Project MUSE

Transactions of the American Philological Association 136 (2006) 149–169

Horace's Ship Ode (*Odes* 1.14) in Context: A Metaphorical Love-Triangle

ORTWIN KNORR
Willamette University

For W. S. Anderson

SUMMARY: The ship in Horace's famous Ship Ode (*Odes* 1.14) continues to be identified with the Ship of State, despite the serious problems with this interpretation demonstrated by Charles Mendell (1938) and W. S. Anderson (1966). Still, a truly convincing alternative to the accepted view has never been proposed. A reading of the ode in the context of the *First Book of Odes*, however, shows that *Odes* 1.14 is part of a series of poems (*Odes* 1.5, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17) that feature different kinds of love triangles. These poems provide multiple clues that the ship in 1.14 is not a worn-out prostitute, as has been argued, but an attractive young *hetaera* faced with the choice between a younger, passionate lover and a calmer, more mature admirer.

HORACE'S FAMOUS SHIP ODE, *O NAVIS REFERENT* (*ODES* 1.14), is commonly considered a political allegory on the Ship of State.[1] As early as 1938, however,

[1] This interpretation goes back to Quintilian (*Inst.* 8.6.44) and the ancient scholiasts (Porphyrio, p. 22, 8–10 Holder; Ps.-Acro, p. 64, 1–6 Keller) and is still widely favored today. There is, however, no agreement on the alleged political background of Horace's *Odes* 1.14. Many scholars assume an allusion to tensions between Marc Anthony and Octavian before 31 BCE, cf. Pilch 1929: 470; Kießling and Heinze 1968 (1930): 71; Wili 1948: 119; Commager 1962: 167; Syndikus 1972: 168. Others speculate that the poem may refer to potential rumors in 29/28 BCE about Octavian's intention to restore the republic, cf. Pasquali 1964 (1920): 34; Wilkinson 1956: 495–99; Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 181; Schäfer 1972: 280; Calboli 1998: 68. Reckford 1969: 43 also assumes a date soon after Actium. Others connect the poem with the dangerous winter journey from Samos to Brundisium that Octavian undertook in January, 30 BCE, in order to quell a mutiny among veteran soldiers (reported in Suet. *Aug.* 17), cf. Ensor 1903: 158; Kukula 1912: 241–42; Quinn 1980: 150; West 1995: 70. A few scholars admit that it is impossible to associate *Odes* 1.14 firmly with any particular historical event, but hold on to the Ship of State interpretation regardless, cf. Jocelyn 1982: 332 and Porter 1987: 78.

Charles Mendell named several reasons why this interpretation cannot be correct. Since then, a number of competing readings have been proposed. Most importantly, William S. Anderson suggested in a 1966 article that Horace's ship symbolizes a woman in love. Anderson's interpretation was mocked as one of those "strange theories that sometimes appear."[2] Yet he was at least partly right, as I hope to show in this paper. Like most previous scholars, however, he did not pay sufficient attention to the context into which Horace put his Ship Ode, the *First Book of Odes*.[3] A sequential reading of the *Odes*, I argue, compels the attentive reader to interpret the Ship Ode as one of several poems in the *Odes* that feature love triangles. In addition, the poem's context makes it clear that the ship of *Odes* 1.14 does not represent a worn-out old prostitute, as Anderson and his supporters believed,[4] but an attractive young *hetaera* faced with the choice between two male lovers: a younger, violently passionate admirer and a calmer, more mature rival.

Anderson, building on Mendell's pioneering work, reviewed several examples of the ancient Ship of State metaphor and pointed out the elements that form an essential part of this literary *topos*. The metaphor typically focuses on the ship's helmsman.[5] Furthermore, it depicts the ship as an inanimate object incapable of steering itself. Speakers who express anxiety about the vessel's condition customarily place themselves on board the ship.[6] Finally, whenever the Ship of State metaphor occurs in a full-blown allegory, the author, as Mendell noted (1938: 147), provides the reader with clues to the allegory's true meaning.[7]

[2] Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 180.

[3] Scholarship in general tends to consider *Odes* 1.14 as an isolated piece of art, not as part of a larger collection of poetry. The few exceptions that can be named are Santirocco 1986: 46–49 and Porter 1987: 77–82. Woodman 1980: 67 closes with some brief but good comments on the links between *Odes* 1.13–15. All these scholars come to conclusions different from mine.

[4] Holleman 1970: 179; Traill 1979: 266; Woodman 1980: 67; Shackleton Bailey 1982: 89.

[5] Mendell 1938: 147; Anderson 1966: 89.

[6] Anderson 1966: 87–88.

[7] Theognis 667–682, for example, speaks of "nobles" (ἀγαθοῖσι, 668; ἀγαθῶν, 679; ἀγαθοῖσιν, 681), "stevedores" that "rule" (φορτηγοὶ δ' ἄρχουσι), and "base" or "lowborn people" (κακοί, 679; κακός, 682). Even the few surviving lines of Alcaeus 326 Lobel-Page, a Ship of State allegory regularly cited as the inspiration for Horace's Ship Ode, contain such a clue. The very first line hints at the poem's allegorical meaning with the word *stasis*, which is commonly used not for clashing waves but for civil uprisings and internal strife in a Greek *polis*. In this context, it may be worth mentioning again that this Alcaeus fragment has very little in common with *Odes* 1.14, cf. Kießling and Heinze 1968 (1930): 71; Mendell 1938: 145; Wili 1948: 118; Fraenkel 1957: 155; Woodman 1980: 64.

In contrast, Horace's Ship Ode gives no such indication of a political subtext. In addition, the poem lacks other essential elements of the Ship of State convention. There is, for example, no talk of a helmsman in *Odes* 1.14.[8] In addition, the ship is addressed as if it were a person. Far from being inanimate, it clearly has a mind of its own and can determine its course by itself (*o quid agis*, 2).[9] Moreover, Horace's speaker is not on board the ship. Instead, he seems to observe the ship from the shore.[10] He calls the vessel his "desire" or "longing" (*desiderium,* 18), which implies that he is physically separated from it.[11] Just like an outside observer, he also refers to the crew in the third person, "The fearful crew (*navita*)[12] does not trust your painted stern" (14–15). If the speaker were on board, we would instead expect him to say, "*We* don't trust your painted stern." Last but not least, Horace's *Odes* 1.14 imagines the ship *after* a storm whereas all texts that mention the Ship of State in connection with a storm picture the ship in the middle of the storm.[13] In sum, a comparison of Horace's *Odes* 1.14 with undisputed examples of the Ship of State metaphor reveals that Horace's poem lacks all the features that would allow us to identify its ship with the Ship of State.[14]

[8] Mendell 1938: 152; Anderson 1966: 88. Bonanno 1976: 190 tries to counter this argument by claiming that the *navita* (14), "appropriately employed at the stern, ... the seat of the helmsman" (my translation), must be identified with the helmsman. The Latin text, however, only says that the sailor "does not trust the painted stern" (*nil pictis ... puppibus / fidit*, 14–15). It says nothing about the sailor's exact location on the ship.

[9] Anderson 1966: 88.

[10] Cf. Wilamowitz 1913, 312; Pasquali 1964 (1920): 21; Anderson 1966: 85 and 91; Reckford 1969: 71; Romano 1991: 540; West 1995: 66. The fact that the speaker is not on board his ship rules out Mendell's theory that *Odes* 1.14 deals with Horace's Ship of Life (Mendell 1938: 155–56) as well as the possibility that the ship is Horace's Ship of Poetry, cf. Anderson 1966: 90–91.

[11] Cf. Pasquali 1964 (1920): 22; Carlsson 1944: 5; Anderson 1966: 85; Jocelyn 1982: 332. In contrast, Syndikus 1972: 163 n. 7 objects that *desiderium* simply denotes the object of one's love, regardless of whether it is absent or not (cf. also Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 187; Santirocco 1986: 47; Carrubba 2003: 614). In both parallels quoted by Syndikus, however, there is a notion of absence. In the case of Petron. 139.4, the beloved man has been absent and dearly missed until recently; *desiderium* thus refers to "past longing," cf. Shackleton Bailey 1982: 89. In Catull. 2.5, the beloved woman is out of the lover's reach and might as well be absent: While she is playing with her pet bird, her lover seems to yearn for her attention in vain.

[12] For *navita* as a collective noun in the sense of the crew of a ship cf., e.g., Prop. 1.8a.10; Ovid. *Met.* 11.475; Luc. 1.502 and 5.427.

[13] Cf. Alc. 326 Lobel-Page; Theog. 671–675; Polyb. 6.44.4; Cic. *Fam.* 1.9.21; *Att.* 7.13.2; Dio Cass. 52.16.3.

[14] Mendell 1938: 152; Anderson 1966: 88. Poets are, of course, free to play with a conventional *topos*, but for a *topos* to remain recognizable, they need to leave certain basic

The evidence Anderson adduced for his erotic interpretation of the poem is far stronger. He correctly emphasized that the ship is thoroughly personified.[15] The speaker gives it vision (*vides,* 3) and voice (*gemant,* 6; *voces,* 10; *iactes,* 13). He also describes the ship as "nude" (*nudum,* 4) and "wounded" (*saucius,* 5), attributes that seem more appropriate for a person than for a ship. Furthermore, the ship can boast of its ancestry (*genus,* 13), just like a human. More specifically, the ship is clearly portrayed as a woman: The poet calls it a daughter (*filia,* 12),[16] and he has the ship wear cosmetics (*pictis,* 14).[17] Given that many ancient ships possessed female names,[18] an ancient reader would easily have associated the ship with a woman. This, in turn, explains the noticeably erotic language of the last stanza, especially the words *taedium* (weariness, 17), *desiderium* (desire, 18), and *cura* (concern or love, 18). These words could have been taken straight out of Roman love poetry.[19] Just like the term *stasis* in Alcaeus 326 Lobel-Page (see n. 7 above), these three

elements untouched. As Anderson 1966: 89 rightly noted, "Elastic as convention may be, it sometimes can be stretched beyond its physical limits, and then it snaps."

[15] Anderson 1966: 86 and 92; cf. Fraenkel 1957: 157–58. Seel, if I understand him correctly, tried to reconcile the ship's personification with the old Ship of State reading. He detected in *Odes* 1.14 "a movement of the *vates* ... toward that which is contained in the image of the ship, the 'Others,' not a frigid political abstract but an individuality experienced in human and anthropomorphical terms" ("eine human und anthropomorph ausgefühlte Individualität") (Seel 1970, 244, my translation). The ship Phasellus in Catull. 4, by the way, is similarly personified but for different reasons than Horace's ship. The Phasellus poem imitates Hellenistic dedicatory epigrams in which the dedicated object is often introduced as a living being with the ability to speak for itself.

[16] Cf. Fraenkel 1957: 157.

[17] Anderson 1966: 92 with n. 13; cf. also Santirocco 1986: 46 n. 13; Carrubba 2003, 608 and 611–12.

[18] Besides the Argo, one could name the Athenian state galleys, the Salaminia (Girl from Salamis) and the Paralos (Girl from the Paralia region of Attica). Jocelyn 1982: 334 n. 33 cites ships of the Athenian fleet that shared their names with prostitutes, Dorkas, Leaina, and Lykaina. Another one was called after the nymph Galateia (*IG* II/III^2 1606,14). In addition, Fraenkel 1957: 157–58 lists several examples for ships in Greek and Roman literature that are imagined as female.

[19] On the erotic character of the vocabularly, cf. Carlsson 1944: 2; Commager 1962: 167 n. 12; Anderson 1966: 96; Romano 1991: 542. Jocelyn 1982: 333 objects that the words *cura, taedium,* and *desiderium* also occur in non-erotic contexts. Yet the combination of all three together is peculiar to love poetry, and *cura* in particular appears commonly in erotic contexts. Cf., for example, Hor. *Epod.* 2.37 (*quas amor curas habet*); *Odes* 4.11.35–36 (*atrae ... curae*); Verg. *Ecl.* 10.22 (*tua cura Lycoris*) and see Nisbet-Hubbard 1978: 127 on *Odes* 2.8.7–8 where Horace writes of the attractive *hetaera* Barine, *iuvenumque prodis / publica cura* (I owe the reference to *Odes* 2.8.8 to one of *TAPA's* anonymous readers).

expressions serve as the key to the true nature of the allegory, except that they do not suggest a political but an erotic reading of the poem.[20] Accordingly, Anderson argued that Horace's ship stands for an experienced courtesan who "has already suffered badly from the Seas of Love" and is about to embark on another affair (1966: 96).[21]

Anderson was surely right in identifying Horace's ship with a woman. Nevertheless, there are undeniable difficulties with his interpretation too. When we look at *Odes* 1.14 closely, we see that Horace's ship is not about to embark on a new voyage. On the contrary, it is at the end of a journey, trying to approach the harbor.[22] Furthermore, Horace generally shows little affection for aging women.[23] Both in his *Odes* and *Epodes*, the poet regularly ridicules mature women who are sexually active.[24] Consequently, it is highly unlikely that Horace's speaker in *Odes* 1.14 should desperately woo an older woman.

[20] Thus, neither Alcaeus fr. 326 Lobel-Page nor Horace *Odes* 1.14 can be considered "open" allegories, *pace* Lowrie 1995: 40.

[21] Pointing to the ship's boast that it is made of wood from Pontus (11–13), the best ship's timber then available, Davis 1989: 337 objected that "a noble pedigree for ... a mistress seems irrelevant." Yet *hetaerae* presumably liked to claim that they were abducted princesses, cf. Hor. *Odes* 2.4.13–16 (your Phyllis may well be a princess) and Pasquali 1964 (1920): 495: "quale donna di piacere moderna non vanta se stessa figlia di buona famiglia decaduta?" For further evidence, see Nisbet-Hubbard 1978: 73.

[22] Anderson himself (1966: 84) mentioned this as one of two possibilities for the ship's situation. I would argue that it is the only viable possibility, cf. the closely parallel situation in Ovid. *Am.* 2.9b.31–33. There, Ovid also uses the nautical metaphor in an erotic context. The fact that Horace's ship is not about to leave the harbor for a new journey also conflicts with the interpretations of Zumwalt 1977–78: 253 (ship of love poetry) and Davis 1989: 335–36 (ship of Horace's poetic *ingenium*). Despite the irrefutable objections of Mendell 1938: 153–54, both compare the Ship Ode with Horace's farewell poem (*propempticon*) for Vergil, *Odes* 1.3, and assume that Horace is speaking of venturing out from love poetry into epical subjects such as the following *Odes* 1.15.

[23] Cf. Jocelyn 1982: 335. Syndikus 1972: 164 n. 13 only objects that it would be tactless of Horace to compare a beloved woman with a run-down galley while simultaneously assuring her of his love.

[24] In *Odes* 1.25, the speaker delights in the thought of an older Lydia begging for sex and being rejected and mocked by young male revelers. Similarly, the speaker of *Odes* 4.13 rejoices that his former girlfriend, Lyce, who presumably once rejected him, has now grown old herself, and he mocks her attempts to be sexually active as if she were still young. In *Odes* 3.6, the poet censures the appetite of mature women for younger adulterers (25–32) and blames this kind of sexual degeneracy for the Civil Wars (17–20). *Epod.* 8 and 12, finally, are notorious for their gross depiction of older women soliciting sex from the poet-speaker. See also Arkins 2000: 111–13.

If even Anderson's identification of the ship cannot be absolutely right, then we have to answer the old question again: what does the ship represent? Jocelyn deplored the fact that we do not know the particular circumstances of the poem's first recital since they would probably have made the author's intention clear (1982: 330). In a way, though, we actually do have the context of the original performance. Horace included *Odes* 1.14 in a collection of poetry, his *First Book of Odes*. Reading this collection of poems in sequence furnishes *Odes* 1.14 with a context that offers abundant clues to the identity of the ship and the meaning of the poem.

The first important clue provided by the poem collection as a whole is the meter of *Odes* 1.14. The Ship Ode is composed in the Third Asclepiadean Stanza,[25] two Asclepiads followed by a Pherecratean and a Glyconic line. This meter links *Odes* 1.14 firmly with the only earlier poem in the book that is written in the same meter, the famous Ode to Pyrrha (*Odes* 1.5).

The Pyrrha Ode belongs to the series of poems that introduce the book, the so-called Parade Odes. Santirocco (1986: 14) has shown that these poems have a programmatic function for the rest of the book. As the first love poem of the collection, the Pyrrha Ode programmatically defines the Third Asclepiad Stanza as a meter that is apt to convey erotic subject matter, regardless of what earlier Greek authors may have used it for. Thus, when the Third Asclepiadean Stanza recurs in *Odes* 1.14 for the second time in the book, any reader who reads Horace's *Odes* in the sequence designed by the poet will expect a love poem, not a political allegory.[26] When the same Asclepiadean system recurs later in the book, it seems to confirm this expectation: the meter reappears first in a prayer with erotic undertones, sung by a mixed choir of boys and girls (*Odes* 1.21), and then once more in a poem with outright amatory content, *Odes* 1.23.[27]

[25] The metrical terminology differs from commentator to commentator. I follow that of the standard editions (Klingner, Borzsák, Shackleton Bailey). For an overview of the differences in terminology, see Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: xxxviii.

[26] Woodman 1980: 65 similarly points out that four of the six other *Odes* in the same meter are erotic. Before him, Alfred Klotz, in private conversations with Otto Seel, had already noticed that the Asclepiad meter does not suit the alleged political content of 1.14 (quoted in Seel 1970: 207–208). Others also observed the metrical link between *Odes* 1.5 and 1.14, but failed to see its true importance, cf. Commager 1962: 164 n. 3 and Santirocco 1986: 46.

[27] Other erotic poems written in the same Third Asclepiadean Stanza are *Odes* 3.7 and 4.13. *Odes* 1.21 and 3.13 seem to be an exception to the rule since they use the same metrical system for prayers. Even the prayers, however, contain erotic motives, cf. the allusion to Jupiter's love for Leto in *Odes* 1.21.3–4 and the lusty young billy-goat in *Odes* 3.13.3–8.

Apart from the meter, *Odes* 1.5 also introduces several other features that will later return in *Odes* 1.14, among them the love triangle and the Sea of Love metaphor. *Odes* 1.5 is addressed to an attractive girl, Pyrrha (3), whose name reveals her to be both blond[28] and a *hetaera* or prostitute.[29] An anonymous speaker asks her who her current young lover is (1–5). He expresses pity for the boy (*heu*, 5; *miseri quibus intemptata nites*, 12–13), and he predicts that Pyrrha will abandon him just as she has abandoned the speaker himself in the past. The poem, thus, features a love triangle consisting of an attractive woman, a passionate young lover, and an older, more experienced lover whose *persona* is adopted by the poet. This love triangle has many parallels in erotic poetry[30] and it prefigures, as we will see, the constellation in *Odes* 1.14, the ship hesitating between the dangerous open sea (that is, a passionate young lover) and the safe harbor (that is, a calmer older lover).

Odes 1.5 is the first poem in the book that employs the Sea of Love metaphor.[31] The speaker compares the *hetaera* and her fickle kind of love to a glittering sea (*nites*, 13) under a deceptively calm breeze (*aurae fallacis* 11–12) that can suddenly turn into rough seas ravaged by a full-blown storm (*aspera nigris aequora ventis*, 6–7). Similar maritime imagery will reappear in *Odes* 1.14, except that the metaphor there will serve to characterize not the girl, but the young, violent lover.

A little later in the book, the same triangular relationship that we have just met in *Odes* 1.5 reappears in *Odes* 1.13, the poem directly before the Ship Ode 1.14. In this poem, written in a related Asclepiadean meter, Glyconics alternating with Asclepiads, the poet appears once more in the *persona* of the deserted older lover. The addressee is again an attractive young girl, Lydia (1). The girl and the boy lover, however, have changed their roles. In *Odes* 1.5, the speaker, in an implicit warning to the boy, predicted that Pyrrha would be unfaithful. In *Odes* 1.13, in contrast, he warns the girl of the boy's lack of loyalty. He prophesies that Telephus will leave Lydia (13–16), just as Lydia herself has left the speaker (this last fact is implied by the final stanza, 17–20).

Many verbal allusions underline the similarities between *Odes* 1.5 and 1.13. Both young lovers are described as "boys" (*puer,* 1.5.1, 1.13.11). Both

[28] Greek πυρρός means "reddish-yellow;" cf. *flavam ... comam*, 4. At the same time, the name Pyrrha, as Arkins 2000: 115 notes, "evokes the mythological figure of the same name [the Greco-Roman equivalent of Biblical Eve], and so women in general."

[29] Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 74.

[30] In addition to the parallels in the *Odes* that will be discussed below, cf., e. g., Theogn. 457–60; Anacr. 358 Lobel-Page; Hor. *Odes* 1.33; Ov. *Ars* 3.565–72.

[31] For the traditional nature of this metaphor, see the many examples from Greek and Latin literature cited in Kahlmeyer 1934: 22–26 and Murgatroyd 1995: 9–25.

poems hint at the ephemeral nature of beauty and passionate love by using the image of the beautiful but short-lived rose:[32] The boy in the Pyrrha Ode lies on a bed of rose petals (*multa ... in rosa,* 1).[33] Telephus in 1.13 is admired for his rose-colored neck (*cervicem roseam,* 2).[34] Finally, in both poems, hopes for eternal love are shown to be in vain (cf. *semper vacuam, semper amabilem sperat,* 1.5.10–11 with *non speres perpetuum dulcia .../ oscula laedentem,* 1.13.14–15).

Compared with the Pyrrha Ode, *Odes* 1.13 also adds an important new feature, the violence of the boy. Telephus is characterized as "raging" (*furens,* 11).[35] In his passionate lovemaking, he bruises[36] the girl's beautiful white shoulders and bites her lips violently (9–15).[37] This notion that young passionate love is associated with violent behavior directly prepares the reader for the next poem, our Ship Ode.

The last stanza (17–20) also provides another new idea that will find an echo in *Odes* 1.14. Here the speaker, in apparent contrast to the passionate but unreliable Telephus, calls those lovers blessed whose love is held by an

[32] Cf. Hor. *Odes* 2.3.13–14: *nimium brevis / flores amoenae ... rosae.* Davis 1991: 229–32 remarks that the bed of roses in *Odes* 1.5, flowers notorious for their "evanescent bloom" and associated with the passing of time, suggests the "ancillary motif of the evanescence of youth." Roses and perfume also played a role in funerals, cf. Putnam 1970: 253–54.

[33] Others assume here a garland of roses, but Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 74 find parallels of the bed of roses motif in Greek erotic writings: [Lucian.] *Asin.* 7 and Philostr. *Epist.* 20 (32), 54 (28).

[34] Lydia also praises the *cerea ... bracchia* (waxen arms, 2–3) of Telephus. Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 172 remark that *cerea* is not a very attractive attribute next to *rosea* because it denotes a yellowish pallor, a sign of disease in humans. Maybe for that reason, the ancient grammarian Flavius Caper (*GL* 7.98 Keil) read *lactea* instead. I would suggest that Horace chose *cerea* specifically because it evokes disease and death (funeral masks were made of wax) and thus stresses again the short-lived nature of his rival's beauty. I do not believe that the lyricist, by calling Telephus's *arms* "waxen," invites us to think of his entire body as a newly coated, unmarked writing tablet, *pace* Sutherland 2005: 60.

[35] *Furere* can also be used for the raging of a storm, cf. *furentibus Austris* (Verg. *Aen.* 1.51), or for the stormy sea, cf. *Neptunum ... furentem* (Hor. *Epist.* 1.11.10).

[36] The contrast between Lydia's white shoulders and the dark wine (*mero*, 10) mentioned in the same sentence "evoke the bruises that are merely implicit in *turparunt* (10)," cf. Sutherland 2005: 68; Commager 1962: 154.

[37] Horace portrays the two young lovers as engaged in *Veneris bella* ("the wars of Venus"), a favorite subject of Roman love elegy, cf. Lucr. 4.1079–83 (erotic violence interpreted as a sign of madness); Tib. 1.6.14, 10.53–67; Prop. 2.5.21–25, 2.15.17–20, 3.8.1–12 and 21–22, 4.5.31 and 39–40; Ov. *Am.* 1.7, *Ars.* 3.567–70.

"unbroken link" (*irrupta ... copula*, 18) that only death will dissolve.[38] These words promise that the speaker himself would be a safer, more faithful alternative to his young rival.[39]

When our sequential reading of the *First Book of Odes* finally reaches *Odes* 1.14, we are already acquainted with three recurring elements of Horatian love poetry. We have repeatedly come across the concept of unstable, passionate love. We have seen love compared to the stormy sea and a lover that was portrayed as "raging." Finally, we have encountered two love triangles with the same set of stock characters: a young girl, a passionate young man, and Horace (the speaker) in the *persona* of a calmer, older, and more loyal lover. All these elements reappear in *Odes* 1.14, albeit cloaked in the disguise of the naval allegory.

The common features that link *Odes* 1.14 to the two previously mentioned erotic poems are designed to guide the reader to a correct understanding of the allegory. In particular, both the Asclepiadean meter and the maritime imagery familiar from *Odes* 1.5 act as clues that alert the reader to the fact that the ship allegory in *Odes* 1.14 is another poem on love. A further clue is the prophetic stance that the speaker assumes in all three poems. In *Odes* 1.5, he predicts that the boy will cry (*flebit*, 6) and that he will look at the spectacle of Pyrrha's changed attitude toward him with a stunned gaze (*emirabitur*, 8). In *Odes* 1.13, this prophetic stance is only implied in the advice that the speaker gives Lydia,[40] but in *Odes* 1.14, it is again very obvious: the speaker predicts that the waves will carry the ship back into danger (*referent,* 1) if she does not make a serious effort to reach the harbor.[41]

[38] Ancona 1994: 125–27 proposes to take *irrupta* in the sense of *interrupta* (interrupted). It seems, however, that the passage expresses exactly the same idea as Prop. 2.15.25–26: *atque utinam haerentis sic nos vincire catena / velles, ut numquam solveret ulla dies* (I wish you wanted to bind us, while we are clinging together, with a chain so that no day could ever untie us). For more parallels, see Romano 1991: 538.

[39] The praise of stable love in lines 17–20 contains an element of self-mockery, cf. Segal 1973: 41–42. After all, the speaker praises enduring love in the hope that this will make Lydia abandon his rival, Telephus. The speaker is obviously not the calm and dispassionate lover he claims to be which, in turn, fits the description of his excessive jealousy in lines 1–12. Commager 1962: 153 detected in the latter passage parody of elegiac conventions. I would prefer to see in the overly emotional tone of most of the poem an illustration (albeit a slightly ironic one) of the effeminate elegiac *persona* that Horace gives his speaker; see now also Sutherland 2005: 75.

[40] Note, however, the prophetic future in which the advice is expressed: *non si me satis audias speres* (13–14).

[41] Woodman 1980: 65 appropriately explains the warnings in *Odes* 1.14 as "a type of 'threat-prophesy' commonly found in erotic poetry."

Furthermore, a strikingly parallel structure serves to confirm the impression that *Odes* 1.14 and 1.13 are talking about the same situation. *Odes* 1.13 contains not one, as is usually believed, but two catalogues of love symptoms. The first one, modeled on a famous poem by Sappho (31 Lobel-Page), describes in detail the emotions that the male speaker experiences when he hears Lydia praise his rival, Telephus (3–11).[42] The second one consists of a much shorter description of the visible traces the boy's love has left on the girl's body and clothes (11–13). *Odes* 1.14 both mirrors and varies this structure: First, we find a detailed account of visible damage that the (female) ship has recently suffered (3–10), then a shorter description of the male speaker's emotional response (17–18).

These structural parallels are further emphasized by similarities in content: In both poems, the speaker utters warnings and suggests appropriate responses (*non, si me satis audias, speres*, 1.13.13–14; *cave*, 1.14.16; *vites*, 1.14.20). More importantly, the Lydia of *Odes* 1.13 bears bite marks and bruises (*Odes* 1.13.9–12), typical signs of a lovers' quarrel. Similarly, the ship of *Odes* 1.14 is not only imagined as a girl (*filia*, 12), the damage it has suffered is depicted in words that would fit remarkably well to a fight between lovers: her "flank is naked" (*nudum ... latus,* 1.14.4); she is "wounded" (*saucius,* 5); and her "linen is not whole" (*non integra ... lintea,* 9). *Lintea* (9), as Anderson has noticed, can also refer to clothes.[43] Taken together, these parallels suggest that the ship in 1.14 stands for a girl like Lydia whose clothes have been torn to pieces by her young lover in a characteristic fit of passion.

If *Odes* 1.14 presents the same kind of love triangle as *Odes* 1.5 and 1.13, then not only the ship is personified but the sea must be personified as well. This is indeed the case. The speaker characterizes the sea with the words *imperiosius aequor* (8–9), and *imperiosus,* in its proper, non-metaphorical sense, usually refers to people.[44] The person represented by the sea must be the speaker's rival, a young lover like Telephus in 1.13. This personification of the lover as the sea portrays him both as violent and as unfaithful. Elsewhere

[42] On the parodic nature of the kitchen metaphors in Horace's first catalogue of symptoms (*Odes* 1.13.3–11), see West 1967: 65–71.

[43] Anderson 1966: 92 n. 12 notes that not only sails but also clothes were made of linen. The tearing of clothes is a typical way in which the elegiac lover expresses his passion, cf. Tib. 1.10.61; Prop. 2.5.21, 2.15.18; Ov. *Am.* 1.7.47–48; *Ars.* 3.569.

[44] Cf., for example, *consul imperiosus*, Cic. *Red. Sen.* 12; *nimis imperiosi philosophi, Fin.* 2.105; *familia imperiosissima,* Liv. 9.34.15. The paraphrase in Quinn 1980: 151 illustrates the personifying force of *imperiosius* well: "a sea too eager to assume command," yet neither Quinn nor anyone else, as far as I know, has ever noticed the personification of the sea in *Odes* 1.14.

in the *Odes*, for example, the sea constitutes the standard against which a girl measures her former male lover's tendency to violent outbursts (*tu ... improbo / iracundior Hadria,* "you, ... more wrathful than the unruly Adriatic Sea," *Odes* 3.9.22–23).[45] And in *Odes* 1.5, as we have seen, the sea served as an apt metaphor for Pyrrha's infidelity. The comparative form, *imperiosius* (1.14.8), adds to this characterization by subtly suggesting that the speaker himself, in comparison to his sea-like young rival, is far less overbearing.[46]

In sum, the speaker in *Odes* 1.14 plays the same role as the older lover in the Lydia Ode 1.13. He warns the girl of the violence and unfaithfulness of his younger rival. The harbor (*portum*, 1.14.3) that the speaker offers the girl as a refuge from the dangerous storm on the open seas represents the calmer, more stable love that the older lover feels for the girl. Thus, the harbor in *Odes* 1.14 is an example of another *topos* of amatory poetry, the Harbor of Fulfilled Love.[47]

Some scholars who, with Anderson, also regard *Odes* 1.14 as a variation on the Ship of Love metaphor view the *navita* (14) as the woman's new lover.[48] This cannot be right. We have seen that the ship, just like the girls in *Odes* 1.5 and 1.13, faces two alternatives, and these are the potentially stormy sea and the safe harbor (1–3). The *timidus navita* in line 14 is quite obviously not a part of these alternatives. Instead, he is an integral part of the argument with which the speaker tries to persuade the ship of the need for making it to shore (3–15).[49] The speaker tries to convince the ship that it is not in a position to withstand another storm by pointing to the current condition of the ship and its rigging: the oar-less side, the damaged mast, the groaning yardarms, the unstable keel, the torn sails, and the tutelary gods that have disappeared from the stern. Within this series of arguments, the last and most convincing

[45] Cf. also *Odes* 1.33.14–15: *Myrtale / libertina fretis acrior Hadriae.*

[46] I owe the inspiration for this idea to one of *TAPA's* anonymous reviewers.

[47] Cf. Theogn. 457–60; Meleager, *Anth. Gr.* 12.167.3–4; Philodem. *Anth. Gr.* 10.21.7–8; Ov. *Ars* 2.9–10; and Anderson 1966: 95. Elsewhere, the harbor metaphor also occurs in an erotic context, but it is used in a slightly different way. In Prop. 3.24.15 and Ov. *Am.* 2.9.31–34, for example, the harbor represents not fulfilled love, but relief from the tribulations of stormy love affairs.

[48] Traill 1979: 267; Woodman 1980: 65; cf. also Carrubba 2003: 611. Davis 1989: 337–38 assumes a "divided *persona*" and considers the *navita* "a *persona* that is a metonymic 'doublet' of the lyricist" who can, thus, both be on shore and address his 'doublet' on board. This seems a rather complicated way of representing a soliloquy. Davis 1989:338 also paraphrases *timidus navita* (14) with "a fearful *navita* <u>like myself</u>" (emphasis mine) although the Latin text contains no equivalent to the words "like myself."

[49] Cf. Anderson 1966: 85: "Of course, sailors man the ship, but the speaker mentions them incidentally, with the collective *navita* (14), and only as part of his argument."

point the speaker makes is the fear of the *navita*, i.e., the collective crew: the ship may be built of the best ship's timber and may be nicely painted, but its crew, who knows it best, is not deceived by outward appearances. Thus, the *navita* is mentioned as one of the elements that customarily belong to a ship. Just as it would be fruitless to look for hidden meanings behind every other detail of the metaphor (the yardarms or the mast, for example),[50] so it is not necessary to give the *navita* a role in the poem's love triangle.

In the context of Horace's erotic odes, other enigmatic details of *Odes* 1.14 become similarly comprehensible. The gods that the ship will invoke in vain (*non di quos ... voces,* 1.14.10) correspond to the gods that appear in the Pyrrha Ode (*mutatosque deos flebit,* 1.5.6). Thus, they are not only the tutelary gods attached to the stern of Roman ships, they are also, in Woodman's words, "the anonymous gods (of) Roman love poetry ... who are said traditionally to be deaf to the lover's plight."[51]

Another detail that *Odes* 1.14 has in common with the Pyrrha Ode is the notion of seductive glamour. In 1.5, Pyrrha, like gold or the sea in bright sunlight, radiates a gleam that proves pernicious to the inexperienced (*miseri, quibus / intemptata nites,* 12–13). There is a textual echo of the Pyrrha Ode in *Odes* 1.14 when the speaker warns the ship to avoid the waters around the gleaming Cyclades (*nitentis ... Cycladas,* 19–20).[52] The Cyclades were not only famous for the white, shining marble from the island of Paros;[53] they were also in a notoriously stormy part of the Aegean.[54] Most importantly,

[50] I agree with Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 179 that "the development of detail is of no more importance than in a Homeric simile." Cf. also Davis 1989: 336: "[W]e are probably not meant to search for trivial correspondences between the ship and its presumed referent." As early as 1822, Bothe wrote: "Illud modo observari velim ..., quod recte etiam Baxterus praecipit, non esse opus in allegoria, ut morose omnes illius partes examinentur et ad rem significatam applicentur" (Bothe 1822: 34). In contrast, Carrubba 2003: 611–12 certainly goes too far in drawing parallels between the parts of the ship and the female anatomy. The same is true for Gentili's allegorical interpretations of Alcaeus fragments (Gentili 1988: 199–213).

[51] Woodman 1980: 65. Woodman overlooked, however, the parallel to *Odes* 1.5. Cf. also the gods by whom Barine swears her false pledges of love (*Odes* 2.8.11).

[52] Putnam 1970: 252 sees this parallel between our Ship Ode and the Pyrrha Ode. In addition, he calls attention to the gleaming of Barine in *Odes* 2.8.6 (*enitescis*), the gleaming of Phyllis in *Odes* 4.11.5 (*crinis religata fulges*), and the *fulgentes Cyclades* in *Odes* 3.28.14 (Putnam 1970: 252–53).

[53] *Odes* 1.19.5–6 makes this comparison between a *hetaera*'s seductive gleaming (*nitor*) and Parian marble explicit: *urit me Glycerae nitor / splendentis Pario marmore purius.*

[54] Cf. Pasquali 1964 (1920): 22; Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 188; Quinn 1980: 152; Romano 1991: 542.

however, they were specifically associated with Venus, the goddess of love.[55] Horace himself addresses Venus in *Odes* 3.28.13–15 as the goddess "who holds Cnidos and the shining Cyclades and visits Paphos with her pair of swans" (*quae Cnidon / fulgentisque tenet Cycladas et Paphon / iunctis visit oloribus*). Thus, the waters around the Cyclades in 1.14 turn out to be the stormy, but dangerously seductive, Sea of Love.

Our interpretation of Horace's ship allegory is supported by the subsequent poems in Horace's collection. The enigmatic poem[56] that immediately follows our Ship Ode, *Odes* 1.15, focuses on two members of another amatory triangle, the beautiful Helen and her young lover, the Trojan prince Paris. The third member of the conventional trio, the abandoned older lover, is not mentioned explicitly. Yet, his existence is implied by the allusions to Paris's breach of his host's trust (*perfidus*, 2)[57] and his adultery (*adulteros*, 19). Both are unambiguous references to Helen's husband, Menelaus. In this version of the topical love triangle, however, the jilted lover remains completely in the background. Instead, the prophetically gifted "Old Man of the Sea," the god Nereus, assumes the role of the warner and prophet of future doom that, in *Odes* 1.13 and 1.14, had been played by the poet-speaker himself in the *persona* of the older lover.

In addition to the love triangle and the prophetic speaker, *Odes* 1.15 shares a similar setting with the Ship Ode 1.14. Just like the ship in 1.14, the ship of the two eloping lovers has not yet reached the safe harbor when Nereus stops them to predict the disastrous results of their relationship (1.15.1–5).

In several respects, *Odes* 1.15 offers an interesting variation on the now familiar amatory triangle. Horace has not only transferred the role of the prophet to Nereus, a character outside of the love triangle proper. He has also changed the addressee of the warnings. In *Odes* 1.13 and 1.14, the speaker always addressed the girl. In 1.15, however, a male, Paris, the ardent young lover, has become the addressee.

[55] Anderson 1966: 96.

[56] Traditionally, *Odes* 1.15 has often been read as a political allegory alluding to Anthony and Cleopatra (Sinko, Magariños, Kraggerud, cited Romano 1991: 542; Kießling and Heinze 1968 (1930): 75–76 support the allusion but reject the idea of an allegory). Others have taken it as an example of the way in which Horace tries "to emulate the Greek lyricists in their rehandling of epic topics" (Nisbet-Hubbard 1970: 190); among recent readings in the latter vein are, e.g., Lowrie 1997, 123–37; Athanassaki 2002, 85–101. For a more promising approach that instead focuses on the structure of the poem itself, see Smith 1968: 67–74.

[57] *Perfidus* (1.15.2) alludes, of course, not only to the fact that Paris has violated the code of *xenia* but also serves as a reminder of the proverbial fickleness of young lovers, cf. the *perfidum ... caput* of Barine in *Odes* 2.8.6.

A second glance at *Odes* 1.15 reveals, however, that Paris here assumes the role that previously belonged to girls. Paris's behavior, at least, is clearly described as effeminate.[58] Nereus depicts the young prince as combing his hair (*pectes caesariem*, 14) in a way that is designed to remind us of the earlier sight of Pyrrha arranging her blond hair (*cui flavam religas comam*, 1.5.4). Moreover, Paris is said to sing songs "popular with women" (i.e., presumably of amatory content)[59] while accompanying himself on an "unwarlike lyre" (*grataque feminis / inbelli cithara carmina divides*, 14–15). In the same way, the poet imagines Tyndaris in *Odes* 1.17.18–20 as singing songs of love to the accompaniment of her lyre. In tune with his portrayal of Paris as effeminate, Nereus also compares him to a stag fleeing a lion (29–31). This simile is clearly inspired by Homer's description of the encounter between Paris and Menelaus in *Iliad* 3.21–25.[60] Yet in the context of Paris's effeminacy, it seems significant that the same kind of simile in erotic lyric usually compares the beloved girl to a pursued and fleeing animal. In *Odes* 1.23, for example, the speaker compares Chloe to a timid fawn (*vitas inuleo me similis*, 1) that is running away from a tiger or a lion (1.23.9).[61]

Finally, just as the girls in 1.13 and 1.14 (and later in 1.17) are threatened by violent young men, so the girlish Paris in 1.15 is told to beware of violent young men like Diomedes. An especially striking parallel is represented by the words *furit te reperire atrox Tydides* (fierce Diomedes is raging to find you, 1.15.27–28)[62] which recall the *puer furens* (raging boy) in *Odes* 1.13.11.

[58] Cf. Kießling and Heinze 1968 (1930): 78; Smith 1968: 71, and the notes on *pectes caesariem* (14) in Nisbet-Hubbard 1970: 195 and Romano 1991: 545; see, moreover, Davis 1991: 26 on Nereus's vilification of Paris.

[59] Cf. the contemptuous way in which Horace in his Satires refers to recitations of elegiac or love poetry: *Demetri, teque, Tigelli, / discipularum inter iubeo plorare cathedras* (*Sat.* 1.10.90–91).

[60] In fact, the entire passage *Odes* 1.15.27–32 is a skillful pastiche of Homeric lines; see, for example, Kießling and Heinze 1968 (1930): 79; Nisbet-Hubbard 1970: 199–200; Romano 1991: 546–47.

[61] Cf. the parallels for *Odes* 1.23 cited by Nisbet-Hubbard 1970: 273–75, esp. Anacreon fr. 417 Lobel-Page. Commager 1962: 238 comments, also on 1.23, "Pursuer and pursued, raging lion and timid fawn: the formulation is an amatory commonplace."

[62] An allusion to Hom. *Il.* 3.449–50 where Menelaus wildly searches for Paris on the battlefield; cf., e.g., Kießling and Heinze 1968 (1930): 79. Scholars have often wondered why Horace here and elsewhere alludes to the fight between Menelaus and Paris in *Iliad* 3, yet replaces Helen's husband with Diomedes (cf. Kießling and Heinze 1968 (1930): 79; Romano 1991: 546). It has been proposed that Diomedes appeared in the dithyramb of Bacchylides which, according to Porphyrio p. 23, 8–10 Holder, served as the inspiration for Horace's *Odes* 1.15 (Nisbet-Hubbard 1970: 199). I would suggest instead that Horace

Furthermore, Paris is told that he will rely in vain on the protection of his special patron goddess Venus (*nequiquam Veneris praesidio ferox*, 1.15.13), just as the girl-ship in *Odes* 1.14.9–10 is warned that it will no longer be able to call on the gods that were once attached to its stern. In sum, Horace framed his erotic ship allegory, *Odes* 1.14, with two other erotic poems that present the same constellation of characters, albeit with some modifications in the case of *Odes* 1.15.[63]

The book continues with a poem, *Odes* 1.16, that links 1.15 with 1.17 through "the looming spectre of Helen of Troy."[64] The poem again addresses a beautiful girl, like most of the amatory *Odes* discussed above. At first, she remains anonymous, but as in *Odes* 1.14, the last stanza provides an unambiguous clue for our interpretation of the poem.[65] With *recantatis* (27), a literal translation of the Greek *palinodein*, Horace points to the famous *palinodia* of Stesichorus as his model.[66] Thus, the address *O matre pulchra filia pulchrior* (1) must be an allusion to Helen of Troy. The same Helen appears in *Odes* 1.15. The girl addressed in *Odes* 1.17 with the mythical Helen's patronymic Tyndaris (daughter of Tyndarus) is presumably also a Helen albeit not the mythical character but a *hetaera* like Pyrrha or Lydia.[67]

Most important in the context of this paper, however, is that *Odes* 1.16 introduces another ingenious variant of the triangle of love *topos*. The poem features, of course, only two characters, the poet-speaker and the girl he addresses. Yet in the last two stanzas (22–28), the speaker looks back at his youth when he raged like Telephus in *Odes* 1.13 and wrote *celeres iambi*

---

introduced the younger Diomedes, rather than the older Menelaus, in order to create an obvious parallel to the violent young men of the other *Odes*.

[63] Thus, the common view that *Odes* 1.15 is a political allegory on Anthony and Cleopatra (rejected on different grounds, e.g., by Fraenkel 1957: 188–89 and Syndikus 1972: 175-76) is just as mistaken as the Ship of State interpretation for *Odes* 1.14.

[64] The quote is from Toohey 1982: 120, who, however, discusses only the connection between 1.16 and 1.17. Santirocco 1986: 49-50 sees that Helen links all three poems.

[65] See above, p. 151.

[66] Horace may even have coined Latin *recantare* himself in order to hint at his debt to Stesichorus; cf., e.g., Nisbet and Hubbard 1970: 202; Lowrie 1995: 42; the allusion to Stesichorus was already noticed in antiquity, cf. Ps.-Acro, p. 71, 21 Keller.

[67] Cf. *Helenen* (1.15.2) and *Tyndari* (1.17.10). For more connections linking 1.15, 1.16, and 1.17, see Santirocco 1986: 49-52. A relatively superficial link between 1.15 and 1.16 that seems to have been overlooked so far consists of the way both she and Diomedes are praised as better than their famous father or mother; cf. *Tydides melior patre* (1.15.28) and *matre pulchra filia pulchrior* (1.16.1). Fraenkel 1957: 207-8 was right to turn against scholars that identified the Tyndaris of *Odes* 1.17 with the *filia pulchrior* of *Odes* 1.16 but he went too far in denying *any* kind of connection between the two poems.

(hasty or swift iambics),[68] but claims that he is now a less hotheaded suitor.[69] This means that *Odes* 1.16 merges the two different kinds of male lovers that regularly appear in lyric love triangles, the fiery youth and the calmer older lover, into a single *persona*, the speaker. Thus, *Odes* 1.16 becomes part of a succession of poems featuring love triangles that starts with *Odes* 1.13 and ends with *Odes* 1.17.

Within this chain of poems, *Odes* 1.16 marks a change, signaled also by the change in meter,[70] from the previous poem's hostile attack on Paris and, implicitly, maybe also on Helen herself[71] to the more conciliatory and persuasive tone that characterizes *Odes* 1.16 itself and the following *Odes* 1.17. Scholars are right to emphasize that the "generic disavowal" (Davis 1991: 75) of Horace's *palinodia* programmatically defines lyric by setting it against invective or iambic poetry such as Horace's own earlier collection of Epodes.[72] I would add that *mitibus* (25) and *tristia* (26) also make sense if we refer them to the poem's immediate surroundings: *Odes* 1.16 not only announces the more gentle words (*mitibus*, 25) of the following invitation to Tyndaris (*Odes* 1.17), it also renounces the *tristia* (1.16.26) of the previous poem, *Odes* 1.15.[73]

[68] See Nisbet-Hubbard 1970: 214 on the ambiguity of *celeres*.

[69] Cf. *me ... in dulci iuventa ... furentem* (1.16.22-25) with *puer furens* (1.13.11) and with the raging Diomedes (*furit ... Tydides*, 1.15.27-28). At the same time, the word the speaker uses to describe his former emotional state, *fervor* (1.16.24), recalls the *fervens ... iecur* (1.13.4) of the older speaker in 1.13 and may thus be a subtle hint that the speaker of 1.16, just like the speaker of 1.13 (cf. above n. 39), has not yet achieved complete tranquility of mind.

[70] *Odes* 1.16 and 1.17 are written in Alcaics, whereas the previous three and the following two poems are composed in various Asclepiadeic stanzas.

[71] Ole Smith (1968: 71) rightly stresses that *Odes* 1.15 focuses almost exclusively on Paris and his sins and that *traheret* (1.15.1) even defends Helen because it "implies that Paris took Helen away without her consent" (*pace* Nisbet-Hubbard 1970: 191). Yet considering that most ancient texts habitually give Helen at least part of the blame, even such a subtle defense of her must evoke associations of Helen's well-known guilt. Similarly, Catullus in c. 64 "both contradicts and evokes the stories told in other versions" (Gaiser 1995: 608; cf. ibid. 584 and 596). Cf. also Commager 1962: 136: even if *Odes* 1.15 "does not abuse Helen, at least (it) predicts the doom she will bring."

[72] Toohey 1982: 121; Santirocco 1986: 51; Davis 1991: 75-76; Lowrie 1995: 43; the core of this idea is already found in Hendrickson 1931: 4 and Syndikus 1972: 180-82.

[73] The fact that Horace denounces not lyric poems, but *iambi* (1.16.3, 24), does not speak against this interpretation. As Quinn 1980: 156 points out, the term *iambi* "denotes verses in the Roman tradition of personal invective, not necessarily in iambic metre."

The following poem, *Odes* 1.17,[74] presents another love triangle that closely mirrors the situation outlined in the nautical allegory of *Odes* 1.14. The poet has again adopted the *persona* of the calmer, more mature lover that we already know from *Odes* 1.5, 1.13, and 1.14, and he tries to lure a girl named Tyndaris (10)[75] away from her violent young lover, Cyrus (25), to his idyllic countryside estate.[76] This place, he claims, offers protection from wind and rain as well as from the oppressive heat of a summer in the city. The phrase *pluviosque ventos* (4) evokes the storms in 1.5 and 1.14.[77] Similarly, the word for summer heat (*aestus*, 18) can be used as a poetical term both for the fires of love and for waves and the sea,[78] and so it may have been chosen as a subtle reminder of the perils of the Sea of Love, as described in *Odes* 1.5 and 1.14. Moreover, the speaker's promise, *Caniculae / vitabis aestus* (you will avoid the heat of the Dog Star, 1.17.17–18) harks back to *vites aequora Cycladas* (avoid the waters of the Cyclades, 1.14.20) and to Nereus's gloomy prophesy for Paris, *nequiquam ... calami spicula Cnosii vitabis* (in vain you will avoid ... the barbs of a Cretan arrow, 1.15.16–18). Most importantly, the speaker in *Odes* 1.17 offers his valley to Tyndaris as a safe refuge from her violent lover who expresses his passion for Tyndaris by tearing the wreath from her hair and destroying her dress (24–28).[79] In the same way, the speaker of the Ship Ode 1.14 holds out to the ship the safety of the harbor and mentions that the

[74] For a good survey of the main strands of scholarship on *Odes* 1.17, see the excellent article by Putnam 1994: 357 n. 1.

[75] For the meaning of the name, see above p. 160. The name's reference to Helen of Troy promises that the *hetaera*'s looks are comparable to the proverbial beauty of the mythical Helen.

[76] In addition to the love triangle Speaker—Tyndaris—Cyrus, the poem also features another love triangle: the song about Odysseus, Circe, and Penelope that Tyndaris will sing in the speaker's valley is, as Davis 1991: 203 has seen, an "amusingly irreverent remodeling" of a part of Homer's *Odyssey*. The roles and ethos of Circe and Penelope in Tyndaris' song mirror those of Cyrus and the speaker, cf. Klingner 1979 (1935): 418; Pucci 1975: 265; Quinn 1980: 159; Dunn 1990: 207; Putnam 1994: 372.

[77] Cf. esp. *aspera / nigris aequora ventis* (1.5.6-7) and *nisi ventis / debes ludibrium* (1.14.15). In all three poems, *ventos* or *ventis* stand in emphatic position at the end of a line. The storms of love are also hinted at in *Odes* 1.5.11-12 (*aurae fallacis*) and in the Barine Ode 2.8.24 (*aura*).

[78] Cf. *OLD* s.v. *aestus* 5a and 7. Putnam 1994: 363 already mentions the association of *aestus* with love or fury.

[79] As in *Odes* 1.13 (see above n. 39), the promise of safety is not free from irony. As Pucci 1975: 266-67 notes, the poet-speaker "hides his own desire and passion" which are not that different from the desire of Circe and Cyrus; cf. also Klingner 1979 (1935): 418; Dunn 1990: 206-7.

storm has damaged her "linen" (*lintea*, 1.14.9), which, as we have seen above, can refer both to sails and to clothes.[80]

It has become fashionable to talk about the "multivalence" of *Odes* 1.14.[81] I agree that many poems do indeed have more than one meaning, and the same may be true of our Ship Ode. Yet with regard to the various interpretations of *Odes* 1.14 that have been proposed so far, be it the Ship of State, the Ship of Life, the Ship of Love Poetry, or the Ship of Horace's Poetic *Ingenium*, I do not see why it is necessary to cling to theories that have been proven wrong a long time ago.[82] The textual support for these readings either does not suffice, or the evidence openly contradicts them.

Our sequential reading of the poems surrounding the Ship Ode in Horace's *First Book of Odes*, in contrast, has made it abundantly clear, I hope, that Horace has designed the poem's allegory so that his readers will decode it as a typical amatory triangle[83] in metaphorical form. Read within the context of Horace's *First Book of Odes*, Horace's Ship Ode turns out to be part of a series of poems (*Odes* 1.5, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17) that offer multiple variations of a single theme, the triangle of love.[84] *Odes* 1.14 presents the amatory triangle in allegorical form, and the ship in this poem represents not the Ship of State,

[80] See above, note 43.

[81] Freudenburg 1993: 185-86; cf. Santirocco 1986: 47-48; the latter is cited with approval by Hutchinson 2002: 531 n. 50 ("a deliberately elusive allegory"). Lowrie 1997: 130 asserts, "neither [*Odes* 1.14 nor 1.15] is 'about' poetry or politics in totality [but] about the need for allegory, and the impossibility of pinning meaning down to any single signification." Carrubba 2003: 615 declares himself to be "comfortable" with the Ship of State interpretation but does not reject the possibility of more than one meaning. Paschalis 2002: 80 concludes, "[I]t is impossible to identify with certainty the nature of the speaker's concern or the precise character of the harbor space." Gall 1981: 205, in contrast, goes so far as to claim that the very ambiguity of the image in *Odes* 1.14 is a defining characteristic of Horace's political poetry.

[82] In particular by Mendell 1938 and Anderson 1966; see also above, n. 10 and n. 22.

[83] For the sake of completeness, I should perhaps also point to a poem outside of Horace's first lyrical collection, *Odes* 4.11, that features another, very similar love triangle. The speaker, an older lover (31-34), invites a girl to his rural home and tries to persuade her to avoid (*vites*, 31) his rival, young Telephus (21-22). Further parallels to the poems discussed above (1.5, 13, 14, 17) are, for example, the references to *Venus marina* (15), to the girl's hair (5), and to her gleaming (*fulges*, 5). The words *Telephum ... occupavit* (21) form a parallel to *occupa / portum* (1.14.2-3), especially when one understands *portum* as the Harbor of Love.

[84] This result further supports Brian Arkins' observation that the love poems in Horace's *Odes* "tend to appear in clusters" (2000: 107). Arkins, of course, does not count *Odes* 1.14 and 1.15 as love poems, and he even hesitates to include *Odes* 1.17 among them (*ibid.*).

the Ship of Life, or the Ship of Poetry, but a young, attractive woman caught between two male admirers, a passionate young man and the poet-speaker in the *persona* of a more relaxed veteran lover.[85]

WORKS CITED

Ancona, Ronnie. 1994. *Time and the Erotic in Horace's* Odes. Durham.

Anderson, William S. 1966. "Horace *Carm.* 1.14: What Kind of Ship?" *CP* 61: 84–98.

Arkins, Brian. 2000. "The Cruel Joke of Venus: Horace as Love Poet." In Niall Rudd, ed. *Horace 2000: A Celebration. Essays for the Bimillenium.* London. 106–119.

Athanassaki, Lucia. 2002. "On Horace, *Odes* 1.15 and Choral Lyric." In Michael Paschalis, ed. *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry.* Rethymnon. 85–101.

Bonanno, Maria Grazia. 1976. "Sull' allegoria della nave (Alcae. 208 V.; Hor. *Carm.* I 14." *RCCM* 18: 179–97.

Bothe, Friedrich H., ed. 1822. *Q. Horatii Flacci Eclogae.* 2nd ed. Leipzig.

Calboli, Gualtiero. 1998. "*O navis, referent in mare te novi fluctus* (zu Horazens *Carm.* I 14)." *Maia* 50: 37–70.

Carlsson, Gunnar. 1944. "Zu einigen Oden des Horaz." *Eranos* 42: 1–23.

Carrubba, Robert W. 2003. "The Structure of Horace's Ship of State: *Odes* 1, 14." *Latomus* 62: 606–615.

Commager, Steele. 1962. *The Odes of Horace. A Critical Study.* New Haven.

Davis, Gregson. 1989. "*Ingenii Cumba?* Literary *aporia* and the rhetoric of Horace's *O navis referent* (C. 1.14)." *RhM* 132: 331–45.

———. 1991. *Polyhymnia. The Rhetoric of Horatian Lyric Discourse.* Berkeley.

Dunn, Francis M. 1990. "An Invitation to Tyndaris: Horace, *Ode* I.17." *TAPA* 120: 203–8

Ensor, Ernest. 1903. "On the Allusions in Horace, *Odes* I, 14." *CR* 17: 158–59.

Fraenkel, Eduard. 1957. *Horace.* Oxford.

Freudenburg, Kirk. 1993. *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire.* Princeton.

Gaiser, Julia H. 1995. "Threads in the Labyrinth: Competing Views and Voices in Catullus 64." *AJP* 116: 579–616.

Gall, Dorothea. 1981. *Die Bilder der horazischen Lyrik.* Königsstein/Ts.

Gentili, Bruno. 1988 (Italian edition 1985). *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece. From Homer to the Fifth Century.* Transl. by A. Thomas Cole. Baltimore.

Hendrickson, G. L. 1931. "The First Publication of Horace's *Odes*." *CP* 26: 1–10.

Holder, Alfred, ed. 1967 (original publication 1894). *Pomponi Porphyrionis commentum in Horatium Flaccum.* Hildesheim.

Holleman, A. J. W. 1970. "Notes on Ovid *Amores* 1.3, Horace *Carm.* 1.14, and Propertius 2.26." *CP* 65: 177–80.

[85] Earlier drafts of this paper were presented in Baltimore, MD, Washington, DC, Fredericksburg, VA, Frankfurt am Main, and Göttingen. I wish to thank the audiences present on these occasions, my wife and perceptive editor, Kristen Klay, and the editor and anonymous readers of *TAPA* whose thoughtful suggestions have made this a much stronger paper.

Hutchinson, G. O. 2002. "The Publication and Individuality of Horace's *Odes* Books 1–3." *CQ* 52: 517–37.

Jocelyn, H. D. 1982. "Boats, Women, and Horace *Odes* 1.14." *CP* 77: 330–35.

Kahlmeyer, Johannes. 1934. *Seesturm und Schiffbruch als Bild im antiken Schrifttum.* Hildesheim.

Keller, Otto, ed. 1967 (original publication 1902). *Pseudacronis scholia in Horatium vetustiora, vol. I: Scholia in carmina et epodos.* Stuttgart.

Kießling, Adolf and Richard Heinze, eds. 1968 (original edition 1930). *Q. Horatius Flaccus. Oden und Epoden.* 13th ed. Dublin/Zürich.

Klingner, Friedrich. 1979 (original publication 1935). "Velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem (1, 17)." In Friedrich Klingner. *Römische Geisteswelt. Essays zur Lateinischen Literatur*, ed. Karl Büchner. Stuttgart.

Kukula, Richard C. 1912. "Quintilians Interpretation von Horaz' Carm. I 14." *WS* 34: 237–45.

Lobel, E., and D. L. Page, eds. 1955. *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta.* Oxford.

Lowrie, Michèle. 1995. "A Parade of Lyric Predecessors: Horace *C.* 1.12–1.18." *Phoenix* 49: 33–48.

———. 1997. *Horace's Narrative Odes.* Oxford.

Mendell, Charles W. 1938. "Horace I. 14." *CP* 33: 145–56.

Murgatroyd, Paul. 1995. "The Sea of Love." *CQ* 45: 9–25.

Nisbet, R. G. M. and Margaret Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I.* Oxford.

———. 1978. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II.* Oxford.

Paschalis, Michael. 2002. "Constructing Lyric Space: Horace and the Alcaean Song." In Michael Paschalis, ed. *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry.* Rethymnon. 71–84.

Pasquali, Giorgio. 1964 (original edition 1920). *Orazio lirico.* 2nd ed. by Antonio La Penna. Florence.

Pilch, Stanislaus. 1929. "Horatii *C.* I 14 quomodo sit interpretandum." *Eos* 32: 449–72.

Porter, David H. 1987. *Horace's Poetic Journey: A Reading of* Odes *1–3.* Princeton.

Pucci, Pietro. 1975. "Horace's Banquet in *Odes* 1.17." *TAPA* 105: 259–81.

Putnam, Michael C. J. 1970. "Horace *Carm.* 1.5: Love and Death." *CP* 65: 251–54 (= M. C. J. Putnam. 1982. *Essays on Latin Lyric, Elegy, and Epic.* Princeton. 95–98).

———. 1994. "Structure and Design in Horace, *Odes* 1.17" *CW* 87: 357–75.

Quinn, Kenneth. 1980. *Horace: The Odes.* London.

Reckford, Kenneth J. 1969. *Horace.* New York.

Romano, Elisa. 1991. *Q. Orazio Flacco. Le Opere, I: Le Odi, il Carmen Secolare, gli Epodi.* Rome.

Santirocco, Matthew S. 1986. *Unity and Design in Horace's* Odes. Chapel Hill.

Schäfer, Eckart. 1972. "Das Staatsschiff. Zur Präzision eines Topos." In Peter Jehn, ed. *Toposforschung. Eine Dokumentation.* Frankfurt am Main. 259–92.

Seel, Otto. 1970. "Zur Ode 1, 14 des Horaz: Zweifel an einer communis opinio." In Doris Ableitiger and Helmut Gugel, edd. *Festschrift K. Vretska.* Heidelberg. 204–245.

Segal, Charles. 1973. "*Felices ter et amplius*: Horace, *Odes* I.13." *Latomus* 32: 39–46.

Shackleton Bailey, David R. 1982. *Profile of Horace.* Cambridge, Mass.

Smith, Ole L. 1968. "A Reading of Horace, Carm. I, 15." *C&M* 29: 67–74.

Sutherland, Elizabeth H. 2005. "Writing (on) Bones." *CP* 100: 52–82.

Syndikus, Hans Peter. 1972. *Die Lyrik des Horaz. Eine Interpretation der* Oden. *Bd. I: Erstes und Zweites Buch.* Darmstadt (Impulse der Forschung, 6).

Traill, David A. 1979. "Horace, *Odes* 1.14: Genealogy, Courtesans and Cyclades." In C. Deroux, ed. *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History, I.* Brussels. 266–70.

West, David. 1967. *Reading Horace.* Edinburgh.

———. 1995. *Horace* Odes *I: Carpe Diem.* Oxford.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Ulrich von. 1913. *Sappho und Simonides. Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker.* Berlin.

Wili, Walter. 1948. *Horaz und die Augusteische Kultur.* Basel.

Wilkinson, L. P. 1956. "The Earliest Odes of Horace." *Hermes* 84: 495–99.

Woodman, A. J. 1980. "The Craft of Horace in *Odes* 1.14." *CP* 75: 60–67.

Zumwalt, Nancy K. 1977–78. "Horace's *Navis* of Love Poetry (*C.* 1.14)." *CW* 71: 249–54.