

has been condemned to a living death (*lumen ademptum*).

K. Quinn recently described this Vergilian phrase as "curiously touching."⁷ He is correct in underscoring the pathos of *cui lumen ademptum*, but in no way is it "curious." The touch of pathos is quite explicable by a

7. Quinn, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

reference to the Catullan phrase echoed here. Vergil poignantly describes Polyphemus' loss of his eyesight with words recalling one of the most famous bereavements of Latin literature—Catullus' lament for his lost brother.

JUSTIN GLENN

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

ARISTOPHANES *FROGS* 788–90: A NEW LOOK AT AN OLD SOLUTION

"Where *καί* is used in anaphora, there is always a fairly marked contrast between the two ideas, whereas *δέ* in anaphora regularly conveys the emphasis of accumulation. Hence *ἐκεῖνος* . . . *κάκεῖνος* at Ar. *Ra.* 788–90 cannot both refer to Sophocles."¹ The passage of Aristophanes' *Frogs* of which Denniston so categorically speaks is perhaps one of the most vexed of the whole play. While there have been attempts to emend the text, most editors accept the reading of the MSS as follows:²

μὰ Δι' οὐκ ἐκεῖνος, ἀλλ' ἔκυσσε μὲν Αἴσχυλον,
 ὅτε δὴ κατήλθε, κἀνέβαλε τὴν δεξιάν,
 κἀκεῖνος ὑπεχώρησεν αὐτῷ τοῦ θρόνου.

Although I take issue with Denniston's assertion of the function of *καί* in our passage, he nonetheless performs a worthy service here in focusing on this deceptively important particle rather than strictly on the bugbear of the second *ἐκεῖνος*. For one thing, recent criticism shows that it is highly unlikely—and without exact parallel—that *ἐκεῖνος*, used twice in close succession by a single speaker in an unbroken speech, can refer to the same person.³ For another, attempts to prove that the subject of *ὑπεχώρησεν* is Aeschylus and

that the word means something other than "conceded" have not been convincing.⁴

The assertion has been made, and rightly, that for Aeschylus to offer Sophocles the throne of honor would be out of character.⁵ The case can be put more strongly, however. At the end of the play, when Aeschylus has been recruited to save Athens, he gives Pluto minute instructions, 1515–19:

σὺ δὲ τὸν θάκον
 τὸν ἐμὸν παράδος Σοφοκλεῖ τηρεῖν
 καὶ διασώζειν, ἦν ἄρ' ἐγὼ ποτε
 δεῦρ' ἀφίκωμαι. τοῦτον γὰρ ἐγὼ
 σοφίᾳ κρίνω δεύτερον εἶναι.

Sophocles is to keep Aeschylus' seat warm until such time as he returns from the upper world; Sophocles is to be accorded this privilege for being *next wisest* to Aeschylus. Aeschylus' language is fatal to the critics who believe that at 790 Aeschylus is "conceding a share of" his throne to an equal.⁶ Sophocles is merely second best, a seat-warmer and not a seat-sharer.

If the subject of 790 cannot be Aeschylus, then it must be Sophocles, a possibility denied by Denniston. What his note does not admit, however, is the suggestion, already proposed

emphatic contrast, Aristophanes does not; Stevens, p. 3, also denies Oliphant's parallel.

4. J. H. Kells, "Aristophanes, *Frogs* 788–792," *CR*, N.S. XIV (1964), 234, paraphrases the verb "got up from his chair for"; L. Radermacher, *Frösche* (Vienna, 1954), *ad loc.*, thinks it means "conceded a share of." Both believe the subject is Aeschylus.

5. Stevens, "Aristophanes, *Frogs* 788–794," *CR*, N.S. V (1955), 235.

6. Radermacher (n. 4) incorrectly holds that only *παραιχωρεῖν* can mean "to withdraw from"; Stevens (n. 5), p. 235, shows that *ὑποχωρεῖν* can mean "withdraw from" and notes, along with Oliphant (n. 3), p. 98, that the verb contains the military image of withdrawal. I would add that lines 792–93 continue the imagery.

1. J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles*² (Oxford, 1954), p. 584.

2. So F. W. Hall and W. M. Geldart, *Aristophanis Comoediae*², II (Oxford, 1907); W. B. Stanford, *Aristophanes: The Frogs* (London, 1958); and J. van Leeuwen, *Aristophanis Ranae cum prolegomenis et commentariis* (Leyden, 1896), who prints καὶ ἐνέβαλε without crasis. V. Coulon, *Aristophane*, IV (Paris, 1954), emends *κάκεῖνος* to *κἀνεῖκος*.

3. Both S. G. Oliphant, "An Interpretation of *Ranae*, 788–790," *TAPA*, XL (1909), 97, and P. T. Stevens, "Aristophanes, *Frogs* 788–92," *CR*, N.S. XVI (1966), 3, assert that the second *ἐκεῖνος* is merely emphatic and refers to Sophocles. The former cites Soph. *Aj.* 271 and 275 as a parallel for the close repetition of *ἐκεῖνος* in a single speech. In each instance, however, the demonstrative is contrasted explicitly with forms of *ἡμεῖς*. While Sophocles has the justification of

by Dobree, Von Velsen, and Merry, that 790 should be assigned to Xanthias. The sentence then becomes simply another in a long series of questions.⁷ The change of speakers makes the second *ἐκεῖνος* acceptable Greek, while the combination of *καί* with anaphoric *ἐκεῖνος* becomes explicable in Denniston's own terms: "*καί*, not followed by an interrogative, sometimes introduces surprised, indignant, or sarcastic questions . . . It is often difficult to determine in such cases whether *καί* is copulative or adverbial ('actually')."⁸

Also to the point is Denniston's observation: "There is often an echo of a word from the previous speech" (i.e., where *καί* precedes an interrogative word).⁹ Although the second *ἐκεῖνος* does not prove that the preceding *καί* introduces a question, it does conform to the peculiar tendency of interrogative *καί* to introduce a word picked up from a different speaker.

The tone of a surprised "actually" that Denniston describes precisely fits the dramatic context. At 786–87 Xanthias asks—with another incredulous *καί*—how it was that Sophocles did not claim Aeschylus' throne:

7. 739–40, 745, 747–48, 749, 750–51, 752, 757–58, 761, 768, 771, 778, 781, 782, 784, 786–87. The questions continue at 795, 798, and 801.

8. Denniston (n. 1), p. 311.

κᾶπειτα πῶς / οὐ καὶ Σοφοκλέης ἀντελάβετο τοῦ θρόνου; The slave replies (788–89), "No, not he; when he came down he kissed Aeschylus and extended his hand's pledge."¹⁰ Then Xanthias, scarcely able to credit this story, merely intensifies his previous question: "Did he (Sophocles) actually yield him the throne?"

Editorially, what is called for in our passage is the placing of a period after *δεξιάν* and a question mark after *θρόνου*. The MSS are poor authority for designating speakers; therefore, there is little besides editorial inertia to prevent reassigning 790 to Xanthias. Doing so makes the passage more intelligible, the language more tolerable. Xanthias' use of *καί* is merely a variation of its function at 778 and 786. His incredulosity is understandable as well, since the servant has just explained, in language similar to Xanthias' own at 787, how Euripides claimed the throne. Xanthias' difficulty is in understanding why Sophocles did not challenge Aeschylus. We learn why at 1515–19.

STEPHEN C. SHUCARD

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

9. Denniston (n. 1), p. 310.

10. See Oliphant (n. 3), pp. 94 ff., for an exhaustive discussion on the meaning of *ἐμβάλλειν χεῖρα*.

A NOTE ON *CONTAMINATIO* IN TERENCE

Terence's prologues to his comedies are noteworthy in more than one way. Considering that his sole concern was to please people by his plays, he seems to have had a strong aversion to writing prologues. He was compelled to provide a prologue for the *Andria*, his first play, produced in 166 B.C., not to explain the plot, as was generally the practice before him, but to answer the abuse of a malevolent old poet (*malevolus vetus poeta*).¹ His second play, the *Hecyra*, when it was first produced without success in 165 B.C., seems to have had no prologue written for it.² Not only does the abandonment by Terence of the omniscient expository prologue mark a def-

inite step in critical literary thinking and constitute an important contribution to the development of dramatic art, but his literary prologues, apart from apprising us of the sources of his plays and the manner of his own construction, allow us to gain an insight into, among other things, the difficult circumstances under which Terence strove to make a name and living for himself as a comedian. We know that an elderly playwright, Luscius Lanuvinus, whom Terence himself does not name, and others were in the habit of criticizing the poet's works: they maintained *contaminari non decere fabulas*;³ they claimed Terence *multas contaminasse*

The play was at last successful in its third production later that year.

3. *And.* 16.

1. *And.* 1–7.

2. *Hec.* (Prologus I). This prologue was written for the second presentation, which was also a failure, in 160 B.C.