

addi viene, ma anche per i suggerimenti metodologici di cui è latore, attestando fattivamente che l'apporto derivante da ambiti disciplinari e da metodi di indagine diversi non può che accrescere la possibilità di conoscere in profondità l'oggetto di una ricerca. Eloquente ed esemplare ci sembra, in proposito, la sua conclusione relativa in particolare alla papirologia (p. 690): «Un tel constat n'est pas sans retombées méthodologiques: l'étanchéité des deux grandes catégories – le littéraire et le documentaire –, qui scindent la science papyrologique, apparaît à la lumière de ce travail artificielle et souvent réductrice».

ANTONIETTA PORRO

C. HEDRICK and P. MIRECKI (ed.), *The Gospel of the Savior*, Polebridge Press, Santa Rosa, Ca. 1995, pp. 165 (plates pp. 123-151).

This text has finally seen the light of publication largely thanks to P. Mirecki. When he first looked at the fragments of P. Berol. 222220 (in the possession of the Berlin-Charlottenburg Museum since 1967), Mr. Mirecki thought that they might be gospel paraphrases from a Coptic homily (p. 3). It appears to have been the suggestion made by Hans-Martin Schenke at the Coptic Congress in 1996 that prompted the re-evaluation of the text as a «gospel», that is, a collection of sayings of Jesus (though never mentioned by this name in the text) in dialogue form, the whole being perhaps situated within a narrative (p. 16). Since the word «saviour» occurs 8 times, the title «Gospel of the Saviour» has been invented for the text (though it might easily have been the «Gospel of the Cross», since the word «cross» occurs 15 times).

In the discussion about the original language of the text (p. 12) the use of the verb *shôrp* to mean «be eager for, hasten to» is explained as a misunderstanding of a secondary meaning of the Greek word *orthrizein*, which can mean «be early, first» and «be eager for», thus making the text likely to be a translation from Greek into Coptic. Two points may be made here: (a) surely the general meaning of the Coptic word includes the notion of «haste» or «eagerness»? (b) if the text really is an early apocryphal gospel to be dated somewhere in the 2nd cent AD, then Greek is in any case likely to have been the original language of composition.

Parallels with other texts are set forth on pp. 20 ff. The only word-for-word similarities are between GSav and two passages of Matthew. All the other parallels, including a saying shared exclusively with the Gospel of Thomas, are similar enough to suggest that they probably come from a common oral tradition, and echoes of gnosticism in GSav suggest a variety of Christianity that predates the homogenising organisation into the Great Church that took place in the 4th cent AD.

The following are a few comments on the text and translation and are quoted by page no. of the book and line no. of the text:

First a general observation: two forms of the definite article (cf. W. Till, *Koptische Grammatik* (1966) §202) seem to be in use throughout the text. Since they are not indexed, here is a list of them, including those that seem clear enough despite the fragmentary nature of the text.



n-: 28, 13, 18, 61; 34, 40, 43; 44, 9, 25; 46, 25, 36, 78, 6; 80, 5

ni-: 34, 35; 40, 60; 44, 5

28, 18: «kingdom» does not require square brackets.

25: the word after *rekrīke* looks as if it might be the verbal prefix «until». Since it is extremely difficult to see anything on the photograph, once can only guess what the text might say, but I suggest something like *shantetnerjiēutn* «until you secure yourselves» (CD 530b).

30, 31: I suppose the translation «the person» is intended to mean «man» (which, minus the definite article, was at one time quite commonly used in the abstract non-sexist sense).

32, 3: It is not clear to me what «yet» means. It seems to imply a contrast between this statement and the preceding quotation, but I would suggest that this is far from obvious. The sense in which I understand this passage is «Well, now. Let me tell you something. I am the Good Shepherd...».

34, 41: The usual preposition here would be *ejn* not *nsa* (CD 445a, but presumably has the meaning attested with various verbs in 314a).

34, 48: *bōl ebol* translated here as «be destroyed», though the induex provides the meaning «tr. destroy», while later on 36, 48 in a fragmentary context it is assigned the meaning «release». The first meaning seems appropriate enough in the context of 34, 48, but there is no context in 36, 48, and either «be destroyed» or «release» could fit.

37, 41: I do not know what the first letter in this line, but it does not much look like a *janja*.

37, 43 ff.: it is not clear how the editors have understood this passage. The commentary merely says that the separation of the two groups has been «effected by the shadow of the cross», but provides no help in understanding the sentence. The understanding seems to be something like «[they/you] have cast a shadow over [them], namely those on the right [to separate them from] those on the left», which is unlikely since the particle *nqi* is normally used to refer back to the subject of a verb, not the object of it. There is undoubtedly a contrast between those on the right and those on the left. Might one perhaps understand the whole passage as follows: *those on the right have not cast a shadow over you (the cross), while those on the left of the (wooden?) cross will be destroyed.*

38, 39 ff.: this passage is explained as a reference to an unknown group looking towards the cross, various members of the group «mocking» and «deriding». The footnote reference in the commentary p. 100 n. 62 evidently relates the passage in some unspecified way to the canonical Gospel texts dealing with the crucifixion, where the soldiers are jeering the Saviour (Mat. 27, 23 and Mk. 15, 18-20) and the followers of Christ are crying and lamenting (Lk. 23, 27). But one might understand the passage in another way: the cross symbolises salvation, and there will be those with a positive attitude to the cross, the smiling and joyful (=saved) and those with a negative attitude, the crying and lamenting (=not saved).

40, 25 f.: presumably an exhortation to stop being afraid. Read something like [*noubm*] *mmōtn* [*hnbh*]ote «save yourselves from the fear of which you are afraid»?

46, 24 ff.: I suggest that a more accurate translation of this passage is «The Son prostrated himself at the feet of his Father», the preposition to be supplied at the beginning of I.26 being *m* and not *e*. Cf. ex. in CD 273b from BMis 518.

34: I wonder if the repetition of the verb *pôht*, albeit in a different sense, at this point is deliberate wordplay? Surely *ejn* means «for» (CD 757a meaning b).

47, 38: *mmate* can mean «only» and «greatly» (CD 190 a-b) arguably means »greatly» here. If the meaning were «only», one would expect it to come after «Jacob» in I.42. The sense is surely that as a Jew himself Jesus is greatly concerned for his nation.

54, 21: *mabk ebol hntmnrmmao* (restored from p. 56, 59-60) could also be translated as «pay/reward you from my wealth». The commentary on p. 116 suggests that it is one of the opposite states juxtaposed in ll. 23 ff., all expressed by the use of the Conjunctive, which implies a certain inevitability. But the sentence using the First Future is not itself one of them, but rather a pro-active commitment of the Saviour to reward the Cross, originally merely mundane planks of wood, for its role in the Crucifixion (a *sine qua non*, as it were) by elevating it to spiritual status.

ANTHONY ALCOCK