds to give himself flying lessons. Halfway in his flight, he gets weak and rests on the moon. Thus the setting is two-storied, where there is an interlude on the moon and final interview in heaven. Here he meets Empedocles, the notorious fraudulent philosopher, who had been blown there from Mount Etna, who tells him how to gain eyesight sharp enough to see the actions on the earth below. Thus Menippus redons the eagle's wing and discovers that he has gained eagle-sharp eyesight in his right eye. This one-eyed observation from the moon paves the way for *catascopia*. The irony and the humour here lies in the fact that Menippus is at such a height that he cannot see and depends upon the advise of a fraudulent philosopher and the wing of an eagle to prove his primary quest, namely, the absurdity of philosophers. Just as life was compared to a stage in the Nekyomantia, here life is compared to an anthill. But what Menippus does not realize is that it seems so because he is looking down from such a great height. Thus when a wealthy landowner is said

to farm an area about the size of an Epicurean atom (section 18), the reader is made to realize that this is due to the fact that the narrator, from such a height, is subjecting the world to an absurd scrutiny which was typical of the scrutiny which the philosophers were wont to give.

Both these satires end with Menippus consulting with some other-worldly figure about the nature of this world, with a council of divinities issuing a proclamation. In the Nekyomantia the reader is told that after death the bodies of the rich are to be tortured and their souls sent back to live in donkeys for a quarter of a million years, in which form they will be subject to the poor. Just as in the Apocolocyntosis, the punishment does not seem to fit the crime. In the Icaromenippus, before he leaves for Olympus, the Moon herself gives a message to be taken to Zeus. She is upset with the conflicting theories that the natural scientists had told about her and would like all philosophers to be destroyed. She has all the more reason for wishing so since she can observe their immoralities at night. The lives and the theories of the philosophers, were after all, the primary reason for Menippus' journey and in a sense, Menippus is no longer bringing his personal outrage to Heaven, but becomes a messenger to the outraged Moon as well. As was Rhadamanthus in the Nekyomantia, and Hercules in the Apocolocyntosis, the gods are frightened at seeing Menippus in their midst. In Olympus, Zeus promises to answer Menippus' questions the following day and goes off to his audience to listen to the prayers of mortals. The scene here is very amusing. The gods are again depicted as being completely useless and powerless. Zeus asks how the weather is on earth, and when one later realizes that he is the one who controls it, the absurdity of the question is obvious. In this humorous vein the scene continues. At the feast, to which Menippus is invited, he is provided with mortal food while the gods enjoy their nectar and ambrosia, and the blood and smoke of sacrifice. The gods fall asleep and Menippus, in his sleeplessness wonders how there can be night in heaven and why Apollo does not yet have a beard. At the council of the Gods, we again hear of the hypocrisy and moral worthlessness of the philosophers and the complaints of Moon, which Menippus has also conveyed, are judged right and proper. Various suggestions are made as to how to destroy the philosophers. Here we have a similarity in situation in the judgement of Claudius in both Heaven and Hell, and the satire ends on a uncertain note with Zeus deciding that it is sacrilegious to kill the philosophers at such a holy time and concludes with a promise to exterminate them at the beginning of the spring.

A similar situation of delusion arises in the Icaromenippus where the philosophers whom Menippus selects and pays only lead him to greater uncertainty and thus comes to the conclusion that their theorizing about the

stars is really an impertinence since they cannot see clearly what is at their feet.. Both journeys are shown to be a pursuit of useless knowledge. Before Menippus started his journey to Hades, he already knew that the life of the ordinary man is the best, in fact, golden, and this moral is repeated to him by the seer Teiresias in section 21. The irony and humour lies in the fact Teiresias, the blind seer can see what Menippus has already seen and observed on earth but cannot really grasp and thus he comes back to earth no more wiser than he was before. In both these satires Menippus relates the events of a fantastic voyage to people who will neither be impressed by his voyage nor his sources, for that matter. Even those who assisted him in achieving this fantastic voyage are not credulous in his quest against pointless philosophical speculation.

It should be noted in the structure of these two satires, that Lucianus models himself on Greek Old Comedy. In the Necyomantia, the pattern is similar to the *Frogs* while that of Icaromenippus to *Peace* of Aristophanes. The similarity ends here with Lucianus using his models in his own innovative way. In the *Icaromenippus* the plot progresses by Lucianus' brilliant use of *catascopia*. The higher he goes, the further removed from reality it is. First Menippus, then the Moon, then Zeus and finally the Divine Council take their turns at grappling with a problem which only ends up with pointless speculation. In both these satires, the support of the other world has been enlisted *bona fide* where Menippus was concerned, but the end result proves useless. The final scene of the *Icaromenippus* ends with Menippus telling his friend that he is going to the Stoa Poikile to tell the Peripatetics the good news, but the reader is left in a quandary. He does not even know whether the good news is the disapproval of the Moon and the Olympian gods or whether it is the deferred punishment of the scientists and philosophers. In the *Nekyomantia* Menippus witnesses the judgement of the wealthy dead but the situation also reveals corruption when we learn of the reprieve granted to the tyrant Dionysius. The satire shows that the machinery of Hades is inadequate to prove the triumph of justice and the rightful exaltation of the poor over the rich. The poor too are punished but they have half of their sentences remitted, which meant that they were given a rest from time to time before the resumption of their punishment. This underworld, at least in meting justice is no more different from that presented by Seneca in his Apocolocyntosis. The conclusion of the Nekyomantia is thus very fitting in the advice given by Teiresias: ...παραδραμης γελων τα πολλα και περι μηδεν εσπουδακως. *Hasten on your way, laughing a great deal and taking nothing seriously (sect. 21)*

Lucianus was at his peak in popularity during the Renaissance, well attested by Erasmus' and More's translation of his works. However modern scholarship has awoken to Lucianus, as it were, and has given him the due which he should

have deserved a long time back. Branham in his book entitled *Unruly Eloquence : Lucian and the comedy of traditions* has made a valuable case for Lucianus' rhetorical virtuosity and the contemporary appeal he has.

# 11. Desiderius Erasmus

## 11.1 Introduction

I have to make a brief explanation regarding the citations quoted. Most of them refer to his letters, which give a very detailed insight into his life, opinions and the times he lived in. Unfortunately he wrote over 2000 of them, which fill over 1932 columns in the famous Leyden edition and eleven volumes in the complete edition of P.S. Allen's 'Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami'. Some, of course, were written by Erasmus to himself! Many authors, in their citations, have been content to quote the letter ( e.g. Ep. 1259) and I will be following a similar procedure in my citations of the letters. All the citations are from Allen.

Martin Luther, although he never met Erasmus personally, is reputed to have stated that Erasmus was like an eel (ankerias) and that nobody could grasp him, except one person, Jesus Christ himself! Luther, of course, had his personal vendetta against Erasmus, but I understand his point of view. Erasmus eluded all classifications and there is something hard to fathom about him. If I myself were to take an example from the marine kingdom, I would rather call Erasmus an octopus, whose tentacles reached and grasped every strata of the times he lived in. A superb example of this is his famous satire 'Moriae encomium' where everyone, from the schoolmaster to the pope, came under the whiplash of his satire, a work so elusive, that it can be interpreted on many levels.

## 11.2 His life

The life of Erasmus reflects the world of the last thirty years of the fifteenth century and the first thirty years of the sixteenth. His letters and writings show us the Netherlands, Paris, Oxford and Cambridge, northern Italy, Rome, the cities of the Rhineland and Basle. Through him we meet the personalities of his age and have an insight into life in the cities. Because the church and religion played a large role in his life, popes, bishops and monasteries became the focus of his attention, thus forming the bulk of his work.

The exact date of his birth is uncertain, he was born at Rotterdam, on October 27th most probably in 1466 or 1469. Erasmus himself, in his 'Compendium vitae', indicated many different years but he could have been purposely indefinite for the reasons given in the following paragraph. In modern times, however, the year 1969 marked the fifth centenary of the birth-date of Erasmus.

Erasmus was the son of a priest, Gerard or Gerrit, who was a native of Gouda, a town in Holland about 25 km from Rotterdam. Gerard disregarded the vow of celibacy, betrayed a maiden named Margeret, the daughter of a physician, resulting in Erasmus and his elder brother Pieter being born out of wedlock. The legal impediment of his illegitimacy weighed heavily on Erasmus during his entire life. It was this circumstance that induced Erasmus to throw a smoke-screen around his youth for he felt his origin to be a shame. His baptismal name, Erasmus, was taken from one of the fourteen auxiliary saints who were popular in the fifteenth century; 'Roterodamus' was added from his birthplace, Rotterdam.

Little is known of his youth. He went to school in Gouda and some years later attended the school of the chapter of St. Lebuinus in Deventer. Here he was exposed to 'devotio moderna', a lay religious movement emphasizing education. After his father's death, the two brothers were sent to monasteries by their guardians, Erasmus to Steyn, near Gouda, which belonged to the order of the Augustinian canons. He became an Augustinian canon at Steyn and was ordained a priest in 1492. His first work, 'De contemptu mundi' was written during this time.

## 11.3 His travels and major works

Although Erasmus had the opportunity to study the classics at the monastery, he felt the constraint of monastic life. Thus in 1493 he became secretary to the bishop of Cambrai, Hendrik van Bergen. The post at the Bishop's court did not suit him, nor did it give him the opportunity to study and he found himself travelling around the southern Netherlands in the entourage of the Bishop. Thus, he was glad when he secured permission to study theology at the University of Paris where he attended the College de Montaigu under the rectorship of Jan Standonck. His stay was a disappointment for he was affronted by the dogmatic theologians and their hostility towards new methods. In Paris (1495), he wrote a dialogue defending the rights of the study of 'bonae litterae'. This work was called 'Antibarbari' and the problems posed in this were different from those of 'De contemptu mundi'. Monastic life no longer

played an important role, for now the question was a larger one, whether classical civilization and learning could be linked to the Christian Faith. Erasmus always upheld the view of the fusion between 'bonae litterae' and 'sacrae litterae'. In other words, to turn to the beautiful literature of the past was not to turn away from Christianity and Christian values, as the enemies of the classics said, but that all that is great in human thought can be turned to the glory of God. The list of ancient classical authors edited and translated by Erasmus is long and varied and includes Aristotle, Cicero, Demosthenes, Euripides, Lucian, Ovid, Seneca, and Plautus, to name but a few. The 'Antibarbari' is his first work in a dialogue form, a form which he was later to handle in such masterly fashion in the 'Colloquies'.

The years 1499-1500 saw his first visit to England. What Erasmus really wanted was to study in reasonable comfort and he saw his various employments only to that end. Thus in 1499 he accepted the offer of William Blount, 4th Baron Mountjoy, to travel with him to England as his tutor. This visit to England was of decisive importance to Erasmus who made friends there with Thomas More, John Colet and William Grocyn. It is worthwhile noting that despite his often acid criticisms of England and the English, their barbarism, their weather and their beer, the country fascinated him and drew him back again and again, no doubt, due to his friendship with More, Colet, as well as the patronage of Archbishop William Warham. He left England in 1500, having relinquished his earnings to the customs at Dover (much to his dismay), and produced a collection of over 800 proverbs, which was to become the germ of his great Adagia. The Adagia finally amounted to over 3000 proverbs collected from classical authors. It was an anthology of prose and poetry containing details from the daily life of the ancient world, leading to a philosophic idea or to a discussion of the burning questions of the day. The Greek quotations were always translated into Latin so the book became a kind of Greek reader as well. The Adagia together with his literary sketch-book, the Colloquia, established his reputation as the foremost scholar in northern Europe.

In the ensuing years, 1501-15, Erasmus travelled from one country to another: 1500-1, Paris and Orleans, 1501-4 the Netherlands, 1504-5 Paris, 1506-9 Italy, and 1509-14 England. The years which followed saw him involved with his work on the Greek New Testament where alongside the Greek text he placed his own elegant Latin version. Erasmus spent the years 1517-21 at Louvain and during this period his correspondence greatly increased and he became one of the most prolific letter writers among the Humanists. He finally settled down at Basle. Perhaps Basle was the most satisfying to him of his many abiding places. From there he published a great series of works. He died in Basel on

July 12, 1536 at the house of Frobenius, his faithful publisher. This just shows that Erasmus became alienated from his original environment and after 1504 he never lived in the Netherlands again. I quote an epigraph cited by Joseph Mangan in his book: Life, Character and Influence of Erasmus.

*Hic iacet Erasmus, qui bonus erat mus;*
*rodere qui solitus, roditur a vermibus*

## 11.4 Erasmus as a satirist

### 11.4.1 The concept of satire in the sixteenth century

Satire, as the concept was understood in the sixteenth century, covered any sort of commentary on personal or social behaviour or values. It occupied a territory between serious moral discourse on the other one hand, and on the other, lampoon, direct verbal assault on named or easily identifiable individual persons. It often makes ridicule its weapon, using exaggeration and fantasy as well. Thus there is no great difference between the concept of satire in Roman times and that of the sixteenth century.

### 11.4.2. The satires of Erasmus

One can attribute at least six works which can be considered as important examples of Erasmus' satire in the context of the explanation given above. They reveal a great deal about Erasmus' attitudes to the moral questions of his time. Joseph Mangan gives a detailed insight into the life of Erasmus, e.g., his financial difficulties (pp.113-161) which often led to his seeking new patrons (pp.162-176) etc. Thus, his first satire, the *Panegyricus* for the Archduke Philip of Austria was primarily written out of this joint need for money and prestige. This essay, deriving from Pliny's panegyric of the emperor Trajan, celebrates the return of Philip of Burgundy from his journey to Spain. This treads a fine line between royal flattery and a serious statement about the exercise of political power. Erasmus never liked writing it, but monetary and reasons for prestige overcame. In his letters (ep. 178, 179) he complains that Pliny's task was easier, since Trajan's achievements were great, to say the least. The *Moriae encomium*, eventually Erasmus' most famous work , is a bitter attack on certain elements of Church doctrine and practice. The *Institutio principis Christiani* contains Erasmus's model of an ideal Christian ruler, with the precepts for education and their practical application. The adage *Dulce bellum inexpertis* and *Querela pacis* provided Erasmus's most explicit plea for peace in Europe. The *Ciceronianus* written in 1528

during a period of cultural turmoil, following the aftermath of his publication of *de libero arbitrio* against Luther and the latter's reply in *de servo arbitrio*, is a comic dialogue over slavish obedience to Cicero as the supreme Latin stylist. The *Julius exclusus* written after *Moriae* will be discussed in a separate chapter.

## 11.5 Erasmus and his attitude to war

To understand the satire *Julius exclusus*, one has to understand Erasmus's attitude to war in general. This is one of the underlying themes of his satire and an appreciation of this attitude, therefore, means an appreciation of Erasmus' *Julius*. The quotations in Latin are from his letters and my source for these is Dorey: Erasmus: chapters by Margeret Mann Phillips etc. War for Erasmus was something to be abhorred. By means of satire he ridicules and at the same time shows his indignation on the incongruity of militant Christendom, the moral absurdity of a society which dotes on it. I shall quote three relevant passages from this book which I consider to be very illuminating.

'*Infamis est qui vestem furto sustulit; qui et proficiscens in miltiam et militans et rediens a militia tot immeritos spoliavit inter probos cives habetur'* (ep. 962 E).
The man who steals a garment is disgraced: one who on his way to the war and during the fighting and on his way back home plunders so many innocent folk is regarded as an admirable member of the community' (Dorey, 32-33).

*Nos, Deum immortalem, quam frivolis de causis quas bellorum Tragoedias excitamus! Ob inanissimos ditionis titulos, ob puerilem iram, ob interceptam mulierculam, ob causas his quoque multo magis ridiculas...Non illud decertatur, ut haec aut illa civitas bono principi pareat potius quam tyranno serviat, sed utrum Ferdinandi censeatur titulo an Sigismundi, Philippo censum pendat an Lodovico'* (ep. 965 B)
How frivolous are the reasons, Immortal God, for which we stir up the catastrophes of war! For the emptiest claims to sovereignty, because of childish passion, or the kidnapping of a wench, or for reasons far sillier still..The motive of the conflict is not to ensure that this or that community should be subject to a good prince rather than enslaved to a despot, but whether it is to rank as part of the dominion of Ferdinand or Sigismund, pay taxes to Philip or Louis' (Dorey, p. 33).

Erasmus is at his most poignant in the following excerpt.

*Denique quod ego sane puto his omnibus atrocius, Christianus cum homine: addam invitus, quod est atrocissimum, Christianus cum Christiano: et o caecitatem mentis humanae! Haec nemo miratur, nemo detestatur. Sunt qui applaudant, qui vehant laudibus, qui rem plus quam Tartaream, sanctam appellent...*(ep. 956 E)

Lastly, what I think more appalling than all this, the Christian (fights) with his fellow-man: I must add reluctantly the most appalling thing of all, Christian with fellow-Christian; and such is the blindness of the human mind, nobody is surprised at this, nobody execrates it. There are people who applaud, who extol, who call 'holy' this worse than hellish business...(p. 36-7)

## 12. Pope Julius II

As far as I know, there were only three popes who assumed the title 'Julius'. Julius I (pope from 337-352) ; Julius II (Giuliano della Rovere) 1443-1513 (Pope from 1503-1513) and finally Julius III 1487-1555 (Pope from 1550-155). Erasmus's satire in question is directed at Pope Julius II.

Guiliano was the son of Rafaello della Rovere, the nephew of the Franciscan cardinal Francesco della Rovere, who subsequently became Pope Sixtus IV. The pope was probably responsible for his becoming a student of the Franciscans at Perugia. Julius was made a cardinal in 1471 and even as a cardinal displayed all the attributes of cupidity and corruption associated with a Renaissance prince. The pope bestowed upon him six bishoprics in France and three in Italy along with an abundance of wealthy abbeys and benefices. Guiliano lacked complete interest in spiritual pursuits but became an outstanding patron of the arts. When Rodrigo Borgia, elected pope as Alexander VI, plotted Giuliano's assassination, he fled to the court of Charles VIII of France, but following the death of the Borgia pope in 1503, he returned to Rome having being ten years in exile and after Pius III's brief pontificate, he was elected Pope Julius II in October 1503 with the liberal help of simony. Immediately after his election he decreed that all future simoniacal papal elections would be invalid and subject to penalty.

Julius was a 'warrior' pope, and viewed as the main task of his pontificate the restoration of the Papal States which had been reduced to ruin by the Borgias. Large portions of it had been appropriated by Venice after Alexander VI's death. As a first step as pope, Julius subjugated Perugia and Bologna in 1508. the very next year he joined the League of Cambrai, an anti-Venetian alliance formed between Louis XII, who then ruled Milan, Emperor Maximilian I of Spain, and Ferdinand II of Spain, who had been king of Naples, and when the league troops defeated Venice, the papal States were restored. His other war enterprises are given in detail by Mangan (1. 223-230) and need not be mentioned here. Despite the methods he employed, Julius's reign is considered one of the most brilliant in the Renaissance. He had promised the cardinals to continue the war against the Turks, to summon a general council within two years, to declare war only with the consent of tow thirds of the cardinals, but, as he became master of the situation , he was less inclined to observe these promises and limitations on the supreme pontifical authority. In short he was

Italy's saviour. I have made mention of Bologna for the simple reason that Erasmus, after receiving his doctor's degree at Turin, proceeded to Bologna and found his progress blocked by the troops of Pope Julius II who were besieging and those of Bentivoglio who were defending the city. Thus Erasmus witnessed the Pope's triumphal entry to Bologna. Erasmus makes mention of this in his letters (ep. 200, 203, 206) and what is more important, comments as follows: 'Pope Julius fights, conquers, triumphs, and perspicuously plays the part of Julius (Caesar)' ( Mangan. p. 225).

The pontificate of Julius (1503-1513 A.D.) was distinguished in a number of ways. It was a period of lavish patronage of the arts, when parts of Rome were rebuilt and his name was closely linked with those of such great artists as Raphael and Michelangelo. He laid the groundwork in the Vatican Museum for the world's greatest collection of antiques. Julius' patronage of the arts is perhaps the most admired feature of his reign, but Erasmus either chose to ignore this aspect or perhaps he was not appreciative of it! However, one can hardly expect Erasmus to extol the positive characteristics of Julius when the moral lesson in the satire lies in the contrast between the worldliness of the contemporary papacy and the spiritual authority enshrined in Peter; between Julius' enrichment of the church with lands and gold to the detriment of its pastoral function.

Once Erasmus's attitude to war is known, one underlying theme of Erasmus' 'Julius exclusus' falls into place and the satire can be appreciated in its correct perspective. Some are of the opinion that Erasmus disliked Julius personally, e.g. Mangan, in his book entitled 'The Life, Character and Influence of Ersamus' quotes a letter to prove this point, where Erasmus writes: *odi enim Iulianum nomen* (Mangan I: p. 224. (ep. 429). I disagree. Erasmus was too much of a humanist to harbour personal hatred. To me it is a question which has to be judged taking his attitude to war into consideration. I quote a quotation from Shakespeare's 'Julius Caesar' where Marc Anthony states.... 'It is not that I like Caesar less, but I love Rome more...'

## 13. Dialogus Julius exclusus e coelis

In this scathing satire, Erasmus uses an imaginary confrontation between St. Peter and Pope Julius II as a device for launching a severe attack upon the abuses of Church. In the dialogue that ensues between the two characters mentioned above, the spirit of the recently deceased Pope, accompanied by his Evil genius and his slaughtered mercenaries, marches to the gates of heaven and arrogantly demands admittance. Saint Peter refuses to admit him, rebuking him for his monstrous personal sins, while Julius, in his efforts to defend himself and his actions, only succeeds in condemning himself, exposing his greed and cynicism. In the course of the satire, the pope is critisized severely for his bellicose temporal policies, the sins and crimes of his private life, the corruption of his court and in the process brings into light an extremely vivid contrast to the apostolic ideal embodied in St. Peter. In short, the Pope is asked to give reasons why he should be admitted to heaven: every reason that the Pope alleges in favour of his admission, St. Peter turns very deftly into a reason why he should be rejected. The third character of the dialogue, the genius of Julius, has an extremely minor function. Nothing would have been lost in the dialogue, if he was never mentioned at all. His function seems to be to explain the more or less obvious allusions. Genius acts the part of the chorus as e.g. in Seneca's Apocolocyntosis or in a comedy of Aristophanes whose minor function is to comment on the action.

Allen in his monumental work gives all the contemporary references to Erasmus' Julius, but since so many editions of the Julius followed in rapid succession, almost all without indication of date or place, it is extremely difficult to arrange the undated editions of the 'Julius' in any chronological order with any degree of certainty. Copies and editions of this appeared in Cologne, Basel, Paris, Louvain and Antwerp, and it was read all over Europe. The difficulty of identification and tracing the early editions lies in the fact that this book was part of the enormous glut of pamphlet literature which was a part and parcel of the popular press in the early sixteenth century - cheaply and hastily printed, usually slanderous, often anonymous and pirated by one printer from another. However, it is more or less certain that the first printed edition of this anonymous dialogue attacking the late Julius II appeared in the early months of 1517. Julius had died some four years before, but his memory was yet fresh in the minds of people, and the increasing anti-papal criticism, which

was soon to swell into the Protestant Reformation, often associated the warlike Pope as the very image of Anti-Christ.

The reaction to the scurrilous dialogue was immediate and varied. Most of the liberal humanists were delighted, the pious and conventional were shocked while the right-wing orthodox defenders of the ecclesiastical status were naturally furious. The Cologne theologians, on the other hand, still recovering from the criticisms contained in the 'Letters of Obscure men' attacked the book vehemently. Allen (III. ep. 622, 635, 785, 908) reports on the hostility on the book in Cologne which were received or noted by Erasmus. The theologian Martin van Dorp wrote to Erasmus as follows:
Everybody is reading the little book on Pope Julius excluded from heaven - and it is strange how few condemn it-: although you would be annoyed at the author, with good reason, who makes literature suspect at this time (ep. 852).
Similar references are recorded in the 'Epistulae'. Erasmus himself reported to Thomas More that even the Burgundian chancellor Jean Le Sauvage was immensely pleased with the Julius, and thus states : Dialogus ille Iulii et Petri, ut intelligo, iam τω καγκελλαριω μεγαλω in manibus est et unice placet (ep. 543)

The question of authorship has led to much speculation. Many, including the Bishop of Paris, Father Poncher, credited it to Faustus Andrelinus, the Italian humanist and sometime French court poet. This is recorded in the correspondence of Thomas More. But from the very first a considerable body of opinion favoured Erasmus as the author of the dialogue. Guy Morillon, a humanist of the Burgundian court called it: so charming, so witty, in a word, so Erasmian (ep. 532). Erasmus protested the charge, pointing to several others who had better cause to write it; denied its affinity with the More encomium and ridiculed the argument based on style: (my informant) tells me something even I can scarcely believe, that many suspect me of writing it because the Latin 'isn't so bad!' (ep. 636). Erasmus was so vehement in his protests defending his innocence in writing this that he wrote to his More in this vein:
Will these slanderers never stop? they leave no stone unturned to do harm to Erasmus! They've convinced many people in Cologne that that outrageous little book was written by me; and they would have convinced many more if I had not promptly blunted the edge of their treacherous lies (ep. 908). A final quotation from a letter would suffice to indicate Erasmus' vehement denial in writing this satire. In a letter to Cardinal Wolsey and the Cardinal-legate Campeggio, he protested his innocence thus:
'They are endeavouring to throw on me the suspicion of having written a certain pamphlet. This piece, as is evident from the argument, was written at the time of the schism to cast odium on his Holiness Julius II; but who the

author is, it is uncertain. Some five rears ago I did read it-or more properly, glanced at it. Afterwards I came across it again in Germany appearing in the works of several people and under various titles..(ep. 961)

It is of course possible that this was published without the knowledge and consent of Erasmus and that he never intended to publish it himself. One obvious fact remains. Once the book was in print, the printings and editions multiplied until it was known all over Europe. Generally speaking, it is quite obvious why Erasmus would have been reluctant to claim authorship of the Julius, but what is surprising is that he has gone to such a length to deny it. He had after all, published a satire 'Moriae encomium' and acknowledged it, and himself states in one of his letters:
It is true that I 'played the fool' in the Folly, but bloodlessly! I have never injured the reputation of anyone by name. I have satirized the mores of men, not their reputations. (ep. 622).
But it was not only his literary reputation which was at stake. From this very pope whom he had castigated so blatantly Erasmus himself had received a valuable dispensation absolving him from the aftermath which he suffered of his illegitimacy and thus enabled him to hold church benefices and freed him from the ties with the monastery of Steyn. Another factor is that at the very time the Julius dialogue appeared in print, Erasmus was carrying on negotiations with Julius' successor, Leo X, to have the terms of the earlier dispensation confirmed and extended. Hence the time was not exactly opportune for him to admit authorship. Furthermore, his Greek New testament had just been published under the patronage of the new Pope and he needed Leo's support. With the development of the Lutheran movement, his position was already difficult without his having to answer for the scathing satire on the papacy.

Thus a superficial similarity between Seneca's 'Apocolocyntosis' and Erasmus' 'Julius exclusus' can be immediately noted. The authorship was questioned. Seneca never made any mention of this work, nor did any authoritative historical source of his time, for that matter, and the sole extant occurrence of the word 'Apocolocyntosis' in antiquity is by Cassius Dio who mentioned this work by Seneca with the comment 'ωσπερ τινα απαθανατισιν. However, it has been proved by analysis of style that Seneca and Erasmus were really the authors of these satires. Martin Luther acknowledged Erasmus as the author and commented as follows: 'For although he flouteth the Pope's ceremonies, yet he hath neither confuted nor overcome him; no enemy is beaten or overcome with mocking, jeering and flouting' (Mangan. 387). Erasmus, on the other hand, in the preface to 'Moria' written to More, states as a defence to his writing this particular satire as follows:

'*Verum quos argumenti levitas et ludicrum offendit, cogitent velim non meum hoc exemplum esse, sed iam olim a magnis auctoribus facitatum;...cum Seneca Claudii luserit* αποθεωσιν, *Lucianus et Apuleius asinum...*'.
Those who are offended by frivolity and fun of the argument may consider that mine is not the first example of this, the same thing has often been done by famous authors in the past...Seneca was joking in his Apotheosis of the Emperor Claudius, Lucianus and Apuleius about an ass..' (Elogio della Follia. p. 52). Thus where authorship is concerned, I can only say, 'aut Seneca aut Diabolus; aut Erasmus aut Diabolus'!

Many factors contributed to the making of the Julius. It was not only Erasmus' attitude to war, which I have already mentioned in the previous paragraphs, but there were other factors which also contributed to it. Unfortunately, the six years preceding the writing of Julius is one of the most poorly recorded and documented in the adult life of Erasmus, but documentation, however scant, does exist, which makes it possible to formulate the making of the Julius.

In 1506 Erasmus finally got his chance to go to Italy, the home of the New Learning. Erasmus in one of his letters describes Italy in this manner: ...where the walls are more learned and eloquent than our men. (ep. 110). Erasmus was welcomed everywhere in Italy, with scholars in Turin, Bologna and Florence opening their doors to him and thus the visit to Italy became the watershed of Erasmus' career. Italy, however, opened his eyes to another aspect. Italy did not only comprise of printing-houses, scholars and patrons, but Erasmus also saw the cynicism, venality and the wholesale corruption of the Italian clergy, and to cap everything, he came across the brutal secularism of the papacy in the person of Julius II. In Italy, Erasmus was already expanding and revising his Adagia, and it is no wonder that the famous Dulce bellum inexpertis, as a famous diatribe against war, appeared in it. Erasmus has already settled in the city of Bologna only to be chased out by the pope's warlike preparations against Bologna. He returned in time to witness, if not the fall of the city, at least to witness the ceremonial entry of the pope, which in one of his letters (ep. 203) he describes as: warring, conquering, triumphing, acting the very Julius!.

Thus the picture of Julius could never have been far from his mind, for at this very time, the pope was directing all his warlike efforts against Venice and the Venetian threat to his north Italian ambitions. Erasmus left Venice in 1508, but his sojourn at Padua was also prevented by the threat of war. Later in the same year the League of the Cambrai was formed and Julius joined it and very soon the towns of northern Italy, including Padua, found themselves in the throes of war. Erasmus saw Julius as the prime mover of the league, thus in the Julius

exclusus, the pope is made to defend himself and his actions to St. Peter in the following manner: '...today there are no Christian kings whom I have not provoked to arms, rending, tearing, and shattering all the treaties by which they had been closely bound together. Most recently, even the treaty of Cambrai, which I entered upon with the King of the French, the King of the Romans, and other princes, has been so obliterated that there is never even any mention of it..'(Jul. exc. 213-218). Thus the participation of the pope, which even the modern historian can find it difficult to defend, was nothing less than monstrous to Erasmus.

Erasmus finally visited Rome in 1509, but his visit was cut short by the invitation from Lord Mountjoy and the Archbishop Warham to return to England. This was tempting to him and the reign of the new, young king, Henry VIII, seemed promising enough for him from the material point of view. The most notable feature of his return to England was the completion of the Praise of Folly which he dedicated to his friend, Thomas More. However, there is no gainsaying the fact that the impressions of Italy underlined some of the most important themes of the Praise of Folly, specifically the papacy of Julius II. I quote three excerpts from the Praise of Folly, which I have paraphrased from prof. Pekkanen's Finnish translation of this work entitled Tyhmyyden ylistys which is sufficient to convey to the reader that Erasmus could not have been thinking of anyone else but Julius when his foolish goddess states:
Who could purchase that office at the cost of every effort? Who would retain it by the sword, by poison, and by every other way?...If wisdom should come to Popes...Did I say wisdom? Even that grain of sense which Christ speaks of would do it. It would deprive them of all wealth, honour and possessions; all the triumphal progresses, offices, dispensations, tributes, and indulgences; the many horses, mules and retainers; in short, it would deprive them of all their pleasures.
and
The Popes are sufficiently generous with...interdictions, excommunications, re-excommunications, anathematizations, pictured damnations, and the terrible bolt of the papal bull, which by a flicker hurls the souls of men to the depths of hell...they give the name of patrimony to lands, towns, tributes, taxes and riches. They fight for these with fire and sword, inflamed by Christian zeal and not without shedding Christian blood...
and finally,
War is so monstrous a thing that it befits beasts and not men, so violently insane that poets represent it as an evil visitation of the Furies, so pestilential that it causes a general corruption of character, so criminal that it is best waged by the worst of men, and so impious that it has no relation with Christ.

Nevertheless, our popes neglect everything else to devote themselves to war.. (section 59)

Erasmus' material position did not improve very much in England, and he was finally constrained to accept a lectureship at Cambridge offered to him by John Fisher, the Bishop of Rochester. The aftermath of his arrival to Cambridge was a satiric epigram entitled 'An Epigram of Erasmus against Julius II. This epigram is over 26 lines and is found in Ferguson's Opuscula (p. 35-37). To quote this whole epigram, however, elucidating it may be, takes an undue lot of space, but some lines would suffice to give the gist of it.

> Your name suits you perfectly,
> For you are certainly another Caesar.
> He was once even Supreme Pontiff.
> He unjustly seized tyrannical power,...
> He despised the gods...
> He turned the whole world upside down
> In slaughter, war and blood...

This epigram is one of the most important links in the argument for Erasmus' authorship of the Julius. Unfortunately, it was never claimed by Erasmus and nor was it published in his lifetime, but it was discovered in a manuscript copy in Erasmus' own hand-writing. According to Pascal, whose book The Julius Exclusus of Erasmus, the case was more strengthened by the fact that on the reverse side of the manuscript the name of his friend, Thomas More appears. As recently as 1957, another manuscript copy of the epigram was discovered, inserted in a copy of a seventeenth century edition of the Praise of Folly. Again the handwriting has been proved to be of Erasmus.

In his excellent introduction to Pascal's translation of the Julius, J. Kelley Sowards refers to contemporary writings which may have influenced the making of this satire. (pp. 25-28). There are no direct links, but the coincidences are very revealing. There was no denying the fact that the warlike personal career of Julius II had caused anti-papal diatribe to flourish in Europe, mostly in those countries which Erasmus visited and stayed. Pascal mentions the Roman pasquinades and states that at the time Erasmus visited Rome it was becoming customary for anonymous satirists to pin their epigrams to an ancient, mutilated statues, which had been unearthed and given the name Pasquino. Even the pope, apparently, did not escape from these lampoons. Another centre for anti-papal propaganda in Italy was Venice. In the months that Erasmus spent in Venice, there was obviously an abundance of satire and libel, the most famous of which was an open letter from Christ to the pope, which Ferguson cites in his Opuscula (p. 53), and which obviously had a close affinity with the theme of the Julius dialogue. German humanists also opposed

pope Julius bitterly, but the focal point of European opposition was in Paris. The role played by Louis XII in this opposition to Julius was very significant. The policy of Louis not only involved military campaigns and diplomatic 'anti-papal' manoeuvres, but also a full-scale assault upon Julius' spiritual claims. For example, in Julius exclusus (l. 587-589), reference is made to the Council of Pisa thus: ...Now in this fashion I aroused great hatred against that gallican Council: I sent letters in every possible direction, in which I referred to our sacrosanct council, execrated their council, and called it Satan's get-together, the devil's convention, a schismatic conspiracy...

Thus the court became a focal point for every sort of propaganda against the pope, with the full support of Louis, and mention has been made of a cartoon depicting the pope in armour and surrounded by corpses. The culmination of this was in 1510 or 1511, when Pierre Gringore, a favourite of the king, published his Hope of Peace, an eloquent condemnation of papal secularity, in which the poet contrasts the pope with bishops and martyrs of the early church. Gringore's most interesting work, however, was The Jest of the Prince of Fools which was presented publicly in Paris with the king's blessings. Its characters were the French people, the Italian people, Divine Punishment, Simony, Hypocrisy, Mother-Fool (the Roman Church), and a character called 'l'homme obstiné'', representing Julius II, wearing the papal tiara and armour, and playing a blustering bully. Both Erasmus and More have referred to this. Erasmus in a letter to John Caesarius (ep. 622) writes: *Audieram iampridem huiusmodi fabulam actam in Gallia, ubi talium nugarum immodica licentia semper fuit.*

Erasmus had spent many years in Paris and had friends both in court and literary circles. The charges made against Julius by the French propagandists were very much similar with his own feelings towards the pope. Erasmus was in Paris in 1511 to see the printing of his Praise of folly and this was the very time the campaign of Louis XII against the pope was at its peak. Thus Erasmus was obviously aware and had access to these 'prime' news of the day. It is, of course, a moot question whether Erasmus needed any external sources, plays, pamphlets or otherwise, to convince him that Julius was brutal, warlike and a disgrace to the chair of St. Peter. Erasmus was well aware of the satiric dialogue. Already in the 1490's in Paris he had prepared the first small collections of the Colloquies, which were really conversations or dialogues. He was already preparing the revision of the *Adagia* that Froben would finally print in 1515 and it was in this edition that his famous Dulce bellum inexpertis , which was filled with his hatred for war, of political manipulation and of the cynicism of contemporary politics would appear. Thus the material for satire was not new for Erasmus and in fact contain enough of the themes to be found

in the Julius exclusus. In England, as early as in 1505, he and Thomas More amused themselves by competing in the translation of some dialogues of Lucianus from Greek to Latin. Erasmus' fondness for both the form and content of Lucianic dialogue was well known and well attested. Thus it was not for nothing that Erasmus has been called the supreme Lucianist of the Renaissance. His revision of the *Adagia*, which according to Margeret Philipps, contain 400 references to Plato, 600 to Aristophanes, 475 to Horace, 99 to Persius, 92 to Martial, 127 to Juvenal and 355 to Lucianus (Adages of Erasmus, pp. 393-403) is ample proof of his acute sensitivity to the forms of the classical writers and to the classical fathers of satire. Finally, just two years before the Julius was written, Erasmus published his Praise of Folly, his greatest work on satire, which had a lot of affinities with Julius in some of its themes and spirit.

The Julius exclusus is a brilliant study in mutual incomprehension. St. Peter simply cannot understand what has happened to the office which he was first to hold, and humbly asks to be instructed. The following conversation is cited as an example.
Peter: *Ni merita narras, inquam, nihil agis* (I say that you will not get anywhere unless you give an account of your merits)
Julius: *Quae merita?* (What merits?)
Peter: *Dicam. Excelluisti doctrina sacra?* (I'll explain. Were you eminent in theology?)
Julius: *Minime; nec hoc vacabat, tot occupato bellis. verum abunde satis est fratrum, si quid hoc ad rem pertinet. (*Very little; I hadn't time. I was too busy with wars. But there are enough monks, if that is of any help*).*
Peter: *Ergo vitae sanctimonia multos Christo lucrifecisti?* (Did you win many souls for Christ by the saintliness of your life?
Genius: *Tartaro quam plurimos* (a good many to Hell)
Peter: *Pure orasti et assidue?* (Did you pray simply and regularly?)
Julius: *Quas nugas hic gannit.* (What nonsense is this fellow jabbering about)

In his portrayal of Julius, Erasmus is not lacking in humour either. When asked to explain himself, Julius replies as follows:
Julius: *Quamquam indigna res est Iulium illum omnibus antehac invictum nunc Petro cedere, ut ne quid aliud dicam, piscatori ac paene mendico, tamen uti cognoscas cuiusmodi contemnas principem, audi iam paucis. Principio, Ligur sum, non, ut tu, Iudaeus, cum quo mihi vel hoc tecum esse commune doleo, quod naviculator aliquando fuerim.*
Although it is demeaning for the ever-invincible Julius to cede to Peter, who was, to put it mildly, a mere fisherman and more or less a beggar, I'll briefly tell you so that you will realize what a chief you are sneering at. In the first

place, I am a Ligurian, not a Jew like you, although, I am sad to say that we have one thing in common, I was once a bit of a seaman

Another example
Peter: *Quid audio? Uxores ac liberos habent summi Pontifices?* (What do I hear? Supreme pontiffs having wives and children?)
Julius: *Suas quidem uxores non habent. Liberos autem habere quid monstri est, cum sint viri, non eunuchi* (Not wives of their own. What's so monstrous about having children, since they are men, not eunuchs?).
I am tempted to make a comment here. Is it possible that Erasmus is making some sort of excuse for his father? The illegitimacy of his birth was a 'cross' which Erasmus always carried on his shoulders. Cornelius Augustijn in his book on Erasmus states that children of priests were numerous and that in the diocese of Utrecht 25% of the priests lived more or less officially with a woman!

The satirical irony of the dialogue arises from the fact that Julius is **convinced** that he has merited heaven and thus rejects Peter's conception of his office. He remains firm in his conviction that he has acted rightly throughout his pontificate. Much of what Julius says condemns not only himself but the aspects of the Church in general. Julius was hopelessly superficial and blithely insensitive to any but material standards. To Peter's lesson from the humility and sufferings of Christ, Julius' answer is as follows:
*'Inveniet fortassis qui laudent, qui imitentur neminem his sane temporibus* (Perhaps he will find some to praise him, but hardly anyone to imitate him in times like these*)*. So very patronizingly he reminds the bewildered Peter that times have changed:
*'Tu fortasse veterem illam ecclesiam adhuc somnias...iam aetas in melius commutavit omnia: alia longe res nunc est Romanus Pontifex.*
Perhaps you are still dreaming about that primitive church...but times have changed everything for the better: it is a very different thing nowadays to be the Bishop of Rome.

Peter eventually achieves understanding and assaults Julius with fine rhetoric, but Julius of course cannot comprehend. Peter and Julius speak totally different languages. When Peter utters the word 'church' he is thinking of the Christian people, united by the spirit of Christ; to Julius the word means church buildings, priests, the curia, and above all himself as the head of the church. e.g.
Peter: *Atqui si Ecclesia est populus Christianus, Christi spiritu conglutinatus, subvertisse mihi videris Ecclesiam, qui orbem universum ad teterrima bella concitaris, quo tu impune malus et pestilens esses.*

But if the church is the Christian people, bound together by the spirit of Christ, you seem to me to have ruined the church by provoking hideous wars throughout the world, so that you could be evil and pestilent with impunity.
Julius: *Nos Ecclesiam vocamus sacras aedes, sacerdotes, et praecipue curiam Romanam, me in primis, qui caput sum Ecclesiae*
What we call the church is the holy temples, the priests, particularly the Roman curia, and above all myself, the head of the church
Peter: *...Sed quibus tandem aucta est Eccleisa?*
How did you enlarge the church anyway?
Julius: *...Illa olim famelica et pauper Ecclesia nunc adeo floret ornamentis omnibus*
The church, once poor and starving, is now enriched with every possible ornament
Peter: *Quibus? Ardore fidei? (What ornaments? Warm faith?)*
Julius: *Palatiis regalibus, equis et mulis pulcherrimis, famulitio frequentissimo, copiis instructissimis...*
Royal palaces, the most handsome horses and mules, hordes of servants, well-trained troops...

Herein lies the core of the satire. It contains not only the diagnosis of the ills of Christendom but their remedy, as expounded in the philosophia Christi by Peter. It is a bitter attack on a pope and through him on the contemporary papacy, but it is manifestly inspired by a real desire for reform. The satire ends as comically as it had begun with Julius threatening Peter with an invasion of heaven!

That Erasmus was aware of Seneca's satire has been shown in his letter to More, which forms a preface to the 'Moriae'. In this satire, in his discourse on the theologists he also uses the word 'cucurbita' e.g. '*Num deus potuerit supposita re mulierem, num diabolum, num asinum, num cucurbitam, num silicem?' Tum quemadmodum cucurbita fuerit concionatura, editura miracula, figenda cruci.*
Was it possible for God to change into a woman, a devil, an ass, a pumpkin or a flint? How could such a pumpkin proclaim the gospel, perform miracles or be nailed to the cross.

The Julius only takes second place to Erasmus' 'Praise of Folly' as a satire. However humorous the contents of the Julius maybe, its purpose was completely serious. It was, more or less, meant to be a moral-religious reform of society. All his previous works as well as what he saw and observed in his travels abroad had contributed significantly to his growing commitment to Christian humanism. The reader almost feels that Erasmus was angry, and

genuinely so. This, naturally, is one of the basic reactions to writing genuine satire. Both the 'Moriae' and the 'Julius' attack the same abuses, but they differ in their approach. Whilst the Moriae is a subtle, highly polished work where the satire is hidden in the rhetorical devices used in it , the Julius is more straightforward and the reader has no doubt whatsoever regarding the intentions of Erasmus. The whole work is based on a simple ironic situation, namely, that a pope should be denied admittance to heaven! Erasmus emphasizes this throughout the work, by portraying the humble fisherman blessed of Christ, representing a functionary *inside the heaven*, and the worldly pope, blessed only of himself and his sycophants representing a functionary *outside the heaven.* In my point of view, Erasmus uses the setting of the Julius to the best advantage. The dialogue between Peter and Julius takes place at the entrance gate to heaven which is alluded to only at the beginning and the end of the work. The setting really could have taken place anywhere and the moral behind the dialogue would have been as effective, but the image of Peter and Julius on opposite sides of a gate, carrying on an animated conversation with only an iron gate barring them, is a brilliant touch. One of the typical characteristics of Menippean satire is the use of other-world settings and consequently the chief character involved can easily be made to look more foolish or tragic as he discovers the vast gulf between the way things are and the way he had imagined them to be. Thus the gate in this dialogue is not only used as a device for a setting, but also as a symbol for the real separation of the two worlds or ways of life here represented, namely, the philosophy of Christ and that of the enemy of Christ, the bane of the Church, which Peter alludes to by calling Julius, Christi hostem, Ecclesiae pestem' (Jul. exc. 1144).

In his preface to the translation of Julius exclusus, Pascal comments on Erasmus' colloquial and almost racy style and vocabulary. Critics have lost no time in observing the 'Erasmian flavour' in the usage of similar words, phrases and passages in both the Praise of Folly and in Julius, thus adding more credence to Erasmus' authorship of the latter. The usage of colloquial, cruel, dirty words were generally considered to be appropriate for the vocabulary of invective satire. Erasmus' usage of vocabulary in the Julius is no exception to this rule. This is due to a great extent to Erasmus' bringing together two very opposite characters, one, a dignified 'gatekeeper-examiner' who proceeds with his interrogation slowly and logically, and the other, a belligerent and arrogant pontiff attempting to force his way into heaven. As in Seneca's Apocolocyntosis the colloquial quality of the Julius can be seen in its use of diminutives such as 'muliercula, conciliabuli, pecuniola or animula. Erasmus uses the rhetorical device of alliteration excellently, as for example, in Peter's '*hec ullo pacto possit publicam pestem depellere* (l. 464) which in the context reflects the anger of Peter at this point. Another example of alliteration and one

can even say the rhetorical device of chiasmus, can be seen in Julius' comment
'*illi vicissim mittunt equos, milites, pecuniam, nonnumquam et pueros, atque ita mutuum, quod aiunt, muli scabunt*
they in turn send us horses, soldiers, money and sometimes even boys and so, as the saying goes, one mule scratches another (l. 858 ff.).
It is interesting to note that '*muli scabunt*' occurs in Erasmus' Adagia, referring to the folk belief that mules groomed each other with their teeth and thus making a proverb signifying wicked and infamous people deluding and justifying themselves to each other (Pascal, p. 135).

Besides these elements, there are other characteristics of Julius' speech which create a mood reminiscent of Plautus. Julius, for example, always has a ready answer for Peter and is never ashamed of its implications. When Peter asks, 'Do you mean to tell me that Popes have wives and children?', Julius's glib and immediate reply is 'Well, they don't have wives of their own, of course. But what's so strange about their having children, since they are men, not eunuchs?' (l. 405-408). Thus Julius will admit to any crime he is accused of, but will always defend his action for some reason or other. He is not only unwilling to listen, but rejects Peter's view of true Christianity outright and mocks many traditional values. Thus the dialogue is not unlike that of Roman Comedy, especially that of Plautus, where underlings have always a ready answer for any occasion with their rapid question and answer style, using a flippant and arrogant tone toward those in authority.

The satiric spirit is constant throughout the Julius exclusus. Julius himself is always the centre of attention and Erasmus makes it clear from the very beginning that his glowing list of achievements must be taken ironically. Julius, of course, condemns himself by his very words. This is a typical Menippean characteristic which shows us that the world is topsy-turvy and that its values and ideals finally come to nothing. The irony is all the more strong since the person who should be the prime example of the philosophy of Christ as a goal for a human's life turns out to be just the opposite. The situation on the whole is really tragic from this point of view, but the dialogue never becomes tragic or gloomy, the reader does not feel too sorry for Julius, but even might have some admiration for this dogged warrior, stubborn and implacable. Were it not for the fact that the reader is constantly reminded of specific and personal details of Julius as a Pope, he would probably have become a type rather than an individual. But in this satire, Julius remains a very real person and, just like Claudius in the Apocolocyntosis, is the main character of the satire.

The Julius exclusus is not only important in its position as a literary satire but it gives an insight into the moral and intellectual ideas of Erasmus. One has to

bear in mind the ideas of Erasmus as a Christian humanist. In all his letters and his writings, Erasmus despised the methodology, and the pedantry of the scholastics, and he had satirized the 'Thomists and Scotists' on innumerable occasions in favour of humanist historicism. To Erasmus, it was really back to the classics or to the bible, as his letters very vividly indicate. Thus one can view the framework of the Julius as *temporal,* in other words, a satire whose point and impact derive from a contrast through time. It is a contrast between Julius, presented in all his temporality and the historic, traditional and apostolic character of St. Peter. It gives a contrast between Julius the contemporary vicar of Christ and the scriptural image of Christ himself and thus provided a distinction between the imperfect reality of the present church and the glowing ideal of primitive Christianity. It must be admitted that these ideas did not really originate with Erasmus as they were in the minds of the intellectual milieu of Europe on the eve of the Reformation. Finally they became, as Kelley Sowards in his introduction to Pascal's translation of the Julius exclusus states, a part of the Reformation 'theory' with men like Luther and Calvin. But Sowards very rightly continues to state that Erasmus was no such visionary, and that he was no more a theorist and system-maker than he was a revolutionary! Thus Erasmus was content with asserting the necessity of the imitation of Christ for the pope as for any ordinary Christian. Similar ideas were soon to be shortly expressed by the revolutionary reformers, which finally led to the much discussed reformation, but Erasmus assumed a passive role. He was neither a Luther nor a Calvin.

## 14. A comparison between the satires of Seneca and Erasmus

It is interesting at this juncture to comment about the relationship of the Julius exclusus to Seneca's Apococyntosis as well as the other satires discussed and to what extent it is Menippean satire. The primary focus of this chapter will be on the satires of Seneca and Erasmus. First of all, it has to be mentioned that very few scholars have made any deep research on this connection, and have been mostly content with passing references to the similarities of these two satires. I have come across an article entitled 'Seneca's Apocolocyntosis as a Possible Source for Erasmus' Julius Exclusus' by Marcia Colish published in the Renaissance Quarterly, but unfortunately, it is not of great help for the purpose of this study. What is important is that the author herself admits that Erasmus' possible sources for the work have received scant attention and treatment and that there has been no study specifically devoted to the analysis of the models on which Erasmus might have drawn for the Julius. Mention has already been made by me as to the possibility of Erasmus' acquaintance with Pierre Gringoire, a satirist employed by King Louis XII of France to produce anti-papal burlesques and that Erasmsus was present in Paris in 1511 when the satire of this author, The Jest of the Prince of Fools was published. Thus even Gringore was considered as a possible source, though there is no direst evidence to substantiate it.

Erasmus was a great admirer of Lucianus and translated and edited his works along with Thomas More. The only classical satirist who has been singled out as a possible model to Erasmus' '*Julius*' is Lucianus. But there is a strong likelihood, however, that Seneca's '*Apocolocyntosis*' served as a model for several satires of Lucianus. Lucianus, who worked in an exclusively Greek literary tradition, wrote four satires, whose action or setting suggest Senecan influence. In the Καταπλους (Downward journey) a wealthy tyrant and a poor but honest cobbler die, go to Hades, and are judged by Rhadamanthus, who pronounces his verdict on the basis of their virtue rather their affluence. In the Θεων εκκλεσια (Assembly of the Gods), the gods debate on how to prevent Olympus from growing overcrowded with interlopers who are being deified without meriting the honour. If one were to consider the two following satires of Lucianus as a 'diphtyh', as has been done during the past, one finds that both in the Ικαρομενιππος and Μενιππος, Menippus travels respectively to Heaven and Hades. On the first trip, he discovers that the philosophers who have sought to rationalize the nature of the universe are wrong and on the

second trip, Menippus, finding the philosophers to be contradictory and confusing in their counsels for good life, has to appeal to the famous Teiresias, who advises him to disregard the philosophers and to adhere to the common decency and the practical day-to-day life of the ordinary man. The setting is common and one can say that there are Senecan reminiscences in Lucianus, but neither the *Apocolocyntosis* nor any of the relevant satires of Lucian provides an **exact formal** model for the *Julius.* Similarities are there, of course, but they are similarities in **ideas** only. The *Julius* shares the theme of the unjust ruler being denied admission to heaven with both the *Apocolocyntosis* and the *Assembly of the Gods*, but in the latter work there is no specific character whose claims to deification is being considered and rejected. As in the Julius, there is a tyrant punished posthumously in the *Downward Journey,* but Lucians' tyrant is a type rather than a historical personage and his fate his paired with that of the humble but virtuous cobbler. On the other hand, in both Seneca's and Erasmus' satires, a recently deceased and a historical figure, in this case Claudius and Julius, has made a mockery of his high office and is held up to ridicule. In both cases the ruler is satirized and an idealized example of how that office ought to function is presented. Claudius is being contrasted with Augustus and Julius with St. Peter. In Seneca, we have the dawn of the Golden Age being predicted under Nero as seen in section 4, while Erasmus, in a letter to Pope Leo X, the successor of Julius, states : 'When Pope Leo was placed at the helm, the world was conscious that by a sudden revolution a worse than iron age had become a golden one...The waves of war were calmed and the mutual threats of rulers were repressed...Let other men extol the wars which Julius II either effectively stirred up or successfully fought...A war that was almost world-wide may have been proof that Julius was a very great man; but at all events the restoration of world peace is evidence that Leo is a greater one.. ( ep.335). In both cases, this idealized figurehead is ultimately responsible for the satirized victim's exclusion from heaven. Thus the parallels between the works, in short, are thematic only.

The *Julius* lacks the subtlety and the variegated literary texture of the *Apocolocyntosis.* Erasmus's dialogue contains only two major speakers, Julius and St. Peter, with the third, Julius's Genius, given only a few unimportant lines. In a work comprising of over 1500 lines, Genius' contribution amounts to only 30, and most of them are 'half-lines' at that! The speeches of Julius and St. Peter are the sole means by which Erasmus characterizes the interlocutors and develops the exposition. Thus the scope of adding variety is very limited. Seneca, on the other hand, conveys the character and reputation of Claudius not only through his own speeches and action but also through the attitude of the other characters toward him and through the description supplied by an anonymous speaker who introduces the story. Erasmus's dialogue is written

entirely in prose, while Seneca uses 'prosimetrum' which is one of the characteristics of Menippean satire.

In her article, Colish emphasizes the possibility of Erasmus' access to Seneca's Apocolocyntosis as a source for the Julius. She bases her argument on the fact that Erasmus wrote the Julius most probably between February 1513 and July 1514, during which time Erasmus was at Oxford. At Oxford there were available three fifteenth-century manuscripts which are now known as Codex Bodleianus 292, Codex Balliolienses 130 and Codex Ballioliensis 136. Although these manuscripts were copied for William Gray, then the Chancellor of Oxford University, in 1440, each of these manuscripts contains the Apocolocyntosis, variously titled, along with a selection of other works by Seneca. Thus at the time when Erasmus was writing the Julius he was also engaged in preparing his first edition of the works of Seneca, which was published by Froben in August 1515. What is significant is that this was a landmark in the history of Senecan scholarship, and Erasmus' edition for the first time demonstrated that correspondence between Seneca and St. Paul, which the Codex Bodleianus 292 contained, was in fact a forgery.

In addition to the Oxford manuscripts of the Apocolocyntosis which Erasmus could have easily consulted while writing the Julius, there were also two printed editions of Seneca which became available before the publication of the Julius. One was entitled *Lucii Annaei Senecae in morte Claudii caesaris ludus nuper repertus* which was published in Rome in 1513 bySylvanus Germanicus and another annotated edition entitled *Ludus L. Annaei Senecae de morte Claudii caesaris* was published by Beatus Rhenanus at Froben's press in 1515. Erasmus was aware of Rhenanus' edition and commentary since he refers to the Apocolocyntosis in a letter (Ep. 325) to Thomas Ruthall, where, inter alia, he states: *Addidimus festivissimum pariter et erudissimum libellum de morte Claudii, nuper in nostra repertum Germania et erudissimis Beati Rhenani scholiis explanatum*...Erasmus retained Beatus Rhenanus' version of the Apocolocyntosis, with some emendations, in his 1529 edition of Seneca. This is further substantiated in letter which he wrote to More from Paris, where he had gone from England to supervise the publication of the first edition of his Moriae encomium. I have already made a brief reference to this letter (ep. 222), and in this letter, which was attached to subsequent editions of the Moriae as a preface, Erasmus justifies the playful tone he is adopting by citing some dozen ancient satires, both Greek and Latin, as precedents for his own work. Among these classical predecessors Erasmus names Seneca specifically: *Verum quos argumenti levitas et ludicrum offendit, cogitent velim non meum hoc exemplum esse, sed iam olim a magnis auctoribus factitatum...cum Seneca Claudii luserit* αποθεωσιν... This letter establishes the fact that

Erasmus knew the Apocolocyntosis well before he wrote the Julius. Erasmus' letter (ep. 325) is also revealing in that it shows the high estimation he had for Seneca. I quote some relevant excerpts: ...Seneca's advice is remarkably sound. With so much feeling does he encourage virtuous living that it is quite obvious that he practised what he preached...In brief, anyone who picks up the works of Seneca with the desire to become a better person, departs a better person...There is such a high degree of moral goodness in him that, even if he were absolutely lacking in eloquence, he would still deserve to be read by all men who desire to live a good life...In this context, I cannot help but draw attention to my introduction to Seneca where I have quoted a modern prevailing view about Seneca as expressed by Landor. Be this as it may, Erasmus at least considered Seneca primarily a moralist, just as he did Lucianus, even though Erasmus might have been thinking of Seneca's letters and essays in the letter quoted above.

Thus it is not difficult to find many similarities between the two works, although very few modern scholars have done any research on their relationship. When one looks at the themes of both these satires, we find that both are concerned with criticizing by lampoon and satire rulers whom both authors had little respect for. Both Claudius and Julius are held up for ridicule, for the abuses they have committed in their reigns and both Seneca, indirectly, as well as Erasmus, directly, portray them as examples of vice in contrast to Augustus and Peter. I have already made mention of the fact that one of the main characteristics of Menippean satire is the depiction of the world as topsy-turvy, and thus both Claudius and Julius are punished for actions they had considered praiseworthy while on earth. It is very ironical that an Emperor would be handed over to his freedmen to function as a court clerk or that one who claimed to be the vicar of Christ be denied entrance to Heaven. In both works the authors concentrate on the particular crimes of the individual ruler and at the same time an ideal is presented . The 'modus operandi' used by Seneca and Erasmus is different. As I have already mentioned, the Apocolocyntosis is a 'three-storied' Menippean satire and thus it is difficult to dissociate the personal, political and social motives of the author. The reader almost feels that having climbed the 'first-storey', and having observed all what has happened there, he is already in the 'second-storey' which is indirectly linked to the observations the reader has noticed in the preceding storey. All the ingredients of a Menippean satire is found in the Apocolocyntosis, the themes, the settings, the presentation while in Lucianus, for example, the satires discussed by me, have to be taken as a 'diptych'. Seneca presents the reader with Augustus, but he holds the stage only for a brief while, and his speech is really a criticism of Claudius' deeds during his emperorship with an enumeration of his own goals and accomplishments. In his

speech, there is no indication as to how Claudius should have conducted himself. Erasmus, on the other hand, makes it clear from the beginning what his ideal is. Peter is present throughout the dialogue, and Julius condemns himself through his own words while Claudius is attacked either by the narrator or other characters.

Claudius, of course, is presented as a bungling and somewhat foolish person while Julius is always shrewd and conniving, aware of what he is doing at every moment and always willing to defend any action he may have performed irrespective of their consequences. As a result, it is easier to feel sorry for Claudius than for Julius. Julius, of course, evokes in the reader a sort of grudging respect. It is appropriate at this point to make a small observation on the presentation of the two satires. Erasmus uses direct rather than narrated dialogue throughout his satire. This has the effect of eliminating all the opinions and points of view of a third person and thus forces the reader to base all his judgements of Julius on his own words and actions themselves rather than as seen through the eyes of a third person. Thus this direct approach gives a narrower, but at the same time, a more penetrating view of Julius, while the character of Claudius, being presented through the eyes of the narrator, remains shallow in comparison. One also notices that except for the symbolic use of the gate, there is no movement at all in the Julius Exclusus, except in the opening and the closing lines. The dialogue could have taken place anywhere, but Erasmus brilliantly uses the gate in a symbolic way to indicate the great gulf separating Julius and Peter. Seneca accomplishes this by means of Claudius' journey. The Julius also lacks the characteristic of 'prosimetrum' which many scholars have considered a 'sine qua non' of Menippean satire. I have pointed that this is not necessarily so and that it only comprises one characteristic of Menippean satire and that also by no means the most important one. One advantage of prosimetrum is that it can show the gulf between the abstract and the reality and also can show what an author can do with language, thus giving more leeway to variety as could be seen in the 'nenae' of the Apocolocyntosis. The dialogue in both of these satires contain the spirit of σπουδογελοιον and remains humorous. Just like Claudius, Julius, however cunning and shrewd, is finally revealed to be a fool as far as heaven is concerned. Just as in his Colloquies, the Julius dialogue contains a Christian rather than a thoroughly Menippean spirit even though it possesses many of the characteristics of the genre.

The weakness of a structure of a 'Dialogus' like '*Julius*' has already been explained by me. Erasmus had no personal vendetta against Pope Julius II. It is really a bitter attack on a 'warrior-pope' and through him on the contemporary papacy. This satire is inspired by a real desire for reform rather than by

political opportunism or mere animosity. One can say that the *'Julius'* contains not only the diagnosis of the ills of Christendom but also their remedy. After all, there is no suggestion whatsoever that papacy be abolished, for the dialogue ends on the hopeful note that the office will survive even its most notorious occupant, in this case, Julius himself. In his closing speeches Peter enjoins that the papacy give the lead to the church by abjuring worldliness and returning to apostolic simplicity. The final plea and hope for reform is contained in these lines:
Peter: *Immo si Christianorum vulgus conspiceret in te veras Christi dotes, nempe vitae sanctimoniam, sacram doctrinam, caritatem flagrantem, prophetiam, virtutes, hoc te magis suspiceret, quo a mundi commodis intelligeret mundiorem...*
If the common people of Christendom were to see in you the true gifts of Christ, such as holiness of life, sacred learning, fervent charity, prophecy and virtue, they would recognise your detachment from worldly possessions and respect you the more for it....
Personally I consider this a fitting conclusion for this 'dialogue', it ends with a plea for reform, a hope 'which springs eternal in the human breast...'

It is appropriate at this juncture to summarize what has be written above. Generally the settings of Menippean satires fall under two different types. Some works employ a setting situated in the 'other-world' as has been seen in Seneca's Apocolocyntosis, or Lucianus' Icaromenippus or Nekyia. This study has been solely concerned with settings of this nature, and although another common setting is a symposium, e.g. works like Lucianus' Carousel or Godly Feast have not been taken into consideration, being beyond the scope of this work. The settings anyway play an important role since it contributes directly to the development of the theme. Then there are also Menippean satire where there is no setting at all, or even if there was, it makes no direct contribution to the development of the theme. To this category falls the dialogues of Erasmus and Lucianus, in the sense that the setting is unimportant to the theme. Thus the Julius exclusus could have taken place anywhere, and the reader would have yet completely grasped the whole purpose of Erasmus in writing this satire. The advantage of a lack of setting is that the author can use it to create more spontaneity and reality. Without the background of a particular setting, the dialogue thus becomes spontaneous and informal. This is a typical feature in the dialogues of Lucianus, where the impression is created as if the characters have just run into each other accidentally and thus commences an informal conversation. For example, Erasmus' Moriae has no 'setting' as such, as the setting is unimportant to the theme.

The lack of characterization is a general feature of satire. Satires are more content to expose types and the authors are more concerned with the external foibles of the characters being satirized. In this context, one can say that most of the characters in the satires of Lucianus examined are types representing what the satirist wants to satirize. Generally, very little information of a personal nature can be got from a satire. Seneca's Apocolocyntosis is an exception to the rule. Seneca had ample reasons for disliking Claudius, having suffered exile for six years at his hands. Thus he conveys loathing for Claudius's physical, mental and moral infirmities through descriptive exposition, through the emperor's own speech and action and through the reaction of other characters to him. To use a boxing term, Seneca punches 'below the belt' but this is not unnatural in satire.

'*Ultima vox eius haec inter homines audita est, cum maiorem sonitum emisisset illa parte, qua facilius loquebatur: 'Vae me, puto, concacavi me.' Quod an fecerit, nescio; omnia certe concacavit.*'

This was the last utterance of his heard among mankind, when he let out a louder sound from that part, through which he spoke more easily. 'Alas! I think I have shit myself.' I do not know whether he did. Certainly he shat up everything else. (4,39,4).

One more example would suffice to prove this point.

'*Ut (Hercules) vidit novi generis faciem, insolitum incessum, vocem nullius terrestris animalis sed qualis esse marinis belius solet, raucam et implicatam, putavit sibi tertium decimum laborem venisse.* (When he saw the shape of novel kind, the unusual gait, the voice of no land-animal but as such was of sea-beasts, he thought that his thirteenth labour had arrived. 5: 14-16)

The satires which have been examined in this study are characterized by their unpretentious and conversational language. The Julius exclusus does not contain any verse, but the other satires do contain the mixture of prose and verse. Lucianus and Seneca use verse for different purposes. Sometimes it is merely decorative, and in some of the dialogues of Lucianus it could be omitted with little loss, while the elimination of it from Seneca's Apocolcyntosis would seriously impair the work. Often it is used as a device to juxtapose appearance with reality. All the three authors are concerned with the accumulation and the abuse of power, which are seen as transitory and which might finally lead to eternal punishment. The three satirists represent in a way the times they lived in and the philosophy which prevailed at that time. The Cynic will abandon all institutions and philosophy preferring to live a simple, day to say life, the Stoic, on the other hand, will be guided by reason and will follow a path designed to bring him wisdom, while for the Christian, the philosophy of Christ is the answer. Erasmus is the only one among the three satirists who proposes a solution that is definite and certain, namely, the

philosophy Christ. Thus while Lucianus suggests an ideal in the Cynic's ordinary man and simple life, and while Seneca indirectly presents a contrasting ideal in Augusts, there is no positive 'philosophy' offered as in Erasmus. This preoccupation with a positive plan for Christian living separates Erasmus from both Seneca and Lucianus. But one should remember, that Lucianus represented the second sophistic, Seneca lived at a time which was turbulent under the Emperors while Erasmus lived in an age of humanism on the brink of the Reformation. In all the satires examined, there is one common recurrence, the spirit of σπουδογελαιον favoured by the cynics. All of the works examined here are satirical to various degrees, sometimes harshly critical and biting, and sometimes mocking or parodying, but the humour prevails, the reader seldom gets angry or depressed after reading through them.

# 15. Modern approaches to Menippean satire

## 15.1 Mihkail Bakhtin (1895-1975)

In the Finnish transliteration of Russian, the surname of this author would really be 'Bahtin' and even the International Standard (ISO) would render the Russian X as 'h'. But for some reason or another, modern scholars use the spelling Bakhtin, thereby resorting to the old international standard. I have followed suit.

Brief mention of Bakhtin and Frye has already been made in the introduction and it is appropriate at this point to review the satires discussed in the light of the characteristics of Menippean satire as propounded by Bakhtin. Bakhtin was not a pioneer in this, and the characteristics of Menippean satires which he has enumerated had appeared in one form or another, especially among German scholars. As Riikonen has correctly pointed out (pp. 17-18), the starting point for Bakhtin was the German *Alterumswissenschaft* and cites the fragments of Varro's satires, *Varronis Saturarum Menippearum reliquiae* edited by Alexander Riese in 1865, as well was Rudolf Helm's *Lucian und Menipp*, a major study on the subject which appeared in 1906. The importance of Bakhtin lies in the fact that he has compiled what he considered to be the characteristics of Menippean satire, and has enlisted fourteen elements of them thus giving a more systematic formulation and a more coherent basis. Naturally, it has to be borne in mind that no author would ever have a 'tabulation' of features in front him and mould his satire based on those features. Each author is motivated by social, political, didactic or even personal factors when writing satire, and it is thus impossible to find all features enumerated in a single satire, whether Menippean or otherwise. However it would be interesting to trace some of these features in the satires discussed in this study, and to see whether such features are evident.

The rediscovery of Bakhtin and the publication of his works, first in Russia and then, upon translation, in the English speaking world has brought with it a significant raising of his reputation making him a major thinker of the twentieth century. Apart from the Bakhtin Circle, there is also a Bakhtin Institute at Sheffield University, devoted primarily to the research of Bakhtin's works. The sole work which concern us here is entitled: The problems of Dostoevsky's

Poetics *(Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo)* the third edition of which published in Moscow in 1972. My paraphrasing and quotations of the salient features of Menippean satire will be from this book.

Bakhtin's works were never fully accepted by the oppressive Soviet regimes under which he lived and wrote. The year that he first published in *Poetics*, he was exiled to Kazakhstan, and even when he returned, the Russian Communist state never fully accepted his dialogic principle to the Marxist conception of dialectical materialism. In reality, the *Poetics* of Bakhtin should be read as a philosophical treatise on man's method for ordering and understanding reality, which involves the structure of free discourse, namely, polyphony. To Bakhtin, polyphony was the answer to the problem of how to convey a complex of contradictory ideas while averting direct judgement.

Bakhtin shows that Menippean satire was not only a Greco-Roman genre but that it continued during the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the Reformation albeit in different forms. Bakhtin was of the view that that this genre was capable of transforming itself, and penetrating other genres just like the legendary 'Proetus'. Riikonen (p. 17) cites works by Highet and Fowler where the 'Proetean' genre of satire is emphasized. Bahktin does not give any strict definition of the 'genre' of Menippean satire but is more content to point out 'Menippean features' in various works, and finds in Dostoevsky the culmination of Menippean satire. An excellent and detailed account is provided by Riikonen ( p 17-29) and I am indebted to it.

In the Russian original Bakhtin deals with Menippean satire (pp. 189-203) by tracing the origins and the stages of Menippean satire in Antiquity. The world which Bakhtin describes is the world of 'carnival', in which everything is upside-down or topsy-turvy. All the satires analyzed in this study prove this point. Bakhtin postulates a prehistory of Menippean satire, and mentions, inter alia, Antisthenes, Heraclides Ponticus and Bion (p. 190) who are said to have written Menippean satire. Thus he starts with the Socratic dialogue, where the search for the truth was conducted with the aid of dialogue in contrast to monologism, which is concerned with saying what the truth is. In the Socratic dialogue, the characters are not really people but ideologies. In a way, this is seen in the characters of Lucianus' satires, since one does not find any character development as such, on the contrary, an ideology is presented through the characters themselves. One can even consider Julius II as a *symbol* of the 'warrior pope' rather than the historical Julius II in flesh and blood, since through Julius the abuses and carnage which war brings along with it has been vividly expressed. Be this as it may, Bakhtin starts by tracing Menippean satire, mentioning, inter alia, Varro, Seneca, Petronius, Lucianus and

Apuleius. I shall now paraphrase the salient features of the fourteen items as enumerated by Bakhtin (pp. 192-201), commenting upon them where necessary.

1) A greater importance is given to the comic element in contrast to the Socratic dialogue. The humour may be exaggerated as in Varro, or reduced, as in Boethius. Bakhtin himself calls this the 'carnival' element. The comic element, of course, is seen in all the satires dealt with in this study.

2) Menippean satire differs from historical writing and that of memoirs. It is characterized by an extraordinary freedom of plot and philosophical invention. The heroes are generally historical or legendary, in this context, Bakhtin cites Diogenes and Menippus, and is of the opinion that in world literature there is no genre more free than Menippean satire in its invention and use of the fantastic.

3) This is one of the longest paragraphs of this section. Basically, it is the creation of extraordinary situations in which to test a truth or philosophical idea. This accounts for the frequent journeys to heaven and hell, wandering through unknown and fantastic lands. Very often the fantastic takes the character of an adventure story, or even assumes a mystical-religious character, but in all these cases, the fantastic is subordinated to the ideological function of testing a truth. The enunciation of the 'philosophy of Christ' is one of the most telling points in the *Julis exclusus.*

4) This point is stressed again here. The organic combination of fantastic and mystical-religious elements with elements of earthly life. Bakhtin himself calls this 'slum naturalism' (p. 194). The adventures of truth take place on the highway, in brothels, dens of thieves etc. and the wise man collides with worldly evil, depravity, baseness and vulgarity in their extreme expression. While Bakhtin mentions Lucianus and Varro in this respect, he points out that this is present in the fullest in the works of Petronius and Apuleius. It is from this point that Menippean satire expanded into novels.

5) The Menippean satire is concerned with the genre of ultimate questions, and contemplates the world and ultimate philosophical positions on the broadest possible scale. This is facilitated by the use of fantasy and free invention.

6) The 'three-tiered' construction of Menippean satire. I have already shown that Seneca's Apocolocyntosis is a perfect example of this, but if the *Icaromenippus* and the *Nekyomatia* are considered as a diphtyh as was done during the times of the Renaissance, this three-tiered construction would fit these two satires as well. In this context, Bakhtin himself mentions the Senecan satire as an example (p. 196). According to him, this exercised a decisive influence on the structure of the medieval mystery play. Bakhtin refers to the 'threshold dialogue', both serious and comic. which was widespread in the Middle Ages and mentions 'literature of heavenly portals' which he calls 'Himmelspforten-Literatur' during the Reformation. Bakhtin further adds that

the Menippean satire accorded great importance to the nether world, and Lucianus' *Dialogue of the Dead* where the character of Menippus appears in at least twelve of them is a classic example of it.

7) For this characteristic, Bakhtin points out the observation from an unusual point of view, as for example, view from high when Menippus looks down on the earth from the moon in Lucianus' *Icaromenippus*. This observation, *catascopia*, has already been discussed in this study and the usage Lucianus made use of it. Apart from Lucianus, Bakhtin also mentions Varro's *Endymiones*, where the narrator sends his *animus* all over the city to spy out what men were doing when they were awake, as Coffey humourously calls a 'kind of peep show on human misbehaviour' (p. 158). A *catascopia* of the life of the city from a great height. Another classic example is Lucianus' Charon, where both Charon and Hermes observe the world below from the heights by piling Parnassus on Mount Oeta and Pelion on Ossa.

8) For the eighth point Bakhtin refers to moral-psychological experimentation and a representation of abnormal psychic states e.g. insanity, unusual dreams, split-personality and so on. This breaks down the unity of the person and suggests another person within. As an example, Bakhtin quotes Varro's Bimarcus, where a clash between two selves are shown, and through it, a clash between different activities, literature and scholarship against philosophy. As mentioned earlier, there were three titles among Varro's satires referring to the name Marcus; *Bimarcus, Marcipor* and *Marcopolis*, and presumably they refer to the person of Varro himself. In this clash within the personalities of the same self, Bakthin sees a similarity in Dostoevsky's representation as well. It is indeed paradoxical that in Seneca's satire, Claudius while looking at his own funeral, understands that he is dead. *Claudius, ut vidit funus suum, intellexit se mortuum esse (12. 13-14).*

9) This item deals with the violations of the established norms of behaviour, scandal scenes, habits of speech etc. which is considered very characteristic for Menippean satire. Bakhtin specially mentions Lucianus, Seneca, Julian and Petronius in this context. Claudius' death scene is very characteristic of such a use of language. I have already quoted this relevant passage (4,2.-4,3.) earlier, thus it needs no repetition here. In Erasmus' *Julius exclusus*, St. Peter does not mince his words either when describing or enumerating the abuses of Julius II.

10) The Menippean satire is full of sharp and oxymoronic contrast. In rhetoric, oxymora is a figure of speech by which a locution produces an effect by a seeming self-contradiction. Various kinds of oxymora, contrasts and sudden changes are to be found in Seneca's satire. A classic example of this is the funeral of Claudius (12. 5-25). There was a lot of joy at Claudius' funeral: *omnes laeti, hilares'* . People walked about like free men, with only a handful of barristers, 'causidici', mourning. Joy over someone's death accords with

Bakhtin's tenth item. He also lists sudden changes as belonging to this item, and in Seneca's satire, the conclusion where the Emperor becomes a servant of a freedman is a typical point. The description of Claudius' life on earth fares no better. In Britain he has a temple where the barbarians adore him by calling him a fool instead of a god: *parum est quod templum in Britannia habet, quod <hunc> nunc barbari colunt et ut deum orant* μωρου ευιλατου τυχειν? (8.3).

11) Bakhtin lists here the elements of social utopia, usually present in the form of dreams or of voyages to an unknown land. According to Riikonen (p. 26), the *Utopia* by Thomas More has been analyzed as a Menippean satire after Bakhtin. One can, of course, see an 'utopian' element in the *Apocolocyntosis* where this aspect is represented by hints at the return of the Golden Age which is to be expected under Nero as seen in section 4 of the satire. The concluding wish of St. Peter, though by no means 'utopian' from a Christian point of view, can also be seen as a fervent plea for reform and the restoration of the rightful place of the Church.

12) Here is listed a wide use of inserted genres: novellas, letters, oratorical speeches, symposia etc. Bakhtin refers to 'prosimetrum', the mixture of prose and verse and adds that verse insertions are almost parodic. I have already mentioned my views of prosimetrum in the earlier chapters of this study, namely, that it is not necessarily a 'sine qua non' for Menippean satire, but that this aspect has been emphasized by classical philologists. The *Julius* does not contain any verse form, but nor does all Lucianus' Menippean satires. In fact, there is very little verse in his *Icaromenippus* and the absence of it would never have impaired the final point of it. Seneca's satire, however, exemplifies this perfectly. As for the linguistic variety which Bakhtin mentions, Seneca's use of quotations and allusions, e.g. from epic literature (Homer, Hesiod, Virgil) has already been shown in this study. Lucianus often relies on quotations from both Homer and Euripides, although he seems to be having his tongue in his cheek, as it were, when in his *Icaromenippus* Menippus takes courage for his proposed voyage to the world above by remembering the tales of Aesop in which dung beetles, camels and eagles go to heaven (sect. 10)! The dung beetle that goes to heaven is found in Aristophanes' *Peace* and not in Aesop. I personally consider this to be a deliberate misquotation on the part of Lucianus.

13) This item is a continuation of the elements mentioned in item 12. Bakhtin mentions a mixture of styles and tones, consistent with the preceding element.

14) In the last item, Bakhtin emphasizes the 'journalistic' nature of Menippean satire which is concerned with current and topical issues. He refers to the satires of Lucianus as an 'encyclopaedia of his times'.

## 15.2 Northop Frye (1912-1991)

Just like Bakhtin, Frye also can be considered as a modern interpreter of Menippean satire. Norhtop Frye was one of the most distinguished of Canadian scholars, and even during his tenure as Chancellor of the University of Victoria, a 'Northrop Frye centre' was established devoted to research of his works, similar to that of Bakhtin established at the University of Sheffield.

In the 1950's he came independently to very much the same conclusions as Bakhtin in the Soviet union. The main difference is that while Bakhtin examined the polyphonic novel with special reference to Dostoevsky, Frye divided prose fiction to four major parts in his book entitled *The Anatomy of Criticism* where in the glossary he defined anatomy as follows: A form of prose fiction, traditionally known as the Menippean of Varronian satire and represented by Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, characterized by a great variety of subject-matter and a strong interest in ideas. In shorter forms it often has a *cena* of symposium settings and verse interludes. (p. 309). In Frye's system, the organizing principles that give literature its coherence and structure are derived from the myth of ancient Greece and in the third essay of his book he suggests that all literature is based on the displacements of these myths. In postulating this, however, Frye denies the individual identity of a work of literature and the originality of a writer's ideas is denied and the author's identity is therefore negated. Thus it is not for nothing that it is said that Frye attempted to do for literature what Linaeus did for biology, namely, to provide a complete taxonomy. The reference is to the legendary Swede, Carl von Linné.

Frye considered Burtons book to be the 'greatest Menippean satire in English (before Swift)' and in this context he stated:
..here human society is studied in terms of the intellectual pattern provided by the conception of melancholy, a symposium of books replaces dialogue, and the result is the most comprehensive survey of human life in one book that English literature had seen since Chaucer...We note in passing the Utopia in his introduction and his 'digressions', which when examined turn out to be scholarly distillations of Menippean forms: the digressions of air, of the marvellous journey; the digression of spirits, of the ironic use of education; the digressions of the miseries of scholars, of the satire of the *philosophus gloriosus*. The word 'anatomy' in Burton's title means a dissection or analysis, and expresses very accurately the intellectualized speech of this form. We may

well adopt it as a covenant name to replace the cumbersome and in modern times the rather misleading 'Menippean satire' (p. 311-312)

Frye's book published in 1957 developed the modern attitude towards the genre. Frye distinguished four types of prose fiction and divided them into four major categories which may occur in pure form (albeit rarely) or in various combinations with each other. These categories were novel, romance, confession and Menippean satire. However, he preferred the term anatomy for the last, since he considered the term Menippean satire to be misleading. According to Frye, the Menippean satire deals less with people as such than with mental attitudes. Thus the writer of a Menippean satire describes pedants, hypocrites, bigots and incompetent representatives of various occupations. Menippean satire differs from the novel in its characterization, which is stylized rather than naturalistic and presents people as the mouthpieces of the ideas they represent. While the novelist sees evil and folly as social diseases, the Menippean satirist sees them as diseases of the intellect. Menippean satire does not concentrate on plot and action nor does it set out to observe the real workings of society and one of the underlying themes of the Menippean satire is the ridicule of the *philosophus gloriosus* and by this means leads finally to the ridicule of various philosophical ideas and doctrines (p. 309).

Thus Frye tries to find an 'axial symbol' in his division of prose fiction into four major categories. Each of these categories also has a corresponding minor form thus forming a 'double-axis' as it were. According to Frye, any work can be chartered on this chart, based either on what is being imitated or the aims and sources of the work. In the case of Menippean satire the minor form is dialogue of colloquy. It is not the intention of this study to make a deep analysis of the works of either Bakhtin or Frye, but it should be noted, however, that Frye concentrates much of his discussion on the classics of Western literature, namely, Shakespeare, Chaucer, Milton, Eliot, Dickens etc. Just like Bakhtin, he also takes examples of the works of Lucianus, Rabelais, Swift and examines the origin and the first stages of the genre more briefly and in a general way than Bakhtin. He too mentions Menippus, Varro, Petronius and Apuleius as representatives of ancient Menippean satire. Unfortunately, Frye completely ignores literature that is outside the Western Classics; contemporary literature and literature from the Oriental traditions, for example, remain outside Frye's scheme and this rigid inflexible system does not allow for literature other than works abstracted from his aggregation of central myths, and the identity of both the writer and any individual works of literature is lost in Frye's structure. In other words, his theory of criticism does not allow for the individual experiencing or interpretations of literature.

Be this as it may, the result of the works of the above-mentioned authors is that outside of classical circles Menippean satire has become a term used to discuss a vast amount of world literature, including Erasmus and humanistic literature, Rabelais and Burton and Swift as well as works like Stearne's Tristam Shandy, Twain's Moby Dick, Carroll's Alice inWonderland and Joyce's Ulysses, to name but a few.

# 16. Conclusion

This study was concerned with tracing the characteristics of Menippean satire in Seneca's Apocolocyntosis, Lucianus' Icaromenippus and Nekyomantia as well as Erasmus' Julius exclusus. All these three authors were widely divergent both in time and culture as well as in interests, but I have tried to show that they bear some relationship in one way or another to the Menippean tradition in the presentation of their satires. Every writer of satire is naturally bound by the cultural, social and political events of the times they lived in, and these three authors were no exception to this. In addition to this, there can be personal motives as well. In the process of this study, I have also tried to show that the mixture of prose and verse, which was so much emphasized by classical scholars, is not necessarily a *sine qua non* in the presentation of Menippean satire. For example, some of Lucianus' dialogues, which were considered to be definitely Menippean, did not contain any verse at all and the same is true with the Julius of Erasmus. But the prosimetric form when used has been shown to have achieved the purpose of pointing out, inter alia, the difference between illusion and reality, the concrete and the reality.

One cannot talk of any single predominant theme common in all the satires examined, but each author in their own way has shown some typical Menippean characteristics. The abuse of ambition and power, of wealth, the difference between illusion and reality leading to the world being 'topsy-turvy' has been clearly shown. The other-world setting has been shown to be common in all the satires examined, and I have also commented upon the conversational and easy-going language as well as the spirit of σπουδαιογελοιον prevalent in all these satires.

Although research abounds on each of these authors individually, scholars have been mainly content to make passing references to any connection of a particular theme among these three authors. This alone has made this study interesting, at least to me, personally. It is not my intention to maintain or claim that any of these authors had Menippus in mind when they wrote these satires, but I have tried to show some common and important characteristics of Menippean satire in all the works examined. I conclude by quoting a passage from the famous English satirist, the poet laureate of 1670, John Dryden:

Many of Lucian's dialogues may also properly be called Varronian satires, particulary his True History...Of the same stamp is the mock deification of Claudius, by Seneca; and the Symposium or Caesars of Julian, the Emperor. Amongst the moderns, we may reckon the Encomium Moriae of Erasmus...and (if it not be too vain to mention anything of my own), the poems of Absalom and MacFleckno. (Essays of John Dyden: A Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire)

## Bibliography

Augustijn, Cornelius. Erasmus. University of Toronto Press, 1991

Bakhtin, Mikhail. Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo. 3rd ed. Moscow, 1972

Blanchard, W. Scott. Scholar's Bedlam. Menippean Satire in the Renaissance. Bucknell University Press, 1995

Branham, R. Bracht. Unruly eloquence : Lucian and the Comedy of Traditions. Cambridge, Mass, 1989

The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. II. Latin Literature. Ed. by E.J. Kenney. Cambridge University Press, 1982

Coffey, Michael. Roman Satire. London, 1976

Coffey, Michael. Seneca, Apocolocyntosis, 1922-1958. *Lustrum* 6: 239-71

Collected Works of Erasmus : Literary and Educational Writings, 27-28. Ed. A.H.T. Levi. University of Toronto Press, 1986

Colish, Marcia. Seneca's Apocolyntosis as a Possible Source for Erasmus' Julius Exclusus. *Renaissance Quartely*. p. 361-368

Dorey, T.A. Erasmus : chapters by Margaret Mann Phillips et.al. London, 1970

Dryden, John. A Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire. Oxford University Press, 1925.

Duff, J. Wight. Roman Satire : Its Outlook on Social life. Cambridge, 1937

Erasmo da Rotterdam. Elogio della Follia. Rizzoli. Milano, 1995

Erasmus von Rotteram. Ausg. Schriften : 5 : Julius Exclusus et al. Ubers von Gertrud Christian. S.l., 1968

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism : Four Essays. Princeton, 1957

Gellius, Aulus. The Attic Nights. Transl. by John Rolfe. Harvard University Press, 1968

Grant, Michael. Roman Literature. Penguin Books. Middlesex, 1958

Harvey, Paul. The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature. Oxford University Press, 1974

The Julius Exclusus of Erasmus. Transl. by Paul Pascal. Introd. by J. Kelley Sowards. Indiana University Press, 1968

Lucian. Transl. by A.M. Harmon. 8 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London, 1967

Mangan, Joseph. Life, Character and Influence of Erasmus. Vols. 1 & 2. Macmillan, 1927

McCarthy, Barbara P. Lucian and Menippus. *YCIS* 4: 3-55

Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterdami. 11 vols. Ed. by P.S. Allen. 1972-

Opuscula. A Supplement to the Opera Omnia. Ed. by Wallace K. Ferguson. Hague, 1933

Relihan, Joel C. A History of Menippean Satire to A.D. 524. Ann Arbor, 1990

Riikonen, H.K. Menippean Satire as a Literary Genre with Special Reference to Seneca's Apocolocyntosis. Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1987

Rose, H.J. A Handbook of Latin Literature. Methuen, 1954

Seneca. Ed. by C.D.N. Costa. Routledge & Kegan, 1974

Seneca. Apocolocyntosis. Ed. by P.T. Eden. Cambridge, 1984

Tacitus. The Annals of Imperial Rome. Trans. by M. Grant. Penguin Books, 1961

Turner, Paul. Satirical sketches. Ann Arbor, 1980

Tyhmyyden Ylistys. Transl. by Tuomo Pekkanen. Hki. Yliopistopaino, 1996

Van Rooy, C.A. Studies in Classical Satire. Leiden, 1966

Witke, Charles. Latin Satire : The Structure of Persuasion. Leiden, 1970

## Index of Names and Titles