



pas cantonner à la seule époque pré-dioclétienne. Et il faut aussi se souvenir des insuffisances du Liddell-Scott-Jones, récemment mises en évidence par Th. Drew-Bear (*Bull.Epigr.* 73.83 et 74.126). Nous attendons encore le dépouillement des témoignages épigraphiques, qui avait été commencé par H. van Herwerden, sans les *a priori* que je crois responsables de l'insatisfaction éprouvée par le lecteur.

Institut F. Courby
Lyon

J. Marcillet-Jaubert

ANNOUNCEMENT

[The following research note, by Mr. Stephen Emmel, was communicated to the Editor in Cairo, December 1976.]

Nag Hammadi Codex I, the Jung Codex, was separated from the rest of the Nag Hammadi Library for more than a quarter of a century, until October 12, 1975, when the Coptic Museum in Old Cairo registered the receipt of 31 plexiglass containers from Zürich, Switzerland. These held the last of the leaves of Codex I, as well as the remaining unidentified fragments, that had been taken out of Egypt at the end of 1948. But although the separation was over, work on the codex was not. During the following year, in conjunction with my participation in the Nag Hammadi Codices Editing Project of the American Research Center in Egypt, I was able to make a series of papyrological observations that have led to an understanding of the construction of the Jung Codex significantly different from the conclusions presented in the *editio princeps* (see especially R. Kasser et al., *Tractatus Tripartitus*, Part I [Bern: Francke Verlag, 1973] 11-13).

The most important discovery concerns the leaf published in the *editio princeps* as pp. "143(?)/144(?)," on which the only two extant pages of *The Prayer of the Apostle Paul* are inscribed. Shortly after the return of this leaf to the Coptic Museum, I was able to verify that its horizontal fibers are identical to those of the small strip of papyrus glued to the inner margin of p. 85 of the codex. Since these two leaves thus form a sheet, the assertions of the *editio princeps* that the codex contained a fourth quire, that all the quires had been glued together at the spine in the same way that the second and third quires clearly were, and that the binder had discarded a leaf from the second quire (*op. cit.* 12, esp. notes 1 and 4) must all be rejected.

On October 18, 1976, I discovered that these same horizontal fibers are also identical to those of p. 83 of the codex. This means that the leaf on which

The Prayer of the Apostle Paul is inscribed came from the same papyrus roll from which part of the first quire was manufactured. The further discovery that the contours of deterioration of this leaf are identical to those of the first pages of the book clearly proved that it is actually the very first leaf of the codex. Since the Coptic scribe apparently gave no page numbers to this leaf, it must originally have been the front flyleaf of the codex and therefore left blank. *The Prayer of the Apostle Paul* must have been inscribed there only after the rest of the codex had been paginated and is a text of only about 48 lines (of which about 3 have been lost from the top of the first page, and 2 or 3 from the top of the second). *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*, in accordance with its usual practice in such matters, will designate the pages of this text as A and B. James M. Robinson has also indicated to me that in that edition and in the editions of *The Coptic Gnostic Library* series the tractates will be renumbered accordingly: *The Prayer of the Apostle Paul* is actually tractate 1, *The Apocryphon of James* tractate 2, *The Gospel of Truth* tractate 3, *The Treatise on the Resurrection* tractate 4, and *The Tripartite Tractate* tractate 5.

The Jung Codex, then, is composed of three quires and originally contained an inscribed but unpaginated front flyleaf and not more than 142 pages. The first quire is comprised of the front flyleaf and pp. 1-86, the second of pp. 87-118, and the third begins with p. 119 and would have ended with p. 142. Since the last leaf would have come from near the end of a papyrus roll, it is possible that it was only a partial leaf and unsuitable for inscription. However, it is clear from the continuity of horizontal fibers that the fragmentary leaf identified in the *editio princeps* as pp. 139/140 is really pp. 137/138 so that thus at least two pages, and perhaps four, must have followed what is thought to be the end of *The Tripartite Tractate*. Nothing of these last two leaves survives. But the fact that *The Prayer of the Apostle Paul* was copied onto the front flyleaf instead of onto the final pages of the codex and the existence of faint traces of ink beneath the presumed end of *The Tripartite Tractate* on p. 138 suggest that these last pages may have been inscribed with yet a fourth very short part of the latter text, or perhaps with a long colophon, or even with a sixth tractate.