

THE POETICS OF ARISTOTLE

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649462018

The Poetics of Aristotle by S. H. Butcher

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

S. H. BUTCHER

**THE POETICS
OF ARISTOTLE**

THE POETICS OF ARISTOTLE

THE
POETICS OF ARISTOTLE

EDITED
WITH CRITICAL NOTES AND A TRANSLATION

BY
S. H. BUTCHER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH; FORMERLY FELLOW OF
TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, AND OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD;
HON. LL.D. GLASGOW; HON. LITT.D. DUBLIN

SECOND EDITION REVISED

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1898

All rights reserved

PREFACE

THE following Text and Translation of the *Poetics* form part of the volume entitled *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, second edition (Macmillan and Co., 1898). In this edition the Critical Notes are enlarged, and the Translation has been carefully revised. The improvements in the Translation are largely due to the invaluable aid I have received from my friend and colleague, Professor W. R. Hardie. To him I would express my warmest thanks, and also to another friend, Professor Tyrrell, who has most kindly read through the proof-sheets, and talked over and elucidated various questions of interpretation and criticism.

In making use of the mass of critical material which has appeared in recent years, especially in Germany, I have found it necessary to observe a strict principle of selection, my aim still being to keep the notes within limited compass. They are not intended to form a complete *Apparatus Criticus*, still less to do duty for a commentary, I trust, however, that no variant or conjectural

emendation of much importance has been overlooked.

In the first edition I admitted into the text conjectural emendations of my own in the following passages:—iii. 3: xix. 3: xxiii. 1: xxiv. 10: xxv. 4: xxv. 14: xxv. 16. Of these, one or two appear to have carried general conviction (in particular, xxiii. 1); two are now withdrawn,—iii. 3 and xxv. 14, the latter in favour of <οίονοῦν> (Tucker).

In the first edition, moreover, I bracketed, in a certain number of passages, words which I regarded as glosses that had crept into the text, viz.:—iii. 1: vi. 18: xvii. 1: xvii. 5. In vi. 18 I now give Gomperz's correction τῶν λεγομένων, for the bracketed words τῶν μὲν λόγων of the MSS., and in xvii. 5 Bywater's conjecture τίς αὐτός for [τινὰς αὐτός].

There remains a conjecture which I previously relegated to the notes, but which I now take into the text with some confidence. It has had the good fortune to win the approval of many scholars, including the distinguished names of Professor Susemihl and Professor Tyrrell. I refer to οὐ (οὔτω MSS.) τὰ τυχόντα ὀνόματα in ix. 5. 1451 b 14 (= b 13 Bekk.), where the Arabic has 'names not given at random.' For the copyist's error cf. ix. 2. 1451 a 38 (= a 36 Bekk.), where A^c has οὔτω, though οὐ τὸ rightly appears in the 'apographa': and for a similar

omission of *οὐ* in A° cf. vi. 12. 1450 a 32 (= a 30 Bekk.), *οὐ ποιήσει ὃ ἦν τῆς τραγωδίας ἔργον*, the indispensable negative being added in 'apogr.' and found in the Arabic. The emendation not only gives a natural instead of a strained sense to the words *τὰ τυχόντα ὀνόματα*, but also fits in better with the general context, as I have argued at some length in *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art* (ed. 2) pp. 367-9 (note).

Another conjecture of my own I have ventured to admit into the text. In the much disputed passage, vi. 8. 1450 a 14 (= a 12 Bekk.), I read <πάντες> *ὡς εἰπεῖν* for *οὐκ ὀλίγοι αὐτῶν ὡς εἰπεῖν* of the MSS., following the guidance of Diels and of the Arabic. I regard *οὐκ ὀλίγοι αὐτῶν* as a gloss which displaced part of the original phrase (see Crit. Notes). As a parallel case I have adduced *Rhet.* i. 1. 1354 a 12, where *οὐδὲν ὡς εἰπεῖν*, the reading in the margin of A°, ought, I think, to be substituted in the text for the accepted reading *ὀλίγον*. The word *ὀλίγον* is a natural gloss on *οὐδὲν ὡς εἰπεῖν*, but not so *οὐδὲν ὡς εἰπεῖν* on *ὀλίγον*.

In two other difficult passages the *Rhetoric* may again be summoned to our aid. In xvii. 1. 1455 a 30 (= a 27 Bekk.) I have (as in the first edition) bracketed *τὸν θεατὴν*, the object to be supplied with *ἐλάνθανεν* being, as I take it, the poet, not the audience. This I have now illus-

trated by another gloss of a precisely similar kind in *Rhet.* i. 2. 1358 a 8, where *λανθάνουσιν τε* [τοὺς ἀκροατὰς] has long been recognised as the true reading, the suppressed object being not the audience but the rhetoricians.

Once more, in xxiv. 9. 1460 a 26 (= a 23 Bekk.), where A^c gives the meaningless *ἄλλον δὲ*, I read (as in the first edition) *ἀλλ' οὐδὲ*, following the reviser of A^c. This reading, which was accepted long ago by Vettori, has been strangely set aside by the chief modern editors, who either adopt a variant *ἄλλο δὲ* or resort to conjecture, with the result that *προσθεῖναι* at the end of the sentence is forced into impossible meanings. A passage in the *Rhetoric*, i. 2. 1357 a 17 ff., appears to me to determine the question conclusively in favour of *ἀλλ' οὐδὲ . . . ἀνάγκη . . . προσθεῖναι*. The passage runs thus: *εἰάν γὰρ ἤ τι τούτων γνώριμον, οὐδὲ δεῖ λέγειν· αὐτὸς γὰρ τοῦτο προστίθῃσι ὁ ἀκροατής, οἷον ὅτι Δωριεὺς στεφανίτην ἀγῶνα νενίκηκεν, ἱκανὸν εἰπεῖν ὅτι Ὀλύμπια γὰρ νενίκηκεν, τὸ δ' ὅτι στεφανίτης τὰ Ὀλύμπια, οὐδὲ δεῖ προσθεῖναι· γιγνώσκουσι γὰρ πάντες.* The general idea is closely parallel to our passage of the *Poetics*, and the expression of it similar even to the word *οὐδὲ* (where the bare *οὐ* might have been expected) in the duplicated phrase *οὐδὲ δεῖ λέγειν, οὐδὲ δεῖ προσθεῖναι*. One difficulty still remains. The subject to *εἶναι ἢ γενέσθαι* is omitted. To supply it in

thought is not, perhaps, impossible, but it is exceedingly harsh, and I have accordingly in this edition accepted Professor Tucker's conjecture, *ἀνάγκη <κάκεινο> εἶναι ἢ γενέσθαι.*

The two conjectures of my own above mentioned are based on or corroborated by the Arabic. I ought to add, that in the Text and Critical Notes generally I have made a freer use than before of the Arabic version (concerning which see p. 4). But it must be remembered that only detached passages, literally rendered into Latin in Professor Margoliouth's *Analecta Orientalia* (D. Nutt, 1887), are as yet accessible to those like myself who are not Arabic scholars; and that even if the whole were before us in a literal translation, it could not safely be used by any one unfamiliar with Syriac and Arabic, save with the utmost caution and subject to the advice of experts. Of the precise value of this version for the criticism of the text, no final estimate can yet be made. But it seems clear that in several passages it carries us back to a Greek original earlier than any of our existing MSS. Two striking instances may here be noted:—

(1) i. 6-7. 1447 a 29 ff., where the Arabic confirms Ueberweg's excision of *ἐποποιία* and the insertion of *ἀνάγκη* before *τυγχάνουσα*, according to the brilliant conjecture of Bernays (see Margoliouth, *Analecta Orientalia*, p. 47).