

THE
OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI
VOLUME LXXXV

EDITED WITH TRANSLATIONS AND NOTES BY

N. GONIS P. J. PARSONS

and

W. B. HENRY

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY

L. H. BLUMELL E. CHEPEL C. CHEUNG
H. ESSLER R. FÄRBER S. FOGARTY
B. W. GRIFFIN G. HATZITSOLIS A. KALININA
P. MALIK M. MALOUTA G. MALTAGLIATI
C. MONACO M. MOUNTFORD P. M. PINTO
L. PRAUSCELLO I. PRIVITERA M. RACETTE-CAMPBELL
G. RANOCCHIA A. SARRI S. SLATTERY
L. TAGLIAPIETRA T. A. WAYMENT M. ZELLMANN-ROHRER

Graeco-Roman Memoirs, No. 106



PUBLISHED BY
THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY
3 DOUGHTY MEWS, LONDON, WC1N 2PG

WITH THE SUPPORT OF
THE BRITISH ACADEMY

2020

5478. LUKE 2.32-4, 40-42, 24.22-8, 30-38

100/175(a)
P¹⁴¹Fr. 1 8.3 × 7 cm
Fr. 2 2.9 × 17.8 cmThird century
Plate I

Two fragments representing two leaves of a single-column papyrus codex. The column in the well-preserved fr. 1 was about 10–10.5 cm wide, while that represented by the narrow fr. 2 may have been about 11–11.5 cm wide. A line of fr. 1, in which the reconstruction is relatively secure, held about 22–5 letters, and the figure for fr. 2 will have been comparable. The line-height measured from the top of one line to the top of the next is about 0.7 cm in fr. 1 and about 0.75 cm in fr. 2, and a reconstruction based on B (Codex Vaticanus) suggests that a page held about 30 lines. The height of the written area will thus have been about 21.5–22 cm. The lower margin is preserved in fr. 1 to a depth of 2.6 cm, and the inner margin survives on the left in fr. 1 ↓ to a width of 0.8 cm; no other lateral margins are preserved. The original page dimensions can only be estimated. If the upper margin was about two-thirds as deep as the lower (cf. Turner, *Typology* 25), a page will have been about 26 cm high. The Pierpont Morgan *Iliad* (MP³ 870), assigned to the fourth century, has similar dimensions: a page measures 12.5–14 × 27 cm and the written area 10 × 23 cm (Turner, *Typology* 108). Among New Testament papyri, one may compare e.g. P⁴⁷ (Revelation, P. Chester Beatty III), assigned to the third/fourth century, in which a page measures about 13–13.5 × 23.5–24.5 cm and the written area 8.8–10.7 × 18.7–20 cm (P. Malik, *P. Beatty III* (P⁴⁷) (2017) 31–8). Turner assigns the first of these to his Group 8 and the second to his Group 7 (*Typology* 19–20). Comparable New Testament papyri from Oxyrhynchus, also assignable to Turner's Group 7, include XIII 1597 (P²⁹, Acts; 3rd/4th c.), LXVI 4497 (P¹¹³, Romans; 3rd c.), LXVI 4498 (P¹¹⁴, Hebrews; 3rd c.), LXVI 4499 (P¹¹⁵, Revelation; 3rd/4th c.), and possibly LXXXI 5258 (P¹³², Ephesians; 3rd/4th c.).

The page represented by fr. 1 → will have held about 718 letters; in fr. 2, the letter count for the stretch between the start of → 2 and the start of ↓ 2 was about 696, while the stretch between the start of → 22 and that of ↓ 22 was about 644 letters long. Luke as transmitted in B includes about 94,600 letters. The text preceding the foot of fr. 1 ↓ would occupy about twelve pages each containing about 700 letters, while the text following the end of fr. 2 → would take up about 1.6 such pages. About 135 such pages would hold the complete text; if the average page held 675 letters, about 140 pages will have been required. The beginning of Luke may then have fallen on a left-hand page, and if it was the first or only text in the codex, the first page of the codex may have been left blank or given over to a title; cf. X 1229 (P²³, James; 4th c.), LXVI 4498 (P¹¹⁴, Hebrews; 3rd c.).

The hand, of medium professional competence, is a somewhat inelegant example of Turner's informal round class (*GMAW*² 21). Most letters fit approximately into a square. The upright of φ extends slightly below and more noticeably above the other letters; otherwise the hand is generally bilinear. (There are no preserved examples of ψ.) The component strokes of a letter are sometimes not correctly joined. For example, there may be a gap at the lower right-hand corner of ν (fr. 1 → 6) or between the tail of a and the upper or lower stroke of its loop (e.g. fr. 1 → 3–4). There is sometimes a contrast in fr. 1 between thick vertical and thin

horizontal strokes, e.g. twice in η at $\downarrow 5$, but the scribe seems to make little effort to achieve such an effect in fr. 2; for η , cf. $\rightarrow 4, 7$. The ends of strokes are commonly decorated, but not consistently. Thus the upper right-hand corner of the second ν in fr. 1 $\downarrow 3$ has a heavy ascending oblique serif, while the first has no decoration there. Letters at the beginnings of lines may be enlarged: note a in fr. 1 $\downarrow 5$ and π and τ with their crossbars extended well into the margin at fr. 1 $\downarrow 3-4$. α , γ , λ , and τ are often linked to the following letter; the crossbar of ϵ may also be extended to touch the letter to its right. The scribe has some difficulty in keeping the lines of text straight: note for example the upward slope of fr. 1 $\rightarrow 3-4$.

Other papyri representing the same graphic stream include III **454** + P. Laur. IV 134 + PSI II 119 (Plato; *GMAW*² 62), copied on the back of a Latin register postdating 111 (ChLA IV 264); VIII **1100** (*GLH* 20b), a document of 206; III **412** (Julius Africanus, *Cesti*; *GLH* 23a), which dates to the period between 227 and 276; and II **209** (\mathfrak{P}^{10} , Romans; *GBEBP* 1a), which 'was found tied up with a contract dated in 316 AD, and other documents of the same period'. The hand of **412**, though somewhat more flattened, seems the closest, and **5478** has therefore been assigned to the third century. A slightly later dating (third/fourth century) could reasonably be supported by comparison with **209**. Parallels for the form of the codex are assigned to the third or third/fourth century (cf. above), and there is a probable example at fr. 1 $\downarrow 3$ of $\overline{\mu\eta\rho}$, a *nomen sacrum* first attested in a papyrus assigned to the third century.

There are no lection signs except a trema on initial ι (fr. 1 $\rightarrow 4$) and small apostrophes marking elision (fr. 1 $\rightarrow 4$) or the end of a foreign name (fr. 1 $\rightarrow 5$). The preserved *nomina sacra* are $\overline{\pi\eta\rho}$ (fr. 1 $\downarrow 3$), $\overline{\chi\rho\nu}$ (fr. 2 $\rightarrow 15$), and $\overline{\kappa\zeta}$ (fr. 2 $\downarrow 14$); the scribe probably also used $\overline{\mu\eta\rho}$ (fr. 1 $\downarrow 3$), $\overline{\theta\nu}$ (fr. 1 $\rightarrow 3$), and $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$ (fr. 2 $\downarrow 22$). The one extant numeral is written out in full (fr. 1 $\rightarrow 6$ $\delta\omega\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha$), but the alphabetical numeral $\overline{\iota\alpha}$ should probably be restored in a lacuna at fr. 2 $\downarrow 13$.

Sentence-ends are marked by spaces left blank between words in six places (fr. 1 $\downarrow 5, 6, \rightarrow 2, 3$; fr. 2 $\rightarrow 10, 14$). The two spaces left blank in chapter 24 correspond to stops in \mathfrak{P}^{75} ; among the Greek manuscripts assigned to the fourth–fifth centuries, A and W indicate divisions at five of the six places, but not in 24.24 after $\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\nu$ (**5478** fr. 2 $\rightarrow 10$), which falls at line-end in W. **5478** does not appear to have had a blank space at the end of 24.26 (fr. 2 $\rightarrow 16$), as would have been expected; there is no break marked in A, but \mathfrak{P}^{75} has a stop and W a blank space.

There is a correction at fr. 1 $\rightarrow 6$, where the omitted word $\epsilon\tau\eta$ was inserted above the line, apparently by the scribe of the main text, but in a smaller, rightward-sloping hand.

The poor quality of the writing surface created difficulties for the scribe. For example, in fr. 1 $\downarrow 5$, the initial a runs across a displaced strip of papyrus, and the τ across a gap in the upper layer: the right-hand side of the crossbar is on the back of the horizontal fibres. In the previous line, the scribe avoids the change in level by leaving a space blank before $\epsilon\pi\iota$. For similar cases in \mathfrak{P}^{47} , cf. Malik, *P.Beatty III* (\mathfrak{P}^{47}) 23, with further references. See also below on fr. 2 \downarrow .

Three other fragments of Luke from Oxyrhynchus have been published, XXIV **2383** (\mathfrak{P}^{69}), LXVI **4495** (\mathfrak{P}^{111}), and LXXXIII **5346** (\mathfrak{P}^{138}), all assigned to the third century. **5478** overlaps \mathfrak{P}^{42} (P. Vind. K. 8706, 7th c.?) at 2.32 and \mathfrak{P}^{75} (P. Bodmer XIV–XV, 3rd/4th c.?) in chapter 24.

The text of 5478 nearly always agrees with that of B, though they diverge in seven places:

- 2.34 (fr. 1 ↓ 5) ηυλογησεν 5478: *ευλογησεν B
 2.42 (fr. 1 → 6) αυτω ετη 5478: *ετων B
 24.23 (fr. 2 → 5) *ηλθον 5478: ηλθαν B
 24.24 (fr. 2 → 9) *καθως και (in lacuna) 5478: καθως B
 24.28 (fr. 2 → 20) *ηγγισαν 5478: ηγγικαν B
 24.32 (fr. 2 ↓ 8) εν ημιν (in lacuna) 5478: (*)ως ελαλει ημιν B
 24.33 (fr. 2 ↓ 12) κυνηθροισμενους (preverb in lacuna) 5478: *ηθροισμενους B

The reading adopted by NA²⁸ in each case is asterisked. 5478 agrees with D against κB in only one of these places, 2.42 (fr. 1 → 6). It would thus fall within what E. J. Epp has termed the B-cluster of early papyri: see B. D. Ehrman and M. W. Holmes (edd.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* (2013) 519–77. The main point of textual interest is the papyrus' inclusion of the disputed longer reading ('Western non-interpolation') at 24.36 (fr. 2 ↓ 20–21, mostly restored), against D and the Old Latin. Except at the places mentioned above, 5478 has the same text as NA²⁸ throughout.

The collation text is NA²⁸ and the supplements printed follow that edition except where otherwise noted. The IGNTP *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (1984–7) has also been used. The notes record places where the papyrus disagrees or appears to have disagreed with B or with the collation text; for a fuller picture, NA²⁸ should be consulted.

Fr. 1

↓

	· · · · ·	
	[εις] αποκαλυψιν εθνων και δο	(2.32)
	ξαν λαου σου [Ισραηλ και ην ο]	33
	πηρ αυτου και η μ[ηρ θαυμαζον]	
	τες επι τοις λαλουμ[ενοις περι]	
5	αυτου ^v και ηυλογησε[ν αυτους]	34
	κυμων ^v και ειπεν προ[ς	

→

	· · · · ·	
	ε]κ[ρ]α[ταιουτο]	(40)
	[πληρουμενο]ν σοφια ^v και χαρ[ις]	
	[θυ ην ε]π[ι] αυτο ^v και επορευοντ[ο]	41
	[οι γονε]ις αυτου κατ' ετος εις [ει]	
5	[ρουσαλ]ημ' τη εορτη του πασχα[ς]	
	[και ο]τε εγενετο αυτω δωδεκα [42

Fr. 2

→

	
]. [
	[εξ] ημῶ[ν ἐξέστησαν ἡμας γενεῶ] (24.22)	
	[μέ]ναι ορθ[ρῖναι ἐπι το μνημειον]	
	[κ]αί μη ἐ[υρουσαι το σωμα αυτου]	23
5	[η]λθον [λεγουσαι και οπτασιαν αγ]	
	[γε]λων ἐ[ωρακεναι οι λεγουσιν αυ]	
	[το]ν ζην [και απηλθον τινες των]	24
	[συν] ημιν [ἐπι το μνημειον και ευ]	
	[ρο]ν ουτω[ς καθως και αι γυναικες]	
10	[ει]πον ὁ α[υτον δε ουκ ειδον και αυ]	25
	[το]ς ειπε[ν προς αυτους ω ανοητοι]	
	[και] βρα[δεις τη καρδια του πιστευ]	
	[ει]ν ἐπι π[ασιν οἱς ἐλαλησαν οι προ]	
	[φ]ηται ὁ ὄ[υχι ταυτα εδει παθειν]	26
15	[το]ν χρν κα[ι ειςελθειν εις την δο]	
	[ξα]ν αυτου κ[αι αρξαμενος απο Μωυ]	27
	[σε]ως και ἀ[πο παντων των προ]	
	[φη]των διε[ρμηνευσεν αυτοις]	
	[εν π]ασαις τα[ις γραφαις τα περι εαυτου]	
20	[και] ηγγισαν [εις την κωμην ου]	28
	[επορ]ευσοντο [και αυτος προσεποιη]	
	[σατ]ο πορρω[τερον]	
	

↓

	
	αρτ]ον [ηυλο]	(30)
	[γησεν και κλασας επε]δ[ιδου αυ]	
	[τοις αυτων δε διηνοι]χθη[σαν]	31
	[οι οφθαλμοι και επεγν]ωσαν [αυ]	
5	[τον και αυτος αφαντ]ος εγε[νετο]	
	[απ αυτων και ειπα]ν προ[ς αλ]	32

	[ληλους ουχι η καρδι]α ημω[ν καιο]	
	[μενη ην εν ημιν εν] τη οδω [ως]	
	[διηνοιγεν ημιν τα]ς γραφ[ας]	
10	[και ανασταντες αυτ]η τη φ[ρα]	33
	[υπεστρεψαν εις Ιερου]σαλ[ημ]	
	[και ευρον συνηθροικμ]ενο[υς τους]	
	[ια και τους συν αυτοις] λεγον[τας]	34
	[οτι οντως ηγερθη ο κ]ς κα[ι ω]	
15	[φθη Τιμωνι και αυτοι] εξ[ηγουν]	35
	[το τα εν τη οδω και ω]ς ε[γνων]	
	[ςθη αυτοις εν τη κλ]αρε[ι του]	
	[αρτου ταυτα δε αυτων] λα[λουν]	36
	[των αυτος εστη εν μ]εσ[ω αυ]	
20	[των και λεγει αυτοις] ει[ρη]	
	[νη υμιν πτοηθεντες δ]ε κ[αι]	37
	[εμφοβοι γενομενοι εδ]οκ[ουν πνα]	
	[θεωρειω και ειπεν αυ]το[ις]	38
	

Fr. 1

↓

2 *Ισραηλ* appears to have been written out in full to judge by the spacing.

3 *μ[ηρ]*. There is no trace of a supralinear bar, but *μ[ητηρ]* written out in full would probably be too long for the gap. For this *nomen sacrum*, cf. LXXI 4805 ↓ 4 (Ψ¹²¹, John; 3rd c.); A. H. R. E. Paap, *Nomina sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries A.D.* (1959) 113; K. Aland, *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri* i (1975) 424.

5 *ηυλογησε[ν]*. The spelling with *ηυ-* rather than *ευ-* is shared with *ⲛ Ⲙ Γ 047 349 579 713 1510 2542*. See e.g. Gignac, *Grammar* ii 240–41.

→

3 *ε]π αυτω*. D has *εν αυτω*, but this seems excluded here. The first trace is a spot of ink on the line, and of *ο*, only part of the left-hand arc survives, joined to the crossbar of *τ*, but *ω* would be slightly too wide, and we would expect to see traces of the central cusp and right-hand curve in the upper half of the line.

4–5 *Ι[ε]||[ρουσαλ]ημ'*. Only the first dot of the trema survives.

6 *αυτω `ετη'*. *αυτω ετη* is the reading of D L 579 a b l q; NA²⁸ adopts the usual reading *ετων*. For the use of *δωδεκα* rather than the alphabetical numeral *ιβ*, see Z. J. Cole, *Numerals in Early Greek New Testament Manuscripts* (2017) 175–8, esp. 177.

Fr. 2

No lateral margins are preserved, and the line-divisions printed above are uncertain. It is not usually possible to choose on grounds of space between supplements of similar length.

→

5 [η]λθον: the usual reading. \mathfrak{P}^{75} and B* have ηλθαν.

7 D alone has εκ after τωε. It would give a long line, but it is just possible that it was written here.

9–10 καθως και αι | [γυναικες ει]πον. The reconstruction follows NA²⁸. B and \mathfrak{P}^{75} have καθως αι γυναικες ειπον, but this may well be too short. D's ωε ειπον αι γυναικες cannot be accommodated.

19 The line as restored has a high letter-count (31), but the reconstructed line-length is similar to that of line 16: the supplement there includes several wide letters, while the present line includes four iotas and no examples of μ or ω.

20 ηγγισαν: the usual reading. \mathfrak{P}^{75} and B have ηγγικαν.

↓

Dr Henry observes: 'The uppermost layer has come off on the left- and right-hand sides, leaving only a narrow strip on which the text is preserved. The fibres visible where the preserved surface is blank on the right-hand side at the level of lines 13–18 are vertical; the right-hand sides of 13 ν[and 14 α[have been lost with the original top surface. The physical situation on the left is more complicated. The surface on which the text stood on the far left is missing, but a layer of horizontal fibres remains stuck to the surface, and the scribe writes over the right-hand part of that layer of horizontal fibres, in 10 (|η), 17 (|αε, with the ε continuing on the vertical fibres to the right), and the lines below. It seems that a reinforcing patch or sheet was stuck here, and the vertical fibres facing outwards were removed from a narrow strip on the right of the upper sheet so that the change in level would present less of an obstacle to the writer. The scribe will then have begun each line on vertical fibres (now missing) and proceeded to horizontal fibres one layer further down and finally to vertical fibres another layer further down.'

1–2 αρτ]ον [, επε]δ[ιδου: the traces could be otherwise assigned (τ]ον [αρτον, επεδε]δ[ου), but considerations of spacing favour the arrangement adopted above.

[ηυλο]||[γηεν was probably given the temporal augment, as in \aleph A D Ψ etc., cf. fr. 1 ↓ 5.

7–8 ημω[ν καιο]||[μενη ην εν ημιν εν] τη οδω. NA²⁸ prints ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν [ἐν ἡμῖν] ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, but this is clearly too long for the gap whether the doubtful εν ημιν is included or omitted (with \mathfrak{P}^{75} B D c e sy^{s.c.}). The text on the line would be of suitable length if the scribe skipped forward from the first ημιν to the second by parablepsy, omitting ωε ελαλει ημιν, as in a b ff² l r¹ and in Greek in a catena fragment printed in *PG* LXXII 753A ('Cyrill von Alexandrien III' fr. 79 in J. Reuss, *Lukas-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche* (1984) 291). The omitted phrase may however have been restored above the line, cf. fr. 1 → 6. For a similar omission due to parablepsy, cf. e.g. *Or. Comm. Jo.* 1.50, 10.105, *Hom. in Jer.* 20.8 (GCS III² 191.13), which have καιομενη ην εν τη οδω, omitting εν ημιν ωε ελαλει ημιν before εν τη οδω.

10 αυτ]η τη ω[ρα]. The decipherment is uncertain, but the traces are clearly incompatible with λυπουμενοι, which follows ανασαντες in D c e sa.

12 συνθηροισμ]ενο[υε (A K L P W Γ Δ Θ Ψ f^{1,13} 565. 579. 700. 892. 1241. 1424. 1844. 12211 \mathfrak{M}) suits the space better than ηθροισμ]ενο[υε (\mathfrak{P}^{75} \aleph B D 33).

13 [α. To judge by the space available, the alphabetical numeral will have been used, as in \mathfrak{P}^{75} D.

20–21 και λεγει αυτοις] ει[ρηη]||[νη υμιν. This sentence is omitted in D and in several Old Latin manuscripts (e a b d ff² l r¹). For the problem, see e.g. J. Hernández in C. E. Hill & M. J. Kruger (edd.), *The Early Text of the New Testament* (2012) 137.

21 *πτοηθεντες*, the majority reading, is supplied from NA²⁸, but the variants *θροηθεντες* (Ψ⁷⁵ B 1241) and *φοβηθεντες* (8 W) would fit equally well.

22 *πνα* was probably written as a *nomen sacrum*: the unabbreviated *πνευμα* seems too long.

B. W. GRIFFIN / L. H. BLUMELL

5479–80. PSEUDO-CHRYSOSTOM

The fame of the golden-mouthed patriarch of Constantinople attracted the spurious attribution of various works in the manuscript tradition. Both those and his genuine works are attested to a limited extent among the papyri. One of the copies of the spuria already bears the attribution to Chrysostom in its title (*Hom. in titulum Ps. 50* (PG LV 565–75; CPG 4544)): P. Berol. 6788 A, ed. K. Treu, in *Studia Patristica* XII (1975) 71–5 (van Haelst 635; Aland, *Repertorium* ii KV 51). The genuine works are not so far preserved as continuous texts. There are only excerpts from Homily 29 on John (PG LIX 163–72; CPG 4425.29) in P. Vind. G 26132 B (MPER NS IV 54; Aland, *Repertorium* ii KV 50), from *In illud: Domine, non est in homine* (PG LVI 153–62; CPG 4419) in the margin of a passage from Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, P. Köln VII 297 (Aland, *Repertorium* ii KV 9a–b + 50a), and from *In epistulam I ad Corinthios* (PG LXI 9–382; CPG 4428) in BKT IX 15, and paraphrases of *De virginitate* (ed. B. Grillet and H. Musurillo (1966); CPG 4313) in P. Monts. Roca IV 55–6. (P. Ant. III 111 is Basil, not Chrysostom: Aland, *Repertorium* ii KV 7.) Various copies of spurious works survive besides that of the homily on Psalm 50 cited above. *De eleemosyna* (PG LX 707–12; CPG 4618) was identified in MPER NS IV 58 r. (van Haelst 1164) by A. Papatomas, *ZPE* 163 (2007) 71–4, and there are three copies of *In decollationem praecursoris et baptistae Joannis* (PG LIX 483–90; CPG 4570): XIII **1603** (cf. R. Harris, *BRL* 5 (1919) 386–7, and S. G. Mercati, *Biblica* 2 (1921) 229–39 = *Collectanea Byzantina* (1970) ii 100–110; van Haelst 634; Aland, *Repertorium* ii KV 52); P. Bodl. I 6 (cf. C. Römer, *APF* 44 (1998) 132–3); and BKT IX 175 (cf. A. Papatomas, *MH* 58 (2001) 47–53). For papyrological witnesses to Coptic versions, see in general S. J. Voicu, in P. Buzi and A. Camplani (edd.), *Christianity in Egypt: . . . Studies in Honor of Tito Orlandi* (2011) 575–610.

The authenticity of the homilies represented in the two papyri published here has long been in doubt, and they have recently been assigned to an anonymous Cappadocian active at the end of the fourth century, along with 35 other homilies including that on the beheading of John the Baptist of XIII **1603**: cf. S. J. Voicu in M. Girardi and M. Marin (edd.), *Origene e l'alessandrinismo cappadoce (III–IV secolo)* (2002) 342, and in A. M. Piazzoni (ed.), *Studi in onore del Cardinale Raffaele Farina* ii (2013) 1200. They were published first by F. du Duc, *Sancti Ioannis Chrysostomi . . . Panegyrici Tractatus XVII* (1601) 369–409, then by H. Savile, *S. Ioannis Chrysostomi Opera Graece* (1613) v 656–9 and 703–7, and again by du Duc, *Sancti Patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani, De diuersis utriusque Testamenti locis Sermones LXXIII . . . Tomus sextus* (1624) 134–48. B. de Montfaucon included them in his *Sancti Patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi . . . opera omnia* vi (1724) 603–11, and they

100/175 (a)

GRIFFIN B.

ἀποκατα
 ΣΑΝΛΑΟΥ ΣΟΥ
 ΠΗΕ ΑΥΤΟΥΕ ΗΟ
 ΤΕΣ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΛΟΥΝ
 ΑΥΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΗΥΛΟΓΗ
 ΟΥΜΕΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΙ ΠΕΝ ΠΡΟ

Ν
 ΚΑΙ
 ΟΥΤΕ
 ΙΤΡΟ
 ΗΥ
 ΗΟ
 Π
 ΤΟΙ
 ΑΛ
 ΕΟΙ
 Κ
 ΕΣ
 ΟΕ
 ΟΕ
 ΑΛ
 ΕΟ
 Κ
 Κ

