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ARISTOTLE'S PHYSICS. BOOK VII.

PARIS AND BODLEIAN MSS.

VERY soon after the publication of the Berlin edition of Aristotle, Spengel proved that the text of the first and of the earlier part of the second chapters given in that edition belonged to what Simplicius calls the second text of that book. Spengel himself unearthed and published the missing first text for these portions of the book, which existed in a note of Sylburg's, quoting from an edition of Morel's. This edition Spengel calls the edition of 1561, and says that he has been unable to obtain sight of a copy of it. The book is in the Bodleian Library. The body of the text follows the Vulgate. The first text is given in a note at the end of the volume, as taken from a variant MS. Spengel stated further that this first text would be found in the Paris MSS. numbered 1859, 1861, and 2033; but this statement seems to rest on that of Belder, who says that the first text is to be found entire.
in these MSS., though he himself can only have collated them (if at all) for chapters 1 and 3; since he is, as we have seen, at the time of the publication of the Berlin Edition, ignorant of the very existence of a distinct first text for chapter 1 and the earlier part of chapter 2. Moreover, as we shall find, he has certainly not collated chapters 4 and 5 in any of these MSS.¹

Since the date of this discovery of Spengel's all subsequent editions, including the smaller text of Bekker, have given the first text of the earlier part of the book as it appears in Spengel's paper. No one apparently has collated the three Paris MSS., and no one has discussed the question as to whether the fourth and fifth chapters of the book, as given in the Berlin text, belong to the first or the second text; though Simplicius, the latest but, for this book, the only trustworthy Greek commentator on the Aristotelian Physics, states distinctly that the two texts run throughout the book, and further, that in all cases the first is of greater authority than the second.

Frankl, the latest editor of the Physics, does indeed refer repeatedly to "codd." in his apparatus criticus in the first part of the book; but, as he never vouchsafes to tell us which of the three MSS. this plural reference points to; as, further, these codices are not always in agreement on the readings so referred to; and as more than once no one of them has the text as he gives it, we are forced to the conclusion that his "codd." means nothing more than the thrice-reprinted text of Spengel, with which, as far as I can discover, his text, allowing for the emendations which he makes himself or adopts from other scholars, is exactly in accordance. It is of course possible that he may have either himself looked up one or two marked passages in these MSS., or have entrusted this task to some scholar resident in Paris; but of this there is no direct evidence, while there is the strongest proof that he can never have read the latter chapters of the book in any of these three MSS.

I am concerned to prove that these MSS. give throughout the

¹ In his smaller edition of the Physics (Berlin, 1843) Bekker gives the first version of the first part of the book with a reference to Spengel's article, relegating the second version to small type throughout the first three chapters; but as there is no apparatus criticus to that edition so few information is given.
The general relations of these MSS. may be estimated by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denoting</th>
<th>Paris 1859</th>
<th>Paris 1861</th>
<th>Bodleian Misc. cxxxviii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stands alone</td>
<td>against</td>
<td>against</td>
<td>AB stand against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against BCD</td>
<td>BCD 55</td>
<td>ACD 17</td>
<td>CD 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AD 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, there are two cases of triple readings A . . . D . . . B C, and A . . . C . . . B D.

Though the number of times when D stands alone as against the other three MSS. is not far short of that in which A stands alone, yet the importance of the variants in the cases where D is unique is far inferior to that of those where A is unique. The majority of unique readings in D are simple errors, and do not militate against the general law that B C D constitute one sub-group, and that A is the solitary representative of another.

As to these MSS. as a whole, it is universally admitted that they are the only MSS. which give us the genuine first text for the first chapter and the earlier part of the second. With regard, then, to this portion of the book, there is little to note, since here our MSS. have the field to themselves; and, though they differ in certain points from Morel’s text, these differences are individually of slight importance.

Little need also be said of the third chapter, though for a somewhat different reason. Here our MSS. also indisputably give the first text; but here they do not stand alone. A considerable number of other MSS. give the correct text for either a large part or the whole of this chapter, and for the latter part of the second chapter. Each separate MS. and each family of MSS. has of course its peculiar errors, and therefore a text may be constituted from the comparison of them all which is superior in accuracy to any of them taken singly, and even to any single group. The Berlin text of this third chapter stands in this position. It differs not greatly from our MSS., but is probably superior in accuracy to them and to any other single group.

It is with regard to the fourth and fifth chapters that the question of the authority of these MSS. assumes the greatest importance.

(1) Here, as we have seen, the Berlin and all subsequent editions give only a single text, though we have Simplicius’ authority for the existence of a double text throughout. I believe that the text given in all these editions is a mixture of the two known to Simplicius, probably more closely approaching the first than the second, while our four MSS. either give the true first text throughout or at least with very slight intermixture of the second.

This I hold to be distinctly provable of the fourth chapter, while with regard to the fifth the matter is less certain, since in that chapter Simplicius quotes less frequently than usual the ipotesis verba of Aristotle; but even there the balance of evidence is definitely, though slightly, in favour of our four MSS.

I shall therefore in this introduction limit myself to citing passages from these two latter chapters, as to which only there is any doubt of the superiority of our MSS.; and shall attempt to establish that, in cases of divergence between these MSS. and the Berlin text, the former are always, or almost always, nearer the first text of Aristotle as it was known to Simplicius.

Taking the more striking cases of divergence in order, we find first in p. 248 a, ll. 21–22 of the Berlin edition, ἀπεκρ. αὐτός, τὸ β’ ἀπάντησε. Here our MSS. have ἀπεκρ. αὐτός, τὸ β’ μὴ κανάνησε τὸ β’ ἀπάντησε. Simplicius in his commentary, folio 351 b, has ἂν ἄν αὐτόν μὴ κανάνησε τὸ β’ ἀπάντησε.

In the Berlin edition, 248 b, l. 7, we have the word δείκνυε. All our four MSS. and Simplicius give δεικνύει. In lines 5–7 of the same page, the Berlin text has ἄλλα δεόν μὴ ημερόμενα ἀπαντάναι ἀναμβλήκησα: our four MSS. and Belckert’s MS. H give ἄλλα δεόν μὴ ημερόμενα ἀπαντάναι ἀναμβλήκησα. On this passage the words of Simplicius are ἄνετον δὲ ὅτι ἡ γραφή τοῦ μετα-τοῦ διάφορος φέρεται. ἦν γὰρ ἁλλὰ δεόν μὴ ημερόμενα ἀπαντάναι ἀναμβλήκησα ὅπως ἀλλὰ δεόν μὴ ημερόμενα ἀπαντάναι ἀναμβλήκησα. τοῖς δὲ τοῖς ἐν τῷ τῆς ἐκφώνησις ἔριδοις ἡμερόμενα γραφεὶ ἐπάνω μετα-τοῦ διάφορος ἐκφώνησις ἀνα-μβλήκησα τοῖς δὲ τοῖς ἐν τῷ τῆς ἐκφώνησις ἔριδοις ἡμερόμενα γραφεὶ ἐπάνω μετα-τοῦ διάφο-ρος ἐκφώνησις ἀναμβλήκησα.

Here the easier reading is undoubtedly that of Alexander, which is substantially the same as that of the second text; but, for that very reason, we should prefer the second reading given by Simplicius as
equally belonging to MSS. of the first text, which also appears in our
four MSS.

If one reading be found only in MSS. of the first text, while the
other is, with slight variation, common to one family of MSS. of the
first text and to all those of the second, we have some ground at least
for assuming that the reading common to the first and second text is
a correction from the latter into the former; while the reading which
occurs only in MSS. of the first text is likely to be the original reading
of that text. From this passage, however, and from another to which
we shall call attention later, we have some reason for doubting whether
the distinction between the first and second texts of this book was
so sharply drawn in the days of Alexander as it was at the time of
the commentary of Simplicius.

A still more important passage occurs in lines 17–19 of the same
page. Here we have—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Berlin text.</th>
<th>Our four MSS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἥλιον καὶ αἱ λέγεις ἰδίᾳνεμων έδεικνύει καὶ λέγεις τι τό θελό τό τοσονέναι καὶ έτι τό τοσονέναι, καὶ τό τόν οὐδές, ταύτα, τό νεώτα, έκκλεις ἰδίᾳνεμων.</td>
<td>ἥλιον καὶ αἱ λέγεις ἰδίᾳνεμων, έδεικνύει καὶ λέγεις τι τό θελό τό τοσονέναι καὶ έτι, καὶ τό δεσπόζον τόνον, αλλά τό τοσονέναι καὶ τό τόν οὐδές, ταύτα, τό νεώτα, έκκλεις, ἰδίᾳνεμων.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The words of Simplicius are, ἥλιον λέγεις τόν τοσονέναι τό λέγεις τι τό θελό έστι τό τοσονέναι καὶ έτι, οὐκέτι καὶ έστιν τόνον. Άλλος γὰρ τό έλεικα τό τό θαος τοσονέναι καὶ έτι, καὶ άλλος τό τό λέγεις. ... καὶ τό δεσπόζον τόν οὐδές, ταύτα, τό νεώτα, έκκλεις, ἰδίᾳνεμων. (Fol. 552 b.)

Two things here are sufficiently clear. First, that both versions
of the text are corrupt; secondly, that Simplicius has got the reading
of our four MSS. and not that of Bekker's text. What the true reading
may be, it is difficult to conjecture. It may possibly have been some-
thing of this kind: Οἴνων εις λέγεις τι τό θελό τό τοσονέναι καὶ έτι τό δε-
σπόζον τόνον, άλλα τό τοσονέναι καὶ τό δεσπόζον τόν οὐδές, έκκλεις, ταύτα,
νεώτα, έκκλεις, ἰδίᾳνεμων. I am inclined to omit the a-
The true reading here is ἐν δ’ ἐν δ’, οὖν οἱ τῶν, βλάστησα, οἱ δ’ ἰδίως τῆς πτέρυγος, οὐ’ [sic: οὔ’] ἀλλ’ τῶν σχῆμας ἐν φορὰ ἀλλ’, which is given in Cod. K (Bekker), and is supported by the authority of Simplicius, fol. 254a. It seems likely that the homoeoteleuton (οὗ, οὗ) caused the omission of the words οὗ, οὖν οἱ τῶν, βλάστησα, οἱ δ’ ἰδίως τῆς πτέρυγος, οὐ’ [sic: οὔ’] ἀλλ’ τῶν σχῆμας, in the archetype of our family of MSS., and that the words ἐν δ’ ἐν δ’, now meaningless, were then altered into ἐν δ’ ἐν δ’, in some attempt to correct the text (the truncated δ’ would naturally be taken for a mistaken repetition of the δ’ immediately preceding). The δ’ for οὗ is obviously a mere later copyist’s slip. The MSS., followed by Bekker probably give a case of the insertion of the words omitted from some correct MS. into one which had the imperfect reading of our MSS., in which insertion, as often happens, the inserter did not notice that a correction, as well as an insertion, was necessary in order to bring his text into conformity with the more correct MS.

In lines 30–31 of the same page


In page 249 b, l. 4.

Berlin text.


I. 14.

Berlin text. ἐλλά γὰρ σῶμα οὐκ εἰς τὸ πάθος διὸ μέμφη, ὥστε ἐπετέλεσεν οὐκ εἰς τὸ πάθος ἐμπότα τῷ καθήκοντος τῆς ἀληθοῦς, ὥστε ἐπετέλεσεν οὐκ εἰς τὸ πάθος διὸ μέμφη, ὥστε ἐπετέλεσεν οὐκ εἰς τὸ πάθος διὸ μέμφη, ὥστε ἐπετέλεσεν οὐκ εἰς τὸ πάθος διὸ μέμφη. Our MSS., ἐλλά γὰρ σῶμα οὐκ εἰς τὸ πάθος διὸ μέμφη, ὥστε ἐπετέλεσεν οὐκ εἰς τὸ πάθος διὸ μέμφη, ὥστε ἐπετέλεσεν οὐκ εἰς τὸ πάθος διὸ μέμφη, ὥστε ἐπετέλεσεν οὐκ εἰς τὸ πάθος διὸ μέμφη.

MS. Paris 1859. αἰτήθη τὸ πάθος ἐν αἰτήθη τῷ χρώμα μεταβαλλόμενι, ὥστε ἐπετέλεσεν οὐκ εἰς τὸ πάθος διὸ μέμφη, ὥστε ἐπετέλεσεν οὐκ εἰς τὸ πάθος διὸ μέμφη, ὥστε ἐπετέλεσεν οὐκ εἰς τὸ πάθος διὸ μέμφη.

1 Εὐχαίρει Paris 1865 and Paris 1883 by a clerical error.
2 τοιούτου Paris 1865 and Paris 1883.
sight the explanatory words inserted in our MSS. look like glosses which have crept into the text, but the fact of the absence of this sentence in these MSS. shows us the two versions as two different methods of arriving at the same result. I doubt much whether the one method can be proved to be more Aristotelian than the other.

There are only two passages in this chapter where the words of Simplicius help us at all to a judgment between the two texts. The first occurs in Il. 9–12 of p. 250 of the Berlin text.

Berlin text.

Our four MSS.

Simplicius, fol. 256 (pr)b.

The Aldine text of Simplicius gives the last few words in the form ἐκεῖ ἰδοὺ οὗτος αὐτῷ Γ, which is obviously merely a misprint. It is to be noticed that the reading here given from Simplicius is not the one which he follows in his commentary, which was apparently quite different from either of our two texts; but he himself prefers the reading I have quoted. The evidence, then, of this passage is, as far as it goes, in favour of our MSS., but I do not think much weight can be attached to it, since in a case of this kind variations of text would be almost necessary from the very beginning, being purely an indifferent matter whether the sentence should be written in the one form or the other. Nor do I lay much stress on the fact that in several places throughout the chapter the commentary of Simplicius comes much nearer to our MSS. than to the Berlin text, for it might be argued that the glosses of Simplicius himself, or of some other commentator, had crept into the text.

The remaining passage, however, is of more importance. It is that in which Aristotle examines the paralogism of Zeno as to the falling medimum of corn.

The two versions here are

1 Bollean MS. omits χρήσεως.

2 8; Paris 1859 by clerical error 3; so also Bollelian.
the words of Themistius, Simplicius, and Johannes Philoponus, than those of any MS. quoted by Bekker, though they often nearly approach the readings of the Aldine Editio Princes. The resemblance to Simplicius is throughout closest, but it is not one which can give rise to the supposition that these MSS. spring from an archetype which was corrected from Simplicius himself, as this resemblance is usually one rather of meaning than of phrase. Of this resemblance I will give only one example.

In the first book, p. 188 a, ll. 23–25, Aristotle is concerned to prove that almost all philosophers have in some sense or other assumed opposition as a necessary factor in the evolution of the universe. The words with which the chapter (v) begins in the Berlin text are as follows:—

Πάντας τε τάσσειν ἀρχής πουάν ὑμεῖς λέγοντες ἃ ἐν τῷ πάν ἐς μὴ κατεστίμενον (καὶ γὰρ Παλαιστίς ἄρομα καὶ συρρόμοις ἄρχα ψιθὺριά, τοῖνα ἐς προσγεγραμμένα τῷ καὶ γένες) καὶ οἱ μακάοι καὶ περικάοι, καὶ Δημοκρίτου τὸ στερεόν καὶ κόσμον, ὡς τὸ μὲν ὡς τὸ ὥς μὴ διὰ τοῦ ἄτομον ὄτι θάνη, σχῆματι, ἀλλὰ τοῖνα ὡς γένει ἄτομως ἄτομοι ὄντως ἄτομοι, πρὸς τόνα ἄτομον, σχῆματος γωνίας εἶναι περιφέρεια.

In the apparatus criticus it is noted that the MSS. F and I read γεγονόμενον for γωνία. But it is perfectly clear that according to either reading the text is defective. For we obviously need a contrary to γεγονόμενον or γωνία. Bekker, with too much reliance on the authority of E, has not troubled himself about the absurdity of the passage, in which, forsooth, Aristotle, having taken in hand to prove that the three prime differences of Democritus are reducible to pairs of opposites, gives us under the head of σχῆμα one pair of opposites and a detached term. But in truth in the MS. E itself the error is yet greater, for not only is there no opposite to γωνία, but διαφθείρα, the needful opposite to πρόσθεν, is also omitted; a fact which Bekker does not notice in his apparatus criticus. If then we follow E we shall have only two pair of opposites where we need four. If we do not, we may look further abroad for the correction of the passage, and we find what we need in our Paris MS. 1859, where the last two lines run thus:—τοῖνα ὡς γένει ἄτομως ἄτομοι ὄντως ἄτομοι, πρὸς τόνα ἄτομον, σχῆματος, γεγονόμενον ἄτομοι, εἶναι περιφέρεια.
Α = Παρισίους 1859; B = Παρισίους 1861; C = Παρισίους 1833; D = Bod. Misc. cccxxviii.

"Απεί τὸ κινούμενον ὑπὸ τοῦτο ἀνάγκη κινεῖται: εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῷ μὴ ἔχει τὴν ἄρχην τῆς κινήσεως, φανερὸν ὅτι ᾖ τρόπῳ κινεῖται. ἄλλα γὰρ ἔσται τὸ κινούμενον εἰ ν' ἐν αὐτῷ, ἄλλοι θετικὰ καθ' ἄλλα, ἄλλα μὴ τὸντο τὶ κινεῖται... τῶν μὲν τὰ ἐπι- 

λαμβάνει τὸ AB ᾖ τρόπῳ κινεῖται ὑπὸ τὸ διότι τὸ κινεῖται καὶ ἀν' ὁδόν τῶν ἐξωθήνει ὁμοίως ἔσται ὅτεν εἰ 2 τὸ ΚΔ κινεῖται τὸ LM καὶ άλλως κινούμενον, εἰ 3 μὴ φάσεσθαι τὸ ΛΜ κινεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ 2 διὰ τὸ μὴ καθότι εἶναι πότερον τὸ κινούμενον καὶ πότερον τὸ κινούμενον. ἄλλα τὸ μὴ ἔσται τῶν κινούμενων αὐτὸ ἀνάγκη παρασταθήσεται κινούμενον τῷ ἔσται ἱσχυρόν, 241 καὶ ἄλλοι εἰ τῇ ἱσχύ τῇ ἄλλα παραστάθησαν κινούμενον, ἀνάγκη ὑπὸ τοῦτο αὐτὸ κινεῖται. τῶν μὲν γὰρ κινούμενον τῷ κινούμενον κινηθήται ὑπὸ τῶν. ἄνευ γὰρ ἐξουσία τὸ κινούμενον ᾖ τὸ AB, ἀνάγκη διαρκείτο ἀπὸ τὴν γὰρ τὸ κινούμενον διαρκείσι. διδοθήτω δὴ κατὰ τὸ Γ. τοῦ δὴ ΓΒ μὴ κινο- 

μένων ὁ πρᾶγματι, ἄλλοι κινηθήται τὸ AB εἰ γὰρ κινεῖται, ὅπως τὸ τοῦ ΓΕ καθ' ἄλλο τοῦ ΓΒ 3 ἱσχυρόν, διότι αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ κινεῖται καὶ πρᾶγμα, ἄλλο 3 ἱσχυρόν καὶ πρᾶγμα. ἀνάγκη δρά τοῦ ΓΒ μὴ κινουμένον ἱσχυρόν τὸ AB. ὁτὲ ἱσχύτω μὴ κινούμενον τοῦ, ἀρμοδίως 5 ὑπὸ τοῦ 

τῶν κινεῖται, διότι πᾶν ἀνάγκη τὸ κινούμενον ὑπὸ τοῦτο κινεῖται: ἀλλ' γὰρ ἔσται τὸ κινούμενον διαρκείσι, τοῦ δὲ μέρους μὴ κινουμένον ἀνάγκη καὶ τὸ διότι ἱσχυρόν. ἄνευ τοῦ τὸ κινούμενον ἀνάγκη κινεῖται καὶ πάλιν τὸ κινούμενον τοῦ ἱσχύτω καθ' ἄλλον κινούμενον κινήτω. 1 ἔκλεισεν ᾗ 4 ἱσχύτω καὶ δεὶ αὐτῶν,

1 ἔσται Β. 2 ἔσται Β. 3 ἐπταλαμβάνει τῇ τοῦ ΚΔ κινεῖται διὰ τὸ μή στηρίζεται σύγκεντρως ἐντὸς κεφαλῆς [ὅπως Δ] τοῦ ΚΔ ἀπὸ τοῦ ΒΣ ἔσται τοῦ ΒΣ ἔσται τοῦ A. 4 ἔσται κινούμενον καταλύεται καταλύεται κινούμενον τῇ τῇ κινούμενον ἀνάγκη τῶν μὲν τοῦ νεοτέρου κινούμενον τοῦ 5 διότι τὸν κινούμενον ἱσχυρόν γῆς ψυχῆς λογοκομήσειν ἀνάγκη πᾶς τὸ κινούμενον κινεῖται: διὸ τοῦτο C et D est usitum secundo; όπως aline B πᾶς φορὰ πρατετέται πρὸς κινούμενον καταλύει ἀνάγκη τῶν. 1 AB B. 2 ἱσχυρότερο Β. 3 καθ' ἄλλον κινούμενον καθ' ἄλλον κινούμενον D.
..
γιά εί μη ήπιτσένεις 4 και δεν είναι τόσο πολύ 5 και είσαι κατά τήν επίτευξη, αλλά
eίδια λαμπείρει η ἑτέρους ή βραβεύεται, διότι 6 αν δεν τό κατάστητε, τό δ' είναι
κατάγεται. 7 η δ' διαφέρει οὕτω τῷ λόγῳ εἰς ταῦτα λάλησαι είναι δυνατόν εἴπει δια
βραβεύεται κατάβασις. ἐνταῦτα 6 γερά μετὰ καὶ εἴπερ καὶ ἐπί την επιφάνεια τήν
ejed1, διότι καὶ λέγει. ἂν εί ἐν τῷ Αρχόν τῷ μέσῳ τῇ διάλεκτῳ τό δὲ
eοῦν, μετά 5 μετά εἴπερ εἶπεν ἓν, τό Β τῇ διάλεκτῇ, ἂν μετά 5, μετά 5, εἰς εἶπεν
eκαθαρτείς, τό Β τῇ διάλεκτῇ. ἂν μετά 5 μετά εἴπερ εἰπεν ἓν, τό Β τῇ διάλεκτῇ.
τὸ δὲ μετὰ, μετά 5, εἴπερ εἰπεν ἓν, τό Β τῇ διάλεκτῇ. 8 ἂν μετά 5, μετά 5, εἴπερ εἰπεν
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καὶ τέκνης 1 ἐνδώρητος τό ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ κυρίτερ ἐν τῷ πλατύντος τῷ μήκος
εἶ ἐν τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος
τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος 9
τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος 9
τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος 9
τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος 9
τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος 9
τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος 9
τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος 9
τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῷ μήκος τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ τῇ διάλεκτῇ
χρόνον τό αὐτό καὶ ἄριστον, οἷον ἀδράρχος ἀλλὰ μὴ χῶσαν· ἄδοξόν δ' ἐν ἐνν' ἄφθονον οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν τινὰ δῶν, ἐν οἷον ἡ ἐπιτρέποντα ἢ εἰ ἡ ἀνομοσθήσει. καὶ ἐκ τούτου διάβολος, διότι δὴ τὰς ἀδράρες ἀδαμπτοῦν τοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἀκατάλογον· ἀντίθετον τοῖς πλείους· διὰ τὸ δὲ αὑτὸν τὸ οὐκ ἤρθαν καὶ τὸ ἐπερχόμενον. 5 Ἐκείνο ὑπὸ τοῦ καθοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἐν τοῖς καὶ μέχρι τοῦ. 6 Ἀλλὰ δὲ τὸ μέν ἐν τοῖς, ὅτι ἐν χρόνῳ, τὸ δὲ μέχρι τοῦ 7 ὅτι ποιοῖ τοὺς μετάξειν ἔρχομαι· ἀλλ' ἀποκατέστημι τοῖς ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ καλλίστηκέναι ἄνευ λόγου τι ἔστασι θυμὸν ἐν σταθερόν. εἰ δ' ὅτι πλῆθος ἢ ὡς ἡ ἀρχή τοῦ καθοῦ, τὸ δὲ τῷ πολλῷ μέγας. 8 Ἐκείνο ὑπὸ τοῦ καθοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἐν τοῖς καὶ μέχρι τοῦ. 9 Ἀλλὰ δὲ τὸ μέν ἐν τοῖς, ὅτι ἐν χρόνῳ, τὸ δὲ μέχρι τοῦ. 10 ὅτι ποιοῖ τοὺς μετάξειν ἔρχομαι· ἀλλ' ἀποκατέστημι τοῖς ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ καλλίστηκέναι ἄνευ λόγου τι ἔστασι θυμὸν ἐν σταθερόν. εἰ δ' ὅτι πλῆθος ἢ ὡς ἡ ἀρχή τοῦ καθοῦ, τὸ δὲ τῷ πολλῷ μέγας. 11 Οὐκ ἔστι παράξενον· τὸ δὲ τῷ πολλῷ μέγας, ὡς ἡ ἀρχή τοῦ καθοῦ, τὸ δὲ τῷ πολλῷ μέγας.
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