



UDC 821.14

## An Interpolation Family in the *Poetics*\*

Michael M. Pozdnev

St. Petersburg State University,

7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation; m.pozdnev@spbu.ru

**For citation:** Pozdnev M. M. An Interpolation Family in the *Poetics*. *Philologia Classica* 2020, 15 (2), 173–190. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu20.2020.201>

The ms. tradition of the *Poetics* is a mine, quite unexpectedly, when it comes to composition on literary matters: four independent witnesses — Parisinus 1741 (A), Riccardianus 46 (B), and mediaeval translations into Latin by William of Moerbeke and Arabic by Abū-Bishr Mat-tā made with the help of a Syriac interlinear (not to mention the *recentiores* which still could prove of some stemmatic value, as for instance Par. gr. 2038, Vat. gr. 1400, Berol. Philipp. and Mon. 493) — allow in most cases for a safe reconstruction of an archetype. Common errors suggest that this text differed from the autograph in some twenty passages, largely interpolations, ranging from a couple of words to a number of phrases. Several intrusions prove to be typologically close. All of them correct what was deemed to be inaccurate or loose argumentation by inserting syntactic complements or references adding cohesion. As a result, both the style and context go largely neglected. The first paragraphs of ch. 6, central to the *Poetics*, suffered most. This text also came down to us in a Syriac translation having a heavily glossed uncial ms. as its source. Insertions in ch. 6 cause ‘harmonising’ additions to the following text of the treatise. The ‘family of interpolations’ under discussion is tentatively attributed to a professor of Aristotelianism of late antiquity (the most suitable candidate seems to be Themistius): a school-room copy diffused by his pupils became the common ancestor of both the extant Greek mss. of the *Poetics* and the reconstructed Greek sources of the mediaeval translations. A fresh collation of the Syriac text together with the evidence of *variae lectiones* in the oldest independent Greek mss. offer a glimpse into the workings of his mind.

*Keywords:* Aristotle’s *Poetics*, manuscript evidence, mediaeval translations, textual criticism.

---

\* The work summarized in this paper is part of the project “*Thesaurus criticus* to Aristotle’s *Poetics*” supported by the Russian Science Foundation (Project Nr. 18-18-0060). I am deeply indebted to Yury N. Arzhanov for all information concerning the Syriac translation, and to Michael N. Suvorov for his indispensable help in collating the Arabic one. I also want to thank Tatiana Kostyleva for valuable suggestions regarding both form and matter of what follows.

It is but common knowledge that the Aristotelian *Poetics* reached a wide intellectual public with the 16<sup>th</sup> century translations and voluminous exegetic commentaries of which the outgoing Cinquecento already saw no less than six.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> previous to the 1508 Aldine *editio princeps*.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> Apart from some deeply contaminated *recentiores* that might still prove disputable as regards their provenance,<sup>5</sup> 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 10<sup>th</sup> and the 12<sup>th</sup> centuries respectively, a Latin translation by William of Moerbeke made in 1278 from the ms. independent from either of these (Φ)<sup>6</sup> and an Arabic translation by Abū-Bishr Mattā b. Yūnus created about the beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> c. (Ar) which, again, derives ultimately from a sovereign Greek source (Σ).<sup>7</sup> To this comes a short fragment of the Syriac translation, cited by Jakob bar Shakkō (†1241) in his *Book of the dialogues* (Syr). The Syriac version is

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> A total of 39 late ms. dating from ca. mid-15<sup>th</sup> to the beginning of 19<sup>th</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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 Phillipicus 1599 (196), but differs from the Ambrosianus.

<sup>4</sup> 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).

<sup>5</sup> 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. Phillipicus 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.

<sup>6</sup> Moerbeke’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.

<sup>7</sup> The ms. is the celebrated Parisinus ar. 2346 (Ancien fonds Arabe 882 a) of the 11<sup>th</sup> 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*’.

supposed to have been the basis for the Arabic and thus the earliest surviving document of the tradition.<sup>8</sup>

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 Tyrannion's edition of Aristotle's and Theophrast's writings reported by Strabo<sup>10</sup>) and the mid-9<sup>th</sup> c. AD (the latest possible date of the Greek ms. used by the Syriac translator<sup>11</sup>) 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 *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:<sup>12</sup> any scholar or copyist, ancient or mediaeval, could supply

---

<sup>8</sup> As follows from the analysis by Gutas (2012, 108–109), partly confirmed by the collation carried out anew for *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.

<sup>9</sup>  $\Omega$  in Tarán's sigla, though the majuscule, perhaps, is more appropriate for the text written or dictated by Aristotle himself.

<sup>10</sup> 13.1.54. The editions produced by βιβλιοπῶλαι 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. *Sulla* 26; Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 24; for the discussion see Hatzimichali 2013, 15–23. That a copy of the *Poetics* in Andronican recension has survived to become an ancestor of A, Φ, B 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  $\omega$ .

<sup>11</sup> At present there is no certainty as to the *terminus ante quem* of Syr. and, respectively, of Σ. 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 9<sup>th</sup> c. In a tentative 'scenario' Gutas considers the late 8<sup>th</sup> c. as the approximate date of the Syriac translation. By that time the copies of Greek ms. containing the *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 *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 (*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. 1<sup>st</sup>–7<sup>th</sup> c. which is an extended period indeed.

<sup>12</sup> The interest in enigmatic catharsis-formula is manifest already in neoplatonic scholarship (Iamb. *bl. Myst.* 1, 11; Procl. *In Plat. Rem publ.* 1, 42, 10–16; Olymp. *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 ἐλεινῶν (1452b32–33 ταύτην φοβερῶν καὶ ἐλεινῶν εἶναι μιμητικῆν) included in the Arabic text (Tkatsch 1928, 246).

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. Having defined tragedy in a rather peculiar way, Aristotle then takes some care to clarify what is meant by ἡδυσμένῳ λόγῳ χωρὶς ἐκάστῳ 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 ἐκάστου, and the Eastern translations perceive χωρὶς as a preposition, the implication being that Σ could have had ἐκάστου as well. The mistake<sup>13</sup> caused by irregularity of expression is little informative for the filiation, especially as Φ seems to have escaped it: Moerbecke translates χωρὶς by *seorsum*, not by *sine*.<sup>14</sup> Equally confusing is the final syntagma. While μόρια (viz. τῆς τραγωδίας) might be readily understood as ‘smaller parts’, or sections, of tragedy like prologue or stasimon, εἶδη is vague enough to encompass any meaning, either technical or not. Aristotle explains that ‘sweetened’ signifies metrical and musical forms of speech: λέγῳ δὲ ἡδυσμένον μὲν λόγον τὸν ἔχοντα ῥυθμὸν 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 (ἁρμονία μὲν καὶ ῥυθμῷ χρώμεναι μόνον ἢ τε αὐλητικὴ καὶ ἡ κιθαρῳδική) and 1448b20–21 (κατὰ φύσιν δὲ ὄντος ἡμῖν τοῦ μιμεῖσθαι καὶ τῆς ἁρμονίας καὶ τοῦ ῥυθμοῦ); cf. *Pol.* 1340b17; 1341b19; *Rhet.* 1403b17. But μέλος cannot be attached to ῥυθμὸς καὶ 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 καὶ μέλος, Gallavotti and Tarán wrongly let it stay.<sup>15</sup> The interpolation common to all witnesses could not have been made independently by A, B, Φ and Σ. Supposedly, 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 ῥυθμῶν ἐστι φανερόν), can effortlessly make its work without the aid of harmony (cf. 1447a26–27: αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ

<sup>13</sup> 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 reproduces the vulgate reading.

<sup>14</sup> Moerbecke’s translation is very different from that of Mattā. The latter interprets almost every pattern 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.

<sup>15</sup> 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 ῥυθμὸς 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 χωρίς ἀρμονίας ἢ 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 χωρίς τοῖς εἶδεσι τὸ διὰ μέτρων ἔνια μόνον περαίνεσθαι καὶ πάλιν ἕτερα διὰ μέλους (1449b29–31, here the instrumental dative is reproduced by A, B and Φ thus justifying ἐκάστῳ in the preceding colon, whereas Syr. and Ar. render the text, again, as if it had χωρίς τῶν εἰδῶν). ‘Metres’ are substituted for ‘rhythm’, and thus one could infer (as Bywater actually did<sup>16</sup>) that ‘song’ is synonymous with ‘harmony’. Yet, μέλος comprises both harmony and rhythm. Choral parts and monodies are, of course, metrical. Aware of this difference the interpolator pedantically added καὶ μέλος to supposedly insufficient ῥυθμὸν καὶ ἀρμονίαν.<sup>17</sup> 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 ἔνια and ἕτερα) 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,<sup>18</sup> but one of the constituents, or properties, of rhythm (others being, for instance, tempo and intensity). Neither do εἶδη bear any specific connotation. Aristotle avoids saying anything like “there are two kinds of speech embellishments”; he does not itemize εἶδη τῶν ἡδυσμάτων in a way he enumerates and specifies τραγωδίας εἶδη in chapter XVIII, 1455b32–56a3. Still, εἶδη 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: οὐς ἀνάγκη ποιούς τινας εἶναι, 49b38–50a1: τὰς πράξεις εἶναι φαμεν ποιὰς τινας, 50a6–7: καθ’ ὃ ποιούς τινας εἶναι φαμεν τοὺς πράττοντας, and then again, 50a8–9: καθ’ ὃ ποιὰ τις ἐστὶν ἢ τραγωδία), 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: ἐπεὶ δὲ πράττοντες ποιοῦνται τὴν μίμησιν, πρῶτον μὲν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἂν εἴη τι μόριον τραγωδίας ὃ τῆς ὄψεως κόσμος (1449b32–33).<sup>19</sup> The iteration

<sup>16</sup> Bywater 1909, 161: “The καὶ is explanatory, μέλος being added as a synonym to explain ἀρμονία”. In retaining καὶ μέλος Bywater is misled by the doubtful parallels he had found for μέλος καὶ μέτρα (*Probl.* 920a12: πολλαπλάσια... τὰ μέλη ἐν ταῖς τραγωδίαις 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 ἀρμονία with μέλος: song is rhythm enriched by harmony. Ἀρμονία is used by Aristotle in numerous difficult contexts without any explanation; ἀρμονία καὶ ῥυθμός (“les élément mélodique et rythmique”, as Dupont-Roc and Lallot elegantly put it) is utterly self-sufficient.

<sup>17</sup> In the similar way καὶ μέτρον is inferred in ch. I, 1447b25: οἷον 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: ἢ τε τῶν διθυραμβικῶν ποιήσεις καὶ ἢ τῶν νόμων καὶ ἢ τε τραγωδία καὶ ἢ κωμῳδία. After *nomos* which can be pure music Aristotle mentions the dramatic genres, and thus needs a specific element of rhythm applicable to them.

<sup>18</sup> 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’ (τμητὰ) and thus should not be used in oration (*Rhet.* 1408b29, Bywater’s conjecture τμήματα is misleading; cf. the commentary by Lucas 1972, 74).

<sup>19</sup> 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 ὁ τὴν δύναμιν φανεράν ἔχει πᾶσαν (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”<sup>20</sup> 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 δέ, ὡσπερ πρότερον εἴρηται, λέξιν εἶναι τὴν διὰ τῆς ὀνομασίας ἐρμηνείαν, 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”.<sup>21</sup> 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. ὡσπερ πρότερον εἴρηται 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 empha-

---

phrastic), 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.

<sup>20</sup> 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 τὴν 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 <ἄλλων> ὀνομάτων σύνθεσιν οὐχ οἷόν τε τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, κατὰ δὲ τὴν μεταφορῶν 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 ἐρμηνεία of Demetrius is evidently a more ‘Aristotelian’ term for that, cf. *Poet.* 1450b14 cited above).

<sup>21</sup> Bywater 1909, 175.

sizes τὴν τῶν μέτρων σύνθεσιν (“the mere metrical arrangement of the words” [Butcher], “l’agencement même des mètres” [Dupont-Roc/Lallot]).<sup>22</sup> 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 ἢ 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 μὲν<sup>23</sup>), 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 εἴρηται 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 ἢ μελοποιία μέγιστον τῶν ἡδυσμάτων) it is a mere pendant to the definition of λέξις. Besides, it is oddly formulated, πᾶσαν being at times misread as πᾶσιν (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]). πᾶσα δύναμις is not altogether alien to Aristotle (cf. SE 172a36: πρὸς ἅπασαν 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.<sup>24</sup> 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 πράξεώς ἐστι μίμησις, πράττεται δὲ ὑπὸ τινῶν πραττόντων, οὓς ἀνάγκη ποιούς τινὰ εἶναι κατὰ τε τὸ ἦθος καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν, διὰ γὰρ τούτων καὶ τὰς πράξεις εἶναι φαμεν ποιὰς τινὰς, πέφυκεν αἷτια δύο τῶν πράξεων εἶναι, διάνοια καὶ ἦθος, καὶ κατὰ ταύτας καὶ τυγχάνουσι καὶ ἀποτυγχάνουσι πάντες. ἔστιν δὲ τῆς μὲν πράξεως ὁ μῦθος ἢ μίμησις· λέγω γὰρ μῦθον τοῦτον τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν πραγμάτων, τὰ δὲ ἦθη, καθ’ ὃ ποιούς τινὰ εἶναι φαμεν τοὺς πράττοντας, διάνοιαν δέ, ἐν ὅσοις λέγοντες ἀποδεικνύασιν τι ἢ καὶ ἀποφαίνονται

<sup>22</sup> Else (1957, 236) tries to save αὐτὴν τὴν τῶν μέτρων σύνθεσιν by reinterpreting αὐτήν: “‘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.”

<sup>23</sup> 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.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Dupont-Roc/Lallot 1980, 53. Schmitt (2008, 9) fancifully translates: “dessen wirkende Kraft ganz im Äußereren präsent ist”, but this is too complicated for a clarification, the pregnant meaning of φανεράν requiring a further comment.

γνώμην. ἀνάγκη οὖν πάσης τῆς τραγωδίας μέρη εἶναι ἕξ, καθ' ὃ ποιὰ τις ἐστὶν ἢ τραγωδία-  
ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶ μῦθος καὶ ἦθος καὶ λέξις καὶ διάνοια καὶ ὄψις καὶ μελοποιία.

Bywater, notably followed by Tarán, renders διὰ γὰρ τούτων... ποιὰς τινὰς parenthetical, and begins the apodosis with πέφυκεν. Else extends the parenthesis to ἀποτυγχάνουσι πάντες, athetizes πέφυκεν... ἦθος (1450a1–2),<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup> 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 > τοὺς > οὖς). Cf. *Poet.* 1448a2: ἐπεὶ δὲ μιμῶνται οἱ μιμούμενοι πράττοντας, ἀνάγκη δὲ τούτους ἢ σπουδαίους ἢ φαύλους εἶναι; *Rhet.* 1365b36: ἀνάγκη δὲ τούτους φαίνεσθαι ἀρίστους; *De gen. et corr.* 332a5: εἰ γὰρ ἐστὶ τῶν φυσικῶν σωμάτων ὕλη..., ἀνάγκη ἦτοι ἐν ἡ δύο εἶναι ταῦτα ἢ πλειῶν. 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 *eqs.* cannot be straightforwardly athetized, least of all because it "was intended as a paraphrase of διὰ γὰρ τούτων καὶ τὰς πράξεις εἶναι φαμεν ποιὰς τινὰς".<sup>27</sup> 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.<sup>28</sup> 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 καὶ κατὰ ταύτας καὶ τυγχάνουσι καὶ ἀποτυγχάνουσι πάντες 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

<sup>25</sup> See Else 1957, 240, with n. 68. Else gives a sound criticism of the attempts of Vahlen and Gomperz to transpose the segment.

<sup>26</sup> For the overlong protasis before ἀνάγκη οὖν cf. *Phys.* 234b15. A full stop before ἀνάγκη (Dupont-Roc/Lallot) would not work: the conclusion would be lacking. Placing a colon after εἶναι φαμεν ποιὰς τινὰς (Gallavotti 1974, 20) is an absurdity.

<sup>27</sup> Else 1957, 240.

<sup>28</sup> 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 ταύτας (sc. πράξεις) καὶ τυγχάνουσι καὶ ἀποτυγχάνουσι πάντες is closely paralleled by κατὰ δὲ τὰς πράξεις εὐδαίμονες ἢ τοῦναντίον (1450a19–20),<sup>29</sup> but B has κατὰ ταῦτα and the Syrian translates likewise<sup>30</sup> possibly following the mistake of his source. We should therefore accept διάνοιαν 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,<sup>31</sup> 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 ω<sup>32</sup> 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 ἦθος. 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 γὰρ μιμοῦνται, δύο μέρη ἐστίν, ὡς δὲ μιμοῦνται, ἕν, ἃ δὲ μιμοῦνται, τρία, καὶ παρὰ ταῦτα οὐδέν. The subsequent text (1450a12–15) in Kassel's edition resembles a graveyard:

τούτοις μὲν οὖν τοῦκ ὀλίγοι αὐτῶν† ὡς εἰπεῖν κέχρηται τοῖς εἶδεσιν· καὶ γὰρ τοῖς ἔχει πάν† καὶ ἦθος καὶ μῦθον καὶ λέξιν καὶ μέλος καὶ διάνοιαν ὡσαύτως.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Valgimigli 1937, 7.

<sup>30</sup> 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 Ε) independent of Σ must not necessarily be followed: 1448b26: τὰς τῶν τοιούτων Π : τῶν om. B, Σ; 1449a7: ἐπισκοπεῖν παρέχει Π : ἐπισκοπεῖν ἄρα ἔχει B, Σ; 1449b9–10: μέτρον μεγάλου Π : μέτρον μετὰ λόγου B, Σ; 1449b26: ἀπαγγελίας Π : ἐπαγγελίας B, Σ; 1450a4: ὁ μῦθος ἢ μίμησις Π : ἢ om. B, Σ; 1450a35: σημεῖον ὅτι καὶ Π : καὶ om. B, Σ; 1452a33: περιπέτεια γίνονται Π : περιπέτεια γένηται B, Σ; 1452b17: στάσιμος B, Σ : στάσιμον Π. See also below, on *Poet.* XIX, 1456a33–34.

<sup>31</sup> 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 ἀνάξιόν ἐστιν δυστυχοῦντα, ὁ δὲ περὶ τὸν ὅμοιον.

<sup>32</sup> 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, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ταῖς τραγωδίαις ἐν ἐνιαίᾳ μὲν ἐν ἡ δύο τῶν γνωρίμων ἐστὶν ὀνομάτων *eqs.* 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<sup>33</sup>) scarcely smoothed by ὡς εἰπεῖν.<sup>34</sup> Apparently, ὄψις ἔχει πᾶν needs to be cured: both ὄψει 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 δράμα. Even if Aristotle would think of δράμα 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 εἶδαι. The use of εἶδη in lieu of μέρη is evidently a mistake. That these are not interchangeable follows from ch. XXVI 1462b16–18: περὶ μὲν οὖν τραγωδίας καὶ ἐποποιίας, καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν εἰδῶν καὶ τῶν μερῶν, καὶ πόσα καὶ τί διαφέρει <...> εἰρήσθω τοσαῦτα. What Aristotle means by τραγωδίας εἶδη 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:

τραγωδίας δὲ εἶδη εἰσὶ τέσσαρα [τοσαῦτα γὰρ καὶ τὰ μέρη ἐλέχθη], ἡ μὲν πεπλεγμένη, ἥς τὸ ὅλον ἐστὶν περιπέτεια καὶ ἀναγνώρισις, ἡ δὲ παθητικὴ, οἷον οἱ τε Αἴαντες καὶ οἱ Ἴξιοι, ἡ δὲ ἠθικὴ, οἷον αἱ Φθιώτιδες καὶ ὁ Πηλεὺς· τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ἡ ἀπλή, οἷον αἱ τε Φορκίδες καὶ ὁ Προμηθεὺς καὶ ὅσα ἐν ἄδου.

At first, a note is required about ἡ ἀπλή which is not a manuscript reading but an emendation by Conrad Bursian.<sup>35</sup> Actually, the idea is some three centuries older: ἀπλή ἴσως ἢ ὀμαλόν stands in the margin of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Codex Riccardianus 16.<sup>36</sup> ὀμαλόν

<sup>33</sup> 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 athetizes οὐκ ὀλίγοι αὐτῶν ὡς εἰπεῖν. Butcher, whom he claims to follow, prints <πάντες> [οὐκ ὀλίγοι αὐτῶν] ὡς εἰπεῖν.

<sup>34</sup> Placing it after πᾶν, as Bywater tentatively suggests in the apparatus, would deprive it of its justifying force. Claas Lattmann (2015, 266–267) applies ὡς εἰπεῖν to κέχρηται, 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 ὡς εἰπεῖν dient damit mehr oder weniger als Ironiesignal — und spielt zum Zweck des argumentativen Effekts am Beginn des neuen Unterabschnitts zugleich mit der inhaltlichen Paradoxie, die die Aussage im Kontext impliziert und die für die bisherige Forschung eben der Stein des Anstoßes war: Nicht wenige ‚nutzen‘ alle qualitativen Teile, nutzen sie aber nicht.” This is inventive enough, but the parallels do not convince: ὡς εἰπεῖν would hardly suite to non-figurative expressions and customary words like χρᾶμαι 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 ὡς εἰπεῖν eine Beschränkung des vorliegenden πάντες liegt, vgl. *Pol.* 1328b15; *Plat. Alcib.* 105c”. But suppose ὡς 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 ὄψις, presented in the next phrase.

<sup>35</sup> Bursian 1859, 757; Tarán (2012, 280) wrongly ascribes it to Susemihl. Schrader suggested τερατώδες, which has gained much approval among the late 19<sup>th</sup> c. editors: Bywater 1909, 250.

<sup>36</sup> Morel — if the notes to the 1555 Paris edition printed by him were by his hand — proposed to read ἀπλοῦν (not ἀπλή, as in the reference by Pia Pattoni 2012, 159, n. 5), see [Anonymus] 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.<sup>37</sup> Originally it was meant as a correction of the inexplicable form ὄης that we find in A. ἀπλή correlates with the previously named πεπλεγμένη and participates among the ‘species’ of epics enumerated in ch. XXIV with explicit allusion to τραγωδίας εἶδη, 1459b8–11: τὰ εἶδη ταῦτα δεῖ ἔχειν τὴν ἐποποιίαν τῇ τραγωδίᾳ, ἢ γὰρ ἀπλῆν ἢ πεπλεγμένην ἢ ἠθικὴν ἢ παθητικὴν. καὶ τὰ μέρη ἔξω μελοποιίας καὶ ὄψεως ταῦτά· (Note that εἶδη and μέρη are juxtaposed and ὄψις listed among the latter.) Unmistakably, the fourth ‘kind’ of tragedy is meant to be ἀπλή. 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 ἀπλῆν 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.<sup>38</sup>

Intriguingly enough, B coincides with A in presenting the unmeaning οἰς written in a very peculiar, unmatched, manner — OHC — as if the scribe suddenly decided to use uncials. Bywater appears to have found the solution: οἰς “is but one remove from ὄψις as it might be written in an uncial ms. (OHC = O+IC)”.<sup>39</sup> Kassel disbelieves this printing οἰς under crosses in his usual agnostic manner. Tarán’s treatment of the text is, on the contrary, quite heavy-handed. οἰς cannot be straightforwardly replaced with ἀπλή, 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 οἰς for undoubtable ὄψις, 1458a5: μία γίγνεται ἀμφοτέρων ὄψ (Empedocl. B 88 DK); Aristotle had in mind the contracted form (cf. a4–5: ἀφηρημένον δὲ οἶον τὸ κρῖ καὶ τὸ δῶ, and Strab. 8.5.3, cited by Diels: Ἐμπεδοκλεῖ δὲ “μία γίγνεται ἀμφοτέρων ὄψ”, 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.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>37</sup> See Batteux 1771, 150, with n. 3. He refers to the same reading in Cod. Par. gr. 2117. Cf. c. XV, 1454a26: τέταρτον δὲ [sc. ἠθος] τὸ ὁμαλόν. ὁμαλόν 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 οικεῖον, and the same reading intruded into Par. Coislinanus 324 which also has ὁμαλόν in the margin. Among numerous emendations listed by Pia Pattoni (159, n. 12; 184–185) some are worse than others: [τὸ δὲ τέταρτον] <ἢ δὲ ἐπεισοδιώ>δης Else; τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ὁ ἦσ<ύχιος μῦθος καὶ ἐπεισοδιώδης> Post; ὄγκος *idem*; πτόησις Georgoulis; διάνοια *inter alios* Schmitt.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Pia Pattoni 2012, 160: “non risulta del tutto perspicuo perché i drammi ambientati nell’Ade (ὄσα ἐν ἄδου) dovrebbero essere *tout court* ἀπλά.”

<sup>39</sup> Bywater 1909, 250.

<sup>40</sup> 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 ἀπλή 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-8<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>41</sup> 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. Φορκίδες is the only Satyr play mentioned in the extant text of the *Poetics*,<sup>42</sup> 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,<sup>43</sup> 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 γάρ, is to link εἶδη 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. εἶδεις 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 εἶδεσι (1449b30). As seen above, Aristotle describes verse and music as ‘kinds’, or means, of speech embellishment. Using εἶδη 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 εἶδη supplied as an alternative to μέρη in 1450a8, πάσης τῆς τραγωδίας μέρη εἶναι ἕξ, that is in but one sentence before the puzzling τούτοις... κέχρηται τοῖς εἶδεσι, 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,<sup>44</sup> and takes it up again at πάσης τῆς τραγωδίας. 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 exegetic particle usually introducing a gloss-like explanation (ܘܡܥܘܪܘܢ). Letting out καθ’ ὃ ποιὰ τις ἐστὶν ἡ τραγωδία which Bar Shakko’s source probably has found

<sup>41</sup> See n. 54 below.

<sup>42</sup> It remained unnoticed by Schoder 1969, 75; hence, perhaps, the common opinion according to which the Satyrs are lacking in the *Poetics*.

<sup>43</sup> Allen (1972, 81–82) proposes to refer it to another work, or “supplementary material”, but such a ‘blank’ reference would be unparalleled; one should at least expect something like ἐν ὑπογραφῇ. But even if Allan is right, why what was four in the scholarly remarks turned to be six in the treatise we read. Are we left to conjecture about the ‘parts’ that were at first considered irrelevant?

<sup>44</sup> “Some claim that tragedy means something mournful <...>” There follows a quote from the Psalms (6:7) in Peshitta version. On the sources of Bar Shakko Arzhanov will have plenty to say in the forthcoming edition of Syr.

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 ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἂν εἴη τι μόριον τραγωδίας (1449b32, the translation ignores μόριον!) and cites the text up to πάσης τῆς τραγωδίας μέρη εἶναι ἕξ 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 εἶδη, if not εἶδη ἢ or εἶδη ἦτοι 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.<sup>45</sup>

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 Shakkō’s text strengthen the probability that, having misapprehended χωρίς τοῖς εἶδεσι (sc. τῶν ἡδυσμάτων), the interpolator regarded εἶδη 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 τούτοις μὲν οὖν οὐκ ὀλίγοι αὐτῶν ὡς εἰπεῖν κέχρηται τοῖς εἶδεσιν (note the emphasis on the last word) followed by the repetitive list (καὶ γὰρ ὄψις *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 εἶδη 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 εἰδῶν εἴρηται, λοιπὸν δὲ περὶ λέξεως καὶ διανοίας εἰπεῖν (B, Σ) and περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων ἦδη

<sup>45</sup> 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: ἐχοντα ρυθμόν] ἔχοντα μέγεθος Syr.; 1449b32: μόριον τραγωδίας] μόριον om. Syr.; 1449b36 ἐπεὶ δὲ πράξεώς] δὲ om. Syr.; 1449b50a2–3 καὶ τυγχάνουσι] γὰρ τυγχάνουσι Syr.; 1450a4 λέγω γὰρ μῦθον τοῦτον] τοῦτον om. Syr.; 1450a6–7 ἐν ὅσοις λέγοντες ἀποδεικνύασιν τι ἢ καὶ ἀποφαίνονται] ἐν ὅσοις ἀποδεικνύασιν καὶ ἀποφαίνονται Syr.; 1450a7–8 ἀνάγκη οὖν] 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 Nadīm’s statement in *Kitāb al Fihrist*. In stating that Mattā was translating from the Syriac Nadīm 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.



εἴρηται *eqs.* (A, Φ, rec.).<sup>46</sup> Modern editors prefer εἰδῶν, but, first, εἰδῶν could hardly have turned into ἤδη; 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, ἤδη appears too sophisticated for a scribe's conjecture, and if we admit that a learned copyist remembered the text of ch. VI, τούτοις... κέχρηται τοῖς εἰδεσιν, he would have considered εἰδῶν acceptable like the current scholarship do.<sup>47</sup> Still, to decide for ἤδη is clearly not a better solution. The adverb is superfluous, and ἤδη εἴρηται has no parallels in the Aristotelian Corpus (ὥσπερ εἴρηται ἤδη, *Met.* 1053a24, is hardly a suitable one). So, we are left to suggest that εἰδῶν and ἤδη originate from a common source that allowed both readings. This must have been εἶδη originally inscribed over the text between τῶν ἄλλων and εἴρηται (cf. *GA* 715a7–8: *περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων εἴρηται*, and *Pol.* 1301a19: *περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων ὧν προειλόμεθα σχεδὸν εἴρηται*), perhaps in the contracted form ΕΙΔ — since A actually has ἤδ'. 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 εἶδ(η) into the text before εἴρηται (cf. the ungrammatical ὄψις in ὄψις ἔχει πᾶν, 1450a13), or even substituted it for the original μερῶν, or μορίων (cf. *Phys.* 199b28: *περὶ τῶν ἄλλων μερῶν*; *GA* 715a1: *περὶ τῶν ἄλλων μορίων εἴρηται*; *HA* 509a21: *περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων μορίων τῶν ἐντὸς εἴρηται*, 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 atheteses of τούτοις... ὡσαύτως (ch. VI. 1450a12–15) and τὸ δὲ τέταρτον... ἄδου (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 τραγωδίας οἷς μὲν ὡς εἶδεσι δεῖ χρῆσθαι πρότερον εἵπομεν, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ποσὸν καὶ εἰς ἃ διαίρεται 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, ὡς εἶδεσι 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, ὡς εἶδεσι 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 εἶδη which to his mind was a more appropriate term to convey abstract meaning. Thus, ὡς εἶδεσι 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?

<sup>46</sup> Cf. above, n. 31.

<sup>47</sup> For Lattmann (2015, 260) *περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἄλλων εἰδῶν εἴρηται* is the main reason for retaining *εἶδεσιν* 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,<sup>48</sup> it was proscribed by several 19<sup>th</sup> century scholars<sup>49</sup> and then by Else, who retains only the first clause arguing that εἶδεσι δὲ χρῆσθαι alludes to 1450a13, κέχρηται τοῖς εἶδεσιν, the words he deems authentic.<sup>50</sup> In supposing this he fails to recognise the difference between μέρη and εἶδη, and makes no effort to explain the point of ὡς εἶδεσι. He believes that μέρη δὲ τραγωδίας... εἵπομεν 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 εἵπομεν believed to be Aristotelian is hampered by ἐφεξῆς ἂν εἶη λεκτέον 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: ὧν δὲ δεῖ στοχάζεσθαι καὶ ἃ δεῖ εὐλαβεῖσθαι καὶ πόθεν ἔσται τὸ τῆς τραγωδίας 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 εἵπομεν, while a deliberate allusion on κέχρηται τοῖς εἶδεσιν 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”.<sup>51</sup> 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: ὡςπερ 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 πᾶν (*Ibid.*), the syntactical inaccuracy of ὄψις [?] (1450a13), εἶδ(η) [?] (1456a33), διάνοια and ἦθος (1450a2, to be compared with likewise scholarly superfluous ἔλεος μὲν περὶ τὸν ἀνάξιον, φόβος δὲ περὶ τὸν ὁμοιον, 1453a5–6) and τὸ δὲ τέταρτον ὄψις

<sup>48</sup> Heinsius 1611, 15. He placed it between chapter VI and VII.

<sup>49</sup> The proponents of athetesis as well as of attribution are listed in Else 1957, 360, n. 1.

<sup>50</sup> Hence Montmollin (1951, 58–59; 125–129), who argues for the authenticity of ch. XII, proposes to change τοῖς εἶδεσιν in ὡς εἶδεσιν in 1450a13.

<sup>51</sup> Else 1957, 362. On p. 351 Else cites a nice account of ch. XII by Gomperz (“Polizeiverordnung inmitten eines rechtsphilosophischen Werkes”).

(1456a2), the salient inconsistency of τοσαῦτα γὰρ καὶ τὰ μέρη ἐλέχθη (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 ἢ λέξις (1450b12–13), in placing ὄψις among the ‘kinds’ of tragedy, and perhaps most of all, in switching from μέρη to εἶδη to denote one and the same thing. The didactic background becomes palpable in the forced account of music as something ὃ τὴν δύναμιν φανεράν 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 εἶδεσι in the closing sentence of ch. XII: μέρη δὲ τραγωδίας 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.<sup>52</sup> He wrote in uncials,<sup>53</sup> 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 (4<sup>th</sup>–6<sup>th</sup> 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.<sup>54</sup>

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*.<sup>55</sup> But, in fact, we cannot

<sup>52</sup> One more interpolation coming from an interlinear gloss reveals literary knowledge. It is to be found in, 1454b13–14: παράδειγμα σκληρότητος οἶον τὸν Ἀχιλλεῖα Ἀγάθων καὶ Ὀμηρος. 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 Ἀχιλλεῖα ἀγαθὸν (*lectio facilior* of B, see: Pozdnev 2015, 196–198) καὶ παράδειγμα σκληρότητος Ὀμηρος. N. A. Almazova (2019, 306) supposes, not without reason, that 1455a4–6, ἐν Χοηφόροις ὅτι ὁμοίος 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: ἄμα δὲ φησιν “ἢ τοι ὄτ’ ἐς πεδίον τὸ Τρωικὸν ἀθρήσειεν”... κατὰ μεταφορὰν εἴρηται is much the same case.

<sup>53</sup> 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.

<sup>54</sup> He taught at Constantinople in the mid-4<sup>th</sup> 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 (Υπερ τοῦ λέγειν ἢ πῶς τῷ φιλοσόφῳ λεκτέον), 316d: καὶ οὐ προσέχομεν Ἀριστοτέλει ὅτι τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὁ χορὸς εἰσιῶν ἦδεν εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς, Θέσπις δὲ πρόλογόν τε καὶ ῥῆσιν ἐξεύρεν, Αἰσχύλος δὲ τρίτον [!] ὑποκριτὴν καὶ ὀκρίβαντας, τὰ δὲ πλείω τούτων Σοφοκλέους ἀπηλαύσαμεν καὶ Εὐριπίδου;

<sup>55</sup> Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1875, 205. The characteristics he gives concerning a group of verse interpolations starting with ἦ in Euripides and Sophocles, for all their mordancy, 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 is there any means to clarify if  $\omega$  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 οὐς, 1449b37, altered in τούτους just to render the passage readable).<sup>56</sup> 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  $\omega$ . The common ancestor we look for proves to be extremely elusive.

## References

- Allan D. J. ΕΙΔΗ ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΙΑΣ in Aristotle's *Poetics*. *CQ* 1972, 22, 81–88.  
 Almazova N. Recognition Based on Paralogism (Aristot. *Poet.* 1455a12–16). *Hyperboreus* 2019, 25, 302–327.  
 [Anonymus (G. Morel?)] (ed.) *Aristotelis De arte poetica liber*. Paris, apud Guil. Morelium, 1555.  
 Batteux Ch. (éd., trad., comment.) *Les quatre poétiques: d'Aristote, d'Horace, de Vida, de Despréaux*. Paris, Saillant et Nyon, 1771.  
 Brescia G. *Sul testo e la fortuna della Poetica. Note di critica aristotelica*. Milazzo, SPES, 1984.  
 Bursian C. Zu Aristoteles *Poetik*. *Jahrb. f. cl. Philol.* 1859, 5, 751–758.  
 Busch T. Chronologische Übersicht zur Textgeschichte [sc. der *Poetik*], in: Schmitt 2008, XVII–XXVI.  
 Butcher S. H. (ed.) *Aristotle. Poetics. Transl. and with crit. notes*. London, Macmillan, 1911.

case: “Curabant absurdi homines, ne tragici quidam viderentur omisisse”; “alia quaevis abesse vel potius addi posse visa sunt male sedulis homuncionibus” (*Ibid.* 206).

<sup>56</sup> Apart from those examined above (1450b12, τῶν μὲν λόγων, 1452b25, <ὡς εἶδουσι> which is, as said, doubtful, and 1454b14: παράδειγμα σκληρότητος, see n. 53), Tarán (2012, 148–149) lists nine cases, most of them (ˆ) controversial: (1) 1449b9, μέχρι μόνου μέτρου: the luckiest attempt to correct it is Tyrwhitt's μέχρι μὲν τοῦ μέτρου; (2ˆ) 1450a29, λέξεις καὶ διανοίαι: Vahlen conjectured λέξει καὶ διανοίαι, and many would like it, but in fact the ms. reading is tenable, if not that elegant; (3ˆ) 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 ὅταν γένηται κτλ. the transmitted text appears coherent; (4) 1454a18–19: προαίρεσιν τινα ἦ; here Φ probably had τις ἦ or τις ἂν ἦ because Moerbecke translates *electionem que sit*, but this could have been a scribe's conjecture; Vahlen's προαίρεσιν τινα ἦ τις ἂν ἦ was accepted by both Kassel and Tarán, while Bywater and others simply deleted ἦ; in any case the corruption was present in the source text; (5ˆ) 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 ἡ 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  $\omega$ ; (7ˆ) 1458a28–29, κατὰ δὲ τὴν μεταφοράν: the ms. reading is in no way worse than μεταφορῶν conjectured by Bywater; actually, it should be τὴν τῶν μεταφορῶν (sc. σύνθεσιν), but this is too smooth to have been altered; (8) 1460a13, ἀνάλογον: this is a corruption of ἄλογον, as noticed by Vettori. (9ˆ) 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 παννύχοι (see also n. 53). Hence at least three archetypal mistakes. To these six more might be added: (1) 1447b29, ἐν αἷς: after Vettori ἐν οἷς is accepted almost unanimously; though the corruption is trivial it is likely to go back to  $\omega$ ; (2) 1448a21: ὅτε μὲν ἀπαγγέλλοντα ἢ ἕτερόν τι γιγνόμενον, where we should restore ὅτε μὲν ἀπαγγέλλοντα ὅτε δὲ ἕτερόν τι γιγνόμενον, since in Aristotle ὅτε μὲν is always followed by ὅτε δὲ; it was first suggested by Sahl, rejected by Kassel, and quite reasonably accepted by Tarán; (3) 1448a35, οὐτο: Spengel's emedation αὐτοί suggests itself; (4) 1449b25 ἐκάστω: Pazzi's ἐκάστω was briefly discussed above; (5) 1453a37, ἂν οἱ ἔχθιστοι: Bonitz was doubtlessly right in conjecturing οἱ ἂν ἔχθιστοι; (6) 1457a35–b1, οἷον τὰ πολλὰ τῶν Μασσαλιωτῶν, Ἐρμολοκῆος; the transmitted text is unsatisfactory: either it is lacunar, or the last word originates from a gloss.

- Bywater I. (ed., transl., comment.) *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1909.
- Dupont-Roc R., Lallot J. (eds). *Aristote. La Poétique. Texte, traduction, notes*. Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1980.
- Else G. F. (ed., comment.) *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument*. Cambridge, Ma, HUP, 1957.
- Gallavotti C. (ed., comment.) *Aristotele. Dell'Arte Poetica*. Milano — Roma, Fondazione L. Valla / Mondadori, 1974.
- Grayeff F. The Problem of the Genesis of Aristotle's Text. *Phronesis* 1956, 1/2, 105–122.
- Guastini D. (ed., comment.) *Aristotele. Poetica. Introd., trad., comment.* Roma, Carocci, 2010.
- Gutas D. *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture: The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early Abbāsid Society (2<sup>nd</sup>–4<sup>th</sup>/8<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> Centuries)*. London — New York, Routledge, 1998.
- Harlfinger D., Reitsch D. Die Aristotelica des Parisinus gr. 1741. Zur Überlieferung von Politik, Rhetorik, Physiognomonik, De signis, De ventorum situ. *Philologus* 1970, 114, 28–50.
- Hatzimichali M. The texts of Plato and Aristotle in the first century BC, in: M. Schofield (ed.), *Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC*. Cambridge, CUP, 2013, 1–27.
- Heinsius D. (ed.) *Aristotelis De Poetica liber*. Leiden, Elsevier, 1611.
- Hermann G. (ed.) *Aristotelis De Arte Poetica liber*. Leipzig, G. Fleischer, 1802.
- Janko R. Rec. Tarán, Gutas 2012. *CPh* 2013, 108, 252–257
- Kassel R. (ed.) *Aristotelis De arte poetica liber*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1965.
- Kemal S. *The Poetics of Alfarabi and Avicenna*. Leiden, Brill, 1991.
- Kemal S. *The Philosophical Poetics of Alfarabi, Avicenna and Averroes: The Aristotelian Reception*. London — New York, Routledge, 2003.
- Lattmann C. Vom Nutzen der ὄψις: Aristoteles, Poetik 1450a12–14. *Philologus* 2015, 159/2, 251–271.
- Lobel E. *The Greek Manuscripts of Aristotle's Poetics*. Oxford, OUP, 1933.
- Lucas D. W. (ed.) *Aristotle. Poetics. Greek text, Latin app., with introd., comment., appendices*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1972.
- Minio-Paluello L. (ed.) *Aristoteles. De Arte Poetica Guillelmo de Moerbeke interprete*. Bruges — Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, 1953.
- Margoliouth D. *Analecta Orientalia ad poeticam Aristoteleam*. London, D. Nutt, 1887.
- Margoliouth D. The Discussion between Abu Bishr Matta and Abu Sa'id al-Sirafi on the Merits of Logic and Grammar. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1905, 37/1, 79–129.
- de Montmollin D. *La Poétique d'Aristote. Texte primitif et additions ultérieures*. Neuchâtel, Messeiller, 1951.
- Pia Pattoni M. Aristotele, Poetica 18, 1456a2–3 e il quarto tipo di tragedia, in: F. Malhomme, L. Miletto et al. (eds). *Renaissances de la tragédie. La Poétique d'Aristote et le genre tragique, de l'Antiquité à l'époque contemporaine*. Napoli, Giannini, 2013.
- Pozdnev M. *Honoratus Achilles* — the Hero of Two Poetics. *Philologia Classica*, 2015, 10, 186–202. (In Russian)
- Pozdnev M. A Tale of Two Manuscripts, *Philologia Classica* 2019, 14/1, 141–153.
- Reiz F. W. (ed.) *Aristotelis De poetica liber*. Leipzig, Svikert, 1786.
- Schmitt A. (übers., erl.) *Aristoteles. Poetik*. Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 2008.
- Schrier O. J. The Poetics of Aristotle and the Tractatus Coislinianus. *A Bibliography from about 900 till 1996*. Leiden, Brill, 1998.
- Schoder R. V. Literary Sources cited by Aristotle in the Poetics. *CJ* 1969, 65, 75.
- Sicherl M. Die Aldina der Rhetores Graeci (1508–1509) und ihre handschriftlichen Vorlagen. *Illinois Classical Studies* 1992, 17/1, 109–134.
- Spengel L. Rec. F. Ritter (ed.) *Aristotelis Poetica*. Coloniae, Renard, 1839. ZA 1841, 149, 1252–1275.
- Tarán L., Gutas D. (eds). *Aristotle Poetics. Editio Maior of the Greek Text with Historical Introductions and Philological Commentaries*. Leiden — Boston, Brill, 2012.
- Tarán L. The Text of Aristotle's Poetics in the Codex Parisinus Graecus 2038. *Mnemosyne* 2016, 69/5, 785–798.
- Tkatsch J. (ed.) *Die arabische Uebersetzung der Poetik des Aristoteles und die Grundlage der Kritik des griechischen Textes*. Wien — Leipzig, Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1928–1932.
- Tyrwhitt T. (ed.) *Aristotelis De poetica liber. Textum rec., versionem refinxit, animandvers. illustravit*. Oxford, Clarendon, 1806.
- Valgimigli M. Note di critica testuale alla Poetica d'Aristotele. *Atti R. Istit. Veneto*. 1937, 96, 1–21.
- Verdenius W. J. Rec. Else 1957. *Mnemosyne* 1960, 13/3, 256–258.
- Weinberg B. From Aristotle to Pseudo-Aristotle. *Comparative Literature* 1953, 5/2, 97–104.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf U. *Analecta Euripidea*. Berlin, Borntraeger, 1875.

Received: July 25, 2020

Accepted: October 27, 2020