Many variants are extensively discussed. The differences from the Oxford text are six, several being either wrong or unnecessary: 16 a 31 οὐτε/οὐδέ instead of οὔτε/οὔτε or οὗτε/οὗτε in the MSS, but see Bonitz Index 546 a 10, where only one example (with a long interval) is found. The athetesis of 16 b 32-3 is wrong, because Aristotle explores the consequences of his definition of λόγος and meets possible objections. 16 b 23 οὐδέ γάρ (thus already Ackrill in his Clarendon translation) and 16 b 30 οὐχί look right, but 16 b 24 οὐτό καθ’ οὐτό ψιλόν does not, for elsewhere Aristotle puts ψιλόν absolutely. The last change is the adoption of the variant readings in 16 b 10-11. All in all a meagre result.
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This is an astonishing book, for two reasons. In the first place because the author, well known for his Homer, Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns: diachronic development in epic diction (1982) and also known to have been working for a few years on one of the volumes (bks. 13-14-15-16) of the Cambridge commentary on the Iliad, has managed to produce—in between these Homeric studies—this substantial book on such a different and tricky matter. Astonishing also because of the thesis he is defending. The Tractatus Coislinianus is an excerpt found, together with excerpts from 6th cent. A.D. commentaries on Aristotelian and post-Aristotelian logical writings, in a 10th cent. Paris MS, published by J. A. Cramer in 1839, and initially welcomed as probably containing the substance of Poetics II, the lost second book of Aristotle’s famous treatise on poetry. Now TC 1) has been laid aside in this century as being the product of an ignorant compiler, though some bits of it might derive ultimately from A. Authoritative editions either do not mention TC at all (so Kassel, 1965; and Lucas, 1968), or do so with contempt (Bywater, 1909). But Janko is highly positive about it: in fact he returns to the initial welcome just mentioned, and it is a return with a vengeance: his assessment of TC as being, in fact, an excerpt of A.’s Poetics II is not just an idea, but a thesis defended by massive learning.

His own position, however, seems not always to have been the same. At the end of his five introductory chapters he comes to the conclusion: "The Treatise deserves more attention than it has received in the past sixty years. Whether or not it represents Poetics II, the analysis is closer to Aristotle than anything we have" (105). Then follows his commentary on TC. Having discussed its very last item (xviii), J. winds up triumphantly in the following words: "Thus xviii makes an appropriate ending to the second book of the Poetics. γέγραφα, ἀνεγνώκατε, ἔχετε, δικάζετε" (250)²). And throughout the commentary J. is obviously not only (a) fighting to defend the 'Aristotelian-ness' of the major concepts and the structure of TC, but also (b) taking pains to prove that the actual wording is close to, and in most instances identical with, the words A. himself must have used in the full text of Poetics II; to attain this goal he makes quite a few corrections in TC.—I get the impression that in the course of the period J. has been working on this book, he has moved his position gradually from position (a) to position (b). My review is a report how I, in my reaction to J.'s book, have shifted my position from (b) back to (a).³).

I shall begin by summing up the points which J. has scored.

1. A. did write a second book of Poetics, and in it he discussed mainly: comedy. The basic evidence for this is already in Kassel's OCT: (apart from A.'s promise in Poetics 1449b21-22) Kassel's fr. I-VI, also Diog. Laert. 5, 24, Eustratius In Eth. Nicom. 320,38 (Heylbut), and Willem van Moerbeke's primus aristotelis de arte poetica liber explicit. To this evidence J. (65) adds Hesychius' Vit. Arist. p. 13, 75 (Rose), and a reference in an Arabic translation of Ptolemy.

2. In Poetics 3, 1448a26-7 A. takes Homer, Sophocles and Aristophanes as representing epic, tragedy and comedy. From his treatment of epic and tragedy in the extant Poetics it is evident that for A. Homer and Sophocles were the past masters each in his own genre; the conclusion is that for him Aristophanes was the comic poet. And from 1 + 2 it follows that A. explained in Poetics II the (according to him) essential features of Aristophanic comedy.

3. The issues one finds in TC (especially v-ix, xiv-xviii) are on one hand related to issues discussed in Poetics book I and on the other hand relevant only to an Aristophanean type of comedy; at any rate not to the serious bourgeois comedies of Menander.

4. If TC had been found in a MS of Aristophanes, its contents might be explained as grammarian's notes meant to throw light