THE COPTIC GNOSTIC LIBRARY

EDITED WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION, INTRODUCTION AND NOTES
published under the auspices of
THE INSTITUTE FOR ANTIQUITY AND CHRISTIANITY

NAG HAMMADI CODEX

III,5

THE DIALOGUE OF THE SAVIOR

CONTRIBUTORS
STEPHEN EMMEL · HELMUT KOESTER · ELAINE PAGELS

VOLUME EDITOR
STEPHEN EMMEL

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1984

THE MANUSCRIPT

cωp (bis; cωтнp is spelled out in full in the super- and subscript title of the text, and once within the text).

The long spelling of the definite article (пе-, те-, не-) is used where expected in Sahidic,[57] with but three exceptions: 125:9 п̄пn̄ɑ, 129:7 n̄ϩвноγє, 130:2 ѳ[н.

Further orthographic fluctuation is evidenced by variations in the spelling of individual words and grammatical forms: ɑмɑϩτε (1x)/ємɑϩτε (2x), ɑpı- (1x)/єpı- (1x), єнєϩ (10x)/ɑннϩє (3x), єpɑτ⸗ (13x)/єpєт⸗ (142:19 єpєт-тноγτn̄), кє- (1x)/бє- (if my analysis of 144:20 is correct), м̄мо⸗ (passim)/м̄мɑ⸗ (138:12–13), мєєγє (1x)/мєоγє (1x), соγn̄- (2x)/соγωn- (3x), тноγтn̄ (1x)/тннoγ (3x), oγωω (1x)/oγωωє (2x), ωϩє (6x)/ɑϩє (1x), ϩн (1x)/єϩн (1x), мɑpıϩɑм (4x)/мɑpıϩɑммн (7x) Rel Pres єтoγ- (4x)/єтєγ- (1x), Fut 2 pl. тєтn̄нɑ- (4x)/тєтнɑ- (7x),[58] III Fut neg n̄нєч- (2x)/нєч- (2x), єнωɑн- (1x)/єнωɑ- (1x), єp-ωɑн- (1x)/єpωɑ- (1x), єpωɑтм̄- (1x)/єpтм̄тє- (5x), possessive art 3 pl. пєγ-, тєγ-, нєγ- (5x)/поγ-, тoγ- (3x), demonstrative art пєєı-, тєєı-, нєєı- (passim)/нɑı̈- (141:6).

In addition, there are a number of words and forms which occur in more or less unexpected spellings, without variants: мнє (12x), нɑє (1x), absolute possessive pron pl. нω⸗ (2x), n̄нɑϩpn̄- (1x), cɑєıє (1x), cєхп- (1x), ϩıє (2x), ϩoлєб (1x), хωвє (2x), моноxoc (1x), III Fut neg 3 pl. n̄нoγ- (1x), Cond 2 sing. f єpωɑн- (1x).[59] Vocalic reduction is not orthographically expressed in n̄тωтn̄- (2x), oγωω- (1x), and ωмк- (1x).

The Relative Perfect forms are spelled with initial n̄ (as also the II Perfect forms), never with єн. But єтɑтєтn̄ is the only attested spelling of the 2 pl. form (145:20), and the paradigm also contains the forms пєнтɑϩ- (146:18*), єтɑϩ- (132:16), and єp- (133:10).[60] Special mention deserves to be made of the peculiar form of the conditional negative єpтм̄тє- (127:1, 134:1, 134:5, for which I have no explanation. ... se introduced by xє- or xєкɑɑc are formed with the negative, but in the affirmative they are formed

16   INTRODUCTION

the Pauline epistles, the affinity with deutero-Pauline language, and the possible use of *Gos. Thom.* suggest a date for the composition of *Dial. Sav.* in the early decades of the second century C.E. The work certainly belongs to an earlier period than the *Epistula apostolorum* (which presupposes the Pauline corpus and whose author possibly knew several gospels of the New Testament canon) and Justin Martyr (who used the gospels of Matthew and Luke). But the dialogue source used by the author of *Dial. Sav.* should be dated in the last decades of the first century C.E., and certainly not later than the gospel of John.