

HORACE—A COOK?*

The most characteristic feature of all satirical writing appears to be its elusiveness. Though much work has been done in recent years on satire,¹ no definition has as yet been offered that has met with general approval. However, to some extent Roman verse satire seems to be the exception that proves the rule. For in view of the statements which the main representatives of this genre themselves have made on their satires, most modern critics are agreed on their major characteristics.² Yet some poems which the ancient satirists included in their collections have not been accepted as satires by contemporary scholars,³ while others seem to have eluded satisfactory interpretation, as e.g. Horace's fourth satire of the second book.

In his masterly book on Horace, which has contributed much to a better understanding of that difficult poet,⁴ E. Fraenkel writes of the second book of satires 'that Horace, as he went on writing *sermones*, began to run short of suitable subjects and settings';⁵ and he is content merely to explain the opening of the fourth satire and to suggest as motto for it (and for the eighth satire) Matron's *δεῖπνά μοι ἐννεπε, Μοῦσα*,⁶ thus implying that Horace is primarily concerned with the preparation of food—and at the same time parodying some piece of didactic poetry. Though much has been written recently on parody in Horace's satires,⁷ this poem does not seem to have received much attention.

* Revised version of a paper read at Cambridge in February 1976; I owe several useful suggestions and warnings to the members of my audience, who must, however, not be held responsible for any of my errors. I also wish to express my gratitude to the Editors and their anonymous referee, for helpful comments.

¹ See I. Hantsch, 'Bibliographie zur Gattungspoetik (2). Theorie der Satire (1900–1971)', *Zeitschr. f. fr. Sprache u. Lit.* 82 (1972), 153–6, and J. Brummack, 'Zu Begriff und Theorie der Satire', *Deutsche Viertelj. f. Lit. wiss. u. Geistesgesch.* 45 (1971), *Sonderhefte Forschungsreferate*, 275–377. Of special importance are the studies by A. Kernan (1959; 1962, 1965), R. C. Elliott (1960), L. Feinberg (1963; 1967), U. Gaier (1967), and J. Schönert (1969).

² Earlier work on Roman satire is listed by W. W. Ehlers in U. Knoche, *Die römische Satire*³ (Göttingen, 1971), pp. 123–36; for the most recent studies I have to refer to *L'Année philologique*.

³ e.g. J. Brummack loc. cit., p. 276—*contra*: C. J. Classen (*Gymn.* 80 (1973), 235–50)—or P. L. Schmidt in a paper read at the meeting of the Mommsen-Gesellschaft at Trier on 18 Apr. 1974 (to be published in *Poetica*). In 1860

L. Doederlein even denied the satirical character of this poem: *Horazens Satiren* (Leipzig, 1860), pp. 253–5.

⁴ Horace (Oxford, 1957); on the problems of writing a book on Horace see W. H. Friedrich, *GGA* 212 (1958), 173–8.

⁵ Op. cit., p. 137, also p. 145.

⁶ Op. cit., pp. 136–7; the quotation is taken from the beginning of Matron's *Convivium Atticum* (*Parod. Epic. Graec.* p. 60 Brandt). N. Rudd (*The Satires of Horace* (Cambridge, 1966), p. 206) takes this satire to be a 'disquisition on eating and drinking', by which Horace is 'making fun of Catius' without 'really attacking luxury' (p. 213, similarly W. Ludwig, *Poetica* 2 (1968), 307–8); see further the rather brief, but more satisfactory remarks by W. S. Anderson, 'The Roman Socrates: Horace and his Satire' in *Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Satire* (ed. J. P. Sullivan (London, 1963)) p. 33, and E. S. Ramage (D. L. Sigsbee, S. C. Fredericks), *Roman Satirists and their Art* (Park Ridge, 1974), p. 84. Most recently, M. Coffey has remarked 'To assess the tone and intention of this work is unusually difficult' (*Roman Satire* (London, 1976), p. 85).

⁷ See e.g. R. Schröter (*Poetica* 1 (1967), 8–23), V. Buchheit (*Gymn.* 75 (1968),

What, then, is Horace's aim and how does he try to achieve it in this satire?⁸

It has been justly remarked by W. S. Anderson that 'the opening of S. 2.4 might remind an educated reader of Plato's *Phaedrus* by its dramatic setting'.⁹ But E. Fraenkel's claim that it is not only the first three words that have been translated from the *Phaedrus*, but that 'this whole passage [i.e. the first three lines] is an elegant transformation of the beginning of the *Phaedrus*'¹⁰ has been criticized by N. Rudd who rightly prefers to take the allusion to Plato as a general one.¹¹ Moreover, Fraenkel unfortunately explains Horace's choice of Platonic reminiscences here and in other satires of the second book only in a rather general way; he does not even hint at the possible reactions of the listener who has just heard Horace converse with Damasippus or rather the latter repeat Stertinius' arguments for the Stoic paradox that all but the wise are mad, and who does not expect a 'Platonic dialogue' to follow.

Indeed, even before the listener may have fully realized the Platonic parallel, he must have been struck by another factor, which does not fit into a Platonic scenery, the name of Catius; and one has to ask, what associations this name is likely to have aroused in the educated member of Horace's audience. The name itself is rare;¹² and neither the military tribune C. Catius Vestinus whom Plancus mentions once in a letter to Cicero (*Fam.* 10.23.5) is a likely candidate nor the otherwise unknown rhetor Catius Crispinus whom the Elder Seneca refers to (*Suas.* 2.16).¹³ A scholion on line 47 of our poem (p.166 Keller) speaks of an author who wrote 'de opere pistorio', Catius Miltiades, while in Cicero, Cassius, Quintilian, and the Younger Pliny we meet with an Epicurean philosopher, who died in 46 or 45 B.C. and who is said by Porphyry to have written 'quattuor libros de rerum natura et de summo bono' (p.308 Holder).¹⁴ We are thus left with the choice between (a) the freedman Catius Miltiades, (b) the Epicurean philosopher Catius, whom Cassius characterizes as one of the 'mali verborum [sc. Epicuri] interpretes' (*Fam.* 15.19.2), or (c) a pseudonym—

519–55), W. Schetter (*Ant. u. Abendl.* 17 (1971), 144–61), K. Sallmann (*Hermes* 98 (1970), 178–203, and in *Musa Iocosa: Festschrift A. Thierfelder* (Hildesheim, 1974), pp.179–206), and D. West in *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry* (ed. T. Woodman and D. West (Cambridge, 1974), pp.67–80); in general: J. P. Cèbe, *La Caricature et la parodie dans le monde romain antique des origines à Juvénal* (Paris, 1966), who discusses (pp.301–2) parodies in *Sat.* 2.4 on the basis of G. Leich, *De Horatii in Saturis sermones ludibundo* (Diss. Jena, 1910).

⁸ In interpreting a Horatian satire one has to consider two aspects, the 'ridentem' and the 'dicere verum', and for this reason it seems inadequate merely to explain the mechanism of parody and humour as Sallmann does in his paper on *Sat.* 1.5 (1974); see my remarks in *German Studies* 9, iii (1976), 46–7, also Sallmann himself, loc. cit. (1970), p.181.

⁹ Loc. cit., p.33.

¹⁰ Op. cit., p.136. Numerous similarities

between Plato and Horace are indicated by D. Heinsius, *De Satyra Horatiana Liber* (Leiden, 1612), pp.62–9, 131–2, and in general 118 ff.

¹¹ Op. cit., p.301 n.21; he does not mention A. M. Prowse's expansion of Fraenkel's suggestion ('Orazio Serm. II 4 e il Fedro di Platone', *RFIC* 91 (1963), 199–201).

¹² Pace P. Lejay, *Oeuvres d'Horace. Satires* (Paris, 1911), p.447, and A. Kiessling —R. Heinze, who claim that 'das Geschlecht der Catii wird nicht selten erwähnt' (*Q. Horatius Flaccus. Satiren*⁶ (Berlin, 1957), p.267). Catia, to whom they refer, testifies more to the notoriety of herself than to the large number of members of the gens Catia; for later bearers of the name see *PIR*² ii (ed. E. Groag, A. Stein (Berlin, 1936)), 129–31 (nn. 562–74).

¹³ The same applies to Q. Catius Aemilianus (*Cic. Tull.* 19).

¹⁴ *Cic. Fam.* 15.16.1; 15.19.1; 2; Quint. 10.1.124; Plin. *Ep.* 4.28.1; Porph. ad *Sat.* 2.4.1 (p.308 Holder).

it has been suggested for C. Matius¹⁵—or (d) a meaningless name; for the name Catus can be classified neither as significant nor as denoting a type character.¹⁶

While it would be rash to decide the problem at this stage, it seems worth remembering that in the opening sections of his satires Horace either introduces names which most of his contemporaries must have been familiar with, such as Maecenas or Trebatius (both alive: 1.1; 1.6; 2.1) or M. Tigellius (recently deceased: 1.2; 1.3); the comic poets Eupolis, Cratinus, and Aristophanes (1.4), literary figures (Tiresias: 2.5; Davus: 2.7), or a god (Priapus: 1.8); or he chooses names which he at least expects his circle of friends to know such as Heliodorus, who had accompanied the group on their journey to Brundisium (1.5),¹⁷ Nasidienus Rufus, the host of Maecenas and some of his friends (2.8), P. Rupilius Rex (1.7), or Ofellus (2.3), both of whom he must have spoken of to his friends before.

Whatever motives Horace may have had in each case for his particular choice, it seems clear to me that invariably he intends to refer to individuals or to well-defined types (Davus), so that one has to assume that Catus, too, is more than an empty and meaningless name and, being less informed than Horace's contemporaries to whom the satire is primarily addressed,¹⁸ we have to look for all possible hints that may help us to appreciate the selection of this name.

The first three lines of the fourth satire do not merely recall Plato's *Phaedrus*. They also depict Catus very clearly as being in a great hurry, as he is anxious to arrange methodically in his memory some new precepts which he says surpass those of Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato. By letting Catus stress both the novelty (2) and the great value of the new maxims (2–3), the poet endeavours, in accordance with the well-known rules of rhetoric,¹⁹ to stir the reader's curiosity and to make him both receptive and attentive. The satirist himself, however, instead of eagerly asking for further details (as one might expect)—merely apologizes for the interruption at so inopportune a moment:²⁰

peccatum fateor, cum te sic tempore laevo
interpellarim; sed des veniam bonus, oro.

He adds a flattering remark which is so obviously out of place that it sounds most amusing (6–7). Catus once more expresses concern that he might forget something, hinting at the same time both at the content and at the form of the new teaching:

¹⁵ J. C. F. Manso, *Verm. Abhandl. u. Aufs.* (Breslau, 1821), pp.284–8, accepted by A. Palmer, *The Satires of Horace* (London, 1883), pp.314–15, and E. P. Morris, *Horace. The Satires* (New York, 1909), p.202, and, not without hesitation, by N. Rudd, *op. cit.*, p.148.

¹⁶ I am using the categories suggested by N. Rudd, *op. cit.*, p.133. A member of my audience at Cambridge suggested a wordplay on *catus*.

¹⁷ I do not believe in T. Frank's suggestion (*CP* 15 (1920), 393) that Heliodorus was Apollodorus (see *Gymn.* 80 (1973), 238 n.21).

¹⁸ This characteristic feature of satire—rightly emphasized for this poem e.g. by

F. L. Heindorf, *Des Quintus Horatius Flaccus Satiren* (Breslau, 1815), p.337, and often stated by later writers on the theory of satire—should never be ignored by scholars when interpreting satires, nor should it be exaggerated (see below, n.117); indeed, it does not preclude the satirist's intention also to address an audience beyond his own life and time (see L. Feinberg, *Introduction to Satire* (Ames, 1967), p.8).

¹⁹ Cf. Cic. *Inv.* 1.23; Auct. ad Her. 1.7.

²⁰ The educated reader who has just been reminded of the great philosophers may well think of Socrates being disturbed by Strepsiades (Aristophanes, *Clouds* 133 ff.), as A. Dacier (*Oeuvres d'Horace* (Amsterdam, 1735), vi.156) aptly remarks.

quin id erat curae, quo pacto cuncta tenerem
utpote res tenuis, tenui sermone peractas,

and though the satirist has paid him a compliment, the very words that Horace puts into Catius' mouth make him look rather helpless: obviously he is not an original mind, not even a very clever pupil. Yet, seemingly unperturbed, the satirist addresses him confidently

ede hominis nomen, simul et, Romanus an hospes,

thereby parodying epic style and making fun of him, who had just been depicted as struggling to remember the newly acquired wisdom. However, all of a sudden Catius no longer seems to be in haste nor bothered by any qualms or misgivings. Though only asked to name his teacher, he is now all too ready himself to give a discourse on the new precepts which he announces in a grand manner ('canam'), suddenly trusting his memory ('memor') and assuming himself the position of authority while he relegates his master to the background ('celabitur auctor'). The audience is amused once more by the parody of epic or didactic poetry and by Catius' unexpected change of attitude, which makes him look a fool. For it appears that neither his claim to be in a rush nor his concern to remember everything need be taken seriously.

At the same time everybody's curiosity is further increased. Those who take Catius to be the Epicurean may ask why here the *auctor* should remain concealed, whereas Epicurus himself is usually worshipped more faithfully by his followers than any other head of a school; and those who are uncertain about Catius' identity, will ask even more eagerly what the doctrine entails.

Rather hastily, without any introduction, Catius plunges into his exposition

longa quibus facies ovis erit, illa memento,
ut suci melioris et ut magis alba rotundis,
ponere.

These words are rather puzzling. While 'illa memento' clearly are reminiscent of didactic or proreptic poetry,²¹ the next lines break the tension (heightened by 'longa quibus facies ovis erit') and finally disclose the secret: eating appears to be Catius' concern here, the selection and preparation of the best kind of food and drink, 'Gastrosophie'.²² Thus, what one expected to be *res tenues*, difficult philosophical problems in subtle language, turns out to be trifling matters,²³ and this makes Catius look even more foolish and adds to the amusement of the reader.

There is no need to go through Catius' discourse line by line. Instead, it seems preferable to consider a few aspects of the poem systematically, the nature of the precepts and their order, the allusions to other literary works and genres, etc.

²¹ See N. Rudd, *op. cit.*, p.211; for examples of the 'majestueux impératif *memento*, courant dans la grande poésie' cf. with J. -P. Cèbe, *op. cit.*, p.301 n.7 (following G. Leich) *Lucr.* 2.66; *Verg. Buc.* 3.7; *Georg.* 2.259; *Aen.* 2, 549; 6.851; etc.

²² For this unusual word see Ch. M. Wieland, *Horazens Satiren ii* (Leipzig, 1786), 148.

²³ On the ambivalence of *tenuis* see H. Schütz's pertinent remarks on line 9 (*Q. Horatius Flaccus. Satiren* (Berlin, 1881), p.212). This poem is full of word-plays and double entendre—a typical feature of genuine satire. However, I would not go as far as K. Witte, who claims that *inmorsus* (line 61) is not only 'doppelsinnig', but to be taken both as *inmorsus* and *in morsus* (*Horaz, i* (Erlangen, 1931), 102; 105).

The precepts are given in various forms, either as general statements²⁴ (that something is or will be, or that something is appropriate or suitable²⁵) or as a personal statement (that you will do something²⁶) or as advice,²⁷ all of them familiar from ancient and modern cookery books.²⁸ They concern the origin and nature²⁹ of food and drinks or indicate the best manner of their preparation³⁰ (mixture³¹). Catus simply says either that something is (or will be) good, better, or best,³² suitable and appropriate or not,³³ without specifying what standards or criteria he is applying. And although he warns his 'pupil' not to claim to possess the art of cooking without first developing a carefully worked out system of tastes (35–6: 'ratio saporum'), he himself does not always account for his statements or his advice.³⁴ However, at times, he refers explicitly to the wholesomeness³⁵ or savouriness³⁶ of the various dishes or drinks. His taste shows no sign of excessive exquisiteness or extravagance, but rather the kind of refinement one would expect from an ordinary man, who enjoys good food, but has to make special provisions when an unexpected guest turns up (17–19). For while most of the food and drinks as well as the ingredients and spices mentioned are not imported, but Italian³⁷—in marked contrast to many of Apicius' recipes—several precepts seem to be at variance with the general practice of the Romans and their eating habits.

Some of the older commentators, e.g. A. Dacier and N. E. Sanadon, have gone too far in their criticism, as they ignored the ancient standards of taste;³⁸ but they were right in emphasizing this aspect³⁹ to which more recent critics

²⁴ 15–16; 20–1; 27–9; 30–4; 37–9; 40–1; 42; 43; 44; 47; 48–50; 55–7; 59–62; 63–6; 70–1; 76–7; 78–80; 81–2 (question).

²⁵ 25–6; 64–6; 71; not suitable: 42; 76–7; 82.

²⁶ 17–20; 51–4; 58–9; 67–9; 72; 83–8; also individually in the first (45–6; 73–5) or third person (21–3; 24–6); warnings: 35–6; 48–50.

²⁷ 12–14; 26–7. A. Cartault (*Étude sur les satires d'Horace* (Paris, 1899), p.265) rightly stresses 'la variété très grande de la forme donnée aux préceptes'.

²⁸ See the compilation ascribed to Apicius (ed. J. André (Paris, 1965)) or the fragments of cookery books, listed by F. Bilabel, *RE* 11 (1922), 932–44.

²⁹ 12–14; 15–16; 20–1; 30; 31–4; 40–1; 42; 43; 44; 45–6; 59–60; 60–2; 70–1.

³⁰ 17–20; 51–4; 58–9; 72; see also 23 (selection).

³¹ 24–6; 27–9; 37–9; 55–7; 63–6; 67–9; 73–5; see in general 35–6; 49–50.

³² 13; 20; 27; (32); 56; bad: 18; 21; 42; 49.

³³ 38; 64–6; 71; 72; contrary: 25.

³⁴ 12–14; 16; 20; 25–6; 40–1; 53–4; 55–7; 59–60; 71.

³⁵ 21–3; 26–7; 27–9; 38; 59–60; negative: 24–6.

³⁶ 15–16; 19–20; 38–9; 40–1; 43;

44; 45–6; 48–50; 51–4; 58–9; 60–2; 70; 73–5.

³⁷ This has been pointed out by several commentators, e.g. P. Lejay, *op. cit.*, pp.450–1; N. Rudd, *op. cit.*, p.212, lists four exceptions: Coan wine (29), African snails (58), Byzantine brine (66), and Corycian saffron (68)—not very much, I think, for a cosmopolitan place like Rome; for Coan wine even Cato gives a recipe (*Agr.* 112).

³⁸ See e.g. A. Dacier, *op. cit.*, p.164 (on line 44) 'Jamais on n'a préféré les épaules du lièvre au rable' (despite Horace's own testimony at *Sat.* 2.8.89–90); N. E. Sanadon, *ibid.*, p.159 (on line 15) merely states 'Autre précepte faux', similarly on lines 20 and 22 (*ibid.*, pp.160 and 161), without supporting his verdicts by references to ancient authors; see also his remarks on line 42 (*ibid.*, p.164) and in general *ibid.*, p.154.

³⁹ Cf. A. Dacier on line 25 (*op. cit.*, p.161) 'Voici encore un goût general que ce philosophe condamne', also N. E. Sanadon, *ibid.*, and L. Müller (*Satiren und Episteln des Horaz* (Vienna, 1891), p.214 on lines 24–7, who refers to Plin. *N.H.* 22.113. See further A. Dacier on line 42 (p.164, also I. G. Orellius-W. Mewes *Q. Horatius Flaccus* ii⁴ (Berlin, 1892), 224, who cite Stat. *Silv.* 4.6.10, or L. Müller, *op. cit.*, p.216 with reference to Mart. 10.45.3 f.) or on lines 22–3

have paid little attention. For there are a good many novelties and oddities in Catus' precepts; and it seems, therefore, only fair to assume that Horace's contemporaries must have been puzzled, to say the least, if not amused by Catus' lecture; this is especially true of the discoveries on which he lays so much stress, as the first group (45–6) is in fact not new⁴⁰ and the second not very grand (73–5). In conclusion we can state that the precepts themselves, the mixture of rather ordinary recipes with most unusual—and not always appetizing—suggestions must have made Horace's readers laugh, and have thus constituted one factor by which the satirist achieved his aim.

Modern scholars are also in disagreement as regards the order in which the various items are presented. While it is obvious that Horace deliberately starts with the usual parts of an *hors d'oeuvre* and finishes with fruit,⁴¹ the rest is not quite so clear as some critics seem to think. Remarks on eggs and cabbage—both items of the *gustatio*⁴²—are followed by advice on how to prepare a fowl at short notice (17–20);⁴³ is it meant as a substitute for the main course or is it regarded as an indispensable part of the *gustatio* when a guest is to be entertained (though there seems to be no parallel)? Next mushrooms are mentioned which nowhere figure amongst the items of a *gustatio*.⁴⁴ It seems, therefore, unjustified to understand 'prandia' as *gustatio* in the next recipe, merely to save the order.⁴⁵ Indeed, as Horace adds first a warning, not to follow Aufidius' example, and then advice, how to secure good digestion, one wonders whether it is not general considerations of wholesomeness and healthiness on which he wants to lay special emphasis. But the catalogue of various shellfish and mussels is, presumably, meant to lead back to the *gustatio*, and a general remark on the 'ratio saporum' certainly leads back to the role of taste, stressing that the selection of food has to be matched by appropriate preparation. The methodological comment (35–6, with a fitting illustration 37–9) clearly separates the earlier section(s) from the following on the most tasty forms of the main (meat-) dishes: boar, venison, and hare are briefly characterized before Catus proudly proclaims.

piscibus atque avibus quae natura et foret aetas,
ante meum nulli patuit quaesita palatum.

(p.160; cf. also Orelli-Mewes, op. cit., p.221 with references to Plin. *N.H.* 23.135 and Celsus 2.29) and in general H. Schütz, op. cit., p.213; Orelli-Mewes, op. cit., p.218; *contra*: L. Doederlein, op. cit., pp.254, 256. On line 15 A. Dacier (op. cit., p.159), after referring to Plin. *N.H.* 19.8 (who agrees with Catus) states 'Palladius n'étoit pas de ce sentiment' (the reference is to 3.24) and adds, characteristically, 'nos jardiniers n'en sont pas non plus'. While, obviously, on several points the ancients held different views, the whole of Catus' lecture is an odd mixture of the ordinary and the most unusual, a 'mélange d'indications sérieuses et de prescriptions ridicules' (E. de Saint-Denis, *Essais sur le rire et le sourire des Latins* (Paris, 1965), p.174 n.11).

⁴⁰ See Kiessling-Heinze, op. cit., p.273,

quoting Archestratos F 3 (p.141 Brandt).

⁴¹ 'Ab ovo usque ad mala' (*Sat.* 1.3.6 f.), cited by Porph. on line 12 (pp.308–9 Holder). Few commentators seem to agree on the rationale of the arrangement so that one hesitates to subscribe to Kiessling-Heinze's 'Klar und durchsichtig ist der Aufbau' (op. cit., p.266).

⁴² Cabbage is recommended by Cato, *Agr.* 156.

⁴³ N. Rudd, op. cit., pp.209–10 points out that there is a modern parallel to this procedure, yet one which is not widely known.

⁴⁴ R. Heinze, op. cit., p.270, seems to doubt that there is any connection at all.

⁴⁵ Suggested by L. Müller, op. cit., p.213 on line 22 with reference to Lipsius; *contra*: Orelli-Mewes, op. cit., p.221 on line 22.

He adds a polemical remark by which he, once more, underscores the need for careful preparation and well-considered and appropriate mixture of the various types of food and drinks. Wine having here been used as illustration, Catius continues with further remarks on wine which again show concern to preserve the taste and emphasize the need for careful preparation and mixture, before he explains how to interest the languishing guest again 'post vinum'.

Why the section on sauces, which were referred to before (38), should come next, is difficult to say, unless one assumes that they are meant to go only with prawns, shrimps and snails, ham and sausages.⁴⁶ This seems unlikely as these are mentioned only as a means to revive the guest's interest in the meal. Appropriately, apples and grapes follow last; but they do not bring us to the end of the lecture. The dried grapes give Catius yet another excuse to refer to more discoveries (73–5), and one of them makes him think of some defects in serving meals.

Some order there is, but only of a rather general nature, and one cannot help feeling that Catius is led by somewhat accidental associations. At any rate, no one would call this a piece of well-reasoned discourse, though occasionally a reason is given for a particular statement or recipe. Thus the structure of Catius' lecture confirms what most readers must feel when they are confronted first with Catius' claim that his precepts surpass those of Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato, and then with some recipes for wholesome cooking.

This discrepancy itself, which nobody can fail to notice and to smile at, is emphasized again and again in the course of the lecture by its general tone, the assumed seriousness and accuracy, with which these trifles are presented, and by the choice of such expressions as 'doctus eris' (19), 'nec satis est . . . ignarum' (37–8), 'sapiens' (44), 'est operae pretium' (63), 'rectius' (72), 'immane est vitium' (76) or 'flagitium ingens' (82). Even more ridiculous, of course, are the polemical remarks

nec sibi cenarum quivis temere arroget artem,
non prius exacta tenui ratione saporum (35–6)

and

sunt quorum ingenium nova tantum crustula promit.
nequaquam satis in re una consumere curam (47–8)⁴⁷

in view of the innovations to which Catius refers so proudly and with so much excitement;⁴⁸ indeed the tone of the whole is more than once at variance with the content. What precepts to overshadow Plato!

This alone is quite enough to make people smile—the claim to be more than one actually is;⁴⁹ and by subtle means Horace knows how to stress this most emphatically in the last lines. For Catius whom he characterized at the beginning as 'bonus' (5) is now addressed by him—on the strength of his discourse, it seems—as 'doctus' (88); and he is asked to lead him to the master

⁴⁶ The marked division 'est operae pretium' renders this most unlikely (*contra*: R. Heinze, *op. cit.*, pp.275–6 on line 63, accepted even by K. Witte, *op. cit.*, p.105).

⁴⁷ Kiessling-Heinze assume that line 48 'parodiert gewiss . . . ein den Lesern bekanntes Dichterwort' (*op. cit.*, p.274).

⁴⁸ 45–6; 73–5; W. Ludwig compares

Lucr. 1.66; 3.2 (*loc. cit.*, p.308).

⁴⁹ As L. Feinberg, *Introduction*, p.3, remarks: 'The essence of satire is revelation of the contrast between reality and pretense' see also pp.176–205, and J. Schönert, *Roman and Satire im 18. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1967), pp.10–11.

himself⁵⁰ and to the distant sources of wisdom from which he wishes to draw the precepts for a life of happiness (94–5). These lines clearly refer to Lucretius,⁵¹ and remind us that in addition to what I would like to call the internal incongruity, the satirical features so far indicated, there are others by which Horace amuses at least his contemporaries and the more educated of his readers. For throughout the poem there are numerous literary reminiscences and allusions, designed to underline the discrepancy between the attitude assumed by Catius and the content of his discourse.

A lecture on the right selection and preparation of food may well remind the educated reader of Archestratus' *Hedypatheia*, a kind of gastronomical *periplus* in which the author, in the language of older poets,⁵² lists the specialities of the various regions and the best seasons for each of them.⁵³ This poem was known to Horace and his friends if not in its original form certainly in Ennius' adaptation.⁵⁴ Besides, Archestratus' poem and other, especially earlier, opsartytic works suggested new topics for ridicule to the Greek comic poets. From the earliest stages onwards, Greek comedies were full of references to cooks and cookery—long lists of foods or kitchen-utensils or descriptions of the preparation of a meal—whatever seemed suitable to create comic effects.⁵⁵ In New Comedy, to which we may be permitted to confine our observations, special emphasis was laid on cooking as being an art that had to be learned from a teacher⁵⁶ and on the help of subsidiary *artes*⁵⁷ as well as on the inventions in this field.⁵⁸ As the aim of cooking is said to be good living or to create pleasure,⁵⁹ it is not surprising that there are not only allusions to or comparisons with the

⁵⁰ Thus Catius is unmasked; for though he is called 'doctus' here, all his learning finally proves neither adequate nor satisfactory, see e.g. N. E. Sanadon, op. cit., pp.172–3 (on line 88) or W. Baxter, *Q. Horatii Flacci Eclogae* (London, 1701), p.353 on line 88.

⁵¹ See Lucr. 1.927–8 (= 4.2–3) and most of the commentators. Those who doubt that Horace has Lucretius in mind, should not forget that Horace is not quoting, but alluding to Lucretius (as he does throughout the poem), both to individual passages and to characteristic features of *De rerum natura* (see below, n.78, also above, n.48, and that in a parodying manner (on which see G. Highet, *The Anatomy of Satire* (Princeton, 1962), p.68; also pp.128–31 and below, n.113).

⁵² For this reason Athenaeus calls him ὁ τῶν ὀψοφάγων ἡσίοδος ἢ θέογυς (310 A) and his poem χρυσᾶ ἔπη (320 F), a phrase which is interesting in view of the third line of this satire. No less interesting is the fact that Archestratus, also, obviously wanted to show the way to a better life.

⁵³ See P. Brandt's introduction in his edition *Parodorum Epicorum Graecorum et Archestrati Reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1888), pp.123–4; he also registers the imitations (pp.140–70).

⁵⁴ See J. Vahlen's edition (Berlin, 1903),

pp.218–20, or E. H. Warmington's *Remains of Old Latin* (London, 1956), i.406–11.

⁵⁵ For a convenient collection of references see H. Dohm, *Ageiros (Zetemata 32* (Munich, 1964)), on Maïson and Tettix pp.11–22, on Epicharmus, pp.22–30, on Old Comedy, pp.30–66 (catalogues 59–61), on passages ridiculing philosophy and philosophers, pp.163–73; for Horace and the New Comedy see *Sat.* 2.3.11, for his models here e.g. P. Lejay, op. cit., pp.446–7, G. Kowalski, 'De Horatii satira II 4' in *Commentationes Horatianae* (Cracow, 1935), pp.25–6, or N. Rudd, op. cit., pp.202–6.

⁵⁶ Cf. Anaxippus F 1; Damoxenus F 2; Euphro F 1.1–12; 10.11; 11.1–5 (all references are to Th. Kock's *CAF*); art: apart from Menander see Anaxippus F 1; Athenio F 1.1; 14–16; 37–38; Damoxenus F 2; Posidippus F 26; Macho F 2; Hegesippus F 1.6–10; Sosipater F 1; Nicomachus F 1.2–3; 11–15;

⁵⁷ Cf. Damoxenus F 2.16–61; Sosipater F 1.15–18; 25–57; Nicomachus F 1.16–42.

⁵⁸ Cf. Anaxippus F 1.11–13; 21–2; 27; Athenio F 1.41–3; Hegesippus F 1.4–10; Euphro F 1.13–15.

⁵⁹ See Athenio F 1.14–16; 34–8; 42–3; Nicomachus F 1.22; (cf. *Hor. Sat.* 2.4.35).

teaching of philosophers,⁶⁰ but especially references to Epicurus, designed to ridicule him and his followers.⁶¹ Epicurus himself had already found it necessary in view of his doctrine that 'the beginning and the root of all good is the pleasure of the stomach',⁶² to warn against misunderstandings, 'for it is not continuous drinkings and revellings, nor the satisfaction of lusts, nor the enjoyment of fish and other luxuries of the wealthy table, which produce a pleasant life, but sober reason' (*Ep. Men.* 132). And, perhaps also provoked by the famous monthly banquets of the members of the school,⁶³ others frequently chose this aspect for their criticism or ridicule,⁶⁴ e.g. Chrysippus who said: 'μητρόπολιν εἶναι τῆς φιλοσοφίας αὐτοῦ [sc. 'Επικούρου] τὴν Ἀρχεστράτου Γαστρολογίαν'.⁶⁵ Later Roman authors continued along the same lines. In one of his Menippean satires (*περὶ ἐδεσμάτων*) Varro not only lists the best products various places have to offer (in the tradition of Arcestratus and others, later followed by Horace—Catius in lines 30–4), he also contrasts the concern for food with that for philosophy;⁶⁶ and Cicero in a letter to the Epicurean Cassius writes: "'ubi igitur" inquires, "philosophia?" tua quidem in culina, mea molestat' (*Fam.* 15.18.1).

However, besides these associations, elicited by the subject-matter, Horace's diction calls others to mind; firstly in line 30 he echoes such Lucilian verses as

luna alit ostrea et implet echinos, muribus fibras
et iecur addit; (1224–5 Krenkel)⁶⁷

and there must have been more allusions by which he related his poem to the tradition of Roman satire.⁶⁸ Other reminiscences seem to be inserted to assist the reader in appreciating other aspects of the poet's intention.

Ede hominis nomen, simul et Romanus an hospes (10)

has, as Heinze aptly remarks⁶⁹ a distinctly epic flavour; and Catius' reply (11)

⁶⁰ See Anaxippus F 1.21; Damoxenus F 2; Euphro F 1.11–12, cf. C. Pascal (*Athenaeum* 8 (1920), 2–5).

⁶¹ See Damoxenus F 2 and Hegesippus F 2.

⁶² Ath. 546 f = F 409 Usener who cites several parallels (*Epicurea* (Leipzig, 1887), pp.278–9); more apt ones are noted by C. Diano (ed.), *Epicuri Ethica et Epistulae*² (Florence, 1974), p.174 ad F 36, also id., *Scritti Epicurei* (Florence, 1974), pp.92–4, G. Arrighetti (ed.), *Epicuro. Opere*² (Turin, 1973), pp.562–4, and H. Adam, *Plutarch's Schrift 'non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum'* (Amsterdam, 1974).

The translation in the text is taken from C. Bailey, *The Greek Atomists and Epicurus* (Oxford, 1928), p.488, the next from C. Bailey (ed.), *Epicurus. The Extant Remains* (Oxford, 1926), p.89.

⁶³ Cf. A. P. (Philod.) 11.44; Cic. *Fin.* 2.101–3; Plut. *Mor.* 1089 C; Ath. 298 D.

⁶⁴ The first seems to have been Timocrates (Cic. *Nat. d.* 1.113; Plut. *Mor.* 1098 D); see further the passages cited in the two previous notes.

⁶⁵ *Stoic. Vet. F.* F 709 (iii.178).

⁶⁶ F 1 and 2 (in F. Bücheler and W. Heraeus's edition of Petronius (Berlin, 1922), pp.226 and 227, F 403 and 404), see also F 315 (p.216) 'et hoc interest inter Epicurum et ganeos nostros, quibus modulus est vitae culina'.

⁶⁷ Ps. -Acro on line 32 quotes F 1233 (Krenkel); cf. also F 1172–3 (Krenkel) with line 54.

⁶⁸ As the anonymous referee points out to me, this Lucilius passage is 'in contrast to exhortations to simplicity of diet like Laelius on the virtues of sorrel' (F 1130–2 Krenkel). M. Coffey, op. cit., p.85 draws attention to such satirical writings as Varro's *nescis quid vesper serus vebat* (F 333–40, pp.218–19 Bücheler–Heraeus).

⁶⁹ Op. cit., p.268 on line 10 (and in general p.266); see also G. Leich, op. cit., p.31 (suggesting an Ennian model with reference to Ovid, *Met.* 3.580) who stresses (35) that Horace '... tota satura II 4 Catium ludibundus grandi et magnifico sermone utentem facit' (adding parallels for line 1 (Lucr. 2.216; 3.259; 5.1019 etc.) and lines 12 and 89 (see above, n.25)); see also G. Leich, op. cit., p.44 (on line 11,

ipsa memor praecepta canam, celabitur auctor

sounds equally grand, as if an 'os magna sonaturum' (*Sat.* 1.4.44) was about to start, thus emphasizing the incongruity between form and content: a characteristic feature of satirical writing.⁷⁰ However, unlike the epic or even such didactic poets as Matron (see above, p.333), Catius refrains from invoking the muses; he rather relies on his own memory and relegates the master, to whom he owes all his knowledge, mysteriously to the background, as occasionally in Plato's dialogues a *τῶν σοφῶν τις* is referred to without being named.⁷¹

The rest of the lecture abounds in features reminiscent of didactic or protreptic poetry.⁷² There are expressions of a more general kind such as 'nec satis est . . . (ignarum . . .)' (37–8),⁷³ 'quae natura et foret aetas . . .' (45),⁷⁴ 'sunt quorum ingenium . . . nequaquam satis in re una consumere curam' (47–8),⁷⁵ 'est operae pretium' (63),⁷⁶ and 'immane est vitium' (76); and there are more personal requests or statements, e.g. 'memento' (12, see also 89 and 26–7; 72)⁷⁷ or 'doctus eris' (19, see also 58; 68–9). They seem natural enough in a cookery book (see above, p.337); but for most of them parallels can be cited also from the epic or especially the didactic poetry known to those who listened to Horace's satires or who read them. Moreover, the questions (81–2; 83–7) as well as the inserted methodological considerations which interrupt the continuous flow of the precepts (35–6; 48–9) are clearly meant to parody the practice of didactic poetry as it is most familiar to us from Lucretius;⁷⁸ and while we do not know what Horace's educated friends may have felt reminded of during the course of this lecture, the last lines unmistakably point to the author of *de rerum natura* (see above, n.51).

cf. J. -P. Cèbe, op. cit., p.301 n.6 and Orelli-Mewes, op. cit., p.220 with reference to Ovid, *Met.* 15.146) and 10 (on line 63, cf. below, n.76).

⁷⁰ See—apart from the commentators and writers on Horace's satires—e.g. G. Highet, op. cit., p.13; N. Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism* (Princeton, 1957), p.233. It seems not always sufficiently realized that parody itself aims at ridiculing its model (apart from causing fun), while satire often employs parody to mock a third party (here not Lucretius, but Catius and Pseudo-Epicureans like him are the victims).

⁷¹ See e.g. Plat. *Resp.* 583 B 5–6; *Chrm.* 161 B 8–C 1; *Meno* 81 A 5–6; also *Ti.* 21 A 7–8; *Crat.* 413 D 3–4. I am grateful to K. Gaiser for supplying me with some useful references from the Plato-Index at Tübingen. Orelli-Mewes, op. cit., refer to Lucian, *Par.* 4.

⁷² See e.g. R. Heinze, op. cit., p.266; E. de Saint-Denis, op. cit., p.170; N. Rudd, op. cit., p.211, also above, nn.21, 47, 51, 69, 70; and the following notes.

⁷³ Cf. Lucr. 2.1137; see also 6.704.

⁷⁴ Cf. Lucr. 1.112; (see also lines 20–1 and Lucr. 1.71; 303 etc., cf. G. Leich, op. cit., pp.11–12, and J. -P. Cèbe, op. cit., p.302 with nn.1 and 2); this may also go

back to Ennius, cf. Archastratus F 3 (p.141 Brandt) and for the subject-matter Damoxenus F 1.16–24; Sosipater 1.30–5; and especially Nicomachus F 1.19–23 (cf. lines 35–6 of this satire).

⁷⁵ See Lucr. 6.703–4, also 3.370 and Heinze's comment, quoted above, n.47

⁷⁶ Cf. Enn. *Ann.* 465 Vahlen, also used by Horace, *Sat.* 1.2.37; the phrase is not uncommon in prose; see Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2.73; more frequent is 'operae pretium est': *SRosc.* 59; 108; *Verr.* 2.1.143; 2.2.131; *Cat.* 4.16; *Fin.* 4.67. On 'pernoscere iuris naturam' see Lucr. 1.949–50; 3.1072, also 4.385, on 'natura' at the beginning of a line see above, n.74.

⁷⁷ Cf. above, n.21; on 'doctus eris' cf. A. Th. H. Fritzsche, op. cit. (n.83), 81 on line 19.

⁷⁸ G. Leich writes (op. cit., p.11) 'complura exempla versuum Lucretianorum deflexorum inveniuntur libri II sat. IV, quae Catius Horatium praecepta culinaria docet festiva adhibita dicendi elegantia, quae iocose a rerum tractatarum vilitate distat' and lists several parallels (pp.11–13), comparing e.g. line 46 with Lucr. 1.926–7, see also above nn.74, 76; further 21. 69, 73, 75; also the general remarks in n.51.

Thus the question arises what Horace was aiming at in this satire. Clearly, Catius' discourse itself is funny as it claims to reveal basic precepts for a life in happiness, but presents mere trifles—Italian food instead of Greek philosophy—as it offers a puzzling mixture of rather ordinary and most unusual and refined recipes, and as it does this in a form which, by tradition, is reserved for loftier topics. The person of the lecturer, too, is funny in his disciple's zeal not to forget any of his master's words and in his pride to reproduce them, without even mentioning his teacher by name; he is funny also, as he lacks full understanding of his subject and an adequate judgement as regards the importance of its central aspects and new discoveries.

But is Horace merely trying to be funny? Even writers of comedy who mock philosophy and especially individual philosophers intend to do more than amuse their audience; they clearly want to criticize them and to caution others against their teaching. However, in attempting to assess Horace's aims we cannot simply point to the tradition of the comic (or the satiric) poets which he obviously follows and assume that he shares all their intentions. Instead, we have to ask whether there are any indications in his poem that may help to answer our questions.

Some scholars have assumed Horace to be attacking gluttony⁷⁹ or at least those who spend all their money on exquisite food only to get not very good meals.⁸⁰ However, it has been shown above that most recipes recommended point rather to wholesome, tasty dishes, and not to extravagance or excess. Lejay has also suggested that Horace is scoffing at the teaching-practices of the philosophers of his time,⁸¹ and in this he is certainly right. Earlier commentators have supposed that Horace is mocking the Epicureans⁸² or at least the 'leves Catillones Epicureae Sectae'⁸³ of his own time; but this has more recently been questioned or rejected.⁸⁴ While many have refrained from naming individuals as Horace's victim(s), others have tried to reveal Horace's intention by identifying the unnamed *auctor* with Horace himself,⁸⁵ with Maecenas,⁸⁶ with Epicurus,⁸⁷

⁷⁹ See e.g. G. T. A. Krüger, *Des Q. Horatii Flacci s  mtliche Werke* ii.11 (Leipzig, 1885), 127, similarly already Jodocus Badius (Josse Bade) *Ascensius in Opera Q. Horatii Flacci* (Paris, 1528), fo. 203r. A comparison with medieval preaching or later satire denouncing this vice does not only reveal Horace's restraint and taste, but indicates that his is a different target.

⁸⁰ See P. Lejay, op. cit., p.453.

⁸¹ Ibid., pp.448–9.

⁸² Porph. on line 1; Ch. Landino in: *Horatius cum quattuor commentariis* . . . (Milan, 1508) fo. 217^r; J. Badius, op. cit., fo. 203^v; D. Lambin, *In Q. Horatium Flaccum* . . . (Frankfurt, 1596), p.175; H. Sch  tz, op. cit., pp.209–11; most recently K. B  chner, *Horaz. Die Satiren* (Bologna, 1970), p.221; see also next note.

⁸³ W. Baxter, op. cit., p.348, similarly A. Dacier, op. cit., p.152; F. Ritter,

Horatii Satirae et Epistulae (Leipzig, 1857), p.187; A. Th. H. Fritzsche, *Des Q. Horatii Flacci Sermonen* ii (Leipzig, 1876), 78–9; L. M  ller, op. cit., p.209; A. Cartault, op. cit., pp.337–8.

⁸⁴ First by Ch. M. Wieland, op. cit., pp.133, 148; later by J. C. F. Manso, op. cit., p.284, who is followed by A. Palmer, op. cit., p.316.

⁸⁵ See Ch. M. Wieland, op. cit., p.134, perhaps Horace himself: *ibid.*, p.136, *contra*: J. C. F. Manso, op. cit., p.285.

⁸⁶ L. Heindorf, op. cit., p.337, accepted by W. S. Teuffel (*Rhein. Mus.* 4 (1846), 215), rejected by J. C. F. Manso, op. cit., p.285; A. Th. H. Fritzsche, op. cit., p.78 and L. M  ller, op. cit., p.210.

⁸⁷ Ps. -Acro on line 11 (p.162 Keller); D. Heinsius, op. cit., p.65 (by implication; *contra*: A. Dacier, op. cit., p.157); H. Sch  tz, op. cit., p.210 (but see *ibid.*, p.221 on line 89); C. Pascal, loc. cit., p.11.

with Ennius,⁸⁸ with Curtillus,⁸⁹ or with Catus,⁹⁰ and the speaker Catus has been taken to be Matius,⁹¹ Catus Miltiades,⁹² or Catus the Insubrian,⁹³ a view which has been so vigorously rejected⁹⁴ that a new examination of the evidence seems to be called for.

Before we resign in despair or indulge in guesswork about pseudonyms or significant names, it seems legitimate in view of Horace's general practice (see above, p.335), to assume that at least Catus is one of Horace's contemporaries or near-contemporaries; the mocking of didactic poetry leaves us with a choice between Catus Miltiades and Catus the Insubrian. There is little to recommend the former as he is not sufficiently known to be used as an example of a sham philosopher, as seems required by the poem's general tone, of which Heinze most appropriately says: 'Horaz gibt die Lehre des Catus vielmehr als Philosophie' (op. cit., p.266). The case of the latter, on the other hand, is supported not only by the 'philosophical' features, but also by Cassius' characterization of Catus as 'malus interpres' (see above, p.334). For this is exactly what he turns out to be, and Horace's remark

nam quamvis memori referas mihi pectore cuncta,
non tamen interpres tantundem iuveris (90–2)

is no more ironical than the rest. Furthermore, this piece of criticism of Epicurean philosophy aptly follows that of Stoic philosophy in the third satire,⁹⁵ in which, however, not a perverted form, but an actual maxim is the target, whereby Horace indicates where his own sympathies lie. Moreover this kind of polemic against philosophers is part of an old tradition; only when one assumes that a school of philosophy is the target, do lines 2–3 seem to be meaningful

⁸⁸ Unnamed scholar, according to H. Schütz, op. cit., p.210, without giving an exact reference.

⁸⁹ H. Düntzer, *Des Q. Horatius Flaccus Satiren und Briefe* (Paderborn, 1868), p.111.

⁹⁰ A. Palmer, op. cit., p.315. Most writers refrain from making guesses; many assume that Horace deliberately chose ambiguity.

⁹¹ See above, n.15; A. Cartault, op. cit., p.34, suggests that 'La S. II, 4 peut avoir eu pour occasion l'apparition d'un livre culinaire, qui fit sensation dans un monde de millionnaires plus riches qu'intelligents', J. Gow, *Q. Horati Flacci Saturarum Liber II* (Cambridge, 1909), p.84, that 'The satire is evidently a skit on some recent work in which culinary recipes were prescribed with great solemnity', see also G. Kowalski, loc. cit., p.27.

⁹² e.g. by Orelli-Mewes, op. cit., p.218; F. Ritter, op. cit., p.187; and not without hesitation by G. T. A. Krüger, op. cit., p.127; Kiessling-Heinze, op. cit., p.267; *contra*: A. Palmer, op. cit., p.314; A. Cartault, op. cit., pp.299, 316.

⁹³ Porph. on line 1; J. Badius, op. cit.,

fo. 203^v; D. Erasmus, 'Colloquia familiaria', *Opera omnia*, i (Leiden, 1703), fo. 662; D. Lambin, op. cit., pp.175, 177–8; D. Heinsius, op. cit., p.64; A. Dacier, op. cit., pp.152–4; L. Doederlein, pp.257–8; H. Düntzer, op. cit., p.110; A. Th. H. Fritzsche, op. cit., p.79; H. Schütz, op. cit., pp.209–11; E. C. Wickham, *Quinti Horatii Flacci Opera omnia*, ii (Oxford, 1891), 160; P. Lejay, op. cit., pp.447–55; L. Cambilargiu, *Athenaeum* 7 (1919), 177–9.

⁹⁴ See e.g. N. E. Sanadon, op. cit., p.154 (who refers also to Vander Béken (i.e. Laevinus Torrentius) and Le Fèvre (i.e. Tanaquil Faber); Ch. M. Wieland, op. cit., p.147; L. Heindorf, op. cit., pp.335–7; A. Palmer, op. cit., p.316; Orelli-Mewes, op. cit., p.218; H. v. Arnim-G. Wissowa, *RE* 3 (1899), 1792, and especially A. Kiessling-R. Heinze, op. cit., p.267; most recently by D. Nardo in: *Dignam Dis a G. Vallot* (Venice, 1972), pp.115–16 n.1.

⁹⁵ For the juxtaposition of Horatian poems on Stoic and Epicurean themes see also *Odes* 2.2 and 2.3 (A. A. Long); cf. *Epist.* 1.1 16 ff.

... praeceptis, qualia vincent
Pythagoran Anytique reum doctumque Platona.

Indeed, a number of passages appear in a new light,⁹⁶ when Horace is taken to be attacking followers of Epicurus in the person of Catius and his unnamed master—i.e. in the light in which those who were prepared to regard Catius as the Insubrian from the start, must have seen them at first sight.

The words 'celabitur auctor' (11) sound doubly funny to anyone who is familiar with the practice of the Epicureans of always referring to and praising their master by name, and no one else; and again 'primus et invenior' (74) stands in perfect contrast to what Epicurus himself in usually said to be: the inventor who has first ventured to do something or discovered something. Horace does not even hint at the identity of the *auctor* nor does he say whether Catius repeats his master's words verbatim (as seems more likely) or claims the innovations for himself. But in ridiculing Catius and his anonymous teacher, Horace's target is not likely to be Epicurus or Epicurus' philosophy as such, nor Catius or his master as individuals, but as examples, representing those who follow Epicurus without understanding his philosophy, those who believe that Epicurus' *ἡδονή* may be attained to by means of bodily pleasures and are, therefore, pictured as concerning themselves with cookery books and wholesome and tasty food; and as thinking that they make important contributions to the master's doctrine when they introduce new recipes. At the same time Horace seems to have in mind those who slavishly adhere to the precepts of their master, which they can, however, at best recite like parrots.

Thus we find Horace not indulging in personal polemics, which he does not consider to be the business of satire; for this purpose he writes epodes.⁹⁸ Here, he introduces proper names as they add to the degree of reality of his attacks;⁹⁹ but he is concerned with actual *general* problems of his time,¹⁰⁰ not ridiculing accepted norms as many critics of their own time do, but—in the manner of satirists—warning against new developments by distorting them and exaggerating their consequences, thus even reaching beyond his own time.

The attitude here attacked is far from Horace's own towards Epicureanism so that there is no difficulty in ascribing this kind of criticism to him. Indeed, in view of such representatives of Epicurus' school as Catius, as depicted in this poem, Horace himself may well have said

⁹⁶ For an even longer list of philosophers attacked by the Epicureans see Plut. *Mor.* 1086 E (beginning with Aristotle, Socrates, and Pythagoras); for the practice of the members of the school to learn their master's principle doctrines faithfully by heart—like Catius—see Cic. *Fin.* 2.20, also Diog. Laert. 10.35–6.

⁹⁷ See Cicero's general characterization: 'qui certis quibusdam destinatisque sententiis quasi addicti et consecrati sunt eaque necessitate constricti' (*Tusc.* 2.5).

⁹⁸ Later writers explicitly distinguish between satire and invective or pasquill or lampoon, as e.g. Dr. Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language* (London, 1755), ii, s.v. satire: 'A poem in which wickedness

or folly is censured. Proper *satire* is distinguished, by the generality of the reflections, from a *lampoon* which is aimed against a particular person'.

⁹⁹ Cf. e.g. A. Cartault, op. cit., p.285. Horace is not afraid to do so—unlike Juvenal and most later satirists (cf. K. Meyer-Minnemann, *Die Tradition der klassischen Satire in Frankreich* (Bad Homburg, 1969), pp.76–7).

¹⁰⁰ N. Frye, op. cit., p.225, says 'For effective attack we must reach some kind of impersonal level'; it seems worth remembering that Cicero, a decade earlier wrote (*Tusc.* 4.7) 'post Amafinium autem multi eiusdem aemuli rationis multa cum scripsissent, Italiam totam occupaverunt.'

at mihi cura
non mediocris inest, fontis ut adire remotos
atque haurire queam vitae praecepta beatae. (93–5)

In comparison with this solution I do not see how the alternative view that Horace scoffs at some otherwise unknown author 'de opere pistorio' can be successfully maintained, as it ignores the tradition of criticism of philosophers and Horace's practice not to attack individuals for their own sake. Nor do I think that any of the objections raised against the identification of Catius with the Insubrian are serious.

(1) Horace was an Epicurean himself.¹⁰¹ Indeed he was, or at least he shared many of the views of the Epicureans.¹⁰² But there is no reason why he should not have criticized other Epicureans whom he regarded as misguided.

(2) Horace does not attack Epicurus openly.¹⁰³ Indeed, he does not, because Epicurus is not his target, but perversions of Epicurean philosophy that do not deserve to be connected with the name of the master himself or any of his serious followers.

(3) Catius does not teach what Epicurus taught (nor does the *auctor*).¹⁰⁴ Indeed they do not, and it is for this reason that Horace chooses them (and not Epicurus himself) for his ridicule; and that neither can be identified with Epicurus himself. However, by attacking a perverted form of Epicurean teaching, Horace does not take a stand as regards his own views; but he achieves agreement with his audience that what Catius teaches does not represent genuine Epicureanism.

(4) Catius was dead.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, he was dead; but Horace, like other Roman writers,¹⁰⁶ had no scruples about attacking dead people. To those who argue that Catius had been dead for a long time,¹⁰⁷ the answer is that 'a long time' is difficult to define. At any rate there is no reason why Catius' book should not have been available to Horace, as it was later to Quintilian. Perhaps this satire was prompted by a copy of Catius' work suddenly turning up in the circle of Maecenas' friends and circulating amongst them.¹⁰⁸

However, before we conclude that Horace, in this poem, is not merely making fun of Catius, but at the same time warning his friends against misunderstandings

¹⁰¹ Cf. A. Palmer, op. cit., p.316.

¹⁰² It is not possible here to discuss at length to what extent Horace may be called an Epicurean. Clearly, he was not hostile to or critical of the basic tenets of Epicurus' school, see e.g. Ph. Merlan (*JHI* 10 (1949), 445–51) nor did he fully subscribe to all aspects of his philosophy, cf. e.g. C. Diano (*AIV* 120 (1961/2), 43–58 = *Sagezza e poetiche degli antichi* (Vicenza, 1968), pp.13–30) and (arguing differently) K. Büchner in *Actes VIII^e congrès G. Budé* (Paris, 1969), pp.457–69. In 'A Discourse concerning the Original and Progress of Satire' (1693) J. Dryden points out that Horace 'is sometimes an Epicurean, sometimes an Eclectic, as his present humour leads him' (*The Poetical Works of Dryden*, ed. G. R. Noyes (Cambridge Mass., 1950), p.307).

¹⁰³ Cf. A. Palmer, op. cit., p.316; see

also N. E. Sanadon, op. cit., p.154.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. N. E. Sanadon, op. cit., p.154; A. Palmer, op. cit., p.316.

¹⁰⁵ Tanaquil Faber according to A. Dacier, op. cit., pp.152–3 (who rejects this view, however, with inadequate arguments); Kiessling-Heinze, op. cit., p.267; see also next note; *contra*: L. Doederlein, op. cit., p.257. Some have assumed an absurd chronology to enable Horace to attack Catius the Insubrian during his lifetime.

¹⁰⁶ *Boll. Stud. Lat.* 1 (1971), 407–8.

¹⁰⁷ See L. Heindorf, op. cit., p.335; Orelli-Mewes, op. cit., p.218; E. Turolla, *Q. Orazio Flacco. Satire* (Turin, 1958), 174; *contra*: H. Schütz, op. cit., p.209.

¹⁰⁸ I do not mean to imply that Horace merely wanted to make fun of this particular book.

and misrepresentations of Epicurus' teaching and against blind attachment to any school of philosophy, we have to ask whether this solution is compatible with the programme that he himself develops in his satires.

According to Horace's own statements—and these alone seem to me to be relevant (so far as they are not meant to be satirical themselves), and not modern theories, when one attempts to appreciate his poems—satire aims at telling the truth while making people laugh (*Sat.* 1.1.25); and this truth is not concerned with physics or logic, with the nature of the universe or the theory of cognition, but with actual problems of the people the poet addresses and of the poet himself, their mistakes and their shortcomings, their vices and their excesses, which he endeavours to point out in a friendly manner, not prescribing—like a philosopher—hard and fast rules as to what is right and what is wrong, but enabling everyone to find his own way, by pointing to good or bad examples.¹⁰⁹ In brief he wants to amuse and he wants to teach, to help, and to warn.

If we assume Catus to be the author 'de opere pistorio' or the pseudonym for another person, there would be nothing in the poem but fun¹¹⁰ or at the most an attack on a particular individual. Only if we take Catus to be the Insubrian, does the criticism become more generally significant as being directed against those Epicureans who misunderstand or misrepresent the teaching of their master; and of those there must have been many at the time.

Thus our observations have led to an interpretation of this satire which has allowed us to understand its individual features in the light of the literary tradition and Horace's own work and time and to explain their function. It has also demonstrated 'the two things' that according to Northrop Frye 'are essential to satire', 'wit and humour' and 'an object of attack'.¹¹¹ For though Horace refrains from harsh personal polemic (see above, p.345), avoids 'the extreme forms of indignation and the more shocking varieties of vice',¹¹² and leaves it to his victim to reveal its own weakness,¹¹³ no one can fail to notice the basic aggressiveness in this poem;¹¹⁴ for the very process of unmasking¹¹⁵ is designed not only to amuse the audience, but by ridiculing Catus and people like him to teach the victim and the audience in general, especially with the help of two of the most common and most effective weapons of satire, irony and parody.¹¹⁶

¹⁰⁹ Cf. *Sat.* 1.4.105–29, cf. K. Sallmann, *Hermes* 98 (1970), 185; *Boll. Stud. Lat.* 1 (1971), 412–13.

¹¹⁰ This is Wieland's view (op. cit., p.134) 'Ich glaube, dass das ganze Stück bloss zur Belustigung des Maecenas und seiner vertrauten Tischgesellschaft geschrieben worden.'

¹¹¹ N. Frye, op. cit., p.224.

¹¹² A. Kernan, *The Cankered Muse* (New Haven, 1959), p.29.

¹¹³ This is a common device of satire, cf. G. Highet, op. cit., pp.52–3.

¹¹⁴ Cf. U. Gaier, *Satire* (Tübingen, 1967), pp.338–9, who refers to R. C. Elliott's definition, and K. Sallmann, loc. cit., p.180, who refers to Gottsched. This feature is frankly admitted by Horace himself, who denies 'laedere gaudere' (*Sat.*

1.4.78 ff.), not 'laedere', cf. also Lucil. F 1089.

¹¹⁵ For the term see already J. Hall, 'Virgidemiarum' lib. I prol. 20 (1598) in: *The Collected Poems of J. H.*, ed. A. Davenport (Liverpool, 1949), p.11; see further A. Kernan, op. cit., p.23; L. Feinberg, *The Satirist* (Ames, 1963), p.6 (referring to E. Johnson, *A Treasury of Satire* (New York, 1945), which is not accessible to me); id., *Introduction*, pp.212–15; J. Schöner, op. cit., pp.10–11.

¹¹⁶ See above, nn.21, 47, 51, 69, 70, 72 ff.; and below, n.118 in general: G. Highet, op. cit., pp.13, 67 ff., 256 ff. with reference to F. J. Lelièvre (*G & R* 23 (1954), 66–81); J. Schöner op. cit. 18 ff.; L. Feinberg, *Introduction*, 184–92.

It has also become clear that this satire is 'une oeuvre d'actualité',¹¹⁷ and it is only when we try to recapture the associations which a satirist is likely to have evoked in his contemporaries that we fully appreciate his immediate purpose and his art. However, as he resorts to distortion and exaggeration,¹¹⁸ it is not always easy immediately to recognize his victims. Indeed, they may look rather different when we see them through the eyes of other sources. This has to be emphasized as the interpretation here suggested has been rejected on the grounds that what Catius professes is not the doctrine of the Epicureans—of course it is not; nor need it be a faithful reproduction of what such a 'malus interpres' as Catius taught; it may well be a distortion of such perversions. But as Chrysippus attacked Epicurus himself in a similar manner, there is no reason why Horace should not have chosen this subject; indeed, for a satirist, a lecture on cookery must have appeared most appropriate for this particular purpose, especially as the philosophical relevance of eating and drinking was generally accepted,¹¹⁹ and 'wine snobs and food snobs are suitable targets for satire *per se*'.¹²⁰

There is no need to demonstrate in detail that all the other features, usually considered to be the characteristics of satire by modern scholars, can be found in Horace's poem, though it may be pointed out in passing that it seems to fit beautifully Feinberg's provisional definition of the satirist's technique as 'playfully critical distortion of the familiar'.¹²¹ However, it seems not superfluous to emphasize that in interpreting a satire, though the genre may appear Protean,¹²² one continuously has to bear in mind all the 'operis leges', and not the least of them is, as has been shown again, that satire is concerned with—however distorted forms of—reality.¹²³ Thus it can only be understood against the background of its own time; it need not, however, be realistic.

University of Göttingen

C. JOACHIM CLASSEN

¹¹⁷ P. Lejay, *op. cit.*, p.449; cf. also n.91; see in general G. Highet, *op. cit.*, pp.17–18; A. Kernan, *op. cit.*, pp.3, 6, 23; L. Feinberg, *Satirist*, pp.39–40, 292–305, 310–28, etc.; U. Gaier, *op. cit.*, p.260. This must not be taken to mean that the poem has nothing but an actual relevance, see nn.18, 108.

¹¹⁸ Cf. G. Highet, *op. cit.*, pp.3, 5, 69, 148 ff., 190 ff.; K. Lazarowicz, *Verkehrte Welt* (Tübingen, 1963), pp.42–59 etc.; L. Feinberg, *Introduction*, pp.4, 90–1, 105–19. For this satire see D. Heinsius, *op. cit.*, pp.66–9; in view of this there is no need to assume that Horace is mocking (or attacking) the author of a cookery-book or an expert on cooking; the amusement of the audience by means of the literary form (also an essential feature of satire, cf. L. Feinberg, *Introduction*, pp.87–8) is more likely to have been achieved by Catius' recipes as parody of philosophical precepts than as parody of culinary ones; see also n. 60.

¹¹⁹ For the philosophical relevance of eating and digestion, especially the importance of the knowledge of the nature

of food, of its preparation and of the process of digestion see D. Gourévitch, 'Le menu de l'homme libre. Recherches sur l'alimentation et la digestion dans les œuvres en prose de Sénèque le philosophe' in *Mélanges P. Boyancé* (Rome, 1974), pp.311–44.

¹²⁰ I owe this point to the anonymous referee.

¹²¹ L. Feinberg, *Satirist*, pp.7, 81; *id.*, *Introduction*, p.19.

¹²² C. F. Flögel, *Geschichte der komischen Literatur* i/iv (Liegnitz, 1784–7), 294; D. Worcester, *The Art of Satire* (Cambridge Mass., 1940), pp.1–10.

¹²³ Cf. F. v. Schiller: 'In der Satire wird die Wirklichkeit als Mangel dem Ideal als der höchsten Realität gegenübergestellt' ('Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung' in *Sämtliche Werke* 12 (Stuttgart, 1905), 194; see also G. Highet, *op. cit.*, pp.3, 5, 158 ff.; R. Poulson, *The Fictions of Satire* (Baltimore, 1967), p.5: 'Satire's purpose ordinarily is not to create something new but to expose the real evil in the existing'; U. Gaier, *op. cit.*, pp.331–8.