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It is but common knowledge that the Aristotelian Poetics reached a wide intellectual public with the 16th century translations and voluminous exegetic commentaries of which the outgoing Cinquecento already saw no less than six. Teachers of classics might know that this triumphal comeback had been prepared by the extensive scribal activity of late Byzantine and Italian copyists resulting in some 30 humanist mss. previous to the 1508 Aldine editio princeps. But probably only experts are aware of the fact that the Poetics was likewise popular with the mediaeval scribes and scholars, however peculiar its content may have appeared to their minds. The text is witnessed astonishingly well for a treatise on a matter in which the Middle Ages displayed little or no interest. Apart from some deeply contaminated recentiores that might still prove disputable as regards their provenance, the editors have at their disposal two Greek codices of equal stemmatic value, Parisinus gr. 1741 (A) and Riccardianus 46 (B), dating back to the 10th and the 12th centuries respectively, a Latin translation by William of Moerbecke made in 1278 from the ms. independent from either of these (Φ) and an Arabic translation by Abū-Bishr Mattā b. Yūnus created about the beginning of the 10th c. (Ar) which, again, derives ultimately from a sovereign Greek source (Σ). To this comes a short fragment of the Syriac translation, cited by Jakob bar Shakko (†1241) in his Book of the dialogues (Syr). The Syriac version is

---

1 Listed by Schrier (1998, 21–30). The seventh could have been supplied by Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (†1601), but he did not manage to bring it to print. His ms., Ambrosianus 647 (P 204 sup.), consists of 51 fol. in Quadro covered with notes in Italian. Casual observation has revealed that Pinelli dealt rather with exegesis in general than with particular text issues. Of the “great commentaries” (cf. Weinberg 1953, 100) Vincenzo Maggi (1550) and especially Pietro Vettori (1560) are the most successful as concerns emendation.

2 A total of 39 late ms. dating from ca. mid-15th to the beginning of 19th c. is now registered. 29 were collated by Lobel (1933); Harlfinger and Reitsch (1970, 37–42) added further two. All other collations including that made by Tarán for his and Gutas’ 2012 “Editio maior” are selective. The collation of all known copies has been accomplished for Thesaurus criticus (see n. 1). The apographs prove to be of no little, should it only be heuristic, value, to say nothing of their importance for the reception studies, of which an instance is given in: Pozdnev 2019.

3 Sicherl 1992, 113–116 supports Lobel 1933, 31–32 in assuming that its primary source has been Parisinus gr. 2038 corrected after Ambrosianus B 78 sup. However, in quite a few cases Ald. coincides with the corrections made in Berolinensis Phillippicus 1599 (196), but differs from the Ambrosianus.

4 Strange as it might seem, no first-hand references to the Poetics by the Byzantine literates have so far been discovered. The thinkers of the Christian West ignored aesthetics. The Arabic poetics was too closely tailored to the local literary and linguistic context to be influenced by Aristotelian critical concepts. The only three original mediaeval philosophers, who make some use of them, largely misapprehending their actual meaning, are al-Fārābī, who was a student of Mattā in Bagdad, Avicenna and Averroes; their attitude is summarized in: Kemal 1991 and 2003 (here esp. 24–27).

5 This mostly refers to Parisinus gr. 2038 which has recently been discussed in: Taran 2016, in reply to Janko 2013. But Vaticanus gr. 1400, Berol. Philippicus and Monacensis 493, to cite just the most pertinent examples, also display peculiar readings and corrections probably inferred from an unknown apograph of A, or, less probably, Φ, but not B which, contrary to Lobel (1933, 18; 30–31), was unknown to the humanist scribes. Corrections by the later hand could derive from the printed editions.

6 Moerbecke’s text (edited in 1953 by Minio-Paluello, Arist. Lat. vol. 33) is transmitted by two mss. (Toletanus Capit. 47.10, ca. 1280, and Etonensis 129, ca. 1300) which agree with each other in nearly all problematic cases.

7 The ms. is the celebrated Parisinus ar. 2346 (Ancien fonds Arabe 882 a) of the 11th c., first published by Margoliouth (1887). On which see Gutas 1998, 147. The monumental posthumous edition by Tkatsch (Vol.I 1928, Vol. II 1932) is at some places supplemented and corrected by Gutas in his notes to the ‘Editio maior’.
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supposed to have been the basis for the Arabic and thus the earliest surviving document of the tradition.\footnote{As follows from the analysis by Gutas (2012, 108–109), partly confirmed by the collation carried out anew for \textit{Thesaurus criticus} (see n. 1 above), the relationship between Ar. and Syr. is more complicated than usually assumed. That Abu-Bishr in some of his unfortunate renderings follows the Syriac source is fairly apparent. But it is likewise clear that other erroneous readings of Syr. are avoided in Ar.; for more details see below, n. 12, 15, 31 and 46.}

The main branches of the paradosis are geographically and culturally dispersed so as to create an impression of far-reaching openness. There certainly existed an archetype ($\Omega^9$) other than in the hand of Aristotle himself or his writing attendants: a number of mistakes and omissions common to all mentioned witnesses are of a later origin; some of these we examine below in detail, and some are listed in the last footnote. But what could its nature possibly be? Was it a Late Ancient recension or a Byzantine school copy? Given the present state of knowledge, every date between ca. 80–60 BC (the famous Tyrranion’s edition of Aristotle’s and Theophrast’s writings reported by Strabo\footnote{13.1.54. The editions produced by βιβλιοπῶλαί τινες γραφεῦσι φαύλοις χρώμενοι καὶ οὐκ ἀντιβάλλοντες (if we should believe this part of Strabo’s story) must have become obsolete after the corpus was edited anew by Andronicus who collated a lot of antigrapha and inscribed the rolls: Plut. \textit{Sulla} 26; Porph. \textit{Vit. Plot.} 24; for the discussion see Hatzimichali 2013, 15–23. That a copy of the \textit{Poetics} in Andronican recension has survived to become an ancestor of A, Φ, Β and Σ is barely thinkable. But in any case, it might have been one of its descendants scattered in the ancient libraries, from which a number of mistakes and omissions (as in 1456a2–3 discussed below) were transmitted to the source of $\omega$.} and the mid-9th c. AD (the latest possible date of the Greek ms. used by the Syriac translator\footnote{At present there is no certainty as to the \textit{terminus ante quem} of Syr. and, respectively, of $\Sigma$. The only thing established so far is that, contrary to the earlier belief, the Syriac translation cannot be attributed to Ishaq b. Hunain, who flourished in the second half of the 9th c. In a tentative ‘scenario’ Gutas considers the late 8th c. as the approximate date of the Syriac translation. By that time the copies of Greek ms. containing the \textit{Poetics} were kept in “the libraries of the Nestorian Christian monasteries in northern Iraq” (Gutas 2012, 108). Yury N. Arzhanov, who is about to give a new edition of \textit{fragmentum Syriacum}, believes that by 780s the translation was already completed. The dating of Syr. largely relies on the interpretation of Patriarch Timothy’s letters (\textit{Ibid}. 80, test. 3–4) and cannot be discussed here at length. Anyway, there is all ground to conclude that the Eastern branch of transmission begins to ramify around 700, and thus the time span for an archetype in question should be narrowed to ca. 1st–7th c. which is an extended period indeed.} can be considered. There remains uncertainty concerning the script of the hypothetic protograph. Was it in uncial letters or, perhaps, already in minuscule? Did it contain glosses or other comments in any form? To clarify all this is clearly a demanding task, as multiple transmission-indicative passages should be scrutinized. Yet there are some cases that seem to be especially instructive for elucidating the appearance of the common ancestor, while the data of textual criticism at our disposal are vast enough to promptly provide additional evidence. One such case is examined below. It is a series of analogous interpolations traceable in more than one passage of the \textit{Poetics}, but mainly in the paragraphs following the definition of tragedy in chapter VI. This section is witnessed by all the aforementioned sources including the Syriac. It has been the object of most attention since the earliest stage of text reproduction:\footnote{The interest in enigmatic catharsis-formula is manifest already in neoplatonic scholarship (Iamb. \textit{Myst.} 1, 11; Procl. \textit{In Plat. Rem publ.} 1, 42, 10–16; Olymp. \textit{In Alcib.} 54–55). It is then reflected in both Syriac and Arabic interpretative renderings of 1449b28–29, but also e. g. in a gloss on έλεεινών (1452b32–33 ταύτην φοβερῶν καὶ έλεεινών εἶναι μιμητικῆν) included in the Arabic text (Tkatsch 1928, 246).} any scholar or copyist, ancient or mediaeval, could supply
what he considered an improvement on the Aristotelian text and thought. In the following
an attempt is made to detect traces of that work.

The first passage in need of revision is close to the beginning of the chapter. Hav-
ing defined tragedy in a rather peculiar way, Aristotle then takes some care to clarify
what is meant by ἡδυσμένῳ λόγῳ χωρὶς ἑκάστῳ τῶν εἰδῶν ἐν τοῖς μορίοις (the second
colon of the definition, 1449b25–26). This surely needs clarification, since ἡδυσμένῳ is
metaphoric and the subordinate modifiers are arranged in an almost perplexing manner:
it is quite clear, why both A and B read ἑκάστου, and the Eastern translations perceive
χωρὶς as a preposition, the implication being that Σ could have had ἑκάστου as well. The
mistake13 caused by irregularity of expression is little informative for the filiation, espe-
cially as Φ seems to have escaped it: Moerbecke translates χωρὶς by seorsum, not by sine.14
Equally confusing is the final syntagma. While μόρια (viz. τῆς τραγῳδίας) might be read-
illy understood as 'smaller parts', or sections, of tragedy like prologue or stasimon, εἴδη
is vague enough to encompass any meaning, either technical or not. Aristotle explains
that 'sweetened' signifies metrical and musical forms of speech: λέγω δὲ ἡδυσμένον μὲν
λόγον τὸν ἔχοντα ρυθμόν καὶ ἁρμονίαν καὶ μέλος (1449b28-29). “Harmony” normally
goes together with “rhythm” to signify two main musical means. Illustrative parallels in
the Poetics are 1447a23–24 (ἁρμονίᾳ μὲν καὶ ῥυθμῷ χρώμεναι μόνον ἥ τε αὐλητικὴ καὶ ἢ
κιθαριστική) and 1448b20-21 (κατὰ φύσιν δὲ ὅτι μὲν τοῦ μιμεῖσθαι καὶ τῆς ἁρμονίας
καὶ τοῦ ρυθμοῦ); cf. Pol. 1340b17; 1341b19; Rhet. 1403b17. But μέλος cannot be attached
to ρυθμός and ἁρμονία in a way it stands in the above cited text. Λόγος ὁ ἔχει μέλος is an
impossible expression. “Rhythm, harmony and song” looks absurd, because song virtually
is speech embellished by rhythm and harmony. Kassel was right in following Tyrwhitt
who athetized and μέλος, Gallavotti and Tarán wrongly let it stay.15 The interpolation com-
mon to all witnesses could not have been made independently by A, B, Φ and Σ. Suppos-
edly, καὶ μέλος goes back to the maker of ω, whose reasons are shortly to be determined.

The rhythm, or metre (cf. 1448b21: τὰ γὰρ μέτρα ὅτι μόρια τῶν ρυθμῶν ἐστὶ φανερῶν),
can effortlessly make its work without the aid of harmony (cf. 1447a26–27: αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ

---

13 Emended by Reiz (1786, 12) and then by Tyrwhitt in the significant 1794 edition (pp. 137–138); the
correct meaning is supposed already by Alessandro dei Pazzi’s translation (a 1536 Aldine ed.) “separatim
singulis generibus in partibus agentibus”, though the parallel Greek text edited by his son Guillelmo repro-
duces the vulgate reading.

14 Moerbecke’s translation is very different from that of Mattā. The latter interprets almost every pat-
ttern he pretends to have understood, expands the original and glosses on it in trying to convey the meaning
of things he had never heard of. What he creates is a chaotic combination of literalism and abstraction. In
both he could have been misguided by the Syriac source (which he sometimes misreads). The Arabic of his
translation is so bewilderingly confused that in many places the text is hardly readable at all. It must have
been typical of all Mattā’s translations (of which only the Poetics survives), and he was justly blamed for that
by his contemporaries: Margoliouth 1905, 86. The text might have been an outline intended for those who
were trained in Mattā’s school. On the contrary, Moerbecke is strict and cold. He uses no intermediaries and
obviously does not need any. He strongly adheres to the style of mirror-translating, mastering it well enough
to make an impression that he understands most of the patterns he writes about. In this he is greatly helped
by the structure of Latin which is far closer to Greek than the Semitic languages. His wording is thoughtful
but rather poorly chosen (cf. the indices in: Minio-Paluello 1953) and could serve the reconstruction of
small words with far more certainty than that of Mattā.

15 Gallavotti is almost obsessively conservative, but καὶ μέλος is retained also by Dupont-Roc/Lallo
(1980) and Guastini (2010), to name the editors of the last decades. Vettori was the first to suspect μέλος.
He replaced it with μέτρον. Cf. Tyrwhitt 1794, 140: “Victorius pro μέλος legit μέτρον, quia μέλος et ἁρμονία
idem valent. Sed etiam μέτρον et ρυθμός idem valent. …Voces igitur καὶ μέλος potius delendas credo, ut ex
glossemate ortas.” After Tyrwhitt the athetesis was argued for by Spengel 1841, 1263.
ῥυθμῷ μιμεῖται χωρὶς ἁρμονίας ἡ τῶν ὀρχηστῶν). All segments of tragedy are metrical but not all of them musical. This should help us to grasp the sense of a second Aristotelian comment immediately following the first one: τὸ δὲ χωρὶς τοῖς εἴδεσι τὸ διὰ μέτρων ἓκαστῳ εἶναι μόνον περαινεσθαι καὶ πάλιν ἑτερα διὰ μέλους (1449b29–31, here the instrumental dative is reproduced by Α, Β and Φ thus justifying ἑκάστῳ in the preceding colon, whereas Syr. and Ar. render the text, again, as if it had χωρὶς τῶν εἴδων). 'Metres' are substituted for 'rhythm', and thus one could infer (as Bywater actually did16) that 'song' is synonymous with 'harmony'. Yet, μέλος comprises both harmony and rhythm. Choral parts and monodies are, of course, metrical. Awareness of this difference the interpolator pedantically added καὶ μέλος to supposedly insufficient ῥυθμὸν καὶ ἁρμονίαν.17 The question is, whether he inferred the words himself or was it a transfer, more or less mechanical, from an annotated text, the motifs of an annotator being then purely didactic. The lengthier interpolations examined below might shed some light on this point.

In the lines under focus μόρια (let out elliptically after ἕνα and ἑτερα) exhibits no cladistic meaning, even less than in 1448b21, where it has the same etymological sense of a 'smaller part': metre is not a species,18 but one of the constituents, or properties, of rhythm (others being, for instance, tempo and intensity). Neither do εἴδη bear any specific connotation. Aristotle avoids saying anything like “there are two kinds of speech embellishments”; he does not itemize εἴδη τῶν ἡδυσμάτων in a way he enumerates and specifies τραγῳδίας εἴδη in chapter XVIII, 1455b32–56a3. Still, εἴδη denoting ‘species’, as in ch. XVIII, is so characteristic of his vocabulary that the word, especially accompanied by μόρια, is not so lightly passed by: it lingers in the reader’s mind ready to be remembered on an appropriate occasion.

Next a reader is offered several appendices to the core definition. The description of the six ‘parts’, or ‘elements’, of tragedy is shaped in similar syntactic structures and remarkably rich in repetitions (cf. 1449b37: οὓς ἀνάγκη ποιούς τινας εἶναι, 49b38–50a1: τὰς πράξεις εἶναι φαμεν ποιάς τινας, 50a6–7: καθ’ ὁ ποιούς τινας εἶναι φαμεν τοὺς πράττοντας, and then again, 50a8–9: καθ’ ὁ ποιά τις ἐστὶν ἡ τραγῳδία), some of them doubtlessly auctorial, others perhaps not. Initially, Aristotle employs the same term he has just used for the formal subdivisions of tragic play: ἥ τε τῶν διθυραμβικῶν ποίησις καὶ ἡ τῶν νόμων καὶ ἥ τε τραγῳδία καὶ ἡ κωμῳδία. After nomos which can be pure music Aristotle mentions the dramatic genres, and thus needs a specific element of rhythm applicable to them.

16 Bywater 1909, 161: “The και is explanatory, μέλος being added as a synonym to explain ἁρμονία”. In retaining καὶ μέλος Bywater is misled by the doubtful parallels he had found for μέλος καὶ μέτρῳ (Probl. 920a12: πολλαπλάσια… τὰ μέλη ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις τῶν μέτρων; Plat. Symp. 187d; Lysis 205a; Isocr. 191b). He seems to assume that Aristotle wanted to explain a more specific term with a common one. However, it is hardly possible to explain ἁρμονία with μέλος: song is rhythm enriched by harmony. Ἀρμονία is used by Aristotle in numerous difficult contexts without any explanation; ἁρμονία καὶ ῥυθμός (“les élément mélodique et rythmique”, as Dupont-Roc and Lallot elegantly put it) is utterly self-sufficient.

17 In the similar way καὶ μέτρων is inferred in ch. I, 1447b25: οἶον ῥυθμῷ καὶ μέλει καὶ μέτρῳ. Citing the tricolon Brescia (1984, 58–59) asserts that καὶ μέλος should be retained. But καὶ μέτρῳ in 47b25, contrary to καὶ μέλος in 49b29, is not out of place, if we consider the examples that follow: ἡ τῶν διθυραμβικῶν ποίησις καὶ ἡ τῶν νόμων καὶ ἡ τραγῳδία καὶ ἡ κωμῳδία. After nomos which can be pure music Aristotle mentions the dramatic genres, and thus needs a specific element of rhythm applicable to them.

18 Cf. Bywater 1909, 11: “Imitation, then, being natural to us — as also the sense of harmony and rhythm, the metres being obviously species of rhythms...” In contrast to other constituents of rhythm metres are ‘fractional’ (τμήματα) and thus should not be used in oration (Rhet. 1408b29, Bywater's conjecture τμήματα is misleading; cf. the commentary by Lucas 1972, 74).

19 Aristotle makes little effort to fully elaborate his thought: the reader is left to conjecture, why the non-narrative mode of delivery (πράττοντες) presupposes visualization (ὄψεως κόσμος must be peri-
seems to be deliberate, albeit not intentional, as Aristotle adds τι, presumably to discern μόριον, here meaning ‘constituent’, from μόρια in the former paragraph. He then decides in favour of variety choosing μέρη to define basic components of the tragic genre. These he catalogues briefly, building on the classification of mimesis through media, modes and objects discussed in ch. I (1447a16–17).

‘Music and word’ are perfectly comprehensible as mimetic means; εἶτα μελοποιία καὶ λέξις, ἐν τούτοις γὰρ ποιοῦνται τὴν μίμησιν (1449b33–34) needs no comment. The next following explanation of λέξις and μελοποιία is not only superfluous, but bizarre in thought and weird in expression: λέγω δὲ λέξιν μὲν αὐτὴν τὴν τῶν μέτρων σύνθεσιν, μελοποιίαν δὲ ὃ τήν δύναμιν φανερὰν ἔχει πάσαν (1449b34–36). Clearly, λέξις can signify both poetic diction (as in 1449a23) and spoken dialect (1459a12, cf. Rhet. 1408b33). But, contrary to Bywater and others, it cannot possibly mean the “composition of verses”, should it be used “in reference to the poet” or in any other reference. A few paragraphs later in the same chapter Aristotle gives an acute general definition of λέξις preceded by a back-reference: λέγω δὲ, ὥσπερ πρότερον εἴρηται, λέξιν εἶναι τὴν διὰ τῆς ὀνομασίας ἑρμηνείαν, ὃ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐμμέτρων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων ἔχει τὴν αὐτὴν δύναμιν (1450b14–15). “If the reference is to 6, 1449b34”, Bywater comments, “Aristotle must have forgotten [!] the exact terms of his previous formula.” Still, to quote Bywater’s next utterance, “the point is the same in both instances”. This sounds even weirder than the above cited ‘Aristotelian’ passage. The “speech” that “interprets by giving names”, and thus “has the same function in verse and prose” is evidently quite another thing than ἡ τῶν μέτρων σύνθεσις, that is to say, the versification of speech. ὥσπερ πρότερον εἰρήτα could refer to language as one of mimetic media. Much more credible, however, is that it is put forth by an interpolator with no other aim than to recall his own self-made definition.

The logic of λέξις defined as ἡ τῶν μέτρων σύνθεσις is easily discernible, indeed if we discredit its genuineness. Music encompasses rhythm, resp. metre. The reader easily infers it, because he was previously informed on what the speech embellishments are. But metre is formally absent, tragic play, we are told, has no media except μελοποιία καὶ λέξις. In an attempt to improve on this seeming shortage, the interpolator supplied a notion of λέξις which included metres. He modelled it on the neighbouring phrase, λέγω γὰρ μῦθον τοῦτον τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν πραγμάτων (1450a4–5; τῶν μέτρων σύνθεσις mirrors σύνθεσις τῶν πραγμάτων), but worded in such a way as to stress his point: αὐτὴν emphatic), especially as he knows that a tragedy goes perfectly well “without movement”, its quality being clear “from mere reading” (1462a10–12). Lucas (1972, 99) might be right in interpreting πράττοντες as “the visible actors”. A piece can be judged by reading but it is always (at least, to Aristotle’s mind) written for staging. It is this uncertainty of expression that induces insertions.

20 Bywater 1909, 162. To support this Bywater has to conjecture λέξιν μὲν ταύτην. Lucas (1972, 99) follows Bywater without accepting ταύτην: “The whole is short for τὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐν μέτρῳ σύνθεσιν”. However, letting out the main term is a strange way to shorten, and the accent made on verse would, by all means, contradict the definition given in 1450b14–15. Gottfried Hermann boldly emends αὐτὴν to τῶν ὀνομάτων σύνθεσιν (1802, 16; cf. 116: “Quid metra hic sibi volunt?” etc.). This matches well with ch. XXII, 1458a28–29: κατὰ μὲν οὖν τὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων σύνθεσιν οὐχ οἷόν τε τοῦτο ποίησαι, κατὰ δὲ τὴν μεταφορὰν ἐνδέχεται — no matter whether we read ἄλλων with Σ, as Kassel and Tarán prefer to, or side with Bywater (1909, 294) in taking ὀνομάτων for κυρίων ὀνομάτων. But pace Hermann there is no palaeographical support to his suggestion: even if contracted ὀνομάτων could not be taken for μέτρων. Besides, ἡ τῶν ὀνομάτων σύνθεσις would be a simplistic definition both for ‘speech’ and ‘literary composition’ (as in Dionysius of Halicarnassus; the ἑρμηνεία of Demetrius is evidently a more ‘Aristotelian’ term for that, cf. Poet. 1450b14 cited above).

21 Bywater 1909, 175.
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sizes τὴν τῶν μέτρων σύνθεσιν ("the mere metrical arrangement of the words" [Butcher], "l’agencement même des mètres" [Dupont-Roc/Lallot]).

Having afterwards encountered the original definition he supplied the reminiscence cliché, perfectly careless about how to reconcile the two concepts. Moreover, he risked a further enhancement to the text he had before his eyes. In 1450b12-13, immediately before the back-reference, all ms. evidence gives τέταρτον δὲ τῶν μὲν λόγων ἡ λέξις. Desperate to grasp the point of τῶν μὲν λόγων Kassel prints it sub cruce. The “speaking of words” is indeed pointless, but “speech as related to words”, with defining genitive (as implied by μέν23), makes sense if opposed to the previously suggested idea of speech as dealing with metres. Tarán’s decision to exclude it appears correct: the interpolator’s obstinate endeavour to coordinate individual sections of the treatise as regards terminology is fairly manifest in ὡσπερ πρότερον εἶρηται and will be observed again later.

The unassuming account of μελοποιία as something “of which every function is manifest” is due to the same scholastic punctiliousness. With no new information provided (cf. 1450b15-16: τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἡ μελοποιία μέγιστον τῶν ἡδυσμάτων) it is a mere pendant to the definition of λέξις. Besides, it is oddly formulated, πάσαν being at times misread as πᾶσαν (and despondently replaced by it in the 1550 Maggi-Lombardi edition; cf. “a tutti può essere chiaro” [Guastini], “whose sense every one understands” [Butcher]) or misinterpreted as πάντως ("parfaitement claire" [Dupont-Roc/Lallot]) or πᾶσα δύναμις is not altogether alien to Aristotle (cf. SE 172a36: πρὸς ἀπασαν τέχνην καὶ δύναμιν), but πᾶς does not go well with δύναμις, if the latter means ‘function’, or ‘significance’, as seems to be the case here.24 Yet, it becomes usable, if one perceives music as consisting of “rhythm, harmony and melos” and accordingly disintegrates its functions to evasively declare that none of these actually need explanation.

The syntax of the next lines (1449b36–1450a10, where the Syriac fragment ends), is confused to the point of incoherence; attempts to isolate interpolations have proved to be unsuccessful, though it is very unlikely that the text is authentic in every word. The paragraph starts with a protasis marker, but opinions widely differ as to where the protasis ends. Bywater punctuates the text as follows:

ἐπεὶ δὲ πράξεως ἐστι μίμησις, πράττεται δὲ ὑπὸ τινῶν πραττόντων, οὓς ἀνάγκη ποιούς τινας εἶναι κατὰ τε τὸ ἢθος καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν, διὰ γὰρ τῶν τούτων καὶ τὰς πράξεις εἶναι φαμέν ποιάς τινας τινας, πέφυκεν αἴτια δύο τῶν πράξεων εἶναι, διάνοια καὶ ἢθος, κατὰ ταύτας καὶ τυγχάνουσι καὶ ἀποτυγχάνουσι πάντες. ἔστιν δὲ τῆς μὲν πράξεως ὁ μῦθος ἡ μίμησις· λέγω γὰρ μῦθον τοῦτον τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν πραγμάτων, τὰ δὲ ἢθη, καθ’ ὅ ποιοῦς τινας εἶναι φαμέν τοὺς πράττοντας, διάνοιαν δὲ, ἐν δόσις λέγοντες ἀποδεικνύεσθι τί ἢ καὶ ἀποφαίνονται

22 Else (1957, 236) tries to save αὐτὴν τὴν τῶν μέτρων σύνθεσιν by reinterpreting αὐτὴν: “‘just’, i.e. that very composition of the verses that was implied by διὰ μέτρων περαίνεσθαι. Λέξις, then, is the composition of the spoken verses, the dialogue.” This was objected to by Verdenius (1960, 257): “(1) ‘just’ is a very awkward way of referring to b30 and (2) it is very improbable that λέξις should be confined to the dialogue. The fact that in b30 μόνον has been added to διὰ μέτρων shows that μέτρον in itself does not denote a dialogue.”

23 In a late humanist Cod. Ferrarensis Cl. II. 348 μὲν is left out: its maker must have been embarrassed by the emphasis laid on τῶν λόγων. Normally, the learned copyist follows Vettori, but in this case he took the decision upon himself.

24 Cf. Dupont-Roc/Lallot 1980, 53. Schmitt (2008, 9) fancifully translates: “dessen wirkende Kraft ganz im Äußeren präsent ist!” but this is too complicated for a clarification, the pregnant meaning of φανεράNH requiring a further comment.
γνώμην. ἀνάγκη οὖν πάσης τῆς τραγῳδίας μέρη εἶναι ἕξ, καθ’ ὃ ποιά τις ἐστίν ἡ τραγῳδία· ταῦτα δ’ ἐστί μύθος καὶ ἥθη καὶ λέξις καὶ διάνοια καὶ ὄψις καὶ μελοποιία.

Bywater, notably followed by Tarán, renders διὰ γὰρ τούτων… ποιάς τινας parenthetical, and begins the apodosis with πέφυκεν. Else extends the parenthesis to ἀποτυγχάνουσι πάντες, athetizes πέφυκεν… ἦθος (1450a1–2), 26 and stretches the ἐπεὶ clause out up to ἀποφαίνονται γνώμην after which he puts a dash mark, apparently perceiving ἀνάγκη οὖν κτλ. as the main clause. In fact, those are the only two options we have. 26 But neither is eligible. As to the suggestion of Else accepted by Kassel, it is hardly feasible that from the speculations on characters and plot of tragedy there should follow that their constituents are six in number. ἀνάγκη οὖν announces a new thought sequence which briefly summarizes the whole section on μέρη: the number of ‘parts’ is given and then expanded in a list (put in brackets by Else but, inconsequently enough, not by Kassel). Bywater’s solution seems more attractive, as it shortens the protasis and avoids elimination. Yet the reasons Aristotle gives for introducing διάνοια and ἦθος into his analysis of tragedy, namely that the acting persons will necessarily exhibit certain moral qualities and make certain judgments, would provide no premise for asserting that there happen to be just two causes of action, and that it is by their actions that everyone’s successes and failures are conditioned.

Accordingly, we have either to consider the text incurably corrupt, or to venture an emendation. Aristotle’s primary concern is to introduce two new evaluation criteria. Hence οὖς can be smoothly replaced with τούτους, the corruption probably resulting from haplography with subsequent correlative correction (τούτους > τούς > οὖς). Cf. Poet. 1448a2: ἐπεὶ δὲ μιμοῦνται οἱ μιμούμενοι πράττοντας, ἀνάγκη δὲ τούτους ἢ σπουδαίους ἢ φαύλους εἶναι; Rhet. 1365b36: ἀνάγκη δὲ τούτους φαίνεσθαι ἀρίστους; De gen. et corr. 332a5: εἰ γάρ ἐστι τῶν φυσικῶν σωμάτων ἤλθ…, ἀνάγκη ἦτοι ἢ ἢ δο σε εἶναι ταύτα ἢ πλεῖω. The conditional clause, then, ends with καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν, διὰ γὰρ τούτων delivering an additional argument, quite naturally, in a separate colon. The next segment is meant to be parenthetical, since the connective particle is lacking. πέφυκεν egs. cannot be straightforwardly athetized, least of all because it “was intended as a paraphrase of διὰ γὰρ τούτων καὶ τὰς πράξεως εἶναι φαμεν ποιάς τινας”.27 What the parenthesis actually aims at, is to supply a passing comment on why actions are commonly qualified by characters and thoughts of the agents. 28 Its first section points out at the causes of actions (the accent lies on τῶν πράξεων), while the second (with slightly adversative καὶ) deals with their results. Having removed the πέφυκεν clause one should concomitantly eliminate and καὶ τὰς πράξεως which is authentic enough: τυγχάνω should be considered synonymous with ἐπιτυγχάνω which in the Aristotelian corpus is used elsewhere in the same combination (EE 1247a36). The text seems not sound, but its content is adequate, the reason for bracketing it away being merely formal.

The main obstacle to rendering the afore-cited section coherent (provided we read τούτους) appears to be the appositive, or rather parenthetical, nominative διάνοια καὶ

25 See Else 1957, 240, with n. 68. Else gives a sound criticism of the attempts of Vahlen and Gomperz to transpose the segment.
26 For the overlong protasis before ἀνάγκη οὖν cf. Phys. 234b15. A full stop before ἀνάγκη (Du- pont-Roc/Lallot) would not work: the conclusion would be lacking. Placing a colon after εἶναι φαμεν ποιάς τινας (Gallavotti 1974, 20) is an absurdity.
27 Else 1957, 240.
28 The detailed analysis is given in Schmitt 2008, 354–357.
ἦθος. It fits not with impersonal πέφυκεν, comma before διάνοια does not rule out the problem, but rather creates a new one, since it becomes less clear what the fem. ταύτας refers to. κατὰ ταῦτα (sc. πράξεις) καὶ τυγχάνουσι καὶ ἀποτυγχάνουσι πάντες is closely paralleled by κατὰ δὲ τὰς πράξεις εὐδαιμονεῖ ή τοὐναντίον (1450a19–20), 29 but B has κατὰ ταῦτα and the Syrian translates likewise30 possibly following the mistake of his source. We should therefore accept διάνοια which is the reading of A. However, it is an easier reading and looks very much like a copyist’s correction. Suppose Aristotle has omitted the subject, for which αἴτια δύο affords a predicate. Having affirmed that actions are qualified by character and thought, he goes on to say that these are by their nature the two causes of action. The interpolation technique, into which some insight has been gained above, consists in filling up the seeming gaps with gloss-like additions. Thus, an interpolator would consider that explanatory διάνοια καὶ ἦθος is to be added, 31 regardless of how irregular such a parenthesis might be. This neglect of syntactic framework will be illustrated below by further examples.

The insertions identified so far are, of course, purely conjectural. If the uncorrupted text was previous to the archetype in question, it can hardly be witnessed anywhere except a secondary source. Yet we are almost completely ignorant about the number of intermediaries between Aristotle and ω32 or between the latter and our earliest mss. Some interpolations might have been originally added over the line to be inserted in the main text later. With καὶ μέλος this could easily be the case, and same is true about διάνοια καὶ ἠθῶς. Hope remains, therefore, to detach supplements that left traces in the ms. tradition, all the more so because the tradition is, as seen above, remarkably ramified.

The insertions identified so far are, of course, purely conjectural. If the uncorrupted text was previous to the archetype in question, it can hardly be witnessed anywhere except a secondary source. Yet we are almost completely ignorant about the number of intermediaries between Aristotle and ω32 or between the latter and our earliest mss. Some interpolations might have been originally added over the line to be inserted in the main text later. With καὶ μέλος this could easily be the case, and same is true about διάνοια καὶ ἠθῶς. Hope remains, therefore, to detach supplements that left traces in the ms. tradition, all the more so because the tradition is, as seen above, remarkably ramified.

The Aristotelian account of “the parts of tragedy” closes with the enumeration linked to the initial divisions of mimesis, 1450a9–12: οἷς μὲν μιμοῦνται, δύο μέρη ἐστίν, ὡς δὲ μιμοῦνται, ἑκ, ἃ δὲ μιμοῦνται, τρία, καὶ παρὰ ταῦτα οὐδέν. The subsequent text (1450a12–15) in Kassel’s edition resembles a graveyard:

τούτοις μὲν οὖν ὃσοι ὑλίγοι αὐτῶν ὃς εἴπειν κέχρηται τοῖς εἴδεσιν· καὶ γὰρ ἄδικος ἔχει πάντως καὶ ἠθῶς καὶ μύθον καὶ λέξιν καὶ μέλος καὶ διάνοιαν ὡσαύτως.

30 The same is to be found in Mattā’s version, while Moerbecke translates secundum has. In fact, it is just one of many cases where Σ displays common mistakes with B against A, Φ (Π). The following sampling from cap. I–XII illustrates that the current consensus which makes all extant Greek mss. descendants of a common ancestor (Tarán’s Ξ) independent of Σ must not necessarily be followed: 1448b26: τὰς τῶν τοιοῦτων Π: τῶν om. B, Σ; 1449a7: ἐπισκοπεῖν παρέχει Π: ἐπισκοπεῖν ἄρα ἔχει B, Σ; 1449b9–10: μέτρου μεγάλου Π: μέτρου μετὰ λόγου B, Σ; 1449b26: ἐπισκοπεῖν Π: ἐπισκοπεῖν ἄρα ἔχει B, Σ; 1450a4: ὁ μύθος η μίμησις Π: η om. B, Σ; 1450a35: σημείον ήτοι παραπάνω Π: σημείον ήτοι Π: σημείον B, Σ: στάσιμος B, Σ: στάσιμον Π. See also below, on Poet. XIX, 1456a33–34.
31 In much the same manner ἔλεος μὲν περὶ τὸν ἀνάξιον, φόβος δὲ περὶ τὸν ὅμοιον (1453a5–6) is added after ὁ μὲν γὰρ περὶ τὸν ἀνάξιον ἐστίν δυστυχοῦντα, ἤ δὲ περὶ τὸν ὅμοιον. 32 For the pre-Andronican (Apellicon’s?) editions see Hatzimichali 2013. To what extent the non-Aristotelian material was incorporated in the Andronicus edition, is not our task to discuss. F. Grayeff (1956) assumes that the text of the Poetics then published was to a great extent a mixture of Aristotle’s thought and late peripatetic additions, but his analysis of ch. IX 1451a37–b32, a well-known passage on ποίησις / ἱστορία and on ‘giving names’, condemned as incongruous and thus partly an interpolation, is not very convincing: see esp. 1956, 112–113 where he reinterprets 1451b19–21, ὃν μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις ἐν ἑνὶ καὶ ἐν ἑνὶ τοῖς γνωρίμως ἐστὶν ὀνομάτων ὡς. The ‘harmonising’ bias Grayeff points out at is in fact palpable throughout the treatise. But to discern the genuine links resulting from the author’s wish to string together parts of a larger whole from what is “incongruous and merely ‘harmonized’” one should base on the actual incongruities in the transmitted text and not on the faulty notions he pretends to read into it.
There is enough reason to side with Kassel in considering the passage largely inexplicable, even if the segments he obelizes might actually be explained away or emended by conjecture. οὐκ ὀλίγοι αὐτῶν is unique in Aristotle and does not look Aristotelian, no more than the nonchalant omission of the substantive (δραμάτων rather than ποιητῶν\textsuperscript{33}) scarcely smoothed by ως εἰπεῖν.\textsuperscript{34} Apparently, ως εἰπεῖν needs to be cured: both ὄψεις and ὄψιν can be found already in the late mss., and the editions differ respectively. Yet the problem recognized by Kassel lies not here, but in πᾶν, evidently meaning πᾶν δρᾶμα. Even if Aristotle would think of δρᾶμα as a plain synonym for tragedy in this context, he would hardly have omitted it. Apart from being useless for the analysis, the whole phrase is painfully trivial and consists mostly of repetition. Together with stylistic discrepancies this more than suffices to consider it an insertion, though question remains as to its purpose, since it does not at all look like a gloss nor, at least prima facie, like a correction of an alleged incongruity.

To answer this, we have to take a closer look at εἴδεις. The use of εἴδη in lieu of μέρη is evidently a mistake. That these are not interchangeable follows from ch. XXVI 1462b16–18: περὶ μὲν οὖν τραγῳδίας καὶ ἐποποιίας, καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν εἰδών καὶ τῶν μερῶν, καὶ πόσα καὶ τί διαφέρει <…> εἰρήσθω τοσαῦτα. What Aristotle means by τραγῳδίας εἴδη is lucidly defined in ch. XVIII, 1455b32–1456a3, the section being crucial for the understanding of how ω could have been created. In Tarán’s edition the text runs as follows:

τραγῳδίας δὲ εἴδη εἰσὶ τέσσαρα [τοσαῦτα γὰρ καὶ τὰ μέρη ἐλέχθη], ἢ μὲν πεπλεγμένη, ἢ τὸ ὅλον ἐστίν περιπέτεια καὶ ἀναγνώρισις, ἢ δὲ παθητική, οἷον οἱ Αἴαντες καὶ οἱ Ἰξίονες, ἤ δὲ ἡθική, οἷον αἱ Φθιώτιδες καὶ ὁ Πηλεύς· τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ἡ ἁπλή, οἷον αἱ Ἀμφικτίτες καὶ ὁ Προμηθέας καὶ ὅσα ἐν ἄδου.

At first, a note is required about ἡ ἁπλὴ which is not a manuscript reading but an emendation by Conrad Bursian.\textsuperscript{35} Actually, the idea is some three centuries older: ἡ ἁπλὴ ἵσως ἢ ὰμαλὸν stands in the margin of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century Codex Riccardianus 16.\textsuperscript{36} ὰμαλὸν

\textsuperscript{33} This is presupposed by the following πᾶν. According to Else (1957, 249), “the rationale of the passage demands that it be the dramatic characters”. Else atheizes οὐκ ὀλίγοι αὐτῶν ὡς εἰπεῖν. Butcher, whom he claims to follow, prints <πάντες> [οὐκ ὀλίγοι αὐτῶν] ὡς εἰπεῖν.

\textsuperscript{34} Placing it after πᾶν, as Bywater tentatively suggests in the apparatus, would deprive it of its justifying force. Claas Lattmann (2015, 266–267) applies ως εἰπεῖν to κέχρηνται, the implication being that the poets use the elements of tragedy insufficiently: “Sie ‚nutzen‘ sie nur, insofern sie sich ausschließlich der ὄψις widmen, die ja qua Modus der Tragödie alles beinhaltet; eine intendierte und zielgerichtete Nutzung im eigentlichen Sinne erfolgt jedoch — anders, als es in Aristoteles’ Augen notwendig wäre — nicht. Der Einschub ως εἰπεῖν dient damit mehr oder weniger als Ironisignal — und spielt zum Zweck des argumentativen Effekts am Beginn des neuen Unterteils zugleich mit der inhaltlichen Paradoxe, die die Aussage im Kontext impliziert und die für die bisherige Forschung eben der Stein des Anstoßes war: Nicht wenige ‚nutzen‘ auch qualitativen Teilen, nutzen sie aber nicht.” This is inventive enough, but the parallels do not convince: ως εἰπεῖν would hardly suite to non-figurative expressions and customary words like χράομαι or give them a special connotation, while its use (in the sense of ‘generally speaking’) to qualify πάντες, οὐδέν, παμπολλοί (= οὐκ ὀλίγοι) and the like generalizing quantitative words is supported by dozens of passages. Hence Bursian (1859, 754) conjectured οὐκ ὀλίγοι ἀλλὰ πάντες, “so dass in ως εἰπεῖν eine Beschränkung des vorliegenden πάντες liegt, vgl. Pol. 1328b15; Plat. Alcib. 105c”. But suppose ως εἰπεῖν is to be taken prospectively. The skeptical overtone in Lattmann’s reading of it is hardly supported by the harmless enumeration, with no discernible stress on ως, presented in the next phrase.

\textsuperscript{35} Bursian 1859, 757; Tarán (2012, 280) wrongly ascribes it to Susemihl. Schrader suggested τερατωδες, which has gained much approval among the late 19th c. editors: Bywater 1909, 250.

\textsuperscript{36} Morel — if the notes to the 1555 Paris edition printed by him were by his hand — proposed to read ἄπλον (not ἄπλη, as in the reference by Pia Pattoni 2012, 159, n. 5), see [Anonymous] 1555, 83.
(sc. εἶδος) which brings forth the same concept has been inferred by several late mss., and accepted in the once famous edition of Charles Batteux. Originally it was meant as a correction of the inexplicable form ὁης that we find in A. ἁπλή correlates with the previously named πεπλεγμένη and participates among the 'species' of epics enumerated in ch. XXIV with explicit allusion to τραγῳδίας εἴδη, 1459b8–11: τὰ εἴδη ταύτα δὲ ἦσαν τὴν ἐποποιίαν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ, ὅ γὰρ ἁπλὴν ἢ πεπλεγμένην ἢ θυκίν ἢ παθητικήν. καὶ τὰ μέρη ἔξω μελοποιιάς καὶ ὄψεως ταύτα· (Note that εἴδη and μέρη are juxtaposed and ὄψεις listed among the latter.) Unmistakably, the fourth 'kind' of tragedy is meant to be ἁπλή. And yet, it turns to be out of place in view of the examples that follow. One might try to argue that Prometheus Bound (if this Aeschylean tragedy is meant) and the Satyr play The Daughters of Phorcys by the same author (F 261–262 Radt) lack peripety and recognition (cf. Poet. 1452a14–17: λέγω δὲ ἁπλῆν μὲν πρᾶξιν ἧς γιγνομένης... ἄνευ περιπετείας ἢ ἀναγνωρισμοῦ ἢ μετάβασις γίγνεται). But it is impossible to claim that all tragedies and, by implication, all Satyr plays the action of which takes place in the underworld are of the similar 'plain' composition.

Intriguingly enough, B coincides with A in presenting the unmeaning οης written in a very peculiar, unmatched, manner — OHC — as if the scribe suddenly decided to use uncials. Bywater appears to have found the solution: οης “is but one remove from ὄψις as it might be written in an uncial ms. (OHC = O+IC)”. Kassel disbelieves this printing οης under crosses in his usual agnostic manner. Tarán’s treatment of the text is, on the contrary, quite heavy-handed. οης cannot be straightforwardly replaced with ἁπλή, because there is one more passage in the Poetics where both A (blindly followed by a number of descendants as well as the Aldine) and B read οης for undoubtable ὄψις, 1458a5: μία γίγνεται ἄφοστέρων ὄψις (Empedocl. B 88 DK); Aristotle had in mind the contracted form (cf. a4–5: ἀρημμένον δὲ οἷον τὸ κρί τοῦ δῶ, and Strab. 8.5.3, cited by Diels: ἐμπεδοκλεῖ δὲ “μία γίγνεται ἄφοστέρων ὄψις”, ἢ ὄψις, in the next following passage by Antimachus ὄψις is contracted in the same way), but a copyist unthinkingly inscribed a commonly known word. The parallel, also noted by Bywater, speaks strongly in favour of his conjecture: ω most certainly had τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ὄψις, ὄψις appears to have been written twice in a similar confusing manner — a trait of personal ductus. Coincidentally, τὸ δὲ τέταρτον OHC was carefully transcribed to finally survive in B. And certainly, Prometheus, Phorcides and “all those that take place in the underworld” should more suitably be called impressive in spectacle than simple in composition.

---

37 See Batteux 1771, 150, with n. 3. He refers to the same reading in Cod. Par. gr. 2117. Cf. c. XV, 1454a26: τέταρτον ὃ [sc. ἡθο] τὸ ὁμαλὸν. ὁμαλὸν first occurs as a marginal note in Estensis α. T. 8. 3 (= Puntoni 100), where it might have been inserted by Giorgio Valla who owed the codex (Lobel 1933, 3). In his 1498 Latin translation Valla renders the locus quarta porro aequabilis. John Rhosus who wrote Laurentianus plut. 31. 14. conjectured οἰκεῖον, and the same reading intruded into Par. Coislinanus 324 which also has ὁμαλὸν in the margin. Among numerous emendations listed by Pia Pattoni (159, n. 12; 184–185) some are worse than others: [τὸ δὲ τέταρτον] <ἡ δὲ επεισοδιώ>δης Else; τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ὃ ἡθο <ὕχις μύθος καὶ επεισοδιώδης> Post; ὄψις ἢς idem; πτόησις Georgoulis; διάνοια inter alios Schmitt.

38 Cf. Pia Pattoni 2012, 160: “non risulta del tutto perspicuo perché i drammi ambientati nell’Ade (ὁσα ἐν ἀδε) dovrebbero esseretout court ἁπλὰ.”

39 Bywater 1909, 250.

40 Cf. Pia Pattoni 2012, 161–162. Like many before her (Rostagni, Valgimigli, Janko, Dupont-Roc/Lallot et al.), Pia Pattoni stands for the authenticity of ὄψις. But note that ὄψις and ἁπλὴ cannot replace each other: the Iliad which is plain in action is less spectacular than the Odyssey which is complex.
This can only mean that 1456a2–3, τὸ δὲ τέταρτον... ἄδου, is not Aristotelian, composed most likely to fill in a break in the given text. The majuscule insertion should be dated at the latest to ca. mid-8th century, 41 but it could have been of much earlier origin, since the author has no difficulty in telling which ancient plays are eye-catching enough to represent ὄψις. It is composed in a careless style already familiar to us. Ἀφρίκας is the only Satyr play mentioned in the extant text of the Poetics, 42 and it is recalled to exemplify the species of tragedy. ὄψις markedly differs from the other three ‘kinds’, not least because of its syntactical inconsistency, so we ought to ask how the interpolator came to the idea to supply it. The answer is partly provided by another striking insertion of the same origin. τοσαῦτα γὰρ καὶ τὰ μέρη ἐλέχθη would seem perfectly absurd, 43 unless we remember that with all his negligence as to the appropriateness of the utterances, intended to be explanatory, the interpolator is painstakingly scrupulous about the terminological coherence. He does not bother himself with the actual number of μέρη, but considers it important to remind that the newly introduced concept of ‘kinds’ strictly corresponds to the preceding notion of ‘parts’. His point, clearly indicated by γὰρ, is to link εἴδη and μέρη together into a kind of terminological unity. This allows him to further add one of the ‘parts’, to the insufficient list of the ‘kinds’. So, he simply transfers ὄψις from the catalogue in ch. VI without even trying to better adjust it to the new setting.

The interpolation method we attempt to observe can be called retrospective: insertions never build on what follows which suggests that they were made in the very process of copying. εἴδεσιν in ch. VI, 1450a12 turns to be very helpful for making of ὄψις a ‘kind’. But it could not have appeared in ch. VI in support of what is asserted in ch. XVIII. Like all other additions, it should have been founded on what precedes. That would cause us to suppose that the interpolator based on χωρὶς τοῖς εἴδεσι (1449b30). As seen above, Aristotle describes verse and music as ‘kinds’, or means, of speech embellishment. Using εἴδη to recapitulate the constitutive elements of tragedy would imply a shift of meaning. The effort it would require is quite needless in view of the possibility to employ the obviously appropriate μέρη. But εἴδη supplied as an alternative to μέρη in 1450a8, πάσης τῆς τραγῳδίας μέρη εἶναι ἕξ, that is in but one sentence before the puzzling τούτοις… κέχρηναι τοῖς εἴδεσι, appears to be witnessed in the Syriac translation. The Aristotelian text is incorporated by Bar Shakko in a leapfrog manner: he starts with the definition of tragedy (from 1449b24 onwards), interrupts the citation at πράττοντες ποιοῦνται τὴν μίμησιν (1449b31) to include alternative definition from another source, 44 and takes it up again at πάσης τῆς τραγῳδίας. What he quotes here is literally to be rendered as follows: “so, the kinds, that is the parts, of tragedy are six in number”. ‘Kinds’ and ‘parts’ are linked together by the exegetical particle usually introducing a gloss-like explanation (ܐܘܟܝܬ). Letting out καθ’ ὃ ποιά τις ἐστίν ἡ τραγῳδία which Bar Shakko’s source probably has found...
unessential the citation proceeds then up to μελοποιία (1450a10) and is again interrupted by summarizing remark: “these are the six kinds of tragedy that we find according to Aristotle’s view”. After that the compiler jumps back to the section corresponding to εξ ἀνάγκης ἂν εἴη τι μόριον τραγῳδίας (1449b32, the translation ignores μόριον!) and cites the text up to πάσης τῆς τραγῳδίας μέρη εἶναι εξ̄ which is this time translated without interpretative additions but with an allusion on what precedes: “Therefore it is necessary that every tragedy should have six parts — those which we have mentioned above”. Since the ‘kinds’ are ‘mentioned above’ twice in the same context, it can be claimed that εἴδη, if not εἴδη ἢ or εἴδη ἢτοι was inscribed supra lineam before μέρη in the archetype: its maker might have recalled the word from previous paragraphs and jumped to the occasion to employ the ‘Aristotelian’ term. Most copyists ignored his note, not least because of its inappropriateness, but it intruded in the text on which the Syriac translation was based.45

We cannot be sure, of course, that ‘kinds’ is not an invention of an intermediary Syriac source. But even if it was never present in any Greek ms., its reflections in Bar Shakko’s text strengthen the probability that, having misapprehended χωρὶς τοῖς εἴδεσι (sc. τῶν ἡδυσμάτων), the interpolator regarded εἴδη as a near synonym of μέρη. He might even have thought it a better suited term, and, with typical pedantry, considered it important to supply a side remark in which it would replace μέρη to denote the constituents of tragedy. That provides an explanation why τούτων μὲν οὖν οὐκ ὀλίγοι αὐτῶν ἡ εἰπέν κέχρηνται τοῖς εἴδεσιν (note the emphasis on the last word) followed by the repetitive list (καὶ γὰρ ὤνις eqs.) came into being. What remains of chapter VI is a prolonged argument in favour of the priority of μῦθος (1450a15–b4), the hierarchy of remaining components appended. Hence, for an insertion aimed at stressing εἴδη no better place could have been found.

Curiously enough, the extant witnesses allow to reconstruct the same interlinear gloss in ω not far after τοσαῦτα γὰρ καὶ τὰ μέρη ἐλέχθη, at the very beginning of ch. XIX, 1456a33–34. In these lines the paradosis divides between περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων εἴρηται, λοιπὸν δὲ περὶ λέξεως καὶ διανοίας εἰπεῖν (B, Σ) and περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων ἴδη

---

45 In reflecting the Greek Syr. displays gaps and errors where Ar. appears faultless. The new collation of Syr. carried out by Arzhanov for Thesaurus criticus (see n. 1) has revealed that in reflecting the Greek Ar. and Syr. have common mistakes to which, however, only Syr. adds its own. These are: 1449b29: ἔχοντα ρυθμὸν] ἔχοντα μέγεθον Syr.; 1449b32: μόριον τραγῳδίας] μόριον om. Syr.; 1449b36 ἐπεὶ δὲ πράξεως] δὲ om. Syr.; 1449b50–2–3 καὶ τυγχάνουσι] γὰρ τυγχάνουσι Syr.; 1450a4 λέγω γὰρ μοῦ οὔτον τούτον] τούτον om. Syr.; 1450a6–7 ἐν ὅσοις ἀποδεικνύεται καὶ ἀποφαίνονται Syr.] ἐν ὅσοις ἀποδεικνύει καὶ ἀποφαίνεται Syr.; 1450a7–8 κατὰ τούτον] ἀνάγκη οὔν] ἀνάγκη δὲ Syr. This is quite enough for one Bekker’s page. The divergences are small, but distinct. Gutas (2012, 101–102) claims that Ar. stems from the revised version of Syr. But it remains obscure who would carry out such a revision (it could hardly have been Ishāq b. Hunayn), and why would he do that kind of editorial work instead of simply translating the text anew. In trying to frame this into his revision scenario Gutas (109) is forced to admit the existence of Greek ms. other than Σ: “Syriac translation itself was revised… on the basis of other, unknown, material, which conceivably could have included another Greek ms. (Ψ)”. The latter probably “belonged to the apographs of the hyparchetype manuscript of the Syro-Arabic tradition” (103). Our conclusion would be that the Greek ms. used for the Syriac translation was copied from the ms. used for the Arabic one. Abu-Bishr had the Syriac text before his eyes. That is confirmed, apart from the common interpretations, by Ibn al Nadim’s statement in Kitāb al Fihrist. In stating that Mattā was translating from the Syriac Nadim uses the word tafsīr (lit. ‘interpretation’): this can be a synonym to naql (‘translation’), but also could mean specifically interpretative translation. Mattā is explicitly called ‘Greek’ (which can, of course, mean ‘Christian’) and could hardly have escaped knowing some Greek, living and teaching in a Syriac monastery (Deir Qunna). We cannot be sure that all his Arabic translations listed in Fihrist were from Syriac only: these works are not attested. But his manner of translating allows to suggest that he was compiling from the Greek and the Syriac. He consulted the latter source for interpretations, probably because it was glossed.
εἰρηται eqs. (A, Φ, rec.). Modern editors prefer εἰδῶν, but, first, εἰδῶν could hardly have turned into ἣδη; the words are not similar either by appearance or by spelling (even considering the itacism; besides, the Byzantine scribes were trained to be very sensitive about accents). Secondly, only some few lines above the term was given quite another meaning. However, ἣδη appears too sophisticated for a scribe's conjecture, and if we admit that a learned copyist remembered the text of ch. VI, τούτοις... κέχρηνται τοῖς εἴδεσιν, he would have considered εἰδῶν acceptable like the current scholarship do. Still, to decide for ἣδη is clearly not a better solution. The adverb is superfluous, and ἣδη εἰρηται has no parallels in the Aristotelian Corpus (ὥσπερ εἰρηται ἣδη, Met. 1053a24, is hardly a suitable one). So, we are left to suggest that εἰδῶν and ἣδη originate from a common source that allowed both readings. This must have been εἰδη originally inscribed over the text between τῶν ἄλλων and εἰρηται (cf. GA 715a7–8: περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων εἰρηται, and Pol. 1301a19: περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων ἄν προειλόμεθα σχεδὸν εἰρηται), perhaps in the contracted form ΕΙΔ—since A actually has ἣδ᾽. The ancestors of B and Σ interpreted that as a genitive, whereas those of A and Φ decided for an adverb in a mistaken itacistic spelling. It is also thinkable that the maker of ω implanted εἰδ(η) into the text before εἰρηται (cf. the ungrammatical ὄψις in ὄψις ἔχει πάν,1450a13), or even substituted it for the original μερῶν, or μορίων (cf. Phys. 199b28: περὶ τῶν ἄλλων μερῶν; GA 715a1: περὶ τῶν ἄλλων μορίων εἰρηται; HA509a21: περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων μορίων τῶν ἐντός εἰρηται, while τῶν ἄλλων εἰδῶν occurs nowhere else in the Corpus). The above-described treatment of the source text is surely very frivolous, and even if the athetes of τούτοις... ὡσαύτως (ch. VI. 1450a12–15) and τὸ δὲ τέταρτον... ἣδου (ch. XVIII.1456a2–3) would prove irrefutable, strong doubt persists that the insertions were meant as embellishments of a text to be widely read. The last related passage we are going to examine might bring more clarity to this issue. The following phrase marks the beginning of what in most editions is printed as ch. XII of the Poetics, 1452b14–16:

μέρη δὲ τραγῳδίας οἷς μὲν ως εἴδεσι δεῖ χρῆσθαι πρότερον εἴπομεν, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ποσὸν καὶ εἰς ἃ διαιρεῖται κεχωρισμένα τάδε ἐστίν·

Hereafter definitions of πρόλογος, ἐπεισόδιον, ἔξοδος, πάροδος, στάσιμον and κομμός are given, and the chapter is concluded by almost verbatim repetition of the passage (1452b25–27) in which, however, ως εἴδεσι is skipped. It is absent in all extant branches of transmission and thus was most probably omitted in ω, though without it δεῖ turns to be pointless: it is fairly absurd to require from tragedy the use of its constitutive elements such as plot or characters. To be sure, ως εἴδεσι is essential: it is this syntagma that renders the phrase comprehensible — if, of course, we read it as interpolation effected by the same person whose techniques we have surveyed above. Provided our assumptions are true, his intention here is the same that he demonstrates later, in ch. XVIII: “parts that are to be used as (= identical with) kinds” is another clumsy attempt to reconcile the authentic μέρη with the interpolated εἰδη which to his mind was a more appropriate term to convey abstract meaning. Thus, ως εἴδεσι is indispensable in the first transition clause. But are we to follow those who restore it in the second, as Kassel and Tarán actually do?

46 Cf. above, n. 31.
47 For Lattmann (2015, 260) περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων εἰδῶν εἰρηται is the main reason for retaining εἴδεσιν in 1450a13. He does not discuss the alternative reading.
This is a more complex question than it might seem. The suspicion that the segment containing definitions of the structural components of tragedy is out of place in the Aristotelian Poetics is as old as the post-humanist age: Heinsius tried to relocate ch. XII, it was proscribed by several 19th century scholars and then by Else, who retains only the first clause arguing that εἴδεσι δὲ χρῆσθαι alludes to 1450a13, κέχρηνται τοῖς εἴδεσιν, the words he deems authentic. In supposing this he fails to recognise the difference between μέρη and εἴδη, and makes no effort to explain the point of ώς εἴδεσι. He believes that μέρη δὲ τραγῳδίας… εἴπομεν concludes ch. XI and thus has to be joined together immediately with the beginning of ch. XIII. That makes his arguments for athetesis insufficient. The syntactical linking to πρότερον εἴπομεν believed to be Aristotelian is hampered by ἐφεξῆς ἂν ἐιλεκτέον τοῖς νῦν εἰρημένοις (1452b30). Ch. XII is, of course, spurious, but, contrary to Else, not on the grounds that it breaks the connection between chapters XI and XIII. Ch. XIII introduces new subjects: ὃν δὲ δὲ στοχάζεσθαι καὶ ἡ δὲ εὐλαβεῖσθαι καὶ πόθεν ἔσται τὸ τῆς τραγῳδίας ἔργον (1452b28–30). The section on πρόλογος, ἐπεισόδιον etc. is incorporated right at the watershed where the descriptive part of the Poetics ends and the prescriptive begins. This is just the proper place to include a few paragraphs on a special topic. Consequently, the dismissal of ch. XII should comprise its first colon not excluding πρότερον εἴπομεν, while a deliberate allusion on κέχρηνται τοῖς εἴδεσιν in ch. VI supports its athetesis.

What is offered in ch. XII is indeed a “purely mechanical division based on no principle and carried out in a crudest possible manner”. But it is not primarily because of this that the section should be excised. More important is the fact that whatever the target audience of the Poetics might have been, it is for his contemporaries that Aristotle was writing. It would be ridiculous to explain them that a prologue is “that part of tragedy which precedes the entrance of the chorus”, or that stasimon is a choral song “without anapests and trochees”. On the contrary, a late ancient or early mediaeval professor would certainly try to explain it to his students. A modern lecturer on ancient tragedy would likewise think that without defining its formal divisions his lectures would be incomplete.

Now, the author of ch. XII writes in the first person pointing at the authorship of what precedes (cf. 1449b34–36: λέγω δὲ λέξιν μὲν αὐτὴν τὴν τῶν μέτρων σύνθεσιν, and 1450b13: ὥσπερ πρότερον εἴρηται). And yet even such a telling detail is not enough to blame him for falsification. Note that the segment is incorporated in a plainly visible manner: its end is marked by a near replica of the transition phrase. This is hardly a proper way to conceal a forgery. His interpolations reveal no desire to defraud a reader; he never disguises himself as an ancient thinker like, for instance, the author of a preface to Theophrastus’ Characters does. Rather, he was copying the Poetics for his own use, conceivably, with an educational purpose. This would explain the casualness of οὐκ ὀλίγοι αὐτῶν (1450a12) and ἔχει πάν (Ibid.), the syntactical inaccuracy of δῆς [?] (1450a13), εἰδη [?] (1456a33), διάνοια and ἠθος (1450a2, to be compared with likewise scholarly superfluous ἔλεος μὲν περὶ τὸν ἀνάξιον, φόβος δὲ περὶ τὸν ὅμοιον, 1453a5–6) and τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ὄψις

---

48 Heinsius 1611, 15. He placed it between chapter VI and VII.
49 The proponents of athetesis as well as of attribution are listed in Else 1957, 360, n. 1.
50 Hence Montmollin (1951, 58–59; 125–129), who argues for the authenticity of ch. XII, proposes to change τοῖς εἴδεσιν in ώς εἴδεσιν in 1450a13.
(1456a2), the salient inconsistency of τοσαῦτα γὰρ καὶ τὰ μέρη ἐλέξθη (1455b32–33; in making passing remarks he has no need to remember the exact number!), as well as the 'equalizing' tendency displayed in καὶ μέλος (1449b29), in the definition of poetic speech as 'the composing of verses', further on, in τῶν μὲν λόγων ἡ λέξις (1450b12–13), in placing ὄψις among the 'kinds' of tragedy, and perhaps most of all, in switching from μέρη to εἴδη to denote one and the same thing. The didactic background becomes palpable in the forced account of music as something ὃ τὴν δύναμιν φανερὰν ἔχει πᾶσαν (1449b35–36). All this creates a general impression of a school copy never intended for use outside the class-room. But if that is true, the maker of ω had no need to repeat ὡς εἴδες in the closing sentence of ch. XII: μέρη δὲ τραγῳδίας οἷς μὲν δεῖ χρῆσθαι would more than suffice to point back to his own conjecture. Thus, the decision to restore it appears preposterous.

What school it could be is not our present concern, but in contrast to the Eastern translators its master was entirely aware of what the Poetics is all about, and was too well-read in the Greek drama even for a Middle Byzantine scholar.52 He wrote in uncials,53 inserting most of his supplements directly in the core text or between the lines, the technique presupposing the use of a papyrus roll rather than a parchment codex. His enthusiasm naturally decreases, as he works through the text, and in the last chapters his presence is much less explicit, the conjectures almost lacking. Some of his notes might have been dismissed by the copyists, others reproduced in the mss. now lost. The recent research confirmed by the fresh collation of Syriac and Arabic translations has shown that the earliest reachable branch of transmission, that is the Eastern, is more ramified than previously thought, its archetype (if they stem from any) probably dating back to antiquity. The interpolations which we have attempted to trace could well have originated some half-millennium before the making of A, in the late Neoplatonic period (4th–6th c.), when Aristotle was read and commented on by many teachers in West and East. As noted by several scholars of the Poetics, the most prominent of them, and whose work on the text of the Poetics is somehow witnessed, was Themistius.54

However, to penetrate thus far is barely possible even for the eye of the keenest textual critic, and so this study has to conclude with uncertainties. We have focused on the phenomenon once called by Wilamowitz interpolationum familia.55 But, in fact, we cannot

---

52 One more interpolation coming from an interlinear gloss reveals literary knowledge. It is to be found in, 1454b13–14: παράδειγμα σκληρότητος οἶον τὸν Ἀχιλλέα Ἀγάθων καὶ Ὄμηρος. παράδειγμα σκληρότητος was secluded by Ritter whom Tarán follows. The ms. text can not be cured in a way proposed by Lobel (1929, 78): οἶον τὸν Ἀχιλλέα ἀγαθὸν (lectio facilior of B, see: Pozdnev 2015, 196–198) καὶ παράδειγμα σκληρότητος Ὅμηρος. N. A. Almazova (2019, 306) supposes, not without reason, that 1455a4–6, ἐν Χορφόροις ὅτι ὅμως τις ἐλήλυθεν κτλ, was inserted by someone who "added a famous example of discovery, which suited his own conception, but not that of the Stagirite." 1461a17–20: ἀμα δὲ φησιν "ἡ τοῦ ἄγος πέδιον τῷ Τρισκεν Αθρήσειν..." κατὰ μεταφοράν ἐρσεται is much the same case.

53 Cf. Gutas 2012, 108: "Σ was in uncials, representing a stage in the transmission parallel to the hyparchetype from which the extant Greek manuscripts and exemplar of the Latin translation derive." If this is so, there remains no doubt that the common source of Σ and other ms. was also in uncials.

54 He taught at Constantinople in the mid-4th c., and as a 'senator' had access to the emperor's library. His glosses in Aristotle's corpus are many. His paraphrase of the Poetics is mentioned in Ibn al-Nadīm's Kitāb al Fihrist. See Busch 2008, XXV, with references. And it seems that numbers were not his strong suit, cf. Or. 36 (Ὑπὲρ τοῦ λέγειν ἡ πῶς τῆς φιλοσοφίας λεκτένεν), 316d: καὶ ὅ προσέχομεν Ἀριστοτέλει ὅτι τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὁ χορὸς εἰσὶν ἡδὲν εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς, Θεσίας δὲ πρὸςλόγον τε καὶ ῥήσιν ἔξερεν, Αἰσχύλου δὲ τρίτον [!] ὑποκριτήν καὶ ὄκριθαντας, τὰ δὲ πλείω τούτων Σοφοκλέους ἀπήλαυσαμεν καὶ Ἑυριπίδου;

55 Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1875, 205. The characteristics he gives concerning a group of verse interpolations starting with ἦ in Euripides and Sophocles, for all their morandancy, fit well with the above examined
be sure that these interpolations have originated from one source. They might have been made by several ancient and mediaeval scholars who used the text for teaching purposes. Nor there is any means to clarify if ω was not a copy of this source, or a copy of this copy. They might have been made by several ancient and mediaeval scholars who used the text for teaching purposes. Nor there is any means to clarify if ω was not a copy of this source, or a copy of this copy.

There is a certain, relatively small, number of indicative gaps and mistakes, as well as interpolations, in the transmitted text of the *Poetics* that do not fall into the mentioned category and thus have found no place in the present discussion (with the only exception of οὗ, 1449b37, altered in τούτοις just to render the passage readable). Any of these faults could have been committed by a person whose supplements we have studied. But they could equally well have been inherited by him from his source or added by the maker of a further copy which should then be thought of as ω. The common ancestor we look for proves to be extremely elusive.
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56 Apart from those examined above (1450b12, τῶν μὲν λόγων, 1452b25, <ως εἴδεις> which is, as said, doubtful, and 1454b14: παράδειγμα σκληρότητος, see n. 53), Tarán (2012, 148–149) lists nine cases, most of them (*) controversial: (1) 1449b9, μέχρι μόνον μέτρου: the luckiest attempt to correct it is Tyrwhitt's μέχρι μὲν τοῦ μέτρου; (2') 1450a29, λέξεις καὶ διανοίας: Vahlen conjectured λέξει καὶ διανοίᾳ, and many would like it, but in fact the ms. reading is tenable, if not that elegant; (3') 1452a3, καὶ μᾶλλον: the athetesis is questionable; in fact, if we let out καὶ after γίνεται (as in B) and read ταῦτα δὲ γίνεται μάλιστα, καὶ μᾶλλον οὖν γένηται κτλ. the transmitted text appears coherent; (4) 1454a18-19: προαιρέσιν τινα ἢ; here Φ probably had τίς ἢ or τις ἢ because Moerbecke translates electionem quae sit, but this could have been a scribe's conjecture; Vahlen's προαιρέσιν τινα ἢ; was accepted by both Kassel and Tarán, while Bywater and others simply deleted ἢ; in any case the corruption was present in the source text; (5') 1456b8, φαίνοιτο ἡδέα is not that dubious as it is thought of; cf. *Rhet.* 1369b16; 19; *EN* 1176a20; *EE* 1231a1; *Probl.* 928b19; 23, while Vahlen's ὣς δέοι meant as a usual expression, almost a colloquialism, is in fact a hapax; (6) 1457b33, where, as noted by Maggi, the explanation of κόσμος is missing: the lacuna is evident, and it cannot be established at what stage of transmission it appeared; it could well have been before the time of ω; (7') 1458a28–29, κατὰ δὲ τὴν μεταφοράν: the ms. reading is in no way worse than μεταφορῶν conjectured by Bywater; actually, it should be τῶν μεταφορῶν (sc. σύνθεσιν), but this is too smooth to have been altered; (8) 1460a13, ἀνάλογον: this is a corruption of ἀλόγον, as noticed by Vettori. (9') 1461a16, ἄλλοι: the case is rather complicated to be explicated here with due care; to cut it short, ἄλλοι i.e. the correct rendering of Homeric passage should not be emended into πάντες with Gräfenhan; the ‘metaphor’ refers to παννύχιοι (see also n. 53). Hence at least three archetypal mistakes. To these six more might be added: (1) 1447b29, ἐν οἷς: after Vettori ἐν οἷς is accepted almost unanimously; though the corruption is trivial it is likely to go back to ω; (2) 1448a21: ὡς ἐν αἷς ἐπηγγέλλοντα ἢ ἐτέρον τι γιγνόμενον, where we should restore ὡς ἐν αἷς ἐπηγγέλλοντα ὡς ἐτέρον τι γιγνόμενον, since in Aristotle ὡς ἐν αἷς is always followed by ὡς δὲ; it was first suggested by Sahl, rejected by Kassel, and quite reasonably accepted by Tarán; (3) 1448a35, οὗτος: Spengel's emendation αὐτοί suggests itself; (4) 1449b25 ἐκάστος: Pazzi's ἐκάστος was briefly discussed above; (5) 1453a37, ἄν οἳ ἔγινατοι: Bonitz was doubtlessly right in conjecturing νῦν ἀν ἐγίνατοι; (6) 1457a35–b1, οἷον τὰ πολλὰ τῶν Μασσαλίωτῶν, ἔριμοκαϊκοῦνθος: the transmitted text is unsatisfactory: either it is lacunar, or the last word originates from a gloss.