A NOTE ON LUCRETIUS 6. 1277

Editors have taken two approaches to the extreme hyperbaton in *De rerum natura* 6. 1276–77: "nec iam religio divum nec numina magni / pendebantur enim: praesens dolor exsuperabat." This *enim* in ninth place in the clause—indeed, in last place—has been excused by some editors (Munro, Bailey) on the grounds of poetic license. Diels, on the other hand, punctuates after *pendebantur*, making *enim* begin the next clause.

Since neither of these awkward solutions seems satisfactory, perhaps another is to be sought. I would suggest that line 1277 should read, "pendebantur; nam praesens dolor exsuperabat." The corruption most probably arose as a result of scribal parablepsy, the copyist's eye falling to the quite similar beginning of line 1280, *perturbatus enim*. The meter of the restored line should raise no great objections, since diaeresis after an initial double spondee is by no means unknown in Lucretius.[1] We can, moreover, call upon 2. 315, "praesertim cum, quae possimus cernere, celent," to demonstrate a clause-break after such a diaeresis.

STEPHEN T. KELLY

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

1. For example, 1. 925; 2. 36, 67, 297; 3. 456; 4. 369, 539; 5. 569; 6. 859, 974, 1073. It should be noted that in more than half of these examples the principal caesura is felt to occur in the fourth foot, as it does in the emended line 6. 1277.

ODYSSEUS AND ANTICLEIA

The scene in Book 11 of the *Odyssey* depicting Odysseus' conversation with his mother's ghost in the world of the dead (152–224) has had its admirers, and justly so, I should say. But it has also been a favorite hunting ground for Analysts engaged in their endless search for incongruity, illogicality, and absurdity. If it were only Analysts who assail the passage, there would be no point in discussing it again. But a number of Unitarians have at times adopted one or another of the elements in the Analysts' case. It may be worth while, therefore, to go over the materials again to see if the Unitarians may have in this instance surrendered before it was necessary.

The most common criticism is that Anticleia describes conditions in Ithaca, not as they were when she died, but as Homer has portrayed them in the earlier books of the poem. The relevant part of her speech is the first six and a half lines. It will be well to see just what it is that she says. To make clear that I am not slanting the evidence in my favor, I use the excellent translation of Denys Page, one of the most vigorous critics of the scene (*The Homeric Odyssey* [Oxford, 1955], p. 40): "Penelope your wife remains steadfast of heart in your palace, and ever sorrowful are the nights and days that pass away upon her weeping. But nobody yet possesses the royal privilege that was yours. Telemachus rules your demesne at his ease, and feasts at equal banquets, such as the dispenser of justice[1] should rightly enjoy; for all men invite him."

There are two striking details here, one which tells for, and one which tells against, those who argue that Anticleia is describing the Ithaca of Books 1 and 2. One of the most prominent features of these books is the presence in Odysseus' palace of a large band of riotous suitors. Anticleia says not a word about them. Considerable ingenuity has been displayed in thinking up reasons for her silence. Since, however, I think she is describing the situation as it was when she died, when there were no suitors present in the palace, I can ignore this ingenuity. I should think, however, that an Anticleia describing the Ithaca of Books 1 and 2 would naturally feel that the presence of the suitors was the most important fact for her son to know.

It is Anticleia's words about Telemachus that have provided the great support for those who are convinced that Homer is in this speech

1. Homer's phrase is *dikaspolon andra*. Bornemann has suggested, ". . . der Ausdruck wird hier mehr in allgemeinem Sinn stehen (für 'Fürst') als im Hinblick auf eine rechtsprechende Tätigkeit Telemachs" (*Odyssee-Interpretationen* [Frankfurt, 1953], p. 127). This interpretation would, I suppose, make things a little easier, but it does not seem necessary.