NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE CRAFT OF HORACE IN *ODES* 1. 14

The standard interpretation of this ode is Quintilian's, that Horace's ship is an allegory of the state.[1] This interpretation has been accepted by the great majority of modern scholars—including Fraenkel, Commager, Nisbet-Hubbard, and Syndikus—on the grounds that the allegory is confirmed by the language of the ode's final stanza and that the ode as a whole is modeled on some lines of Alcaeus which themselves employ the same allegory.[2] I believe, however, that Quintilian is wrong and that these grounds will not stand up to examination.

I

Fraenkel opens his discussion of the ode with a fundamental statement of his approach: "The question whether or no *O nauis referent* is to be taken as an allegory must either be answered by the poem itself or cannot be answered at all."[3] It is on precisely this basis, with which I am in complete agreement, that my own discussion of the ode will be conducted. Fraenkel continues: "I write for those who are willing not to read into the poems of Horace any facts of which the words of the text say nothing. I will, however, remark that the beginning of the final stanza, *nuper sollicitum quae mihi taedium, nunc desiderium curaque non leuis*, is sufficient to show the impossibility of any non-allegorical interpretation." Both Commager and Nisbet–Hubbard agree with Fraenkel that the final stanza is decisive evidence that the ship is allegorical, and Nisbet–Hubbard, following Heinze, explain what the nature of this evidence is: "*taedium* is a lover's word," "*desiderium* [is] a lover's word for his heart's desire," "*cura* is also a lover's word."[4] But how is it possible to reconcile this linguistic evidence, upon which Fraenkel rightly laid so much emphasis, with the notion that the ship allegorizes the *res publica?* It cannot be done.[5] The obvious and natural conclusion to be drawn from

1. *Inst. orat.* 8. 6. 44, in the discussion of allegory: "allegoria . . . aut aliud uerbis, aliud sensu ostendit, aut etiam interim contrarium. prius fit genus plerumque continuatis translationibus, ut 'O nauis, referent . . . portum,' totusque ille Horatii locus, quo *nauem pro re publica*, fluctus et tempestates pro bellis ciuilibus, portum pro pace et concordia dicit." It will be noticed that Quintilian makes no distinction between allegory and extended metaphor; for the purposes of this paper I intend to do the same. See further on this point S. Commager, *The "Odes" of Horace* (New Haven, 1962), p. 165, n. 6.

2. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 154–58; Commager, *"Odes,"* pp. 163–69; R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: "Odes" Book 1* (Oxford, 1970), ad loc.; H. P. Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz*, vol. 1 (Darmstadt, 1972), pp. 162–70. The same view was also held by R. Heinze (see his and A. Kiessling's *"Oden" und "Epoden"*[11] [Berlin, 1964], ad loc.) and by innumerable earlier scholars. At the Editor's request I have kept bibliographical references and quotations in Greek to a minimum.

3. *Horace*, p. 154.

4. Commager, *"Odes,"* p. 164; Nisbet–Hubbard, *Commentary*, pp. 179, 187; cf. Kiessling–Heinze, *"Oden" und "Epoden,"* p. 74. Commager remarks on the "erotic vocabulary of the last stanza" (*"Odes,"* p. 167, n. 12).

5. As is clear from Commager's highly unsatisfactory attempt to do so: "His [Horace's] former estrangement from political reality is revealed to be merely a lover's quarrel" (*"Odes,"* p. 167).

this evidence is that the ship allegorizes a woman, Horace's mistress; but to my knowledge only W. S. Anderson, in an earlier volume of this periodical, has ever drawn this conclusion, and his paper has suffered unwarranted neglect.[6]

One reason why Anderson's paper has been neglected is, I suspect, that scholars have failed to appreciate the regularity with which women were represented as ships in ancient poetry. Anderson quoted what he believed to be three examples of this metaphor, of which only the first (Theognis 457–60), though of uncertain date, is straightforward: "A young wife is not suitable for an old husband: for like a boat she does not respond to the helm, nor do her anchors hold her, but she often slips her moorings overnight to make for another harbor." In these lines the initial simile is transformed into metaphor where the identification of woman and ship is complete. Anderson's second example is Catullus 64. 97–98, where he says that Ariadne is described "as a ship tossing wildly on the waves": *qualibus incensam iactastis mente puellam / fluctibus!*[7] Yet unfortunately there existed another, and confusingly similar, set of nautical metaphors according to which the ship represents the love felt for the beloved by the lover, the helmsman represents the lover, and the harbor represents the beloved.[8] Catullus' language would in fact be equally appropriate if Ariadne were the afflicted helmsperson; and, since she is certainly not specified as a ship,[9] I believe this example must be considered doubtful.

Anderson's third example is Alcaeus 73, lines 3–10 of which may be translated as follows: ". . . and struck by a wave . . . say(s) she has no wish to fight against the rain, but striking a hidden reef . . . ; forgetting all this [I would] be merry and playful with you, and together with Bycchis. . . ." From "say(s)" (5 φαῖσ') it is possible to conclude that the ship is being personified,[10] but the precise context of the fragment remained obscure until the publication by Lobel in 1951 of a papyrus commentary on some verses of Alcaeus (306 [14], col. ii), lines 8–25 of which may be summed up thus: "being crushed and penetrated, much impurity comes upon

6. "Horace *Carm.* 1. 14: What Kind of Ship?" *CP* 61 (1966): 84–98. His paper is dismissed by Syndikus in a footnote to which I shall return below (p. 66), and by Nisbet–Hubbard, *Commentary*, p. 180, as a "strange theory" without further comment; it is not even mentioned by O. Seel, "Zur *Ode* 1, 14 des Horaz: Zweifel an einer communis opinio," in *Festschrift K. Vretska* (Heidelberg, 1970), pp. 204–49, who sees Horace's ship as a metaphor for life—an interpretation first put forward by another scholar whom he does not mention, C. W. Mendell, "Horace I. 14," *CP* 33 (1938): 145–56. Anderson's paper is mentioned by his pupil N. K. Zumwalt, who sees Horace's ship as a metaphor for love poetry and who appears to be the only other recent critic of the standard interpretation: see "Horace's *Navis* of Love Poetry (*C.* 1. 14)," *CW* 71 (1977–78): 249–54. In fact, Anderson most effectively exposed the inadequacies of the standard interpretation, although he was perhaps rather less successful at putting forward his own suggestion; in what follows I assume a knowledge of his paper and do not consciously repeat any of his points without acknowledgment.

7. "Horace *Carm.* 1. 14," p. 94.

8. For some examples, cf. Cercidas frag. 5 Powell; Meleager, *Anth. Pal.* 12. 167; Prop. 2. 14. 29–30 (but depending on how one emends the corruption); Ov. *Ars am.* 2. 9–10; and see Nisbet–Hubbard, *Commentary*, ad 1. 5. 16. One might properly call this particular metaphor the "ship of love" and the other the "lover-ship," but Anderson confusingly uses the former even when he means the latter. It is all the more regrettable that he adopted this practice knowingly (see "Horace *Carm.* 1. 14," p. 93), because the resulting imprecision is perhaps one reason why his paper has not received the attention it deserves.

9. Catullus seems to have no specific picture in mind (cf. *incensam mente*).

10. This is admittedly not certain: see D. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford, 1955), p. 190. I refer to Alcaeus' poems by the marginal numbers in E. Lobel and D. Page (eds.), *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* (Oxford, 1955).

her. . . . Her legs too have grown old. . . . In terms of the allegory . . . the voyages she has made; because she has sailed many different voyages, she has already grown old. . . . It is not because she has grown old [that she wishes] to be brought to harbor. . . ."[11] Lobel noted that the author of this commentary seemed to be referring to a ship in terms which are equally applicable to a courtesan, and he pointed to the same linguistic ambiguity in Alcaeus 117(b). 20–27. Page capitalized on Lobel's researches by arguing that the subject of the commentary is Alcaeus 73, from which Anderson was inclined to conclude that the ship of that poem represents a woman.[12]

Unfortunately not everyone agrees with Page that the fragmentary commentary has Alcaeus 73 as its subject. Koniaris has argued against it, and Voigt in her recent edition remains doubtful.[13] Yet the reservations of these scholars do not seem to me to affect the main point, for, even if the commentary does not refer to poem 73, it nevertheless provides us with evidence that in at least one poem (which on this hypothesis we no longer possess) Alcaeus was thought in antiquity to have exploited the identification of women with ships. This fact is important, for it means that, so far as Horace's ode is concerned, the ship–woman allegory cannot be dismissed by scholars on the ground that it has no precedent in Alcaeus.[14]

Turning now to examples of the metaphor which Anderson did not quote, we find three relevant poems in Book 5 of the *Greek Anthology*, of which the first is by Rufinus (44):

> Λέμβιον, ἡ δ' ἑτέρα Κερκούριον, αἱ δύ' ἑταῖραι
> αἰὲν ἐφορμοῦσιν τῷ Σαμίων λιμένι.
> ἀλλά, νέοι, πανδημὶ τὰ λῃστρικὰ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης
> φεύγεθ'· ὁ συμμίξας καὶ καταδὺς πίεται.

Admittedly Rufinus is a much later poet than Horace;[15] but the Hellenistic age, which we know to have greatly influenced Horace, is represented by Meleager around 100 B.C.:[16]

11. Originally published in *P. Oxy.*, 21. 105 (p. 120 for Lobel's annotations).

12. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, pp. 193–96; Anderson, "Horace *Carm.* 1. 14," p. 97. Page found it a "difficult problem whether the ship is symbolic of the woman or the woman of the ship"; unlike Anderson, he decided that the ship was being described in terms of a woman, a conceit found also in Catull. 4 (see K. Quinn [ed.], *Catullus: The Poems* [London and New York, 1970], ad loc.) and *Anth. Pal.* 9. 415 (Antiphilus) and 416 (Philip) (= Gow–Page, *Garland of Philip*, 1051–58 and 2979–86, respectively). This conceit must naturally not be confused with that under discussion, although doubtless both were mutually supportive so far as their effectiveness in any given context was concerned.

13. G. L. Koniaris, "Some Thoughts on Alcaeus," *Hermes* 94 (1966): 385–97; E. M. Voigt (ed.), *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta* (Amsterdam, 1971), p. 291.

14. I am not suggesting that Horace's ode is actually modeled on Alcaeus 73, which I do not believe to be the case. Any verbal similarities between the two poems (which have even persuaded some supporters of the ship–state allegory to see Alcaeus 73 as yet another "model" for Horace's ode) are no more significant than that mentioned on p. 64. We are dealing, as I hope to show, with a long literary tradition which is common to many authors.

15. See D. Page (ed.), *The "Epigrams" of Rufinus* (Cambridge, 1978), p. 39. In his introductory note to this epigram (p. 88) Page unfortunately confuses the two conceits which he was so concerned to distinguish in the case of Alcaeus 73 (see n. 12 above). For the specific metaphor of pirate ships, Prof. P. White refers also to Plaut. *Men.* 344 "nunc in istoc portu stat nauis praedatoria" and 42.

16. *Anth. Pal.* 5. 204 = Gow–Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams*, 4298–307.

Οὐκέτι Τιμάριον, τὸ πρὶν γλαφυροῖο κέλητος
πῆγμα, φέρει πλωτὸν Κύπριδος εἰρεσίην·
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μὲν νώτοισι μετάφρενον ὡς κέρας ἱστῷ
κυρτοῦται, πολιὸς δ' ἐκλέλυται πρότονος,
ἱστία δ' αἰωρητὰ χαλῷ σπαδονίσματα μαστῶν,
ἐκ δὲ σάλου στρεπτὰς γαστρὸς ἔχει ῥυτίδας,
νέρθε δὲ πάνθ' ὑπέραντλα νεώς, κοίλη δὲ θάλασσα
πλημμύρει, γόνασιν δ' ἔντρομός ἐστι σάλος.
δύστανος †τε ζωὸς ἔτ' ὢν δ'† Ἀχερουσίδα λίμνην
πλεύσετ' ἄνωθ' ἐπιβὰς γραὸς ἐπ' εἰκοσόρου.

and by Asclepiades around 290 B.C.:[17]

Εὐφρὼ καὶ Θαΐς καὶ Βοίδιον, αἱ Διομήδους
γραῖαι, ναυκλήρων ὀλκάδες εἰκόσοροι,
Ἄγιν καὶ Κλεοφῶντα καὶ Ἀνταγόρην ἔν' ἑκάστη
γυμνούς, ναυηγῶν ἥσσονας, ἐξέβαλον.
ἀλλὰ σὺν αὐταῖς νηυσὶ τὰ λῃστρικὰ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης
φεύγετε, Σειρήνων αἵδε γὰρ ἐχθρότεραι.

Further back, in the fifth century B.C., the identification of women with ships was extensively exploited, as has recently been demonstrated by Jeffrey Henderson: for example, πλεῖν (lit. "to sail a ship") and ἐλαύνειν (lit. "to drive a ship") are both used in the sense of having sexual intercourse with a woman, and πλωτήρ (lit. "a ship's passenger") is used to describe a man in the sexual act.[18]

Given such a well-established tradition, which Alcaeus too had exploited, I do not see how any contemporary reader of Horace's final stanza could have failed to identify Horace's ship as yet another example of this metaphor. But (it will be objected) Quintilian in the next century failed to do so. Not necessarily. We must remember that in the ancient world a standard cause of allegorical interpretations was the elimination of erotic material from literature.[19] Quintilian was writing an educational manual, and in his discussion of allegory he had a golden opportunity of assigning to a virtuously political tradition an ode which Horace had written in an erotic tradition.[20] Quintilian's action, however well intended, has meant that generations of scholars have been misled into believing that Horace's ship allegorizes the state.

As I remarked at the very beginning, however, modern scholars have argued that Quintilian's interpretation is in fact correct on the ground that the ode is

17. *Anth. Pal.* 5. 161 = Gow–Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams*, 996–1001.

18. *The Maculate Muse* (New Haven, 1975), pp. 49, 161–64. For a possible anthropological connection between women and seafaring vessels, see S. Pembroke, "Women in Charge," *JWI* 30 (1967): 32 (a reference I owe to Professor T. J. Saunders).

19. See, e.g., Commager, "*Odes*," p. 165.

20. When commenting on a Roman poet, as Mr. I. M. Le M. DuQuesnay points out to me, ancient scholars conventionally borrowed some of their material from existing commentaries on whichever Greek poet was thought to be the Roman's "model" (cf. E. Fraenkel, *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, vol. 2 (Rome, 1964), pp. 383–88). When he mentioned Horace in his discussion of allegory at 8. 6. 44, Quintilian may well have adopted this practice, but, instead of using a commentary on Alcaeus' ship–woman poetry (e.g., Alcaeus 306 [14], col. ii, perhaps), simply substituted one on Alcaeus' ship–state poetry (on which see below). I am very grateful to Mr. DuQuesnay for commenting on an earlier draft of this paper.

modeled on some lines of Alcaeus which themselves employ the ship–state allegory. Does this argument not contradict my conclusion? I think not. The lines of Alcaeus in question belong to two poems, 6 and 326, and for the purposes of this discussion I shall accept the assumption of most scholars that in Horace's time these lines were indeed understood to allegorize the state.[21] Now one group of scholars (represented by Nisbet–Hubbard and Syndikus) believes that Horace's ode is modeled on *both* poems of Alcaeus and that, in Syndikus' words, "auch eine Reihe von Einzelheiten . . . übernimmt Horaz direkt daraus."[22] On the other hand, another group (represented by Heinze, Fraenkel, and Commager) believes that Horace's ode is modeled only on Alcaeus 326 and that, in Heinze's words, "mit dem alkäischen Gedicht hat das horazische, soviel wir sehen, im einzelnen kaum einen Zug gemein."[23] It emerges from this brief survey that, even among those who are agreed that Horace's ship represents the state, there is a considerable lack of agreement about the extent to which Horace's ode is indebted to one or the other of Alcaeus' poems. It also emerges that it is the former group of scholars whose opinion constitutes the most serious objection to a critic of Quintilian's interpretation. To what, then, does their evidence amount?

Their best piece of evidence (it is the only item mentioned also by the more skeptical Fraenkel) would appear to be the torn sails of Horace's ninth line, which are said to have been "obviously influenced" by lines 7–8 of Alcaeus 326.[24] We must however remember that storms at sea were regularly described in ancient poetry from Homer onward and that such descriptions, with their set topoi, were heavily conventionalized.[25] Disregarding the question of allegory, Horace's ode and Alcaeus' two poems are all examples of such descriptions: it is therefore hardly surprising that each author refers to torn sails—so had Homer (*Od.* 9. 70–71), yet Horace's ode has never been said to be indebted to him. It is therefore clear that scholars have allowed their presumption of the nature of Horace's allegory (that the ship is the state) to determine the significance of any verbal correspondences between his ode and Alcaeus; thus, once we can show that Horace's ship is *not* allegorical of the state, as I believe both Anderson and myself have done, any verbal correspondences immediately lose any significance they have been thought to have.[26] I therefore believe that the supposed similarities between Horace's ode and Alcaeus' two poems, already disputed even among scholars who believe in

21. In fact, I believe this assumption to be almost certainly correct, although I have never seen it argued. Another commonly made assumption is that Alcaeus *intended* poems 6 and 326 as allegories of the state: I believe this assumption to be demonstrably *in*correct, but since Alcaeus' intention (as opposed to how Horace's contemporaries understood his poetry) is not strictly relevant to the present discussion, I do not deal with the issue here. I am, however, very grateful to Prof. M. L. West for discussing the whole matter with me.

22. *Die Lyrik des Horaz*, 1:162.

23. *"Oden" und "Epoden,"* p. 71.

24. Nisbet–Hubbard, *Commentary*, p. 179; cf. Fraenkel, *Horace*, p. 155. Syndikus' *Einzelheiten* are so generalized as to be even more open to the objection I put forward in this paragraph ("nämlich die Erwähnung der Segel, der Ruder und der Schiffstaue"). Nisbet–Hubbard also say that "let us run to a secure harbour" in Alcaeus 6. 8 "certainly lies behind" Horace's *fortiter occupa portum;* but of course this is a poem left out of account even by other supporters of the ship–state allegory, and in fact the meanings of the two phrases are only superficially alike.

25. See M. P. O. Morford, *The Poet Lucan* (Oxford, 1967), pp. 20–23.

26. We are clearly dealing with a literary tradition common to many authors rather than any specific influence of Alcaeus upon Horace.

the ship–state allegory, do not contradict my conclusion that Horace's ship allegorizes a woman.

II

At the beginning of the previous section we saw that comments on Horace's final stanza, made in good faith by those who believe his ship to be allegorical of the state, make much better sense if the ship allegorizes a woman. This procedure can be carried considerably further. Fraenkel, for example, says that Horace's phrases "are chosen with admirable skill in such a way as to intensify the idea that it is to a living being that the poet is speaking. All the verbs lead our imagination in the same direction . . . *fortiter occupa*, then *nonne uides ut* . . . then *gemant* and *uix durare possint*, then *uoces* and *iactes*, then *tu nisi uentis debes ludibrium, caue*, where the impatient warning seems almost to descend to the level of excited everyday language, and at last *uites*. Moreover, by *nudum latus* and *saucius* we are reminded of a human body. Finally, the ship, whose boasting of her *genus et nomen* will be of no avail, comes from a very noble stock: *Pontica pinus, siluae filia nobilis*."[27] Again, Nisbet-Hubbard on line 2 say that *o quid agis?* "expresses anxiety at the rash behaviour of a friend"; and Seel, who of course argued against the standard interpretation, made the point that none of the six other odes which are written in the Third Asclepiad is political; however, he drew no conclusion from the fact that four out of these six are erotic.[28]

It seems to me that we have here ample evidence to support the erotic interpretation of Horace's ode; but some additional details will help to clarify the general context and to shade in his mistress' personality. The gods of line 10, for example, are usually taken to be the tutelary images which were fixed to the sterns of ancient ships; but they are also the anonymous gods whom we meet constantly in Roman love poetry and who are said traditionally to be deaf to the lover's plight.[29] Horace is predicting that his beloved's voyage to a new romance is doomed to failure, a type of "threat-prophecy" commonly found in erotic poetry.[30] Again, *pictis* in lines 14–15 is usually taken to refer to the decoration of ancient ships; but the word can also refer to the cosmetics which Horace's beloved applies in order to hide her impaired appearance.[31] The *nauita* of line 14 (in nonmetaphorical terms the woman's new lover) will not trust the makeup, *nil . . . fidit*, because women who wore cosmetics were conventionally unfaithful.[32] Hence, the new lover will be afraid, *timidus* (14): fear is the traditional plight of lovers whose mistresses are prone to walk out on them,[33] and in erotic poetry it was conventional

27. *Horace*, p. 157.

28. "Zur *Ode* 1, 14," pp. 208–10. The four erotic odes are 1. 5, 1. 23, 3. 7, and 4. 13; the other two are 1. 21 and 3. 13. Interestingly, 1. 5 also exploits nautical metaphors in an erotic context (a fact which Commager uses to support the ship–state interpretation of 1. 14!); and 4. 13 also has some affinity with 1. 14 (see on 1. 25, below, p. 66).

29. See, e.g., Prop. 1. 1. 8, 1. 15. 25–26.

30. See F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh, 1972), pp. 81, 85–87.

31. This point is made by Anderson, "Horace *Carm.* 1. 14," p. 92 and n. 13, comparing Plaut. *Poen.* 221.

32. Cf. Prop. 1. 2, 1. 15; Tib. 1. 8.

33. E.g., Prop. 2. 6. 13.

for the poet to depict his new rival as likely to suffer the same fate as himself.[34]

It is now time to offer a paraphrase of the ode as an erotic poem: "You're being carried away again. What on earth are you doing? Stay where you are, you're in no condition to set off on another affair. The gods won't help you out this time, your background won't save you,[35] and your makeup will only put your new lover on his guard. It's true I was annoyed with you, but that's over now and I need you badly. Oh well, take care as you go."

This paraphrase is not essentially different from that of Anderson,[36] against whose interpretation Syndikus raised an objection which, in view of its brevity, he evidently considered fatal: "Can one really attribute to Horace a lapse of taste whereby he describes his beloved as a storm-tossed ship and at the same time assures her of his loving affection?"[37] Syndikus seems to be alluding to the contrast between the final stanza and the rest of the poem, which in his view produces an inconsistency; yet this is not the case. The ode belongs to a category of poem known as the "schetliastic propemptikon,"[38] in which the poet tries to dissuade the addressee from embarking on a journey. It is true that on this occasion the propemptikon is addressed to the ship rather than to its potential passenger; but this is not unusual even in ordinary propemptika,[39] and in the present case it is of course inevitable since the ship represents a person. The first four stanzas of the ode constitute the "schetliasmos": they contain various reasons why the journey should not be undertaken—the stormy seas and the poor condition of the vessel. Now several propemptika conclude with the poet's recognition that his attempts at dissuasion have failed and that the addressee is determined to leave despite the poet's protestations: in such cases it is normal for the poet's earlier antagonism to be replaced by good wishes for the addressee's journey.[40] An excellent example of this volte-face occurs in Propertius 1. 8, where after sixteen lines of schetliasmos the poet eventually issues good wishes to his girl friend for her journey—even though she is departing with another man (17–26).[41] The situation in our ode is exactly similar, with the qualification that Propertius nowhere mentions the poor condition of his girl friend. For this last detail we have to turn to another of Horace's odes: in 1. 25 Horace says to Lydia, "You don't have many customers coming to you now and soon you'll have even fewer"; but, despite the uncompli-

34. E.g., Hor. *Epodes* 15. 23.

35. It is, admittedly, often believed that the women of Latin love poetry are not of noble birth. Yet Catullus' Clodia was noble, and there is evidence in Propertius (2. 13. 9–10, 3. 20. 7–8) that his Hostia was also of distinguished ancestry. G. Williams has used these two women as the basis of his heterodoxical argument that not only Catullus and Propertius, but also Tibullus and Ovid, "normally conceived themselves as addressing ladies of reasonably high social standing" (*Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* [Oxford, 1968], p. 542). Even if Williams' argument is rejected or thought to be inapplicable to the present case, the passages from Propertius demonstrate that there were exceptions to what is thought to be the rule.

36. See "Horace *Carm.* 1. 14," p. 96.

37. *Die Lyrik des Horaz*, 1:164, n. 13.

38. So Cairns, *Generic Composition*, pp. 218–21, although he accepts the ship-state allegory. For a definition of schetliastic propemptika, together with examples of their characteristics, see Cairns, ibid., pp. 7, 12–14, and Nisbet–Hubbard, *Commentary*, ad 1. 3.

39. It happens in *Odes* 1. 3, where see Nisbet–Hubbard, *Commentary*.

40. See Cairns, *Generic Composition*, pp. 132–33, 138.

41. On this particular case, see ibid., p. 150.

mentary nature of this message, Horace's clear implication is, "Therefore admit me [Horace] to your presence now."[42]

III

By paying heed both to the words of Horace's ode (particularly of its final stanza) and also to the literary tradition, scholars have concluded that Quintilian was right to interpret Horace's ship as representing the *res publica*. In this paper I have argued that by carrying out exactly the same procedures one should conclude that Anderson was right to interpret the ship as representing Horace's wayward and rather unpresentable mistress. The poem thus raises none of the vexed questions of dating with which scholars have occupied themselves;[43] it does, however, provide yet one more example of Horace's characteristic wit. In the preceding ode, 1. 13, Horace is jealous of his mistress' new lover: true happiness, he says, belongs to those whose love is free from all complaints. There follows 1. 14, in which Horace once again depicts himself, not without a certain irony, as a jealous and complaining lover and his unfaithful mistress as a sea-worn craft. It is surely not without an additional irony that the following ode, 1. 15, begins with an unfaithful woman, Helen, being carried across the sea on board ship!

A. J. WOODMAN
University of Newcastle upon Tyne

42. For this interpretation of 1. 25, see F. O. Copley, *Exclusus Amator* (Madison, Wisc., 1956), pp. 58–60; Anderson, "Horace *Carm.* 1. 14," p. 98, n. 18; and Cairns, *Generic Composition*, pp. 88–89. Another example of the same thing seems to me to be Rufinus, *Anth. Pal.* 5. 103, where (*contra* Page, "*Epigrams*," p. 102) the komast says that old age is *already* upon the woman.

43. See, e.g., Syndikus, *Die Lyrik des Horaz*, 1:165–70.

FLY-FISHING AMONG THE ROMANS

namque quis nescit
Auidum uorata decipi scarum musca?
uorato . . . musco Brodaeus et alii

[Mart. 5. 18. 7–8]

Future editors of Martial should not ignore D'Arcy W. Thompson's objection to this line: "*Scarus* cannot be thought of as rising to a fly; neither would seaweed be a tempting bait, nor *muscus* an appropriate name for it."[1] Thompson goes on to surmise that the word for bait, *esca*, "somehow underlies *musco*, or *musca*" (cf. [Ov.] *Hal.* 9–11 "Sic et scarus . . . adsumptaque dolo tandem pauet esca").

This conjecture, although recommended by its content, involves excessive rewriting (*auidos . . . scaros* is unlikely to have been corrupted to *auidum . . . scarum*).[2] In order to avoid this difficulty, I tentatively propose another, more economical alternative, namely, that a scribe miscopied *squalum* as *scarum*. Anglers need no biologist to tell them that a fly is a suitable bait to catch a member

1. *A Glossary of Greek Fishes* (London, 1947), p. 241.

2. The same applies to *alga* (cf. W. Gilbert, "Beiträge zur Textkritik des Martial," *RhM* 39 [1884]: 518–19).