his chair reflects his pretended low social position.[19] But there is one further change: as Odysseus strings the bow and shoots an arrow through the axes at the end of Book 21,[20] the chair he sits on is still a δίφρος, for he is still posing as a beggar, but only fourteen lines later, when Telemachos comes to Odysseus to stand by his chair, and we see the father and son together, this same seat has changed to a θρόνος,[21] the chair not of a beggar, but of a man of power. Thus the poet gives his audience, in this delicate and unobtrusive way, an indication of the significance of this crucial point in the narrative: Odysseus is no longer a contemptible beggar, but rather a powerful man, ready to exact his vengeance.[22]

GEORGE W. HOUSTON
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA,
CHAPEL HILL

19. 19. 97, 19. 101, 19. 506, 20. 259, 21. 243.

20. 21. 420.

21. 21. 434. There is no other instance in the *Odyssey* of the same chair being referred to by more than one name.

22. I am very much indebted to the referees of this paper, who made a number of suggestions which I have adopted, both in the body of the paper and in the notes. They point out two further examples of Homeric care in referring to chairs. First, at *Od.* 10. 233, Circe has Odysseus' men sit upon κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε, but when she later seats Odysseus, he is seated upon a θρόνος described by no fewer than three adjectives and furnished with a footrest. In this way, Odysseus' importance and stature, relative to that of his men, are indicated. Second, in *Iliad* 11, when Nestor and Machaon withdraw from battle to refresh themselves in Nestor's hut, they seat themselves upon κλισμοί (623); but when Patroclos appears shortly thereafter, Nestor offers him his chair, which is now called a θρόνος (645). Here there can be no question of a difference in the rank or honor of the men; rather, the chair is called a θρόνος in the second passage because Nestor is concerned with fulfilling the requirements of hospitality, a formal responsibility.

O REM RIDICULAM!

Like other graduate students, I once looked up Housman's "*Praefanda*" in *Hermes*, LXVI (1931), but must have given it merely a glance, for the meaning of Catullus 56 is not obscure to modern readers. Housman, although there has been some effort to make him a dirty old man, seems to have been more innocent. In spite of Housman and Kroll before him, *trusantem* does not refer to masturbation, and *puellae* is not genitive. Contemporary translators, as might be expected, do not shun the situation, but they too might note that Housman is presumably right in making *protelo* one word, "three in a row." *Pro telo*, even in Catullan Latin, is no way to express "with my weapon." This note would hardly be worth making if the 1959 reprint of Kroll did not perpetuate the misinterpretation of *trusantem* and adduce Housman 1931 as the only addition to the literature.

KIFFIN ROCKWELL

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY