

IAN C. STOREY, *Fragments of Old Comedy*, edited with introduction, translation, explanatory notes, indices and appendices by I. S. in 3 volumes. Loeb Classical Library nos. 513 (Alcaeus to Diocles), 514 (Dioppeithes to Pherecrates), and 515 (Philonicus to Xenophon: Adespota), Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2011. vol. 1: pp. xlvi + 449, ISBN 978-0-674-99662-5; vol. 2: pp. xi + 520, ISBN 978-0-674-99663-2; vol. 3: pp. xi + 464, ISBN 978-0-674-99677-9.

Ian Storey's *Fragments of Old Comedy* appeared during the centenary year of the Loeb Classical Library. Appropriately they establish an important landmark in that series. Originally Loeb founded the Library with the intention of making the great works and great writers of ancient Greece and Rome accessible to the average reader.¹ Fragments, let alone purely fragmentary authors, were not part of the original vision. The Loeb Aeschylus seems always to have been an exception (both Smyth's and Lloyd Jones' second volumes of 1926 and 1957 contained "major fragments"), but it was not until the 1990s that the LCL began systematically to add fragments to the existing authors in the series: "all the major fragments" were added to the plays of Sophocles by Hugh Lloyd-Jones in 1996; this was followed by an expanded volume of the fragments of Aeschylus by Sommerstein (but still excluding smaller fragments) in 2008; then came the complete fragments of Euripides by Collard and Cropp in 2008; and, most pertinently, the complete fragments of Aristophanes by the current Loeb editor Jeffrey Henderson in 2008. The same years also saw new Loeb volumes for basically fragmentary authors like Cunningham's Herodas, Sophron and mime (2003), and Arnott's Menander (1979-2000). These however included many near complete works. A substantial number of complete or near complete poems also distinguish lyric volumes by Campbell (1982-93). Closer in kind to the volumes under review is West's *Greek Epic Fragments* (2003) insofar as it deals with entirely fragmentary remains of non-canonical authors, but in this case the myths if not the general contents of the epics are in large part recoverable. Storey's three-volume work, though not quite the biggest work of the Loeb series dedicated to mere scraps (Arnott's three-volume Menander is 240 pages longer), is certainly the logical limit of the series' foray into the fragmentary: the scraps are small (the longest chunk of virtually readable text is only 50

¹ There is an excellent history of the series by G. H. R. Horsely, "One Hundred Years of the Loeb Classical Library", *Buried History* 47, 2011, 35-58.

lines, the majority are two or less); none of the authors survive in anything but scraps; few are even known to anyone but readers of scraps; and the outlines of the works to which they belong are with few exceptions matters of free speculation.

The extent of the departure this represents from the traditional interpretation of the Loeb mandate may be best captured by an anecdote recently recorded by Greg Horsley. A piece of oral tradition, transmitted from one Loeb editor to another, cites Henderson citing Stewart citing Goold, who once explained:

why the Loeb would include only a selection of certain fragments, not the complete corpus. He compared the [Loeb] Library to the public exhibition area of a museum. In the storerooms there are indeed many more artifacts for specialists to study and enjoy, but in the public areas are placed only the most important and most meaningful pieces.²

While “the average reader” Loeb wished to serve has always to some extent included “the average scholar” the series is now definitely committed to serving specialist as well as public interests. There are signs in Storey’s volumes that the ideal reader is now somebody with at least a little Greek and a greater than average ability to cope with the mannerisms and protocols of Classical scholarship (more below). In theory however everyone is now invited into the storeroom.

This is no small privilege and one we can all be very happy about. Storey’s translations makes the fragments of Greek Old Comedy really accessible to the general reader for the first time. He provides the necessary guidance for anyone interested in gaining familiarity with these difficult texts, which are usually devoid of context, full of lacunae, often corrupt and written in a language unrivalled in Greek poetry for its range of linguistic registers, inventiveness and frequent hapax legomena.³ But one should be happier still about the Greek side of the page. The eight volumes of the as-yet-still-incomplete set of *Poetae Comici Graeci* (PCG) is the greatest material investment I made in my life, next to my house and car. Now over half of the same texts are available for a mere US \$72 (Storey’s cut-off date is ca. 385 BC). The Greek texts follow PCG with few and generally noted departures

² Horsley, “One Hundred Years”, 49.

³ The project “Kommentierung der Fragmenten der altgriechischen Komödie” at the University of Freiburg, led by Bernhard Zimmermann, will generate full commentaries for all these fragments over the next fifteen years.

(though not with total consistency: e.g. 1.412, Cratinus 342 and see below). Storey even provides a brief apparatus where most helpful. He follows PCG's numbering for the fragments and includes the majority of testimonia⁴ found in PCG (though with different numbering). One does miss PCG's normally generous provision of the citation contexts for the book fragments and the testimonia. The absence of citation context can be frustrating: Eupolis T xxxiii (2.50) for example reads "<He is alluding> to the comic poets, one of whom is Eupolis" and leaves you to dig out a text of Aelius Aristides to try to find out what the allusion is—and how is one supposed to process testimonia such as "among whom were two of these" (2.99, Eupolis, Demes T i a)?

Excluded are Aristophanes' fragments because already nicely provided in the Loeb series by volume five of Jeff Henderson's recent Aristophanes (well, okay, add another US \$24). In addition, Sicilian comedy seems to be excluded from 'Old' for reasons that are not directly explained but inferable from Storey's introductory definition of the "genre". Equally disappointing is the decision to exclude the Greek text for most single-word and single-phrase fragments, though all are given in English translation. This follows the trend established by all earlier volumes of Loeb dramatic fragments, beginning with Smyth's Aeschylus in the Heinemann era, but broken, one hoped finally, by Henderson fragments of Aristophanes. Storey thus excludes the Greek text of a lot of fragments (nearly a hundred for Cratinus alone), including some of the most interesting words in the language. The reader might well be curious to know the Greek word for such translations as "bugger-off dance" (1.329), "a woman who could take on a whole village" (1.411), "quickishly" (2.520) or "frypan-whiff-hunters" (2.147). Having the Greek might even help you understand the English translation of Alcaeus 35 "not to go around a large teasel in one circle" (1.57). Most of all we would have liked to have all the fragments, not just because we can't afford PCG, but because the Loeb Foundation is committed to keeping material in print in perpetuity. This means that Storey's text will remain available one day when PCG is not. But there is another reason. The Loeb Classical Library plans in the next year or two to produce a fully searchable on-line edition of all its volumes (either for free, I am told, or at minimal cost).

This is only the second time the corpus of Old Comic fragments has been translated into English, the first being the notoriously unreliable Edmonds⁵, who freely emended the Greek text without notice and wrote a verse translation that stifled both meaning and humour. Storey's translation

⁴ There are sometimes surprising omissions, e.g. the Suda and Athenaeus but not Aristotle (*Po.* 1448a 12) are cited on Hegemon.

⁵ J. M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, vol. 1, Leiden 1957.

is generally as clear as the material allows. No mean feat, if one tries to capture the tone as well as the meaning of these difficult texts. Storey frequently captures the colloquial flavour of most fragments, though his penchant for normally UK English (“arse-bandit”, “do a runner”) might cause confusion for some, like myself, who does not share his cultural range. Only occasionally the injection of brio leads to imprecision (if I understand the idiom): at Cratinus T xxv (1.256) γυμνῆ τῆ κεφαλῆ translated “full speed ahead” is hard to understand when applied to slander, but passages such as Pl. *Phdr.* 243b show that it means “barefaced”; ὥστ’ ἀνεψύχης “and just chilled out” 1.75 (this time American slang) seems an unlikely conclusion to a day of downpayments and perjury; one wonders how soon “Death-Tripper” for ἀδοφοίτης (3.217) will itself require a gloss and commentary. I cannot tell if “so what a thing is a tongue” is slang, Shakespearean, or clumsy for “just such a thing” (2.242 Eupolis 342). The world seems turned upside down when we find “Legs and buttocks hanging straight to the roof” at Eupolis 54 (2.75; at Storey, “Eupolis”, 93, the same legs are reassuringly “raised”). At the other end of the scale, nuance and specificity are sometimes sacrificed in favour of a safe and bland translations: πασχητίων “sex-crazed” 1.274; μονοφάγε καὶ τοιχωρύχε “selfish crook” 1.79; σύμβολον “cent” 1.104; ἄνθρωπος ἀποφράς “miserable fellow” 2.238; πορνοτελῶναι “tax-farmers” 3.14; πατραλοῖαι “murderers” 3.14; τὰ ἀλλότρια “love affairs” 3.180. Sometimes the lack of nuance is just erroneous: the desiderative suffix is ignored in χεζητιᾶ, 3.381; at 2.249, Eupolis 367, the translation “who has corrupted the young man just by being with him” for συνὼν διέφθορεν strikes one as a bit naive; at 2.435 you would never guess that διὰ πασῶν is a technical musical term (“through all”). Such instances are however relatively rare and for most of the many thousands of lines translated in these volumes Storey strikes a skilful balance between nuance and meaning.

In addition to an accessible text and a first reliable translation of the corpus, Storey provides helpful and authoritative introductory notes on authors, dates, komodoumenoi, and plot-reconstruction. The most difficult fragments receive help with textual reconstruction and/or translation. References are also given to “major studies published since the appearance of the relevant volume of PCG” (1.ix). The value of the volumes is greatly increased by a crisp and sensible thirty-page introduction and by the inclusion of some of the more important indirect evidence for Old Comedy: the relevant parts of the important “archival” inscriptions (Fasti, Didaskalia, Victor Lists)⁶, sixteen texts of the Classical to Byzantine scholarship “On Old

⁶ The imminent release of the important re-edition of this by Millis and Olson will unfortunately render some of this obsolete: B. W. Millis and S. D. Olson, “Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals at Athens: IG II² 2318–25 and Related Texts”, Leiden, forthcoming 2012.

Comedy”, an Appendix on “Old Comedy on Vases”, and separate indices for komoidoumenoi, geographical names, and mythological names.

The Appendix on vasepaintings is an especially welcome recognition of the importance of this body of material. It lists, describes and gives some bibliography for 32 Attic and West Greek vasepaintings relevant to Old Comedy. This might have been an opportunity for the Loeb Foundation to spring for a few illustrations (it would not be a first time: the Loeb Pausanias has a complete volume of illustrations and plans). Storey’s is of course an arbitrary selection of the 250 or so vases that show comic actors or scenes of performance. The choice is generally a judicious one, though I regret the absence of the Apulian relief guttus (ca. 330) that appears in three copies and certainly shows the Telephos parody of Aristophanes’ “Acharnians”.⁷ The scene is not a vasepainting and therefore escapes the standard treatments, but its importance is not to be dismissed, especially if, as J. Richard Green argues (not yet in press), it copies a metalware (probably Athenian) vessel of late fifth-century date. I also find it odd that the texts of the “New York Goose Play” were not included as fragments, as they are in PCG 8 F 57. This has always been a key-piece in discussions of the sources for these images, and will prove to be still more important since the amazing discovery that the “Scythian’s” words “Noraretteblo” are Circassian for “Indeed he is the one who stole it/them from over there in their yard (or barn)”.⁸ As for the indices, an index of titles would have been very welcome.

These volumes are highly recommended, indeed indispensable to anyone interested in Old Comedy. Storey has done an excellent job; one could not hope for a better guide; one is happiest when he is most present. Indeed the sources of most of my reservations would probably have been eliminated with another one or two hundred pages of text, context and explanation. It is literally a κτῆμα εἰς αἰεῖ, thanks to the terms of the Loeb bequest and the diligence and ambition of its editors.

I will end this review by raising a concern about possible negative consequences of the Loeb series’ otherwise very welcome entry into the storerooms of fragments and then provide a small list of errata. The purpose of the latter will not (and is certainly not intended to) diminish Storey’s achievement but to aid in the correction of the texts when they soon go on line.

While the targeting of the Loeb’s to a more specialised readership is welcome, I am concerned that new trends are, often unwittingly, beginning

⁷ See most recently E. Csapo, *Actors and Icons of the Ancient Theater*, Chichester 2010, 64-5.

⁸ A. Mayor, J. Colarusso, and D. Saunders, “Making Sense of Nonsense Inscriptions Associated with Amazons and Scythians on Athenian Vases: Version 2.0”, *Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics*, July 2012, 15.

to neglect the Greekless “average reader”. In Storey’s volumes the meaning of brackets is nowhere explained. The brackets also differ in meaning from the Greek to the English side of the page, though both sides display the whole gamut. A non-professional audience might especially appreciate a full explanation and rigorous consistency. Other punctuation habits sometimes mislead, especially the tendency to begin the translation of even a fragmentary phrase with a capital letter and end it with a period. One can only assume it is done out of a misguided desire for visual tidiness, but it leads the Greekless reader to wonder if something has dropped out of his text: e.g. 2.120, Eupolis 117-8, “A citizen, an octopus in his ways.”, “We long for, all this famous city.” Supplements in square brackets usually do not get a close-bracket if they are on separate lines in Greek, but they also don’t get it on the English side, even when they are all arranged on the same line and separated by slashes, leading to visual confusion even to those familiar with the Greek and the conventions (e.g. 2.61). At times the translation seems to assume its own unnecessary: e.g. words like ‘hemiekt’ (1.220) are transliterated and left unexplained; the fictional name “Apolexis” for one of the fifty commissioners in Platon’s “Sophists” is left as an untranslated proper name “Apolexis” and excludes the Greekless from the joke (3.163).

Very frequently the English side is treated as an aid to understanding the Greek whereas the original intention of the Loeb series seems to me to require it to stand alone. Bracketed supplements are usually not reproduced as such in the translation (e.g. 1.115 Archippus F 37). There are also pitfalls to the student who might use the English to help interpret the Greek. On several occasions, without notice, Storey translates an emendation rather than the facing Greek text (1.190 Cephisodorus 10; 2.145 Eupolis 174; 3.149 Platon 119; 3.373 adesp. 233; 3.381 adesp. 511). At Eupolis 191 (2.148) a manuscript variant σκαῖρι’ appears in the text instead of PCG’s σκευάρι’ although σκευάρι’ is translated. Similarly PCG’s text for Eupolis 233 appears with Μαραθῶνι but Μαραθῶνα, a text printed in Storey’s earlier book on Eupolis⁹, evidently serves as the basis for the translation.

For a nearly 1500 page bilingual work with complex layout, I noticed generally few faults in the text. The worst errors are in the copyediting: at 2.82 a glitch at page break has put the Latin words of the scholiast to Juvenal into Greek font; between 2.266 and 2.267 the Greek text for Eupolis 494 has been omitted, indeed it looks as if a whole page or two may have dropped out; the Greek text of Nicochares’ “Lakones” T i is also lost (2.390); a sentence of the Greek for Platon T xviii has dropped out though it appears in the English (3.94).

Translation errors are scarce: the English syntax does not correspond to the Greek at 1.109 Archippus 23; βαλανειομαφάλους cannot be “acorn-navelled”

⁹I. C. Storey, *Eupolis. Poet of Old Comedy*, Oxford 2003, 223.

1.297; κωμωιδῶν in choregic inscriptions is “in the comic contest” = literally “[in the contest of] the comic choreuts”, not “of comic poets”, as at 2.24 and 2.343, though correct at 2.380; at Eupolis 288 (2.224) ἐν Κέφῳ is translated as “in Chios”, a proverbial error as Eupolis 343 (οὐ Χίος ἀλλὰ Κεῖος) himself shows; at Eupolis 290 (2.224) νῶ is translated as “you both” (these errors also appear in Storey, “Eupolis”, 26); φακή is “bean-soup” at 2.271, though correctly translated as “lentils” at 2.433; κηπαία “kitchen door” 2.301; φιβάλεων “Philabean” 2.303; ξυσναλία “aulos company” 2.377; ἑπτὰ “five” 2.501; ὀψώνιον at Thugenides 3, 3.356, is surely “food”, “shopping”, not “salary”. Both χορηγεῖν and διδάσκειν are generally translated as “produce”. The translation of Susarion T xiii is bewildering and misleading (3.283). I will also hazard the opinion that when it is said that Sannyrion’s humour alay in τὸ κατασκευαζόμενον, this should mean “in the costuming” not “in the performance” 1.261, 3.274.

Errors in the Greek text are still fewer. The worst are: 1.106 φοφώτατοι; at 2.32–3 T xi Eupolis’ victories at the Lenaea should be “III” and “three” not “III” and “four” (correct at 2/26); at 3.416 a tau is missing in γειόνων. There are a few bad or missing accents: εὐσχήμενος (1.326), ἀνειν (2.514), πάιζει (2.516), Ἄφ’ Ἱέρων (3.84); κωμαση (3.416).

The English text is nearly error-free: a syntax error at 2.65 (delete one negative in “neither reference need not be to a recent event”); “Pranscello” for “Prauscello” at 2.12; an exclamation mark, not a question mark, should follow “You, take off his sandals” 2.505; “Polydeuctes” for “Polydektes” (3.401); the transliterated Greek emendation of Meineke should be “hai aph’ hieron”, not “eph’ hieron” 3.99.

E. CSAPO
University of Sydney
eric.csapo@sydney.edu.au

