been uttered in the month October–November. That they afterwards received and were capable of receiving a wider application does not invalidate their original restriction to a particular period and special circumstances.

Adolf Büchler.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF ORIGEN'S COMMENTARY ON I CORINTHIANS.

I do not think that the Journal of Theological Studies, in the nine years of its existence, has published any contribution to theological learning more solid and more valuable than the edition of the fragments of Origen on St Paul's epistles to Ephesus and Corinth. We owe, indeed, to Cramer's Catena our first introduction to the greater part of these fragments: but the copyists whom Cramer employed were capable of quite phenomenal blunders, and to Mr Gregg and Mr Jenkins belonged in effect, in each case, both the labour and the merit of an editio princeps.

Certain it is that these commentaries contain many interesting things which appear so far to have escaped the notice of Church historians. A reference to the inconsistencies between the duty of a Christian and the duty of a soldier (on 1 Cor. v 11) has escaped even Harnack's encyclopaedic knowledge of early Christian literature. The summary of the Eucharistic service as the 'invocation of the name of God and of Christ and of the Holy Spirit' over the elements (on 1 Cor. vii 5) is absent from Mr Brightman's collection of liturgical passages from the Egyptian fathers. And I myself, when writing on Patristic commentaries on St Paul (in the supplementary volume to Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible p. 489), ought to have cited Origen's distinct allusions to a predecessor or predecessors in the exegesis of the same epistle: οἱ λοιποὶ ἐρμηνεῦσαν . . . ϕασίν (on 1 Cor. vii 24), τινὲς ἐξήγησαν τὸς η διαφορά τῶν ὕπὸ τῶν νόμων παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς (on 1 Cor. ix 20). Note further the information about Ophites (on xii 3), about Montanists (on xiv 34), about heretics who used the Creed (on xv 20), about parts of the Old Testament unsuitable for Church lessons (on xiv 7, 8), about a Pauline citation found in Aquila and the other interpreters but not in the LXX text (on xiv 21), about Apollos being bishop of Corinth (on xvi 12).

Any fragments of the original Greek of Origen's work on the New Testament are worth all that we can devote to them of loving and
patient study: and it is in the spirit of sincere gratitude for
Mr Jenkins’s services to this subject that I call attention to some
difficulties and offer some suggestions of my own. It is only by the
successful contributions of many scholars that a final result will be
attained.

§ xxxvii l. 19. For πάλιν οὖ καλῶν ἐστίν read πάλιν οὐκ ᾧ (τοπ.) ὁν ἐστι.
The two clauses, ll. 16–18, 19–22, appear to be exactly parallel, each
referring to one half of the verse I Cor. vii 18: οὖκ ἄτοπον ἐστὶ τῷ ἤπτῳ
χρῆσασθαι ποτε πρὸς τοὺς οἰομένους μετὰ τὴν πίστιν δεν περίτεμνεσθαι εἷς
εὐλαβείας... πάλιν οὐκ ᾧ (τοπ.) ὁν ἐστι διά τινας τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστεύνον-
tας καὶ οἰομένους αἰσχύνην φέρειν αὐτοῖς τὴν περιτομῆν, καὶ βουλομένους
ἀκροβυσσίαν (ἐπι)στάσασθαι [so I suppose we must read for περιστάσασθαι],
χρῆσασθαι ἤπτῳ τῷ λέγοντι...

§ xxxix l. 6. ἄκοιν γάρ, φησίν, τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἡσσοῦ Χριστοῦ διδάσκοντος
ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ λέγοντος... A comma is necessary after εὐαγγελίου.

ib. ll. 38–41. οὐκόνος δεδεμένον μὲν ἐπει τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν γεγαμηκότα· εἰ
dὲ περίστασις ἐστὶ τὸ δεδέσθαι, καὶ δὲι φεύγειν ταῖς περιστάσεις ὅση δύναμις.
καὶ τὸ δεδέσθαι γνωμική μὴ ζητεί λόγων, ὅ ὑπὲρ μὲν δεδεμένους θηλείης φυλάττεσθαι
ὑπὸ μὴ δεθῇ. This punctuation is unsatisfactory: it does not offer any
proper antithesis between μὲν and δὲ, and it makes the clause καὶ δὲι
φεύγειν... δύναμις the apodosis to εἰ δὲ... δεδέσθαι, which is extra-
ordinarily harsh. The sense must I think be ‘On the one hand he
calls the husband “in bonds”’; but even if it is a calamity to be in
bonds, and we must avoid calamities to the best of our power, yet do
not seek to loose the bonds binding you to a wife. On the other hand
he that is not in bonds ought to guard himself against them’. The
comma and full stop after δύναμις and λόγων might therefore be inter-
changed. But even this is unsatisfactory: Dr Swete suggests that we
should read ζητεῖν—so that καὶ τὸ... μὴ ζητεῖν λόγων would be still part
of the protasis—and suppose something lost.

§ xl l. 16. ἵνα μὴ τῇ προφάσει αὐτῷ ἄλλοις ἀπολλύωνται. Rom. xiv 15.

§ xlii ll. 13, 14. οὖτος οὖν ἐστὶν ὁ μυθιστός, ἵνα ὅπως ἐξουσιάζῃ ἐχω μὴ
ποιήσω. Origen is commenting on 1 Cor. ix 17 et yρ ἕκων τοῦτο
πράσον, μυθισθὼν ἐχω... εἰ δὲ ἀκον... , and his point is that we can only
claim reward for what we do without being forced to it, when we might
have left it undone. Read therefore ἵνα ὅπως ἐξουσιάζῃ ἐχω μὴ (ποιήσαι)
ποιήσω.

§ xliii l. 24. ἀμα δὲ τηρεῖ καὶ τὸ ἄκριβος αὐτοῦ. Read certainly τηρεῖ
in the imperative [suggested tentatively by Mr Jenkins in his apparatus].

1. 26. Ἰουδαῖος γὰρ ἤν ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ, οὐκέτι ἐν τῷ φανερῷ. Rom. ii
28, 29.

§ xlv l. 6. Dele comma after σωζόμενοι.

ib. ll. 6–9. ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ οὖν πάντες τρέχουσιν, ὅσοι πρῶς δάγμα πολι-
Origen is not dividing heretics and philosophers into the two classes of those who had a rule of life and those who had not, but he means that heresy, and Judaism, and Gentile philosophy, had each some rule of life and conduct. The 'one that receives the prize' is the Church: the 'all who run' are the religions outside the Church, all that have a rule of life: 'even the heretics have a rule of life; and Jews may be, and those who follow Gentile philosophy, have a rule of life.'

§ xlvii II. 10, 11. εἰδὼς κυνδυνεύειν εν αὐτῷ τῷ δοκιμάζειν ἡ ἀποδοκιμάζειν. Read in both instances οἱ for οἱ, and print the last πάντες in thick type.

I suspect we ought to read τό for τῶ, 'knowing that he may have to accept or reject.'

ib. II. 15–17. οὗ μόνον οὖν εἰ τις ἀγνοεῖ τὰ τοῦ ἀποστόλου, οὕτως ἀγνοεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ εἰ τις ἀγνοεῖ λέγων πνεύματι θείοι (καὶ) λέγων ὅτι μὴ πνεύματι θείοι λέγει, ἀγνοεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. Here the meaning of the two balanced clauses ought to be that the 'ignorance' which results in being 'ignored' by God is not only that which takes the true to be false but also that which takes the false to be true. Read therefore in the second clause ἀλλὰ εἰ τις ἀγνοεῖ λέγων ' Πνεύματι θείοι λέγει.' τι [οὔ ὅτε] μὴ πνεύματι θείοι λέγει, κτλ. [This and the preceding sentence ought I think to be run on with the last paragraph, and the new paragraph should begin at ἐώς ὅτε.]

§ xlviii I. 4. ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου ἤρτου ἀναφωνεῖ ὅτι κτλ. I suggest ἐκ τοῦ δεύτερον ἤρτοῦ ἀναφαίνει ὅτι κτλ., referring to δεύτερον προφήτας of 1 Cor. xii 28.

ib. II. 7–11. ὡστε εἶναι τινὰ μὲν προφητείαν ὑπερβεβηκίαν τω δὲ προφητείαν ἀναβεβηκίαν. τὴν μὲν γὰρ καθολικοτέραν καὶ μεμονωμένην τὰς προφητείας Ἡσαύου καὶ Ἰερεμίου δευτέραν τάξιν μετὰ τὴν ἀποστολὴν ἔρει, ταύτην δὲ τὴν τελειώταταν τεταγμένην τάξιν μετὰ τὰ εἰρημένα χαρίσματα τοιοῦτην οὖσαν κτλ. This ought to mean 'at the top of the list', 'at the bottom of the list', but I cannot get that sense out of the two words. The next sentence, too, I cannot translate as it stands, and would prefer to run it on with what precedes and govern it still by εἶναι of l. 7, omitting γὰρ and in l. 10 substituting ἐκεῖ, ταύτη δὲ 'in that passage, and in this' for ἔρει, ταύτη δὲ.

II. 22–25. ὥρα εἰ δύναμαι ἐτί παραστήσαι σαφέστερον τὸ λεγόμενον ὁ θεὸς κτλ. According to this punctuation Origen is trying 'to give a clearer proof' of the whole verse 1 Cor. xii 28. But the words can only mean a clearer proof than that which he has just given, i.e. of the dual form of prophecy, and we must put a full stop after λεγόμενον. Then follows this 'clearer' proof: 'not all are apostles,' 'not all are
prophets' in the sense of xii 28: whereas in the other sense of prophecy, xiv 24, 'all' may prophesy.

§ xlix l. 41. A comma, not colon, is wanted after ἐστι διάλεκτος.

ib. l. 45. ἀγαμον διδωμι φωνήν. i Cor. xiv 8, 9.

ib. l. 48. οἴδεν γὰρ ποιεῖ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ήτοι τῶν ἀγγέλων τραγῳ καὶ σαφή, ὡς ἢ ἀγάπη. I suppose we must understand (τὴν) γλῶσσαν from the line before.

§ li ll. 9, 10. μαχόμενον πράγμα ἐστιν τὸ ἁγαπάν, τὸ ζηλοῦν. Possibly μαχόμενον πράγμα ἐστι τῷ ἁγαπᾷ τὸ ζηλοῦν.

l. 17. οἴον μήτηρ τὸ ἁγαπᾶν τῶν υἱῶν ἢ πατήρ οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἰδα ὡς τὰ τοῦ νιόν. Read τῷ ἁγαπᾶν: 'as a mother or father through loving the child seek not their own so much as the things of the child.'

§ liv l. 5. έαυτῷ λαλεῖ καὶ τῷ θεῷ. i Cor. xiv 28.

§ lvi ll. 8-11. τὰ μὲν οὖν τῆς θεωρίας δόγματα αἰεὶ καὶ καθάραν εἶπεν ὡς μηκέν ἐμφανίζων θέλων, τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ ἀρέτῃ προτεροτομένους σάλπιγγι {α}: διὰ τούτων ἐπείν ὅτι τὰ ἁσαφή τῆς γραφῆς...οὐ δεὶ αναγινώσκειν. The MS gives σάλπιγγι διὰ τοῦ δὲ εἶπεν. A simpler change than that adopted would perhaps be τοὺς δὲ ἐπὶ ἀρέτῃ προτεροτομένους σάλπιγγα διὰ τούτου εἶπεν, ὧν κτλ.: but I rather think that the corruption is more extensive, and that διὰ τοῦ δὲ εἶπεν introduced a citation of the words καὶ ἡμαῖς...ἐὰν μή εἴσημον λόγων δώτε, followed by some such verb as ἑσήμεναι or ὑπέδειξεν. This latter suggestion has the sanction of Dr Swete.

§ lx l. 6. επιδώσωμεν. The aorist subjunctive επιδώσωμεν would make better sense, if the form had sufficient authority.

§ lxvi ll. 10, 11. ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐστὶ τῶν τοιούτων. εἰ δὲ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ χαράματα στρείδα ἐστὶ τοῦ ὄντος εἶναι θεόν, ἐν τίνι ξηρατίον; Transpose the comma from θεὸν to τινι, make the latter word enclitic, and abolish the note of interrogation: 'but we must enquire whether the other charismata as well (as prophecy) are signs of God's being really in a man.'

§ lxvii ll. 2-4. πνευματικὸς ἐστιν ὁ πάντα λόγων καὶ πάντα νοῦν δυνάμενος βασανίζειν, καὶ διὰ πολλὴν βαθύτητα νοῦ δυνάμενων ὄντα ὡστε μὴ δύνασθαι ἀνακρίνεσθαι. Comparing i Cor. ii 15 and lines 7-9 of § lxviii, I do not see how we can avoid altering to δυνάμενως ὅν.

§ lxviii l. 15. For colon after πραμὴν substitute comma: the words ἔξησον τί δῆστε cover the next two lines. 'I used often to wonder why the false prophets had more influence with the kings than the true, and yet that their books were not copied or preserved while those of the true prophets were.' It was the combination of phenomena which had excited Origen's surprise.

§ lxix ll. 3-5. ταύτης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς [sc. that women should keep silence in church] οὐκ ἤσαν οἱ τῶν γυναικῶν μαθηταί, οἱ μαθητευόντες

VOL. X.
The editor rightly sees two difficulties: the first he meets by suggesting ἀκρωσταὶ after ἐντόλης, for the other he suggests Ἐκκλησία τοῦ ἀνδρός. I would, in the first case, get the same sense, but by reading ὁδὸς ἡ(κον)σαν for ὁδὸς ἡσαν. As regards the second, the placing of the words οἱ ... Ἐκκλησία within dashes, as an explanatory parenthesis, would perhaps remove the difficulty.

ib. II. 8, 9. ταῦτα δὲ λύσομεν. πρῶτον μὲν λέγουσε δὴ Ἡ ἡμέτεραι προεφήτευον, δεῖξατε τὰ σημεῖα τῆς προεφήτειας ἐν αὐταίς: δεύτερον δὲ Ἐἰ καὶ προεφήτευον κτλ. Put comma for full stop after λύσομεν, and read Ἐἰ αἱ ἡμέτεραι.

ib. I. 34. Instead of a colon, a new paragraph should, I think, begin at αἰσχρόν γὰρ γνωσκεί.

ib. I. 36. Γυνὴ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ δηλονότι κατὰ τὸ αἰσχρὸν λέγεται ἐπὶ κατηγορίᾳ τῆς ὅλης ἐκκλησίας. There is something wrong here, either in the text or the punctuation: could we read ἀναθροῦν for αἰσχρόν? and perhaps transfer γυνὴ to the previous sentence, putting the full stop after instead of before it? "In church": it is put without the article, clearly in order to apply to the whole church, and not to Corinth alone. But I admit that this is violent: and the fault may lie in κατὰ.

ib. I. 41. τούτῳ οὖν λέγει δὴ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Jo. iii 17 (Gal. iv 4).

§ lxxv II. 3-5. ὅνα ... ποιήσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ κρατοῦντος πνεύματος πνευματικοῦ καὶ αὐτῶς ἐπὶ τοῦ κράνεων ποίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ποία οὐκ ἔστων αὐτοῦ. There is something wrong in ἐπὶ τοῦ: read perhaps ἐπὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ κράνεων.

§ lxxvi II. 14-16. εἰσόμεθα δὴ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ εἰσίν τὸν εἰκή πεποιθεκότα οὕτω πεποιθεκέναι ψευδεὶ· ἄλλα τὰ πεποιθεκέναι μὲν, ἀληθεὶς δὲ, ἔργον οὐκ ἐστὶν· ἐν κρίσις δὲ πιστεύειν. This is quite untranslateable, even as emended (the MS is without either ἐν or δὲ): the corruption is perhaps deep seated, but part of the reconstructed sentence should probably run οὐ τῷ πεποιθεκέναι ψευδεὶ ἄλλα τῷ πεποιθεκέναι μὲν ἀληθεὶς ...

§ lxxxi II. 3. 4. οἱ δὲ, οἱ ἐτερόδοξοι, ἀλληγοροῦν θέλοντι τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀνάστασιν ἀλληγορίζωσαν καὶ τὴν τῶν Σωτῆρος. Read ἐἰ δὲ οἱ ἐτερόδοξοι κτλ., and substitute comma for colon. [It is further pointed out to me that we must alter to ἀλληγορεῖσθαι καὶ ἀλληγορεῖσθαι.]

§ lxxxii I. 3. εἰ καὶ ζητεῖ τοὺς διαλεκτικοὺς λόγους ὁ Παύλος, ἀλλὰ φυσικὸς αὐτῶς ἔχρησαστο. Must we not read εἰ καὶ ζῆτε; εἰ καὶ ζῆτε; ‘Even if the apostle had [not] learnt dialectics, yet he argued dialectically by the light of nature.’

§ lxxxiv I. 8. οὐδεὶς δὲ πρωτότοκος ἐστὶν ἐτερογενῶς. Read ἐτερογενῶς.

ib. II. 13-17. εἰ δὲ ἐκεῖνος μὲν ἐφόρεσε σῶμα, καὶ ἢ ἀνάστασις αὐτοῦ μετὰ σώματος ἢν ὡστε αὐτὸν καὶ φαγεῖν ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ κατὰ Ιωάννην
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αὐτοῦ ἐπηρεάσθει, ὅς ἀντέχει οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν αἱρέσεων, οἱ ἀναστάμενοι τῶν τισευόμενων εἰς τὸν χριστόν. οὐ δύνανται παραστῆσαι τῶν Ἱησοῦ πρωτοτόκος ἐστιν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν. Αὐτό, which is divided into three sentences, should be punctuated as one: the first sentence is the one premiss, the second the other premiss, the third the conclusion: 'if on the one hand He wore a body and His resurrection was a bodily resurrection (so that He even ate, as John describes in his gospel), and if on the other hand, as the heretics think, those believers who rise again rise in a different way, without a body; then they cannot shew in what sense Jesus is “firstborn from the dead”.

ib. l. 35. ἀνθρώπος ἦσαν, μορφωθησότας, ὅστα ἦσαν, ἀπὸ τούτου σάρκες, νεῖρα, φλέβες. Punctuate after τούτου, not after ἦσαν: 'from this there shall be bones, flesh, nerves, veins.'

ib. ll. 40, 41. Substitute comma for full stop after τῇ τελειωτῇ τοῦ θεοῦ: and for τῷ σῶμα τὸ ἐνεστηκός, νῦν τὸ παρεστηκός, punctuate τὸ ἐνεστηκός νῦν, τὸ παρεστηκός.

ib. l. 45. ἐκ τῆς διαστήματος τοῦ κόκκου τοῦ σίτου στάχυς ἐκατον<άις> γίνεται. MS ἐκατοντάχοσ: read ἐκατοτ<ά>χοσ, ὧν αἱρέσεων, ‘of a hundred measures,’ ‘yielding fruit a hundredfold.’

ib. l. 51. τῶν αὐτῶν τρόπων τοῦ τοῦ νεκρῶν κόκκου ἦστι σίτου τῷ θεῷ ὡς τὸ προαναστησόμενον. I cannot translate the last three words: ἀναστησόμενον should be right, comparing lines 46 and 56, but some corruption must lurk in ὡς τὸ πρό. I can think of nothing better than ὡς ὁπορά.

ib. l. 55. Substitute comma for full stop after ἀνθρώπου: the next clause is still governed by ὡς τῶν of I. 54, as μὲν ... δὲ shews.

ib. l. 57. τὸ ἀπιστὸν δὲ τῇ ἀναστάσει. Read certainly ἀπιστῶν [suggested also in the editor’s app. crit.].

ib. ll. 62, 63. καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς δὲ ὡς κατὰ τοὺς λέγοντας μὴ εἶναι ἀναστάτων νεκρῶν, μηδὲ ζωῆς ὑπαρξόντις κατὰ τῶν βιῶν τούτων, φησί κτλ. This punctuation obscures the sense: read μετὰ τῶν βιῶν [suggested also by the editor], place comma after ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς δὲ, and remove that after νεκρῶν: ‘and in the next verses, too, he assumes that in the view of those who denied the resurrection of the dead there was no life at all after our present state, and says ...’

ib. l. 67. Φορὰ μᾶς ἔχει. For ἡμᾶς read ἡμᾶς.

ib. ll. 73-75. ὡς δὲ ἐπὶ παραδείγματος τῶν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ εἰδομένων ἀπαρχή ἀναφέρεται σίτῳ ἐπὶ τῶν σίτων θερισάντων ... ὡς κτλ. For colon after εἰδομένων substitute comma. I find some difficulty in εἰδομένων ‘we have seen’, for the whole of the passage in which ἀπαρχή might be dealt with seems to have been preserved, and there has been no reference to the firstfruits offered under the law: possibly διδομένων (compare Num. xviii 12 ὡς αὐτὸς ἀν δῶσι τῷ κυρίῳ) ‘just as in the parallel
case of the things given under the law an offering is made of corn...'

ib. l. 76. For ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν read ὁ κύριος ἡμῖν.

ib. l. 79. εἰ μὲν ὁνὸς κ.χ.ἱ.χ.ο.μεν λέξει ἀπλ' ἡς ἄρχης, κἀν ἐλέγομεν κτλ. I cannot translate the protasis as it stands: we seem to want something like εἰ μὲν ὁνὸς μόνην (ορ μὴ ἐτέραν) εἰχομεν λέξειν τῆς ἀπαρχῆς, 'if we had only got the phrase about firstfruits, we might have understood it as firstfruits of the righteous.'

ib. ll. 82-84. νῦν δὲ καὶ αὐτός ὁ ἀπόστολος λέγει ἐπειδή γὰρ δι' ἀνθρώπου ὁ θάνατος, καὶ δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν ἔποιες ἐπὶ τινας αὐτῶς λέγει ὃ τι ἐπὶ πάντας; ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῇ Ἀδὰμ πάντες κτλ. I should prefer to punctuate, πῶς; ἐπὶ τινας; αὐτός λέγει ὃτι ἐπὶ πάντας.

§ lxxxvii ll. 2-9. The construction of this sentence would be made clearer if lines 4-7, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς κιγκραμίδος... οὐ καταγελᾶς, were printed as a parenthesis.

§ lxxxix 1. 3. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ἄναγκαι μετὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς πέμπων αὐτὸν παρακατατιθέναι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Read παρακατατίθεναι: the verb is only used in the middle voice.

ib. ll. 24. Substitute comma for full stop after ποιήσων: lines 23 to 27 form a single sentence, and the νῶν μὲν of l. 23 is answered (I suppose) by ἀλλὰ of l. 25.

ib. ll. 28, 29. ἐκδέχομαι οὖν ἄκοιν γὰρ ἐπανελευσόμενον, ἀπαγγέλλοντά μοι τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς. I do not think this can mean either Ἐμ I am waiting to hear that he is coming back’ (which is doubtful grammar), or Ἐμ I am expecting him, for I hear that he is coming back’ (which is untrue to fact): the sentence is complete without ἄκοιν, and something like τάχον would give better sense. [ἄκοιν has been suggested to me, and is certainly a very easy change.]

ib. l. 33. οὖν ἐπείδικαξέστο τούτῳ ποι. ἀλλὰ παρεκώρισεν. Read ἵπποι τότου [so even Cramer]: ‘he did not claim the position [of bishop], but retired.’ Possibly the text reading is a misprint.

ib. l. 35. For ἀπεθάνας read ἀπεθήκας.

C. H. TURNER.