

cation, as both material and formal topics must have been used by the orator in the process of invention and composition<sup>37</sup>).

University of Missouri  
at Columbia

Barbara Price Wallach

---

37) M. von Albrecht, *Cicéron. Théorie rhétorique et pratique oratoire*, EtCl 52 (1984) 19–24, has shown that the *exordium* of Cicero's *Pro rege Deiotaro*, a product of Cicero's maturity, follows rules set forth in the *De inventione*.

### INGENII CUMBA?

#### Literary *aporia* and the rhetoric of Horace's *O navis referent* (C.1.14)

Per correr miglior acqua alza le vele  
omai la navicella del mio ingegno,  
che lascia retro a se mar sì crudele.

Dante: *Purg.* 1.1–3

Horace's cryptic ode *O navis referent* (C.1.14) has launched an impressive array of competing interpretations. The most widely credited, as well as pristine, of these is sanctioned by Quintilian's dogma that goes under the conventional label of "the ship of state". Its many modern adherents find powerful ancient support in a Hellenistic critical tradition that practised an allegorical method of interpreting certain texts of Horace's model, Alcaeus – including, of course, the very poem that C.1.14 is presumed to echo<sup>1</sup>). A rival allegorical account (magisterially advanced by W.

---

1) Alcaeus 326 L–P; P.Oxy. 2306, 2307; Page SLG, S 267, 271; Heraclitus: *Alleg. Hom.* 5.1–9; Quintilian: *Inst. Orat.* 8.6.44; D. Page: *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford 1955) 179–197; E. Fraenkel: *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 154–8; G. Pasquali: *Orazio lirico* (Florence 1920; repr. 1964) 16–38; R. Nisbet and M. Hubbard: *A Commentary on Horace Odes Bk.1* (Oxford 1970) 179–180 (hereafter abbreviated Nisbet-Hubbard). The anti-allegorical position is represented by Muretus, Dacier and Bentley (the latter with dismissive curttness).

S. Anderson and recently championed by A. J. Woodman) makes the referent of the *navis* a woman instead of the commonwealth, primarily on the grounds of the erotic diction of the culminating stanza<sup>2</sup>). In this paper, I propose to reopen and refine the case for a line of interpretation (first developed in outline by N. K. Zumbalt) that has received less support than it merits from the scholarly literature, viz. the sea-voyage as an extended metaphor for the progress of the poem<sup>3</sup>). In defending the validity of the “self-referential” view of the *navis*, I hope also to account for the patently erotic aura of the final lines as well as the implicit *subversion* of the political reading that may have been a part of Horace’s rhetorical strategy.

Before embarking upon an analysis of the poem’s *topoi*, I offer a preliminary synopsis of the chief textual evidence for the prominence of the poetic sea-voyage in major Augustan poets and in Pindar. Once the commonplace aspect of the metaphor<sup>4</sup>) and its typical thematic nexus have been acknowledged, we shall be in a better position to rechart the unique course of C.1.14 in terms more germane to a contemporary Augustan audience.

(a) Vergil Georg. 2. 39–46<sup>5</sup>)

*tuque ades inceptumque una decurre laborem,  
o decus, o famae merito pars maxima nostrae,  
Maecenas, pelagoque volans da vela patenti.  
non ego cuncta meis amplecti versibus opto,  
non, mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum,  
ferrea vox. ades et primi lege litoris oram;  
in manibus terrae: non hic te carmine ficto  
atque per ambages et longa exorsa tenebo.*

2) See W. S. Anderson: Horace Carm. 1.14: What Kind of Ship? CP 61 (1966) 84–98; A. J. Woodman: The Craft of Horace in Odes 1.14, CP 75 (1980) 60–67.

3) Horace’s *Navis* of Love Poetry (C.1.14), CW 71 (1977–8) 248–254. The hypothesis of the “poem-ship” was astutely anticipated (though rejected) by Anderson (note 2 above) 91–92: “What logically kills the hypothesis has ruined all other interpretations: the simple fact that Horace separates himself from his ‘ship’, whereas poet and ship conventionally belonged together ...” In reviving the hypothesis, one might counter that, in the rhetorical fiction of self-admonition, addressee and speaker may be imagined as sharing the same identity. Moreover, there is no evidence in the poem that the speaker is to be envisaged as planted on the shore.

4) Consult A. Kambylis: Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik (Heidelberg 1965) 149–155, where examples are given of “Das Motiv der Selbstbescheidung im Bilde der Seefahrt.”

5) Citations of Vergil, Propertius and Horace are from the OCT editions.

In this exordium, in which the poet of the *Georgics* invokes the presence of his patron in terms appropriate to a hymn, Maecenas is asked to accompany Vergil on a thematic voyage over the open sea (*pelago . . . patenti*). Once his poetic project has been broached in what might initially seem to be ambitious language, Vergil immediately disavows any intention to be all-embracing and prolix (*non ego . . . vox*). The use of an Homeric “breaking off” formula for the disavowal is deliberate: the poet appropriates epic diction even while setting the *epos* up as foil for the didactic enterprise on which he is engaged. After proclaiming a more limited scope for his poem, he repeats the request to his patron-muse to manifest his presence and adds a refinement to the sea-voyage metaphor: Maecenas is exhorted to stay close to the shore: *primi lege litoris oram; / in manibus terrae*. The geographical coordinates of *shore*, on the one hand, (*litoris oram*) and *open ocean*, on the other, (*pelago patenti*) mark extremes of literary ambition. Vergil’s prooemium deploys the metaphor of a sea-voyage in a context of generic self-definition.

(b) Propertius 3.3.21-4

*cur tua praescriptos sevecta est pagina gyros?  
non est ingenii cumba gravanda tui.  
alter remus aquas alter tibi radat harenas,  
tutus eris: medio maxima turba mari est.*

The context of the above prescription is a typical elegiac disavowal (*recusatio*) of the kind that is widespread in Augustan verse: a god (in this case, Apollo) is represented as intervening in the initial stages of the poem in order to redirect the poet’s *ingenium* to a more appropriate theme. By metaphorizing the elegist’s *ingenium* as a light vessel (*cumba*) and by attaching to it the gerundive *gravanda*, Propertius brings into play the critical antonyms: light/heavy (*levis/gravis*) that are *de rigueur* in such disavowals. In the following distich, he employs the same extension of the metaphor that occurs in the Vergilian example: a modest poetic voyage is characterized as one that stays close to the shore (*harenas*). The open ocean of poetic endeavor (*medio mari*) is to be avoided as too turbulent. Both Propertius and Vergil utilize the sea-voyage metaphor in programmatic contexts in order to clarify their literary orientations.

(c) Horace C.4.15.1-4

*Phoebus volentem proelia me loqui*

*victas et urbes increpuit lyra,  
ne parva Tyrrhenum per aequor  
vela darem.*

In the final *envoi* of his *Carmina*, Horace succinctly prefaces his encomium of Augustus with a formulaic exclusion of epic enterprise. As in the Propertius passage, Apollo summarily interrupts the lyricist at the very inception of the song. Heroic subject-matter here finds its metaphorical equivalent in the open sea (*Tyrrhenum aequor*). A key epithet in the stylistic repertory of antinomies (*parva*) is employed to characterize the *vela* of the poem as inadequate. Like his contemporary masters of prooemial technique, Horace uses the image of the poetic sea-voyage in a manner so perfunctory as to suggest that the trope is a cliché, and that he is alluding, in a very abbreviated form, to a common *topos*<sup>6</sup>).

The metaphor of the progress of the poem as a sea-voyage is not only common to the Augustan poets, but also frequent in Horace's great predecessor and model, Pindar. Throughout the *Epinikia*, which Horace gives ample evidence of having studied with great attention<sup>7</sup>), the *laudator* often introduces the metaphor as a way of signalling an *aporia*, in which he represents himself as forced to redirect his discourse to the topic at hand. Three examples of this rhetorical gambit will perhaps serve to schematize the motif.

At P.11.38–40, the poet professes to have been blown off course by a breeze and compares his situation to that of a light vessel in the open sea<sup>8</sup>):

ἦρ', ὦ φίλοι, κατ' ἀμευσίπορον τρίοδον ἐδινάθην,  
ὄρθάν κέλευθον ἰῶν  
τὸ πρὶν ἢ μέ τις ἄνεμος ἔξω πλόου  
ἔβαλεν, ὡς ὄτ' ἄκατον ἐνναλίαν;

In correcting this involuntary deviation, he goes on to address his Muse and justify his re-orientation by appealing to the nature of the obligation that he has accepted (41–50).

In P.10, 51–4 Pindar exhorts himself, as encomiast, to terminate his course in the following terms:

6) Cp. Propertius 3.9.1–4 and 35–6; Ovid: Met. 15.176–7.

7) For a specific illustration of Horace's debt to Pindaric motifs of praise see G. Davis, *Silence and Decorum: Encomiastic Convention and the Epilogue of Horace C.3.2*, *Classical Antiquity* 2.1 (1983) 9–26.

8) Pindaric quotations are from the edition of B. Snell and H. Maehler: *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* (Leipzig<sup>5</sup> 1971).

κώπαν σχάσον, ταχὺ δ' ἄγκυραν ἔρεισον χθονί  
 πρόφραθε, χοιράδος ἄλλακρ πέτρας.  
 ἐγκωμίων γὰρ ἄωτος ὕμνων  
 ἐπ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὅτε μέλισσα θύνει λόγον.

In this instance, the danger of shipwreck on a reef is the ostensible reason for the poet's self-admonition. As in the previous example, the poet engages in a dialogue with himself concerning the appropriateness of his itinerary and puts a timely end to his contrived digression.

Finally, we may cite the passage in N.3.26–28 which dramatizes the poet's *aporia* in the form of a rhetorical question addressed to his θυμός:

θυμέ, τίνα πρὸς ἄλλοδαπάν  
 ἄκρην ἔμὸν πλόον παραμείβειαι;  
 Αἰακῶ σε φαμί γένει τε Μοῖσαν φέρειν.

Such “digressions” are, of course, manipulated in order to portray the *laudator* as sincerely committed to the task of praise<sup>9</sup>). These Pindaric deployments of the sea-voyage metaphor are, in the main, epilogic and show the poet's concern to steer the discourse of praise to its proper destination. Taken together, they provide cogent evidence from Greek lyric of the conventional nature of the metaphor in the context of an adjustment of the poetic curriculum.

The foregoing illustrations of the navigational trope in Pindar and Augustan poetry are, in my view, sufficient to posit a *prima facie* plausibility for the hypothesis that Horace's apostrophe to the ship may be a self-directed discourse on the subject of poetic ambition and its proper limits. My version of the hypothesis entails a modification of Zumwalt's proposal to equate the ship with love-poetry, *tout court*. Instead of understanding the ship in the narrower sense as signifying a particular genre, I shall postulate a broader reference to the poet's *ingenium* (cp. Propertius' expression *ingenii cumba*). As my epigraph from Dante is meant to suggest, I intend to substantiate the notion that the poet of the *Odes* is self-consciously contemplating the direction and scope of his *carmen*.

9) On various techniques of controlled digression in Pindar, see in general E. Bundy: *Studia Pindarica* 1, University of California Publications in Classical Philology 18 (1962) 1–34. For further examples of the motif of the poetic sea-journey in the *Epimikia* cp. P.3.63–76; O.6. 100–105; O.13.49–52. There may be an Horatian allusion to the poetic skiff in C.3.2.28–9 (*fragilem ... phaselon*) and C.3.29.62 (*biremis praesidio scaphae*).

The tone of strenuous remonstrance in the opening lines: *o navis . . . agis* is fully consonant with the Pindaric self-corrections we have cited above. The *navicella* of song is imagined as having taken an involuntary direction. In the case of Pindar, however, the voyage of the poem is represented as well under way before the remonstrance occurs. Horace's strident exhortations are, by contrast, exordial in context. Nevertheless, since the logical implication of the prefix in *referent* is that previous journeys have been undertaken by the *navis*, we may infer that the poet is alluding to earlier as well as anticipated excursions, within the horizon of the *Carmina*, into more turbulent thematic seas (cp. C.1.15). If those seas bring him close to an encroachment on epic matter and manner, then the phrasing of his expostulation to return to shore is aptly ironic; for the militaristic coloring of *fortiter occupa / portum* poaches on heroic diction in urging the kind of "fortitude" that would be required even to terminate such an audacious enterprise.

In the anxious question introduced by *nonne* (3-9), the speaker catalogues the ship's material deficiencies part by part. The very redundancy of the catalogue serves to emphasize the inadequacy of the ship's resources to undertake an extended voyage. As the major supporters of the rival allegories have acknowledged, we are probably not meant to search for trivial correspondences between the ship and its presumed referent<sup>10</sup>). Such an elaborate correspondence would be grotesquely anachronistic. Rather, the main effect sought by the accumulation of details is one of hyperbole. A non-trivial element in the personified description, from the vantage-point of our interpretation, is the verb *gemant* placed resoundingly between the two choriambic in v.6; for the auditory image is coherent with an account that privileges the voyage of the *carmen*<sup>11</sup>).

In terms of the theme of poetic *ingenium*, the comparative *imperiosius* as applied to *aequor* announces doubt concerning the lyricist's ability to master the overwhelming task of elevated composition. The definitive judgment of the speaker with respect to the integrity of the sails: *non tibi sunt integra lintea* (v.9) is especially pertinent to the conventional treatment of the poetic voyage, in which the *vela* play a prominent symbolic role (cp. the passages from Propertius, Vergil and Horace cited above).

10) Cp. Kiessling-Heinze ad loc.; Syndikus: Die Lyrik des Horaz, Vol. 1 (Darmstadt 1972) 162-3.

11) The "vocal" propensities of the vessel are continued in *voces* (10) and *iactes* (13). Cp. the eloquence of the *phaselus* in Catullus 4, lines 2, 6, 12, 15, 16.

The portion of the ode that comprises the “genealogy” of the vessel has caused some discomfort to both the political and erotic readings:

*quamvis Pontica pinus,  
silvae filia nobilis,  
iactes et genus et nomen inutile:  
nil pictis timidus navita puppibus  
fidit.*

A noble pedigree for the Roman republic, on the one hand, or a mistress, on the other, seems equally irrelevant. In the case of the woman-ship allegory, Woodman’s ingenious effort to argue that certain *puellae* of Roman elegy and lyric may be assumed to have been of aristocratic extraction<sup>12</sup>) pales before the simple observation that the *puellae* of the Odes are uniformly portrayed as ἑταῖραι.

What relevance, then, does the *topos* of the ship’s genealogy have for the hypothesis of the *ingenii cumba*? Firstly, it is noteworthy that nobility of origin is a claim made by the addressee. In the concessive clause, *quamvis . . . inutile*, it is the vessel that boasts (*iactes*) of its ancestry. Despite this claim on the part of the addressee, the *timidus navita* remains distrustful and unimpressed (*nil . . . fidit*). The speaker’s point is that exalted origin is totally irrelevant (cp. *inutile*: v.13) to the situation now confronting an unseaworthy bark. While the speaker, however, perceives the irrelevance of lineage claims, the personified ship does not. The discrepancy between the ship’s perception of its capacity and that of the observer’s makes sense if we assume a divided *persona*. In the dialogue with his innate *ingenium* the candid interrogator (the self-critical voice of the lyric poet) dramatizes his doubts about the scope of his talent in relation to generic adventurism. Whereas his more ambitious bent makes specious (and irrelevant) claims to literary nobility (and, by implication, to noble genres), his circumspect, lyric self realizes the practical limitations and advises caution.

The transparent allusion to Catullus’ *phaselus* provides crucial support for the idea of an interlocutor-ship as a self-reflexive device. As more than one critic has pointed out<sup>13</sup>), the expressions *Pontica pinus* and *silvae . . . nobilis* recall Catullus 4, in which the

12) Woodman (note 2 above) p. 66, footnote 35.

13) Cp. Zumwalt (note 3 above) p. 252; Nisbet-Hubbard ad 12 and 13.

provenance and credentials of a loquacious vessel are touted. The confident claims made by and on behalf of Catullus' light, swift vessel are different, in some respects, from those made by Horace's impetuous *navis*. What the allusion accomplishes is not to be sought in strict analogies, but rather in the general *cadre* in which poetic values are conveyed in the metaphor of the sea-voyage. With typical sophistication, Horace appears to employ Catullus 4 as a subtext in order, *inter alia*, to highlight the literary referentiality of his own *navis*.

If our interpretation of the intertextual frame created by the Catullan allusion is trustworthy, it should comfortably accommodate a *dramatis persona* that has proved a stumbling-block for the main allegorical approaches to the poem: the *timidus navita* of v.14. The majority of interpreters apparently assume that Horace intends a radical disjunction between speaker, crew and navigator. Consequently, the sailor is variously imagined to be a person other than the speaker. For example, a version of the ship-woman hypothesis argues that the timid sailor is an amatory rival of the poet who is sceptical about the fidelity of his new mistress<sup>14</sup>). If, however, we understand the *timidus navita* as a *persona* that is a metonymic "doublet" of the lyricist, the problem of an intrusive third character vanishes from the poem's horizon. On this account of the poem, the address to the *ingenium* may be paraphrased in prosaic terms as follows: "You may claim to be noble and seaworthy, but a fearful *navita* like myself is distrustful of superficial claims." The timorousness of the *navita* is thus readily explicable in terms of authorial anxiety at the prospect of a departure onto the high seas of elevated subject-matter. That the term *timidus navita* delineates a *type* is evident from the categorizing plural *pictis puppibus* (where *puppibus* is clearly a synecdoche for *navibus*)<sup>15</sup>). *Navita*, as often in Horace's poetry, denotes simply a person on a voyage – without hierarchical distinction between crew and skipper<sup>16</sup>). From this perspective, the apprehensive

---

14) Cp. Woodman (note 2 above) p.65.

15) The same observation holds true for the generalizing plural *carinae* in v.7. Like *puppibus*, *carinae* is *pars pro toto* for "ships" – a point made with his usual verve and acumen by Bentley ad loc., who also adduces the plural *funibus* in the previous line as corroborating the conception of an all-inclusive caveat. The majority who wish to limit the speaker's remarks to a single vessel throughout are obliged to account for the paradoxical plurals with hyper-ingenious explanations that ignore the *synecdoche*.

16) Cp. *pavidus nauta* in the priamel of C.1.1.14.

*navita* who is sceptical about “painted ships” represents a person “in the same boat” as the speaker, i. e. a writer who is poetically “out of his depth.”

In this regard, Zumwalt’s attractive interpretation of the epithet *pictis* as referring to stylistic ornamentation<sup>17)</sup> deserves some credence; especially since the preceding Catullan tag has established an ambience in which literary connotations are germane. Along the same lines, it is plausible that the *silva* to which the addressee claims affiliation is also to be subsumed within the same over-arching cadre, for “woods” no less than “groves”, are extremely common tropes for poetic tradition in Horace and the other Augustans<sup>18)</sup>. By claiming descent from a literary stock that originates in Argonautic (hence epic) domains (*Pontica pinus*), the battered though proud craft asserts the innate adequacy of its *ingenium* to heroic *materia*. Since subject-matter and style are routinely treated as inseparable in ancient poetics, the speaker’s distrust of stylistic bombast (*pictis puppibus*) is all of a piece with his implied diffidence about origins<sup>19)</sup>. In sum, the entire “genealogical” section may be construed as an expression of the diffidence that the speaker experiences concerning the claim on the part of his wayward *ingenium* to have the necessary credentials for an ambitious exploration of the *aequor*.

If the Catullan tag serves to highlight the literary ancestry of the ship metaphor, the subsequent warning to the vessel in lines 15–16 points, via its ironic parenthetical clause, to a *topos* that

17) Zumwalt (note 3 above) p.252. Her view gains some support from a passage in Epp. 1.3.10–14 where Horace is making distinctions between diverse generic ambitions: *Pindarici fontis qui non expalluit haustus, / fastidire lacus et rivos ausus apertos. / ut valet? ut meminit nostri? fidibusne Latinis / Thebanos aptare modos studet auspice Musa, / an tragica desaevit et ampullatur in arte?* Though the verb *ampullari* is generally recognized to be a metaphor of style modelled on the Greek ἀγκυθίζειν, most commentators refer the image to the shape of the container (hence the standard rendition, ‘swells’). It is possible, however, that A. S. Wilkins is right in interpreting the metaphor of *ampullatur* as “derived not . . . from the shape of the *ampulla*, but from its use to hold pigments”. See his commentary: *The Epistles of Horace* (London 1955) ad line 14. Consult further D. Russell: *Criticism in Antiquity* (Berkeley/Los Angeles 1981, p.130) on the metaphor of stylistic ornamentation.

18) For *silva* as the locus of creativity, see e.g. C.1.22.9; Ovid: Am. 3.1.1. *Nemus* is the scene of Bacchic (poetic) inspiration in C.1.1.30; 3.25.2 and 13. In C.4.3.11 the *memorum comae* (a reminiscence of Catullus’ *comata silva* in the *phaselus* poem) are witness to the poet’s preeminence in lyric.

19) For the related conception of the poetic product as *filia*, see Pindar N.4.2 (cited by Gow-Page apropos of AP 7.407.9 f.).

Horace uses elsewhere in the odes: the “debt” incurred by the ship in delivery of its cargo: *Tu, nisi ventis / debes ludibrium, cave*. In the *propempticon* (C.1.3) in which the ship carrying Vergil to Greece is personified and apostrophized, the deposit on the “debt” is none other than the poet of the *Aeneid*: *Navis, quae tibi creditum / debes Vergilium, finibus Atticis / reddas incolumem precor*. As Cairns most recently, and others previously, have cogently argued, the *navis* of the latter poem is, in all probability, a metaphor for the voyage of Vergilian *epos*: the Roman poet’s audacious effort to rival Homer<sup>20</sup>). If this interpretation is accepted, then the appropriate context of the ironic warning in C.1.14 becomes more sharply focussed: the would-be adventurer into epic waters is reminded of the imminent danger of violent storms and by, extension, shipwreck. The idea of exposing oneself to mockery (*ludibrium*) in the event of literary failure is easily paralleled in the Horatian *corpus*. In the ambitious ode 3.4, for instance, the lyricist, after invoking the presence of Calliope and the Muses for his *longum melos*, wonders aloud whether he has been deluded:

*auditis an me ludit amabilis  
insania?* 5–6

Taken together, the reminiscence of Vergilian epic enterprise and the fear of mockery suggest the speaker’s own self-doubt, which is “externalized” onto the *navis*.

The stance of creative modesty that Horace adopts in this particular ode is, of course, strategic. In a disparate context – for example, a *melos longum* requiring an elevated manner – he does not hesitate to make the kind of bold claim concerning his powers that is appropriate. To return once again to 3.4, which is a grand encomium of Augustus, the lyricist employs the sea-voyage metaphor in his proemium in order to proclaim not his modest means, but, on the contrary, his supreme confidence in his capacity to undertake the poetic journey:

*utcumque mecum vos eritis, libens  
insanientem navita Bosporum  
temptabo* 29–31

---

20) F. Cairns: *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh 1972) 235; C. W. Lockyer Jr.: *Horace’s Propempticon and Vergil’s Voyage*, *CW* 6 (1967) 42–45; Anderson (note 2 above) p. 91 (in reference to an unpublished paper by Lionel Pearson). On poetic *audacia* see documentation in Brink ad AP 10.

The addressee here is the Muses, led by Calliope, and the poet is both affirming his special relationship with them (as witnessed by the *topos* of his willingness to go anywhere with them) and declaring his intention to essay the raging seas of encomiastic verse. The passage contributes additional evidence that Horace utilizes the conventional image of the poetic voyage in the context of an address to his Muse (i. e. the external representation of his creative powers). An ambitious poetic itinerary (C.3.4) is described in terms of a turbulent seascape (*insanientem Bosporum*). In short, the same navigational metaphor may subserve the ends of rhetorical confidence, no less than diffidence, vis-à-vis the poetic program.

The final stanza of the ode is the touchstone for any coherent interpretation of the ship in figurative terms. Its erotic overtones have been the traditional obstacle to the political allegory and, conversely, the trump-card of the woman-ship hypothesis. In elaborating our rival account, we shall first consider the literary ramifications of the separate phrases, *taedium*, *desiderium* and *cura non levis* within the metaphorical framework we have proposed. By focussing on these expressions, we are not so much concerned to exclude competing interpretations as to demonstrate the viability and coherence of our own.

The distinction between *nuper* and *nunc* (lines 17 and 18) marks an ambivalence in the attitude of the speaker towards the generic excursion he is contemplating. A project that was “previously” conceived as a *sollicitum taedium*<sup>21</sup>) is “now” regarded with affectionate *Angst*. In terms of a lyric discourse concerning *ingenium*, *taedium* registers the speaker’s ostensible attitude to grandiose poetic aspirations, i. e. one of *ennui* combined with anxiety. Though the word *taedium* is unique to this passage in the Horatian *corpus*, the idea expressed – that of boredom at the prospect of elevated matter – is quite common<sup>22</sup>). The component of anxiety (*sollicitum*) relates to the apprehension expressed earlier in the poem over transgressing the bounds of lyric. The adverbs *nuper* and *nunc* are best taken as relative terms, expressing, on the

---

21) I concur with Cairns (note 20 above) in explaining *sollicitum taedium* as equivalent to *taedium sollicitudinis*.

22) Consult Lane Cooper: *A Concordance to the Works of Horace* (Washington 1916). The tediousness of epic themes is implied in *recusationes* such as C.1.6.5–12. Cp. Juvenal S. 1.1 ff.

temporal plane, two competing (and contradictory) orientations<sup>23</sup> of the poetic *ingenium*. In this manner the lyricist dramatizes the tension between *taedium* and *desiderium*, repulsion and attraction, that he experiences at the prospect of generic audacity.

*Desiderium* designates a desire for an object that one lacks. In what sense, then, does the speaker experience lack? The answer is problematic for the “ship of state” and “puella” theories, but less so for the metaphor of *ingenii cumba*. If the poet has chosen to represent himself as inadequate to the heroic task, then *desiderium* is an apt metaphor for this sense of lack as well as for his uncharacteristic desire to venture into unknown waters. The idea of a present desire also carries an implicit confession of a change of heart. Having tried in vain to dissuade his wayward *ingenium* from undertaking the extravagant journey, the lyricist resigns himself to the inevitable. His contrived *aporia* has been resolved in favor of the reckless sea-voyage and he now concludes his appeal by bowing to necessity, though his anxiety (*cura*) remains undiminished.

The epithet *levis* that Horace applies to his *cura* serves to promote the literary interpretation of the voyage. “Lightness” is such a frequent generic catchword for the concept of the non-ambitious poem that it scarcely requires documentation for even the most casual reader of the odes. *Non levis* would undoubtedly have struck an audience attuned to stylistic decorum as a synonym for *gravis*. By implying the “gravity” of his anxiety, Horace ironizes his critical sense of alienation from the *navis* of epic exploration. Though *non levis* is grammatically an attribute of the speaker’s *cura* (the nearer subject), it may also be intended to apply in sense to *desiderium*.

While the *ingenii cumba* metaphor may be regarded as having survived a detailed examination without shipwreck on the reefs of the final stanza, it cannot be said to have arrived safely at port without coming to terms with the erotic diction of lines 17–18. As we have observed earlier, those who interpret the ship as a woman regard such diction as a key with which to unlock the riddle of the poem. To accept this view entails a *literal* reading of the terms *desiderium* and *cura*, whereas all competing allegories assume a non-literal import. For example, Nisbet and Hubbard in their

---

23) In C.3.21.6 *nuper* and *nunc* appear at first to be absolute terms implying the poet’s definitive conversion. Yet that poem’s notorious denouement (*tange Chloen semel arrogantem*) proves that the speaker’s attitude is not univocal but rather ambivalent: he in fact reverts to an erotic wish that contradicts his resolve.

commentary rescue the “ship of state” from the erotic shoals by the skilfull argument that the speaker represents himself as a “lover of the state” (ἔρασιτῆς τῆς πόλεως). Any reading that rejects the identification of the ship with a woman is *ipso facto* compelled to assume that a new metaphor (erotic desire) is superimposed on an elaborate figurative base of a different nature. In the case of the *ingenii cumba* hypothesis, the superimposed metaphor may be seen as derived from a domain (amatory lyric) that is diametrically opposed to the thematic afflatus of *epos*.

Is there corroborative evidence from other odes for the kind of metaphoric “contamination” that is required for a figurative reading of the erotic language of the final stanza? A frequent, but neglected feature of the *recusatio* is what may be called the appropriation of a counterterm. The poet sets up a sharp dichotomy only to blur it by incorporating the opposing term on the metaphorical level. A salient example is C.1.6 in which battles are repudiated as subject-matter early in the poem and are later included as *proelia amoris* at the end. In C.1.14 grand themes cause the poet intense anxiety and he distances himself from them by his urgent parainesis to the ship. Once he has reconciled himself to the inevitable, however, he boldly reconstructs himself as a passionate convert and marks the new relationship to a hitherto alien theme by the erotic metaphors *desiderium* and *cura*.

The prayer of the ode’s final lines (*interfusa . . . Cycladas*) has elicited two conflicting modes of interpretation: one seeks a *particular* significance to the proper name, Cyclades, the other a *general* or categorical significance. Those particularists who subscribe to the allegory of the ship as female lover see the special relevance of the islands as cult centers of Aphrodite. Against this attractive suggestion, however, is the pervasive Horatian practice of using proper names to designate types. We may illustrate this virtually at random by quoting a passage from the very first ode of the collection (C.1.1.9–14):

*illum, si proprio condidit horreo  
quidquid de Libycis verritur areis.  
gaudentem patrios findere sarculo  
agros Attalicy condicionibus  
numquam dimoveas, ut trabe Cypria  
Myrtoum pavidus nauta secet mare.*

In this programmatic passage, which is part of an extended priamel, the underlined epithets *Libycis*, *Attalicy*, *Cypria* and

*Myrtoum* all are instances of the particular employed as representative of the typical, to wit: “grain-producing”, “super-rich”, “well-built” and “turbulent,” respectively. Examples of this widespread practice in the *Carmina* could be multiplied *ad lib*. Like the *mare Myrtoum* of C.1.1.14, the *Tyrrhenum aequor* of 4.15.3, and the *Aegaeos tumultus* of 3.29.63, the *aequora* in the vicinity of the Cyclades stand for a type (in this case, “rough seas”). To search for a specific reference in this circumlocution is, in my view, to deflect attention from the main purpose of the prayer, which, of course, is to avert shipwreck in notoriously treacherous “seas”. Despite the aura of geographical precision, then, the *aequora* of v.20 are typologically interchangeable with the *imperiosius aequor* of v.9 – the verbal *reprise* functioning, as often in the Odes, as a means of emphasising the argument of the poem<sup>24</sup>).

Although we have sought to establish the validity of the *ingenii cumba* hypothesis, we do not claim to have eliminated the prime ancient contender, viz. the prestigious “ship of state”. The most persuasive argument in its favor, in my judgment, was made by Pasquali, who observed that Horace would probably have utilized a commentary in reading Alcaeus and that such a commentary was more likely than not to have been of the Hellenistic, allegorizing variety<sup>25</sup>). If Pasquali’s reasoning is sound, then Horace’s audience would presumably have been predisposed to interpret the opening strophes of the ode with their Alcaic reminiscences as referring to the “ship of state”. How are we to reconcile this hermeneutic tradition with the convention of the poetic sea-voyage as we have outlined it? The answer lies, I suggest, in a conception of Horace’s art that allows for a sophisticated *subversion* of critical clichés. If the reader begins with a bias towards the ship of state, his preconceptions are soon challenged, at midpoint (stanza 3), by the apparition of the Catullan allusion and the evocation of Vergilian enterprise. In the process, the

---

24) Our interpretation of the Ode sees the *navis* that makes for high seas as the disavowed impulse to write on grand themes. A reader who wishes to remain anonymous has suggested a novel way of construing the final stanza: *quae*, though routinely taken to refer to the *navis*, may be understood with *aequora*. The hyperbaton may be thought extravagant; the resulting shift in emphasis would refocus the idea of the “oceanic” dangers of the *genus grande*.

25) Pasquali (note 1 above) p.21. He argues that an annotated edition of Alcaeus would have been “indispensabile anche per il dialetto” for a Roman reader and cites Epp. 1.2 to show Horace’s familiarity with allegorical modes of interpretation that were in vogue as a result of the influence of Stoic and Cynic hermeneutics.

reader is induced to reinterpret the poem along new lines, but his enriched perception does not lead to a straightforward *deletion* of the earlier assumption; rather he is made to test it against an increasingly cogent alternative<sup>26</sup>). That alternative, to which I have given the Propertian tag '*ingenii cumba*', has the advantage of circumventing some of the problems that mar the conventional allegory of the "ship of state".

Stanford University, California

Gregson Davis

---

26) I do not exclude the possibility that the educated Augustan reader acquainted with the Hellenistic epigrams as well as the Alcaeus parallels discussed by Anderson and by Woodman might also have "tested" the woman-ship hypothesis in the act of reading. The onus of my argument is rather that Horace is more likely to have privileged the literary metaphor at the expense of the other alternatives.

## DREI NEUE FRAGMENTE DES GRAMMATIKERS APION

Die überlieferten Reste der verlorenen Schriften des Grammatikers Apion sind von Felix Jacoby in seiner Sammlung der Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (Dritter Teil, Leiden 1958, Nr. 616, S. 122–144) und von Susanne Neitzel in ihrer Dissertation „Apions Γλώσσαι ‘Ομηρικοί“ ediert worden<sup>1</sup>). In diesen zwei Sammlungen fehlen drei in den Handschriften mit dem Namen des Apion bezeugte Bruchstücke, auf die ich bei der Arbeit am zweiten Band des Lexikons des Photios gestoßen bin. Hier sollen die drei übersehenen Bruchstücke vorgelegt sowie die Überlieferung

---

1) Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker, Band 3, Berlin–New York 1977, S. 185–328. – Die Sammlungen von F. Jacoby und S. Neitzel ersetzen entsprechend jene von Carl Müller (Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum vol. III, Paris 1849, 506–516) und von H. Baumert, Apionis quae ad Homerum pertinent fragmenta, Diss. Königsberg 1886.