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The International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, nominated by UNESCO and appointed by the Arab Republic of Egypt, held its first meeting in Cairo on 15–18 December 1970 (see Chapter 11, Part 3 below). Item 13 in the Minutes called for a recording of the history of the discovery and subsequent research:

It was agreed that a history of the Nag Hammadi discovery and of subsequent research should be written in the future.

*The Nag Hammadi Story: From the Discovery to the Publication* thus becomes the last implementation on my part of the agreements made by the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, of which I was Permanent Secretary. *The Nag Hammadi Story* is not a history of research in the usual sense of a *Forschungsbericht*, which would report on the massive amount of scholarship that has been devoted to the content of the Nag Hammadi Codices for more than a half-century. Rather it is a socio-historical narration of just what went on during the thirty-two years from their discovery late in 1945, via their initial trafficking, and then the attempts to monopolize them, until finally, through the intervention of UNESCO, the whole collection of thirteen Codices was published in facsimiles and in English translation, both completed late in 1977.

The sequence of the thirteen chapters that follow is in general chronological, but does focus topically on the main issue involved at each juncture, and on the rôle of the nation whose scholars were at that time most active. Obviously the camel-drivers who made the discovery, the village traffickers, and the Cairo antiquities dealers of 1945–1946 were all located in Egypt (Chapter 1). The French have long dominated the international culture of Cairo, as well as its archaeological activities, so that the first scholarly involvement in 1947–1953, largely by Jean Doresse and his mentor Henri-Charles Puech, was French (Chapter 2). The acquisition by the Jung Institute of the bulk of the Eid Codex (Codex I) on 10 May 1952 brought the center of activity to Zürich for the celebration of its ‘baptism’ as the ‘Jung Codex’ on 15 November 1953 (Chapter 3). From then on, until the Swiss Ambassador to Egypt, Beat von Fischer-Reichenbach, was transferred to Portugal on 14 June 1954, efforts to gain access and publication rights to the small part of
Codex I remaining in Egypt, and even to gain publication rights for all the Nag Hammadi Codices, had their focus in Zürich and the Swiss Embassy in Cairo (Chapter 4). This undertaking was then continued by Dutch diplomacy, with Gilles Quispel going to Cairo for this purpose in April 1955 (Chapter 5). Finally an ‘International Committee of Gnosticism’ met in Cairo in September–October 1956, though this International Committee achieved little, and never met again (Chapter 6). Hence the most significant outcome of the 1956 meeting, though without official approval, was the publication of The Gospel of Thomas, which however took place only toward the end of 1959 (Chapter 7). Meanwhile the Suez War, which exploded just as the meeting of the International Committee of Gnosticism was reaching its conclusion, suspended all French influence, with the result that leadership was taken over by scholars from the German Democratic Republic from 1957 through 1963 (Chapter 8). The French regained indirect leadership by involving UNESCO, based in Paris and quite naturally turning to local scholars for advice, through the 1960s (Chapter 9). The American involvement began, after the Messina Congress on the Origins of Gnosticism in 1966, with the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of California’s Institute for Antiquity and Christianity late in the 1960s (Chapter 10). Then UNESCO’s International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices met in Cairo in 1970, and again in 1976, leading to the final publication in San Francisco of all the Nag Hammadi codices by the end of 1977 (Chapter 11). Beginning in 1975, the site of the discovery was excavated by a Swedish-American team led by Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, while the excavation of the nearby Basilica of St. Pachomius was led by Peter Grossmann (Chapter 12). The Nag Hammadi Story would not be complete without Acknowledgements of the many who were constructive in quite varied ways through all of this 32-year period (Chapter 13).

Extensive quotations from French, Dutch, and German correspondence are included in footnotes, with only minimal standardizing of style and correction of typographical errors (letters are not as carefully proof-read by their authors as are published texts!). Then, in the body of the text, these extensive footnotes are translated into English. In the translations, square brackets [ ] are occasionally used to insert something needed to clarify a given point in a letter. The translations are not pedantically verbatim, since they should be readable as good English, not just as wooden translation-English. But they do seek to translate accurately and fully both the statement being made and the subtle overtones involved.

Yet translation cannot convey everything, and hence the attention of readers should be drawn to the original language in the footnotes, to sense Jean Doresse’s every-day street French and his occasional attempts at En-
lish, in contrast to Henri-Charles Puech’s convoluted and elegant, though often verbose and blunt, French-only prose, based on his higher education at the École normale supérieure; Beat von Fischer-Reichenbach’s sophisticated and diplomatically nuanced multi-lingualism as an aristocrat (Baron) from an elegant estate I visited in Bern; and Gilles Quispel’s journalistic ability to function effectively, if not always grammatically exact, in German, French, and English, well beyond his native Dutch, and thus to become Doresse’s successor, and my predecessor, both in mediating among the academic communities and in facilitating the involvement of the wider public.

In order to avoid having to repeat the same details in more than one chapter, cross-references to the main discussion of a topic are given in parentheses, where lengthy French quotations that are not subsequently repeated in the original language may be found, or a more extensive discussion be followed.

As a result of the vast amount of correspondence involved, the profiles of the main participants become unmistakable. Particularly impressive for their integrity, fairness, generosity, and helpfulness were Walter Till and Antoine Guillaumont. But the presentation itself is not intended to evaluate the persons involved; it only reports criticisms of persons, which often occur in the correspondence, when they have to do with what was actually taking place. This does not necessarily mean that the criticisms themselves are valid, but only that the making of such criticisms played a relevant rôle in what was going on. In some quotations there are condescending references to Egyptians; when they are explicit or implicit in letters quoted for other reasons, they are retained, since that prejudice played a rôle in what was taking place. But one should also acknowledge the corrective launched by Edward W. Said, University Professor at Columbia University, to expose such ‘orientalism’ as superimposed on the reality of the ‘Near East’ by precisely such condescending scholars.¹

Most of the personages in The Nag Hammadi Story are men. But there are significant women whose rôle should not be overlooked. Marianne Doresse, née Guentch-Ogloueff of Russian emigré background, studied in Paris as a classmate of the future Director of the Coptic Museum, Togo Mina, under Abbé Étienne Drioton, the head of the Egyptian Department of Antiquities. Then, prior to her marriage to Jean Doresse, she became a Curator at the Musée Guimet in Paris. She not only wrote reports of their annual

missions in Egypt for my information, as well as a curriculum vitae of Jean Doresse, but she typed, and no doubt in part helped compose, his texts for publication. Dr. Gertrud Böhlig, a scholar of early Christianity in her own right, shared in the research of her husband Prof. Alexander Böhlig, as well as caring for his epileptic needs. During our work in the Coptic Museum Peggy Hedrick, wife of my Research Assistant Charles Hedrick, joined the conjugate leaves of the Nag Hammadi Codices in new double-sized plexiglass containers, as the placement of fragments moved toward completion. This made it possible, when these containers were stacked one on top of the other, to see the whole codex in place, as if opened at the center of the quire, so that pervasive traits, such as holes in the papyrus and the irregular edges of the leaves, could be traced down from leaf to leaf through the whole codex. Samiha ‘Abd el-Shaheed was Curator at the Coptic Museum beginning in December 1963, Chief Curator responsible for the manuscript section from December 1966 on, Vice-Director of the Coptic Museum from 1993–1997, General Director of the Coptic Museum from March to October 1997, and again Vice-Director from October 1997 to her retirement in October 2001. She was hence our Supervisor: She had to authorize the opening of each plexiglass container when a fragment was identified, then to record it being moved from that container onto the leaf to which it belonged in another container. Indeed, she shared with us the work of attaching such placed fragments to the lower plexiglass pane before closing and sealing the two panes, and thus became the primary Copt actually involved in the final conservation of the Nag Hammadi Codices.

The present volume could not have been produced without the exacting and complete bibliographical coverage provided by David M. Scholer, in his three volumes devoted to the Nag Hammadi bibliography.2 They provide full bibliographical information for most items in the footnotes, which, in the case of monographs, does not have to be repeated, after an initial footnote, in each subsequent reference. Furthermore, a complete bibliography at the conclusion of the present work is also not necessary.

Just as the present work does not need to seek bibliographical exhaustiveness, given the accessibility of Scholer’s *Nag Hammadi Bibliography*, so also it does not need to include other scholarly material that is already available elsewhere. Hence it does not reproduce photographs of individual pages, in view of *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*, or present a critical edition of the Coptic texts, in view of the critical editions that have been published in German, French, and English, or present the resultant insights into Coptic grammar, in view of Bentley Layton’s Sahidic grammar, or present the codicology of the Nag Hammadi codices, in view of the analyses of the quires, rolls, kollemata, and covers in the *Introduction* to *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*, or present translations, 

---

3 *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*, published under the auspices of the Department of Antiquities of the Arab Republic of Egypt in conjunction with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, James M. Robinson, Permanent Secretary (Leiden: Brill), in twelve volumes: *Introduction* (paperback brochure, 1972; greatly enlarged hardback edition, 1984); *Codex I* (1977); *Codex II* (1974); *Codex III* (1976); *Codex IV* (1975); *Codex V* (1975); *Codex VI* (1972); *Codex VII* (1972); *Codex VIII* (1976); *Codices IX–X* (1977); *Codices XI–XIII* (1973); *Cartonnage* (1979).

4 They are listed in the introductions to each tractate in *Nag Hammadi Deutsch and Nag Hammadi Deutsch: Studienausgabe* (see below).


in view of complete translations now available in English, German, and French, or present detailed studies of texts, in view of Nag Hammadi Studies, the sub-series ‘Études’ in the Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi (see above), and many individual contributions. Instead, The Nag Hammadi Story presents the socio-historical context behind these basic scholarly tools, with a narration of the discovery, trafficking, monopolizing, and final publication of the Nag Hammadi Codices.

The Nag Hammadi Story is based on very extensive Nag Hammadi Archives, donated to me in my capacity as Permanent Secretary of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices. These archives reveal what was really going on, usually behind the scenes, in the otherwise hardly intelligible series of events between their discovery and the completion of their publication. These letters are identified in the footnotes by date, sender, and recipient, e.g.: “4 i 55: Letter from Meier to Quispel.” This alerts the reader to the fact that the letter in question is available to the public in the Nag Hammadi Archives housed in the Honnold Library of the Claremont Colleges. French, Dutch, and German letters are quoted extensively in the footnotes, with an English translation in the body of the text. There are

---


11 Jean-Paul Mahé and Paul-Hubert Poirier, eds., Écrits gnostiques: La bibliothèque de Nag Hammadi (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade; Paris: Gallimard, 2007).

12 Nag Hammadi Studies (eds. Martin Krause, James M. Robinson, and Frederik Wisse; Leiden: Brill, 1971); then, since 1994, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies (eds. James M. Robinson and Hans Joachim Klimkeit); then, since 1998, edited by Stephen Emmel and Hans Joachim Klimkeit; then, since 1999, by Stephen Emmel and Johannes van Oort; then, since 2008, by Einar Thomasson and Johannes van Oort).
also previously unknown early reports that are here made public (see below, Chapter 1, Part 4).

Appreciation needs to be expressed to those who have provided their correspondence to the Archives, in hopes that they would serve to set the record straight, a trust the present work seeks to honor. The largest contributions came from C.A. Meier, Director Emeritus of the Jung Institute; Gilles Quispel; Pahor Labib; Alexander Böhlig; UNESCO; Antoine Guillau- mont; the Bollingen Foundation; the Library of the University of Michigan; and Jean Doresse, who in retrospect published the fact of his donation.\(^\text{13}\)

So I did not know until much later—too late—that J.M. Robinson, having decided to save—which he did—this extraordinary library, was trying to enter into contact with me; ... these attempts were embroiled, disfigured by strange gossip, until the day in 1972 when I accepted, reluctantly ('burnt fingers,' as the proverb puts it) to take myself to this Institute of Claremont to which I transmitted, once I had determined its efficiency, what I had accumulated on a discovery that had become the worst memory of my career. ...

And that is why J.M. Robinson and myself, after having pulled this affair from the mire, me with 'gee,' to save the manuscripts, he with 'haw,' to publish the edition, cannot look at each other without a smile.

There have also been criticisms of my early published reports on the discovery and the trafficking in the codices. I have quoted them extensively, and provided my response (see Chapter 1, Part 5 below).

In the Arab world a person is normally given only one name, but, to distinguish that person from others with the same name, the name of the father is usually added, and even that of the grandfather (or clan). Thus the use of the first name is not a sign of familiarity, but rather the normal and even formal form of address; only in international society does the name of the father

or grandfather come to function as a family (‘last’) name at the expense of one’s own (‘first’) name. The most familiar instance is ‘Pahor Labib,’ who is not usually referred to simply as ‘Pahor,’ or ‘Labib,’ but rather as ‘Pahor Labib.’ When a person with such a name makes use of a spelling in our script, this standardized western spelling is retained, even though it often presupposes not the English, but the French transliteration system dominant in the international society of Egypt (e.g. the French for the definite article, el-, rather than al-). In the French, Dutch, and German correspondence quoted in footnotes, various transliterations of the same Arabic name occur, in which case they are retained with these minor divergences, also in the translation, and indeed in the discussion of such quotations in the surrounding body of the text. But elsewhere the transliteration system has been followed that was prepared for the Library of Congress by Dr. Lola Atiya. Her husband, Aziz S. Atiya, Distinguished Professor of History at the University of Utah, was the Editor of The Coptic Encyclopedia, but only with her major assistance as copy editor, for which the University of Utah, at my suggestion, awarded her an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters. Her transliteration system has subsequently been expanded for the present work by S. Michael Saad and Ramses Wassif. I am also indebted to Joseph Sanzo, at the time a graduate student at U.C.L.A., for assisting in entering these transliterations of Arabic script into the text, as well as for providing the fonts of Coptic (New Athena Unicode) and Greek (Lucida Grande) used when these languages occur.

Persons with Arab names who use a westernized spelling that is followed here are the following: Georgy Sobhy, Togo Mina, Pahor Labib, Raouf Habib, Victor Girgis, Samiha ʿAbd el-Shaheed, Boulos, Labib Habachi, Murad Kamil, Hishmet Messiah, Gamal El Din Mokhtar, Aly Ayoub, Taha Hussein, Alexandre Badawy, S. Michael Saad, Hany N. Takla, Edward W. Saad, Hanny M. el-Zeiny.

In some cases I have enlisted the support of those more familiar with material in a given chapter than am I. François Bovon resolved problems in the French of Doresse and Puech; Gerrit K. Bos, Kristin de Troyer, and Loes Schouten helped produce publishable translations of Dutch quotations. For all such assistance both the author and the readers are indebted.

---

14 The Arabic alphabet, in its traditional order (but beginning with hamzat-alqatʿ, rather than alif, which is omitted) is transliterated as follows: ʾ, b, t, th, j, ḥ, kh, d, dh, r, z, s, sh, ṣ, ḍ, ṭ, ṭzʿ, gh, f, q, k, l, m, n, h, w, y. The vowels are transliterated as short and long a ā, i ī and u ū. ʾ is omitted before a and u at the beginning of a word.

The sheer amount of material that is available in the Archives makes a narration possible that is not only much more complete, but also much more accurate and objective, than what is usually the case in recording recent history. Of course, even the very extensive Archives do not contain all the correspondence and documentation regarding what took place in connection with the Nag Hammadi codices. Yet much that is absent can be determined from letters that refer to missing items and at times even quote them.

Most of what happens in history is not in written form, but oral. I also carried on rather endless interviews, especially in Egypt, both in the villages of the Nag Hammadi region, and in Dishna, Cairo, and Alexandria. When a character in the narrative is first mentioned in *The Nag Hammadi Story*, a footnote lists all the dates on which he was interviewed. This avoids the easy assumption that they were only passing comments of little value; rather, an ongoing process of repeated cross-examination, and of interviewing participants about the involvement of other participants, tended to lay bare the factual dimensions of what went on. Jotted notes of these interviews were preserved in black notebooks where I recorded day by day what went on while in Egypt. A tape recorder was used to a limited extent, so as to be able to have Copts involved in the story tell their memories without being constantly interrupted by a translator. A student at Pomona College whose native tongue was Arabic transcribed for me her English translation of such Arabic reports.

In following up leads, interviews were conducted outside of Egypt, in Cyprus, Israel, France, Switzerland, The Netherlands, East and West Germany, Italy, England, the United States, Denmark, and Sweden. Some chapters were circulated in early drafts not only to the members of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, but also to participants whose activity was also primarily involved, such as Hans-Martin Schenke and Alexander Böhlig in Germany, and Simone Eid in Belgium.


The Claremont Colleges Digital Library (CCDL) is home to the photographic Nag Hammadi Archive (http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/landingpage/collection/nha). It is an open access, online, digital collection of more than a thousand photographs of the persons and places that occur in The Nag Hammadi Story: selected photographs of the codices themselves, the discoverers and traffickers, those who worked on the papyri at the Coptic Museum, scholarly meetings devoted to the Nag Hammadi Codices, and the archaeological excavations near the site of the discovery. In footnotes throughout the present work, one will find URL (Universal Resource Locator) references to photographs. By entering such a URL in one’s computer browser program, one will immediately see the referenced photograph from the digital collection along with additional (at times still imprecise) information about the photograph. For example, the following footnote provides the URL for the photograph of most of the Nag Hammadi Codices stacked together in the Cairo home of Maria Dattari before they were disassembled at the Coptic Museum.

If on the other hand one would simply like to browse the digital Nag Hammadi photographic collection, one may access the collection using the URL of the collection as a whole listed above, then click on Browse items in this collection located in a box on the right side of the collection home page. Miniatures of all the photographs that are in the Nag Hammadi Archive, in the alphabetical order of their titles, will appear seriatim on the screen. One can scroll through them in search of a desired photograph. If one then clicks on the miniature itself, it is enlarged, and information about the photograph becomes visible. The last item listed beneath this enlarged photograph is a field called ‘Object File Name,’ beginning ‘nha’ and continuing with 5 digits, followed by ‘.tif.’ This is the permanent number of this photograph that should be used in requesting a copy of a given photograph (see below).

Or, one can shorten this time-consuming procedure if one enters the name of a person or place in the Search this collection box on the collection home page,

---

and then clicks search, which gives an alphabetized list only of photographs using that name. In order to obtain for use in this procedure the transliteration of an Arabic name that involves lines above and dots below letters, even hooks on the line, one may browse through the photographs seriatim until that name appears, and then copy it into the Search this collection box.

Or, if one already knows the Object File Name of a photograph, one can enter, in the Search this collection box on the collection home page, just nha and the five-digit number followed by an asterisk (*), e.g. nha00001* in the case of the photograph of the codices stacked together, and click on search, whereupon the desired miniature photograph will appear on the screen.

Or, beneath the Search this collection box there is a yellow bar with an option reading Across All Fields. It contains, when activated on its right, a series of options narrowing one’s search. If one chooses among the options either ‘Title’ or ‘Description,’ and enters in the Search this collection box the name of the person or place, and then clicks search, the list of miniature photographs with that name in the title or description comes on the screen.

Or, below Across All Fields there is the further indication: Index by: Subject. When this is clicked, one is given an alphabetical listing of names, places, and other key words to help locate particular items. If one clicks on a term from this list, a list of miniature photographs with that term in the subject field comes on the screen.

Since the Object File Name is always the official identification of a given photograph, it should be used to request a copy of that photograph from the Claremont Colleges Digital Library. Anyone interested in obtaining a copy of a particular photograph for research and/or publication purposes should forward their request to the Claremont Colleges Digital Library—a ‘contact us’ link can be found at the top of every page within the CCDL. CCDL staff members will forward the request to the appropriate organization for their review and approval. Because of its open access status, all collections within the Claremont Colleges Digital Library are accessible to researchers around the world free of charge.

In the footnotes, the first time a monograph is cited, the full bibliographical information is provided, but in subsequent references only the author, title, and relevant pagination is given, unless the fuller entry is useful at a given location. In the early period the source of most information about the Nag Hammadi Codices came from two books that are hence so basic that the full bibliographical information is provided here, especially since their publication was in both cases complex: Jean Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, translated into English, The Secret Books of the Egyptian

---

Gnostics, then with a changed title, *The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts*;\(^{18}\) and Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*.\(^{19}\) The printing of the latter book, by the *Imprimerie* of the *Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire*, was begun in 1960, with parts actually printed for private distribution as early as 1961. Hence “Nachträge und Verbesserungen” are appended (pp. 295–307), reflecting work through 1962. Hans-Martin Schenke was able to report:\(^{20}\)


\(^{19}\) Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo* (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Koptische Reihe, 1; Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1962). The book was written by Martin Krause of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Abteilung Kairo under the supervision of Pahor Labib, Director of the Coptic Museum in Cairo. The printing of the book, by the *Imprimerie* of the *Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire*, was begun in 1960, with parts actually printed for private distribution as early as 1961, even before Krause gained access to the parallel text from Codex IV that was to be included in the volume.

\(^{20}\) Schenke, *OLZ* 59 (1964): 552–553:

Übrigens muß man, um zur rechten Beurteilung der vorliegenden Ausgabe zu gelangen, in Rechnung stellen, was ich von K. erst nachträglich brüflich erfuhr, daß sie unter ganz ungewöhnlich schwierigen Bedingungen zustande gekommen ist: K. bekam z. B. Codex IV erst zu sehen, als Codex III schon gesetzt war; dann sollte die Edition, auf Wunsch von Pahor Labib, möglichst schnell erscheinen, zog sich aber doch unerwartet in die Länge; das Manuskript ging stückweise in Druck; die Fragmente durften nicht zusammengesetzt werden usw.
Incidentally, in order to reach a true evaluation of this edition, one must take into account what I first learned subsequently in a letter from Krause: It took place under quite unusually difficult conditions. For example, Krause was able to see [the parallel text in] Codex IV only after Codex III was already set in type. Then, at the request of Pahor Labib, the edition was supposed to appear as rapidly as possible, and yet unexpectedly dragged on over a long period of time. The manuscript went to press bit by bit; the fragments could not be joined together, etc.

Though the title page lists 1962 as the date of publication, Rodolphe Kasser reported that it was actually published only in 1963:

... this work did not really leave the press until 1963.

In the case of journals and series, the abbreviations are used that are to be found in Siegfried M. Schwertner, IATG: Internationales Abkürzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete: Zeitschriften, Series, Lexika, Quellenwerke mit bibliographischen Angaben, 2., überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1992).

Two Copts call for special recognition, since they provided me with reliable and intelligent mediation, including translation, as the work was being carried on. Labib Habachi, the outstanding Coptic archaeologist of his generation, provided the workers for the excavation and in many other ways facilitated the work both at the site of the discovery and in Cairo. Abrām Bibāwī, Principal of the Nag Hammadi Boys’ Preparatory School, provided contact with local persons who were involved in the discovery and trafficking. Indeed, his home in Nag Hammadi above the Pharmacie El-Salam on Station Street operated by his brother became the informal headquarters of the project. Fortunately, they worked well together, and with all involved.

Those involved in Nag Hammadi studies near the beginning were tempted to sensationalize the discovery, as was more recently the case with The Gospel of Judas, apparently so as to heighten their own importance for

---


... cet ouvrage n’est réellement sorti de presse qu’en 1963.


being involved in such sensational events. The French-language newspaper of Cairo, La Bourse Égyptienne, published an article on 10 June 1949 based on an interview with Jean Doresse.\footnote{10 vi 49: La Bourse Égyptienne, “Les Découvertes Archéologiques: Le gouvernement égyptien acquiert des papyrus d’une importance considérable”.

Selon les spécialistes consultés, il s’agit d’une des plus extraordinaires découvertes réservées jusqu’à présent par le sol d’Égypte, dépassant en intérêt scientifique des trouvailles spectaculaires telles que le tombeau de Tut-Ankh-Amon. Elle restitue subitement la presque totalité d’une littérature religieuse jusqu’ici perdue, et dont l’importance, pour l’histoire de la fin du paganisme oriental et des débuts du christianisme, est considérable.

27 2 iii 57: Letter from Quispel to Barrett of the Bollingen Foundation.}

According to the specialists consulted, it has to do with one of the most extraordinary discoveries reserved until the present by the soil of Egypt, surpassing in scientific interest such spectacular discoveries as the tomb of Tut-Ankh-Amon. It suddenly restores almost the totality of a religious literature lost up until now, and whose importance, for the history of the end of oriental paganism and the beginnings of Christianity, is considerable.

Gilles Quispel wrote to the Bollingen Foundation about The Gospel of Thomas as follows:\footnote{27 iii 57: Letter from Quispel to Barrett of the Bollingen Foundation.}

I discovered that these sayings are derived from two unknown Gospels, the Gospel of the Egyptians (AD ± 130) and the Gospel of the Hebrews (= the Gospel of the primitive Christian community of Jerusalem AD ± 100). This text will cause sensation all over the world, because it throws a completely new light upon our existing gospels.

Such sensationalizing is only detrimental to the serious assessment of the importance of the Nag Hammadi Codices. The Nag Hammadi Story: From the Discovery to the Publication only seeks to reconstruct what took place, as best one can, from their discovery in 1945 to their first complete publication in English translation in 1977, free of such excessive value judgments.

On 15 September 1996 a German television program on Südwestrundfunk edited by Rudij Bergmann with its point of departure in the Nag Hammadi discovery was shown in two 45-minute segments, entitled Abendteuer Wissenschaft: Jenseits der Welt des Bösen das Gute suchend (Adventure Science: Beyond the World of Evil seeking the Good). It began with an interview with Samiha ‘Abd El-Shaheed, Curator of Manuscripts at the Coptic Museum in Cairo, who displayed several Nag Hammadi leaves, and moved on to Muḥammad ‘Ali, the discoverer, pointing out the site of the discovery near
Nag Hammadi. Then it interviewed scholars who had been involved, such as myself, Kurt Rudolph, Hans-Martin Schenke, and Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, before moving on to the history of Gnosticism and its possible involvement in modern religion and politics. A DVD copy was supplied in 2008 by Bernd Seidl of SWR, from their TV documentary archive in Stuttgart.

The Nag Hammadi story has also been told fictionally. At least three books of fiction have used the Nag Hammadi discovery as the context for their novels: Ursula and Terry Loucks’ *Burning Words* (Jacksonville, Fla.: InfoNovels, a division of Integral Publishers, 1998); Tucker Malarkey’s *Resurrection* (Riverhead: Janklow & Nesbit, 2006); and Laurence Caruana, *The Hidden Passion: A Novel of the Gnostic Christ Based on the Nag Hammadi Texts* (Paris: Recluse Publishing, 2007). Though the present book avoids fiction, it is at times as fascinating, exotic, incredible, as any fictional story might be.
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The International Association for Coptic Studies held its Third International Congress of Coptology in 1984 in Warsaw. There I reported that the final volume of *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*, entitled simply *Introduction*, had gone to press, and would be published before the end of the year, thus completing the major responsibility of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices.

At the conclusion of my report on *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*, I read the ‘Foreword’ to the volume *Introduction*, which was signed by the Chair of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, Gamal Mokhtar, as President Emeritus of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization, Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Culture, Arab Republic of Egypt (written with the help of Labib Habachi):¹

... One of the big events in the history of coptology was the appointment of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices in 1970 by the Egyptian Ministry of Culture in conjunction with UNESCO (a project envisaged as early as 1961, when a Preliminary Committee had prepared an inventory and presented recommendations). The task of that Committee was to prepare for publication a facsimile edition of these manuscripts, consisting of a library of fifty-two texts, most of them Gnostic in character. ...

The International Committee was composed of scholars from eleven countries: the U.S.A., Germany, both East and West, France, Sweden, Great Britain, Denmark, Switzerland, The Netherlands, Belgium, and Egypt. Its job was primarily to identify and reassemble the fragments scattered in the several codices, and to organize the codices for scientific publication, thus giving scholars throughout the world access to them by putting the texts into the public domain. The work, over which I had the honor to preside, has been done so very well—the results, visible in the volumes printed by E.J. Brill, have been marvelous and completely successful! [xi]

I would like to thank the International Committee and its Technical Subcommittee, which performed their job, for concerning themselves with the publication of the Nag Hammadi Codices within the wider scope of fostering

Coptic studies in general and at the same time attaining international cooperation in the field of coptology.

I must also express here my profound gratitude to Professor James M. Robinson, the Permanent Secretary of the Committee, whose enthusiasm and energy was reflected in the work of the International Committee. In addition to his great task regarding the facsimile edition, he has worked hard to edit the English language edition of the Nag Hammadi codices, has directed—with the help of Dr. Labib Habachi and other eminent scholars—subsequent archaeological research in the Nag Hammadi area, and has succeeded in holding the First International Congress of Coptology at Cairo in December 1976 and in establishing an International Association for Coptic Studies. ...

I deeply thank Dr. Baumann-Jung and the other heirs of C.G. Jung for returning to Cairo as a gift to the Coptic Museum the material from the Nag Hammadi Codices that was in their possession.

Finally I must express our gratitude to the UNESCO organization, especially to Mr. N. Bammate, the long-time Director of the Department of Culture, and to Mlle Dina Zeidan, the specialist in the Arab Program of the Division of Cultural Studies.

I hope that the International Committee shall continue to function, even after the completion of the publication of *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*, as an active force in the development of Coptic studies.

It had been noted at the First Meeting of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices of 15–18 December 1970 that Coptic study was expanding so rapidly that a learned society in the field should be created (see Chapter 11, Part 3):

In view of the large increase in the number of students of the Coptic language during the last decade, as a result of the Nag Hammadi materials available thus far, a still greater activity in Coptic studies in general can be expected as a result of the facsimile edition. We wish to express ourselves as favoring initiatives and projects, many of them mentioned during our discussions, which share in this widening activity. The founding of an international coptological learned society would be desirable.

Yet it was also recommended that the Committee continue after the publication of *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*:

The International Committee should continue to function even after the completion of the publication of the facsimile edition, as an active force in the encouragement of Coptic studies.

---

I realized that this would occupy me for the remainder of my academic career, as it had for the preceding decade, and so I developed a better alternative: At the Second Meeting of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices of 9–10 December 1976 I saw to it that we stipulated (see Chapter 11, Part 7):

The plan to found, during the Colloquium on the Future of Coptic Studies, an International Association for Coptic Studies was endorsed. It was agreed that if this plan materialized these proposals would be turned over to that learned society with the Committee’s endorsement, and that the Committee itself would cease to exist with the completing of the Facsimile Edition.

By the time of the third meeting of that International Association for Coptic Studies in Warsaw in 1984, I had already entered in upon another equally massive project, which I had launched in 1983, by picking up an interest that I had begun as early as 1964, but then had suspended in favor of the Nag Hammadi cause. Hence I pointed out that the founding of the International Association for Coptic Studies, open to more than one scholar per nation (as the UNESCO committee was not), and to coptologists in other areas of research than the Nag Hammadi Codices, was intended to take up into itself and supercede the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices. Hence I declared it officially disbanded, having completed its primary task of publishing The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices.

The Introduction, the last volume of The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices, included my ‘Acknowledgements,’ which should be repeated here as a final expression of gratitude to all who shared in this large undertaking:

---


An expression of appreciation is due to many who have contributed to the *Facsimile Edition*. In first place should be mentioned the indispensable cooperation of the Egyptian authorities: the Chair of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices Gamal Mokhtar, Under-Secretary of State in the Ministry of Culture of the Arab Republic of Egypt and President of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization until 1977, and his successors as President, especially the current President Ahmad Kadry; and the staff of the Coptic Museum that made our work on the Codices such an enjoyable and fruitful experience, especially Pahor Labib, Shafik Farid and Victor Girgis, Directors emeriti, and Munir Basta, Director; Girgis Daoud, Chief Curator; Boulos Farag, Photographer during most of the period of our work, and Makram Girgis Gatas, Photographer; and Samiha ‘Abd al-Shaheed †, First Curator of Manuscripts, directly responsible for the Nag Hammadi codices and for us when we were there working on them. Victor Girgis together with Pahor Labib efficiently prepared the Arabic translations of the Prefaces to the individual volumes of the *Facsimile Edition*.

The participation of UNESCO has been administered within its Division of Cultural Studies by N. Bammate from its inception to his retirement in 1978, with the scientific assistance of Henri-Charles Puech and Antoine Guillaumont as advisors in initiating the *Facsimile Edition*. Louis Christophe represented UNESCO in Cairo when the Nag Hammadi Codices were photographed 1962–1966 and at the first meeting of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices on 15 xii 70. John E. Fobes, then Deputy Director-General of UNESCO, attended the ceremony marking the publication of the first volume of the *Facsimile Edition* at the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity in Claremont, California on 17 iii 72 and, by means of telegraphed felicitations, participated in the reception marking the successful completion of the publication of all thirteen Nag Hammadi Codices sponsored by E.J. Brill at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in the San Francisco Hilton Hotel on 29 xii 77.

The International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, nominated by UNESCO and appointed by the Arab Republic of Egypt, consisted of Shafik Farid (Arab Republic of Egypt), Gérard Garitte (Belgium), Victor Girgis (Arab Republic of Egypt), Søren Giversen (Denmark), Antoine Guillaumont (France), Rodolphe Kasser (Switzerland), Martin Krause (Federal Republic of Germany), Pahor Labib (Arab Republic of Egypt), Gamal Mehrez (Arab Republic of Egypt; deceased), Gamal Mokhtar (Arab Republic of Egypt), Henri-Charles Puech (France), Gilles Quispel (The Netherlands), James M. Robinson (United States of America), Hans-Martin Schenke (German Democratic Republic), Torgny Säve-Söderbergh (Sweden) and R.McL. Wilson (Great Britain). The committee has planned the *Facsimile Edition*
and functioned in an advisory capacity as its Editorial Board. The actual work of preparing the leaves for photography and publication has been carried out by the Technical Sub-Committee of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, consisting of Søren Giversen, Rodolphe Kasser, Martin Krause and James M. Robinson, at five work sessions averaging about a fortnight each in xii 70, i 71, xii 71, xii 72 and ix 74, with the help of members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity at all but the first session, who then reconvened as the Nag Hammadi Codices Editing Project of the American Research Center in Egypt in July 1974–January 1975 and August–September 1975, with one Project member, Stephen Emmel, staying through 1977 to complete the work.

Most of the fragments still in the lining of the covers of Codices IV, V, VII and VIII were separated in 1971 at the laboratory of the Department of Antiquities in Cairo by the chemist Abd el-Moeiz Shaheen, Sub-Director of the Center for the Study and Conservation of Antiquities. Anton Fackelmann completed the separation of the cartonnage in 1974.

The photography for the first two sessions of the Technical Sub-Committee was done by Peter Herman van der Velde of the Amsterdam firm of Kees Scherer. The subsequent photography was done by Basile Psiroukis, at the time Director of the Imprimerie of the Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire. Photographs made in 1947 by the son of Albert Eid, Georges, in 1948–1949 by Jean Doresse, in 1952 by Søren Giversen of the Institute of Egyptology of the University of Copenhagen, and in 1959–1961 by Rolf Herzog for the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Abteilung Kairo, were put at the disposal of the Technical Sub-Committee for use in assembling fragments and, to the extent relevant, for publication in the Facsimile Edition. Two photographs made in 1984 were prepared by Makram Girgis Gatas.

Arabic names, except for those with a well-established French or English spelling, have been transliterated according to the system employed by the Library of Congress, a procedure greatly facilitated by the help of Lola (Mrs. Aziz Suryal) Atiya.

David M. Scholer has provided bibliographical control of Nag Hammadi literature, greatly facilitating the work of us all, and has agreed to include in his annual supplement, published in the October issue of Novum Testamentum, addenda et corrigenda that may occur after the publication of the present volume.

UNESCO funded the photography of 1962–1966 and participants' expenses at both meetings of the International Committee as well as at the five sessions of its Technical Sub-Committee. The photographic costs of
the first and second sessions were carried by the publisher E.J. Brill. The bulk of the funding was provided through the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Philosophical Society, the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, and Claremont Graduate School; and through the American Research Center in Egypt by the Smithsonian Institution. The Cairo staff of the American Research Center in Egypt, especially John Dorman, Director Emeritus, and his successors Paul Walker and James P. Allen, have provided logistical support especially to the Nag Hammadi Codices Editing Project, as have the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Abteilung Kairo and the Institut Suisse de recherche architectural et archéologique de l’Égypte ancienne of Cairo to their nationals on the Technical Sub-Committee.

F.C. Wieder, Jr., Director Emeritus of the firm E.J. Brill, has exemplified a deep commitment to the undertaking; without his willingness to fund the supplemental photography and to publish without subsidy, the undertaking could hardly have been initiated. His successors T.A. Edridge and W. Backhuys and their staff have continued this fine relationship on to the successful completion of this major publishing project.

Heinz Häfner of the printing firm of E. Schreiber in Stuttgart has exerted great care and skill in the technical preparation of the collotype photographic reproduction. During the years when the collotype prints were being prepared Alexander Böhlig, at the time Director of the Tübingen branch of the Sonderforschungsbereich 13 ‘Orientalistik,’ placed members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project on his staff, who thus became available as scholarly consultants to the firm E. Schreiber in Stuttgart, James Brashler (1970–1975: Codices VI; VII; XI, XII and XIII; II; and V) and Frederik Wisse (1973–1977: Codices IV; III; VIII; I; IX and X; Cartonnage; and Addenda et Corrigenda). This made it possible to alleviate the logistical problem of preparing in America facsimiles of manuscripts in Egypt to be printed in Germany and published in The Netherlands.

To these expressions of gratitude should be added, for the present work, my indebtedness especially to Louise Schouten, Senior Acquisitions Editor of Brill, for her constant encouragement and assistance in this massive project, and to my wife Anne Moore, who has kindly functioned as Volume Editor.

It is with this expression of gratitude to all those involved in editing the Nag Hammadi Codices that the present publication of The Nag Hammadi Story: From the Discovery to the Publication comes to its completion.
Our information concerning the discovery and trafficking of the Nag Hammadi codices was originally derived almost exclusively from reports by Jean Doresse, who was in Egypt for much of the winter season each year from September 1947 through February 1953. They are analyzed in Part 1 of the present chapter. My own repeated investigations thereafter in the Nag Hammadi region have provided the bulk of the information about the actual discovery and trafficking summarized in Parts 2 and 3. This is followed by a presentation of previously unavailable early reports in Part 4: A letter of the Department of Antiquities from 1946 locating the site of the discovery; Doresse’s report of his and his wife’s visit to Nag Hammadi on 26–27 January 1950; the report later in 1950 by Ludwig Keimer, a European scholar residing of Cairo, summarizing what was known at that time; then Doresse’s recommendations to me in 1972 for undertaking archaeology in the region. Finally, Part 5 presents and discusses the scholarly debates about my own early reports.

A visit to the site of the discovery was first made by the antiquities dealer Phokion J. Tano(s) in the spring of 1946 (see Part 3 below). After visiting in Tano’s shop, Doresse wrote to Puech the oldest record of the discovery available to us for years:

1 http://cdllibraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/336. Phokion J. Tano(s) was interviewed at his shop in Cairo on 20 xii 71. His daughter Cybele Hadjioannou was interviewed at her home near Nicosia on 28 ix 73, and provided his photograph. Tano was from Cyprus, and his mother tongue was Greek. His full name was Phokion J. Tanos, but in Cairo he spoke Arabic with the Egyptians, and French with those of the international colony. In French his last name was pronounced without the final ‘s,’ and so was usually written Tano. The French pronunciation of his first name was Phoqué, which was the usual way one referred to him.

2 14 xii 47: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

J’ai eu d’autres nouvelles de la trouvaille, fait dans une jarre en un lieu dont on ne peut savoir le nom. Il y avait, dit-on, dix manuscrits. Deux ont été brûlés et les autres vendus en bloc par les paysans pour une ou deux livres. Des huit restant nous en avons deux: celui du Musée et celui de l’antiquaire. Deux autres ont été proposés à Kuentz
I have obtained other news of the discovery, made in a jar in a place whose name one cannot know. There had been, one says, ten manuscripts. Two have been burnt, and the others sold all together by the peasants for one or two pounds. Of the eight that remained, we have two: that of the Museum and that of the antiquities dealer. Two others have been offered to Kuentz, who has seen them, but messed up the affair, in wanting to pay a ridiculous price. One no longer knows where they are, and about them Kuentz maintains a silence that nothing can break. Schwartz, who had alerted him to them at that time (a year and a half ago) recalls having seen there the title *Apocalypse of Peter* and having recognized in several places the name of Seth. The binding was decorated with a serpent. Finally, three other manuscripts are said to have been acquired by Tano (who denies it energetically, but I do not believe him), who can already have granted them to Chester Beatty. The total count makes me think that there had been nine manuscripts in all, of which perhaps seven still exist.

Tano’s information was no doubt used by Jean and Marianne Doresse on their visit 26–27 January 1950 (see Part 4 below). Other scholars interested in the discovery made visits to Nag Hammadi without publishing records of their visits: Søren Giversen went early in 1958, as reported to me by Edward F. Wente from the Chicago House in Luxor who accompanied him. Nag Hammadi was then visited by Robert North in 1959, who learned nothing beyond what Doresse had reported:

In two visits to Qaṣr Sayyâd and Dabba (Ḥamrâ-Dûm, hamlet of the finders), I found no townsfolk able (or willing!) to clarify the circumstances of the discovery.

Martin Krause visited Nag Hammadi in the early 1960’s, but he did not publish any new information he might have obtained. My visits on 3 March
and 23 April 1966\textsuperscript{5} produced a few ultimately decisive leads (see Chapter 12, Part 1), but the inaccessibility of the Egyptian countryside to foreigners other than Russians from the Six Day War of June 1967 until 1 November 1974 delayed any follow-up. Ultimately my many visits to Nag Hammadi\textsuperscript{6} provided a control base for assessing Doresse’s reports, as well as providing the bulk of new information concerning the discovery and trafficking recorded in Parts 2 and 3 of the present chapter.

1. \textit{The Investigations of Jean Doresse}

The repeated visits to Cairo by Jean and Marianne Doresse, and especially their hurried trip on 26–27 January 1950 to Nag Hammadi, including the base of the cliff Jabal al-Ṭārif and the nearby hamlets, did in fact produce some initial clarification with regard to the date, the location of the burial site, its nature, and the \textit{dramatis personae}. Yet his published reports were presented with a poetic elusiveness, a mystique, even sensationalism, and included various inexactitudes, all of which are responsible both for the fixation on ‘The Story of a Discovery’\textsuperscript{7} in our collective memory, and for the dearth of concrete leads or detailed data upon which others could readily build. This is largely responsible for the decade of uncertainty and stagnation that followed his departure for Ethiopia in 1953.

\textit{The Date of the Discovery}

With regard to the actual date of the discovery, which took place near the end of 1945 (see Part 2 below), Doresse’s initial calculation, included in the announcement made by Henri-Charles Puech to the \textit{Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres} in Paris on 20 February 1948, was remarkably close:\textsuperscript{8}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{6} 3 iii and 23 iv 66; 18–21 xi 74; 11–13 i, 10–18 ix, 25 xi–20 xii 75; 30 xi–6 xii, 18–30 xii 76; 5–24 i 78; 3–11 i and 15–20 xii 1980.
  \item \textsuperscript{8} Henri-Charles Puech and Jean Doresse, “Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Égypte,” \textit{CRAI} 1948 (1948): 87–95: 89:

\end{itemize}
... more than a year and a half ago ... so that the discovery would perhaps date from the beginning of 1946.

Togo Mina presented much the same report to the *Institut d’Égypte* in Cairo on 8 March 1948, in which he stated the date of the discovery:9

... about two years ago—the exact date could not be established.

At about the same time Puech used the more general formulation:10

... in the course of 1946.

Doresse followed suit:11

... it was about 1946.

Puech then repeated this date as vague:12

... in the course of 1946 ... at a date itself imprecise.

But Doresse shifted to the preceding year:13

The discovery would have taken place toward 1945.

Doresse could be even more precise:14

... in 1945.

---


Il y a environ deux ans,—la date exacte n’a pu être établi.

10 Henri-Charles Puech, “Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts à Nag Hammadi,” in the “Chronique” of *RHR* 134 (1948): 244–248: 244:

... dans le courant de 1946.


... c’était vers 1946.


... dans le courant de 1946 ... à une date elle-même imprécise.


La trouvaille aurait eu lieu vers 1945.


... en 1945.
This was also later adopted by Puech: \(^{15}\)

... toward 1945.

The natural assumption might be that this shift was the result of Doresse's investigations near Nag Hammadi on 26–27 January 1950. But although his brief published report on that trip is where the shift first takes place, the new dating is included in the opening summary of what was known before the trip. In the same report, which had been presented to the Belgian Academy on 2 August 1950, Doresse wrote as to what the peasants at the site told him: \(^{16}\)

... four years ago ...

The formulation ‘in 1946’ occurred in an article by Doresse published only in English in 1950, though the French original could well have been written in 1949. \(^{17}\) This may account for the date 1946 published in *Newsweek*. \(^{18}\) Since adequate reasons for neither 1946 nor 1945 were published, the public was left in the position of being unable to make a rational choice, with the result that 1946 continued to be used. Even Pahor Labib published years later the date 1946. \(^{19}\)

The dating of the discovery was rendered even more complicated by Doresse’s attempt to define the term ‘discovery’ as referring to his identification of Codex III in the Coptic Museum as Gnostic, which took place late in 1947. He wrote a news release at the conclusion of his first very successful mission to Egypt that made this claim. \(^{20}\)

---


... vers 1945.


... il y a quatre ans ....


\(^{20}\) 10 i 48: “Une importante découverte: Un papyrus gnostique copte du IVème siècle,” *La Bourse Égyptienne*. On 11 i 48 it was summarized in *Le Progrès Égyptien*, and then reprinted in the *Chronique d’Égypte* 23 (1948): 260–261:

Une des plus heureuses découvertes faites en Égypte depuis longtemps marquera l’année 1947.
One of the most fortunate discoveries made in Egypt for a long time will mark the year 1947.

This was naturally misunderstood as referring to the original discovery at the cliff. *La Tribune de Genève* reported:\(^{21}\)

... the discovery made in 1947 to the north of Luxor.

In 1948 L.Th. Lefort gave this same date for the original discovery to the Royal Academy of Belgium:\(^{22}\)

About a year ago, *fellahin* pulled from the sand ...

This misunderstanding became even worse in the report of a news conference with Jean Doresse at UNESCO published only in 1949:\(^{23}\)

It was a year ago, on the shore of the Nile, at the foot of a mountain honeycombed with grottos and tombs, near the ancient hamlet of Chenoboskion.

This interview at UNESCO may have taken place in 1948, in which case the reference to ‘a year ago’ would have meant 1947. But since it was only published in 1949, a date of 1948 for the original discovery would be the natural inference. This kind of imprecision, referring without date to some time ago, which was used not just by the news media, but already by Doresse, has led to many misleading assumptions. This single quote is especially misleading, since it would lead one to think the codices were found ‘on the shore of the Nile,’ which they were not, and probably in one of the ‘grottos and tombs,’ which they were not, and ‘a year ago,’ in 1948, which they were not. And this misleading information has the semi-official status of appearing in a UNESCO publication!

It is not surprising that a complex investigation was required to ascertain what the date of the actual discovery really was: about December 1945 (see Part 2 below).

---

\(^{21}\) 1–2 ii 58: “Une extraordinaire découverte archéologique en Haute-Égypte: Quarante-neuf livres secrets révèlent la religion gnostique,” in “La vie littéraire” of *La Tribune de Genève*, 13:

... la découverte faite en 1947 au nord de Luxor.


Il y a environ un an, des fellahs tirent du sable, ... 


C’était il y a un an, sur la rive du Nil, au pied d’une montagne creusée de grottes et de tombeaux, près de l’antique bourgade de Khénoboskion.
The Location of the Burial Site

Doresse wrote Puech from Cairo on 14 December 1947:\textsuperscript{24}

I have obtained other news of the discovery, made in a jar in a location whose name one cannot ascertain.

Since Doresse mentions in the same letter having talked with Tano, the Cypriote antiquities dealer of Cairo who visited the site in the Spring of 1946, Tano is no doubt the source of Doresse’s news. In his next letter to Puech of 21 December 1947 Doresse added:\textsuperscript{25}

Finally, I have been able to come to know the place of the discovery.

But he did not pass on to Puech whatever information he had obtained.

On Doresse’s return to Paris, the Director of the Department of Antiquities of Egypt, the Abbot Étienne Drioton, mailed Doresse the earliest reference to the precise location that has been found:\textsuperscript{26}

... the find of Daba.

Ludwig Keimer collected information available in Cairo and wrote it up on 5 August 1950 (see Part 4 below):\textsuperscript{27}

Found at Dibba a bit to the south of Nagʾ Hamadi in a grotto; ...

This is the name of the nearest train stop to the site of the discovery, no more than a first whistle-stop, as one moves upstream from Nag Hammadi. Hence it was listed in guidebooks as the place from which to visit the Jabal al-Ṭārif as one continues toward Luxor. Thus it occurs in the English translation of the standard German guidebook of the day under the spelling Ed-Dabeh.\textsuperscript{28}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{24} 14 xii 47: Letter from Doresse to Puech:
\quad J’ai eu d’autres nouvelles de la trouvaille, faite dans une jarre en un lieu dont on ne peut savoir le nom.
\item\textsuperscript{25} 21 xii 46: Letter from Doresse to Quispel:
\quad Enfin j’ai pu savoir le lieu de la trouvaille.
\item\textsuperscript{26} 13 ii 48: Letter from Drioton to Doresse:
\quad ... la trouvaille de Daba.
\item\textsuperscript{27} 5 viii 50: Memorandum from Ludwig Keimer to Gilles Quispel:
\quad Trouvés à Dibba un peu au sud de Nagʾ Hamadi dans une grotte; ....
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
There is only a bare mention of the name upstream from Nag Hammadi in an early British guidebook:\(^{29}\)

... *Nag-Hammadi* (p. 226). Continuing, the line passes Dâbba and comes to Fâw (Fâw), where a few columns mark the site of the famous monastery founded by Pachomius.

This hamlet is also used to identify the more precise location of the Jabal al-Ṭārif in the standard French *Guide Bleu*:\(^{30}\)

All this necropolis, which contains many other tombs of no interest, served as a refuge for anchorites, whose memory is conserved by several Coptic inscriptions. ...

On the slopes of the Jabal al-Ṭārif, to the north of the village of Dabbah, numerous grottos contain Coptic inscriptions.

The hamlet al-Dâbbah (Daba/Dibba/Ed-Dabeh/Dâbba/Dabbah), on the right bank of the Nile, is in fact much closer to the site of the discovery, which is also on the right bank, though back at the foot of the cliff Jabal al-Ṭārif (see Part 2 below), than is the city of Nag Hammadi, on the left bank of the Nile, or even than the hamlet al-Qaṣr on the right bank at water's edge, which Doresse preferred to give with its Greek name as the site of the discovery, ‘Chénoboskion.’

It was only later, on 26 January 1950, that the Doresses actually visited the site (see Part 4 below). Canon L. Th. Lefort presented to the Royal Belgian Academy on 2 August 1950 Doresse’s report on this brief visit. The bulk of his report is based on what had been published previously by Egyptologists interested in the Sixth Dynasty tombs at the base of the cliff, and by patristic scholars interested in the Pachomian monasteries nearby. But the report went on to present the first published description of the location of the discovery, apparently assumed to be in one of the caves for which the cliff was famous:\(^{31}\)

---


30 *Égypte: Le nil égyptien et soudanais du delta à Khartoum* (Les guides bleus sous la direction de Francis Ambrière; Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1956), 290, 305:

> Toute cette necropole, qui contient beaucoup d’autres tombes sans intérêt, a servi de refuge aux anachorètes dont le souvenir est conservé par plusieurs inscriptions coptes.

> ... [305]

> Sur les pentes du gebel Târif, au N. du village de Dabbah, de nombreuses grottes renferment des inscriptions coptes.

Is it in one of these tombs that the jar of papyri was found? In any case, even in searching for some kilometers in the neighborhood, one finds no other ancient site, ruin or tomb, from which they could come. Besides, the peasants who accompany us—and who do not know the real purpose of our research—lead us on their own toward the southern part of this cemetery, and indicate to us there, at the foot of the mountain, a series of cavities. Formerly, they say, peasants of Hamra-Doum and of Debba found there a large zîr (jar) full of papyri. They were bound like books. The vase has been broken, nothing remains of it. The papyri have been carried to Cairo, and one does not know what has become of them. The opinions differ—up to a dozen meters—as to the exact point, but all confirm that it does have to do with this location. We learn nothing more from the terrain itself, where there are only broken bones and the remains of cloth that cannot be dated.

Doresse’s phrase for the location ‘at the foot of the mountain’ is very ambiguous, when one stands before the mountain and seeks to identify precisely where he intended to identify the site. For his language would seem to be applicable either to the talus (where the discovery was actually made) or to the flat desert land in front of it:

Underneath the yawning entrances to the great tombs, the face of the cliff is pierced by many narrow, deep cavities in which bodies had been summarily interred. Sepulchers are scattered about to as far as a hundred yards from the

---

Est-ce dans une de ces tombes que la jarre aux papyrus a été trouvée? En tout cas, même en cherchant sur quelques kilomètres aux alentours, on ne trouve aucun autre site antique, ruine ou sépulture, d’où ils pourraient provenir. D’ailleurs les paysans qui nous accompagnent,—et qui ignorent l’objet réel de nos recherches,—nous conduisent d’eux-mêmes vers la partie sud de ce cimetière et nous y signalent, au pied de la montagne, une série de cavités. Naguère, disent-ils, des paysans de Hamra-Doum et de Debba ont trouvé là un grand zîr (jarre) rempli de papyrus: ceux-ci étaient reliés comme des livres. Le vase a été brisé, rien n’en reste. Les papyrus ont été portés au Caire, et l’on ne sait pas ce qu’ils sont devenus. Les avis diffèrent,—à une dizaine de mètres près,—sur le point exact, mais tous confirment qu’il s’agit bien de cet endroit. Nous n’apprendrons rien de plus du terrain lui-même où il n’y a que des os brisés et des débris de tissus indatables.

Much the same report is in Doresse, *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte*, 151; *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, 133; *The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts*, 104.


Au-dessous des ouvertures bâentes des grandes tombes, la falaise est percée de multiples cavités étroites et profondes où des corps avaient été sommairement ensevelis. Les sépultures se dispersent même jusqu’à une centaine de metres du pied de la montagne, jusque dans le sable du désert où une grande quantité d’excavations montrent à quel point toutes ont [151] été pillées par les paysans, avides d’en tirer l’engrais naturel appelé sebakh. C’est ici, donc, l’antique cimetière. ...
base of the cliff, even into the sands of the desert, where a great number of excavations show how much [151] they have been pillaged by the peasants, greedy to get from it the natural manure they call sebakh. Here, then, is the ancient cemetery ...

Yet only on the site itself, or on the basis of adequately detailed photographs or maps, unavailable at the time, can one observe that the Sixth Dynasty tombs are about midway up the talus. Hence the reference to ‘the face of the cliff’ that is ‘underneath the yawning entrances to the great tombs’ could be taken to mean the bedrock that emerges from place to place on the talus amid the fallen rubble, though it is far from ‘white,’ and not to the vertical face of the cliff above the talus. Yet that misunderstanding could result from such expressions as:33

... half way up the white cliff ... at the middle of the flank of the calcium cliff ...

Apparently Doreesse used ‘flank’ as his term for ‘talus,’ which would have made these references more nearly correct. The standard French guidebook locates the caves:34

On the slopes of the gebel Târif ...

Thus, from all the place references provided by Doreesse on the basis of his one-day visit to the site on 26 January 1950, it is not clear if what was pointed out to him as the approximate site of the discovery was where the vertical cliff met the talus (or even much higher above on the face of the ‘white cliff’ where there are further unexplored caves), or midway down the talus where the Sixth Dynasty tombs are located, or between them and the flat land below, or in the flat ‘sands of the desert’ in front of the talus. Our subsequent efforts to excavate ‘the site of the find’ were tormented by these uncertainties—his poetic prose was not written for pedantic archaeologists (see Chapter 12 below)!

This should have been no problem, since Doreesse published a photograph labeled ‘The Site of the Discovery,’ in his report to the Royal Belgian

---


34 Égypte: Le nil égyptien et soudanais du delta à Khartoum (Les guides bleus sous la direction de Francis Ambrière; Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1956), 305: Sur les pentes du gebel Târif ...
Academy, facing the first page of the report, and in both the French and the English editions of his basic book. Yet the photograph in the two French publications\(^{35}\) was not the same as in the English editions!\(^{36}\) Indeed, the photograph in the English editions presented a different segment of the cliff. (Dorissse also subsequently gave me a third photograph of the site of the discovery.\(^{37}\)) Only after I had compared the published photographs at the site, with the help of a camera whose viewfinder was commensurable with that of Dorissse, did it become apparent that these photographs were taken from the same position. It is in terms of the shared foreground, the undulating and pitted talus in front of the cliff, rather than the diverging cliff faces, that the pictures can hence be reconciled. This is the same location pointed out to me by a peasant from Ḥamrah Dūm, ‘Abd al-Naẓīr Yāsin ‘Abd al-Raḥīm, as well as by the discoverer Muḥammad ‘Ali himself (see Part 2 below and Chapter 12 below): Under a large broken boulder that fell from the cliff in prehistoric times and still lies on the talus, quite visible in Doresse's photograph used in both French publications, though the boulder is not mentioned by him. Hence Doresse did locate the approximate site of the find.

Of course the use of the term ‘Nag Hammadi’ to identify the site of the discovery, still current today, is due to it being the larger town and railroad station in the area, though on the other side of the Nile. It was so used in the public press as early as 12 January 1948:\(^{38}\)

... discovered at Nag Hammadi in the habitation of a villager.

The erroneous reference to a ‘habitation of a villager’ is otherwise unattested.

On 14 April 1948 Doresse referred to the site of the discovery in terms of another village also on the other side of the Nile:\(^{39}\)

... the find of Hou.


\(^{38}\) 12 i 48: “Le Roi Humbert au Musée Copte,” La Bourse Égyptienne:

... découverts à Nag Hammadi dans l’habitation d’un villageois.

\(^{39}\) 14 iv 48: A report from Doresse to Albert Eid on Codex I:

... la trouvaille de Hou.
Hiw is the name of the modern village on the site of ancient Diospolis Parva, just across the Nile from the hamlet where the discoverer Muḥammad ʿAli lived, al-Qaṣr. Apparently Doresse, prior to visiting the region in search of the site of the discovery, found references to Diospolis Parva as an important town at the time in question. But it would be pure speculation to identify it as the site of the discovery.

Doresse came to prefer Chénoboskion to designate the site of the discovery. This was the Greek name (though it was probably more exactly Chenoboskeia), of the modern hamlet al-Qaṣr. This was the village where St. Pachomius was baptized and spent his novitiate in the cave of the hermit Palamon. Hence it today is a priestly hamlet, on the edge of which is located the Monastery of St. George, where one of the churches is named after Palamon. Although these associations are no doubt responsible for Doresse’s preference for this designation, he did not actually locate the copying, using, and burying of the codices at a Pachomian monastery. He was probably not aware that the (Muslim) discoverers themselves, whom he did not actually identify, were from al-Qaṣr (see Part 2 below).

The Nature of the Burial Site

The site of the discovery was apparently first visited by Tano in the Spring of 1946. For Doresse reported the location to Puech after visiting Tano:

All has been found, one says, in a jar, in the tomb of a monk, toward Nag Hammadi (near Farchout).

Tano would have reported the site in terms of the Sixth Dynasty tombs at the Jabal al-Ṭārif familiar to archaeologists. But there are two monasteries nearby, the Monastery of St. George and the Monastery of al-Malāk, whose considerable distance from the Jabal al-Ṭārif, 5 km., is not at all obvious to those unfamiliar with the region. Hence a monastic tomb would be readily suggested. Doresse’s report of his visit to the site on 26–27 January 1950 began with just such an open question:

---

41 7 x 47: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Le tout a été trouvé, dit-on, dans une jarre, dans la tombe d’un moine, vers Nag Hammadi (près de Farchout).


Quel était l’emplacement et la nature exacte du lieu de la découverte: tombe païenne, ou tombe chrétienne; ruine de quelque édifice monastique?
What was the location and the exact nature of the place of the discovery: pagan tomb, or Christian tomb; ruin of some monastic edifice?

His visit apparently did not lead to a clear answer, though he did rule out a building as the burial place, since there was no building at the site.\[43\]

Below the gaping openings of the large tombs, the cliff is pierced by numerous narrow and deep cavities, where bodies had been buried. The tombs extend even as much as a hundred meters from the foot of the mountain, where a large number of excavations indicate that everything had been unintentionally or intentionally pillaged by persons searching for natural fertilizer or sabakh. Here is the ancient cemetery of Diospolis Parva and of Chénoboskion, a vast but poor necropolis where the bodies were deposited, in their clothes and their shrouds, right in the sand. ... \[437\]

In any case, even in searching for several kilometers in the environs, one finds no other ancient site, ruin or sepulcher from which they could come. ... Thus it is certain that it is not in the ruins of an edifice, \[438\] be it a monastery or some other structure, that the famous library was found, but that it was well buried in a tomb situated quite far from all the convents of the region, in a cemetery that seems to have been no longer used by Christians.

Henri-Charles Puech made no investigations of the site on his own. Hence he would not sense the distance of the monasteries from the site of the discovery, nor realize that there was no evidence at the site even of the ruins of a structure. So he left all options open.\[44\]

---


Au-dessous des ouvertures béantes des grandes tombes la falaise est percée de multiples cavités étroites et profondes où des corps avaient été ensevelis. Les tombes s’étendent même jusqu’à une centaine de mètres du pied de la montagne où une grande quantité d’excavations indiquent que tout a été inconsciemment, ou consciemment pillé par les chercheurs d’engrais naturel ou ”sebakh.” C’est ici l’antique cimetière de Diospolis Parva et de Chénoboskion, vaste mais pauvre nécropole où les corps étaient déposés, dans leur vêtements et leurs linceuls, à même le sable. ... \[437\]

En tout cas, même en cherchant sur quelques kilomètres aux alentours, on ne trouve aucun autre site antique, ruine ou sépulture, d’où ils pourraient provenir. ... Ainsi il est assuré que ce n’est pas dans les ruines d’un édifice, \[438\] monastère ou autre, que la fameuse bibliothèque a été trouvée, mais qu’elle était bien ensevelie dans une tombe située fort loin de tous les couvents de la région, dans un cimetière qui semble ne plus avoir été utilisé par les chrétiens.

We are ignorant for the moment of the nature of the hiding place thus brought to light, and the exact place that concealed it: tomb, cavern, niche or basement of a ruined chapel, or perhaps even, basement of a house long since deserted.

The conjecture of a monastic ruin, given the proximity of the Monastery of St. George, was so appealing that it would not go away. Perhaps this was in part due to forcing the analogy of the Dead Sea Scrolls discovered near a monastery whose ruins, the *Khirbat Qumran*, have been excavated. In order to emphasize the importance of his discovery, Doresse began his book with a comparison of the Nag Hammadi codices and the Dead Sea Scrolls.\(^{45}\) He even considered an identification of ‘Gomorrah’ in *The Gospel of the Egyptians* (III,2: 56,10.12; 60,14.16) with ‘Qumran,’ so as to speculate about the connection of the Sethians, whom he considered to be the owners of the Nag Hammadi Codices, with the Essenes.\(^{46}\)

Yet the theory of a monastic ruin seems to have been revived by an old map. For when Doresse provided in November 1972 guidelines for an archaeological investigation of the site (see Part 4 below), he stated the objectives as follows:\(^{47}\)

... perhaps to find other vestiges of this library, or at least of the recipients, indeed of buildings where it was hidden. ...

If one believes in this regard a map of Linant de Bellefonds ... there would have been in that direction the remains of a convent (but this could be an error?). ...

---

Nous ignorons pour l’instant la nature de la cachette ainsi mise au jour et l’endroit exact qui la recelait: tombeau, caverne, niche ou sous-sol d’une chapelle ruinée, ou, peut-être encore, cave d’une maison depuis longtemps désertée.


\(^{47}\) Doresse, in a previously unpublished memorandum of November 1972:

... de retrouver éventuellement d’autres vestiges de cette bibliothèque ou, tout au moins, des récipients, voire des bâtiments, où elle fut cachée. ...

Si l’on en croit une carte de Linant de Bellefonds ..., il y aurait eu par là (mais ce peut être une erreur?), des restes de couvent. ...

On y recherchera: l’emplacement exact de la trouvaille; les éventuels vestiges de constructions; les débris datables (écrits, tissus, monnaies, tessons de poterie ...). On recherchera, à proximité de ce même cimetière, les éventuelles traces du monastère que situe, là, la carte établie en 1866 par Linant de Bellefonds (*Carte Hydrographique de la partie méridionale de la Haute-Égypte*).
One will investigate there: the exact location of the find; the possible vestiges of constructions; datable debris (writings, cloth, coins, sherds of pottery ...).
One will investigate in the proximity of this same cemetery the possible traces of the monastery that the map made in 1866 by Linant de Bellefonds situates there (Carte Hydrographique de la partie méridionale de la Haute-Égypte).

This would tend to suggest that Doresse was uncertain whether Linant de Bellefonds had identified ‘remains of a convent’ at the cliff that he himself had overlooked, or had erroneously located a ‘monastery’ at the cliff. The map does mark at the foot of the cliff near the site of the find a spot with the caption convent ['convent']. But this may well be a reference to one or the other of the two monasteries that are still standing (neither of which is marked at its correct position some 2 cm. from his location of the ‘convent’).

In any case, the official guidebook of the Coptic Museum through the fifth edition of 1962, and again in 1975, stated:48

These codices were discovered in an earthen jar buried in the ruins of a Coptic monastery near Naga-Hammadi.

The intervening guidebook of the Coptic Museum of 1967 reported:49

The most valuable contents of the library are the papyri found in a monastery at Nag Hammadi, in Upper Egypt in 1946.

Hence it is hardly surprising that this view has been taken over, in reporting on the Coptic Museum, by a comprehensive guidebook of Egypt:50

Papyrus of 13 Gnostic codices, found in the ruins of a Coptic monastery near Nag Hammadi.

All of this pure speculation should have been prevented by Doresse’s published statement of 1950 cited above:51

---


Ainsi il est assuré que ce n’est pas dans les ruines d’un edifice, [438] monastère ou autre, que la fameuse bibliothèque a été trouvée, mais qu’elle était bien ensevelie dans une tombe située fort loin de tous les couvents de la région, dans un cimetière qui semble ne plus avoir été utilisé par les chrétiens.
Thus it is certain that it is not in the ruins of an edifice, if be it a monastery or some other structure, that the famous library was found, but that it was well buried in a tomb situated quite far from all the convents of the region, in a cemetery that seems to have been no longer used by Christians.

It is less surprising for Directors of the Coptic Museum to have overlooked Doresse’s publications than for Doresse himself to have ignored them when he wrote his unpublished archaeological memorandum in 1972. Perhaps this indicates how uncertain he actually was when he wrote that ‘it is certain’ in 1950.

The edition of the guide to the Coptic Museum published in 2007 has finally presented an accurate and reliable statement, based on the work of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices.  

The Dramatis Personae of the Discovery and Trafficking

With regard to the persons who were actually involved in the discovery and trafficking, Doresse again is more imprecise than inaccurate. Concerning his visit at the Jabal al-Ṭārif and nearby hamlets on 26–27 January 1950, he reported that on the second day he left his police escort behind so that the people would speak more freely. Yet he seems not to have identified any of the discoverers or traffickers who may have been in the crowds following him, since he provides no names or details. He reported that he had been told in Cairo traits to identify some, a comment that he later edited to refer only to some who sold the manuscripts in Cairo, since of course they could more readily be described by persons in Cairo. But it remains unclear what the traits he picked up in Cairo to identify traffickers would be. Only the one-eyed middleman Bahīj ʿAlī (see Part 3 below) would seem to be readily identifiable on the basis of an oral description. The two or three brothers who were the principal discoverers would not have been at the cliff with Doresse (see Part 2 below), though they could have been in the crowds when Doresse visited the monasteries near their home. Doresse states that the discoverers came from Ḥamrah Dūm.

---


53 One may consult Doresse’s unpublished memorandum, written soon after his visit in i 50, and revised by hand in iv 57 (quoted in full in Part 4 below).

or al-Dābbah, which however seems rather to apply to his sources of information, the sheikh at Ḥamrah Dūm, and Abūnā Dāʾūd serving at the church of the Monastery of al-Malāk at al-Dābbah Bahri (now renamed al-Raḥmāniyah Qibli), the hamlet where he still lived when I interviewed him.

Doress's published report of his and his wife's visit is in his book as follows:

After having thoroughly examined the site, we go back to the villages and their churches to gossip with sundry individuals who were concerned in the discovery. They all talk willingly about the find that was made four years ago and was no great matter of mystery here: the material profit was not for these peasants, whose total gain from it was doubtless no more than a few dozen piasters. Several remember having seen and handled the manuscripts. The Coptic abuna of the Deir al-Malak—a young priest named David—had even tried to read them, but in vain, since they were written in dialects other than the Bohairic still used today in his liturgy. Was it he, then, who scribbled with his stylus those notes, in an obviously modern ink, which had so intrigued us on the margin of one of the pages? He mentions it himself, which shows us that he is not lying—or not much. True, one may have spoil a few already damaged leaves; but one attached so little value to them! But all that remained intact was sold, for three Egyptian pounds (3,000 [French] francs), and no one

55 Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte 151; The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 133; The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts, 105.
56 Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, 154:

Après avoir bien parcouru les environs, nous retournons vers les villages et leurs églises pour bavarder avec quelques individus qui furent mêlés à la découverte. Tous parlent volontiers de la trouvaille faite il y a quatre ans et qui ne fut guère, ici, entourée de mystère: le profit réel n’en a pas été pour ces paysans qui n’y gagnèrent sans doute, au total, que quelques dizaines de piastres. Plusieurs se souviennent d’avoir vu et manié les manuscrits. L’abouna copte du Deir el-Malak—un jeune prêtre nommé David—a même tenté de les lire, mais en vain, car ils étaient écrits dans d’autres dialectes coptes que le bohairique qu’on utilise aujourd’hui encore pour la liturgie. Est-ce lui qui, de son stylo, griffonna d’une encre toute moderne quelques mots qui nous ont intrigué dans la marge d’un des manuscrits? Il nous en parle lui-même, ce qui atteste qu’il ne ment pas, ou peu. Bien sûr, on a peut-être gâché quelques feuilles endommagées: on leur attribuait si peu de prix! Mais tout ce qui restait d’intact a été vendu, pour trois Livres égyptiennes (trois mille francs) et personne, depuis, ne s’en est plus soucié. Tels sont, résumés, les renseignements que l’on peut recueillir de côté et d’autre à Debba, à es-Sayyad, à Hamra-Doum et même auprès de bédouins qui se sont établis en sédentaires tout au pied du Gebel.

The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 134; The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts, 105.
has since thought any more about it. And there, in short, are all the particulars that one could collect on one side and another in Dabba, in es-Sayyâd, at Hamra-Dûm and even among the Bedouins who have settled as squatters right at the foot of Gebel.

Abûnâ Dâʾūd (*1912) has subsequently conceded to me that he had never seen any of the codices, but that his information was from the head priest then serving at the same church, al-Qummuṣ Mattâ Sarjîyûs, who was still alive at the time of Doresse’s visit, though he is now deceased (†1956). Among the extant parts of the Nag Hammadi Codices, there are no Arabic notes ‘on the margin of one of the pages.’ The only Arabic writing is written between the lines of Codex IV, page 49, lines 26–27; it is just above the Greek [!] subscript title on lines 27–28 “According to John/Apocryphon” and reads “Gospel [!] according to John.” Abûnâ Dâʾūd or al-Qummuṣ Mattâ Sarjîyûs would not, in all probability, have identified this Greek title and inserted its Arabic (mis)translation. It is probably the work of the Librarian of the Coptic Museum, Yassah ‘Abd al Masih, who also wrote the (also inaccurate) pagination in the only codex that lacked Coptic pagination, Codex II.

With regard to persons in Cairo, Doresse is somewhat more precise. He named a Miss Dattari, daughter of a well-known numismatician, as the person in possession of the bulk of the codices. Most of them were in fact in the home of Maria Dattari in Garden City near the center of Cairo. But the actual owner was apparently Phokion J. Tano(s), the proprietor, from 1924 until his death on 9 February 1972, of the Antiquities Gallery in Cairo founded in 1870 by Panagiotis Tanos at 53 al-Jumhûrīya Street (later owned by the “Sons of Farag el-Chaer, Antiquities Dealer,” with license number 116 from the Department of Antiquities). Tano was a friend of such preeminently successful collectors as Chester Beatty, Anthony E. Benaki and

----

57 Abûnâ Dâʾūd al-Qiss Yuwakim was interviewed at the monastery of al-Malâk at al-Rahmâniyah Qibli on 20 xii 74 and at his home there on 20 i 78.
58 The Arabic pagination of Codex II was inserted by the librarian of the Coptic Museum, according to Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib, Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (Institut für Orientforschung 58; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1962), 13. Pahor Labib has clarified that the librarian involved was Yassah ‘Abd al-Masih. Since the two large fragments of pp. 3/4 were treated as separate leaves and hence numbered 3–6, the page numbers thereafter are two digits too high in the Arabic pagination and in publications of Codex II dependent on it.
59 Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, 139; The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 121; The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts, 94.
Martin Bodmer, as well as King Farouk. He was known to the middlemen in al-Qaṣr and Qinā by his first name, which is thus made to conform to the Arabic custom, but in his case ‘frenchified’ in pronunciation into Phoqué. Tano is thought to have used Maria Dattari as his front, in an effort to avoid Egyptian restrictions applicable to licensed dealers but not to private collectors. Although Doresse was quite familiar with Tano’s rôle, he cooperated in his publications with the use of Dattari as a front; first Gilles Quispel made public the role of Tano, in a Dutch radio talk of 7 January 1960 reported to Tano, somewhat to his dismay, by KLM pilots sent by Quispel to Tano’s shop to pick up a (completely unrelated) manuscript. Doresse also at first refrained from making public the name of Albert Eid as the owner of a codex, but after the Jung Institute acquired it and ‘baptized’ it the ‘Jung Codex,’ Doresse published Eid’s name as owner of Codex I. Thus Doresse did meet and in fact worked closely with the two main Cairo antiquities dealers in possession of Nag Hammadi materials, even though he did not trace the story behind them to the lesser dealers, the village traffickers (see Part 3 below), or the discoverers themselves (see Part 2 below).

In sum, the problem with the status of our knowledge of the story during the 1950’s and 1960’s, the period when we were almost completely dependent on Doresse’s investigations, was not so much his general conclusions as it was a dearth of clearly presented evidence, with a resultant lack of precision and finality. Thus the presentation that follows is by and large not a refutation of Doresse’s results, but rather a detailed confirmation of his general presentation. Of course in some details there have been rectifications. But what is new is not so much the story in its broad outlines as the detail with which it has been tracked down, fleshed out, pinpointed, and, to the extent possible, verified or rectified. From this belabored pedantry, there emerges into the clear light of day a story whose basic accuracy can be sensed from the evidence that is presented. For the story is not legendary, either in the historical sense of anecdotes of saints idealized with pious embellishments for the edification of the pious, or in the modern equivalent of village gossip, but is based on the memory of the participants or their immediate families, who were interviewed and cross-examined repeatedly over a period of years (see the dates of the interviews that are listed in footnotes as each character is introduced). And, lest one underestimate the retentiveness of memory

---

61. Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, 135; The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 118; The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts, 92.
in an oral culture, especially on the part of the participants themselves, attention should be drawn to the high correlation between these local memories and the published reports of the initial investigation. Indeed there is greater precision in the local memory regarding some points of fact where something was at stake for the participants, such as whether two or three codices had been seen, though not acquired, by Charles Kuentz and Jacques Schwartz (see Part 3 below). Though the tendentiousness of vested interest is to be presupposed both on the part of the local villagers and of the European scholars involved, and indeed could be detected and discounted on a number of occasions, an awareness of the vested interest of a single narrator and the narration of the same incident from different perspectives by a plurality of participants make it possible to delimit the margin of error and establish the course of events with a relatively high degree of precision and reliability.

2. The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices

ʿAlī (son of) Muḥammad (son of) Khalīfah of the al-Sammān clan of al-Qaṣr was a night watchman for German-made irrigation machinery located out in the fields about a kilometer from the village. One night he killed a person from Ḥamrah Dūm whom he accused of being a thief. By the middle of the morning the next day ʿAlī's son Muḥammad found his father, shot through the head in broad daylight in blood vengeance, lying beside the head of the person he had killed. Muḥammad (son of) ʿAlī (nicknamed al-Jamīl, ‘handsome’) recalls this as occurring at the beginning of the grain harvest, at about the time of the Egyptian festival of spring, Sham al-Nasīm (‘getting a breath of fresh air ...’), Christianized as the Coptic Easter Monday (‘... on the

---


63 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/947; http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/835; http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1354; http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1559. Muḥammad ʿAlī was interviewed at al-Qaṣr on 16 ix 75; at the Jabal al-Ṭārif on 17 ix 75; at al-Qaṣr and at the Sugar Factory, where the archaeological team was lodged, on 30 xi 75; and at al-Qaṣr on 11 xii 75, 13 xii 75, 18 xii 75, 28 xii 76, and 9 i 80. Once his identity was revealed, he has been interviewed by other scholars, and even by the Südwestrundfunk in 1995: “Abenteuer Wissenschaft: Jenseits der Welt des Bösen das Gute suchend,” shown on German TV 15 ix 96.
way to Emmaus’). Easter Sunday that year (1945, see below) was on 1 April in the West, hence on 8 April in Egypt, and so the Coptic Easter Monday would be 9 April.

It is in terms of this family tragedy that Muḥammad ʿAlī dates the discovery of the jar, since for him the murder of his father was a much more important occurrence than the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices. He dated the discovery about six months after the death of his father. Furthermore, he recalls that the discovery was made in the winter while digging sabakh, rich soil from archaeological sites used to fertilize the hard ground of the arable fields. Muḥammad ʿAlī and other villagers agree that this is usually done in December; when pressed, he thought the discovery took place before the Coptic Christmas, which is on 6 January. Since the Registry of Deaths in the Nag Hammadi Real Estate Taxation Office gives the date of the death of ʿAlī Muḥammad Khalīfah as 7 May 1945, one may move from a relative toward an absolute chronology of some precision. ‘About six months later’ would mean about 7 November 1945. One may conclude that the date of the discovery of the Nag Hammadi codices was late in 1945, a dating that harmonizes with subsequent relative and absolute chronological indications.

In this part of Egypt, the Nile flows not from south to north, but from east to west. Just before it does then turn north to go to Cairo, there is a small U-shaped bend moving south and then curving around to the west and then to the north. Nag Hammadi lies on the left bank, outside the bend, on its south-west flank.

The railroad tracks, and the paved highway that runs beside the tracks, on their way south from Cairo to Luxor, cross the Nile at Nag Hammadi, from the left (southern) to the right (northern) bank, over the narrow British-built draw-bridge. Then they traverse diagonally toward the north-east the fertile

64 7 xii 75: Report from Abrām Bibāwī of what he was told by his friend Munir al-Qummuṣ Basīlyūs ʿAbd al-Masīḥ (see Part 3 below), whom I had asked to find this date, since he had access to that office.


land enclosed in the bend,\textsuperscript{67} to pass at its far north-east edge between the river and the cliff, which here approach each other until they are less than 2 km. apart. Near the tracks and highway, on their right side to the south within the bend, there are two villages that previously shared the name al-Dābbah. The popular etymology, provided by Abrām Bibāwī, is that this name simply means ‘the donkey.’ But this need not be mutually exclusive with an ancient etymology, such as that suggested by L.Th. Lefort on the basis of his French spelling Debba.\textsuperscript{68}

Some 300 meters from Deir [monastery] el-Malak, one of the numerous fallāhīn who have stuck to our heels since our arrival at Qasr-es-Ṣayad pulls on our arm, pretending to have something curious to show. In a small wādī that splits in two the rocky crest, he shows us in the rock two cavities almost completely obstructed by debris, and proudly announces that it is the ‘grotto of Amba Palamoun.’ We note the information for what it is worth; but, as we walk on, we reflect that the name of the present village, Debba, could be, as is so often the case, no more than a transposition into Arabic of a Coptic name. Which name? Transposing letter by letter on our note pad, we arrive at THBBE, or, no doubt better, TBHBE, derived from BHB = cavern. Is it a coincidence? In fact another locality carrying the same name TBHBE has been pointed out in the region of Thebes.

In any case, the name has been changed. The village to the north-west formerly designated al-Dābbah Baḥrī, Northern al-Dābbah, the location of the Monastery of al-Malāk, is now called al-Raḥmānīyah Qiblī, Southern al-Raḥmānīyah. The other further east formerly designated al-Dābbah al-Sharqiya, Eastern al-Dābbah, is now designated al-Ṣayyād. It lies just north-east of, indeed adjoining, the Monastery of St. George, locally named after its churches, Amba Balāmūn and Abū Sayfayn, ‘the father of the two swords.’

\textsuperscript{67} http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1543.


À quelque 300 mètres de Deir-el-Malak un des nombreux fellahs, qui ne nous quittent pas d’une semelle depuis notre arrivée à Kasr-es-Sayad, nous tire par le bras, prétendant avoir quelque chose de curieux à montrer. Dans un petit wadi, qui fend en deux la crête rocheuse, il nous montre dans le rocher deux cavités presque complètement obstruées par des éboulis, et annonce fièrement que c’est la “la grotte d’amba Palamoun.” Nous enregistrons le renseignement pour ce qu’il vaut; mais tout en cheminant nous songeons que le nom du village actuel Debba pourrait bien n’être, comme c’est si souvent le cas, qu’une transposition en arabe d’un nom copte. Lequel? Transposant lettre par lettre sur notre bloc-notes nous aboutissons à THBBE, ou mieux sans doute, TBHBE dérivé de BHB = Caverne. Est-ce un hasard? En fait une autre localité portant le même nom TBHBE a été signalée dans la région de Thèbes.
The reference to swords is no doubt the origin of the English designation for the monastery, St. George, who always carries a (single) sword to kill the dragon.\footnote{Giovanni d’Athanasi, \textit{A Brief Account of the Researches and Discoveries in Upper Egypt, made under the direction of Henry Salt, Esq.} (London: John Hearne, 1836), 143.}

Between the village of Naggadi [sic!] and Thebes there is a church dedicated to the Archangel Michael, called Abou-Seffain, which signifies the father of the two swords. On St. Michael’s Day Copts and Arabs all indiscriminately assemble in one spot, and engage in horse races and sacrifices of animals in honour of this day. St. Michael inspires them with such veneration and fear that they swear by his name, which is never done in Lower Egypt.

Al-Dābbah is the first train stop (only a whistle-stop) as one moves upstream from Nag Hammadi, just north of the monastery, near where the Nile and the cliff are so near each other.

Just south of the monastery, on the eastern flank inside the bend, at the water’s edge, lies ancient Chenoboskeia. On the English map of 1939, second edition 1954 (scale 1:25,000), this village is designated al-Qaṣr wa (= ‘and’) al-Šayyād. This double name is explained locally by the fact that there used to be one mayor for the two hamlets with his office in al-Qaṣr; the other version of the name that is found in Egyptological literature, Qaṣr al-Šayyād, ‘Castle of the Hunter’\footnote{Alan H. Gardiner, \textit{Ancient Egyptian Onomastica} (London: Oxford University Press, 1947), 1. 32*:

Qaṣr es-Sayyad, right bank, with many Old Kingdom tombs, see Porter and Moss, V, 119 ff., to which now add Kēnī, VI, 81 ff. The Arabic form given above, meaning ‘Castle of the Hunter,’ is that of the \textit{Descr. de l’Ég.}, and is certainly preferable to El-Kasr we’s-Sayyad given by others, see Gauthier, \textit{Bull. Inst. fr.} X, 100.} (for game or fish) is held locally to be inaccurate. Indeed the double name is attested in the colophon of a hand-written liturgical book of the region bearing the date 1892 (which I acquired at al-Qaṣr, and gave to the Holy Virgin Mary [and St. Pshoy] Coptic Orthodox Church of Los Angeles). Now that the two hamlets no longer have the same mayor, the one south of the monastery, where vestiges of the Roman period are visible at the water’s edge, is called simply al-Qaṣr.

Where the railroad and highway pass through the narrows at the north-east corner of the U-shaped bend, 11 km. from the Nag Hammadi bridge, a dirt road built on an elevated dike traversing irrigated land turns left off from the highway in a north north-west direction toward a wādi, with a gravel quarry in the cliff ahead on the right, to bend then due north and
run at ground level parallel to the cliff about 200 meters out from the foot of the talus, just where the arable land begins.\textsuperscript{71} The peaceful hamlet 'Izbat al-Būṣah\textsuperscript{72} lies near the cliff on the left to the west of this road and the \textit{wādi}. But both the arable land on the right, to the east of the road, and the strip of desert land between the road and the cliff (legally belonging to the Department of Antiquities, but actually beginning to be irrigated and planted) are controlled by the walled and fortified hamlet of Ḥamrah Dūm.\textsuperscript{73} It lies two and a half kilometers north-east of 'Izbat al-Būṣah and six and a half north-east of al-Qaṣr, two and a half kilometers north of the Nile and one kilometer east of the foot of the talus.\textsuperscript{74}

Ḥamrah Dūm and its dependent hamlets to the north-east are inhabited by the Hawwārah, a fierce clan conceiving of itself as an especially noble race of Arabs directly descended from the Prophet. Hence, though the six large families in the village also feud among themselves, they have a more basic sense of hostile alienation from the population nearer the Nile. In fact, on reaching the cliff area, one has moved beyond the area in basic continuity with the center of population along the river, to an isolated area more related to the foot of the cliff.\textsuperscript{75} It recedes further from the river northwest, then north, then northeast around an arc as one moves upstream from the Jabal al-Ṭārif to the Jabal Abū Mana', thereby creating a small inland empire that is sufficiently isolated to have taken the law into its own hands, often without very effective governmental control.\textsuperscript{76} It is from this area dominated by the cliff, as it arches back from the Nile in full view of the Basilica of St. Pachomius at Fāw Qiblī lying nearer the river, that there seem to have come both the Nag Hammadi codices at the western limit of the arc and at the eastern limit the Bodmer papyri (see Part 5 below).

In order to insure law and order in al-Qaṣr, a strong man from the opposing Hawwārah tribe, Īsmā'il Ḥusayn of the al-Sayyid family of Ḥamrah Dūm, had, like his father before him, been imposed on the village by the British as its sheriff. In al-Qaṣr, Īsmā'il's son Aḥmad was accused of being


\textsuperscript{73} http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1361.

\textsuperscript{74} http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1351.

\textsuperscript{75} http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1494.

\textsuperscript{76} http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1411.
‘Alī’s murderer, though this was to be denied by Aḥmad’s son Muḥammad,77 who maintained that the location of ‘Alī’s corpse near Aḥmad’s home at al-Qaṣr was a plant, precisely to arouse such suspicion.

Sometime between a few days and a month after the discovery of the codices, Aḥmad (son of) Īsmā’il was sitting by the side of the road in al-Qaṣr, asleep with a jug of sugarcane molasses beside him, near the home of ‘Alī’s widow Umm Ahmad. On being informed that her victim slept defenseless nearby,78 Umm Ahmad,79 who had told her seven sons Khalīfah, Muḥammad, Fādil, Abū al-Wafā, Abbas, Ahmad, and Abū al-Majd to keep their mattocks sharp, now handed them to her sons to avenge her. They fell upon Aḥmad Īsmā’il pitilessly—Abū al-Majd,80 the youngest son, then only a teenager, brags he struck the first blow straight to the head. After having hacked Aḥmad Īsmā’il to pieces limb by limb, they cut out his heart and consumed it among them—the ultimate act of blood revenge.

A Coptic neighbor, Andarāwus, the son of the priest al-Qiss ‘Abd al-Sayyid, called upon them to stop killing, whereupon they threatened to kill him if he interfered, adding that if the Copts wanted to intervene, the best thing they could do would be to give burial to the remains. At the police investigation Andarāwus and other villagers of al-Qaṣr denied being witnesses to the crime, especially in view of their widespread hatred of the sheriff at al-Qaṣr, but also out of fear of ‘Alī’s family. But it was the son of this same Andarāwus who narrated the story to me in all its gory detail! Though the six older sons of ‘Alī were detained by the police and interrogated, the crime went unsolved, but has remained a vivid memory. Indeed the Cairo antiquities dealer Tano reported that the discoverer had avenged his father’s death, and Doresse has reported that, though he had not accorded enough credence to this report to publish it, he had in fact heard a version of it:81

---

77 Muḥammad Aḥmad Īsmā’il was interviewed in Ḥamrah Dūm on 13 xii 75.
79 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1356. Umm Ahmad (deceased 1980) was interviewed through her son Muḥammad ‘Alī in al-Qaṣr on 30 xi 75, 28 xii 76, and 9 i 80.
80 Abū al-Majd was interviewed in al-Qaṣr on 12 i 78.
81 5 vii 75: Letter from Doresse to Robinson:

... j’ai moi-même entendu l’histoire d’El Samman et de la grotte, et j’ai vu la grotte; mais les détails archéologiques des lieux et aussi, certaines faiblesses de cette légende comparée à la solidité plus probable des autres traditions, m’avaient fait écartner cette anecdote. Il faut toutefois, comme vous le faites, la relater. Mais il faut parallèlement
... I myself have heard the story of El Samman and of the grotto, and I have
seen the grotto; but the archaeological details of the places, and also certain
weaknesses in this legend, compared to the more probable solidarity of the
other traditions, led me to set this anecdote aside. One must, nonetheless,
as you do, relate it. But one must, parallel to it, relate the other version: the
discovery made in the cemetery at the foot of the cliff, in a place where the
excavations, the fragments of the broke jar, and some other details seem to
confirm the quite precise witness of the priest David.

In view of the blood feud, it is not surprising that the sons of ‘Alī did not
go near the Jabal al-Ṭārif for the next thirty years, simply out of fear for
their lives. This policy was quite realistic, a repeatedly attested prudence.
For blood feuds have their own momentum: Three months after Aḥmad
Īsmāʾīl’s death, his brother Abū al-Ḥamd (deceased) killed two from the
al-Sammān clan in revenge. But Aḥmad’s eleven-year-old son Muḥammad
did not feel thereby personally vindicated, and so, on reaching manhood,
he looked for his own chance. It came in 1957, eleven years after his father’s
murder. He heard that there had been a death in the al-Sammān clan, which
meant that before the sun went down a funeral procession, in which ‘Alī’s
family would participate, would move to the Muslim cemetery on the near,
north-east edge of al-Qaṣr. At dusk Muḥammad (son of) Aḥmad Īsmāʾīl with
six young men to support him slipped in a canal boat to the edge of al-Qaṣr
unnoticed. With the automatic weapons the Hawwārah carried, usually
slung quite ostentatiously over their shoulders, they shot down a score or
more—Muḥammad Aḥmad estimated the figures as twenty-seven shot, of
whom nine to eleven were killed.

When interviewed at Ḥamrah Dūm, Aḥmad affirmed that he thus con-
siders peace restored, would feel free to go to the weekly bazaar at al-Qaṣr,
and assumed that Muḥammad ‘Alī could come to Ḥamrah Dūm without
harm, though perhaps not beyond it to the dependent hamlet Naj al-ʿAdī,
where Muḥammad Aḥmad now lived. Nor would Muḥammad Aḥmad speak
to him, but would walk on the other side of the road. Yet two days ear-

Thus Doresse seems to have discounted information about the discoverer on the erroneous
assumption that such information was incompatible with his basically valid identification of
the location.

libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/818; http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/
cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1066.
lier, when Muḥammad ‘Ali had been interviewed on the same topic, he held a very different view. He reported the fatalities in the attack as fourteen, proudly pulled open at the neck his jallabīyah (the cotton robe worn by fallāḥīn), and showed the scar of the wound just above his heart, to boast that Muḥammad Aḥmad failed to get him. He further asserted that if he could ever lay hands on Muḥammad Ahmad, he would kill him. This presumably defines the status quaestionis with regard to the blood feud, from the point of view of the al-Sammān clan.

The on-going blood feud gives to the geography of the area a polarization not visible on a map. It renders the nature of the meager ‘official’ information concerning the site of the discovery more intelligible: ʿAbd al-Majīd Muḥammad Badārī,84 of al-Qaṣr at the time, was guard (ghafīr) for the Department of Antiquities at the Jabal al-Ṭārif during the period 1947–1967, succeeding a guard from Ḥamrah Dūm who had retired. (Doresse reported that the guard was away on a trip at the time he visited the cliff in 1950, see Part 4 below). ʿAbd al-Majīd Muhammad maintained that shortly after the discovery he learned where the site was from Khalīfah, one of the sons of ʿAli who was present at the discovery. It seemed clear to him that the discovery was under a large boulder in the flatland at the foot of the talus. But it became equally clear he did not actually know which boulder. On two occasions, 3 March 1966 and 15 September 1975, he identified one or another of the boulders almost 200 meters south of the clandestine excavation that had been carried out by the villagers of Ḥamrah Dūm, and on 19 November 1974 a boulder about 600 meters south of that clandestine excavation.85 When two of these boulders were excavated on 28–29 November 1975 with sterile results,86 he somewhat apologetically said on 11 December 1975 that his aide memoire was the configuration of the cliff just north of the wādi, the northern of the two areas he had identified, but that he did not want to produce further inconvenience to us by proposing others among the various boulders nearby. Thus, his information may well have been based only on an oral report rather than an on-site identification at the time, especially in view of the fact that during the period when he was guard, the source of his information, Khalīfah, the brother of Muḥammad ‘Ali, would hardly have dared, after avenging his father’s murder, to return to the site to point it out.

84 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1495. ʿAbd al-Majīd Muḥammad Badārī was interviewed at the Jabal al-Ṭārif on 3 iii 66, 23 iv 66, 19 xi 74, 15 ix 75, and 11 xii 75.


ʿAbd al-Hamīd ʿAbd al-Mawjūd Riḍwan, a member of the same al-Sayyid family of Ḥamrah Dūm as was Aḥmad İsmāʿīl, reported that he had been near the tomb of Thauti (T 73), 750 meters to the north of the site of the discovery, at the time the discovery was made, but that his cousin ʿAbd al-Naẓīr Yāsīn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm (born 1913) was at the time further south near the site of the discovery. The next day ʿAbd al-Naẓīr led us to a location some 50 meters south-east of the large broken boulder lying on the talus in the photograph of ‘the site of the discovery’ in the French edition of Doresse’s book (see Part 1 above). This is in the undulating terrain where the talus gradually merges into the flatland. He conceded he could not be sure he was standing on the precise spot, but knew that he was within ‘give or take a dozen meters’ of it. A trial trench produced no confirming evidence. He was about a hundred meters south of the point from which Doresse photographed, yet within the area photographed. He was, in fact, in the midst of the area pitted with the depressions resulting from a clandestine excavation led by the leading Shaykh of Ḥamrah Dūm, a short man of the Hindāwī family. Presumably this was the same Shaykh whom Doresse mentioned as having identified on 26 January 1950 this pitted area as the site of the discovery. Since there was some skepticism among other villagers of Ḥamrah Dūm as to whether ʿAbd al-Naẓīr had been at the site at the time of the discovery, and since Muḥammad ʿAlī had maintained that none of the camel drivers with him at the time of the discovery was from Ḥamrah Dūm, what ʿAbd al-Naẓīr identified may be no more than the site of the clandestine excavation in which he may well have been involved. The pitting near the foot of the talus also apparently gave him a

87 ʿAbd al-Hamīd ʿAbd al-Mawjūd Riḍwan was interviewed at the Jabal al-Ṭārif on 2 xii 75.
88 In order to make it possible that every cave could be cited precisely in our reports, I numbered each one with black paint, more than 150 in all, from south to north. We referred to them as T 1, T 2, etc., although it was clear that most were not actually Sixth Dynasty tombs cut into the face of the cliff, but no more than holes or cavities used by wild animals, yet able to hold the jar, since we began with Doresse’s assumption that the burial was in a cave.
89 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1476.ʿAbd al-Naẓīr Yāsīn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm was interviewed at the Jabal al-Ṭārif on 3 xii 75.
91 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/693.
convenient point of reference with the help of which the location would have been kept in mind. Since this pitting extends out into the flatland and is more noticeable there than in the naturally irregular and undulating terrain midway up the talus itself, at least when seen from below, this *aide memoire* would have tended to focus the memory onto the bottom of the talus and out into the flatland, a demarcation that in any case is not very sharp at this location. The choice of this area for the illicit excavation, if not derived from ʿAbd al-Naẓīr himself, could have been derived from Muḥammad ʿAlī, who may well have continued digging *sabakh* at the cliff for a few days or weeks prior to avenging his father’s death, or from others of those digging *sabakh* with him at the time who were not sons of ʿAlī, and so whose return to the cliff later on would pose less of a threat to their safety.

Keimer’s report located the discovery in a ‘grotto,’ Puech had listed among options ‘tomb, cavern, niche,’ and Doresse had alluded to a ‘sepulture’ or ‘tomb’ (see Part 1 above). The cliff, both at the top of the talus and in outcroppings of live rock midway down the talus, is honeycombed with over 150 caves (not to speak of further caves, not visible from below, on a less readily visible and accessible ledge much higher up the face of the cliff). Many of these are natural niches, but a number are square shafts cut just large enough for a sarcophagus to pass, in theory descending to a burial room below, although several tombs in the cliff of this type were unfinished. A few were preceded by an entrance room for worshippers, with the shaft leading down from the back of this room-size funerary chapel.

It was in terms of such alternatives that the initial interview with Muḥammad ʿAlī had been conducted at al-Qaṣr on 16 September 1975, although he maintained that the discovery had not been in a cave. When interrogated about the size of the area of the discovery, he said that one could stand up, conceding a comparison with the size of the room in which the interview was taking place. He also conceded that there was stone overhead and behind, but mentioned no walls. Since he maintained it was neither at the top nor at the bottom of the talus, but somewhere in the middle, only the tombs of Idu (T 66) and Thauti (T 73) from the Sixth Dynasty, though caves, seemed in any way to fit such specifications, for they are the only funerary chapels midway down the talus.

In view of the ambiguous outcome of this interview, I tried to get Muḥammad ʿAlī to return to the cliff. His flat refusals finally were overcome with the help of a financial consideration. It was agreed that we would ride past the cliff without stopping, in order that he be given an opportunity to point out
the location, but he agreed even to this much only on the conditions he laid down: He would be camouflaged in my American clothes, seated on the cliff side of the back seat of an official, governmental, Russian-made jeep, familiar in the area as that of the Director General of the Nag Hammadi Sugar Factories, Hanny M. el-Zeiny, who was to ride in the front seat next to his driver. I was to ride on the side of the back seat exposed to Ḥamrah Dūm, getting out of the jeep to trade places with Muḥammad ʿAlī at the turn-around point. We would go toward the end of the day when the hunger and thirst of the Ramadan season would have rendered the inhabitants of Ḥamrah Dūm lethargic in the relative cool of their homes.

The clandestine excursion took place the next afternoon near dusk. It was explained to Muḥammad ʿAlī, in driving past the tombs of Idu and Thauti, that they had changed their outward appearance since he was last at the cliff 30 years before, in that cement walls with iron gates had been installed to replace the facades long since robbed away for the antiquities market. Thereupon he pointed to the larger tomb (T 73), that of Thauti, as the site of the discovery.

After the rubble on the floor of the upper chambers of this tomb had been cleared to bedrock on 26–30 November 1975, Muḥammad ʿAlī was confronted on 30 November at the Sugar Factory with the absence of any confirming evidence. He was shown a floor plan of the tomb of Thauti, in part to inquire if he had ventured down the shaft to the darkened rooms below. He started afresh in trying to describe the site by taking a potsherd and leaning it at about a 45 degree angle as the shape of the area. But this did not further clarify the site, in view of the fact that neither this tomb nor any others in the area had such a sloping wall or ceiling.

Then on 11 December 1975 Muḥammad ʿAlī was induced, by challenging his courage, to return, as the shadows darkened at dusk, to where the cliff began, in our rented car rather than the official car of the Sugar Factory, and from there to walk along the foot of the talus to the site. So as not to influence his choice, we got out of the car where the dirt road first reaches the cliff, at its southern end near the wādī and the quarry. He lead us unhesitatingly and directly north toward the enormous broken boulder visible in the photograph of ‘the site of the discovery’ in the French edition of Doresse’s book midway up the talus, almost 400 meters away. On reaching the nearer,
southern edge of the boulder where it had broken in two, he walked and crawled through the break between the two main segments, testing the ground and beginning to vacillate, then on reaching the far northern side turned down along the flank of the barrel-shaped main segment, beneath whose curving overhang he fell to digging with his hands, announcing this to be the spot. He pointed out the overhang of the barrel-shaped boulder as what he had sought to describe, and even to illustrate with the potsherd held at an angle, back at the Sugar Factory.\(^98\) He conceded that it had been his brother Abū al-Majd\(^99\) who actually first saw the jar. He furnished the supplemental details that he broke the jar a few meters further down the talus, and that his camel had been tethered at the southern side of the boulder.

Muḥammad ‘Alī excused his identification of the tomb of Thauti at our drive-by as due to fear, thinking he should accommodate what he assumed to be our identification of the location. At the initial interview in the Sugar Factory he had said that the camel drivers had been afraid the rock might tumble down on them. The room-sized caves gave no cause for such fear, but our subsequent excavation under the overhanging boulder was limited by the workmen’s fear that it might fall on them. Thus, in spite of efforts to have him identify a cave, which he had accommodated with a false lead, and in addition to other instances of not impeccable veracity on his part, Muḥammad ‘Alī seems to have made a serious effort to describe, and then to point out, what he recalled as the site of the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices.

When the site was excavated on 14–15 December 1975, no confirming evidence was found. Muḥammad ‘Alī once spoke of a corpse with abnormally elongated teeth, fingers and legs lying on a bed of something like charcoal beside the jar, but he denied a rumor from earlier years that a staff and a rug were at the site. His younger brother Abū al-Majd denied that anything other than the jar was found. Whatever evidence there must have been—perhaps vestiges of a leather cover or so, papyrus fragments, and sherds of the broken jar—may well have been eliminated by the clandestine excavation and the passage of time; or the position may not have been precisely that identified and excavated, especially in view of Muḥammad ‘Alī’s initial vacillation as to the precise spot, once he was actually at the boulder. His comment that the jar had actually been broken a few meters further down the talus leaves


open the question as to whether we had actually excavated the spot where parts of the jar or its contents might have been found.

This broken boulder midway down the talus may with reasonable probability be considered the site of the discovery, in spite of the absence of archaeological confirmation, in that it alone makes intelligible the various locations proposed. Although Muḥammad ‘Ali headed directly for it from a distance too far away to be able to see the pitting of the clandestine excavation, he in fact confirmed the general correctness of this excavated area, as well as the photograph in the French edition of Doresse’s book, which he of course had never seen and remembered in such detail. This site could also make intelligible the false leads in the flatland below. For the site could well have been identified orally at al-Qaṣr as ‘under’ a boulder, which would then have led to the various boulders pointed out in the flatland as that ‘under’ which the jar was found. Yet it is not burdened with the improbabilities they share, namely, that the jar would hardly have been buried or sabakh dug literally underneath such boulders too heavy to move, boulders moreover that lie in the sandy flatland. Indeed, a burial in the flatland is improbable, since the annual inundations of the Nile are reported to have approached the foot of the talus before the High Dam had its effect. Furthermore, when I returned with a tour group in the mid-90s, the High Dam had increased the area of green, which had moved even nearer to the talus. In fact, there are no surface indications of a cemetery visible on the flatland. Nor did the protonmagnetometer and resistivity survey conducted by Philip C. Hammond on 11–18 September 1975 in a section of the flatland nearby (though not in the pitted rocky terrain unsuited to the instrumentation) produce evidence of a cemetery. On the other hand, a first small crude cave (as one moves from south to north), with a scattering of bones and sherds, occurs about twenty meters south-east of the boulder, somewhat lower than it on the talus but not yet in the flatland. About 800 meters further north, midway up the talus, fragments of burial cloth were found in January and September 1975 in a cave (T 117), which was excavated 29–30 November 1975, after samples had been given a carbon 14 dating of the Fifth Century AD. Thus the talus, in distinc-

---

100 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1704.
102 James M. Robinson with Bastiaan van Elderen, “The First Season of the Nag Hammadi Excavation 27 November–19 December 1975,” *Newsletter* 96 of the American Research Center in Egypt (Spring 1976): 18–24; garbling that was due to copy-editing is corrected in the reprint in *GöMisz* 22 (1976 [1977]): 71–79 (see Chapter 12, Part 2 below).
tion from the flatland, has been shown to have been used as a burial site at the time in question. This result serves to correct Doresse, who sought to limit the cemetery to the pre-Coptic period.\footnote{Doresse, “Sur les traces des papyrus gnostiques: Recherches à Chénoboskion,” \textit{BAB.L}, 5ème Série, 36 (1950): 432–439: 436:}

The numerous fragments of cloth that one can disengage seem to be of the Greek or Roman epoch, without any trace of Coptic.

The fragments of cloth collected by Doresse and turned over to my Institute for Antiquity and Christianity lack Coptic (as well as any other) decorative pattern, but such an argument from silence cannot substantiate an exclusively pre-Coptic date.

There is a reference in \textit{The Life of Pachomius} to Palamon's burial that seems to contradict Doresse's position.\footnote{L. Th. Lefort, \textit{Les vies coptes de Saint Pachôme et de ses premiers successeurs: Traduction française} (BMus 16; Bureaux du Muséon: Louvain, 1943), 57:}

... at the mountain a short distance from where he lived.

But Doresse interpreted this as applying to a bare elevation adjoining al-Qaṣr, in defense of his view that the cemetery at the cliff was not used by Christians.\footnote{Doresse, “Sur les traces des papyrus gnostiques: Recherches à Chénoboskion,” \textit{CRAI}, 5ème Série, 36 (1950): 432–439: 436, n. 4.} Yet burial at the mountain is standard terminology for Pachomian burials, even though, when one thinks in terms not of Chenoboskeia but of the headquarters monastery Phbow at Fāw Qiblī, there is no such elevated desert area between the Nile and the cliff to which references to Pachomian monks being buried at the holy mountain could refer. Hence such burials would presumably have been somewhere at the cliff, such as the Jabal al-Ṭārif, similar to those in the Wādi Shaykh ‘Ali,\footnote{http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1482; http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1498. Marvin W. Meyer, “Wadi Sheikh Ali Survey, December 1980,” \textit{American Research Center in Egypt Newsletter} 17 (1982): 22–24; “Archaeological Survey of the Wadi Sheikh Ali: December 1980,” \textit{GÖMİsz} 64 (1983): 77–82; “Wādi Shaykh ‘Ali,” \textit{The Coptic Encyclopedia} 7. 2312–2313.} where there are pious graffiti of monks in the same red paint as occurs at the Jabal al-Ṭārif (see below). Or one might refer to the Jabal Abū Mana‘, where there is a modern Coptic cemetery, and where the discovery of the Dishna papers
(i.e. the Bodmer Papyri, see Part 4 below), which proved to be the library of the Pachomian Monastery, has been pinpointed.\textsuperscript{107} Doresse himself ultimately published a non-committal reference to the cloth that avoided the issue:\textsuperscript{108}

... fragments of cloth without interest.

The talus was also a religious site, frequented both by Christian and non-Christian ‘holy men.’ The Sixth Dynasty cave with a room-size chapel at its front that is nearest to the boulder identified by Muhammad ‘Ali as the site of the discovery is at the top of the talus (T 8). It had apparently been cut well, in a way comparable to the tombs of Idu (T 66) and Thauti (T 73). But the walls have been secondarily chipped away to remove whatever pharaonic inscriptions may have been present. On the irregular recessed surface that resulted, there is scrawled in red paint a Coptic inscription of the opening lines of Old Testament psalms.\textsuperscript{109} The floor was strewn with a meter or more of rubble (including mummy beads), to the height at which one would stand to paint the inscription. Near the top of this rubble, a quantity of twelve and forty nummia coins was found dating from the reigns of Anastasius I (491–518 AD) and Heraclius (610–641 AD).\textsuperscript{110} Thus the talus would seem to have been frequented by religious people from the non-Christian (or not-yet-exclusively-Christian) period of the Greek Zeus Serapis inscriptions scrawled with the same kind of red paint in the tombs of Idu (T 66) and


\textsuperscript{108} Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, 151:

... des débris de tissu sans intérêt.

The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 133; The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts, 105.


Thauti (T 73) down into the Coptic period, when large crosses were similarly scrawled on the north and east walls of T 65.\footnote{Robinson and van Elderen, “The First Season of the Nag Hammadi Excavation 27 November–19 December 1975,” GëMiss, 76 (see Chapter 12, Part 2 below).}

The account of the actual discovery given by Muḥammad ‘Ali is as follows: Two or three of the sons of ‘Ali and Umm Aḥmad, Muḥammad (born 1919), Khalifah (died 1975—his presence is denied by Muḥammad but affirmed by others) and Abū al-Majd (born 1930), were digging sabakh to fertilize the fields, along with other camel drivers at the time the discovery was made. Muḥammad ‘Ali has listed their names as ‘Abbas, Qināwī, Ḥasan, Aḥmad, Sawāris (the only Copt) and Lūqā. He maintains that all are deceased, though this could simply be a way to discourage us from trying to track them down. He has denied that anyone from Ḥamrah Dūm was present. He conceded that Abū al-Majd actually unearthed the jar, but since Muḥammad ‘Ali was the older brother (Muḥammad ‘Ali was 26, Abū al-Majd just 15), he took control of the situation, quite naturally assuming the rôle of paternal authority over his much younger brother. At first he feared to break the jar, thinking there might be a jinn inside. But on reflecting that it might contain treasure, he regained his courage. Raising his mattock, he smashed the jar. He described a strange material, like grains of sand perhaps capable of turning into gold, swirling up and disappearing into the air. This would seem to be a conflation of the jinn and the gold treasure, perhaps in fact a mythic experience of papyrus fragments. For when Muḥammad ‘Ali opened a codex, he reported experiencing it being transformed into very small pieces that disappeared into the air, with only the cover remaining.

The pottery jar was red slip ware, in distinction from the cream color of the modern Qinā ware common in the region, with four small handles near the opening. The jar was large, with dimensions roughly illustrated by Muḥammad ‘Ali as 60 cm. or more in height and a diameter of 15 to 20 cm. at the mouth, widening into 30 cm. in the flank.\footnote{Muḥammad ‘Ali’s drawing of the jar was published in James M. Robinson, “The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices,” BA 42:4 (Fall 1979): 206–224: 212.} The jar had been closed by laying into its mouth a pottery bowl,\footnote{http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1484; http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1468. A similar bowl was found in the excavation of the Basilica of St. Pachomius (see Chaper 12 below): http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1463; http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1502; http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1500; http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1464.} which Khalifah took with him to al-Qaṣr. There he was employed as a servant and camel driver for a Copt, Sami ‘Abd al-Malāk, who took the bowl as a talisman that would bring a
blessing. Through the mediation of his wife Umm Nadya, a relative Salib ‘Abd al-Masīḥ,\footnote{http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/714. Salib ‘Abd al-Masīḥ was interviewed at his home in al-Qaṣr on 30 xii 76 and 8 i 80. The information was further clarified in a letter of 21 vi 79 from Abrām Bibāwī.} for a modest consideration, made it available for study. It is now in the Schøyen Collection of Oslo. It is Coptic red slip ware of the Fourth or Fifth Century, with a flange rim decorated with four fields of stripes. The diameter at the outer edge is 23.3 to 24.0 cm., with a diameter inside the bowl of 18.2 to 18.7 cm., adequate to close a mouth large enough to admit the codices, whose broadest leaves, in Codex VII, measure up to 17.5 cm. There are a few black tar-like stains about 2.0 cm. from the outer edge on the underside of the rim of the bowl, perhaps vestiges of a bitumen used to seal the bowl into the mouth of the jar. As a result, the jar probably could not be readily opened to investigate its contents, which would help to explain why it was broken, though of course the fallāhin might in any case have broken it impetuously. But the sealing of the jar would also explain the relatively good state of preservation of a number of the codices (I, II, III, VI, VII, XIII), and would suggest that much of the deterioration of the others may have taken place prior to their burial or subsequent to their discovery.

Muḥammad ‘Ali reported that he decided to divide the codices on the spot with the other camel drivers present at the time of the discovery. Since the number of codices was less than enough for each to receive two, Muḥammad ‘Ali prepared lots consisting each of a complete codex and parts of others torn up for this purpose.

There should have been only twelve books that would come in question for such a division. For what is called Codex XIII consists of only eight leaves, which were removed from near the center of a codex in late antiquity in order to separate out a tractate inscribed on them, and then laid inside the front cover of Codex VI early enough to share the contours of deterioration characteristic of the first leaves of Codex VI.\footnote{James M. Robinson, “Inside the Front Cover of Codex VI,” in Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in Honour of Alexander Böhlig (ed. Martin Krause; NHS 3; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 74–87.} Thus Codex XIII would probably not even have been noticed by the discoverers, much less considered a separate codex, for example on the basis of the difference in the scribal hand from that of Codex VI (itself not a sure criterion for different codices, since Codices I and XI display each two scribal hands). Yet, when pressed, Muḥammad ‘Ali maintained that the number of codices in the jar was not twelve, but thirteen. Thus it is possible, though unconfirmed and improbable, that a quite fragmentary codex was completely lost at the cliff.
Muḥammad ʿAlī said that covers were abandoned at the cliff, which would account for the missing cover of Codex XII as well as for that of any unattested codex. But since Muḥammad ʿAlī was illiterate, he may well not have counted the codices. His insistence on 13 codices may reflect only what he had heard from us as we questioned him.

The other camel drivers, ignorant of the value inherent in the codices, and fearing both sorcery and Muḥammad ʿAlī, renounced any claim to a share. He then stacked the lots back together in a pile, unwound his white turban from his head, knotted the codices in it, and then slung the whole bundle over his shoulder. Unhobbling his camel, he rode back to his home in al-Qaṣr,116 into the closed courtyard where the animals were kept, and where bread was cooked in the large clay oven.117 Here he dumped the books, loose leaves, and fragments on the ground among the straw that was lying by the oven to be burnt. Umm Aḥmad has conceded that she burnt in the oven along with the straw some of the ripped-up books—both papyrus and pieces of broken covers. But this may only be her effort to accommodate us with the answer she thought we desired. Probably at the time she would not have noted or remembered whether she included in the kindling she used to light the fire papyrus fragments along with the straw in which they lay. Hence the interview with her cannot simply be taken at face value.

Doresse’s early reports that “two would have been burned”118 or “some were burned to heat tea”119 was subsequently discounted by Puech:120

---


118 Puech and Doresse, “Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Egypte,” CRAI 1948 (1948) 87–95: 89:

... deux auraient été brûlés.


Deux d’entre eux, a-t-on prétendu, auraient été brûlés par les fellahs, qui s’en seraient aussitôt servis comme de combustible pour préparer leur thé. C’est là une vieille histoire, qui ne manque pas d’être débitée en Égypte à l’occasion de trouvailles de ce genre: un racontar analogue a circulé à propos de la charta Borgiana; il a été répété lors de la découverte des papyrus d’Origène. ... Ici, en tout cas, le bruit était faux. Les fellahs, fut-ce en un coin reculé de Haute-Égypte, savent fort bien que les vieux manuscrits qu’ils leur arrive de déterrer ont toujours quelque valeur marchande.
Two of them, one has maintained, are said to have been burned by the *fallāhīn*, who would have made use of them promptly as fuel to prepare their tea. This is an old story that never fails to be spread in Egypt on the occasion of finds of this kind. An analogous tale circulated with regard to the *charta Borgiana*; it was repeated at the time of the discovery of the papyri of Origen. ... Here, in any case, the rumor was false. The *fallāhīn*, even in a far corner of Upper Egypt, know very well that the old manuscripts they happen to dig up always have some commercial value.

In an unpublished memorandum (see Part 4 below), Doresse later conceded Puech’s point:\(^{121}\)

Had there been, as one claims in Cairo, some manuscripts that were burnt? But *no one* is that stupid!

The reference to Cairo would suggest that the report of the burning came from Tano, who had visited Nag Hammadi in March 1946, perhaps mediated to Doresse through Drioton.

Doresse continued to publish this skepticism:\(^{122}\)

One maintained that some of them had been burnt by the *fallāhīn* to heat tea—a simple fable! The value of an ancient papyrus is, in Egypt, too well known.

This burning has been conceded, along with the requisite correction in the details and circumstances under which it took place, by the person who is said to have done the burning, Umm Aḥmad, as well as by her son Muḥammad ʿAlī, who said he observed the burning, and by Bahīj ʿAlī, who acquired what was left of the torn books after the burning (see Part 3 below). These illiterate villagers knew nothing of the *charta Borgiana* or the papyri of Origen, nor of Puech’s generalizing *topos* derived from them. They only knew of the one case that took place in their experience in their village, where the codices did at first turn out to be practically worthless, as Muḥammad ʿAlī learned to his chagrin (see Part 3 below). The only reason to doubt the burning would be their desire to accommodate what they took to be our view, based on our question.

---

\(^{121}\) *iv 57*: Doresse’s handwritten Report of the visit to Nag Hammadi on 26–27 January 1950, dated April 1957 (see Part 4 below):

> Y eut-il, comme on le prétend au Caire, des mss. brûlés? Mais *nul* n’est assez fou!

\(^{122}\) Doresse, “Le roman d’une grande découverte,” *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* (25 July 1957): 5:

> On a prétendu que certains d’entre eux auraient été brûlé par les fellahs pour se chauffer du thé: simple fable! La valeur d’un papyrus antique est, en Égypte, trop connu.
There is no empirical evidence of the burning on the extant papyrus or covers, as had been assumed in the case of the first extant leaves of Codex XIII.\textsuperscript{123} For on closer examination the discoloration found there is seen to contain whitish, crystalline matter more like a saline or other chemical precipitate. The first extant leaf had stuck to the leather of the inside of the front cover of Codex VI, so that one may assume some natural deterioration took place.\textsuperscript{124}

The *topos* of the burning of papyrus usually has to do with its aroma when burnt, making of papyrus a kind of incense.\textsuperscript{125} But this motif is completely lacking in the story of the burning of the papyrus of the Nag Hammadi codices.

The rumors about what went on at the time of the discovery do not lead to the conclusion that one or more codices were completely lost. The surviving unplaced fragments either seem to have the same scribal hands as do the codices that survive, and hence presumably come from them and thus provide no basis for conjecturing further codices, or are too small or preserve too little ink to provide a basis for conjecturing the existence of further codices. Hence it will be prudent to continue referring to the discovery as consisting only of thirteen codices, and to mean by this twelve codices (Codices I–XII), plus eight leaves removed in late antiquity from its own codex (Codex XIII), and put inside the front cover of Codex VI. If another codex more nearly complete existed in the jar, no trace of it has been brought to light.

To turn to what is lacking in the surviving codices: The cover of Codex XII is missing. Also missing is the vast majority of the leaves of Codex XII and probably of Codex X. But since the extant material is (in both cases) from different parts of the codex and of different sizes and shapes, the loss cannot be wholly attributed to natural causes such as rot, worms, or rodents, but is best explained in many instances as having taken place after the discovery. The same is true of individual missing leaves (one in Codex II, nine in Codex III, one in Codex VI, three in Codex VIII, and two in Codex IX). There are also leaves that are practically lost, in that only a vestige survives, and

---


sequences of extant leaves with continuing contours that lack sequences of large or small fragments. Clean breaks also suggest rough handling rather than gradual deterioration. Although relatively minor losses may well have taken place at various later stages in the transmission of the material, apparently most seriously in the case of Codex III (see Part 3 below), the massive losses must have taken place at the very beginning, as the principals concede. Thus hopes of identifying further material in private or public collections are correspondingly reduced. Stephen Emmel’s discovery in the Beinecke Library of Yale University of a number of fragments which when assembled restored the bulk of III, 145/146, is hence to be considered more an exception than the beginning of any ingathering of thus far unidentified but still extant material. Nothing has surfaced since that time.

No further material could be found in the home of al-Qummuṣ Basīlyūs ʿAbd al-Masīḥ, who retained Codex III for a time (see Part 3 below), though I carried out a careful search through his clerical vestments and Coptic and Arabic liturgical books still stored in a trunk in his courtyard. Nor was anything found in the manila folders and wrapping paper containing papyrus fragments in the ‘Old Shop’ in the Khān al-Khalīlī formerly owned by Albert Eid, who retained Codex I for a time (see Part 3 below), though the folders still bore his name. Nor have the repeated interviews with discoverers and traffickers brought such material out of hiding. Hence one may infer that it is to be considered lost.

The idea that the Codex Tchacos is a lost Nag Hammadi codex, suggested by Gilles Quispel, has no more basis in fact than would a similar conjecture concerning P. Berol. 8502, though each includes two duplicates of Nag Hammadi tractates. Their provenience far downstream from Nag Hammadi is well enough attested to discount that idea. P. Berol. 8502 was of course discovered long before the Nag Hammadi discovery. Codex Tchacos and P. Berol. 8502 merely document the fact that Coptic Gnostics were located at various places along the Nile.


3. The Trafficking of the Nag Hammadi Codices

The Earliest Trafficking

The initial disappointment that the hoped-for buried treasure turned out to be only a stack of old books was confirmed by the inability of Muḥammad ʿAlī's family to sell them among the villagers for piasters or cigarettes. A codex would be offered for an Egyptian Pound (here abbreviated in the usual Cairo way, £É), so that one could see what they were like, with the assurance that others would be brought if this one would be purchased. Then, with no buyers, the price would go down to no more than fifteen or twenty-five piasters, but still without a sale.

A Copt of al-Qaṣr, Zakhārī Ḥannān, had refused to buy any, though he observed that they were books of the church. This comment was probably based on no more than the recognition that the writing was not Arabic but Coptic. As a result, the early efforts to dispose of the books seem to have been directed primarily to Copts. Since Muḥammad ʿAlī drove a camel for a Copt, Ilyās Balāmūn Ghubriyāl of al-Qaṣr, he left three or four codices with him for a couple of days, but Ilyās refused to buy them; his son Milik128 (*1938) recalls laughing together with Muḥammad ʿAlī over their worthlessness. Ṣahyūn Jaddīs129 was offered one for sale, but refused, feeling that his church's Arabic Bible was all he needed. A priest from al-Qaṣr, at the time living in al-Raḥmāniyah Qiblī as the head priest at the Monastery of al-Malāk, al-Qummuṣ Mattā Sarjīyūs, who was already at that time of a very advanced age, turned down an offer to sell for 3 £É.

Doresse apparently reported the same incident, but as an actual sale:130

---

128 Milik Ilyās Balāmūn was interviewed at his home in Nag Hammadi on 20 xii 76 and 23 i 78.
129 Ḥilmī, the son of Ṣahyūn Jaddīs, was interviewed in Nag Hammadi on 3 iii 66 (see Chapter 12, Part 1 below) and in his new home in Heliopolis on 23 viii 75. He was a member of the panel of Copts presenting a "Report on the Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices," who were interviewed at the Second Meeting of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, included in the First International Congress of Coptology at the Société de géographie in Garden City, Cairo, on 10 xii 76. (By that time he had had a stroke and lost much of his memory, so he was the silent member of the panel.) See James M. Robinson, "The First International Congress of Coptology," American Research Center in Egypt Newsletter 106 (Fall 1978 [1979]): 24–40: 27 (and Chapter 11, Part 7 below).
130 Jean Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, 154:
But all that remained intact had been sold for 3 ££ (3,000 Fr. Francs), and no one since then has worried further about it.

However his source of information concerning al-Qummuṣ Mattā Sarjīyūs, Abūnā Dāʾūd, has subsequently clarified to me that the purchase was not made. The figure of 3 ££ adheres to this story as a constant, whereas what was offered for that price varies. On 20 January 1978 Abūnā Dāʾūd interpreted the figure as meaning three codices at 1 ££ each, whereas on 15 September 1975 he had interpreted it as meaning five codices at 3 ££ each. Nabīh Maṣūd Iskārūs (see below) recalled the rejected offer as ten codices for a total of 3 ££.

After the murder of Aḥmad Īsmāʾīl, a codex (Codex III, see below) was stored in a drawer of the wardrobe in the bedroom of al-Qummuṣ Basilyūs ’Abd al-Masīḥ († 1970), a priest serving the village church of al-Qaṣr at the Monastery of St. George and a neighbor of Zakhārī Ḥannān, who had identified the codices as books of the church. The priest’s wife Rūmah, the matriarch of the family at al-Qaṣr when I was there, was the daughter of Andarāwus al-Qiss ’Abd al-Sayyid and his wife Baraswiyah Sid-Hum Awwād († 1961).

The son of Andarāwus, Rāghib (* 1910), taught history and English from village to village on a circuit of Coptic parochial schools. Though when I came to know him he lived at Qinā, 52 kilometers upstream from al-Qaṣr, in retirement from a position as chief clerk there in the regional office of the Ministry of Public Education, he had lived at the time of the discovery in Dishnā only some twenty-two kilometers upstream from al-Qaṣr. On the

---

132 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1358; http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1567. Munīr, the son of al-Qummuṣ Basilyūs ’Abd al-Masiḥ and his wife Rūmah, was first interviewed in Nag Hammadi and al-Qaṣr on 16 ix 75, and on each subsequent trip to Nag Hammadi. http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1365. He is the source of the hand-written codex that had belonged to his father, bearing in a colophon the date 1892 and containing a reference to ‘al-Qaṣr and al-Ṣayyād’ (see Part 2 above).
133 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1364; http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/814. Rāghib Andarāwus al-Qiss ’Abd al-Sayyid was interviewed at his home in Qinā on 18 ix 75, 7 xii 75, and frequently thereafter on each subsequent trip to Egypt in his home in Qinā, in Nag Hammadi, in al-Qaṣr, and in Cairo through 1978. He was a member of the panel entitled ‘Report on the Discovery of the Nag Hammādi Codices,’ where he summarized what he had told me repeatedly about the discovery and trafficking of the Nag Hammādi Codices (see Chapter 11, Part 7 below).
day of the week when he taught at al-Qaṣr, he usually visited in his sister Rūmah’s home. When he was shown the codex that had been turned over to al-Qummuṣ Basilyūs, he recognized its potential value, which he proudly attributed to his being a teacher of history. He asked al-Qummuṣ Basilyūs if he might have it, a request readily granted. When he took it to his childhood home, his father Andarāwus immediately told him to leave. For the police investigation of the murder that Andarāwus had witnessed was taking place, and he wanted to have nothing to do with those involved.

Rāghib inquired of the youngest of the sons of Umm Aḥmad whether he could acquire any other of the codices. He was told he would have to wait, since the police were detaining the other brothers. A day or so later this brother brought a second codex (probably Codex I, see below). Rāghib had paid nothing for the first codex, since, as he has explained, it had been a gift to al-Qummuṣ Basilyūs, but he offered some fifty piasters for the second. The offer was declined with the comment that, after all, Rāghib was a neighbor. Rāghib, no doubt recognizing the hollowness of such a gesture, offered a mantle, whereupon the lad said he would like to have a jallabīyah, for which purpose Rāghib gave him a small amount of money. The lad added that Rāghib should not tell his brothers, from which Rāghib inferred that the boy had in effect taken the codex without their knowledge. Since in Dishnā Rāghib lived on the ground floor, he feared mice might damage the codices. So he deposited them on the floor above, in the room of his housekeeper Bahīyah Jirjis (*1889).

Zakī Basṭā (*1897), a well-established provincial antiquities dealer of Qinā, heard from Tano late in March 1946 that a week earlier Tano had acquired two codices from peasants of al-Qaṣr working at Giza. Since Zakī Basṭā was given no name, they may remain unidentified. Abūnā Dāʿūd had spoken of a carpenter selling a codex in Cairo at such a profit that he was able to remain there. This could refer to the same transaction. It is possible that this seller may have been Fikrī Jibrāʾīl Khalil (*1922). For Muḥammad ‘Alī has reported that Fikrī acquired two codices, for which he paid with sugar and tea from his al-Qaṣr shop. Bahīj ‘Alī and Jamāl Nāshid Bisādah, themselves among the traffickers (see below), also identified Fikrī as having acquired a codex. Fikrī’s brother ‘Azīz is reported to have maintained that

135 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1629. Zakī Basṭā was interviewed in Qinā on 9 xii 75, 23 xii 76, and 7 i 78.
136 Fikrī Jibrāʾīl Khalil was interviewed at his shop in Cairo on 26 xii 75, and again, when I was accompanied by Rāghib, in vii 76.
Fikrī had a codex, though he did not see it. Kamāl Fūʿād of Nag Hammadi, the brother-on-law of Fikrī, recalls Fikrī having told him on his return from Cairo that he had just sold one or some codices—he could not recall any specifics. Fikrī, originally proprietor of a small store at al-Qaṣr, improved his situation by moving his business to Nag Hammadi at about that time. A decade later he moved to Cairo, where I met him as proprietor of the Nag Hammadi Store of food staples on al-Qubaysī Street in the al-Ẓāhir district. This success story is attributed by Rāghib to the start provided by the sale of the codices.

When interviewed at his Cairo shop on 26 December 1975, Fikrī denied having owned any of the material, though he did recall that Muḥammad ʿAlī and his brothers were offering codices to any Copt for a piaster or so, and that Nāshid Bisādah, the grain merchant of Nag Hammadi, had one or two that he sold for next to nothing. When pressed on these matters in December 1976 by Rāghib, Fikrī became angry, conceding that he had been offered some of the material, but not that he had acquired any. Thus Fikrī seems to be the only one, among the discoverers and traffickers (or, if deceased, their sons or relatives) who was unwilling to confirm his involvement. This is in spite of what the other party to the transaction and other traffickers have affirmed, and indeed what Fikrī himself had earlier confided in his own family circle.

Such hesitancy may have been motivated by a residual fear of the authorities with regard to such transactions, or merely by a concern to appear to acquaintances such as Rāghib to be telling consistently one ‘true’ version of the story.

Codices II and VII

Zakī Basṭā, whom I met through Rāghib, had a one-fourth interest in Qinā’s Cinema Firyāl (named after King Farouk’s daughter) until it closed. However, his main business had been to circulate among the villages and antiquities sites of the region collecting antiquities for the small shop upstairs in his home on their way to the antiquities market of Cairo. His contact person at al-Qaṣr was Bahīj ʿAli Muḥammad Ādam, notorious there as

137 Kamāl Fūʿād was interviewed in al-Qaṣr on 12 i 78.
140 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1367. Bahīj ʿAli Muḥammad Ādam was interviewed in al-Qaṣr on 11 xii 75, 18 xii 75, 28 xii 76, 20 i 78, and 8 i 80.
a one-eyed bad-man, who acquired two or more of the books from Umm Ḍhahmad in January 1946 shortly after the discovery. Bahīj ‘Alī wrote to Zākī Basṭā and then took two books to show him in Qīnā. Zākī Basṭā bought one from him, which seems in substance to have amounted to an agreement to divide the costs and the profit. Accompanied by a jeweler of Qīnā named Ayyūb, they went to Cairo, where they stayed three or four days at the Port Saʿīd Hotel. They went to the ‘Mansoor Abdel Sayed Mansoor’ antiquities shop of Maṃṣūr ‘Abd al-Ṣayyid Maṃṣūr (1881–1968), on Ibrāhīm Pasha (later Opera) Square, across from the Ezbekieh Gardens, in the same building as the old Shepherd’s Hotel. Zākī Basṭā recalls that Maṃṣūr telephoned a foreigner to come and see the books. Since the foreigner did not speak Arabic, they did not talk with him, but observed from the back of the shop. The foreigner insisted on buying not just the two books, but the whole lot, which they should go and bring, but the foreigner would not pay the 700 £É they asked for the two books. Since Bahīj ‘Alī did not produce the other codices, the negotiations were not completed. Maṃṣūr then telephoned Tano, who came to Maṃṣūr’s shop and acquired the two books for 200 £É each, which Zākī Basṭā and Bahīj ‘Alī divided equally between them.

This same negotiation is reported from the European side as follows: Jacques Schwartz was a fellow at the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire in 1945–1948, and later became Professor of Papyrology at the University of Strasbourg. I met him there while I was teaching a course on the Nag Hammadi texts as a Fulbright Professor during the school year 1970–1971. He reported to me that he had seen two codices in March 1946, whereupon I asked him to put his report in writing. On 13 November 1972 he sent a full report, which began by identifying the antiquities dealer he referred to as Mansoor:

---

142 13 xi 72: Report from Schwartz to Robinson:

J’étais pensionnaire de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale au Caire depuis novembre 1945, et j’avais, naturellement, fait la connaissance de Mansoor, un copte ancien employé des chemins de fer, qui avait son magasin d’Antiquités à coté de l’ancien Shepherds, face aux jardins de l’Ezbekieh. Mansoor parlait bien le français, était aidé de deux fils d’une vintaine d’années et était alors l’un des plus importants antiquaires du Caire. Il avait vendu à Farouk un certain nombre d’objets de Tell-el-Amarna, dans des conditions telles qu’il y a tout lieu de supposer que ce sont des faux ... et Mansoor le savait.
I had been a boarder of the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire since November 1945, and naturally I had made the acquaintance of Mansoor, a Copt, a former employee of the railroad, who had his shop of antiquities beside the old Shepherds, in front of the Ezbekieh Gardens. Mansoor spoke French well, was aided by two sons in their twenties, and at the time was one of the most important antiquities dealers of Cairo. He had sold to [King] Farouk a certain number of objects of Tell-el-Amarna, under such circumstances that there was every reason to suppose that they are fakes ... and Mansoor knew it.

The report of Schwartz continued with detailed information, which can be coordinated both with what I had already learned at Nag Hammadi about the history of the discovery, and with what I learned about the Nag Hammadi codices themselves:

---

144 13 xi 72: Report from Schwartz to Robinson:

Mansoor savait que je m’intéressais au grec et une fin d’après-midi de mars 1946, il me téléphone à l’IFAO pour me dire qu’il avait quelque chose pour moi. Je me rends aussitôt à son magasin. Là, il me montre deux codices reliés, c’est du copte et ce que j’ai pu remarquer est très exactement reproduit par M. Puech (C.R.A. I., 1948, p. 89) qui le tenait de Doresse à qui j’avais, entre temps, raconté ma visite. J’ajouterais simplement que les livres étaient plus hauts que larges et en excellent état de conservation.

Mansoor me raconte alors que deux indigènes (mais je ne sais plus s’il a prononcé dès ce moment le nom de Nag Hammadi) lui ont confié ces deux livres pour 48 heures et qu’il y en a en tout sept comme cela. Je lui reponds que c’est du copte, que cela ne m’intéresse pas mais que je vais en référer à mon directeur M. Charles Kuentz. Ce dernier était très difficile à atteindre à tout autre moment que le matin; j’arrive quand même à le voir dans la soirée. Il comprend fort bien l’importance de ces documents qui ne peuvent être que gnostiques et nous décidons d’aller le lendemain matin rendre visite à Mansoor.


La journée se passe sans appel téléphonique, et le lendemain de même. Dans ce pays, il ne faut jamais donner l’impression que l’on est pressé de conclure. Au bout d’une quinzaine de jours, je retourne chez Mansoor. Désolé, cela n’a pas marché. Les deux indigènes sont revenus, comme prévu, mais ont déclaré qu’ils n’étaient pas seuls
Mansoor knew that I was interested in Greek, and at the end of an afternoon in March 1946 he telephoned me at the IFAO [Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale] to tell me that he had something for me. I immediately go to his shop. There, he showed me two bound codices. It is Coptic, and what I was able to note is very exactly reproduced by Mr. Puech (Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions, 1948, 89), who got it from Doresse, to whom I had meanwhile told of my visit. I would simply add that the books were more tall than wide and in an excellent state of preservation.

Mansoor tells me then that two natives (but I no longer recall if he pronounced at that time the name of Nag Hammadi) have entrusted to him these two books for 48 hours, and that there are, in all, seven of this kind. I reply to him that it is Coptic, which does not interest me, but that I am going to refer it to my Director, Charles Kuentz. The latter was very difficult to reach at any time other than the morning; nonetheless, I succeed in seeing him in the evening. He understands quite well the importance of these documents, which can only be Gnostic, and we decide to go the next morning to pay a visit to Mansoor.

The shops of the antiquities dealers do not open early in the morning. When we arrive at Ezbekieh the next morning around 10 AM, Mansoor is not yet in his shop, which a servant is sweeping. He comes a bit later, and, as one must do in the Orient, we chat for some time of irrelevant matters. The real conversation finally gets under way, and Mansoor shows the two books to Kuentz. Kuentz then puts on an act: “Peuh! These are Coptic books of spells, this is not interesting. But, after all, the French Institute could buy them. How much do the owners want for them?” Mansoor proposes the figure of 100 £E per codex. Kuentz pretends to hesitate, then accepts. So in theory he will pay 700 £E for 7 books. Mansoor says: “I will do my negotiating and will telephone you.” We leave, satisfied.

propriétaires et qu’il leur fallait consulter les autres. Mansoor les a laissés repartir avec les livres et, dit-il, il a envoyé à leur suite un homme de confiance, lequel leur a offert 110 £E par codex, sur quoi ils ont demandé 120 £E, puis ces sortes d’enchères ont monté. Je n’ai pas su à quel montant Mansoor a lâché pied (150 à 200 £E par pièce, sûrement pas plus), puis Mansoor m’apprend que c’est Tano qui a fait l’affaire; il croit même savoir que c’est pour une somme globale de 7000 £E. Plus tard, lors des tractations avec le gouvernement égyptien, c’est la fille du numismatiste Dattari qui sert de prête-nom à Tano.

Mansoor a disparu quelques années plus tard et son magasin avec lui. Phocion Tano est mort au printemps 1972; je l’ai assez bien connu mais n’ai jamais pu le faire parler des manuscrits de Nag Hammadi qui lui ont valu, par la suite, de nombreux ennuis. Mlle Dattari est morte il ya a quelques années; elle n’a joué qu’un rôle très effacé dans toute cette histoire; Charles Kuentz vit toujours; il a 79 ou 80 ans et passe la majeure partie de son temps au Caire ou à Luxor; il a parfaitement compris l’enjeu et agi en conséquence.
The day passes without a telephone call, and the next day as well. In this country, one should never give the impression that one is eager to close a deal. At the end of a fortnight, I return to Mansoor. Sorry to say, it did not work out. The two natives returned, as expected, but declared that they were not the sole owners, and that they would have to consult the others. Mansoor let them leave with the books, and, he says, sent after them a person he trusted who offered them 110 £É per codex, whereupon they asked for 120 £É, then this kind of bidding climbed. I did not find out at what level Mansoor gave up (150 or 200 £É each, certainly not more). Then Mansoor informs me that it is Tano who made the deal; he even thinks he knows that it is for a global sum of 7,000 £É. Later, at the time of the negotiations with the Egyptian government, it is the daughter of the numismatician Dattari who serves as a pseudonym for Tano.

Mansoor disappeared a few years later, and his shop with him. Phocion Tano died in the spring of 1972. I knew him rather well, but was never able to get him to speak of the Nag Hammadi manuscripts that brought him, in what followed, numerous annoyances. Miss Dattari died a few years ago; she only played a very subdued role in all this story. Charles Kuentz is still alive. He is 79 or 80 years old, and spends most of his time in Cairo or Luxor. He understood perfectly what was at stake, and acted accordingly.

Then, in retrospect, Schwartz conjectured what may well have actually taken place:

---

Quand, un quart de siècle après, je me demande pourquoi les choses ont tourné comme elles l’on fait, je crois pouvoir constater ce qui suit:

1. En allant un peu trop tôt, ce matin-là, chez Mansoor, nous lui avons peut-être donné l’impression que l’affaire était plus importante que nous ne le lui disions. Peut-être a-t-il alors eu le sentiment qu’il pourrait gagner plus. Il n’avait pas demandé de pourcentage, mais nous pensions bien qu’il ne verserait aux propriétaires qu’une partie de la somme prévue.

2. Visiblement, Mansoor, habitué à travailler avec des objets égyptiens, ne s’est pas rendu compte de l’importance réelle. Il aurait pu garder les deux pièces qui étaient entre ses mains et faire pression sur ses interlocuteurs qui étaient légalement en mauvaise position, puis il s’agissait de fouilles (ou trouvailles) clandestines. Il y avait un risque, c’est que les autres livres ne soient détruits par leur détenteurs, par peur. Mansoor a dû préférer les assurer en rendant les textes, dans l’espoir d’avoir le tout.

3. Le moment auquel Tano est intervenue est très difficile à fixer. Mais je ne serais pas autrement étonné si, lors de leur voyage au Caire, les gens de Nag Hammadi étaient allés, à la fois, chez Mansoor et chez Tano, avec une partie de leur trouvaille. Tano, qui était sans conteste plus intelligent que Mansoor, a dû comprendre aussitôt la situation. Mansoor n’était pas de taille à lutter avec lui (ni même peut-être financièrement). La partie était perdu pour Mansoor et pour ceux à qui il avait montré les documents.
When, a quarter of a century later, I ask myself why things turned out the way they did, I think I am able to state the following:

1. By going a bit too early, that morning, to Mansoor’s shop, perhaps we have given him the impression that the matter was more important than we told him. Hence he perhaps had the sentiment that he could get more. He did not ask for a percentage, but we of course thought that he would turn over to the owners only a part of the expected amount.

2. Obviously, Mansoor, accustomed to work with Egyptian objects, did not realize the real importance. He would have been able to keep the two pieces that were in his hands, and put pressure on his discussion partners, who were legally in a bad position, since it was a matter of clandestine excavations (or discoveries). There was a risk that the other books be destroyed, by those who held them, out of fear. Mansoor must have preferred to reassure them, by returning the texts, in hopes of getting everything.

3. The moment when Tano intervened is very difficult to determine. But I would not be surprised if, at the time of their trip to Cairo, the people of Nag Hammadi had gone, at the same time, to Mansoor and to Tano, with a part of their discovery. Tano, who without doubt was more intelligent that Mansoor, must have immediately understood the situation. Mansoor did not have the stature to fight with him (perhaps not even financially). The match was lost for Mansoor and for those to whom he had shown the documents.

The information that Schwartz passed on to Doresse was published by Puech and Doresse:146

The name of Seth recurred there rather often. In one there could be read the title *Apocalypse of Peter*. The leather cover of another carried the image of a serpent. The format was more reduced than that of our manuscript [Codex III].

In a rapid survey of a codex, one would naturally look for titles to identify works. Since Schwartz did not know Coptic, he would be limited to Greek loan words, proper names, and the occasional occurrence of a title left in Greek. He has confirmed:147

---

146 Puech and Doresse, “Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Égypte,” *CRAI* 1948 (1948): 87–95: 89:

> Le nom de Seth y revenait assez souvent; dans l’un se lisait le titre: *Apocalypse de Pierre*; la couverture de cuir d’un autre portait l’image d’un serpent; le format était plus réduit que celui de notre manuscrit.

147 19 viii 76: Letter from Schwartz to Robinson:

> Je n’ai pas de notion de copte et les titres que j’ai lus étaient en grec.
I do not have any notion of Coptic and the titles that I read were in Greek. One title, still in Greek, had in fact been noted by Schwartz, that of VII, 3: ‘Apocalypse of Peter,’ set off at the beginning and the end of the tractate as a title (VII, 70,13; 84,14). The two lines just above the superscript title Apocalypse of Peter bear, also still in Greek, the subscript title of VII, 2, concluding with the name Seth: The Second Treatise of the Great Seth. The name Seth also occurs in titles dominated by Greek loan words, though in Coptic syntax, in VII, 5, at 121,17,19; 124,15; 127,17, as well as in the text near the beginning of that tractate (VII, 118,12,25,28). Although the name Seth occurs in other Nag Hammadi codices, it does not occur elsewhere in titles. Hence one may safely assume the first two details of the published report refer not to two different codices, as was apparently thought to be possible by Doresse, but to a single codex, Codex VII. Since the spirals in the leather tooling on the cover of Codex II are the only decoration on covers that could be described as serpents, the third detail must identify the second codex as Codex II. But Doresse inferred that the three traits would refer to “two or three” codices, or more precisely to “three.” It is ironic that the report to the French Academy in this regard was imprecise, whereas the report I gleaned from the traffickers in Upper Egypt was quite precise.

Doresse’s report that the format was “more reduced” than Codex III does not fit Codices II and VII. In terms of the height of the leaves, Codex III is shorter (Codex III: 25.5 cm.; Codex II: 28.4 cm.; Codex VII: 29.2 cm.). In fact only Codices IV (23.7 cm.), VIII (24.2 cm.), V (24.3 cm.) are shorter than Codex III. In terms of the breadth of the leaves, Codex III is narrower (15.5 cm.) than Codices II (15.8 cm.) and VII (17.5 cm.), though the other Nag Hammadi codices are slightly narrower.

---


150 Puech and Doresse, “Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Égypte,” CRAI 1948 (1948): 87–95: 89:

... deux ou trois ....


152 This detail was omitted from the similar report by Puech, “Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts à Nag-Hammadi,” in the ‘Chronique’ of the RHR 134 (1948): 244–248: 244.
Hammadi codices are narrower than Codex III. In terms of thickness, to judge by the number of leaves then extant (since an actual measurement of the thickness of Codex III was not possible after its conservation at the end of 1947), there is but little distinction among the three in question (Codex VII: 65; Codex III: 69; Codex II: 75); Codices IV–VI and IX–XIII do have appreciably fewer extant leaves than Codex III. Of course the report on format is based on subjective memories rather than actual measurements. At the time the comparison was made, no one had seen them side by side. Schwartz has subsequently reported:153

... I did not make a comparison with Codex III.

He has also added about the two codices he did see:

... higher than they were wide.154

Since Codex III is the nearest to a square format of any of the Nag Hammadi codices, one may suspect that the reference to a ‘more reduced’ format is at best an imprecise formulation for the impression that Codices II and VII are narrower than they are high.

By a process of elimination one is forced back to Codices II and VII. Schwartz has also reported that the two were:155

... in an excellent state of preservation.

This would eliminate Codices IV–V and VIII–XIII. Codex I may be excluded from consideration, since it seems to have circulated in three parts, with only 18 leaves plus small fragments circulating together with the bulk of the other codices, though without its cover. Schwartz has reported that both the codices which he saw were bound:156

... he showed me two bound codices ...

---

153 12 viii 76: Letter from Schwartz to Robinson: ... je n’ai pas fait de comparaison avec le codex III.
154 12 viii 76: Letter from Schwartz to Robinson: ... plus hauts que larges.
155 13 xi 72: Report from Schwartz to Robinson: ... en excellent état de conservation.
156 13 xi 72: Report from Schwartz to Robinson: ... il me montre deux codices reliés ....
Thus only Codex VI comes in question, since it is in almost as good a condition as Codices VII and II. But it contains no reference to Seth, no spirals on the cover, and no *Apocalypse of Peter*; though it is narrower (14.9 cm) and thinner (39 extant leaves, plus 8 leaves of Codex XIII lying inside its front cover) than is Codex III, it is higher (27.9 cm). Rather than conjecturing otherwise unknown codices, one may in all probability conclude that Schwartz and Kuentz were shown Codices II and VII, a conclusion in which Schwartz concurs (see below).

Doresse has been very critical of this incident:157

Chiefly because of the intervention of a learned person, to whom three of these other manuscripts had been offered at a ridiculously low price—one says a hundred and ten pounds (Egyptian). ... But this expert to whom they were offered refused them as of no interest and mentioned them to no one else. It was a misjudgment ...

But Schwartz was concerned to exonerate Kuentz (see below). Kuentz has reported to me that he followed up the lead by going to Tano and seeking unsuccessfully the necessary funding from Paris, whereupon he reported the matter to Étienne Drioton.158

Kuentz was apparently an alcoholic, as was suggested by Schwartz’ comment that he ‘was very difficult to reach at any time other than the morning.’ This was also indicated by a comment of Étienne Drioton, indirect though it was:159

Meanwhile, one must get the opinion of the members of the Commission of the Cairo School. That of Kuentz, if it is possible for him to have one, does not have great importance, for it is now admitted as a postulate that he does

---

157 Dorresse, *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte*, 137:

Par suite, tout particulièrement, de l’intervention d’un savant à qui trois de ces manuscrits furent proposés dès le début pour un prix dérisoire: 110 livres égyptiennes, dit-on. ... Mais le savant auquel on les offrait les rejeta, lui, comme sans intérêt et n’en parla à personne. Pareils mécomptes ...


158 2 xii 72: My interview with Charles Kuentz.

159 25 ix 45: Letter from Drioton to Marianne Dorresse:

En attendant, il faut faire l’opinion des membres de la Commission de l’École du Caire: celle de Kuentz, s’il peut en avoir une, n’a pas grande importance, car il est maintenant admis comme un postulat qu’il ne sait pas diriger son établissement et qu’il n’y a qu’un moyen de le conserver, c’est de le mettre en tutelle. Je ne pense pas que les membres de la Commission le disent, mais je sais qu’ils le pensent.
not know how to direct his establishment, and that there is only one way to preserve it, namely to put him on leave. I do not think that the members of the Commission say it, but I know that they think it.

After I wrote up a very early draft of this part of the record, I sent it to Schwartz to verify, along with a number of questions to clarify ambiguities. He responded fully:

My response will address, one after the other, your questions, and the text that you have written.

A.

1. Kuentz and I, we have never seen other than two codices. Doresse was obviously mistaken in reporting what I was able to say to him.

2. I do not know what decision-making authority the confidant of Mansour had. Every time he accepted the asking price, the seller would raise by 10 £É. If my recollections are correct, Mansour told me that he went so far as to offer 150 £É per codex, or even a bit more. Without result.

3. Miss Dattari was certainly a pseudonym. It would surprise me that she advanced money to Tano, who was wealthy. Miss Dattari, who retained the coin collection of her father, lived in an institution that depended, it would seem, on the Franciscans; the latter inherited some of the collection, which they have had sold in major lots, in recent years, to the large coin merchants of Europe.

4. After my two visits to Mansour, I did not see the codices again, and I have not made a comparison with Codex III. I never spoke of it to Puech, who must

---

160 12 viii 76: Letter from Schwartz to Robinson:

Ma réponse concernera, successivement, vos questions et le texte que vous avez rédigé.

A.

1. Kuentz et moi, nous n’avons jamais vu que deux codices. Doresse s’est manifestement trompé en rapportant ce que j’avais pu lui dire.

2. Je ne sais pas quel pouvoir de décision avait l’homme de confiance de Mansour. Chaque fois qu’il acceptait le prix demandé, le vendeur augmentait de 10 £É. Si mes souvenirs sont bons, Mansour m’a dit qu’il est allé jusqu’à offrir 150 £É par codex ou même un peu plus. Sans résultat.

3. Mlle Dattari a certainement été un prête-nom. Cela m’étonnerait qu’elle ait avancé de l’argent à Tano, qui était fortuné. Mlle Dattari, qui détenait la collection de monnaies de son père, vivait dans une institution dépendant, semble-t-il, des Franciscains; ces derniers ont hérité de la collection qu’ils ont fait vendre par lots importants, ces dernières années, aux grands marchands de monnaies d’Europe.

4. Après mes deux visites chez Mansour, je n’ai plus revu les codex et je n’ai pas fait
have used poorly a suggestion of Doresse. All that I can repeat is that the two books were higher than they were wide.

5. I have no notion of Coptic, and the titles that I have read were in Greek.

6. Mansour never spoke of other than seven books, according to what the native who had come to show the two books said to him.

B. History of Research:

P. 1. I was a boarder at the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale from 1945 to 1948, and my Director was Charles Kuentz, who still lives in Cairo and must be 86 years old.

On one of the codex covers, I clearly saw engraved the image of a serpent, and immediately thought of a document having to do with the Ophites.

I repeat that I never made a comparison with Codex III.

P. 2. I am quite persuaded that Kuentz and I have seen Codices II and VII; your demonstration is perfect. I would like to insist on the attitude of Kuentz, of whom one spoke ill in a country as slanderous as Egypt. In spite of Doresse (Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, 137 [The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 119; The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts, 92]), the price offered by Kuentz was not ‘ridiculously low.’ Mansour did not consider it low, for he immediately replied that he would do his negotiating. Hence it had to do with
a sum of 700 £É, rather high for the time, for which the disbursement, to be charged to the Institut [Français d’Archéologie Orientale], posed short-term problems. Kuentz certainly had in mind the story of ‘Coptic-Schmidt’ and the Manichaean papyri of the Fayyum. Schmidt had been able to get an option for 24 hours to telegraph to Berlin and secure from the Ministry the sum asked by the merchant. An equivalent step by Kuentz to Paris would be met with a turn-down, given the budgetary conditions of the French administration. I will add, in sum, that the attitude and the remarks of Kuentz with Mansour were perfect; the only error, perhaps, consisted in coming too early and thus underlining, without intending to, the importance of the books in question. It also seems to me desirable, in your note 3, that you underline still more the injustice of the commentary of Dorese.

In any case, Codices II and VII were not acquired by Kuentz for the French Institute, but by Tano. Thereupon he obtained what was left from Bahīj ‘Alī, who returned alone for this purpose to Cairo (see below).

*The Eid Codex = the Jung Codex = Codex I*

Now that the value of the codices had become evident to the brothers at al-Qaṣr, three of them went armed several times to Rāghib at Dishnā to retrieve the two codices he had obtained for practically nothing. They threatened his life and that of his three daughters living (with their abandoned mother) at al-Qaṣr, and even shot at his house in Dishnā. On their first visit he returned the second codex he had acquired from the youngest brother, and would have returned the first if he could. But he had already sent it to Cairo with a cousin, a teacher at Dishnā, Yannī Buqṭur (*1906), to see if some learned person there could tell anything about its worth. Rāghib immediately telegraphed to Yannī to return the codex. When Yannī returned without the codex, with only the weak excuse that he had left it in Cairo with a friend, Rāghib seized him by the collar and said: “You must go back to Cairo and

---

162 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1372. Yannī Buqṭur was interviewed at his home in Cairo on 26 xii 75.
bring the book or else I will kill you or you me, since otherwise the brothers will kill me!” Rāghib gave Yanni 5 £É for train fare to go back to Cairo to fetch the codex.

The Coptic Mayor of al-Qaṣr, al-Muqaddis [Pilgrim] Tānyūs ʿAbd al-Masīḥ, a neighbor of Rāghib, warned the brothers, whom he had aided somewhat at the time of the police investigation, not to resort to violence. But before Yanni sent the codex back from Cairo, Rāghib had to make a financial settlement of 15 £É to 20 £É with the brothers. Rāghib reported that while Yanni had the codex in Cairo, he showed it to the Patriarch of Alexandria, the Coptic Pope residing in Cairo. The Patriarch had him show it to the Curator of the Coptic Museum,\(^\text{163}\) Yassah ʿAbd al-Masīḥ, who wished to keep the book for the museum. Yanni, now living in Cairo, did not recall the crisis that remained so vivid in the memory of Rāghib. He said he showed it in Cairo only to Georgy Sobhy (see below), but did not leave it with him; he did not show it more widely, since he feared he would be thought to be a thief. He recalled mailing the codex back to Rāghib.

Rāghib thought the codex was returned with five or six leaves missing. This would account for the fact that Codex III, among the codices in relatively good condition, lacks the most leaves (six inscribed and three uninscribed, as well as others of which only a negligible fragment survived). It might also account for about half of a leaf, III, 135/136, that was acquired by the Beinecke Library of Yale University early in the 1960s and was identified, reassembled from fragments, and published in 1980 by Stephen Emmel.\(^\text{164}\) Rāghib also reported that, in the process of housecleaning, Bahīyah found one or two leaves she did not preserve, which may also have come from Codex III; in 1976 she searched in vain for them at Dishnā and in Rāghib’s books in Qinā.

One may already observe an unmistakable inflation in the market for the codices taking place at al-Qaṣr. After the other camel drivers at the cliff had turned down a share of the discovery, offers had also been refused when the family of Umm Aḥmad tried to sell for a few cigarettes or piasters, for an Egyptian Pound, or perhaps the whole lot for as little as 3 £É. One codex became, in effect, a gift to al-Qummuṣ Basīlyūs and from him to Rāghib. Though Rāghib responded to a second ‘gift’ of a codex with a ‘gift’ of a few

\(^{163}\) http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1400.

piasters to buy a *jallabīyah*, the actual sales began as barter for sugar and tea at the local shop of Fikrī Jibrā’īl (see below). Then it progressed to 40 oranges and a cash amount of 12 £É for the whole, according to Muhammad ‘Ali, or a cash purchase of from 12 £É to 18 £É, according to Bahīj ‘Ali, which would mean a price per codex of 2 £É or 3 £É; then, reflecting the impact of Bahīj ‘Ali’s success in Cairo and the threats to Rāghib’s life, Rāghib reached a cash settlement of from 15 £É to 20 £É for Codex III. Zākī Bastā recalled Rāghib offering him a codex for a price too high to pay.

Thus, in terms of market value, it can hardly be before this juncture that a purchase of a codex, or part of a codex, was made for a price that is reported by Muhammad ‘Ali to have been 11 £É, but may well have been considerably more (see below). In either case, such a unit price would indicate a sizable inflation beyond the rate at which Bahīj ‘Ali had purchased, and therefore suggest a subsequent date. However, there is a basic problem with placing this purchase so late: Bahīj ‘Ali had obtained all that was left with the family of Muhammad ‘Ali and had sold it all to Tano. If this additional purchase presupposes Bahīj ‘Ali’s sale to Tano, the codex in question could only have been that which had been subsequently recovered from Rāghib. As it turns out, it must indeed have been the Eid Codex = the Jung Codex = Codex I (see Chapter 3 below), to which we hence now turn.

Nāshid Bisādah (1902–1963), though born at al-Qaṣr, was at the time a grain merchant in Nag Hammadi. He is reported by Bahīj ‘Ali to have bought some torn leaves with their cover from Umm Aḥmad, and Fikrī Jibrā’īl also recalled Nāshid having bought a codex. Nāshid’s younger son Ḥusnī (*1938), a cobbler who later worked in his uncle’s shop at Nag Hammadi, was less well informed than an older brother Jamāl (*1934), who continued his father’s business as a grain merchant in al-Qaṣr. Whereas Ḥusnī guessed there might have been seven or eight leaves, Jamāl, who did not actually see the codex either, but obviously had heard it described, thought there might have been about twenty-five loose leaves, complete except at the margins, so soft that if rubbed they would come to pieces, with an undecorated leather cover.

Muḥammad ‘Ali estimated the book was sold by his family to Nāshid for 11 £É, but all other figures that have been proposed are considerably higher. Ḥusnī suggested 30 £É. Jamāl initially thought almost 200 £É, but later

---

165 Ḥusnī Nāshid Bisādah was interviewed in Nag Hammadi on 19 xii 75.
166 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1359. Jamāl Nāshid Bisādah was interviewed in al-Qaṣr on 19 xii 75.
decided that 50 £É had been the purchase price. Jamāl recalled that Nāshid entrusted the codex to the gold merchant of Nag Hammadi, Masʿūd Iskārūs, to take to Cairo and sell, since he would know better its value. Masʿūd went to Cairo without Nāshid, sold the codex “for a price he said was 350 £É” (a figure Jamāl cites but questions), reimbursed Nāshid the 200 £É that Nāshid said he had paid, and divided equally the profit of 150 £É with him. Another version of the figures is to the effect that Nāshid was reimbursed the 50 £É that he said he had paid for it, and Nāshid and Masʿūd divided the profit of 300 £É equally between them. This would mean Nāshid received a total of 200 £É. Thus Nāshid would have received the same amount as had Bahīj ‘Alī, a figure for Nāshid’s sale that Bahīj ‘Alī also confirms. Jamāl Nāshid Bisādah lives in the home of Aḥmad Īsmāʾīl, which his father Nāshid purchased after the murder of Aḥmad, that is to say, at about the time Nāshid’s share of the profit became available for investment.

Masʿūd Iskārūs died in the cholera plague of 1947,¹⁶⁷ and was succeeded by a son Shawqī, who became wealthy enough to move to Cairo. Thereupon an older brother, who was a lawyer, Nabīh¹⁶⁸ (* 1926), took over the goldsmith shop.

Nabīh recalled with irony what may well be the same incident reported above concerning al-Qummuṣ Mattā Sarjīyūs: Ten codices (III perhaps having already gone to Rāghib, and XII and XIII, since lacking covers and consisting of only a few leaves, perhaps not counted) had once been offered to his father Masʿūd for only 3 £É. He did not buy them, since a Coptic priest sitting with him at the time said the writing did not look old and the books must hence be recent. It would at least be a valid observation that the writing looked different from the script of the oldest books known by the church today, even if the priest made a false inference. The oldest hands known to the priests today would be quite different from those of the Nag Hammadi codices—all because even the oldest hands known to priests today are much later than those in the Nag Hammadi codices.

Nabīh reported in some detail about the codex Nāshid entrusted to his father Masʿūd. It had a cover made of the hide of a gazelle (which is the term that seemed to function in the region as a generic way to refer to leather).

¹⁶⁷ This would have been the same epidemic in Upper Egypt that forced Jean Doresse to remain in Cairo in 1947 just long enough to see Codex III at the Coptic Museum and Codex I at the shop of Albert Eid, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, 133; The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 116; The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts, 90.

¹⁶⁸ Nabīh Masʿūd Iskārūs was interviewed at his jewelry shop in Nag Hammadi on 13, 16 and 17 i 78. http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/339.
Nabih could tell that it was not a complete codex, since he could see where leaves had been ripped out at the spine. There were about forty leaves, which he copied out by rote (having studied in Cairo, though he did not know Coptic), in hopes someone would be able to identify it. Unfortunately he no longer has his copy. Nabih later heard that the Coptic Museum had seized nine and a half codices, and inferred that this included the other half of the codex his father Mas’ud had sold. He learned that the codices of the Coptic Museum had to do with the first Christians in Egypt; Nabih is sure that, had his father Mas’ud known this, he would not have sold the codex.

Nabih recalled the purchase price as 200 £É, half of which his father Mas’ud supplied to Nāshid. Of course the exact figures involved cannot be confirmed, since one has to do with approximations and/or guesses. All that they have in common is that an appreciable inflation had taken place locally on the Nag Hammadi market, reflecting rumors of the higher prices Bahij ‘Ali secured on the Cairo market. A high price on the local market would explain not only Mas’ud’s involvement, but also, since he provided what it took to make the purchase possible, his virtually exclusive control of the material. Mas’ud hid the codex under the floor of his home for a few months, then in July or August 1946 went to Cairo, taking Nabih with him. They went to a gold merchant whom Mas’ud knew, Jurji Andarāwus, who sent for an antiquities dealer Tawfiq, who had moved from Luxor to Cairo some three years previously. The negotiations were carried on in the shop of Jurji Andarāwus, and the final figure was 300 £É. Nabih recalls that it was he who put the codex into the hands of Tawfiq. He heard that the codex was later sold to a foreigner for 5,000 £É.

Simone Eid, the widow of the Cairo antiquities dealer Albert Eid, sold the bulk of Codex I to the Jung Institute of Zürich on 10 May 1952 (see Chapter 3 below). She reported that Tawfiq Fām of Giza, whom she considered not reputable as an antiquities dealer, was a frequent contact of Albert Eid, though she was not able to confirm that it was he who in this case sold to her husband.169 But he would be a more probable identification of this trafficker than would Tawfiq Sa’d of Alexandria, who was involved a few years later in the marketing of the Bodmer Papyri rather than the Nag Hammadi codices (see Part 5 below).170

---

169 6 ix 81: Interview with Simone Eid in Brussels.
170 Tawfiq Sa’d’s son Émile Saad, proprietor of the jewelry shop Tewfīk Saad et Fils in Alexandria, was interviewed on 30 xii 75 at his home there, concerning his father’s involvement in what turned out to be the Bodmer papyri, but not the Nag Hammadi codices.
The report of Nabīh points in several respects to Codex I. Not only is it the only codex sold to ‘a foreigner.’ It is the only codex to have been transmitted in more than one lot, as Nabīh’s report of ripped-out leaves would tend to suggest. Since Codex I is also the only multiple-quire codex, it could most readily have given the impression of leaves having been ripped out, in that there are two binding thongs near the bottom and presumably there had been two near the top, though one of the latter is now missing. If some leaves were still bound in by one pair of thongs, but none attached to the third thong, it would be easy to infer that there had been a fourth thong, which had been lost when leaves were torn out. The third thong would be a residual indication that there had been another quire.

Furthermore Albert Eid, the Cairo antiquities dealer who acquired the material from Tawfīq and took it to America, wrote there to Warner G. Rice, Director of the University Library of the University of Michigan:

In spite of the fact that I have at present an offer in Egypt of 5,000 £É from a donor through the mediation of Professor J. Doresse, I prefer to sell the manuscript here [in America], for I do not want to return this money to Egypt. Thus the figure of 5,000 £É, though never actually paid, became associated with Codex I.

As to the amount of material that was involved, Eid had written to Father Bernhard Couroyer in Jerusalem:

40 leaves of papyrus written on both sides, i.e. 80 pages of text, with the leather cover.

Eid had written to Rice that there were forty-one, though one was “in very bad condition.” This may well have meant that a collection of miscellaneous fragments was numbered as a leaf, since three leaves classified as

---

171 18 ii 49: Letter from Albert Eid in New York to Rice:
Malgré que j’ai actuellement une offre en Égypte de 5000 £É d’un donateur par l’entremise du professeur J. Doresse, je préfère céder le manuscrit ici, car je ne désire pas rentrer cet argent en Égypte; 

172 Circa vi–viii 46: Handwritten text on the back of a photograph of Codex I, page 43, sent from Albert Eid to Father Bernhard Couroyer:
40 feuilles de papyrus écrit des deux cotés soit 80 pages de texte avec la couverture en cuir.

173 13 i 47: Letter from Eid to Rice.
only “in bad condition” were defined as having “a fourth of the text missing.” Thus the number of relatively complete leaves would seem to agree with the report of Nabih.

Eid reported that the material “has been entrusted to me by one of my customers for sale,”\textsuperscript{174} which suggests that it was still owned by Tawfīq and only on consignment with Eid. But by the end of 1948 Eid acquired eleven further leaves of Codex I, and thereupon acquired the forty that until then may have only been with him on consignment. Doresse has reported that the additional leaves were acquired after his first visit to Eid’s shop in October 1947 (see Chapter 2, Part 2 below). Thus between October 1947 and January 1949 a second lot of Codex I was offered to Eid. One may conjecture that if the second lot had been available at the same time as was the first, the whole would have been negotiated; this consideration, together with the fact that the number of leaves recalled by Nabih Masʿūd Iskārūs does not include the second lot, leads to the inference that the second lot had not been originally available to Masʿūd.

The question as to who was retaining the eleven leaves at that time remains unclarified. The eleven leaves could have been removed from the cover at any juncture along the way. They could have been separated from the cover at the same time as the leaves acquired by Tano were removed from the cover, and then this part subdivided between Eid and Tano; or there could have been two occasions when leaves were removed from the cover. If the eleven leaves had been removed from the cover at the cliff, they might have been expected to go from Bahīj ʿAlī to Tano, as did the other material not in covers, to the extent that it was not burnt; or the eleven leaves could have been removed from the cover by the youngest son of ʿAlī before giving the codex to Rāghib; or it could have been done by the sons of ʿAlī on retrieving it from Rāghib; or it could have been done by Nāshid Bisādah before turning it over to Masʿūd Iskārūs; or it could have been done by Masʿūd Iskārūs so as to retain a nest-egg whose sale price would not have to be divided with Nāshid Bisādah; or it could have been done by Tawfīq so as to avoid, for part of the material at least, the commission of Eid. None of these alternatives is sufficiently convincing to rule the others out of consideration.

If Rāghib returned Codex I only when forced to do so, it would be understandable if he retained some leaves, thinking they would not be missed, and hoping that he would later be able to dispose of them either

\textsuperscript{174} 13 i 47: Letter from Eid to Rice.
through the same chain of middlemen or more directly. Though Rāghib is conjectured by some to have profited from more than the one codex (Codex III), this is neither conceded by Rāghib nor has it been confirmed by other means. Zakī Basṭā’s reference to Rāghib asking too high a price may well be a reference to Codex III or to the 40 leaves of Codex I before they were retrieved by the sons of ‘Alī, rather than to eleven leaves of Codex I retained by Rāghib.

The second lot from Codex I may also have gone to Eid via Tawfīq. For Zakī Basṭā has reported that, subsequent to his own sale to Tano, Tawfīq had sold two codices to Eid. Since Eid had only acquired Codex I, this may be a reference to the two lots from that codex, considered to be two codices.

Ludwig Keimer’s report (see Part 4 below), though in some details inaccurate, does give a record from as early as 1950 reporting the information of both Tano and Doresse, who had reached ‘the same result’:¹⁷⁵

The book in the possession of Mr. Albert Eid had been sold first of all to a Coptic grain merchant of Nagaʿ Hamadi. Tano was informed that the merchant was in possession of this book. The merchant and Tano reach agreement on the sum of 300 £É as the price of this book. But the merchant changes his mind, he asks 800 £É—the agent of Tano had notified the latter. The agent and Tano think that the Coptic merchant would give up the book at 300 £É, in any case at a price significantly lower than 800 £É. Tano and his agent do nothing. Tano returns to Cairo. The Coptic grain merchant from Nagaʿ Hamadi comes some time later to Cairo. There he meets another agent, who takes him to Albert Eid, who buys the book for 500 £É or 600 £É. The book, it would seem, is at present in the USA. Michigan had offered $12,000, but Albert Eid demanded $25,000. The book of Eid is composed of about 50 leaves (= 100 pages).

Keimer’s report may be interpreted in light of the first-hand reports from Upper Egypt as follows: One could well expect Bahīj ʿAlī to have made inquiries at al-Qaṣr before his second trip to Cairo, in his effort to acquire all that was left in order to sell it all to Tano. And one could expect Tano to have interrogated Bahīj ʿAlī in this regard, especially since the codices torn up at the cliff, to the extent not burnt but sold to Tano on Bahīj ʿAlī’s second trip, would have alerted Tano to the fact that he had not acquired all parts of some codices. If however Bahīj ʿAlī had been interrogated by Tano, it would have been natural for Bahīj ʿAlī also to have become Tano’s ‘agent.’ For Bahīj ʿAlī had proven his value first as the local contact of Zakī Basṭā, then as a

¹⁷⁵ 5 vii 50: Ludwig Keimer’s report (see Part 4 below).
trafficker independent of Zakī Baṣṭā. Zakī Baṣṭā himself would hardly come in question as the ‘agent,’ since Nāshid acquired his material only after the inflation of the local market due to the trip of Zakī Baṣṭā and Bahīj ‘Alī to Cairo, after which Bahīj ‘Alī cut out Zakī Baṣṭā as an unnecessary expense. Tano would have heard of the codex belonging to Nāshid from Bahīj ‘Alī, either when Tano made his trip to Nag Hammadi in March 1946, or as the motivation for that trip. For Bahīj ‘Alī may have heard by then that a still further local sale had in fact been made, although he had been assured that he had acquired all that was left. Whatever attempts he may have made to acquire the material from Nāshid were unsuccessful. But if he reported this to Tano, it would have been reasonable for Tano to come to Nag Hammadi to help Bahīj ‘Alī acquire what the latter had not been able to acquire on his own.

The price of 300 £É initially agreed upon by the Coptic grain merchant Nāshid Bīsādah and Tano might have originally been intended by Bahīj ‘Alī to provide himself with his usual amount of 200 £É and a more modest profit for Nāshid. This might nonetheless have been a very acceptable profit for Nāshid, if the purchase price had been low, which Bahīj ‘Alī might in any case have initially assumed. Nāshid for his part might have assumed that it should be Bahīj ‘Alī who would receive only a modest tip, since after all the book belonged to Nāshid, an alternative to which Bahīj ‘Alī would probably not agree. In any case a deal should have been negotiated within some such figure, especially in view of the reports that this, or only a bit more, was ultimately the sale price. Thus the collapse of the negotiations, leaving everyone empty-handed, seems inexplicable, unless one may assume that Nāshid had already entrusted the cover and forty leaves to Masʿūd, who held them in hiding. Masʿūd would have been unwilling to be cut out of the deal, and might well have pointed out to Nāshid that it was they, rather than Bahīj ‘Alī, who had first claims on payments of 200 £É. Nāshid would have had no choice but to report back to Bahīj ‘Alī their matching claims, which would have led Bahīj ‘Alī to report to Tano that they would have to work down from 800 £É. Since this was unacceptable to Tano, he and Bahīj ‘Alī may have planned for Tano to return to Cairo so as to crush the others’ hopes of high profits, whereupon Bahīj ‘Alī could acquire the codex for nearly the original local market value and sell it to Tano at 300 £É, or in any case much less than 800 £É.

This hypothetical reconstruction of the course of events could explain the nuance in Keimer’s report (which however should not be pressed) to the effect that it was the Coptic grain merchant himself who made the initial agreement but that it was Tano’s agent who announced it had been revoked.
In any case the negotiations broke down. What turned out to be nineteen leaves and fifty-four fragments of Codex I in the Tano collection may best be explained as already acquired from Bahīj ‘Alī among the material torn out at the cliff, rather than as having been a sample of leaves acquired by Tano during the negotiations at Nag Hammadi. For they are not included in the number of leaves recalled by Nabīh Masʿūd Iskārūs, about forty, which agrees with the number put on consignment with Albert Eid; nor does Keimer’s report suggest any such partial success.

It would then not have been the ‘Coptic grain merchant’ Nāshid Bisādah himself, but rather his partner Masʿūd Iskārūs, who went later to Cairo and met ‘an other agent’ Tawfīq, who, after acquiring the codex, put it on consignment with, and ultimately sold it to, Eid—an understandable inexactitude on Keimer’s part, namely the omission of one link in the chain of four middlemen leading from Eid back to ‘another agent’ (Tawfīq) and then (via Masʿūd) back to the ‘Coptic grain merchant’ (Nāshid). Even if Masʿūd received for the original 40 leaves no more than the 300 £É to 350 £É he reported to Nāshid, the profit for Nāshid and Masʿūd would nonetheless be considerably greater due to the elimination of Tano’s agent from the partnership. If Eid ultimately paid 500 £É to 600 £É for up to 50 rather than the initial 40 leaves, this relatively modest markup would presumably reflect the passage of time and the rates prevalent between Cairo antiquities dealers, in distinction from those paid to villagers.

Codices II, IV–IX, XI, and Part of Codices I, X, XII, XIII

On returning from Cairo, where Zakī Baştā and Bahīj ‘Alī had sold Codices II and VII to Tano (see above), Bahīj ‘Alī acquired all that was left of the books from Umm Aḥmad. He recalled the quantity as four further books, plus the material torn up at the cliff, though he speculated that over half of the latter had already been burnt. Since Muḥammad ‘Alī had spoken of the ripped-out leaves having been stuffed by Bahīj ‘Alī into a cover to make a book or so, and Umm Aḥmad reported that the second time Bahīj ‘Alī obtained five books (indeed Bahīj ‘Alī had originally spoken of having acquired a total of four books in good and four in bad condition), this miscellaneous material may have included not only leaves without their cover, such as Codex XII, but a cover without most of its leaves, such as Codex X. Bahīj ‘Alī recalled the price he paid as 12 £É to 18 £É, whereas Muḥammad ‘Alī recalled the payment as 12 £É plus forty oranges.

Bahīj ‘Alī then returned to Cairo alone, since, as he put it, he now knew the way, or, as Zakī Baştā put it, Bahīj ‘Alī did not want to divide the profit.
with him. Bahīj ʿAlī went directly to Tano and sold the codices for a rate he will not divulge, but which Zakī Bastā assumes to be the same rate of 200 £É per codex that they had received. Since the remainder of the material torn up at the cliff that was acquired by Bahīj ʿAlī seems to have been lumped together, even though it may well have consisted of ingredients of more than one codex, one can reach a total of seven, which is the total number mentioned to Schwartz. But the price of 7,000 £É for the lot cited by Maṇṣūr may have been inflated to justify his not having acquired the lot for the French Institute. Since neither Zakī Bastā nor Maṇṣūr were directly involved in the second transaction, neither may have been privy to the actual figures.

Bahīj ʿAlī bought farm land with his profit and has been on bad terms with Muḥammad ʿAlī ever since. In an interview with Bahīj ʿAlī in the presence of Muḥammad ʿAlī, I asked him how much he received for selling the books in Cairo, but he refused to answer. My interpreter explained to me that if he had stated the astronomical sum in the hearing of Muḥammad ʿAlī, he would have been attacked on the spot.

During an interview I held with Tano in his shop 20 December 1971, he mentioned that he had obtained the codices from small dealers in several lots. This would seem to be confirmed by the subsequent investigations summarized above. They tend to indicate that he may have obtained two codices from persons working at Giza (perhaps one from Fikrī Jibrāʾīl and his part of Codex I from Tawfīq Fām), two from Zakī Bastā and Bahīj ʿAlī (Codices II and VII), and from Bahīj ʿAlī alone five (of the other six relatively intact Codices IV–VI, VIII–IX, XI), plus remains of perhaps two others (Codices X and XII). Thus Tano’s total holdings were eight codices (II, IV–IX, XI) and parts of three others (I, X, XII), which he would have purchased as a total of hardly more than nine units, the number of covers involved. (Codex XIII, consisting of the eight leaves of a single tractate tucked inside the front cover of Codex VI, would have been completely overlooked in such calculations.) The inventory of Tano’s holdings communicated by Abbot Étienne Drioton to the Doresses on 13 February 1948 in fact listed 9 codices plus eighteen leaves of Codex I (see Chapter 2, Part 5 below). If one may conjecture that Tano was able to avoid inflation in the purchase prices, his costs may not have reached 2,000 £É. When I interviewed him, he reported British and Swiss offers of 100,000 £É, but bitterly reported that once the codices were sequestered and nationalized he received only 5,000 £É—aabout 500 £É per codex, twice as much per codex as Rāghib received for Codex III, but little more than a fourth as much per codex as Simone Eid received for the bulk of Codex I that was outside Egypt (see Chapter 3, Part 3 below).
Codex III

Codex III was not among the codices that passed through Tano's hands. It made its way to Cairo, but by quite a different route. Rāghib's report concerning Codex III is as follows:176 The Bishop of Qinā, al-Muṭrān al-Anbā Kirullus († 1965), heard that Rāghib had a valuable book. On a visit to Dishnā, he asked Rāghib in the presence of a dozen important personages if this were the case. Rāghib was too frightened to speak publicly, but when Bishop Kirullus took him aside, he admitted that he had a codex. The Bishop insisted that he himself take it to Cairo on a forthcoming trip, in order to learn its value. On the date of the Bishop's trip, Rāghib put the codex in a tin box and got a bouquet of roses for the Bishop. He then went to the station to meet the train on which the Bishop would be riding from Qinā to Cairo, when it passed through Dishnā around 11 PM. At the station Rāghib happened to meet another teacher, Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Karīm, who, on hearing that the Bishop was on the train, accompanied Rāghib to greet him. Rāghib passed the bouquet and the tin box with the codex through the train window to the Bishop, who however became very angry, thinking Rāghib had brought Aḥmad along as a witness.

A month or more later, Rāghib heard that Bishop Kirullus had returned to Qinā, and went to call on him, accompanied by the headmaster of the Dishnā Coptic school, Shākir Maksī. When the Bishop inquired angrily why Rāghib had come, he said to inquire after his health. After some small talk, the Bishop repeated his question, and Rāghib said he had come to say goodbye. Taking Rāghib aside, the Bishop reproached him for bringing a witness to the train station, and refused to accept Rāghib's explanation that it was a pure coincidence. He demanded that Rāghib sign a receipt for the return of the codex and tell no one. Rāghib feared that the government had seen the codex and, if he signed, would put him in prison. Hence he refused to give a receipt, pointing out that he had asked no receipt from the Bishop. Bishop Kirullus threatened to dismiss Rāghib from his position as teacher, to which Rāghib replied that the Bishop could do as he liked, but that he would not sign. A servant of the Bishop, Sidrah, intervened, but was struck on the cheek and sent away. Rāghib left in tears, but two servants ran after him and brought him back. Bishop Kirullus pulled the codex from his bag and began counting the leaves. Rāghib said this was unnecessary, since he had not counted the leaves when he turned it over to the Bishop (though he

apparently was aware of the number of leaves of Codex III returned by Yannī Buqṭur, since he noted a diminution at that time). Bishop Kirullus told him to take the book and leave. Rāghib replied he would not leave without the Bishop's blessing. Bishop Kirullus forgave him, agreeing that Ahmad had not been brought as a witness. He advised Rāghib to give the codex to the Coptic Museum, laid his hand on his head, and put the sign of the cross upon him.

Rāghib took the codex to the Qinā train station and waited for the train back to Dishnā, sitting in the coffee shop with the tin box between his knees. When a policeman entered the café, Rāghib, thinking he had been sent to capture him, trembled, and thought of abandoning the codex in the café. But the policeman, after getting a drink of water, went away, and Rāghib took the train safely back to Dishnā.

When the summer vacations came, Rāghib went to Cairo himself, as he did every year, this time accompanied by a relative, a priest of Nag Hammadi, al-Qummuṣ Ishāq Ḥannan (†1975). They stayed in New Cairo with the brother of Rāghib's father Andarāwus, Diryās al-Qiss ʿAbd al-Sayyid. They first visited a wealthy Coptic Pasha, who was ill in bed and refused to see them, until al-Qummuṣ Ishāq Ḥannan said he wished to bless him, whereupon after some two hours they were admitted. When the Pasha saw the codex, he put on his monocle to examine it more closely, and announced that Rāghib would become very wealthy, himself a Pasha. Rāghib recalled he was so overjoyed he felt like a king between heaven and earth. The Pasha said that, if they would return in three days, he would take them to the hotel of an American who would pay any price for the codex.

They then took the local train down to the main Cairo station, near the residence of Georgy Sobhy Bey, a Coptic physician deeply involved in Coptic studies. When they showed the book to him, Dr. Sobhy was so delighted he danced up and down and declared that Rāghib would become wealthy. He suggested they return the next day at 6 PM so he could examine the book again, and asked for their Cairo address. Al-Qummuṣ Ishāq, who was ill and hoped for free medical aid from Dr. Sobhy, suggested to Rāghib that they might leave the codex overnight with him. Rāghib, noting a telephone on Dr. Sobhy's desk, and hence fearing he might telephone the police, agreed. When they returned the next day, they were shocked to see limousines with chauffeurs in livery before the door. Once they had entered, those inside arose and were introduced as Étienne Drioton, Director of the Department of Antiquities, Togo Mina Bey, Director of the Coptic Museum, as well as other museum officials. Drioton interrogated Rāghib as to the source of the codex. When Rāghib maintained it had come down through his priestly family for centuries, Drioton said that he had seen a quite similar codex
in the Cairo bazaar Khān al-Khalīlī, in the shop of a Belgian antiquities dealer, and asked sarcastically: “Is the Belgian your brother?” (Thus by the summer of 1946 the first installment of Codex I had already reached Albert Eid.) Drioton threatened Rāghib with imprisonment, and reminded him of his three daughters, thereby seeking to obtain the codex without payment. Rāghib refused, but finally told the truth as to the origin of the codex. Drioton was angry with Rāghib for not having purchased all the codices. He asked if Rāghib knew the site of the discovery, so that he might come and see it. Rāghib replied that he did not know the precise location, and that it would in any case be necessary to bring the Egyptian army in order to excavate there.

A meeting was set for three days later at the Coptic Museum, to meet with the persons authorized to settle upon a price. Dr. Sobhy urged Rāghib to attend, though Rāghib was very angry with Dr. Sobhy. Yet, since the codex had been taken into custody, Rāghib had no choice but to go to the Coptic Museum. Al-Qummuṣ Ishāq was later reproached by a relative for having delivered Rāghib into the hands of the authorities. Out of fear, Rāghib refused to enter the Museum building, and hence the authorities came out into the Museum’s garden to negotiate with him. He was offered 300 £É, or, if he could wait a year, 600 £É. He agreed to the price of 300 £É. But when he later returned to Togo Mina at the Coptic Museum, assuming he would receive the money, he was told he was foolish to think the money was at the Coptic Museum. He should address himself to the Ministry of Education. Rāghib spent the rest of the summer vacations and all his funds in going from office to office, and giving tips to persons he thought would help him. Whenever he visited the Coptic Museum, he noted Togo Mina busily involved in putting the leaves of the codex in order, as well as repairing them with transparent tape (which we later had to remove with chemicals recommended by the British Museum). Finally Togo Mina told him he was foolish not to wait for the higher price, but that if he would just contribute 50 £É to the Coptic Museum, his name would be inscribed on an alabaster plaque at the Museum and he would receive 250 £É at once. Rāghib also wanted to have his name in the Registry of the Coptic Museum. Finally he received a check for 250 £É from the Ministry of Education, which he took home with him and cashed at the National Bank of Egypt in Qinā. But when he was asked back home how much he got for the book, he replied that he had given it to the Coptic Museum. When he visited the Coptic Museum with me on 11 December 1976 and did not find the plaque with his name inscribed on it, he was bitterly disappointed. He had long felt that Bishop Kirullus’ wrath was responsible for his misfortune with Codex III.
The death of Togo Mina in October 1949, the departure of Étienne Drioton after the fall of King Farouk in 1952, and the departure of Doresse from the scene in 1953 (see Chapter 2, Part 7 below), meant that the trail grew cold and the scent was lost regarding the story of the discoverers and the traffickers of the Nag Hammadi codices. This is evident as early as Keimer’s report of 5 August 1950 concerning Codex III:

A Coptic orthodox priest accompanied by an Arab (Muslim) sold one book to the Coptic Museum. (The priest had shown this book first of all to Dr. Georgy Sobhy.) The Coptic Museum paid a trifle (200 £É?).

Yet the Registry of Acquisitions of the Coptic Museum has the following entry, though written only in Arabic:

4851. Papyri, manuscript in Coptic, Sahidic, about Fourth Century, with cover. Seventy leaves. Most of them are damaged and incomplete; some of them are very small fragments. Price: 250 £É. Purchased from Râghib Effendi Andarâwus al-Quss ‘Abd al-Sayyid. Received 4 October 1946. Archive: 5/13

In Keimer’s report, this entry in the Registry does not even seem to have been consulted. For Keimer’s assumption that the seller was a Muslim ignores the recorded fact that Râghib’s father bore the Christian name Andrew, and the listed purchase price of 250 £É is overlooked.

Yassah ‘Abd al-Masîḥ, Librarian of the Coptic Museum, may well have been privy to the events, as well as being familiar with the Registry. Indeed, he is probably the person who made the entry in the Registry. For Gilles Quispel has recalled being told by him that Codex III was acquired from ‘Rag Andraus,’ [grand]son of a priest from Nag Hammadi, and was aware that there was an entry in the Registry concerning the codex. When, with Pahor Labib’s assistance, I consulted the entry in the Registry on 5 August 1974, and again on 11 September 74, he, recalling a report that the seller had been accompanied by a priest, assumed that the priestly name on a

---

178 5 viii 50: Keimer’s memorandum:
Un prêtre copte-orthodoxe accompagné d’un arabe (muselman) a vendu un livre au Musée copte (le prêtre avait montré ce livre tout d’abord au Dr. Georgy Sobhy). Le Musée copte a payé peu de chose (200 £É?).
180 25 ii 71: Letter from Quispel to Robinson.
181 16 vii 80: Letter from Quispel to Robinson.
second line under Rāghib Effendi Andarāwus in the Registry, al-Qiss ‘Abd al-Sayyid, was that of this priestly companion. But al-Qiss ‘Abd al-Sayyid was Rāghib’s grandfather, and hence functioned as Rāghib’s third name, rather than being a separate person accompanying him. The priest from Nag Hammadi who had accompanied Rāghib to Cairo, Al-Qummuṣ Ishāq Ḥannan, is not mentioned in the Registry. He had no doubt returned to Nag Hammadi long before the actual acquisition by the Coptic Museum became official.

On 10 December 1976, at the second meeting of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, held in the context of the First International Congress of Coptology at the Société de Géographie in Garden City, Cairo (see Chapter 11 below), there was a ‘Report on the Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices’ 182 Abrām Bibāwī, Principal Emeritus of the Boys’ Preparatory School at Nag Hammadi, 183 narrated the story of the discovery that had been narrated in his presence by Muḥammad ‘Ali. (Gamal Mokhtar, Chairman of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization, did not want to honor Muḥammad ‘Ali with an invitation.) Then Rāghib narrated the story of the transmission of Codex III to the Coptic Museum. The session was completed with questions from the floor. One important dimension of the status of the report on the Nag Hammadi codices is thus the quality of repeatability inherent in the scientific experiment, in that most of the persons interviewed were at that time still accessible for others who might wish to repeat or advance the investigative process. Actually, this possibility seems not to have been followed up by those who nonetheless have expressed reservations about the conclusions reached by the present report (see Part 5 below).


183 A silent member of the panel was Ḥilmī Šahyūn Gaddīs, my first contact in 1966 at Nag Hammadi concerning the Nag Hammadi Codices (see Chapter 12, Part 1 below). Hence I sought to find him again almost a decade later at the Boys’ Preparatory School where he had taught. There Abrām Bibāwī supplied me on 10 i 75 with his new Cairo address, though by mistake listed the street number in the reverse order, no doubt assuming that numerals, like letters, were in English in the reverse order from their Arabic order, which is not the case. After finding no one at that street number, I suspected the nature of the problem and had the driver turn around and find the house with the reverse street number. There I located both of them on 23 viii 75, only to find that Ḥilmī Šahyūn Gaddīs had had a stroke and lost most of his memory. http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/819. But I followed up this contact with Abrām Bibāwī at his home in Nag Hammadi frequently thereafter, on each subsequent trip to Egypt through 1980.
4. Previously Unknown Reports

Doresse had published the story of the discovery and the trafficking, in articles, news releases, and his book, whereas others had not. Hence his very readable and accessible version of what went on gradually came to be the accepted version of what had actually taken place. There were however other early written reports that were previously unknown, which, together with the oral reports from my many interviews, make possible a fuller understanding of what actually took place. Hence these early written reports are reproduced here:

A letter of 2 October 1946 from Inspector Mansour in the Egyptian Department of Antiquities to his superior, of which a copy was sent to the Director of the Coptic Museum, is the earliest extant documentation of the site of the discovery. An abstract was made available in 2000, and a French translation was published in 2001, both of which are included here.

Ludwig Keimer, a European scholar living in Cairo, recorded on 5 August 1950 what he could learn in Cairo about the Nag Hammadi Codices, presumably from the antiquities dealer Phokion J. Tano(s), from the head of the Department of Antiquities Étienne Drioton, and from Jean Doresse. When Quispel visited Cairo, Keimer gave Quispel a copy updated 13 April 1955, of which Quispel gave me a copy.

Doresse himself wrote up his and his wife’s all too hectic visit to Nag Hammadi on 26–27 January 1950, on which he based his subsequent published summaries that presented themselves as authoritative. He gave me his chaotic unpublished report, reproduced here as accurately as possible.

Doresse again, in November 1972, wrote up proposals for an archaeological excavation relevant to the Nag Hammadi discovery, in view of the interest of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices in such an excavation. This ‘Project of Archaeological Research’ serves to document how uncertain his earlier conclusions about the site of the discovery had become even to him, whereas the public, for lack of better evidence, had taken his earlier publications as definitive.

It is this largely inaccessible documentation that is presented here.


The earliest extant record, dated 2 October 1946, for an official visit to the site of the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices, is an internal letter of
the Egyptian Department of Antiquities, from Mansour, ‘Inspector of Mon-
uments of Aswan and of Qéna,’ to the ‘Inspector in Chief of the Monuments
of Upper Egypt.’ It recorded Mansour’s visit to the site of the discovery on
25 July 1946. The purpose of his visit was to confirm a conversation about
the discovery between two local guardians that took place on 5 July, which
had been reported in a letter of 18 July from the Sohag office of the Depart-
ment of Antiquities, accompanied by a photocopy of the report signed by
the guardian in chief.

A copy of Mansour’s letter was found in the archives of the Coptic
Museum and made public by the Chief Curator of the Coptic Museum,
whose name is transcribed Gamal Hermena Betros in English and Gamal
Hermina Botros in French. He submitted the first part of Mansour’s letter
in English translation as a paper proposal for the Seventh International
Congress of Coptic Studies that met from 27 August to 2 September 2000 in
Leiden, The Netherlands. But since he was not present to present his paper
at the meeting in Leiden, it was not published in the acts of the Congress.
Then in 2001 the full text was published in French translation.

The unpublished English abstract of 2000 read as follows:

A document concerning the discovery of the Nag-Hammadi Library
Gamal Hermena Betros, Curator in chief, Coptic Museum, Old Cairo

The Nag-Hammadi library in 1945 was the great discovery of the 20th century.
The history of this discovery is still dark. In the present paper, we will try to
highlight the early beginning of the discovery. The document in question is
a letter, from an Inspector of the Antiquity Service to the Inspector in chief,
which had been sent to the director of the Coptic museum Dr. PAHOR LABIB
[the name of the Director was given as Dr. MAHER HABIB in the published
French essay; actually Togo Mina was Director at the time]. The letter is dated
2/10/1946 and bears [the identification] No. 5/7/1/347:

Dear Sir Inspector in chief of Upper Egypt.

I have the honour of informing you about a letter which we received from
the Inspection of Antiquities office of SOHAG, dated 18/7/1946, according
to which the guardian (Ghafir) of the Antiquities of AL-BALABISH heard
about the discovery of some ancient books by the Sabbakhin while working
in the desert in the area of the Ghafir of AL-KASR WAL SAYYAD.

So I went in the 25th of the above mentioned (month) with the Guard in
chief (Sheikh al Ghefr) to the mountain of AL-TAREF in order to meet this
Ghafir according to an appointment. We asked the Ghafir of AL-BALABISH
about the above-mentioned information. He confirmed this point accord-
ing to the written statements of the chief office of the Police of AL-TAREF
and its Ghafir. They confirmed his view mentioning that they heard this in
the discussion between the two Ghafirs on 5/7/1946.
The letter shows clearly that until this date it was only a rumour and there were some doubts about the reality of this discovery. We believe that the publication of the document will contribute positively to the reconstruction of the events of this great discovery.

The brief published French essay itself (which contains inexactitudes, as to the Director of the Coptic Museum and the year involved!) read as follows:

A Document Concerning the Discovery of the Library of Nag Hammadi
[by Gamal Hermina Botros]

The discovery, in 1945, of the library of Nag Hammadi is, without any doubt, a major event in the world of history in general, and of Christian and Coptic history in particular.

The history of this discovery remains obscure. However we have found a letter dated 2 October 1946, addressed to the Inspectorate of Antiquities of Aswan, by the Inspector MANSOUR, which gives us a sketch of the first investigations relative to this discovery. The letter was sent to the director of the Coptic Museum at the time, Dr. MAHER HABIB [actually, Togo Mina was Director at the time].

What follows is the integral translation of the document:

Bureau of Inspection of the Monuments of Aswan
Letter № 734/1/7/5

Mr. Inspector in Chief of the Monuments of Upper Egypt,

---


La découverte, en 1945, de la bibliothèque de Nag Hammadi est, sans aucun doute, un évènement majeur dans le monde de l’histoire en général et de l’histoire chrétienne et copte en particulier.

L’histoire de cette découverte demeure obscure. Nous avons trouvé cependant une lettre datée du 2 octobre 1946, adressée à l’Inspectorat des Antiquités d’Assouan, par l’inspecteur MANSOUR qui nous donne un aperçu des premières enquêtes relatives à cette découverte. La lettre fut envoyée au directeur du musée copte de l’époque, Dr. MAHER HABIB.

Ci-dessous la traduction intégrale du document:

Bureau d’inspection des monuments d’Assouan
Lettre № 734 / 1 / 7 / 5

Monsieur l’inspecteur en chef des monuments de la Haute-Égypte,

J’ai l’honneur de vous informer que nous avons reçu une lettre de l’inspection des monuments de Sohag datée du 18/07/1947, à laquelle est jointe une photocopie d’un
I have the honor of informing you that we have received a letter from the Inspection of Monuments of Sohag dated 18 July 1947 [read: 1946], to which is attached a photocopy of an opinion signed by the guardian of the monuments of Balabiche announcing that certain porters of grain, at the time of their work at the mountain, have found some ancient books in the zone of the guardian of monuments of El Qasr and of El Sayade.

I directed myself, on the 25th of the same month, accompanied by the guardian in chief, toward the mountain of El-Tarek, to meet the guardian in question, according to an appointment. The guardian reaffirmed, according to the transcript, what he had already mentioned in his letter, and named as witnesses the Commissioner and the guardian of the zone El Tarek [read: al-Ṭārif] who, in their turn, have confirmed their remarks, and have added that the first time they heard talk of this subject was as the time of their meeting with the two guardians on 5 July 1947 [read: 1946].

This is where the English abstract for the meeting in Leiden had broken off. But the French translation continued the translations of the Arabic letter, largely providing confirmation of our own investigations (see Parts 2 and 3 above), as well as providing a few previously unknown and unconfirmed details:

When we posed the question to the guardian of El Qasr and of El Sayade, he denied what the guardian of Balabiche had said, as well as the fact that he has spoken [60] on this topic to the Commissioner and to the guardian of this zone. He added that the remarks of the guardian of Balabiche had only the purpose of drawing attention to his reputation.

We have also posed the question to the guardian in chief of the monuments of Qena (who is the uncle of the guardian of El Qasr and of El Sayade), who supported his nephew and denied the discovery of these ancient books.
We then carried the investigation to Qéna and its neighborhood, and we have deduced that certain inhabitants of El Qasr, when carrying grain at the East Mountain, in the proximity of El Habcha and of Ebzet El Boussa, last winter, have found in an excavation a certain number of books (one maintains that they are seven in number, as well as some documents, the whole in the Coptic language). Two of these books were in good condition, and have been sold by the porters of grain to the inhabitants of El Qasr. The latter went to Qéna and presented them to SAWIREIS (dealer in antiquities at Qéna), who only agreed to pay 3.5 £É. They then refused to sell them to him, and later on presented them to another merchant—ZAKI BASTA—who bought them for an unknown price, then went to Cairo to resell them to MANSOUR, another merchant, but the sale did not take place because of the price he asked.

BASTA then presented the same books to a merchant Fouquet [Phokion Tano], who bought them for a price that is uncertain to us, since some say

(qi est l’oncle du gardien d’El Qasr et d’El Sayade) qui a soutenu son neveu et a nié la découverte de ces anciens livres.

Nous avons alors mené l’enquête à Qéna et à ses alentours et nous avons déduit que certains habitants d’el Qasr, lors du transport des engrais à la Montagne-Est, à proximité d’El Habcha et d’Eset El Boussa, l’hiver dernier, ont trouvé dans une fouille un certain nombre de livres (on prétend qu’ils sont au nombre de sept, aussi bien que quelques documents, le tout en langue copte). Deux de ces livres étaient en bon état et ont été vendus par les porteurs d’engrais à des habitants d’El Qasr. Ceux-ci se sont rendu à Qéna et les ont présentés à Monsieur SAWIREIS (commerçant d’antiquités à Qéna) qui n’a accepté de payer que 3.5 £É. Ils ont alors refusé de les lui vendre et les ont présentés ultérieurement à un autre commerçant—Monsieur ZAKI BASTA—who les a achetés à un prix inconnu, puis s’est rendu au Caire pour les revendre à M. MANSOUR, un autre commerçant, mais la vente n’a pas eu lieu en raison du prix proposé.

M. BASTA a alors présenté les mêmes livres au commerçant Fouquet qui les achetés à un prix qui nous est imprécis; puisque les uns disent à 700 £É and les autres à 1300 £É; tandis que les documents joints à ces livres ont été vendus au même commerçant à plusieurs reprises.

Le commerçant SAWIREIS m’a, de sa part, confirmé ces faits tandis que le commerçant BASTA a tout nié. Je me suis dirigé alors vers la maison de ce dernier et j’ai bien fouillé la pièce où il expose sa marchandise mais je n’ai rien trouvé.

Sur ce, je vous prie de tenir au courant M. l’inspecteur des monuments du Caire.

Veuillez agréer l’expression de mes sentiments de respect.

Registre

ABDEL RAHMANE

Inspecteur des monuments d’Assouan et de Qéna

MANSOUR

2/10/1946
for 700 £É, and others for 1,300 £É, whereas the documents joined to these books have been sold to the same merchant on several occasions.

The merchant SAWIREIS, for his part, has confirmed these facts to me, whereas the merchant BOSTA denied everything. I then directed myself to the latter’s house, and I have fully ransacked the room where he displayed his merchandise, but I have found nothing.

On this, I ask you to keep informed the Inspector of Monuments of Cairo.

Please accept the expression of my sentiments of respect.

Register
ABDEL RAHMANE

Inspector of the Monuments of Aswan and of Qena
MANSOUR
2 October 1946

The letter quoted in the essay of Gamal Hermina Bostros is hence the earliest written record of the identification of the site of the discovery, and thus is a valuable document. There is of course vagueness in the details, and a few inaccuracies. MUHAMMAD ‘ALI and the others present at the time of the discovery are not named, but his finding the codices while seeking sabbakh at the cliff is mentioned. When RAGHIB went to Cairo in the summer of 1946 to sell Codex III, Togo Mina, not Maher Habib, was Director of the Coptic Museum (the Leiden abstract had even named PAHOR LABIB as Director).

It may be no coincidence that the letter, dated 2 October 1946, would have arrived in the Coptic Museum just at the time when Codex III was recorded in the Registry of the Coptic Museum: 4 October 1946. The letter also mentions the Cairo trip of the antiquities dealer of Qinā, ZAKI BASTA, with his (unnamed) informant from al-QAṢR, BAHJ ‘ALI MUHAMMAD ĀDAM, who had acquired from MUHAMMAD ‘ALI two codices (Codices II and VI): They first approached the antiquities dealer MANṣūR ‘Abl al-Sayyid MANṣūR at the old Shepherds Hotel, and then effected the sale to Tano, locally referred to by the ‘frenchified’ form of his first name Phokion, as Phoqué, here transcribed from Arabic as Fouquet. There may even be an allusion to Bahij ‘Ali’s return to Cairo to sell what was left in al-Qaṣr to Tano, who made purchases ‘on several occasions,’ as Tano himself mentioned to me. It remains unclear whether the reference to ‘documents joined to these books,’ as what was sold on these occasions, has in view the (today largely missing) documentary papyri usually used for the cartonnage, or merely the numerous leaves no longer in their leather covers.

Zaki Basta’s denial of having been involved, to protect himself from legal difficulties, reflects a caution I experienced when Raghib took me to Qinā
to meet him: Rāghib left me in a café while he went alone to persuade Zakī Basṭā to see me, and reported to me that a meeting with Zakī Basṭā had been agreed upon only after Zakī Basṭā told Rāghib he would murder him if this were a trap to get him into trouble. Then we went to his house, where Zakī Basṭā finally told me of his involvement quite freely, on this and subsequent visits, since I was not connected to the police. Clearly the passage of time had diminished the danger to him. He also mentioned that he kept the antiquities he had for sale in the second floor of his house, but he never showed me the storage room that had been unsuccessfully ransacked in 1946.

Jean Doresse, Report on the Visit to Nag Hammadi on 26–27 January 1950, Written 1950, Revised April 1957

Doresse’s publications were practically all that the scholarly world had to go on for more than a decade after the discovery, and so they have to a very large extent been taken at face value. Hence his chapter on ‘The Story of a Discovery’ is all the interested public has assumed could be known about what actually took place.185

Among the many documents that Doresse provided for the Nag Hammadi Archives is an unpublished memorandum of the trip he and his wife Marianne made to Nag Hammadi on 26–27 January 1950. It is on this trip that his assertions about the site of the discovery are based, to the extent they are first-hand information, and not simply what he had learned in Cairo and had already reported, all of which went back directly or indirectly to the antiquities dealers Phokion Tano and Albert Eid.

Doresse’s unpublished report of his two-day visit must have been written shortly after the trip, since its more academic dimensions were already expanded in a publication of 1950.186 Hence a handwritten date to April 1957 must be when he revised it, to judge by such handwritten comments in the opening sentences as a reference to Ethiopia, where his work began only in 1953, and the retrospective comment “their colors fade away and their pains are forgotten.”

From the unpublished typescript of 1950 and the handwritten notes of 1957 one cannot fail to sense how hasty, imprecise, and happenstance his

two-day visit to the site of the find actually was. It is hence reproduced below, to put in context the published excerpts on which subsequent scholarship was of necessity dependent. It stands in contrast to my own report on the discovery and the trafficking, which has been narrated in Parts 2 and 3 of the present chapter, since my report is based on repeated investigations and interviews. This serves to relativize the criticisms by Doresse, and by others, of my published reports (see Part 5 below), since his two-day visit is of necessity the basis for their criticisms of my much more detailed investigations and narration.

Though Doresse’s report is typewritten, there are many handwritten improvements (reproduced here in italics). When a mark in the typewritten text indicates where the handwritten addition is intended to be inserted, it is put there. If it is only written in the left margin, without any precise indication of where it is intended to go in the text, it is put where it seems to fit or at the end of the paragraph beside which it was written. In the case of additions on the back of p. 4, they are put where they seem best to fit, on the facing p. 5. Sometimes the handwritten addition is not actually composed as a sentence to fit into the flow of the paragraph, but is only an idea not yet developed into a part of the text. When the insertion of such handwritten material breaks the flow of the text, it are put between slashes / \, so that the insertion can be overlooked in reading the original sentence. Where Doresse marked through the text by hand, and hence the underlying text is legible, it is included with a line through it.—My English translation is in the body of the text, with the French original reproduced in footnotes, paragraph by paragraph. Thus the complete text of the rather disorganized memorandum is included:

Draft
April 1957

Memories of Upper Egypt—

Adventures to which archaeology leads, when one wants to follow up on the trace /—Notebooks of Egypt and of Ethiopia—\ or disengage some episodes /—their colors fade away and their pains are forgotten—\[187

---

187 Soon after i 50, and, added by hand, iv 57: Doresse’s memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25–28 i 50:

brouillon
avril 1957

Souvenirs de Haute-Egypte—
It is around the 24th or the 25th of January 1950 that, from the region of Luxor, I went to Naga-Hammadi to inspect the site where the Gnostic Coptic manuscripts were found by peasants who ... . It was important to collect precise facts, and also to kill while still in the egg novels that were already beginning to be born, and thus to avoid the birth of too many of those hypotheses without foundation that—far from the real framework of the discoveries—the learned often cook up. But we needed more details: to know, for example, if one could locate approximately the date at which they had been buried; to determine whether they had been hidden in a Christian site or not; if it was a matter of a funeral deposit, or if they had rested in some building suddenly abandoned. The quicker we would make this inspection (five years had already passed since peasants had made this memorable discovery), the more the material facts would still be identifiable, and the recollections still precise in the memory of the inhabitants. Let us say it immediately: None of our expeditions were as complicated by annoying incidents as this one was going to be. Truly, one could have believed that the curses, written at the conclusion of certain of these Coptic writings against those who would divulge them unduly, turned against us.

Soon after 150, and, added by hand, iv 57: Doresse's memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25–28 i 50:

C'est vers le 24 ou le 25 janvier 1950 que, de la région de Louxor, j'allai à Naga-Hammadi pour inspecter le site où les manuscrits gnostiques coptes, / partir d'une brève description de la pile de mss./—les informateurs étaient tous d'accord sur ce point—, été trouvés par des paysans qui ... . / Il importait de recueillir les faits précis et aussi, de tuer dans l'oeuf des romans qui commençaient déjà à naître, et d'éviter ainsi la naissance de trop de ces hypothèses sans fondement que—loin du cadre réel des découverts—les érudits échafaudent parfois./ Mais il nous fallait plus de détails: savoir, par exemple, si l'on pouvait situer approximativement la date à laquelle ils avaient été enfouis, reconnaître s'ils avaient été cachés dans un site chrétien ou non; s'il s'était agi d'un dépôt funéraire, ou s'ils étaient restés dans quelque édifice subitement abandonné. Plus vite nous ferions cette inspection (cinq ans s'étaient déjà écoulés depuis que des paysans avaient fait cette mémorable trouvaille) plus les faits matériels seraient encore identifiables, et les souvenirs encore précis dans la mémoire des habitants. Disons le tout de suite: aucune de nos expéditions ne fut autant compliquée d'incidents fâcheux qu'allait l'être celle-ci. Vraiment, on aurait pu croire que
My wife and I were residing then for research concerning the innumerable remains of Coptic convents near the Theban necropolis, at Gournah, on the bank of the Nile which was exactly opposite Luxor. No bridge united the two banks in this region. It was necessary to descend toward the south, by small rural routes, down to the dam of Esneh, cross the river, and return from there on the other bank as far as Luxor itself, a detour that took us the whole morning, since the speed of our old convertible Lancia,—an unbelievable military car salvaged from El-Alamein—was not of any help for such trips.

It is necessary to abridge the report.—Yet, how not mention (Guébélein: the countryside and the canals of Armant with their dwarf banana trees, reflecting, in dark water, the approaches to Esneh = Deir-el-Fachouri: the former grandeur of this region).

At Luxor, we stopped only the time it takes for lunch and to get gas. This was not yet the Egyptian spring, delicious in nuances of the countryside, but a season slightly cool, a bit dry, where the long hours of driving along the canals pass without fatigue. And then, the scenery around Qift, the village of Qéna, the countryside around Phbòou, are among the most pleasant places of Egypt—at least so long as one does not have to mark time behind some bus. In the middle of the afternoon, one discovers in the distance, beyond the flat expanse of verdant fields, a white cliff advancing from the east, from the end of the desert, toward the course of the Nile, lost somewhere on our left. It is the desert plateau from which the spur called the Gebel et-Tarif detaches itself. Nearer this veritable cape, we enter into a countryside where the verdure often rises up from the two sides of the road, hiding any more distant perspective. An opening exposes two neighboring hamlets and bizarre churches crowned by bell towers. Finally one reaches the iron bridge by which the train tracks and the road, side by side, reach, on the other side of the Nile, the market town of Naga-Hammadi.

Soon after i 50, and, added by hand (here in italics), iv 57: Doresse’s memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25–28 i 50:

Ma femme et moi résidions alors pour de rech. concernant les innombrables restes de couvents coptes près de la nécropole thébaine, à Gournah, sur la rive du Nil qui fait exactement face à Louxor. Aucun pont ne joignant les deux rives en cette région, il fallut descendre vers le sud, par les petites routes de campagne, jusqu’au barrage d’Esneh, traverser le fleuve et remonter de là sur l’autre rive jusqu’à Louxor même: détour qui nous prit la matinée, la vitesse de notre vieille torpedo Lancia,—une voiture militaire invraisemblable, rescapée d’El-Alamein—n’étant d’aucun secours sur de pareils trajets. Il faut abréger le récit.—Pourtant, comment ne pas mentionner (Guébélein; la campagne et les canaux d’Armant avec leurs bananiers nains se mirant dans une eau sombre les approches d’Esneh = le Deir-el-Fachouri: grandeur passée de cette région).
other bank (landscape), the factories of the Société des Sucreries [the Sugar Factory at Hiw], where we are awaited.\footnote{Soon after i 50, and, added by hand, iv 57: Doresse's memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25–28 i 50:}

Here, bad news: No one will accompany us in the region where we have to go, on the fallacious pretext of seeing certain tombs and certain ancient monasteries that one has known about for a long time. Indeed, various members of the personnel of the Sugar Factory have already been seized on other occasions by bandits hidden in this region, and were only returned for a ransom proportionate to the importance of the functions that they had at the factory. The countryside that extends on the other bank is enclosed by a large loop of the river and ends beyond the spur of the Gebel et-Tarif. Very fertile, it contains admirable plantations of sugarcane, and wooded orchards, bushy enclosures with high walls, all places where it is easy to conceal oneself or to conceal the individuals thus taken until their ransom is paid. The Egyptian authorities, could they do for us more than the personnel of the factory? At Naga-Hammadi, at the local prefecture, le ‘mamour,’—the governor—does not go, so to speak, in this region, where neither he, nor his men, are well received. Nonetheless, one agrees to put at our disposal, to protect us, perhaps a non-commissioned officer and a few soldiers.\footnote{Soon after i 50, and, added by hand, iv 57: Doresse's memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25–28 i 50:}
The next morning, accompanied by the men who have thus been loaned to us, we cross again the Nile and find this so verdant countryside that we have known for some time by having passed through it each time that we went from Cairo to Luxor or the return. / rare palms—[?]—/ At the village of el-Qasr / (describe) / we have the misfortune of not meeting the guardian appointed by the Department of Antiquities ['Abd al-Majīd Muḥammad Badārī]. Notified of our arrival by the administration, he preferred ... to be away, for using as a pretext some family affair that took him very far away from here and from which he will only return after a number of days. No doubt his conscience, with regard to his service, is not absolutely at peace? That gives us already the tone of this region: It is going to be impossible, although we gave innocent pretexts, to count on the officials, but we will benefit on the other hand from all the cooperation of those that one considers ordinarily as the ‘bad people.’ Yet, thanks to the non-commissioned police officer who accompanies us, we make the acquaintance of the minor local authorities and with some other persons who are useful enough. First of all the Coptic priest of the locality, / his costume Abouna Dawit [Father David], who has been (we will discover later on) among the first personages who had seen the manuscripts discovered by the peasants. / Describe the hamlet—/ And then, the chief bedouin of a hamlet very near the cliff of the Gebel et-Tarif. / portrait / We also meet a good fellow who, during the years of the war, had gone in search of some work in Cairo and Suez. He heard talk, down there, of the affairs of Europe, and he asks us seriously for news of the great French politician Edouard Daladier [sic] who, in his mind, is an irremovable head of government.192

Fort fertile, elle comporte d’admirables plantations de canne à-sucre, et des vergers boisés, touffus enclos de haut murs, tous lieux où il est facile de se dissimuler ou de dissimuler les individus ainsi enlevés jusqu’à ce que leur rançon soit payée. Les autorités égyptiennes pourront-elles faire, pour nous, plus que le personnel de l’usine? A Naga-Hammadi, à la préfecture locale, le mamour,—le gouverneur—, ne se rend autant dire jamais dans cette région où ni lui, ni ses hommes, ne sont bien accueillis. Pourtant, on accepte de mettre à notre disposition pour nous protéger éventuellement un sous-officier et quelques soldats.

192 Soon after i 50, and, added by hand, iv 57: Doresse’s memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25–28 i 50:

Le lendemain matin, accompagnés des hommes qui nous ont été ainsi prêté adjoints, nous franchissons de nouveau le Nil et retrouvons par le pont du ch. de fer—/ lumière du matin / cette campagne si verdoyante que nous connaissions depuis longtemps pour l’avoir traversée chaque fois que nous sommes allés du Caire à Louxor ou inversement. / rares palmiers—[?]—/ Au village d’el-Qasr / (décrire) / nous avons la malchance de ne pas rencontrer le gardien appointé par le Service des Antiquités. Prévenu de notre arrivée par l’administration, il a préféré ... prendre le large, pour une prétendant quelque affaire de famille qui l’a emmené fort loin d’ici et d’où il ne reviendra que dans plusieurs jours. Sans doute sa conscience, quant à son service, n’est-elle pas absolument tranquille? Cela nous donne déjà le ton de cette region:
Then leaving the countryside—we turn to the foot of the cliff\textsuperscript{193}—the car is really willing to go in this bad terrain—where, in an ancient cemetery of the very poorest kind (of simple pits), but very dug up, either by those seeking the natural fertilizer that one calls sebâkh, or by those seeking antiquities, the jar with the manuscripts would have been found. One alluded openly enough to that discovery. It is not at all possible to hope, among all the debris that one sees there, to find the least fragment certain to be from this pot, broken five years ago.\textsuperscript{194}

Above this place, on the flank of the cliff, we visit the Pharaonic tombs that contain some beautiful bas-reliefs, but that unfortunately no gate protects. Some psalms have been copied there\textsuperscript{195} [T 8], in large red letters, by some ancient Coptic hermit.\textsuperscript{196}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Soon after i 50, and, added by hand, iv 57: Doresse’s memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25–28 i 50:
    \textit{Alors quittant la campagne—nous rendons au pied de la falaise—la voiture veut bien aller dans ce mauvais terrain—où, dans un cimetière antique des plus humbles (de simples fosses) mais fort bouleversé soit par les chercheurs de cet engrais naturel qu’on appelle sebâkh, soit par les chercheurs d’antiquités, la jarre aux manuscrits aurait été trouvée. On fait assez franchement allusion à cette découverte. Il ne faut point espérer, parmi tous les débris que l’on voit là, retrouver le moindre morceau certain de ce pot, brisé depuis cinq ans.}
  \item Doresse’s photograph: http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/739.
  \item Soon after i 50, and, added by hand, iv 57: Doresse’s memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25–28 i 50:
    \textit{Au dessus de cet endroit, à flanc de falaise, nous visitons} les tombes pharaoniques qui comportent quelques beaux bas-reliefs mais que nulle porte malheureusement ne protège. Des psaumes y ont été copiés, en grandes lettres rouges, par quelque antique ermite copte.
\end{itemize}
Since it can be observed that the presence of soldiers hardly stimulates the inhabitants to give many details on a certain discovery of manuscripts that we pretend to be unaware of, we press further toward —afternoon, visit the priests— \[?] we return to N[ag] H[ammadi]. \ We return to these parts the next day, without our protectors. At the home of the personages whose acquaintance we had made the day before, we receive a most cordial welcome. Abouna Dawit has us visit the monasteries of Saint Pachomius and of Saint Palémon / there, small desert and \[?] / Tabennèsé— \ which are, one and the other, enormous buildings with white walls, inside of which are squeezed only some churches and chapels surmounted by bizarre bell towers with latticed walls.\(^{197}\) / Interior of churches—empty \ At the same time, the information that we are on the lookout for comes to light bit by bit. Some of the individuals who have participated in the discovery are even—one points them out to us among the curious people who accompany us. I had been able to obtain \ heard, in Cairo, some details on the description of some among them of those who sold the manuscripts, which confirms to me their identification. One talks to us also with some precision of the appearance of the manuscripts: It appears that it is Abouna Dawit himself who, in seeking to read one, left on a leaf of papyrus a few marks of his stylus whose modern character had surprised seemed very unusual to me. / Had there been, as one claims in Cairo, some manuscripts that were burnt? But no one is that stupid! Nonetheless, one sold them for only 3 Pounds, a ridiculous amount in comparison with the astronomic prices that had to be paid for certain of the manuscripts of the Dead Sea. \ In the afternoon, after having shared the meal that one of the inhabitants offers us, we take, for some twenty kilometers, the route [that \?] had led us from Luxor, to visit in the village of Phbôou the ruins of the basilica of Saint Pachomius: / appearance of the places— \ It was standing with a large monastery around it at the time that the manuscripts of the Gnostics of Khénoboskion were buried in a tomb, no doubt beside one of the last members of the sect.\(^{198}\)


\(^{198}\) Soon after i 50, and, added by hand, iv 57: Doresse’s memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25—28 i 50:

Comme il est notable que la présence de soldats n’incite guère les habitants à donner beaucoup de détails sur certaine trouvaille de manuscrits, que nous je faisons mine d’ignorer, nous pouvons plus loin vers —/ aprés-midi, visite aux religieuses— \[?] / regagnons N.H. Nous revenons dans ces parages le lendemain, sans nos protecteurs. Chez les personnages dont nous avions fait la veille la connaissance, nous recevons un accueil des plus cordiaux. Abouna Dawit nous fait visiter les monastères de S. Pachôme et de S. Palémon / là-bas, petit désert et \[?] / / Tabennèsé \ qui sont, l’un et l’autre, d’énormes bâtisses aux murs blancs à l’intérieur desquelles ne se tassent plus que/ quelques églises et chapelles surmontées de bizarres clochetons aux parois à claire-voies. / intérieurs d’églises—vides \ En même temps, les renseignements que nous
In these parts, rivals of the first monks of Pachomius, and perhaps often mingled among them, but also often excluded by them (homily of Theodorus)—the sectarian of the great Seth, etc. of Hermes, and of a strange Jesus, have copied their sacred texts— In some hovels of these parts they were copied, then bound— Across the manuscripts, in a script often extraordinarily beautiful—and anonymous we sense aging or at least physically decaying of at least one among them—the latest—it was most often with glosses that he enriched his texts— to imagine that certain of these texts, they betray it by their movement, were recited, psalmed, consummating themselves as hymns more and more obscure and exalted, accompanying mysterious baptisms and strange sacraments! / that he copies, betraying his incessant need to have recourse to astrological, magical books, put under the names of Zoroaster, of Solomon—
And to imagine that the true Christianity, at its origins, had to struggle for several centuries in order to disengage itself from this rubbish."

guettons se font jour peu à peu. Quelques uns des individus qui ont participé à la trouvaille sont mêmes,—on nous les indique—parmi les curieux qui nous accompagnent. J'avais pu obtenir entendu, au Caire, quelques détails sur le signalement de certains d'entre eux de ceux qui vendaient les mss. ce qui me confirme leur identification. On nous parle aussi avec quelque précision de l’aspect des manuscrits: il appert que c’est Abouna Dawit lui même qui, en voulant en lire un, laissa sur un feuillet de papyrus quelques marques de son stylo dont le caractère moderne m’avait étonné paru fort insolite. / Y eût-il, comme on le prétendait au Caire des mss. brûlés? Mais nul n’est assez fou! Pourtant, on ne les vendit que pour 3 Livres, somme ridicule en comparaison des prix astronomiques qui devraient être payés pour certains des mss. de la M. Morte. / L’après-midi, après avoir partagé le repas que nous offre l’un des habitants, nous prenons, pour une vingtaine de kilomètres, la route qui nous avait amenée de Louxor afin de visiter au village de Phbôou les ruines de la basilique de S. Pachôme: / aspect des lieux— elle était debout avec auprès d’elle un grand monastère au temps où les manuscrits des gnostiques de Khénoboskion furent ensevelis dans une tombe, sans doute auprès d’un des derniers membres de la secte.

Soon after i 50, and, added by hand, iv 57: Doresse’s memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25–28 i 50:

Dans ces parages, rivaux des ières moines de Pachôme, et p. être parfois mêlés à eux, mais + souvent hormis par eux (homélie de Théodore)—les sectaires du grand Seth, etc. d’Hermès, et d’un Jésus étrange ont copié leurs textes sacrés— / Dans quelques cabanes de ces parages furent copiés, puis reliés— / A travers les mss., à l’écriture parfois extraord. belle—et anonyme / nous sentons vieillir ou au moins déchoir physiq. au moins l’un d’entre eux—le plus tardif—son écriture est des abords du V S— / c’était le plus souvent des gloses dont il enrichit ses textes— / songer que certains de ces textes, ils le trahissent par leur mouvement, firent récités, psalmodyés, s’achevant comme des hymnes de plus en plus obscurs et exaltés, accompagnant de mystérieux baptêmes et d’étranges sacrements! / qu’il copie trahissent son incessant besoin de recourir à des livres astrologiques, magiques, mis sous les noms de Zoroastre, de Salomon— / Et songer que le vrai christianisme, à ses origines, dut lutter pendant plusieurs siècles pour se dégager de ce fâchés!
The 28th, we judge that we have collected all the information we wanted. More insistence would incite the people to reward our curiosity with fantastic details imagined by them. We will hence return to Gournah, satisfied with this inspection. At the Sugar Factory, one spoke to us of a path crossing directly the desert to the west of the Nile in the direction of Dendérah, from where one finds a rural route leading that we know for a long time and that leads to Gournah by the west bank of the river. Such a distance is brief enough to return us to our residence in a few hours, by avoiding the long circuits on the east bank and the some hundred and twenty kilometers that one has to take, from Luxor to rejoin Gournah situated just opposite, but accessible only by the dam of Esneh. To encourage us, one assures me that the administrators of the Sugar Factory ‘often’ make use of this short cut when they go to the factory that the Society possesses further to the south, at Armant. It is probable enough, for the maps of the Survey,—of which I have not yet learned enough to be distrustful,—carry vague traces of routes in this direction (in fact, some camel drivers often use, no doubt, these itineraries).
As a result, we decide not to leave at all before the afternoon. During the morning, after a good promenade along the Nile / *landscape* — in the direction of the dam,— where we make the acquaintance of the engineer in charge of the electric installations — (isolated from everything, he has the cinema for his only distraction: he films his installations, sends these films to be developed in Cairo, then projects them with his family to overcome the boredom of his evenings),— we wander about in Naga-Hammadi, then we go / *toward the village* — *it is still as Froment* [?] *described it* — *p. 84* / toward the interior of the land, beside the ancient site of Hou, where we hope to find something of the ancient monastery of a monk called ‘Bidaba.’ In fact, we reach the limit between cultivated land and the desert without having seen anything of what we are looking for, and there we light upon a magnificent modern cemetery. It is not the few rustic mausoleums that make its richness that we admire. It is a multitude of Bedouin tombs aligned on the pale sand,— such as one very rarely sees. / Flaubert? Froment *pp. 84–85* cites it [?] / These tombs have high benches with a rounded back, one of whose extremities rises to a high point that represents, no doubt, the upright of a camel’s saddle extremely enlarged. The solid mass has moved to limestone, and this white layer is covered in many cases by a rich geometric decoration with blue and red traits, triangles of ochre and yellow, representing approximately a rug with fringes on this pack saddle. The decoration and the colors follow different types, someone tells us, according to whether the deceased is a man, a young girl, a wife, an old woman.  

202 assez vraisemblable car les cartes du Survey,— dont je n’ai pas encore assez appris à me méfier —, portent de vagues tracés de pistes dans cette direction (de fait, quelques chameliers empruntent, sans doute, parfois ces itinéraires).

202 Soon after i 50, and, added by hand, iv 57: Doresse’s memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25–28 i 50:
In the afternoon we leave, with our car loaded with all our equipment, by the small route that, between a canal and the Nile, goes upstream. At the level of the village of el-Marashdah, the annoyances begin. While I am asking at a police station what road to follow to reach the desert that I am to cross, and from which the canal and a whole expanse of fields separates us, without a visible way across, children assemble around the car. The plug on the valve of my spare tire is quite new; it tempts them; *diabolic seduction*—fearing not to succeed in disconnecting it without my noticing it—they pull out the complete valve and take it off. At the sound of the tire emptying itself, I turn around: ‘It is nothing,’ one says, to calm me down. A bit further, it is again necessary to ask our way of a young peasant who is working in a field. He agrees with joy to guide us,—good opportunity for him to make a trip by car. Across the fields, he directs us toward a hamlet near which we finally arrive on dry and burning soil that we will have to traverse for some sixty kilometers. Where then is the promised trail? The peasant who guides us knows nothing of it, but insists that we will soon meet up with it. Anyhow, here goes—we set out in the desired direction across a terrain that, unfortunately, those hunting sebakh have dug up kilometer after kilometer; to *cross* across their endless holes, the car runs and slides. The gas pedal comes off as the result of a more brutal jolt. One readjusts it. But progress is slow. Further along, the motor stops. It is the gas pump that has had enough. I tighten it again. A moment later it begins to escape irreparably. From all our tools, I pull a press that permits us to readjust it water-tight. But it is already evening, and, everywhere, one only sees desert. At sundown, my repair breaks definitively. The cultivated fields in the neighborhood of Dendérah and the good route of Gournah that begins there, which we counted on reaching so rapidly after Naga-Hammadi, have not yet appeared on the horizon. One cannot pass the night here. It is necessary to abandon the car, carrying with us the most precious tools. On foot, we hope to reach inhabited regions to find some help there, or, at least, quarters for the night. Will we let our guide guard the car? We do not know him at all. Perhaps we will find neither him nor the belongings that remain in the car. It is better to bring him along as companion. The car has a chance of not being seen by any curious wanderer in the desert (there are always some) before we have returned with guardians.\(^{203}\)

\(^{203}\) Soon after i 50, and, added by hand, iv 57: Doresse’s memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25–28 i 50:

*L’après-midi, nous partons avec notre voiture rechargée de tout notre équipement par la petite route qui, entre un canal et le Nil, se dirige vers l’amont. Au niveau du village d’el-Marashdah, les ennuis commencent. Tandis que je demande à un poste de police quel chemin suivre pour atteindre le désert que je dois traverser, et qu’entre le canal et toute une étendue de champs nous séparent, sans passage visible, des enfants s’assemblent autour de la voiture. Le bouchon de valve de ma roue de recharge est...*
Just at the moment when the sun plunges under the horizon, I depart very much ahead in order to locate the road. From the summit of a knoll, I perceive with great pleasure a dark mass, very distant, on the horizon of the sky, still transparent. It is the roof of the temple of Dendérah. It indicates for us the direction to follow. The moon has not yet risen. I trot in the semi-darkness and it is thus that, at the end of a long time, I suddenly locate, at the border between the fields and the desert, some huts built by the bedouin whose dogs go after my toilet articles. I cannot avoid them all. My calves remain almost uninjured. My trousers are less fortunate. Just by chance, near the temple of Dendérah, we are received by our colleague Daumas [see Chapter 2, Part 3 below], master of the / spiritual lord of these \ localities that he studies to publish their / of which he edits—enormous task—\ the inscriptions. He finds us guardians who will go watch over the car during the night and offers us cordial hospitality, of which we were very much in need.204

204 Soon after i 50, and, added by hand, iv 57: Doreesse's memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25–28 i 50:

Au moment où le soleil plonge sous l’horizon, je pars très en avant pour découvrir le chemin. Du sommet d’une butte, j’aperçois avec bonheur une masse sombre, très
The next day, I repair the car, one more time, for better or for worse. We immediately resume the route to Gournah. The peasant of el-Marashdah insists on not leaving our company, since he has never seen Luxor. Unfortunately, we break down a little beyond Dendérah, near the notorious market-place of Ballas. Ballas is not only the place where one produces almost all the large jars that the peasants of Upper Egypt employ (and that one calls, for this reason, ‘Ballas’). This locality is also distinguished by the traditions of violence that make it dreaded. One says that no one of its inhabitants is well viewed here so long as he has not killed a stranger. That agrees very well with the savage character that already the classical authors accord to the population of Ombos, an ancient town that was located in these parts. Did they not do battle—Juvenal reports it—with those of Dendérah over the killing of a sacred animal, an occasion when they devoured one of their adversaries? We would like very much to pass these hardly reassuring locations rapidly, but it is the precise moment that the car chooses to break down again. All the population is just then in the fields where the flocks pass among the threshed harvest. A compact crowd encircles us. But these assumed cannibals—children for the most part, are very cordial. Only, when I attempt to make repairs, the tools, as soon as they leave my hands for an instant, pass into those of a hundred curious people, who do not restore them to me until their curiosity has been satisfied. At this tempo, the dismantling of the least screw takes an infinite amount of time. And then, to complicate things, two horseback policemen who patrol in the countryside have noticed this assemblage and approach at a gallop. They try to separate the crowd from the car by kicking their mounts, which is even more annoying. Finally, here is the bus that heads toward Dendérah. It stops, and its personnel tries, it too, to bring us aid, and embroils us even more. For the sake of peace and quiet we give up,—we should have done so long ago,—repairing this accursed pump. I remove completely the cap of the motor, which is going to rejoin our baggage in the back of the vehicle. A man is quickly recruited in this crowd who, for a few piasters, is quite willing to sit and clutch onto the wing of the car. By means of a tube of gum applied to the carburetor, he pours gas
from a kettle that he holds in his hand. Rarely has the car moved so well and so rapidly. The distance that separates us from Gournah is eaten up at full speed.  

The epilogue of this story? At Gournah, once one had settled the bill for the young peasant of el-Marashdah, quite happy with the tip he receives, he regrets that the adventure is already finished. He expresses the wish that this promenade continue, not only to Cairo, but even to Paris. As to the bite received the evening of the arrival at Dendérah, it is hardly noticeable. But rabies is indigenous to Egypt. Besides, the animal that was responsible cannot be identified, and one will never know if it is sick or not. The Egyptian rules are, quite rightly, formal: It is necessary to take the train to Cairo, where, every day for a month, I am to receive anti-rabies shots. Are these annoyances...
the consequences of the curses launched by the secret books of the Gnostics against those indiscreet persons who discover them inappropriately?206

This research of the Doresses at the site of the discovery, chaotic and dangerous as it was, serves to put in context Marianne Doresse’s bitter criticism of the lack of support from Puech, who did indeed live in any ivory tower:207

It is true that Puech, never having accomplished any research except in a library, did not have the slightest idea of the difficulties and the expenses of research in a foreign terrain, research from which he nonetheless took, instead of Jean, real profits for his career and reputation.

This criticism of Puech’s lack of understanding is of course quite valid at the personal level. But such a previously unpublished write-up of the brief visit to Nag Hammadi by the Doresses on 26–27 January 1950 does not inspire confidence in the specifics of their published reports, on which subsequent scholarship all too uncritically depended.

*Ludwig Keimer, Report Dated 5 August 1950, Copied for Gilles Quispel 13 April 1955*

Ludwig Keimer wrote the following report on 5 August 1950. He had heard of Tano’s acquisitions of March 1946, either directly from Tano or from the Abbot Étienne Drioton who had talked to Tano. And he must have heard of Doresse’s visit to Nag Hammadi on 26–27 January 1950, no doubt directly from Doresse in Cairo rather than from Doresse’s first publication of his visit, his report to the Royal Belgian Academy presented by Canon L.Th. Lefort on

206 Soon after i 50, and, added by hand, iv 57: Doresse’s memorandum of the trip to Nag Hammadi on 25–28 i 50:

L’épilogue de cette histoire? A Gournah, lorsque l’on règle les comptes du jeune paysan d’el-Marashdah, fort content de la gratification qu’il reçoit, celui-ci regrette que l’aventure soit déjà finie. Il exprime le voeu que cette promenade se continue, non seulement jusqu’au Caire, mais même jusqu’à Paris. Quant à la morsure reçue le soir de l’arrivée à Dendérah, elle est imperceptible. Mais la rage est endémique en Egypte; l’animal responsable est, en outre, indentifiable et l’on ne saura jamais s’il est malade ou non. Les règles égyptiennes sont, à juste titre, formelle: il faut prendre le train pour le Caire où chaque jour, un mois durant, je recevrai les injections antirabiques. Ces ennuis sont-ils les conséquences des malédictions lancées par les livres secrets des gnostiques contre les indiscrets qui les découvrent indûment.

207 Marianne Doresse: *Troisième mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte* (see Chapter 2, Part 2 below).
2 August 1950. Keimer prepared a handwritten copy of this report for Gilles Quispel in Cairo on 13 April 1955 (see Chapter 5, Part 4 below), to judge by that date appended at the end.

Keimer’s report is as follows:

Keimer’s report is as follows:

5 August 1950
Tano and Doresse have obtained, with regard to the discovery of the Gnostic papyri, the same result:

Found at Dibba a bit to the south [i.e. upstream, but here actually north] of Naga’ Hamadi in a grotto [a cave was the common inaccurate assumption]; the papyri themselves were put in a vase of clay (a large zir).

---

208 5 viii 50: Ludwig Keimer’s handwritten memorandum, given to Gilles Quispel on 13 iv 55:

5 août 1950
Tano et Doresse ont obtenu, au sujet de la découverte des papyrus gnostiques, le même résultat.

Trouvés à Dibba un peu au sud de Naga’ Hamadi dans une grotte; les papyrus mêmes étaient placés dans un vase en terre (un grand zir)

– un prêtre copte-orthodoxe accompagné d’un arabe (musulman) a vendu un livre au Musée Copte (le prêtre l’avait montré ce livre tout d’abord au Dr. Georgy Sobhy). Le Musée Copte a payé peu de chose (200 £É?)

– Le livre en possession de M. Albert Eid avait été vendu tout d’abord à un marchand de céréales copte de Naga’ Hamadi. Tano fut averti que le marchant était en possession de ce livre. Le marchand et Tano se mettent d’accord sur la somme de 300 £É comme prix de ce livre. Mais le marchand change d’avis, il demande 800 £É—le courtier de Tano avait averti ce dernier. Le courtier et Tano pensent que le marchand copte céderait le livre à 300 £É; dans tout les cas à un prix notablement inférieur à 800 £É. Tano et son courtier ne font rien—Tano rentre au Caire. Le marchand de céréales copte de Naga’ Hamadi vient quelque temps plus tard au Caire. Là il rencontre un autre courtier qui l’amène chez Albert Eid qui achète le livre pour 500 ou 600 £É—Le livre se trouve, paraît-il, actuellement en USA—Michigan avait offert 12,000 $, mais Albert Eid exigea 25,000 $. Le livre de M. Eid se compose d’à près 50 feuilles (= 100 pages)

– Le lot de la “Demoiselle” (= Dattari, c’est-à-dire Tano!) est composé comme suit:

a) une vingtaine de feuilles appartenant au livre d’Albert Eid.
b) 7 volumes reliés en cuir (avec lacets) dont quatre gros et grands qui sont intacts
c) trois ou quatre volumes plus petits qui ne sont pas tout à fait complets.

Voici ce que j’ai appris en août 1950 sur les papyrus gnostiques de Chénoboskion.

L.K.

13 IV 55.
a Coptic orthodox priest accompanied by an Arab (Muslim [inaccurate]) sold one book to the Coptic Museum (the priest [al-Qummus Ishâq Hannân, accompanying the seller, Râghib Andarâwus al-Qiss 'Abd al-Sayyid, himself of a Coptic priestly family] had shown this book at first to Dr. Georgy Sobhy). The Coptic Museum paid a trifile (200 £ [actually 250 £])

The book in the possession of Albert Eid had been sold at first to a Coptic grain merchant of Naga' Hamadi [Nâshid Bisâdah]. Tano was informed that the merchant was in the possession of this book. The merchant and Tano [who had gone to Nag Hammadi in March 1946] reach agreement on the sum of 300 £ as the price of this book. But the merchant changes his mind, he asks 800 £—the agent of Tano had notified the latter. The agent and Tano think that the Coptic merchant would give up the book for 300 £; in any case for a price notably less than 800 £. Tano and his agent do nothing—Tano returns to Cairo. The Coptic grain merchant of Naga' Hamadi comes somewhat later to Cairo. There he meets another agent, who brings him to Albert Eid’s, who buys the book for 500 or 600 £—The book is, it seems, at present in the USA—Michigan had offered $12,000, but Albert Eid demanded $25,000 [Eid brought his price down to $10,000, but Michigan still did not make the purchase]. The book of Eid consisted of about 50 leaves (= 100 pages).

The portion of the ‘lady’ (= Dattari, i.e. Tano!) consists of the following:

a) some twenty leaves belonging to the book of Albert Eid [this is no doubt the origin of the standard inaccurate expression ‘the missing 40 pages’].

b) 7 volumes [Codices II, V, VI, VII, IX, X, XI] bound in leather (with laces) of which four [Codices II, VI, VII, XI], thick and large, are intact

c) Three [Codices IV, VIII, XII] or four volumes [adding Codex XIII, eight leaves of which were tucked inside the front cover of Codex VI], smaller, that are not entirely complete.

—

This is what I learned in August 1950 on the Gnostic papyri of Chénoboskion.

L[udwig] K[eimer]

Thus Ludwig Keimer did track down in 1950 a relatively accurate and complete report, which then became available to Quispel in 1955, and, via Quispel, to the Nag Hammadi Archives. Here it has been minimally corrected and supplemented in square brackets in the translation, but of course much more extensively in the whole of the present work.

P.E. Kahle, The Date of Codex Jung, 14 August 1954

In August 1954 Gilles Quispel wrote Paul Kahle (1875–1964), a distinguished German orientalist, requesting him to date the Jung Codex (= Codex I) on the basis of two photographs Quispel enclosed. At the time Kahle was
working at Oxford, and perhaps for this reason signed his name as P.E. Kahle. A covering letter to Quispel dated 14 August 1954 commented:

Thank you for your letter with the enclosures which did not reach me until the day before yesterday. I enclose my note on the date and I am returning the two photos herewith. It has been extremely interesting for me to see these photos and I have made a copy of them. You will note that I date the Codex without any hesitation about 330 AD—there were many points which confirmed my earlier dating. I have no objection if you wish to publish my note in full or whatever parts seem interesting to you. I must say that I am surprised how well the dialect bears out my Bala'izah-new theories, particularly as the Codex shows the early type of Subachmimic and has so many Sahidic(-Bohairic) features. As regards the place where the manuscript was written, I should say that it can certainly not have been written north of Abydos, but on the other hand I do not think it can have been written very much further south, because we do not find such a confusion of the letter ϣ at Thebes.

Kahle’s note itself is typewritten, with but a few handwritten insertions; yet all the Coptic letters are written by hand. The concluding date and signature are handwritten.

The note itself reads as follows:

The date of Codex Jung

We have four criteria for the dating of this Codex:

1) Paleography.

There are two hands in the Codex:

(a) The first hand (heavy uncials).

The only close parallel to this hand among Coptic manuscripts known to me is the Achmimic Ms. of II Maccabees of which a photo was published by Lacau in BIFAO VIII. There can be no doubt that both manuscripts were written about the same time. Very similar to the hand is also BM 711 (Crum pl. 11) which can be dated with fair certainty about the middle of the fourth century (see Milne and Skeat, Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus pp. 60ff.). Among other manuscripts the hand is closest to the BM Ms of Deuteronomy, Jonah and Acts (publ. Budge, Biblical Texts) especially the second hand, the Louvain Exodus and Luke fragments (ed. Lefort in Museon LXVI, 1ff.), the Chester Beatty Genesis (Ms. IV—Greek), the Sahidic Elias (ed. Steindorff), the Berlin I Clement (ed. Schmidt), and the Sahidic letter in the Melitian Archive (P. Lond. 1920 ed. Bell and Crum, Jews and Christians in Egypt); also the Subachmimic St. John (ed. Thompson).

Among the individual letters one might note especially the almost third century form of the letter ϖ, the small ρ, the ω with the middle stroke hardly
projecting outside the circle, the typical fourth century α, the early form of μ, and the letters τ and ρ only rarely have dots on the top cross-bars e.g. not ‘τ’ ‘ρ’—again a sign of the early fourth century.

I would place this hand—purely on paleographical data—a little earlier than Budge, *Biblical Texts*, certainly earlier than the Subachmimic St. John, but later than the third century. The general impression and resemblance to the type of the hand of the Codex Sinaiticus would seem to point to the early fourth century.

(b) The second hand (sloping uncials).

I know of no Coptic manuscript closely resembling this hand, but it is the fore-runner of the type familiarly known by the second hand of the *Pistis Sophia* (fourth-fifth century, see Hyvernat, *Album* pl. II). The closest to this hand is Bal. 22–25 (v. Balaʿizah pl. I), probably of the middle of the fourth century, see the discussion of the date (l. c.), and cf. W.S. 17. The hand is fairly uniform, in particular the γ is not yet much elongated below the lines as also in the first hand, and it is clearly earlier than Bal. 22, which again would point to the early fourth century. One might note especially the remarkable form of the letter α.

2) The shape of the additional Demotic letters.

The ϱ is of a fourth century type, cf. P. Lond. 1921 (Melitian Archive), Subachmimic St. John, also Budge, *Biblical Texts*, but definitely not of a third century type, or of the unusual early type.

The ς still in a few cases has a form otherwise known only from third century and early fourth century Coptic hands, but its uniformity and its shape in most cases would rule out a third century date.

The ς is frequently made in two strokes, pointing to an early fourth century date, cf. Balaʿizah p. 236.

The ρ and ρ are not unusual.

The exact use of the additional letters with the exception of ϱ rules out a third century date and would suggest the middle rather than the very early fourth century.

3) The system of superlineation.

The superlineation is already fairly regular, though the following points show an early fourth century date:

The first hand often shows knowledge of both systems of superlineation found in Budge, *Biblical Texts*, and in particular the second system in that manuscript is confined to our earliest Coptic texts; examples of this system are τοῦτο (not τοῦτο), ἦν πογεῖα (not ἦν πογεῖα) etc. Very interesting is the usage of writing the ἦ and ἦ, when written with a single-letter-stroke,
separately from the letters on either side with a long stroke over it, which is noticeable in a few instances in this manuscript, e.g. ḫẉ ṇ ȝẉ (not ḫẉṇỵẉ) and ḫṃ ḳ ɺẉ (not [ḳṃḳẉɺẉ]) but it is not as pronounced as in the Achmimic Psalm-fragment (ed. Crum, Miss. LXVI, 73 ff.), the Achmimic Ms. of Hymns (Hieracas? ed. Lefort in Museon LII, 1 ff.), and a few other early texts; this would again point to the early fourth century.

In general the fairly developed use of the superlineation in both hands of the papyrus would rule out a third century date, and a date after the middle of the fourth century is equally unlikely.

4) The dialect of the manuscript

A number of forms, in particular the complete irregularity in the verbal system, would almost suggest a third century date; the same applies to the use of ṇ, ṇ, ṇ as definite articles which so far have not been found in Achmimic or Subachmimic and were confined to early Sahidic MSS, and the use of ṇṇ, ṇṇ, ṇṇ with the relative. Other early features are ṭṛỵ for ṭṛỵ (see Balaizah ch. VIII par. 56A), the confusion of ṇ and ṇ, ṇ and ṇ, the doubling of ṇ in ṇṇ and ṇ before vowels, the use of oγẉṛ without preceding ṇ, the use of ṭṇe and ṭṇe side by side with ṇe and (?) ṛp̣, the use of ṛ with Greek verbs (later Subachmimic manuscripts—Mani AP—are irregular in this), and the irregular use of g even outside the verbal prefixes e.g. g̣ẉ for g̣ẉ. One should also mention that the dialect is of the early type of Subachmimic e.g. ṇṇ ẹẉṇ, c̣ẉṭ, oγẉṇ (not oγẉṇ), etc. Another sign of a very early date is the intrusion of Sahidic forms e.g. eβol, ṭβol side by side with ṭβol which is extremely unlikely after the middle of the fourth century.

On the other hand a number of points suggest a date after the third century, in particular the degree of standardisation outside the verbal system and the full use of the additional Demotic letters. Also the frequent use of Greek verbs, and in particular particles like ṭḳ, ṛω, ḫḳl; and the frequent use of θ̣l.

Summary

We are fortunate that there are so many points permitting us to fix the date of the Codex with considerable certainty. All the four criteria—paleography, additional Demotic letters, superlineation and dialect—point to a date later than the third and earlier than the middle of the fourth century and I have no hesitation to assign the codex to about 330 AD.

P.E. Kahle
14-viii-54

Kahle’s report seems to be so detailed and precise that it should be made public.
Jean Doresse, Project of Archaeological Research, November 1972

Doresse sent me in November 1972 advice for the archaeological research I envisaged. It was not very useful in that regard, but does document his understanding of the situation at that time:

The origins, the formation, and the transmission of the Coptic Gnostic library found at Nag-Hammadi / Khénoboskion.

Project of Archaeological Research

The text of Doresse's archaeological advice was as follows:

PURPOSE: The aim of such research should be:

1) to analyze in detail the archaeological topography of the region where the manuscripts were found, with the purpose of completing as much as possible our knowledge of the historical and religious context in which this collection of writings was created, and which then produced its sudden burial. This is, in all the domain of ancient Christian heresies, the sole case where, up to the present, such research is possible.

2) perhaps to find other vestiges of this library, or at least of the recipients, even of buildings where it was hidden.

THE GEOGRAPHIC FRAMEWORK: It has to do with the section of the eastern shore of the Nile that extends near the present city of Nag-Hammadi, opposite to the village of How. The river makes there, from East to West, a noticeable bend oriented toward the South ... . In this bend there extends cultivated land—a vast semi-circle in which are found the villages of es-Salamieh, el-Qasr, es-Sayyâd, Debbah (railroad station), and—more to the East, the double locality of Faw (Faw-Gibli and Faw-Bahari: Faw of the desert and Faw of the river). This bend in the river has been caused by a natural obstacle—a

---

209 xi 72: Jean Doresse, “Projet de recherche archéologique”:
“Les origines, la formation et la transmission de la bibliothèque gnostique copte retrouvée à Nag-Hammadi / Khénoboskion”
Projet de recherche archéologique.

210 xi 72: Jean Doresse, “Projet de recherche archéologique”:
BUT: L’objet d’une telle recherche doit être:

1) d’analyser en détail la topographie archéologique de la région où les manuscrits furent retrouvés, dans le but de compléter au maximum notre connaissance du cadre historique et religieux dans lequel se créa cette collection d’écrits, puis se produisit son subit ensevelissement. C’est, pour tout le domaine des anciennes hérésies chrétiennes, le seul cas où, jusqu’à présent, une telle recherche soit possible.

2) de retrouver éventuellement d’autres vestiges de cette bibliothèque ou, tout au moins, des récipients, voire des bâtiments, où elle fut cachée.
spur of the eastern desert—a raised plateau whose cliff blocks off on the North this semi-circle of cultures. This mountain is named the Gebel-et-Tarif. It is at its foot that the Gnostic manuscripts that interest us were discovered almost thirty years ago. The place where they were hidden, in a jar entrusted to the sands of the desert, was it attached to one of the Christian monasteries that were at that time coming into existence in this region? Or rather were they hidden there by the sectarians fearing the orthodox Christians? In other words, our manuscripts, do they represent documents collected by Christians for their information—for their anti-heretical polemics, or rather does it have to do with a sacred library abandoned by the sect that made use of it? It would be important to respond to these questions, which we have posed already some twenty-five years ago, but which only methodical excavations can clarify.

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK: The vestiges permitting us to imagine the religious life of this region in the past that interests us are relatively numerous, although some of them have been effaced in the course of the last century. Toward 1830, Sir Gardner Wilkinson had the good fortune, in the course of two visits, to see there many details that today have disappeared. (Sir Gardner Wilkinson, *Modern Egypt and Thebes*, London: 1843, 2.117–118).

On the western shore, where the present How remains as a faint memory of the ancient city of Diospolis Parva—the main location in these parts—he still noted near the river the existence of the debris of the ancient city, with the remains of a Ptolemaic or Roman temple. Near the desert, a mile south of How, there were still to be seen tombs, one of which, ornamented with Egyptian funerary bas-reliefs, had been constructed for a certain Dionysius, scribe of one of the Ptolemies. Opposite to this city, on the eastern shore, in the

---

211 xi 72: Jean Doresse, “Projet de recherche archéologique”: 

LE CADRE GÉOGRAPHIQUE: Il s'agit du secteur de la rive orientale du Nil qui s'étend près de l'actuelle ville de Nag-Hammadi, en face de la bourgade de How. Le fleuve décrit là, d’est en ouest, une boucle marquée, orientée vers le sud ... . Dans cette boucle s’étendent des terres cultivées—vaste demi-cercle où se trouvent les villages de es-Salamieh, el-Qasr, es-Sayyād, Debbah (gare du chemin de fer), et—plus à l’est, la double localité de Faw (Faw-Gibli et Faw-Bahari: Faw du désert et Faw du fleuve). Cette boucle du fleuve a été provoquée par un obstacle naturel—un éperon du désert oriental—plateau élevé dont la falaise barre, au nord, ce demi-cercle de cultures. Cette montagne porte le nom de Gebel-et-Tarif. C’est au pied de celle-ci que les manuscrits gnostiques qui nous préoccupent ont été découverts il y a bientôt trente ans. Le point où ils étaient dissimulés, dans une jarre confiée aux sables du désert, était-il lié à l’un des monastères chrétiens qui naissaient alors dans cette région? Ou bien furent-ils dissimulés là par des sectaires craignant les chrétiens orthodoxes? En d’autres termes, nos manuscrits représentent-ils des documents recueillis par des chrétiens pour leur information—pour leur polémiques anti-hérétiques, ou bien s’agit-il d’une bibliothèque sacrée abandonnée par la secte qui en fit usage: Il serait capital de répondre à ces questions, que nous avons posées il y a déjà quelque vingt-cinq ans mais que seules des fouilles méthodiques pourront clarifier.
bend of the river, he noted, first of all, on the shore the remains of an ancient quai of masonry, debris among which one saw a Greek dedicatory inscription dating from the reign of Antoninus Pius, and the remains of a bas-relief with the effigy of the goddess Isis. Inland, near the twin villages of el-Qasr and es-Sayyad, some hillocks still marked the traces of the ancient hamlet of Shénésit, otherwise named in Greek Knénoboskion. In the cliff, more to the north, Wilkinson visited the pharaonic tombs—those of the princes of the Sixth Dynasty that in fact dominate the place in the desert where our manuscripts were discovered. If one may believe in this regard a map of Linant de Bellefonds dating from the same epoch, there would have been the remains of a convent in that area (but this can be an error?). Wilkinson had the merit of recognizing in the plain, more to the east, ancient Pbôou, today represented by the villages of Faw: Faw-Gibli (Faw of the desert) and Faw-Bahari (Faw near the river). However he committed an error in situating ancient Tabennèsé on the opposite shore, upstream from How. Shénésit, Pbôou, Tabennèsé: three of the first places frequented by Saint Pachomius when he instituted coenobitic life and constituted in this region the first monasteries of his order.212

212 xi 72; Jean Doresse, "Projet de recherche archéologique":

Today, it does not seem that one preserves much of a memory of the nearby tombs of Diospolis Parva, of the quai along the Nile at Shénésit, of the monastery whose remains were noted by Linant de Bellefonds at the foot of the Gebel-et-Tarif. By way of compensation, certain sites that are quite visible, having to do with the ancient Pachomian monastic history, have been identified by the regretted Mgr L.Th. Lefort ("Les premiers monastères pachômiens," in Muséon 52 [1939]: 1–29 and plates 11–14). It has to do with the Deir-el-Malak in the interior of the land and the Deir-Amba-Palamoun near the Nile, close to the village of El-Qasr. Mgr Lefort became more precise, by referring to the ancient Pachomian chronicles that he had the merit of having brought together, as to what a very real place these two sites had held in the history of the first foundations of St. Pachomius. At the same time he recalled the interest of the ruins of the Basilica of St. Pachomius at Faw—a field of ruins still today left unexplored! Without being definitive, the archaeological topography of this area, in the epoch of the earliest monasticism, is already very copious, very precise, and it indicates to what an extent excavations would be desirable at several places.\footnote{xii 72: Jean Doresse, "Projet de recherche archéologique":}

The last contribution to this topography is related to the discovery of the Coptic Gnostic manuscripts of Khênoboskion—it has to do with verifications that we have been able to make, and to evidence that we were able to collect, in 1949–1950, proving that these manuscripts had been rediscovered, buried, in a jar, in the middle of what seems to be a vast cemetery of antiquity at the foot of the cliff where the tombs of the princes of the Sixty Dynasty were cut out. One knows, incidentally, that Copts lived in these regions, since they copied out there certain psalms on the walls of pharaonic hypogea [underground chambers] (Jean Doresse, “Sur les traces des papyrus gnostiques: Recherches à Khênoboskion,” in: BABL, 5e Série, 36 [1950], 432–439). We have been able, incidentally, to cite several ancient attestations

\footnote{xii 72: Jean Doresse, “Projet de recherche archéologique”:}
showing that the Coptic monasticism of this region certainly was not unaware of the Gnostic apocrypha.\textsuperscript{214}

THE MOST URGENT EXPLORATIONS: As a result, there is reason to explore here the different fields of pre-Christian and Christian archaeological remains that await excavators. Certainly, they have been tolerably dug over by the peasants of the region—less in search of sellable antiquities than for reasons more down to earth. But these diggings have not been deep enough to efface all ancient vestiges. Hence there is reason to plan, from case to case: a) trenches of deep exploration; b) the clearing of important surfaces; c) brief reconnaissances with rapid soundings of very precise points.\textsuperscript{215}

Here is the list of sites to explore:

1) At the foot of the cliff of the Gebel-et-Tarif, near the hamlet of Hamra-Doum, in the region of the tombs of the Sixth Dynasty, the clearing of the cemetery of the Christian period, in the middle of which the jar with the manuscripts is thought to have been found. One will investigate: the exact location of the discovery; the possible vestiges of constructions; datable debris (writings, cloth, coins, sherds of pottery ...). One will investigate in the proximity of this same cemetery the possible traces of the monastery that the map set up in 1866 by Linant de Bellefonds situates there (\textit{Carte Hydrographique de la partie méridionale de la Haute-Égypte}, by Linant de Bellefonds, 1866). A complete exploration of the cliff is desirable.

\textsuperscript{214} xi 72: Jean Doresse, “Projet de recherche archéologique”:

Le dernier apport à cette topographie est lié à la découverte des manuscrits gnostiques coptes de Khénoboskion: il s’agit des constatations que nous avons pu faire et des témoignages que nous avons pu recueilli en 1949–1950, prouvant que ces manuscrits avaient été retrouvés ensevelis, dans une jarre, au milieu de ce qui paraît être un vaste cimetiére antique, au pied de la falaise où se creusent les tombes des princes de la Vie dynastie: on sait, par ailleurs, que des Coptes vécurent dans ces parages, puisqu’ils y copièrent certains psaumes sur les parois des hypogées pharaoniques (J. DORESSE, \textit{Sur les traces des papyrus gnostiques, Recherches à Khénoboskion}, dans: Académie Royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres ... 5e Série, t. XXXVI, 1950, pp. 432–439). Nous avons pu, par ailleurs, citer quelques témoignages anciens montrant que le monachisme copte de cette région n’ignorait certainement pas les apocryphes gnostiques.

\textsuperscript{215} xi 72: Jean Doresse, “Projet de recherche archéologique”:

EXPLORATIONS LES PLUS URGENTES: Il y a lieu, par conséquent, d’explorer ici les différents champs de restes archéologiques pré-chrétiens et chrétiens qui atten- dent les fouilleurs. Certes, ils ont été passablement bouleversés par les paysans de l’endroit—moins pour la recherche d’antiquités vendable que pour des buts plus terre-à-terre. Mais ces bouleversements n’ont point été assez profonds pour effacer tous vestiges antiques. Il y a donc lieu de prévoir, selon les cas: a) des tranchées d’exploration profonde; b) des décapages de surfaces importantes; c) de sommaires reconnaissances avec sondages rapides de points très précis.
2) In the cliff there opens, a bit further to the west, a wādi that cuts deeply. A summary exploration of this wādi should be anticipated (graffiti?). It would also be good to traverse the plateau and to locate there possible traces of the paths that were used there in antiquity. Recall that there is reason to search, in these parts, the hidden place where the Pachomian monks had the policy of secreting the tombs of their deceased!

3) The monasteries named Deir-el-Malak ... and Deir-Amba-Palamoun ... erect their modern constructions, reduced to large churches, on the large kôms of ruins, part of which is occupied by the Christian cemeteries still in use. There is reason to probe the periphery of these kôms (where no present cemetery forbids archaeological work) to investigate there the characteristics a) of Christian layers; b) of layers that immediately preceded the Christian installations. This, so as to envisage, perhaps, how the transition from paganism to Christianity presented itself in this region.

4) At Faw, the field of ruins that is strewn with the columns of the ancient Pachomian basilica deserves an exhaustive excavation—perhaps too important for the means at one's disposal?

5) Finally, it would be good to make a general topographic exploration of the surroundings: To investigate the traces of the ancient quay noted by Wilkinson, and even cross to the western shore, to study the environment of How and of Nag-Hammadi. Near this last location, Mgr Lefort had already noted the existence of an ancient monastery—today reduced to a church that is not very old—placed under the name of Amba Bidaba. The ancient identity of this convent is worth determining.

---

216 xi 72: Jean Doresse, "Projet de recherche archéologique":

Voici la liste des sites à explorer:

I) au pied de la falaise du Gebel-et-Tarif, près du hameau de Hamrah-Doum, dans les parages des tombes de la VIe dynastie, décapage du cimetière d’époque chrétienne au milieu duquel la jarre aux manuscrits aurait été trouvée. On y recherchera: l’emplacement exact de la trouvaille; les éventuels vestiges de constructions; les débris datables (écrits, tissus, monnaies, tessons de poterie …). On recherchera, à proximité de ce même cimetière, les éventuelles traces du monastère que situe, là, la carte établie en 1866 par Linant de Bellefonds (Carte Hydrographique de la partie méridionale de la Haute-Égypte, par Linant de Bellefonds, 1866). Une exploration complète de la falaise est à souhaiter.

II) dans la falaise s’ouvre, un peu plus à l’ouest, un ouadi qui s’enfonce profondément. Une sommaire exploration de ce ouadi est à prévoir (Graffites?). Il serait également bon de parcourir le plateau et d’y relever des éventuelles traces des sentiers qui y furent fréquentés dans l’antiquité. Rappelons qu’il y a lieu de rechercher, dans
Of course not all of the archaeological suggestions of Doresse could be followed up in the Nag Hammadi excavations that followed, though the excavation of the Basilica of St. Pachomius could be included along with the more immediate area of the discovery of the Nag Hammadi codices at the Jabal al-Ṭārif (see Chapter 12 below). Perhaps Doresse’s “Project of Archaeological Research” is most relevant in indicating his ongoing uncertainties about the site of the discovery. They seem to have been aroused especially by the map published by de Bellefonds in 1866 that seemed (inaccurately) to locate a monastery at the site itself.

5. Criticisms of My Reports

My own investigations of the discovery and trafficking began to be made public a generation later than those of Doresse, by which time his long-since published views had become the generally assumed version of the facts.

It is hence not surprising that criticisms of my reports were raised by two members of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, Rodolphe Kasser and Martin Krause, in defense of Doresse's version of the story, to which I then responded.

Paris, novembre 1972
J. Doresse.
Doresse in turn built on their views to present his own criticisms of my reports that diverged from his, to which I hence respond here. Then I go on to correct bits of disinformation that I had indeed published as the information first began to trickle in.

Kasser also criticized my report on the discovery and trafficking of the Bodmer Papyri. That discovery had been made near the Nag Hammadi discovery; I stumbled onto the story in tracking down the Nag Hammadi story. Hence I quote his criticism of 1988 and my response of 1993, then his criticism of 1991, to which I here respond for the first time in print.

It is this dialogue with my critics that is recorded in this section.

*Rodolphe Kasser and Martin Krause, Criticism of My Reports, 1984*

The final volume of *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*, entitled *Introduction*, began with a criticism of my publications about the discovery and trafficking that had been raised by Rodolphe Kasser and Martin Krause, who insisted that they be quoted in a first footnote as follows:  

> [Rodolphe Kasser and Martin Krause wish to make it known here that they have serious reasons to put in doubt the objective value of a number of important points of the Introduction that follows. They contest especially the detailed history of the discovery of the Coptic Gnostic manuscripts of Nag Hammadi resulting from the investigation of James M. Robinson. Kasser and Krause and others who were involved do not consider as assured anything more than the core of the story (the general location and approximate date of the discovery), the rest not having for them more than the value of stories and fables that one can collect in popular Egyptian circles thirty years after an event whose exceptional significance the protagonists could not at the time understand. R.K. and M.K.]

This quotation is then followed by my detailed response, here somewhat abbreviated:

> Jean Doresse did not identify and hence did not interview any of the principals involved prior to the material reaching the two main Cairo antiquities dealers Phokion J. Tano and Albert Eid, and hence his publication of the story a generation ago did not go beyond “the general location and approximate date of the discovery.” Yet his story has become familiar over the past generation and hence gained general acceptance without any effort to verify it prior to my investigations.

---


I then list quotations from and bibliographical references to Kasser and Krause, where they repeat as factual the rumors Doresse had reported, some of which had by then proven to be inaccurate:

For example, Rodolphe Kasser, “Les manuscrits de Nagʾ Hammâdi: Faits, documents, problèmes,” RThPh, 3rd series, 9 (1959), 358: “Selon l’enquête menée sur place par M. Doresse, la découverte fut faite vers 1945, au pied d’une montagne de Haute-Égypte, le Djebel et-Târif, à une centaine de kilomètres au nord de Louxor, sur la rive droite du Nil, aux environs du hameau de Hamra-Doum, au nord-est de Nagʾ Hammâdi, près des sites anciens de Phbôou et Khénéboskion ... Quand les fellahs de Hamra-Doum eurent extrait ces documents de la jarre où ils les avaient trouvées, enfouis dans le sol, ils les vendirent à des trafiquants, qui les apportèrent au Caire. Là, ils passèrent de main en main, et, finalement, quelques folios aboutirent au Musée Copte ...”

This quotation from Kasser, when translated, is as follows:

According to the inquiry conducted on the site by Doresse, the discovery was made around 1945, at the foot of a mountain of Upper Egypt, the Djebel et-Târif, a hundred kilometers north of Luxor, on the right bank of the Nile, near the hamlet of Hamra-Doum, north-east of Nagʾ Hammâdi, near the ancient sites of Phbôou and Khénéboskion ... When the fellahin of Hamra-Doum had extracted these documents from the jar where they had found them, buried in the soil, they sold them to traffickers, who carried them to Cairo. There, they passed from hand to hand, and, finally, some folios ended up in the Coptic Museum ...

Yet this quotation from Kasser is inaccurate: The peasants of Ḥamrah Dūm did not find the jar and extract the documents to sell to traffickers, since this was done by Muḥammad ‘Ali and his brothers from al-Qaṣr.

My response in footnote 1 then continues with a quotation from Martin Krause and Pahor Labib:


This quotation from Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, when translated, is as follows:

About 15 years have passed since in 1945 or 1946 fellahin found in a clay jar at the foot of the Gebel et-Tarif at Nagʾ Hammadi, near old Chenoboskion, 13 old papyrus books.

Then I continue critically:
Yet such reports by Cairo dealers should be considered an inadequate basis for methodically and critically established statements of fact.

Indeed, the information provided so confidently by Kasser and Krause came ultimately from Phokion Tano and Albert Eid, even if mediated through Abbot Étienne Drioton, Togo Mina, and Jean Doresse, whose two-day trip to Nag Hammadi on 26–27 January 1950 did not add to the information he had obtained from these Cairo dealers (see Part 4 above).

This then is followed by quotations from and bibliographical references to Kasser and Krause nonetheless affirming that such reports by Cairo dealers are not trustworthy.

Next I quote a publication by the Bibliothèque Bodmer reaffirming the reliability of information concerning the provenience of the Bodmer Papyri, on the grounds that the antiquities dealer made his confession to Kasser, information that Kasser passed on as reliable.

My assessment continued:

Fortunately the dealer (in this case also Tano) had provided Kasser with basically accurate information, as he did also to Doresse. But such a confirmation of the validity of these reports is dependent on the methodical investigations I have made of the two discoveries [the Nag Hammadi Codices and the Bodmer Papyri] in interviews with the discoverers and middlemen, especially during visits to Nag Hammadi on 3 iii 66; 23 iv 66; 18–21 xi 74; 11–13 i, 10–18 ix, 25 xi–20 xii 75; 30 xi–6 xii, 18–30 xii 76; 5–24 i 78; 3–11 i and 15–20 xii 80. Village rumor and second-hand information (“stories and fables that one can collect in popular Egyptian circles thirty years after an event”) are of course not only imprecise but also quite unreliable. Fortunately, most of the principals are still alive and quite willing to be interviewed: The two brothers primarily responsible for the discovery, Muhammad ‘Ali and Abū al-Majd, sons of ‘Ali Khalīfah of the al-Sammān tribe in [4] al-Qaṣr; the Guard posted by the Department of Antiquities at the site at the time of the discovery, ‘Abd al-Majīd Muḥammad Badārī, now living in retirement in Qinā; and most of the middlemen who took the material to Cairo: Nabīh Masʿūd Iskārūs, formerly a lawyer, now a goldsmith in Nag Hammadi (Codex I), Yannī Buqṭur, a shop-keeper of produce in Cairo (Codex III), Rāghib Andarāwus al-Qiss ‘Abd al-Sayyid, a retired parochial school teacher and public school administrator in Qinā (Codex III), Zaki Baştā, formerly part-owner of a movie theater and retired antiquities dealer in Qinā (Codices II and VII), and Bahīj ‘Alī Muḥammad Ādam, a one-eyed villager in al-Qaṣr (Codices II, VII and most of the others). Thus it has been possible to reconstruct the events in more than the general way that Jean Doresse did, and in various regards to clarify, confirm, make more precise, and even rectify details, by coordinating information they supplied both with the published and unpublished reports of Doresse (who commends the presentation that follows as ‘remarquablement net et concentré’ [‘remarkably clear and concentrated’]), and with public records, such as
the Acquisitions Registry at the Coptic Museum, the Registry of Deaths in the Nag Hammadi Real Estate Taxation Office, the files of the Director Emeritus C.A. Meier of the Jung Institute, the administrative files of the Library of the University of Michigan, and the Archives of the Bollingen Foundation (most of which documentation is now available to the public in the Nag Hammadi Archives of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity), not to speak of data provided by European scholars who have been directly involved, such as Charles Kuentz, Director of the French Institute in Cairo at the time, Prof. François Daumas of the University of Montpellier, Prof. Ludwig Keimer of Cairo, Father B. Couroyer of the École biblique in Jerusalem, and Prof. Jacques Schwartz of the University of Strasbourg. For example, the Acquisitions Registry lists the full name Rāghib Andarāwus al-Qiss ʿAbd al-Sayyid as the seller of Codex III; he was tracked down to his home in Qinā and interviewed, confirming in detail his involvement and providing leads to the others involved. They were tracked down in Qinā, al-Qaṣr, Nag Hammadi and Cairo and interviewed. They in turn confirmed Rāghib’s involvement as well as their own. This methodical and critical investigation is what history is made of, not fable. Like scientific experiment, it can be repeated, and unless that is done with contrary results, it is unscientific to deny the validity of the result attained thus far. Rāghib and Abrām Bibāwī, the usual translator for Muḥammad ʿAlī, reported publicly on the discovery and marketing of the codices on 10 xii 76 at the second meeting of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices during the First International Congress of Coptology in Cairo, at which time a period of cross-examining was provided without their reports being put in question [both Kasser and Krause being present]. See James M. Robinson, “The Discovering and Marketing of Coptic Manuscripts: The Nag Hammadi Codices and the Bodmer Papyri,” Mortals and Pharaohs: Studies presented in honorem Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, Boreas: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis: Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations, 14, 1984.

By now, a generation later, these principals whom I interviewed have no doubt all passed away. Since no one carried on interviews subsequent to mine that were ever published, what I here publish is no doubt all that can be known of the discovery and trafficking of the Nag Hammadi codices (see Parts 2 and 3 above).

Jean Doresse, Criticism of My Reports, 1988

Doresse later validated his original presentation of the discovery by seeking to discredit my much more detailed presentations:

---


AROUND THE JAR WITH THE MANUSCRIPTS

It is natural that one wanted to know everything about the site and the conditions of the discovery, with, on the part of certain curious people, the secret hope of finding forgotten debris. Was there not even a time when particularly sly traffickers tried, so as better to sell some papyrus, to make one believe that it came from Khénoboskion! … How many people passed, after my first inspections, among the peasants of Hamra-Doum (not counting the representatives of the Department of Antiquities, the local police, the merchants of antiquities from Cairo, who would have lost face if they had not been able to obtain there some pretended secret). Should one not have opened there a Book of Gold, where these visitors could sign and leave their impressions! Since then, to find there whatever there might be of something forgotten is all the less likely, since, with the passage of the years, even the least peasant of the locality had heard so much talk of this discovery (even though at its time it was veiled in mystery and silence) that he would think he almost participated in it and boast of it, if he finds there some advantage.

The archaeologist who lives long enough in Egypt for his activity to awaken the interest of the population knows with what patience it is necessary to feign credulity and listen daily to a thousand confidences about hidden monuments, marvelous manuscripts, and often to yield to improbable traces in the villages and as far as the full desert, only to see one offered there, all for the best, only pitiful fakes. This exhausting game—he knows it—will lead him, once in a thousand, to discover something that is valid, even extraordinary, which is generally not what they wanted to show him. It is a
game of hazard. Robinson believes that he has found in the place itself some personages whose tongues would suddenly have been loosened? It is both possible and unverifiable. The investigation that he carried on in the place itself in the first versions that he gave of it call to mind for us Hercule Poirot in the Egyptian tomb of Men-Her-Re (*Poirot Investigates*). Agatha Christie knew admirably Egypt and its mirages. Robinson has imparted the wisdom of his revelations on pp. 1–4 (in a long note) of his *Introduction* to the large Facsimile Edition (1984).

Doressé’s investigations at Hamra Dom, on 26–27 January 1950, were more than four years after the discovery. Hence most of what he thinks local legend had built ‘with the passage of the years,’ so as to discredit my investigations in 1966–1980, would have already taken place in those first four years. As Doressé himself commented:221

But all that remained intact was sold, for three Egyptian Pounds (3,000 francs), and no one has since thought any more any more about it.

It was only later that the outside world of scholarship became excited enough about the discovery to talk about it on all sides, but this timing cannot be projected back on the illiterate peasants who lived at the scene, by which time the story would have died down.

Doressé’s doubt that by the time of my investigations, ‘some personages whose tongues would suddenly have been loosened,’ does not take into account the reason that they had indeed gradually loosened over a generation: There was no longer a risk of being arrested for illegal excavation, or for trading in illicit antiquities, if they told of their involvement. As Doressé himself had observed (see Part 4 above), “the presence of soldiers hardly

---


Mais tout ce qui restait d’intact a été vendu, pour trois Livres égyptiennes (trois mille francs) et personne, depuis, ne s’en est plus soucié.

The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 134; *The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts*, 105.
stimulates the inhabitants to give many details on a certain discovery of manuscripts that I pretend to be unaware of." By my time, they often did so, even in the presence of the Inspector from the Department of Antiquities for the Nag Hammadi region who was assigned to accompany us.

There is however one bit of misinformation I published in 1975, though only as a possible alternative to the standard view. This was done when the search for the discoverer had only begun, but the discoverer himself had not been located and interviewed. I had received a vague report to the effect that he was of the al-Sammān clan of al-QAṣr, and had been involved in a blood vengeance feud that caused him to take refuge in a cave, where he came upon the codices. That published report read:222

The codex published in this volume is part of a collection of twelve codices plus one tractate apparently found late in 1945 by peasants seeking sebakh or, from other reports, by El Samman, a blood avenger of his father’s murder who had taken refuge in the caves, some 10 km. northeast of Nag Hammadi in a jar buried in a cemetery or hidden in a cave near the village of Hamra Dom at the foot or in the face of the cliff of the Gebel et-Tarif.

Another published report that was somewhat more detailed was also inaccurate:223

The local tradition near the site of the find reflects a unity of the library in terms of a single finder: El Samman (deceased) had fled to the caves in the hills on avenging the murder of his father, and came upon the codices in a jar buried in a tomb.

Once Muḥammad ʿAlī Khalīfah al-Sammān had been located and repeatedly interviewed, it became clear that more nearly the reverse was true: His involvement in avenging the murder of his father meant that he could not return to the cliff, fearing the family of the person he had murdered, since it was a family from Ḥamrah Dūm at the foot of the cliff. Hence rather than taking refuge in a cave, he avoided returning to the caves at the Jabal al-Ṭārif, until I was finally able to persuade him to show me there the site of the discovery (see Part 2 above).

Another such minor bit of misinformation published in the same place was the assumption that the manuscripts that were for a time in Dishnā were the Nag Hammadi codices:

Local bedouin report the find consisted of eight books, and eight codices were once in the hands of Abouna Makarios and his son Tanios of Dechneh (both deceased).

Hence I made reference there to some of the Nag Hammadi codices in the Tano collection coming ‘presumably from Dechneh,’ whereas in reality it was the Bodmer Papyri that were from Dishnā. I have rectified this mistake already in 1993 (see below).


Rodolphe Kasser made quite similar criticisms about my report on the Bodmer Papyri, criticisms which he published in an Italian journal, to which I responded in some detail:

It has taken more than a generation to establish the provenience of the Bodmer Papyri, the approximate extent of their contents beyond the holdings of the _Bibliothèque Bodmer_, and the details of their discovery and marketing. The course of this development can be traced as follows: ...

Instead, in a recent article, “Status quaestionis 1988 sulla presunta origine dei cosiddetti Papiri Bodmer,” _Aegyptus: Rivista italiana di egittologia e papirologia_ 68:1–2 (1988), 191–194, especially p. 192 and n. 9, [37] Kasser has maintained that my investigations were based on no more than village ‘rumor’ rendered irrelevant by the passing of 25 years. Though this criticism is to be dismissed as simply not accurate, it does serve to indicate that it would be relevant to publish the sources of the information presented above ...

My own investigation began as part of my efforts to track down the discoverers and middlemen of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Jean Doresse had referred to a priest he thought had seen the Nag Hammadi codices, Abūnā Dāʾūd, whom I found after church on 20 November 1974 at the Deir al-Malāk where he had officiated, near al-Qaṣr not far from Nag Hammadi. Another priest there, to whom he introduced me, mentioned that the discovered codices had been for a time in the possession of a Dishnā priest named Manqaryūs and his son Tānyūs. I added this secondarily to my essay “On the Codicology of the Nag Hammadi Codices,” _Les Textes de Nag Hammadi: Colloque du Centre d’Histoire des Religions (Strasbourg, 23–25 octobre 1974)_ , ed. by Jacques-É. Ménard (Nag Hammadi Studies 7; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), p. 16, on the assumption that it had to do with the Nag Hammadi Codices.

---


It was in the process of following up this lead that I interviewed the Inspector for Agriculture of the Dishnā Governate, Isḥāq Ayyūb Isḥāq, who told me about what he referred to as the Dishnā Papers. He gave me on 12 September 1975 the name of an antiquities dealer in Alexandria, Tawfīq Saʿd, who, he said, had acquired some of them. On 30 December 1975, his son, a jeweler in Alexandria, Émile Tawfīq Saʿd, showed me pictures of antiquities his deceased father had sold. He even let me borrow the three pictures that had to do with manuscripts, which were soon identified as leaves of P. Bodmer XXIV (with the help of Albert Pietersma) and XL (with the help of Marvin W. Meyer and Hans Quecke). …

These investigations ultimately located the discoverer, Ḥasan Muḥammad al-Sammān, whom I interviewed at Abū Mānāʾ on 11 August 1981. During the interview someone from the back of the crowd called out that he too had been involved. I asked his name. He replied: ‘Abd al-ʿĀl ʿUmar, giving in the customary Arab way his and his father’s name. I acknowledged the validity of his claim by adding his grandfather’s name: al-ʿAbbādī, in this way incidentally accrediting myself as someone with the basic facts already in hand, which he then reported much as I had already heard more than once. Obviously in such repeated interviews there are minor fluctuations and contradictions, at times protestations of innocence and self-serving interpretations, but in the cross-examination procedure the basic facts were again and again confirmed. …

Written documentation, when available, has provided striking confirmation, such as the parish diary of the Franciscan Church near Nag Hammadi confirming that José O’Callaghan had been there “to look for papers” in 1964–1965, as Saʿīd Diryās Ḥabashī had maintained. Well after my investigations in Egypt had been completed, I located on 19 January 1984, stapled at ac. 1390 in the Accessions Book of the Chester Beatty Library, the typed note in Tano’s wooden English and unusual spelling that summarized the conclusions regarding the provenience to which my investigations had already led me.

I am heavily indebted to Father Louis Doutreleau, S.J., who has written me over a period of years (1976–1980), with authorization to publish, details of the acquisition process in Cairo, together with memoranda he wrote in Cairo at the time and photographs taken in Cairo of materials he examined there for Bodmer that later became Bodmer Papyri. Kasser’s repudiation of Father Doutreleau (whom he has never met) as too senile to be taken seriously is valid neither in terms of his age nor in terms of his detailed, intelligent letters and the earlier records he has supplied. I called to Kasser’s attention a doctorate honoris causa Father Doutreleau had recently received from the...
University of Cologne. When I visited Father Doutreleau at the offices of Sources Chrétiennes at Lyon on 26 May 1992, he took satisfaction in pointing out a second honorary doctorate framed and hung on his wall. ...

[38] In his article on the Bodmer Papyri in The Coptic Encyclopaedia (New York: Macmillan, etc., 1991) 8.48–53, esp. p. 49, Kasser has summarized his criticism of my results:

Thus, there are nineteen [!] codices if one considers only the reliable information gathered by the Bodmer Foundation at the time the Bodmer papyri came to be included in the library. There are some scholars who, on the basis of much later research (some thirty years after the presumed date of discovery of the Bodmer papyri), think that they can also include in the Bodmer [39] papyri various other famous manuscripts such as the P. Palau-Ribes from Barcelona (the Gospels of Mark, Luke, and John in Sahidic Coptic, edited by H. Quecke), and, above all, various letters of Pachomius, one of which is preserved in the Bodmer Foundation but with nothing to indicate that it might be part of the Bodmer papyri. Their suggestion is that the actual library of the famous Monastery of Saint Pachomius at Fāw al-Qībli has been rediscovered. This hypothesis is certainly very tempting, but the reliable information referred to above tends to weaken rather than strengthen it.

Actually, information originally available to the Bibliothèque Bodmer seems to have been lost from sight. On 26 July 1956 Father Doutreleau had written to Victor Martin [editor, with Rodolphe Kasser, of Bodmer Papyri]:

It is quite certain that this find of some thirty [!] codices (in the region of Nag Hammadi, like the Gnostic papyri) cannot remain the act of a single individual.

If Kasser can identify only 19 at the Bibliothèque Bodmer, where does he assume the others are to be found? Apparently he was simply unaware of some of the “reliable information gathered by the Bodmer Foundation at the time the Bodmer papyri came to be included in the library,” such as the correspondence of which Doutreleau gave me a copy. ...

It is quite arbitrary to limit one's information about the provenience and the contents of the discovery to that of the Bibliothèque Bodmer. The amount of fragments in one repository that belong to codices in another link the materials in Barcelona, Cologne, Dublin and Mississippi just as firmly with the materials in the Bibliothèque Bodmer as does Kasser’s comment (p. 49) that ‘not a single shred belonging to the Gnostic library [of Nag Hammadi] has been found among the Bodmer papyri and vice versa’ effectively serves to indicate that we have to do with two quite distinct discoveries. The reasoning is the same, and hence consistent conclusions should be drawn in both cases.

Actually, Kasser’s list of 19 items does include two not represented in the Bibliothèque Bodmer ..., precisely because Bodmer acquired fragments of material in Barcelona and Mississippi and was kind enough to turn them over
to the repository that held the bulk of the codex. Since Sir Chester acquired fragments from Tano belonging to codices acquired by Bodmer, it would be reasonable to assume other acquisitions by Sir Chester acquired at the same time from Tano should, at least as a working hypothesis, be considered part of the same discovery. This assumption has been confirmed by a note from Tano in the Book of Accessions in the Chester Beatty Library identifying one item (ac. 1390) as coming from Dishnā, with the conjecture that it was “from the Library of the Monastery.” When Bodmer’s assistant Mlle Bongard was later permitted to sort through Tano’s fragments for vestiges of Bodmer’s acquisitions, it was a matter of course that Bodmer made available to Sir Chester those that he did not identify as belonging to his acquisitions, just as he gave to Barcelona and Mississippi fragments of their acquisitions he had unknowingly acquired.

Father Doutreleau emphasized to me on my visit with him in Lyon on 26 May 1992 that Martin Bodmer and Mlle Bongard knew hardly anything about the discovery and middlemen, and that the little they knew they had learned from him. Kasser’s ‘reliable information’ is thus a second-hand version of the information I received first-hand from Doutreleau and the Copts who had been directly involved.

To discredit such research as “some thirty years after the presumed date of the discovery” is neither accurate nor relevant. The discovery in 1952 preceded by 22 years my investigations which began in 1974, which compares not too unfavorably with the 19 years that elapsed before Tano confided in Kasser information about the provenience that Kasser took at face value. Since my research included interviews with the principals, made use of the notes Father Doutreleau made at the time of the acquisitions, and has been confirmed by written records where available, it is hard to see how the presentation by Kasser, based on none of these sources, has a higher claim to be accurate. It is not as if he had retraced my steps and come to different conclusions; he has simply used the authority implicit in his status as an editor of the material at the Bibliothèque Bodmer to assert his view to be correct, as if he did not have to give the reasons for his claims.

In the case of P. Palau Ribes 181–183, it was put in last place in my Inventory, as being least certain. Hans Quecke has expressed skepticism to me in view of the considerably better condition of this codex compared to that of the Bodmer Papyri. Kasser may hence be right that it is from a different provenience. But his [40] negative conclusion is reached without considering the information I received from the parish diary of the Franciscan Church near Dishnā, to the effect that José O’Callaghan, who acquired the materials for the Palau Ribes collection, was actively searching in 1964–1965 for papers in the Dishnā region, and from Sa’īd Diryās of Dishnā to the effect that O’Callaghan had obtained some material from the local Dishnā priest. When I wrote O’Callaghan to inquire if he had secured any Nag Hammadi material (which was my interest at the time), he replied that he had not, though he might have secured something from the same provenience as the Bodmer
papyri. Of course O’Callaghan may have had something other than P. Palau Ribes 181–183 in mind. And of course these reports can be discredited, if one can establish reasons to do so. However they should not simply be dismissed out of hand, but rather should be investigated as to whether there may be some truth in them. Kasser was apparently unaware of them.

To postulate an independent discovery of the archival copies of letters from Abbots of the Pachomian Monastery Order,229 which then by pure coincidence passed through the same canals to reach the same European repositories as those which obtained Dishnā Papers at about the same time, is of course theoretically possible, but hardly probable. After all, the Coptic and Greek Pachomian letters had been completely unattested for 1500 years. Riyāḍ’s report that Tano told him that the small rolls the size of a finger, among the manuscripts Riyāḍ had for sale, were letters, seems to confirm the converse probability that the Pachomian materials belong with the Dishna Papers Riyāḍ [Jirjis Fām, who later had the Codex Tchacos containing The Gospel of Judas] was trafficking.230

Part of the difficulty in carrying on such a discussion is that Kasser’s opinion is based on undocumented claims. He maintains that “the reliable information referred to above tends to weaken rather than strengthen” the view that one has to do with the archival remains of a Pachomian monastic library. But he does not provide that information for consideration. Michel Testuz, Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliothèque Bodmer, 1959), p. 9, speculated: “The content of this anthology shows that the book was produced by Christians of Egypt, probably on the order of a well-to-do member of their community, who intended it for his own library.” Such pure speculation is not ‘reliable information’; if there is such, it should be made public.

The Methodological Problem: Obtaining Verifiable Information

The methodological problem with regard to tracing the discovery and trafficking of the Nag Hammadi codices, both in the case of Doresse and in the case of Kasser, has been that their reports depended only on them, since there were no outside collaborators who could verify their reports. Hence I attempted to introduce such a verifiable method. It is for this reason that my undocumented report, “The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices,” in an issue of Biblical Archeologist popularizing the Nag Hammadi discovery,231 was accompanied by its unabridged scholarly publication with documen-


the discovery and trafficking of the Nag Hammadi codices presented at the International Colloquium on the Texts of Nag Hammadi in Que\textsuperscript{1}bec\textsuperscript{232} it concluded with a discussion of just this problem:\textsuperscript{233}

If thus the discovery had become public and the history of research had begun, the death of Togo Mina in October 1949 and the resultant decline in Dore\textsuperscript{s}e\textquoteright s r\textdeg;le meant that the trail grew cold and the scent was lost regarding the story of the discoverers and the middlemen of the Nag Hammadi codices. This is evident from the part of Keimer's report of 1950 concerning Codex III:

A Coptic orthodox priest accompanied by an Arab (Mussulman) sold one book to the Coptic Museum (the priest had shown this book first of all to Dr. Georgy Sobhy). The Coptic Museum paid only a pittance (200 £\textsuperscript{[57]}).

Yet the Registry of Acquisitions of the Coptic Museum has the following entry written in Arabic:

4851. Papyri, manuscript in Coptic, Sahidic, about Fourth Century, with cover. Seventy leaves. Most of them are damaged and incomplete; some of them are very small fragments. Price: 250 £. Purchased from R\textsuperscript{a}ghib Effendi Andar\textsuperscript{a}wus al-Qiss 'Abd al-Sayyid. Received 4 October 1946. Archive: 5/13.

Keimer's report does not yet reflect the more recent uncertainty of the staff of the Coptic Museum as to whether the priestly name in the Registry, al-Qiss 'Abd al-Sayyid, is to be understood as R\textsuperscript{a}ghib's grandfather (which in Arabic names stands in third place after one's own personal name and that of one's father), or as his companion, of which there has remained a vestige of a memory. For the entry in the Registry does not even seem to have been consulted. Keimer's assumption that the seller was a Muslim ignored the recorded fact that his father's name was Andrew. Keimer's uncertainty and inaccuracy as to the purchase price again makes it clear that the entry in the Registry had not been used. Hence Keimer's reference to a priest simply reflects the oral transmission of the memory of the presence of al-Qummu\textsuperscript{s} Ish\textsuperscript{a}q. Thus the crucial lead in the Registry of Acquisitions lay undetected for a generation.

Abr\textsuperscript{a}m Bib\textsuperscript{a}w\textsuperscript{i}, then Sub-Principal of the Boys' Preparatory School of Nag Hammadi (later Principal of the Preparatory School near the Nag Hammadi barrage), when asked on 28 August 1975 in Cairo if the name R\textsuperscript{a}ghib Effendi Andar\textsuperscript{a}wus al-Qiss 'Abd al-Sayyid was familiar, responded that he, like most Copts of his age in the Nag Hammadi region, had studied under R\textsuperscript{a}ghib

\textsuperscript{232} http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/edm/ref/collection/nha/id/1417.

Effendi. It was then Abrām Bibāwī who on 18 September 1975 provided Rāghib with the personal assurance necessary for him to be willing to tell his story in his home in Qinā. Abrām Bibāwī had also volunteered the information that the teacher of English in his school, Wādī‘ Faltā‘us ‘Abd al Masīḥ, lived in al-Qaṣr and had there a relative, Munīr al-Qiss Basīlyūs ‘Abd al-Masīḥ, Secretary to the Criminal Investigation Agent at the Nag Hammadi Court House, who knew the discoverer. Munīr in fact arranged the first interview with Muḥammad ʿAlī on 16 September 1975. It is primarily through the intelligent, energetic and loyal assistance of these local Copts that the story has been unraveled.

On 10 December 1976, at the second meeting of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices held in the context of the First International Congress of Coptology in Cairo, there was a [58] ‘Report on the Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices.’ Abrām Bibāwī narrated the story told in his presence by Muḥammad ‘Alī (whom Gamal Mokhtar, Chairman of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization, did not wish to honor with an invitation), after which Rāghib narrated the story of the transmission of Codex III to the Coptic Museum, followed by questions from the floor.

One important dimension of the status of the story of the Nag Hammadi codices from the cliff to Cairo is the quality of repeatability inherent in the scientific experiment, in that the persons interviewed are still accessible for others who may wish to repeat and advance the investigative process.

Similarly, in an essay published in a volume in honor of Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, the Swedish representative on the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, I began with a brief summary of the procedure by which the discoverer and the site of the discovery were identified, a procedure in which he himself was involved:

On 16 September 1975 Muḥammad ʿAlī, the discoverer of the Nag Hammadi Codices, was first interviewed at al-Qaṣr (Chenoboskeia). He gave a very garbled version of the site of the discovery, partly because interrogation about which cave the jar was in produced responses to the effect it was not in a cave, which seemed hard to believe. He was persuaded to ride by the cliff in a government jeep at dusk the next day, since it was Ramadan and the Muslims

of the hamlet Ḥamrah Dūm next to the cliff would be at home waiting for sunset to gorge themselves (he had not been at the site for a generation because it was off limits to him in the blood feud of al-Ẓār against Ḥamrah Dūm, in which he was very personally involved). It was drawn to his attention at the cliff that the front wall of the tomb of Thauti (T 73), which had long since been dynamited off to sell on the antiquities market, had, since he was there last, been cemented over except for an iron gate, so that if that cave were the site he might not recognize it. He hurriedly conceded this was the site. The next day Rāghib Effendi Andarāwus al-Qiss ‘Abd al-Sayyid, as his name was recorded as the seller of Codex III in the Acquisitions Registry of the Coptic Museum, was first interviewed in Qinā, from which contact the story of the marketing of the codices began to emerge.

From 27 November through 4 December 1975 Torgny Säve-Södebergh, Field Director of the First Season of the Nag Hammadi Excavation of which I was Principal American Investigator, supervised excavation and transcribed hieroglyphs at the Jabal al-Ṭārif during the work day, which consisted in part in excavating various such ill-founded rumors as to the site of the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Then after the work day was over he often joined me in my ongoing inquiries into details of the discovery and marketing of the codices. On 30 November he was present at the first visit to the home of Muḥammad ‘Alī, where we met his mother, Umm Aḥmad, who has attained a kind of notoriety for having burnt some of the discovery in the oven to cook bread in the patio. He was also present on 3 December when ʿAbd al-Naẓīr ʿĀṣīn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm of Ḥamrah Dūm pointed out the site of the discovery, that is to say, the site of the clandestine excavation by the peasants of Ḥamrah Dūm, in which ʿAbd al-Naẓīr may well have been personally involved. This location coincided with that identified by Jean Doresse in a photograph labeled “site of the discovery,” and belatedly by Muḥammad ‘Alī himself. Only on 11 December, after Säve-Söderbergh’s departure, did the retired Guard posted by the Department of Antiquities at the site supply the name of Bahīj ʿAlī, who had acquired most of the codices from the family of Muḥammad ‘Alī. Bahīj ʿAlī was interviewed that same day, and identified Nashīd Bīsādah and Fikrī Jabrāʾīl as other middlemen. That very full day was climaxed with a clandestine return by foot with Muḥammad ‘Alī to the site of the discovery, after Muhammad ‘Alī had been confronted with the fact that the place he had indicated on 16 September had been excavated with no confirming evidence found. To this he replied that he had accommodated what he took to be our suggestion out of fear, but that he would show us the actual site. When left to his own devices to locate the site, it did in fact coincide with that of Doresse’s picture and of ʿAbd al-Naẓīr.

Thus it was methodological progress that made this report of the discovery and trafficking a more reliable record of what actually took place than what had been previously available.
CHAPTER TWO

THE FRENCH LEADERSHIP
IN EARLY NAG Hammadi STUDIES 1946–1953

1. The French Leadership in Egypt since Napoleon

After his conquest of Egypt, Napoleon left behind a large staff of scholars, who continued their work long after the British had taken over and Napoleon was gone. Hence Egyptology began with the massive Napoleonic multi-volume Description de l’Égypte, ou Recueil des observations et des recherches qui ont été faites en Égypte pendant l’expédition de l’armée française, publié par les ordres de sa majesté l’Empereur Napoléon le Grand.1 The total work appeared in 29 volumes from 1809–1828. Edward W. Said evaluated it in retrospect as follows:2

Yet the military failure of Napoleon’s occupation of Egypt did not also destroy the fertility of its over-all projection for Egypt or the rest of the Orient. ... The Description became the master type of all further efforts to bring the Orient closer to Europe, thereafter to absorb it entirely and—centrally important—to cancel, or at least subdue and reduce, its strangeness and, in the case of Islam, its hostility. For the Islamic Orient would henceforth appear as a category denoting the Orientalist’s power and not the Islamic people as humans nor their history as history. ...

One might say that the Description is just a scientific, and therefore objective, account of Egypt in the early nineteenth century ... Napoleon’s is an ‘objective’ account from the standpoint of someone powerful trying to hold Egypt within the French imperial orbit ...

---

1 This is the title of a volume given to me by the widow of the papyrologist John W.B. Barns, who was the first to examine the cartonnage for us. The subtitle read “État moderne, Tome premier.” It was published in 1809 “à Paris de l’Imprimerie impériale.” See now the updated one-volume work, Description de l’Égypte ou recueil des observations et des recherches qui ont été faites en Égypte pendant l’expédition de l’Armée française publié sous les ordres de Napoléon Bonaparte, with a Préface by Sydney H. Aufrère (Tours, France: Bibliothèque de l’Image, 2001), as well as the English volume by Franco Serino, Description de l’Égypte: Napoleon’s Expedition and the Rediscovery of Ancient Egypt (Cairo, New York, and London: The American University in Cairo Press, 2004).

The Description was followed by the first great French Egyptologists, Jean François Champollion (1790–1832), the decipherer of the hieroglyphs, and François Auguste Ferdinand Mariette (1821–1881), the founder of the Service des Antiquités, as well as by the Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire. Ever since, Egyptian archaeology has been led by French scholarship. At the time of the Nag Hammadi discovery, the Directeur général of the Service des Antiquités was a French Abbé, Chanoine Étienne Drioton (1889–1960), and the Directeur du Musée Copte a Copt who had studied under him in Paris, Togo Mina (1906–1949). Furthermore, the présence française gave the tone to international Cairene society on until Nasser. Still today, in Egypt the transliteration of Arabic names usually follows the French system.

Thus it is not surprising that the first contacts of scholarship with the Nag Hammadi Codices were French (see Chapter 1, Part 3 above): The antiquities dealer at the very British Shepherds Hotel was Mansoor Abdel Sayed Mansoor—he used as the sign on his shop this French transliteration as a matter of course. He telephoned to Jacques Schwartz at the Institut français d’archéologie orientale late in March, 1946, inviting him to come and see what can today be identified as Codices II and VII, both on consignment in his shop. The next morning Schwartz came with the Institute’s Director, Charles Kuentz, to carry on (unsuccessful) negotiations for their purchase. Schwartz reported to Doresse at the time:

The name of Seth recurred there rather frequently [in titles: Codex VII, 1: 1, 1; 2: 70, 12; 5: 118, 25; 120, 17, 19; 124, 15; 127, 27]. In one there occurred the title Apocalypse of Peter [Codex VII]. The leather cover of another carried the image of a serpent [Codex II].

These three traits misled Doresse into speculating that two or three codices had been seen, an opinion made public in a presentation that Henri-Charles Puech gave to the French Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (see Chapter 2, Part 3 below). Doresse himself published the view that three codices had been seen. Two traffickers, Zakī Basṭā and Bahīj ‘Ali, whom I

---

4 Schwartz’ report to Doresse was published by Henri-Charles Puech and Jean Doresse, “Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Égypte,” CRAI 1948 (1948): 87–95: 89:

Le nom de Seth y revenait assez souvent; dans l’un se lisait le titre: Apocalypse de Pierre; la couverture de cuir d’un autre portait l’image d’un serpent.

tracked down in Upper Egypt, set the record straight: Together they came to Cairo, each with his one codex (see Chapter 1, Part 3 above).

Later in 1946, Albert Eid, a Levantine of Belgian citizenship, enlisted the help of a fellow-francophile, Père Georges Anawati, resident at the Cairo Institut Dominicain des Études Orientales, to secure a brilliant expertise on what turned out to be Codex I, from Père Bernard Couroyer, the Coptologist at the École Biblique et Archéologique Française housed in the Couvent Dominicain de St. Étienne in Jerusalem (see Chapter 1, Part 3 above). This French présence continued, quite naturally, in the persons of François Dau-
mas, Henri Corbin, and then Jean Doresse.

Things began to change in January 1951 with the appointment of a Berlin-trained German-speaking Copt as Director of the Coptic Museum, Pahor Labib, then the Egyptian coup d’ état of 23 July 1952 deposing King Farouk, followed by the breaking of diplomatic relations with France as a result of the Suez crisis later in 1952, all of which lead to the expulsion of the French head of the Service des Antiquités and the closing of the Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire for a time. Then the intervention of Beat von Fischer-Reichenbach, the Swiss Ambassador to Egypt, on behalf of the Jung Institute in Zürich (see Chapters 3 and 4 below), began the gradual internationalization of access to the Nag Hammadi codices.

2. Summary Records by Jean and Marianne Doresse

Jean Doresse was by far the most aggressive French scholar involved in Nag Hammadi studies in the first years, and hence of necessity any one else, such as his supervisor in Paris, Henri-Charles Puech, was almost completely dependent on him for the information one used. Doresse was also the source of much of the published information during these years. Hence the story of the Nag Hammadi codices was in large part his story. He provided the Nag Hammadi Archives with a curriculum vitae and a summary of his activities, and also produced reports that became necessary at the death of his main protagonist, Togo Mina, so as to make public documentation for the central rôle he had been accorded at the Coptic Museum during the administration of Togo Mina. He also provided his correspondence, especially copies of his letters to Puech, as well as Puech’s responses. (Puech himself provided no documentation for the Nag Hammadi Archives.)

Jean Doresse was ably assisted by his wife Marianne Doresse, who functioned in large part as a partner in his activities. She was also his public-relations agent, writing up for me each of his ‘missions’ to Egypt. She had
written regularly to her mother in Paris what was going on, week by week, and used these letters that her mother had saved to provide a very precise chronology, for example in the secondarily added endnotes to her reports, here inserted at the appropriate places between square brackets.

Thus there is considerable documentation from the Doresses in the Nag Hammadi Archives for the years of French leadership in Nag Hammadi studies. These reports are of course very tendentious, bypassing what others were doing and refuting the criticisms of Puech. But, in the absence of almost all other documentation, they are the source of most of the detailed information that is available. Their documentation hence begins this presentation. It is then followed by a critical analysis of what can be determined from all sources (see Parts 3–6 below). Thus a more balanced understanding of the French leadership during the early years emerges.

By quoting these reports provided by the Doresses in Part 2, it is unnecessary to repeat the French text again in footnotes when quoting from them in English translation in Parts 3–6, since each reference in the footnotes of Parts 3–6 back to Part 2 makes it possible to find there the original French. Similarly a footnote reference back to the location of the original quotation makes it unnecessary to repeat the French text of the lengthy letters from Puech to Doresse and to Quispel, as well as of other letters, when subsequently repeating the English translation. Even the lengthy excerpt from Ludwig Keimer’s report did not need to be quoted in French already in Chapter 1, Part 3, since it is quoted in full in Chapter 1, Part 4.

Jean Doresse: Summary Presentation of the Titles and Activities

Doresse provided for the Nag Hammadi Archives his curriculum vitae:

Jean DORESSE

(born 27 June 1917, at Champagne-Mouton, Charente)

Research Assistant at the C[entre] N[ational de la] R[echerche] S[cientifique]
[National Center of Scientific Research]

Summary Presentation of Titles and Activities

6 JEAN DORESSE

(né le 27 Juin 1917, à Champagne-Mouton, Charente)

Chargé de Recherches au C.N.R.S.

Exposé sommaire des Titres & Travaux.
Teacher’s License in Letters, 1940.


Diploma of the École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section of Religious Sciences, 1944 (“Les Chaînes coptes sur les Évangiles”).

Doctorate in Letters: “Les anciens monastères coptes de Moyenne-Égypte (du Gebel-et-Teir à Kôm-Ishgaou) d’après l’archéologie et l’hagiographie”; after having obtained the imprimatur in June 1968, this thesis was defended on 16 May 1970 before a jury consisting of Messrs J. Lassus (President). P. Lemerle (Director of the Dissertation), M. Malinine (Second Reader); J. Leclant, and Ant[oine] Guillaumont. The distinction ‘Very Honorable’ was awarded in unanimity.

HONORARY DISTINCTIONS

“The Sottas” prize, in Egyptology, awarded by the University of Paris, 1944.

--
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TITRES

Licence d’Enseignement ès-Lettres, 1940

Diplôme d’Études Supérieures de Lettres, 1941 (comme mémoire, une étude de papyrologie grecque: “Les métiers dans les archives de Zénon”).


Diplôme de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section des Sciences Religieuses, 1944 (“Les Chaînes coptes sur les Évangiles”).


8 Jean Doresse: Exposé sommaire des Titres & Travaux:

DISTINCTIONS HONORIFIQUES

Prix “Sottas,” d’Égyptologie, décerné par l’Université de Paris, 1944.


Corresponding Member of the Institute of Egypt, 1949.
Officer of the Order of the Star of Ethiopia, 1961.
Member of the Editorial Committee of the journal *Novum Testamentum*, in Leiden, since 1956.

**KNOWLEDGE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES**

*Ancient languages:* Latin, Greek, Egyptian hieroglyphs and Coptic, Arabic, Gueze, Old Slavonic, Classical Armenian.

*Modern languages:* reading, writing, and speaking: English; reading with fluency: German, Russian, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese.

**FUNCTIONS & MISSIONS**

*At the National Center of Scientific Research:* Entered the C[entre] N[ational de la] R[echerche] S[cientifique] as Research Assistant in October 1944; promoted to Agent of Research in 1954; at the sixth level of this rank since March 1969; inscribed on the aptitude list of the Mastery of Research since January 1969.

*Other Functions and Missions:*  

---
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---
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---
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---
Assistant at the Egyptian Department of the Museum of the Louvre: 1942–1947 (study and inventory of the Coptic collections; classification of the Greek and Coptic papyri of the Department).

Conference Assistant at the École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section of Religious Sciences: 

Free Conferences from 1944 to 1946; then Temporary Conferences from 1946 to 1949, attached to the Direction of Studies of H.Ch. Puech.

Subjects: Oriental Christian Literatures, 1) explanation of the Coptic Gnostic writings (*Pistis Sophia* and the *Books of Jéou*); 2) the Coptic *Synaxaria* (Arabic and Gueze redactions), and the hagiography of the Theban region.

Entrusted with a Mission at the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire (1 October to 31 December 1947). The preliminary exploration of the Coptic vestiges of the Theban region; the discovery of vestiges unknown until then of the Deir Gizâz, in the desert to the west of Qamoula; identification of these remains with those of Benhadab, the convent of Anba Samuel. The identification of the content of the first two Coptic Gnostic manuscripts from Khénoboskion; the preparation of the edition of the codex acquired by the Coptic Museum.

Entrusted with a Mission in Egypt by the Commission of Archaeological Excavations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs: Annual campaigns from October 1948 to February 1953.

---

Chrétiennes, 1) explication d’écrits gnostiques coptes (*Pistis Sophia* et *Livres de Jéou*); 2) les Synaxaires coptes (rédactions arabes et guèzes), et l’hagiographie de la région thébaine.

12 Jean Doresse: *Exposé sommaire des Titres & Travaux*: Chargé de Conférences à l’École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section des Sciences Religieuses:

Conférences libres de 1944 à 1946; puis Conférences Temporaires, de 1946 à 1949, rattachées à la Direction d’Études de M. H.Ch. PUECH. Sujets: Littératures Orientales Chrétiennes, 1) explication d’écrits gnostiques coptes (*Pistis Sophia* et *Livres de Jéou*); 2) les Synaxaires coptes (rédactions arabes et guèzes), et l’hagiographie de la région thébaine.
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Chargé de Mission à l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire (1er octobre / 31 décembre 1947). Exploration préliminaire des vestiges coptes de la région thébaine; reconnaissance des vestiges, jusqu’alors inconnus, du Deir-Gizâz, dans le désert à l’ouest de Qamoula; identification de ces restes avec ceux de Benhadab / couvent d’anba Samuel. Identification du contenu des deux premiers manuscrits gnostiques coptes provenant de Khénoboskion; préparation de l’édition du codex acquis par le Musée Copte.
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1948–1949: Eleven other codices from Khénoboskion are in turn identified: completely read, partially copied, they permit a complete identification of the writings that are contained there, a result, nevertheless, of which only the essential facts can be divulged immediately, since these manuscripts remain at the time private property; 2) the complete excavation of the vestiges of the Deir-Gizâz in the Theban desert, illustrating, by means of the documents thus discovered, the past existence (from the sixth to thirteenth century) of the convent of the Abbot Samuel, about which our studies on the Coptic Theban Synaxarion had, since 1946, revealed the hagiographic activity.

1949–1950: 1) The identification, near ancient Khénoboskion, of the site where the Gnostic codices already recovered were by chance unearthed; 2) the continuation of the study of Coptic vestiges of the Theban region, between Edfou and Nag-Hammadi; 3) the first study of the Coptic monasteries of Saint Anthony and of Saint Paul in the desert by the Red Sea.


1948–1949: onze autres codices provenant de Khénoboskion sont, à leur tour, identifiés: lus intégralement, copiés en partie, ils permettent une identification complète des écrits qui y sont contenus, résultat dont, toutefois, seuls les faits essentiels pourront être immédiatement divulgués, ces manuscrits restant, alors, propriété privée; 2) fouille intégrale des vestiges du Deir-Gizâz dans le désert thébain, illustrant, par les documents ainsi découverts, l’existence passé (du VIe au XIIe siècle) du couvent de l’abbé Samuel dont nos études sur le Synaxaire copte thébain avaient, dès 1946, révélé l’activité hagiographique.

1949–1950: 1) identification, près de l’ancienne Khénoboskion, du site où furent fortuitement exhumés les codices gnostiques déjà récupérés; 2) poursuite de l’étude des vestiges coptes de la région thébaine, entre Edfou et Nag-Hammadi; 3) première étude des monastères coptes de S. Antoine et de S. Paul au désert de la Mer Rouge.


1951–1952: 1) relevé photographique des peintures des monastères de S. Antoine et de S. Paul; recherche des documents historiques contenus dans leurs manuscrits; 2) seconde exploration en Moyenne-Égypte, particulièrement à Ouadi-Sarga, Apa-Macrobe, Abou-Fana, Shakalkil; 3) repérage, dans le désert thébain, des restes du “couvent de la source” mentionné par divers ostraca coptes; monastères d’Esné (inscriptions coptes relevées à Deir-el-Fachouri) et d’Edfou.

1952–1953: élaboration, avec le Dr. PAHOR LABIB, Directeur du Musée Copte, d’un programme pour la mise en état et l’édition de l’ensemble des codices gnostiques coptes de Khénoboskion.
1950–1951: 1) The beginning of the editing of Codex I [= Codex III] of the Coptic Museum of Cairo, whose printing is undertaken at the Imprimerie Nationale of Paris; 2) an architectural study of the monasteries of Saint Anthony and of Saint Paul; 3) an inventory of the monastic remains of Middle Egypt; 4) the discovery of a fragment of a codex on parchment containing an ancient redaction of the Coptic anaphora of Saint Basil (edited, subsequently, in the Bibliothèque de Le Muséon).

1951–1952: 1) A photographic record of the paintings of the monasteries of Saint Anthony and of Saint Paul; research on the historical documents contained in their manuscripts; 2) a second exploration in Middle Egypt, particularly at the Wadi Sarga, Apa-Macrobe, Abou-Fana, Shakalkil; 3) the restoring, in the Theban desert, of the remains of the ’convent of the well’ mentioned by various Coptic ostraca; the monasteries of Esné (Coptic inscriptions retrieved at Deir-el-Fachouri) and of Edfou.

1952–1953: The working out, with Dr. Pahor Labib, Director of the Coptic Museum, of a program to restore and edit the ensemble of the Coptic Gnostic codices of Khénoboskion.

Expert with the Imperial Ethiopian Government, the Archaeology Section of the Ethiopian Institute of Study and Research, Addis-Abeba, from February 1953 to August 1955, released from the C.N.R.S. at the request of the General Direction of Cultural Relations:

1953: Under the direction of J. Leclant and in collaboration with A. Caquot, the organization of the new archaeological service.

1954–1955: Doresse carries out, at the request of the Imperial Government, the functions of General Secretary of the Imperial Board of Antiquities, and conducts the research of the new Institute: excavations at Axoum (the sector of the grand steles, and the south-east sector, where three underground tombs that had not been tampered with were discovered); a survey at Yēha; the recovery, at Maqallé, of a group of ancient monuments (a statue of the Sabean type, a votive ‘scepter,’ bronze bowls of the Pharaonic type), then a survey of the ancient cites of the region of Atsbi/Dera, the origin of this find. The establishment of a collection of Axoumian coins and preparations for its publication.¹⁶

¹⁶ Jean Doresse: Exposé sommaire des Titres & Travaux:


1953: sous la direction de M. J. LECLANT et en collaboration avec M.A. CAQUOT, organisation du nouveau service archéologique.

1954–1955: M. DORESSE exerce, à la demande du Gouvernement Impérial, les fonctions de Secrétaire Général du Board Impérial des Antiquités et conduit les recherches
Member of the Publication Committee of the Gnostic manuscripts constituted by the Coptic Museum of Cairo, from 1955 on. Nevertheless, the affair of Suez will impede the realization of the systematic and complete publication that Dr. Pahor Labib had projected.\textsuperscript{17}

Sojourn, based on an invitation, at the Warburg Institute of the University of London, May to July 1961. Study of the Gnostic elements in the Greek magic literature. At the British Museum, study of the unpublished results of the British excavations at Wadi Sarga, whose publication was offered to us, and of unedited Coptic hagiographic texts.\textsuperscript{18}

Jean Doresse provided also a summary of his four seasons in Cairo, followed then by the fuller reports prepared by Marianne Doresse, who made use of her weekly letters written to her mother in Paris. All this was supplied to me for the scholarly record, a trust I seek to honor by their publication here:

\textit{Jean Doresse: Summary of the Work of 1947–1951}

Jean Doresse provided a general survey of his four seasons in Egypt, entitled “\textit{Summary of the work of 1947–1951}.”\textsuperscript{19} It serves to give an initial overview. (Omitted here is a purely archaeological section not having to do with the Nag Hammadi Codices, but having to do with various Coptic archaeological sites, work which provided the funding for the successive missions in Egypt and much later became the basis of Doresse’s doctoral dissertation.)

1947–1948: In the course of a mission of three months, carried out on the account of the Institut Français d’Archéologie, and having as its goal the study of different Theban monasteries, by chance I was, when passing via Cairo, put in the presence of a manuscript on papyrus purchased by Togo Mina for the

\begin{flushright}
\textit{du nouvel Institut: fouilles à Axoum (secteur des grandes stèles, et secteur sud-est où trois tombes souterraines inviolées sont découvertes); reconnaissances à Yéha; récupération, à Maqallé, d’un lot de monuments anciens (statue de type sabéen, “sceptre” votif, bols en bronze de type pharaonique), puis reconnaissance des sites antiques de la région d’Atsbi/Dera, origine de cette trouvaille. Établissement d’une collection de monnaies axoumites et préparatifs de sa publication.}
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{17} Jean Doresse: \textit{Exposé sommaire des Titres & Travaux:}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Membre du Comité de Publication des manuscrits gnostiques, constitué par le Musée Copte du Caire, à partir de 1955. Toutefois, l’affaire de Suez empêchera la réalisation de la publication systématique et complète que le Dr. PAHOR LABIB avait projetée.}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{18} Séjour, sur invitation, au Warburg Institute de l’Université de Londres, mai à juillet 1961. Études sur les éléments gnostiques dans la littérature magique grecque. Au British Museum, étude des résultats, inédits, des fouilles britanniques à Ouadi-Sarga, dont la publication nous est proposée, et de textes hagiographiques coptes inédits.

\textsuperscript{19} Jean Doresse, \textit{Résumé des travaux de 1947–1951}. 
Coptic Museum in 1946. Togo Mina asks me to repair the document and study it, whereupon I was able to recognize immediately five unpublished Gnostic texts. Togo Mina then offered for me to share with him the complete responsibility for editing this document. At my request, he agrees to associate in the edition, for the subsequent commentary, H.C. Puech. He asked in addition Prof. Walter Till, of Vienna, entrusted by the German Academy with the editing of the unpublished codex of Berlin [P.Berol. 8502], to contribute his assistance to our publication, in furnishing all the variants in the text that was at his disposal. The discovery of the content of the manuscript of the Coptic Museum by Togo Mina and myself was announced to the Egyptian press by the Ministry of Education on 11 January 1948. Following that, a communication was made to the Académie des Inscriptions [et Belles-Lettres] by Puech and myself on 20 February, and to the Institute of Egypt by Togo Mina on 8 March 1948. I published as early as July 1948 an analysis of three of the documents: “Trois livres gnostiques inédits.” A historical study of a fourth, the Secret Book of John [The Apocryphon of John], was presented by me to the Congress of Byzantine Studies of Brussels (August 1948), but the negotiations entered into for the purchase of the other manuscripts of Khénoboskion in the following months made considering any new publication to be inopportune for the time being.  

1948–1949: The first mission granted by the Commission des Fouilles [Archéologiques] was intended to permit the discovering of the remainder of the Gnostic library, a trace of which I had been partially able to discover already at the beginning of 1948. Put in the presence of the manuscripts in October,  

20 Jean Doresse, Résumé des travaux de 1947–1951:  

I could obtain, most of all, a quantity of photographs of them and of notes sufficient to preserve for us, in case they should disappear again, the passages that are the most valuable of each of the 44 new works that they provided. On the same occasion, a detailed expertise, established by me and countersigned by Étienne Drioton and Togo Mina, makes it possible, from January 1949 on, to present, quite confidentially, the discovery of the manuscripts to the committees of the Coptic Museum, to have them put under seal so as to avoid their possible disappearance, and to have their purchase finally undertaken by the Ministry of Education, under the most favorable conditions. Initiated on the basis of 65,000 £É, the negotiations, supported by the Committees of the Coptic Museum, had practically settled by July 1949 on the price of 40,000 £É proposed by His Excellency Ali Ayyoub, then Minister of Education. The illness of Togo Mina, then the fall of the Ministry, made it necessary to leave the matter in suspense. However I had already obtained simultaneously from Togo Mina and from the owner [feminine] of the papyri authorization to use partially my report as expert to announce in summary the content of the discovery to the Académie des Inscriptions [et Belles-Lettres] on 17 June 1949, a communication subsequently completed with various notes established on the basis of the same expertise.\footnote{Jean Doresse, Résumé des travaux de 1947–1951:}

1949–1950: The death of Togo Mina in October 1949 would, by leaving the Coptic Museum without a Director, impede resuming the purchase formalities, and even put in question the conditions of the edition that we had obtained for the first manuscript, and that had never been formalized in an official way, a certain disagreement having surfaced from the beginning between Togo Mina and H.C. Puech. The mission of 1949–1950 should hence first obtain

\footnote{Jean Doresse, Résumé des travaux de 1947–1951:}
the confirmation of the conditions for editing that were already envisaged by Togo Mina, conditions particularly important to firm up, since they would probably be useful in what followed for the twelve other collections of the same discovery. On the other hand it was necessary to push for the resumption of the negotiations entered into for the purchase of these latter documents. On the first point, a draft of a statute for the edition, found in the papers of Togo Mina and corresponding precisely to what he had expressed to various committees of the Museum, was recognized as valid both by the Egyptian authorities (including Drioton) and by the interested editors, except for H.C. Puech, who asked and still asks for additional advantages. (This statute anticipates in effect that the texts communicated to the editors cannot be utilized by them for personal publications before they achieve the publication itself of the texts in question.) As to the second point—the resumption of the negotiations for the purchase of the other codices—the Ministry, overworked with putting in action the new program of education, tried in vain to find a rapid solution for the problem of the directorship of the Coptic Museum, the absence of any functionary who is administratively competent delaying the accomplishment of every step or formality. One did arrive at a project to reorganize the Museum, a project whose implementation was however put off until October 1950.22

1950–1951: Continuing the mission of 1950, the present mission has made it possible to obtain almost all the hoped-for results. The Gnostic papyri, whose

---

purchase was in suspense, have been returned last February to the hands of Étienne Drioton. His Excellency Taha Hussein Pacha has committed himself, with the committees of the Coptic Museum, to complete their legal purchase in two months [actually completed only in 1955], and is working actively at it. The various questions of the Coptic Museum have been regulated to our advantage, thanks to the personal support of His Excellency Taha Hussein, by according to me a rôle in the various scientific activities that interest us, and in others as well. It seems certain that the publication of the whole of the Gnostic texts in the conditions hoped for by the Commission des Fouilles will be accepted when the time has come to undertake it. I have been able to continue the preparations for the edition in a way for it to appear rapidly, once the documents are legally able to be edited. No doubt we would even have the possibility of submitting to the printer, about next October, the content of the first manuscript of the Coptic Museum, if one no longer risks by an inopportune publication at that time making more trouble for the negotiations entered into for the purchase of the other documents.

Doresse’s summary of his four seasons in Egypt do indicate his central rôle in early Nag Hammadi studies from October 1947 on, indicating his dependence on Togo Mina for that rôle, as well as his constant tension with Henri-Charles Puech who supervised him from Paris. But completely bypassed were the beginnings of French leadership the year before Doresse’s arrival in Cairo, on the part of Jacques Schwartz in March 1946 (see Chapter 1, Part 3 above) and François Daumas in December 1946 (see Part 3 below).

Marianne Doresse wrote up in considerably more detail for my use each of their trips to Egypt from 1947 through 1954.

---

23 Jean Doresse, Résumé des travaux de 1947–1951:

Marianne Doresse: The First Mission of Jean Doresse 1947

First Mission of Jean Doresse in Egypt: Charged with a mission at the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, October, November, December 1947

On 20 September 1947 we embark at Marseille on the Egyptian ship S.S. Er-RAWDA. We travel with Canon Drioton (‘the Abbot’), my teacher. While at sea we learn that an epidemic of cholera has made its appearance in Egypt.

On arrival in Cairo, we install ourselves at the Institut Français [d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire]. Immediate and very warm contact with Togo and his family. Jean did not yet know directly my old friend Togo. On our first visit to the Coptic Museum (probably as early as the end of September), Togo pulls from the drawer of his desk to show to Jean a Coptic codex on papyrus that he has recently purchased, and for the study of which, on the advice of Canon Drioton, he was awaiting our arrival. John instantly identifies its content: unedited Gnostic texts. In a letter of 10 October 1947, I write to my mother that Togo invites Jean to edit with him the Gnostic manuscript and that he entrusts entirely to him all that has to do with the commentary on the texts. (For the date of this visit, see a letter of Puech dated 7 October, replying to a letter of Jean speaking to him of a Gnostic codex.)

Because of the cholera, which from Lower Egypt has not touched Upper Egypt in the least, all the normal routes between Cairo and Assiout have been barred, with the exception of an aerial line between Cairo and Assiout that only vaccinated persons can use. We reserve places there, and, on a day in October or at the beginning of November, we embark, early in the

---


25 Marianne Doresse, Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Le 20 septembre 1947 nous nous embarquons à Marseille sur le navire égyptien, S.S. Er-RAWDA. Nous voyageons avec le Chanoine Drioton (‘l’Abbé’), mon maître. En mer nous apprenons qu’une épidémie de choléra a fait son apparition en Égypte.

26 Marianne Doresse, Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Arrivée au Caire, nous nous installons à l’Institut Français. Contact immédiat et très chaleureux avec Togo et sa famille. Jean ne connaissait pas encore directement mon vieil ami Togo. À notre première visite au Musée Copte (probablement dès fin septembre), Togo sort du tiroir de son bureau pour le montrer à Jean un codex copte sur papyrus qu’il a récemment acheté et pour l’étude duquel, sur le conseil du Chanoine Drioton, il attendait notre arrivée. Jean en identifie instantanément son contenu: des textes gnostiques inédits. Dans une lettre du 10 octobre 1947, j’écris à ma mère que Togo invite Jean à éditer avec lui le manuscrit gnostique et qu’il lui confie entièrement tout ce qui concerne le commentaire des textes. (Pour la date de cette visite, cf. une lettre de Puech datée du 7 octobre, réponse à une lettre de Jean lui parlant d’un codex gnostique).
morning, at the airport of Cairo, with, as companion, Henri Chevrier, chief architect of the monuments of Karnak. ...  

Since the work for which Jean had obtained a mission was practically completed in Upper Egypt, we return to Cairo. There, bad news awaits us: The funding for the mission at the *Institut d'Archéologie* have been amputated by 10 or 15%, without our having been warned of this in Upper Egypt. To complete our sojourn in Cairo and return to Alexandria (our tickets, from Alexandria to France, have fortunately been paid in advance!), we have to resell our material for camping, topography, and photography (including a reflex 6x6 Korelli that Albert Eid buys back!).

At the Coptic Museum, during our absence, the Gnostic codex has been entirely photographed and put under glass page by page, but without taking note of the order in which they were found. Better still: Whereas the two double leaves at the center of the volume had remained intact, one has cut their median fold, to put them under glass, without noting the respective [connecting] links of these pieces. Togo Mina is not responsible for anything in this massacre. He had entrusted the work to his subordinates. The subordinates of Togo were: Abdel Bakhîh and Raouf Habib [later Director of the Coptic Museum], adjunct conservators, George Helmy, architect (a relative of the wife of Togo), Abdel Messîh [ʿAbd al-Masîh], librarian, the priest Basilios, representing the Patriarchate, the photographer Boulos, working at half-time.  

---

27 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

A cause du choléra, qui de Basse Égypte n’a point touché la Haute Égypte, toutes les voies normales entre Le Caire et Assiout ont été barrées à l’exception d’une ligne aérienne entre Le Caire et Assiout que seules les personnes vaccinées peuvent emprunter. Nous y réservons des places et, un jour d’octobre ou du début de novembre, nous nous embarquons, de bon matin, à l’aéroport du Caire, avec comme compagnon Henri Chevrier, architecte en chef des monuments de Karnak ....

28 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Le travail pour lequel Jean avait obtenu une mission étant pratiquement achevé en Haute Égypte, nous rentrons au Caire. Là, une mauvaise nouvelle nous attend: les crédits de mission de l’Institut d’Archéologie ont été amputés, de 10 ou de 15%, sans que, en Haute Égypte, l’on nous en ait prévenus. Pour achever notre séjour au Caire et gagner Alexandrie (nos billets, d’Alexandrie en France ont heureusement été payés d’avance!), nous devons revendre notre matériel de campement, de topographie, de photographie (dont un reflex 6x6 KORELLI que rachète Albert Eid!).

29 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Au Musée Copte, pendant notre absence, le codex gnostique a été photographié intégralement et mis sous verres page par page, mais sans prendre note de l’ordre où se trouvaient celles-ci. Mieux encore: alors que les deux feuillets doubles du centre du volume étaient restés intacts, on a coupé leur pli médian, pour les mettre sous verres, sans noter les liens respectifs de ces morceaux. Togo Mina n’est pour rien dans ce massacre: il avait confié le travail à ses subordonnés; les subordonnés de
As our departure was approaching, in order for us to have in time the enlarged prints of the negatives of the Gnostic manuscript that had been taken by Boulos, Togo proposes to us to use the photographic laboratory of the Coptic Museum and to do the work ourselves. We make these enlargements. (These are the large prints that you know).  

We made the acquaintance of Albert Eid already before our departure to Upper Egypt [on 26 October 1947]. We return to see him with Togo, who makes him promise not to sell his Gnostic manuscript (that Jean, meanwhile, had identified), except to the Coptic Museum. We buy from Eid a few small antiquities. Then we sell to him our camera ‘Korelli.’ With this 6x6 camera Eid photographs his codex before our departure and gives Jean a complete set of proofs (contact prints pasted on the pages of green cardboard).

We leave Egypt 31 December 1947, on the SS ‘Providence.’ We arrive at Paris in possession—in addition to the photographs—of a first copy of the Gnostic papyrus of the Coptic Museum made from the original, and photographs of Eid’s papyrus.

Jean prepared in Cairo the text of a communication for the Académie des Inscriptions [et Belles-Lettres] and for the Institut d’Égypte that he left with Togo. He invites Puech to bring any additions he might have. Hence he brings him the text. Puech only made there a few corrections of details (the copy thus corrected is in your archives). Yet, the 20 February 1948, on entering the

Togo étaient: Abdel Bakih et Raouf Habib, conservateurs adjoint, Georges Helmy, architecte (un parent de la femme de Togo), Abdel Messih, bibliothécaire, le prêtre Basilios, représentant du Patriarchat, le photographe Boulos, travaillant à mi-temps.

30 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Notre départ approchant, pour que nous ayons en temps voulu les tirages agrandis des négatifs du manuscrit gnostique pris par Boulos, Togo nous propose d’user du laboratoire photographique de Musée Copte et de faire le travail nous même. Nous faisons ces agrandissements. (Ce sont les grands tirages que vous connaissez).

31 In a supplément by Marianne Doresse to her *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*.

32 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Nous avons fait la connaissance d’Albert Eid déjà avant notre départ en Haute Égypte. Nous revenons le voir avec Togo qui lui fait promettre de ne vendre son manuscrit gnostique (que Jean, entre temps, avait identifié) qu’au Musée Copte. Nous achetons à Eid quelques petites antiquités. Puis nous lui vendons notre appareil photo “KO-RELLI”; avec cet appareil 6x6, Eid photographie son codex, avant notre départ et donne à Jean un jeu complet d’épreuves (tirages directs collés sur des pages de carton vert).

33 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

room of the sessions, Puech says to Jean that, if he has nothing against it, since he has more experience, he will take upon himself the reading of the communication. This first encroachment disturbs me. (For the communication Doresse and Puech, "Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Égypte", see the C[omptes r]endus de l’Académie des Inscr[iptions et Belles-Lettres] 1948, pp. 87–95).  

I do not recall if it is before the communication to the Académie, or just afterwards (the delay of correspondence with Egypt at war, even by airmail, was very long at this time), Jean received from Canon Drioton a letter (dated Cairo, 13 February 1948) in which the latter indicates in a few words the other manuscripts that finally he has just seen, and sends six small photographs intended for Jean by the person who has the codices.

A good time later, the Abbot clarified to us how these manuscripts had been shown to him: It was an evening. Tano had come to see him in his house to ask his advice, though asking him to maintain the secrecy of the confessional. He then showed him the lot of papyri. The Abbot had been embarrassed by this mystery, for he would have wished, first of all, to preserve the interests of Egypt. In order to respect the jurisprudence in force on antiquities, he made Tano promise not to have these documents leave Egypt, secretly, while assuring him that in return he would have them bought from him at a fair price (by the government or by the king), based, first of all, on an expertise one would entrust to Jean Doresse, already accredited by the aid he had furnished to Togo Mina. It was after the acquiescence of Tano that he had written us this letter and transmitted the photos. In order to respect the commitments made then, we would never have been able to reveal to anyone these conditions! But it is now indispensable to make known how, thanks to the Abbot Drioton, Egypt has retained its Gnostic papyri. Besides, it is thanks to the trusting

---

34 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:  
Jean a préparé au Caire le texte d’une communication pour l’Académie des Inscriptions et pour l’Institut d’Égypte qu’il a laissé à Togo; il invite Puech à y apporter éventuellement ses additions; il lui porte donc le texte. Puech n’y fait que quelques corrections de détail (l’exemplaire ainsi corrigé est dans vos archives). Cependant, le 20 février 1948, en entrant dans la salle des séances, Puech dit à Jean que, s’il n’a rien contre, comme il a plus d’expérience, il se chargera de lire la communication. Ce premier empiéttement m’inquiète. (Pour la communication Doresse-Puech, “Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Égypte”; cf. C. r. Académie des Inscr. 1948, pp. 87–95).

35 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:  
Je ne me souviens pas si c’est avant la communication à l’Académie ou juste après (les délais de correspondance avec l’Égypte en guerre même par Poste aérienne, étaient très longs à cette époque) Jean a reçu du Chanoine Drioton une lettre (datée, Le Caire, 13 février 1948) dans laquelle ce dernier signale en quelques mots les autres manuscrits, qu’il vient enfin de voir, et envoie six petites photographies destinées à Jean par le détenteur des codices.
contacts that the Abbot maintained with the negotiators of antiquities in Cairo that no piece of value left Egypt secretly during all the time he directed the Department of Antiquities.36

In the summer of 1948 three Congresses took place in Paris: the Congress of Museums; the Seventh Congress of Byzantinologists; the Congress of Orientalists.37


---

36 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Bien plus tard, l’Abbé nous précisa comment ces manuscrits lui avaient été montrés: c’était un soir; Tano était venu le voir dans sa maison pour lui demander conseil tout en le priant de garder le secret de la confession: il lui montra alors le lot de papyrus. L’Abbé avait été embarrassé de ce mystère car il aurait voulu, en premier lieu, préserver les intérêts de l’Égypte. Pour respecter la jurisprudence en vigueur sur les antiquités il fit promettre par Tano de ne pas faire sortir d’Égypte, clandestinement, ces documents tout en lui assurant qu’en retour il les lui ferait acheter à un juste prix, (par le gouvernement ou par le roi) fondé, avant tout, sur une expertise dont on confierait la charge à Jean Doresse, déjà agrémenté pour l’aide qu’il avait fournie à Togo Mina. C’était après l’acquiescement de Tano qu’il nous avait écrit cette lettre et transmis les photos. Pour respecter les engagements pris alors nous n’aurions jamais dû révéler à personne ces conditions! Mais il est maintenant indispensable de faire connaître comment, grâce à l’Abbé Drioton l’Égypte a gardé ses papyrus gnostiques. C’est d’ailleurs, grâce aux contacts confiants que l’Abbé entretenait avec les négociants en Antiquités du Caire qu’aucune pièce de valeur ne quitte l’Égypte clandestinement pendant tout le temps où il dirigea le service des Antiquités.

37 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

En été 1948 trois Congrès se tenaient à Paris: Congrès des Musées, VIIe Congrès des Byzantinistes; Congrès des Orientalistes.

38 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Togo returned to Egypt, whereas we went, on a motorcycle with side-car (automobiles were not to be found after the war), to Belgium for the Eighth Congress of Byzantinologists (which took place immediately after the Seventh, to make up for the time lost during the war), organized with great pomp by Prof. Grégoire. Togo had charged us with making contact with Louvain for a possible publication of the codex of the Coptic Museum by the C.S.C.O. (= Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium of Louvain). Meanwhile, as a consequence, when one learns in Paris the project to publish at the C.S.C.O. of Louvain, a project accepted by Togo Mina and for which one has the agreement of the Abbot Drioton and especially of Georges Salles [Director of the Museums of France], certain people will put pressure violently on Jean to make him abandon it.\textsuperscript{39}

The adversaries of the project are Lacau, systematically hostile to Jean, and Puech, who fears not having any control over this edition—the C.S.C.O. escaping his tentacles, and only publishing texts with translations and a brief introduction. Puech wished to reserve for himself the monopoly on the texts, so as to be the first to give commentaries on them. Lacau (see your archives) went so far as to demand that Jean be excluded from the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique if the texts were published in Belgium, an attitude all the more absurd since, one must recall, at that time no French organism had at its disposal funds for this publication.\textsuperscript{40}

At the Eighth Congress of Byzantinologists Jean gives the complete analysis of the ‘Secret Book of John’ [The Apocryphon of John], ascribing it to the Ophites, given the fact that it corresponds point by point with the summary

\textsuperscript{39} Marianne Doresse, \textit{Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte}:

Togo rentra en Égypte tandis que nous allions, en moto avec side-car (les voitures étaient introuvables après guerre), en Belgique pour le VIIIe Congrès des Byzantinistes (qui s’est tenu immédiatement après le VIIe pour rattraper le temps perdu pendant la guerre) organisé avec grande pompe par le professeur Grégoire. Togo nous avait chargés de prendre contact avec Louvain pour une publication éventuelle du codex du Musée Copte par le C.S.C.O. (= Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium de Louvain). Cependant, par la suite, quand on apprend à Paris le projet de publication au CSCO de Louvain, projet accepté par Togo Mina et pour lequel on a l’accord de l’Abbé Drioton et de Georges Salles, notamment, certains feront violemment pression sur Jean pour le faire abandonner.

\textsuperscript{40} Marianne Doresse, \textit{Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte}:

Les adversaires du projet sont M. Lacau, systématiquement hostile à Jean, et M. Puech qui craint de n’avoir aucun contrôle sur cette édition—le C.S.C.O. échappant à ses tentacules et ne publiait que des textes avec traductions et brève introduction: M. Puech voulait se réserver le monopole des textes pour être le premier à en donner les commentaires. M. Lacau (cf. vos archives) alla jusqu’à demander que Jean soit exclu du CNRS si les textes étaient publiés en Belgique; attitude d’autant plus absurde que, il faut le rappeler, à ce moment aucun organisme français ne disposait de crédits pour cette publication.
that Epiphanius gives of the doctrine of these sectarians. (I myself give—at a session that by chance was presided over by Jean—a description of the clothing that the ‘mummy of Thais’ discovered by Gayet at Antinoe and conserved until 1944 at the Musée Guimet wore—a collection of which I was in charge).  

At Brussels we visit Father Peeters in his convent of the Bollandists.

Then we go to Louvain to see for a longer time than at the Congress Monsignor Lefort and Canon Draguet, who directs the C.S.C.O. The latter hopes to undertake the publication of the Gnostic codex. Louvain has just received from the United States the linotypes to print oriental characters with which the work of composition of the Coptic texts should go at an exceptional speed. Jean leaves with Canon Draguet the copy of a leaf of the codex. We receive the printed specimen of it in Cairo, dated 11 March 1949 and signed by Canon Draguet (in our archives).

Puech, as well as Quispel, with whom we have just become acquainted at the Congress of Orientalists, go to Ascona, where Puech speaks about the texts that however he does not yet know (but he does not admit it), except through what Jean has said or published about them. Quispel meets Barrett at Ascona, and he writes to Jean to inform him of the interest that the Bollingen Foundation seems to take in his discovery. Later Mellon will come to Paris, and in fact discusses with Jean, whom he receives at the Hotel Meurisse on 20 October 1948. He gives hope of aid from the Foundation, which Jean would appreciate all the more, perceiving already the new developments of the discovery. Indeed, Canon Drioton urges us to come to Egypt to make the report on the

---

41 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Au VIIIe Congrès des Byzantinistes Jean donne l’analyse complète du “Livre sacré de Jean” le rattachant aux Ophites, étant donné qu’il correspond point par point au résumé que donne Epiphane de la doctrine de ces sectaires. (Je donne moi-même—à une séance présidée par hasard par Jean—une description des vêtements que portait la “momie de Thais” découverte par Gayet à Antinoe et conservée jusqu’en 1944 au Musée Guimet, collection dont j’avait la charge).

42 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

À Bruxelles nous visitons le Père Peeters dans son couvent des Bollandistes.

43 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Puis nous allons à Louvain voir plus longuement qu’au Congrès, Monseigneur Lefort et le Chanoine Draguet qui dirige le CSCO; ce dernier souhaite entreprendre la publication du codex gnostique. Louvain vient de recevoir des États-Unis les linotypes pour l’impression de caractères orientaux avec lesquelles le travail de composition des textes coptes devrait aller à une vitesse exceptionnelle. Jean laisse au Chanoine Draguet la copie d’un feuillet du codex: nous en recevrons le spécimen imprimé au Caire, daté du 11,3,1949 et signé du Chanoine Draguet (dans nos archives).
new codices for the Department of Antiquities—the Egyptian authorities not being able to subsidize this affair, which incidentally was secret. Although held to secrecy, Jean had already in the spring summarily submitted a request for a mission to the C.N.R.S., where it will be dryly refused (documents in your archives), probably because of the intervention of Lacau. He could not request a new mission of the I.F.A.O., Kuentz having declared that Coptic studies did not interest his Institute for the moment. But R. Dussaud, President of the Commission of Excavations, and C. Schaeffer, its General Secretary, are going to save the affair of the Gnostic papyri, by liberating Jean partially from being under the thumb of Messrs Puech and Lacau. At the Commission of Excavations they vote for Jean (in spite of the opposition of Lacau) a grant officially destined for the excavations of the Deir el-Gizâz that the Department of Antiquities has assigned to Jean—Georges Salles, Director of the Museums of France, also brings administrative assistance in giving him the title of Agent of Excavations of the Museum of the Louvre. The grant, on the budget of the Excavations of 1949, would provide a round-trip ticket to Egypt and what was needed for four weeks of soundings at the Deir el-Gizâz—it is left up to Jean, how to manage handling his funds and prolong his sojourn in Cairo for the study of the manuscripts!^44

^44 Marianne Doresse, *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*: Puech, ainsi que Quispel dont nous venons de faire la connaissance au Congrès des Orientalistes, vont à Ascona où Puech parle de textes qu’il ne connaît pourtant encore (mail il ne l’avoue pas) que par ce que Jean en a dit ou publié. Quispel rencontre à Ascona Mr. Barrett et il écrit à Jean pour le prévenir de l’intérêt que le Bollingen Foundation semble prendre à sa découverte. Plus tard Mr. Mellon viendra à Paris et s’entretiendra effectivement avec Jean qu’il reçoit à l’Hôtel Meurisse le 20 octobre 1948. Il laisse espérer l’aide de la Fondation que Jean apprécierait d’autant plus qu’il entrevoit déjà les nouveaux développements de la découverte. Effectivement, le Chanoine Drioton nous presse de venir en Égypte pour faire le rapport sur les nouveaux codices pour le Service des Antiquités—les autorités égyptiennes ne pouvant pas subventionner cette affaire, d’ailleurs secrète. Bien que tenu au secret, Jean avait dès le printemps déposé sommairement une demande de mission au CNRS où elle sera sèchement refusée (documents dans vos archives) probablement à cause de l’intervention de M. Lacau. Il ne pouvait pas demander une nouvelle mission à l’IFAO, M. Kuentz ayant déclaré que les études de copie n’intéressaient pas pour le moment, son institut. Mais M. R. Dussaud, Président de la Commission des Fouilles et M. C. Schaeffer, son Secrétaire Général, vont sauver l’affaire des papyrus gnostiques en libérant partiellement Jean des tutelles de MM. Puech et Lacau: à la Commission des Fouilles ils font voter pour Jean (malgré l’opposition de Lacau) un crédit officiellement destiné aux fouilles du Deir el-Gizâz que le Service des Antiquités a concédées à Jean—Georges Salles, Directeur des Musées de France, apporte également une aide administrative en lui donnant le titre de Chargé des Fouilles du Musée du Louvre. Le crédit, sur le budget des Fouilles de 1949, allait fournir un billet aller-retour pour l’Égypte et de quoi faire, pendant quatre semaines, des sondages au Deir el-Gizâz—à Jean de se débrouiller pour ménager ces fonds et prolonger son séjour au Caire pour l’étude des manuscrits!
Not being able to await the disbursement of the grant of 1949, we leave in November [1948]—Jean uses funds coming from his inheritance from his parents; and my mother, a Russian refugee, aids us as much as she can. The expenses that we will incur will not be covered by the small amount that will remain after the month of excavations of the Deir el-Gizâz, with the result that, again at this second stage, the discovery of the Gnostic manuscripts will in effect be at our own expense. Incidentally, we will be able to hold out in Cairo only to 5 June. If we had been able to remain longer, the Gnostic papyri would have been purchased at that time—our absence having left in indecision the persons who, ready to give their accord, would have wanted to receive the opinion of Jean. Togo, the Abbot, Mlle Dattari, Tano, will depart each in turn, to pass the vacations outside of Egypt, the Abbot Drioton to Nancy, Miss Dattari to Paris to arrange an inheritance, Tano to Cyprus, and Togo to Lebanon, assuming that it would still be possible in September to reply to the Minister Ali Ayoub and to accept the 40,000 £É that at the time he had in hand.


Second Mission of Jean Doresse in Egypt: as Agent of Excavation for the Commission of Archaeological Excavations and for the Museum of the Louvre, from 25 October 1948 to 5 June 1949

After having received a letter from Tano inviting Jean to come examine the manuscripts (without it being very clear if they are Tano's or if he represents Mlle Dattari), we embark around 20 October 1948 for Alexandria on the S.S.
‘Providence’ of the [line of steamers] Messageries Maritimes. [N. 1: Arrived in Alexandria the last Saturday of October 1948.]

Upon our arrival in Cairo [N. 2: On 31 October we take tea with Togo; upon our return to Cairo, Jean puts himself to work at the Coptic Museum. Togo would like him to make the catalogue of the Coptic paintings and sculptures that entered the Museum since the catalogue of ...], we go see Tano in his shop, where he leads us to a flat, where he takes from a valise the manuscripts. [N. 3: I do not have the date when we saw for the first time the other papyri. Jean is already at work on 15 November. In the letter dated to the 15th: “Jean works on the other Gnostic manuscripts.”]

During the two weeks that the examination of the papyri lasts, we are in the euphoria of discoveries that Jean makes as the work goes on, as he runs through the leaves (which nevertheless he is not at all permitted to copy). Generally, in the afternoons, Tano calls us and brings out a codex that he entrusts to us. Jean reads, takes a few notes, consolidates the pages that are fragmenting, but abstains from leafing through, which wears them out, any more than opening the packets of leaves stuck together by the passage of time.

Once this summary ‘reading’ of the codices is terminated, Tano returns the treasure to the residence of Mlle Dattari, in Garden City, where she lived in a baroque villa built by her father. Mlle Dattari was an extremely genteel person, probably in her fifties, who spoke French, English, Italian, Greek, and Arabic.

---

47 Marianne Doresse: Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Après avoir reçu une lettre de Tano invitant Jean à venir examiner les manuscrits, (sans qu’il soit très clair s’ils sont à Tano où s’il représente Mlle Dattari) nous nous embarquons vers le 20 octobre 1948 pour Alexandrie sur le S.S. “PROVIDENCE” des Messageries Maritimes. [N. 1:—Arrivé à Alexandrie le dernier samedi d’octobre 1948.]

48 Marianne Doresse: Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Dès notre arrivée au Caire, [N. 2:—le 31 octobre prenons le thé avec Togo; dès notre retour au Caire Jean se remet au travail au Musée Copte. Togo voudrait qu’il fasse le catalogue des peintures et des sculptures coptes, entrées au Musée depuis la catalogue de ...] nous allons voir Tano dans son magasin où il nous mène dans un appartement où il sort, d’une valise les manuscrits. [N. 3:—je n’ai pas la date où nous avons vu pour la première fois les autres papyrus; Jean est déjà au travaille le 15 novembre; dans la lettre datée du 15: "Jean travaille sur les autres manuscrits gnostiques."]

49 Marianne Doresse: Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Pendant deux semaines que dure l’examen des papyrus nous sommes dans l’euphorie des découvertes que fait Jean au fur et à mesure qu’il en parcourt les feuilles (qu’il ne lui est toutefois point permis de copier). Généralement l’après-midi, Tano nous appelle et sort un codex qu’il nous confie. Jean lit, prend quelques notes, consolide des pages qui se fragmentent mais s’abstient de feuilleter ce qui s’effrite non plus que d’entrouvrir les paquets de feuilles collés ensemble par le temps.
Her father, Italian, had been a renowned numismatian. Her mother was from a very wealthy Greek family of Cairo. Mlle Dattari and her brother (who at the time had recently died) had Italian passports, which during the war had caused, especially to the brother, various annoyances: The brother was interned and their possessions were sequestered. It is to her that belonged the famous valise where the papyri were kept. It is at this time that Jean made the photography of the ensemble of the manuscripts—which he published and which is now reproduced everywhere. On this occasion, Mlle Dattari permits Jean to take some twenty other photos, which we did in full sunlight, which entered by the window of her salon (it is one of the lots where I hold the pages with my hands). On another occasion, perhaps the day when we took Togo to see the manuscripts (see below), Jean photographed some other leaves of papyrus.

Toward the end of November, in agreement with Canon Drioton, who always lends us his Director's villa at Karnak, we leave by train, taking along our cook, to Upper Egypt. [N. 4: Departure for Karnak 24 November 1948.] There, Jean could prepare in peace the report on the Gnostic papyri. Canon Drioton has also lent us, from his personal library, some works that were essential for this task, though these books would not have been enough to identify the texts that Jean had just discovered in the papyri, if the Americans of the Institute of Chicago had not invited us to use the library of the Chicago House at Luxor.

---

50 Marianne Doresse: Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Cette “lecture” sommaire des codices une fois terminée, Tano report le trésor chez Mlle Dattari, à Garden City, où celle-ci habitait une villa baroque construite par son père. Mlle Dattari était une personne extrêmement gentille, paraissant la cinquantaine, parlant français, anglais, italien, grec et arabe. Son père, italien, avait été un numismate renommé; sa mère était d’une famille de grecque du Caire, très fortunée. Mlle Dattari et son frère (alors décédé depuis peu) avaient des passeports italiens, ce qui leur avait valu durant la guerre, surtout au frère, divers ennuis: le frère fut interné, et leur biens furent mis sous séquestre. C’est à elle qu’appartenait la célèbre valise où se trouvaient les papyrus. C’est à ce moment que Jean a fait la photographie de l’ensemble des manuscrits—celle qu’il a publiée et qui est maintenant reproduite partout. À cette occasion Mlle Dattari permit à Jean d’en prendre une vingtaine d’autres, ce que nous fimes au beau soleil qui entrait par la fenêtre de son salon (c’est un des lots où je retiens les pages de mes mains). À une autre occasion, peut-être le jour où nous menâmes Togo voir les manuscrits (cf. plus bas) Jean a photographié quelques autres feuillets du papyrus.

51 Marianne Doresse: Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Vers la fin de novembre, d’accord avec le Chanoine Drioton qui nous prête toujours sa villa directoriale de Karnak, nous partons, par le train en emmenant notre cuisinier, en Haute Égypte. [N. 4:—départ pour Karnak le 24 novembre 1948.] Là, Jean pourra, en paix, préparer le rapport sur les papyrus gnostiques. Le Chanoine Drioton nous a prêté aussi, de sa bibliothèque personnelle, quelques ouvrages essentiels pour ce
During our stay in Karnak, we went almost every morning to the library of the Chicago House, where Jean found most of the works that he wanted; the afternoons he worked in our villa (on the texts, notes and photos that he had put together in Cairo).  [N. 5: Letter of 29 November 1948: Jean works on the notes, copies, and photographs of the papyri of Mlle Dattari, which he made in Cairo. He transcribes and translates the texts that are on the photos that he was permitted to take.]

Once the report is written, we return to Cairo at the beginning of December.  [N. 6: We leave Karnak to return to Cairo on 8 December 1948.] On 10 December we move to the sixth floor of an apartment, 6 Kasr el Nil Street, beside the Automobile Club of Egypt. We lodge in two rooms rented from an Austro-Hungarian lady, with whom the conversation was quite droll, given the respective languages that we spoke.

The report composed in Karnak is immediately submitted to Canon Drioton and to Togo, who are enthusiastic about this discovery. Jean has also sent a summary of it to Puech (before leaving Karnak), giving him the inventory and identifications of new texts; he received a response only a month later (17 January 1949). Puech expresses himself there much less enthusiastic than over the announcement of the first codex. (One never finds there any longer such an expression as ‘your discovery.’) A fictional indifference, for, we will know later, Puech unveils in Paris the contents of this new lot of Gnostic papyri (without saying that this information comes exclusively from the work that Jean has done in Cairo).
On 28 December 1948 [N. 7: It is the 26th and not the 28th December 1948 that we take Togo to the residence of Miss Dattari. In the letter of 24 December I say that Togo counts very much on the assistance of Jean to make the acquisition of this lot of manuscripts for the Coptic Museum.], we finally take Togo to the residence of Miss Dattari in Garden City, where she presents the papyri to him, telling him that she is ready to cede them to the Coptic Museum.55

At this time, Canon Drioton instructs Togo to organize a meeting of the Purchase Committee of the Coptic Museum, to present to its members the lot of papyri with a request for purchase, supported by the report that one has had Jean make. [N. 8: Letter of 17 January 1949: Jean and Togo prepare together the request for the purchase of the papyri of Mlle Dattari, which will be presented to the Committee of the Coptic Museum.] This meeting could not take place before [N. 9: Monday 26 January, meeting of a reduced commission consisting of Canon Drioton, Gaston Wiet, Chafik Ghorbal, etc. Togo presents the request for the purchase of the Gnostic papyri, supported by a text from Jean and some photographs. The asking price seems excessive. The commission decides to charge Jean with preparing an expertise of the offered manuscripts.] Saturday 19 or 20 February 1949, the Abbot having had the flu, which leaves him very tired, and Togo hardly having any better health. The Under-Secretary of State for Education, Chafik Bey Ghorbal, was not available (it was perhaps the moment when the Prime Minister, Nokrâshi Pacha, was assassinated). [N. 10: Nokrâshi Pacha was assassinated by the Muslim Brotherhood at the end of December 1948. Togo knew him well, had spoken with him about the manuscripts that he hoped to acquire for the Coptic Museum, and had obtained from this Prime Minister the promise of his assistance.][56]
Meanwhile, we have just received our funds for excavations, and we prepare our expedition. [N. 11: Our funds for excavations arrived on 2 February 1949. After the meeting of the commission that is to decide on the purchase of the papyri, and to which a study by Jean will be presented, we will leave for Upper Egypt, to undertake excavations of the Deir el Gizâz.] It is necessary to purchase camping equipment to live in the full desert. To move around, we equip a Triumph motorcycle with a side-car, a large wooden trunk equipped with a seat in Dunlap. 57


57 Marianne Doresse: Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Cependant, nous venons de recevoir nos crédits de fouilles et nous préparons notre expédition. [N. 11:—Nos crédits de fouilles sont arrivés le 2 février 1949. Après la réunion de la commission qui doit décider de l’achat des papyrus et à laquelle sera présentée une étude de Jean, nous partirons en Haute Égypte pour entreprendre les fouilles du Deir el Gizâz.] Il faut acheter du matériel de campement pour vivre en plein désert. Pour nous déplacer, nous équipons une motocyclette TRIUMPH avec un side-car, large caisse en bois pourvue d’un siège en Dunlopille.

58 Marianne Doresse: Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Le samedi 22 janvier, Jean fait une communication à l’Institut d’Égypte: “Nouveaux aperçus historiques sur les Gnostiques coptes: Ophites et Séthiens” (cf. Bull. de l’Inst. d’Égypte, t. 31, 1948–1949, p. 409 et s.). [N. 12:—Le 1 février 1949 Jean donne une conférence sur la gnose à Dar el Salam, le centre animé par Mlle Marie Nahil. À la suite de cette conférence la presse égyptienne s’intéresse à Jean, lui demande des interviews, et publie des résumés de sa communication à l’Institut d’Égypte et de sa conférence de Dar el Salam, ce qui suscite la harangue de divers savants français (cf. lettres de Puech et de Lacau).]
On 17 February 1949 he is elected Corresponding Member of this Institute. Finally the day set for the Purchase Committee arrives: the 19th (or the 20th?) February [N. 13: It was the morning of this same 17 February 1949.], very early, we go look for the valise at the residence of Mlle Dattari and take it to the Coptic Museum, where, in the office of Togo, a show-case is prepared. I unpack the codices that Jean installs in the show-case.⁵⁹

The Purchase Committee included, as French, Canon Drioton, and Gaston Wiet, Director of the Arabic Museum, who will oppose the purchase by the Coptic Museum of the papyri that were offered; as Egyptians, a representative of the Patriarchate; Ghaleb Pacha; [N. 14: Kamel Bey;] Togo Mina; Chafik Bey Ghorbal (who presided); Dr. Sobhy, who had sent to Togo the seller [Rāghib] of the manuscript already acquired by the Museum [Codex III]; and still others ...

One showed the members of the Committee the show-case of papyri, and, after having explained that an expertise had been made by Jean Doresse, Togo read them a summary of this report. We ourselves were in the Museum, in case the Committee had asked for more by way of explanation. There was a piquant detail that the Canon [Drioton] told us in leaving: Once the Abbot [Drioton] said that the content of the texts was explosive for the history of Christianity, a Muslim launched the view that the Pope of Rome would then do well to buy these manuscripts and destroy them! The decision of the Committee was that one could not decide on the purchase before knowing if the Egyptian Government would be in a position to pay their price. One will submit the matter to the Minister of Education (perhaps already Aly Ayoub?), who, with the maximum of funds at his disposal, will negotiate with the owner or owners to complete the purchase. The asking price was 60,000 £É. Then we returned the valise to Miss Dattari.⁶⁰

---

⁵⁹ Marianne Doresse: Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Le 17 février 1949, il est élu Membre correspondant de cet Institut. Enfin le jour fixé pour le Comité d’Achat arrive: le 19 (ou le 20?) février [N. 13: Ce fut le matin de ce même 17 février 1949.], de très bonne heure, nous allons chercher la valise chez Mlle Dattari et la portons au Musée Copte où dans le bureau de Togo, une vitrine est préparée: Je déballe les codices que Jean installe dans la vitrine.

⁶⁰ Marianne Doresse: Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Le comité d’achat comprenait, comme Français, le Chanoine Drioton, et Gaston Wiet, Directeur du Musée Arabe, qui s’opposera à l’achat par le Musée Copte des papyrus proposés; des Égyptiens: un représentant du Patriarcat; Ghaleb Pacha; [N. 14:—Kamel Bey;] Togo Mina; Chafik Bey Ghorbal (qui préside); le Dr. Sobhy, qui avait envoyé à Togo le vendeur du manuscrit déjà acquis par le Musée Copte; et d’autres encore ....

⁶¹ Marianne Doresse: Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

On montra aux membres du Comité la vitrine de papyruses et, après avoir précisé qu’une expertise avait été fait par Jean Doresse, Togo leur lut un résumé de ce rapport. Nous étions nous-même au Musée, pour le cas où la Comité eut demandé plus d’explication.
Were the minutes of the meeting copied by Togo into the Register of the Coptic Museum? Togo was more and more ill, and perhaps there remains only what I say about them. But, after all, the commission did meet, and had gotten the purchase under way. ...\[62\]

Togo is more and more exhausted. In addition to uremia that consumes him, he has taken on a permanent hiccups, and is bedridden. He calls us to his bedside and orally makes his testament as a scholar, in having Jean promise to concern himself with the Coptic Museum, to prevent any turning away from the papyri by obtaining their purchase and their edition, just as he had decided it ...\[63\]

In the new Ministry, Aly Ayoub is Minister of Education (a very cultured and very congenial attorney, whom we still often meet, afterwards, when he is no longer Minister). He has been brought up to date by Chafik Bey Ghorbal and by Togo, on the value for the Coptic Museum in acquiring the lot of Gnostic papyri. He takes note of the report of Jean, is convinced, and decides not to arrange anything for the purchase immediately. He goes to find Mlle Dattari, who, for her part, is preparing for her departure on vacation in Paris. He notifies her that he would be able to acquire the manuscript lot for 40,000 £É, the maximum at his disposal at present in his budget. Tano has left for Cyprus, and Mlle Dattari does not dare make a decision. We ourselves, not being able financially to remain in Egypt, have to leave Cairo on 4 June, to embark at Alexandria on S.S. ‘Providence’ on 5 June 1949. Miss Dattari does not respond to the Minister, but herself leaves for Europe.\[64\]

\[62\] Marianne Doresse: *Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Le procès-verbal de la séance fut-il copié par Togo dans le registre du Musée copte? Togo était de plus en plus malade et peut-être ne reste-t-il que ce que j’en dis. Mais enfin la commission s’était tenue et avait mis l’achat en train. ....

\[63\] Marianne Doresse: *Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Togo est de plus en plus fatigué; outre l’urémie qui le ronge il est pris d’un hoquet permanent et doit s’aliter! Il nous appelle à son chevet et nous fait oralement son testament de savant en faisant promettre à Jean de s’ occuper du Musée Copte, d’ empêcher tout détournement des papyrus en obtenant leur achat et leur édition telle qu’il l’a décidée ....

\[64\] Marianne Doresse: *Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:
Togo, who has to leave for Lebanon to convalesce, telegraphs us in France on two occasions, for us to find Miss Dattari in Paris and pressure her to accept this offer, which is the limit of the immediate or foreseeable possibilities of the Minister (the telegrams are already in your archives). Tano hesitates, persuaded that on his return to Cairo he can obtain from the Ministry a more advantageous price—45,000. ...

On our return to Paris, in full agreement with and under the patronage of René Dussaud, Jean presents a communication to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres on 17 June (1949): “Nouveaux documents gnostiques coptes découverts en Haute-Égypte” (cf. C[omptes] R[endus de l’)Académie des Inscr[iptions] 1949, pp. 176–180). On the recommendations of the Egyptian authorities, irritated by the indiscretions of Puech, the latter had not been invited to associate himself with it. In return, Puech, who does not know a single line of the new lot of texts, and who fears that Jean may launch fantasy identifications, himself asks him, urgently, by [letter] pneumatique, not to involve his name at all in the communication (see the pneumatique in our archives). But Jean's identifications, limited to what he can cite exactly, are incontestable. At the conclusion of his presentation, the President of the Academy (or the Perpetual Secretary?) asks Puech, who had come as an auditor, if he has any observations to make. Puech replies that, having participated in the communication (which is completely false; besides, it will appear under the sole name of Jean), he has nothing to add.  

Dans le nouveau ministère, Aly Ayoub est Ministre de l’Éducation (un avocat très cultivé et très sympathique que nous rencontrons maintes fois par la suite, quand il ne sera plus ministre). Il est mis au courant par Chafik Bey Ghorbal et par Togo de l’intérêt pour le Musée Copte d’acquérir le lot des papyrus gnostiques; il prend connaissance du rapport de Jean, est convaincu et décide de ne rien ménager pour les acheter immédiatement. Il va trouver Mlle Dattari qui, elle, prépare son départ en vacances pour Paris; il l’avise qu’il serait acquéreur du lot de manuscrit pour 40,000 livres égyptiennes, maximum dont il dispose actuellement sur son budget. Tano est parti pour Chypre et Mlle Dattari n’ose pas se décider. Nous-mêmes ne pouvant plus tenir financièrement en Égypte, devons quitter le Caire le 4 juin pour nous embarquer à Alexandrie sur le S.S. “PROVIDENCE,” du 5 juin 1949. Mlle Dattari ne répond pas au Ministre mais part, elle-même pour l’Europe.

65 Marianne Doresse: Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Togo qui doit partir en convalescence au Liban nous télégraphie en France à deux reprises pour que nous retrouvions Mlle Dattari à Paris et la pressions d’accepter cette offre qui est à la limite des possibilités immédiates ou prochaines du Ministre (les télégrammes sont déjà dans vos archives). Tano freine, persuadé qu’à son retour au Caire il pourra faire obtenir du Ministère un prix plus avantageux—45,000. ....

66 Marianne Doresse: Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

À notre retour à Paris, en plein accord et sous le patronage de M. René Dussaud, Jean présente une communication à l’Académie des Inscriptions, le 17 juin (1949): “Nouveaux documents gnostiques coptes découverts en Haute-Égypte” (cf. C. r. Académie
At the end of June, we go, by road, to bring to Prof. Wassink the manuscript of the article: “Nouveaux textes gnostiques coptes découverts en Haute-Égypte” (cf. *VigChr*, 3.3 [1949]: 129–141). We were lodged at the Dutch Institute of Leiden by our friend, Dr. Kampman. It is, I believe, at this occasion that Jean gave a conference for the Oostersch Genootschap (cf. the letter of Prof. de Zwaan that you have); (unless this conference was given in September, hence on another trip?).

Quispel, whom we met at the Congress of Orientalists the preceding summer [1948], and with whom Jean believed to be on excellent terms, invites us, first, in the morning, to his house; he interrogates Jean about the papyri, and especially about the Eid papyrus. Then he takes us to Scheveningen, to a Javanese restaurant, for a sumptuous lunch.

On the return, we stopped at Louvain, where we see again Mgr Lefort and Canon Draguet. On 4 July, under the auspices of Mgr Lefort, Jean presents to the *Académie Royale de Belgique* the communication: “Une bibliothèque gnostique copte découverte en Haute-Égypte” (cf. *Bulletin of the Academy*, 1949, pp. 399–413).

---

67 Marianne Doresse: *Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Fin juin, nous allons, par la route, porter au professeur Wassink le manuscrit de l’article: “Nouveaux textes gnostiques coptes découverts en Haute-Égypte” (cf. *Vigiliae Christianae*, III, 3, pp. 129–141, 1949). Nous sommes hébergés à l’Institut Néerlandais de Leyde par notre ami, le Docteur Kampman. C’est, je crois, à ce moment que Jean a fait une conférence pour la Oostersch Genootschap (cf. lettre du Prof. de Zwaan que vous avez); (à moins que cette conférence n’ait été faite en septembre, donc à un autre voyage?).

68 Marianne Doresse: *Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Quispel, que nous avions rencontré au Congrès des Orientalistes de l’été passé, et avec qui Jean se croit en excellents termes, nous invite, d’abord, le matin chez lui; il interroge Jean sur les papyri et surtout sur le papyrus Eid. Puis il nous emmène à Scheveningen, dans un restaurant javanais, pour un déjeuner somptueux.

69 Marianne Doresse: *Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Au retour, nous nous arrêtons à Louvain où nous revoymons Mgr Lefort et le Chanoine Draguet. Le 4 juillet, sous les auspices de Mgr Lefort Jean fait à l’Académie royale
In Paris in October (?) there is held the Congress of Papyrology. Jean reveals parallels of *Eugnostos* and the *Wisdom of Jesus*.  

In a letter dated 25 October 1949, which we receive in Paris, Tano announces to us the death of Togo. A letter from Canon Drioton follows in a bit with the same news.

In Cairo, Tano has been able to resume negotiations with Aly Ayoub; the Minister has succeeded in preserving until then the 40,000 £, but Tano, obstinately, demands 45,000 for them.

The Ministry, of which Aly Ayoub was part, falls, and with it, the offer of 40,000 £ is put in question.

A transition Ministry is installed, to prepare for elections, which will bring to power the Wafdist party. It is after that when, on 1 January 1950, Taha Hussein becomes Minister of Education, and when any chance of a freely negotiated purchase is definitively lost. Taha Hussein considers that antiquities from the Egyptian soil belong by right to the State, that trading in them is robbery, and that it can only be a question of confiscating them—for which he is patiently going to prepare a law.

---

70 Marianne Doresse: *Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:
À Paris en octobre (?) se tient le Congrès de Papyrologie, Jean révèle des parallèles "d'Eugnoste" et de la "Sagesse de Jésus."

71 Marianne Doresse: *Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:
Par une lettre datée du 25, octobre 1949, que nous recevons à Paris, Tano nous annonce la mort de Togo. Une lettre du Chanoine Drioton suit de peu avec la même nouvelle.

72 Marianne Doresse: *Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:
Au Caire, Tano a dû reprendre les tractations avec Aly Ayoub; le Ministre a réussi à préserver jusque là les 40,000 livres, mais Tano obstinément, en fait demander 45,000.

73 Marianne Doresse: *Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:
Le ministère dont faisait partie Aly Ayoub tombe et avec lui, l’offre de 40,000 Livres égyptiennes est remise en question.

74 Marianne Doresse: *Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:
Un ministère de transition est installé pour préparer des élections qui amèneront au pouvoir le parti wafdiste. C’est après cela que le 1er janvier 1950, Taha Hussein devient Ministre de l’Éducation et que toute chance d’un achat librement négocié est définitivement perdue. Taha Hussein considère que les antiquités du sol égyptien appartiennent de droit à l’État, que leur trafic est un vol, et qu’il ne peut être question que de les confisquer—ce pour quoi il va patiemment préparer une loi.
Marianne Doresse: The Third Mission of Jean Doresse 1949–1950


We arrive on 21 November 1949. [N. 1: On 19 November 1949 departure by train for Rome. At Rome we take the plane for Cairo, where we arrive the evening of 21 November 1949.]

In Cairo, we stop at the hotel Gezireh Palace, on the quay of the Nile opposite the bridge of Zamalek. It has just opened, entirely empty, and one gives us exceptional prices.

In what has to do with the papyrus of the Coptic Museum, the Under-Secretary of State for Education, Chafik Bey Ghorbal, confirms to Jean the charge to organize, alone, its edition, according to the plans left by Togo Mina (which will be confirmed later by Taha Hussein when he takes over the Ministry of Education). He is also charged to resume contacts with the owners of the other Gnostic papyri.

Canon Drioton offers the king the most recent article of *Vigiliae Christianae*, clothed in a leather cover imitating the most beautiful of the covers of the codices.

At the Coptic Museum, as a result of the death of Togo and in the absence of Canon Drioton, Wiet named, with a provisional title, Abdel Bakih, an inactive and incompetent person, and set aside an Egyptian proposal calling

---


76 Marianne Doresse: *Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:*

Nous arrivons le 21 novembre 1949. [N. 1:—Le 19 novembre 1949 départ en train pour Rome. À Rome nous prenons l’avion pour le Caire où nous arrivons le soir du 21 novembre 1949.]

77 Marianne Doresse: *Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:*

Au Caire, nous nous arrêtons à l’hôtel Gezireh Palace, sur le quai du Nil face au pont de Zamalek. Il vient juste de s’ouvrir, il [est] entièrement vide et l’on nous fait des prix exceptionnels. ....

78 Marianne Doresse: *Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:*

En ce qui concerne le papyrus du Musée copte, le Sous-secretaire d’État à l’Éducation, Chafik Bey Ghorbal confirme à Jean la charge d’organiser, seul, son édition suivant les plans laissés par Togo Mina (ce qui sera plus tard confirmé par Taha Hussein quand il prendra le Ministère de l’Éducation). Il est aussi chargé de reprendre contacts avec les propriétaires des autres papyrus gnostiques.

79 Marianne Doresse: *Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:*

Le Chanoine Drioton offre au roi, le dernier article des Vigiliae Christianae, revêtu d’une couverture de cuir imitant la plus belle des reliures des codices.
for the nomination of Jean Doresse to the post of Director of the Coptic Museum. [N. 4: The general elections took place at the beginning of January 1950 with the victory of Nahas Pacha (head of the Wafd party). When the Ministry is formed, Taha Hussein receives the position of Minister of National Education.]

It was around the end of 1949 (the exact dates are in the letters written to my mother) that there emerged, at the Service des Antiquités, an imbroglio that was going to have repercussions on the direction of the Coptic Museum. A short time ago Canon Drioton was supposed to second, as General Secretary of the Service des Antiquités, Abbas Bayoumi, whose services he did not appreciate, and he wanted to shift him to the General Direction of the Museum of Cairo. In his place he took as General Secretary the chief architect of the Service des Antiquités, Roustom, personage with whom we ourselves were in sympathy, since he was in origin Circassian, and even the wife of his brother, an Egyptian diplomat in New York, was a Circassian of Russia, of a family that had known mine forever (she would visit in New York a relative of mine, Jacques Kayaloff, who had become American and Director of a large New York bank). But Abbas, judging his transfer illegal, obtained from the Tribunal his reintegration as General Secretary. This operation left Roustom without employment, whereas the temporary nomination of Abdel Bakih to the Coptic Museum came to its end and left that position of Director of this Museum without an incumbent. The Service des Antiquités had Roustom named there, who immediately demanded, incidentally, that one join with him as an expert Jean Doresse. The idea pleased Taha Hussein, who had become Minister of Education at the beginning of January 1950. On being consulted, Jean agreed to give annually 5 to 6 months of his time to the Museum, and the Minister charged the Abbot to prepare the contract.

---

80 Marianne Doresse: Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Au Musée copte à la suite de la mort de Togo et en l’absence du Chanoine Drioton, Wiet a nommé à titre provisoire, Abdel Bakih, homme inactif et incompétent, et a écarté une proposition Égyptienne demandant la nomination au poste de Directeur du Musée copte de Jean Doresse. [N. 4:—Les élections générales ont lieu au début de janvier 1950 avec la victoire de Nahas Pacha (chef du partie Wafdiste); à la formation du Ministère, Taha Hussein reçoit la charge de Ministre de l’Éducation Nationale.]

81 Marianne Doresse: Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

C’est à peu près vers la fin de 1949 (les dates exactes sont dans les lettres écrites à ma mère) que se produisit, au Service des Antiquités, un imbroglio qui allait se répercuter sur la direction du Musée copte. Le Chanoine Drioton, avait, depuis peu, pour le seconder, comme Secrétaire Général du Service des Antiquités, Abbas Bayoumi, dont il n’apprécia pas les services et il voulut le muter [?] à la Direction Générale du Musée du Caire. Il prit, à sa place, comme Secrétaire Général, l’architecte en chef du Service des Antiquités, Roustom, personnage avec qui nous étions nous-même en sympathie car il était d’origine circassienne, et que même la femme de son frère, diplomate égyptien
In the month of December, festivities were held in Cairo celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Egyptian University. French personalities were invited, which made it possible for Jean to meet L. Joxe, at the time Director of Cultural Relations at the Quai d’Orsay, to explain to him the matter of the papyri. Joxe conceded that, for a fair collaboration with Puech to be possible, it was most of all necessary to liberate my husband from the C.N.R.S., by means of which Puech bullied Jean, and made his activity impossible. Joxe envisaged naming Jean 'Professor in a foreign country,' and invited him to come see him in Paris, to establish this nomination. However, on our return to France, the proposal of Joxe was set aside by his own administration (where Puech had friends), on the pretext that at the time there was not any position available in the budget. [N. 5: The celebrations of the 25th anniversary of the Egyptian University took place at the end of December 1950 and January 1951. It is at this time, in the course of the fourth mission, that Jean met Joxe. ...]

At this juncture Marianne Doresse reported on their investigations at Nag Hammadi in January 1950. Since Jean Doresse’s initial report has been given above (see Chapter 1, Part 4), only the part relevant to their actual visit to the site is given here:

82 Marianne Doresse: Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Au mois de décembre se tinrent au Caire les festivités célébrant le 25ème anniversaire de l’Université Égyptienne. Des personnalités françaises y furent invités, ce qui permit à Jean de rencontrer M. L. Joxe, alors Directeur des Relations Culturelles au Quai d’Orsay, pour lui exposer l’affaire des papyrus. Joxe concéda, que pour qu’une juste collaboration fut possible avec M. Puech, il fallait avant tout libérer mon mari du CNRS par le moyen duquel Puech brimait Jean et rendait son activité impossible; M. Joxe envisagea de nommer Jean "professeur à l’étranger," et l’invita à venir le voir à Paris pour établir cette nomination. Pourtant, à notre retour en France, la proposition de Joxe fut écartée par sa propre administration (où Puech avait des amis) sous le prétexte qu’il n’y avait point eu alors, sur le budget, de postes disponibles. [N. 5:—Les fêtes du 25 anniversaire de l’Université Égyptienne ont lieu en fin décembre 1950 et janvier 1951. C’est à ce moment, au cours de la 4e mission, que Jean rencontre M. Joxe. ...]
The first day, since the region was not safe, we are supplied with a police officer, to visit the right bank. With him, we visit the chief of the bedouin of Hamra-Doum ... . He had heard talk of the discovery of the papyri, found somewhere along the cliff, but he knows nothing very precise. In fact, as long as we have the policeman near us, no one will talk. So we return without escort, taking as a guide, at the location itself, an old man ... and suddenly the tongues become unstuck, bringing us from several sides information whose agreement is striking enough for Jean to have published it. No one, incidentally, other than the priest Daoud, wanted his identity to be revealed.  

During the month that Jean's treatment lasts [rabies shots], Taha Hussein calls for him. Jean goes to see him along with me: “You are not going to have any more time to lose,” he says, “for I am going to have all the Gnostic papyri entrusted to you, to edit as rapidly as possible!” Taha Hussein urges, in fact, Canon Drioton to conclude the contract that connects Jean, as expert, to the Coptic Museum. How is it that this contract was never signed? Taha Hussein, blind, depended on his secretaries, who daily made the papers interesting their own friends placed before all other matters, putting the contract of Jean under the pile, on the top of which, the evening before, Taha had had it placed. The bite by the dog, with this return for a month to Cairo, was for us a financial catastrophe. It cost us a round trip by train, and, by delaying our program, brought us back to Upper Egypt, whereas we had rented an apartment in Cairo, for our return planned for the 1st of March.

---

83 Marianne Doresse: *Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Le premier jour, la région n’étant pas sûre, on nous adjoignit, pour visiter la rive droite, un officier de police. Avec lui nous rendons visite au chef des bédouins de Hamra-Doum ... . Il a entendu parler de la découverte des papyrus, trouvés quelque part le long de la falaise, mais il ne sait rien de précis. De fait, tant que nous aurons le policier près de nous personne ne parlera. Aussi revenons nous sans escorte, prenant pour guide, sur place, un vieillard ... et, du coup les langues se délient, nous apportant de plusieurs côtés des renseignements dont la concordance est assez frappante pour que Jean les ait publiés. Personne, d’ailleurs, à part le prêtre Daoud, ne veut que son identité soit révélée.

---

84 Marianne Doresse: *Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Durant le mois que dure le traitement de Jean, Taha Hussein le réclame. Jean va le voir avec moi: “vous n’allez plus avoir de temps à perdre—dit-il; car je vais vous faire confier tous les papyrus gnostiques à éditer au plus vite!” Taha Hussein pressa, de fait, le Chanoine Drioton, de terminer le contrat qui lie Jean, comme expert, au Musée copte. Comment ce contrat ne fut-il jamais signé? Taha Hussein, aveugle, dépendait de ses secrétaires, qui chaque jour faisaient passer avant toutes autres affaires les papiers intéressant leurs propres amis, remettant le contrat de Jean sous la pile par dessus laquelle, la veille, Taha l’avait fait replacer. La morsure du chien avec ce retour d’un mois au Caire fut pour nous un catastrophe financière. Elle nous coûta un voyage...
I speak to you about the financial difficulties, for your will see in the letters of Puech that he did not stop reminding Jean that he is responsible for the funds that are granted him, and for the use of which he is required to give account to his colleagues. Now since these credits never cover more than a third or fourth of our expenses, Jean then had to use his salary, minimal at that time (a month of salary hardly covered the cost of a month’s rent for a modest apartment in Egypt). It was necessary to sell, in order to survive, piece by piece, a splendid collection of ancient weapons that Jean had inherited from his father, who, himself, had spent forty years collecting it. It is true that Puech, never having accomplished any research except in a library, did not have the slightest idea of the difficulties and the expenses of research in a foreign terrain, research from which he nonetheless took, instead of Jean, real profits for his career and reputation.85

Lacau was hardly better, never having wanted to admit that Jean had been the author of the discovery, and indignant that we incurred automobile expenses (and what automobiles!), whereas according to him an Egyptologist should move around only on the back of a donkey.86

At the Coptic Museum, Roustom, named Director, falls ill of typhoid, and cannot assume his position until March, just before Easter. Muslim, he knows poorly the Christian customs, and the personnel of the Museum profit from this to extract from him, on the pretext of the Paschal week, a week of supplementary vacations. A new loss of time, just when we were about to succeed in getting the manuscripts in hand. [N. 10: During our stay in Cairo,

aller et retour par train et, en retardant notre programme, nous ramena en Haute Égypte, alors que nous avions loué au Caire, pour notre retour prévu au 1er mars, un appartement.

85 Marianne Doresse: Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Je vous parle des difficultés financières, car vous verrez dans les lettres de Puech que celui-ci ne cesse de rappeler à Jean qu’il est responsable des crédits qu’on lui alloue et sur l’emploi desquels il est obligé de rendre compte à ses collègues; or ces crédits ne couvrirent jamais que le tiers ou le quart de nos frais, Jean devait donc dépenser son traitement, minime à cette époque (un mois de traitement couvrait à peine le coût du loyer mensuel d’un appartement modeste en Égypte). Il fallut vendre, pour subsister, pièce par pièce, une splendide collection d’armes anciennes que Jean avait hérité de son père, qui lui-même, avait mis une quarantaine d’années à la constituer. Il est vrai que M. Puech n’ayant jamais accompli que des recherches de bibliothèque, n’avait pas la moindre notion des peines et des frais de recherches sur un terrain étranger, recherches dont il prit pourtant, à la place de Jean, les réels profits de carrière et de réputation.

86 Marianne Doresse: Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

M. Lacau n’était guère meilleur; n’ayant jamais voulu admettre que Jean ait été l’auteur de la découverte et s’indignant que nous fassions des frais d’automobile (et quelles automobiles!) alors que selon lui un égyptologue ne doit se déplacer qu’à dos d’âne.
in a letter of 22 February 1950, I speak of the meeting with Prof. W. Till, and of his agreement for the publication of the first Gnostic volume, following the plan left by Togo.\textsuperscript{87} ...

[N. 13: On 10 April Jean is urgently called by Taha Hussein, who wants information on the matter of the Gnostic papyri.\textsuperscript{88} ...

We leave Cairo after the Committee of Publication of the codex of the Coptic Museum, consisting of Canon Drioton, Chafik Bey Ghorbal, Gaston Wiet, and Jean, has held its meeting. The minutes of the meeting are in our files. [N. 18: We return to France on the Italian SS 'Pace,' which puts in at Naples. We arrive in Paris on 11 June.\textsuperscript{89}]

The decisions of the Committee ought to have been communicated to the participants in the edition: Prof. W. Till, Puech, Canon Draguet, and Jean, of course. Till and Draguet were in agreement. Puech fulminated to Canon Drioton—you have in hand the letter that Canon Drioton (who communicated it to us) wrote him in response to his complaints. In a packet that we are now sending you, you will find, with the covering note of Canon Drioton, the copy itself—given to us by the Abbot—of the complains that Puech had addressed to him. It is from this moment on that the relations of Jean with Puech become decidedly sour.\textsuperscript{90} ...

\textsuperscript{87} Marianne Doresse: \textit{Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte}:

"Au Musée copte Roustom nommé directeur, tombe malade de typhoïde et ne peut prendre son poste qu’en mars, peu avant Pâques. Musulman, il connaît mal les coutumes chrétiennes et le personnel du musée en profite pour lui extorquer, sous prétexte de la semaine pascale, une semaine de vacances supplémentaires. Nouvelle perte de temps alors que nous aurions dû aboutir à la prise en main des manuscrits. [N. 10:—Pendant notre séjour au Caire, dans une lettre du 22 février 1950, je parle de la rencontre avec le Prof. W. Till et de son accord pour la publication du premier volume gnostique suivant le plan laissé par Togo.]

\textsuperscript{88} Marianne Doresse: \textit{Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte}:

[N. 13:—le 10 avril Jean est appelé d’urgence par Taha Hussein qui désire des renseignements sur l’affaire des papyrus gnostiques.] ....

\textsuperscript{89} Marianne Doresse: \textit{Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte}:

Nous quitterons le Caire après que se soit tenu le comité de publication du codex du Musée copte comprenant le Chanoine Drioton, Chafik Bey Ghorbal, Gaston Wiet et Jean; la minute du procès verbal est dans nos dossiers. [N. 18:—Nous rentrons en France sur le SS italien "PACE" qui fait escale à Naples. Revenons à Paris le 11 juin.]

\textsuperscript{90} Marianne Doresse: \textit{Troisième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte}:

Les décisions du Comité devaient être communiquées aux participants à l’édition, le professeur W. Till, M. Puech, le Chanoine Draguet et Jean, bien entendu. Till et Draguet furent d’accord; Puech fulmina auprès du Chanoine Drioton—vous avez en mains la lettre que le Chanoine Drioton (qui nous la communiqua) lui écrivit en réponse à ses réclamations. Dans un paquet que nous vous envoyons maintenant,
In this same year 1950 was to appear the ‘Crum Festschrift,’ a special number of the Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute where Jean presents his note on the Apocalypses of Zoroaster and Zostrianus [Codex VIII, Tractate 1]. He thought he had published, on the inventory of the whole of the manuscripts, as much as he had been permitted to reveal in the present state of the negotiations, and hence he had not wanted to give to the Bulletin more than a note on a small detail. He was very surprised, for that reason, to find in the same volume a ‘New Inventory’ signed by Puech, giving, without admitting it, a simple synthesis of his [Doresse’s] own analyses, though proposing a different numeration! His [Doresse’s] final numeration had been based on grouping the manuscripts according to the script that one recognized there, and according to their probable relative age. Was there a reason to change it? 

It is of course quite understandable that Doresse resenting finding his inventory of the Nag Hammadi Codices first published by Puech under Puech’s own name.

Jean Doresse: The Gnostic Papyri Coming from Hamra-Doum

The death of Togo Mina in October 1949 left Doresse without the support he needed to carry out his plans. Hence he wrote a memorandum soon thereafter—the reference to Hamra-Doum suggests it was written after his visit to the site in January 1950, as does the listing of publications in 1950. Yet it is intended to document Doresse’s rôle that Togo Mina, under his guidance, had approved:

The Gnostic papyri coming from Hamra-Doum (Chénoboskion) contain two different lots, posing distinct problems.
I. The manuscript acquired by Togo Mina for the Coptic Museum about 1946 was entrusted to me for study in October 1947. After the discovery that I made there of five unpublished Gnostic texts, Togo Mina asked me to assure their edition in collaboration with him. Subsequently he invited, for the philological part, Prof. W. Till, who in return, in agreement with the Berlin Academy, made it possible for us to obtain the right to use completely the unpublished parallel texts of the *Secret Book of John* [*The Apocryphon of John*] and of the *Wisdom of Jesus* that were present in the Gnostic codex of Berlin [P.Berol. 8502], unpublished. This support has made it possible to reconstruct the mutilated passages of the codex of Cairo. The Coptic Museum has, in return, accorded to Prof. Till the right to use the variants of the manuscript of Cairo for his future edition of the Gnostic codex of Berlin. Finally, Togo Mina had also associated to the edition, for certain questions of commentary, Prof. H.C. Puech, who is at present the only specialist for many of the problems having to do with Manichaeism and Gnosticism.93

There remains, of the work thus organized by Togo Mina:

1°) The communications made at the time of the discovery, announcing officially the broad lines of the future edition. These are:

– the communication made at the Institute of Egypt by Togo Mina in February 1948
– the same communication made simultaneously by H.C. Puech and myself at the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* on 20 February 1948
– the two communications made by Togo Mina and myself at the International Congress of Orientalists in Paris in July 194894

93 1950: Jean Doresse: *Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chénoboskion)* comprennent deux lots différents posant des problèmes distincts:

I. Le manuscrit acquis par Togo Mina pour le Musée Copte vers 1946 me fut confié pour l’étude en octobre 1947. À la suite de la découverte que j’y fis de cinq textes gnostiques inédits, Togo Mina me demanda d’en assurer l’édition en collaboration avec lui. Par la suite il invita, pour la partie philologique, le Professeur W. Till qui en retour, d’accord avec l’Académie de Berlin, nous fit obtenir le droit d’utiliser au complet les textes parallèles inédits du *Livre Secret de Jean* et de la *Sagesse de Jésus* qui figuraient dans le codex gnostique de Berlin, inédit. Cet apport a permis de reconstituer les passages mutilés du codex du Caire. Le Musée Copte a, en retour, accordé au Professeur Till le droit d’utiliser les variantes du manuscrit du Caire pour sa future édition du codex gnostique de Berlin. Enfin Togo Mina avait également associé à l’édition, pour certaines questions de commentaire, le Professeur H.C. Puech qui est actuellement le seul spécialiste pour bien des problèmes touchant au manichéïsme et à la gnose.

94 1950: Jean Doresse: *Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chénoboskion)* comprennent deux lots différents posant des problèmes distincts:

Il reste du travail ainsi organisé par Togo Mina:

1°) Les communications faites au moment de la découverte et annonçant officiellement les grandes lignes de la future édition. Ce sont:
2°) The articles of Togo Mina and of myself:

- Togo Mina: “Le papyrus gnostique du Musée Copte.”
- J. Doresse: “Trois livres gnostiques inédits” (in *VigChr*, Leiden, July 1948)
- J. Doresse: “Nouveaux aperçus historiques sur les gnostiques coptes: Ophites et Séthiens” (Institute of Egypt, on 22 January 1949) etc. ...

3°) The publication itself, which, already very advanced at the death of Togo Mina, has not ceased to be sharpened up by Till, Puech, and myself. It is at present practically completed, and its definitive edition is only a question of months [it was never published]. The volume should contain, in addition to the texts and translations accompanied by critical notes and variants of the manuscript of Berlin, an extensive commentary elaborated by Puech and myself, and a series of introductions concerning each text. Prof. Till is at present completing the cleaning up of the indices.

Togo Mina had asked that its printing be assured, either at Louvain, or at Paris. The proposal presented by the Imprimerie Orientaliste of the University of Louvain could contain only the text and the translation, without commentaries. The proposal of Paris, which permits, in contrast, a complete development of the commentaries and introductions, was hence retained. It would also present the advantage of not making necessary, on the part of the Coptic Museum, of any financial intervention, and would remain entirely
insured personally by the editors themselves. It is this project that is in the course of being carried out.\textsuperscript{97}

This makes it clear that the plans previously reported by Marianne Doresse (see above), to the effect that the publication would take place at Louvain, had been successfully cancelled by Puech, in order to insure the inclusion of his commentary and his supervision of the publication in France.

II. The second lot of manuscripts, which seems related to the first codex [Codex III], and also to come from Chênoboskion, was in 1948 in the home of Mlle Dattari, whom I could convince to show it to me, then to offer the manuscripts for purchase to the Coptic Museum, especially qualified to hold them. Togo Mina then asked me to prepare a scientific expertise on them, on the basis of the very complete study that in the meantime I had made of them. Then this expertise, signed with my name and countersigned by him and by Drioton, was presented to the Council of the Museum at the beginning of 1949. In order to prevent the discovery from escaping Egypt as a result of the numerous covetousnesses that it could arouse, Togo Mina decides (1°) that the papyri would be put under seal until the end of the negotiations that had begun; (2°) that the expertise established by me would immediately be published. This publication, edited in such a way as not to infringe on the rights of the owner by detailed citations, would nonetheless serve to assure us first rights of discovery in case circumstances permitted the manuscripts to escape.\textsuperscript{98}

\textsuperscript{97} 1950: Jean Doresse: \textit{Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chênoboskion) comprennent deux lots différents posant des problèmes distincts}:

Togo Mina avait demandé que l’impression en soit assurée, soit à Louvain, soit à Paris. Le projet présenté par l’imprimerie orientaliste de l’Université de Louvain ne pouvait comporter que le texte et la traduction sans commentaires. Le projet de Paris qui permettait par contre un développement complet des commentaires et introductions fut donc retenu. Il présentait en outre l’avantage de ne nécessiter, de la part du Musée Copte, aucune intervention financière et de rester entièrement assuré à titre privé par les éditeurs eux-mêmes. C’est ce projet qui est en cours de réalisation.

\textsuperscript{98} 1950: Jean Doresse: \textit{Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chênoboskion) comprennent deux lots différents posant des problèmes distincts}:

II. Le second lot de manuscrits, qui semble lié au premier codex et provenir lui aussi de Chênoboskion, se trouvait en 1948 chez Mademoiselle Dattari que je pus décider à me le présenter, puis à offrir les manuscrits, pour achat, au Musée Copte, particulièrement qualifié pour les détenir. Togo Mina me demanda alors d’en rédiger une expertise scientifique sur la base de l’étude très complète que j’en avais faite entre temps. Puis cette expertise, signée de mon nom et contresignée par lui et par Mr. Drioton, fut présentée au Conseil du Musée au début de 1949. Afin d’éviter que la découverte n’échappe à l’Egypte par suite des convoitises nombreuses qu’elle pouvait exciter, Togo Mina décide: (1°) que les papyrus seraient mis sous scellés jusqu’à la fin des négociations engagées; (2°) que l’expertise établie par moi serait aussitôt publiée.

The discovery was immediately announced, first by a communication to the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (which was to have as a parallel a communication by Togo Mina at the *Institut d’Égypte*, if he had not been already too ill), then by a series of articles that appeared in the revues of the *Académie Royale de Belgique* and in other publications in various languages. Let us mention only the review made of these articles by the *UNESCO Features* of 1 August 1949.

The announcement of the discovery was completed by various articles established on the very strict basis of what had been revealed in the report of the expertise just as it was published. These are:

- J. Doresse: “Cryptographie copte et cryptographie grecque” (Communication made at the *Institut d’Égypte* on 2 December 1950).

Cette publication, rédigée de façon à ne pas léser les droits de la propriétaire par des citations détaillées, permettait cependant de nous assurer la primauté de la découverte pour le cas ou les circonstances auraient fait échapper les manuscrits.

---

99 1950: Jean Doresse: *Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chénoboskion)* comprennent deux lots différents posant des problèmes distincts:


100 1950: Jean Doresse: *Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chénoboskion)* comprennent deux lots différents posant des problèmes distincts:

La découverte fut aussitôt annoncée, d’abord par une communication à l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (qui aurait dû avoir pour parallèle une communication de Togo Mina à l’Institut d’Égypte si celui-ci n’avait été déjà trop souffrant), puis par une série d’articles parus dans les revues de l’Académie Royale de Belgique et dans d’autres publications de diverses langues. Citons seulement le compte rendu qui fut fait de ces articles par les *UNESCO Features* du 1er août 1949.

101 1950: Jean Doresse: *Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chénoboskion)* comprennent deux lots différents posant des problèmes distincts:

L’annonce de la découverte fut complétée par divers articles établis sur la base très stricte de ce qui avait été révélé dans le rapport d’expertise tel qu’il était publié. Ce sont:
Finally, an investigation made on the terrain at my own expense, makes it possible for me to establish the place and the exact circumstances in which the manuscripts were discovered by the peasants [see Chapter 1, Part 4 above]:

J. Doresse: “Sur les traces des papyrus gnostiques: Recherches à Chénobskion,” BAB.L. 5th Series, 36, 1950.\(^{102}\)

It is a matter of course that, in the process of the expertise, we have had to study very closely some of the collections held by Mlle Dattari, with the result that our personal research would make it possible to establish very rapidly a definitive edition, for example for the collection number I of our inventory [= Codex II] (containing a Secret Book of John, the Gospel of Thomas, the Hypostasis of the Archons, etc.), or for the collection number IX [= Codex VI] (containing a series of Hermetic books). Nonetheless, at the time of the primitive expertise, the other texts, they too, have been read and analyzed in detail, which has made it possible to make a definitive identification of them, in comparison with what one knew, from other ancient writings, of this literature that was lost until now. Incidentally, none of the results of these studies, which remain my person property, has been published, since that cannot be done legitimately.\(^{103}\)

---

\(^{102}\) 1950: Jean Doresse: Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chénobskion) comprennent deux lots différents posant des problèmes distincts:

Enfin une enquête faite sur le terrain à mes propres frais me permit d’établir le lieu et les circonstances exactes dans lesquelles les manuscrits avait été découverts par les paysans:

J. Doresse: Sur les traces des papyrus gnostiques: Recherches à Chénobskion (Académie Royale de Belgique, 5\(^{o}\) série, T XXXVI, 1950).

\(^{103}\) 1950: Jean Doresse: Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chénobskion) comprennent deux lots différents posant des problèmes distincts:

Il va de soi qu’au cours de l’expertise nous avions eu à étudier de très près certains des recueils détenus par Mademoiselle Dattari, de sorte que nos travaux personnels permettraient d’établir très rapidement une édition définitive, par exemple pour le recueil n\(^o\) I de notre inventaire (contenant un Livre Secret de Jean, l’Évangile de Thomas, l’Hypostase des Archontes, etc.) ou pour le recueil n\(^o\) IX (contenant une série de livres hermétiques). Toutefois, lors de l’expertise primitive, les autres textes ont été lus et analysés, eux aussi, en détail, ce qui a permis d’en donner une identification définitive par comparaison avec ce que l’on savait, par d’autres écrits anciens, de cette
These manuscripts pose at present three different problems. 1°) Independently of any future acquisition, the most urgent is their being put in a state of preservation. These papyri have no doubt been exposed to the air ever since, no doubt, 1945. Nothing has been done since, for their conservation. Now, after an examination made about two years ago, we have had to address to Dr. Taha Hussein, then Minister, a report insisting on the progressive decomposition of the leaves and on the existing urgency to dismantle these manuscripts so as to put them page by page between panes of glass. This work would have to be completed by photography carried out bit by bit as the operation proceeded.104

Incidentally, this putting into shape is especially complicated by the fact that several of the collections, broken into multiple fragments, are no longer in order. Moreover, we have had to arrange their fragments in an arbitrary and provisional way, to avoid any increase of damage. They are in need of a veritable restoration, which cannot be entrusted to anyone other than a papyrologist competent from the technical point of view, and at the same time capable of basing his work on the fragments of text that are legible, so as to reconstitute the whole.105

2°) The second problem will be that of the edition. The thousand pages of Coptic text contained in the manuscripts of Mlle Dattari will represent fourteen volumes in 8° of 350 to 500 pages each, containing, for the clarification of the text, critical notes, variants, and rather abundant commentaries. It will be necessary for the specialists who will make this edition to work in close liaison jusqu’ici perdue. D’ailleurs rien du résultat de ces études qui restent ma propriété personnelle n’a été publié, cela ne pouvant se faire légitimement.

104 1950: Jean Doresse: Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chénoboskion) comprennent deux lots différents posant des problèmes distincts:

Cette mise en état est d’ailleurs particulièrement compliquée du fait que plusieurs des recueils, brisés en fragments multiples, ne sont plus en ordre. Nous avons dû, d’ailleurs, disposer leurs morceaux de façon arbitraire et provisoire pour éviter l’accroissement des dégâts. Ils ont besoin d’une véritable restauration qui ne peut être confiée qu’à un papyrologue compétent au point de vue technique et en même temps capable de se fonder sur les fragments de texte lisible pour reconstituer l’ensemble.

105 1950: Jean Doresse: Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chénoboskion) comprennent deux lots différents posant des problèmes distincts:
son, each using the complete ensemble of the documents. All of these, under diverse forms, laying out the same Gnostic systems, contain in effect numerous parallel or comparable passages, and complement each other. One may estimate the cost of each of these volumes, independent of the scientific costs, at two or three thousand Pounds for each.\footnote{106}

3°) The third problem has to do with the editing of the first manuscript [Codex III]. In effect the manuscripts of Mlle Dattari contain several parallel redactions of certain of the large Gnostic texts present in the manuscript of Togo Mina. There would hence be considerable interest, for editing this manuscript, as well as for editing the Gnostic codex of Berlin, that these parallel texts can be made accessible to scholars interested in these publications.\footnote{107}

Togo Mina envisaged in advance the publication of these manuscripts, as having to be established along the same lines and in the same conditions as those of the first volume [Codex III]. In effect, under these circumstances we would have been able to grant him our total collaboration, in taking complete charge both of the costs of printing and of the cost of the scientific work, as long as that may be. The various credits for publication that are at our disposal would even permit us to assure the immediate restoration of the manuscripts and their preliminary photography.\footnote{108}
This text was apparently prepared for consumption in Egypt, to accredit Doresse there after the demise of Togo Mina. For its assurances that the publication of Codex III was only ‘a question of months,’ the assurance that the *Imprimerie Nationale* in Paris would publish without subsidy, and the assurance of funding for the restoration, photography, and publication of the whole, had little basis in fact, and hence could hardly have been intended for Puech to circulate in Paris.

**Jean Doresse: Note on the Editing of the Gnostic Papyri of Cairo**

Dorresse also composed a typewritten text heavily emended by hand, which he sent me in first draft for the Nag Hammadi Archives. Whether a final draft was ever prepared is unclear, and to whom it was to be circulated is also unclear. It presents more explicitly the tension with Puech:

*Note on the editing of the Gnostic papyri of Cairo*¹⁰⁹

The Gnostic papyri of Cairo consist of two different lots: On the one hand a *codex* acquired in 1946 by the Coptic Museum; on the other hand twelve other collections, uncovered and studied by me in Cairo in 1947, and whose purchase, undertaken at the time by the Egyptian Government, is on the point of being completed.¹¹⁰

Perhaps all that can be envisaged for the moment is the editing and use of the first of these manuscripts, containing five unpublished texts. This edition had been organized in 1948 by Togo Mina, then Director of the Coptic Museum, today deceased. Togo Mina had decided to share with me the editing of the document; to associate, at my request, H.C. Puech for certain parts of the commentary; finally, to add to the Committee thus constituted Prof. Till of Vienna, who would be happy to contribute, in effect, for two of our own texts, all the assembled variants figuring in an unedited manuscript of Berlin.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹ Jean Doresse: *Note sur l’édition des papyrus gnostiques du Caire.*

¹¹⁰ Jean Doresse: *Note sur l’édition des papyrus gnostiques du Caire:*

Les papyrus gnostiques du Caire comprennent deux lots différents: d’une part un *codex* acquis en 1946 par le Musée Copte; d’autre part douze autres recueils retrouvés et étudiés par moi au Caire en 1947, et dont l’achat, entrepris alors par le Gouvernement Égyptien, est sur le point de se terminer.

¹¹¹ Jean Doresse: *Note sur l’édition des papyrus gnostiques du Caire:*

Seule peut-être envisagée, pour le moment, l’édition et l’utilisation du premier de ces manuscrits, contenant cinq textes inédits. Cette édition avait été organisée dès 1948
In fact, the conditions established by Drioton were never clearly accepted by Puech, who since the death of T[ogo] M[ina] insists on a larger part in the general direction of the edition.\textsuperscript{112}

It is hence appropriate to envisage asking for the establishment of a new statute of publication, a maneuver that cannot be carried out without recourse to the view of Dr. Pahor Labib, present Director of the Coptic Museum.\textsuperscript{113}

While waiting, and in the framework of present conditions, it is already possible, and even urgent, to undertake the editing of the codex of the Coptic Museum on the budget of the Commission des Fouilles. This is why, in agreement with Schaeffer and Puech, it has been decided to have the I[mpri]m[N]ationale of Paris establish the first efforts at printing, which will be submitted to the Egyptians at the same time that one will seek to obtain from them an enlargement of the conditions set up for Puech. These primarily typographic efforts established by me have been approved by Dussaud, Merlin, G[ustave] Lefevre, Drioton; they have on the other hand been contested by H.C. Puech, who would like to see substituted, rather than a ‘diplomatic’ edition of the text, a partial effort to reconstitute what he thinks the primitive text to have been.\textsuperscript{114}

\textsuperscript{112} Jean Doresse: \textit{Note sur l'édition des papyrus gnostiques du Caire}:

En fait, les conditions établies par M. Drioton n’ont jamais été clairement acceptées par M. Puech, qui depuis la mort de T.M. demande une part plus grande dans la direction générale de l’édition.

\textsuperscript{113} Jean Doresse: \textit{Note sur l’édition des papyrus gnostiques du Caire}:

Il y a donc lieu d’envisager à demander l’établissement d’un nouveau statut de publication, manoeuvre qui ne peut être effectuée qu’en recourant à l’avis de Dr. Pahor Labib, actuel directeur du Musée Copte.

\textsuperscript{114} Jean Doresse: \textit{Note sur l’édition des papyrus gnostiques du Caire}:

En attendant, et dans le cadre des conditions actuelles, il est déjà possible et même urgent d’entreprendre l’édition du codex du Musée Copte aux frais de la Commission des Fouilles. C’est pourquoi, en accord avec M. Schaeffer et M. Puech, il a été décidé de faire établir par l’I N de Paris de premiers essais d’impression qui seront soumis aux égyptiens en même temps qu’on tentera d’obtenir d’eux un élargissement des conditions fixées pour M. Puech. Ces essais avant tout typographiques établis par moi ont été approuvés par M. Dussaud, M. Merlin, M. G. Lefevre, M. Drioton; ils sont par contre contestés par M H.C. Puech qui désirerait voir substituer, à une édition ‘diplomatique’ du texte, un essai partiel de reconstitution de ce qu’il pense avoir été le texte primitif.
Though such an attempt at reconstruction does not conform to the methods of editing currently followed in the case of Coptic texts, it will without doubt be possible to collect in the edition these often precious restitutions, in giving them a place only in notes justifying them.\footnote{Jean Doresse: \textit{Note sur l'édition des papyrus gnostiques du Caire}: Bien qu'un tel essai de reconstitution ne soit pas conforme aux méthodes d'édition suivies actuellement en matière de textes coptes, il sera sans aucune doute possible d'accueillir dans l'édition ces restitutions souvent précieuses, en ne leur faisant place que dans des notes justificatives.}

But in fact, this problem, like the problem of the placement of the commentary, for which Puech will dispose of all the space necessary, can only be regulated by an agreement of all the present editors, an agreement that we hope to obtain without delay.\footnote{Jean Doresse: \textit{Note sur l'édition des papyrus gnostiques du Caire}: Mais en fait, ce problème, comme le problème de l'emplacement du commentaire, pour lequel M. Puech disposera de toute la place nécessaire, ne pourra être réglé [que] par un accord de tous les éditeurs actuels, accord que nous espérons obtenir sans délai.}

As to the twelve codices whose purchase is taking place at present, my new sojourn in Egypt has as its goal to bring back the text, to the extent possible. They contain in effect parallel redactions of three of the texts to appear in the first volume, and the knowledge of these texts is practically indispensable.\footnote{Jean Doresse: \textit{Note sur l'édition des papyrus gnostiques du Caire}: Quant aux douze codices dont l'achat s'achève actuellement, mon nouveau séjour en Égypte a pour but d'en rapporter le texte, dans la mesure du possible. Ils renferment en effet des rédactions parallèles de trois des textes à paraître dans le premier volume, et la connaissance de ces textes est pratiquement indispensable.}

\textit{Marianne Doresse: The Fourth Mission of Jean Doresse 1950–1951}

Marianne Doresse's report on their fourth mission in 1950–1951, in the parts relevant to the Nag Hammadi Codices, is as follows:


We embark at Marseille on the Italian SS ‘Pace,’ which puts in at Genua. I write in a letter of 17 October 1950: We have been in Cairo for several days. We have reinstalled ourselves in the apartment of Dokki.\footnote{Marianne Doresse: \textit{4e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte}:}
The Abbot presents to us Pahor Labib, whom one envisages naming Director of the Coptic Museum, if Jean is willing to work with him as expert in the Coptic Museum.\textsuperscript{120} ...

In the second half of January, Pahor is named Director of the Coptic Museum. Before being named, he asked Jean if he would like to work as expert with him in the Museum. Taha Hussein hoped that Jean would give 9 months per year to the Coptic Museum; Jean agrees to give 5 months. \textsuperscript{121}

Every morning, we go work at the Coptic Museum; we are in very friendly terms with Pahor.\textsuperscript{122}

Taha Hussein calls Jean to tell him that the papyri will be purchased in two months. \textsuperscript{123}

We leave our things at the residence of the Abbot, and our truck with Alexandre Badawy, who lives not far from us at the Pyramids, and we leave Cairo on 24 April 1951. On 2 May we are at Tunis, to embark the 5th for Marseille.\textsuperscript{124}

This report suggests that Doresse would survive the appointment of Pahor Labib as the new Director (see Part 6 below). In fact they subsequently did have good enough relations for Pahor Labib to appoint him to the

\textsuperscript{120} Marianne Doresse: \textit{4e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte}:

L’Abbé nous présente Pahor Labib que l’on envisage de nommer Directeur du Musée Copte si Jean veut bien travailler avec lui comme expert au Musée Copte. ....

\textsuperscript{121} Marianne Doresse: \textit{4e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte}:

Dans la seconde moitié de janvier, Pahor est nommé Directeur du Musée Copte. Avant sa nomination il avait demandé à Jean s’il voulait travailler comme expert avec lui au Musée. Taha Hussein souhaitait que Jean donne 9 mois par an au Musée Copte; Jean accepte de donner 5 mois. ....

\textsuperscript{122} Marianne Doresse: \textit{4e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte}:

Chaque matin, nous allons travailler au Musée Copte; nous sommes en rapports très amicaux avec Pahor.

\textsuperscript{123} Marianne Doresse: \textit{4e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte}:

Taha Hussein appelle Jean pour lui dire que les papyrus seront achetées dans deux mois. ....

\textsuperscript{124} Marianne Doresse: \textit{4e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte}:

Nous laissons nos affaires chez l’Abbé, et notre camion chez Alexandre Badawy qui habite non loin de nous aux Pyramides et nous quittons le Caire le 24 avril 1951. Le 2 mai nous sommes à Tunis, pour nous embarquer le 5 pour Marseille.
International Committee of Gnosticism that met in 1956, even though Puech did not make it possible for him to attend (see Chapter 6 below).

Marianne Doresse: The Fifth Mission of Doresse to Egypt 1951–1952

Marianne Doresse's report, in the parts relevant to the Nag Hammadi Codices, is as follows:

_Fifth Mission of Jean Doresse in Egypt: Agent of Excavations of the Museum of the Louvre, October 1951 to April 1952_\(^\text{125}\)

On board our Citroën-11, Saturday 29 September 1951, we arrive at Marseille to embark with our car on the SS ‘Kairouan.’ The next morning we will disembark at Tunis.\(^\text{126}\) ...

On 12 December 1951 Jean finally received the proofs from the Imprimerie Nationale of Paris, a page of _The Gospel of the Egyptians_. They were supposed to have been sent to him at the beginning of October! The complaints that he sent by mail have remained without response.\(^\text{127}\)

Taha Hussein has Jean come to the Ministry, and tells him that the papyri of Mlle Dattari will be at his disposal a month from now. He would like to see him edit, very rapidly, their texts, without adding commentaries to them.\(^\text{128}\)

The new law on antiquities that Taha Hussein prepared has appeared. But it differs very little from the preceding law, for it has been toned down, with the result that Taha cannot requisition the papyri as he had wanted to do. ...\(^\text{129}\)

\(^{125}\) Marianne Doresse: _5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:_ Chargé de Fouilles du Musée du Louvre; octobre 1951 à avril 1952.

\(^{126}\) Marianne Doresse: _5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:_ À bord de notre Citroën-11, le samedi 29 septembre 1951 nous arrivons à Marseille pour nous embarquer avec notre voiture sur le SS “Kairouan”; le lendemain matin nous débarquerons à Tunis. ....


\(^{128}\) Marianne Doresse: _5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:_ Taha Hussein fait venir Jean au Ministère et lui dit que les papyrus de Mlle Dattari seront d’ici un mois à sa disposition: il souhaiterait le voir éditer, très rapidement, leur textes sans y adjoindre de commentaires.

\(^{129}\) Marianne Doresse: _5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:_ La nouvelle loi sur les antiquités que préparait Taha Hussein est parue: mais elle diffère très peu de la loi précédente car on l’a modérée, en sorte que Taha ne peut pas réquisitionner les papyrus comme il le voulait. ....
On 2 February 1952, one decides to verify the good conservation of the papyri. Mlle Dattari and Tano bring the valise to the Service des Antiquités, where it is opened, in the office of the Abbot. Then, with the written agreement of Mlle Dattari and Tano, the valise is sealed and entrusted to the Abbot Drioton to guard.130

Every day we work at the Coptic Museum.131 ...

On 26 January serious anti-British troubles and conflagrations in Cairo. From the Pyramids we heard nothing.132

On 27 February, Jean has just sent to the Imprimerie Nationale, to be set in type, a second packet of Gnostic texts (Coptic texts and translations) of the first volume purchased by Togo.133

We envisage making with Pahor Labib, on our truck, an inspection of the Coptic monuments of the Valley.134

Life resumes after the troubles of January. But the new Ministry which has replaced the Wafds does not concern itself with the papyri.135

Letter of 10 April: We have made a visit, in his home, to Taha Hussein, who is no longer Minister.136

---

130 Marianne Doresse: 5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

131 Marianne Doresse: 5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:
Chaque jour nous travaillons au Musée Copte. ....

132 Marianne Doresse: 5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:
Le 26 janvier troubles anti-britanniques graves et incendies au Caire; des Pyramides nous n’avons rien entendu.

133 Marianne Doresse: 5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:
Le 27 février, Jean vient d’envoyer à l’Imprimerie Nationale, pour composition, un deuxième paquet de textes gnostiques (textes coptes et traductions) du premier volume acheté par Togo.

134 Marianne Doresse: 5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:
Nous projetons de faire, à bord de notre camion, avec Pahor Labib, une inspection des monuments coptes de la Vallée.

135 Marianne Doresse: 5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:
La vie reprend après les troubles de janvier; mais le nouveau ministère qui a remplacé les wafdistes ne s’occupe pas des papyrus.

136 Marianne Doresse: 5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:
On April 26, we arrange our things, which we leave with the Abbot.\footnote{Marianne Doresse: 5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte: Le 26 avril, nous rangeons nos affaires que nous laissons chez l’Abbé. ...}

... hence we have left Cairo the 8th or the 9th of May. The 16th we are at Algiers, from where we embark for Marseille.\footnote{Marianne Doresse: 5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte: ... nous sommes donc partis du Caire le 8 ou le 9 mai. Le 16 nous sommes à Alger d’où nous nous embarquons pour Marseille.}

\textit{Marianne Doresse: The Sixth Mission of Doresse to Egypt 1953}

Marianne Doresse’s report, in the parts relevant to the Nag Hammadi Codices, is as follows:

\textit{Sixth Mission of Jean Doresse in Egypt, always as: Director [!] of Excavations of the Museum of the Louvre, 1st January to 17 February 1953}\footnote{Marianne Doresse: 6e Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte, toujours comme: Directeur de Fouilles du Musée du Louvre; 1er janvier au 17 février 1953.}

On 31 December 1952 we leave Paris on the Citroën, and we embark on the 1st January at Marseille for Tunis.\footnote{Marianne Doresse: 6e Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte: Le 31 décembre 1952 nous quittons Paris à bord de la Citroën et nous nous embarquons le 1er janvier à Marseille pour Tunis. ...}

The first letter from Cairo dates on 14 January 1953. We are in the villa at the Pyramids. On the desert route, at Soffoum, the Egyptian officer who is posted there has us bring him to Cairo, for he wants to be present in the celebrations of the Revolution presided over by General Néguib.\footnote{Marianne Doresse: 6e Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte: La première lettre du Caire date du 14 janvier 1953. Nous sommes dans la villa des Pyramides. Sur la route du désert, à Soffoum, l’officier égyptien qui y est en poste, se fait ramener au Caire par nous, car il veut assister aux fêtes de la Révolution présidées par le général Néguib. ...}

On 29 January we have seen the new General Director of the Service des Antiquités, Moustafa Amer. He now has the administration of all the Antiquities of Egypt (Pharaonic, Coptic and Arab Egypt). Jean explains to him the work already accomplished in what has to do with the first volume of the Gnostic papyri. Moustafa Amer asks him to continue the work. Jean shows him
the first drafts of them (since Pahor has already ‘borrowed’ from him the definitive manuscript prepared for the edition of the *Secret Book of John* [*The Apocryphon of John*], according to the versions of the first codex of Togo and the codex of Berlin). (Pahor pretended he wanted to present this work to the Committee of the Coptic Museum, to get a renewal of the authorization given a long time ago to Jean to publish this volume. But Jean will never see his manuscript, which will serve for Pahor, probably, as a ‘personal’ contribution to its publication that he will do with Martin Krause.)

As was previously agreed with him, before leaving for Ethiopia we see again Moustafa Amer, who tells us that when the reorganization of the *Service des Antiquités* will have been achieved, he will absolutely need us. Thus, we leave our car with the Garitos, and we retain our apartment at the Pyramids, so as to be able to return as soon as we are recalled.

On 17 February we take the plane for Addis-Abeba.

At the beginning of July we return to Cairo by plane. We liquidate our house at the Pyramids and arrange our affairs and our books in the residence of the Garitos.

---

142 Marianne Doresse: *6e Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Le 29 janvier nous avons vu le nouveau Directeur Général du Service des Antiquités, Moustafa Amer. Il a maintenant l’administration de toutes les Antiquités d’Égypte (Égypte Pharaonique, Copte et Arabe). Jean lui explique le travail déjà accompli en ce qui concerne le premier volume des papyrus gnostiques. Moustafa Amer le prie de continuer le travail. Jean lui en montre les brouillons (car Pahor lui a déjà “emprunté” le manuscrit définitif préparé pour l’édition du “Livre sacré de Jean” selon les versions du premier codex de Togo et du codex de Berlin). (Pahor a prétendu vouloir présenter ce travail au comité du Musée Copte pour faire renouveler l’autorisation donnée depuis longtemps à Jean de publier ce volume. Mais Jean ne reverra jamais son manuscrit qui servira à Pahor, vraisemblablement, de contribution “personnelle” à la publication qu’il en fera avec Martin Krause.)

143 Marianne Doresse: *6e Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Comme entendu avec lui précédemment, avant de partir en Éthiopie nous voyons encore Moustafa Amer qui nous dit que lorsque la réorganisation du Service des Antiquités sera achevée il aura absolument besoin de nous. Ainsi, nous laissons notre voiture chez les Garito et nous conservons notre appartement des Pyramides, pour pouvoir revenir sitôt que nous serons rappelés.

144 Marianne Doresse: *6e Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Le 17 février nous prenons l’avion pour Addis-Abeba.

145 Marianne Doresse: *6e Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte*:

Au début de juillet nous revenons au Caire en avion; nous liquidons notre maison des Pyramides et rangeons nos affaires et nos livres chez les Garito.
We return to France on our Citroën by the desert route, and we embark at Tunis.\textsuperscript{146} ...

\textit{Marianne Doresse: 1954}

Marianne Doresse could not continue her reports by listing a seventh mission, since there was none. She concludes with a brief section entitled simply 1954:

We return from Addis-Abeba to Cairo on 1st July 1954 by plane. From Cairo, we take the plane for Geneva, where I had an uncle with his family. ...\textsuperscript{147}

We return to Egypt, at the end of September, in our Citroën. We have with us Serge Sauneron, our colleague and friend, and his wife (since then, Sauneron was named Director of the Institute of Cairo; he killed himself in Egypt in a car in 1976). ... Once arrived in Cairo, we see Pahor, who, far from returning Jean's manuscript, asks him for more of them.\textsuperscript{148}

Since then, we have not returned to Cairo any more. Jean obtained a mission of three months from the Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, in 1972. But we did not have time to take advantage of this mission.\textsuperscript{149}

This is the ending of Marianne Doresse’s reports on their Egyptian activity. They were based on her having been involved in whatever Jean Doresse was doing, and information as to dates and itineraries were derived from letters she wrote regularly to her mother at the time. Of course what is not

\textsuperscript{146} Marianne Doresse: 6e Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte:

Nous revenons en France à bord de notre Citroën par la route du désert et nous nous embarquons à Tunis. ....

\textsuperscript{147} Marianne Doresse: 1954:

Nous revenons d’Addis-Abeba au Caire le 1er juillet 1954 en avion. Du Caire, nous prenons l’avion pour Genève où j’avais un oncle avec sa famille. ....

\textsuperscript{148} Marianne Doresse: 1954:

Nous rentrons en Égypte, fin septembre, à bord de notre Citroën. Nous avons avec nous Serge Sauneron, notre collègue et ami, et sa femme (depuis, Sauneron a été nommé Directeur de l’Institut du Caire; il s’est tué en Égypte en voiture en 1976). ... Arrivée au Caire nous voyons Pahor qui, loin de rendre son manuscrit à Jean, lui en réclame d’autres.

\textsuperscript{149} Marianne Doresse: 1954:

Depuis, nous ne sommes plus retournés au Caire. Jean avait obtenu une mission de trois mois de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, en 1972; mais nous n’avons pas eu le temps de profiter de cette mission.
recorded in them is what they were not able to achieve. Doresse’s inability to accept the invitation to attend the meeting of the International Committee of Gnosticism of 1956, and to be called back to Cairo to conserve and photograph the codices, became the greatest disappointments, passed over here in silence. Omitted is also what was taking place on the part of Henri-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, and C.A. Meier, to purchase and publish the Jung Codex, with Michel Malinine replacing Doresse as coptologist (see Chapters 3 and 4 below), and on the part of Henri-Charles Puech, Antoine Guillaumont, Gilles Quispel, Walter Till, and Yassah ʿAbd al-Masih, with Guillaumont replacing Doresse as coptologist, to publish The Gospel of Thomas (see Chapter 7 below). This is in part because this information was kept from the Doresses, but also because Marianne Doresse’s reports played up the positive side of what they were doing or hoped to be doing. Her reports do, no doubt accurately, reflect the good relations they maintained in Cairo, which made it difficult for the Europeans to exclude them completely.


François Daumas

On 5 December 1946, just two months after Codex III was recorded in the Register of the Coptic Museum (on 4 October 1946), Togo Mina showed it to François Daumas, a beginning Egyptologist at the French Institute, and Henri Corbin (1903–1978), an internationally known French expert on the cultural history of the Near East, Professor at the Sorbonne in the Chair of Islam and the Religions of Arabia. Daumas has reported the occasion to me in detail, obviously interested to put on public record the facts that have not previously been known, to the effect that he and Corbin, rather than Togo Mina, much less Doresse, were the first to identify Codex III as a Gnostic document of very great importance. Hence Daumas contacted Corbin for his recollections to supply to me, and on 8 April 1977 Daumas received Corbin’s reply:150

150 n viii 77: Letter from Daumas to Robinson, quoting a letter of 8 iv 77 that Daumas had received from Corbin:

C’est exactement le jeudi 5 décembre 1946 (quarante-six) que nous étions ensemble le matin au Musée Copte. C’est sans doute ce jour-là que nous avons vu pour la première fois l’Apocryphon Johannis. En tout cas je me rappelle fort bien avoir vu avec vous un de ces manuscrits coptes de Nag Hammadi.
It is precisely Thursday 5 December 1946 (forty-six) that we were together in the morning at the Coptic Museum. It is without doubt that day that we saw for the first time the *Apocryphon Johannis*. In any case, I recall quite well having seen with you one of these Coptic manuscripts of Nag Hammadi.

Thereupon Daumas reported to me:151

With regard to the identification of *The Apocryphon of John*, here are the facts: I saw the manuscript in the company of H[enri] Corbin on 5 December 1946, in the office of Togo Mina. The latter was certainly aware that he was holding a very ancient text, doubtless unpublished, having to do with Christianity. That is all. He had clearly been delighted to see the enthusiasm of Henri Corbin, when I read the first leaf of the manuscript that Togo must have placed (or left?) at the front of the book. It was only the title *ⲡⲣⲟⲕⲣⲟⲧⲱ ⲛⲓⲧⲓⲧⲓⲥ*. I certainly pronounced the word “Gnostic.” Corbin was delirious and said to me: If it is of Gnosticism, translate that immediately. Along side [the Gospel of] John, it will be Gnostic mysticism. I do not guarantee the terms, but the meaning. Corbin does not recall more details, for he was less directly interested than was I.

Daumas emphasized that he kept the discovery a secret at the time, lest a sensational report escalate the price being asked of the government for the bulk of the discovery (see Part 5 below):152

When I talked about the matter with J[acques] Schwartz, he recommended to me secrecy until the Egyptian government has acquired the rest of the lot. Drioton told me the same thing later. I scrupulously respected what had been

151 29 ix 77: Letter from Daumas to Robinson:


152 29 ix 77: Letter from Daumas to Robinson:

Quand j’ai parlé de la chose à J. Schwartz, il m’a recommandé le secret jusqu’à ce que le gouvernement égyptien ait acquis le reste du lot. Drioton m’a dit la même chose plus tard. J’ai scrupuleusement respecté ce qu’on m’avait demandé. Le seul à qui j’ai parlé de cette affaire était A. Guillaumont.
There may be a bit of chagrin in Daumas’s words, as would be understandable, in view of Doresse’s sensational news releases of 10 January 1948, 1 February 1949, and 10 June 1949 (see Parts 3 and 5 below), reflecting little concern for the impact on the market value of the codices; furthermore, Doresse gave himself and Togo Mina credit for the discovery, and announced they would publish the text—whereas Daumas’ rôle was completely ignored.

The first public announcement, written by Doresse and revised by Togo Mina (see below), but reported as an interview with Togo Mina, presented a more favorable image of Togo Mina’s first impression, even before acquiring the codex, than had Daumas. For Daumas’ recognition that it was Gnostic would have been presupposed in the presentation of Togo Mina’s description to Doresse of his ‘first’ impression leading to its acquisition:153

After having read, at first glance, some lines, Togo Mina recognized that it had to do with a manuscript of the fourth century, containing an unpublished Christian *apocryphon* and Gnostic texts, and he decided to make their acquisition immediately.

The back of the front flyleaf has only two lines of text, consisting of a title which consisted of Greek loan words in Coptic syntax, and hence had not been hard for Daumas (or Togo Mina) to read on sight: *The Apocryphon / of John*. Thus it seems clear that Togo Mina had simply left this first leaf in place, since it was this that had caused the excitement of Corbin and Daumas.

Togo Mina had in fact originally proposed that he and Daumas co-edit the codex, and Daumas was glad to accept; tentative plans had even been made for their collaboration:154

---

153 10 i 48: *La Bourse Égyptienne*:

Après avoir lu, à première vue, quelques lignes, M. Togo Mina reconnut qu’il s’agissait d’un manuscrit du IVe siècle, contenant un apocryphe chrétien inédit et des textes gnostiques, et il décida d’en faire immédiatement l’acquisition.

154 11 viii 77: Letter from Daumas to Robinson:

C’est alors que Togo Mina me proposa d’éditer ce manuscrit avec lui. Sous la pression de Corbin que le gnosticisme intéressait et de Togo Mina et, d’ailleurs avec plaisir, parce que j’étais déjà convaincu des rapports étroits de la pensée gnostique avec celle des anciens Égyptiens, j’ai accepté. J’ai dû revoir à ce sujet trois ou quatre fois Togo M. Il était convenu que nous commencerions le travail en octobre 1947, quand je reviendrais en Égypte et qu’il aurait fait mettre sous vitre les pages du vénérable manuscrit.
It was then that Togo Mina proposed to me to edit this manuscript with him. Under the pressure of Corbin, who was interested in Gnosticism, and of Togo Mina, I accepted, and incidentally with pleasure, because I was already convinced of the close relations of Gnostic thought with that of the ancient Egyptians. I must have seen Togo M[ina] again on this topic three or four times. It was agreed that we would begin the work in October 1947, when I would return to Egypt, and that he would have had the pages of the venerable manuscript put under glass.

Daumas added that it was he who recognized the nature of the codex:  

It is at this moment that Togo spontaneously proposed to me to publish with him, obviously because I had told him by and large what it was about.

Daumas also saw in the spring of 1947 the part of Codex I that was then in the antiquities shop of Albert Eid. Daumas recalled that the leaves were not conserved, but lay loose and out of order without their cover. He forwarded photographs on Eid’s behalf to Mme d’Alverny in the section of Oriental Manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale, who however reported to him that summer that there were not sufficient funds available to make the acquisition.

On his return to Paris for the summer of 1947, Daumas contacted Antoine Guillaumont, no doubt in preparation for the editing due to begin on his return to Cairo in the fall.

... during the summer of 1947 in Paris we immediately evoked with Ant[oine] Guillaumont the unpublished text of Berlin made known by C[arl] Schmidt. Perhaps [it was] in June, or the beginning of July 1947, hence several months before Doresse became acquainted with the manuscript.

When I sent Doresse an early draft of this report, he responded as follows:

---

155 29 ix 77: Letter from Daumas to Robinson:  
C’est à ce moment que Togo m’a spontanément proposé de publier avec lui; visiblement parce que je lui avais dit en gros de quoi il s’agissait.

156 30 xi 76 and 3 xii 76: Interviews with Daumas at the site of his excavation in Denderah.

157 29 ix 77: Letter from Daumas to Robinson:  

158 10 vii 83: Letter from Doresse to Robinson:  
... le rôle aujourd’hui prêté à Daumas et Guillaumont est étrange. Nul n’en avait entendu parler, même apparentem M. Puech qui les avait parmi ses familiers, et qui n’en dit point mot dans ce que, soit avec moi, soit seul, il publia de l’histoire.
the rôle accorded today to Daumas and Guillaumont is strange. No one had heard talk of it, apparently not even Puech, who held them among his acquaintances, and who never said a word about it in what—either with me, or alone—he published on the history of the discovery (at least so it seems to me?). It is very late to launch this anecdote. ... I know that Daumas had seen the codex in the hands of Togo Mina, who was furious in this regard, and that Daumas had pestered him to know more. In any case, the existence of a codex containing, in addition to the *Apokryphon of John*, various unidentified Gnostic texts, was not a secret for everyone [!], since Togo Mina had, according to regulations, sought the approval of Drioton to acquire the manuscript; he had even begun to transcribe by hand the *Apokryphon*, and Drioton had already let me know in the summer of 1946 that Togo Mina hoped to see me arrive soon in Cairo to undertake with him the study of a certain codex where ...

However the actual acquisition of Codex III was not based on Drioton or Togo Mina identifying apocryphal and Gnostic texts in it (see Chapter 1, Part 3 above). The fact that Doresse had not heard from Puech or otherwise what Daumas reported to me in letters and twice in face-to-face interviews at Denderah does not prove that what he reported did not take place. The detailed reports of Daumas were surely not invented out of the whole cloth. But they effectively undermine Doresse's claim to have 'discovered' the Nag Hammadi Codices in the sense of having first identified their Gnostic character (see Chapter 1, Part 1 above), which Doresse's letter to me unintentionally conceded. Daumas had overcome whatever resentment he may have had, to the extent that he did graciously provide the Doresses with accommodations when their car broke down at sundown in the desert near his headquarters at Denderah in 1950 (see Chapter 1, Part 4 above).

---

de la découverte (à ce qui me semble tout au moins?). Il est bien tard pour lancer cette anecdote. ... Je sais que Daumas avait aperçu le codex aux mains de Togo Mina, qui en était furieux, et que Daumas l'avait obsédé pour en savoir plus. De toute façon, l'existence d'un codex contenant, outre l' "Apokryphon de Jean," divers textes gnostiques non identifiés n'étaient pas un secret pour tous puisque Togo Mina avait, réglementairement, recouru à l'approbation de Drioton pour acquérir le manuscrit, qu'il avait même commencé de transcrire de sa main l' "Apokryphon," et que Drioton n' avait déjà fait savoir à l' été de 1946 que Togo Mina espérait me voir bientôt arriver au Caire pour entreprendre avec lui l'étude de certain codex où ... (je pense que Drioton en savait, en fait de littérature apocryphe copte, autant que Daumas et Guillaumont réunis). ....
Jean and Marianne Doresse

Doresse’s wife Marianne had been two years ahead of him as a student in Paris,\(^{159}\) where she, but not Jean, had studied under Étienne Drioton, and where Togo Mina had been her classmate and apparently her suitor.\(^{160}\) She had a staff position at the Musée Guimet. Just prior to the discovery of the Nag Hammadi codices, as early as 25 September 1945, Drioton wrote her:\(^{161}\)

> For my part, I am ready to make known in any way that might be helpful what is the strict truth: From the French point of view, there is a position to be filled in the direction of Coptic studies, even in the Coptic circles of Egypt. It is necessary that a young scholar qualified, as is your husband, by his publications and his teaching, come spend three winter seasons in Egypt to complete his formation by means of some practical archaeology, to bring in a harvest of unpublished documents right here, and to establish for himself some contacts in Coptic circles. This is my absolute conviction, and I think that we can make it prevail through Massignon, who likes your husband a great deal.

Louis Massignon (1883–1962) held the Chair of Muslim Sociology at the Sorbonne from 1922 to 1954.

Doresse’s chance came by means of obtaining a grant to explore ruins of Coptic monasteries in Upper Egypt:\(^{162}\)

> Entrusted with a Mission at the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire (1 October to 31 December 1947): The preliminary exploration of the

---


Doresse’s wife had met the director of the museum [Togo Mina] while both were studying in Paris at the École des Hautes Études. Doresse studied Egyptology two years later at the same school and knew of the director’s reputation from Marianne and from his professors.

160 Based on an oral communication from Marianne Doresse. But Togo Mina married in Egypt, indeed his widow visited us in the Coptic Museum on 2 December 1974, and gave me a copy of a photograph of Togo Mina and Jean Doresse at the Coptic Museum.

161 25 ix 45: Letter from Étienne Drioton to Marianne Doresse:

> De mon côté je suis prêt à faire savoir par toute voie utile ce qui est la stricte vérité: qu’il y a, au point de vue français, une place à prendre dans la direction des études coptes, même dans les milieux coptes d’Égypte. Il faut qu’un jeune savant qualifié comme votre mari par ses publications et son enseignement vienne passer trois saisons d’hiver en Égypte pour parfaire sa formation par de l’archéologie pratique, pour faire sur place une moisson de documents inédits et pour se créer des relations dans les milieux coptes. C’est ma conviction absolue et je pense que, par M. Massignon qui aime beaucoup votre mari, nous pourrons la faire prévaloir.

162 Jean Doresse: *Exposé sommaire des Titres & Travaux* (see Part 2 above).
Coptic vestiges of the Theban region; the discovery of vestiges unknown until then of the Deir Giza, in the desert to the west of Qamoula; identification of these remains with those of Benhadab, the convent of Anba Samuel. The identification of the content of the first two Coptic Gnostic manuscripts from Khénoboskion; the preparation of the edition of the codex acquired by the Coptic Museum.

But on 15 November 1948 the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique turned down Doresse’s application of 22 August 1948 to fund a second mission, whereupon, when informed by Drioton, Doresse commented:


Hence Doresse was in Egypt officially to carry on archaeological excavations, which however became only a sideline, as he sought to obtain more information about and control over the Nag Hammadi Codices, under pressure to do so from Puech. He was sent on future missions to Egypt not by the Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique but by the Commission des Fouilles Archéologiques of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, annually from October 1948 to February 1953, at which time he moved to Ethiopia.

Claude F.A. Schaeffer was the Secretary of the Commission des Fouilles Archéologiques. He recognized (according to an oral communication from Schaeffer) that Puech was not supporting Doresse, and hence sought to provide Doresse with a degree of independence and adequate funding through a source that Puech did not control (as he did the funding through the Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique).

Doresse Replaces Daumas

Two years after his letter to Marianne Doresse, Drioton took the Doresses with him when he returned to Cairo from his summer in France, the three

---

163 From a Curriculum Vitae of Doresse:

Mais la Commission du CNRS—dont M. Puech est membre—refuse toute aide. (Seule la Commission des Fouilles, grâce à MM Dussaud, Schaeffer et Drioton, m’aidera personnellement et sans liaison avec M. Puech.)

164 A copy of Doresse’s book, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, given to me by Schaeffer, who was my father-in-law, bears the handwritten inscription: “À Monsieur C.F.A. Schaeffer / Membre de l’Institut / hommage très respectueux / Jean Doresse.”
of them leaving Marseilles together on the Egyptian boat Er-Rawda on
20 September 1947.\footnote{Marianne Doresse, “Première Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte” (see Part 2 above).} They had notified Togo Mina in advance of their arrival in Cairo.\footnote{19 ix 74: A reply from Doresse to questions that John Dart had sent to him.} Marianne Doresse has reported the arrival as follows:\footnote{Marianne Doresse, “Première Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte” (see Part 2 above).}

On arrival in Cairo, we install ourselves at the Institut Français [d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire]. Immediate and very warm contact with Togo and his family. Jean did not yet know my old friend Togo directly. On our first visit to the Coptic Museum (probably as early as the end of September), Togo pulls from the drawer of his desk to show to Jean a Coptic codex on papyrus that he has recently purchased, and for the study of which, on the advice of Canon Drioton, he was awaiting our arrival.\footnote{http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/481.} John instantly identifies its content: unedited Gnostic texts. In a letter of 10 October 1947, I write to my mother that Togo invites Jean to edit with him the Gnostic manuscript and that he entrusts entirely to him all that has to do with the commentary on the texts.

Daumas learned about his replacement by Doresse only from Doresse’s own bragging at the French Institute. Though Daumas maintained outward calm, he was perplexed and no doubt infuriated:\footnote{29 ix 77: Letter from Daumas to Robinson:}

With regard to the publication of The Apocryphon of John, I had clearly accepted with enthusiasm the proposal of Togo Mina. He was awaiting my return to get at it, around November 1947, after having had the leaves put under glass. Doresse arrived in Cairo in 1947 about a month before I did. I never knew anything about what transpired between Togo and him. But I heard him proclaim very loudly that it was he who was going to publish the manuscript with Togo. I immediately understood that there had been what one calls in slang ‘skulduggery.’ I thought that Togo would contact me. I do not recall having gone to the Coptic Museum. ... In any case, I did not see him again and, on seeing the attitude of Doresse, I gave up any pretension about the manuscript.
It would seem that Togo Mina did not keep a commitment he had in fact made to Daumas several months earlier. The shift was apparently due to the influence of Drioton, as Doresse maintained. For Drioton had encouraged the Doresses already in 1945 to come to Cairo ‘to bring in a harvest of unpublished documents right here’ (see above), and in fact did bring them to Cairo in the autumn of 1947 ‘about a month’ before Daumas arrived. Togo Mina’s shift from Daumas to Doresse may have been more congenial to him due the fact that he had known Marianne Doresse as his classmate in Paris.

Doresse and Puech Exchange Enthusiastic Letters

Doresse went to work promptly in the Coptic Museum transcribing the Coptic text of Codex III. He initially identified two tractates easily recognizable from their titles: *The Apocryphon of John* (III,1) on the back of the front fly-leaf (which Daumas had pointed out to Corbin and Togo Mina), repeated on p. 40; and *The Sophia of Jesus Christ* (III,4) at the beginning and end of the tractate (on pp. 90 and 119). He also learned about another codex still in private hands (Codex I, most of which was in the possession of Albert Eid). He wrote promptly and excitedly on all this to Henri-Charles Puech, Professor of the History of Religions at the École pratique des Hautes Études and at the Collège de France, who was Doresse’s supervisor at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique that provided his funding on that first mission, which included his residence at the French Institute in Cairo:

We have been in Cairo for a week, and I have already made an interesting discovery. It has to do with a volume on papyrus of more than 140 pages, probably from the end of the fourth century, in rather good condition, and

---

4 x 47: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Nous sommes au Caire depuis une semaine, et j’ai déjà fait une découverte intéressante. Il s’agit d’un volume sur papyrus de plus de 140 pages, vraisemblablement de la fin du IVᵉ S., en assez bon état, et contenant, entre autres textes, l’ΑΡΟΚΡΥΦΟΝ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ et la ΚΟΦΙΑ ΙΗϹΟΥ ΧΡΙϹΤΟΥ! Le tout est en sahidique, très correct, mais avec des traits dialectaux un peu marqués dans sa phonétique. Le texte semble beaucoup plus clair que la *Pistis Sophia* ou le *Papyrus Bruce*. J’en ai mis en ordre, ce matin, presque tous les feuillets. J’espère que j’en aurai lu et transcrit une bonne partie à la fin de la semaine prochaine. Je crois que l’heureux possesseur du manuscrit acceptera de m’en confier l’édition.

Il y a actuellement au Caire un autre papyrus gnostique qui vient sans doute de la même trouvaille mais qui, par malheur, a été cédé à un antiquaire, lequel voudrait le vendre à des américains pour 6,000 £ (3,000,000 fr.). Je pense voir ce volume la semaine prochaine. Peut-être pourra-t-on l’empêcher de sortir d’Égypte et le diriger vers une collection accessible.
containing, among other texts, the ΑΡΟΚΡΥΦΟΝ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ and the ΣΟΦΙΑ ΙΗϹΟΥ ΧΡΙϹΤΟΥ! The whole is in Sahidic, very correct, but with dialect traits somewhat pronounced in its phonetics. The text seems much clearer than the Pistis Sophia or the Bruce Papyrus. I have put in order, this morning, almost all the leaves. I hope that I will have read and transcribed a good part by the end of next week. I believe that the fortunate owner of the manuscript will agree to entrusting the editing to me.

There is at present in Cairo another Gnostic papyrus that comes no doubt from the same discovery, but which, unfortunately, has been conceded to an antiquities dealer who would like to sell it to Americans for 6,000 £ (3,000,000 Francs). I plan on seeing this volume next week. Perhaps one will be able to prevent it from leaving Egypt and direct it toward an accessible collection.

Here Doresse referred first to Codex III, without revealing that it belongs to the Coptic Museum, and then to Codex I, in the possession of Albert Eid. Puech’s prompt response was of course enthusiastic:

---

171 8 x 47: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

J’attends avec une curiosité et une impatience extrêmes tous les renseignements que vous voudrez bien me donner à votre retour sur le contenu des trois manuscrits gnostiques dont vous me parlez; je voudrais surtout connaître les textes dans le détail: il y aura tant à en tirer. Mais, avant tout, il faudrait publier ces documents le plus vite possible ou, en tout cas, les signaler de façon détaillée au public scientifique. Je vous y aiderai dans toute la mesure de mes moyens, et—inutile de vous le dire—la RHR est toute prête à publier aussitôt notices préliminaires, rapport d’ensemble ou, s’il y a lieu, extraits commentés de textes. Mettez donc tout en œuvre, je vous le demande instamment, pour obtenir le droit de publication—totale ou partielle—de ces pièces et prenez le plus grand nombre possible de copies ou de notes.

1° Tout particulièrement, amenez le possesseur du manuscrit de l’Apokryphon Iohannis et de la Sophia Ièsou Khristou à vous confier le soin d’éditer ces deux écrits. Nous en attendons la publication depuis trop longtemps; les bibliothèques de Berlin ne seront pas de sitôt accessibles, et c’est une chance inouïe d’avoir un second exemplaire des deux ouvrages. Nous trouverons vite ici un éditeur; la Bibliothèque de la 5ème Section, la grande collection du Musée Guimet ou, peut-être, Geuthner. Auparavant, si vous le voulez, la trouvaille pourrait être plus ou moins succinctement signalée dans la RHR et nous pourrions faire de la traduction et du commentaire des textes l’objet d’un cours commun aux Hautes Études durant l’année 1948/1949. Enfin, le plus pressé, le plus nécessaire, est de convaincre le possesseur du manuscrit: employez-y tous vos efforts, et obtenez tout au moins l’autorisation de publier une analyse détaillée de la pièce et de son contenu. Au cas où vous réussiriez entièrement à emporter le morceau, ne serait-il pas bon de faire photographier le manuscrit?

2° Le cas de l’autre papyrus gnostique que vous me signalez paraît plus chanceux et presque désespéré. Tâchez cependant d’avoir quelques indications sur le titre, le sujet ou le contenu de cet inédit. Ne pourriez-vous pas également vous faire autoriser par l’antiquaire à en parler brièvement, soit dans une note particulière, soit au cours
I await with extreme curiosity and impatience all the information that you would be so kind as to give me on your return, as to the content of the three Gnostic manuscripts of which you tell me. I would especially like to know the texts in detail—there will be so much to get from them. But, most of all, it would be necessary to publish these documents as quickly as possible, or, in any case, to announce them in a detailed way to the scientific public. I will aid you in this to the full measure of my means and—unnecessary to tell you—the Revue de l’histoire des religions is quite ready to publish immediately preliminary notices, a report of the whole, or, if appropriate, extracts from the texts with comments. Hence put everything in motion, I urgently ask of you, to obtain—totally or partially—publication rights for these pieces, and copy as much, or make as many notes, as possible.

1° Quite particularly, get the owner of the manuscript of the Apocryphon Iohannis and of the Sophia Ièsou Khristou to entrust to you the responsibility of editing these two writings. We await their publication for too long a time. The libraries of Berlin will not be accessible very soon, and it is a stunning stroke of luck to have a second copy of the two works. We will quickly find here an editor: the Library of the 5th Section [of the École Pratique des Hautes Études], the large collection of the Musée Guimet, or, perhaps, Geuthner. Previously, if you wish, the discovery could be more or less succinctly announced in the Revue de l’histoire des religions, and we could make of the translation and commentary on the texts the subject of a shared course at the École Pratique des Hautes Études during the year 1948/1949. Finally, what is most urgent, what is most necessary, is to convince the owner of the manuscript. Employ there all your efforts, and obtain at least the authorization to publish a detailed analysis of the piece and its contents. In case you were to succeed completely in taking the fragment along, would it not be good to have the manuscript photographed?

2° The case of the other Gnostic papyrus that you indicate to me seems more risky and almost desperate. Try nonetheless to obtain some indications on the title, the subject, or the content of this unpublished text. Could you not also have yourself authorized by the antiquities dealer to speak briefly of it, be it in a separate note, be it in the course of a general report, and in giving a concise, though precise, description of the piece? The thing could not fail to highlight the value of what he has (scientifically, and, for him, unfortunately! financially).

Here Puech advanced his own involvement, since Doresse was of course under his supervision, such as Puech coming ‘to know the texts in detail,’ in that Doresse should bring back to him in Paris notes, transcriptions, and
photographs. Then he suggests publishing a preliminary report in the *Revue de l’histoire des religions* of which Puech was editor, without mentioning that he rather than Doresse would be the author,\(^{172}\) and Doresse teaching a shared course where Puech was a professor, the *École Pratique des Hautes Études*, during the next school year.

Doresse had just mailed him an inventory of Codex III and further (inaccurate) information on Codex I, which crossed in the mail.\(^{173}\)

---


\(^{173}\) 7 x 47: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je me hâte de vous indiquer le contenu exact du papyrus gnostique, dont j’ai presque fini de remettre en ordre les feuillets:

- pp. 1 à 44 ou 46: Apocryphe de Jean.
- pp. 44 ou 46 à 69: Évangile des Égyptiens (*φιλαγγελον την ίκινη*), appelé aussi *τιβλακος τηρά ημιγρατον *καικευμά.
- pp. 70 à 90: un traité d’Eugnoste le Bienheureux—incipit: “Eugnoste le Bienheureux aux siens; réjouissez-vous …” etc, ...
- Le même *συνακοτος παγαντικος* est mentionné dans l’explicit de l’Évangile des Égyptiens.
- pp. 90–119: Sagesse de Jésus Christ.
- pp. 120 à 137 (ou plus): Le Dialogue du Sauveur—incipit: “Le sauveur dit à ses disciples: le moment est déjà venu, mes frères, d’abandonner vos peines …”

La longueur relative de l’Apocryphe de Jean et de la Sagesse de Jésus Christ correspond avec une exactitude parfaite à ce que Schmidt dit de leur longueur dans son manuscrit. Malheureusement je ne dispose ici que de l’article des Sitzungsberichte de 1896.

J’ai vu hier chez un antiquaire le papyrus qui m’avait été signalé. Il devait comprendre 140 pages au moins. L’écriture, très maladroite, peut être du début du V\(^e\) S. Le texte est en subachmimique et n’a rien de gnostique. Je n’ai pu y repérer aucun titre ou tête de chapitre. J’espère obtenir la photo ou la copie d’au moins une page.

Il provient en tout cas du même lot que le papyrus gnostique. Il me reste à découvrir trois autres manuscrits qui sont chez un autre antiquaire. Le tout a été trouvé, dit-on, dans une jarre, dans la tombe d’un moine, vers Nag Hammadi (près de Far-chout). Nous gardons un silence complet sur l’intérêt de la trouvaille, afin de ne pas éveiller l’attention des antiquaires qui peuvent avoir d’autres manuscrits. Je passerai moi-même à Nag Hammadi quand je reviendrai de Haute Égypte. Pour le moment, je voudrais que le premier manuscrit soit mis sous verre et photographié. Je pourrai partir alors tranquillement pour Assouâń.

J’attends avec impatience de savoir ce que vous pensez de notre découverte. J’espère qu’on pourra la rendre officielle dans deux mois. Je vous communiquerai le texte dès que ce sera possible. Je voudrais commencer par l’Évangile des Égyptiens …
I hasten to indicate to you the exact contents of the Gnostic papyri, on which I have almost finished putting the leaves in order:

Pp. 1 to 44 or 46: Apocryphon of John.

Pp. 44 or 46 to 69: Gospel of the Egyptians (περὶ ἑατέρων ἐπὶ ἐκεῖνοι), also called τῶν ἔρωτων ἡμῶν ἰδίοις.

Pp. 70 to 90: A treatise of Eugnostos the Blessed—incipit: "Eugnostos the Blessed to his own; rejoice ...", etc. ...

The same εὐγνωστὸς παγαντικὸς is mentioned in the explicit of the Gospel of the Egyptians.

Pp. 90 to 119: Wisdom of Jesus Christ.

Pp. 120 to 137 (or more): The Dialogue of the Savior—incipit: "The Savior says to his disciples: The time has already come, my brothers, to abandon your pains. ..."

The relative length of the Apocryphon of John and of the Wisdom of Jesus Christ corresponds with perfect exactitude to what Schmidt says of their length in his manuscript. Unfortunately I have available here only the article in the Sitzungsberichte of 1896.

I saw yesterday at the shop of an antiquities dealer the papyrus that had been mentioned to me. It must contain 140 pages at least. The script, very awkward, can be from the beginning of the fifth century. The text is in Subachimetic and has nothing that is Gnostic. I have not been able to recover there any title or head of a chapter. I hope to obtain the photo, or the copy, of at least one page.

In any case it comes from the same lot as does the Gnostic papyrus. It remains for me to discover three [read: two!] other manuscripts [Codices II and VII] that are at another antiquities dealer's. All has been found, one says, in a jar, in the tomb of a monk, in the direction of Nag Hammadi (near Farchout). We keep complete silence as to the interest of the discovery, so as not to arouse the attention of the antiquities dealers who may have other manuscripts. I will myself pass by Nag Hammadi when I return from Upper Egypt [this first visit to Nag Hammadi was 26–27 January 1950]. For the moment, I would like for the first manuscript to be put under glass and photographed. I will then be able to leave in tranquility for Aswan.

I await with impatience to learn what you think of our discovery. I hope that one will be able to make it official in two months. I will communicate the text to you as soon as this will be possible. I would like to begin with the Gospel of the Egyptians ...

Of course Togo Mina would consider a Gospel of the Egyptians a specifically Coptic Gospel, more precious no doubt than any Gnostic heretical text could ever be. When I first visited the Coptic Museum, the leaf with this title
(Codex III, page 69) was on display in a showcase on the wall in the stairway, the only Nag Hammadi material that was on display at the time.

In his third letter, having now received Puech’s enthusiastic letter, Doresse emphasized his own central rôle in the publication:

I have just received your letter, and I think that you have already, on your part, received mine in which I indicate to you the exact content of the manuscript. Since that letter, we have fixed the conditions of the edition: The texts will be published by Togo Mina (who two years ago entered the manuscript into the Coptic Museum that he directs) and by myself. Incidentally, Togo takes responsibility only for the transcription and the philological study. He leaves to me the commentary and all the rest. He will accept with open arms that you add to the edition all the notes that you would judge to be useful. We would think of publishing the texts one after the other, to make them accessible more rapidly, instead of waiting for the commentary of all five to be completed. The Egyptian government would take responsibility for the edition, which would be sold at an expensive price, and would be carried out rapidly. Later on I will give you samples of the text. For the moment I press forward the work of photographing the manuscript. The first sample that one brought me is excellent. Unfortunately, in the Museums here, one works only in the morning, which limits my time for work on the papyrus.

174 12 x 47: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je viens de recevoir votre lettre, et je pense que vous avez déjà, de votre côté, celle dans laquelle je vous indique le contenu exact du manuscrit. Depuis celle-ci, nous avons fixé les conditions d’édition: les textes seront publiés par Togo Mina (qui a fait entrer le manuscrit, il y a deux ans au Musée Copte qu’il dirige) et par moi. Togo ne prend d’ailleurs à sa charge que la transcription et l’étude philologique. Il me laisse le commentaire et tout le reste. Il acceptera de grand coeur que vous ajoutiez à l’édition toutes les notes que vous jugerez utiles. Nous penserions sortir les textes l’un après l’autre pour les rendre plus vite accessibles, au lieu d’attendre que le commentaire de tous les cinq soit achevé. Le gouvernement égyptien se chargerait de l’édition qui serait vendue au prix coûtant, et serait menée rapidement. Je vous donnerai plus tard des échantillons du texte. Je presse, pour le moment, le travail de photographie du manuscrit: le premier échantillon que l’on m’a apporté est excellent. Malheureusement, dans les Musées d’ici, on ne travaille que le matin, ce qui limite mon temps de travail sur le papyrus.

Nous gardons un silence total sur l’intérêt du texte pour ne pas alerter l’antiquaire qui possède l’autre papyrus: en y réfléchissant, je le crois plus intéressant qu’il m’a paru à première vue: mais comment pouvoir l’étudier de près? L’abbé Drioton fait son possible pour nous aider à le faire acheter par le Musée Copte—mais, pour faire baisser le prix, nous sommes obligés de garder secrète l’importance du texte déjà acquis. J’espère pourtant que l’on pourra l’acquérir assez tôt: on pourrait alors annoncer la découverte de nos cinq textes gnostiques ...

Bien sûr la RHR aura la primeur de tout ce qui pourra être dit.
We maintain a complete silence on the interest of the text [Codex III], so as not to alert the antiquities dealer who possesses the other papyrus [Codex I]. In reflecting on it, I believe it is more interesting than it seemed to me when I first saw it. But how to be able to study it from close up? Abbot Drioton does what he can to assist us in having it bought by the Coptic Museum—but, to make the price go down, we are obliged to keep secret the importance of the text that is already acquired. I nonetheless hope that one will be able to acquire it [Codex I] rather soon. One would then be able to announce the discovery of our five Gnostic texts [Codex III]...

Of course the *Revue de l’histoire des religions* [edited by Puech] will have priority on all that can be said.

Puech immediately responded:

—

175 14 x 47: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Vous avez dû recevoir déjà la réponse que je vous ai postée, par avion, vendredi dernier. Celle-ci vous confirmera les sentiments qu’excite en moi l’annonce de votre trouvaille et qu’avivent plus que jamais les compléments d’information transmis ce matin: joie, enthousiasme, impatience. Comme il me tarde de parcourir et d’étudier avec vous tous ces précieux inédits et de faire éclater ce pétard de première grandeur que va être la communication officielle de la découverte au monde scientifique!

Oui, et sans négliger le *Dialogue du Sauveur* et, sans doute, le traité d’Eugnoste, vous avez mis la main sur des textes importants. Si l’on excepte l’*Evangile de Marie* (dont nous connaissons du reste depuis 1938 un assez long fragment en deux versions parallèles copte et grecque), le papyrus de Nag Hammadi est plus riche que le papyrus de Berlin, trop jaloureusement gardé par feu C. Schmidt dans un secret dont nous allons tirer bonne et prompte vengeance. Si, comme vous me le faites espérer, vous parvenez à obtenir le droit d’éditer le tout, faites photographier l’ensemble du manuscrit, et rapportez la copie avec vous. Ne donnez pas, pour le moment, la préférence à tel écrit sur tels autres: tous ont un intérêt, et que nous ne soupçonnons peut-être pas encore pleinement. Ne vous inquiétez pas encore du commentaire et de toutes questions concernant le contrôle ou la datation des textes: je vous fournirai ici, dès votre retour, tous les matériaux nécessaires, entre autres une copie de la traduction de l’*Apokryphon Iohannis* donnée par Schmidt en 1907 dans *Philothesia*, un fragment du même “apocryphe” recueilli en 1925, toutes les citations utiles aux difficultes mais passionnants problèmes que va soulever l’*Évangile des Égyptiens*, etc. L’édition successive de tous ces textes (de tous, sans exception, je le souligne encore une fois) peut-être rapide si nous l’élaborons de concert: une fois déchiffré le contenu, nous pourrons très vite, à l’aide des notes que j’ai amassées sur la gnose, élaborer l’introduction, l’annotation et le commentaire. Préoccupez-vous pour le moment de toutes les questions qui peuvent être réglées sur place: circonstances de la découverte (lieu, date, achat, etc.); apparence matérielle (format exact, écriture, encre, mise en pages, etc.); lecture des lettres ou des passages difficiles qui ne peuvent être déchiffrés ou contrôlés que sur le papyrus lui-même. C’est déjà une assez lourde besogne, surtout étant donné le peu de temps dont vous disposez.

Je crois qu’il n’y a plus lieu de s’inquiéter outre mesure des destinées du second papyrus qui, me dites-vous, n’a rien de gnostique. Il contient peut-être une œuvre sans
You must have received already the reply I airmailed you last Friday. This will confirm for you the sentiments that the announcement of your discovery excites in me, and that the supplements of information transmitted this morning enliven more than ever: joy, enthusiasm, impatience. How I long to scan and study with you all these precious unpublished texts, and to set off this firecracker of first magnitude, which the official communication of the discovery to the scholarly world is going to be!

Yes, and without neglecting the *Dialogue of the Savior* [III,5] and, no doubt, the treatise of *Eugnostos* [III,3]—you have laid hands on important texts. If one puts to one side the *Gospel of Mary* (of which, besides, we have known since 1938 a rather long fragment in two parallel versions, Coptic and Greek),\(^{176}\) the papyrus of Nag Hammadi is richer than the papyrus of Berlin, which has been guarded too jealously by the late C[arl] Schmidt, in a secrecy for which we are going to take good and prompt revenge. If, as you give me reason to hope, you succeed in obtaining the right to edit everything, then have the whole manuscript photographed and bring the copy with you. For the time being, do not give preference to one writing over the others. They all have an interest, and perhaps one we do not yet fully suspect. Do not worry yet about the commentary and all the questions about the verification and the dating of the texts. On your return I will furnish you here all the necessary material, among other things a copy of the translation of the *Apocryphon Iohannis* given by Schmidt in 1907 in *Philothesia*, a fragment of the same ‘apocryphon’ gleaned in 1925,\(^{177}\) all the quotations useful for the difficult but engrossing problems that the *Gospel of the Egyptians* [III, 2] will raise, etc. The successive editing of all these texts (of all, without exception, I underscore again) can be rapid if we elaborate it together. Once the content is deciphered, we will be able

\(^{176}\) C.H. Roberts, *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, vol. 3 (Manchester: University Press, 1938), 18–23. This is P.Ryl. 463—but it is only a single leaf, and only in Greek.

\(^{177}\) Although Puech provided no identification of his source for this fragment, he may well have been referring to Eugène de Faye, *Gnostiques et Gnosticisme: Étude critique des documents du gnosticisme chrétien aux IIe et IIIe siècles* (Paris: Geunther, 2nd ed., 1925).
very quickly, with the help of notes that I have amassed on Gnosticism, to elaborate the introduction, the annotation, and the commentary. For the time being, occupy yourself with all the questions that can be handled on the spot: the circumstances of the discovery (place, date, purchase, etc.); the physical appearance (exact format, writing, ink, layout, etc.); the reading of difficult letters or passages that can only be deciphered or verified on the papyrus itself. This is already a heavy enough responsibility, especially given the little time at your disposal.

I believe that there is no further need to concern oneself excessively about the destiny of the second papyrus that, you tell me, has nothing Gnostic. Perhaps it contains a work without interest, or that has interest only for the dialect in which it has been composed or translated. If you can get a more profound look at it and procure for yourself a fragment of it, all the better. Too bad, if the antiquities dealer persists in demanding an exorbitant price for it. …

Good idea to pass by Nag Hammadi on your return from Upper Egypt. Why, since the way the wind blows is up to chance, could you not get there some new treasure?

What does the Abbot Drioton think of it (to whom please pass on my best greetings)? Does he envisage the possibility of an edition in one of the collections of the Institut Archéologique [Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire], or do you think it better to do the publication at Paris and to oversee its printing on the spot?

Once again my very vivacious felicitations, all my great joy, and all my profound gratitude.

Here one can hear the first expression of the post-war competition among the scholarship of the different nationalities (‘good and prompt revenge’), which remained a major impediment to Nag Hammadi scholarship until UNESCO convened the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices in December 1970. For the German translation of the Jung Codex Quispel, who as a teenager had lived under the German occupation of The Netherlands, secured an Austrian, Walter Till, and on Till’s death he was succeeded by a Swiss, Rodolphe Kasser (see Chapter 4 below).

In his next letter, Doresse provided more details of the plans for publication, and more about The Egyptian Gospel:

---

178 20 x 47: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je me hâte de répondre à votre lettre du 14 et de vous en remercier. J’espère que vous avez déjà reçu celle où je vous indiquais comment les textes seraient publiés ici. Le gouvernement égyptien peut mener l’impression rapidement, et imprimerà tout ce que l’on voudra. J’ai déjà expliqué à Togo Mina que votre collaboration était nécessaire: il l’acceptera donc de grand coeur lorsque je lui annoncerai que vous me...
I hasten to reply to your letter of the 14th and to thank you for it. I hope that you have already received the letter in which I indicated to you how the texts would be published here. The Egyptian government can carry out the printing rapidly, and will print everything that one would wish. I have already explained to Togo Mina that your collaboration is necessary. Hence he will accept it with an open heart, when I announce that you have already offered it to me. As it is necessary that Togo Mina have some rôle in the editing of his manuscript, he will officially assign to himself the transcription, the translation, and the philological commentary. He will accept, incidentally, all the advice that one gives him.

I have already transcribed a good part of the text that characterizes itself as *Gospel of the Egyptians*. This characterization is found in the *explicit*, where it is attached to the title itself: *Book of the Great Invisible Spirit*, title that is also that of the beginning of the work. Nevertheless the text is not the dialogue known from Clement of Alexandria. It is a tractate comparable, in its form and its genre, to the anonymous text of the Bruce papyrus, to which it is a bit similar, though it has a very different doctrine. Perhaps it has more rapport with the *Gospel of the Egyptians* mentioned by Epiphanius and Hippolytus, but I have not seen any trace of this thus far.

Doresse then wrote a last letter to Puech before going to Upper Egypt:

---

l’avez déjà offerte. Comme il faut qu’il ait une certaine part dans l’édition de son manuscrit, il se chargera officiellement de la transcription, de la traduction, et du commentaire philologique. Il acceptera, d’ailleurs, tous les conseils qu’on lui donnera.

J’ai déjà transcrit une bonne partie du texte qui se qualifie d’“Évangile des Égyptiens.” Ce qualificatif se trouve dans l’explicit, où il est accolé au titre même: “Livre du Grand Pneuma Invisible,” titre qui est aussi celui du début de l’ouvrage. Pourtant le texte n’est pas le dialogue connu d’après Clément d’Alexandrie. C’est un traité comparable, par sa forme et son genre, à l’écrit anonyme du papyrus Bruce, dont il se rapproche un peu, bien qu’il ait une doctrine très différente. Peut-être a-t-il plus de rapports avec l’Évangile des Égyptiens mentionné par Épiphane et Hippolyte, mais je n’en ai pas vu de trace jusque là.

---

23 x 47: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Nous partons enfin dimanche pour Louxor ... Mais je n’oublierai pas, certes, de passer à Nag Hammadi. ...

M. Kuentz est arrivé hier et m’a consacré ce matin sa première réception: ½ h d’entretien, durant lequel j’ai dû, naturellement, lui signaler notre découverte. Il m’a dit, à ce sujet, qu’il avait déjà vu le papyrus de Togo Mina,—ce qui est vrai,—et qu’il savait déjà ce qu’il contenait,—ce que je crois difficilement, car il croit que ces textes sont en achmimique; je ne l’ai pas contredit, mais ils sont en sahidique, et il ne les a certainement pas lus, et en tout cas il ne les a pas identifiés.

Pour cette semaine, le plus intéressant est la visite que j’ai faite au possesseur de l’autre papyrus. Je lui ai déjà fait baisser son prix vers 3,000 £ (1,000,000 f.) mais le Musée Copte achètera-t-il? Où trouverai-je un autre acheteur? Il faut en effet donner à ce texte, je
We finally leave Sunday for Luxor ... But I will not forget, certainly, to pass by Nag Hammadi. ...

Kuentz arrived yesterday and granted me this morning his first appointment. One and a half hours of discussion, during which I of course had to indicate to him our discovery. He told me in this regard that he had already seen the papyrus of Togo Mina [Codex III],—which is true,—and that he already knew what it contained,—which I find hard to believe, for he believes that these texts are in Achmimic. I did not contradict him, but they are in Sahidic, and he certainly has not read them, and in any case he has not identified them.

For this week, the most interesting thing is the visit that I made to the owner of the other papyrus [Codex I]. I have already made him lower his price toward 3,000 £ (1,000,000 French Francs), but will the Coptic Museum buy it? Where will I find another purchaser? It is necessary, in effect, to ascribe to this text, I believe, more interest than I thought at first glance. In any case, we will be ready. I have asked for photos of several pages, and I will soon have them. I will transmit them to you as soon as possible. The text is in Sub-Achmimic with dialect traits that are very rare, very accentuated. The presentation of the papyrus recalls the Gospel of John or the first Clementine epistle. The content seems to me nevertheless Gnostic at places. Let us await the photos. In any case, I think I am sure that the antiquities dealer will permit me to make a restoration of the order of the leaves, a detailed analysis of the text, and more photos.

As to the manuscript of the five tractates [Codex III], it seems to me that our revenge on Schmidt will be complete. Did he not publish the Acta Petri in T[ext] u[nd] Unters[uuchungen]? In these circumstances we have all that he left unpublished, since the Gospel of Mary and the Apocryphon of John only make up one [they are in fact two different tractates!]. If there had been some...
doubts on this subject (as your letter of the 14th seemed to make one think),
the relative length of the texts in the two manuscripts suffices to remove them.
We hence have all that was unpublished [Nag Hammadi Codex III contains:
P.Berol. 8502, Tractate 2 = Nag Hammadi Codex III, Tractate 1; P.Berol. 8502,
Tractate 3 = Nag Hammadi Codex III, Tractate 4; but not P.Berol. 8502, Tractate
1, *The Gospel of Mary!*], plus the three unexpected texts [Codex III, Tractates
2, 3, 5]. Fortunately your documentation will permit, I hope, to fill the several
mutilations of the papyrus of Togo Mina and to restore the few mutilated
passages, just as if we could compare them with the text itself that is jealously
hidden by Schmidt. This all promises formidable revelations on Gnosticism!

Of course *The Gospel of Mary* is not in Nag Hammadi Codex III, a deficiency
that Doresse tried as best he could to obscure. But Doresse will later negoti-
tiate with Carl Schmidt’s successor Walter Till, to give each other access to
the other instances of duplicates (see Part 4 below).

**The Sethians**

In his letter of 20 October 1947 Doresse had included a first translation from
*The Gospel of the Egyptians*, consisting of the concluding lines (III, 68, 1–4,
10–17, 19–21):180

This is the book that the Great Seth wrote. He deposited it in elevated
mountains on which the sun never rises. … This book has been written by the
Great Seth in writings of one hundred thirty (?) years. He deposited it in the
mountain that one calls Χαραξιω in order that, in the last ages and times, by
the will of the άιως άφθαρτη of all the Plérôme, … it emerges and appears
to this holy and incorruptible generation …

Puech again responded enthusiastically, producing a parallel to the quota-
tion Doresse had sent, and identifying the text as Sethian:181

---

180 20 x 47: Letter from Doresse to Puech:
“Ceci est le livre qu’a écrit le Grand Seth. Il l’a déposé dans des montagnes élevées sur
lesquelles le soleil ne se lève jamais. … Ce livre a été écrit par le Grand Seth dans des
écrits de cent trente (?) ans. Il l’a déposé dans la montagne que l’on appelle Χαραξιω
afin que dans les derniers âges et temps, par la volonté de άιως άφθαρτη, de tout
le Plérôme, … il sorte et apparaîsse à cette génération sainte et incorruptible …”

181 27 x 47: Letter from Puech to Doresse:
Merci une fois de plus de vos lettres et du soin que vous voulez bien mettre à
satisfaire si rapidement et si constamment à ma curiosité. Celle-ci est avivée à chaque
fois par les nouvelles de plus en plus excellentes que vous me communiquez avec
tant de spontanéité touchant la trouvaille et les possibilités de sa publication. Très
égoïstement, je l’avoue, il me tarde que vous soyez rentré pour me pencher avec vous
Thanks once again for your letters and the care you are kind enough to invest in satisfying so rapidly and so constantly my curiosity. The latter is enlivened each time by the more and more excellent news that you communicate to me with so much spontaneity concerning the discovery and the possibilities for its publication. Very selfishly, I admit, I am impatient for you to be back, to bend with you over the study of these new texts and to assure, for the benefit of our science, their most prompt and complete edition possible.

According to what you tell me, the *Gospel of the Egyptians* seems to relate even more closely to the *Apocryphon Johannis* than to the anonymous Bruce text. Incidentally, all these works form a block, it seems, and in any case—

---

sur l’étude de ces textes nouveaux et en assurer, au profit de notre science, l’édition la plus prompte et la plus complète possible.

D’après ce que vous me dites, l’*Évangile des Égyptiens* paraît s’apparenter plus encore à l’*Apokryphon Iohannis* qu’à l’écrit anonyme de Bruce. D’ailleurs, tous ces ouvrages forment bloc, semble-t-il, et en tout cas—la chose me paraît plus que probable en ce qui concerne l’*Évangile*—être des productions de la gnose des Sethiens, groupe important et particulièrement actif en Égypte au IIIème siècle, comme le prouvent les témoignages (ordinairement négligés ou passés inaperçus) que j’ai réunis dans mes dossiers. ... La tradition selon laquelle Seth a déposé ses écrits dans un lieu caché se retrouve notamment dans un écrit astrologique dont le *CCAG*, VIII, 1 (1929), p. 160, donne un extrait etc. Nous aurons donc à reprendre (ou, plus exactement, à résoudre pour la première fois) la question du séthianisme prise dans son ensemble et dans toutes ses ramifications ...

Enfin, nous verrons tout cela sur place, et une fois en possession du texte complet. Tâchez d’en apporter toutes les photographies ou une transcription soignée et complète. Surtout, j’y insiste, ne négligez pour rien au monde les autres documents du recueil. Les uns et les autres doivent être apparentés et s’éclaireront l’un par l’autre; ils sont tous, en outre, trop importants pour ne pas être au plus tôt photographiés, transcrits et étudiés à fond.

Encore une fois, la publication de toutes ces pièces peut être faite avec assez de rapidité et de facilité, surtout si le gouvernement égyptien fournit les fonds nécessaires. Nous devons viser à une édition savante, entourée de toutes les garanties scientifiques possibles et accompagnée d’une introduction et de commentaires solides. Assurez-vous le concours, qui paraît indispensable, de M. Togo Mina. De mon côté, je me chargerais volontiers de toutes les parties de l’Introduction qui concerneront les problèmes littéraires, historiques et dogmatiques, et des annotations autres que les remarques philologiques ou paléographiques. D’ailleurs, nous pourrons fort bien rédiger tout cela collectivement.

L’intérêt de l’”écrit de l’antiquaire” rebondit, me semble-t-il. Souhaitons que vos efforts et ceux de M. l’abbé Drioton aboutissent à nous faire entrer en possession du papyrus ou, tout au moins, à vous permettre d’y jeter un long coup d’œil. Il faudrait obtenir aussi l’autorisation d’en annoncer la découverte et d’en parler de façon tant soit peu détaillée. Votre tactique est bonne: faites silence sur le reste et dépréciiez négligemment la pièce, en la donnant pour du fatras magique. Peut-être le possesseur en arrivera-t-il ainsi à rabattre de ses prétentions.
this seems to me more than probable with regard to the Gospel [of the Egyptians]—to be products of the Gnosticism of the Sethians, an important group and particularly active in Egypt in the third century, as the attestations (ordinarily neglected or passed by unnoticed) that I have collected in my dossiers prove. ... The tradition according to which Seth deposited his writings in a hidden place is notably found again in an astrological text of which the CCAG, VIII, 1 (1929), 160 gives an extract, etc. We will hence have to take up again (or, more exactly, to resolve for the first time) the question of Sethianism taken in its entirety and in all its ramifications. ...

Well, we will see all that on the spot, and once in possession of the complete text. Try to bring all their photographs, or a careful and complete transcription. Especially, I insist, do not neglect for anything on earth the other documents of the collection. The ones and the others must be related to and clarify each other. They are all, furthermore, too important not to be photographed, transcribed and studied to the core, as soon as possible.

Once again, the publication of all these pieces may be done rapidly enough and with enough facility, especially if the Egyptian government furnishes the necessary funds. We should envisage a scholarly edition, surrounded with all possible scientific guarantees, and accompanied by an introduction and solid commentaries. Make sure of the collaboration, which seems indispensable, of Togo Mina. For my part, I would gladly assume responsibility for all the parts of the Introduction relative to literary, historical, and dogmatic problems, and for the annotations, other than the philological or palaeographic remarks. Besides, we can very well edit all that collectively.

The interest of the 'document of the antiquities dealer' increases, it seems to me. Let us hope that your efforts and those of the Abbot Drioton will result in letting us enter into possession of the papyrus, or, at least, in permitting you to have a long look at it. It would also be necessary to obtain authorization to announce its discovery and to speak of it in much or little detail. Your tactics are good: Be silent as to the rest, and depreciate the piece as unimportant, in presenting it as magic rubbish. Perhaps the owner will thus come to reducing his pretensions.

Puech thus used the brief quotation sent by Doresse to identify the Sethian nature of much of the Nag Hammadi texts, which since then has indeed been up for discussion 'in its entirety and in all its ramifications':

Doresse devoted a whole chapter to the Sethians, for he generalized to make it apply to the whole sect whose library consisted of the Nag Hammadi Codices.182 This has of course been considerably refined:

Alexander Böhlig conjectured in 1963 that seven tractates were Sethian: *The Apocryphon of John* (II,r; III,i; IV,i); *The Egyptian Gospel* (III,2; IV,2); *The Apocalypse of Adam* (V,5); *The Second Treatise of the Great Seth* (VII,2); *The Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5); *Zostrianos* (VIII,1); and *Allogenes* (XI,3).\(^{183}\)

The International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale\(^{184}\) in 1978 devoted one of its two main sections to Sethian Gnosticism,\(^{185}\) though skeptical of the Sethian thesis at the Yale conference were Frederik Wisse\(^{186}\) and Kurt Rudolph.\(^{187}\)

Hans-Martin Schenke has over the years done most to develop the Sethian thesis, beginning with his paper prepared for the Yale conference (for which the German Democratic Republic did not provide him a visa to attend).\(^{188}\) He also published a sketch of the history of Sethianism:\(^{189}\) Jewish are *The Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5), *The Thought of Norea* (IX,2), *Marsanes* (X), and *Allogenes* (XI,3); some may have been very faintly Christianized: *The Apocalypse of Adam* (V,5) and *Zostrianos* (VIII,1); more clearly Christianized are *The Egyptian Gospel* (III,2; IV,2) and *The Trimorphic Protennoia* (XIII,1); Christian are *The Apocryphon of John* (II,r; III,i; IV,i), *The Hypostasis of the Archons* (II,4), and *Melchizedek* (IX,3); some are also Neo-Platonic: *The Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5); *Zostrianos* (VIII,1); *Marsanes* (X); and *Allogenes* (XI,3).

Recently the most productive Sethian research, especially concerning the philosophical dimension of Sethianism, has been that of John D. Turner.\(^{190}\)

---


Puech’s understandable assumption that all the tractates of a given codex would ‘form a block’ has itself not been validated by subsequent scholarship. Codex III is not simply Sethian. The same has turned out to be the case with regard to the postulated Valentinianism of Codex I.

The Conservation ‘Massacre’ of Codex III

The Doresses proceeded to Upper Egypt on 26 October 1947\(^{191}\) for the archaeological work for which they had been funded. But on their return trip on 2 December 1947\(^{192}\) they were not able to get out of the train at Nag Hammadi, a visit that had to wait until 26–27 January 1950 (see Chapter 1, Part 4 above).

Doresse reported to me on the intact condition of Codex III when he first saw it, and its dismemberment while he was away in Upper Egypt:\(^{193}\)

1) When Togo Mina showed me the codex for the first time, it was apparently in order, the central pages still intact at their middle fold, other pages still a bit attached by shreds at their center. The pages whose middle fold was completely broken, they seemed to have been left in their place. Hence, I would not have had to put the leaves in order, if we had been able to complete its copying immediately at that time (end of September—beginning of October 1947).

2) But I had to leave then for Upper Egypt for six weeks. On my return to Cairo at the end of December 1947, then the leaves had been removed from the cover and mounted under glass, page by page, for which purpose the middle folds that had remained intact had been cut! This time, indeed, I had to reestablish the order of the manuscript, a simple task, by and large, except for a page of the *Gospel of the Egyptians* and for the end of the *Dialogue of the Savior*.

Marianne Doresse has clarified this ‘massacre’ in such a way as to clear both the Doresses and Togo Mina of responsibility:\(^{194}\)

---

\(^{191}\) Marianne Doresse, “Première Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte” (see Part 2 above).

\(^{192}\) Marianne Doresse, “Première Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte” (see Part 2 above).

\(^{193}\) 22 i 72: Letter from Doresse to Robinson:

1) Lorsque Togo Mina me montra le codex pour la première fois, il était apparemment en ordre, les pages centrales encore intactes dans leur pli médian; d’autres pages encore quelque peu rattachées par des lambeaux à leur milieu. Les pages dont le pli médian était entièrement brisé paraissaient, elles, avoir été laissées à leur place. Donc, je n’aurais pas eu à mettre les feuillets en ordre si nous avions pu achever immédiatement sa copie à ce moment (fin septembre—début octobre 1947).


\(^{194}\) Marianne Doresse, “Première Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte” (see Part 2 above).
At the Coptic Museum, during our absence, the Gnostic codex had been entirely photographed and put under glass page by page, but without taking note of the order in which they were found. Better still: Whereas the two double leaves at the center of the volume had remained intact, one has cut their median fold, to put them under glass, without noting the respective [connecting] links of these pieces. Togo Mina is not responsible for anything in this massacre. He had entrusted the work to his subordinates. The subordinates of Togo were: Abdel Bakhih and Raouf Habib [later Director of the Coptic Museum], adjunct conservators, George Helmy, architect (a relative of the wife of Togo); Abdel Messih ['Abd al-Masīḥ], librarian, the priest Basilios, representative of the Patriarchate, the photographer Boulos, working at half-time.

Of course a staff without experience in conserving papyrus codices should have been instructed and supervised by someone who was qualified to do so. But as a matter of fact there was no one who was so qualified. Togo Mina did what he could to exonerate his staff, by attributing the disorder to the peasants who had made the discovery or served as middlemen:  

Nonetheless, when it was purchased, it was still difficult to identify its exact contents. The peasants had completely disjoined the quires and the cover, separating thus the leaves whose order had been completely mixed up.

The result was that the sequence of leaves in Codex III had to be reconstructed after the basic surviving evidence had been lost.

The Codicology of Codex III

The codicological analysis of Codex III published by Puech and Doressé was pure speculation, having nothing to do with an actual codicological analysis of Codex III, but more nearly with the codicology of later centuries:

---

195 Togo Mina, “Le papyrus gnostique du Musée Copte,” *VigChr* 2 (1948): 129–136: 130:

Toutefois, lorsqu’il fut acheté, il était encore difficile d’en identifier le contenu exact: les paysans avaient entièrement disjoint les cahiers et la couverture, séparant ainsi les feuillets dont l’ordre avait été totalement brouillé.


Le manuscrit, aujourd’hui un peu endommagé, devait primitivement être fait de 19 cahiers de papyrus cousus ensemble et réunis sous une simple feuille de cuir souple formant couverture. Chaque cahier étant de quatre feuillets, il avait donc en tout 152 pages. Il ne nous en reste plus que 134 et plusieurs fragments.
The manuscript, today slightly damaged, must have originally been made of 19 quires of papyrus sewn together and united under a simple sheet of supple leather forming the cover. Since each quire was of 4 leaves [i.e. 8 pages], it hence had in all 152 pages. There remain for us only 134 and several fragments.

A similar presentation was made by Togo Mina. The formulation goes back to the typescript whose first person formulation and inadequate French indicate the authorship of Togo Mina. Togo Mina later wrote Doresse for further clarification:

Have you succeeded in placing the few leaves that had not been classified?

Missing are the eight leaves 1/2, 3/4, 19/20, 45/46, 47/48, 79/80, 109/110, and 115/116 of the 147 inscribed pages, and the three uninscribed leaves D/E, F/G, and H/I, a total of eleven missing leaves = 22 pages, so that the codex originally had a total of 156 pages = 78 leaves, plus two stubs. Extant are hence 67 leaves = 134 pages, of which 59 leaves = 118 pages are inscribed, though the back of p. 147 is uninscribed. (A small fragment each of the leaves 1/2 and of 3/4 has been identified among the ‘several fragments.’) From the typescript authored by Togo Mina, he listed “3 leaves” missing from the second tractate (pp. 40–69), whereas only two leaves are missing (pp. 45/46, 47/48). But for publication, Togo Mina corrected this to read “two leaves.” Since in both cases the total of pages is given as 134, it was not a matter of subsequently finding another leaf, but of allocating a leaf originally assigned to another tractate to this tractate.

Doresse later withdrew this codicological analysis. I published a complete codicological analysis of this single-quire codex.

---

198 23 i 48: Letter from Togo Mina to Doresse:

Etés-vous arrivé à placer les quelques feuillets qui n’avaient pas été classés?

199 Togo Mina, typescript:

... 3 feuillets ....

200 Togo Mina, “Le papyrus gnostique du Musée Copte,” VigChr 2 (1948): 129–136: 130:

... deux feuillets ....

201 Jean Doresse, “Les reliures des manuscrits gnostiques coptes découverts à Cheno-
The Return of Doresse from Upper Egypt to Cairo for December 1947

Doresse had been given strict instructions by Puech concerning Codex III ‘to try to bring all its photographs or a careful and complete transcription’ back to Paris (see above). As a result, on their return to Cairo the Doresses focused their attention on achieving these goals before their imminent departure:

As our departure was approaching, in order for us to have in time the enlarged prints of the negatives of the Gnostic manuscript that had been taken by Boulos, Togo proposes to us to use the photographic laboratory of the Coptic Museum and do the work ourselves. We make these enlargements.

Doresse reported to Puech optimistically, as usual, without mentioning the dismemberment of Codex III. And he included a report on the discovery, without mentioning that he had not stopped in Nag Hammadi, but secured his information in Cairo, no doubt largely from Phokion J. Tano(s), the Greek-Cypriote antiquities dealer of Cairo who purchased from Bahij ‘Ali the bulk of the manuscripts (see Chapter 1, Part 3 above):

---

203 Marianne Doresse, “Première Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte” (see Part 2 above).
204 14 xii 47: Letter from Doresse to Puech:


J’ai eu d’autres nouvelles de la trouvaille, faite dans une jarre en un lieu dont on ne peut savoir le nom. Il y avait, dit-on, dix manuscrits. Deux ont été brûlés et les autres vendus en bloc par les paysans pour une ou deux livres. Des huit restant nous en avons deux: celui du Musée et celui de l’antiquaire. Deux autres ont été proposés à Kuentz qui les a vus mais a gâché l’affaire en voulant payer un prix ridicule. On ne sait plus où ils sont et Kuentz, sur eux, est d’un silence que rien ne peut rompre. Schwartz, qui les lui avait signalés à ce moment (il y a un an et demi) se souvient d’y avoir vu le titre “Apocalypse de Pierre” et avoir reconnu à plusieurs endroits le nom de Seth. La reliure était décorée d’un serpent. Enfin trois autres manuscrits auraient été acquis par Tano (qui nie avec énergie, mais je ne le crois pas) qui peut les avoir cédés déjà à Chester Beatty. Le compte total me fait penser qu’il y aurait eu 9 manuscrits en tout, dont 7 existent peut-être encore.

En tout cas, il faudra publier le nôtre à une vitesse extrême, pour le cas où Chester Beatty aurait réellement trois autres volumes. Le nôtre est certainement la meilleure pièce de la collection. ...


Dimanche—Photos parfaits; le “Providence” partirait le 31. Je serais donc à Paris vers le 5 ou 6 janvier?
We have been in Cairo for ten days, and I work at putting in order the Gnostic papyrus, of which the photos are completed. I also have photos of the other papyrus, which will make it possible to study it a bit. I will go, if I have time, to make myself some negatives at the shop of the antiquities dealer.

I have obtained other news of the discovery, made in a jar in a place whose name one cannot know. There had been, one says, ten manuscripts. Two have been burnt, and the others sold all together by the peasants for one or two pounds. Of the eight that remained, we have two: that of the Museum and that of the antiquities dealer. Two others have been offered to Kuentz, who has seen them, but messed up the affair, in wanting to pay a ridiculous price. One no longer knows where they are, and about them Kuentz maintains a silence that nothing can break. Schwartz, who had alerted him about them at that time (a year and a half ago) recalls having seen there the title *Apocalypse of Peter* and having recognized in several places the name of Seth. The binding had been decorated with a serpent. Finally, three other manuscripts are said to have been acquired by Tano (who denies it energetically, but I do not believe him), who can already have granted them to Chester Beatty. The total count makes me think that there were nine manuscripts in all, of which perhaps seven still exist.

In any case, it will be necessary to publish ours with extreme rapidity, just in case that Chester Beatty would really have three other volumes. Ours is certainly the best piece of the collection....

P.S. I return from the Khan Khalili, where I received permission to photograph a dozen leaves—on the condition of not publishing anything. But that becomes interesting. If the negatives are decent! I was in very bad lighting conditions.

Sunday—Photos perfect. The *Providence* should depart the 31st [December 1947]. I would hence be in Paris toward the 5th or 6th January [1948]? Of course Doresse had no way of knowing that Codex III was ‘certainly the best piece in the collection,’ since he had not seen the others in the collection. Furthermore he had no reason to assume that Chester Beatty had acquired three volumes (which he had not). But this conjecture served to put pressure on Puech for a rapid publication.

Then Doresse wrote Puech a last time before leaving Cairo:

205 21 xii 47: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Nous devons partir après demain sur le *Providence.* Je serais à Paris, dans ces conditions, la semaine prochaine, et je pourrais immédiatement reparaître aux Hautes Études. En tout cas, j’y serai absolument la semaine suivante.

Nous avons vu M. Massignon, à qui j’ai donné les dernières nouvelles des textes gnostiques. Depuis, j’ai pu photographier la partie la plus importante du texte de
We should leave day after tomorrow on the ‘Providence.’ I would be in Paris, in this case, next week, and I could immediately appear again at the *Hautes Études.* In any case, I will certainly be there the following week.

We have seen Massignon, to whom I have given the latest news on the Gnostic texts. Since then, I have been able to photograph the most important part of the text of the antiquities dealer. With the photos that I already had of the same collection, we have at our disposal a fourth of the manuscript, which is really interesting, even though it is not as valuable as the one we are editing.

Drescher, who works at the Coptic Museum on hagiographic texts, had heard some comments on the papyrus of the Museum. He hastened to write to Till, and Togo Mina has just reprimanded him for that. Fortunately he has not been able to give Till any details on the content of the texts. In any case, Till has written to inform Togo that he has completed, in manuscript, the edition of the papyrus of Berlin [P.Berol. 8502], a papyrus that has disappeared for the time being. The edition of Till cannot appear for some time—it is in the hands of the Academy of Berlin. But Till would like to have information on

l’antiquaire. Avec les photos que j’avais déjà du même recueil, nous disposons du quart du manuscrit, qui est réellement intéressant bien que ne valant pas celui que nous éditons.


Les journaux du Caire vont annoncer la découverte des textes dans quelques jours: on ne pouvait plus tarder. Mais je n’annonce pas que le recueil contient l’Apocryphe de Jean et la Sagesse. Tout ce qui est intéressant sera annoncé à Paris. Il faudrait le faire au milieu de janvier: mais où? À l’Institut, ce serait le mieux—ou à la rigueur, à la Société Asiatique. J’apporte avec moi tous les documents, déjà mis en ordre, de sorte que la communication peut être immédiatement rédigée. J’ajoute que je sais presque tous les titres des ouvrages contenus dans le papyrus de l’antiquaire et que je suis autorisé à les mentionner, et à parler brièvement du texte. Enfin j’ai pu savoir le lieu de la trouvaille.

En tout cas je retiens toute la place que vous pourrez réserver dans la RHR. Il faudrait y parler en détail de la découverte complète, et cela de tout urgence. Je vous passerai tous les textes peu à peu un ou deux jours après mon arrivée (il faut que je les recopie, mais cela ira vite)—et vous pourrez en profiter aussitôt.

Si l’édition peut être faite très rapidement hors d’Égypte, Togo Mina et le Sous Secrétaire d’État m’autorisent à la confier à un éditeur européen (on pense à la Belgique ou à la Suisse, pour des raisons financiers).
our manuscript. Fortunately, he is not aware that we have the *Apocrifôn of John* and the *Wisdom of Jesus*. Hence one makes a friendly reply to his advances and that leaves open all the possibilities of asking him later for information that he may offer us, but one does not tell him anything precise.

The newspapers of Cairo are going to announce the discovery of the texts in a few days. One could not wait any longer. But I do not announce that the collection contains the *Apocryphon of John* and the *Wisdom of Jesus*. Everything that is interesting will be announced in Paris. It would be necessary to do it in the middle of January, but where? At the Institute, that would be best—or, if necessary, at the *Société Asiatique*. I bring with me all the documents, already put in order, so that the communication can be edited immediately. I add that I know almost all the titles of the works contained in the papyrus of the antiquities dealer, and that I am authorized to mention them, and to speak briefly of the text. Finally, I have been able to come to know the place of the discovery.

In any case I retain all the space that you can reserve in the *Revue de l’Histoire des Religions*. It would be necessary to speak there in detail about the complete discovery, and that with all urgency. I will give to you all the texts bit by bit, one or two days after my arrival (it is necessary that I recopy them, but that will move rapidly)—and you can profit from them immediately.

If the edition can be made very rapidly outside of Egypt, Togo Mina and the Under-Secretary of State authorize me to entrust it to a European publisher (one thinks of Belgium or Switzerland, for financial reasons).

Thus Doresse left it to Puech to arrange for the official announcement in Paris, though he did conclude with the possibility of publishing Codex III outside of France.

**Publicizing the Success of the First Mission**

Marianne Doresse has reported their triumphal return to Paris, having accomplished more than they or Puech ever could have hoped:

> We arrive at Paris in possession—in addition to the photographs—of a first copy of the Gnostic papyrus of the Coptic Museum made from the original, and photographs of Eid’s papyrus.

Before leaving Cairo, Doresse had prepared the news release that he left with Togo Mina, who then wrote Doresse after Doresse’s return to France:

---

206 Marianne Doresse, “Première Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte” (see Part 2 above).

207 23 i 48: Letter from Togo Mina to Doresse:

> Quant à votre fameux manuscrit, voilà ce qui s’est passé depuis votre départ. J’ai
As for your famous manuscript, here is what has taken place since your departure. I sent the communication to the newspapers on Saturday the 10th of this month, after having made minor modifications to it.

Hence already on 10 January 1948 their sensational press release broke the news of the discovery to the public for the first time:

One of the most fortunate discoveries made in Egypt for a long time will mark the year 1947.

Indeed, several months ago, the well-known professor, Dr. Guorgui Sobhi bey, referred to Togo Mina, Director of the Coptic Museum, the seller of a Coptic book on papyrus. ...

Having hardly scanned the volume, Doresse congratulated heartily Togo Mina for his remarkable acquisition, and gave him the impression that this discovery would be a date, not only in the history of Coptic studies, but also in the study of the oldest texts of Christianity. Indeed it had to do with...
Gnostic texts of an exceptional interest. The discovery was comparable, in its importance, to that of the Manichaean texts seventeen years ago. ... Professor J. Doresse, who is preparing its edition and commentary with Togo Mina, has already concluded from his first readings that a good part of current theories on Gnosticism and Manichaicism is going to be overturned by the new texts, older, more detailed, and more exact than the few Gnostic works one previously possessed.

While awaiting the edition, whose preparation is almost completed, Togo Mina announces for the near future precise communications on the content of the texts of the Coptic Museum.

A fortunate discovery that has just underlined once again the exceptional literary as well as religious importance of Coptic literature.

In the news release, the involvement of Daumas and Corbin in the initial identification of the text, and of Puech in the planned commentary, is simply ignored. Furthermore, George Sobhy, who deserves great credit for securing Codex III for the Coptic Museum, and who was himself both a Copt and a coptologist of some distinction, had apparently hoped to be entrusted with editing the codex. Clearly he was annoyed by the part of the news release stating that Doresse and Togo Mina were to publish Codex III. Thereupon Togo Mina wrote Doresse:

Dr. Sobhy, who seems to have read the complete text of La Bourse [Égyptienne], seems to be irked that the edition has not been entrusted to him, but that leaves me neither hot nor cold.

Already in that first news release, imminent publication plans had been broached: An edition and commentary of Codex III by Doresse and Togo Mina was ‘almost completed.’ Actually, it had hardly been begun, and was never completed and published.

The Scholarly Announcements in Paris and Cairo

Puech made the formal announcement on 20 February 1948 to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. It was based on the text provided by

---


[23 i 48: Letter from Togo Mina to Doresse:]

Le Dr. Sobhy, qui semble avoir lu le texte complet de la Bourse, paraît être fâché que l'édition ne lui a pas été confiée, mais cela ne me fait ni chaud ni froid.

---
Doressé, which he had written in collaboration with Togo Mina. Though Doressé pointed back to this event as of major significance, its four-line report in the semi-official French newspaper *Le monde* of 23 February 1948 could lead one to infer otherwise:

... awakened, practically, no interest.

Togo Mina requested that Doressé send him the final text, since Togo Mina wanted to make use of it in his own presentation to the *Institut d’Égypte* on 8 March 1948 entitled “Un papyrus gnostique copte”:

My paper for the *Institut d’Égypte* has been set for the beginning of next March. So I hope to receive your text as soon as possible, if that does not cause you too much trouble.

A fortnight later Togo Mina had to remind Doressé to send it:

I count on receiving soon the analysis of the contents of our text, so as to have time to prepare my paper, which has been set for the first Monday of next month.

One can note a certain jostling for position in the way the conclusion of the shared text presented the publication plans. In his original typescript, Togo Mina had explained:

---


... n’éveilla, pratiquement, aucun intérêt.

212 23 i 48: Letter from Togo Mina to Doressé:

Ma communication pour l’Institut d’Égypte a été fixé pour le début du mois de mars prochain. J’espère donc recevoir votre texte le plus tôt possible si cela ne vous ennuie pas trop.

213 9 ii 48: Letter from Togo Mina to Doressé:

Je compte recevoir bientôt l’analyse du contenu de notre texte pour avoir le temps de préparer ma communication qui a été fixée pour le premier lundi du mois prochain.

214 From the typescript written by Togo Mina:

Our concern will be, above all, to give as soon as possible an impeccable edition of these capital documents. Having entrusted to Doresse a good part of the work, the undertaking can be quickly brought to a good conclusion. Doresse has been able, in addition, to obtain the participation and collaboration of Puech, Director of Studies at the École [Pratique] des Hautes Études of Paris, for questions of Patristics and the general history of Gnosticism. I reserve for myself the philological study of the text and a part of the introduction and translation. Doresse retains as his responsibility the critical establishment of the text and a part of the translation. In addition, he will elaborate the notes and the commentary, for which he will collaborate with Puech. The commentary and the introduction will be as developed as possible, and will handle all the historical and doctrinal aspects of the questions that arise. The work is already being carried on actively. The text is almost definitively established. Two translations will be made, one by Doresse, the other by me, which will then be compared to avoid any error. Doresse and Puech announce the sending of their first manuscripts in the near future. The edition will consist of two or three volumes in 4°. We have good hopes of presenting its first leaves in July, on the occasion of the International Congress of Orientalists that is to be held in Paris.

Togo Mina’s published summary omitted the presentation of the different responsibilities:215

Our concern will be, above all, to give as soon as possible an impeccable edition of these capital documents, and we have good hopes of presenting its first leaves next July, on the occasion of the International Congress of Orientalists that is to be held in Paris.


Notre soin sera avant tout de donner au plus tôt une édition impeccable de ces documents capitaux, et nous avons bon espoir d’en présenter les premières feuilles en juillet prochain, à l’occasion du Congrès International des Orientalistes qui doit se tenir à Paris.

Togo Mina published a more extensive, but still brief, draft of his essay, “Le papyrus gnostique du Musée Copte” (see below).
But Doresse's own draft had gone into further detail, such as the publication in Paris, and heightening the important rôle of Doresse, while suggesting Puech's dependence on him.\footnote{From Doresse's typewritten first draft:}

In view of the importance of this discovery, Togo Mina has been kind enough immediately to entrust to Doresse the editing of the manuscript, and authorizes him to invite the collaboration of H.C. Puech. ...

The Director of the Coptic Museum nonetheless reserves for himself the philological study of the text and a part of the work of translation. Doresse retains as his responsibility the critical establishment of the text and the definitive translation, and shares with Puech the composition of the commentary, which should be as developed as the new texts warrant. He has already been able to bring back from Egypt a certain and definitive text [on whose inadequacies see below], on which the work has begun. The edition will consist of two or three volumes, and is to be printed by the \textit{Imprimerie Nationale}. We are endeavoring to present its first leaves for the International Congress of Orientalists.


The announcement, edited and presented by Puech on 20 February 1948 to the French Academy, omitted the itemized prominence of Togo Mina and Doresse in the publication plans, but concluded succinctly with an allusion to the commentary in which he would be primarily involved:\footnote{Puech and Doresse, “Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Égypte,” Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres: \textit{CRAI} 1948 (1948): 87–95: 95.}
One will be concerned to give, above all, an edition with commentary of these capital documents. It will be established, in collaboration, by Messrs Togo Mina, J. Doresse and H.-C. Puech.

Doresse then envisaged a two-volume edition, the first limited to the transcription, which he alone had prepared, the second containing the translation and commentary, where Puech’s contribution would be published (or with Doresse’s translation included in the first volume, see below). That would in effect give Doresse a volume to himself.

*The Trip of Togo Mina to Paris*

Doresse wrote Puech of Togo Mina’s imminent arrival in Paris to attend the International Congress of Orientalists meeting there in July 1948:219

He will participate in the Congress and will arrive in Paris toward the beginning of July.

Puech responded promptly for Doresse to come to his home with the letters he had received from Till and Togo Mina:220

Can you please come see me at my home Tuesday morning around 11AM? Bring the letters of Togo Mina and of Till, as well as the documents sent by the latter. I will take note of them with interest.

After that meeting, Doresse again wrote Puech about the visit of Togo Mina:221

---

219 24 vi 48: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Il participera au Congrès et arrivera à Paris vers le début de juillet.

220 26 vi 48: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Voulez-vous venir me voir chez moi mardi matin aux environs de 11 heures? Apportez les lettres de Togo Mina et de Till, ainsi que les documents communiqués par ce dernier: j’en prendrai connaissance avec intérêt.

221 4 vii 48: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je ne pourrai sans doute pas vous présenter Togo Mina avant la fin de la semaine prochaine, car il commence mardi un traitement dont il a grand besoin. D’ailleurs,
I will no doubt not be able to present Togo Mina to you before the end of next week, since he begins Tuesday a treatment of which he has great need. Besides, the Under-Secretary of State does not arrive until the 12th, and, for the important questions, we need his presence.

The Gnostic papyrus continues to be in Cairo, one of the things about which one speaks the most. The Council of Administration of the Coptic Museum has appointed, to supervise the future edition, a committee composed of Togo Mina, Canon Drioton, and G[aston] Wiet. This choice guaranties the future and permits the work to take place in peace.

As to the publication, in order for it to be rapid, if we cannot do anything on our side, the Egyptian government would take it over at its own expense and have it printed by the French Institute.

While waiting to be able to occupy himself with the other texts, Togo prepares the purchase of the Eid papyrus by legal procedures. This purchase could be carried out the day I identify the owner of the other documents.

Puech replied, offended that he was not named to the Committee of Publication:

I am happy at the constitution of the Committee of Publication charged with supervising the edition of the Gnostic papyrus of Cairo. Nonetheless you understand that I am amazed not to see my name mentioned there at all. It seems to me that there is in all this affair a tendency to delegate me into

---

²²² vii 48: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Je me réjouis de la constitution du Comité de publication chargé de patronner l’édition du papyrus gnostique du Caire. Vous comprendrez toutefois que je m’étonne de n’y voir point figurer mon nom. Il me semble qu’il y a dans toute cette affaire tendance à me reléguer dans l’ombre ou au rang de collaborateur de second ordre. Condition inacceptable pour moi. La situation doit donc être tirée au clair, une fois pour toutes, afin que j’avis à fixer mon attitude et celle de l’École des Hautes Études à l’égard de l’entreprise.
the shade or to the level of a collaborator of the second order. Unacceptable condition for me! The situation must hence be brought into the open, once for all, so that I am able to settle upon my attitude and that of the École des Hautes Études with regard to the enterprise.

Doresse tried to explain:

I hasten to respond to your letter. The 'Committee of Publication' is composed of three members of the Council of Administration of the Coptic Museum. Its only role is to approve the decisions of Togo Mina, in his capacity of Director of the Coptic Museum—and that, both for the present papyrus, as well as for the future papyri. Hence we have nothing to do with its activity, and this Committee, for its part, has no desire to become involved in the editing as scientific work. Togo Mina will thus have much more facilities to make acquisitions that we hope for, and one can only be happy with his choice. As to the edition of the present texts, it is official in Egypt as in France that you are associated in them. The fact has been announced by Togo at the Institute of Egypt on 8 March, just as we have announced it here at the Institute.

Puech then wrote Doresse emphasizing that what was needed was an official meeting with Togo Mina, whom he had never met:

Is it necessary that the two of us meet before having a shared interview with Togo Mina? The time for private secret meetings has only lasted too long. The time has finally come to hold a plenary meeting of the three of us, where we will examine the situation in all frankness and in all clarity, and make, without innuendos or reticences, the necessary decisions. If however you wish to do

---

223 8 vii 48: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je me hâte de répondre à votre lettre. Le "comité de publication" est composé de trois membres du Conseil d'Administration du Musée Copte; il a pour seul rôle d’approuver les décisions de Togo Mina en tant que Directeur du Musée Copte—et cela aussi bien pour le papyrus actuel que pour les papyrus futurs. Nous n’avons donc rien à voir avec son activité, et ce comité, de son côté n’a aucune envie de se mêler de l’édition en tant que travail scientifique. Togo Mina aura ainsi beaucoup plus de facilités pour faire les acquisitions que nous souhaitions et on ne peut que se féliciter de son choix. Quant à l’édition des textes actuels, il est officiel en Égypte comme en France que vous y êtes associé; le fait a été annoncé par Togo à l’Institut d’Égypte dès le 8 mars, comme nous l’avons annoncé ici à l’Institut.

224 14 vii 48: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Est-il nécessaire que nous nous rencontrions tous deux avant d’avoir une entrevue commune avec Togo Mina? Le temps des conciliabules privés n’a que trop duré; l’heure est venue de tenir enfin entre nous trois une réunion plénière, où nous examinerons en toute franchise et en toute clarté la situation et prendrons, sans sous-entendus ou réticences, les décisions nécessaires. Si vous le désirez cependant, vous pourrez me trouver aux Hautes Études, où je serai sans doute lundi après-midi et peut-être aussi mardi.
so, you could find me at the Hautes Études, where I will no doubt be Monday afternoon and perhaps also Tuesday.

But nothing came of such a meeting to change the basic situation: Puech would remain in Paris and Doresse would return to Cairo to work with Togo Mina on the edition there. Hence Puech had contact with the Coptic Museum that owned the codex only through the mediation of Doresse.

4. P.Berol. 8502: Jean Doresse and Walter Till

The Missing P.Berol. 8502

Both in the first draft by Togo Mina as well as in the first draft by Doresse of their joint scholarly article, there is the query:

What has become of the papyrus of Berlin today? According to the most recent reports that we have had, today it would have disappeared.

Much the same question recurs in the published version presented by Puech:

But what has become of the papyrus of Berlin today?

The Papyrus Collection of Berlin did survive the war, but this may not have been known, much less its whereabouts, in 1947–1948:

The bulk of the Papyrus Collection not in the Ibscher home, along with other Museum holdings, was put for safe keeping during the war in a reinforced concrete bunker (removed after the war) at the Zoo Train Station in what

---

225 From the typescript of Togo Mina:

Qu’est devenu aujourd’hui le papyrus de Berlin? Selon les derniers renseignements que nous avons eus, il serait aujourd’hui disparu.

This recurs in Doresse’s draft.


Mais qu’est devenu aujourd’hui le papyrus de Berlin?

became West Berlin. The Museum was indeed very heavily damaged in a massive air raid on 3 February 1945, which left intact only the outer walls of the gutted Neues Museum, where the Papyrus Collection had been housed.

In 1946 the Papyrus Collection was taken to Leningrad, which may be reflected in Doresse’s later, somewhat more explicit nuance: 228

No one knows what has now become of it. For at the end of the last war it disappeared toward an unknown destination after the fall of Berlin.

The Papyrus Collection was returned to the Berlin Museum only in 1958. But P.Berol. 8502 was in fact published by Walter Till, the successor to Carl Schmidt as its editor, already in 1955, working on the basis of photographs, without access to the original papyrus itself. In the second, revised edition Hans-Martin Schenke noted: 229

The main task in the reworking of Till’s edition of P.Berol. 8502 was to verify on the basis of the original the text of BG [P.Berol. 8502] that had been worked out only on the basis of photographs. And surprisingly in the process it turned out that at certain places corrections had to be carried out, by means of which certain ‘dark’ statements clarified themselves on their own.

Till had actually completed the transcription in 1943 (see below), but already by then the manuscript itself was probably no longer accessible in the museum.

**Difficulties in Exchanging Copies of P.Berol. 8502 and Codex III**

Already on 23 January 1948 Togo Mina had written to Walter Till, informing him of the acquisition of Codex III. He mentioned at least the titles of III, 1, 4 and 5, *The Apocryphon of John* and *The Sophia of Jesus*, which are also

---

228 Doresse, *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte*, 93:

Nul ne sait aujourd’hui ce qu’il est devenu car, à la fin de la dernière guerre, il disparut vers une destination inconnue après la prise de Berlin.

229 *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 herausgegeben, übersetzt und bearbeitet von Walter C. Till. Zweite, erweiterte Auflage bearbeitet von Hans-Martin Schenke* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 60; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1955, 2nd ed. 1972), xi:

represented in P.Berol. 8502. Togo Mina solicited from Till pre-publication access to his texts, and he suggested to Doresse to write to see if Till's texts could be included in their edition.\textsuperscript{230}

Regarding the edition, I give you carte blanche to act as you wish, for I am sure that you will draw the maximum of profit for us. ...

For the question of the text of Berlin, you can write directly to Till, proposing to him to add his texts to our edition. ... Test out the terrain with him first, and see if he agrees to communicate to us his text, and if we receive a favorable response, we could judge, once we know the content of his text, if it is necessary to include it in our edition, or if we can take no notice of it.

Since giving Togo Mina a copy of his text would prove difficult, Till suggested that a copy of the Cairo texts be sent to him rather than the reverse: \textsuperscript{231}

I am pleased to learn that the work of publication is well advanced, and that we can hope to have the publication soon in front of us. Naturally it would be very useful to compare your Gnostic text with those of Berlin that are not yet published. ...

So as to be able to make the necessary comparisons, I propose to you the following method: Since I have only a single copy of the text of Berlin, I cannot

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{230} 9 ii 48: Letter from Togo Mina to Doresse:
\begin{itemize}
\item Quant à l’édition, je vous donne carte blanche d’agir comme vous voudrez car je suis sûr que vous en tirerez le maximum de profit pour nous. ...
\item Pour la question du texte de Berlin, vous pouvez écrire directement à Till en lui proposant d’adjoindre ses textes à notre édition. ... Tâtez d’abord le terrain avec lui et voyez s’il accepte de nous communiquer son texte et si nous aurons une réponse favorable nous pourrions juger lorsque nous connaissions le contenu de son texte s’il faut l’inclure dans notre édition ou si nous pouvions passer outre.
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{231} 8 ii 48: Letter from Till to Togo Mina (accompanying a letter from Till to Doresse of the same date):
\begin{itemize}
\item Je suis heureux d’apprendre que le travail de la publication est bien avancé et que nous pouvons espérer d’avoir la publication bientôt devant nous. Naturellement il serait très utile de comparer votre texte gnostique avec ceux de Berlin qui ne sont pas encore publiés. ...
\item Pour pouvoir faire les comparaisons nécessaires je vous propose la méthode suivante. Puisque je n’ai pas qu’un seul exemplaire du texte de Berlin je ne peux pas vous l’envoyer et il est trop copieux pour le copier. En outre, chargé avec l’édition de ce texte par l’académie allemande, j’aurais besoin de la permission expresse pour faire cela. Peut-être il est possible de m’envoyer une copie de votre texte gnostique et je vous en enverrai les parallèles du texte de Berlin. Naturellement vous êtes tout à fait sûr que je n’en publierai rien, cela va sans dire.
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{flushleft}
send it to you, and it is too copious to copy. Besides, entrusted with the edition of this text by the German Academy, I would need explicit permission to do that. Perhaps it is possible to send me a copy of your Gnostic text, and I would send you its parallels from the text of Berlin. Naturally you are completely certain that I will publish none of it, that goes without saying.

Doresse replied, listing the equally official sponsors of his publication, maintaining that it is they who would require an exchange of texts for comparison:232

I have already established and translated the text, and at present H.C. Puech and I are writing the commentary, which will be extremely developed. The publication, which in principle will take place at the *Imprimerie Nationale* of Paris, is put under the patronage of the Coptic Museum, the *Institut de France* (*Acad[émie] des Inscriptions [et Belles-Lettres]*)*, the *École [Pratique] des Hautes Études*, and the *Société Asiatique*. Thanks to these various forms of support, the first pages should be printed for the Congress of Orientalists that will be held here in July.

As a result of the official character of this publication, it is very difficult to communicate to you the text of the papyrus of Cairo without receiving in exchange the corresponding text of the manuscript of Berlin. An exchange, which would have to do with the texts of ‘The Apocryphon of John’ and ‘The Wisdom of Jesus’, could however be of great interest, in permitting each of us in our editions of these works to include the variants, for you of the papyrus of Cairo, for us of the papyrus of Berlin. There would still be time to envisage such an exchange, if your edition is not in the press. I hope that the Academy of Berlin will give you full freedom to do this.

---

232 3 iii 48: Letter from Doresse to Till:


Par suite du caractère officiel de cette publication, il est très difficile de vous communiquer le texte du papyrus du Caire sans recevoir en échange le texte correspondant du manuscrit de Berlin. Un échange, qui porterait sur les textes de l’“Apocryphe de Jean” et de la “Sagesse de Jésus” pourrait cependant présenter un grand intérêt en nous permettant d’inclure respectivement dans nos éditions de ces ouvrages les variantes, du papyrus du Caire pour vous, du papyrus de Berlin pour nous. Il serait encore temps d’envisager un tel échange si votre édition n’est pas sous presse. J’espère que l’Académie de Berlin vous laissera toute liberté pour cela.
Till replied, itemizing the problems involved in getting the transcription to Doresse, but also indicating that he had finished his edition years ago:

In the case of my text, the situation is as follows: Already in 1911 the Coptic text, as Carl Schmidt edited it, was printed. But as a result of a break in a pipe in the printing firm, the whole edition was destroyed. Only the one copy that was in the hands of Schmidt survived. On the basis of this, a new printing ... was made, about in the middle of the 1930s, of which I, after the death of Schmidt, received a copy, in order to publish the text. Schmidt had in fact only had the Coptic text printed. Of course I cannot send away this one copy, for I cannot expose it to the possibility of getting lost. So I would have to transcribe the whole rather long text. Now I wrote today to the Kommission für spätantike Religionsgeschichte of the German Academy in Berlin ... and made the proposal, in case the Academy is in agreement with exchanging the texts already before their publication, advantageous for both sides, to send you from Germany a printed copy of the Coptic text. ... Now of course I do not know whether printed texts are still on hand in Germany at all. I believe they were in a printing house in Leipzig. In the bombardments, almost all Leipzig printing houses were destroyed. So it would be quite possible that the fate of the first printed Coptic text has repeated itself now once again, and so the copy in my hand is again the only one. I have received no information about this. ...
My treatment is finished, already on hand for years. However one must now wait until the publishing house (Hinrichs in Leipzig) receives a work permit from the occupation force. Only then can the printing be undertaken. When that will be, I cannot guess.

Possibilities for Collating Difficult Passages

Till received a negative reply from the Berlin Academy, but nonetheless proposed mutual assistance:

Unfortunately I must inform you that the German Academy has not agreed to my proposal to exchange the Coptic Gnostic texts before their publication. But on considering it carefully, I find that, though this does involve a disadvantage for me, it does not for you. For my publication will probably appear still before your second volume with the translation and the commentary, so that you can still use the Berlin text for your translation.

If you wish, I would nevertheless like to be helpful to you with the Berlin text, to the extent it stands in my power without exceeding my authority—I have in mind places where for you the knowledge of the passage in question in the Berlin text can be useful already for your edition of the text, in the uncertain reading of individual words or the filling out of lacunae in your text. If that is the case, I ask of you to communicate to me the passages in question with the surrounding text, best of all the whole sentence. I will then communicate to you how the Berlin text reads at this place, presupposing that the passage occurs in the Berlin text.

Doresse accepted this limited offer of assistance:

---

234 23 v 48: Letter from Till to Doresse:


235 Circa 4 vi 48: Undated letter from Doresse to Till:

Je reçois votre lettre du 29 mai et regrette que l’Ac. de B. n’ait pas autorisé l’échange
I receive your letter of 29 May [presumably the arrival date, since Till dated his letter to 23 May] and regret that the Academy of Berlin has not authorized the exchange that you have been so kind as to ask of it. It would have been somewhat useful to us for the edition of the mutilated parts of the Apocryphon of John. But your offer to verify for us readings that are doubtful or complicated as a result of lacunae will render to us without any doubt a service that is also precious. ...

I will naturally not use the information that you would be so kind as to give me except for my personal information, and will not mention it in the edition, unless I receive authorization from you.

Apparently Doresse also proposed that they combine their two editions into one large edition, which had been suggested to Doresse by Togo Mina already on 9 February 1948, to which Till replied:

I will write today again to the Academy [of Berlin] and will present your new proposal to it, to make in common a large critical edition of both the codices. But, to tell the truth, I do not know how we will be able to do that, how you imagine that. Can you give me details about it? I will inform you immediately as soon as the reply arrives. But I fear that in the current conditions in which Berlin finds itself at present [the Berlin blockade from June 1948 to May 1949], my letter does not have much chance of arriving or of being answered. Nonetheless I will attempt it. During this time, we can carry out the project of which you speak in your letter: You send me in parts the copy of the text of the Apocryphon of John, and I will return it to you as soon as possible, furnished with my notes. I am happy that I can be a bit useful to you in this way.

---

que vous aviez bien voulu lui demander. Il nous aurait été quelque peu utile pour l’édition des parties mutilées de l’Apocryphe de Jean. Mais votre offre de vérifier pour nous les lectures douteuses ou compliquées par suite de lacune, nous rendra sans aucun doute un service aussi précieux. ...

Je n’utiliseraie naturellement les renseignements que vous voudrez bien me donner que pour mon information personnelle et n’en ferai pas état dans l’édition, sauf autorisation de votre part.

236

12 vi 48: [French!] Letter from Till to Doresse:

I’ écrirai aujourd’hui encore à l’Académie et lui présenterai votre nouvelle proposition de faire en commun une grande édition critique de tous les deux codices. Mais, pour dire la vérité, je ne sais pas comment nous pourrons faire cela, comment vous vous imaginez cela. Pouvez-vous m’en donner des détails? Je vous informerai aussitôt que la réponse arrivera. Mais je crains que dans les conditions actuelles dans lesquels Berlin se trouve à présent ma lettre n’a pas beaucoup de chance d’arriver ou d’être répondue. Pourtant je l’essayerai. Pendant ce temps nous pouvons exécuter le projet dont vous parlez dans votre lettre: vous m’envoyez en parties la copie du texte de l’Apocryphon de Jean et je vous la retournerai le plus tôt que possible munie de mes notes. Je suis heureux que je peux vous être utile un peu de cette manière.
Doresse had sent Till on 6 June 1948 his transcription of a few pages of *The Apocryphon of John*, to which Till replied.

From your transcription, no matter how full of holes the piece of text is, and from the comparison with the corresponding parts of the Berlin manuscript, I see how important, indeed indispensable, a comparison of the texts is for their correct understanding. I now recognize also that I cannot give the treatment of the Berlin text to be printed before I know the Cairo text completely. Hence I must wait at least until the first volume of your work, with the Coptic text, has appeared, and must then rework everything. So I imagine the sequence of publication as follows: First your text volume appears, then my treatment, and finally your second volume with the translation and the commentary.

If you have passages with lacunae or also unclear texts, where something seems to you to be in error or incomprehensible, then send me a transcription of them. I will then communicate to you how I (on the basis of my knowledge of the Berlin text) propose to fill out or emend or interpret the passages. I could fill out rather extensively, on the basis of the Berlin text, the transcription you sent me. It is not at all necessary that you keep it to yourself as private information. I make the proposal to you to publish my supplements, i.e. to take them up into the text (as supplements), and to note there that I have proposed this supplement on the basis of the Berlin text. No one can have

---

15 vi 48: Letter from Till to Doresse:


Wenn Sie lückenhafte Stellen haben oder auch unklare, an denen Ihnen etwas fehlerhaft oder unverständlich vorkommt, so senden Sie mir eine Abschrift davon. Ich werde Ihnen mitteilen, wie ich (auf Grund meiner Kenntnis des Berliner Textes) die Stellen zu ergänzen bzw. zu emendieren oder aufzufassen vorschlage. Ihre mir gesandte Abschrift konnte ich nach dem Berliner Text ziemlich weitgehend ergänzen. Es ist durchaus unnötig, dass Sie das als private Information für sich behalten. Ich mache Ihnen den Vorschlag, meine Ergänzungen zu publizieren, d. h. in den Text (als Ergänzungen) aufzunehmen und dazu zu vermerken, dass ich diese Ergänzung auf Grund des Berliner Textes vorgeschlagen habe. Dagegen kann niemand etwas einzuwenden haben. Es wäre doch schade, wenn diese Textergänzungen erst im zweiten Band erscheinen könnten. ...

Ich sende Ihre Abschrift mit meinen Ergänzungen (in Bleistift) zurück und bitte um Rückfragen, falls etwas unklar sein sollte.
anything against that. After all, it would be a pity if these supplements to the text could appear first in the second volume. ...

I return your transcription with my supplements (in pencil), and request your questions in return, in case something happens to be unclear.

Till added his own request:238

Do you permit me to ask of you how you fill the lacunae of the text of Berlin according to the text of Cairo? I would send you the incomplete passages, as you have done, and you would return them to me with your notes, please.

To this Doresse readily agreed:239

I will communicate to you all the passages of the text of Cairo that can interest you. For that, it will be enough for you to send me the copy of the defective passages. ...

Your idea to publish first the text of Cairo, then that of Berlin, touches me a great deal. That would indeed be practical enough. ...

I will hence send you soon, bit by bit, the copy of the Apocryphon of John, and will be very grateful to you if you would be so kind as to indicate to me, as the work goes on, as rapidly as possible, the necessary ‘restitutions.’

Till of course finally published P.Berol. 8502, without waiting longer for Doresse’s edition, which never appeared. For this Doresse then reproached him (see below); but Till had made his offer to publish after Doresse’s publication on the assumption that Doresse would publish promptly, as Doresse had said he would.

Doresse informed Puech of the plans he was developing with Till:240

---

238 15 vi 48: A second letter from Till to Doresse:

Me permettez-vous de vous demander comment vous combleriez les lacunes du texte de Berlin d’après le texte du Caire? Je vous enverrais des passages incomplètes comme vous l’avez fait et vous me les renverriez avec vos notices, s’il vous plaît.

239 24 vi 48: Letter from Doresse to Till:

Je vous communiquerai tous les passages du texte du Caire qui peuvent vous intéresser: il vous suffira pour cela de m’adresser la copie des passages défectueux. ...

Votre idée de publier d’abord le texte du Caire, puis celui de Berlin me touche beaucoup. Ce serait en effet assez pratique. ...

Je vous adresserai donc bientôt, peu à peu, la copie de l’Apocryphe de Jean, et vous serait bien reconnaissant si vous voulez m’indiquer au fur et à mesure aussi vite que possible les “restitutions” nécessaires.

240 24 vi 48: Letter from Doresse to Puech:
I just received two letters: One from Togo Mina, with whom everything is going perfectly ... The other letter, very long, is from Till, who returns to me four pages of the ‘Secret Book’ [The Apocryphon of John] completed with the help of the text of Berlin. He will communicate everything to me, bit by bit, in the same way. I will speak to you in detail of the contents of his letter, if I can see you, without disturbing you, at the beginning of next week. His proposals go very much beyond what I had requested!

Puech responded:

Would you like to come see me at my home Tuesday morning at about 11 AM? Bring the letters of Togo Mina and of Till, as well as the documents communicated by the latter. I will take note of them with interest.

The Benelux Connection

In August 1948 Doresse presented a paper on The Apocryphon of John from Codex III at the Eighth International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Brussels, which he summarized as follows:

Then at the Congress of Byzantine Studies in Brussels, I gave a paper on the Secret Book of John where, in giving for the first time the analysis of

241 26 vi 48: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Voulez-vous venir me voir chez moi mardi matin aux environs de 11 heures? Apportez les lettres de Togo Mina et de Till, ainsi que les documents communiqués par ce dernier: j’en prendrai connaissance avec intérêt.


243 vii 48: Letter from Doresse to Gustave Lefevre:

Puis au C. d’Ét. By. de Bruxelles, j’ai donné une communication sur le L.S. de Jean où, tout en donnant pour la première fois l’analyse de ce texte, j’ai quelque peu bousculé les conclusions hâtives de C. Schmidt sur l’ancienneté ... J’ai pu, surtout, rattacher le livre directement aux Ophites et montrer qu’il correspondait, en effet, point par point, à la notice d’Épiphane relative à ces sectaires.
this text, I overturned somewhat the hasty conclusions of Carl Schmidt on its ancientness… I have been able, especially, to attach the work directly to the Ophites, and show that it corresponded, in effect, point by point, to the notice of Epiphanius relative to these sectarians.

Doresse had mentioned to Puech in his last letter from Cairo, on 21 December 1947, that he had received authorization to publish rapidly in Belgium or Switzerland for financial reasons (see above). He took advantage of his trip to Belgium to work in this direction. He made plans with Canon Draguet (see below), Director of the new Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, to publish Codex III in Louvain, Belgium, with the support of the leading Coptologist of Louvain, Canon L.Th. Lefort. This would have the great advantage for Doresse of removing the project from the direct control of Puech in Paris. Indeed, Walter Till came to be envisaged as the author of the introduction and commentary (see below). Of course this Belgian publication never took place, but the plan is indicative of the mutual alienation of Doresse and Puech from 1948 on. Both came to prefer, rather than continuing their increasingly impossible collaboration, the internationalization of the project, Doresse with Till in Louvain, Puech with Quispel in Zürich. Already in the summer of 1948 Doresse published, not in the journal Puech edited (Revue de l’histoire des religions), but in the new Dutch journal *Vigiliae Christianae*, a description of three tractates of Codex III (Tractates 2–4), the latter two of which were related to P.Berol. 8502 (Tractate 3).244

*A Joint Edition in Louvain or Berlin*

Doresse wrote Till of the plans he had made to publish in Louvain, and enclosed some damaged passages of the Cairo copy of The Apocryphon of John to solicit help from the Berlin copy.245

---

245 18 viii 48: Letter from Doresse to Till:

> Je reviens du Congrès d’Études Byzantines de Bruxelles, ...

Quant à une grande édition commune, il s’agirait de faire en commun l’édition des textes gnostiques du Caire et de Berlin, édition à laquelle vous prendriez le même part que nous. J’ai parlé de ce projet à M. Draguet (qui dirige le nouveau Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum … où nos textes vont être imprimés); j’en ai parlé à Togo Mina; tous sont d’accord pour souhaiter, avec votre collaboration, l’établissement d’une grande édition critique. Je crois que l’Académie de Berlin n’aurait aucune raison de refuser cette offre d’une association, où tous ses droits seraient respectés et qui permettrait l’édition des textes qu’elle possède dans les conditions scientifiques les plus parfaites. On ferait
I return from the Congress of Byzantine Studies in Brussels. ...

With regard to a large edition in common, it would be a matter of making in common the edition of the Gnostic texts of Cairo and Berlin, an edition in which you would take the same part as we would. I have spoken of this project to Draguet (who directs the new *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* [Orientalium] where our texts are going to be printed). I have spoken of it to Togo Mina. All are in agreement in the hope, with your collaboration, to establish a large critical edition. I believe that the Academy of Berlin would not have any reason to refuse this offer of an association where all its rights would be respected, and which would permit the edition of the texts that it possesses in the most perfect scientific conditions. One would first of all publish the critical edition of the texts and the translation, then the commentary. The new presses of Louvain would do this work very rapidly.

Of course, as long as you do not have a favorable response from Berlin, I continue to prepare the edition according to your first offer, by completing the text of Cairo with your restitutions, which permits me to finalize completely, already now, the commentary and even the translation. ...

I hope that you can rapidly send me your restitutions of the texts of which I send you a copy. As soon as we will have settled on the designs of the Academy of Berlin, we can thus very quickly go to press, in one form or the other.

This helpful exchange of texts between Doresse and Till led Till again to appeal to the Berlin Academy, from which he received a limited approval, which he discussed with Doresse:246

---

246 28 viii 48: Letter from Till to Doresse:

When one reads the parallel text, this advances the understanding greatly, and is unusually instructive. After all, an edition of the text is in fact only possible if one also knows the other text. I already realized this, when I saw the first piece of text sent by you in your next-to-last letter, and at that time I have also written in this sense to the German Academy, in which I also forwarded your proposal of a shared edition. To my great pleasure I received, at the same time as your last letter, the following communication of 5 August from the German Academy:

In a session of the Kommission [für spätantike Religionsgeschichte] that has quite recently taken place, your correspondence with the French about the publication of Berolinensis Copticus [P.Berol. 8502] was discussed. The Kommission is very happy that you have reached agreement with Messrs Puech and Doresse. It is in full agreement with a shared publication, by you and the French gentlemen on the basis of both witnesses, in our Corpus. This much already today to you for your orientation, so that you can enter into negotiations on the more specific technical details with your partners.

That is the wording of the whole letter. ... What worries me is only the phrase 'in our Corpus.' What one is to understand by this Corpus, I do not know. But in any case a series of texts published by the German Academy. But it may be that this again cannot be brought into agreement with your already settled


Das ist der Wortlaut des ganzen Briefes. ... Bedenken macht mir nur der Passus “in unserem Corpus.” Was man unter diesem Corpus zu verstehen hat, weiss ich nicht. Jedenfalls aber eine von der Deutschen Akademie herausgegebene Schriftenreihe. Das dürfte aber nun wieder nicht mit Ihren schon festgelegten Abmachungen über die Veröffentlichung in Einklang zu bringen sein. Ich fürchte, dass sich die beiderseitigen Interessen und Wünsche bezüglich der Publikation nicht in Einklang bringen lassen werden. ...

Sollte sich, wie ich derzeit noch fürchte, eine Einigung betreffender Publikation nicht erzielen lassen, so wird wohl der alte Plan möglich sein, nämlich dass wir uns vor der Veröffentlichung gegenseitig die Texte vollinhaltlich mitteilen und dass daher jeder in voller Kenntnis der Arbeit des anderen seine Bearbeitung macht. Teilweise ist ja der Austausch der Texte schon geschehen und könnte ja leicht vervollständigt werden. ...

Ich hoffe nun sehr zuversichtlich, dass eine Zusammenarbeit in irgendeiner Form zustande kommen wird, denn keiner von uns kann ohne die Kenntnis des Textes des anderen seinen Text bearbeiten.
agreements about the publication. I fear that the interests and wishes on both sides regarding the publication cannot be brought into agreement. ...

If, as I at present still fear, an agreement concerning publication cannot be reached, then no doubt the old plan will be possible, namely, that we communicate to each other prior to publication the texts in their full contents, and that hence each makes his treatment with full knowledge of the work of the other. Indeed, the exchange of the texts has in part already taken place, and could indeed easily be completed. ...

So I hope very confidently that a collaboration in some form will come to pass, for neither of us can prepare his text without the knowledge of the text of the other.

This suggests that the whole text, not just difficult passages, could be exchanged!

Dorese's counter-proposals representing the French interests were as follows:\textsuperscript{247}

\textsuperscript{247} 28 ix 48: Letter from Dorese to Till:


Le seul point à régler sera celui de l’édition. En effet afin d’assurer une édition très rapide et impeccable des textes nous tendrions beaucoup à ce qu’ils soient édités dans le Corpus Script C Or dont la publication va reprendre sous le patr. de l’Univ. de Louvain et de l’Univers. de Washington. Le Corpus de Louvain dispose de machines neuves et de caractères neufs. Il pourra assurer l’impression non seulement du papyrus actuel mais aussi de tous les autres textes dont vous avez entendu parler et dont l’existence reste encore confidentielle.

En confiant l’édition au Corpus de Berlin, quand celle-ci pourra-t-elle être terminée? Les circonstances actuelles ne m’encouragent pas. Toutefois pour respecter les désirs de l’Ac. de Berlin, ne suffira-t-il pas d’être mentionnée sur la page de titre de l’ouvrage à côté du Musée Copte et à égalité avec lui?

Il reste en question la langue dans laquelle seront faits la traduction, le commentaire et les introductions. Les Égyptiens préfèrent le français à l’anglais. Ils pratiquent peu l’allemand et pas du tout le latin. Il vaudrait donc mieux obtenir que la traduction soit en français. Mais vous pourriez rédiger en allemand les chapitres d’introduction et de commentaire, un chapitre sur le papyrus de Berlin, l’étude philologique. ... De toutes
I have been extremely happy to learn from your last letter that the Academy of Berlin had finally accepted the principle of a common edition of the two Coptic Gnostic papyri. We are hence completely in agreement to make a critical edition that will be put under the shared control of the Academy of Berlin, the Coptic Museum of Cairo, and, for France, probably the Académie des Inscriptions [et Belles-Lettres] or the École [Pratique] des Hautes Études. This last point is still to be clarified officially. In effect, up to the present the situation was as follows: Regarding the texts belonging to the Coptic Museum, their publication was placed under the patronage of a committee consisting of Togo Mina, Drioton and G[aston] Wiet. The scientific work of publication was entrusted to Togo Mina and myself. I had in addition appealed to H.-C. Puech for a part of the volume of commentaries.

The only point to settle on will be that of the publisher. In effect, in order to assure a very rapid and impeccable publication of the texts, we would hold very much to them being published in the Corpus S[criptorum] C[hristianorum] Or[ientalium], whose publication is going to begin again under the patro[nage] of Univ[ersity] of Louvain and the Univers[ity] of Washington [= Catholic University]. The Corpus of Louvain has at its disposal new machines and new characters. It will be able to assure the printing not only of the present papyrus but also of all the other texts of which you have heard talk and whose existence still remains confidential.

On entrusting the edition to the Corpus of Berlin, when can it be completed? The present conditions [the Berlin blockade June 1948 to May 1949] do not encourage me. Nonetheless, to respect the desires of the Ac[ademy] of Berlin, will it not suffice to be mentioned on the title page of the work along side the Coptic Museum and in equality with it?

There remains in question the language in which the translation, the commentary and the introductions will be made. The Egyptians prefer French to English. They use German little, and Latin not at all. It would hence work better to see it that the translation be in French. But you could compose in German the chapters of introduction, and of the commentary, a chapter on the papyrus of Berlin, the philological study. ... In any case it will be easy to publish rapidly a German translation of the texts in the Corpus of Berlin, which, thus, would preserve its rights. C[arl] Schmidt has indeed published...
two translations of Pistis Sophia. Besides, the Academy of Berlin will be bypassed. ...

In any case, we are already in agreement with regard to everything that concerns the critical establishment of the texts, whatever be the place and the collection in which they will be published. It will no doubt be good to follow the order of the papyrus of Cairo, which corresponds very closely to the relative ancientness of the texts, and to place later the few pages of the Gospel of Mary. Besides, we may perhaps find the Gospel of Mary complete in the papyrus that I have not yet studied.

Doresse then laid out these alternatives, both of which bypass France, to Puech:248

Till let me know a few weeks ago that the Academy of Berlin finally accepts the principle of a critical edition made in common. It even offers that the edition, if we so wish, be made in the Corpus of Berlin. In any case, Till sent me in the same mail the copy of several pages of the Secret Book [The Apocryphon of John], all of whose lacunae I have now filled. The restitutions that I had carried out previously, and that had permitted me to give at Brussels a complete analysis of the Apocryphon, have all been confirmed by the manuscript of Berlin—of a later date, incidentally, that of Cairo.

As to our edition, it could be done in the 'Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium,' as Togo Mina hopes. At Louvain I saw Canon Draguet, who puts at our disposal new machines and new characters for this. Perhaps it is this solution that it is necessary to adopt? Of course, one cannot prepare anything for printing before knowing completely the content of the ten other volumes. In any case the C.S.C.O. has the material means needed to edit all the Gnostic texts.

---

248 4 x 48: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Till m’a fait savoir, il y a quelques semaines, que l’Académie de Berlin accepte enfin le principe d’une édition critique faite en commun. Elle offre même que l’édition, si nous le désirons, se fasse dans le Corpus de Berlin. En tout cas, Till m’a adressé, par le même courrier, la copie de plusieurs pages du “Livre Secret”, dont j’ai maintenant bouché toutes les lacunes. Les restitutions que j’avais opérées auparavant, et qui m’avaient permis de donner à Bruxelles une analyse complète de l’“Apocryphon”, ont toutes été confirmées par le manuscrit de Berlin—plus récent, d’ailleurs, que celui du Caire.

Quant à notre édition, elle pourrait se faire dans le “Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium” ainsi que le souhaite Togo Mina. J’ai vu à Louvain le chanoine Draguet qui met à notre disposition pour cela des machines neuves et des caractères neufs. Peut-être est-ce cette solution qu’il faut adopter? Naturellement, on ne peut rien préparer pour l’impression avant de connaître entièrement le contenu des dix autres volumes. En tout cas le C.S.C.O. a les moyens matériels voulus pour éditer tous les textes gnostiques.
Till then pointed out potential problems on the part of the Berlin Academy:

I have received your letter of 28 September and the rest of the *Apocryphon of John*, and I thank you very much for it. I have sent the German Academy a transcription of your letter with the request that they state their position regarding it. As soon as I have an answer, I will communicate it to you. For me personally, it is of course basically irrelevant, where the edition appears. To be sure, I do see one difficulty: The Coptic text of the Berlin codex is already extant in print! According to Schmidt’s original reading. It would spare many costs if one could avoid again setting type and printing this text, or, put the other way around, it would be a bad extravagance, if one would throw away this whole edition. But that is of course not my business. I only anticipate this objection.

This presupposes that the printing was not destroyed in the bombardment of Leipzig, which was Till’s concern in his letter of 13 March 1948 about whether he would be able to send a copy to Doresse.

*The Problem of the Long Version of The Apocryphon of John*

Once back in Cairo late in 1948, Doresse proposed to Till to include in their joint edition the codices newly emerging in Cairo:

---

249 12 x 48: Letter from Till to Doresse:


250 5 xii 48: Letter from Doresse to Till:

J‘ajoute,—confidentiellement,—, qu’ils nous donneront en outre deux autres exemplaires de l’Apocryphe de Jean dont un bien supérieur aux textes du Caire et de Berlin et d’une conservation impeccable. Je ne pourrai en révéler l’existence que dans quelque temps, mais voilà qui nous promet une édition critique extraordinaire. Les principes de collaboration que nous avons proposé pour les papyrus du Caire et de Berlin ne seront pas échangés par la découverte de nouveaux exemplaires, car nous restons d’accord pour une édition commune. Lorsque l’Académie de Berlin aura donné l’autorisation, il vous sera facile de faire reproduire à Vienne vos photographies
I add—confidentially—that they will give us, besides, two other copies of the Apocryphon of John, one of which is much superior to the texts of Cairo and Berlin and of impeccable conservation. I will not be able to reveal its existence for some time, but, there it is!—which promises us an extraordinary critical edition. The principles of collaboration that we have proposed for the papyri of Cairo and Berlin will not be altered by the discovery of new copies, for we remain in agreement for a shared edition. When the Academy of Berlin will have given the authorization, it will be easy for you to have reproduced your photographs of the manuscript of C[arl] Schmidt at Vienna, and we will send you in return the photos of our documents.

I think I can communicate to you in a few weeks more of the details on the new volumes. We will have great need of your contribution for their publication, in particular from the philological point of view. I hope that you will soon be able to give us good news of your negotiations with the Academy of Berlin.

On his return from Cairo, Doresse wrote Till in July 1949, mentioning the practical problem posed by the two new copies of The Apocryphon of John, and suggesting that the Berlin publication be limited to the Berlin codex, reserving the publication of a critical apparatus that would list the variants of the other copies for the Louvain edition.\textsuperscript{251}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{251} 29 vii 49: Letter from Doresse to Till:
\end{footnotesize}

\begin{footnotesize}
Surtout, nous avons là deux nouvelles rédactions de l’Apocryphon Iohannis, dont une est visiblement beaucoup plus ancienne que les autres, beaucoup plus développée, beaucoup plus claire. ... Les textes seront publiés, une fois l’acquisition terminée, dans la collection du CSCO. Togo Mina et moi nous mettrons au point les conditions d’édition lorsque je serai de retour en Égypte et je compte beaucoup sur votre collaboration, particulièrement pour l’exploitation philologique. Il reste à savoir comment nous pourrons nous entendre avec l’Académie de Berlin pour l’édition de l’Apocryphon: nous disposerons nous-mêmes de trois rédactions différentes et par suite il serait extrêmement désirable que la rédaction de Berlin soit jointe à notre édition critique. Mais ce que vous me dites de l’avancement de l’édition de Berlin me fait penser qu’il vaut peut-être mieux publier d’abord le texte de Carl Schmidt, puis faire nous-mêmes notre édition du Caire en l’y intégrant sous forme de variantes. En tout cas, quelque soit le moyen adopté, vous êtes déjà associé officiellement à l’édition pour l’Ap de Jean du premier papyrus du Musée Copte, si vous n’y voyez aucun inconvénient.
\end{footnotesize}
Most of all, we have there two new redactions of the Apocryphon of John, one of which is visibly much older than the others, much more developed, much more clear. ... The texts will be published, once the acquisition is completed, in the collection of the Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Togo Mina and I will put in focus the conditions of the edition when I am back in Egypt, and I count a great deal on your collaboration, particularly for the philological assessment. There remains to determine how we will be able to reach agreement with the Academy of Berlin for the edition of the Apocryphon of John. We will ourselves dispose of three different redactions, and as a result it would be extremely desirable that the redaction of Berlin be joined to our critical edition. But what you tell me of the progress of the edition of Berlin makes me think that it is perhaps better to publish first the text of Carl Schmidt, then ourselves make our edition of Cairo by integrating it there in the form of variants. In any case, whatever be the means adopted, you are already officially associated in the edition for the Apocryphon of John of the first papyrus of the Coptic Museum, if you do not see there any inconvenience.

Till responded, confirming that the Berlin text would be published there:

The Berlin Academy would like, already in consideration of the fact that the Coptic text for the whole edition has been printed out already for so long a time, that the Berlin manuscript appear in its Texte und Untersuchungen [zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur].’ But for that I must, nonetheless, wait until I know the new parallel texts, otherwise such a text edition is meaningless.

I am in agreement with your proposal to collaborate in publishing the newly found texts. Please keep me up to date on this. If the texts appear in the Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, must the translation there appear in Latin? I would regard French to be much more practical, after all, for the sake of readability.

Doresse responded to Till, advocating the separate publication of the Berlin text without use of the still-inaccessible long version of The Apocryphon of John in Nag Hammadi Codices II and IV, indeed without even including

252 9 viii 49: Letter from Till to Doresse:

Die Berliner Akademie möchte schon mit Rücksicht darauf, dass der koptische Text schon so lange ausgedruckt für die ganze Auflage vorliegt, dass die Berliner Handschrift in ihren “Texten und Untersuchungen” erscheint. Aber ich muss doch warten damit, bis ich die neuen Parallel-Texte kenne, sonst ist so eine Textausgabe sinnlos.

Mit Ihrem Vorschlag zur Mitarbeit bei der Herausgabe der neu gefundenen Texte bin ich einverstanden. Ich bitte Sie, mich über die Angelegenheit am Laufenden zu halten. Wenn die Texte im Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium erscheinen, muss da die Übersetzung lateinisch erscheinen? Ich hielte Französisch der Lesbarkeit zu liebe doch für wesentlich praktischer.
variants from Codex III, but at most making minor improvements of the already-printed Berlin text, for which purpose a complete copy of the parallel tractates of Codex III (1 and 4) would be supplied to Till: 253


For the moment, I seek first of all a way to permit you to complete the edition of the texts of Berlin. Since the Coptic text is already set in type, it is in effect impossible to join an apparatus to it. No doubt one could only publish it as it is, after the verification of doubtful passages. I will hence ask Togo Mina to authorize me to communicate to you officially the first text of the Coptic Museum, so that you may use it to verify and complete the translation of the text of Berlin. If you judge that it is thus possible to complete the edition of Berlin, I think that Togo Mina will be in agreement. On the other hand, it is impossible to introduce into the edition of the text of Berlin the recension of the Apocryphon of John that is in the new manuscripts. It is indeed rather different at many places, and at the same time much longer. Besides, we will not have access to it before the volumes have been purchased and put under glass and photographed. It will serve as a basis later on for a critical edition and a literary study of the Secret Book [of John], a task very long, which it is better to reserve for the C[orpus] S[criptorum] C[haristianorum] O[rientalium].

The Cairo Agreement of May 1950

The death of Togo Mina in October 1949 led to a rapid exchange of memoranda in May 1950, when both Doresse and Till were in Cairo, to firm up their publication plans in view of the new situation. Doresse wrote: 254

253 16 x 49: Letter from Doresse to Till:

En tout cas l’édition du CSCO comporterait une traduction en français.

Pour le moment, je cherche surtout un moyen de vous permettre de terminer l’édition des textes de Berlin. Puisque le texte copte est déjà composé, il est en effet impossible de lui adjoindre un apparat, il n’y aurait sans doute qu’à le publier tel quel après vérification des passages douteux. Je demanderai donc à Togo Mina de m’autoriser à vous communiquer officiellement le premier texte du Musée Copte afin que vous l’utiliser pour vérifier et compléter la traduction du texte de Berlin. Si vous jugez qu’il est ainsi possible d’achever l’édition de Berlin, je pense que Togo Mina sera d’accord. Il est par contre impossible de faire intervenir dans l’édition du texte de Berlin la recension de l’Apocryphe de Jean qui figure dans les nouveaux manuscrits. Elle est en effet assez différente à bien des endroits et en même temps beaucoup plus longue. En outre, nous n’en disposerons par avant que les volumes aient été achetés et mis sous verre et photographiés. Elle servira de base plus tard à une édition critique et une étude littéraire du Livre Secret, travail très long qu’il vaut mieux réserver pour le CSCO.

254 15 v 50: Letter from Doresse to Till:
The death of our friend Togo Mina, who directed the edition of the Gnostic papyrus of the Coptic Museum, makes it necessary today to modify the composition of the Committee recently charged by him with the publication of this manuscript. I transmit to you, attached, the text of the note that he had himself established concerning the composition and the rôle of this Committee. From now on the presidency of the Committee will be assumed by Étienne Drioton, General Director of the Service des Antiquités; since Drioton, however, is not able to participate himself in the work of editing, as did Togo Mina, the direction of this work will be entrusted in me.

We have the intention, before giving The Secret Book of John to be printed, to await the acquisition of the new documents discovered last year. It is indispensable, in effect, to include in a sole edition the two other recensions of The Secret Book [of John] which are present there. We are, besides, in agreement for you to use, in the edition of the Gnostic papyrus of Berlin, the texts of The Secret Book of John and The Wisdom of Jesus to which we already have access. We are in return extremely appreciative to you for the precious aid that you are kind enough to provide here, for the establishment of a complete critical edition of these two texts, and for the other tasks to which the new discovery will give rise.

On the very next day Till replied, listing his understanding of the agreement:255

---

La mort de notre ami Togo Mina qui dirigeait l'édition du papyrus gnostique du Musée Copte oblige aujourd'hui à modifier la composition du Comité chargé naguère par lui de la publication de ce manuscrit. Je vous transmet ci-joint le texte de la note qu’il avait lui-même établie concernant la composition et le rôle de ce comité. La présidence du comité sera désormais assurée par Mr Ét. Drioton, Directeur Général du Service des Antiquités; Mr. Drioton, cependant, ne pouvant participer lui-même au travail d'édition comme le faisait Togo Mina, la direction de ce travail me sera confiée.

Nous avons l'intention avant de donner à l'impression le Livre Secret de Jean, d'attendre l'acquisition des nouveaux documents découverts l'an dernier: il est indispensable en effet d'inclure dans une seule édition les deux autres recensions du Livre Secret qui y figurent. Nous sommes par ailleurs d'accord pour que vous utilisiez dans l'édition du Papyrus Gnostique de Berlin les textes du Livre Secret de Jean et de la Sagesse de Jésus dont nous disposons déjà. Nous vous sommes en retour extrêmement reconnaissants de l'aide précieuse que vous voulez bien apporter ici pour l'établissement d’une édition critique complète de ces deux textes et pour les autres travaux auxquels la nouvelle découverte donnera lieu.

255 16 v 50: Letter from Till to Doresse:

Heute erhielt ich Ihren Brief vom 15. d. M. und eine Kopie des im Juni 1949 aufgestellten Statuts über die Veröffentlichung des vom Koptischen Museum (Alt Kairo) angekauften gnostischen Papyrus. Ich danke für die ehrenvolle Einladung, an der Publikationsarbeit teilzunehmen, und erkläre mich mit den Bestimmungen, wie sie aus den beiden Schriftstücken hervorgehen, einverstanden. Die Punkte dieser Bestimmungen sind folgende:
Today I received your letter of the 15th of this month and a copy of the Statutes set up in June 1949 about the publication of the Gnostic papyrus bought by the Coptic Museum (Old Cairo). I thank you for the honorable invitation to participate in the work of publication, and declare myself in agreement with the conditions, as they become clear from the two documents. The points of these conditions are as follows:

1) After the death of the previous Director of the Coptic Museum, Togo R. Mina, the Committee for the publication of the Gnostic texts consists of the following persons: Dr. Étienne Drioton, General Director of the Service des Antiquités (President); Jean Doresse (Director); Director-of-Studies H.C. Puech; Canon Draguet, Director of the Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalum; and myself.

2) The texts of the manuscript of the Coptic Museum should appear in the Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalum (Louvain, Belgium).

3) Without special authorization, no one of the members of the Committee may publish one of these texts, either in Coptic or in translation, also not partially.

4) In the publication of the manuscript of the Coptic Museum, the task is assigned to me to collaborate in the textual criticism of The Apocryphon of John and The Sophia of Jesus Christ, and to take over the purely philological part of the work.

1) Nach dem Tode des früheren Direktors des Koptischen Museums, Herrn Togo R. Mina, besteht das Komité für die Veröffentlichung der gnostischen Texte aus folgenden Personen: Herrn Dr. Étienne Drioton, General Direktor des Service des Antiquités (Präsident); Herrn Jean Doresse (Direktor); Herrn Studiendirektor H.C. Puech; Herrn Canonicus Draguet, Direktor des C.S.C.O.; und mir.


3) Ohne besondere Ermächtigung darf keines der Komité Mitglieder einen dieser Texte weder koptisch noch in Uebersetzung, auch nicht teilweise, veröffentlichen.


5) Ich bin von der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin die mich mit der Bearbeitung und Herausgabe der Berliner gnostischen Handschrift betraute, ermächtigt, Ihnen den Text der Berliner Handschrift bekannt zu geben damit er zur textkritischen Bearbeitung des Kairener Codex herangezogen werden kann, wogegen auch ich das Recht habe, bei der textkritischen Bearbeitung des Berliner Codex die Kairener Texte heranzuziehen.

6) Mit der Veröffentlichung des Apokryphons Johannis soll jedoch noch solange gewartet werden, bis auch die Handschrift zugänglich ist, in der sich ein weiterer Paralleltext dieser Schrift befindet.

Ich gebe dem lebhaften Wunsch Ausdruck, dass es bald gelingen möge, die Veröffentlichungen durchzuführen an denen ich, soweit es meine Aufgabe ist, gerne nach Kräften mitarbeiten werde.
5) I am authorized by the German Academy of Sciences in Berlin, which entrusted me with the treatment and publication of the Berlin Gnostic manuscript, to make known to you the text of the Berlin manuscript, so that it can be used for the text-critical treatment of the Cairo codex, whereas I also have the right, for the text-critical preparation of the Berlin Codex, to make use of the Cairo texts.

6) With the publication of the Apocryphon of John, one should nevertheless still wait until the manuscript is also available where a further parallel to this text is to be found.

I give expression to the hearty wish that it will soon be possible to carry through the publications in which I, to the extent it is my task, am glad to collaborate as much as I am able.

Doresse took this to be a full acceptance by Till of the new conditions Doresse had outlined in his letter and in ‘Statutes’ about the publication that had been set up in June 1949:

Till accepts point by point the project of publication, just as it has been confirmed after the death of Togo Mina.

Doresse and Till both realized that, without the cooperation of the other, neither could succeed. It was not just that they needed the divergent readings of the manuscripts the other controlled. It was that Doresse needed Till for the philological analysis, which Togo Mina had assumed, but whose death meant that Till was the only one of the editors capable of such an analysis. And Till was of course very eager to gain access to the other Coptic Gnostic texts, for which he was dependent on Doresse.

The Reversal in the Balance of Power

A series of untoward events (see below) shifted drastically the balance of power in the case of the Nag Hammadi Codices: The death of the French-oriented Togo Mina as Director of the Coptic Museum (October 1949) and his replacement by the German-oriented Pahor Labib (Director 1951–1965) indicated a basic shift in power between French and German scholarship.

---

256 From a handwritten note of Doresse to me accompanying his copy of Till’s letter:

Till accepte point par point le projet de publication, tel qu’il est confirmé après la mort de Togo Mina.

Then the nationalization of Tano’s codices on 12 May 1952 and their transfer out of Drioton’s control to the Coptic Museum on 9 June 1952 were followed by political events that changed everything: The Egyptian coup d’état on 23 July 1952, which Drioton reported to the press in such a way as to produce a ‘tumult’ leading to the interdiction of Drioton to return to Egypt, the breaking of diplomatic relations with France following the Suez crisis later in 1952, and the resultant (temporary) closing of the French Institute, all worked against France and hence against Doresse’s work in Egypt.

Under such changed circumstances, Walter Till moved forward without waiting until the other copies of The Apocryphon of John in Codices II and IV became available, and hence without waiting until the copy in Codex III was first published.258


Till’s Foreword contained the following acknowledgements:259


Dem Administrationsrat des Koptischen Museums in Alt-Kairo und dem verdienten Direktor dieses Museums, Herrn Dr. Pahor Labib, bin ich für die Erlaubnis, die Textvarianten aus dem CG I hier zu veröffentlichen, zu grossem Dank verbunden, wie auch für die Photographien, die mir von Teilen dieser Handschrift zur Verfügung gestellt wurden. Ebenso gebührt Herrn J. Doresse (Fontenay-aux-Roses) mein herzlicher Dank für die zahlreichen Photographien, die er mir lieh, sowie für die Möglichkeit, in einen Teil seines Manuskriptes der Bearbeitung des CG I im Konzeptstadium Einsicht nehmen zu können.
To the Administrative Council of the Coptic Museum in Old Cairo and to
the worthy Director of this Museum, Dr. Pahor Labib, I owe many thanks for
permission to publish here the textual variants from C[airensis] G[nosticus]
I [Nag Hammadi Codex III], as also for the photographs that were put at my
disposal of parts of this manuscript. Just so I owe J. Doresse (Fontenay-aux-
Roses) my hearty thanks for the numerous photographs which he lent me,
as well as for the possibility of being able to look into a draft of a part of his
manuscript editing C[airensis] G[nosticus] I [Nag Hammadi Codex III].

On 25 December 1953 Puech wrote Doresse, reproaching him in view of Till’s
going ahead with his German publication:260

Our situation would be stronger if the printing of the first volume of the
Collection were more advanced. But, here again, you leave me without news,
giving the impression either of having abandoned your work or of drawing
back in view of the difficulties of the task. However, German prospectuses
announce the imminent publication of the papyrus of Berlin.

Actually, Till’s edition of P.Berol. 8502 appeared only in 1955. Yet for years
to come, all that was accessible to the scholarly public of Nag Hammadi
Codex III, 1, 3, and 4 were the references in Till’s critical apparatus to
divergent readings and to places where there were lacunae in P.Berol. 8502.

With regard to the two other (longer) copies of The Apocryphon of John in
Nag Hammadi Codices II,7 and IV,7 Till explained as best he could their
absence from his edition:261

---

260 25 xii 53: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Notre situation serait plus forte si l’impression du premier volume de la Collec-
tion était plus avancée. Mais, ici encore, vous me laissez sans nouvelles, donnant
l’impression soit d’avoir abandonné votre travail soit de reculer devant les difficultés
de la tache. Des prospectus allemands annoncent pourtant la publication prochaine
du Papyrus de Berlin.

261 Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 herausgegeben, über-
setzt und bearbeitet von Walter C. Till, zweite, erweiterte Auflage bearbeitet von Hans-Martin
Schenke (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 60; Berlin:
Akademie Verlag, 1955, 2nd ed. 1972), Till, 10–11 (and similarly 34):

Vom Apokryphon des Johannes liegen ausser den einander sehr ähnlichen Texten des
BG und des CG I noch zwei weitere Texte vor, die eine längere Version bringen. Sie sind
im CG II und im CG VII enthalten. Diese beiden Handschriften sind aber derzeit noch
nicht zugänglich. Soviel ich aus Photographien eines Teiles des im CG II enthaltenen
Textes des Apokryphon des Johannes ersehe, weichen die kürzeren Fassungen des BG
und des CG I sehr erheblich von der längeren des CG II ab, so dass es für die vorliegende
Erstausgabe des BG wohl keinen sehr empfindlichen Mangel bedeutet, dass die beiden
längeren Versionen nicht herangezogen werden konnten.
Of The Apocryphon of John there are, apart from the very similar texts of $B$[erolinsis] $G$[nosticus] [P.Berol. 8502] and $C$[airensis] $G$[nosticus] I [Nag Hammadi Codex III], still two further texts that present a longer version. They are contained in $C$[airensis] $G$[nosticus] II and $C$[airensis] $G$[nosticus] VII [Nag Hammadi Codices II and IV]. But thus far both of these manuscripts are still not accessible. So far as I can see from photographs of a part of the text of the Apocryphon of John contained in $C$[airensis] $G$[nosticus] II [Nag Hammadi Codex II], the shorter versions of $B$[erolinsis] $G$[nosticus] [P.Berol. 8502] and $C$[airensis] $G$[nosticus] I [Nag Hammadi Codex III] diverge very heavily from the longer version of $C$[airensis] $G$[nosticus] II [Nag Hammadi Codex II], so that it involves, no doubt, no very painful deficiency, for the present first edition of $B$[erolinsis] $G$[nosticus] [P.Berol. 8502], that the two longer versions could not be brought in.

But Doresse commented:262

It is thus that the texts of The Secret Book of John [III,1] and of The Sophia of Jesus [III,4], whose publication we were preparing ..., were prematurely utilized for the critical publication of the two parallel texts of the Codex Berolinensis 8502, thus withdrawing from the edition being prepared at the Imprimerie Nationale of Paris [!] in advance a notable part of the unpublished material it would have contained. This borrowing from the edition of Codex I of Cairo [Nag Hammadi Codex III] was entirely contrary to the conditions stipulated among the members of the committee created by Togo Mina.

Doresse's Publications from Codex III

Doresse did publish the Introduction, Text, and Translation of III,2 [The Holy Book of the Great Invisible Spirit = The Egyptian Gospel] in 1966 [actually 1968],263 after having revised slightly the proofs, and even later, in 1968 [actually 1971], his own (rather than Puech’s) Commentary,264 with primary,
secondary and tertiary notes, though the Commentary and first series of notes had been set in type about a decade earlier:

On pp. 291–362 the commentary and a first series of notes, which, originally written by us seven years ago, were then the object of a first typographical composition without being immediately published.

Since this volume of the *Journal asiatique* is dated 1968, but actually appeared in 1971, it is unclear which year is intended in the reference “seven years ago.” Probably 1961 is intended, since it had to be earlier than two additional sets of notes added in 1964:

A certain number of supplements prepared in 1964, and which contain: a. On pp. 367–376, additions to the commentary; b. On pages 376–386, a new series of notes, some completing the annotation of the first commentary ..., the others referring to the additions on the pages 367–376.

Doresse’s plan ultimately to publish also III,5, *The Dialogue of the Savior*, in the *Journal asiatique* was not implemented. Doresse has stated, as a reason that his complete edition of Codex III did not appear, the following:

---


Aux pages 291–362, le commentaire et une première série de notes qui primitivement rédigés par nous, il y a sept ans, firent alors l’objet d’une première composition typographique sans être immédiatement publiés.


Le docteur Pahor Labib céda, des lors, aux désirs de certains savants de voir paraître au plus vite plusieurs textes très impatiemment attendus et il autorisa la divulgation et l’utilisation de ces écrits aux fins de publications indépendants. C’est ainsi que nous avons dû renoncer à parachever l’édition critique intégrale du Codex I dont, désormais, certaines parties, déjà utilisées par d’autres éditeurs, n’auraient plus été inédites lors de notre propre publication. Nous nous sommes résignés à ne donner en
Dr. Pahor Labib yielded, from then on, to the desires of certain scholars to see appear as quickly as possible several texts that were very impatiently awaited, and he authorized the divulging and using of these writings for independent publications. It is thus that we had to renounce achieving the integral critical edition of Codex I [Nag Hammadi Codex III], certain parts of which, from now on, already used by other editors, would no longer have been unpublished at the time of our own publication. We resigned ourselves to give, in the form of individual editions, only some of the texts of which we had prepared the publication.

Thus P.Berol. 8502 appeared in 1955, followed by a second edition prepared by Hans-Martin Schenke in 1972, where some improvements could be introduced on the basis of Nag Hammadi Codices II, and IV, .

Also places had to be changed where, as a result of the long version of The Apocryphon of John having meanwhile been edited, certain (other) supplements of text in lacunae necessarily resulted. And of course the translation had to be assimilated to these changes in the text.

Doresse's edition of the parallel texts in Codex III, 3, and 4, and his edition of the other two copies of The Apocryphon of John (II, and IV, ), not to speak of the not-yet-identified second copy of III, 3 in V, never appeared.

It is hardly the German publications that prevented the French edition of the parallel texts of Codex III from appearing. Rather, the agreement with Till that the French text appear first, then the complete German

---


269 Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 herausgegeben, übersetzt und bearbeitet von Walter C. Till. Zweite, erweiterte Auflage bearbeitet von Hans-Martin Schenke (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 60; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972), xi:

edition, then the French translation and commentary, had been based on repeated assurances from Doresse that the publication of the French text was imminent (see above). When this did not prove to be the case, it is appropriate that Till, with Pahor Labib’s support, went ahead and published the German edition of the Berlin texts in 1955.

Part of the problem seems to be the pressure on Doresse to publish only previously unpublished texts (what Hans Jonas dubbed ‘firstmanship’). This may explain his publication in the *Journal asiatique* only of III,2, and his unfulfilled hope to publish there III,5, arranged at a time when both were still unpublished. One may recall by way of corrective the *dictum* of Bentley Layton that what is important is not to publish the first edition, but rather to publish the final, definitive edition.

5. *Codices II, IV–XIII: Jean Doresse and Maria Dattari and/or Phokion J. Tano(s)*

*The Tano-Dattari Collection*

Reports about the rest of the discovery had been circulating for some time. Charles Kuentz had reported to Étienne Drioton his and Jacques Schwartz’s experience late in March 1946 at Mansoor’s shop, when Codices II and VII had been shown as part of a lot said to be of seven codices that was ultimately acquired by Tano. Doresse had reported similar rumors reaching him in 1947:

> [Albert] Eid told us—Togo and myself—about the possibility of other codices, of the same nature and origin, hiding somewhere. But he could not give any proof, so Togo thought that it was one more legend of fabulous discoveries aiming to increase the price of Eid’s codex [= Codex I]. But later, in December 1947, Tano told me secretly that there would be other manuscripts of the same kind, and asked me to stay in Egypt until he could give more indications. I could not stay, for administrative reasons, but Tano promised to contact me as soon as something could be known. I think, now, that at this exact time Tano knew about the other codices, wanted to buy them, but did not have the necessary money, so he had to direct them to another buyer and associate: Miss [Maria] Dattari.

It is more likely that Tano had already acquired at least Codices II and VII in March 1946, after the French Institute failed to make the acquisition when they were on deposit at Mansoor’s shop.

---

270 19 x 74: Memorandum from Doresse to John Dart.
It may be due to the attention Codex III was receiving as a result of the news release that appeared in the Cairo press on 10–11 January 1948\(^{271}\) that Tano went to Drioton with the bulk of the discovery. Marianne Doresse has reported:\(^{272}\)

Jean received from Canon Drioton a letter (dated Cairo, 13 February 1948) in which the latter indicates in a few words the other manuscripts that finally he has just seen, and sends six small photographs intended for Jean by the person who has the codices.

A good time later, the Abbot clarified to us how these manuscripts had been shown to him: It was an evening. Tano had come to see him in his house to ask his advice, though asking him to maintain the secrecy of the confessional. He then showed him the lot of papyri. The Abbot had been embarrassed by this mystery, for he would have wished, first of all, to preserve the interests of Egypt. In order to respect the jurisprudence in force on antiquities, he made Tano promise not to have these manuscripts leave Egypt, secretly, while assuring him that in return he would have them bought from him at a \emph{fair price} (by the government or by the king), based, first of all, on an expertise one would entrust to Jean Doresse, already accredited by the fact of the aid he had furnished to Togo Mina. It was after the acquiescence of Tano that he had written us this letter and transmitted the photos.

The letter from Drioton to Doresse read as follows:\(^{273}\)

---


\(^{272}\) Marianne Doresse: *Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte* (see Part 2 above).

\(^{273}\) 13 ii 48: Letter from Drioton to Doresse:

Il y a (et je les ai vus):

- 18 feuilles qui complètent le mss Eid [\(=\) Codex I].
- 1 livre relié, d’environ 60 feuillets (je dis environ parce que je n’ai pas voulu qu’on manipule ces papyrus très fragiles, pour compter les pages).
- 1 livre relié, d’environ 100 feuillets.
- 1 livre relié, d’environ 150 feuillets.
- 1 livre relié, assez abîmé, d’environ 30 feuillets.
- idem.
- 1 gros livre relié dont la dernière page est numérotée \(p\).\(\alpha\).
- 2 livres reliés, dont l’intérieur, tout fragmenté, représente environ 10 feuillets.
- 1 livre relié, d’environ 50 feuillets.

J’ai obtenu une photographie spécimen des 6 principaux, mais, pressé par le temps
Everything comes to fruition for the one who knows how to wait. The Coptic manuscripts of the discovery of Daba, which everyone hunts for feverishly, are now within reach of my hand. They belong to an individual. Following the rules of the game, I do not know (and I will never want to know) who it is, and I will not divulge the name of the intermediary. It is because the contrabandists have confidence that the policeman (who I am) wishes them no ill, that they have turned to me.

There are (and I have seen them):
- 18 leaves that complete the Eid manuscript [= Codex I].
- 1 bound book, of about 60 leaves (I say 'about,' because I did not want to handle these very fragile papyri to count the pages).
- 1 bound book, of about 100 leaves.
- 1 bound book, of about 150 leaves.
- 1 bound book, rather damaged, of about 30 leaves.
- The same.
- 1 large bound book, whose last page is numbered ρⲕⲧ [= Codex VII, 124].
- 2 bound books, whose interior, very fragmented, represents about 10 leaves.
- 1 bound book of about 50 leaves.

I obtained a sample photograph of the 6 main ones, but, pressed for time, I could only identify the photograph marked 'a' on the back. Besides, the lot is considered by the owner (who is not a merchant) as indivisible. If one offers him a satisfactory price for the whole, he will sell it. If not, he will keep it.

I was approached so as to establish the fair price and to function as an expert in the operation.

______________________________

je n’ai pu identifier que la photo marqué “a” au dos. Du reste le lot est considéré par celui qui le possède (et qui n’est pas un marchand) comme indivisible. Si on lui offre un prix satisfaisant du tout, il le vendra. Si non il le gardera.

On s’ est adressé à moi, pour établir le juste prix et servir d’expert dans l’opération.

L’opération me semble devoir être la suivante. Établir le juste prix. Proposer au gouvernement de l’acheter pour le Musée Copte ou si non, d’en permettre la sortie. On m’a mêlé à l’affaire parce qu’on sait que le gouvernement écoute mon avis, et Togo aussi, sur le juste prix. Après ce qu’on a dit du mss du Musée Copte, un prix de surprise n’est plus possible.

Je m’adresse à vous, mon cher Jean—en vous demandant le secret le plus absolu, sauf envers Marianne bien entendu—d’abord parce que cela vous fera plaisir et aussi parce que, si le Musée Copte l’achète, on vous appellera sûrement pour éditer le lot.

Je voudrais savoir, grâce à ces spécimens, si ces livres paraissent d’un intérêt de premier, de second on de troisième ordre. C’est la donnée essentielle pour établir le prix.

Hein, en voilà une affaire!
The operation, it seems to me, ought to be as follows: Establish the fair price. Propose to the government to buy it for the Coptic Museum, or, if not, to permit its exportation. I was involved in the affair because one knows that the government will listen to my opinion, and Togo as well, as to the fair price. After what one has said about the manuscript of the Coptic Museum [= Codex III], a surprise price is no longer possible.

I turn to you, my dear Jean—asking of you the most absolute secrecy, except toward Marianne, of course—first of all because that will please you, and also because, if the Coptic Museum buys it, one will surely call on you to edit the lot.

I would like to know, thanks to these specimens, if these books seem to be of an interest of the first, second, or third order. It is the essential datum for setting the price.

Hey! There you have an affair!

The ‘private person’ to whom Drioton refers as the owner was Maria Dattari, whose father, Giovanni Dattari, had been a well-known Italian numismatist living in Cairo, who had been in charge of the late King Fouad’s coin collection. The ‘intermediary’ was Phokion J. Tanos, the Cypriote antiquities dealer in Cairo. It was not clear whether Dattari was the real owner, or just a front for Tanos, since the law governing the ownership of such antiquities was different in the case of private individuals from what it was in the case of antiquities dealers. Jacques Schwartz explained:

Later, at the time of the negotiations with the Egyptian government, it is the daughter of the numismatist Dattari who would function as the figurehead for Tano. ... Mlle Dattari has died some years ago. She only played a very subdued rôle in all this story. ...

Schwartz added later:

---

274 13 xi 72: Memorandum from Schwartz to Robinson:

Plus tard, lors des tractations avec le gouvernement égyptien, c’est la fille du numismatiste Dattari qui sert de prête-nom à Tano. ... Mlle Dattari est morte il y a quelques années; elle n’a joué qu’un rôle très effacé dans toute cette histoire; ....

275 12 viii 76: Letter from Schwartz to Robinson:

Mlle Dattari a certainement été un prête-nom. Cela m’étonnerait qu’elle ait avancé de l’argent à Tano, qui était fortuné. Mlle Dattari, qui détenait la collection de monnaies de son père, vivait dans une institution dépendant, semble-t-il, des Franciscains; ces dernières ont hérité de la collection qu’ils ont fait vendre par lots importants, ces dernières années, aux grands marchands de monnaies d’Europe.
Mlle Dattari was certainly a figurehead. It would surprise me if she advanced money to Tano, who was wealthy. Mlle Dattari, who retained the coin collection of her father, lived in an institution that depended, it would seem, on the Franciscans; the latter inherited some of the collection, which they have let be sold in major lots, the last years, to the large coin merchants of Europe.

Schwartz reported that Mansoor said Tano paid 7,000 £É.

Drioton’s rough estimates of the number of leaves in some of the codices are not only inexact, they are considerably exaggerated. The largest codices, in terms of the number of extant leaves, are as follows (if one excludes Codex I, only 18 leaves of which were in the Tano collection, Codex III, which was in the Coptic Museum, and Codex VII, which is clearly identified by the page number Drioton listed): Codex II: 75 leaves; Codex IV: 46 leaves, but at the time they were mostly just fragments; Codex V: 47 leaves; Codex VI: 39 leaves, plus 8 leaves of Codex XIII inside the front cover; Codex VII: 71 leaves, but at that time many were only fragments; Codex IX: 36 leaves, some in fragments; Codex X: heavily fragmentary; Codex XI: 37 leaves, some quite fragmentary; Codex XII, very fragmentary.

In any case nine codices are identified in terms of covers (not including Codices I and III, whose covers are also extant), whereas 18 leaves of Codex I are mentioned, and of course Codex III was known to be at the Coptic Museum, so that only two of the thirteen are unaccounted for in Drioton’s list. Since Codex XIII was at the time no doubt still inside the front cover of Codex VI, only one remains unaccounted for. Since all of those in this inventory have a cover (except Codex I), the overlooked codex would be the very fragmentary Codex XII, whose cover is missing. It may have been put inside another codex, or in any case thought to be part of another codex whose cover was extant.

Conversely, there is no reason to assume that material attested at this earliest report was later lost from sight.

No doubt the accuracy of Doresse’s predictions published in the summer of 1948 are due to their being a *vaticinium ex eventu*, based on the photographs Drioton had supplied:

---


Bien des espoirs sont actuellement permis, et l’on ne serait peut-être étonnés qu’un instant si quelque nouveau hasard ramenait au jour, hors d’une jarre ensevelie depuis quinze siècles, d’autres volumes cachés par les gnostiques d’Égypte, qu’il s’agisse...
Many hopes are currently permitted, and one would perhaps be astonished only a moment if some new chance would bring to light, from a jar buried for fifteen centuries, other volumes hidden by the Gnostics of Egypt, be it a matter of an *Apocalypse of Adam* [V,5], or a treatise of the prophet Marsianes [X: Marsanes!] or, who knows, writings still more Hermetic [VI,6-8!—Doresse considered other tracts in Codex VI also to be Hermetic].

Doresse's subsequent report of his first identification of titles begins\textsuperscript{277} with the same title as did the 'prediction':

There was there a *Revelation of Adam* to his son Seth ...

Doresse has reported the follow-up as follows:\textsuperscript{278}

A few months elapsed, then, before I received by mail some good photographs, in Paris, of the manuscripts which were shown to me, later, in Cairo, by Miss Dattari (Phokion J. Tano presented himself, then, as the commercial advisor of Miss Dattari). From the photographs, I could recognize several Gnostic writings of such interest that—having reported to Mr. René Dussaud, at this time Secrétaire Général of the Académie des Inscriptions [et Belles-Lettres] and Président of the Commission des Fouilles Archéologiques—I obtained instantly some funds, very moderate, to get back to Egypt and to stay there till 1953 (period when I left for Ethiopia).

Of course Doresse's comment that he stayed there until 1953 does not mean that he did not returning to France during these years. It was customary to be in France about half the year, including the summer, and to be in Egypt during the winter. His reference to staying there means his on-site research continued to be in Egypt until his departure for Ethiopia.

*The Second Mission of Jean Doresse 1948–1949*

The second mission of Doresse to Cairo began on 31 October 1948 as ‘tea with Togo.’\textsuperscript{279} The air raid warnings Doresse mentions\textsuperscript{280} as characteristic of

d’une *Apocalypse d’Adam*, ou d’un traité du prophète Marsianès, ou—qui sait—d’écrits plus hermétiques encore.

\textsuperscript{277} Doresse, *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte*, 138; *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, 120; *The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts*, 93:

“*Il y avait là une Révélation d’Adam à son fils Seth ...*”

\textsuperscript{278} 19 x 94: Memorandum from Doresse to Dart.

\textsuperscript{279} Marianne Doresse, *Deuxième mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte* (see Part 2 above).

\textsuperscript{280} Doresse, *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte*, 138; *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, 120; *The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts*, 93.
this trip had already begun, for an Israeli plane bombed Cairo on 15 July 1948, initiating a time of blackouts at night. Doresse has published the following report concerning the first steps with regard to the Tano collection:

It became important to orient this discovery no longer toward some foreign library, but rather toward a purely Egyptian scientific organism able both to assure the putting into shape of the manuscripts, their conservation, and then their minute publication. Consulted confidentially, Canon Drioton, Directeur Général of the Service des Antiquités, resolved that such a treasure could not on principle go but to the Coptic Museum—unless, of course, the latter were to commit the unpardonable error of refusing the necessary credits, in which case it would become legitimate to authorize the departure from Egypt of these manuscripts if their owner so desired. The affair was all the more delicate to handle since in matters of antiquities the Egyptian authorities often have the tendency to use their rights of confiscation to avoid paying the just price for certain treasures. And in any case the inconveniences of such a system are well known: No owner, even a legitimate one, of an antiquity of value dares in this country to offer it to the authorities, but prefers to let it depart toward the clandestine market that exports them.

Doresse reported regarding the negotiations with Maria Dattari that “we were near the end when Prime Minister Nokrachi was assassinated” (on 28 December 1948). 

---

282 Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, 138–139; The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 121; The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts, 93–94:

Il devenait important d’orienter cette découverte, non plus vers quelque bibliothèque étrangère, mais vers un organisme scientifique purement égyptien, susceptible à la fois d’assurer la mise en état des manuscrits, leur conservation, puis leur minutieuse publication. Consulté confidamment, M. le chanoine Drioton, Directeur Général du Service des Antiquités, résolut que pareil trésor ne pouvait, en principe, aller qu’au Musée Copte—à moins, bien entendu, que celui-ci ne commette l’impardonnable erreur de refuser les crédits nécessaires, auquel cas il deviendrait légitime d’autoriser la sortie hors d’Égypte de ces manuscrits si leur propriétaire le désirait. L’affaire était d’autant plus délicate à mener qu’en matière d’antiquités les autorités égyptiennes ont parfois tendance à user de leur droits de confiscation pour éviter de payer au juste prix certains trésors. Et pourtant, les inconvénients d’un tel système sont bien connus: nul possesseur, même légitime, d’une antiquité de valeur n’ose, dans ce pays, la proposer aux autorités mais préfère la laisser partir vers le marché clandestin qui les exporte.

283 19 x 74: Memorandum from Doresse to Dart.
On 1 February 1949 there was a newspaper report in Cairo of an interview with Doresse that infuriated Puech:285

At the very moment I am closing this letter, which for some time I had left abandoned on my table, I receive a communication of a document which, on reading it, distresses me. It has to do with a clipping from the Bourse Égyptienne of 1 February, which reproduces, accompanied by your picture and with a flashy title, an interview with you. I had, however, recommended to you at your departure, in your interest as well as in that of the negotiations taking place, to show yourself both more discrete and more skilled. The publication of such an article shows great clumsiness, and will not fail to do very great harm to you. To me also, who supports you against winds and waves, and who had thought it fitting to insist, in my report to the C[entre] N[ational de la] R[echerche] S[cientifique], on the disinterested nature of your devotion to pure science. One had already spoken to me on various sides of the article in question, proof that it is known here by many, and that it is exploited against you. It has shocked, specifically, one of your best supporters. I fear very much, in the direction that things are going, that it compromises seriously the success of your application for a renewal at the Centre [National de la Recherche Scientifique] or of your being sent again on a mission. One would say that you tax your ingenuity to make the task of your defenders more and more difficult. I ask of you: If you do not want to stand in the way of your own future, and of the future of the discovery of N[ag] H[ammadi] (whose interests should surpass all others), cease permitting that one adorn you with the title ‘professor,’ or any other title, and that one gives oneself up to such

285 23 iii 49: Postscript to a letter from Puech to Doresse:

Au moment de clore cette lettre, que j’avais quelque temps abandonnée sur ma table, je reçois communication d’un document dont la lecture me navre. Il s’agit d’une coupure du numéro du 1er février de la Bourse Égyptienne qui reproduit, accompagné de votre photographie et sous un titre tapageur, un interview de vous. Je vous avais pourtant recommandé à votre départ, dans votre intérêt comme dans celui des négociations en cours, de vous montrer à la fois plus discret et plus habile. La publication d’un tel article est d’une grande maladresse et ne va pas manquer de vous faire le plus grand tort. À moi aussi, qui vous soutiens contre vents et marées et qui avais cru bon d’insister dans mon rapport au C.N.R.S. sur le caractère désintéressé de votre dévouement à la pure science. On m’avait déjà parlé de divers côtés de l’article en question, preuve qu’il est connu ici de beaucoup et qu’il est exploité contre vous. Il a notamment choqué l’un de vos meilleurs appuis. Je crains fort, au train où vont les choses, qu’il ne compromette gravement le succès de votre demande de renouvellement auprès du Centre ou de nouvel envoi en mission. On dirait que vous vous ingéniez à rendre de plus en plus malaisée la tâche de vos défenseurs. Je vous en prie: si vous ne voulez pas nuire à votre propre avenir et à l’avenir de la découverte de N.H. (dont les intérêts doivent primer tous les autres), cessez de tolérer que l’on vous pare du titre de “professeur” ou de quelque autre title, et que l’on se livre autour de votre personne à de pareilles manifestations. Aimez votre travail pour lui-même, et non pour vous. Je vous dis tout ceci en toute sincérité, croyez-le bien.
manifestations around your person. Love your work for itself, and not for
yourself. I tell you all this in all sincerity, believe me.

Doresse replied as best he could:

I receive your letter of 23 March, and have just communicated it to Abbot
Drioton. It is in sum he who inspired, and approved, the incriminated article,
an article necessary at the time to lend support indirectly to the Coptic
Museum. The Abbot has been, as was I, grieved and surprised by the use made
of this article in France, and of the interpretation that has been given to it. The
title ‘professor’ is here customary in such cases ... . Let us, I ask of you, carry
on the negotiations in terms of a situation which Drioton and I are alone in
knowing. You know all that my present mission, and the preceding one, have
cost me. To ‘defend’ me, repulse first the malice and the slanders, very little
disinterested, which some spread abroad for over a year, so as to break our
collaboration, and which pain me very much.

Of course such a response would not satisfy Puech, or others who saw in it
only Doresse’s vanity.

_Doresse’s Inventory_

After having taken hasty notes of the codices when they were with Tano,
and then when they were with Dattari, and sending Puech a preliminary
inventory in November, the Doresses went to Luxor to make use of the
library of the Chicago House, there to identify any texts they could. While
still in Luxor, Doresse mailed Puech an improved inventory, which is the
earliest extant inventory of the Nag Hammadi Codices that is available. In
his covering letter, Doresse explained:
Here, while awaiting a more detailed analysis, is an almost definitive inven-
tory of the content of each volume. One can already count on, as you will see,
at least 36 works, a good number of which are in excellent condition. For the
moment, I think I have succeeded in having the two parties admit to the prin-
ciple of a global purchase of all the manuscripts as soon as possible. Without
doubt the volumes are going to be officially offered to the Coptic Museum in
a few weeks, which is what is essential; after that they will no longer be able to
escape. In the meantime, I prepare the most abundant documentation pos-
sible, for the expertise with which I am going to be charged; for that I have
recourse to the American library of Luxor (Oriental Institute of Chicago). I
find there the essential books that are lacking in Cairo, and I am received there
in a friendly manner.

This inventory, on which Puech's inventory in the Crum *Festschrift* is based
(see below), is as follows.288

Manuscript nº 1. [= Codex VII]289
More than 120 pages. No lacunae.
1) Paraphrase of Séem, on the topic of the unengendered Spirit, things re-
vealed by Derdékéa according to the will of the mégéthos ... explicit: second
treatise of the great Seth. [Tractates 1 and 2]
2) Apocalypse of Peter (from p. 81 to p. 94). [Tractate 3]
3) The Teachings of Silvanos (abstract and moral, with Christian elements,
perhaps attributable to the Audian cited by Epiphanius?). [Tractate 4]
4) Apocalypse of Dosithée, or the three Tables of Seth. It has to do with three
short texts of a mystical character. [Tractate 5]

réussi à faire admettre par les deux parties le principe d’un achat global de tous les
manuscrits le plus tôt possible. Sans doute les volumes vont-ils être officiellement
proposés au Musée Copte dans quelques semaines, ce qui est l’essentiel; après cela ils
ne pourront plus échapper. En attendant, je prépare la plus abondante documentation
possible pour l’expertise dont je vais être chargé; je recours pour cela à la bibliothèque
américaine de Louxor (Oriental Institute of Chicago). J’y trouve des livres essentiels
qui manquent au Caire et j’y suis aimablement accueilli.

288 Italics in French indicate what was written by hand. Material between pointed brackets
< > was added at the Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi of the University of Laval (see
Part 8 below).
289 4 xii 48: Inventory from Doresse to Puech:

Manuscrit n° 1.
plus de 120 pages. Pas de lacune.
1) Paraphrase de Séem, au sujet de l’Esprit inengendré, choses révélées par Derdékéa
selon la volonté de la mégéthos ... explicit: second traité du grand Seth
2) Apocalypse de Pierre (de la page 81 à la page 94)
3) Les enseignements de Silouanos (abstrait et moral avec éléments chrétiens, peut-
être attribuables à l’audien cité par Épiphane?)
4) Apocalypse de Dosithée, ou les trois Tables de Seth. Il s’agit de trois textes courts
de caractère mystique.
Manuscript nº 2. [= Codex V][290]

About 88 pages; partially broken up, but it is possible to restore it to a good condition.
1) Epistle of Eugnoste. [Tractate 1]
2) Apocalypse of Paul, very different from the work known previously in Coptic. It is the Ascension of Paul. [Tractate 2]
3) Apocalypse of James. [Tractate 3]
4) Another Apocalypse of James of a different character. [Tractate 4]
   (Please note: There exists still a third Apocalypse of James, it also different, in the first pages of the Eid papyrus [Codex I, Tractate 2])
5) Apocalypse of Adam to his son Seth. [Tractate 5]

Manuscript nº 3. [= Codex II][291]

The most voluminous and the most beautiful of these manuscripts. No pagination is indicated. Only the few leaves at the beginning are lacking, the rest is impeccably conserved.
1) The Apocryphon of John. Recension independent of those of the Coptic Museum and of Berlin. [Tractate 1]
2) Incipit: “Here are the secret sayings that Jesus spoke and that Didymus Judas Thomas has (sic) written”; explicit: “Gospel of Thomas.” [Tractate 2]

---

290 4 xii 48: Inventory from Doresse to Puech:

Manuscrit nº 2.
environ 88 pages; en partie brisé, mais il est possible de le remettre en état.
1) Épître d’Eugnoste.
3) Apocalypse de Jacques
4) autre Apocalypse de Jacques de caractère différent.
   (N.B. il existe encore une troisième Apocalypse de Jacques, elle aussi différente, dans les premières pages du papyrus Eid.)
5) Apocalypse d’Adam à son fils Seth.

291 4 xii 48: Inventory from Doresse to Puech:

Manuscrit nº 3.
Le plus volumineux et le plus beau de ces manuscrits. Aucune pagination indiquée.
Seuls les quelques feuillets du début manquent, le reste est impeccablement conservé.
1) Apocryphe de Jean. Recension indépendante de celles du Musée Copte et de Berlin.
2) incipit: “Voici les paroles secrètes qu’a dites Jésus et que Didyme Judas Thomas a (sic) écrit ces”; explicit: “Évangile de Thomas.”
3) Évangile de Philippe.
4) Exégèse sur l’âme. (morale et mystique, nourrie d’Ézéchiel et surtout des Psaumes).
5) “Paroles secrètes dites par le Sauveur à Judas et écrites par Matthias.” Quelifié à la fin: “Le livre de Tho ma s”.

---
3) Gospel of Philip. [Tractate 3 (tractates 4–5 are overlooked)]
4) Exegesis on the Soul (moralistic and mystical, nurtured by Ezechiel and especially by the Psalms). [Tractate 6]
5) “Secret sayings spoken by the Savior to Judas <Thomas and> written by Matthias.” Qualified at the end: “The book of Thomas.” [Tractate 7]

Manuscript nº 4. [= Codex VI]
About 80 pages. The beginning is damaged.
1) The Acts of Peter and of the twelve Apostles. [Tractate 1]
2) \(\text{λογος \ αὐθεντικος} \) [Tractate 2]
3) \(\text{τεσσαρας \ Πιλατος \ Πιλατος \ Πιλατος} \) [Tractate 3]
4) Epistle without title. [Tractate 4]
5) Hermetic book, dialogue between Hermes and his disciple ... [Tractate 6]
6) Asclepius. (The Coptic text corresponds approximately to the sections VII to XI of the Latin recension; it brings important variants.) [Tractate 8]

− Apart from the first and third texts, all the works contained in this volume are appropriately and authentically Hermetic. (Number 3 is in the form of prophecy in Sibylline style, with biblical and Christian allusions.)

Numbers 2, 4, and 5 do not even seem to have parallels in the Corpus Hermeticum.

Manuscript nº 5. [= Codex IV]
More than 72 pages; rather damaged.
1) Apocryphon of John. (Still another redaction). [Tractate 1]

\[\text{4 xii 48: Inventory from Doresse to Puech:}\]
Manuscrit nº 4.
environ 80 pages. Le début est endommagé.
1) Actes de Pierre et des douze Apôtres.
2) \(\text{λογος \ αὐθεντικος} \)
3) \(\text{τεσσαρας \ Πιλατος \ Πιλατος \ Πιλατος} \)
4) épître sans titre
5) livre hermétique, dialogue entre Hermes et son disciple ...
6) Asclépios (Le texte copte correspond à peu près au sections VII à XI de la recension latine; il apporte des variantes importantes.)

− à part le premier et le 3\° texte, tous les ouvrages contenus dans ce volume sont proprement et authentiquement hermétiques. (Le nº 3 est en forme de prophè\(\text{t}e\) de style sibyllin [Doresse: sybillins], avec des allusions bibliques et chrétiennes.)

Les numéros 2, 4 et 5 semble ne pas avoir même de parallèles dans le Corpus Hermeticum.

\[\text{4 xii 48: Inventory from Doresse to Puech:}\]
Manuscrit nº 5.
Plus de 72 pages; assez endommagé.
1) Apocryphe de Jean. (encore une autre rédaction).
2) Gospel of the Egyptians. (Similar to the one of the Coptic Museum). [Tractate 2]

3) Sethian cosmogonic text.

One cannot say more on this volume, so long as the broken leaves have not been regrouped and mounted under glass.

Manuscript n° 6. [= Codex X]\footnote{294}

Volume rather broken. Among other texts, one recognizes a treatise on the Cosmos, perhaps one of the “Symphonia”? [Tractate 1]

Manuscript n° 7. [= Codex VIII]\footnote{295}

Rather damaged; contained 140 pages.

One recognizes there, prior to all restoration into good condition, the two last works:

a) Apocalypse de Zostrien, whose content is properly Sethian, cosmological (extremely long and developed). [Tractate 1]

b) Epistle of Peter to Philip (that ends the volume; length 8 pages). [Tractate 2]

Manuscript n° 8. [= Codex I]\footnote{296}

18 leaves coming from completing the Eid papyrus and containing the fragments of two works of which one has as explicit: “Discourse on the Resurrection.” [Tractate 4]
Manuscript nº 9. [= Codex IX] 297
To be restored.
1) Fragments of a Sethian book apocalypse, where the great luminaries appear; explicit: “These revelations, do not reveal them to anyone who is in the flesh. ... When they were told these things, the brothers who belong to the generation of life. ...” [Tractate 1]
2) One or several epistles, one of which begins in the form of the Epistle of Eugnostos (and others as well): “... Many have sought the truth. ...” [Tractate 3]
3) Treatise where there is especially question of the baptism of Christ, explained symbolically. Gnostic, for there is question of the Father of the universe, of Adamas who is in all the Adamases and in the great luminaries ... The temptation is also referred to, in terms of, and according to, a spirit very close to Genesis, but it is said that the God has been jealous of Adam. [Tractate 2]

Manuscript nº 10. [= Codex XI] 298
1) θερινή νηστηνοσίς: [Tractate 1]
2) ἀλλογενής γείτος: [Tractate 3]
3) Another Sethian book. [Tractate 4]
   – To be restored.

297 4 xi 48: Inventory from Doresse to Puech:
Manuscrit nº 9.
à remettre en état.
1) fragments d’une livre apocalypse séthienne où apparaissent les grands luminaires; explicit: “Ces révélations, ne les dévoile à personne qui est dans la chair. ... Lorsqu’ils eurent dit ces choses, les frères qui appartiennent à la génération de vie. ...”
2) une ou plusieurs épîtres dont une débute à la façon de l’épître d’Eugnoste (et d’autres encore): “... Beaucoup ont cherché la vérité. ...”
3) traité où il est tout particulièrement question du baptême du Christ expliqué symboliquement. Gnostique, car il y est question du Père de l’univers, de l’Adamas qui est au-dedans de tous les Adamas et des grands luminaires ... La tentation est aussi évoquée dans des termes et selon un esprit très proches de la Genèse, mais il est dit que le Dieu a été jaloux d’Adam.

298 4 xi 48: Inventory from Doresse to Puech:
Manuscrit nº 10
1) θερινή νηστηνοσίς;
2) ἀλλογενής γείτος;
3) autre livre séthien.
   – à remettre en état.
Some beautiful leaves of a large book that is lost, and which seem to have been placed, since antiquity, at the beginning of volume 3 [to be corrected to read, in his numeration, volume 4 = Codex VI], to which it absolutely does not belong. One recognizes there

1) the end of a Sethian tractate: a long definition of Sacla; the great luminaries; etc. [Actually this is all that has survived of Part one of the tractate that continues below.] Explicit [only that of Part one of Tractate 1]: πλογος ἕτερας την ἀποθήκηα:

2) The following discourse, completely conserved, is consecrated to similar subjects. Explicit:

πλογος ἕτερας την ἀποθήκηα ἡ
πρωτεύεια τρισέρος ἡ
ἀγκαθαγήνα πατρόγραφος εἰς γνώσει τελεῖα:

Hence this explicit has to do with the two discourses which one has just seen and those that preceded them.

3) This group of texts is followed by another work, in the form of an epistle, announcing revelations on the cosmos, chaos, etc ... [Tractate 2 is the opening 10 lines of a duplicate of Codex II, Tractate 5, which, along with Codex II, Tractate 4, is overlooked completely in this inventory.]

Doresse’s inventory reached the number of 11 codices. This would suggest that it included all that was with Tano and Dattari, for if one adds Codex III in the Coptic Museum and Codex I held by Eid, and reaches the correct total of 13 codices in the discovery. But since Tano’s part of Codex I is here included (manuscript no 8 in Doresse’s inventory), his inventory should have reached the number 12, rather than only 11. Completely missing from this inventory is Codex XII. Since Codex XII lacks its leather cover, and Doresse provided

---

299 4 xii 48: Inventory from Doresse to Puech:

Manuscrit no 11.

Quelques beaux feuillets d’un grand livre perdu et qui semblent avoir été placés, dès l’antiquité au début du volume 3 auquel ils n’appartiennent absolument pas. On y reconnaît 1) la fin d’un traité séthien: longue définition de Sacla; les grands luminaires; etc. Explicit: πλογος ἕτερας την ἀποθήκηα:

2) Le discours suivant, entièrement conservé, est consacré à des sujets semblables. Explicit:

πλογος ἕτερας την ἀποθήκηα ἡ
πρωτεύεια τρισέρος ἡ
ἀγκαθαγήνα πατρόγραφος εἰς γνώσει τελεῖα:

Cet explicit concerne donc les deux discours qu’on vient de voir et ceux qui les précédéaient.

3) Ce groupe de textes est suivi d’un autre ouvrage en forme d’épître annonçant des révélations sur le cosmos, le chaos, etc ....
no photographs of Codex XII for use in The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices (see Chapter 11, Part 4 below), he may well have considered its few tattered leaves as part of another of the more fragmentary codices.

On his return from Luxor, Doresse worked at completing his expertise for the Coptic Museum:300

I am back in Cairo since the middle of the month [December 1948]. We have now begun the operations that should result in the purchase of the documents, of which my expertise is almost completed.

I hope that the two inventories that I have addressed to you in November and in December have reached you safely, in spite of the slowness of the [diplomatic] pouch. As soon as I have a response from you, I will address to you more complete analyses.

Doresse summarized his plans for the use of his expertise as follows:301

The second lot of manuscripts, which seems tied to the first codex [Codex III] and also to come from Chénoboskion, was in 1948 in the home of Mlle Dattari, whom I could convince to show it to me,302 then to offer the manuscripts for purchase to the Coptic Museum, especially qualified to hold them. Togo Mina then asked me to prepare a scientific expertise on them, on the basis of the very complete study that I meanwhile had made of them. Then this expertise, signed with my name and countersigned by him [Togo Mina] and by Drioton, was presented to the Council of the Museum at the beginning of 1949. In order to prevent the discovery from escaping Egypt as a result of the numerous covetousnesses that it could arouse, Togo Mina decides (1) that the papyri would be put under seal until the end of the negotiations that had begun; (2) that the expertise established by me would immediately be published. This publication, edited in such a way as not to infringe on the rights of the owner by detailed citations, would nonetheless serve to assure us first rights of discovery in case circumstances would let the manuscripts escape.


300 30 xii 48: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je suis de retour au Caire depuis le milieu du mois. Nous avons maintenant commencé les opérations qui doivent aboutir à l’achat des documents, dont mon expertise est à peu près terminée. ... J’espère que les deux inventaires que je vous ai adressés en novembre et en décembre vous sont bien parvenus malgré les lenteurs de la valise. Dès que j’aurai une réponse de vous, je vous adresserai des analyses plus complètes.

301 1950: John Doresse, “Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chénoboskion) comprennent deux lots différent posant des problèmes distincts” (see Part 2 above).

This publication bears the names both of Togo Mina and of Doresse, but is then subdivided into a prefatory statement signed by Togo Mina on 1 June 1949, followed by the actual expertise of the Tano collection signed by Doresse. Togo Mina concluded with a comment about Doresse's report that follows:  

... the contents of the long report established by Doresse and by myself several months ago.

Doresse, in a paragraph varying only slightly from that of Togo Mina, reported elsewhere:

... the publication of the report made by Mina and myself appraising these papyri.

A news release of 10 June 1949 reported:

The volumes have been studied by Togo Mina, Director of the Coptic Museum of Cairo, Doresse, charged with excavations by the Louvre Museum, and Dr. Drioton, General Director of the Service des Antiquités.

Henri-Charles Puech wrote:

The direction of the Museum, after having had the exportation of the documents from Egypt interdicted, entrusted to a commission composed of several specialists the responsibility of preparing a concise inventory of the pieces that had been offered.

---


... le contenu du long rapport établi par M. Doresse et par moi-même il y a déjà plusieurs mois.


305 10 vi 49: La Bourse Égyptienne:  


La direction du Musée, après avoir fait interdire l’exportation hors d’Égypte des documents, confia à une commission composée de plusieurs spécialistes le soin de dresser un inventaire succinct des pièces proposées.
Puech’s reference to a plurality of (unnamed!) specialists apparently reflect the three signatures to Doresse’s expertise. Doresse has of course rightly emphasized:

This second description remains up to the present [1958], the only direct and complete inventory of the documents that has been made: no other title of any work has yet been added to the list that I thus prepared.

Doresse’s memorandum continued:

It is a matter of course that, in the process of the expertise, we have had to study very closely some of the collections held by Mlle Dattari, with the result that our personal research would make it possible to establish very rapidly a definitive edition, for example for the collection number I of our inventory (= Codex II) (containing a Secret Book of John, the Gospel of Thomas, the Hypostasis of the Archons, etc.), or for the collection number IX [Codex VI] (containing a series of Hermetic books). Nonetheless, at the time of the primitive expertise, the other texts, they too, have been read and analyzed in detail, which has made it possible to make a definitive identification of them, in comparison with what one knew, from other ancient writings, of this literature that was lost until now. Incidentally, none of the results of these studies, which remain my person property, has been published, since that cannot be done legitimately.

Puech of course responded enthusiastically to Doresse’s inventory:

---

307 Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, 139; The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 122; The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts, 94.

308 1950: John Doresse, “Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chénoboskion) comprennent deux lots différent posant des problèmes distincts” (see Part 2 above).

309 17 i 49: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Le principal porte, n’est-ce pas? sur le complet succès de votre mission, l’heureuse continuation de votre séjour en Égypte, les importantes conséquences que les résultats de votre travail actuel ne manqueront pas d’avoir pour votre renom scientifique et votre carrière future. Ce ne sont même pas des souhaits que j’exprime là, mais des quasi certitudes, puisque l’affaire qui nous intéresse tous deux si profondément paraît, d’après ce que vous voulez bien me dire, en excellente voie et sur le point d’aboutir à la satisfaction de tous. ...

La liste des écrits inventoriés que vous me communiquez avec une diligence et un soin dont je suis fort reconnaissant confirme et, plus encore, révèle l’importance capitale de la découverte. Comme je le conjecturais avant votre départ, il semble qu’il y ait là, outre des inédits proprement gnostiques, des apocryphes chrétiens proprement dits,
The essential point has to do, doesn’t it, with the complete success of your mission, the happy continuation of your stay in Egypt, the important consequences that the results of your present work will not fail to have for your scientific reputation and your future career. These are not even desires that I express, but quasi-certitudes, since the affair that interests us both so profoundly seems, according to what you are kind enough to tell me, in excellent course and on the point of concluding to the satisfaction of all. ... The list of inventoried texts that you communicate to me with a diligence and a care, of which I am very grateful, confirms, and, still more, reveals, the capital importance of the discovery. As I conjectured before your departure, it seems that there are, beyond unpublished purely Gnostic texts, Christian apocrypha properly speaking, and some of them have been sought for a long time. If this impression is correct, the fact raises still more the price of the discovery. ... How impatient I am to know the happy ending of all these negotiations, whose difficulties I nonetheless can suspect! How impatient I am to know that you are in possession of all the photographs of the collections, and authorized to speak of them and to publish them, or organize their collective publication! Quick, your return, that I can only wish to imagine as triumphal, and the moment when we both can lean over these inspiring texts!

Doresse replied, listing the next steps to be taken:

il est encore trop tôt pour parler de la trouvaille de Nag Hammadi, les plus officiels des Égyptiens n’ayant pas encore été eux-mêmes mis au courant. Une indiscretion pourrait causer de grosses difficultés au moment où nous demanderons les droits d’édition. Pour le moment, nous en sommes aux opérations d’achat qui ne peuvent être officiellement menées que par les Égyptiens. Nous avons déjà victorieusement franchi, en janvier, le Comité d’Achat du Musée Copte. Il a fallu ensuite s’accorder sur le prix définitif et faire une expertise complète. Ces résultats ont été présentés hier au Conseil d’Administration du Musée qui a été favorable. Mais il faut maintenant, pour avoir l’argent, obtenir l’appui du ministre, puis du Président du Conseil et, enfin, un vote du Parlement. Nous avons été très retardés par l’assassinat de Nokrachi Pacha, sur qui nous comptions beaucoup; tous les préparatifs ont été à refaire. L’abbé Drioton nous aide tant qu’il peut mais le Musée Copte échappe totalement à son autorité officielle. Il va cependant agir cette semaine auprès du Palais pour intéresser le Roi à la découverte et obtenir une intervention personnelle de celui-ci sur les ministres et
It is still too early to talk of the discovery of Nag Hammadi, since the most official of the Egyptians themselves have not yet been brought up to date. An indiscretion could cause great difficulties, at the moment we will ask for the rights of publication. For the moment, we are involved in the transactions of their purchase, which can be officially led only by the Egyptians. We have already victoriously cleared, in January, the Purchase Committee of the Coptic Museum. It was then necessary to reach agreement on the definitive price, and to make a complete expertise. These results have been presented yesterday [19 February 1949] to the Council of Administration of the Museum, which was favorable. But now it is necessary, in order to have the money, to obtain the support of the Minister, then of the President of the Council, and, finally, a vote of Parliament. We have been slowed down very much by the assassination of Nokrachi Pacha, on whom we counted a great deal; all the preparations have to be done again. Abbot Drioton helps us as much as he can, but the Coptic Museum falls completely outside of his official authority. He is nonetheless going to take action this week with the Palace, to interest the King in the discovery, and obtain his personal intervention with the Ministers and the Parliament. For that, we hold to the papyri being named: ‘Papyrus Farouk the First.’ If in fact His Majesty lets it be made known that he is favorable to such a designation, the Parliament and the Ministry will be obliged, by deference, to grant the necessary credits. You will have all the difficulties in perspective, from the price on which one has settled: 66,000 £, and that at the time when the war of Palestine has emptied the treasuries of the State.

Il ne faut d’ailleurs pas se cacher qu’il y aura un très gros travail matériel à faire avant de pouvoir photographier page par page tous nos documents avec les 41 ouvrages qu’ils contiennent. Nos papyrus sont extrêmement fragiles; six volumes sont brisés: je les ai mis provisoirement en état et soigneuse emballés pour que l’ordre des fragments—dont aucun ne manque—ne soit pas brouillé. Il faudra donc, aussitôt que possible après l’achat, reconstituer tout page par page en le mettant sous verre, puis le photographier. Ce sera l’affaire de trois ou quatre mois et nécessitera mon retour au Caire dès septembre prochaine.
But the documents will not escape us. They are at present in a valise that has been returned to the owner for a receipt, and after having been sealed.

One can think that the purchase will be completed by the end of the present session of Parliament, no doubt toward May or June. I will not be able to leave Egypt before that time, for the health of Togo Mina is always wavering, and, until the end, everything will have to be drawn up by me, incidentally without me showing myself at any time. ... In any case, I will, once the documents are in our possession, have need of material resources sufficient to proceed in peace in the editing of these thousand pages of Coptic, not one of which is of secondary importance.

Incidentally, it is not possible to hide the fact that there will be a very great deal of material work to be done, before being able to photograph page by page all our documents with the 41 works that they contain. Our papyri are extremely fragile; six volumes are broken. I have restored them provisionally, and carefully packed them, so that the order of the fragments, not one of which is lacking, not be mixed up. It will hence be necessary, as soon as possible after the purchase, to reconstitute everything, page by page, by putting it under glass, then photographing it. That will be a matter of three or four months, and will necessitate my return to Cairo from next September on.

But Puech himself went actively to work on the inventory that Doresse had sent. He wrote Doresse a query about manuscript 4, tractate 6 (= Codex VI, Tractate 8):\footnote{9 iii 49: Letter from Puech to Doresse:}

> With regard to these famous documents, can you tell me if the rediscovered version of the Hermetic *Asclepius* contains what forms chapter 24 of the present Latin translation (sinister predictions of the future irreligiosity of Egypt, and the transformation of its temples into ‘sepulchers’)? And, in case the passage is recovered in the Coptic, under what form does it present itself there? I would have need of information for a study on the destruction of the Serapeum.

Since Doresse no longer had access to the codices themselves, but only to his few photographs and handwritten notes, he may well not have been able to reply to this query. The answer should be in the affirmative; the sepulchers are mentioned on p. 70, line 34.

\footnote{9 iii 49: Letter from Puech to Doresse:}

> À propos de ces fameux documents, pouvez-vous me dire si la version retrouvée de l’*Asclépius* hermétique contient ce qui forme le ch. 24 de l’actuelle traduction latine (prédictions sinistres sur l’irréligion future de l’Égypte et la transformation de ses temples en “sépulcres”)? Et, au cas où le passage se retrouverait dans le copte, sous quelle forme s’y présente-t-il? J’aurais besoin du renseignement pour une étude sur la destruction du Sérapeum.
Puech also identified a Greek fragment of the *Wisdom of Jesus*, a text that Doresse had identified in the codex already in the possession of the Coptic Museum (Codex III, Tractate 4).\(^{\text{312}}\)

This little word is to inform you rapidly that I have just discovered in a papyrus [P.Oxy. 1081] the Greek text of some pages of the *Wisdom of Jesus*. The papyrus is anterior to the manuscript of Nag Hammadi, and it is without any doubt, after the confrontation of the two texts, that the Coptic is only a literal translation (with a few mistakes, and the omission of a line) made from a Greek original. It will hence not be possible to retain the hypothesis that you have expressed in *Vigiliae Christianae*: We do not have to do, in the *Wisdom of Jesus*, with a composition that is more or less original, made by a Coptic author on the basis of the *Letter of Eugnostos*. The adaptation had already been carried out by a Greek, in the course of the third century, at the latest.

... I would like to entrust as soon as possible to a revue specializing in papyrology a complete article giving the integral reconstitution of the fragment, explaining the doctrinal content of the morsel and exposing all the consequences that the discovery implies. I lack for the moment: ... the photographs of the pages in question of the *Epistle of Eugnostos* and of the *Wisdom of Jesus* (you have them, I believe, in Paris; it will be necessary to revise on their basis your first translation, which seems to me inexact or too vague at places).

\(^{\text{312}}\) 23 iii 49: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Ce petit mot pour vous informer rapidement que je viens de découvrir dans un papyrus le texte grec de quelques pages de la *Sagesse de Jésus*. Le papyrus est antérieur au manuscrit de Nag Hammadi, et il est hors de doute, après confrontation des deux textes, que le copte n’est qu’une traduction littérale (avec quelques bêvues et l’omission d’une ligne) faite sur un original grec. Il y aura donc lieu de revenir sur l’hypothèse que vous aviez émise dans les *Vigiliae Christianae*: nous n’avons pas, avec la *Sagesse*, affaire à une composition plus ou moins originale, faite par un auteur copte à partir de la *Lettre d’Eugnoste*; l’adaptation avait déjà été opérée par un grec, dans le courant du IIIème siècle, au plus tard.

... je voudrais confier au plus tôt à une revue spécialisée de papyrologie un article complet donnant la reconstitution intégrale du fragment, expliquant le contenu doctrinal du morceau et exposant toutes les conséquences qu’implique la trouvaille. Il me manque pour le moment: ... les photographies des pages en question de l’*Épître d’Eugnostos* et de la *Sagesse de Jésus* (vous les avez je crois, à Paris: il faudra réviser d’après elles votre première traduction, qui me paraît inexacte ou trop vague par endroits). ... J’attends donc votre retour avec encore plus d’impatience. ...

Vous voyez que l’étude des écrits de N.H. commence à se révéler féconde. Et ce n’est qu’un petit début. D’autres résultats nous attendent, de plus vaste portée et bien plus surprenants.
I hence await your return with still more impatience. ...

You see that the study of the texts of N[ag] H[ammadi] begins to reveal itself to be rich. And this is no more than a small beginning. Other results await us, of vastly more significance and even more surprising.

From these letters it is clear that Puech was avidly following up on the inventory and notes he received from Doresse, while at the same finding how unreliable Doresse's information was. In this particular case, Doresse did change his position to agree with that of Puech, and gave Puech credit for the discovery.\footnote{Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, 213; The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 196; The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts, 150.} But Puech had to continue appealing to Doresse for information.

Doresse maintained his upbeat posture, though the goal was always still just a bit away.\footnote{22 iv 49: Letter from Doresse to Puech:}

... the situation has improved. Togo Mina is in these days going to see the Prime Minister, and insist that one purchase immediately the whole lot. He has a great deal of weight with the Ministry and will be able to succeed. If not, one will ask now for the needed credits to purchase a good part of the documents, and one will take the remainder in the following years. In any case, the interdiction to export is maintained, and it is necessary to continue to keep the existence of the manuscripts secret.

A month later Doresse wrote Puech to arrange a formal announcement at the French Academy on his return in June:\footnote{24 v 49: Letter from Doresse to Puech:}

———

\footnote{Togo Mina vient d’être, pendant un mois, très gravement malade. Nous avons même craint de le perdre. Mais il est enfin rétabli et reprend les affaires avec énergie. En tout cas, malgré ce nouveau retard, je ne rentrerais pas sans une bonne nouvelle: j’ai pu faire reconnaître de part et d’autre l’intérêt et même la nécessité qu’il y a à annoncer dès maintenant la découverte—au moins de façon sommaire—pour faciliter la suite des négociations en cours. On s’est accordé, après bien des discussions, pour autoriser la publication intégrale du rapport établi pour l’expertise des manuscrits. Tel que je l’avais préparé, ce texte contient la description des volumes, l’enumération de leur contenu et de première constatation sur la nature des différents ouvrages et l’importance de l’ensemble. Il n’a en fait jamais été lu au comités auxquels les vol-}
Togo Mina has been, for a month, very gravely ill. We even have fear of losing him. But he is finally reestablished, and resumes business with energy. In any case, in spite of this new delay, I will not return without good news: I have been able to get recognized, on one side and on the other, the interest, and even the necessity, to announce the discovery already now—at least in a summary way—so as to facilitate the continuation of the negotiations taking place. One has reached agreement, after many discussions, to authorize the integral publication of the report established for the expertise of the manuscripts. This text contains, just as I prepared it, the description of the volumes, the enumeration of their content, and first statements on the nature of the different works, and the importance of the whole. In fact, it was never read to the Committees to which the volumes have been presented, but only summarized. Hence it is really unpublished. We can hence without inconvenience communicate it as it is to the Académie des Inscriptions [et Belles-Lettres]. (We will see how to present together this text, while respecting its exact contents.) I have just written to Dussaud and to Merlin this happy news, and I would be very grateful to you to intervene, so that one gives us a date toward the end of June. It is difficult to delay longer. The report must, in effect, be printed immediately, so that copies of it can be distributed here at a useful time. One is agreed to give its publication to Vigiliae Christianae, which without doubt will be able to insert it into the July issue. I could not propose it to Revue de l'histoire religieuse, whose delays in printing are longer and which could not bear, doubtless, the costs of the numerous reprints that are necessary.

Doresse’s inventories and his written expertise of 1948 remained the only available information about the Nag Hammadi Codices for a decade, with the exception of the first and only facsimile volume published by Pahor Labib in 1956, until Martin Krause got access to the codices at the Coptic Museum in 1959. Hence whatever others might publish came either from his inventory and his expertise, as in the case of Henri-Charles Puech, or from his hastily taken notes, as in the case of Gilles Quispel. Yet they hastened to publish such information without acknowledging Doresse as their source.
Gilles Quispel's Excerpt from Doresse

Gilles Quispel initially cultivated the Doresses, who however gradually came to realize he was trying to exploit their knowledge of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Marianne Doresse described what took place as follows: 316

Quispel, whom we met at the Congress of Orientalists the preceding summer [1948], and with whom Jean believed to be on excellent terms, invites us, first, in the morning, to his house; he interrogates Jean about the papyri, and especially about the Eid papyrus. Then he takes us to Scheveningen, to a Javanese restaurant, for a sumptuous lunch.

It only became apparent later that Quispel was primarily concerned to secure the Eid papyrus for the Jung Institute in Zürich (where it became the Jung Codex, then Codex I), where he replaced Doresse among the editors (see Chapter 3, Part 3 below).

Quispel was apparently the first to publish an excerpt from a Nag Hammadi text, The Egyptian Gospel, for which he was of course dependent on Doresse. 317 Now that the text is available, one can see that the excerpt is actually Doresse’s summary, rather than a verbatim excerpt from the text itself. However Quispel had stated: 319

I have had the Coptic text before my eyes, but of course cannot publish it before the final edition.

Doresse published a repudiation of Quispel’s claim: 320

G. Quispel, to whom I had privately reported some details on the contents of the new texts, has since written, in his note “Die Reue des Schöpfers” (Theologische Zeitschr., 5, 1949, p. 157), “Ich habe den koptischen Text unter Augen gehabt, kann ihn aber natürlich vor der endgültigen Ausgabe nicht publizieren” (“I have had sight of the Coptic text, but naturally cannot publish it in advance of the authoritative edition”). This assertion is quite inaccurate.

---

316 Marianne Doresse: Deuxième mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte (see Part 2 above).
319 Quispel, “Die Reue des Schöpfers,” VigChr 2 (1948): 137–160: 157:

Ich habe den koptischen Text unter Augen gehabt, kann ihn aber natürlich vor der endgültigen Ausgabe nicht publizieren.

320 Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, 158–159, n. 17, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 127, n. 17; The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts, 318, n. 18:

... M. G. Quispel, à qui j’avais communiqué à titre privé quelques détails sur le contenu d’un des nouveaux textes a écrit ... Cette affirmation est entièrement inexacte.
When I inquired of Quispel, he explained:\textsuperscript{321}

When I prepared my article on “Die Reue des Schöpfers,” I asked Doresse to give me the relevant passage. He sent me a handwritten copy of the passage. So I saw the text, but not the manuscript.

Doresse reported that he sent Quispel both a French translation and a Coptic transcription of the relevant passage. But since Quispel had not acknowledged Doresse as the source of his information, but rather gave the impression that he had seen the papyrus itself (‘the Coptic text’), Doresse published his blunt criticism.

\textit{The Inadequacies of Doresse’s Inventory}

Doresse of course recognized the limitations of his expertise, which had to be done rapidly, and before the conservation of the fragmentary codices:\textsuperscript{322}

There is furthermore reason to hope that the papyri, which we had to handle, at the time of their expertise, with extreme prudence so as not to damage them, will reveal, once put into shape, some further writings that escaped us. Similarly with regard to the texts on which it has not yet been possible to put a precise title, it is certain that when one will have been able to read them closely enough, it will be easy to recognize there two or three other of the great treatises whose names the heresiologists have mentioned.

But Doresse minimalized any deficiencies in the inventory he had made under very difficult circumstances, without having had a subsequent opportunity to verify what he had done, due to the codices having been sequestered:\textsuperscript{323}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{321} 13 viii 76: Letter from Quispel to Robinson.
\footnote{322} Jean Doresse, “Une bibliothèque gnostique copte sur papyrus,” BiOr 6 (1949): 102–104: 103:
\begin{quote} Il y a en outre lieu d’espérer que les papyrus que nous avons dû, lors de leur expertise, manier avec une prudence extrême pour ne pas les endommager, révèleront, une fois mis en état, encore quelques écrits qui nous ont échappé. De même, en ce qui concerne les textes sur lesquels il n’a pas encore été possible de mettre de titre précis, il est assuré que, lorsqu’on aura pu les lire d’assez près, il sera facile d’y reconnaître deux ou trois autres des grands traités dont les hésiologues ont mentionné les noms.
\end{quote}
\footnote{323} 15 v 59: Letter from Doresse to Puech:
\begin{quote} Il me semble que le résultat ainsi obtenu par moi fut assez satisfaisant puisqu’effectivement ce premier inventaire n’a pratiquement nécessité que les quelques corrections de détail que j’ai récemment signalées dans \textit{Hermès et la Gnosis}.
\end{quote}
\end{footnotes}
It seems to me that the result I thus obtained was satisfactory enough, since in effect this first inventory has necessitated practically only the few corrections of detail that I have recently noted in “Hermès et la Gnose.”

Yet once the Nag Hammadi Codices became accessible to the world of scholarship in general, many improvements in the inventory were promptly made, a number of which can be listed to illustrate the dimensions of the problem with Doresse’s inventory:

Further fragmentary titles were identified: IX,1, Melchizedek (by Birger A. Pearson); X, Marsanes (by Birger A. Pearson); XI,4, Hypsiphrone (by myself).

A tractate was identified with fragments previously known: Henri-Charles Puech identified II,2 with P.Oxy. 654 and I

II,5 was identified by Christian Oeyen with the British Library collection of papyrus fragments Or. 4926 (1), and by Pierre Nautin with the Symphonia mentioned by Epiphanius, Panarion, 40.2.1. Doresse in his inventory had raised the question of whether in Codex X (his Manuscript 6), Tractate 1, “one recognizes a treatise on the Cosmos, perhaps one of the ‘Symphonia’?”

---


Doresse’s identifications of II,4 with the \textit{Book of Norea} mentioned by Epiphanius,\footnote{Doresse, \textit{Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte}, 192; \textit{The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics}, 170; \textit{The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts}, 170.} II,7 with the \textit{Traditions of Matthias} mentioned by Hippolytus,\footnote{Doresse, \textit{Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte}, 244; \textit{The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics}, 226; \textit{The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts}, 174.} and VII,1-2 (as a single tractate) with the \textit{Paraphrase of Seth} mentioned by Hippolytus have not been generally accepted (though VII,1 is thought to share with the \textit{Paraphrase of Seth} a common ancestor).\footnote{Doresse, \textit{Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte}, 173; \textit{The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics}, 170; \textit{The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts}, 170.}
Some of Doresse’s titles for tractates turned out to be inaccurate: For II,7, his title *Thomas the Contender* has been corrected by Hans-Martin Schenke to read *The Book of Thomas*. And his title for III,2, *The Holy Book of the Great Invisible Spirit or The Gospel of the Egyptians*, has been corrected to read *The Holy Book of the Great Invisible Spirit or The Egyptian Gospel*.

Codex VI, though relatively intact and hence easier than most to catalogue, was actually cluttered with inaccuracies in Doresse’s inventory: He abbreviated the title for VI,1, which should read *Acts of Peter and the twelve Apostles*, to read just *Acts of Peter*. And his identification of the rest of Codex VI proved to be inaccurate:

It has to do with five treatises, all Hermetic. The first four: *Authentic Discourse of Hermès to Thot* [VI,3, the Hermetic names being a gratuitous addition to the title], another treatise designated: *Thought of the Supreme Power* [VI,4], finally an anonymous epistle [VI,5; Plato, *Republic* 588A–589B] and a treatise of Hermès to his disciple [VI,6], are authentic and lost Hermetic texts, none of which is present in the current corpus of Hermes Trismegistos. The fifth is no less remarkable [VI,8]; it has to do with the celebrated *Asclepius*, which one knew only from the Latin transposition of Pseudo-Apuleius, which seems very vague compared to the Coptic text.
Martin Krause pointed out\textsuperscript{343} that Doresse listed here only seven tractates in Codex VI, rather than eight. But this is merely due to Doresse not counting as a separate tractate the Hermetic prayer (VI,7), which he did note. Yet Krause also pointed out that Doresse did not mention VI,2\textsuperscript{344}. Doresse interpreted the title to VI,2 at 13,1 as the *incipit* of the same tractate as that whose subscript title is at the bottom of VI, 3\textsuperscript{5} (VI,3), thereby merging tractates 2 and 3 into a single second tractate.\textsuperscript{345} But Krause correctly attributed there VI, 2\textsuperscript{ff.} to a separate third tractate, in view of the decoration at the bottom of p. 21 indicating the end of the second tractate. (VI, 22 has a lacuna at the top of the page, so it is indeterminate whether a title stood there.) Krause also noted there in general that what Doresse reported about VI,4\textsuperscript{ff.} relates to other texts.

Martin Krause and Pahor Labib analyzed these problems with Codex VI in more detail:\textsuperscript{346} Since Doresse had made no allusion to VI,2, he put in third place the title of VI,4, which he numbered 22. But when he discussed a text under this title,\textsuperscript{347} he used material only from VI,5. When he discussed the texts in fourth and sixth places, which he numbered 23 and 25,\textsuperscript{348} he in both cases actually reported on VI,6. The ‘Sethian’ text, in fifth place, numbered 24, was discussed,\textsuperscript{349} using only material from VI,4. Thus the text numbered 24 (VI,4) actually precedes the text numbered 22 (VI,5).

Doresse then identified in Codex VI:\textsuperscript{350}

... a Sethian apocalypse, omitted in our first inventories.


\textsuperscript{346} Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, 27, n. 4.


... une apocalypse séthienne, omise dans nos premiers inventaires.
He even later listed it in fifth place:351

... Sethian Revelation, title missing.

His identifications of this text (actually VI,4) and of IX,3 as Sethian have not been accepted.352

Other confusions of tractates by Doresse also occur. His division of VIII,1 and XI,3 into two tractates each, and his fusion of XI,1,2 into one tractate, are inaccurate. In Codex X, tractates 2 and 3 are put in reverse order.

At times a fortuitous excerpt rather than a balanced assessment of the whole text has apparently determined the identification. The very fragmentary Codex XII that lacks a binding was omitted completely from the inventory of 1948, but is included a decade later to round out the total of 13 codices. But here it is referred to only as “... dealing with, among other subjects, the influence of demons upon the soul,”353 an unidentified reference to Sentences 348–349 of *The Sentences of Sextus* (XII,1).

In sum, it is clear that, once Doresse’s access to the Nag Hammadi Codices was no longer possible, the selection of the photographs and transcriptions that he happened to have at his disposal with him in France did not make a definitive inventory possible. Doresse’s attempt to refute Martin Krause’s inventory in favor of his own354 only documents further the inadequacy of the information available to him.

With regard to Codex I, the bulk of this codex was not in the Tano-Dattari collection, but had been acquired by Albert Eid and sold by his widow Simone Eid to the Jung Institute (see Chapter 3 below). Doresse stated that there were 18 leaves in the Tano-Dattari collection (the so-called

---

351 Doresse, *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte*, 166; *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, 143; *The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts*, 113:

... révélation séthienne, dont le titre est perdu.


353 Doresse, *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte*, 167:

... traitant, entre autres sujets, de l’influence des démons sur l’âme.

*The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, 145; *The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts*, 114.

‘missing 40 pages,’ see Chapter 4, Part 1 below), consisting of parts of two tractates. He gave correctly the explicit of one, Discourse on the Resurrection (I,4). Doresse’s inaccurate inventory of Codex I was published by the editio princeps sponsored by the Jung Institute in Zürich, since a small tractate, there treated as the last tractate, turned out to be the first, the secondarily inscribed front flyleaf. This necessitated the correction of the numeration of all the tractates of Codex I. Also the title used for that brief tractate, Prayer of the Apostle Peter, has been changed to read: Prayer of the Apostle Paul. But since this Prayer was in the Eid collection, rather than the Tano-Dattari collection, it was not included in Doresse’s inventory.

Given the difficult circumstances under which Doresse worked, some improvements by the scholarly community, once the material became generally accessible, were of course to be expected, as Doresse himself had to acknowledge in 1984.355

My first inventory reflects, in a few errors and imprecisions, the difficult conditions under which I was obliged to do it.

Once Puech secured more information from Doresse, he also came to recognize its limitations, and was embarrassed that he had published Doresse’s inventory, as if it were his own, without himself having been able to verify it:356

Thus I had occasion to ascertain the ignorances or the carelessness of Doresse. Whether it has to do with Hermetism, or with what he takes to be that, with titles arbitrarily given to certain writings, with the numbering of the content of this or that collection, his preliminary report on the ensemble of the discovery contains inexactitudes, errors, gratuitous statements. It has to be begun again, and I regret having been obliged, due to the lack of any means

---

355 Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, in the 1984 reprint, an unpaginated “avertissement au Lecteur (avril 1984)”: 

Mon premier inventaire reflète, par quelques erreurs et imprécisions, les conditions difficiles dans lesquelles j’ai dû le faire.

356 29 ix 52: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

J’ai eu ainsi l’occasion de constater les ignorances ou l’incurie de Doresse. Qu’il s’agisse de l’hermétisme ou de ce qu’il prend pour tel, des titres arbitrairement donnés à certains écrits, de dénombrement du contenu de tel ou tel recueil, son rapport préliminaire sur l’ensemble de la découverte renferme des inexactitudes, des erreurs, des affirmations gratuites. Il est à reprendre, et je regrette d’avoir dû, faute de moyens de contrôle, m’y fier et en reproduire les grandes lignes dans ma contribution aux Mélanges Crum.
of control, to have put my trust in it, and to have reproduced its main lines in my contribution to the Crum Festschrift.\textsuperscript{357}

It is of course correct that Puech should either have made clear that this was Doresse's inventory, or deferred (indeed indefinitely) the publication of his own inventory until he was able to verify that of Doresse.

It is very difficult to give an appropriate assessment of Doresse's inventory of 1948. He had to go afternoon after afternoon to the antiquities shop of Tano, who would take from the valise a codex for Doresse to study enough to jot down hurried notes, recording titles and translating segments of text, though he was not permitted to make transcriptions. His procedure must have been simply to open the leather cover and go through the codex leaf by leaf, fragment by fragment, turning pages carefully so as not to damage the very fragile papyrus. Some breakage must inevitably have taken place, which was unintentionally conceded in his reporting of how very fragile the papyrus actually was, preventing more detailed (mis)handling. He was also permitted to photograph a few leaves in the home of Mlle Dattari. But once the fragmentary leaves had subsequently been reassembled and conjugate leaves joined together between panes of plexiglass, and then photographs of these restored leaves published in \textit{The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices} (1972–1977) and translated in \textit{The Nag Hammadi Library in English} (1977) and elsewhere (see Chapter 11, Part 8 below), it was much easier to work through the codices and improve on Doresse's inventory. But, in all fairness, we should be grateful to Doresse for doing the best he could under the circumstances a generation earlier. It was his inventory, inaccurate though it was, that inspired a generation of more highly qualified young scholars to make the Nag Hammadi Codices fully available.

\textit{Public Announcements of the Tano-Dattari Collection}

The existence of the Tano-Dattari collection was broken to the press on 10 June 1949 in a sensational news release prepared by Doresse before leaving Egypt on 5 June 1949:\textsuperscript{358}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{358} 10 vi 49: \textit{La Bourse Égyptienne}, “Les Découvertes Archéologiques: Le gouvernement égyptien acquiert des papyrus d’une importance considérable”:

\begin{quote}
L’acquisition de ces précieux documents par le gouvernement égyptien est en cours.
Selon les spécialistes consultés, il s’agit d’une des plus extraordinaires découvertes
\end{quote}
\end{flushright}
The acquisition of these precious documents by the Egyptian government is on track.

According to the specialists consulted, it has to do with one of the most extraordinary discoveries reserved until the present by the soil of Egypt, surpassing in scientific interest such spectacular discoveries as the tomb of Tut-Ankh-Amon. It restores suddenly almost all of a religious literature lost until now, whose importance is considerable for the history of the end of oriental paganism and the beginnings of Christianity.

The announcement to the French Academy took place on 17 June 1949.\textsuperscript{359} It was presented by Doresse alone, since Puech in advance disassociated himself completely from what Doresse might say.\textsuperscript{360}

I receive just now your pneumatique letter. Not knowing whether you make your communication tomorrow in your name alone or in our name, I would be grateful if you would come by my place tomorrow morning, Friday, toward 10 AM, or, better, at the beginning of the afternoon, around 2 PM (I have an appointment at 11 AM) I would at least like to glance at your report, and in case it would contain propositions or hypotheses that the Parisian or regional press ascribe to you, I would ask you to make clear at the Institute that you make these suggestions on your own responsibility. Not knowing anything of the content of the documents, I would not want to see my name pronounced on the occasion of suppositions so risky or adventurous.


\textsuperscript{360} 16 vi 49: Pneumatique from Puech to Doresse:

Je reçois à l’instant votre pneu. Ignorant si vous faites votre communication de demain en votre nom seul ou en notre nom, je vous serais reconnaissant de passer chez-moi demain matin vendredi, vers les dix heures ou, tout au mieux, au début de l’après-midi, aux environs de quatorze heures (j’ai un rendez-vous à onze heures du matin). Je voudrais au moins jeter un coup d’œil sur votre rapport, et au cas où il renfermerait les propositions ou hypothèses que vous prête la presse parisienne ou régionale, je vous demanderais de bien spécifier à l’Institut que vous prenez ces propos sous votre propre responsabilité. Ne connaissant rien du contenu des documents, je ne voudrais pas voir mon nom prononcé à l’occasion de suppositions aussi hardies ou aventureuses.
In distinction from the report of the preceding year, it was published under Doresse’s name alone. But Puech did of course talk of it with colleagues.\footnote{The report by Oscar Cullmann, “Die neuesten Papyrusfunde von Origenestexten und gnostischen Schriften,” \textit{ThZ} 5 (1949): 153–157, is based on information from Puech, who lectured in Basel at the time, on which occasion Cullmann introduced me to him.} Canon L.Th. Lefort presented it with due respect on Doresse’s behalf to the Royal Belgian Academy on 2 August 1949.\footnote{Jean Doresse, “Une bibliothèque gnostique copte découverte en Haute-Égypte,” \textit{BAB.L}, 5\textsuperscript{e} Série, 35 (1949), 422 (for the listing of it among the “Communications”), 435–449 (for the text itself). This is a considerably enlarged version of what was published by the French Academy. See already L.Th. Lefort, “Communication sur la découverte en Haute-Égypte de nombreux manuscrits,” \textit{BAB.L}, 5\textsuperscript{e} Série, 34 (1948), 100–102.}

A report by Togo Mina at the \textit{Institut d’Égypte} had been planned, but due to his failing health did not take place:\footnote{1950: John Doresse, “Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chénoboskion) comprennent deux lots différent posant des problèmes distincts” (see Part 2 above).}

The discovery was immediately announced, first by a communication to the \textit{Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres} (which would have been able to have as a parallel a communication by Togo Mina at the \textit{Institut d’Égypte}, if he had not been already too ill) ...

\textbf{Purchase Negotiations with Maria Dattari}

All of this publicity, while good for Doresse’s status, would of course raise the asking price for the codices in the Tano-Dattari collection, but might also encourage the Egyptian government to make the acquisition. A Paris newspaper correspondent had, prior to the public announcement, published figures as to the negotiations between Maria Dattari and the Egyptian government for the purchase of the Tano-Dattari collection:\footnote{24 iv 49: \textit{The Manchester Guardian}.}

It is understood the Egyptian Government will purchase all the 850 pages of Coptic Gnostic papyri found at Nag Hammadi by peasants in 1946 and not yet in its possession (it acquired one volume two and a half years ago) for 60,000 £. They were originally offered by the present owner at 100,000 £, but Mr. Togo Mina, the director of the Coptic Museum, has been carrying on the negotiations with skill and energy and has secured a reduction.

Then, the day after Doresse’s Paris presentation was published in the Paris newspaper \textit{Le Monde}, an interview with Aly Ayoub, the Egyptian Minister of Public Instruction, was published in Cairo as follows:\footnote{20 vi 1949: \textit{Le Journal d’Égypte}, “À propos de la découverte des papyrus coptes gnostiques: Le ministère de l’Instruction Publique offre 40,000 livres pour leur acquisition”:

\textit{Le Journal d’Égypte}, “À propos de la découverte des papyrus coptes gnostiques: Le ministère de l’Instruction Publique offre 40,000 livres pour leur acquisition”:}
“It became known that the other tomes, ten in number, were in the possession of an Italian lady living in Egypt, whose father had organized the museum of ancient coins of the late King Fouad. But when the ministry wished to acquire them, the lady demanded the amount of 70,000 L, and, after long discussions, she agreed to reduce this figure to 60,000 L. A commission of archaeologists was unanimous in recommending the purchase of this inestimable work.”

“I personally went to the home of this lady and succeeded in convincing her that the acquisition of this work is of public interest, and that as a result she should not exaggerate the price asked. I offered her the amount of 40,000 L.”

The article concluded:

“Let us add that if the lady accepts this last offer, the minister of Public Instruction will ask the Council of Ministers to make available the necessary credits.”

Dattari had not accepted this reduced offer. Later Doresse listed 50,000 £È as the amount Ali Ayoub was willing to appropriate, which Doresse thought Dattari would have accepted. Yet before the transaction was completed, there was a change in the Egyptian government, which could only suspend any resumption of negotiations until after the summer vacations.

When autumn came, Puech expressed his renewed concern over the suspended negotiations:

The issue of the negotiations relative to the purchase of the papyri of Nag-Hammadi preoccupies me more than ever. The news that I received from

“Il apparut que les autres tomes, au nombre de dix, se trouvaient en possession d’une dame italienne habitant l’Égypte, dont le père avait organisé le musée de monnaies anciennes de feu le Roi Fouad. Mais lorsque le ministère voulut les acquérir, la dame exigea la somme de 70 mille livres et, après de longues discussions, elle accepta de réduire ce chiffre à 60 mille livres. Une commission d’archéologues fut unanime à recommander l’achat de cet ouvrage inestimable.”

“Je me suis personnellement rendu chez cette dame et réussis à la convaincre que l’acquisition de cet ouvrage est d’intérêt public et que, par suite, elle ne doit pas exagérer le prix demandé. Je lui ai offert la somme de 40 mille livres.”

“Ajoutons que si la dame accepte cette dernière offre, le ministre de l’Instruction Publique demandera au Conseil des Ministres l’ouverture du crédit nécessaire.”

Doresse, Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte, 140; The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 123; The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts, 95.

19x49: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

L’issue des négociations relatives à l’achat des papyrus de Nag-Hammadi me préoccupe plus que jamais. Les nouvelles que j’ai reçues d’Égypte vers la mi-août étaient franchement mauvaise; en avez-vous de meilleures ou de plus sûres?
Egypt toward the middle of August were frankly bad. Have you better or more certain news?

This was followed in October 1949 by the death of Togo Mina of diabetes, an affliction that had hindered his pursuing the matter as actively as otherwise he might have.\textsuperscript{368} Doresse wrote Puech of this as a further justification for his own indispensable rôle.\textsuperscript{369}

We have just learned the sad news of the death of Togo Mina. One had to expect it for some time, since, in the last months, he could hardly stand upright. He leaves a family that, without him, will find it difficult to live. He also leaves us the matter of the Gnostic texts, fortunately entered into in such a way that one can no longer refuse their acquisition. It is fortunate that one succeeded in announcing the discovery already last June! The Egyptian Ministry has just been revised, and, if one handles it in time, the acquisition should no longer be delayed.

Doresse’s main opponent in Paris, allied with Puech, was Lacau (see Part 2 above), whose arrival in Cairo at this juncture was hence feared by Doresse. This is reflected in Doresse’s comment to Puech on his return to Cairo in November 1949:\textsuperscript{370}

The acquisition of the volumes should have priority over everything, and I hope that it will be in good progress when Lacau arrives in Egypt. One now knows, in effect, that he is at the origin of the difficulties that certain Egyptians caused us last year. He has already committed some inopportune indiscretions, as to the purpose of my present mission, and I assume that his presence here will lead to new complications.

\textsuperscript{368} 19 x 74: The memorandum from Doresse to John Dart.
\textsuperscript{369} 4 xi 49: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Nous venons d’apprendre la triste nouvelle de la mort de Togo MINA. Il fallait depuis longtemps s’y attendre car, dans les derniers mois, il tenait à peine debout. Il laisse une famille qui, sans lui, aura bien du mal à vivre. Il nous laisse aussi l’affaire des textes gnostiques, heureusement engagée de telle façon qu’on ne puisse plus en refuser l’acquisition. Il est heureux que l’on ait réussi à annoncer la découverte dès juin dernier! Le ministère égyptien vient d’être remanié et, si l’on s’y prend à temps, l’acquisition ne doit plus tarder.

\textsuperscript{370} 4 xii 48: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

L’acquisition des volumes doit passer avant tout et je souhaite qu’elle soit en bonne voie lorsque M. Lacau va arriver en Égypte. On sait en effet maintenant qu’il est à l’origine des difficultés que nous ont causé l’an passé certains Égyptiens. Il a déjà commis quelques indiscretions inopportunes sur le but de ma mission actuelle et je présume que sa présence ici amènera de nouvelles complications.
Doresse wrote Puech after a month in Egypt about the sluggishness of the procedures:\footnote{22 xii 49: Letter from Doresse to Puech:}

We arrived a month ago, and from the beginning I have resumed the matter of the Gnostic texts, which here had almost fallen into forgetfulness since the death of Togo. The task will not be easy, for we now have to count on the opposition of Wiet, who tries to make the negotiations drag. Before Drioton’s return to Cairo, Wiet began by hastening the provisional nomination, as head of the Coptic Museum, of a subordinate of Togo, with whom one cannot do anything at all, and whom one must still support for many months. ... The Egyptian University has just invited Prof. Till to give courses, and, once he is here, he can be a dangerous competitor. Fortunately, we already have associated him with the editing of the first volume, which permits us to have some control over him. ...

On the Egyptian side, the news would be very good, on the other hand; one considers the purchase as decided, and one only awaits the competent personages to concern themselves with it again. ... It seems that the preceding Minister of Education, who had accepted the purchase of the papyri for 40,000 £, has decided to campaign for the success of that. The opposition of Wiet is hence completely unjustifiable. Lacau, whose friend he is, would be involved in that?

Since Puech did not respond, Doresse wrote again a few months later, this time from Luxor:\footnote{12 iii 50: Letter from Doresse to Puech:}

\footnotetext[371]{22 xii 49: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Nous sommes arrivés il y a un mois et j’ai dès le début repris l’affaire des textes gnostiques qui était ici presque tombée dans l’oubli depuis la mort de Togo. La tâche ne sera pas facile car nous avons à compter maintenant avec l’opposition de M. Wiet qui essaie de faire traîner les négociations. Avant le retour au Caire de M. Drioton, M. Wiet a commencé par hâter la nomination provisoire, à la tête du Musée Copte, d’un subordonné de Togo dont on ne peut absolument rien faire et qu’il faudra supporter encore pendant de longs mois. ... l’Université Égyptienne vient d’inviter le Professeur Till à faire des cours, et il peut être, une fois sur place, un concurrent dangereux; heureusement nous l’avons déjà associé à l’édition du premier volume, ce qui nous permet d’avoir sur lui quelque contrôle. ...

Du côté égyptien, les nouvelles seraient par contre fort bonnes; on considère l’achat comme décidé et l’on attend seulement que les personnages compétents s’en occupent de nouveau. ... il semble que le précédent ministre de l’Éducation, qui avait accepté l’achat des papyrus pour 40,000 £, soit décidé à faire campagne pour la réussite de cela. L’opposition de Wiet est donc tout à fait injustifiable. Lacau, dont il est l’ami, serait-il là dessous?

\footnotetext[372]{12 iii 50: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

J’espère que, seules, les nombreuses occupations que vous avez dû avoir cet hiver vous ont empêché de répondre à la lettre dans laquelle je vous exposais, il y a bientôt
I hope that it is only the numerous occupations that you have had to have this winter that have prevented you from replying to the letter in which I laid out for you, almost three months ago, our first activities. The complications caused by the death of Togo Mina have been many. Other difficulties introduced by personages that you know [Lacau] have been added. We have regretted a great deal that you have not come to Cairo, the University having judged it good, incidentally, to invite Prof. Till to give a series of courses—among others on the Gnostic texts. Hence we have not only had friends. In any case, Till brought to me in Cairo the complete text of the papyrus of Berlin, and we are going, in a few days, to begin to sharpen together the critical edition of the Secret Book of John [The Apocryphon of John] and the Wisdom of Jesus.

In spite of that, the purchase of the papyri is still not completed, though it is on a good track, and the editing committee has not yet been officially reorganized—even for the first volume of the Coptic Museum. Nonetheless everything should proceed rapidly. His Excellency the Minister would accept, if things delay on the side of finances, to confiscate the documents, and then to indemnify the owner. However Drioton thinks that it is not necessary to move too rapidly. In any case, in a few weeks, I will have the seals removed from the valise of the manuscripts, to verify their state of conservation.

There is still no Director of the Coptic Museum, though one has charged the previous General Secretary of the Service des Antiquités (Muslim!), for an unlimited duration, with the administrative direction. No doubt one will not name a real Director.

trois mois, nos premiers travaux. Les complications causées par la mort de Togo Mina ont été multiples. D’autres difficultés entretenues par des personnages que vous connaissez, s’y sont ajoutées. Nous avons beaucoup regretté que vous ne soyez pas venue au Caire, l’Université ayant jugé bon, par ailleurs, d’inviter le Prof. Till à faire une série de cours—entre autres sur des textes gnostiques. Nous n’avons donc pas que des amis. En tout cas, Till m’a apporté au Caire le texte complet du papyrus de Berlin et nous allons, dans quelques jours, commencer à mettre au point ensemble l’édition critique du Livre secret de Jean et de la Sagesse de Jésus.

Malgré cela l’achat des papyri n’est pas encore terminé, bien qu’en bonne voie, et le comité d’édition n’est pas encore officiellement réorganisé—même pour le premier volume du Musée Copte. Cependant tout doit aller rapidement. S. Exc. Le Ministre accepterait, si les choses tardent du côté finances, de confisquer les documents et d’indemniser ensuite la propriétaire. Mr. Drioton pense cependant qu’il ne faut pas aller trop vite. En tout cas, dans quelques semaines, je ferai enlever les scellés de la valise aux manuscrits pour vérifier leur état de conservation.

Il n’a toujours pas de Directeur du Musée Copte, bien que l’on ait chargé l’ancien Secrétaire Général du Service des Antiquités (musulman!), pour une durée illimitée, de la direction administrative. On ne nommera sans doute pas de directeur véritable.
Puech then wrote Doresse about Puech's essay in the Crum *Festschrift*, in which Doresse's inventory had in large part been used, as well as inquiring about the status of the acquisition of the Togo-Dattari collection, and then complaining about the invitation for Till, rather than Puech, to lecture in Cairo.\footnote{13 iv 50: Letter from Puech to Doresse:}

\begin{quote}
J'ayais à peine achevé quelques jours auparavant ma contribution au *Mélanges W. Crum*. Je croyais, au début, que celle-ci se réduirait à une quinzaine de pages et serait simplement un résumé et une mise au point des informations que l'on peut avoir à l'heure actuelle touchant la découverte de Nag-Hammadi, et, tout au plus, une synthèse des premiers résultats auxquels la trouvaille a donné lieu. En cours de route, cependant, j'ai été amené à préciser et à développer considérablement les hypothèses relatives à l'identification des écrits retrouvés et de leur auteurs ou possesseurs (l'une des mes conférences de cette année aux Hautes Études porte sur un tel sujet et m'a déjà permis de parvenir à des constatations ou à des recoupements de grand intérêt). Aussi, au bout du compte, mon manuscrit est-il devenu un gros mémoire de quatre-vingts pages, actuellement à l'impression. J'avoue que j'ai mis le point final avec un profond sentiment de soulagement. …

Rassurez-moi, aussi sur le sort des volumes gnostiques dont l'acquisition reste encore en suspens. La lenteur des négociations, l'impression (fausse, je l'espère malgré tout) qu'elles ont abouti à une impasse me font perdre à peu près toute confiance. Je ne puis néanmoins me résigner à envisager un échec, qui serait une trop grave catastrophe. D'autre part, même au cas où le lot serait acheté un de ces jours par le Gouvernement égyptien, aurez-vous le temps de tout photographier avant votre départ? Faites tous, je vous le demande instamment, pour que l'on arrive au plus tôt à une solution. Est-il besoin de faire appuyer les démarches auprès de S.E. Taha Hussein? Je puis faire agir en ce sens un de ses amis, qui est aussi le mien. Pressez également la formation du Comité franco-égyptien de publication, afin de ne pas être privés du dépouillement au moment de l'acquisition. De toute façon, tenez-moi au courant: j'informerai régulièrement MM. Dussaud, Merlin et d'autres membres de l'Institut ou du Comité des Fouilles, qui commencent, eux aussi, à s'inquiéter. Les mois qui viennent risquent d'être décisifs pour votre avenir et celui de la découverte, qui lui est lié. À quand le mot de vous qui m'annonce la bonne nouvelle et dissipera mon pessimisme?

L'avis est ici que vous devez vous défiar quelque peu de Till. Sa présence au Caire a quelque chose d'insolite et d'assez inquiétant. À plus d'un égard. Vous savez, entre autres, que l'Université du Caire avait l'intention d'inviter deux directeurs d'études de l'École des Hautes Études—en l'espèce, Vignaux, sans doute, et moi-même—à faire une série de conférences sur la philosophie médiévale et sur l'histoire du gnosticisme et du manichéisme. En fait, depuis juillet dernier, il n'a plus été soufflé mot de ce projet, qui m'avait cependant été soumis par un intermédiaire autorisé. On a fait appel, au contraire, à Patronnier de Gandillac (ce qui peut, à la rigueur, se justifier), mais aussi, et précisément pour parler de la Gnoèse, à Till. En soi, mais également à la lumière d'autres faits que je ne puis vous confier, la chose paraît étrange. Tentez sur place une enquête discrète: j'en fais faire une autre, par une voie différente et quelque peu officielle. Il importerait de s'expliquer exactement les raisons de la venue de Till en Égypte. Voyez, en particulier, si sa présence ne constitue pas un risque pour le sort
I had hardly finished, a few days before, my contribution to the Festschrift for W. Crum. I believed, at the beginning, that this would reduce itself to some fifteen pages and would simply be a résumé, and a focusing of the information that one can have at the present time with regard to the discovery of Nag-Hammadi, and, at most, a synthesis of the first results that the discovery had made possible. Along the way, however, I have been led to clarify and develop considerably the hypotheses relative to the identification of the rediscovered texts and their authors or owners. (One of my conferences this year at the [École Pratique des] Hautes Études has to do with such a topic, and has already permitted me to reach verifications or revisions of great interest.) Also, at the final count, my manuscript has become a large memorandum of eighty pages, at present at the printers. I admit that I have finalized it with a profound feeling of relief. ...

Reassure me also as to the fate of the Gnostic volumes whose acquisition still remains in suspense. The slowness of the negotiations, the impression (false, I hope, in spite of everything) that they have reached an impasse, makes me lose almost all confidence. Nevertheless, I cannot resign myself to envisaging a check, which would be too grave a catastrophe. On the other hand, even in case the lot would be purchased one of these days by the Egyptian Government, would you have the time to photograph everything before your departure? Do everything, I ask urgently of you, so that one arrives as soon as possible at a solution. Is it necessary to have the steps supported with H[is] E[xcellency] Taha Hussein? In this sense I can activate one of his friends who is also my friend. Press equally for the formation of the French-Egyptian Committee of Publication, so as not to be taken unprepared at the moment of the acquisition. In any case, keep me up to date. I will inform regularly Messrs Dussaud, Merlin and other members of the Institute or of the Committee of Excavations, who begin, they too, to be disturbed. The months that come risk being decisive for your future and that of the discovery, which is tied to it. When will the word come from you that will announce to me the good news and dissipate my pessimism?

The view here is that you should beware somewhat of Till. His presence in Cairo has a bit of the unusual, and is rather disturbing, in more than one regard. You know, among other things, that the University of Cairo had the intention of inviting two Directors of Study of the École [Pratique] des Hautes Études—in the case in point, Vignaux, doubtless, and myself—to give a series of conferences on medieval philosophy and on the history of Gnosticism and Manichaeanism. In fact, since last July, no word has been breathed about this project, which had nonetheless been submitted to me by an authorized intermediary. One has to the contrary appealed to Patronnier de Gandillac (which can, if absolutely necessary, be justified), but also, and to speak de la découverte de Nag-Hammadi. Il faut manoeuvrer avec prudence, mais ne pas se laisser manoeuvrer par Till.
precisely on Gnosticism, to Till. In itself, but equally in the light of other facts that I cannot confide to you, the thing seems strange. Make a discrete inquiry on the spot. I will have another made, by a different path and somewhat official. It would be relevant to explain to oneself precisely the reasons for the coming of Till to Egypt. See, in particular, if his presence does not constitute a risk for the fate of the discovery of Nag-Hammadi. It is necessary to maneuver with prudence, but not to let oneself be maneuvered by Till.

Puech’s letter concluded with the hope that this time Doresse would come back with the mission achieved.\footnote{13 iv 50: Letter from Puech to Doresse:}

\begin{quote}
Mettons-nous vivement au travail d’édition et à l’étude attentive des textes eux-mêmes. Que nous en finissions, une fois pour toutes, avec les préambles, les promesses, le vague, le provisoire, les conjectures plus ou moins fragiles! Et, pour cela, revenez-nous vite, porteur des photographies de tous les manuscrits enfin acquis, déposés en lieu sûr!
\end{quote}

Yet when Doresse returned to France on 11 June 1950, he was again without the photographs. He could only write Puech with his usual reassurances that soon all would be well, pointing out that Togo Mina had put Doresse in charge before Togo Mina’s death, and playing down the relevance of Till, rather than Puech, having been invited to lecture at the Egyptian University.\footnote{19 vi 50: Letter from Doresse to Puech:}

\begin{quote}
Les derniers temps ont été occupés par l’affaire des papyrus qui se terminera, espérons-le, en octobre. ...

Nous avons fait porter tous nos efforts, également, sur l’organisation officielle de l’édition du premier manuscrit. La mort de Togo Mina avait tout laissé en suspens. On a retrouvé dans les dossiers du Musée Copte un projet (ci-joint) établi en juin 1949. Comme tous les points en ont été, à diverses occasions, reconnus et approuvés par les comités du Musée, on doit de ce fait le considérer comme valable, – à part la question du remplacement de Togo Mina dont Mr. Drioton et moi nous partageons actuellement le rôle. Naturellement ces conditions ne concernent en rien les nouveaux documents dont l’édition ne peut être organisée tant qu’ils ne seront pas achetés. Leur entrée au Musée amènera sans doute à modifier certains points du statut établi pour le premier manuscrit. ...

Du côté de Till, son voyage en Égypte était prévu depuis un certain temps et n’avait rien à voir avec l’affaire des papyrus. Ce voyage n’a en tout cas apporté aucune modification
The most recent times have been occupied by the affair of the papyri, which will be terminated, let us hope, in October. ...

We have made all our efforts apply equally to the official organization of the edition of the first manuscript [Codex III]. The death of Togo Mina had left everything in suspense. One found in the files of the Coptic Museum a project (appended) established in June 1949. Since all its points have been, on diverse occasions, recognized and approved by the committees of the Museum, one can hence consider it as valid—other than the question of the replacement of Togo Mina, whose rôle Drioton and I share at present. Naturally these conditions do not concern in any way the new documents, whose edition cannot be organized as long as they are not purchased. Their entry into the Museum will no doubt lead to modifying certain points of the statute established for the first manuscript. ...

With regard to Till, his trip to Egypt had been anticipated for some time and had nothing to do with the affair of the papyri. In any case, this trip has not brought any modification on the part of Till in the committee of edition, a part that remains just as Togo Mina had arranged it as early as 1948. His presence in Cairo has in any case permitted putting on the move definitively the critical edition of the Secret Book of John [The Apocryphon of John] and the Wisdom of Jesus, both in the edition of Cairo and in that of Berlin.

I have shared your anxiety with Bernard Guyon [of the Egyptian University]. He has been a bit surprised to learn of the invitation that had been addressed to you and which he had never heard mentioned. He affirmed to me that he would have supported this invitation with pleasure if there had been a question of it, but that your name was never mentioned at any of the committees of the University, which alone are competent for that, and of which he himself is a member. Neither had Drioton heard anything said on this topic.

This tends to suggest that Puech had envisaged coming to lecture in Cairo, but that this plan had not gotten support at high enough levels to have been discussed at the Egyptian University itself.
The 'statute' Doresse appended to his letter, though he implicitly ascribed it to Togo Mina (‘found in the files of the Coptic Museum,’ ‘found in the papers of Togo Mina’), was no doubt actually composed by Doresse himself, who already at the time it was dated (June 1949) was writing for the physically incapacitated Togo Mina what needed to be recorded. It read as follows:376

The Committee charged with editing the Gnostic papyrus of the Coptic Museum is composed of the following: Togo Mina, Director; Jean Doresse, Secretary; H.C. Puech, Director of Studies at the École [Pratique] des Hautes Études of Paris; Prof. Dr. Walter Till of Vienna; Canon Draguet, Director of the Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium of Louvain.

The first goal of the editors should be to furnish a critical edition accompanied by a translation and summary notes. The texts will be published in the C.S.C. O. of Louvain, where they will form a series bearing equally the imprint of the Coptic Museum.

Other than as an exception, no member of the committee of edition will be able to publish, or communicate to third parties, in the form of a text or of a translation, even if only partial, any of the texts that will be confided to him.

Cairo, June 1949

To this is appended Doresse’s updating of the statute:377

376 19 vi 50: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Le comité chargé de l’édition du papyrus gnostique du Musée Copte est composé comme suit: Mr Togo MINA, Directeur; Mr Jean DORESSE, Secrétaire; Mr. H.C. PUECH, Directeur d’Études à l’École des Hautes Études de Paris; Mr. le Professeur Dr. Walter TILL de Vienne; Mr. le Chanoine DRAGUET, Directeur du Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, de Louvain.

Le premier but des éditeurs devra être de fournir une édition critique accompagnée d’une traduction et de notes sommaires. Les textes seront publiés dans le CSCO de Louvain où ils formeront une série portant également la marque du Musée Copte.

Sauf cas exceptionnel, aucun membre du comité d’édition ne pourra publier, ni communiquer à des tiers, sous forme de texte ou de traduction même partielle, aucun des textes qui lui auront été confiés.

Le Caire, juin 1949.

377 19 vi 50: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Par suite de la mort de Mr. Togo Mina en octobre dernier, la présidence du Comité d’édition a été confiée à Mr. Ét. Drioton, Directeur Général du Service des Antiquités; la direction du comité et la poursuite du travail commencé par Mr. Togo Mina seront assurés par Mr. Jean Doresse.

Le Professeur Dr. Walter Till a été autorisé par l’Académie Allemande à communiquer,
Following upon the death of Togo Mina last October, the presidency of the Committee of Edition has been entrusted to Étienne Drioton, General Director of the Service des Antiquités; the directing of the Committee and the continuation of the work begun by Togo Mina will be assured by Jean Doresse.

Prof. Dr. Walter Till has been authorized by the German Academy to communicate, for the edition of Cairo, the text of Berlin, which can be utilized uniquely for the establishment of a complete critical edition of the *Apocryphon Johannis* and of the *Wisdom of Jesus*. He receives in return the authorization to use, to restore the lacunae and to establish the translation of the papyrus of Berlin, the parallel texts that figure in the manuscript of Cairo.

Puech was of course not in agreement with this document, though it was ruled by Doresse to be authoritative. He wrote Doresse that it should not be considered valid:

> An interview between us is, I repeat, urgent and indispensable. In your interest, most of all. I do not need long news reports concerning the fate of the discovery of Nag-Hammadi, having been kept up to date by various good sources. But it would be convenient for us to reach agreement on the terms of the ‘conventions,’ whose text you have deferred too long in submitting to me, and whose tenor seems to me, at places, unacceptable. Besides, as long as a regular Committee of Publication has not been constituted, after approval by Taha Hussein, and an accord has not been reached among its potential members, duly informed and consulted, there is no way that such papers could have any value at all.

Doresse’s report on his third mission of 1949–1950 had described this disagreement, though Doresse presented it as Puech’s disagreement with Togo Mina, rather than with Doresse himself:

---

> pour l’édition du Caire le texte de Berlin qui pourra être utilisé uniquement pour l’établissement d’une édition critique complète de l’*Apocryphon Johannis* et de la *Sagesse de Jésus*. Il reçoit en retour l’autorisation d’utiliser, pour restituer les lacunes et établir la traduction du papyrus de Berlin, les textes parallèles figurant dans le manuscrit du Caire.

378 29 vi 50: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

> Un entretien entre nous est, je vous le répète, urgent et indispensable. Dans votre intérêt, avant tout. Je n’ai pas besoin de longues nouvelles touchant le sort de la trouvaille de Nag-Hammadi, ayant été tenu au courant par diverses bonnes sources. Mais il conviendrait de nous entendre sur les termes des ‘conventions’ dont vous avez trop différé de me soumettre le texte et dont la teneur me paraît, par endroits, inacceptable. D’ailleurs, tant qu’un comité régulier de publication n’aura pas été constitué, après approbation de M. Taha Hussein, et qu’un accord ne se sera pas établi entre ses membres éventuels, dûment informés et consultés, de tels papiers ne sauraient avoir une valeur quelconque.

1949–1950: The death of Togo Mina in October 1949 should, by leaving the Coptic Museum without a Director, impede resuming the purchase formalities, and even put in question the conditions of the edition that we had obtained for the first manuscript, and that had never been formalized in an official way, a certain disagreement having surfaced from the beginning between Togo Mina and H.C. Puech. The mission of 1949–1950 should hence first obtain the confirmation of the conditions for editing already envisaged by Togo Mina, conditions particularly important to firm up, since they would probably be useful in what followed for the twelve other collections of the same discovery. On the other hand it was necessary to push for the resumption of the negotiations entered into for the purchase of these latter documents. On the first point, a draft of a statute for the edition, found in the papers of Togo Mina and corresponding precisely to what he had expressed to various committees of the Museum, was recognized as valid both by the Egyptian authorities (including Drioton) and by the interested editors, except for H.C. Puech, who asked and still asks for additional advantages. (This statute anticipates in effect that the texts communicated to the editors cannot be utilized by them for personal publications before they achieve the publication itself of the texts in question.)

Much of this would be unacceptable to Puech: The publication outside of France at the Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium in Belgium, where Puech’s contribution of an extensive commentary could not be included; the inability for Puech to use the contents, before the official edition appeared, in his courses and publications, or to share them with others, such as Gilles Quispel; and even, in the updating of the statute, the directorship rôle given to Doresse (over Puech!).


The New Director Dr. Pahor Labib

Pahor Labib, born on 19 September 1905 in Ein Shams near Cairo, received the D. Phil. in Egyptology from the Humboldt University in Berlin in November 1934. He was named Director of the Coptic Museum by the new Minister of Education Taha Hussein in January 1951, and held this position for fifteen years until his retirement on 19 September 1965. When his

---

380 28 iii 51: Letter from Doresse to Schaeffer. See also Marianne Doresse, Fourth Mission of Jean Doresse in Egypt (Part 2 above).

protégé Victor Girgis succeeded Raouf Habib as Director in 1971, Pahor Labib resumed control as the power behind the throne.

The death of Togo Mina in October 1949 brought to an end Doresse’s dominant rôle at the Coptic Museum. Togo Mina’s replacement by Pahor Labib marked a transition from French to German as the most important foreign language there.

Yet Doresse wrote Puech optimistically of the new German-oriented Director:382

First of all, H[is] E[xcellency] Taha Hussein has finally resolved the question of the Coptic Museum. One named as Director Dr. Pahor Labib, Instructor at the University. Of German culture, he seems well disposed with regard to us,383 and I hope that he will understand sufficiently the scientific necessities of the work in progress.

Doresse could not speak German, whereas Pahor Labib could speak German well, though French hardly at all. This did cause the French concern:384

... Dr. Pahor Labib, to whom I have written more than a month and a half ago, and who still has not responded to me, perhaps because he is not capable of writing correctly in English or in French.

The transition was made even more awkward by the shift from Ali Ayoub to Taha Hussein as the Minister of Education and Instruction also in 1951. For Ali Ayoub had negotiated with Maria Dattari a purchase price in the tens of thousands Pounds, whereas Taha Hussein went about nationalizing the Tano collection, presupposing a much smaller indemnification.


382 16 iii 51: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Tout d’abord, S.E. Taha Hussein a enfin réglé la question du Musée Copte. On a nommé comme directeur le Dr. Pahor LABIB, Chargé de Cours à l’Université; de culture allemande, celui-ci semble bien disposé à notre égard et j’espère qu’il comprendra suffisamment les nécessités scientifiques du travail en cours.


384 31 vii 51: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

... Dr. Pahor LABIB, auquel j’ai écrit il y a plus d’un mois et demi et qui ne m’a toujours pas répondu, peut-être parce qu’il n’est pas capable d’écrire correctement en anglais ou en français.

Dr. Pahor Labib, Director of the Museum, at the time quite intelligently submitted the manuscripts to Dr. Taha Hussein, then Minister of Education and Instruction (1951), who decided immediately, given their exceptional interest, to modify the law relative to the preservation of antiquities: Manuscripts, up until then susceptible to being exported from the country, were assimilated to antiquities and became national property.

This new law, making a nationalization of the codices in effect a *fait accompli*, was not fully implemented until the Tano-Dattari collection was requisitioned for the Coptic Museum and the resultant legal proceedings resolved.

*The Fourth Mission of Doresse in Egypt 1950–1951*

Doresse reported from Cairo to Schaeffer, Secretary of the Commission of Archaeological Excavations that provided the funding for Doresse’s missions to Egypt.\footnote{28 iii 51: Letter from Doresse to Schaeffer:}

Simultaneously, H[is] E[xcellency] Taha Hussein again took personally in hand the affair of the papyri. Pursuant upon a move by the owner [feminine] of the documents (the second since November), H[is] E[xcellency] demanded the deposition of the manuscripts in the hands of Ét[ienne] Drioton to assure their preservation. Drioton and I then proceeded to a new examination of the manuscripts and have written a report concluding that it

\footnote{Simultanément, S.E. Taha Hussein reprenait personnellement en mains l’affaire des papyrus. A la suite d’une démarche de la propriétaire des documents (la seconde depuis novembre), S E demanda le dépôt des manuscrits dans les mains de M. Ét. Drioton pour assurer leur préservation. M. Drioton et moi—avons alors procédé à un nouvel examen des manuscrits et avons rédigé un rapport concluant qu’il était nécessaire de procéder à leur mise en état de conservation le plus rapidement possible, et pour cela de hâter les formalités d’achat. Le rapport en question approuvé par le conseil du Musée Copte et transmis au ministre: S E Taha Hussein s’est engagé à terminer l’achat dans un délai de deux mois. C’était il y a quatre semaines, mais il faudra sans doute compter encore avec quelques remous, car on a l’intention de fixer arbitrairement le prix des papyrus à un taux assez bas, ce qui équivaudra à une confiscation.}
was necessary to proceed in putting them in a state of conservation as rapidly as possible, and for that purpose to hasten the formalities of the purchase. Once the report in question is approved by the Council of the Coptic Museum and transmitted to the minister, His Excellency Taha Hussein pledges to complete the purchase within two months. That was four weeks ago, but it will no doubt still be necessary to count on some slippage, for one has the intention to fix arbitrarily the price of the papyri at a rather low sum, which will be equivalent to a confiscation.

Doresse wrote Puech the same information he sent to Schaeffer. Puech, as usual, passed on the good news to Gilles Quispel, to the effect that the purchase should be completed before the end of May: 4

According to what Drioton, Director of the Department of Antiquities of Egypt, and J. Doresse, recently wrote me, the purchase of the eleven Gnostic collections still held by an individual (III to XIII of my inventory) should be done before the end of this month.

In his next letter to Quispel, Puech gave expression to his own feelings concerning what Doresse was doing:

Your letter restores confidence for me, but, in these kinds of affairs, and seen the direction taken by the negotiations of Cairo following the blunders accumulated by the childish and incoercible vanity of Doresse, one could not be, I believe, too pessimistic.

Doresse’s letter to Puech from Cairo of 16 March 1951 had continued with his usual upbeat presentation:

---

4 v 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

D’après ce que m’ont écrit récemment M. Drioton, directeur du service des Antiquités d’Égypte, et J. Doresse, l’achat des onze recueils gnostiques encore détenu par un particulier (III à XIII de mon inventaire) doit être faite avant la fin de ce mois.

12 v 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Votre lettre me redonne confiance, mais, en ces sortes d’affaires et vu la tournure prise par les négociations du Caire à la suite des maladresses accumulées par la vanité puérile et incoercible de Doresse, on ne saurait, je crois, être trop pessimiste.

16 iii 51: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Quant à l’édition même, du point de vue administratif, les nombreux problèmes—posés par la réorganisation du Musée Copte (dont l’importance va être accrue) et par l’achat et la préservation du principal lot de manuscrits,—ont obligé à la laisser de côté pour le moment. Cependant, maintenant que les nouveaux manuscrits ne pourront plus échapper je pense qu’il n’y aura plus d’objections aux publications que nous souhaitons. On déterminera globalement les conditions d’édition lorsque l’on aura en
As to the edition itself, from the administrative point of view, numerous problems—posed by the reorganization of the Coptic Museum (whose importance is going to be increased), and by the purchase and preservation of the main lot of manuscripts—have made it necessary to leave it to one side for the time being. However, now that the new manuscripts can no longer escape, I think that there will no longer be objections to the publications that we hope for. One will determine globally the editing conditions when one has in hand all the papyri, and I believe that at that moment we will receive full satisfaction. Besides, it would be difficult to arrive at a valid scientific result, if one did not accord to us in this regard the freedom and the guarantees that are indispensable.

It remains necessary, for the time being, to show oneself patient enough to obtain at the final moment the essential point: the publication at Paris of the ensemble of the volumes. ...

I count on being able, on my return to France, already to put in your hands the manuscript of the critical edition of the Secret Book of John [The Apocryphon of John] and of the Wisdom of Jesus, perhaps also other documents. ...

We count on returning to France in the second half of April, so as to continue in Paris, in a more convenient way, the work prepared here. The affair of the papyri seems at present to be moving in a good enough course that I can absent myself without compromising anything.

Doresse thus gave Puech to understand that he had almost succeeded, even though he could not return to France with real results.

_The Imprimerie Nationale_

Puech expected Doresse to spend as long a time back in France as possible, so as to get something ready for publication. Hence Doresse wrote Puech...
on his return from Egypt that he would now prepare something for the *Imprimerie Nationale* to set in type:

Concerning the affair of the papyri, I can give you some very good news. One has not yet been able to achieve the purchase of the twelve codices, but H[is] E[xcellency] Taha Hussein pursues without respite the finalizing of the general law on antiquities that will permit him to take possession of them. The manuscripts themselves have moved from the office of Drioton to the safe of the *Service des Antiquités*. All this is a good sign, but, of course, there can be no question of editing them before the acquisition and the restoration are completed.

It seems difficult, now, that any publication whatever could appear that would influence the price of the latter documents, or trouble their acquisition, just as in the main nothing indicates with certainty at what date they can be taken in hand. Hence I believe that it would be possible and legitimate to publish already now, without waiting any longer, those that we already possess. To be sure, some people will think that it would have been preferable not to edit the five texts of the first collection separately from the rest of the discovery, but

---

21 v 51: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

De l’affaire des papyrus, je peux vous donner de fort bonnes nouvelles. On n’a pas encore achevé l’achat des douze codices, mais S.E. Taha Hussein poursuit sans relâche la mise au point de la loi générale sur les antiquités qui lui permettra d’en prendre possession. Les manuscrits eux-mêmes sont passés du bureau de Mr. Drioton dans le coffre-fort du Service des Antiquités. Tout cela est bon signe mais, naturellement, il ne peut être question de leur édition avant que l’acquisition et la mise en état ne soient terminées.

Comme il semble difficile, maintenant, que quelque publication que ce soit puisse paraître influer sur le prix des derniers documents ou troubler leur acquisition, comme au fond rien n’indique sûrement à quelle date ceux-ci pourront être pris en mains, je crois qu’il serait possible et légitime de publier dès maintenant, sans plus attendre, ceux que nous possédons déjà. Bien sûr, certains penseront qu’il aurait été préférable de ne pas éditer les cinq textes du premier recueil séparément du reste de la découverte, mais qu’il aurait mieux valu fournir une édition dans laquelle tous les traités auraient été classés selon un ordre général méthodique autre que celui observé dans les manuscrits. Bien sûr, il aurait mieux valu établir, pour toutes les rédactions parallèles du *Livre Secret de Jean*, de l’*Évangile des Égyptiens* et de l’*Épître d’Eugnoste*, une édition critique comprenant toutes les recensions. Mais, si nous nous en tenons à ce projet, notre attente, déjà trompée par de perpétuelles promesses, risque peut-être de se prolonger. Par contre, en publiant dès maintenant nos premiers textes nous hâterons sans aucun doute,—si elle a tendance à tarder encore un peu,—la mise en état et l’édition des autres documents. Enfin nous supprimerons du coup les entraves qui paralysent tout travail scientifique réel depuis plus de deux ans.

J’ai donc avant de quitter le Caire profité du moment opportun pour négocier en ce sens, et n’ai plus rencontré d’objections insurmontables. Seul, Mr. Drioton éprouve encore quelques craintes prudentes à ce sujet.
that it would have been better to provide an edition in which all the treatises would have been classified according to a general methodical order other than that which is followed in the manuscripts. To be sure, it would have been of more value to establish, for all the parallel redactions of the Secret Book of John [The Apocryphon of John], of the Gospel of the Egyptians, and of the Epistle of Eugnostos, a critical edition including all the recensions. But, if we hold to that plan, our waiting, already misled by perpetual promises, perhaps risks being prolonged. On the other hand, by publishing already now our first texts, we will hasten without any doubt—even if there a tendency to slow down a bit—the restoration and the editing of the other documents. Finally, we will suppress by this one stroke the obstacles that have been paralyzing all real scientific work for more than two years.

Hence, before leaving Cairo, I have profited by an opportune moment to negotiate in this sense, and have no longer encountered insurmountable objections. Only Drioton still senses some prudent concerns in this regard.

Doresse concluded with an offer to meet Puech before presenting a proposal to the Imprimerie Nationale:391

I would hence like to see you as rapidly as possible, and, if you are in agreement, I could immediately furnish the Imprimerie Nationale with a precise proposal, so that everything can be put in motion without delay. As to the finalizing of the edition, in what concerns the text and the translation, I will recast one more time all that I had prepared (for I had begun to use the parallel recensions in the volumes that are not yet purchased), and I think that thus the first proofs could come from the press already this winter. Of course, for the variants, one will use in full the text of the Berlin codex.

Naturally Puech agreed to meet, especially to make clear that he opposed the specific arrangements having to do with himself:392

---

391 21 v 51: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je voudrais donc vous voir le plus rapidement possible et, si vous êtes d’accord, je pourrai fournir immédialement à l’Imprimerie Nationale un projet précis afin que tout puisse être mis en train sans délai. Quant à la mise au point de l’édition, en ce qui concerne le texte et la traduction, je remanierai une fois de plus tout ce que j’avais préparé (car j’avais commencé à utiliser les recensions parallèles figurant dans les volumes pas encore achetés) et je pense qu’ainsi les premières épreuves pourraient sortir l’imprimerie dès cet hiver. Naturellement, on utilisera intégralement, pour les variantes, le texte du codex de Berlin.

392 24 v 51: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Je serai, moi aussi, fort désireux de vous rencontrer le plus tôt possible: il faut, en effet, mettre au point toutes les questions relatives à l’édition des textes gnostiques, à la composition du Comité de publication, aux droits des personnes chargées d’éditer les volumes, etc.
I too will be very desirous to meet with you as soon as possible. It is necessary, in effect, to refine all the questions having to do with the editing of the Gnostic texts, the composition of the Committee of Publication, the rights of the persons entrusted with editing the volumes, etc.

Puech had Doresse agree to spend most of the rest of the year finalizing the publication of Codex III, only to learn that Doresse was seeking funding to spend more time in Egypt:393

In the afternoon of 13 June, at the time of the talk we had at the École [Pratique] des Hautes Études, you declared to me your intention to shorten as much as possible your next sojourn in Egypt, and seemed even to repudiate somewhat accomplishing a mission that, no matter how brief it might be, would turn you away from your essential task: the editing of the Gnostic papyri. However, already on the next day, 14 June, you wrote to Schaeffer requesting him to ask of the Commission of Non-Classical Civilizations not to oppose a prolongation of this sojourn [in Egypt]. ...

Do not forget, on the other hand, that I am responsible for your case at the Commission of the C.N.R.S. On my proposal, it has just promoted you to Agent of Research. It has thus put confidence in the promise that you have made to me, and that I transmitted to it, to publish before the end of next year the first volume of the texts of Nag-Hammadi. I am myself implicated in this commitment. If, as a result of the prolongation of your sojourn in Egypt, it is not observed in the anticipated schedule, I would see myself constrained to abandon to someone else the task of pleading your case at the next sessions of the Commission.

Doresse of course hastened to reply.394

---

393 19 vi 51: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Dans l’après-midi du 13 juin, lors de l’entretien que nous avons eu à l’École des Hautes Études, vous m’aviez déclaré votre intention d’abréger le plus possible votre prochain séjour en Égypte et sembliez même répugner quelque peu à accomplir une mission qui, si brève fût-elle, vous détournerait de votre tâche essentielle: l’édition des papyrus gnostiques. Cependant, dès le lendemain, 14 juin, vous écriviez à M. Schaeffer pour le prier de demander à la Commission des Civilisations non classique de ne pas s’opposer à une prolongation de ce séjour. ...

N’oubliez pas, d’autre part, que je suis responsable de votre cas devant la Commission du C.N.R.S. Sur ma proposition, celle-ci vient de vous promouvoir chargé de recherches. Elle a fait ainsi confiance à la promesse que vous m’avez faite, et que je lui ai transmise, de publier avant la fin de l’année prochaine le 1er volume des écrits de Nag-Hammadi. Je suis moi-même impliqué dans cet engagement. Si, par suite du prolongement de votre séjour en Égypte, il n’était pas tenu dans le délai prévu, je me verrais contraint d’abandonner à un autre le soin de plaider votre cause aux prochaines sessions de la Commission.

394 20 vi 51: Letter from Doresse to Puech:
I have no intention at all to go back on the commitment that I have made personally to you and to the C.N.R.S., to begin the work of editing at Paris this winter. ...

The Commission of [Archaeological] Excavations, which has furnished thus far the necessary funds for the discovery, and which is prepared to support the costs of publication, no doubt attaches very great importance to the complete success of the negotiations undertaken with the Coptic Museum, and maintains rights as to the organization of these negotiations that I cannot neglect. Hence I would not want it to hold me personally responsible for a possible failure to succeed, if that were due to conditions imposed by the C.N.R.S.

Doresse again wrote Puech later in the summer about plans to get samples from the *Imprimerie Nationale* before returning to Cairo, to be able to show them to Pahor Labib:395

Most of all it would be necessary to give to the *Imprimerie Nationale* the two pages to print as an experiment. I will immediately transmit them to Pahor Labib, from whom I have no news in spite of my letters, and who has to give us his agreement before one can continue the edition. The necessary credits for printing the first volume have already been granted to me by the Commission of [Archaeological] Excavations, and I await the agreement of Mr. Blanchot [of the *Imprimerie Nationale*] to disburse them to him.

---

395 23 viii 51: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Il serait surtout nécessaire de donner à l’Imprimerie Nationale les deux pages à composer à titre d’essai. Je les transmettrais aussitôt à Pahor Labib dont je n’ai pas de nouvelles malgré mes lettres, et qui doit nous donner son accord avant que l’on puisse continuer l’édition. Les crédits nécessaires pour l’impression du premier volume m’ont déjà été attribués par la Commission des Fouilles, et j’attends l’accord de Mr. Blanchot pour les lui verser.

Mr. Drioton m’a prévenu que Taha Hussein prépare toujours la loi destinée à permettre l’acquisition forcée des papyrus. Sans doute sera-t-il achevée pour la rentrée. Nous avons dû, de toutes façons, retenir nos places dès le début d’août: nous partirons à la fin de septembre pour être au Caire en temps utile.
Drioton has notified me that Taha Hussein is still preparing the law designed to permit the forced acquisition of the papyri. Without doubt it will be completed by the time of the return [to Cairo from the usual summer vacations]. In any case, we have had to make our reservations already at the beginning of August: We will leave by the end of September, so as to be in Cairo at a useful time.

All this came to a head in terms of the *Imprimerie Nationale* producing samples for Pahor Labib, including a title page for the cover. Puech gave Doresse detailed instructions so as to protect his own interests:\[^{396}\]

[^{396}]: 31 viii 51: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

> Je regrette que, comme l’an dernier, vous n’ayez pas trouvé le temps ou jugé bon de me faire signe dans le courant de juillet ou dans la première quinzaine d’août. Je déplore également votre départ, un peu trop précipité, me semble-t-il, en Égypte: nous aurions pu durant le mois d’octobre nous mettre enfin au travail. ...

> N’omettez pas de me faire parvenir les épreuves avant de les envoyer à Pahor Labib: s’il y a des modifications à leur faire subir, je vous le ferai savoir, et nous nous mettrions d’accord sur le texte définitif, qui doit être approuvé par l’un et l’autre d’entre nous.

> Il reste entendu que la couverture ne portera aucune indication relative à un Comité directeur de publication ou à un directeur quelconque de la publication, puisque aussi bien, par suite de la confusion qui règne sur les détails essentiels de l’entreprise, ni l’un ni l’autre n’existe. À cet égard, vous voudrez bien me confirmer par écrit que vous considérez comme nul et non advenu l’étrange petit papier que vous m’aviez communiqué en juin 1950 et où Till, le chanoine Draguet et moi-même étions censés travailler sous votre direction. Priez également, en temps voulu, Pahor Labib de me proposer par lettre officielle de collaborer à l’édition, dans des conditions qu’il aura l’obligance de me fixer très précisément. ...

> En vue de l’édition du volume I des papyri de Nag-Hammadi et, sans doute aussi, de tous ou de la plupart des autres, il serait bon d’établir entre nous une sorte de contrat ou de convention écrite, fixant le *modus vivendi* de notre collaboration ainsi que nos fonctions, nos droits et nos devoirs. Il y serait, par exemple, spécifié que les éditeurs recevraient communication de tous les textes découverts, seraient, après entente, en droit d’en publier certaines parties (aussi brèves que possible) sous forme d’études préparatoires destinées à alléger l’apparat critique ou l’annotation des volumes à paraître, ou réviseraient les dernières épreuves dont le texte, une fois muni du “bon à tirer” signé par eux tous, ne saurait subir aucun changement. Voulez-vous rédiger vers novembre un projet en ce sens? Je vous proposerai à mon tour les additions ou modifications qui me paraîtront souhaitables. Peut-être conviendrait-il, en outre, de demander au Comité des Fouilles d’approuver ce contrat.

> De toute façon, je ne puis personnellement m’engager à apporter mon concours à une si longue et si difficile entreprise tant que les conditions en seront laissées dans le vague.

> S’il ne vous est pas possible de me rencontrer dans les tout premiers jours d’octobre, déposez chez ma concierge ou faites-moi apporter par une personne sûre le manuscrit
I regret that, just as last year, you have not found the time or considered it wise to contact me in the course of July or in the first fortnight of August. I deplore equally your departure, a bit too precipitously, it seems to me, for Egypt. We would have been able during the month of October finally to put ourselves to work. ...

Do not fail to have proofs sent to me before sending them to Pahor Labib. If there are modifications to be made in them, I would let you know, and we would reach agreement on the definitive text, which has to be approved by each of us.

It remains agreed that the cover will not carry any indication relative to a directing Committee of Publication, or to a Director of any kind for the publication, since, as a result of the confusion that prevails on the essential details of the undertaking, neither the one nor the other exists. In this regard, please confirm to me in writing that you consider to be null and void the strange little paper that you communicated to me in June 1950 and where Till, Canon Draguet, and myself were thought to work under your direction. Also ask Pahor Labib, at the appropriate time, to propose to me in an official letter that I collaborate in the edition, with conditions that he will have the kindness to settle for me very precisely. ...

In view of the editing of Volume I of the papyri of Nag-Hammadi [= Codex III], and, no doubt, also of all or most of the others, it would be good to establish between us a kind of contract or written convention, specifying the *modus vivendi* of our collaboration, as well as our functions, our rights, and our duties. It would be specified there, for example, that the editors would receive the communication of all the texts that were discovered, that they would, after agreement, have the right to publish certain parts of them (as briefly as possible) in the form of preparatory studies intended to lighten the critical apparatus or the annotation of the volumes to appear, or that they would review the final proofs whose text, once it was tagged with the ‘ready to publish’ signed by all involved, could not undergo any change. Would you be so kind as to compose around November a draft along these lines? I will propose to you in turn the additions or modifications that seem to me desirable. Perhaps it would be appropriate, in addition, to ask the Committee of [Archaeological] Excavations to approve this contract.

de votre travail. Il comprendra, je l’espère, le texte (muni de l’apparat critique) et une première traduction de tous les écrits du Musée Copte du Caire. J’aurai sans doute à retravailler sur certains passages de l’Apokryphon et de la Sagesse de Jésus. Ajoutez les parties de la Préface et les notes ou fragments de commentaire que vous aurez déjà rédigés. À votre retour, nous verrons comment fondre tout cela et mes apports personnels en une seule masse homogène. ...

Mais, pour tout cela, votre présence à Paris est obligatoire. Encore une fois, abrégez le plus possible votre séjour au Caire.
In any case, I cannot personally commit myself to provide my collaboration in such a long and difficult enterprise, as long as its conditions are left vague.

If it is not possible to meet me in the very first days of October, then deposit at my residence, or have a reliable person bring me, the manuscript of your work. It will contain, I hope, the text (equipped with the critical apparatus) and a first translation of all the texts of the Coptic Museum of Cairo. I will no doubt have to rework certain passages of the *Apokryphon [Johannis]* and of the *Wisdom of Jesus*. Attach the parts of the Preface and the notes or fragments of commentary that you have already written. On your return, we will see how to merge all that, and my personal reports, into a single homogeneous whole.

... But for all that, your presence in Paris is obligatory. Once again, abbreviate as much as possible your sojourn in Cairo.

The title page set in type by the *Imprimerie Nationale* read as follows:

COPTIC MUSEUM OF CAIRO  
GNOSTIC PAPYRI  
OF CHÉNOBOSKION  
CODEX I  
Secret Book of John—Gospel of the Egyptians  
Wisdom of Jesus—Epistle of Eugnostos—Dialogue of the Savior  
edited by  
J. Doresse Togo Mina  
H.-C. Puech W. Till  
under the auspices  
of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres  
PARIS—MDCCCCLI  
IMPRIMERIE NATIONALE OF FRANCE.

---

397 Proofs of the title page set in type by the *Imprimerie Nationale*:

MUSÉE COPTE DU CAIRE  
PAPYRUS GNOSTIQUES  
DE CHÉNOBOSKION  
CODEX I  
Livre secret de Jean—Évangile des Égyptiens  
Sagesse de Jésus—Épître d’ Eugnostos—Dialogue du Sauveur  
edités par  
J. Doresse Togo Mina  
H.-C. Puech W. Till  
sous les auspices  
de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres  
PARIS—MDCCCCCLI  
IMPRIMERIE NATIONALE DE FRANCE.
Doresse sent Puech the pair of trial pages that the *Imprimerie Nationale* had sent him:\textsuperscript{398}

I hasten to send you the trial double page that has just been set in type. I have already added some indispensable corrections, but I wait, so as to correct the whole at one time, until you have in turn reviewed the text. ....

I await your view before having this double page cleaned up.

Puech responded with a mass of detailed corrections, and an overarching criticism:\textsuperscript{399}

I thank you for the mailing that you have been kind enough to send of the double page 18 of the *Apokryphon of John*, printed as a sample.

I must say that I find this effort very imperfect: ...

On all these points I await from you before 1 October a clear reply or a precise explanation.

Doresse responded to the specific criticisms as best he could, playing down the points that Puech had scored, while at the same time having to concede that Puech was right:\textsuperscript{400}

I sent you the draft of the double page immediately, as soon as it was set in type, which explains why there remained a few misprints. ...

Doresse then replied in as conciliatory a way as he could concerning the overarching editorial policies:\textsuperscript{401}

\textsuperscript{398} 16 ix 51: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je m’empresse de vous adresser la double page d’essai qui vient d’être composée. J’y ai déjà porté quelques corrections indispensables, mais j’attends, pour faire rectifier le tout d’un seul coup, que vous ayez revu le texte à votre tour. ...

J’attends votre avis avant de faire mettre au net cette double page.

\textsuperscript{399} 20 ix 51: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Je vous remercie de l’envoi que vous avez bien voulu me faire de la double page 18 de l’*Apokryphon de Jean*, imprimée à titre d’échantillon.

Je dois dire que je trouve cet essai bien imparfait: ...

Sur tous ces points, j’attends de vous avant le 1er octobre une réponse nette ou une explication précise.

\textsuperscript{400} 26 ix 51: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je vous ai envoyé la double page d’essai aussitôt qu’elle a été composée, ce qui explique qu’il y soit resté quelques coquilles. ....

\textsuperscript{401} 26 ix 51: Letter from Doresse to Puech:
As to the editing conditions to be settled upon anew with the Egyptians, I do not at all have the intention of playing there any ‘directorial’ rôle. On the contrary, it seems essential for Drioton to continue to preside over the committee chosen by Togo Mina, and that he intervenes there, even actively, to facilitate the task for us. But can we succeed in that, or do we have to have recourse to the annoying authority of Dr. Pahor Labib? In any case, I count fully on obtaining from the latter the texts that we need, and this is one of the reasons for my departure in October, a date incidentally that had been settled upon in agreement with Schaeffer.

From here it is easy to see how Puech sought to create a completely different Committee of Publication, together with C.A. Meier, Director of the Jung Institute, and Gilles Quispel, as Puech’s way of replacing Doresse, with himself as President of any such Committee (see Chapter 4 below). Actually, Pahor Labib, as Director of the Coptic Museum where the codices were housed, became the presiding officer of the International Committee of Gnosticism (see Chapter 6 below).

The Fifth Mission of Doresse to Egypt 1951–1952

During the autumn of 1951 while Doresse was in Cairo, Doresse and Puech did not correspond. But on 28 October 1951 Doresse reported to René Dussaud, Chairman of the Commission of [Archaeological] Excavations:

Quant aux conditions d’édition à fixer à nouveau avec les égyptiens, je n’ai aucune-ment l’intention d’y jouer aucun rôle “directorial.” Par contre, il semble essentiel que M. Drioton continue de présider le comité choisi par Togo MINA, et qu’il y intervi-enne même activement pour nous faciliter la besogne. Mais pourrons-nous l’obtenir? ou devons-nous recourir à l’autorité tracassière du Dr. Pahor LABIB? En tout cas, je compte bien obtenir de ce dernier les écrits dont nous avons besoin, et c’est une des raisons de mon départ en octobre, date qui d’ailleurs avait été fixée en accord avec M. Schaeffer.

Nous sommes arrivés au Caire il y a un peu plus de dix jours. J’ai déjà pu obtenir l’essentiel des résultats espérés. Je ne crois pas qu’il y ait de difficultés à faire figurer, sur la couverture de l’édition, le patronage de l’Académie des Inscriptions si celle-ci veut bien nous l’accorder. Il facilitera, au contraire, bien des choses. J’ai en effet été bien mieux accueilli que les circonstances ne le laissaient prévoir. Je n’attends plus que les dernières épreuves de l’Imprimerie Nationale pour demander au Musée Copte confirmation des autorisations accordées jadis par Togo Mina. Mais ces épreuves, qui devaient être achevées vers le 10 octobre, ne me sont pas encore parvenues et cela m’inquiète un peu car le comité du Musée doit siéger dans quelques semaines. Si nous ne pouvons présenter nos essais à cette prochaine occasion, il faudra attendre quatre à cinq mois de plus!
We arrived in Cairo a bit more than ten days ago. I have already been able to obtain the essential of the hoped-for results. I do not believe that there would be difficulties in printing on the cover of the edition the patronage of the *Académie des Inscriptions [et Belles-Lettres]*, if it is willing to accord it to us. It will on the contrary facilitate many things. I have in fact been much better received than the circumstances would lead one to expect. I am only awaiting the last proofs from the *Imprimerie Nationale*, to ask the Coptic Museum to confirm the authorizations accorded previously by Togo Mina. But these proofs, which should have been completed around October, have not yet reached me, and this disturbs me somewhat, for the Committee of the Museum is to meet in a few weeks. If we cannot present our samples at this next occasion, it will be necessary to wait four to five months more!

Drioton, to whom I submitted our difficulties, and who is completely in agreement with my plan of publication, is quite willing to resume his functions as President of our committee of edition, from a scientific point of view, and on the condition that one does not ask him to serve as intermediary between the Egyptian authorities and us (all the administrative questions depend directly and uniquely on the Coptic Museum). Drioton considers, incidentally, that his being President will certainly not give full satisfaction to Puech, since he will again only be able to make clear to him the conditions of the edition that he has already communicated to him several times, and that Puech refuses to accept. Perhaps, nonetheless, the intervention of Dr[ioton] will permit me to work more in peace.

M. Drioton, à qui j’ai soumis nos difficultés et qui est entièrement d’accord avec mon plan de publication, veut bien reprendre ses fonctions de président de notre comité d’édition, du point de vue scientifique, et sous condition qu’on ne lui demande pas de servir d’intermédiaire entre les autorités égyptiennes et nous (toutes les questions administratives dépendant directement et uniquement du Musée Copte). M. Drioton considère, d’ailleurs, que sa présidence ne donnera certainement pas toute satisfaction à M. Puech car il ne pourra que lui préciser à nouveau les conditions d’édition qu’il lui a déjà fait connaître à plusieurs reprises et que M. Puech se refuse à accepter. Peut-être, malgré cela, l’intervention de M. Dr. me permettra-t-elle de travailler plus en paix.

Avant mon départ, j’ai envoyé à M. Puech une lettre aussi déferente que possible. Je lui ai demandé, puisqu’il était en désaccord avec mon projet d’édition, de me préciser ses désirs. Mais je n’ai, jusqu’à présent, aucune réponse. Or il est indispensable que notre premier volume paraisse pour le printemps afin de nous aider à obtenir les meilleures conditions pour l’édition du reste, dont l’acquisition approche. La loi préparée par Son Exc. Taha Hussein pour l’achat du principal lot de papyrus est, en effet, déjà passée à l’Assemblée en second lecture.

Le Dr. Pahor Labib, Directeur du Musée Copte, m’a pratiquement pris pour collaborateur et conseiller, de sorte que je participe officieusement à l’administration du Musée. Je pourrai donc tout régler assez facilement s’il ne me vient pas, de France, des complications imprévues.
Before my departure, I sent to Puech as deferential a letter as I could. I asked him, since he was in disagreement with my proposal for the edition, to specify for me his desires. But up to the present I have received no response. Now it is indispensable that our first volume appear by spring, in order to aid us to obtain the best conditions for editing the rest, whose acquisition approaches. The law prepared by His Excellency Taha Hussein for the purchase of the principal lot of papyri has, in fact, already passed the Assembly in its second reading.

Dr. Pahor Labib, Director of the Coptic Museum, has practically taken me as collaborator and counselor, so that I participate semi-officially in the administration of the Museum. I can hence arrange everything easily enough if unexpected complications for me do not come from France.

These optimistic plans were upset by the political disturbances early in 1952:

On 26 January serious anti-British troubles and conflagrations in Cairo.

Doressé took advantage of the political crisis finally to write at length to Puech justifying the extension of his time in Egypt, given the very negative situation:

I hoped, on arriving in Egypt in the middle of October, to obtain without difficulty the confirmation of the authorizations that had already been accorded

---

403 Marianne Doresse: *5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte* (see Part 2 above).
404 30 ! 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

J’espérais, en arrivant en Égypte au milieu d’octobre, obtenir sans difficulté la confirmation des autorisations qui nous avaient déjà été accordées au sujet du codex du Musée Copte, et revenir en France sans tarder. Mais les choses ont été fort difficiles. Les circonstances politiques ont évolué d’une façon complètement imprévue et j’en ai été réduit, pendant quelque temps, à défendre tout simplement ce que nous avions déjà acquis. Actuellement nous avons de nouveau les choses en main: l’édition des textes gnostiques, dans les limites qui viennent d’être fixées, reste même le seul travail, en partie français, encore autorisés. Voici dans quelles conditions:

1°) M. Drioton a bien voulu conserver la présidence du comité d’édition du premier volume, étant entendu que cette présidence ne devra avoir qu’un caractère scientifique et que la direction même de la publication dépend uniquement du Dr. Pahor Labib.

2°) La publication du codex du Musée Copte doit constituer un volume du “Catalogue Général du Musée Copte” qui, —bien qu’imprimé par la France—, sera établi en fonction des principes adoptés pour ce Catalogue Général: il doit s’agir avant tout d’une édition documentaire, complétée d’introductions, de commentaires et de bibliographies. En fait, Taha Hussein m’avait déclaré il y a deux mois qu’il désirait une édition strictement diplomatique et sans commentaires, mais on a pu éviter ces conditions catastrophiques.
to us with regard to the codex of the Coptic Museum, and to return to France without delay. But things have been very difficult. The political circumstances have evolved in a completely unexpected way, and I have been reduced for some time to defending quite simply what we had already acquired. At present we again have things in hand: The edition of the Gnostic texts, in the limits that have just been firmed up, remains indeed the only partially French work that is still authorized. Here it is with what conditions:

1°) Drioton has been kind enough to maintain the presidency of the editorial committee of the first volume, it being understood that this presidency can only have a scientific character, and that the directing of the publication itself depends uniquely on Dr. Pahor Labib.

2°) The publication of the codex of the Coptic Museum should constitute a volume of the ‘General Catalogue of the Coptic Museum,’ which—though printed by France—will be established in terms of the principles adopted for this General Catalogue: It must above all be a documentary edition, made complete with introductions, commentaries, and bibliographies. In fact, Taha Hussein had declared to me two months ago that he wanted a strictly diplomatic edition and without commentaries, but one has been able to avoid these catastrophic conditions.

Doresse’s point would seem to be that it is only by him extending his stay in Cairo that he would be able to continue to rescue the major rôle of Puech in the whole enterprise.

Doresse reported in the same letter more fully on the situation in Cairo:

---

30 i 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

J’ai en même temps déposé le manuscrit des textes et traductions, déjà établis, aux mains du Dr. Pahor qui doit les soumettre à l’approbation du Conseil du Musée Copte et du Ministre. Le Conseil aurait dû donner sa réponse depuis plus de six semaines mais sa réunion a été retardée par les événements.

Dans ces conditions, nous restons à l’abri des interdictions édictées par Taha Hussein au sujet des travaux français, interdictions qui seront peut-être levées par le nouveau ministère, mais pourront toujours être reprises suivant l’évolution des rapports franco-égyptiens. M. Drioton avait toujours demandé, d’ailleurs, que notre publication soit un travail strictement égyptien, placé sous la seule autorité du Directeur du Musée Copte. Sans doute n’aurons-nous pas à nous plaindre de ce système. Le Dr. Pahor, bien que très autoritaire, n’en est pas moins disposé à autoriser l’emploi des textes aux publications et aux cours projetés dès que le ministère le lui permettra. Il a l’intention de vous écrire, en attendant, pour vous communiquer les conditions d’édition que je viens de vous indiquer et, tout en vous remerciant de votre collaboration, vous demander de lui préciser dans quelle mesure vous accepteriez de participer à l’élaboration du commentaire. Il désirerait par la même occasion, afin qu’il n’y ait pas de malentendu, savoir si vous étiez parvenu à quelque accord plus précis avec Togo Mina sur les principes de l’édition.
I have at the same time deposited the manuscript of the already established
texts and translations in the hands of Dr. Pahor, who is to submit them for
the approval of the Council of the Coptic Museum and of the Minister. The
Council would have been able to give its response for more than six weeks,
but its meeting has been delayed by the events.

Under these circumstances, we remain sheltered from the interdictions en-
acted by Taha Hussein on the topic of French projects, interdictions that will
perhaps be lifted by the new Ministry, but can always be restored, following
the evolution of French-Egyptian relations. Drioton had always asked, inci-
dentally, that our publication be a strictly Egyptian work, placed under the
sole authority of the Director of the Coptic Museum. Doubtless we have no
need to complain of this system. Dr. Pahor, though very authoritarian, is no
less disposed to authorize the use of the texts for publications and for pro-
posed courses, as soon as the Ministry permits him to do so. He has the inten-
tion of writing you, in the meantime, to communicate to you the conditions
for the edition, which I have just indicated to you, and, while thanking you for
your collaboration, to ask you to make clear to him to what extent you would
accept to participate in the elaboration of the commentary. At the same time,
he would like, so that there is no misunderstanding in this regard, to know if
you had reached some more precise agreement with Togo Mina on the prin-
ciples of the edition.

Dioresse then turned to what he had learned about the Tano-Dattari collec-
tion: 406

406 30 i 52: Letter from Dioresse to Puech:

En ce qui concerne les autres manuscrits, dont le cas reste absolument distinct de celui
du codex du Musée Copte, ils seraient,—s’il n’y avait pas eu les incidents des dernières
semaines—, déjà entre mes mains. Leur acquisition n’a plus qu’à être régularisée
par un comité composé essentiellement du Ministre, de M. Drioton et du Dr. Pahor
Labib. J’ai déjà fourni une nouvelle note sur la valeur de ces papyrus et je pense que
la chose ne tardera plus. Taha Hussein, dont nous n’avons pas entièrement à nous
plaintre, m’avait demandé dès novembre d’assurer personnellement la mise en état
de ces manuscrits et leur publication. Ses projets d’édition étaient un peu sommaires,
mais les mesures qu’il a prévues pour assurer la conservation des papyrus et leur
étude sont excellentes. Le nouveau ministre n’a aucune raison d’interrompre ou de
modifier ce qui est en cours. Je dois seulement noter que certains tentent de faire
confier l’édition au Prof. Till, qui pourtant ne le désire nullement. Mais il faut être
prudent et je souhaite, plus vivement que jamais que l’on puisse publier aussi vite que
possible, non seulement le premier volume, mais les diverses études que vous avez
déjà mises au point. Ne pourrait-on pas, pour ces dernières, les considérer comme
des “appendices” au premier volume et les faire composer par l’Imprimerie Nationale
sous forme de fascicules destinés à compléter le volume? Les crédits versés pour la
publication de ce premier tome permettraient largement ce travail qui pourrait ainsi
être mené immédiatement et ne passerait pas, alors, pour une publication séparée,
indépendante de l’édition?
Regarding the other manuscripts, whose case remains absolutely distinct from that of the codex of the Coptic Museum, they would already be in my hands—if there had not been the incidents of the last weeks. Their acquisition needs only to be regularized by a committee composed basically of the Minister, of Drioton, and of Dr. Pahor Labib. I have already furnished a new note on the value of these papyri, and I think that the thing will not be delayed any longer. Taha Hussein, whom we do not need completely to complain about, asked me already last November to assure personally the restoration of these manuscripts and their publication. His proposals for editing were a bit summary, but the measures that he anticipated to assure the conservation of the papyri and their study are excellent. The new Minister has no reason to interrupt or modify what is taking place. I should only note that certain persons try to have the edition entrusted to Prof. Till, who however does not want that at all. But it is necessary to be prudent, and I hope, more actively than ever, that one can publish as rapidly as possible not only the first volume, but the diverse studies that you have already finalized. Could one not, regarding the latter, consider them as ‘appendices’ to the first volume, and have them set in type by the Imprimerie Nationale in the form of fascicles intended to complete the volume? The funds allocated for the publication of this first volume would largely permit this work, which could thus be carried out immediately, and would not pass, then, as a separate publication independent of the edition?

Doresse then concluded his lengthy report to Puech with the delicate issue of achieving some reconciliation between Puech and Pahor Labib:\footnote{30 i 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech: Je continue, en tout cas, à n’envisager pour le moment que l’édition du premier volume. Nous n’avons plus besoin, pour commencer à publier, que de l’approbation écrite du Musée Copte et, en même temps, d’une entente définitive entre vous et le Dr. Pahor. Quant à l’autorisation d’utiliser les documents pour des cours, nous sommes obligés, par prudence, de la demander séparément: mais je pense l’obtenir elle aussi en faisant valoir que, le volume étant en cours d’impression, les textes peuvent, déjà, ne plus être considérés comme absolument inédits et que nous sommes en droit d’en user librement.}

I continue, in any case, to envisage for the moment only the editing of the first volume. To begin publishing we only need the written approval of the Coptic Museum, and, at the same time, a definitive understanding between you and Dr. Pahor. As to the authorization to use the documents for courses, for the sake of prudence we are obliged to request that separately. But I think it too can be obtained, by pointing out that, since the volume is in the course of being printed, the texts can, already, no longer be considered as absolutely unpublished, and so we have the right to make use of them freely.
In retrospect, this all seems overly optimistic, even naïve, though much may have been less what Doresse himself actually thought than what he wanted Puech to think.

The General Catalogue of the Coptic Museum

Doresse then appended a prospectus that he and Pahor Labib had already agreed on, and hence that Puech had little choice but to accept:

I have already proposed to Dr. Pahor a precise project, which he has accepted with few modifications. I attach a copy of it for you. It seems to me that it leaves all the desired freedom for the elaboration of commentaries and notes.

The attached proposal for the project read as follows:

---

308 30 i 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

J’ai déjà proposé au Dr. Pahor un projet précis qu’il a accepté avec peu de modifications. Je vous en joins la copie. Il me semble qu’il laisse toute la liberté voulue pour l’élaboration du commentaire et des notes.

309 30 i 52: Attachment to the letter from Doresse to Puech:

CATALOGUE GÉNÉRAL DU MUSÉE COpte:

Papyrus gnosti ques de Chénoboskion, Tome I.

PRÉFACE par M. Étienne Drioton.

INTRODUCTION:

La découverte de Chénoboskion, lieu et circonstances; nombre des manuscrits; leurs caractères extérieurs; reliures, paléographie, langue.

Inventaire sommaire de leur contenu.

Histoire du premier manuscrit du Musée Copte; description matérielle: reliure, paléographie, disposition des textes.

La langue: ses caractéristiques, par comparaison avec les autres textes de Chénoboskion, les autres écrits gnostiques coptes et les plus anciens documents sahidiques connus (par le Prof. W. TILL).

Contenu du manuscrit. Caractères généraux des textes rassemblés dans ce codex, au point de vue littéraire et religieux. Dans quelle mesure sont-ils traduit du grec?

Comparaison avec les recensions parallèles du codex de Berlin (comportant une description sommaire de ce dernier). Qualités relatives des récensions transmises par le Codex du Caire.

SIGLES et BIBLIOGRAPHIE:

TEXTES et TRADUCTIONS des cinq traités coptes, avec, pour chacun:

1°) Une introduction séparée, comportant analyse du texte, identification de celui-ci; caractères littéraires; étude générale du contenu.
Preface by Étienne Drioton.

Introduction:

The discovery of Chénoboskion, location and circumstances; number of manuscripts; their external characteristics; bindings, palaeography, language.

Summary inventory of their content.

History of the first manuscript of the Coptic Museum; physical description: binding, palaeography, layout of the texts.

The language: its characteristics, in comparison with the other texts of Chénoboskion, with other Coptic Gnostic texts, and with the oldest Sahidic documents [already] known (by Prof. W. Till).

Content of the manuscript. General characteristics of the texts brought together in this codex, from the literary and religious point of view. To what extent are they translated from Greek?

Comparison with parallel recensions of the codex of Berlin (containing a summary description of the latter). Relative qualities of the recensions transmitted by the Codex of Cairo.

Sigla and Bibliography:

Texts and Translations of the five Coptic tractates, including for each:

2° Texte, accompagné de notes critiques et, éventuellement, de variantes pour le Livre Secret et pour la Sophia: variantes du codex de Berlin; en ce qui concerne les passages parallèles de l’Épître d’Eugnoste et de la Sophia, les variantes seront indiquées une seule fois, au bas de l’Épître d’Eugnoste. Au bas des pages de texte de la Sophia, on fera figurer seulement un renvoi au texte parallèle de l’Épître d’Eugnoste, l’espace disponible étant déjà occupé ici par les variantes de la Sophia de Berlin. (On utilisera toutefois les variantes d’Eugnoste dans les notes critiques de la Sophia toutes les fois où l’intelligence du texte le nécessitera.)

3° Face au texte, sa traduction, accompagnée de notes critiques suivies de la traduction de celles des variantes qui portent sur le sens.

4° Un commentaire développé, disposé à la suite de chaque texte.

Éventuellement: APPENDICES, parmi lesquels on pourra faire figurer l’étude de problèmes portant sur plusieurs textes, ou dont l’exposé dépasse les limites du commentaire courant.

INDEX des noms propres. INDEX des mots grecs. INDEX par sujets.

Six ou sept PLANCHES photographiques: la reliure du manuscrit et [de] ses pages les plus caractéristiques, par exemple celles où figurent les titres des ouvrages.
1°) a separate introduction, containing an analysis of the text, its identification; literary characteristics; a general study of the content.

2°) The text, accompanied with critical notes, and, perhaps, variants for the Secret Book [Apokryphon of John] and the Sophia [of Jesus Christ]: the variants of the codex of Berlin; in what has to do with the parallel passages of the Epistle of Eugnostos and the Sophia, the variants will be indicated only once, beneath the Epistle of Eugnostos. At the bottom of the pages of the text of the Sophia, one will present only a reference to the parallel text of the Epistle of Eugnostos, since the available space is already occupied here by the variants of the Sophia of Berlin. (Nevertheless one will utilize the variants of Eugnostos in the critical notes of the Sophia in all instances where the understanding of the text makes it necessary.)

3°) On the facing page to the text, its translation, accompanied by critical notes, followed by the translation of those of the variants that have to do with the meaning.

4°) A developed commentary, placed after each text.

Possibly: Appendices, among which one could present the study of problems bearing on several texts, or whose exposition exceeds the limits of the running commentary.

Index of proper names. Index of Greek words. Index by subjects.

Six or seven photographic Plates: the binding of the manuscript and its most characteristic pages, for example those where the titles of the works occur.

Pahor Labib’s approval of this document obviously composed in French by Doresse meant that Puech was in effect presented with a fait accompli. This procedure was of course not acceptable to him.

The Confrontation between Pahor Labib and Puech

Somewhat later Doresse wrote Puech indicating that he was seeking to get Pahor Labib at least to communicate with Puech:

I have just seen Dr. Pahor Labib. He has not yet followed up on his intention to write you on the subject of the conditions for editing the codex of the Coptic Museum. I urge him to send you the promised letter. Whether he writes it in English or in German, makes little difference. We cannot wait any longer.

410 24 iii 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je viens de voir le Dr. Pahor Labib. Il n’a pas encore donné suite à son intention de vous écrire au sujet des conditions d’édition du codex du Musée Copte. Je le presse de vous envoyer la lettre promise; qu’il l’écrit en anglais ou en allemand, peu importe: nous ne pouvons attendre plus longtemps.
The letter did not materialize. Instead, the confrontation between Pahor Labib and Puech came to a head. For Pahor Labib proceeded simply to reject Puech outright, according to Doresse's next report a fortnight later:

The situation has just experienced unexpected rebounds, and of an untested kind. Dr. Pahor—whom I reminded of his promise to write you officially—suddenly replied to me that, not having found in the papers of the Coptic Museum any trace of an agreement made with you (the fact is unfortunately correct), he ultimately did not judge it necessary to ask you for your collaboration, and would himself do the part of the work with which you would have been charged. I was stupified at that. I was still more dumbfounded when the same Pahor added that he did not see, either, any reasons

---

8 iv 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

La situation vient de connaître des rebondissements inattendus, et d’un genre inédit. Le Dr. Pahor,—à qui je rappelais sa promesse de vous écrire officiellement,—, m’a subitement répondu que, n’ayant trouvé dans les papiers du Musée Copte aucune trace d’accord passé avec vous (le fait est malheureusement exact), il ne jugeait finalement pas nécessaire de vous demander votre collaboration et ferait lui-même la part du travail dont vous auriez été chargé. J’en ai été stupéfait; j’ai encore plus été éberlué quand le même Pahor a ajouté qu’il ne voyait pas non plus de raisons de maintenir le nom de Togo Mina parmi ceux des collaborateurs de l’édition. Le Conseil du Musée Copte devant se tenir quelques jours après cette histoire, la situation qui, en d’autres temps n’aurait été que fort comique, devenait gênante et nécessitait une mise au point énergique. J’ai donc préparé immédiatement, pour être lu au Conseil par M. Drioton, une note écrite précisant que, le travail d’édition se faisant à la charge des éditeurs, il s’agissait avant tout d’un travail privé sur lequel le Musée Copte n’avait qu’un contrôle de forme, contrôle qui ne pouvait aucunement s’exercer sur l’activité scientifique du comité d’édition, même si l’étiquette de “Catalogue du Musée Copte” était imposée à l’ouvrage. J’ajoutais que, de toutes façons, la publication dépassant le cadre du Musée Copte, (puisqu’elle constitue également une publication de textes dépendant de l’Académie de Berlin), toute modification aux conditions d’édition devrait être acceptée non seulement par les éditeurs désignés mais encore, à un certain point de vue, par cette Académie qui a concédé ses textes inédits uniquement à MM. Puech, Till et Doresse. Je crois, d’ailleurs, que l’incident créé par Pahor n’aura pas de suite et n’ira pas même jusqu’au Conseil. En effet, le Dr. Pahor, qui se doutait que nous n’accepterions pas facilement son coup de force, tentait de nous gagner de vitesse: jeudi dernier, il convoquait par téléphone les membres de son Conseil pour le lendemain après-midi, c’est à dire plus tôt que prévu et à un moment précis où M. Drioton est,—chacun le sait ici,—, régulièrement absent du Caire. Les protestations des membres du comité ont été telles que le ministre lui même a prié le Dr. Pahor de remettre à plus tard cette réunion. De tout cela nous comptons tirer, avec quelque prudence, plus d’avantages de d’ennuis. Le Dr. Pahor a indisposé bon nombre de gens. Non seulement ses désirs ne seront pas pris en considération, mais les nôtres auront plus de chance d’être accueillis et je pense que l’on verra maintenant avec quelle discrétion on doit nous appliquer cette étiquette de “Catalogue du Musée Copte.” Tout ira donc bien,—à moins que le Wafid, dont le Dr. Pahor est un partisan fervent,—, ne revienne en force aux prochaines élections.
to maintain the name of Togo Mina among those of the collaborators of the edition. Since the Council of the Coptic Museum was to meet some days after this, the situation, which in other times would only have been very comical, became annoying, and necessitated an energetic correction. Hence I immediately prepared, to be read to the Council by Drioton, a written note specifying that, since the work of editing was taking place at the expense of the editors, it had to do before anything else with a private work, over which the Coptic Museum only had control in form, a control that could in no sense assert itself over the scientific work of the committee of edition, even if the label of ‘Catalogue of the Coptic Museum’ was superimposed on the work. I added that, in any case, in that the publication went beyond the framework of the Coptic Museum (since it constitutes equally a publication of texts dependent on the Academy of Berlin), any modification of the conditions of the edition had to be accepted not only by the designated editors, but also, from a certain point of view, by this Academy, which has conceded its unpublished texts uniquely to Messrs Puech, Till, and Doresse. I believe, incidentally, that the incident created by Pahor will have no consequences, and will not go even to the Council. In effect, Dr. Pahor, who suspected that we would not easily accept his power play, tried to prevail over us by means of acting quickly: Last Thursday, he called together by telephone the members of his Council for the next day in the afternoon, that is to say, earlier than expected, and precisely at a time when Drioton is—as everyone here knows—regularly absent from Cairo. The protests of the members of the Committee have been such that the Minister himself asked Dr. Pahor to postpone this meeting until later. From all of that, we count on drawing, with some prudence, more advantages than annoyances. Dr. Pahor has inconvenienced a good number of people. Not only his wishes will not be taken into consideration, but ours will have a better chance of being welcomed, and I think that one will now see with what discretion one is to apply to us this label of ‘Catalogue of the Coptic Museum.’ Hence everything will go well—unless the Waft, of which Dr. Pahor is a fervent partisan, returns in force at the next elections.

In a Postscript the next day Doresse added:  

I just received, on the same mail, both your letter of 4 April and the proofs of the text of the Gospel of the Egyptians, which the Imprimerie [Nationale] must have also had sent to you. This last packet permits me finally to declare to Dr. Pahor that the edition is under way, and that there can no longer be a question for him to have anything at all in it modified.

---

412 9 iv 52: Postscript to the letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je viens de recevoir, par le même courrier, votre lettre du 4 avril, et les épreuves du texte de l’Évangile des Égyptiens, que l’Imprimerie a également dû vous faire parvenir. Ce dernier paquet me permet enfin de déclarer au Dr. Pahor que l’édition est en cours et qu’il ne peut plus être question, pour lui, d’y faire modifier quoi que ce soit.
Doresse no doubt submitted this printing of the text of *The Gospel of the Egyptians* to Pahor Labib to document that the printing of Codex III was already under way at the *Imprimerie Nationale*. Then, before leaving Egypt, Doresse sent him as positive a report as he could, including the prospectus he had sent to Puech on 30 January 1952.\textsuperscript{413}

Just as I have let you know previously, the work of publication of the Gnostic codex of the Coptic Museum is today almost completely finished. Begun in 1947 with Togo Mina, the establishment of this edition has been carried on by Professor Till, Professor H.-C. Puech, and myself. In agreement with the Berlin Academy, we have used here for the first time the unpublished Gnostic texts whose discovery had been announced by the late Carl Schmidt in 1895, texts for which our volume will as a result also constitute the *editio princeps*.

The ensemble of the work has been carried on in agreement with general principles identical with those proposed for the future catalogue of the Coptic Museum: An integral edition of the documents, accompanied by the material description of the manuscripts, the whole completed with introductions, critical notes and a detailed bibliography.

Hence the editors think that there would be no inconvenience, if the Coptic Museum so desires, in presenting this volume materially (format, disposition, and title)—because of its content—as a volume of the ‘General Catalogue of the Coptic Museum.’ Before delivering their manuscript to the press, the editors would hence like to know the view of the Council of the Museum on this point, to which they would be grateful to you to present the appended plan and specimen.

\textsuperscript{413} 27 iv 52: Letter from Doresse to Pahor Labib:

Ainsi que je vous l’ai fait connaître précédemment, le travail de publication du codex gnostique du Musée Copte est aujourd’hui presque entièrement terminé. Commencé en 1947 avec M. Togo Mina, l’établissement de cette édition a été mené par M. le Professeur Till, M. le Professeur H.-C. Puech et moi-même. En accord avec l’Académie de Berlin, nous y avons utilisé pour la première fois les textes gnostiques inédits dont la découverte avait été annoncée par le regreté Carl Schmidt en 1895, textes dont notre volume constituera aussi, par conséquent, l’édition princeps.

L’ensemble du travail a été mené en accord à des principes généraux identiques avec ceux proposés pour le futur catalogue du Musée Copte: édition intégrale des documents, accompagnée de la description matérielle des manuscrits, le tout complété d’introductions, de notes critiques et d’une bibliographie détaillée.

Les éditeurs pensent donc qu’il n’y aurait aucun inconvénient, si le Musée Copte le désire, à présenter matériellement ce volume (format, disposition et titre),—et cela en raison de son contenu—, comme un volume du “Catalogue Général du Musée Copte.” Avant de livrer leur manuscrit à l’impression, les éditeurs désireraient donc connaître sur ce point l’avis du Conseil du Musée auquel ils vous seraient reconnaissant de présenter le plan et le spécimen ci-joints.
Dioresse was clearly attempting to get some official authorization from the Coptic Museum for the edition of Codex III that he and Puech were preparing, so that they could actually publish their edition.

After returning to France, Dioresse heard, no doubt from Drioton, further information about Pahor Labib’s inappropriate action, and wrote Puech:414

Dr. Pahor has, finally, convened the committee of the Coptic Museum (four weeks ago), and made himself perfectly ridiculous. Hence there is hardly a matter of taking his direction too seriously any more.

Yet, in fact, only he could authorize the publication of Codex III, since it belonged to the Coptic Museum he directed.

The Status of the Eid Codex

Dioresse had also been picking up a rumor in Cairo concerning the codex of Albert Eid, apparently having been kept completely unaware of plans being developed by Puech, Quispel, and the Jung Institute that excluded Dioresse. He reported to Puech the little information he had:415

In what has to do with the papyrus that formerly belonged to the antiquities dealer Eid, it is at present the object of negotiations on the part of a Swiss group that seems to be very desirous that the document escape from the editors of the manuscript or manuscripts of Cairo—that is to say, us.

Simone Eid had in fact asked Dioresse to return the set of pictures he had of Codex I when Dioresse returned to Cairo from Upper Egypt on 18–19 March 1952, which was no doubt the source of Dioresse’s vague information (see Chapter 3 below).

Puech responded briefly to Dioresse’s letter with rather condescending generalities that conveyed no information:416

---

414 29 v 52: Letter from Dioresse to Puech:

Le Dr. Pahor a, finalement, réuni le comité du Musée Copte (il y a quatre semaines) et s’est rendu parfaitement ridicule. Il n’est donc guère plus question de prendre sa direction trop au sérieux.

415 24 iii 52: Letter from Dioresse to Puech:

En ce qui concerne le papyrus qui appartenait naguère à l’antiquaire Eid, il est actuellement l’objet de négociations de la part d’un groupe suisse qui semble très désireux que le document échappe aux éditeurs du ou des manuscrits du Caire,—c’est à dire nous.

416 4 iv 52: Letter from Puech to Dioresse:
We will talk again of the Eid Codex when the time is ripe. But doubtless you
know poorly the intentions of the ‘Swiss group’ to which your letter makes
allusion.

Doresse did in fact know poorly the intentions of the ‘Swiss group,’ since
Puech, as the member of that group closest to Doresse, had told him nothing
of what was going on. In fact, the ‘Swiss group’ was very eager to see to it that
Doresse did not present Simone Eid with an alternative purchaser before
they could complete their own acquisition.

On 10 May 1952 Quispel took possession of the codex in Belgium on
behalf of the Jung Institute of Zürich (see Chapter 3 below). Puech had been
kept fully informed of this transaction, since it was he who with Quispel
was to edit what became the Jung Codex. Obviously Doresse had not been
informed, since he was to be kept out of the editorial committee.

The Status of the Tano-Dattari Codices

Doresse had also updated Puech with information about the bulk of the
codices said to be owned by Maria Dattari.\textsuperscript{417}

The acquisition of the remaining papyri has suddenly become complicated
after the departure of Taha Hussein. The attorney of Mlle Dattari has called on
Drioton to return the documents, which had been deposited in the Egyptian
Museum. Unless the present Minister immediately pays the price asked,
Drioton will no doubt be obliged to give them up.

Then Doresse gave Puech a further discouraging report on the Dattari
collection:\textsuperscript{418}

\begin{quote}
Nous reparlerons en temps utile du Codex E. Mais sans doute connaissez-vous mal les
intentions du “groupement suisse” auquel votre lettre fait allusion.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{417} 24 iii 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

L’acquisition des papyrus restants s’est subitement compliquée, après le départ de
Taha Hussein. L’avocat de Mlle Dattari a sommé M. Drioton de rendre les documents
qui avaient été déposés au Musée Égyptien. À moins que le ministre actuel ne paye
immédiatement le prix demandé, M. Drioton sera sans doute obligé de céder.

\textsuperscript{418} 8 iv 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Il n’y a en effet aucun espoir d’obtenir quoi que ce soit, au sujet des documents non
achetés, avant leur acquisition effective, surtout au moment même où l’avocat de
la propriétaire attaque énergiquement M. Drioton. Il n’y a pas d’espoir non plus de
pouvoir associer à la publication d’autres collaborateurs français: nous avons déjà bien
du mal à nous faire accepter nous-mêmes, et l’Égypte est de plus en plus le centre
In effect, there is no hope of obtaining anything at all, with regard to the documents not purchased, prior to their actual acquisition, especially at the very moment when the attorney of the owner attacks Drioton energetically. There is no hope either of being able to associate in the publication other French collaborators. We already have very much difficulty in having ourselves accepted, and Egypt is more and more the center of intense anti-French propaganda. Hence we only have the possibility of working, prudently and as rapidly as possible, on what we already have in hand, and on what we will succeed in obtaining in a more or less complete fashion. It is evidently a situation that in appearance has little that is encouraging, and very difficult to have the commission of the C.N.R.S., for example, understand. I myself have the impression, in confronting the very fixed principles of Dr. Pahor and of the other officials with your wishes—which are basically the only logical and legitimate ones, if one envisages the realization of an edition that is as perfect as possible—that we are trying to resolve here a problem that is becoming more and more difficult.

After his return to France, Doresse also heard more about the Dattari collection, and passed on the news to Puech.\footnote{29 v 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech: En ce qui concerne l’achat des autres documents, il est—enfin—en progrès: l’avocat de Mlle Dattari adresse sommation sur sommation au ministère et obtiendra,—par contrainte s’il le faut—, le paiement des papyrus.}

As to what concerns the purchase of the other documents, there is—finally—progress. The attorney of Mlle Dattari directs summons after summons to the Ministry and will obtain—by force if necessary—payment for the papyri.

After a meeting with Puech, Doresse sent him the next day a further very positive update from Drioton:\footnote{8 vi 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech: Je viens d’apprendre, de M. Drioton, que les négociations du Caire ont abouti. Les papyrus sont acquis, et M. Drioton a réussi, en outre, à ne pas les laisser aller au Musée Copte. Il les a mis personnellement sous clé, prétendant leur fragilité. Il a été entendu d’une propagande antifrançaise intense. Nous avons donc uniquement la possibilité de travailler, prudemment et le plus vite possible, sur ce que nous avons déjà en mains et sur ce que nous arriverons à obtenir de façon plus ou moins complète. C’est évidemment une situation en apparence peu encourageante et très difficile à faire comprendre, par exemple, à la commission du CNRS. J’ai moi-même l’impression, en confrontant les principes très arrêtés du Dr. Pahor et des autres officiels avec vos désirs,—qui sont au fond les seuls logiques et les seuls légitimes si l’on envisage la réalisation d’une édition aussi parfaite que possible,—que nous essayons de résoudre ici un problème de plus en plus difficile.}
I have just learned from Drioton that the negotiations of Cairo have reached their goal. The papyri have been acquired, and furthermore Drioton has succeeded in not letting them go to the Coptic Museum. He has personally put them under key, with their fragility his pretext. It has been agreed that they would not be released except to me, and that I only would be charged with their restoration and their photography. Drioton asks that I be in Cairo from the beginning of October. ...

It goes without saying that once the photographs are between our hands, we will have the whole control of the publication, not only officially, but—what is the most important—practically. This is what removes the last difficulties.

Nonetheless I write to Drioton, as agreed, to have him let us know definitively these conditions and their guarantee, according to what we agreed on yesterday.

But Doresse soon passed on to Puech further information from Drioton, to support Doresse’s need for funding to return to Cairo in October:

I have further news from Drioton, who has succeeded, effectively, in having the manuscripts guarded under seal, so that no one takes them in hand before I do. But the Egyptians will not wait longer than October!

Yet the indispensable rôle of Drioton came to an end well before October. And what took place even before that had in effect brought the French control of the Nag Hammadi Codices to an end as well.

_The Status of The Apocryphon of John_

'The Gnostic Gospels (continuation),' and in 1952–1953 by 'Explication of the Gnostic texts discovered near Nag Hammadi: The Apocryphon or Secret Book of John.'\textsuperscript{422} So on 27 August 1952 Puech called on Doresse to honor his offer to provide the material on \textit{The Apocryphon of John}:\textsuperscript{423}

Agreed also, for the copy of the pieces relative to \textit{The Apocryphon of John} (Coptic text of the copy at the Museum of Cairo [Codex III, \textsuperscript{1} your translation, and the translation and notes of Till]. If the expense is not too great, one may, as you suggest, have them photographed (would this be legible?). You have only to submit to me, or have me receive in Paris, the package before your departure.

Then on 1 October 1952 Puech wrote Doresse to make an appointment, which was set for 9 October 1952. But on 5 November 1952 Puech wrote again complaining about Doresse’s failure to provide him with \textit{The Apocryphon of John} from Codex III, and calling for another meeting before Doresse returned to Egypt:\textsuperscript{424}


\textsuperscript{423} 27 viii 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Entendu également, pour la copie des pièces relatives à l’\textit{Apokryphon de Jean} (texte copié de l’exemplaire au Musée du Caire, votre traduction et la traduction et les notes de Till). Si la dépense n’est pas trop forte, on peut, comme vous le suggérerez, les faire photographier (sera-ce lisible?). Vous n’aurez qu’à me remettre ou à me faire recevoir à Paris le paquet, avant votre départ.

\textsuperscript{424} 5 xi 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Il est nécessaire que je vous voie au plus tôt, afin de vous donner les instructions relatives à votre mission. Je voudrais, en outre, recevoir d’urgence de vous les textes
It is necessary that I see you as soon as possible, so as to give you the instructions relative to your mission. I would urgently like, in addition, to receive from you the promised texts. My courses begin soon at the [École Pratique des] Hautes Études, and I cannot wait indefinitely.

Bring me also your translation of Volume I [= Codex III]. It would be useful to me, and Lacau would like to get acquainted with it.

On 21 November 1952 Puech again wrote, reproaching Doresse for not having met an appointment, and repeating:425

My courses have begun, and I cannot continue to live from day to day. I have to know in advance the Coptic text of the Museum of Cairo [Codex III], and to have access from now on to the material communicated by Till. Hence I ask you urgently to come bring me everything. ...

On reading the heavily improved translation of the Apocryphon [of John] that you let me receive Sunday, and for which I thank you, the commentary on this text should in my view be relatively easy, abundant, and extraordinarily fruitful in results and in rapprochements. It would nonetheless be expedient to correct both text and translation in some places, by taking into consideration the indirect tradition that you seem to neglect as well as does Till. ...

In any case, I need absolutely, and as soon as possible, the photographs of the text of the Apocryphon [of John], the version of the Museum of Cairo [Codex III,1].

---

promis; mes cours commencent bientôt aux Hautes Études, et je ne puis attendre indéfiniment.

Apportez-moi également votre traduction du Volume I: elle me serait utile, et M. Lacau serait désireux de la connaître.

425 21 xi 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Mes cours sont commencés, et je ne puis continuer à vivre à la petite semaine: il me faut connaître à l’avance le texte copte du Musée du Caire et disposer dès maintenant des matériaux communiqués par Till. Je vous prie donc instamment de venir m’apporter le tout. ...

À la lecture de la traduction fortement améliorée de l’Apokryphon que vous m’avez faite remettre dimanche, et dont je vous remercie, le commentaire de cet écrit m’apparaît devoir être relativement aisé, abondant et extraordinairement fécond en résultats et en rapprochements. Il conviendra cependant de corriger texte et traduction en quelques endroits, en tenant compte de la tradition indirecte que vous paraissez négliger ainsi que Till. ...

De toute façon, il me faut absolument, et au plus tôt, les photographies du texte de l’Apokryphon, version du Musée du Caire.
The Status of Proofs of Codex III

In January 1977 Doresse sent me proofs from Codex III that provide some positive documentation for what had been set in type by the *Imprimerie Nationale*. At least a title page dated 1951 had in fact been set in type. On the page facing the title page was the printed note:

Published with the participation of the Commission of Archaeological Excavations.

Proofs of Tractate 1 could not be prepared, because a text using the long version of *The Apocryphon of John* from Codices II and IV was not yet available. And proofs of Tractates 1, 3, and 4 could not be prepared, because the parallel texts in P.Berol. 8502 had not been worked in. Though Tractate 3, *Eugnostos the Blessed*, was not present in P.Berol. 8502, it had been recognized that Tractate 4, *The Sophia of Jesus Christ*, was a christianization of that tractate, which hence had many parallels in Berlin that would have to be included.

Thus only Tractates 2 and 5 were even available for publication. Proofs of the last two pages (68–69) of Tractate 2, *The Egyptian Gospel*, may have been sent to Puech, Schaeffer, Doresse, Till, Drioton and Labib on 12 September 1951; second proofs were dated to January 1952.

To begin publication with this tractate was of course also politically wise, since it gave the Copts a claim to having their own Gospel—it was a leaf of this tractate showing this (secondary) title, translated *The Gospel of the...*

---


427 From a copy of the typeset of the page facing the title page:

Publié avec le concours de la Commission des Fouilles Archéologiques.

428 The galley proof of the last two pages of *The Gospel of the Egyptians* (III, 68–69) bears at the top, written by hand, this list of recipients.

429 A handwritten note initialed by Doresse and dated January 1977 is entitled:


There is a further underlined note:

secondes épreuves, janvier 1952.

This is followed by a further note:

texte établi par Togo Mina et J. Doresse.
Egyptians, that was for years the only leaf on public display at the Coptic Museum. The original title, *The Holy Book of the Great Invisible Spirit*, was of course played down. And since no one on the staff of the Coptic Museum could read Coptic well enough to translate the tractate, it would not be noticed that the tractate was not actually a Gospel.

Doresse maintained that first proofs of III,5, *The Dialogue of the Savior*, were also prepared as early as 1952. Included with the proofs he gave me in January 1977 are his notes to document the ultimate outcome:  

At that date [January 1952] the Imprimerie Nationale had already established the first composition of the Coptic text of the *Dialogue of the Savior*—a composition of which we have the proofs.

In 1964–1965 we had asked permission to publish this *Dialogue of the Savior* in the *Journal Asiatique*, much as we were just publishing the *Gospel of the Egyptians*. But the “lead” [type] established by the Imprimerie Nationale could not—it seems—be found!

But the proofs Doresse gave me serve to document the problems inherent in the situation: Ultimately type was set for the transcription and translation of III,1, III,2, and over half of III,5. But the transcription of page 18 from III,1, *The Apocryphon of John*, presents a wrong letter in line 4; line 16 is omitted by oversight; a letter is missing in line 17 of Till’s transcription from P.Berol. 8502 in a second critical apparatus. The proofs of the last two pages, 68–69, of III,2, *The Gospel of the Egyptians*, present a wrong letter each in 68, 2; 68, 10; and 69, 16. There are also proofs of the transcription of the first half of *The Dialogue of the Savior* (III, 120–133). But proofs of the last half of *The Dialogue of the Savior* (III, 134–147) are not present. As a result, it cannot be ascertained whether the half of one leaf (III, 145/146) discovered in fragments at Yale University by Stephen Emmel had already been separated from the codex. In any case, the proofs of III, 120–133

---

430 177: Note from Doresse to Robinson:


contain a transcription that is only a very rough first draft, in comparison with the *editio princeps*.\textsuperscript{432}

In 1958 Doresse asserted that Codex III had been ready for years to go to press;\textsuperscript{433}

... and, lastly, my critical edition of the first codex [Codex III]—that which Togo Mina so happily acquired—has been ready for several years, and is only awaiting the good pleasure of the Egyptian authorities to be sent to the press.

Yet the evidence at hand indicates that a critical edition of Codex III was never really ready to go to press.

*The Sequestration of the Tano-Dattari Collection*

Doresse had first seen the bulk of the Nag Hammadi Codices in an apartment of the antiquities shop of Tano, where they were kept in a valise belonging to Maria Dattari;\textsuperscript{434}

After having received a letter from Tano inviting Jean to come examine the manuscripts (without it being very clear if they are Tano’s or if he represents Mlle Dattari), we embark around 20 October 1948 for Alexandria …

… we go see Tano in his shop, where he leads us to an apartment, where he takes from a valise the manuscripts. …

During the two weeks that the examination of the papyri lasts, we are in the euphoria of discoveries that Jean makes as the work goes on, as he runs through the leaves (which nevertheless he is not at all permitted to copy). Generally, in the afternoons, Tano calls us and brings out a codex that he entrusts to us. …

Once this summary ‘reading’ of the codices is terminated, Tano returns the treasure to the residence of Mlle Dattari, in Garden City, where she lived in a baroque villa built by her father. … It is to her that belonged the famous valise where the papyri were kept.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{433} Doresse, *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte*, 143:

Enfin, j’ai préparé, depuis plusieurs années déjà, l’édition critique du premier codex—celui dont Togo Mina avait si heureusement fait l’acquisition—et ce travail dont la publication a été retardée par les événements, n’attend que le bon plaisir des autorités égyptiennes pour être mis à l’impression.

\textsuperscript{434} Marianne Doresse: *Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte* (see Part 2 above).
\end{flushright}
The material in the valise was put under seal for the duration of the negotiations with the Egyptian government, though Maria Dattari was initially permitted to keep the valise in her home: 435

II. The second lot of manuscripts, which seems tied to the first codex [Codex III], and also to come from Chénoboskion, was in 1948 in the home of Mlle Dattari, whom I could convince to show it to me, then to offer the manuscripts for purchase to the Coptic Museum, especially qualified to hold them. Togo Mina then asked me to prepare a scientific expertise of them, on the basis of the very complete study that meanwhile I had made of them. Then this expertise, signed with my name and countersigned by him and by Drioton, was presented to the Council of the Museum at the beginning of 1949. In order to prevent the discovery from escaping Egypt as a result of the numerous covetousnesses that it could arouse, Togo Mina decides (1°) that the papyri would be put under seal until the end of the negotiations that had begun; (2°) that the expertise established by me would immediately be published. This publication, edited in such a way as not to infringe on the rights of the owner by detailed citations, would nonetheless serve to assure us first rights of discovery in case circumstances permitted the manuscripts to escape.

Early in 1949 the valise was brought to the Coptic Museum, where its contents were shown to its Purchase Committee. Then it was returned to the valise and to the home of Maria Dattari: 436

Finally the day set for the Purchase Committee arrives: the 19th (or the 20th?) February [N. 13: It was the morning of this same 17 February 1949!], very early, we go look for the valise at the residence of Mlle Dattari and take it to the Coptic Museum, where, in the office of Togo, a show-case is prepared. I unpack the codices that Jean installs in the show-case. ...

The decision of the Committee was that one could not decide on the purchase before knowing if the Egyptian Government would be in a position to pay their price. One will submit the matter to the Minister of Education (perhaps already Aly Ayoub?), who, with the maximum of funds at his disposal, will negotiate with the owner or owners to complete the purchase. The asking price was 60,000 £É. Then we returned the valise to Miss Dattari.

Already by May 1951 the valise had been moved from the home of Maria Dattari to the office of the Abbot Drioton, from which it was moved to the safe of the Service des Antiquités: 437

---

435 1950: Jean Doresse: “Les papyrus gnostiques provenant de Hamra-Doum (Chénoboskion) comprennent deux lots différents posant des problèmes distincts” (see Part 2 above).
436 Marianne Doresse: Deuxième Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte (see Part 2 above).
437 21 v 51: Letter from Doresse to Puech:
The manuscripts themselves have moved from the office of Drioton to the safe of the Service des Antiquités.

Then early in 1952 the valise was reopened to verify the condition of the papyri, and again entrusted to the Abbot Drioton for safekeeping.\footnote{Marianne Doresse: 5e mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte (see Part 2 above).}

On 2 February 1952, one decides to verify the good conservation of the papyri. Mlle Dattari and Tano bring the valise to the Service des Antiquités where it is opened, in the office of the Abbot. Then, with the written agreement of Mlle Dattari and Tano, the valise is sealed and entrusted to the Abbot Drioton to guard.

But on the 8th or 9th of May 1952 Doresse left Egypt for France, without having achieved a solution that could again give him access to the codices. Instead, what Doresse most feared promptly happened: By order number 10730 of the Ministry of Public Instruction issued on 12 May 1952, the Tano-Dattari collection was requisitioned. On 8 June 1952 it was deposited in the Coptic Museum, where it was registered on 9 June as items 1–11 in the General Registry of the Coptic Museum and in a new Special Registry for Manuscripts.\footnote{9 vi 52: Letter from Drioton to Doresse:}

On that same day Drioton wrote Doresse what had taken place:

And then, my dear Jean, you had hardly left, when the Minister made the decision to requisition the Gnostic papyri. How I would have wished that you...
would have been here to supervise the movement, and Pahor also as well! The
Minister charged us, him and me, with the execution, me to deliver the *corpus
delicti* and him to receive it in the name of the Coptic Museum. Given the
terms of the decree, I had nothing to discuss. All this, while knowing quite well
that Taha [Hussein] had not wanted that. But Taha is no longer here. Hence I
delivered yesterday to Pahor the sealed valise, in good and due form. It is now
necessary that Pahor convene the Committee of Appraisal. According to the
new law, it must be composed of an Under-Secretary of State as President (this
will be Sadek Gohar Pacha), the Chief Conservator of the Museum involved,
and two of his adjunct conservators, plus an expert. If you had been here,
you would have been the quite obvious expert, and the one whom Pahor
would have wanted to have. Now I really fear lest they come down to me. But
then it will be necessary to hurry, for in 15 days I too will have bolted. If this
Committee is postponed until October, then, my old Jean, you will not be cut
out!

On 15 June 1952 Drioton again wrote the Doresses:

> As I wrote you, I had to release the papyri to put them in the Coptic Museum,
not without having tried to terrorize Pahor with regard to the responsibilities
that he was assuming before the scholarly world. Perhaps I have in part
succeeded, for, since one does not talk about the Committee of Appraisal in
spite of my quite imminent departure (I have here no more than 5 useful days
left), I suppose that Pahor does not want to do anything, as I advised him,
before your return. He feels lost without you.

But the deposition of King Farouk on 23 July 1952 meant that everything
in Egypt was suspended until order could be restored under a government
that would be ready and able to function normally, all of which left the
Tano-Dattari collection inaccessible.

Doresse has explained his non-involvement at this time as follows:

> C'est alors que la valise dans laquelle les précieux manuscrits étaient enfermés depuis
1949 quitta enfin le Service des Antiquités pour le Musée Copte où un directeur avait
enfin été nommé: le Dr. Pahor Labib. Allait-on désormais ouvrir ce précieux paquet,
étudier en détail son contenu et, cela, sans trop se soucier d'un procès que Mlle.
Dattari, spoliée et se jugeant sans doute aussi dupée, intentait au gouvernement? Oui,
Only then did the handbag which had imprisoned the precious manuscripts since 1949, at last leave the Service of Antiquities for the Coptic Museum, to which a director had at last been nominated—Dr. Pahor Labib. Did they now mean to open the priceless package, study its contents in detail, and all this regardless of the lawsuit which Miss Dattari, despoiled and indeed doubtless regarding herself as swindled, was bringing against the government? Yes, but this solution was so brutal and unexpected, that it came just as I was returning to France [for the summer]. Nor could I get back to Egypt before autumn. The ensuing weeks were unexpectedly filled by the Destiny that placed there ... the Egyptian revolution.

The situation resulting from the depositing of the Tano-Dattari collection in the Coptic Museum was made evident in published interviews with Pahor Labib and Maria Dattari:

mais cette solution était si brutale et inattendue que je venais, justement, de quitter l’Égypte pour la France. Il ne pouvait être question (les crédits nécessaires ne me furent accordés qu’avec un certain délai) de répartir en Égypte avant l’automne. Les semaines qui s’ouvrirent alors furent remarquablement occupées par le Destin qui y plaça ... la révolution égyptienne.

The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, 124; The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Texts, 95–96.

443 12 vii 52: Gabriel Boktor, La Bourse Égyptienne:

Le ministre de l’Instruction publique d’alors, Me. Aly Ayoub bey, à qui le comité du Musée d’Art Copte avait soumis le cas, en avait débattu le prix avec la dame en question.

Cette dernière qui nous a demandé de respecter son anonymat en avait demandé 60,000 livres. Après diverses expertises et transactions, on était tombé d’accord pour le prix de 45,000 livres égyptiennes.

Toutefois, la commission d’achat, chargée d’évaluer ce précieux document, avait trouvé le prix exorbitant et avait refusé de le sanctionner. Elle appuyait sa décision sur le fait que le Musée Copte du Caire possédait déjà une partie de cette collection, et qu’il l’avait achetée à des marchands d’antiquités à un prix relativement minime. ... 

—Qu’il nous suffise de dire que d’après les lois en vigueur, tout objet antique trouvé dans le sous-sol égyptien, sans autorisation préalable de fouilles, est la propriété de la nation égyptienne. Or, dans le cas qui nous intéresse, ces papyrus proviennent de fouilles clandestines. La partie qui est en possession du Musée Copte a été achetée à un prix très raisonnable, je puis dire dérisoire comparativement à celui qui a été accepté par l’ancien ministère pour les ouvrages en question.

Ayant examiné le rapport dressé par la commission d’achat qui s’était refusée à ratifier le prix demandé de 45,000 livres, le Dr. Taha Hussein pache, se trouvant après Me. Aly Ayoub bey à la tête du ministère de l’Instruction Publique, s’opposa à son tour à la transaction sur cette base.

Le ministère soutint en effet que ce sont des pièces rares trouvées dans le sol égyptien et qu’il a le devoir d’en prendre possession puisqu’il n’avait pas été avisé en son temps de leur découverte. ...
The Minister of Public Instruction at the time, Minister Ali Ayoub Bey, to whom the Committee of the Museum of Coptic Art had submitted the case, had debated its price with the lady in question.

The latter, who has asked us to respect her anonymity, had asked for them 60,000 £. After various expertises and transactions, one had reached agreement on the price of 45,000 £.

Nonetheless, the Purchase Commission, charged with evaluating this precious document, had found the price exorbitant, and had refused to sanction it. It based its decision on the fact that the Coptic Museum of Cairo already possessed a part of this collection, and that it had purchased it from merchants of antiquities at a relatively minimal price. ...

[A quotation from Pahor Labib] Let it suffice for us to say that, according to the laws in force, every antique object found beneath the surface of Egyptian soil, without prior authorization for excavations, is the property of the Egyptian nation. Now, in the case that interests us, these papyri come from clandestine excavations. The part that is in the possession of the Coptic Museum has been purchased for a very reasonable, I might even say ridiculous, price, compared to that which was agreed upon by the former Ministry for the works in question.

Having examined the report prepared by the Purchase Commission that had refused to ratify the price demanded, 45,000 £, Dr. Taha Hussein Pacha, at the head of the Ministry of Public Instruction after Minister Ali Ayoub Bey, opposed for his part the transaction on this basis.

The Ministry maintains, in effect, that these are rare pieces found in the soil of Egypt, and that it has the duty to take possession of them, since it had not been notified of their discovery at the time. ...

“I offered them honestly to the Ministry of Public Instruction,” she tells us. “If it does not wish to give me a price equivalent to their rarity and their archaeological importance, let it return them to me.”

———

Je les ai honnêtement proposés au ministère de l’Instruction Publique, nous dit-elle. S’il ne veut pas m’en donner un prix équivalent à leur rareté et leur importance archéologique, qu’il me les rende.

Aux dernières nouvelles, les fameux papyrus gnostiques ... ont été réquisitionnés par le gouvernement égyptien et consignés au Musée Copte pour faire partie de sa collection, quitte à fixer plus tard, par une commission spéciale, le prix à offrir à titre de dédommagement à la propriétaire.

Quelle sera la réaction de la dame italienne? Fera-t-elle appel au Conseil d’État? Interrogée à ce sujet, elle nous a répondu que, pour l’instant, elle n’a pas encore pris de décision. Mais que, le moment venu, elle ne manquera pas de rompre son anonymat ou de prier son avocat, Me. Aly Ayoub bey, ancien ministre de l’Instruction Publique, qui a pris cette affaire en main, de nous accorder un entretien qui nous permettra d’entendre l’autre son de cloche.
According to the most recent news, the famous Gnostic papyri ... have been requisitioned by the Egyptian government and consigned to the Coptic Museum, to become part of its collection, subject to fixing later, through a special commission, the price to offer by way of indemnification to the owner.

What will be the reaction of the Italian lady? Will she appeal to the Council of State? Interrogated on this point, she replied to us that, for the moment, she has not yet made a decision—but that, when the time comes, she will not fail to break her anonymity or to ask her lawyer, Minister Ali Ayoub Bey, former Minister of Public Instruction, who has taken this affair in hand, to accord us an interview that will permit us to hear the other tone of the bell.

Since Maria Dattari had reached agreement with Ali Ayoub Bey when he was the Minister of Public Instruction, she had engaged him as her attorney to support her in her claim, over against his successor, Taha Hussein Pacha, who had revoked that agreement before it could be implemented, and had simply nationalized the codices.

The Swiss ambassador to Egypt, Beat von Fischer-Reichenbach, representing the Jung Institute of Zürich, obtained from Ali Ayoub a letter reporting on the situation two years later:

---

Le 12 mai 1952 le Ministre de l’Instruction Publique avait en effet promulgué un arrêté ordonnant la séquestration des documents précités et leur mise en dépôt au Musée Copte.

En principe, l’arrêté ordonnant la séquestration émanant du Ministre compétent transfère la propriété de ces manuscrits de Mlle Dattari au Ministère de l’Instruction Publique. La loi sur les antiquités stipule cependant que l’arrêté de séquestration sera suivi par les délibérations d’une commission spéciale qui établit la compensation équitable due à la propriétaire des documents. Cette dernière a le droit d’accepter cette évaluation ou d’y faire opposition en intendant un procès devant les tribunaux. Nous regrettons de dire que cette commission ne s’est pas réunie jusqu’aujourd’hui; elle n’a donc jamais émis une décision quant à la compensation due à la propriétaire des documents. Mlle Dattari considère par conséquent que l’arrêté ordonnant la séquestration est entaché de vice, ce qui lui enlève son caractère d’ordonnance ministérielle et le transforme en décision arbitraire. Elle a soumis le cas au Conseil d’État, demandant l’annulation de l’arrêté ordonnant la séquestration. L’affaire est encore pendante devant le contentieux administratif; une séance pour le plaidoyer n’a pas encore été fixée. Mlle Dattari a mis le Ministère de l’Instruction Publique en garde contre toute publication concernant les documents ou les copies de ces documents avant que le jugement dans le procès susmentionné n’ait été rendu. Avant que le jugement dans l’affaire soulevée devant le contentieux administratif du Conseil d’État ne soit rendu, il est impossible de considérer que la propriété des manuscrits soit définitivement revenue à Mlle Dattari. La propriété reste au contraire répartie entre Mlle Dattari et le Ministère de l’Instruction Publique.
On 12 May 1952 the Ministry of Public Instruction had indeed promulgated a decision ordering the sequestration of the said documents and their deposit at the Coptic Museum.

In principle, the decision ordering the sequestration, coming from the competent Ministry, transfers the property of these documents of Mlle Dattari to the Ministry of Public Instruction. The law on antiquities stipulates however that the decision of sequestration will be followed by the deliberations of a special commission that will establish the equitable compensation due to the owner of the documents. The latter has the right to accept this evaluation or to oppose it by submitting a procedure before the courts. We regret to say that this commission has not met up to today. Hence it has never submitted a decision as to the compensation due to the owner of these documents. Mlle Dattari considers as a result that the decision ordering the sequestration is tainted with vice, which removes from it its character of ministerial ordinance and transforms it into an arbitrary decision. She has submitted the case to the Council of State, demanding that the ruling ordering the sequestration be annulled. The affair is still pending before the administrative litigation office [of the Council of State]. A meeting for the presentation of the defense has not yet been scheduled. Mlle Dattari has put the Ministry of Public Instruction on guard against any publication concerning the documents or copies of these documents before the judgment in the above-mentioned process is rendered. Before the judgment in the affair raised before the administrative litigation office of the Council of State is rendered, it is impossible to consider that the ownership of the manuscripts has returned definitively to Mlle Dattari. The ownership remains on the contrary contested between Mlle Dattari and the Ministry of Public Instruction.

This long drawn-out litigation explains why the texts did not become available to scholarship prior to the meeting of the International Committee of Gnosticism in October 1956 (see Chapter 6, Part 2 below).

Maria Dattari also went to Luxor to meet Rāghib Andarāwus al-Qiss ʿAbd al-Sayyid, who had shown his codex (Codex III) to the Coptic Museum, only to see it requisitioned with a compensation to him of only £ 250 (see Chapter 1, Part 3 above). She inquired of him if he would make with her a joint legal proceeding against the government for the confiscation of their codices. Rāghib consulted an attorney, who told him he could not win such a case. Hence he declined to get involved.445

445 7 xii 75: Interview with Rāghib.
The Gospel of Thomas and P.Oxy. 654 and P.Oxy. 1

Doresse wrote Puech on his return from Egypt to Paris on 29 May 1952, and on 3 June 1952 Puech replied, setting an appointment for 7 June 1952 to gain access to Codex III:

Bring, I ask of you, in whatever condition it may be, the complete manuscript of the first volume of the edition of the papyri of N[ag] H[ammadi] [Codex III].

Later that summer Doresse supplied Puech also with some material from II,2, The Gospel of Thomas. For on 29 July 1952 Puech wrote Doresse announcing that he had identified there P.Oxy. 654 and P.Oxy. 1, which for him gave priority to The Gospel of Thomas over everything else from Nag Hammadi.

---

446 3 vi 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:
Apportez, je vous prie, en quelque état qu’il soit, le manuscrit complet du premier volume de l’édition des papyrus de N.H.

447 29 vii 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:
De retour chez moi, quelques heures après notre entrevue, j’ai pu rapidement découvrir le texte grec de tout le début et d’un des passages suivants de l’Évangile de Thomas et la traduction latine d’un autre morceau du même écrit. Le texte grec est conservé, plus ou moins mutilé, par deux papyrus distincts; la version latine est fournie, sans indication de source, par un opuscule gnostique ou, en tout cas, anti-biblique que réfute saint Augustin.

À la suite de ces premières constatations, le document retrouvé à Nag-Hammadi prend un intérêt considérable, prodigieux même. C’est toute la question des logia (ou, plus exactement, des logoi) de Jésus qui va être remise en jeu, renouvelée et, sans doute, en grande partie résolue. De là à reprendre le problème de la composition des Évangiles canoniques et à revenir sur les travaux de la Formgeschichtliche Schule, il n’y a qu’un pas. L’Évangile de Thomas (si l’on doit conserver ce titre à notre texte) exige, avant d’être édité dans la collection générale des recueils de Khénoboskion, la publication d’une série de travaux préalables et même, me semble-t-il, d’un ouvrage particulier, à faire paraître le plus tôt possible. Encore une fois, à propos de cet écrit comme de tous les autres, il faut absolument obtenir le droit d’utiliser et de citer les textes découverts dans notre enseignement, nos conférences et nos articles. Je regrette même qu’il soit trop tard (ou trop tôt) pour faire connaître les premiers résultats de ma découverte au prochain Congrès de Papyrologie: la communication n’aurait pas manqué de faire sensation. Il s’agit, en effet, de textes et de problèmes qui ont donné lieu à une surabondante bibliographie et dont, je crois, nous tenons aujourd’hui la clef. De toute façon, il convient de prendre rang au plus tôt, de signaler “officiellement” dans le plus bref délai au monde savant des faits lourds de conséquences et de ne pas laisser à d’autres le mérite de le faire. ...

Tout ceci me persuade que, parallèlement à la préparation de l’édition du volume du Musée du Caire, nous devons faire porter tous nos efforts sur le recueil III de mon classement et en entreprendre la publication immédiate: c’est certainement une des pièces les plus importantes, si non la pièce capitale, de la découverte.
On my return home, some hours after our interview, I was rapidly able to
discover the Greek text of all the beginning, and of one of the subsequent
passages, of the Gospel of Thomas, and the Latin translation of another bit
of the same text. The Greek text is conserved, more or less mutilated, in two
distinct papyri [P.Oxy. 654; P.Oxy. 1]; the Latin version is provided, without an
indication of the source, by a tract that is Gnostic, or, in any case, anti-biblical,
which St. Augustine refutes.

As a result of these first observations, the document found at Nag Hammadi
assumes an interest that is considerable, even prodigious. The whole question
of the logia (or, more exactly, the logos) of Jesus is what is going to be brought
into play, renewed, and, without doubt, in large part resolved. From there, it
is only one step to resume the problem of the composition of the canonical
Gospels, and to return to the works of the Formgeschichtliche Schule. The
Gospel of Thomas (if one is to retain this title for our text) requires, before
being edited in the general collection of the volumes of Khénoboskion, the
publication of a series of preliminary essays, and even, it seems to me, a
separate work, to have it appear as soon as possible. Once again, regarding this
text, as all the others, it is absolutely necessary to obtain the right to use and
quote the discovered texts, in our teaching, our conferences, and our articles. I
even regret that it is too late (or too early) to make known the first results of my
discovery at the next Congress of Papyrology. The communication would not
have failed to create a sensation. It has to do, in effect, with texts and problems
that have given rise to a super-abundant bibliography, and for which, I believe,
we today hold the key. In any case, it is fitting to assume one's position as soon
as possible, to signal to the scholarly world 'officially,' with the least possible
delay, the facts heavy with consequences, and not to let others have the merit
of doing it.

All this persuades me that, parallel to the preparation of the edition of the
volume of the Museum of Cairo [Codex III], we should put all our efforts on
collection III of my classification [= Codex II], and undertake its immediate
publication. This is certainly one of the most important pieces, if not the
capital piece, in the discovery.

In the same letter Puech asked Doresse to bring him photographs or tran-
scriptions of II,2 and II,7, and draft translations of the parts of II,2 parallel to
the two Oxyrhynchus papyri, as well as translations of samples of II,7. Hav-
ing received no response from Doresse, Puech wrote again on 3 August 1952,
disturbed by the news from Egypt.\footnote{3 viii 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:}

\begin{quote}
Il est cependant urgent, plus urgent que jamais, que nous nous rencontrions. La
nouvelle de l’interdiction faite à M. l’abbé Drioton de revenir en Égypte bouleverse
tous nos plans et risque fort de signifier la ruine de tous nos espoirs. Votre projet
\end{quote}
It is however urgent, more urgent than ever, that we meet. The news of the interdiction for Abbot Drioton to return to Egypt overthrows all our plans, and strongly risks meaning the ruin of all our hopes. Your project of a mission itself seems compromised. Hence we have to examine afresh the situation and envisage what can be done, if we want to save what can still be saved.

Doresse wrote Puech on 24 August 1952, offering to send him transcriptions and translations of *The Gospel of Thomas* (II,2), *The Book of Thomas* (II,7), and *The Apocryphon of John* (III,1) together with proofs of Till’s edition of P.Berol. 8502, an offer that Puech readily accepted:

I would indeed be very happy to receive here the text and the translation of the *Gospel* and of the *Book of Thomas*, and I thank you for your offer. This month of September is the last when I can still enjoy some leisure and examine these documents in a relaxed way. Moreover the hypotheses that I formed a month ago have ripened in my mind, and the *Gospel of Thomas* would from now on seem to be a collection of the *Logia* of Jesus. It has been easy for me to discover new allusions to this text that up to now have passed unnoticed. One can, in particular, determine that the *Gospel* is prior to the *Acts of Thomas*. The piece seems to me more and more important, both in itself and in relation to the problem, so unnecessarily complicated, of the ‘sayings of Jesus.’ But, before expressing myself more decidedly, I would need to know completely, and in their [gen]erality, the texts in question, and to be in the clear on the relations that the *Gospel* and the *Book [of Thomas]* may have between them.

But Puech received only a summary of the texts he had requested from Doresse, and hence replied:

---

27 viii 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Je serait en effet très heureux de recevoir ici le texte et la traduction de l’Évangile et du *Livre de Thomas* et vous remercie de votre proposition. Ce mois de septembre est le dernier où je puisse encore jouir de quelque loisir et examiner ces documents à tête reposée. Les hypothèses que j’avais formées il y a un mois l’ont d’ailleurs mûries dans mon esprit, et l’Évangile de Thomas apparaîtrait désormais comme un recueil des Logia de Jésus. Il m’a été facile de découvrir de nouvelles allusions à cet écrit, passées jusqu’ici inaperçues. On peut, en particulier, établir que l’Évangile est antérieur au *Actes de Thomas*. La pièce me semble de plus en plus importante, et en elle-même et par rapport au problème, si inutilement compliqué, des “dits de Jésus.” Mais, avant de me prononcer plus décidé, il me faudrait connaître entièrement et dans leur [gén]éralité les textes en question, et être au clair sur les rapports que l’Évangile et le *Livre* peuvent soutenir entre eux.

7 ix 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:
But I do not think that I am in a position to make known the first results of this research before having in hand the entire text both of the Gospel and especially the Book of Thomas. Actually, I do not know if the summary of these texts is complete in the form that you transmitted it to me.

Yet Puech wrote excitedly to Gilles Quispel:

There are in it some sensational pieces that I have immediately identified.

The ultimate publication of The Gospel of Thomas by Puech and Quispel, to the exclusion of Doresse, would seem to be already in view (see Chapter 7 below).

The Photographs of Doresse

Puech was persistent in his effort to get from Doresse whatever photographs Doresse had of the Nag Hammadi texts. Puech himself could not have made use of the photographs, since he did not read Coptic, but would have been able to use them to replace Doresse with someone in whom he had more confidence. Doresse no doubt sensed this, which may be why he did not supply them.

Puech was never quite certain that he had received all the photographs of Doresse. Even at the first meeting of the International Committee for

---

451 29 ix 52: Letter from Puech to Gilles Quispel:

Il y a là-dedans quelques pièces sensationnelles que j’ai identifiées immédiatement.

the Nag Hammadi Codices in Cairo in December 1970, Puech called on me, as Permanent Secretary of the Committee, to develop a friendship with Doresse so as to secure from him his photographs. Though we had never met, the friendship was established in the Doresses’ Paris apartment, and Doresse did turn in all the photographs he had. They were very important in producing The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices, since inscribed edges of lacunae were visible on the photographs that had subsequently been broken off from the papyrus itself (see Chapter 11, Part 4 below). His photographs consisted of far less than all the pages of the Nag Hammadi texts. But they did for a time serve his purpose of keeping Puech dependent on him, and thus maintaining at least a superficial (and subservient) collaboration.

7. The Consequences of the Egyptian Revolution of 23 July 1952

The Dismissal of Drioton

Drioton was of course the key person in Egypt in terms of French interests. Doresse emphasized this in a letter of 15 July 1952 to Puech:

I share your uneasiness in what has to do with editing the new documents. Nonetheless I must say that, as long as the valise that contains them remains sealed, and as long as Drioton is at the head of the Service des Antiquités, we do not have to fear that one accepts other editors than ourselves. I have had, on this topic, certain and precise news.

But a coup d’état was launched on 23 July, elevating Gen. Mohammad Naguib to the head of government instead of King Farouk.

Tano became very embittered as a result of the dismissal of King Farouk, since Drioton had assured him that he could not lose out if he would entrust the codices to him, since his friend King Farouk would if necessary intervene.

---

453 15 vii 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je partage vos inquiétudes en ce qui concerne l’édition des nouveaux documents. Je dois dire cependant que, tant que la valise qui les contient reste scellée, et tant que Mr. Drioton est à la tête du Service des Antiquités, nous n’avons pas à craindre que l’on accepte d’autres éditeurs que nous. J’ai eu, à ce sujet, des nouvelles sûres et précises.

454 “Egypt,” Encyclopaedia Britannica, 8: 89.

455 19 xii 71: My interview with Tano in his antiquities shop, to which I was taken by Søren Giversen.
Then a fortnight later the news came that Drioton could not return to Egypt, which of course changed everything:456

It is however urgent, more urgent than ever, that we meet with each other. The news of Drioton being prohibited from returning to Egypt overturns all our plans, and strongly risks indicating the ruin of all our hopes. Your proposal for a mission seems itself compromised. It is hence necessary for us to examine the situation anew, and to envisage what can be done, if we want to save what can still be saved.

But Doresse, on hearing the same bad news, argued on his own behalf that they would nonetheless somehow be able to continue:457

I have read in the newspapers that Drioton, inscribed on the ‘list’ of former friends of the King, could not return to Egypt. I do not believe that it is necessary to attach great importance to this news. There will be, between now and October, many changes in Egyptian politics. Archaeology has always been protected by the King, and one cannot make trouble on that account to all those that he supported. I do not doubt that Egyptian personalities who are currently well-placed will on their own have suppressed the name of the Abbot from this ‘black list’ where it has been put.

But Puech replied that Drioton had made declarations to the press at the time of the revolution that provoked a ‘tumult,’ which raised for Drioton the question whether he should return to Cairo in the fall:458

456 3 viii 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:
Il est cependant urgent, plus urgent que jamais, que nous nous rencontrions. La nouvelle de l’interdiction faite à M. Drioton de revenir en Égypte bouleverse tous nos plans et risque fort de signifier la ruine de tous nos espoirs. Votre projet de mission paraît lui-même compromis. Il nous faut donc examiner à nouveau la situation et envisager ce qu’il y a lieu de faire si nous voulons sauver ce qui peut l’être encore.

457 4 viii 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech:
J’ai lu dans les journaux que M. Drioton, inscrit sur la “liste” des anciens amis du Roi, ne pourrait rentrer en Égypte. Je ne crois pas qu’il faille attacher grande importance à cette nouvelle. Il y aura, d’ici octobre, bien des changements dans la politique égyptienne. L’archéologie a été toujours protégée par le Roi et l’on ne peut faire grief de cela à tous ceux qu’il a appuyés. Je ne doute pas que des personnalités égyptiennes actuellement bien placées, ne fassent supprimer d’elles-mêmes le nom de l’Abbé de cette “liste noire” où il a été porté.

458 27 viii 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:
Un point grave: les papyrus achetés sont sous scellés personnels dans le cabinet de M. Drioton. Celui-ci, s’il revient au Caire, n’y sera pas avant la mi-octobre au plus tôt. En son absence, il vous sera impossible d’accéder aux manuscrits. N’y a-t-il pas,
A serious point: The purchased papyri are under personal seal in the office of Drioton. He, if he returns to Cairo, will not be there before mid-October at the earliest. In his absence, it will be impossible for you to gain access to the manuscripts. Besides, is it not to be suspected that they have already been or will soon be recuperated by the Egyptian Government? And if Drioton does not return to Egypt? The question should be clarified before your departure.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, some representatives of which I met in August, hopes that Drioton will agree to resume his functions for one more year, once the tumult provoked by his declarations to the press subside. But the Abbot, under the influence of those around him, was very hesitant. I regret, in any case, his silence with regard to you.

Drioton then wrote Puech that he would not return to Cairo, whereupon Puech raised the question with Doresse as to what their next steps should be:

---

7 ix 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

J’ai reçu une lettre de M. le chanoine Drioton, qui me confirme qu’il se refuse à revenir au Caire. Nous voilà donc réduits à agir seuls et à agir vite. Ce que vous me dites du transfert des papyrus du cabinet de l’abbé au Musée Copte n’est pas sans m’inquiéter. Il faut prendre les devants, et je vous propose la démarche suivante, sur laquelle j’ai demandé à M. Drioton son avis et aimerais avoir le vôtre: vous écririez à Pahor Labib (s’il est vraiment le grand maître de l’affaire) pour lui faire approuver la constitution immédiate d’un comité de publication ou d’édition de tous les papyrus acquis par le Gouvernement Égyptien, comité composé de lui (en cas où vous ne pouvez faire autrement), de vous, de moi-même et, comme vous me le proposez, de Guillaumont. J’aurais bien voulu aussi y voir figurer Malinine. Peut-être même pourriez-vous n’avancer que les trois premiers noms, à charge pour nous de recruter par de suite d’autres collaborateurs. Il serait bien entendu que, seuls, les membres de ce Comité, auraient à leur disposition les manuscrits et assumeraient la responsabilité de diriger et de mener à bien l’édition.

Si Pahor Labib accepte et vous donne avant votre départ une réponse offrant toutes les “garanties officielles,” ce serait un grand point d’acquis. Il est toujours à craindre que d’autres offres de publication se surgissent en novembre ou même d’ici là.

Pour cette même raison, je vous engagerais à vous rendre au Caire vers le mi-octobre plutôt qu’au début de novembre, ainsi que vous me l’écrivez.

De toute façon, maintenant que M. l’abbé Drioton ne peut plus compter dans le jeu,
I have received a letter from Canon Drioton, who confirms to me that he refuses to return to Cairo. There we are, then, reduced to acting alone and acting quickly. What you tell me of the transferring of the papyri from the office of the Abbot to the Coptic Museum does not fail to disturb me. It is necessary to take proactive measures, and I propose to you the following procedure, about which I have asked Drioton his view, and would like to have yours: You would write to Pahor Labib (if he really is the grand master of the affair) to have him approve immediately the constitution of a committee of publication or edition of all the papyri acquired by the Egyptian government, a committee composed of him (in case you cannot do otherwise), of you, of myself, and, as you propose to me, of Guillaumont. I would have also wished to see listed there Malinine. Perhaps indeed you could only propose the three first names, with a charge for us to recruit subsequently other collaborators. It would be clearly understood that only the members of this Committee would have the manuscripts at their disposal, and would assume the responsibility of directing the edition and leading it for the good.

If Pahor Labib accepts, and gives you before your departure [from France] a reply offering all the ‘official guarantees,’ this would be a grand point achieved. It is always to be feared that other offers of publication arise in November or even between now and then.

For this same reason I would engage you to return to Cairo toward the middle of October rather than at the beginning of November, as you write proposing to me.

In any case, now that Abbot Drioton can no longer count in the affair, inform me of the way in which you envisage acting, once you arrive in Egypt, and of the chances for success that we have left. ...

I am happy to have received from Drioton the assurance that from now on you and I can make known or publish the results of our preliminary research on the Gnostic papyri now acquired.

As early as 3 August 1952 Puech had heard of the interdiction for Drioton to return to Cairo. Hence Drioton was in effect no longer in office when he gave this authorization on 7 September 1952, so that it actually had no force.

fixez-moi sur la façon dont vous envisagez d’agir, une fois arrivé en Égypte, et sur les chances de réussir qui nous restent. ...

Je suis heureux d’avoir reçu de M. Drioton l’assurance que, vous et moi, nous pouvons désormais faire connaître ou publier les résultats de nos recherches préliminaires sur les papyrus gnostiques maintenant acquis.
The Last Trips of Doresse to Egypt

Doresse had applied over the summer of 1952 for funding to return to Cairo in the autumn to conserve the codices. But in view of the revolution that had taken place, Puech wrote Doresse shortly thereafter:

I remind you that in the eyes of the C[entre] N[ational de la] R[echerche] S[cientifique], such a task, whose expenses will again be provided by France, could not be carried on for the sole benefit of the Egyptians, and must signify that the publication of the papyri will be entrusted to French scholars.

On 27 November 1952 Puech wrote Doresse that he had resolved the administrative and financial delays in Doresse's departure for Egypt:

Everything necessary should be done this morning, at the business office itself, which has been alerted, and has agreed to forward to you by postal check, I believe, the agreed-on amount next Monday or Tuesday. It is necessary to count on a maximum of eight days for the formalities of receiving it, but it can also be possible that you receive the check earlier. In any case, you can envisage your departure in the week that follows the 8th December. The earlier, to repeat, the better.

Doresse's departure for Egypt actually became possible only on 31 December 1952. The sixth mission of Doresse to Egypt was limited to January 1953 and half of February (see Part 2 above).

Doresse sent Puech a discouraging report from Cairo, justifying in effect his transfer to Ethiopia:

---

460 27 viii 62: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Je vous rappelle qu’aux yeux du CNRS, un tel travail, dont les frais seront une fois de plus couverts par la France, ne saurait être amené au seul bénéfice des Égyptiens et doit signifier que la publication des papyrus sera confiée à des savants français.

461 27 xi 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Tout le nécessaire doit être fait ce matin même auprès du service comptable, qui a été alerté et s’est engagé à vous verser par chèque postal, je crois, la somme convenue lundi ou mardi prochain. Il faut compter huit jours au maximum pour les formalités de réception, mais il se peut aussi que vous receviez le chèque plus tôt. En tout cas, vous pouvez envisager votre départ dans la semaine qui suivra le 8 décembre: le plus tôt, encore une fois, sera le mieux.

462 25 i 53: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

J’espérais pouvoir vous annoncer, dès mon arrivée au Caire, que les manuscrits étaient enfin entre mes mains. Mais, depuis deux mois en particulier, bien des choses ont subitement changé ici, et j’ai eu beaucoup à faire pour retourner en notre faveur une situation qui nous était franchement contraire. Tout est d’autant plus compliqué que les manuscrits, “réquisitionnés” en juillet dernier comme nous l’avait fait savoir
I hoped I could announce to you that from my arrival in Cairo the manuscripts were finally in my hands. But, for the past two months in particular, a good number of things have suddenly changed here, and I have had a lot to do in order to turn a situation that was frankly opposed to us back around in our favor. Everything is all the more complicated, since the manuscripts ‘requisitioned’ last July, as Drioton let us know, have still not been paid for, which now disturbs a great deal the Egyptians in organizing their edition. From this fact, in spite of the good will (at least apparent) of Pahor Labib, it is impossible to gain access to the texts immediately. The Council of the Coptic Museum, fearing lest it owe damages to Mlle Dattari, decided it this way. Furthermore, our Egyptian colleagues undergo at present a severe (and often deserved) purification, such that they no longer dare make the least decision, or let the least budget items be voted on. ...

Baillou, Schaeffer, and Drioton have already anticipated these possible difficulties, and envisaged, as a solution, having me named to an archaeological position in Ethiopia, which would permit me to stay in the Orient the desired time, and to have me go to Egypt at the opportune time, without having to appeal for special subsidies. It is no doubt the only solution that offers itself.

Puech replied on 4 April 1953, which was after Doresse had already gone to Ethiopia:

---

M. Drioton, n’ont toujours pas été payés, ce qui gêne beaucoup, maintenant, les Égyptiens pour organiser leur édition. De ce fait, malgré la bonne volonté (au moins apparente) de Pahor Labib, il est impossible d’accéder aux textes immédiatement : le Conseil du Musée Copte, par peur de devoir des dommages intérêts à Mlle Dattari, l’a ainsi décidé. De plus, nos collègues égyptiens subissent pour le moment une épuration sévère (et souvent méritée) telle qu’ils n’osent plus prendre la moindre décision ni faire voter les moindres crédits. ...

M. Baillou, M. Schaeffer et M. Drioton avaient déjà prévu ces difficultés éventuelles et envisagé, comme solution, de me faire désigner pour un poste archéologique en Éthiopie qui permettrait de me maintenir en Orient le temps voulu et de me faire aller en Égypte au moment opportun sans avoir à recourir à des subventions spéciales. C’est sans doute la seule solution qui s’offre.

---

4 iv 53: Letter from Puech to Doresse:


Bien que vous me fassiez entrevoir quelques chances de solution pour mai ou juin, mon impression demeure pessimiste. Elle l’est d’autant plus que je suis sans nouvelles
Your letter of 2[5] January brought me—as you can guess—a very great deception. Thus, the manuscripts of N[ag] H[ammadi] are not yet the possession of the Egyptian government! Does one even have the intention to acquire them some day? We are more than ever at a dead end, and the situation risks being prolonged without end. What aggravates it is that neither the Abbot Drioton nor your informants have made clear that the documents had not been paid for, and were, as a result, inaccessible. It is going to be difficult to justify with the C[entre] N[ational de la] R[echerche] S[cientifique] sending you on a mission, and the use of the credits that have been accorded to you for buying material.

Though you had me perceive some chances of a solution for May or June, my impression remains pessimistic. It is all the more so since I am without news since January, and among other things I have not received the letter—promised for ‘the next [diplomatic] courier,’ in which you were to share with me the results of your efforts with Dr. Mustapha Amer. What has happened and what is happening?

Have you obtained, or tried to obtain, permission to use from now on the texts already studied from photographs, and to make known publicly, officially, their contents? It would be urgent and decent to announce the discovery of the Logia, of which I hoped to have the complete text by February. Try to negotiate the matter. We are however not going to keep silent to the end, and risk being finally duped, frustrated, outdistanced.

Marianne Doresse reported on this brief sixth and final Cairo mission as follows:464

On 29 January we have seen the new General Director of the Service des Antiquités, Moustafa Amer. He now has the administration of all the Antiquities of Egypt (Pharaonic, Coptic and Arabic Egypt). Jean explains to him the work already accomplished in what has to do with the first volume of the Gnostic papyri. Moustafa Amer asks him to continue the work. …

As was previously agreed with him, before leaving for Ethiopia we see again Moustafa Amer, who tells us that when the reorganization of the Service

464 Marianne Doresse: 6e Mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte (see Part 2 above).
des Antiquités will have been achieved, he will absolutely have need of us. Thus, we leave our car with the Garitos, and we retain our apartment of the Pyramids, so as to be able to return as soon as we are recalled.

On 17 February we take the plane for Addis-Abeba.

At the beginning of July we return to Cairo by plane. We liquidate our house of the Pyramids and arrange our affairs and our books at the residence of the Garitos.

We return to France ...

Marianne Doresse could not continue her reports by listing a seventh mission, since there was none. She concludes with a brief section entitled simply ‘1954’:

We return from Addis-Abeba to Cairo on 1st July 1954 by plane. From Cairo, we take the plane for Geneva ...

We return to Egypt, at the end of September ... Once arrived in Cairo, we see Pahor, who, far from returning Jean's manuscript, asks him for more of them.

Since then, we have not returned to Cairo any more. Jean obtained a mission of three months from the Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, in 1972. But we did not have time to take advantage of this mission.

Puech had finally given up on Doresse as his agent in Cairo. This brought Doresse's involvement in Nag Hammadi studies for all practical purposes to an end. Doresse's inability to attend the meeting of the International Committee of Gnosticism of 1956 (see Chapter 6, Part 1 below), and to be called back to Cairo to conserve and photograph the codices, were the greatest disappointments. He was then excluded from the publication of the Jung Codex (see Chapters 3 and 4 below) and of The Gospel of Thomas (see Chapter 7 below). Puech was prominent in both cases, and saw to it that the French coptologists Michel Malinine and then Antoine Guillaumont replaced Doresse.

The Beginning of the Conservation of the Tano-Dattari Collection

The Coptic Museum opened the sealed valise and began conserving and photographing the codices only after lengthy legal proceedings with Maria Dattari had been concluded with a relatively small financial settlement. It was then that the photographs were made which Pahor Labib published in

---

465 Marianne Doresse: 1954 (see Part 2 above).
1956 (see Chapter 6, Part 3 below). Apparently the conservation had not gone beyond the leaves published in that volume.

Once the first volume had appeared, the problem was there to see: In Codex II, the leaf 3/4, which was broken in two, was published as if it were two fragmentary leaves. Noticing this, Doresse again expressed his concern over the unpacking and conservation, arguing that it must have taken place quite differently from the way he had intended when he had packed the material in the valise:

There would be occasion to point out ... some other confusions ... that relate, apparently, to the incontestable confusion of the leaves contained in certain of the codices as a result of their too hasty 'restoration.' At the time of our first inventories, carried out on the manuscripts still bound to leather covers enveloping them, we had preferred to resign ourselves to not reading some codices integrally at all, so long as their pages, fragile and often broken, risked having their fragments more or less mixed up by our manipulations. It would

---


Il y aurait lieu de révéler ... quelques autres confusions ... qui tiennent, apparemment, à l’incontesstable embrouillement des feuillets contenus dans certains des codices à la suite de leur “mise en état” trop hâtive. Lors de nos premiers inventaires effectués sur les manuscrits encore liés aux couvertures de cuir qui les enveloppaient, nous avions préféré nous résigner à ne point lire intégralement certains codices tant que leurs pages, fragiles et parfois brisées, risquaient de voir leurs fragments plus ou moins brouillés par nos manipulations. Mieux valait patienter jusqu’à ce qu’un travail de consolidation et de reconstitution des feuillets ait pu être accompli, travail relativement facile tant que l’on conservait les manuscrits dans l’état original où il nous étaient alors parvenus. Mais qui eut pensé, à ce moment, que, du jour où elle allait être administrativement possible grâce à l’acquisition de ces manuscrits par le Musée Copte, cette tâche serait menée avec si peu de précautions et de méthode (les pages étant ôtées de leurs reliures et séparées les unes des autres) que nos premières et très sommaires analyses deviendraient le seul témoignage sur ce qu’avait été l’état originel des manuscrits? Il semble, en effet, que, tout en mettant sous plexiglas les pages ou fragments de pages des recueils que l’on démontait, l’on ait aussi bien négligé de s’assurer de leur ordre primitif que d’essayer, au fur et à mesure, d’en raccorder des morceaux correspondants. C’est ainsi que certains fragments de pages du Codex X de notre inventaire se sont trouvés séparés des feuillets d’où ils provenaient (et auxquels ils tenaient encore lors de nos expertises de 1948–1949) et présentés sous des numéros distincts dans la reproduction photographique qui en a été publiée par le Dr. Pahor Labib (*Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum*, vol. I, 1956), où il faut raccorder respectivement les fragments des planches 49 et 50 aux pages mutilées des planches 52 et 51.
have been better to be patient until a work of consolidation and of the recon-
stitution of the leaves could have been accomplished, a work relatively easy,
so long as one conserved the manuscripts in the original state in which they
had come to us at that time. But who would have thought, at that time, that, on
the day when it was going to become administratively possible, thanks to the
acquisition of these manuscripts by the Coptic Museum, this task would be
carried out with so little precaution and method (the pages being removed
from their bindings and separated one from the other), that our first and
very summary analyses would become the only witness as to what had been
the original status of the manuscripts? It seems, in effect, that, while putting
under plexiglass the pages or fragments of pages of the collections that one
dismantled, one had neglected both to assure oneself of their original order
and to attempt, as one went along, to join their corresponding fragments. It
is thus that certain fragments of pages of Codex X of our inventory [Codex II]
were found separated from the leaves from which they came (and to which
they were still holding at the time of our expertises of 1948–1949) and were
presented under distinct numbers in the photographic reproduction of them
which was published by Dr. Pahor Labib (Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic
Museum, vol. 1, 1956), where it is necessary to join respectively the fragments
of the plates 49 and 50 to the mutilated pages of plates 52 and 51.

Since the leaf with pages 3 and 4 of Codex II was presented as the vestiges of
two leaves, thought to be 3/4 and 5/6, 4a/3b were published as plates 49/50,
and 3a/4b were published as plates 51/52. Hence they were subsequently
assigned numbers as two separate leaves, pages 3/4 and 5/6, with the result
that all subsequent pages of Codex II came to be numbered two digits too
high.

Much the same ‘massacre’ as had taken place in the case of Codex III in
December 1947, when Togo Mina was Director, was resumed when Pahor
Labib was Director and the conservation was started again after the legal
settlement. This even took place a third time with the bulk of the Nag
Hammadi codices, more than a decade later, when Pahor Labib was the
Director and Martin Krause the scholarly consultant. For, in the third case,
the German Archaeological Institute of Cairo, where Krause was stationed,
provided plexiglass sheets only wide enough for a single leaf, but not wide
enough for conjugate leaves, which made it necessary to cut apart whatever
conjugate leaves were still attached to each other.

Victor Girgis, Conservator on the staff of the Coptic Museum at the time
of Krause’s involvement, later himself became the Director of the Museum,
a position which he held at the time when the painstaking restoration by
the Technical Sub-Committee of the International Committee for the Nag
Hammadi Codices was carried out in the 1970s. Victor Girgis explained his
procedure to me: He simply cut apart any still-intact conjugate leaves with
his pocket knife! The absence of any records of the sequence of the leaves, other than the numbering of the plates in the order in which they were conserved, made the reassembling of the fragments of broken leaves, the establishing of page sequence, the rejoining of the conjugate leaves, and thus the restoration of the codices, a much more laborious process. I went to Zürich and ordered new plexiglass sheets that were wide enough for conjugate leaves to be conserved together, and then organized a reconservation of all the codices. It was carried to completion by the Nag Hammadi Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity (see Chapter 11, Parts 5 and 6 below).

When I reported to Doresse the condition of the material as found in December 1970, he again regretted not having been entrusted with the unpacking:\footnote{22 ii 71: Letter from Doresse to Robinson:}

\begin{quote}
I myself had the responsibility for putting the codices in the valise, where they remained under seal until their definitive acquisition by the Coptic Museum. I had taken certain precautions, so that the leaves or fragments of leaves that were damaged or detached could not be mixed up. It is regrettable that I was not at all consulted at the time of the disassembling of the manuscripts! It is, without doubt, even more catastrophic that the quires of papyrus were disassembled, and that the conjugate leaves, kept until then intact, were cut in two!
\end{quote}

Here Doresse is of course correct.

One of the adjunct conservators at the time when the first ‘massacre’ had taken place, Raouf Habib, became Pahor Labib’s successor as Director, and of course did not acknowledge that there had been a conservation problem:\footnote{Raouf Habib, \textit{The Coptic Museum: A General Guide} (Cairo: General Organization for Government Printing Offices, 1967), 135.}

\begin{quote}
On acquiring these papyri, the Museum preserved them inside glass or transparent plastic sheets (these are less fragile), to facilitate their study by scholars.
\end{quote}
When the Technical Sub-Committee of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices finally began the work of reassembling the leaves and establishing the page sequence in December 1970, Martin Krause, a member of the Technical Sub-Committee, did not produce notes on what were conjugate leaves that had been originally joined together at the spine before they were cut apart at the fold, or where fragments lay before they were collected for conservation at the end of each codex. During the conservation by Victor Girgis, Krause would seem to have kept himself busy transcribing the intact texts themselves, as soon as Victor Girgis had conserved them one by one in plexiglass.

8. The Ongoing French-Canadian Edition

Doresse’s plans for publishing a complete edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices were never implemented. There were a number of reasons. It was to a limited extent due to Doresse himself: His supervisor Henri-Charles Puech, who had an excellent classical education that did not include Coptic, found Doresse’s Coptic transcriptions and translations not fully reliable, and turned to Michel Malinine for the Jung Codex (see Chapters 3 and 4 below) and Antoine Guillaumont for *The Gospel of Thomas* (see Chapters 6 and 7 below). But since Puech was less diplomatic and more blunt than was helpful, Doresse also had to function as his public relations agent, until replaced in this regard by Gilles Quispel, who also replaced Doresse on the editorial boards of the Jung Codex and *The Gospel of Thomas*. External circumstances were also responsible for much that did not get done. The French-trained Director of the Coptic Museum Togo Mina supported Doresse fully, but died prematurely in 1950 and was succeeded by the German-trained Pahor Labib; he tolerated Doresse, but repudiated Puech, and welcomed German scholars to assume leadership in editing the Nag Hammadi Codices (see Chapter 8 below). Egyptian politics also added to the unfavorable climate. King Farouk was overthrown in 1952, and the French Director of the Department of Antiquities, Abbot Drioton, a staunch supporter of Doresse, was promptly replaced by a Muslim Egyptian. This meant that Doresse in effect lost control of the bulk of the codices belonging to Tano-Dattari, which he had hoped to conserve, photograph, and publish. His funding was always precarious, derived from the archaeological work he did on the side, and leading him in 1953 to move his work to Ethiopia. He never succeeded in resuming his central rôle in Nag Hammadi studies. He did subsequently publish his edition of Nag Hammadi Codex III, tractate 2, *The Egyptian
Gospel (see above).\textsuperscript{470} And he published the leather covers of the Nag Hammadi codices.\textsuperscript{471} But that was all.

Michel Tardieu, Puech’s successor at the École Pratique des Hautes Études, announced a more modest plan, limited to a French translation, in 1984:\textsuperscript{472}

A complete French translation is also being prepared by the Centre d’études des Religions du Livre of the École Pratique des Hautes Études, Section des Sciences Religieuses, Sources Gnostiques et Manichéennes (Paris: du Cerf, 1984 ff.).

It was initiated with P.Berol. 8502 in 1984,\textsuperscript{473} but has not been further implemented at the École Pratique des Hautes Études.

After Doresse’s central rôle in the French leadership of early Nag Hammadi studies from 1947 to 1952 faded away, Puech turned to Paris-based UNESCO, with the help of Antoine Guillaumont, to reassert French leadership on an international scale (see Chapter 9 below).

The most recent and ongoing phase of French leadership in Nag Hammadi studies is taking place in the French-speaking province of Canada, Québec: The University of Laval has initiated a complete edition, which had also been announced in 1984.\textsuperscript{474}

Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, begun by the Laboratoire d’Histoire religieuse, then taken over by the Faculté de théologie, Université Laval (General Editors Jacques É. Ménard, Paul-Hubert Poirier and Michel Roberge) (Québec: Les Presses de l’Université Laval, 1976 ff.).

This critical edition, including a commentary, currently under the direction of Louis Painchaud, Wolf-Peter Funk and Paul-Hubert Poirier, has produced 34 volumes of Texts, as well as 8 of Studies and 7 of Concordances. They list their publications as of 2009 as follows:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{472} \textit{The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices}: Introduction, 91.
\item \textsuperscript{473} Michel Tardieu, \textit{Écrits gnostiques: Codex de Berlin} (Sources Gnostiques et Manichéennes 1; Centre d’études des Religions du Livre, L.A., C.N.R.S. 152; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1984).
\item \textsuperscript{474} \textit{The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices}: Introduction, 91.
\end{itemize}
BIBLIOTHÈQUE COPTE DE NAG HAMMAIDI

Section "Textes"

4. La Prôtennoia trimorphe (NH XIII, 1), Yvonne JANSSSENS, 1978.
11. Les Sentences de Sextus (NH XII, 1). Fragments (NH XII, 3), Paul-Hubert POIRIER, suivi du Fragment de la République de Platon (NH VI, 5), Louis PAINCHAUD, 1983.
20. La Sagesse de Jésus-Christ (NH III, 4; BG 3), Catherine BARRY, 1993.
25. La Paraphrase de Sem (NH VII, 1), Michel ROBERGE, 2000.

Section “Études”

1. Colloque international sur les textes de Nag Hammadi, Bernard Barc éditeur, 1981.

Section “Concordances”

A number of further volumes are in preparation, including Gnostic texts not from Nag Hammadi. A one-volume French translation has also been published in 2007, directed by Jean-Pierre Mahé and Paul-Hubert Poirier.\footnote{Jean-Pierre Mahé and Paul-Hubert Poirier, Directors, \textit{Les écrits gnostiques: La bibliothèque de Nag Hammadi} (Collection “Bibliothèque de la Pléiade”; Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 2007).}
1. Gilles Quispel, ‘History of the Discovery’

A decade after the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices, Gilles Quispel published in 1955, in the first book to appear in English on Nag Hammadi, or, more exactly, only on the Eid Codex = the Jung Codex = Codex I, what has become the standard ‘History of the Discovery.’ It is hence reproduced here, as the point of departure for the much more detailed documentation from the Nag Hammadi Archives that follows.

It was on 10 May 1952, that I acquired at Brussels a Coptic codex of a hundred pages which contained four unknown writings from the second century AD, one of them a heretical Gospel. This is how it came to pass.

In the spring of 1948 I received at Leyden vague reports from Jean Doresse about an important discovery of Coptic MSS. in Egypt. Since I had myself been engaged for several years on a study of Valentinus, the most important Gnostic from the middle of the second century AD, and as I considered it possible that Valentinian texts were included among these writings, I gave Mr. Doresse the address of an institution with which I was acquainted, the Bollingen Foundation at New York, with the request that it be handed over to a person in Egypt. At the same time, viz. in August 1948, I urged on Jack D. Barrett, the Secretary of the Foundation, the purchase of the Gnostic writings. Such was the beginning of laborious negotiations and investigations which lasted for several years and can be reported only briefly here. [41]

What happened was that in the winter of 1948–1949 the possessor of a Gnostic Codex appeared at the offices of the Bollingen Foundation and sought to interest Mr. Barrett in its purchase. He asked 12,000 dollars for it, saying that the University of Michigan had already offered him 6,000 dollars. If American scholars really had the Codex previously in their hands, it is not easily conceivable that they would not have paid the price demanded. At a later date the same person inquired, after he had failed to sell the Codex, whether he might store it in the safe of the Bollingen Foundation. This request

---

was naturally refused in view of the responsibility involved for its safety and
the owner returned to Europe.

The situation was extremely delicate. The rumour went round—which later
turned out to be correct—that its owner had died. It was not known where the
Codex was to be found, what it contained and who was its new owner. It was
no imaginary risk that the MS. might remain inaccessible to investigation for a
great many years, and perhaps for good. Such writings sometimes happen to
disappear mysteriously from the market. Moreover, at a time when foreign
currencies were scarce, who could make such a large sum available for a
papyrus codex?

The only possibility seemed to be that the generous Bollingen Foundation
should interest itself in the matter. With this end in view I approached
Professor C.G. Jung of Zürich who with great willingness wrote several letters
to the members of the Board of the Bollingen Foundation, in which he
emphasized [42] the importance of the Codex and urged the Foundation to
buy it.

In the meantime it had become known that the MS. contained a collection
of four writings, one of them with the title: *The Gospel of Truth*. More than
the title, however, was hardly known. And yet all our passionate exertions
rested on the supposition that this *Gospel of Truth* was identical with the
‘Evangelium Veritatis’ about which the Church Father, Irenaeus, writing c.
180 AD, tells us that it was in use among the disciples of the Gnostic Valentinus.

The result of all these negotiations was that in August 1950 I instituted
some investigations at Paris on behalf of the Bollingen Foundation and could
establish that the Codex reposed in a safe at Brussels. On 19 July 1951, Dr.
C.A. Meier of Zürich succeeded in discovering the address of the new owner
and of the price which he asked for the Codex. It was accordingly decided
at Ascona in August 1951 that the Bollingen Foundation should provide the
money for the purchase and I was commissioned to investigate whether
or not the writings had been forged and if they were of value. For even
if the writings were genuine it remained a possibility that their contents
were Gnostic speculations of little worth, whereas what we primarily hoped
for was the writings of Valentinus. The expert examination took place at
the beginning of March 1952 at St. Idesbald (Coxyde). Although it was not
possible to unpack the papyri, and such indeed was not justified because of
the dilettante way in which they had been packed up, the [43] reading of a
single page convinced me that it was Valentinian. Hence, despite a certain
risk, I ventured to recommend their purchase. This, however, did not happen
forthwith. The owner suddenly asked for delay, and there were also alarming
signs which seemed to indicate that other interested parties, if not offering
a higher sum, were at any rate negotiating. At the same time the Bollingen
Foundation made certain very understandable stipulations about furnishing
the purchase money, which it was not possible at that moment of pressing
urgency to comply with. It appeared as if our exertions spread over four years
had all come to nothing and our endeavours had failed.
It was at this juncture that Dr. C.A. Meier, acting with great decision, rendered a real service to learning. He put the situation before George H. Page of Wallisellen, who proved a new Maecenas and made available the money for the purchase. The result was that on 10 May 1952 I bought the Codex at Brussels on behalf of the C.G. Jung Institute at Zürich. At the request of its previous owner, this acquisition was not to be made known until 10 November 1953. The study of the papyrus, however, could be immediately taken in hand. It appeared that the Gospel of Truth beyond doubt came from the school of Valentinus and was identical with the writing which was referred to by Irenaeus of Lyons c. 180 AD. A new heretical Gospel, the only one of its kind which is as yet available to students, had been discovered. Our surmise has proved to have been correct. [44]

There still remained one great source of anxiety for us. In the examination of the MS. at St. Idesbald in March 1952 it was stated that it showed a lacuna of about forty pages. Moreover, during this examination it became clear, as we had suspected, that a photograph of the Codex had already been made in Egypt in 1947 or thereabouts and had somehow come into the hands of a French student, and it was our hope that this photograph would also give us the missing sheets. The owner requested the student in question to restore the photograph to its rightful possessor. The latter stated in a letter his unwillingness to do this, but he sent it none the less. It seems, however, that this photograph contained nothing that was not in our Codex. So there remains the by no means easy task of finding out whether or not these missing pages still repose in Egypt and whether there is any way in which they are, or can be made, accessible.

On closer examination it appeared that the four writings in the MS. were all translations from the Greek. Three of them are without doubt Gnostic and come from the school of Valentinus. Professor Henry Charles Puech of the Collège de France and myself have been commissioned to edit them while Professor W.C. van Unnik will concern himself with the significance of the discovery for the study of the New Testament. Professor M. Malinine of Paris is primarily entrusted with the constitution of the Coptic text. In particular, the Gospel of Truth, which was written round about AD 150, appears to be of special importance.

The report that follows below fills in many details on the acquisition and publication. Albert Eid’s codex was ‘baptized’ on 15 November 1953 the ‘Jung Codex,’ ultimately to became Codex I in the numeration of the Coptic Museum in Cairo, where the last leaves were returned from Zürich only in 1975. Excerpts from my review article on the final publication of the

---

2 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/edm/ref/collection/nha/id/1698.
Jung Codex,\textsuperscript{3} with which the present chapter closes, serve as a balance to Quispel’s initial presentation before the publication had actually begun.

\textbf{2. Albert Eid’s Attempts to Sell the Eid Codex}

Joseph\textsuperscript{4} Albert Eid\textsuperscript{5} (1885–1950) was the scion of a prosperous Syro-Lebanese family originating in Damascus, but himself representing the fifth generation residing in Egypt (17 rue Boustane, Cairo), the third with Belgian citizenship, indeed the son and grandson of the Belgian consul in Cairo. He was the proprietor of an antiquities shop on the Rue El Badestane in the Khan al-Khalili bazaar in Cairo,\textsuperscript{6} with permit number 112 from the Department of Antiquities. He had acquired somewhat more than half of the Jung Codex by the summer of 1946, when Étienne Drioton broke down the claim of Rāghib Andarāwus that Codex III was a family heirloom, by confronting him with the fact that a codex like Rāghib’s was in the antiquities shop of a Belgian in the Khan al-Khalili (see Chapter 1, Part 3 above).

\textit{Father Bernhard Couroyer}

Father Bernhard Couroyer,\textsuperscript{7} the Coptologist of the École pratique d’études bibliques at the Dominican convent Saint-Étienne in Jerusalem, returned to Jerusalem from a visit to the Institut dominicain des études orientales, 1 Masna al-Tarabish Street, Abbasiyah, Cairo, at the end of the spring semester of 1946. He assumes that it was probably shortly after his return, but in any case the same year, that he received from Father Georges Anawati,\textsuperscript{8} subsequently Director of the Cairo Dominican house, four small photographs for identification (Codex I, 7, 8, 43, 44). Father Couroyer requested enlargements, which turned out to be hardly improvements. Especially I, 43, pho-

---


\textsuperscript{4} 8 vi 51: The first name Joseph is documented in a ‘Procuration’ signed by Harold Eeman, Ambassador and General Consul of Belgium in Cairo.

\textsuperscript{5} http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1391.

\textsuperscript{6} http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1375.

\textsuperscript{7} http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1386; http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1551. Father Bernhard Couroyer was interviewed in this regard at the École pratique d’études bibliques in Jerusalem on 29 iii and 1 v 72 by Bentley Layton, and by myself at the end of xii 72 and in ix 77.

\textsuperscript{8} 13 i 80: My interview with Father Georges Anawati in this regard at the Institut dominicain des études orientales in Cairo.
toographed before being conserved between panes of glass, has lighting from
the side putting the fibres in profile at the expense of the legibility of the
text, a problem hardly alleviated in the enlargement. But after consultation
with H.J. Polotsky, Couroyer returned the following report:

The language used is not pure Achmimic, nor even Sub-Achmimic (the
language of the Manichean texts), but an intermediary between these two
forms. It is a dialect still rather poorly known, for whose study the present
manuscript can contribute a great deal. One finds oneself in the presence of
two different works, the second in a more cursive hand.

The content of leaves 7 and 8 is a dialogue of Our Lord with
his disciples, and especially with St. James. The vocabulary and the content
are related to the literature of which the ‘Pistis Sophia’ and the Discourses
of Jesus after his Resurrection are the most notable representatives. One is
at the borders of orthodox theology and Gnosticism. I do not believe that
in the case of the present manuscript one finds oneself in the presence of
a purely Gnostic work. Our Lord speaks to his disciples, but clearly, not in
parables. The ‘logos’ is similar to a grain of wheat, etc. But since one has no
superscription (I do not know if one exists in the manuscript), one is reduced
to approximations.

Thus, just a year after its discovery, Codex I was subjected to a first scholarly
assessment, in that the dialect was sharply and correctly defined, the two
hands and Tractates 2 and 4 distinguished, and Tractate 2 provided with a
remarkably accurate analysis.

---

9 Late in ix 71 and at the end of xii 72: My interviews with H.J. Polotsky in this regard at
his home in Jerusalem.

10 13 i 47: Couroyer’s report sent by Albert Eid to Warner Grenelle Rice, Director of the
General Library of the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor:

La langue employée n’est pas de l’akhmimique pur ni même le subakhmimique
(langue des écrits manichéens) mais un intermédiaire entre ces deux formes. C’est
un dialecte encore assez mal connu à l’étude duquel le manuscrit présent pourra
beaucoup contribuer. On se trouve en présence de deux œuvres différentes, la seconde
en écriture plus cursive.

Le contenu des feuillets 7 et 8 est un entretien de Notre Seigneur avec ses disciples
et notamment avec St. Jacques. Le vocabulaire et le contenu s’apparentent à cette
littérature dont la “Pistis Sophia” et les Discours de Jésus après sa Résurrection sont
les représentants les plus marquants. On se trouve en présence d’un ouvrage purement gnostique. Notre Seigneur parle à ses disciples mais
clairement non en paraboles. Le “logos” est semblable à un grain de blé, etc. Mais
comme on n’a aucune suscription (je ne sais s’il en existe dans le manuscrit) on est
réduit à des approximations.
Correspondence with America

Albert Eid made use of Couroyer's analysis to seek to sell in America the part of Codex I that was apparently only on consignment with him. In November 1946 he wrote from Cairo to the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston offering what he had for sale:\footnote{7 xii 46: Letter from Bernard V. Bothmer of the Museum of Fine Arts, to Prof. W.H. Worrell of the University of Michigan.}

A few weeks ago, a dealer—Mr. Eid of Cairo—offered us a number of Egyptian objects and a Coptic papyrus.

This was no doubt the first lot of forty-one leaves of Codex I that Eid had acquired. These must have been scattered leaves from the front, center, and back of the codex, to judge by the photographs Eid was circulating (Codex I, 7, 8, 43, 44), as well as by his descriptions of the leaves in terms of their state of preservation analyzed below. These descriptions were imprecise, but fluctuated only slightly from report to report.

Since papyrus lies outside the limits of the collection of the Museum of Fine Arts,\footnote{7 vii 76: This is the explanation provided to me in an interview with Curator Simpson of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.} Bernard V. Bothmer, then Assistant in the Department of Egyptian Art of the Museum of Fine Arts, sent W.H. Worrell, the papyrologist of the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, a copy of one of the photographs from Eid as well as Eid’s inventory in French and covering letter in English:\footnote{7 xii 46: Eid’s inventory appended to the letter from Bothmer to Worrell:}

\begin{verbatim}
41 leaves recto verso—82 pages
27 leaves like this photo
8 leaves slightly chafed 1 to 1 ½ cm on half a side
1 " where there is lacking ¾ of 3 lines
3 " where a corner lacks about ⅓ of 7 lines
1 " where there is lacking ¼
1 " in a bad condition
——
41 leaves—82 pages
\end{verbatim}

---

\footnote{11 7 xii 46: Letter from Bernard V. Bothmer of the Museum of Fine Arts, to Prof. W.H. Worrell of the University of Michigan.}

\footnote{12 7 vii 76: This is the explanation provided to me in an interview with Curator Simpson of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.}

\footnote{13 7 xii 46: Eid’s inventory appended to the letter from Bothmer to Worrell:}

\begin{verbatim}
41 feuilles recto verso—82 pages
27 feuilles comme cette photo
8 feuilles légèrement rongées 1 à 1 ½ cms sur un demi côté
1 " où il manque les ¾ de 3 lignes
3 " où un coin manque environ ⅓ de 7 lignes
1 " où il manque le ¼
1 " en mauvais état
——
41 feuilles—82 pages.
\end{verbatim}
From the information we have been able to gather regarding this manuscript from friends in Cairo and Jerusalem, it appears that it is a sort of Sub-Achmimic. We have given two pages to be studied, pages 7 & 8, and enclosed are the comments in French by our Jerusalem friend. We are also enclosing the photos of these two pages (7 & 8).

This collection of forty-one pages has been entrusted to me by one of my customers for sale at $20,000 (twenty thousand dollars); my commission is 10% on the transaction, thus making the total price twenty-two thousand dollars.

Warner Grenelle Rice, Director of the General Library of the University of Michigan, expressed interest to Eid, who responded on 13 January 1947 with a slightly reformulated English version of the same inventory that had already reached Rice:

The collection of forty-one leaves of papyrus written on the two sides gives a text of eighty-two full pages. The size of the page is thirteen centimeters by twenty-nine centimeters.

Here is the condition in which they are:

- 26 leaves in excellent condition.
- 8 leaves have been damaged on one of the sides only.
- 2 leaves have the three-quarters of the five first lines missing.
- 1 leaf with three-fourths of the last line missing.
- 3 leaves in bad condition, a fourth of the text missing.
- 1 leaf in very bad condition.

41 leaves all told belonging to the same manuscript.

From Eid’s inventory one can identify with reasonable certainty at least leaves 1/2, 3/4, 125/126, 135/136 and 137/138 as belonging to this first lot.

Rice forwarded this inventory on 23 January 1947 to Worrell, with the small photographs Eid had provided of pp. 7/8 of Codex I appended, but made the comment:

The price asked is $22,000, which seems to me much too high for consideration here. I shall be glad to have your opinion.

Worrell wrote a note at the bottom of the letter, which he returned to Rice:

Yes, this price is much too high.
Father Anawati’s brothers, A. and Ed. C. Anawati,17 ‘authorized by the Egyptian government to deal in Antiquities under License No. 117’ according to their letterhead, were proprietors of a shop in Alexandria named ‘Khan Khalil,’ 32–34 Fouad 1 Street, and were ‘mail order specialists,’ according to their brochure of September 1946 they gave to me advertising the ‘antiquities department.’ On 20 January 1947 Ed. C. Anawati forwarded to Rice a copy of Eid’s letter of 13 January 1947 to Rice with the explanatory note:18

The writer has been entrusted by the owner of the manuscript to dispose of it in the region of the Delta, and Mr. Eid was to market it in Cairo and Upper Egypt.

This is being written to you after the consent and approval of Mr. Eid.

This letter reached Rice on 1 February 1947, after Rice had already reached a negative conclusion. Rice wrote Anawati to that effect on 4 February 1947,19 with which letter the correspondence closed.

The Bibliothèque Nationale

The French would of course have much preferred that Eid sell to the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, where they would easily have obtained exclusive publication rights.

In the spring of 1947, François Daumas had seen in Cairo the part of Codex I that Eid had obtained at the time (see Chapter 2, Part 3 above). The leaves were not conserved, but lay loose and out of order without their cover. Eid gave Daumas some photographs to forward to Mme d’Alverny in the section of Oriental Manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale. In the summer of 1947 she notified Daumas that there were not adequate funds to make the purchase.20

When I sent Doresse an early draft of this report, he responded as follows:21

---

17 30 xii 75: I visited their antiquities shop in Alexandria, and was informed that they both were now deceased. Though it was still run by the family, no relevant information was provided.

18 20 i 47: Letter from Ed. C. Anawati to Rice.

19 4 ii 47: Letter from Rice to Anawati.

20 30 xi 76 and 3 xii 76: Interviews with Daumas at the site of his excavation in Denderah.

21 10 vii 83: Letter from Doresse to Robinson:

“In the spring of 1947 ...”: Si c’est vrai, Daumas défiait les lois égyptiennes. Togo Mina avait déjà interdit à Eid l’exportation du manuscrit, interdiction qu’il allait lui réitérer en ma présence et sous condition d’obtenir les photos complètes du codex comme
'In the spring of 1947 ...': If this is true, Daumas defied Egyptian laws. Togo Mina had already forbidden Eid the exportation of the manuscript, a prohibition that he was going to repeat to him in my presence, and with the requirement of securing complete photos of the codex as a guarantee (end of 1947). But it could also be that this declaration of Daumas is apocryphal: Since Eid had later exported the manuscript secretly (he let all of us believe that he had shipped it in the bottom of a crate of banal antiquities that had the exportation visa of the Department of Antiquities—why did he later correct this version?), the Egyptian authorities lost hope of recovering the manuscript and admitted that they would be less annoyed if it ended in a public collection such as the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris. In agreement with Puech, I then indicated to the conservation department of the Bibliothèque what we knew of the manuscript (of which I had complete photographs, at least of the 'Eid' part), an initiative that Puech had me carry out without saying to me that, previously, Daumas had already indicated these papyri to the same Bibliothèque Nationale. ... If Daumas, if Guillaumont, knew something about these things, why have they kept silent so long? Their contribution to the history of the discovery would have been welcome, even though certain interventions of Daumas have been—if they are true?—contrary to the rules and the rights of the Egyptian government.

Doressé notified Eid already on 15 April 1948 the negative outcome of whatever investigations he may have made in France:22

I do not think that France can buy it for the moment.

---

22 15 iv 48: Letter from Doressé to Eid:

Je ne crois pas que la France puisse l’acheter pour le moment.
But this remark was made in the context of suggesting that Belgium might buy it (see below), which does not free Doresse from the criticism he made of Daumas.

The reason France did not ultimately purchase the codex may have been provided by Eid's widow, Simone Eid, née van Lierde, in her 'strictly confidential' comment to the Swiss Ambassador to Egypt:  

Madame E[id] does not wish to sell the volume in France, where the government has made a commitment not to buy objects of archaeological value other than by passing through the authorities here [Egypt].

Simone Eid has also given as the reason:  

... because Paris did not want to pay the asking price.

For whatever reason or reasons, the Bibliothèque Nationale did not make the acquisition.

Jean Doresse's Inventory

Since Togo Mina was present at the confrontation between Drioton and Rāghib (see Chapter 1, Part 3 above), he would have known that at least some of Codex I was in Eid's antiquities shop. Hence it was to be expected that, after showing Codex III to Doresse at the end of September 1947, he would also mention the Eid Codex (as he may well have done also in the case of Daumas). Doresse has reported the following details:  

A few days later [than the first visit to the Coptic Museum, hence early in October 1947], Togo told me about the Eid Codex and asked me to see if this manuscript was of the same nature and perhaps of the same origin as the one which he bought for the Museum. We jumped in his car and drove to Eid's shop in Khan Khalili. Eid was good enough to let me look at the whole of the manuscript he had bought—a large part of a codex, of which he recovered,
later, some more pages. The Gnostic contents were evident and I was able, a few days later, to obtain some indications about the common origin of both codices.

In response to Doresse’s first letter from Cairo concerning the Eid Codex, Puech wrote with great interest:\[26\]

The case of the other Gnostic papyrus that you indicate to me seems more risky and almost desperate. Try nonetheless to obtain some indications on the title, the subject, or the content of this unpublished text. Could you not also have yourself authorized by the antiquities dealer to speak briefly of it, be it in a separate note, be it in the course of a general report, and in giving a concise, though precise, description of the piece? The thing could not fail to heighten the value of what he has (scientifically and, for him, unfortunately! financially).

Yet Puech responded to Doresse’s next letter that had played down any Gnostic connection by expressing indifference to the Eid Codex:\[27\]

I believe that there is no further need to concern oneself excessively about the destiny of the second papyrus that, you tell me, has nothing Gnostic. Perhaps it contains a work without interest, or that has interest only for the dialect in which it has been composed or translated. If you can get a more profound look at it and procure for yourself a fragment of it, all the better. Too bad, if the antiquities dealer persists in demanding an exorbitant price for it.

But Puech replied more positively to further word about the Eid Codex from Doresse, who had written to the effect that it was more interesting than it had at first seemed to him:\[28\]

The interest in the ‘document of the antiquities dealer’ increases, it seems to me. Let us hope that your efforts and those of the Abbot Drioton will result in letting us enter into possession of the papyrus, or, at least, in permitting you to take a long look at it. It would also be necessary to obtain authorization to announce its discovery and to speak of it in much or little detail. Your tactics are good: Be silent as to the rest, and depreciate the piece as unimportant, in presenting it as magic rubbish. Perhaps the owner will thus come to reduce his pretensions.

On learning of this, Simone Eid responded angrily:\[29\]

---

\[26\] 8 x 47: Letter from Puech to Doresse (see Chapter 2, Part 3 above).
\[27\] 14 x 47: Letter from Puech to Doresse (see Chapter 2, Part 3 above).
\[28\] 27 x 47: Letter from Puech to Doresse (see Chapter 2, Part 3 above).
\[29\] 28 iv 82: Simone Eid, written on an early draft of this report that I had mailed to her on 5 ii 82 and she mailed back with her marginal notes:

Je juge cette déclaration honteuse pour ne pas dire hypocrite de la part de Doresse.
I consider this declaration to be shameful, not to say hypocritical, on the part of Doresse.

Marianne Doresse had reported:30

We made the acquaintance of Albert Eid already before our departure to Upper Egypt [on 26 October 194731]. We return to see him with Togo, who makes him promise not to sell his Gnostic manuscript (that Jean, meanwhile, had identified), except to the Coptic Museum. We buy from Eid a few small antiquities. Then we sell him our camera ‘Korelli.’ With this 6x6 camera Eid photographs his codex before our departure and gives Jean a complete set of proofs (contact prints pasted on the pages of green cardboard).

We leave Egypt 31 December 1947, on the SS ‘Providence.’ We arrive at Paris in possession—in addition to the photographs—of a first copy of the Gnostic papyrus of the Coptic Museum made from the original, and photographs of Eid’s papyrus.

Simone Eid also reacted strongly on reading this:32

This says in effect that I had been deceived by D[oresse] when I asked him to return to me the film that he had taken, whereas it was that of Prof. Schmidt of Berlin.

C.A. Meier, Director Emeritus of the Jung Institute, told me that the book of negatives of the Eid Codex that he entrusted to me are what Simone Eid obtained from Doresse and turned in to him (see below, Part 3). Hence Simone Eid was apparently mistaken in conjecturing that they were not negatives of the Eid Codex that Doresse turned in to her.

Doresse’s report presented on 20 February 1948 by Puech at the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Letters contained the first information about the Eid Codex to be made public.33

---

30 The memorandum of Marianne Doresse, “Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte” (see Chapter 2, Part 2 above).
31 In a supplément by Marianne Doresse to her “Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte” (see Chapter 2, Part 2 above).
32 28 iv 82: Simone Eid’s marginal note:

Ce qui veut dire que j’ai été trompé par D. lorsque je lui ai demandé de me rendre le film qu’il détenait alors que c’était celui du Prof. Schmidt de Berlin.

Other instances of Simone Eid’s marginal annotations are simply inserted, following her name, in quotation marks between brackets in the text itself at the relevant position.
33 Henri-Charles Puech and Jean Doresse, “Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Égypte,” CRAI 1948 (1948) 89:

M. Doresse a eu lui-même la chance d’étudier un autre volume du même lot et d’en photographier bon nombre de feuillets. Mais la personne qui le détient actuellement
Doresse has himself had the opportunity to study another volume of the same lot, and to photograph a good number of its leaves. But the person who retains it at present does not authorize one to give out more about it than a few details. It has to do with a codex of about 150 pages, rather well conserved, and which, as its binding shows, was part of the same stock. The format is very allongated; the pages contain from 39 to 41 lines of writing on all its length. The writing, extremely clumsy and even unkempt, seems to date from the fourth century. This time we are in the presence of texts written in a Sub-Achmimic dialect presenting some new particularities. At least three works comprise the volume: an *Apocalypse of James*, on a moral topic; a *Gospel of Truth* (is it the *Veritatis Evangelium* of the Valentinians, mentioned by St. Irenaeus?); and a *Prayer of the Apostle Peter*, both treatises of an abstract nature.

The observations that the tractates are ‘on a moral topic’ or ‘of an abstract nature’ do no more than document Doresse’s ignorance of their content.

A similar report was made by Togo Mina on 8 March 1948 at the *Institut d’Égypte*, though without mentioning the Eid Codex I in the official publication. However, in an article published later that year based on the Academy address, Togo Mina reported on the Eid Codex as follows:

On the codex held by an individual, one can only give a few details. It contains, under a cover made of a leaf of supple leather, some sixty large leaves, rather elongated. The writing is an uncial of the end of the fourth century, remarkable for its irregularity. The three or four texts that it contains, drawn up in the Subachmimic dialect, are unpublished apocrypha whose contents, though Gnostic, has seemed, to those who have been able to examine it, rather abstract and philosophic.

---

35 Togo Mina, “Le papyrus gnostique du Musée Copte,” *VigChr* 2 (1948): 9:
This seems then to have been updated in the light of a somewhat fuller inventory of the Jung Codex Doresse made for Albert Eid on 14 April 1948. Here Doresse was still hesitant as to the identification of I,3 with the Valentinian *Gospel of Truth*:36

The absence, in the text that we have, of precise cosmogonic Gnostic allusions, makes such a conclusion still open to discussion.

Doresse wrote Walter Till playing down the importance of Codex I:37

... from the Gnostic point of view of little interest.

But only a week later he told Eid, when requesting permission to report on I,3 at the International Congress of Orientalists in Paris that was to take place on 23–31 July 1948:38

... a rather important Gnostic treatise.

He had already invited Eid to attend, in order to meet American orientalists:39

The International Congress of Orientalists will take place at Paris in July. You could meet there most of the American orientalists who are going to come, and who will not be in the United States at this time.

On 12 November 1948 Doresse provided Eid with a more detailed inventory:40

---

36 14 iv 48: Inventory by Doresse for Albert Eid:
L’absence, dans le texte que nous avons, d’allusions cosmogoniques gnostiques précises, rend une telle conclusion encore discutable.

37 24 vi 48: Letter from Doresse to Till:
... au point de vue gnostique peu intéressant.

38 1 vii 48: Letter from Doresse to Eid:
... un traité gnostique assez important.

39 15 iv 48: Letter from Doresse to Eid:
Le Congrès International des Orientalistes se tiendra à Paris en juillet: vous pourriez y rencontrer la plupart des orientalistes américains qui vont venir, et qui ne seront pas aux États-Unis à ce moment.

40 12 xi 48: Inventory from Doresse to Eid:
Une Apocalypse de Jacques, complète, qui va de la première page à la page 16. Cet ouvrage est un apocryphe sans caractères gnostiques.

Un traité abstrait qui semble, d’après ses premières lignes, porter le titre d’*“Évangile de Verité”* et qui pourrait être un ouvrage valentinien de ce titre, aujourd’hui perdu,
An Apocalypse of James [The Apocryphon of James, I,2], complete, pp. 1–16. This work is an apocryphal text without Gnostic characteristics.

An abstract treatise that seems, according to its first lines, to carry the title ‘Gospel of Truth’ [I,3]; it could be a Valentinian work of this title that is today lost, unless one should recognize in it the Gospel of Perfection used by other Gnostics.

A Treatise on the Resurrection [I,4], again little enough Gnostic, at least according to the passages of it that I have seen. This work is in the form of an epistle, addressed to a person named Reginos (?)

Next the volume seems to contain another book, completely Gnostic, divided into Parts [I,5]. The title occurs nowhere in the leaves that I have seen.

Finally, the last leaf shows that the collection closed with an apocryphal text: Prayer of the Apostle P(eter) [Prayer of the Apostle Paul, I,1]. … The title is mutilated.

This inventory must have been completed in Cairo at the beginning of Doresse’s second expedition that began at the end of November 1948, for it reflects for the first time the part of Codex I that was in the Tano collection, which Doresse had returned to Egypt to inventory. Although this may perhaps be inferred from the fact that first with this inventory of Codex I is I,5 mentioned, in view of the fact that much of this tractate was in the Tano collection (I, 59–90), yet more conclusive is the use of the title of I,4 for the first time in this inventory. For this title exists only on the leaf 49/50, which was part of the Tano collection.

In the editio princeps of I,3, the title of I,4 was reported to be:41

... on a leaf recently spotted in Cairo.

41 Michel Malinine, Henri-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, Walter Till (with R. McL. Wilson and Jan Zandee), De Resurrectione (Epistula ad Rheginum): Codex Jung F. XXIIr–F. XXVv (pp. 43–50) (Zürich and Stuttgart: Rascher, 1963):

... sur un feuillet récemment repéré au Caire.
Doresse uses this comment to illustrate his claim that the Preface to that edition gives details on the description, date and content of Codex I that come from him:42

I still possess the letters in which he [Quispel] asked me for precise information on the content of the manuscript and on the possible Valentinian authenticity of the Gospel of Truth—information that I furnished to him at the time confidentially. It is hence obvious that many details given in the Preface of the Zürich edition of the Evangelium Veritatis, as much on the physical description of the codex as on its possible dating, or on its content (for example, the pretended discovery in ‘a leaf recently spotted in Cairo’ of the title Discourse on the Resurrection relating to one of the tractates of the volume), far from being new facts, only reproduce information that I had already given in my first articles (see my “Nouveaux documents gnostiques coptes découverts en Haute-Égypte,” in the Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions ..., 1949, p. 179; also: “Une bibliothèque gnostique copte ..., “ in the Bulletin de l’Académie royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres, 1949, p. 444; etc.)

He had in fact published the title Discourse to Reginos on the Resurrection, without that fact having been mentioned in the critical edition. In the booklet of contact prints of Codex I that he took with him from Egypt at the end of 1947 and passed on to me, there is the annotation after the photograph of I, 48: ‘49–50 one leaf Dattari,’ to which a further note is appended, ‘found again = Coptic Museum.’ Beside the incipit of I,4, in the same ink, there is written: ‘Reginos.’ But it remains unclear whether these notes were made before or after facsimiles of I, 49/50 were published by Pahor Labib in 1956,43 from which the actual title found on I, 50 is evident: The Treatise on the Resurrection.

---

42 Doresse, L’Évangile selon Thomas, pp. 18–19:

Je possède encore les lettres par lesquelles il me demande des renseignements précis sur le contenu du manuscrit et sur l’authenticité valentinienne possible de l’Évangile de Vérité—renseignements que je lui fournis alors à titre privé. Il est donc manifeste que bien des détails donnés dans la préface de l’édition zurichoise de l’Évangéline Veritatis tant sur la description matérielle du codex que sur sa datation possible ou sur son contenu (par exemple la prétendue découverte dans “un feuillet récemment repéré au Caire” du titre de Discours sur la Résurrection se rapportant à l’un des traités du volume), bien loin d’être des faits nouveaux, ne font que reproduire des informations que j’avais déjà données dans mes premiers articles (cf. mes Nouveaux documents gnostiques coptes découverts en Haute-Égypte, dans les Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions ..., 1949, p. 179; également: Une bibliothèque gnostique copte ..., dans le Bulletin de l’Académie royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres, 1949, p. 444; etc.).

43 Pahor Labib, Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo (Vol. I; Cairo: Government Press; Antiquities Department, 1956).
Canon L.Th. Lefort of Louvain

Doresse had every reason to seek to interest the leading coptologist of Louvain, Canon L.Th. Lefort, in publishing the Nag Hammadi material there. Not only was that a distinguished publication option, but it would be a way that Doresse could get out from under the domination of Puech. And of course Albert Eid was also Belgian.

Doresse must have sent Lefort a copy of his report that Puech had presented to the French Academy on 20 February 1948 (see Chapter 2, Part 3 above), since Lefort summarized it to the Académie Royale de Belgique just nine days later (1 March 1948), concluding with reference both to that report and to a letter from Doresse received ‘a few days ago.’

L.Th. Lefort announces the discovery, in Upper Egypt, of an enormous jar containing a quantity of well-conserved manuscripts. Lefort expresses himself in the following terms: ...

It is not possible, or permitted, for me to say more about them at this time. Besides, I may refer you to the next Compte-rendu of the last meeting of the Académie des Inscriptions [et Belles-Lettres of France] (20 February). A communication on this topic was made there by Messrs Puech and Doresse, who know about it for a longer time than do I. In effect, they have just been entrusted with the publication of the codex of the Coptic Museum. Doresse, commissioned with courses at the École des Hautes Études, wrote me a few days ago: “I am going to publish these five texts as rapidly as possible, with a very developed commentary edited in collaboration with H.-C. Puech.”

Yet Lefort reported details that are neither in Doresse’s typescript of the report to the French Academy nor in the published report, details which

44 BAB.L, 5e Série, 34 (1948): 100–102:100, 102:

M. L.Th. Lefort annonce la découverte, en Haute-Égypte, d’une énorme jarre renfermant une quantité de manuscrits bien conservés. M. Lefort s’exprime dans les termes suivants: ...

Il ne m’est pas possible, ou permis, d’en dire davantage en ce moment; au reste, je me permets de vous renvoyer au prochain Compte-rendu de la dernière séance de l’Académie des Inscriptions (le 20 février); une communication sur ce sujet y fut faite par MM. Puech et Doresse qui en savent plus long que moi; ils viennent, en effet, d’être chargés de la publication du codex du Musée copte. M. Doresse, chargé de cours à l’École des Hautes Études, m’écrivait il y a quelques jours: “Je vais publier ces cinq textes le plus rapidement possible, avec un commentaire très développé, rédigé en collaboration avec M. H.-C. Puech.”
Doresse may well have known and passed on to Lefort, but had not felt free
to publish (see Chapter 2, Part 3 above):^45

Eid, son of the former Belgian consul, retains another codex. A merchant
offered [Charles] Kuentz, Director of the Institut français [d’archéologie orien-
tale du Caire] three [read: two; see Chapter 1, Part 3 above] codices equipped
with their leather covers. Not having been able to reach agreement on the
price, the merchant[s] left, taking with him [read: them] the three [two] vol-
umes. According to a serious informer, other volumes are in the hands of
different merchants.

Doresse wrote Eid that he visited Lefort in Louvain ‘last month,’ hoping to
interest him in acquiring Codex I, which would serve to secure Doresse’s
own involvement in its publication. Apparently this negotiation was unsuccess-
ful. But it is not surprising that Doresse would lead Eid to think that a
fellow-Belgian might be motivated to acquire Codex I for the University of
Louvain. So Doresse wrote to Eid in a tone that might serve to lower the
price.^46

It has to do with still unpublished apocryphal texts, but among which only
one may be Gnostic. For this reason, I believe, the asking price shocked Lefort
(with whom I had talked a great deal at Louvain about your papyrus last
month). I hope nonetheless to be able soon to give you some certain and
encouraging indications.

I do not believe that France can buy it for the moment. I hope to find, on
the other hand, sufficient arguments to interest Lefort. I still have some other
rather precise ideas. Give me notice, some time before making offers to the
United States. It could be that I might have a Maecenas to refer you to.

---

^45 Lefort, BAB.L, 5e Série, 34 (1948): 100–102:101:

M. Eid, fils de l’ancien consul belge, détient un autre codex; un marchand a présenté
à M. Kuentz, directeur de l’Institut français trois codices munis de leurs couvertures
en cuir; l’accord sur le prix n’ayant pu se faire, le marchand est parti en emportant les
trois volumes. Selon un informateur sérieux, d’autres volumes sont entre les mains de
différents marchands.

^46 15 iv 48: Letter from Doresse to Eid:

Il s’agit d’apocryphes encore inédits, mais parmi lesquels un seul peut être gnostique.
Pour cette raison, je crois, le prix demandé a effrayé M. Lefort (avec qui j’ai beaucoup
parlé de votre papyrus à Louvain, le mois dernier). J’espère toutefois arriver à vous
donner bientôt des indications sûres et encourageantes.

Je ne crois pas que la France puisse l’acheter pour le moment. J’espère trouver, par
contre, des arguments suffisants pour intéresser M. Lefort. J’ai encore quelques autres
idées assez précises: prévenez-moi quelque temps avant de faire des propositions aux
États-Unis. Il se pourrait que j’aie un mécène à vous adresser.

Observations of Lefort, who underlines the importance of the discovery.

The Doresses returned again to Belgium (5–18 August 1948). First, they went to Brussels for the Eighth Congress of Byzantinologists:\footnote{48}{Marianne Doresse, “Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte” (see Chapter 2, Part 2 above).}

\begin{quote}
Togo returned to Egypt, whereas we went, on a motorcycle with side-car (automobiles were not to be found after the war), to Belgium for the Eighth Congress of Byzantinologists …
\end{quote}

Then they went to Louvain, to seek to make publication plans there, which would be well beyond the control of Puech:\footnote{49}{Marianne Doresse, “Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte” (see Chapter 2, Part 2 above).}

\begin{quote}
Togo had charged us with making contact with Louvain for a possible publication of the codex of the Coptic Museum by the C.S.C.O. (= \textit{Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium} of Louvain). Meanwhile, as a consequence, when one learns in Paris the project to publish at the C.S.C.O. of Louvain, a project accepted by Togo Mina and for which one has the agreement of the Abbot Drioton and especially of Georges Salles [Director of the Museums of France], certain people will put pressure violently on Jean to make him abandon it.

The adversaries of the project are Lacau, systematically hostile to Jean, and Puech, who fears not having any control of this edition—the C.S.C.O. escaping his tentacles, and only publishing texts with translations and a brief introduction. Puech wished to reserve for himself the monopoly on the texts, so as to be the first to give commentaries on them. Lacau (see your archives) went so far as to demand that Jean be excluded from the \textit{C[entre] N[ational de la] R[cherche] S[cientifique]} if the texts were published in Belgium, an attitude all the more absurd since, one must recall, at that time no French organism had at its disposal funding for this publication. …

Then we go to Louvain to see for a longer time than at the Congress Monsignor Lefort and Canon Draguet, who directs the CSCO. The latter hopes to undertake the publication of the Gnostic codex. Louvain has just received from the United States the linotypes to print oriental characters with which the work of
composition of the Coptic texts should go at an exceptional speed. Jean leaves with Canon Draguet the copy of a page of the codex. We receive the printed specimen of it in Cairo, dated 11 March 1949 and signed by Canon Draguet (in our archives).

There is indeed a ‘Specimen of the Coptic of the Corpus, Louvain,’ with the initials DG (Draguet) in the Archives. On his return to Paris, Doresse reported the outcome to Walter Till:

I have spoken of this project to Draguet (who directs the new Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum [Orientalium] … where our texts are going to be printed). ...

One would first have the critical edition of the texts and the translation appear, then the commentary. The new presses of Louvain would do this work very rapidly.

Then Doresse sent Lefort a copy of the inventory of the bulk of the Nag Hammadi codices, held by Tano-Dattari, which he had prepared for Togo Mina (see Chapter 2, Part 5 above). Lefort welcomed it as a vindication of his position, in a long-standing debate with Carl Schmidt, as to whether Coptic literature was merely a parasite on Greek literature, or a source of original literature of its own:

Truly, you have made a ‘master-stroke,’ and will have put Coptic philology in your debt. This discovery is quite simply marvelous. It particularly gives me pleasure, since it clearly confirms a point of view that I supported in a discussion with Carl Schmidt: I maintained that one could expect some day

---

50 11 iii 49: Mailed to Doresse in Egypt by Canon Draguet:

Spécimen du copte du Corpus, Louvain.

51 18 viii 48: Letter from Doresse to Till:

J’ai parlé de ce projet à M. Draguet (qui dirige le nouveau Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum … où nos textes vont être imprimés). ...

On ferait d’abord paraître l’édition critique des textes et la traduction, puis le commentaire. Les nouvelles presses de Louvain feraient ce travail très rapidement.

52 9 vi 49: Letter from Lefort to Doresse:

Vraiment vous avez fait un "coup de maître," et vous aurez bien mérité de la philologie copte. Cette trouvaille est tout simplement merveilleuse. Elle me fait particulièrement plaisir, parce qu’elle confirme nettement un point de vue que je soutenais dans une discussion avec Carl Schmidt: Je prétendais qu’on pourrait s’attendre un jour à devoir admettre l’existence d’un très actif foyer de gnosticisme dans la Haute-Égypte et que pas mal de textes gnostiques dérivaien de là. C. Schmidt me traita d’illuminé et maintenait radicalement que tout ce qui est copte dérivait du grec!! Vous apportez aujourd’hui la preuve irréfutable que je voyais plus juste que C. Schmidt.
to have to admit the existence of a very active hearth of Gnosticism in Upper Egypt, and that quite a few Gnostic texts came from there. C. Schmidt treated me as a fanatic and maintained radically that everything which is Coptic is derived from Greek!! Today you bring the irrefutable proof that I saw more correctly than did C. Schmidt.

Schmidt was of course correct. Yet Doresse confirmed Lefort’s evaluation:53

But one can, from now on, affirm that the discovery of Chénoboskion easily competes with the richest manuscript discoveries that one knows, and that in any case it outdoes everything which, as regards writings, has thus far come from the soil of Egypt. Thanks to it, Coptic literature will from now on assume, among the literatures of the Hellenized and Christian Orient, the place of the very first order, which, for lack of evidence, only a very few informed historians could have anticipated for it in advance.

Some French newspapers reported the sensational Cairo news release of 10 June 1949 (see Chapter 2, Part 5 above), but with the significant addition of Louvain as the place of publication:54

The library of Louvain would be disposed to assure the costs of publication of the editio ‘princeps’ of the documents.

There was a similar report in Nice Matin, with the most sensationalistic headline of all, based on the Cairo article: “More powerful than the treasure of Tout-Ank-Ammon.”55

53 Book notice by Doresse in BiOr 6 (1949): 102–105: 103:

Mais on peut, dès maintenant, constater que la trouvaille de Chénoboskion rivalise aisément avec les plus riches découvertes de manuscrits que l’on connaisse et qu’elle efface en tout cas tout ce qui, en fait d’écrits, est sorti jusqu’à présent du sol d’Égypte. Grâce à elle, la littérature copte prend désormais, parmi les littératures de l’orient hellénisé et chrétien, la place de tout premier rang que, faute de preuves, seuls de rares historiens avertis pouvaient par avance lui pressentir.

54 11 vi 49: Under the headline “Découverts près de Louxor: Douze papyrus du IIIe siècle bouleversent l’histoire du Christianisme,” Le populaire of Paris; under the headline “Douze livres exhumés d’une grotte égyptienne remettent en question l’histoire du Christianisme,” La patrie of Montpellier; under the headline “Sensationnelle découverte archéologique en Égypte: Douze gros volumes relatant le début de l’histoire du Christianisme mis au jour par des paysans,” Le reveil of Grenoble; and under the headline “Une découverte archéologique d’un intérêt considérable: Douze gros volumes du XIIIe [sic!] siècle exhumés d’une grotte égyptienne,” Rouergue Republcaain of Rodez:

La bibliothèque de Louvain serait disposée à assurer les frais de publication des textes “princeps” des documents.

55 ii vi 49: Nice Matin, the headline “Plus fort que le trésor de Tout-Ank-Ammon: Douze volumes du IIIe siècle exhumés d’une grotte égyptienne remettent en question l’histoire des débuts du Christianisme.”
There was also a special report from Paris in *The Manchester Guardian* with the same addition:\(^{56}\)

There will be no unnecessary delay in publication. The text of the volume which is already the property of the museum will shortly be published at Louvain (which thus again shows itself the Phoenix of learning) accompanied by a translation and notes under the joint editorship of M. J. Doresse (French), Mr. Togo Mina, of the Cairo Coptic Museum, M. H.-C. Puech (French), and Professor Till (Austrian). This first volume contains “The Secret Book of John”; a work bearing the alternative titles “The Book of the Great Invisible Spirit” and “The Gospel of the Egyptians”; “The Epistle of Eugnostus the Blessed”; “The Wisdom of Jesus Christ”; and “The Dialogue of the Savior.”

Publication of the other volumes will follow as is practically possible. There is every desire to avoid the kind of delay which has held up for a quarter of a century publication of the only other known lengthy Gnostic documents contained in a codex that was in Berlin.

Even Puech conceded in 1950 that publication would possibly be in the *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium*, though without mentioning its location:\(^{57}\)

In case that they [the negotiations] succeed and that the volumes become the possession of the Egyptian government, a collective publication of the ensemble of the discovered texts could be envisaged. According to a project already set up, there would be the possibility of being edited in the *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium*.

Of course, Puech had not given up the struggle, and ultimately forced Doresse to shift from the *C.S.C. O.* of Louvain to the *Imprimerie Nationale* of Paris.

On 4 July 1949 Lefort had Doresse present to the *Académie Royale de Belgique* his inventory of the Tano collection:\(^{58}\)

---

\(^{56}\) 24 vi 49: *The Manchester Guardian*.


Au cas où elles réussiraient et où les volumes deviendraient possession du gouvernement égyptien, une publication collective de l’ensemble des textes découverts pourrait être envisagée. Selon un projet déjà formé, elle aurait chance d’être éditée dans le *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium*.

\(^{58}\) Marianne Doresse, “Deuxième mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte” (see Chapter 2, Part 2 above).
On the return [from the Netherlands], we stopped at Louvain, where we see again Mgr Lefort and Canon Draguet. On 4 July, under the auspices of Mgr Lefort, Jean presents to the Académie Royale de Belgique the communication: “Une bibliothèque gnostique copie découverte en Haute Égypte” ....

Then Doresse’s presentation was published by the Académie Royale de Belgique.59

After the Doresses visited Nag Hammadi in January 1950, Lefort presented on 2 August 1950 to the Royal Academy of Belgium Doresse’s report on the site of the discovery.60

The continuing interest of Lefort in the Nag Hammadi codices was eulogized by Gérard Garitte to the Royal Academy of Belgium:61

The Classe des Lettres of the Académie Royale was the first, after the Académie des Inscriptions [et Belles-Lettres of Paris], to be informed of the extraordinary discovery that was made in Egypt, toward the end of the war, of a collection of Coptic Gnostic manuscripts. It is to the always vigilant attention of the regretted Mgr Lefort that the Classe is indebted for this priority. In the session of 1 March 1948 he communicated to it the essentials of a report that Messrs Puech and Doresse had made eight days earlier to the Académie des Inscriptions on the topic of “Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Égypte.” The next year, on 4 July 1949, Mgr Lefort presented to the Classe an exposition by Doresse entitled “Une bibliothèque gnostique copie découverte en Haute

---

59 Jean Doresse, “Une bibliothèque gnostique copie découverte en Haute Égypte,” BAB.L, 5e Série, 35 (1949): 422 (just listed in the “Communications”), 435–449 (Doresse’s essay itself). It is a second draft of the article that had been separated into two parts, one ascribed to Togo Mina, one to Jean Doresse, published in VigChr 3 (July 1949): 129–141, cited in the present article on p. 436, n. 2.


61 Gérard Garitte, “Le nouvel Évangile copie de Thomas,” BAB.L, 5e Série, 50 (1964): 33:

La Classe des Lettres de l’Académie Royale a été la première, après l’Académie des Inscriptions, à être informée de l’extraordinaire découverte, qui se fit en Égypte vers la fin de la guerre, d’une collection de manuscrits copies gnostiques. C’est à l’attention toujours vigilante du regreté Mgr Lefort que la Classe a dû cette priorité; dans la séance du 1er mars 1948, il lui fit connaître l’essentiel d’une communication que MM. Puech et Doresse avaient faite huit jours plus tot à l’Académie des Inscriptions au sujet des “Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Égypte”; l’année suivante, le 4 juillet 1949, Mgr Lefort présentait à la Classe un exposé de M. Doresse intitulé “Une bibliothèque gnostique copie découverte en Haute Égypte,” et le 2 août 1950, il vous soumettait les résultats d’une exploration que le même M. Doresse avait fait, au mois de janvier précédent, sur les lieux présumés de la découverte.

Après 1950, Mgr Lefort n’eut plus l’occasion de vous entretenir des nouveaux manuscrits gnostiques; ce n’est pas qu’il les ait dès lors négligés; au contraire, il a continué, jusqu’à la fin de ses jours, à s’y intéresser activement.
Égypte,” and on 2 August 1950 he submitted to you the results of an exploration that the same Doresse had made, in the preceding January, on the assumed locations of the discovery.

After 1950, Mgr Lefort had no further occasion to talk with you about the new Gnostic manuscripts. It is not that he neglected them from then on. Quite to the contrary, he continued, on down to the end of his days, to be actively interested in them.

An interview with Simone Eid documenting Lefort’s interest was summarized by the Swiss ambassador to Egypt, Beat von Fischer-Reichenbach, as follows:

The volume in question should be evaluated for the Belgian fiscal office by Canon Lefort, professor at the University of Louvain, a great Belgian coptologist who is said to have manifested at one time the intention of acquiring the manuscript for the University where he taught.

Quispel reported as follows:

On 1 April 1955 Simone Eid told me that her husband had got a fine of 5,000 £É for illegal exportation of the Codex. After having promised the codex to von Fischer [on 30 July 1951], two priests sent by Louvain offered her the double amount. Is it so that Doresse, having heard from me that I had contacted Jung, incited Lefort to outwit me?

Doresse’s interest in Lefort publishing the Eid Codex was initially less to avoid Quispel and the plans of the Jung Institute, of which he was not at the time aware, than it was to circumvent Puech. For the very fact that Louvain would publish Puech’s commentary only in a volume separate from the text and translation was simply unacceptable to Puech, though favored by Doresse so as to expedite publication.

The Exportation of the Eid Codex

Doresse has recalled that the Eid Codex left Egypt about the time when Prime Minister Nokrachi was assassinated (28 December 1948).
Elaine Pagels wrote that Albert Eid 'smuggled' the Codex out of Egypt:\(^{67}\)

In 1949 Albert Eid, worried about government intervention, flew from Cairo to America. By including the manuscript in a large collection of export items, he succeeded in smuggling it out of Egypt. ... The Egyptian government indicted Eid for smuggling antiquities, but by the time of his conviction, the antiquities dealer had died. The court imposed a fine of £6,000 on his estate.

Simone Eid asked me to 'annul' this accusation of smuggling, a request I honored already in the Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices.\(^ {68} \)


Henri-Beat von Fischer-Reichenbach, Swiss ambassador to Egypt, who served as an intermediary for the Jung Institute, wrote C.A. Meier, the Director of the Jung Institute, the view of the Coptic Museum:\(^ {69} \)

> It came out of the country by legal means.

Yet Quispel and R. Rahn wrote the Curatorium of the Jung Institute (see Chapter 5 below):\(^ {70} \)

> Without incriminating your Institute, the Egyptians continue, wrongly or rightly, to assert that the departure took place in an illegal way.

The talk of Eid smuggling out his codex has not gone away. In a novel\(^ {71} \) inspired by Pagels' The Gnostic Gospels,\(^ {72} \) the author combines fictional characters and a fictional plot with the historical persons involved in the

---


\(^{68}\) Facsimile Edition: Introduction, p. 9, n. 10.

\(^{69}\) 19 vii 51: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

> Es kam rechtmässig ins Ausland.

\(^{70}\) 13 iv 55: Letter from Quispel and Rahn to the Curatorium of the Jung Institute:

> Sans incriminer votre Institut, les Égyptiens continuent, à tort ou à raison, à prétendre que la sortie s’était faite d’une façon illégale.

\(^{71}\) Tucker Malarkey, Resurrection (New York: Riverhead Books, 2006).

\(^{72}\) Malarkey, Resurrection, "Acknowledgements," 401.
early years of the discovery. Then there is an appendix entitled “Who is Real,” where the historical personages are identified. There one reads concerning Albert Eid:73

Though warned by Mina not to remove the manuscripts from the country, Eid smuggled them out of Egypt in the winter of 1948, taking them first to New York City, where he failed to find a buyer, and then to Belgium.

Simone Eid was ambivalent in my interview with her as to how the codex left Egypt: She initially indicated it left by (Belgian) diplomatic courier, but then indicated that only her stamp collection was exported by that means. Perhaps two different occasions are in view, since Albert Eid got the codex out of Egypt a number of years before Simone Eid moved permanently to Belgium, which is when her stamp collection may well have been exported. In any case, it is clear from the interview that the diplomatic courier was available to Simone Eid.

Von Fischer reported that in 1953 her version of the story ran:74

Officially “her husband sold the codex to her brother, who brought it officially to Europe, i. e. he took the paper along, without knowing its value, and the police and customs officials let it go through unhesitatingly.”

Doresse has reported a still further version of how the codex left Egypt:75

I followed everything from the start. I can tell it now: As soon as Eid planned to export the manuscript, he told me about his projects. We thought he could not do it, but he did it, under our eyes, as a proof that the administrative controls of Egypt, on the export of antiquities, were completely inefficient.

Eid had prepared, especially to be sold in the U.S.A., several antiquities, most of them pharaonic, fine and interesting, but of such a kind that the Egyptian authorities would not be interested to retain them in the country. He filled with this stuff one or several large wooden boxes, and showed the whole for inspection at the Antiquities Department. [Marianne Doresse reported that customs clearance was obtained from the Islamic Museum, thought at that time to be easier in this regard.] He received the export permit. We don’t know if the small envelop containing the leaves of papyrus—a very flat and small package—was in one of the boxes at the time of the inspection, and remained unnoticed to the inspectors, or if Eid slipped them at the last minute in the

74 18 x 53: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Offiziell hat “ihr Mann den Codex ihrem Bruder verkauft, der ihn offiziell nach Europa brachte, d. h. er nahm das Papier ohne seinen Wert zu kennen mit, und die Polizei und die Zollbehörden liessen es anstandslos durchgehen.”

75 17 vii 75: Report from Doresse to Dart.
the eid codex = the jung codex = codex i

box when the lid was nailed in front of the officials. Perhaps he showed, to the inspectors, a package of very ordinary leaves of papyrus, which he replaced at the last minute with the other package—the ‘Gnostic’ one. Anyhow, he told everyone, after that, that the thing was so easy to do! He went to America, accompanying his collections, and took contact with some people able to help him in selling the things—pharaonic and others.

It may thus remain indeterminate by which of the alternative procedures the codex left Egypt.

The University of Michigan Again

On 4 January 1949 Eid wrote Rice of the University of Michigan from New York, offering him for $8,000 a Coptic manuscript of eighty leaves that had been identified by Doresse as dating from the Tenth Century and containing a sermon of Shenoute ‘On Galaad.’ When Rice responded with interest, Eid wrote offering to come to Ann Arbor and bring both this manuscript and the Eid Codex:

For your guidance, the Coptic manuscript of the fourth century on papyrus, which was the topic of your correspondence of 14 December 1946 and 4 February 1947, I have finally purchased for my account, after the acquisition of 11 new leaves of the same manuscript. This means that it is at present composed of 52 leaves, i.e. 104 pages, in good condition, with the exception of two leaves or 4 pages. Professor Doresse has secured for me a purchaser for the sum of 5,000 £É, i.e. a bit more than $20,000 for the 52 leaves. If this second manuscript is still able to interest you, I am ready to let it go for $20,000, if you buy the first.

He also enclosed Doresse’s analyses of his Codex of 14 April, 1 July, and 12 November 1948.

---

76 4 i 49: Letter from Eid to Rice.
77 8 i 49: Letter from Rice to Eid.
78 12 i 49: Letter from Eid to Rice:

Pour votre gouverne le manuscrit copte du IVe siècle sur papyrus, qui a fait l’objet de votre correspondance du 14 décembre 1946 et du 4 février 1947, je l’ai finalement acheté pour mon compte, après l’acquisition de 11 nouvelles feuilles du même manuscrit; ce qui fait qu’il se compose actuellement de 52 feuilles soit 104 pages, en bon état, à l’exception de deux feuilles ou 4 pages. Le Professeur Doresse m’a procuré un acheteur pour la somme de £É 5,000, soit un peu plus de $20,000 pour les 52 feuilles. Si ce second manuscrit est encore susceptible de vous intéresser, je suis prêt à le laisser pour $20,000, si vous achetez le premier.

79 14 iv 48: Letter from Doresse to Eid.
80 1 vii 48: Letter from Doresse to Eid.
81 12 xi 48: Letter from Doresse to Eid.
Bourse Égyptienne of 10 January 1948, first announcing the discovery of Codex III. Herbert C. Youtie, Worrell’s successor in the chair of papyrology at the University of Michigan, having been consulted by Rice, advised the purchase.

The two Coptic manuscripts that are being offered to you for purchase are obviously important, the Fourth Century one being of course far more significant than the later one. They could be used to initiate a new era of Coptic studies at the University of Michigan ...

Hence Rice opened negotiations with Eid:

I have taken the opinion of persons chiefly concerned with Coptic and papyrological studies in the University of Michigan and find that they would like very much to acquire the material which you offer. I regret to say, however, that the limitations of the Library budget make it impossible for me to meet the prices which you have named, so that I must postpone consideration of such purchases until larger amounts are available.

But Eid telegraphed:

Arriving tomorrow at ten o’clock.

The next day, on 10 February 1949, an agent named Sislian did in fact show the codices at Ann Arbor, even offering to extend credit. On 14 February 1949 Rice wrote insisting the price was out of the question, whereupon on 18 February 1949 Eid sent a letter by special delivery asking for a counter-offer. He explained that the offer he had in hand, mediated by Doresse, had come from Egypt, where he did not want to make the sale, since he did not want his funds to be tied up in Egypt. Rice inquired if Eid would cut the price in half, since from various funds Rice could bring together, he had available at most $10,000. Thereupon Eid sent Sislian back to Ann Arbor on 13 March 1949 with a note:

---

82 10 i 48: “Une important découverte: Un papyrus gnostique copte du IVème siècle,” in La Bourse Égyptienne.
83 21 i 49: Letter from Youtie to Rice.
84 29 i 49: Letter from Rice to Eid.
85 9 ii 49: Telegram from Eid to Rice.
86 18 ii 49: Letter from Eid to Rice.
87 7 iii 49: Letter from Rice to Eid.
88 13 iii 49: Letter from Eid to Rice:

Ce prix est très bas, vu l’importance du manuscrit, et mon dernier prix aurait été de $15,000.

Mais, comme belge et vétéran de la guerre de 1914–1918, et désirant montrer ma reconnaissance, dans la mésure de mes moyens, envers l’Amérique qui a aidé mon
This price is very low, given the importance of the manuscript, and my last price would have been $15,000.

But, as a Belgian and a veteran of the war of 1914–1918, and wishing to show my gratitude, to the extent my means permit, toward America, which aided my country in the two World Wars, I am ready to give up, to the profit of your University, $5,000, and to receive only the ten thousand dollars that you believe you can offer.

Yet Rice did not take advantage of this offer, and the matter rested there.

On 8 April 1949 Eid wrote Rice that he was taking the plane back to Europe on 18 April 1949 and hoped the transaction might at some future time be completed, a hope in which Rice concurred.

On 7 November 1949 Eid wrote Rice to the effect that he had just arrived in New York by plane for three weeks before returning via Brussels to Cairo, and again offered his codex to Rice:

On the topic of the Coptic manuscript, you perhaps know that the Ministry of Public Instruction has offered me the price of £É 4,000, i.e. about $12,000. I have deferred my response, pretending there is an option that I said I had given. In any case, I am disposed to give you the preference, if it is a matter of the same price. If you are still disposed to acquire it, and wish to see again the manuscript, I am disposed to bring it in its entirety to you in Michigan. There is only the cover that is in Egypt.

I have also another purchaser who has written to me in Cairo to come and see it. But I await your reply before contacting him.
If the manuscript no longer interests you, nor interests the second purchaser, I would then be obliged to return it to Cairo and to accept the offer of the Egyptian government for the Coptic Museum.

He enclosed the sensational newspaper clipping of an interview with Aly Ayoub, Minister of Public Instruction, who is quoted as saying:  

“It seemed that the other volumes, ten in number, were in the possession of an Italian lady who lives in Egypt, whose father had organized the museum of ancient coins of the regretted King Fouad. But when the ministry wished to acquire them, the lady demanded the sum of 71,000 Pounds, and, after long discussions, she agreed to reduce the sum to 60,000 Pounds. A commission of archaeologists was unanimous in recommending the purchase of this inestimable work.”

“I went personally to the residence of this lady and succeeded in convincing her that the acquisition of this work is of public interest, and that, as a result, she should not exaggerate the asking price. I have offered her the sum of 40,000 Pounds.”

Eid had written by hand on the clipping:  

The lady has refused the amount of 40,000 £É for the ten manuscripts—she demands as her lowest price 60,000 £É. I have also been offered 4,000 £É; I have deferred my reply. Mine is the most important of them all.

The University administration decided not to invest additional funds in its collections of manuscripts and papyri.
On 3 March 1953 Leonard Epstein, appointed by Eid as his power of attorney before leaving America in 1949, offered Rice a photostatic copy of the codex, on the grounds that an interest in making such a purchase had been expressed to Eid.\(^\text{95}\) In view of the University’s policy, this too was declined.\(^\text{96}\)

Quispel reported that Eid proposed his codex to the University of Michigan for $12,000, but was offered in return only $6,000, a price unacceptable to Eid. He assumed that American scholars had failed to recognize the significance of the codex:\(^\text{97}\)

One must assume that the American scholars who must have had the codex before their eyes could not have identified the content. Otherwise they should not have found the asking price too high.

However it was not a matter of scholars not identifying the content. For the list of tractates and the identification of *The Gospel of Truth* were available not only in the published report to the French Academy,\(^\text{98}\) but also in the expertises of Doresse that Eid had made available to Youtie, whose recommendation of purchase was simply not followed.

Actually, at the time the codex was in fact acquired by the Jung Institute for only $8,009, Henri-Charles Puech described this transaction:\(^\text{99}\)

... just between us, for an excessive price.

A newspaper article in Ann Arbor, the city where the University of Michigan is located, referred to the Nag Hammadi codices as ‘a literary treasure.’\(^\text{100}\)

While on his first trip to the United States, Eid offered the Jung Codex also to the Bollingen Foundation. Quispel has published the background:\(^\text{101}\)
In the spring of 1948 I received at Leiden vague reports from Jean Doresse about an important discovery of Coptic MSS in Egypt. ... I gave M. Doresse the address of an institution with which I was acquainted, the Bollingen Foundation at New York, with the request that it be handed over to a person in Egypt [Eid]. At the same time, viz. in August 1948, I urged on Jack D. Barrett, the Secretary of the Foundation, the purchase of the Gnostic writings.

Marianne Doresse has reported:102

Quispel meets Barrett at Ascona and he writes to Jean to inform him of the interest that the Bollingen Foundation seems to take in his discovery. Later Mellon will come to Paris, and in fact discusses with Jean, whom he receives at the Hotel Meurisse on 20 October 1948.

The records of the Bollingen Foundation are to the effect that there was a meeting between Barrett and Doresse in Paris and that Eid did visit the Foundation in New York. On 18 November 1952 Vaun Gillmor, Assistant Secretary of the Bollingen Foundation, wrote up Barrett's recollection of Eid's visits for Quispel:103

At the behest of Mr. Doresse, Mr. Eid came to the office of the Foundation with the hope that he might interest the Foundation in the purchase of the codex. It is Mr. Barrett's recollection that at that time Mr. Eid was asking $12,000. He stated to Mr. Barrett that the University of Michigan had offered him something in the neighborhood of $6,000 which he had refused. At a somewhat later date, during the winter of 1948–1949, having failed to make a sale and being on the eve of his departure for Europe, Mr. Eid made the request that he might leave the codex in New York in the care of the Foundation or in a bank to which the Foundation would have access, should they wish to have the manuscript expertised. This request was refused, as you may imagine, in view of the responsibility involved for another's property, and the codex was eventually taken back to Europe by Mr. Eid.

If it is of interest to you, to the best of my recollection, in which Mr. Barrett concurs, the codex was contained in a fairly sizeable leather box or case, the leaves separated by cellophane. We were shown only the uppermost pages which seemed to be in rather good condition.

Another excerpt from the file of the Bollingen Foundation reads:

The manuscript and its leaves were packed in cotton and appeared to be in very fragile condition.

102 Marianne Doresse, Première mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte (see Chapter 2, Part 2 above).
103 18 xi 52: Letter from Vaun Gillmor to Quispel.
Eid's desire to deposit the Codex in New York at the conclusion of his first visit in the Spring of 1949 might suggest that he had given up hope of a purchase by Louvain; in any case he seems to have taken the Codex back with him to Brussels at least at the end of his second trip in the Autumn of 1949. He planned to take it back to Egypt, but was dissuaded by his wife, who feared that the customs officers at the Cairo airport might have been alerted to be on the watch for them. The codex was deposited in the safety deposit box number 149 of the Banque de Réports et de Dépots, 11 rue des Colonies, Brussels. The Eids were in fact meticulously searched by the customs officers on their arrival in Egypt.

Albert Eid died a year later in Cairo, on 29 November 1950. He had failed in his efforts to sell his codex. This became the task of his widow Simone Eid.

The Leather Cover of the Eid Codex

The leather cover of Codex I must have been part of the original lot acquired by Eid. For Eid had written on the back of one of the photographs he sent to Couroyer for his expertise in 1947:

40 leaves of papyrus written on both sides, i.e. 80 pages of text, with the cover in leather.

The cover was also mentioned in the report to the French Academy of 20 February 1948, where it is the only reason given for assuming Codex I came from the same discovery as did Codex III. In view of the fact that previously papyrus codices of this early date had not been found with their covers, it would be the cover, rather than forty leaves of quite different hands, dialects and dimensions, that would associate the two items.

The cover was not taken to America, nor was it acquired by the Jung Institute, but had remained in Egypt, as Eid mentioned to Rice:

There is only the cover that is in Egypt.

104 8 vi 51: 'Procuration' by the Belgian Embassy in Cairo, certified by Harold Eeman.
105 Circa vii–viii 46: Written on the back of the print of Codex I, page 46, sent by Eid to Couroyer:
40 feuilles de papyrus écrit des deux côtés soit 80 pages de texte avec la couverture en cuir.
107 7 xi 49: Letter from Eid to Rice:
Il n’y a que la couverture qui se trouve en Égypte.
Doresse has explained:\(^{108}\)

In 1947 and 1948, in Cairo, Prof. Doresse had had the opportunity to study, when it was with the antiquities dealer Albert Eid, not only those of the leaves of this codex that were some years later to reappear in Switzerland under the designation ‘Jung Codex,’ but also the binding of this manuscript. He had noted, inside this binding (as is the case for some other bindings of the Gnostic codices of Nag-Hammadi / Khénoboskion) the presence of a padding or cartonnage made of several layers of papyrus documents put into the trash, and pasted one on the other. He was able to make a photograph of the most important of these paddings.\(^{109}\)...

In fact, it seems that, at the time of his trip to the U.S.A. and his return via Europe (1949?), Albert Eid (short of funds) had ceded the cover of the codex to a collector in whom he hoped to find, later on, a purchaser for the whole of the leaves. But the affair ended there.

When the acquisition of the Jung Codex was officially announced in Zürich on 15 November 1953, Puech reported that the cover ‘unfortunately has today disappeared.’\(^{110}\) In 1959 Doresse published, as a decoration for the cover of his edition of *The Gospel of Thomas* from Codex II, a photomontage that shows the cover of Codex I (not identified as such) with a corner turned back to show (a photograph of) a page tucked inside (III, 53). On the back of the title page the information is provided.\(^{111}\)

---

\(^{108}\) Undated communication from Doresse:

En 1947 et 1948, au Caire, le Prof. Doresse avait eu l’occasion d’étudier, chez l’antiquaire Albert Eid, non seulement ceux des feuillets de ce codex qui allaient, quelques années plus tard, réparaître en Suisse sous l’appellation de “Codex Jung,” mais encore la reliure de ce manuscrit. Il avait constaté, au dedans de cette reliure (comme c’est le cas pour quelques autres reliures des codices gnostiques de Nag-Hammadi / Khénoboskion) la présence d’un rembourrage ou cartonnage faite de plusieurs couches de documents sur papyrus, mis au rebut, et collés les uns sur les autres. Il put faire une photographie du plus important de ces rembourrages. ...

En fait, il semble que, lors de son voyage aux U.S.A. et de son retour par l’Europe (1949?), Albert Eid (à court d’argent) ait cédé la couverture du codex à un collectionneur en qui il espérait trouver, par la suite, un acquéreur pour l’ensemble des feuillets. Mais l’affaire en resta là.


\(^{110}\) Henri-Charles Puech, “Der ‘Codex Jung’ im Rahmen der gnostischen Bibliothek von Chenoboskion,” *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, Fernausgabe, Nr. 313, Blatt 11, of 14 November 1953:

... ist heute leider verschwunden.

\(^{111}\) Jean Doresse, *L’Évangile de Thomas*:

Couverture: la reliure d’un des manuscrits de Khénoboskion. (Photomontage J.D.)
Cover: The binding of one of the manuscripts of Khénoboskion. (Photomontage: Jean D[oresse])

But by 1960 the very existence of the cover had been lost from sight. Berthe van Regemorter wrote:\(^{112}\)

The codex that one calls the Jung Codex does not have a binding. Has it lost it, or did it never have one? We do not know. [Simone Eid: ‘?’] The same thing applies to the codex [actually the remainder of the same codex] that at present carries the number I and whose complete photocopy has been published by the efforts of the International Committee that has Dr. Pahor Labib, Director of the Coptic Museum, as President. [Actually, it was printed for Pahor Labib just before the International Committee met in 1956, see Chapter 6, Part 3 below.]

Then Doresse published the cover in 1961, with the comment:\(^{113}\)

This binding, which I had the opportunity to study when it was with the antiquities dealer Albert Eid, seems to have, today, disappeared. [Simone Eid: ‘???’]

Hence Martin Krause, inferring that the cover was indeed ‘missing,’ considered Doresse’s publication of it as ‘the most important thing in his essay.’\(^{114}\) The report of the Preliminary Committee to UNESCO of 4 November 1961 (see Chapter 9, Part 2 below) stated:

No leather binding of Codex I is preserved.

In 1962 Krause also reported:\(^{115}\)

---

112 Berthe van Regemorter, “La reliure des manuscrits gnostiques découverts à Nag Hammadi,” *Scriptorium* 14 (1960): 226:

   Le codex que l’on appelle le codex Jung n’a pas de reliure. L’a-t-il perdue ou n’en a-t-il jamais eu? Nous l’ignorons. Même chose pour le codex qui porte actuellement le no 1 et dont la photocopie complète a été publiée par les soins du Comité International qui a le Dr. Pahor Labib, directeur du Musée Copte, comme président.


   Cette reliure, que j’ai eu l’occasion d’étudier lorsqu’elle se trouvait chez l’antiquaire Albert Eid, semble avoir, aujourd’hui, disparu.


   … verschollen …; … das Wichtigste in seinem Aufsatz.


   Der Ledereinband des Codex ist nicht erhalten geblieben.
The leather cover of the codex has not been preserved.

Consequently he and Pahor Labib list as only ten the total number of covers.\textsuperscript{116}

Yet on 23 August 1971 Doresse wrote me that he might be able to rediscover the binding of Codex I:\textsuperscript{117}

As to the binding of codex XIII (I), it would not be impossible to rediscover it. I have, in any case, very detailed photographs. [Simone Eid: ‘See what I say above.’\textsuperscript{118}]

But then Doresse added its purchase as a condition for studying it:\textsuperscript{119}

I hope to be able to have you rediscover the binding of the ‘Jung Codex,’ but, no doubt, in order to be able to study it in a parallel way, it would be necessary that it be purchased from its present holder, who would not concede it except for a respectable price.

Then he reported a delay:\textsuperscript{120}

As to the cover of the ‘Jung’ Codex, the present holder of this is, for the time being, absent from Paris. [Simone Eid: ‘Idem.’]

Then he added a handwritten postscript to his next letter:\textsuperscript{121}

I hope soon to give you news of the binding of the Jung Codex.

\textsuperscript{116} Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, 30.

\textsuperscript{117} 23 viii 71: Letter from Doresse to Robinson:

Quant à la reliure du codex XIII (I), il ne serait pas impossible de la retrouver. J’en ai, en tout cas, des clichés très détaillés.

\textsuperscript{118} 28 iv 82: Simone Eid:

Voir ce que je dis ci-haut.

\textsuperscript{119} 18 xi 71: Letter from Doresse to Robinson:

J’espère pouvoir vous faire retrouver la reliure du ‘Codex Jung,’ mais sans doute, pour pouvoir l’étudier pareillement, faudrait-il qu’elle soit achetée à son détenteur actuel qui ne la cèderait que contre un prix respectable.

\textsuperscript{120} 3 xii 71: Letter from Doresse to Robinson:

Quant à la couverture du Codex “Jung,” l’actuel détenteur de celle-ci est, provisoirement, absent de Paris.

\textsuperscript{121} 15 i 72: Letter from Doresse to Robinson:

J’espère vous donner bientôt des nouvelles de la reliure du Codex Jung.
Finally on 15 August 1972 he wrote:\textsuperscript{122}

I have been able to see again the binding of the Jung Codex. I do not believe that the owner would separate from it for less than US $2,000 (two thousand $). What do you think of this? [Simone Eid: ‘That confirms what I have noted above.’\textsuperscript{123}]

When writing a retrospective comment in 1975, Doresse supplemented the story:\textsuperscript{124}

Some years ago, the cover of the codex was in the hands of the heirs of the collector who had bought it, and Doresse had the opportunity to see it again. Since the holders seemed disposed to sell this piece, there was reason to fear that it would be distanced even more from the ensemble of the manuscripts of Khénoboskion, and, especially, that it might end in some collection where its study—and most especially the examination of the layers of pasted papyrus that thicken it—would not be possible. Hoping that this document could either rejoin the Coptic Museum or end in the hands of persons interested enough in the discovery of Khénoboskion to facilitate its study, Prof. Doresse indicated at that time the problem to Prof. Robinson, thanks to whom this precious document has just been recuperated.

Simone Eid querrated:\textsuperscript{125}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{122} 15 viii 72 Letter from Doresse to Robinson:
    \begin{quote}
      J’ai pu revoir la reliure du Codex Jung. Je ne crois pas que le propriétaire s’en sépare pour moins de 2,000 US $ (deux-mille $). Qu’en pensez-vous.
    \end{quote}
  \item \textsuperscript{123} 28 iv 82: Simone Eid:
    \begin{quote}
      Cela confirme ce que j’ai noté ci-haut.
    \end{quote}
  \item \textsuperscript{124} During 1975: Jean Doresse:
    \begin{quote}
      Il y a quelques années, la couverture du codex se trouvait aux mains d’héritiers du collectionneur qui l’avait achetée, et Mr. Doresse eut l’occasion de la revoir. Les détenteurs paraissant disposés à vendre cette pièce, il y avait lieu de craindre qu’elle ne s’éloigne plus encore de l’ensemble des manuscrits de Khénoboskion et, surtout, qu’elle n’aboutisse dans quelque collection où son étude —et tout particulièrement l’examen des couches de papyrus collé qui la garnissent—ne serait pas possible. Espérant que ce document puisse, soit rejoindre le Musée Copte, soit aboutir aux mains de personnes assez intéressées à la découverte de Khénoboskion pour en faciliter l’étude, le Prof. Doresse signala alors le problème au Prof. Robinson grâce à qui ce document précieux vient d’être récupéré.
    \end{quote}
  \item \textsuperscript{125} 28 iv 82: Simone Eid:
    \begin{quote}
      Qui est ce collectionneur? Pourquoi D. ne le mentionne-t-il pas? Et comment se fait-il qu’il ait finalement été chez D. lequel devait connaître le nom de son vendeur? ... Il faudrait connaître le nom de ce collectionneur pour connaître qui sont ses héritiers! Tout ceci me semble en effet très bizarre.
    \end{quote}
\end{itemize}
Who is this collector? Why did not Doresse mention him? And how did it happen that it was finally with Doresse, who ought to know the name of its seller? ... One would have to know the name of this collector to know who are his heirs! In sum, all this seems to me very bizarre.

At the point in my draft when I mention that Doresse refers to its sale, she wrote that she had been completely unaware of this sale:

> I have learned of it via you—on the occasion of your visit to Brussels.

Her interest was to make clear that it was not in her possession or that of her son Georges, as the ‘heirs’ of her husband. But if she was not involved, and did not even know of the sale, one must, as she may wish to suggest, think of Doresse himself.

Doresse brought the cover to Claremont, California, on 29 August 1972, on a charter plane I had arranged for participants in a meeting there of the Society for New Testament Studies, a prelude to a large International Congress of Learned Societies in the Field of Religion on ‘Religion and the Humanizing of Man,’ that I had organized to meet at the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles. On 2 September 1972 Doresse granted an option for its purchase, on the basis of a 30% down-payment of the purchase price of $2,000.

The Technical Sub-Committee of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices met in Cairo on 18 December 1972, together with Gamal Mokhtar, President of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization, Pahor Labib, Director Emeritus, and Victor Girgis, current Director of the Coptic Museum, on which occasion the option was offered to the Egyptian government. President Mokhtar clarified that such a purchase by the government would be contrary to established policy. Director Girgis pointed out that the Coptic Museum already had nine covers (actually, ten, if one include with the nine from Tano the one from Rāghib), adequately illustrating their nature. Hence my proposal was approved that the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity seek to obtain funds to acquire the cover, so that rights of

---

126 28 iv 82: Simone Eid:

> Je l’ai appris par vous—lors de votre passage à Brusselles.

publication could be assured to *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*. The balance was paid to Doresse on 4 January 1973. The cover was later sold to the Schoyen Collection near Oslo.

Doresse never identified the collector who was the original holder, or that person's heirs, from whom Doresse mediated the purchase by the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity. But Doresse's many comments cited above may be more revealing than he intended, when they are reviewed with this question in mind. He had begun his retrospective comment as follows:

Some years ago, the cover of the codex was in the hands of the heirs of the collector who had bought it, and Doresse had the opportunity to see it again.

Apparently Doresse knew who the collector was, knew that the collector had died, and knew the heirs of the collector. He was close enough to them that he was able to bring it to California on approval. These rather close ties to the heirs suggest the Doresses themselves as the heirs.

The mother of Marianne Doresse had died by this time, for they had secured her small Paris apartment where I visited them. Marianne Doresse's mother had on occasion provided funds for the Doresses to work in Egypt, some of which they could have used to make the acquisition. She could hence have been considered the owner, with the Doresses being the heirs, as they were to her apartment. This conjecture would explain Doresse's reticence to identify the heirs, since he wanted to function as an objective mediator in the purchase. For the initial suggestion of letting the codex or its photographs be freely studied was replaced by the comment that “it would be necessary that it be purchased from its present holder, who would not concede it except for a respectable price.” How would he know about this condition the present holder would make, unless he had talked about the sale with the present owner, or was himself or his wife that present owner?

The Doresses had been in Cairo in contact with Eid when Eid took the codex from Egypt to America. Eid reported to Father Couroyer in 1947 that he had ‘the cover in leather.’ Already in the initial interview with Rāghib in Cairo about Codex III in the summer of 1947, Drioton had indicated that there was a second codex on the Cairo market that he assumed was from the same discovery. The similarity of the covers of two Coptic codices

---

128 31 i 73: James M. Robinson, memorandum to the UNESCO Committee, p. 2.
would have been the probable basis for his association of the two. For Drioton would not have been able to study the second codex sufficiently to make an identification on the basis of the texts in the two codices, neither of which he had read. Furthermore Codex I was in a different Coptic dialect from Codex III; they were written in divergent hands; and they were of different dimensions. Since Drioton was the initial source of much of Doresse’s information, he could have mentioned the similarity of the covers to Doresse. Doresse would have carried this point over to the report presented by Puech to the French Academy on 20 February 1948. In that report, the cover is the only reason given for assuming this codex came from the same discovery as Codex III.

Doresse reported that before Eid went to America Eid had permitted Doresse to photograph the cover. He went on to comment that, when Eid was about to leave for America, he had needed funds, and hence sold the cover to a collector “in whom he hoped to find, later on, a purchaser for the whole of the leaves.” This could very well apply to Doresse himself, who encouraged Eid to think he would help find a purchaser.

The only bit of contrary indication is a letter written by Doresse to me on 3 December 1971 stating that that the present holder is, “for the time being, absent from Paris.” But this could refer to his wife, who might at the time have been in their own home in the village of Seillans, from which he had written me on 22 February 1971, or simply be a way to avoid showing the cover to me when I arrived in Paris on 10 December 1971.

If there were other alternatives to the identification of the collector or the heirs, they might well outweigh the conjecture made here. But Simone Eid made it clear that she and her son Georges were not the heirs in question. There are no indications in the Nag Hammadi Archives of any other person(s) who might come in question. Thus there is an argument from silence in favor of the conjecture made here.

The conjecture that the Doresses were the owners of the cover of Codex I would thus make sense. He sold it to the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity for $2,000, which he could have considered “a respectable price,” no doubt much more than Eid had been paid in Egypt. It is a fourth of the price that the Jung Institute paid for 50 leaves of the Jung Codex itself ($8,009, see below, Part 3).

This line of reasoning is based on inferences rather than on documented evidence. For this reason it should of course not be pressed.
3. The Acquisition of the Eid Codex by the Jung Institute

The Bollingen Foundation

Doresse reported what happened on Eid’s return to Egypt:129

Then he came back to Egypt, leaving specially the Gnostic leaves in the hands of somebody who tried, slowly and not very competently, to sell them. When Eid was back in Cairo, he told me from time to time about the fact that he would rather like selling these leaves to a scientific institute, able to study and publish them, rather than to an amateur who would bury them among his secret collections.

We could not do anything to obtain from Eid the return of the manuscript to Egypt: It was impossible to prove that the inspectors at the Antiquities Department did not see the Gnostic codex when they allowed the export of a too complex collection of carved figures, coins, manuscripts, etc. Eid had, from the beginning of our contacts—I mean with Togo Mina and myself—promised to leave us a complete set of photographs of the codex, as a guarantee in case the codex would disappear from his hands; he gave me, in fact, a collection of small photographs of every page, a collection which was in my hands at the time the manuscript left Egypt. After that, he gave me, again—for the Coptic Museum—a complete set of larger sized photographs, on the condition that these photographs would be given by me to the Museum only after his manuscript should be sold to some library, institute or collector. I gave these photographs to the Coptic Museum in 1953, according to this agreement.

These photographs are apparently not at the Coptic Museum, for if they were we would surely have been shown them as we restored the codices and requested them (see Chapter 11 below).

Doresse passed on to Puech rumors he had received of negotiations taking place in the Netherlands for the purchase of the Eid Codex, whereupon Puech wrote Quispel for clarification:130

---

129 17 vii 75: Report from Doresse to John Dart.
130 27 i 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Je vous avais demandé de me fournir quelques précisions sur le sort du volume d’écrits gnostiques coptes qui, d’après ce que m’a confié Doresse, est actuellement offert pour achat en Hollande et l’objet de négociations auxquelles vous seriez assez étroitement lié. ...

Le mécène hollandais, que vous connaissez, je crois, a-t-il acheté le volume proposé? A-t-il renoncé à ce projet, ou bien les transactions sont-elles encore en cours? En ce cas à quelle date peut-on compter que sera faite l’acquisition, et qu’envisage-t-on pour la publication du recueil? Doresse m’avait fait prévoir, au début d’octobre, que
I had asked you to furnish me some precisions on the fate of the volume of Coptic Gnostic texts that, according to what Doresse has confided to me, is at present offered for purchase in Holland, and the object of negotiations with which you would be rather closely connected. ...

The Dutch Maecenas, whom you know, I believe, has he purchased the volume offered? Has he given up this plan, or rather are the transactions still underway? In this case, by what date can one assume that the acquisition will be made, and what does one envisage for the publication of the collection? Doresse let me anticipate, at the beginning of October [1950], that the manuscript would be put at your disposal, and that on your part you would get in contact with us, in order to study it and prepare its edition (no doubt, in the collection that will contain the ensemble of the Library discovered at Nag-Hammadi). What is there that is certain in all that?

You know how much everything having to do with these unpublished Gnostic texts lies close to my heart, and, more particularly, how much I would like to know the exact identity of the texts of the collection in question, which perhaps contains the Gospel of Truth of Valentinus. If we would succeed in publishing the work in collaboration, that would be very good.

Thus information that Doresse had apparently obtained from the Eids in Cairo and passed on to Puech was forwarded to Quispel by Puech, who made the point that he wanted to be included in the publication. Ultimately Puech and Quispel replaced Doresse in the publication.

Quispel responded to Puech late in January 1951 to the effect that the report of Doresse must refer to the Bollingen Foundation. It had not completely lost interest in the codex, since in September 1950 John D. Barrett, by then Vice-President of the Bollingen Foundation, consulted Quispel in this regard, 131 and on 13 December 1950 Quispel had kept the topic alive with the Bollingen Foundation with a response. 132 Puech of course urged Quispel to conclude the arrangements with the Bollingen Foundation: 133

---

131 Mentioned in the letter of 17 iii 51 from Puech to Quispel.
132 Also mentioned in the letter of 17 iii 51 from Puech to Quispel.
133 17 iii 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
I am grateful to you for what you have had the kindness to inform me with regard to the collection of Coptic Gnostic texts that could be acquired by the ‘Bollingen Foundation.’ So there is good reason to be skeptical of the veracity of Doresse, on this point as on many others, alas! The essential thing is that the volume be purchased as soon as possible, and, without further delay, may be studied and published, be it separately, be it in the edition of the ensemble of the papyri of Nag-Hammadi which, according to the most recent plan, would be assured, not by the Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium of Louvain, but by the Imprimerie Nationale, in Paris, the expenses being covered by the French Comité des Fouilles and our Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. ...

It would be helpful to conclude with the Bollingen Foundation, in case it would continue in its intention, a sort of preliminary agreement, establishing especially the names of the persons charged with the edition, to whom would be entrusted either the manuscript itself or, rather, if they are clear enough that one can work directly from them, the photographs of the papyrus. It goes without saying that I am fully disposed to collaborate in the publication, and even to furnish and direct a team of specialists, already well trained in the knowledge of Coptic and Gnosticism. Of course it is necessary that you would cooperate in the enterprise.

Puech was anxious to resolve the situation before the annual meeting of the Eranos Circle in Ascona, Switzerland, where Jungian psychologists and those close to them, such as Puech, Quispel, and Barrett, met each year, in this year on 22–30 August 1951.134 Puech wrote Quispel to have the matter resolved before then.135

---

134 The dates are derived from a letter of 12 vii 51 from Meier to von Fischer.
135 23 iii 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
Obviously the American purchasers have to avoid exposing themselves to legal proceedings that the Egyptian government risks bringing against them. Has Barrett spoken to you of this difficulty, and does he believe it to be insurmountable? ...

Of course, at Ascona I will see this summer Messrs Jung and Barrett. Nevertheless it is necessary that the matter be resolved between now and then. I fear that the codex be offered and acquired elsewhere, if we wait too long.

Hence Quispel asked Carl Gustav Jung to write on 27 March 1951 to the Bollingen Foundation, and also Puech wrote a letter. Barrett responded to Quispel reaffirming the ongoing interest of the Bollingen Foundation:

Too long a time has elapsed since the receipt of your letter of December 13th [1950]. In the interim I have received word from Dr. Jung and from Professor Puech in reference to the manuscript containing the Gnostic texts. We have sought information as to the best manner of handling this matter, and are still rather undecided about which plan to follow. At this time I am anxious to let you know that our interest in assisting you and Dr. Jung to obtain this material has not dimished.

The dilemma, as expressed by Puech, was as follows:

The Egyptian government, which now makes of the discovery a kind of national affair, and has forbidden the exportation of pieces belonging to the discovery, does it not risk turning against the purchaser? ... The fact that the manuscript would be edited in the general collection of the papyri of Nag-Hammadi that dirigera probablement le Directeur du Musée Copte du Caire, permettrait, je crois, d’écart er les objections ou interdictions éventuelles. Ce qui m’angoisse à ce propos, c’est que, si le Gouvernement égyptien se montre intransigeant et si la Fondation Bollingen renonce, par peur des difficultés juridiques et diplomatiques que l’affaire aurait chance de soulever, à acheter le manuscrit, il est à craindre que celui-ci ne soit à jamais perdu pour la science. Nous en perdrons toute trace; il demeurera caché et ne sera pas publié de si tôt.

---

136 Mentioned in a letter of 10 v 51 from Jung's secretary, Marie-Jeanne Schmidt, to Quispel.
137 27 iv 51: Letter from Barrett to Quispel.
138 4 v 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel.
Nag-Hammadi that probably the Director of the Coptic Museum in Cairo will direct, would make it possible, I believe, to dispel the possible objections or interdictions. What distresses me in this plan is that if the Egyptian government shows itself to be intransigent, and if the Bollingen Foundation renounces buying the manuscript, out of fear of the juridical and diplomatic difficulties that the affair would possibly raise, it is to be feared that it be forever lost to science. We will lose every trace of it; it will remain hidden, and will not be published any time soon.

Puech was aware that Doresse had obtained photographs of some of Codex I.\textsuperscript{139}

In effect, Doresse has indeed in his possession photographs of the manuscript. Yet note that it has to do only with a certain number of fotos, and they do not reproduce all the pages of the codex. Besides, these photographs have been executed in a more or less clandestine way, and as a consequence could not serve for an edition of the collection, in case the original would not be acquired at all.

Puech then learned that Doresse's position in this regard was even stronger:\textsuperscript{140}

Doresse—as a result of what maneuver?—has been able to obtain photographic reproductions of all the collection [Simone Eid: ‘... no doubt taken by D[oresse] himself\textsuperscript{141}], which he has shown to me, brought together in an album. Without doubt it would be helpful to have some explanations about this—has there been here imprudence on the part of the heir of Eid? [Simone Eid: ‘... no, for my son was unaware of this story\textsuperscript{142}] Has this person conceded

\textsuperscript{139} 12 v 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Doresse, en effet, a bien en sa possession des photographies du manuscrit. Observez cependant qu’il ne s’agit que d’un certain nombre de clichés, et qui ne reproduisent pas toutes les pages du codex. En outre, ces photographies ont été exécutées d’une façon plus ou moins clandestine et ne pourraient pas, en conséquence, servir à une édition du recueil, dans le cas où l’original ne serait point acquis.

\textsuperscript{140} 27 vii 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Doresse—à la suite de quelle manoeuvre?—a pu obtenir les reproductions photographiques de tout le recueil, qu’il m’a montrées, réunies en album. Sans doute conviendrait-il d’avoir là-dessus quelques explications—y a-t-il eu imprudence de la part de l’héritier de Eid? Celui-ci a-t-il concédé à Doresse le droit de disposer du manuscrit—droit qui ne devrait appartenir en propre qu’à l’acheteur définitif?

\textsuperscript{141} Simone Eid:

... sans doute prises par D. lui-même.

\textsuperscript{142} Simone Eid:

... non, car mon fils ignorait cette histoire.
to Dioresse the right to make use of the manuscript—a right that ought not to belong appropriately to anyone except the definitive purchaser?

Furthermore the Dioresse had become friends of Simone Eid, whereas Puech had never met Eid:

Since I do not know the antiquities dealer Eid except by name, it would be difficult for me to engage him to resume contact with the [Bollingen] Foundation.

Indeed, Puech suggested to Quispel that the Bollingen Foundation, or Dioresse, might know how to locate Eid:

I cannot communicate to you the address of the antiquities dealer Eid or his representative. Eid is dead, I am told, and I am completely ignorant of who the present possessor of the manuscript is, and where to make contact with him. I never had to do, from near or from far, with one or the other of these persons.

The Bollingen Foundation, which has already negociated with a seller, must have a lead. Perhaps, via Dioresse, who has had relations with Eid, I could get some information.

But there had been an agreement prevailing since early in 1951 between Puech and Quispel that their activity directed toward acquiring Codex I would not be made known to Dioresse:

Once again, all this should remain confidential. Among others, I will not breathe a word of your letter to Dioresse, just as you ask of me.

---


144 23 iii 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Ne connaissant l’antiquaire Eid que de nom, il me serait difficile de l’engager à reprendre contact avec la Foundation.

145 4 v 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Je ne puis vous communiquer l’adresse de l’antiquaire Eid ou de son représentant. Eid est mort, m’a-t-on dit, et j’ignore entièrement qui est le possesseur actuel du manuscrit et où prendre contact avec lui. Je n’ai jamais eu affaire, de près ou de loin, avec l’une ou l’autre de ces personnes. La Fondation Bollingen, qui a déjà négocié avec un vendeur, doit tenir un but de piste. Peut-être, par Dioresse, qui a été en relations avec Eid, pourrai-je avoir quelques renseignements.

146 17 iii 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Encore une fois, tout ceci doit rester confidentiel. Entre autres, je ne soufflerai pas mot de votre lettre à Dioresse, ainsi que vous me le demandez.
Hence it was not through Doresse that communication with Cairo could be maintained in search of the heir of Eid. Rather the Bollingen Foundation seemed the only other alternative as a possible source of information.

Quispel was in Zürich lecturing at the Jung Institute in the Summer Semester of 1951, lectures clearly designed to persuade the Jungians that the Nag Hammadi Codices (of which Quispel knew only what he could learn from the inventory of Doresse) would prove the historicity of the Jungian psychological theory of archetypes (see Chapter 5, Part 1 below). On Quispel's instigation Jung wrote Barrett:

Dr. Quispel, who is in Zürich at the present moment, told me that he is rather afraid that the codex might disappear altogether if matters cannot be brought to a head. He is rather anxious therefore, to know whether you kept in touch with Mr. E[id].

Jung also suggested to Barrett that the attitude of the Egyptian government might be sounded out unofficially by von Fischer.

We also wondered whether it wouldn't be a good idea to ask the Swiss Ambassador in Egypt (who happens to be a personal friend of Dr. Meier's) if he would approach the Egyptian government—quite unofficially of course—in order to find out what their attitude to this problem actually is. This might clear matters considerably. But I do not want to undertake anything in this direction, of course, without knowing first, whether the Bollingen Foundation agrees that such steps might be taken.

Barrett approved, if the Bollingen Foundation were not mentioned, and if it were made clear that the manuscript would be returned to Egypt after being made available to Quispel for his research.

It is thought best that no reference be made to the possibility of assistance from a foundation, but rather to indicate that there was the possibility of finding a donor who would be willing to return the manuscript to the Egyptian government, provided it could be first made available to Dr. Quispel for his research, for photostating, and for eventual publication for the benefit of scholarship in this field.

---

147 The date is mentioned in a letter of 12 vii 51 from Meier to von Fischer.
149 11 vi 51: Letter from Jung to Barrett.
150 11 vi 51: Letter from Jung to Barrett.
151 2 vii 51: Letter from Barrett to Jung.
Meier wrote von Fischer, described Codex I (in terms derived from Doresse’s reports), and asked him, in view of his friendship with King Farouk, to sound out the Egyptian administrator involved, Taha Hussein.\(^\text{152}\)

One would of course have to say to the people that the publication of this seventh volume [Codex I] by Dr. Quispel and Prof. Puech would take place under the supervision of the Director of the Coptic Museum in Cairo in the series of the six other volumes [containing Codices II–XIII]. This promise should be good bait for the Egyptians.

Thus the effort was made to see to it that the Bollingen Foundation would be in a position to make the grant necessary for the acquisition of the Eid Codex. Yet the Bollingen Foundation did not provide the funding (see below), on the grounds that the exportation of the Eid Codex might not be considered legal, which might endanger the good relations of the Bollingen Foundation with Egypt, where it was involved in other worthy projects.

Finding the Eid Codex

The search for Albert Eid or his heir had to continue without the involvement of Doresse or the Bollingen Foundation. Since neither Puech, Quispel, nor Meier had ever contacted Eid, the only remaining alternative seemed to be to ask von Fischer to turn to his Belgian colleague in Cairo to assist in locating Albert Eid or his heir. Von Fischer promptly supplied the first lead.\(^\text{153}\)

The 12th book of the Gnostic papyri [Codex I] is in Louvain [read: Brussels] and is the property of the widow of the former Belgian consul in Alexandria, Mrs. Albert Eid, now in Cairo, 17, Sharia El Bustan; she is in rather precarious circumstances and would probably accommodate herself to an arrangement. 10 volumes of the papyri are in the lock-box of the state in Cairo, where they are the object of a struggle between the state and Ms. Dattari, who is their

\(^{152}\) 12 vii 51: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Man müsste den Leuten natürlich sagen, dass die Publikation dieses siebenten Bandes durch Dr. Quispel und Prof. Puech, unter der Aufsicht des Direktors des Koptischen Museums in Kairo in der Serie der sechs anderen Bände erfolgen würde. Dieses Versprechen dürfte ein guter Köder für die Ägypter sein.

\(^{153}\) 19 vii 51: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Das 12. Buch der gnostischen Papyri befindet sich in Louvain und ist Eigentum der Witwe des früheren belgischen Konsuls in Alexandrien, Frau Albert Eid, jetzt Kairo, 17, Sharia El Bustan; sie befindet sich in ziemlich prekären Verhältnissen und würde sich wahrscheinlich zu einem Arrangement herbeilassen.

10 Bände der Papyri befinden sich im Kassenschrank des Staates in Kairo, wo sie Gegenstand eines Streites zwischen dem Staat und Frau Dattari bilden, die ihre
owner. She demanded 65,000 Pounds, then 45,000 Pounds for the papyri. The state wants to give only 5 to 10,000 Pounds, probably even less.

Eid had demanded in his time 5,000 Pounds, i.e. about 1/10 of the sum of Mrs. Dattari, for his single volume.

The Coptic Museum believes that the volume of Eid was purchased legally by Eid. It came legally out of the country and could now also be acquired legally.

That the state would oppose its publication seems not to be the case, yet this would need to be investigated more closely.

Taha Hussein Pasha would have nothing legally to say against this, but it would be good to talk with him, since he is extraordinarily sensitive, and somehow could still make difficulties later on.

I could do this, as soon as he is here again. I am also quite willing to speak with Mrs. A[bert] Eid.

Meier cabled von Fischer:154

Please contact Mrs. E[id] tentatively without giving names and ask for address of her representative in Louvain for negotiations.

Von Fischer immediately responded to Meier with a memorandum:155

Mme E[id] is still owner of the object. This is somewhere in Belgium, where it is part of the inheritance of her husband, who died a few months ago. This

____________________

155 25 vii 51: Memorandum from von Fischer to Meier:

Madame E. est toujours propriétaire de l'objet. Celui-ci se trouve quelque part en Belgique où il fait partie de la succession de son mari mort il y a quelques mois.
inheritance has not yet been liquidated, and the volume in question has not yet been evaluated. In the case of a sale, it could hence not be delivered.

For fiscal reasons, Mme E[id] does not want under any circumstances that one knows where the book is to be found, and her business people are under the impression that she is no longer the owner of it, and that it has been sold to some third parties. Hence it is from them that in theory it should be purchased. Mme E[id] wishes that no indiscretion be made on this point.

The book in question belonged to her husband, who was an antiquities dealer and collector. It left the country in spite of the fact that the laws forbade the exportation of objects of this kind. The customs are today making a legal procedure against the inheritance for having frauded this authority. This legal procedure has not yet been concluded. However the state has renounced, at least for the present, taking action against the family of the deceased.

The confidant of Mme E[id] in Belgium is Mr. Georges Loop, former Consul of Belgium in Cairo, inhabiting at present the villa ‘La Flamande,’ in the quarter of Sainte Jedesbalde at Coixe (near La Panne in western Flanders), rue des Méliłotes. It is to him that one could address oneself, but by adopting an equally extreme reserve regarding the questions exposed above. …

Doresse, a French coptologist at the Louvre in Paris, is also interested in it.

Just the preceding month, Simone Eid appeared before the Ambassador and General Consul of Belgium to Cairo, Harold Eeman, who drew up a...

---

Cette succession n’est pas encore liquidée et le volume en question n’a pas encore été évalué. Dans le cas d’une vente, il ne pourrait donc pas être livré.

Pour des raisons fiscales, Madame E. ne désire en aucun cas qu’on sache où se trouve le livre et ses hommes d’affaires sont dans l’idée qu’elle n’en est plus le propriétaire et qu’il a été vendu à des tiers. C’est donc de ceux-là qu’en théorie il devrait être acheté. Madame E. désire qu’aucune indiscretion ne se fasse sur ce point.

Le livre en question appartenait à son mari qui était antiquaire et collectionneur. Il est sorti du pays en dépit de ce que les lois défendaient l’exportation d’objets de ce genre. Les douanes font aujourd’hui un procès à la succession pour avoir fraudé cette autorité. Ce procès n’est pas encore terminé. L’État a cependant renoncé, pour le moment au moins, à faire un procès à la famille du défunt.

L’homme de confiance de Madame E. en Belgique est Monsieur Georges Loop, ancien Consul de Belgique au Caire, habitant actuellement la villa “La Flamande,” quartier de Sainte Jedesbalde à Coixe (près de la Panne dans les Flandres occidentales), rue des Méliłotes. C’est à lui qu’on pourrait s’adresser mais en adoptant également une extrême réserve quant aux questions exposées ci-dessus. …

M. Doresse coptisant français, au Louvre à Paris, s’y intéresserait également.

‘Procuration’ that he notarized on 8 June 1951, naming as her agent Georges André Louis Loop, formerly the Belgian Consul in Cairo, with explicit authority to open her safety deposit box, and remove and sell:157

... all objects, pieces, books, manuscripts, titles and obligations that are there.

But Meier wrote von Fischer a new concern:158

It alarms me that Mrs. E[id] lives in precarious circumstances, which could mislead her into dumping the codex on anyone, so that it could actually get lost. Precisely that is the danger that we wanted to hinder.

Yet von Fischer reassured Meier on this point:159

Mme E[id] came to see me yesterday afternoon, to tell me that the legal procedure that the customs had brought against her husband, that is to say, his succession, had been concluded, with a judgment that condemned it to a fine of 6,000 £É. Mme E[id] is thinking of leaving the country before this judgment is due to be carried out.

She remains owner of the object that interests you, and has promised me, on her word of honor, to reserve it for you in first place.

Loop also received the following year a report concerning the fine from J.P. Swart, Quispel’s attorney, who had just returned from Egypt:160

During my second visit she told me that she did not want even that it would become known that the manuscript was sold as long as she had not left Egypt. I understand that her husband had been fined for an amount of about 6,000 £É, and that she was afraid that the authorities would claim this amount from

---

157 8 vi 51: ‘Procuration’ notarized by Harold Eeman:
... tous objets, pièces, livres, manuscrits, titres et obligations s'y trouvant.

158 25 vii 51: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:
Es alarmiert mich, dass Frau E. in prekären Verhältnissen lebt, was sie verleiten könnte, den Kodex an irgend jemanden zu verschleudern, sodass er tatsächlich verloren gehen könnte. Gerade das ist die Gefahr, die wir verhindern wollten.

159 31 vii 51: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:
Madame E. est venue me voir hier après-midi pour me dire que le procès que les douanes avaient intenté contre son mari, respectivement sa succession, s’était terminé par un jugement qui la condamne à une peine de 6,000 £É. Mme. E. pense quitter le pays avant que ce jugement ne devienne exécutoire.

Elle reste propriétaire de l’objet qui vous intéresse et m’a promis, sur sa parole d’honneur, de vous le réserver en premier lieu.

160 7 iv 52: Letter from P.J. Swart to G.A.L. Loop, a copy of which came to Quispel.
her as soon as they discovered that the manuscript was still in existence. So far she has maintained that it became lost after the death of her husband, but when the sale becomes known they probably won’t believe this any more.

A year later von Fischer reported to Meier:161

The tribunal knows already, from a statement by the husband of Mrs. E[ld], that the manuscript has left the country.

Quispel also later reported:162

On 1 April 1955 Simone Eid told me that her husband had got a fine of 5,000 [read: 6,000] £É for illegal exportation of the codex.

Meanwhile Puech responded to Quispel’s report of Bollingen’s willingness in principle to proceed:163

So we will have the free and exclusive use of the papyrus, even if, as indeed we should, we would offer the original to Jung, in recognition of all the assistance that he has provided us in the matter.

On the basis of what he could learn from Doresse, Puech urged Quispel to go to Brussels ‘as soon as possible’164 and open negotiations with the heir or heirs of Eid, whom Puech now located in Brussels together with the codex.

It is also apparently from Doresse that he was reminded that there were leaves of Codex I in the Tano collection:165

---

161 19 x 53: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Der Tribunal weiss bereits aus einer Aussage des Mannes der Frau E., dass das Manu-
script ins Ausland gegangen ist.

162 6 ix 76: Letter from Quispel to Robinson.

163 27 vii 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Nous aurons donc la libre et exclusive disposition du papyrus, quand bien même, comme nous le devons, nous offrirons l’ original à M. Jung en reconnaissance de toute l ’aide qu ’ il nous a apportée en l ’ occurrence.

164 27 vii 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

... le plus tôt possible ....

165 27 vii 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Autre question délicate: vous savez que, dans son état actuel le recueil Eid est amputé
d’un certain nombre de feuillets qui se trouvent, en fait, dans un des lots acquis par
une autre personne et destiné à devenir possession du Gouvernement Égyptien (v.
mon memoire des Coptic Studies en l’honneur de W.E. Crum, p. 103 et n. 1). Il sera donc
nécessaire que la publication de ces feuillets soit jointe à celle du recueil. Nous voilà
dans l’obligation, non seulement d’attendre l’achèvement des tractations menées
Another delicate question: You know that, in its present state, the Eid collection is amputated of a certain number of leaves that are in fact found in one of the lots acquired by another person and destined to become the possession of the Egyptian government (see my essay in *Coptic Studies* in honor of W.E. Crum, p. 103, and n. 1). It will hence be necessary that the publication of these leaves be joined to that of the collection. There we are, under obligation not only to await the conclusion of the transactions carried on for almost three years between the Egyptian government and the possessor of the lots, or debris of lots, of which the leaves are part, but also to try, once the affair is concluded, to have attributed to us the right to edit these supplementary pages.

The Ascona Agreement, 24 August 1951

Thus, by the time of the annual meeting of the Eranos Circle of 1951, the major problems related to gaining access to the Nag Hammadi library had emerged, but were still far from resolved. Hence a planning meeting was held during the conference, attended by Barrett, representing the Bollingen Foundation, Meier, representing the Jung Institute, and Puech and Quispel, as editors. The following list of 'further steps to be taken re Jung Codex' were agreed upon:

Dr. Meier will write to Mr. v[on] F[ischer] asking him to give Mrs. E[id] Dr. Quispel's address and to tell her that she should contact him on her arrival in Brussels. On no account is she to write to him from Egypt.

Dr. Quispel will then ask about Mrs. E[id]'s price for the Ms. and will also ask for securities with regard to the photo-copy which was given to Mr. Doresse by Mr. E[id]'s heirs.

(Mr. Barrett's suggestion, that Mr. Doresse should be asked to join the Comité de publication is accepted unanimously.)

(To contact the Chanoine Lefort seems unnecessary, since the volume is not going to be published at Louvain.)

Since Mr. Barrett points out that an official and formal request for the purchase of the manuscript should be made to the Bollingen Foundation by some institution it was agreed that:

---

24 viii 51: Minutes of the Ascona meeting taken by Jung's secretary, Marie-Jeanne Schmidt.
Dr. Quispel will approach the Institut für Patristik at Utrecht and/or some other Institution in Holland.

Prof. Puech will get in touch with some Institutes in France.

Dr. Meier will represent the C.G. Jung Institute in Zürich.

This international set-up is also important with regard to the Egyptian government, to which the manuscript is to be returned after publication.

Dr. Meier, as the representative of the C.G. Jung Institute, is to receive the money. He is also to function as headquarters, and all information about further developments should be sent to him.

Prof. Puech will contact Mr. Doresse and ask him not to undertake anything while these transactions are pending.

Not all of the Ascona agreements were literally implemented. It was assumed that Simone Eid was soon to arrive in Belgium and would there meet Quispel directly, whereas in fact Quispel met her agent Loop in Belgium and carried out the acquisition there while she was still in Egypt. Puech did not invite Doresse to join the editorial board as Barrett proposed, since Doresse would not really be favored by Quispel, even though the proposal was ‘accepted unanimously.’ Barrett’s proposal may have been made more as a courtesy; he did not know anything about the academic qualifications of the proposed editors. His suggestion would in any case have little force unless the Bollingen Foundation provided the necessary funding for the acquisition, which did not actually take place. Doresse remained uninformed, and hence the fear that he might negotiate the acquisition elsewhere went unresolved. The return of the Jung Codex to Egypt was questioned by Quispel and became a problem after the resignation of C.A. Meier as Director of the Jung Institute, though it was ultimately carried out. But apart from such adjustments in the implementation (see below), the Ascona agreement was subsequently appealed to as the policy to be followed.

Meier’s Frantic Search for the Eid Codex in Brussels

Early in November 1951 von Fischer interviewed Simone Eid, who was still in Cairo, and obtained information about her agent in Belgium whom she had authorized to make the transaction.  

167 4 xi 51: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:
Frau E. kann Ägypten nicht verlassen. Sie kann aber einen Ihrer Vertrauten beauftragen, die Transaktion vorzunehmen.

Der konkrete Verkaufsvorschlag von Frau E. liegt ja bei mir vor: Frau E. hat es mir vor
Mrs. E[id] can not leave Egypt. But she can commission one of her confidants to undertake the transaction.

In fact I have in hand the concrete proposal of Mrs. E[id] for the sale. Mrs. E[id] has told it to me in the presence of witnesses. Would you now please tell me where and when the agent of Mrs. E[id] can see or receive your agent, if you are in agreement with the above conditions.

Yet Quispel, on a visit to Meier in Zürich, expressed his concern, derived no doubt from Puech, that competing negotiations were underway, and indicated that he thought Simone Eid would soon be coming to Brussels where he could meet her. Meier hence wrote von Fischer inquiring discretely when she might be available for such a meeting in Belgium:168

He [Quispel] has communicated to me that at present all kinds of efforts are again being made regarding the manuscript in which we are interested. It may hence be appropriate that we exert ourselves afresh to get an absolutely binding assurance that one reserve the thing for us. It should indeed be clear that we for our part can only undertake further steps when Quispel, whose address I have given you, has, as agreed, information directly from Mrs. E[id] and can visit her. I would be very indebted to you for occasional information, also about the question of whether you can anticipate this point in time.

While Quispel was in Zürich, Puech happened to be in Amsterdam. He wrote Quispel that he regretted not seeing him, since it might have provided an occasion to advance the urgent cause of contacting the person who has the codex in Brussels, all the more so since Doresse seemed to be working behind their backs to secure a competing purchaser:169

---

168 23 xi 51: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:
Er hat mir mitgeteilt, dass momentan wieder allerhand Bemühungen gemacht werden hinsichtlich des Manuskriptes, für das wir uns interessieren. Es dürfte also angezeigt sein, dass wir uns von Neuem bemühen, eine absolut bindende Zusicherung zu erhalten, dass man die Sache für uns reserviert. Es dürfte ja klar sein, dass wir erst dann von uns aus weitere Schritte unternehmen können, wenn Quispel, dessen Adresse ich Ihnen gegeben habe, wie abgemacht, von Frau E. direkt Nachricht hat und sie besuchen kann. Ich wäre Ihnen für gelegentliche Nachricht auch über die Frage, ob Sie diesen Zeitpunkt voraussehen können, sehr verbunden.

169 29 xi 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
J’ai beaucoup regretté de ne pas vous avoir rencontré à Amsterdam il y a quinze jours, à l’occasion du bref séjour que j’ai fait dans cette ville comme vice-président
I have regretted a great deal not having met you in Amsterdam a fortnight ago, on the occasion of the brief sojourn that I made in this city as Vice-President of the I.A.S.H.R. It was such a fine project, the one we formed at Ascona! And from now on, until the coming vacations, it will no longer be possible for me, I fear, to leave Paris.

I deplore all the more this disappointment, since it would have been quite necessary and urgent for us to get in contact, in Brussels itself, with the present holder of the Eid Codex. I know, from an absolutely sure source, that, without informing me of it, Doresse has launched another possible purchaser onto the track. Warned in time, I have succeeded in having, for the time being, the negotiations suspended that one proposed to enter into. There is nothing to fear at the moment from that side, and I will, in any case, be kept up to date. But I ask myself whether the strange silence maintained by Mme Eid with regard to the representatives of the Bollingen Foundation would not be more or less explained by this initiative of Doresse.

In any case, it is absolutely necessary to enter again into contact with this person, and to negotiate promptly and firmly the purchase of the manuscript. Press the affair, as much as possible. It is important to the very highest degree to have from the heirs of Eid as soon as possible a decisive response—either a precise agreement, or a definitive refusal. In the latter case, all would not be lost, for I foresee the possibility of having the codex acquired by another route. But, since Mme Eid has given priority to the Bollingen Foundation, and it is quite disposed to make the purchase on the conditions that we agreed to

---

de l’I.A.S.H.R. C’ était un si beau projet que celui que nous avions formé à Ascona! Et désormais, jusqu’aux vacances prochaines, il ne me sera plus possible, je le crains, de quitter Paris.

Je déplore d’autant plus ce contretemps, qu’il aurait été tout à fait nécessaire et urgent de nous mettre en rapport, à Bruxelles même, avec l’actuel détenteur du codex Eid. Je sais, de source absolument sûre, que, sans m’en informer, Doresse a lancé sur la piste un autre acheteur eventuel. Prévenu à temps, j’ai réussi à faire suspendre pour le moment les négociations que l’on se proposait d’engager. Il n’y a rien à craindre actuellement de ce coté-là, et je serai de toute façon tenu au courant. Mais je me demande si l’étrange silence gardé par Mme Eid à l’égard des représentants de la Fondation Bollingen ne s’expliquerait pas plus ou moins par cette démarche de Doresse.

De toute façon, il faut absolument entrer à nouveau en contact avec cette personne et négocier promptement et fermement l’achat du manuscrit. Pressez l’affaire, autant que possible. Il importe au plus haut point d’avoir au plus tôt des héritiers Eid une réponse décisive: ou un accord précis, ou un refus définitif. En ce cas, tout ne serait pas perdu, car j’entrevois la possibilité de faire acquérir le codex par une autre voie. Mais, puisque Mme Eid a donné priorité à la Fondation Bollingen et que celle-ci est tout à fait disposée à faire l’achat dans les conditions dont nous sommes convenus à Ascona, pourquoi la combinaison envisagée échouerait-elle? En tout cas, il est indispensable d’agir sans retard. Ne pourriez-vous pas aller enquêter sur place à Bruxelles?
at Ascona, why should the envisaged combination fall through? In any case, it is indispensable to act without delay. Could you not go inquire on the spot in Brussels?

Quispel, apparently inferring that Simone Eid had come to Brussels and was negotiating there, and knowing that Meier would attend a psychological meeting in Brussels early in December 1951, telegraphed Meier\(^\text{170}\) to telephone Quispel on his arrival in Brussels, in which conversation he communicated to him Puech’s concerns. Thereupon Meier entered upon a remarkable \textit{tour de force} to locate Simone Eid and the codex in Belgium:\(^\text{171}\)

This was one of the most critical moments in the hunt for the codex. For nights on end I telegraphed and telephoned around from Brussels in the whole world and as far as Cairo. Only with the personal help of a friend in Brussels, of whom I would never had thought, were I not right then in Brussels, did I succeed on the third night in identifying where the codex resides.

Meier has narrated the events that transpired, especially on the night of 12 December 1951, as follows:\(^\text{172}\)

> In Brussels our Swiss Ambassador found out that Eid, on his return from America, had rented a safe in a Brussels bank. Our Swiss Ambassador in Belgium obtained from Mrs. Eid via von Fischer authorization to open this safe. But this took place only on the next day, when I was already on my return trip to Switzerland. I then received here in Zürich a report that indeed remarkable papers and nothing else lay in the safe.

Von Fischer responded to Meier with the name and address of the agent, Georges Loop, to whom Meier’s agents should address themselves.\(^\text{173}\)

---

\(^{170}\) 4 xi 51: Telegram from Quispel to Meier.

\(^{171}\) 18 xi 53: Letter from Meyer to a Prof. Clerc who had arranged for him to go to Brussels:


\(^{172}\) 18 ix 75: Letter from Meier to Robinson:


\(^{173}\) 14 xii 51: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:
The Legation just received a telegram of the Swiss diplomatic Representation in Brussels, asking on your behalf the address of Mrs. A[lbert] Eid, and asking it the question of whether the latter had left Egypt.

As I had the honor of letting you know by my letter of last 31 July, Mrs. Eid still lives in Cairo, where she inhabits rue Boustan 17. ...

In addition, she wishes that every negotiation about the matter that you know be conducted for the time being between her confidant in Europe (Georges Loop, Villa ‘La Flamande,’ sentier des Ménilots, Saint Idesbald, Coxyde), and your delegates on this continent.

Meier then apologized to von Fischer, explaining that he had heard in Brussels, apparently in his phone conversation with Quispel, that Simone Eid was in Belgium:

I am exceedingly sorry to have made for you so much unnecessary work, and I hope very much that you did not go to the trouble of answering the telegram of our Legation in Brussels, in case it even reached you, since meanwhile it had become inoperative because of your letter of 4 December [1951]. The uncertainty arose, in that, during my stay in Brussels, I received information that the widow was already there for some time, and had come into discussion with others. You can think how much I was relieved, on my return to find your letter. ... Now indeed everything has proceeded fortunately, and I may still ask you only to communicate to me as soon as possible the name and address of the agent, so that the matter can finally be brought to a conclusion.

La Légation vient de recevoir un télégramme de la Représentation diplomatique suisse à Bruxelles lui demandant, à votre intention, l’adresse de Mme A Eid et lui posant la question de savoir si cette dernière avait quitté l’Égypte.

Comme j’ai eu l’honneur de vous le faire savoir par ma lettre du 31 juillet dernier, Mme Eid vit toujours au Caire où elle habite la rue Boustan No 17. ...

Elle voudrait en outre que toute négociation au sujet de l’affaire que vous savez fût conduite, pour le moment, entre son homme de confiance en Europe (M. Georges Loop, Villa “La Flamande,” sentier des Ménilots, Saint Idesbald, Coxyde) et vos délégues sur ce Continent.

20 xii 51: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Of course von Fischer had already, more than once, provided Meier with the name and address of Georges Loop, the agent of Simone Eid in Belgium. But the misinformation that Meier had received from Quispel, who apparently had received it from Puech, to the effect that Simone Eid was already in Brussels, had led to the frantic search for her by Meier, with the assistance of the Swiss diplomatic Representation in Brussels. It did indeed succeed in locating and even looking at the Eid Codex in Brussels, but only after Meier had left Brussels for Zürich. Meier apparently made no attempt to contact George Loop, the agent of Simone Eid in Belgium.

*Negotiations between Meier and Puech*

Meier was understandably annoyed with Puech for putting him to the inconvenience he experienced in Brussels, as he wrote Quispel:

Mrs. Eid is now, just as before, in Alexandria [actually Cairo], does not have the money and the other facilities to come out of Egypt, and any kind of contradictory reports are monkey-business. To find this out has, apart from three sleepless nights, cost me a senseless amount of time and also money to a considerable extent. The report of Minister von Fischer in Cairo is absolutely reliable, and the matter is there now, just as it was before, in the best of hands. But I would like to ask you, in the interest of a complete clarification of the situation, to send me the letter of Puech in the original, including the address of Prof. P[uech]. The most recent status of this detective story is now this, that Mrs. E[id], in view of the fact that she does not get out of Egypt, is ready to entrust a personal agent with the negotiations with us. As soon as I know that person's address [!], I will have to ask you to enter into personal contact with this man. This monkey-business has after all achieved this much that is positive.

---

175 20 xii 51: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Puech, having been brought up to date by Quispel, reformulated his position.

You only have to say to him [Meier] that in November I had serious reasons to believe that measures had been attempted and, especially, risked being attempted with the agent of Mme Eid, by other potential purchasers. I remain persuaded that, on our side, it is necessary to press our steps as actively as possible.

Meier, on getting this report from Quispel, from whom he had also received Puech’s address, wrote Puech as follows:

As you know already, dear Sir, I have an ambitious program concerning all this Gnostic library. I think that it will be relatively easy for us to obtain the authorisation of the Egyptian government for the edition of all the twelve codices. One will return our codex, after its publication, only under this condition. ...

Given all the difficulties and confusions of these last times, I permit myself to ask of you to be so kind as to direct all correspondence and important questions concerning the purchase of our codex and the program of the editing of the other volumes to my address. I ask of you especially to leave the negotiations with the Egyptian government entirely to my initiative. My friend, the Ambassador of Switzerland in Cairo, has during this whole affair shown remarkable efficacy and tenacity.

176 28 xii 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Vous n’avez qu’à lui dire que j’avais en novembre de sérieuses raisons de croire que des démarches avaient été tentées et, surtout, risquaient d’être tentées auprès du représentant de Mme Eid par d’autres acheteurs éventuels. Je reste persuadé que, de notre coté, il faut presser nos démarches le plus vivement possible.

177 18 i 52: Letter from Meier to Puech:

Comme vous le savez déjà, cher Monsieur, j’ai un programme ambitieux concernant toute cette bibliothèque gnostique. Je pense qu’il nous sera relativement facile d’obtenir l’autorisation du Gouvernement Égyptien pour l’édition de tous les douze Codices. On rendra notre Codex, après publication, seulement sous cette condition. ...

Vue toutes les difficultés et les confusions de ces derniers temps je me permets de vous demander de bien vouloir diriger toutes les correspondances et questions importantes concernants l’achat de notre codex et le programme de l’édition des autres volumes à mon adresse. Je vous demande spécialement de laisser les négociations avec le Gouvernement Égyptien entièrement à mon initiative. Mon ami, l’ambassadeur de Suisse au Caire, a été pendant toute cette affaire d’une efficacité et ténacité remarquables.
Puech requested confirmation of Meier’s interpretation of their mutual agreement, to the effect that Meier had in view the French publication plan, which would limit Meier’s role to negotiating the purchase of Codex I.\(^{178}\)

But what general edition of the twelve (or, more exactly, the thirteen) codices of \(N[ag]\) \(H[ammadi]\) is involved here? I have already indicated to you that such a publication has been projected for a long time in France, on the initiative and with the moral and financial support of several large scientific institutions of this country. The collection in its entirety is to be edited by our \textit{Imprimerie Nationale} (which disposes of a team of specialized type-setters and a remarkable set of Coptic characters) and is to appear in Paris. The printing of the first volume has, by the way, already begun. Is it to this collection to which your letter makes allusion, or rather to a distinct publication, for which you would have formed the plan and which would be done elsewhere than in Paris? In this latter case, it would be very delicate for me, not to say impossible, you understand, to play in the enterprise the rôle that you have the courtesy to attribute to me. ...

Would you also confirm to me that it remains agreed, following our agreements of Ascona, that the collection \(E[\text{id}]\), or 'Jung Papyrus,' will be published by Quispel, myself and some other collaborators, in the complete collection of the \textit{Papyrus de N[ag]\, H[ammadi]}’ destined, until we hear otherwise, to be edited in Paris. I considered the point achieved, and it is with this conviction that in November I advised a potential purchaser not to think of the acquisition of this codex. If we are still in agreement on that, tell me, I ask of you, if it is permitted to me, or when it will be permitted to me, to inform the representatives of the French establishments who patronize the envisaged edition about our project, and to converse with them about the conditions of publication of the collection \(E[\text{id}]\) in the whole of the collection. ...

\(^{178}\) 31 i 52: Letter from Puech to Meier:

Mais de quelle édition générale des douze (ou, plus exactement, des treize) codices de N.H. s’agit-il ici? Je vous ai déjà signalé qu’une telle publication a depuis longtemps été projetée en France, sur l’initiative et avec l’appui moral et financier de plusieurs grandes institutions scientifiques de ce pays; la collection tout entière doit être édité par notre \textit{Imprimerie nationale} (qui dispose d’une équipe de compositeurs spécialisés et d’un jeu remarquable de caractères coptes) et paraître à Paris. L’impression du premier volume est, d’ailleurs, amorcée. Est-ce à cette collection que fait allusion votre lettre, ou bien à une publication distincte, dont vous auriez formé le projet et qui serait faite ailleurs qu’à Paris? En ce dernier cas, il serait fort délicat pour moi, pour ne pas dire impossible, vous le comprendrez, de jouer dans l’entreprise le rôle que vous avez l’obligeance de m’attribuer. ...

Voudriez-vous également me confirmer qu’il reste entendu, suivant nos conventions d’Ascona, que le recueil \(E\), ou “Papyrus Jung,” sera publié par M. Quispel, moi-même et quelques autres collaborateurs, dans la collection complète des “Papyrus de N.H.” destinée, jusqu’à nouvel ordre, à être éditée à Paris. Je tenais le point pour acquis, et c’est dans cette conviction que j’ai conseillé en novembre à un acheteur éventuel de
I think that, when you ask of me ‘especially to leave the negotiations with the Egyptian government entirely to’ your ‘initiative,’ it has to do uniquely with the codex E[id]. In this case, I leave you complete liberty to maneuver, it being understood that the Egyptian government will be asked to entrust to Quispel and myself the direction of the publication of the codex (with the right to publish preliminary studies about it), and that, in return, the codex will be, once published, returned to the Egyptian State and reunited with the other codices of N[ag] H[ammadi] that have already been acquired or are destined to be acquired by Cairo.

Meier supplied Puech with the desired reassurances:179

The ambitious project of which I have spoken was to obtain the authorization of the Egyptian government for the publication of all the codices in exchange for our gift. ...

By the way, if you are already in the possession of a similar authorization, what do you think one could ask of the Egyptian government in exchange for our donation?

I confirm to you that it continues to be agreed, following our agreements of Ascona, that the collection E[id], that is to say, the ‘Jung Codex,’ will be published by you and Quispel and some other collaborators in the complete collection of the ‘Papyrus de N[ag] H[ammadi]’ to be edited in Paris.

ne pas songer à l’acquisition de ce codex. Si nous sommes toujours d’accord là-dessus, dites-moi, je vous prie, s’il m’est permis, ou quand il me sera permis, de faire part de notre projet aux représentants des établissements français qui patronnent l’édition envisagée, et de m’entretenir avec eux des conditions de publication du recueil E. dans l’ensemble de la collection. ...

Je pense que, quand vous me demandez "spécialement de laisser les negociations avec le Gouvernement Égyptien entièrement à" votre “initiative,” il s’agit uniquement du codex E. En ce cas, je vous laisse entière liberté de manoeuvre, étant entendu qu’il sera demandé au Gouvernement Égyptien de confier à Quispel et à moi-même la direction de la publication du codex (avec le droit de publier à son sujet des études préalables) et qu’en retour, le codex sera, une fois publié, remis à l’Etat égyptien et réuni aux autres codices de N.H. déjà acquis ou destinés à être acquis par Le Caire.

179 7 ii 52: Letter from Meier to Puech:

Le projet ambitieux dont j’ai parlé était d’obtenir l’autorisation du gouvernement Égyptien pour la publication de tous les Codices en échange de notre cadeau. ...

Si d’ailleurs vous êtes déjà en possession d’une pareille autorisation que pensez-vous qu’on puisse demander au gouvernement Égyptien en échange de notre donation?

Je vous confirme qu’il reste entendu suivant nos conventions d’Ascona que le recueil E., c’est à dire le “Codex Jung,” sera publié par vous et Mr. Quispel et quelques autres collaborateurs dans la collection complète des “Papyrus de N.H.,” à être édité à Paris.
In fact no such Egyptian authorization had been given, and hence Puech wrote Quispel concerning the status of the acquisition of Codex I:\textsuperscript{180}

In any case, would you be so kind as to let me know urgently (before Friday, if possible) if, from now on, we can count on the possession and the free disposition of the codex? It would be very important to me to be settled on this point. The negotiations carried on in Cairo and Paris on the topic of the purchase and publication of the papyri of N[ag] H[ammadi] are rushing forward, and have entered, it would seem, into their decisive phase. Meier has authorized me to enter, regarding the edition of the E[ider] ms., conversations with the French organisms that are concerned with the publication. It would be necessary for me to be sure of the acquisition of the E[ider] codex. It is a trump-card in our game.

Puech then replied to Meier the next month:\textsuperscript{181}

As to what concerns the E[ider] codex, it would hence be appropriate, I believe, to act as follows: To offer it to the Egyptian government, under the modalities envisaged at Ascona, on the condition: 1st, that its study and publication be entrusted principally to Quispel and myself; 2nd, that the volume be...

\textsuperscript{180} 18 ii 52: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

De toute façon, voudriez-vous bien me faire savoir d’urgence (avant vendredi, si possible) si, dès maintenant, nous pouvons compter sur la possession et la libre disposition du codex? Il me serait très important d’être fixé sur ce point: les négociations poursuies au Caire et à Paris au sujet de l’achat et de la publication des papyrus de N.H. se précipitent et sont entrées, semble-t-il, dans leur phase décisive. M. Meier m’a autorisé à entamer, à propos de l’édition du ms. E., des conversations avec les organismes français qui s’occupent de la publication. Il me faudrait être sûr de l’acquisition du codex E. C’est un atout dans notre jeu.

\textsuperscript{181} 14 iii 52: Letter from Puech to Meier:

En ce qui concerne le codex E., il conviendrait donc, je crois, d’agir ainsi: l’offrir au Gouvernement Égyptien sous les modalités prévues à Ascona, à condition: 1° que l’étude et la publication en soient principalement confiées à Quispel et à moi-même; 2° que le volume fasse partie de la publication générale des “Papyrus de Chéno- boskion,” dont un premier tome est à l’impression, étant bien entendu que cette publication d’ensemble serait imprimée à l’Imprimerie Nationale de Paris et serait, pour le principal, assurée par des savants français; 3° que Quispel et moi-même, nous avons le droit de faire des conférences, de donner des cours, ou de publier des études sur le Codex E. avant son édition intégrale. Il faudrait obtenir sur tous ces points un engagement formel par écrit. ...

Voyez s’il y a lieu de retenir une autre suggestion, que je me permets de proposer: ne serait-il pas opportun que M. v. F. s’entretint de l’affaire avec l’abbé Drioton? Cet entretien devrait avoir un caractère rigoureusement personnel et confidentiel, l’abbé Drioton s’engageant à n’en rien dévoiler, notamment à Doresse.
part of the general publication of the ‘Papyrus de Chénoboskion,’ of which a first volume is in the press, it being well understood that this publication of the ensemble would be printed at the *Imprimerie Nationale* of Paris, and would, for the most part, be assured by French scholars; 3rd, that, as for Quispel and myself, we have the right to hold conferences, give courses, or publish studies on the E[idi] Codex before its complete publication. It would be necessary to obtain on all these points a formal, written commitment. 

See if there is a chance to retain another suggestion, which I allow myself to propose: Would it not be opportune that v[on] F[ischer] discuss the matter with Abbot Drioton? This discussion should have a rigorously personal and confidential character, Abbot Drioton committing himself to reveal nothing of it, especially not to Doresse.

*Negotiations between Quispel and Loop*

Meier sent Quispel, as the agent of the Jung Institute, the address of Loop, the agent of Simone Eid, so that the negotiations could begin:

Please get into contact for the purchase of the codex with the person authorized by Mrs. A[lbert] Eid in Belgium, Mr. Georges Loop, Villa ‘La Flamande,’ Sentier des Melilots, Saint Idesbald, Coxyde.

In the attachment, I send back to you with best thanks the letter from Puech. I have written to him, and at the same time drew attention again to the fact that he should make a plan for the editing and publishing of the whole library, so that we can pressure the Egyptian government on its basis for the sole right to publish.

Loop replied to Quispel’s inquiry by indicating he was not oriented on the topic and could assume no responsibility. Hence Meier wrote von Fischer via diplomatic courier asking him to obtain from Simone Eid a written statement to the effect that in principle she is willing to sell the codex to them through Loop as her agent, as well as a written statement to be

---

182 i 52: Letter from Meier to Quispel:


In der Beilage send ich Ihnen mit bestem Dank den Brief von Puech wieder zurück. Ich habe ihm geschrieben und gleichzeitig noch einmal darauf aufmerksam gemacht, dass er sich einen Plan für die Bearbeitung und Herausgabe der gesamten Bibliothek machen solle, sodass wir von der ägyptischen Regierung auf Grund desselben das alleinige Herausgeberrecht erpressen können.
forwarded to Loop naming him her agent and instructing him concerning the price to ask:  

Quispel immediately got in contact with Mr. L[oop], who however maintains that he is not informed, and does not want to assume any responsibility.

Hence we cannot move ahead, unless we, i.e. I as agent of the C.G. Jung Institute, have from Mrs. E[id] a written explanation, according to which she authorizes us in principle for the purchase, and explains that she has given us, for the purpose of the negotiation, the address of L[oop] as her agent. Probably a second statement from Mrs. E[id], which would be sent directly to L[oop], would be advantageous, and in which she designates him officially as her agent, and perhaps gives him also the necessary instructions, especially with regard to what she is asking. The latter seems to me then to be necessary, if it were to prove to be a fact, that L[oop] really was not previously oriented by Mrs. E[id] about the whole matter. ...

If it were possible for you to visit Mrs. E[id] soon, and to secure the written texts from her soon, we would all be extraordinarily grateful to you. The matter does in fact begin, if we do not soon reach tangible results, to consume our nerves.

Meanwhile Quispel had telegraphed Loop on 24 January 1952 for clarification, who responded that the main problem was that he lacked the password needed to open her safe.  

---

183 25 i 52: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Quispel hat sich sofort mit Herrn L. in Verbindung gesetzt, der aber angibt, nicht im Bilde zu sein und keine Verantwortung übernehmen will.

Wir können also nicht vorwärts kommen, ohne das wir, d. h. also ich als Vertreter des C.G. Jung-Institutes von Frau E. eine schriftliche Erklärung haben, wonach sie uns prinzipiell zum Kaufe berechtigt und erklärt, dass sie uns zum Zwecke der Verhandlung die Adresse von Herrn L. als ihrem Bevollmächtigten angegeben hat. Wahrscheinlich wäre eine zweite Erklärung von Frau E. von Vorteil, die Herrn L. direkt zuzustellen wäre, und in welcher sie denselben offiziell als ihren Bevollmächtigten bezeichnet und ihm evtl. auch die nötigen Instruktionen insbesondere hinsicht der Forderung gibt. Das letztere scheint mir dann nötig zu sein, wenn es sich als Tatsache erweisen sollte, dass Herr L. tatsächlich von Frau E. über die ganze Sache bisher nicht orientiert wurde. ...

Wenn es Ihnen möglich wäre, Frau E. bald zu besuchen und die Schriftstücke von ihr bald zu besorgen, würden wir alle Ihnen ausserordentlich dankbar. Die Sache fängt nämlich, wenn wir nicht bald zu tangibeln Resultaten kommen, an, unsere Nerven zu konsumieren.

184 25 i 52: Letter from Loop to Quispel:
I just received your telegram of the 24th of this month, and thank you for it.

I believe nonetheless that it is useful to make clear that the information that is lacking to me, which the owner should let me know in all urgency, is the ‘word’ of the safe.

Without this Sesame that I have been looking for in vain for the past three months, it is impossible for me to free the object from the safe.

Hence I solicit your intervention with the interested person, for her to furnish me this information.

Thereupon Quispel talked with Loop, who offered to write via diplomatic courier to Simone Eid, hoping to have the password by 31 January 1952, information that Quispel forwarded to Meier.\textsuperscript{185}

I have talked with Loop. It becomes clear that he does not dispose of the ‘word of the safe,’ and hence cannot reach the codex. He will not turn directly to Mrs. Eid, but will get in contact with her via diplomatic channels. About Thursday [31 January 1952] he expects an answer. I have in mind to visit him Saturday or Sunday. It was agreed, wasn’t it, that I can go up to $6,000?

There still remains a small difficulty, in case he asks for more. To whom should I turn? Barrett said to me that I should write personally to him. But in the Protocol it says that the financial matters go via you.

Meier immediately wrote Barrett:\textsuperscript{186}

\begin{quote}
Je viens de recevoir votre télégramme du 24 d. m. et vous en remercie.

Je crois toutefois utile de préciser que le renseignement qui me manque est que la propriétaire devrait me faire connaître de toute urgence c’est le "mot" du coffre.

Sans ce SéSAME que je recherche vainement depuis trois mois il m’est impossible à libérer l’objet du coffre.

Je sollicite donc votre intervention auprès de l’intéressée pour qu’elle me fournisse cette information.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{185} 28 i 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Ich habe mit Herrn Loop gesprochen. Es stellt sich heraus, dass er nicht über den “mot du coffre-fort“ verfügt und also den Kodex nicht erreichen kann. Er wird sich nicht unmittelbar an Frau Eid wenden, sondern auf diplomatischem Wege mit ihr in Verbindung treten. Gegen Donners erwartet er Antwort. Ich habe im Sinn, Samstag oder Sonntag ihn zu besuchen. Es war doch abgemacht, dass ich bis 6,000 dollar gehen kann?

Es bleibt noch eine kleine Schwierigkeit, falls er mehr fragt. An wem sollte ich mich wenden? Barrett sagte mir, ich sollte ihm persönlich schreiben. Im Protokoll aber steht, die finanziellen Angelegenheiten gehen über Ihnen.

\textsuperscript{186} 31 i 52: Letter from Meier to Barrett.
After a dramatic series of exciting and annoying peripeties the business with the Gnostic Codex eventually seems to come to a head. The proprietor has named us her *homme de confiance* in Belgium and I have put Quispel in contact with this man. Quispel now asks me about the sum of money available from Bollingen Foundation since he would of course have to know the limit in order to be able to negotiate.

As you know from the information our Swiss Ambassador in Egypt gave me, Mrs. E[id] is asking 4,000.- £, whereas her deceased husband has asked 5,000.- £. The sum is more or less in accordance with what the owner of the other volumes asks of the Egyptian government.

I shall be very grateful for an answer at your earliest convenience, and in order to save time I should like to ask you to send a carbon copy of your answer directly to Prof. G. Quispel, Duinvoetlaan 5, Wassenaar, Holland.

Meanwhile a fight between British forces and Egyptian police on 25 January 1952 at Ismailia led to riots in Cairo the next day, whereupon the king sent the army into the streets and dismissed Nahas Pasha as Prime Minister.\(^{187}\)

On 8 February 1952 von Fischer described the situation in its effect on his efforts:\(^{188}\)

> I have received your letter of 25 January, but at first could not find Mrs. E[id]. She was, because of the terrible days around 26 January, in hiding. Only today do I find her ...

> The days around 26 January were a terrible mayhem for our western world. For six hours we were completely at the mercy of rampage, egged on by Moscow. They could have done the same with us, as with those numerous Englishmen, who were knocked down by the mob, cut in pieces, and then openly burned. Moscow wants to bring under its power the Near East and North Africa, then Brazil. Then Europe is so defenseless that it is easier to take.

Simone Eid recorded her impressions of the same day in a letter to Loop:\(^{189}\)

---

187 *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, volume 8, p. 89.
188 8 ii 52: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

> Ihren Brief vom 25. Jan. habe ich erhalten, konnte aber Frau E. erst nicht finden; sie war wegen der schrecklichen Tage um den 26 Jan. untergetaucht. Heute erst finde ich sie ...


189 9 ii 52: Letter from Simone Eid to Loop:
In any case, all that Cairo had of beauty has been destroyed, millions and millions of £É are now in cinders. With my mother and my children, I had to leave the house and stay with friends in the suburbs, and it is only yesterday that I have returned home.

Meanwhile she had apparently heard from Loop, since in the same letter she commented:

Now it seems that you wish to know the word that opens the safe, and though my memory is not very trustworthy in these last times, it seems to me that it has to do with ALVA, ALSI, or ALBI. In any case, if I am mistaken, then please be so kind as to have the lock opened by force.

Her letter was accompanied by a ‘Plan for the sale of the Manuscript’ dated 9 February 1952 and notarized by the Vice-Consul of Switzerland:

The sale of this manuscript should be agreed upon as follows:

1. The acceptance by the purchaser of the price of 42,700 Swiss Francs (forty-two thousand seven hundred Swiss francs), the equivalent value of this manuscript, of course after the experts whom the purchaser will delegate have seen it.

---

En tout cas, tout ce que Le Caire avait de beau a été détruit, des millions et millions de £. Eg. sont actuellement en cendres. Avec ma mère et mes enfants j’ai dû quitter la maison et habiter chez des amis dans la banlieue et ce n’est qu’hier seulement que je suis rentrée chez moi.

190 9 ii 52: Letter from Simone Eid to Loop:

Or il semble que vous désirez savoir le mot qui ouvre le coffre, et bien ma mémoire ne m’est pas très fidèle ces derniers temps, il me semble qu’il s’agit de ALVA, ALSI ou ALBI. En tous cas si je me trompe veuillez alors avoir l’obligeance de faire forcer la serrure.

191 9 ii 52: Simone Eid, “Projet pour la vente du Manuscrit”:

La vente de ce manuscrit devra être convenue comme suit:

1) Acceptation par l’acheteur du prix de Frs. S. 42,700 (Quarante deux mille sept cent francs suisses) contre-valeur de ce manuscrit, bien entendu après vision par les experts que l’acheteur déléguera. 
2) La susdite somme de Frs. S. 42,700 sera payable à la Société de Banque Suisse—Genève, au nom de la personne qui sera indiquée en temps et lieu. 
3) En cas de décision définitive par l’acheteur de ce manuscrit, le vendeur demandera à ce qu’une partie de cette somme soit transférée à Bruxelles et le solde payable en Suisse contre livraison du manuscrit dont le transfert se fera par l’entremise de la Légation de Suisse à Bruxelles. 
4) Il est clairement entendu que les acheteurs ne devront faire aucune offre de ce manuscrit pour l’Égypte, et de plus ne pas publier quoi que ce soit à son sujet avant un délai de deux années du jour de la vente définitive, à moins d’une autorisation spéciale du vendeur.
2. The said amount of 42,700 Swiss Francs will be payable to the *Société de Banque Suisse* in Geneva, in the name of the person who will be indicated at the proper time and place.

3. In the case of the definitive decision of the purchaser of this manuscript, the seller will ask that a part of this sum be transferred to Brussels, and the balance payable in Switzerland on the delivery of the manuscript, whose transfer will take place by the mediation of the Swiss Legation in Brussels.

4. It is clearly understood that the purchasers may not make any offer of this manuscript for Egypt, and furthermore not publish anything at all regarding it before the lapse of two years from the day of the definitive sale, unless there is a special authorization by the seller.

Quispel wrote Meier that he found Simone Eid's condition of a two-year delay in publication 'difficult,' a concern which Meier forwarded to von Fischer:

> But a difficult thorn in the eye is the one condition in the attached exposé about the procedure, namely, that one may not publish anything before two years pass. I understand that under certain circumstances this is necessary for the protection of the owner, yet it is for us and the editors and publishers an almost unbearable handicap. I hence ask you quite politely, whether you do not believe that this condition could be dropped.

Thereupon Simone Eid reduced the publication delay to eighteen months:

> If the seller has asked for a delay of two years in permitting you to make the publication, it is uniquely so that he [she] can terminate his [her] business that is in suspense in Egypt prior to that time. He [She] is happy to reduce this delay to eighteen months, promising that if he [she] finishes earlier (which is his [her] only desire), he [she] will notify you immediately.

---

192 19 ii 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

> … schwierig …

193 21 ii 52: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

> Ein schwerer Dorn im Auge ist aber die eine Bestimmung in dem beigelegten Exposé über das Procedere, nämlich, dass man vor Ablauf von zwei Jahren nichts publizieren dürfe. Ich verstehe, dass das unter Umständen für den Schutz der Besitzerin nötig ist, jedoch ist es für uns und die Bearbeiter und Herausgeber ein fast unerträgliches handicap. Ich frage Sie deshalb höflichst an, ob Sie nicht glauben, dass diese Bestimmung fallen gelassen werden könnte.

194 27 ii 52: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

> Si le vendeur a demandé un délai de deux ans pour vous permettre de faire la publication, c’est uniquement pour qu’il puisse terminer ses affaires en suspens en Égypte au préalable. Il veut bien réduire ce délai à 18 mois en promettant que s’il termine avant (ce qui est son seul désir) il vous en fera part immédiatement.
A year later, in March 1953, Simone Eid visited Meier in Zürich to ask him to extend the delay of the public announcement from November 1953 to March 1954, in view of the fact that she could not leave Egypt permanently by November 1953. Meyer found her ‘exceptionally charming’ and wrote Quispel:  

But I would be personally delighted here to meet her half-way if possible.

Quispel replied:

It seems to me, in terms of science, impossible to keep the discovery of the Gospel of Truth secret any longer. I have also already made arrangements to make the essay on the report of the discovery known exactly in the middle of November, as was agreed. From a technical point of view it is hardly possible still to change this. Besides, I do not believe that Mrs. Eid will have left Egypt by March 1954. But it is quite possible to pass over completely in silence the fact that the codex was found in Nag Hammadi.

Quispel wrote again intransigently:

It can really almost not be shifted. So I really must ask that the date be not changed.

Meier agreed to retain the earlier date, but urged that one should then carefully spare Simone Eid difficulties prior to that date.

---

195 25 iii 53: Letter from Meier to Quispel:
... ausserordentlich charmante ...
Ich wäre aber persönlich gereizt, ihr hier womöglich entgegenzukommen.

196 28 iii 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

197 1 iv 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier:
Es kann wirklich beinahe nicht verschoben werden. Ich muss wirklich dann bitten, dass das Datum nicht versetzt wird.

198 20 iv 53: Letter from Meier to Quispel.
The Actual Acquisition of the Eid Codex

On 11 February 1952 Barrett wrote to Meier that it would be at least a fortnight before the Trustees of the Bollingen Foundation could act, but that the action could be expected to be along the following lines: A formal application by one or more institutions would be needed, and $6,000 would be the limit. Furthermore Barrett emphasized:

It should be further stated [in the formal application] that it is the intention of this institution or institutions to return the manuscript to the Egyptian government as a gift. ... Because of the present political situation and the Foundation’s commitments in connection with the translations of the Pyramid Texts being carried on in Egypt, it is felt to be not only wise but essential that the Foundation’s name be kept out of any negotiations for the purchase of the manuscript ...

On 18 February 1952 Meier wrote both Paul Mellon, the President of the Bollingen Foundation, and Barrett, the Vice-President, inquiring if the Foundation could speed up the procedure and provide more funds:

Is it asking you too much to make an extra effort to speed up the question of the Foundation’s contribution as well as giving the question of the amount of money, i.e. about 9,000.- Dollars, a second thought?

On 21 February 1952 Quispel wrote Barrett saying that on the preceding day he had seen the codex, ‘a most precious jewel,’ and had obtained a one-month option.

Quispel had written Loop on 13 February 1952 for an appointment. Thereupon Loop notified Quispel he would go to Brussels on 18 February 1952 to open the safe and bring the codex to his home, where Quispel could see it. Meier sent Simone Eid’s letter to Quispel to give to Loop, as well as his own formal certification naming Quispel the Jung Institute’s appointed agent in all negotiations concerning the purchase of the Coptic-Gnostic Codex. In his covering letter he suggested Quispel delay seeing Loop for at least 10 days

---

199 11 ii 52: Letter from Barrett to Meier.
200 18 ii 52: Letter from Meier to Paul Mellon.
201 18 ii 52: Letter from Meier to Barrett.
202 21 ii 52. Letter from Quispel to Barrett.
203 14 ii 52: Letter from Loop to Quispel.
204 18 ii 52: Letter from Meier to Quispel, with the sealed letter from Simone Eid to Loop appended.
205 18 ii 52: Certification from Meier ‘to whom it may concern,’ sent to Quispel.
in hopes the money would then be available.\textsuperscript{206} Quispel wrote Loop proposing 2 March 1952 as the earliest date for his visit.\textsuperscript{207} He wrote Meier that the missing $3,000 might have to be borrowed; a lecture in Zürich with a price of admission could repay half; a lecture tour in America would raise what was needed.\textsuperscript{208} Loop answered Quispel’s letter, setting an appointment for Sunday afternoon 2 March 1952.\textsuperscript{209}

The original asking price had been set by Albert Eid at 5,000 £É, a figure reached by taking a tenth of the amount of 50,000 £É, assumed to be the agreed-upon price for the Dattari collection, which was considered to contain 10 codices.\textsuperscript{210} Simone Eid had maintained that an American university had offered 4,500 £É but she would accept 4,000 £É.\textsuperscript{211} Then she reduced her price to 3,500 £É, or 42,700 Swiss Francs (at the fixed Egyptian exchange rate of 12.20 Swiss Francs per Egyptian Pound), pointing out that recently the University of Michigan had offered her $12,000 or 52,300 Swiss Francs (at the current exchange rate of 4.358 Swiss Francs per dollar).\textsuperscript{212} However, von Fischer pointed out to her that 3,500 £É was worth 52,300 Swiss Francs only at the fixed rate of Egypt, to take advantage of which she would have to receive the money in Egypt. He persuaded her that, since she would not be permitted to export it, it would be a better deal to accept the equivalent of 3,500 £É at the free Swiss exchange rate, only 35,000 Swiss Francs, but payable in Switzerland.

Mrs. Eid signed a document reducing the price to 35,000 Swiss Francs. It read as follows:\textsuperscript{213}

With regard to the price set at 3500.00 £É, he [i.e. she] calculated the Swiss Franc at 12.25 for an Egyptian Pound, the official exchange rate of the bank. Since your funds do not permit you to pay the amount of 42,700 Swiss Francs,

\begin{flushright}
Quant au prix fixé de £É 3,500.- il a calculé le Fr. Suisse à 12.25 la livre égyptienne, cours officiel de la Banque. Puisque vos crédits ne vous permettent pas de payer le montant de Frs. S. 42,700.- il accepte \textit{sous toutes réserves} le prix de Frs. S. 35,000.- car il ignore jusqu’à ce jour le montant qu’il aura à payer pour les droits de succession en Belgique. Veuillez donc patienter quelques jours jusqu’à réception de la réponse de son mandataire à Bruxelles.
\end{flushright}
he [she] accepts with full reservations the price of 35,000 Swiss Francs, for he [she] does not know even to this day the amount he [she] will have to pay for the rights of inheritance in Belgium. Hence please be patient a few days, until the reception of the response of his [her] agent in Brussels.

Von Fischer communicated this result to Meier.214

Quispel later wrote:215

The expert examination took place at the beginning of March 1952 at St. Idesbald (Coxyte). Although it was not possible to unpack the papyri, and such indeed was not justified because of the dilettante way in which they had been packed up, the [43] reading of a single page convinced me that it was Valentinian. Hence, despite a certain risk, I ventured to recommend their purchase.

At that meeting Loop gave the Jung Institute an option valid until 1 April 1952.216 Quispel then wrote Loop summarizing the agreement reached at their meeting:217

Since the 100 pages of manuscript have been packed in such a way that only some few are visible, and because unpacking would perhaps damage the contents, it is agreed that you would write as soon as possible to Mrs. Eid to have sent to you the photocopy of the manuscript, which is still in the possession of Doresse, and then you would give me this photocopy, so as to carry out the expert assessment. In case Mme Eid would not send the said photocopy, you would come to Holland (Utrecht), so that one could make there a copy of the piece. ... 

Mme Eid for her part will take steps with Doresse, who is, so far as one knows, the sole person who is in a position to make such a publication, to the effect that he abstain from it.

---

214 28 ii 52: Letter from von Fischer to Meier.
216 2 iii 52: Option from Loop to the Jung Institute via Quispel.
217 4 iii 52: Letter from Quispel to Loop:

Parce que les 100 pages du manuscrit ont été emballé d’une telle manière que seulement quelques unes sont visibles et parce que le déballage endommagerait peut-être le contenu, on est convenu que vous écririez aussitôt que possible à Madame Eid de vous faire envoyer la photocopie du manuscrit, laquelle se trouve encore dans la possession de M. Doresse, puis vous me donneriez cette photocopie pour achever l’expertise. Le cas échéant que Madame Eid n’enverrait pas la dite photocopie vous viendriez en Hollande (Utrecht), afin qu’on fasse là une copie de la pièce. ...

Madame Eid de sa part prendra ses mesures auprès de M. Doresse, celui étant d’après ce qu’on sait la personne unique, qui est à même d’une telle publication, de sorte qu’il s’en abstienne.
On the same day Quispel wrote Meier that he had seen the correct manuscript:

It seems to me that the codex really contains the *Evangelium Veritatis*. We have obtained an option for one month.

On 5 March 1952 Meier ascertained that this 35,000 Swiss Francs was equal to $8,009, and cables Barrett and Mellon that the price was now $8,000. He received a cabled reply from Bollingen:

Believe transaction can be financed on [the] basis [of] your cabled figure subject to satisfactory procedures.

In his letter of 6 March 1952 to Quispel giving the final price, Meier added that if the money were not soon forthcoming from Bollingen:

... I will dig up the money here in Switzerland.

On his calendar of 13 March 1952, Meier wrote the dates when his friend George H. Page, a successful American business man living permanently in Switzerland, would be away from home. It seems clear that Meier had entered into discussion with him about the possibility of funding part or all of the acquisition, even before terminating his efforts with Bollingen. The next day he cabled Barrett:

Can't wait longer than March 22. Please contact Mellon and answer before this date, yes or no.

He received a response by telephone that same day repeating that the approval of the Egyptian government was necessary. On Meier’s calendar of Saturday 15 March 1952 is written Page’s telephone number. This must

---

218 4 iii 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Es scheint mir, dass der Codex wirklich das Evangelium Veritatis enthält. Wir haben Option für einen Monat bekommen.

219 6 iii 52: Letter from Meier to Quispel.

220 6 iii 52: Telegram from Meier to Barrett.

221 Mentioned in the letter of 6 iii 52 from Meier to Quispel.

222 8 iii 53: Telegram from Sharp of the Bollingen Foundation to Meier.

223 6 iii 52: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

... werde ich das Geld hier in der Schweiz auftreiben.

224 13 iii 52: Leaf from the desk calendar of Meier.

225 14 iii 52: Handwritten copy of telegram from Meier to Barrett.

226 14 iii 52: Handwritten notes on the desk calendar of Meier of his telephone conversation with Sharp of the Bollingen Foundation.

227 15 iii 52: Handwritten note on the desk calendar of Meier.
be the date on which the agreement of Page to provide the whole purchase price was obtained. For apparently Meier wrote that day to Quispel, who on 17 March 1952 acknowledged receipt of the good news and immediately began formulating suggestions in light of the new situation: Meier should be honored by a university, preferably Utrecht; the full report of the codex’s acquisition could be sold to *Life* or *Time*; lectures in the U.S.A. by Puech or Quispel should be arranged only with Meier’s approval, in order that he receive part of the honoraria; Quispel would be glad to come to Zürich for the presentation to Jung; it would be appropriate that the first reports be made at the time of his course at the Jung Institute in December 1952.\(^\text{228}\)

The withdrawal of the Bollingen Foundation from the funding began already to put in question items required by Barrett.\(^\text{229}\)

Does the necessity still exist to return the codex to the Egyptian government? In any case, one now has a powerful means to carry the negotiations further.

This tends to suggest that the decision in Ascona to return the Jung Codex after publication to Egypt was only at the insistence of Barrett, whereas Quispel would prefer to keep it, or at least barter it, now that the Bollingen Foundation was no longer involved.

On 25 March 1952 Meier had the attorney of the Jung Institute, Dr. W. Keller-Staub, write Barrett informing him that other funds had been secured, which Barrett acknowledged on 3 April 1952.\(^\text{230}\) Thereupon Quispel applied to the Bollingen Foundation on 28 August 1952 for a research grant to prepare the codex for publication, and on 15 December 1952 was notified he had been awarded $6,000 (the same amount that had been offered by the Bollingen Foundation for the purchase), to be paid in monthly installments during 1953–1954.\(^\text{231}\)

Quispel telephoned on 17 March 1952 to Loop, who that same day confirmed in writing the gist of the conversation (which consisted in a repetition of what he had written Quispel on 13 March 1952): Doresse was in Upper Egypt until 18 or 19 March 1952, when Simone Eid would ask him to

---

\(^{228}\) 17 iii 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier.

\(^{229}\) 17 iii 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Besteht noch die Notwendigkeit, den Kodex der Ägyptischen Regierung wieder zu geben? Auf jeden Fall hat man nun ein kräftiges Mittel, die Verhandlungen weiter zu führen.

\(^{230}\) 3 iv 52: Letter from Barrett to Keller-Staub.

\(^{231}\) 15 xii 52: Letter from Ernest Brooks, Jr. of the Bollingen Foundation to Quispel.
return the photographs, whereupon she would send them to Loop ‘by a sure route’ who would then give them to Quispel. If the transaction were not completed by 1 April 1952, the option could be extended. Quispel must also have written immediately to Puech, who responded the next day with his felicitations and an inquiry as to who produced the funds.

Loop had also itemized complicated details of the formalities of the transaction. Keller-Staub proposed a simpler procedure. Quispel would be provided with a letter of credit from a Swiss bank to the effect that the purchase price agreed upon is at Loop’s disposal as soon as he turns over the codex, which is to be documented by a receipt signed by Quispel. Loop telegraphed Quispel his agreement to this procedure. On the same day Page had 35,000 Swiss Francs accredited to Loop via Keller-Staub, who promptly mailed Quispel a letter of credit for 35,000 Swiss Francs on the Union Bank of Switzerland for Loop, upon presentation of:

Receipt from Prof. Dr. Gilles Quispel, on receiving a Coptic Bible Volume XIII in the original, for, and to the hands of, the C.G. Jung Institute, Zürich.

Quispel telegraphed Loop that he had this letter of credit, and asked when he should come. Loop wrote Quispel that he would come to Utrecht on 3 April 1952 to complete the transaction. But on 1 April 1952 he wrote again cancelling the trip:
I regret to have to inform you that I have been asked by Mrs. Eid to wait some days before delivering the document to you! She has written me this in a letter received this morning, so as to terminate the affair in Cairo!!!!

... Be that as it may, on my own authority I prolong until 15 April of this year the option that I accorded you on 2 March 1952.

Quispel wrote Loop to write Mrs. Eid urging the completion of the transaction, which Loop did on 5 April 1952. Quispel again wrote Loop on 9 April 1952 and on 11 April 1952 sent a special-delivery, registered letter, pointing out that an extension of the option was no longer needed, since the Jung Institute he represented had accepted the conditions, and hence the transaction had been consummated. Loop replied that Mrs. Eid had cabled to extend the option until 25 April 1952, pending his receipt from her of a letter due 22 April 1952 specifying the mode of payment. Loop wrote Quispel on that date that he had just received a letter from Mrs. Eid itemizing the mode of payment:

1) The sale is concluded for thirty-five thousand Swiss Francs (35,000.-)

2) The payment is made in the following way:

   a) Submission to Georges Loop of a check made out to him payable in Brussels of fifty thousand Belgian Francs (50,000.-)

   b) The balance of 35,000 Swiss Francs less 50,000.- Belgian Francs (i.e. X Swiss Francs) in a check in Swiss Francs to submit in Brussels to Georges Loop, in a check made out as follows:

   “Please pay to the order of the Société de Banque Suisse, rue de la Confédération, in Geneva, to be credited to the account of Mr. Edouard Heinrich.

---

242 According to a letter of 5 iv 52 from Loop to Quispel.
243 9 iv 52: Letter from Quispel to Loop.
244 15 iv 52: Letter from Loop to Quispel.
245 22 iv 52: Letter from Loop to Quispel:

1) la vente est conclue pour francs Suisses trente cinq mille (35,000.-)

2) le payment se fait de la façon suivante:

   a) remise à M. Georges Loop d’un chèque à son ordre payable à Bruxelles de cinquante mille francs belges (50,000.-)

   b) le solde 35,000 fr. Suisses moins 50,000.- fr. Belges (soit X fr. Suisses) en un chèque en francs Suisses à remettre à Bruxelles à M. Georges Loop, en un chèque libellé comme suit:


   ...”
Heinrich [from whom Mrs. Eid was borrowing money in Cairo\textsuperscript{246}], X Swiss Francs. ..."

On 23 April 1952 Quispel wrote Loop his agreement.\textsuperscript{247} Loop replied, making an appointment with Quispel at Brussels at the cafe-bar of the Hotel Albert Premier next to the Gare du Nord, at a time Quispel was to set.\textsuperscript{248}

On 2 May 1952 Keller-Staub and Page drew up the legal papers. Page lent the Jung Institute without interest 35,000 Swiss Francs due 1 January 1962, the debt to be reduced on receipt of payments for this purpose from a third party, with any balance on 1 January 1962 to be cancelled.\textsuperscript{249} Page received a receipt for two checks, one for 30,898 Swiss Francs, one for 50,000 Belgian Francs, totaling 35,000 Swiss Francs.\textsuperscript{250} Keller-Staub sent the two checks to Quispel on 5 May 1952, the first made out to Heinrich, the second to Loop.\textsuperscript{251}

Quispel wrote handwritten letters to Meier and Keller-Staub on 10 May 1952, to the effect that the codex had been in his house since the preceding day. His letter to Keller-Staub stated:\textsuperscript{252}

\begin{quote}
Since 9 May I possess the Coptic codex, as trustee for the Jung Institute, and have it at my disposal according to the instructions of this Institute, i.e. Dr. med. C.A. Meier.
\end{quote}

The letter to Meier stated:\textsuperscript{253}

\begin{quote}
It is so far. Since yesterday the codex is in my house.
\end{quote}

But the formal documents signed in Brussels were themselves actually dated only to 10 May 1952, which thus became the official date of the transaction. Quispel signed on behalf of the Jung Institute a guarantee not to publish anything for 18 months, unless the seller grants permission, indeed not even

\textsuperscript{246} 1 xi 52: Letter from von Fischer to Meier.
\textsuperscript{247} According to a letter of 26 iv 52 from Loop to Quispel.
\textsuperscript{248} 26 iv 52: Letter from Loop to Quispel.
\textsuperscript{249} 2 v 52: ‘Vereinbarung’ signed by Keller-Staub and Page.
\textsuperscript{250} 5 v 52: ‘Quittung’ from Keller-Staub to Page.
\textsuperscript{251} 5 v 52: Letter from Keller-Staub to Quispel.
\textsuperscript{252} 10 v 52: Letters from Quispel to Meier and to Keller-Staub:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{253} 10 vi 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

\begin{quote}
Es ist so weit. Seit gestern befindet sich der Kodex in meine Hause.
\end{quote}
to admit owning the codex, or even to mention the name of the seller. Quispel gave Loop a copy, for which Loop gave him a receipt for the two checks. On 11 May 1952 Meier received a telegram:

Have codex at home. Quispel.

Page was notified on 29 November 1952 by the bank that the check for Heinrich had been cashed.

Quispel turned the papyri over to Dr. E.P. Wegener of Leiden to conserve, and authorized the St. Lucas Society of Rapenburg near Leiden to provide the plexiglass panes and photographs. On 31 May 1952 Wegener completed the conservation of the papyrus between the panes of plexiglass.

The Netherlands Organization for Pure Research (Z.W. O.) covered the expenses, on the condition that additional photographs be deposited at relevant institutes of Dutch universities. The Z.W. O. inquired on 1 November 1952 and 8 December 1952 about meeting this condition, and on 18 December 1952 agreed to Quispel’s proposal that two of the three sets of photographs which had been made for Quispel, Puech and van Unnik be so deposited after the publication of the codex.

Quispel’s speech on ‘Jung and the Jung Codex’ at the ‘Panarion’ Conference sponsored by the C.G. Jung Institute of Los Angeles on 4 September 1975 began:

On the 10th day of May, 1952, a professor from Utrecht took a train to Brussels. However, due to his absentmindedness, he stepped out of the train in Tilburg, while thinking he was in Roosendaal, and thus missed his connecting

---

254 10 v 52: Receipt from Quispel to Loop.
255 10 v 52: Receipt from Loop to Quispel.
256 11 v 52: Telegram from Quispel to Meier:

Habe Kodex zu Hause. Quispel.

257 29 xi 52: Letter from the Schweizerische Bankgesellschaft to Page.
258 21 and 24 v 52: Letters from E.P. Wegener to Quispel.
259 28 vii 52: Receipt from the St. Lucas Society to Quispel.
260 31 v 52: Letter from Wegener to Quispel.
261 5 vi 52: Letter from J.H. Bannier, Director of the Z.W.O., to Quispel.
262 1 xi 52: Letter from J.H. Bannier, Director of the Z.W.O., to Quispel.
263 8 xii 52: Letter from J.H. Bannier, Director of the Z.W.O., to Quispel.
264 18 xii 52: Letter from J.H. Bannier, Director of the Z.W.O., to Quispel.
265 The speech was a free and abridged English translation of a paper whose typescript he left with me, as his host, which is quoted here. The Dutch original had been published as “Jung en de Gnosis,” in C. Aalders, J.H. Blokker, and G. Quispel, Jung—een mens voor deze tijd (Rotterdam: Lemniscaat, 1975), 85–138: 85.
train. But when he finally approached the appointed meeting place, a cafe somewhere in Brussels, two hours too late, he saw the middleman, from Saint Idesbald close by Coxyde on the Belgian coast, still waiting at the window and kindly waving to him. The professor then reached out and handed the man a check for 35,000 Frs. S. In return, the man gave the professor about 50 papyri. How does one manage to transfer them over the border without complication? One cannot very easily hide such a package. Thus one must remain honest and when the customs officer asks ‘What do you have in that package?’ then one just tells the truth: ‘An old manuscript.’ And the customs officer makes a gesture of total disinterest and lets one pass. So this is how the Jung Codex was purchased.

Jean Doresse and Simone Eid

Quispel’s published report of the sudden delay on the part of Simone Eid at the beginning of April 1952 is as follows:\textsuperscript{266}

The owner suddenly asked for delay, and there were also alarming signs which seemed to indicate that other interested parties, if not offering a higher sum, were at any rate negotiating.

This seemed to be a reference to Doresse’s involvement. For Quispel’s lawyer, P.J. Swart, in Cairo on other business in March 1952, wrote a letter to Loop on 7 April 1952\textsuperscript{267} that he did not actually mail at the time, ‘as I did not want to complicate the negotiations which were going on at that time.’\textsuperscript{268} But he did give a copy to his client Quispel. It read in part:\textsuperscript{269}

Just before I left (March 30th) she [Simone Eid] had contacted Mr. Doresse, who had told her that he would give her the photocopy and a written statement that he would not make any use of his knowledge for publication. She promised to send the photocopy and the statement to you [Loop], being the safest way.

Rather than the photocopy and the signed statement, it was the instruction to delay that actually reached Loop from Simone Eid. What disturbed Quispel most was the comment of Simone Eid quoted by Loop that she wanted a delay ‘in order to terminate the affair in Cairo.’\textsuperscript{270} It is understandable that

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[267] 7 iv 52: Letter from P.J. Swart to Loop.
\item[268] 28 vii 52: Letter from P.J. Swart to Loop.
\item[269] 7 iv 52: Letter from P.J. Swart to Loop.
\item[270] 11 iv 52: Quoted in a letter from Quispel to Loop:
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
one might wonder if Doresse were making a last effort to acquire the codex. Hence Quispel sent Loop an implied threat that Quispel might go public if that were to happen.\footnote{11 iv 52: Letter from Quispel to Loop.}

Mrs. Eid would act contrary to her own interest in trying to get the deal cancelled, as this would make secrecy impossible.

On his return from Brussels to get the codex, Quispel wrote Meier of a further threat that had been effective.\footnote{10 v 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier:}

In the last minute Mrs. Eid wanted to break off the discussions, since another purchaser seemed to offer more. The threat of legal proceedings was however effective.

On his return from Brussels to get the codex, Quispel wrote Meier of a further threat that had been effective.\footnote{10 v 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier:}

In the last minute Mrs. Eid wanted to break off the discussions, since another purchaser seemed to offer more. The threat of legal proceedings was however effective.

The position of Quispel stands in contrast to that of Puech. Puech wanted to mitigate the opposition to Doresse, since he apparently had, as a fall-back plan, a purely French publication making use of Doresse and his photographs. Hence on receiving a full report already in mid-March from Quispel, including the plan to include in the bill of sale the conditions that Simone Eid was to get Doresse to agree both not to publish and to turn in his photographs, Puech responded.\footnote{18 iii 52: Letter from Puech to Quispel:}

I believe that it would be prudent not to insist too much, for the time being, with Doresse, in requiring of him the execution of the two clauses of the contract of which you speak to me. If one intimates the thing to him
immediately, and, if I may say so, brutally, he is capable of working against us with Pahor Labib, the present Director of the Coptic Museum in Cairo, and with other Egyptian personalities, and either to cause the negotiations of His Excellency von Fischer to collapse, or to have us forbidden, in return, the use of the other collections of the discovery. Perhaps it would be good to let him understand already now that, as it had been agreed on this in Ascona, he will be attached to the publication of the codex, and that this must be edited in the general collection of the *Papyri de Chénoboskion*. One could also soften the first clause by specifying that Doresse, or whoever it may be, cannot publish anything of the content of the manuscript *without the authorisation of the owner of the codex*. As to the second clause, it seems to me difficult or unnecessary to execute: Doresse can quite well have a second file of photographic proofs or a copy of the manuscript.

The sale transaction was successfully completed without further assurance to or from Doresse. But after it had been completed, Quispel raised with Meier the question of Doresse’s photographs:\footnote{274}{23 vii 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier: Ich mache Sie darauf aufmerksam, dass eine Photographie sich noch immer in Händen von Doresse befindet. Wäre es nicht angebracht, Herrn Keller-Staub einen Brief an ihm schreiben zu lassen?}

I draw your attention to the fact that a photograph is still in the hands of Doresse. Would it not be appropriate to have Keller-Staub write him a letter?

Later Swart, returning from a second trip to Egypt, mailed Loop his first letter along with a second:\footnote{275}{28 vii 52: Letter from Swart to Loop.}

During the last months I paid several visits to Mrs. Eid. ... I asked her several times [for] the photocopy of the manuscript. She promised to give it to me, but later on she told me that it was in Alexandria and that she would send it by diplomatic mail. Please remind her when you write. I got the impression that she did not quite know what she wanted. I met her friend Heinrich several times. She has full confidence in him.

Shortly thereafter Heinrich wrote Swart from Egypt by regular mail, and hence encoded, his assurance that the photography would be delivered to him:\footnote{276}{14 viii 52: Letter from Heinrich to Swart: Quant au Révérend Père Quispel je vous prie de lui dire que dès qu’il me sera possible je lui ferai parvenir la photo de l’acte de naissance de mon père.}

With regard to the Reverend Father Quispel, I ask of you to say to him that, as soon as it becomes possible for me, I will have the photo of the birth certificate of my father come to him.
After the annual meeting of the Eranos Circle of the Jung Institute in August 1952, where Meier and Quispel discussed the situation, Meier asked Keller-Staub to write to Doresse and Simone Eid, pressuring them to have him restore the photographs and refrain from publication. Immediately Keller-Staub wrote to Simone Eid (a letter which von Fischer was happy, in view of its sharpness, not to need to deliver), as well as to Doresse, telling him:

Mme Eid has committed herself to return this [photographic] copy to one of my clients who is interested in this volume. I ask you as a result to have it reach me as soon as possible.

Doresse replied to Keller-Staub:

Charged with the research on and the study of the Coptic Gnostic papyri of Cairo by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and by the Coptic Museum of Cairo, I have at my disposal, in what concerns these manuscripts, only documents which are the property of one or the other of these organisms. I am not authorized, in what concerns them, to supply any information, and I hold nothing which is due to be ‘restored.

In case your client is interested in these manuscripts for scholarly reasons, it will always be possible for him to get in contact with me directly.

Yet von Fischer reported good news to Meier:

---

277 4 ix 52: Letter from Meier to Keller-Staub.
278 4 ix 52: Letter from Keller-Staub to Simone Eid.
279 11 xi 52: Letter from von Fischer to Meier.
280 4 ix 52: Letter from Keller-Staub to Doresse:

Madame Eid s’est obligé de rendre cette copie à un de mes clients qui s’intéresse de ce volume. Je vous prie par conséquent de me la faire parvenir le plus tôt possible.

281 8 ix52: Letter from Doresse to Keller-Staub:

Chargé de la recherche et de l’étude des papyrus gnostiques coptes du Caire par le Ministère Français des Affaires Étrangères et par le Musée Copte du Caire, je ne dispose, en ce qui concerne ces manuscrits, que de documents qui sont la propriété de l’un ou l’autre de ces organismes. Je ne suis autorisé, en ce qui les concerne, à fournir aucun renseignement et je ne détiens rien qui ait lieu d’être “restitué.”

Au cas où votre client s’intéresserait à ces manuscrits pour des raisons scientifiques, il lui sera toujours possible de se mettre en contact avec moi directement.

282 11 xi 52: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

1) Herr J. Doresse hat die Photocopy Ihres Papyrus an Frau Eid zurückgegeben.
2) Diese Photocopy steht zu meiner Verfügung; ich kann sie verlangen wenn ich will und werde sie in unseren Safe-Schrank versorgen.
3) Frau Eid sagt, sie habe alle Seiten des Papyrus verkauft; sie habe keine anderen.
1) J. Doresse has *returned* the photocopy of your papyrus to Mrs. Eid.
2) This photocopy stands *at my disposal*. I can call for it when I wish, and will care for it in our safe.
3) Mrs. Eid says she has sold *all* the pages of the papyrus; she has *no* other ones.

On this Simone Eid later wrote me:  

This is false. What D[oresse] gave me was a box with the photo copies from Schmidt, but I did not realize it, having confidence in Doresse.

But apparently she was mistaken (see above, Part 2). In any case, what came from her to Meier was the box of negatives of Codex I that Meier later gave to me. The small prints mounted on green paper were later given to me by Doresse.

Von Fischer wrote again to Meier that Heinrich would come on 20 November 1952 to cash his check:  

As legitimization, Heinrich will probably bring along the photos of the codex.

The photocopies were actually turned over to Meier by a Dr. Studer of the Interchemie Co. of Zürich, as Meier reported to Heinrich.

On 11 December 1952 Meier’s secretary, Ms. Anelia Jaffé, wrote on his behalf to Quispel:
... after we let you and Mrs. Eid be informed via the attorney that he [Doresse] has no claim to the photocopies, since there is a purchaser who wants to acquire the codex only if at the same time he gets the photocopies, he wrote our attorney a shameless letter, to the effect that he has no idea of giving back his photocopies. Fourteen days later I received a report from Cairo that Mrs. Eid has gotten them back and fourteen days ago they were delivered here in Zürich. [Simone Eid: ‘I do not at all recall this passage between Heinrich and the others. I am lost here!’\textsuperscript{287}] So they are now with me, and in fact it is not a matter of photographic prints, but rather of a negative. Each leaf is photographed individually in the format 12 by 9 cm. The leaves are extraordinarily clearly and naturally photographed before being preserved in the safe, so that I am convinced that individual leaves are much better preserved than in the form in which the codex today stands at your disposal. So this negative material could doubtless be very useful to you for the reconstruction of what are now gaps in the text. If this is the case, I would like to ask you to telegraph me, since in the coming days a patient of mine returns to Holland, and could bring the material, since I would not like to entrust it to the mail.

Quispel telegraphed Meier he would be glad to have the film,\textsuperscript{288} as well as writing him the same day:\textsuperscript{289}

Fortunately we now have control of Doresse’s negative. But he still possesses photographic prints. No doubt it has been said to him clearly that he may not publish his material. [Simone Eid: ‘If all this is exact, I wonder where I was!’\textsuperscript{290}]

\textsuperscript{287} 28 iv 82: Simone Eid:

Je ne me souviens pas de tout ce passage entre Heinrich et les autres. Je me perds ici!

\textsuperscript{288} 13 xii 52: Telegram from Quispel to Meier.

\textsuperscript{289} 13 xii 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Glücklicherweise verfügen wir jetzt über Doresse’s Film. Er besitzt aber noch immer Fotografien. Es ist ihm wohl deutlich gesagt worden, dass er sein Material nicht veröffentlichten darf.

\textsuperscript{290} 28 iv 83: Simone Eid:

Si tout ceci est exact je me demande où j’étais.
Meier wrote Quispel the address of a lady, D.I.N. van Gelder in Zandvoort, where the film could be picked up.\footnote{291} It is to this episode that Quispel refers in a published report:\footnote{292} Moreover, during this examination it became clear, as we had suspected, that a photograph of the Codex has already been made in Egypt in 1947 or thereabouts and had somehow come into the hands of a French student, and it was our hope that this photograph would also give us the missing sheets. The owner requested the student in question to restore the photograph to its rightful possessor. The latter stated in a letter his unwillingness to do this, but he sent it nonetheless. It seems, however, that this photograph contained nothing that was not in our Codex.

Quispel had in fact written Meier when the codex was first acquired:\footnote{293}

> In the course of the years it has suffered and also has not been taken care of properly.

But this was not based on a comparison that could identify whatever loss had taken place between Doresse’s photography and the date Quispel saw the papyrus. Since Quispel determined that the film included no additional pages, it was not used significantly in the preparation of the editio princeps.

On 7 January 1973 the film was given to me by Meier for the Nag Hammadi Archives. It provided a basis for Dieter Mueller’s preliminary transcription and translation of I, which was promptly duplicated and circulated privately in August 1973. The editio princeps was published only in 1973–1974.

Meier’s suggestion that the photographs might include material that was subsequently lost was nonetheless valid: Many vestiges of ink are conserved on these photographs that improve a reading but are no longer extant. They have been included in Codex I of The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices:\footnote{294}

> The photographs from Eid of fragments 14, 19, 21, 22, 24 and 31–68 on plates 143/144 and of no-longer extant segments of ink on pp. A, lines 10–17 from

\footnote{291} 29 xii 52: Letter from Meier to Quispel.
\footnote{293} 10 x 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Im Laufe der Jahre hat er gelitten und ist auch nicht richtig versorgt worden.
\footnote{294} The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Codex I, xxxi.
This list has been subsequently updated and improved by Stephen Emmel.\(^\text{295}\)

Thus Doresse, though he had photographed the Eid codex in Cairo, was finally compelled to return his negatives of what became the Jung Codex, though he retained small prints that he ultimately gave to me for the Nag Hammadi Archives.

Puech wrote to Quispel his satisfaction that Doresse had turned in his photographs, but expressed some concern that Doresse had not reported to him anything at all about his contact with the Jung Institute:\(^\text{296}\)

> I am happy that Doresse restored the photographs he had of the codex. He has not breathed a word of the affair to me.

**Doresse’s Exclusion from the Editorial Board of the Jung Codex**

The position of Doresse on the editorial board of the Jung Codex, proposed by Barrett and agreed upon by the others at Ascona, was open to renegotiation, once Doresse had turned in the negatives and they had reached Meier. Puech had already on 18 March 1952 suggested to Quispel not to force the issue (see above), and once the codex was in hand, Puech wrote Quispel implicitly suggesting that Doresse could be retained:\(^\text{297}\)

> It will need to be investigated whether we ought or ought not invite Doresse to participate in our work. I have not yet said anything to him about the purchase of the codex and about our plans. We can, if you think well of it, talk with him on the occasion of your trip to Paris. He should be back toward the middle of this month.


\(^{296}\) 6 ix 53: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

> Je suis heureux que Doresse ait restitué les photographies du manuscrit qu’il détenait. Il ne m’a pas soufflé mot de l’affaire.

\(^{297}\) 13 v 52: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

> Il y aura à examiner si nous devons ou non inviter Doresse à participer à notre travail: je ne lui ai encore rien dit de l’achat du Codex et de nos projets; nous pourrons, si vous le jugez bon, nous entretenir avec lui lors de votre passage à Paris. Il doit être de retour vers le milieu de ce mois.
But Quispel apparently did not favor including Doresse. After Puech and Quispel met in Paris the first week of July, Quispel wrote Meier:

In regard to Doresse, I will give you the information about which you ask, but also will have to say something about his connections with the Egyptian government. But that orally.

In connection with the Ascona meeting, Quispel visited Meier on 9 August 1952 in Zürich. He must have convinced Meier that Doresse should not be included. For shortly thereafter Meier wrote to Puech, Quispel, Malinine and van Unnik inviting them to be the editors:

1) I have the honor to inform you that the C.G. Jung Institute in Zürich has assumed responsibility for the edition of the Coptic Gnostic Codex, which is to be published under the name of C.G. Jung.

2) The C.G. Jung Institute has entrusted all the work of editing the text to Messrs Henri Ch. Puech, Gilles Quispel, M. Malinine, van Unnik.

3) The C.G. Jung Institute promises that no other person will have access to the text, which is in the hands of the said Institute.

4) The Institute asks you in return to give us each individually a formal declaration that the affair will be treated quite discretely, until the moment when we will have the right to publish the text.

Each responded accepting the conditions and the assignment, though van Unnik was not mentioned subsequently as being involved in the actual editing process.

---

298 30 vi 52: Dutch travel agency receipt for Quispel; 8 vii 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier referring back to the visit with Puech.

299 8 vii 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

In Sachen Doresse werde ich Ihnen die gefragten Auskünfte geben, zugleich aber über seine Verbindungen mit der ägyptischen Regierung einiges sagen müssen. Aber darüber mündlich.

300 7 viii 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier announcing his arrival time.

301 4 ix 52: Letter from Meier to Puech, Quispel, and Malinine:

1) j’ai l’honneur de vous informer que l’Institut C.G. Jung à Zürich a pris la responsabilité pour l’édition du Codex Coptique-Gnostique qui doit être publié sous le nom de C.G. Jung.

2) L’Institut C.G. Jung a confié tous les travaux d’édition du texte aux Messieurs Henri Ch. Puech, Gilles Quispel, M. Malinine, van Unnik.

3) L’Institut C.G. Jung promet qu’aucune autre personne aura accès au texte qui se trouve en mains du dit Institut.

4) L’Institut vous prie à son tour de nous donner individuellement une déclaration formelle que l’affaire sera traitée strictement discret jusqu’au moment ou nous aurons le droit de publier le texte.
Yet Quispel and/or van Unnik may have made an exception to their commitment to treat the text quite discretely in the case of their Dutch coptologist, J. Zandee. For he identified fragments published in Pahor Labib’s volume of facsimiles in terms of their pagination in the Jung Codex\(^\text{302}\) which he hence must have been permitted to study, in spite of the agreed-upon exclusion of all except the editors. And Michel Malinine was added as an editor, though also not listed by Meier. Since neither Quispel nor Puech knew enough Coptic to do the actual work of transcribing and translating the Coptic text, they seem to have enlisted Zandee and Malinine to carry out this basic editorial work for the officially-appointed editors. Later Walter Till and Antoine Guillaumont were enlisted as coptologists.

Once Puech conceded that Doresse be excluded, he wrote Quispel indicating the course he was following regarding Doresse:\(^\text{303}\)

> Since Meier confirms it with me, I make for myself a rule not to say a word to Doresse on the present situation of the Jung Codex.

Only after the public announcement of the ‘baptism’ of the Jung Codex on 15 November 1953 did Puech inform Doresse of his exclusion from its editorial board, while softening this bitter pill by affirming his willingness to include him in the editing of the other codices,\(^\text{304}\) for which he might well need Cairo connections that only Doresse had:

> Incidentally, time has moved on, and here we are, whether one likes it or not, faced with a situation that is partly new: An American Maecenas (who lives, by the way, in Switzerland, and is a friend of France), as well as the Jung Institute of Zürich, are in the process of trying to settle on the spot the fate of the Gnostic library of Nag Hammadi. They have in hand several trump-cards: Official support, financial means, the disposal of the codex that

\(^{302}\) Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, 8, notes 4–8.

\(^{303}\) 29 ix 52: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

> Puisque M. Meier me le confirme, je me fais une règle de ne pas dire mot à Doresse du sort actuel du Codex Jung.

\(^{304}\) 25 xii 53: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

> Le temps, d’ailleurs, a marché, et nous voici bon gré mal gré devant une situation en partie nouvelle: un mécène américain (vivant, du reste, en Suisse et ami de France) ainsi que l’Institut Jung de Zürich sont en train d’essayer de régler sur place le sort de la bibliothèque gnostique de Nag-Hammadi. Ils ont en main plusieurs atouts: des appuis officiels, des moyens financiers, la disposition du codex qu’Eid avait proposé pour achat à une fondation scientifique des U.S.A. dont, paraît-il, vous lui aviez indiqué le nom. L’initiative ne semble pas cependant devoir nous inquiéter outre mesure, bien que j’eusse préféré voir les négociations menées par les seuls Français. L’Institut
Eid had offered for sale to a scientific foundation of the U.S.A., whose name, it would seem, you indicated to him. However, the initiative does not seem to need to concern us unduly, though I would have preferred to see the negotiations carried on only by the French. The Jung Institute has loyally informed me of its plans, and I have had discussions at great length on 27 October regarding them with Baillou, who has given me his agreement. It has been agreed that the action of the Swiss would combine with our own, the latter, for reasons of political opportunity, taking place for the moment behind the scene. In principle, the publication of the thirteen volumes will be done, as planned, in France, at the Imprimerie Nationale. ... It has been promised to me that the general direction of the publication would be entrusted to me. There will nevertheless be occasion to envisage the constitution of a Committee of publication of an international character, and to divide up the edition among several teams of scholars of different countries. Defying rather strong opposition, I have insisted that you be included among the potential collaborators. ...

Quispel, Malinine and I have advanced considerably the preparation of the edition of the codex that the Jung Institute has entrusted to us. The volume, composed of Valentinian writings, is of an extraordinary interest. It has been presented in Zürich on 15 November, and, since then, one has spoken a great deal about it in foreign newspapers and on the radio. A long study will appear in the January number of Vigiliae Christianae.

Thus Doresse was excluded from the editorial board of the Jung Codex, though his inclusion had been agreed upon at the planning meeting at Ascona. He was consoled with the assurance that Puech would assign him other tractates to edit, a hope which was later not realized.

Jung m’a loyalement fait part de ses desseins et je me suis longuement entretenu à leur propos, le 27 octobre, avec M. Baillou, qui m’a donné son accord. Il a été entendu que l’action des Suisses se combinerait avec la nôtre, celle-ci, pour des raisons d’opportunité politique, s’exerçant momentanément dans la coulisse. En principe, la publication des treize volumes sera faite, comme prévu, en France, à l’Imprimerie Nationale. ... Il m’a été promis que la direction générale de la publication me serait confiée. Il y aura lieu, toutefois, d’envisager la constitution d’un Comité de publication de caractère international et de répartir l’édition entre plusieurs équipes de savants de divers pays. Bravant d’assez fortes oppositions, j’ai insisté pour que vous fussiez compris parmi les collaborateurs éventuels. ...

Quispel, Malinine et moi avons bien avancé la préparation de l’édition du Codex que nous a confiée l’Institut Jung. Le volume, composé d’écrits valentiniens, est d’un extraordinaire intérêt. Il a été présenté à Zürich le 15 novembre et, depuis, il en est beaucoup parlé dans les journaux étrangers et à la Radio. Une longue étude paraîtra dans le numéro de janvier des Vigiliae Christianae.
4. First Translation Efforts

Where to Publish All the Nag Hammadi Codices

Meier wrote Puech agreeing that Codex I be published with the rest of the codices, presumably at the *Imprimerie Nationale* as Puech had proposed:

As you already know, dear Sir, I have an ambitious program concerning all this Gnostic library. I think that it will be relatively easy for us to obtain the authorization of the Egyptian Government for the editing of all the twelve [read: thirteen] codices. One will return our Codex, after publication, only under this condition.

Meier also wrote Mellon of the Bollingen Foundation the plan to publish all the Nag Hammadi Codices together at the *Imprimerie Nationale*, in encouraging him to provide the funds to acquire the Eid Codex, since otherwise the whole grandiose plan would collapse:

This would mean that the Codex would most probably be lost forever to the scientific world. It would moreover spoil the whole plan for [the] edition and publication of the 12 volumes of the newly found Gnostic Library, which would be carried out by a team of world famous experts and scientists under the supervision of Prof. Puech of the Sorbonne, at the *Imprimerie Nationale* at Paris. For we had planned to give our volume back to the Egyptian Government as a gift after publication, asking them to authorize this team for this complete edition as a reward for our gift. This would mean that this whole *Corpus Gnosticum* would be made available in a scientific form in due time.

Meier also wrote von Fischer, to enlist his aid in gaining publication rights for the other codices in the edition envisaged by Puech at the *Imprimerie Nationale*.

---

305 18 i 52: Letter from Meier to Puech:

Comme vous le savez déjà, cher Monsieur, j’ai un programme ambitieux concernant toute cette bibliothèque gnostique. Je pense qu’il nous sera relativement facile d’obtenir l’autorisation du Gouvernement Égyptien pour l’édition de tous les douze Codices. On rendra notre Codex, après publication, seulement sous cette condition.

306 18 ii 52: Letter from Meier to Mellon.

307 17 iii 52: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Sie hatten mir schon früher einmal mitgeteilt, dass die dortige Regierung einsehe, keinen Rechtsanspruch mehr auf das besagte MS zu besitzen. Ich wäre nun sehr dankbar, wenn dies irgendwie schriftlich verifiziert werden könnte. Im Moment, wo wir eine solche Zusicherung hätten, würde sich ein interessanter, weitgehender Plan ermöglicht hinsichtlich der Publication der gesamten Nag Hammadi Literatur. Es besteht nämlich die Gefahr, dass die übrigen, im Koptischen Museum liegenden
You had earlier once reported to me that the government there sees that it no longer has a legal claim to the said manuscript. I would now be very thankful if this could be verified somehow in writing. As soon as we would have such a reassurance, an interesting, far-reaching plan would become possible regarding the publication of the whole Nag Hammadi literature. There is indeed the danger that the other volumes lying in the Coptic Museum would not be published at all in a useful timetable, due to procrastination and struggle over the financial dimensions. Now I have the tendency to encourage the government there to grant to this circle around Prof. Puech of the Sorbonne the official right to publish the other codices through the Egyptian government, in that we entice the latter by granting them our Codex, after the publication has taken place, if they would give this permission in return. One would not at all need to have in Paris etc. the original codices, which could simply remain in the Coptic Museum, but one could work merely on the basis of well-prepared photographs. Prof. Puech thinks that such an arrangement could be obtained really only through you. I permit myself to quote to you for this purpose the relevant passages from a letter of Puech of 13 March. But first I would still want to make clear that our Jung Codex, just as the one purchased by the Coptic Museum, will appear at the Imprimerie Nationale in Paris; on the cover there will stand the title 'Catalogue du Musée Copte,' and the edition will stand under the authority of Pahor Labib, present
Director of the Coptic Museum, and Abbot É. Drioton, General Director of the Egyptian Department of Antiquities.—And now to the quotation from Prof. Puech [letter of 14 March 1952 from Puech to Meier, see Part 3 above]:

Would it not be opportune that von F[ischer] discuss the matter with Abbot Drioton? This discussion should have a rigorously personal and confidential character, Abbot Drioton committing himself to reveal nothing of it, especially not to Doresse. Abbot Drioton is well informed on all that underlies the question, and he plays or can plan a central role here. He would without doubt be inclined to favor us. In any case, one must underline, he is impeded by his quality as Egyptian functionary. The problem is hence infinitely delicate. I leave to you yourself or to von F[ischer] the problem of deciding if it is for the moment advantageous or, on the contrary, dangerous to inform Abbot Drioton of our projects.

Von Fischer replied:

*Intervention regarding the publication of the whole Nag Hammadi literature.* It would be juridically impossible for me to intervene with the Egyptian authorities, if it has to do with purely French interests, since I can concern myself of course only with Swiss affairs. But if it were possible to set up a Swiss interest in this matter, be it that the publishers, be it that the financing, be it that the supervisory instance is Swiss, then I would be glad to take the matter in hand.

Von Fischer then visited Meier on his next trip to Switzerland, after which Meier wrote Quispel.

---

308 29 iii 52: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

*Intervention betreffend die Publikation der ganzen Nag Hamadi Literatur.* Es würde für mich juristisch unmöglich sein, deswegen bei den ägyptischen Behörden zu intervenieren, wenn es sich um rein französische Interessen handelt, da ich mich ja nur um schweizerische Belange kümmern kann. Sollte es aber möglich sein, ein schweizerisches Interesse an dieser Angelegenheit aufzustellen, sei es dass die Publikatoren, sei es dass die Finanzierung, sei es dass die Aufsichtsbehörde schweizerisch ist, so würde ich gerne die Angelegenheit in die Hand nehmen.

309 4 vi 52: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Eben war Minister von Fischer hier. Er meint, dass die Idee, unseren Codex nach der Publikation den Ägyptern zu geben und von ihnen das Recht zur Publikation der anderen Bände dagegen zu fordern, gut sei; insbesondere, da er mit den ägyptischen Behörden wirklich gute Beziehungen hat, hält er es für möglich, eine solche Erklärung zu erhalten. Die Sache ist lediglich so, dass er selber in der Angelegenheit nur unter der Bedingung etwas tun kann, wenn die Schweiz, respektiv das Jung-Institut an der Sache aktiv beteiligt ist. Ohne dies hätte er als Schweizerischer Diplomat keine Möglichkeit, Schritte zu unternehmen. Es stellt sich nun die Frage, in welcher Form evtl. bei der Publikation der übrigen Texte das Jung-Institut in Erscheinung treten könnte. Könnte man evtl. auf dem Titel der entsprechenden Publikationen ausser dem
Minister von Fischer was just here. He thinks that the idea of giving our Codex after publication to the Egyptians, and to require of them in exchange the right to publish the other volumes, is good; especially, since he has really good connections with the Egyptian authorities, he considers it possible to obtain such a declaration. Only the situation is as follows: He himself can do something on the issue only on the condition that Switzerland, i.e. the Jung Institute, is actively involved in the matter. Without this, he, as a Swiss diplomat, would have no possibility to undertake any measures. This then poses the question, in what form, perhaps in the publication of the other texts, the Jung Institute can make an appearance. Could one, perhaps on the title page of the relevant publications, in addition to the Coptic Museum, also put the Jung Institute at the head? How do you evaluate the chances for something like this? And do you believe that Puech would be against it out of jealousy? I myself, even though in Paris, again have not been able to make any real contact with Puech, and would, if it comes in question, perhaps ask you, for the clarification of this point, to negotiate with Puech. In case the negotiations with Puech should collapse in this regard, I would, always in the interest of a rapid publication of the whole material, not hesitate to interest other specialists, and would like to ask you to reflect upon what further colleagues beside yourself would come in question for this.

Quispel wrote Meier that he would seek to work out a compromise with Puech:

I will travel Monday to Paris, to discuss the situation with Puech. He cannot have anything against letting the whole thing appear under the patronage of the Jung Institute, but has for some time been in discussion with the government of Egypt. I would like to ask you to defer your plans until we have seen each other.


23 vi 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Since the Egyptian government had not agreed to a complete edition at the *Imprimerie Nationale* in Paris, Meier proceeded to make plans with the Rascher Verlag in Zürich to publish the Jung Codex in a series edited by Meier, Studien aus dem C.G. Jung-Institut. But, since the Rascher Verlag lacked a Coptic type font, Quispel arranged with Brill to print the Coptic text for Rascher. The final complete publication of the Nag Hammadi Codices actually took place at Brill in the Netherlands.

**Plans to Publish the Whole Jung Codex for Jung’s Birthday, 26 July 1953**

Meier’s original hope for the publication of what was to become the Jung Codex was to prepare a one-volume edition to be printed in time to present it to C.G. Jung little more than a year after its acquisition, i.e. on his birthday 26 July 1953. It was assumed that the commitment to Simone Eid to wait eighteen months after the purchase before making it known publicly might have been renegotiated to this somewhat earlier date. But it never came to that, since there were very practical difficulties. The correspondence over the months following the acquisition reported delay after delay. The blame tended to be put on Malinine, who, after all, had to produce the transcription and translation, which Puech and Quispel would have to edit heavily to make Gnostic sense of it. But then Malinine would have to adjust their improvements so as to be a valid translation of the Coptic text.

Immediately upon receipt of the Codex from Loop, Quispel wrote Puech, who responded by laying out in some detail his plan for their procedure:

> Your letter fills me with a very great joy: There, finally, the Eid Codex acquired, and between your hands. Meier, whom I met more than a month ago in Paris, had already assured me that the matter was concluded, thanks to the generosity of one of his Swiss friends. But you bring me definitive certitude. I have especially a great deal of satisfaction to learn that the *Gospel of Truth* is really of Valentinian origin.

> I am in entire agreement with you as to the path to follow in preparing the edition. We will work, each for our part, on the double set of photographs

---

311 13 v 52: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

> Votre lettre me remplit d’une joie très grande: voilà enfin le codex Eid acquis et entre vos mains. M. Meier, rencontré il y a plus d’un mois à Paris, m’avait déjà assuré que l’affaire était conclue, grâce à la générosité d’un de ses amis suisses. Mais vous m’apportez de certitude définitive. J’ai surtout beaucoup de satisfaction à apprendre que l’*Évangile de Vérité* est bien d’origine valentienne.

> Je suis entièrement d’accord avec vous sur la voie à suivre dans la préparation de l’édition. Nous travaillerons, chacun de notre côté, sur le double jeu de photographies
that you are in the process of having made. For the translation, I will appeal either to Malinine, who has just been named Professor of Demotic and Coptic at the École des Hautes Études, or to my former pupil, A[ntoine] Guillaumont, who also has recently become Director of Studies at our École, and Secretary of the Revue de l'Histoire des Religions. It is a matter of course that I approve quite willingly the collaboration of van Unnik. …

It goes without saying that all the contacts with Valentinian texts and other Gnostic or heresiological documents will have to be noted either in the apparatus or the notes, or in the commentary that of necessity the publication will contain. We will put together all our discoveries, all our hypotheses, all our suggestions, and, after having discussed or controlled them, we will establish a homogeneous manuscript. …

You know how much I will be happy to work with you on the edition of the Gnostic texts, and to see our two names united on the cover of a work that, I am now sure, will not delay in being published. How much I long to have contact with the new texts, and to put myself immediately to work!

Of course the identification of The Gospel of Truth as Valentinian was quite premature, since Loop had let Quispel scan only one page, due to the fragility of the papyrus, and the conservation of the Codex making a more detailed examination possible was completed only some time later, on 31 May 1952 (see Part 3 above). Quispel ruled at the time that the page he only scanned was Valentinian, probably for no stronger reason than that this would serve to advance the acquisition.

Quispel wrote Meier on 23 June 1952 that he would arrive in Zürich on 8 August 1952 to deliver a lecture on ‘Gnosticism in the Light of Recent
Discoveries,’ and would deliver the Codex to Meier the next day.\footnote{23 vi 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier.} But after Quispel and Puech met in Paris the first week of July 1952, Quispel wrote to Meier proposing he bring only a few sample leaves of the Codex with him, since he wished to keep for consultation the bulk of the Codex until January 1953:\footnote{8 vii 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier: Gegen diese Zeit werde ich das ganze Manuskript durchgearbeitet, vorläufig übersetzt und sorgfältig kollationiert haben. ... Mir ist es nicht zweifelhaft, dass diese Sammlung die wichtigste des Fundes ist. Im August bringe ich Ihnen die Übersetzung des Apokryphon Jakobi, des Briefes an Rheginos und des Evangeliums der Wahrheit, wenn fertig, mit.}

At about that time [January 1953] I will have worked through, preliminarily translated, and carefully collated the whole manuscript. ...

I do not doubt that this collection is the most important of the find. In August I bring you the translations of the Apocryphon of James, the Letter to Rheginos, and the Gospel of Truth, if finished.

Apparently Meier had not received the translation in August, for on 7 September 1952 Puech wrote to Meier:\footnote{7 ix 52: Letter from Puech to Meier: Je lui avais, du reste, écrit au début d’août afin de recevoir de lui la traduction du Codex qu’il devait me remettre vers cette date, ainsi qu’il était entendu entre lui, M. G. Quispel et moi-même. Mais je n’ai encore obtenu aucune réponse.}

I have, besides, written to him [Malinine] at the beginning of August, in order to receive from him the translation of the Codex, which he was to submit to me around that date, as was agreed between him, G. Quispel and myself. But I have not yet received any reply.

On 29 September 1952 Puech wrote Quispel:\footnote{29 ix 52: Letter from Puech to Quispel: M. Malinine ne m’ayant donné aucun signe de vie depuis notre rencontre, je lui avais écrit au début d’août pour lui rappeler nos conventions et lui demander de me fixer au plus tôt un rendez-vous afin d’étudier avec lui les textes du Codex Jung, dont il devait me remettre une première traduction. ... Il n’a pu jusqu’ici traduire que le premier écrit de notre Codex, la Lettre (?) de Jacques, dont il me transmet une première version. Il compte toutefois se mettre bientôt à la traduction de l’Évangile de Vérité et des écrits qui suivent. Je lui réponds par le même courrier en lui disant combien je tiens à le rencontrer tout prochainement, ainsi qu’il me le propose, du reste, lui-même. Soyez sûr que j’insisterai}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{23 vi 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier.}
  \item \footnote{8 vii 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier: Gegen diese Zeit werde ich das ganze Manuskript durchgearbeitet, vorläufig übersetzt und sorgfältig kollationiert haben. ... Mir ist es nicht zweifelhaft, dass diese Sammlung die wichtigste des Fundes ist. Im August bringe ich Ihnen die Übersetzung des Apokryphon Jakobi, des Briefes an Rheginos und des Evangeliums der Wahrheit, wenn fertig, mit.}
  \item \footnote{7 ix 52: Letter from Puech to Meier: Je lui avais, du reste, écrit au début d’août afin de recevoir de lui la traduction du Codex qu’il devait me remettre vers cette date, ainsi qu’il était entendu entre lui, M. G. Quispel et moi-même. Mais je n’ai encore obtenu aucune réponse.}
  \item \footnote{29 ix 52: Letter from Puech to Quispel: M. Malinine ne m’ayant donné aucun signe de vie depuis notre rencontre, je lui avais écrit au début d’août pour lui rappeler nos conventions et lui demander de me fixer au plus tôt un rendez-vous afin d’étudier avec lui les textes du Codex Jung, dont il devait me remettre une première traduction. ... Il n’a pu jusqu’ici traduire que le premier écrit de notre Codex, la Lettre (?) de Jacques, dont il me transmet une première version. Il compte toutefois se mettre bientôt à la traduction de l’Évangile de Vérité et des écrits qui suivent. Je lui réponds par le même courrier en lui disant combien je tiens à le rencontrer tout prochainement, ainsi qu’il me le propose, du reste, lui-même. Soyez sûr que j’insisterai}
\end{itemize}
Since Malinine has not given me any sign of life since our meeting, I had written him at the beginning of August to remind him of our agreements and to ask of him to settle with me upon a meeting as soon as possible, in order to study with him the texts of the Jung Codex, of which he is to submit to me a first translation. ...

Up to the present he has not been able to translate anything except the first text of our Codex, the *Letter (?) of James* [= I,2], of which he transmits to me a first version. Nonetheless he counts on soon getting to the translation of the *Gospel of Truth* and the writings that follow.

I reply to him by the same mail in telling him how much I hold to meeting him quite soon, as, after all, he himself proposed to me. Rest assured that I shall insist with him that he make amends, if it is not already done, for his negligence with regard to you. As soon as I have seen him, I will pass on to you the results of our conversation. Believe me, I deplore, as do you, such a heedlessness, a bit too ‘Slav.’ ...

A first reading, still rapid, of the *Letter of James* (in reality, a secret revelation of Jesus to Peter and James transmitted by the latter in epistolary form) has let me down a bit. The content of the text seems to me of relatively mediocre interest, and the translation of Malinine should be seriously revised and rectified. Some passages present a doubtful meaning or remain incomprehensible. ...

The results of your negotiations with Dr. Meier seem to me satisfactory. It will nonetheless be fitting that he obtain as soon as possible the right to dispose freely of the Codex and to publish it. It is painful to have to keep silent until then on this important collection, be it in our works, be it in our instruction. When will we be permitted to let the article, composed jointly, which will assess it for the first time, appear in *Vigiliae Christianae*?
On 21 October 1952 Quispel wrote to Meier:\textsuperscript{316}

> It took some time before I could write, since Malinine has not worked. Now he writes me that he will come to me at the beginning of November, and around Easter has the manuscript complete for publication.

Still as late as 2 February 1953 Quispel wrote Meier of the delays, just having been informed that Rascher wanted the whole manuscript by the middle of June 1953, a deadline that already seemed difficult to meet:\textsuperscript{317}

> The publisher Brill has just phoned me and reported that Rascher still wants to have the whole manuscript around the middle of June.

> Now already a few weeks ago I sent to Puech a draft of the introduction, and to Malinine a German translation. But they did not answer.

> If anything is to come of your plan, it would be desirable for you personally to call urgently upon Malinine to send within one week the transcription of the Coptic text to Brill. It can then begin setting type.

> It would also be desirable that you communicate personally to Puech how you (as owner) want the edition, and that you want to have it finished by mid-June. After all, one needs him neither for the Translation nor for the Introduction.

\textsuperscript{316} 21 x 52: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

> Es hat einige Zeit gedauert, ehe ich schreiben konnte, weil Malinine nicht gearbeitet hat. Jetzt schreibt er mir, dass er Anfang November zu mir kommt und um Ostern das Manuskript für die Veröffentlichung fertig hat.

\textsuperscript{317} 2 ii 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

> Der Verlag Brill hat mich soeben angerufen und mitgeteilt, Rascher wolle doch etwa halb Juni das ganze Manuskript haben.

> Nun habe ich schon vor einigen Wochen Herrn Puech einen Entwurf der Einleitung und Herrn Malinine eine deutsche Übersetzung geschickt. Sie antworteten aber nicht.

> Wenn etwas von Ihrem Plan kommen soll, wäre es erwünscht, dass Sie persönlich Herrn Malinine dringend auffordern, er schicke innerhalb einer Woche die Transkription des koptischen Textes an Brill. Der kann dann anfangen zu setzen.

> Auch wäre es wünscht, dass Sie Herrn Puech persönlich mitteilen, wie Sie (als Besitzer) die Ausgabe wünschen, und dass Sie wünschen, sie sei halb Juni fertig. Schliesslich braucht man ihn nicht, weder für die Übersetzung noch für die Einleitung.


> Persönliches Eingreifen Ihrerseits ist sehr erwünscht. ...

> P.S. Auch wenn die Ausgabe nicht genau am Geburtstag fertig wäre, müsste sie doch endlich in diesem Jahr erscheinen.
We have agreed that I come around 14 April to Paris for the Introduction. Then one has still at least a month to formulate that. Meanwhile Malinine can make the Indices.

Personal intervention on your part is much to be desired. ...

P.S. Even if the edition would not be complete exactly on the birthday, it would after all finally have to appear in this year.

On 6 April 1953 Puech wrote Quispel that Malinine had supplied him with two inadequate drafts of the translation (‘the second much better than the first, but still incomplete’):\textsuperscript{318}

However I have to be more certain of the exactitude of the present translation, which, in too many places, remains approximate, uncertain, or hardly even intelligible.

I think, besides, that Malinine is at the moment with you, and that you are attempting to elucidate together the difficulties of the text. Perhaps, as a result, it will be possible to dream, on the return of our colleague, of a first draft of the edition.

What do you think of this suggestion? I do not have any news from Dr. Meier, and do not know if he has arrived at settling the difficulties that the Egyptian government could raise. It is true that the situation down there is not at all the most favorable for a rapid and precise solution. However it would be

\textsuperscript{318} 6 iv 53: Letter from Puech to Quispel: “... la seconde bien meilleure que la première, mais encore incomplète”:

Il me faudrait cependant être plus sûr de l’exactitude de la traduction actuelle, qui, en de trop nombreux endroits, demeure approximative, incertaine, ou même peu intelligible.

Je pense, d’ailleurs, que Malinine est actuellement auprès de vous et que vous tentez d’élucider de concert les difficultés du texte. Peut-être, de la sorte, sera-t-il possible de songer, dès le retour de notre collègue, à une première ébauche d’édition.

Qu’envisagez-vous à ce propos? Je n’ai aucune nouvelle du Dr. Meier et ne sais s’il est parvenu à régler les difficultés que pourrait susciter le Gouvernement Égyptien. Il est vrai que la situation n’est point là-bas des plus favorable à une solution rapide et précise. Il conviendrait pourtant que nos droits fussent fixés avant d’entreprendre la préparation de la publication, c’est-à-dire un lourd et long travail qui ne doit ni rester vain ni nous valoir une série de déboires ou de désagréments.

useful that our rights are settled before undertaking the preparation of the publication, that is to say, a heavy and long task that should neither remain in vain nor cost us a series of vexations or disagreements.

The question of printing and publishing at the *Imprimerie Nationale* in Paris of the ensemble of the library found at Nag Hammadi remains in suspense, as long as Egypt has not made known its decision as to the rest of the lot that it holds. The affair, though still very mixed up, is on a good course, but is not resolved definitively. Alone, the Coptic text of the first volume is in large part printed [by Brill in The Netherlands, not by the *Imprimerie Nationale* in Paris].

I follow, in my courses at the *École des Hautes Études*, the elaboration of the commentary.

This was followed promptly by a second letter from Puech to Quispel.\(^{319}\)

All that you tell me of the deferred negotiations of Dr. Meier and of the abusive pretensions of Mrs. Eid [Simone Eid: “This is a somewhat harsh and unfair term in my regard, given the situation in which I found myself.”\(^{320}\)] risk very much to delay the publication of the Jung collection. This is very regrettable. Nonetheless, it seems to me that, for juridical as well as scientific reasons, there is no reason to hurry too much. What should be obtained is the right to use the papyrus freely and publicly, and to study its contents, be it in

\(^{319}\) n iv 53: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

>Tout ce que vous me dites des négociations différées du Dr. Meier et des prétentions abusives de Mme Eid. [Simone Eid: “C’est un terme un peu dur et injuste à mon égard, vu la situation dans laquelle je me trouvais.”] risquent fort de retarder la publication du recueil Jung. C’est fort regrettable. Toutefois, il me semble que, pour des raisons juridiques aussi bien que scientifiques, il n’y a pas lieu de trop se hâter. Ce qu’il faudrait obtenir, c’est le droit de disposer librement et publiquement du papyrus et d’en étudier le contenu soit dans des conférences ou des communications, soit dans notre enseignements, soit dans des articles ou des notes préliminaires. Ce droit devrait être acquis au plus tôt, dès le novembre prochain, en tout cas, ainsi que vous le suggérez.

Confier l’impression du volume à l’Imprimerie nationale de Paris et le faire paraître comme l’un des tomes de la Collection complète des papyrus gnostiques de Nag-Hammadi me paraît non seulement souhaitable, mais très possible. J’engagerai ici les négociations nécessaires dès que seront réglées les questions générales concernant notre recueil et les onze autres volumes détenu par le Gouvernement Égyptien. Si vous le croyez bon, nous associerons à l’édition Kahle ou, plutôt, Till. Mais nous pourrions aussi faire appel à l’excellent coptisant français qu’est M. Lacau. Je le connais fort bien, ainsi que Malinine. Il s’intéresse aux nouveaux textes et ne demandera certainement pas que son nom soit joint aux nôtres sur la couverture.

\(^{320}\) 28 iv 82: Simone Eid:

>C’est un terme un peu dur et injuste à mon égard, vu la situation dans laquelle je me trouvais.
conferences or communications, be it in our courses, be it in articles and preliminary notes. This right should be acquired as soon as possible, by next November, in any case, as you suggest.

To entrust the printing of the volume to the *Imprimerie Nationale* of Paris and to have it appear as one of the tomes of the complete Collection of the Gnostic papyri of Nag Hammadi seems to me not only desirable, but very possible. I will undertake here the necessary negotiations as soon as the general questions concerning our collection and the eleven other volumes held by the Egyptian government are resolved.

If you think well of it, we will add Kahle to the edition, or, rather, Till. But we could also appeal to the excellent French coptologist, Lacau. I know him quite well, as does Malinine. He is interested in the new texts, and certainly will not demand that his name be joined to ours on the cover.

Malinine had gone to The Netherlands to work with Quispel on 11–20 April 1953.321 Thereupon Quispel wrote Meier:322

Malinine was here a whole week. We have translated the Valentinian myth, which contains very much about demons, archons, etc. Quite fabulous. He has promised to send me the whole translation within three weeks. Hopefully he keeps his promise.

Puech wrote Quispel, planning a work session with him in Utrecht for four or five days beginning 27 July 1953.323
I am persuaded that we can do good work. All the last days I have studied thoroughly the translations of Malinine, and have succeeded, I think, in dissipating most of the difficulties, and in understanding, almost completely, the meaning of the four texts [1,2–5]. ...

It no longer seems to me doubtful that all the writings of the collection are Valentinian, and from the middle or second half of the second century, probably. ...

After discussion, the confrontation of our respective research, and the revision of the passages still obscure or incomprehensible, it seems to me that it will be easy for us to draft our article.

Has Maliline furnished you the ingredients of the few pages that should be consecrated to the particular characteristics of the Coptic employed by the translator, the date of the manuscript, and, in a more general way, the philological and palaeographical questions posed by the collection?

Knowing the state of the spirits in today's Egypt, I repeat to you that it would be imprudent on our part to let the planned article appear without have received in writing from Dr. Meier the necessary guarantees.

Meier wrote Quispel that he would be attending a meeting of psychologists at Utrecht from 30 July to 5 August 1953, and hoped to meet with him on that occasion.\(^{324}\) In fact he met there both Puech and Quispel hard at work, and on his return reported to Page enthusiastically about his visit:\(^{325}\)

Both are in the highest degree enthusiastic, and now have a thoroughly intelligible French translation so-to-speak completed.

Meier's initial idea of publishing in 1953 a one-volume edition of the Jung Codex in time for Jung's birthday on 26 July 1953, seems to have been replaced by successively more limited objectives: He hoped to have a French translation available at the time of the public announcement, which would

\(^{324}\) 21 vii 53: Letter from Meier to Quispel.
\(^{325}\) 7 viii 53: Letter from Meier to Page:

Die beiden sind in höchstem Masse begeistert und haben jetzt eine durchaus verständliche französische Übersetzung sozusagen fertig.
be the ‘baptism’ of the Eid Codex as the ‘Jung Codex’ on 15 November 1953 [see Part 5 below]. Meier’s efforts to find someone to produce a German translation of the Codex on the basis of the French translation had long since been given up. Then he hoped to have at least *The Gospel of Truth* published at the celebration of Jung’s eightieth birthday on 25 July 1955, which was to take place the day before that birthday (see Chapter 4, Part 3). This indicates how the objective was progressively reduced and deferred, as the enormity of the task and the sluggishness of the editors became progressively evident.

**Seeking Access to ‘the Missing 40 Pages’**

The problem that the Jung Codex was not complete, that is to say, some pages were missing, was raised by Puech in a letter of 27 July 1951 to Quispel. Puech referred Quispel to Puech’s 1950 inventory:

> Collection corresponding to the volume purchased by Eid and nine supplemental leaves found in the lot whose acquisition is at present offered to the Egyptian government. … Rather well conserved, it seems, it should contain in all 168 pages (about 150 pages held by Eid and 18 pages in the hands of another individual).

Doresse had inexactly reported in 1949 that the Tano collection included ‘18 leaves,’ i.e. 36 pages. At the public announcement of the acquisition of the Jung Codex on 15 November 1953, Puech listed as sequestered only ‘eight leaves detached from the manuscript.’ Puech and Quispel report at

---

326 19 vii 53: Letter from Nill Hoerni to Meier.
327 27 vii 51: Letter from Puech to Quispel.

Recueil correspondant au volume acheté par M. Eid et à neuf feuillets complémentaires retrouvés dans le lot dont l’acquisition est actuellement offerte au Gouvernement égyptien. … Assez bien conservé, semble-t-il, il devait comporter en tout 168 pages (150 pages environ détenues par M. Eid et 18 pages aux mains d’un autre particulier).


> … 18 feuillets [sic!] ….

330 15 xi 53: Puech’s presentation at the celebration:
this time that in the purchase from Mrs. Eid 'the collection is reduced to a hundred pages and a few fragments,'\textsuperscript{331} whereupon their estimation of the size of the whole Codex vacillated from 154 or 156 down to 136 or 138, with from 18 to 20 missing pages neither in the Eid nor in the Tano collection.\textsuperscript{332} Actually, there were only 38 pages from Codex I in the Tano collection and 100 in the Eid collection, plus 2 pages too fragmentary to have been counted, with only 4 pages out of the original 144 pages completely and permanently missing.\textsuperscript{333} But the expression, ‘the missing 40 pages,’ though known to be imprecise, persisted as something like a technical term.

Eid's film, made prior to the exportation of the Codex from Egypt, did not contain more pages than the material acquired by the Jung Institute, as Quispel later reported.\textsuperscript{334}

Yet after a visit from Mrs. Eid in Zürich, Meier wrote Quispel:\textsuperscript{335}

As to the missing 40 pages, Mrs. Eid is of the opinion that possibly they are not at all among the codices sequestered in Cairo. She believes she recalls unclearly that Eid, already before he purchased our Codex, once gave out a rather large sum for another codex, and that it possibly could have had to do with those 40 pages. She believes that that codex was sold to France and Puech had something to do with it.


\textsuperscript{335} 25 iii 53: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Was die fehlenden 40 Seiten betrifft, so ist Frau Eid der Ansicht, dass dieselben möglicherweise gar nicht bei den in Kairo sequestrierten Codices seien. Sie glaubt sich dunkel zu erinnern, dass Mr. Eid schon bevor er unsern Codex ankaufte, einmal eine grössere Summe für einen andern Codex ausgegeben habe und dass es sich dabei möglicherweise um jene 40 Seite habe handeln können. Sie glaubt, dass jener Codex nach Frankreich verkauft worden sei und dass Puech etwas damit zu tun gehabt habe.
Of course a codex or leaves were not sold to France, and Puech knew nothing about them. The false rumor may be based on a garbled memory of the fact that Codex I came to Eid in two lots, the first of which included 41 folios or their equivalent in fragments, together with the leather cover; the cover did in fact go to France (see Part 2 above).

Von Fischer reported that Mrs. Eid had told him a somewhat similar vague memory:

The missing 40 leaves [i.e. pages] of your Codex are still in the hands of the bedouin. One could perhaps know where they are, but it is again dangerous to come in contact with them, since one thus would get the reputation of carrying on illegal trade with papyri.

Mrs. E[id] does not believe that these 40 pages are with the others in the Coptic Museum.

Fortunately, these memories of Simone Eid seem to be inaccurate, and were largely ignored. But they did render uncertain whether ‘the missing 40 pages’ were with the Tano-Dattari collection.

Meier posed to Quispel the problem of gaining access to ‘the missing 40 pages’ in time to include them in the volume he hoped to publish when the acquisition of the Codex is made public:

If they are not in France: How then do we get them out of Egypt, before we can even speak of it at all, according to our contractual obligation with Mrs. Eid? That we secure them from the Egyptians, in that we make the whole Codex a present for them, I hold to be certain. But unfortunately this will first be possible after the grace period has expired. For the time being, I see here no way out. Would you please tell me once quite clearly how you conceive of this.

---

336 18 x 53: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Die 40 fehlenden Blätter Ihres Codex seien noch in Händen der Bedouinen; man könne evtl. wissen, wo sie seien, aber es sei wieder gefährlich mit ihnen in Kontakte zu kommen, da man so in den Ruf komme illegalen Handel mit Papyri zu treiben.

Frau E. glaubt nicht, dass diese 40 Seiten mit den anderen im Musée Copte seien.

337 20 iv 53: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Quispel replied, presupposing either that the volume would not be published by the time of the public announcement or that it would be published without ‘the missing 40 pages’.

I imagine that, immediately after it is made known, von Fischer gets into contact with the Egyptian government, to negotiate the exchange of the missing pages, of course if they are sold by then.

Meier then wrote von Fischer:

The main problem is now the missing 40 pages of our Codex, which most probably are among the other sequestered papyri in Cairo. It would be a calamity if we had to publish our Codex incomplete. But, to obtain the pages, we have to get in contact with the Egyptians. In the process, we could at the same time make them the offer of the gift of the Codex. A further fantasy of mine is that George H. Page might perhaps be ready to give the Egyptians the money to purchase the rest of the papyri, on the condition that for this the Jung Institute receives the right to publish the thing along with the French.

Puech wrote Meier favoring the involvement of Page, sending his inventory of all the codices from the Crum volume to lend to Page, and saying he would meet with the French officials in October 1953 ‘about the plan that you have submitted to me,’ as well as inquiring about the result of the conversations with von Fischer. Meier later forwarded Puech’s inventory to Page as an expression of appreciation for an evening they spent together with von Fischer.

---

338 21 iv 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Ich stelle mir vor, dass unmittelbar nach der Bekanntmachung Herr von Fischer sich mit der Ägyptischen Regierung in Verbindung stellt, um über den Austausch der fehlenden Seiten zu verhandeln, allerdings wenn sie dann verkauft sind.

339 7 viii 53: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Das Hauptproblem sind jetzt die 40 fehlenden Seiten unseres Codex, welche sich mit größter Wahrscheinlichkeit bei den sequestrierten anderen Papyri in Kairo befinden. Es wäre ein Jammer, wenn wir unseren Codex unvollständig herausgeben müssten. Um die Seiten aber zu erhalten, müssten wir uns mit den Ägyptern in Verbindung setzen. Wir könnten ihnen dabei gleichzeitig die Offerte des Geschenkes des Codex machen. Eine weitere Phantasie von mir ist, dass Herr George H. Page vielleicht bereit wäre, den Ägyptern das Geld zum Ankauf für die übrigen Papyri zu schenken unter der Bedingung, dass das Jung-Institut dafür das Recht erhält, die Sache zusammen mit den Franzosen zu publizieren.

340 30 viii 53: Letter from Puech to Meier:

... du projet que vous m’avez soumis.

341 23 ix 53: Letter from Meier to Page.
Meier reported to Quispel the plan that had emerged: 342

Regarding our Codex, v[on] Fischer, on his return, i.e. after 10 November, will first seek to obtain the missing 40 pages from the Egyptians. If it would became necessary that you travel to Egypt on their behalf, I wonder who can pay for these travel costs. For I cannot very well come again and again to Page, especially where he perhaps is willing to pay this much higher sum for the other volumes!

Meier wrote von Fischer about the plans as they were developing: 343

It should be possible that the experts there can decide which pages those are. The worse case scenario would be that Quispel would have to travel to Cairo, in which case however I do not know who should pay these expenses.

Whether you should already speak of our gift in the matter of the 40 pages, or only when you want to achieve that we may also edit the other texts, is a question that I do not yet see through. Perhaps I must leave that wholly to you, or to the particular circumstances at the time. ...

Of course the Egyptians do not get the Jung Codex for nothing! It must be emphasized that an editor, or committee of translators, i.e. a larger group of

342 6 ix 53: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Was unseren Codex betrifft, so wird Herr v. Fischer bei seiner Rückkehr, d.h. nach dem Termin vom 10.xi. zunächst versuchen die fehlenden 40 Seiten von den Ägyptern zu erhalten. Wenn es nötig würde, dass Sie nach Ägypten fahren deswegen frage ich mich, wer diese Reisespesen zahlen kann. Ich kann nämlich nicht gut immer wieder an Herrn Page gelangen, besonders wo er vielleicht diese weit grössere Summe für die übrigen Bände zahlen will!

343 6 ix 53: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Es sollte möglich sein, dass die dortigen Fachleute entscheiden können, welche Seiten das sind. Schlimmsten Falles müsste Herr Quispel nach Cairo reisen, wobei ich aber nicht weiss, wer diese Spesen bezahlen soll.

Ob Sie schon bei der Frage nach den 40 Seiten von unserem Geschenk sprechen sollen, oder erst, wenn Sie erwirken wollen, dass wir die übrigen Texte auch edieren dürfen, ist eine Frage die ich noch nicht durchschaue. Vielleicht muss ich das ganz Ihnen, bzw. dannzumaligen Umständen überlassen. ...

Natürlich bekommen die Ägypter den Codex Jung nicht für nichts! Es muss betont werden, dass ein Herausgeber, bzw. Übersetzer-Committee, d.h. ein grösseres Gremium von internationalen Fachleuten gebildet werden soll, wobei auch die Ägyptischen Fachleute sein sollen und die Ägypter auch gewisse Mitspracherechte haben sollen. Eigentlich sollte man ja dafür nichts zu bezahlen haben. Die Offerte, dass wir den Ägyptern vielleicht etwas Geld geben können, damit sie die Codices rechtmässig erwerben können ist ja ohnehin noch hypothetisch und falls die Ägypter die Codices nun tatsächlich schon besitzen überflüssig. Dann bleibt unser einziger Trumpf das Geschenk des Codex Jung, sodass Sie dann mit diesem Köder sparsam umgehen müssen.
international experts, should be set up, in which also the Egyptian experts should be included, and the Egyptians should also have certain rights to play a part. Actually one should of course not have to pay anything for that. The offer that we could perhaps give the Egyptians some money so that they could obtain the codices legally, is, after all, in any case still hypothetical, and, in case the Egyptians actually now already possess the codices, superfluous. Then our only trump card remains the gift of the Jung Codex, so that you must then act frugally with this enticement.

Quispel answered that he could get a travel grant, but could only go during the vacations, i.e., after 1 December, and then only if it were really necessary.\textsuperscript{344}

A month later Quispel wrote Meier:\textsuperscript{345}

It is a pity that Puech has heard about your plans with the other texts. He is very afraid that the Gallic honor is threatened. We must seek to reassure him in Zürich.

Meier replied that he would write Puech opposing such nationalism:\textsuperscript{346}

A pity, if Puech is disturbed. I will write him. Science is international, and the passport is not to play any roll in the process. Besides, after all we want to work with him, and, if necessary, also with still other French, and not against him. We need him most assuredly, as has already been shown.

Quispel pointed out to Meier the danger that Puech’s nationalism could pose:\textsuperscript{347}

Puech is a nationalist, and I think even now is working on political persons to get ahead of you.

\textsuperscript{344} 8 ix 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier.
\textsuperscript{345} Circa 4 x 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Es ist schade, dass Puech über Ihre Pläne mit den andern Schriften vernommen hat. Er fürchtet sehr, dass die gallische Ehre bedroht wird. Wir müssen versuchen, ihn in Zürich zu beruhigen.

\textsuperscript{346} 6 x 53: Letter from Meier to Quispel:


\textsuperscript{347} 9 x 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Meier did wrote Puech against such nationalism, but using the Egyptians rather than Puech himself as his illustration:\footnote{8 x 53: Letter from Meier to Puech: Ich möchte hierzu gerne Ihre wertvollen Ratschläge haben und hoffe, für den Fall eines Gelingens sehr auf Ihr Mitwirken als wichtigster und unentbehrlicher Mitarbeiter, bzw. als leitender Mann der Gesamtausgabe. Ich habe gutes Vertauen darauf, dass es uns gelingen wird diesen nationalistischen Unsinn der Ägypter zugunsten der Wissenschaft zu überwinden. Es wäre doch wirklich beschämend, wenn der passeport wichtiger wäre als der universale Geist.}

I would very much like to have your valuable suggestions on this, and I hope very much, in case it succeeds, on your collaboration as the most important and indispensable coworker, i.e. as the leading person for the whole edition. I have great confidence that we will succeed in overcoming this nationalistic nonsense of the Egyptians, in favor of science. It would after all be really shameful if the passport were more important than the universal spirit.

Quispel in retrospect has summarized the French egotism as follows:

Jung and Meier acted scholarly and unselfishly when they wanted to put these manuscripts at the disposal of the competent scholars. Therefore they were ready to give the Jung Codex back. This generous feeling inspired Page when he wanted to pay Tano in order to finish his quarrel with the Coptic Museum.

... Compare their generosity with the egotism of the French: Drioton who deceived Tano, Puech who said Doresse was a plagiarist, but really minded that he had contacted Lefort in Louvain and Barrett in Paris. The team of French, allegedly formed by Puech, never existed.

Von Fischer wrote Meier about steps that could be taken to make a positive impression on the Egyptians:\footnote{7 x 53: Letter from von Fischer to Meier: Wegen unserer Codices, wollte ich Sie noch um die Liste der hauptsächlichen Wissenschaftler bitten, die die Herausgabe derselben besorgen sollten. Es ist dies vielleicht ein wichtiges Verhandlungselement. Wären Sie geneigt, einen Ägypter in dieser Corona aufzunehmen? Wenn ja, welchen? Wären Sie eventuell einverstanden, dass ein ägypt. Wissenschaftler das Ehrenpräsidium übernähme? Könnte eventuell das schweiz. archäologische Institut in Kairo eingeschaltet werden, für den Fall, dass wir jemanden als Korrespondenten in Kairo haben, der unsere Interessen vertritt und zugleich das wissenschaftliche Vertrauen der Ägypter hätte?}

Regarding our codices, I wanted to ask you also for the list of the main scholars who are to carry out their publication. This is perhaps an important element in the negotiations. Would you be inclined to take up an Egyptian into this corona? If so, whom? Would you perhaps be in agreement that an Egyptian scholar take over the honorary presidency? Could perhaps the Swiss
Archaeological Institute in Cairo be brought in, so as to have someone as correspondent in Cairo who represents our interests, and at the same time has the scholarly confidence of the Egyptians?

Meier replied by return mail agreeing with von Fischer, but also emphasizing the interests of the Jung Institute:

Regarding your ideas about the codices, the idea of bringing in the Archaeological Institute seems to me quite excellent. But regarding the personnel I am not informed, and would have to leave it completely up to you. Also regarding an Egyptian, the matter seems to me harmless, to the extent it is someone who has an interest in seeing to it that the things appear as rapidly as possible. But in my view the honorary president should be a Swiss, why not perhaps C.G. Jung! If, because of the Egyptians, there is no great rush, I could then on 14 November talk with Puech, who knows the experts there, but not earlier, since Puech even so feels his national pride threatened at the moment. In any case, one could say to the Egyptians that one wants to bring out the whole series also under the patronage of the Coptic Museum, as it is already the case with the volume handled by the French. But the C.G. Jung Institute would have to stand in equal rank on the cover, if indeed not in first place. But in no case should it fail for that reason. The main thing remains that we organize it in grand style and thus can assure a prompt publication. Incidentally, it would be wonderful if, already on 14 November, one could say that one will obtain the missing 40 pages!

Von Fischer sent Meier suggestions for giving the Egyptians a good impression of the Swiss in regard to the Jung Codex:


---

350 8 x 53: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:


351 16 x 53: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:
Puech and Doresse are to translate and comment on the pieces [in Codex III]. A beginning of the work has been done, but the publication did not take place, since Puech and Doresse quarreled with the Director of the Coptic Museum over the ‘honor’ of being sole editors! ...

Regarding our Codex, its existence is known, but one apparently does not know exactly where it is. It is now important that one here be clear that we bought it legally and in Europe, i.e. that the document did not come illegally to us with our approval through the diplomatic courier or however.

It is hence important that in this regard we create most of all a good atmosphere and engage the spirits for us. This new point of view changes our tactics. I would now suggest the following:

Our Institute announces already now, i.e. as soon as possible, before 14 November, the appearance of the Codex, and from the very beginning states that it purchased the Codex in Switzerland. For this, it writes a letter, along the lines of the appended draft, to the ‘Direction des antiquités’ in Cairo. In this way we can achieve, 1°, that the Egyptian authorities learn about the appearance of the Codex directly and ahead of time, and not belatedly and through the press, and know, 2°, that the Codex was not bought in Egypt and then illegally brought out of the country.

Thereupon Meier wrote along the lines indicated by von Fischer a formal letter to Dr. Moustafa Amer, General Director of the Department of Antiquities in Cairo:

---

Puech & Doresse sollten die Stücke übersetzen und kommentieren. Eine erste Arbeit ist gemacht worden, aber die Herausgabe fand nicht statt, weil sich Puech & Doresse mit dem Direktor des Musée Copte wegen der “Ehre” zankten, alleinige Herausgeber zu sein! ...

Was unseren Codex betrifft, so ist dessen Existenz bekannt, aber man weiss offenbar nicht genau, wo er liegt. Es ist jetzt wichtig, dass man hier darüber im Bilde ist, dass wir ihn rechtmässig und in Europa gekauft haben, d.h. dass das Dokument nicht durch unseren dipl. Kurier oder sonst wie mit unserem Willen illegal zu uns gekommen ist.

Es ist daher wichtig, dass wir hier vor allem eine gute Atmosphäre schaffen und die Geister für uns einnehmen. Dieser neue Gesichtspunkt ändert unsere Taktik. Ich würde nun folgendes vorschlagen:


---

22 x 53: Letter from Meier to Moustafa Amer:
In 1951 [read: 1952], we were able to buy in Zürich a Gnostic papyrus of the very greatest importance for studies that our Institute pursues, i. e. a text concerning the psychology of religions. We immediately brought together a group of scholars of international reputation to copy, translate and comment on this text. This work is today ended, and we are happy to be able to announce to you that the said manuscript will be published next 15 November in Zürich under the patronage of our Institute.

On the other hand, we have learned in the course of the work that the Coptic Museum of Cairo has acquired some time ago two volumes [read: one Codex, Codex III] of the same series to which the papyrus that we possess belongs, and that these texts have already been the object of preliminary work in view of their publication. From the press we also know that other volumes, all of the same series, have been offered to the Egyptian Government, but that no decision has yet been made regarding them.

Now, desirous of continuing our work, we would like to know if the Government anticipates the purchase and publication of these other volumes. In case it does, we would be pleased to offer you our collaboration, and to put at your disposal the treasure of experiences that we have already acquired in this field.

En 1951, nous avons pu acheter à Zürich un papyrus gnostique de la plus haute importance pour les études que poursuit notre Institut, soit un texte concernant la psychologie des religions. Nous avons aussitôt réuni un groupe de savants de réputation internationale pour relever, traduire et commenter cet écrit. Ce travail est aujourd’hui terminé et nous sommes heureux de pouvoir vous annoncer que ledit manuscrit sera publié le 15 novembre prochain à Zürich sous le patronage de notre Institut.

D’autre part, nous avons appris, en cours de travail, que le Musée Copte du Caire a acquis, il y a quelque temps, deux volumes de la même série à laquelle appartient le papyrus que nous possédons et que ces textes ont déjà fait l’objet de travaux preliminaires en vue de leur publication. Par la presse, nous savons aussi que d’autres volumes, toujours de la même série, ont été offerts au Gouvernement Égyptien, mais qu’aucune décision n’a encore été prise à leur sujet.

Or, désireux de continuer nos travaux, nous aimerions savoir si le Gouvernement envisage l’achat et la publication de ces autres volumes. Dans le cas positif, nous nous ferions un plaisir de vous offrir notre collaboration et de mettre à votre disposition le trésor des expériences que nous avons déjà acquises dans ce domaine.

Dans l’autre cas, nous serions disposé à entreprendre nous-mêmes la publication de ces textes en faisant appel, comme jusqu’ici, à des spécialistes reçus; bien entendu, nous aimerions voir figurer parmi eux des savants égyptiens.

Nous vous serions fort reconnaissants de nous faire savoir le plus rapidement possible ce que vous entendez faire, afin que nous puissions nous-mêmes rendre nos disposi-
In the other case, we would be disposed to undertake ourselves the publication of these texts, by appealing, as we have thus far, to distinguished specialists. Of course we would like to see among them Egyptian scholars.

We would be very grateful to you to let us know as rapidly as possible what you plan to do, so that we can ourselves make our plans.

This official letter served as a basis for good relations with the Department of Antiquities of Egypt in the coming years. Of course Meier commends the Swiss initiative by making excessive claims, to the effect that the Jung Codex would be published in less than a month. Quite the contrary was the case. The final publication in the *editio princeps* took place only in 1975. But the complete publication presupposed the securing of publication rights for ‘the missing 40 pages’ that were in Cairo.

### 5. The ‘Baptism’ of the Eid Codex as the ‘Jung Codex’

The original concept of publishing a one-volume edition of the Jung Codex, if not for Jung’s birthday on 26 July 1953, then at least by 15 November 1953 when the ‘baptism’ of the Jung Codex was to be made public, was replaced during the autumn of 1953 by the objective of having a draft translation available for Jung to read in time to prepare his comments for the presentation ceremony, and to have a scholarly article, newspaper articles, and oral presentations prepared by Puech and Quispel in time for that event. This fell far short of the assurances that had been provided on 22 October 1953 to Mustapha Amer, General Director of the Egyptian Department of Antiquities: ‘This work is today ended.’ What did take place in the autumn of 1953 can be sketched as follows:

*Preparing Translations from the Jung Codex for the Ceremony*

As late as 21 September 1953 Puech wrote Quispel:

354 21 ix 53: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Comme vous, je suis géné par l’incertitude de certaines traductions. Il me paraît prématuré et, en tout cas, impossible pour le moment de publier tels quels tel ou tel passage des textes cités; je préfère sauter les phrases scabreuses et mettre à la place une série de points. Vous verrez—ou je verrai avec Malinine—s’il y a lieu d’améliorer ces passages.

---

Like you, I am annoyed by the uncertainty of certain translations. It seems to me premature and, in any case, impossible for the moment, to publish, as is, this or that passage of the texts we cite. I prefer to jump over rough phrases and put in their place a series of dots. You will see—or I will see with Malinine—if there is a way to improve these passages.

Around 4 October 1953 Quispel sent Meier the French translations of I,2,3 and a first part of I,5:355

You receive here a transcription of the *Apocryphon Johannis* [I,2], the *Evangelium of Truth* [I,3], the first part of the fourth text [i.e. I,5] (the Letter to Rheginos on the Resurrection [I,4] is with Puech).

Quispel wrote Meier:356

The difficulty with the second part [I, 91–136] of the fourth [read: fifth] text was that this was heavily corrected and is now still being worked on. If you need it urgently, I can still send it to you, but I would rather not. Further, you will note that our essay of 60 pages contains a much better text, and has intentionally chosen precisely the passages important for Jung.

Puech did forward to Meier *The Letter to Rheginos on the Resurrection* [I,4], though unedited, on 12 October 1953.357

Meier wrote Quispel358 and asked him to write Puech, to whom then Meier also wrote,359 that a summary of each of their speeches is to be published in the literary supplement of the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of 14–16 November 1953; the manuscript should reach Meier for translation and duplication as a press release no later than 23 October 1953.

Quispel had written Meier with regard to his own speech:360

---

355 Circa 4 x 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Sie empfangen hierbei eine Abschrift von Apokryphon Johannis, Evangelium der Wahrheit, 1. Teil der 4ten Schrift (der Brief an Rheginos über die Auferstehung ist bei Puech).

356 9 x 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier:


357 12 x 53: Letter from Puech to Meier.

358 10 x 53: Letter from Meier to Quispel.

359 14 x 53: Letter from Meier to Puech.

360 9 x 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier:
To prevent any difficulties, I send you my text, which you can correct in substance and language. I must yield completely to your wishes.

Later he added: 361

I have sent you a part of my lecture, in order that nothing becomes known about the facts that you do not wish known.

Meier wrote Quispel concerning his newspaper article that the Bollingen Foundation should be pushed into the background. 362 Quispel replied: 363

If a word or sentence is not appropriate, you can readily change it.

Meier wrote von Fischer, with whom he was in frequent correspondence about what should and should not be said, that he had telephoned Quispel to follow the ‘fiction’ proposed by von Fischer to protect Mrs. Eid. 364

The Codex was offered to me in Zürich, received and paid for here by me.

Already on receipt of Puech’s manuscript, Meier had written him that he had revised Puech’s newspaper article to omit reference to Eid and the plan to return the Codex to Egypt. 365 His secretary A. Jaffé also wrote the members of the Curatorium reminding them not to mention the plan to publish the other Nag Hammadi codices. 366

A comparison of Quispel’s manuscript with the article published in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of 14–16 November 1953 does in fact show the elimination of the names of Doresse, the Bollingen Foundation, and Barrett. 367

---

361 14 x 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Ich habe Ihnen einen Teil meines Vortrags geschickt, damit über die Tatsachen nichts bekannt werde, was Sie nicht wünschen.

362 15 x 53: Letter from Meier to Quispel.

363 Circa 17 x 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Wenn ein Wort oder Satz nicht opportun ist, können Sie es ruhig ändern.

364 26 x 53: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Der Kodex sei mir in Zürich angeboten, von mir hier in Empfang genommen und bezahlt worden.

365 11 xi 53: Letter from Meier to Puech.

366 13 xi 53: Letter from A. Jaffé to the Curatorium.

367 Gilles Quispel, “Der ‘Jung Codex,’” *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, n° 2708, 14 xi 53, Bl. 11; 14 xi 53: Fernausgabe Nr. 313, Bl. 11; n° 2716, 16 xi 53, Bl. II, 4; n° 2724, 16 xi 53, Bl. 12.
though the article was published including such items in the *Algemeen Handelsblad* of Amsterdam on 14 November 1953. In both publications of Quispel’s presentation the ‘fiction’ was replaced by the fact that Quispel, as Meier’s representative, made the purchase, whereas a deletion of a reference to Belgium left the location of the transaction open.

**Hesitations about the Ceremony**

The event of 14 November 1953 was shifted to 15 November 1953 due to a conflict in schedule with the *dies academicus* of the *Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule*. It developed into a very large event, held at the Zürich guild hall *Zum Ruden*,\(^\text{368}\) with a wide range of guests, including the academic, political, journalistic, and diplomatic circles, as well as the usual constituency of the Jung Institute. The very dimensions of the event caused some concern on the part of this constituency itself. For on 27 October 1953 Jung himself had written to Meier:\(^\text{369}\)

> I was never comfortable with the idea that the Codex is to be baptized in my name, where, after all, as it can be shown, I had the least merits for acquiring it. The large shindig that you want to set up brings me into the foreground to such an extent that it looks as if I have intended such a large personality cult. In reality I wanted, recognizing your good intentions, not to disturb...

---

\(^{368}\) Reported by Gilles Quispel, from his presentation ‘Jung and the Jung Codex,’ summarized at the meeting of the Los Angeles Jungian society ‘Panarion,’ on 4 September 1975. The speech was a free and abridged English translation of a paper whose 119-page typescript he left with me, as his host, which is quoted here, p. 97. The Dutch original had been published as “Jung en de Gnosis,” in C. Aalders, J.H. Blokker, and G. Quispel, *Jung—een mens voor deze tijd* (Rotterdam: Lemniscaat, 1975), 85–138.

\(^{369}\) 27 x 53: Letter from Jung to Meier:

> Es war mir nie geheuer bei dem Gedanken, dass der Codex auf meinen Namen getauft werden sollte, wo ich doch nachgewiesenermassen die geringsten Verdienste bei seiner Erwerbung hatte. Die grosse Veranstaltung, die Sie in die Wege leiten wollen, bringt mich dermassen in den Vordergrund, dass es so aussieht, als ob ich einen derartigen Personenkult beabsichtigt hätte. In Wirklichkeit wollte ich, in Anerkennung Ihrer guten Absicht, Ihre Freude an der Taufe des Codex nicht stören. Die Dimensionen, welche das Fest anzunehmen droht, stimmen so wenig mit meinem Geschmack überein, dass ich nicht mehr mittun kann und will. Ich will nicht in das falsche Licht eines ehrgeizigen und geltungssüchtigen Menschen kommen, was mir unfehlbar droht, wenn ich mich in die Mitte einer solchen überdimensionierten Aufmachung setze.

> Ich bitte Sie daher, von der Teilnahme meiner Person in jeder Hinsicht absehen zu wollen: ich will nicht der Mittelpunkt der Feier sein, noch will ich, dass der Codex auf meinen Namen getauft wird.
your pleasure in the baptism of the Codex. The dimensions that the festivity threatens to take on agree so little with my taste that I no longer can and will go along. I do not want to come into the false light of a conceited person seeking recognition, which without fail threatens me, if I put myself in the middle of such a super-dimensional show.

I hence ask you to be so kind as to leave out of account the participation of my person in every regard. I do not want to be the center of the celebration, nor do I want the Codex to be baptized in my name.

Actually Jung was reassured, and did go through with the event.

But the invitations, sent to the Curatorium, the governing board of the Jung Institute, also gave rise to reservations. Hence Meier wrote to von Fischer:

Yesterday I was asked to attend an ad hoc meeting of the Curatorium, in which it became clear that there are certain concerns that we could have difficulties with the Egyptian government, perhaps even risk a trial, which would compromise the name of Jung and of the Institute. Besides, Mr. Rilkin as a new member of the Curatorium registered concern that the firm of the family of his wife, to which he himself also now belongs, could have reason to fear reprisals. My reassurance that you, as protector of the Swiss colony in Egypt, would never have offered your hand to something that could endanger those you protect, did not quite suffice. Hence I have been asked to write to you immediately with the question as to whether it would be possible for you before 15 November to sound out Mustapha Amer and perhaps get from him an official declaration, or have him write us, that on the part of the Department of Antiquities there is no objection to the legality of our procedure. We would be happy if this reassurance would take place already before our event.

---

29 x 53: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Gestern bin ich zu einer ad hoc Sitzung des Curatoriums gebeten worden, wobei es sich herausstellte, dass gewisse Bedenken bestehen, wir könnten mit der ägyptische Regierung Schwierigkeiten bekommen, evtl. sogar einen Prozess riskieren, womit dann der Name Jung’s und des Institutes kompromittiert wäre. Ausserdem hat Herr Riklin als neues Curatoriums-Mitglied Bedenken angemeldet, dass die Firma der Familie seiner Frau, welcher er selber jetzt auch angehöre, Repressalien zu befürchten haben könnte. Meine Versicherung, dass Sie als Schutzherr der Schweizerkolonie in Ägypten niemals Hand geboten hätten zu etwas, was Ihre Schützlinge gefährden könnte, hat nicht ganz genügt. Ich bin deshalb gebeten worden, Ihnen sofort zu schreiben mit der Frage, ob es Ihnen wohl möglich wäre, schon vor dem 15. November bei Mustapha Amer zu sondieren und von ihm evtl. eine offizielle Erklärung zu erhalten, bezw. an uns schreiben zu lassen, dass von Seiten des Service des Antiquités kein Einspruch gegen die Rechtmässigkeit unseres Vorgehens besteht. Wir wären froh, wenn diese Beruhigung noch vor unserem Anlass stattfinden würde.
Although Meier sent Rilkin excerpts from von Fischer's previous letters to the effect that there was no danger, since the Codex had been legally acquired in Egypt, legally exported, and legally purchased outside Egypt, the next meeting of the Curatorium repeated its concerns and suggested that at the ceremony no names at all be mentioned. On 10 November 1953 von Fischer sent Meier an official response to the effect that the Department of Antiquities had no authority to pass on a legal purchase made in Europe, but that the ‘friendly reception' given by Moustapha Amer, Director of the Department of Egyptian Antiquities, indicated there should be no problem:

In reference to the correspondence exchanged on the topic of the Gnostic papyrus that you have the intention soon to publish, I have the honor to inform you that the Legation has, conformable to your wish, transmitted to Moustapha Amer, Director of the Egyptian Department of Antiquities in Cairo, the letter you intended for him.

Meanwhile E. Combe, Director of the Swiss Institute of Archaeology in Cairo, has seen Amer. Amer said to Combe that your communication had interested him a great deal and that he was personally favorable to a collaboration with your Institute regarding the publication of the other papyri that are part of the series with your own. He has however added that he did not yet know the opinion of Pahor Labib, Director of the Coptic Museum in Cairo, to whom he

---

371 29 x 53: Letter from Meier to Rilkin.
372 10 xi 53; Letter from Von Fischer to Meier: “acceuil amical”:

En me référant à la correspondance échangée au sujet du papyrus gnostique que vous avez l’intention de publier sous peu, j’ai l’honneur de vous faire savoir que la Legation a, conformément à votre désir, transmis à M. Moustapha Amer, Directeur du Service des Antiquités Égyptiennes au Caire, la lettre que vous lui destinez.

M. E. Combe, Directeur de l’Institut Suisse d’Archéologie au Caire, a vu M. Amer entretemps. M. Amer a dit à M. Combe que votre communication l’avait beaucoup intéressé et qu’il était personnellement favorable à une collaboration avec votre Institut pour ce qui concerne la publication des autres papyrus qui font partie de la série du vôtre; il a cependant ajouté qu’il ne connaissait pas encore l’opinion de M. Pahor Labib, directeur du Musée Copte au Caire, auquel il avait immédiatement donné connaissance de votre message. M. Amer pense qu’il pourra parler de votre projet lors de la prochaine séance du Conseil d’Administration du Musée Copte, mais il n’est pas sûr de pouvoir le faire, cette séance étant réservée à la réorganisation du dit Conseil. Une reponse à votre lettre se fera donc sans doute attendre un peu.

... Mais il me semble que l’acceuil amical que M. Amer a fait à votre communication vous met à l’abri de toute critique et vous permet d’augurer assez bien d’une future collaboration entre votre Institute et le Service des Antiquités Égyptiennes.
had immediately communicated your message. Amer thinks that he will be able to speak of your project at the next meeting of the Administrative Council of the Coptic Museum, but he is not sure he will be able to do so, since this meeting is reserved to the reorganization of this Council. One will hence no doubt have to wait a bit for a reply to your letter. ...

But it seems to me that the friendly reception that Amer gave to your communication protects you from any criticism and permits you to anticipate well enough a future collaboration between your Institute and the Department of Egyptian Antiquities.

*The Ceremony Itself*

The ‘baptism’ of the Codex in Jung’s name involved speeches by Puech and Quispel followed by Meier’s presentation of the Codex to Jung, which was only intended as a symbolic gesture. Meier sent this agenda to Puech:

After both of your lectures, which will last, as Quispel writes me, a total of 35 minutes, I will baptize the Codex in the name ‘C.G. Jung Codex’ and symbolically give it over to Jung.

In his presentation speech Meier said:

One could be tempted to say that the book has sought the Jung Institute since its discovery, and its 1500-year sleep as the ‘Seven-Sleepers’ has been calculated into this plot. This may be the hidden reason for the fact that the scholars, as you have seen, have already as a matter of course baptized the Codex the ‘Jung Codex.’ So now it has become the property of the Institute, whose *Heros eponymos* ['hero after whom it is named'] you are, honored Professor. It is hence nothing but a natural consequence, when I herewith ask you, as honorary President of the Institute, to receive the Codex into your trusted hands.

---

373 8 x 53: Letter from Meier to Puech:

Nach Ihren beiden Vorträgen, welche, wie mir Quispel schreibt, zusammen 35 Minuten dauern werden, werde ich den Codex auf den Name “Codex C.G. Jung” taufen und ihn symbolisch Jung übergeben.

374 15 xi 53: Speech by Meier:

Man könnte versucht sein zu sagen, das Buch habe das Jung-Institut seit seiner Entdeckung gesucht und sein 1500-jähriger Siebenschläfer-Schlaf sei in diesem Plot eincalculiert gewesen. Dies dürfte der verborgene Grund sein dafür, dass die Gelehrten, wie Sie gesehen haben, den Codex bereits in aller Selbstverständlichkeit “Codex Jung” getauft haben. Nun ist er also Eigentum des Instituts geworden, dessen Heros eponymos Sie, verehrter Herr Professor, sind. Es ist darum nichts als eine natürliche Consequenz, wenn ich Sie hiermit bitte als Ehrenpräsident des Institutes den Codex zu getreuen Händen zu nehmen.
Jung himself then made a brief speech to indicate the importance of the Codex, though his comments derive more from the texts of the heresiologist Hippolytus than from the rough translation that he had received belatedly from Quispel. The first draft of his speech, which was then edited prior to its actual presentation, had reflected some of the difficulty he had in getting access to the material and studying it thoroughly, in order to prepare his presentation. It originally included the somewhat awkward formulation:

At present, unfortunately, I know only three of the treatises contained in the Codex. One of these is important, so it seems, early Valentinian text that affords us some insight into the mentality of the second century AD.

The final draft of the speech was presented in German. The English

---


376 Jung’s speech was published (with some editing, to judge by the typescript provided to me by C.A. Meier) by Quispel in C. Aalders, J.H. Plokker, and G. Quispel, Jung—ein mens voor deze tijd (Rotterdam: Lemniscaat, 1975), “Jung und Gnosis,” 144–146.
Mr. President, Mr. Minister, viri magnifici, Ladies and Gentlemen!

It gives me much pleasure to accept this precious gift in the name of our Institute. For this I thank you, and also for the surprising and undeserved honour you have done me in baptizing the Codex with my name. I would like to express my special thanks both to Mr. Page, who through generous financial

assistance made the purchase of the papyrus possible, and to Dr. Meier, who through unflagging efforts has given it a home.

Dr. Meier has asked me to say something about the psychological significance of Gnostic texts. Of the four tracts contained in this Codex, I should like to single out especially the *Evangelium Veritatis*, an important Valentinian text that affords us some insight into the mentality of the second century AD.

‘The Gospel of Truth’ is less a gospel than a highly interesting commentary on the Christian message. It belongs therefore to the series of numerous ‘phenomena of assimilation,’ its purpose being to assimilate this strange and hardly understandable message to the Hellenistic-Egyptian world of thought. It is evident that the author was appealing to the intellectual understanding of his reader, as if in remembrance of the words: “We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness” (I Cor. 1:23). For him Christ was primarily a metaphysical figure, a lightbringer, who went forth from the father in order to illuminate the stupidity, darkness, and unconsciousness of mankind and to lead the individual back to his origins through self-knowledge. This deliverance from *agnosia* relates the text to the accounts which Hippolytus, in his *Elenchos*, has left of the Gnostics, and of the Naassenes and Peratics in particular. There we also find most of what I call the ‘phenomena of assimilation.’ By this term I mean to delineate those specifically psychic reactions aroused by the impact that the figure and message of Christ had on the pagan world, most prominently those allegories and symbols such as fish, snake, lion, peacock, etc., characteristic of the first Christian centuries, but also those much more extensive amplifications due to Gnosticism, which clearly were meant to illuminate and render more comprehensible the metaphysical role of the Saviour.

The phenomenon of assimilation mainly represents the reaction of the psychic matrix, i.e., the unconscious, which becomes agitated and responds with archetypal images, thereby demonstrating to what degree the message has penetrated into the depths of the psyche and how the unconscious interprets the phenomenon of Christ.

These assimilation phenomena are naturally of especial significance for the psychologist and psychiatrist, who are professionally concerned with the psychic background, and this is the reason why our Institute is so interested in acquiring and translating authentic Gnostic texts.

Although suppressed and forgotten, the process of assimilation that began with Gnosticism continued all through the Middle Ages, and it can still be observed in modern times whenever individual consciousness is confronted with its own shadow, or the inferior part of the personality. Under the influence of extraordinary psychic situations, especially life crises, these archetypal forms or images may spontaneously invade consciousness, in the case of sick persons just as in the case of healthy ones. The general rule, however, is that modern man needs expert help to become conscious of his darkness,
because in most cases he has long since forgotten this basic problem of Christianity: the moral and intellectual agnosia of the merely natural man. ...

The urgent therapeutic necessity of confronting the individual with his own dark side is a secular continuation of the Christian development of consciousness and leads to phenomena of assimilation similar to those found in Gnosticism, the Kabbala, and Hermetic philosophy. ...

Since comparison with these earlier historical stages is of the greatest importance in interpreting the modern phenomena, the discovery of authentic Gnostic texts is, especially for the direction our research is taking, of the greatest interest, all the more so in that it is not only of a theoretical but also of a practical nature. If we seek genuine psychological understanding of the human being of our own time, we must know the spiritual history absolutely. We cannot reduce him to mere biological data, since he is not by nature merely biological but is a product also of spiritual presuppositions.

I must unfortunately content myself with these bare outlines in attempting to explain our interest in a Gnostic text. ...

Jung wrote Meier after the event:378

The celebration fortunately took place without too much disturbance, although Quispel danced somewhat out of line.

The specifics in Quispel's presentation that annoyed Jung are not specified.

6. The 'Jung Codex' after Its 'Baptism'

Meier had suggested to von Fischer early on that the presentation of the Codex be to the Institute rather than to Jung personally:379

There would in fact also be the possibility that the Codex would be presented to the Jung Institute, rather than to Jung personally ...

---

378 21 xi 53: Letter from Jung to Meier:
Die Feier ist glücklicherweise ohne zuviel Störendes verlaufen, obschon Quispel etwas aus der Reihe tanzte.

379 12 vii 51: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:
Es bestünde nämlich auch die Möglichkeit, dass der Codex statt Jung persönlich dem Jung-Institut übergeben würde ....
Jung's own understanding was to the effect that the Codex was presented only pro forma to him on behalf of the Institute, ultimately to be returned to Egypt, as a wrote Meier a week after the 'baptism'.

I herewith confirm to you that I have received the Codex in the name of the C.G. Jung Institute, with the agreement that it will later be used as an exchange to the Egyptian government, in case it gives permission that the other volumes of the library of Chenoboskion are also published by the said Institute. It is a matter of course that I consider this clause as strictly confidential and will abide by this agreement.

But this not only created problems later on as to who was in effect the legal owner, the Jung Institute or the heirs of Jung (see Chapter 4, Part 4 below), but also left unresolved what to do with the Jung Codex in the meantime.

Where to Keep the Jung Codex

Quispel had brought the Codex from the Netherlands to Zürich for the presentation, after which it was put for a time in Meier's home:

The Jung Codex is, incidentally, still with me for a few days, before it wanders into the safe.

Meier wrote to Jung, proposing to rent a safety deposit box in the name of the Institute to store the Codex:

A further question has to do with the storing of the Codex until the time of its possible further use. It is impossible for me to assume personally the

---

380 23 xi 53: Letter from Jung to Meier:


381 18 xi 53: Letter from Meier to Adolf Keller:

Der Codex Jung liegt übrigens noch einige Tage bei mir bevor er ins Safe wandert.

382 18 xi 53: Letter from Meier to Jung:

Eine weitere Frage betrifft die Aufbewahrung des Codex bis zum Moment eventueller weiterer Verwendung. Ich kann unmöglich die Verantwortung dafür persönlich übernehmen und würde vorschlagen, dass man dafür ein Banksafe auf den Namen des Institutes mietet. Darf ich Sie bitten, mir zu Handes des Kuratoriums Ihr Einverstandnis mit diesem Vorschlag zu geben oder dann einen anderen besseren Vorschlag von sich aus zu machen.
responsibility for it, and would propose that one rent for it a bank safe under the name of the Institute. May I ask you to give me, on behalf of the Curatorium, your agreement with this proposal, or then to make another better proposal of your own.

Jung, who himself had no desire to restrict access to the Codex, proposed it be deposited in Zürich's Central Library, where it would be accessible to interested scholars:383

It would perhaps be still better, if it were deposited in the Central Library, where it is accessible for scholars who no doubt will now interest themselves in it, and where it would be just as securely stored as in a bank safe. One would of course have to make clear to the administration that this deposit is of a temporary nature.

Thereupon Meier wrote Ludwig Fohrer, Director of Zürich’s Central Library, requesting permission to deposit it there:384

We have turned over the critical work on the texts and their translation to Prof. H.Ch. Puech and Prof. G. Quispel. The work of these gentlemen has progressed so far that they no longer have need of the manuscript itself. It is for the moment with me for safekeeping. The 52 leaves have been conserved by papyrologists in Leiden, put hermetically leaf by leaf in plexiglass in a fireproof way. There arises for us the question of the further safekeeping. Prof. C.G. Jung proposes to me to ask of you, honorable Professor, whether there is the possibility of depositing the Codex ad interim in the Central Library. It is admittedly possible that we some day have to withdraw again the precious manuscript, in order to give it to the Coptic Museum in Cairo.

383 21 xi 53: Letter from Jung to Meier:
Es wäre vielleicht noch besser, wenn derselbige in der Zentralbibliothek deponiert würde, wo er für Gelehrte, die sich jetzt wohl dafür interessieren werden, zugänglich und ebenso sicher aufbewahrt wäre wie in einem Banksafe. Man müsste der Direktion allerdings klar machen, dass dieses Depot temporärer Natur sei.

384 26 xi 53: Letter from Meier to Ludwig Fohrer:
The Director of the Central Library replied that the library was willing to receive on temporary deposit only items with a permanent public interest for Zürich, such as family archives, and hence would not receive the Codex. Then the Codex was deposited in a safe in the Leu Bank on Bahnhofstrasse in Zürich. It was returned to Egypt only bit by bit, after a given tractate was published (see Chapter 4, Part 5 below).

It is indeed ironic that more than twenty years later Kasser would argue that the Jung Codex should not be returned to Egypt, since the editors still needed it in a bank safe in Zürich. Of course they would have had access to it in Cairo, if it had been returned promptly. After all, Kasser was the only Swiss among the editors, and he lived near Geneva, not Zürich. Furthermore he worked regularly in the Coptic Museum in Cairo as a member of the Technical Sub-Committee of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, where ‘the missing 40 pages’ of Codex I were available, as would be the bulk of Codex I once it was returned from Zürich. The actual reassembling of fragments only became possible when both parts of the Codex were in the same place, since fragments in one location often belonged on leaves in the other location.

On 8 July 1961 Walter Till, after studying the photographs, proposed to Max Rascher, the publisher, and to Meier, a viable solution:

---

385 30 xi 53: Letter from Fohrer to Meier.
386 8 vii 61: Letter from Till to Rascher:

Sie werden sich vielleicht erinnern, dass ich vorgeschlagen habe, dass sich ein verlässlicher und erfahrener Papyrus-Restaurator den Codex Jung, und zwar sowohl die in Zürich wie die in Kairo befindlichen Teile, vor der Bearbeitung der vierten Schrift vornimmt. Mein Gedanke war dabei in erster Linie der, dass der Restaurator die Struktur, den Aufbau des Codex feststellt: welche Blätter einst Doppelblätter, welche Doppelblätter Lagen waren. Auf diese Weise, und nur so, könnte man einwandfrei feststellen, an welchen Stellen und wie viele Blätter fehlen u. dgl. Nebenbei, dachte ich mir, würde es einem erfahrenen Papyrusrestaurator gewiss gelingen, die Bruchstücke einzuordnen. ...

Die Bruckstücke müssten wirklich vereinigt und so noch einmal abgebildet werden, um den Text verlässlich wiedergeben zu können. ...

Ich teile Ihnen das hauptsächlich deshalb mit, um zu zeigen, wie unerlässlich es ist, dass ein wirklich verlässlicher, sorgfältiger und erfahrener Papyrus-Restaurator an den Codex Jung herankommt und ihn ganz in Ordnung bringt, bevor man an eine wirklich einwandfreie Bearbeitung und Veröffentlichung des Textes der vierten Schrift gehen kann. Sollte Herr Dr. Rolf Ibscher aus irgend welchen Gründen nicht in Betracht kommen, so möchte ich darauf hinweisen, dass der Restaurator der Wiener Papyrus-Sammlung, Herr Anton Fackelmann, ausserordentlich tüchtig in seinem Fach ist und gewiss auch dieser Aufgabe gewachsen wäre.
You will perhaps recall that I have proposed that a reliable and experienced restorer of papyrus undertake the Jung Codex, and indeed both the parts in Zürich and the parts that are in Cairo, before working on the fourth [i.e. fifth] text. My thought here was first of all that the restorer determine the structure, the construction of the Codex: which leaves were once double leaves [i.e. sheets], which double leaves were quires. In this way, and only thus, could one determine unequivocally at what places, and how many, leaves are missing, and the like. Along side this, I thought to myself, an experienced papyrus restorer would certainly succeed in placing the fragments. ...

The fragments really have to be assembled and again photographed in this way, in order to be able to reproduce the text reliably. ...

I communicate that to you primarily in order to show how indispensable it is that a really reliable, careful, and experienced restorer of papyrus gets to the Jung Codex and brings it fully into order, before one can go at a really irreprouachable preparation and publication of the text of the fourth [i.e. fifth] text. Should Dr. Rolf Ibscher not come in question for whatever reasons, then I would like to point out that the restorer of the papyrus collection of Vienna, Anton Fackelmann, is extremely diligent in his specialty and would certainly be up to this task.

We did in fact enlist the assistance of Anton Fackelmann in 1974, especially with regard to the conservation of the cartonnage (see Chapter 11, Part 6 below).

*The Very Slow Publication*

Keeping the Jung Codex in a bank safe would not have been such a problem, if it had not been for the inordinate delays in its publication. The original hope had been to publish the whole Codex immediately upon the conclusion of the 18 months of delay granted to Simone Eid (if not even sooner), that is to say, at the event when it was to be ‘baptized’ as the ‘Jung Codex,’ 15 November 1953. But this plan was reduced to publishing just *The Gospel of Truth* by then, and even further reduced to providing Jung an unpublished translation just in time for him to prepare his acceptance speech at the ‘baptism.’ This limited publication of just one of the five tractates (in a very prestigious volume, including facsimiles) was then planned to honor Jung’s eightieth birthday (26 July 1955), as its dedication suggests: “C.G. Jung Octogenario 26. VII. MCMLV.” Yet even this deadline was not met. Furthermore, contrary to the copyright date of 1956, the actual publication was only in 1957, with an explanatory comment concerning the translators and those who assisted them.  

---

387 *Evangelium Veritatis* Codex Jung f. VIIIr–XVIr (pp. 16–32) / f. XIXr–XXIIr ediderunt
The French version which is presented on the page facing the Coptic text is the fruit of work carried on in common by the three signers of this preface [Malinine, Puech, Quispel]. The editor has insisted on that being followed by two translations, in German and in English. The first is due to Messrs G. Quispel and G.P. Zacharias, the second to Mrs. Helen Wall.

The professors W.C. Till and H.J. Polotsky have been kind enough to revise the proofs of this book and propose to us many a valuable suggestion. Let them be here heartily and sincerely thanked for this.

There had been unsuccessful attempts to get access to ‘the missing 40 pages,’ so as to include the four missing pages from The Gospel of Truth, but these two leaves in Cairo were published (without facsimiles) only in a supplementary volume in 1961. There R. McL. Wilson is listed as assisting, in providing the English translation. The facsimiles were only published in 1975 in the last volume.

The Treatise on the Resurrection appeared in 1963, with Till added to the editors, then The Apocryphon of James [I,2] in 1968, with the addition of the names of Kasser and, assisting, Jan Zandee.
The Coptic text was established by Messrs Till, Zandee and Malinine. The French translation was made by Messrs Malinine and Puech; the German translation, by Till; the English translation by Messrs Zandee, Quispel and McL. Wilson. ... Kasser, added very late, after the death of W. Till, to the group of the other authors of the edition, had as his task carrying through diverse verifications and revising the contributions of his predecessor (Index, German translation) ...

The Tripartite Tractate[1,5], Part One, appeared in 1973, with the explanation in the text elaborated in a footnote:393

The French version was established by Malinine and H.-Ch. Puech, the German version by R. Kasser and W. Vycichl, the English version (obviously conformable to the brief commentary in the introduction and to the theological critical notes) by R. McL. Wilson and J. Zandee.

To the extent that the different parts of the Tractatus Tripartitus became accessible to them, the authors of the present edition made, for their personal use, provisional translations of the text, and these translations served as the basis for preliminary studies that they have published on this treatise. It is

Henri-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, Walter Till†, Rodolphe Kasser, adiuvantibus R. McL. Wilson, Jan Zandee (Zürich and Stuttgart: Rascher Verlag, 1968), pp. xxx–xxxi:

Le texte copte a été établi par MM. Till, Zandee et Malinine. La traduction française a été faite par MM. Malinine et Puech; la traduction allemande, par Till; la traduction anglaise, par MM. Zandee, Quispel et McL. Wilson. ... M. Kasser, adjoint très tardivement, après la mort de W. Till, au groupe des autres auteurs de l’édition, a eu pour tâche de procéder à diverses vérifications et de réviser les contributions de son prédécesseur (Index, traduction allemande); ....

393 Tractatus Tripartitus Pars I De Supernis Codex Jung F. XXVI –F. LIV (pp. 51–104) ediderunt Rodolphe Kasser, Michel Malinine, Henri-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, Jan Zandee, adiuvantibus Werner Vycichl, R. McL. Wilson (Bern: Franke Verlag, 1973), ‘Avant-Propos,’ p. 8 and n. 3:

La version française a été établie par M. Malinine et H.-Ch. Puech, la version allemande par R. Kasser et W. Vycichl, la version anglaise (évidemment conforme au bref commentaire de l’introduction et aux notes critiques théologiques) par R. McL. Wilson et J. Zandee.

À mesure que les différentes parties du Tractatus Tripartitus leur devenaient accessible, les auteurs de la présente édition ont fait, pour leur usage personnel, des traductions provisoires du texte, et ces traductions ont servi de base aux études préliminaires qu’ils ont publiées au sujet de ce traité. C’est ainsi que, dès 1955, MM. Malinine, Puech, et Quispel, ont pu rédiger une première version de tout le texte qui leur était alors accessible; et surtout, en janvier 1967, MM. Quispel et Zandee achevèrent et mirent à la disposition de MM. Kasser, Malinine, Puech, et Wilson, une version anglaise plus parfaite encore; toutes ces contributions préliminaires, révisées sur la base du texte plus complet connu aujourd’hui, ont été extrêmement utiles aux savants qui, finalement, ont eu la responsabilité de réaliser la présente édition.
Thus that, from 1955, Messrs Malinine, Puech, and Quispel were able to edit a first version of all the text that was then accessible to them. Especially, in January 1967, Messrs Quispel and Zanide produced, and put at the disposal of Messrs Kasser, Malinine, Puech, and Wilson, an English version still more perfect. All these preliminary contributions, revised on the basis of the more complete text known today, have been extremely useful to the scholars who, finally, had the responsibility to achieve the present edition.

In this volume Zanide was promoted from assistant to co-editor, to be replaced as assistant by Werner Vycichl; Wilson continued as assistant.

Then, finally, a last installment, containing The Tripartite Tractate [I,5], Part Two and The Prayer of the Apostle Paul [I,1] (thought to be the last tractate in the Codex, though it was actually the first), appeared in 1975.\footnote{Tractatus Tripartitus Pars II De Creatione Hominis Pars III De Generibus Tribus Codex Jung F. LII–F. LXX (pp. 104–140) ediderunt Rodolphe Kasser, Michel Malinine, Henri-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, Jan Zanidee, adiuvantibus \textit{sic} Werner Vycichl, R. McL. Wilson (Bern: Franke Verlag, 1975). There is a second title page on p. 243: Oratio Pauli Apostoli Codex Jung F. LXXII (?) (p. 143?–144?), with the same listing of authors, assistants and publication data.}

The basic problem causing the sluggishness of the publication was that Puech and Quispel controlled the publication (until Kasser took over the administration), but neither was a competent coptologist, a fact carefully kept out of sight when it was a matter of their being in charge. Only when delays emerged did they tend to refer to Malinine as responsible for the translation. Furthermore, Puech’s insistence that his commentaries be included made everything go at a snail’s pace.

The policy of publishing commentaries as separate volumes was implemented in the American edition: The series Nag Hammadi Studies (now Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies) included both the critical edition as a sub-series (The Coptic Gnostic Library) and an open-ended series of monographs, without delaying the appearance of the volumes in the critical edition (See Chapter 5, Part 5 below).

\textit{Meier’s Addition of Till to the Editorial Board}

Meier, in desperation to get the Jung Codex published, sought to replace the editors with Walter Till.

Till had already published in 1959 the four pages of The Gospel of Truth\footnote{Walter Till, “Die Kairener Seiten des ‘Evangeliums der Wahrheit,’” Or 28 (1959), 170–185.} that had been made available in Pahor Labib’s volume of plates,\footnote{Pahor Labib, \textit{Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo}, volume 1 (Cairo: Government Press: Antiquities Department, 1956), plates 9, 10, 6, 5 (in that order).} as well as
a new translation of the whole text of *The Gospel of Truth*. Furthermore he published a report on the problem of editing the Nag Hammadi Codices, in which he expressed quite clearly his opposition to the procedures then in practice:

In view of the great amount of material, it is quite excluded that the committee members alone do the whole work. All qualified forces must be enlisted for the joint work. It is also not possible that a single publishing house accomplish the editions. For when one monopolizes these works, they drag on through more than a century. ... 

But of course one may not be content with photographing, one must fulfill the objective of photography, namely, making the photographs accessible. ...

From the viewpoint of easier marketability, and also to assure an appearance of the texts as rapidly as possible, the individual publications should not contain all writings that are in one manuscript, but rather each publication should contain only one of these writings. For the same reasons one must separate the edition of the text and the commentary.

Meier’s plan to replace Puech, Quispel, and Malinine with Till as the sole editor of the rest of the Jung Codex did not materialize. But Meier was able to achieve a partial success, in that Till was added to the list of editors, with special responsibility for coptology and the German translation. He was involved in the subsequent volumes that appeared in 1961 (pp. 33–36, the four ‘missing’ pages), 1963 (pp. 43–50), and 1968 (pp. 1–16). But he was

---


Beim großen Umfang des Materials ist es ganz ausgeschlossen, daß die Komiteemitglieder die ganze Arbeit allein machen. Es müssen alle dazu befähigten Kräfte zur Mitarbeit heranzogen werden. Es ist auch nicht möglich, daß eine einzige Druckerei die Editionen bewältigt. Denn wenn man diese Arbeiten monopolisiert, ziehen sie sich durch mehr als ein Jahrhundert hin. ...

Nur darf man es natürlich nicht beim Photographieren bewenden lassen, man muß auch dessen Zweck erfüllen, nämlich die Photographien zugänglich machen. ...

Vom Standpunkt der leichteren Verkäuflichkeit und auch um ein möglichst rasches Erscheinen der Texte zu gewährleisten, sollten die einzelnen Veröffentlichungen nicht alle in einer Handschrift vereinigt werden, sondern nur je eine dieser Schriften enthalten. Aus denselben Gründen muß man Textedition und Kommentar voneinander trennen.
no longer able to do this in the longest tractate, and had to be replaced by Werner Vycichl, 1973 (pp. 51–104) and 1975 (pp. 104–140, 143–144? [actually through p. 138 plus the front flyleaf, A/B]).

The several enlargements of the editorial board were not welcomed by the original editors. Gilles Quispel brought this to expression quite bluntly:399

Walter Till, R. McL. Wilson and R. Kasser took part in the publishing without the consent of the other researchers and against their will. They directed themselves straight to the publisher Rascher in Zürich, whom Jung had put in trust of the Codex and its publication. And he accepted the newcomers. This has led to much wasted time, especially because R. Kasser did not know that Irenaeus of Lyon (180 AD) offered a parallel for the fourth treatise of the Jung Codex [actually tractate 5]. That is why Kasser thought that this part consisted of three different writings [they published it as a single tractate under the title *The Tripartite Tractate*], written by Valentinus himself. Nevertheless the publication of all the writings of the Jung Codex was brought to a good end.

Yet the additions to the editorial board not only improved the quality of the editions. They also increased considerably the speed of their publication. Hence the academic community could only welcome them.

*‘The Jung Codex: The Rise and Fall of a Monopoly’*

Upon the final completion of the publication of the deluxe edition of the Jung Codex (1975), I was asked to write a review article. I gave it the title: ‘The Jung Codex: The Rise and Fall of a Monopoly,’400 and began with a tongue-in-cheek financial calculation:

[A subscription to the whole *editio princeps* of the Jung Codex would have cost circa $308.62. If only twenty-six scholars had subscribed in advance, they could at that rate have purchased the Jung Codex itself (35,000 Swiss francs was then worth $8,009). The scholarship of the editors would not have been included in this price, but the scholars who subscribed would have obtained for themselves and the rest of the scholarly world access and publication rights as much as twenty-three years earlier than was in fact the case (1952

---

399 Reported by Gilles Quispel, from his presentation “Jung and the Jung Codex,” summarized at the meeting of the Los Angeles Jungian society ‘Panarion,’ on 4 September 1975. The speech was a free and abridged English translation of a paper whose typescript he left with me, as his host, which is quoted here, p. 24. The Dutch original had been published as “Jung en de Gnosis,” in C. Aalders, J.H. Blokker, and G. Quispel, *Jung—een mens voor deze tijd* (Rotterdam: Lemniscaat, 1975), 85–138.

elapsed generation they would, rather than waiting to buy the scholarship 
of the editors in deluxe volumes, have been able to do their own scholarship 
in cooperation with that of the rest of the scholarly community (including, 
though perhaps in more modest dimensions, that of the editors).

This was then followed, before I actually got into the review article itself, 
by a ‘Prelude.’ Here I quoted correspondence between Till and Meier, in 
which Till reports on his dreams, and then Meier, in his capacity as a Jungian 
psychologist, interprets them in terms of their shared experience with the 
Jung Codex:

On 10–15 September 1958 Walter Till was a house guest in Zürich of Dr. 
C.A. Meier, erstwhile Director of the Jung Institute and himself an analyst. The 
occasion is a proposal by Meier, who is seeking to administer the publication 
of the Jung Codex, that Till take over the assignment to complete the public-

cation of the manuscript, which for six years has been in the hands of three 
scholars who have only succeeded thus far in publishing some 17 per cent of 
it. For Meier everything hangs on getting the complete manuscript published 
promptly, since he has given his word to the Egyptian government to return 
the manuscript and the editors do not wish this to be done before they fin-

ish editing it. Hence Meier has turned to Till. The day after his departure Till 
writes a thank-you note and expresses his willingness to be the editor. Before 
he mails the letter he has a dream and delays mailing the letter until he can 
write up the dream and enclose it with the letter.

Walter C. Till to C.A. Meier, 24 September 1958:

I am clearly an inhabitant of the beyond, and in fact of a section where I can 
be certain that nothing unpleasant can happen to me. Just to the side is a large 
square antechamber that contains no furnishings at all. On the far narrow side 
of this antechamber is a black iron door without latch. It has only an iron handle 
for opening and is the entrance to hell. The floor near the door is quite black; in 
the antechamber there is an unpleasant odor. An acquaintance of mine (a fully 
defined male person) asks me whether I have already seen the large snake 
that they have in hell; one could also see it at the cinema. I say I have not yet 
seen it. He thinks he will investigate whether it can now be seen. He goes through 
the entrance door to hell. I go after him. When I come to the black part of the 
floor I note that the floor is very sticky; it is doubtless tar. So as not to make the 
soles of my feet sticky I float to the door, which is of course quite possible for 
me without further ado as an inhabitant of the beyond. I know that behind the 
door is a deep abyss. But beside the door it stinks so much that I make a hasty 
retreat. Immediately thereafter a young devil comes out of the door. He has on 
a formless sack-like white garment reaching from his neck to the floor, with an 
indiscriminate olive green print. He is holding some kind of longish object like a 
violin to his neck (with the left hand), with the right he plays on it with another 
longish object (branch with leaves?). In this way he is dancing around as if he
were a violin player. He is followed by two further quite similar devils. They all hop around as if they were playing the violin. They are distinguished from each other only by the slightly different coloring of their clothing, which, however, is dark for all of them. I look inquisitively at the activity; for I know that they can do nothing to me. Then one of the devils touches me lightly with his “violin bow”-branch on my sexual organ. I immediately have the thought that I could thus lose my masculinity and become feminine. But the thought of this possibility produces in me such discomfort that I (also in reality) give out an unarticulated sound of discomfort and wake up.

C.A. Meier to Walter C. Till, 30 September 1958:
Your dream has in fact interested me in the highest degree. Without being in a position, due to the lack of more detailed familiarity with the dreamer, to give an exegesis that would only be half accurate, I would nonetheless like to recall that the situation with the manuscripts could be rightly designated as hellish. Consider yourself lucky that for you as an inhabitant of another world these circumstances could no longer do real harm to you.

Walter C. Till to C.A. Meier, 10 October 1958:
... Also it is pointless, for I hardly believe that the three envisaged editors will give up their rights. Please do not assume that this circumstance somehow annoys or embitters me. Truly I have more than enough to do and it can only be agreeable to me if I am spared a very difficult task.

Now this hangs together with my dream of hell, or better with the tentative interpretation that you have given to it. I must admit that a connection to this matter would not have occurred to me. But you may nonetheless be right. On this assumption you would be the man who wishes to show me the giant snake in hell, who even courageously climbs down into hell to see how things stand with this giant snake. The giant snake is the matter itself: an endless story such as one does indeed often designate as a “snake.” Actually I have nothing to do with the matter and am only looking on as a non-participant. The three friendly devils would be the three presumptive editors. They leap about in lively fashion and act as if they play the violin, i.e., as if they were doing something, without really doing anything. I believe this would be a meaningful and possible interpretation.

Till's dream and its Jungian interpretation thus tend to put in perspective the title page of The Gospel of Truth published the preceding year, where only the three editors Malinine, Puech, and Quispel were listed by name.
Once the ‘baptism’ of the Jung Codex on 15 November 1953 had made its acquisition by the Jung Institute public knowledge, the follow-up had of necessity to consist in securing photographs and publication rights for the so-called ‘missing 40 pages’ of Codex I that had remained in Egypt, as part of the sequestering of the collection of Maria Dattari and Phocion J. Tano on 12 May 1952 (see below).

But this objective of the Jung Institute concerning ‘the missing 40 pages’ had expanded into the hope of being entrusted with the publication of all the Nag Hammadi Codices. This could either be in France at the Imprimerie Nationale, as Puech had always advocated ever since the publication of Codex III was first planned, or in the Netherlands, where Quispel favored Brill as the publisher, or in Switzerland through the Jung Institute, following upon the publication of the Jung Codex, as Meier would prefer. Though Puech, Quispel and Meier all attempted through their national representatives in Egypt to gain publication rights, sometimes to the detriment of each other and of the shared objective, it was the Swiss Ambassador to Egypt, Beat von Fischer-Reichenbach, a personal friend of C.A. Meier and Patron of the Jung Institute, who pressed forward most relentlessly.

Planning was rendered much more complicated by two political factors: Beat von Fischer was transferred from Cairo to Lisbon, to become Ambassador to Portugal. This was scheduled to take place the end of April 1954, which put pressure on him to find a solution for the Nag Hammadi Codices before he left; he actually left on 14 June 1954, with the task still incomplete.

The other difficulty was the ongoing upheavals of the Egyptian government. The deposition of King Farouk was begun by Muhammad Naguib on 23 July 1952, leading to the proclamation of the Republic of Egypt on 18 June 1953, with Naguib as President. On 25 February 1954 Naguib was forced to resign, but street protests brought him back to power the next day, though with Gamal Abd el-Nasser as Prime Minister and Naguib only a figurehead. Naguib resigned from this position on 14 November 1954, leaving Nasser as the head of the government. These radical shifts in Egyptian politics meant
almost a complete administrative paralysis throughout this period, resulting in an inability to get decisions finalized, precisely at the time von Fischer was trying to get them finalized before he left Egypt.

1. Von Fischer’s Final Diplomatic Efforts

Proposing Committees, Memberships, and Chairpersons

Already in producing a translation of the Jung Codex, the woodenness, even unintelligibility, of the draft translations by Malinine made it necessary to find other translators more familiar with the subject matter. Puech made proposals to Quispel in this regard:

If you think well of it, we will add Kahle to the edition, or, rather, Till. But we could also appeal to the excellent French coptologist, Lacau. I know him quite well, as does Malinine. He is interested in the new texts, and would certainly not demand that his name be joined to ours on the cover. Do you want me to talk about him to Malinine? In any case, do not give up too quickly on the elucidation of the text. We will come to the goal in fine shape bit by bit.

Yet the situation was actually much more acute, since Meier had written Puech about the idea of publishing not only the Jung Codex, but also all of the Nag Hammadi Codices:

---

1 11 iv 53: Letter from Puech to Quispel (see Chapter 3, Part 4 above).
2 18 i 52: Letter from Meier to Puech:

Comme vous le savez déjà, cher Monsieur, j’ai un programme ambitieux concernant toute cette bibliothèque gnostique. Je pense qu’il nous sera relativement facile d’obtenir l’autorisation du Gouvernement Égyptien pour l’édition de tous les douze Codices. On rendra notre Codex, après publication, seulement sous cette condition.

Il me semble que pour faire cette demande ou cet offre aux Égyptiens il vous faut avoir un plan complet pour l’édition de tous les Codices. Je me permets donc, cher Monsieur, de vous prier de tâcher à trouver un cadre de collaborateurs. Il me semble que le choix de ces collaborateurs soit indispensable pour l’édition de tous les volumes sans trop de délai. Vue toutes les difficultés et les confusions de ces derniers temps je me permets de vous demander de bien vouloir diriger toutes les correspondances et questions importantes concernants l’achat de notre codex et le programme de l’édition des autres volumes à mon adresse. Je vous demande spécialement de laisser les négociations avec le Gouvernement Égyptien entièrement à mon initiative. Mon ami, l’ambassadeur de Suisse au Caire, a été pendant toute cette affaire d’une efficacité et ténacité remarquables.
As you already know, dear Sir, I have an ambitious program concerning all this Gnostic library. I think that it will be relatively easy for us to obtain the authorization of the Egyptian government for the edition of all the twelve Codices. One will return our Codex, after publication, only under this condition.

It seems to me that, in order to make this demand or this offer to the Egyptians, you need to have a complete plan for the edition of all the Codices. I hence permit myself, dear Sir, to ask you to try to find a team of collaborators. It seems to me that the choice of these collaborators is indispensable for the edition of all the volumes without too much delay. Given all the difficulties and the confusions of these last times, I permit myself to ask you to be so kind as to direct all correspondence and important questions concerning the purchase of our Codex and the program of the edition of the other volumes to my address. I ask you especially to leave the negotiations with the Egyptian government entirely to my initiative. My friend, the Ambassador of Switzerland to Cairo, has been of remarkable efficacy and tenacity during all this affair.

Von Fischer also wrote Meier shortly before the ‘baptism’ of the Jung Codex that it would facilitate negotiations if a translation team could be proposed to the Egyptians for the publication of all the Nag Hammadi Codices:³

Regarding our codices, I wanted to ask you also for the list of the main scholars who are to carry out their publication. This is perhaps an important element in the negotiations. Would you be inclined to take up an Egyptian into this corona? If so, whom? Would you perhaps be in agreement that an Egyptian scholar take over the honorary presidency? Could perhaps the Swiss Archaeological Institute in Cairo be brought in, so as to have someone as correspondent in Cairo who represents our interests, and at the same time has the scholarly confidence of the Egyptians?

Then, soon after the ‘baptism’ event, von Fischer wrote Meier again about who should be enlisted, reporting on the value structure in Cairo that should be taken into consideration:⁴

³ 7 x 53: Letter from von Fischer to Meier (see above, Chapter 3, Part 4).
⁴ 14 xii 53: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:


2) Ist eine Gruppe schon vorgesehen? Wie wäre ihre Form? Wer würde sie leiten? Prof. Jung? Sie?

7 x 53: Letter from von Fischer to Meier (see above, Chapter 3, Part 4).
14 xii 53: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:
1) Who should be present in your working group? Here [in Cairo] Walter Till of Manchester is valued very highly. Doresse strikes upon different evaluations. Everyone knows that here Pahor Labib is no internationally recognized copystolog. But we will need him practically. Doubtlessly no solution could be reached without him. Puech has many enviers. Quispel seems to be less popular than Till.

2) Is a group already in view? What would its form be? Who would lead it? Prof. Jung? You?

Meier wrote to von Fischer agreeing to submit a list of collaborators, but suggesting that he rather than Jung should be the leader:5

You will soon receive a list of possible collaborators. To your suggestions in this regard there is no objection. The whole will no doubt have to proceed under my leadership.

Meier immediately wrote Quispel for a list of names that von Fischer might submit to the Egyptian authorities:6

Now I urgently need from you a list with names and addresses of coptologists whom we must enlist for the editing of the other twelve volumes. There should be as few as possible French, English, and Jews among them. Till seems to stand very high in the Egyptians’ favor. Thus the list should be representative mainly for the eyes of Egyptians in the above sense. Then once we have permission, we can still always decide more freely.

Quispel replied to Meier by return mail:7

5 21 xii 53: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

6 21 xii 53: Letter from Meier to Quispel:
Ich brauche nun dringend von Ihnen eine Liste mit Namen und Adressen von Kopstologen, die wir für die Herausgabe der übrigen 12 Bände gewinnen müssen. Es sollen möglichst wenig Franzosen, Engländer und Juden dabei sein. Till scheint bei den Ägyptern sehr gut angeschrieben zu sein. Die Liste soll also hauptsächlich für die Augen der Ägypter repräsentativ sein im obigen Sinn. Wenn wir dann die Erlaubnis haben, können wir immer noch freier verfügen.

7 24 xii 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier:
You ask me for a list of coptologists with their addresses. I must of course first collect the addresses, and that will take some time. But I can assure you that some Belgian, German and Austrian scholars are already informed and are very willing to take part in an international undertaking. That few Jews, English, and French can be included is understandable. Polotsky has already agreed, to the effect that he is willing to work even without public participation. But one cannot pass over Puech.

On the other hand one can only make use of such coptologists as have some awareness of Gnosticism. Otherwise a terrible nonsense results, as we have been able to ascertain in the case of Malinine.

Hence I would like to suggest that we form a committee under your presidency, with the heresiologists Quispel and Puech, which is responsible for the publication, and works with 6 coptologists (each for 2 volumes). Among these six that I have in view, there is no Englishman, Frenchman, or Jew. Hence one could perhaps insert three more—1 Frenchman, 1 Englishman, 1 Jew.

I am rather strongly convinced that the scholars I have in mind would agree, if the project is laid before them in this form, i.e. if the committee of publication is really international, and they have no unpleasantnesses with the influential Puech.

Of course the Egyptians can then put their names on the volume. That is all silly. But it is important that a working community be formed of people who...
understand both Coptic and Gnosticism, and can consult one with another. Famous Egyptologists can provide no help here. ... P.S. I have been in contact with Till for years. He is very competent. Of course he is now in Manchester, but nonetheless he can be regarded as an Austrian.

Till much later explained in more detail his Austrian background to Quispel:8

For your information, I would like to communicate some more about myself. First, the purely external: As Director of the papyrus collection of Vienna I am ‘retired,’ but am still Professor at the University of Vienna, on leave for an indeterminate time, of course without salary. I am here [Manchester] Senior Lecturer in Coptic.

Puech wrote Quispel his need for more clarification from Meier, especially in view of what he had learned from Malinine about what the Swiss were doing in Cairo:9

I am going to write to Dr. Meier to firm up the terms of the conversation that I had with him in Zürich with regard to the fate that will be reserved for the ensemble of the texts found at Nag-Hammadi. The proposals of Dr. Meier have seemed to me rather vague. I know, not from him, but from Malinine, that Mr. and Mrs. Page have been in Cairo since the beginning of the month. Malinine is to meet them there and—if permission is given to him for this—he will copy the 16 [!] complementary pages of the Jung Codex. It goes without saying that, if one forms an International Committee of publication, you will be a member.

But it was in a letter to Doresse that Puech expressed his begrudging acceptance of the Swiss rather than the French initiative:10

8 6 iii 55: Letter from Till to Quispel:

9 24 xii 53: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
   Je vais écrire au Dr. Meier pour préciser les termes de la conversation que j’ai eue avec lui à Zurich au sujet du sort qui sera reservé à l’ensemble des textes retrouvés à Nag-Hammadi. Les projets du Dr. Meier m’ont paru assez vagues. Je sais, non par lui, mais par Malinine, que M. et Mme Page sont au Caire depuis le début du mois. Malinine doit les rencontrer là-bas et—si permission lui en est donnée—il copiera les 16 pages complémentaires du Codex Jung. Il va de soi que, si l’on forme un Comité international de publication, vous en ferez partie.

10 25 xii 53: Letter from Puech to Doresse:
Nevertheless, the [Swiss] initiative does not need to disturb us unduly, though I would have preferred to see the negotiations led by the French alone. The Jung Institute has loyally shared with me its intentions, and I talked at great length about their proposal on 27 October with Baillou, who gave me his consent. It has been agreed that the action of the Swiss would combine with our own, though this, for reasons of political opportunism, takes place for the moment behind the scenes. On principle, the publication of the thirteen volumes will be done, as planned, in France, at the *Imprimerie Nationale*. Baillou will do everything to obtain from the Committee of Excavations the necessary funds. Unfortunately he cannot already make a commitment for too long a term. It was promised to me that the general direction of the publication would be confided in me. There will nonetheless be a place to envisage the constitution of a Committee of Publication of an international character, and to divide up the editing among several teams of scholars of different countries. Facing down rather strong opposition, I insisted that you be included among the possible collaborators. In any case, the goal being pursued is shared: as soon as possible to permit the scholarly world to have access to documents that are so important.

Meier wrote Quispel his concern about Puech, as well as repeating his need for a list of translators:

---

L’initiative ne semble pas cependant devoir nous inquiéter outre mesure, bien que j’eusse préféré voir les négociations menées par les seuls Français. L’Institut Jung m’a loyalement fait part de ses desseins et je me suis longuement entretenu à leur propos, le 27 octobre, avec M. Baillou, qui m’a donné son accord. Il a été entendu que l’action des Suisses se combinerait avec la nôtre, celle-ci, pour des raisons d’opportunité politique, s’exerçant momentanément dans la coulisse. En principe, la publication des treize volumes sera faite, comme prévu, en France, à l’Imprimerie Nationale. Baillou fera tout pour obtenir du Comité des Fouilles les crédits nécessaires; il ne peut malheureusement prendre dès maintenant un engagement à trop long terme. Il m’a été promis que la direction générale de la publication me serait confiée. Il y aura lieu, toutefois, d’envisager la constitution d’un Comité de publication de caractère international et de répartir l’édition entre plusieurs équipes de savants de divers pays. Bravant d’assez fortes oppositions, j’ai insisté pour que vous fussiez compris parmi les collaborateurs éventuels. De toute façon, le but poursuivi est commun: permettre le plus tôt possible au monde savant l’accès de documents aussi importants.

---

28 xii 53: Letter from Meier to Quispel:


Dass Polotsky vorläufig in keiner Weise in Erscheinung treten darf, ist zwar sehr bedauerlich, aber keinesfalls zu ändern.

Ich erwarte nun, da es eilt, mit Ungeduld Ihre Liste möglicher Mitarbeiter. Sie muss umgehend nach Ägypten weitergeleitet werden. Nachher wird ein Komite von Ihnen,
I am at the same time writing Puech again, for the whole plan could now really be destroyed with such baubles. Von Fischer wrote me again a few days ago, as to how cautious we must be with such comments, as also with any about the price (alas).

That Polotsky may in no way become visible for the time being is indeed very regrettable, but is not at all to be changed.

I await now with impatience, since it is urgent, your list of possible collaborators. It must be forwarded immediately to Egypt. Afterwards a Committee of you, Puech and myself will have to greet these gentlemen officially. The letter in this regard will no doubt have to be composed by us together.

Meier also wrote Puech confirming the proposed leadership committee:

Meanwhile it really seems that one has good success. You, dear Sir, Quispel and I should soon form a committee that will direct the work.

But in a letter that must have crossed in the mail, Puech had spelled out to Meier his position in considerable detail:

---

Puech und mir diese Herrn offiziell begrüssen müssen. Der entsprechende Brief wird wohl von uns zusammen verfasst werden müssen.

12 28 xii 53: Letter from Meier to Puech:

Cependant il paraît vraiment qu’on a du bon succès. Vous, cher Monsieur, Quispel et moi doivent former bientôt un comité qui dirigera les travaux.

13 26 xii 53: Letter from Puech to Meier:

J’ai confirmé ici que votre initiative ne saurait aller à l’encontre des longs et coûteux efforts prodigués dans le même sens depuis 1947 par les services culturels de notre Ministère des Affaires Étrangères et par notre Centre national de la Recherche Scientifique. Il reste bien entendu que, comme vous me l’avez proposé à Bilthoven en août dernier, la direction générale de la publication me sera confiée et qu’en principe, l’impression et l’édition des treize volumes—soit: de la collection complète des écrits retrouvés près de Nag-Hammadi—seront assurées par l’Imprimerie Nationale de Paris, qui a, du reste, déjà composé un certain nombre de feuilles du premier volume (Apokryphon de Jean, Évangile des Égyptiens, etc.). Un comité de publication de caractère international devra être constitué. Il conviendrait, je crois, de nous entendre au plutôt, vous-même, M. Quispel et moi, sur la composition éventuelle de ce Comité. Il va de soi que nous en ferons tous trois partie. M. von Fischer vous dira s’il est opportun d’y faire entrer quelques personnalités égyptiennes. On peut aussi y comprendre des établissements scientifiques ou des organismes collectifs. Comme, cependant, s’il veux être efficace, un tel Comité gagnerait à être restreint, il y aurait peut-être lieu d’envisager le format: et d’un Comité de rédaction (chargé du travail effectif—distribution des tâches, surveillance de l’édition, etc.—et composé d’un petit nombre de membres) et d’un Comité de patronage (de caractère plus purement honorifique et qui, lui, pourrait être considérablement élargi). Communiquons-nous nos propositions ou nos suggestions et mettons-nous d’accord sur un choix commun après discussion. Je vous proposerais, pour ma part, MM. M. Malinine et Antoine
I have confirmed here [in Paris] that your initiative would not risk running counter to the long and expensive efforts squandered in the same direction since 1947 by the cultural services of our Ministry of Foreign Affairs and by our Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. It still remains fully agreed that, as you proposed to me in Bilthoven last [23] August [1953], the general directorship of the publication will be entrusted to me, and that in principle the printing and the editing of the thirteen volumes—that is to say, of the complete collection of the texts discovered near Nag-Hammadi—will be taken care of by the Imprimerie Nationale of Paris, which has, besides, already set type on a certain number of leaves of the first volume (Apocryphon of John, Gospel of the Egyptians, etc.). A Committee of Publication of an international character should be set up. It would be appropriate, I believe, for us to reach agreement as soon as possible, you yourself, Quispel and myself, on the possible composition of this Committee. It goes without saying that all three of us will be members. Von Fischer will tell you if it is expedient to have some Egyptian personalities admitted into it. One can also include in it scientific establishments or collective organizations. Since, however, if it is to be effective, such a Committee would profit by being limited, it would perhaps be appropriate to envisage the format: both a Committee of Redaction (entrusted with the actual work—distribution of the tasks, supervision of the edition, etc.—and composed of a small number of members) and a Committee of Patronage (of a more purely honorific character, and which could be considerably enlarged). Let us exchange our proposals or our suggestions, and let us reach agreement on a common choice after discussing it. I would propose to you, for my part, Messrs M. Malinine and Antoine Guillaumont, each Director of Study at the École des Hautes Études (Sorbonne). J. Doresse

Guillaumont, l’un et l’autre directeurs d’études à l’École des Hautes Études (Sorbonne). J. Doresse, également, à moins que nous le désignions comme secrétaire du Comité de rédaction. De toute façon, bien que, comme vous et Quispel, j’aie quelques griefs à son égard, il serait injuste—et peut-être maladroit—de l’exclure absolument. Encadré, guidé, commandé, Doresse peut, d’ailleurs, rendre service.

Que pensez-vous de tout ceci? Si, comme nous le souhaitons tous, les négociations doivent bientôt aboutir, il faut régler ces questions dans un délai assez bref. M. von Fischer serait sans doute aidé dans ses démarches s’il présentait aux autorités égyptiennes un projet de publication aux lignes déjà bien arrêtées.

Comme je vous l’avais dit à Zurich, j’ai, sur recommandation de notre Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, informé notre attaché culturel au Caire de notre entente. J’ai également écrit à Doresse, actuellement en Abyssinie, pour lui rappeler que, dès qu’il sera possible, il a charge de mettre les manuscrits en état de conservation, et en exécuter intégralement la photographie et d’envoyer ou de porter ici toutes les photos. Il a reçu d’importants crédits pour cela! Vous n’auriez qu’à m’avertir dès que l’autorisation d’accéder aux papyrus sera obtenue.

Plus généralement, tenez-moi, je vous prie, au courant des progrès et des résultats de vos démarches et de celles de M. von Fischer.
also, unless we were to designate him as secretary of the Committee of Redac-
tion. In any case, though I, like you and Quispel, have some complaints with
regard to him, it would be unjust—and perhaps awkward—to exclude him
absolutely. Fenced in, guided, ordered, Doresse can, besides, be of service.

What do you think of all of this? If, as we all hope, the negotiations should
soon reach a conclusion, it is necessary to regulate these questions in a rather
short time. Von Fischer would doubtless be assisted in his efforts if he would
be able to present to the Egyptian authorities a publication project along lines
already well established.

As I told you in Zürich, I have, on the recommendation of our Ministry of
Foreign Affairs, informed out Cultural Attaché in Cairo of our agreement. I
have also written to Doresse, at present in Abyssinia, to remind him that, as
soon as it becomes possible, he is in charge of putting the manuscripts in a
state of conservation and of carrying out the photography integrally, and of
sending or bringing here all the photos. He has received sizable grants for that!
You will only need to notify me, as soon as the authorization for access to the
papyri is obtained.

More generally, keep me, I ask of you, up to date on the progress and the results
of your steps and those of von Fischer.

On receipt of this letter, Meier wrote back, conceding Puech’s conditions.
Indeed, he quoting verbatim the core conditions, and even listed Puech as
chairperson. Yet he did not fail to mention Swiss political neutrality. This
is the basis on which his own unmentioned candidature, proposed to him
both by von Fischer and by Quispel, might later be substituted.\footnote{30 xii 53: Letter from Meier to Puech:}

\begin{quote}
Il va sans dire que la direction générale de la publication de la bibliothèque de
Nag-Hammadi sera confiée à vous, cher Monsieur. Vous, Quispel et moi constituerons
un comité de publication et de rédaction, chargé du travail effectif—distribution
des tâches, surveillance de l’édition, etc. Il nous faut être prudents avec le choix
des collaborateurs, car les Égyptiens n’accepteront pas de juifs et des anglais. Ils ont
egalement une assez forte résistance contre les français à cause du Maroc. Mais je suis
sûr qu’ils accepteront vous et Doresse. Néanmoins je donnerai les noms de Malinine
et Guillaume à Monsieur de Fischer comme ballon d’essai. Il nous faudra également
inclure un ou deux Égyptiens pour satisfaire leur nationalisme. Dans la formation de ce
second comité moins restreint nous devons être vraiment international et je crois que
nous trois auront toute liberté de choisir les collaborateurs qui ne sont pas seulement
des coptisants, mais qui comprennent en même temps la Gnose. ...

Je suis touché de votre collaboration si cordiale et je suis convaincu que finalement
nous arriverons à notre but commun. N’oubliez pas que j’ai personnellement qu’un
seul intérêt: la science. C’est pour elle que je fais tout ce travail, car je sais que dans les
circonstances politiques actuelles presque uniquement le nom d’un Suisse neutre a la
chance d’être regardé sans trop de soupçons par les Égyptiens. C’est ainsi seulement

\end{quote}
It goes without saying that the general direction of the publication of the library of Nag-Hammadi will be entrusted to you, dear Sir. You, Quispel and I will constitute a committee of publication and redaction, entrusted with the actual work—distribution of the tasks, supervision of the edition, etc. We need to be prudent in the choice of collaborators, for the Egyptians will not accept Jews and Englishmen. They also have a rather strong resistance to the French, because of Morocco. But I am sure that they will accept you and Doresse. Nonetheless I will give the names of Malinine and Guillaumont to von Fischer as a trial balloon. It will also be necessary for us to include one or two Egyptians to satisfy their nationalism. In the formation of this second, less restricted committee, we will need to be truly international, and I believe that we three will have full liberty to choose the collaborators who are not only coptologists, but who understand at the same time Gnosticism.

...I am moved by your so cordial collaboration, and I am convinced that finally we will reach our common goal. Do not forget that I personally have but one interest: Science. It is for it that I do all this work, for I know that, in the present political circumstances, almost only the name of a neutral Swiss has the chance of being regarded without too much suspicion by the Egyptians. It is only thus that I should figure in our committee, although I do not know a word of Coptic. So let’s play the comedy until the ‘happy end.’

Quispel promptly sent Meier several names of potential translators:15

The list that I have enclosed contains the names of coptologists who have also concerned themselves with Gnosticism. I know them all personally, with two exceptions, and know that they are outstanding scholars. Till is Austrian, Kahle the son of the famous German orientalist Paul Kahle. Hopefully these names suffice. Otherwise I can send you a few more names of good scholars who admittedly are not so famous.

This reference to Kahle must refer to P.E. Kahle, who was not the son of Paul Kahle, but rather the signature of Paul Kahle himself when he corresponded with Quispel from Oxford in 1954 (see Chapter 1, Part 4 above).

15 

31 xii 53: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Three names were also suggested by Puech to Quispel a few days later, but with the change from coptologists and specialists in Gnosticism to coptologists or specialists in Gnosticism, so that he, as a specialist in Gnosticism but not a coptologist, would be included without question:\textsuperscript{16}

Good news on the negotiations undertaken in Cairo. I was very touched by a quite congenial letter from Dr. Meier. It is fully agreed that we—he, you, and I—form the Committee of Publication. It is necessary, beginning now, to think of the choice of the possible collaborators: Coptologists or specialists in Gnosticism. After agreement among us, we will make our proposals to them by means of a circular letter. What names would you for your part think of? Is it necessary, in your view, to alert Till, Vergote, Lefort, for example?

Meier was able to submit to von Fischer the list of potential editors that von Fischer had solicited, in hopes that it would impress the Egyptian authorities as to the necessity to set up such a procedure, and incidentally show them the practical value of working with the Jung Institute:\textsuperscript{17}

I give you here the list that comes in question of the coptologists who at the same time understand something about Gnosticism.

Prof. Dr. T. Säve-Söderbergh, Uppsala, Sweden
Prof. Dr. J. Vergote, Leuven, Belgium

\textsuperscript{16} 3 i 54: Letter of Puech to Quispel:

\textbf{Bonnes nouvelles des négociations engagées au Caire. J’ai été très touché par une lettre fort sympathique du Dr. Meier. Il est bien entendu que lui, vous et moi, nous formons le Comité de publication. Il faut songer dès maintenant au choix des collaborateurs éventuels: coptisants ou spécialistes de la Gnose. Après entente entre nous, nous leur ferons nos propositions par lettre circulaire. À quel noms songeriez-vous pour votre part? Faut-il, à votre avis, alerter Till, Vergote, Lefort, par exemple?}

\textsuperscript{17} 14 i 54: Letter from Meyer to von Fischer:

\textbf{Ich gebe Ihnen hier die Liste der in Frage kommenden Koptologen, welche gleichzeitig etwas von Gnosis verstehen.}

Prof. Dr. T. Säve-Söderbergh, Uppsala, Schweden
Prof. Dr. J. Vergote, Löwen, Belgien
Prof. Mgr. L.Th. Lefort, Löwen, Belgien
Prof. Mgr. W. Erichsen, Kopenhagen, Dänemark
Prof. P. Kahle, (Deutscher) Oxford, England
Prof. Dr. W. Till (Österreicher), Manchester, England
Mgr. A. von Lanschoot, Città del Vaticano
Dr. B.H. Stricker, Leiden, Holland
Dr. Josef M.A. Janssen, Leiden, Holland

Dazu kämen natürlich Puech und Quispel. Ersterer möchte noch einen Franzosen drin haben, nämlich ausser Malinine noch Prof. Antoine Guillaumont von der Sorbonne. Doresse müssten wir irgendwie als Sekretär camouflieren, damit er uns keinen Unsinn anstellt.
Prof. Mgr L. Th. Lefort, Leuven, Belgium
Prof. Mgr W. Erichsen, Copenhagen, Denmark
Prof. P. Kahle, (German) Oxford, England
Prof. Dr. W. Till (Austrian), Manchester, England
Mgr. A. von Lanschoot, Vatican City
Dr. B.H. Stricker, Leiden, The Netherlands
Dr. Josef M.A. Janssen, Leiden, The Netherlands

To this would come of course Puech and Quispel. The former would like to have still another Frenchman in it, namely, in addition to Malinine, also Prof. Antoine Guillaumont of the Sorbonne. We would have to camouflage somehow Doresse as Secretary, so that he doesn't cause us any foolishness.

This is Quispel's largely Dutch/Flemish list. Only The Netherlands and Belgium have two each (plus Quispel, and van Lanschoot, who is listed as representing the Vatican City). This Benelux list is then augmented with a few other names of persons who were needed, who also serve to increase the internationality of the list. Then, as a kind of appendix, Quispel lists Puech and himself, and includes Puech's list of two French scholars, Guillaumont and Doresse.

This translation team was actually never organized or put to work, but it served the purpose of assisting von Fischer in commending the leadership of the Jung Institute to the Egyptian authorities. Yet the administrative committee of Puech, Quispel, and Meier was never actually recognized as such by the Egyptian authorities.

**Von Fischer and Aly Ayoub**

Von Fischer hoped to get a legally binding written concession from the Egyptian Department of Antiquities for the C.G. Jung Institute to publish all the Nag Hammadi Codices. But as long as the legal proceedings between Maria Dattari and the Egyptian Ministry of Public Instruction (to determine who was the legal owner) were not resolved one way or the other, he also had to get her approval through her attorney Aly Ayoub, the former Minister of Public Instruction. Then a Consultative Commission of the Department of Antiquities needed to be set up and give its approval, along with that of the Coptic Museum.

Von Fischer approached Aly Ayoub to secure Maria Dattari’s approval for the requests from the Jung Institute. But von Fischer was initially only disgusted.\(^{18}\)

---

\(^{18}\) 3 i 54: Letter of von Fischer to Meier:
We have still not come a single step forward. Dr. Aly Ayoub has taken back his promise to give us permission to work on the papyri. To be sure, I have been able to convince him, after who knows what efforts, to give this permission after all under certain conditions, and yet I await for weeks his written confirmation! ...

Hence patience! Also the 40 pages are naturally not to be gotten out so long as there is no court ruling to the effect that that the sequestering can be lifted. But no one has an interest in getting things rolling, least of all the government, which of course wants to pay nothing for the expropriated papyri.

I insist that Puech say nothing of a gift of the C.G.J papyrus. We are not yet that far along, and we do not know in the last resort whom we must win over. Making our intentions known would only damage our position here and make the situation still more complicated. ...

I am somewhat depressed about the horrible manner of the attorney of Miss Dattari, but I remain on duty. Yet in the process one almost loses one's honor.

The written permission from Aly Ayoub, though weighed down with conditions, was forthcoming a few weeks later. It was to the effect that she was of course pleased with the proposal, if it did not infringe on her rights, and if the Ministry of Public Instruction that controlled the codices made them available without prejudice to her interests:19

19 28 i 54: French translation of an Arabic letter from Aly Ayoub to von Fischer:

Le 12 mai 1952, le Ministre de l’Instruction Publique avait en effet promulgué un arrêté ordonnant la séquestration des documents précités et leur mise en dépôt au Musée Copte.

En principe, l’arrêté ordonnant la séquestration émanant du Ministre compétent transfère la propriété de ces manuscrits de Mlle Dattari au Ministère de l’Instruction.
On 12 May 1952 the Minister of Public Instruction had in effect promulgated a decision ordering the sequestering of the documents cited above and putting them on deposit in the Coptic Museum.

Publique. La loi sur les antiquités stipule cependant que l’arrêté de séquestration sera suivi par les délibérations d’une commission spéciale qui établira la compensation équitable due à la propriétaire des documents. Cette dernière a le droit d’accepter cette évaluation ou d’y faire opposition en intendant un procès devant les tribunaux. Nous regrettons de dire que cette commission ne s’est pas réunie jusqu’aujourd’hui; elle n’a donc jamais émis une décision quant à la compensation due à la propriétaire des documents. Mlle Dattari considère par conséquent que l’arrêté ordonnant la séquestration est entaché de vice, ce qui lui enlève son caractère d’ordonnance ministérielle et le transforme en décision arbitraire. Elle a soumis le cas au Conseil d’État, demandant l’annulation de l’arrêté ordonnant la séquestration. L’affaire est encore pendante devant le contentieux administratif; une séance pour le plaidoyer n’a pas encore été fixée. Mlle Dattari a mis le Ministère de l’Instruction Publique en garde contre toute publication concernant les documents ou les copies de ces documents avant que le jugement dans le procès susmentionné n’ait été rendu. Avant que le jugement dans l’affaire soulevée devant le contentieux administratif du Conseil d’État ne soit rendu, il est impossible de considérer que la propriété des manuscrits soit définitivement revenue à Mlle Dattari. La propriété reste au contraire répartie entre Mlle Dattari et le Ministère de l’Instruction Publique.

De ce que je viens d’exposer à Votre Excellence, vous comprenez facilement à quel point la situation est délicate. Mlle Dattari est heureuse de savoir que les documents sont l’objet de la sollicitude de l’Institut scientifique Jung. Tout Égyptien, voire tout habitant de l’Égypte, se réjouira à la pensée que les savants en question se rendront en personne en Égypte, qu’ils passeront un certain temps dans notre pays et qu’ils mettront leurs énergies et leur vaste savoir au service de l’élucidation de certains points secrets concernant notre histoire politique, culturelle et celle des croyances ayant été en vogue dans notre patrie. Mlle Dattari se réjouit d’autant plus de tout cela qu’elle a compris de vos déclarations et de votre première lettre que ces savants n’ont aucun but commercial en vue, que c’est uniquement l’esprit de recherche scientifique qui les anime et que leurs travaux [litt.: eux] n’entraîneront aucune dépense pour la propriété des documents ou pour le Gouvernement égyptien.

Pour toutes ces raisons, Mlle Dattari souhaite, pour sa part, la bienvenue à ces savants et accueille avec joie [littéralement: souhaite la bienvenue à] leur projet de photographier ces documents, de les publier et de les étudier dans un esprit scientifique, libre de toute aspiration commerciale, et elle pose les conditions suivantes:

1) Il faut qu’un ou plusieurs savants égyptiens, spécialistes de l’époque copte, tels que le Dr. Pahor Labib, soient attachés en tant que collaborateurs à la reproduction photographique et aux recherches et études entreprises par les personnalités venant de la part de l’Institut Jung.
2) Il faut que les savants venant de l’étranger rédigent, avant toute autre chose, un procès-verbal dans lequel ils établissent l’état des papyrus, le nombre des volumes et des pages contenues dans chaque volume et qu’une copie de ce procès-verbal soit envoyée à Mlle Dattari.
3) Il faut que parmi les savants attachés à ces recherches scientifiques il y ait un ou plusieurs spécialistes dans la technique du traitement et de la préservation de
In principle, the decision ordering the sequestration, emanating from the competent Minister, transfers the proprietorship of these manuscripts of Mlle Dattari to the Ministry of Public Instruction. The law on antiquities stipulates however that the decision of sequestration will be followed by the deliberations of a special commission that will establish the equitable compensation due to the owner of the documents. The latter has the right to accept this evaluation or to raise opposition to it by initiating a process before the tribunals. We are sorry to say that this commission has not met up to today; hence it has never made a decision as to the compensation due to the owner of the documents. Mlle Dattari considers, as a consequence, that the decision ordering the sequestration is tainted with vice, which eliminates its character as a ministerial ordinance and transforms it into an arbitrary decision. She has submitted the case to the Council of State, demanding the nullification of the decision ordering the sequestration. The affair is still pending before the administrative office in charge of the settlement of disputed claims; a session for arguing the case has not yet been set. Mlle Dattari has put the Ministry of Public Instruction on guard against any publication concerning the documents or copies of these documents, before the judgment in the above-mentioned case has been rendered. Until the judgment in the affair raised before the Council of State's administrative office for the settlement of disputed claims has been rendered, it is impossible to consider that the papyrus, cela en vue du fait que l’âge des papiers les rend fragiles et les expose à l’effritement.

4) Mlle Dattari demande en outre que ces savants lui envoient une copie de tout ce qu’ils publient comme résultats de leurs études et recherches et que Mlle Dattari soit la première à recevoir ces communications.

5) Il faut que les droits moraux et matériels de Mlle Dattari ou du Gouvernement égyptien restent intacts par rapport à ces documents. Si par conséquent des reproductions de ces documents ou des commentaires ayant ces documents pour base ou paraissant comme résultats des études consacrées à ces documents devaient être publiés avant que la contestation entre le Ministère de l’Instruction Publique égyptien et Mlle Dattari ne soit tranchée et avant que Mlle Dattari ne soit entrée en possession de ses droits par rapport au Ministère en question, Mlle Dattari aurait droit à l’équivalent d’un tiers de tous les bénéfices résultant de la publication sans être obligée de contribuer en quoi que ce soit aux dépenses causées soit par le déplacement des savants, soit par leurs recherches et l’impression, et sans que ces dépenses, quelle que soit leur origine, puissent être la cause d’une réduction de la quote-part qui lui est due.

6) Il faudra demander la permission du Ministère de l’Instruction Publique sous la main duquel les documents se trouvent actuellement en bonne garde. J’enverrai moi-même une copie de cette lettre à M. le Directeur Général du Service des Antiquités. Il doit être entendu que dans aucun cas une autorisation accordée par Mlle Dattari ou un consentement obtenu de sa part ne saurait affecter son droit légal à obtenir de la part du Ministère de l’Instruction Publique égyptien une compensation complète et juste, correspondant à la valeur de ces documents.
ownership of the manuscripts be definitively returned to Mlle Dattari. The ownership remains, on the contrary, divided between Mlle Dattari and the Ministry of Public Instruction.

From what I have just laid out before Your Excellency, you easily understand the extent to which the situation is delicate. Mlle Dattari is happy to know that the documents are the object of the solicitude of the scientific Jung Institute. Every Egyptian, that is to say, every inhabitant of Egypt, will rejoice over the idea that the scholars in question will come in person to Egypt, that they will pass a certain time in our country, and that they will put their energies and their vast knowledge in the service of the elucidation of certain hidden points concerning our political and cultural history, and concerning the beliefs that were in vogue in our country. Mlle Dattari rejoices all the more over all that she has understood of your declarations and of your first letter, to the effect that these scholars have no commercial goal in view, that it is uniquely the spirit of scientific research that animates them, and that their work [literally: they] will not involve any expense for the owner of the documents or for the Egyptian government.

For all these reasons, Mlle Dattari, for her part, wishes for the good arrival of these scholars and receives with joy [literally: wishes for the good arrival of] their project to photograph these documents, to publish them, and to study them in a scientific spirit, free of any commercial aspiration. She poses the following conditions:

1) It is necessary that one or several Egyptian scholars, specialists in the Coptic period, such as Dr. Pahor Labib, be attached as collaborators in the photographic reproduction and in the research and study undertaken by the personalities coming on behalf of the Jung Institute.

2) It is necessary that the scholars coming from outside prepare, before anything else, an official report in which they establish the status of the papyrus, the number of volumes, and the pages contained in each volume, and that a copy of this official report be sent to Mlle Dattari.

3) It is necessary that among the scholars attached to this scientific research there be one or more specialists in the technique of the treatment and preservation of papyrus, in view of the fact that the age of the papers makes them fragile and exposes them to damage.

4) Mlle Dattari asks in addition that these scholars send her a copy of all that they publish as results of their study and research, and that Mlle Dattari be the first to receive these communications.

5) It is necessary that the moral and material rights of Mlle Dattari or of the Egyptian government remain intact with regard to these documents. If as a result of the reproductions of these documents, or commentaries having these documents as their base, or appearing as results of these studies consecrated to these documents, were to be published before the dispute between the Egyptian Ministry of Public Instruction and Mlle Dattari is resolved, and before Mlle Dattari regained possession of these rights with regard to the Ministry in question, Mlle Dattari would have
the right to the equivalent of a third of all the benefits resulting from the publication, without being obligated to contribute in any way to the expenditures caused either by the travel of the scholars or by their research and the printing, and without these expenses, whatever may be their origin, causing a reduction of the share that is due to her.

6) It will be necessary to ask the permission of the Ministry of Public Instruction, in whose hands the documents are at present retained in safe keeping. I will myself send a copy of this letter to the General Director of the Service des Antiquités. It must be understood that in no case would an authorization accorded by Mlle Dattari or an agreement obtained on her part be able to affect her legal right to obtain from the Egyptian Ministry of Public Instruction a complete and just compensation corresponding to the value of these documents.

Von Fischer sent Meier this report, accompanied by details for the next step, namely getting authorization from the Egyptian Ministry of Public Instruction:20

---

20 3 ii 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:


2. Nun muss die gleiche Erlaubnis vom Service des Antiquités in Kairo erhalten werden, was wohl ebenso schwierig wie zeitraubend sein wird. Ich habe bereits einige Demarchen gemacht und ausserdem Erhebungen bei der Rechtsabteilung dieses Amtes vorgenommen, woraus hervorgeht, dass ich nun eine Vollmacht unseres Institutes haben müsste, um die erwähnte Konzession zu dessen Gunsten zu erhalten.

3. Die weitere Frage, die sich nun ergibt, wäre, wie wir unsere Gelehrtengruppe zusammenstellen. Ich nehme an, dass das Institut zuerst die Konzession erhält und dann die besagte Gelehrtengemeinschaft im freundschaftlichen Einverständnis mit dem Service des Antiquités bildet. Dies wäre mein Vorschlag, um die Sache zu beschleunigen. Es könnte aber auch so kommen, dass der Service des Antiquités zuerst die Gelehrtengruppe kennenlernen möchte, um erst dann die Studienkonkession zu erteilen.

Auf alle Fälle müssen wir bereit sein. Frage ist, ob wir eine kleine oder grosse Gruppe aufstellen sollen, wobei wohl entscheidend sein wird, was die Arbeit am meisten fördert. Vielleicht könnten vorerst einmal bloss drei oder vier Gelehrte als titularisierte Beauftragte gelten, mit dem Recht weitere Gelehrte zu konsultieren. Es müsste dann wohl auch ein kleines Patronatskomitee aufgestellt werden, wo wir eventuell
1. Today I can give you gratifying news. The attorney of Miss Dattari has given us the permission to photograph and study the papyri, and to publish the result of our studies. ... The advantage that Miss Dattari attains lies in this, that through the publication of the papyri they finally obtain a value, and that this will be able to compel the Egyptian government to pay out to the previous owner a corresponding indemnification. Thus it is, so to speak, that we render a service to Miss Dattari, rather than that she renders one to us. In practical terms, our interests have at the right moment come together.

2. Now the same permission must be obtained from the Service des Antiquités in Cairo, which will no doubt be just as difficult and time-consuming. I have already taken a few steps, and in addition undertaken investigations in the legal division of this office, from which it appears that I now must have an authorization from our Institute, in order to obtain the above-mentioned concession for its advantage. ...

3. The further question that now arises would be how we are to bring together our circle of scholars. I assume that the Institute first secures the concession and then forms the said society of scholars in friendly agreement with the Service des Antiquités. This would be my proposal, in order to expedite the matter. But it could also happen that the Service des Antiquités would first like to get acquainted with the group of scholars, so as to grant the concession for the studies only then.

In any case we must be ready. The question is, whether we should set up a small or a large group, where no doubt the decisive thing will be what advances the work most. Perhaps first of all merely three or four scholars could count as entitled representatives, with the right to consult further die ägyptischen und sonstige nicht zu vermeidende Honoratioren einreihen könnten.

Aus der ägyptischen Gelehrtenwelt müsste wohl Herr Pahor Labib, Direktor des koptischen Museums in Kairo, in Anspruch genommen werden. ...

4. Herr Puech hat die Französische Botschaft mit einem langen Brief begrüsst, wo er den Wunsch zum Ausdruck bringt, dass das Studium der Papyri ja nicht französischen Gelehrten entgehe, und dass sie wenigstens einen Teil des Ruhmes davon trügen. Ich habe mit der französischen Botschaft abgemacht, dass wir beide allein der Wissenschaft dienen wollen und dass es jetzt zweckmässig ist die Arbeiten zum Erhalt der fraglichen Bewilligungen der Schweizerischen Gesandtschaft zu überlassen. ...

5. Soweit ich sehe, erwarten sowohl der Service des Antiquités und Fr. Dattari, dass unsere Gelehrtengruppe nach Kairo kommt, sobald die Konzession erteilt ist, um die Arbeiten aufzunehmen. Praktisch wird dies wohl nicht möglich sein. Deshalb würde ich vorschlagen, dass sobald die Konzession erteilt ist, Prof. Jung oder Sie selbst, und eventuell Herr Puech und Doresse nach Kairo kommen um die Konzession in Empfang zu nehmen und die Arbeiten für die Photokopie anzuordnen. Könnten Sie wohl eine solche Reise in den nächsten Monaten in Aussicht nehmen?
scholars. There would no doubt then have to be a small committee of Patrons set up, where we perhaps could include the Egyptian and other unavoidable honorees.

From the Egyptian scholarly world, Pahor Labib, Director of the Coptic Museum in Cairo, would no doubt have to be enlisted. ...

4. Puech has sent a long letter to the French Embassy, where he brings to expression the desire that the study of the papyri not elude French scholars, and that they gain from this at least a part of the fame. I have reached agreement with the French Consulate that we both only want to serve scholarship, and that it is now advantageous to leave to the Swiss Embassy the tasks of obtaining the grant in question. ...

5. To the extent I can see, both the Service des Antiquités and Miss Dattari expect our group of scholars to come to Cairo, as soon as the concession is accorded, in order to take up the work. In practical terms this will probably not be possible. Hence I would propose that, as soon as the concession is awarded, Prof. Jung, or you yourself, and perhaps Puech and Doresse, come to Cairo, to receive the concession and to arrange for the work of the photography. Could you perhaps envisage such a trip in the coming months?

At von Fischer’s request, the Institute quickly provided him the power of attorney:21

The C.G. Jung Institute authorizes, by means of the present power of attorney, Henry-Béat de Fischer, Minister of Switzerland in Cairo, in its name to undertake with the competent Egyptian authorities steps in view of obtaining the authorization:

a) for representatives of the Institute to study and photograph a collection of twelve Coptic documents written on papyrus that have been deposited by Mlle Maria Dattari at the General Directorship of the Department of Antiquities in Cairo.

b) for the Institute itself to publish the text and the translation of these twelve documents, as well as the result of the studies made by its representatives.

---

21 9 ii 54: ‘Projet de procuration’ signed by the President C.A. Meier and Vice-President Emma Jung of the Curatorium of the C.G. Jung-Institut:

L’Institut C.G. Jung donne par la présente procuration à M. Henry-Béat de Fischer, Ministre de Suisse au Caire, pour entreprendre en son nom, auprès des autorités égyptiennes compétentes, des démarches en vue d’obtenir l’autorisation;

a) pour des représentants de l’Institut d’étudier et de photographier une collection de douze documents coptes écrits sur papyrus qui ont été déposés par Mlle Maria Dattari à la Direction Générale du Département des Antiquités au Caire.

b) pour l’Institut lui-même de publier le texte et la traduction de ces douze documents ainsi que le résultat des études faites par ses représentants.
A Possible Trip to Cairo

Meier wrote von Fischer that if necessary he would be willing to come to Cairo to receive the concession to publish the Nag Hammadi Codices:

No doubt one may now also say that this is the first time in history that Switzerland ranks beside the great nations, to whom alone it has thus far been granted, in the sense of serving great archaeological undertakings, as for example Germany, France, and America. ...

---

22 11 ii 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Man darf jetzt wohl auch sagen, dass es das erste Mal in der Geschichte ist, dass die Schweiz sich in dem Sinne zu den grossen Nationen gesellt, denen es bisher einzig vergönnt gewesen war, grossen archäologischen Unternehmungen zu dienen, wie etwa Deutschland, Frankreich und Amerika. ...


So the publishing of the library of Chenoboskion lies in the central orientation of our work. It is hence nothing other than natural if the approval, in the sense of the authorization by the Egyptians, is given to the Institute, and for me personally it would be even preferable, in view of the small-town lack of understanding on the part of certain members of the Curatorium, if this approval were accorded to the President of the Institute, i.e. to me personally. In any case, my talks with Puech and Quispel, the two scholars whom we cannot dispense with at all, have been carried on thus far in the sense that I would preside over the small and first Committee, which should consist of them and me. To this Committee Pahor Labib could of course also belong. We would then, on our initiative, delegate the further division of the work. But it must be said that, for working on the individual volumes, only such persons come in question who, besides being outstanding coptologists, also must at the same time be familiar with early Christian and contemporary pagan theological literature. Both of these characteristics are unfortunately not combined very often. But those people that I named to you in the list accompanying my last letter really fulfill these requirements. We have just seen, in the translation of the Jung Codex by the first-class coptologist Malinine, that the translation remained completely unintelligible, since he did not know the theological expressions from the pagan and Christian literature of the same time period.

Puech has said to me expressly that the photographs will of course be willingly prepared by the French, whereby no financial burdens will accrue to us. With regard to the desire that the corresponding group of scholars, which then probably would consist of Puech, Quispel, and myself, are to come to Cairo for the sake of receiving the permission, i.e. the photographs, admittedly we have thus far not thought about that. But if there is no other way, I would of course do this very gladly, all the more so since thus a long cherished unattainable desire on my part could be realized. I hope that the necessary finances could be brought together somehow. In the case of Quispel, I am certain that the money for this would be put at his disposal from Dutch circles. In the case of Puech, I know nothing in detail.

Von Fischer then updated Meier about the next steps to be taken in Cairo:

23 17 ii 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Herr Mustafa Amr hat nun mit dem Unterrichtsminister und dem Juristen dieses Departements unseren ganzen Fragenkomplex eingehend besprochen. Der Unterrichtsminister ist gerne bereit, unserem Wunsche zu entsprechen. Er hält jedoch dafür, dass die Angelegenheit der noch zu bildenden Kommission für Antiquitäten unterbreitet wird; diese hat dann zu entscheiden, ob und wie unsere Arbeiten begonnen werden können. ...

Das wichtigste ist, dass der Unterrichtsminister und sein Jurist der Meinung sind, dass die Frage der Entschädigung an Frl. Dattari mit unserer Publikationsfrage nichts zu tun hat, dass also der Prozess Dattari, der noch Jahre dauern können wird, völlig
Mr. Mustafa Amr [General Director of the Egyptian Department of Antiquities] has now spoken in detail about our whole complex of questions with the Minister of Education and the attorney of this department. The Minister of Education is quite willing to meet our desire. Yet he is of the opinion that the matter be laid before the commission for antiquities, which is yet to be constituted; this then has to decide whether and how our work can be begun. ...

The most important thing is that the Minister of Education and his attorney are of the opinion that the question about reimbursement to Miss Dattari has nothing to do with our question about publication, and hence that the Dattari legal proceedings, which could still go on for years, are completely independent of our scholarly work. This is the great victory that we have now gotten from this.

Now my next task is to advance the forming of the Committee for Antiquities. Today I see the Minister of Education himself, and will again point out to him the urgency of this matter.

Further, we must now compose the letter with which you offer to the Ministry of Education your work and the assumption of the necessary expenses. In my view you must now offer to set up a small Committee of Patrons, where the Egyptian Minister of Education, the Director of the ‘Service des Antiquités’ and, on the Swiss side, Prof. Jung and perhaps you yourself would be envisaged. The task of this Committee of Patrons would consist in regulating administrative details and defending the matter officially.


Meine nächste Aufgabe ist es nun, die Bildung des Komitees für Antiquitäten zu fördern. Ich sehe heute selbst den Unterrichtsminister und werde ihn erneut auf die Dringlichkeit dieser Angelegenheit hinweisen.

Weiter müssen wir jetzt den Brief aufstellen, womit Sie dem Unterrichtsministerium Ihre Arbeit und die Übernahme der nötigen Kosten offerieren. Nach meiner Meinung müssten Sie nun die Bildung eines kleinen Patronatskomitee anbieten, wo der ägyptische Unterrichtsminister, der Direktor des “Service des Antiquités” und auf schweizerischer Seite Prof. Jung und eventuell Sie selbst vorgesehen wären. Die Aufgabe dieses Patronatskomitee bestünde darin, die administrativen Angelegenheiten zu regeln und die Angelegenheit offiziell zu verteidigen.

Further, the working group would need to be set up. In my view it could, on the one hand, consist of a Committee of Direction, in which you as President and Professors Puech and Quispel would figure, and on the other hand, of a larger committee, where the other specialized scholars were listed. (See your letter of 14 January; I see from this list that Doresse is not listed; but I fear that if that does not take place, we could have difficulties with the French Embassy, since after all Doresse has already worked on the first papyri). I wonder to what extent Pahor Labib should be counted in the Committee of Patrons or in the working group?

But then he added a postscript after meeting with the Minister of Education:24

P.S. ... After my talk with the Minister of Education, I believe that for the time being we should give up constituting a Committee of Patrons, in order not to make our work more difficult; if later on the Egyptians themselves call for such a group, then we would of course have to take up their desire.

This then is followed by a telegram to Meier from von Fischer, not to act on the draft of the formal document to be sent from the C.G. Jung Institute to the ‘Direction générale des antiquités’ before receiving further instructions, so as to give von Fischer time to go over the plans with the Cultural Attaché of France, Philippe Rebeyrol.25 He then sent suggestions that emerged from that meeting for the improvement of the formal document:26

24 17 ii 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

P.S. ... Nach meinem Gespräch mit dem Unterrichtsminister glaube ich, dass wir vorerst auf die Bildung eines Patronatskomitees verzichten sollten, um unsere Arbeit nicht zu erschweren; sollten die Ägypter später selbst eine solche verlangen, so müssten wir natürlich auf ihr Begehren eingehen.

25 19 ii 54: Telegram from von Fischer to Meier.

26 24 ii 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

… Es muss genau hervorgehoben werden, wie und warum wir dazu gekommen sind, die Konzession für die Herausgabe der koptischen Texte zu verlangen; dies ist für später sehr wichtig, da sich dann viele Leute aus der Welt der Wissenschaft diese Frage stellen werden.

… Es wird wohl besser sein, wenn wir kein Patronatskomitee aufstellen und so die ganze Prozedur vereinfachen; im übrigen ist es auch nicht leicht zu sagen, worin eigentlich die Aufgabe eines solchen Komitees bestehen würde; weiter sind sowohl der Unterrichtsminister wie Herr Moustafa Amr Menschen, die auf solche äussere Ehren verzichten.

Ferner wird es kaum möglich sein, die Konzession für eine einzelne Person zu erhalten; sie wird leichter dem Institut erteilt werden.

… Frage ist, ob die Präsidentschaft des engeren Gelehrtenausschusses Ihnen oder
... It must be precisely emphasized, *how and why* we have come to request the concession for editing the Coptic texts; this is very important for later on, since then many people from the world of scholarship will pose this question.

... It will no doubt be better if we do not set up a Committee of Patrons, and thus simplify the whole procedure; besides, it is also not easy to say what the task of such a Committee would really be; furthermore, both the Minister of Education and Mr. Moustafa Amr are people who forego such external honors.

Further, it will hardly be possible to obtain the concession for a single individual; it will be accorded more easily to the Institute.

... The question is whether the presidency of the smaller Committee of Scholars should come to you or to Prof. Jung; this question should be investigated in all directions. Which is more opportune? Prof. Jung could perhaps take over the theoretical presidency and you the practical presidency, in order that the name of Prof. Jung somehow appear?

... It would be best here to list first the different materials on which certain scholars should be consulted, and only then name the different persons to whom we could appeal—all this, so as to give the Egyptian authorities the possibility also to express themselves, or in general to add new names.

In view of the not very numerous Egyptian scholars who come in question in this area, it would be helpful if we would leave it to the Egyptians themselves to make the corresponding selection.

... There should be mentioned here the individual materials and the specialists who come in question in their regard. For this your list of 14 January could

---

Prof. Jung zukommen soll; diese Frage wäre nach allen Richtungen hin zu untersuchen. Was ist opportuner? Prof. Jung könnte eventuell die theoretische und Sie die praktische Präsidentschaft übernehmen, damit der Name von Prof. Jung irgenwie erscheint?

... Es wären hier am besten, zuerst die verschiedenen Materien aufzuzählen, wo gewisse Gelehrte konsultiert werden sollten, und erst dann die verschiedenen Herren zu nennen an die wir appellieren könnten; dies alles, um den ägyptischen Behörden die Möglichkeit zu geben, sich ebenfalls auszusprechen oder überhaupt neue Namen hinzuzufügen.

In Angebracht der wenigen zahlreichen ägyptischen Gelehrten, die auf diesen Gebieten in Betracht fallen, wäre es günstig, wenn wir es den Ägyptern überlassen würden, selbst die entsprechende Wahl zu treffen.

be used. Doresse should also be listed for reasons of tact. We could already
now sound out all these gentlemen as to whether they are willing to collabo-
rate.

Thereupon Meier wrote an urgent letter to Quispel:27

Of course no one knows what the new political events in Egypt will bring
about. [Naguib resigned the preceding day as President (25 February 1954),
then street demonstrations led to his reinstatement the following day, but
without real power, since Nasser became Prime Minister.] With plans such
as ours, one is of course accustomed to irrational factors, and the ‘trickster’ is
again in full swing.

But up until 20 February, the development was not only unusually favorable
for our affair, but also, for oriental conditions, even precipitously rapid. Actu-
ally, this week the official decision of the government was to take place, but we
will after all now probably still have to have patience once again. There is no
point in me laying out before you the whole development, but Minister von
Fischer wrote me at the end of last week that the thing stands just before com-
pletion. If the matter goes through in spite of the turmoil, then the C.G. Jung
Institute in Zürich receives authorization, both from the owner and from the
Egyptian government, to photograph the whole library of Chenoboskion, with
the sole commitment that the texts be published and translated. But it seems
that the Egyptians want to gain prestige from this really grandiose gesture, in
the sense that they stand before the world as great supporters of science, i. e.
they want in a certain sense to make the handing over of this permission a

---

27 26 ii 54: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Was die neuen politischen Ereignisse in Ägypten bringen werden, weiss natürlich nie-
mind. Bei Plänen wie den unsrigen, ist man sich ja gewohnt, an irrationale Faktoren
und der “trickster” ist wieder einmal in vollem Gang.

Bis zum 20.2. war aber die Entwicklung für unsere Angelegeheit nicht nur eine
ausserordentlich günstige, sondern auch für orientalische Verhältnisse geradezu sich
überstürzend rasche. Eigentlich hatte diese Woche die offizielle Entscheidung der
Regierung fallen sollen, aber wir werden jetzt wahrscheinlich doch noch einmal
Geduld haben müssen. Es hat keinen Sinn, dass ich Ihnen die ganze Entwicklung
darstelle, aber Minister von Fischer schrieb mir Ende letzter Woche, dass die Sache
vor dem Abschluss stehe. Wenn die Sache trotz der Wirren durchgeht, so bekommt
das C.G. Jung-Institut Zürich die Bewilligung, sowohl von der Besitzerin wie von der
ägyptischen Regierung, die ganze Bibliothek von Chenoboskion zu fotografieren
mit der einzigen Verpflichtung, dass die Texte publiziert und übersetzt werden. Es
scheint aber, dass die Ägypter aus dieser immerhin grandiosen Geste in dem Sinne
Preisige machen wollen, dass sie vor der Welt als grosse Förderer der Wissenschaft
dastehen, m. a. W. sie wollen gewissermassen einen Staatsakt aus der Überreichung
dieser Bewilligung machen. Dies bedeutet sehr wahrscheinlich, dass Puech, Sie und
ich u. U. plötzlich nach Kairo reisen müssen zu diesem Akt. Da man nie weiss, wann
dieser Zeitpunkt eintreten wird, rät uns v. Fischer, schon jetzt das ägyptische Visum zu
verlangen. Ich hoffe nur, dass Sie und Puech in der Lage sind, das Geld für eine solche
the swiss leadership in nag hammadi studies

formal act of the state. This implies very probably that Puech, you, and I, if it works that way, suddenly have to travel to Cairo for this act. Since one never knows when this time will come, v[on] Fischer advises us to apply already now for Egyptian visas. I only hope that you and Puech are able to find funds for such a trip. The Institute could pay none of this. In order that, in the last minute, we can reach agreement with each other, so that we three can then lay before the Egyptians in Cairo an absolutely complete plan, I believe that all three of us would have to sit together at least two days in advance, and fly together. What I already need immediately from you is whether the nine coptologists whom you named in your list have already received word and would be ready to take over the work without payment. In no case should there be, at the handing over of the permission by the Egyptians, uncertainties in any regard as to the personnel and the financing for carrying out the plan. I will still ask Puech whether the Imprimerie Nationale can really take over caring for the publication of the text of all thirteen volumes, without financial obligations growing out of that.


Obschon die Angelegenheit nun höchstoffiziell ist, muss ich Sie immer noch bitten, möglichst strenge Diskretion zu wahren. Ich bin dies Minister v. Fischer gegenüber schuldig, der mich darum bittet, weil noch im letzten Moment irgendeine Unvorsichtigkeit das ganze Projekt verunmöglichen könnte.
It must be clear that the whole permission is to be given solely and alone to the Jung Institute. The result of this will necessarily be that I as its President will have to stand at least *pro forma* at the tip of our collegium of three. Yet I hope to be able to make my ignorance harmless. But as a result I will not be able to avoid *me* having to lay before the Egyptians all binding agreements of collaborators, printers, etc. So I must ask you perhaps to compose a letter for me, that I can send with the same wording to all the collaborators we have in view, even if they have already received word from you. The translations should all appear at Rascher in the ‘Studien aus dem C.G. Jung-Institut.’ If the *Imprimerie Nationale* should not be able to publish all the volumes of the critical text, then we also have to turn immediately to other publishers that can print Coptic, and which have the necessary financial means. What do you know about this? And would you provide me, if the occasion arises, the necessary draft of a letter for such an inquiry?

Although the matter is now highly official, I must ask you still to maintain the greatest possible discretion. I owe this to Minister v[on] Fischer, who asks this of me, since still at the last minute any carelessness could render the whole project impossible.

Meier wrote a similar letter, if briefer and less detailed, to Puech the next day.\(^\text{28}\)

It seems at this time that the Egyptians will get involved only slightly or not at all in the choice of our collaborators. The main thing seems to be that our Committee of three assumes all responsibility toward the Egyptians and can assure them of that. It only seems inevitably that Pahor Labib be included and—a remarkable thing—one does not seem to be able to bypass Doresse. But it seems to me that these are only formalities with little risk.

It was indeed the case that at the time the Egyptians seemed disinterested in the potential translators. The list seems to be something von Fischer thought would commend their leadership to the Egyptians, but it actually seems to have played no significant rôle in the ongoing procedure.

Puech immediately replied that he probably could not go to Cairo, but suggested alternatives that would make it unnecessary: \(^\text{29}\)

\(^{28}\) 27 ii 54: Letter from Meier to Puech:

> Il semble en ce moment que les Égyptiens se mêleront peu ou pas du choix de nos collaborateurs. La chose principale a l’air d’être que notre comité de trois se charge de toute responsabilité vis à vis des Égyptiens et puisse les en assurer. Il semble inévitable seulement, que Monsieur Pahor Labib soit inclus et—chose remarkable—on n’a pas l’air de pouvoir se passer de Monsieur Doresse. Mais il me semble que ce ne soient que des formalités peu dangereuses.

\(^{29}\) 1 iii 54: Letter from Puech to Meier:
It would be very difficult, if not impossible, for me to go to Cairo in the coming weeks. ... In any case, I ask myself if my presence, and even the presence of all three of us (you, Quispel, and myself), is absolutely necessary to 'receive plenipotentiary powers.' Cannot von Fischer sign the act in the name of the Jung Institute or in our name? Or even would it not suffice for your presence alone and your signature, accompanied by the express indication that it is given in the name of the Committee that directs publication, that is to say, equally in the name of Quispel and myself? I think this is all the more possible in view of the fact that the official act authorizing the photography and the publication of the papyri should necessarily state that this right is accorded to the 'Committee composed of Messrs Meier, H.-C. Puech and G. Quispel.'

If you see there some difficulty, please indicate it to me. We could envisage another solution: For example, have me represented by Rebeyrol, the French Cultural Attaché at the Embassy of Cairo, who would sign instead and my place. ...

I have already indicated to you the names of the French coptologists that it would seem to me good to associate in the edition. Quispel must have communicated to you those of the international scholars on whom we reached agreement by correspondence in the month of January. But Quispel was, like myself, of the opinion that there is no urgency in establishing immediately a definitive list. You yourself note that the Egyptians seem to concern themselves little in the choice of our possible collaborators. It also seems to me that we cannot send them a circular letter designed to sound them out until the

Il me serait très difficile, si non impossible, de me rendre au Caire dans les semaines à venir. ... Toutefois, je me demande si ma présence, et même notre présence à tout trois (vous-même, Quispel et moi), est absolument indisensable pour la "réception des pleins pouvoirs." M. von Fischer ne peut-il signer l'acte au nom de l'Institut Jung ou en notre nom? Ou bien encore, ne suffirait-il de votre seule présence et de votre signature, accompagnée de l'indication expresse qu'elle est donnée au nom du Comité directeur de publication, soit également de Quispel et de moi-même? Je crois la chose d'autant plus possible que l'acte officiel autorisant la photographie et la publication des papyri devra nécessairement porter que ce droit est accordée au "Comité composé du MM. Meier, H.-C. Puech et G. Quispel."

Si vous voyez là quelque difficulté, veuillez me l'indiquer. Nous pourrions envisager une autre solution: par exemple, de me faire représenter par M. Rebeyrol, l'attaché culturel français auprès de l'Ambassade du Caire, qui signerait en mon lieu et place. ...

Je vous ai déjà indiqué les noms des coptisants français qu'il me paraîtrait bon d'associer à l'édition. Quispel a dû vous communiquer ceux des savants internationaux sur lesquels nous étions tombés d'accord par correspondance au mois de janvier. Mais Quispel était comme moi d'avis qu'il n'y avait pas urgence à établir tout de suite une liste définitive. Vous remarquez vous-même que les Égyptiens paraissent peu se soucier du choix de nos collaborateurs éventuels. Il me semble aussi que nous ne pouvons envoyer à ceux-ci une lettre circulaire destinée à les pressentir qu'une
rights of publication have been attained and the Committee directing publication is agreed upon by the Egyptian government.

If we are obliged to introduce into this Committee Pahor Labib and Doresse, I for my part see no inconvenience. Perhaps, nonetheless, it would be convenient to distinguish two Committees: a Directors’ Committee, as restricted as possible, and a Committee of Publication, which we could enlarge as we think best, or for reasons of opportuneness. In any case, let it remain fully agreed, and be stated expressly in the official act, that I assume the functions of the General Director of the publication.

Since the formal authorization by the Egyptian Ministry of Education for the Jung Institute to publish the Nag Hammadi Codices did not materialize, a trip by Meier, Puech, and Quispel, or just by Meier, did not materialize before von Fischer left his Cairo post.

In Meier’s statement to Quispel of 26 February 1954 (see above), he had been quite explicit about himself being the chairperson:

> It must be clear that the whole permission is to be given solely and alone to the Jung Institute. The result of this will necessarily be that I as its President will have to stand at least pro forma at the tip of our collegium of three.

But in Meier’s letter to Puech, both his German original and the French translation sent to Puech, the language is softened to become much more ambivalent.\(^{30}\)

> Although I am a completely ignorant person, I will, because of the circumstance that the authorization is given exclusively to the Jung Institute of
Zürich whose President I am, have to appear as the contractual partner with the Egyptian government.

By the fact that the authorization will be given exclusively to the Jung Institute of which I am the President, I will be obliged—as ignorant as I am—to figure as the contracting party toward the Egyptian government.

But Puech sensed the threat to his becoming chairperson. So he sent Meier, as Meier had requested, an accompanying succinct formal letter to submit to the Egyptian authorities as his agreement to participate, but of course making it clear that he would be General Director:31

I confirm to you that I am ready to handle gratuitously, and in a spirit of complete scientific disinterestedness, the general direction of the publication of the thirteen Coptic Gnostic volumes discovered near Nag-Hammadi, and to charge myself, under the same conditions, to study and edit these texts in collaboration with other specialists.

Since the trip to Cairo envisaged for 1954 did not materialize, such a formal letter from Puech was never submitted.

The ambivalence as to the chairperson continued. Meier wrote von Fischer, even after he had moved from Cairo to Lisbon to be the Swiss Ambassador to Portugal, suggesting that in effect von Fischer propose Meier as Chairperson to the Egyptians:32

Perhaps thanks to your knowledge and connections here you can after all once again do a very effective deed, either personally or through [Robert] Rahn [the Swiss Cultural Attaché in Cairo], and thereby at the same time once again offer the good services of the International Committee under the leadership of the Institute.

Meier wrote Quispel to the same effect:33

31 1 iii 54: Letter from Puech to Meier:

Je vous confirme que je suis prêt à assurer gratuitement, et dans un esprit d’entier désintéressement scientifique, la direction générale de la publication des treize volumes gnostiques coptes découverts près de Nag-Hammadi et à me charger dans les même conditions d’étudier et d’éditer ces textes en collaboration avec d’autres spécialistes.

32 4 i 55: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Vielleicht können Sie dank Ihrer Kenntnisse und Beziehungen hier doch noch einmal eine ganz tüchtige Tat tun entweder persönlich oder durch Rahn, und dabei gleichzeitig noch einmal die guten Dienste des Internationalen Kommites unter Führung des Institutes anbieten.

33 4 i 55: Letter from Meier to Quispel:
Once now that the Committee of Publishers has in principle been founded, I would like to ask you, where now should the initiative for the intended meeting come from? Of course somebody must, after all, have the strong hand, without which every Committee goes to sleep in hibernation. So I ask you, whether you or Puech want to do that, or whether it is up to the Institute to activate the Committee? In no case should we count on a non-existent activity of the Egyptians, although we can ascribe to these gentlemen pro forma fully the main roll.

Quispel responded that the leadership would in any case be Egyptian, and that Puech should not be eliminated from the triumvirate, though Quispel did not address the awkward issue of who should be chairperson.\textsuperscript{34}

It was also reported to us that the Egyptian government would have nothing against it, if the International Committee we set up would be involved in the matter, although under Egyptian leadership or supervision. We now await still the confirmation of this report. ...

And indeed one apparently sensed difficulties with the collaboration of a Frenchman. I replied to that to the effect that it was impossible for me to give up the collaboration, and that I would not participate without my Swiss [and] French friends. That was then accepted. And now I must say, also over against you, that it seems to me best not to dissolve the triumvirate. After all, you probably know still better than do I that the French in Cairo have no chance,
that they have conducted themselves in such a way (especially Drioton) that the Egyptians can have no confidence in them. I think that the situation has now gone so far that all indiscretions of Puech cannot harm us any more. I would like to ask of you that you tolerate him.

The issue of the chairperson was in fact not resolved. When the International Committee of Gnosticism met in 1956, it was on the invitation of Pahor Labib, who presided as chairperson at the meeting (see Chapter 6 below).

As to the international translation team, Quispel wrote two letters of response to Meier, both on the same day. In the first he stated:35

Since you had asked me to maintain the greatest discretion, I have written none of the scholars that I mentioned to you. There is the possibility that some will not take part, Lefort for example and Friedricksen [who was not even on Quispel's list!]. ... I have money to travel to Cairo if you wish. I will immediately order the visa. If Puech does not come with us, one could perhaps enlist Malinine, who may still be in Egypt. Or Walter Till, Oriental Department, The University, Manchester. He is Austrian; the Egyptians trust him. I promise you, now as before, to maintain the greatest discretion.

In the second letter Quispel went on:36

It seems to me that it is now perhaps time to act quickly. Naguib is again there [reinstated as titular President on 26 February 1954]; perhaps he disappears in a few months [replaced by Nasser 14 November 1954]. Now the government needs to make a gesture to elevate its prestige for foreign countries.

Today I have ordered a visa and thus am ready to depart. Hopefully it does not last too long. I have in fact anxiety that confusion can emerge, as a result of

35 1 iii 54: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Weil Sie mich gebeten hatten, die grösste Diskretion zu bewahren, habe ich keinen der Gelehrten, welche ich Ihnen erwähnt habe, geschrieben. Es besteht die Möglichkeit, dass einige nicht teilnehmen werden. Lefort zum Beispiel und Friedricksen. ...

Ich habe Geld um nach Kairo zu reisen, wenn Sie wollen. Das Visum werde ich sofort bestellen. Wenn Puech nicht mitgeht, könnte man eventuell Malinine, der vielleicht noch in Ägypten ist, heranziehen. Oder Walter Till, Oriental Department, The University, Manchester. Er ist Österreicher, die Ägypter vertrauen ihm. Ich verspreche Ihnen nach wie vor die grösste Diskretion zu wahren.

36 1 iii 54: Letter from Quispel to Meier:


Heute habe ich ein Visa bestellt und bin so fertig abzureisen. Hoffentlich dauert es
which the manuscripts remain inaccessible for a longer period of time [which is precisely what happened]....

I have the money ready to fly to Cairo via Zürich, as you inquired. And I really hope that Puech can accompany us, since he enjoys great esteem in the scholarly world. But perhaps we must still have a bit of patience.

Meier then wrote a preliminary letter to von Fischer: 37

1. Everything would surely be much simpler if we did not yet have to show up with a complete Committee. Puech has difficulties with getting away from Paris in the near future. On the other hand, Quispel and I could fly already to Cairo, and it would be good if this would suffice.

2. It will be difficult to come to Cairo with a fully firmed-up plan, and to lay before them properly all necessary acceptances. But there is no doubt at all that the project can be carried through to its full extent. But how we want to prove this in writing to the Egyptians, especially in so short a time, is not clear to me. Can one not say to them in this regard that we have basic agreements in all areas of the publication, but binding promises can first be made when the photographs lie before us, from which we can see especially the size of the texts and, after some insight into their content, choose the specific collaborators in a given area. I as President of the Institute would not hesitate already today to undertake the corresponding guarantee toward the Egyptians. The question is whether that would not suffice for them temporarily. Puech has

37 5 iii 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:


2. Es wird schwer halten, mit einem vollkommen festgelegten Plan nach Kairo zu kommen und sämtliche nötigen Zusagen richtig vorzulegen. Es besteht aber keinerlei Zweifel darüber, dass das Projekt in vollem Umfang durchgeführt werden kann. Wie wir dies aber den Ägyptern schriftlich beweisen wollen, namentlich in so kurzer Zeit, ist mir nicht ersichtlich. Kann man ihnen in dieser Hinsicht nicht sagen, dass wir in allen Bereichen der Publikation prinzipielle Zusagen haben, verbindliche Versprechungen aber erst gemacht werden können, wenn uns die Photographien vorliegen, woraus wir insbesondere den Umfang der Schriften ersehen können und nach Einsicht in deren Inhalt die speziellen Sachbearbeiter auswählen konnten. Ich würde als Präsident des Institutes nicht zögern, heute schon die entsprechende Garantie den Ägyptern gegenüber zu übernehmen. Die Frage ist, ob ihnen das nicht vorläufig
committed himself to me in writing to take over the leadership in the publishing of the 13 volumes. Rascher is contractually committed to us to publish the translations in the ‘Studien aus dem C.G. Jung-Institut.’

3. I hope that you recall that the missing 40 pages of the Jung Codex represent temporally an especially urgent item on the agenda. Do not forget that the translation of the Jung Codex has to be in print as a formal gift for 25 July 1955, i.e. Jung’s 80th birthday, and that the preparation of the 40 pages also claims considerable time. So we should already have them today. But in this connection I must leave it to you to wink possibly already now with our gift.

This letter illustrates the extent to which the plans did not correspond to reality. To notify the Egyptian authorities officially that ‘we have basic agreements in all areas of the publication,’ whereas in reality the envisaged translators have apparently not even been sounded out in a preliminary way, is simply to mislead both von Fischer and, through him, the Egyptian authorities. To expect the 40 pages to be published eighteen months later is to be completely unaware of the work schedule of the editors. The original idea of having it all published in time for the ‘baptism’ on 15 November 1953 had to be given up. That should have warned Meier not to hope to publish the whole codex in 1955! In fact, the bulk of the Jung Codex was only published in a last installment in 1975.

‘The Missing 40 Pages’

Von Fischer replied to Meier with a letter that seemed to provide a solution to the problem at least of ‘the missing 40 pages’.38

---

38 25 iii 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Die 40 Seiten des Codex Jung, die Ihnen noch fehlen, befinden sich tatsächlich im Koptischen Museum, wo sie, wie die übrigen Papyri der Frl. Dattari, unter ägyptischen Sequester stehen. Herr Pahor Labib sagte mir aber, dass er bereits selbst angefangen habe, sie zu photokopieren und dass er bereit sei, mir Abzüge davon noch vor meiner
The 40 pages of the Jung Codex that you still lack are indeed in the Coptic Museum, where they, like the other papyri of Miss Dattari, are sequestered by the Egyptians. But Pahor Labib said to me that he has already begun himself to photograph them, and that he is ready to give me prints of them for your hands already before my departure from Cairo. He could do this on his own authority, without asking the Consultative Commission, incidentally still not yet named, since it has to do with a part of a book that is not in the Coptic Museum. ...

I myself leave here on 1 May.

Meier recognized the importance of this information, and responded enthusiastically:39

Perhaps the most important information in your letter is that about the 40 pages. For the Institute, it will be the nicest triumph, if then for the 80th birthday of Jung we can add to our special volume the translation of the fourth tractate [ = Tractate 5]. For the time being I will still say nothing about this to Puech and Quispel, until I have the photographs in hand.

But then Meier realized that Quispel would need to expedite the translation, and so he wrote the news to Quispel the very same day:40

The news from Egypt continues to be favorable. The missing 40 pages have turned up and I will already receive the photographs in a short while. I hope that they will be good enough to be usable. Would you please carefully note any unclear elements in the text, in order that, if the situation arises, we can

---

39 18 iii 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:


40 18 iii 54: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Die Nachrichten aus Ägypten sind anhaltend günstig. Die 40 fehlenden Seiten haben sich gefunden und ich werde die Photographien schon in Kurzem erhalten. Ich hoffe, dass sie so gut sein werden, dass sie brauchbar sind. Wollen Sie sich bitte allfällige Unklarheiten im Text genau merken, damit wir u. U. bei unserem Besuch in Kairo anhand des Originales die Unsicherheiten beheben können. Aller Voraussicht nach wird unser Besuch in Kairo Ende April stattfinden; da Puech offensichtlich
clear up the uncertainties during our visit in Cairo on the basis of the original. According to all expectations, our visit to Cairo will take place at the end of April. Since Puech apparently cannot get off, it is all the more necessary that you are along. It seems to me now extremely important that the working over of the 40 pages can be carried out as expeditiously as possible immediately after receiving them, and perhaps I may ask of you to take in hand already now the preparations necessary for that. I hope you understand that for me it is something of the highest importance that the translation of the complete Jung Codex can be out in printed form for Jung’s 80th birthday, i.e. hence about the middle of July next year. With the translation of the fourth [fifth] tractate, it may well become a highly impressive festive gift. For me personally, this fourth [fifth] tractate seems especially promising, in that it, in my view, contains something like a systematic Gnostic theology.

Meier hardly knew anything of the contents of The Tripartite Tractate, and hence his expectation of a systematic Gnostic theology was pure speculation. But Quispel responded to him with enthusiasm:41

First I would like to congratulate you on the brilliant success of your efforts. I will work over the photographs immediately. I do have time, since the vacations are beginning, and I will seek to bring a preliminary translation with me to Zürich.

If you want to have the translation finished by the middle of July next year, the French must also do something. Now they are doing nothing, especially Malinine. That is annoying.


41 19 iii 54: Letter from Quispel to Meier:


Wenn Sie mitte Juli nächstes Jahres die Übersetzung fertig haben wollen, müssen die Franzosen auch etwas tun. Jetzt schaffen sie nichts, besonders Malinine. Das ist ärgerlich.
Meier then communicated the news to Puech, following Quispel's suggestion that he activate the French in the translation of the Jung Codex in time for it to be bound and presented at Jung's birthday:42

First, I am happy to be able to communicate to you that the missing 40 pages of the fourth [fifth] tractate of the Jung Codex have been found. The Director of the Coptic Museum in Cairo is in the process of having photographs made, and he is going to send them to me at any moment.

This discovery is of a very particular interest to us, since we have always had the intention of publishing the complete translation of the Jung Codex on the occasion of the 80th birthday of Professor Jung, that is to say, for the 26 July 1955.

Then Meier reported to Quispel that he had put pressure on Puech as requested, while expecting momentarily the concession from the Egyptian authorities to publish all the Nag Hammadi Codices:43

I hope that with a letter of the 23rd of this month to have given Mr. Puech legs, with regard to the translation. ...

As soon as I receive news from v[on] Fischer that the approval is awarded, I will send a letter to all the collaborators in the sense of your draft, for which I would still like to thank you very much.

At Meier’s request, Quispel had indeed already provided the draft of a letter to potential translators, which Meier edited in German, French, and English, and addressed to each person on the list, dated simply April 1954:44

The Egyptian Government has delegated to a committee consisting of H.-Ch. Puech, G. Quispel and the undersigned the editing of the Nag Hammadi Codices.

42 23 iii 54: Letter from Meier to Puech:
D’abord, je me réjouis de pouvoir vous communiquer que les 40 pages manquantes du 4em traité du Codex Jung ont été retrouvées. Monsieur le Directeur du Musée Copte au Caire est en train de faire faire les photos-copies et il va me les envoyer incessamment.
Cette trouvaille nous est d’un intérêt tout particulier, puisque nous avons toujours eu l’intention de publier la traduction en entier du Codex Jung a l’occasion du 80em anniversaire du Professeur Jung, c’est à dire pour le 26 Juillet 1955.

43 25 iii 54: Letter from Meier to Quispel:
Ich hoffe, mit einem Brief vom 23. ds. Herrn Puech Beine gemacht zu haben, was die Übersetzung betrifft. ...
Im Moment, wo ich die Nachricht bekomme von v. Fischer, dass die Bewilligung erteilt wird, werde ich an alle Mitarbeiter einen Brief abgeben lassen im Sinne Ihres Entwurfes, für den ich Ihnen noch bestens danken möchte.

44 iv 54: Letter from Meier to the collaborators, English draft.
Codices. As chairman of this committee, and in the name of the other members, I have the honour of inviting you to collaborate in this undertaking. I should like to ask you to take over the editing with critical apparatus and the translation of one of the twelve Codices. It is planned to have these volumes printed at the *Imprimerie Nationale* in Paris by order of an international ad hoc commission, in which various academies and institutes will participate. It is also expected that a German translation of all these texts will appear in the ‘*Studien aus dem C.G. Jung Institute Zürich,*’ Rascher-Verlag, Zürich, at a somewhat later date.

We should be very gratified if you, as a leading specialist in the field of Coptic literature, were able to assure us as soon as possible of your valued collaboration in this joint undertaking.

Awaiting the favor of your reply, I am

Very truly yours,

Meier noticed von Fischer that he was ready to send the letters of invitation to those chosen to become collaborators:

You have set up various groups of specialties. But now it is so that these specialties cannot be separated in terms of personnel. Precisely, our collaborators must combine in one person: coptologists who both know something of Gnosticism and must be heresiologists, and besides must command early Christian literature as well as pre-Christian Jewish elements. They should also in addition be quite familiar with New Testament literature. You can understand without difficulty that these far-reaching requirements are only met by very few experts. Puech is of course the most brilliant example of this. For this reason the list submitted to you has been composed by us together, and it is only to be hoped that at least the great majority of these people will say yes. They will be asked in writing only now, since, due to the discretion you recommended, we did not want to make a lot of noise about the whole question.

---

45 11 iii 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Since the authorization by the Egyptian government was not forthcoming, the letters were never actually mailed.

Meanwhile Puech responded to Meier concerning completing the edition of the Jung Codex by the time of Jung’s eightieth birthday:

I have shared with Malinine your desire to see the translation of the Jung Codex ready to appear by July 1955. He and I, we will work on it intensively beginning the second week of May. Not having photographs of the codex, I alone can hardly advance the study and commentary on the text. Do put pressure, from your side, on Quispel. However let us not hide from ourselves that it has to do with a very arduous task and that many difficulties, especially in the fourth [fifth] text, have a good chance of remaining still unresolved for a long time.

We will no doubt be considerably aided by reading the 40 pages of the manuscript found again in the Coptic Museum. It is an unexpected windfall, in which I very actively rejoice. We await with impatience and curiosity, Malinine and myself, the photographs that you mention to me. The Director of the Coptic Museum, does he authorize us to make use of them immediately and to publish them with the rest of the Jung Codex?

Puech did not have the openness to concede to Meier that he was dependent on Malinine for the translation. Puech’s contribution to the translation seems to have been to try to make Gnostic sense of Malinine’s all-too-wooden and hence meaningless draft translations. Puech wrote Quispel somewhat more openly in this regard:

---

46 10 iv 54: Letter from Puech to Meier:

J’ai fait part à M. Malinine de votre désir de voir la traduction du Codex Jung prête à paraître pour juillet 1955. Lui et moi, nous y travaillerons intensément dès la seconde semaine de mai. Ne disposant pas des photographies du Codex, je ne puis guère faire avancer seul l’étude et le commentaire du texte. Pressez, de votre côté, Quispel. Ne nous cachons pas cependant qu’il s’agit d’une tâche fort ardue et que beaucoup de difficultés, surtout dans le quatrième écrit, ont chance de demeurer longtemps encore irrésolues.

Nous serons sans doute considérablement aidés par la lecture des 40 pages du manuscrit retrouvées au Musée Copte. C’est une aubaine inespérée, dont je me réjouis très vivement. Nous attendons avec impatience et curiosité, M. Malinine et moi, les photocopies dont vous me parlez. M. le Directeur du Musée Copte nous autorise-t-il à en faire immédiatement état et à les publier avec le reste du Codex Jung?

47 14 iv 54: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Le Dr. Meier a dû vous apprendre, en même temps qu’à moi-même, que 40 pages du Codex avaient été retrouvées au Caire et que la Direction du Musée Copte était en train de les faire photocopier. Le nombre élevé de ces pages me surprend un peu; mais tant mieux s’il est exact! Espérons que les photographies nous parviendront
Dr. Meier must have informed you at the same time as he did me that 40 pages of the Codex have been found again in Cairo and that the Direction of the Coptic Museum was in the process of having them photographed. The elevated number of these pages surprises me somewhat, but all the better, if it is correct! Let us hope that the photographs reach us as soon as possible. The assistance that they will provide us is apparent. On the other hand Malinine, who has returned from Egypt some time ago, is beginning to supply me the revised translation of certain parts of this fourth [fifth] text. In certain places it improves or makes more precise the interpretations that we had believed at first to have to adopt. ... For the rest, we are going, Malinine and myself, to review very closely in the course of June the text and translation of all the Codex. If you could come to Paris and join us, that would be both simpler and more fruitful. We have to move rather rapidly, since, as you know, Dr. Meier wants there to appear in July 1955, in the collection of the Jung Institute, a first German translation of the volume. Will we succeed however in overcoming all the difficulties? It would be annoying to expose ourselves to the criticisms of specialists.

This report that the photography had already begun in the Coptic Museum would seem to be accurate. Plates 1–46 do contain facsimiles of the Cairo part of Codex I, ‘the missing 40 pages.”48 Yet Meier seems to have gotten access to photographs only after that volume was published and copies of Pahor Labib’s facsimile volume were handed out to Quispel and Puech at the meeting of the International Committee of Gnosticism in October 1956.

Meier’s Letter to Mustafa Amr

On 11 March 1954 Meier sent von Fischer a final draft of a formal letter to Mustafa Amr, General Director of the Department of Egyptian Antiquities, based on an earlier draft that von Fischer had sent Meier on 24 February 1954. Until Mustafa Amr requested Quispel on 13 April 1955 to have the Jung Institute again write to him, stating its willingness to return the Jung Codex

to Egypt, and requesting permission to secure photographs and publication rights for ‘the missing 40 pages’ (see Chapter 5, Part 4 below), this letter of 11 March 1954 represented the official position of the Jung Institute toward the Egyptian authorities:\[49\]

We have the honor to confirm to you our letter of 22 October 1953 [see Chapter 3, Part 5 above] and to submit to you the following proposals: ...

2) The Jung Institute had the occasion to acquire recently one of the volumes of the said series, and has immediately subjected it to the study of a group of scholars of international reputation. This work is in progress, but cannot be completed until the 40 pages that are lacking in the said volume and that seem still to be in the Coptic Museum with the other sequestered texts can be studied.

3) Today the Jung Institute would also be very happy to get to know as well the other volumes of the series in question. It hence solicits authorization to have a photographic copy made of them, and then to submit it to the study of a group of scholars in view of their publication.

4) With this in view, it offers:

a) to constitute a small Committee of scholars, such as Professor Puech, of the Institute of France; Professor G. Quispel, of the Faculty of Theology of the University of Utrecht; Professor C.G. Jung, Professor at the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule of Zürich and the University of Basel; and Professor C.A. Meier, President of the C.G. Jung Institute. The President of this group would need to be named later on. This small Committee would assume the direction of the scientific work that comes in question.

---

\[49\] 11 iii 54: Letter from Meier to Mustafa Amr:

Nous avons l’honneur de vous confirmer notre lettre du 22 octobre 1953 et de vous soumettre les propositions suivantes. ...

2) L’Institut Jung a eu l’occasion d’acquérir récemment un des volumes de ladite série et l’a aussitôt soumis à l’étude d’un group de savants de réputation internationale. Ces travaux sont en cours, mais ne pourront être terminés que lorsque les 40 pages qui manquent audit volume et qui semblent se trouver encore au Musée copte avec les autres textes séquestrés auront pu être étudiées.

3) L’Institut Jung serait aujourd’hui fort désireux de connaître également les autres volumes de la série dont il s’agit. Il sollicite donc l’autorisation d’en faire faire une photocopie et de la soumettre ensuite à l’étude d’un groupe de savants en vue de leur publication.

4) Dans cette idée, il offre

a) de constituer un comité restreint de savants tels que le Professeur Puech, de l’Institut de France; le Professeur G. Quispel de la Faculté de Théologie de l’Université d’Utrecht; le Professeur C.G. Jung, Professeur à l’École Polytechnique Fédérale de Zurich et à l’Université de Bâle; et le Professeur C.A. Meier, Président de
b) to constitute a group of scholars of international reputation to whom the Committee of Direction could appeal in the course of the work. It must have to do here with scholars who are at the same time coptologists and specialists in Gnostic literature, as well as heresiologists, and those familiar with early Christian literature. It goes without saying that there is not a large pool of scholars who would meet all these conditions. I give you under 5b a tentative list of collaborators.

The C.G. Jung Institute would be happy if the Direction of Egyptian Antiquities would see fit to designate for it the Egyptian scholar or scholars who, in its opinion, could be consulted.

5) ... In this regard the Jung Institute can already make the following proposals:

a) the photocopy of the Gnostic texts would be made in Cairo under the care of specialists attached to the Direction of Antiquities (Museum of Antiquities or Coptic Museum), and under the direction of a coptologist residing in Cairo, be it Doresse, or, for example, the Reverend Father du Bourguet, member of the Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale in Cairo, or by Ch. Kuentz, former Director of the said Institute, also a coptologist. The expenses of the photography would be assumed by the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Paris (C.N.R.S.), on the presentation of a detailed bill.

b) the study of the texts in view of their transcription in printed letters would be done by the scholars who come in question, several of whom have already announced their gratuitous collaboration. Here is the list: ...
c) The printing of the said transcribed texts, with an introduction and possibly a French translation, would be entrusted to the *Imprimerie Nationale* in Paris; the expenses that would result from this would also be assumed by the C.N.R.S.

d) later, a German translation of the texts could be carried out under the care of our Institute and published by the house Rascher & Co. in Zürich, in a series of *Studien aus dem C.G. Jung Institut Zürich,* at the expense of the said house.

6) The former owner of the papyri, Mlle Dattari, who is still in legal proceedings with the Egyptian Government with regard to these texts, has given up all opposition to the photography and the publication of these documents (see the letter of Aly Ayoub to the Embassy of Switzerland in Cairo, of 28 January 1954).

Meier included the list of scholars he had received from Quispel: Säve-Söderbergh, Vergote, Lefort, Erichsen, Kahle, Till, Lanschoot, Stricker, Jannsen, ‘several of whom have already announced their gratuitous collaboration.’ But it remains unclear who had even been approached orally in this matter!

In a covering letter Meier explained to von Fischer:

---

par les savants dont il s’agit, dont plusieurs ont d’ores et déjà annoncé leur collaboration gratuite. Voici la liste: ...

[c) L’impression desdits textes transcrits, d’une introduction et éventuellement d’une traduction en français serait confiée à l’*Imprimerie Nationale* à Paris; les frais qui en résulteraient seraient assumés également par le C.N.R.S.

d) plus tard, une traduction allemande des textes pourrait être effectuée par les soins de notre Institut et publiés par la maison Rascher & Cie, à Zurich, dans une série des *Studien aus dem C.G. Jung Institut Zürich,* aux frais de ladite maison.

6) L’ancienne propriétaire des papyri, Mlle Dattari, qui est encore en procès avec le Gouvernement égyptien au sujet de ces textes, a renoncé à toutes oppositions à la photocopie et à la publication de ces documents (voir lettre de M. Aly Ayoub à la Légation de Suisse au Caire, du 28 janvier 1954).

---

50 n iii 54: Letter from Meier to Mustafa Amr:

... dont plusieurs ont d’ores et déjà annoncé leur collaboration gratuite.

51 n iii 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Quispel und Puech haben begeistert zu dem Plane zustimmt, was mich besonders bei dem letzteren sehr freut, der jetzt wirklich seine chauvinistischen Tendenzen zugunsten der Wissenschaft zurückgestellt zu haben scheint. Er schreibt mir aber, dass es für ihn wegen anderweitiger Verpflichtungen (Lehramt und Kongresse) sehr schwer sein werde, vor Ende Mai nach Ägypten zu fahren. Ich frage mich, ob wir in diesem Fall nicht auf seine Mitreise verzichten müssen, trotzdem er prestigemässig einzigartig dasteht. Er macht aber selber den Vorschlag, dass er nötigenfalls durch Mr. Rebeyrol vertreten werden könnte.
Quispel and Puech have agreed enthusiastically to the plan, which pleases me very much, especially in the case of the latter, who now seems to have really put his chauvinistic tendencies behind him in favor of science. But he writes me that it will be very difficult for him to travel before the end of May to Egypt because of other responsibilities (teaching and congresses). I wonder whether in this case we must not give up on his traveling with us, in spite of him having a quite unique standing in terms of prestige. But he himself makes the suggestion that if necessary he could be represented by Rebeyrol.

Rebeyrol of the French Embassy sent von Fischer a follow-up of his conversation with von Fischer, listing the French participation:\textsuperscript{52}

As a follow-up to our recent conversation on the subject of the publication of the Gnostic papyri discovered at Nag Hamadi, I believe I can give you already now the assurance that the Comité National de la Recherche Scientifique of Paris will be able to give to the Jung Institute the scientific and material aid necessary for the photography of the manuscripts in the best possible conditions.

You are not ignorant of the fact that Doresse, at present member of the Ethiopian Department of Antiquities, had previously been charged with this work of photography. I hope that he will be able to obtain the necessary leave in order to return to Cairo for the time required for the satisfactory execution of this work.

In case that Doresse would not be able to return from Addis Abeba, I have the best hope that other French scientific collaboration can be found under the auspices of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

\textsuperscript{52} 12 iii 54: Letter from Rebeyrol to von Fischer:

Comme suite à notre récent entretien au sujet de la publication des papyrus gnostiques découverts à Nag Hamadi, je crois pouvoir vous donner dès maintenant l’assurance que le Comité National de la Recherche Scientifique de Paris pourra donner à l’Institut Jung l’aide scientifique et matérielle nécessaire à la photocopie des manuscrits dans les meilleures conditions possibles.

Vous n’ignorez pas que M. Doresse, actuellement membre du Comité éthiopien des Antiquités, avait été précédemment chargé de ce travail de photocopie. J’espère qu’il pourra obtenir le congé nécessaire pour revenir au Caire durant le temps indispensable à la bonne exécution de ce travail.

Au cas où M. Doresse ne pourrait pas revenir d’Addis Abeba, j’ai le meilleur espoir que d’autres concours scientifiques français pourront être trouvés sous l’égide du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Je saisïs cette occasion pour vous témoigner la reconnaissance des savants français pour les efforts si précieux que vous avez bien voulu déployer en vue de permettre aux savants du monde entier de prendre connaissance des manuscrits gnostiques.
I take this opportunity to attest to you the gratitude of the French scholars for the very precious efforts that you have been kind enough to display in view of permitting the scholars of the whole world to come to know the Gnostic manuscripts.

Von Fischer replied to Meier:

Your letter of 11 March reached me recently and I have turned your text over personally to the ‘Service général des Antiquités’ in Cairo, Moustafa Amer. He thinks that in its present form it provides a good basis for your proposal and that it can be thus circulated to the ‘Commission consultative des Antiquités.’ You do not need to change anything, and the further details can be handled through correspondence.

The ‘Commission consultative’ still has not yet been named, and I also do not know when it is to be named. Nonetheless Pahor Labib presented to the Minister of Education last Sunday a written report on the whole situation.

On 23 March 1954 Meier sent Puech his assurances that Puech would chair the International Committee:

I promise you to do what is necessary, on the occasion of submitting the authorization for publication, that it is expressly made clear in the official document that Monsieur Puech, Professor at the Collège de France, assumes the functions of General Director of the Publication.

This does not fit well with Meier’s official letter to Moustafa Amr of 11 March 1954, in which he said: “The President of this group would need to be named later.” Indeed, his own subtle efforts to be so named may be heard in his referring to himself as Professor in his official letter of 11 March 1954.

---

53 17 iii 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:
Ich gelangte in den Besitz Ihres Briefes vom 11. März letzthin und habe Ihr Schreiben an das “Service général des Antiquités” in Kairo, Herrn Moustafa Amer, bereits persönlich übergeben. Er meint, dass es in der vorliegenden Form eine gute Basis für Ihren Vorschlag bilde und dass es so der “Commission consultative des Antiquités” unterbreitet werden könne; Sie brauchten nichts zu ändern und das Weitere liese sich durch Korrespondenz erledigen.

Die “Commission consultative” ist immer noch nicht ernannt worden und ich weiss auch nicht, wann sie ernannt werden soll. Immerhin hat Herr Pahor Labib dem Unterrichtsminister letzten Sonntag ein schriftliches Referat über die ganze Angelegenheit unterbreitet.

54 23 iii 54: Letter from Meier to Puech:
Je vous promets de faire le nécessaire, à l’occasion de la remise de l’autorisation de publication, pour qu’il soit expressément précisé dans l’acte officiel, que Monsieur Puech, Professeur au Collège de France, assume les fonctions de Directeur Général de la Publication.
though he did not actually have that august title so important in a European university—he was a *Privat-Dozent*, roughly equivalent to an Instructor. Puech had reproached Doresse for a similar misuse of the title Professor to refer to himself in a news release (see Chapter 2, Part 3 above)! Of course it was Pahor Labib who became the chairperson.

*Almost Returning the Jung Codex to Egypt, April 1954*

Von Fischer raised with Meier the possibility of returning the Jung Codex to the Swiss Embassy in Cairo, so as to have it there available to present to the Egyptian government when the time was ripe:

> I am not in favor of us giving the Jung Codex away too soon. *We can still get into the situation of urgently needing somewhere this important argument.* I am in favor of us pursuing our goal as long as possible with purely scholarly motives. We should not force the issue by means of enticements or profit. We now have the trust of the Egyptian authorities, and this is more valuable than anything else.

But my plan would be that we donate the codex to the Egyptian government, once we have the concession for the publication of the papyri finally in hand. We would then respond to a gift with another gift, and this would also correspond better to the dignity both of our country and of scholarship.

If the concession does not seem to have come within reach by the beginning of April, I would say to Moustafa Amer that I had the intention to encourage the C.G. Jung Institute to present the Jung Codex to the Egyptian government when the negotiations regarding the papyri are completed. But now since

---

55 iiii 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

> Ich bin *nicht* dafür, dass wir den Codex Jung vorzeitig verschenken. *Wir können immer noch in die Lage kommen, dieses wichtige Argument irgendwo dringend zu brauchen.* Ich bin dafür, dass wir unser Ziel so lange wie möglich aus reinen wissenschaftlichen Motiven verfolgen; wir sollten die Sache nicht durch Lockungen oder Gewinne erzwingen. Wir haben jetzt das Vertrauen der ägyptischen Behörden und dies gilt mehr als etwas anderes.

> Mein Plan wäre es aber, dass wir den Codex der ägyptischen Regierung dann schenken, wenn wir die Konzession für die Veröffentlichung der Papyri endgültig in Händen haben. Wir würden dann ein Geschenk mit einem anderen Geschenk erwidern und dies würde auch besser der Würde sowohl unseres Landes wie auch der Wissenschaft entsprechen.

> Sollte die Konzession bis Anfang April nicht in greifbare Nähe gelangt sein, so würde ich Herrn Moustafa Amer sagen, dass ich die Absicht hatte, das C.G. Jung-Institut zu bewegen, den Codex Jung der ägyptischen Regierung zu schenken, wenn die Verhandlungen betreffend die Papyri beendet seien. Da nun aber die Dinge nicht
things have not moved forward, I still could not do so. Then perhaps with this I can expedite things at the last minute.

Hence I wonder whether you, in view of the envisaged solution, do not want to consider the question of getting the Jung Codex to the Embassy in Cairo already now by means of the diplomatic courier, so that it is there when we need it. We could then present it to the government on the occasion of your presence in Cairo.

What does Page say to such a further presentation? He is surely in agreement with this?

Meier approved enthusiastically:

I fully share your opinion about donating the Jung Codex, and find your formulations on the topic absolutely ingenious. I can only be amazed to the highest degree at the skill with which you proceed here, and hope that your outstanding services are honored at the appropriate time. I have now written to Hubacher [the head of the diplomatic courier service in Bern] and asked him when we could turn over the codex personally to him. We would of course have to see to it that the possibility exists to send back the codex again in the same way, in case our efforts should not succeed after all.

Meier wrote Hubacher:

In seinem Brief vom 15. März, den ich mit Poststempel vom 17. III. durch Sie erhielt, schlägt Herr Minister von Fischer in Cairo vor, dass unser Institut ihm durch den diplomatischen Curier bereits jetzt den “Codex Jung” zukommen lässt. Er will das Dokument zu Händen haben, um es im Falle des günstigen Verlaufes seiner Verhand-
In his letter of 15 March, which I received from you with the postmark of 17 March, Minister von Fischer in Cairo proposes that our Institute already now send him by diplomatic courier the 'Jung Codex.' He wants to have the document in hand, in case there is a favorable outcome of his negotiations with the Egyptian government, to be able to present it to them as a gift in return, in the name of the Jung Institute.

Hence I permit myself the polite question, whether you are in agreement, if in the near future we bring the document over to you. Since it has to do with an exceptionally valuable manuscript, it could only be brought to Bern by someone personally, and we would have to insist that it be turned over to you personally, honorable Mr. Hubacher. The package is rather cumbersome and weighs at least two kilograms.

Then Meier wrote a letter to von Fischer to accompany the shipment:

After reaching agreement with Hubacher, I can send you the accompanying 'Jung Codex' by diplomatic courier. I assume that you will understand when I ask you to be willing, to relieve my mind, to confirm the correct reception. It has to do with 104 pages, on 52 individual leaves contained in fireproof plexiglass. This method of conservation, handled by the Leiden papyrologists, was carried out according to the most strict and modern criteria, and should keep the texts safe for millennia. It was an expensive procedure, which however was necessary, since the codex had suffered severely while lying many years in a bank safe.

The same day Meier wrote to Hubacher of the diplomatic courier service in Bern:

lungen mit der ägyptischen Regierung derselben als Gegenleistung im Namen des Jung-Institutes schenken zu können.

Ich gestatte mir deshalb die höfliche Anfrage, ob Sie damit einverstanden sind, wenn wir Ihnen in nächster Zeit das Dokument überbringen würden. Da es sich um eine ausserordentlich kostbare Handschrift handelt, könnte dieselbe nur von jemandem persönlich nach Bern gebracht werden, und wir müssten darauf dringen, sie Ihnen, sehr verehrter Herr Hubacher auch persönlich zu überweisen. Das Paket ist ziemlich umfänglich und wiegt mindestens 2 kg.

25 iii 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:


25 iii 54: Letter from Meier to Hubacher:
In reference to my letter of 18 March and our telephone conversation yesterday, I take the liberty of sending you with this letter the 'Jung Codex' as a registered package, and repeat the request that you send the valuable document to Minister von Fischer in Cairo, at his request, by means of the diplomatic courier.

But then Meier had to write von Fischer the very next day:  

After agreeing yesterday on the phone with Hubacher that I can send the codex to him in Bern, and he was willing to transmit it to you through the courier, I delivered the package early today to the post office. Now Hubacher has just phoned me again and asks me to inform you that you must send a request to Bern for this, since in the Political Department one is not adequately oriented. I hasten to inform you of this now, since it is not quite comfortable for me, if the codex lies around the courier office all too long.

Von Fischer requested the authorization:  

In response to your two letters of 18 and 25 March, I have the honor to inform you that I have solicited from the Federal Political Department in Bern authorization to transport the Jung Codex in the diplomatic pouch. I hope that the office of the courier will be able to receive my request favorably, since

---

60 26 iii 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

61 1 iv 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:
En réponse à vos deux lettres des 18 et 25 mars, j’ai l’honneur de vous faire savoir que j’ai sollicité du Département Politique Fédéral à Berne l’autorisation de transporter le Codex Jung par la valise diplomatique. J’espère que le bureau du courrier pourra accueillir favorablement ma demande, puisqu’il s’agit ici d’une occasion unique de raffermer les liens culturels entre les deux pays.

Pour ce qui est de la constitution de la Commission consultative de la Direction des Antiquités, rien n’a encore été fait, l’évolution de la situation politique empêchant toute décision. Je n’en poursuis pas moins mes efforts en vue d’arriver à une solution avant mon départ, fixé à la fin du mois d’avril.
it has to do here with a unique opportunity to strengthen the cultural ties between the two countries.

As to the constitution of the Consultative Commission of the Direction of Antiquities, nothing has yet been done, since the evolution of the political situation impedes every decision. I do not pursue any less my efforts to reach a solution before my departure, set for the end of the month of April.

Meier proceeded on his Easter vacations to Rome, where he received a letter from his secretary:

As an Easter egg I provide a small chapter to the novel ‘C[odex]’. Hu[bacher] just phoned from Bern and explained to me that ‘C[odex]’ could not be forwarded by the courier. They had reached that conclusion after lengthy consultations. But he proposed that ‘C[odex]’ be handed over by you to the appropriate Embassy at the appropriate time.—I will personally pick up ‘C[odex]’ tomorrow evening at 7:25 PM at the main train station and take it home. Not happily!!! Should it remain at my place?

But von Fischer had sent a telegram to Meier in Rome:

Legation Adviser Studmann could transport the Jung Codex. Contact the Political Department. Beat von Fischer

Once back in Zürich after the Rome vacation, Meier wrote von Fischer hopefully:

It seems that the transport of the codex is now going to work. Hubacher phoned me yesterday, and it is probable that Studmann picks up the package here in Zürich personally.

---

62 10 iv 54: Letter from A. Jaffé to Meier:


63 14 iv 54: Telegram from von Fischer to Meier:

CONSEILLER LEGATION STUDMANN POURRAIT TRANSPORTER CODEX JUNG STOP CONTACTEZ LE DEPARTEMENT POLITIQUE + BEAT DE FISCHER.

64 21 iv 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Es scheint, dass der Transport des Codex nun zum Klappen kommt. Herr Hubacher hat mich gestern angerufen, und es ist wahrscheinlich, dass Herr Studmann das Paket hier in Zürich persönlich abholt.
But the next day this last chance disappeared:\textsuperscript{65} Early today I finally could reach Studmann at his parents’ home. He would not have phoned me on his own initiative, although Hubacher had urgently requested him to do so. Studmann is incapable of measuring the significance of the matter and lacks the courage of his convictions. In short, he is not taking the codex with him. Where would we be if all diplomats were so short-sighted?

Some months later a Swiss bank receipt dated 9 September 1954 was made out to ‘Dr. C.A. Meier Privat-Dozent Zürich.’ It reported the deposit of a ‘fourfold sealed package with address, registered value 20,000 Swiss Francs.’\textsuperscript{66} The Jung Codex was finally returned, presumably from Meier’s home, to its usual location, just a week before Meier left for a trip to America on 16 September 1954.

Had Puech and Quispel been consulted about the ingenious idea of returning the Jung Codex to Cairo, to climax the successful completion of von Fischer’s career there, they would as always have opposed the returning of any leaves before they were published, so as to maintain their monopoly until their own \textit{editio princeps} appeared. In fact, Meier himself had given Puech this assurance from the very beginning (see Chapter 3, Part 1 above):\textsuperscript{67}

As you already know, dear Sir, I have an ambitious program concerning all this Gnostic library. I think that it will be relatively easy for us to obtain the authorization of the Egyptian government for the edition of all the twelve [read: thirteen] codices. One will return our codex, after publication, only under this condition.

A diplomatic offer to donate the Jung Codex to Egypt after its publication, carefully edited by von Fischer and Rahn, was finally sent by C.A. Meier, as Director of the Jung Institute, to Mustafa Amr, General Director of Antiquities in Cairo, on 22 June 1955:\textsuperscript{68}

\textsuperscript{65} 22 iv 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Heute früh habe ich endlich Herrn Studmann telephonisch erreichen können bei seinen Eltern. Er hätte mich nicht von sich aus angerufen, trotzdem ihn Herr Hubacher dringend darum ersucht hatte. Studmann ist unfähig, die Bedeutung der Sache zu ermessens und hat keine Zivilcourage. Kurz, er nimmt den Codex nicht mit. Wo ständen wir, wenn alle Diplomaten so kurzichtig wären?

\textsuperscript{66} 9 ix 54: Schweizerischer Bankverein statement:

Herrn Dr. C.A. Meier Privat-Dozent Zürich ... 4-fach versiegeltes Paket mit Aufschrift, dekl. Fr. 20,000.-.

\textsuperscript{67} 18 i 52: Letter from Meier to Puech (see Chapter 3, Part 1 above).

\textsuperscript{68} 22 vi 55: Letter from Meier to Mustafa Amr:
In reference to the correspondence exchanged on the subject of the publication of the Gnostic papyri of Nag-Hammadi, as well as to the conversation that took place on 13 April 1955 between you and Messrs Professor Quispel and Rahn, representing on this occasion our institution, we have the honor to confirm to you the content of the declarations that these two above-mentioned gentlemen have made to you on that occasion. We confirm in particular that we will be able to publish next summer, on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of Professor C.G. Jung, a large part of the papyrus of this collection that bears his name, and that we were able to acquire in Europe a few years ago, thanks to the munificence of a Maecenas. When the time comes, we will take pleasure to present a copy to you. It has to do, of course, and as you know, with the publication of the only *Gospel of Truth*, the leaves that complete the other parts of this papyrus being still missing to us.

With the publication of the text, our scientific interest in this papyrus will be exhausted. But nonetheless it will keep all its archaeological value. In view of the fact that the text is edited in Coptic and that the other papyri belonging to the same collection are found today in the Coptic Museum of Cairo, we would take pleasure in rendering a service to this Egyptian institution by restoring our original to it.

We would be grateful to you, therefore, to let us know if this idea finds your approval. In the affirmative case, we would be happy to offer the C.G. Jung
papyrus, gratuitously, to the said Coptic Museum of Cairo, as a sign of our friendship and as a token of a pleasant collaboration.

Please receive, Monsieur Director, the assurance of my very distinguished consideration.

Just Photographs of ‘the Missing 40 Pages’

All of these various plans were completely upset shortly before von Fischer was to leave Cairo, as he wrote Meier:69

With the most recent evolution *everything* is again overturned. The good will is there with M. Amer and Pahor Labib, yet Abbas Ammar [Minister of Education] failed completely and has resigned, although he had promised me everything. I have to begin everything all over again, and have already requested an audience with the new Minister of Education.

We have some luck, in that I leave not at the end of April, but only at the end of May. Perhaps something can still be done by then. It would be false to believe that we would have achieved our result if I had already offered our Codex. To the contrary, that would have confused everything still again.

Further, the question of their *40 pages* arises. Pahor Labib is always ready to give them to us, but *he does not know which they are*. I wonder whether we should commission someone to seek them out. Or do you yourself want to *come*?

Meier sent von Fischer instructions for identifying ‘the missing 40 pages’:70

69 24 iv 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:


Weiter erhebt sich die Frage ihrer 40 Seiten. Pahor Labib ist immer bereit, sie uns zu geben, aber er weiss nicht, welche es sind. Ich frage mich, ob wir jemanden beauftragen sollten, sie auszusuchen. Oder wollen Sie selbst *kommen*?

70 6 v 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Die Unklarheit wegen der 40 Seiten lässt sich sehr leicht beheben: der Codex Jung und alle zu ihm gehörenden Blätter hat gegenüber den anderen 12 Bänden ein auffallend anderes Format. Die Blätter sind höher und schmaler als die übrigen. ... Es sollte also sehr leicht sein, auch für einen des Koptisch nicht genügend Kundigen und auch für
The unclarity regarding the 40 pages can be overcome quite easily: The Jung Codex, and all leaves belonging to it, has, over against the other 12 volumes, a strikingly different format. The leaves are higher and narrower than the others. ... So it should be very easy, even for someone who does not know Coptic adequately, and also for someone who is not familiar with the extant [Zürich] pages, to diagnose these pages. To be sure, the fact that Pahor Labib told you that he had already found and begun to photograph the pages seems to me to point to an odd mystification.

Quispel then wrote Meier about access to the missing pages:?

In your letter you do not speak at all about the photographs of the missing 38 [!] pages. That disturbs me somewhat, since I tell myself that, after all, the whole text of the Jung Codex has to be finished already next year. Have you already received these pages? Can you tell me when I could expect them?

If indeed still nothing has come from Egypt, and also in the immediate future nothing will come from Egypt, I do fear that this edition cannot be completed before Jung's birthday.

I wonder whether it would not be better then, only to publish a translation of the Gospel of Truth, with introduction and commentary.

In the beginning of June I go to Paris, and would like at that time to lay before Puech a clearly defined plan, i.e. either the translation of the whole Codex, or only that of the Gospel of Truth. Hence may I ask you to report to me on this, already before the beginning of June?

71

jemanden, der die vorhandenen Seiten nicht kennt, diese Seiten zu diagnostizieren. Allerdings scheint mir die Tatsache, dass Ihnen Pahor Labib sagte, er hätte die Seiten schon gefunden und angefangen zu photographieren, auf eine merkwürdige Mystifizierung hinzuweisen.

In Ihrem Brief sprechen sie gar nicht über die Fotografien der fehlenden 38 Seiten. Das beunruhigt mich ein wenig, weil ich mir überlege, dass der ganze Text des Codex Jung doch schon im nächsten Jahren fertig sein muss. Haben Sie diese Seiten schon empfangen? Können Sie mir berichten, wann ich sie erwarten könne?

Wenn allerdings noch nichts aus Ägypten gekommen ist, und in der nächsten Zukunft auch nichts aus Ägypten kommen wird, fürchte ich doch, dass diese Ausgabe nicht vor Jung's Geburtstag fertig gestellt werden kann.

Ich frage mich, ob es nicht besser wäre dann nur eine Übersetzung des Evangeliums der Wahrheit, mit Einleitung und Kommentar herauszugeben.

Anfang Juni gehe ich nach Paris und möchte dann dem Puech einen festumrissenen Plan vorlegen, das heisst, entweder die Übersetzung des ganzen Codex, oder nur die des Evangelium der Wahrheit. Darf ich Sie deswegen bitten mir noch vor Anfang Juni darüber zu berichten?
Meier then wrote von Fischer to make a last effort in Cairo before von Fischer had to leave for Lisbon:\textsuperscript{72}

As to your last letter, I have the following to say:

In principle there is nothing against a photographic reproduction of the texts and their publication by the Egyptians. As soon as this has taken place, anyone can go at a critical edition or a translation, whether he is competent or not. Of course this is already less of a disadvantage. The greatest disadvantage in this procedure seems to me to be that, to judge by our experiences thus far, even the simple work of photographic publication will make us wait again for years. Perhaps this person also only promises something, but does nothing, or then he is soon again replaced by another Minister, who again has quite other views. Of course we cannot say these things to the Egyptians. But it is clear that in this way science is seriously neglected, and that the Egyptians would achieve appreciably more recognition if they would agree to our complete and carefully prepared plan, which would guarantee an overall edition of a irreproachable kind in a quite brief amount of time. By agreeing to this plan, enough would be done to meet all requirements, and we would of course honor adequately the great service of the Egyptians.

I do not know whether in the brief time still at your disposal you can still achieve anything, but I would be terribly relieved if you would try to make a last very strong effort, even if this had to take place by winking with the Jung

\textsuperscript{72} 13 v 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

\begin{quote}
Zu Ihrem letzten Brief habe ich folgendes zu sagen:

Im Prinzip ist gegen eine photographische Reproduktion der Texte und deren Herausgabe durch die Ägypter nichts einzuwenden. Im Moment, wo dies geschehen ist, kann jedermann an eine kritische Herausgabe oder an eine Übersetzung herangehen, ob er kompetent sei oder nicht. Dies ist natürlich schon ein kleinerer Nachteil. Der schwerwiegendstes Nachteil dieses Vorgehens scheint mir zu sein, dass nach unseren bisherigen Erfahrungen zu schließen auch die einfache Arbeit der photographischen Publikation wieder um Jahre auf sich warten lassen wird. Vielleicht verspricht dieser Herr auch nur etwas und tut nichts oder dann wird er in Kurzem wieder durch einen anderen Minister ersetzt, der wieder ganz andere Ansichten hat. Diese Dinge können wir den Ägyptern natürlich nicht sagen. Es ist aber eindeutig, dass die Wissenschaft auf diese Weise schwer vernachlässigt ist und dass sich die Ägypter wesentlich grössere Verdienste erwerben würden, wenn sie unserem kompletten und sorgfältig vorbereiteten Plan zustimmen würden, der eine Gesamtedition tadelloser Art in recht kurzer Zeit garantieren würde. Mit der Zustimmung zu diesem Plan wäre allen Erfordernissen Genüge geleistet, und wir würden natürlich den grossen Verdienst der Ägypter gebührend würdigen.

Ich weiss nicht, ob Sie in der kurzen, Ihnen noch zur Verfügung stehenden Zeit, noch etwas erreichen können, wäre aber ungeheuer erleichtert, wenn Sie noch einen letzten, sehr kräftigen Versuch machen wollten, auch wenn dies unter Winken mit dem Codex Jung geschehen müsste. ... Dementsprechend möchte ich dringend hoffen,
Codex. ... Correspondingly I would urgently like to hope that even after your departure from Egypt, we can, after all, carry the negotiations further, in case you yourself have not by then attained a result. In that case, I would like to ask you urgently to reflect whether you could not interest your successor in the whole matter, or someone else there with whom I could correspond further.

... But the most important thing is that we receive the missing 40 pages—and, indeed, as I already wrote you, very soon.

Von Fischer responded on 18 May 1954 as positively as he could to Meier:

In response to your letter of 13 May I can tell you that the Consultative Commission for the Coptic Museum is said to have been named, and is to meet soon. Please find the names of the members of this committee in the appended list.

The idea of publishing the Gnostic papyri themselves and here in Cairo in photographs seems now to have established itself in the spirit of the definitive Egyptians. It is for them a question of national honor. Recently the idea also seems to have come to expression of themselves taking over the plan you worked out, and forming an international commission under Egyptian leadership, and to do this before other countries have laid hold of such an initiative.

In what has to do with the 40 pages that you are missing, I spoke again yesterday with Pahor Labib, and he asked me to send him your indications...
of 6 May [as to how to identify the leaves of Codex I]. I have asked him to let me know immediately whether he possesses these folios and whether he can put them at my disposal.

My successor is A. Boissier, who comes from a family of scholars. Surely he will also have interest in your affair. ...

Finally, I am quite ready to speak about a possible donation of the Jung Codex, and have also already suggested such a possibility.

The appended list of members of the Consultative Commission was as follows:74

Members of the Committee for the Coptic Museum:

President: Mustafa Amr
Members: Gorgis Sobhy, Girgis Mata, Jassa Messiah, Pahor Labib

Then von Fischer wrote Meier on 2 June 1954 with more news:75

My departure has now been set firmly for 14 June. ...

Now I am still attempting to see Amer, and in any case to rescue the 40 pages of the codex. According to Tano, they should certainly be in the safe of the Coptic Museum. P[ahor] Labib was ready to hand them out to us, but Amer does not want to, and wants to wait until the [legal] process against Miss Dattari is settled. Now this process is in fact already under way. The first meeting has

74 19 v 54: Appended list from von Fischer to Meier of members of the Egyptian committee for the Coptic Museum:

Mitglieder des Ausschusses für das Koptische Museum: Präsident: Mustafa Amr; Mitglieder: Gorgis Sobhy, Girgis Mata, Jassa Messiah, Pahor Labib.

75 2 vi 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Meine Abreise ist jetzt auf dem 14. Juni festgelegt worden. ...

taken place, the next, on 6 June, should give the government the opportunity to explain its viewpoint. According to the opinion of most whom I asked, Tano will lose his case and the government will come into possession of the papyri. A commission will then have to decide on the indemnification.

But this too will go on forever.

One must then see whether Cairo wants to publish the photographs itself, which would not be so expensive, and for which the money is said to be in hand, or whether Cairo wants to entrust to us the matter after all.

The second question is whether Cairo itself wants to lead the work on the papyri, or whether it turns it over to those who take the initiative for that. But it is questionable whether they want to turn it over to the French, since, after all, they stand on a bad footing with them. So there is still a chance that Cairo turns the matter over to us, but itself wants to create the committee and take over the presidency.

A week later von Fischer wrote a final time to Meier from Cairo:76

I have just come from a visit with the General Director [of the Department of Egyptian Antiquities] Mustafa Amr, and can report to you that, according to his statements, the commission for the purchase and evaluation of antiquities and other documents has in fact been formed, but that the President is still to be elected. He will without doubt be his own adjunct, which means that in
this way Mustafa Amr will be able to exert his personal influence directly on this committee.

Professor Amr will at its next meeting—which should take place within the next week—call on the commission to take a position regarding your proposal. He himself will recommend to it that Egypt itself take over the photography of the papyri and also publish them itself. Further, he will propose that Egypt itself set up and preside over the committee for the scholarly work on these papyri. Professor Amr tells me that of course this is only his personal view, but that in case it prevails he will also get your opinion.

With regard to the 40 pages missing in your codex, Professor Amr believes that the commission mentioned above will declare itself ready without further ado, i.e. without awaiting the outcome of the process with Miss Dattari, to put them at your disposal in the form of photographs. For this reason I will without delay write in this sense a letter in your name to the 'Service des Antiquités,' and hope that the desired success will be accorded to it.

Thus von Fischer, after really doing all that diplomacy could do on behalf of the Jung Institute, had to leave Cairo without having achieved his basic objectives: to obtain photographs of 'the missing 40 pages' with the right to publish them, indeed to obtain the right to publish all of the Nag Hammadi Codices.

2. Tensions That Surfaced after Von Fischer's Departure from Cairo

As long as von Fischer was in Cairo to lead the negotiations, Puech and Quispel, as well as Meier, seem to have waited in hopes he would achieve success. But once he had departed from the scene for Lisbon, tensions among them surfaced anew.
Puech’s Need for ‘the Missing 40 Pages’

The lack of access to ‘the missing 40 pages’ became for Puech his reason, perhaps his excuse, for indicating that the Jung Codex would not be published in time for Jung’s 80th birthday.\footnote{30 vi 54: Letter from Puech to Meier:}

Our friend G[illes] Quispel is to arrive in Paris next Monday and stay here all the week, so as to work with me and Malinine on the text and the translation of the Jung Codex. We will also certainly have to occupy ourselves with the closely related questions: What to do in the absence of the sixteen, or, perhaps, forty pages of the codex rediscovered in the lot of papyri of Cairo? What are we to anticipate as to the remainder of the volumes of the library of Nag-Hammadi, about which, as I have learned painfully, the negotiations of von Fischer did not succeed at all in assuring us that we can make use of them?

We would be happy—and for us it would be very useful, not to say indispensable—to know where we are in this regard, how the situation presents itself now, and what your plans are. Do you judge the affair to be insoluble or definitively compromised? Are you on the contrary counting soon on resuming the steps with some hope of succeeding? I have the impression that, so long as the proprietor of the lot has not touched the large amount of money he has not ceased to demand, the Egyptian government will hesitate to make a definitive decision and valid commitments. Since it hardly seems to want to pay out the ‘indemnity’ demanded, or to expose itself to legal proceedings, the only possible solution seems to be what you laid out to us last August: To find a ‘Maecenas’ who would be disposed to cover the costs of the purchase. Would Page still again be the ‘providential person’?

\footnote{30 vi 54: Letter from Puech to Meier:}

Notre ami G. Quispel doit arriver à Paris lundi prochain et y séjourner toute la semaine afin de travailler avec moi et M. Malinine sur le texte et la traduction du Codex Jung. Nous aurons certainement aussi à nous occuper de questions très voisines: que faire en l’absence des seize ou, peut-être, des quarante pages du Codex retrouvés dans le lot des papyrus du Caire? Que prévoir au sujet du reste des volumes de la bibliothèque de Nag-Hammadi dont, comme je l’ai appris avec peine, les négociations de M. von Fischer ne sont point parvenues à nous assurer la disposition?

Nous serions heureux—et il nous serait fort utile, pour ne pas dire indispensable—de savoir où nous en sommes, comment se présente actuellement la situation et quels sont vos projets, jugez-vous l’affaire insoluble ou définitivement compromise? Comptez-vous, au contraire, reprendre bientôt les démarches avec quelque espoir d’aboutir? J’ai l’impression que, tant que le propriétaire du lot n’aura pas touché la forte somme d’argent qu’il n’a cessé de réclamer, le Gouvernement égyptien hésitera à prendre une décision définitive et des engagements valables. Comme il ne paraît guère désireux de verser l’“indemnité” demandée ou de s’exposer à un procès, la seule solution possible semble être celle que vous nous aviez exposée en août dernier: trouver un “mécène” qui soit disposé à couvrir les frais de l’achat. M. Page serait-il encore une fois l’“homme providentiel”? 
George H. (Tony) Page, who had contributed the 35,000 Swiss Francs (= $8,009) to purchase the Jung Codex, was born a citizen of the United States, indeed was once on an American Olympic team. He explained to me that he had taken up Swiss citizenship since the income tax rates were lower. He lived in a villa on the Lake of Zürich in a stretch of the shore known as the ‘gold coast.’ Once I was invited to spend a few days as a house guest, and on my arrival the host apologized for the bare walls. He explained that he and his Swiss wife had just returned from a trip, and so had not had time to go to the bank vault to retrieve their Van Goghs. Hence he would clearly have been able to donate a reasonable purchase price to be paid to Maria Dattari for ‘the missing 40 pages,’ which would then be donated to the Egyptian government without their even leaving Egypt.

Yet Meier wrote Puech not to mention the possibility of purchasing ‘the missing 40 pages’:

The court proceedings with the owner of the lot has already begun, and according to von Fischer it would be a crime to speak of money at this time. Hence Page, who, incidentally, would be disposed to pay a large amount for these 40 pages, is no help to us.

But to return to Puech’s letter to Meier:

I grope along, nevertheless, not having received from you any information on the causes that have led to the check in the recent negotiations.

In any case, this check, and the ignorance in which I am left, put me in an embarrassing position. Deprived of the knowledge of the complementary pages for which we awaited the photos, or the copy, it will be difficult for us to elaborate an edition or a really serious or scientific translation of the Jung Codex. It would be suitable to wait. Besides, as I have just been able to realize

---

78 13 vii 54: Letter from Meier to Puech:

Le procès avec la propriétaire du lot a déjà commencé, et selon Mr de Fischer il serait un crime de parler d’argent en ce moment, et conséquemment Mr Page, qui serait d’ailleurs incliné de payer une forte somme pour ces 40 pages, nous est inutile.

79 30 vi 54: Letter from Puech to Meier:

Je tâtonne cependant, n’ayant reçu de vous aucune information sur les causes qui ont amené l’échec des récentes négociations.

De toute façon, cet échec et l’ignorance où je suis laissé me mettent dans une situation embarrassante. Privés de la connaissance des pages complémentaires dont nous attendions les photos ou la copie, il nous sera difficile d’élaborer une édition ou une traduction vraiment sérieuse ou scientifique du Codex Jung. Il conviendrait d’attendre. D’ailleurs, ainsi que je viens de m’en rendre compte en en reprenant l’étude avec M. Malinine, le texte actuellement disponible oppose encore de trop grands obstacles
in resuming its study with Malinine, the text that is presently available still presents too great obstacles to every attempt at interpretation. All this risks delaying the publication of the German translation that you would like to see appear next July. On the other hand, I owe certain explanations to the Office of Cultural Relations of our Ministry of Foreign Affairs and to the Direction of our Imprimerie Nationale, having, at your suggestion, entered into discussions with both one and the other, either on the topic of the photography of the manuscripts and the mission entrusted in this regard to Doresse, or on the topic of the edition of the whole of the texts discovered near Nag-Hammadi. I would really like to be in a position to furnish the arguments that would justify either the suspension or the continuation of these discussions.

It would be dangerous, disastrous even, to leave the affair to chance. A new plan must be set up as soon as possible. But I cannot imagine one without knowing your intentions and having your view or your consent.

Hence inform me as soon as possible, I urgently ask of you. In possession of your letter, we can, Quispel and myself, discuss the situation in the course of the coming week, and try to find a solution to it.

Meier gave up hope of publishing all the Nag Hammadi Codices, and focused attention at least on including ‘the missing 40 pages’ in their publication of the Jung Codex for Jung’s birthday, as he wrote von Fischer:3 vii 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

3 vii 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Heute erhielt ich einen Brief von Puech, wonach die drei Herausgeber des Codex Jung sich nächste Woche in Paris treffen und gemeinsam am Texte weiter arbeiten. Puech ist nun sehr aufgeregt, dass diese Arbeit Stückwerk bleiben muss, solange wir die 40 Seiten nicht haben. Ich möchte Sie aus diesem Grunde dringend ersuchen, sich zu überlegen was in dieser Hinsicht gemacht werden könnte. Eine wissenschaftliche Verarbeitung des Codex Jung ist wirklich nur dann möglich, wenn die 40 Seiten berück-
Today I received a letter from Puech, according to which the three editors of the Jung Codex are meeting next week in Paris, and together will work further on the text. Puech is now very upset that this has to remain patchwork as long as we do not have the 40 pages. For this reason I would urgently like to ask you to reflect about what could be done in this regard. A scholarly editing of the Jung Codex is really possible only when the 40 pages can be taken into account, and a publication of the Codex for Jung’s 80th birthday would really be the crowning of the whole.

‘The missing 40 pages’ did not in fact become available in time for Jung’s 80th birthday, and, therefore, were not included in what was presented to him.

**Puech’s Need to Control Doresse**

It was no doubt Puech who had seen to it that the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique pressured Doresse to complete the French publication, out of concern that other nations, presumably the Swiss and Dutch, could take over:  

Your negligence brings with it a delay in the publication that is completely prejudicial to French science, for certain foreign nations have manifested the intention to interest themselves in this work.

Doresse, having just been to Cairo to renew his position there, responded bluntly to this letter from the C.N.R.S.:

The publication of the Coptic Gnostic texts of Cairo, in progress at the Imprimerie Nationale on the budget of the Commission of Excavations (and not of the C.N.R.S.) has unfortunately suffered the consequences of the departure of Drioton from the post of General Director of the Department of Antiquities, since the new Egyptian administration decided at the time to reexamine our rights to the editing of these documents. A few weeks ago, however,
Dr. Mustapha Amer, the present Director of the Department of Antiquities, was kind enough to give me again the assurances sufficient for us to resume without risk the publication of the first volume of texts and translations. I hope that the manuscript, established by myself almost two years ago, but which I had to deposit in the hands of the Egyptian authorities to attest the real advancement of our work, will soon be restored to me, and can thus be transmitted to the *Imprimerie Nationale*.

It is certain that the difficulties that we have undergone in this affair have in large part had as their cause the urgent steps undertaken by the representatives of certain foreign countries to obtain instead of us the publication of the documents that I myself discovered. I am all the more surprised by the criticisms that have been directed at me in this regard by the Direction of the C.N.R.S., in that these competing steps have been organized by Puech himself, with the consent no doubt of the C.N.R.S., if I may believe in this regard the letter of which I attach a copy.

I must, under these circumstances, receive with the most energetic protestations the complaints of negligence and of delay that were addressed to me without the least reason.

At the same time Doresse addressed a letter to Claude F.-A. Schaeffer, General Secretary of the Commission of Archaeological Excavations, who supported Doresse over against Puech.\(^{83}\)

---

\(^{83}\) 10 viii 54: Letter from Doresse to Schaeffer:

Le Dr. Mustapha Amer a bien voulu, là-bas, me montrer tout le dossier de cette affaire. Il est désormais certain que les propositions d’édition faites avec insistance par le Ministre de Suisse au Service des Antiquités (et les exigences manifestées par lui pour obtenir les photographies des documents que nous avons découverts!) sont bien ce...
Dr. Mustapha Amer has been so kind as to show me down there [Egypt] the whole dossier of this affair. He is from now on certain that the proposals for editing made with insistence by the Minister of Switzerland to the Department of Antiquities (and the efforts he manifested to obtain the photographs of the documents that we have discovered!) are indeed what Puech announces, and are supported by Puech himself. However these propositions attack without scruples all our rights in this matter and all that we have obtained, even (what Puech does not know) what concerns the publication of the first volume at present in the printing press! Finally, it is probable that these negotiations have been pushed against our interests for a much longer time than the letter of Puech would let it appear. ...

Does Puech have the right to transmit on his authority alone the result of my past—and future—work, and the obligations that I have taken toward the C.N.R.S. and the Commission of Excavations, for the benefit of a Swiss, American, Dutch team, for which I would be no more than ‘among the potential collaborators,’ and that with ‘rather strong opposition’ [see Chapter 3, Part 3 above]. May I here recall that, from the beginning of the discovery, Puech has apparently demanded with insistence from Drioton authorization to give primacy for the analyses of the texts discovered by me to ‘Neutestamentliche Apokryphen’ of Berlin?

But the rights, strictly French, that we have on the discovery, are not all that negligible. Dr. Mustapha Amer has again confirmed to me his willingness to

qu’annonce M. Puech et sont appuyées par M. Puech lui-même. Ces propositions s’attaquent, cependant, sans scrupules à tous nos droits en cette affaire et à tout ce que nous avons obtenu, même (ce que M. Puech ne sait pas) en ce qui concerne la publication du premier volume actuellement à l’impression! Il est enfin probable que ces négociations ont été poussées contre nos intérêts depuis bien plus longtemps que la lettre de M. Puech ne le laisserait supposer. ...

M. Puech est-il en droit de transmettre de sa seule autorité le résultat de mon travail passé, et future, et les obligations que j’ai prises envers le C.N.R.S. et la Commission des Fouilles au bénéfice d’une équipe suisse, américaine, hollandaise, pour laquelle je ne serais plus qu’un “collaborateur éventuel” et cela avec “d’assez fort oppositions”. Dois-je rappeler ici que, dès le début de la découverte, M. Puech avait semblablement demandé avec insistance à M. Drioton l’autorisation de donner le primeur des analyses des textes découverts par moi aux “Neutestamentliche Apocryphen” de Berlin?

Or les droits, strictement français, que nous avons sur la découverte ne sont pas tellement négligeables: le Dr. Mustapha Amer m’a encore confirmé sa volonté d’appuyer l’ensemble de notre plan d’édition du jour où les questions posées par l’acquisition des derniers manuscrits auront été résolus. Par contre, les autorités égyptiennes ne considèrent pas favorablement l’acquisition faite par l’Institut Jung d’un codex qu’elles jugent leur avoir été dérobé et dont, tant au Musée Copte que dans mes mains, existait déjà une photographie complète. De plus, les égyptiens jugent un peu étrange l’attitude de M. Puech, abandonnant le groupe des éditeurs légitimes des documents pour patronner contre ceux-ci une initiative suisse et américaine.
support the whole of our plan of editing, as soon as the questions posed by
the acquisition of the last manuscripts have been resolved. On the other hand,
the Egyptian authorities do not consider with favor the acquisition made by
the Jung Institute of a codex that they judge to have been taken from them,
and of which, both at the Coptic Museum and in my hands, there already
existed a complete photographic copy. In addition, the Egyptians consider the
attitude of Puech a bit strange, abandoning the group of legitimate editors of
the documents to patronize against these a Swiss and American initiative.

Doresse passed on to Abbot Drioton Schaeffer’s supportive reply, to which
Drioton later responded:

You were right, my dear Jean, to provide me documentation, as you have
done (I keep for you precisely the letter of Schaeffer [which hence is not
available]). That makes it possible for me to defend you with knowledge of the
case, if one attacks you in my presence, which incidentally has not happened.
But that has permitted me to shape the opinion, and rigorously, of Massignon,
whom I meet every month at the Counsel of Museums. In the month of
December, he asked me for news of you and spoke to me of Puech. I said to him
then straight out what I thought of the measures of the latter. Besides, that let
Massignon ‘laugh’ in a relaxed way. The conclusion of our discussion was the
following:—‘So your view is that it is necessary to defend Doresse?’—‘Fully
and rigorously.’—‘It's agreed, I will do so.’

Actually, Puech supported Doresse to a limited extent, since he favored
whatever French involvement was possible. He had even written Quispel
in this regard:

84 1 i 55: Letter from Drioton to Jean and Marianne Doresse:

Vous avez eu raison, mon cher Jean, de me documenter comme vous l'avez fait (je
vous garde précieusement la lettre de Schaeffer); cela me permet de vous défendre
en connaissance de cause si l'on vous attaque devant moi, ce qui du reste n’a pas
eu lieu. Mais cela m’a permis de faire l’opinion, et rigoureusement, de Massignon,
que je rencontre tous les mois au Conseil des Musées. Au mois de décembre, il m’a
demandé de vos nouvelles et m’a parlé de Puech. Je lui ai alors dit sans ambages ce que
je pensais des agissements de ce dernier. Cela a du reste fait “rigoler” d’aïse Massignon.
La conclusion de notre entretien a été la suivante: ‘—Alors votre avis est qu’il faut
defendre Doresse?—À font et rigoureusement.—C’ est entendu, je le ferai.’

85 14 ix 54: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

J’ai, au contraire, toujours soutenlu les droits de Doresse à collaborer à l’étude et à
l’édition de ces textes et, comme vous devez vous le rappeler, je les ai fait encore
valoir l’an dernier à Bilthoven, alors que vous incliniez, le Dr. Meier et vous, à éliminer
Doresse de toute cette affaire. Doresse, qui n’a que trop tendance à jouer au savant
exploité, pillé, victime d’intrigues, triumpherà s’il peut, en s’appuyant sur votre
témoignage, m’accuser de déloyauté à son égard. Efficace donc, je vous prie, la phrase
en question.
I have, to the contrary, always supported the rights of Doresse to collaborate in the study and the editing of these texts, and, as you must recall, I asserted them still last year at Bilthoven, when you were inclined, Dr. Meier and you, to eliminate Doresse from this whole affair. Doresse, who only has too much of a tendency to play the exploited, plundered scholar, victim of intrigues, will triumph if, in building on your testimony, he can accuse me of disloyalty with regard to him. So delete, I ask of you, the phrase in question.

Doresse passed by Cairo another time, and reported to Puech:

I have just passed by Cairo, and saw still another time the various personalities interested in the affair of the papyri. Dr. Mutapha Amer told me that the question would be submitted to the competent Committee—finally set afoot?—in the course of the coming week. Taha Hussein thinks that things will not go that fast, and is devastated over it. Dr. Pahor Labib, on the other hand, wants to fix with me already a date for the photography and the publication of the manuscripts. But he insists on not returning to me my definitive manuscripts of the first volume, which he pretends to need, so as to show his Committee what we are capable of. It is already two years that he has them in hand, and nevertheless I would not want to have to make a new copy of them! I will however do so, at least for a part of the work, and so as not to retard further the Imprimerie Nationale. Mr. Rebeyrol, whom I have seen for a long interview, judges, incidentally, that the politics of patience that we follow remains the best. Whatever the solution chosen by the Egyptians, be it that proposed by the Jung Institute or that formerly proposed by me, we ought to win out.

Puech despaired of the Swiss initiative, while realizing that Doresse was not only undermining it, but that Doresse was also Puech’s own French fall-back

---

86 2 x 54: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je viens de passer au Caire et de voir encore une fois les diverses personnalités intéressées à l’affaire des papyrus. Le Dr Mustapha Amer m’a déclaré que la question serait soumise au comité compétent,—enfin mis sur pied?—dans le courant de la semaine suivante. Taha Hussein croit que les choses n’iront pas aussi vite, et s’en désole. Le Dr. Pahor Labib, par contre, veut déjà prendre date avec moi pour la photo et la publication des manuscrits; mais il s’obstine à ne pas me rendre mes manuscrits définitifs du premier volume, dont il prétend avoir besoin pour montrer à son comité de quoi nous sommes capables. Il y a déjà deux ans qu’il les a en mains, et je ne voudrais pourtant pas avoir à en refaire une nouvelle copie! Je le ferai pourtant, tout au moins pour une partie de l’ouvrage et pour ne plus retarder l’Imprimerie Nationale. M. Rebeyrol, que j’ai vu longuement, juge d’ailleurs que la politique de patience que nous suivons reste la meilleure. Quelle que soit la solution choisie par les égyptiens, que ce soit celle proposée par l’Institut Jung ou celle proposée jadis par moi, nous devons gagner la partie.
position, a position that, after all, was dependent on Doresse. He expressed his confusion to Quispel: 87

I share your pessimism on the upshot of the negotiations in Cairo. Dr. Meier and von Fischer, in modifying the plan of action that they proposed to us in Bilthoven, seem to have maneuvered awkwardly, and compromised the situation of the Jung Institute in the affair. They were in any case wrong in not having notified us of their tactical change. And what to say of the strange silence observed with regard to me?

My impression is, more and more, that the Egyptians are going to decide themselves to publish the codices in photographic reproduction. Perhaps they will turn to Doresse for this work. I have the most contradictory rumors on the attitude assumed in Cairo with regard to Doresse. Some report that he is discredited there, while others, to the contrary, that he still has a chance to find real welcome there. In that case, the first project that he had submitted to the Egyptian authorities could prevail over that of the Jung Institute. What will come of all that? I do not know. I live in extreme confusion, which the silence of Dr. Meier contributes not a little to augment. In any case, we should not hide from ourselves that Doresse must be extremely irritated against us. His refusal to come to see me this summer during his stay in Paris is indicative enough.

Of course Doresse was quite understandably irritated with Puech and Quispel, on learning in Cairo of the Jung Institute's plans that built on them and left him out.

---

87 29 x 54: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Je partage votre pessimisme touchant l’issue des négociations du Caire. Le Dr. Meier et M. von Fischer, en modifiant le plan d’action qu’ils nous avaient proposé à Bilthoven, paraissent avoir manœuvré maladroitement et compromis la situation de l’Institut Jung dans l’affaire. Ils ont eu, en tout cas, le tort de ne pas nous prévenir de leur changement tactique. Et que dire de l’étrange silence observé à mon égard?

Mon impression est, de plus en plus, que les Égyptiens vont se décider à publier eux-mêmes les codices en reproduction photographique. Peut-être auront-ils recours à Doresse pour ce travail. J’ai sur l’attitude observée au Caire à l’endroit de Doresse les bruits les plus contradictoires: les uns rapportent qu’il y est discrédité; les autres, au contraire, qu’il a chance d’y trouver encore bon accueil. En ce cas, le premier projet qu’il avait soumis aux autorités égyptiennes pourrait prévaloir sur celui de l’Institut Jung. Qu’advienira-t-il de tout cela? Je ne sais. Je vis dans une confusion extrême, que le silence du Dr. Meier ne contribue pas peu à augmenter. De toute façon, il ne faut pas nous cacher que Doresse doit être fortement irrité contre nous. Son refus de venir me voir cet été durant son séjour à Paris est assez significatif.
The Stalemate Prior to Meier’s Departure for America on 16 September 1954

Puech had already laid out his French position in some detail to Meier:\(^\text{88}\)

Why this number of ‘twelve’? Would the enterprise include the collection acquired by the Museum in 1946 and containing the *Apocryphon of John*, the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, etc., a collection whose publication had been entrusted by Togo Mina to Doresse and myself, and part of which has already been set in type at the *Imprimerie Nationale*? ... Who will assume the costs of the photography and under what form will the publication be made? Does the project have some relation to the mission entrusted to Doresse by the (French) *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*, or are the operations envisaged quite independently? Is it a matter, finally, of a formal and definitive decision? ...

Or, as Quispel seemed to present it, the antiquity dealers will have carried the day, and, in that case, they risk securing the restitution of the manuscripts, and, as they have previously done, offering their acquisition to possible purchasers. Such will not be lacking, certain American covetousness having already surfaced, as you know. There is hence every reason to foresee and forestall this grave danger. The Jung Institute, does it dream of being immediately the purchaser, with the financial aid either of Page or the Bollingen Foundation? Or, to the contrary, does the Egyptian government see itself legally...

\(^{88}\) 18 vii 54: Letter from Puech to Meier:

Pourquoi ce chiffre de “douze”? L’entreprise engloberait-elle le recueil acquis par le Musée en 1946 et contenant l’*Apocryphon de Jean*, l’*Évangile des Égyptiens*, etc., recueil dont la publication avait été confiée par Togo Mina à Doresse et à moi-même et dont une partie a été déjà composée à l’*Imprimerie Nationale*? ... Qui assurera les frais de la photocopie et sous quelle forme la publication se fera-t-elle? Le projet a-t-il quelque rapport avec la mission dont le Centre National (français) de la Recherche Scientifique a chargé Doresse, ou les opérations sont-elles envisagées tout à fait indépendamment? S’agit-il, enfin, d’une décision formelle et définitive? ...

Ou, comme semblait le pressentir Quispel, les antiquaires auront gain de cause, et, en ce cas, ils risquent d’obtenir la restitution des manuscrits et, ainsi qu’ils l’ont déjà fait, d’en proposer l’acquisition à des acheteurs éventuels. Ceux-ci ne manqueront pas, certaines convoitises américaines s’étant déjà fait jour, vous le savez. Il y a donc tout lieu de prévoir et de prévenir ce grave danger. L’Institut Jung songe-t-il à se porter immédiatement acquéreur avec l’aide financière soit de M. Page soit de la Fondation Bollingen? Ou bien, au contraire, le Gouvernement égyptien se verra-t-il juridiquement reconnaître la qualité de propriétaire légitime et exclusif des manuscrits. Il entreprendrait alors la publication photocopique des volumes. ...

Dans cette hypothèse, il faudrait aussitôt obtenir du Gouvernement égyptien le droit exclusif de donner une édition typographique et critique, accompagnée d’une traduction et de notes, de l’ensemble des papyri une fois ceux-ci parus en simple reproduction photographique.
accorded the status of legitimate and exclusive proprietor of the manuscripts. It would then undertake the photographic publication of the volumes. ...

On this hypothesis, it would be necessary to obtain immediately from the Egyptian government the exclusive right to produce a typographic and critical edition, accompanied by a translation and notes, of the ensemble of the papyri, once they have appeared in simple photographic reproduction.

But since Meier did not reply to Puech with the details he requested, Puech complained to Quispel: 89

No response from Dr. Meier to the precise demands that I had posed to him in a second letter. Would he abandon our cause?

Meier in turn complained to Quispel about Puech: 90

If it were possible for you to calm Puech down, I would be unusually grateful to you. I myself am not in a position to do this, since he asks me a lot of things about which I do not want to answer him. He plays such an uncertain rôle that I would rather give up informing him precisely. He could all too easily misuse such information. ... One should now deal with the Egyptians very carefully and honorably, since they themselves, as a result of the political situation, are terribly uncertain, and for this reason could also very easily do something senseless. I would be very indebted to you if you would have the kindness to make this clear to Puech. I myself can no longer take this on, since I leave the day after tomorrow for America. Perhaps one must also tell Puech what is the truth, that the French for political reasons do not have the slightest chance of getting anything from the Egyptians.

89 22 viii 54: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
Aucune réponse du Dr. Meier aux demandes précises que je lui avais posées dans une second lettre. Abandonnerait-il la partie?

90 14 ix 54: Letter from Meier to Quispel:
Wenn es Ihnen möglich wäre, Puech zu beruhigen, so wäre ich Ihnen ausserordentlich dankbar. Ich selbst bin dazu nicht imstande, da er mich eine Menge Dinge frägt, die ich ihm nicht beantworten will. Er spielt eine so unsichere Rolle, sodass ich lieber darauf verzichte, ihn genau zu informieren. Er könnte diese Informationen allzu leicht missbrauchen. ... Man sollte jetzt mit den Ägyptern sehr vorsichtig und anständig umgehen, da sie selber zufolge der politischen Lage entsetzlich unsicher sind und deshalb auch sehr leicht Unsinn machen könnten. Ich wäre Ihnen sehr verbunden, wenn Sie die Freundlichkeit haben wollten, dies Puech klar zu machen. Ich selber kann dies nicht mehr übernehmen, da ich übermorgen nach Amerika fahre. Vielleicht muss man Puech auch sagen, was der Wahrheit entspricht, dass die Franzosen aus politischen Gründen nicht die geringste Chance haben von den Ägyptern irgend etwas zu bekommen.
But Puech again complained to Quispel about the lack of information from Meier, and in effect proposed that he and Quispel go forward without Meier: 91

If Dr. Meier persists in his silence, I would not be able to remain, for my part, inactive, once I return [from vacation] to Paris. ...

It is agreed that, for my part, I will keep you current on all the news that I can get from Egypt. The essential thing, in all this affair, is that we always act as we have done thus far: Loyally, in concert, and in the sole interest of science.

Meier seems to have realized before leaving for America that his goal of publishing the Jung Codex for Jung’s 80th birthday had finally to be given up, as he conceded to Quispel: 92

But unfortunately we again and again have to have lots of patience, and the publishing of the Jung Codex will perhaps after all no longer be finished for the 80th birthday.

Quispel put it positively, in that the publication of at least The Gospel of Truth could celebrate the event: 93

I wonder if the Gospel of Truth cannot after all be printed separately for Prof. Jung’s birthday. We have it practically finished, and the rest must still wait.

Just before his trip to America, Meier did what he could to make up both for his absence and for the absence of von Fischer in Cairo, by turning to Rahn to brief the new Ambassador Boissier, and even introducing to Rahn...
a former schoolmate, an Egyptian who hence lived in Cairo, as a possible contact person to use as needed in the ongoing negotiations.\textsuperscript{94}

The bearer of this letter, Wali-el-din Sameh of Cairo, is an old classmate of mine. I have absolute trust in him, and so have initiated him into the affair of the codices of Nag-Hammadi. Sameh has shown great interest in and complete understanding for our plans. It is not excluded that he can be of use to us in reaching our goals. Of course he would not want to intrude, and so we agreed that he would simply call on you and put his good services at your disposal, in case you could make use of them. You can have complete trust in Sameh, as I said already. ...

May I on this occasion also for my part thank you very heartily for the great pains that you have take in this matter. On the basis of your report to Boissier, which I had an opportunity to read at von Fischer’s, I do again have new hope that we will yet come to experience that these texts, so important for the history of religions, can be made available to scholarship.

Von Fischer then wrote Meier while Meier was in America of still another completely different alternative.\textsuperscript{95}

I just had a visit from Prof. Combe, Director of our archaeological institute in Cairo. He told me that Prof. Attya in Alexandria has the intention of opening soon an institute for the scholarly study of Coptic antiquities in Egypt. He

\textsuperscript{94} 14 ix 54: Letter from Meier to Rahn:

Der Überbringer dieses Briefes, Herr Wali-el-din Sameh aus Kairo ist ein alter Schul- freund von mir. Ich habe absolutes Vertrauen in ihn und habe ihn deshalb in die Angelegenheit der Codices von Nag-Hammadi eingeweiht. Herr Sameh hat großes Interesse bekundet und völliges Einverständnis mit unseren Plänen. Es ist nicht ausgeschlossen, dass er uns zur Erreichung unserer Ziele von Nutzen sein kann. Er möchte sich selbstverständlich nicht eindrängen und so sind wir dahin übereingekommen, dass er sich einfach bei Ihnen meldet und Ihnen für den Fall, dass Sie davon Gebrauch machen können, seine guten Dienste zur Verfügung stellt. Sie können in Herrn Sameh, wie schon gesagt, jedes Vertrauen haben. ...

Darf ich Ihnen bei dieser Gelegenheit auch meinerseits sehr herzlich danken für die grosse Mühe, die Sie sich in dieser Angelegenheit gegeben haben. Auf Grund Ihres Berichtes an Herrn Boissier, den ich bei Herrn von Fischer zu lesen bekam, habe ich doch wieder neue Hoffnung, dass wir es noch erleben werden, dass diese religionsgeschichtlich so bedeutenden Texte der Wissenschaft zur Verfügung gestellt werden können.

\textsuperscript{95} 29 ix 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Soeben war Prof. Combe, Direktor unseres archeologischen Institutes in Kairo, bei mir. Er erzählte mir, dass Prof. Attya in Alexandrien die Absicht habe, demnächst ein Institut für die wissenschaftliche Erforschung der koptischen Altertümer in Ägypten zu eröffnen; er verfüge bereits über die nötigen Summen und die Unterstützung
already disposes of the necessary funds, and has the support both of the rich and powerful Copts and of the Coptic church. Also the Department of Antiquities in Cairo is in favor of the affair and will support the initiatives of Prof. Attiya. As one of the first tasks of the institute to be newly founded, he named the publication and study of our Coptic texts. Yes, he would have spoken of the possibility of buying these texts themselves from Miss Dattari (?).

Dr. Aziz Suryal Atiya did in fact found the Institute of Coptic Studies in Cairo at that time, but then became the founder of the Middle East Center of the University of Utah. There he created the Aziz Atiya Library for Middle East Studies, for which he acquired in Egypt massive manuscript collections, but not the Nag Hammadi Codices. He edited *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, for which I served as Consultant.\(^{96}\)

**Disintegrating Relations on Meier’s Return from America**

On his return from America, Meier could only repeat to von Fischer his standard position of securing the photographs of ‘the missing 40 pages’ in time for their inclusion in the birthday celebration:\(^{97}\)

> The topic is now of course beginning to become terribly boring, and yet it seems to me that it would nonetheless be necessary that you make Prof. Rahn once again quite especially attentive to the urgency with regard to the 40 pages. If we do not receive them very soon, the thing can in no case appear for Jung’s 80th birthday, which would after all really be the only meaningful thing in terms of time. For this reason I again wonder whether it would not


\(^{97}\) 4 i 55: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:
after all be good to wink with our codex, for example in the sense that one promises it as a gift to the Egyptians if they do us the favor of providing us immediately the 40 pages in good photographs. ... Perhaps after all you could, thanks to your knowledge and connections, still do here a very skilful deed again, either personally or through Rahn, and thus at the same time offer still again the good services of the International Committee under the leadership of the Institute. ... In an emergency, I would like to remind you that, as I said, I could at any time travel personally to Egypt.

As Meier’s own language indicates, this is just a repetition of the proposals that had already failed to achieve their goal before his trip to America. But von Fischer loyally replied, no doubt from Lisbon:

On the basis of the second paragraph of your letter of the 4th of this month, I have immediately written to Minister Boissier in Cairo and asked him to send Prof. Rahn to Mustafa Amer to see how far the question of the Coptic papyri has progressed.

Meanwhile Puech had reported to Quispel what he had learned from Cairo, and doubted that The Gospel of Truth would be ready in time:

In Cairo one envisages, in effect, the constitution of a ‘Committee of Publication’ for the Gnostic manuscripts, of which, already, the Egyptian Government (that has fixed the amount of the indemnity to offer to Mlle D[attari]) considers itself to be the owner. The question is to be on the program of the next meeting of the ‘Committee of Coptic Archaeology,’ one of the new organisms created since last July. On the other hand, I do not have confirmation of the

---

98 12 i 55: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:


99 4 i 55: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

On envisage, en effect, au Caire la constitution d’un “Comité de publication” des manuscrits gnostiques dont, d’ores et déjà, le Gouvernement égyptien (qui a fixé le montant de l’indemnité à proposer à Mlle. D.) se considère comme le possesseur. La question doit figurer au programme de la prochaine réunion du “Comité d’Archéologie copte”, un des nouveaux organismes créés depuis juillet dernier. En revanche, je
fact that the Egyptian government would have accorded the permission to have access to the manuscripts. ...

In principle, I can only approve your plan to publish soon a translation of the *Gospel of Truth*, doubtless preceded by a brief Preface for the use of the ‘public at large.’ ... On the other hand, it seems to me illusory to dream of having the volume ready by the month of May.

Quispel could only suggest to Meier that they could have the photographs of *The Gospel of Truth*, with a translation on the facing page, printed rapidly under his supervision at Brill, presumably without including Malinine’s Coptic transcription and whatever Puech would need to supply:100

I would like to clarify more precisely my suggestion to publish separately the Gospel of Truth.

What seems to me to be best is that we reproduce photographs of this text and then put on the facing page the translation. In this way the volume becomes stately and a real *editio princeps*. ...

The book appears in the series of the Jung Institute at Rascher. But I would suggest that Rascher have it printed by E.J. Brill in Leiden. ...

We have agreed with Puech that the definitive edition will appear at the *Imprimerie Nationale*. But Puech and Malinine work so slowly, and the setting of Coptic type lasts so long, that one will certainly not be finished before the birthday. If you let it be done at Brill, I will see to it that it is certainly complete.

---

100 6 i 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Ich möchte meinen Vorschlag, das Evangelium der Wahrheit separat heraus zu geben, näher beleuchten.

Mir scheint es das Beste, dass wir die Photographien dieser Schrift reproduzieren und dann auf der andern Seite die Übersetzung. Dadurch wird der Band stattlich und eine wirkliche *Editio Princeps*. ...

Das Buch erscheint in der Schriftenreihe des Jung-Instituts bei Rascher. Ich würde aber vorschlagen, dass Rascher es bei E.J. Brill in Leiden drucken lässt. ...

Meier expressed himself as resigned to publishing for the birthday only *The Gospel of Truth*, though he was not resigned to publishing unedited Quispel's German translation.\textsuperscript{101}

Only now do I understand that an impeccable publication of the whole codex for the birthday in the limited period of available time does not come in question at all, and I can also appreciate your reasons for a separate publication of the Gospel of Truth. ... You do know that your translation at the time [of the ‘baptism’] was hardly intelligible. The German version would of course have to be edited by someone whose mother tongue is German.

Quispel wrote Meier that the Coptic text could not be printed in time, and even suggested that a preliminary translation was uncertain.\textsuperscript{102}

It seems to me really impossible that the Coptic text is already complete before Jung's birthday. ...

In case a preliminary translation appears, it is still not at all certain to me that it is complete before Jung's birthday.

Meier turned to Malinine, in hopes of getting prompt results from him.\textsuperscript{103}

As you perhaps already know, one has decided to publish the Gospel of Truth on the occasion of the 80th anniversary of Jung. I received today a letter from Prof. Quispel, who complains of not having received a response [from you]. He told me to ask you urgently to send the Coptic transcription of the text of the Gospel of Truth to the house Brill by the 10th of February at the latest.

\textsuperscript{101} 7 i 55: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Erst jetzt verstehe ich, dass eine einwandfreie Herausgabe des gesamten Codex für den Geburtstag in nützlicher Frist gar nicht in Frage kommt und kann auch Ihre Gründe für die separate Publikation des Evangelium der Wahrheit würdigen. ... Sie wissen ja, dass Ihre seinerzeitige Übersetzung kaum verständlich war. Die deutsche Fassung müsste natürlich von jemandem redigiert werden, dessen Muttersprache deutsch ist.

\textsuperscript{102} 2 ii 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Es scheint mir wirklich unmöglich, dass der koptische Text vor Jung's Geburtstag noch fertig ist. ...

Falls eine vorläufige Übersetzung erscheint, ist es mir noch keineswegs sicher, dass sie vor Jung's Geburtstag fertig ist.

\textsuperscript{103} 3 ii 55: Letter from Meier to Malinine:

Comme vous le savez peut-être déjà, on a décidé de publier à l'occasion du 80e anniversaire de Jung l’Évangile de la Vérité. J’ai reçu aujourd’hui une lettre du Prof. Quispel qui se plaint de ne pas avoir reçu de réponse. Il m’a demandé de vous prier instamment d’envoyer la transcription Copte du texte de l’Évangile de la Vérité à la maison Brill justu’qu’10 février au plus tard.
Meanwhile Malinine wrote Quispel confidentially about his disagreement with Puech over seeking to work through the French Institute in Cairo:  

Personally it is not for me to pronounce myself on the subject of the new decision, and, naturally, I am in agreement to do everything I can for it to be achieved under the best of circumstances. But it is my duty to notify you that, according to my personal observations that I communicate to you confidentially, the new project will probably receive an unfavorable reception from Puech. I underline that these are my personal impressions, based on previous conversations that I have had with him, and in which he showed a great deal of nervousness provoked by the attitude of the authorities of the Jung Institute. ...

There are many things about which I would need to talk to you, and on which topic it is impossible to write to you. It has to do with the situation, in regard to the Gnostic texts, in Egypt. I am completely in disagreement with Puech on this topic, and it is difficult for me to convince him.

Quispel of course inquired of Malinine what these disagreements with Puech over Cairo involved, to which Malinine replied, with a handwritten marginal note: ‘From here on, my letter is strictly personal’:

You ask me to tell you in a few words where I am not in agreement with Puech, regarding the situation in Egypt, on the point of view that interests us. I know nothing about what the Swiss are doing. But on the French side it seems that it is the French Institute of Cairo that wants to take the lead—which, in my

---

104 4 ii 55: Letter from Malinine to Quispel:

Personnellement je n’ai pas à me prononcer au sujet de la nouvelle décision et, naturellement, je suis d’accord pour faire tout mon possible qu’elle soit réalisée dans les meilleurs conditions. Mais il est de mon devoir de vous avertir que, d’après mes observations personnelles que je vous communiqué confidentiellement, le nouveau projet trouvera vraisemblablement un accueil défavorable auprès de Mr. Puech. Je souligne que telles sont mes impressions personnelles, basées sur les conversations antérieures que j’ai eues avec lui et dans lesquelles il montrait beaucoup de nervosité provoquée par l’attitude des autorités de l’Institut Yung. ...

Il y a beaucoup de choses dont j’aurai à vous parler et au sujet de quoi il m’est impossible de vous l’écrire. Il s’agit de la situation, au point de vue de textes gnostiques, en Égypte. Je suis complètement en désaccord avec Mr. Puech, à ce sujet et il m’est difficile de le convaincre.

105 10 ii 55: Letter from Malinine to Quispel:

Vous me demandez de vous dire, en quelques mots, en quoi je ne suis pas d’accord avec Puech, au sujet de la situation, au point de vue qui nous intéresse, en Égypte. Je ne sais rien sur ce que font les Suisses. Mais du côté français, il semble que c’est l’Institut français du Caire qui veut mener le jeu,—ce qui est, à mon avis, une erreur
view, is a profound error, since the said Institute is in open conflict with the Egyptian authorities, who have denied it not only excavations, but even, often, the simple tasks of copying texts. I believe that Puech is wrong to want to act, in general, through the French authorities in Egypt.

Quispel wrote Meier urging him to limit the publication on Jung’s birthday just to a translation of *The Gospel of Truth*:\(^{106}\)

Malinine reports to me that for his part he still has important corrections to contribute to the translation. On this we should again discuss for half a week. But now we sit in the middle of the academic activity and are free first at Easter. Under these circumstances it seems to me dangerous and somewhat overhasty, already now to offer the Coptic text. But, to be sure, a translation with a very brief introduction could be finished in time for the birthday. That is what I would recommend under the given circumstances. Meanwhile the work goes on. It cannot last long. ...

Also Brill has warned me not to prepare the publication too hastily. Do not forget how important the text is. And if the publication is not admirable, that would really be a shame for Jung. So please reflect as to whether you would not after all prefer a translation for the birthday.

Meier responded that just a translation without a transcription would not be enough to honor Jung on his 80th birthday, so that an undesirable delay would even be preferable:\(^{107}\)

---

\(^{106}\) 9 ii 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:


Auch Brill hat mich gewarnt, die Ausgabe nicht zu überreilen. Vergessen Sie nicht, wie wichtig der Text ist. Und wenn die Ausgabe nicht beispielhaft ist, wäre das wirklich eine Blamage für Jung. Überlegen Sie sich also, bitte, ob Sie doch nicht eine Übersetzung zum Geburtstag bevorzugen.

\(^{107}\) 15 ii 55: Letter from Meier to Quispel:
Now a simple translation is in scholarly terms really not important enough, so that I am not willing to publish this alone for this occasion. I hence propose that by enlisting all our forces we work on the plan as I proposed to you in my last letter. If worst comes to worst, the work can come out somewhat later than the birthday, which still is better than your proposal.

Puech addressed himself to Meier for clarification as to what was now expected of him, having received Quispel’s minimal proposal and Meier’s maximal proposal conveyed by Malinine:

Quispel had envisaged a simple translation for the use of the ‘public at large’ and without an erudite character, preceded by a very general introduction. Malinine on the other hand now speaks to me of an edition of the Coptic text itself, accompanied by an Index and notes both numerous and scholarly. In this case, the work is much more considerable, and risks offering serious difficulties. It would have to do with a kind of editio princeps, which would involve our responsibility and our scholarly reputation. Would you hence make clear to me exactly what is expected of us?

Meier’s hope was that at the celebration of Jung’s 80th birthday he could publish, if not the whole Nag Hammadi Library, then at least the Jung Codex, or if not the whole Jung Codex, at least The Gospel of Truth, or if not the whole Gospel of Truth, at least all that was in Zürich. Even this repeatedly pruned-down objective materialized only to a very limited extent.

With the collapse of the working relationships of Puech both with Doresse and with Meier, Quispel seemed to be the only person with ongoing working relations with Puech and Meier, though not with Doresse. Indeed, Quispel did not want Doresse to resume his rôle as the inside track in Cairo, since in effect Quispel sought to be Doresse’s replacement in the eyes of
Puech. Hence he sensed that any restoration of Doresse’s position could only be to his own detriment.

The visa and funding Quispel had obtained for the trip to Cairo with Meier in 1954 that never materialized became the point of departure for his trip of 1955 alone to Cairo, which kept him in the center of the action and did produce some positive results (see Chapter 5 below).

3. *The Celebration of Jung’s 80th Birthday on 25 July 1955*

The actual celebration of Jung’s 80th birthday, 26 July 1955, was scheduled for the day before, on 25 July 1955.\(^{109}\)

It has to do with a large reception at the Grand Hotel Dolder, in the morning at 10:30, and a supper the evening of the 25th (only for the guests of honor).

In the months leading up the event, Meier had tried as best he could to keep the procedure moving. For example, he enlisted Malinine’s American student Helen K. Wall to prepare the English translation.\(^{110}\) But things moved slowly. Puech blamed Meier for the delay in finalizing the edition, but hoped that another trip of Quispel to Paris would complete the work.\(^{111}\)

The significance of the text and of certain terms has not yet been sufficiently elaborated, the lack of having been able to study basically and in detail the text in conferences and practical courses in our teaching, due to the interdiction of Dr. Meier. All that seems improvisation, and reflects the unreflected haste with which the publication has been decided on. ...

Hence your presence in Paris, from 31 May to 4 June (and still the amount of time seems very short) shows itself to be quite indispensable.

---

\(^{109}\) 9 vi 55: Letter from Meier to Malinine:

Il s’agit d’une grande réception au Grandhotel Dolder, le matin à 10:30 h et d’un souper le soir du 25 (seulement pour les hôtes d’honneur).

\(^{110}\) 9 v 55: Letter from Wall to Meier; 12 v 55: Letter from Meier to Wall.

\(^{111}\) 18 v 55: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

La signification du texte et de certains termes n’a pas été encore suffisamment élaborée, faute d’avoir pu, par suite de l’interdiction du Dr. Meier, étudier à fond et en détail l’écrit dans les conférences et les travaux pratiques de notre enseignement. Tout cela sent l’improvisation et reflète la hâte irréfléchie avec laquelle a été décidée la publication. ...

Votre présence à Paris, du 31 mai au 4 juin (et encore le laps de temps semble-t-il bien court) se révèle donc tout à fait indispensable.
Meier wrote Quispel the plans he had worked out for a successful completion of the volume:\footnote{21 v 55: Letter from Meier to Quispel:}

On Thursday I saw with great satisfaction at Rascher that the printout of the Coptic text is already finished. So the matter with Brill goes forward very nicely, and Rascher is full of hope that the thing can be published by 25 July. Also about the plates, a much better print has been produced, so that we will get a very exemplary edition, with which I hope then also to make an impression on the Egyptians. ...

Presupposing your agreement, the procedure would be as follows, and has to be carried through with the greatest speed:

1. You help us with Puech for the final formulation of the definitive French translation.
2. You send it to us by express mail, together with your German version, and our colleagues here will then complete the whole text in the way they have begun, taking into account your suggestions for modification, as principles for the reworking.

\footnote{21 v 55: Letter from Meier to Quispel:}

Mit grosser Freude habe ich bei Rascher am Donnerstag gesehen, dass der koptische Text bereits fertig ausgedruckt ist. Die Sache mit Brill geht also sehr schön voran, und Rascher ist voller Hoffnung, dass die Sache zum 25. Juli herauskommen kann. Auch von den Tafeln ist jetzt ein noch viel besserer Druck hergestellt worden, sodass wir eine ganz exemplarische Ausgabe bekommen werden, mit der ich dann auch den Ägyptern Eindruck zu machen hoffe. ...

Ihr Einverständnis vorausgesetzt wäre das Procedere folgendes und müsste mit grösster Beschleunigung durchgeführt werden:

1. Sie verhelfen uns, mit Puech zur endgültigen Formulierung der massgebenden französischen Übersetzung.
2. Sie schicken uns dieselbe per express, zusammen mit Ihrer deutschen Version, und unsere hiesigen Mitarbeiter werden daraufhin den Gesamttext in der angefangenen Weise, unter Berücksichtigung Ihrer Modifikationsvorschläge qua Bearbeitungsprinzipien fertigstellen.
4. Diese Revision würden Sie uns wiederum express zustellen, damit sie bei Rascher in Druck gegeben werden kann.

Wenn dieser Plan klappt, so glaubt Rascher noch heute, dass die Ausgabe zur Zeit erscheinen kann. Ich glaube, es ist unnötig, Ihnen nochmals zu sagen, wie wichtig dies uns erscheint, und wie dankbar Jung und wir alle Ihnen wären, wenn Sie dies ermöglichen könnten.
3. This German translation would then be sent to you as quickly as possible, so that you can perhaps revise it a last time with the coptologists who have German as their mother tongue whom you already proposed.

4. You would again send us by express mail this revision, in order that it can be given to Rascher for printing.

If this plan works, Rascher believes as recently as today that the publication can appear on time. I believe it is unnecessary to say to you again how important this seems to us, and how thankful Jung and we all would be to you if you could make this possible.

Quispel, Puech and Malinine were invited to attend, on which occasion Puech still hoped to revise the text:113

Let us hope that the presentation of the volume that will be offered to Prof. Jung, and whose content, incidentally, has to be revised, completed, and in part redone, will not cause too much resentment. ...

Quispel would like us, Malinine and myself, to remain four or five days at Zürich in order to revise the provisional text of the volume and to prepare an improved edition of it, and, this time, complete (let us not say: definitive). But perhaps it would be better to do this work here.

Since at the last minute Malinine had to cancel his trip,114 these revisions proposed by Puech could not be carried out in Zürich. But on his return to Paris Puech continued to work with Malinine on The Gospel of Truth:115

We have worked and, each for our part, will still work these months, Malinine and myself, on the Gospel of Truth.

It was actually only the next year that Puech wrote Quispel that he would make no further changes on the French material for which he was responsible, since he had given his final approval to print The Gospel of Truth:116

113 23 vi 55: Letter from Puech to Meier:
Espérons que la présentation du volume qui sera offert au Prof. Jung, et dont le contenu doit, d’ailleurs, être révisé, complété et en partie refait, ne s’en ressentira pas trop. ...

Quispel désirerait que nous demeurions, M. Malinine et moi, quatre ou cinq jours à Zürich afin de réviser le texte provisoire du volume et d’en préparer une édition améliorée et, cette fois, complète (ne disons pas: définitive). Mais peut-être vaudrait-il mieux faire ce travail ici.

114 21 vii 55: Telegram from Malinine to Meier.

115 10 viii 55: Letter from Puech to Meier:
Nous avons travaillé et, chacun de notre côté, travaillerons encore ces mois-ci, Malinine et moi, à l’Évangile de Verité.

116 14 v 56: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
Your letter reached me too late. I have already turned over to Malinine the corrected proofs with the note ‘ready to print,’ and our friend is to send them these days to Rascher, after having reviewed as rapidly as possible the Coptic text and the indices.

In any case it is absolutely necessary to give up modifying or adding whatever it might be.

Only on 25 June 1956 did Meier authorize Rascher actually to print the German material of *The Gospel of Truth* for which Quispel was responsible:¹¹⁷

I have carefully looked over the last corrections of the German translation of the *Evangelium Veritatis* as well as the various titles. Both are now ready to print. I assume you know that Quispel is here now, and you can reach him at any time until Monday, in case this were to be necessary. He will not turn to you on his own initiative, since, with some justification, he is a bit angry.

Quispel was presenting lectures in Zürich for the Jung Institute, to be published in book form as *Gnosis als Weltreligion* (see Chapter 5 below), and had hoped that the published *editio princeps* of *The Gospel of Truth* could be presented at that occasion.

Yet the final approval of Helen Wall’s English translation was still lacking. Hence Meier wrote R.F.C. Hull, an English friend in Ascona, for final help in this regard:¹¹⁸

Now, Mrs. Wall being American, Quispel and I are doubting her English slightly. It will certainly be correct as far as the rendering of the idea goes, particularly since she has the Coptic text which she understands, the ‘massgebende’ [definitive] French translation and the German one. But we should hate to have an English translation which is full of Americanisms.

Quispel and I know only one person on this planet who would be able to give the translation of Mrs. Wall the finishing touch it will certainly need badly.

¹¹⁷ 25 i 56: Letter from Meier to Rascher:


¹¹⁸ 29 vi 56: Letter from Meier to R.F.C. Hull.
This person is of course a certain Mr. Hull in Ascona. The publication which is due in a few weeks is going to be a world shaking event in this field, without exaggeration. Equally important as the Dead-Sea-Scrolls.

Hull replied promptly to Meier:  

Mrs. Wall's English text is clear and intelligible, and it reads quite well. ... 

I think it safe to say that Prof. Quispel's fear lest the English translation might prove to be unreadable and would show up very badly beside the other two is unjustified. On the other hand, there is no doubt that it is considerably less of a 'prose poem.'

Thereupon Rascher sent Meier the final proofs of Wall's English text for his approval.  

To this Meier responded:

I ask you to realize that if we still have to ask Mrs. Wall to approve the possible corrections of Hull, we will again lose a lot of time. Since I have to be in Cairo on 26 September, I would certainly have been very glad to take along one or two copies for the authoritative people there, which would of course be a good advertisement for the other experts who will meet there.

On 24 September Rascher sent Meier four copies of the *Evangelium Veritatis*:  

As an enclosure we send you as agreed four copies of 'Evangelium Veritatis,' though in the case of the English text it only has to do with uncorrected hand-done proofs.

Meier ultimately did not himself go to Cairo (see Chapter 6 below), but did write Pahor Labib on 24 September 1956 announcing that he could not come to Cairo but wanted to send him the first copy that had just become available:

---

119 Between 29 vi 56 and 2 vii 56: Letter from Hull to Meier.
120 2 vii 56: Letter from Rascher to Meier.
121 17 vii 56: Letter from Meier to Rascher:

Ich bitte dich zu bedenken, dass wenn wir Mrs. Wall noch um die Genehmigung der eventuellen Korrekturen von Hull bitten müssen, wir wieder eine Menge Zeit verlieren werden. Da ich am 26. September in Kairo sein muss, hätte ich unbedingt gerne 1–2 Exemplare für die dortigen massgebenden Leute mitgenommen, was natürlich auch für die andern Fachleute, die sich dort treffen werden, eine gute Reklame wäre.

122 24 ix 56: Letter from Rascher to Meier:

Als Beilage senden wir Ihnen wie vereinbart vier Exemplare “Evangelium Veritatis” wobei es sich beim englischen Text nur um unkorrigierte Handabzüge handelt.

123 24 ix 56: Letter from Meier to Pahor Labib.
These days I received the first copies of our splendid edition of *Evangelium Veritatis*, and would like to send you a copy with dedication. Could you give me a hint how it could be transported? Do you think there is a possibility through the Egyptian Embassy in Berne?

Meier did airmail to Pahor Labib by registered mail a hand-bound copy of *The Gospel of Truth* on 20 October 1956, for which Pahor Labib wrote to Meier on 23 October 1956 to thank him, with the good news that the Cairo part of the Jung Codex was being conserved (so that it could be photographed):

While I, with my dear friend Prof. G[illes] Quispel, was putting under plexiglass, from their [previous] condition, the missing pages of the Jung Codex (Codex I of the Coptic Museum), I received your very endearing gift: ‘*Evangelium Veritatis*.’

The title page of the volume as presented to Jung at the celebration of his 80th birthday read *Evangelium Veritatis*, and listed as editors Michel Malinine, Henri-Charles Puech, and Gilles Quispel, with the date 1955 both on the title page and also, as the copyright date, on the back of the title page. The actual published volume changed the date in both cases to 1956. An addition on the back of the title page in 1956 was that the Coptic text was printed by Brill. The Table of Contents also differs slightly, in that the 1955 copy listed who was responsible for the individual parts: The Introduction by H.Ch. Puech, the Coptic text and French translation by Michel Malinine, the German translation by G. Quispel, and the English translation by Helen K. Wall, whereas the 1956 Table of Contents does not list the names of the person responsible for each part. A copy of the 1955 title page supplied to me by Page included a blank page with an inscription in Quispel’s handwriting:

Mr. G.H. Page, the *benefactor munificentissimus*, in grateful remembrance.  
25 July 1955

---

124 20 x 56: Receipt from the Zürich post office for shipment to Pahor Labib; 23 x 56: Letter from Meier to Rahn.

125 23 x 56: Letter from Pahor Labib to Meier:

> Während ich mit meinem lieben Freund Prof. G. Quispel die fehlenden Seiten des Jung Codex (Codex I des Koptischen Museums) aus ihrem Zustand zusammenfügten sie unter Perspex, erhalte ich Ihr sehr liebenswürdiges Geschenk: “Das Evangelium Veritatis.”

It was signed by Jung, Quispel, Puech, Malinine, and Meier.

Thus, the presentation of the *Evangelium Veritatis* did take place at the celebration of Jung’s 80th birthday, even if with only a preliminary version of the gift: The Zürich part of *The Gospel of Truth*, pages 16–32 and 37–43,\(^{127}\) while the Cairo part, pages 33–36, was first published in facsimiles by Pahor Labib in 1956,\(^ {128}\) then in German translation twice by Walter Till in 1959,\(^ {129}\) and only then with Till’s help by the Jung Institute in 1961.\(^ {130}\) The rest of the Jung Codex was published tractate by tractate with the help of Till, then with that of Rodolphe Kasser as his successor, but was completed only in 1975, when Jung would have been 100 years old.

### 4. The Confrontation between Meier and the Curatorium

*The Gentleman’s Agreement to Return the Jung Codex to Cairo*

The series of political upheavals in Egypt that complicated the publication of the Nag Hammadi Codices was matched by upheavals at the C.G. Jung Institute in Zürich, which also impeded the publication of the Jung Codex by the C.G. Jung Institute and its return to Egypt.

Pahor Labib wrote Quispel his concern that he had not heard anything following the Cairo meeting:\(^ {131}\)

> Up until now I have received nothing, either from Brill or from Dr. Meier.

Robert Rahn, who had been the Swiss contact during Quispel’s trips to Cairo (see Chapter 5, Part 3 and Chapter 6, Part 2 below), wrote Meier reporting on Pahor Labib’s impatience for the Jung Codex to be returned to Egypt:\(^ {132}\)

---


\(^{131}\) 24 i 57: Letter from Pahor Labib to Quispel:

> Bis jetzt habe ich nichts, weder von Brill noch von Dr. Meier, erhalten.

\(^{132}\) 6 ii 57: Letter from Rahn to Meier:

> Sie erhalten beiliegend den ersten Band der vom Koptischen Museum in Alt-Kairo herausgegebenen Photographien der Gnostischen Papyri. Der Band enthält gleich
You receive enclosed the first [and only] volume of the photographs of the Gnostic papyri published by the Coptic Museum in Old Cairo. The volume contains right at the beginning the 23 leaves (plates 1–46) that are regarded as the fragment missing in Zürich of the *Evangelium Veritatis*. The copy has been delivered to me with a dedication to you from Dr. Pahor Labib, with the request that I send it to you.

About the activities and plans of the Committee, to which you do belong, you have been informed by Prof. Quispel, whom I saw several times at the beginning of his visit in October, but unfortunately no more in the decisive days at the end of his visit, which he had to break off precipitously as a result of the events. For us as well, the weighty events of the autumn and winter, which are far from having reached a conclusion, put everything else into the background.

From Pahor Labib I learn that he has given to Quispel the photographs of the fragments for your hands. Also the photographs should be in your hands.

Dr. Pahor thinks that with the sending of the photographs the conditions are fulfilled that were set for the return of the Jung Codex to the Coptic Museum. After the photographs of the fragments were also published, although not edited critically or translated, I am not as certain whether your intentions are fully met. But as to the relation between this reproduction of the text and the final publication, you must have been adequately enlightened by Prof. Quispel. I for my part will attempt to learn more in detail from Pahor Labib when there is an opportunity.
Rahn strongly suggested that he bow out of his intermediary rôle, suggesting that Meier and Quispel negotiate further directly with Pahor Labib.\textsuperscript{133} To be sure, it would be a relief to me now, where the activity already for a considerable time moves in technical and business directions, if the official contact with Pahor Labib took place directly through you or Prof. Quispel. That is important, not only because both of you belong to the Committee of editors and hence can speak with more authority, and because you both represent the Jung Institute, but also with regard to the fact that precisely Prof. Quispel knows much about the intentions of the Egyptian as well as the non-Egyptian collaborators, of which nothing is known to me, and that on the other hand it is important that Pahor Labib for his part has to do only with one position in a binding way on business matters and knows exactly who has this position and whom he can consider merely as a well-wishing postman. Also in a triangular or a parallel relation, unintended misunderstandings are only all too easily possible.

Only three months later, and then only briefly, did Meier respond to Rahn.\textsuperscript{134} For your shipment of 6 February I would like at the same time to thank you quite heartily, as well as for your letter. I understand your wishes very well and will be glad to follow them in the future.

But Meier did not follow up accordingly, either with Pahor Labib or with Quispel, due to a crisis at the Jung Institute, apparently over the return of the Jung Codex. He wrote in considerable agitation but quite vaguely to Quispel almost a month after having written to Rahn.\textsuperscript{135}

\textsuperscript{133} 6\textsuperscript{ii} 57: Letter from Rahn to Meier:

Es wäre mir allerdings jetzt, wo sich die Arbeiten bereits seit geraumer Zeit im Technischen und Geschäftlichen bewegen, eine Erleichterung, wenn der offizielle Verkehr mit Pahor Labib direkt durch Sie oder Professor Quispel stattfände. Das ist wichtig, nicht nur deshalb, weil Sie beide zum Herausgebercomité gehören und deshalb mit mehr Autorität sprechen können und weil Sie beide das Institut Jung vertreten sondern auch mit Rücksicht auf die Tatsache, dass gerade Prof. Quispel manches über die Absichten der ägyptischen wie der nicht-ägyptischen Mitarbeitern weiss, von dem mir nichts bekannt ist, und dass es andererseits wesentlich ist, dass Pahor Labib seinerseits nur mit einer Stelle geschäftlich verbindlich verkehrt und genau weiss, wer diese Stelle vertritt und wen er bloss als gutwilligen Briefboten betrachten darf. Bei einem Triangular- oder Parallelverkehr sind auch unbeabsichtigte Missverständnisse nur allzu leicht möglich.

\textsuperscript{134} 9\textsuperscript{v} 57: Letter from Meier to Rahn:


\textsuperscript{135} 5\textsuperscript{vi} 57: Letter from Meier to Quispel:
I have not let you hear from me for a very long time, since here in Zürich at the Institute things have taken place that have consumed my energy and that now have lead to this, that I have resigned from the Curatorium. Before I did this, I handed over the question of your lectures to Dr. Jacobi, and hope that she has gotten into contact with you. As a matter of fact, I am hardly in the position personally to lay out in a letter all the complications, all the more because, also with Jung, grotesque things have happened on the issue of the Codex, and hence I hope all the more that you will come personally to Zürich, and that we have time to discuss things at length. But I must prepare you for this, that everything is extremely unpleasant, with the exception of the fact that Jung's attorney [Keller-Staub] stands completely on my side, so that there is some hope that at least the matter of the codex still comes into order.

Meier then wrote at considerable length to his successor as President of the Jung Institute, Franz Rilkin, to argue that, rather than the heirs of Jung being the owners of the Jung Codex, it was actually the Jung Institute that should be considered the owners, to justify that what he had done in his capacity as Director of the Jung Institute was appropriate:

On the occasion of a conversation that I had with Prof. Jung, the talk also turned to the codex. Then I also mentioned that Page gave the amount for the purchase of the codex to the Institute (documentation can be seen at Dr. Keller-Staub's). Jung had taken the presentation in Rüden [where the 'baptism' took place] already at the time to be a 'symbolic' act, and made it
clear to me before and after that he put no value on possession. He himself had said to me expressly, ‘but please consider the codex still further as property of the Institute.’ Then on the basis of this position I carried on negotiations with the Egyptian authorities in the course of the years regarding the publication of the other 12 codices, with the intention of gaining a certain influence on their publication, so that the texts would finally be accessible. Then when the missing 30 [!] pages in our codex were discovered in the Coptic Museum in Cairo, naturally our first priority was to secure these. When we had them at our disposal, i.e., the photographs of them, the moment had also come, as a reciprocal gesture, to offer our codex to the Coptic Museum as a gift, all the more so as it was no longer needed for the editing. The Egyptians now correctly await its presentation. In case this should not take place, one would have to reckon with very unpleasant consequences. Prof. Jung asked me to communicate this situation to the Curatorium, and also to say that under these circumstances he raises no claim to the possession of the Codex, and hopes that the situation can be put in order.

An echo from Cairo of what was going on in Zürich took the form of a letter Quispel received from Rahn:

Pahor Labib complained to me months ago that he had received no answer to the letter that he together with you had sent on 13 October 1956 to Dr. C.A. Meier. Surely you still recall the writing, in which I too was enlisted, especially for the work on the typewriter. According to Pahor's view, with the presentation of the missing leaves of the Jung Codex in photostatic form, which apparently you mediated, the time had after all come, when the offer to give the codex back to Egypt should be honored. I myself float completely in the dark on this point.
After the beginning of my vacations in Zürich I wanted to visit Dr. Meier about the matter, but he was at the time himself on vacation. Although, after all, the whole affair is no longer a matter of the Legation (now Embassy), I drew to his attention in a letter at the beginning of February that an answer to this question is awaited. Before I visit him now after my return to Zürich, I would be glad to learn to what an extent you are informed about these matters and how you stand on the question.

Rascher, with whom I once came into conversation quite by chance, gave expression to the view that in terms of the present Egyptian politics the moment for a ‘gift’ is not well chosen. I would consider such a viewpoint incorrect and dangerous. After all, it has to do not simply with a ‘gift,’ but, since 1955, with a kind of gentleman’s agreement. Furthermore, precisely in the present moment politics and archaeology must be held apart as cleanly as possible, and indeed in the fundamental interest of scholarship. The negotiations about the publication of the Coptic papyri never had anything to do with the politics of the day, and the Jung Institute has least of all interest in drawing politics into the area.

Of course the logic of Pahor oversimplifies also, and yet it would surely not be difficult for him, after all the pressure and all the explanations on the part of the Institute, to validate at least an appearance of being correct in his thesis. But at all costs the reproach should be avoided—in view of further...
archaeological collaboration—that European commitments in the area of archaeology are not kept also this time, as soon as they do not work out quite as satisfactorily as one imagined. What began apparently so generously should at least not end in petty carping or even in silence.

Rahn replied a week later to a reply from Quispel.\footnote{11 ix 57: Letter from Rahn to Quispel:}

I thank you for your prompt and detailed answer, which communicated to me valuable details about which I was not informed. I believe I can infer from your words that in general we are of the same opinion. I would like to summarize it as follows: The promises made by the Jung Institute or its authorized representatives should be maintained in spite of war and war cries, to the extent that the Egyptians do their part, so as to make a business-like procedure at all possible.

The attorney for Jung and the Jung Institute, W. Keller-Staub, wrote Meier on 17 August 1957, to which Meier replied:\footnote{24 ix 57: Letter from Meier to Keller-Staub:}

I think I see from it [the letter] that the situation concerning ownership of the ‘Jung Codex’ has recently been clarified again in the sense that it belongs to the Institute, but I would like to ask you to answer this question for me and, only if this question is answered in the affirmative, to make use of the details that follow.

The details begin with a recent visit from his Egyptian friend Sameh, who updated him over the situation there:\footnote{24 ix 57: Letter from Meier to Keller-Staub:}
In these days I have had the visit of a friend from Egypt who knows the whole situation and is familiar with all those involved in it in Egypt. He reports to me that considerable agitation prevails there about the fact that the codex still has not been turned over. This agitation is justified, and it is high time that the gentleman’s agreement of the Institute is also fulfilled in a gentleman-like way.

Meier then outlined to Keller-Staub his argument for the return of the codex:

The facts are, briefly, as follows: Already in November 1953 Prof. Jung confirmed to me in writing that 1) at the presentation he had received the codex only for the Institute, and 2) he is in agreement that it be given later to the Egyptians in return for a certain reciprocity. Dr. Jung designated this communication as confidential. Our negotiations from the very beginning only had the goal of pressuring the Egyptians so that the texts can finally be published. In this sense Minister von Fischer and the Cultural Attaché of the Cairo Legation, Prof. Rahn, for years got personally involved and exposed themselves in Egypt, until then finally last year the Egyptians formed the plan to take in hand this publication themselves, admittedly with the help of an International Committee, to which, as you know, I also belong. Hence our efforts had in this sense led to the desired outcome. Now we still had a sole interest, namely to request the missing 40 pages of our codex, which meanwhile had

__24 ix 57: Letter from Meier to Keller-Staub:__

been discovered in Cairo, so that we could publish the Jung Codex in its completeness. This proposal was made to the Egyptians on 17 July 1956, with the first-time offer of our long-since planned reciprocity. Thereupon Prof. Quispel (Utrecht) received on 13 October 1956 in Cairo the photographs of our missing pages. On 23 October 1956 I confirmed their receipt and thereby for the second time our offer. This fact has in December 1956 already been made public in Egypt. Thus there are no longer any debated issues, all the more so since everything has now been achieved for the publication of the Jung Codex, and the original manuscript represents only a museum piece. Hence without doubt it best belongs together with the twelve other codices of the same discovery in the Coptic Museum in Cairo. The scholarly interests are all fulfilled and the text can be published at any time by us or anyone else. There has been no talk on our part for a long time of the other twelve Codices.

Meier here recognized that with the facsimile edition of Pahor Labib making the texts available to the public at large, ‘anyone else’ can publish critical editions, which may explain his other comment that ‘there has been no talk on our part for a long time of the other twelve Codices,’ since their publication can no longer be controlled by the committee of Meier, Quispel, and Puech that was envisaged a year earlier.

Meier went on to solicit Keller-Staub’s assistance in achieving the return of the Codex to Cairo:

I may perhaps clarify still further that our offer, as well as its presupposition, the making available of the 40 pages, always took place, as is usual in the Orient, by means of a personal handshake, between Minister von Fischer, Prof. Rahn and Prof. Quispel, and the Egyptians, whereby these gentlemen acted with our authorization—and that I confirmed these events in each case.
only afterwards in writing to the Egyptians. Hence it has to do, as I said in the beginning, explicitly with a gentlemen’s agreement, for whose binding force it would only be all the worse, if that should now be belatedly undermined from here. It may be emphasized that the Egyptians have acted absolutely honestly both at the scholarly and at the collegial level. In no case may political and other temporary viewpoints be mixed into this purely scholarly matter, and it is perhaps not unimportant to point out that it could have highly unpleasant consequences for the Political Department and its protégés outside Switzerland, if now the Curatorium did not hold itself to obligations validly made at the time. Difficulties could also arise for Prof. Quispel and a few other scholars, for whom the work with these Gnostic texts has now become almost a life’s work.

I trust very much, dear Doctor, that your smart efforts will still succeed after all in bringing the matter to a rapid and good solution, which, as you know, lies for me, in the interest of scholarship, very much on my heart. I may also say personally to you that only when this thorn is out of my flesh can I feel myself freed from this fruitless burden through the Institute. In this sense I would be doubly thankful to you if your friendly efforts would succeed.

Meier again soon wrote to Keller-Staub, giving him a further summary of the situation as Meier understood it:
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Meier again soon wrote to Keller-Staub, giving him a further summary of the situation as Meier understood it:143
Indications increase that the matter of the Codex is soon to be resolved, and now to my horror I have heard that the Curatorium has set up a Committee (!) to handle the matter, there being still many unclarities. But one does not find it appropriate to inquire at the source, for which of course I am personally quite thankful, but this is probably not in the interest of the matter. Thank God you are the mediator and also understand plain talk. For this reason I want to give you here quiet briefly an aide-memoire on a point which, if my information is correct, still does not seem to the people to be clear:

From the beginning it was clear that, besides the Jung Codex, the other twelve are also of great importance. But since for years the situation as to their ownership remained unclear, there was nothing to hope for. Even after the Egyptian state had won the legal proceedings in this regard, there was, due to oriental laziness, no hope that these texts would become accessible in the foreseeable future. But with our own edition, and our interest, we then after all made the Egyptians pay attention, so that they then took the publication of their codices in hand. Thus our first goal was achieved and, as you know, this work is now in full swing. Meanwhile two-and-a-half years ago in Cairo the missing 40 pages of our codex were to everyone's surprise discovered. To be sure, a new interest had now arisen among us, namely to obtain these pages. Hence this was the opportunity to wink with our 'gift,' which then also took place. The success was complete, in that in September 1956 Quispel could receive photocopies of these pages, and brought them home. Thus not only our 'conditions' have been met by Egypt, but all scholarly goals that the
Institute could ever have were attained. Anything else would be mere quarrels and would correspond to or serve no substantive interest, but could easily mess up everything already attained, and still more.

Thus Meier was very eager for the Jung Codex to be returned to Egypt, as promised in a gentlemen’s agreement, whereas the new administration of the Jung Institute was of a different opinion.

The Return of the Jung Codex to Jung’s Possession

On 14 November 1956 the Curatorium had ruled that the Jung Codex was Jung’s personal property. For Meier, at the time still President of the Curatorium, this was no more than a polite gesture to Jung, so that Jung could receive credit for returning it to Egypt. But the Curatorium took it much more seriously. A year later its new President F. Rilkin replied to a letter from von Fischer, explaining that the Curatorium no longer had anything to do with the Codex: 144

I thank you for your letter of 27 September, whose content was discussed at our last meeting of the Curatorium. We regret to say that the matter of the Codex basically does not have to do with us at all, after Dr. Meier himself, in the meeting of the Curatorium of 14 November 1956, affirmed that the Codex is the property of Prof. Jung and not of the Institute, and that we hence have no right at all to dispose of it.

At the suggestion of Keller-Staub, Meier wrote Rahn, Page, and Quispel to support his case. He himself wrote Quispel: 145

But unfortunately I must now trouble you in the matter of the Jung Codex. As you could already have been able to notice from my comments, the whole matter of the return of the codex to the Egyptians is about to go catastrophically wrong. When I was again today with our old attorney, Dr. Keller-Staub, he urgently advised me to mobilize you too in this matter, and to ask you to write a corresponding letter to the Curatorium.

144 15 x 57: Letter from Rilkin to von Fischer:

Ich danke Ihnen für Ihr Schreiben vom 27. September, dessen Inhalt an unserer letzten Curatoriumssitzung besprochen worden ist. Wir müssen leider feststellen, dass die Codex Angelegenheit im Grunde genommen gar nicht uns betrifft, nachdem Herr Dr. Meier selbst in der Curatoriumssitzung vom 14. November 1956 festgestellt hat, dass der Codex Eigentum von Professor Jung ist und nicht vom Institut und dass wir deshalb gar kein Verfügungsrecht haben.

145 15 x 57: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Leider muss ich Sie nun aber in der Angelegenheit Codex Jung bemühen. Wie Sie schon aus meinen Bemerkungen gemerkt haben könnten, ist die ganze Angelegenheit
Minister von Fischer, Prof. Robert Rahn, the Cultural Attaché of the Swiss Legation in Cairo, and Page have all promised firmly to take such a step, and Minister von Fischer has already done so.

Meier then laid out to Quispel the specifics of the situation, as he had come to understand it:146

Here in all brevity is the situation: One now maintains that the Codex is Jung's personal property and hence one is not bound by any promises that I as representative of the Institute made to the Egyptians. Dr. Keller-Staub is completely honest and maintains the standpoint that both Jung and the Institute are absolutely bound to keep the promises entered into, since you after all have received the compensation in the form of the photographs of the 40 pages. Now comes the cloven hoof in the story, and here I must at the same time ask for your discretion: But Dr. Keller-Staub says to me that the real reason for this shamelessness is an interest in the inheritance. The whole thing comes, as Dr. Keller-Staub knows directly, from Jung's step-son, Dr. Fritz Baumann, who without doubt would like to have the Codex in the family. Since Mrs. Jung's death, Dr. Baumann is a member of the Curatorium, and, as one recognized only belatedly, has since then already carried out some preliminary activity to make the coup possible. Although the legal situation is completely clear, one can understand that the matter is extremely

146 15 x 57: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Hier in grosser Kürze der Tatbestand: Man behauptet jetzt, der Codex sei Jungs persönliches Eigentum und man sei deshalb nicht gebunden an irgendwelche Versprechungen, die ich als Vertreter des Institutes den Ägyptern gemacht hätte. Dr. Keller-Staub ist vollkommen integer und vertritt den Standpunkt, dass sowohl Jung wie das Institut absolut gebunden sind, die eingegangenen Versprechen einzuhalten, da Sie ja die Gegenleistung in Form der Photokopien der 40 Seiten in Empfang genommen haben. Nun kommt der Pferdefuss in der Geschichte und hier muss ich Sie gleichzeitig um Ihre Diskretion bitten: Dr. Keller-Staub sagt mir aber, dass das eigentliche Motiv zu dieser Schamlosigkeit ein Erbschaftsinteresse sei. Das Ganze gehe, wie Dr. Keller-Staub direkt wisse, von Jungs Schwiegersohn, Dr. Fritz Baumann, aus, der den Codex unbedingt in der Familie haben möchte. Dr. Baumann ist seit Frau Jungs Tod Kuratoriumsmitglied und hat seither, wie man erst nachträglich erkannte, schon einige Vorarbeit geleistet, um diesen Coup zu ermöglichen. Trotzdem die Rechtslage völlig klar ist, versteht man, dass die Angelegenheit äusserst heikel ist im Moment wo solche geheime persönliche Absichten dahinter stecken. Deshalb meint Dr. Keller-Staub, man könne den Herren nur dadurch Beine machen, dass die verschiedenen in der
awkward when such secret personal intentions lurk in the background. Hence Dr. Keller-Staub thinks that one can make the gentlemen shake a leg only by having the various personalities involved in the matter protest on their own and independently of each other. Especially von Fischer and Rahn have gotten themselves involved and exposed themselves so personally in the matter that they cannot risk such a shot in the back at all. You too, dear Quispel, would be suspiciously compromised with the Egyptians, if this inheritance-hunting plan were to succeed. A large part of your future work and also your reputation as an honest scholar would be endangered. Of course I too would be compromised very severely as a respectable person. Of course we all could wash our hands over against the Egyptians, and say it is now precisely the new Curatorium that, since my resignation, maintains that it is no longer bound by the earlier agreements. But not only would the reputation of the Institute be endangered by this, but it would also not serve the cause.

As far as I am concerned, even the Institute could go to the devil, but the Egyptians have an absolute claim on the Codex, and this must be honored. Moreover you and I would also be impossible in the International Committee. Furthermore through a very close and loyal Egyptian friend, who knows personally very well Pahor Labib and all the other relevant persons, I have heard that one sits on pins and needles there, since the Codex still has not arrived. I have also owed Pahor Labib a letter now for a long time, but, in view of these facts, I do not know, with my best will, what I should write him. So the situation becomes very urgent, and I would hence like very much to ask you to complain by return mail to the Curatorium. If I could have a copy of your letter, I would be very glad, yet this is not essential, and I ask you to act fully in accordance with your own judgment. That something must happen urgently,
is surely clear to you now, and if the call upon you to undertake something, as I said to you, comes from Dr. Keller-Staub, the attorney of the Curatorium and of Prof. Jung, then it should be clear enough to you how legitimate it is.

Finally, Meier brought to expression just how distraught he had become over the whole affair:¹⁴⁷

Personally, I would nonetheless also like to say to you that this whole business is so grotesque and hateful that I would never have thought it to be possible in a circle such as the Jungian. It goes beyond both my most naïve and my wildest fantasies, and for weeks brings me and my wife from one rage and despair into another. I hope that for you too the blood is rising to your head when you read this story. If I could still tell you all the details, your reason itself would stand still. Fortunately I am slowly beginning to see through the matter, since I, as you know, have some channels to those parts of the Jung family that are still rational. Through such inside information I can slowly see where the core of the blunder lies, but perhaps more of that only when you are in Zürich.

Quispel responded promptly with a detailed letter to the Curatorium, in which he declined to address whatever tensions existed between Meier and the Curatorium, but did speak to the situation with the Egyptians:¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁷ 15 x 57: Letter from Meier to Quispel:


¹⁴⁸ 17 x 57: Letter from Quispel to the Curatorium:

Allerdings muss ich Ihnen mitteilen, dass die Ägypter seit November 1956 überhaupt nicht mehr antworten auf Briefe, die man ihnen schickt. Wir hatten zu entscheiden, dass die Schriften jetzt alle in schnellem Tempo herausgegeben werden sollten, und auch alle Massnahmen genommen um das zu realisieren. Die Ägypter müssen da aber mitarbeiten, sonst geht es nicht. Sie müssen ihre Zustimmung geben zum Druck,
Yet I must tell you that since November 1956 the Egyptians no longer answer at all letters that one sends them. We had to decide that the texts should now all be published in a rapid tempo, and also had taken all the steps needed to achieve that goal. But the Egyptians must collaborate in this, otherwise it does not work. They must give their approval for printing, etc. We now have the ‘Sayings of Jesus’ [The Gospel of Thomas] as good as finished, but the Egyptians do not send their permission. Up until now I have not understood that. But apparently it is that they do not do anything at all until they have received the Jung Codex. I know these orientals a bit, and I believe that in this way I interpret their silence correctly. These people are so terribly suspicious.

Now of course this rests on a misunderstanding. Again and again I emphasized to Pahor Labib that the Codex could not be returned to Egypt until the texts contained in it were published. Apparently he does not want to understand that.

But Quispel went on to suggest the strength of the Egyptian position, and, as if in passing, to mention that the Jung Institute’s title to the Codex was questionable in terms of international law, and that the Codex, once published, would have little value:

On the other hand the position of the Egyptians is strong. They know that the Codex cannot be published without the some 40 pages that they control. Especially the treatment about the three natures [1,5] is unintelligible without the missing pages. Besides, it is quite clear to them that, from the standpoint of international law, the ownership of the Codex is rather precarious, and that with the history of this Codex there are complications of a diplomatic kind,
which weigh much more heavily than the ownership of an already published Codex, which in and of itself does not have much value.

Quispel concluded by offering to meet with the Curatorium on his forthcoming trip to Zürich to lecture at the Jung Institute:150

I am quite ready, if you wish, to communicate to you something about the background, for example after my lectures, on 18 January. Especially I would like to ask you not to decide anything until you have inquired from Prof. Rahn and myself concerning the real dangers that are connected with such a decision.

Quispel then wrote a reassuring letter to Meier:151

Your letter has really shaken me up, and I can imagine what an unpleasant and exhausting time you and your wife have no doubt gone through. I regret that very much, since after all it is so very useless to fight over a matter that is completely clear.

I am of the opinion that, after an official promise, the Codex must return to Egypt, and I cannot really believe that persons I have come to know as honorable would not keep their word that they have given. That seems to me simply quite impossible.

150 17 x 57: Letter from Quispel to the Curatorium:

Ich bin gerne bereit, wenn Sie das wünschen, Ihnen etwas über diese Hintergründe mitzuteilen, etwa nach meinen Vorträgen, am 18. Januar. Vor allem möchte ich Sie bitten, nichts zu entscheiden, ehe Sie sich bei Herrn Prof. Rahn und mich erkundigt haben über die reellen Gefahren, welche mit so einer Entscheidung verbunden sind.

151 25 x 57: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Ihr Brief hat mich geradezu erschüttert und ich denke mir, was Sie und Ihre Frau wohl eine unangenehme und erschöpfende Zeit erlebt haben. Ich bedauere das sehr, weil es doch so ganz nützlos ist zu streiten um eine Sache die vollkommen klar ist.

Ich bin der Meinung dass, nach feierlichem Versprechen, der Kodex nach Ägypten zurückkehren muss und ich kann eigentlich nicht glauben dass Menschen die ich als Ehrenmänner kennen gelernt habe, nicht ihr gegebenes Wort halten würden. Das scheint mir einfach ganz unmöglich.


Der Besitz ist vom Standpunkt des Internationalen Rechtes sehr prekär. Die diplomatischen Komplikationen würden für die Schweiz ungeheuer sein. Der Kodex hat nach der Ausgabe einen sehr geringen Wert. Er kann nicht herausgegeben werden ohne die fehlenden Seiten über welche das Kuratorium nicht verfügt. ...

P.S. Habe dem Kuratorium geschrieben.
As I already wrote you, during my visit in Zürich I will get in touch with the Curatorium. I hope then to be able to clarify the grounds and backgrounds of the case in such a way that no doubt exists in the Curatorium too that the word once given must be honored.

The possession is very precarious from the standpoint of International Law. The diplomatic complications for Switzerland would be enormous. After publication, the Codex has a very small value. It cannot be published without the missing pages, over which the Curatorium has no control. ...

P.S. Have written to the Curatorium.

But Quispel did not send Meier a copy of his letter to the Curatorium, where he had made clear that the return of the Jung Codex to Egypt should come only after its publication. This would insure that the edition in which he was involved was the *editio princeps*.

Quispel's view is reflected in a letter he wrote to Giversen who was then in Cairo, though without mentioning the delay until after publication:\textsuperscript{152}

The other day I sent a letter to the Direction of the Jung Institute, stressing the point that they had promised solemnly to return the Codex to the Coptic Museum and that they are expected to do so as soon as possible. Will you tell Dr. Pahor Labib that he will receive a copy of this letter one of these days?

Von Fischer also wrote to Meier a supporting letter:\textsuperscript{153}

It seems to me now appropriate that for the time being I do not answer the letter of the C.G. Jung Institute, and first of all wait for the position that you take. But already today the legal relations seem to me to be rather clear, since after all Prof. Jung, in the letter that is in your possession, has turned over the Jung Codex to the C.G. Jung Institute. Regarding the agreement between this Institute and the Coptic Museum in Cairo, I do not know whether it was made in writing or orally. But in any case it was made. On the other hand I assume that you, as President of the C.G. Jung Institute at the time, could make such an agreement in a binding way.

\textsuperscript{152} 25 xi 57: Letter from Quispel to Giversen.

\textsuperscript{153} 25 x 57: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

In a phone conversation, Quispel made clear to Meier that he would keep the photographs of ‘the missing 40 pages,’ rather then turning them in to the Curatorium, to which Meier responded in a letter:154

Our telephone conversation and your letter, which arrived yesterday, have indeed reassured me somewhat. But the situation is nevertheless very bad, and I am only thankful that you maintain the standpoint that for the time being the Curatorium is not in control of the missing pages. But it is not to be overlooked that you have received them in the name of and for the Institute, and that the reciprocation is now contested.

Meanwhile Meier had written von Fischer to address himself more explicitly to the Curatorium:155

As you know, Dr. Keller-Staub is the attorney of the Curatorium in matters of the Codex. But he is clearly convinced of the correctness of our position, and has documented this in a number of writings sent to the Curatorium. He says that although the situation is juristically clear, it is difficult to move forward, since the personal intentions of the Jung family known to you do exist, about which, in spite of knowing them, one may not speak openly. Hence he asked me to ask Page and Quispel urgently to raise objections. Both are in the process of doing this. He also thinks that you, in case you still have received no answer from Rilkin or only an unsatisfactory answer, should become somewhat more clear.

A week later Meier again wrote to von Fischer, urging him to refute the Curatorium’s claim that the Codex again belongs to Jung:156

---

154 29 x 57: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Unser Telefon und Ihr Brief der gestern kam, haben mich zwar einigermaßen beruhigt. Die Situation is aber trotzdem sehr schlimm und ich bin bloss dankbar dafür, dass Sie auf dem Standpunkt stehen, dass das Kuratorium vorläufig über die fehlenden Seiten nicht verfügt. Es darf aber nicht übersehen werden, dass Sie dieselben im Namen des und für das Institut in Empfang genommen haben und dass nun die Gegenleistung bestritten wird.

155 22 x 57: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:


156 29 x 57: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:
One seems now to want to get around the thing by claiming the Codex belongs not to the Institute, but to Jung. As a matter of fact on 14 November of last year, on a motion of Dr. Fritz Baumann, such a resolution of the Curatorium was passed. I did not contradict it at the time, since I naively assumed that Jung wanted this, only to be able himself to make the gesture of returning the Codex. Of course he knew exactly about the obligations that had been entered into, and my boldest fantasy would not have sufficed for me to dream that the whole thing could be a chess move by the heirs. I had until then believed I had to do with honorable persons. After I had again informed Jung this September about the factual situation, he said to me that in this case he had been falsely informed, and that in this case he raises no claim to the Codex. I should write this to the Curatorium as the outcome of our conversation, and ask the gentlemen to correct the matter. This I then did, but meanwhile someone seems again to have worked on him differently, on the part of ‘those who would be favored.’

Von Fischer wrote Meier for further clarification:

It seems to me to be especially important to know whether the letter of Prof. Jung back then, where he ascribed in writing and explicitly the possession of the codex to the Institute, is still valid, or whether it has been replaced by some other document. Does the decision of the C.G. Jung-Institute, in which


9 xi 57: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Besonders wichtig erscheint es mir zu wissen, ob der seinerzeitige Brief von Prof. Jung, wo er schriftlich und ausdrücklich den Besitz des Codex dem Institut zuschreibt, noch immer gilt, oder ob er durch ein anderes Schriftstück ersetzt worden ist. Muss etwa die Entscheidung des C.G. Jung-Institutes, an die Sie offenbar selbst gearbeitet haben, als eine Rückgabe des Codex an Prof. Jung betrachtet werden? Hat er selbst dazu Stellung genommen und betrachtet er sich nunmehr als Eigentümer des Codex?

Haben Sie anderseits, das Versprechen den Codex an das Koptische Museum in Kairo im Rahmen Ihrer Funktion als Direktor des C.G. Jung-Institutes allein abgeben können, oder mussten noch normalerweise andere Rechtsorganen gültig mitwirken?
you yourself have apparently been involved, perhaps have to be considered a return of the Codex to Prof. Jung? Has he himself taken a position on this, and does he consider himself now as the owner of the Codex?

Did you, on the other hand, given the promise [to return] the Codex to the Coptic Museum in Cairo in the framework of your function as Director of the C.G. Jung Institute alone, or did still normally other legal organisms have to collate to be in an admissible way?

Meier then supplied von Fischer with further information:158

The Curatorium was always informed about the obligations entered into, and has never protested against anything. On the contrary, one let me handle it independently through all the years. If one now on the other hand wants to raise objection, since I am no longer a member, the reason for this must be sought in newly awakened interests of a personal kind. Unfortunately one may not talk about this! Of course I have copies of all documents. How many of them are present in the Institute I cannot verify. In any case three thick dossiers, i.e. all my acts regarding the Codex, were for three weeks with the attorney of the Curatorium, Dr. Keller-Staub, with my explicit permission to make unlimited use of it, although much in it is designated as strictly discrete.

Your position would be extremely urgent, since, as I hear, next week a meeting of the Curatorium should take place, where the decision is to be made.

On the basis of such information, von Fischer responded to Rilkin:159

---

158 14 xi 57: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:


159 17 xi 57: Letter from von Fischer to Rilkin:

Welcher Art auch die intern bestehenden Meinungsverschiedenheiten sein mögen, sie sollten nach meinem Dafürhalten ausschliesslich innerhalb der Organe des Institutes und mit den Herren Professor Jung und Dr. C.A. Meier bereinigt werden. Nach
Also whatever kind of differences of opinion exist internally, they should in my opinion be cleaned up exclusively within the organs of the Institute and with Prof. Jung and Dr. C.A. Meier. Toward the outside, really the only thing that is relevant is that the Director of the C.G. Jung Institute, who could represent it and bind it legally toward third parties, in his time promised to the Coptic Institute [read: Museum] in Cairo to turn over the Jung Codex in exchange for having its missing pages put at its disposal.

Whether at the time the Codex also really belonged to the C.G. Jung Institute, the Coptic Institute [read: Museum] in Cairo does not need to interest itself juristically. Your Institute had assumed the commitment to return it to it. But, as I know personally, the Coptic Institute [read: Museum] knew that the Codex was bought by a Maecenas in Switzerland and that it had then been presented to Prof. Jung, who then ceded it to the C.G. Jung Institute in Zürich. Hence at the time when the promise was made, the Codex was in fact the property of your Institute. When the Institute later gave it back again to Prof. Jung, it had to be quite clear about its responsibility, and see to it that the Codex is taken to its destination.

Since the condition on the Egyptian side has now been fulfilled, the promise of your Institute must be maintained.

Von Fischer sent a copy to Meier, and in his covering letter pointed out:

You have bound the Institute juridically on the basis of your position as President of the Curatorium, which for all practical purposes gave you a free
hand. But the Curatorium would have had the possibility to oppose your promise, which it knew about. But it did not do so, and thus has sanctioned it.

In any case, it seems important to me that the Institute, when in November 1956 it gave the Codex again to Prof. Jung as his property, no doubt knew the promise given previously by you. It hence would have had to see to it already then that handing it over to Prof. Jung did not run counter to carrying out the promise that existed. It is today juridically the task of the Institute to see that the donation comes to Cairo according to the agreement.

Meier replied to von Fischer: 161

I thank you heartily for your letter of 18 November and the attachment of your answer to Rilkin, about which I am naturally very pleased. Meanwhile Dr. Peyer from Schaffhausen, as the legal representative of the Swiss Institute and friend of the children of both Jung and of Rilkin, after a rather long conversation with me, in a very clear and sharp letter turned to Rilkin and drew attention to the fatal consequences that a negative outcome could also have for the Cairo Institute, about which right now new negotiations with the Egyptians are underway. Prof. Rahn has reported in an alarming way about this to Dr. Peyer. Unfortunately nothing seems to help, for, as I have now learned, Jung is not at all informed by the Committee of the Curatorium about these protests.

Meier received from Peyer an encouraging report: 162

Möglicherweise gehabt, sich Ihrem Versprechen zu widersetzen, das es kannt. Es tat es aber nicht und hat es damit sanktioniert.

Wichtig erscheint mir auf alle Fälle, dass das Institut, als es im November 1956 den Codex dem Herrn Prof. Jung wieder zum Eigentum abgab, das von Ihnen vorher abgegebene Versprechen wohl kannte. Es musste also schon damals sorgen, dass die Übergabe an Prof. Jung der Ausführung des bestehenden Versprechens nicht zuwiderlief. Es ist heute juristisch die Aufgabe des Institutes zu sehen, dass die Schenkung verabredungsgemäss nach Kairo kommt.

161 25 xi 57: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:


162 26 xi 57: Letter from Peyer to Meier:
Your suggestion that I send Prof. Jung a copy of my letter to Dr. Rilkin has already been done some time ago. From what I hear, Prof. Jung has as a result written to the Curatorium that he is in agreement with the return. Hence I believe that the return of the Codex will take place in the very near future, to the extent that the members of the Curatorium do not get in each other’s hair as to who should get the honor for the return.

Rilkin and Baumann had by then written Page a letter, countersigned also by Jung, justifying the Curatorium’s present position, and inquiring if he would approve returning the Jung Codex to Egypt merely on the basis of obtaining photocopies of ‘the missing 40 pages,’ without receiving the right to publish the remaining 12 Codices:

The undersigned of this letter, Prof. C.G. Jung and the Curatorium, are concerned to make clear to you the situation of the ‘Jung Codex.’ We want to limit ourselves to facts, and must leave their evaluation to you.

On 28 November 1953 Prof. Jung confirmed in writing to Dr. C.A. Meier that the Codex could be used later on as a return gift to the Egyptian government, in case the latter gives permission that also the remaining 12 volumes of the library of Chenoboskion be published by the C.G. Jung Institute.

Neither Prof. Jung nor the Institute have departed from this formulation of the commission to Dr. Meier down to this day. Yet Dr. Meier has, in the course of his negotiations, committed himself (with confirmation on 23 October 1956 to Dr. Labib in Cairo) to exchange the Codex for the mere handing over of

163
photographs of the still missing 40 pages. Thus he has neither noted our wishes and instructions nor carried them out.

The evaluation of the situation was made much more difficult for us by the systematic lack of elucidation on the part of Dr. Meier. Only on 27 October 1957, as an answer to the letter from the Curatorium of 22 October 1957 of which you are aware, did we learn from Dr. Meier

a) that Prof. Quispel already a year ago, on 26 September 1956, received the photos of the 40 pages in our name

b) the wording and thus the exact content of the commitment of Dr. Meier on 23 October 1956 to Dr. Labib

c) that the Egyptian government has already begun to publish serially the Coptic text of the twelve volumes, so that they stand at the free disposal of science,

and further, only ten days ago, from a third party

d) that the publisher E.J. Brill in Leiden will publish translations of them.

It is unintelligible to us why these important ingredients in our evaluation were kept from us, and we can only ask ourselves whether carelessness, distain, or intention is present.

den Codex abzutauschen gegen blosse Aushändigung der Photokopien der noch fehlenden 40 Seiten. Er hat somit unsere Wünsche und Instruktionen weder beachtet noch sie durchgeführt.

Die Beurteilung der Sachlage wurde uns wesentlich erschwert durch den systematischen Mangel an Aufschluss von Seiten Dr. Meiers. Erst am 27.10.57, als Antwort auf den Ihnen bekannten Brief des Curatoriums vom 22.10.57, erfuhren wir von Dr. Meier

a) dass Prof. Quispel schon vor einem Jahr, am 26.9.56, die Photos der 40 Seiten in unserem Namen entgegengenommen hat

b) den Wortlaut und somit den genauen Inhalt der Verpflichtung Dr. Meiers vom 23.10.56 gegenüber Dr. Labib

und vor wenigen Tagen durch eine telefonische Mitteilung an Frau Jaffé

c) dass die ägyptische Regierung bereits laufend den koptischen Text der 12 Bände zu publizieren begonnen hat, sodass sie der Wissenschaft zur freien Verfügung stehen, und ferner erst vor 10 Tagen von dritter Seite

d) dass der Verlag v. h. E.J. Brill in Leiden Übersetzungen davor herausgeben wird.

Es ist uns unverständlich, warum uns diese wichtigen Bewertungselemente vorenthalten wurden, und wir können uns nur fragen, ob Nachlässigkeit, Missachtung oder Absicht vorliegt.

Wir wiederholen, was auch im Brief des Curatoriums vom 22.10.57 an Dr. Meier steht: “Wir betonen, dass selbstverständlich Prof. Jung wie auch das Institut gewillt sind,
We repeat what also stands in the letter of the Curatorium of 22 October 1957 to Dr. Meier: “We emphasize that of course Prof. Jung, just as the Institute, have the will to fulfill every duty legally entered into.” Also the undersigned know how to treasure in its full value your lofty intervention through the purchase of the Codex and its presentation, and are thankful to you for your noble gesture in the interest of science.

Hence Prof. Jung would not like to give the Codex for the mere handing over of the 40 photo pages without your express confirmation. He hence awaits eagerly your written agreement.

Meier warned Page to see to it that his response to Jung would get through to him ‘personally’.

Today I learned that the ‘Committee’ of the Curatorium that handles the matter of the Codex neither gave access to the protest letters from you, Minister von Fischer, Dr. Peyer and Prof. Quispel to the other members of the Curatorium, nor to Jung himself. This means in practice a misleading of Jung, behind whom, on the other hand, one takes shelter, as [is apparent] from the letter of Baumann that I read to you. These methods are not exactly fine, but if one would not see through them, they would no doubt be ‘psychologically’ skillful. I have now asked Dr. Peyer, Prof. Quispel and Minister von Fischer to send their letters to the address of Prof. Jung directly and [marked] ‘personal.’
I am in fact convinced that Jung himself is still honest in regard to decency toward any Maecenas and also with regard to his interest in cultural matters. Over against that, the other side apparently works with misinformation, as in fact that was already conceded by Jung himself on the occasion of my last conversation with him in July of this year, when in fact he also conceded I was right. Hence I consider it extremely important that you send also your answer to him with the note 'personal.'

Thereupon Jung answered Page, surprised that Page was willing to return the Jung Codex, which Jung hence seemed no longer willing to oppose.  

I thank you kindly for your letter of 29 November 1957 together with the enclosure, from which I draw the conclusion that you are in agreement to return the Codex. At first I did not dare to assume that you would be in agreement that the Codex be exchanged for the photostats of the missing 40 pages. This transaction seemed to me somewhat too Levantine, after, in such a generous way, you have entered in upon the purchase of the document.

Baumann, in his capacity as Vice-President of the Curatorium, had written to Quispel to send to the Curatorium whatever material it needed before it could act.  

We thank you for your letter of 24 October 1957, a reply to which has unfortunately been somewhat delayed because of the influenza of our President. Since you possess useful documents for the clarification of the matter, we ask you to communicate to us all that is worth knowing by return mail. We are being pressured a great deal from the circles of Dr. C.A. Meier to act unusually quickly. Thus waiting for your visit here would only delay the matter still further.

Of especial interest to us is the agreement made with the N.V. Boekhandel en Drukkerij E.J. Brill in Leiden regarding the publication of the other 12 volumes. Prof. Jung lays great importance on the scholarly use of these documents.

---

165 30 xi 57: Letter from Jung to Page:


166 19 xi 57: Letter from Baumann to Quispel:

Wir danken Ihnen für Ihre Zuschrift vom 24. Oktober 1957, deren Beantwortung sich leider etwas verzögert hat wegen der Grippe unseres Präsidenten. Da Sie zur Abklärung der Angelegenheit nützliche Dokumente besitzen, bitten wir Sie, uns alles Wissenswerte umgehend mitzuteilen. Wir werden aus den Kreisen von
We heard for the first time on 27 October 1957, in a letter from Dr. C.A. Meier, that on 26 September 1956 you received in Egypt photocopies of the missing 40 pages commissioned by our Institute, which was kept secret from us for over a year.

In order to make the delivery of the Jung Codex possible at all, we ask you to send as rapidly as possible these 40 pages, to hand over to Prof. Jung. You can no doubt have a further set made for yourself. Prof. Jung also wants a complete set of photocopies of the whole codex. Neither he nor we have ever received this.

Baumann also wrote Meier on the same day a letter that was no doubt similar to his letter to Quispel, to which Meier responded:

Unfortunately I must tell you that I do not understand your letter and hence cannot act either rapidly or slowly.

1.) The codex, as it was given to the Institute, is to be found today either in your or Prof. Jung’s property or possession. You can hence at any time have photocopies made of it. I myself do not possess any, and hence cannot ‘tender’ any to you.

2.) The photocopies of the 40 pages are to be found, as you learned not first from my letter to Dr. Rilkin of 27 October, with Prof. Quispel, who, as you
know, works on them. If you or Prof. Jung want to have these photographs quickly, why then do you delay this by asking me rather than Quispel?

I would like to hope that you are so aware of your responsibility that you can apply to yourself your well-intended advice for speed, and can spare yourself unnecessary chicanery.

Rilkin replied to Meier in much the same sharp tone:¹⁶⁸

I cannot avoid noting that not only the tone of your writing of 25 November, but also your whole conduct in general, are in no way suited to further a profitable collaboration and to strengthen our trust in your good will.

Meier was so offended that he wrote Keller-Staub that he would no longer correspond with Rilkin over the matter, but was still concerned to get an answer to the basic question:¹⁶⁹

I am still interested in only one question: When will one become clear about it and state it, as to whether one wants to retain or return the Codex?

But just then Jung had written a letter to von Fischer, with copies to Page, Quispel, and the Curatorium, which seemed to indicate that Meier had succeeded, though now with Quispel’s reservation that the Jung Codex be returned only ‘after publication’:¹⁷⁰

[Paragraph 2] I had at the time only given Dr. Meier authority to exchange the Codex for the other twelve volumes of Chenoboskion, yet, without my

---

¹⁶⁸ 30 xi 57: Letter from Rilkin to Meier:
Ich kann nicht umhin festzustellen, dass nicht nur der Ton Ihres Schreibens vom 25.11., sondern auch Ihr ganzes übriges Verhalten in keiner Weise geeignet sind, eine ersprießliche Zusammenarbeit zu fördern und unser Vertrauen auf Ihren guten Willen zu stärken.

¹⁶⁹ 5 xii 57: Letter from Meier to Keller-Staub:
Mich interessiert nur noch eine Frage: wann wird man sich klar darüber und spricht es aus, ob man den Codex behalten oder zurückgeben will?

¹⁷⁰ 3 xii 57: Letter from Jung to von Fischer (paragraphs 2–4):
Ich hatte seinerzeit Dr. Meier nur die Vollmacht erteilt, den Codex gegen die übrigen 12 Bände von Chenoboskion einzutauschen, jedoch hat er ohne mein Wissen und meine Einwilligung mit den Ägyptern die Abmachung getroffen, den Codex gegen die noch
knowledge and my agreement, he entered into a deal with the Egyptians, to release the codex for the still missing 40 pages, that is to say their photocopies. I have learned this only quite recently, as well as especially also the fact that the Egyptians have already begun publishing the texts of the twelve other codices. Thereupon I immediately turned to the donor, G. Page, with the question as to whether he agrees with the altered conditions of the exchange. I myself could not assume alone the responsibility for this.—My inquiry to Page crossed with his letter to me, from which it becomes apparent that he favors the return under these new conditions, so that now nothing else stands in its way.

[Paragraph 3] At the same time as your letter, I received the copy of a letter from Prof. Quispel to the Curatorium of 23 November 1957, in which he mentions that in the official report about the acquisition of the Codex (August 1951) it reads that this should be returned to the Egyptian government 'after publication.' Corresponding to this, he, Prof. Quispel, together with Prof. Rahn, made in a letter an agreement on 13 April 1955 with Mustafa Amr, that ‘the return of the codex will take place once the publication of the text is achieved.’—As the Curatorium communicated to me, information about the status of the scholarly work has been solicited. As soon as this is in hand, the Curatorium will also announce to Dr. Pahor Labib and Prof. Rahn the imminent return of the codex.

[Paragraph 4] I am extremely sorry that the matter of the codex has taken such an unpleasant development, troubling for all those involved. Unfortunately I have in no way been sufficiently informed about the status of the negotiations
Jung's letter would seem to assume that once Quispel reported to the Curatorium on the status of publication plans, the return of the Jung Codex to the Coptic Museum in Cairo would be ‘imminent.’ What Jung and the Curatorium, as well as Meier, did not realize was that the publication would take place so slowly that only the return of The Gospel of Truth was ‘imminent,’ though actually its return was more than twenty months later, on 21 August 1959. The return of the bulk of the Jung Codex would take place over the years, and only be completed in 1975. Meier commented angrily about Jung's letter to von Fischer, with copies to Quispel and Page.  

To paragraph 2: There was never talk of giving out authority, and certainly not for such a senseless exchange of twelve volumes for the Jung Codex. Jung had no authority at all to grant, since according to the same letter of which he speaks, the Codex did not belong to him at all, but to the Institute. There was hence also no agreement from Jung necessary for the new accord. In July 1956 I reported to Jung the locating of the 40 pages, and of our intention to make the exchange, as well as the founding of the Committee and the planned publication of the twelve volumes by the same Committee. He congratulated me and was highly pleased. Here he writes that it happened without his knowledge and later that he has learned this only quite recently. Then he says that he turned to Page. In reality Page turned to him. There is no question of a crossing of letters. At the end of paragraph 2 it is said that now nothing more stands in the way of the return. Then at the end of paragraph 3, in
To paragraph 3: The agreements of 13 April 1955 were replaced by Prof. Quispel's personal agreement in September 1956. Besides, the text has been completely transcribed, so that nothing more stands in the way of publication. Only the Curatorium has undertaken nothing further in this matter, and hence should get this information from itself.

To paragraph 4: Prof. Jung has been informed by me about every single step of the negotiations, unfortunately always only orally. But thus far I saw no reason to doubt our understanding and also his memory. To be sure, to my great regret both of these points now seem to have changed. Now I for my part consider this letter from Jung to be unpardonable.

Von Fischer then wrote Jung a letter (with a copy to Quispel\textsuperscript{172}) that should have made the return of the Jung Codex possible without further delay:\textsuperscript{173}

At the time, there were negotiations between me and Dr. Pahor Labib as to whether the Jung Codex could not be exchanged for the twelve volumes of Chenoboskion, for their publication by a yet-to-be-appointed commission. Thereupon the Coptic Museum itself published the twelve volumes in question \textsuperscript{1!}, with which our scholarly interest was satisfied and our objective fulfilled. It was then later agreed that the missing 40 pages of the Jung Codex

\textsuperscript{172} 23 xii 57: Letter from von Fischer to Quispel.

\textsuperscript{173} 23 xii 57: Letter from von Fischer to Jung:
would still also be turned over to the C.G. Jung Institute in Zürich. In the meantime this too has taken place.

Hence the conditions for the exchange have today been fulfilled completely and in a fully satisfactory way, so that nothing else should stand in the way of presenting the Jung Codex to the Coptic Museum.

When the Director of the C.G. Jung Institute asked me to enter into negotiations with Dr. Pahor Labib, the Jung Codex, to the extent known to me, was the property of this Institute, so that the latter could hence dispose of it without limitations. I was at the time glad that this indeed made the negotiations easier.

The day after Jung’s letter to von Fischer, Baumann wrote Quispel further ‘wishes’ before ‘the final resolution of the matter’ could take place (presumably the return of the published parts of the Jung Codex): 174

May we lay before you still the following wishes:

1) That you send us as quickly as possible a complete series of photographs of the whole Codex, including the previously missing 40 pages, as you kindly offered at the end of your letter of 23 November 1957. We would also be very indebted to you for sending the translation of the words of Jesus.

2) Could you tell us who will be presented at the publication of the Codices by the printing house Brill as the publisher? We assume that the Jung Codex will also appear in the complete series. For this Codex it seems to Prof. Jung and to us appropriate that the C.G. Jung Institute appear as the publisher.

Die Bedingungen des Tausches sind also heute ganz und in voll zufriedenstellender Weise erfüllt, sodass der Übergabe des Codex-Jung an das Koptische Museum nichts mehr im Wege stehen sollte.

Als der Direktor des C.G.-Jung Institutes mich bat, mit Herrn Dr. Pahor Labib in Verhandlungen zu treten, war der Codex-Jung, soviel mir bekannt war, Eigentum dieses Institutes, sodass dieses letztere also uneingeschränkt darüber verfügen konnte. Ich hatte mich damals darüber gefreut, da dies ja die Verhandlungen erleichterte.

Dürfen wir Ihnen noch folgende Wünsche unterbreiten:

1) Dass Sie uns, wie am Ende Ihres Briefes vom 23.11.57 freundlicherweise angeboten, eine vollständige Serie der Photographien des ganzen Codex, inclusive der bisher fehlenden 40 Seiten, raschmöglichst zustellen. Auch für die Einsendung der Übersetzung der Jesusworte wären wir Ihnen verbunden.

2) Könnten Sie uns sagen, wer bei der Herausgabe der Codices durch den Verlag Brill als Herausgeber auftreten wird? Wir nehmen an, dass in der ganzen Serie auch der
3) Since a large part of the material in the dossier is unfortunately not yet in our hands, we ask you for a copy of your letter of 13 April 1955 to us, which apparently made clear your agreements with Mustafa Amr.

As soon as these three points are clarified, apparently nothing more stands in the way of the final resolution of the matter. We hence await eagerly your rapid report and also look forward to being able to discuss with you once again the whole complex of questions on the occasion of your being here in January.

The reason for inquiring of Quispel if Brill planned to publish the twelve other codices could be that their publication instead by the Jung Institute had been a condition for returning the Jung Codex to Egypt. But if, instead, Brill were publishing them, the Curatorium could argue that this condition had not been met! Of course the Curatorium no longer had an interest in publishing the twelve other codices. Hence the Curatorium seems to have accepted the compromise that in the case of the Jung Codex the Brill edition mention the C.G. Jung Institute as publisher.

Quispel did not supply what Baumann requested, but he did meet with the Curatorium on 17 January 1958. In Quispel’s handwritten notes of that meeting one can read:

*Letter from the Institute to P[ahor] Labib* is urgent

1) Pages of *Evangelium Veritatis* return
2) The rest retain

The letter that Quispel then wrote the Curatorium at Meier’s insistence stated Quispel’s understanding of their agreement with Egypt:

---

**Codex Jung erscheinen wird. Für letzteren scheint es Prof. Jung und uns angezeigt, dass das C.G. Jung-Institut als Herausgeber in Erscheinung tritt.**


Sobald noch diese drei Punkte geklärt sind, dürfte der endgültigen Erledigung der Angelegenheit wohl nichts mehr im Wege stehen. Wir erwarten deshalb gerne Ihren raschen Bericht und freuen uns auch, anlässlich Ihres Hierseins im Januar den ganzen Fragenkomplex noch einmal mit Ihnen besprechen zu können.

---

175 17 i 58: “Besprechung Curatorium Jan. 1958”: Notes taken by Quispel:

*Brief vom Institut an P. Labib pressiert*

1) Seiten Ev. Ver. zurück
2) Übrige behalten

176 23 i 58: Letter from Quispel to the Curatorium (second draft):
I am happy that our discussions proceeded so pleasantly, and would hope that all those involved are now in agreement that 1) the Curatorium answers Pahor Labib, 2) the pages of the *Evangelium Veritatis* are returned symbolically as soon as possible, and 3) the remainder of the Codex be returned only after publication, trusting that Dr. Pahor Labib has by then fulfilled all his promises about the publication of the manuscripts at Brill, the permission to use Giversen’s photographs, and the making available of minutes of the [1956] meeting.

I, on behalf of the International Committee, would in addition like to ask of you to allow that the Jung Codex appear in the series of the Committee and at the same publisher. I have thus far found no written document that indicates that we have bound ourselves already with Rascher for the publication of the whole, but it would after all be morally desirable if you would discuss this matter with him and ask for his permission that, in the interest of science, a similar solution for all the texts of Nag Hammadi be found.

Quispel included in his letter his support for Meier, as Meier had insisted:

As I already wrote you, in my view Dr. Meier has rendered very great service in the securing of the Codex, and has always in an admirable way sought the goal of making the Codices available to science.

In order to avoid a reproach to him perhaps arising from the fact that his view on the return of the Codex was not quite my own, I consider it important to explain to you how this difference could arise.

Es freut mich, dass unsere Besprechungen so angenehm verlaufen sind und dürfte hoffen, alle Beteiligten jetzt damit einverstanden dass 1) das Kuratorium Pahor Labib antwortet 2) die Seiten des Evangelium Veritatis symbolischerweise sobald wie mög- lich zurückkehren und 3) der Rest des Kodex erst zurückkehren wird nach der Ver- öffentlichung, im Vertrauen dass Dr. Pahor Labib dann einstweilen all seine Ver- sprechungen über die Herausgabe der Manuskripte bei Brill, die Erlaubnis Giversens Photographien zu benützen und ein Protokoll der Sitzung zur Verfügung zu stellen eingelöst hat.

Auszserdem möchte ich Sie im Auftrag des Internationalen Komitéts bitten zu erlauben dass der Jung Kodex in der Serie des Komitéts und beim selben Verleger erscheint; ich habe bisher kein schriftliches Dokument gefunden woraus hervorgeht, dass wir uns schon mit Rascher zu der Ausgabe des Ganzen verbunden haben, aber es wäre doch moralisch erwünscht, wenn Sie mit ihm diese Sache besprechen und um seine Erlaubnis beten dass im Interesse der Wissenschaft eine gleiche Lösung für alle Schriften von Nag Hammadi gefunden wird.

23 i 58: Letter from Quispel to the Curatorium (second draft):

Wie ich Ihnen schon schrieb, hat m. E. Dr. Meier sich für die Erwerbung des Codex sehr verdienstlich gemacht und immer in lobenswerter Weise das Ziel erstrebt, die Kodizes für die Wissenschaft zugänglich zu machen.

Um zu verhindern dass ihm vielleicht daraus ein Vorwurf entstehe, dass seine Ansicht
In a letter of 17 July 1956 Dr. Meier asked me whether we could already now get along without the Codex. To this I answered on 19 July 1956 that this could take place if one knew with certainty that the missing pages in fact stood at our disposal. On 14 August 1956 I advised Dr. Meier, since this presupposition did not seem to have been met, to hand over only one page symbolically, since one then still had something in hand as security. This Dr. Meier accepted (letter of 6 September 1956), but then he did not go to Cairo, since he would have to consider that ‘as an abuse of collegiality’ toward Till (who was ill) (24 September 1956).

When Dr. Meier now learned from me that I had control of the missing 40 pages, whereas I hid from him that other promises of Pahor Labib had not been met (access to the documents, etc.), he from his standpoint could rightly think the time for returning the Codex had come, also since he did not receive from me, to read black on white, that I did not consider the return under the given circumstances to be so urgent.

But when I explained to him during my visit in Zürich that ‘the other leaves were still needed for the collation,’ he conceded my point and welcomed the solution I proposed. If I had known at all that differences of opinion over the Codex existed between him and you, of course I would have immediately said

über die Rückgabe des Kodex nicht ganz die meine war, lege ich Wert darauf, Ihnen zu erklären, wie diese Differenz entstehen konnte.


Als Dr. Meier nun von mir vernahm ich verfüge über die 40 fehlenden Seiten, während ich ihm verschwieg dass andere Versprechungen von Pahor Labib (Zugang zu den Dokumenten, etc.) nicht eingelöst waren, könnte er von seinem Standpunkt mit Recht meinen, die Zeit den Kodex zurückzugeben sei gekommen, auch schon weil er nicht schwarz auf weiss von mir zu lesen bekam ich hielt die Zurückgabe in den gegebenen Umständen nicht für so dringend.

that to him, but I hold it to be my fault that he was not better oriented. To be sure I hope that the whole matter is now resolved.

Meier finally decided to get out of the whole sordid mess, and so wrote Keller-Staub asking how to do it:\textsuperscript{178}

After Quispel with his ‘Solomonic’ advice has no doubt finally botched the Codex matter, I do not feel myself any longer obligated in the whole affair. ...

May I now perhaps still ask you, honored Doctor, to let me know briefly, after looking into the small enclosed dossier, whether you too find it right that I do not react, or in the other case give me your advice.

Keller-Staub replied\textsuperscript{179} with a paragraph that Meier might send to Rilkin, which Meier then did send:\textsuperscript{180}

With reference to your letter of 13 February \textsuperscript{1958}, I refer to my letter of 3 February 1958, according to which I no longer have any reason to worry myself in any regard with the matter of the Codex, and correspondingly I will no longer worry myself with it.

Jung’s own last word on the Jung Codex was in his letter to Page cited above:\textsuperscript{181}

I thank you kindly for your letter of 29 November 1957 together with the enclosure, from which I draw the conclusion that you are in agreement to return the codex. At first I did not dare to assume that you would be in agreement that the codex be exchanged for the photographs of the missing 40 pages. This transaction seemed to me somewhat too Levantine, after, in such a generous way, you have entered in upon the purchase of the document.

Jung concluded with a sad personal comment:\textsuperscript{182}

\textsuperscript{178} 17 ii 58: Letter from Meier to Keller-Staub:

Nachdem Quispel mit seinem “salomonischern” Rat, die Codex-Angelegenheit wohl endgültig verpfuscht hat, fühle ich mich nun nicht mehr weiter in der ganzen Sache verpflichtet. ...

Darf ich Sie, verehrter Herr Doktor, jetzt vielleicht noch bitten, mich nach Einsicht des kleinen beiliegenden Dossiers noch kurz wissen zu lassen, ob auch Sie es richtig finden, dass ich nicht reagiere oder mir im andern Fall Ihren Rat zu erteilen.

\textsuperscript{179} 11 ii 58: Letter from Keller-Staub to Meier.

\textsuperscript{180} 1 iii 58: Letter from Meier to Rilkin:


\textsuperscript{181} 30 xi 57: Letter from Jung to Page.

\textsuperscript{182} 30 xi 57: Letter from Jung to Page:
It lies heavily on my soul that up until now the Institute for its part has not been in the position to perform the expected scholarly work, especially for the *Evangelium Veritatis*. As a result of my advanced age I am unfortunately no longer able to do this myself. I could still only function as advisor. I can only hope that in the future we find a collaborator who proves himself capable of this task.

Of course no such collaborator has emerged. Indeed, Quispel had made the grandiose prediction to the Jung Institute in Zürich, before he had even seen any of the texts, to the effect that the Nag Hammadi Codices would provide the historical proof for the Jungian psychological theory that the whole human race possesses the same archetypes (see Chapter 5, Part 1 below). But this is in fact not proven by the Nag Hammadi Codices.

Thus Jung’s basic concern went unfulfilled. This may well have played a rôle in the Curatorium’s impatience with Meier’s obsession to be on the International Committee, preferably as its presiding officer, in charge of publishing all the Nag Hammadi Codices, over against the Curatorium’s down-to-earth orientation to the Jung Codex as a valuable antiquity that might well belong to the Jung family.

Only a very small part of the grandiose plans of Meier for the Jung Institute to publish all the Nag Hammadi Codices was actually achieved (see Chapter 3, Part 6 above): All of the Jung Codex was finally published by a necessarily enlarged editorial board. Only Tractates 2-4 (at the time considered to be Tractates 1-3) were published by the Rascher Verlag. Only Tractate 3 (considered to be Tractate 2), *The Gospel of Truth*, plus the supplemental volume with the two Cairo leaves, were published in the series of the Jung Institute edited by Meier. Tractates 1 and 5 (considered to be Tractates 5 and 4) were published by the Franke Verlag of Bern.

5. *The Final Return of the Jung Codex to Cairo*

Rilkin finally sent von Fischer the good news that the return of the Jung Codex, at least of the *Evangelium Veritatis*, had begun.

---

184 24 x 60: Letter from Rilkin to von Fischer:
I am happy to be able to inform you that in the matter of the Jung Codex our negotiations with the Rascher Verlag on the one hand and with the participating scholars on the other have allowed us, commissioned by Prof. C.G. Jung, on 4 August of this year [1960], to give over to the Cultural Attaché of the Egyptian Embassy in Bern the original papyri of the *Evangelium Veritatis*, in conformity with agreements made earlier about the return of the Jung Codex to the Coptic Museum in Cairo.

We hope that you can affirm that you are in accord with the result of these efforts on our part, and we will hand over the other papyri to the Egyptian Embassy for the Coptic Museum as soon as they are worked through to the extent that they can be published, also according to the agreement.

Furthermore, on 24 July 1961 Fritz Baumann-Jung, as spokesman for the heirs of Jung, reaffirmed to Page the position of Jung that the papyri should always be available to the scholarly community.\(^{185}\)

Today, as always, the papyri are at the disposal of every scholar who wishes to see them, and I have never refused or discouraged taking a look at them.

But when in 1974 I wanted to see the part of the Jung Codex that was still in Zürich, I had no contact with Baumann-Jung. I saw no other alternative than to negotiate via Kasser. But the most I could get from him was permission to study the fibers of the material in Zürich, not the text itself, in view of the fact that I was functioning as Secretary of the UNESCO Committee, whose responsibility was limited to *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*. For this reason I could only carry out a codicological function, not an editorial function. Once I conceded this condition, he set up a meeting for me with Baumannn-Jung and himself in the basement of the Leu Bank in Zürich. The examination, lasting somewhat less than two hours, was carried

\(^{185}\) 24 vii 61: Letter from Baumann to Page:

Nach wie vor *stehen die Papyri* jedem Gelehrten, der sie zu sehen wünscht, zur Verfügung, und ich habe noch nie eine Einsichtnahme abgelehnt oder erschwert.
out on 30 October 1974. Even if Kasser were not involved as intermediary, it would hardly have been practical for a scholar, during such a brief time in the basement of the Leu Bank, to prepare a publishable text. In fact no publication resulted from such a visit during the years that the Jung Codex, or major parts of it, were in the Leu Bank.

I took this opportunity to express to Baumann-Jung the urgency of the need to return the remainder of the Jung Codex to Cairo, so that fragments could be placed and the Codex rephotographed for publication in *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*. He stated that the heirs of Jung, as owners of these leaves, are quite disposed to consent to this request, if the signers of the publication contract of 30 June 1970 between the seven authors and the Franke Verlag at Bern would not see any difficulty in this step.

At my suggestion, Baumann-Jung agreed to write those who had signed the contract with the Franke Verlag for their permission. Hence he wrote a letter that he sent to Kasser, Malinine, Puech, Quispel, Vycichl, Wilson, Zandee, and the Franke Verlag, asking for their consent to my request that the remaining leaves be returned without further delay to Cairo. Unknown to him, though known to Kasser, there was a clause in the contract with the Franke Verlag to the effect that the papyri would be returned only after publication.

Baumann-Jung wrote me the outcome as follows:

After our meeting on 30 October [1974] in Zürich, I have, according to your request, asked all seven editors and the publisher Franke in Bern to give me their agreement to an immediate handing over of the ‘Codex’ to the Egyptian embassy in Bern, on behalf of the Coptic Museum. Messrs Zandee, Quispel, and Wilson are in agreement. Kasser and Vicichl make a few reservations. From Paris I have no reply, no doubt because of the postal strike. Franke did not reply.

I fear very much that your wish for it to be turned over soon will hardly be fulfilled very quickly. Naturally I must have the unconditional agreement of

---

186 19 xi 74: Letter from F. Baumann-Jung to Robinson:


Ich befürchtete sehr, dass Ihr Wunsch nach baldiger Übergabe kaum sehr rasch in Erfüllung gehen wird. Ich muss natürlich die vorbehaltlose Zustimmung aller Beteiligten
all those involved before I undertake anything. From one side there was even a threat that the heirs of Jung would have to bear the financial responsibility if, because it were turning over prematurely, the publication would be delayed. One can never make it right for everybody.

I suggest to you to intervene perhaps yourself with your colleagues, if that seems right to you. I have personally undertaken what stands in my power, and now simply am waiting. I am sorry not to be able to give you any more positive information.

Since Baumann-Jung had received no reply from Puech and Malinine, or from the Franke Verlag, and only positive replies from Zandee, Quispel, and Wilson, the financial threat to the heirs of Jung could only have come from Kasser and/or Vycichl. Since however Vycichl had only been added at the last minute, and was not even listed on the title page as one of the editors, but only as an assistant, he could hardly have taken such a bold and challenging position on his own. Thus by the process of elimination the threat to the heirs of Jung must have come from Kasser—the same person who had initially told me that the reason the Jung Codex could not be returned to Egypt was that the heirs of Jung were aware of its financial value and hence it was they who did not want to return it!

Once Kasser informed me at the end of 1974 that the last of the editio princeps had been sent to the publisher, I contacted Baumann-Jung. I have published the final outcome as follows:187

Baumann-Jung wrote the Egyptian Embassy in Bern in January 1975 and again in May 1975 to send a representative to Zürich to receive the rest of the Jung Codex, but without response. On my arrival in Cairo in August 1975 Gamal Mokhtar [President of the Egyptian Antiquities Authority], on receiving my report, began steps that led to sending Maher Salib, Chief Curator of the Coptic Museum, to Zürich from 28 September to 5 October 1975; on 12 October 1975 the Coptic Museum in Cairo formally received pages A/B, 51–58, 91–136, two large fragments of pages 83/84, one large fragment of pages 85/86, the largest fragment of pages 137/138, and all but thirty-eight of the ninety-seven

small inscribed fragments in the Eid collection (the others having been lost presumably when the material was between cellophane before it was conserved in Utrecht).

I also pointed out that the policy of the editors to keep the leaves of Nag Hammadi Codex I separated into two lots, one in Zürich and one in Cairo, until after their publication, had led them to making codicological mistakes in the editio princeps, which even included a false numeration of the pagination and the tractates:188

Since the middle of the first quire is at pages 42–43, it was assumed the quire had only eighty-four pages, without the usual front flyleaf. Hence an extant leaf that did not seem to fit into quires 1–3 was thought to be all that survived of an otherwise completely unattested fourth quire. But its fibers and profile show it to be the first leaf of the codex and part of the first quire. Since this front leaf is not included in the pagination, which at the beginning of the codex is certain, one may conjecture that it was originally uninscribed, and was intended as the usual uninscribed and unpaginated front flyleaf. Since it is in fact inscribed with the brief Prayer of the Apostle Paul, one may assume that as an economy measure it was secondarily inscribed. ... This means that the brief tractate of Codex I, numbered 5 and paginated 143–144 in the editio princeps, is in fact tractate 1 and may best be paginated A–B, as is customary with uninscribed flyleaves in The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices. The result is that what the editors of the editio princeps have listed as tractates 1–4 must also be renumbered, as 2–5. ...

It was hardly a service to the editio princeps, much less to scholarship [29] at large, to keep the Codex unavailable for reliable codicological analysis by the scholarly community until the editors had published their erroneous codicological conclusions with the resultant confusion of pagination and tractate numeration.

Once all the material was together again in Cairo, the fragments that had been at one location but belonged on leaves at the other location could be placed. Thus it was possible finally to publish, as the last volume of The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices, improved photographs of all the reassembled leaves of Codex I in their proper codicological sequence and numeration.189

---
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CHAPTER FIVE

THE DUTCH LEADERSHIP IN NAG HAMMADI STUDIES

1. The Leading Dutch Nag Hammadi Scholars

Gilles Quispel

The scholar of the Netherlands who was most deeply involved in Nag Hammadi studies, and who did the most to make them generally known, was certainly Gilles Quispel, initially at Leiden, later Professor of the History of the Early Church at the University of Utrecht.2

Quispel became involved in the Nag Hammadi texts through the Doresses, whom he met at the Congrès des Orientalistes in Paris in the summer of 1948. He then wrote Doresse encouragingly about the interest of the Bollingen Foundation in the Nag Hammadi texts, as Marianne Doresse reported:3

Puech, as well as Quispel, with whom we have just become acquainted at the Congress of Orientalists, go to Ascona, where Puech speaks about the texts that however he does not yet know (but he does not admit it), except through what Jean has said or published about them. Quispel meets Barrett at Ascona, and he writes to Jean to inform him of the interest that the Bollingen Foundation seems to take in his discovery. Later Mellon will come to Paris and in fact discusses with Jean, whom he receives at the Hotel Meurisse on 20 October 1948. He gives hope of aid from the Foundation, which Jean would appreciate all the more, perceiving already the new developments of the discovery.

1 http://ccdilibraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1542. Gilles Quispel's collected essays on Gnosticism were printed in two volumes in 1974–1975 in Leiden: Gilles Quispel, Gnostic Studies I, 1974 (Scholer 3055, containing Scholer 4032, 4035, 4038, 4047, 4048, 4056, 4575, 5184, 4867, 5186, 5255, 6387) and II, 1975 (Scholer 3060, containing Scholer 4044, 4051, 4510, 7159–7161, 7163, 7164, 7166, 7168, 7171, 7175), in the series Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul XXXIV, 1 and 2. I am indebted to Quispel for entrusting his Nag Hammadi archives to me.

2 Gilles Quispel published his autobiography in Dutch: Gilles Quispel, Een jongetje uit Kinderdijk: herinneringen van Gilles Quispel [verzameld door Reinout Quispel ... et al.] (Leeuwarden: Mooi Rood Pers, 2003). It was printed with 25 numbered copies. One unnumbered copy is in the Special Collections of the Royal Library in The Hague.

3 Marianne Doresse, “Premiere mission de Jean Doresse en Égypte” (see Chapter 2, Part 2 above).
No funding was forthcoming. But after the Bollingen Foundation, headed by Paul Mellon, a member of the circle that met annually at Ascona, declined on 25 March 1952 to fund the purchase of the Jung Codex, for fear it would hurt the activities of the Bollingen Foundation in Egypt (see Chapter 3, Parts 2 and 3 above), Quispel applied on 28 August 1952 to the Bollingen Foundation for a research grant to prepare the codex for publication. On 15 December 1952 he was notified that he had been awarded $6,000, the same amount that had originally been offered by the Bollingen Foundation for the purchase.4

Already at the Congress of Orientalists in 1948, Quispel had begun to replace Doresse as Puech's closest colleague with regard to the Nag Hammadi materials:5

During this congress Puech and Q[uispel] made their plans.

Gilles Quispel's involvement in Gnosticism has been summarized as follows:6

Gilles Quispel (b. 1916), Professor of the History of the Early Church at the University of Utrecht, is a distinguished scholar of Gnosticism perhaps best known for the argument that the chief roots of Gnosticism are Jewish—a view that builds on the work of Gershom Scholem and Erik Peterson. Quispel is also conspicuous for his advocacy of a Jungian approach to Gnosticism. In 1947 he began lecturing at the Eranos Conference, where he became friends with Jung. Quispel's lectures at the Jung Institute in Zürich were published as Gnosis als Weltreligion, his best-known work. In honor of Jung, Quispel even bought for the Institute the Gnostic codex, Nag Hammadi I, subsequently known as 'the Jung Codex.' Quispel's admiration for Jung is unblushing: Jung, he declares, "has done more for the interpretation of religion than any other living [i. e., present-day] person."

Quispel himself reported on how he first got involved, moving from Valentinus to Jung. In the process he recorded from his perspective what is narrated in more detail and more objectivity elsewhere in the present work:7

---

4 15 xii 52: Typewritten signed one-page letter from Brooks of the Bollingen Foundation to Quispel.
5 In 1978 Quispel mailed me his 'Carte de Membre, G. Quispel, XXIe Congrès International des Orientalistes, Paris, 23–31 Juillet 1948,' on the back of which Quispel wrote: "During this congress Puech and Q. made their plans."
During the war we had plenty of time: you could not go out, or eat, or resist, or participate in public life. It so happened that I was a teacher of Greek and Latin in a small provincial town of the Netherlands and was working on my dissertation. For this I had to read Christian Fathers of the second century, heresy hunters like Irenaeus and Tertullian. And then, in the particular constellation of that time and that moment in my life, I found that the heretics were right. Especially the poetic imagery of a certain Valentinus, a second-century Gnostic, the greatest Gnostic that ever lived, made a deep and lasting impression upon me. Only a few fragments of his writings remained, but the reports about the views of his pupils were so numerous that it was tantalizing to try and reconstruct the original doctrine of the Master himself. This I did from 1941 till 1945—I told you I had nothing to do—and after the war I published an article about it. You know what happens in such circumstances. You are young; when you have laid an egg, you think it is the world egg, in short I sent an offprint of this article to Aldous Huxley in California, Karl Barth in Basel and Carl Gustav Jung in Zürich. At that time I was disappointed that the first two mentioned did not answer; now I am rather astonished that Jung, at that time already a world celebrity of seventy-one, replied with a personal and encouraging letter. This led to an invitation for a conference in Ascona, Switzerland, one of the so-called Eranos Conferences, which Jung and his followers used to visit every year. Of course I lectured about my Valentinus, Jung said a few words of appreciation and then everybody liked me. This was in 1947.

Soon afterwards the news spread that Gnostic manuscripts in Coptic had been discovered in Egypt. It was said that among them there was the so-called Gospel of Truth, which according to a Father of the Church was in use among the Valentinians. And there was more.

One day the French professor Henri-Charles Puech, when sitting in the underground railway of Paris, was turning over the leaves of transcriptions from Nag Hammadi, which a young Frenchman, Jean Doresse, had given to him. His attention was drawn to the beginning of one writing, which runs as follows: “These are the secret words which the Living Jesus spoke and Didymus Judas Thomas wrote.”

In a flash it occurred to him that he had read that before. When the train stopped, he ran home and took a book from the shelf of his bookcase. It was so: the famous fragments of the sayings of Jesus in Greek, found at Oxyrhynchus in 1897 and 1903, began with the same words and turned out to belong to one specific writing, The Gospel of Thomas. For the first time in history a collection

of sayings of our Lord, independent of the New Testament and in some cases completely new, had come to light. Puech had discovered this. And he had no possibility to get access to the manuscript. He wrote to me, I wrote to Jung, and in 1951 we had the opportunity to discuss certain matters in Ascona with Jung and his associate C.A. Meier. Why was this?

At this time the whole collection of Coptic writings known as the Nag Hammadi Library and discovered in 1945 could have been published completely. The Director of Egyptian Antiquities, the French priest Étienne Drioton, would have surveyed the whole enterprise and distributed the writings to French scholars exclusively. A start had already been made: Jean Doresse and Pahor Labib made an edition and translation of the very important Apocryphon of John, printed at the Imprimerie Nationale of Paris, which I have seen with my own eyes, but which was never published. But there occurred a revolution in Egypt, Drioton had to leave the country, Doresse could no longer get a passport, not even from his own government, and this precious treasure of mankind fell into the hands of a people not really interested in it. The legal owner of most of these manuscripts was persuaded to bring them to a place and later to the Coptic Museum for expertise, where they were seized (the reason for which remains unknown) and left in Tano’s suitcase, where I found them in 1955. No contacts with other scholars were made; at a later date it was even stipulated that the greatest experts, Puech and Walter Till, were not to participate in the edition, for reasons unknown. How little some people cared is obvious from the fact that the whole file with correspondence on Nag Hammadi had gotten lost in the Coptic Museum. And yet experts urged the authorities to proceed. Prominent scholars of Harvard, among them Arthur Darby Nock, wrote in this sense to Mustafa Amr, the successor to Drioton, unselfishly adding that they themselves did not know Coptic. In these circumstances Jung and Meier have rendered an invaluable serve to impatient students of Gnosticism. The old man had considered what he could do and had come to the conclusion that he would help these manuscripts to be put at the disposal of the qualified scholars who had already waited so long (in his own words; ‘den zuständigen Gelehrten zur Verfügung gestellt werden sollten’). Therefore one codex which had left Egypt was to be acquired and after publication given back to the Egyptian government on the condition that the other manuscripts would be released for serious study. So I acquired the Jung Codex on 10 May 1952. Now imagine what it is for a scholar to study Valentinus during the whole war and afterwards to acquire a whole manuscript with five authentic and completely new writings of Valentinus and his school. Is not that an act of God?

So in 1955 the lacking pages of the Jung Codex were found in the Coptic Museum and an arrangement was made which was accepted at a meeting of an international committee in Cairo in 1956: (1) The Jung Codex was to return to Egypt and an international committee of experts was to publish all the writings of Nag Hammadi; (2) the firm Brill at Leiden (and not the French Institute at Cairo) was to publish them; (3) the Rask Oersted Foundation at Copenhagen was to finance the photographic edition of the
manuscripts; (4) the Bollingen Foundation at New York was to pay all the expenses of the committee, including the travel of some Egyptian members to Paris. Of course, everybody concerned signed the convention that only members of the committee would have access to the manuscripts. This solemn pledge was broken and pirated editions were published in Germany.

And then the decline of classical studies became only too obvious. All these writings have been translated into Coptic from the Greek. Knowledge of Greek is a must for everybody who wants to study these documents, if only because so many Greek words still occur in the text. The mistakes made against the Greek in these pirated editions are appalling. In these texts the spouse of God, a female symbol of wholeness, is sometimes called Metro-pator, Motherfather, because she has synthesized the male and the female principle. This extremely profound imagery is completely obscured by the unspeakable translation: ‘Grandfather’\(^8\) (‘Grannie is now in heaven’). Moreover, these editors proved too prudishly for Gnosis; they translated métra as ‘mother,’\(^9\) and physis as ‘nature,’\(^9\) whereas it means in this context ‘uterus.’

And even those who translated the Coptic correctly did not establish and fix a text, but printed manuscripts, sometimes even three. There has been, however, since antiquity, a technique of edition. The first rule of it is that you have to establish a text of your own choice, based upon the manuscripts available, but with the necessary conjectures and emendations, of which account is given in the critical apparatus under the text. I’m sorry to say that quite a few editions are completely deficient in these respects. Therefore it was right that Antoine Guillaumont, of the Collège de France in Paris, urged UNESCO to publish photographic editions. This desire has been implemented at last. Moreover, we may trust that our American friends, under the inspiring leadership of James Robinson, will see to it that the Coptic, the Greek, and the art of editing will be adequately dealt with in their future editions. It will be only then that Jung’s wish that these texts might be put at the disposal of the qualified scholars available will be realized.

What was the reason that Jung, already an old man, had a hunch of the importance of this discovery, whereas so many prominent theologians and

---

8 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, Codex II, 5,6–7; 6,16; 14,19; 19,17; 20,9–10; 27,33–34; Codex IV, [7,21–22]; 9,19–20; 22,23–24; 31,4; 43,9.


philosophers at that time disparaged the perennial religion of Gnosis as 'nihilism' and 'metaphysical anti-Semitism'? That was because Jung was one of the few outsiders who had really read the fragments of this faith forgotten and was keenly aware of its relevance for scholarship. He had written his doctoral dissertation 'On the Psychology of So-called Occult Phenomena' (1902): in this he had interpreted the fancies of a medium, who was none other than his niece Helly Preiswerk, and had rightly called them Gnostic. And yet the youth and mentality of the patient precluded the possibility that she knew the reports of the anti-heretical Church Fathers. Hence the conclusion arises that Gnosis lives unconsciously in the soul even of a modern woman.

Jung was already on the right track at that time, but the rising sun of the 'Religionsgeschichtliche Schule' helped him to continue in the right direction. German theology at that period was dominated by the political theology of Ritschl and Harnack, who were very much against Rome, mysticism, and pietism, and all for Luther, justification by faith alone, and the nation. Jung, the doubting son of a clergyman, was as a student already an outspoken opponent of Ritschl.

On the contrary, people like Herman Usener, Albrecht Dieterich, and Wilhelm Bousset loved popular religion, mysteries, syncretism, and Gnosis. They found that God very often had been experienced as a Woman, Mother Earth, that 'rebirth' is found also in the Hellenistic cults of the beginning of our era, etc. Dieterich even wrote a book about a cosmic God of good and evil, represented as an officer with the head of a cock and serpentine legs, called Abraxas. They explored what they called 'die Grundformen religiösen Denkens,' the fundamental patterns (or archetypes) of religious thought. Jung knew this literature. It should be observed that at that time studies had already been made of symbols that were held to be typically Aryan or Indo-Germanic. And others already divided humanity into classes with different patterns of thought. Against these, men like Dieterich found basic forms of religious symbolism that are characteristic for all human beings. The implications of their work are thoroughly liberal and humanistic.

When working in an asylum, Jung one day was told by a patient that the sun had a tail, which caused the wind. Later on he read in a book by Dieterich, Eine Mithrasliturgie, that a magical papyrus of antiquity contained the same view. The hallucinations of a mad clerk of Zürich showed affinity with Gnostic lore. This fact led Jung to suppose that our collective unconscious contains basic patterns which he called archetypes.

Jung studied the then available Gnostic literature, especially after his rupture with Freud, when he had terrible experiences and the Gnostics were his only friends. He even made a Gnostic painting reflecting his own state of mind. The stream of Eros starts with dark Abraxas, a world creator of contradictory nature, and leads up to the figure of a youth within a winged egg, called Phanes and symbolizing rebirth and the true Self. At the same time he wrote a Gnostic apocryphon called The Seven Sermons to the Dead by Basilides
of Alexandria, in which he proclaimed a new God beyond good and evil, called Abraxas. The German author Hermann Hesse took over these ideas in his book Demian. As a matter of fact, the impressive image of individuation, the young bird who picks its way out of the eggshell, comes from Jung. So a whole generation in Europe found the expression of its deepest aspirations in a Gnostic symbol. As Fred Haynes remarked, Jung had renewed and revitalized Gnosticism in Europe after the First World War. And Jung really thought that familiarity with Gnostic imagery and Gnostic experiences helped uprooted modern man to solve his psychological problems. Starting from his own experiences and their parallels in ancient lore Jung tried during a long life to prove that these patterns were to be found in all religions and recur in dreams of modern men (in fact, his theory is also liberal and humanistic). He considered the archetypes as the language of life itself, universal symbols of all men, black, white, yellow, or red, and of all times. He discovered sense in nonsense and thought he could perceive in the soul an inbuilt tendency toward self-realization, the process of individuation.

When man comes to himself, he is, according to Jung, in the first place faced with his shadow of deficiency; then he starts to explore his female side, the anima, often accompanied by the wise old man, who incarnates the cumulative wisdom of mankind, until the Self announces itself in dreams and visions, symbolized by the child or the square, heralding the healing of the split between reason and instincts. All these archetypes are and were already to be found in Gnostic texts: the demiurge as shadow, Sophia as anima, Simon Magus as the wise old man, the Logos as child, the tetraktys or four fundamental aeons as quaternio.

It did not take long for students of Gnosis to realize that this theory and this terminology were useful tools for the interpretation of Gnostic texts. Especially Henri-Charles Puech, once a teacher of Simone Weil, later professor at the Sorbonne and the Collège de France, pointed out that the center of every Gnostic myth is man, not God. These confused and confusing images of monstrous and terrifying beings should be explained according to Puech in terms of the predicament of man in search of himself. The discovery of the Self is the core of both Gnosticism and Manicheism. Even before Nag Hammadi this psychological approach was already a necessary supplement to the purely historical or unilaterally existentialistic interpretation of Gnosis which prevailed in other quarters. There is no question that psychology in general is of great help, an auxiliary science, for history in general, which otherwise tends to become arid and pedantic. And more specifically the Jungian approach to Gnosticism, once decried as a soul-shaking spectacle concocted by decadent psychologists and vain students of Judaic mysticism, turned out to be adequate when The Gospel of Truth was discovered. For then it became clear to everyone that Gnosis is an experience, inspired by vivid and profound emotions, that in short Gnosis is the mythic expression of Self experience.
Puech and Quispel were active participants in the Eranos conferences of the Jung Institute of Zürich held each year at Ascona—Quispel read papers there from 1947 through 1971,\textsuperscript{11} Puech in 1951.\textsuperscript{12}

Quispel's involvement led to him to present four lectures at the Jung Institute in Zürich, which he published in a small book on Gnosticism as a world religion.\textsuperscript{13} The first chapter, entitled ‘Significance of the New Discoveries,’ begins and concludes with the good news that the new discovery of Gnostic texts will prove Gnosticism to be a world religion, thus documenting historically what the Jungian psychology had postulated, the universality of the Jungian archetypes.\textsuperscript{14}


\textsuperscript{14} Quispel, \textit{Gnosis als Weltreligion}, chapter 1: “Bedeutung der neuen Funde,” 1–12; 1, 12:


Der Gnostizismus ist ein grosser Strom, der von der vulgären Urgnosis zum Manichäismus führt; Valentin, Basilides, gewissermassen auch Markion, sind Abzweigungen des grossen Stromes, die christliches Gebiet durchqueren. An sich aber ist die Gnosis eine
A world religion is newly discovered. One may perhaps already now sum-
mimarize in this way the new discoveries of Gnostic manuscripts. Up to now
there has been a certain uncertainty and embarrassment in evaluating and
classifying this remarkable current, which could be explained as due to the
sparseness of the material and the difficult of the interpretation. Now we see
clearly, and the time is not distant, when we can have an overview of the whole
of Gnosticism from its source until its outpouring, present in summary fash-
ion its phenomenological physiognomy, and work out its psychological roots.
The historical philologian, the historian of religion, and the symbol researcher
are called to a beautiful collaboration, to map this new territory. Already now
a preliminary sketch, still in need of correction, can be presented of the com-
ing tasks and objectives. ...

Gnosticism is a great flood leading from common primitive Gnosticism to
Manichaeism. Valentinus, Basilides, in a certain sense also Marcion, are off-
shoots of the great flood that crisscross Christian terrain. But in itself Gno-
sticism is a religion in and of itself. The genealogy of the Gnostic systems, the
great difficulty for heresiological research, would then lie clearly before our
eyes. The history of Gnosticism would then be the development of a religion
whose stages can be determined historically. A world religion would be newly
discovered. The discovery of the 48 Gnostic books in Nag Hammadi opens this
perspective for us.

This is then sketched in sweeping outline:\textsuperscript{15}

What these new books mean for our knowledge of the literature of antiquity
is inestimable. ...

To be sure, Plotinus’ pupil Porphyry handed down the titles of a few books
these Gnostics possessed, but that does not say much. But in Nag Hammadi
three of these books have been found, namely: the ‘Supreme Allogenes,’ the
‘Apokalypse of Messos,’ and the ‘Apokalypse of Zostrianus.’ Hence one can now

\textsuperscript{15} Quispel, \textit{Gnosis als Weltreligion}, 6–7, 9–10:

Was diese neuen Bücher für unsere Kunde der antiken Literatur bedeuten, ist kaum
abzuschätzen. ...

Zwar hat uns Plotins Schüler, Porphyry, die Titel einiger Bücher, die diese Gnostiker
besassen, überliefert, aber das will nicht viel besagen. In Nag Hammadi aber sind drei
dieser Bücher gefunden, nämlich: Der “höchste Allogenes,” die “Apokalypsis des Messos”
und die “Apokalypse des Zostrianus.” So kann man jetzt genau die Lehre kennen
lernen, [gegen die] sich Plotin richtet. Vielleicht das merkwürdigste dieser Bücher ist
come to know the teaching exactly, [against which] Plotinus directed himself. Perhaps the most remarkable of these books is ‘The Apokalypse of Zostrianus’: Zostrianus was considered to be a Persian prophet, kinsman of Zoroaster: the Apocalypse of Zostrianus must hence contain allegedly Persian truth.

... But just as not only Iran has contributed its Mithraism to Greco-Roman syncretism, and just as every land that was subjected by Alexander the Great—Babylon, Syria, Samaria, Palestine, Egypt—that perhaps present epochs in the development, can be identified in the new discoveries. Syria, Palestine, Samaria, Egypt are equally represented. Hence I consider it to be very important that also an Apocalypse of Dositheos has been handed down. Dositheos was a Samaritan, the alleged Messiah of the Samaritans, according to the tradition the teacher of the prime heretic Simon Magus, from Samaria. ...

Thus then allegedly almost the whole Middle East belonged to the ancestors of Gnosticism: the Iranian Zostrianus, the Babylonian astrology, the Syrian Noria, the Samaritan Dositheos, the Jewish ‘True Prophet’ came together in this grab-bag. ... which proves that Gnosticism is not only an inner-Christian reaction, a heresy, but rather a general movement of Late Antiquity, which displays itself in Christian and pagan ramifications.

Thus the Nag Hammadi codices are predicted to document the universality of Gnosticism. The problem is, Quispel had not yet seen the texts on which this claim, so exciting for Jungians, is based. All he has to work with at this early stage is the quite inadequate inventory of Dresse (which he neglects...

"die Apokalypsis des Zostrianus": Zostrianus galt als ein persischer Prophet, Verwandter von Zoroaster: die Apokalypse des Zostrianus muss also angeblich persische Weisheit enthalten. ...


So hat dann angeblich beinahe der ganze Vorderorient zu den Ahnen des Gnostizismus gehört: der iranische Zostrianus, die babylonische Astrologie, die syrische Noria, der Samariter Dositheos, der jüdische “Wahre Prophet” fanden sich in diesem Sammelurnium zusammen. ... das beweist, dass die Gnosis nicht nur eine innerchristliche Reaktion ist, eine Härtesie, sondern eine allgemeine Bewegung der Spätantike, die sich in christlicher und heidnischer Verzweigung zeigt.
to acknowledge). Today, in retrospect, one can see that his prediction of finding practically all of the Gnosticizing religiosity of antiquity is highly overdrawn:

The *Apokalypsis of Messos* mentioned by Plotinus is in Doresse’s inventory of tractates, but it turns out that there is no Nag Hammadi tractate with this name (though a personage Messos is mentioned in the tractate *Allogenes*, which is what misled Doresse).

*Zostrianos* is the title of a very long and fragmentary tractate that consumes most of Codex VIII. It concludes with a cryptogram that Doresse had deciphered, though this is not mentioned by Quispel: ‘Words of Truth of Zostrianos. God of Truth. Words of Zoroaster.’ But John D. Turner, the most recent editor of this text, comments:

> The subtitle provides no warrant for ascribing any of *Zostrianos*’s content to Zoroaster, whose teachings in the *Gathas* and later Persian literature are completely different.

Codex VII, Tractate 5 begins: “Dositheos’s revelation of the three steles of Seth ...” Yet it has no insights into Dositheos, but is rather just another instance of Platonized Sethianism, as again John D. Turner comments:

> The *Three Steles of Seth* represents a somewhat simplified version of the same ontological doctrine and ascensional technique found in *Zostrianos* and *Allogenes the Stranger*.

On the whole, the *Three Steles of Seth* is probably contemporary with *Zostrianos* and *Allogenes* but earlier than *Marsanes* and the Bruce Codex, even though it seems to preserve a simpler and perhaps earlier version of the basic structure and function of the Barbelo Aeon than do the other Platonizing Sethian treatises.

In sum, the Nag Hammadi texts do not provide Persian or Samaritan Gnostic traditions, such as would help to validate the status of Gnosticism as a world religion. Of course Quispel knew only titles, and to this extent it is inappropriate to criticize in retrospect his assumptions. But it may also have been inappropriate for Quispel to promulgate, among eager non-specialists, such

---

grand assumptions in support of his thesis, before he had any supporting evidence. We are in effect left with Manichaeism as the only worldwide form of Gnosticism.\footnote{Quispel, \textit{Gnosis als Weltreligion}, 20: Der Manichäismus endlich hat sich über ganz Asien bis nach China verbreitet, hat ganze Völker für sich gewonnen, und ist erst nach einem Jahrtausend erloschen.}

Manichaeism finally expanded over all of Asia as far as China, won for itself whole peoples, and only after a millennium became extinct.

Quispel’s follow-up lecture on “Gnosticism, Neoplatonism and Christianity” makes clear (if only to attentive Jungian ears) that the solution of it all is to be found in archetypes that are shared by the whole human race, though they have been largely suppressed by main-line Christianity, until C.G. Jung rediscovered them cropping up in therapy sessions, as patients grope to bring to the surface of consciousness what their inner experience has actually been:\footnote{Quispel, \textit{Gnosis als Weltreligion}, chapter 3: “Gnosis, Neuplatonismus und Christentum,” 16–27: 17: Der Katharismus muss seinen dualistischen Tendenzen gemäß als mediävaler Manichäismus bezeichnet werden. Bisher aber ist es, wie besonders Puech gezeigt hat, noch nicht gelungen, eine direkte oder indirekte Verbindung mit dem Manichäismus zu beweisen. ... Überall, wo sich Ähnlichkeit zeigt, Abhängigkeit anzunehmen, wäre doch wohl des Guten zuviel. Vielmehr gilt es, die Forschung von den falschen Prinzipien der religionsgeschichtlichen Schule zu reinigen und anzuerkennen, dass Ähnlichkeit, Verwandtschaft, Gleichheit religiöser Phänomene auch vorliegen kann, wenn keine historische Abhängigkeit besteht. Gewiss muss es Aufgabe der künftigen Forschung bleiben, eventuellen historischen Beziehungen zwischen dem Manichäismus und dem Katharismus nachzugehen, aber es soll heute klar sein, dass die Ähnlichkeit wichtiger ist als die Abhängigkeit, und dass die erste ohne die letztere bestehen kann. ... \textit{Gnosis ist mythische Projektion der Selbsterfahrung}.}

Catharism must, on the basis of its dualistic tendencies, be designated medieval Manichaeism. But thus far, as especially Puech has shown, it has not yet been possible to prove a direct or indirect connection with Manichaeism. ...

To assume dependence, wherever similarity appears, would after all be too much of a good thing. Rather it is valid to purify research from the false principles of the history-of-religion school and to acknowledge that similarity, kinship, likeness of religious phenomena can also be present when no historical dependence exists. Certainly it must remain a task of future research to investigate possible historical relations between Manichaeism and Catharism, but
it should today be clear that the similarity is more important that the dependence, and that the former can exist without the latter. ... Gnosticism is mythical projection of the experience of the Self.

Thus, in effect, Quispel calls on the Jungians to demonstrate the universality of their archetypes by investigating Gnosticism, beginning with the purchase of the Eid Codex containing The Gospel of Truth, which had just come on the market in Belgium (see Chapter 3, Part 3 above), where Quispel postulated that Jungian truth may well lie hidden.

Willem Cornelis van Unnik

Willem Cornelis van Unnik, Professor of New Testament Exegesis at the University of Utrecht, Quispel’s senior colleague on the Theological Faculty, was involved in publications related to Nag Hammadi since they first began to become available. He published (in Dutch) as early as 1954 an article on The Gospel of Truth, several years before the editio princeps appeared. It was republished in English a year later. Then in 1958 he published a book on Nag Hammadi in Dutch, republished in 1960 in English and German, and in 1962 in Swedish.

Van Unnik, together with Christine Mohrmann of Utrecht and Amsterdam, Gilles Quispel then of Leiden, and J.H. Wassink of Leiden, were the
founding Editors-in-Chief of *Vigiliae Christianae: A Review of Early Christian Life and Language*. Van Unnik served from 1 (1947) through 32 (1978). It became the standard Nag Hammadi journal. Puech was one of the Associate Editors. Initially it was where Doresse and Togo Mina published articles announcing the Nag Hammadi discovery. Puech and Quispel published here on the Jung Codex. Indeed, Quispel published here for half a century his many articles and reviews on Gnosticism. And of course van Unnik published Gnostic material here.

Johannes de Zwaan of Leiden (1883–1957) organized in 1955 the journal *Novum Testamentum*, and invited Doresse, probably at the instigation of Quispel, to contribute an article, and even to become a member of the editorial board:


28 There were also many reviews by Quispel (Scholer 239r, 253r, 682r, 1999r, 2365r, 2522r, 2546r, 2571r, 2786r, 2833r, 2984r, 3134r, 3163r, 3213r, 4790r, 5067r, 5393r, 5699r, 5765r, 5832r, 5897r, 6377r, 6476r, 6714r, 6734r, 6808r, 6862r, 7264r, 7597r, 7597r, 8180r).


30 ii 55: Letter from de Zwaan to Doresse:

On m’avait raconté que les documents, dont vous nous aviez montré quelques photographies, seraient maintenant absolument réservés et inaccessible, exception faite pour vos recherches. Je ne sais pas le vrai et je n’ai pas le désir de m’en occuper. Mais
One has told me that the documents of which you have shown us some photographs would now be absolutely kept back and inaccessible, an exception being made for your research. I do not know the truth and I do not have the desire to get myself involved. But I would be very happy if you could produce for me a small study from your hand on some of these unpublished texts, by preference accompanied with a reproduction of the parts on which your argument is based. I imagine that your article would have a good place and that I would in all probability even find a modest honorarium. One has in addition suggested to me, and I am glad to associate myself with this suggestion in perfect sympathy, to invite you to enter into our circle.

Doresse published an essay on Ethiopia, to which his attention had by then turned.\(^{32}\)

But de Zwaan was Editor-in-Chief of *Novum Testamentum* from 1 (1956) through 2 (1957–1958). He was soon succeeded by van Unnik, from 3 (1959)\(^{33}\) through 20 (1978). David M. Scholer published in *Novum Testamentum* the ‘Bibliographia Gnostica: Supplementum’ I–XXIV after the completion of his first volume of the bibliography,\(^{34}\) and again the ‘Bibliographia Gnostica: Supplementum’ II/1–8 after the completion of his second volume of the bibliography.\(^{35}\)

Van Unnik’s many essays on Gnosticism\(^{36}\) continued on until his untimely death in 1978 (he was only 67 at the time). A brief eulogy was immediately published in *Novum Testamentum*.\(^{37}\) One part spoke of his and his wife’s hospitality, which has stuck in my mind, since I had experienced it myself:

---


\(^{33}\) “Introduction by the New Editor in Chief,” *NT* 3 (1959): ix–xi.

\(^{34}\) Scholer 6270–6291, 10323–10324.


The editors will miss the hospitality of Professor and Mrs. van Unnik at the regular meetings. They will remember both his learning and his kindness with deep gratitude.

When I was in Paris working on the Nag Hammadi materials at UNESCO during a sabbatic in 1970–1971 (see Chapter 11 below), van Unnik invited me to lecture at the University of Utrecht. While I was there, I was a houseguest in his home. At breakfast, I noticed that he kept his toast on the plate, and cut it with his knife and fork. I was a bit embarrassed that I had picked up my toast to eat it. I asked him if leaving it on the plate is the way his mother taught him, rather than picking the toast up in one’s hands, as I was taught; he assured me that was the Dutch custom, but I should of course follow the American custom.

A posthumous volume of van Unnik’s collected essays republished many of them, as well as a previously unpublished 1964 address. The Van Unnik Archives are in the Library of the University of Utrecht, and a building at the University of Utrecht is named in his honor.

Jan Zandee

At the Messina Colloquium on the Origins of Gnosticism, 13–18 April 1966, Martin Krause presented the assignments to publish individual tractates. He mentioned as unassigned:

It is a matter of texts from Codices VII–XIII ...

He added in a note concerning The Teachings of Silvanus, Codex VII, Tractate 4:

It is to be hoped that J. Zandee will be entrusted with the edition of this very interesting text.


Es handelt sich um Texte aus den Codices VII–XIII ....


Es ist zu hoffen, dass J. Zandee mit der Ausgabe dieses sehr interessanten Textes betraut wird.
Zandee was present at the Messina Colloquium. Hence I inferred from Krause’s footnote that he had given Zandee a copy of his transcription of the text, in hopes that it could be assigned to him. So I enlisted Zandee to translate, together with Malcolm L. Peel, that tractate for *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*.\(^{41}\) It was preceded by a joint essay by both Peel and Zandee.\(^{42}\) Zandee went on to publish a number of essays on this tractate,\(^{43}\) as did Peel.\(^{44}\) When Zandee wrote me to complain about delays in the completion of the critical edition, I encouraged him to go ahead and publish elsewhere his own books on the tractate.\(^{45}\) The critical edition appeared then in 1996,\(^{46}\) with Peel listed as responsible for the Introduction, Text, and Notes,\(^{47}\) but both for the Translation.\(^{48}\) It was reprinted in 2000.\(^{49}\)

In September 1968 I and my Research Assistant, Frederik Wisse (born in Haarlem, The Netherlands, though educated in the Dutch community in Michigan before coming for his doctorate to Claremont), met with F.C. Wieder, Jr., Director of Brill, to set up the monograph series that became Nag Hammadi Studies (see Chapter 10, Part 3 below). To encourage Wieder’s support for the project, I proposed as the co-editor for Continental manuscripts Jan Zandee. But Wieder replied that Brill understood itself less as a Dutch publisher than as an international publisher. Hence I proposed and he accepted Martin Krause.

Zandee was enlisted by Quispel to assist him in editing *The Gospel of Thomas* (see Chapter 7, Part 3 below), though this is not mentioned in the publication.

The Jung Codex was published over a period of 20 years (see Chapter 3 above); Zandee was ultimately worked into the editorial team to assist

---


\(^{43}\) Scholer 8210–8221.

\(^{44}\) Scholer 8201–8202.


\(^{47}\) Scholer 8998.

\(^{48}\) Scholer 8999.

Quispel. The first publication from the Jung Codex, The Gospel of Truth, had listed on the title page as the Editorial Board Michel Malinine, Henri-Charles Puech, and Gilles Quispel. They were assisted by G.P. Zacharias for the German translation and Helen Wall for the English translation, though they were not mentioned on the title page, but only at the end of the ‘Introduction’ (p. xvi). This first publication had been scheduled to appear in 1955 at Jung’s eightieth birthday, but then only appeared later; it was dated 1956, and hand-bound copies were available to mail to Pahor Labib at the time of the meeting of the International Committee of Gnosticism in October 1956, though it actually appeared on the market first in 1957. In order to expedite further publications of the Jung Codex, the Rascher Verlag, on the advice of C.A. Meier, Director of the C.G. Jung Institute, added Walter Till to the Editorial Board (and R. McL. Wilson as an ‘assistant’ for the English translation), first for the supplement to The Gospel of Truth published in 1961. For the publication of the next two tractates, The Treatise on Resurrection in 1963, and The Secret Book of James in 1968, both R. McL. Wilson and Jan Zandee were included in the Editorial Board, though not as full members, but as assistants (‘adjuvantibus’). Then in the last two volumes, published in 1973 and 1975 after the death of Till, with Rodolphe Kasser replacing him, Zandee was elevated to full membership in the Editorial Board, with Werner Vycichl and R. McL. Wilson listed as the assistants.

The original editors had from the very beginning opposed the enlargement of the Editorial Board. 

Walter Till, R. McL. Wilson and R. Kasser took part in the publishing without the consent of the other researchers and against their will. They directed themselves straight to the publisher Rascher in Zürich, whom Jung had put in trust of the codex and its publication. And he accepted the newcomers. This has led to much wasted time, especially because R. Kasser did not know that Irenaeus of Lyon (180 AD) offered a parallel for the fourth [fifth] treatise of the Jung Codex. That is why Kasser thought that this part consisted of three different writings, written by Valentinus himself. Nevertheless the publication of all the writings of the Jung Codex was brought to a good end.

50 Gilles Quispel, ‘Jung and the Jung Codex,’ p. 24 of the 119-page typescript used as the basis for his speech at the ‘Panarion Conference’ of Jungians in Los Angeles, 4 September 1975, a free and abridged English translation of a paper whose typescript he left with me, as his host, which is quoted here, p. 97. The Dutch original had been published as “Jung en de Gnosis,” in C. Aalders, J.H. Blokker, and G. Quispel, Jung—een mens voor deze tijd (Rotterdam: Lemniscaat, 1975), 85—138.
It may be significant that Quispel does not here complain about the Dutch scholar who was also added, Jan Zandee, by then Professor at the Universities of Amsterdam and Utrecht as coptologist. Actually it is Quispel who had asked the Curatorium of the Jung Institute to include Zandee as a collaborator:

I begin now immediately after the vacations again with the study of the Codex and would like to request your permission to enlist as collaborator on the Codex the coptologist Dr. J. Zandee, who was named especially for working on the Gnostic writings at our university.

Till sensed this was taking place:

By holding back the photographs [of ‘the missing 40 pages’] Quispel will no doubt force his inclusion in the publication of the Jung Codex, which however may no doubt have in any case been expected. Perhaps in this way he wants to assure a place for his assistant Dr. Zandee.

Quispel could only welcome a competent coptologist at his side, and even more so when Till was no longer available as his coptologist. He implicitly conceded as much to Till:

It really did make me so heartfully sorry, that during the vacations you have not recuperated well. After all, consider how much we need you for the translation of the Coptic texts. There is indeed no person in the world who can do it as well as you can. Recently also Lefort told me that.

Zandee did in fact replace Till as Quispel’s coptologist, much as Guillaumont replaced Malinine as Puech’s coptologist.

---

51 Shortly after 18 i 58: Letter from Quispel to the Curatorium:

Ich fange jetzt sofort nach den Ferien wieder mit dem Studium des Kodex an und möchte Ihr Erlaubnis bitten, den Koptologen Dr. J. Zandee, der eigens zur Bearbeitung der gnostischen Schriften an unserer Universität ernannt wurde als Mitarbeiter am Kodex heran zu ziehen.

52 18 vii 58: Letter from Till to Meier:

Quispel will wohl durch das Zurückhalten der Photographien erzwingen, dass er an der Ausgabe des Codex Jung beteiligt ist, was aber wohl ohnehin vorgesehen sein dürfte. Vielleicht will er dadurch seinem Assistenten Dr. Zandee einen Platz sichern.

53 1 ix 58: Letter from Quispel to Till:

Es tat mir doch so herzlich Leid, dass Sie sich während der Ferien nicht gut erholt haben. Bedenken Sie doch, wie sehr wir Sie brauchen für die Übersetzung der Koptischen Texte. Es gibt ja keinen Menschen in der Welt der es so gut kann wie Sie. Das sagte mir neuerdings noch Lefort.
2. Queen Juliana and the Dutch Embassy in Cairo

Quispel saw to it that Queen Juliana played a significant rôle in urging the Egyptian authorities to make the Nag Hammadi texts, still locked away in the Coptic Museum, accessible to scholarship. Quispel and his wife were invited to the palace Het Kleine Loo to make a speech on 29 May 1954, as he informed Meier:

P.S. I forgot also to let you know that I was invited to the palace to give a lecture (in May).

This was followed by an audience with the Queen, which took place on the same day that von Fischer was leaving Cairo for Lisbon (14 June 1954), with the Swiss objectives of Meier still unresolved. Quispel then wrote Meier about the assistance offered by the Queen:

I am indebted to Gerrit K. Bos, a beginning Dutch scholar whose M.A. degree is from Claremont Graduate University, and who then became a doctoral student in the Faculty of Philosophy in the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam, for providing relevant material concerning the Queen’s involvement reflected in Dutch publications, both from the Archive of the Department of Foreign Affairs and from the Van Unnik Archive in the Library of the University of Utrecht. Bos has also assisted in translating relevant Dutch texts.

P.S. Ich vergass noch mitzuteilen, dass ich eingeladen wurde auf dem Palast einen Vortrag zu halten (in Mai).

Wie gesagt, war ich Montag auf Audienz bei der Königin, es dauerte von zehn vor elf bis halb eins. Ihre Majestät empfing mich beim schwarzen Kaffee. Sie sagte mir, sie hatte meinen Aufsatz über den Codex Jung gelesen; daraufhin hatte Ihr Herr Gemahl ihr gesagt, dass Sie vielleicht etwas für uns tun könnten. Sie möchte nun von mir hören, wie die Lage war; während des ganzen Gespräches zeigte es sich, dass Sie vollkommen im Bilde war und jedes Detail beherrschte. Ich hatte den Vortrag von van Unnik mitgebracht, aber Sie brauchte ihn nicht, weil er schon auf Ihrem Schreibtisch lag.

Ich habe betont, dass es hier um ein internationales Geschäft geht und gehen muss. Die Franzosen haben das nicht verstanden aber die Schweizer vollkommen und deswegen würde die ägyptische Regierung wohl nur ein Komitee unter schweizerischer Führung übergeben.

"Die Nachrichten seien an sich ungünstig und wohl nur ein persönlicher Brief der Königin an Nasser könne aus der Not helfen." Daraufhin bemerkte sie, dass Sie sich unmittelbar nur an Naguib wenden konnten, was die Lage vielleicht noch verschlimmern würde. Sie fragte sich, ob ein Gespräch mit dem ägyptischen Gesandten oder die Intervention der niederländischen Gesandten in Kairo nicht nützlich sein konnte.
As I said, I was Monday at an audience with the Queen; it lasted from ten before eleven until twelve thirty. Her Majesty received me with black coffee. She said to me she had read my essay about the Jung Codex; thereupon her husband had said to her that she could perhaps do something for us. She would now like to hear from me how the situation was. During the whole conversation it was clear that she was completely informed and mastered every detail. I had brought with me the lecture of van Unnik, but she did not need it, since it already lay on her desk.

I have emphasized that here it has to do and must have to do with an international affair. The French have not understood this, but the Swiss have fully understood it, and hence the Egyptian government would no doubt only turn it over to a committee under Swiss leadership.

‘The reports are in and of themselves unfavorable, and no doubt only a personal letter of the Queen to Nasser could help to get out of the plight.’ To this she remarked that she could only turn directly to Naguib, which would perhaps only make the situation worse. She wondered whether a talk with the Egyptian Ambassador or the intervention of the Dutch Ambassador in Cairo would not be useful. About this I was quite skeptical, under the impact of the unfavorable reports in our first telephone conversation.

Thereupon she thought out the follow ruse: A few outstanding scholars, among them the presiding officer of the Royal Academy, should turn to her and emphasize the significance of the find in very general and vague formulations. Thereupon she will receive these gentlemen in an audience and immediately thereafter also take all possible steps that could serve to

Darüber war ich nun, unter dem Eindruck der ungünstigen Berichte in unserem ersten Telefongespräch, ganz skeptisch.

Daraufhin hat Sie folgenden List ausgedacht: einige hervorragende Gelehrten, darunter der Vorsitzende der Königlichen Akademie, sollen sich an Sie richten und die Bedeutung des Fundes im ganz allgemeinen und vagen Ausdrücken betonen. Daraufhin wird Sie diese Herren in Audienz empfangen und unmittelbar darauf auch alle mögliche Massnahmen nehmen welche dazu dienen können die Kodizes von den zuständigen Gelehrten unter der Aufsicht des Inner-circle, Meier, Puech, Quispel, so bald wie möglich herausgeben zu lassen.

Sie war vielleicht ein wenig enttäuscht, dass wir keine finanzielle Hilfe brauchen. Man war sich darüber einig, dass dies alles in Einverständniss und Zusammenarbeit mit Ihnen und von Fischer geschehen sollte.

have the codices published as soon as possible by the competent scholars under the supervision of the inner circle, Meier, Puech, Quispel.

She was perhaps a bit disappointed that we need no financial help. One was in agreement that all this should take place in agreement and collaboration with you and von Fischer.

The next morning, after our telephone conversation, I reported the most recent news to the chamberlain. On the evening this gentleman phoned me and told me that five minutes after I had phoned him in the morning, the Queen had stuck her head around the door of his room and inquisitively asked whether already anything new was there from Quispel. She was very happy with the newest turn and remains burningly interested in our cause. Hence you must indicate to me as soon as possible which steps can be undertaken from Holland.

Though Meier and Quispel went over the Cairo situation on the phone, Meier wrote Quispel with more detail.\footnote{17 vi 54: Letter from Meier to Quispel:}

\ldots And second, one never knows how the constellation changes politically, and also the opinions of the people. In this sense Minister von Fischer also thinks that it could not hurt if, on the part of the Dutch government, it was emphasized how important all these finds really are, and how helpful it would be if the Egyptians would prepare the way for the work on the texts to take place as quickly as possible. \ldots

It would to the highest degree be advisable, if whatever steps are taken by Holland would be done in basic consultation with Prof. Rahn in Cairo. Prof. Rahn is the only person in Cairo who is now precisely oriented on the status of the whole affair. He is an orientalist, interests himself personally for the whole matter, and is Counselor for Arabic Affairs in the Swiss Legation in Egypt. It is good to use as mediators people who on the one hand are substantively
informed and on the other have made friends with the decisive people, and thus know how difficult it is to get along with them.

The Dutch letter suggested by the Queen was composed by van Unnik and submitted to her on 21 June 1954. It read as follows:

Leiden
Utrecht, 21 June 1954
Bilthoven

To her Majesty the Queen,
Soestdijk

MAJESTY,

Perhaps it is known to Your Majesty that in 1945 several manuscripts were found in Egypt that are of great importance for several fields of scholarship. There had been talk to the effect that, thanks to the intervention of Dr. G. Quispel, Professor at the State University of Utrecht, several Dutch investigators would participate in the publication of these documents.

Just now we learn that difficulties have arisen, which could cause these new finds not to be accessible in the near future for scholarly investigation.

In these circumstances we address ourselves to Your Majesty with the request whether, possibly from the Dutch side, steps could not be taken that can advance and speed up the publication.

---

58 21 vi 54: Letter from van Groningen, Byvanck, Wagenvoort and van Unnik to Queen Juliana (there is a copy in the Dutch Department of Foreign Affairs and another, with minor divergences noted below, in the Van Unnik Archive):

Leiden Utrecht, 21 Juni 1954 Bilthoven Aan Hare Majesteit de Koningin, Soestdijk.

MAJESTEIT, Wellicht is het Uwe Majesteit bekend, dat in 1945 in Egypte een aantal handschriften gevonden werden, welke voor verschillende gebieden van wetenschap grote betekenis bezitten. Er was sprake van, dat dank zij de bemoeiingen van Dr. G. Quispel, hoogleraar aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht, een aantal Nederlandse onderzoekers aan de uitgave van deze geschreven zou deelnemen.

Thans vernemen wij, dat moeilijkheden gerezen zijn, welke zouden kunnen bewerken, dat deze nieuwe vondsten niet binnen afzienbare tijd voor het wetenschappelijk onderzoek toegankelijk worden.

In deze omstandigheden richten wij ons tot Uwe Majesteit met de vraag, of niet wellicht van Nederlandse zijde stappen gedaan zouden kunnen worden, welke de uitgave zouden kunnen bevorderen en verhaasten.

Wij verzekeren Uwe Majesteit, dat alle bereidheid bestaat, dat de Nederlandse geleerden, die [the Van Unnik Archives: welke] zich op dit gebied bewogen hebben, volgaarne hun diensten ter beschikking zullen stellen [Van Unnik Archives: volgaarne bereid zijn hun diensten te beschikking te stellen], wanneer daarop een beroep gedaan wordt. ’t Welk doende van Uwe Majesteit de dienstwillige dienaars B.A. van Groningen, A.W. Byvanck, H. Wagenvoort, W.C. van Unnik.
We assure Your Majesty that every willingness exists that the Dutch scholars, who have been active in this field, will offer quite gladly their assistance if this is requested.

Requesting this of Your Majesty
the faithful servants
B.A. van Groningen
A.W. Byvanck
H. Wagenvoort
W.C. van Unnik

Quispel wrote an informal but more detailed memorandum appended to the letter to the Queen, to be forwarded to the Department of Foreign Affairs:

Memorandum regarding the manuscripts found in 1945 in Egypt

On 14 November 1953 it was announced that the so-called Jung Codex was located. The acquisition of this codex was reported earlier to the directorate of the Coptic Museum in Cairo. This news was positively welcomed in Egypt. Through mediation of Baron von Fischer, the Swiss ambassador to Egypt, negotiations were initiated regarding the publication of the remaining eleven codices, which were in the Coptic Museum in Cairo. These negotiations developed, according to eastern standards, very rapidly. It was the intention that Professor Quispel would travel to Cairo around Christmas 1953, in order to identify the forty missing pages of the Jung Codex and, if possible, to reach an agreement regarding the publication. Incomprehensible responses in the Dutch press prevented the execution of this plan. But on 31 December 1953 Quispel sent, after the Egyptian government had informed him of its desires, a
list of scholars who were best qualified to publish these writings. The list consisted of names of Swedish, Danish, Belgian, French, Austrian, English and Vatican scholars, together with the names of four Dutchmen: Dr Stricker of the Museum of Antiquities at Leiden, Dr. Jansen, egyptologist, also at Leiden; Prof. W.C. van Unnik at Bilthoven, and Prof. Quispel. It was intended that each of these scholars would publish one of the codices under the supervision of an inner circle, consisting of the following gentlemen: Dr. C.A. Meier at Zürich; Prof. H.C. Puech, professor at the Collège de France in Paris; and G. Quispel. The latter two would be appointed to supervise the translations, because these heretical writings absolutely require the supervision of heresiologists who know Coptic as well as Greek. Dr. Meier became member of this committee because it was through him that negotiations had taken place, and because it was the goal that the C.G. Jung Institute in Zürich, the owner of the Jung Codex, would be involved in the edition. From the very beginning, we had in mind that all parts that were found would be published as a Corpus Gnosticorum with the Imprimerie Nationale in Paris. But it seemed that the Egyptian government was not willing to give the writings to a French team, but that it was perhaps willing to entrust the publication to an international team under Swiss supervision. The message that von Fischer had practically concluded negotiating reached Prof. Quispel on the day that Naguib fell. About the same time the owners of the codices, with whom the Egyptian government had not yet reached an agreement, contacted Quispel with the request to reveal to them the price of the Jung Codex, because they wanted to start a lawsuit against the Egyptian government. Their request was denied. In the meantime, the lawsuit seems to have begun.

After the fall of Naguib, the civil servants involved did not dare to make decisions, as the situation had not yet been consolidated.
Thus the edition of these writings, which were discovered nine years ago, risks being postponed indefinitely. This was the status of the negotiations.

As to the importance of these writings, one does not need to say a word, since the entire world press has mentioned the discovery of the Jung Codex—the New York Times even put the news on its front page. But among the eleven codices that are in the Coptic Museum in Cairo, there is one that is even more important than the Jung Codex, namely the ‘Words of Jesus’ [The Gospel of Thomas], of which for the past fifty years only fragments have been known. Science has a right for this text, along with the other codices that might hide some surprises, to be made available, because the whole discovery, combined with the discoveries at the Dead Sea, might change considerably the picture of the origins and history of early Christianity. By no means is this also doubted by authoritative scholars in the Netherlands.

When Prof. van Unnik gave his talk to the Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences about the newly discovered Gospel of Truth and the New Testament, this lecture was well received by the audience. Not a word of disapproval, doubt, or irritation was heard. No highly regarded scholar, regardless of confession, who has real competence, has kept silent over this being a discovery of the utmost...
importance. Professor Berkouwer of the Free University has said this in so many words, and also Professor Grossouw of the Roman Catholic University at Nijmegen has uttered many words of praise. We are thus faced with the fact that, through a coincidence, four Dutch researchers were involved in the publication of these writings, and that the scholarly world of the Netherlands was fully aware of the significance of these discoveries.

This could have contributed to the fact that the Dutch government made known to some circles of the Egyptian government that there was great interest in these discoveries in the Netherlands. It is to be expected that Prof. B.A. van Groningen, professor at Leiden, President of the Royal Academy of Sciences; Prof. H. Wagenvoort, professor at Utrecht, chair of the Organization for Pure Scholarly Research, and/or other scholars of world renown will address the government in this spirit. It may be a good idea to bring these gentlemen together, with or without Prof. Quispel, so that they, who are completely aware of the state of affairs, could explain orally to the others these issues, which can hardly be dealt with in a written way.

The memorandum concluded with specific steps the Dutch side could take:60

60 16 vi 54: “Memorandum inzake de Handschriften welke in 1945 in Egypte gevonden zijn”:

De stappen, welke van Nederlandse zijde zouden kunnen worden ondernomen, zijn onder anderen de volgende:

1. Aan de Egyptische gezant zou kunnen worden medegedeeld, dat Nederlandse krigen met grote belangstelling van de vondsten in Egypte hebben kennis genomen, dat Nederlandse geleerden zeker bereid zouden zijn geheel belangeloos en onbaatzuchtig hun diensten aan de Egyptische mannen van wetenschap aan te bieden, opdat deze nationale Egyptische schat door spoedige uitgave de bewondering van de gehele
The steps that could be undertaken on the Dutch side are, among others, the following:

1. It could be reported to the Egyptian ambassador that Dutch circles have received the news about the discoveries in Egypt with great interest, that Dutch scholars are certainly prepared to offer their services to the Egyptian scholars disinterestedly, with total unselfishness, so that this national Egyptian treasure, through speedy publication, can awaken the admiration of the entire world, and that technical and financial ‘collaboration’ surely will not take away the rightful honor and fame of Egyptian scholarship.

2. The Dutch ambassador in Cairo could communicate with the head of the [Swiss] Legation, Rahn, who is fully informed about everything; he could also, in circles of the Egyptian Ministry of Education, and in those of the Coptic Museum, cautiously make clear that Dutch scholars are ready to travel to Egypt at their own expense, whenever their presence, whether for advice or support, would be desired. The ambassador could also underline that the
members of the above-mentioned committee are fully aware of the fact that the French cannot be allowed egotistically to take credit, and that honor should go to Egypt, while the foreigners are more than happy to serve as cutters of wood and drawers of water.

The ambassador could also keep himself fully informed about the lawsuit that is going on at this moment. Finally, he could also send to the Netherlands all reports about these finds that appear or have appeared in French or English in the Egyptian press.

3. It is also worth considering whether a personal note addressed to the Egyptian prime minister could be given to Prof. van Unnik and Prof. Quispel, when they undertake their trip to Cairo, which they still intend to undertake in the autumn of 1954. The last reports regarding a possible forthcoming publication are not unfavorable. It is to be hoped that a close collaboration between the Swiss and Dutch authorities can achieve a rapid development. In case the Egyptian government would decline the offer of collaboration with the foreign scholars, then it is to be feared that the discoveries will be made inaccessible for a long time, if not forever, to the scholarly world.

It is however reported to Prof. Quispel, on the part of Baron von Fischer, that every step on the Dutch side that makes it known in Egyptian circles that there is an unselfish interest in these writings in our country could contribute to a positive development.

The Queen then had the Dutch Embassy in Cairo alerted to the need to be useful as seemed best to advance the cause.

Quispel thus received her support, though he made it public only many years later, in 2000–2001:61

At that time the circle [around Queen Juliana] decided that it must do something to free up the manuscripts of Nag Hammadi, which had been found in 1945 but were left lying in the Coptic Museum in Cairo. Greet Hofmans came before that time to call on me at home, for what reason I do not recall. And Juliana thought up a stratagem. Wim van Unnik, professor in Utrecht and member of the Royal Academy, gathered a group of scholars, such

---


Toen besloot die kring dat het iets moest doen om die handschriften van Nag Hammadi, die al in 1945 waren gevonden en maar bleven liggen in het Koptisch Museum in Cairo, los te krijgen. Greet Hofmans kwam voordien een keer bij mij thuis, waarom weet ik niet meer. En Juliana bedacht een krijgslist. Wim van Unnik, hoogleraar in Utrecht en lid van de Koninklijke Academie, charterde een aantal geleerden als B.A. van Groningen, H. Wagenvoort en A.W. Byvanek om een verzoekschrift te richten tot Hare Majesteit met de vraag of zij iets aan de publicatie van de papyrusboeken van Nag Hammadi kon doen. Toen de toenmalige minister van Buitenlandse Zaken Beyen,
as B.A. van Groningen, H. Wagenvoort and A.W. Byvanek, to send a petition to Her Majesty with the question whether she could do something now for the publication of the Nag Hammadi papyrus books. When the Secretary of Foreign Affairs at that time, [J.W.] Beyen, was admitted to the royal presence, she spoke with him for hours about the find. He did not know anything about it, but transmitted this request to the Ambassador in Cairo, Cnoop Koopmans. In the margin of his letter this complete layman in this field wrote: “This matter interests H.M. very much, and me too.” And so I could go to Cairo in 1955 with the proposal that the *Jung Codex* would be returned, if the twelve other codices were made accessible. This happened. And so the Queen of the Netherlands, inspired by her friends both male and female, has been of great service to scholarship.

But Meier was concerned lest a Dutch governmental initiative render the issue more political and thus impede the desired result.\(^{62}\)


\(^{62}\) 1 vii 54: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Wenn die Königin mit Naguib oder Nasser in Verbindung tritt, so bekommt die ganze Sache ungewöhnlicher Weise einen hochpolitischen Aspekt. Dies ist genau das, was unter allen Umständen vermieden werden sollte. Es soll alles auf einem rein wissenschaftlichen Niveau bleiben, welches leider schon genug unter den Wechselsefällen der Politik zu leiden hatte. Auch Minister von Fischer, mit dem ich noch einmal sprach, konnte nicht genug vor einer solchen Wendung in der Angelegenheit warnen. Es gibt doch sicher eine Möglichkeit, dass die Königin über ihren ägyptischen diplomatischen Dienst und Prof. Bahn, mit dessen engster Collaboration vorgegangen werden muss, direkt in Beziehung zu treten mit der neu gebildeten Commission. ... Ich hoffe sehr,
If the Queen enters into contact with Naguib or Nasser, the whole matter gets in an unusual way a highly political aspect. This is precisely what under any circumstance should be avoided. Everything should remain on a purely scientific niveau, which unfortunately has already had to suffer enough under the changes in politics. Also Minister von Fischer, with whom I spoke still another time, could not warn enough of such a turn in the situation. There is surely a possibility for the Queen, via her Egyptian diplomatic service and Prof. Rahn, with whose closest collaboration one must move forward, to enter directly in connection with the newly formed commission. ... I hope very much that no misfortune has yet taken place in the feared direction, and that the Queen still finds a way, where it would also be good, in the view of Minister von Fischer, if one let it shine through that, for the publishing of the texts and the like, supplements of a material and intellectual kind are to be awaited from the Dutch Academy.

Meier then confirmed to von Fischer that he had instructed Quispel: 63

I have written Quispel that in our opinion it would be highly dangerous if the Dutch Queen would get in contact with Naguib or Nasser, since in that way the thing would become political. He has exact orders, that, if at all, something is to be undertaken only via Rahn.

Quispel on the other hand played down the French to Meier, and continued to suggest instead a Dutch involvement: 64

63 1 vii 54: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:


64 2 ix 54: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

The situation seems to me rather clear: If one had let the French do it, the Jung Codex would also still today not yet be purchased. They are trying to make of the matter a national affair, which is precisely what does not work. Also I do not see that in the acquisition of the Jung Codex Puech played a significant rôle. I have passed on your warning against personal intervention by higher authorities to the responsible place. You need have no concern—it will be handled according to your guidelines by diplomatic mediation. But now after the vacations it could be the right time for you again to take the initiative. Especially the missing pages are now very important for us. In your efforts you can, if necessary, make use of the support of the Royal Academy of the Netherlands, as its President emphatically assured me.

The Dutch initiative in Cairo was then reported by Quispel to Meier: \[65\]

The Dutch Ambassador in Cairo has taken a step officially with the Egyptian government. He has proposed that an International Committee would assist the Egyptians. That was received favorably. Of course, as one explained, this Committee would have to be international, and then also include Swiss (i.e. Meier) among its members. The negotiations have not yet been carried through to completion. The Ambassador has informed Rahn fully.

Rahn in turn informed von Fischer, who forwarded his letter to Meier: \[66\]

Since the end of the summer business standstill, I have been seeking to keep abreast of what is happening or has already happened with the famous Coptic papyri. Now a detailed discussion that I had today with Dr. Brugman, the orientalist and Third Secretary of the Dutch Embassy in Egypt, also known to you, provides the desired occasion to reply to your letter, which inquires about the fate of the papyri. Brugman, with whom I had talked in August, as you know, about a shared initiative of the C.G. Jung Institute and circles at Utrecht University, informed me today in detail about the development on

---

65 Later in 1954: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Der holländische Gesandte in Kairo hat offiziell einen Schritt getan bei der ägyptischen Regierung; er hat vorgeschlagen, dass ein internationales Komité die Ägypter helfen würde. Das wurde günstig aufgenommen. Selbstverständlich, so erklärte man, muss dieses Komité international sein und dann auch Schweizer (i.e. Meier) unter seinen Mitgliedern zählen. Die Verhandlungen sind noch nicht bis zum Ende geführt. Der Gesandte hat Herrn Rahn vollständig informiert.

66 23 x 54: Letter from Rahn to von Fischer:

Seit dem Ende der sommerlichen Geschäftsstille bin ich bestrebt gewesen, mich über das was mit den berühmten koptischen Papyri geschieht oder bereits geschehen ist auf dem laufenden zu halten. Nun gibt ein eingehendes Gespräch, das ich heute mit Dr. Brugman, dem auch Ihnen bekannten Orientalisten und dritten Sekretär der Niederländischen Gesellschaft in Ägypten, geführt habe, den erwünschten Anlass, auf Ihren Brief, der sich nach dem Schicksal der Papyri erkundigt, zu antworten. Herr Brugman, mit dem ich mich, wie Sie wissen, im August über ein gemeinsames
the Dutch side. As you recall, the step of the Dutch Embassy, initiated by the University of Utrecht, in the interest of the scholarly release of the papyri, has indeed now taken place in the most recent days, and indeed both at the Foreign Ministry and at the Service des Antiquités, where the step found a real echo. In its external form it recalled the formalities you mentioned. Even the visit with Ali Aiyub and the possible Arab relinquishing were not missing! For the Dutch Embassy, the step was apparently all the more urgent as time went on, due to the strong interest in the content of the papyri that meanwhile has fascinated the royal family and thus also wider circles. ...

The visit on the Dutch side to Mustafa Amir was also in form and result similar to the audiences granted to us. I visited Amir right after his return from vacation, and since then have contacted him by telephone. The right of ownership has been conceded to the state about three weeks ago, at least administratively, namely by the Commission that was finally set up. Also the sum of the indemnification is said to have been established. But as to the amount, I only know rumors. Still nothing has been determined as to the kind of scholarly utilization, as Amir reported to me ten days ago, and as also seems to be the view of the Dutch. At my visit in September, this most important decision was presented as immediately imminent, and the offer of the Jung Institute was, after my repeated inquiry, designated as an item on the agenda. As friendly as the discussion with Amir ran at that time, I still sensed certain inhibitions on his side, which did not surprise me. The impressions of the
Dutch correspond to mine also in details. It also struck me e. g. as remarkable, that now suddenly also the name of Doresse was mentioned, as that of a scholar whose collaboration came seriously into consideration. ...

In case the C.G. Jung Institute is still interested in collaborating in the publishing of the papyri, a critical moment has now come, even if the Dutch and Swiss should be the only applicants. As I see the matter from here, the Institute should without delay enter into contact with the Dutch scholarly circles interested in the work, which should after all not be difficult, in case the connections to Quispel are still as close as they were earlier—namely in order to turn into reality the proposed broad platform. It does not call for long discussion, that, once the decision of the Egyptians is made, a Swiss and an official Dutch candidature should not outwardly stand one over against the other.

The Dutch plan involved Quispel going to Cairo, which was approved by von Fischer to Rahn:67

Possibly Prof. Quispel himself will travel to Cairo to fulfill this task.

I would indeed have nothing against it if Prof. Quispel himself went to Cairo to try to get free these 40 pages. Perhaps his visit would also advance the other matter [of getting approval for the Jung Institute's publication Committee]. Whether he succeeds in the first task is of course not certain, since on the Egyptian side for the time being administrative and financial questions seem

67 8 xi 54: Letter from von Fischer to Rahn:

Möglicherweise wird Herr Prof. Quispel selbst nach Kairo reisen, um diese Aufgabe zu erfüllen.

Ich hätte in der Tat nichts dagegen einzuwenden, wenn Prof. Quispel nach Kairo ginge, um zu versuchen, diese 40 Seiten freizubekommen. Vielleicht fördert sein Besuch auch die übrige Angelegenheit. Ob ihm die erste Aufgabe gelingt, ist freilich nicht sicher, da vorläufig ägyptischerseits administrative und finanzielle Fragen eine Entscheidung in der ganzen Angelegenheit zu hemmen scheinen. Die Reise könnte aber gewagt werden, wenn Prof. Quispel Zeit und Geld zur Verfügung hat: man ist
to impede a decision in the whole affair. But the trip could be risked, if Prof. Quispel has time and money at his disposal. Indeed, one is often ready to do something as a favor to those who travel here especially for that, while one is glad to let those applicants wait who find themselves already in the country. Perhaps Prof. Quispel can also present himself to the Egyptian authorities as an specialist regarding the scholarly work on the rest of the papyri.

At the end of the year Puech received information from Cairo that he communicated to Quispel:

The news that you give me overlaps in part with those that I have just received from Cairo no more than a few days ago. ...

One envisages, in effect, in Cairo the creation of a 'Committee of Publication' of the Gnostic manuscripts, of which the Egyptian government (which has fixed the price of the indemnification to propose to Mlle D[attari]) already considers itself the owner. The issue is to be an item on the program of the next meeting of the 'Committee of Coptic Archeology,' one of the new organisms that have been created since last July. On the other hand, I do not have confirmation of the fact that the Egyptian government has accorded permission to have access to the manuscripts.

On his return from his trip to America, Meier wrote Quispel of his concerns that the Dutch, not to speak of the French, could be doing more harm than good in Cairo, and even offered to accompany Quispel to Cairo:

---

68 4 i 55: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Les nouvelles que vous me donnez se recoupent en partie avec celles que je viens de recevoir du Caire il y a à peine quelques jours. ...

On envisage, en effet, au Caire la constitution d’un “Comité de publication” des manuscrits gnostiques dont, d’ores et déjà, le Gouvernement égyptien (qui a fixé le montant de l’indemnité à proposer à Mlle D.) se considère comme le possesseur. La question doit figurer au programme de la prochaine réunion du “Comité d’Archéologie copte,” un des nouveaux organismes créés depuis juillet dernier. En revanche, je n’ai pas confirmation du fait que le Gouvernement égyptien aurait accordé la permission d’avoir accès aux manuscrits.

69 4 i 55: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Sie haben meiner Frau versprochen, mich nach meiner Rückkehr genau zu informieren über das was von Holland aus geschah und alles was Sie wissen. Ich wäre Ihnen dafür sehr dankbar. Darf ich Sie aber dringend bitten, sich daran zu erinnern, dass es inopportun ist, mit dem Codex eine grosse Publizität zu machen. ... Ich fürchte, dass einiges in dieser Richtung bereits geschehen ist durch den hochoffiziellen Schritt
You promised my wife to inform me after my return in detail about what has taken place from Holland, and all that you know. I would be very grateful to you for that. But may I urgently ask of you to remember that it is inopportune to make great publicity with the Codex. ... I fear that something in this direction has already taken place through the highly official step of your Ambassador, and not least of all also through the unfortunate intrigues of Puech. ... We two must carry on here a very precise team-work, and I am always still ready to travel with you to Egypt, if this should prove to be useful. I hope very much that you are as free as I, and could fly at any time.

To this Quispel responded, reporting on Puech's intrigues to have Doresse do the photography, and his own plans to go to Cairo (without mentioning Meier accompanying him):  

In Egypt things are now moving fast. The government considers itself from now on owner of the manuscripts. They will be published photographically. A Comité de Publication will now be formed. The [Dutch] Ambassador will do everything to carry through our plans. On the other hand Puech does everything to achieve his plans. He writes me that Doresse will photograph all the codices and immediately put them at his disposal. I cannot believe that. ...

I have proposed to the Dutch Ambassador that I go in February or March for the missing pages. Whether it will succeed?

It was precisely at this juncture that de Zwaan invited Doresse to join the editorial board of Novum Testamentum, no doubt to insure as need be a working relation with him, presumably based on reports such as those that Quispel has received from Puech.

---

Ihres Gesandten und nicht zuletzt auch durch die unglückseligen Machenschaften des Herrn Puech. ... Wir zwei müssen hier ein sehr präzises team-work leisten und ich bin immer noch bereit, mit Ihnen nach Ägypten zu fahren, wenn sich dies als nützlich erweisen sollte. Ich hoffe sehr, dass Sie so frei sind wie ich und jederzeit abfliegen könnten.

70  10 i 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

In Ägypten geht es jetzt schnell. Die Regierung betrachtet sich von jetzt als Besitzerin der Manuskripte. Sie werden photographisch ausgegeben werden. Es wird jetzt ein Comité de Publication gebildet. Der Gesandte wird alles tun, um unsere Pläne durchzusetzen. Andrerseits tut Puech alles, um seine Pläne zu realisieren. Er schreibt mir, Doresse wird alle Kodices photographieren und sie ihm sofort zur Verfügung stellen. Das kann ich nicht glauben. ...

Ich habe dem holländischen Gesandten vorgeschlagen, dass ich im Februar oder März hingehe für die fehlenden Seiten. Ob es gelingen wird?
Meier responded to Quispel that the Swiss and Dutch needed to maintain a solid front together:71

Prof. Rahn, who, as it seems to me, judges the situation extremely shrewdly, has come to the conviction that only a united procedure of the Dutch and Swiss can lead to success: If we coordinate our intentions sufficiently well, then the prospects are not at all bad. But if the Swiss and Dutch, only in the least, arouse the impression of being competitors, the Egyptians would immediately attempt to exploit this fact, and the situation would be endlessly delayed and made more complicated. Hence it would, from a purely diplomatic point of view, be the best by far, if we would continue to present ourselves as a joint Committee.

Quispel replied to Meier that he was completely uninvolved in the Dutch diplomatic activity:72

On Sunday I was again called in by the Queen. She informed me the Egyptian Ambassador has communicated officially to her that the texts will in any case be published as soon as possible. But that is not much new.

In this regard I would again like to call to your attention that I have not asked that her Majesty get involved. She did that on her own. My task seemed to me always to be to set up the connection with your attempts. That was not

71 19 i 55: Letter from Meier to Quispel: Prof. Rahn, der die Situation, wie mir scheint, äußerst klug beurteilt, ist zu der Überzeugung gekommen, dass nur ein geschlossenes Vorgehen der Holländer und Schweizer zu einem Erfolg führen kann. Wenn wir unsere Absichten genügend gut koordinieren, so seien die Aussichten durchaus nicht schlecht. Sollten aber die Schweizer und Holländer auch nur im leisesten den Eindruck von Konkurrenten erwecken, so würden die Ägypter sofort versuchen, Kapital aus dieser Tatsache zu schlagen und die Situation würde endlos verzögert und kompliziert. Es wäre also rein diplomatisch weitaus das Beste, wenn wir weiterhin als gemeinsames Comité auftreten würden.


always easy, but I still have, I hope, made it clear to the gentlemen in the Foreign Office that I do not go along without you and Puech. I do not have the impression that one is following egotistical motives, but for a government it is after all easier to undertake a national rather than an international affair. The step of the Dutch Ambassador took place without my knowledge.

Cnoop Koopmans, the Dutch Ambassador in Cairo, wrote the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs favoring Quispel’s trip to Cairo:73

Perhaps with a visit to Egypt Professor Quispel can bring clarity to this situation, by means of which the publication of the Codices can be advanced very much. For in these regions personal contact is always of great value, and often is able to bring one solution for many possibilities.

When the Dutch Embassy in Cairo informed Quispel that the time was ripe for him to come to Cairo, he informed Meier:74

I have now received word from Cairo that it would be propitious if I could go there the end of March. So I will go then, if nothing comes in the way, and among other things will try, if possible, to identify the missing pages of the Jung Codex. Please let me know what in your opinion I can do on this trip for the cause we share. It has indeed been agreed that we would go forward together. Meanwhile I have heard that the French Institute in Cairo intrigues constantly. Do you have reports that the French really have a chance?

Meier wrote Quispel in reply:75

---

73 21 ii 55: Letter from Cnoop Koopmans to the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs (Gerrit K. Bos reports that this letter is also in the archives of the Department of Foreign Affairs):

Wellicht kan Professor Quispel door een bezoek aan Egypte in deze situatie klaarheid verschaffen, waarmede de uitgave van de codices zeer zou worden bevorderd. Persoonlijk contact is immers in deze streken van grote waarde en vermag dikwerf voor vele moeilijkheden een oplossing te brengen.

74 20 ii 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Ich habe jetzt aus Kairo Bericht empfangen, dass es günstig wäre, wenn ich Ende März dorthin könne. So gehe ich dann, wenn nichts dazwischen kommt und werde u. a. versuchen, wenn möglich, die fehlenden Seiten des Codex Jung zu identifizieren. Wollen Sie mir mitteilen, was ich bei dieser Reise Ihrer Meinung nach für die gemeinschaftliche Sache tun kann. Es ist ja abgemacht, dass wir zusammen vorgehen würden. Inzwischen habe ich vernommen, dass das Institut de France in Kairo fortwährend intrigiert. Haben Sie Berichte, dass die Franzosen wirklich eine Chance haben?

75 1 iii 55: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Dass Sie nach Kairo fahren, freut mich sehr. Wollen Sie mir bitte noch Ihren Reisetermin mitteilen, damit ich Sie noch bis im letzten Moment auf dem Laufenden halten kann. Wenn Sie die momentane Politik verfolgen, werden Sie sehen, dass die Franzosen weniger Chancen haben als je.
That you are going to Cairo pleases me very much. Would you please tell me your travel dates, so that I can keep you up to date, down to the last moment. If you are following today's politics, you will see that the French have less chances than ever.

Puech also heard from Cairo that the spring would be a decisive time:

The situation in Cairo also seems always indecisive. All the more one can, it seems, hope for a solution this spring. But in what sense?

Hence Puech inquired of Quispel about his travel plans for Cairo:

You still have not told me who invited you, as well as van Unnik, to come to Cairo to take photographs of the papyri (of all, or only of the supplemental pages of the Jung Codex?)....

In this regard, do you still hope to go to Egypt this spring?

Puech wrote Quispel that he might have accompanied him to Cairo if he had known sooner:

I learn that Dr. Mustapha Amer, the Director of Antiquities of Egypt, thought that I ought to come to Cairo soon in order for me to discuss with him the publication of the codices of N[ag] H[ammadi]. What if I had known that sooner? Perhaps I would have been able to make the trip with you. But it is too late now.

Meier also wrote von Fischer of Quispel's trip:

76 20 ii 55: Letter from Puech to Meier:
La situation au Caire paraît toujours aussi indécise. Tout au plus peut-on, semble-t-il, espérer une solution pour ce printemps. Mais en quel sens?

77 20 ii 55: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
Vous ne m’avez toujours pas dit qui vous avait invité, ainsi que M. van Unnik, à venir au Caire prendre des photographies des papyrus (de tous? ou seulement des pages complémentaires du Codex Jung?)....
A ce propos, comptez-vous toujours vous rendre en Égypte ce printemps?

78 7 iii 55: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
J’apprends que le Dr. Mustapha Amer, le Directeur des Antiquités d’Égypte, croyait que je devais me rendre au Caire prochainement afin de m’entretenir avec lui de la publication des codices de N.H. Que ne l’ai-je su plus tôt? J’aurais pu peut-être faire le voyage avec vous. Mais il est trop tard maintenant.

79 14 iii 55: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:
Alles was ich gehört habe, ist, dass Quispel beabsichtigt, noch diesen Monat nach Cairo zu fahren. Er hätte aber gerne von uns noch nähere Instruktionen gehabt. Falls Ihre Instruktionen nicht mehr rechtzeitig eintreffen, sodass ich sie Quispel noch vor
All that I have heard is that Quispel intends, still this month, to travel to Cairo. But he would have liked to have more detailed instructions from us. In case your instructions do not arrive in time, so that I can still forward them to Quispel before his departure, it would probably be best if you would inform Prof. Rahn of the expected arrival of Quispel and have him track Quispel down. Quispel promised me in writing several times he would not try to undertake anything on his own and that he would proceed only in the closest cooperation with us. That would mean, under the present circumstances, that in Egypt he should hold to Rahn and Minister Boissier.

Rahn then sent two memoranda to von Fischer trying to determine where the Swiss position now stood:80

As Mustafa Amir has constantly said to me, the decision about the utilization has not yet been made, though the decision is now immediately imminent, of course the basic one. ... Unfortunately Zürich and Utrecht have not been able to get together, in spite of my indications in the autumn and the suggestions of my Dutch colleague that went to the other side. The handling of the question is made more complicated by this, and no doubt has also been deferred in time.

In a second memorandum Rahn asked for further clarification:81

As I indicated, I also regret that Zürich and Utrecht have not reached agreement, indeed that Zürich also never let it be heard, whether, and in which

80 16 iii 55: Memorandum from Rahn to von Fischer:

Wie mir Mustafa Amir beständig gesagt hat, ist noch nicht über die Verwendung entschieden, doch steht nun der Entscheid unmittelbar bevor, natürlich der grundsätzliche. ... Leider haben sich ja Zürich und Utrecht nicht zusammentun können trotz meinem Hinweisen im Herbst und den Anregungen meines holländischen Kollegen, die nach der anderen Seite gingen. Die Erledigung der Frage ist dadurch kompliziert und wohl auch zeitlich hinausgeschoben worden.

81 19 iii 55: Memorandum from Rahn to von Fischer:

direction, there had been a follow-up to my initiatives for sounding them out, in the interest of a unified position. I groped in the dark over this situation until the end of January, and often asked myself whether in Zürich the interest in the question, as it was posed a year ago, had not gotten lost.

Von Fischer himself wrote Rahn about Quispel, as he reported to Meier:82

I write personally to Prof. Rahn, to introduce also for my part Prof. Quispel to him.

Quispel had informed Puech of his proposal for the University of Utrecht to offer Puech an honorary doctorate precisely when Quispel told him of his plans to go to Cairo alone. Puech was of course very grateful for the honor:83

I am very moved—and more than I would know how to say to you—by the proposal that you would want to make to me of receiving from the University of Utrecht the grade of doctor honoris causa. Yes, that would be for me an honor, a great honor, and a great pleasure, and I can only accept with pride and gratitude the project that you confide to me. I am, particularly, touched that you are the main artisan, and the new proof that you thus give me of your esteem and of your friendship is infinitely precious to me. How to thank you?

Quispel had also proposed to Meier an honorary doctorate, but Meier had declined:84

You yourself know that it is for me here not a matter of personal things, in that, at the time, I did turn down with gratitude your effort to get for me an honorary doctorate.

82 29 iii 55: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Persönlich schreibe ich Herrn Prof. Rahn, um auch meinerseits Prof. Quispel bei ihm einzuführen.

83 7 iii 55: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Je suis extrêmement sensible—et plus que je ne saurais vous le dire—à la proposition que vous voulez bien me faire de recevoir de l’Université d’Utrecht le grade de docteur honoris causa. Oui, ce serait pour moi un honneur, un grand honneur, et une grande joie, et je ne puis qu’accepter avec fierté et reconnaissance le projet que vous me confiez. Je suis, en particulier, touché que vous en soyez le principal artisan, et la nouvelle preuve que vous me donnez ainsi de votre estime et de votre amitié m’est infiniment précieuse. Comment vous remercier?

84 12 v 56: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Dass es mir hier nicht um persönliche Dinge geht, wissen Sie selbst, indem ich ja seinerzeit Ihre Bemühung, mir einen Ehrendoktor zu verschaffen, dankend ablehnte.
Quispel had earlier suggested to Puech, as a result of their week of work together in Paris in June 1954, that the Collège de France might invite Quispel as a guest lecturer, to judge by the discouraging response he received from Puech:85

Concerning what has to do with the assigning of a course at the Collège de France, the initiative comes from and belongs entirely to the Council of professors of this establishment. So avoid carefully intervening personally, or of having the Dutch authorities intervene. The Collège is too jealous of its liberty, too proud (justifiably) of its independence, not to take offense at an intervention or pressure coming from outside. We will see what there is to do, and what can be done, when the occasion presents itself. In any case, I need to get in advance the view of the administrator and of my colleagues. I will also have to inform myself on the status of the relations between the Collège and Dutch universities. All that will require time, and I do not see anything that is possible before two years from now, at the least.

This way for Puech to thank Quispel did not materialize.

When on the other hand Quispel presented a speech on ‘The Gospel of St. Thomas and the New Testament’ at the Oxford congress on ‘The Four Gospels in 1957’ (see Chapter 10, Part 1 below), in which he did not acknowledge Puech’s involvement in editing The Gospel of Thomas, he received a blunt reproach:86

I believe I have in your regard shown myself generous enough, well-wishing enough, even indulgent enough, and to have aided enough at the beginnings of your scholarly career, to deserve on your part, if not more acknowledgement, at least more deference.

85 17 vii 54: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Pour ce qui est de l’attribution d’un cours au Collège de France, l’initiative revient et appartient entièrement au Conseil des professeurs de cet établissement. Gardez-vous donc bien d’intervenir personnellement ou de faire intervenir les autorités hollandaises. Le Collège est trop jaloux de sa liberté, trop fier (à juste titre) de son indépendance pour ne pas se froisser d’une intervention ou d’une pression venant de l’extérieur. Nous verrons ce qu’il y a à faire et ce qui peut être fait lorsque l’occasion s’en présentera. De toute façon, il me faut prendre auparavant l’avis de l’Administrateur et de mes collègues. J’aurai également à me renseigner sur l’état des relations entre le Collège et les Universités hollandaises. Tout cela demandera du temps et je ne vois rien de possible d’ici deux ans, au moins.

86 17 vii 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Je crois m’être montré à votre égard assez généreux, assez bienveillant, assez indulgent même, et avoir assez aidé aux débuts de votre carrière scientifique, pour mériter de votre part, si non plus de reconnaissance, du moins plus de déférence.
In spite of such an oversight, Quispel did maintain a working relationship with Puech.

The importance of the Queen in the developing Nag Hammadi situation was not limited to Quispel's trip to Cairo, but was still apparent on the occasion of the honorary doctorate awarded to Puech by the University of Utrecht in 1956:

And when the expert on Gnosticism, Henri-Charles Puech, received an honorary doctorate in Utrecht in 1956, he and his wife had to come to the palace to talk about Nag Hammadi. It then struck me [Quispel] that the Queen spoke French very poorly.

Quispel's close ties with the Dutch Embassy in Cairo continued throughout the whole Nag Hammadi experience. At the first meeting of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, held in the Director's office at the Coptic Museum on 15 December 1970 (see Chapter 11, Part 3 below), many local dignitaries were also present, though I only met one foreign Ambassador—the Ambassador of the Netherlands, introduced to me by Gilles Quispel. I was not greeted by an American Ambassador, since at that time the United States had no diplomatic relations with Egypt, and hence I was on my own! But John Dorman, Director of the American Research Center in Egypt, introduced himself, and offered to be of service, which he proved to be.

3. Quispel's Cairo Trip, 30 March–17 April 1955

At the beginning of his stay in Cairo, Quispel formulated two documents, the first a memorandum in which he laid out his objectives, as in agreement with those of Pahor Labib, and the second a news release that did much the same a week or so later. The first, dated to the day after his arrival, is as follows:

---

87 Gilles Quispel, “Zij was vóór de vrede ...: Koningin Juliana en Greet Hofmans” Bres 205 (December 2000–January 2001): 18–23: 21:

En toen de kenner van de Gnosis, Henri-Charles Puech, in 1956 in Utrecht een eredoctoraat kreeg, moest hij met zijn vrouw op het paleis komen vertellen over Nag Hammadi. Daarbij viel me op, dat de koningin slecht Frans sprak.


89 30 iii 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier, lists 30 iii 55 as the date of arrival.

90 31 iii 55: Memorandum by Quispel. There were two first drafts, one handwritten in
Some observations on the Gnostic manuscripts currently at the Coptic Museum of Cairo

Prof. Pahor Labib has invited me to formulate some observations on the Gnostic manuscripts whose publication is being prepared. I am happy to find myself in complete agreement with the views that Pahor Labib has been kind enough to express to me during the conversation that he granted me, when he declared that one is going to form an International Committee for the publication of these texts. A first observation of a rather general nature is called for: The importance of these manuscripts is not less than that of the texts of the Dead Sea, which have been announced in the world-wide press with so much publicity. In effect, these documents add a new luster to the scientific glory of Egypt. In my opinion one should, once the Committee is formed, announce the news of the publication with a certain emphasis, on the occasion of a ceremony where the representatives of different countries would be present: The correspondents of the world-wide press could be invited. An Egyptian or foreign scholar could present an address to put in relief the importance of these new documents. Such a solemn meeting

English and one typewritten in French, then a second typewritten draft in French, quoted here:

Quelques observations sur les manuscrits gnostiques actuellement au Musée Copte du Caire

M. le professeur Pahor Labib m’a invité de formuler quelques observations sur les manuscrits gnostiques dont on prépare la publication. Je me félicite de me trouver en plein accord avec les vues que M. Pahor Labib a bien voulu m’exposer pendant l’entretien qu’il m’a concédé et dans lequel il a déclaré qu’on va former un comité international pour la publication de ces textes. Une première observation plutôt général s’impose: l’importance de ces manuscrits n’est pas moindre que celle des écrits de la Mer Morte qui ont été annoncés dans la presse mondiale avec une si grande publicité. En effet, ces documents ajoutent à la gloire scientifique de l’Égypte un éclat nouveau. À mon avis on devrait, une fois formé le comité, annoncer la nouvelle de la publication avec une certaine emphase, à l’occasion d’une cérémonie où seraient présents les représentants de divers pays: les correspondants de la presse mondiale pourraient être invités, un savant égyptien ou étranger pourrait prendre la parole pour mettre en relief l’apport de ces nouveaux documents. Une telle réunion solennelle ne manquerait pas d’avoir un certain retentissement dans le monde entier et créerait une atmosphère favorable pour le progrès des études coptes. Si à cette occasion je pouvais me rendre utile, je pourrais établir des contacts avec le New York Times, le Manchester Guardian, le Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung et l’Handelsblad d’Amsterdam. Je suis sûr que les autorités égyptiennes ont déjà considéré la possibilité d’une telle réunion et mes remarques ne peuvent que leur montrer que une même idée est vivante dans le monde savant.
would not fail to have a certain echo in the whole world, and would create a favorable atmosphere for the progress of Coptic studies. If on this occasion I could make myself useful, I could establish contacts with the New York Times, the Manchester Guardian, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, and the Handelsblad of Amsterdam. I am sure that the Egyptian authorities have already considered the possibility of such a meeting, and my remarks can only show them that the same idea is alive in the scholarly world.

This largely diplomatic introduction was followed by the presentation of three texts (referred to as ‘codices’) of particular interest to Quispel, so as to be sure that they were included on any agenda. The first has to do with *The Gospel of Thomas*:

1) *The ‘book of Thomas.’* This text does not seem to contain Gnostic speculations, but rather the complete text of the ‘Sayings of Jesus,’ several fragments of which have been known for some fifty years. This text is capital for the history of the New Testament and could be published by a coptologist and a historian of religion in close collaboration with a New Testament scholar. In any case, it should be considered with the highest precision.

It is indeed odd that Quispel designates Codex II, Tractate 2, *The Gospel of Thomas,* by using the title of a different tractate in the same Codex II, Tractate 7, *The Book of Thomas,* and indeed puts the mistaken title in quotation marks. The reference to the text as the ‘Sayings of Jesus’ may explain this mistake: In his correspondence with Puech, the Oxyrhynchus Papyri 1, 654, and 655 were usually referred to as the *Logia* of Jesus. Quispel had apparently not yet familiarized himself with Doresse’s inventory of the Nag Hammadi Codices to the extent of being able to use the title in the text itself, *The Gospel according to Thomas.*

With regard to the suggestions as to the kind of scholar(s) needed to publish it, the three specializations Quispel lists would, if he had been asked at the time, have led him to suggest himself, Puech, and van Unnik, respectively, though in practice Guillaumont and Till were added as coptologists, and van Unnik did not actually become one of the editors.

---

91 31 iii 55: Memorandum by Quispel:

The second text to which Quispel refers is *Asclepius*:92

2) The Coptic *Asclepius* offers us a text that is superior, it would seem, to the Latin Asclepius. The publication requires of the editor very precise knowledge of the criticism of the Latin text, of the methods of the Latin translators, and of Coptic. One must admit that scholars of this kind are rather rare.

This draws attention to the good fortune of enlisting, later on, just such a scholar, Jean-Pierre Mahé,93 who edited the Hermetic texts for the French-Canadian edition (see Chapter 2, Part 8 above). Yet Quispel may at the time have had some interest in it himself, since he had actually taught Latin at the beginning of his academic life, when he may well have worked on the Latin Hermetic text. And of course its focus is Egyptian.

The third text Quispel mentions is ‘the missing forty pages’ of the Jung Codex:94

3) Thirty-six (!) pages of a Valentinian codex, namely pp. 32–37 of the Gospel of Truth, written by Valentinus (± 150), and pp. 58–91 of the Treatise on the Three Natures of Heracleon (± 170 AD). Modesty forbids me to underline the interest of these texts, and to formulate very conceivable desires as to the way they could be published.

Ascribing these two Tractates of the Jung Codex to specific Gnostics known from heresiological sources served to highlight the importance of these texts, which were the primary interest to Quispel during this trip. In the case of Valentinus, to whom *The Gospel of Truth* is ascribed, this ascription has been discussed, often favorably, ever since, whereas the ascription to Heracleon of the Treatise on the Three Natures (= *The Tripartite Tractate*) is hardly more that speculation, since not even the part of this tractate that was in the Jung Codex in Zürich had been adequately translated and studied.

92 31 iii 55: Memorandum by Quispel:

2) L’*Asclepius* copte nous offre un texte qui est supérieur, semble-t-il, au Asclepius Latin. La publication demande de l’éditeur des connaissances très précises de la critique du texte latin, des méthodes des traducteurs latins et du copte. Il faut avouer que des savant[s] de la sort sont assez rares.


94 31 iii 55: Memorandum by Quispel:

Quispel's reference to his own 'modesty' suggested his own interest in the texts and 'the way they could be published.' Obviously he would very much like to be consulted as to the publication of 'the missing forty pages,' which would thus lead to the discussion of returning to Egypt the Zürich pages of the Jung Codex, in exchange for publication rights to 'the missing forty pages.'

In the next paragraph Quispel explicitly volunteers his and Puech's services:

Given the facts listed above, it is permissible to suspect that the lot of manuscripts currently present in the Coptic museum, about which one has at one's disposal today only rather vague information [Doresse's inventory], contains still other surprises. Experience has shown that it is the specialists in Gnosticism who have succeeded in identifying these important texts. For this reason one would hope that the Egyptian authorities, in case that they want to consult experts, would appeal to specialists who know not only Coptic, but also Gnosticism. Unnecessary to say that my friend H.Ch. Puech and I are always ready to come to Cairo, at our own expense, whenever Pahor Labib wishes to consult us on the identification of certain texts. We are completely at the disposal of the Egyptian authorities.

This opportunity did present itself in October 1956, when Puech and Quispel spent a month at the Coptic Museum. But no more precise inventory of texts resulted from that trip than what Doresse had provided, since the fragmentary and fragile leaves had not been conserved. Yet Puech had brought along a French coptologist, Antoine Guillaumont, who did transcribe The Gospel of Thomas (see Chapters 6 and 7 below).

Quispel's memorandum continued:

---

95 31 iii 55: Memorandum by Quispel:

Vu les faits cités plus haut il est permis de soupçonner que le lot des manuscrits actuellement au Musée Copte, sur lesquels on ne dispose aujourd'hui que des données assez vagues, contient encore d'autres surprises. L'expérience a montré que ce sont les spécialistes de la Gnose qui ont réussi à identifier ces textes importants. Pour cette raison on souhaiterait que les autorités égyptiennes, dans le cas qu'ils veulent consulter des experts, feraient appel à des spécialistes qui connaissent non seulement le Copte, mais aussi la Gnose. Inutile de dire que mon ami M. H.Ch. Puech et moi-même sommes toujours prêts à venir au Caire, à nos propres frais, quand M. Pahor Labib désire nous consulter sur l'identification de certains écrits. Nous sommes tout à fait à la disposition des autorités égyptiennes.

96 31 iii 55: Memorandum by Quispel:

Nous avons déjà offert nos services à plusieurs occasions, soit par la bouche de S.E.M. von Fischer, soit par l'intermédiaire du Ministre des Pays Bas, qui a appuyé les efforts du premier nommé. Évidemment nous ne savons pas exactement à quel point les
We have already offered our services on several occasions, either from the mouth of His Excellency von Fischer, or by the intermediary of the Minister of the Netherlands, who has supported his efforts. Of course we do not know exactly to what extent the steps of these diplomats have corresponded to our conceptions. We, i.e. Puech, Walter Till and other well-know scholars, envisage only an international collaboration of scholars in the service of science, and it seems to us that only by such an international unanimity will it be possible to integrate the new data. It seems to us that these texts are so difficult to interpret that it is out of the question that a single person, or the researchers of a single nation, would be able to publish all these texts in a relatively short period of time. There are few scholars who know Gnosticism to such an extent that they can publish a Coptic Gnostic text. It is almost inevitable that one always turns again and again to the same persons. For this reason any rivalry and any particularism should be banished. Hence it is with great satisfaction that I have learned from Pahor Labib that the Egyptian authorities propose forming an International Committee, which will count among its members as many coptologists as specialists in Gnosticism (the latter, of course, possessing also Coptic).

May I be permitted to express my views as to the methods to be followed by the Committee. I have talked at length about this a few weeks ago with Walter Till, who has just completed his edition of the text of Berlin [P.Berol. 8502], and hence who possesses a rich experience in the publication of Gnostic texts. He has authorized me to speak also in his name when I declare that, in our opinion, the preparation of each volume must be undertaken by a coptologist and a specialist in Gnosticism, who must work together and consult each other constantly. It is only thus that the publication can have all the perfection
that it deserves. This is because the Gnostic speculations are so different for
our ways of thinking that special knowledge is necessary to penetrate into
these unknown worlds. Besides, these texts, which for the most part have
been translated from Greek, require of the editor a knowledge of Greek that
is more than superficial. I am sure that the Egyptian authorities wish editions
for their national treasures that are perfect in every regard. But in this case
it is desirable that the specialists in Gnosticism can aid their colleagues the
coptologists with their advice. Of course one knows at the Coptic Museum
better than anywhere else in the world who are the coptologists most gifted
for this difficult task. If however one wishes to know my opinion, I will
willingly give the names of several well-known coptologists who seem to me
to merit the honor of participating in this enterprise.

The prominence in Quispel's value structure, of using specialists in Gnos-
ticism as well as coptologists, is based on the experience with Malinine's
unintelligible draft translations of *The Gospel of Truth*, since he was not
familiar with Gnosticism. But it is especially based on the fact that Quispel
and Puech were specialists in Gnosticism, with Quispel knowing only some
Coptic, yet needing to turn to someone like Till or Zandee to help with the
translation, and Puech knowing no Coptic (kept hidden from sight, in view
of Quispel's memorandum saying that the specialists in Gnosticism will also
know Coptic). Hence Puech needed to turn first to Doresse, then to Malin-
ine, then to Guillaumont, to translate for him.

Of course Quispel's point is well taken! But today most coptologists have
began with the Nag Hammadi texts, and therefore have experience with
Gnosticism and these difficult texts, so working in pairs is less necessary
than it was then. Of course Till, after editing P.Berol. 8502, had expertise in
both coptology and Gnosticism, but Quispel would envisage himself as Till's
partner for Gnosticism in the editing of *The Gospel of Thomas*.

par un coptisant et un spécialiste de la Gnose, qui doivent travailler ensemble et se
consulter contamment. C'est alors seulement que la publication pourrait avoir toute
la perfection qu'elle mérite. C'est que les spéculations gnostiques sont tellement
différentes de nos modes de pensée que des connaissances spéciales sont nécessaires
pour pénétrer dans ces mondes inconnus. En outre ces textes, qui pour la plupart ont
été traduits du Grec, exigent de l'éditeur une connaissance plus que superficielle du
Grec. Je suis sûr que les autorités égyptiennes désirent pour leurs trésors nationaux des
éditions qui sont parfaites par tous les rapports: mais dans ce cas il est désirable que les
spécialistes de la Gnose puissent aider leurs collègues les coptisants avec leur conseils.
Évidemment, on sait au Musée Copte mieux qu'aucune part ailleurs au monde qui
sont les coptisants les mieux doués pour cette tâche difficile. Si cependant on désire
savoir mon opinion, je citerai volontiers les noms de quelques coptisants reconnus qui
me semblent mériter l'honneur de participer à cette entreprise.
Quispel next turned to the awkward issues of a facsimile edition and the place of publication:

Pahor Labib has communicated to me that, while awaiting the definitive editions, one is going first to publish photographs of the documents, while announcing at the same time (or even a bit earlier) that the Egyptian authorities have entrusted the edition of these texts to such and such a scholar. All this is perfectly reasonable. Thus, everyone can read these revelations that one awaits with such impatience, and at the same time one avoids non-authorized editions from appearing on all sides. Nonetheless in this regard one must avoid misunderstandings. Rumors have circulated that these documents would be published entirely at Paris, or at Louvain. After having made the acquaintance of the Egyptian authorities, it is difficult for me to believe that these rumors have foundation. For, in my view, these definitive editions could appear better as the publications of the Coptic Museum, because these texts are to be found in the Coptic Museum and are the glory of Egypt. Has one considered in what way the scientific Academies of all the nations, united with the Egyptian Academy in the Union of Academies, could become interested in this undertaking, which, due to the generosity of the Egyptian scientific authorities, is going to contribute everything to the progress of international science?

Of course the difficulty with a facsimile edition is that it puts the codices in the public domain, where any competent scholar can publish one’s own edition, irrespective of whether it be ‘authorized.’ This did in fact happen massively in the case of the first volume of Pahor Labib’s facsimile edition containing plates of The Gospel of Thomas (see Chapter 7, Part 5 below). As to the place of publication, a complete edition could be listed on each title page as belonging to a series of the Coptic Museum, irrespective of

97 iii 55: Memorandum by Quispel:

M. Pahor Labib m’a communiqué qu’en attendant les éditions définitives on va publier d’abord des photographies des documents, tout en annonçant à la fois (ou même un peu avant) que les autorités égyptiennes ont confié l’édition de ces textes à tel ou tel savant. Tout ceci est parfaitement raisonable. Ainsi, tout le monde peut lire ces révélations qu’on attend avec une telle impatience, et en même temps on évite que des éditions non-authorisées paraissent un peu partout. Toutefois il faut à ce propos éviter des malentendues. Des bruits ont couru que ces documents seraient publiés entièrement à Paris, ou à Louvain. Après avoir fait la connaissance des autorités égyptiennes il m’est difficile de croire que ces rumeurs sont fondées. Car, à mon avis, ces éditions définitives pourraient mieux apparaître comme des publications du Musée Copte, parce que ces textes se trouvent dans le Musée Copte et font la gloire de l’Egypte. Est-ce qu’on a considéré de quelle manière les Académies scientifiques de toutes les nations, réunies avec l’Académie égyptienne dans l’Union des Académies, pourraient s’intéresser à cette entreprise, qui par la générosité des autorités savantes égyptiennes, va contribuer tout au progrès de la science internationale?
where the series was published, a proposal that was indeed later to be made. But Quispel did not favor France or Belgium, since he favored the Dutch publisher E.J. Brill (see Part 5 below).

In a final paragraph, Quispel turned to the rôle of the Netherlands in the undertaking:

I would never dare formulate these wishes as to the publication of the new texts if Pahor Labib had not encouraged me. And I hope with all my heart that our meeting initiates a productive cooperation between Egypt and Holland in this area of science. It was by now about a year ago that Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, without any initiative on my part, received me twice in audience, and expressed the desire to be informed in detail on the importance of the discoveries at Nag Hammadi. If the conversations of the Minister of the Netherlands with the Egyptian authorities could have as its consequence that also Dutch scholars participate in the anticipated publication, the cultural connections that unite Egypt and Holland would thus find themselves reinforced and confirmed.

This suggestion of Dutch scholars participating in the editing of the Nag Hammadi texts replaced an ‘Additional Remark’ that Quispel added to the English first draft:

As members of the international committee I may venture to recommend:

Girgis Matta, Cairo
W. Till, University of Manchester
H.-Ch. Puech, COLLÈGE DE FRANCE, 79 Rue du Cherche-Midi, Paris
J. Doresse, Addis Abeba
W.C. v. Unnik, Wagnerlaan 22, Bilthoven, Holland
(for the relations with the New Testament).

The first draft of the French text had a similar but diverging paragraph on participants that read:

98 31 iii 55: Memorandum by Quispel:

Je n’aurais jamais osé formuler ces voeux sur la publication des textes nouveaux, si M. Pahor Labib me n’avait pas encouragé. Et j’espère de tout mon cœur que notre rencontre initie un coopération féconde entre l’Égypte et la Hollande dans ce domaine de la science. Il y a maintenant à peu près une année que S.M. la Reine des Pays Bas, sans aucune initiative de ma part, m’a reçu deux fois en audience et a exprimé le désir d’être informée en détail sur l’importance des trouvailles à Nag Hammadi. Si les conversations du Ministre des Pays-Bas avec les autorités égyptiennes pourraient avoir pour conséquence qu’ aussi des savants hollandais participent à la publication prévue, les liens culturels, qui unissent l’Egypte et la Hollande s’en trouveraient renforcés et confirmés.

99 31 iii 55: First draft of Quispel’s memorandum:
It is not in my competence to judge the qualifications of my colleagues for this difficult and delicate task. All that I can say is that I have consulted Walter Till (Manchester), Paul Kahle (Oxford), and B. Stricker (Leiden), all well-known coptologists, who would quite happily be willing to take part in this publication, if they were invited.

Neither of these lists of potential collaborators, divergent as they were one from the other, was included in the second French draft, which instead had its focus on the participation of unnamed Dutch scholars, such as van Unnik and Stricker whose names were in the lists, but not in this final draft. Such lists, recommending Dutch scholars but no Swiss scholars, could understandably lead the Egyptian authorities to think there might be some kind of competition between the Dutch and the Swiss, not to speak of the French, omitted from the first draft which was in French. Quispel apparently decided that listing no names would avoid such complications.

A week or so later, Quispel summarized all this into a press release for the French-language newspaper of Cairo, *La Bourse Égyptienne*:  

Coptic studies are the order of the day. All over the world there are forming centers of academic research where eminent specialists study the problems of Coptic art, liturgy, history and literature. The discoveries of the last years are certainly going to stimulate the activities of scholars who are occupied with this period of Egyptian history, which shows so clearly the undeniable continuity in the civilization of this country from the beginning down to our time. Among these recent discoveries, the manuscripts found a short time ago at Nag Hammadi deserve very especial attention. In fact, these documents, which are found at present in the Coptic Museum of Old Cairo, are no less important than the texts of the Dead Sea, and add a new luster to the scientific glory of Egypt. The scholarly world awaits impatiently the publication of...
the ‘Sayings of Jesus,’ ‘The Apocryphon of John,’ ‘The Gospel of Truth’ of Valentinus, an Alexandrian thinker of ±100–160 AD. It has to do here with manuscripts of the second and third century, which cannot be understood except in the social and cultural perspective of that period, that is to say, the Egypt of the first centuries of our era. It is not to be doubted that Coptic studies can only profit from their publication.

The Egyptian authorities, recalling the old maxim that to govern is to look ahead, have found it useful to proceed already now with the creation of an organism that will occupy itself quite especially with the promotion of the studies listed above. On 5 April there was founded a ‘Committee for Coptic Monuments,’ under the direction of His Excellency Major Kamel el-Din Hussein, Minister of National Education. We learn that in the very near future this committee is in turn going to create a small International Committee, including specialists both Egyptian and foreign, to whom will be entrusted the publication of the texts of Nag Hammadi. This news will doubtless be received with the greatest satisfaction everywhere, both throughout the world and by historians of religion who are meeting in Rome these very days for their International Congress, on whose program there is a conference precisely on the capital significance of the Gnostic manuscripts of Nag Hammadi.

University of Utrecht (the Netherlands)
Prof. Dr. G. Quispel (passing through Cairo)

Morte, et ajoutent à la gloire scientifique de l’Égypte un éclat nouveau. Le monde savant attend impatiemment la publication des “Paroles de Jésus,” de “l’Apocryphe de Jean,” de “l’Evangile de Vérité” de Valentin, penseur alexandrin de ±100–160 après Christ. Il s’agit ici de manuscrits du deuxième et troisième siècle qui ne peuvent être compris que dans la perspective sociale et culturelle de cette période, à savoir de l’Égypte des premiers siècles de notre ère. Il n’est pas à douter que les études coptes ne pourront que profiter de leur publication.

Les autorités égyptiennes, se souvenant du vieux maxime que gouverner c’est prévoir, ont jugé utile de procéder dès maintenant à la création d’un organe qui s’occuperait tout spécialement de la promotion des études citées plus haut. Le 5 avril on a fondé un “Comité pour les Monuments Coptes,” sous la direction de S.E. le Major Kamel el-Din Hussein, Ministre de l’Éducation Nationale. Nous apprenons que ce comité va créer à son tour dans un avenir très prochain, un petit comité international, comprenant des spécialistes tant égyptiens qu’étrangers, auquel on va confier la publication des textes de Nag Hammadi. Cette nouvelle sera accueillie sans doute avec la plus grande satisfaction partout dans le monde et par les historiens de la religion, réunis ces jours mêmes à Rome par leur congrès international, sur le programme duquel figure justement une conférence sur l’apport capital des manuscrits gnostiques de Nag Hammadi.

Université d’Utrecht (Pays-Bas)
Prof. Dr. G. Quispel (de passage au Caire).
In describing these texts as ‘manuscripts of the second and third centuries,’ Quispel could hardly intend the dating of the copies from Nag Hammadi, but rather the dating of their original (Greek) composition. While Quispel was in Cairo, Meier and Puech were in fact on their way to the Eighth International Congress of the History of Religions\footnote{3 v 55: Letter from Puech to Meier.} that took place in Rome 17–20 April 1955; Puech made a speech there.\footnote{2 iv 55: Letter from Meier to von Fischer.}

After the completion of Quispel's trip, the Queen called him in to receive enthusiastically his very positive report:\footnote{25 vi 55: Letter from Quispel to Pahor Labib:}

Day before yesterday the Queen had me come to her and inform her in detail from 8 to 11AM about my trip to Cairo. I had occasion not only to report a great deal about the codices, but also about Coptic Christianity and the Coptic Museum. Her Majesty was very enthusiastic about the possibility of participating in excavations perhaps in Achmim, and showed such great interest in your land that she even brought to expression the wish once to visit Egypt.

Quispel published in Dutch the success of his trip to Cairo as follows:\footnote{Gilles Quispel, “Jung en de Gnosis,” in C. Aalders, J.H. Blokker, and G. Quispel, Jung—een mens voor deze tijd (Rotterdam: Lemniscaat, 1975), 85–138: 89–90:}

It [The Gospel of Truth] was at that time an incomplete text: four pages were missing. The complete Jung Codex had even greater lacunae, about 40 pages. Where they were was unknown. Jean Doresse had written that they were to be found among the manuscripts that Tano had bought. But his communications had not always proven to be trustworthy. He had meanwhile fallen out with Puech and could no longer be contacted.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{Vorgestern hat die Königin mich bei sich kommen lassen und sich von 8–11 ausführlich informieren lassen über meine Reise nach Kairo. Ich hatte Gelegenheit nicht nur über die Kodices, sondern auch über Koptisches Christentum und das Koptische Museum manches zu berichten. Ihre Majestät war sehr begeistert über die Möglichkeit etwa in Achmim zu Ausgrabungen teil zu nehmen und zeigte ein so grosses Interesse an Ihrem Lande, dass sie sogar den Wunsch zum Ausdruck brachte einmal Ägypten zu besuchen.}
  
  \item \footnote{Het was destijds een onvolledig geschrift: er ontbraken vier bladzijden aan. De hele Jung Codex bevatte nog grotere lacunes, ongeveer 40 pagina's. Waar die waren, was onbekend. Jean Doresse had geschreven dat zij zich bevonden bij de handschriften die Tano had gekocht. Maar zijn mededelingen waren niet altijd betrouwbaar gebleken. Hij was intussen gebrouilleerd met Puech en kon niet meer geraadpleegd worden. Bovendien had iemand in Cairo, aangelokt door de verkoop van de Jung Codex, andere Koptische geschriften te koop aangeboden. Daarover moesten onderhandelingen}
\end{itemize}
Besides this, someone in Cairo, motivated by the sale of the Jung Codex, had offered for sale other Coptic manuscripts. Negotiations had to be carried out for them. They were Coptic papyri from the estate of Carl Schmidt in Berlin, which were bought in 1956 by the University of Utrecht. They contained among other things fragments of the apocryphal Acts of Andrew, the oldest form of the Faust story, and an unknown piece about the bird Phoenix, about which Dr. Roel van den Broek wrote his scholarly book (The Myth of the Phoenix, 1972).

But especially the twelve other codices in Cairo in the Coptic Museum were under lock and key, among which was the Gospel of Thomas with unknown words of Jesus, until now unheard of in history. Someone had to try to make these treasures accessible for scholarship.

It seemed best that Quispel go to Cairo, after preliminary work by the Dutch Ambassador there. This happened in April 1955. But he was blocked behind a wall. He was promised that he could see the manuscripts, but time after time it was denied.

Excerpt of diary: “11 April. Pahor Labib (the Director of the Museum) had the coffer waiting with seals on it and rope around it, but he could not open it since the chemist had to visit the minister. Tomorrow.”

A last remedy that was available had to be applied. Quispel promised officially that the Jung Codex would be returned to Egypt after publication and would be given to the Coptic Museum in Cairo. There would be formed an international committee that would publish all the manuscripts. The Coptic
Museum would let the missing pages of the Jung Codex be published by the scholars who were appointed to this, M. Malinine (Paris), H.Ch. Puech (Paris), and G. Quispel (Utrecht). In this way the boxes with the manuscripts were opened on 12 April, with the use of flash sprayers to chase out the insects. The top leaves, the first the best, contained the sought-for pages. The pages were mixed up and were very fragmentary. It took a lot of work to put them together in Cairo in 1956. Four years after the purchase, it had actually become possible to publish the Jung Codex in its entirety.

4. Dutch-Swiss Collaboration

Already at the beginning of 1955, when Quispel was making plans for him and van Unnik to go to Cairo, the involvement of the Dutch and Swiss embassies in Cairo tended to produce a certain tension, since each embassy had an understandable tendency to speak for their own nationals but not for others.¹⁰⁵

You probably know how far Knoop Coopmans [Knoop Koopmans, Dutch Ambassador to Egypt] brought things, since he loyally informed fully Prof. Rahn [at the Swiss embassy in Cairo]. But now a while ago the Egyptian
Emissary [to the Netherlands] visited personally the Foreign Ministry to report that the Egyptian government has made access to the manuscripts possible for me and van Unnik [who did not accompany Quispel to Cairo]. So that means that we can seek there the missing pages of the Jung Codex and also, as we assume, photograph everything [though Quispel was not able to photograph anything]. That would already be very important. ... The highly official step of the Ambassador [von Fischer] has been a headache for me from the very beginning. If now the state mixes in, one is of course no longer free. Hence it was also very good that von Fischer led the negotiations not in his official capacity, but rather as curator of the Jung Institute. Of course before I visited the Queen I telephoned you and did nothing that you had not permitted. But yet the mixing in of the state already had as its consequence that one asked me to attempt the matter without you and Puech, since that would make the negotiations easier.

Thus Quispel blamed the Dutch Foreign Ministry for his necessity to make the trip alone. In fact the scheduling of Quispel's trip to Cairo just when Meier and Puech were at the congress in Rome may have been a subtle way to limit the trip to Quispel. But whereas Quispel stayed in close contact with Prof. Rahn of the Swiss embassy in Cairo, he apparently did not keep Puech equally informed (see below).

On the day of his arrival in Cairo, Quispel had immediately gotten in contact with Prof. Rahn, and on the same day wrote Meier:

This morning I arrived in Cairo and immediately visited Prof. Rahn, with whom I reflected for a very long time. It became clear that there is a misunderstanding among the Egyptians. They think that the Dutch and the Swiss are rivals, and do not see correctly that the steps the Dutch took were only intended to support the efforts of B[eat] von Fischer.

---

106 30 iii 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Heute morgen bin ich in Cairo angekommen und habe sofort Prof. Rahn besucht mit dem ich sehr lange überlegt habe. Es stellt sich heraus, dass bei den Ägyptern ein Missverständnis besteht: sie meinen, dass Holländer und Schweizer rivalisieren und sehen nicht recht dass die holländischen Schritte die Versuche von B. von Fischer nur unterstützen wollten.

Er hat mich nun gebeten, da er Sie selbst nicht kennt, Ihnen zu schreiben und zu fragen, ob Sie sich nicht an die Légation der Schweiz richten wollen, mit der Mitteilung, dass seinerzeit auf Ihre Veranlassung eine Nota den ägyptischen Behörden überreicht wurde, in Einverständnis mit Puech und mir; dass Sie von meiner Reise nach Kairo wissen und Herrn von Rahn gerne überlassen Ihren Vortrag so zu modifizieren, wie er es an Ort und Stelle für opportun hält, und dass Sie es begrüssen würden, wenn Prof. v. Rahn und ich zusammen Mustafa Amr besuchen. Wollen Sie bitte auch mitteilen, dass wir zusammen unsere Pläne gemacht haben und darüber ständig miteinander Fühlung gehalten haben.
Then he asked me, since he does not know you himself, to write to you and to ask whether you would not direct yourself to him at the Légation of Switzerland, with the communication that, at your instigation back then, a note was handed over to the Egyptian authorities, in agreement with Puech and me [11 March 1954\textsuperscript{107}]; that you know about my trip to Cairo, and are happy to leave it to von Rahn to modify on the spot your statement as he thinks to be advantageous; and that you would welcome it if Prof. v[on] Rahn and I visit Mustafa Amr together. Would you please also communicate that we have made our plans together and have constantly maintained contact with each other about them.

Meier wrote von Fischer in Lisbon playing down Rahn's concern:\textsuperscript{108}

I also do not fully understand why Rahn complains that Zürich and Utrecht had not reached agreement. I have after all written to you that Quispel, it seems to me, has asserted quite honorably that he only wants to proceed together, and that he has committed himself, in case he goes to Cairo, to get in touch immediately with Minister Boissier and Prof. Rahn. It seems to me that one can do no more from here.

Meier also wrote to the new Swiss Ambassador in Cairo, Minister Boissier, as Quispel had requested, with a copy to Quispel:\textsuperscript{109}

Very honorable Minister,

Just now Prof. G. Quispel from Utrecht, Holland, is in Cairo, to get in contact with the relevant authorities in the matter of the Codices from Nag Hammadi. Prof. Quispel has already entered into contact with Prof. Rahn, and he now

\textsuperscript{107}11 iii 54: Letter from Meier to Mustafa Amr.

\textsuperscript{108}2 iv 55: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:

Ich verstehe auch nicht ganz, warum sich Rahn darüber beklagt, dass sich Zürich und Utrecht nicht verständigt hätten. Ich habe Ihnen doch geschrieben, dass Quispel, wie mir scheint, durchaus ehrlich beteuert, nur gemeinsam vorgehen zu wollen, und dass er sich verpflichtet hat, für den Fall, dass er nach Cairo geht, sich mit Minister Boissier und Prof. Rahn sofort in Beziehung zu setzen. Mehr kann man, wie mir scheint, von hier aus nicht tun.

\textsuperscript{109}2 iv 55: Letter from Meier to Boissier:

Sehr verehrter Herr Minister, momentan weilt Herr Prof. G. Quispel aus Utrecht, Holland in Cairo, um in der Angelegenheit der Codices von Nag Hammadi mit den zuständigen Behörden Fühlung zu nehmen. Prof. Quispel hat bereits mit Prof. Rahn Fühlung genommen und ersucht mich nun, Sie offiziell, vom Institut aus, über die Natur dieser Bemühungen und den offiziellen Status unserer Cooperation zu unterrichten.

Sie wissen durch Herrn Minister von Fischer, der im Patronat unseres Institutes ist und in dieser Eigenschaft seinerzeit mit den ägyptischen Behörden verhandelte, dass unser
asks me to inform you officially, from the Institute, about the nature of these efforts and the official status of our cooperation.

You know from Minister von Fischer, who is in the Committee of Patrons of our Institute, and in this capacity has negotiated during his time with the Egyptian authorities, so that by means of his mediation our Institute entered already a few years ago into contact with Mustapha Amr. The step that we took at that time was done in the closest agreement with Prof. Quispel and Prof. Puech (Paris). The team of probable collaborators for the texts from Nag Hammadi and the plan for their editing was worked out by the three of us together. We three have until now oriented each other as carefully as possible about the further developments. Minister von Fischer, before his departure from Cairo, familiarized Prof. Rahn with the further follow-up of the matter, and still maintains his own active interest in it. Now it is important for me to affirm to you that it is fully legitimate if Prof. Rahn, together with our colleague Prof. Quispel, undertakes, in further negotiations with the Egyptian authorities, the modifications of our original proposal to the Egyptian authorities resulting from today’s circumstances. Prof. Quispel asks me in a letter of 30 March, in the name of Prof. Rahn, to communicate this to you, honorable Minister. The trip of Prof. Quispel to Cairo also takes place with our full agreement, and we would welcome it to the highest degree if Quispel and Rahn would visit Mustapha Amr together. All our plans have been made in unison from the very beginning on.

I hope very much that these explanations serve to simplify for Quispel together with Rahn the negotiations with the Egyptian government.


Ich hoffe gerne, dass diese Ausführungen dazu dienen, Herrn Quispel in Gemeinschaft mit Herrn Rahn die Verhandlungen mit der ägyptischen Regierung zu erleichtern.
Quispel found Tano, who as the agent of Maria Dattari had ‘owned’ the bulk of the material until it was put under seal by Abbot Drioton and nationalized by the Egyptian government, and reported to Meier what Tano told him about ‘the missing forty pages’ that Doresse had listed as part of that material:\footnote{5 iv 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:}

I was reassured by Tano that the missing 18 x 2 pages are in the Coptic Museum. Among them are 4 pages of the Gospel of Truth, as you know. In case he is telling the truth, we can relax somewhat. Thus far however \textit{no one} has had access to the manuscripts, not even the director of the Museum, since the owner Tano sealed them. But a few days ago the court gave the Coptic Museum the right to take in hand the publication of the manuscripts. An International Committee will be formed. Now tomorrow I go to Mustafa Amr, with Pahor Labib, to discuss the whole thing.

Now it seems to me important in any case to seek to identify, and if possible to photograph, the missing pages of the Jung Codex. I have everything with me to do that. But there remains the question as to whether the Egyptians will permit me. If that is the case, I will immediately report to you. I have reflected on everything carefully with Rahn. He is a very refined, quiet man, who can judge the situation here quite well.

A week later Quispel wrote Meier the successful outcome of his negotiations with Mustafa Amr as follows:\footnote{13 iv 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:}

\begin{itemize}
\item 1) Das Komitee ist offiziös gebildet mit Zustimmung von Mustafa Amr und Pahor Labib: es enthält die folgenden Mitglieder: Girgis Mattha, Cairo, W. Till, Manchester, H.Ch. Puech, Paris, J. Doresse, Addis Adeba, C.A. Meier, Zürich und G. Quispel,
\end{itemize}
1) The committee has been semi-officially formed with the agreement of Mustafa Amr and Pahor Labib. It has the following members: Girgis Matta, Cairo, W. Till, Manchester, H.Ch. Puech, Paris, J. Doresse, Addis Abeba, C.A. Meier, Zürich, and G. Quispel, Utrecht. Thereupon the official invitations were sent. This committee will meet perhaps in September to discuss the modalities of the edition.

It went without saying that the presiding officer would be Pahor Labib. The prominence of Egypt is strengthened by including Girgis Mattha (Professor at the University of Cairo),\(^\text{112}\) who however did not later play an active rôle. It was no doubt Pahor Labib who proposed that Doresse be included, which Quispel would not have dared to oppose explicitly. Invitations were in fact not sent for a meeting in September 1955, and the meeting did not take place at that time, but was delayed for a year. But in any case the official process had begun. Quispel's letter continued:\(^\text{113}\)

2) Both Mustafa Amr and Pahor Labib have assured me that the court decided at the beginning of April that the documents are to remain in the Coptic Museum and can be studied from now on.

Thus the trip of Quispel fell at a very propitious moment. Yet the documents could not be studied immediately, since they would need first to be conserved before they could be transcribed without damage to the papyrus. But at least Pahor Labib could in theory open the valise and proceed with this process. Quispel's letter went on:\(^\text{114}\)

3) In the sealed coffer I have found the missing page of the Letter to Rheginos. One side is completely inscribed, the other side only for a third, and ends with the words: \textit{ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ}. Hence it seems that the Tractate on

---

\(^{112}\) 28 iv 55: Letter from Keimer to Quispel.

\(^{113}\) 13 iv 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

2) Sowohl Mustafa Amr wie Pahor Labib haben mir versichert, dass der Gerichtshof Anfang April entschieden hat die Dokumente bleiben im Koptischen Museum und können von jetzt an studiert werden.

\(^{114}\) 13 iv 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

3) In dem versiegelten Koffer habe ich die fehlende Seite vom Brief an Rheginos gefunden. Eine Seite ist ganz beschrieben, die andere Seite nur ein Drittel und endet mit den Worten: \textit{ⲗⲟⲅⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲧⲁⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ}. Es scheint also, dass die Verhandlung über die Drei Naturen ohne Titel anfängt und dass am Anfang nichts fehlt. Darunter lag Seite 70 von der Verhandlung über die drei Naturen. Es kann sein, dass
the Three Natures begins without title, and that nothing is missing at the beginning. Underneath lay page 70 of the Tractate on the Three Natures. It can be that the pages have become mixed up. That could not yet be determined, and hence it is not yet known whether the 4 missing pages of the Gospel of Truth are there. Mustafa Amr said to me this morning that the Jung Institute should address itself immediately to him with the request to get photographs of these pages. Then he would be glad for you to get these missing pages.

Quispel overlooked the opening letter in the title (the Coptic definite article) in his transcription of the tractate’s title, *The Discourse on Resurrection* (Codex I, page 50). The editors had already settled on their own title, *The Letter to Rheginos*, before this discovery of the tractate’s real title. Hence the *editio princeps* appeared in 1963 with the double title *De Resurrectione (Epistolula ad Rheginum)* (see Chapter 3, Part 2 above). Quispel’s letter continued:

4) The photographic reproductions of all manuscripts will begin to appear already in the course of this year.

The one volume of Pahor Labib’s facsimile edition that he presented at the opening session of the International Committee of Gnosticism on 29 September 1956 made several valuable texts, especially *The Gospel of Thomas*, available to anyone who wished to edit and publish them, though access to that volume was difficult in Europe before 1958 (see Chapter 8, Part 1 below). But the facsimiles were considered inadequate, and hence further volumes were not published. The leaves would in any case have needed to be conserved before being photographed, for which plexiglass containers were not available. Quispel’s letter continued:

115 13 iv 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

4) Die photographischen Reproduktionen aller Manuskripte werden noch im Laufe dieses Jahres anfangen zu erscheinen.

116 13 iv 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Das scheint mir nun ein schöner Erfolg von schwierigen und mühsamen Verhandlungen. Als ich hier ankam, meldete Mustafa Amr sich krank und hatte schon seit einiger Zeit den Kontakt mit Herrn Prof. Rahn gemieden. Obwohl der Empfang herzlich war, stiess man auf gewisse Widerstände und réticences. Pahor Labib erzählte...
That seems to me indeed a fine success of difficult and tiresome negotiations. When I arrived here, Mustafa Amr reported he was sick and for some time already had avoided contact with Prof. Rahn. Although the reception was hearty, one struck on certain resistances and reticences. Pahor Labib told me as a great secret certain slanders that are also known to you, which he indeed did not believe, but yet liked to repeat. He especially avoided my question about access to the manuscripts.

What Quispel did achieve in the nineteen days in Cairo was indeed impressive, to get the valise opened on 12 April 1955\textsuperscript{117} and to verify that ‘the missing forty pages’ were more or less present. He also seemed to have convinced the Egyptian authorities to appoint an International Committee that would include the members he proposed, though not von Unnik or other Dutch scholars. There may have been a policy of including only one scholar per nation, with Doresse in Addis Abeba brought in along side Puech in Paris (as later the UNESCO committee was limited to one delegate per nation, though both Guillaumont and Puech were involved). Thus the achievements of the following year, culminating in the meeting of the International Committee of Gnosticism from 29 September through 27 October 1956, may in large part have been due to Quispel’s success in April 1955.

Concerning the offer to return the Jung Codex, an offer that von Fischer had advised should not be made at this time, Quispel continued his letter to Meier with a lengthy justification for the offer that he had just made:\textsuperscript{118}

On the day of my arrival in Cairo, even before I visited the Egyptian authorities, I had a discussion with Prof. Rahn. Since then we have constantly reflected on the situation and discussed everything. When the situation was really so that it seemed to me impossible to gain access to the manuscripts, we have thought that it was time to return to your offer to wink with the codex. And indeed for the following reasons:

\begin{itemize}
  \item mir als grosses Geheimnis gewisse auch Ihnen bekannte Verleumdungen, welche er zwar nicht glaubte, aber doch gerne wiedererzählte. Vor allem entwickelte er meiner Frage um Zugang zu den Manuskripten.
  \item 1–15 iv 55: Quispel’s Dutch diary.
  \item 13 iv 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:
    \begin{quote}
      Am Tage meiner Ankunft in Kairo hatte ich noch ehe ich die ägyptischen Behörden besuchte eine Besprechung mit Prof. Rahn. Seither haben wir fortwährend die Lage überlegt und alles besprochen. Als die Lage nun wirklich so war, dass es mir unmöglich schien um Zutritt zu den Manuskripten zu bekommen, haben wir gedacht dass es an der Zeit war auf Ihr Angebot zurückzukommen mit dem Kodex zu winken. Und zwar aus folgenden Gründen:
      \begin{enumerate}
        \item Die Lage von Mustafa Amr und Pahor Labib ist so unsicher, dass in der nächsten Zukunft ein anderer ihren Platz einnehmen könnte. Wenn aber das Jung Institut
      \end{enumerate}
    \end{quote}
\end{itemize}
1) The situation of Mustafa Amr and Pahor Labib is so uncertain that in the very near future someone else could take their place. But if the Jung Institute promises to give back the Codex after publication, one has some certainty that the International Committee continues to exist.

2) Everyone bears one’s own part in this solution: The Egyptians give the documents, the scholars provide their knowledge, and the third in the band gives (as, by the way, was always already planned) the Codex to Egypt. Such a selfless and generous demeanour on the part of the Jung Institute will make a certain impression here in the Orient.

3) Only then will the photographs of the missing pages be put at our disposal by the Egyptian authorities. But Rahn emphasized that the impression should be avoided as if it had to do here with a business transaction. One should keep the two items separate as much as possible.

4) In this way any conjecture is refuted, as if the Swiss Embassy had not acted selflessly and correctly in the interest of science.

5) The Jung Institute is represented officially in the Committee and can have its influence felt.

6) The situation of the widow E[ld] has become quite tragic because of this transaction. It is surely agreed among us that her difficulties, to the extent they have to do with this Codex, will now end.

verspricht den Kodex zurückzugeben nach der Publikation, hat man eine Gewissheit, dass das internationale Komitee bestehen bleibt.

2) Jedermann trägt das Seine bei dieser Lösung, die Ägypter geben die Dokumente, die Gelehrten stellen ihr Wissen zur Verfügung und der dritte im Bunde gibt (wie es übrigens immer schon geplant war) den Kodex an Ägypten. Ein solches selbstloses und generöses Benehmen von Seiten des Jung Instituts wird hier im Orient einen gewissen Eindruck machen.

3) Erst dann werden die Photographien der fehlenden Seiten von den ägyptischen Autoritäten zur Verfügung gestellt werden. Herr Rahn hat aber betont, dass der Eindruck vermieden werden sollte als ob es sich hier um ein Geschäft handelte. Man soll die zwei Sachen so viel wie möglich scheiden.

4) In dieser Weise wird jede Vermutung wiederlegt als ob die schweizerische Gesandtschaft nicht selbstlos und korrekt im Interesse der Wissenschaft gehandelt hätte.

5) Das Jung Institut ist offiziell im Komitee vertreten und kann seinen Einfluss gelten lassen.

6) Die Lage der Witwe E. ist durch dieses Geschäft ganz tragisch geworden. Es ist wohl uns entweder dass jetzt ihre Schwierigkeiten, soweit sie mit diesem Kodex zusammenhängen, enden werden.


Nachdem wir à tête reposée die Modalitäten überlegt hatten, haben wir heute morgen Mustafa Amr offiziell mitgeteilt, dass das Jung Institut sich vornahmen den Kodex nach
On all these points of view there was complete agreement between Prof. Rahn and myself. But Rahn also told the whole matter to ‘someone of the embassy’ and asked his opinion. I for my part have discussed everything in detail with my legation [Brugman]. All were of the opinion that in the given circumstances this solution was the best.

After we had slept over it and reflected on the modalities, this morning [13 April 1955] we officially communicated to Mustafa Amr that the Jung Institute undertook to give back the Codex to the Egyptian government after publication. He asked that the Jung Institute confirm this to him in writing, and then at the same time ask for the photographs. The rest I have already told you above.

You thus see that your letter [of 2 April 1955 to Ambassador Boissier with a copy to Quispel] arrived at the right time and achieved a favorable solution. I hope I have acted completely as you wished.

Quispel wrote the same day a more formal and less detailed letter to the Curatorium of the Jung Institute signed by himself and Prof. Rahn.

Thus Quispel worked out the modalities for the Jung Institute to obtain photographs of ‘the missing 40 pages,’ which he now referred to as ‘36 pages,’ with the carefully disassociated agreement to return the Jung Codex after publication to the Coptic Museum. Yet the correspondence makes it harder to avoid ‘the impression … as if it had to do here with a business transaction, … as if the Swiss embassy had not handled selflessly and correctly in the interest of science.’

Meier wrote Quispel to clarify ambiguities in what Quispel had written from Cairo:

I would have been glad to know from you whether you have found and could photograph the missing pages of the Gospel of Truth, and, if you could, whether the additional work connected to that implies a delay in the deadline of the publication.
The publication was planned for 26 July 1955 in honor of Jung's eightieth birthday. But Quispel did not return to Europe with pictures of the four missing pages of *The Gospel of Truth*, which hence had to be published (only in 1956–1957) without them; they were published in 1961 as *Evangelium Veritatis: (Supplementum)* (see Chapter 3, Part 6 above).

Meier requested further clarification from Quispel: 123

Now that the Committee of editors has in principle been founded, I would like to ask you, where now the initiative for the envisaged meeting should come from? Naturally somebody must of course have the strong hand, without which every committee falls into hibernation. I hence ask you whether you or Puech want to do that, or whether it is up to the Institute to activate the Committee? In no case should we entrust ourselves to a non-existent activity of the Egyptians, although we can of course ascribe to these gentlemen pro forma the main rôle.

What Meier did not realize was that the meeting could be convened only by the 'non-existent activity of the Egyptians,' and hence that the Committee would indeed hibernate for over a year, before Pahor Labib did finally convene it to meet in September and October 1956.

Prof. Rahn wrote more realistically to von Fischer than had Quispel to Meier: 124

Since the Egyptians are determined to assure for themselves the fame of the publication, one cannot force them to leave the leadership to others. ...

Quispel, with whom I reached agreement thoroughly without difficulty, was naturally always somewhat too optimistic, and tended to make of friendly

123 28 iv 55: Letter from Meier to Quispel:

Nachdem nun das Comité der Herausgeber prinzipiell gegründet ist, möchte ich Sie fragen, von wo aus nun die Initiative zu der beabsichtigten Zusammenkunft gehen soll? Irgend jemand muss ja natürlich die starke Hand haben, ohne welche jedes Comité in einen Winterschlaf fällt. Ich frage Sie also an, ob Sie oder Puech das machen wollen, oder ob es dem Institut obliegt, das Comité zu aktivieren? Auf keinen Fall sollten wir uns einer nicht existierenden Aktivität der Ägypter anvertrauen, obschon wir diese Herren pro forma durchaus die Hauptrolle zuschreiben können.

124 29 iv 55: Letter from Rahn to von Fischer:

Da die Ägypter entschlossen sind, sich den Ruhm der Herausgabe zu sichern, so kann man sie nicht zwingen, die Leitung anderen zu überlassen. ...

Quispel, mit dem ich mich durchwegs ohne Schwierigkeiten verstand, war natürlich immer etwas zu optimistisch und geneigt, aus freundlichen Zusagen wirkungsvolle Abkommen zu machen. Hoffnungen sind also berechtigt, aber Siegesfreudigkeit ist noch verfrüht und wird es noch Jahre hinaus sein.
affirmations functional agreements. So hopes are justified, but it is still too early for the joy of victory, and may be for years to come.

Quispel then replied to Meier’s inquiries for clarification:[125]

The missing approximately 18 leaves (36 pages) of the Jung Codex are in Case XI in the Museum. They have not yet been prepared in a scholarly way and put under plexiglass, and for this reason cannot yet be photographed by me. Besides, Mustafa Amr asked that you request it in writing. ...

The initiative for the envisaged meeting now comes from Pahor Labib. The strong hand in the Committee can in any case not be Puech, and I believe it would be very useful if you, as representative of the Jung Institute, would once let your influence count. But one must wait until our meeting in Cairo.

But Quispel on his return kept Puech in the dark, as Puech complained to Meier:[126]

Contrary to what is supposed in your letter of 28 April, which awaited me here, Quispel has not furnished me any information on the results of his trip to Cairo. At the most, he wrote me, on 21 April, at the beginning of a very laconic message, that I should ‘certainly’ have learned them from you. There is here a back-and-forth that is annoying enough, and which leaves me for the moment ignorant of what could be done, obtained, or projected. ...

I have only very little news, and, as always, discouraging enough, of Egyptian projects to publish the papyri of N[ag] H[ammadi]. What becomes of them?

---

[125] 30 iv 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Die fehlenden etwa 18 Blätter (36 Seiten) des Kodex Jung befinden sich in Kasse XI im Museum: sie sind noch nicht wissenschaftlich präpariert und unter Perspex gebracht und konnten deswegen von mir noch nicht photographiert werden. Ausserdem hat Mustafa Amr gebeten, dass Sie es schriftlich anfragen. ...


[126] 5 v 55: Letter from Puech to Meier:

Contrairement à ce que suppose votre lettre du 28 avril, qui m’attendait ici, Quispel ne m’a fourni aucune information sur les résultats de son séjour au Caire. Tout au plus m’a-t-il écrit, le 21 avril, au début d’un message fort laconique, que je devrais “certainement” les avoir appris de vous. Il y a là un quidproquo assez fâcheux, et qui me laisse pour l’instant ignorant de ce qui a pu être fait, obtenu ou projeté. ...

Je n’ai que très peu de nouvelles, et, comme toujours assez décevantes, des projets égyptiens de publication des papyrus de N.H. Que deviennent-ils?
Puech of course wrote Quispel for a report: 127

... I have no other news of your trip than that which has been incidentally furnished to me by an article in the 'Journal de la Bourse Égyptienne.'

Not knowing, especially, in what consisted the consultation that was permitted you to make of the lot of papyrus deposited in the Coptic Museum, I do not understand very well certain lines in your letter and in the 'note of correction' that you have added to it. Have you quite really located the 18 leaves (= 36 pages) that are lacking in the Jung Codex? How to interpret the end of the note: 'One would not know how to affirm anything with certitude before having been able to study the missing pages' (which? pages 49–50 or the 32 (?) pages that are missing in the Fourth Tractate [= Codex I, Tractate 5]), 'of which one is happy to have been able to identify the place where they are found' (With what does this have to do? With their place in the manuscript or in the Coptic Museum of Cairo?). And, in this regard, how would the number of pages that disappeared (or were refound) rise to 36, whereas you break down its total as follows: '4 Go[spel] of T[ruth] + 2 L[etter] to R[heginus] + 32 Tr[eatise] on [the] Thr[ee] Natures,' which—if I am not mistaken—would give 38 pages? ...

Presumably ‘the place where they are found’ refers to Case 11 in the Coptic Museum, which Quispel had reported to Meier was the location of the ‘the missing approximately 18 leaves (36 pages)’ (see above). He listed to Puech the number of leaves at the Coptic Museum as a total of 19, containing pp. 33–36, 49–50, 59–90, a total of 38 pages.

This disparity between the report that 36 pages were absent from Zürich and 38 pages present in Cairo may have to do with the fact that two leaves (pp. 83/84 and 85/86) were split in two from top to bottom, with half in each repository. If each half were counted as a leaf, the result would be a

---

127 4 v 55: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

... je n’ ai pas d’autres nouvelles de votre voyage que celles qui m’ ont été incidemment fournies par un article du “Journal de la Bourse égyptienne.”

Ne sachant pas, notamment, en quoi a consisté la consultation qu’il vous a été permis de faire du lot de papyrus déposé au Musée Copte, je ne comprends pas très bien certaines lignes de votre lettre et de la “note de correction” que vous lui avez adjointe. Avez-vous bien réellement repéré les 18 feuillets (= 36 pages) qui manquent au Codex Jung? Comment interpréter la fin de la note: “On ne saurait rien affirmer avec certitude avant (d’)avoir été à même d’étudier les pages manquantes” (lesquelles? les pages 49–50 ou les 32 (?) pages qui font défaut dans le 4ème Traité), “dont on est heureux d’avoir pu identifier la place où elles se trouvent.” (De quoi s’agit-il? De leur place dans le manuscrit ou du Musée Copte du Caire?) Et, à ce propos, comment le chiffre des pages disparues (ou retrouvées) s’éleverait-il à 36, alors que vous en décomposez la somme comme suit: “4 Ev. d. V. + 2 L. à R. + 32 Tr. s. tr. Natures,” ce qui—si je ne me trompe—donnerait 38 pages? ....
total count of two leaves more than the Codex actually contained: If the half-leaves in Zürich were counted as leaves in the number extant in Zürich, only 18 leaves (36 pages) would be listed as missing from Zürich. If the half-leaves in Cairo were counted as leaves in the number extant in Cairo, 19 leaves (38 pages) would be listed as extant in Cairo. A total of 54 inscribed fragments were in the part that remained in Cairo, which could also help account for the larger number of ‘pages’ found in Cairo than the number of the ‘pages’ missing in Zürich. But, in any case, Quispel’s listing of the number of leaves must have been based on the information he had from his study of the material in Zürich, not from any study of the material in Cairo. Given the very fragile condition of the unconserved leaves, a precise counting would not have been permitted by Pahor Labib.

Quispel had continued in his letter to Meier (see above):

They have not yet been prepared in a scholarly way and put under plexiglass, and for this reason cannot yet be photographed by me.

Yet it is doubtful if Quispel could have gotten from Tano any such detailed information. All von Fischer had reported from Tano was much more general:

Tano, the antiquities dealer, thinks that the 40 missing leaves are in what is sequestered!

Hence the disparity to which Puech calls attention may be no more than a careless mistake on the part of Quispel. In his Memorandum written in Cairo on 31 March 1955 (see above), he had referred (item 3) to there being 36 pages missing from the Jung Codex, simply by omitting any reference to the leaf pp. 49/50 from *The Letter to Rheginus*.

Puech’s letter to Quispel went on:

128 7 xii 53: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Tano, der Antiquar, meint, die 40 fehlenden Blätter seien in Sequester!

129 4 v 55: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Avez-vous pu obtenir au Caire quelques renseignements sur les intentions des autorités égyptiennes touchant le sort et la publication du reste de la découverte de N.H.? Aux dernières nouvelles, il ne s’agirait plus d’une édition photographique des papyrus, mais simplement de l’exécution de photographies qui seraient communiquées aux savants (mais à qui, exactement, et par qui?). La constitution d’un Comité international de publication ne paraît pas avoir été encore décidée.

Un détail important ne laisse pas d’inquiéter: le Gouvernement égyptien se considère-t-il maintenant, et est-il pleinement en droit de se considérer, comme l’unique et
Have you been able to obtain in Cairo some information on the intentions of the Egyptian authorities having to do with the fate and the publication of the rest of the discovery of N[ag] H[ammadi]?

According to the most recent news, it no longer would have to do with a photographic edition of the papyri, but simply of the making of photographs that would be communicated to scholars (but to whom, exactly, and by whom?). The constitution of an International Committee of publication does not seem yet to have been decided.

An important detail does not stop disturbing me: Does the Egyptian government now consider itself, and does it fully have the right to consider itself, as the unique and legitimate possessor of the papyri, and, for its part, the consortium of antiquity dealers, grouped behind Mlle D[attari], does it consider the question resolved and does it renounce any claim? Have you made an investigation about this aspect of the situation?

Puech’s hopes that the publication of a facsimile edition could be avoided, and hence the French monopoly maintained, may have been no more than wishful thinking on his part, perhaps proposed on his behalf by the French Embassy or the French Institute in Cairo. On the other hand, the final legal decision that the material no longer belonged to Tano-Dattari but was now national property does seem to have taken place.

Malinine, who himself had just returned from Cairo, wrote Quispel about Puech’s attitude. 

I presented to him as best I could the situation in Cairo. ... I had to soften the description rather heavily. After all, it is up to him to understand, on the scene itself, the mental state of the Egyptians, and as a result to modify his conduct in this whole affair.

On 11 May 1955 Pahor Labib wrote a brief note to Quispel:

légitime possesseur des papyrus, et, de son côté, le consortium d’antiquaires, groupé derrière Mlle D., tient-il la question pour résolue et renonce-t-il à toute revendication? Vous êtes-vous enquis de cet aspect de la situation?

130 10–11 v 55: Letter from Malinine to Quispel:

Je lui ai présenté comme j’ai pu, la situation du Caire. ... J’ai dû adoucir la description, assez sensiblement. Après tout, c’est à lui de comprendre, sur place, l’état d’esprit des égyptiens et de modifier en conséquence son comportement dans toute cette affaire.

131 11 v 55: Letter from Pahor Labib to Quispel:

Vielen Dank für Ihren sehr liebenswürdigen Brief vom 30. April 55, und für Ihre drei lehrreiche Bücher: ...

Von Herrn Prof. Meier, habe ich noch nicht gehört. Und besten Dank dafür.
Many thanks for your very lovable letter of 30 April 1955, and for your three informative books: ...

From Prof. Meier I have not yet heard. And many thanks for them.

Thus neither Puech nor Meier were doing anything useful to support Quispel. In retrospect, Quispel deserves full recognition for his very practical diplomatic efforts. While Meier and Puech were attending a scholarly congress on the history of religions in Rome, Quispel was in Cairo to see what he could get done literally with his feet on the ground. They seemed to assume that they could just write letters from their distinguished positions in order to create an International Committee to control the Nag Hammadi codices, of which each hoped to be the chairperson, whereas Quispel, who had no such divisive plan to chair the International Committee, did the preparatory work in Cairo to make publication possible.

At the quite literal level, he did not attain his objectives in Cairo. He did verify that ‘the missing forty pages’ were at the Coptic Museum as the property of the Egyptian government, but he did not get agreement for the Jung Institute to publish them, and he did not return with photographs of these missing materials. Yet he did reach agreement on how it could be done. The objective could be attained by Meier promising in writing to return the Jung Codex to Egypt, and requesting in writing permission from Mustafa Amr to publish ‘the missing forty pages.’ He did not get the International Committee officially appointed, but he did achieve a semi-official agreement as to its membership including the three of them, an agreement that became official and was acted on favorably by Pahor Labib a year later.

The crucial importance of these achievements on the part of Quispel is reflected in letters from Doresse to Puech proposing he go to Egypt, written in complete ignorance of Quispel’s trip to Egypt:132

There is, to my knowledge, still nothing new at the Coptic Museum, and I wonder if we can even expedite things in any way. In any case, I am going to have the opportunity, be it in the coming days, be it a bit later, to make a trip to Cairo, and I would want to use it in the way that is the most effective.

---

132 3 v 55: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Il n’a toujours, à ma connaissance, rien de nouveau au Musée Copte et je me demande si nous pouvons même hâter les choses en quoi que ce soit. De toute façon, je vais avoir l’occasion, soit dans les jours qui viennent, soit un peu plus tard, de faire un séjour au Caire, et je désirerais l’utiliser de la manière la plus efficace.
A week later Doresse repeated this suggestion to Puech: 133

Here I am then, free for work on Gnosticism, thought I still have to await the arrival of all my documents that are in Ethiopia. The most urgent would be to envisage the question of the trip to Cairo that I could perhaps accomplish any time from now on.

Doresse would only be able to learn from Pahor Labib the plans that Quispel had worked out, which however did include Doresse as a member of the International Committee. It was Puech who decided to exclude Doresse from the International Committee, and to take Antoine Guillaumont with him to Cairo instead (see Chapter 6, Part 2 below).

5. *The Nag Hammadi Publisher E.J. Brill*

The rôle played by the publishing house E.J. Brill in the publication of the Nag Hammadi Codices is documented throughout this volume, from the Foreword with which it opens to the Acknowledgements with which it closes. When van Proosdij was Director, Brill began its involvement by printing the Coptic transcription of *The Gospel of Truth* for the Rascher Verlag, which did not have that capability, and continued on to the publication of the best-selling *Nag Hammadi editio princeps, The Gospel of Thomas*. Then, when F.C. Wieder Jr. was Director, it launched the monograph series Nag Hammadi (and Manichaean) Studies, currently seventy-one volumes and still counting, involving the present volume *The Nag Hammadi Story* and beyond. It included a sub-series The Coptic Gnostic Library in thirteen volumes, reprinted in five paperback volumes. It published *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices* in twelve volumes, promptly followed by *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* with several reprints. All of this is not narrated in detail here, since it is narrated throughout this work.

Let it suffice to present here two dimensions not otherwise covered: One is that the Director van Proosdij and Quispel worked out Brill's initial offer to the International Committee of Gnosticism to publish the *editio princeps* of the Nag Hammadi Codices, though this did not materialize except for their small unofficial edition of *The Gospel of Thomas*. The other is the

---

133 n v 55: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Me voilà donc libre pour les travaux sur la gnose, bien que je doive attendre encore l'arrivée de tous mes documents qui sont en Éthiopie. Le plus urgent serait d'envisager la question du voyage au Caire que je pourrais peut-être accomplir dès maintenant.
close bond that developed between its subsequent Director, F.C. Wieder, Jr., and myself. It is this which made it possible for me to carry through the complex program of UNESCO’s International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, with which I as Permanent Secretary was entrusted, and of which the present work is the last installment.

Gilles Quispel met with the Director of Brill following the Cairo meeting of the International Committee of Gnosticism in October 1956 and drew up, on Brill’s letterhead, proposals for publishing the Nag Hammadi Codices: 134

International Committee for the Study and Publication of the Gnostic Papyri of the Coptic Museum

Leader of the Committee: Dr. Pahor Labib, Permanent Secretary, further, there is a working committee consisting of Messrs Puech, Quispel and Till. On behalf of the Committee Professor Quispel negotiates with the firm Brill. The Committee had a meeting and reached an outcome that still has to be ratified by the High Council of Antiquities.

The following decisions have been made:

1. Brill publishes a definitive version of the whole collection.
2. The Committee members have the right to publish studies, books, and translations.
3. Dr. Pahor Labib publishes photographic reproductions.
4. Puech is willing to give up the publication of the Ἀπόκριφον Ἰωάννης [sic!], already printed at the Imprimerie Nationale. This printing came about without authorization by the Egyptian authorities and cannot be put on the market. The format is small octavo and would not agree with point 5.

---

134 Document on the letterhead reading “N.V. Boekhandel en Drukkerij v/h E.J. Brill Directie Leiden”:

International Committee for the Study and Publication of the Gnostic Papyri of the Coptic Museum

Leden van het Committee: Dr. Pahor Labib, Permanent Secretary, verder is er een working committee bestaande uit de heren Puech, Quispel en Till. Namens het Committee onderhandelt Professor Quispel met de Firma Brill. Het Committee heeft vergaderd en een beslissing genomen die nog geratificeerd moet worden door de high counsel of Antiquities.

De volgende besluiten zijn genomen:

1) Brill geeft een definitieve uitgave van het geheel uit.
2) De Committee-leden hebben het recht, studies, boeken en vertalingen te publiceren.
3) Dr Pahor Labib publiceert foto-reproducties.
4) De heer Puech is bereid de uitgave van het Ἀπόκριφον Ἰωάννης reeds gedrukt bij de Imprimerie Nationale, af te staan. Deze druk is tot stand gekomen zonder
5. As a model of the corpus, the publication of *Evangelium Veritatis* will be used, without the photographic plates.

6. For the Coptic letters, the new type has to be used (not that of *Evangelium Veritatis*).

7. The λόγια Ἰησοῦ are 20 pages of manuscript. New photographs of them have to be taken and added to the publication. The edition should be prepared by Dr. Pahor Labib, Messrs Yassah 'Abd al-Masīḥ, Puech and Quispel. The edition can appear soon, i.e., before April 1958, when the Committee will convene.

8. The Jung Codex. The Jung Foundation still has the right to publish this with the Coptic text. Quispel will try to bring it about that it releases its rights to the Coptic text in favor of Brill.

9. Subsidy. The principle would be that those giving a subsidy are to receive a certain number of copies in return for their subsidy. A request for a subsidy has been made to the Bollingen Foundation.

The International Committee of Gnosticism was the name used on the sign displayed prominently and even photographed at the meeting itself, but on the present document it has been reformulated as the International Committee for the Study and Publication of the Gnostic Papyri of the Coptic Museum. This brings into the title itself the main objectives of Puech and Quispel, the authorization to study and publish the Nag Hammadi codices.

The meeting in September and October 1956 produced neither official minutes nor the follow-up meeting it projected for April 1958. Therefore the plans listed here did not materialize as envisaged. The definitive critical edition was not published by the International Committee of Gnosticism (item

1) or by its successor, the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, but rather by the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity; yet Brill was nevertheless the publisher. The publication of the one volume of Pahor Labib’s facsimile edition, presented on 29 September 1956 to the members of the International Committee of Gnosticism on their arrival in Cairo, did put these texts into the public domain; hence members of the Committee did have the right to publish studies, books, and translations about them (item 2), but so did other scholars, whose translations actually preceded those of the official Committee members. Pahor Labib’s facsimile edition (item 3) was not continued, but rather was replaced by *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices* sponsored by the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices; yet again Brill was the publisher. Puech did not publish *The Apocryphon of John* (item 4), actually prepared inadequately by Doresse, though envisaged by Puech as the launching of a French *editio princeps* of all the Nag Hammadi Codices published by the *Imprimerie Nationale*. The proposal to use the Jung Institute’s edition of *The Gospel of Truth* as the model (item 5), though without facsimiles, and with new Coptic fonts136 (item 6), was oriented toward Brill for the Coptic fonts (item 8). *The Gospel of Thomas* (item 7) was indeed published by Brill, but only toward the end of 1959, not prior to April 1958, and then only by adding Guillaumont and Till to produce publishable French and German translations, while not naming Pahor Labib, which made it impossible to present it as an official publication of the International Committee of Gnosticism. The Bollingen Foundation did not subsidize the publication (item 9).

What is perhaps most significant in this document is that while lip service is paid to the Jung Institute (without mentioning the Rascher Verlag) and to the *Imprimerie Nationale*, the efforts of Meier on the one hand and Puech on the other to have their publisher be entrusted with the whole *editio princeps* is simply bypassed, in favor of Brill as the publisher of the whole, placed at the head of the document as item 1.

Perhaps the most important contribution of Quispel is involving Brill in the planning from the very beginning back in 1956, even though almost nothing came of it at the practical level. Yet it did prepare the groundwork for the efforts I undertook more than a decade later to enlist Brill in the enterprise. Though I did not go to Brill accompanied by Quispel (but by a

---

136 6 ii 57: Letter from Quispel to Till mentioning the new Coptic fonts.
Dutch-American, Frederik Wisse), Wieder's willingness, indeed eagerness, to publish the material with no subsidy on my part was due both to the initiatives of Quispel and to the dramatic sales record of the one tractate published up until then by Brill, *The Gospel of Thomas* (see Chapter 7, Part 5 below).

Since the academic collaboration between Wieder and myself is documented throughout the present volume, I limit myself here to the personal bond that kept us together, a never-stated but clearly-perceived shared intention to do whatever it took to get the Nag Hammadi codices published.

At first I addressed Wieder with the title Dr. Wieder, since I had heard him referred to with that title. But when this persisted, he corrected me, saying he had not earned a doctorate and did not find a doctorate necessary for him to carry on his work as publisher. Though on occasion people may have reminded me that they had a doctorate, this is the only time a person reminded me that he did not have a doctorate.

At the time of the International Congress of Learned Societies in the Field of Religion that I organized to meet at the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles 1–5 September 1972, I offered free round-trip seats on a charter plane (which I had arranged from London to Los Angeles for members of the Society for New Testament Studies) also to F.C. Wieder, Jr. and his wife, and to his assistant Edridge and his wife, which they were glad to accept. On their arrival they together presented me with an antique Coptic fabric they had found somewhere in an antique shop in the Netherlands.

Wieder volunteered for Brill to contribute $2,000 to the Nag Hammadi excavations I was organizing a few years later, without even making as a condition that Brill publish whatever might be found in the excavation. He and I worked so closely together that it was not necessary to state such a condition. In fact, no volume on the site of the discovery resulted from the excavation.

When I was changing planes once at Paris, on the way to Cairo, I found him at the foot of the stairs on the tarmac of the Charles de Gaulle airport. He was upset that the book by Jacques-É. Ménard, *L’Évangile de Vérité*, which Brill had published in 1972, was too similar to another book on the same topic by Ménard published elsewhere a decade earlier. I pointed out that

---

in our contract it was Krause, not myself, who was responsible for books proposed from the continent of Europe, whereas I was only responsible for books proposed from the United Kingdom and North America. Ménard was Professor of the History of Religions in the Catholic Faculty of Theology at the University of Strasbourg, France. So I suggested to Wieder that he address himself to Krause.

In 1992 Krause set up a monograph series of his own, where dissertations could be published, which tended to compete with Brill's Nag Hammadi Studies. When in 1994 Nag Hammadi Studies was reorganized to include Manichaean studies, and was renamed Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, a new editorial board was formed, excluding Krause. The page facing the title page now read: “Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, formerly Nag Hammadi Studies, edited by J.M. Robinson & H.J. Klimkeit, Editorial Board H.W. Attridge, R.A. Cameron, W.-P. Funk, C.W. Hedrick, H. Jackson, D.M. Parrott, B.A. Pearson, K. Rudolph, W. Sundermann, F. Wisse.”

Wieder inquired of me whether he should attend the first International Congress of Coptology in Cairo in December 1975, in view of proposing a journal of Coptic studies. He wrote that he was torn, since it would mean missing Christmas with his grandchildren. I wrote back that there were hardly enough Coptic scholars to fund a Coptic journal, and hence I voted for the grandchildren. He did not attend. A number of papers presented at the Congress were published in a special fascicle of the journal *Enchoria* 8 (1978). A volume of papers related to Gnosticism was published in Nag Hammadi Studies. A second volume of papers from the Congress was also published by Brill, in a new series entitled Coptic Studies launched by Martin Krause. But that series has indeed remained stagnant. The International Association for Coptic Studies began an annual *Journal of Coptic Studies* only in 1999.

---

142 *Journal of Coptic Studies*, ed. Karlheinz Schüssler, 1 (1999) ff. At first it could only be ordered through the International Association for Coptic Studies, but it is now listed in the Peeters catalogue for 2008 at a subscription rate of 60 Euros.
Brill published in 1983 a small volume in honor of its three-hundredth anniversary. The title of the volume, *Tuta sub Aegide Pallas*, ‘Pallas is Safe under the Shield [of Zeus],’ refers to Athena the goddess of wisdom, whose epithet is Pallas. ‘Aegis’ is closely associated with her, as the dictionary reports: ‘a shield or breastplate emblematic of majesty that was originally associated chiefly with Zeus but later mainly with Athena.’ This Latin motto is printed in a circle on all Brill publications as well as its letterhead. Indeed, in 1983 it was embossed on ties presented to its authors. Wieder presented one to me when we met that year, which I still wear on August academic occasions. The lead essay in the commemorative volume *Tuta sub Aegide Pallas*, entitled ‘Theology, Religious Studies and Judaic Studies,’ had a section on ‘New Testament and Gnostic Studies,’ which concluded:

It is publications on Gnostic literature, however, to which we are bound to pay special attention. The discovery of the papyrus codices near Nag Hammadi immediately posed the problem of the editing of the texts they contained. As early as in 1959 Brill’s published the *editio princeps* of the best known and most widely studied Nag Hammadi text, the Gospel of Thomas. Nevertheless the publication of most of the other texts was delayed by several circumstances. A very large part of the find remained unknown to most of those interested until a (new) international committee of scholars decided upon a facsimile edition of the 13 codices (for this story see J.M. Robinson in *New Testament Studies* 16 [1969–1970], 185–187, and *ibidem* 18 [1971–1972], 236–242). This edition appeared at Brill’s over a period of five years (1972–1977), a remarkable feat (*The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices* published under the auspices of the Department of Antiquities of the Arab Republic of Egypt in conjunction with UNESCO). In 1977 there also appeared the English translation of all of the Nag Hammadi documents (*The Nag Hammadi Library in English*), which finally allowed the non-specialist to acquaint himself with the content of the whole find. The series ‘Nag Hammadi Studies,’ which began in 1971 and already contains 17 volumes, has presented new critical editions of a number of codices (see nos. 4, 11, and 15). All in all, these publications constitute without doubt a milestone in the history of research into Gnosticism.

---

CHAPTER SIX

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF GNOSTICISM 1956

1. To Attend or Not to Attend the International Committee Meeting in Cairo

Immediately on his return to Paris from the presentation of *The Gospel of Truth* to Jung for his 80th birthday on 25 July 1955, Puech wrote Meier that he had heard that Pahor Labib had put Doresse instead of Puech on the International Committee:

Mr. Mourad Kamel, Vice-President of the new Coptic Institute of Cairo, at present on an official mission to Paris and in Europe, has informed me that the composition of the International Committee of publication of the papyri of Nag Hamadi had been fixed, about three weeks ago, by Dr. Pahor Labib, and would soon be submitted for the approval of the Governmental Council that,

---

1. iii vii 55: Letter from Puech to Meier:

M. Mourad Kamel, vice-président du nouvel Institut Copte du Caire, actuellement en mission officielle à Paris et en Europe, m’a appris que la composition du Comité international de publication des papyrus de Nag Hamadi avait été fixée, il y a environ trois semaines, par le Dr. Pahor Labib et serait bientôt soumise à l’approbation du Conseil Gouvernemental, lequel, très vraisemblablement, se contenterait d’entériner la proposition. Or, mon nom serait exclu de ceux des membres du Comité, qui, en revanche, comprendrait Doresse. Le prétexte pris pour m’écarter est que mon nom n’a, paraît-il, guère été prononcé au cours des négociations, que (quelle récompense de ma discrétion!) je ne me suis pas assez manifesté et que, le Comité ne pouvant inclure deux français, il avait lieu de me préférer Doresse. ...

Puisque le Dr. Labib a l’air de tenir à la présence de Doresse et qu’il serait, paraît-il, difficile d’introduire plus d’un français dans le Comité proprement dit, vous pourriez proposer la formule suivante: *Membres du Comité de publication* (outre les personnalités égyptiennes), MM. Till, Meier, Quispel, Puech; *Secrétaires du Comité*: un jeune savant égyptien (sans doute, le technicien qui sera chargé de faire les photographies des papyrus) et Doresse. ...

Je vous signale que, d’après les informations qui m’ont été transmises par M. Kamel, les égyptiens songeraient à publier tout d’abord, et le plus rapidement possible, les papyrus en fac-similé photographique, les mettant ainsi à la disposition de tous. Si le désaccord subsistait à mon égard, il nous serait de la sorte permis d’envisager, ainsi que nous l’avons fait au cours de nos conversations, une édition personnelle, indépendante, de tous les ouvrages découverts.
very probably, would be happy to ratify the proposition. Well, my name would be excluded from those of the members of the Committee, which, on the other hand, would include Doresse. The pretext given for eliminating me is that my name has, it seems, hardly been mentioned in the course of the negotiations, that I have not manifested myself enough (what reward for my discretion!), and that, since the Committee could not include two Frenchmen, he had good reason to prefer Doresse to me. ...

Since Dr. Labib has the air of insisting on the presence of Doresse, and it would, it seems, be difficult to introduce more than one Frenchman into the Committee strictly speaking, you could propose the following formula: Members of the Committee of publication (other that the Egyptian personalities), Messrs Till, Meier, Quispel, Puech; Secretaries of the Committee: a young Egyptian scholar (no doubt the technician who will be charged with making the photographs of the papyri) and Doresse. ...

I indicate to you that, according to the information that has been transmitted to me by Kamel, the Egyptians would plan to publish first of all, and as rapidly as possible, the papyri in photographic facsimiles, thus putting them at the free disposal of all. If the disagreement continued with regard to me, it would as a result be permissible for us to envisage, as we have done in the course of our conversations, a personal, independent edition of all the works discovered.

Meier had copies of this letter sent to Rahn and to Quispel.

Yet at the beginning of January 1956 Mourad Kamel notified Puech that Egypt was about to announce officially an International Committee that would include both him and Gilles Quispel, as Puech promptly reported to Quispel: 2

One of our shared hopes seems already gratified, or on the way to being: To believe a letter that I have just received from Mourad Kamel, the International Committee of publication of the papyri of N[ag] H[ammadi] has been constituted a short time ago and I would decidedly be a member of it. Let us however await the details or the official confirmation. The news that I have been able to obtain previously from other sources was much less encouraging.

---

2 15 i 56: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Un de nos souhaits communs paraît déjà comblé ou en voie de l’être: à en croire une lettre que je viens de recevoir de M. Mourad Kamel, le Comité international de publication des papyrus de N.H. aurait été constitué il y a peu de temps et j’en ferais décidément partie. Attendons cependant les détails ou la confirmation officielle. Les nouvelles que j’avais pu avoir auparavant d’autres sources étaient bien moins encourageantes.
But when a month had elapsed and no official invitation was forthcoming, Puech expressed his concern to Quispel:  

No news from Cairo, or, at least, nothing official. I have been strongly advised to have UNESCO intervene.

Finally in June 1956 Puech heard of the official constitution of the International Committee, as he notified Meier:

Very agreeable news awaited me, of which, according to what was reported to me, you yourself—the only one, with me—should already have been informed: The official constitution of the International Committee of publication of the papyri of N[ag] H[ammadi] (Meier, Peterson or Pedersen [?], Puech, Quispel, Till, and, as General Secretary, Pahor Labib), and the plan for a meeting of the Committee in Cairo toward the end of September or the beginning of October. As soon as this information is made precise and a more than semi-official confirmation has been received, we will need to envisage in all their details, and rather soon (before the beginning of the vacations, in any case) the innumerable and serious questions raised by the expected trip and sojourn, as well as by the agenda or the objective of the meeting (the rôle of the Committee, the plan and modalities of the edition, the photography of the manuscripts, the constitution of the teams of collaborators, etc.)

This was followed promptly by another letter, this time to Quispel:

---

3 17 ii 56: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Aucune nouvelle du Caire, ou, tout au moins, rien d’officiel. Il m’est fortement conseillé de faire intervenir l’UNESCO.

4 15 vi 56: Letter from Puech to Meier:

De fort agréables nouvelles m’attendaient, dont, d’après ce qui m’est rapporté, vous devez être vous-même—et le seul avec moi—déjà informé: la constitution officielle du Comité international de publication des papyrus de N.H. (Meier, Peterson ou Pedersen [?], Puech, Quispel, Till et, comme secrétaire général, Pahor Labib) et le projet d’une réunion du Comité au Caire vers la fin de septembre ou au début d’octobre. Dès que ces informations auront été précisées et reçu une confirmation plus que semi-officielle, il nous faudra envisager dans tous leurs détails et assez tôt (avant le début des vacances, en tout cas) les innombrables et graves questions soulevées par le voyage et le séjour prévu aussi bien que par l’ordre du jour ou l’objet de la réunion (rôles du Comité, plan et modalités de l’édition, photographie des manuscrits, constitution des équipes de collaborateurs, etc.)

5 20 vi 56: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

En particulier, qui est le Peterson ou le Pedersen (un suédois ou un américain, paraît-il) dont il est fait mention parmi les membres du Comité?

Il faudra, en effet, prendre assez tôt nos dispositions pour le voyage et nous entendre assez à l’avance sur les propositions à soumettre aux Égyptiens. Si nous pouvions faire
In particular, who is the Peterson or the Pedersen (a Swede or an American, it seems), mentioned among the members of the Committee?

In effect, we will need to make rather soon our plans for the trip, and reach agreement among ourselves far enough in advance on the propositions to submit to the Egyptians. If we could travel together, that would be perfect. In case, as one has led me to expect, the sojourn in Cairo is extended, I would without doubt be led, so as to economize my credits, to accept the hospitality that is offered to me at the *Institut Français*. However let us not form projects too precisely, so long as we have not received the official invitation.

A letter of invitation signed by Pahor Labib was sent to the members of the International Committee on 7 July 1956. It read as follows:vi.

As you know 13 Papyrus Codex dealing with Gnosticism have been discovered some time ago. The Coptic Museum at Old Cairo is entitled now to publish these texts. The High Council of Antiquities of Egypt and the direction of the Coptic Museum have decided to form an international committee in order to publish the complete and definite edition of the volumes. H.E. the Minister of Education approved the idea.

Will you please accept this invitation to work with us as a member of this committee. The first meeting will take place in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo on 29th September 1956 and our work together will continue till 27th October 1956.

I am sending this invitation to you, hoping that you can join us at your own expense.

With personal greetings, I am, Yours sincerely Dr. Pahor Labib Director

Doresse contacted Puech to see how to arrange his trip, in hopes of being able on this occasion to photograph the codices:

---

vi 7 vii 56: Letters from Pahor Labib to Doresse, Meier, Quispel.

vii 17 vii 56: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je suppose que vous avez, de votre côté, reçu la même invitation et j’attends que vous me le confirmez pour répondre par une acceptation de principe.

Il reste à savoir comment organiser les choses pour pouvoir faire, dès le milieu de septembre, le voyage d’Égypte, et cela dans des conditions telles que l’on en revienne avec, si possible, les photographies des manuscrits. Au point de vue de ce dernier travail, je suis entièrement prêt.
I suppose that you for your part have received the same invitation, and I wait for you to confirm it to me, in order to reply with an acceptance in principle.

It remains to know how to organize things to be able to make the Egypt trip from the middle of September, and to do that in such a way that one comes back from there with, if possible, the photographs of the manuscripts. From the point of view of this last-mentioned task, I am entirely ready.

Puech replied by setting up an appointment for 20 July 1956, and added his hopes of having further information:

I hope to have by then some further information that will permit me to see a bit more clearly into a situation that seems to me singularly complicated and difficult.

Following his meeting with Puech, Doresse replied to Pahor Labib:

As soon as I received your kind invitation, I took steps in order to free myself and to be in Cairo before the 29th of September. But, till now, the matter is somewhat difficult for me. I have different engagements here until the beginning of 1957, and it will be only a chance if I obtain the possibility to postpone all of them. So I can't, for the moment, give a complete acceptance of your very kind invitation. It's only after a few weeks that I will know what will be the answer from the different authorities entitled to direct my actual work.

Perhaps, some other members of the intended committee will find themselves in the same sort of difficulties as I myself am? Under these circumstances, may I suggest we have a first discussion by letters, all of us, in order to select a time when everyone will be free to get to Cairo and to start the new work under your direction?

Doresse sent copies of Pahor Labib's invitation with almost identical covering letters to Claude F.-A. Schaeffer, General Secretary of the Commission of Excavations, to the Direction of Cultural Relations of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and to L. Plin, the Director of the Fourth Bureau on Non-Classical Civilizations of the *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*:

---

8 17 vii 56: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

J’espère d’ici là quelques compléments d’information qui me permettront d’y voir un peu plus clair dans une situation qui me paraît singulièrement compliquée et difficile.

9 24 vii 56: Letter from Doresse to Pahor Labib.

10 24 vii 56: Letters to Schaeffer, to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and to Plin; that to Plin is quoted here:

Je vous serais reconnaissant d’envisager dans quelle mesure je pourrai être mis en
I would be grateful to you to envisage to what extent I will be able to be put in a position to reply to this invitation, of going to participate in the work of the Committee of which I have just been named a member.

Based upon what can be decided, I will let Dr. Pahor Labib know either my complete acceptance, or my absolute refusal to participate in the edition of these documents, of which I personally made the discovery.

Schaeffer responded that he could submit the application to the Commission of Excavations only in January 1957:11

I have the honor to acknowledge reception of your letter of 24 July. Its content will be submitted to the Commission of Excavations when it meets in the month of January 1957. I am obliged to mention however an inexactitude in your letter: To the extent I am aware, the documents were not discovered by you personally. If I am mistaken, please clarify it for me. In the reverse case, I will not take into consideration this affirmation in your letter at the time of its discussion before the commission.

Doresse first sent to Drioton a draft of his reply to Schaeffer (in which he questioned Doresse's reference to himself as the 'discoverer'), whereupon Drioton responded:12

mesure de répondre à cette invitation en allant participer aux travaux du Comité dont je vient d’être nommé membre.

Suivant ce qui pourra être décidé, je ferais connaître au Dr. Pahor Labib, soit mon acceptation complète, soit mon refus absolu de participer à l’édition de ces documents, dont j’avais fait personnellement la découverte.

11 1 viii 56: Letter from Schaeffer to Doresse:
J’ai l’honneur d’accuser réception de votre lettre du 24 juillet. Son contenu sera soumis à la Commission des Fouilles quand elle se réunira au mois de janvier 1957. Je suis obligé de relever cependant une inexactitude dans votre lettre: autant que je sache, les documents n’ont pas été découverts par vous personnellement. Si je me trompais, veuillez me le préciser. Dans le cas contraire, je ne tiendrai pas compte de cette affirmation dans votre lettre lors de sa discussion devant la commission.

12 8 viii 56: Letter from Drioton to Doresse:
Je suis, comme vous, offensé de l’assertion contenue dans la lettre de Schaeffer, mais votre projet de réponse est bon et solide.

Il ne faut pas jouer sur les mots. Vous avez découvert les papyrus gnostiques en ce sens que c’est vous qui les avez identifiés et reconnu leur intérêt de premier ordre. J’essaie en vain de me rappeler si c’est à propos de ce lot, ou des papyrus d’Origène, que Tano m’a raconté qu’il les avait offerts à Kuentz (à ce moment le tout était proposé pour 400 livres) et que celui-ci lui avait répondu: “Ce ne sont que des textes religieux, ils sont sans intérêt.”
I am, as are you, offended by the assertion contained in the letter of Schaeffer, but your draft of a reply is good and solid.

One should not play with words. You discovered the Gnostic papyri in this sense, that it is you who identified them and recognized that their value was of the first order. I try in vain to recall whether it is with regard to this lot, or the papyri of Origen, that Tano told me that he had offered them to Kuentz [Director of the French Institute] (at that time the whole was offered for 400 pounds), and that the latter had replied to him: ‘These are only religious texts, they are of no interest.’

Thereupon Doresse sent a final draft to Schaeffer:13

I have the honor to thank you for your letter of the first of August. I regret that the very concise terms of my letter could seem ambiguous to you. It is indeed the case that the Coptic Gnostic manuscripts have not been discovered by me in the course of excavations, but rather in Cairo where they had already arrived. Nonetheless I am alone in being able to claim the honor of their discovery from the scientific point of view.

But Doresse’s application for funding from the C.N.R.S. was turned down:14

It is impossible for the Direction of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique to give its assent to the trip that you project in Egypt.

Much the same reply came from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs:15

I believe I know that the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique from which you depend has already notified you that it is not in a position to remunerate you except for work done in France itself.

---

13 21 viii 56: Letter from Doresse to Schaeffer:

J’ai l’honneur de vous remercier de votre lettre du 1er août. Je regrette que les termes très concis de ma lettre aient pu vous paraître ambigus. Il est effectif que les manuscrits gnostiques coptes n’ont pas été retrouvés par moi au cours de fouilles, mais au Caire où ils étaient déjà parvenus. Je suis toutefois seul à pouvoir revendiquer l’honneur de leur découverte au point de vue scientifique.

14 27 vii 56: Letter from Plin to Doresse:

Il est impossible à la Direction du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique de donner son assentiment au voyage que vous projetez en Égypte.

15 2 viii 56: The Ministry of Foreign Affairs to Doresse:

Je crois savoir que le Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique dont vous dépendez, vous a fait connaître antérieurement qu’il n’est en mesure de vous rémunérer que pour des travaux effectués en France même.
This refusal to provide funds for a trip to Egypt ignored Doresse’s threat to discontinue his assistance (‘my absolute refusal to participate’), if the necessary funding were not provided.

Doresse’s proposal that he photograph the codices during the month in Cairo was the basis for his argument that he should be funded for this trip. Yet photographing all the unconserved Nag Hammadi Codices during a month in Cairo still remained quite impossible. The very fragile leaves had still not been prepared for photography, which would involve removing them from their bindings, identifying the many fragments, placing each fragment correctly on the leaf to which it belonged, establishing the page sequence, and conserving the reconstituted leaves between panes of plexiglass, which were at the time not available in the Coptic Museum (for this laborious and time-consuming task see Chapter 11 below).

Doresse finally accepted the inevitable, that he could not attend the meeting in Cairo:  

I make careful note of the conditions posed by the Commission, and I confirm to you that I will carry out no mission in Egypt without the agreement of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, of the Commission of Excavations, and of the Department of Cultural Relations.

In view of the high priority Puech placed on securing photographs of the Cairo pages of the Nag Hammadi Codices, he had already written Quispel to find another alternative to Doresse as photographer in Cairo:  

---

16 6 ix 56: Letter from Doresse to Plin:

Je prends bonne note des conditions posées par la Commission, et je vous confirme que je n’accomplirai nulle mission en Égypte sans l’accord du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, de la Commission des Fouilles et du Département des Relations Culturelles.

17 6 viii 56: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Si nous allons au Caire (mais les circonstances le permettront-elles?), une des plus importantes des questions à régler sera celle de la photographie des papyrus. Plus exactement, celle du financement des travaux photographiques. Je ne sais si, comme ce serait le mieux, les Égyptiens prendront l’affaire à leur charge. Au cas où nous aurions à nous débrouiller par nos propres moyens, il conviendrait d’aviser à une pareille éventualité (ainsi qu’à beaucoup d’autres, d’ailleurs). Il faudrait, assez longtemps à l’avance (et le temps presse), être assuré de l’appui financier d’un mécène ou, comme on nous l’a, semble-t-il, promis, de la Fondation Bollingen et trouver aussitôt sur place l’argent mis à notre disposition. Sinon, et bien qu’il soit bien tard pour accomplir les démarches nécessaires, je ne vois guère d’autre solution que de faire appel à l’UNESCO.
If we go to Cairo (but do the [political] circumstances permit it?), one of the most important questions to resolve will be that of the photography of the papyri. More exactly, that of the financing of the photographic work. I do not know if the Egyptians will take over the matter at their expense, which would be best. In case we would have to manage by our own means, it would be helpful to envisage a parallel alternative (as well as many others, incidentally). It would be necessary, far enough in advance (and time is running short), to be assured of the financial support of a Maecenas or from the Bollingen Foundation, as it seems we have been promised, and find the money put at our free disposal immediately on the spot. If not, and though it is very late to accomplish the necessary steps, I hardly see any other solution than to appeal to UNESCO.

Quispel applied for funding from a Dutch source, and Meier also applied for funding from two Swiss sources. Though no funding was forthcoming, Meier did receive a thousand Swiss Francs from Page, to whom von Fischer recommended he apply. But it is unclear to what extent such funding would be allocated for travel expenses, and to what extent it could be used for photography, for which no concrete plan with a budget was ever set up.

Puech wrote Quispel from his vacation home in Cailar his suggestions for advancing their planning:

---

18 1 viii 56: Letter from J.H. Bannier to Quispel.
19 31 vii 56: Letter from Meier to Alexander von Muralt; 1 viii 56: Letter from Meier to Hans Pallmann.
20 3 viii 56: Letter from P. Sutermeister to Meier.
21 3 viii 56: Bank coupon from Page to Meier; 6 viii 56: Letter from Meier to Page.
22 5 viii 56: Letter from von Fischer to Meier.
23 Before 14 viii 56: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Je n’ai pas, comme vous, reçu une lettre de Dr. Pahor Labib. Il est vrai qu’il a pu m’écrire au Collège de France. ...

Si je ne puis assister au “meeting” (mais je crois que nous serions tous alors dans le même cas), il vaudrait mieux que Till fût, lui aussi, absent. Sinon, il mènera le jeu. Le silence de Meier, qui paraît oublier toutes ses promesses de Bilthoven et de Zürich, autorise bien des craintes.

Puisque vous ne devez partir que le 27, je vous enverrai auprès du 15 septembre (au cas où j’aurai du renoncer à mon voyage) une liste des points qui me semblent devoir être discutés ou acquis au cours des réunions. L’essentiel serait d’obtenir l’exécution et la distribution à chacun des membres du Comité (ou du moins, des membres qui s’occuperont effectivement et avec compétence de la publication) de toutes les photographies des papyrus avec le droit d’en disposer partiellement soit dans notre enseignement soit dans des conférences, articles ou livres, j’attache, vous le savez, une particulière importance à cette clause, en ce qui concerne les Logia de Jésus, l’Évangile de Thomas dont il me semble indispensable d’avoir cet hiver ce texte complet.
I have not, as have you, received a letter from Dr. Pahor Labib. It is true that he could have written to me at the Collège de France. ...

If I cannot attend the ‘meeting’ (but I fear that we would then be all in the same situation), it would be better that Till too be absent. If not, he will lead the game. The silence of Meier, who seems to forget all his promises of Bilthoven and of Zürich, really causes anxiety.

Since you are not able to leave until the 27th, I will send you around the 15th of September (in case I have to give up my trip) a list of the points that seem to me ought to be discussed or achieved in the course of the meetings. The essential thing would be to obtain the printing and distribution to each member of the Committee (or at least the members who will occupy themselves effectively and with competence in the publication) of all the photographs of the papyri, with the right to make use of them partially, be it in our teaching, be it in conferences, articles, or books. As you know, I attach a particular importance to this clause with regard to the Logia of Jesus, the Gospel of Thomas, of which it seems to me indispensable to have this winter the complete text.

It may well be the document Puech planned to send Quispel around the 15th of September that became his ‘Wishes’ and ‘Decisions’ used as replacement for the non-existent official Minutes of the Cairo meeting (see below).

Quispel wrote Meier what they needed to do to plan for the meeting, based in large part on Puech’s letter to Quispel:\textsuperscript{24}

Of course what now matters is that our plans are very precisely discussed in advance, and for this reason I would like to ask you the following:

\textsuperscript{24} 14 viii 56: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Allerdings kommt es jetzt darauf an, dass unsere Pläne vorher ganz genau besprochen sind, und ich möchte Sie deswegen Folgendes bitten:

1) Haben Sie sich schon entschieden, dass Sie auch unter den jetzigen Umständen den ganzen Kodex mitnehmen, oder stellen Sie sich vor, nur eine Seite symbolisch zu überreichen. Das letzte wäre vielleicht zu empfehlen, weil man dann noch immer etwas als Pfand in der Hand hat.

2) Wir müssen in Kairo den Ägyptern ganz konkrete Zusagen machen über die Herausgabe dieser Schriften. Haben Ihre Pläne entsprechend unseren gemeinsamen Besprechungen in Bilthoven und Zürich letztes Jahr, sich schon konkretisiert?

3) Ich vernehme, dass es vielleicht nötig sein wird, während unseres Aufenthalts in Kairo, die Photographien selber zu bezahlen. Allerdings weiss ich das nicht ganz genau, aber ich möchte Sie doch bitten, dafür Sorge zu tragen, dass wir, wenn nötig, über dieses Geld in Kairo verfügen können. Ich halte es für sehr wichtig, dass wir diese Photographien bekommen und mitnehmen, weil man ja nie weiss, was mit den Manuskripten geschehen wird.
1) Have you already decided to bring the whole codex along, under the present circumstances, or do you have in mind to present symbolically only one page. The latter would perhaps be what one should recommend, since one then still has something in the hand as security.

2) In Cairo we must make quite concrete agreements to the Egyptians about the publication of these texts. Have your plans already become concrete, corresponding to our shared discussions in Bilthoven and Zürich last year?

3) I hear that it will perhaps be necessary during our stay in Cairo for ourselves to pay for the photographs. To be sure, I do not know that very exactly, but I would like to ask you to be concerned with that, so that we can if necessary have access to this money in Cairo. I consider it very important that we get these photographs and bring them with us, since one never knows what will happen with the manuscripts.

Till heard of the meeting, though his invitation had not reached him in Austria. He wrote Quispel on 9 August 1956 that complications with his passport would prevent his attending at the appropriate time:

If it should really be planned to invite me for a trip to Egypt, then it is quite impossible for me at the present time even to give an estimate of when I would, on the basis of the described circumstances, be in a position to accept such an invitation. I fear it can hardly be done before December.

He wrote Quispel more positively on 15 August 1956, though still without having received the invitation from Pahor Labib:

If I should in fact come to Cairo, then it is irrelevant to me who bears the cost, so long as I myself do not have to come up with it, which would of course be impossible for me. ...

In this case I could get for myself the Egyptian visa in Vienna. However the presupposition would be that I can show an invitation of an Egyptian office.

---

25 9 viii 56: Letter from Till to Quispel:

Sollte es wirklich geplant sein, mich zu einer Fahrt nach Ägypten einzuladen, so ist es mir im gegenwärtigen Zeitpunkt ganz unmöglich, auch nur schätzungsweise anzugeben, wann ich auf Grund der geschilderten Umstände in der Lage sein würde, einer solchen Einladung Folge zu leisten. Ich fürchte, es wird sich vor Dezember kaum machen lassen.

26 15 viii 56: Letter from Till to Quispel:

Sollte ich tatsächlich nach Cairo kommen, so ist es mir einerlei, wer die Kosten trägt, wenn nur nicht ich selbst dafür aufkommen muss, was mir natürlich unmöglich wäre. ...

Puech alerted Quispel both to the problem with the photography, after having blocked Doresse's participation, and to the status of Till's participation:27

The only question that preoccupies me is that of the execution and the financing of the photographs of all the papyri, which Dr. Pahor Labib will permit us, it seems, full liberty to make, and of which a complete file should in all decency be provided to each of the (competent) members of the Committee.

Perhaps, given the circumstances, Dr. Labib will consider it better to postpone the ‘meeting’ to a later date and will notify us in time. But this is hardly probable. It would be especially necessary to know if Till has accepted the invitation, and if so, given his status as professor in England, whether there will not be for him also difficulties to go there.

Quispel alerted Meier to all the financial problems:28

As you know, Till as an Austrian is the only scholar in the field whom the Egyptians prize and do not distrust. Besides, he is the only coptological

---

27 17 viii 56: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

La seule question qui me préoccupe est celle de l’exécution et du financement des photographies de tous les papyri que le Dr. Pahor Labib nous laissera, paraît-il, toute liberté de faire et dont un jeu complet devrait décemment être remis à chacun des membres (compétents) du Comité.

Peut-être, étant donné les circonstances, le Dr. Labib jugera-t-il meilleur de remettre le “meeting” à une date ultérieure et nous préviendra-t-il à temps. Mais c’est peu probable. Il faudrait surtout savoir si Till a accepté l’invitation et si, en sa qualité de professeur en Angleterre, il n’aura pas, lui aussi, des difficultés à s’y rendre.

28 20 viii 56: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

Wie Sie wissen ist Till als Österreicher der einzige Fachgelehrte, den die Ägypter schätzen und nicht misstrauen. Ausserdem ist er der einzige koptologische Fachspezialist unter uns und ohne ihn geht es einfach nicht. Ich möchte Sie doch dringend fragen, mit Page darüber zu sprechen und wenn möglich Herrn Till Ihre günstige Entscheidung sofort mitzuteilen. ... Wenn er nicht mitgeht, brauchen wir wirklich auch nicht zu gehen, denn was sollen wir zwischen Puech und den Ägyptern: das gibt Krach, und weiter nichts.

Weiter gibt es dann noch die Finanzierung der Photographien: ich vernehme, dass Pahor Labib uns alle Freiheit lassen wird, diese zu machen, aber dass wir sie selbst bezahlen müssen.

Können wir damit rechnen, dass dieser Betrag den Mitgliedern zu diesem Zweck zur Verfügung steht? Sie werden sich erinnern, wie wir Sommer 1955 alles zusammen beprochen haben und dass Sie die finanziellen Angelegenheiten für Ihre Rechnung genommen haben. Es muss dann aber in Ordnung sein ehe wir gehen.
specialist among us, and it simply will not work without him. I would still like to ask you urgently to speak with Page about this, and if possible to communicate immediately to Till your favorable decision. ... If he does not go along, we really also do not need to go, for what are we to do, caught between Puech and the Egyptians: That makes for a row, and nothing else.

Further there is then still the financing of the photographs. I understand that Pahor Labib will give us full freedom to make them, but that we ourselves have to pay for them.

Can we count on it that this amount stands at the disposal of the members for this purpose? You will recall how in the summer of 1955 we discussed everything together and you took responsibility for the financial matters. But then this must be in order before we go.

Quispel had gone ahead and written Pahor Labib his acceptance, but had also reported to Pahor Labib that Till had not received an invitation. Hence Pahor Labib sent the invitation a second time to Till's Austrian address, with a covering note on a copy he sent to Quispel:29

Many thanks for your very kind letter of 17 August. I am very glad that you will come to us.

Till himself wrote Meier that he had finally received the invitation from Pahor Labib, but needed financing:30

I now ask of you to inform me whether the full financing of the travel costs (plane round trip), and of the costs during the stay, is possible, and indeed before the beginning of the trip, and, if so, what steps I must take.

Weeks later Quispel telegraphed Till offering funding, in a last effort to get Till's agreement to come:31

Two thousand florins are at your disposal in Cairo. Will you come?

---

29 21 viii 56: Letter from Pahor Labib to Till, with a copy to Quispel on which Pahor Labib had written:

Vielen Dank für Ihren sehr lieben Brief von 17. August. Es freut mich sehr, dass Sie zu uns kommen werden.

30 24 viii 56: Letter from Till to Meier:

Ich bitte Sie nun, mir mitzuteilen, ob eine volle Finanzierung der Reisekosten (Flug hin und zurück) und der Aufenthaltskosten möglich ist und zwar vor Antritt der Reise, und wenn ja, welche Schritte ich tun muss.

31 16 ix 56: Telegram from Quispel to Till:

Zweitausend Gulden für Sie in Cairo zur Verfügung. Kommen Sie?
Though this did not meet Till’s requirement that he needed the funds before departure, no doubt to purchase the plane ticket, Quispel telegraphed Meier that Till would presumably be able to come, whereupon Meier telegraphed Till for confirmation:\textsuperscript{32}

Please telegraph confirmation whether Quispel’s information is valid that you can now come after all.

Till telegraphed Meier from Vienna:\textsuperscript{33}

Now impossible to come. Explanation airmail letter day before yesterday.

That explanation was to the effect that Till had just had a heart attack. He had written Meier that as a result he could not go to Egypt during the hot season:\textsuperscript{34}

The trip here did not run smoothly, which produced as a consequence for me a severe heart attack. Here I consulted today immediately the doctor who has handled me constantly since I was 16. When he heard that I am to travel to Egypt at the end of September, he forbad me very emphatically even to think of it, since with the condition of my heart, that would amount to a suicide attempt. So I ask of you not to count on it that I can now travel to Egypt. In the opinion of the doctor, an Egypt trip is possible for me only in the time between November and March. ...

If in the future it should come into consideration that I sometime travel to Egypt, then I ask of you to put the meeting between November and March,

\textsuperscript{32} 17 ix 56: Telegram from Meier to Till:

Bitte telegraphieren Bestätigung ob Quispels Angabe stimmt, dass Sie nun doch kommen können.

\textsuperscript{33} 17 ix 56: Telegram from Till to Meier:

Kommen jetzt unmöglich. Erklärung Luftbrief vorgestern.

\textsuperscript{34} 15 ix 56: Letter from Till to Meier:

Die Fahrt hierher verlief nicht glatt, was bei mir eine schwere Herzattacke zur Folge hatte. Hier konsultierte ich heute sofort den Arzt, der mich seit 16 ständig behandelt. Als er davon hörte, dass ich Ende September nach Ägypten fahren soll, verbot er mir sehr nachdrücklich, auch nur daran zu denken, denn bei meinem Herzzustand käme das einem Selbstmordversuch gleich. Ich bitte Sie daher, nicht damit zu rechnen, dass ich jetzt nach Ägypten fahren kann. Nach Meinung des Arztes ist eine Ägyptenreise für mich nur in der Zeit zwischen November und März möglich. ...

Sollte es weiterhin in Betracht kommen, dass ich irgendwann nach Ägypten fahre, so bitte ich, die Tagung zwischen November und März anzusetzen und mich etwa 4 bis 5 Monate vorher verständigen zu lassen, damit ich alle nötigen Vorbereitungen in Ruhe treffen kann.
and to let me know about four or five months in advance, so that I can in peace make all the necessary preparations.

Meier immediately proposed delaying the meeting. He telephoned Quispel and telegraphed Puech:

Till incapable of traveling. I propose adjourning the conference into the spring. What do you think of this. Please telegraph.

Puech agreed to Meier’s proposal, and telegraphed Quispel whether he agreed:

I accept Meier’s proposition. Telegraph your agreement.

Thereupon Meier telegraphed Pahor Labib to delay the meeting:

Till heart attack unable to travel. Puech Quispel Till and myself very strongly propose postponement of meeting for several months as Till is only real Coptic expert on Committee. If postponement possible please notify Peterson and myself by cable.

Meier also wrote Puech a fuller explanation:

I regret always to be the one who causes you inconveniences. But I assure you that at least this time I am only the scapegoat, for I hope I am not guilty of the heart attack of our friend Till. He stopped at Vienna, and his doctor does not permit him to travel at least until November, possibly until February. After

---

35 14 ix 56: Telegram from Meier to Puech:
Till incapable de voyager je propose ajourner conférence au printemps qu’en pensez vous. Télégraphiez s. v. p.

36 16 ix 56: Telegram from Puech to Quispel:
Accepte proposition Meier. Télégraphiez accord.

37 17 ix 56: Telegram from Meier to Pahor Labib.

38 18 ix 56: Letter from Meier to Puech:
Je regrette de toujours être celui qui vous cause des inconvénients. Mais je vous assure qu’au moins cette fois je suis seulement le bouc émissaire, car j’espère de ne pas être coupable de la crise cardiaque de notre ami Till. Il est arrêté à Vienne et son médecin ne lui permet pas de voyager au moins jusqu’en Novembre, possiblement jusqu’en Février. Après avoir reçu cette nouvelle, je vous ai immédiatement télégraphié et téléphoné à Quispel, qui était immédiatement d’accord avec l’ajournement et après avoir reçu votre télégramme, j’ai immédiatement télégraphié à Pahor Labib que vous, Quispel, Till et moi proposent ajournement pour quelques mois et lui ai indiqué que c’était à cause de la maladie de Till qui est le seul expert coptisant de notre comité, J’ai demandé Pahor Labib de notifier Peterson et moi par télégramme. Jusqu’à ce moment je n’ai pas reçu de ses nouvelles. J’ai préparé mon voyage, comme d’ailleurs vous et Quispel, et du moment où j’ai des nouvelles du Caire, je vous télégraphierai.
having received this news, I immediately telegraphed you and telephoned Quispel, who was immediately in agreement with the postponement. After having received your telegram, I immediately telegraphed Pahor Labib that you, Quispel, Till and myself propose a postponement for several months, and have indicated to him that it was because of the illness of Till, who is the only expert coptologist in our Committee. I asked Pahor Labib to notify Peterson and myself by telegram. Up to the present moment I have not received word from him. I have prepared my voyage, as of course have you and Quispel, and as soon as I have news from Cairo I will telegraph you.

Puech wrote Quispel what had to happen before he would cancel his travel plans:³⁹

I immediately replied [to Meier] by telegram that I would accept the proposed postponement, but making clear in a letter that, since my plane ticket was for the 21st (the plane of Air France of the 19th is cancelled), I awaited being reassured before Thursday on the following points: Did Meier have your agreement and that of Henoch Peterson? Do all the members of the Committee commit themselves not to go to Cairo at the indicated date? Has Meier notified Dr. Pahor Labib in the name of us all, and what is the official decision he has made? ...

I await a letter or a telegram from Meier communicating to me the decision of Pahor Labib, or, even better, a message from Pahor Labib himself, postponing the meeting until later.

It would have to be certain that Peterson is notified and that he too gives up making the trip.

Meier telegraphed Pahor Labib again:⁴⁰

Your answer very urgent.

³⁹ 18 ix 56: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

J’ai répondu immédiatement par télégramme que j’acceptais l’ajournement proposé, mais en précisant dans une lettre que, mon billet d’avion étant pris pour le 21 (l’avion d’Air France du 19 est supprimé), j’entendais être fixé avant jeudi sur les points suivants: Meier avait-il votre accord et celui de Henoch Peterson? Tous les membres du Comité s’engagent-ils à ne pas aller au Caire à l’époque indiquée? Meier a-t-il prévenu le Dr. Pahor Labit en notre nom commun et quelle est la décision officielle prise par celui-ci? ...

J’attends une lettre ou un télégramme de Meier me communiquant la décision de Pahor Labib ou, mieux encore, un message de Pahor Labib lui-même remettant à plus tard la réunion.

Il faudrait être sûr que Peterson est averti et qu’il renonce lui aussi, à faire le voyage.

⁴⁰ 19 ix 56: Telegram from Meier to Pahor Labib.
Quispel also telegraphed Pahor Labib:\textsuperscript{41}

Till has heart attack. Therefore Meier suggests delay. I ready to come. What shall I do?

The next day Puech telegraphed Meier:\textsuperscript{42}

Send urgently letter giving all the demanded assurances.

Puech also telegraphed Quispel:\textsuperscript{43}

In the absence of a response from Labib I need a telegram and letter clarifying your intentions.

He obviously did not want Quispel to go to Cairo without him. Indeed, the next day Puech wrote a letter to Quispel, expressing his anxiety that some Committee member might go to Cairo without him:\textsuperscript{44}

In case that Dr. Pahor Labib would decide on the postponement of the conference (and I await for my part that the news be sent to me directly and officially from Cairo), it is, isn't it? agreed that no member of the Committee will be present in Egypt from the 29th September to the end of October.

On the same day Puech wrote Meier that, unless rather improbable conditions are met, he will in any case go to Cairo:\textsuperscript{45}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item 19 ix 56: Telegram from Quispel to Pahor Labib.
\item 20 ix 56: Telegram from Puech to Meier:
\begin{quote}
Envoyer urgence lettre donnant toutes assurances demandées.
\end{quote}
\item 20 ix 56: Telegram from Puech to Quispel:
\begin{quote}
Absence réponse Labib désirerai telegramme et lettre précisant vos intentions.
\end{quote}
\item 21 ix 56: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
\begin{quote}
Au cas où le Dr. Pahor Labib déciderait l’ajournement de la conférence (et j’attends pour ma part que la nouvelle me soit directement et officiellement envoyée du Caire), il sera, n’est-ce pas? entendu qu’aucun membre du Comité ne sera présent en Égypte du 29 septembre à la fin d’octobre.
\end{quote}
\item 21 ix 56: Letter from Puech to Meier:
\begin{quote}
Mes positions sont très nettes:
\begin{enumerate}
\item Je suis d’accord pour souhaiter l’ajournement de la conférence, en esprit de solidarité avec Till et les autres membres du Comité.
\item Cependant, si je n’étais pas prévenu à temps et de façon absolument certaine de l’ajournement de la réunion, si je n’étais pas assuré que tous les membres du Comité ne sont pas disposés à renoncer au voyage, ou si Quispel maintenait au 27 septembre son départ pour le Caire, je suis décidé à prendre l’avion du 28 et à participer à la conférence qui devra avoir lieu, même à effectif réduit.
\end{enumerate}
\end{quote}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
My positions are very clear:

1° I am in agreement to hope for the postponement of the conference, in the spirit of solidarity with Till and the other members of the Committee.

2° Yet if I am not notified in time, and in an absolutely certain way, of the postponement of the meeting, if I am not assured that all the members of the Committee are disposed to give up on the trip, or if Quispel maintained his departure on 27 September for Cairo, I have decided to take the plane of the 28th and to participate in the conference that is to take place, even with a reduced force.

On 24 September 1956 Pahor Labib did send telegrams to Puech, Meier, and Quispel, with identical wording: 46 ‘No Change.’ Puech immediately telegraphed Meier and Quispel the same message: 47 ‘Pahor maintains Congress. Will be Cairo 29th.’

Quispel immediately telephoned the Director of the Dutch Organization for Pure Scientific Research (Z.W. O.), and obtained his travel expenses to Cairo reimbursed in advance, with the agreement to be reimbursed on his return for his expenses while there: 48

Regarding our telephone conversation on 24 September—in which you informed me about having received a message on 17 September from the Dutch delegation in Cairo that the meeting will take place in any case, and in which you further informed me that Professor Puech’s planned trip is now more or less certain—I have, after having consulted Professor Wagenvoort, decided to release the approved sum of DGL 2,200 maximum for your travel to Cairo (see also my note 46473a, dated 1 August 1956).

---

46 24 ix 56: Telegram from Pahor Labib to Meier; 24 ix 56: Telegram from Pahor Labib to Quispel.
47 24 ix 56: Telegram from Puech to Meier; 24 ix 56: Telegram from Puech to Quispel:


48 24 ix 56: Letter from the Director of the Dutch Organisation for Pure Scientific Research to Quispel:

Mede naar aanleiding van ons telefoongesprek d. d. 24 september—waarbij U mij mededeelde bericht d. d. 17 dezer te hebben ontvangen van de Nederlandse Legatie te Cairo, dat de bijeenkomst in ieder geval zal doorgaan, en waarbij U mij voorts liet weten, dat de reis van Professor Puech zo goed als vaststaat—hab ik, na overleg met Professor Wagenvoort, besloten de toekenning van ein bedrag van ten hoogste f 2,200,—voor Uw reis naar Cairo te bekrachtigen (zie mijn schrijven 46473a d. d. 1 augustus 1956).

De nota van Uw passagebiljet kan ter betaling naar Z.W.O. worden gezonden. Ik ga er voorts mee akkoord, dat de bijdrage in de verblijfkosten na afloop van Uw reis zal worden uitgekeerd, conform de in de brief van 1 augustus gestelde bepalingen.
Please send the invoice of your ticket for payment to Z.W. O. I also agree that payment towards costs of the stay will be made after your travel has been completed, in agreement with the conditions set out in the letter of 1 August.

Apparently before receiving his telegram from Pahor Labib, but after hearing from Puech of the telegram’s arrival, Meier wrote Pahor Labib (with similar letters to Puech, Quispel, and von Fischer) that he was not attending the meeting:

I am very sorry for not having received any answer to my two cables. I had sent my first cable in the name of Till, Puech, Quispel and myself. Not knowing Peterson’s address, I had asked you to notify him directly. I find it embarrassing not to know whether you did it or not, but today only received a cable from Puech, telling me that the reunion shall take place. Not knowing where he got this information from, I feel uncertain and as I would have to leave the day after tomorrow, I find it impossible to do so at such short notice—even if I still received your answer before that date. I am very sorry to have to renounce to the trip under these conditions, even should Puech and Quispel travel. Prof. Till returned to Manchester, but would not be allowed to travel as far as to Egypt. I can’t very well see what our committee could do without him, being the only real expert in Coptic among us. Moreover I think it’s not very nice to let a colleague down in such a way. I shall at any rate not come at this juncture and wait until I hear from you or the committee.

Only Quispel and Puech actually flew to Cairo to attend the meeting of the International Committee, though Puech apparently brought, unannounced, Antoine Guillaumont along with him (see Part 2 below).

2. The International Committee Meeting
29 September to 27 October 1956

There was considerable fluctuation as to the actual name of the International Committee. Mourad Kamel, a Coptic member of the committee, published an essay in January 1957 in the Egypt Travel Magazine that included a picture of a sign with appropriate flags apparently used at the meeting, with the title ‘International Committee of Gnosticism 1956,’ which he used

49 24 ix 56: Letter from Meier to Puech.
50 24 ix 56: Letter from Meier to Quispel.
51 24 ix 56: Letter from Meier to von Fischer.
52 24 ix 56: Letter from Meier to Pahor Labib.
in French translation in his essay. Hence ‘International Committee of Gnosticism’ is the title used here, as being the nearest thing to an official title. But the Agenda was entitled ‘The International Committee for Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum,’ which also seems to function as a title, but is too lengthy to have achieved wide acceptance. As one will observe in the following discussion, other titles were variously used. Puech preferred International Committee of Publication of the Papyri of Nag Hamadi, which had the advantage of including in the title his publication rights. Similarly Quispel referred to the Committee for the Publication of the Gnostic Manuscripts. He and Pahor Labib referred to the International Committee for the Study and Publication of the Gnostic Writings of the Coptic Museum. It was clearly in the interest of Pahor Labib to include in the title a reference to the Coptic Museum of which he was Director, and therefore ex officio the presiding officer of the committee. Pahor Labib later invited Doresse to ‘the 2nd Session of the International Committee of the Study and Publication of the Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum.’ Garitte wrote of the International Committee for the Study and Edition of the Gnostic Manuscripts. It is usually unclear if these are intended as an official title of the committee, or simply unofficial ways of referring to it, such as Till referring to ‘the International Committee for the study and publication of these texts.’ Since capital letters are not used in French after the first noun in quoting such titles, and German capitalizes nouns that occur not only in titles, their presence or absence is usually indeterminate in establishing a precise title for the committee. The capitalization in the English translations is usually limited to ‘International Committee.’

The two Coptic members chosen by Pahor Labib for the International Committee were Prof. Murad Kamil and Dr. Georges Sobhy, each distinguished in Coptic circles and of especial relevance to the Nag Hammadi Codices. Murad Kamil, Dr. phil. habil. (Tübingen), was Secretary of the Institut d’Égypte, Vice-President of the Société d’archéologie copte, and Member of the Committee of the Coptic Museum.

Alexander Böhlig summarized the credentials of Murad Kamil as follows:

---


57 4 v 77: Letter from Böhlig to Robinson:

Murad Kamil hat zur gleichen Zeit wie Pahor Labib, Abu Bakr und Ahmed Badawi in Deutschland studiert, sich nach einem Aufenthalt in Berlin dann in Tübingen bei Professor Enno Littmann habilitiert. Später wurde er Professor für semitische Philologie.
Murad Kamil studied in Germany at the same time as did Pahor Labib, Abu Bakr, and Ahmed Badawi. After a stay in Berlin he then did his habilitation with Prof. Enno Littmann in Tübingen. Later he became Professor for Semitic Philology at Gizeh University. Two things are especially characteristic of him: He was a burning adherent of his Coptic Church and an exceptional Manager. ... He was the only Egyptian Christian in the Academy for Arabic Language in Cairo, he had a leading position in the *Institut d'Égypte*, which after all has the status of an Academy, he was the initiator and especial supporter of the Institute of Coptic Studies, very engaged in the *Société d'Archéologie Copte*, and, what is most important, he was offered at the time of the vacancy around 1960/61 to become Patriarch, although not a clergyman, though admittedly not married. He turned this down, since he was afraid that as scholar he could not harmonize enough with the clergy. ... If you consider his many-sided organizational activity, you will understand that in the Coptic Museum and in organizing Nag Hammadi research he was also an advisor of Pahor Labib, whom the latter was very glad to follow. Furthermore Murad Kamil was after all a member of the Nag Hammadi Committee of 1956. ... *Summa summarum*: Murad Kamil was always the leading Copt in everything in scholarly politics that had to do with the Coptic church and with Egyptian coptology.

Georges Sobhy was well-known as an authority on the Coptic language at the time, to such an extent that Rāghib Andarāwus al-Qiss ʿAbd al-Sayyid took Codex III to him to evaluate. It was Sobhy who then turned it over to the Coptic Museum, which initiated the whole Nag Hammadi experience in academic circles (see Chapter 1, Part 3 above).

The opening session held at the Coptic Museum on 30 September 1956 had an agenda that was distributed:58

---

58 29 ix 56: Agenda of the ‘1st Session.’
THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE for COPTIC GNOSTIC PAPYRI in THE COPTIC MUSEUM

Agenda of the 1st Session

1) Greeting the members by Dr. Pahor Labib
2) Contents of the 13 Gnostic Codices
3) Distribution of the work
4) Publication
5) Means of Publication
6) Decisions
7) Reception in the gardens of the Museum in honour of the members on Sunday 14th October at 5 pm.

No official minutes of the meeting were ever distributed, and hence apparently never existed. But what took place can in large part be inferred from letters written from Cairo at the time, as well as from documents written by Puech and Quispel that they considered to be unofficial minutes.

Pahor Labib and Quispel both signed a letter of 13 October 1956 to Meier:

Wir bedauern sehr, dass Sie nicht bei der ersten Sitzung des internationalen Komitees für das Studium und die Ausgabe der gnostischen Schriften des Koptischen Museums gegenwärtig sein konnten. Wir hoffen, dass Sie das nächste Mal an unserer Diskussion teilnehmen können, und danken Ihnen, dass Sie Ihr grosszügiges Angebot, den Jung Kodex, nach Publikation, dem Koptischen Museum zu schenken, in Ihrem letzten Brief bestätigt haben.

Inzwischen erlauben wir uns, eine Frage an Sie zu richten, deren Beantwortung für die Entscheidung des Komitees von hervorragender Bedeutung sein wird. Angesichts der Wichtigkeit, die der Gegenstand für unsere Beratungen besitzt, möchten wir Sie bitten, uns Ihre Antwort so schnell wie möglich zuzustellen.

Dr. Pahor Labib hat sich freundlich bereit erklärt, die Photographien der fehlenden Seiten des Jung Kodex (= Kodex I des Koptischen Museums) noch vor dem 26. Oktober zur Verfügung zu stellen, unter der Voraussetzung nämlich, dass das Jung Institut und das Koptische Museum sich zusammentun, um den Jung Kodex und zwar ganz, samt den fehlenden Blättern, eventuell bei Rascher in Zürich herauszugeben. Dieses Werk würde als I. Teil des Corpus Scriptorum Gnosticorum Musei Coptici erscheinen, im selben Format und in derselben Ausstattung, wie die anderen Codices, welche vom internationalen Komitee im Auftrag des Koptischen Museums herausgegeben werden. Wir sind davon überzeugt, dass damit dem Interesse der Wissenschaft, welche ja ihrem Wesen nach Einheitlichkeit strebt, ein wesentlicher Dienst geleistet würde. ...

P.S. Prof. Quispel hat grundsätzlich auch die Erlaubnis erhalten, die in Kairo befindlichen Seiten zu kollationieren.
We regret very much that you could not be present at the first meeting of the International Committee for the study and publication of the Gnostic writings of the Coptic Museum. We hope that next time you can take part in our discussion, and we thank you that in your last letter you have confirmed your generous offer to give the Jung Codex, after publication, to the Coptic Museum.

Meanwhile we permit ourselves to direct a question to you, whose answer will be of outstanding significance for the decision of the Committee. In view of the importance that the issue has for our reflections, we would like to ask you to send your reply as rapidly as possible.

Dr. Pahor Labib has kindly declared himself ready to put at our disposal the photographs of the missing pages of the Jung Codex (= Codex I of the Coptic Museum) already before 26 October, with the presupposition namely that the Jung Institute and the Coptic Museum join forces to publish the Jung Codex, and indeed completely, together with the missing leaves, possibly at Rascher in Zürich. This work would appear as the Part I of the Corpus Scriptorum Gnosticorum Musei Coptici, in the same format and in the same make-up as the other codices that will be published by the International Committee commissioned by the Coptic Museum. We are convinced that thus an important service would be performed in the interest of scholarship, which indeed by its very nature seeks uniformity. ...

P.S. Prof. Quispel has in principle also obtained permission to collate the pages that are in Cairo.

This was a very carefully worked out compromise solution for the various positions. The Jung Institute would get both the photographs and Quispel’s transcription of the pages of the Jung Codex that were still in Egypt, with publication rights, on the condition that after publication the part of the Jung Codex in Zürich be returned to the Coptic Museum. This of course overlooked the problem of placing fragments: some fragments that were in Zürich belonged on leaves in Cairo, and vice versa, and even fragments in Cairo that belonged to leaves in Cairo would not be placed before publication. A further compromise was that the International Committee would be authorized to publish all the Nag Hammadi Codices, while leaving open the question of the language(s) of such an edition. The Jung Institute would achieve its initial goal of publishing all of the Jung Codex, but there is no reference to its expanded goal of publishing the other codices. The series edited by Meier, ‘Studien aus dem C.G. Jung-Institut,’ is not mentioned, whereas a new series of the Coptic Museum is introduced, with a title in Latin, thus avoiding having to choose between Coptic, Arabic, French, German, or English. Rascher would ‘possibly’ be able to publish the Jung Codex, but the publisher of the other codices is not mentioned, leaving open
the possibility for Quispel to introduce Brill and/or for Puech to introduce the *Imprimerie Nationale* as publisher. Neither a presidency by Meier nor one by Puech is mentioned. But the letter does not designate Pahor Labib as President of the International Committee.

In these polite, but very real, negotiations, the only two power brokers were Meier, in control of returning the Jung Codex to the Coptic Museum, and Pahor Labib, in control of giving access to and publication rights for the material in the Coptic Museum. But Quispel was more skillful than either, in advancing quietly his interests whenever he could. The very fact that the letter was not sent by the International Committee as such made it possible to ignore French interests, for whose explicit inclusion Puech would have insisted.

Quispel commended himself to Pahor Labib on 18 October 1956 by presenting ‘to the Coptic Museum 4 Hebrew scrolls containing parts of the Old Testament.’ Meier did the same by airmailing to Pahor Labib by registered mail a hand-bound copy of *The Gospel of Truth* on 20 October 1956, for which Pahor Labib wrote to Meier on 23 October 1956 thanking him, with the good news that the Cairo part of the Jung Codex was being conserved (so that it could be photographed).

While I, with my dear friend Prof. G. Quispel, was assembling from their [previous] condition [to be] under plexiglass the missing pages of the Jung Codex (Codex I of the Coptic Museum), I received your very endearing gift: *Evangelium Veritatis.*

Meier wrote on 22 October 1956 to all the members of the Curatorium of the Jung Institute, to get before 26 October 1956 their approval for the arrangement Quispel had worked out with Pahor Labib. They declined, pending a full discussion at the next regular meeting of the Curatorium.

---

61 18 x 56: Agreement signed by Quispel and Labib for Quispel’s gift of four Hebrew scrolls; 23 iii 57: Letter from Pahor Labib to Quispel reporting gratefully their acceptance by the High Council of Antiquities.

62 20 x 56: Receipt from the Zürich post office for shipment to Pahor Labib; 23 x 56: Letter from Meier to Rahn.

63 23 x 56: Letter from Pahor Labib to Meier:

> Während ich mit meinem lieben Freund Prof. G. Quispel die fehlenden Seiten des Jung Codex (Codex I des Koptischen Museums) aus ihrem Zustand zusammenfügten unter Perspex, erhalte ich Ihr sehr liebenswürdiges Geschenk: “Das Evangelium Veritatis.”

64 22 x 56: Letter from Meier to the Curatorium.

65 23 x 56: Letter from Baumann-Jung to Meier; 23 x 56: Letter from Bash to Meier; 23 x 56: Letter from Jacoby to Meier; 24 x 56: Letter from Biswanger to Meier; only one response was positive: 26 x 56: Letter from Rilkin to Meier.
But Meier wrote his Swiss contact in Egypt, Prof. Rahn, on 23 October 1956 that he had answered Pahor Labib ‘in an agreeing sense,’\textsuperscript{66} even before hearing from the Curatorium.

The Cairo meeting took place at an extremely inauspicious time in terms of Egyptian politics. The situation was summarized by Gérard Garitte:\textsuperscript{67}

The most severe political convulsions seemed to combine with the slowness that is always the rule in the Orient, so as to defer endlessly the conclusion of the matter. At the end of 1948, it was the assassination of the Prime Minister Nokrachi Pacha; in 1952, the deposition of King Farouk by Mohammed Naguib; in 1953, the proclamation of the Republic; and in 1954, the elimination of Naguib by Gamal Abd el-Nasser. The several \textit{coups d’état}, the changes of the government, the administrative reforms, made it so that at several junctures the negotiations had to be begun again \textit{ab ovo}. It is only in the autumn [summer] of 1956, ten years after their discovery, that the manuscripts, freed of their seals, became, finally, the property of the Coptic Museum.

In September of the same year there was constituted an ‘International Committee for the Study and Edition of the Gnostic Manuscripts.’ This Committee held a reunion in Cairo in October 1956, but its deliberations, in which only two non-Egyptian members participated, was interrupted by the disembarkation at Suez, another disgrace.

The Israeli-Egyptian war of 1956 and the complications that followed did not serve to facilitate the relations between Egypt and Western Europe.

\textsuperscript{66} 23 \texttimes{} 56: Letter from Meier to Rahn:

\begin{quote}
Ich habe natürlich in zustimmendem Sinne geantwortet.
\end{quote}


\begin{quote}
Les convulsions politiques les plus graves semblaient se liguer avec la lenteur toujours de règle en Orient pour remettre sans cesse la conclusion de l’affaire; fin 1948, ce fut l’assassinat du Premier Ministre Nokrachi Pacha; en 1952, la déposition du roi Farouk par Mohammed Naguib; en 1953, la proclamation de la République; et en 1954, l’élimination de Naguib par Gamal Abd el-Nasser; les coups d’état, les changements de gouvernement, les réformes administratives firent en sorte que les négociations durent à plusieurs reprises être recommencés \textit{ab ovo}. C’est seulement à l’automne de 1956, dix ans après leur découverte, que les manuscrits, délivrés de leurs scellés, devinrent, enfin, propriété du Musée Copte.

En septembre de la même année, fut constitué un “Comité international pour l’étude et l’édition des manuscrits gnostiques.” Ce Comité tint une réunion au Caire en octobre 1956, mais ses délibérations, auxquelles deux membres non-égyptiens seulement participaient, furent interrompus par le débarquement de Suez, autre disgrâce.

La guerre israélo-égyptienne de 1956 et les complications qui s’en suivirent ne furent pas pour faciliter les relations entre l’Égypte et l’Europe occidentale.
Till heard that there were in fact difficulties for the return trip.\textsuperscript{68} Giversen told me that you [Quispel] had difficulties on the return trip from Egypt; I am sorry. I was afraid that Prof. Puech would no longer be able to return. Hopefully the political development in Egypt will not take such a turn that the work on the Gnostic texts is impeded.

Quispel reported that he had to be evacuated from Alexandria on an American naval vessel.

The Suez crisis, leading Egypt to break diplomatic relations and postal communications with France and Great Britain, followed immediately upon the meeting of the International Committee. It was assumed to be the reason that the official minutes of the meeting were not sent to its members. Antoine Guillaumont later explained the situation as follows:\textsuperscript{69}

W[alter] Till, who had not been able to go to Cairo because of the state of his health, has complained about not having received the official text of the decisions of the Committee. As a matter of fact no one has received it; the affair of Suez exploded immediately afterwards (we left Cairo, Puech and myself, a Saturday at the end of September [read: October] and the hostilities began on the Canal the following Tuesday); P[ahor] Labib has hence not been able to send anyone this document. ... Puech tells me that he has written to P[ahor] Labib in 1957, after the end of the hostilities, by registered letter, to ask him to send the text of the decisions, but has received no reply.

Here Guillaumont mentions casually that he had been with Puech in Cairo, although this is not a fact mentioned in the correspondence of Puech with the others involved in that meeting. Guillaumont was not a member of the International Committee of Gnosticism. One may conjecture that Puech brought him along, since he was competent in Coptic (though his specialty

\textsuperscript{68} 30 i 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:

Herr Giversen erzählte mir, dass Sie bei der Rückreise von Ägypten Schwierigkeiten hatten; das tut mir leid. Ich fürchtete, Prof. Puech hätte nicht mehr zurückkehren können. Hoffentlich nimmt die politische Entwicklung in Ägypten nicht einen solchen Verlauf, dass die Arbeiten an den gnostischen Texten gehindert wird.

\textsuperscript{69} 12 v 77: Letter from Guillaumont to Robinson:

W. Till, qui n'avait pas pu se rendre au Caire à cause de son état de santé, s'est plaint de n'avoir pas reçu le texte officiel des décisions du Comité. En vérité, personne ne l'a reçu; l'affaire de Suez a éclaté aussitôt après (nous avons quitté Le Caire, M. Puech et moi, un samedi de la fin Septembre et les hostilités ont commencé sur le Canal le mardi suivant); P. Labib n'a donc pu envoyer à personne ce document. ... M. Puech me dit qu'il a écrit à P. Labib en 1957, après la fin des hostilités, par lettre recommandée, pour lui demander d'envoyer le texte des décisions, mais il n'a reçu aucune réponse.
was actually Syriac), to work in the Library of the Coptic Museum, identifying the Nag Hammadi texts of major importance, such as ‘the missing forty pages’ of Codex I and *The Gospel of Thomas* of Codex II. On their return to Paris Puech reported that Guillaumont had promptly translated for him *The Gospel of Thomas*:

Guillaumont has put on foot for me, since the end of November, a first translation of the integral text. Combined with what I already had of a good part of the small text [from Doresse], it has served a great deal in my courses at the *Hautes Études* and at the *Collège de France*. We are working nonetheless to improve this translation and, especially, it seems that the Coptic text needs to be corrected at places.

Of course Guillaumont could have worked on the basis of the facsimiles in Pahor Labib’s volume of facsimiles. But Puech did not know before leaving for Cairo that he would be given a copy of that volume in Cairo, and so made arrangements to bring with him someone to make a transcription. He did not trust the accuracy of Doresse, and Malinine had turned out to be unable to produce a meaningful translation of the Jung Codex. Both were well-known in Cairo, and would have had more authority with the relevant officials there than would Puech. But Guillaumont was new on the scene and would function only as Puech’s assistant. Ultimately, Guillaumont became one of the publishers of *The Gospel of Thomas*, and this may have been already in view. Guillaumont then became France’s member on UNESCO’s International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, with Puech functioning as a Consultant, so as to maintain the principle of one member per nation (except, of course, for Egypt).

Doresse realized in retrospect that he had been replaced by Guillaumont:

---

70 17 i 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Guillaumont m’a mis sur pied, dès la fin de novembre, une première traduction du texte intégral qui, combinée avec celle que j’avais déjà d’une bonne partie de l’opuscule, a beaucoup servi à mes cours des Hautes Études et du Collège de France. Nous travaillons cependant à améliorer cette traduction et, surtout, il apparaît que le texte copte doit être par endroits corrigé.


72 10 vii 83: Letter from Doresse to Robinson:

En effet, Pahor Labib, qui réclamait depuis quelque temps mon retour en Égypte pour l’assister dans la mise en état des codices, m’invita par écrit à participer à la réunion du Comité International d’octobre/novembre 1956. Mais le C.N.R.S. me refuse
In fact, Pahor Labib, who for some time called for my return to Egypt to aid him in putting the codices in shape, invited me in writing to participate in the meeting of the International Committee of October/November 1956. But the C.N.R.S. refused to authorize me to make the trip, and sent in my place Antoine Guillaumont, whom Pahor Labib (I am convinced) had not invited!

Till wrote to Doresse at the time, to help explain to Doresse why he had not received minutes of the meeting:

Unfortunately it does not look like the political situation in Egypt would improve in the foreseeable future. At present is seems instead as if it will get worse. It surely smells rather strongly of powder in Egypt. This climate is hardly favorable for our work. But unfortunately we cannot do anything about it and have to take it as it is and as it comes. If the Russians succeed in establishing themselves in Egypt, it will doubtless be nothing we can do for the duration of another generation.

In spite of there being no minutes that were circulated, Mourad Kamel’s essay published in January 1957 included a summary of the meeting:

It was not at all easy, in the present circumstances, to form an International Committee. Taking his point of departure in the principle that science has

---

73 23 iii 57: Letter from Till to Doresse:


Il n’était guère aisé, dans les circonstances actuelles, de former un Comité International. Partant de ce principe que la science n’a pas de patrie et que le domaine de la recherche appartient à l’humanité entière, M. Kamal El Dine Hussein, Ministre actuel de l’Éducation et de l’Enseignement, réussissait, envers et contre tous, à constituer un “Comité International de Gnosticisme”, groupant l’Autriche, les États-Unis d’Amérique, la Grande-Bretagne, la France, la Hollande et, naturellement, l’Égypte. Et c’est ainsi que, pendant tout le mois d’octobre dernier, le Musée Copte du Vieux-Caire a abrité les réunions, en table ronde, de savants et de spécialistes de ces pays, venus une fois de plus dans cette Égypte généreuse, pour y puiser dans les trésors inestimable de son impérissable et universelle culture.
no nationality and that the domain of research belongs to all humanity, Kamal El Dine Hussein, presently Minister of Education and Instruction, succeeded, against all odds, in constituting an ‘International Committee of Gnosticism,’ bringing together Austria, the United States of America, Great Britain, France, Holland, and, naturally, Egypt. It is thus that, during all the month of last October, the Coptic Museum of Old Cairo sheltered the meetings, at a roundtable, of scholars and specialists of these countries, come once again to this generous Egypt, to dig there into the inestimable treasures of its imperishable and universal culture.

Two documents did result from the meeting, neither official, but each reflecting the desiderata of Puech and Quispel. One, clearly echoing Puech’s letter to Quispel that had been written just before 14 August 1956, is simply presented as ‘Wishes’ and ‘the Decision’ of the meeting, listing what Puech wanted the meeting to accept. He supplied a copy to Guillaumont to send to me, which Guillaumont did, accompanying Guillaumont’s own letter to me of 12 July 1977.

Wishes
I-The International Committee for the publication of the Gnostic papyri of the Coptic Museum discovered at Nag Hammadi felicitates its permanent

\[\text{75 Circa 27 x 56: ‘Voeux’ (unsigned, but clearly from Puech):} \]

\textit{Voeux}

I—Le Comité international pour la publication des papyrus gnostiques du Musée Copte découverts à Nag Hammadi félicite son Secrétaire permanent, le Dr Pahor Labib, directeur du Musée Copte, de la diligence qu’il a mise à mettre à la disposition du public et des travailleurs un premier volume de reproductions photographiques de trois des recueils de Nag Hammadi.

Il souhaite d’une façon pressante que cette publication soit poursuivie dans les délais les plus courts et que, dans un proche avenir, l’ensemble des documents soit photographié et publié de la même façon.

II—Le Comité insiste sur la nécessité de fournir à chacun des membres du Comité comme exemplaire et instrument de travail un lot complet de photographies de tous les manuscrits découverts, ces photographies devant être livrées le plus rapidement possible et au fur et à mesure de leur exécution. Le Comité rappelle qu’il a déjà suggéré le nom de plusieurs personnes et organismes qui seraient disposés à exécuter le travail et à couvrir les frais de l’opération.

Décision

Tout membre du Comité a le droit de publier, soit seul, soit en collaboration, afin d’aider à la préparation de l’édition définitive, des communications, articles ou livres concernant le contenu de la découverte et comportant éventuellement des citations et des traductions des nouveaux documents, ou de se servir de ces textes dans son enseignement.
Secretary, Dr. Pahor Labib, Director of the Coptic Museum, on the diligence that he has exercised in putting at the disposition of the public and the researchers a first volume of photographic reproductions of three of the collections of Nag Hammadi.

It hopes in an urgent way that this publication be continued in the shortest possible intervening periods of time and that, in the near future, the whole of the documents be photographed and published in the same way.

II-The Committee insists on the necessity to furnish to each of the members of the Committee, both as a specimen and as an instrument of work, a complete file of photographs of all the manuscripts that were discovered, these photographs to be delivered as rapidly as possible and as they are executed. The Committee recalls that it has already suggested the name of several persons and organizations that would be disposed to do the work and to cover the costs of the operation.

Decision

Each member of the Committee has the right to publish, be it alone or be it in collaboration, so as to aid in the preparation of the definitive edition, reports, articles, or books concerning the content of the discovery and containing perhaps quotations and translations of the new documents, or to make use of these texts in one's instruction.

I inquired of Quispel concerning the minutes that Guillaumont had forwarded to me from Puech, and he replied: 76

Puech was obsessed by the idea that he would be prevented to publish. Therefore we discussed the minutes which I received this morning [from me—I sent him a copy of what Guillaumont had sent me from Puech] at the French Archaeological Institute one Sunday [in October 1956]. They were accepted. But my minutes are [also] correct. It escaped Puech and Guillaumont because they could not follow the conversation in English.

These letters from Quispel and Guillaumont would tend to suggest that Guillaumont, when in Cairo in October 1956, did not just work on the Nag Hammadi texts themselves in the Library of the Coptic Museum, but also gained admission to the Director's Office of the Coptic Museum to hear the Committee's deliberations. 77 They may well have taken place in English, since Pahor Labib was rather fluent in English, but probably did not understand French very well; German was the foreign language in which he was most fluent. Since Puech only understood French, Guillaumont may

---

76 26 vii 77: Letter from Quispel to Robinson.
have been brought in to interpret for him, as he did in 1970 at the first meeting of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices (see Chapter 11 below).

The other document consisted of ‘Decisions’ written up by Quispel on the back of a letter, presumably at the conclusion of the meeting, but without evidence of ever having been validated officially as Minutes:\(^{78}\)

*Decisions.*

*The Committee for the publication of the Gnostic Manuscripts decides:*

1) that the ed. of Codex I \(=\) Codex III (Apocry. Joh. etc.) should be assigned to P. Labib and J. Doresse.
2) that the publication of the lacking pages of the so-called Jung Codex /II/ \(=\) Codex I is entrusted to the publishers of this Codex \(=\) P.L./G.Q.H.Ch.P.M. Malinine.
3) that the publication of Codex III \(=\) Codex II is entrusted to Yassa, Puech and Q[uispel].
4) the Coptic Museum declares to possess the rights of publication and assumes the responsibilities.
5) no reward whatsoever will be given to the scholars who do the work by the Committee or the Coptic Museum: The Committee will fix the amount of subventions to be asked from scientific foundations and the UNESCO for travels, etc. of members of the Committee.
6) Microfilms will be made by the Center of Documentation of all the leaves of the collection and be put exclusively at the disposal of members of the Committee.
7) The next meeting will take place in December 1957 or January 1958 in the Coptic Museum in Cairo. All members should be there.
8) On that meeting the Committee will proceed to make a complete inventory of the whole collection of 13 Codices, which by that time will be all put under glass or perspex etc.

The reassurance to the Egyptian government that *no reward whatsoever will be given to the scholars who do the work by the Committee or the Coptic Museum* did not prevent Quispel from signing an Agreement with the London *Daily Mail*, according to which he received on the spot ‘Five Hundred Pounds Sterling or is equivalent in Egyptian Currency’ for Quispel to ‘supply to Vroom the necessary materials for the said Vroom to write five articles each of about one thousand words.’\(^ {79}\) One condition of the contract, ‘This material shall be exclusive to the *Daily Mail*,’ was not rigorously carried out,

---

\(^{78}\) Circa 27 x 56: Quispel’s minutes on the back of a letter of 2 vii 56 from Vaun Gillmor to Quispel.

\(^{79}\) 12 x 56: ‘Agreement between Professor Gilles Quispel and Julian W. Vroom’ of the *Daily Mail.*
to judge by the many news releases at the time, most of which no doubt derive from Quispel, and certainly those in Dutch, one in the town where Quispel taught.  

I inquired of Guillaumont concerning these minutes that Quispel had given me, and received the following reply:

I wanted also to see again Puech before replying to you, especially on the topic of the decisions taken by the Committee that met in 1956.

To reply directly to your question on this topic, I can say to you that Puech is in full agreement with me: The text that Quispel has sent you is, as you yourself suppose, a personal draft. Also you cannot give it out as formulating the decisions taken by the Committee. Puech has found the text that I mentioned to you and of which I send you a photocopy attached. These are the Wishes and the Decision expressed, by common consent, at the time of the closing of the meeting. It is this text that Pahor Labib was charged to circulate, as was agreed, to all the members of the Committee, those present and also those absent. ... But it would have been normal for it to be kept at the Coptic Museum, and it is very regrettable that it is lost. In these circumstances the best, it seems to me, is to stick to the copy conserved by Puech.

Quispel later sent me the following statement:

The final document was signed by Pahor Labib, Dr. Sobhy, Gobry, Murad Kamel, Puech and Quispel, but not by A. Guillaumont. On 13 October 1956 Pahor Labib showed me a letter of 9/9/56 to Guillaumont: ‘I am sorry I cannot ask you now the pleasure of joining our committee.’ P[ahor] L[abib] was quite surprised to see G[uillaumont] appear at our first meeting.

---


81 12 vii 77: Letter from Guillaumont to Robinson:

Je voulais aussi revoir M. Puech avant de vous répondre, spécialement au sujet des décisions prises par le Comité réuni en 1956.

Pour répondre directement à votre question à ce sujet, je puis vous dire que M. Puech est pleinement d’accord avec moi: le texte que vous a envoyé M. Quispel est, comme vous-même le supposez, un brouillon personnel; aussi vous ne pouvez pas le donner comme formulant les décisions prises par le Comité. M. Puech a retrouvé le texte dont je vous avais parlé et dont je vous envoie ci-joint une photocopie: ce sont là les Vœux et la Décision exprimés, d’un commun accord, lors de la clôture de la réunion. C’est ce texte que M. Pahor Labib était chargé de diffuser, comme il était convenu, à tous les membres du Comité, les présents et aussi les absents. ... Mais il aurait été normal qu’il soit conservé au Musée copte et il est fort regrettable qu’il soit perdu. Dans ces conditions, le mieux, me semble-t-il, est de s’en tenir à la copie conservée par M. Puech.

82 6 ix 76: Letter from Quispel to Robinson.
Puech had obviously brought Guillaumont as a replacement for Doresse on the International Committee, which replacement Quispel opposed (see Chapter 7, Part 2).

3. Pahor Labib’s Facsimile Edition

Any publication of the texts would need to make use of photographs. Hence photography became a central issue in planning the publication, both of ‘the missing 40 pages’ and of the whole of the Nag Hammadi Codices in Cairo. But how to get the photography done, and how to keep others than one’s own team from using them, were interrelated problems.

Von Fischer had written Meier as early as 3 February 1954 as to who might come in question to photograph the Nag Hammadi Codices.

As specialist for the photography of the papyri, there would come into consideration, so far as I can see, first of all two local specialists, an Eid of the Service des Antiquités and a Viktor [Girgis] of the Coptic Museum. Apparently Doresse was originally in view to lead the work of photography. The French Consulate in Cairo has also already received from the relevant French officials certain sums to pay this work. I assume that these sums could be put at our disposal for our work, this of course only if we work together with the French.

But von Fischer also heard from Pahor Labib that Doresse had photographs of all the Nag Hammadi Codices:

83 3 ii 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:


84 15 iii 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Wie mich nun aber Herr Pahor Labib neulich streng vertraulich wissen liess, soll Herr Doresse die Photokopien unserer Papyri bereits im geheimen angefertigt haben, und zwar zur Zeit als Frl. Dattari ihm und Herrn Drioton die Papyri zur Begutachtung anvertraut hatte. Er soll heute die Photokopien bei sich haben; die ägyptischen Gerichte sollen ihn jüngst aufgefordert haben, sie (wem?) zurückzugeben.

Ich weiss nun nicht, ob dies wirklich stimmt; immerhin hatte mir seinerzeit Herr Tano selbst Andeutungen in diesem Sinne gemacht. Wenn es zutrifft, so brauchen wir die
As Pahor Labib recently let me know quite confidentially, Doresse is thought to have completed already in secret the photographs of our papyri, and indeed at the time that Miss Dattari entrusted the papyri to him and Drioton for their evaluation. He is thought to have the photographs with him today. The Egyptian courts are said to have called upon him recently to give them back (to whom?).

I do not know whether this is really true. Nonetheless Tano back then made suggestions to me in this direction. If it is true, then we do not need to make the photocopies again. But one would then have to proceed so that the honor of Doresse, perhaps that of Drioton and the French scholars, would not be smeared. For this reason I have agreed with the French Cultural Attaché [Rebeyrol] that he now first poses to Drioton the strictly confidential and personal question, whether he knows something about this. If so, Doresse should turn the photocopies over to the French Embassy. It would then later need to be decided, to whom they should further be passed on (to our Embassy, to the C.G. Jung Institute, to the Coptic Museum, or to Miss Dattari?).

For the time being please keep the matter strictly to yourself and wait until we have the answer from Drioton.

Von Fischer even itemized the evidence that the Egyptians used for their assumption that Doresse had photographs of all the Nag Hammadi Codices.85

With regard to the possible photocopies of the Dattari texts, Moustafa Amer and Pahor Labib seemed to be able to infer from the photographs that have
appeared in *Vigiliae Christianae*, Volume 3, Number 3, July 1949, in the text of the studies by Doresse and Togo Mina: ‘Nouveaux textes gnostiques coptes découverts en Haute Égypte: La bibliothèque de Chenoboskion,’ that Doresse has in fact photographed all the texts. I now am waiting until Rebeyrol has received the answer from Abbot Drioton in Paris.

Drioton came out very emphatically on the side of Doresse:  

I find particularly odious the war about which you tell me, that persons, well situated in their armchairs, are making on you in Paris. Recently I had echoes of this from Rebeyrol, who wrote me, incidentally with excellent intentions, what reply was needed to shut the mouth of people who accused Jean of having taken surreptitiously photographs of the Gnostic manuscripts of the Coptic Museum for his personal use. I immediately replied to him that this accusation was all the more absurd in that Jean had been charged with studying and identifying the manuscripts both by the seller [feminine] of the manuscripts and by the Egyptian government, which had officially put him, as voluntary worker, on the Committee of Publication, and charged him personally with preparing the edition. But all that is odious and I find these people disgusting. They would do better to occupy themselves with their own work.

Yet the assumption that Doresse had photographs of all the Nag Hammadi Codices persisted. The Director of the Fourth Bureau on Non-Classical Civilizations of the *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique* used this as an argument for not funding Doresse's attendance at the meeting of the International Committee, arguing that he should stay in France and work at editing his photographs for publication:

---

86 5 v 54: Letter from Drioton to Marianne Doresse:

Je trouve particulièrement odieux la guerre, dont vous me parlez, que vous font à Paris les gens bien carrés dans leurs fauteuils. J’en ai eu récemment des échos par Rebeyrol qui m’a écrit, dans une excellente intention d’ailleurs, ce qu’il fallait répondre pour clore le bec à des gens qui accusaient Jean d’avoir pris subrepticement pour son usage personnel des photographies des manuscrits gnostiques du Musée Copte. Je lui ai répondu immédiatement que cette accusation était d’autant plus absurde que Jean avait été chargé d’étudier et d’identifier les manuscrits à la fois par la vendeuse des mss. et par le gouvernement égyptien qui l’avait officiellement mis, comme charitable ouvrier, dans le comité de publication et chargé personnellement de préparer l’édition. Mais tout cela est odieux et je trouve ces gens-là dégoûtants. Ils feraient mieux de s’occuper de leur propre travail.

87 27 vii 56: Letter from L. Plin to Doresse:

Nous entendons que vous restiez en France pour travailler à l’édition de ces papyrus dont vous possédez un jeu complet de photographies.
We understand that you remain in France, to work on the edition of these papyri of which you possess a complete file of photographs.

But then von Fischer notified Meier that the Egyptians had decided to publish a facsimile edition of their own:

With the naming of a new Minister of Education (Dr. Awad), our affair has taken a new turn. It seems that he, instigated by Pahor Labib, wants himself to publish the photocopies of the Gnostic papyri, i. e. in the form of simple photocopies without text and commentary. This is a requirement of the honor of Egypt.

I do not know what position Miss Dattari wants to take. Yet I think that she will maintain her opposition, in order to receive her money. I wonder however where the government wants to get the money?

What position would you assume in such a case? Do you think that in a publication of the photocopies you could still maintain the leadership in the publication of the text printed in modern type? I assume that then everyone will be free to make translations and commentary?

Up until now the French still know nothing of the new plan.

It is also not yet certain that it will be carried out. But I do not see who in Egypt would oppose it.

It would interest me to hear what you think of this new turn.

---

88 1 v 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Mit der Ernennung eines neuen Unterrichtsminister (Dr. Awad) hat unsere Angelegenheit eine neue Wendung genommen. Es scheint, dass er auf Anregung von Pahor Labib die Photocopien der gnostischen Papyri selbst herausgeben will, d. h. in Form von einfachen Photocopien ohne Text und Kommentar. Es sei dies ein Gebot der Würde Ägyptens.

Ich weiss nicht, wie sich Frl. Dattari dazu stellen will; doch denke ich, dass sie ihre Opposition aufrechterhalten wird, um ihr Geld zu bekommen. Ich frage mich aber, wo die Regierung das Geld hernehmen will?

Welche Stellung würden Sie in einem solchen Falle einnehmen? Glauben Sie, dass Sie bei einer Veröffentlichung der Photocopien noch die Führung in der Publikation des in modernen Typen gedruckten Texts behalten könnten? Ich nehme an, dass dann Jedermann frei sein wird, Übersetzungen und Kommentar zu machen?

Bis jetzt wissen die Franzosen noch nichts vom neuen Plan.

Es ist auch noch nicht sicher, dass es zur Ausführung kommt; doch sehe ich nicht, wer in Ägypten dagegen opposieren soll.

Es würde mich interessieren zu erfahren, was Sie von dieser neuen Wendung denken.
When Puech did come to hear from Quispel the Egyptian plan to publish a facsimile edition, Puech assumed that it meant that Doresse would do the photography.\textsuperscript{89}

An important detail seems to have escaped you. The Minister of Public Instruction has decided that the papyri should be photographed entirely, and the photographs published in the fashion of the Pierpont Morgan Collection. According to what I think I know, this photographic work will be entrusted by Pahor Labib to Doresse, who, as you know, has for a long time been sent on mission to do that by two French scientific organisms and has received instructions and the necessary credits. I await precisions concerning the concrete modalities of the operation and the goal or the immediate use of these photographs, which, on principle, aught to be communicated to me immediately. As a result, I cannot explain to myself very well a phrase of your letter: ‘We will go immediately afterwards to Cairo to photograph the manuscripts.’ Who, ‘we’? And at the expense and for the budget of who or what? Explain to me, I ask of you.

The reference to the policy of the Pierpont Morgan Collection is wishful thinking: That repository has made microfilms of its papyri, but retains publication rights, which it assigns as it sees fit to individuals wishing to publish an edition of a text. Such a policy might make it possible for the Jung Institute to secure a monopoly on the editing of the Nag Hammadi Codices in spite of them being published in a facsimile edition.

Quispel did not make that assumption, but simply alerted Meier to the plan to publish a facsimile edition.\textsuperscript{90}

\textsuperscript{89} 4 i 55: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Un détail important paraît vous avoir échappé. Le Ministre de l’Instruction Publique a décidé que les papyrus devront être photographiés entièrement et les photographies publiées à la façon de la Collection Pierpont Morgan. D’après ce que je crois savoir, ce travail photographique sera confié par Pahor Labib à Doresse, qui, comme vous le savez, a, depuis longtemps, été envoyé en mission pour cela par deux organismes scientifiques français et a reçu les instructions et les crédits nécessaires. J’attends des précisions concernant les modalités concrètes de l’opération et le sort ou l’emploi immédiat de ces photographies, qui, en principe, doivent m’être communiquées aussitôt. En conséquence, je ne m’explique pas très bien une phrase de votre lettre: “nous irons immédiatement après au Caire pour photographier les manuscrits.” Qui “nous”? Et aux frais et pour le compte de qui ou de quoi? Éclairez-moi, je vous prie.

\textsuperscript{90} 10 i 55: Letter from Quispel to Meier:

In Ägypten geht es jetzt schnell. Die Regierung betrachtet sich von jetzt als Besitzerin der Manuskripte. Sie werden photographisch ausgegeben werden. Es wird jetzt ein Comité de publication gebildet.
In Egypt things are now moving rapidly. From now on the government considers itself as owner of the manuscripts. They will be published photographically. A Committee of Publication will now be set up.

Puech wrote Quispel his concern that a facsimile edition was being planned before appointing an International Committee of Publication to control somehow the critical edition, which would mean other scholars would publish their critical editions as they saw fit:

After what you have told me, and according to what I can learn from my side, it seems that the solution toward which one orients oneself is the following: A photographic edition of the papyri, thus put pell-mell at the disposal of every scholar; printed publication of the discovered volumes, whose care will be entrusted to an International Committee (but this second project seems, for the moment, less firm than the first, and the composition of the directing Committee is not yet fixed).

Puech feared that the facsimile edition would precede the International Committee and hence render it irrelevant, in that anyone could publish critical editions:

An important point to settle on will be to know what can be the rôle of this Committee, if the texts of N[ag] H[ammadi] are at first published in photographs, and if, as one seems to envisage it, everyone then has the right to use them and to edit them.

On his arrival in Cairo, Quispel drew up a memorandum (see Chapter 5, Part 3 above), which addressed this issue.

---

91 20 ii 55: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
D’après ce que vous m’avez dit et selon ce que je puis savoir de mon côté, il semble que la solution vers laquelle on s’oriente soit la suivante: édition photographique des papyrus, ainsi mis en vrac à la disposition de tout savant; publication imprimée des volumes retrouvés dont le soin sera confié à un Comité international (mais ce second projet paraît, pour le moment, moins ferme que le premier et la composition du Comité directeur n’est pas encore fixée).

92 7 iii 55: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
Un point important à fixer sera de savoir quel pourra être le rôle de ce Comité, si les écrits de N.H. sont d’abord publiés en photographie et si, comme on semble l’envisager, tout le monde a alors le droit de les utiliser et de les éditer.

93 31 iii 55: Memorandum by Quispel:
M. Pahor Labib m’a communiqué qu’en attendant les éditions définitives on va publier d’abord des photographies des documents, tout en annonçant à la fois (ou même un peu avant) que les autorités égyptiennes ont confié l’édition de ces textes à tel ou tel savant. Tout ceci est parfaitement raisonnable. Ainsi, tout le monde peut lire
Pahor Labib has communicated to me that, while awaiting the definitive editions, one is going first to publish photographs of the documents, while announcing at the same time (or even a bit earlier) that the Egyptian authorities have entrusted the edition of these texts to such and such a scholar. All this is perfectly reasonable. Thus, everyone can read these revelations that one awaits with such impatience, and at the same time one avoids non-authorized editions from appearing on all sides. Nonetheless in this regard one must avoid misunderstandings. Rumors have circulated that these documents would be published entirely in Paris, or at Louvain. After having made the acquaintance of the Egyptian authorities, it is difficult for me to believe that these rumors have foundation. For, in my view, these definitive editions could appear better as the publications of the Coptic Museum, because these texts are to be found in the Coptic Museum and are the glory of Egypt. Has one considered in what way the scientific Academies of all the nations, united with the Egyptian Academy in the Union of Academies, could become interested in this undertaking, which, due to the generosity of the Egyptian scholarly authorities, is going to contribute everything to the progress of international science?

Yet the publishing of a facsimile edition would not in and of itself limit critical editions to those to whom the Egyptians assigned them, since critical editions could be published by any scholar who wished (‘non-authorized editions’).

Puech heard a different rumor, to the effect that the photographs would not be published at all, but only supplied to assigned scholars to edit and publish.\textsuperscript{94}

\textsuperscript{94} 4 v 55: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Avez-vous pu obtenir au Caire quelques renseignements sur les intentions des autorités égyptiennes touchant le sort et la publication du reste de la découverte de N.H.? Aux dernières nouvelles, il ne s’agirait plus d’une édition photographique des papyrus mais simplement de l’exécution de photographies qui seraient communiquées aux savants (mais à qui, exactement, et par qui?). La constitution d’un Comité international de publication ne paraît pas avoir été encore décidée.
Have you [Quispel] been able to obtain in Cairo any information on the intentions of the Egyptian authorities concerning the fate and the publication of the remainder of the discovery of N[ag] H[ammadi]? According to the most recent news, it no longer would have to do with a photographic edition of the papyri, but simply with the production of photographs that would be passed on to scholars (but to whom, exactly, and by whom?). The constitution of an International Committee of publication does not seem to have been decided on yet.

But Mourad Kamel confirmed to Puech the Egyptian plan to publish a facsimile edition:

I [Puech] point out to you [Quispel and Meier] that, according to the information that has been transmitted to me by Kamel, the Egyptians would be thinking of publishing the papyri at first, and as rapidly as possible, in photographic facsimile, thus putting them at the free disposal of everyone.

Till obtained similar details at the Papyrological Congress in Vienna, but drew attention to the practical difficulties in its implementation:

95 3 viii 55: Letters from Puech to Quispel and Meier:

Je vous signale que, d’après les informations qui m’ont été transmises par M. Kamel, les Égyptiens songeraient à publier tout d’abord, et le plus rapidement possible, les papyrus en facsimilé photographique, les mettant ainsi à la libre disposition de tous.

96 26 viii 55: Letter from Till to Doresse:


A gentleman, who has come from Egypt to Vienna for the Congress of Papyrologists [presumably A. Grohmann, an Austrian papyrologist teaching in Cairo, see below], told me that in Cairo one intends to publish the Gnostic manuscripts at first only as volumes of plates. On the first (CG I) [= Codex III], there stands, alongside others, your [Doresse’s] name. When all manuscripts are published, one intends to create an International Committee, in which you too should be. Whether that is really correct, I do not know. In any case, it contradicts what I was told last year in Switzerland. Perhaps both are not right. So I communicate this to you only in a private way, and ask you, not to name me as disseminator of this information, since I cannot guarantee its truth.

If the latest report is true, then the idea gives me concern as to whether the papyri will really be restored and assembled correctly. What happens with the small fragments that are doubtless present? Who assembles them? Or will they be simply omitted in the publication done according to photographs, or ultimately even be thrown away? Will and can the plates be good enough to make possible a reliable treatment, squeezing out the very last detail? In brief, a lot of questions arise. But perhaps it is completely useless to worry about it, for possibly the news turns out to be inaccurate, or the plan will also perhaps again be rejected. The gentleman who told me that, named no one other than your name.

Till passed on the same report to Quispel, and mentioned a still further concern:

How many years will the whole thing take, and will one really wait on the Committee for the editing? Will not anyone who so desires be able to publish a treatment without regard to the Committee?

Actually, it was Till himself who published a non-authorized translation from Pahor Labib’s facsimile edition, namely the four pages from The Gospel of Truth that were among ‘the missing 40 pages’ in Cairo.

Plans in Egypt had advanced to the stage that a subscription price had already been set on the first volume of the series.

---

97 26 viii 55: Letter from Till to Quispel:
Wie viele Jahre dauert das ganze und wird man wirklich mit der Bearbeitung auf das Komitee warten? Wird nicht jeder Beliebige in der Lage sein, ohne Rücksicht auf das Komitee eine Bearbeitung herauszubringen?


99 3 ix 55: Letter from Till to Quispel:
Professor Grohmann (Cairo) sagte auf dem Papyrologenkongress, man könne jetzt zum Preise von einem Pfund auf die photographische Ausgabe der Chenoboskion
Professor Grohmann (Cairo) reported at the Congress of Papyrologists that one can now subscribe to the photographic edition of the library of Chenoskosion at the price of one Pound. I cannot imagine that everything would cost only one Pound. Perhaps that is only CG I.

R. McL. Wilson has confirmed that the price of the first (and only) volume was 1 £É.\textsuperscript{100}

Puech presented his interpretation of these rumors to Quispel as follows:\textsuperscript{101}

The news that Prof. Grohmann would have communicated at the Congress of Papyrology in Vienna contains in itself nothing improbable. Only, the price asked for the photographic reproductions seems extraordinary. The information fits well with what had been told me in February by a friend from Cairo and confirmed a month ago by Murad Kamel: Picking up an old idea of Taha Hussein [the former Minister of Culture and National Orientation], Pahor Labib has formed the plan of publishing the papyri of N[ag] H[ammadi] in photography, and seems to have conceived of the enterprise as independent of the creation of the International Committee of publication. Assuming that the news is correct, it worries me [Puech], in a sense, less than it does you [Quispel]. No doubt the constitution of the International Committee would, because of this, lose a good part of its interest and its raison d’être. But in this way we would be much freer with regard to the Egyptians and even free to publish (finally!) the results of our discoveries. Do you know to whom it is appropriate to address oneself to procure the photographs? I count on buying a complete set as soon as possible.

\textsuperscript{100} 30 iv 81: Letter from Wilson to Robinson.

\textsuperscript{101} 21 ix 55: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

La nouvelle dont le Prof. Grohmann aurait fait part au Congrès de Papyrologie de Vienne n’a en soi rien d’invraisemblable. Seul, le prix demandé pour les reproductions photographiques semble extraordinaire. L’information est bien conforme à ce qui m’avait été annoncé en février par un ami du Caire et confirmé il y a un mois par M. Murad Kamel: reprenant une vieille idée de Taha Hussein, Pahor Labib a formé le projet de publier les papyrus de N.H. en photographie et paraît avoir conçu l’entreprise comme indépendante de la création du Comité international de publication. À supposer que la nouvelle soit exacte, elle m’inquiète, en un sens, moins que vous. Sans doute la constitution du Comité international perdrait-elle de ce fait une bonne part de son intérêt et de sa raison d’être. Mais nous serions ainsi beaucoup plus libres à l’égard des Égyptiens et à même de publier (enfin!) les résultats de nos découvertes. Savez-vous à qui il convient de s’adresser pour se procurer les photographies? Je compte en acheter un lot complet dès que possible.
Puech would have assumed that a facsimile edition would make use of the photographs of Doresse, whom he controlled, and thus would insure French access. Besides, Puech's scholarship did not have its focus on the editing of the texts themselves, but rather on interpreting them once edited, which he would be free to do whenever some coptologist published the critical edition of a text.

Pahor Labib's volume *Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo*, had made the following statement in the preface which he signed:

An international Committee from among scholars dealing with this subject (coptologists and specialists on Gnosticism) has already been approved by H.E. Major Kamal El-Din Hussein, Minister of Education, for studying the different aspects of these Coptic Gnostic Papyri. The Committee will start its work in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo in September next.

To create a favourable atmosphere for the progress of the Coptic studies, this international Committee has been founded to publish all these Gnostic Papyri in a short period. At the same time, it will be avoided that no authorized edition will be published elsewhere.

The co-operation of Prof. W. Till (Manchester, England), Prof. Quispel (Utrecht, Holland), Prof. Puech and Monsieur Doresse (France), Prof. Theodore C. Peterson (Washington, U.S.A.), Prof. Meier (Jung Institute, Zurich, Switzerland), Prof. Murad and Dr. Sobhy have already been promised.

Quispel's memorandum of 31 March 1955 (see Chapter 5, Part 3 above) had advocated that 'one avoids non-authorized editions from appearing on all sides.' This is presumably echoed in Pahor Labib's statement that 'it will be avoided that no authorized edition will be published elsewhere.' But Pahor Labib's comment that founding an international Committee 'to publish all these Gnostic Papyri in a short period' seems to indicate that the International Committee would be the way to implement this objective. His publication of the first volume of his facsimile edition precisely at the opening of the meeting of the International Committee would also indicate this assumption. But, given the incohesiveness of the International Committee, the texts in the first volume of his facsimile edition were not published by the International Committee as such. In fact, Puech and Quispel, who received the first copies at the Cairo meeting in 1956, only published 'the missing 40 pages' from Codex I, to complete their edition of

---

the Jung Codex (see Chapter 3 above), but nothing from Codex II except The Gospel of Thomas (see Chapter 7 below).

Pahor Labib’s volume contained ‘the missing 40 pages’ of Codex I on plates 1–46, and pages 1–110 of Codex II on plates 47–158. In the case of Codex II, plates 47 and 48 present the recto and verso of the first leaf, pages 1 and 2. But plate 49 presents part of the outer margin of page 4, plate 50 part of the outer margin of page 3, plate 51 the inner margin of page 3, and plate 52 the inner margin of page 4. This is due to these two broken leaves being conserved each in two plexiglass containers. The outcome is that the following plates are numbered two digits higher than they otherwise would be. Alexander Böhlig explained this in his edition of one of the affected texts:

The numbers written on the pages by the librarian of the Museum are in each case two higher, since he had numbered separately two pieces belonging to one leaf in the preceding part of the codex.

The librarian of the Coptic Museum wrote page numbers in the top margin. They are cropped off in most cases in Pahor Labib’s facsimile volume, but are still visible on his Plate 68 (Codex II, page 20), where that number 68 in traditional Arabic digits is faintly legible in the top margin, then copied in modern European digits on the pane at the bottom of the page, and on his Plate 145 (Codex II, page 97), where the number 99 in traditional Arabic digits is clearly legible in the top margin of this page, then copied in modern European digits on the pane at the bottom of the page. In UNESCO’s The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Codex II, no numeration is visible at the bottom of the pages, since new plexiglass has replaced the old panes with the old numeration, but, since all the margins are fully visible, the traditional Arabic numeration in the top margin is visible. My ‘Preface’ to the UNESCO volume explained:

---

104 Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib, Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung Nr. 58 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962), 13:

Die vom Bibliothekar des Museums auf die Seiten geschriebenen Zahlen sind jeweils um zwei höher, da er zwei zu einem Blatt gehörige Stücke im vorangehenden Teil des Codex gesondert nummeriert hatte.

105 James M. Robinson et al., eds., The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Codex II, xv, xvii.
The codex did not originally have page numbers. Arabic pagination (absent on plates 3, 4, 6 and hence added after 1949 [when Doresse made these photographs in the residence of Maria Dattari]) numbered the two major fragments of p. 3 as four and five and of p. 4 as three and six, with the result that this numbering system is two numerals too high for the rest of the codex. In the present edition inscribed pages are assigned numbers, given in pointed brackets < >; uninscribed pages are assigned letters. ... To avoid the confusion of a plurality of numbering systems, users are requested to refer to pages by the inferred original pagination printed at the top of each plate rather than by the plate numbers in the facsimile volume of 1956 or those printed at the bottom outside corner of the present edition. References in previous literature frequently make use of the earlier plate numbers but can be converted into these page numbers by subtracting 48 (plates 53–158 of the 1956 edition = pages <5>–<110>), except that plates 47–48 = pages <1>–<2> and plates 49–52 = pages <3>–<4>.

The reproductions in Pahor Labib’s volume were about two-thirds their natural size. His plate 145 (Codex II, page 97), which includes the top and bottom margins, measures 18 cm. in height, whereas the one-to-one reproduction of this page in *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices* measures 28 cm. in height.

Though Pahor Labib’s facsimile volume did not state that it was initiating a series of facsimile volumes, the preface did conclude:106

Further volumes with photographic reproductions will soon follow.

Hans-Martin Schenke had been active translating the tractates published in Pahor Labib’s first volume of facsimiles (see Chapter 8, Part 1 below), and hence he wrote to the *Deutsches Archäologisches Institut* in Cairo late in 1958 to inquire about the status of the second volume of facsimiles. But no clear answer was forthcoming:107

The final form of the second volume by Pahor Labib has still not been decided. Originally it was planned that it should contain the translations of the first volume. Only today did I speak again with Dr. Pahor Labib. Apparently the question is still not clarified, and does not depend on him, but on the Ministry.

---


107 5 xii 58: Letter from Erik Hornung of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut in Cairo to Schenke:

Die endgültige Form des zweiten Bandes von Pahor Labib ist immer noch nicht entschieden, ursprünglich war geplant, dass er die Übersetzungen des ersten Bandes enthalten sollte. Ich sprach erst heute nochmals mit Dr. Pahor Labib. Anscheinend ist die Frage aber immer noch ungeklärt und hängt nicht von ihm, sondern vom Ministerium ab.
But Martin Krause and Pahor Labib announced in 1962 that further volumes of facsimiles were in preparation:\textsuperscript{108}

Two further volumes of plates, which will contain Codex II, p. 111 to the end, and Codex III, are in preparation.

The second volume was to contain the rest of Codex II:

The rest of the text [Codex II, Tractate 5: \textit{On the Origin of the World}] will follow in Volume 2, plates 159–175.\textsuperscript{109}

Pahor Labib will publish photos of [Codex II, Tractate 6] \textit{The Exegesis on the Soul}. [Footnote 8:] P. Labib, op. cit., II, Plates 175–185.\textsuperscript{110}

P. Labib will publish photos of [Codex II, Tractate 7] \textit{The Book of Thomas the Athlete}. [Footnote 10:] P. Labib, op. cit., II, Plates 186–193.\textsuperscript{111}

The third volume was to contain Codex III (see above), though this is also referred to as included in the second volume:\textsuperscript{112}

In the year 1958 S[e]ren Giversen, commissioned by the Egyptological Institute of the University of Copenhagen, made 137 microfilm pictures of Codex

\textsuperscript{108} Krause and Labib, \textit{Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo}, 6, n. 6 (which begun on p. 5):

Zwei weitere Tafelbände, die Codex II S. 111 bis Ende und Codex III enthalten werden, befinden sich in Vorbereitung.

\textsuperscript{109} Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, \textit{Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo}, 17, n. 2:

Der Rest der Schrift wird in Bd. II Tafel 159–175 folgen.

\textsuperscript{110} Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, \textit{Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo}, 17:


\textsuperscript{111} Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, \textit{Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo}, 17 and n. 10:


\textsuperscript{112} Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, \textit{Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo}, 19:

III. The numbers 162–298 contain Codex III. For technical reasons it will unfortunately not be possible to use these microfilm pictures for the second volume of plates that P. Labib will publish.

None of this actually appeared, for Pahor Labib’s facsimile edition was in fact discontinued. This was apparently because the published photographs were not clear enough for good transcriptions to be made of the Coptic text for translation. This seems to be what is intended in a letter from Erik Horning of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Abteilung Kairo to Schenke:113

To your inquiry I can inform you that the second volume of Pahor Labib, ‘Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo’ has not yet appeared, and, as I have been told, also probably will not appear very soon, since difficulties with translating have surfaced.

UNESCO’s Preliminary Committee of 1961, chaired by Pahor Labib, recommended that UNESCO provide a photographer, and allocate all the funds that were available to the Nag Hammadi project for 1962 to advance a seven-volume facsimile edition edited by Pahor Labib (see Chapter 9, Part 2 below). But then this facsimile edition planned by UNESCO came to be interpreted not as a continuation of Labib’s inadequate edition, but rather as its replacement with an edition based on new photography, though no doubt initially intended to be presented as edited by Pahor Labib:114

Quispel reported that the International Committee meeting in 1956 agreed that the Nag Hammadi codices would not be published in a facsimile edition, but instead would be microfilmed only for the use of the Committee:115

Microfilms will be made by the Centre of Documentation of all the leaves of the collection and be put exclusively at the disposal of members of the Committee.

113 16 ix 58: Letter from Hornung to Schenke:


114 18 vi 63: Letter from Krause to Schenke:

Der 2. Photoband von Pahor Labib wird wohl nicht erscheinen, denn—das ist das Ergebnis der UNESCO-Besprechungen—die UNESCO will Geld zur Verfügung stellen, dass alle 13 Codices in Tafelbänden publiziert werden.

115 According to the hand-written memorandum prepared at the time by Gilles Quispel (see Part 2 above).
Yet these minutes prepared by Quispel may well represent only Quispel’s preferences, rather than the actual plan of Pahor Labib, who never distributed official minutes, and, as we have just seen, continued to publish reports that his facsimile edition would continue. The Center of Documentation had at that time not yet been enlisted for the photography.

4. The Photography of Jean Doresse

On 12 October 1956 Pahor Labib wrote Doresse:116

In its meeting of October 9th 1956, the International Committee for the study and publication of the Gnostic papyri of the Coptic Museum, “regretting the absence of Monsieur Doresse, asks him urgently to put as soon as possible at its disposition, through the intermediary of Dr. Pahor Labib, Director of the Coptic Museum, all the photographic reproductions that he has of the manuscripts found near Nag-Hammadi, those being indispensable for preparing the edition which he and the other members of the Committee are bound to publish, together.”

“His colleagues will appreciate immensely this act of solidarity with the Committee.”

You remember dear Monsieur Doresse, that you promised me orally and also in your letter dated 18th January 1953, to put all these photographic reproductions under the disposal of the Coptic Museum.

You can send the photos to me through my friend the present Ambassador of Egypt in Paris.

The specific date of 9 October 1956, while the meeting was taking place, and the explicit quotations, sound as if Pahor Labib is quoting from minutes, of which however there is otherwise no record. The quotations may actually have been supplied by Quispel, since they reflect his point of view.

On 26 October 1956 Doresse answered Pahor Labib.117

116 12 x 56: Letter from Pahor Labib to Doresse.
117 26 x 56: Letter from Doresse to Pahor Labib:

Je regrette très vivement de ne pas avoir été présent aux séances du comité qui devait envisager les conditions de publication des manuscrits gnostiques. Étant donné la date tardive à laquelle m’était parvenue votre convocation, il n’a pas été possible,—comme je le craignais,—, de préparer mon voyage en Égypte pour ce moment.

Je reste, comme je vous l’ai écrit, très sensible à l’offre que vous m’avez faite de participer à ce travail sous votre direction. Mais je ne pourrai vraiment accepter de façon définitive, d’être membre du comité responsable d’un travail aussi important, que lorsque je connaîtrai de vous les conditions précises de cette publication, qui pose
I regret very much not having been present at the sessions of the committee that is to envisage the conditions for the publication of the Gnostic manuscripts. Given the late date on which your invitation reached me, it was not possible—as I feared—to prepare my trip to Egypt for this time.

I remain, as I wrote you, very appreciative of the offer that you made to me to participate in this work under your direction. But I will really be able to accept in a definitive way becoming a member of the committee responsible for a work so important when I know from you the precise conditions of this publication that poses so many problems. All that I know up to the present is limited to what your preceding letter informed me. I would hence like to know who are going to be the members of the committee; what will be their work, and what exact part will be reserved in it for me; where, and in what language, will the volumes be published; by whom, finally, will the material expenses of the work be assured.

I suppose that the first reunions that you hold in Cairo will permit making all these points precise. I hope to be informed with regard to them as rapidly as possible.

I will be happy to transmit to you whatever photographs I had made, personally, of the manuscripts, when I made their appraisal. I recall to you that there should exist one or two series of them in the Coptic Museum, which it would perhaps be possible to locate. They have already served to make the manuscripts known to the members of the Purchase Committee of the Museum, in February 1949. These are the same as those that I possess. You will see that, though they have been sufficient for a first expertise, they are not clear enough for the work of editing. It would be necessary, above all else, to
photograph the complete manuscripts. It would even be preferable to establish the texts on the basis of the manuscripts themselves. This is the only way to avoid errors in readings.

I would hope very much, for my part, to receive the first manuscripts of my draft of an edition, which I had entrusted to you, and of which, no doubt, you now have no further need.

It is clear from this letter that the others invited to the Cairo meeting had not communicated with Doresse. He quite understandably wanted to know what rôle he might play other than turning in his photographs. He also wanted to make clear that the photographs were his personal property, not funded by the archaeological grant that took him to Egypt. This was a subtle way of suggesting that he was not obligated to turn them in, and might even expect remuneration for them. Since Togo Mina was Director when he had provided photographs to the Coptic Museum, they may not have remained at the Coptic Museum during the difficult transition of leadership.

Furthermore, Doresse wanted back the manuscripts he had prepared for an edition of Codex III, perhaps out of fear that the committee publish them without his involvement, or, in case he no longer had a copy at his disposal, so that he could proceed to their publication. He obviously sensed the policy of the others to exclude him, and so tried to do what he could to maintain his position.

After waiting for more than a year for a reply, Doresse again wrote Pahor Labib, saying that, in view of the possibility that Pahor Labib may not have received his letter, he would repeat its contents. He clarified his comment that he did not have photographs of all the pages, and offered to do the complete photography and their publication; and he was also more explicit in what he wanted returned to him, namely what he had edited of Codex III.\footnote{22 xii 57: Letter from Doresse to Pahor Labib:}

\begin{quote}
Surtout, elles ne représentent qu’une petite partie des manuscrits: exactement celle que Mademoiselle Dattari m’avait autorisé à photographier. Vous avez maintenant en mains tous les manuscrits: il y aurait sans doute lieu d’en établir des photographies nouvelles, complètes, et plus claires. Si le Musée Copte ne pouvait prendre ce travail à sa charge, il nous serait facile de l’exécuter. Vous savez qu’en 1951 déjà nous étions prêts à vous apporter notre aide la plus large et la plus amicale pour la remise en état des manuscrits, pour leur complète photographie, et aussi pour leur publication.

De mon côté, je souhaiterais bien vivement recevoir de vous le projet d’édition du manuscrit découvert en 1946–1947 par le Musée Copte (Sagesse de Jésus, Épître d’Eugnoste, ...) que je vous avais confié il y a déjà plusieurs années pour que vous puissiez le présenter au Comité du Musée Copte. Sans doute n’en avez-vous plus besoin maintenant?
\end{quote}
Most of all, they [Doresse's photographs] represent only a small part of the manuscripts, precisely those that Mlle Dattari had authorized me to photograph. You now have in your hands all the manuscripts. It would no doubt be appropriate to make new, complete, and more legible photographs of them. If the Coptic Museum could not take this work under its responsibility, it would be easy for us to execute it. You know that already in 1951 we were ready to accord you our very substantial and amicable assistance, to put the manuscripts in good condition, to photograph them completely, and also to publish them.

For my part, I would very much hope to receive from you the draft of an edition of the manuscript discovered in 1946–1947 by the Coptic Museum (Wisdom of Jesus, Epistle of Eugnostos, ...), which I had entrusted to you several years ago so that you could present it to the Committee of the Coptic Museum. No doubt you no longer have need of it now?

Doresse then wrote Puech with a copy of his letter to Pahor Labib:

Attached I send you the photographs of the Gnostic manuscripts that I have in hand. I will have a new series of them printed for myself. ...

I add to this a copy of the letter that, by this courier, I send to Dr. Pahor Labib. Having verified the dates of the various occurrences, it is possible that he never received the reply that I wrote to his request of October 1956 for the photographs. It is very possible that my letter never got through in time.

The ‘various occurrences’ that could have prevented Doresse’s letter from reaching Pahor Labib were the Suez Crisis and Egypt breaking diplomatic relations with France. But the actual cause for Pahor Labib not replying to Doresse during 1957 would seem to be the plans being worked out with Quispel for Søren Giversen to come to Cairo and do the photography (see Part 5 below).

The photographs that Doresse finally supplied to Puech clearly did not satisfy him. Doresse had earlier encouraged Puech to think that he had photographs of many, if not all, the Nag Hammadi pages, so as to keep Puech dependent on him. Hence Doresse’s talk now of having photographs of only ‘a small part of the manuscripts’ (in his letter to Pahor Labib, of which he

---

119 25 xii 57: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Ci-joint je vous remets les photographies des manuscrits gnostiques que j’ai sous la main: je m’en ferai tirer une nouvelle série. ...

J’ajoute à cela la copie de la lettre que, par ce courrier, j’envoie au Dr. Pahor Labib. Vérification faite des dates des divers événements, il se peut qu’il n’ait jamais reçu la réponse que je lui ai faite, à sa demande de photographies d’octobre 1956. Il se peut fort bien que ma lettre n’ait point passé à temps.
sent a copy to Puech) must have seemed to Puech to be a deception. In any case, at the first meeting of UNESCO’s International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices in December 1970 at Cairo (see Chapter 11, Part 4 below), Puech explicitly asked me, as Permanent Secretary of that Committee, to introduce myself to Doresse, win his friendship, and get from him all his photographs. I carried through, visiting Jean and Marianne Doresse in the tiny Paris flat of her mother, a Russian émigrée, putting him on the mailing list of all my mailings to the UNESCO committee, and seeing to it that Brill sent him a complimentary copy of each volume of *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices* as it appeared. Doresse then entrusted to me his Nag Hammadi archives, including his photographs. Though they are much less than Puech hoped, they are as follows:

1. The photographs of Codex III that Doresse made in December 1947 at the Coptic Museum, in the form of small prints pasted onto green paper.
2. The small number of photographs Maria Dattari had permitted him to make in her apartment of the codices she owned, to use in selling her manuscripts.
3. A booklet of transparent containers with negatives of Codex I, which Albert or Simone Eid had given Doresse in hopes of selling the bulk of Codex I that they owned, but which Simone Eid then had to retrieve from him and transmit to the Jung Institute in Zürich, after it purchased her major part of Codex I (as the Jung Codex). C.A. Meier gave me this booklet of negatives.

I made use of all three parts of Doresse’s photographs in preparing *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices* (see Chapter 11, Part 4 below). Every volume lists in the Introduction the source of each photograph that was published. Some of Doresse’s photographs proved to be valuable, since they provided the only surviving evidence, on the edge of fragmentary leaves, of letters, or just parts of letters, that had broken off and become lost after his photographs were made.

5. *The Microfilming of Søren Giversen*

Gilles Quispel attended the Second International Congress for Classical Studies in Copenhagen 24–28 August 1954. It may well be at this meeting

---

120 ii 54: Letter of invitation from Carsten Høeg to Quispel; i iii 54: Letter from Quispel to Meier.
that he became acquainted with C.E. Sander-Hansen, the Professor of Egyptology at the University of Copenhagen, and his student Søren Giversen. In any case, Giversen received a grant from the Foundation for the Awarding of Guest Stipends in the Netherlands to Danish Students (‘Stichting tot de verlening van gastvrijheid in Nederland aan deense studenten’), making it possible for him to study with Quispel at Utrecht University from August through November 1955, after which he went to Paris to meet Puech. Quispel then contacted Pahor Labib proposing that Giversen come to Cairo to photograph the codices, and Pahor Labib replied approving Giversen’s mission. Finally Quispel could write Giversen as follows:121

In a letter of 24 January 1957 Pahor Labib lets me know that Giversen is welcome from the beginning of February 1957 in the Coptic Museum.

I would kindly ask you to turn directly to Dr. Pahor Labib (Coptic Museum—Old Cairo), to inform him that the Rask Ørstedt Foundation is ready to pay for your trip and the camera and to ask him as a result to confirm that you can work there.

I would be glad to hear from you whether and when you plan to go to Egypt. I advise you not to go before September 1957.

Puech expressed to Quispel concern over how he could control Giversen:122

Keep me up to date on the news that you can have from Cairo and on your negotiations with the Danish and American foundations. ...

121 6 ii 57: Letter from Quispel to Giversen:

In een brief van 24 januari 1957 deelt de heer Pahor Labib mij mede, dat de heer Giversen vanaf begin februari 1957 welkom is in het Koptisch Museum.

Ik zou U willen verzoeken zich direct tot Dr Pahor Labib (Coptic Museum—Old Cairo) te wenden, om deze mede te delen dat de Rask Ørstedt Foundation bereid is Uw reis en het fotoapparaat te betalen en hem bevestiging te vragen van het feit, dat U daar kunt werken.


122 30 iv 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Tenez-moi au courant des nouvelles que vous pouvez avoir du Caire et de vos négociations avec les fondations danoise et américaine. ...

Si le jeune Giversen se rend au Caire en septembre, auriez-vous l’obligence de le prier de m’écrire pour que je lui donne mes instructions avant son départ? J’aimerais bien aussi avoir son adresse.

Le travail de photographie se poursuit-il au Caire, et sera-t-il terminé en septembre? Giversen nous rapportera-t-il tous les lots à son retour?
If the young Giversen goes to Cairo in September, would you be so kind as to ask him to write me so that I can give my instructions to him before his departure? I would also like to have his address.

The work of photography, will it take place in Cairo, and will it be terminated in September? Will Giversen bring us all the lots on his return?

Quispel, apparently waiting for Giversen’s grant to be confirmed, provided no satisfactory reply. Hence a month later Puech again wrote Quispel even more explicitly his demands concerning Giversen’s mission:  

Tell me, as I have already asked of you, the address of Giversen, who was to have put himself in contact with me and ask for my instructions. I do not wish to have the air of being held at a distance from the decisions relative to his mission, as it seems that I am from the negotiations undertaken with the Danish Foundation and the Bollingen Foundation. Make clear to me, I ask of you, from your side, the objective of the mission of Giversen and the results that one should expect from it. Especially, is it specified that, in case he succeeds in taking photographs or microfilms of all the papyri of Nag Hamâdi, a complete set of these documents is to be reserved for me and immediately supplied after his return, as well as to each of the members of the Committee?

Once Giversen received the necessary funding from the Rast-Ørsted Foundation, he promptly wrote Quispel inviting him to Copenhagen to discuss plans for the trip to Egypt:  

Yesterday professor Hal Koch and later Prof. Sander-Hansen phoned to me and told me that the trustees of the ‘Rask-Ørsted Foundation’ in a meeting now had resolved to give the sum, which was asked for of Prof. Sander-Hansen, for the project of microfilming the manuscripts from Nag-Hammadi, in all 15,000 Danish crowns (I have as you know already a grant for the journey); at the same time Sander-Hansen asked me to write to you and invite to come to Denmark; they would be very glad if you would come before the 22. June, because the term ends at that date, and they would like in good time to make

---

123 31 v 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel: 

Indiquez-moi, ainsi que je vous l’avais déjà demandé, l’adresse de Giversen, qui aurait dû se mettre en relation avec moi et s’enquérir de mes instructions. Je ne veux pas avoir d’air d’être tenu à l’écart des décisions relatives à sa mission, comme il semble que je le sois des négociations engagées avec la Fondation danoise et la Fondation Bollingen. Précisez-moi, je vous prie, de votre côté, le but de la mission de Giversen et les résultats qu’on en doit attendre: est-il notamment spécifié qu’au cas où il parviendrait à exécuter les photographies ou les microfilms de tous les papyrus de Nag Hamâdi, un lot complet de ces documents devra m’être réservé et aussitôt remis après son retour, ainsi qu’à chacun des membres du Comité?

124 30 v 57: Letter from Giversen to Quispel.
all plans for the project ready. The Rask-Ørsted Foundation has given some money to pay your journey. ...

I hope soon to see you and I shall be very glad to hear from you. I am very happy that I now can tell you the final decision from Rask-Ørsted.

On the occasion of Quispel’s visit to Copenhagen, Sander-Hansen wrote on their behalf a joint letter to Pahor Labib:

On the occasion of the visit of Prof. Quispel we feel the necessity to send you our most hearty greetings. ...

We have come together to prepare the trip of Giversen, who in your last letter you were so kind as to say would be welcome for collaboration in the Coptic Museum. Giversen thinks he can present himself to you at the beginning of October, and I thank you again that you have drawn him to you for this very significant collaboration. Furthermore I am convinced that it will be very useful for him in general to study with you and in addition to experience the wonders of Egypt. ...

Prof. Quispel, Prof. Koch and Giversen have wished to join me in our most hearty greetings.

Pahor Labib could only welcome this letter, with its news that Giversen was coming to the Coptic Museum to photograph the Nag Hammadi Codices. This would seem to Pahor Labib to be a much-needed alternative, either to the inadequate photographic staff and equipment of the Coptic Museum, which had provided the photography in the first volume of Pahor Labib’s facsimile edition, or to Doresse as photographer. But what was not made clear to Pahor Labib was Quispel’s intention for Giversen not to make photographs to be used for Pahor Labib’s facsimile edition, but rather to make

---

125 11 vi 57: Letter from Sander-Hansen to Pahor Labib, co-signed by G. Quispel, H. Koch, S. Giversen:

Anlässlich des Besuchs von Herrn Professor Quispel fühlen wir den Drang Ihnen unsere herzlichsten Grüsse zu senden. ...

Wir sind zusammen gekommen um die Reise von Herrn Giversen vorzubereiten, den Sie nach Ihrem letzten Brief so freundlich zu einer Zusammenarbeit im Koptischen Museum willkommen gehissen haben. Herr Giversen gedenkt sich anfangs Oktober bei Ihnen vorzustellen, und ich danke Ihnen wiederum, dass Sie ihn zu der bedeutungsvollen Zusammenarbeit hinzugezogen haben. Ausserdem bin ich überzeugt, dass es ihm sonst sehr nützlich wird bei Ihnen zu studieren und noch dazu die Wunder Ägyptens zu erleben. ...

Herr Professor Quispel, Professor Koch und Herr Giversen haben gewünscht sich mit mir in den herzlichsten Grüsse zu vereinigen.
microfilms as an alternative to it (see the reference to microfilms in Quispel’s list of ‘Decisions’ of the International Committee that he considered to be ‘minutes’ that ‘are correct,’ see Parts 2 and 3 above). For a facsimile edition would be accessible to all, which would frustrate any attempt to keep the texts limited to the International Committee and those to whom they chose to assign them. But the written agreement with which each of the three microfilms made by Giversen begins (see below) does not make this clear, but continues to speak of Pahor Labib’s ongoing facsimile edition:

The negatives of the microfilms, taken by Søren Giversen, will be used for enlargements of which the photographic reproductions of the rest of the collection will be published in the second and following volumes by Dr. Pahor Labib, director of the Coptic Museum, and Søren Giversen, delegate from the Institute of Egyptology, Copenhagen.

Pahor Labib continued to assume that his facsimile edition would be published, since he and Krause went on to announce that the second and third volumes would soon appear (see above).

Apparently Quispel had realized already during one of his Cairo trips in 1955 or 1956 that the monopoly might not be maintained, since the facsimile edition was already then in the planning stage. He may have devised the microfilm alternative while there, since he was able to supply Sander-Hansen with information about a Cairo firm that could supply microfilming equipment. On the same day that Sander-Hansen wrote Pahor Labib, he also wrote the firm:

We have with the greatest interest studied your information concerning microfilming, using your portable microfilming camera. These instructions have been sent to us through Professor Quispel. Negotiations concerning the microfilming of some manuscripts in the Coptic Museum in Cairo are now coming to a head and we want further information about the procedure and the prices you may offer us.

As mentioned, the object to be filmed are manuscripts and we want to know if you can lend our representative, Mr. S. Giversen, a microfilming camera and what price it will be pro month. Then we want to know what the price is for the camera, if we decide to buy instead of hiring the camera. Furthermore we should like to know whether you will be kind enough to help, inform and assist Mr. Giversen concerning the use of the camera. Mr. Giversen intends to come to Egypt about the beginning of October.

\[126\] 11 vi 57: Letter from Sander-Hansen to FOPEX, Elie Alexandre Kiomgi.
We should be most grateful to you if you would kindly tell us something about these points and let us know some more details about the practical side of hiring or buying the camera.

We have with the greatest pleasure read your information to Professor Quispel and are now awaiting the pleasure of receiving your most honoured reply.

Sander-Hansen had Giversen forward to Quispel the reply from Kiomgi offering to send the camera to Europe. In his covering letter to Quispel Giversen reported:

Professor Sander-Hansen has asked me send you a copy of a letter to him from Mr. Kioumgi. Prof. Sander-Hansen would be very pleased for possible remarks or suggestions from you concerning the project before he answers Mr. Kioumgi, and I am asked to inform you about prof. Sander-Hansen's view which is following:

– that we buy the camera (and the sufficient films) which—invoiced to the university of Copenhagen—is to be delivered at the Danish Embassy in Cairo, to a price of L.E. 300; that the camera not shall be sold again, but be brought to Denmark;
– that we—for the sake of cautiousness—take two negatives of each page and keep them separate;
– that we at the place let make 5 positive copies: for you, Messrs Puech, Till and Labib, and us.

Several things can be inferred from this letter: Giversen would be using equipment first made available to him in Cairo, with which he was hence not familiar. This would help to explain the inadequacy of his microfilms. The inquiry about monthly rental costs indicates that he intended to stay more than a month, if necessary, to microfilm all the codices. As it turned out, his actual microfilming of Nag Hammadi Codices was limited to a matter of days (1–9 January 1958), and included only three of the thirteen codices. Actually, he had begun preparations at the Coptic Museum as early as 19 November 1957, but a problem had arisen about which he wrote to Quispel for a solution:

I have started the work in the Coptic Museum. Dr. Labib has received me very kindly, and I hope the best for the project. The microcamera is here and it functions fine.

Thus should everything be in order, but a problem is now to be dissolved in one or another way, and concerning this I now write to you. Dr. Labib has told

127 1 vii 57: Letter from Kiomgi to Sander-Hansen.
128 30 vii 57: Letter from Giversen to Quispel.
129 19 xi 57: Letter from Giversen to Quispel.
me, that he expects photographs of the Jung Codex, according to a promise from you, and that M. Doresse once promised him to send him copies of all the photographs which Doresse once took of the Gnostic papyri now here in the museum, and he said that before the museum had received the photographs of the Jung Codex and the photographs from M. Doresse, would there not be send positive copies of the microfilms to you and to professor Puech.

I am very anxious to go on with work, and I therefore ask you, if you have any influence on it to try to dissolve this problem, and I ask you so soon as possible get in contact with Dr. Labib, who suggested that you should get in contact with respective parts in Europe, the Jung Institute and prof. Puech and M. Doresse.

I write to you in the hope that you will try to dissolve this problem. I have no authority in this case, but wish that you and Dr. Labib may find a way through direct negotiations.

Quispel responded to Giversen: 130

I think Dr. Pahor Labib is perfectly right: neither I nor Prof. Puech should receive the photographs before Mr. Doresse and the Jung Institute have fulfilled their obligations. ...

Remember that you are not working for Puech or me but for the International Committee. It is of interest for scholarship in general that all the manuscripts should be microfilmed. So please, go on with your work and finish it as soon as possible.

But Puech had received a written commitment from Giversen that he would receive a copy of the photographs: 131

You can naturally count on receiving a positive copy of all the microfilms of these texts that I will have taken in Cairo for the Rask-Ørsted Foundation. It is the plan of Sander-Hansen that one should make two (two as a measure of precaution) microfilms of all the lot and to make five positive copies of one: one for you, one for Quispel, one for Till, one for Pahor Labib, and one for Denmark.

130 25 xi 57: Letter from Quispel to Giversen.
131 14 viii 57: Letter from Giversen to Puech, quoted in a letter of 8 iv 58 from Puech to Quispel:

Vous pouvez naturellement compter recevoir une copie positive de tous les microfilms de ces textes, que j’aurai exécutées au Caire pour la Fondation Rask-Ørsted. C’est le plan de M. Sander-Hansen qu’on doit exécuter deux (2 comme une mesure de précaution) microfilms de tout le lot, et de l’un exécuter 5 copies positif: 1 à vous, 1 à M. Quispel, 1 à M. Till, 1 à Pahor Labib et 1 à Danemark.
Quispel may have informed Puech of the condition Pahor Labib imposed on Giversen’s microfilms being made available to them. In any case Puech wrote Doresse to come for an urgent meeting in his office about the Nag Hammadi texts.\footnote{18 xii 57: Letter from Puech to Doresse.} Thereupon Doresse wrote to Pahor Labib, trying to reactivate his rôle as photographer of the Nag Hammadi texts: \footnote{22 xii 57: Letter from Doresse to Pahor Labib:}

> The last letter that you sent me dated from 12 October 1956 (reference 7/8/241). I replied to it immediately, but, perhaps as a result of the events, this reply never reached you? So I recall to you what I wrote you at that time. ... 

> I replied, finally, to your request for photographs of the Gnostic manuscripts that I possessed.

> On this last point, I informed you that I was ready to transmit to you the few photographs of the manuscripts of Naga Hamadi that I had been able to make personally, when I made the expertise of these writings in 1948–1949 for the Purchase Committee of the Coptic Museum. I indicated to you at the same time that two complete sets of these photographs ought still to be in the

> Je souhaite pouvoir enfin vous transmettre ces photographies—celles dont je dispose à Paris—par la voie que vous voudrez bien m’indiquer.

> Je dois toutefois vous signaler que—comme vous pourrez vous-même le constater sur mes documents—ces photographies qui avaient été suffisantes pour une première expertise ne sont certainement pas assez nettes pour un travail d’édition. Surtout, elles ne représentent qu’une petite partie des manuscrits: exactement celle que Mademoiselle Dattari m’avait autorisé à photographier. Vous avez maintenant en mains tous les manuscrits: il y aurait sans doute lieu d’en établir des photographies nouvelles, complètes, et plus claires. Si le Musée Copte ne pouvait prendre ce travail à sa charge, il nous serait facile de l’exécuter. Vous savez qu’en 1951 déjà nous étions prêt à vous apporter notre aide la plus large et la plus amicale pour la remise en état des manuscrits, pour leur complète photographie, et aussi pour leur publication.
Coptic Museum, to which I gave them to facilitate the work of the Purchase Committee that met in February 1949.

So I hope to be able to transmit the photographs to you—those that I have at my disposal in Paris—by any avenue that you would be so kind as to indicate to me.

I should nonetheless indicate to you—as you could yourself establish on the basis of my documents—that these photographs that had sufficed for a first expertise are certainly not clear enough for the work of publication. Especially, they only represent a small part of the manuscripts: precisely, what Mlle Dattari had authorized me to photograph. You now have in hand all the manuscripts. There would no doubt be occasion to establish new photographs of them, complete and clearer. If the Coptic Museum could not take charge of this work, it would be easy for us to carry it out. You know that already in 1951 we were ready to bring you our greatest and most amicable aid, for restoring the condition of the manuscripts, for their complete photography, and also for their publication.

Puech proposed having Doresse’s photographs hand-carried to Pahor Labib through the intermediary of Mme Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt of the Louvre, a personage highly esteemed in Egypt for having been instrumental in creating the Centre de Documentation et d’Études sur l’Histoire de l’Art et de la Civilisation de l’Égypte Ancienne:

To come to the most urgent matter, Mme Desroches-Noblecourt (whose views with regard to you are excellent) is quite willing to transmit to Dr. Pahor Labib the set of photographs requested. However she leaves for Cairo next Saturday, to be back about 15 January. It is hence necessary to act as quickly as possible, in spite of the inappropriateness during these days of vacation. ... Mme Desroches will turn them in personally to Dr. Pahor Labib, who thus will...

---

134 24 xii 57: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Pour en venir au plus urgent, Mme Desroches-Noblecourt (dont les dispositions à votre égard sont excellentes) accepte volontiers de transmettre au Dr. Pahor Labib le lot de photographies demandées. Cependant, elle part au Caire samedi prochain pour être de retour vers le 15 janvier. Il faut donc agir au plus vite, en dépit de l’inopportunité de ces temps de vacances. ... Madame Desroches les remettra personnellement au Dr. Pahor Labib, qui n’aura ainsi plus de grief, ou de prétexte, à invoquer contre vous et, par ricochet, contre moi ou les Français. Les entretiens qu’elle doit avoir avec lui contribueront, d’ailleurs, à lui donner toute satisfaction, tout apaisement, et nous fixeront sur ses intentions à notre égard. Mais la remise des photographies constitue une condition, ou un atout, indispensable.

J’insiste, en effet, une fois de plus, sur la gravité de l’affaire, et du risque que nous courons l’un et l’autre. Il est aussi important qu’urgent de tenter de gagner la partie en mettant entre les mains du Dr. Pahor Labib les photographies qu’il désire si vivement. Le point noir est qu’il soit persuadé que vous avez photographié tous les papyrus.
no longer have a grievance, or a pretext, to invoke against you, and by ricochet, against me or the French. The discussions that she would have with him will contribute, incidentally, to giving him full satisfaction, full appeasement, and will clarify for us his intentions with regard to us. But the turning in of the photographs constitutes an indispensable condition or trump card.

I insist, in effect, one more time, on the gravity of the situation, and of the risk that we both run. It is as important as it is urgent to try to win the game by putting in the hands of Dr. Pahor Labib the photographs that he desires so much. The black point is that he be persuaded that you have photographed all the papyri.

Doresse replied promptly by submitting the prints of his photographs that he had on hand:  

Attached I supply to you the photographs of the Gnostic manuscripts that I have immediately at hand. I do not have duplicates, but, with the negatives, it will be easy to print a new series of them.

I add to this a copy of the letter that I have sent to Dr. Pahor Labib. I think, after having verified the dates of the events of October and November 1956, that he may have never received the response that I made to his request for photographs last year. Madame Noblecourt will be able, I hope, to clarify this fact, and at the same time to appease Dr. Pahor, who, if this is the case, may remain under the impression that I left his letter unanswered!

In this way Puech was able to have Doresse's photographs, as well as a copy of Doresse's letter to Pahor Labib, hand-carried to Pahor Labib through the intermediary of Mme Desroches-Noblecourt. But it met only one of Pahor Labib's conditions for authorizing Giversen to give Quispel and Puech copies of his microfilm; the other depended on the Jung Institute providing photographs of the Jung Codex leaves that were in Zürich. Nor did it achieve Doresse's objective of being enlisted as the photographer, since instead Giversen had been engaged to do the photography.

135 25 xii 57: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Ci-joint, je vous remets les photographies des manuscrits gnostiques que j’ai immédiatement sous la main. Je n’en ai pas de doubles mais, avec les négatifs, il sera aisé d’en tirer une nouvelle série.

J’ajoute à cela une copie de la lettre que j’ai envoyée au Dr. Pahor Labib. Je pense, après avoir vérifié les dates des événements d’octobre et novembre 1956, qu’il a pu ne jamais recevoir la réponse que j’avais faite à sa demande de photographies de l’an passé. Madame Noblecourt pourra, je l’espère, éclaircir ce fait et apaiser en même temps le Dr. Pahor qui, s’il en est ainsi, doit rester sous l’impression que j’ai laissé sa lettre sans réponse!
Till heard of Giversen’s project, and informed Doresse of it:136

As I hear, the Danes want to have all the Chenoboskion manuscripts photographed, and persons who are authorized can then get prints. But I do not know how far that has become a settled fact or is merely a plan.

Till wrote Quispel of an instance in America of the ‘unauthorized’ use of Pahor Labib’s facsimile edition to edit a tractate, and suggested a way to prevent that happening in the case of the projected subsequent volumes of Pahor Labib’s facsimile edition:137

Incidentally, I recently received a letter from the USA in which the sender mentions as an aside that he now has a pupil who for his dissertation is working on one of the texts ‘published’ by Pahor Labib. As I already once earlier said: Whenever these texts are once published, in whatever form that may be, everyone can work on them and publish such works. If such works appear before our official edition, that limits the sale of the official edition very much. For a person who already possesses an edition of this text will think twice about giving out an appreciable amount to acquire a further edition. I believe it would after all be much better if Pahor Labib would not publish his facsimile volumes before the publication of the official edition of the texts. I have not yet read Doresse’s new book. What he intends to do is also quite uncertain.

A fortnight later Till wrote again to Quispel about ‘unauthorized’ editions:138

---

136 27 xii 57: Letter from Till to Doresse:

Wie ich höre, wollen die Dänen alle die Chenoboskion-Handschriften photographieren lassen und die dazu berechtigten Personen können sich dann Abzüge verschaffen. Ich weiß aber nicht, wie weit das schon eine abgemachte Sache oder bloss ein Plan ist.

137 12 ii 58: Letter from Till to Quispel:


138 27 ii 58: Letter from Till to Quispel:

Auf Grund des Tafelbandes von Pahor Labib will Garitte eine Übersetzung des Thomas-Evangeliums herausgeben, in Philadelphia und in Rom werden Dissertationen...
On the basis of the volume of facsimiles of Pahor Labib, Garitte wants to publish a translation of *The Gospel of Thomas*; in Philadelphia and in Rome dissertations are being made on these texts. That is only what I have learned by chance from letters. One also does not know at all what Doresse, who indeed also possesses the photographs, has in mind. ...

There you are unfortunately only too correct: The rivalry between Puech and Doresse is a bad impediment and can ruin a lot. But I do not see there any right way out.

Although Doresse was a member of the International Committee, he had been excluded from the Brill edition being prepared by the team led by Puech and Quispel, and hence his *editio princeps* of *The Gospel of Thomas* was in this sense not ‘official,’ though as it turned out the Brill edition was also not ‘official’ (see Chapter 7, Part 4 below).

Another such instance of ‘unofficial’ editions was the publication in 1959 by Till himself of the four pages of *The Gospel of Truth* that were among ‘the missing 40 pages’ published in Pahor Labib’s facsimile volume. The official *editio princeps* of these Cairo pages of the Jung Codex was published by the Jung Institute only in 1961.

The International Committee as such actually published no tractates, and hence the problem of others publishing prior to the International Committee actually turned out to be of no substance.

The agreement signed by Pahor Labib and Søren Giversen on 28 December 1957 at the beginning of Giversen’s microfilming activity stated:

---


142 On Giversen’s microfilm: Codex II, Filmstrip no. 1, Microphoto no. 1–2; Codex III,
The microfilms are taken with the kind permission of Dr. Pahor Labib, director of the Coptic Museum, and at the request of the International Committee for the Study and Publication of the Coptic Gnostic Papyri, founded by H.E. the Egyptian Minister of Education. ...

The codices are microfilmed in that order they have been ready for photographing. The Coptic Museum has already edited the first volume of a series with photographic reproductions of the papyri. The negatives of the microfilms, taken by Søren Giversen, will be used for enlargements of which the photographic reproductions of the rest of the collection will be published in the second and following volumes by Dr. Pahor Labib, director of the Coptic Museum, and Søren Giversen, delegate from the Institute of Egyptology, Copenhagen.

While at the Coptic Museum, Giversen actually produced microfilms of Codex II (dated 1 January 1958), III (dated 4 January 1958) and IX, which he numbered IV (dated 9 January 1958). The microfilm began with the statement:

Microfilm edition of the Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo by Søren Giversen, delegate from the Institute of Egyptology, University of Copenhagen. The microfilms are taken with the kind permission of Dr. Pahor Labib, director of the Coptic Museum, at the request of the International Committee for the Study and Publication of the Coptic Gnostic Papyri, founded by His Excellence the Egyptian Minister of Education.

157 Photographs Søren Giversen 2 II 1.1.58
299 4.1.58 Codex III
379 IV 9.1.58

The volume of facsimiles published by Pahor Labib in 1956 had included the Cairo part of Codex I, just as it did the first part of Codex II. Giversen would then have continued in this numerical sequence: Codex II (repeating the first pages that were in Pahor Labib’s volume of facsimiles, though not repeating the Cairo part of Codex I), Codex III, and Codex IV (though it was not yet conserved). Giversen’s dissertation was to be a study of The Apocryphon of John, of which there were three copies in Cairo, the first tractate in Codices II, III, and IV, as well as a fourth copy in P.Berol. 8502. Therefore he would be eager to microfilm these three Cairo copies of The Apocryphon of John, including the first part of Codex II already published by Pahor Labib and the unconserved Codex IV. But the numeration at the Coptic Museum at the time still used an old numeration, listing as Codex IV
what today is listed as Codex IX. Thus Giversen did not microfilm the third Cairo copy of *The Apocryphon of John*, but, perhaps unknown to him at the time, Codex IX. Krause reported on Giversen's microfilm of Codex IX as follows:\(^{143}\)

Already in 1958 S[øren] Giversen, commissioned by the Egyptological Institute of the University of Copenhagen, made microfilm photographs of this Codex. [Footnote 4]: The numbers 303–378. This film still carries the old designation Codex IV.

Apparently Giversen was so eager to get the copy of *The Apocryphon of John* that is in Codex IV that he microfilmed Codex IX in spite of the fact that, in distinction from Codices II and III, it was not yet conserved between panes of plexiglass:\(^{144}\)

In all I took of the Gnostic papyri approximately 400 pictures, of which the first 300 were of the pages which were in the codices which mainly are put between sheets of glass or in any case very well preserved pages; and the rest of the pictures are pictures of a codex which not yet is between sheets of glass. This last codex is somewhere well preserved, some very fragmentary, but I thought it was best to take the pictures, since the permission was given.

No explanation is given as to why other unconserved codices, some in much better condition than was Codex IX, such as Codices VI and VII, were not microfilmed. The microfilming was discontinued after about ten days of work.

Giversen therefore returned to Copenhagen without microfilms of all three of the Cairo copies of *The Apocryphon of John*, but rather with Codices II, III, and IX. He chose, no doubt in part as a result of lacking one of the three Cairo copies, to limit his dissertation to one of the copies, that of Nag Hammadi Codex II.\(^{145}\)

\(^{143}\) Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und Codex VI*, (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Koptische Reihe, 2; Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin, 1971 [1972]), 7:


\(^{144}\) 21 iv 58: Letter from Giversen to Quispel.

Only later when we printed Giversen’s negatives did we discover that Giversen had placed his flash right beside the camera, directly above each plexiglass container of a papyrus leaf, with the result that the flash reflected on the plexiglass, producing a white blank in the middle of each page, making some parts of several lines unreadable, as Krause and Labib mentioned in the case of Codices II and III:

In the year 1958 S[øren] Giversen, commissioned by the Egyptological Institute of the University of Copenhagen, made microfilm pictures of Codex II. For technical reasons it was not possible to use these microfilm pictures for the volume of plates that P[ahor] Labib published in 1956.

Of course it was not for technical reasons, but for purely chronological reasons, that photographs taken in 1958 could not be published in 1956! But in the case of Codex III, ‘technical reasons’ were also mentioned to explain why Giversen’s photographs could not be used for the projected second volume of Pahor Labib’s facsimile edition:

In the year 1958 S[øren] Giversen, commissioned by the Egyptological Institute of the University of Copenhagen, made 137 microfilm pictures of Codex III. The numbers 162–298 contain Codex III. For technical reasons it will unfortunately not be possible to use these microfilm pictures for the second volume of plates that P[ahor] Labib will publish.

In this case, there were indeed technical reasons, due to the positioning of the flash bulb.

Puech wrote angrily to Quispel about not having received any word from Giversen on his return, much less the photographs he had been promised:

146 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, 14:


147 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, 19:


148 8 iv 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
The question posed by the silence of Giversen goes beyond all the others, and it is of an exceptional gravity.

I have learned indirectly, from a person returning from Egypt, that Giversen was back in Copenhagen, bearer of the microfilms he made of the papyri of Nag Hamâdi. It is already strange—not to say more—that this young man, incidentally after having failed to give me any news of himself and of his mission during his stay in Cairo, has entirely neglected to inform me of his return, and to give me an account of the work with which our Committee had charged him. I have written him immediately to communicate my astonishment to him and to recall to him the commitment that he had made in his letter of 14 August 1957: “you can,” he assured me, referring to the agreement reached between you and Prof. C.E. Sander-Hansen, “you can naturally (underlined by him!) count on receiving a positive copy of all the microfilms of these texts that I will have taken in Cairo for the Rask-Ørsted Foundation. It is the plan of Sander-Hansen that one should make two (two as a measure of precaution) microfilms of all the lot, and to make 5 positive copies of one: one for you, one for Quispel, one for Till, one for Pahor Labib and one for Denmark.” As I have had verified on the spot, Giversen did indeed receive my letter, but up until the present he has refused to give a reply to it, of which I nevertheless underlined the importance and the urgency. Would he be inclined to betray his word? His silence, in any case, besides being completely discourteous and attesting to a profound ingratitude, proves his embarrassment and, by that,

La question posée par le silence de Giversen prime toutes les autres, et elle est d’une exceptionnelle gravité.

J’ai indirectement appris, par une personne revenant d’Égypte, que Giversen était de retour à Copenhague, porteur des microfilms exécutés par lui, des papyrus de Nag Hamâdi. Il est déjà étrange—pour ne pas dire plus—que ce jeune homme, après ne m’avoir, d’ailleurs, donné aucune nouvelle de lui et de sa mission durant son séjour au Caire, ait entièrement négligé de me prévenir de son retour et de me rendre compte du travail dont notre Comité l’avait chargé. Je lui ai écrit aussitôt pour lui faire part de mon étonnement et lui rappeler l’engagement qu’il avait pris par lettre du 14 août 1957: “vous pouvez,” m’assurait-il en invoquant l’accord conclu entre vous et le prof. C.E. Sander-Hansen, “vous pouvez naturellement (souligné par lui!) compter recevoir une copie positive de toutes les microfilms de ces textes, que j’aurai exécutées au Caire pour la Fondation Rask-Ørsted. C’est le plan de M. Sander-Hansen qu’on doit exécuter deux (2 comme une mesure de précaution) microfilms de tout le lot, et de l’un exécuter 5 copies positif: 1 à vous, 1 à M. Quispel, 1 à M. Till, 1 à Pahor Labib et 1 à Danemark.” Comme je l’ai fait vérifier sur place, Giversen a bien reçu ma lettre, mais s’est jusqu’à présent refusé à lui donner une réponse dont je soulinais cependant l’importance et l’urgence. Serait-il disposé à trahir sa parole? Son silence, en tout cas, outre qu’il est tout à fait discourtois et témoigne d’une profonde ingratitude, prouve son embarras et, par là, sans doute, qu’il a mauvaise conscience: c’est l’aveu que les explications qu’il aurait à me fournir, le rôle que, peut-être malgré lui, il a joué, ne lui paraissent ni nets ni probes ou très droits. C’est, du moins, l’impression qu’a eue la personne qui lui a téléphoné à Copenhague.
no doubt, that he has a bad conscience. It is the admission that the explanations that he would have to furnish me, the rôle that he has played, perhaps in spite of himself, do not seem to him either clear or honest, or very straight. It is, at least, the impression that the person received who telephoned him in Copenhagen.

Puech then expressed his concern that Pahor Labib was responsible for his not getting a copy of the photographs:149

Giversen aggrèvates his case by refusing to let me know the motives that push him not to fulfill his commitments, that is to say, not to transmit to me, as was agreed and promised, the set of microfilms destined for me. These motives, I only suspect them, thanks to an allusion in your letter of last 14 December: Pahor Labib would be opposed to having the photographs delivered to me

---

149 8 iv 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Giversen aggrave son cas en se refusant à me faire connaître les mobiles qui le poussent à ne pas remplir ses engagements, c’est-à-dire à ne pas me transmettre, comme il était convenu et promis, le lot de microfilms qui m’était destiné. Ces mobiles, je les devine seulement grâce à une allusion de votre lettre du 14 décembre dernier: Pahor Labib se serait opposé à ce que les photographies me fussent livrées (ainsi qu’à vous, du reste, en l’occurrence). Je remarquerai que ni Giversen ni Pahor Labib lui-même m’ont prévenu et que, puisque Pahor Labib rompait ou n’acceptait pas ainsi les conditions du contrat qui a dû être passé entre lui et la Fondation Rask-Ørsted et qui comportait, en échange de l’exécution des microfilms, l’obligation d’une pareille remise, Giversen était tenu à faire respecter les clauses de la convention et à défendre les positions et les intérêts du Comité, à nous demander nos instructions, voire à ne pas entreprendre son travail ou à en suspendre la poursuite. Car enfin, il n’était là que comme agent d’exécution du Comité qui l’avait choisi et dont je fais partie. Que ce soit incapacité ou duplicité, il a, en fait, soit trahi au profit de Pahor Labib les intérêts du Comité et de la Fondation Rask-Ørsted, soit travaillé au profit d’intérêts particuliers et à mon détriment. De son côté, Pahor Labib n’a aucune raison (du moins, avouable) de me refuser la livraison des microfilms, acceptée par lui au Caire lors de notre réunion de 1956 et objet d’une des décisions prises à cette occasion par le Comité. Les photographies qu’il réclamait de Dorese lui ont été remises au début de janvier. Que veut-il de plus? Les photographies de tous les papyrus? L’exigence est vaine, Dorese l’ayant assuré et m’ayant assuré une fois de plus qu’il n’avait eu la possibilité et la permission que d’exécuter un nombre restreint de clichés, ceux-là mêmes qui ont été envoyés à Pahor Labib. Celui-ci prétend avoir un papier où Dorese affirmerait le contraire: il s’est cependant dérobé lorsqu’on lui a demandé de montrer le document ou d’en fournir une copie. Il parle tout aussi bien de 150 photographies seulement, mais sans préciser ce qu’il entend par là. Il doit s’agir des photographies du Codex I, dont il a, d’ailleurs, déjà, m’a dit Dorese, tout un lot. Il y a, semble-t-il, à l’origine de tout cela, beaucoup de confusion. Encore faudrait-il que Pahor Labib aide à la dissiper en précisant ce qu’il désire au juste. Or, nous n’avons, ni Dorese ni moi, reçu de réponses aux lettres que nous lui avons fait remettre par des voies absolument sûres. De toute façon, je ne vois pas pourquoi il me fait solidaire de Dorese en cette affaire et ce qu’il a à me reprocher, sinon ma qualité de français. Qu’il le dise! Qu’il s’explique! Jusqu’à nouvel ordre, je suis et je reste membre du Comité international qu’il a lui-même formé et qui a été convoqué officiellement au Caire.
(as well as to you, besides, in the case in question). I will note that neither Giversen nor Pahor Labib himself informed me, and that, since Pahor Labib thus broke, or did not accept, the conditions of the contract, which must have been approved, between him and the Rask-Ørsted Foundation, and that permitted, in exchange for taking the microfilms, the obligation of a parallel delivery, Giversen was bound to have the clauses of the agreement respected and to defend the positions and the interests of the Committee, to ask of us our instructions, even not to undertake his work or to suspend carrying it out. For, after all, he was there only as agent to work for the Committee that had chosen him and of which I am part. Whether this be incompetence or duplicity, he has, in effect, either betrayed the interests of the Committee and the Rask-Ørsted Foundation to the advantage of Pahor Labib, or worked to the profit of individual interests and to my detriment. For his part, Pahor Labib has no reason (at least, that he could admit) to refuse me the delivery of the microfilms, accepted by him in Cairo at the time of our meeting in 1956 and the object of one of the decisions taken on this occasion by the Committee. The photographs that he requested from Doresse have been supplied to him at the beginning of January. What more does he want? The photographs of all the papyri? The requirement is vain, since Doresse has assured him, and has assured me once again, that he had the possibility and the permission to execute only a restricted number of photographs, the same that have been sent to Pahor Labib. The latter pretends he has a paper where Doresse affirmed the contrary. Yet he was shown up when he was asked to produce the document or furnish a copy of it. He also speaks quite as well of only 150 photographs, but without clarifying what he means by that. It must have to do with photographs of Codex I [= Codex III], of which, incidentally, he already has a whole file, as Doresse has told me. It seems that there is, at the origin of all this, a great deal of confusion. Still, it would be necessary for Pahor Labib to help to dissipate it by making clear what exactly he wants. Now we, neither Doresse nor I, have received replies to letters that we have had sent him by means that are absolutely safe. In any case, I do not see why he makes me one with Doresse in this matter, and what he has to reproach me for, if not my quality of being French. Let him say so! Let him explain himself! Until a new order, I am and I remain a member of the International Committee that he himself formed and that was officially assembled in Cairo.

Puech then itemized for Quispel the action to be taken:  

---

8 iv 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Le refus de me livrer les microfilms des papyrus met précisément en question l’autorité et les pouvoirs de ce Comité. Ils ne sauraient être battus en brèche par un seul de ses membres, fût-il son secrétaire permanent, et de façon tout arbitraire et clandestine. Je compte donc sur vous et sur M. Till pour les faire respecter. Voici ce que je vous propose, afin d’éviter, autant que possible, de porter l’affaire sur un plan international:

1° Je vais agir auprès de M. Sander-Hansen et suis prêt, s’il le faut, à me rendre à Copenhague pour tirer la question au clair (en ce cas, quelle sera la somme mise
The refusal to deliver to me the microfilms of the papyri puts in question precisely the authority and the powers of this Committee. They should not be breached by a single one of its members, even if it be its permanent Secretary, and in a way completely arbitrary and clandestine. I hence count on you and Till to make them respected. Here is what I propose to you, so as to avoid, as much as possible, putting the affair on an international plane:

1. I am going to take action with Mr. Sander-Hansen, and am ready, if necessary, to go to Copenhagen to get the question clarified (in this case, what will be the sum put at my disposal by the Bollingen Foundation?). To provide a solid basis for my steps and the discussion, would you please send me urgently the text of the agreement made by you, in the name of our Committee, with the Rask-Ørsted Foundation on the topic of the mission of Giversen?

2. I would also ask of you to write, addressed to Sander-Hansen, a letter in which, as member of the Committee and responsible for the choice of Giversen, you will recall in a very firm way the clauses of the contract that was drawn up, and insist that they be observed and carried out, that is to say, that the file of microfilms be sent to me, as was agreed. Send this letter to me, which I will share with Till, in asking him to approve its objective, and which I will send to Sander-Hansen, clothed with our three signatures.

3. Have you personally received a file of the microfilms? In this case, would you be disposed to have a copy made of it, and to send it to me? I could, if necessary, send to Utrecht one of your young fellow-citizens, attached to the photographic studio of the École des Hautes Études, who would carry out the work.
All these points have for me an extreme importance, as are the responses that you would be so kind as to furnish me. The detriment that has been brought on me is considerable, and the solidarity of the Committee is at stake. It is necessary to act quickly and very clearly.

Thereupon Quispel wrote Giversen, who replied to him first of all about the positive side of his Cairo trip:151

I thank you very much for your letter. I have as you guessed now returned from Egypt and shall with pleasure here give you a little report about my work. At the same time I will write to prof. Puech and tell him about the work.

My work has until now only partly been completed and it is the intention of my chief, prof. Sander-Hansen, that I later shall resume the task. I was only able to microfilm a part of the papyri since only a part of the papyri were put between sheets of perspex or glass or treated finally with chemical treatment; it was for the moment not possible to get perspex in Egypt, neither for a private man to bring so much as needs with himself as traveler. But I microfilmed so much as for time being was possible.

Dr. Pahor Labib did his best to make everything so easy for me as possible, and I am sure that the collaboration could not have been better, and I am him very thankful for the time in the museum.

Giversen then went on to discuss with Quispel as best he could the diplomatic problems:152

I think you remember the letter from me in Egypt about problems in connection with the work. In that letter I told you about the director's conditions for the delivery of the photos, and I asked you to inform the interested parts. I understood from your answer that you thought, that the director was fully right, that the Jung Institute and M. Doresse should fulfil their duties before the photos should be delivered. My chief, Prof. Sander-Hansen wrote to Dr. Labib about the question and said that the director for the Coptic Museum had to decide to whom and when the photos should be given, and according to Sander-Hansen's and dr. Labib's agreement the copies for you and for professor Puech deposit in the Coptic Museum until the two conditions are fulfilled. Together with these copies I delivered two other positive copies and a negative to the Museum, and I got permission to take two copies with me home, where they now are in the institute of Egyptology. Unfortunately I was not able to take a copy for dr. Till, but if the situation changes it is naturally very easy for the museum in Cairo to get a positive copy produced from its negative.

151 21 iv 58: Letter from Giversen to Quispel.
152 21 iv 58: Letter from Giversen to Quispel.
According to the correspondence between dr. Sander-Hansen and dr. Labib it is the plan that I shall resume the work with the microfilming in Old Cairo when the time is ready, but this depends naturally of many things when it can be. I know, that the treatment takes time. I am sure that the Egyptian authorities expect to see results concerning fulfilling of the mentioned duties, but it is my hope that everything will be in order.

I have not taken all the pictures I would like, but I think, that the number of photos was taken, which it was possible to take. It is my hope that the task which the Rask-Ørsted Foundation and the Institute of Egyptology here has in charge for the International Committee, once may be completed when all technical things are in order and other important questions are solved. Indulgence and patience is—as you stressed here last year in June—still needed, if it shall be a success.

I think that this will give you information enough for the moment and covers, I think, also what dr. Sander-Hansen has asked me to write to you. Sander-Hansen at the same time asked me to bring you his compliments. ...

I have from professor Puech got a letter after my return, about the papyri and the microfilms, and I have in this occasion been called to the French institute here and had a talk with the director of this institute.

I was glad for your letter and agree fully that everything for the rest remain, as said in your meeting with Sander-Hansen and Koch here last year.

No doubt it is as a result of this outcome that Puech considered Quispel’s initiative with Giversen as a setback to his own plans:153

I take note of your refusal to intervene with Sander-Hansen and to inform me if, yes or no, you are in possession of the lot of microfilms executed by Giversen. However it is you who have brought the Raske-Ørstedt Foundation and Giversen into the matter, and contributed to the proposals of France and of UNESCO being dismissed.

Puech insisted on the involvement of UNESCO, where he himself was recognized as an authority, as was evident from the fact that he was named as a delegate of UNESCO to the Ninth International Congress on the History of Religions and the appended Symposium held in Tokyo in the period from 21 August to 17 September 1958.154 Hence he planned on his return from that

---

153 17 vii 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Je prends note de votre refus d’intervenir auprès de M. Sander-Hansen et de m’informer si, oui ou non, vous êtes en possession du lot de microfilms exécutés par Giversen. C’est vous, cependant, qui avez introduit la Fondation Raske-Ørsted et Giversen et contribué à faire écarter les propositions de la France et de l’UNESCO.

154 17 vii 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel.
trip to begin negotiations necessitated by the outcome of Giversen's mission, unsatisfactory as far as Puech was concerned, although it remained unclear to him whether Quispel had obtained a copy of Giversen's photographs.\textsuperscript{155}

It would be indispensable for me to be settled on this point [of Giversen’s photographs] before my departure for Tokyo, and I would not want to have to assess your [Quispel’s] silence in the negotiations that will take place after this date.

Till wrote Meier of the improbable situation that was involved in securing Giversen's photographs:\textsuperscript{156}

I found here among the mail that awaited me a letter from Prof. Sander-Hansen (Copenhagen), in which he answers me about my inquiry as to how it stands with the photographs of the Gnostic texts made by Mr. Giversen. I had learned of the alleged existence of such photographs through an upset letter from Puech, in which he complains bitterly that they are kept from him; hence I inquired of Sander-Hansen.

S[ander]-H[ansen] now informs me that the following agreement was reached: Puech promised that Doresse would send to Pahor Labib the

\textsuperscript{155} 5 viii 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Il me serait indispensable d’être fixé sur ce point avant mon départ pour Tokyo, et je ne voudrais pas avoir à faire état de votre silence dans les négociations qui auront lieu après cette date.

\textsuperscript{156} 23 ix 58: Letter from Till to Meier:


photographs made by him; Quispel promised that the Jung Institute would send to Labib photographs of the part of the Jung Codex that is there. Labib should give out the copies of the shots taken by Giversen as soon as he has the promised photographs.

Just between us: This agreement seems to me so naïve that I cannot believe it will be carried out. Two persons promise that in each case someone else will do something, a person on whom they have no influence at all. With the complete lack of willingness to communicate and the animosity that prevails between individual persons, it seems to me doubtful whether Doresse and the Jung Institute have learned anything at all about the promise. And if they have, will Doresse ever give out his photos? All these difficulties and impediments that endlessly emerge anew again and again are shocking and discouraging.

Yet Quispel wrote Pahor Labib which steps had been taken toward the return of the Jung Codex to Egypt, and as a result requested authorization to get from Giversen a copy of his photographs:

You will recall that some time ago I sent you copies of my correspondence with the Jung Institute.

Now since I have now received your letter during the summer, I have put at the disposal of Messrs Rilkin and Baumann the photographs of the missing pages of the Jung Codex.

They now report to me that Prof. Jung has made the condition that the Jung Codex will be given back to Egypt to the extent that the publication takes place in the same form and make-up as that of the other volumes. Since the

---

157 6 ii 59: Letter from Quispel to Pahor Labib:

Sie werden sich erinnern, dass ich Ihnen vor einiger Zeit Kopien meiner Korrespondenz mit dem Jung Institut geschickt habe.


Sie berichten mir nun Herr Prof. Jung habe die Bedingung gestellt, daß der Kodex Jung nach Ägypten zurückgegeben wird, sofern die Herausgabe in derselben Form und Aufmachung erfolgt wie diejenigen der übrigen Bände. Weil das Internationale Komitee das schon bewilligt hat in seiner Sitzung in September 1956, scheint mir jetzt an allen Mißverständnissen ein Ende gekommen zu sein.

International Committee already approved this at its session in September 1956, it seems to me that now an end has come to all misunderstandings.

Hence I believe I may assume that no doubt you have nothing against it if Giversen, whom I see in April of this year, puts at my disposal the photographs made by him under the commission of the International Committee. Besides, I believe that we can no doubt be finished by the end of this year with the publication of the whole Jung Codex, so that it can then soon, as agreed, be returned to Egypt.

Since the bulk of the Jung Codex was returned to Egypt only in 1975, when the last tractates were published, Quispel clearly knew in 1959 that it was impossible for the whole codex to be returned by the end of the year. After all, the editors at the time were devoting their energies to completing an abbreviated editio minor of The Gospel of Thomas, not to speak of the editio maior, rather than to the Jung Codex (see Chapter 7, Part 4 below).

6. Proposals for a Second Meeting of the International Committee

Walter Till had not been present at the first meeting of the International Committee in Cairo in October 1956, and hence was eager to learn what had taken place there, what had taken place since then, and what should be done in the future. His correspondence involved in this effort functioned somewhat as a clearing house of information both for the members of the International Committee and for coptologists who were not members of the International Committee.

Till passed on to Quispel a report he had received from Murad Kamel that omitted any reference to French representation, which raised concern as to the future constitution of the membership of the International Committee:

I am pleased to tell you [Walter Till] that the International Committee for studying the Gnostic Papyri at the Coptic Museum had the honour to choose you to be an executive member in this committee. It gives me much pleasure to collaborate with you and Professor Quispel in publishing The Gospel of Thomas.

Actually, not only Mourad Kamel was excluded from the final publication of The Gospel of Thomas, but also Pahor Labib, so that it could not be

158 24 xii 56: Letter from Murad Kamel to Walter Till, cited in a letter of 9 ii 57 from Till to Quispel.
published as a publication of the International Committee (see Chapter 7, Part 4 below).

Puech’s basic objective at the time was initially to maintain the validity and integrity of the International Committee, of course primarily so as to assure his own involvement:

Since all postal communications seem impossible between Egypt and France, I have received nothing from Dr. Pahor Labib, and I will even ask you to serve for the time being as intermediary between him and me. There is no reason to be excessively disturbed by the decisions that may be taken by the authorities on whom Dr. Pahor Labib depends. The resolutions taken by our Committee—an international Committee whose members were officially designated and convened in Cairo—could not be purely and simply annulled, and the meeting that it held in October considered as invalid or purely non-existent. I do not see, in particular, how using, in our instruction and our publications, the texts whose photographic reproductions were furnished in the volume of Dr. Pahor Labib, could be forbidden. Even if it is attempted, the Egyptian Government will hesitate to exclude from the Committee one or the

---

159 17 i 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Toutes communications postales paraissant impossibles entre l’Égypte et la France, je n’ai rien reçu du Dr. Pahor Labib et je vous demanderai même de servir pour le moment d’intermédiaire entre lui et moi. Il n’y a pas lieu de s’inquiéter outre mesure des décisions que doivent prendre les autorités dont dépend le Dr. Pahor Labib. Les résolutions prises par notre Comité—un Comité international dont les membres ont été officiellement désignés et convoqués au Caire—ne sauraient être purement et simplement annulées et la réunion qu’il a tenue en octobre, considérée comme invalide ou un pur néant. Je ne vois pas, en particulier, comment pourrait être interdit l’usage dans notre enseignement et nos publications des textes dont le volume du Dr. Pahor Labib fournit les reproductions photographiques. Même s’il en est tenté, le Gouvernement égyptien hésitera à exclure du Comité tel ou tel de ses membres: ce serait trop visiblement mêler politique et science ou “culture” et aller à l’encontre du slogan: “Nous en voulons à Eden et à Mollet, non à Shakespeare et à Molière.” S’il va jusque-là, le Comité a deux armes pour se défendre: mon exclusion ne pourrait être que conjointe à celle de W. Till, professeur en Angleterre et entraînerait votre démission, puisque vous m’avez formellement assuré, et avez signifié au Dr. Pahor Labib, qu’en toute cette affaire votre sort était solidaire du mien. On imagine mal la compétence ou l’efficacité scientifique d’un Comité de publication amputé de ces trois membres. D’autre part, il est permis de penser que les Fondations Bollingen et Sander Hansen se refuseraient à subventionner un organisme qui n’aurait plus un caractère francement international et scientifique et ne comprendrait plus quelques-uns des spécialistes dont, dans vos récentes négociations, vous n’avez pas manqué de leur faire connaître le nom afin de garantir la nature et le sérieux de l’entreprise et d’obtenir leur consentement. Au reste, après le grand pas qui vient enfin d’être fait, il serait difficile d’entraver la marche d’une affaire aujourd’hui rendue publique et portée à la connaissance du monde savant, et donc soumise à son jugement. Il n’y a qu’à continuer de travailler avec toute la sérénité possible.
other of its members. This would be mixing too visibly politics and science or ‘culture,’ and run counter to the slogan: ‘We have it in for Eden and Mollet, not for Shakespeare and Molière.’ If it goes that far, the Committee has two weapons with which to defend itself: My exclusion could only be joined to that of W. Till, professor in England, and would lead to your resignation, since you have formally assured me, and have signified to Dr. Pahor Labib, that in all this affair your fate would be one with mine. One can hardly imagine the scientific competence or efficacy of a Committee of Publication amputated of these three members. On the other hand, it is permissible to think that the Bollingen Foundation and that of Sander Hansen would refuse to subsidize an organism that would no longer have a clearly international and scientific character, and would no longer contain some of the specialists whose names, in your recent negotiations, you have not failed to pass on to them, in order to guarantee the nature and the seriousness of the undertaking, and to obtain their consent. As for the rest, after the great step that finally has just been made, it would be difficult to shackle the march of an affair that today has been made public and brought to the attention of the scholarly world, and hence is subject to its judgment. One can only continue working with all the serenity possible.

Yet the mixing of politics and science was built into what was going on, as Edward Said observed:

_The distinction between pure and political knowledge_. It is very easy to argue that knowledge about Shakespeare or Wordsworth is not political … One reason for saying that a humanist who writes about Wordsworth, or an editor whose specialty is Keats, is not involved in anything political is that what he does seems to have no direct political effect upon reality in the everyday sense. … [10] … but in practice the reality is much more problematic. No one has ever devised a method for detaching the scholar from the circumstances of life, from the fact of his involvement (conscious or unconscious) with a class, a set of beliefs, a social position, or from the mere activity of being a member of a society. These continue to bear on what he does professionally, even though naturally enough his research and its fruits do attempt to reach a level of relative freedom from the inhibitions and the restrictions of brute, everyday reality. For there is such a thing as knowledge that is less, rather than more, partial than the individual (with his entangling and distracting life circumstances) who produces it. Yet this knowledge is not therefore automatically nonpolitical.

But on 30 January 1957 Till wrote Quispel that he had recently received a letter from Yassah ʿAbd al-Masih to the effect that the International Committee

---

had decided to publish first The Gospel of Thomas, and to include Till among its editors.\footnote{30 i 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:}

Recently I received via Austria a writing from Yassa Abd-al-Masih in Cairo, in which he communicated to me that the International Committee had decided to publish first the Gospel of Thomas, for which I too should collaborate.

Still no mention of Puech! But on 18 May 1957 Till send Schenke a list of members of the International Committee that did include Puech:\footnote{18 v 57: Letter from Till to Schenke:}

The International Committee for the study and publication of these texts was founded in September 1956. I was at the time not in Cairo, and so am only insufficiently informed, and do not know quite exactly who all belongs to the Committee. But certainly among the Egyptian persons Dr. Pahor Labib (the Director of the Copt[ic] Mus[eum]) and probably also Yassa Abd-al-Masih (the Librarian), perhaps still other Egyptians. Of non-Egyptian members: Quispel (Utrecht), Puech (Paris), Meier (Zürich), Peterson (Washington) and perhaps also Doresse.

\footnote{102}
Whether others will be invited to collaborate I do not know. It is in this regard obviously a very awkward problem because of the political circumstances—unfortunately. A fixed plan for the publication may not yet exist. The texts should be published uniformly in a Corpus, each with a French, English, and German translation. Where the printing press and the publisher will be I do not know. First probably the Gospel of Thomas will be published (Abd-al-Masih, Quispel, Puech and I). Perhaps next CG I [= Codex III] (Pahor Labib and perhaps other Egyptians, Puech, Doresse, myself). But that will still last a while, whereas the Gospel of Thomas will appear perhaps already at the beginning of 1958 [it appeared at the end of 1959].

That is unfortunately all that I at the moment know to say about this. Because of the inseparable connection with Egypt, everything moves with the great expenditure of time. Apparently a direct exchange between Egypt and England, probably also France, is either not possible or after all not desired.

C.A. Meier’s Egyptian friend, Wali-el-din Sameh (see Chapter 4, Part 2), met personally with Pahor Labib, to explain why there had been no communication from Meier to Pahor Labib, and to learn why there had been no communication from Pahor Labib to Meier:163

To Dr. Pahor it was a great surprise to know that you are no longer President of the C.G. Jung Institute. Very carefully and politely, before the beginning of the explanations, he let his mild pique be felt, since he had heard nothing from you for so long—all the more so, in that he had given to Dr. Rahn for you a copy of the publication here. I explained your silence by the fact that you as a private person could not intervene officially. Just between us, be so kind as to confirm this to him in a couple of lines—also that you have asked me as childhood friend to get involved in this matter.

163 4 i 58: Letter from Sameh to Meier:


Die nun hier vorzunehmende Prozedur, ist leider nicht so einfach wie es sich Herr Page in Zürich vorstellte. Dr. L. Pahor, als Direktor des Koptischen Museums, kann aus administrativer Hierarchie heraus, nicht persönlich mit dem Ausland correspon-
dieren. Alles muss der Altertums-Verwaltung vorgelegt werden, welche ihm nach Beschluss beauftragt, so und so zu antworten. Da bisher keine schriftliche Absage des Jung-Institutes hier vorliegt, hat er keinerlei Handhabe, um ein Vorgehen der Altertums-Verwaltung vorzuschlagen. Ich selber stehe ausserhalb und meine Bemü-
hungen sind lediglich freundschaftlicher Art.
The procedure to be followed here is unfortunately not as simple as Page imagined in Zürich. Dr. L[abit] Pahor, as Director of the Coptic Museum, cannot correspond personally with foreign countries outside of the administrative hierarchy. Everything must be presented to the antiquities administration, which then, after a decision, authorizes him to answer thus and so. Since no written renunciation from the Jung Institute is thus far present, he has no device to propose a procedure to the antiquities administration. I myself stand outside, and my efforts are merely of a friendly kind.

Meier wrote his own position to Sameh:164

I forced Quispel to confirm to me in writing, that he had oriented me to the effect that the Codex is for us unnecessary. I must have such a document, since otherwise the Curatorium will certainly reproach me that I had pressed for the return of the Codex on the basis of invalid reasons. Quispel has in fact written this letter and sent me a copy. I enclose a copy for you. At the same time, I am writing Quispel that, after careful reflection, I can only consider his ‘Solomonic’ solution as extremely painful. ... I consider this whole story to be the culmination of all these knaveries already undertaken, and am simply disgusted at all that our European gentlemen are able to do ‘in the name of science.’

To this Sameh replied:165

My doubts about Quispel I expressed already in the summer in a guarded way. Academic pride without limits can really lead very far. It is impossible that I show the transcription of his letter here without harming him.

The ‘Solomonic’ solution was to the effect that only the leaves of the one published tractate, *The Gospel of Truth*, be returned now, with the rest of the...

---

164 17 i 58: Letter from Meier to Sameh:


165 6 ii 58: Letter from Sameh to Meier:

Codex to be returned as it was published. But Quispel himself wrote directly to Pahor Labib, reassuring him of the imminent return of the leaves of *The Gospel of Truth* from the Jung Codex, with the rest to come later.\(^{166}\)

You will recall that in September 1956 we together wrote a letter to Dr. Meier, in which we asked him to confirm that after publication the Jung Codex will be given to the Coptic Museum. Subsequently quarrels in the membership of the Curatorium of the Jung Institute took place, and Dr. Meier withdrew from it. On 17 January 1958 I urgently recommended to the Curatorium in Zürich: 1) to answer our letter; 2) to send to Egypt without delay the pages of the *Evangelium Veritatis*, which is already published; 3) to send the remaining pages after publication; 4) to let the whole Codex be published in the series of the International Committee. The Curatorium has taken that up favorably.

... I am glad that I can again write you, and that the news about the Jung Codex are thoroughly favorable. I can imagine to myself that to some extent you were disturbed by the silence of Dr. Meier, but I have confidence that you will now receive very soon a satisfactory answer.

Quispel was consistent in preferring that leaves of the Jung Codex not be returned to Cairo until after their publication. But the reasons he gave were not always the same, e.g. that Pahor Labib had not met the conditions for the return, or that the unpublished tractates should be kept in Zürich in case the editors needed again to collate the text. The reason not mentioned was to keep others from getting access to Tractates 1–2 and 4–5, if they were returned promptly to Cairo, lest someone else publish the *editio princeps* before Quispel could do so.

---

\(^{166}\) 29 i 58: Letter from Quispel to Pahor Labib:

Sie werden sich erinnern, dass wir in September 1956 zusammen einen Brief an Dr. Meier schrieben in dem wir ihn baten zu bestätigen, dass der Kodex Jung nach der Ausgabe dem Koptischen Museum gegeben wird. Nachher sind Streitigkeiten im Gremium des Kuratoriums des Jung Institutes vorgefallen und Dr. Meier hat sich daraus zurückgezogen. Ich habe nun am 17. January 1958 in Zürich dem Kuratorium dringend empfohlen 1) unserem Brief zu beantworten 2) die Seiten des Evangelium Veritatis, das schon veröffentlicht ist, unmittelbar nach Ägypten zu schicken 3) die übrigen Seiten nach der Ausgabe zu schicken 4) den ganzen Kodex in der Schriftreihe des Internationalen Komitees herausgeben zu lassen. Das Kuratorium hat das günstig aufgenommen. ...

Es freut mich, dass ich Ihnen wieder schreiben darf und dass die Nachrichten über den Jung Kodex durchaus günstig sind. Ich kann mir denken, dass Sie über das Schweigen von Dr. Meier einigermaßen beunruhigt waren, aber ich hege das Vertrauen, dass Sie jetzt sehr bald eine befriedigende Antwort bekommen.
Quispel included in his unofficial minutes of the meeting of the International Committee in 1956 a scheduling of the next meeting of the International Committee: 167

The next meeting will take place in December 1957 or January 1958 in the Coptic Museum in Cairo. All members should be there.

Such a meeting of the International Committee had not taken place. But in the summer of 1958 Pahor Labib was able to break his silence in this regard, by responding to a letter from Doresse with a preliminary invitation to the second meeting of the International Committee: 168

Many thanks for your kind letter dated the 17th August 1958.

I hope I will be able to hold the 2nd Session of the International Committee of the Study and Publication of the Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum in December 1958.

I will let you know and our other colleagues the exact date as soon as our new minister will fix up the date.

It will be a good occasion to meet you again here in Egypt, especially that it will be the time of celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the Coptic Museum.

On 16 November 1958 Doresse replied: 169

167 Circa 27 x 56: Quispel’s unofficial minutes of the meeting of the International Committee of Gnosticism.

168 29 viii 58: Letter from Pahor Labib to Doresse.

169 16 xi 58: Letter from Doresse to Pahor Labib:

Je vous remercie bien vivement de votre lettre du 29 août, qui m’est parvenue en son temps: j’attendais, pour pouvoir y répondre avec précision, d’avoir vu M. H.-C. Puech qui était alors en voyage. Je l’ai rencontré hier seulement. Il s’associe à moi pour vous dire combien il accueille avec plaisir l’annonce des fêtes du Musée Copte et de la réunion du Comité d’Édition qui pourrait se tenir à cette occasion. Toutefois, comme nous recommençons ces jours-ci les cours de l’École Pratique des Hautes Études, nous craignons l’un et l’autre, si cette réunion doit avoir lieu dès le mois de décembre comme vous nous l’annoncez, de ne pouvoir quitter commodément nos occupations à ce moment. De plus, il faudrait que nous soyons fixés sur la date exacte assez longtemps à l’avance pour pouvoir obtenir les subventions nécessaires à ce voyage. Ne serait-il pas possible de mettre cette réunion vers le printemps, par exemple à Pâques où l’on a un congé assez long? Ce serait—cette année—à la fin du mois de mars?

De toute façon, nous attendons les nouvelles que vous voudrez bien nous communiquer: nous espérons qu’il sera ainsi possible de reprendre sur des bases solides la publication de vos précieux manuscrits.
I thank you very much for your letter of 29 August, which reached me in due time. I waited, so as to be able to reply to it with precision, until I had seen H.-C. Puech, who at the time was away on a trip. I only met him yesterday. He joins me in telling you how much he welcomes with pleasure the announcement of the festivities of the Coptic Museum and of the reunion of the Committee of Edition which could be held on this occasion. Nonetheless, since we resume precisely in these same days the classes at the École Pratique des Hautes Études, we fear, both of us, that if this reunion has to take place as early as the month of December, as you announce to us, we will not to be able very conveniently to leave our occupations at that time. Furthermore, it would be necessary for us to be fixed on the exact date long enough in advance to be able to obtain the grants necessary for this trip. Would it not be possible to locate this meeting toward spring, for example at Easter when one has a rather long vacation? This would be, this year, at the end of the month of March?

In any case, we await the news that you are kind enough to communicate to us. We hope that it will thus be possible to resume, on solid bases, the publication of your precious manuscripts.

It is unclear whether the new minister did in fact authorize Pahor Labib’s proposal and fix a date for a second meeting of the International Committee. It may well be that Pahor Labib scheduled the meeting of the International Committee to coincide with the 50th anniversary of the Coptic Museum, since it would then enhance the international glamour of that anniversary. But once that became impossible, because of the problems Doresse posed, Pahor Labib may not have been able to carry through whatever efforts were necessary to arrange a meeting at a later date. In any case, a second meeting of that International Committee in Cairo did not take place.

There was talk of a meeting of the International Committee in Copenhagen, but that too did not take place.

Actually, Quispel seems to have become active in organizing a meeting of a new International Committee. He wrote Pahor Labib suggesting such a meeting:

170 20 v 59: Letter from Sander-Hansen to Quispel:
I have written Prof. Labib and suggested that we have a meeting here at Copenhagen Sept. 29th–30th.

171 5 ii 59: Letter from Quispel to Pahor Labib:
Es freut mich, daß dann doch verschiedene Texte aus Nag Hamadi zur Verfügung der gelehrteten Welt kommen werden, was wir dann doch Ihrer Initiative und auch Ihrer Geduld zu verdanken haben werden. Möglich muß dann aber wieder eine Sitzung des Komitees stattfinden.
I am happy then that, after all, diverse texts from Nag Hamadi will become available to the scholarly world, for which we then will have to thank your initiative and also your patience. But then possibly a meeting of the Committee must again take place.

Quispel received from Baumann and Rilkin a response to such an invitation:

Whether we can take part in the meeting of the International Committee in the week of 28 September [1959], we will still let you know. Would you please also say how the International Committee is composed?

Such a new International Committee was never officially named, and never met.

7. Walter Till’s Proposals for a Functional International Committee

Walter Till finally wrote each of the members of the International Committee of 1956 an identical letter, proposing a procedure for the rapid publication of all the Nag Hammadi Codices:
To the members of the International Committee for the publication of the Coptic Gnostic texts of Naga Hammâdi.

The Gnostic library found in 1945 in Upper Egypt that contains almost 50 different texts has been available to scholarly research since 1956. For the Jung Codex preserved in Zürich, that has already been the case for a few years longer. Yet until now only a small part of the Jung Codex, the 'Evangelium veritatis,' has been made available to the public in an edition.

If every three years we publish one of these texts—which is a very optimistic assumption, based on the experiences thus far—we need about a century and a half to edit all the texts. That is nonsense. In my view certainly an acceleration of the publication of these important texts should be sought. That should not take place in overly hasty work. But on the other hand one must also realize that one cannot produce anything final, either in the translation or in the commentary of the first edition.

The understanding of the Gnostic texts is very difficult, and not everyone who understands a Coptic narration possesses the necessary experience for the understanding of the Gnostic texts. I see a way to produce as good a translation as possible already in the first edition, by having in each case two coptologists work together in the translation.

In principle one should separate the publication of the text and translation from that of the commentary, in order to make a more rapid appearance possible. That would also work well in terms of the book market, since the purchase would be much less expensive for those interested.

The text edition would have to contain: a brief introduction; the Coptic text with a facing translation; a complete index of words, listing all places where each occurs; at least one plate with a good picture of one page of the text. If possible, different editions would be desirable in German, French, and English. If that is not possible, one of these languages would have to suffice, or one brings three translations, as in the edition of the 'Evangelium veritatis,' which can be considered a model.

bringen zu können, sehe ich darin, dass jeweils zwei Koptologen bei der Übersetzung zusammenarbeiten.

Man sollte grundsätzlich die Ausgabe des Textes mit Übersetzung von der des Kommentars trennen, um ein rascheres Erscheinen zu ermöglichen. Das würde sich auch buchhändlerisch gut auswirken, da die Anschaffung für die Interessenten wesentlich billiger käme.

Die Texausgabe hätte zu enthalten: eine kurze Einleitung; den koptischen Text mit einer gegenüberstehenden Übersetzung; ein vollständiges Wörterverzeichnis mit allen Stellenangaben; wenigstens eine Tafel mit einer guten Abbildung einer Textseite. Wenn möglich wären verschiedene Ausgaben in deutscher, französischer und englischer Sprache erwünscht. Lässt sich das nicht machen, so muss eine dieser Sprachen genügen oder man bringt drei Übersetzungen, wie in der Ausgabe des 'Evangelium veritatis,' die als vorbildlich gelten kann.
Till's letter also proposed a more functional organization of the International Committee:174

A different proposal has to do with the organization. Basic rules (Statutes) for the International Committee would have to be established.

The complete lack of a system for communicating information has worked thus far in a very disadvantageous way. All agreements and other events would have to be communicated to each member of the Committee, partly for information, partly to give him the opportunity to present a position.

In order to be able to carry this through, a central office for the organization would have to be created with a Secretary, who of course would have to be paid for his activity. The publisher preparing the editions could take that over. The central office of the organization should however not be a department of the publishing house, but would have to remain independent, merely because

---

174 171 59: Letter from Till to the members of the International Committee:

Eine andere Anregung betrifft die Organisation. Es müssen Grundsätze für das Internationale Komitee (Statuten) festgelegt werden.

Der vollständige Mangel eines Informationssystems hat sich bisher sehr nachteilig ausgewirkt. Es müssten alle Vereinbarungen und sonstigen Ereignisse jedem Komiteemitglied bekanntgegeben werden, teils zur Information, teils um ihm Gelegenheit zu geben, dazu Stellung zu nehmen.

Um das durchführen zu können, müsste eine Organisationszentrale geschaffen werden mit einem Sekretär, der natürlich für seine Tätigkeit gezahlt werden müsste. Das könnte der die Ausgaben besorgende Verlag übernehmen. Die Organisationszentrale dürfte allerdings nicht eine Abteilung des Verlages sein, sondern müsste selbständig bleiben, schon weil der Verlag wechseln kann. Besser wäre es, wenn diese Zentrale ganz unabhängig bestünde. Dabei wäre allerdings die Frage der Finanzierung zu lösen.


Das sind augenblicklich meine Vorschläge. Ich würde mich sehr freuen, wenn sich die Komiteemitglieder dazu äußerten, wenn in absehbarer Zeit eine Organisationszentrale entstünde und auch die Edition der für die Wissenschaft so wichtigen Texte beschleunigt würde.
the publisher can change. It would be better if this central office stood quite independently. Of course the question of its financing would need to be resolved.

All decisions of the Committee would have to be written down in minutes, of which each member of the Committee would receive a copy. The decisions would become effective only when the absent members have also submitted their agreement.

All that comes in and goes out is kept in an archive available to all members of the Committee. If the Egyptian members of the Committee express such a wish, a second such archive could be set up in Cairo. Both archives would then have to contain exactly the same acts.

I do not consider a renewing of the Committee to be necessary at present. If a member leaves, then that person could, if necessary, be replaced by some other person, with the agreement of all members. From case to case, persons who do not belong to the Committee could be invited to collaborate in the publication of a given text.

For the moment, these are my recommendations. I would be very happy if the members of the Committee would express themselves as to whether, in the foreseeable future, a central office for the organization should emerge, and also whether the editing of the texts so important for scholarship should be expedited.

Quispel expressed to Pahor Labib his full agreement with Till:175

I am in very full agreement with the recommendations of Walter Till about the publication.

Till responded to a letter of agreement from Meier as follows:176

Your reply to my circular letter with agreement along the whole line naturally pleased me very much, and I thank you heartily for it. It is quite correct that the committee be formally, juridically founded.

I sent my circular letter only once to Egypt, to Pahor Labib.

---

175 6 ii 59: Letter from Quispel to Pahor Labib:

Mit den Vorschlägen Walter Tills über die Ausgabe bin ich ganz und gar einverstanden.

176 20 ii 59: Letter from Till to Meier:

Ihre Antwort auf mein Rundschreiben mit der Zustimmung auf der ganzen Linie hat mich natürlich sehr gefreut und ich danke Ihnen herzlich dafür. Dass das Komitee juristisch formal gegründet sein müsste, ist sehr richtig. ...

Mein Rundschreiben habe ich nach Ägypten nur einmal, und zwar an Pahor Labib geschickt.
Doresse wrote Pahor Labib his agreement as well:

I do not know to what an extent the criticisms expressed by Prof. Till are exact. In any case, with regard to the editing principles he proposes—and which are no doubt equally your own—I can only express to you my most absolute agreement. It is important that the Committee, such as it has been organized, be in a position, without too much delay, to establish the edition, for which, by lengthy activities, we, each of us, are well prepared.

Till also reported to Meier the positive response of Petersen:

Petersen [sic!] agrees and states he is ready to begin immediately with a task assigned to him.

Thus everyone named to the International Committee, with the exceptions of Puech and Pahor Labib himself, as well as other Egyptians, expressed their agreement with Till's proposals, which however were never implemented.

8. The Disintegration of the International Committee

Meier, Quispel and Puech were not only in charge of editing the Jung Codex in Zürich. They also wanted to be in charge of editing the other Nag Hammadi Codices that were in Cairo. Hence the disintegration of their partnership in Zürich inevitably led to a disintegration of the International Committee of Gnosticism in Cairo.

The Disintegration in Zürich

The disintegration of the International Committee took the form of a bifurcation with regard to editing the Jung Codex, between Meier, Rascher, von Fischer, and Till on the one hand, and the Curatorium, led by Baumann and Rilkin and supported by Quispel on the other.

---

177 2 iii 59: Letter from Doresse to Pahor Labib:

Je ne sais dans quelle mesure les critiques exprimées par le Prof. Till sont exactes: en tout cas, en ce qui concerne les principes d'édition qu'il propose—et qui sont sans doute également les vôtres—je ne peux que vous exprimer mon accord le plus absolu. Il importe que le Comité tel qu'il a été organisé soit en mesure, sans trop tarder, d'établir l'édition à laquelle, par de longs travaux, nous nous sommes les uns et les autres bien préparés.

178 7 iii 59: Letter from Till to Meier:

Petersen stimmt zu und erklärt sich bereit, sofort mit einer ihm zugeteilten Arbeit anzufangen.
The Curatorium, of which Meier was no longer Director, had waited impatiently for Pahor Labib to provide high-quality pictures of 'the missing 40 pages' and to authorize their publication, which might have activated the Jung Institute's responsibility to return at least *The Gospel of Truth* to Egypt. Hence the Curatorium wrote Quispel for advice. Quispel replied:179

From your letter of 28 May 1958 I infer that you want to address yourself directly to the Coptic Museum in Cairo. I would very much welcome that, since Dr. Pahor Labib would then be informed about our plans.

Namely it is the case, as you know, that he handed me photocopies with the express information that they were meant only for me as a personal gift. But, after all, that can only mean that the photocopies should be put at your disposal in the context of the whole plan.

Hence I have ordered a print of the photocopies to be made (as you know, that always takes some time), and I hope then to hear from you what Dr. Pahor Labib has answered. If he does not answer, then we may assume that it is fine with him that you receive the photocopies. To be sure, please be so kind as to confirm to me that these photocopies will not be put at the disposal of others.

At this juncture Meier, apparently learning of this position that Quispel had assumed, wrote Sameh:180

---

179 19 vi 58: Letter from Quispel to the Curatorium:


    Es ist nämlich so, wie Sie wissen, dass er mir Photokopien zur Hand gestellt hat mit der nachdrücklichen Mitteilung, sie seien nur für mich als persönliches Geschenk bestimmt. Das kann doch aber nur bedeuten, die Photokopien sollen im Rahmen des Gesamtplanes Ihnen zur Verfügung gestellt werden.

    Deswegen habe ich angeordnet, einen Abdruck der Photokopien machen zu lassen (wie Sie wissen, dauert das immer einige Zeit) und ich hoffe dann von Ihnen zu vernehmen, was Dr. Pahor Labib geantwortet hat. Antwortet er nicht, dann dürfen wir annehmen, dass es ihm recht ist, dass Sie die Photokopien bekommen. Allerdings wollen Sie mir wohl gütigst bestätigen, dass diese Photokopien andern nicht zur Verfügung gestellt werden.

180 26 vi 58: Letter from Meier to Sameh:

    Vom Institut erfahre ich gar nichts mehr, was mir im Grunde genommen natürlich ganz recht ist, aber Du weiss ja, dass mir schliesslich und endlich nur die Sache am Herzen liegt und dazu gehört natürlich in erster Linie die Herausgabe des vollständigen Textes, d. h. eben in diesem Falle der “fehlenden Seiten” des “Codex Jung.” In dieser Beziehung steht es nun deswegen besonders schlecht, weil Quispel dieses Problem aus egoistischen Gründen so verdreht hat, dass er daraus eine Machtposition machte gegen Alle. Er behauptet, P.L. habe die Photokopien der fehlenden Seiten ihm nur
From the Institute I learn nothing more at all, which is, of course, basically quite fine for me, but you of course know that ultimately and finally only the issue itself lies on my heart, and to this belongs naturally in first order the publishing of the complete text, i.e. in this case precisely the publishing of the 'missing pages' of the 'Jung Codex.' Now in this connection things are especially bad, since Quispel has twisted this problem, for egotistical reasons, so as to make out of it a power position against everyone. He maintains that P[ahor] L[abib] gave him the photocopies of the missing pages only *ad personam*, so that with that the original requirements of the Institute would not be met at all. Thus the Institute would also have a right to maintain that the codex does not need to be returned. But furthermore, if this be so, no one can compel Quispel to work on these texts [on 'the missing 40 pages'] in the foreseeable future, and for this reason all efforts thus far remain deplorable piecework.

Now you of course know that I can never get a written word out of the odd P[ahor] L[abib]. Without this I have of course nothing to hold on to, so as to undertake anything. Also even until today I have received no answer to my question, whether, since my resignation from the Institute, he still considers me to be a member of the Committee or not. Of course only in the case of a positive answer would I have any kind of position in this whole affair, about which I would however have to be able to validate myself through a corresponding statement on his part. The question is hence whether you could not motivate him, on the one hand, to take this harmless step, and, on the other hand, to communicate to the Institute whether Quispel's explanation [that he received the photographs *ad personam*] is true or not. If it is true, Egypt loses any claim on the Institute. If it is not true, P[ahor] L[abib], whether he wants to or not, must disavow Quispel, otherwise the matter will never move forward.

---

*ad personam* gegeben, sodass damit die ursprünglichen Forderungen des Institutes gar nicht erfüllt wären. Damit hätte dann das Institut auch ein Recht zu behaupten, der Codex brauche nicht zurückgegeben zu werden. Aber ausserdem kann, wenn dies stimmt, niemand Quispel zwingen, diese Texte in absehbarer Zeit zu bearbeiten und alle bisherigen Bemühungen bleiben dadurch jämmerliches Stückwerk.

Nun weisst Du ja, dass ich aus dem merkwürdigen P.L. nie ein geschriebenes Wort herausschaffen kann. Ohne ein solches habe ich natürlich keinerlei Handhabe, irgend etwas zu unternehmen. Bis heute habe ich von ihm auch keine Antwort auf meine Frage, ob er mich seit meinem Rücktritt vom Institut noch als Komité-Mitglied betrachtet oder nicht. Ich hätte natürlich nur im bejahenden Fall noch irgendeine Position in dieser ganzen Angelegenheit, worüber ich mich aber durch eine entsprechende Erklärung seinerseits ausweisen könnte müsste. Die Frage ist also, ob Du ihn nicht veranlassen kannst, seinerseits diesen harmlosen Schritt zu tun und andererseits dem Institut mitzuteilen, ob Quispels Erklärung stimmt oder nicht. Wenn sie stimmt, so verliert Ägypten jede Position dem Institut gegenüber. Wenn sie nicht stimmt, muss P.L., ob er will oder nicht, Quispel desavouieren, sonst wird die Sache nie weitergehen.
Some months later Meier wrote Rascher his concerns about what the Curatorium and Quispel were doing.\textsuperscript{181}

With regard to the ‘Evangelium Veritatis’ and the other texts of the Jung Codex, an unheard-of dark-man’s-politics is being carried on by the Curatorium and Quispel. As you know, I am still a member of the Committee for the publication of the discoveries of Nag-Hammadi. As such, I constantly receive inquiries, encouragements, and complaints over the fact that nothing happens. It would now be valuable for me to know whether you still maintain your publisher’s rights, and I would like very much to ask you to do this, since these rights still represent the only legal position over against the intrigues of the gentlemen mentioned above. It is to be feared that if you give up these rights, nothing more happens at all, with which of course the Institute would then be discredited before the whole scholarly world. I really hope that it does not come to that.

Thereupon Meier received reassurance from Rascher.\textsuperscript{182}

Now what has to do with the Evangelium Veritatis, I am of course basically determined to keep upright my rights as publisher. It must now indeed be determined, by getting in touch with Page, whether it has to do with the complete supplementation of the still missing leaves, in which case it will be best that we get in contact with Quispel and find out whether he is ready

\textsuperscript{181} 3 i 59: Letter from Meier to Rascher:


\textsuperscript{182} 6 i 59: Letter from Rascher to Meier:

Was nun das EVANGELIUM VERITATIS betrifft, so bin ich im Grunde natürlich entschlossen, meine Verlagsrechte aufrecht zu erhalten. Es muss nun eben festgestellt werden, durch eine Fühlungnahme bei Page, ob es sich um die vollständige Ergänzung der noch fehenden Blätter handelt, und dann wird es das Beste sein, dass wir uns mit Quispel in Verbindung setzen und uns erkündigen, ob er bereit ist, die Bearbeitung für eine weitere, ergänzende Ausgabe—die ich an mich für sehr wichtig halte—zu übernehmen. Falls er allerdings mit Brill zusammen bereits eine Herausgabe unternommen hat oder zu unternehmen im Begriffe steht, wird es sich kaum mehr lohnen, sich die enormen Ausgaben einer hiesigen Ausgabe zu machen.
to take over the preparation of a further, supplementary edition—which I hold to be very important in and of itself. To be sure, in case he has already undertaken a publication with Brill, or is in the process of undertaking that, it will hardly be worth making any more the enormous outlays of an edition here.

But Baumann wrote Rascher that he and Rilkin would be acting with regard to the Jung Codex not on behalf of the Curatorium, but rather as agents of Jung: 183

What has to do with our correspondence concerning the Evangelium Veritatis, we will, for the sake of form, be glad to conduct it on blank paper, since actually Dr. Rilkin and the undersigned act as individuals personally commissioned by Prof. Jung.

But Meier wrote von Fischer the measures he envisaged undertaking: 184

---

183 20 i 59: Letter from Baumann (on behalf of himself and Rilkin) to Rascher:

Was unsere Korrespondenz über das Evangelium veritatis anbelangt, so werden wir sie der Form halber gerne auf neutralem Papier führen, da tatsächlich Herr Dr. Rilkin und der Unterzeichnete als persönliche Beauftragte von Herrn Prof. Jung handeln.

184 22 i 59: Letter from Meier to von Fischer:


Here quite obviously a very dark game is being played. One apparently says something different to each person, in order to make the confusion as great as possible, so that one can ultimately do whatever one wants. Page is very exasperated, and tomorrow we will have a meeting with Sameh. Apparently Jung is now put forward as the owner, and Baumann and Rilkin presented as his executives. The question of the return to Egypt must hence be separated from that of the publication. With regard to the first question, I have good grounds to maintain that I did everything that stood in my power. The second question interests me and Page very much more—I for scholarly reasons, and Page because, after all, he made the gift exclusively for the purpose that these texts become accessible. Under certain circumstances he is ready to move forward and annul the gift, since its purpose has not been fulfilled. Then we would have the opportunity to proceed independently, and in the shortest amount of time to make the publication with Rascher, who is on our side, and with Till, who was here and would be very happy to work on the matter.

It remains not only unclear what position Pahor Labib assumes, but it is also basically questionable whether he is interested in the edition at all. Actually he would like most to publish all thirteen volumes in the way begun in Cairo. But the first volume is so very bad that nobody can do anything with it, and the continuation of this publication would be completely worthless. After never hearing anything to the contrary from P[ahor] L[abib], I may with justification assume I am still a member of the commission to publish these texts, as well as Till. Given this general sloppiness, I am determined to do something ...

But if Page and I now go ahead, I would like very much to ask you for your support. Perhaps a palace revolution is unavoidable, and various members [such as von Fischer] of the Patronage [of the Jung Institute] would be inclined to exert pressure, with the threat of resignation, while informing the other members of the Patronage. I think that we have had patience long enough with these dark-men-methods. Page and I still want in this regard to talk to Dr. Keller-Staub, and I will then inform you in a coherent way about the course of the two conferences, but count already now on your powerful support.

Mitglied der Kommission zur Herausgabe dieser Texte zu sein, ebenso wie Till. Bei dieser allgemeinen Schlamperei bin ich entschlossen etwas zu tun. ...

Baumann and Rilkin for their part had in their letter to Quispel sought clarification regarding the return of the Jung Codex.\textsuperscript{185}

One knows that Prof. Jung has imposed the condition that the Jung Codex will be given back to Egypt, only if the publication takes place in the same form and make-up as that of the other volumes. We would like to ask you in your own interest to hold to that and reach agreement about it with the various publishers.

Albert Rascher, the son and successor of Max Rascher, had received a copy of this letter, and forwarded a copy to Meier. Thereupon Meier laid out his plans to Albert Rascher, asking him to take the initiative:\textsuperscript{186}

I thank you very much for your kindness in permitting me to have insight into the letters of Messrs Rilkin and Baumann to you and Quispel of 20 January.

\textsuperscript{185} 20 i 59: Letter from Baumann (on behalf of himself and Rilkin) to Quispel:

\begin{quote}
Bekanntlich hat Herr Prof. Jung die Bedingung gestellt, dass der Codex Jung nach Ägypten zurückgegeben wird, sofern die Herausgabe in derselben Form und Aufmachung erfolgt wie diejenige der übrigen Bände. Wir möchten Sie in Ihrem eigenen Interesse bitten, sich daran zu halten und sich mit den verschiedenen Verlagsfirmen darüber zuverständigen.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{186} 29 i 59: Letter from Meier to Albert Rascher:

\begin{quote}


Ich werde als Comitémitglied immer wieder von den verschiedensten Seiten angefragt, warum die restlichen drei Schriften des Codex Jung, sowie auch die fehlenden Seiten des Evangelium veritatis, noch nicht erschienen seien. Es ist mir deshalb eine grosse Genugtuung, aus den von mir eingesehenen Briefen entnehmen zu können, dass es nicht am Verleger fehlt, sondern dass derselbe im Gegenteil ein actives Interesse an dieser Herausgabe hat, wofür ich Dir und Onkel Max auch im Namen des Comités bestens danken möchte. Es freut mich sehr, dass Ihr auf diese Weise die Interessen des Comités und damit der wissenschaftlichen Welt so tatkräftig unterstützt.

Ich habe mit Herrn Page, dem Donator des Codex Jung, neuerdings die Situation besprochen und er unterstützt meine Auffassung voll und ganz und ist überdies der Meinung, es sei nun Zeit, dass etwas geschehe, da er sonst geneigt wäre die Verschleppung der Angelegenheit im Sinne eines Missbrauches seiner Schenkung zu interpretieren.
\end{quote}
As you know, I am a member of the International Committee that has been created for the publication of the texts that were found some time ago in Nag Hammadi. For this reason I still have, though no longer connected with the Jung Institute, of course always an active and legitimate interest that work be done not only on the twelve volumes that are in Egypt, but also on the thirteenth volume, namely the Jung Codex, and especially its parts that have not yet been published.

As a member of the Committee, I am again and again asked from very different sides, why the remaining three texts of the Jung Codex, as well as also the missing pages of the *Evangelium veritatis*, have not yet appeared. It is hence for me a great satisfaction, to be able to infer from the letters I could look over, that it is not an issue with the publisher, but that, to the contrary, the publisher has an active interest in this publication, for which I thank you and Uncle Max [Rascher] very much, also in the name of the Committee. I am very pleased that in this way you so helpfully support the interests of the Committee and thus of the scholarly world.

I have recently discussed the situation with Page, the donor of the Jung Codex, and he supports my understanding fully and completely, and he is furthermore of the opinion that it is now time for something to happen, since he otherwise would be inclined to interpret the obstructing of the affair in the sense of a misuse of his gift.

Then Meier’s letter continued, as he tried to understand the letter from Baumann and Rilkin:187

---

187 29159: Letter from Meier to Albert Rascher:

In diesem Sinne sind zwar die Erklärungen der Herren Rilkin und Baumann im oben erwähnten Briefe an Euern Verlag ganz befriedigend. Hingegen bleibt es völlig dunkel, was der zweite Abschnitt im Briefe dieser Herren an Quispel bedeuten soll. Ich habe schon vor längerer Zeit versucht, von den beiden Herren eine Erklärung darüber zu bekommen, worin denn die angeblichen Bedingungen von Prof. Jung bestehen. Auch Herr Minister von Fischer hat dies versucht und wir haben beide die sehr unfreundliche Antwort erhalte “es bestehe nicht die Absicht, sich in weitere Diskussionen einzulassen.” Nun hast Du aber, wie mir scheint, anhand der Abschrift des Briefes an Quispel, die Du erhalten hast, eine glänzende Berechtigung, wenigstens über die eine dieser Bedingungen nähere Auskunft zu verlagen, denn es ist ja sicher auch für Dich wesentlich zu wissen, was es heissen soll “sofern die Herausgabe in derselben Form und Aufmachung erfolgt wie diejenige der übrigen Bände.”? Auf was für “übrige Bände” bezieht sich dies? Sollte das Evangelium veritatis gemeint sein, so wäre dies zwar ganz in Ordnung, aber der Plural bliebe dann unverständlich. Wenn nicht das E. v. gemeint ist, so kann nur die von den Ägyptern begonnene Ausgabe “Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo” gemeint sein, von welcher aber auch erst ein Band (1956) erschienen ist. Ausserdem kann diese Ausgabe nach dem Urteil aller Fachleute keinerlei Wünsche befriedigen. Sie besteht lediglich aus einer technisch miserablen photographischen Reproduktion der Papyrusblätter. Die Reproduktionen sind so schlecht, dass nicht danach gearbeitet werden kann. Mit einer
In this sense the explanations of Messrs Rilkin and Baumann, in the above-mentioned letter to your publishing house, are of course quite satisfying. On the other hand, what the second paragraph in the letter of these gentlemen to Quispel is supposed to mean remains completely obscure. I have already a long time ago tried to get from the two gentlemen an explanation as to wherein then the alleged conditions of Prof. Jung consist. Also Minister von Fischer has attempted this, and we both have received the very unkind answer, ‘there is no intention to enter into further discussions.’ But now you have, it seem to me, on the basis of the copy of the letter to Quispel that you have received, a brilliant justification to ask for more precise information at least about one of these conditions, for it is certainly also important for you to know what it is supposed to mean, ‘so far as the publication takes place in the same form and make-up as that of the other volumes.’? To what kind of ‘other volumes’ does this refer? If the Evangelium veritatis is meant, this would of course be quite in order, but the plural would then remain unintelligible. If not the Evangelium, a publication begun by the Egyptians, ‘Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo,’ of which however also only one volume has appeared (1956). Besides, this edition can satisfy no wishes at all, according to the opinion of all experts. It consists merely of a technically miserable photographic reproduction of the papyrus leaves. The reproductions are so bad that one cannot work on their basis. A publication of the remaining three texts of the Jung Codex and the missing texts of the Evangelium in this form would not only serve no purpose, but your publishing house would have to refuse to publish

something so inferior, after it has produced such a model edition as that of the *Evangeli*um *Veritatis*. Hence it would be in everyone’s interest if you could bring clarity into this obscure part of the letter to Quispel. So as to remain cautious, I would ask you not to quote me in a query regarding this to Messrs Rilkin and Baumann.

It also seems very alarming to me that the two gentlemen write Quispel that he should ‘reach agreement with the different publishing houses about it.’ I would like to recall that Quispel is committed in writing to publishing the *editio princeps* of the writings of the Jung Codex at the Rascher Verlag. In my opinion you should write Quispel very energetically about respecting this obligation, and ask him to give you a deadline as to when it will be possible for him and his team to deliver the text and one translation not only of the missing pages of the *Evangeli*um *Veritatis* but also of the other tractates of the Jung Codex. If he then is evasive, one should, as I have also proposed more than once to Baumann and Rilkin, take the matter out of his hands, and turn it over to other collaborators. There are such who are available, and indeed these are appreciably more competent than Quispel, and would offer every guarantee of carrying out the work in the shortest amount of time with a good outcome. I could at any time give you access to the correspondence related to this.

Rascher followed up on Meier’s suggestions by writing Quispel for concrete publication plans:

After we determined that, among the photographs you kindly provided to us, it has in part to do with the missing four leaves [read: pages] of the *Evangeli*um *Veritatis*, and on the other hand with the supplemental leaves of the Jung Codex, we would like to get in contact with you again to discuss the further procedures. We are ready as soon as possible to publish the missing pages of

---

188 9 ii 59: Letter from Rascher to Quispel:

Nachdem wir festgestellt haben, dass es sich bei den uns freundlicherweise übermittelten Fotokopien teilweise um die fehlenden vier Blätter des EVANGELIUM VERITATIS und andererseits um die Zusatzblätter zum CODEX JUNG handelt, möchten wir uns gerne wieder mit Ihnen in Verbindung setzen, um das weitere Vorgehen zu besprechen. Wir sind bereit, so bald wie möglich die fehlenden Seiten des EVANGELIUM herauszubringen, und möchten Sie daher anfragen, ob Sie bereit wären, zusammen mit den andern Bearbeitern, Herrn Prof. Malinine und Herrn Prof. Puech, die Bearbeitung innerhalb der nächsten zwei Monate fertigzustellen. Da wir ständig wegen der fehlenden Seiten angefragt werden, liegt uns wirklich daran, sie bald herausbringen zu können. Wir wären Ihnen daher für eine baldige Entscheidung sehr dankbar...

P.S. In Bezug auf die restlichen Teile des Codex Jung könnten wir uns ja dann überlegen, ob eventuell andere Bearbeiter ins Auge gefasst werden sollten.
the *Evangelium*, and hence would like to ask you if you were ready, together with the other collaborators, Prof. Malinine and Prof. Puech, to complete the work within the next two months. Since we are constantly asked about the missing pages, it really is our concern to be able to publish them soon. We would hence be very grateful to you for a rapid decision. ...

P.S. With regard to the remaining parts of the Jung Codex, we can then of course reflect whether perhaps other collaborators should be brought in view.

Meier hoped to turn to Till as editor, but described to Till the impossible situation in which he found himself with regard to Baumann, Rilkin, Quispel, and Pahor Labib.\[189\]

I have now had Puech and Malinine asked whether they would possibly be ready for this work without Quispel, and with ‘an other’ collaborator [Till]. ...

In Zürich there would still be a series of preliminaries to take care of: 1. No longer the Jung Institute, but rather Prof. Jung himself, is owner of the Codex. This is a twist that took place after my resignation from the Institute. 2. Jung entrenches himself behind his two presumed representatives, Dr. Baumann and Dr. Rilkin. These declare themselves as indeed in agreement with our publication intentions, but then make everything difficult by means of procrastination or silence. 3. Quispel remains silent and not transparent, but now is being put under pressure by Rascher, and if he does not answer, which we would like to hope, is to be kicked out. 4. Pahor Labib’s posture toward me remains obscure. My Egyptian friend [Sameh], who has negotiated without interruption with Pahor Labib personally, and is now in Zürich, reports to me that Quispel has obviously made the most absurd defamations concerning me, and that it is very difficult to repair their effects.

\[189\] 12 ii 59: Letter from Meier to Till:

Ich habe Puech und Malinine jetzt anfragen lassen, ob sie zu dieser Arbeit eventuell ohne Quispel und mit "einem andern" Mitarbeiter bereit wären. ... In Zürich wären noch eine Reihe von Präliminarien zu erledigen. 1. ist nicht mehr das Jung-Institut, sondern Prof. Jung selber, Eigentümer des Codex. Dies ist ein Dreh, der seit meinem Rücktritt vom Institut stattfand. 2. verschaukelt sich Jung hinter seinen zwei angeblichen Vertretern, Dr. Baumann und Dr. Rilkin. Diese erklären sich zwar einverstanden mit unsern Publikationsabsichten, erschweren aber dann alles durch Prokrastination oder Stillschweigen. 3. bleibt Quispel schweigsam und undurchsichtig, wird aber jetzt von Rascher unter Druck genommen und, wenn er nicht antwortet, was wir hoffen wollen, ausgebootet. 4. Ganz dunkel bleibt Pahor Labibs Einstellung zu mir. Mein ägyptischer Freund, der ununterbrochen mit Pahor Labib persönlich verhandelt hat und sich eben in Zürich befindet, berichtet mir, dass Quispel in Kairo offensichtlich über mich die tollten Verleumdungen gemacht hat und dass es sehr schwer hält, deren Effekte wieder gut zu machen.
Meier subsequently wrote Till about the difficulty Rascher found with Meier's proposal to replace Quispel with Till among the editors of the Jung Codex: 190

Of course Rascher is, as we say in Swiss German, a pants-wetter. His newest fear is that Quispel, if he throws him out, might arrange his own edition, which will compete with his own. Hence he would prefer if the work on the remaining texts of the Jung Codex would be undertaken by you together with Puech and Quispel. He receives no answer namely from the two last-named gentlemen. After all, I think that you stand well with them, and could perhaps yourself undertake steps in that direction.

Can you perhaps enlighten me as to who a Hans Martin Schenke is, and whether he knows Coptic?

Meanwhile Baumann and Rilkin had written Rascher what they had learned from Quispel to clarify the ambiguities sensed in their earlier letter: 191

---

190 19 xii 59: Letter from Meier to Till:

Rascher ist allerdings, wie wir auf Schweizerdeutsch sagen, ein Hosenscheisser. Seine neueste Befürchtung ist, dass Quispel, wenn er ihn rausschmeisst, eine eigene Ausgabe veranstaltet, die die seine kontrastieren werde. Es wäre ihm deshalb lieber, wenn die Bearbeitung der restlichen Schriften des Codex Jung von Ihnen mit Puech und Quispel zusammen unternommen würde. Von den beiden letzteren Herren erhält er nämlich keine Antwort. Ich denke mir, Sie stehen doch gut mit diesen und könnten vielleicht selber dahingehende Schritte unternehmen.

Können Sie mich wohl darüber aufklären, wer ein Herr Hans Martin Schenke ist, und ob derselbe koptisch kann?

191 17 ii 59: Letter from Baumann (and Rilkin) to Rascher:

Was die Einheitlichkeit der Herausgabe der 10 zusammengehörenden Codices anbetrifft, so hat Herr Prof. Jung gewünscht, dass sie alle in der gleichen Aufmachung erscheinen.

Sie selber sind ja bereit, nun den ganzen Codex Jung genau gleich wie bisher das Evangelium veritatis herauszugeben, was wir sehr begrüssen.

Bezüglich der übrigen in Ägypten liegenden Bände schreibt uns Herr Prof. Quispel am 6.2.59 (Photokopie beiliegend), dass das Internationale Komitee beschlossen habe, die übrigen Bände in derselben Form und Aufmachung erscheinen zu lassen wie das Evangelium veritatis. Damit wären nun alle Wünsche erfüllt und wir glauben, dass die Angelegenheit nun rasch vorwärts geht.

Gemäß dem beiliegenden Brief ist Herr Quispel auch einverstanden, dass Sie den ganzen Codex Jung herausgeben. Er schliesst daran den Wunsch, dass Sie sich noch mit dem Brill-Verlag über die Form und Aufmachung verständigen, was jedoch nicht nötig sein sollte, nachdem die oben gegebene Zusicherung vorliegt. Zur Sicherheit aber möchten wir Ihnen doch empfehlen, Kontakt mit dem Brill-Verlag aufzunehmen.

Bezüglich der fehlenden Seiten verweisen wir auf den 3. Abschnitt des Briefes von
What has to do with the cohesion of the publication of the ten [sic!] codices that belong together, Prof. Jung has wished that they all appear in the same format.

After all, you yourself are ready to bring out the whole Jung Codex exactly as you previously did the Evangelium veritatis, which we welcome very much.

Regarding the other volumes that lie in Egypt, Prof. Quispel writes on 6 February 1959 (appendend photocopy) that the International Committee has decided to have the other volumes appear in the same form and make-up as the Evangelium veritatis. Thus all wishes would now seem to be met, and we believe that the matter can now move forward rapidly.

According to the appended letter, Quispel has also agreed that you bring out the whole Jung Codex. He attaches to this the desire that you would come to an understanding with the publisher Brill over the form and make-up, which after all should not be necessary, now that the assurance stated above is present. But to be certain, we would, after all, like to recommend to you to make contact with the publisher Brill.

Regarding the missing pages, we refer to the third paragraph of the letter of Quispel. If he brings his own photographs to you, then indeed everything is also here in order. On paragraph four in Quispel's letter you do not need to assume a position, since it has to do with the return of the Jung Codex, which can probably also be carried out as agreed.

In Rascher’s reply to Baumann and Rilkin, a change in the English translator is proposed:

We will no longer turn over to Mrs. Helen Wall the English work on the text, since the English translation of the Evangelium was not satisfactory and had to be corrected a great deal. We would turn over this work to Prof. Dr. Walter Till in Oxford.

Since English was not Till's native tongue, he did not consider his English adequate for publication. He wrote Meier that it would have to be corrected.
by an Englishman. R. McL. Wilson was ultimately enlisted for the English translation.

In view of the progress made by Rascher, Meier told Page that consulting their attorney Keller-Staub would no longer be necessary.

Before I got around to contacting Dr. Keller-Staub, Rascher appeared at my place with four letters from Quispel and Baumann-Riklin, who now after all seem to relent somewhat. ... Until the information of Quispel is verified, there seems to me to be no value in talking with Keller-Staub, and I assume that you, after reading the letters, can agree with my view.

One would think that it had become clear that the heirs of Jung had no further plans to retain the Jung Codex as a valuable family possession. Yet Keller-Staub reported quite differently, to the effect that the family of Jung, represented by his son-in-law Baumann, still wanted to retain the Jung Codex. This was reported by Meier to Sameh:

Page called for a talk with me together with the attorney Dr. Keller-Staub. Keller-Staub said that Baumann had conceded to him without hesitation that he would like to inherit the codex. We all know that if the whole thing is still delayed long enough Jung has to die during the process, whereupon Baumann is in the situation to do what he wants. In view of this danger, Page explained

\[^{193}\text{193 ii 59: Letter from Till to Meier.}\]
\[^{194}\text{21 ii 59: Letter from Meier to Page:}\]
\[^{195}\text{3 x 59: Letter from Meier to Sameh:}\]
to Dr. Keller-Staub that he will, if something does not happen soon, proceed legally against Jung and annul the gift, since the purpose has not been fulfilled, and his intention was never that any private person should be enriched from his gift. Dr. Keller-Staub, who, after all, is also the attorney of Jung, said to this that Jung, via Baumann, had obligated himself by means of the ‘note from the Minutes’ of 8 June 1959 (that you also have) as to the return to Egypt, and that he will see to it that Jung is compelled to give the codex to the Egyptians, the moment when the only valid condition is fulfilled by the Egyptians, namely that we receive the photos requested in the letter of 26 August.

Baumann was able to reach Pahor Labib by telephone on 29 December 1959, and thereupon wrote Quispel, inviting him and Puech to come to Zürich to discuss publication plans for the Jung Codex.\(^{196}\)

From my telephone conversation yesterday with Dr. Labib in Cairo it resulted that the publication of the Jung Codex has now entered into an active stage. Messrs Page, Dr. Rilkin, Rascher and I are hence of the opinion that it would be right to sit together with you and Prof. Puech, in order basically to talk through and make firm again all details. Hence we would like to ask you to come on Monday, 11 January 1960 to Zürich; Page will be glad to cover your travel expenses.

This internal struggle among the persons involved in the Jung Institute with regard to the ownership and return to Egypt of the Jung Codex was formally resolved only with the return of the bulk of the codex after publication to Egypt in 1975 (see Chapter 4, Part 5 above).

The Disintegration in Cairo

The disintegration of the Zürich committee of Meier, Puech and Quispel in charge of editing the Jung Codex was accompanied by a disintegration of the Cairo committee where Meier, Puech and Quispel had also hoped to control the publication of all the Nag Hammadi Codices.

---

\(^{196}\) 30 xii 59: Letter from Baumann to Quispel:

In Zürich, ownership of the Jung Codex had indeed been returned to Jung himself, which in effect removed the Jung Institute, and hence Meier, from a leadership position.\(^{197}\)

... Prof. Dr. C.G. Jung, ... who after all is now owner of the Codex ...

Hence Baumann wrote Quispel that the Jung Institute did not need representation on the International Committee:\(^{198}\)

The Institute in Zürich does not consider it necessary to be represented in the Committee.

Quispel wrote Pahor Labib in this regard to insure his own membership:\(^{199}\)

I understand that a reorganization of the Committee is necessary, because the Jung Institute does not want to be represented any longer. But you certainly will agree that those members, who were nominated \textit{officially and called} to Cairo, and did not act against the decisions of the Committee, are still members.

Meanwhile Sameh had written Meier that a new International Committee had already been chosen, in which Quispel played a leading rôle, though he had not informed his colleagues:\(^{200}\)

Our friend Quispel has done basic work. At a reception of the East Germans with coptologists from Leipzig and Dresden, I met Pahor Labib and Murad Kamel. In the course of the evening I pulled the worms out of Pahor's nose.

---

\(^{197}\) 18 v 59: Letter from Meier to Till:

... Prof. Dr. C.G. Jung, ... der ja nun Eigentümer des Codex ist ....

\(^{198}\) 24 vi 59: Letter from Baumann to Quispel:

Das Institut in Zürich hält es nicht für nötig, im Komitee vertreten zu sein.

\(^{199}\) 13 vii 59: Letter from Quispel to Pahor Labib.

\(^{200}\) 10 iii 59: Letter from Sameh to Meier:


A new Committee has been named, and Quispel has had himself named to the position that he always wanted to have: Right on top, alone the ruler among the Europeans. All previous decisions are outdated, i.e., you too are no longer in the Committee. The main reason is the evasive correspondence of Dr. Rilkin, which has sealed the distrust here after three years of back and forth. Quispel has been crowned as the savior in the plight. Of course he will hardly be able to redeem his promises (return of the codex etc.). If he does, then he is the winner. In the reverse case, he has, so to speak, predicted it, and so stands, as the one most involved, at the tip of the new publications.

In retrospect, Böhlig reported on this East German involvement as follows: 201

As a result of the events of the war of 1956 and the breaking of diplomatic relations with England and France, one sought new collaborators. Initially the invitation to me took place orally. Of course Murad Kamil had discussed it with Pahor Labib, who was not present at the 1957 congress. Besides, at that time one invited other scholars, e.g., Giversen.

This would tend to indicate that a reorganization of the International Committee of Gnosticism, or dispensing with it in favor of Pahor Labib simply making assignments to editors, goes back to as early as 1957. But the first published allusion to the changes taking place seems to have come in 1959 from Hans-Martin Schenke of the German Democratic Republic: 202

It has belatedly become known that the full edition of the text with commentary authorized by the International Committee of Gnosticism is being worked on by Professor Pahor Labib of Cairo and Professor Alexander Böhlig of Halle.

On receiving a reprint of this article from Schenke, Puech wrote him: 203

---

201 4 v 77: Letter from Böhlig to Robinson:


Nachträglich ist bekannt geworden, dass die vom International Committee of Gnosticism autorisierte kommentierte Volledition des Textes durch die Herren Professor Pahor Labib—Kairo und Professor Alexander Böhlig—Halle bearbeitet wird.

203 6 vi 59: Letter from Puech to Schenke:

Je ne comprends pas bien la note ajoutée par la rédaction de la Theologische Liter-
I do not understand clearly the note added by the redaction of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (col. 243) to the title of your article ‘Vom Ursprung der Welt.’ No member of the International Committee for the publication of the papyri of the Coptic Museum, as it was constituted in 1956 on the initiative of Dr. Pahor Labib, has been informed of the project of publication announced in this note. Is it simply a matter of the ‘authorized’ edition of the ‘Tractate without Title’ [= II,5]? If you had any clarification on this that you can supply to me, I would be very grateful to you.

Böhlig has provided the following explanation for his absence from the Committee:

... Schenke’s view no doubt goes back to the fact that at that time the founding of a new International Committee was initiated by Murad Kamil and Pahor Labib, and I was even called upon to make an application for admission. But I was then later informed that, as a citizen of the German Democratic Republic, I could not come into such a committee, since the German Democratic Republic (in contrast to the Federal Republic [of Germany]) was not a member of UNESCO. As a consequence, only Krause could become a member.

This would seem to indicate that such a Committee was never officially appointed or convened, until the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices was nominated by UNESCO and appointed by the Egyptian government in 1970.

Till wrote Meier late in 1959 that he had not been able to learn anything in Cairo about a new Committee:

---

\[\textit{aturzeitung} (col. 243) au title de votre article “Vom Ursprung der Welt.” Aucun membre du Comité international de publication des Papyrus du Musée Copte, tel qu’il a été constitué en 1956 sur l’initiative du Dr. Pahor Labib, n’a été informé du projet de publication annoncé dans cette note. S’agit-il simplement de l’édition “autorisée” du “traité anonyme”? Si vous aviez là-dessus quelques précisions à me fournir, je vous en serais fort reconnaissant.\]

\[\textit{204} \textit{9 v 81: Letter from Böhlig to Robinson:}\]

... Schenke’s Meinung wohl darauf zurückgeht, dass damals von M. Kamil und P. Labib die Gründung eines neuen internationalen Komitees initiiert und ich sogar aufgefordert wurde, einen Antrag auf Aufnahme zu stellen. Später wurde mir dann aber mitgeteilt, ich könnte als DDR-Bürger nicht in ein solches Komitee kommen, weil die DDR (im Gegensatz zur Bundesrepublik) nicht Mitglied der UNESCO sei; infolgedessen konnte nur Krause Mitglied werden.

\[\textit{205} \textit{2 xii 59: Letter from Till to Meier:}\]

Ich habe mich bemüht, etwas über die “Umorganisierung” des Internationalen Komitees zu erfahren, von der Sie mir auf Grund einer Nachricht aus Kairo vor längerer Zeit Mitteilung machten. Niemand wusste etwas davon oder man behauptete...
I have made an effort to learn something about the ‘reorganization’ of the International Committee, of which you informed me a long time ago on the basis of news from Cairo. No one knew anything about it, or one maintained in any case not to know anything. Puech wrote me recently he had heard that one wanted to exclude him, Doresse and me from the Committee. (I would surely survive that!) From Germany I now hear that someone (who?) in Cairo knows nothing of a reorganization of the Committee that has taken place or was planned. Hence the thing remains puzzling, still now just as it was before.

All that seemed clear by the end of 1959 was that both the committee of Meier, Quispel, and Puech for the publication of the Jung Codex in Zürich and the International Committee of Gnosticism that had met in Cairo in 1956 had ceased to exist as functional bodies. These two administrative structures, rather than being merged into one, had clearly disintegrated.
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE GOSPEL OF THOMAS

1. The Identification of The Gospel of Thomas

The first reference to The Gospel of Thomas is in the inventory of the Nag Hammadi Codices that Jean Doresse sent from Cairo to Henri-Charles Puech in Paris on 4 December 1948. Here he listed as the second tractate in his Codex III (= Codex II): 2

2) *incipit*: “Here are the secret sayings that Jesus has said and that Didymus Judas Thomas has written; *explicit*: “Gospel of Thomas.”

In 1950 Puech published an extensive analysis of the Nag Hammadi Codices based on Doresse’s inventory. There he published the *incipit* that Doresse had provided: 2

*incipit*: “Here are the secret sayings that Jesus has said and that has written Didymus Jude Thomas.”

Puech went on to correlate The Gospel of Thomas with Hippolytus’ allusion to its use by the Naassenes: 3

---

1 4 xii 48: Inventory accompanying letter from Doresse to Puech:


*incipit*: “Voici les paroles secrètes qu’a dites Jésus et que Didyme Judas Thomas a écrites” *explicit*: “Évangile de Thomas.”


L’Évangile attribué à Thomas, ou, plus précisément, et conformément à une tradition particulière, à Didyme Jude Thomas, paraît identique à l’Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Θωμᾶν dont Hippolyte atteste l’empoi chez les Naassènes ou “Gnostiques” et cite un passage.
The Gospel attributed to Thomas, or, more precisely, and conformable to a particular tradition, to Didymus Jude Thomas, seems identical with the Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Θωμᾶν that Hippolytus attests among the Naassenes or ‘Gnostics’ and cites a passage.

Hippolytus, in the passage that Puech goes on to quote in footnote 6, does seem to allude to Sayings 3 and 4 of The Gospel of Thomas, though Doresse may not yet have given Puech access to these sayings.

Once Doresse communicated to Puech a French translation of much of The Gospel of Thomas, Puech was able to identify on 29 July 1952 The Gospel of Thomas with P.Oxy. 654 and P.Oxy. 655, as he wrote excitedly to Doresse:

On my return home, a few hours after our interview, I was rapidly able to discover the Greek text of all the beginning and of one of the subsequent passages of the Gospel of Thomas and the Latin translation of another bit of the same writing. The Greek text is conserved, more or less mutilated, in two distinct papyri [P.Oxy. 654; P.Oxy. 655]; the Latin version is provided,
without any indication of the source, by a tract that is Gnostic, or, in any case, anti-biblical, which St. Augustine refutes.

As a result of these first observations, the document found at Nag-Hammadi assumes an interest that is considerable, even prodigious. The whole question of the *logia* (or, more exactly, the *logoi*) of Jesus is what is going to be brought into play, renewed, and, without doubt, in large part resolved.\(^5\) From there, it is only one step to resume the problem of the composition of the canonical Gospels, and to return to the works of the *Formgeschichtliche Schule*. The *Gospel of Thomas* (if one may retain this title for our text) requires, before being edited in the general collection of the volumes of Khénoboskion, the publication of a series of preliminary essays, and even, it seems to me, of a separate work, so as to have it appear as soon as possible [Puech's edition appeared late in 1959, see Part 5 below]. Once again, regarding this writing, as well as all the others, it is absolutely necessary to obtain the right to use and to quote the discovered texts, in our teaching, our conferences, and our articles. I even regret that it is too late (or too early) to make known the first results of my discovery at the next Congress of Papyrology. The communication would not have failed to make a sensation. It has to do, in effect, with texts and problems that have given rise to a super-abundant bibliography, and for which, I believe, we today hold the key. In any case, it is fitting to assume one's position as soon as possible, to signal to the scholarly world 'officially,' with the least possible delay, the facts heavy with consequences, and not to let others have the merit of doing so.

Puech went on to pose very specific questions that he called on Doresse to answer.\(^6\)

---


\(^6\) 29 vii 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Pour me permettre de continuer mes recherches et de vérifier mes reconstitutions et mes hypothèses, pourriez-vous:

1° me fournir une copie ou les photographies du texte complet de l’*Évangile de Thomas* et du *Livre de Thomas* (dont l’incipit paraît, par certain détail, plus conforme à ce que je retrouve aux premières lignes d’un des papyrus grecs) ou me confier pendant quelque temps les photographies de ces deux écrits;

2° Tout au moins, me refaire une traduction intégrale et littérale du début de l’*Évangile de Thomas* (jusqu’au “dit” relatif au “lion,” inclusivement) et du passage qui se lit plus
In order to permit me to continue my research and to verify my reconstructions and my hypotheses, could you:

1° furnish me with a copy or the photographs of the complete text of the Gospel of Thomas and of the Book of Thomas [Codex II, Tractate 7] (whose incipit ["The hidden sayings that the Savior has said to Judas Thomas"] seems, in certain detail, more conformable to what I find in the first lines of one of the Greek papyri [P.Oxy. 654]) or entrust to me for some time the photographs of these two texts;

2° At least make me an integral and literal translation of the beginning of the Gospel of Thomas (down to the 'Saying' related to the 'lion' [Saying 7], inclusive) [P.Oxy. 654 contains Sayings 1–7] and of the passage that reads further down (Jesus says: “The Pharisees and the scribes have hindered Gnosis” [Saying 39], etc. But the phrase, is it not in the vocative? [no!]);

3° Translate for me, even if only grosso modo, the page or the development that precedes this last passage (there must be there a saying on nourishment and clothing [Saying 36], followed by a question of the disciples [Saying 37]: “When will you reveal yourself to us and when will we see you?” He says: ‘When you will have removed your clothes and have no shame for it at all.” The presence or the absence of this logion in the Coptic has great importance?)? [P.Oxy 655 contains Sayings 36–39; although Saying 38 in P.Oxy. 655 is too fragmentary to reconstruct, it is complete in Nag Hammadi Codex II; although Saying 36 is in part fragmentary in P.Oxy. 655, it does include the reference to nourishment and clothing that is lacking in Nag Hammadi Codex II, and hence the omission of that reference would not be an omission by Doresse.]

------

loin (Jésus dit: “Les Pharisiens et les scribes ont empêché la gnose”, etc. Mais la phrase n’est-elle pas au vocatif?);

3° Me traduire, ne serait-ce que grossu modo, la page ou le développement qui précède ce dernier passage (il doit y avoir un dit sur la nourriture et le vêtement, suivi d’une question des disciples: Quand te relèveras-tu à nous et quand te verrons nous? Il dit: “Quand vous aurez dépouillé vos vêtements et n’en aurez point honte”. La présence ou l’absence de ce logion dans le copte a une grand importance)?

Tout ceci me persuade que, parallèlement à la préparation de l’édition du volume du Musée du Caire, nous devons faire porter tous nos efforts sur le recueil III de mon classement et en entreprendre la publication immédiate: c’est certainement une des pièces les plus importantes, sinon la pièce capitale, de la découverte.

7 The absence of the bulk of Saying 36 from Nag Hammadi Codex II is of great importance, since P.Oxy. 654 contains the original reading “they do not card” corrupted already in Q into “they grow.” This was discovered by T.C. Skeat, “The Lilies of the field,” ZNW 37 (1938): 211–214, and was renewed and defending in seven essays I wrote and republished together, “Essays on the Original Reading behind Q 12:27 in Codex Sinaiticus and P.Oxy. 655,” in The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays (eds. Christoph Heil and Joseph Verheyden; BETL 189; Leuven: University Press and Uitgeverij Peeters, 2005), 711–884.
All this persuades me that, parallel to the preparation of the edition of the volume of the Museum of Cairo [= Codex III], we should put all our efforts on collection III of my classification [= Codex II], and undertake its immediate publication. This is certainly one of the most important pieces, if not the capital piece, of the discovery.

Puech here has identified two Oxyrhynchus papyri with The Gospel of Thomas: P.Oxy 654 (Sayings 1–7) and P.Oxy. 655 (Sayings 36–39, where Saying 38 is too fragmentary to reconstruct). Yet the editio princeps of P.Oxy. 655 did not consider it to be part the same text as P.Oxy. 1 and 654; Grenfell and Hunt wrote about the latter:8

That the present text [P.Oxy. 654] represents the beginning of a collection which later on included the original ‘Logia’ [P.Oxy. 1] is very probable.

Yet they ascribed P.Oxy. 655 to a different text, a ‘Fragment of a Lost Gospel’:9

[P.Oxy. 655] seems to belong to a Gospel which was closely similar in point of form to the Synoptics.

Yet on the basis of what Doresse had sent him, Puech recognized that P.Oxy. 655, like P.Oxy. 654, is part of the Coptic Gospel of Thomas, and seeks further clarification of the reading of Sayings 36, 37, and 39. Puech has no doubt read Grenfell and Hunt, as is suggested by his expression, ‘logia (or, more exactly, logoi),’10 reflecting Grenfell and Hunt’s expression, ‘λόγια not λόγια.’11 But he has already made a significant improvement over Grenfell-Hunt, in recognizing that P.Oxy. 655 belongs to the same text as does P.Oxy. 654, and hence to the same text as does P.Oxy. 1. Yet he says nothing of P.Oxy. 1, Sayings 26–33, perhaps because Doresse has not yet provided a translation of that section of the text.

10 29 vii 52: Letter of Puech to Doresse:

... des logia (ou, plus exactement, des logoi).

Dioresse replied promptly to Puech’s excited letter asking for more:12

I am going to establish for you a translation, this time precise, of all that I have of the Gospel of Thomas and of the Book of Thomas, accompanied by the corresponding transcription of the Coptic text. I hope that you can thus immediately use these texts. I write by the same mail to Drioton about diverse questions that are urgent, and particularly to ask him to clarify for us in writing that—as I have said to you—no longer does anything oppose the utilization of the texts of Chénoboskion in publications distinct from the edition. I hope in effect that you could announce as quickly as possible what you have just discovered and that surpasses, I must say, even what I had hoped from our manuscripts.

Three weeks later Dioresse again wrote Puech:13

However, I finish making a clean copy of the texts and translations of the Gospel of Thomas and of the Book of Thomas. Should I send them to you at Cailar [Puech’s vacation residence]?

Puech replied immediately:14

---

12 4 viii 52: Letter from Dioresse to Puech:
Je vais vous établir une traduction, cette fois précise, de tout ce que j’ai de l’Évangile de Thomas et Livre de Thomas, accompagnée de la transcription du texte copte correspondant. J’espère que vous pourrez ainsi utiliser immédiatement ces textes. J’écris par le même courrier à M. Drioton pour les diverses questions qui pressent et particulièrement pour lui demander de nous préciser par écrit que,—ainsi que je vous l’ai dit,—rien ne s’oppose plus à l’utilisation des textes de Chénoboskion dans des publications distinctes de l’édition. Je souhaite en effet que vous puissiez annoncer le plus vite possible ce que vous venez de découvrir et qui, je dois le dire, dépasse encore ce que j’espérais de nos manuscrits.

13 24 viii 52: Letter from Dioresse to Puech:
Je termine néanmoins la mise au net des textes et traductions de l’Évangile de Thomas et du Livre de Thomas. Dois-je vous les envoyer au Cailar?

14 27 viii 52: Letter from Puech to Dioresse:
Je serais en effet très heureux de recevoir ici le texte et la traduction de l’Évangile et du Livre de Thomas et vous remercie de votre proposition. Ce mois de septembre est le dernier où je puisse encore jouir de quelque loisir et examiner ces documents à tête reposée. Les hypothèses que j’avais formées il y a un mois ont d’ailleurs mûries dans mon esprit, et, l’Évangile de Thomas apparaissant désormais comme un recueil des logia de Jésus, il m’a été facile de découvrir de nouvelles allusions à cet écrit, passées jusqu’ici inaperçues. On peut, en particulier, établir que l’Évangile est antérieur aux Actes de Thomas. La pièce me semble de plus en plus importante, et en elle-même et par rapport au problème, si inutilement compliqué, des “dits de Jésus.” Mais, avant de me prononcer plus décidément, il me faudrait connaître entièrement et dans leur littéralité les textes en question, et être au clair sur les rapports que l’Évangile et le Livre peuvent soutenir en eux.
I would indeed be very happy to receive here the text and the translation of the Gospel and of the Book of Thomas, and I thank you for your proposal. This month of September is the last when I can still enjoy some leisure and examine these documents with a rested head. The hypotheses that I formed a month ago have, by the way, matured in my mind, and, since the Gospel of Thomas seems from now on to be a collection of the logia of Jesus, it has been easy for me to discover new allusions to this text, passed by unnoticed until now. One can, in particular, establish that the Gospel is prior to the Acts of Thomas. The piece seems to me to be more and more important, both in itself and in relation to the problem, so needlessly complicated, of the 'sayings of Jesus.' But, before pronouncing myself more decidedly, it would be necessary for me to know totally and in their literalness the texts in question, and to be in the clear on the affinity that the Gospel and the Book can have in them.

Doresse complied:\textsuperscript{15}

I have just this instant received your letter, and I hasten to reply to it: I will go down to Seillans tomorrow to take to the post office myself the texts of the Gospel and of the Book of Thomas. Included is unfortunately merely the content of the only photographs that I have, and which represent merely a small part of the text. I nonetheless hope that this will permit you to be patient until I have in hand the complete manuscript. I have announced to Drioton the first observations that you have made on this text. He has just finally replied to me and is enthusiastic.

The next day Doresse again wrote a letter accompanying the material he sent:\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{15} 2 x 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je reçois à l’instant votre lettre, et m’empresse d’y répondre: je descendrai à Seillans demain pour porter moi-même à la poste les textes de l’Évangile et du Livre de Thomas. Il n’y a là, par malheur, que le contenu des seules photographies dont je dispose, et qui ne représentent qu’une petite partie du texte. J’espère toutefois que cela vous permettra d’attendre que j’aie en mains le manuscrit complet. J’ai annoncé à M. Drioton les premières constatations que vous avez faites sur ce texte: il vient enfin de me répondre et en est enthousiasmé.

\textsuperscript{16} 3 x 52: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Voici les textes et traductions des pages de l’Évangile et du Livre de Thomas dont j’ai la photographie. Le début suit mot à mot, en effet, Oxyrh. 654,—dont malheureusement je n’ai ici qu’une traduction sous la main. Comment n’y a-t-on pas deviné l’Évangile de Thomas jusqu’à présent? Et comment a-t-on pu tirer de ce texte mutilé les reconstitutions que l’on a tentées? Je vous ai transcrit le texte copte sans trop essayer de boucher les lacunes. Je suis allé un peu plus loin dans la traduction, mais sans que celle-ci soit définitive. Pas mal de formes étaient jusqu’ici inconnues et je n’ai pas sous la main tous les documents voulu pour en proposer des traductions infailliblement exactes.
Here are the text and translations of the pages of the *Gospel* and of the *Book of Thomas* for which I have the photography. The beginning follows word for word, indeed, P.Oxy. 654,—of which unfortunately I have here in hand only a translation. How could one not divine there the Gospel of Thomas down to the present? And how could one draw from this mutilated text the reconstructions that one has attempted? I have transcribed for you the Coptic text, without trying too much to fill the lacunae. I have gone a bit further in the translation, but without it being definitive. A number of forms were until now unknown, and I do not have in hand all the documents needed to propose for them infallibly exact translations.

Puech replied promptly:\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{17} 7 x 52: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Je m’empresse de vous accuser réception et de vous remercier bien vivement des documents que vous avez bien voulu me faire parvenir et que la poste vient de me remettre il y a un instant.

Je vais étudier à nouveau et de plus près l’Évangile de Thomas, surtout en vue de la reconstitution de certaines parties du texte. Mais je ne pense pas être en état de faire connaître les premiers résultats de mes recherches avant d’avoir eu en main le texte intégral et de l’Évangile et surtout du Livre de Thomas. J’ignore, en effet, si le premier de ces écrits est complet sous la forme que vous me le transmettez. Quant au second, le peu que vous avez pu en photographier ne permet pas de se rendre compte de la structure de l’ouvrage (dialogue ou entretien? discours continu de Jésus? recueil de logia?). Il faudrait, au moins, la photographie de tout le début. En conséquence, il est trop tôt pour se prononcer avec plus ou moins d’assurance sur le rapport entre Évangile et Livre de Thomas et sur l’identité de l’un ou l’autre de ces écrits avec l’Évangile gnostique de même nom connu par des sources antérieures. Trop tôt aussi pour résoudre l’important problème des “dits” de Matthias. Il convient d’attendre, une fois de plus, mais ce n’est plus, je l’espère, qu’une question de mois.

Le début de l’Évangile traduit en copte correspond effectivement à P.Oxyrh. 654 (défiez-vous cependant de la traduction qu’en donne James: le papyrus grec a donné lieu à trop de reconstructions, toutes à la fois techniquement rigoureuses et de fait arbitraires). Il peut paraître étonnant que personne n’ait soupçonné d’après les premières lignes de ce papyrus que l’Évangile de Thomas n’était autre que le recueil des logia de Jésus. Mais cette sorte d’aveuglement s’explique assez aisément: à l’exception d’un seul critique, tous les savants ont voulu combler par des conjectures aberrantes la lacune initiale du papyrus grec; d’autre part, on a été intoxiqué par l’idée que l’Évangile de Thomas ne pouvait être que relatif à l’enfance de Jésus. Et puis, il y a avait trop de théories sur les “paroles” de Jésus et la façon dont elles ont été transmises! Il y a plus étonnant: un rapprochement avec certain passage des Actes de Thomas aurait donné la solution du problème.

Le P.Oxyrh. 654 n’est pas, d’ailleurs, la seule pièce à entrer en ligne de compte. Comme je vous l’ai déjà écrit, d’autres morceaux de l’Évangile se retrouvent dans tel ou tel autre texte grec ou latin, et certains, dans les pages que je ne connaissais pas encore, ne sont pas sans m’évoquer, à une première lecture, des “agrapha” jusqu’ici transmis en ordre dispersé.
I hasten to acknowledge receipt of and to thank you quite warmly for the
documents that you were kind enough to send me and that the mail has just
delivered to me a moment ago.

I am going to study afresh and more closely the Gospel of Thomas, especially in
view of the reconstitution of certain parts of the text. But I do not think I will
be in a position to make known the first results of my research before having
had in hand the complete text both of the Gospel and especially of the Book of
Thomas. I do not know, in effect, if the first of these texts is complete in the
form that you transmit to me. With regard to the second, the small amount
that you have been able to photograph does not permit one to take account of
the structure of the work (dialogue or homily? continuous discourse of Jesus?
collection of logia?). It would at least be necessary to have the photography
of all of the beginning. As a result, it is too early to speak with more or less
assurance on the relation between Gospel and Book of Thomas and on the
identity of one or the other of these texts with the Gnostic Gospel of the same
name known from previous sources. Too early also to solve the important
problem of the ‘sayings’ of Matthias. It is appropriate to await, one more time,
but I hope this is no more than a question of months.

The beginning of the Gospel translated into Coptic does in fact correspond
with P.Oxy. 654 (beware however of the translation that James gives of it—the
Greek papyrus has provided the occasion for too many reconstitutions, both
technically rigorous and yet in fact arbitrary). It can seem surprising that no
one has suspected, on the basis of the first lines of this papyrus, that the
Gospel of Thomas was no other than the collection of the logia of Jesus. But
this kind of blindness is explained easily enough. With the exception of a
sole critic, all the scholars have wanted to combine, by means of aberrant
conjectures, the opening lacuna of the Greek papyrus; on the other hand, one
was intoxicated by the idea that the Gospel of Thomas had to be related to the
infancy of Jesus. And then, there were too many theories on the ‘sayings’ of
Jesus and the way that they have been transmitted! What is more surprising:
A comparison with a certain passage of the Acts of Thomas would have provided
the solution to the problem.

P.Oxy. 654 is not, incidentally, the only piece to come into consideration. As I
have already written you, other pieces of the Gospel are found in this or that
other Greek or Latin text, and some, in the pages that I did not yet know, do
not fail to evoke in me, on first reading them, the ‘agrapha’ transmitted up
until now in scattered order.

When Doresse was back in Egypt, Puech wrote him to ask if he had obtained
permission to make public what he had learned from the photographs.18

18 4 iv 53: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Avez-vous obtenu ou tenté d’obtenir la permission d’utiliser dès maintenant les textes
déjà étudiés sur photographies et d’en faire connaître publiquement, officiellement,
Have you obtained or tried to obtain permission to use from now on the texts already studied on photographs, and to make known publicly, officially, their content? It would be urgent and decent to announce the discovery of the Logia, whose complete text I have hoped to have since February. Try to negotiate the affair. Nevertheless we are not going to keep silent down to the end, and risk being finally duped, frustrated, outdistanced.

2. Adding Guillaumont and Till as Coptologists and Translators

Doresse never produced what Puech needed in order to publish *The Gospel of Thomas*, and Puech finally gave up on him and turned to Guillaumont as his replacement: He had not taken Doresse with him to the meeting of the International Committee of Gnosticism, though Doresse was a member of that Committee, but did see to it that Guillaumont, who was not a member of the Committee, was nonetheless in Cairo at the time, no doubt to produce a publishable transcription and translation of *The Gospel of Thomas* (see Chapter 6 above). Quispel protested, sensing that a French edition could be produced that might appear independently of the edition he was preparing with Walter Till, but Puech insisted that Guillaumont’s work was done with Quispel’s knowledge and approval (see below).

Guillaumont did produce by the end of November 1956 such a text and translation, which led Puech to propose publishing a French translation in France alongside the *editio princeps* at Brill, both scheduled at that time for late in 1957. A French translation was not published separately, but Guillaumont was listed among the editors of the *editio princeps*, which appeared at Brill in French as well as in English, German, and Dutch.

No minutes of the International Committee of Gnosticism were circulated that might have listed those assigned to publish the critical edition of *The Gospel of Thomas*. But at the conclusion of the meeting Ludwig Keimer wrote Father Louis Doutreleau, reporting on whatever plans he had picked up for the publication of *The Gospel of Thomas*:  

---

24 x 56: Letter from Keimer to Doutreleau:

“Les dits nouveaux de Jésus,” dont on parle tant en ce moment, seront publiés par MM. les professeurs Puech, Quispel, Girgis Mattha et par le bibliothécaire du Musée Copte, Yassa ‘Abd al Messiha. P. ne connaît point le copte, Q, un peu, Girgis le connaît au point
'The new sayings of Jesus,' of which one talks so much at this moment, will be published by the professors Puech, Quispel, Girgis Mattha, and by the librarian of the Coptic Museum, Yassa 'Abd al Messiha. P[uech] knows no Coptic at all, Q[uispel] a bit. Girgis knows it from the scientific, linguistic point of view (as the last phase of ancient Egyptian); as for Yassa, I have the impression that he will be the strongest in Coptic (in Egypt) ...

Girgis Mattha actually seems to have played no rôle in the publication, and was not considered a member of the International Committee of Gnosticism. But Keimer makes no mention of several members of the International Committee of Gnosticism listed by Pahor Labib in the Preface to the one volume of facsimiles he published, who were indeed not included in the final publication of The Gospel of Thomas: Pahor Labib, Jean Doresse, Theodore C. Peterson, C.A. Meier, Murad Kamil, Georges Sobhy. Walter Till, not in Cairo at the time though a member of the International Committee of Gnosticism, was also not mentioned by Keimer, but was enlisted by Quispel to produce the German translation, whereas Guillaumont, in Cairo at the time to transcribe The Gospel of Thomas, though not a member of the International Committee of Gnosticism, was added by Puech to produce the French translation, in effect replacing Doresse. The final publication was not in fact presented as a publication of the International Committee of Gnosticism.

The Gospel of Thomas had first became available to the public in the volume of facsimiles published by Pahor Labib, just in time to present copies to Puech and Quispel at the meeting of the International Committee of Gnosticism on 29 September 1956.20 But this publication meant that the monopoly on The Gospel of Thomas had in effect been broken, since the International Committee of Gnosticism had failed to secure exclusive control over it. Members of the International Committee of Gnosticism nonetheless planned an editio princeps that would not be as such a publication of that committee. Meier was not included in any of the planning. Puech and Quispel planned an editio princeps at Brill, to the exclusion of Doresse and Pahor Labib. But Puech had enlisted Guillaumont to prepare a French translation to be published first, and proposed that the critical edition be published without including Walter Till and Pahor Labib. Quispel

used the transcription provided by Yassah ‘Abd al-Masih, edited and translated by Walter Till, to prepare a German edition to the exclusion of Guillaumont. Puech and Quispel then transcended their differences sufficiently to publish a joint *editio princeps* at Brill including both Till and Guillaumont. Doresse, realizing he was excluded from this edition, protested that as a member of the International Committee of Gnosticism he should have been included, and thereupon published his own *editio princeps*. And others, using Pahor Labib’s facsimile edition, published their own editions before the quasi-official *editio princeps* of Brill. It is this complex procedure which is to be presented here in more detail.

Rather than Pahor Labib’s gift of his volume of photographs to Puech and Quispel at the meeting of the International Committee of Gnosticism pleasing them, it created the anxiety that once it was available on the public market anyone could publish critical editions of its contents, prior to their own publication. Indeed, Puech heard that the volume was on sale to the general public shortly after their Cairo meeting:21

According to what a Norwegian scholar wrote me, who addressed himself to Dr. Pahor Labib himself, it seems that the first volume of photographic reproductions appeared about the end of last November. Do you have confirmation?

This put tremendous pressure on Puech and Quispel to publish *The Gospel of Thomas* rapidly, if they wished, as they did, to publish the *editio princeps*.

Quispel advocated publishing their *editio princeps* only at Brill, without a competing French publication. Puech wrote Quispel on 17 January 1957 conceding that separate independent publications of *The Gospel of Thomas*, reflecting the divergent points of view of Quispel and Puech, would be premature and not advisable:22

---

21 30 iv 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

D’après ce que m’a écrit un savant norvégien, qui s’était adressé au Dr. Pahor Labib lui-même, il semble que le 1er tome des reproductions photographiques ait paru vers la fin de novembre dernier. Avez-vous confirmation?

22 17 i 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

En ce qui concerne les Logia, je suis tout à fait d’accord avec vous. La publication de deux traductions à l’usage du grand public risquerait de créer une certaine confusion, surtout si, chacune de son côté, elles devaient être présentées et commentées (ce qui est, en effet, indispensable) de façon plus ou moins divergente. Il faut, en outre, se garder de donner un travail trop hâtif et de proposer des vues générales insuffisamment mûries, dont, aussitôt, seraient relevées les erreurs ou les lacunes. Je m’applique depuis trop d’années à ce texte pour n’être pas persuadé qu’on ne saurait résoudre
With regard to the *Logia*, I am completely in agreement with you. The publication of two translations for use by the public at large would risk creating a certain confusion, especially if, each from its side, they had to be presented and commented on (which is, in effect, indispensable) in a way more or less divergent. It is necessary, besides, to keep from giving out a work too hastily, and to propose general views insufficiently ripened, in which, immediately, there would be noted errors or lacunae. I have been applying myself to this text for too many years not to be persuaded that one would not know how to resolve in a few months the innumerable problems, complex and infinitely delicate, that it poses. Guillaumont has put on foot for me, since the end of November, a first translation of the integral text. Combined with what I already had of a good part of the small text [from Doresse], it has served a great deal in my courses at the *Hautes Études* and at the *Collège de France*. We are working nonetheless to improve this translation, and it especially seems that the Coptic text needs to be corrected in places. In this regard, and in addition to the points where similar corrections force themselves more or less of themselves, a precious aid, decisive here or there, is furnished either by the three papyri of Oxyrhynchus 1, 654, and 655, of which T.C. Skeat and I are preparing to edit the reconstituted text [which was never published], be it by quotations more or less partial or fugitive of this or that Saying, which I do not cease to find in the very hidden recesses of ancient Christian literature. No matter how advanced this work may be, and no matter how considerable be the mass of material brought together, we do not estimate, Guillaumont and I, that we can or should publish our personal translation before next November or December. Having understood that your own translation can only appear at the same time as ours or immediately thereafter, you see that you have all the time needed to sharpen it up or to decide if it will be opportune to publish it independently (which you seem today to doubt).
Puech went on to propose what in abbreviated form became the joint Brill publication of 1959, over which he would have control, though he envisaged its publication toward the end of 1957, at which time Puech and Guillaumont would nonetheless also publish their separate French translation in France (which never appeared):23

The best solution would be, I believe, to finalize urgently and to publish as soon as possible in collaboration (you, Guillaumont, Dr. Yassa and me) the partial edition of the Gospel of Thomas (preface, Coptic text with critical apparatus, translation, succinct notes), about which we have dreamed, and which, with the reservation that each collaborator can dispose freely of one's personal contribution, could be entrusted to Brill. If we would come together at the end of April or in the course of May or June, I think that this work in common would be rapidly carried out, and that it would be easy to reach agreement on the language of the preface and the content of the notes. The manuscript could thus be ready in July and the volume could appear

23 17 i 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

La meilleure solution serait, je crois, de mettre au point d'urgence et de faire paraître au plus tôt en collaboration (vous, Guillaumont, le Dr. Yassa et moi) l'édition partielle de l'Évangile de Thomas (préface, texte copte avec apparat critique, traduction, notes succinctes) à laquelle nous avons songé et qui, sous réserve que chaque collaborateur pourra librement disposer de sa contribution personnelle, pourrait être confiée à Brill. Je pense que, si nous nous réunissions à la fin d'avril ou dans le courant de mai ou de juin, ce travail en commun serait rapidement mené et qu'il serait aisé de nous entendre sur les termes de la préface et sur le contenu des notes. Le manuscrit pourrait ainsi être prêt en juillet et le volume paraître trois ou quatre mois après, peu avant notre petit livre français ou presque simultanément. De tout façon, il serait nécessaire qu'il vit le jour avant la publication de la troisième édition des Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, qui doit comprendre une traduction des Logia dont je compte remettre le manuscrit en juin ou en juillet.

Serait-il possible d'inviter le Dr. Yassa Abd Al-Masih à participer à ces réunions de travail? En tout cas, avertissez-le qu'il y a lieu de mettre au plus vite notre projet à exécution et pressez-le de nous communiquer avant Pâques le manuscrit de sa contribution.

Veuillez me dire au plus tôt si vous êtes d'accord sur tous ces points ou si vous y voyez certaines difficultés.

Je vous serais reconnaissant d'attendre, avant de publier quoi que ce soit sur les Logia, que j'aie d'abord communiqué officiellement les résultats essentiels des recherches que je poursuis depuis plus de quatre ans en ce domaine. D'ailleurs, surtout si, comme vous me le dites, vos vues diffèrent des miennes, vos articles ne pourraient que se référer à celles-ci, c'est-à-dire à ce que vous en connaissiez par ma conférence d'Utrecht, conférence dont le texte, enregistré à mon corps défendant, fait foi de la priorité de mes découvertes, mais dont il m'a été promis qu'il ne serait fait aucun usage et auquel j'aurais aujourd'hui à apporter des modifications et des compléments. Il ne serait donc possible ni d'en parler ni de n'en pas parler.
three or four months later, slightly before our little French book or almost simultaneously. In any case, it would be necessary for it to see the light of day before the publication of the third edition of *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, which is to contain a translation of the Logia, for which I count on submitting the manuscript in June or in July.

Would it be possible to invite Dr. Yassa Abd Al-Masih to participate in these working meetings? In any case, notify him that there is reason to carry out our project as rapidly as possible, and urge him to give us before Easter the manuscript of his contribution.

Please tell me as soon as possible if you are in agreement on all these points or if you see there certain difficulties.

I would be grateful for you to wait, before publishing anything at all on the Logia, until I have first communicated officially the essential results of the research that I have been carrying on for more than four years in this area. Besides, especially if, as you tell me, your views differ from mine, your articles could only refer to these, that is to say, to what you know of them from my conference in Utrecht, a conference whose text, taped against my will, gives credence to the priority of my discoveries. But it was promised me that no use would be made of it, and I would today be able to bring modifications and complements to it. It would hence neither be possible to speak of it nor not to speak of it.

Thus, in effect, Puech was agreeing with Quispel to publish the *editio princeps* at Brill, while retaining the right to publish separately Guillaumont's French translation in France.

Thereupon Puech and Quispel made tentative plans to meet in Paris in June 1957, so as to expedite their edition as rapidly as possible. This would make it natural for Guillaumont to participate, as Puech's coptologist producing the French translation. Ultimately this meeting was shifted to early July in Utrecht, and included also the participation of Walter Till as Quispel's coptologist to produce the German translation.

Quispel wrote Till about becoming involved, to which Till replied on 30 January 1957:24

24 30 i 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:

I recently received via Austria a letter from Yassa Abd al-Masih, in which he informs me that the International Committee has decided to publish first the Gospel of Thomas, on which I should also work. Yassa transcribes first of all the text and makes a translation (English?). I hope that we have here in Europe good photos of the whole text, so that each involved in the edition can verify uncertain places and judge for oneself. I do not say that from any special distrust of Yassa. But I know how everyone can err, especially from my work on B[erlin] G[nosticus 8502]. Certainly Schmidt [its original editor] knew Coptic exceptionally well, and was also very careful. With all care one can err. Six eyes see more than two. ...

I would be very happy if I could receive the material for the contribution expected of me at a time when I can work on it. I have as always the intention to travel at the beginning of July to Austria, and to remain there over the summer vacations. So in that time I have no possibility to work in a scholarly way, since I have at hand no books at all. I assume that you expect me to take a position on the reading and translation, perhaps on the dialect (if necessary). In what language is the book to appear and where? Hopefully it will be printed in Europe, otherwise there are difficulties in correcting proofs. Unfortunately not many printers have good Coptic type.

Quispel then wrote Till his concern that Puech not be excluded from the editing of The Gospel of Thomas:

6 ii 57: Letter from Quispel to Till:


In der Tat ist es so, dass natürlich in Prinzip jedes Mitglied des Komitees an der Ausgabe miterarbeiten und über die Photographien verfügen kann. Es war aber so, dass Ihre spezielle Mitarbeit für die Ausgabe des Kodex I vorgesehen war, wie Herr Puech Ihnen doch berichtet haben wird. Persönlich würde ich natürlich nichts lieber wünschen als dass Sie sich auch am Evangelium des Thomas beteiligten. Man muss aber vorsicht[ig] sein in dieser Hinsicht, weil Herr Puech sich so ungefähr als Besitzer des Evangeliums des Thomas betrachtet und es mir aus Ihrem Brief nicht klar wird, ob Yassah ihn unter den Bearbeitern erwähnt. Nun ist es zwar nicht so, dass nur
From your letter of 30 January I infer that Yassah has informed you that you should be a co-worker on the edition of the Gospel of Thomas.

In fact it is of course true that in principle every member of the Committee can work on the edition and have access to the photographs. But it was the case that your special collaboration was foreseen for the edition of Codex I [= Codex III], as Puech has no doubt reported to you. Personally I would naturally wish nothing better than that you also take part in the Gospel of Thomas. But one must be cautious in this regard, since Puech considers himself practically as the owner of the Gospel of Thomas, and it is not clear to me from your letter whether Yassah mentions him among the collaborators. Now it is of course not so that only Puech can have control over this text, but on the other hand it would not be decent if one wanted to eliminate him. At least I will not go along with that, and you certainly not also. I have now written Yassah that he should send me his text and his preliminary translation, whereupon Puech and I can add our improvements and publish the text at the end of the year.

At least I will gladly work with you, and then also, with the agreement of the Egyptians, mention your name among the editors, but only on the condition that Puech is also there. I know that you will be completely in agreement with this, and I hope that the Egyptians will be also.

One has planned to publish the book at Brill in Leiden with new type fonts.

Till promptly wrote Quispel the following clarification of the rôle of Puech:26

____________________

26 9 ii 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:

Aus Ihrem Brief vom 6.2. ersehe ich, dass sich Herr Yassa in einem grundlegenden Irrtum befindet. Er ist ein guter Mann und will bestimmt nicht etwas auf eigene Faust machen oder gar intrigieren. Ich bin überzeugt, dass er irgend etwas missverstanden hat. Es wäre wohl gut, ihn über den wahren Sachverhalt aufzuklären. Um Ihnen ein genaues Bild von Yassas Ansicht zu vermitteln, schreibe ich hier die betreffenden Teile seines Briefes vom 24.12.56 ab. Er schreibt: “I am sorry I could not write to you before. ... I am pleased to tell you that the International Committee for studying the Gnostic Papyri at Coptic Museum had the honour to choose you to be an executive member in this committee. It gives me much pleasure to collaborate with you and Professor
From your letter of 6 February I see that Yassa finds himself in a basic error. He is a good person and certainly does not want to do anything on his own initiative, or indeed to be involved in an intrigue. I am convinced that he has misunderstood something or the other. It would no doubt be good to enlighten him about the true situation. In order to give you an exact picture of Yassa’s view, I transcribe here the relevant parts of his letter of 24 December 1956. He writes:

I am sorry I could not write to you before. ... I am pleased to tell you that the International Committee for studying the Gnostic Papyri at Coptic Museum had the honour to choose you to be an executive member of this committee. It gives me much pleasure to collaborate with you and Professor Quispel in publishing the Gospel of Thomas. ... I am beginning to copy out the text and about to finish its copying. ... When I finish the copying of the text, I shall send it to Professor Quispel who will consult with you the difficult passages. I shall send also the translation to Prof. Quispel who will forward it to you with his suggestions. ...

This letter conveyed to me the impression—as I now see, a false impression—that Yassa was commissioned to transmit to me these communications officially. For this reason I considered them to be a decision of the commission. So now I know that this is not the case.

From newspaper clippings that F[ather] Simon (Rome) sent me, I saw that Prof. Puech is occupied very much with the Gospel of Thomas, and I was surprised that he was not to collaborate in the editing, but I thought that this corresponded to one of the agreements reached in Cairo.

Until now I have received in this matter only the letter of Yassa I mentioned and your letter, otherwise I have received no communication.

Yassah ʿAbd al-Masih had answered two earlier letters from Quispel as follows:27

Quispel in publishing the Gospel of Thomas. ... I am beginning to copy out the text and about to finish its copying. ... When I finish the copying of the text, I shall send it to Professor Quispel who will consult with you the difficult passages. I shall send also the translation to Prof. Quispel who will forward it to you with his suggestions ...

Aus Zeitungsausschnitten, die mir P. Simon (Rom) sandte, sah ich, dass Prof. Puech sich sehr um das Thomas-Evangelium bemühte, und wunderte mich, dass er bei der Herausgabe nicht mitwirken sollte, dachte aber, dass dies einer in Kairo betroffenen Abmachung entspricht.


27 2 ii 57: Letter from Yassah ʿAbd al-Masih to Quispel.
I am sending by the registered mail 13 leaves of the text which I copied out. Would you kindly examine them and make the necessary corrections?

I beg to bring to your notice the following points:—

1) On receiving your letter, I had already copied out about 8 leaves following the method of Lefort. Prof. Garitte who visited Egypt last week told me that it was not necessary to recopy the text. ...

2) All the words which I write in pencil are doubted. I leave them to your activity. ...

5) I put in pencil the sign (—) at the end of the line, if the last words are not completed.

Within one week I hope that I shall send you the rest of the text. Then I begin to translate it.

Dr. Pahor is good enough to make facilitation to collate the text with origin for me. According to the agreement, I told Prof. Till to collate and revise our work. Please give him the enclosed letter.

Thereupon Till responded to an invitation from Quispel to come to Utrecht to work on *The Gospel of Thomas* together with Puech:28

Best thanks for your letter of the twelfth and the enclosed letter of Yassa of the fourth of this month. I do not know Professor Puech personally. I heard years ago that he is somewhat difficult. For your warning I am very grateful to you. In the summer of 1955, when I was already in the hospital for an operation, I received from him a letter, in which he wrote me that he had heard that he was

---

28 16 ii 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:


Wenn ich bis dahin Zeit und Gelegenheit hätte, das Material (Text und Übersetzung) bequem durchzuarbeiten, wäre unsere Konferenz wesentlich entlastet.
not to become a member of the Committee. He pressured me to write to Pahor Labib that he should after all come into the Committee. I knew at the time nothing at all about a Committee and who should be in it. I did indeed write to Pahor Labib, but emphasized that I only do so in order not to be impolite to Puech, and that I in no way sought to influence the decisions of the Egyptian authorities. Perhaps it would have been better if I had not written.

If you wish, and no one has anything against it, I am of course quite willing to collaborate also on the Gospel of Thomas. In this case I would be very grateful if I could have the material as soon as possible, at least in part. My wife and I thank you heartily for your friendly invitation. We are happy to reflect about this possibility. ... Would time at the end of June, from the 27th on, be suitable for you? And how long do you count on our stay?

If until then I had time and opportunity to work through the material (text and translation) comfortably, our conference would be unburdened very much.

Apparently Quispel hoped to limit the edition to members of the International Committee of Gnosticism, making use of the transcription he was receiving bit by bit from Yassah ʿAbd al-Masīḥ as edited and translated by Till, with the help of the facsimiles in Pahor Labib’s volume and advice from Puech.

In Quispel’s list of ‘Decisions’ that replaced the non-existent Minutes of the meeting of the International Committee of Gnosticism in October 1956, item 3 stated:

that the publication of Codex III [= Codex II] is entrusted to Yassa, Puech and Q[uispel].

It was such an edition, basically excluding any French coptologist, that Puech opposed. Hence he wrote Quispel to insist on the inclusion of Guillaumont in those named in the editio princeps:29

---

29 17 ii 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

J’attendais pour répondre à vos lettres d’avoir eu avec Guillaumont un entretien sur le point très délicat que vous souleviez le 21 janvier. À vrai dire, je ne comprends pas très bien votre objection ou vos scrupules. Guillaumont a été accepté par notre Comité comme membre d’un de ces groupements ou sous-groupements de collaborateurs techniques qui seraient appelés à participer effectivement et efficacement à l’édition de tel ou tel volume de la publication projetée et dont, naturellement, il était entendu que les noms figurent à juste titre à plus juste titre que ceux de certains membres, purement “honoraires,” du Comité lui-même sur la couverture du volume. Si nous excluons par avance ces précieux collaborateurs sous le prétexte que leur nom n’a pas été spécifié à propos d’une répartition des codices qui ne concernait, d’ailleurs, que les seuls membres du Comité proprement dit, le mécanisme de l’entreprise est faussé.
I waited in replying to your letters in order to have a talk with Guillaumont on the very delicate point that you raised on 21 January. To tell the truth, I do not understand very well your objection or your scruples. Guillaumont has been accepted by our Committee as a member of one of these groups or sub-groups of technical collaborators who would be called on to participate effectively and efficaciously in the edition of this or that volume of the projected publication, and of whom, naturally, it was understood that their names would figure appropriately—more appropriately than those of certain members, purely ‘honorary,’ of the Committee itself—on the cover of the volume. If we exclude in advance these valuable collaborators, under the pretext that their name was not specified in regard to a division of the codices that concerned, incidentally, only the actual members themselves of the Committee, the mechanism of the enterprise is falsified from the beginning. It would be the same as rejecting—which would be unjust and absurd—the participation of Till from the edition of Codex III [= Codex II] or the Logia (participation in which, for my part, I am very far from having the least opposition), in alleging that his name was not pronounced on the topic of this volume or of this text!

dès le départ. Autant repousser—ce qui serait injuste et absurde—la participation de M. Till à l’édition du Codex III ou des Logia (participation à laquelle, pour ma part, je suis très loin de faire la moindre opposition) en alléguant que son nom n’a pas été prononcé au sujet de ce recueil ou de cet écrit!

La collaboration de Guillaumont (à laquelle, d’ailleurs, le Dr. Pahor Labib paraissait tenir) m’a été et me sera indispensable, et je me suis toujours fait un devoir de ne pas taire les noms de ceux qui, de proche ou de loin, ont aidé et facilité mes travaux. Ayant été trop souvent moi-même victime de pareils “oubli,” de semblables ingratitudes, je ne veux pas user envers les autres des procédés qui me font horreur. Au reste, Guillaumont se refuserait, à juste titre, à prêter son concours et je devrais m’interdire de faire usage de sa contribution si son nom ne devait pas être joint aux nôtres sur le titre de l’édition des Logia. Cette contribution est essentielle, en particulier pour ce qui est des corrections à apporter au texte copte et de l’établissement du sens précis de certains termes ou de certains passages, sens qui est plus difficile à fixer que vous ne sembliez le croire et dont dépend mon commentaire, ou tout commentaire qui se veut tant soit peu rigoureux. Comment, en outre, travailler ensemble ici cet été, nous accorder sur un texte commun, nous entendre sur la traduction, élaborer la préface et les notes du volume, sans la présence, l’aide et les avis d’un collègue dont, comme moi, vous estimez grandement la compétence, le sérieux, la pondération?

La question que vous soulèvez—et que, me semble-t-il, vous êtes seul à soulever—est donc préjudiciable. De sa solution dépendent, pour le principal, toutes les autres. Pour ma part, elle ne se pose pas, ou ne devrait pas se poser. Il vous appartient de la résoudre et de me dire, de nous dire, au plus tôt, en quel sens. Je suis sûr que vous jugerez vos scrupules mal fondés et que vous approuverez, comme conforme à la justice et nécessaire à la bonne tenue scientifique de l’édition comme à la bonne marche de son élaboration, l’admission de Guillaumont à nos côtés.
The collaboration of Guillaumont (to which, by the way, Dr. Pahor Labib
seemed to hold) has been and will be indispensable for me, and I have always
made it a duty not to suppress the names of those who, from near or far,
have aided and facilitated my work. Having too often myself been the victim
of similar ‘forgetfulness,’ of similar ingratitude, I do not want to use toward
others the procedures that offend me. Besides, Guillaumont would refuse,
quite correctly, to offer his participation, and I would have to forbid myself
from making use of his contribution, if his name could not be joined to
ours in the title of the edition of the Logia. This contribution is essential,
particularly for what has to do with corrections to be brought into the Coptic
text, and in the establishment of the precise meaning of certain terms or
of certain passages, a meaning that is more difficult to fix than you seem
to realize, and on which my commentary depends, or any commentary that
wants to be more or less rigorous. Besides, how are we to work together here
this summer, reach agreement on a shared text, agree on the translation,
elaborate the preface and the notes of the volume, without the presence, the
aid, and the viewpoint of a colleague whose competence, seriousness, and
level-headedness you esteem greatly, just as do I.

The question that you raise—and which, it seems to me, you are alone in
raising—is hence prejudicial. On its solution depends, for the most part,
all the others. For myself, the question does not pose itself, or should not
be posed. It is up to you to resolve it, and to tell me, tell us, as soon as
possible, in what sense. I am sure that you will judge your scruples poorly
founded and that you will approve the admission of Guillaumont among us,
as conformable to justice, and as necessary for the good scientific bearing of
the edition, as well as for the good progress of its elaboration.

Puech then proceeded to propose a June meeting in Paris, to complete plans
for the editio princeps:30

It would be helpful to fix a date, already now, for our meeting in Paris. Less
fortunate than you, Guillaumont and I are consumed by our teaching and
other professional obligations until the end of June. Personally I will not
dispose of a bit more freedom until the beginning of the vacations of Easter

---

30 17 ii 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Il conviendrait de prendre date, dès maintenant, pour notre réunion à Paris. Moins
heureux que vous, nous sommes, Guillaumont et moi, pris par nos enseignements
et autres obligations professionnelles jusqu’à la fin de juin. Personnellement, je ne
disposerai d’un peu plus de liberté qu’à partir des vacances de Pâques ou même ...
à partir du début de mai. Ce n’est que d’ici là, ou alors, que j’espère pouvoir mettre
au point, avec Guillaumont, notre traduction des Logia, en la faisant bénéficier des
apports fournis par la tradition indirecte et notamment, par les parallèles que je ne
cessé de découvrir. Nous pourrions donc prendre rendez-vous pour le courant de juin:
plutôt vers le milieu ou la fin du mois.
or even ... beginning in May. It is only from now to then, or at that time, that I hope to be able to bring to a head, with Guillaumont, our translation of the *Logia*, in having it benefit from the aid furnished by the indirect tradition, especially by the parallels that I do not cease to discover. We could hence make an appointment for the course of June: rather toward the middle or the end of the month.

The meeting actually took place only in July, to fit Till's schedule, and in Utrecht (see Part 3 below).

Then Puech went on to list what issues needed to be resolved.31

It would also be necessary to determine in advance, even if only *grosso modo*, the length and the kind of preface and notes that will accompany the text and translation (in three languages? only in English, and by whom?). If, as you think, the notes should be brief, if, specifically, they do not mention the parallels, we can rapidly establish them together and on the spot. On the other hand, how are we to envisage the preface? One can obviously reduce it to the strict minimum, simply paleographical and philological indications. If we go beyond that, the difficulties begin. The person who will be in charge of preparing this introduction will have to take account of all our points of view (and, according to what you tell me, yours would diverge from mine), and integrate into the ensemble, if it is called for, the views of Till and of Dr. Yassa. It will then be necessary to submit this text to all the co-signers of the volume. What decide, and in what way proceed?

You do not make clear if Till has agreed to collaborate in this partial edition of the *Logia* and what exactly his rôle will be. I also do not know what the

31 17 ii 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Il faudrait aussi déterminer à l'avance, ne serait-ce que *grosso modo*, la longueur et le genre de la préface et des notes qui accompagneront texte et traduction (en trois langues? En anglais seul, et par qui?). Si, comme vous le pensez, les notes doivent être brèves, si, notamment, elles ne comportent pas mention des parallèles, nous pourrons rapidement les établir en commun et sur place. En revanche, comment envisager la préface? On peut évidemment la réduire au strict minimum, à de simples indications paléographiques et philologiques. Si nous allons au delà, les difficultés commencent: celui qui se chargera de rédiger cette introduction devra tenir compte de tous nos points de vue (et, à ce que vous me dites, les vôtres divergeraient des miens) et intégrer à l'ensemble, s'il y a lieu, les apports de M. Till et du Dr. Yassa; il faudra ensuite soumettre ce texte à tous les cosignataires du volume. Que décider, et de quelle façon procéder?

Vous ne me précisez pas si M. Till a accepté de collaborer à cette édition partielle des *Logia* et quel sera ici son rôle exact. J'ignore aussi en quoi consiste la contribution du Dr. Yassa et ce que contient le manuscrit dont il vous a communiqué la première partie. Il serait bon de m'envoyer une copie de ce manuscrit ou, dès que vous n'en aurez plus besoin, le manuscrit lui-même, ainsi que la suite annoncée.
contribution of Dr. Yassa is, and what the manuscript contains, of which he has sent you the first part. It would be good to send me a copy of this manuscript, or, once you no longer have need of it, send the manuscript itself, as well as the announced follow-up.

Puech next laid out the details for reaching an agreement with Brill to publish *The Gospel of Thomas*:32

I am happy that ‘Brill’ is disposed to print in the course of the summer, or, in any case, as rapidly as possible, the text of the edition, and to have it appear as soon as possible. It is nonetheless necessary to be very attentive to the terms of the contract, and for it be submitted to me in advance, as well as to all the ‘co-authors.’ It must, among other clauses, expressly recognize, and without equivocation, to all the authors, the right to publish elsewhere, and independently, before or after this edition, or at the same time as it, a translation of the text, and to dispose freely, at this occasion or any other, of the text of the contributions that they will have furnished. Have you spoken of this with van Proosdij? It is all the more important to me to be involved in the elaboration of the draft of the contract, that, not without some surprise for me, you announced to me in your letter of 21 January that you have ‘nothing to do’ with the house Brill and that you would transfer onto me the task of negotiating with it all the conditions relative to the edition of the Corpus. Van Proosdij has not yet alerted me. I wrote him last week to ask him to get in contact with me at the time of his next trip to Paris. It will also be necessary for him to reach agreement directly, or by your mediation, with Dr. Pahor Labib.

Puech next insisted he be the first to publish, and be recognized as the scholar who first identified the *Logia*:33

---

32 17 ii 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Je suis heureux que “Brill” soit disposé à imprimer dans le courant de l’été ou, de toute façon, le plus rapidement possible le texte de l’édition et à la faire paraître au plus tôt. Il faut cependant être très attentif aux termes du contrat et que celui-ci me soit soumis au préalable, ainsi qu’à tous les “co-auteurs.” Il doit, entre autres clauses, reconnaître expressément, et sans équivoque, à tous les auteurs le droit de publier ailleurs, et indépendamment, avant ou après cette édition ou en même temps qu’elle, une traduction du texte et de disposer librement, à cette occasion ou à toute autre, du texte des contributions qu’ils auront fournies. Avez-vous parlé de cela avec M. van Proosdij? Je tiens d’autant plus à être mêlé à l’élaboration du projet de contrat, que, non sans quelque surprise pour moi, vous m’avez dans votre lettre du 21 janvier que vous n’aviez “rien à faire” avec la Maison Brill et que vous déchargez sur moi du soin de négocier avec elle toutes conditions relatives à l’édition du Corpus. Van Proosdij ne m’a pas encore alerté. Je lui ai écrit la semaine dernière pour le prier de se mettre en rapport avec moi lors de son prochain passage à Paris. Il faudra également qu’il s’entende directement, ou par votre entremise, avec le Dr. Pahor Labib.

33 17 ii 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
Do you persist in your intention to publish a Dutch translation of the *Logia*, and at what time do you count of having it appear? Have you modified your plan in terms of our edition with a shared translation, and of the publication of the French translation that Guillaumont and I are able, I confirm to you, to render public only in November, at the earliest?

It will be difficult for me to give to the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* before 30 March an official communication of my discovery of the *Logia*. I hardly have the time, these months, to edit a text on this subject. It is necessary to give notice, and to get in line a rather long time in advance; and, especially, it is necessary for me to reach an understanding with Dr. Pahor Labib on the date when he will give, more or less simultaneously, the reading of the same note to a scientific society of Cairo. I will soon entrust to you a letter in this sense, which I will ask you to transmit to Dr. Labib, since all direct communication is for the time being forbidden between France and Egypt. I would hence be grateful to you to note in your conference of 30 March the priority of the rôle that I have played in the study of the *Gospel of Thomas* and, as you propose to me with much courtesy and kindness, to postpone to a bit later the publication of the text of your presentation.

---

Persistez-vous dans votre intention de publier une traduction hollandaise des *Logia* et vers quel moment comptez-vous la faire paraître? Avez-vous modifié votre projet en fonction de notre édition-traduction commune et de la publication de la traduction française que, Guillaumont et moi, nous ne pourrons, je vous le confirme, rendre publique qu’en novembre, au plus tôt?

Il me sera difficile de donner avant le 30 mars communication officielle de ma découverte des *Logia* à l’*Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*. Je n’ai guère le temps, ces mois-ci, de rédiger un texte à ce sujet; il faut avertir et prendre rang assez longtemps à l’avance, et, surtout, il faut que je m’entende avec le Dr. Pahor Labib sur la date où celui-ci donnera, à peu près simultanément, lecture de la même note à une Société scientifique du Caire. Je vous confierai bientôt une lettre en ce sens, que je vous prierai de transmettre au Dr. Labib, toute communication directe étant pour le moment interdite entre la France et l’Égypte. Je vous serais donc reconnaissant de bien marquer dans votre conférence du 30 mars la priorité du rôle que j’ai joué dans l’étude de l’*Évangile de Thomas* et, comme vous me le proposez avec beaucoup de courtoisie et de gentillesse, de remettre à un peu plus tard la publication du texte de votre exposé.

À cet égard, nous pourrions donner côte à côte dans un même et tout prochain fascicule de *Vigiliae Christianae*, vous vos remarques et vues particulières sur le nouveau document, moi un relevé systématique de toutes les citations et traces des *Logia* que j’ai relevés depuis plus de quatre ans dans la littérature patristique, manichéenne, médiévale, etc. Mon article, qui serait très sec, tout en citations et en références, pourrait être assez rapidement rédigé et le manuscrit vous être remis lors de votre séjour ici. Il n’a aura qu’à recommander à la direction de la revue de faire diligence.

---

In this regard, we could give side by side in a same and very soon fascicle of *Vigiliae Christianae*, you, your remarks and particular views of the new document, me, a systematic listing of all the citations and traces of the *Logia* that I have identified for more than four years in Patristic, Manichaean, and Medieval literature, etc. My article, which would be very dry, all in citations and references, could be edited rather rapidly, and the manuscript turned over to you at the time of your visit here. It would only be necessary to recommend to the editor of the revue to be diligent.

Puech then wrote Till, welcoming his rôle in editing *The Gospel of Thomas*:

Unnecessary to tell you how much I take satisfaction in this cooperation. I hope that it extends to all the other volumes of the expected Corpus, and, already this very year, to the partial edition of the *Gospel according to Thomas* of Codex III [= Codex II].

Quispel asked Yassah ʿAbd al-Masīḥ to transcribe the text of *The Gospel of Thomas* by the original in the Coptic Museum, which was his way of securing a text more reliable than what he could produce based on the facsimile edition of Pahor Labib. On 2 March 1957 Yassah ʿAbd al-Masīḥ wrote Quispel:

I am glad to receive your notes on the text which I copied out. I collated these notes with the MS. And I agree with you at most of them.

Here are my remarks on your notes together with my own which I recognized when the translation had been done.

When I read the text again with the translation, I hope that I may be able to fill the gaps which are still empty with the correction of some doubtful words.

There followed a page listing specific corrections.

Then on 24 April 1957 Yassah ʿAbd al-Masīḥ wrote Quispel thanking him for his enthusiastic response.

Meanwhile Quispel engendered from the Bollingen Foundation $250 to pay the travel expenses of Puech and Till. In his request, he gave an overview

---


36 24 ii 57: Letter from Puech to Till:

Inutile de vous dire combien je me félicite de cette coopération. Je souhaite qu’elle s’étende à tous les autres volumes du Corpus prévus et, dès cette année même, à l’édition partielle de l’*Évangile selon Thomas* du Codex III.

37 2 iii 57: Letter from Yassah ʿAbd al-Masīḥ to Quispel.

38 27 iv 57: Letter from Yassah ʿAbd al-Masīḥ to Quispel.
of his interpretations and promised a popularizing book that the Bollingen Foundation could publish in 1958.\footnote{2 iii 57: Letter from Quispel to Barrett.}

For the time being, we need only some money for paying our trips. We decided that we will publish first all the ‘Sayings of Jesus.’ This is a text of 20 pages, in Coptic, containing about 118 [read: 114] sayings attributed to Jesus, practically all unknown. I discovered that these sayings are derived from two unknown Gospels, the Gospel of the Egyptians (± 130 AD) and the Gospel of the Hebrews (= the Gospel of the primitive Christian community of Jerusalem ± 100 AD). This text will cause sensation all over the world, because it throws a completely new light upon our existing gospels. Prof. Puech and myself will try to publish this text in the course of this year. Therefore it will be necessary to consult Prof. Walter Till in Manchester in June. Therefore some expenses will be necessary. May I suggest that Bollingen puts an amount of 250 dollars at our disposal? I will send you back at the end of this year the remaining amount and the bills of Puech and Till. If you grant us this amount, the book would appear toward the Fall of this year.

Moreover I suggest that I write for Bollingen Foundation a book on these Sayings, consisting of an introduction, translation and commentary. This should be intended for the general public, avoiding linguistic details about Coptic and Greek text, but showing what new light this new writing throws on our canonical gospels. I could write this book immediately after the publication of the text, in the course of 1958.

The grant was forthcoming,\footnote{26 iv 57: Letter from Barrett to Quispel.} but the popularizing book (whose views Puech rightly did not accept) was never written.

In a letter of 22 February 1957 Quispel had again written Puech opposing the inclusion of Guillaumont’s name. This elicited on 30 April 1957 a rebuttal from Puech, who proposed an editorial committee for \textit{The Gospel of Thomas} consisting of Quispel, Guillaumont (replacing Doresse and Malinine), Puech, and Yassah ‘Abd al-Masīḥ, without mentioning Walter Till and Pahor Labib:\footnote{30 iv 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:}

Votre lettre du 22 février m’a, d’autre part, jeté au sein de perplexités et de complications parmi lesquelles je me débats encore sans leur trouver de solution bien nette. Il faudrait pourtant qu’il y en eût une au plus tôt, si nous voulions aboutir à ce qui est pour le moment l’essentiel: la toute prochaine publication de l’édition princeps de \textit{l’Évangile de Thomas}. La situation paraissait claire en janvier. Comme je vous le proposais, il semblait simple et naturel que l’édition fût préparée, avec l’aide des matériaux fourni par Yassa et, comme nous l’avions fait avec Malinine, en étroite collaboration, par vous, Guillaumont et moi, et que le volume, dont le manuscrit pouvait ainsi être rapidement établi, fût signé de nos quatre noms. Van Proosdij, que j’ai vu
Your letter of 22 February has on the other hand thrown me into the midst of perplexities and complications, among which I debate with myself without yet finding a very clear solution for them. However it is necessary that there be one as soon as possible, if we want to arrive at what for the moment is essential: the publication very soon of the *editio princeps* of *The Gospel of Thomas*. The situation seemed clear in January. As I proposed to you, it seemed simple and natural that the edition be prepared, with the assistance of materials furnished by Yassa and, as we did with Malinine, in close collaboration, by you, Guillaumont and me, and that the volume, whose manuscript could thus be rapidly established, be signed by our four names. Van Proosdij, whom I saw last month, confirmed to me that he was quite ready to give the text to the printer as early as September or October, and to have it appear in the very briefest of time. It would have sufficed for us to meet before summer and, face to face, compare our corrections of the text and our respective translations, in order to reach, after active and sharp discussion, agreement on a common version.

Puech then proceeded to insist on the inclusion of Guillaumont’s name, just as other collaborators outside of the inner circle would be named on volumes to which they contributed:

The difficulties you raise with regard to the admission of the name of Guillaumont among those of the co-signers of the volume compromises seriously

---

42 30 iv 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Les difficultés que vous soulevez à propos de l’admission du nom de Guillaumont parmi ceux des signataires du volume compromettent gravement l’exécution de pareil projet et risquent de nous engager dans une impasse. Je les déplore d’autant plus, qu’elles me paraissent, je vous le répète, sans fondement.

Rien dans les décisions prises au Caire ne me semble justifier l’étroite et toute personelle interprétation que vous en donner. Il n’a jamais été entendu que les noms des membres du Comité entre lesquels était répartie la direction de l’édition des trois premières volumes étaient exclusifs de ceux d’autres collaborateurs éventuels. Pourquoi, alors, aurions-nous envisagé la constitution de sous-comités ou de comités particuliers chargés de l’édition technique de tel ou tel volume et dont, précisément, il a été décidé qu’entre autre, Guillaumont ferait partie? Ne vous êtes-vous pas, vous-même, adjoint certains collaborateurs et, lorsqu’ils auront fourni une contribution efficace et importante, passerez-vous leurs noms sous silence? En particulier, exclurez-vous le nom de Malinine de la couverture du volume qui renfermera l’édition du Codex II? Ne serait-ce pas ruiner par avance toute l’entreprise ou courir le risque d’en écarter des savants français tel que Malinine et Guillaumont, quitte à me laisser seul à seul avec Doresse?
Nothing in the decisions taken in Cairo seems to me to justify the strict and quite personal interpretation that you give them. It was never understood that the names of the members of the Committee to whom was allocated the direction of the edition of the three first volumes excluded the names of other possible collaborators. Why, then, would we have envisaged the constitution of sub-committees or of particular committees charged with the technical edition of this or that volume, and among whom, precisely, it was decided that, among others, Guillaumont would be part? Did not you yourself add certain collaborators, and when they have furnished an effective and important contribution, will you pass over their names in silence? Specifically, would you exclude the name of Malinine from the cover of the volume which will contain the edition of Codex II [= Codex I, the Jung Codex]? Would this not be to ruin in advance the whole enterprise, or run the risk of excluding French scholars such as Malinine and Guillaumont, ending up leaving me quite alone with Doresse?

Then Puech focused on the specific indispensability of Guillaumont in the edition of *The Gospel of Thomas*: 43

---

43 30 iv 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

J’attire aussi votre attention sur les conséquences qu’aurait, en fait, et dans le cas présent, l’exclusion de Guillaumont.

Une première remarque, entre parenthèses. Il est inexact d’avancer, comme vous le faites, que Guillaumont “a déjà fait une grande partie du travail avant que le comité se réunissait (et à l’insu du reste des autres membres du comité)”. Guillaumont n’est intervenu dans l’affaire que sur le désir qu’en mai dernier, le Dr. Pahor Labib en a exprimé à M. Sainte Fare Garnot, directeur de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie orientale; il n’a, pour la première fois, pris connaissance du texte de l’Évangile de *Thomas* qu’en octobre, au cours de son séjour au Caire, et ce n’est qu’une fois sa présence et collaboration acceptées par vous-même et les autres membres du Comité qu’il a commencé à travailler avec moi sur ce document, dont, à son retour, c’est-à-dire en novembre, il a élaboré une traduction personnelle et encore provisoire. Je ne vois donc pas ce que vous auriez à reprocher à sa conduite, ou à la mienne.

Autre point, et capital; comment concevriez-vous que nous procédions à l’élaboration du manuscrit en l’absence de Guillaumont? Vous avez pu vous rendre compte que le texte copte de l’Évangile a besoin d’être amendé par endroits et que, si nous tenions à en donner une édition vraiment scientifique, il doit être accompagné d’un appareil critique. D’autre part, quoi que vous sembliez dire, et à moins de se contenter d’à peu près, l’interprétation de certains passages n’est pas des plus faciles. Je ne sais si Yassa est parvenu à vaincre toutes les difficultés; j’ignore même, puisque vous avez omis jusqu’ici de m’en envoyer copie, en quoi consiste au juste sa contribution. De toute façon, il me paraîtrait délicat, sinon impossible, soit de vous communiquer sous ma seule responsabilité un texte, des corrections, une traduction, qui ne seraient pas mon œuvre propre, soit de proposer au texte et à la traduction établis par vous et par
I also draw your attention to the consequences which the exclusion of Guillaumont would have, in fact, and in the present instance.

A first remark, in parentheses. It is incorrect to suggest, as you do, that Guillaumont 'had already done a large part of the work before the Committee met (and in the ignorance of the other members of the Committee).' Guillaumont intervened in the affair only on the desire that in last May Dr. Pahor Labib expressed to Sainte Fare Garnot, Director of the Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale. He did not get acquainted with the text of the Gospel of Thomas for the first time until October, in the course of his sojourn in Cairo, and this only after his presence and collaboration were accepted by you yourself and the other members of the Committee, that he has begun to work with me on this document, of which, on his return, that is to say, in November, he worked out a personal translation that was still provisional. So I do not see what you would have to reproach in his conduct, or in mine.

Another point, and a capital one: How do you conceive of us proceeding in the elaboration of the manuscript in the absence of Guillaumont? You have been able to realize that the Coptic text of the Gospel is in need of being emended at places and that, if we stick with producing an edition of it that is really scientific, it has to be accompanied by a critical apparatus. On the other hand, though you seem to say, and at least to be satisfied, more or less, the interpretation of certain passages is not the most simple. I do not know if Yassa has been able to overcome all the difficulties. I even do not know, since you have omitted until now to send me a copy of it, wherein specifically his contribution consists. In any case it would seem to me delicate, if not impossible, either to pass on to you, on my own responsibility, a text, corrections, a translation, that would not be my own work, or to propose for the text and the translation established by you and by Yassa amendments or improvements, a part of which would be due to Guillaumont. How, otherwise, to think of giving a commentary that would not agree with your interpretation of this or that logion or to expose myself to reproaches in having the air of contradicting myself in the Brill edition and in the small work that I plan to publish with Guillaumont? Think, besides, of the loss of time involved in an exchange of correspondence on all these points before arriving at an agreement? Hence the confrontation of our respective translations and hypotheses cannot be made except with the better procedure, the agreement

Yassa des amendements ou des améliorations dont une part serait due à Guillaumont. Comment, en outre, songer à donner un commentaire qui ne cadrerait pas avec votre interprétation de tel ou tel logion ou à m’exposer à des reproches en ayant l’air de me contredire dans l’édition Brill et dans le petit ouvrage que je compte publier avec Guillaumont? Songez, au reste, à la perte de temps que représenterait un échange de correspondance sur tous ces points avant de parvenir à un accord? La confrontation de nos traductions et hypothèses respectives ne peut donc se faire qu’avec le meilleur procédé que celui dont nous avons usé pour la publication de l’Évangile de Verité et dont nous avons tout lieu, je pense, de nous féliciter.
and the assistance of Guillaumont, and in his presence, which we have used for the publication of *The Gospel of Truth* and where we have had, I think, every occasion to felicitate ourselves.

Puech then summarized his arguments as follows:

A new embarrassment is grafted onto the preceding ones. A better way to do it rapidly and well would be, as I suggested and you seemed at first to approve, that we meet in Paris in June ... . The middle of July, which you propose, would not suit. Guillaumont will by then have already left for vacations. I have too many occupations, and only have too many trips in other countries this year, to be able to come to Utrecht. Besides, our work would not be efficient and easy except here where I have in hand all my notes and the books and other instruments of research and control that are necessary. And of what profit would it be without the assistance of Guillaumont? One more time, your coming to Paris and a meeting of the three in June seems to me to be the only solution that is possible.

How to disentangle a situation this complicated? It seems to me that the whole knot of the question lies in your attitude with regard to Guillaumont, and that, if you would revise it, all would arrange itself marvelously. Would you please, in any case, focus on it as soon as possible, and help me get out of so many confusions and uncertainties? I do not give up hope that in examining the difficulties clearly and together, we would arrive at resolving them for the good of all. ...

---

44 30 iv 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Un nouvel embarras se greffe sur les précédents. Le meilleur moyen de faire vite et bien serait, ainsi que je le suggérais et que vous sembliez d’abord l’approuver, que nous nous réunissions à Paris en juin ... . Le milieu de juillet, que vous proposez, ne saurait convenir: Guillaumont, à ce moment-là, sera déjà parti en vacances. J’ai trop d’occupations, et n’ai que trop de déplacements à faire à l’étranger cette année, pour que je puisse venir à Utrecht. D’ailleurs, notre travail ne serait efficace et aisé qu’ici, où j’ai sous la main toutes mes notes et les livres ou autres instruments de recherches et de contrôle nécessaires. Et de quel profit serait-il sans l’assistance de Guillaumont? Encore une fois, votre venue à Paris et une réunion à trois en juin me semblent la seule solution possible.

Comment débrouiller une situation aussi compliquée? Il me semble que tout le noyau de la question est dans votre attitude à l’égard de Guillaumont et que, si vous la revisiez tout s’arrangerait à merveille. Voulez-vous, en tout cas, me fixer au plus tôt sur elle et m’aider à sortir de tant de confusions et d’incertitudes? Je ne désespère pas qu’en examinant clairement et en commun les difficultés, nous n’arrivions à les récoudre pour le bien de tous. ...

Vous a-t-il dit, comme à moi, qu’il trouvait dispendieux et inutile de publier trois traductions d’un même texte et qu’il aurait quelque préférence pour le français? Till, de son côté, se demande qui fera la traduction anglaise. Il est, en effet, paradoxal que (l’enigmatique Peterson excepté) aucun des spécialites chargés de l’édition n’ait l’anglais pour langue natale ou normale.
Has he [van Proosdij] told you, as he has told me, that he found it costly and unnecessary to publish three translations of the same text, and that he would have some preference for French? Till, for his part, wonders who will make the English translation. It is, in effect, paradoxical that (apart from the enigmatic Peterson) no one of the specialists charged with the edition has English as mother or normal tongue.

Till wrote Quispel again on 23 May 1957, reporting the problem raised in a letter from Doresse that now anyone could publish The Gospel of Thomas on the basis of Pahor Labib's facsimile volume:

Yesterday I received a letter from Doresse. He is very unhappy about the fact that he receives no communications about what was decided. I will bring the letter with me. He also thinks that, after the publication of plates by Pahor Labib, anyone who wanted could, without impediment, make full use of these texts. Also others, e.g. Drescher, expressed the same concern. I must say that they are right. What is good in this is only that there are—in this case fortunately—few people who understand Coptic enough to exploit these texts. Also the reproductions of the texts in Pahor Labib's plates are appreciably less good than in the Evangelium Veritatis. But we must be prepared for it, that some people write about these texts before they are published. One cannot prevent anyone from doing this.

Till replied to Doresse in a similar vein:

__45__


__46__

With respect to the information about the planned publication of the Gnostic texts, I must say to you that I find myself in exactly the same situation as do you: I know nothing at all. In any case less than you. I thought that you were in constant contact with Professor Puech and hence informed fully by him. Directly from Egypt I hear nothing at all. It seems as if it were not desirable that one corresponds from Egypt with England. I do not even know whether my letters arrive there. I attempt to write via Austria, but have also received up until now still no answer. Surely the unfortunate political relationships are guilty here. ... Who the members of the committee are, I infer from the introduction to Pahor Labib's volume of plates. Whether further collaborators are in view I do not know. I explain to myself the fact that we were not informed thus, that it was not agreed upon who should inform us. If anyone
at all thinks of that, each no doubt thinks that another does it. Hence no one does it. That is only my opinion, which could of course be false.

Just as do you, I also do not consider it a very good idea to publish the texts in plates, before they are edited. You are quite right: Everyone can exploit them as one wishes. One could not do anything at all against that. You are also not the first who has expressed these concerns to me. This concern is tempered only by the fact that the plates are not very good, in any case not as good as in the *Evangelium Veritatis*, and that there are not very many people who know Coptic. There is admittedly the danger that someone who has only poked one's nose into Coptic thinks now to be equipped to understand these texts correctly. The less one knows, the less one sees the difficulties. Perhaps one could do it in this way, that in each case the volumes of plates appear only when the texts in question are already edited. ...

With regard to inviting further persons to collaborate, I think that at the present time it is not very favorable to do this. Indeed, you see that even those who are already members of the Committee can do nothing thus far, and are uninformed. What purpose would it have, to add now one or more additional persons? Besides, in each individual case it would have to be carefully thought through, not to offend anyone out of personal or political reasons.

When I travel to the continent at the beginning of July, I come via Holland, where I meet together with Professor Quispel. I have been invited to collaborate on the publication of the Gospel of Thomas. What I am to do on it is not yet settled. I think, no doubt, the German translation. On this occasion I hope I can discuss the things with Professor Quispel in general. He should no doubt be rather well informed. If you yourself want to write to him, you can of course do that. But if you do not want to do so, you could pass on to me your wishes and suggestions in a letter. I could let Prof. Quispel read this letter of yours. To be sure, I would have to have the letter before the end of June. ...

One must be careful with a protest against Pahor Labib's volumes of plates, already for political reasons. In and of itself there is after all nothing to complain about it. Perhaps one can limit the protest to the timing of the publication. If the plates appear after the text edition, one can of course only welcome them.

**Doresse replied to Till in consternation:**

---

31 v 57: Letter from Doresse to Till:

J'ai été entièrement tenu dans l'ignorance des projets d'éditer des maintenant l'Évangile de Thomas. J'aurais pourtant, volontiers, participé à ce travail,—et je ne connais nulle raison pour m'en laisser exclure. Pour que ce travail s'organise régulièrement, il faudrait que les membres du Comité régulièrement désignés (je ne connais comme tels que vous-même, M. PUECH, QUISPEL, un représentant de la fondation Jung, un nommé Peterson, et moi-même) se réunissent d'abord pour établir à l'unanimité les principes qui vaudront pour toutes les publications, et pour se partager la besogne.
I have been kept completely in ignorance of the projects to edit already now the Gospel of Thomas. However I would have gladly participated in this work—and I do not know any reason to have led to my exclusion. In order that this work be organized regularly, it would be necessary that the members of the Committee regularly designated (I only know as such yourself, Puech, Quispel, a representative of the Jung foundation, someone named Peterson, and myself) meet first of all to establish unanimously the principles that apply for all the publications, and to divide the work. That supposes, of course, that this Committee contain only the members whose competence makes them able to collaborate actively in the work of editing (which is perhaps not the case of the present committee).

Cela suppose bien sûr, que ce Comité ne comprenne que des membres que leur compétence rend susceptibles de collaborer activement au travail d'édition (ce qui n'est peut-être pas le cas du comité actuel).

Or il est patent que l'on s'engage actuellement (est-ce sur l'initiative de M. QUISPEL, qui n'a pourtant nul droit à nous diriger?) dans de premiers travaux sans avoir jamais consulté l'ensemble du Comité (puisque vous et moi sommes entièrement tenu à l'écart), et sans même avoir défini de premiers principes de travail. J'entends dire également que de nouveaux collaborateurs auraient été "désignés" (par qui?) et cela toujours sans l'avis du Comité puisque celui-ci ne s'est pas encore réuni une seule fois.

Bien que je sois l'auteur de la découverte, et bien que j'ai été en la matière l'expert du Gouvernement Égyptien, je ne demande pas à exercer dans le Comité un rôle plus important que les autres membres. Mais je crois être en droit, du moment où les Égyptiens m'ont officiellement prié de participer à ce travail, d'être consulté sur tout ce qui concerne l'édition.

Il est certain que des décisions qui seraient prises sans la présence des membres authentiquement actifs du Comité (vous-même, M. PUECH, moi-même) et sans la présence ou l'approbation expresse des autorités égyptiennes, n'auraient pas la moindre valeur, et que je m'empresserais de reprendre, par rapport à un Comité devenu fantomatique et dépourvu d'autorité légale, une liberté à laquelle j'aurais tout bénéfice puisque je connais mieux que nul autre et depuis bien plus longtemps que mes collègues, les textes gnostiques de Khénoboskion.

Je ne crois pas avoir à écrire à M. QUISPEL à ce sujet, car il n'a encore, depuis le début de cette affaire, pris aucun contact avec moi. Je vous indique seulement quelle est la situation afin que, si la réunion projetée pour juillet se tient sans que j'aie été invité à y participer, vous sachiez dans quelle mesure les décisions qu'elle prendrait seraient contestables.

J'ajoute que je n'ai encore reçu nul exemplaire de la publication photographique établie par Pahor Labib. J'ai seulement entrevu l'exemplaire que M. PUECH a rapporté du Caire. Peut-être Pahor Labib comptait-il que la publication critique des textes se ferait assez vite pour la diffusion des photographies n'ait point d'inconvénients? S'il en est ainsi, je crois qu'il s'est fait de grandes illusions sur les possibilités de travail du Comité qu'il a constitué.
Now it is obvious that one is at present engaged (is this on the initiative of Quispel, who however as no right to direct us?) in the first tasks, without ever having consulted the whole of the Committee (since you and I are entirely kept aside), and without even having defined the first principles of the work. I also hear it said that new collaborators have been ‘designated’ (by whom?), and that always occurs without the opinion of the Committee, since it has never met a single time.

Although I am the author of the discovery, and though on this subject I have been the expert of the Egyptian Government, I do not ask to exercise in the Committee a rôle more important than do the other members. But I think I have the right, from the moment that the Egyptians officially asked me to participate in this work, to be consulted on all that concerns the edition.

It is certain that decisions that would be taken without the presence of the members of the Committee who are authentically active (yourself, Puech, myself) and without the presence or the express approval of the Egyptian authorities, would not have the least value, and that I would hasten to resume, with regard to a Committee that had become a fantasy and lacking legal authority, a liberty to which I would have every advantage, because I know better than anyone else, and for a much longer time than my colleagues, the Gnostic texts of Khénoboskion.

I do not believe I have to write to Quispel in this regard, for he has never, since the beginning of this affair, made any contact with me. I indicate only to you what the situation is, so that, if the meeting projected for July takes place without my having been invited to participate in it, you know to what extent the decisions that it would take would be contestable.

I add that I have not yet received any copy of the photographic publication arranged by Pahor Labib. I only have looked at the copy that Puech brought back from Cairo. Perhaps Pahor Labib assumed that the critical publication of the texts would take place rapidly enough for the diffusion of the photographs not to produce any inconveniences? If this is the case, I believe that he makes for himself grand illusions about the possibilities of work by the Committee that he has constituted.

Doresse’s point was valid, that decisions presented as those of the International Committee of Gnosticism without all the members of that Committee having been consulted to give their assent would have no legal status. But his suggestion that he assume the ‘liberty’ to proceed on his own, in fact pointed to the ultimate outcome: two separate unofficial publications of The Gospel of Thomas, one by those on the Committee: Puech, Quispel, Till, and Yassah ʿAbd al-Masih, after adding Guillaumont to replace Doresse, and Doresse’s own independent publication of The Gospel of Thomas, though he was also a member of the Committee.
Till then replied sympathetically to Doresse’s letter:\(^{48}\)

I too did not know until recently that now first the Gospel of Thomas should be published. But then Prof. Quispel once wrote me that I would be added ‘on the express desire of the Egyptians.’ He also asked me to come to Utrecht for a couple of days, in order to discuss with him the German translation. Hence a meeting of the Committee is not at all to take place, as you inferred from my comment in the last letter, but merely a discussion of the German translation between Prof. Quispel and myself. In my last letter to you I only meant that on this occasion perhaps there would be the possibility to learn more about what was decided or at least discussed in Cairo, and how things now stand.

This reassurance to Doresse avoided mentioning that Puech and Guillaumont would also be in Utrecht, which meant that more than the German translation was on the agenda, and that in effect Doresse was being replaced by Guillaumont.

Till’s letter continued:\(^{49}\)

\(^{48}\) 5 v 1957: Letter from Till to Doresse:

Auch ich wusste bis vor kurzem nicht, dass nun zunächst das Evangelium des Thomas herausgegeben werden sollte. Da schrieb mir aber einmal Prof. Quispel, dass ich "auf ausdrücklichen Wunsch der Ägypter" hinzuzuzogen würde. Er bat mich auch, für ein paar Tage nach Utrecht zu kommen, um mit ihm die deutsche Übersetzung zu besprechen. Es soll also keineswegs ein Meeting des Komitees stattfinden, wie Sie nach meiner Erwähnung im vorigen Brief vermuten, sondern lediglich eine Besprechung der deutschen Übersetzung zwischen Prof. Quispel und mir. Ich meinte nur in meinem letzten Brief an Sie, dass sich bei dieser Gelegenheit vielleicht die Möglichkeit ergibt, mehr von dem zu erfahren, was in Kairo beschlossen oder doch besprochen würde und wie die Dinge jetzt stehen.

\(^{49}\) 5 vi 57: Letter from Till to Doresse:

Die Ägypter, als die Eigentümer der Handschriften, spielen die maßgebende Rolle bei dieser Sache. Es sind auch etliche Ägypter Mitglieder des Komitees, zumindestens Dr. Pahor Labib und Yassa Abd al-Masih, vielleicht noch andere, wie Prof. Sobhy, Matthä, Murad Kamil—ich weiß das nicht sicher.

Dass die Benachrichtigung nicht recht klapt, erkläre ich mir durch die besonderen Umstände. Sie sollte doch wohl von Kairo aus erfolgen. Da wir beide, Sie und ich, in Ländern wohnen, die sich mit Ägypten in einer gewissen diplomatischen Spannung befinden, wird eine Korrespondenz von Ägypten aus mit uns vermieden. ... Dass Prof. Quispel nicht an Sie schreibt, finde ich ganz natürlich, denn er muss ja denken, dass Sie längst durch Prof. Puech ausreichend informiert sind. So dachte ja auch ich. ...

Ich bin gleich Ihnen der Meinung, dass alle Mitglieder des Komitees von der getroffenen Organisation verständigt werden müssen und dass auch allen Gelegenheit gegeben werden müsste, ihrer Meinung über die allgemeinen Grundsätze der Veröffentlichungen Ausdruck zu geben. Da Sie, wie Sie im vorigen Brief schreiben, ständig mit Prof. Puech in Verbindung stehen, ist es für Sie ja leicht, eine Organisation, die dies ermöglicht, bei Prof. Puech anzuregen. Ich bin hier weit weg von allen anderen,
The Egyptians, as owners of the manuscripts, play the decisive rôle in the matter. There are also some Egyptians who are members of the Committee, at least Dr. Pahor Labib und Yassa Abd al-Masih, perhaps still others, such as Prof. Sobhy, Mattha, Murad Kamil—I do not know for certain.

I explain to myself the fact that the sending out of information does not work correctly as due to the unusual circumstances. After all, it should no doubt take place from Cairo. Since both of us, you and I, live in countries that find themselves in a certain diplomatic tension with Egypt, a correspondence from Egypt with us is avoided. ... That Prof. Quispel does not write to you I find to be quite natural, for he must of course think that you have long ago been adequately informed by Prof. Puech. Indeed, I thought so too. ...

Like you, I am of the opinion that all members of the Committee have to reach agreement on the organization set up, and also that opportunity would have to be given to all to give expression to their opinion about the general principles of the publications. Since you, as you write in your last letter, stand constantly in contact with Prof. Puech, it is of course easy for you to suggest to Prof. Puech an organization that makes this possible. I am here far away from all the others, in regular contact with no one on the Committee, and for this reason it is not easy for me to suggest something of this kind. It will be difficult to bring about a meeting of all the members of the Committee. The Europeans alone do not comprise the whole Committee. And for trips to Egypt the Committee seems to have no money at its disposal. I for example am not in the position to travel to Egypt and to stay there a number of weeks at my own expense. Also I cannot, because of my sick heart, go there in the hot season. But there is after all the mail, and we could reach agreement by means of letters. One would only have to decide how that is to be done, for of course it cannot be that each writes to each. At least one could clarify many questions in this way, or suggest solutions. I have attempted this, but have received no reply.


Von der Einladung weiterer Mitarbeiter habe ich nichts gehört. Ich weiß weder, wer sie eingeladen hat noch welche eingeladen wurden.
Of the invitation of further collaborators I have heard nothing. I do not know either who invited them or who was invited.

Till then wrote Quispel the next day:\textsuperscript{50}

I am happy now also to get to know Prof. Puech. Of course for a rather long time I have not spoken French, and do not know whether it suffices for an orderly conversation. ...

From Doresse I again received a letter. He is very offended that one does not ask him and inform him as a member of the Committee. Admittedly I do not understand that clearly, since he probably stands constantly in connection with Prof. Puech. I tried to reassure him, but admittedly do not know whether I succeeded, since he seems to be rather wrought up and feels very much disregarded.

Quispel responded to Till a week later, to which Till replied on 16 June 1957:\textsuperscript{51}

Is now also Guillaumont part of the party? If only Doresse does not learn that. Even so he is already very enraged. If he now learns that not he, but another Frenchman is added—yes, I do not know what he then does. But he seems to be so enraged that I am afraid that he could do things that are unpleasant for us. I give you the corresponding parts of his letter of 31 May in transcription.

Thereupon Till quoted the passage cited above from Doresse’s letter, skipping over only the sentence:

I do not believe I have to write to Quispel in this regard, for he has never, since the beginning of this affair, made any contact with me.

\textsuperscript{50} 6 vi 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:

Ich freue mich, nun auch Professor Puech kennen zu lernen. Allerdings habe ich schon recht lange nicht französisch gesprochen und weiß nicht, ob es zu einer ordentlichen Konversation ausreicht. ...


\textsuperscript{51} 16 vi 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:

Nun ist auch Guillaumont mit von der Partie? Wenn das nur Doresse nicht erfährt. Er ist ohnehin schon sehr aufgebracht. Wenn er nun erfährt, dass nicht er, aber ein anderer Franzose beigezogen wird,—ja, ich weiss nicht, was er dann tut. Er scheint aber so aufgebracht zu sein, dass ich fürchte, er könnte Dinge tun, die uns unangenehm sind. Ich geben Ihnen die entsprechenden Teile seines Briefes vom 31. Mai in Abschrift.
Quispel forwarded on to Puech the lengthy quotation from Doresse’s letter to Till, after having deleted invidious references to himself, to judge by Puech’s quotations of Doresse in his bitter response:52

Only a few remarks:

1. Our Utrecht meeting is not a meeting of the Committee. It has to do strictly with work sessions devoted to the publication of only the ‘Gospel according to Thomas,’ and bringing together the collaborators chosen for this effort by the Committee in Cairo last October. If Prof. Till thinks well of transforming these sessions into a general meeting of the Committee, or to add Doresse to the collaborators of the edition of the ‘Gospel according to Thomas,’ you decide if there is any place (and financial possibility) to invite Doresse.

2. Doresse has the air to take as nothing, as not having happened, the meeting of the International Committee of last October. He is more than bold to write that ‘it is obvious that one is at present engaged in the first tasks, without ever having consulted the whole of the Committee, and without

---

52 vi 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Quelques remarques seulement:

1. Notre réunion d’Utrecht n’est pas une réunion du Comité: il s’agit strictement de séances de travail consacrées à la publication du seul “Évangile selon Thomas” et groupant les collaborateurs désignés à cet effet par le Comité, au Caire, en octobre dernier. Si le Prof. Till juge bon de transformer ces séances en réunion générale du Comité ou à adjoindre Doresse aux collaborateurs de l’édition de l’ “Évangile selon Thomas,” décidez s’il y a lieu (et possibilité financière) de convoquer Doresse.

2. Doresse a l’air de tenir pour nulle et non advenue la réunion du Comité international d’octobre dernier. Il est plus que téméraire d’écrire qu’ “il est patent que l’on s’engage actuellement dans de premiers travaux sans avoir jamais consulté l’ensemble du Comité, et sans même avoir défini de premiers principes de travail.” Qu’avons-nous fait alors au Caire, où Doresse avait été régulièrement convoqué? C’est nier l’évidence que d’affirmer: “celui-ci (le Comité) ne s’est pas encore réuni une seule fois.”

3. Je serais moi-même d’avis que les members du Comité se réunissent de nouveau (ici ou en Europe, puisque la présence du Prof. Till est indispensable) pour préciser les conditions techniques et financières dans lesquelles devra se faire l’édition de tout le Corpus. Mais si les décisions du Comité ne doivent être tenues pour valables qu’à condition que tous les members soient effectivement présents aux réunions, nous n’aboutirons jamais à rien.

4. Ce qui vicie toute l’affaire, c’est que le Dr. Pahor Labib, Secrétaire permanent du Comité, ait jusqu’ici négligé de communiquer officiellement à tous les members de notre organisme (à vous-même et à moi, autant qu’à Doresse ou à tout autre) les conclusions adoptées à l’issue de la réunion du Caire. Son silence à tous égards (je n’ai pas encore reçu de réponses à mes lettres) est très déplorable. Doresse n’est pas, d’ailleurs, sans avoir été tenu par moi au courant de ce qui a été fait et envisagé en octobre. A-t-il, de son côté, satisfait à la demande que le Dr. Pahor Labib lui avait adressée au nom du Comité?
even having defined the first principles of the work.’ What have we done back then in Cairo, where Doresse had been regularly summoned? It is to deny the evidence to affirm: ‘It (the Committee) has never met a single time.’

3. I myself would be of the opinion that the members of the Committee should meet again (here or in Europe, since the presence of Prof. Till is indispensable), to clarify the technical and financial conditions under which the edition of all the Corpus should take place. But if the decisions of the Committee are not to be held to be valid except on the condition that all the members are actually present in the meetings, we will never arrive at anything.

4. What vitiates the whole affair is that Dr. Pahor Labib, Permanent Secretary of the Committee, has up until now neglected to communicate officially with all the members of our organism (with yourself and with me, as well as with Doresse or with any other) the conclusions adopted at the end of the meeting of Cairo. His silence in all respects (I have not yet received replies to my letters) is very deplorable. Incidentally, Doresse is not without having been kept up to date by me concerning what has been done and envisaged in October. Has he, for his part, satisfied the demand that Dr. Pahor Labib addressed to him in the name of the Committee?

Thus the replacement of Doresse by Guillaumont did not take place without great resentment on the part of Doresse. But just as Quispel succeeded in adding Till, Puech succeeded in adding Guillaumont.

3. Editing Brill’s Edition

The Meeting at Utrecht, 4–8 July 1957

Puech wrote to Quispel to change their meeting from June in Paris to July in Utrecht.\(^{53}\)

I have just seen Guillaumont. Unfortunately it will not be possible for us to meet in Paris from 3 to 8 June. But there is a much better proposal. We will come to Utrecht, Guillaumont and myself, on 4 July. We can thus work
effectively in common with you and Till. Guillaumont agrees to delay his departure for vacation and I am going to arrange to have some days of freedom at the beginning of July.

It is agreed that our expenses for travel and for the sojourn will be paid by the Bollingen Foundation.

Till wrote Quispel confirming his presence at this Utrecht meeting:\(^{54}\)

It is lovely of Yassa to send me the book, and I will of course immediately thank him. ...

I have now translated the whole text of the Gospel of Thomas. It does indeed have its tricks in it. At a number of places the text is certainly incorrect. Often it is unclear to me what is supposed to be said by the sayings. For such texts, it is quite clear that working together can be very fruitful. ...

Since unfortunately one must divide well ahead of time exactly day by day, I have worked out the time in this way: 1 July to Amsterdam; 4 July to Bilthoven; 8 July back to Amsterdam; 9 July to Vienna.

Puech wrote Quispel insisting again on including Guillaumont among those named as editors, and leaving up to Quispel the accepting of Yassah ‘Abd al-Masih, perhaps as a kind of compromise between their diverging preferences:\(^{55}\)

\(^{54}\) 19 v 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:

Es ist reizend von Yassa, mir das Buch zu senden, und ich werde mich natürlich sofort bei ihm bedanken. ...

Ich habe nun den ganzen Text des Evangeliums des Thomas übersetzt. Es hat schon seine Tücken an sich. An manchen Stellen ist der Text sicher unrichtig. Vielfach ist mir unklar, was mit den Sprüchen gesagt sein soll. Bei solchen Texten ist es ganz klar, dass die Zusammenarbeit recht fruchtbar sein kann. ...


\(^{55}\) 31 v 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Il est entendu que nous viendrons à Utrecht, Guillaumont et moi, dans l’après-midi du 3 juillet et que nous y séjournerons jusqu’au 8 ou au 9. ...

Il est indispensable de nous entendre dès maintenant, et expressément, sur une condition essentielle. Guillaumont ne peut venir à Utrecht et participer au travail d’édition de l’Évangile selon Thomas que si son nom doit figurer sur la couverture et le titre du volume à côté de ceux des autres auteurs. Le Dr. Pahor Labib (qui n’est aucunement, quoique vous en disiez, le “président” de notre Comité et dont la prétention à pareil titre a été récusée en octobre par notre assemblé) ne me répondra probablement pas. Il nous appartient, d’ailleurs, à Till, à vous et à moi, de décider du choix de nos collaborateurs immédiats et des modalités concrètes de l’édition. Je ne
It is understood that we will come to Utrecht, Guillaumont and myself, in the afternoon of 3 July and that we will sojourn there until the 8th or the 9th. ...

It is indispensable for us to reach agreement already now, and expressly, on an essential condition. Guillaumont cannot come to Utrecht and participate in the work of editing *The Gospel according to Thomas* unless his name is to be placed on the cover and the title page of the volume along side of those of the other authors. Dr. Pahor Labib (who is in no way, although you spoke of it, the ‘President’ of our Committee, and for whom the pretension to such a title was challenged in October by our meeting) will probably not reply to me. Besides, it is up to us, to Till, to you, and to me, to decide on the choice of our closest collaborators and on the concrete modalities of the edition. I do not think that Till will present any opposition. For your part, give me as soon as possible, I ask of you, the formal assurance that Guillaumont will be fully included among the authors of the edition. It has to do with the success of the enterprise.

I do not grasp very well the rôle that you intend to reserve for Yassa. Not having received any communication of his work, not even knowing in what it has consisted and what its value is, I am completely disinterested in this question. It is on you, who have introduced Yassa into the Committee and favor his collaboration, that falls the duty of regulating the matter.

Quispel did succeed in getting the name of Yassah ‘Abd al-Masîḥ included on the cover and title page among the editors.

Till wrote Quispel a letter of appreciation soon after the meeting in Utrecht:56

---

pense pas que Till fasse opposition. De votre côté, donnez-moi au plus tôt, je vous prie, l’assurance formelle que Guillaumont sera bien compris parmi les auteurs de l’édition. Il en va du succès de l’entreprise.

Je ne sais pas très bien le sort que vous entendez réserver à Yassa. N’ayant reçu aucune communication de son travail, ne sachant même en quoi il a consisté et quelle en est la valeur, je me désintéresse entièrement de cette question. C’est à vous, qui avez introduit Yassa dans le Comité et réclamé sa collaboration, qu’incombe la responsabilité de régler l’affaire.

56 18 vii 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:

Vor allem danke ich herzlichst für Ihre so ausserordentlich freundliche Aufnahme und Gastfreundschaft in Ihrem idealen Waldheim. Die Tage in Bilthoven-Utrecht werden mir stets in schönster Erinnerung bleiben. Auch unsere Zusammenarbeit um das Thomas-Evangelium war sehr schön und fruchtbar. Für mich das erte Erlebnis dieser Art und daher besonders eindrucksvoll. Könnten nicht die Völker sich so untereinander verstehen und fruchtbar zusammenarbeiten, wie wir Einzelpersonen das taten?
Most of all I thank you heartily for your so exceptionally friendly reception and hospitality in your ideal forest home. The days in Bilthoven and Utrecht will always remain for me in most beautiful recollection. Also our collaboration on the Gospel of Thomas was very beautiful and fruitful. For me the first experience of this kind, and hence especially impressive. Could not the nations understand each other in this way and work fruitfully together, just as we individuals did?

*Till's Contributions and Quispel's Questionable Theories*

Following the very successful Utrecht meeting, the actual editing was carried on by correspondence, which of course meant that the preparation of a publishable text dragged on interminably.

Apparently it was Till who contributed most to the Utrecht meeting, to judge by the follow-up he wrote to Quispel:57

Day before yesterday I sent the Coptic text of the Gospel of Thomas, written for the printing, to you (the original) and Guillaumont (the carbon copy). The German translation is also written. I will then write it on the typewriter in Manchester and send the original to you, the copy to Guillaumont. The chapter about the language of the text I will also be able to send first from Manchester. The original I send also to you, the copy to Puech, who must after all translate it into French.

Now I must still write the indices of words. I still hope to finish them before my departure for Italy (4 September) and to be able to send them to you. Is it necessary that Guillaumont also receive a copy?

Then Till again wrote Quispel, on receipt of a letter from Guillaumont:58

---

57 24 viii 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:


Nun muss ich noch die Wörterverzeichnisse abschreiben. Ich hoffe, sie noch vor meiner Abreise nach Italien (4. 9.) fertig zu bekommen und an Sie senden zu können. Ist es nötig, dass Guillaumont eine Durchschrift erhält?

58 3 ix 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:

Herr Guillaumont, dem ich die Durchschrift des koptischen Textes des Thomasevangeliums sandte, schrieb, er werde die Noten ins Lateinische übersetzen, da dies so beschlossen worden sei. Mir ist es gleichgültig, ob diese Fussnoten lateinisch sind oder...
Guillaumont, to whom I sent the carbon copy of the Coptic text of the Gospel of Thomas, wrote that he will translate the notes into Latin, since it had been decided in this way. It is irrelevant to me whether these footnotes are in Latin or in the language of each edition. For me personally a living language is preferable. Latin footnotes would only have the advantage that they could be the same for all three editions, which would reduce the cost of setting type and hence the price. As I said, I am personally not interested in the solution of this question.

Till wrote Quispel still another time on the progress he was making:

I could not yet send the index of words, since unfortunately it is not yet completely transcribed. But I hope to get finished with that in a very short time. To be sure, there will be many kinds of work at the beginning of the school year. The translation is completed, yet I must still write it on the typewriter for printing. This will still take some time. I must first write the small chapter on the language. I hope it will not take all too long.

Quispel sent his English translation of The Gospel of Thomas to Till in Manchester to smooth out his English, to which Till replied:

You wished that I look through your English translation, regarding the English. But since I am not competent to do that, I have, as I already wrote you in an earlier letter, asked Dr. Geoffrey G. Willis to do it. He has also done so, and besides had transcribed the whole for you—which of course I had not asked him to do. I had also not thought that he had that in mind. Now I return to

---

59 29 ix 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:


60 9 xi 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:

you both your translation, with the handwritten comments from Dr. Willis, and enclose his transcription.

Apparently Quispel responded that he also needed Till’s suggestions, since what he had sent was not just an English translation of Till’s German translation, but a new English translation. This can be inferred from Till’s explanation of why he himself had not worked through the English translation:

I have not yet been able to compare your new English translation of the Gospel of Thomas with the Coptic text and the German translation. I did not want to delay you, and hence sent Dr. Willis’ text as soon as I received it. Dr. Willis gave me a carbon copy of it, on the basis of which I wanted to make the comparison. Unfortunately the stay in the hospital has now come in between.

Guillaumont received material from Till and Quispel, and responded to Quispel:

I receive this morning your English translation, which your letter had announced to me. W[alter] Till for his part has sent me his German translation, already a few days ago. I am going to try to make a clean copy, as soon as possible, of my French translation, and, after agreement with Puech, I will send it to you. Till has also sent me a copy of his index. I will complete it by entering the French words into it, then will send it to you.

I think I can achieve that before Christmas. If you can send me, at that time, your references, I will profit by the ten days of vacation that we have at Christmas to begin to edit with Puech the notes to the translation.

---

61 25 xi 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:


62 25 xi 57: Letter from Guillaumont to Quispel:

Je reçois ce matin votre traduction anglaise que m’annonçait votre lettre. Mr. W. Till, de son côté, m’a fait parvenir sa traduction allemande, il y a plusieurs jours déjà. Je vais tâcher de mettre au net, le plus tôt possible, ma traduction française et, après accord avec Mr Puech, je vous l’enverrai. Mr Till m’a aussi communiqué un exemplaire de son index; je le complèterai en y mettant les mots français, puis vous l’enverrai.

Je pense pouvoir achever cela avant Noël. Si vous pouvez m’envoyer, à ce moment-la, vos références, je profiterai des dix jours de congé que nous avons à Noël pour commencer de rédiger avec Mr Puech les notes de la traduction.

Je suis pleinement d’accord avec vous sur le plan de travail que vous proposez, et je serai personnellement heureux de vous revoir, à Paris cette fois, pour Pâques.
I am in full accord with you on the plan of work that you propose, and I will personally be happy to see you again, in Paris this time, for Easter.

Yassah ‘Abd al-Masih wrote Quispel at this same time:63

I have to thank you very much for your kind letter of the 15th Nov. which I received two days ago.

I have not yet received a correct copy of the Gospel of Thomas. I shall try to read it carefully but I believe that I shall not find anything to be improved.

Till then wrote Quispel his concerns about his responsibility for the German translation of *The Gospel of Thomas*:64

I do not know whether there is the intention to make known to the reader, perhaps in the Preface to our edition of the Gospel of Thomas, who among us is responsible for which individual parts of the book. But even if that is not explicitly said, it is nonetheless clear to each reader that I am responsible for the German translation. So I ask that in my German translation and the footnotes to it something is changed only in agreement with me. Of course I am always very grateful for suggestions of improvement, and will consider carefully every stimulus that comes to me. Hence I would be very thankful to you to communicate Zandee’s suggestions.

Though the name of Zandee is not included in the publication, he did make at least a minor contribution. For Till did in fact respond to a series of Zandee’s suggestions forwarded by Quispel.65

Guillaumont sent Quispel his French translation, and reported on what he had done.66

63 27 xi 57: Letter from Yassah ‘Abd al-Masih to Quispel.
64 16 xii 57: Letter from Till to Quispel:


65 12 ii 58: Letter from Till to Quispel.
66 27 i 58: Letter from Guillaumont to Quispel:

Je vous envoie ci-jointe ma traduction française des Logia. Cette traduction est prête depuis Noël, et si je ne vous l’ai pas envoyée plus tôt, c’est simplement parce que Mr Puech (très pris, dès son retour de Londres, par la préparation de se cours) n’a pas eu encore le temps de la revoir, comme il m’en avait exprimé le désir. Je vous l’envoie
I send to you, attached, my French translation of the Logia. This translation has been ready since Christmas, and if I have not sent it to you sooner, it is simply because Puech (very occupied, since his return from London, by the preparation of his classes) has not yet had time to see it again, as he had expressed his desire to me. I hence send it to you in asking you urgently not to send it to the printer before having received our agreement.

Besides, in looking again at your translation and that of Till, I have reached the conviction that it would be good to wait until we see each other again to send these translations to the printer. It is necessary, it seems to me, that the three translations follow faithfully the proposed text ... and are in agreement on all points with each other. I have been able to note in some passages divergences that persist. ...

I do not return to you the index this time, since I await, in order to complete it with the French words, for the French translation to be fixed with no further alterations.

Guillaumont then suggested, as delicately as he could, that personal interpretations on which all might not agree should be omitted, to be published in one's separate works. This was no doubt due to the fact that Puech would never agree with Quispel's interpretations.\(^\text{67}\)
I do not need to tell you that I desire quite as much as do you, and, I think, as all of us, to see this edition appear as soon as possible, at least within the time frame we projected last July. But my view is that this will surely not be achieved unless the notes and the introduction are reduced to a minimum, i.e. if we leave for the edition a purely philological and documentary character. I doubt, indeed, that all of us would rapidly reach agreement on a theory concerning the origin and the composition of the collection. In this material, conjecture and personal factors necessarily play a large rôle. And supposing that we would reach it, would it be good to attach the fate of the edition, which should remain a basic work, to the fate of a theory that will inevitably be discussed and always discussable? The notes, in particular, should not give the impression that they have been composed to serve, in a more or less explicit way, the demonstration of a theory. In my opinion, the essential in it should remain the references, for the logia already known elsewhere, in the Oxyrhynchus papyri and in quotations by church authors—for the logia of the Synoptics, the agreements with the ‘Western’ witnesses only in the cases where the rapprochement is indisputable. For the Semitisms, I think that the best would be to note them indistinctly, without trying to make a distinction between those that can be considered as coming from the Greek, by then traditional, influenced by the Septuagint, and those that can be due to an Aramaic substratum of the present text, a distinction that in my eyes would be essential for measuring the significance of these Semitisms from the point of view of the problem of the Aramaic origin. But, in my view, the work of interpreting the document, which could not be brought to a satisfactory conclusion within a few months, should be distinguished from the work of the edition properly speaking, and should remain the work of each of us in publications separate from the collective work, each thus retaining the merit of one’s own discoveries and the responsibility for one’s personal theories.

To judge by the final publication, Guillaumont’s suggestions seem to have been followed. Quispel’s interpretations were in fact not included in the published work. Guillaumont then returned to Quispel the latter’s notes and introduction, and proposed a meeting for the following June.
Yassah ‘Abd al-Masiḥ sent his proposed corrections to Quispel’s translation, whereupon Quispel replied gratefully, encouraging him to remain in Egypt to continue his help in editing the Nag Hammadi codices by verifying readings on the original papyrus:

I received your correction on my translation of the Gospel of Thomas which I shall discuss with the other editors. You may be sure that we will give a serious consideration to every correction you propose. ...

Now you sometimes speak about leaving Egypt. But then it is impossible to subvention you for taking part in the edition of these manuscripts. So you must make up your mind which you want: either you can go abroad, ..., or you help Mr. Till and me in the publication of the Manuscript which the International Committee attributed to us. ...

I was very pleased to see that you accepted most of our suggestions. I do hope that the commentary and the preface of the Gospel of Thomas will be ready in the course of this month. Of course you will receive the proofs.

Yassah ‘Abd al-Masiḥ replied to Quispel that he was resigned to staying in Egypt, and would continue assisting in the editing of the Nag Hammadi Codices:

Of course I shall not write any application once more but I shall make up my mind to help you and Dr. Till in the publication of the MS and furnish you with any further information. ...

I shall be glad to receive the proofs of the commentary and the preface of Thomas’ Gospel.

The language of this exchange between Quispel and Yassah ‘Abd al-Masiḥ tends to confirm that Yassah ‘Abd al-Masiḥ functioned for Quispel to verify the original in Cairo, much as Guillaumont’s transcription in Cairo provided Puech with a reliable text.

Till and Guillaumont also exchanged material:

A few days ago I received from Guillaumont a copy of his French translation of the Gospel of Thomas. He has made no footnotes to it, in the way I have done according to our shared agreements. Now I do not know, does he want to publish these notes somewhere else or not publish them at all?

---

68 24 ii 58: Letter from Quispel to Yassah ‘Abd al-Masiḥ.
69 8 iii 58: Letter from Yassah ‘Abd al-Masiḥ to Quispel.
70 27 ii 58: Letter from Till to Quispel:

Vor ein paar Tagen bekam ich von Guillaumont eine Kopie seiner franz. Übersetzung des Thomas-Evangeliums. Er hat keine Fußnoten dazu gemacht, so wie ich es nach unseren gemeinsamen Beschlüssen gemacht haben. Ich weiß nun nicht, will er diese Bemerkungen anderswo oder überhaupt nicht bringen?
Guillaumont then wrote Quispel about disagreements among the editors:

Before replying to your letter, I waited to see, this morning, Puech, and to share with him your complaints, since they are addressed as much to him as to me. He told me that he planned himself to write you soon. I think it is better that you send to him himself, rather than to me, the part of the introduction that you have composed, since it is he who is more especially charged with the introduction. We should put ourselves, both of us, at editing the commentary after the return from Easter (of course while taking count of the notes that you have sent), and I do not see that there is such a large delay in our work as you would like to maintain. I do not recall, in effect, that there was ever a question of submitting the complete manuscript to the printer before the summer.

You tell me that Till complains that in my translation I have not at all held to the principles that we had established in common. I admit to you that this astonishes me, first of all because Till himself did not say anything to me of that kind, and further because I thought, on the contrary, that I had conformed very scrupulously to everything that we had agreed on together. In any case, I am ready to make all the useful modifications, and it is with that in mind that I sent this translation to you, as well as to Till. But the only example that you cite for me completes my amazement. ... Besides, we have discussed it together in Utrecht and I recall that Till rejected your interpretation. I am

---

23 iii 58: Letter from Guillaumont to Quispel:

J' ai attendu, pour répondre à votre lettre, d'avoir vu, ce matin, Mr Puech et de lui avoir fait part de vos doléances, puisqu'elles s' adressent aussi bien à lui qu' à moi. Il m'a dit qu'il comptait lui-même vous écrire prochainement. Je pense qu'il vaut mieux que vous lui envoyiez à lui-même, plutôt qu' à moi, la partie de l' introduction que vous avez rédigée, puisque c'est lui qui est plus spécialement chargé de l' introduction. Nous devons nous mettre, tous deux, à rédiger le commentaire dès la rentrée de Pâques (en tenant compte naturellement des notes que vous avez envoyées), et je ne vois pas qu'il y ait dans notre travail un aussi grand retard que vous voulez bien le dire. Je ne me souviens pas, en effet, qu'il ait jamais été question de remettre le manuscript complet à l'imprimeur avant l' été.

Vous me dites que Mr Till se plaint de ce que je ne me suis point tenu, dans ma traduction, au principes que nous avions établis en commun. Je vous avoue que cela m'étonne, d' abord parce que Mr Till lui-même ne m'a rien dit de tel, et ensuite parce que je croyais au contraire m' être conformé très scrupuleusement à tout ce dont nous avions convenu ensemble. En tout cas, je suis prêt à faire toutes les modifications utiles, et c'est dans cette pensée que je vous ai envoyé, ainsi qu'à Mr Till, cette traduction. Mais le seul exemple que vous me citez met le comble à mon étonnement. ... Nous en avions du reste discuté ensemble à Utrecht et je me souviens que Mr Till avait rejeté votre interprétation. Je veux bien revoir la chose (mettre, par exemple, en note votre interprétation si Mr Till est d'accord), et ce sont des mises au point de ce genre que nous pourrions faire si nous pouvons nous rencontrer de nouveau.
willing to reexamine the thing (for example, put your interpretation in a note, if Till agrees), and it is such sharpening of the details that we could do if we can meet again.

Puech himself finally expressed to Quispel his own reservations about including Quispel's theories:

I would have wished to talk to you longer of our project of editing the Gospel according to Thomas. ... As perhaps you have been told by van Prosdij, who was of the same opinion, I would be of the view that we reduce the introduction to what is strictly essential and raise there, by referring to the elements assembled in the critical notes, only the sticky problem of the source or sources of the pseudo-Synoptic logia. As I am advised by Cullmann, whom your hypothesis has not convinced, it is necessary to avoid having the air of imposing on the reader a systematic solution, and, in any case, we would find it very difficult to reach agreement on the terms of its presentation. It would be better that you reserve for a special publication the justification for your theories. I myself will quite willingly make the sacrifice of personal contributions, free to publish them elsewhere, that would risk being tied up in a preface that was too long. I will see more clearly when I will have sifted and completed, with Guillaumont, the content of the critical notes. Besides, we will have our meetings at the end of June in Paris to discuss all that.

Till then wrote Quispel about what remained to be done, especially the introduction:

---

72 8 iv 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

J’aurais voulu vous parler plus longuement de notre projet d’édition de l’Evangile selon Thomas. ... Comme vous l’a peut-être dit M. van Prosdij, dont c’était aussi l’opinion, je serais d’avis de réduire l’introduction au strict essentiel et de ne faire qu’y soulever, tout en renvoyant aux éléments rassemblés dans les notes critiques, l’épineux problème de la source ou des sources des logia pseudo-synoptiques. Comme me le conseille Cullmann, que votre hypothèse n’a pas convaincu, il faut éviter d’avoir l’air d’imposer au lecteur une solution systématique et, de toute façon, nous serions très embarrassés de nous accorder sur les termes de son exposé. Il vaudrait mieux que vous réserveriez à un écrit spécial la justification de vos théories. Je ferai, moi-même, bien volontiers, quitte à les publier ailleurs, le sacrifice d’apports personnel qui risqueraient d’être noyés dans une trop vaste préface. Je verrai plus clair lorsque j’aurai épluché et complété, avec Guillaumont, le contenu des notes critiques. Nous aurons, du reste, pour discuter de tout cela, nos réunions de fin juin à Paris.

73 8 v 58: Letter from Till to Quispel:

Sie wünschen meine deutsche Übersetzung des Evangeliums nach Thomas. Leider habe ich damals nur einen Durchschlag gemacht und diesen (ich glaube) an M. Guillaumont geschickt. Ich habe ihm sofort geschrieben und ihn gebeten, er möge den Durchschlag an Sie senden und Ihnen auch mitteilen, ob er ihn zurück haben will, oder ob Sie ihn an mich zurücksenden. Es tut mir sehr leid, dass ich keinen weiteren Durchschlag habe. ...
You wanted to have my German translation of the Gospel according to Thomas. Unfortunately I made back then only one carbon copy and sent this (I believe) to Guillaumont. I have immediately written him and asked him to send the carbon copy to you, and also to tell you whether he wants to have it back or whether you are to send it to me. I am very sorry that I have no further carbon copy. ...

Recently a man from the Daily Express was with me and asked me when the Gospel of Thomas would appear. I showed him the Prospectus and said to him that I had long since done my part, but up until now had not received the introduction to translate into German. Of course I could give him no deadline.

Till again wrote Quispel about further delay in receiving the introduction to translate:

Meanwhile Guillaumont has written me that he has sent you my translation of the Gospel of Thomas. I hope he has also told you whether he wants it back or not. Now I have written to Guillaumont and, as you wished, also to Puech, that I hope to get their French text now soon, so that I can translate it into German for the German edition. Whether that will help any?

Guillaumont wrote Quispel that he had finalized the French translation, but pointed to the remaining problems in the notes:

Vor Kurzem war ein Mann vom Daily Express bei mir und fragte mich, wann das Evangelium Thomas erscheinen würde. Ich zeigte ihm den Prospekt und sagte ihm, dass ich meinen Teil längst getan hätte, aber die Einleitung bis jetzt nicht zum Übersetzen ins Deutsche erhalten hätte. Ich konnte ihm natürlich keinen Termin angeben.

18 v 58: Letter from Till to Quispel:

Inzwischen hat mir Guillaumont geschrieben, dass er Ihnen meine Übersetzung des Thomas-Evangeliums geschickt hat. Ich hoffe, er hat Ihnen auch mitgeteilt, ob er sie zurück haben will oder nicht. Ich habe nun an Guillaumont und, wie Sie es wünschten, auch an Puech geschrieben, dass ich hoffe, nun bald ihren französischen Text zu bekommen, damit ich ihn für die deutsche Ausgabe ins Deutsche übersetzen kann. Ob das etwas nützt?

15 vii 58: Letter from Guillaumont to Quispel:

Je vous envoie aujourd’hui même, sous pli séparé, le manuscrit de ma traduction française des Logia destiné à l’imprimerie: j’ai suivi la disposition de Mr Till, ajouté les mots grecs et les notes. Vous pourrez donc remettre, quand vous le jugerez bon, cette traduction pour l’impression.

J’ai, d’autre part, remis samedi à Mr Puech le manuscrit que j’ai entièrement rédigé pour les Notes ... et il me charge de vous dire qu’il vous l’enverra aussitôt ... . Avant de rédiger ce manuscrit, j’ai travaillé pendant 15 jours avec Mr Puech, pour revoir avec lui
I send you already today, under separate cover, the manuscript of my French translation of the Logia intended for the printer. I have followed the arrangement of Till, added the Greek words and the notes. Hence you can submit, if you think well of it, this translation for the setting of type.

On the other hand I submitted Saturday to Puech the manuscript that I have edited completely for the Notes ... and he asked me to say to you that he will send it to you promptly .... Before editing this manuscript I worked for 15 days with Puech to review with him the notes that you were kind enough to send me, and to receive his own documentation. I added for my part a contribution concerning the Semitisms, of which you will see the importance. ...

You will also see that certain elements of your notes, seeming to us to be too debatable, have been left to one side. ...

I want to tell you, in any case, so as to respond to certain terms in your last letter, that it is not at all a question of ‘changing unilaterally’ or of ‘omitting’ the contributions of any one among us. But it is normal to insert into a work written in collaboration only what has the agreement of all the collaborators. For my part, I am quite willing to adapt myself to this rule, and I am ready to withdraw any remark that seemed to me interesting to make, but that would not convince someone among you. ...

I believe that if you have important modifications to propose, it would be necessary that we meet again (for example in Paris, at the beginning of October); such discussions are in fact impossible by mail. If you yourself and Till are in agreement to keep the text that I have composed, it would then be possible to have it printed beginning in October.

Puech also wrote Quispel the agreement he had made with van Prosdij:

76 17 vii 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
The essential thing is that, if you wish, you have in your hands very soon a first draft—already very complete and precise—of the manuscript. You could, in effect, examine it quite at leisure this summer, express in writing (but not on the text itself, but on independent pages!) your criticisms, your suggestions, your additions, and prepare in this way the establishment of the final redaction. This would be fixed in the course of October, after discussions and agreement among us, and by means of your coming to Paris, which we, Guillaumont and myself, hope for, and which we ask you to confirm to us, also making clear to us its date. ...

I will complete editing the Introduction by the end of September or the beginning of October, and in any case once I have settled on the rôle to reserve for the contribution that you sent me in April in this regard. Van Prosdij must have talked about that with you on his return from Paris. I consulted him on this topic, as well as did Messrs Till and Guillaumont. We all reached agreement, judging that there would be serious inconveniences in inserting, as is, totally, your contribution into the text of the Preface, or even in the volume. It is really too large, too developed, too rich in arguments that are related only indirectly to the text itself of the Gospel according to Thomas itself, or that duplicate the remarks registered in the 'Critical Notes.' ...

La solution la plus raisonnable me paraît être celle que M. van Prosdij nous a proposée et qu’il a dû déjà vous soumettre: publier à part, et sous votre seul nom, sans doute dans la collection de Novum Testamentum, votre copieuse, minutieuse et très intéressante étude. Vous n’auriez qu’à la résumer en une vingtaine de pages, et en concentrant la substance en de sèches statistiques et en en réduisant les preuves à de simples renvois aux “Notes critiques,” en ajoutant toutefois une rapide discussion des cas qui font, ou peuvent faire, difficulté à vos hypothèses et que nous avons signalés, Guillaumont et moi. Vous m’enverriez votre contribution ainsi abrégée vers la mi-septembre, et je n’aurais qu’à l’insérer dan mon Introduction.
The solution that is most reasonable seems to me to be the one proposed to us by van Prosdij and which he must have already transmitted to you: To publish separately, and under your name only, no doubt in the collection *Novum Testamentum*, your copious, minute, and very interesting study. You would only have to summarize it in some twenty pages, in concentrating the substance in dry statistics and in reducing the evidence to simple references to the ‘Critical Notes,’ with the addition nonetheless of a rapid discussion of the places that pose, or could pose, difficulties to your hypothesis, and that we have noted, Guillaumont and myself. You would send me your contribution thus abbreviated by the middle of September, and I would only have to insert it into my Introduction.

Till reported these problems to Meier, who could infer from them that Puech and Quispel were not working on the Jung Codex at this time:77

The working on the Gospel according to Thomas (for whose publication I was brought in without my initiative, at the express request of the Egyptians) should after all by now have come to an end. Nevertheless unfortunately here too disagreements have arisen: Puech and Quispel both reproach each other that the other has not held to what had been agreed on. I only have to do with the text, the translation, and the indices of words. But I sense that the Introduction has the tendency to swell beyond all bounds.

But Quispel then made an upbeat report to Till:78

I have now received and worked through the Commentary of Puech and Guillaumont. We will still negotiate over it in September in Paris. But then everything is finished and Puech will write his brief Introduction. Hence we will not be much too late.

---

77 18 vii 58: Letter from Till to Meier:


78 1 ix 58: Letter from Quispel to Till:

Puech wrote Quispel again for his abbreviated contribution to the Introduction:79

For the redaction of the Introduction, which I would like to complete as soon as possible, I still lack the twenty pages that you had promised me and that would be quite necessary for me to know before reaching agreement with you at the time of your coming visit on the definitive text of this portion—especially delicate—of the envisaged Preface. Like you, I congratulate myself that we converged toward a similar hypothesis. Yet it would be necessary to put ourselves exactly in agreement on the terms and how to present it, which has to be very nuanced. I hence await your contribution so as to join it to those of Messrs Till and Guillaumont, and as a result to be in the position to put on foot the ensemble of my manuscript.

Less than a week later Puech wrote Quispel about his contribution to the Commentary, and listed what had to be done before the meeting in Paris, which he now proposed be 4–8 November 1958.80

Guillaumont has communicated to me the two lists of supplementary remarks that you had told me you were sending. We will examine them together one of these next days, trying to integrate them, as largely as possible, into the Commentary. We will have to verify likewise the references, which are often inexact or have been recopied with too much haste. Be assured that attention will be given carefully to all your suggestions and counter-proposals. As a result, the effort will be well chewed over for our meeting in November, and it will facilitate the work of revising and sharpening up the Commentary that we ought to conduct in common.

79 3 x 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Pour la redaction de l’Introduction, que je voudrais achever au plus tôt, il me manque encore la vingtaine de pages que vous m’aviez promises et qu’il me serait bien nécessaire de connaître avant de m’entendre avec vous, lors de votre venue, sur le texte définitive de cette portion—particulièrement délicate—de la préface envisagée. Comme vous, je me félicite que nous convergions vers une hypothèse semblable: il faudrait toutefois nous mettre exactement d’accord sur les termes et la présentation, qui doit être très nuancée. J’attends donc votre contribution afin de la joindre à celles de MM. Till et Guillaumont et d’être de la sorte en état de mettre sur pied l’ensemble de mon manuscrit.

80 8 x 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

M. Guillaumont m’a communiqué les deux listes de remarques supplémentaires dont vous m’aviez annoncé l’envoi. Nous les examinerons ensemble un de ces jours prochains en tâchant de les intégrer, le plus largement que possible, dans le commentaire. Nous aurons également à vérifier les références, qui sont parfois inexactes ou ont été recopiées avec trop de hâte. Soyez sûr qu’il sera tenu un compte attentif de toutes vos suggestions ou contre-propositions. De la sorte, le besonge sera toute mâchée pour notre réunion de novembre, et le travail de révision et de mise au point du commentaire que nous devons mener en commun en sera facilité.
4. Planning the Editio Minor and the Editio Maior

Till broke the news to Quispel that they would not produce the first translation and interpretation, since Johannes Leipoldt had already published a German translation:\textsuperscript{81}

You will also no doubt have read Leipoldt’s translation and discussion of the Gospel of Thomas under the title “Ein neues Evangelium?” in \textit{ThLZ} 83 [(1958)]; 481–96. The translation is not outstanding and contains all kinds of inaccuracies. The danger is that someone takes it seriously in all its details and builds on it. Puech will no doubt point to it in his Introduction. Otherwise I do not think that we need to enter into it more closely. Interesting is the dating of the manuscript: around 500! Hence Leipold puts it about 100 years younger than I did. From this one again sees how uncertain all that is. G. Zuntz here, whom I asked, thought: Fourth Century.

Puech noted Leipoldt’s publication with bitterness:\textsuperscript{82}

The July issue of the \textit{Theologishe Literaturzeitung} shows that we are already outstripped.

Once Leipoldt’s German translation of \textit{The Gospel according to Thomas} had been published late in 1958, Brill decided to go ahead and publish its edition of \textit{The Gospel according to Thomas} without waiting further for all the debates about the Introduction and Notes to be resolved, a solution with which Puech was in basic agreement:\textsuperscript{83}

\textsuperscript{81} 25 ix 58: Letter from Till to Quispel:


\textsuperscript{82} 8 x 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Le numéro de juillet de la \textit{Theologishe Literaturzeitung} montre que nous sommes déjà gagnés de vitesse.

\textsuperscript{83} 25 xii 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Je suis heureux que la Maison Brill se soit décidée à faire paraître au plus tôt une “editio minor” du document comprenant seulement le texte copte et la traduction française. Ce que je ne sais pas, ou ne puis admettre, c’est que le volume ainsi
I am happy that the firm Brill has decided to publish as soon as possible an ‘editio minor’ of the document, containing only the Coptic text and the French translation. What I do not grasp, or cannot admit, is that the volume envisaged this way—and which of necessity will be very thin—is to be, to reuse your terms, envisaged as ‘fascicle one of the complete edition,’ and carries on its cover a similar title or subtitle. It seems to me, to the contrary, that it needs to be published quite separately, independently, and apart from the ‘large edition’ (by which one understands either the principal edition of the Gospel that is fully scientific, or the edition of the totality of the codices discovered near Nag Hamâdi). At most it will suffice to indicate, in the prospectus or in a brief Foreword, that it has to do only with an extract, or a preparatory sample of the scholarly edition, which is much more voluminous, to be supplied later on. …

It is hence fitting to restrict oneself in it, for what is the editio minor, to a very small volume without pretensions, entitled only ‘The Gospel according to Thomas: Coptic text and French translation,’ and preceded—as I believe, in spite of everything, to be indispensable—by a ‘Foreword’ that is as brief as possible (a page, or, at most, two or three pages). Are you in agreement on this, as well as van Proosdij? …

A question: Should we join to our names on the cover that of Yassa abd el-Masih? This would perhaps be a good way to free ourselves of having it figure in the title of the ‘editio maior,’ for which he has contributed so little. We would content ourselves to naming him at the end of the (long) Preface,
by thanking him for his meager services that he has been able to provide us. I leave you to be the judge. I nonetheless admit sensing some pity for this poor devil, today in disgrace and deprived of his position as Librarian of the Coptic Museum.

In all of this discussion of the *editio minor*, it is clear that Puech wants as much as possible to play it down so as to play up the *editio maior*, since that is where his contributions would play a major rôle. He lists only a French translation, since he all along had planned to publish together with Guillaumont a French translation to appear simultaneously with the full Brill edition. And he puts the name of Yassah ʿAbd al-Masīḥ on the title page of the *editio minor*, so as not to have to put it on the *editio maior*.

In fact the final publication of the *editio minor* conformed to Puech’s suggestions, though without naming the language of the translation, since it was printed in four different languages, not just in French, as Puech had suggested. The ‘Preliminary Remarks’ were limited to three pages. And Yassah ʿAbd al-Masīḥ was listed on the front of the dust jacket and on the title page, as one of the five editors. The ‘very thin’ book was only 61 pages long.

Puech proceeded in his letter to Quispel to turn his attention to the *editio maior*:

84

Regarding what has to do with the ‘large edition’ or the ‘complete edition,’ I await:

1. A copy, typed by your secretary, of the critical notes whose manuscript we agreed on last October;
2. The text of the parts of the preface that you had agreed to furnish. ...

84 25 xii 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Pour ce qui est de la "grande édition," ou "édition complète," j’attends:

1. un exemplaire, dactylographié par votre secrétaire, des notes critiques dont nous avons mis au point le manuscrit en octobre dernier;
2. le texte des portions de la préface que vous vous étiez engagé à fournir. ...

Faute d’avoir reçu votre contribution, je ne puis que ramener celle-ci à Pâques ou à un peu plus tard. D’ici là je suis entièrement pris par mes cours et des travaux personnels, et, d’ailleurs, vous me dites vous-même que la Maison Brill ne saurait procéder à l’impression avant cette date. Envoyez-moi cependant votre manuscrit dès que vous le pourrez. Il faudra l’examiner et en discuter le contenu avec autant de soins que vous en aurez mis à le composer. Les questions soulevées sont infiniment délicates, et la plupart de vos hypothèses semblent devoir se heurter aux critiques ou aux objections équillées dans divers chapitres du tome I des NA3 de Hennecke, dont je viens de recevoir un jeu complet d’épreuves.
Having failed to receive your contribution, I can only postpone [editing] it to Easter or a little later. From now until then I am entirely taken up by my courses and personal work, and, besides, you yourself tell me that the house Brill would not be able to proceed to print before this date. Send me, however, your manuscript as soon as you can. It will be necessary to examine it and discuss its contents with as much care as you will have invested into composing it. The questions raised are infinitely delicate, and most of your hypotheses seem to have to surmount the criticisms or the objections sketched in various chapters of volume one of the third edition of Hennecke's *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, of which I just received a complete set of proofs.

In spite of this delay, Quispel wrote Pahor Labib an upbeat schedule:

> Also the Gospel of Thomas will appear in the course of this year [1959]. First, in February or March, the text in triple publication, with English, French, and German translation, then later the commentary.

In fact, ‘the text in triple publication’ appeared not in the first quarter of the year, but in the last quarter of the year, whereas the commentary never appeared.

Doresse, on learning that Brill planned to publish *The Gospel of Thomas*, wrote Brill not to state that this edition involved his participation, or was a publication authorized by the International Committee:
I have been informed of the fact that you would currently be preparing a publication of the Coptic work entitled ‘Gospel according to Thomas’ or ‘The Secret Sayings of Jesus.’ On this topic, it has been said to me that this edition: 1°) would present itself as the official work of the International Committee of Publication established in Cairo for the study of the Gnostic manuscripts of the Coptic Museum (manuscripts in which is found the original of this ‘Gospel according to Thomas’); 2°) that it would mention in this connection my name among those of its editors.

Hence I hasten to inform you, so that there not be any error on these points: 1°) that I have never participated in, or even been associated in any way with, the development of such an edition; 2°) that the International Committee of Publication of the Gnostic texts of the Coptic Museum—a Committee of which I am personally a member—has not yet had, down to this day, the opportunity to deliberate even on the simple possibility of an edition of this ‘Gospel according to Thomas.’

I make clear to you, under these circumstances: 1°) that I could not in any case authorize the mention of my name on the occasion of whatever edition of the ‘Gospel according to Thomas’ that you would publish; 2°) that in addition no edition of the ‘Gospel according to Thomas’ would at present be able to clothe itself in the authority of the International Committee of Publication of the Gnostic texts of the Coptic Museum, but that it could only be a strictly private edition, destitute of any official character, and involving only the names and the sole responsibility of its real authors.

As a consequence of these facts, I indicate to you that in case there would be made use abusively either of my name or of any reference to the authority of the International Committee of Publication of the Coptic Gnostic texts conserved in Cairo, I would not fail to give to such an affair, without delay, the consequences that it would seem to me to warrant.

Both of the points made by Doresse were in fact respected by Brill in its publication of The Gospel of Thomas.
The French draft of a contract between Brill and the editors of *The Gospel of Thomas* made explicit the distinction between the *editio minor* and the *editio maior* as follows:87

There will be two editions, one containing only the Coptic text and its translation, accompanied by a small Introduction, called Editio Minor, and another, containing again the Coptic text and its translation, but accompanied by an ample Introduction and Indices, called Editio Maior. The authors yield the author’s right for these editions to the house Brill.

Till wrote Meier concerning the *editio maior* with commentary:88

As I now know from experience with the Gospel of Thomas, the production of the commentary is extremely ‘sticky.’ Everything else was already a year and a half ago ready to print. And now one has finally determined to publish first the texts with translation and index of words, as a second volume the commentary, whose preparation lasts perhaps for years, and ultimately involves, if possible, four volumes that no one reads. The collaborators should first of all be servants of science, and not pursue objectives on the side, as, e. g., achieving a position or the elevation of one’s personal fame. I promise myself from the separation of the editions into text and commentary a much more rapid way of working. Namely in this way the commentators will also be motivated to work somewhat more rapidly, since otherwise some other person will get ahead of them.

---

87 20 i 50: Contract between Brill and the editors of *The Gospel according to Thomas*:

On en fera deux editions, une contenant seulement le texte copte et sa traduction, accompagnée d’une petite Introduction, dite EDITIO MINOR et une autre, contenant de nouveau le texte copte et sa traduction, mais accompagné d’une ample Introduction et des Registres, dite EDITIO MAIOR. Les auteurs cèdent le droit d’auteur de ces éditions à la maison Brill.

88 20 ii 59: Letter from Till to Meier:

Till made his primary contribution to the *editio minor*, and hence hoped to make it more acceptable in a scholarly way by including ingredients usual in the editing of a text, such as word indices. But in this he did not succeed.

On 9 May 1959 Till wrote Quispel his fundamental objections to the contract for the *editio minor*: 89

Regarding the *Editio minor* and *maior*, I have to make the situation clear. Originally it was only reported to me that there would be an *Editio minor* and an *Editio maior*. What each should contain I did not know. Rationally I could only think to myself that it had to do with a division of the edition into a first volume, containing the text and what belongs to that, and a second volume containing the commentary. I also made this view of mine clearly known in my answer, and it was not contradicted, hence I had to assume that it was correct. Only now, in the contract sent to me by Brill, do I see the whole extent of the malheur.

---

89 9 v 59: Letter from Till to Quispel:


Es wird sich natürlich alle auf die Editio minor stürzen. Aber jeder wird davon bitter enttäuscht sein. Wer nicht koptisch versteht, ärgert sich, dass er auch den koptischen Text, der ihm nichts sagt, mitkaufen muss. Wer aber koptisch versteht, ärgert sich erst recht, denn er hat nur eine völlig unzureichende Textausgabe, der Kopt und Schwanz fehlt. Es fehlen die bei einem so seltenen Dialekt nötigen sprachlichen Erläuterungen und das Wörterverzeichnis, ohne das keine Textstelle gefunden werden kann.


Of course everyone will now go for the Editio minor. But each will be bitterly disappointed in it. The one who does not understand Coptic is annoyed that he must also buy the Coptic text, which says nothing to him. But the person who understands Coptic is annoyed even more, for he has only a completely inadequate edition of the text, which lacks head and tail. There is lacking the linguistic explanations necessary for such a rare dialect, and an index of words, without which no location in the text can be found.

In the last 40 years I have worked through very many Coptic text editions, and have written a number myself. Hence I believe I know what is absolutely necessary for such a text edition. Something like the Editio minor is not defensible from a scholarly point of view. What we discussed in Utrecht would no doubt have been best. But since this became impossible, as a result of the commentary that had become too extensive for that, only a division into two volumes would have been defensible: First volume, the linguistic matters, second volume, the substantive matters.

Unfortunately I have only been informed quite inadequately, not to speak of my opinion having never been solicited, otherwise I would have raised my opposing ideas in time. Of course this cannot lead to successful collaboration. I would not have thought this to be possible, since I have never before encountered it. I would have secured myself against it from the very beginning. Now it is of course already too late to change anything about it.

Till added in a handwritten postscript that Yassah ‘Abd al-Masih was dying of cancer:

As I learn from Cairo, Yassa is fatally ill: Lung and stomach cancer. He himself does not know it. The illness is too far advanced for healing.

Yassah ‘Abd al-Masih died three days later, on 12 May 1959. A cross was printed by his name on the title page of The Gospel according to Thomas.

Pahor Labib insisted that his name be on the title page, as J. Brugman of the Dutch Embassy in Cairo wrote W.C. Wieder, Jr., Director of Brill:
In answer to your letter of 3 June 1959, Nr. FCW/VUP, 20330, I have the honor to tell you that I have made a visit with Dr. Pahore Labib, with whom I have discussed your edition of The Gospel according to Thomas. Dr. Labib had not received a letter either from you or from Prof. Quispel.

Dr. Labib has made the following protests about the proofs you presented:

1) that his name does not occur on the title page with the names of Guillau-mont, Puech, Quispel, Till and Abd al-Masih, whereas he ‘after all has given so much effort, extended scholarly advice, whereas Abd al-Masih, whose name does function on the title page, has been his (Labib’s) assistant’;

2) that he has been referred to as ‘secretary’ of the international committee and not ‘chairman,’ as Prof Quispel had already promised him. ...

I enclose to you the photo of the page on which the name of The Gospel according to Thomas occurs, which Dr. Labib handed over to me.

Apparently Wieder had written to the Dutch Embassy to get from Pahor Labib a photograph of the page bearing the title The Gospel according to Thomas, to use in the Brill edition. Pahor Labib did supply it, and it does in fact appear on the front cover of the paperback editions, but not on the hardback English edition co-published with Harper & Brothers in New York. Yet Pahor Labib’s name was not added to the title page.

Proofs of the editio minor were sent to Pahor Labib, and Quispel wrote him as a result of Brugman’s letter to Wieder: 92

We received from Mr. Brugman the answers which you gave us concerning the Gospel of Thomas. We were glad to understand that you would accept that the Gospel of Thomas be published under the heading of the International Committee and I must persuade Mr. Puech that you are the chairman of that Committee and must be mentioned as such. To prevent all unnecessary delay we publish first the text and the translation as an extract (to appear towards the end of July) whereas the authoritative edition with commentary and introduction is to appear before the end of the year. Brill has printed already the text, the translation, the indexes, the commentary but Mr. Puech must still redact the introduction.

92 13 vii 59: Letter from Quispel to Pahor Labib.
This is to show you that Brill has already realized to a great part the task which was committed to her by the International Committee during its meeting in Cairo. This firm is ready to print all the Gnostic works in your museum without any condition and I think Brill would only be delighted to put on the first page Cairo as the place of publication. ...

I understand that a reorganization of the Committee is necessary, because the Jung Institute does not want to be represented any longer. But you certainly will agree that those members, who were nominated officially and called to Cairo, and did not act against the decisions of the Committee, are still members. ...

You know that difficulties have arisen concerning the return of the Jung Codex to Egypt. According to the latest reports the representatives of Dr. Jung decided that it will return to your museum if certain understandable conditions are fulfilled. But of course the decisions of the Committee are one and indivisible if one decision is invalidated, the other has no validity either. And I am afraid a terrible weapon would be given in the hands of those who rather tend to keep the Codex Jung in Switzerland, if Egyptian officials are going to annul the official decisions, made in 1956 and already to a large extent realized. The money of Bollingen will be there, Brill will print without conditions, the Jung Codex will return to your Museum, I am sure of that, but at the same time I am confident that the decisions of the Committee are to be maintained.

But Puech had already written Quispel a week earlier, refusing the inclusion of Pahor Labib among the editors or the mention of the International Committee in the *editio minor*:

---

5 vii 59: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Le Dr. Pahor Labib n’a porté sur ces épreuves ni sa signature ni indication de lieu et de date; rien n’authentifie ses additions, rien ne prouve qu’il autorise expressément la mention du Comité et la publication de ces pages telles qu’elle sont composées. …

Si la lettre du Dr. Pahor Labib n’est pas assez explicite et précise, ou, à plus forte raison, si elle fait entièrement défaut, nous n’avons entre les mais que du néant.

2° Il paraît assez contradictoire de m’annoncer que le Dr. Pahor Labib a l’intention de m’exclure, ainsi que M. Till, du Comité et de me demander, dans la même lettre, d’accepter que son nom figure, à côté des nôtres, parmi ceux des auteurs de l’édition et de consentir non seulement à voir mentionner dans l’ouvrage ce même Comité, mais aussi à reconnaître au Dr. Labib la qualité de “chairman” du dit Comité. Si le Comité et le Dr. Labib ne veulent plus de M. Till ni de moi-même, il nous est absolument impossible de nous placer sous leur “autorité” et de répondre à cette disgrâce par des grâces ou des gracieusetés. Ou nous faisons, M. Till et moi, toujours partie du Comité, ou nous n’en faisons plus partie: tout est là. C’est, en tout cas, la question préalable, et je vous prie de demander au Dr. Pahor Labib d’y répondre. …

M. Till se montrait opposé à l’admission, parmi les noms des auteurs effectifs de l’édition, de celui du Dr. Labib, qui n’a, en effet, collaboré en rien à l’entreprise
Dr. Pahor Labib has not put on these proofs either his signature or an indication of the place and the date. Nothing authenticates his additions, nothing proves that he expressly authorizes the mention of the Committee and the publication of these pages as they are composed. ...

If the letter of Dr. Pahor Labib is not explicit and precise enough, or, with even more reason, if it is entirely lacking, we have in hand only nothingness.

et l’a même entravée en se refusant à fournir, ou à permettre à Yassah de fournir, des renseignements sur le manuscrit et à nous remettre les microfilms exécutés par Giversen. N’oubliez pas non plus que M. Till—d’accord en cela avec Doresse—ne reconnaît pas l’existence légale du Comité et la valeur de décisions dont il n’a jamais eu communication officielle. ...

Songeriez-vous à remplacer par celui du Dr. Labib le nom de Yassah, introduit parmi nous sur votre initiative et qu’il serait déloyal de désavouer, maintenant qu’il est mort? Le nom du Dr. Labib devrait-il aussi figurer sur la couverture de l’édition complète? ...

Nous en revenons au même point. Cette “élimination” ou menace d’élision ne peut que peser d’un poids très lourd sur ma décision: celle-ci sera différente selon que je serai assuré de faire ou non partie du Comité. De toute façon, je crois qu’il n’est pas possible de joindre le nom du Dr. Pahor Labib à ceux des autres auteurs de l’édition. Peut-être, si cette concession lui suffit, pourrait-on le mentionner, à la suite du Comité, comme “chairman.”

Une question, cependant,prime toutes les autres: la publication de la petite édition (prévues pour le début du mois dernier) n’a déjà que trop tardé; il faut qu’elle se fasse dans le plus bref délai, sans quoi nous perdons définitivement la partie. Le “bon à tirer” de l’édition française a été depuis longtemps donné. La décision a été prise par les auteurs de ne pas faire figurer, à quelque endroit que ce soit de la “petite édition,” la mention du Comité, et M. Wieder a pris l’engagement formel qu’il veillerait, sous sa propre responsabilité, à ce qu’il en soit ainsi et à ce que le texte du volume à paraître soit entièrement conforme à celui des dernières épreuves revêtues du “bon à tirer.” Il était aussi entendu que la question de la mention du Comité et du nom du Dr. Pahor Labib, à quelque titre que ce soit, ne se reposerait plus qu’à propos de la “grande édition.” Pourquoi revenir là-dessus après deux mois de silence? ... Dans ces conditions, force est de s’en tenir strictement aux décisions déjà prises: publier au plus tôt (avant la fin du mois!) l’”extrait” sans mention du Comité ni du nom de Pahor Labib (vous expliquerez la chose à celui-ci, en lui disant qu’il ne s’agit pas de l’édition proprement dite et qu’il nous a répondu trop tard, le volume étant déjà composé et le “bon à tirer” donné); réserver la solution des questions en suspens (et sans préjuger ce qu’elle sera, sans s’engager à rien) pour le moment où commencera l’impression de l’édition complète. ...

Je me résume, pour qu’il n’y ait aucune ambiguïté: nous maintenons le status quo en ce qui concerne l’édition de l’”extrait”; le volume paraîtra incessamment; son texte, dans toutes ses parties et dans toutes les éditions qui en seront faites (anglaise, allemande, etc.), devra être intégralement conforme à ce qu’il est dans les épreuves, revêtues du “bon à tirer,” de l’édition française; tout retard ou toute modification engagerait gravement et exclusivement l’entièr e responsabilité de qui en serait la cause.
2. It seems rather contradictory to announce to me that Dr. Pahor Labib has the intention to exclude me, as well as Till, from the Committee, and to ask of me, in the same letter, to accept his name figuring, beside ours, among those of the authors of the edition, and to consent not only to see this same Committee mentioned in the work, but also to acknowledge to Dr. Labib the quality of ‘chairman’ of the said Committee. If the Committee and Dr. Labib do not want any more of Till or of myself, it is absolutely impossible to put us under their ‘authority,’ and to reply to this disgrace with grace and graciousness. Either we, Till and myself, are always part of the Committee, or we are no longer part of it, that I everything. It is, in any case, the antecedent question, and I ask you to demand Dr. Pahor Labib reply to it. …

Till shows himself opposed to the admission, among the names of the actual authors of the edition, of that of Dr. Labib, who has not, in effect, collaborated in any part of the enterprise, and has even impeded it, in refusing to furnish, or to permit Yassah to furnish, information on the manuscript, and to submit to us the microfilms executed by Giversen. Also do not forget that Till—in agreement in this regard with Doresse—does not acknowledge the legal existence of the Committee and the value of decisions of which he has never received official communication. …

Do you conceive of replacing, with that of Dr. Labib, the name of Yassah, introduced among us on your initiative, and whom it would be disloyal to disavow, now that he is dead? The name of Dr. Labib, should it also figure on the cover of the complete edition? …

We return here to the same point. This ‘elimination’ or menace of elimination can only weigh very heavily on my decision, which will be different according to whether I will be assured of being part of the Committee or not. In any case, I believe that it is not possible to join the name of Dr. Pahor Labib to those of the other authors of the edition. Perhaps, if this concession is enough for him, one could mention it after the Committee as ‘chairman.’

One question, however, outstrips all the others: the publication of the small edition (planned for the beginning of last month) has already been delayed only too long. It must take place in the shortest time, without which we lose the game definitively. The ‘ready to print’ of the French edition has been given a long time ago. The decision has been taken by the authors not to have the mention of the Committee figure in the ‘small edition,’ at whatever place that might be, and Wieder has made the formal commitment that he would see to it, on his own responsibility, that it be this way, and that the text of the volume to appear be entirely conformable to that of the last proofs endorsed with the ‘ready to print.’ It was also agreed that the question of the mention of the Committee and of the name of Dr. Pahor Labib, with whatever title that might be, would arise only with regard to the ‘large edition.’ Why raise that again after two months of silence? … Under these circumstances it is necessary to hold oneself strictly to the decisions already taken: to publish as soon as possible (before the end of the month!) the ‘extract,’ without mentioning the Committee or the name of Pahor Labib (you will explain it to him, in telling
him that it is not a matter of the edition strictly speaking, and that he replied to us too late, since the volume was already composed and the ‘ready to print’ given); to reserve the solution of the questions in suspense (and without prejudicing what they will be, without committing oneself to anything), for the time when the impression of the complete edition will begin. ...

I summarize, so that there not be any ambiguity: We maintain the status quo in what has to do with the edition of the ‘extract’; the volume will appear any moment; its text, in all its parts and in all the editions that will be made of it (English, German, etc.), must be integrally conformable to what is in the proofs, inscribed with the ‘ready to print,’ of the French edition; any delay or any modification would be gravely and exclusively the whole responsibility of the person who would be the cause.

Puech again wrote Quispel announcing further delay.94

Van Proosdij told me yesterday that the edition of the ‘extract’ could not appear until the end of September, at the earliest (!), and that the printing of the index and the commentary would not be undertaken until still later. We reached agreement that under these circumstances it would be completely useless that I make the effort to complete in a dare-devil way the manuscript of the introduction. The latter, which is, incidentally, already very voluminous, should be seen again by Guillaumont, who will not be back before the middle of September. Besides, I will have several verifications and additions to make, which will not be possible until the libraries reopen. Hence I am going to grant myself some respite. I am tired out with fatigue and do not want to use what remains to me of health to redo or painfully revise manuscripts which then sleep in the vaults of the editor.

Since Brill never published the introduction, notes, and commentary of the editio maior, whatever is in fact in the vaults of Brill might well be brought to light and published!

---

94 16 viii 59: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

M. van Proosdij m’a dit hier que l’édition de l’“extrait” ne pourrait paraître qu’à la fin de septembre, au plus tôt (!), et que l’impression de l’index et du commentaire ne serait entreprise que plus tard. Nous sommes tombés d’accord que, dans ces conditions, il était tout à fait inutile que je fasse effort pour terminer dare-dare le manuscrit de l’introduction. Celui-ci, qui est du reste déjà très volumineux, doit, d’ailleurs, être revu par M. Guillaumont, qui ne sera pas de retour avant le milieu de septembre. J’aurai, en outre, plusieurs vérifications et additions à faire, ce qui ne sera possible qu’une fois les bibliothèques réouvertes. Je vais donc m’accorder du répit. Je suis recue de fatigue et ne tiens pas à user ce qui me reste de santé à refaire ou à rédiger péniblement des manuscrits qui dorment ensuite dans les coffres-forts de l’éditeur.
5. Publications of The Gospel of Thomas

The editio minor did actually appear in November, as Till was able to report to Schenke:95

The ‘excerpt’ of the edition of the Gospel of Thomas (Coptic text plus translation) has indeed now finally appeared. The complete edition should appear in a few months. When it really appears is known to the gods.

In England, The Gospel according to Thomas was published in the Sunday Times on 22 November 1959:96

In agreement with Collins, one set the date of this publication on 22 November, date of the beginning of the distribution of the copies of the English translation in England.

Brill published identical editions of the editio minor in English, French, German and Dutch late in 1959, with the following caption:

The Gospel According to Thomas: Coptic text established and translated, by A. Guillaumont, H.-Ch. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till and †Yassah ‘Abd al Masih

The Brill edition made no claim to be official or edited by the International Committee. Its ‘Preliminary Remarks’ merely stated:97

What follows is nothing more than a fragment of a work which is much more extensive and complete: a critical, scholarly edition of The Gospel according to Thomas, which will include a long introduction devoted to the various problems—philological, historical and exegetical—which have been raised by the document, as well as the Coptic text of the writing, a translation in German, French or English, a commentary consisting of detailed notes, and an index of Coptic and Greek terms. This volume will be published in the near future. In view, however, of certain technical difficulties which have delayed

---

95 14 xi 59: Letter from Till to Schenke:


96 23 xi 59: Letter from van Proosdij to Puech:

En accord avec Collins on a fixé la date de cette publication sur le 22 novembre, date du commencement de la distribution des exemplaires de la traduction anglaise en Angleterre.

the printing and publication of the larger work, we think it wise to make available in advance this extract. ... [vi]

The variants, the extra-canonical parallels, the testimonies of the indirect tradition relative to this or that *logion*, the Semitisms which here or there lie beneath the surface, and other analogies, will be expounded in the commentary of the authoritative edition.

It did however go on to state: 98

The manuscript, now preserved in the Coptic Museum of Old Cairo, has been collated there, in October 1956, by three of us.

Four of the editors were in Cairo in October 1956: Puech, Quispel, Yassah ʿAbd al-Masih, and Guillaumont. Puech must not have been actually involved in the collation, since he did not know Coptic. Therefore it would be the other three who made the collation.

The controversial issue of Quispel’s Jewish-Christian source theory, 99 which delayed the *editio maior* endlessly, came to expression only on the dust jacket inside the back cover of the German and French editions. In the German edition, for which Quispel and Till would have been primarily responsible, it reads as an open question: 100

The Semitisms recognizable at many places pose an interesting problem. The text that lies before us is certainly a Coptic translation or reworking of a Greek collection put together around 140. Should parts of it have been drawn from a still older Jewish-Christian source?

In the French edition, for which Puech and Guillaumont would have been primarily responsible, a mere allusion to a ‘Hebrew or Aramaic substratum' reflecting Guillaumont’s own research is what completes the paragraph: 101

98 *The Gospel according to Thomas*, vi.

99 See Quispel’s view, quoted above in the Foreword, of a *Gospel of the Egyptians* dated to around 130 and a *Gospel of the Hebrews* used by the primitive Christian community of Jerusalem around 100.

100 *Evangelium nach Thomas*:

Die an manchen Stellen erkennbaren Semitismen stellen ein interessantes Problem auf. Der uns vorliegende Text ist gewiss eine koptische Übersetzung oder Bearbeitung einer um 140 zusammengestellten griechischen Sammlung. Sollten Teile davon aus einer noch älteren judenchristlichen Quelle geschöpft worden sein?

101 *L’Évangile selon Thomas*:

La presence de sémitismes en maints passages d’un aussi riche écrit ajoute à son intérêt: n’aurions-nous pas ici, traduit ou adapté du grec en copte, le texte d’un ouvrage dont la première version daterait de 140 environ et aurait été composée, en
The presence of Semitisms in many passages of a text so rich adds to its interest. Would we not have here, translated or adapted from Greek into Coptic, the text of a work whose first version would date around 140 and would have been composed, in part, of elements borrowed from sources still older and, probably, Judeo-Christian? Too many of the assumed ‘Sayings of Jesus’ presuppose a Hebrew or Aramaic substratum for the question to be avoided.

The English dust jacket does not have this paragraph at all.

Guillaumont published his own views, which diverged from those of Quispel, in a journal article at the time. Puech presented his diverging views in French and German at the time. Quispel’s views were published frequently, though the brief bibliography in the Brill edition lists only one lecture given in Oxford.

**Competing ‘Editiones Principes’**

Once the floodgates were open, publications of *The Gospel of Thomas* appeared on all sides, and the quasi-official edition of Brill sold very well in several languages.

As we have seen, the first published translation of *The Gospel of Thomas* was by Johannes Leipoldt in German in 1958. Doresse, replaced by Guillaumont in the quasi-official edition, published his own translation and commentary in 1959. Other translations were published already in 1959: In

---


Swedish by Torgny Säve-Söderbergh,107 and in Danish by Søren Giversen.108 Two translations were published in 1959/60, one in Dutch by Hans Quecke,109 and one a retroversion into Greek by T.D. Moschonas.110 Bruce Metzger made an English translation that was available in mimeographed form in 1959,111 though it was not formally published until 1964.112 In view of all this that was taking place already in 1959, Brill pressured the editors until they published something in 1959. Many translations appeared in 1960, and from then on.

Already in 1957 Puech had expressed to Quispel his concern that someone publish The Gospel of Thomas before they could, and in this regard mentioned Gérard Garitte, the outstanding Belgian Nag Hammadi scholar at the time:113

"It is necessary to have the editio princeps of the Logia appear as soon as possible. Otherwise we risk being outrun—and soon: the volume of photographic facsimiles has indeed appeared, and Dr. Pahor Labib seems to have distributed it rather widely. From now on anyone has the right to use it freely and to give a translation of its content. In his note in the Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, Garitte says he has translated already in January the Gospel of Thomas, and I know that others lie in wait. Hence let us press on, but will we be ready in time?"

---

107 Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, Evangelium Veritatis och Thomasevangeliet; Symbolae Biblicae Upsaliensis; Supplemehäften till SEA, 16 (Uppsala: Wretmans Boktryckeri, 1959).
113 31 v 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel:
The breaking of the monopoly on *The Gospel of Thomas* could only be viewed positively by those on the outside. Gérard Garitte, wrote in retrospect:\textsuperscript{114}

The intelligent initiative of the Director of the Museum, the publication of a photographic edition, immediately had fortunate effects. In a very brief time, four of the Gnostic texts were put at the disposal of researchers in translations based on the plates of this edition: the Gospel of Philip, the Hypostasis of the Archons, a treatise without title on the origin of the world, and the Gospel

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

L’intelligent initiative du Directeur du Musée, la publication d’une édition photographique, eut immédiatement d’heureux effets: en un temps très bref, quatre des écrits gnostiques étaient mis à la disposition des chercheurs dans des traductions fondées sur les planches de cette édition: l’Évangile de Philippe, l’Hypostase des Archontes, un traité sans titre sur l’origine du monde et l’Évangile de Thomas; de ce dernier texte parurent ensuite coup sur coup, de 1958 à 1960, deux traductions allemandes, une traduction suédoise, une traduction danoise, trois traductions française, deux traductions anglaises, trois traductions néerlandaises et une traduction polonaise. En même temps, au sujet de l’Évangile de Thomas particulièrement, la littérature—articles et livres—se mettait à pulluler, *ex omni lingua et natione*; une bibliographie parue il y a quelques semaines et arrêtée à l’automne de 1963 enregistre près de 630 titres.

Tout ceci montrait, une fois de plus, l’efficience de l’initiative individuelle; car, pendant que des savants isolés, armés seulement de l’édition photographique, réussissaient à faire connaître quatre des écrits gnostiques et à livrer aux études des spécialistes, le Comité qui s’était chargé de la publication de tous les textes restait apparemment paralysé; on vit paraître toutefois, en 1959, sous forme d’“extrait” d’une *éditio maius* (que l’on attend toujours), l’édition princeps de l’Évangile de Thomas; édition en vérité très rudimentaire, car elle ne comporte rien d’autre que la transcription du texte copte et une traduction.

En 1960, c’est-à-dire une quinzaine d’années après la découverte, sur les quelque onze cents pages que comptent les manuscrits gnostiques, 48 seulement étaient publiées dans la langue originale; certes, cette situation désolante (que l’on songe au sort, si différent, des manuscrits de la Mer Morte) était due pour une bonne part à un enchaînement de circonstances exceptionnellement malheureuses; toutefois, les longueurs procédurières, l’instabilité politique et la guerre ne doivent pas être *seules* incriminées; autour des manuscrits gnostiques s’était tissé un réseau paralysant de rivalités personnelles, de concupiscences savantes et de prétentions au “firstmanship,” comme écrit Hans Jonas, qui ajoute: “Ce mal a pris (dans le cas des manuscrits gnostiques) les proportions d’une véritable ‘chronique scandaleuse’ de l’érudition contemporaine”; de fait, il faut bien reconnaître que tout s’est passé comme si certains avaient nourri l’étrange prétension de monopoliser des documents qui n’appartiennent qu’à la science, c’est-à-dire à tous.

On one occasion Quispel reproached me for using the term ‘monopoly,’ to which I replied that I was only quoting Garitte.
of Thomas. Of this last text, there then appeared one after the other, from 1958 to 1960, two German translations, one Swedish translation, one Danish translation, three French translations, two English translations, three Dutch translations, and one Polish translation. At the same time, especially on the topic of the Gospel of Thomas, the literature—articles and books—began to multiply, ex omni lingua et natione. A bibliography that appeared a few weeks ago, and stopped at the autumn of 1963, registered nearly 650 titles.

All this showed, one more time, the efficacy of individual initiative. For, while isolated scholars, armed only with the photographic edition, succeeded in making known four of the Gnostic texts, and delivering them for the studies of specialists, the Committee that charged itself with the publication of all the texts apparently remained paralyzed. Nevertheless one saw appear in 1959, in the form of an ‘extract’ of an editio maior (that one is still awaiting) the editio princeps of the Gospel of Thomas, an edition in truth very rudimentary, for it contains nothing other than the transcription of the Coptic text and a translation.

In 1960, that is to say, fifteen years after the discovery, of the some 1,100 pages that the Gnostic manuscripts involve, only 48 had been published in the original language. Certainly, this desolate situation (one need merely think of the fate, so different, of the manuscripts of the Dead Sea) was due in good part to a chain of exceptionally unfortunate circumstances. Nonetheless, the procedural sluggishness, the political instability, and the war may not only be incriminated. Around the Gnostic manuscripts was woven a paralyzing network of personal rivalries, scholarly lusts, and pretensions to ‘firstmanship,’ as Hans Jonas wrote, and added: “This evil has taken (in the case of the Gnostic manuscripts) the proportions of a veritable ‘scandalous chronicle’ of contemporary erudition.” In fact, one really has to recognize that it all took place as if certain people had nourished the strange pretension of monopolizing the documents that only belong to science, that is to say, to all.

Torgny Säve-Söderbergh told me that Brill had written him not to publish his edition before the ‘official’ Brill publication appeared, but Säve-Söderbergh had replied that Pahor Labib’s facsimile edition had put the text in the public domain and hence he was free to publish.

Since their complete edition never appeared, Puech and Quispel published separately their own interpretations. Puech did this by reprinting in 1978, in the second volume of his collected essays, an article he published in 1954–1955 in theBulletin de la Société Ernst Renan and the Revue

---

The gospel of thomas,\textsuperscript{116} his announcement of 1957 to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres,\textsuperscript{117} and his courses from 1957–1972 at the Collège de France.\textsuperscript{118} Gilles Quispel published in Dutch a popularizing commentary only in 2004.\textsuperscript{119}

**The Success of the Brill Edition**

The sales of the Brill edition of *The Gospel of Thomas* were phenomenal for that time. F.C. Wieder, Jr., Director of Brill, was kind enough to write me the details:\textsuperscript{120}

Here are some data with regard to sales of the edition of *The Gospel of Thomas*, which has been published by Brill in 1959.

There were four editions; all had the Coptic text with translation, respectively in English, French, German, and Dutch. I now give further details of each edition.

**English edition.**

There were three distributors: Harper, New York, for the USA, Collins, London, for Great Britain and the Commonwealth, Brill’s for the rest of the world.

Harper sold in 1959–1960 31,000 copies [cost: $2.00 each!] and up till the end of 1975 another 20,000 copies. The demand slowed down in the sixties, but increased again in the seventies to an average of 2,000 copies annually. This may be a result of your activities in the Nag Hammadi field, although one is never sure about what people influences to buy a certain book.

Collins in London sold roughly 10,000 copies in the first two years, and sales slowed down after that completely until Collins decided to stop with the distribution about 1970. After that we took over and sold about 1,000 copies during the past five years.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{119} Gilles Quispel, *Het Evangelie van Thomas. Uit het koptisch vertaald en toegelicht* (Amsterdam: In de Pelikaan, 2004).
  \item \textsuperscript{120} 27 i 77: Letter from Wieder to Robinson.
\end{itemize}
French edition.

This was being done by the Presses Universitaires de France in Paris, and they sold a complete edition of 2,000 copies. This edition will presumably not be reprinted.

German edition.

This edition sold so far about 3,000 copies. Unlike the others it has regular sales of 50–100 copies annually, but 1500 in the first two years.

Dutch edition.

So far we sold 1800 copies of this edition, 1100 in the first two years.

All in all we have sold about 60,000 copies in the four editions all over the world. This does, however, not mean that the number of coptologists has been increased with the same number. There have also been sales of rights: the Sunday Times in London has reproduced the complete English text in one of their issues; the same was done by the Dutch newspaper De Volkskrant. The English actor Alec Guinness spoke a few verses from the Gospel of Thomas on a Christmas recording. All this happened just before Christmas in the year 1959 when the Gospel of Thomas had the general interest of people with a religious mind.

Gérard Garitte summarized in 1964 the sensation caused by the publication of *The Gospel according to Thomas*:

As soon as the scholarly public, and the public at large, learned about the discovery of the Gospel according to Thomas, and some details on its form and content, the news made a sensation. In America alone, up to the

---


Dès que le public savant, et le public tout court a appris la découverte de l’Éth et quelques détails sur sa forme et son contenu, la nouvelle a fait sensation. Rien qu’en Amérique ont été vendu jusqu’à présent 55,000 exemplaires de l’édition du texte copte! Des mercantis du journalisme n’ont pas manqué, qui ont trouvé l’occasion bonne pour remplir profitablement leur devoir d’informateurs des peuples. La grande presse des deux mondes cria au “cinquième évangile,” retrouvant sans le savoir une expression qui avait déjà servi en 1935 à propos du papyrus Egerton; les rues de Londres ont put voir, en 1959, les voitures d’un grand quotidien promener des placards annonçant la découverte de nouvelles paroles de Jésus et la publication “for the first time in any newspaper,” “the lost Gospel,” de l’Évangile perdu; et au copyright de l’édition princeps du texte copte, on peut lire: “Tous droits réservés, y compris les droits de diffusion par télévision, radio, théâtre et cinéma.” L’apparition de l’Éth a été entourée d’un véritable “battage” publicitaire que les gens sérieux ont trouvé, suivant leur tempérament, ou choquant ou ridicule.
present 55,000 copies of the edition of the Coptic text have been sold! The hucksters of journalism have not been lacking, who found the occasion good to fulfill profitably their duty of informers of the public. The press at large in the two worlds cried out about the ‘fifth Gospel,’ rediscovering, without knowing it, an expression that had already been used in 1935 with regard to the Egerton papyrus. The streets of London have been able to see, in 1959, cars of a large daily newspaper [The Sunday Times] carrying placards announcing the discovery of new sayings of Jesus and the publication, ‘for the first time in any newspaper,’ ‘the lost Gospel’ of the lost gospel. And on the copyright of the editio princeps of the Coptic text, one can read [in the English edition]: “All rights reserved including television, radio broadcasting, dramatic and motion-picture rights, and the right of published edition of the Coptic text. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means without written permission from the publisher.” The appearance of the Gospel according to Thomas has been surrounded by a veritable ‘churning’ of publicity, which serious people found, following their temperament, either shocking or ridiculous.

This is no doubt responsible for Brill's willingness to support the publication of the rest of the Nag Hammadi discovery, in the form of The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices, the monograph series Nag Hammadi (and Manichaean) Studies, and, as its sub-series, the critical edition: The Coptic Gnostic Library: A Complete Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices, which was reprinted in 2000 in a five-volume paperback edition in its own right. It also served to focus attention on the United States as the best market for future sales.

The Gospel of Thomas has been much more widely studied than any other Nag Hammadi tractate. In Scholer's Bibliography, Volume One (1948–1969), when only a few tractates were available, the entries 1556–2425, a total of 869 entries, were devoted to all the Nag Hammadi tractates, whereas entries 1789–2244, a total of 455 entries, were devoted to The Gospel of Thomas, 52%. But the percentage was cut in half as all the tractates became available. In Scholer's Bibliography, Volume Two (1970–1994), entries 10381–11579, a total of 2125 entries, were devoted to all the Nag Hammadi Tractates, whereas entries 6794–7258, a total of 464 entries, were devoted to The Gospel of Thomas, 22%. In Scholer's Bibliography, Volume Three (1995–2006), entries 8518–11579, a total of 3,062 entries, were devoted to all the Nag Hammadi Tractates, whereas entries 10540–10987, a total of 448 entries, were devoted to The Gospel of Thomas, 15%.

A Brill catalogue of 1984 listed the original German and English editions of Evangelium nach Thomas and The Gospel according to Thomas as being still in print without alteration, but not the original French edition. Instead there was listed: “L'Évangile selon Thomas. Publié par A. Guillaumont,

6. The Doresse-Puech Confrontation

Puech had turned away from Doresse in favor of Guillaumont for editing The Gospel of Thomas, just as he turned away from Doresse in favor of Quispel for acquiring and Malinine for editing the Jung Codex. Puech wrote Quispel about his basic problem with Doresse’s inaccuracy:

Since Meier confirms it to me, I make as a rule for myself not to say a word to Doresse about the present status of the Jung Codex.

I have finally been able, during these vacations, to work on certain parts of the texts rediscovered at Nag-Hammadi, about which I have received information [from Doresse]. There are among them some sensational pieces that I have immediately identified. Thus I had occasion to ascertain the ignorance or the carelessness of Doresse. Whether it has to do with Hermetism (or with what he takes to be that), with titles arbitrarily given to certain texts, with the numbering of the content of this or that collection—his preliminary report on the ensemble of the discovery contains inexactitudes, errors, gratuitous statements. It has to be begun again, and I regret having been obliged, due to the lack of some means of control, to have trusted it and to have reproduced its main lines in my contribution to the Crum Festschrift.

Puech referred to his identification of P.Oxy. 654 and P.Oxy. 655 as fragmentary copies of The Gospel of Thomas known from Nag Hammadi Codex II as

122 29 ix 52: Letter of Puech to Quispel:

Puisque M. Meier me le confirme, je me fais une règle de ne pas dire mot à Doresse du sort actuel du Codex Jung.


his ‘discovery’ (see above). Yet Doresse made the point that this does not amount to the discovery of *The Gospel of Thomas* itself, for which Doresse gave himself credit.

Cf. J. Doresse, “Nouveaux documents gnostiques coptes [découverts en Haute-Égypte],” in the *Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1949, p. 179; “Une bibliothèque gnostique copte …,” in the *Bulletin de l’Académie royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres*, 1949, p. 440, where I wrote, precisely, that this *Gospel of Thomas* is a Gnostic composition that has no relation to the Christian apocryphon of the same name, related to the infancy of Jesus, and of which fragments have been conserved, but that it corresponds perhaps to the work used by the Naassenes and by the Manicheans (cf. *Philosophoumena* V, 7; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechism*, IV, 36). Cf. the same indications in my “Nouveaux textes gnostiques coptes [découverts en Haute-Égypte: La bibliothèque de Chénoboskion],” in *Vigiliae Christianae*, III, 3, [July] 1949, p. 134. H.-Ch. Puech, in his report of 24 May 1957, “Une collection de Paroles de Jésus récemment retrouvée [en Égypte: l’Évangile selon Thomas],” *CRAI* 1957 (1958): 146–166: 147 writes: “... this document, a part of which had been communicated to me as early as 1952, and that I was the first to identify ....” Of course Mr. Puech is making an allusion here to his capital identification of our work with the fragments of the *logia* of Oxyrhynchus, and not with the identification itself of *The Gospel of Thomas*.

In his address to the *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* in Paris on 17 June 1949, Doresse said of II,2, 3 and 8:

---

123 17 ii 57: Letter from Puech to Quispel.


M. H.Ch. Puech, dans sa communication du 24 mai 1957, *Une collection de Paroles de Jésus récemment retrouvée ...*, p. 147, écrit: “... ce document, dont une partie m’avait été communiquée dès 1952, et que j’ai été le premier à identifier ...”: bien entendu, M. Puech fait allusion, ici, à sa capitale identification de notre ouvrage avec les fragments des *logia* d’Oxyrhynchus, et non à l’identification propre de l’*Évangile selon Thomas*.

125 The date is given by Jean Doresse, “Une bibliothèque gnostique copte,” *La Nouvelle Clio* 1 (1949): 59–70: 59–60, n. 3.
126 Jean Doresse, “Nouveaux documents gnostiques coptes découverts en Haute-Égypte,”
It is noteworthy that none of these texts corresponds with the fragments of Christian apocrypha that existed under certain identical titles.

This makes clear that *The Gospel of Thomas* is not the infancy Gospel under that same name.

Doress’s communication to the *Académie Royale de Belgique* was presented on 4 July 1949 by Canon L. Th. Lefort on his behalf, under the title “La découverte d’une bibliothèque gnostico-hermétique en Égypte.” It was published under the title “Une bibliothèque gnostique copte découverte en Haute Égypte.” Doresse referred to it in the quotation above merely as “Une bibliothèque gnostique copte ...”.

In the third essay to which Doresse referred, “Nouveaux textes gnostiques coptes …,” published in July 1949, he wrote similarly:127

The first [*The Gospel of Thomas*] is a Gnostic composition without relation to the Christian apocryphon of the same name, relative to the infancy of Jesus, fragments of which have been conserved for us, but corresponding without doubt to the lost work that the Naassenes and the Manicheans used.

The footnote was specific:


The article that Doresse published later in 1949 stated:128

It is to be noted that *not one* [of the Nag Hammadi Tractates named after apostles] has ties with the fragments previously known under identical titles.

---

127 Jean Doresse and Togo Mina, “Nouveaux textes gnostiques coptes découverts en Haute-Égypte: La bibliothèque de Chenoboskion,” *VigChr* 3 (1949): 129–141, the part by Doresse 130–141: 134:

Le premier est une composition gnostique sans rapports avec l’apocryphe chrétien du même nom, relatif à l’enfance de Jésus, dont des fragments nous ont été conservés, mais correspondant sans doute à l’ouvrage perdu qu’employaient les Naassènes et les Manichéens.

128 Doresse, “Une bibliothèque gnostique copte,” *La Nouvelle Clio* 1 (1949): 59–70: 64, and n. 17:

Il est à noter qu’aucun n’a de rapports avec les fragments précédemment connus sous des titres identiques. Il s’agit ici des ouvrages mêmes dont les hérésiologues ont mentionné l’emploi chez les gnostiques et dont plusieurs se retrouvèrent dans la littérature manichéenne.
It has to do here with the same works that the heresiologists have mentioned being used among the Gnostics and several of which are to be found in Manichean literature.

The footnote is again specific (with only a small deviation):

Cf. Hippolytus, *Refutatio*, V, 7; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechism* IV, 38 [sic!].

Puech refers in a letter to Doresse of 13 April 1950 that he has made use of this article by Doresse in composing his contribution to the Crum *Festschrift:*¹²⁹

I have read and been able to use in my contribution to the Crum *Festschrift* your article of *La Nouvelle Clío*.

Hence one can assume that Puech had access to all of Doresse’s articles of 1949 in composing his essay for the Crum *Festschrift*.

In his own publication of *The Gospel of Thomas*, Doresse summarized:¹³⁰

---

¹²⁹ 13 iv 50: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

J’ai lu et pu utiliser dans mon mémoire des *Mélanges Crum* votre article de *La Nouvelle Clío*.


Je dois rappeler ici que j’avais signalé très exactement, dès 1949, dans mes premières communications sur la bibliothèque de Khénoboskion, la presence parmi ces écrits de cet *Évangile selon Thomas*; que j’avais déjà souligné qu’il était différent de l’*Évangile de Thomas l’Israélite* (ou *Évangile de l’enfance*) que l’on possédait jusqu’alors, et qu’il y avait sans doute lieu d’y reconnaître l’écrit homonyme mais différent de contenu dont, selon les *Philosophoumena* du pseudo-Hippolyte, les Gnostiques naassènes auraient assez largement fait usage.

Mais c’est M. H.Ch. Puech qu’il revenait, par la suite, d’après les passages de ce texte que je lui communiquai en 1952, d’éclaircir pleinement la véritable nature des prétendus “paroles de Jésus” précédemment connues par trois fragments grecs d’Oxyrhynchus en y reconnaissant le début et deux autres fragments de ce qui n’était en réalité que la rédaction grecque de l’*Évangile selon Thomas*.

I need to recall here that I had indicated very exactly, since 1949, in my first communications on the library of Khénoboskion, the presence among these texts of this Gospel according to Thomas; that I had already underlined that it was different from the Gospel of Thomas the Israelite (or Gospel of the Infancy) that one possessed up until then, and that there was without a doubt reason to recognize here the text with the same title but different content of which, according to the Philosophoumena of Pseudo-Hippolytus, the Naassene Gnostics would have made rather extensive use.

But it is to the credit of H.Ch. Puech that he returned, later, according to the passages of this text that I communicated to him in 1952, to clarify fully the true nature of the assumed ‘sayings of Jesus’ previously known from three Greek fragments of Oxyrhynchus, in recognizing there the beginning and two other fragments of what had in reality only been the Greek redaction of the Gospel according to Thomas.

Doresse’s publication of The Gospel of Thomas prior to the Brill edition was in one regard very awkward for Doresse, since he had to retain as best he could his good relations with Puech, whom he wrote to forestall any difficulties on 3 May 1959: 131

---

131 3 v 59: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

J’ai longuement vu M. Didier et je suis, en principe, d’accord pour lui fournir, à l’intention de la presse américaine surtout, les quelques articles qu’il désire au sujet des écrits gnostiques. Je prendrai toutefois la précaution de vous en soumettre la substance avant de les lui donner: la rédaction de textes destinés à un public particulièrement vaste ne présente en effet d’intérêt que dans la mesure où leur retentissement peut venir appuyer nos efforts pour la mise en valeur, dans des conditions normales, des écrits de Khénoboskion. M. Didier souhaitait synchroniser la publication de ces articles avec la parution de l’”Évangile de Thomas” que prépare Brill. Il me dit toutefois que, d’après les nouvelles qu’il a reçues de Hollande, le volume ne sortirait pas dès maintenant ce qui me désole pour des raisons diverses. En effet, le tapage que la presse de tous pays a fait, à la suite de la conférence new-yorkaise de M. Cullmann (tapage auquel le “Figaro” a donné des échos contre lesquels vous avez légitimement protesté et au sujet desquels je demande moi-même, au même journal, de faire preuve d’un peu plus d’exactitude et de précision en ce qui concerne l’histoire de la découverte!) a excité la curiosité de manière bien prématurée. J’en suis moi-même quelque peu ennué car ce battage a incité la Librairie Plon à envoyer à l’impression en toute hâte le manuscrit du tome IV de mes “Livres secrets …”, prévu pour beaucoup plus tard et dont j’avais soumis, il y a quelques mois, une rédaction première que j’aurais voulu perfectionner! Pris de court par cette initiative, j’ai dû, sur les épreuves, apporter à mon texte, bref et hâtif, des corrections multiples destinées à la fois à le mettre au courant et à lui donner forme de volume. J’ai même dû, pour que la substance de ce fascicule ne soit pas des plus maigres, y associer, dans le corps de la préface et sous forme d’un appendice, des pages que je destinais à d’autres tomes. J’espère que le résultat de ces remaniements, qui viennent de m’éreinter, ne sera pas trop hétéroclite. Comme l’article de Garitte et la traduction de Leipoldt, d’une part,—et d’autre
I had a long visit with Didier and I am, in principle, in agreement, to furnish him, especially for the American press, the several articles that he wishes on the subject of the Gnostic texts. I will nonetheless take care to submit to you their substance, before giving them to him: The redaction of texts destined for a particularly vast public are in effect of interest only to the extent that their reverberation can support our efforts to validate, in normal conditions, the texts of Khénoboskion. Didier would like to synchronize the publication of these articles with the appearance of the ‘Gospel of Thomas’ that Brill is preparing. He tells me nonetheless that, according to the news that he has received from Holland, the volume will not appear just now, which distresses me for diverse reasons. In effect, the uproar that the press of all countries has made, following the conference of Cullmann in New York, has excited curiosity in a very premature way—an uproar which the _Figaro_ has echoed, against which you have legitimately protested, and on which topic I myself demand of the same journal to give evidence of a bit more exactitude and precision in what concerns the history of the discovery! I myself am a bit annoyed by it, for this churning has incited the Librairie Plon to send to the printer in all haste the manuscript of volume IV of my _Livres secrets_ ..., envisaged for much later, and of which I had sent, some months ago, a first redaction, which I would have wished to perfect! Taken up short by this initiative, I have had to bring to my text, on the proofs, briefly and hastily, multiple corrections destined both to bring it up to date and to give it the form of a volume. So that the substance of the fascicle not be the most meager, I have even had to add to it, in the body of the preface and in the form of an appendix, pages that I intended for other volumes. I hope that the result of these adjustments, which have broken my back of late, will not be too eccentric. Since the article of Garitte and the translation of Leipoldt, on the one hand—and on the other hand your own presentation to the Académie and the article of Madame Meyerovitch which

echoes it, are now accessible to all, and very generally known, I do not believe that the small amount of unpublished material that my own fascicle will reveal can cause the least difficulty. I develop there especially what you yourself have published, to which I refer very explicitly. At the same time, I recall to Messrs Garitte and others the stages in the discovery of this text and its interpretation, clarifying once again that the essential was discovered and signaled here—and by yourself—well before their own publications. In brief, Garitte and Quispel could be the only ones to be concerned by this publication. For the rest, this little volume does not have the least chance of supplanting your edition. It will hence be limited to causing it to be awaited and hoped for with all the more impatience. I will send you the proofs as soon as they are returned from the printer, that is to say, in a few days.

A week later Doresse wrote Puech again:

---


135 n v 59: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

J’ai enfin pu communiquer à M. Orengo, Directeur littéraire de la Librairie Plon, les quelques éléments que vous avez bien voulu me faire connaître au sujet des éditions de l’“Évangile selon Thomas” qui sont préparées par E.J. Brill et des conséquences possibles. Plon ayant en cette affaire la plus grosse partie, à la fois, des risques et des profits, je laisse maintenant à M. Orengo le soin de décider en fonction de ses intérêts et des miens, et d’adopter la position défensive qu’il jugera la plus sûre.

Comme je tiens également à ne point avoir, à l’égard de l’éditeur E.J. Brill, une position qui pourrait faire supposer que je sois engagé envers lui à quelque point de vue que ce soit, j’ai personnellement confié toute l’affaire à un conseil compétent, dont je vais suivre les directives. Il est, en tout cas, absolument certain, pour le moment, que—n’ayant moi-même pris aucune part à l’édition de l’“Évangile selon Thomas,” que ce soit en tant que membre du Comité International ou bien à titre personnel, et n’ayant même jamais été consulté sur l’organisation de ce travail—je n’ai pas la moindre obligation envers Brill ni envers ses correspondants, lesquels, en retour, ne sont point en droit d’associer mon nom ni ma personne à la présentation de leur actuelle publication, et ne peuvent, sans doute, pas plus légitimement se prévaloir actuellement de quelque patronage officiel du Comité International de Publication. Je tiens, sur ces points, à prendre dès maintenant très nettement position.

Ne voyez en cela, bien sûr, je vous prie, nulle mauvaise intention. Mais la façon dont j’ai été, en 1956, dépouillé contre tout droit de quelque possibilité que ce soit de participer de près ou de loin à la constitution du Comité International et à sa première réunion, ne peut manquer d’avoir, pour la bonne marche des travaux qu’on aurait alors pu engager sur des bases plus solides, certaines conséquences que je regrette plus vivement que personne puisque j’ai été et que je reste le premier à les subir!

Le FIGARO, auquel j’avais demandé de rappeler en quelles circonstances exactes avait été découvert et signalé le manuscrit contenant l’“Évangile selon Thomas,” semble accueillir ma demande de mise au point avec la même indolence qu’il vous avait opposée.
I have finally been able to pass on to Orengo, literary Director of the Librairie Plon, the details that you have been kind enough to let me know, on the topic of the editions of the ‘Gospel according to Thomas’ that are being prepared by E.J. Brill, and the possible consequences. Since Plon has in this affair the greatest part, both of risks and of profits, I now leave it to Orengo to decide, in terms of his interests and my own, and to adopt the defensive position that he will judge to be the most certain.

Since it is also important to me not to have, with regard to the editor E.J. Brill, a position that could lead one to suppose that I am under obligation to him from whatever point of view it might be, I have personally confided all the matter to a competent counsel, whose directions I will follow. It is, in any case, absolutely certain, for the time being, that—not having myself taken any part in the edition of the ‘Gospel according to Thomas,’ be it as member of the International Committee or be it in a personal rôle, and not even having ever been consulted on the organization of this work—I do not have the slightest obligation toward Brill nor toward its correspondents, who, in return, have no right to associate my name or my person with the presentation of their present publication, and cannot, doubtless, at present legitimately maintain any official patronage of the International Committee of Publication. I intend, on these points, to assume from now on a very clear position.

Of course, do not see in that, I ask of you, any hostile intention. But the way in which in 1956 I was stripped, contrary to every right, of any possibility that there might be to participate, from near or far, in the constitution of the International Committee and in its first meeting, cannot fail to have, for the good progress of the work that one would have been able to envisage then on more solid bases, certain consequences, which I regret more deeply than anyone, since I was and remain the first to suffer from them!

The Figaro, which I had asked to recall in what exact circumstances the manuscript containing the Gospel according to Thomas had been discovered and described, seems to receive my request to set the record straight with the same indolence that it had put in opposition to you.

Puech promptly responded:136

---

136 14 v 59: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

Le Figaro me communique le texte de la lettre que vous lui avez adressée au sujet de son entrefilet du 16 avril.

Voudriez-vous me préciser le sens de votre réclamation? Entendriez-vous contester que j’aie été le premier à découvrir l’identité véritable et les attaches littéraires et historiques de l’Évangile selon Thomas fortuitement retrouvé près de Nag Hamâdi, et prétendriez-vous vous attribuer le principal mérite en cette affaire?

Si s’est là ce que veut insinuer votre lettre, il ne m’est que trop facile de fournir la réplique qui m’est demandée: je n’ai qu’à faire appel à des faits que vous ne sauriez nier et à vous mettre en contradiction avec vous-même en invoquant ce que vous
The *Figaro* communicates to me the text of the letter that you have sent it with regard to its article of 16 April.

Would you please clarify for me the meaning of your complaint? Would you intend to contest that I was the first to discover the true identify and the literary and historical contacts of the *Gospel according to Thomas* rediscovered by chance near Nag Hamâdi, and would you pretend to attribute to yourself the principal merit in this affair?

If that is what your letter wants to insinuate, it would be only too easy for me to furnish the reply that is asked of me: I have only to appeal to the facts that you would not be able to deny, and to put you in contradiction with yourself, in appealing to what you have written on pp. 245–251 of your ‘Livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte.’ If your protestation, on the other hand, has as its goal only to recall that you noted from as early as 1949 the existence of the text, whose title you noted, this is irrelevant or should have been formulated in less ambiguous terms. Justice is done to you in my publications, and, specifically, in the bibliography arranged in chronological order joined to my study of the *Gospel according to Thomas* in the first volume of the *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen of Hennecke* (pp. 202–203). It would be strange if in return I were treated by you with injustice. ...

Tell me also, in writing, if you recall or not, having asked me from Cairo, in 1948, information on the identity of a certain number of texts of N[ag] H[ammadi].

Dioresse replied the next day in great detail:  

---

Dites-moi aussi, par écrit, si vous reconnaissez ou non m’ avoir demandé du Caire, en 1948, des renseignements sur l’identité d’un certain nombre d’ écrits de N.H.

---

137 15 v. 59: Letter from Dioresse to Puech:

Je crois, en effet, que ce que j’ai écrit dans le tome I de mes “Livres Secrets” et aussi, plus brièvement, dans des articles des *Nouvelles Littéraires*, de la *Table Ronde* ou de *Novum Testamentum*, doit suffire à vous rassurer pleinement sur mes sentiments! Il vient d’ailleurs, à l’instant, de s’ajouter à cela le volume que Plon (qui n’a pu prendre cette décision qu’après avoir considéré les observations que vous m’aviez formulées et dont j’avais très franchement soumis les détails à M. Orengo) vient d’achever d’imprimer, et dont je vous envoie en toute hâte un des premiers exemplaires brochés (je passe sur un certain nombre de coquilles et d’imperfections pour lesquelles je tente
I believe, indeed, that what I wrote in volume I of my ‘Livres Secrets’ and also, more briefly, in articles in Nouvelles Littéraires, in the Table Ronde, or in Novum Testamentum, should suffice to reassure you fully as to my sentiments! Besides, there is to be added just at this moment the volume that Plon (which could not make this decision until after having considered the observations that you had formulated for me, the details of which I have quite frankly submitted to Orengo) has just completed printing—I send you in all haste one of the first paperback copies (I overlook a certain number of misprints and imperfections for which I try to obtain the addition of an erratum). I believe I have in this volume mentioned with enough insistence your rôle and your discoveries and even to have taken sides more than it was incumbent on me personally to do (cf. e. g. p. 22), against the attempts of certain persons to contest in your regard what is essential in this affair. I would hence like, in regard to me, to see my named mentioned when it has to do with a text that you have received from me, of which your letters of August and September 1952, responding to the sending of fragments that I was then in a position to transmit to you, thanking me, after all, warmly enough. ... Do not think that I attach any more importance than you yourself do to the successive information and corrections of the Figaro. I wanted to make clarifications only because the communications that appeared in that way in March and April aroused, for many people who know my publications,
surprise and spontaneous protestation. But there have been many other cases where I would have had a right even more to protest against the way in which my rôle in this discovery was systematically limited or even passed in silence—and where I have not done so. Doubtless I was wrong in that regard, for example when it had to do with certain fantastic assertions in the preface of the ‘Evangelium Veritatis,’ which would have justified a reply without circumspection.

I have not forgotten (to reply to the last paragraph of your letter) that I wrote you from Cairo right at the end of 1948 to give you concise details on the manuscripts that I was reading then. But I did not receive from you, at the time, the least response. It was only several months later that you wrote me, your health having been the cause of this long silence—as you told me in your letter—, which I regretted very much. At that time, in effect, the documents themselves were already definitively under seal and inaccessible, and the detailed inventory, which I had finally been able to establish by my means alone, had already been countersigned by Messrs Drioton and Togo Mina and

par mes seuls moyens, avait déjà été contresigné par MM. Drioton et Togo Mina et présenté tel quel au Conseil du Musée Copte! Ne m’en veuillez pas de vous rappeler aujourd’hui ces faits. Si, à ce moment là et en réponse à votre lettre, je ne vous ai point assez précisé cette situation, c’est que je n’attachais alors pas d’importance à ce détail, l’essentiel ayant été, pour moi, d’avoir réussi, malgré tout, à faire à temps les identifications voulues au moyen de la documentation pourtant très limitée dont je disposais sur place. Il me semble que le résultat ainsi obtenu par moi fut assez satisfaisant puisqu’effectivement ce premier inventaire n’a pratiquement nécessité que les quelques corrections de détail que j’ai récemment signalées dans Hermès et la Gnose.

Pardonnez-moi, dans ces conditions, de tenir très vivement au rôle que j’ai dû jouer en cette affaire. Il est, certes, regrettable qu’alors que j’avais eu, dès 1948, la possibilité de lire de près ces documents, d’en copier de longs passages et d’y relever quantité de détails extraordinaires, il ne m’aît été permis, jusqu’à 1956, d’en faire connaissance que de simples titres et encore à condition de voiler l’importance réelle de certains écrits pour ne point susciter d’appétits gênants autour de ces manuscrits. Mais je ne voudrais en aucun cas que cette règle du silence qui me fut si longtemps imposée—et à laquelle je ne manquai que pour vous communiquer personnellement certains documents plus particulièrement importants—soit interprétée aujourd’hui à mon désavantage, alors que j’ai eu en cette aventure tous les risques et ennuis. Je ne crois pas vous avoir jamais importuné des détails des multiples difficultés que j’ai dû surmonter: mais vous savez—pour n’en évoquer que les plus récents épisodes—combien certains procédés employés ces dernières années pour me tenir à l’écart de la publication de ces documents seraient légalement contestables et auraient justifié, de ma part, d’énergiques et publiques protestations que j’ai jusqu’à présent différencées. Vous ne me reprocherez sans doute pas, dans ces conditions, de tenir, aujourd’hui plus vivement que par le passé, à ce dont je n’ai pas été encore dépossédé, et d’essayer de rétablir, en ce qui concerne plus particulièrement mon rôle passé et mes droits actuels par rapport aux écrits que j’ai découverts et dont je vous ai assez souvent et bien volontiers communiqué la primeur, une position qui ne laisse plus à la moindre ambiguïté.
presented as such to the Council of the Coptic Museum! Do not hold it against me to recall these facts to you today. If, at that moment and in response to your letter, I did not make this situation clear enough at all, it is because I did not attach importance to this detail then, the essential having been, for me, to have succeeded, in spite of everything, in making the desired identifications in time, with the help of the documentation, though very limited, that I had at my disposal on the site. It seems to me that the result thus obtained by me was satisfactory enough, since in fact this first inventory has only necessitated in practice the few corrections of detail that I have recently mentioned in ‘Hermès et la Gnose.’

Pardon me, under these conditions, for maintaining very strongly the rôle that I had to play in this affair. It is, certainly, regrettable that when, as early as 1948, I had the chance to read these documents close up, to copy long passages from them, and to locate in them a quantity of extraordinary details, it was not permitted, until 1956, to make known more than the simple titles, and still on the condition of veiling the real importance of certain texts, so as not to arouse awkward appetites surrounding these manuscripts. But in no case would I want this rule of silence that was imposed on me for such a long time—and according to which I only lacked communicating to you personally certain documents that were particularly important—to be interpreted today to my disadvantage, whereas in this adventure I had all the risks and annoyances. I do not believe I have ever burdened you with the details of the multiple difficulties that I had to overcome. But you know, to evoke only the most recent episodes, how much certain procedures employed in these last years to keep me out of the publication of these documents would be legally contestable, and would have justified, on my part, energetic and public protestations from which I have refrained up to the present. You will doubtless not reproach me in these circumstances for holding, today more vividly than in the past, to that from which I have not yet been dispossessed, and to attempt to reestablish, in what concerns more particularly my past rôle and my present rights with regard to the texts that I have discovered and about which I have often enough and quite voluntarily communicated to you first of all, a position which can no longer be taken with the least ambiguity.

Having had to miss an appointment with Puech for medical reasons, Doresse wrote him on 25 May 1959:

---

138 25 v 59: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je suis d’autant plus navré de ce contretemps que j’aurais moi-même vivement désiré vous rencontrer. Il me paraît impossible de rester plus longtemps dans l’ignorance de ce à quoi nous sommes effectivement engagés, les uns et les autres, en tant que membres du Comité de Publication des écrits gnostiques du Musée Copte. Je ne tiens pas plus à embarrasser mes collègues dans leurs travaux qu’à être moi-même mis dans l’embarras. Nulle besogne importante et requérante du temps, ne pourra être engagée (comme vous et moi le désirons) tant que nous ne saurons pas ce
I am all the more distressed by this misfortune, in that I myself would have eagerly desired to meet you. It seems to me impossible to remain in ignorance longer as to what we are in effect engaged in, one and the other, as members of the Committee of Publication of the Gnostic texts of the Coptic Museum. I no more want to embarrass my colleagues in their work than myself to be embarrassed. No important job that consumes time can be entered into (such as you and I desire), so long as we do not know what the Committee of edition represents today, what work is incumbent on it, and under what conditions. The confusion seems, here, to be as total as possible. It is hence up to the Egyptian authorities, alone competent and authorized, to whom it pertains, either themselves to clarify the situation, or to let it be known in what measure they permit us to do it ourselves, by means of agreements reached in common. I will hence resolve to go to Cairo very soon, finally to know what has and has not been decided. I need, incidentally, to make a trip to Egypt in any case, to recuperate there goods and documents that I have left there and that I need more and more. I believe that it is the only solution that remains for us, if we do not want to find ourselves completely in the impossibility of continuing our work.

Yet before receiving that letter, Puech sent Doresse a *pneumatique* letter, to be sure Doresse would receive it the same day, telling him not to come to the École des Hautes Études the next day. For Puech’s letter seemed intended to break off all relations with Doresse, having just read Doresse’s book on *The Gospel of Thomas*: 139

---

139 25 v 59: *Pneumatique* letter from Puech to Doresse:

Je relève dans votre livre sur l’*Evangile selon Thomas* trop d’emprunts inavoués à mes publications et à mes cours du Collège de France pour n’en être pas profondément indigné. Ces plagiats—dont il sera ailleurs rendu compte—sont d’autant plus révoltants qu’ils portent sur cette partie de mes découvertes que, dans tel passage de votre ouvrage et dans votre note au “Figaro,” vous tentez de minimiser ou de laisser dans l’ombre, en entendant réduire, en dépit des faits et contre toute justice, le rôle—pourtant, essentiel—que j’ai joué dans l’“identification” du document et
I pick up in your book on the *Gospel according to Thomas* too many unacknowledged borrowings from my publications and my courses at the Collège de France, not to be profoundly indignant about it. These plagiarisms—of which it will be given account elsewhere—are all the more revolting in that they have to do with that part of my discoveries that, in the given passage of your work and in your note in the ‘Figaro,’ you try to minimize, or leave in the shade, so as to reduce, in spite of the facts and contrary to all justice, the rôle—nonetheless essential—that I have played in the ‘identification’ of the document, and pretending—ready to let the others pass as improper deceptions—to attribute to yourself all the merit in this affair.

I skip, so as to be brief, the procedures you have used with regard to me and the International Committee of publication of the papyri of Nag Hamâdi, motivated by the desire to equal our edition of *The Gospel according to Thomas*. I believe I have acted in your regard with enough generosity, benevolence, even indulgence, total frankness, to have rendered to you—at the C.N.R.S. and in circumstances particularly painful for you—great enough services, and for which I have been sufficiently reproached, to expect to be treated quite differently or with less equivocation.

Hence you understand that it is no longer possible for me to continue to be your patron and to pursue with you the work in common that we had undertaken at the Hautes Études and that cannot be carried on except in an atmosphere of confidence, of disinterestedness, of reciprocal sincerity. Believe that I regret it, having in view, in all this, only the fate of, and the scientific study of, the documents of Nag Hamâdi. As a consequence, I ask of you not to come tomorrow, Tuesday, to the École des Hautes Études, and to cease from now on to attend my conferences.

---

en prétendant—quitte à laisser passer les autres pour des imposteurs abusifs—vous attribuer tout le mérite en cette affaire.

Je passe, pour faire bref, sur les procédés dont, poussé par le désir de faire pièce à notre édition de *l’Évangile selon Thomas*, vous avez usé à mon égard et à l’égard du Comité international de publication des Papyrus de Nag Hamâdi. Je croyais avoir agi en votre endroit avec assez de générosité, de bienveillance, d’indulgence même, de totale franchise, vous avoir—au prêtre du C.N.R.S. et dans des circonstances pour vous particulièrement pénibles—reçu d’assez grands services, et qui m’ont été assez reprochés, pour m’attendre à être traité tout autrement ou avec moins d’équivoque.

Vous comprendrez donc qu’il ne me soit plus possible de continuer à vous patronner et de poursuivre avec vous le travail en commun que nous avions entrepris aux Hautes Études et qui ne peut être mené que dans une atmosphère de confiance, de désintéressement, de sincérité réciproque. Croyez que je le regrette, n’ayant en vue, dans tout ceci, que le sort et l’étude scientifique des documents de Nag Hamâdi. En conséquence, je vous prie de ne pas venir demain, mardi, à l’École des Hautes Études et de cesser désormais de fréquenter mes conférences.
Doresse replied promptly, proposing public arbitration, and even suggesting court procedures:\footnote{25 v 59: Letter from Doresse to Puech:}

I have just received your pneumatique letter of today, whose content pains me very much, at the moment when I am least in the condition to take cognizance of it and reply to it. I will do so, nonetheless, though briefly.

You intend to accuse me of plagiarisms, and contest the exposition that I give of the discovery and identification of the ‘Gospel according to Thomas.’ The controversy that you thus open, and in which you and I each think we are right, is neither of a scientific nor of an administrative kind. Given the nature of, indeed the gravity of the accusations that you formulate with regard to me, there is, if you intend to maintain them, only one solution that is admissible: Carry, I ask of you, the case before a competent jurisdiction that can settle impartially and publicly.

I do not have to put you on guard as to the fact that all other measures, publications, or steps that, in the absence of such an arbitration, would have the effect of injuring my honorableness, my works, and my situation, would for this reason be fully contestable, from which I would not at all fail to draw the consequences.

Without doubt it would be simpler, before adopting such a radically hostile attitude, for you to appeal to the explanations that I would have a right to furnish to you, and which would have been of a kind to make you recognize both my full right and my good faith.
More than a year later, Doresse did in fact receive notification of his dismissal from the C.N.R.S. He had no other recourse than to write Puech, pleading for his support in his appeal to be permitted to maintain his position.

141 23 xi 60: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

M. Lejeune m’a fait savoir, il y a quelques semaines, que, la Commission des Langues et Civilisations Orientales n’ayant pas été “en mesure de décider mon maintien,” je cesserai de dépendre au CNRS le 31 décembre prochain.

Je savais déjà que le vote, intervenu après un long débat, ne m’avait pas été aussi favorable que je l’espérais compte tenu de mes plus récents travaux. Peut-être le résultat eut-il été différent si la Commission avait été au complet? Quoi qu’il en soit, la décision que ce vote a entraînée est assez imprévue et lourde de conséquences pour que je me juge en droit de solliciter, de la Direction du CNRS, une révision de mon cas.

Entré au Centre en 1944, sous votre direction dont nul ne saurait contester l’absolue et complète compétence pour les recherches où j’étais engagé, j’ai vu, depuis, régulièrement renouveler mes fonctions, avec votre appui et avec l’approbation explicite d’autres personnalités elles aussi qualifiées pour me juger. Les approbations ainsi portées sur mes recherches et sur leurs résultats ont été, pendant quinze années, assez précises et positives pour entraîner (même lors des circonstances où des raisons extra-scientifiques m’exposèrent passagèrement à de vives attaques) le maintien de mes fonctions, d’ailleurs renforcées, à partir de 1951, par ma promotion au grade de Chargé de Recherches. Il y a un an encore, avec votre approbation expresse, la Commission me manifestait son accord quant à mes travaux antérieurs et quant à mes projets pour 1959–1960 en me proposant cette fois pour une promotion d’échelon que la Direction du CNRS voulait bien, à son tour, accorder. Je crois donc avoir quelques motifs d’espérer que mon recours, face à une décision dont on ne saurait contester la brutalité inattendue, soit accueilli favorablement. Certes, il se peut que de nouveaux membres de la Commission aient exprimé ou suscité, sur la forme de mes publications, des objections parfaitement fondées: mais je me serais empressé, si l’on m’en avait fourni la possibilité, d’éclairer plus complètement les personnes intéressées sur les conditions de plus en plus difficiles dans lesquelles se poursuivent nos recherches, conditions qui m’ont fait juger indispensable de publier hâtivement ce que je pouvais encore sauver des découvertes faites il y a dix ans! En outre, je me serais empressé de me conformer, pour la suite de mes publications, aux directives qui auraient pu aisément m’être données après complet examen du problème. Peut-être voudra-t-on bien tenir compte de cela, et surseoir à la mesure qui m’a été notifiée, en me permettant de prouver que je suis à même de donner des travaux de fond et de produire des éditions minutieuses que—comme vous le savez—j’ai déjà depuis longtemps préparées. Si toutefois mon recours était rejeté, je ne manquerais pas de faire appel, dans toute la mesure où j’y aurais droit, aux juridictions administratives compétentes: je ne crois pas que le CNRS puisse invoquer de faute contre moi, et mon congédiement fait trop figure de paradoxe au moment même où vient d’entrer en vigueur un statut dont le but officiel est d’empêcher de pareils licenciements.

J’espère donc, de tout cœur, que vous voudrez bien apporter votre appui à la demande de recours, adressée à M. le Directeur Général du CNRS, dont je viens de soumettre le texte à M. Virolleaud. Dans un cas où sont mises en cause les approbations motivées
Lejeune let me know a few weeks ago that, the Commission of Oriental Languages and Civilizations not having been ‘in a position to decide my continuance,’ I would cease to belong to the C.N.R.S. next 31 December.

I already knew that the vote, taken after a long debate, had not been as favorable as I hoped, in view of my most recent works. Perhaps the result would have been different if the Commission had been in full attendance? Whatever the case, the decision that this vote has led to is rather unforeseen and heavy in consequences, so that I think I have the right to solicit from the Direction of the C.N.R.S. a review of my case.

Having entered into the Center in 1944 under your direction, whose absolute and complete competence for the research in which I was engaged no one would contest, I have seen, since then, my functions regularly renewed, with your support and with the explicit approval of other personalities, they also qualified to judge me. The approvals thus accorded to my research and their results have been, for fifteen years, precise and positive enough to lead (even when circumstances or non-scientific reasons exposed me in passing to lively attacks) to the maintenance of my functions, incidentally reinforced, from 1951, by my promotion to the grade of Chargé de Recherches. Again, one year ago, with your express approval, the Commission manifested to me its accord both as to my previous work and as to my projects for 1959–1960, in proposing for me this time a promotion in level, which the Direction of the C.N.R.S. would be glad in its turn to accord. I hence believe that I have some reason to hope that my appeal, in view of a decision whose unexpected brutality one would not be able to contest, may be received favorably. Certainly, it could be that new members of the Commission have expressed or requested, as to the form of my publications, perfectly appropriate objections. But I would be eager, if one had provided me the possibility, to clarify more completely to the interested persons the conditions more and more difficult in which our research takes place, conditions that have made me think it indispensable to publish quickly what I could still save of the discoveries made ten years ago! Besides, I would be eager to conform, for the continuation of my publications, to the directives that could have easily been given to me after a complete examination of the problem. Perhaps one would want to take account of that,
and suspend the measure of which I had been notified, in permitting me to prove that I am both able to provide basic research and to produce minute editions that—as you know—I have prepared long ago. If nonetheless my appeal would be rejected, I would not fail to make an appeal, to the full extent that I have the right, to the competent administrative jurisdictions. I do not believe that the C.N.R.S. can invoke blame on me, and my firing presents too much the figure of a paradox, at the same time that a statute comes into force whose official objective is to prevent such dismissals.

I hence hope, with all my heart, that you would be so kind as to provide your support to the request for appeal, addressed to the General Director of the C.N.R.S., the text of which I have just submitted to Virolleaud. The case has to do with the approvals that you yourself have not ceased to accord for the continuation of my work (and this without taking into account, at a given moment, the personal disagreements that, by the way, have pained me very much). Your silence and your abstention from testifying would be so full of consequences that, well persuaded on my part of not having committed against you any fault that justified a comparable refusal, I would believe it necessary to bring to light the reasons and the nature of the complaints that you could have with regard to me, no longer by me explaining personally to you, as I have hoped for it up to the present, but by soliciting the mediation of a jurisdiction, scientific or otherwise, that would be in the position to recognize what has been my part in the discovery and first identification of certain texts, and in what very contestable conditions I have been brutally eliminated from their publication.

Puech does seem to have come ultimately to Doresse’s support, to judge by Doresse’s letter of gratitude written on 7 January 1961:142

142 7 i 61: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je tiens, avant tout, à vous exprimer encore ma plus vive reconnaissance pour ce que vous avez bien voulu faire afin de rétablir, auprès du CNRS, la situation de laquelle dépend la poursuite des travaux que j’ai engagés depuis tant d’années. ...

L’aide que M. Lejeune veut bien me proposer par votre intermédiaire m’apporte, sur le plan moral, un grand réconfort en me manifestant que le CNRS n’entend point m’abandonner. Toutefois je souhaite, du point de vue financier, qu’elle soit suffisante pour nous permettre de vivre à peu près en paix jusqu’au jour où je retrouverai une situation normale. ... J’ajoute que c’est seulement à partir de ma promotion au second échelon de Chargé de Recherches que j’avais enfin commencé d’être entièrement libéré d’inquiétudes matérielles. Or, aujourd’hui, j’ai à faire vivre, outre moi-même, deux autres personnes. Je souhaite donc que M. Lejeune puisse me rendre existence et travail aussi faciles que possible jusqu’au jour où je pourrai retrouver mes fonctions de Chargé de Recherches ou quelque poste équivalent—ce pourquoi je ferai tous les efforts que l’on voudra bien me conseiller.
I want above all to express to you again my most vivid gratitude for what you have had the kindness to do so as to reestablish, with the C.N.R.S., the situation on which the continuation of the work in which I have been engaged for so many years depends. ... 

The assistance that Lejeune is kind enough to propose to me by your intervention provides for me, on the level of morale, a great reassurance, in manifesting to me that the C.N.R.S. does not at all intend to abandon me. Nonetheless I hope, from the financial point of view, that it be sufficient to permit us to live more or less in peace until the time when I resume a normal situation. ... I add that it is only since my promotion to the second level of Chargé de Recherches that I have finally begun to be entirely liberated from material uncertainties. For, today, I have to provide for, other than myself, two other persons. Hence I hope that Lejeune can render my existence and work as easy as possible, until the day when I can find again my functions of Chargé de Recherches or some equivalent position—this is why I will take all the steps that one would want to advise me.

But on 18 January 1961 he was still waiting: 143

I have not yet received the least news of the intentions of the C.N.R.S. with regard to me. Given the urgency of the work that I have to pursue for the moment, I would like to be assured that something adequate will be done, in the immediate future, for my material situation.

Some months later Doresse again wrote Puech for support, with more encouraging news: 144

---

143 18 i 61: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je n'ai pas encore la moindre nouvelle des intentions du CNRS à mon égard. Étant donnée l'urgence des travaux que j'ai à poursuivre pour le moment, je souhaiterais être assuré que quelque chose de suffisant sera fait, dans l'immédiat, pour ma situation matérielle.

144 5 v 61: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

Je joins enfin à cet envoi une copie du bref rapport que je destine, avec quelques documents à "l'appui, au CNRS. J'ai appris que mon cas serait inscrit au programme de la prochaine Commission. J'avais en effet écrit à M. le Directeur Général, d'une part pour exprimer ma gratitude des mesures prises en ma faveur, mais aussi, d'autre part, pour dire que je souhaiterais réintégrer la catégorie des chercheurs lorsque cela paraîtrait opportun. Je souhaite surtout que la Commission, sans aller jusqu'à se "dégager," daigne prendre connaissance, maintenant, de façon plus complète qu'elle n'avait pu le faire en l'absence de Monsieur Schaeffer, du caractère scientifique précis de mes travaux et de l'aide non seulement matérielle mais aussi morale que la poursuite de ces recherches peut nécessiter. Je n'ai trouvé, auprès des membres de la Commission auxquels j'ai exposé mon cas, que bienveillance et attention et vous m'avez vous-même manifesté la plus grande bienveillance en m'apportant l'aide la plus efficace. Je crois donc pouvoir me confier au jugement de la Commission.
Finally, I add to this mailing a copy of the brief report that I prepare, with a few documents in support, for the C.N.R.S. I have learned that my case would be written into the program of the next meeting of the Commission. I had in effect written to the Director General, on the one hand to express my gratitude for the measures taken on my behalf, but also, on the other hand, to say that I would like to be integrated into the category of researchers when that would seem opportune. I especially hope that the Commission, without going as far as to ‘reverse’ its position, would see fit to become aware, now, in a more complete way than it could do it in the absence of Schaeffer, of the precise scientific character of my work, and of the aid not only material but also moral that the continuation of these researches may necessitate. I have only found, among the members of the Commission to whom I have laid out my case, good will and attention, and you yourself have manifested to me the greatest good will, by providing me the most effective assistance. Hence I think I can entrust myself to the judgment of the Commission.

Schaeffer must have been the absent member of the Commission mentioned earlier by Doresse when it reached its negative conclusion, since Schaeffer told me personally that he had on occasion come to the support of Doresse over against Puech. Schaeffer gave me his copy of Doresse’s *Les Livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte*, with Doresse’s handwritten dedication: “To Mr. C.F.A. Schaeffer, Member of the Institute, very respectful hommage, Jean Doresse.”

After a meeting of the Commission of the C.N.R.S. that apparently provided some support for Doresse, he wrote Puech on returning from some months in London the customary thank-you note:

I left for London immediately after the meeting of the Commission, and I only now have returned to Fontenay-aux-Roses. I intended to write you from there, to express to you my very great gratitude.

But Doresse still wrote Puech from Ethiopia as late as 18 February 1963, hoping to be able to resume his functions at the C.N.R.S.:
The Imperial Government [of Ethiopia], at the moment we were finally going to take a leave, intervened with the Quai d’Orsay to ask that I be maintained at its disposition. This meant that I had to return to Ethiopia, without having been able to resume my functions at the C.N.R.S., after passing a few weeks in Europe. The Direction of the Relations Culturelles et Techniques had assured me at the time that what was necessary would be done so that my ‘leave of absence’ would be prolonged. But these steps have been accomplished too late, and, apparently, without consideration for the administrative problems posed by my situation at the C.N.R.S. The result is that, for my next return, I have to apply, still again, for a ‘reintegration’ that, I hope, one will be kind enough to accord to me early enough for our material existence to be assured, with the possibility of resuming my activities—from our next return on.

But, in effect, Doresse was never able to shift back from Ethiopia to Egypt as the center of his research. Puech replaced him as the French coptologist with Malinine for the Jung Codex and with Guillaumont for The Gospel of Thomas, along with excluding him from the International Committee of Gnosticism of 1956 and the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices of UNESCO of 1970. And Quispel was successful in replacing Doresse with himself as Puech’s closest Nag Hammadi associate.

7. Quispel’s Retrospect

Years later (in 1977) Quispel wrote me in retrospect a letter reflecting the ambivalence on all sides involved in the Brill publication of The Gospel of Thomas, in which he had nonetheless played the major rôle:

> Brill has not corresponded with an author, when he wrote to Pahor Labib. ... I do remember that Brill became nervous because Labib did not answer any letters or messages. ... I do remember how I received the proofs with Pahor’s corrections in red ink. I do remember that he definitely did not give the green light to Brill, who

---

\[148\] 18 ii 77: Letter from Quispel to Robinson.
was very anxious to publish after Cullmann's lecture on Thomas in New York. I think we had the authorization for publication from the committee, and brought out a provisional text and translation at the insistence of Brill, who was keen to earn money. Nevertheless, it was considered the 'official edition' also by us. Puech should have accepted my proposal to mention Labib. ...

B.A. van Proosdij, employee of Brill, told me, wrongly, that Pahor wanted Yassa's name to be replaced. This I never accepted. ... Doresse sent a telegram to the *Evening News*, reserving all rights (which he did not have), and [Doresse sent] the letter to Brill, in which he said the edition was not legal because he had not given his permission, which is nonsense.

By hindsight it seems strange that Puech was so worried. But at that moment there was a nervous uncertainty. Brill and the *Evening News* took Doresse seriously and Puech is afraid of everything. Even acquittal in a lawsuit on plagiarism is not pleasant.
CHAPTER EIGHT

THE GERMAN LEADERSHIP IN NAG HAMMADI STUDIES

The first direct contacts of German scholarship with the Nag Hammadi codices came through the distinguished Copt Murad Kamil, who had a doctorate from Germany and a teaching position as ‘habilitated’ at a German university, in both cases the University of Tübingen. While participating in the Twenty-Fourth International Congress of Orientalists held in Munich in August 1957, he made preliminary plans with Alexander Böhlig for Böhlig to visit Egypt and participate in the publication of the Nag Hammadi codices; and Murad Kamil received on the same occasion an offer from Rolf Ibscher for the latter to come to Cairo to conserve them.

But it was the publication in 1956 of Pahor Labib’s volume of photographs that gave the Germans hope of getting involved in publishing German translations of Nag Hammadi tractates, even without personal contact, as soon as they could obtain copies of that volume, which only became possible in 1958.

Especially the breaking of diplomatic relations between Egypt and France as a result of the Suez crisis in 1956 made it possible for Germans from the German Democratic Republic to go to Cairo and get more directly involved. This was facilitated by the fact that Pahor Labib, the Director of the Coptic Museum, had received his doctorate from the Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität of Berlin located in what was to become the capital of the German Democratic Republic. The French were able to re-enter the scene only by involving UNESCO, based in Paris and hence dependent on French scholars as their consultants. Thus they could internationalize Nag Hammadi studies in such a way that would include the French in a leadership rôle.

---

1 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/col/7/ref/collection/nha/id/1557.
Furthermore, the German Democratic Republic was at the time not recognized by UNESCO, and hence its citizens could not be named to UNESCO committees. Yet scholars in the German Democratic Republic became involved in Nag Hammadi research in the period prior to the involvement of UNESCO.

1. The Germans Who Were Involved

**Johannes Leipoldt and Hans-Martin Schenke**

Johannes Leipoldt, the senior coptologist of the German Democratic Republic, joined with Hans-Martin Schenke, then a beginning coptologist, to gain access to and then to publish translations of Nag Hammadi tractates, whenever they might become accessible. Schenke has described their entry into Nag Hammadi studies as follows:

---


Als “Steinzeit” kann einem diese frühe Phase der Nag-Hammadi-Forschung, in der Leipoldt eine so bedeutende Rolle spielen sollte, schon erscheinen, wenn man von der Gegenwart auf sie zurückblickt. ... 

This early phase of Nag Hammadi research in which Leipoldt was to play such a significant rôle can indeed be perceived as the ‘stone age,’ when looked back on from the present. ...

One knew of the discovery and of its great significance. But in practice one did not get to the texts. Leipoldt, and also other significant coptologists, who seemed predestined for the rôle of opening up these writings, simply gained no access. Many were especially electrified by the news that in one of the codices (now numbered as Codex II) the Gospel of Thomas was contained in its entirety, of which up until then only three Greek fragments from Oxyrhynchus were known. Finally, the news came that in Egypt a photographic edition of a part of the Nag Hammadi find, containing the Gospel of Thomas, had appeared (Pahor Labib, *Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo*, Volume I, Cairo, Government Press, 1956). Leipoldt was carried away. For him it was immediately clear that he must translate *The Gospel of Thomas*. For my part, I was more interested in the genuinely Gnostic texts that were said to be contained there. So far—so good! But it still did not work. For this book was in practice unattainable in Europe, for reasons that up until now I still do not understand. We could not get hold of it. Complaints also came, for example, from Great Britain. The colleagues there had the same difficulties. In this situation Leipoldt and I formed a kind of ‘emergency team’: The one of us who might first have luck, would immediately inform the other, and make available for him as fast as possible the texts that interested him. What all Leipoldt may have attempted I do not know. I even involved a specialized book dealer of West Berlin—without success. The ‘old master’ of Egyptian lexicography from the Academy of Sciences, Hermann Grapow, wrote a letter on my behalf to Pahor Labib, who had earlier studied in Berlin with him, with the request after all to send him a copy of the book. This letter did indeed have success, but only much later. Finally I actually had luck. Martin Krause (Professor of Coptology in Münster), who then was still employed in the Egyptian Section of the State Museums in Berlin, took a business trip to Egypt and brought for him and for me a copy of this literary rarity. I did not even first go home


See also the eulogies listed there, *Evangelische Monatsschrift* 8 (1980): 341.
with the book, but straight to VEB Halox, which then had a branch in the
State Library, to have a film of plates 80 to 99 made for Leipoldt. In my pocket
calendar of 1958 there stands at 20 February the entry: Microfilm sent by
express mail to Prof. Leipoldt. Thereupon I received a letter from him whose
content only read: ‘Matthew 25:40’ [‘Truly, I say to you, as you did it to one
of the least of my brethren, you did it to me.’] Of the many letters that in the
course of time I had already received and would still receive from Leipoldt,
this was the one that moved me most—naturally also the most original. For
Leipoldt was also an original.

Leipoldt and Schenke decided not to publish transcriptions:

... to leave priority for the Director of the Museum [Pahor Labib].

The facsimiles in Pahor Labib’s volume were also often not clear enough
for reliable transcriptions. But translations were published, by Leipoldt of
II,2, and by Schenke of II,4, II,3, and II,5a. Thus by early 1959, more first
translations of Nag Hammadi tractates had been published in the German
Democratic Republic than in any other state. All (except the last) were

The German Democratic Republic was authorized to send from 28 January
1959 until the middle of March a scholarly delegation consisting of
Johannes Leipoldt, Alexander and Gertrud Böhlig, Rolf Ibscher, and Siegfried
Morenz to the United Arab Republic. This mission was no doubt made
possible by the prominence of Leipoldt, who was a Delegate in the Volk-
skammer of the German Democratic Republic; indeed the departure date
was deferred until the completion of his (successful) reelection campaign.
The delegation reached the Coptic Museum on 2 February 1959.

---

4 Johannes Leipoldt, OLZ 61 (1966): 374, regarding Schenke’s translation of II,3:
... um dem Museumsdirektor den Vortritt zu lassen.

5 Johannes Leipoldt, “Ein neues Evangelium? Das koptische Thomasevangelium über-
setzt und besprochen,” ThLZ 83 (July 1958): 481–496.

6 Hans-Martin Schenke, “‘Das Wesen der Archonten’: Eine gnostische Originalschrift aus

7 Hans-Martin Schenke, “‘Das Evangelium nach Philippus’: Ein Evangelium der Valen-

8 Hans-Martin Schenke, “‘Vom Ursprung der Welt’: Eine titellose gnostische Abhandlung

9 Johannes Leipoldt and Hans-Martin Schenke, Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den
Papyrus-Codices von Nag-Hamadi (ThF 20; Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich Evangelischer
Verlag, 1960).

10 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1395; http://ccdl
Contact with the Coptic Museum was facilitated by the fact that its Director, Pahor Labib, was, like Alexander Böhlig, not only a pupil of Kurt Sethe, but also of Hermann Grapow (1885–1967), Director of the Institut für Orientforschung of the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (at the time named Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR). Pahor Labib wrote in appreciation for Grapow in a Geleitwort to the editio princeps of II,5 that he and Böhlig published; Böhlig wrote similarly in the Preface:

The editors owe special thanks to their honored teacher, the Director of the Institut für Orientforschung of the German Academy of Sciences in Berlin, Prof. Dr. H. Grapow, who had the work taken up into the publications of the Institut für Orientforschung, as well as to the Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, which took over the printing with very generous conditions.

Grapow was a Guest Professor in Cairo in 1960–1961. Henri-Charles Puech resented not having been the one invited! Furthermore Hans Stock (1908–1966), then Director of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut in Cairo where Krause stayed in 1958 and Morenz in 1959, had, like Böhlig, been on a first-name basis with Pahor Labib since their student days together in Germany. In fact the delegation from the German Democratic Republic did gain access to the Nag Hammadi codices, even though normal diplomatic relations did not yet exist between the two states (it was first formalized in July 1969).

---

11 Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib, *Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi* (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung 58; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962), in the "Geleitwort" by Pahor Labib, 5:

Besonderen Dank schulden die Herausgeber ihrem verehrten Lehrer, dem Direktor des Instituts für Orientforschung der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Herrn Professor Dr. H. Grapow, der die Arbeit unter die Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Orientforschung aufnehmen ließ, sowie dem Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, der unter sehr großzügigen Bedingungen die Drucklegung übernommen hat.

12 Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib, *Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi* (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung 58; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962), in the "Vorwort" by Alexander Böhlig, 7:

Weiter gilt mein aufrichtiger Dank unserem gemeinsamen verehrten Lehrer, Herrn Professor Dr. Hermann Grapow, der als Direktor des Instituts für Orientforschung der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin die Arbeit in die Veröffentlichung des Instituts aufnahm.
Leipoldt was permitted to collate his transcription of *The Gospel of Thomas* (II,2). For in his translation that had just been published he had commented:\(^{13}\)

He who has the good fortune to be able to look at the manuscript itself will no doubt be able to read a few more letters than could I.

But this translation was followed by a brief article in which he said:\(^{14}\)

Thanks to the friendly permission of Dr. Pahor Labib, the Director of the Coptic Museum in Old-Cairo, I could at the beginning of 1959 consult the papyrus piece that contains the Gospel of Thomas, and thus correct my first translation (*ThLZ* 1958, col. 481ff.).

In the publication of tractates from Codex II together with Schenke he reported similarly:\(^{15}\)

When I was in Cairo at the beginning of 1959, Pahor Labib gave me permission to consult the manuscript, for which I am very grateful. Only in this way were many readings achieved and made certain. The black ink contrasts well with the brown papyrus.

He then published a complete edition in which he repeated:\(^{16}\)

---


Wer das Glück hat, die Handschrift selbst einzusehen, wird wohl einige Buchstaben mehr lesen können als ich.


\(^{15}\) Johannes Leipoldt and Hans-Martin Schenke, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag-Hamadi*, (ThF 20; Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich Evangelischer Verlag, 1960), 9:

Als ich Anfang 1959 in Kairo war, gab mir Pahor Labib dankenswerterweise die Erlaubnis, die Handschrift zu vergleichen. Dadurch erst wurden manche Lesarten gewonnen und sichergestellt: die schwarze Tinte hebt sich von dem braunen Papyrus gut ab.

\(^{16}\) Johannes Leipoldt, *Das Evangelium nach Thomas: Koptisch und Deutsch* (TU 101; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967), 23:

Der Museumsdirektor Labib erlaubte mir, den Text des Thomas zu vergleichen (Februar 1959).

A similar comment is made in the same volume in the ‘Vorbemerkung’ by the ‘Kommission für spätantike Religionsgeschichte.’
The Museum Director Labib permitted me to consult the text of *Thomas* (February 1959).

After Leipoldt’s death (22 February 1965), Schenke read the manuscript and saw to it that it was published. He then proceeded to found the *Berliner Arbeitskreis für Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften* and, after the reunification of Germany, to play an active rôle both at Québec’s *Bibliothèque coppte de Nag Hammadi* and Claremont’s Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity.

**Alexander Böhlig**

Alexander Böhlig was a student at the *Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität* of Berlin from 1930–1934, working primarily under Kurt Sethe (1869–1934); he received a Dr. Phil. from Sethe and Hermann Grapow in 1934 and a Dr. Theol. from the *Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität* of Münster under R. Stupperich in 1947. He had become involved with the Nag Hammadi codices as early as 1957:

As a result of the war events of 1956 and the breaking off of diplomatic relations with England and France, one sought new collaborators. The invitation to me was first made orally. Of course Murad Kamil had discussed it with Pahor Labib, who was not present at the 1957 congress. Besides, other scholars were invited at that time, for example Giversen.

Once in Cairo, Böhlig was invited by Pahor Labib to join with him in editing II,5. Böhlig transcribed the text and turned in a copy to Pahor Labib while

---


19 4 v 77: Letter from Böhlig to Robinson:


still in Egypt. When approached in 1961 by Hans-Martin Schenke for access to the latter part of II, Böhlig clarified the limited nature of access as follows:

But since, as has now become clear, it has to do after all with constitutive parts of the work, I do not believe I am authorized to provide you the requested look into the manuscript on my own authority. It after all is a matter of shared work, and indeed not with you, but with Professor Labib. He earlier proposed to me to work on the manuscript together with him. I would like to make clear in this connection that I, in turn, obtained no insight into the texts that Professor Labib works on with Dr. Krause, except insofar as it had to do with purely organizational and type-setting questions (as is also mentioned in my Preface). Dr. Krause has received or requested just as little insight into the manuscript composed by Professor Labib and myself. In order to be able to lay the text before you and authorize you to use it, one would need the special approval of my colleague Professor Labib, especially since the second photographic volume has not yet appeared, in which the rights for editing and translating will be explicitly contingent upon the approval of the relevant authorities.

Böhlig’s Preface repeated:

reprinted in his collected essays Mysterion und Wahrheit: Gesammelte Beiträge zur späta-
tiken Religionsgeschichte (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des späteren Judentums und des Urchris-
tentums 6; ed. Otto Michel; Leiden: Brill, 1968), 135; similarly in Alexander Böhlig, "Gnostische Probleme in der titellosen Schrift des Codex II von Nag Hammadi," Mysterion und Wahrheit,

22 2 xii 61: Letter from Schenke to Böhlig.
23 9 xii 61: Letter from Böhlig to Schenke:


Ich hatte leider auch nicht die Möglichkeit, andere Teile des Codex im Original einzusehen. Deshalb war mir selbst nur wie allen Lesern der im Jahre 1956 erschienene
Unfortunately I too did not have the possibility to look at other parts of the codex in the original. Hence only the photographic book vol. I that appeared in the year 1956 was accessible to me for comparison, just as to all readers. For this reason I also had to refrain from a more profound comparative investigation of the linguistic material. Such an investigation will be fruitful only after the complete publication of Codex II.

Thus, though both Böhlig and Krause had received assignments from Pahor Labib, access even to the two of them was limited to their own assignments.

Böhlig was in Cairo from 20 February to 6 April 1960, at which time he had hoped to be assigned Codex VI, but was in fact offered Codex V. In view of the fact that Jean Doresse had already begun work on *Eugnostos the Blessed* in Codex III (Tractate 3), Böhlig did not want to seem to compete by publishing the copy of the same tractate in Codex V (Tractate 1). But he agreed to publish together with Pahor Labib V, 2-5, of which he received photographs later that year through the German Archaeological Institute in Cairo. From 12 December 1960 to 18 April 1961 Böhlig was again in Cairo, where he was invited to participate in the centennial celebration of the Institut d’Égypte by presenting an English lecture.²⁵ He was again in Cairo from 16 March to 18 May 1962, working on his assignments. Böhlig and Pahor Labib published V,2-5 in 1963.²⁶

**Rolf Ibscher**

Rolf Ibscher had developed a technique for conserving papyrus codices leaf by leaf in pliable transparent cotton chiffon, thus permitting them to be rebound and thus retain the codex form. He exemplified this technique on a Demotic papyrus document in the Chester Beatty collection, and then in the summer of 1956 wrote to the Coptic Museum offering to conserve the Nag Hammadi codices with this technique. He, like Böhlig, took advantage of the Congress of Orientalists in 1957 to seek to achieve his goal through Murad

---


Kamil, an initiative he then followed up by sending samples of his work to Cairo for Murad Kamil and Pahor Labib to examine. He also made use of the good offices of Walter Till and Gilles Quispel. For Till wrote Quispel in this regard:

These days I received a letter from Dr. Rolf Ibscher. I do not know if you know him. He is the son of the well-known Berlin papyrus restorer Dr. Hugo Ibscher, who died during the war. The son also has been for some time a papyrus restorer.

At the Orientalist Congress in Munich, Murad Kamil was approached, and Dr. Ibscher declared himself ready to restore the Gnostic papyri in the Coptic Museum of Old Cairo. The question of money as compensation should be worked out with the East German government. In my view that is purely a matter for the Museum. The International Committee can only be happy if good progress is made in the work of restoration. ...

Incidentally, this whole matter seems to have been drawn up in an unfortunate way. In any case, it is now stuck somewhere, and Ibscher would like very much to get it moving. He asks me for advice, as to what he should do. ...

The work of restoration on the other hand should be a matter of the Museum and not of the Committee. But nonetheless the Committee, or you representing it, could welcome it if Ibscher would deal with the restoration. Perhaps Dr. Ibscher will address himself directly to you.

---

27 18 v 58: Letter from Till to Quispel:


Beim Orientalistenkongreß in München ist man an Murad Kamil herangetreten und Dr. Ibscher hat sich bereit erklärt, die gnostischen Papyri im Koptischen Museum von Alt-Kairo zu restaurieren. Die Geldfrage sollte durch Kompensation mit der Ostdeutschen Regierung geregelt werden. Das ist meines Erachtens eine rein museale Angelegenheit. Das internat. Komitee kann nur froh sein, wenn bei den Restaurierungsarbeiten ein guter Fortschritt gemacht wird. ...

Diese ganze Aktion scheint übrigens unglücklich aufgezogen worden zu sein. Jedenfalls steckt sie nun irgendwo und Ibscher möchte sie gerne flott machen. Er bittet mich um Rat, was er da machen soll. ...

Die Restaurierungsarbeiten dürften hingegen Sache des Museums und nicht des Komitees sein. Immerhin aber könnte das Komitee, oder Sie in seiner Vertretung, es begrüßen, wenn Ibscher mit dem Restaurieren befassen würde. Vielleicht wird sich Dr. Ibscher direkt an Sie wenden.
Ibscher did then address himself directly to Quispel:28

Professor Till wrote me some time ago that he wanted to write you and already indicate by and large what is involved.

I may assume that in the meantime he has done so, and would like once again for my part cordially to ask you to exert your influence on the Egyptians to entrust me with the restoration of the Nag Hammadi Codices according to my new procedure of imbedding [leaves] between silk chiffon, tested on the Codex Ravennatensis in Munich, by means of which the codex in question remains indeed preserved naturally in its original form, after being bound anew.

Professors Murad Kamil and Labib are now acquainted with sample pieces I sent to Cairo.

The difficulty for them lies in the fact that there seems to be no money able to pay for my stay. I would have found a formula for that, in that, first of all, my East German government would somehow pay for it. But perhaps there is another possibility through UNESCO.

Quispel did write to Pahor Labib on Ibscher’s behalf:29

Dr. Ibscher, Gosslerstr. 13, Göttingen, Germany wrote me about the project that he should help you to preserve your valuable codices by his new methods. Dr. Ibscher is an expert and a very able man whom I recommend to you: both Prof. Till and I would appreciate it if a way could be found to realize this project.

---

28 24 vi 58: Letter from Ibscher, then in Göttingen, to Quispel:

Herr Professor Till schrieb mir vor einiger Zeit, er wolle an Sie schreiben und schon im Großen und Ganzen angeben, worum es sich handelt.

Ich darf nun annehmen, daß er es inzwischen getan hat und möchte Sie noch einmal von mir aus herzlich bitten, Ihren Einfluß geltend zu machen, daß die Ägypter mir die Restaurierung der Nag Hammadi-Codices nach meinem neuen am Codex Ravennatensis in München erprobten Verfahren des Zwischen-Chiffonseide-Bettens zu übertragen, wodurch der betreffende Codex natürlich in seiner ursprünglichen Form nach neuem Einbinden eben erhalten bleibt.

Die Herren Professoren Murad Kamil und Labib kennen jetzt Modellstücke, die ich nach Cairo schickte.

Die Schwierigkeit für sie liegt darin, daß man kein Geld zu haben scheint, um meine Aufenthalte bezahlen zu können. Dafür hätte ich eine Formel gefunden, indem erst einmal meine Ostdeutsche Regierung das irgendwie bezahlt. Möglichwerweise aber gibt es vielleicht eine andere Möglichkeit durch die UNESCO.

29 11 vii 58: Letter from Quispel to Pahor Labib.
When Till wrote Ibscher to inquire about his availability to restore the Jung Codex in Zürich, Ibscher welcomed this initiative as a step toward the conservation of the Codices in Cairo:30

A few days ago I received a letter from Professor Till with regard to the Zurich Codex of the Nag Hammadi discovery. You [Meier] will understand that the inquiry transmitted to me seems to me like a sign from heaven, that, in spite of all impediments, I may yet have my wish fulfilled to restore also the Nag Hammadi discovery in Cairo, according to my new procedure, so that it remains preserved in a book-lover’s way.

The mission of the delegation from the German Democratic Republic to Cairo took place just as Ibscher was finishing the exemplification of his method on a complete codex in Berlin, the Achmimic Proverbs codex, which delayed his arrival in Cairo until 12 February 1959.31

Now, after having seen these [Nag Hammadi] leaves in Cairo in the spring of 1959, I know that my procedure guarantees the sole possibility to restore again...
this precious discovery professionally in such a way that it could survive the
next centuries without danger. At the same time it would again be an aesthetic
sign for sore eyes, in contrast to the second-class method of conservation
now being used, which must from now on rather come across as dilettantism,
since a procedure more appropriate to the material has been found, which
circumvents the dubious use of plexiglass, i.e. a new incalculable source of
danger: ... 

Precisely this eminent requirement ['an absolute claim to the best possible
treatment'] is also what the Nag Hamadi discovery imperatively poses, with
its many texts standing out from the light papyrus with wonderful clarity, texts
that fulfill such a method of an especially obliging kind, joining itself with the
material and, as it were, blending into it, imperatively as the only suitable
treatment, and where it now can be designated as a dilettantic sinning over
against these objects, if, for such royal patients, a second-class method of
conservation that seems outdated were to be applied.

Krause has reported that Ibscher was permitted by the Coptic Museum
to experiment on irrelevant papyrus,\(^{32}\) to the effect that, already in a few
days, the papyrus had holes from the chewing of parasites, which led to the
rejection of his policy.\(^{33}\)

Victor Girgis had given Ibscher a papyrus on which his method was to be
tested. Already after a few days the papyrus showed holes from parasite
chewing, and hence his procedure was rejected by the Copts.

Böhlig however wrote a rebuttal on Ibscher’s behalf:\(^ {34}\)

Incidentally, it should also be noted that the Egyptians did not store appro-
priately the document he conserved with chiffon silk. As a matter of fact they
laid it simply in a drawer, instead of putting it first in a container, as Ibscher
had called for. So it was no wonder that worms nested in it.

\(^{32}\) http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1577; http://ccdl
 .libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1568.

\(^{33}\) 26 iii 77: Letter from Krause to Robinson:

Viktor Girgis hatte Ibscher einen Papyrus gegeben, an dem seine Methode geprüft
werden sollte. Bereits nach einigen Tagen wies der Papyrus Löcher durch Parasitenfraß
auf, deshalb wurde sein Verfahren von den Kopten abgewiesen.

\(^{34}\) 12 iv 77: Letter from Böhlig to Robinson:

Übrigens ist dazu noch zu bemerken, daß die Ägypter die von ihm mit Chiffonseide
konservierte Urkunde nicht sachgemäß aufbewahrt haben; sie legten sie nämlich
einfach in eine Schublade, anstatt sie, wie Ibscher es gefordert hatte, zunächst in eine
Kassette zu tun; da war es kein Wunder, daß sich Würmer einnisteten.
In an extensive report on the progress that had been made in publishing the Nag Hammadi Codices, Böhlig expressed his regrets that Ibscher’s procedure was not permitted.\textsuperscript{35}

The offer of R[olf] Ibscher, papyrus conservator of the Academy of Sciences of the DDR, to restore again into book form, by means of a restoration procedure he has developed, the volumes suited for it, was turned down. Perhaps the time for that was also still too early.

Ibscher’s method had in view the aesthetic advantage of restoring a codex so that it resembled a real book, a clear advantage for the collector who cherished it as a treasured artifact in one’s collection. But it might have rendered ink on the edges of lacunae less legible (by filling the lacunae with a liquid that would dry to resemble papyrus), and would have made it more-or-less impossible to insert subsequently identified fragments into the thus-filled lacunae on the leaf to which they belonged. Hence the conservation of the individual leaves between panes of plexiglass, while eliminating the appearance of a codex, did serve better the academic needs of scholarship.

\textit{Martin Krause}

Martin Krause studied under Siegfried Morenz (1914–1970) from 1949 to 1954; he received a Dr. Phil. from the \textit{Humboldt-Universität} in Berlin under Fritz Hintze on 29 June 1956 and a Dr. Theol. from the \textit{Karl Marx-Universität} in Leipzig under Johannes Leipoldt on 15 October 1958. He also worked on a volunteer basis from May 1952 to September 1953, and then as a \textit{Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter} from 15 July 1954 to 31 October 1958, in the \textit{Ägyptische Abteilung} of the \textit{Staatliche Museen} in Berlin. He described his next period of travels as follows:\textsuperscript{36}


Das Angebot von R. Ibscher, Papyruskonservator der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, die dafür geeigneten Bände mittels eines von ihm entwickelten Restaurierungsverfahrens wieder in Buchform herzustellen, wurde abgelehnt; vielleicht war damals die Stunde dafür auch noch zu früh.

\textsuperscript{36} 26 iii 77: Letter from Krause to Robinson:

Vom Dezember 1957 bis März 1958 nahm ich teil an dem Survey de Butana (im Sudan) durch die Humboldt-Universität Berlin unter Leitung meines Berliner Lehrers
From December 1957 until March 1958 I took part in the survey of Butana (in the Sudan) by the Humboldt University of Berlin under the leadership of my Berlin teacher F. Hintze, then I spent April 1958 in Egypt and also almost 3 weeks in Cairo, where I lived in the west-German Archaeological Institute. I advised the German diplomatic representative in the East-German “Business Mission” [euphemism for Embassy, since there were at that time no diplomatic relations between East Germany and Egypt] to make it possible for scholars from the DDR [German Democratic Republic of East Germany] to visit for study in Egypt, which then took place in the Spring of 1959. In April 1958 I bought in the Coptic Museum a number of copies of Pahors volume of plates for which Leipoldt and Schenke had asked me. Making use of these, both have then made their translations of the tractates of Codex II.

On 1 November 1958 Krause assumed a position at the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut in Cairo, which he held from November 1958 through February 1963. He summarized this period as follows:

I was employed five years at the German Archaeological Institute in Cairo, and the task I was assigned there was to work on Coptic texts. I decided for the Gnostic texts, and have brought it about that the German Archaeological Institute provided plexiglass, so that the texts, which until then lay, with but few exceptions, in a leather suitcase, and on which nothing was taking place, were first glassed. And indeed they were all glassed in the sequence in which they were found, and I transcribed all the texts as they were glassed.


Ich bin von berufswegen 5 Jahre am Deutschen Archäologischen Institut in Kairo gewesen und die Aufgabe, die ich dort bekam, war, an koptischen Texten zu arbeiten. Ich habe mich für die gnostischen Texte entschieden und habe erreicht, daß das Deutsche Archäologische Institut Plexiglas zur Verfügung gestellt hat, damit die Texte, die bisher mit wenigen Ausnahmen in einem Lederkoffer lagen und an denen nichts geschah, überhaupt erst einmal verglast wurden. Und zwar wurden sie alle in der vorgefundenen Reihenfolge verglast, und beim Verglasen habe ich sämtliche Texte abgeschrieben.
When the delegation from the German Democratic Republic arrived at the Coptic Museum early in 1959, they found Krause there at work transcribing the already-conserved parts of the codices.  

On 10 January 1959, the Director of the Coptic Museum in Cairo, Dr. Pahor Labib, accorded me the authorization to transcribe all 13 codices of Nag Hammadi. After I had transcribed the codices that were at that time glassed, III and II, pages 1–110, he announced that he was in agreement to conserve also the remaining, still unglassed, part of the manuscript discovery between panes of plexiglass. This shared work, in which also Victor Girgis participated as specialist for papyrus conservation, and which lasted until 1961, ... brought us close to each other.

Hans Stock worked out with Pahor Labib an arrangement for the conservation of the leaves and fragments of the Nag Hammadi codices between panes of plexiglass according to specifications provided by Krause. On 5 May 1959, 800 panes were ordered from the firm Rohm and Hass; they arrived at the Museum on 6 August, and the conservation began on 10 August. Later 500 more panes were supplied, so that the conservation could be completed by the summer of 1961.

In 1960 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib reported on this activity as follows:

---


Am 10. Januar 1959 erteilte mir der Direktor des Koptischen Museums zu Kairo, Herr Dr. Pahor Labib, die Genehmigung zur Abschrift aller 13 Codices von Nag Hammadi. Nachdem ich die damals verglasten Codices III und II Seite 1–110 abgeschrieben hatte, erklärte er sich einverstanden, auch den übrigen, noch unverglasten Teil des Handschriftenfundes zwischen Plexiglasscheiben zu konservieren. Diese gemeinsame Arbeit, an der sich auch Victor Girgis als Fachmann für Papyruskonservierung beteiligte und die bis 1961 andauerte, ... haben uns einander nahegebracht. ...


40 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, in the part printed in 1960, 1, 5–6:

The preliminary work on the present publication began in the Spring of 1959, after the Director of the Coptic Museum in Old-Cairo, Dr. Pahor Labib, on 10 January 1959 accorded to the staff person for coptology at the German Archaeological Institute, Dr. Dr. Martin Krause, permission to transcribe the tractates of Codex II and III. After the Coptic Museum had received 800 plexiglass panes for 400 papyri on 6 August 1959 from the German Archaeological Institute, Victor Girgis glassed the fragments of Codex IV, and these could then next be transcribed.

On 20 October 1959, Dr. Pahor Labib proposed publishing first the three versions of The Apocryphon of John, and to publish only in the second volume the tractates already then ready to print, ‘The Exegesis on the Soul’ and ‘The Book of the Athlete Thomas.’ …

[5] Victor Girgis then placed between plexiglass panes and conserved Codex II and—after the German Archaeological Institute [6] in Cairo had acquired 800 plexiglass panes—also Codex IV and V, so that it became possible to work on them in a scholarly way. Codex III had already been previously conserved and protected by glass panes, which in the near future should be replaced by panes of plexiglass.

The role of Victor Girgis is also acknowledged in the Preface:41

We are also indebted to Victor Girgis, the Custos at the Coptic Museum in Old-Cairo, who glassed the codices and also came to the Coptic Museum on off-duty days and prepared the papyri of his department to be worked on, to speed up the process of our work.

Victor Girgis reported to me in December 1972 that he was assisted in this work by the Assistant Curator Zakhary.

41 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, “Vorwort” (without page number):

Zu Dank sind wir auch Herrn Viktor Girgis, dem Kustos am Koptischen Museum in Alt-Kairo, verpflichtet, der die Codices verglast hat und auch an dienstfreien Tagen ins Koptische Museum kam und die Papyri seiner Abteilung zur Bearbeitung bereitstellte, um den Fortgang unserer Arbeit zu beschleunigen.
To this extent a photograph of Krause and Pahor Labib attaching tape to seal the plexiglass panes enclosing a papyrus leaf is misleading, since they did not actually perform this work. Krause made transcriptions of the material as it was conserved, which must have been his main interest and occupation.

They provided the following information concerning individual codices:

Concerning Codex II, they provided the following information:43

The pages did not have page numbers. They were protected by a leather cover, from which they were taken in 1956 and put between panes of plexiglass.

Concerning Codex III, they provided the following information:44

The papyrus leaves were protected by a leather cover, from which they were taken after the purchase and put between panes of glass.

Concerning Codex IV, they provided the following information:45

The papyrus leaves were protected by a leather cover, from which they were taken in the autumn of 1959 and put, in the sequence in which they were found, between 76 panes of plexiglass.

Concerning Codex V, they provided the following information:46

---


43 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, 13:

Die Seiten waren nicht mit einer Seitenzahl versehen. Sie wurden durch einen Ledereinband geschützt, aus dem sie 1956 genommen und zwischen Plexiglasscheiben gelegt wurden.

44 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, 18:

Die Papyrusblätter wurden durch einen Ledereinband geschützt, aus dem sie nach dem Ankauf genommen und zwischen Glasscheiben gelegt wurden.

45 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, 21:

Die Papyrusblätter wurden durch einen Ledereinband geschützt, aus dem sie im Herbst 1959 genommen und in der vorgefundenen Reihenfolge zwischen 76 Plexiglasscheiben gelegt wurden.

46 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, 22:

The pages were protected by a leather cover, from which they were taken in 1960 by Victor Girgis and, in the sequence in which they were found, put between 88 panes of plexiglass.

Concerning Codex VI, they provided the following information:

The papyrus leaves are protected by a leather cover, in which they are still to be found, with the exception of pp. 1–12, which were put by Victor Girgis between panes of plexiglass.

Concerning Codex VII, they provided the following information:

The papyrus leaves were protected by a leather cover, from which they were taken in January 1961 and put between 128 panes of plexiglass. Only a few fragments are also in a box.

Concerning Codex VIII, they provided the following information:

While glassing, we noted in February 1961 that only 54 pages, pp. 1–26 and 113–140, had remained in the leather cover. All the other pages were, mostly broken into several pieces and no longer in the correct sequence, taken by the discoverers or middlemen and put in cellophane bags. On instruction from

---

47 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, 25:

Die Papyrusblätter werden durch einen Ledereinband geschützt, in dem sie sich noch befinden, mit Ausnahme von Seite 1–12, die von Viktor Girgis zwischen Plexiglasscheiben gelegt wurden.


Pahor Labib, Victor Girgis first separated pp. 1–26 from the leather cover. They received the plexiglass numbers 1–26. Then it was the turn for pp. 113–140. They received the plexiglass numbers 27–54. The fragments of the rest of the pages 27–112, which lay out of order in the cellophane bags, were glassed in the sequence in which they were found, and received the numbers 55–128.

Concerning Codex IX, they provided the following information:

The papyrus leaves were found in a leather cover, from which Victor Girgis took them in 1961, and put them between 72 panes of plexiglass.

Concerning Codex X, they provided the following information:

The papyrus leaves lay broken in fragments, loose and out of order in a leather cover, from which they were taken in October 1960, and put, in the sequence in which they were found, between 45 panes of plexiglass.

Concerning Codex XI, they provided the following information:

The papyrus leaves were found, in part loose and not in the right order, in a leather cover, from which they were taken in May and June 1961, and put, in the sequence in which they were found, between 92 panes of plexiglass.

Concerning Codex XII, they provided the following information:

---


Die Papyrusblätter befanden sich in einem Ledereinband, aus dem sie 1961 von Viktor Girgis genommen und zwischen 72 Plexiglasscheiben gelegt wurden.


Die Papyrusblätter lagen, in Stücke zerbrochen, lose und ungeordnet in einem Ledereinband, aus dem sie im Oktober 1960 genommen und in der vorgefundenen Reihenfolge zwischen 45 Plexiglasscheiben gelegt wurden.


Die Papyrusblätter befanden sich, z. T. lose und nicht in der richtigen Ordnung, in einem Ledereinband, aus dem sie im Mai und Juni 1961 genommen und in der vorgefundenen Reihenfolge zwischen 82 Plexiglasscheiben gelegt wurden.


Vom Ledereinband, der die Papyrusblätter einst schützte, sind nur noch die Leder-
From the leather cover, which once protected the papyrus leaves, only the leather thongs are retained [corrected, p. 236, to the effect that the thongs were from Codex II]. From the whole codex only a few pages and fragments are still extant. They were put in [13] April 1961 between 12 panes of plexiglass.

Concerning Codex XIII, they provided the following information:54

The papyrus leaves were put in February 1961 between 18 panes of plexiglass in the same sequence in which they were found.

In 1962 Krause and Pahor Labib reported that the completion of this conservation had taken place in the summer of 1961:55

After the German Archaeological Institute had made available to the Coptic Museum 500 further plexiglass panes, in addition to the 800 plexiglass panes, the glassing of all 13 codices could be completed in the summer of 1961.

The panes of plexiglass provided by the German Archaeological Institute were only large enough to accommodate a leaf, not a whole sheet of two conjugate leaves. Hence, when conjugate leaves were still joined to each other at the spine, and not broken (as was often the case), Victor Girgis, who had been sent to Italy to learn conservation technology, used his pocket knife to cut apart the conjugate leaves at the spine. In the conservation process, no record seems to have been made of conjugate leaves that were still joined, or any other such information that would have been very useful in the final conservation. In any case, no such information was supplied to the Technical Sub-Committee, of which Krause was a member and Pahor Labib an interested spectator, in its work of restoring fragments and conjugate leaves into the sheets that made up the codices. Indeed, by this time Victor Girgis was the Director of the Coptic Museum, but offered no information about his conservation. Information identifying conjugate leaves before they were

---


Die Papyrusblätter wurden im February 1961 in der vorgefundenen Reihenfolge zwischen 18 Plexiglasscheiben gelegt.


Nachdem das Deutsche Archäologische Institut dem Koptischen Museum außer den 800 Plexiglasscheiben weitere 500 zur Verfügung gestellt hatte, konnte die Verglasung aller 13 Codices im Sommer 1961 abgeschlossen werden.
cut apart would have been especially important when the sequence of leaves in one half of a quire is preserved, but not in the other. For when one knows what the conjugate leaves were, this make it possible to reconstruct the correct sequence of leaves in both halves of a fragmentary quire. Once we had obtained plexiglass containers large enough to conserve conjugate leaves together, we did join them back together, after we had established their location as best we could by other means, such as by the continuity of horizontal fibres.

In 1963 Krause described the very difficult work conditions involved in preparing his first volume, where he was under constant pressure from Pahor Labib to work rapidly. In preparing his second volume, he was able to move much more slowly, so as to find parallels in already published literature and to produce an inventory of Codices VII–XIII to correct Doresse’s inventory. But this facilitated primarily his work on his still unpublished Habilitationsschrift, entitled Literarische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Apokryphon des Johannes, which he hoped to complete by the following spring. As he wrote Schenke:

In contrast to the edition of The Apocryphon of John, which on the desire of Pahor Labib, and not to the advantage of the edition, had to be finished very rapidly (when Codex III went to press, I did not know the [parallel] text in Codex IV at all!), I leave myself for the second volume more time, and give a commentary for each tractate, which has cost and still costs me much time, on the one hand because the texts belong to different literary genres (for example, for the Acts of Peter I had to occupy myself very much in detail with the apocryphal Acts, to find parallels for topoi), on the other hand for all tractates of Codices VII–XIII I give a table of contents, and must there debate very much with J[ean] Doresse, whose listing of the contents of these texts was unfortunately often not correct. But this work had a rich harvest.

---

56 18 vi 63: Letter from Krause to Schenke.

for the third volume, for whose preparation I have received a grant from the German Forschungsgemeinschaft and which I will complete by next Spring as my habilitation on the theme “Literararische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Apokryphon des Johannes.”

In his review of Martin Krause and Pahor Labib's edition of The Apocryphon of John (II,1; III,1; IV,1), Schenke was able to report:\footnote{Schenke, OLZ 59 (1964): 552–553:}

Incidentally, in order to reach a correct evaluation of this edition, one must take into account what I first learned subsequently in a letter from K[rause]: It took place under quite unusually difficult conditions. For example, K[rause] was able to see Codex IV only after Codex III was already set in type. Then, at the request of Pahor Labib, the edition was supposed to appear as rapidly as possible, and yet unexpectedly dragged on over a long period of time. The manuscript went to press bit by bit; the fragments could not be joined together, etc.

This also serves to explain a problem in the edition of The Apocryphon of John to which Schenke drew attention:\footnote{Schenke, OLZ 59 (1964): 549:}

\footnotesize{In der einleitenden Erörterung über die drei Versionen des AJ (S. 37–53) findet sich innerhalb der Beschreibung der einzelnen Blätter und Fragmente relativ häufig eine mißliche Vertauschung in der Zählung der Fragmente zwischen Rekto und Verso ein und dasselbe Blatt; ein und dasselbe Fragment wird bei der Beschreibung der Vorderseite etwa als Nr. 1 gezählt, bei der Beschreibung der Rückseite aber etwa als Nr. 2. ... Diese Vertauschung hängt natürlich damit zusammen und kommt so zustande, daß K. die nur fragmentarisch erhaltenen Blätter, deren Fragmente bei der ersten vorläufigen Konservierung zwischen verschiedene Plexiglasscheiben geraten sind, nicht richtig zusammensetzen durfte, sondern sich mit dem Zusammensetzen der Photographien behelfen mußte (so wurden aus einem Blatt zwei gewissermaßen isolierte Seiten!) und daß K. in Zusammenhang damit und auch sonst die Fragmente nicht als Fragmente je eines Blattes mit Rekto und Verso betrachtet, sondern als Fragmente zweier isolierter Seiten, wobei er dann die Fragmente jeder Seite konsequent von links nach rechts zählt. K. versichert in einem an den Herausgeber gerichteten Schriftstück, wie ich nachträglich erfahren, diese nicht am Blatt, sondern an der Einzelseite orientierte Betrachtungs- und Zählweise mit ihren offenkundigen Nachteilen bewußt gewählt zu haben, und hält sie auch jetzt noch für das—unter den gegebenen Umständen—beste Verfahren.}
In the introductory discussion of the three versions of the Apocryphon of John (pp. 37–53), within the description of the individual leaves and fragments, there is relatively often a troublesome confusion in the numbering of the fragments between recto and verso of one and the same leaf. One and the same fragment is numbered, for example, as No. 1 in describing the front, but in describing the back as No. 2. ... Of course, this interchanging has to do with the fact that, and came to pass when, Krause was not permitted to put together correctly the leaves that were only fragmentarily extant, and whose fragments, at the first preliminary conservation, had gotten between different plexiglass panes, but he had to be content with just putting together the photographs (hence out of one leaf there became, as it were, two isolated pages!). It also has to do with the fact that in this context, as well as otherwise, Krause considered the fragments not as fragments each of a leaf with recto and verso, but rather as fragments of two isolated pages, whereby he then numbered the fragments of each page consistently from left to right. In a document directed to the editor, as I subsequently learn, Krause affirmed that he consciously chose this way of thinking and numbering, oriented not to the leaf, but rather to the individual page, with its obvious disadvantages, and considers it still the best procedure under the given circumstances. 

Though the title page lists 1962 as the date of publication, Rodolphe Kasser reported that it was actually published only in 1963:

... this work did not really leave the press until 1963.

In 1966 Krause summarized this period of conservation as follows:

While Codex III, the larger part of Codex II, and the Jung Codex were already conserved in 1957, the bulk of the find was glassed only between 1959 and the

---


... cet ouvrage n’est réellement sorti de presse qu’en 1963.


Während Codex III, der größere Teil von Codex II und der Jung Codex wurden schon 1957 konser-viert wurden, wurde die Hauptmasse des Fundes erst zwischen 1959 und Sommer 1961 verglast, nachdem dem Koptischen Museum in Kairo vom Deutschen Archäologischen Institut PLEXIGLAS zur Verfügung gestellt worden war. ... [89]

Ich hatte nie die Absicht, alle Texte zu veröffentlichen, denn das würde für einen einzelnene eine Arbeit von vielleicht 100 Jahren erfordern. Ich beabsichtigte daher, nur einige Texte zu veröffentlichen.
summer of 1961, after plexiglass had been put at the disposal of the Coptic Museum in Cairo by the German Archaeological Institute. ...

I never had the intention to publish all the texts, since that would, for an individual, require the work of perhaps 100 years. I hence intend publishing only some texts.

The texts that Krause intended to publish, and those that he has actually published, are listed in Part 3 below.

Johannes Irmscher and Peter Nagel

Johannes Irmscher, Director of the Institut für griechisch-römische Altertumskunde of the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin, and for a time Director in Böhlig’s stead of the Institut für Byzantinistik at the Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, visited Cairo late in 1964. There he obtained publication rights from Pahor Labib for the part of Codex I that was then at the Coptic Museum, though only on the condition that it be published together with the part of Codex I that was then in Zürich. Thereupon Irmscher wrote the Rascher Verlag proposing that Peter Nagel edit all the unpublished parts of Codex I, or the part in Cairo in collaboration with the editors already at work on the part in Zürich.\footnote{18 xii 64: Letter from Irmscher to Albert Rascher:}

\begin{quote}
Anläßlich meines Besuches im Koptischen Museum zu Alt Kairo, von dem ich eben zurückkehre, teilte mir Herr Labib die Kairener Seiten des Codex Jung, nach dortiger Nomenklatur Codex I, zur Veröffentlichung durch unser Institut zu. Als Bearbeiter schlug ich Herrn Dr. Theol. Dr. Phil. Peter Nagel vor, der auch von Herrn Labib akzeptiert worden ist. Dr. Nagel ist für diese Aufgabe trefflich disponiert, da er bereits an der Ausgabe der “Schrift ohne Titel” aus Codex II und der Apokalypsen aus Codex V beteiligt war. ...


1. Herr Dr. Nagel ediert die Kairener Seiten von Codex I plus noch ausstehende Seiten des Codex Jung, die das C.G. Jung-Kuratorium zu publizieren gestatten würde. 2. Die Herren Editoren des Codex Jung ziehen Herrn Dr. Nagel für die Kairener Seiten hinzu und der gesamte Restbestand des Codex I resp. Codex Jung erscheint als Gemeinschaftsarbeiten von Zürich und Halle.
\end{quote}
On the occasion of my visit to the Coptic Museum in Old Cairo, from which I have just returned, Labib granted to me the Cairo pages of the Jung Codex, Codex I according to the nomenclature there, to be published by our Institute. As editor I proposed Dr. Theol. Dr. Phil. Peter Nagel, who was also accepted by Labib. Dr. Nagel is eminently equipped for this work, since he was already involved in the publication of the ‘Schrift ohne Titel’ from Codex II [Tractate 5] and the Apocalypses from Codex V [Tractates 2–5]. ...

To be sure, the negotiations with Pahor Labib have left open a question about whose interrelated clarification I may trouble you, since, after all, the whole publication hangs on it. Labib puts the Cairo material at our disposal only if it appears together with the Zürich parts. From my view of things, two possibilities now suggest themselves, which I ask you to consider as a proposal, and which clearly stand open to modification on your part.

1. Dr. Nagel edits the Cairo pages of Codex I plus the still unpublished pages of the Jung Codex, which the Curatorium of the C.G. Jung Institute would permit to be published.
2. The Editors of the Jung Codex bring Dr. Nagel in for the Cairo pages, and the whole remainder of Codex I, i.e. of the Jung Codex, appears as a shared work of Zürich and Halle.

Actually, Nagel was Böhlig’s assistant, and it was he, along with Böhlig’s wife, herself a patristics scholar, who had indeed assisted in Böhlig’s own publications. In the case of II,5:

Not last of all my especial thanks are due to my wife, Dr. Gertrud Böhlig, who has always supported me actively in carrying out the work in Egypt and at home, as well as to my assistant, Dr. Peter Nagel, who prepared the Indices and helped correct the proofs.

And in the case of V,2–5:

Not last of all I also thank the colleagues of my Institute, Dr. G[ertrud] Böhlig and Dr. P[eter] Nagel, for their support during the printing.

---

62 Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib, *Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi*, ‘Vorwort,’ 7:

Nicht zuletzt gebührt mein besonderer Dank auch meiner Frau, Dr. Gertrud Böhlig, die mich beim Werden der Arbeit in Ägypten wie zu Hause jederzeit aktiv unterstützt hat, sowie meinem Assistenten, Herrn Dr. Peter Nagel, der das Stellenregister angefertigt und die Korrekturen mitgelesen hat.

63 Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib, *Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, ‘Vorwort,’ 7:

Nicht zuletzt danke ich auch den Mitarbeitern meines Instituts, Frau Dr. G. Böhlig und Herrn Dr. P. Nagel, für ihre Unterstützung bei der Drucklegung.
But just as the suggestion that Ibscher become involved in the conserva-
tion of the Jung Codex in Zürich did not materialize, just so this suggestion
that Nagel become involved in the editing of Codex I = the Jung Codex was
not implemented. However, Nagel did publish an editio princeps of II,4 in
1970 (see Part 3 below). And he has subsequently published, in 1998, a criti-
cal edition of I,5 from the Jung Codex, the lengthy and very difficult Tractatus
Tripartitus.64

2. The Non-Germans Who Were Mentioned

Kendrick Grobel

In March 1960 Kendrick Grobel worked at the Coptic Museum, where he
met Krause on 26 March. Krause has reported that on that day or one of the
following days Grobel received from Pahor Labib permission to publish The
Gospel of Philip (II,3), which Grobel was collating.65 Böhlig has also reported
hearing of this assignment at that time.66 R. McL. Wilson, who was preparing
a translation of The Gospel of Philip, heard, he supposes from Till, that it had
been assigned to Grobel to edit.67 In 1962 Wilson wrote Grobel to inquire:68

I have heard a report that you are now at work on an edition of the Gospel of
Philip, so [I] decided that I had better let you know I have been engaged on
the same job for some months past. It’s a free world, of course, and there is
nothing to prevent anyone tackling this text if he wants to—nobody can lay
claim to a monopoly, whatever the publishers may think about it! But it seems
rather a pity to have two books coming out round about the same time—they
are bound to have some effect on each other’s sales. Hence this letter—can
we come to some kind of agreement on the subject?

Grobel replied69 to the effect that the report was ‘flattering but untrue,’
though Orval Winternmute had prepared a translation. Hence Wilson con-
tinued the preparation of his translation. On 24 September 1964 Krause had
written Schenke to the effect that Grobel had transcribed the text, which

64 Peter Nagel, Der Tractatus Tripartus aus Nag Hammadi Codex I (Codex Jung) (Studien
und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 1; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1998).
65 26 iii 77: Letter from Krause to Robinson.
66 23 iv 77: Letter from Böhlig to Robinson.
67 15 iv 77: Letter from Wilson to Robinson.
68 29 i 62: Letter from Wilson to Grobel.
69 23 iii 77: Letter from Wilson to Robinson.
Pahor Labib authorized him to edit, and that in 1962 Pahor Labib had even heard that it had already appeared: 70

The “official edition” will no doubt be handled by K[endrik] Grobel. Some years ago he transcribed the text in the Coptic Museum and obtained from P[ahor] Labib permission to print it. Already two years ago Pa[hor] Labib inquired of me about this edition. He had heard that it had already appeared.

Thereupon Schenke wrote Grobel to inquire if this was the case: 71

It has reached my ears that you have been entrusted by the Coptic Museum in Cairo with the editing of the Philip Gospel. May I permit myself to ask whether this information is accurate? In that case it would interest me a great deal to know how far along you are with the work on this edition. Or has it perhaps already appeared, without one having heard anything about it here in Europe? These questions are acute for me on the occasion of a book review of Till’s unofficial and provisional edition of this Gospel.

Grobel replied to Schenke that he had no such assignment: 72

It reached also my ears, and indeed from Scotland, that I was to have something to do with the publication of the Philip Gospel. The source of such information is unknown to me. I await, as do you, and for the same reason, the official edition.

The widow of Grobel, Marianne Grobel Beare, reported her recollection of what had and had not taken place: 73

70 24 ix 64: Letter from Krause to Schenke:

71 15 x 64: Letter from Schenke to Grobel:

72 11 xii 64: Letter from Grobel to Schenke:

73 3 vi 77: Letter from Marianne Grobel Beare to Robinson.
Immediately after finishing his work on The Gospel of Truth, Kendrick was eager to tackle The Gospel of Philip similarly. He considered Labib's work on it quite unsatisfactory and eagerly looked forward to seeing the ms. himself and working on it in Cairo. ...

We stopped in Cairo on our way home in March 1960, and for a week or 10 days, I believe … Kendrick immediately went to meet P. Labib. (I was with him on that first day and shared his agony at the amount of time that had to be spent—waiting, introductions, explanations, etc.—the atmosphere was one of reluctance if not suspicion, as I recall it.) After much small talk, drinking of Coca Cola, etc., he received permission to see the Gospel of Philip—only this, I recall, and I think he was never left alone with it. He tried to transcribe as much as he could, spending every day of our stay in the museum. How seriously he was supported and encouraged at the museum, I do not know; I doubt very much that he felt any optimism, though. I am quite sure that he was not given any serious assignment at all, much as he had hoped for it and would have loved it. If it had come to him later, I am sure (I am rather certain!) he would have shared it with me, and knowing the enthusiasm with which he threw himself into any project that interested him, I believe he would have worked practically day and night on it. At the time of his death, he was working on an entirely different (NT) subject.

Krause has assumed that Grobel expected written confirmation of an informal oral suggestion by Pahor Labib, and that Grobel inferred from the lack of such a confirming letter that the assignment had in fact not been made. Böhlig has explained the procedure in Cairo as follows:

Stock took over the arranging of things, in order to guarantee that all those involved indeed kept to the agreement. Regarding the assigning of the writings, Pahor Labib was in fact accustomed to give no written assignments to the persons who were to do the editing, other than the entry into a list kept by him (for example, I never received anything in writing). This is where I also see the reason that Grobel, for example, awaited such a written confirmation from Pahor Labib, and, when it did not arrive, considered the matter
closed. The same uncertainty happened to me in my stay at the beginning of 1961, when Pahor Labib at first did not want to let me work further on the apocalypses allocated to me in 1960, whereupon Krause pointed him to the agreement and the note in Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes, p. 24.

In any case, Grobel did not consider himself authorized to publish The Gospel of Philip, and hence did not proceed to work on it.

J. Martin Plumley

In December 1960 J. Martin Plumley collated The Gospel of Thomas (II,2) at the Coptic Museum, and was invited by Pahor Labib to take part in the publication of some of the texts. When he agreed, he was given photographs. When he determined that they were photographs of already published tractates, II,2–4, he proceeded no further with them.

Alexander Böhlig made public the assignments to Grobel and Plumley:76

Meanwhile Grobel has taken over the editing of the Philip Gospel, and Plumley that of the 'Nature of the Archons.' Krause also announced Plumley's, but not Grobel's, assignment.77

In 1960 Krause and Pahor Labib had reported that II,5 and V,2–5 were to be published by Böhlig and Pahor Labib,78 but had made reference to no other authors. With regard to the Coptic series of the German Archaeological Institute, however, they reported that number 2 containing II,6–7 and VI,1–8 would be published by Martin Krause and Pahor Labib,79 and that number 3 would contain III,2 and IV,2.80 Though the editors of number 3 are not mentioned, the reader would assume they would be the same as the editors of numbers 1 and 2 and as the authors of the report, namely

76 Alexander Böhlig, in his review of Leipoldt-Schenke, Koptisch-agnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag Hamadi, in DLZ 84 (1963): 304:

Inzwischen hat die Edition des Philippusevangeliums Grobel, die des "Wesen der Archonten" Plumley übernommen.


79 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, 17 and 27.

Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, especially in view of Krause's position as the coptologist of the German Archaeological Institute. In the 'Nachträge und Verbesserungen' of 1962, number 2 was reported to be in the press, and number 3 was announced as the commentary to *The Apocryphon of John* planned by Krause (to whom the shift into the first person singular may be taken to refer). The status of the previous publication plans for III,2 and IV,2 in number 3 was not mentioned.


The report prepared on 4 November 1961 for UNESCO by the Preliminary Committee consisting of Pahor Labib, President, Michel Malinine and Martin Krause (see Chapter 9 below) gave the following description of the present situation:

In 1959 the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo and the German Archaeological Institute in Cairo began to cooperate in order to preserve the Gnostic texts found at Nag Hammadi. The German Archaeological Institute presented 1100 sheets of perspex to the Coptic Museum, so that the papyri of 12 codices—one codex had been between glass since 1947—could be put between perspex.

The publication of some of the texts began. Three of them will be out within the next months, others are in the press or in preparation. A detailed description of all 13 codices—included in the introduction of two publications [ADAIK, Koptische Reihe, 1 and 2]—are added to this report in order that it may be distributed to all members of the committee.

The following publications and publication plans were itemized: *The Gospel of Truth* (I,2a [actually 3a]) was listed as published (except for the two leaves in Cairo that were listed as to be published) by M. Malinine, H.-Ch. Puech, G. Quispel, and W.C. Till, with the recommendation that the other two [sic!] tractates of Codex I (tractates 1 [actually 2] and 3 [actually 4]) be distributed for publication in correspondence with the Jung Institute. *The Apocryphon of John* (II,1; III,1; IV,1) was listed as published by Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, and their second volume was also listed as published in the case of II,6-7, but as to be published in the case of VI,1-8. Also VII,1-2 were listed as to be published by Krause. II,2 was listed as published ‘by the members of the first session of the International Committee;’ II,3 as to be published by

---

Kendrick Grobel, and II,4 by J.M. Plumley. II,5 was listed as published by Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib, but XIII,2 as to be [sic!] published in the same volume. V,2-5 were listed as to be published by Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib. Thus, twenty-seven were listed as published or to be published, whereas two were overlooked (I,1 and 5), thus leaving only twenty-three unassigned texts. It is striking that, apart from the Jung Codex in Zürich and the tractates from Codex II published in Pahor Labib’s one volume of plates (and hence available to anyone who wished to publish them), the only publications and publication plans were those assigned to Krause and Böhlig. This makes it all too clear that the Germans had replaced the French in Nag Hammadi studies.

With regard to the tractates listed by the report as already published, the actual publication facts are as follows:


II,1; III,1; IV,1: Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, ADAIK, 1 (printed at the Imprimerie of the Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire, distributed at Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1962 [1963]). Apparently the three tractates to which summary reference was made as due to be published ‘within the next months’ were these three copies of The Apocryphon of John, since Martin Krause and Pahor Labib had stated in 1960 that ‘the publication should be printed by the beginning of December 1960,’ but had added in 1962:

82 Krause and Pahor Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, 1:

... die Publikation bis Anfang Dezember 1960 gedruckt vorliegen sollte.

83 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, 295:

Unser auf Seite 1 geschildertes Vorhaben, die Publikation bis Ende Dezember 1960 vorlegen zu können, konnte leider nicht realisiert werden, weil die Druckerei des Französischen Archäologischen Institutes in Kairo so mit Arbeit überlastet war, daß sich der Druck über nahezu drei Jahre hinzog.
Our plan outlined on p. 1, to be able to present the publication by the end of December 1960, unfortunately could not be achieved, since the printing press of the French Archaeological Institute in Cairo was so overburdened with work that the printing dragged out over almost three years.

On 15 January 1963 Krause wrote Schenke informing him that in April 1962 the book had been printed and bound in 100 copies (through p. 255, but then lacking the indices, pp. 257–293, and later supplements, pp. 295–307). Pahor Labib gave these copies away, though Krause still had not received his copies of the complete bound book, as he wrote Schenke:84

In April of last year 100 copies of the text, at that time printed up to p. 255, were bound and given away by Pahor Labib. Since then finally also the indices and supplements are printed. Since the binding of the book should not take too much time, I await daily the shipping of my author's copies.

Then on 18 June 1963 Krause again wrote Schenke that he had only received one copy, dedicated to him by Pahor Labib and presented at the opening of a Coptic exhibit at the beginning of May in Germany. But Krause was informed by the German Archaeological Institute that other copies would come from Harrassowitz; yet this book distributor reported to him that as of 20 May 1963 the crate shipped from Egypt had not yet arrived.85


84 15 i 63: Letter from Krause to Schenke:

In April vergangenen Jahres sind 100 Exemplare des damals bis S. 255 ausgedruckten Textes gebunden und von Pahor Labib verschenkt worden. Inzwischen sind endlich auch die Indices und Nachträge gedruckt worden. Da das Binden des Buches nicht zu viel Zeit in Anspruch nehmen dürfte, erwarte ich täglich die Übersendung meiner Autorenexemplare.

85 18 vi 63: Letter from Krause to Schenke:

Nachdem mir aus Kairo mitgeteilt worden war, die Exemplare würden mir per Post zugesandt, schrieb mir Herr Professor Stock am 9.4., daß ich sie von Harrassowitz erhalten würde, an den mehrere Kisten mit Schiffsfacht abgesandt worden seien. Harrassowitz schrieb mir am 20.5., daß die Kisten noch nicht eingetroffen seien. ... Ich selbst besitze nur ein Exemplar mit einer Widmung von Pahor Labib, das er mir zur Eröffnung der Koptischen Ausstellung Anfang Mai schenkte.

II,6-7 (together with VI,1-8, listed as to be published): Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Gnostische und hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und Codex VI*, ADALK, Koptische Reihe 2 (Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin, 1972). II, 6-7 were ‘already ready for printing’ as early as 20 October 1959,86 and the volume was ‘already in the press’ at least by 1962.87 In 1964, the year 1964 was listed as the anticipated date of publication,88 and, in 1967, the anticipated date of publication was listed as 1967.89

Thus in fact neither of the two books listed as already published by Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, two of the three members of the Preliminary Committee, were in fact already published, as is also the case of one book edited by Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib. This may be what is meant by the introductory comment that ‘three of them will be out within the next months.’ But this too proved to be overly optimistic.

The unspecified material said to be ‘in the press’ is hard to identify, though the following may have been intended:

I,2a [= I,3a] (actually listed as to be published, see below): Malinine, Puech, Quispel, Till, with Wilson, *Evangelium Veritatis [Supplementum]: Codex Jung

---

86 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, 1:

... bereits druckfertig.

87 Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, 295:

... schon im Druck.

23 ix 62: Letter from Krause to Schenke that he had received galley proofs.


... tracts I,2 [=I,3a] and I,3 [= I,4] are printed except for the Preface, I am told.


This may hence have been included among unspecified material said to be in the press (see above).


This may also have been included among unspecified material said to be in the press (see above).


II,4 was never published by J.M. Plumley. The *editiones principes* are: Roger A. Bullard, *The Hypostasis of the Archons: The Coptic Text with Translation and Commentary, with a Contribution by Martin Krause* (Patristiche Texte und Studien 10; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970); Peter Nagel, *Das Wesen der Archonten aux Codex II der gnostischen Bibliothek von Nag Hammadi:

---

90 31 iii 61: Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, in a memorandum to UNESCO:

... les traités I,2 et I,3 sont imprimé sauf le préface, m’a-t-on dit.


VI, 1-8 (though listed as to be published, it was published together with II, 6-7, which was listed as already published, see above): Martin Krause and Pahor Labib: Gnostische und hermetische Schriften aus Codex II and Codex VI (ADAI.K, Koptische Reihe 2; Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin, 1972).


XIII, 2 (together with II, 5, which was listed as already published): Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib, Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung 58; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962), p. 36.

Some of the 23 tractates listed by the Preliminary Committee as to be assigned by the proposed Committee were subsequently announced by Krause in 1966 as being prepared for publication, though the source of this information was not stated:

III, 2 and IV, 2 were reported to be under preparation by Böhlig.\textsuperscript{91}


Die Ausgabe der beiden Versionen des Ägypterevangeliums wird von A. Böhlig vorbereitet, nachdem P. Labib und ich auf eine solche verzichtet haben.
The edition of both versions of the *Egyptians Gospel* is being prepared by A[lexander] Böhlig, after P[ahor] Labib and I [Martin Krause] have given up such an edition.

Pahor Labib in fact continued his involvement, but in coordination with Alexander Böhlig.

III, 3-4 and V, 1 were reported to be under preparation by Krause.\(^{92}\)

The two versions of the ‘Eugnostos Letter’ and of the ‘Sophia of Jesus Christ’ will be published by me as a Synopsis (cf. M[artin] Krause, “Das literarische Verhältnis des Eugnostosbriefes zur Sophia Jesu Christi,” *Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser 1964 = Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, Ergänzungsband 1, 217, n. 28), since there the relation of the two writings to each other almost stares you in the face.

III, 5 was reported to be under preparation by Krause.\(^{93}\)

Also the publication of these writings is being prepared by me.

VII, 3 and 5 were reported to be under preparation by Victor Girgis.\(^{94}\)

---


Auch die Ausgabe dieser Schriften wird von mir vorbereitet.


Viktor Girgis bereitet seit längerem diese Textausgabe vor.
For some time Victor Girgis has been preparing this text edition.

Krause also reported a revision in the plans for publishing II, although, since the text had been made generally available by Pahor Labib’s facsimile volume, it is at least in this case safe to assume it is not a matter of actual reassignments:95

R[oger] Bullard, a pupil of K[endrik] Grobel, will presumably publish this text with a commentary in the course of the coming year, in Patristische Texte und Studien. Also V[iolet] MacDermot plans a publication of this text, after J.M. Plumley gave up his intention to edit this text.

R. McL. Wilson reported concerning Bullard’s dissertation:96

Bullard worked with Grobel up to Grobel’s death in 1965, preparing a doctoral dissertation for Vanderbilt. As nobody on the faculty had specialist knowledge in the field, I was invited to assist in the examination of this dissertation (having spent the previous semester at Vanderbilt before the lecture tour which brought me to Claremont). It was at my suggestion that it was sent to Krause (hence his knowledge of it).

Krause concluded his 1966 report:97

There remain then still 14 writings on 382 pages, about whose publication, so far as I know, no decision has been made.

---


96 30 iv 81: Letter from Wilson to Robinson.


Es bleiben dann noch 14 Schriften auf 382 Seiten übrig, über deren Publikation meines Wissens noch keine Entscheidung gefallen ist.

It is to be hoped that J[an] Zandee will be entrusted with the publication of this very interesting text.

Further clarification about some of these publication plans was provided by Böhlig:\footnote{\textit{\textsuperscript{7}} vi 77: Letter from Böhlig to Robinson: Was Eugnostosbrief und Sophia Jesu Christi betrifft, so hatte sie ja Till bereits für die Ausgabe des Berolinensis gnosticus mitherangezogen, so daß die Ausgabe eigentlich schon frei war. Ich hatte 1960 aber bei der Übernahme von Codex V abgelehnt, den Eugnostosbrief von V,1 mit zu übernehmen, um Doresse nicht vorzugehen, der ja ursprünglich den Eugnostosbrief herausgeben wollte.}

As far as the \textit{Letter of Eugnostos} and the \textit{Sophia of Jesus Christ} \textit{[III,3–4 and V,1]} are concerned, Till had already included them in the edition of the \textit{Berolinensis Gnosticus}, so that the publication was really already free. However, in taking over Codex V in 1960, I had turned down the \textit{Eugnostos Letter} of V,1 in order not to encroach on Doresse, who after all originally wanted to publish the \textit{Eugnostos Letter}.

Böhlig had already explained how he moved from the \textit{Letter of Eugnostos} and the \textit{Sophia of Jesus Christ} \textit{[III,3–4 and V,1]} to the \textit{Egyptians Gospel} \textit{[III,2 and IV,2]}:\footnote{\textit{\textsuperscript{12}} iv 77: Letter from Böhlig to Robinson: Da P. Labib nach Abschluß des UNESCO-Vertrages die Editionsvergabe als an diese Institution abgetreten betrachtete, ist seine stereotype Auskunft an mich von da ab ”es ist alles vergeben” verständlich. Deshalb hat mich P. Labib auch bei meinem Aufenthalt in Kairo im Frühjahr 1963, als die Ausgabe der ”Apokalypsen” schon gedruckt war, nur mit der weiteren Bearbeitung bereits bekannter Texte aus dem Codex III betraut: Eugnostosbrief und Sophia Jesu Christi. Allerdings stellte es sich dann, als ich von Kairo nach München gekommen war und dort M. Krause traf, heraus, daß dieser bereits diese Texte in Angriff genommen hatte. Da M. Krause weniger an der Edition des Ägypterevangeliums gelegen war, für die ihn P. Labib in seiner Liste eingetragen hatte, haben wir im Herbst 1963 ganz offiziell unsere Aufgaben getauscht.}
Since P[ahor] Labib, after the conclusion of the contract with UNESCO, considered the giving of editing assignments as turned over to that institution, his stereotypical information to me from then on is understandable, ‘everything is given out.’ And so on my sojourn in Cairo in the spring of 1963, when the edition of the ‘Apocalypses’ was already printed, P[ahor] Labib entrusted to me only further work on already known texts from Codex III: the Letter of Eugnostos and the Sophia of Jesus Christ. When I had come from Cairo to Munich and met there M[artin] Krause, however, it became clear that he had already worked on these texts. Since M[artin] Krause was less interested in editing the Egyptians Gospel, for which P[ahor] Labib had entered his name in his list, in the fall of 1963 we officially exchanged our assignments.

Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib then entered into a contract with the German Archaeological Institute to publish The Gospel of the Egyptians.101 Böhlig has also reported an otherwise unknown assignment to Richard A. Parker:102

I asked him [Pahor Labib, in the spring of 1963] to be permitted to work on Codex VIII, whereupon he answered me that it was already given out, namely to [Richard A.] Parker. He then offered me, as already reported, after going back and forth a long time, to take on The Letter of Eugnostos and The Sophia of Jesus Christ. When in the year 1965 I met Parker at the German Orientalists Convention in Heidelberg at the end of July, I asked him about his work on Codex VIII, whereupon he replied to me in amazement that he knew nothing about an assignment.

Parker himself has reported:103

I have never had even one letter from Pahor Labib nor have I had any verbal communication from him, either directly or through an intermediary. I have no claim on any codex nor would I have accepted an assignment to publish one, since my time was fully occupied with the study of the astronomical texts of ancient Egypt during the sixties. I have no idea what Labib was up to with his remarks to Böhlig.


102 4 v 77: Letter from Böhlig to Robinson:


103 26 v 77: Letter from Parker to Robinson.
Böhlig has explained the general conditions of the joint publications with Pahor Labib as follows: 104

With regard to me, Pahor had maintained, from the beginning of 1961 on, that one could receive a new editing assignment only when the publication of the preceding one has taken place (at that time, he constantly reproached me for having done no work). For the publications, he made the following conditions: 1. That his name also would appear on the title page. 2. That he would receive half the edition as honorarium for his collaboration. Both conditions were met both by the German Institute for the two publications with Krause in the series of the Institute, and also by the G[erman] D[emocratic] R[epublic] for the Tractate without Title and the Apocalypses.

With regard to the half of the printed copies that was given to Pahor Labib, Böhlig has explained: 105

Incidentally, the idea came from Murad Kamil. Labib considered the turning over of half the edition as a political factor. Furthermore, in the DDR there was a note concerning ordering and delivering the volumes in question: Not to be delivered to Egypt. This should mean that Egypt itself could market copies in its country (namely the ones that were a gift). This also involved a freeing up of currency. Thus P[ahor] Labib had the possibility to give many free copies to interested visitors of the Museum.

Pahor Labib’s successor as Director of the Coptic Museum, Raouf Habib, reported to me in March 1966 that, as a result of the assumption of publication rights by UNESCO, he was not free to permit scholars to consult the originals, even to clarify uncertain readings in specific texts. However, such a

---

104 12 iv 77: Letter from Böhlig to Robinson:


105 16 vi 77: Letter from Böhlig to Robinson:

policy was not strictly enforced. Initially Böhlig, in distinction from Krause, had not gained general access to the Nag Hammadi codices during Pahor Labib's directorship:

To be sure, from the very beginning I [Böhlig] must point to the fact that I, in contrast to Dr. Krause, have obtained access only to those not yet edited texts with whose edition I myself had been commissioned, i.e. only to the Egyptians Gospel in Codex III and IV.

This situation changed to the extent that in 1967 Böhlig could cite unpublished parallels in VII, 120,15; VIII, 6,30; 30,14 (both cited only by the name of the tractate); 51,24–25 (cited as p. 95); and XIII, 38,5–6.15 (referred to as pl. 15,5 f. and pl. 15,15).

He has explained the situation as follows:

First during my stay in Cairo in March and April 1967 could I follow up certain hints by Doresse in The Secret Books. But also at that time I did not get access to all the texts I wanted. Besides, that took place as follows: I wanted to

---


Ich muß allerdings von vornherein darauf hinweisen, daß ich im Gegensatz zu Herrn Dr. Krause nur zu den noch nicht edierten Texten Zugang erhalten habe, mit deren Edition ich selbst beauftragt worden bin, d.h. allein zu dem Ägypterevangelium in Codex III und IV.


108 12 iv 77: Letter from Böhlig to Robinson:

have certain passages from the codices VII, VIII and XIII shown to me by Pahor Labib [who, though retired, apparently functioned, in view of his being co-editor of The Gospel of the Egyptians, as if the Nag Hammadi codices were still in his care]. Pahor had someone bring a few prints. When he saw that I began to make notes for myself, he took the things again away. So in all haste I could only make notes of any one of the numbers listed on the back of the prints (hoping in this way to be able to verify them again later). But since I did not have the possibility later to compare my notes, there emerged the quotation mistakes that, of course, you too have noticed. But not only was every possibility of verification taken from me, but, especially, a continuous reading of the important texts was impossible.

The publication facts for the tractates Krause listed first in 1966 as being prepared for publication are as follows:


III,3-4 and V,1: A synopsis by Martin Krause was reported to be “in preparation;” publication can be expected “within the next five years.” The publication in Christentum am Roten Meer, ed. Franz Altheim and Ruth Stiehl, 3 was announced in 1975 as due to appear at the “end of this year.” It did not appear by then.

III,5: “In preparation” by Martin Krause; publication can be expected “within the next five years.” It did not appear.

In sum, the reports by Krause in 1961 and 1966 as to the status of publications and publication plans did not correspond to reality then or later, but did serve the purpose of supporting Germany’s claim for publication rights to the more desirable tractates.

4. *A Complete German Edition*

Johannes Irmscher was able to anticipate already in 1959 a definitive complete edition of the Nag Hammadi tractates:\textsuperscript{112}

Thus the volume appears in improved form at a time when the analysis of the finds of Nag Hammadi begins to make visible progress. May the day not be distant when their study has advanced far enough that further volumes can follow upon these *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften* I, which present the newly-discovered texts in a similarly definitive way, just as that has taken place for those reproduced in the present volume.

This plan for a complete German translation was less motivated by the publications of Leipoldt and Schenke than by the assumption that the whole Nag Hammadi library would soon be made available:\textsuperscript{113}

---


... in Vorbereitung ... innerhalb der nächsten 5 Jahre ....

\textsuperscript{113} 30 vii 77: Letter from Schenke to Robinson:
The plans for a complete German translation, which was mentioned already in 1959, had in my view nothing to do with one's own activity in the pioneer work, but rather emanated from the assumption, understandable at the time, that reliable editions of the entire discovery would soon be available, which one could take as one's point of departure.

Now that the material has become fully available, the plan for including the Nag Hammadi Codices in the series "Koptisch-gnostische Schriften" has been revived. The plan could be listed in the final Introduction to The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices in 1984:

Koptisch-gnostische Schriften, Volumes 2 and 3, by the Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostische Schriften (General Editor Hans-Martin Schenke), to appear in the series Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag), the non-fragmentary tracts of which were preprinted primarily in the Theologische Literaturzeitung ([1958–1959 and] 1973–1978), without transcription, except when the text had to be reconstituted, in which case there are transliterations in endnotes.


---

CHAPTER NINE

UNESCO UNDER FRENCH LEADERSHIP 1960–1970

1. The Involvement of UNESCO

UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) first became involved with the Nag Hammadi Codices as a result of problems that arose in forming and maintaining an International Committee to publish the texts. At the beginning of January 1956 Murad Kamil had notified Henri-Charles Puech that Egypt was about to announce officially an International Committee, which would include both Puech and Gilles Quispel (see Chapter 6, Part 1 above).\(^1\) But when a month had elapsed and no official invitation was forthcoming, Puech was advised to have UNESCO intervene:\(^2\)

No news from Cairo, or, at least, nothing official. I have been strongly advised to have UNESCO intervene.

After all, UNESCO was located in Paris where French scholars functioned as consultants, and UNESCO had leverage in Egypt, since it was in charge of the archaeological rescue operations triggered by the construction of the High Dam. However, an International Committee without UNESCO involvement had in fact been appointed on 7 July 1956, and had met from 29 September to 27 October 1956 in Cairo (see Chapter 6, Part 2 above). Yet, at that meeting, some support from UNESCO was envisaged:\(^3\)

The Committee will fix the amount of subventions to be asked from scientific foundations and the UNESCO for travel etc. of members of the Committee.

---

\(^1\) 15 i 56: Letter from Puech to Quispel.

\(^2\) 17 il 56: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

\[Aucune nouvelle du Caire, ou, tout au moins, rien d’officiel. Il m’est fortement conseillé de faire intervenir l’UNESCO.\]

\(^3\) Circa 27 x 56: The hand-written memorandum of ‘Decisions’ prepared at the time by Gilles Quispel on the back of the letter of Gillmor to Quispel of 2 vii 56.
It may have been an echo of this, when Rolf Ibscher on 24 June 1958 expressed to Quispel the hope that UNESCO might fund his trip to Cairo to conserve the papyri (see Chapter 8, Part 1 above).

The Suez crisis just at the conclusion of the 1956 meeting raised concern as to the future constitution of the membership of the International Committee, since that crisis had led to the breaking of diplomatic relations between Egypt and France. The French were not even receiving mail from Egypt, though they had hoped to receive minutes of the 1956 meeting. Puech’s stated objective at the time was of course to maintain the validity and integrity of the International Committee, though his primary motivation was to assure his own involvement. Hence a communication from Murad Kamil to Walter Till late in 1956 omitting any reference to French representation made the question acute:  

I am pleased to tell you [Walter Till] that the International Committee for studying the Gnostic Papyri at [the] Coptic Museum had the honour to choose you to be an executive member in this committee. It gives me much pleasure to collaborate with you and Professor Quispel in publishing the Gospel of Thomas. [Murad Kamil, though named to the International Committee, was actually not involved in publishing The Gospel of Thomas, see Chapter 7 above.]

On 30 January 1957 Till had written Quispel that he had recently received a letter from Yassah ʿAbd al-Masiḥ to the effect that the International Committee had decided to publish first The Gospel of Thomas, and to include Till among its editors. This too might not sound well for Puech being included in an International Committee to come.

Puech and Quispel continued to hear nothing from Cairo of French involvement, but, instead, they heard rumors of German participation. For when Walter Till heard of Alexander Böhlig’s involvement (see Chapter 8, Part 1 above), he informed Quispel:

4. 24 xii 56: Letter from Murad Kamil to Walter Till, cited in a letter of 9 ii 57 from Till to Quispel.
5. 30 i 57: Letter from Till to Quispel.
6. 18 v 58: Letter from Till to Quispel:

However [Rolf] Ibscher writes in his letter that Böhlig ‘wanted in his way to get involved’ in the matter. But what that means is not to be seen from the letter. Böhlig is at present Professor at the University of Halle (East Germany), I believe in the Theological Faculty. Böhlig seems to have negotiated with Murad Kamil completely on his own initiative. I learned about this first through Ibscher’s letter.

Till also notified Puech, who inquired of Quispel:

Till tells me [Puech] all his anxieties that are inspired in him by the intervention of Prof. A. Böhlig, called in by the Egyptians. Are you [Quispel] up on this?

Hence, on his return from a UNESCO mission to Japan, Puech thought the situation called for some action:

Have you [Quispel] any news from Denmark [Giversen, see Chapter 6, Part 5 above] and from Pahor Labib? Has the latter come this summer to Germany, as he informed me? His appeal to Böhlig—which I drew to your attention, though you have not passed on to me your impressions regarding it—does not cease worrying me, as well as Till. We will soon have to examine here these grave affairs. I am, for my part, of a mind to settle them promptly and decisively.

Antoine Guillaumont has subsequently clarified this position:

No member of the Committee that met in 1956 has been informed of these steps of M[urad] Kamil with Böhlig. It would have been normal that the members of this Committee were consulted, or at least informed, about this.

---

7 17 vii 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

M. Till me dit toutes ses inquiétudes que lui inspire l’intervention du Prof. A. Böhlig, appelé par les Égyptiens. Étiez-vous au courant?

8 3 x 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Avez-vous des nouvelles du Danemark et de Pahor Labib? Celui-ci est-il venu cet été en Allemagne, comme il me l’avait fait savoir? Son recours à Böhlig—que je vous avais signalé, mais à propos duquel vous ne m’avez pas communiqué vos impressions—ne laisse pas de m’inquiéter, ainsi que M. Till. Nous aurons à examiner bientôt ici ces graves affaires. Je suis, pour ma part, décidé à les régler promptement et décidément.

There was on 8 x 58 a similar letter from Puech to Quispel.

9 12 vii 77: Letter from Guillaumont to Robinson:

Aucun membre du Comité qui s’était réuni en 1956 n’a été informé de ces démarches de M. Kamil auprès de Böhlig. Il aurait été normal que les membres de ce Comité fussent consultés, ou du moins informés, à ce sujet.
This assessment of the situation with regard to French involvement was only aggravated by the German publication of translations of material made accessible through Pahor Labib’s volume of plates:10

The publications made or begun by Schenke confirm that we play, in all of this lamentable affair, the rôle of victims or of dupes.

In Hans-Martin Schenke’s last publication in this series, there was also the announcement that Böhlig’s first assignment had been made by the International Committee:11

It has belatedly become known that the full edition of the text [Codex II, Tractate 5] with commentary authorized by the International Committee of Gnosticism is being worked on by Professor Pahor Labib of Cairo and Professor Alexander Böhlig of Halle.

On receiving a reprint of this article from Schenke, Puech wrote him:12

I do not understand clearly the note added by the redaction of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (col. 243) to the title of your article “Vom Ursprung der Welt.” No member of the International Committee for the publication of the papyri of the Coptic Museum, as it was constituted in 1956 on the initiative of Dr. Pahor Labib, has been informed of the project of publication announced in this note. Does it have to do simply with the “authorized” edition of the “anonymous tractate”? If you have any clarification on this that you can supply to me, I would be very grateful to you for it.

Puech was coming to suspect that the International Committee of Gnosticism had for all practical purposes ceased to exist, and that another was being set up in its place.

---

10 25 xii 58: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

Les publications faites ou commencées par Schenke confirment que nous jouons, dans toute cette lamentable affaire, le rôle de victimes ou de dupes.


Nachträglich ist bekannt geworden, dass die vom International Committee of Gnosticism autorisierte kommentierte Volledition des Textes durch die Herren Professor Pahor Labib-Kairo und Professor Alexander Böhlig-Halle bearbeitet wird.

12 6 vi 59: Letter from Puech to Schenke:

Je ne comprends pas bien la note ajoutée par la rédaction de la *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (col. 243) au title de votre article “Vom Ursprung der Welt.” Aucun membre du Comité international de publication des Papyrus du Musée Copte, tel qu’il a été constitué en 1956 sur l’initiative du Dr. Pahor Labib, n’a été informé du projet de publication annoncé dans cette note. S’agit-il simplement de l’édition “authorisée” du “traité anonyme”? Si vous aviez là-dessus quelques précisions à me fournir, je vous en serais fort reconnaissant.
Böhlig has provided the conjectural explanation:13

... that Schenke's view no doubt goes back to the fact that at that time the founding of a new International Committee was initiated by M[urad] Kamil and P[ahor] Labib, and I was even called upon to make an application for admission. But I was then later informed that, as a citizen of the G[erman] D[emocratic] R[epublic], I could not come into such a committee, since the G[erman] D[emocratic] R[epublic] (in contrast to the Federal Republic) was not a member of UNESCO. As a consequence, only Krause could become a member.

The possibility of the dissolution of the International Committee of which Puech was a member made the intervention of UNESCO all the more important to him. UNESCO's involvement did succeed in preventing Böhlig from becoming a member of the International Committee.

On 5 February 1961 N. Bammate, head of the Section of Human Sciences of UNESCO, met with Puech concerning UNESCO assuming some responsibility in the publication of the Nag Hammadi Codices. The following day Bammate had a similar talk with Guillaumont, who has reported their position:14

It is precisely because Puech and I myself (and also, probably, Quispel), have received no information from Pahor Labib, and of the follow-up of the decisions of 1956, that we have agreed, both of us, in 1961, to prepare a new project, with an enlarged Committee, under the auspices of UNESCO and the government of the United Arab Republic. I should clarify that the initiative came not from us, but from UNESCO. It is Messrs Asabuki and Bammate who took the initiative of the first contact.

Quispel was heavily involved in all of this, but had not informed the French (see Chapter 6, Part 8 above).

13 v 81: Letter from Böhlig to Robinson:
... dass Schenkes Meinung wohl darauf zurückgeht, dass damals von M. Kamil und P. Labib die Gründung eines neuen internationalen Komitees initiiert und ich sogar aufgefordert wurde, einen Antrag auf Aufnahme zu stellen. Später wurde mir dann aber mitgeteilt, ich könnte als DDR-Bürger nicht in ein solches Komitee kommen, weil die DDR (im Gegensatz zur Bundesrepublik) nicht Mitglied der UNESCO sei; infolgedessen konnte nur Krause Mitglied werden.

14 vii 77: Letter from Guillaumont to Robinson:
C’est précisément parce que M. Puech et moi-même (et aussi, probablement M. Quispel) nous n’avions reçu aucune information de Pahor Labib et de la suite donnée aux décisions de 1956, que nous avons accepté, tous deux, en 1961, de préparer un nouveau projet, avec un Comité élargi, sous l’égide de l’UNESCO et du gouvernement de la R.A.U. Je dois préciser que l’initiative est venue, non pas de nous, mais de l’UNESCO: ce sont MM. Asabuki et Bammate qui ont pris l’initiative du premier contact.
2. The Preliminary Committee of UNESCO

The Purpose of the Preliminary Committee

On 7 February 1961 Bammate reported on the talks with Puech and Guillaumont to the Director of the Department of Cultural Activities, who on 10 February 1961 proposed to René Maheu, at the time adjunct General Director of UNESCO, that a Preliminary Committee consisting of Pahor Labib, Guillaumont, and Till be convened at the Coptic Museum in September 1961, to prepare for a meeting of an International Committee to take place in November 1961.15 The three-year-project would begin in 1962, with Guillaumont as General Secretary, a responsibility he was willing to assume if so designated by the International Committee. When it subsequently became clear that he could not participate in the meeting of the Preliminary Committee at the time envisaged, he proposed that UNESCO choose Michel Malinine or Pierre du Bourguet, and, if Till’s health did not permit his participation, a German in his place.

On 28 February 1961 Bammate passed on to the Director of the Department of Cultural Activities a list of scholars in the field: Guillaumont, Puech, Malinine, du Bourguet, Till, Quispel, Säve-Söderbergh, Theodore C. Peterson (taken to be Swedish), Gerard Garitte, Krause, Ibscher, Schenke, William R. Schoedel, and R. McL. Wilson. He suggested that an International Committee with Pahor Labib as President and five or six members, one per nation, be proposed to Egypt by the end of April 1961. After another visit of Guillaumont to UNESCO, it was proposed on 21 April 1961 that the International Committee consist of Pahor Labib (President), Guillaumont, Quispel, Säve-Söderbergh, Garitte, and Krause, with the possibility of enlarging the number to include Schoedel, Wilson, and Kasser. Guillaumont had proposed that Puech and Till be included as Consultants, thereby circumventing in the case of France the limitation of one person per nation.

In his invitation to Till to participate in the Preliminary Committee, Bammate formulated the project as follows:16

---

15 Such specific information about internal communications among UNESCO offices, for which there is no footnoted documentation here, derive from notes I took during a morning when I was permitted to sift through and take notes from the UNESCO archives on the Nag Hammadi Codices, which had been assembled in Bammate’s office for this purpose. Guillaumont was also present on this occasion.

16 28 iv 61: Letter from Bammate to Till:

Donnant suite à une initiative des autorités de la République Arabe Unie, demandant une coopération scientifique internationale, pour la publication de l’ensemble des
Following upon an initiative by the authorities of the United Arab Republic, calling for international scientific cooperation in the publication of the ensemble of the manuscripts of Naga Hammadi, UNESCO is currently studying the various steps that could be taken. The creation of an International Committee charged with advancing the work of translation and editing is envisaged, conformable to the desire of the authorities of the United Arab Republic. But before that, one of the first tasks should be, it would seem, to send a technical mission of experts in order to assess the status of the manuscripts. Two specialists of worldwide reputation would be sent for this purpose, to P[ahor] Labib at the Coptic Museum of Cairo for a duration of a month, preferably next September. The report of this mission would serve as the basis for the discussion in the Committee, to work out a plan for the work, to be undertaken by the beginning of 1962.

Till took this to imply that the International Committee that had met in 1956 no longer existed:

Meanwhile a letter from UNESCO has come, which is for me a confirmation of my impression, that in Eg[ypt] the Intern[ational] Committee formed in 1956 is considered as not extant: One wants to found a new one—i.e. there is no mention at all of an old one.

On 12 May 1961 Till wrote Bammate listing as the non-Egyptian members of the 1956 committee Doresse, Meier, Peterson, Puech, Quispel, and Till. But reasons of health made it necessary for Till to decline membership in the Preliminary Committee. Following upon a visit on 21 June 1961 from Guillaumont, Puech and Malinine, Bammate reported that they, together with François Daumas, proposed Krause for the Preliminary Committee. On 15 August 1961 S. Asabuki, interim Director of the Department of Cultural
Activities of UNESCO, wrote to Pahor Labib, appointing him President of the Preliminary Committee, and to Louis-A. Christophe, Representative of UNESCO in Cairo for the Antiquities of Nubia, outlining to him the responsibilities of the Preliminary Committee: to provide a technical description of the codices, a plan, with a time-table, for their translation and publication, a budget, and a list of potential collaborators.

Guillaumont summarized the shape of the project as it had emerged thus far:

The project will be launched beginning this year [1961]. The project, as it is conceived at that time, envisages the edition of the Coptic text in transcription, a French, English, and Arabic translation, a succinct annotation. The publication will be made under the responsibility of an International Committee. At his [Bammate's] request, Puech and I propose to Bammate the names of qualified coptologists—on principle, one per nation—open to becoming members of this Committee, designating preferably those who, by their publications, have already shown an interest for the texts of Nag Hammadi.

A first meeting of this Committee is anticipated for the month of November of this same year 1961. Prior to this meeting, it seems useful to prepare an inventory of the texts conserved in the Coptic Museum of Old Cairo. It has been decided that this task will be entrusted to a preliminary study group consisting of Pahor Labib, Director of the Coptic Museum, Martin Krause, from the German Archaeological Institute of Cairo, and Michel Malinine, Director of Studies at the École Pratique des Hautes Études in Paris.

On 2 June 1961 Maheu notified Saroit Okacha, Minister of Culture and National Orientation of the Egyptian Region of the United Arab Republic, that UNESCO would fund the activity of an International Committee beginning with 1962:

As I made clear to you in my letter of 2 June, UNESCO would assume their functional expenses next year.

On 4 August 1961 Maheu sent out identical letters of invitation for membership in the International Committee to Garitte, Guillaumont, Quispel and Säve-Söderbergh:

---

18 According to an aide-memoire prepared by Guillaumont: ‘Édition des textes de Nag Hammadi. Documentation A. Guillaumont’ (see Part 5 below).

19 1 xii 61: Letter from Maheu to Okacha:

Comme je vous l’ai précisé dans ma lettre du 2 juin, l’Unesco prendrait à sa charge ses frais de fonctionnement l’an prochain.

20 4 viii 61: Letters from Maheu to Garitte, Guillaumont, Quispel, and Säve-Söderbergh:
The government of the United Arab Republic proposes undertaking, in collaboration with UNESCO, the translation and publication of the Gnostic manuscripts discovered at Naga Hammadi and conserved at the Coptic Museum in Cairo.

A small part of these manuscripts has been translated and published, but these texts remain as a whole unknown, and the preoccupation of the government of the United Arab Republic, shared with UNESCO, is to give to scholars and the cultured public access to them. At the same time as the translation, the edition will present the reproduction of the texts in photography and phototype. It will include only the critical apparatus that is strictly indispensable, the objective being to put the documents themselves in their totality at the disposal of scholars and the interested public, and not to propose an interpretation of them.

At the beginning of the autumn, a preliminary study group composed of Dr. Pahor Labib, Director of the Coptic Museum in Cairo, assisted by Krause, of the staff of the German Archaeological Institute in Cairo, and Malinine, of the École Pratique des Hautes Études in Paris, will proceed to a complete technical description of the manuscripts. An International Committee, to which will be entrusted the direction of the work of translation and publication, will be created by a decree of the government of the United Arab Republic. This Committee will meet for the first time in the month of November in Cairo, under the high patronage of the Minister of Culture and National Orientation.
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of the Egyptian Region of the United Arab Republic [Saroit Okacha]. In the course of this reunion, the Committee of publication will have as its task to trace the plan of the work of translation, to choose the collaborators, to designate a General Secretary, and, finally, to proceed to an estimate of the necessary expenditures.

A similar letter was sent to Martin Krause on 25 August 1961. By 20 October 1961 acceptances had been received from Garitte, Guillaumont, Quispel, Säve-Söderbergh, and Krause.\textsuperscript{21} Puech was of course concerned not to have received an invitation to membership in this International Committee.\textsuperscript{22}

Malinine reported that Krause had presented an inventory of the Nag Hammadi Codices at a conference in Germany, which might suggest Krause as the person in Cairo in charge of implemented the project. Hence on 9 August 1961 Malinine, together with Puech, proposed to UNESCO that Guillaumont function as the Cairo Secretary of the International Committee. If the rôle of Guillaumont be that of an outside agent working for the Committee, Puech could be included as the French member in the Committee. On 18 August 1961 Bammate suggested these possibilities to Asabuki, as well as proposing that Schoedel be replaced by Richard A. Parker. On 4 September 1961 Asabuki suggested to Maheu the substitution of Parker for Schoedel, and on 16 November 1961 wrote Parker inviting him.\textsuperscript{23} On 4 September 1961 Asabuki also recommended that Puech and Till be proposed to Egypt as Consultants to the International Committee. On 7 September 1961 Maheu made these supplemental nominations to Okacha.

On 3 October 1961 Okacha confirmed Maheu's nomination of Parker as a regular member of the International Committee and of Puech and Till as its Consultants.\textsuperscript{24} This did in fact conform to the rôle that Puech and Till had played thus far. For Puech, though not a coptologist, had participated fully in the planning.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{21} 23 x 61: Letter from Asabuki to Quispel.

\textsuperscript{22} 20 ix 61: Letter from Puech to Quispel.

\textsuperscript{23} 16 xi 61: Letter from Maheu to Parker.

\textsuperscript{24} 1 xii 61: Reported in a letter from Maheu to Okacha.

\textsuperscript{25} 20 ix 61: Letter from Puech to Quispel:

C’ est moi, en effet, qui ai proposé que votre nom figurât parmi ceux des savants internationaux appelés à se réunir au Caire vers la fin de novembre et, sans doute, à former le nouveau comité de publication des papyrus de Nag Hammadi. Je ne puis, pour le moment, entrer dans le détail du projet dont l’UNESCO a pris, ce printemps, l’initiative à la suite d’une série de démarches auxquelles j’ai été constamment et intimement mêlé. Je précise seulement que l’UNESCO s’est adressé à moi, pour le
It is I, in effect, who proposed that your [Quispel's] name figure among those of the international scholars invited to meet in Cairo toward the end of November, and, no doubt, to form the new committee of publication of the papyri of Nag Hammadi. For the moment I cannot enter into the details of the project for which UNESCO has taken the initiative, this spring, following a series of steps in which I have been constantly and intimately involved. I make clear only that UNESCO addressed itself to me, as the first, and, shortly thereafter, to Guillaumont, to indicate to them the persons most qualified to participate in the enterprise. Through our efforts, and with the participation of Malinine, this list, subsequently submitted to the Egyptian Minister of Culture, has been established with the greatest possible objectively, a perfect disinterestedness, with the sole purpose of serving the cause of science.

We have been occupied, in the same spirit, with preparing the mission entrusted to Messrs Malinine and Krause (the first is, incidentally, at present, at work there), and to elaborate, in concord with the representatives of UNESCO, the program and the objectives of the next meeting in Cairo. All this has cost us a great deal of time, I was going to say, since it has been necessary for me to occupy myself with the matter even in the month of August, and has made me lose a great deal of time.

Till, for his part, though prevented by his health from accepting an assignment as a member of the Preliminary Committee, had submitted recommendations:26

premier, et peu après, à M. Guillaumont, pour que nous leur indiquions les personnes les plus qualifiées pour participer à l'entreprise. Par nos soins, et avec le concours de M. Malinine, cette liste, soumise ensuite au Ministre égyptien de la Culture, a été établie avec la plus grande objectivité, un parfait désintéressement, dans le seul dessein de servir la cause de la science.

Nous nous sommes employés, dans le même esprit, à préparer la mission confiée à MM. Malinine et Krause (le premier est, d'ailleurs, actuellement à pied d’oeuvre) et à élaborer, de concert avec les représentants de l’UNESCO le programme et les objets de la prochaine réunion du Caire. Tout cela nous a coûté beaucoup de temps, j’allais dire, puisqu’il m’a fallu m’occuper de l’affaire encore au mois d’aôut, m’a fait perdre beaucoup de temps.

26 20 v 61: Letter from Till to Meier:

I have not only said to the UNESCO people that I cannot come to Cairo, but have made a lot of positive proposals, all that I wrote you, and that you mention in your letter. Also I sent my small contribution from the book of van Unnik, *Evangelien aus dem Nilsand.* 27 ... After all, there everything is recorded in detail. ... Only I have made no suggestions for personnel, since I was not asked about that. I did not mention Page. But it would be quite excellent, if he could take part. I will propose it to UNESCO.

On 6 November 1961 Puech and Till were formally invited to become Consultants to the International Committee: 28

I have the honor to invite you, with the agreement of the Minister of Culture and National Orientation of the United Arab Republic [Okacha], to participate, as a Consultant, in the work of the Committee of publication of the Gnostic manuscripts of Naga Hammadi. I address a similar invitation to Walter Till. It has in fact seemed particularly desirable that the International Committee of publication be able to benefit from you and Till, as much for your active support as for the exceptional authority associated with your and his name. I hope very much that it will be possible for you to provide us your cooperation, which is one of the conditions of the success of this great enterprise.

Of course the rôle of the International Committee itself would be primarily consultative, thus minimizing the distinction between regular members of the International Committee and its Consultants. But this mechanism made it possible to include Puech as well as Guillaumont without violating UNESCO’s policy of one person per nation, since in a technical sense the Consultants were not members of the International Committee, but Consultants to the International Committee. The listing also of Till as a Consultant gave a certain objectivity to this procedure, though Till did not in effect attend any meetings of the International Committee.

28 6 xi 61: Letter from Maheu to Puech:

J’ai l’honneur de vous inviter, avec l’agrément de Monsieur le Ministre de la Culture et de l’Oriantation Nationale de la République Arabe Unie, à prendre part, en qualité de conseiller, aux travaux du Comité de publication des manuscrits gnostiques de Naga Hammadi. J’adresse une semblable invitation à M. Walter Till. Il a paru en effet particulièrement souhaitable que le Comité international de publication puisse bénéficier de votre part et de la part de M. Till tant d’un appui actif que de l’exceptionnelle autorité reconnue à votre nom et au sien. J’espère très vivement qu’il vous sera possible de nous apporter un concours qui est une des conditions du succès de cette grande entreprise.
The Report of the Preliminary Committee

The Preliminary Committee, consisting of Pahor Labib (President), Malinine, and Krause, met at the Coptic Museum from 9–30 October 1961. On 4 November 1961 they submitted the first part of their report, which consisted primarily of the inventory already prepared by Martin Krause and published elsewhere. For each tractate, information concerning the state of publication plans was also recorded. The tacit assumption was that the Jung Codex and the tractates already assigned for publication by Pahor Labib would not be included in the UNESCO project. This would explain why the recommendations of the Preliminary Committee concerned only the distribution and publication of the 23 unassigned tractates:

23 treatises are to be distributed and published by the Committee, which will have its first meeting in November: in Codex III treatises 2-5; in Codex IV treatise 2; in Codex V treatise 1; in Codex VII treatises 3-5; all the treatises in Codex VIII–XII [VIII: 2; IX: 3; X: then thought to be 2, now thought to be 1; XI: 4; XII: then thought to be 1, now thought to be 3], and the first treatise in Codex XIII. [According to their counting of tractates codex by codex, they should have reached a total of 22 tractates, but as a matter of fact the correct numeration of the tractates does reach a total of 23.]

We propose, that first of all 11 treatises which are well preserved should be published: in Codex III treatises 2-5; in Codex V treatise 1; in Codex VII treatises 3-5; in Codex VIII treatise 2; in Codex XIII treatise 1. [This makes a total of 10, not 11, treatises.] The publication of the other 12 [13] treatises will require more time as they are more fragmentarily preserved and the publisher must come to Cairo.

All the publications should include the Coptic text, a translation, notes of textual criticism below the text and an index of the Greek and Coptic words. A commentary should be published separately. All publications should be of the same size. The Coptic text and the translation should be on the same page, as in the publication of The Apocryphon of John (we add a specimen), or text and translation should be separated, as in the publication of The Gospel of Thomas. If text and translation are on the same page, the publication will be less expensive. According to our estimation the publication of the 23 treatises which consist of about 565 pages will run to about 1500 pages (text

---

and translation on one page) or to about 2000 pages (text and translation separated).

We propose that UNESCO place a photographer, as soon as possible, at the disposal of Dr. Pahor Labib in order to photograph all the Gnostic Papyri for the publication of the texts that may be done in photocopy, as is mentioned in your letter, and not in fascicles. Dr. P[ahor] Labib's publication should perhaps be printed in Europe, since the plates produced in Egypt are not sufficient.

We do not think that in 1962 a manuscript for the publication of a treatise by the scholars indicated by the Great Committee will be finished. We, therefore, propose that in 1962 all the credits may be directed to the next volumes of Dr. P. Labib.

In about seven volumes—each containing about 150 plates—all the Gnostic texts can be published in phototypy. We will join an estimate of cost on a separate paper.

It is impossible to say how many years it will take to publish all the 23 treatises, as it depends on the number of scholars who will cooperate in the publication; this can be decided by the Great Committee.

We hope that UNESCO will create a centre to which every scholar who is cooperating should send the cards of his index, at the end of his work, to establish a complete index of all the words occurring in the texts of Nag Hammadi.

After consulting with Puech and Guillaumont, Asabuki raised two questions with Christophe:30

The report gives next a list of these 23 tractates. The total number of the tractates being, I believe, 48, I am led to ask myself the question as to what will be the fate of the tractates that, it seems, cannot be confided to the International Committee of publication. This seems to me very grave. If a large part of the tractates, and perhaps the most rich, are already on the way

---

30 17 xi 61: Letter from Asabuki to Christophe:

Le rapport donne ensuite une liste de ces 23 traités; le nombre total des traités étant, je crois, de 48, je suis amené à me poser la question de savoir quel sera le sort des traités qui, semble-t-il, ne peuvent être confiés au Comité international de publication. Ceci me paraît très grave; si une grande partie des traités, et peut-être les plus riches, se trouvent déjà en voie de publication, la création d’un Comité international de publication est-elle vraiment justifiée ...

Un autre point n’est pas sans me préoccuper. Je crois comprendre à la lecture du rapport de M. Labib qu’il publiera très prochainement des photographies des manuscrits. Une telle publication ne retirerait-elle pas beaucoup de son intérêt à la publication savante assortie de traductions que ferait ensuite le Comité de publication?
to publication, is the creation of an International Committee of publication really justified ... 

Another point does not fail to preoccupy me. I believe I understand, in reading the report of Labib, that he will publish in the very near future the photographs of the manuscripts. Will not such a publication take away much of the interest in the matching scholarly translations that the Committee of publication would subsequently make?

Both of these factors are valid. For the report of the Preliminary Committee would keep the better part of the Nag Hammadi codices out of the hands of the International Committee. And a facsimile edition would indeed render the assigning of individual tractates to chosen scholars superfluous, since then any scholar could produce a critical edition on the basis of the facsimiles, without official authorization to do so, as the German translations of much of Codex II had illustrated in the case of Pahor Labib's one volume of facsimiles. Thus the report of the Preliminary Committee actually rendered superfluous the assigning of tractates for publication to individual scholars by an International Committee. It would seem that in these regards Malinine had overlooked important considerations that Guillaumont would have flagged, had he been able to attend the meeting of the Preliminary Committee.

3. UNESCO’s Limitation to a Facsimile Edition

In view of these problems, Maheu outlined to Okacha on 1 December 1961 the implementation of the project as he had originally envisaged it involving a complete edition.31

---

31 xii 61: Letter from Maheu to Okacha:

L’intervention de l’UNESCO dans la traduction et la publication des manuscrits de Naga Hammadi me paraît largement justifiée par le fait que cette intervention rendrait possible une édition savante originale et complète. Je me permets de souligner l’importance essentielle que j’attache à ce que cette édition comprenne tous les manuscrits découverts à Naga Hammadi qui se trouvent, pour la plus grande partie, au Musée Copte du Caire, et pour une partie moindre à l’Institut Jung en Suisse. Chaque page du texte original reproduite en photographie et phototypie serait assortie d’une double traduction, la première dans la langue arabe, la seconde en langue allemande, anglaise ou française selon la langue de travail du traducteur.

Sous réserve des conclusions suggérées par le rapport de la mission préliminaire, le Comité serait prêt à commencer ses activités dans quelques semaines. Il sera officiellement constitué dès que le Gouvernement de la République Arabe Unie
The intervention of UNESCO in the translation and publication of the manuscripts of Naga Hammadi seems to me in large measure justified by the fact that this intervention would make possible an original and complete scholarly edition. I permit myself to underline the essential importance that I attach to this edition containing all the manuscripts discovered at Naga Hammadi.
that are found, in very large part, in the Coptic Museum in Cairo, and for a smaller part at the Jung Institute in Switzerland. Each page of the original text reproduced in photography and phototype would be equipped with a double translation, the first in the Arabic language, the second in the German, English, or French language, according to the translator’s work language.

With reservations concerning the conclusions suggested by the report of the preliminary mission, the Committee would be ready to begin its activities in some weeks. It will be officially constituted once the government of the United Arab Republic will have promulgated the decree which will define its responsibility and its composition. I would be very indebted to you, in view of the cooperation that has been established between the government of the United Arab Republic and UNESCO on this occasion, to be so kind as to communicate to me a first draft of the text of this decree, so that I can, if the case should occur, let you share, before the adoption of the definitive text, my observations or suggestions concerning the role of UNESCO as it will be mentioned.

The Committee of publication would have, it seems to me, a double function: On the one hand, it would propose to you, by the intermediary of UNESCO, all the measures suitable to assure the translation and publication, between the beginning of 1962 and the end of 1964, of the totality of the Gnostic manuscripts discovered at Naga Hammadi. On the other hand, it would assume later on the responsibility of implementing the measures that you will have been kind enough to approve.

It is also anticipated that the Committee of publication should, at its first meeting, propose a calendar for the work, bring together a list of the names of the competent collaborators among whom would be divided the work of translation, suggest the possible modalities of the edition and the printing, and proceed to budgetary estimates.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the Committee of publication will need to receive, to accomplish its task, the necessary indications and authorizations of the organism that holds the manuscripts. These manuscripts are unedited, with the exception of fragments that are found at the Jung Institute in Switzerland, and it will be the duty of the Committee of publication to have them translated, to join to them the indispensable critical apparatus, and to assure their complete scholarly edition. The question of the rights resulting from the publication could be the object of a later exchange of views between the government of the United Arab Republic and UNESCO.

The Committee should, on the other hand, formulate suggestions concerning its executive organ. It would seem to me particularly useful that its Secretariat be entrusted to a member of the Committee residing most often in Cairo, and who would thus act under the direct authority of the President of the Committee. If, as I assume, the printing is done in Cairo, the permanent presence of the Secretary in this city, along side of the President, would be
a necessity. It seems to me equally useful that a member of the Committee residing in the proximity of the location of UNESCO be charged with the functions of liaison with the Organization, as well as the coordination of the ensemble of the work, especially the work of translation, which will doubtless have to be entrusted, in large part, to specialists who are in the countries of Western Europe. I would be grateful to you, if you would be so kind as to let me know your view as to the method that I have permitted myself to propose to you. If it meets with your agreement, it will be brought to the attention of the Committee of publication, in order that it can inspire itself from it, in its suggestions regarding the composition of its executive organ. This executive organ would be constituted, on its initiative, with your approval, right after the first meeting of the Committee of publication, at the beginning of 1962.

These recommendations for a Cairo executive organ and a Paris liaison with UNESCO for the International Committee could be implemented only by naming Guillaumont as Cairo Secretary and Puech as Paris liaison with UNESCO. A publication in Cairo would point to the *Institut Français d’Archéologie Oriental du Caire* as publisher. With UNESCO providing the photography, Doresse would not be needed. In view of a French liaison person responsible for coordination with UNESCO, it would be relatively easy to circumvent the Germans Böhlig and Schenke, both from the German Democratic Republic, a state that was at the time not a member of UNESCO. Thus the recommendations seem to be what Puech and Guillaumont had expressed to the French General Director of UNESCO René Maheu. But the recommendations were never implemented.

Asabuki had invited Guillaumont at the end of November to come discuss the report of the Preliminary Committee in more detail with him; this meeting took place on 4 December 1961. Guillaumont then wrote out his position as follows:32

32 15 xii 61: Letter from Guillaumont to Asabuki:

> Je vous avoue que la lecture de ce rapport me cause quelque surprise et me révèle une situation fort différente de celle que supposait notre précédente correspondance relative au Comité projeté pour la publication des textes de Nag Hamadi.

> Je constate, en effet, à sa lecture, que sur environ 46 traités (mis à part le Codex I, formé de feuillets détachés de l’actuel Codex Jung):

> 7 traités seraient actuellement publiés, 17 autres seraient déjà attribués pour publication, et qu’il reste seulement, selon les termes mêmes des rapporteurs, 23 traités, c’est-à-dire à peine la moitié de l’ensemble de la collection de Nag Hamadi qui seront mis à la disposition du Comité, pour être attribués, lors de sa première réunion.

> Je constate, de plus, que les traités présentés comme déjà publiés ou à publier par des personnes déjà désignées sont incontestablement ceux qui ont le plus grand intérêt
I admit to you [Asabuki] that the reading of this report causes me some surprise and reveals to me a situation very different from what our previous correspondence presupposed relative to the Committee envisaged for the publication of the texts of Nag Hamadi.

In fact, I observe on reading it that of about 46 tractates (putting to one side Codex I, made up of leaves detached from the present Jung Codex):

7 tractates would at present have been published, 17 others would have been already assigned for publication, and there remain only, according to the terms themselves of the reporters, 23 tractates, that is to say, hardly half of the ensemble of the collection of Nag Hamadi, which will be put at the disposal of the Committee, to be assigned at the time of its first meeting.

I note, in addition, that the treatises presented as already published or to be published by persons already designated, are undoubtedly those that have the most interest, and that give to the Nag Hamadi discovery its exceptional
importance. Only those are left to be distributed by the Committee that offer the least interest and those whose publication, in view of their poor state or their fragmentary condition, will be especially thankless.

Upon the invitation addressed to me last 4 August by the General Director of UNESCO [Maheu], I agreed quite willingly to become part of a Committee whose stated objective was the publication of the ensemble of the Nag Hamadi texts; it was, in addition, made clear that this Committee would have for its task, at its first meeting, to sketch the plan of the work of publication and to divide the work among the competent specialists. Now it seems to me evident that, in the conditions defined by the report, the Committee is from the very beginning dispossessed of this essential antecedent task, for the major and most important part of the Nag Hamadi texts. If its rôle must be limited to covering with its authority a work organized without it and accomplished outside of its effective control, I for my part think that it no longer has any raison d’être.

I hope nonetheless that the situation can still be modified. For that, it would seem to me desirable to ask of the reporters the following clarifications:

At which publishing houses and at which dates did the tractates presented as already published appear? For my part, I only know of two publications (apart from the photographic volume published in Cairo in 1956): that of the Gospel according to Thomas (Codex II,2), published in 1959 at Brill in Leiden, and that of four complementary pages of the Gospel of Truth (Codex I,1 [= I,3]), announced in the report as going to be published, but in fact having appeared in 1961, at Rascher in Zürich.

On what date were the tractates presented as about to be published assigned to the designated persons? What work has in fact been done on these documents by these persons? If these assignments had already been made by the time when the project of forming the Committee was announced to those interested, it seems to me strange that the government of the United Arab Republic and UNESCO were not informed of it from that time on by those who, among the beneficiaries of these assignments, were proposed to be members of the Committee, and especially by PA[ahor] Labib, Conservator of the Coptic Museum.

Thereupon Asabuki and Maheu decided on 19 December 1961 that UNESCO should support a very rapid publication of photographic reproductions of all the manuscripts, a facsimile edition, after which the International Committee would assign the texts to translators and supervise the quality of their translations. There followed a meeting on 29 December 1961 of Puech and Guillaumont with Asabuki, to whom they proposed that UNESCO limit itself to a facsimile edition:33

33 According to the aide-memoire prepared by Guillaumont for UNESCO: Édition des textes de Nag Hammadi. Documentation A. Guillaumont (see Part 5 below).
Puech and I [Guillaumont], in the course of this discussion, confirm to Asabuki the terms of my letter, and propose to UNESCO, given the situation revealed by the report, a change of program: Give up the edition of a transcription, and of the projected translations, and publish, instead of them, a photographic edition of the ensemble of the documents, in such as way as to put them, as soon as possible, at the disposal of all the specialists who might be interested in them.

Guillaumont’s aide-memoire recorded that his proposal was accepted:34

This new project is accepted. It is agreed that the photographs, made at the Coptic Museum by the photographers of the ‘Center of Documentation and of Studies on the History of the Art and Civilization of [Ancient] Egypt,’ will be stored at the office of UNESCO and will not be communicated to anyone, up until the completion of the photographic work and the meeting of the Committee, which will decide on the method to follow for the publication. At the request of P[ahor] Labib, a second set of photographs will be made for the Coptic Museum, under the same condition, that the photos will not be diffused before the meeting of the Committee.

When I inquired of Pahor Labib if I could see these photographs at the Coptic Museum, he replied that since his retirement they seem to have disappeared.

Guillaumont has further clarified:35

It was after this that UNESCO gave up the originally projected edition, which was to contain text and translation. Following a proposal that I myself had made to Bammate, the project has been transformed, and a photographic edition of the documents has been undertaken. The Center of Documentation in Cairo has been entrusted with making photographs, a task what was carried out during the years 1962–1966.

The plan for a meeting of the International Committee was repeatedly deferred: The meeting had originally been planned for November 1961.36

---

34 According to the aide-memoire prepared by Guillaumont for UNESCO: Édition des textes de Nag Hammadi. Documentation A. Guillaumont (see Part 5 below).

35 17 xii 76: The face sheet to a dossier provided by Guillaumont for the present report:

C’est après cela que l’UNESCO a renoncé à l’édition d’abord projetée, devant comporter texte et traduction. Suivant une proposition faite par moi-même à M. Bammate, le projet a été transformé et une édition photographique des documents a été entreprise. Le Centre de documentation du Caire a été chargé de faire les photographies, travail qui s’est fait durant les années 1962–1966.

36 4 viii 62: Letters from Asabuki to Guillaumont and Säve-Söderbergh.
Säve-Söderbergh reported on 2 November 1961 that he would only be available between 20 November and early December, 1961. The schedule was then reformulated: 

... probably in the last days of November, or in the course of the month of December.

On 16 November 1961 the time was stated as ‘in the following months.’ On 22 November 1961 it was reported that the first part of the report of the Preliminary Committee dated 4 November 1961 had been received, but not the second, budgetary part, with a resultant delay of the meeting until early 1962:

> Il me paraît sage de prévoir que cette première réunion ne pourra avoir lieu avant la fin de l’année, mais dans les premiers mois de 1962.

On 1 December 1961 Maheu gave the same reason for a delay until 'a coming month.' He added that responses were still outstanding from Parker, Puech, and Till, after which the official naming of the members of the committee could take place:

> Il sera officiellement constitué dès que le Gouvernement de la République Arabe Unie aura promulgué le décret qui définira son mandat et sa composition.

Furthermore Maheu had also requested an opportunity to see a draft of the decree before it was officially passed.

---

37 2 xi 61: Letter from Säve-Söderbergh to Asabuki.
38 20 x 61: Letters from Asabuki to Guillaumont and Säve-Söderbergh and of 23 x 61 from Asabuki to Quispel:

... probablement dans les derniers jours de novembre, ou au cours du mois de décembre.

39 16 xi 61: Letters from Maheu to Puech and Parker:

... dans les mois suivants.

40 22 xi 61: Letters from Asabuki to Guillaumont and Säve-Söderbergh:

Il me paraît sage de prévoir que cette première réunion ne pourra avoir lieu avant la fin de l’année, mais dans les premiers mois de 1962.

41 1 xii 61: Letter from Maheu to Okacha:

... un prochain mois.

42 1 xii 61: Letter from Maheu to Okacha:

Il sera officiellement constitué dès que le Gouvernement de la République Arabe Unie aura promulgué le décret qui définira son mandat et sa composition.
Actually, when the decree was finally published in Arabic on 27 January 1971 in the Cairo newspaper *El Akhbar*, only one representative per nation was named. In the case of France, Guillaumont was named and Puech was omitted, though this was not known at the meeting of the International Committee itself on 15–18 December 1970, where Puech was chosen as one of the honorary presidents (see Chapter 11, Part 3 below).

On 11 December 1961 the first part of the report was circulated to those envisaged for membership in the International Committee, with a note to the effect that the second part had not yet been received. On 11 December 1961 the first part of the report was circulated to those envisaged for membership in the International Committee, with a note to the effect that the second part had not yet been received. Parker accepted membership in the International Committee, on the condition that the date of the meeting be between February 1962 and late April 1962, the period when he would be available in Egypt. But on 28 December 1961 Quispel wrote UNESCO urging haste:

> I have received your letter of 22 November and the report of 11 December 1961, which have disappointed me greatly. One would have been able at least to expect a complete report and a new date for the meeting of the Committee.

Knowing somewhat the history of the manuscripts of Nag Hamadi, I give you the urgent advice to call for the second half of the report before the end of January and to settle upon a date for the meeting of the Committee, which should take place before the first of May.

On 29 December 1961 Säve-Söderbergh wrote that he would be in the Sudan from 15 January 1962 to the end of March 1962, but could, if given advance notice, come to Cairo for a week during that time.

On 10 January 1962 Krause submitted to Asabuki the second part of the report of the Preliminary Committee, giving a cost estimate for a critical edition of the 23 tractates it proposed be published under the auspices of UNESCO. Krause’s report was based upon estimates by the *Institut français d'archéologie orientale* in Cairo of £É 12,000 and by the Augustin Verlag (that

---

43 11 xii 61: Letters from Asabuki to Guillaumont and Säve-Söderbergh.
44 11 xii 61: Letter from Parker to Maheu.
45 28 xii 61: Letter from Quispel to Asabuki:

> J’ai bien reçu votre lettre du 22 novembre et le rapport du 11 décembre 1961, qui m’ont beaucoup déçu. On aurait pu attendre au moins un rapport complet et une nouvelle date pour la réunion du Comité.

> Connaissant un peu l’histoire des manuscrits de Nag Hamadi, je vous donne le conseil urgent d’exiger la deuxième moitié du rapport avant la fin de janvier et de fixer une date pour la réunion du Comité qui devrait avoir lieu avant le premier mai.

46 29 xii 62: Letter from Säve-Söderbergh to Asabuki.
also published for the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut) of DM 165,000, to which estimates the cost of binding would have to be added.

Thus the expenditures for printing and binding could lie somewhat under DM 200,000.

On 2 February 1962 Asabuki proposed that a meeting could take place:

... in the first months, for example at the end of March or the beginning of April.

However he recalled the problem posed by the previously made assignments as follows:

I immediately add that the Committee has no official existence, and cannot have any, until the Government of the United Arab Republic has established the decree by which the Committee will be created. ...

It is hence important to dissipate any ambiguity on this point, and to ascertain whether really the listed tasks have been assigned to certain specialists even before the Committee has been created, or if it is rather a matter of suggestions.

On 5 April 1962 Bammate received a staff report:

47 10 i 62: Report from Krause to Asabuki with the second part of the report of the Preliminary Committee:

Somit dürften die Ausgaben für Druck und Einband leicht unter DM 200,000 liegen.

48 2 ii 62: Report from Asabuki to Van der Haagen, Director of the Service des monuments de Nubie:

... dans les premiers mois, par example à la fin de mars ou au début d’avril.

49 2 ii 62: Report from Asabuki to Van der Haagen:

J’ajoute aussitôt que le Comité n’a encore aucune existence officielle et ne pourra en avoir que lorsque le Gouvernement de la RAU aura pris le décret par lequel ce Comité sera créé. ...

Il importait donc de dissiper tout équivoque sur ce point et de savoir si réellement des tâches précisées ont été assignées à certains spécialistes avant même que le Comité ne soit créé, ou s’il s’agit plutôt de suggestions.

50 5 iv 62: Staff report to Bammate:

Il semble certain, pourtant, que le Directeur du Musée Copte, à son échelon, a donné à plusieurs spécialistes européens l’autorisation de traduire et de publier les traductions du plus grand nombre des manuscrits de Naga Hammadi. Ce que je ne sais pas pour ma part, c’est si le Gouvernement peut maintenant suspendre son autorisation, et au cas où il pourrait le faire, s’il le souhaiterait. Ce que je ne vois pas davantage, c’est si les travaux dont on nous dit qu’ils sont “sous presse” sont vraiment en cours d’impression au sens technique du terme. Si ces traductions sont vraiment sous presse, cela signifie
It seems certain, however, that the Director of the Coptic Museum, at his level, has given to several European specialists the authorization to translate and publish translations of most of the manuscripts of Naga Hammadi. What I for my part do not know is whether the Government can now suspend his authorization, and in case it can do so, if it would wish to. What I in addition do not see is whether the works that one tells us are “in the press” are really in the course of being printed, in the technical sense of the word. If these translations are really in the press, that indicates that the translations are already completed—well, the lists of tractates annexed to the notes of Christophe either come under the title “published” or under the title “in the press.”

If twenty-seven tractates are on the point of appearing, it is no doubt too late for the Organization to intervene. If on the other hand these twenty-seven tractates, or the large majority of them, are only in the course of being translated, it is perhaps still possible for the Government and the Organization to take the ensemble of the works under their common auspices. ...

The idea of publishing a complete collection of good working photographs of the manuscripts of Naga Hammadi can be envisaged as long as these reproductions will appear first. Once a large part of the manuscripts would be translated and published, a complete photographic edition would lose much of its interest.

If one supposes that the translations “in the press” will appear only in 1963 and that these publications would be regrouped under the double patronage of the Government and UNESCO, it would still be possible to convene the International Committee of publication in the autumn, to put all the enterprise in the framework of a concerted international cooperation.
In the case of the two volumes “in the press,” the edition of II,1; III,1; IV,1 is listed on the title page as appearing in 1962, but the printing was completed only in 1963, and the edition of II,6–7; VI,1–8 was published in 1971–1972.

Säve-Söderbergh also recommended the limitation of the UNESCO project to a facsimile edition:51

51 31 iii 62 (the date is given only on the letter from Säve-Söderbergh to Louis-A. Christophe written on the same day): Letter from Säve-Söderbergh to Asabuki:

Pendant mon voyage de retour du Soudan j’ai eu l’occasion de discuter les problèmes concernant la publication des manuscrits coptes de Naga Hammadi avec M. Christophe au Centre de Documentation et avec M. Krause de l’Institut Allemand au Caire.

A mon avis, et nous étions tous d’accord sur ce point, le plus essentiel et le plus urgent est que l’UNESCO intervienne pour rendre possible une édition complète en photo de tous les manuscrits. … Une telle édition, qui pourra être imprimée dans peu de temps et à un prix probablement plus bas que pour une édition en caractères d’imprimerie, mettrait l’ensemble de ces textes si importants à la disposition de tous les savants nombreux qui s’y intéressent.

On a déjà eu l’expérience, même avec une édition en photos de mauvaise qualité au point de vue technique telle que celle de Pahor Labib (Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum, 1) que les facsimilés ont immédiatement provoqué un grand intérêt et ont eu comme conséquence toute une littérature de traductions, commentaires et traités spéciaux, tandis que dans le cas, où, comme c’était le cas du Papyrus Jung et de l’Évangile de Thomas, un texte est donné avec “copyright” à une groupe de savants, non pas seulement la publication du texte même, mais aussi les traductions et les commentaires sont très retardés. A vrai dire dans aucun de ces cas le commentaire annoncé par le groupe en question n’est encore paru. …

Une édition photographique ne perd rien en valeur du fait que plusieurs des papyrus sont en train d’être publiés, étant donné que, d’après les informations que j’ai eu de M. Krause, aucune de ces publications ne donnera le texte en facsimilé. …

Quant au plan d’une publication de l’ensemble proposé par le “working group” (“the Coptic text, a translation, notes of textual criticism below the text and an index of the Greek and Coptic words”) il est en principe excellent. Mais je comprends très bien vos réactions, qui m’ont été expliquées par M. Christophe comme réponse à ma question, pourquoi la réunion du Comité a été remise plusieurs fois. Le fait que 27 des traités ont été déjà distribués à divers savants et sont en train d’être publiés sous peu, et que le projet, dont se chargerait l’UNESCO, n’impliquerait qu’une distribution et publication du reste, c. a. d. 23 (ou plus exacte 22) traités, en réduit naturellement l’intérêt, comme une telle publication aurait dû contenir tout l’ensemble.

Ce problème, ainsi que la question, si ces traités doivent du tout être distribués à des savants choisis par un Comité international, pourra être discuté plus tard, quand on aura vu les effets de la publication en photos. A juger par l’expérience qu’on a eue jusqu’ici il ne sera probablement pas nécessaire de rien entreprendre pour obtenir des traductions ou des commentaires, car ils seront publiés grâce à l’intérêt des textes immédiatement que ces textes sont mis à la disposition du monde savant.
During my return trip from the Sudan, I had the opportunity to discuss the problems concerning the publication of the Coptic manuscripts of Naga Hammadi with Christophe at the Center of Documentation and with Krause of the German Institute in Cairo.

In my opinion, and we were all in agreement on this point, the most essential and urgent thing is that UNESCO intervene to make possible a complete edition in photos of all the manuscripts. ... Such an edition, which can be printed in a short time and at a price probably lower than for an edition in characters of the printing press, would put the ensemble of these so important texts at the disposal of all the numerous scholars who are interested in them. [On 12 April 1962 Jacques Gomel, Director of the Division of Production (‘Chef de Fabrication’) of UNESCO, estimated that the cost of a facsimile edition would be $30,000 to $40,000.]

One has already had the experience, even with an edition of photos of poor quality from the technical point of view, such as that of Pahor Labib (Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum, 1) that the facsimiles have immediately provoked a great interest and have as a consequence produced a whole literature of translations, commentaries, and special treatises, whereas when, as was the case with the Jung Papyrus and the Gospel of Thomas, a text is given with “copyright” to a group of scholars, not only the publication of the text itself, but also translations and commentaries are very delayed. To tell the truth, in none of these cases has the commentary announced by the group in question yet appeared. ...

A photographic edition loses nothing in value by the fact that several of the papyri are in the course of being published, given that, according to the
information that I have received from Krause, none of these publications will provide the text in facsimile. ...

Regarding the plan for a publication of the ensemble proposed by the “working group” (“the Coptic text, a translation, notes of textual criticism below the text and an index of the Greek and Coptic words”) it is in principle excellent. But I understand very well your reactions, which have been explained to me by Christophe in response to my question as to why the meeting of the Committee has been delayed several times. The fact that 27 of the tractates have already been distributed to diverse scholars and are in the course of being published soon, and that the project for which UNESCO would assume responsibility would involve only a distribution and publication of the remainder, i.e. 23 (or more exactly 22) tractates, reduces naturally its interest, since such a publication should have contained all the ensemble.

This problem, as well as the question as to whether these tractates ought to be distributed at all to scholars chosen by an International Committee, can be discussed later, after one has seen the effects of the publication in photos. To judge by the experience that one has had up until now, it will probably not be necessary to undertake anything to obtain translations or commentaries, for they will be published thanks to the interest of the texts, as soon as these texts are put at the disposal of the scholarly world.

If one finds that it is nevertheless necessary to try to obtain a “standard edition” that is scientific, as envisaged by the “working group,” the quality of such an edition will in any case surely be much better, if the editors will be able to use the results of preliminary studies and all the discussions of the problems based on the edition in photos.

The only scholars who could perhaps complain of such an arrangement are those who have received the tractates for publication with a sort of copyright, and who will not have time to complete these publications before the publication in facsimile by UNESCO. This problem is not very serious, and Krause is also of this view, in spite of the fact that he is one of these scholars. The two volumes of Krause-Labib are already in the press, as is that of Böhlig-Labib (tractates II,5 and XIII,2 “in proofs”), and the tractates I,2 [= I,3] and 3 [= I,4] are also printed, except for the Preface, I am told. The tractates II,3 (assigned to Grobel) and II,4 (Plumley) are already available for everyone in the volume of Pahor Labib (Coptic Gnostic Papyri, 1) and have been translated by Schenke.

The only assigned tractates that perhaps cannot be published before an edition in photos by UNESCO, if this edition is begun immediately, are hence VII,1 and 2 (assigned to Krause, who has no objections concerning the “copyright”) and V,2 to 5 (Böhlig-Labib).

Since the publication of the Facsimile Edition was delayed a decade, a number of the previously assigned texts had indeed appeared by the time the relevant volume of the Facsimile Edition was published (square brackets
indicate editors not named in the listing of assignments, and also indicate the actual dates of publication: II,1 (Krause and Pahor Labib) [1962/1963]; II,2 (“the members of the first session of the International Committee” [Guillaumont, Puech, Quispel, Till, Yassah ‘Abd al-Masih]) [1959]; II,3 [Till, 1963]; II,4 [Bullard, 1970 and Nagel, 1970]; II,5 (Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib) [1962]; II,6-7 (Martin Krause and Pahor Labib) [1971/1972]; III,1 (Martin Krause and Pahor Labib) [1962/1963]; IV,1 (Martin Krause and Pahor Labib) [1962/1963]; V,2-5 (Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib) [1965]; VI,1-8 (Martin Krause and Pahor Labib) [1971/1972]; XIII,2 (Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib) [1965]. Previously assigned texts that had still not been published when the relevant volume of The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices appeared were only VII, 1-2 (Krause), since the volume of the Facsimile Edition appeared in 1972 and his critical edition appeared in 1973. With regard to the texts whose assignment was announced by Krause only in 1966, well after the report of the Preliminary Committee, those that had been published by the time the relevant volume of the Facsimile Edition appeared were III,2 ([Doresse 1966/1968]), then III,2 and IV,2 (both Alexander Böhlig and [Frederik Wisse with] Pahor Labib) [1974/1975]; what had not been published was III,3-5 (Krause); V,1 (Krause); and VII,3 and 5 ([both Martin Krause and] Victor Girgis) [1973].

Säve-Söderbergh also raised the question whether a meeting of the International Committee would even be necessary, if the project is to be limited to a facsimile edition:52

I cannot judge whether a meeting of a Committee will be necessary, if UNESCO limits itself now to the first part of the project—the edition in photos, about whose necessity I think all the interested scholars are in agreement. But it seems to me that these problems need not retard the beginning of the work.

The plans for the convening of an International Committee seem indeed to have been suspended:53

52 31 iii 62: Letter from Säve-Söderbergh to Asabuki:

Je ne peux pas juger, si une réunion d’un Comité sera nécessaire, si l’UNESCO se limite maintenant à la première partie du projet—l’édition en photos, sur la nécessité de laquelle je pense que tous les savants intéressés sont d’accord. Mais il me semble, que ces problèmes ne doivent pas retarder le commencement du travail.

53 3 viii 62: Letter from Maheu to Okacha:

Les dispositions nouvelles du plan de publication que nous envisageons me font douter de la nécessité de réunir maintenant un Comité international. La tâche d’un
The new arrangements for the plan of publication that we envisage cause me [Maheu] to doubt the necessity to convene now an International Committee. The task of such a Committee would have been to assure the translations that were originally envisaged. But since these translations are no longer envisaged, it seems to me more useful to shift the funds that would have been absorbed by the meeting of an International Committee to the printing itself.

One could nonetheless put the publication under the patronage of a small number of scholars of different countries, who would assist the specialist of the United Arab Republic whom you [Okacha] designate, and who would preserve for the enterprise the international character that you have wished to assure it, quite appropriately, in view of the echo it has evoked. If you think so, I would be ready to submit to you suggestions in this regard, right after the twelfth session of the General Conference.

UNESCO’s letter of invitation to membership in the new International Committee had stated:54

At the same time as the translation, the edition will present the reproduction of the texts in photograph and phototype.

The Preliminary Committee had recommended that UNESCO provide a photographer and allocate all the funds available to the Nag Hammadi project for 1962 to the advancement of the seven-volume facsimile edition of Pahor Labib, who was the chair of the Preliminary Committee.

On 19 June 1962 Okacha wrote Maheu that he should:55

---

54 4 viii 61: Letters from Maheu to Guillaumont and Säve-Söderbergh:

En même temps que la traduction, l’édition présentera la reproduction des textes en photographie et phototypie.

55 As cited in the letter of 3 viii 62 from Maheu to Okacha:

... proposer que l’UNESCO assure l’édition photographique de la collection entière de ces manuscrits.
... propose that UNESCO assure the photographic edition of the whole collection of these manuscripts.

Maheu responded:\(^{56}\)

I believe, as do you, that a photographic edition must be of a quality that is technologically irreproachable. In the hands of the specialists, it should constitute the reliable and practical instrument that is still lacking, and which alone will permit the subsequent publication not only of complete translations but also of multiple commentaries.

---

\(^{56}\) 3 viii 62: Letter from Maheu to Okacha:

Je crois, comme vous, qu’une édition photographique doit être d’une qualité technique irréprochable. Elle devra constituer entre les mains des spécialistes l’instrument sûr et pratique qui fait encore défaut et qui seul permettra la publication ultérieure non seulement de traductions complètes mais aussi de commentaires multiples.

Je n’ai pas manqué de ménager, dans le projet de programme et budget de l’Organisation pour 1963–1964, la possibilité d’apporter un appui à d’importantes publications intéressant l’histoire des civilisations. Je voudrais attirer votre attention sur le paragraphe suivant de ce projet de programme et budget.

Participation aux activités des États membres: (ref. déc. 12 chapitre 4, Activités culturelles, Sciences humaines, Para. 89)

L’aide que l’Organisation apportera à des États membres dans le cadre de son programme de participation pour des travaux de recherche (50,000 dollars) portera notamment sur les suivants:

(i) missions de recherches et publications de documents, de traductions ou d’études d’un intérêt scientifique exceptionnel et appelant une coopération internationale entre savants, comme, par exemple, la publication des manuscrits coptes de Naga Hammadi qui contiennent des écrits d’une grande importance pour l’histoire culturelle des débuts de l’ère chrétienne;

(ii) préparation et publication de lexiques ou de dictionnaires bilingues ou multilingues intéressant des langues pour lesquelles de tels ouvrages n’existent pas, ou sont encore insuffisants.

Si la Conférence générale veut bien, comme je l’espère, approuver ces dispositions lors de sa prochaine session, il vous appartiendra de demander la participation de l’UNESCO à la publication des manuscrits de Naga Hammadi. Cette publication pourrait alors être entreprise dès 1963 et menée aussi loin que les crédits disponibles le permettraient.

Je me suis informé, d’autre part, des conditions d’exécution du travail préliminaire de photographie. Le Centre de documentation et d’études sur l’histoire de l’art et de la civilisation de l’Égypte ancienne me paraît particulièrement qualifié pour accomplir cette tâche. Il pourrait être chargé, si une telle suggestion rencontrent votre agrément, de photographier, avant la fin de 1962, les manuscrits de Naga Hammadi en vue de leur publication. Je serais prêt alors à fournir au Centre les “négatifs” et le papier nécessaires et à mettre à sa disposition la somme de trois cents livres—à titre d’honoraires—à l’intention du personnel à qui ces travaux seraient confiés.
I have not neglected to arrange, in the plan of the program and budget of the Organization for 1963–1964, the possibility for providing support to important publications concerning the history of civilizations. I would like to draw your attention to the following paragraph of this program and budget plan.

Participation in the activities of the member States: (ref. Dec. 12, chapter 4, Cultural Activities, Human Sciences, Par. 89)

The assistance that the Organization will provide to member States within the framework of its program of participation for works of research (50,000 dollars) will apply especially to the following:

1. Missions of research and publication of documents, of translations, or of studies of an exceptional scientific interest, and calling for an international cooperation among scholars, as, for example, the publication of the Coptic manuscripts of Naga Hammadi that contain texts of great importance for the cultural history of the beginnings of the Christian era;

2. Preparation and publication of lexica or bilingual or multilingual dictionaries concerning the languages for which such works do not exist, or are still insufficient.

If the General Conference desires, as I hope, to approve these proposals at the time of its next session, it will be up to you to ask for the participation of UNESCO in the publication of the manuscripts of Naga Hammadi. This publication could then be undertaken beginning in 1963, and be carried on as far as available credits permit.

I have informed myself, on the other hand, about the conditions for executing the preliminary work of photography. The Center of Documentation and of Studies on the History of the Art and Civilization of Ancient Egypt seems to me particularly qualified to accomplish this task. It could be charged, if such a suggestion would meet with your approval, to photograph, before the end of 1962, the manuscripts of Naga Hammadi in view of their publication. I would then be ready to furnish to the Center the ‘negatives’ and the necessary paper, and to put at its disposal the amount of three hundred Pounds—as honoraria—intended for the personnel to whom these tasks will be entrusted.

On 22 September 1962 the concerns of Krause were expressed by Christophe as follows: 57

---

57 22 ix 62: Christoph's report to Bammate:

Le Dr. Krause, que j'ai mis au courant de nos discussions, s'est montré très satisfait. Mais il m'a averti d'une difficulté que nous pourrions rencontrer.

Les papyri ont été placés sous 1,100 feuilles de perspex, voir page 1 du Rapport. Or très souvent il y a des fragments qui ont été mis ensemble, alors qu'ils appartiennent à des pages différents.
Dr. Krause, whom I have brought up to date on our discussions, indicated he was very satisfied. But he notified me of a difficulty that we could encounter. The papyri have been placed under 1,100 panes of plexiglass, see page 1 of the Report. Now very often there are fragments that have been put together, when they belong to different pages.

Dr. Krause indicated to me that it would be indispensable that Dr. Pahor Labib collaborate very actively with the photographer that we send him. In effect, in the projected publication, it would be necessary to put the fragments with the pages to which they belong.

Dr. Krause, who will not leave Egypt definitively until 31 December, has promised to provide me, to the extent possible, his gratuitous collaboration in a task that is difficult, but absolutely necessary.

On 12 December 1962 a supply contract ("contrat de fourniture") was signed between UNESCO and Dedawy, General Administrator of the Center of Documentation and of Study on the History of the Art and Civilization of Ancient Egypt (Administrateur Général du Centre de Documentation et d’Études sur l’Histoire de l’Art et de la Civilization de l’Égypte Ancienne). UNESCO would provide $1,000 for photographic equipment and processing, and £300 for the work of the photographers. Two complete sets of enlargements (13 by 18 cm.) were to be made, one for the archives of the printer, one for UNESCO. The project was to be completed by 1 March 1965. Article 5 of the contract read: 58

The right of reproduction in all countries as well as the individual property rights, and to the ensemble of materials brought together in the course of

---

the work (with the exception of already existent materials, either public or private), will become the exclusive property of UNESCO, who alone will have the right to publish them in totality or in part, to adapt them and to use them as it sees fit and to give authorization to translate them or to make extended quotations from them.

On 30 December 1962 Christophe notified UNESCO: 59

Nonetheless I permit myself to suggest to you to send an official word to Pahor Labib, without however insisting too much on his collaboration, since that would call forth on his part a reaction of interest that is quite inopportune.

... Dr. Krause has left Cairo for Münster ten days ago. There is a collaboration that escapes us, but it is not necessary to despair over that. Another solution will certainly be found, and I will not neglect any effort in this direction. I am entirely in agreement with you: The photographer of the Center of Documentation must be guided by a qualified specialist.

On 6 January 1963 Christophe reported further: 60

---

59 30 xii 62: Christoph's report to UNESCO:

Toutefois, je me permets de vous suggérer d’envoyer un mot officiel à M. Pahor Labib, sans cependant trop insister sur sa collaboration parce que cela susciterait de sa part une réaction intéressée tout à fait inopportune. ...

Le Dr. Krause a quitté Le Caire pour Münster il y a une dizaine de jours; voilà une collaboration qui nous échappe, mais il ne faut pas désespérer pour cela. Une autre solution sera certainement trouvée et je ne négligerai aucun effort en ce sens, je suis entièrement d’accord avec vous: le photographe du Centre de Documentation doit être guidé par un spécialiste qualifié.

60 6 i 63: Christoph's report to UNESCO:

Le Dr. Pahor Labib m’a immédiatement fait savoir que rien n’avait été fait, depuis la rédaction du rapport du Comité préparatoire en décembre 1961. ...


Le Dr. Pahor Labib se propose, avec l’aide d’une assistante, de faire ce travail en dehors des heures d’ouverture du Musée. ...

Dans ces conditions, les travaux de photographie des Papyrus gnostiques risquent de durer plus de trois mois. Un délai de six mois (au total) me paraît absolument nécessaire.

Reste à savoir quel spécialiste viendra pour régler le problème du Codex VII. Reste à savoir aussi si le Dr. Pahor Labib et son assistante ne demanderont pas à être rémunérés pour leur travail supplémentaire. Qui, dans ce cas, assumerait ces frais nouveaux?
Dr. Pahor Labib has let me know immediately that nothing had been done since the redaction of the report of the Preliminary Committee in December 1961. ...

Thus five codices are now able to be photographed (II?, X, XI, XII and XIII), and eight codices must be placed under “sheets” of plexiglass (I, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX) before being entrusted to the photographer.

Dr. Pahor Labib proposes, with the aid of an assistant, to do this work outside of the hours that the Museum is open. ...

Under these conditions, the work of photography of the Gnostic papyri risks lasting more than three months. A duration of six months (in all) seems to me absolutely necessary.

One must still determine which specialist will come to handle the problem of Codex VII [cartonnage]. One must also determine if Dr. Pahor Labib and his assistant will not ask to be remunerated for their supplementary work. Who, in this case, would assume the new costs?

Actually, the work of conserving the papyri between panes of plexiglass was reported to have been completed in the summer of 1961 (See Chapter 8, Part 1 above); it was the placing of fragments and the identification of leaves that had not been completed. However, the distinction made between those that were or were not ready to be photographed does not correspond to those in which fragments needed to be placed and the sequence of leaves needed to be located, over against those in which this was not necessary. The work needing to be done prior to photography was presented as follows by Krause in 1966:61

Codices I, IV, V, VIII–XIII would, prior to the photography, still have to be reglassed and arranged by a papyrus restorer and a coptologist, since the disarranged pages of these codices were glassed in the sequence in which

---


they were found. ... Only codices II, III, VI and VII, whose pages, with but few exceptions (the first pages of Codex II) have survived and are glassed in the correct sequence, do not have to be arranged prior to photography.

The first shipment of photographs to UNESCO, consisting of all of Codex V and most of Codices III, VI, VII and VIII, can be partly correlated to this list, but not at all to the list cited by Christophe on 6 January 1963, where they are among those needing to be conserved between panes of plexiglass prior to photography.

Ten days later Christophe reported again to UNESCO:

> So the work has begun. But Dr. Pahor Labib, Director of the Coptic Museum, has immediately asked the Center of Documentation to furnish him for his own archives, and, as the work of photographing the documents proceeds, a print of each negative.

Krause’s assessment of the situation on 18 June 1963 was as follows:

> To be sure, UNESCO should first send to Cairo a conservationist, so that this person, under the guidance of Pahor Labib and myself, put together and arrange all broken and scattered pages and fragments, which we, following the wishes of Pahor Labib, had put under glass in the order in which we found them. Then a good photographer should photograph them all, and have them printed in Europe. But as Pahor Labib said to me in May, UNESCO has sent a photographer, who wanted to photograph all the papyri in their

---

62 16 i 63: Christoph’s report to UNESCO:

> Le travail a donc commencé. Mais le Dr. Pahor Labib, Directeur du Musée Copte, a aussitôt demandé au Centre de Documentation de lui fournir pour ses propres archives, et au fur et à mesure de la photographie des documents, un tirage de chacun des clichés.

63 18 vi 63: Letter from Krause to Schenke:

> Allerdings sollte die UNESCO zuvor einen Konservator nach Kairo senden, damit dieser unter Anleitung von Pahor Labib und mir alle zerbrochenen und verstreuten Seiten und Fragmente, die wir auf Wunsch von Pahor Labib in der vorgefundenen Reihenfolge verglast hatten, zusammensetzt und ordnet. Dann sollte ein guter Fotograf alles fotografieren und die Tafeln in Europa gedruckt werden. Wie mir Pahor Labib im Mai sagte, habe die UNESCO aber einen Fotografen gesandt, der alle Papyri in ungeordnetem Zustand fotografieren wollte. Ich rechne nicht damit, dass mir Pahor Labib aus Kairo schreiben wird, was daraus geworden ist und muss daher sein Kommen abwarten, um zu erfahren, ob die UNESCO die 13 Codices nur ungeordnet publizieren will. Dann müsste man an Hand meiner Beschreibung der Codices in ADIK Kopt. Reihe I und II die Tafelbände benutzen. Es ist aber auch möglich, dass Pahor Labib darauf besteht, dass die Codices erst geordnet werden, bevor sie fotografiert werden dürfen.
condition before they were put in order. I do not expect Pahor Labib to write me from Cairo as to what came of that, and so I must await his coming to find out whether UNESCO wants to publish the 13 codices before they are put in order. Then one would have to use the volumes of plates on the basis of my description of the codices in ADIK Kopt. Reihe I and II. But it is also possible that Pahor Labib insists that the codices be first put in order before it is permitted that they be photographed.

Yet the photography was actually done before fragments were placed and page sequences established.

Krause considered the facsimile edition planned by UNESCO not as a continuation of Pahor Labib's edition, but as its replacement.

On 16 July 1963 Christophe recalled the problems to which he had drawn attention on 6 January 1963, with the following updating of the situation:

Dr. Pahor Labib lets me know that, during his recent visit in Germany, he met with Dr. Krause. The latter would be quite willing to be the desired specialist. (I recall to you also, see my letter AN/LC/345 of 22 September 1962, that very often there are fragments of broken pages that it would be necessary to identify and, for the photography, restore to their real place.)

I have permitted myself to recall to you all these problems, since, lacking an immediate solution, a new delay risks annoying our enterprise considerably.

On 23 September 1963 UNESCO responded to Christophe:

As to what has to do with the involvement of Krause, we will not have in the immediate future the means to cover the expenses of a trip from Germany to Cairo. In case Krause were in Cairo in the autumn, it would doubtless be possible to ask him his advice.

---

64 16 vii 63: Memorandum of Christophe:

Le Dr. Pahor Labib me fait savoir qu’au cours de son récent séjour en Allemagne, il avait rencontré le Dr. Krause. Celui-ci serait tout disposé à être le spécialiste souhaité (je vous rappelle aussi, voir ma lettre AN/LC/345 du 22 septembre 1962, que très souvent il y a des fragments de pages brisées qu’il faudrait identifier et, pour les photographies, remettre à leur place réelle).

Je me suis permis de vous rappeler tous ces problèmes parce que, faut de solution immédiate, un nouveau retard risque de gêner considérablement notre entreprise.

65 23 ix 63: Memorandum from UNESCO to Christoph:

En ce qui concerne l’intervention de M. Krause, nous n’aurons pas dans l’immédiat les moyens de couvrir les frais d’un voyage d’Allemagne au Caire; au cas où M. Krause se trouverait au Caire à l’automne, sans doute serait-il possible de lui demander ses conseils.
As late as November 1964 a UNESCO memorandum reported:

There is a provision still available under the 1964 budget for pursuing the photographic work and for an expert's mission to detach the folios [of cartonnage]. The work might proceed in 1965, but the contract should be signed as soon as possible if the 1964 budget is still to be used.

In fact a conservator was not sent to the Coptic Museum to prepare the material for photography, though Ibscher had as early as 24 June 1958 hoped that UNESCO might send him for this purpose (see Chapter 8, Part 1 above). The decision was reached nonetheless to go ahead and photograph the materials. But there were also other delays in the photography, due, according to Pahor Labib, to the use of photographers of the Institut français d'archéologie orientale who at this time were often unavailable, since they were photographing in the area to be flooded by the High Dam. On the other hand, according to Christophe, the delays were due to the fact that Pahor Labib would only produce a few leaves at a time when the photographers were at the Coptic Museum. Guillaumont's assessment of the situation has been as follows:

The photographic work ... could only be carried out rather slowly, because of the work conditions imposed on the photographers at the Coptic Museum.

Christophe shipped the negatives and prints (18 by 24 cm.) from Cairo to UNESCO in Paris in three installments, 423 on 26 November 1963, 339 on 23 August 1965, and 314 on 9 June 1966, a total of 1076. He appended to the last installment his “commentaries,” in which he listed problems and uncertainties, due to the fact that the inventory of the Preliminary Committee from which he worked had used the numeration of the codices themselves as provided by Krause, whereas on the photographs one finds only the numeration of the plexiglass containers, reflecting for each codex only the sequence in which the leaves and fragments lay when conserved. Thus the photographs reflect only the preliminary conservation based on the sequence in which the leaves and fragments lay, not a conservation of the papyri involving the placing of the fragments and the reconstruction of the original sequence of leaves. Yet in spite of such difficulties the third installment concluded:

---

66 According to the aide-memoire prepared by Guillaumont: “Édition des textes de Nag Hammadi. Documentation A. Guillaumont” (see Part 5 below).

67 9 vi 66: Letter from Christoph to UNESCO accompanying the third installment:

Le travail doit être considéré comme terminé.
The work must be considered terminated.

Yet, in reality, the photography had to be done again and again from 1970 on, as the fragments were placed in successive work sessions of the Technical Sub-Committee of UNESCO’s International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices together with the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity (see Chapter 11, Parts 5 and 6 below).


Krause reported at the Colloquium on the Origins of Gnosticism held under the auspices of the International Association for the History of Religions and the Societa italiana di storia delle religioni at Messina, Sicily on 13–18 April 1966:68

Our recommendations made in 1961 have unfortunately not yet been carried out by UNESCO. As far as I know, they have only begun photographing the manuscripts. Whether at least the planned volumes of plates will still appear, escapes my knowledge.

In the discussion, I remarked that a month prior to the colloquium Christophe had reported to me in Cairo that two shipments of photographs to Paris, one of 423 photographs, the other of 339 photographs, had been made thus far, but that the photography was not yet complete. The deadline of 1 March 1965 for the completion of the photography had hence not been met. Since I thus had the most recent information, I was included in an ad hoc committee, along with Säve-Söderbergh and Krause, which was appointed to prepare during the colloquium a telegram to UNESCO “concerning the


Unsere 1961 gemachten Vorschläge sind leider von der UNESCO bisher nicht verwirklicht worden. Es wurde meines Wissens nur damit begonnen, die Handschriften zu fotografieren. Ob wenigstens die geplanten Tafelbände noch erscheinen werden, entzieht sich meiner Kenntnis.
urgency of the definitive publication of all the texts of Nag Hammadi as follows.\footnote{18 iv 66: A three-page document contained the Messina ‘Report for Presentation to UNESCO’ including the telegram, which was sent to UNESCO. I published the telegram later: “The Coptic Gnostic Library Today,” NTS 12 (1968): 356–401: 363, n. 1. This article was reprinted with the same pagination as a brochure in Claremont, Ca. by the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity in 1970, and again as its Occasional Paper 1 in 1972.}

(1) The Nag Hammadi codices are of quite fundamental significance for the study of Gnosticism, which is itself of considerable importance for understanding the context of ideas out of which our modern world emerged.

(2) We wish to express our satisfaction over the adoption, by the General Conference of UNESCO, of the project of producing facsimile photographs of the pages of these codices. We are also pleased with the amount of work that has been accomplished thus far. We are furthermore grateful for the interest and co-operation of the United Arab Republic in this project. (One recalls in the case of the comparable Manichaean documents discovered a generation ago that the failure to take such measures led to the irretrievable loss of many of them as a result of the troubled political circumstances of our times.)

(3) The work that has thus far been done in preparation for a facsimile edition is not yet accessible to the scholarly world, pending the completion of the photography and the publication of the plates. It is hence important that this project be carried through to completion and that the work thus far done should not be lost.

(4) Transcriptions that have been published of a part of the codices do not replace photographs. For in many cases a repeated study of photographs of the original text, after it has been translated and interpreted, produces corrections of the readings of the transcription made at the beginning of the process. Lacunae and fragmentary pages can be restored reliably only when one can study photographs of the original, to detect vestiges of letters in broken areas and to calculate exactly how many letters were originally in part of a page that is now lost.


(5) In some cases the papyri need to be prepared prior to definitive photography. For some of the plexiglass sheets into which the pages have been placed contain fragments that do not belong together. The final photography of such pages would best be subsequent to an ordering of the fragments that puts them in their original relationship to each other. And some fragments are stuck to the cover of one codex [cartonnage of Codex VII], from which they must be disengaged by an expert prior to photographing. It is hoped that UNESCO can provide assistance to make possible this aspect of the photographing project.

(6) The publication of the photographic plates in a series of volumes of facsimiles should begin as soon as possible, so as to make the documents available to scholars. (In the case of the Gospel of Thomas, in which case the plates were published a decade ago, one can observe the number of translations, scholarly monographs and discussions that follow upon such publication.)

(7) In view of the factors stated above, the 66 experts assembled from eleven countries in April 1966 at Messina for an “International Colloquium on the Origins of Gnosticism,” arranged by the University of Messina and the International Association for the History of Religions, wish to express unanimously their fervent wish that this project can be carried through to its completion with the support of UNESCO without delay.

The telegram was adopted as a formal request of the International Association for the History of Religions and the Societa italiana di storia delle religioni, under whose auspices the Colloquium was held, and was signed by Ugo Bianchi as President of the Colloquium and Geo Widengren as President of the International Association for the History of Religions. It was sent by Bianchi to UNESCO, with which Widengren was also in personal contact. L. Gomes Machado, Director of the Department of Culture, promptly presented an aide-memoire concerning this initiative to M. Elmandjra, Director of the Cabinet of the General Director.  

71 24 iv 66: L. Gomes Machado’s aide-memoire to M. Elmandjra:

Il a proposé les services du Congrès scientifique de Messine pour contribuer à lever les obstacles existants.

Les causes d’interruption avaient été:

– l’opposition du Directeur du Musée Copte qui souhaitait en réalité publier les manuscrits lui-même avec quelques collaborateurs proches de ses Services;
– l’argument technique selon quoi tous les manuscrits disponibles avaient été reproduits dans le cadre du projet UNESCO, les autres étant dans un état de conservation trop défectueux pour être photographiés (nombreux feuillets collés les uns aux autres p. ex.)
He [Widengren] proposed the services of the scientific Congress of Messina to help overcome the obstacles that exist.

The causes of interruption had been:

– the opposition of the Director of the Coptic Museum, who in reality hoped to publish the manuscripts himself, with some collaborators close to his Department;
– the technical argument, according to which all the manuscripts at one’s disposal had been reproduced in the framework of the project of UNESCO, the others being in a state of conservation too defective to be photographed (numerous leaves pasted one to another, for example [cartonnage of Codex VII])
– the replacement, at the Ministry of Culture, of Dr. Okacha, whose personal interest alone had made it possible to transcend the various juridical and material obstacles that surfaced on the spot.

This explanation of the difficulties did not include a proposal for their solution. UNESCO did nothing further during the ’60s to make the Nag Hammadi Codices available to the academic community.

5. Guillaumont’s Aide-Memoire

The planning at UNESCO throughout the ’60s, with the help especially of Antoine Guillaumont, is summarized in an aide-memoire he prepared for UNESCO and made available to me for this report, of which I have already made some use in Part 3 above:72

---

72 The aide-memoire prepared by Antoine Guillaumont:

Édition des textes de Nag Hammadi. Documentation A. Guillaumont.

Mon premier contact avec l’Unesco, au sujet des textes de Nag Hammadi, le 6 février 1961: visite, ce jour, de M. Bammate, qui avait vu M. Puech la veille.

Suite à cette visite, lettre de M. Bammate, le 29 mars, me disant que le projet sur lequel il m’avait consulté doit se réaliser.

Nouvel échange de lettres et nouvel entretien au siège de l’Unesco: le projet sera mis en route dès cette année. Le projet, tel qu’il est formé alors, envisage l’édition du texte copte en transcription, une traduction française, anglaise et arabe, une annotation succincte. La publication sera faite sous la responsabilité d’un Comité international. Sur sa demande, M. Puech et moi proposons à M. Bammate les noms de coptisants qualifiés—en principe, un par pays—susceptibles de faire partie de ce

My first contact with UNESCO on the topic of the texts of Nag Hammadi, 6 February 1961: a visit, that day, from Bammate, who had seen Puech the day before.

Following this visit, letter of Bammate, on 29 March, telling me that the project about which he had consulted me is to be realized.

New exchange of letters and new discussion at the office of UNESCO: The project will be launched beginning this year [1961]. The project, such as it has been conceived at that time, envisages the edition of the Coptic text in transcription, a French, English, and Arabic translation, a succinct annotation.

Comité, désignant de préférence ceux qui, par leurs publications, ont déjà montré un intérêt pour les textes de Nag Hammadi.


Par lettre datée du 4 août 1961, M. René Maheu, Directeur général p. i. de l’Unesco, m’informe officiellement de l’accord survenu entre l’Unesco et le gouvernement de la R.A.U. (en la personne de M. H. E. Saroit Okacha) aux fins d’éditer, sous l’égide d’un Comité international, les textes découverts à Nag Hammadi, et me demande d’entrer dans ce Comité, dont la première réunion est annoncée pour novembre 1961 (Document 1).

Par lettre du 29 août, adressée au Directeur général, je donne mon acceptation pour faire partie de ce Comité.

Par lettre du 1er septembre 1961, M. S. Asabuki, Directeur p. i. du Département des activités culturelles, accue sa réception de ma lettre et confirme que la première réunion du Comité est prévue pour la fin du mois de novembre, au Caire (Document 2).

Début octobre, M. Malinine part en mission au Caire, pour faire, avec P. Labib et M. Krause, l’inventaire des textes.


26 novembre 1961, lettre de M. René Maheu à M. Puech l’invitant à prendre part, en qualité de conseiller, aux travaux du Comité de publication des textes de Nag Hammadi. Même invitation est envoyée à W. Till. Copie de la lettre adressée à M. Puech m’est envoyée, le 20 novembre, par M. B. Monsour (Document 4).
The publication will be made under the responsibility of an International Committee. At his [Bammate's] request, Puech and I propose to Bammate the names of qualified coptologists—on principle, one per nation—open to becoming members of this Committee, designating preferably those who, by their publications, have already shown an interest in the texts of Nag Hammadi.

A first meeting of this Committee is anticipated for the month of November of this same year 1961. Prior to this meeting, it seems useful to prepare an inventory of the texts conserved in the Coptic Museum of Old Cairo. It has been decided that this task will be entrusted to a preliminary study group consisting of Pahor Labib, Director of the Coptic Museum, Martin Krause, from the German Archaeological Institute of Cairo, and Michel Malinine, Director of Studies at the École Pratique des Hautes Études of Paris.

By means of a letter dated on 4 August 1961, René Maheu, interim General Director of UNESCO, informs me officially of the agreement reached between UNESCO and the government of the United Arab Republic (in the person of His Excellency Saroit Okacha), as to the objective of editing, under the auspices of an International Committee, the texts discovered at Nag Hammadi, and invites me to enter into this Committee, whose first meeting is announced for November 1961 (Document 1).

In a letter of 29 August, addressed to the General Director, I give my agreement to take part in this Committee.

In a letter of 1 September 1961, S. Asabuki, interim Director of the Department of Cultural Activities, acknowledges reception of my letter and confirms that the first meeting of the Committee is foreseen for the end of the month of November, in Cairo (Document 2).

At the beginning of October, Michel Malinine leaves on a mission to Cairo, to make, along with Pahor Labib and Martin Krause, the inventory of the texts.

Letter of S. Asabuki, of 20 October 1961, informing me of the progress of the project, of the presence in Cairo of the preliminary mission, and of the composition of the International Committee: There have given their acceptance, in addition to myself, Messrs Gérard Garitte, Martin Krause, Gilles Quispel, Torgny Säve-Söderbergh; Richard A. Parker, of Brown University, who was sounded out, has not yet replied. In addition, Messrs Puech and Till are accredited in the capacity of Consultants for the Committee. The first meeting of the Committee is foreseen for the last days of November or in the course of December (Document 3).

26 November 1961, a letter of René Maheu to Puech inviting him to take part, in the capacity of Consultant, in the work of the Committee of publication of the texts of Nag Hammadi. The same invitation is sent to W. Till. Copy of the letter addressed to Puech is sent to me, on 20 November, by B. Monsour (Document 4).
Guillaumont’s aide-memoire continued with the discussion of the report of the Preliminary Committee:\(^{73}\)

\(^{73}\) The aide-memoire prepared by Antoine Guillaumont:

Par lettre du 22 novembre, M. Asabuki m’annonce qu’il a reçu de M. P. Labib la première partie du rapport de la mission chargée, au Caire, de l’inventaire des textes. Ce rapport devant être communiqué aux membres du Comité préalablement à sa réunion, il est prévu que cette première réunion aura lieu, non pas à la fin 1961, mais "dans les premiers mois de 1962."

Fin novembre, M. Asabuki m’invite à venir le voir à l’Unesco pour prendre connaissance du rapport qu’il a reçu. L’entretien a lieu le 4 décembre et je lui dis mes premières impressions concernant ce rapport.

Le 11 décembre M. Asabuki m’envoie le texte de "la première partie du rapport établi par MM. P. Labib, M. Krause, M. Malinine." L’autre partie, qui doit traiter plus particulièrement des aspects budgétaires de l’entreprise, ne lui est pas encore parvenue.

Ce rapport, donnant les résultats de l’inventaire fait par la mission du Caire, du 9 au 30 octobre 1961, fournit une analyse des treize codices et dresse la liste des traités (estimés alors au nombre de 46), codex par codex; pour 23 de ces traités, il est signalé qu’ils sont, soit déjà édités, soit déjà attribués pour publication à tel ou tel savant nommément désigné (Document 5). J’adresse mes remarques sur ce rapport à M. Asabuki par lettre du 15 décembre 1961: voir copie de cette lettre (Document 6).

À la suite de cette lettre M. Asabuki m’invite à le rencontrer, ainsi que M. Puech. Rendez-vous est pris pour le 29 décembre. M. Puech et moi, au cours de cet entretien, confirmons à M. Asabuki les termes de ma lettre et proposons à l’Unesco, étant donnée la situation révélée par le rapport, un changement de programme: renoncer à l’édition-transcription et aux traductions projetées et publier, à la place, une édition photographique de l’ensemble des documents, de façon à mettre ceux-ci, la plus tôt possible, à la disposition de tous les spécialistes susceptibles de s’y intéresser.

Ce nouveau projet est accepté. Il est convenu que les photographies, faites au Musée copte par les photographes du “Centre de Documentation et d’Études sur l’histoire de l’art et de la civilisation de l’Égypte [ancienne],” seront conservées au siège de l’Unesco et ne seront communiquées à personne jusqu’à l’achèvement du travail photographique et à la réunion du Comité, qui décidera de la méthode à suivre pour la publication. A la demande de M. P. Labib, un second jeu de photographies sera fait pour le Musée copte, sous la même condition que les photos ne seront pas diffusés avant la réunion du Comité.

Le travail photographique, prévu d’abord pour 1962, ne put commencer qu’à la fin de cette année, après signature du contrat l’autorisant, le 12 décembre 1962. Ce travail ne put être exécuté qu’assez lentement, à cause des conditions de travail faites aux photographes, au Musée copte.

Une lettre de M. L.-A. Christophe (Unesco, Le Caire) m’avertit, le 12 juin 1966, qu’il envoie, ce même jour, à M. Bammate, "les derniers négatifs et les derniers tirages 18 x
By means of a letter of 22 November, Asabuki informs me that he has received from P[ahor] Labib the first part of the report of the mission charged in Cairo with the inventory of the texts. Since this report needed to be communicated to the members of the Committee prior to its meeting, it is expected that this first meeting will take place, not at the end of 1961, but “in the first months of 1962.”

End of November, Asabuki invites me to come see him at UNESCO to get acquainted with the report that he has received. The discussion takes place on 4 December and I give him my first impressions of this report.

On 11 December Asabuki sends me the text of “the first part of the report established by Messrs P[ahor] Labib, M[artin] Krause, M[ichel] Malinine.” The other part, which is to treat more particularly the budgetary aspects of the undertaking, has not yet reached him.

This report, giving the results of the inventory made by the mission in Cairo, from 9 to 30 October 1961, gives an analysis of the thirteen Codices and draws up the list of tractates (estimated then at the number of 46), Codex by Codex; for 23 of these tractates, it is indicated that they are either already edited or already assigned for publication to such and such a scholar designated by name (Document 5).

I submit my remarks on this report to Asabuki in a letter of 15 December 1961. See the copy of this letter (Document 6).

As a result of this letter Asabuki invites me to meet him, as well as Puech. An appointment is made for 29 December. Puech and I [Guillaumont], in the course of this discussion, confirm to Asabuki the terms of my letter, and propose to UNESCO, given the situation revealed by the report, a change

24 des papyrus gnostiques. “La collection complète (souligné par lui), ajoute-t-il, est maintenant à Paris.”

Je revois M. Bammate le 28 juin, pour provoquer la réunion, le plus tôt possible, du Comité international, pour passer sans retard à la seconde phase dans l’exécution du projet. Faute des crédits nécessaires, cette réunion doit être remise à la prochaine année.

Les spécialistes participant au Colloque sur “les origines du gnosticisme” tenu à Messine en avril 1966 (ni M. Puech ni moi-même n’y participions) adressent à l’Unesco une motion demandant que l’édition des textes de Nag Hammadi soit publiée dans les plus courts délais.

A la suite de cette motion, M. J. Robinson (réacteur de cette motion?) entre en contact avec l’Unesco et obtient l’autorisation de travailler sur les photographies déposées à l’Unesco (1968?).

Le 11 novembre 1970 m’est adressée par M. Gamal Moukhtar, Sous-Secrétaire d’État, Ministre de la Culture de la R.A.U., une invitation à participer à la première réunion du Comité international pour la publication des textes de Nag Hammadi, tenue au Caire du 15 au 18 décembre 1970.
in the program: Give up the edition of a transcription, and of the projected translations, and publish, instead of them, a photographic edition of the ensemble of the documents, in such a way as to put them, as soon as possible, at the disposal of all the specialists who might be interested in them.

This new project is accepted. It is agreed that the photographs, made at the Coptic Museum by the photographers of the “Center of Documentation and of Studies on the History of the Art and Civilization of [Ancient] Egypt," will be stored at the office of UNESCO and will not be communicated to anyone, up until the completion of the photographic work and the meeting of the Committee, which will decide on the method to follow for the publication. At the request of P[ahor] Labib, a second set of photographs will be made for the Coptic Museum, under the same condition, that the photos will not be diffused before the meeting of the Committee.

The photographic work, foreseen at first for 1962, could only begin at the end of that year, after the signing of the contract authorizing it, on 12 December 1962. This work could only be carried out rather slowly, because of the work conditions imposed on the photographers at the Coptic Museum.

A letter of L.-A. Christophe (UNESCO, Cairo) notifies me on 12 June 1966 that he is sending, that same day, to Bammate, “the last negatives and the last 18 by 24 cm. prints of the Gnostic papyri." “The complete collection" (italics by him), he adds, “is now in Paris.”

I see Bammate again on 28 June, to bring about the meeting, as soon as possible, of the International Committee, so as to move without delay to the second phase in carrying out the project. Due to the lack of the necessary credits, this meeting has to be deferred to the next year [1967—the meeting actually took place on 15–18 December 1970].

The specialists participating in the Colloquium on “the origins of Gnosticism" held at Messina in April 1966 (neither Puech nor I participated in it) address to UNESCO a motion requesting that the edition of the texts of Nag Hammadi be published with the least delay.

Following upon this motion, J[ames] Robinson (editor of this motion?) enters into contact with UNESCO and obtains the authorization to work on the photographs deposited at UNESCO (1968?).

On 11 November 1970 an invitation is sent to me by Gamal Mokhtar, Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Culture of the U[nite]d A[rab] R[epublic], to participate in the first meeting of the International Committee for the publication of the texts of Nag Hammadi, held in Cairo on 15–18 December 1970.

Guillaumont and I worked closely together—I visited him in his Paris apartment on the rue de Vaugirard and he visited me in Claremont. His sharing of this summary report of the French activation of UNESCO during the 1960s seemed to me, as its concluding remarks suggest, a passing of the
torch to me to carry forward Nag Hammadi studies at UNESCO in the 1970s. After all, he had been earlier envisaged as the Secretary of the UNESCO committee, the position for which I was ultimately chosen.
CHAPTER TEN

THE COPTIC GNOSTIC LIBRARY PROJECT


The beginnings of the American involvement in Nag Hammadi studies were very modest indeed:

I was motivated to get into Nag Hammadi studies by two factors important to me at the time: the new access to Jesus provided by The Gospel of Thomas, and the possibility of documenting pre-Christian Gnosticism provided by The Apocalypse of Adam:

This section has as its subject matter the mission and suffering of the light prophet. At first one might think of a play on the suffering of Jesus. Yet that would be the sole mention of Jesus in our text, and even then, after all, the name does not occur a single time. So the assumption of a pre-Christian concept is closer at hand. ... In our text, which first of all is not to be regarded as under Christian influence, there is apparently a balancing of Jewish Gnosticism with Iranian ideas.

Böhlig later explained to me that he meant pre-Christian not chronologically, but only to indicate the absence of Christian influence.

I organized a very small group of faculty and students at Claremont Graduate University and the Claremont School of Theology to learn Coptic.

---


2 Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo (Halle-Wittenberg: Sonderband of the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität, 1963), 90–91:

Dieser Abschnitt hat die Mission und das Leiden des Lichtpropheten zum Gegenstand. Zunächst möchte man an eine Anspielung auf das Leiden Jesu denken. Doch wäre das die einzige Erwähnung Jesu in unserem Text und selbst dabei wäre der Name ja nicht einmal genannt. Also liegt die Annahme einer vorchristlichen Vorstellung näher. ...

[91] In unserem Text, der zunächst nicht als christlich beeinflusst anzusehen ist, liegt wahrscheinlich ein Ausgleich jüdischer Gnosis mit iranischen Gedanken vor.
We were led by the two among us who had at least an elementary knowledge of Coptic, Loren Fisher and Ernest Tune.

Otto Meinardus, pastor of the German Lutheran Church of Cairo and the American community church in the Cairo suburb of Maadi, himself an amateur collector of Coptic manuscripts, visited us in Claremont as part of an itinerary seeking to market his collection. I told him of my forthcoming sabbatic year, which I would spend in Jerusalem, on the side of Jerusalem that was then part of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. On hearing of my interest in the Nag Hammadi codices, Meinardus offered to introduce me to the relevant people if I would come to Cairo. I of course took him up on the offer.

I was Annual Professor at the American Schools of Oriental Research (soon to be renamed the W.F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research) in Jerusalem, Jordan for 1965–1966. I with my family left Claremont on 1 August 1965 and arrived via the Far East in Jerusalem on 5 September 1965. We returned, leaving Jerusalem on 16 May 1966 for Cairo, then going on 17 May 1966 to Athens, on 19 May 1966 to Rome, on 21 May 1966 to Venice, on 23 May 1966 to Nice, on 3 June 1966 to Zürich, on 7 June 1966 to Frankfurt, on 9 June 1966 to Paris, on 16 June 66 to New York; then, via the South to visit relatives, we arrived on 24 vi 66 back in Claremont.

I went to Cairo from Jerusalem via Amman on 24 February 1966 and stayed at the American Mission there, until going to Luxor on 27 February 1966, and then returned to Cairo on 4 March 1966, after spending the day in Nag Hammadi. I returned to Jerusalem on 9 March 1966.

I mailed from Jerusalem detailed memoranda on my trips to Egypt to Tune. Since they not only document our floundering efforts to get involved, but also give a flavor for the situation at that time, I reproduce them here, with only occasional deletion of irrelevant material and very minor stylistic editing:

Dr. Meinardus on 25 February drove me first to the *Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie*. It was closed (Friday!), but he would not take no for an answer. We drove around to the street on the other side, where the *Institut Français d’Archéologie* backs onto the *Imprimerie*. From this angle we were automatically inside the gates of the *Imprimerie* and found the people at work. A receptionist took my questions to a superior and reported to me his answers:

---

5 8 ii 66: Letter from Robinson to Miss Kingan of the American Mission in Cairo.
6 22 iii 66: Letter from Robinson to Tune.
Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, whose first volume (Martin Krause-Pahor Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo) they published in 1962 ... is not to be published by them, but in Germany. They assume that since Harrassowitz in Wiesbaden distributed volume 1 it may be the publisher of the rest, but they did not have concrete information. ...

Next Dr. Meinardus drove me to the Coptic Museum. On entering we met Victor Girgis, who had done the actual work of putting the papyrus pages in plexiglass. He is a Copt, second in command at the Museum, seemed intelligent, fluent in various languages. To my inquiry about the availability of the Apocalypse of Adam for a fresh collation he replied that I should see the Director, who is no longer Pahor Labib, but rather Dr. Raouf Habib (I later heard that Raouf Habib stands in tension to Pahor Labib, that Pahor Labib had prepared Victor Girgis as his successor, that this had not succeeded, but that in about a year Raouf Habib would retire and Victor Girgis would succeed him.) Victor Girgis accompanied us to the director’s office and joined in the further conversation. I was told by Dr. Raouf Habib that the access to the codices was now the decision of UNESCO, which has made an agreement with the Centre de Documentation des Monuments (behind the Egyptian Museum, on Sharia Mariette) for photographing the codices. I was referred to Dr. Gamal Mokhtar, Egyptologist at the Centre, who is the liaison person to UNESCO. Dr. Raouf Habib said he was not free to make any decisions himself. He referred to the codices as being locked in a room upstairs.

The Coptic Museum was briefly shown to me by Dr. Meinardus. We noted a section upstairs devoted to Coptic manuscripts on display. On the wall next to the stair well were 4 sheets from Nag Hammadi behind glass: III, 64, 66, 68, 69, all from The Gospel of the Egyptians. (The reverse was not visible. The verso would be III, 63, 65, 67, and 70, the beginning of The Letter of Eugnostos.) The papyrus is brown, in excellent condition, quite legible with a good hand. The other manuscripts on display are later and ecclesiastical-liturgical, rather like—in some cases part of the same materials—what Meinardus discussed with us at Claremont. A lot was on display. Meinardus tried on a previous occasion to find other material supposed to be at the Coptic Museum, was told it was at the Metropolitan Museum; he asked there, they said they had only photographed it—it was at the Coptic Museum. ... It is physically located in the oldest part of Cairo (“Babylon”), and nearby are the oldest Synagogue, oldest Church, and oldest Mosque of Cairo.

... In general it is shocking to see how many people in Cairo have a half-hearted interest in the Coptic Gnostic material, and I did not find one person in the whole city who knew as much specifically about the situation as do we! ...

In a few days I continued my report to Tune:7

---

7 Shortly after 22 iii 66: Letter from Robinson to Tune.
Friday in Cairo I went to the Coptic Museum and copied off the wall the four pages of *The Gospel of the Egyptians* that I have since translated in rough draft and am sending you for your improvements of my translation and your queries when I recheck the pages in Cairo. Although a guard gave me a chair and a cup of tea, it was not an ideal arrangement, for the pages were too high to be able to keep one hand on the place in the ms. and write with the other. Hence in some places I skipped a line—homoioteleuton or the like. But I did check each page a second time, and caught most mistakes. I had also previously practiced a bit by transcribing a page of *The Apocalypse of Adam* from Böhlig’s plate. But I was far from experienced in reading the Coptic hand and no doubt now, with more experience and the studying of the pages, I can complete a fully accurate version capable of being published. The ms. is in good condition and the hand is clear. I will be at the Hotel Jolly, Messina, Sicily, Italy, 12–18 April, and, since you do not have time to send back the enclosed pages before I leave here 11 April—unless you work mighty fast—I would think you should send them either to Messina, or, if you want to try for the earlier date, then to Cairo, to the address already given. I will on 11 April have from noon to 6 PM in Cairo and will spend most of this time in the Coptic Museum. I can telephone from the airport on arrival to the American Mission to see if your letter has arrived, and if so stop there in the taxi on my way to the Coptic Museum and pick it up to use as I recollate. I would hope to finish that bit of work on the 11th, for I would like to be free of it so that on my return thru Cairo 21–23 April I can go at other things that might open up (see below). But if you don't have time to put the pages with your advice back in the mail promptly, send it to Sicily where I can go over it more leisurely and pinpoint readings to verify—if I have not on my own already cleared up questions you have—and then rapidly check again in Cairo.

On Saturday I went to the Coptic Archaeological Society—hard to find, since numbers on one side of the street are odd numbers, and across the street are railroad tracks instead of houses—one has to continue a mile or so beyond the nearest odd numbers until, across the street, houses occur again, and there one finds the even numbers (222). I arrived about 6 PM after having to telephone to get instructions for the taxi, and found Burmester outside signaling me. It turned out that usually they are closed Saturday and Sunday (open other days 5:30 to 8:30 PM), but he and Khater [the Secretary of the French Institut d’Archéologie Copte du Caire and also of the Coptic Archaeological Society] were there because they had to do some work together. I arrived about 6 and stayed until about 8, so they didn’t get much of their work done. Burmester is a slight, frail old man, delightfully jolly in a quiet way, did not strike me nearly as eccentric as Meinardus had said, but a straightforward committed specialist who made sense when he talked. (I guess, it is just that we are ourselves as technical scholars eccentric enough that he doesn’t strike us as being as different as he may strike other people.) In any case, he is in full possession of his intellectual capacities and quite efficient in scholarly matters. I asked him if on Monday evening, when I had originally been invited to
come and proposed to return, he would bring Crum [A Coptic Dictionary]—
he had the library copy at home—and help me translate the pages of The
Gospel of the Egyptians. (I didn’t have time Monday.) …

Sunday 11 AM I had an appointment with Dr. Gamal Mokhtar of the Centre
de Documentation to whom the new director of the Coptic Museum had
referred me, as the liaison person between UNESCO and the Coptic Museum
with regard to the right to see the codices. The Centre de Documentation was
founded about a decade ago under the stimulus of a Madame Noblecourt
with the initial purpose of recording with photos etc. the Nubian arts to
be covered by the High Dam, but with the hope of continuing for all of
Egypt. It is located one block behind the Egyptian Museum, and can be
reached by walking thru the yard of the Egyptian Museum, across a big street.
Mokhtar let me read a Contrat de Fourniture between UNESCO and Monsieur
Dedawy, Administrateur Général du Centre de Documentation et d’Études sur
l’Histoire de l’Art et de la Civilisation de l’Égypte Ancienne, 4 rue Ramses, Cairo.
The contract concerned UNESCO providing 1,000 dollars for photographic
equipment and processing, and 300 £É for local labor, to photograph the Nag
Hammadi pages. Two complete sets of photos were to be made, in 13×18 cm.
size, legible and capable of publication as good copies, one copy to be in the
archives of the printer, one at UNESCO Paris. (I was told that Pahor Labib
demanded that a copy go to the Coptic Museum, and that his successor, on
taking over the directorship, was not able to find or get from Pahor Labib
whatever photos had been given Pahor Labib. ...) The contract was signed
12 December 1962, and stipulated the photos were to be completed by 1 March
1965. Mokhtar told me they had not been completed by that date, but that
work would go on until they were. He did not know exactly how much had
been done, but had one old record listing as already done 11 negatives from
Codex II, 45 from Codex III, 88 from Codex V, 58 from Codex VI, a total of
202. [He] thought about 800 had by now been done. Photographers from
the French Institute were doing the work, and were given access only to a
bit of material at a time, and at times were in Nubia (for example, now)
when permission to work at the Coptic Museum was given. I. e. a pattern
of obstructionism was delaying the process. It seemed to me significant that
the contract with UNESCO had to do only with photography. Article 5 of the
contract I copied.8

8 UNESCO contract, Article 5:

Le droit de reproduction dans tous les pays ainsi que les droits de propriété afférent et
da l’ensemble des matériels réunis au cours des travaux (à l’exception des matériaux
pré-existants, qu’il s’agisse de biens publiques ou privés), deviendront la propriété
exclusive de l’UNESCO qui aura seule le droit de les publier en totalité ou en partie,
de les adapter et de les utiliser comme elle l’entendra et de donner l’autorisation de
les traduire ou d’en tirer des citations étendus.
The right of reproduction in all countries, as well as the property rights applying also to the whole of the material brought together in the course of the work (with the exception of pre-existent materials, whether it has to do with public or private goods) will become the exclusive property of UNESCO, which alone will have the right to publish them in whole or in part, to adapt them, and to use them as it may see fit, and to give authorization to translate them or to draw from them extended citations.

Mokhtar said he had no authority with regard to what was done with the manuscripts themselves. He was not sure just what was on his premises in terms of negatives or pictures. I was referred to UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), Place de Fontenoy, Paris 7, specifically Mr. N.A. Bammate, Acting Chief of the Section of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies. ...

Monday morning I went to the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Cairo, in the island suburb Zamalek, 22, Sharia, Gezira al-Wusta. I had previously written them inquiring information about Krause etc., had received in return a letter from the Director Dieter Arnold that Krause and Böhlig were not in residence; their addresses in Germany were sent me, and I had been invited to pass by when in Cairo. Arnold was not there, but I talked with Dr. Wolfgang Müller-Wiener, Second Director, who told me Krause was habilitated [habilitiert] at the Uni. of Münster, where he could be written at the Ägyptologisches Institut—I had written Krause at the previous Munich address (which included a wrong street number) and had received no reply. I have not written Krause since my return from Cairo, since the program at Messina lists Krause as the first item with a paper on “The Status of the Publication of the Nag Hammadi Texts” ["Der Stand der Veröffentlichung der Nag-Hammadi Texte"], which is precisely what I want to ask him. All the papers for Messina are being distributed in advance, so that the meeting can begin with a five-minute summary and move promptly to discussion. I have a stack six inches high of papers—but Krause’s has not come. So I wait impatiently for every mail, hoping it, like other late papers, will dribble in. ...

Monday evening I returned to the Coptic Archaeological Society, was admitted to membership (fee) ...

I had telephoned UNESCO’s Cairo office, but had been referred to Paris for information. I did not take No for an answer, but asked for an appointment with the head of the Cairo office. I was told he was out of town. I asked the date of his return, and asked for an appointment that day. This was confirmed by telephone at breakfast time Tuesday. It was just one day before my departure, a little late to get permission to use the material in the Coptic Library. Meanwhile I had been told by Khater that the person at UNESCO who knows most was Monsieur Louis Christophe. The UNESCO address is Garden City, 8 Sharaz, Cairo. Christoph was very nice and helpful. He first came to Cairo in 1945, and thus has been with the Nag Hammadi story from the very
beginning, and is the nearest to being informed of anyone. He tells e. g. of helping Doresse and his wife equip a caravan of servants for exploratory trips over the desert. He says that just after the Suez crisis the Germans profited by the French being _persona non gratae_ to move in on the Nag Hammadi material, which no doubt explains the splurge of German publications around 1962, and their inside track since then. Christophe said he has had a hard time convincing Krause he was impartial and not opposed to Krause. I. e. the French embassy was at that crucial time closed, and the Frenchmen at UNESCO under the guise of UNESCO protected French interests. Christophe ... also showed me official UNESCO documents pertaining to the codices. A preliminary committee drew up a description of the codices (briefer version of what we have already from Krause-Pahor Labib I, with a few minor details not yet known from Krause-Pahor Labib II). This was signed 4 November 1961, by (President) Pahor Labib, M. Malinine, M. Krause. They propose that “23 treatises are to be distributed and published by the Committee which will have its first meeting in November; in Codex III, Tractate 2–5; in Codex IV, Tractate 2; V, Tractate 7; VII, Tractates 3 and 5; all the Tractates in Codex VIII–XII and the First Tractate in Codex XIII.” They propose that, first, well preserved texts be published: III, Tractates 2–5; V, Tractate 7; VII, Tractates 3–5; VIII, Tractate 2; XIII, Tractate 1. They propose that what is included in this publication be the Coptic text, translation, notes on the text, indices of Greek and Coptic words. Commentaries are to be published separately. All volumes are to be of the same size. The physical layout is either to be with text and translation on the same page (as in _The Apocryphon of John_) or the text and translation separate (_The Gospel of Thomas_). The former would be considerably more economical. (No doubt Krause wrote the document.) I saw a subsequent document reporting on the assignments made. (Here it is stated that 22, not, as previously written, 23, were to be distributed.) I give you the break-down:

I, 1 Malinine, Puech, Quispel, Till
  2 not defined [non défini] [I take it the Jung Codex is excepted from this whole arrangement]
  3 not defined [non défini]
II, 1 Krause
  2 Malinine, Puech, Quispel, Till, i. e. “the members of the first session of the International Committee”
  3 Grobel (in December 1964 Grobel told me he had recently heard a rumor—perhaps from Wilson—that he had been assigned a tractate, but since he had heard no such word he denied the

---

In some discussions of Till’s edition of *Philip* I recall the passing remark that his was an unauthorized edition—cf. Schenke\(^{11}\) or Krause,\(^{12}\) in one of which places the allusion may be.)

4 Plumley
5 Böhlig-Pahor Labib
6 Krause-Pahor Labib
7 Krause-Pahor Labib

III,\(^1\) Krause
2 to be distributed [à distribuer] (the jotted note added in ink: ‘Böhlig?’)
3 to be distributed [à distribuer]
4 to be distributed [à distribuer]

IV,\(^1\) Krause
2 to be distributed [à distribuer] (ink addition: ‘Böhlig?’—Böhlig in his Messina paper says he has access among unpublished tractates only to those with whose publication he has been entrusted—and in his footnotes refers repeatedly to column and line of *The Gospel of the Egyptians*. So he obviously has succeeded in getting rights on the two examples of this tractate.)

V,\(^1\) to be distributed [à distribuer]
VI,\(^{1–8}\) Krause

VII,\(^{1–2}\) Krause
3–5 to be distributed [à distribuer]

VIII–XIII,\(^1\) to be distributed [à distribuer]

XIII,\(^2\) “This tractate will be published by A. Böhlig and P. Labib together with the parallel text in Codex II” (It may already have appeared in the 1962 volume listed above [as was the case].)

The date of the document making these assignments is March 1962. I do not know how many of the items listed as yet to be distributed have in the meantime been distributed, so I do not know if there are any slots still open to which a “Coptic Section” of our Institute for Antiquity and Christianity could apply. I will however make inquiries at Messina, if Krause’s paper does not answer all the questions. I was told by Christophe that I should inquire at the office of Monsieur Bammate, in the *Département de la Culture* in the basement of the UNESCO building in Paris. He suggested A. Guillaumont, about 50 years old and both cooperative and, as coptologist, far superior to Puech and Quispel, as a good person to contact in this connection in Paris. I will try in June to make this contact. He is at the *École des Hautes Études*.

Christophe was of the opinion that actually what they were to do was rapidly to publish the plates, and he was thoroughly opposed to scholars holding back material until they could exhaustively publish it. I inquired why the photos

---

already taken were not published, even while awaiting the rest of the photos. He said the fragments were not put together and indeed some were stuck to the covers and needed to be detached by an expert. I noted in the report by the 3-man committee a reference at Codex VII to the effect that the binding ‘is stuck together with many papyri.’ Of course Christophe did not seem to realize that the agreement was not just for the publication of plates, but also for all the rest that one has in Krause-Pahor Labib and Böhlig-Pahor Labib. Though the document seemed to show scholarly concern at various points (i.e. good legible photos, uniformity of size, not waiting for commentaries), what was oddly lacking was any time limit on publication (i.e. such a clause that if a document assigned to a person did not appear within x years it would be reassigned). It was Christophe who told me the number of photos was about 800, and that he always sent them directly to Paris. The total number of photos will probably be about 1050.

You recall that in Krause-Pahor Labib there are references to Giversen having some microfilms, and to Krause having written out by hand all the codices. Böhlig in his Messina paper contrasts his own limited access to the material to Krause who has access to it all. It is not clear to me how much Giversen has. Nor is it clear whether the exclusion of public or private material in the agreement quoted above is referring to still further material. Nor do I know what Pahor Labib has done with the photos given to him for the Coptic Museum. I did not get to see Pahor Labib—he has no phone, is not at the Coptic Museum—, but I hope to see him on my forthcoming visit to Cairo. I shall make an attempt at Messina and Cairo to follow up the trace of these copies of unpublished material that are circulating and get hold of whatever I may be able to.

On my return here [to Jerusalem] I was told by Prof. Ira Jay Martin, who had arrived from a visit to Egypt just as we left [and so I could interrogate him only after our trip], that a guide had taken him into the library behind the Coptic Museum, opened a big wall case, pulled out glassed papyri that he said were the Nag Hammadi things—and they doubtless were, since they would hardly have anything in plexiglass except Nag Hammadi, since the Germans provided the plexiglass for that. A couple of people were working in the room—on what, he did not know. I did not even get shown the Library when at the Coptic Museum, and spent my time moving thru the official channels described above. Next time I shall play innocent, ask for the library, and see what happens. Second alternative will be to inform the new director that both the Centre de Documentation and UNESCO agree that the use of the mss. themselves is not covered by the UNESCO contract. Not only Christophe confirmed this, but also the head man of UNESCO whom I briefly visited just after leaving Christophe.

Thus you can see my extended efforts to get to the bottom of the story did advance our information, but left many dangling strings, a situation where one feels a break-thru could be in the offing to reward these various spadework labors, but nothing too tangible thus far.
I hope this extended report has not been too burdensome, but that the verbosity has been compensated for both by some new information and by some of the local color of my trip.

I published important details not included in the reports to Tune:13

Louis Christophe has complained about the obstructionism of the Director of the German Archaeological Institute in Cairo, Dr. Hanns Stock, as Christophe tried to implement the photographic mission. He also recalled that when the photographers would go to the Coptic Museum and set up their equipment they would be given a leaf or so to photograph and told to come back the next week to continue. Pahor Labib, on the other hand, recalls that the photographers were often in Nubia photographing archaeological sites that would be covered by Nasser Lake and hence were not often available. Christophe sent to UNESCO 423 negatives and prints on 20 November 1963, 339 on 23 August 1965, and the last 314 on 9 June 1966.

After the Messina trip, I wrote Tune a further memorandum:14

I want to give you a report on my two quick trips to Egypt going and coming from Messina:

I was in Cairo 31 April, in the afternoon, left early the next morning. During the afternoon I went to the Coptic Museum and collated the four pages on display on the basis of my own translation efforts and the conjectural emendations I had essayed. I was able to clear up a number of items, some of which your letter to me at Messina—your first letter, the second came too late, was forwarded, according to Robert Grant, whom I later met at Paestum, to Jerusalem, but has not arrived here yet—had included. Also one or two new readings became apparent. I met Howard N. Bream of the Lutheran Seminary in Gettysburg, PA., who was also copying the pages on display, and on a couple of readings we compared notes. After this collation task I met for only about 10 minutes Pahor Labib. I had written Meinardus asking him to set up an appointment at the Coptic Museum at 4 PM, and he had set it up for 3:30 PM. The main thing Labib did was to assure me he had left the position of Director with everything in shipshape order—a topic I of course did not open—he did. He said he would send me a list of assignments, so I gave him my address. Nothing has arrived. He also gave me his address—more exactly, that of his son, where he can be reached, saying he would like a report on the Messina meeting. He said the Nag Hammadi material was partly in the library—which was closed, it being Easter holiday, and whose door he showed me—partly in a work room for photographing. ...

13 James M. Robinson, “Getting the Nag Hammadi Library into English,” BA 42 (Fall 1979): 239–248: 244.
14 27 iv 66: Letter from Robinson to Tune.
Then [on the return trip from Messina] we went by taxi to the Coptic Museum, checked the matters in the first letter you wrote that I had received, rechecked the two other pages on which I did not have your letters, took photos of the 4 exposed pages. Then at 10:45 we went to the library, to see what we could do there at the grass roots level. [Olaf] Schumann [see Ch. 12 below] told the young lady at the desk [Samiha Abd el-Shaheed] what we wanted to see. A man in the library went back to the back, behind a partial partition, then to the left, where on the left side was a cupboard he opened, that had standing vertically like a discothèque the plexiglass sheets. In the rim was written the number. There could have been a hundred or so glasses, certainly not the thousand plus of the whole library—and indeed Labib had said not all was here. They then closed it back up, and we returned to the library's reception desk, explained to the young lady we would like to study them a while. She said they were published. She mentioned The Gospel of Thomas, and the Gospel of John that is in the Bible. (I had noticed the colophon of The Apocryphon of John—doubtless that of Codex III, since it was about a third down the page, and does not look like those Krause has photos of from Codex II and IV—and assume the lady librarian had confused this with the Gospel of John.) I explained that in published items one sometimes cannot quite make out dubious readings and it is hence useful to check by the original. She said we should go ask the director. Since that had proven a wild goose chase before (even though I was now armed with a letter from the head of the Jordan Antiquities Department to him) I said our time was short—we had only half an hour—and would rather just look at them. She asked if I could return tomorrow and I said I was leaving Cairo today. So she let me at them. Obviously I had to choose something fast, and hence did not get an accurate assessment of all that was there. I found one sheet from The Gospel of the Egyptians, and settled on it. Transcriptions of both sides are included with this letter. (I have not had time to complete even a temporary translation, but send them on.) I hastily transcribed, then Schumann collated, then I collated. One hour later we left, having completed the two sides. During this time the man in the library sat at the table beside us, the lady had gone and gotten the director, who also sat at the table, carrying on with the other man his business in Arabic. I.e. they kept a close watch on us. I doubt if the director recognized me as the person who had interviewed him a month or so earlier. Although we shook hands and expressed appreciation, and they had our names, he gave no such indication. My conclusion is that more of this disorganized procedure could produce results in the library, though I have no further occasion to follow this up. They obviously do not know what of the material is in the library, or, put otherwise, they must have put there what had already been assigned for publication and do not have any idea whether it has or not. Thus in effect they have such things of an unpublished nature as The Gospel of the Egyptians classed as what has been published. Since Krause predicted Böhlig would take a couple more years to publish it, it may be worth publishing the 6 pages I have now transcribed. Incidentally, although Krause confidently said his next volume would be out in 1966, I received on my return to Jerusalem a letter from the editor of the series in which it appears, Dr. Stock from Cairo (who was not at
the German Institute the times I visited it), saying Krause had not yet submit-
ted the completed ms. So I question a 1966 publication here also [it appeared
in 1971/72]. I will inquire further of Krause in Münster on this one. And I have
the address of Böhlig in (near) Tübingen and hope to visit him in June too ...

I will have little time to work on the material before reaching Claremont 24
June. I hope to bring with me my transcription of Krause’s transcription of
The Letter of Peter to Philip, which he promised me when I am in Münster.
His idea is that when (if) UNESCO publishes the plates, there will be no
need for a committee to assign documents to individuals to publish, but
anyone who will, can do so. He gives us access to this one—I chose it as the
best conditioned unassigned one, with the relevance of having to do with
Christianity and not being too long—in view of us being ready to publish
it immediately upon publication of the plates. He is opposed to creating a
third time an international committee. Although he, I and Säve-Söderbergh
drafted an appeal to UNESCO that the Messina Colloquium sent by telegram
to UNESCO in Paris to expedite completion of photographing and to assume
responsibility for publishing the plates, I am a bit pessimistic about this. No
one at UNESCO is much interested in it, and without anyone being officially
responsible (like a committee) to push UNESCO I don’t see much quick
progress. Presumably something will be done of one kind or another, and
meanwhile Krause has photos and transcriptions of most of the material
(probably of all that is not fragmentary).

Though I attended the “Colloquium on the Origins of Gnosticism” at Mes-
sina on 13–18 April 66, I did not consider myself an authority on Gnosticism.
Hence I withdrew to a small side room when all participants were called
upon to collect for a group picture.15

At the closing session, devoted to an all-morning French-German-English
discussion and constant ongoing emendation of a French document on the
topic of the Colloquium that had been prepared in advance by a small group
of experts, so as to be finally adopted as the outcome of the Colloquium, I
was called upon to produce an English translation of the final outcome, and
to read it at the conclusion of the debate for final approval.16

15 Le origini dello gnosticismo: Colloquio di Messina 13–18 aprile 1966. Testi e discussioni pub-
licati a cura di Ugo Bianchi. The Origins of Gnosticism: Colloquium of Messina 13–18 April
1966. Texts and Discussions published by Ugo Bianchi. Published with the help of the Consiglio
Nazionale delle Ricerche della Repubblica Italiana (Studies in the History of Religions [Sup-
plements to Numen] 12; Leiden: Brill, 1967, reprinted 1970). The photograph was published

16 Le origini dello gnosticismo: Colloquio di Messina 13–18 aprile 1966. Testi e discussioni pub-
licati a cura di Ugo Bianchi. The Origins of Gnosticism: Colloquium of Messina 13–18 April
1966. Texts and Discussions published by Ugo Bianchi. Published with the help of the Consiglio
It was at Messina that I met Father George MacRae, who became a major participant in the Coptic Gnostic Library Project, though more behind-the-scenes than in retrospect I think should have been the case.

The other important person I met there was of course Martin Krause. I noted in his speech he mentioned that a tractate not officially assigned thus far might well be assigned to Jan Zandee. I took this to imply that Krause had given Zandee his transcription to study. So I inquired if he might let me copy his transcription of a text to work on. I suggested *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, since I had ascertained that it was a relatively brief and largely intact apocryphal New Testament text. Krause gave me the transcription of the opening page or two, asking me to provide the next day my translation, no doubt to see that I was capable of translating Coptic. I sat up all night with the transcription, and, with the help of Krause’s own summary of the text accompanying his transcription, produced an English translation of sorts that I presented to him the next morning (fortunately it is no longer extant). Then I mentioned that on my return trip from Jerusalem to America I would be visiting his university, Münster, to visit Kurt Aland, the New Testament textual critic there. Krause kindly said he would on that occasion let me copy his transcription of *The Letter of Peter to Philip*.

On arrival at Münster in June 1966, I was welcomed by Kurt Aland with the news that he had written to me in Jerusalem inviting me to speak the next day at a meeting of the theological faculties of Münster and a nearby *Kirchliche Hochschule*. But the letter had arrived in Jerusalem after I had left, so I was completely unaware that I was supposed to have prepared a German lecture on theological education in America, as Aland phrased it. I could of course have pulled together something overnight to say, but I had an even higher priority: The transcription that Krause had turned over to Aland to lend to me to copy contained not only *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, but also other transcriptions as well. Aland kindly xeroxed for me the transcription of *The Letter of Peter to Philip*, to spare me the all-night chore of transcribing it anew, so that I would be fresh to present my lecture the next day. But he then left with me the original transcription to return...
to Krause, whom I would see the next day—but which contained another tractate Aland had not xeroxed! Of course I worked through the night transcribing that text, rather than conjuring up a guest lecture in German on theological education in America. But fortunately I had with me a copy of my introduction to the latest German reprint of Albert Schweitzer’s *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, which I had submitted to the German publisher just before leaving Jerusalem.\(^{17}\) I suggested using that for the guest lecture, which Aland accepted, although the meeting included the spouses of the two faculties, who no doubt expected a less academic and more entertaining presentation.

On my trip home from Jerusalem, I stopped over in Paris and went to UNESCO to inquire if the telegram had been received and when the photography would be completed. Actually, the photography was completed on 9 June 1966, when the last 314 negatives and prints had been sent from Cairo to UNESCO, according to Christophe. But it was this casual visit intended to do no more than satisfy my curiosity that began my involvement in the UNESCO project itself.


I have published a report on my follow-up of the telegram to UNESCO:\(^{18}\)

In June 1966 I visited Bammate at UNESCO to inquire of the reception of the telegram and was assured that the General Conference of UNESCO in October 1966 would authorize sufficient funding in the Participation Program for 1967–1968 to complete the publication. When a letter of inquiry in December 1966 remained unanswered, I asked Guillaumont on 4 March 1967 to call on Bammate and then come to Claremont in May to discuss the situation. He reported optimistically that the signing of an agreement with Egypt was “imminent,” with the convening of the committee planned for September 1967. But Krause, who had been in Cairo in February and March 1967, wrote on 17 June:

The fragments and pages of the codices were not put in order prior to photographing, and the papyri in the cover of Codex VII were not removed


and hence were not photographed, as I was able to determine at the Center of Documentation in Cairo. Hence most of the photographs are not at all suitable for publication.

Two days later, on 19 June, Dr. William Benton, American Ambassador to UNESCO, reported:

According to the UAR Minister of Culture (Mr. Okacha), who spoke to Mr. Bammate about the matter only last month, the Egyptian Government will sign soon with UNESCO a contract for their publication, which is to be financed through UNESCO’s Participation Program at a cost of about $8,000.

Yet none of this has taken into account the Six-Day War that took place the same June. As a matter of fact on 5 June a bomb had exploded at the railroad tracks across the street from the Coptic Museum. The Nag Hammadi codices, at that time conserved leaf by leaf between heavy panes of plexiglass, were hurriedly stacked into a very large and excessively heavy wooden crate stored for safekeeping with other Museum treasures in the unlit basement of the Egyptian Museum, inaccessible for the foreseeable future. And the war and its demoralizing aftermath tended to suspend the decision-making process as well.

On 21 September 1967 Guillaumont reported on the basis of a recent visit with Bammate that the agreement with Egypt for the publication still had not been signed, that the meeting of the Committee had hence been deferred, but that Bammate hoped that the agreement would be signed in the autumn. On 16 December 1967 Guillaumont reported that Bammate had told him that the Egyptian delegation to the General Conference had taken the document containing the proposal back to Cairo for study. When I visited Bammate in January 1968, he reported that he expected the agreement to be signed by the end of that month, or by the middle of February at the latest, and planned to convene the Committee in May.

When I inquired whether the photographs were publishable or should be redone after fragments were assembled, Bammate asked me to work through the photographs and supply him with a report giving the answer. On 12 and 28 February 1968 I supplied detailed recommendations and reports itemizing for each codex the work remaining to be done and an estimate of the supplementary photography that would be needed. When there was no response to these reports or to a further letter of 20 May, I telephoned Bammate in Paris from California on 17 June. We made tentative plans for him to come to Claremont in July when he would be in America, a plan that did not materialize. But on 1 July 1968 Richard K. Nobbe, Secretary to the American Delegation to UNESCO, wrote:

The contract, signed about two months ago between UNESCO Deputy Director of Education Mohamed Labib Shukeir, provided, *inter alia*, for the convening of an experts’ meeting of the International Committee of Gnostic Scholars to advise on the publication of the Gnostic manuscripts.
Nobbe also reported that Bammate hoped for a meeting “in early 1969.” I visited Bammate in September 1968 and, like Guillaumont in October 1968, and Guillaumont again in January 1969, was assured that things were moving forward, with the meeting tentatively scheduled for Easter or late spring, 26–30 May 1969. In August 1969 I again visited Bammate, who planned to write to Egypt before the end of the month, proposing a place and a date (this time December 1969) for a meeting of the Committee.

From the Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions (IAHR) I was able to reach Bammate by telephone [on 22 August 1970]. He reported that the Committee would be convened in December 1970. The same committee that had prepared the telegram from Messina was reconstituted to prepare a similar telegram to UNESCO, which was approved by the International Committee of IAHR on 22 August 1970. Though the newly elected Secretary of IAHR neglected actually to send the telegram, I went to Paris and, accompanied by George MacRae, reported the IAHR action to UNESCO. On 13 November I was informed by Bammate that he had met with Okacha and Mokhtar at the General Conference and had made his final plans for the Committee to meet in Cairo on 15–18 December 1970. On 16 November, Dr. Gamal Mokhtar, then Under-Secretary of State in the Ministry of Culture, sent invitations to persons nominated to the Committee to meet in Cairo on those dates in December.

Meanwhile, on the basis of access provided to the UNESCO photographs, I had organized a team of translators into the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, which prepared draft transcriptions and translations. This material was circulated privately to cooperating scholars in the field beginning in the summer of 1968. In view of the fact that we did not have publication rights, there was stamped on each page the following statement:

This material is for private study by assigned individuals only. Neither the text nor its translation may be reproduced or published in any form in whole or in part.

It was furnished to Kurt Rudolph (among others), who agreed to supply Mandaean parallels. His report on the Nag Hammadi codices in his thorough survey of research on Gnosticism in the Theologische Rundschau of 1969 reported explicitly and at length on the material that had been circulating privately. Since I had not been notified in advance of his plans to make it public, and since our working drafts were constantly being revised, much that he reported was already out of date. In a subsequent “postscript” Rudolph corrected some of the mistakes that I called to his attention. Puech, on reading Rudolph’s article, made a protest to UNESCO for granting access

---

to its photographs. Bammate convened the relevant UNESCO officials. They agreed among themselves that it was UNESCO’s responsibility to facilitate the dissemination of the cultural heritage of the member states, not to impede access to it.

What was not included in that published report is the following important background information: When I returned to UNESCO over the Christmas and New Year’s recess 1967–1968 to inquire if the fragments had been placed before UNESCO’s photography, so that these photographs could be published in the facsimile edition, Bammate suggested I work through the photographs and see for myself. He offered me an adjoining office vacant over the weekend, and provided me about half of the photographs in enlarged prints and half in negatives. I took the negatives to the photographer I had come to know in a Paris suburb, St. Germain-en-Laye, but found on the window of his shop a notice that he had moved to Poissy on the other side of the national forest, where my taxi proceeded to take me: Photographe Jean Bernot, 1, Bd Lemelle, 78, Poissy (Les Yvelines). I turned over to him on Saturday morning, 30 December 67, 704 negatives, each 13 by 18 cm., to make two 18 by 24 glossy prints of each by Sunday evening, when I would pick them up so as to return them to UNESCO before Bammate returned to work Monday morning. Bernot did return the negatives Sunday evening, but the prints were not yet dry, so I returned the following Saturday to obtain the prints and pay the bill ($300).

Over that weekend I myself worked with the approximately equal number of glossy prints Bammate had put out for me to examine. In my temporary UNESCO office I set up my simple 35 mm. tourist camera on a tripod, and then laid each glossy print on the floor just below the tripod, and photographed, one by one, for hours, until all were photographed.

On my return to Claremont the members of the Coptic Gnostic Library team worked feverishly on these photographs that Bernot and I had made, with the result that I was able to provide Bammate by February 1968 itemizations for each codex of the work remaining to be done and the supplementary photography that would be needed.

Søren Giversen had invited me to come to Copenhagen to receive from him copies of his microfilms of the three Nag Hammadi Codices that he had made at the Coptic Museum (see Chapter 6, Part 5 above), so I could avoid photographing these in Paris. H.J. Polotsky happened to be a visiting scholar that year at the University of Copenhagen. He met me at the airport and rode with me back to the University in a taxi, providing me with the Indo-European etymological history of each of the Danish street names as we passed through town.

The basic documentation for the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, from its inception in 1967 to the convening of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices in 1970, is to be found in the three successive applications and reports to the National Endowment for the Humanities that funded this phase of research.\(^{21}\)

It is in the nature of the case that changes take place as one works through such complex procedures as were involved in getting the Nag Hammadi codices into print. Therefore the specifics of what is projected change as one moves through the implementation of the project, with the final reports itemizing what has actually taken place.

*The First Application to NEH, 10 September 1966*

On 3 March 1966 the White House officially inaugurated the National Council on the Humanities, which in turn founded the National Endowment for the Humanities.\(^{22}\) This converged nicely with my return from the sabbatical year in Jerusalem in the summer of 1966. For I immediately set out organizing the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, to be a center for basic research projects in the Humanities. In addition to enlisting projects from my Claremont colleagues, I organized my own project, the “Coptic Gnostic

---

\(^{21}\) 10 x 66: “Project Proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities to support the activities of The Institute for Antiquity and Christianity,” 1 June 1967 through 31 August 1968; 8–9 ii 68: “Project Grant Application Renewal … The Coptic Gnostic Library, Grant Number H 68-o-132,” 1 September 1968 through 31 August 31, 1969; 18 i 69 “A Report to the National Endowment for the Humanities on The Coptic Gnostic Library Project, James M. Robinson, Director, 1 June 1967 to 31 August 1968, Grant Number H 67-o-86;” 14 vii 69: “Project Grant Application … The Coptic Gnostic Library”; 25 v 70: “A Report to The National Endowment for the Humanities on The Coptic Gnostic Library Project, James M. Robinson, Director, 1 September 1968 to 31 August 1969, Grant Number H 3079;” 16 xi 71: “Final Narrative Report … Grant RO-38-70-3877, Grant Period November 1969 through August 1970.” Of course the language of such funding correspondence has its own literary style, though introductory generalizations and repetitions are here replaced as much as possible by ellipses, even if some overlaps are unavoidable; and when the funding source is a national government, that nation of necessity has to be played up in listing the achievements made possible through the funding, which nationalistic overtones the reader is asked to forgive.

\(^{22}\) 20 iii 66: Circular entitled “Statement by Dr. Henry Allen Moe, Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities.”
Library Project,” and enlisted a team of American coptologists, to the extent that I could identify any of this very rare commodity at the time.

I prepared a grant application of 103 bound pages (plus 38 pages of appendices) for the six initial projects of the Institute, and flew to Washington D.C. to turn it in personally just before the deadline.

I had been advised that an application for less than $100,000 would have a better chance of being granted, so I drew up an application with a total budget for the year from 1 April 1967 through 31 March 1968 of $91,674. This meant that the newly launched Coptic Gnostic Library Project could only apply for $16,594. As it turned out, this was the only one of the projects whose application was granted (for 1 June 1967 to 31 August 1968: $16,300). I was later advised by the National Endowment for the Humanities that we should in the future not apply for a plurality of projects, lest the weaker ones jeopardize the chances of the stronger ones. Hence for a second and third year we applied only for this one project, applications that were then granted. In the initial grant application’s General Statement, I reported:23

Claremont’s Institute has secured transcriptions of a large segment of that part of the library that has not been published and is not being studied. Hence this Project proposes to produce first translations of The Letter of Peter to Philip (resurrection appearances of Jesus to the Apostles, seen from a Gnostic viewpoint); The Paraphrase of Shem (Gnostic teaching attributed to the son of Noah from whom the Semites are traced); The Second Treatise of the Great Seth (Gnostic teaching attributed to Seth, Adam’s third son); Words of Zostrianos and Zoroaster (Gnostic teaching with a Zoroastrian background).

In the part of the grant application devoted to The Coptic Gnostic Library Project, this is spelled out in more detail.24

Prof. Robinson also talked with the major participants in the work on the Nag Hammadi material, in Egypt, France, Germany, Switzerland, and Italy. ... He secured in the process transcriptions of unpublished tractates, comprising about 12.5% of the total 1130 pages. Of this amount, 11.5% comes from those parts of the library that have neither been announced as soon to be published, nor defined as so fragmentary as to suggest deferment of publication indefinitely. This 11.5% of the whole is hence a very much higher percentage of that which is not being actively worked on elsewhere and that is in good enough condition to be profitably studied. One document, The Letter of Peter to Philip, containing a narrative resurrection appearance of Christ of

---

23 10 x 66: “Project Proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities to support the activities of The Institute for Antiquity and Christianity,” 7.
24 10 x 66: “Project Proposal to the National Endowment for the Humanities to support the activities of The Institute for Antiquity and Christianity,” 76–78.
a Gnostic character, was provided in transcription by Prof. Krause, in view of the Claremont Coptic Gnostic Library Project preparing the first edition, with introduction, transcription, translation, indices (Coptic words; Greek words; proper names), notes and commentary. Work on this document was begun September 1966 by Professors Robinson, Tune, and Hamerton-Kelly, and four doctoral students at Claremont Graduate School. This personnel is the nucleus of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project.

The other transcriptions are to be translated in view of publication simultaneously with the plates to be published by UNESCO toward the end of the decade. This publication will be in the form of a volume of translations of all that is available. It will include the 8% that has previously appeared in English, the 20% that has appeared only in French or German, the 10% that will appear in 1967 in Europe (mostly in German), and the 11.5% that is being translated in our Project from transcription, and will be put in the public domain by the publication of the UNESCO plates. Two editions of this “Coptic Gnostic Bible” is envisaged: A first edition should be ready by 1969 or 1970, with about 50% of the total library included. If the UNESCO publication takes place on schedule, a second edition including the whole library could appear in 1972.

Project Activities in 1967

The public relations office of the Claremont Graduate School and University Center published on 29 May 1967 a news release, which first made public the beginnings of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project:25

Coptic Gnostic Library Project Receives Grant

Translation of ancient documents which will throw important new light on the first 400 years of Christianity will be expedited by a grant of $16,300 to the Claremont Graduate School and University Center by the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. Within 14 months a team organized by the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity expects to prepare the first translation of parts of the Coptic Gnostic library, a group of 13 manuscript books discovered 20 years ago near Nag Hammadi in Egypt.

Dr. James M. Robinson, professor of religion in the Graduate School, secured transcriptions of some of the manuscripts during 1965–1966, when he was annual professor at the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. He has been working for some time with Ernest Tune, the librarian at the School of Theology at Claremont, and several graduate students to translate into English documents written originally in ancient Egyptian inscribed in Greek letters. One of these students, Frederik Wisse, will become the research assistant of the project under the terms of the grant.

Like the Dead Sea Scrolls, which were discovered at about the same time, the Coptic Gnostic manuscripts represent religious movements outside the main streams of Judaism and Christianity. The Dead Sea Scrolls document such movements to approximately 70 AD and the Nag Hammadi codices to the Fifth Century AD. The Coptic Gnostic library shows how religious thinkers on the fringe of Judaism and Christianity moved into Gnosticism, thus forming a new religion that for a time successfully competed with the other two for prominence in the Roman Empire.

Professor Hans Jonas, the world’s leading interpreter of Gnosticism and a senior adviser to the team at work on the project, came from New York to Claremont 4–7 May as a first step in getting the project under way. Professor Antoine Guillaumont of the École des Hautes Études in Paris, a member of the UNESCO committee to publish plates of the manuscripts, has been invited to come to Claremont later in the month, to coordinate the Claremont project with UNESCO plans. The translation team plans during the summer to meet with Professor H.J. Polotsky of Hebrew University, Jerusalem, who is the world’s foremost coptologist, to consult with him over translation problems.

Father George MacRae, S.J., of Weston College, Mass., will visit Claremont in August to discuss his role in the translation project. Others who are already involved in translation are Professor John Sieber, a graduate of the Graduate School now teaching at Luther College, Decorah, Iowa; Professor Roger A. Bullard, Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, N.C.; and Professor Malcolm L. Peel, Lycoming College, Williamsport, Pa. Others have expressed interest in participating, and Continental scholars who have worked on the Nag Hammadi material are cooperating in the work being undertaken at Claremont.

The visit of Guillaumont at the end of May 1967 was summarized in a letter of 6 June 67 to Richard A. Parker of Brown University, whom UNESCO had in view in 1961 to represent the United States on the committee:

A month ago we had Professor Hans Jonas from New York out to advise us about our plans and a week ago Professor Guillaumont. From the latter we learned the following information. The photography of the 13 codices was completed by UNESCO by 1966. He was not certain, but shared my suspicions, that this photography was not done on the basis of having the fragments assembled, and hence that part of this activity might conceivably need to be redone. Presumably also the sheets of papyrus containing business documents that were used in the cover of Codex VII to reinforce it, according to Krause, were not disengaged and photographed, since such an activity would require an expert papyrologist.

Guillaumont will contact Bammate at UNESCO on his return to France this month, but will spend the summer out of Paris and hence expects a resumption of the activities only at the beginning of the fall. The original committee of 1961–1962 is to be convened in late September or early October. He hopes the meeting will be in Paris rather than Cairo. According to the last he heard from Bammate, a new agreement with the Egyptian government is about to be signed. For diplomatic reasons Bammate would prefer that the codices be published by Egypt. Hence Egypt would have to request UNESCO to give her the money needed to complete the publication. Publication would be done theoretically by the Centre de Documentation. Bammate would also like the volumes to be published in Cairo. Guillaumont thinks that distribution from Cairo would be difficult and hence thinks that the documents should be in stock in Paris from where they could be purchased. I pointed out the slowness with which Krause’s volume was published and his decision to publish henceforth outside of Egypt. Guillaumont did not think that this would be a problem since he had great confidence in the Imprimerie Française in Cairo.

It has been Guillaumont’s assumption since the report of the 1961–1962 preliminary committee that the UNESCO project would be limited to a publication of the plates and would not include introductions, notes, transcriptions, translations or commentaries. Also that once the plates were published, assignments would be superfluous since the material would be available to the scholarly world without restrictions. He thinks that there will be a series of volumes of plates, usually one per codex. I proposed that if all volumes are not to appear more or less simultaneously, it would be wise to begin with those volumes that have not been made available thus far, or that have not been announced for publication in the immediate future. This would mean beginning with Codex VII. According to the report of the preliminary committee of 1962, Codices VII and VIII are among those that are in good condition and should hence be given priority. (Since that list of materials in good condition concerned itself only with those that had not been assigned, it did not refer to VII, Tractate 1 and VII, Tractate 2. However, these are also in good condition.) Codex VIII has many pages that are missing, but those that have survived are in rather good condition and hence are listed in the priority class by the preliminary committee. I would hope this material could become available promptly, with the non-Gnostic papyri in the binding of Codex VII either not included in the publication, or rapidly made available, so as not to retard the publication.

If the publication of plates is delayed for one reason or the other, I mentioned to Guillaumont the possibility that the committee might make the copies in Paris at UNESCO available to qualified scholars, and in this way put them into the public domain so that transcriptions and translations can be published, or to sell copies of the pictures to a limited number of research centers around the world. In view of the fact that the original contract between UNESCO and Egypt gave UNESCO control over the publication and the translation of the plates, it would seem to me a pity if the International Committee did not succeed in making the material available promptly.
Professor Guillaumont told me he would keep me abreast of developments and I will pass on to you anything further that I might get from him. I would be grateful to you if you would let me know if you hear anything officially about a meeting of the committee.

Before mailing this letter on 7 June 1967 I added a handwritten postscript:

Since dictating this letter the war has begun and diplomatic ties between the UAR and USA broken. I hope this does not, as in 1956, make all our plans in vain!

Parker replied: 27

I have heard nothing about a meeting of the committee but will certainly inform you if anything official comes my way. As I have become so completely involved with other matters I doubt that I would be able to attend any meeting this fall, and as a matter of fact I question my utility as a member of the committee for the future. Should an occasion arise would you be agreeable to my suggestion that you replace me as the American representative? I feel that you would be much better qualified than I to serve.

I replied promptly to Parker: 28

Thank you very much for your letter of 12 June. You are very kind to suggest that you will be willing to propose me as your successor on the committee. I am, as you have discovered from my other correspondence thus far, not America’s leading coptologist. I do not know to what extent participation on the committee would call for a person with a coptological specialization, or to what extent the kind of intermediate Coptic ability combined with the concern for the present state of the question characteristic of my position would meet the requirements. Professor Hans Jonas in New York is more of an authority on Gnosticism than am I, though not able to work in Coptic.

Of course, the fact that diplomatic relations with the U.S. were broken by Egypt may make all of this a very academic question. I for my part am primarily motivated by a desire for the material to become available officially so that we are free to publish the transcriptions we have at our Institute, and to study the content of the documents as a whole, as well as to interest others in this country to become more actively involved in Nag Hammadi studies, which have not only suffered from a lack of coptologists but also from a feeling that the material was in any case not available.

The Linguistic Institute of the Linguistic Society of America together with the University of Michigan conducted a summer session from 26 June to

27 12 vi 67: Letter from Parker to Robinson.
28 13 vi 67: Letter from Robinson to Parker.
17 August 1967, at which H.J. Polotsky taught an ‘Introduction to Coptic’ four mornings a week. Our NEH grant made it possible to send Ernest Tune, Frederik Wisse, John Sieber, Malcolm L. Peel, and Roger A. Bullard to attend that course. Outside of class they invited Polotsky to join them in the afternoon as they sought to translate the texts they had brought with them from Claremont. To give but one example of problems Polotsky solved for us: We had not been able to identify an unfamiliar Greek loan word (meaning ‘nauseate’) in The Paraphrase of Shem (Codex VII, 1: 2, 24), because in Coptic it was spelled differently from the ‘correct’ Greek spelling available to us in a Greek lexicon. Polotsky in turn expressed surprise and satisfaction that, after escaping the holocaust by moving from Berlin to Jerusalem, his European colleagues had not shared with him the Nag Hammadi tractates to which they had gotten access, but that he gained access to them from students in his class sent from an unknown Institute in California.

The Second Application to NEH, 8–9 February 1968

Already in the middle of the one-year grant period, on 8–9 February 1968, an application was submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities for the second year of the grant, from 1 September 1968 through 31 August 1969. It began with a report of what had been achieved thus far:

1. **The results** achieved in the first seven months of the present grant (July 1967 through January 1968) go **beyond** what could have been reasonably expected at this juncture, and hence indicate that a renewal of the grant should be equally productive.

2. Whereas the initial grant was made in view of the accessibility to the project of modern hand-written **copies** of 12.5% of the Nag Hammadi Coptic Gnostic Library (from the 70% otherwise inaccessible), the project has just acquired at Claremont **photographs** of the **whole** library in Cairo, so that a major enlargement of the project’s immediate objectives has become possible.

Whereas our initial application was cast on the background of the need for American scholarship to **enter** an area of research activity previously confined to Europe, our application for renewal is in view of the prospect that America can, with the financing provided by a renewal, become the **center** of world-wide research in this field.

---

29 8–9 ii 68: “Project Grant Application Renewal,” document from Robinson and Dean Rice to NEH, 1.
The Progress Report required of a reapplication that it include an introductory Summary.\(^{30}\)

The 12% of unpublished material which originally became available from this library of about 1130 pages has been translated at least in first draft (and some in second draft) in the first three months of the grant, and second drafts will be complete by the end of the twelfth month. The 20% that had been previously published only in German is now in English translation, at least in first draft (and some in second draft), and second drafts will be complete by the end of August, 1968. The progress of our projects, and reports on its finds, are being periodically made known to the scholarly world. Plans have been made to publish the results of our project: a three-volume edition of the previously unpublished Codices VII–XIII at the Cambridge University Press, including transcriptions, translations, indices, notes, introductions; and a one-volume edition of Codices I–VI (plus BG 8502), limited to English translation, notes, and introductions, since transcriptions and indices of these codices have been (or soon will have been) published elsewhere. Interpretation of the Coptic Gnostic Library, which our project will thus make accessible, is planned, initially in the form of collected essays by members of our team, then in the form of commentaries on the most significant tractates. We have assembled into our team most of the available scholarly forces in the U.S.A., and have achieved good cooperative working arrangements with most of the scholars working in the field in Europe. We have obtained membership in the UNESCO International Committee and have been asked to provide UNESCO with a report of its photographic holdings with recommendations affecting UNESCO policy, and have good reason to think that the previous lethargy of UNESCO will be overcome so that publication of our work can proceed promptly upon its completion.

The body of the Progress Report proper went into more detail.\(^{31}\)

UNESCO had obtained from the Egyptian government in 1962 rights to photograph and publish the Coptic Gnostic Library. This agreement brought to an end the previous policy, which had been for the Director of the Coptic Museum in Cairo to assign individual tractates to individual scholars to publish. The UNESCO intention had been to make the whole library promptly accessible to all scholars, but the effect has been that only those with prior assignments have been able to continue work. The sluggishness of the UNESCO plan led an International Colloquium on the Origins of Gnosticism meeting in Italy in the Spring of 1966 to send a telegram to UNESCO urging the completion of the publication of the plates. The response of UNESCO

\(^{30}\) 8–9 ii 68: “Project Grant Application Renewal,” document from Robinson and Dean Rice to NEH, 3–4.

\(^{31}\) 8–9 ii 68: “Project Grant Application Renewal,” document from Robinson and Dean Rice to NEH, 14–18, 24.
was to plan to make in the autumn of 1966 a new agreement with Egypt for Egyptian publication of the plates, which would take place in 1967–1968. The International Committee was to have been convened in the winter of 1966–1967 to supervise the publication of the plates.

The fact that this plan was delayed became evident during the winter of 1966–1967. Inquiries through the American Ambassador to UNESCO, William Benton, to our Permanent Delegate at UNESCO, Robert H.B. Wade, as well as a visit to Claremont from Prof. Antoine Guillaumont, scholarly adviser in Paris to Mr. N.D. Bammate of UNESCO on this project, made it clear that the signing of the agreement with Egypt was imminent in May, 1967. The International Committee was to be convened in September 1967. The Six Day War came before the agreement was signed, and brought a delay for a period in which Egypt did not act. According to a revised timetable, UNESCO was to sign the agreement with Egypt in the autumn of 1967, with the Committee to meet shortly thereafter.

By the end of the autumn of 1967 it was apparent that a further delay had taken place. At this juncture Prof. Robinson went to Europe in January, 1968, to seek to expedite matters at UNESCO and to seek to obtain copies of further material so that our preparation of translations could proceed during the time until the UNESCO plates were published. He was informed by Mr. Bammate that the Egyptian representative had taken a favorable view of the new contract and that he expected the agreement to be signed by the end of January or at the latest by mid-February; he also wrote during Prof. Robinson's visit a further letter to Cairo seeking to hasten completion of the agreement. Prof. Robinson also reported to Mr. Bammate that Prof. Krause had been permitted to see some of the original manuscripts (which he had earlier been assigned to publish) on a visit to Cairo early in 1967 and had observed that the fragments were still unassembled. This indicated that the UNESCO photography had been done on the basis of unassembled and often unidentified fragments and hence that much of this photography would have to be redone. Upon Prof. Robinson’s inquiry as to the exact status of the photos, Mr. Bammate requested Prof. Robinson to survey the photos and negatives in Mr. Bammate's office and make a report to him. A preliminary report was made in January in Paris and a more detailed report is to be mailed in February. It is clear that a majority of the photos need to be redone, and that prior to this rephotography, scholars must assemble the fragments.

Mr. Bammate expects to name an enlarged International Committee as soon as the agreement with Egypt is signed, and to convene the committee in Cairo (or Paris) in May 1968. He invited Prof. Robinson to become a member of that International Committee.

Prof. Robinson during his January 1968 trip overseas was able to secure photographs of the whole of the Coptic Gnostic Library in Cairo. The Codices that are largely fragmentary are IV, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII. Only IV has been studied by scholars: Krause has assembled the first part (only in his mind’s eye—the Cairo Museum would not permit him to assemble the fragments physically),
and Böhlig—in collaboration with Prof. Robinson and Mr. Wisse—is editing the last half, including the assembling of fragments on the basis of photos. Photos of Codices VIII–XIII available to our project have been distributed to members of our team to cut up and reassemble (VIII: Sieber; IX: Giversen; X: Peel; XI: Winternute; XII: Wisse; XIII: Turner). This is to be completed by the end of May [1968], so that, if the present UNESCO schedule is maintained, Prof. Robinson can, at the meeting of the International Committee, have available a tentative assemblage of the fragments to expedite the actual assemblage of the papyrus fragments themselves. ... Since the Cairo Museum has consistently refused to various scholars the right to assemble fragments, it is necessary that this task be undertaken directly [by a subcommittee] in connection with the International Committee meeting, which presumably will be given authority to handle the manuscripts at seems best. Since the Coptic Museum extended by delaying tactics the photographing process over a five-year period (to photograph only 1130 plexiglass containers!), it is necessary that the photography be done promptly while this subcommittee is still in control of the situation (and also before the assembled fragments become disarranged). If this policy is adopted, the assembling of the fragments and the rephotography could be completed by the end of the summer of 1968, and the publication of the plates could begin in 1969.

Meanwhile our team is translating this material ..., and will be in a position to publish the three-volume edition of Codices VII–XIII described above as soon as the UNESCO publications put the material in the public domain. In fact it is to be hoped that the International Committee will exercise its right to publish the plates as well as transcriptions and translations in the form of an official declaration at its first session that the whole library is public, so that publication of our transcriptions and translations need not be held up until the plates are published. ...

An unexpected windfall to our project was the acquisition in January, 1968, of a complete photographic file of the Coptic Gnostic Library in Cairo. This makes of our project the one center of research in the world to have the whole Coptic Gnostic Library in Cairo available for study. ... Our research is no longer contingent upon the uncertainties of the publication of the UNESCO plates, and our English edition should be the first complete edition to appear in any language after the publication of the plates has freed publication rights for transcriptions and translations.

Our complete English edition, The Nag Hammadi Library in English, was indeed the first complete edition to appear in any language; it was published simultaneously with the publication of the last two volumes of The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices, in December 1977 (see Chapter 11, Part 8 below).
Statement of Mutually Agreed upon Principles, 24 June 1968

In 1968 our initial plan was published as follows:32

In order to increase the tempo at which the material becomes available to the English-speaking world, a group of translators and consultants has been composed under the auspices of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity at Claremont Graduate School. They plan to publish in 1970 a one-volume English translation of what has been published through 1968 as well as to participate in the translation of material not previously published.

To implement this plan, I convened an organizational workshop of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project at the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity to meet for two weeks, beginning 24 June 1968. Some were able to spend a longer period during the summer working at the Institute.

For the organizational meeting of the project, I had prepared a “Statement of Mutually Agreed upon Principles,” which was adopted:

STATEMENT OF MUTUALLY AGREED UPON PRINCIPLES

It is the purpose of the Coptic Gnostic Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity to make accessible to the scholarly world the Nag Hammadi codices with a minimum of delay. We recognize that the implementation of this policy involves some personal renunciation on our part, for example in that we will not hold up publication until we, to the exclusion of others, have exhaustively studied the material. In assigning material to members of our group we recognize that these assignments may need to be adjusted as the work proceeds in order to get the job done as nearly on schedule as possible, and that this may mean that what is initially an assignment to one of us alone may end up a joint assignment or that some of us may have to do some relatively unacknowledged work of giving a boost at some point along the line. In such cases the Director of the Project will, in consultation with the parties involved, make such adjustments. Phase one is to be completed by the end of August 1968 and the whole work by the end of August 1969, with the work of the volume editors the only functions still incomplete at that time.

We shall seek to attach names to the individual units of the publication in a way that symbolizes as accurately as possible the credit due, and we shall try in the introductions to describe accurately what the individual participants have done, so that most contributions that are of a minor nature will

---

nonetheless be acknowledged. ... We recognize that we as well as the public we serve are human beings with our rights and needs, and that, within the limitation implicit in the basic purpose stated above, due acknowledgement and fair treatment of all participants is a moral obligation. Work on this project keeps us from other work that in some cases might have been preferable in terms of financial return or professional advancement. There is no financial return on this project, other than some grants provided during research on the basis of need and of availability of funds, and the royalties for the Reader which will come to the Institute to finance future research. We hope that the involvement in the project will be recognized by our administrative superiors as professionally important, and when it is desirable, letters confirming the contribution individuals are making can be provided, especially in view of the uncertainty as to when the result of our research will appear in print.

With regard to publication of references to our work prior to the publication of our Nag Hammadi edition itself, we are guided by two major considerations: 1. Not to act in such a way as to create problems or delays in the publication of our edition; 2. Not to act in such a way as to be unfair to our colleagues. It is agreed that any oral or written publication envisaged, that refers to unpublished Nag Hammadi material circulating among us, should be cleared in advance with the editorial office in Claremont, which will approve in writing the use made of unpublished materials, with such revisions as it proposes; it will decide whether the use made of another member of the team's work is such that it should be cleared with him as well. A quote of two or more lines should be so cleared; important discoveries should be cleared.

Press interviews are dangerous, since “off the record” comments or information pried loose by interrogation can at the discretion of the news media be published, irrespective of our protests; for this reason interviews should be avoided as much as possible. Public relations offices of our institutions are legitimately interested in sending out news releases about our work. The Claremont public relations office has listed the institutions or local news media of the participants in the project on its mailing list, which will provide some grist for the mill. Other news releases should if possible be cleared with Claremont before they are sent out.

Scholarly speeches and articles should avoid the sensational and should not involve a de facto publication of a tractate prior to or apart from our edition. Work done on assignments in the project is the property of the Institute. If a member of the project withdraws, the work he has done up to that time remains the property of the Institute and continues to be under the restrictions of the project and available to the project for its use and publication, so long as the Institute continues its plan to publish the Nag Hammadi Library. Citation of unpublished material will be restricted to the kind of citation that does not constitute publication of the document itself, i.e. to brief references, ordinarily in indirect discourse, in connection with an
argument being presented rather than an extended quotation. Such citation has already begun, e.g. in Böhlig’s footnote references in *Le Muséon* 1967 to Zostrianos. A progress report on the project at AAR in October 1968 by Robinson, Peels’ paper on Gnostic Eschatology at that meeting, the first annual report on the Institute’s work to be published in late autumn, and Robinson’s contribution to the Schaeffer *Festschrift* are instances of such secondary literature currently envisaged; the seminar on Nag Hammadi and the NT to be conducted by members of our team at SNTS in August 1968 is an instance of pre-publication study of our material by a limited group outside the project membership itself with the approval of the persons whose material is used.

Translators have the last word in the wording of the translation when material differences exist; alternate translations can be given in a note. Volume editors are free to carry through their standardizing policies when material issues are not involved. The editorial office will have more latitude in editing the introduction and notes.

*The Final Report to NEH on Year One, January 1969*

The report to NEH at the conclusion of the first year of the grant, written in January 1969, gave a much more advanced and detailed update than did the application for the second year of the grant that had been written in February 1968. The Final Report of January 1969 stated:

The first step of the Project’s activity was to send members of our team to Ann Arbor during the summer of 1967 to translate there the 12.5% of the Library available to us but not previously translated, in consultation with Professor H.J. Polotsky of Hebrew University, who was teaching in the Linguistics Institute at Ann Arbor that summer. This step was carried to completion as scheduled. Frederik Wisse completed a first draft of *The Paraphrase of Shem*, Roger A. Bullard a first draft of *The Second Treatise of the Great Seth*, John Sieber and Malcolm L. Peel a first draft of *The Words of Zostrianos* (or, as we were subsequently to discover, of the half of it included in Krause’s inventory; the other half was to turn up during the year!); *The Letter of Peter to Philip* had already been translated by team activity just before the grant period began. Professor Polotsky met with members of the group at first one afternoon a week, later two afternoons, at which time translations were read to him and he made suggestions for solving problems. He also oriented his course to the needs of the group, which audited the course each morning, with the result that a technical grammar, geared to Nag Hammadi purposes in the form of notes, has become available to the Project.

---

At the conclusion of the summer George MacRae of Weston College visited Claremont and went over the summer's translations, making useful suggestions and joining the Project. A sample of our work (transcription and translations with notes of The Letter of Peter to Philip) was submitted to the Editorial Board of the Society for New Testament Studies at the annual meeting of that society in Switzerland at the end of August, in view of proposing that the Monograph Series of the Society, published by Cambridge University Press, publish our edition. The Board unanimously agreed to publish three volumes.

The Research Assistantship provided by the NEH grant was awarded to Frederik Wisse (as indicated already in the letter to Dr. Keeney of 28 February 1968). The one-year stipend was spread out over the 15 months to which the grant was extended, in such a way that Wisse worked full-time the summers of 1967 and 1968, and part-time during the winter of 1967–1968. During that winter he and Robinson revised the translations of The Letter of Peter to Philip and The Paraphrase of Shem, as well as carrying on the normal office activities of the Project, and the specific activities listed below.

During the Thanksgiving holidays Professor Orval Wintermute of Duke University visited the Project at Claremont, worked through some of our translations with us, and joined the Project. ... He also worked out plans for a doctoral pupil of his, John Turner, to gain access to the material for his dissertation and to work at the Institute June 1968 through August 1969 as a Research Associate, which is currently taking place.

In January 1968 Robinson visited Europe in the interests of the Project. In addition to the significant work at UNESCO described below, he consulted with the main persons involved in Nag Hammadi research (Guillaumont and Puech in Paris, Quecke in Rome, Kasser in Geneva, Böhlig in Tübingen, Giversen and Polotsky in Copenhagen), going over with them problems in translations as well as the following specific concerns:

Guillaumont and Kasser provided information concerning archaeological excavation in Egypt in the Byzantine period, in view of an excavation of the site of the find near Nag Hammadi, which is being planned by the Project. [See Ch. 12 below.]

Kasser is preparing a new Coptic lexicon, of which only the first half of the letter A has appeared; he agreed to make his unpublished files available, for the purpose of identifying words, spellings, and meanings not listed in published lexica.

Böhlig received some years ago the assignment to publish The Egyptian Gospel. Robinson and Wisse prepared a correction of one page Böhlig had published, which Robinson went over with Böhlig, with the result that Böhlig invited them to join him as co-authors of his edition, which would appear in English rather than in German. Robinson invited Böhlig to participate in the Nag Hammadi Seminar of the Society for New Testament Studies in August (see below) as an outside authority. ...
Giversen turned over to the Project microfilms he made in Cairo of the codices in 1958, and joined the Project. Polotsky continued his role of consultant on grammatical materials not solvable on the basis of published grammars.

A windfall in the activity of the Project during the report period was already reported in the application for renewal of the project. ...

The last half of the report period (i.e. 1968 through August 31) has been marked by rapid and steady progress toward this objective.

Robinson visited UNESCO in Paris in January [1968] to verify reports that, though the photography in Cairo for UNESCO had been completed, it was based upon unassembled fragments. Mr. N.D. Bammate, the UNESCO official in charge, requested Robinson to study the UNESCO materials himself to ascertain the facts, and make a report to UNESCO of the condition of its materials and recommendations concerning it. This report, consisting of two letters summarizing the report and a detailed analysis of the UNESCO materials on each codex ..., was prepared and submitted by Robinson and Wisse in February and March. Bammate also invited Robinson to become a member of the International Committee envisaged to publish the plates, and asked him to nominate others to that Committee. He nominated stronger American representation. At the end of the report period (August–September 1968) Robinson and Wisse visited UNESCO in Paris again, to advance further their analysis of the material there and to begin the process (completed December 1968 by Wisse) of attaching to the container of each UNESCO negative a gummed label identifying the Coptic page or pages to which the fragment(s) on that photograph belong. Thus our Project has undertaken for UNESCO, prior to the convening of the International Committee (which has been repeatedly delayed and still has not taken place), the basic task of that Committee to prepare the UNESCO materials for publication. This is both a service to scholarship at large and a means to expedite the UNESCO publication of the plates freeing publication rights for our edition. As a result of these activities for UNESCO Mr. Bammate asked Robinson in September 1968 to prepare for him the "position paper" he is supposed to prepare in connection with convening the International Committee (currently scheduled for 26–30 May 1969), outlining the present status of the UNESCO project and outlining the items to which the Committee should address itself. Thus the Claremont Project has moved from the position of contacting UNESCO through such intermediaries as Professor Guillaumont (see the letter of 28 February 1968 to Dr. Keeney) to the status of the primary consultant to UNESCO concerning this topic. These UNESCO activities have been carried on in contact with the American delegation to UNESCO (Benton, Wade, Nobbe). Inquiries from the Information Offices of the New York office of UNESCO for news releases have been deferred until the delicate diplomatic negotiations are complete. ...

During the period of the grant, contacts were made throughout the nation of persons qualified and interested in becoming members of the translation team. Furthermore consultants were secured in this country and abroad
with specific assignments other than that of translation. The outcome of this activity is that some twenty younger American scholars have been involved in the Project and leading European authorities in the field enlisted in its support. ...

In June 1968 a meeting of American participants in the Project was held at the Institute in Claremont. It lasted two weeks and was attended by [James M.] Robinson, [Frederik] Wisse, [Douglas M.] Parrott, [John D.] Turner, [George W.] MacRae, [John H.] Sieber, [William R.] Murdock, [Malcolm L.] Peel, [Andrew K.] Helmbold, [Geoffrey] Story[. Jr.], [Francis] Williams, [Birger A.] Pearson, [Carmino J.] de Catanzaro, [Roger A.] Bullard. A series of documents was prepared, ranging from a statement of mutually agreed upon principles [see above] (functioning something like a contract) to policy decisions about format and mechanical details. ... Of these persons Robinson, Wisse, Parrott, Turner, MacRae, Sieber, Murdock and Peel worked together in Claremont during the summer, the others working at their home bases. By the end of the summer (and the end of the report period) the following twenty-seven tractates had been transcribed and translated. ...

This means that within the report period in which we proposed to translate about a third of the total library, mostly from what has already been published in other languages, we have in fact translated two-thirds of the total library, mostly from what has never been published. Thus the actual achievement of the grant period has not been curtailed by the fact that European activity is behind schedule (the 10% due to be published there in 1967 and thus become available to us has still not been published; the publication of the UNESCO plates making all the material available, originally planned for 1967–1968, still has not taken place). Our Project has been rapidly enlarged in scope, by means of the securing of copies of the whole library, and thus a dramatic increase in activity beyond that of the initial proposal has been achieved. ...

The meeting of the Society for New Testament Studies in Exeter, England, 27–29 August 1968, included a three-day seminar on the Coptic Gnostic Library chaired by Robinson. Furthermore the Society's Editorial Board received from him a report on the Project and it expressed to the Business Meeting of the Society its considerable satisfaction in the progress made, and authorized a fourth volume, so that the whole Coptic Gnostic Library (not just the three volumes involving the use of Coptic type) could be included in its Monograph Series. It also addressed an official letter to UNESCO requesting full coordination of the Project's edition with the UNESCO Project. ... A meeting of Robinson and Wisse with Cambridge University Press together with R. McL. Wilson of Scotland, Associate Editor of the Monograph Series, was arranged for early September, 1968. At this meeting details of format were discussed, as well as the need by the Press for a subvention to cover the cost of setting Coptic type.

The edition as now planned consists of four volumes. The first volume does not include Coptic transcriptions, since these have been or will have been published already in connection with German or French editions, but makes
available in English the half of the Coptic Gnostic Library that will have been published on the Continent by the time our volume appears. Volumes II–IV include Coptic transcription and Coptic index of words, for the last half of the library, for which there are no current plans for publishing elsewhere the Coptic text. All fifty-five tractates have been assigned. ...

The survey of Project Activities and Results, having been presented basically in chronological terms of the project activities, may be summarized in terms of basic results:

1. A nation-wide team of translators and a more international team of consultants has been assembled and has begun to work cooperatively on the Project.
2. Access to the unpublished bulk of the library has expanded from a minor fraction to all the unpublished material in Cairo, and this material has become available to the translation team.
3. Transcription and translation already achieved by the end of the grant period is about double the amount proposed in the grant application.
4. A distinguished publishing house capable of setting Coptic type (Cambridge University Press) has agreed to publish the edition. The Editorial Board of the Learned Society in the field (Society for New Testament Studies), to which Robinson has been elected a member, has agreed to publish the edition in its Monograph Series.
5. Very close working relations with UNESCO, which has publication rights on the unpublished majority of the library and plans to convene an International Committee (to which Robinson has been named) to publish the plates, have been established.
6. Oral progress reports to Learned Societies, written reports in scholarly journals, and news releases are keeping the scholarly world abreast of the progress of the Project, to the extent the delicate diplomatic status of the UNESCO/UAR negotiations permit.
7. Already activities beyond the first grant period are underway in a second grant year, and the main objective of the Project of preparing for publication the Nag Hammadi library of thirteen codices should be completed in a third year. Further activities growing out of this Project are already being actively investigated, as will be described in the next section of this report.

Status

The Project is currently in a second grant period (1 September 1968 through 31 August 1969), during which period the individual translators are to complete their assignments and turn in their manuscripts to volume editors. During the summer of 1969 a core of the team, including the Claremont staff and volume editors plus a few of the best-qualified members, will spend the summer at Claremont working on the Project, with individual translators coming in and out to turn in their work and go through it with this core group. Collections of parallels for footnotes, as well as introductions to individual tractates, are to be prepared and talked through critically during the summer.
In the year beginning 1 September 1969 the volume editors will copy edit and verify the accuracy of the material submitted for the volume each volume editor is editing, in consultation with the General Editor, Robinson. The material will then be forwarded to Wilson, Associate Editor of the Monograph Series, who will in turn forward it to Cambridge University Press. During the year 1969–1970 the setting of type will begin and continue without interruption until the completion of the four volumes. A subvention to cover the additional costs involved in the setting of Coptic type, somewhere in the region of $10,000, will be needed by Cambridge Press. An application for a third grant period to the NEH will be submitted in the near future, when more exact cost estimates for publication have been obtained.

Further related activities in which the Project is becoming involved are as follows:

The International Committee to be named by UNESCO to publish the photographic plates is scheduled to meet 26–30 May 1969 in Paris. Robinson has not only been invited to be a member, but has been asked to prepare for UNESCO the "position paper" which will provide the basis for the Committee’s work. It is hoped that the Committee, to which UNESCO’s publication rights are to be entrusted, will either immediately declare the material in the public domain, thus releasing publication rights for our Project’s edition (and any others as well), or grant publication rights to specific editions (in view are a German, a French, and our English edition), or as last choice let publication rights become available only as a result of the publication of the photographic plates. The third option is less desirable, because it could cause further delay. However the plates should in any case be published, and the Project is currently involved in identifying fragments on the basis of photographs so that the fragments can be reassembled and rephotographed. Page sequences are being established and Coptic numeration established. ... It is planned that all the identifications that can be done on the basis of photographs will have been completed by May 1969, so that the verification of these identifications by the actual assembling of pages and fragments in Cairo can take place the summer of 1969, with pages definitively photographed as soon as they are assembled; this would mean that the photographs could go to the publisher within a matter of months of the convening of the International Committee at UNESCO.

A Monograph Series of individual studies related to the thirteen codices has been arranged with the publisher Brill in Leiden, Holland. Members of the Project will comprise a majority on the international Editorial Board. Since it is our policy to publish the English edition rapidly, only a minimum of interpretive introduction and notes will be included; the arrangement for a series of monographs complements the English edition, in that such detailed studies that will take years to prepare can be published in the Monograph Series as they become ready and not retard the publication of the English edition.

In January 1969, Professor Paul Lapp, formerly Director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, and Dr. Frederik Wisse, of the
Claremont office of the Project, are visiting Egypt to investigate the possibility of an archaeological excavation of the Graeco-Roman cemetery near Nag Hammadi, where the jar containing the thirteen codices was found. If Egypt permits an American dig at this site (which unfortunately has become “political” since it was the site of the recent Israeli reprisal raid on Egypt), and financing can be arranged through the American Research Center in Cairo (using blocked counterpart funds), a first expedition will be planned for 15 December 1969, through 30 January 1970. (If an American excavation is not admitted by the UAR, perhaps the International Committee of UNESCO will become the sponsoring agency, in which case the American archaeologists could still participate.)

An item on the agenda of the UNESCO International Committee meeting in May 1969 has to do with whether this Committee should become a permanent committee to handle any additional matters related to its narrower assignment of publishing the photographic plates. Our Project plans not only to make proposals of such related activities, but to be open to involvement in them.

**Anticipated Dissemination of Results ...**

Needless to say, the publication by Cambridge University Press, in the Monograph Series of the Society for New Testament Studies, of our four-volume complete edition of the Coptic Gnostic Library in the early 1970s, is the basic “dissemination” of the results of our Project, since the Project has as its main objective to publish an English edition of these thirteen Gnostic codices. ...

**Comments and Suggestions**

This Project has as its objective the publication of an English translation of previously unpublished material. It is therefore in its interest that the National Endowment consider including within its scope the financing of publications, at least of publications which are the direct objective of research the National Endowment has financed. We hope to submit shortly an application for a third grant, and would like to include in that application the funding of the costs of setting Coptic type; our Project is therefore concerned that this expense, directly related to the completion of the Project itself, be eligible for consideration.

The National Endowment for the Humanities did not change its policy against funding publications. Fortunately, F.C. Wieder, Jr., Director of Brill in the Netherlands, offered to include, as a Coptic Gnostic Library sub-series in the series Nag Hammadi Studies, publication of the transcriptions with Coptic type at no cost to the Project itself. Indeed, when the archaeological excavation actually began to materialize in 1975, he made a grant of $2,000 from Brill to cover some of the excavation costs.
The Third Application to NEH, 14 July 1969

The third application included a statement of what was being accomplished through the summer of 1969:

II. Statement of Accomplishment.

The following Statement of Accomplishment contains both a statement of what has been done through June 30, 1969 and a description of what will be done through August 31, 1969. ...

1. Translations. The production of a translation involves considerably more than simply translating a given text. Therefore the following data are to be understood as involving not merely the actual translation, but the following accompanying activities: Most tractates have never been published, and hence one must work from photos, and the photos are often of unassembled fragments that do not even belong to the same page. Thus one often must begin with the laborious process of mentally assembling fragments, on the basis of the contours of the fragments, of fiber lines in the papyrus, of the continuation of a word or phrase from one fragment to the other, etc. Fragments and pages must then be transcribed, that is to say, written by hand in Coptic lettering, which involves the difficult editing tasks of word division, reconstructing letters only partly surviving, filling in holes conjecturally (by exact measurement of the space available, and matching it with what the sense requires and the Coptic vocabulary and grammar of each individual tractate permits). Even the order of the pages must often be established by detailed study of the whole book, since the pages have all been cut out of their binding and put separately in plexiglass containers.

The translation of these transcriptions is then carried out, with the translator also listing queries to all unknown word spellings and grammatical forms, since the Coptic Gnostic library represents very early Coptic for which existing dictionaries and grammars do not suffice. When this much work has been done, the material is reduplicated and circulated to all members of the team, who thus gain early access to the rest of the library for use in their own work on their own translation assignment, as well as providing from their own experience suggestions to the translator for improving his work. ...

Of the 52 tractates in the Nag Hammadi library, 26 have already been translated by our team and distributed to its members for study and comment. Twelve further tractates are translated and shortly to be distributed. Seven further tractates are at least half finished and nearing completion. Four further tractates are also to be finished by the end of the second grant period. Thus only three will remain untranslated at the end of the second grant period; this is because one consists of a few inaccessible fragments (I, 5), two others (II, 2, 3)
have already been published in English and hence have not been given priority in our project. That is to say, by the end of the second grant period, with the exception of the fragments, the whole library will be in English translation.

The degree to which individual tractates have been moved from first draft to final publishable form varies. Some have already been "combed" and checked thoroughly. Already in January 1969, Dr. Wisse worked in Jerusalem with Prof. H.J. Polotsky, the greatest living coptologist, going through several tractates for which Dr. Wisse is volume editor; and in the spring of 1969 John Turner, also a volume editor, worked in Jerusalem with Prof. Polotsky combing further translations. The summer of 1969 is being devoted primarily to translators going through this process with the staff at Claremont.

Prof. Alexander Böhlig of the University of Tübingen, Germany, is one of the world’s leading authorities in Nag Hammadi studies. In the application for the second grant it was envisaged to bring him to the Institute for several months to aid in perfecting translations. When the escalation proposed in the budget was not granted, and a pruning of projected costs was necessary, the budget for Prof. Böhlig’s visit had to be eliminated. But in personal discussions with him in London in September 1968 a lecture tour was planned that would take him to the main campuses where project members are located. The trip was funded by the respective institutions. Thus over $1,000 was engendered, and the tour took place 31 March–23 May [1969]: Harvard, Claremont, Rice, Luther College, Vanderbilt, Duke. Prof. Böhlig rendered great service, not only in lecturing on Nag Hammadi, but also in working through the translations that had been prepared with individual translators.

In addition to the staff of editors (Robinson, General Editor; Parrott, Wisse, Turner, Pearson, Volume Editors), two of America’s leading coptologists, Prof. Orval Wintemute and Prof. George MacRae, are at Claremont for the summer of 1969 working with individual translators, who are either spending the summer here also, or are coming in for a week or two to finalize their translations. Thus, not only has the quantity of material in translation moved close to completion, but the quality of translation is moving toward that “final” stage suitable for publication. Most of the library will be turned in by individual translators in final publishable form to the volume editors for the copy-editing process by the end of the summer. Thus, whereas the final report on the first grant period could report (p. 11) that about half the library (27 tractates) had been translated, one can report now that almost all has not only been translated but also moved in quality toward reaching the final publishable form.

During the third grant period (November 1969–August 1970), the Volume Editors will standardize all manuscripts. Indices to individual tractates provided by translators will be pooled and edited for publication at the end of each of the four volumes. Copy-editing in details of format, final verification of transcriptions, accuracy of translation, uniformity in translating standard terms, etc. will be carried through. Translators will submit introductions, which will
be edited. Specialists who have been collecting parallels from the Bible and from ancient sources, such as other Gnostic literatures, will have submitted their cards, and translators will combine this information with their own study to produce publishable notes, which will include: Variations from the published transcription, when that has already been published and we are not republishing it; alternate translations worthy of mention; parallels to other Nag Hammadi tractates and to other literature; other items of historical value. ... By the end of the third grant period, publishable introductions, notes, and indices will have been submitted by translators, and the volume editors will have completed their editing activities on all four volumes. The General Editors will have been checking each segment of completed manuscript as it is ready, and will then spend a year following the third grant period in Europe working in close conjunction both with UNESCO, in connection with the publication of the plates, and with the publisher of the English edition. ...  

3. UNESCO relationships. Following upon the very successful and encouraging meetings of the project director and the project research assistant (Robinson and Wisse) with Mr. Bammate of UNESCO, in charge of the publication of the plates (reported in the final report on the first grant period, pp. 18–20), Dr. Wisse remained from September, 1968 through January, 1969 in Europe, involved in a series of activities of the project. By December the Claremont office had prepared conversion tables for each of the UNESCO photos, on the basis of information collected while going through the files of UNESCO at Paris, listing the position of each fragment on each photo and identifying each fragment, as far as possible, as well as the original Coptic page to which it belonged and the position on the page. Gummed stickers were prepared at Claremont for each UNESCO negative in Paris, recording all the information available on the identification and location of the fragments pictured on each negative. These stickers were mailed to Dr. Wisse, who went to UNESCO and put each sticker on the container of each negative. Mr. Bammate was also sent typed conversion tables in converse order, i.e. in the sequence of the original Coptic books, so that in reassembling fragments one could work from these lists in seeking the fragments that belong together. Thus UNESCO has been equipped with as much information as is currently available as to what is on the photos it has, information UNESCO previously lacked. The project director will in August 1969 return to UNESCO in Paris to add to these stickers further identifications that have been made in the meantime, as well as to submit to UNESCO revised conversion tables. 

In view of the fact that UNESCO has not convened the international committee it had envisaged for May 1969, the project director will lay before Mr. Bammate at UNESCO suggestions for publication of the plates that would make publication possible even without the convening of that committee (see item 4 below), since the work of that committee will in effect have already been carried out. The fact that the project director plans to be residing in Paris 1969–1970 will make available to UNESCO a resident person to carry to completion the UNESCO project to the extent needed at that time.
4. The monograph series. In September 1968, the project director and project assistant discussed with leading European Nag Hammadi experts the creation of a monograph series devoted to Nag Hammadi studies, and presented the proposal to Mr. Wieder, head of the publishing house Brill in Leiden, the Netherlands. He agreed on the spot to the proposal.

In subsequent correspondence Wieder of Brill has in addition offered to publish the four-volume English edition our project is preparing, and to do so without subsidy. Thus far our plan has been to publish in the Monograph Series of the Society for New Testament Studies, to the editorial board of which the project director has been elected, at Cambridge University Press. In this connection the project director and the project assistant visited Cambridge, England in September 1969. Cambridge Press needs a subsidy of at least 1,000 Pounds for each volume that contains the Coptic text, i.e. Volumes 2, 3, and 4. Cambridge Press even anticipates a still higher rate, in view of rising costs, and would not want to use Coptic type in Volume 1, where transcriptions are not to be published but where Coptic would be useful in footnotes, introductions, etc. Brill's offer thus saves about $10,000.00 in publication costs.

Furthermore, Brill has in recent correspondence agreed to publish the UNESCO plates with no subsidy, whereas the preliminary committee of UNESCO which (around 1962) reported on the library estimated at $50,000.00 the subsidy that might be needed at that time to publish the plates. Dr. Martin Krause, who a decade ago conserved in plexiglass the pages in Cairo, has been agreed upon by the publisher and his Dutch professorial advisors as the European editor, and Dr. Krause has approved of the project director as co-editor for American materials, such as the English language edition and further materials originating here....

The membership of the editorial board of the monograph series was proposed by the project director and accepted by Dr. Krause; they are being invited to join the board by the project director, and a first meeting is being organized for August, 1969. Since Brill is the publisher that has been most involved in Nag Hammadi publication in the past (publishing *The Gospel of Thomas* and setting type for the Jung Codex publisher, the Rascher Verlag), this will put American scholarship emanating from the project at the top of worldwide publication in the field. The board will consist of the leading European authorities on Nag Hammadi (almost all of whom are members of our project team), and several American members of the project. Thus the Brill editorial board will be largely composed of our project team, which in turn is much the same as the committee UNESCO has envisaged.

Thus it may be anticipated that if UNESCO does not itself convene its committee, it may ratify the plans worked out by the board of the Brill series and in effect adopt that editorial board as the UNESCO committee.

5. Archaeological excavation plans. Prof. Paul Lapp, archaeological consultant of the project, and former Director of the American School of Oriental
Research in Jerusalem, together with Dr. Wisse, Research Assistant of the project, visited Egypt in January 1969, in view of the possibility of arranging an excavation of the cemetery near Nag Hammadi from which the 13 books are reported to have come. Prof. Lapp has submitted to the Smithsonian an application for counterpart funds for an excavation in December and January 1969–1970. The amount of the equivalent of $39,859 in Egyptian Pounds has been granted to the expedition, available as soon as permission from the United Arab Republic is received. Application has been made by the American Research Center in Cairo, through whom the grant is made, to the Department of Antiquities of the U.A.R. for the permission, and the outcome is now being awaited. The American staff of the dig consists of archaeologists with previous experience on digs under Lapp’s direction and members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project (Robinson, Wisse, Murdock).

The Final Report on Year Two, 28 May 1970

Archaeological excavation plan

The United Arab Republic has not permitted the dig to take place as scheduled December 1969 and January 1970. A deferment of one year in the timing of the dig has been agreed upon, in hopes that the political situation will permit a dig in December 1970 and January 1971. The project director is director of publication of whatever written materials may emerge from the dig. Professor Paul Lapp of Pittsburgh has organized the actual digging operation, with a staff comprising archaeological technicians and three project members who have had some archaeological field experience. Professor Lapp died April, 1970 while on an excavation in Cyprus, and plans are underway to replace him, with agreement from the Smithsonian that the funding that has been arranged will not be jeopardized if a qualified successor can be named in the near future. ...

Results

The Nag Hammadi library is now translated, which has been the basic objective of the project. Individual translators are turning in their assignments to five volume editors. The volume editor has the translation verified by a coptologist other than the translator or himself, and then himself works through the translation for accuracy as well as for the normal editing requirements. Then he turns in the material on each assignment to the general editor, who is the project director. Material is now steadily moving through this process, with expectation that by the end of August 1970 all the material will be in the hands of the general editor.

---
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The interpretation task has already begun. It is already apparent that the assumption held by scholarship thus far, to the effect that the library is purely Gnostic, is in need of revision. Some of the tractates are clearly not Gnostic (e.g. *The Sentences of Sextus*), while others are not demonstrably Gnostic, but reflect developments toward Gnosticism in Judaism and Christianity. Materials of philosophical Gnosticism, to which allusion is made in the writings of the Neo-Platonist philosopher Plotinus, have emerged, to fill in a segment of the history of philosophy. Previously unidentified tractates have emerged, as the fragments are identified and translated. Materials filling in our understanding of the Dead Sea Scrolls are emerging, e.g. a tractate entitled *Melchizedek*, containing traditions similar to some emerging at Qumran. Thus the Coptic Gnostic library is beginning to shed the expected light on various aspects of the history of religions in the Graeco-Roman world.

**Status**

This final report on the second grant has already anticipated the continuing activities of the third grant period that ends 31 August 1970, by which time the manuscripts of the team will have been edited by volume editors and turned in to the general editor, the project director. He will be on sabbatic leave beginning 1 September 1970, for a year, to edit and see through the press the edition. He will be located in Paris, to consult the UNESCO photographs and aid in preparing them for publication in volumes of plates, which will bring the last half of the library into the public domain. An open-ended monograph series has been created, so that continuing research will have a ready access to publication. The learned society in the field, the Society of Biblical Literature, has instituted an annual section on Nag Hammadi studies, organized and chaired by project members. It is in addition organizing a Nag Hammadi seminar, so that the project can continue working together as a seminar in SBL, with annual meetings at the annual SBL meetings and with common research and publication objectives. This seminar is being organized under the auspices of the Research and Publications Committee, of which the project director is chairman. The international Society for New Testament Studies has begun seminars on Gnosticism, which was chaired in 1968 by the project director, and in which project members participate. In 1972, when the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity is host to a joint annual meeting of SBL and SNTS in the Los Angeles region, these two seminars will merge. The computer is being integrated in the research in the field in a way that is pioneering both for future Coptic studies and for the editing of ancient texts in general. The establishment of a monograph series on Nag Hammadi Studies and the integration of the project team into an SBL seminar means that continuing activities of the team in research and publication can be carried on without major sustaining support such as NEH has provided for the launching of Coptic Gnostic studies in America. The sabbatic leave of the project director to complete the editing activities is funded by a Guggenheim grant and a Fulbright lectureship in Strasbourg, where the Nag Hammadi library will be made available to French scholarship. The American team has
emerged in a three-year period of NEH funding as the most active group of scholars in the field anywhere in the world.

Summary

This project has within its second year completed its main objective, the translation of the previously untranslated Coptic Gnostic library from near Nag Hammadi, Egypt. The revision, verification, and editing of a five-volume edition is underway. Frequent progress reports are being made to learned societies and in university seminars, and through scholarly journals. Offshoots of the project are emerging, such as an archaeological excavation to investigate the site of the find, various uses of the computer, a monograph series at Brill in Leiden, a Nag Hammadi seminar at the Society of Biblical literature, etc.

The Final Report to NEH on Year Three

Project Activities. ... Scholarly communications and publications.

Papers that had been read by project members at the American Academy of Religion's annual meeting of 1968 and at the Society of Biblical Literature's annual meeting of 1969 were published in 1970 in a special double issue of the journal *Novum Testamentum*. An off-print of these articles was published as a brochure entitled *Essays on the Coptic Gnostic Library: An off-print from Novum Testamentum XII,2* by Brill in 1970. The section of papers begun at the annual meeting of SBL in 1968 was continued at each annual meeting since then, and a seminar on Nag Hammadi studies has been added to the SBL program each year since 1969. There were Nag Hammadi sections at the meeting of the International Association for the History of Religions at Stockholm in August 1970 and at the Oxford Patristics Congress in August 1971. Some of the more recent of these papers are to be published in a *Festschrift* for Alexander Böhlig to appear in 1972 as a special volume in Nag Hammadi Studies.

Courses and/or seminars at the institutions of higher learning where project members are located have become the rule rather than the exception. ...

There was a press interview of the principal investigator in February 1971 at UNESCO in Paris, with a news release entitled “The Nag Hammadi Library: New Light on Early Christianity?” in the *UNESCO Features* No. 592/593 of February (I/II) 1971, followed up by a popular article by the principal investigator “Early Christian Manuscripts from the Sands of the Nile” published in the *UNESCO Courier* May 1971, which is published by UNESCO in about 10 languages.

---

This series of Applications and Reports to the National Endowment for the Humanities gives a contemporary impression of the hopes, plans, and achievements, as they changed with the changing circumstances, and yet reached the ultimate goal of transcending the endless delays in making the material accessible. The next chapter documents the actual transactions involved in publishing the Nag Hammadi Codices.
I arranged to have a full year’s sabbatic in 1970–1971, in hopes of getting the UNESCO committee to meet and the facsimile edition started. So my base was in Paris.

I had obtained a Fulbright professorship at the University of Strasbourg for that school year. Every Thursday I took the train from Paris at dawn and reached Strasbourg by noon, to conduct a seminar for four advanced students on the Nag Hammadi texts, handing out each week our preliminary translation of one tractate as the “homework” for the discussion the following week. Then after class each week Jacques-É. Ménard, the history-of-religions professor in the Catholic faculty, a Canadian in origin who had done his doctorate under Puech in Paris and hence had strong interests in Nag Hammadi (and great fear of Puech), met me at the door of the seminar room. Together we took the streetcar to the train station, where we had a beer together awaiting my train back to Paris, all the while discussing the text I had given him the preceding week for this purpose. This is the source of the material with which the project at Laval University in Québec began its Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hammadi.

I also secured the position of Scholar in Residence at the American Church in Paris, with my only responsibility there being an adult class Sunday mornings. The great advantage for me of being able to live there was that it is in walking distance of UNESCO, where I had been assured I could secure an office to work on the Nag Hammadi photographs.

I returned to the photograph shop of Bernot to get further enlargements of a list that Charles W. Hedrick, my Research Assistant at the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, had telegraphed to me as still needed. On 16 September 1970 I obtained 286 enlargements (for 629.20 French francs).

Even before moving to Paris, I began the sabbatic year in Europe by attended in Stockholm on 20–25 August the International Colloquium on Gnosticism sponsored by the International Association for the History of Religions. It authorized the same ad hoc committee that had composed...
the telegram sent to UNESCO from Messina to compose another telegram inquiring about the UNESCO project, and entrusted it to the newly elected Secretary to send to UNESCO.

The Stockholm meeting made it possible to convene on 19 August 1970 a founding meeting of the Editorial Board of Nag Hammadi Studies, hosted by Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, at the University of Uppsala. The membership of the Editorial Board had only recently been published, a bit earlier in 1970:1 Alexander Böhlig, Søren Giversen, Hans Jonas, Rodolphe Kasser, Martin Krause, Pahor Labib, Jacques-É. Ménard, George W. MacRae, James M. Robinson, Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, Willem Cornelis van Unnik, R.McL. Wilson, Frederik Wisse, and Jan Zandee, with the comment: “Other names may be added to the Editorial Board.” The Editorial Staff is listed as follows: “Martin Krause, Editor; James M. Robinson, Co-Editor; Frederik Wisse, Managing Editor. Continental European manuscripts should be submitted to Dr. Krause, manuscripts from the English language world to Dr. Wisse.”

Puech, who did not attend the Stockholm meeting, wrote Doresse of the threat that he sensed from that meeting:2

It is all the more necessary and urgent for us to reach an understanding on the publication of the *Dialogue of the Savior* and, perhaps also, the *Book of Thomas the Athlete*, since an enlarged project of publication of the Coptic Gnostic texts, just as untimely and arbitrary as the preceding ones, has just been formed by the International Association of the History of Religions on the occasion of the Congress held in August at Stockholm.

When I had an opportunity to meet Guillaumont, Puech, and Malinine in Paris, I invited them to join the Board. By the time volume 1 appeared in 1971, Antoine Guillaumont had been added to the Editorial Board listed on the page facing the title page. But when Puech declined my invitation, on the grounds that it was not appropriate for a student of his, Ménard, to be in the position of participating in the decision as to whether to publish any of his writings, Guillaumont felt called upon to withdraw, and was not listed in future volumes. Malinine, no doubt following Puech’s lead, never

---


2 3 x 70: Letter from Puech to Doresse:

accepted the invitation extended to him. Beginning with volume 2 (1972), Jean Doresse's name was included on the Editorial Board. Thus France was represented by two of Puech's alienated pupils, Ménard and Doresse.

On 16 October 1970 I wrote a report to the Editorial Board, outlining what had taken place following the Board's Uppsala meeting:

I am writing to give you a report of developments since our organizational meeting at Stockholm. ...

As Prof. Säve-Söderbergh suggested that each of us do, MacRae and I visited 24 August at Paris our American Permanent Representative to UNESCO, Mr. P.R. Graham. He expressed considerable interest and willingness to be of assistance.

On my return to Paris [from Greece] 2 September I received a call from Mr. C. Lahiguera, the person on the American Delegation staff in charge of cultural affairs. I visited him promptly and explained our concern. He suggested a meeting with Prof. Richard Hoggart, Assistant Director-General of UNESCO for the Sector of Social Sciences, Human Sciences and Culture. Nag Hammadi falls within the Department of Culture within this Sector.

The meeting in the office of Prof. Hoggart included the relevant UNESCO personnel. Mr. Bammate, Director of the Division of Cultural Studies in the Department of Culture, who has been in charge of the Nag Hammadi Project, had indicated to me on the phone from Stockholm that he would be back from a trip only 18 September, but he had been able to return earlier and was present, as was Mr. Taha-Hussein of his staff and Mr. Louis Christophe, who, though in another Division, has been involved with Nag Hammadi for years, having been the UNESCO official in Cairo when the photographs were made. I am sorry to say that the cable authorized by the IAHR Congress had not been sent by Prof. Brandon, but Mr. Christophe was able to verify its existence by reference to Prof. Säve-Söderbergh having contacted him about it, and I showed Mr. Bammate a copy which I had with me. Subsequently I have contacted Prof. Brandon to submit it.

All persons at that meeting were agreed that we should press for the December convening of the International Committee, and that final plans should be made with the Egyptian Delegation to UNESCO, due to arrive at the latest for the General Assembly which began 12 October. The Minister of Culture of the UAR, Dr. Okacha, was expected to be present. It was with him that the Director General of UNESCO, Mr. Maheu, had first made Nag Hammadi plans, and perhaps one reason for delay is that Dr. Okacha had for some time not been Minister of Culture. Thus the fact that he again holds that position was regarded as grounds for encouragement. The hope was also expressed

---

3 16 x 70: Letter from Robinson to the Editorial Board of Nag Hammadi Studies.
4 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/335.
that in addition to the funds already granted for the Nag Hammadi project for 1969–1970 in the framework of the UNESCO participation program, funds to be used early in 1971 (by a sub-committee plus papyrologist to assemble fragments) could be provided within the regular administrative budget of UNESCO, i.e. not in the participation program, which would have perhaps required the delay until the member state requested and was granted the funds. Also clarification of the legal status of the 1962 contract between the UAR and UNESCO, in which the latter was apparently granted publication rights, was to be sought, at to just where the publication rights do lie. The possibility that the International Committee might declare the material in the public domain even before the plates could be published was discussed. The desirability of gaining access to the originals in Cairo was stressed. The plans Mr. Bammate and I had envisaged a year ago, when I mentioned that my sabbatic plans were approved, were to the effect that I be permitted to continue in Paris the work with the negatives and prints at UNESCO in preparation for the meeting of the International Committee. Mr. Bammate has been kind enough to permit me to make use of room 2.08 in Building 3 of UNESCO at times when it is not being occupied by the person to whom it is regularly assigned. There I have been continuing the process of labeling the plexiglass containers of the negatives and the prints with the stickers I showed you at Stockholm, on which the material of the conversion tables is included, so that, to the extent possible, each fragment on a given photograph is identified on the sticker attached to the photograph itself. This should mean that the work of actually assembling the papyrus fragments will consist primarily in sorting the contents of each plexiglass container according to the information attached to the photograph of that container, verifying on the basis of the original the identifications made on the basis of photographs and transcriptions, making whatever further identifications can be made in a brief period of time on the basis of the papyrus itself that could not be made with the use of photographs, and then the photographing of the papyrus pages thus assembled. The eventuality was envisaged as possible though not preferable that if access were not gained to the originals the assembling would have to be on the basis of photographic prints enlarged uniformly to the size of the originals, then cut out, assembled and rephotographed.

I have subsequently suggested to Mr. Wieder that a representative of Brill be sent to examine the condition of the negatives from a photographic point of view, as to their suitability for use in the volumes of plates, and also so as to know what kind of photographic equipment to take to Cairo for whatever rephotographing would be necessary in order that it be conformable to the photographs already made. Hence on 2 October Mr. Digksterhuis of Brill visited me at UNESCO and I presented him to Mr. Bammate, who assured him of his support for the proposal of Brill publishing the plates and welcomed the suggestion he go over the photographs in view of the work to be done in that connection. We were able at that occasion to present Mr. Bammate with a copy of the off-print from Novum Testamentum entitled 'Essays on
the Coptic Gnostic Library' which had just come off the press a day or so before, and in which Brill's offer was published. I understand that Brill has sent each of you a complimentary copy of that off-print. Mr. Dijkstra found that with but a few exceptions the UNESCO photographs were quite good, and that apart from those where fragments were involved only a small amount of rephotographing would be necessary. He thought that Heliogravure is the method Brill would use, similar to the Rascher Verlag plates of the Jung Codex, though perhaps with more contrast to facilitate exact reading.

On 5 October I was able to spend a day working in Münster with Prof. Krause, coordinating information he had from the time he was working with the originals in Cairo and information I had concerning the UNESCO photographs. I hope to complete this comparative activity in November or December.

On 8 October Mr. Bammate presided over a meeting of myself with Prof. Puech, Prof. Guillaumont, and Mr. Christophe, in which information was exchanged concerning progress on the publication of the Jung Codex and my work in preparing for the publication of the plates, as well as plans being made for the international English-language edition and the Monograph Series. The possibility was discussed that the excavation of Nag Hammadi, for which funding has already been provided through the Smithsonian Institute of Washington, might well become a project of the International Committee, and I offered to investigate the acceptability of such an arrangement with Washington when I am there early in November.

With regard to the Editorial Board of the Monograph Series, it was observed that French participation was relatively limited. I visited Prof. Puech on 12 October and Prof. Guillaumont on 13 October, and sought to explain in as much detail as I could the objectives of the Editorial Board as expressed in our talks in Stockholm, e. g. that the material should be brought into the public domain as quickly as possible, that there should not be exclusive assignments, but that all materials should be available to all scholars to translate, study and publish at will, which coincides with the UNESCO policy. They of course felt that there should be a French edition, and we agreed that this was desirable and the responsibility of French-language scholarship. Mr. Bammate envisages the International Committee discussing various translation projects, simply for practical interests of information and avoidance of unnecessary reduplication. But it is still UNESCO policy that the International Committee as such will be responsible only for publishing the plates and will impose no limitations on the freedom of scholarship. We also felt that scholars of one language working cooperatively on a translation in that language should not be limited to those on the International

---

Committee, and that cooperative activities should not prevent individuals not on such a team from carrying on their own research and publication. I was glad that Prof. Guillaumont expressed more positively than I had understood (when he was in Claremont several years ago) his readiness to continue his involvement in Nag Hammadi research. Prof. Puech, in view of his own age and that of Prof. Malinine, thought that Prof. Guillaumont might well take the lead in envisaging a team to produce a French language translation. Prof. Guillaumont in turn drew attention to the fact that Prof. Puech is without a doubt the most knowledgeable expert on the history of Gnosticism alive today. I expressed my own hope that perhaps the commentary on The Gospel of Thomas they are preparing and plan to publish at Brill might be included within our series, and Prof. Guillaumont said this would have to be discussed with the publisher, since they already had a contract with Brill.

We also discussed the desirability of bringing the Editorial Board of the Monograph Series and the International Committee of UNESCO into as close a personal union as possible, so as to have a maximum of coordination. When I visited Mr. Bammate on 12 October he mentioned that Prof. Parker, the American nominated in 1961–1962 for the International Committee, had written that he felt he should resign and that he proposed me for his successor as American representative. In this connection Mr. Bammate expressed the idea that the International Committee might be enlarged and be more inclusive than merely the 1961–1962 list of proposed members. I for my part expressed the hope that the central figures in the Nag Hammadi story in Paris, who were not able to attend the Messina and Stockholm meetings, might nevertheless be included in the Editorial Board of the Monograph Series, i.e. Prof. Puech, Prof. Guillaumont, and Prof. Malinine. After consultation with Prof. Krause in his capacity of editor for Continental manuscripts in our series, I have extended an invitation to them to become members of our Board, and I feel sure they will be willing to join us [but see above].

I shall be in the USA from 18 October to 7 November, but will thereafter be concentrating on preparations for the meeting of the International Committee, currently scheduled for 15–18 December at Cairo. My address in Paris for the school year is 65 quai d’Orsay, Paris 7. I shall be glad to receive any suggestions or assistance any of you might have to offer, and I shall keep you informed of developments as they occur. It is to be hoped that official invitations to those named to the International Committee will be sent out by the UAR or UNESCO within the immediate future.

Richard A. Parker later wrote me of his actual non-involvement in Nag Hammadi studies (see Chapter 10, Part 3 above) and hence his support for my being the American delegate:6

---

6 26 v 77: Letter from Parker to Robinson.
I offer you my congratulations on the splendid publication of the Nag Hammadi codices that goes forward under your charge and I am glad that I had the good sense to recommend you to the Committee back in 1970.

2. Planning the Cairo Meeting, 13 November–8 December 1970

On 11 November 1970 Dr. Gamal Mokhtar, Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Culture, of the United Arab Republic, wrote non-Egyptian members envisaged for the International Committee inviting them to a Cairo meeting. On 13 November 1970 I met with Bammate and received this good news that I immediately forwarded in a letter that same day to the Editorial Board of Nag Hammadi Studies:  

In spite of the very busy schedule of the last day of the General Conference of UNESCO Mr. Bammate was able to see me for a few moments today. I received from him the good news that he has been able, during the days of the General Conference, to talk with Mr. Okacha, Minister of Culture of the United Arab Republic, and Mr. Mokhtar, both in attendance here at the General Conference. Mr. Bammate has made final plans with them for convening the International Committee as follows: The Egyptian authorities are sending the invitations to those nominated in 1961–1962 (with the exception of Till, who has died, and Parker, who has written Mr. Bammate withdrawing and proposing that I be named in his place to represent the USA); plus a few additional names which he could not at the moment itemize. The meeting is to be 15–18 December, probably at the Coptic Museum. The representatives of the UAR have assured Mr. Bammate the originals will be available to the Committee.

Since I have a temporary office at UNESCO to be working with the negatives and prints identifying and labeling them and in general making preparations for their use by the Committee, Mr. Bammate suggested that the invitation to me be sent to UNESCO care of him. It has not yet arrived, but as soon as it does, I shall communicate again with you, as well as in case there is other information to pass along. When any of you receive invitations, perhaps it would be useful to drop me a note so I can pass on that information in my next mailing.

The suggestion that a small sub-committee remain after the 18th with a papyrologist and Brill’s photographer to carry through immediately the assembling and rephotographing will not be acted upon until the Committee itself is convened. However I shall in the meantime seek to make preliminary inquiries about available papyrological technicians.

8 13 xi 70: Letter from Robinson to the Editorial Board of Nag Hammadi Studies.
On leaving Mr. Bammate’s office I by chance saw Christophe, who told me he
was to be at the Cairo meeting as UNESCO’s representative. (Mr. Bammate
had earlier said a conflict in schedule would prevent his own participation
and he would hence delegate someone such as Mr. Christophe.)

While in Washington a few days ago I visited the Smithsonian Institution
to inquire whether participation by the UNESCO committee and/or individ-
ual non-American archaeologists would be permitted under the terms of the
grant of some $122,000.00 made for three annual digs at the site near Nag Ham-
madi, and was assured that such international and/or UNESCO participation
would be welcomed. Mr. Bammate thinks the Committee may wish to discuss
this in Cairo.

I have not received replies from the French authorities invited to join our
Editorial Board, but this may be due to their knowledge that I have been
out of the country since writing them. I shall hope to receive their favorable
responses soon.

A copy of this letter, with an explanatory Postscript, was also sent to the
members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project for their information.

On 24 November 1970 N.A. Bammate, as Director of the Division of
Culture of UNESCO, wrote those invited to join the International Committee
in Cairo, concerning travel arrangements. I then wrote them on 8 December
1970 about the actual agenda, sending to each of the European members the
conversion tables that had been prepared in Claremont, as I explained in the
letter of 8 December: 9

They record (on the right side of the page) the numbers placed in the plex-
iglass containers and hence visible on the UNESCO photographs, and then
list (on the left side of the page) on the same line the original numeration of
the Coptic codex (to the extent this could be determined). The position of
the fragments on the photographs and on the original Coptic page has been
indicated by a grid system, dividing the page into 4 parts, letter A (top left), B
(top right), C (bottom left) and D (bottom right), with each square then subdi-
vided (e. g. the section A divided into 4 parts, a, b, c, d) and each subdivision
still further divided (when such precision is needed, e. g. when many small
fragments are involved), into 1, 2, 3, 4. Thus a plexiglass listing 12 A a 1 would
mean that the fragment in question is in the top left corner of the plexiglass
container numbered twelve, and a Coptic listing 27 D d 4 would mean that
the fragment in question belongs in the far bottom right corner of the Coptic
page 27.

I then outlined the actual work of fragment placement that would have to
take place prior to the leaves being rephotographed for publication:

---

9 8 xii 70: Letter from Robinson to the European members of the International Committee
for the Nag Hammadi Codices.
The prints of the photographs at UNESCO have been labeled with a sticker in the upper right hand corner, on which each fragment present on the photograph is listed (according to the above system); beside each such listing is given the correct place for that fragment on the correct Coptic page (if it has been identified), according to the above system. Mr. Bammate has agreed that these photographic prints, thus prepared for the work of reassembling the fragments, be taken to Cairo for our use. This would make it possible to use these already identified photographs to sort and identify the individual plexiglass containers themselves. An extra copy of the inscribed stickers will be brought along, so that a sticker can be put on each plexiglass container once identified. A further file of stickers will be brought. It lists each page of the restored and identified Coptic pages, so that when fragments not belonging to the page (or main fragment) in a given plexiglass container have been removed and replaced by the fragments actually belonging to that reassembled Coptic page, the sticker which had contained the original listing of contents can be covered over with the new sticker, listing the number of the Coptic page now permanently reassembled into that plexiglass container. Unidentified fragments of each codex would be placed together as a miscellany in plexiglass containers. I am bringing also Scotch tape to re-seal the plexiglass containers in case they are to be opened, the fragments sorted, and then resealed.

I also outlined the work that the committee would need to do to prepare the codices for publication:

I have sent these conversion tables both in order that you may have them at your disposal and also that you may get from them an impression of the extent to which fragments that belong to one Coptic page are scattered among various plexiglass containers, and hence must be sought on several different photographs in the UNESCO file. For this reason it would perhaps be desirable that some UNESCO photographs, where fragments are not in their correct position, be replaced by new photographs based upon the reassembling of such fragments in their correct position. Needless to say it has not been possible to identify all fragments; lists of unidentified fragments are included at the back of the conversion table of each codex. And the work of reassembling the original papyrus would involve a verification, rectification, and supplementation of the identifications that have been made.

I then proposed how a sub-committee could actually carry out the work of preparing the codices for publication:

It may be possible for a few members of the committee to stay over in Cairo after the meeting during the Christmas holidays and carry through this assembling activity, if it is the recommendation of the committee to proceed in this way. Dr. Mokhtar has assured Mr. Bammate and Mr. Christophe that the papyrus originals will be made available to the committee for this purpose, in case it decides that the fragments should be assembled and rephotographed prior to publication.
I explained that I had arranged for the rephotographing in the following way:

The publishing house Brill of Leiden, the Netherlands, has made a formal offer to UNESCO to publish the photographic plates without requiring a subsidy, and indeed to cover at its own expense the cost of whatever rephotographing may be necessary, i.e. both the cost of the photographer and photographic equipment used, and the cost of publishing the volume of plates. If this generous offer on the part of Brill is accepted, Brill is prepared to send (at its expense) a qualified Dutch photographer immediately, if this is desired by the Committee and Brill is notified, so as to make the photographs as the pages are reassembled.

These suggestions were largely adopted in Cairo by the International Committee, since they provided a way to get the codices into the public domain—and no one came with an alternative solution.

3. The First Meeting of the UNESCO Committee, 15–18 December 1970

I flew to Cairo, accompanied by Christophe and his secretary, on 14 December 1970. The members of the International Committee stayed at Shepherds Hotel, which had been rebuilt as a state-owned facility for official visitors. After having been elected Secretary of the International Committee, I prepared the minutes of the meeting and the appended recommendations as follows:10

Minutes

1. Membership

The Ministry of Culture of the United Arab Republic, in consultation with UNESCO, named the following persons to membership in the committee:11

Dr. Gamal Mokhtar, Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Culture of the United Arab Republic
Dr. Gamal Mehriz, Director General of the Department of Antiquities of the United Arab Republic
Dr. Pahor Labib, Member of the High Council of Fine Arts, Literature and Social Sciences and Director Emeritus of the Coptic Museum

10 These are the official minutes and recommendations I recorded and the International Committee approved at its last session. I published a summary, "The International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices: A Progress Report," *NTS* 18 (1972): 236–242.


Dr. Shafik Farid, Director of the Coptic Museum
Mr. Victor Girgis, Chief Curator of the Coptic Museum
Prof. Gérard Garitte, University of Louvain, Louvain, Belgium
Prof. Søren Giversen, University of Copenhagen, Denmark
Prof. Antoine Guillaumont, École des Hautes Études, Paris, France
Prof. Rodolphe Kasser, University of Geneva, Switzerland
Prof. Martin Krause, University of Münster, Germany
Prof. Henri-Charles Puech, Collège de France, Paris, France
Prof. Gilles Quispel, University of Utrecht, the Netherlands
Prof. James M. Robinson, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, Cal., USA
Prof. Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, University of Uppsala, Sweden
Prof. R. McL. Wilson, University of St. Andrews, Great Britain
Prof. Garritte sent regrets for his inability, due to a previous engagement, to attend the meeting. Mr. Louis Christophe represented UNESCO at the meeting.

2. Opening session

The opening session, at 11 am 15 December, was presided over by H.E. Badr Eldine Abu-Ghazi, Minister of Culture of the United Arab Republic. It was attended by the International Committee (with the exception of Prof. Garritte), Mr. Reheem, Cairo representative of UNESCO, Mr. Louis Christophe, representing the UNESCO Secrétariat in Paris, Dr. Karl Brunner, UNESCO General Commissioner in Arab Countries for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, Mr. John Dorman, representing the American Research Center in Egypt, the Reverend Basilios

---

19 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1510.
21 Gérard Garitte was not able to participate in either of the two meetings of the International Committee or to respond to mailings, but his name was retained in the membership.
23 John Dorman, Director of the American Research Center in Egypt, introduced himself to me before the formal meeting began, and kindly offered to be of any service if I would just call on him. The United States did not have at the time diplomatic relations with the United Arab Republic (as Egypt and Syria were then known), whereas Quispel had seen to it that the Dutch Ambassador was present and highly visible. Dorman did prove to be very helpful. After the UNESCO funding ran out before the assembling of fragments had been completed, members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity came for seven months to complete that work, and the funding from the Smithsonian Institution was channeled through the American Research Center in Egypt.
Ibrahim,24 Expert for Religious Matters at the Coptic Museum, Miss Samiha 'Abd el-Shaheed,25 Curator for Manuscripts in the Coptic Museum, and other dignitaries and guests. H.E. the Minister of Culture inaugurated the session with a brief address welcoming the committee and expressing support for its objectives, to which Mr. Reheem, Mr. Christophe, and Dr. Pahor Labib responded. The formal ceremonies were completed by a tour of the Coptic Museum by the Minister as well as by Dr. Gamal Mokhtar and other dignitaries, guided by the Director, Dr. Shafik Farid, together with Dr. Pahor Labib and the staff of the Coptic Museum.

3. Agenda

Mr. Christophe presided at the resumption of the session at 1PM, and proposed the following agenda, which was adopted:

1. Opening
2. Election of officers for the meeting
3. Examination of technical and scientific questions related to the publication of the codices
4. Consideration of, (a), offers by publishing houses for the publication of a facsimile edition of photographs, and, (b), plans for publishing translations
5. General exchange of views concerning international scientific cooperation for Coptic studies
6. Adoption of the report
7. Adjournment

4. Officers for the Meeting

The following officers for the meeting were chosen by acclamation:

Dr. Gamal Mokhtar, Chairman (Président)
Dr. Pahor Labib, Vice-Chairman (Vice-Président)
Prof. Puech, Vice-Chairman (Vice-Président)
Prof. Säve-Söderbergh, Vice-Chairman (Vice-Président)
Prof. Robinson, Secretary (Rapporteur)

Upon the election of Dr. Gamal Mokhtar, Mr. Christophe ceded the chair to him; whenever Dr. Gamal Mokhtar was not able to be present, Dr. Pahor Labib assumed the chair.

5. Schedule

Morning sessions for each of the four days were held from 9 AM to 1 PM at the Coptic Museum; sessions were also held from 4 PM to 7 PM at the Center of Documentation the first two afternoons. After the first day most of each morning was devoted to the examination of the papyrus originals, the assembling of fragments, and the choice of materials to be rephotographed; the items on the Agenda were taken up primarily in the afternoon sessions.

6. The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices

It was agreed that the primary task of the committee was to make recommendations concerning the facsimile edition. It was agreed that in this facsimile edition any written text should be kept to an absolute minimum, to avoid subjectivity and to avoid delay in publication. (See RECOMMENDATION 1.)

7. Title page

It was proposed that no individual names occur on the title page, but instead there be named the two sponsoring entities, the Department of Antiquities of the United Arab Republic and UNESCO. (See RECOMMENDATION II.) The committee members should be listed on the back of the title page. (See RECOMMENDATION III.)

8. Number and priority of volumes

An edition of about eight volumes, with priority to those codices not yet accessible, was proposed. (See RECOMMENDATION IV.)

9. The technical sub-committee

It was decided that a technical sub-committee should be entrusted with the task of assembling whatever fragments have been identified and supervising the photographing of such materials as should be rephotographed. This sub-committee consists of Professors Giversen, Kasser, Krause, Robinson, together with the staff of the Coptic Museum, explicitly Dr. Shafik Farid and Mr. Victor Girgis. The sub-committee began its work already on the third morning, and will continue through December 23, to reconvene in January if necessary.

26 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/.../id/1553.
27 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/.../id/1399.
28 There were in fact twelve volumes, since Codices IV and V, and Codices VI and VII, were not published as envisaged, with two codices together in one volume, but were published instead, here as elsewhere, with one volume per codex; there was a volume *Cartonnage*, and a final volume *Introduction*, which was a greatly enlarged replacement of the brochure entitled *Introduction* that was circulated with Codex VI.
29 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/.../id/782.
to complete the work. (See RECOMMENDATION V.) It was agreed with the staff of the Coptic Museum that the sub-committee work in the Library itself. This made it possible to begin opening plexiglass containers and reassembling fragments on several codices at the same time. On the third day Prof. Krause began on Codex VIII, Prof. Giversen on Codex IX, and Prof. Kasser on Codex X, with Prof. Säve-Söderbergh assisting Prof. Krause and Prof. Giversen, and Prof. Robinson interpreting materials prepared for this activity. Mr. Victor Girgis and Miss Samiha ‘Abd el-Shaheed were of great assistance to the sub-committee in its work.

10. Choice of a publisher

It was agreed to recommend the acceptance of the offer made by Dr. F.C. Wieder, Director of the Publishing House E.J. Brill in Leiden, the Netherlands, to publish without subsidy the facsimile edition and to cover the costs of the supplemental photographing. Dr. Gamal Mokhtar expressed his approval of this recommendation. (See RECOMMENDATION VI.)

11. Supplemental photographing

In view of the fact that a condition of Brill's offer is that an expert in the field be present with the photographer, and in view of the urgency to complete the supplemental photographing, Brill had made available a photographer ready to come immediately to Cairo, if requested to do so. With the approval of Dr. Gamal Mokhtar a cable was sent. The photographer, Mr. van der Velde, arrived 17 December and worked with the sub-committee through 22 December.

12. Photographs made prior to the UNESCO photographs

It was agreed that the Secretary request Dr. Jean Doresse to put at the disposal of the committee for possible use in the facsimile edition whatever photographs he may have of material not otherwise available.

13. History of Nag Hammadi research

It was agreed that a history of the Nag Hammadi discovery and of subsequently research should be written in the future. [The present work implements this agreement of the International Committee.]

14. Continuation of the International Committee

It was agreed to recommend that the committee should continue to function until the publication of the facsimile edition, and also later, in order to further international cooperation in the field of Coptic studies. (See RECOMMENDATION VII.) It was agreed that the Secretary of the meeting be Permanent Secretary of this continuing committee.
15. Translations

Plans for an international English-language edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices in five volumes, to be published by Brill in the monograph series Nag Hammadi Studies, were reported by Prof. Robinson, General Editor of that edition. It was agreed that there would be no “official” edition endorsed by the International Committee, but that the preparation of translations into various languages should be permitted and indeed encouraged for the whole scholarly world, thus making the contents generally available. It was agreed that no critical edition of the text, i.e. no Coptic transcription, would be prepared by the committee, since as early as 1962 the government of the United Arab Republic and UNESCO decided not to assign the tractates to individual scholars to prepare as part of the UNESCO project.

16. Reciprocal exchange among different publication projects

Prof. Giversen has made copies of his microfilms available to members of the International Committee and is willing to make further copies available to any interested scholar. The members of the Jung Codex Committee present at the International Committee meeting agreed (pending formal consent from their other members and their publisher) to put the manuscript of the unpublished parts of the Jung Codex at the disposal of members of the International Committee and other groups of scholars on a reciprocal basis, an initiative that was endorsed by the International Committee.

17. Project of microfilming papyri

Dr. Gamal Mokhtar reported on an International Committee for a Photographic Archive of Greek Papyri. This project has the following chain of

---

command: UNESCO; CIPSH (Conseil international de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines); FIÉC (Fédération Internationale des Études Classiques); AIP (Association Internationale de Papyrologues). We share the concern of this project to preserve a record of all surviving papyri through photographic archives. In view of the fact that that project is limited to Greek papyri, we would recommend a similar project for Coptic papyri. (See RECOMMENDATION VIII.)

18. The importance of Coptic studies

The volume of photographic plates of some Nag Hammadi materials published by Dr. Pahor Labib in 1956 and of facsimiles from the Jung Codex from 1956 on have led to an impressive quantity of scholarly publication and public interest. The committee anticipates a similar acceleration of research and public interest as a result of the publication of the complete facsimile edition. We wish to go on record as commending to the scholarly world that individuals and groups move rapidly and energetically into research and publication in view of the imminent publication of the facsimile edition. (See RECOMMENDATION IX.) In view of the large increase in the number of students of the Coptic language during the last decade, as a result of the Nag Hammadi materials available thus far, a still greater activity in Coptic studies in general can be expected as a result of the facsimile edition. We wish to express ourselves as favoring initiatives and projects, many of them mentioned during our discussions, that share in this widening activity. The founding of an international coptological learned society would be desirable. We defer further consideration to subsequent meetings of the committee.

19. Expression of appreciation by the foreign guests

The foreign guests on the International Committee wish to express their profound gratitude to their host, the Ministry of Culture of the United Arab Republic, and especially to Dr. Gamal Mokhtar, who has not only served as our able Chairman but has made such excellent arrangements for our accommodations and use of leisure time; and to the staff of the Coptic Museum, Dr. Pahor Labib, Director Emeritus, Dr. Shafik Farid, Director, Mr. Victor Girgis, Chief Curator, and Miss Samiha ‘Abd el-Shaheed, Curator for Manuscripts, without whose ready cooperation and assistance the work of the committee and its technical sub-committee could not succeed. All members of the committee wish to express their high appreciation for the preparation and implementation of this meeting by the Secretary.

---

Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION I

A facsimile edition should be published as soon as possible. The photographs should be enlarged to natural size. Any written text should be kept to an absolute minimum, to avoid subjectivity and to avoid delay in publication. Material to be included, in addition to the photographs themselves, can be limited to the following:

a) Beneath each photograph the number of the codex and page.

b) A brief introduction to each volume, supplying such matters as information about the binding, the dimensions of the pages, the color and condition of the papyrus, and brief bibliographical reference to inventories and bibliographies to which the reader may be referred to inform himself about
   the status quaestionis of scholarly opinion.

c) The first volume to appear (and it only) should contain a brief resumé (circa two pages) of the discovery, the Directors and Curator of the Coptic Museum and the Committees that have been involved, and the importance of the codices for scholarly study and the understanding of our cultural heritage. The text of items b) and c) should be prepared in draft form by Prof. Robinson and circulated to the members of the committee. If they have any suggestions for improvement, they should submit them to him within a month, whereupon he will prepare a final draft in the light of such suggestions. A copy of this final draft will be sent to Mr. Victor Girgis, who together with Dr. Pahor Labib will provide an Arabic translation within a month, which should accompany the English text in the published edition.  

RECOMMENDATION II

The title page of each volume should read: Nag Hammadi Codex ... (or Nag Hammadi Codex ... and Codex ...), published under the auspices of the Department of Antiquities of the United Arab Republic in conjunction with UNESCO.

---

32 A nineteen-page brochure entitled Introduction was laid unbound in the front of each copy of the first volume to appear, The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Codex VI, which appeared in 1972. An Arabic translation of this Introduction was not published, whereas an Arabic translation of the introduction to each individual volume was published in the respective volume.

33 By the time The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices began to appear in 1972, the name of Egypt had been changed to Arab Republic of Egypt, which hence was used on the title page (except for the first volume, Codex VI, which read Arabic Republic of Egypt).
RECOMMENDATION III

On the back of the title page of each volume should be written Editorial Board, followed in alphabetic order by the members of the committee, and below the list of the Board again the name of Prof. Robinson with Secretary in parentheses.

RECOMMENDATION IV

The facsimile edition should be published as soon as possible in about eight volumes, containing approximately the following contents (though some adjustments may subsequently appear to be desirable to avoid delay),

- Codex I (circa 140 plates)
- Codex II (circa 154 plates)
- Codex III (circa 140 plates)
- Codex IV (circa 88 plates) and Codex V (circa 90 plates, a total of circa 178 plates)
- Codices VI and VII (circa 82 and 134 plates, a total of circa 216 plates)
- Codex VIII (circa 142 plates)
- Codices IX and X (circa 76 and 48 plates, a total of circa 124 plates)
- Codices XI, XII, and XIII (circa 80 and 20 and 20 plates, a total of circa 120 plates)

Priority should be given to those codices where public accessibility and publication rights for translations depend upon the publication of the facsimile edition, i.e. especially Codices VII–XIII, although this priority should not be understood to encourage an artificial or unnecessary delay in publishing other codices when they are ready for publication. The volume containing codices VI and VII should probably appear first, since the least work needs to be done in preparing it for publication. Codex I should appear last, so as to include the pages of the Jung Codex in Zürich some considerable period after complete publication of the Jung Codex.34

RECOMMENDATION V

UNESCO is requested to provide funds early in 1971 for the continuing work of the sub-committee and the photographer, especially for a return trip to Cairo in January to complete the assembling of fragments and photographing, and, if it proves necessary, for a second meeting of the sub-committee in Europe.

---

34 The actual sequence, date, and number of plates is as follows: *Codex VI* (1972), 84 plates; *Codex VII* (1972), 136 plates; *Codices XI, XII and XIII* (1973), 120 plates; *Codex II* (1974), 160 plates; *Codex V* (1975), 100 plates; *Codex IV* (1975), 96 plates; *Codex III* (1976), 144 plates; *Codex VIII* (1976 [1977]), 152 plates; *Codices IX and X* (1977), 144 plates; *Codex I* (1977), 144 plates; *Cartonnage* (1979), 72 plates; *Introduction* (1984), Frontispiece and 24 plates. Thus the total is 1377 plates, rather than the originally estimated 1214 plates, which had not included plates of the leather covers, the unidentified fragments, the cartonnage, and the *addenda et corrigenda*. 
RECOMMENDATION VI

The offer submitted by F.C. Wieder, Jr., Director of the publishing house E.J. Brill of Leiden, the Netherlands, to publish without subsidy the facsimile edition and to cover the costs of the supplemental photographing should be accepted.

RECOMMENDATION VII

The International Committee should continue to function even after the completion of the publication of the facsimile edition, as an active force in the encouragement of Coptic studies. It is desirable that funds be provided by UNESCO for the committee to meet again within a year’s time.

RECOMMENDATION VIII

A project to microfilm Coptic papyri similar to that sponsored by UNESCO through CIPSH [Conseil international de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines] for Greek papyri should be initiated.

RECOMMENDATION IX

The UNESCO photographs should be accessible for study at UNESCO by any member of the International Committee or by any scholar with a letter of recommendation from a member of the committee. Persons publishing studies based on such access are requested to supply a copy to the Secretary of the International Committee and to the Library of the Coptic Museum.

The formal opening meeting was filled with the speeches of dignitaries and then their lengthy tour of the Coptic Museum (designed by the staff of the Coptic Museum to enhance the chances for more funding in the next year’s budget). The actual convening of the International Committee, the election of its officers, and the adopting of its agenda, seemed all that could be achieved that day.

This created a very real problem. For I had made an arrangement with W.C. Wieder, Jr., Director of Brill, for him to fly in a photographer, Herman van der Velde, whom he had engaged for this purpose, on 16 December, if I could telegraph him the evening before that Brill had been accepted as publisher of The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices. It would not be possible to fly in the photographer a day or so later, since in the Christmas season all planes were long since fully booked. I hurriedly explained all this to Säve-Söderbergh, and asked him to see if this item in the agenda could be moved from fourth to third place, and then 4. (a) acted upon before we adjourned for the day. He did agree, and we did get this much done before adjournment.
All I had to do then was to send the telegram to Wieder, to put the photographer on the plane the next morning. I asked at our hotel if I could send a telegram, and they said that there was no telegraph office available to tourists, except, in the case of emergencies, at the Nile Hilton Hotel. I walked to that nearby hotel, conjuring up on the way an “emergency” to permit my telegram to be sent. I did in fact succeed, the telegram was sent, and the next afternoon the photographer arrived. On the morning of 17 December 1970 he set up his equipment in the Library of the Coptic Museum, where we had just been shown the codices, and from then on photographed as fast as I could give him papyrus leaves. During the mornings the rest of the International Committee just thumbed through the stacks of plexiglass containers that had been put at our disposal to satisfy their curiosity, and in the afternoons after a siesta completed the agenda.

On 19 January 1971 the formation of the International Committee was made public in the Cairo newspaper *El Akhbar*:35

Dr. Gamal Mokhtar, Under-Secretary of the Ministry of Education and Archaeology, has formed a committee in order to continue its research in the buried manuscript which was discovered by the International Committee of the UNESCO delegation. These papers point to very dangerous discoveries in the religious beliefs of ancient Egyptians.

It was actually only late in January 1971 that the International Committee was officially constituted as an ongoing International Committee by a governmental decree:36

Decree No. 18 for the year 1971
Concerning the Formation of an International Committee for the Studying of Manuscripts of Gnostic Philosophy

Minister of Cultural Affairs:

After reviewing the memorandum of the Antiquities Department with regard to the formation of an international committee for studying manuscripts of Gnostic philosophy, and based on what has been presented to us by the Under-Secretary of the Ministry,

It is decreed:

Article 1: To form the international committee for studying the manuscripts of the Gnostic philosophy as follows:

---

35 19 i 71: Newspaper clipping from *El Akhbar*, supplied along with this translation by Labib Habachi.
36 27 i 71: Egyptian governmental decree. This English translation was supplied by Labib Habachi.
1. Mr. Dr. Mohammed Gamal al-Din Mokhtar, Under-Secretary for Antiquities affairs
2. Mr. Dr. Gamal Mohammed Mehriz, General Director of the Antiquities Department
3. Mr. Victor Girgis, Curator of the Coptic Museum
4. Mr. Dr. Abdel-Latif Ahmed Ali, Dean of the Faculty of Arts at Cairo University [replacing Dr. Shafik Farid, Director of the Coptic Museum?]
5. Dr. Pahor Labib, Former Director of the Coptic Museum.
6. Prof. Dr. Krause, Germany
7. Prof. Kasser, Switzerland
8. Prof. Guillaumont, France
9. Prof. Quispel, Holland [literally: Poland]
10. Prof. Wilson, United Kingdom
11. Prof. Säve-Söderbergh, Sweden
12. Prof. James Robinson, United States of America

Article 2: this decree is effective from the date of its publication and it is for the concerned authorities to execute it.

Published on 27/1/1971 [27 January 1971]
(Signed by) Dr. Badr al-Din Abu Ghazi

The Arabic article in El Akhbar included a list of the non-Egyptian members, transcribed from Arabic back into European-American letters, as follows:

Prof. Dr. Krause
Prof. Kasser
Prof. Guimont
Prof. Quispel
Prof. Wilson
Prof. Geverson
Prof. Save Sadebegh
Prof. Roben Sun

The list may well go back to Pahor Labib as its author. This could explain the replacement of the current Director of the Coptic Museum, Dr. Shafik Farid, by Dr. Abdel-Latif Ahmed Ali, Dean of the Faculty of Arts at Cairo University. This could also explain that the closest colleague of Pahor Labib on the committee, Martin Krause, was put in first place, and as the only person with the title Dr. Also the fact that only Krause’s and Kasser’s names are spelled correctly would suggest Pahor Labib as author. This would also explain the most significant omission from membership (other that that of Garitte, whose health had not permitted him to attend): Henri-Charles Puech of France. The policy of having only one delegate per nation seems to have been implemented, with Guillaumont as the French delegate. The UNESCO plan of including (Walter Till and) Puech as Consultants, so as to have de facto two French representatives, seems not to have been included.
in the decree itself. In any case, the meeting itself had included the members recommended by UNESCO. Hence Puech was listed as a member in the minutes I wrote, indeed was elected *pro forma* as one of the honorary co-chairmen, and of course was included in subsequent publications and mailings.

4. *Obtaining the Photographs of Doresse*

After thus achieving item ten in the agenda, ‘Choice of a publisher’ (see Recommendation VI), I set to work on item twelve in the agenda, “Photographs made prior to the UNESCO photographs,” which had in view getting access to Doresse’s photographs:

It was agreed that the Secretary request Dr. Jean Doresse to put at the disposal of the committee for possible use in the facsimile edition whatever photographs he may have of material not otherwise available.

It had at times been assumed that Doresse had photographed all the leaves of the Nag Hammadi Codices when he had access to them in the home of Maria Dattari, without actually realizing that this would have been physically impossible prior to their conservation. Typical of this assumption is the letter of Beat von Fischer to C.A. Meier:

Pahor Labib thinks he knows that Doresse has obtained a photocopy of *all* the papyri from Miss Dattari. Can that be true?

Beat von Fischer repeated this rumor a few months later:

---

37 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1384.
38 7 xii 53: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:

Pahor Labib glaubt zu wissen, dass Doresse eine Photokopie *aller* Papyri von Frl. Dattari bekommen hat. Mag das stimmen?

39 17 iii 54: Letter from von Fischer to Meier:


In an added note von Fischer gave the bibliographical references to two further essays by Doresse (Scholer 1396 and 1401).
With regard to the possible photographs of the Dattari texts, Moustafa Amer and Pahor Labib seemed to be able to deduce from the photographs that appeared in *Vigiliae Christianae*, volume 3, number 3, July 1949, in the text of the studies of Doresse and Togo Mina: “Nouveaux textes gnostiques coptes découverts en Haute Égypte: La bibliothèque de Chenoboskion,” that Doresse has in fact photographed all the texts.

Puech explicitly asked me, in discussing this item of the agenda, to develop enough friendship with Doresse to obtain all his photographs, which Puech thought he had not succeeded in obtaining, in spite of his many attempts.

I began in a very circuitous manner, by means of Christmas cards! I asked the members of the committee to sign Christmas cards that I would then send as our greetings to persons interested in Nag Hammadi who were not on the UNESCO Committee. Thus on 28 December 1970 I mailed to the members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project in Claremont a Christmas card from Cairo stating:

> I want to express to all of you, on behalf of the International Committee for the Publication of the Nag Hammadi Codices, our appreciation for preparing the materials being used by the “technical sub-committee” of Krause, Kasser, Giversen and myself, who have stayed over a few days (and will return 12–23 January a second time) to assemble fragments and rephotograph. Without your hard work the International Committee could not have moved concretely toward publication, and they all knew it.

It had been signed (in advance) by Louis A. Christophe, Gamal Mokhtar, Gamal Mehrez, Pahor Labib, and the European “experts” Giversen, Guillau-mont, Kasser, Krause, Puech, Quispel, Säve-Söderbergh, and Wilson, as well as myself.40 I attached a hasty letter with a series of initial discoveries from our work on the leaves, fragments and bindings.41

I also sent a similar Christmas card with the same signatures to Jean Doresse (and to Alexander Böhlig), to which I added some general expression of good will and the hope that he could in some way contribute to the work of the Committee. This way of approaching Doresse had a positive effect. He wrote to Puech on 31 December 1970:42

---

40 28 xii 70: Christmas card from Cairo, signed by the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, to the members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity.

41 28 xii 70: Letter from Robinson to the Coptic Gnostic Library Project.

42 31 xii 70: Letter from Doresse to Puech:

> Je viens de recevoir la carte de voeux envoyée par le Comité International réuni au Caire et je m’empresse de vous dire combien je vous suis reconnaissant de la part
I just received the card of good wishes sent by the International Committee meeting in Cairo, and I hasten to tell you how grateful I am to you for the part that you have taken in sending this message. On first glance, it seems to augur better the chances of immediate and integral publication of the texts of Nag-Hammadi. Since James M. Robinson announces to me his visit for around 10 January, it would doubtless be useful that I have meet with you before this date. If you judge it useful, would you please arrange with me a meeting for the time that is convenient to you.

Presumably after getting clearance from Puech, Doresse wrote me on 22 February 1971, indicating both his satisfaction with my friendly and inclusive approach, and his dissatisfaction over the way he had been treated over the years.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{43} 22 ii 71: Letter from Doresse to Robinson:

J’ avais regretté de ne pouvoir attendre à Paris au-delà du début de février la visite que vous m’ aviez annoncée pour le 10 janvier. J’ avait été sensible à l’ aimable carte de voeux que vous-même et les autres membres du nouveau Comité m’ aviez adressée du Caire et je souhaitais, d’ autant plus, vous rencontrer.

Bien entendu, je serai fort intéressé de savoir quel rôle vous souhaitez me proposer dans la nouvelle organisation d’ édition. Lorsqu’ il y a plus de vingt ans j’ étais parvenu à dépister, puis à étudier les codices de Khénoboskion, et à les faire connaître en sorte qu’ ils ne puissent plus échapper à la science, cette recherche et ces études avaient été menées aux frais du Gouvernement Français et, aussi, aux miens propres (les subventions qui m’ étaient allouées n’ étant point toujours suffisantes!). Si nous avions choisi de diriger le bénéfice matériel de cette découverte et d’ en partager le bénéfice scientifique avec le Musée Copte, alors dirigé par Togo MINA, c’ était dans un but de coopération franco-égyptienne et sous la condition expresse que l’ édition des textes serait menée par la France et l’ Égypte. Il avait été entendu, alors, que le Gouvernement Français assurerait les frais d’ une édition couvrant l’ ensemble complet des manuscrits, édition dont le premier volume fut, effectivement, commencé à l’ Imprimerie Nationale de Paris (où, certaines parties, déjà composées, restent encore, aujourd’hui, inutilisées: ma récente publication du “Livre Sacré du Grand Esprit Invisible” n’ est, pour le texte copte et la traduction, qu’ une tranche de ce qui fut alors composé). En 1956, l’ “Affaire de Suez”, interrompant toute coopération franco-égyptienne, amena le Musée Copte, tout d’ abord à “mettre en état” les codices sans faire appel à la connaissance que j’ en avais, puis à laisser se disperser l’ édition des manuscrits, en publications partielles, et sans souci des droits que nous avions. Rien ne sert, aujourd’hui, de regretter ce qui a été ainsi perdu. Mais il est certain que, même si nous le souhaitions, il n’ est plus possible d’ entreprendre la grande édition documentaire que nous avions projetée et qu’ avec, entre autres, la collaboration de Monsieur
I had regretted not being able to wait in Paris beyond the beginning of February for the visit that you announced to me for 10 January.\(^44\) I had been appreciative of the friendly greeting card that you and the other members of the new Committee had addressed to me from Cairo and I wanted, all the more, to meet you.

To be sure, I will be very interested to know what rôle you would like to propose to me in the new organization of the edition. When, more than twenty years ago, I had succeeded in ferreting out, then in studying, the Codices of Khénoboskion, and in making them known, so that they could no longer escape from science, this research and these studies had been carried out at the expense of the French Government, and also at my own expense (the grants allocated to me were not at all always sufficient!). If we chose to direct the material benefit of this discovery, and to share its scientific benefit, with the Coptic Museum, directed then by Togo Mina, it was for the purpose of French-Egyptian cooperation, and under the express condition that the edition of the texts would be carried out by France and Egypt. It had been understood, back then, that the French Government would guarantee the expenses of an edition covering the complete ensemble of the manuscripts, an edition whose first volume was indeed begun at the *Imprimerie Nationale* of Paris (where, certain parts, already set in type, remain still today unused—my recent publication of the *Livre Sacré du Grand Esprit Invisible* is, for the Coptic text and translation, only a segment of

\[^{44}\text{Doresse's residence was not in Paris, but in Seillans in the province of Var. Doresse did not respond by setting up an appointment, and I lacked an address where I could meet him in Paris (actually, I later learned that where we did meet was the small apartment of his wife's mother, an émigrée from Russia). Hence this visit had to be deferred until an appointment could be made, as this letter suggests, in the last half of April.}\]
what was at the time set in type). In 1956, the “Suez Affair,” interrupting all French-Egyptian cooperation, led the Coptic Museum first of all to “put in order” the codices, without appealing to the knowledge that I had of them, then to let the editing of the manuscripts be dispersed in partial publications, and without concern for the rights that we had. Nothing helps, today, in regretting what has thus been lost. But it is certain that, even if we wished, it is no longer possible to undertake the grand documentary edition that we had projected, and that we had in large part prepared, with, among others, the collaboration of H.-Ch. Puech, associated with this discovery since the beginning.

In any case, I do not hide at all from myself that the documents and information that I hold on these manuscripts have, at present, a notable value. I remain the only witness of the state in which the codices found themselves in 1947 and 1948. In fact, I had back then taken enough photographs and notes to be able to draw from them the inventories that I have published and, even, the material for a certain number of other studies that remained unpublished. I myself had the responsibility for putting the codices in the valise, where they remained under seal until their definitive acquisition by the Coptic Museum. I had taken certain precautions so that the leaves or fragments of leaves that were damaged or detached could not be jumbled up. It is regrettable that I have not been consulted at all, at the time of the disassembling of the manuscripts! It is, without doubt, even more catastrophic that the quires of papyrus have been undone and that the double-leaves, still intact until then, have been cut in two! The inventories established since that time seem to indicate that confusions have resulted. The descriptions of the bindings, as Mlle van Regemorter saw them in the Coptic Museum, confirm these uneasinesses. Perhaps, as you think, I could hence contribute to the correction of some of these confusions. But such a task could not be done in only a few days.

Doresse’s letter continued:45

45 22 ii 71: Letter from Doresse to Robinson:

Quant aux circonstances de la découverte, notre enquête de 1949–1950 avait été menée, sur le site de la trouvaille, en coopération avec le Service des Antiquités et avec les meilleurs moyens d’information. Nul curieux n’était encore passé dans cette région pour s’y informer de tout ce qui pouvait conceriner des découvertes de manuscrits. Mais je crains qu’aujourd’hui, non seulement l’endroit où la jarre fut exhumée, mais encore tous les alentours n’aient été bouleversés par les fouilleurs clandestins.

Je dois rester ici jusque vers le 7 avril. Jusqu’à mon départ pour l’Afrique, je suis tenu par l’achèvement, urgent, de plusieurs publications. Mes documents sur les écrits gnostiques sont, pour la plupart, à Paris, mais avec une partie de mes archives que j’ai dû provisoirement exiler dans des caisses peu accessibles. Une autre partie de mes notes sur les codices est restée au Caire, bloquée à la suite de l’Affaire de Suez.” Nous ne pourrions, donc, rien faire de sérieux avant que je sois à Paris pour quelque temps, c’est-à-dire vers le milieu d’avril. Je ne crois pas que cela vaille la peine que nous nous
As to the circumstances of the discovery, our investigation of 1949–1950 had been carried out, on the site of the discovery, in cooperation with the Department of Antiquities and with the best means of information. No curious person had yet passed in this region to inform oneself there of all that could have to do with the discoveries of manuscripts. But I fear that today, not only the place where the jar was dug up, but even all the surrounding areas have been unsettled by clandestine excavators.

I have to remain here until about 7 April. Until my departure for Africa, I am held to the urgent completion of several publications. My documents on the Gnostic writings are, for the most part, in Paris, but are together with a part of my archives that I have had to exile provisionally in boxes that are hardly accessible. Another part of my notes on the codices has remained in Cairo, blocked as a result of the “Suez Affair.” We would hence not be able to do anything that is serious before I am in Paris for some time, that is to say, around the middle of April. I do not believe that it is worth the effort to meet rapidly but not very usefully before that time. I would not want you to overestimate the collaboration that I could provide; all the more since I am, at present, held up by the completion of several works. It would hence be preferable that you examine, first of all, the situation such as I have just exposed it to you, and that at the same time you let me know a bit more completely what part would be mine in the new program of publication, now that the most attractive texts have already been published, or are on the point of being published by others that ourselves. It will then be possible to decide.

So I thank you for the news that you can give me, and I ask you to accept, dear Sir, the expression of my very cordial sentiments.

In fact, there was not much to offer Doresse. Perhaps, for him, the most important item was that the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices had limited its activity to publishing a facsimile edition. Thus Doresse was not prevented by Pahor Labib’s assignments to Krause and Böhlig from publishing whatever he wanted, Codex by Codex, as soon as each volume of facsimiles was in the public domain. But as a matter of
fact he did not proceed to publish any critical editions of Nag Hammadi tractates. His area of research had by then shifted from Nag Hammadi to Ethiopia.

I also assured Doresse that, though I could not appoint him to the UNESCO committee, I could send him all the communications I sent to them, so that he would remain abreast, rather than being kept in the dark, as had been his experience up until then. And I assured him that Brill would provide him with each volume of The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices as it appeared, if he would make available to me for that purpose his photographs of the materials, which he in fact agreed to do. Perhaps what counted more than anything else was the good will I expressed toward him, and the open line of communication between us, the feeling of having become, after all, even if only in an informal way, a member of the team. This was what made our relationship such that he entrusted to me much of his Nag Hammadi archives, and his wife Marianne wrote up and sent me his curriculum vitae, as well as reports on each of his missions in Egypt (see Chapter 2, Part 2 above).

Doresse did in fact turn over to me the photographs he had, which was not a complete file of all Nag Hammadi leaves, as had been assumed. At times Doresse may not have wanted to disabuse Puech readily of this assumption, since it provided Doresse the only tidbit of power he had over Puech; but, conversely, when pressured by Puech to give him prints of all the photographs he had, he would argue that the prints he had already given Puech were of all the photographs he had.

Yet the photographs Doresse turned over to me were gratefully used in the Facsimile Edition when relevant. Such a picture as that of all the codices still in their bindings lying together on the table of Maria Dattari in 1949 could not be made once the leaves were removed from their bindings and conserved between panes of plexiglass. Hence that valuable photograph is used as the Frontispiece facing the title page of The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Introduction (1984).

Furthermore Doresse's photographs did at times preserve letters otherwise lost at the edges of lacunae, and so were used in each volume of the Facsimile Edition, acknowledged in the Preface to the respective volume:

Albert Eid's negatives of Codex I, which Doresse had returned to Simone Eid at her request after the purchase of Codex I by the Jung Institute, and which she then returned via an intermediary to C.A. Meier, were turned over to me by Meier; the many that were used in The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Codex I were listed and acknowledged as “supplied
through the courtesy of Jean Doresse and C.A. Meier in my Preface, xxxi. There I also acknowledged photographs received directly from Doresse:

The photographs of pp. 36 and <50> were supplied through the courtesy of Jean Doresse.

In the Preface to *Codex II*,

Plates 2–4, 6 reproduce photographs of 1949 supplied by the courtesy of Jean Doresse; a small peninsula on II, <17>–<18> was supplemented from a photograph by Doresse to supply a letter at <18>,28; Doresse also supplied photographs for the part of plate 159 reproducing miscellaneous leather fragments, two of which survive and may be identified with Codex II.

In the Preface to *Codex III*,

The photographs of one inscribed fragment on pp. [12]7/1[28], six inscribed fragments on pp. 1[43]/[144], and the unidentified inscribed fragments 1–5 on plates 143–144 were supplied by the courtesy of Jean Doresse, except that the vertical-fiber side of fragment 3 was supplied by the courtesy of Søren Giversen. From the photographs by Doresse it was also possible to retouch the inner edge of [4]3/44 to document up to a whole letter at [4]3, 2–4: 44, 4–7, a small peninsula on 111/112 to document part of a letter at the beginning of 111,17 and a notch in [145]/[146] to document the third extant letter in [145],19.

In the Preface to *Codex IV*,

Plate 3 reproduces a photograph of 1949 supplied by the courtesy of Jean Doresse.

In the Preface to *Codex V*,

Plates 3–4 reproduce photographs of 1949 supplied by the courtesy of Jean Doresse.

In the Preface to *Codex VI*,

Plates 1 and 3 use photographs of 1949 supplied by the courtesy of Jean Doresse.

In the Preface to *Codex VII*,

... plate 2 uses a photograph supplied by the courtesy of Jean Doresse.

---

In the Preface to *Codex VIII*,\(^5^2\) xix:

The photographs of plates 1 and 3–6 were supplied by the courtesy of Jean Doresse.

In the Preface to *Codices IX*\(^5^3\) and *X*,\(^5^4\) xxv:

The photographs of plates 3, 82–85, of the margins of IX, 27–30 and of vestiges of ink at IX, 29, 28; 30, 22 were supplied by the courtesy of Jean Doresse.

In the Preface to *Codices XI*,\(^5^5\) *XII*, and *XIII*, xvii:

Plates 4 and 104 use photographs supplied by the courtesy of Jean Doresse.

This was of course part of the exhaustive listing of the origin of each photograph used in each volume of *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*. But it also provided Doresse, as he received a volume or so of the *Facsimile Edition* each year, the satisfaction of finding his own contribution clearly acknowledged, in a way it had not been acknowledged to his satisfaction prior to that time.


Martin Krause reported on the work of the Technical Sub-Committee as follows:\(^5^6\)


the international committee for the nag hammadi codices 1069

1973), has reglazed most of the leaves of the Codices I, IV, V and VIII–XIII, as well as some leaves of the other Codices; established the original sequence of the leaves; brought together individual leaves from fragments; and identified most of the remaining fragments. Also the Greek and Coptic papyri pasted to the inner sides of the book-bindings of Codices IV, V, VII and VIII were again reassembled. Thereupon the newly reconstituted leaves were photographed for their publication.

After the first session of the Technical Sub-Committee, it was quite obvious that the total amount of work that would be involved in placing the fragments, establishing page sequence, and rephotographing was more than the four members of the Technical Sub-Committee and the photographer from the French Institute could achieve in only fortnightly yearly sessions. Already for the second session I brought along James Brashler from the Coptic Gnostic Library Project, and then in subsequent sessions of the Technical Sub-Committee more members, as the following report indicates:

Members of the NEH project team (the five volume editors have been chosen) have been granted access to the originals in Cairo in December, 1971, on the occasion of a third work session by the UNESCO Technical Sub-Committee. This will permit final verification of the project's transcriptions, which have been prepared by the team on the basis of photographs; they should hence be checked on the basis of the originals. During this work session project members will also verify the placement of fragments by the Technical Sub-Committee. Since these placements were done on the basis of the conversion tables prepared by the project, the volume editors of the project are at present actually more familiar with the library than the official UNESCO committee members. Thus in effect the American project has been doing the bulk of the preparation for and execution of the work of the International Committee. This is a clear instance of a NEH project preparing a specialty of research, hardly existent in the USA prior to the project, to lead in international scholarship when the opportunity presented itself.

Yet arranging the work sessions of the Technical Sub-Committee was far from simple. I would have to come to Paris and go to Bammate’s office, where he would graciously receive me. Once, when he was out of town on my arrival, I went to his superior for answers to my questions. When I politely


complained that Bammate had not responded to my letter listing the date of my arrival, I was told that he came from an oral culture (Afghanistan). Yet his superb Oxford accent and eloquent French indicated that he had spent most of his life not in his native country, which nonetheless is what had served to make him eligible for the UNESCO position (since UNESCO has to distribute it staff positions among the member nations).

Each time when the Technical Sub-Committee reached Cairo, we spent the bulk of the first day in a time-consuming but obligatory formal visit to Mokhtar in his office, before being able to go to the Coptic Museum to get to work. But this produced a snag for the meeting scheduled for the first half of December 1972. I had written Bammate the dates when plane tickets were to be issued to the members of the Technical Sub-Committee, but as usual had received no reply. Hence I simply flew to Paris 28/29 November, to urge him to send airplane tickets to the others. I reached his office at noon on 29 November. There he informed me that Mokhtar was leaving Cairo for Marseille to receive an honorary doctorate, and hence on 21 November had proposed we delay our arrival in Cairo until late in December. But Bammate mentioned that Mokhtar had told him that this change of date to late December should be done only if it were not inconvenient for us. He quoted Mokhtar as saying, regarding our perfunctory initial meeting with him: “But if everything has already been arranged, then let it be on the second of December as scheduled.” We had all made arrangements for our classes and other university responsibilities to be handled during the period of our absence scheduled for the first half of December. It was of course not practical for us to be away from home at Christmas, as, understandably enough, our Islamic administrators had not realized when they proposed late December. I explained all of this to Bammate, to make clear that it would indeed be inconvenient, and hence that he should ask Mokhtar to permit the Technical Sub-Committee to work as scheduled the first half of December, perhaps staying a bit later than planned, so as on his return to meet with him before returning home for Christmas.

Bammate agreed to telephone Mokhtar to see if the earlier schedule could be approved. He was able to make a telephone appointment for 3 PM. He succeeded in reaching Mokhtar’s sister at 4:40 PM, who said Mokhtar would be available between 5:40 and 6:30 PM. I spent the afternoon in Bammate’s office. We finally got through to him at 9 AM the next morning, and did get his approval for us to begin work in his absence. Bammate then cabled the Technical Sub-Committee to fly to Cairo 1 December, which we all were able to do. We did have our formal appointment with Dr. Mokhtar on 18 December before leaving Egypt for home.
But things were still not all that simple. The Nag Hammadi Codices were not stored at the Coptic Museum, but were in safe-keeping, a location not publicly known, in view of the fact that the United Arab Republic was technically at war with Israel. Each time the Technical Sub-Committee was due to arrive, the plexiglass containers with the leaves would be brought from safe-keeping to the Coptic Museum. On our arrival at the Coptic Museum on 2 December, a large crate had already been brought to the Library of the Coptic Museum. But when it was opened, it proved to be the wrong crate. We were told that if we could provide transportation (which we did the next day), this crate could be returned to safe-keeping and the right crate brought. In this way we learned that ‘safe-keeping’ was the unlighted basement of the Egyptian Museum in the center of town, some miles from the Coptic Museum. The right crate was brought, and the plexiglass plates stacked on the table for our use.

Then another problem emerged: There was, just then, no electricity in the Coptic Museum! Our efforts to make joins and to transcribe the text could hardly be done in the natural light, for, though there are windows in the Library, they were covered with sandbags and paper, to protect the Library from possible bomb explosions in the garden outside. Yet, one by one, such problems got solved, and our work proceeded in its normal way.  
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I spent a sabbatic semester of seven months in Egypt working at the Coptic Museum, with the assistance of two students, Charles W. Hedrick and Stephen Emmel, aided by Peggy Hedrick as well as by Carol


Crochet, who lived in the same international suburb as did we, Maadi, since her father worked “in oil,” as one put it there. A number of colleagues also came in for briefer times to work with us in the Coptic Museum.

This was not a particularly propitious time for Americans to seek to do UNESCO-based work in Egypt:

Between 1974 and 1976 Gerald Ford suspended a total of $43.1 million in payments to the Paris-based United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). That body had voted in favor of a resolution that cut off UNESCO funding to Israel for “altering the historical features” of Jerusalem.

And yet we continued our work for UNESCO in Cairo as best we could.

In 1979 I published a brief report on the work of the Technical Sub-Committee, including the way it was aided and the work completed by the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity:

The Technical Sub-Committee met for about a fortnight each year through 1973 at the Coptic Museum to seek to reassemble the Codices and identify the hundreds of scattered fragments. Each of these work sessions presupposed that the crate containing the codices would be brought out of the basement of the Egyptian Museum and unpacked in the Library of the Coptic Museum for the duration of the session and then repacked and returned into safekeeping. And each was conducted in the awareness that it might well be the last, in view of the imminence of war—the first work session took place during a 90-day cease-fire, and the last ended only a few days before

---

66 xi 82: “Playing International Hardball,” Time, 47.
the October War, which erupted while some of the team were still in the Near East on the return trip.

Since it became apparent that the other members of the Technical Sub-Committee could not devote their time between these brief work sessions to studying texts other than those previously assigned to them to publish, I turned to the only persons intimately knowledgeable about the more fragmentary and hence never officially assigned texts, namely, the relevant members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project. So each year members of the Project went to Cairo to work with the Technical Sub-Committee.\footnote{http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1423.}...

After UNESCO funding ended, a core group of the Coptic Gnostic Library team, funded by the Smithsonian Institution through the sponsorship of the American Research Center in Egypt, went to Cairo for seven continuous months from July 1974 through January 1975, as well as for briefer sessions twice later in 1975 and each year that followed, to complete the bulk of the task. Indeed, we left one member, Stephen Emmel, at work there until late in 1977. He finished the conservation of the papyrus and the ultra-violet collation of the text, as well as almost single-handedly completing the work on the Jung Codex (Codex I). It had only been possible to effect the return the bulk of this Codex to Cairo and thus to general accessibility late in 1975, after the European editors finally had completed their edition begun in 1952. In this Codex it was possible to make not only seven more fragment placements, but also to make a correction in the pagination, in the sequence of the leaves, and even in the numeration of the tractates.

This longer period of work at the Coptic Museum for a whole sabbatic semester of seven months made it possible to handle several other matters that could not be handled in the shorter trips of a fortnight or the like:

At the XIV International Congress of Papyrologists at Oxford on 24–31 July 1974 I was able to go to the British Museum to seek advice from their papyrus conservationists. We had again and again run across the problem of Scotch tape, used over the years to attach fragments together in more or less their correct positions. Scotch tape shows up as very dark stripes on photographs, as one can observe e. g. by comparing the \textit{editio princeps} of the Jung Codex published by the C.G. Jung Institute in Zürich, where dark streaks of Scotch tape are visible on many pages, and our edition of Codex I, after the Scotch tape had been removed. I learned from the British Museum what chemical removed Scotch tape, and even neutralized the residual stickiness after the tape was removed. For if the stickiness had remained once the tape was removed, the leaf would stick to the plexiglass when we reconserved it. They even told me where to go to a chemist shop (pharmacy) and find the right chemical, which I hastened to do.
We needed to avoid the further use of Scotch tape, but we also needed to be able to attach fragments to the lower pane of plexiglass in their correct relationship to each other, rather than having them sliding around when one held the container up to the light, which would of course alter their correct relation to each other. The papyrologist Anton Fackelmann happened to be in Cairo that summer on one of his frequent trips, and came to see what we were doing at the Coptic Museum. We immediately enlisted him to conserve the cartonnage from the bindings, especially the thick pad in the binding of Codex VII. In the process, he of course taught us, mere beginners, many useful things. We explained our need for something other than Scotch tape to keep the fragments in their correct relation to each other within the plexiglass containers. He explained that there had been a new technological break-through in Library Science, the development of a kind of tape that did not have the sticky problems. After pressing it down on the papyrus and plexiglass, one could remove it by merely putting a touch of water on the back, and, with tweezers, simply lifting it off. The problem was solved! Fackelmann gave us some of this tape, so we could hold down in their correct place fragments that we had identified and wanted to attach to a leaf in its correct position in the plexiglass. This new tape was immediately nicknamed “Fackelmann tape.”

I also inquired at the British Museum about the advisability of using plexiglass. They indicated that they preferred glass, since it had stood the test of time, whereas plexiglass was such a recent development that they did not know whether over a length of time it would leave the enclosed papyrus intact. When I reported this on my return to Gamal Mokhtar, suggesting that we should perhaps reconserv with panes of glass, he told the following sad story: When Israeli bombs fell on Cairo, the Department of Antiquities quickly evacuated the treasures from the Coptic Museum (as well as from other Museums) to put them in safe keeping. Large crates of treasures had to be rolled end over end down the streets from the Coptic Museum for several miles to their safe destination in the basement of the Egyptian Museum. When they were later returned to the Coptic Museum and unpacked, they discovered that glass panes containing cloth material had broken into shreds and the cloth was just a mass of threads. This is why he insisted we use plexiglass.

In the process of establishing the sequence of the leaves in the more fragmentary codices, we had found it necessary to identify and restore conjugate leaves so that they touch each other where they had originally joined at the spine. Many had broken at the spine. But those that had not broken had been cut at the spine by Victor Girgis with his pocket knife. He explained to me that this was done in order to conserve them in the new plexiglass containers donated by the German Institute, at the recommendation of their in-house coptologist, Martin Krause, who could transcribe each leaf only as fast as Victor Girgis conserved it—but these plexiglass containers were only wide enough for a single leaf! I flew to Zürich and ordered plexiglass sheets large enough to conserve together conjugate leaves of the largest dimensions we would need, so that all conjugate leaves would be conserved in plexiglass containers of a standard size. When these arrived at the Coptic Museum, individual leaves were removed from their old plexiglass containers, placed each beside its conjugate leaf, and thus conserved together. This work was largely carried out by Peggy Hedrick. She sealed each plexiglass container in such a way that we could if necessary reopen it to insert a fragment that may have subsequently been identified as belonging to one or the other of the conjugate leaves, before she carried out a more definitive sealing.

We had noticed that the staff of the Library avoided one end of the Library where we worked. On inquiring why, we were told that rats came out of a hole in the baseboard on that side, which they of course wanted to avoid. So during my trip to England I secured from the chemist some rat poison. It was so effective that for years thereafter that area was still avoided by us all, because of the odor of rotting rats. Fortunately, the Director of the Museum let us move to a room for ourselves, on the third floor of the administration building, well before Henry Kissinger came to visit us.\(^2\)

Clearly the public highlight of our seven-month daily work sessions in the Coptic Museum was the visit of Henry Kissinger, then Secretary of State. By now, diplomatic relations had been restored between the United States and the Arab Republic of Egypt (as Egypt was now named). He was in Cairo for diplomatic reasons, but on the Friday of his visit there could be no diplomatic work, since it is the Islamic day of rest. The Embassy wanted to engender good public relations by having him show appreciation for Egyptian culture, and at the same time highlight American involvement in fostering that culture. The Embassy’s solution was for him to visit our

\(^2\) http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/399.
project at the Coptic Museum. The day before his arrival, secret service agents visited us to survey the situation. When they asked me if there were any problems in the area, I mentioned that from the third-story windows the Jewish ghetto was visible. It was now largely vacated, except for the synagogue, where the attendant proudly showed visitors what he said was the original Torah scroll that Moses himself had written. I also suggested they not agree to an extensive tour of the Coptic Museum, since that included the underground ruins of the town from Roman times, an area that could not be kept in full view by the persons protecting every move of the Secretary of State.

We cleaned our work-room in anticipation of the visit, even attaching an attractive wall hanging. When Kissinger actually arrived for the visit, he did seem interested in what we had to show him. His visit was duly reported by the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity:

On 10 October Dr. Henry Kissinger, U.S. Secretary of State, visited the IAC Coptic Gnostic Library Project at the Coptic Museum in Cairo, Egypt.

He was greeted by a receiving line which included the American ambassador to Egypt, museum personnel, Dr. James M. Robinson, IAC director and head of the project, and John Dorman, director of the American Research Center in Egypt which administers the project grant. ...

“Kissinger himself was much better than the chaos on all sides. He was not rushed, asked perceptive and interested questions of each person,” commented Dr. Robinson. “He began by going around and shaking hands with each person at work in the room, asked why we were doing what we were doing, etc.” Dr. Robinson is spending a sabbatical semester in Cairo with a team of scholars to work on the original fourth century documents known as the Nag Hammadi Codices, which are housed in the Coptic Museum.

Kissinger’s visit reactivated the interest of the National Endowment for the Humanities in the Coptic Gnostic Library Project. Simone Reagor, Director
of the Division of Research Grants of the NEH, wrote on 16 January 1975 requesting a retrospective view of what their three-year grant (1967–1969) had facilitated:77

We were very interested to learn from the Institute’s December 1974 Bulletin of Dr. Kissinger’s visit to the Coptic Gnostic Library Project during his trip to Cairo in October. The Bulletin and summary of NEH support for the Library have been forwarded to the Chairman of the Endowment for his perusal.

In reviewing the grant file, we have noted that the publication of the English edition of the Nag Hammadi Library was expected to be completed in 1974. We would very much appreciate learning the status of this edition. We would greatly appreciate receiving two copies of this edition and any other publications which have resulted from activities pursued during the grant period.

I responded with the following informal report:78

The English edition which was supported by NEH for three successive years when that project first began is under way but not yet completed. The first volume (containing The Gospel of the Egyptians) has just been published by Brill in the Netherlands and has not yet reached me. I will see to it that you receive two copies. It may be of some interest to note that this first volume is co-authored by two members of our team, one a German scholar, and the other, Frederik Wisse, who was employed as my research assistant in the project with the NEH money the first year we received a grant from you. Dr. Wisse is now a member of the research staff of the University of Tübingen, Germany, and has accompanied me to Cairo to work on the manuscripts each year for the past five years. Therefore, one fruit of your grant has been that it launched a very promising career, which is now going at full speed.

Our English edition is envisaged as a total of eleven volumes. All of the material has been turned in by individual translators and is now in the hands of volume editors preparing the different volumes for publication. We expect more than one to go to press during the present calendar year. The reason for our delay is primarily the fact that we have of necessity had to divert our energies to the facsimile edition. As you may recall from our NEH application, we were working from photographs, but did not have publication rights on the material. Publication rights were obtainable through the publication by UNESCO of a facsimile edition, which UNESCO had been planning since around 1960. However, UNESCO had not carried through its plans. Therefore, I spent a sabbatic in 1971 in Paris working at UNESCO, and succeeded to name and convene a committee to publish the facsimile edition. I ended

---
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up as the American delegate on that committee and the Permanent Secretary of the committee, which in fact means that the production of the facsimile edition was turned over to me. The other members of the UNESCO committee were dignitaries performing more of a representative role for their nations than persons who would actually do the work. As a result, I have found it necessary to bring to Cairo with me each year the volume editors of the English edition who had continued to work as we assembled fragments in Cairo. Thus the English language team organized under NEH funding has in the period 1970–1975 borne the brunt of preparing the facsimile edition being published by the Arab Republic of Egypt in conjunction with UNESCO. That is also an eleven-volume edition of large quarto format. The fifth volume has just appeared and the sixth volume is in the press. I have just completed a six-month sabbatic [in Cairo] where again members of the English team joined me in a massive effort to get that work completed. We assume the facsimile edition will be completed within two years. Since the contract for that edition is between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the publisher, Brill, I am not able to secure, in the contract, presentation copies, and, therefore, am not able to supply you two copies of each volume of the facsimile edition. I regret not being able to do this. Since these volumes cost $100 each I can hardly spare the thousand dollars it would take to purchase copies to supply you. I did write as a separate brochure a preliminary introduction to the facsimile edition at the time the first volume appeared (on that occasion NEH was represented at our local celebration by its former Director, Barnaby C. Keeney). I shall be glad to send you a xerox of that preliminary introduction as well as a more recent brochure published a year ago when we began circulating through the Smithsonian Institution an exhibit of the Nag Hammadi codices. You may also be interested to know that the past six-month period has been funded through the Smithsonian Institution with P.L. 480 funds. We are also planning an archaeological excavation of the site of the find, which should also come from that same governmental funding source. The project has continued to grow and expand from very modest beginnings, and governmental funding has continued to back up our work, even though more recent funding has not come through the channel of NEH.

It may also be worth noting that a number of the young scholars that we originally enlisted into our team have now become established and well-known authorities in this field. One of the purposes of our original plan was to create a cluster of American scholars working in this area of specialization, and that purpose has been achieved. A few members of our team have proven to be disappointments ... . However, a good number of members of our team are now established in professorial positions in this country or members of the Nag Hammadi Seminar of the learned society (the Society of Biblical Literature), and have established themselves in Europe as authorities on Nag Hammadi questions, as is documented by articles and books they are publishing in Europe and papers they are presenting at Congresses and learned societies in Europe.
The other important visitor we received during the sabbatic semester at the Coptic Museum was the widow of Togo Mina. She came on 2 December 1974 to meet us, and presented a copy of a picture of Togo Mina with John Doresse in the Coptic Museum for the Nag Hammadi Archives (see Chapter 2, Part 3 above).

The sabbatic report I was required to turn in to my employer Claremont Graduate School (CGS) on our return to Claremont read as follows:

During the seven months 1 July 1974 through 31 January 1975 I headed up a research team working at the Coptic Museum in Cairo on the Nag Hammadi Codices. The period of team research was funded by the Smithsonian Institution under the auspices of the American Research Center in Egypt. The grant was for $47,430; I was the "Principal American Investigator."

The core team consisted of myself, my wife, two CGS graduate students Charles Hedrick and Steve Emmel, and Peggy Hedrick. During the seven-month period some twenty scholars from America and Europe came to Cairo at my invitation to work with us for shorter periods of time. Among them were a CGS student Michael Fiske and two graduates of CGS, John Sieber and Frederik Wisse.

There were three aspects to our work at the Coptic Museum:

1. The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices published under the auspices of the Arab Republic of Egypt in cooperation with UNESCO by the firm E.J. Brill in Leiden, the Netherlands, an eleven-volume edition. I am Permanent Secretary of the International Committee appointed by Egypt and UNESCO to plan this edition. Four volumes had appeared before the research period, a fifth appeared during that period, the sixth is due out in a few months and the seventh is being sent now in installments to the press. The whole edition should be completed in 1977. Work on this edition at the Coptic Museum consisted first in placing unidentified fragments on the basis of the papyrus fiber patterns, profile, texture, and text; about 140 fragments were placed during the period. Another task is determining page sequence and page numeration in the more fragmentary codices. The numeration of Codex VIII had remained uncertain through the efforts of previous years but was finally solved in August. The sequence and numeration of Codex X, the most fragmentary of all, had been uncertain except for the first ten pages; the basic solution was reached in December. A further task is the mounting of identified fragments in exact relation to other vestiges of the page and photographing the reassembled pages as our basic scientific record and as the basis for the plates of the Facsimile Edition. About 600 photographs were made.

2. The Coptic Gnostic Library, an eleven-volume edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices including transcription, English translation, introductions, notes and

---
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indices, under the auspices of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity of CGS, is published by E.J. Brill. I am General Editor of this edition. Our work on this edition is in many respects identical with that for the Facsimile Edition, since when a fragment is identified or a page sequence established, this is information used in both editions. The first volume of this English edition (The Gospel of the Egyptians edited by Alexander Böhlig and Frederik Wisse), due to appear last autumn, was delayed a few months so as to add some 20 fragments we had placed at the Coptic Museum in preparing the Facsimile Edition volume on Codex IV. But the additional work involved in preparing the English edition has to do primarily with collating the text. We had already transcribed the text on the basis of photographs and collated that transcription with the original in previous years. This time we took ultraviolet lamps that made so much more lettering legible that we have found it desirable to re-collate all the material. This was begun but not completed; Emmel has stayed in Cairo to work further on this activity.

3. Conservation. I attended a Papyrological Congress at Oxford in July where I met conservationists and obtained advice and materials for conserving the papyrus. Our recommendations for conservation were approved by the President of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization and the Director of the Coptic Museum in September. The major conservation activities were: a. Scotch tape was removed with chemicals from the face of the papyrus pages where antiquities dealers had put it a generation ago. b. Conjugate leaves cut apart in a preliminary conservation effort around 1960 were rejoined and transferred into new plexiglass imported by us from England and Switzerland in the autumn. c. Plans were drawn up for boxes with slots for the plexiglass containers, an Egyptian interior decorator was given a contract for their construction, they were delivered and the material stored in them in January. These boxes correspond in contents to the eleven volumes of the Facsimile Edition. They are portable, so that whenever the treasures of the Coptic Museum are removed to safe keeping in danger of war the boxes can be transported rather than the individual plexiglass containers being stacked in crude crates where they have in the past been scratched, shaken and battered. Also two large cabinets with glassed display tops were designed, contracted, and delivered in January, into which the eleven boxes fit.

During this period I made the following public lectures:


At the Colloque sur les textes de Nag Hammadi at the University of Strasbourg 23–25 October 1974, “On the Codicology of Nag Hammadi Codices.”

---

At the Institut d’Égypte in Cairo on 2 December 1974, “The Nag Hammadi Codices of the Coptic Museum.”

Popular lectures on the Nag Hammadi codices in Cairo at the Coptic Institute, the Evangelical Coptic Seminary, and the Maadi Community Church in January 1975.

At the University of Rome 4 February 1975 in French, “Les manuscrits coptes de Nag Hammadi.”

Thus the seven-month sabbatic, working daily at the Coptic Museum in Cairo, and the continuation and completion of that work by Stephen Emmel, made it possible to convene the second meeting of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices in 1976 and the publication of the facsimile volumes of all 13 codices by the end of 1977.

7. The First International Congress of Coptology, 8–18 December 1976

The First International Congress of Coptology took place in Cairo on 8–18 December 1976. The program was divided into two parts. The first part, taking place on 9–10 December, consisted of The Second Meeting of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices. The second part, taking place on 11–17 December, consisted of The Colloquium on the Future of Coptic Studies.

The Second Meeting of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, 9–10 December 1976

The Meeting was attended by the following Committee members: Prof. Gamal Mokhtar, Chairman of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization; Dr. Pahor Labib, Director Emeritus of the Coptic Museum; Mr. Victor Girgis, General Director of the Coptic Museum; Professors Søren Giversen (Denmark), Antoine Guillaumont (France), Rodolphe Kasser (Switzerland), Martin Krause (Federal Republic of Germany), Gilles Quispel (the Netherlands), James M. Robinson (U.S.A.), Torgny Säve-Söderbergh (Sweden), Hans-Martin Schenke (German Democratic Republic, added to the Committee in 1972),

and R. McL. Wilson (Great Britain). Members not in attendance were Dr. Gamal Mehrez, formerly General Director of the Department of Antiquities (deceased), Mr. Shafik Farid, Director Emeritus of the Coptic Museum, Professors Henri-Charles Puech (France) and Gérard Garitte (Belgium). Prof. Tito Orlandi (Italy) and Mr. Stephen Emmel (U.S.A.) were invited to attend the Second Meeting to present reports. Except for the opening session of the Committee, held in the Director’s office at the Coptic Museum, the sessions of the Committee were held at the Société de géographie and were open to the participants in the Congress.

The opening session was convened by Prof. Gamal Mokhtar; General Director Victor Girgis welcomed the Committee to the Coptic Museum.

The Permanent Secretary reported for the Technical Sub-Committee concerning the primary task of the Committee, a facsimile edition of the Nag Hammadi codices. Work sessions of the Technical Sub-Committee were held at the Coptic Museum in December 1970, January 1971, December 1971, December 1972 and September 1973, funded through UNESCO’s Participation Programs for 1971–1972 and 1973–1974. Great appreciation was expressed for the constant helpfulness and willingness to go beyond their normal duties on the part of the staff of the Coptic Museum, especially Mr. Victor Girgis, General Director, and Ms. Samiha ʿAbd el-Shaheed, Curator for Manuscripts. A publishing contract between the Ministry of Culture of the Arab Republic of Egypt, represented by Prof. Gamal Mokhtar, Under-Secretary of State, and E.J. Brill, Publisher, represented by F.C. Wieder, Jr., Director, was initialed by Prof. Gamal Mokhtar 16 September 1971 and formalized later that year; it stipulated that the carrying through of publication is entrusted to the Committee through the Permanent Secretary; royalties are paid to the Ministry of Culture of the Arab Republic of Egypt; complimentary copies are provided to the Ministry of Culture for eight Egyptian libraries, to UNESCO and to each member of the Committee. The collotype plates are printed by E. Schreiber, Stuttgart, Federal Republic of Germany. The edition is entitled *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*. The sub-titles of the twelve volumes of the edition and the status of their publication are as follows:

- Introduction, 1984
- Cartonnage, 1979
A separate volume, *Cartonnage*, and a concluding volume, *Introduction*, are to go to press after 1977 [published 1979 and 1984]. The number of copies sold of the volumes published 1972–1978 are as follows:

| 1972 | 148 | 54 |
| 1973 | 99  | 142 166 |
| 1974 | 46  | 56 204 |
| 1975 | 26  | 30 33 44 199 107 |
| 1976 | 22  | 19 23 29 63 79 188 |
| 1977 | 12  | 12 14 17 21 78 77 247 |
| 1978 | 12  | 17 18 21 20 23 22 26 245 242 |

Totals 395 330 300 315 303 289 290 273 245 242 2983

[Comparable data for more recent years has been provided by Loes Schouten, Senior Acquisitions Editor of E.J. Brill. (A dash—indicates that the volume is no longer in print):

| 1994 | 20  | 42 20 26 23 25 24 24 24 24 26 29 |
| 1995 | -10  | 1 18 2 -12 -1 -16 -16 -18 1 1 1 |
| 1996 | 1 0  | 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 |
| 1997 | 1 0  | 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |
| 1998 | 5 5  | 6 7 5 3 5 5 5 5 6 5 5 5 |
| 1999 | 18 20 | 6 25 18 0 19 4 15 23 16 22 |
| 2000 | 1 2  | 3 2 1 0 1 2 1 1 1 1 |
| 2001 | 1 2  | 2 3 2 0 2 1 2 1 1 1 |
| 2002 | 3 2  | 2 3 1 0 2 2 2 2 1 1 |
| 2003 | 0 0  | 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 |
| 2004 | 1 1  | 0 3 1 0 1 2 0 1 0 0 |
| 2005 | 1 0  | 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 |
| 2006 | 1 0  | 1 2 1 1 0 1 1 |
| 2007–2013 | 1 2 6 6 7 6 4 4 6 6 |

From 1984 to 2013, 56 complete sets were also sold, included in the totals below.

| Totals | 494 466 418 499 438 397 424 409 391 432 390 376 |

The resultant grand total of all volumes in *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices* that have been sold (including the years 1979–1993 not itemized above) stood as of 18 November 2013 at 5,184 volumes.]

Mr. Stephen Emmel of the continuing Cairo staff of the 1974–1975 Nag Hammadi Codices Editing Project of the American Research Center in Egypt reported on the reconservation of the Nag Hammadi codices, in which fragments were attached to leaves and conjugate leaves reunited into sheets that
were put between panes of plexiglass 32 by 37 cm. in eleven portable boxes (each containing the material in one volume of *The Facsimile Edition*) in two display cabinets. These conservation materials and the conservation work itself were funded by the Smithsonian Institution through the sponsorship of ARCE.  

The Secretary reported on the Nag Hammadi Archive that has been established at the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity of Claremont Graduate School [now University] to collect photographs, correspondence, documents, clippings, off-prints and notebooks related to the Nag Hammadi codices. This collection, begun to provide supplemental data for use in *The Facsimile Edition*, is also made available at cost to scholars and publishers wishing to reproduce a photograph or to consult documentation. The Secretary renewed the request that persons with relevant archival material put it at the disposal of this repository, either by supplying the original, which can be copied and, if desired, then returned, or by supplying a copy, in which case copying costs can be defrayed. In this way the Nag Hammadi Archive, already the fullest collection of such material available, thanks to materials contributed by several members of the Committee as well as others such as Dr. Jean Døresse and Dr. C.A. Meier, may become more complete, in time for the material to be used in preparing the *Introduction to The Facsimile Edition*. The Committee suggested that Prof. Guillaumont convey to Prof. Puech the hope of the Committee that he would provide such materials.

Prof. Tito Orlandi presented an offer to make a microfilm collection of Coptic manuscripts similar to that being made for Greek papyri by the *Association internationale des papyrologues*. Prof. Martin Krause itemized a series of steps that could be taken to advance coptology as a discipline, such as publishing catalogues of materials in each country, publishing groups of texts, excavating Coptic sites, collecting Coptic inscriptions, preparing a catalogue of ostraca, etc. The plan to found, during the Colloquium on the Future of Coptic Studies, an International Association for Coptic Studies, was endorsed. It

---


84 When a first draft of the present document was circulated to the International Committee for inclusion in *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*, Martin Krause wrote that he had consulted an attorney, who reported that books could not be sold in the Federal Republic of Germany if they contained letters from an author without his or her permission, until a decade after that person's death had passed. Although it would have been easy to remove the few quotations from letters written by Krause (or by others such as Kasser and Puech who would not have given their permission), it was clear that it was best not to include the record of what had gone on in the official publication of the International Committee. A decade has passed since the death of Puech, who is hence quoted. Letters by Kasser are not quoted.

was agreed that if this plan materialized these proposals would be turned over to that learned society with the Committee’s endorsement, and that the Committee itself would cease to exist with the completion of the Facsimile Edition.

Reports on plans for complete English, German and French translations of the Nag Hammadi codices were presented by Prof. James M. Robinson (The Coptic Gnostic Library), Prof. Hans-Martin Schenke (Koptisch-gnostische Schriften, Bände 2 und 3), and Prof. Jacques-É. Ménard (Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi). Prof. Martin Krause reported on the monograph series of E.J. Brill, Nag Hammadi Studies. Prof. Torgny Säve-Söderbergh reported on the excavation in November and December 1975 of the site of the discovery of the Nag Hammadi codices, at the Jabal al-Ṭārif. A special report prepared by Bishop Samuel concerning the deterioration of Coptic monuments in Egypt and the need for immediate steps for their preservation was received.

Mr. Victor Girgis, General Director of the Coptic Museum, presented the reconserved Nag Hammadi codices for the admiration of the Committee in the Library of the Museum. The Committee unanimously urged the continuation of open access for scholars to study the original papyri characteristic of the past few years, in view of the fact that the Facsimile Edition, excellent though it is, cannot replace the originals when preparing an exact transcription. For it is only in the case of the originals that ultra-violet light reveals invisible traces of ink, the impression and ductus of the pen may be detected, and the brilliantly-black ink may be distinguished from chance discoloration such as foxing.

An interview concerning the discovery of the Nag Hammadi codices was conducted with Abrām Bibāwī of Nag Hammadi,86 who had functioned as the main translator at interviews with the discoverer Muḥammad ‘Alī Khalīfah al-Sammān Muḥammad Khalīfah, and with Rāghib Andarāwus al-Qiss ‘Abd al-Sayyid of Qinā,87 who brought Codex III to the attention of the authorities in Cairo and thus led to the ultimate deposition of all the Codices in the Coptic Museum. After their narration of the discovery of the Codices and of the transmission of Codex III to the Coptic Museum, the Committee and members of the Colloquium were given the opportunity to pose questions to the panel. By means of such a collective experience of interrogation, it is possible that such unrecorded facts, which by the very nature of the case are imprecise due both to the fading and tendentious coloring of memories of events 32 years ago and to the limitations of interviews conducted by a single individual, can be brought nearer to the verifiability, experimental repetition, and community of knowledge sought by scholarship.

The largest segment of time was devoted to reports on individual research on the Nag Hammadi codices, first by members of the Committee:

86 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/999.
Then brief reports of worldwide research on the Nag Hammadi codices were presented:

Jan Helderman: Anapausis in *The Epistula Jacobi Apocrypha*.
Peter Nagel: The Stylistic Analysis of the Coptic Gnostic Texts from Nag Hammadi.
Maddalena Scopello: Un “rituel idéal” dans trois textes de Nag Hammadi.
Elaine Pagels: The Dialogue of the Savior.
François Daumas: Au sujet de l’Asclépius.
Eric Segelberg: The Asclepius Prayer.
Jacques-É. Ménard: La Lettre de Pierre à Philippe.
K.W. Tröger (in absentia, read by Frederik Wisse): Hermeticism.
Alexander Böhlig (in absentia): Jacob as an Angel in Gnosticism and Manichaeism.

The Second Meeting of the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices was formally closed by Prof. Gamal Mokhtar at the conclusion of the afternoon session on 10 December 1976.88

---

88 The papers were published in *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis: Papers read at the First International Congress of Coptology (Cairo, December 1976)* (ed. R. McL. Wilson; NHS 14; Leiden: Brill, 1978).


of Coptology into the broader context of similar Congresses on Egyptology in October 1976, on Islamics scheduled for May 1977, and on Graeco-Roman antiquities, as an effort on the part of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization to assess on a broad scale the methods, emphases, and objectives in the study of Egypt’s cultural heritage in the next fifty years. He spoke of the importance of the Nag Hammadi Codices for Coptic studies, commended the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices for its work in this regard, and invited scholars in the field to come and verify their work by “consulting the original manuscripts themselves,” expressing the hope “that you will often return there to study them in greater detail.” Mirrit Boutros Ghali extended greetings on behalf of the Société d’archéologie copte, pledged the full cooperation of the Société in plans to found an International Association for Coptic Studies, invited the Congress to a reception at the Société, and, as he had already done in 1959, registered a desideratum: “While the Faculty of Archaeology and the Archaeology Departments naturally—and unavoidably—deal with at least one branch of Coptic Studies, namely the language, there is no Department or Professorship specifically devoted to Coptology in any Egyptian University, neither for Art or Architecture, nor for History or Literature.”

The program of the Colloquium was organized according to major themes, which were treated both in terms of thematic papers and in terms of project reports and reports on current research. The following presentations were made:

*The Future of Coptology as a Discipline*
- Martin Krause, Pierre du Bourguet (in absentia), Werner Vycichl (in absentia)

*Coptic Textiles*
- Pierre du Bourguet (in absentia), Dorothée Renner, Claudia Nauerth, Loretta del Francia

*Linguistics and the Coptic Language*
- Gerd Mink, Wolf-Peter Funk (in absentia), Werner Vycichl (in absentia), Magdi Zikri, Kamal Farid Issac, Hans-Martin Schenke, Jürgen Osing

*Lexicography*
- Bentley Layton, Rodolphe Kasser, Bruce M. Metzger, Gerd Mink, Maddalena Scopello, Adel Sidarus

*Coptic Liturgical Literature*
- Hans Quecke, Theofried Baumeister, Frederik Wisse, George Habib Bihawi (in absentia)

*Coptic-Arabic Literature*
- Samir Khalil, Samiha ʿAbd el-Shaheed

*Coptic Biblical-Ecclesiastical Literature*
- Tito Orlandi, Kurt Aland, Gerald M. Browne, Bernd Jörg Diebner, William G. Rusch

---

Coptic Manichean Literature
   Julien Ries

Coptic Codicology, Papyrology and Epigraphy
   James M. Robinson, L.S.B. MacCoull, E. Silver, E. Lueddeckens, Hadi
   Basilios Ibrahim, Linda K. McWilliams, Stefan Jakobielski

Coptic Sculpture
   Hans-Georg Severin, Marguerite Rassart-Debergh (in absentia), Elisabeth
   Lucchesi-Palli, Klaus Parlasca, Margherita Cecchelli-Trinci, Marie-Hélène
   Rutschowscaya

Coptic Music
   John Gillespie (in absentia), Nabil Kamal Butros

Coptic Art
   Victor Girgis, Stefan Jakobielski, Bernard V. Bothmer, Victor H. Elberb

Coptic Archaeology
   Labib Habachi, Peter Grossmann, Bastiaan van Elderen, Antoine
   Guillaumont, Rodolphe Kasser, Wincenty Myssor, Michel Egloff,
   Mieczyslaw Rodziewica

Two films, one on “Coptic Art” and the other on “The Flight of the Holy Family
in Egypt,” were made available to the Congress through the good offices of
Victor Girgis.

The list of the 106 registrants at the Congress is as follows: ʿAbd el-Shaheed,
Samia; Aland, Barbara; Aland, Kurt; Attridge, Harold W.; Basilios, Hadi;
Baumeister, Theofried; Bellet, Dom Paulinus; Birdsall, R. Scott; Bothmer,
Bernard V.; Brown, S. Kent; Browne, Gerald M.; KHS-Burmester, O.H.E.; Cec-
chelli-Trinci, Margherita; Cox, James J.C.; Daoud, Girgis; Daumas, François;
Debolo, Fernand; del Francia, Lopretta; Devos, Paul; Diebner, Bernd Jörg;
Egloff, Michel; Elberb, Victor H.; Emmel, Stephen; Gabra, Gawdat; Ghali, Mir-
rit Boutros; Girgis, Victor; Giversen, Søren; Godlewski, Wlodzimierz; Golgo-
wski, Tadeuss; Gregorius, Bishop Anba; Grossmann, Peter; Guendi, Maher
Margoni; Guillaumont, Antoine; Habachi, Labib; Haggard, Hugh E.; Hardy,
E.R.; Harpigny, Abbé Guy; Hassan, Nawal; Hedrick, Charles W.; Helderman,
J.; Issac, Kamal Farid; Jakobielski, Stefan; Johnson, David W.; Khalil, Samir,
S.J.; von Kanel, Frédérique; Kasser, Rodolphe; Krafft, Walter; Krause, Mau-
rin; Labib, Pahor; Layton, Bentley; Louis, Senouty; Lucchesi-Palli, Elisabeth;
Lueddeckens, E.; Luttikhuizen, Gerard P.; MacCoull, L.S.B.; MacDermot, Vio-
let; McWilliams, Linda K.; Maehler, H.; Maher, Émile; Megally, M.; Meier,
C.A.; Ménard, Jacques-É.; Metzger, Bruce M.; Meyer, Marvin W.; Mikhail, Nabil
A.; Mikhail, Morice A.; Mink, Gerd; Mokhtar, Gamal; Müller, Christa; Myss-
or, Wincenty; Nagel, Peter; Nauerth, Claudia; Orlandi, Tito; Oning, Jürgen;
Page, George H.; Pagels, Elaine; Papini, Lucia; Parlasca, Klaus; Plumley, J. Mar-
rin; Poirier, Paul-Hubert; Ruche, Hans; Quispel, Gilles; Renner, Dorothée;
Ries, Julien; Roberge, Michel; Robinson, James M.; Rodziewica, Mieczyslaw;
Roquet, Gérard; Roy, Martha; Rutsch, William G.; Rutschowscaya, Marie-
Hélène; Säve-Söderbergh, Torgny; Shenke, Hans-Martin; Scholz, Piotr; Sco-
pello, Maddalena; Segelberg, Eric; Severin, Hans-Georg; Pope Shenouda III;
Sideras, Adel; Silver, Emanuel; Soliman, Soliman F.; Tardieu, Michel; Uriu,
Bruno; van Elderen, Bastiaan; Viaud, P. Gérard; Wilson, R. McLachlan; Wisse, Frederik; Zdanowicz, Krystyna; Zikri, Magdi.

Special events of the Colloquium were a guided tour of the Coptic Museum, a reception by the Egyptian Antiquities Organization at the Tahrir Club, a special lecture at the Institut d’Égypte by Martin Krause on “The Relation between Egypt and Nubia during the Christian Period,” a reception at the Coptic Orthodox Patriarchate, an excursion to the Wadi Natrun, a reception at the Société d’archéologie copte, and a dinner hosted by Ahmed Kadry of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization for the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices with the honored guests and their wives, Dr. C.A. Meier, Director Emeritus of the Jung Institute, and George H. Page, Patron of the Jung Institute, who were primarily responsible for the acquisition by the Jung Institute of the Jung Codex and its return to Cairo for the Coptic Museum.

The Founding of the International Association for Coptic Studies, 18 December 1976

A business meeting of the Colloquium chaired by Prof. Tito Orlandi was convened at the Société d’archéologie copte for the purpose of founding an international association for Coptic studies. The Colloquium was welcomed by The Honorable Mirrit Boutros Ghali, President of the Société d’archéologie copte. The following resolution was approved:

We, the participants in the First International Congress of Coptic Studies meeting in Cairo 9–17 December 1976 and today guests of the Société d’archéologie copte, as we plan an affiliated International Association for Coptic Studies, wish to express formally to you, the distinguished founder and President of the Société d’archéologie copte, Mirrit Boutros Ghali, together with your wife, our profound respect and appreciation for your almost single-handed efforts over the past 42 years to carry on the work of fostering the study of Coptic culture, a mission in which we now hope to join forces with you and the Société d’archéologie copte. The model which you have given and the continuing work of the Société d’archéologie copte of which you are President are our main bases for hope that such an enterprise on our part may also be undertaken. Not only do we wish you success in the continuation of your work and that of the Société d’archéologie copte, but we wish to recognize that whatever success we may achieve will in large part be due to the impetus and precedent you have set.

---

Statutes for the association were proposed, discussed, revised and adopted. They are as follows:

International Association for Coptic Studies

1. Name. The name of this learned society in the field of Coptic Studies shall be The International Association for Coptic Studies.

2. Purposes of the Association. The Association shall be a non-profit organization designed to encourage and contribute to the progress of all aspects of Coptic Studies. It shall promote international cooperation among individuals as well as among organizations and institutions. It shall advance the dissemination of information about work in progress, new discoveries, and new results; organize periodic Congresses on Coptic Studies; facilitate full access to and the rapid publication of source materials; identify priorities for research at a given time; bring to the attention of younger scholars the whole range of Coptic Studies; etc.

3. Membership. The Association is open to all who are interested in Coptic Studies. All participants in the First International Congress of Coptology, as well as those not present but known to be interested in membership, are given the opportunity through the end of 1977 to be charter members. Subsequent members will be elected by a poll of the board if nominations are submitted by at least two members to the Congress Secretary at least six months prior to the next Congress. The annual membership fee will be set by the Business Meeting of the Association, with a reduced rate for students. Institutional memberships are permitted; a representative of such an institution would have one vote.

4. Officers.

a. Honorary Officers. The association may choose to elect permanent honorary Presidents.

b. Executive Officers. There will be five non-permanent officers: President, President-Elect, Congress Secretary, Editor of the Association’s Newsletter, and the Director of the Cairo Center of the Association. The terms of office of the executive officers are from one stated Business Meeting to the next, i.e. three or four years, and will expire with the election of new officers. Only the Editor of the Newsletter and the Director of the Cairo Center are subject to reelection without intervening term. The President-Elect presides in the absence of the President and normally succeeds him as President. The office of the Editor of the Newsletter also functions as a clearing-house of information to members; the Editor also functions as Treasurer of the Association, in which capacity he will submit an annual report to the Board.

5. Board. The Board will consist of all executive officers plus four members at large. The members at large have staggered terms in two classes of two members each. Initially two will be elected to serve until the second Congress and two until the third. Decisions will be by a majority vote of
those present at the meetings. The Board receives and approves reports from the officers for presentation at the Business Meeting, and is responsible for the Association’s activity between Congresses. It holds stated meetings just before and after each Congress. Special meetings of the Board may be called by a request of three of its members approved by a majority of its members and scheduled at least three months in advance; a quorum shall consist of five members. The Board will have the right in the case of a vacancy to elect a replacement to serve until the next Business Meeting.

6. Congresses. The Association will meet normally at three or four year intervals. Priority should be given to locations at which members are not excluded from attending. A Business Meeting of the Association will be held at each regular Congress. The Business Meeting confirms members elected by the Board, elects officers, chooses a new Nominations Committee, sets dues, endorses research projects, and takes other action advancing Coptic Studies. Nominations may also be made by mail. Decisions will be made by a majority vote of those present at the Business Meeting. Special meetings may also be convened in addition to the Congresses. Visitors may be admitted to the Congress but not to the Business Meeting.

7. Finances. The expenses of the Association will be borne by the members in the form of annual dues and registration fees at the Congresses, as well as by donations and grants from individuals and institutions.

8. The Cairo Center. This Center will be set up in cooperation with the Société d’archéologie copte through a mutually adopted Agreement.

9. The Statutes may be revised by a majority vote at a Business Meeting.

The International Association for Coptic Studies held its first Business Meeting at the Société de géographie from 4 to 7 p.m. 17 December. The report of a nominating committee was presented by James M. Robinson. The nominees were formally elected to office. They are as follows:

**Permanent Honorary Presidents**
- Pierre de Bourguet (Paris)
- Mirrit Boutros Ghali (Cairo)
- Labib Habachi (Cairo)
- Gamal Mokhtar (Cairo)
- Torgny Säve-Söderbergh (Uppsala)

**President**
- Martin Krause (Münster)

**President-Elect**
- Bentley Layton (New Haven)

**Editor of the Newsletter/Treasurer**
- Tito Orlandi (Rome)

**Congress Secretary**
- Frederik Wisse (Hamilton, Ontario)
Board Members at Large (double term)
  Rodolphe Kasser (Geneva)
  Peter Nagel (Halle)

Board Members at Large (single term)
  Barbara Aland (Münster)
  Jacques-É. Ménard (Strasbourg)

Director of the Cairo Center
  O.H.S. KHS-Burmester (Cairo)

President Krause assumed the chair and presided over the rest of the Business Meeting, assisted by Prof. Orlandi.

The emended Statutes of the Association were presented and approved.

An agreement between the International Association for Coptic Studies and the Société d'archéologie copte was adopted as follows:

One. The Société will provide to the Association an office reserved for the use of members of the Association. The Société will make its Library and facilities available to members of the Association as a Research Center when in Cairo. At such times the Library and the office will be accessible daily beyond customary office hours.

Two. The Association will pay to the Société an amount initially set at $5 from the dues of each of its members in support of the Cairo Center.

Three. Each member of the Association will receive without further payment the Bulletin of the Société and other privileges of the Société (except those of voting and holding office).

Four. It is hoped that this Agreement will be but the first step toward even closer relations of the Association and the Société.

Resolutions were adopted endorsing the completion of a microfilm collection of Coptic manuscripts at the Instituto di Studi del Vicino Oriente of the University of Rome under the leadership of Prof. Tito Orlandi, of Coptic New Testament manuscripts at the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung at Münster in Westfalia under the leadership of Prof. Kurt Aland, and of Arabic-Coptic manuscripts at the Pontificio Instituto Orientale of Rome under the leadership of Prof. Samir Khalil, S.J. A resolution urging civil and ecclesiastical authorities to make their holdings of such manuscripts available for microfilming was approved.

The Association endorses the Coptic bibliography published in the journal Enchoria; its editor, Prof. E. Lueddeckens, announced that the bibliography would be made available as a separate fascicle and that members of the Association could subscribe to the journal at a reduced rate.

Labib Habachi introduced resolutions that were endorsed by the Association urging that priority be given to recording endangered Coptic monuments, that general surveys of the region be included in excavations, and that excavators give more attention to the consolidation of ancient buildings.
At the proposal of Labib Habachi, a telegram signed by James M. Robinson on behalf of the members of The First International Congress of Coptic Studies was sent to His Excellency President Anwar Sadat, with copies to H.E. the Minister of Education, His Holiness Pope Shenouda III, Chairman Gamal Mokhtar of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization, the Chancellor of Cairo University, and the Dean of the Faculty of Archaeology of Cairo University. The text of the telegram is as follows:

At the closing session of the First International Congress of Coptic Studies the members of the Congress—who have come to Egypt from over fifteen countries and have spent nine full days in studying one of the great periods of Egypt’s prestigious history—have the honour and the pleasure to present their compliments to your Excellency and to express their grateful thanks to all the institutions and personalities who have welcomed us so warmly in Egypt, and particularly to Dr. el-Oteify, the Minister of Information and Culture, His Holiness Pope Shenouda Third, and Dr. Mokhtar, the President of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization.

While hereby assuring your Excellency of their high regard for your untiring efforts to preserve peace and prosperity and your constant concern for the Egyptian cultural achievement inherited from the successive periods of Egypt’s ancient civilization, the members of the First International Congress of Coptology venture to express their hope that Egyptian universities will create Departments and Professorships for various branches of Coptic studies, as have been established in universities in other countries.

Please accept our most sincere good wishes for Egypt and the Egyptian people and for your own continued success in your vital and essential tasks.

The members of the First International Congress of Coptic Studies

A traveling exhibition of selected sheets and covers of the Nag Hammadi codices was proposed by Prof. Quispel. Prof. Robinson reported on tentative plans for such an exhibit sponsored by the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity that is to open in San Francisco at the annual national meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature 28–31 December 1977, after which it would go on tour. [Permission was not granted for these materials to leave Egypt. A photographic exhibit nonetheless toured the United States.]

The Curator of Manuscripts of the Library of the Coptic Museum, Ms. Samiha ʿAbd el-Shaheed, requested members of the IACS to contribute books to the Library of the Coptic Museum.

Prof. Orlandi announced plans to publish annually two or more issues of the Newsletter for the IACS beginning in March 1977.

Annual dues of the IACS were set at the equivalent of $15, of which $5 would go to support the Cairo Center of the IACS. Student dues were set at $10. [A reduced rate for members in retirement was subsequently approved by the Board.] The possibility that members of the Société d’archéologie copte
who are also members of the IACS might if desired pay a reduced annual membership fee to the Société and receive only one copy of the Bulletin rather than the two to which the double membership would otherwise entitled them was assessed with favor by the President of the Société. It is hoped that the IACS will be registered with UNESCO as an affiliate so that payment can be effected in the form of UNESCO bonds.

It was proposed that the Board of the IACS investigate the production of a Coptic unit for the IBM Selectric typewriter.

A resolution was adopted to ask the Board to contact the responsible authorities of the collections of every kind of Coptic source materials in order to reach agreement with them as to free access, at stated conditions, for all the members, and the best possible facilities for their study. The IACS went on record as opposing giving or receiving exclusive publication rights, after approving an amendment offered by Prof. Kasser to the effect that a period of grace of 12 months from the date of this resolution be approved for editors presently in the course of preparing an edition. The members of IACS also request that in the case of findings from official excavations each expedition publish within 5 years after the excavation, which is the period of grace stipulated by Egyptian law, whereupon these discoveries are to be fully available to the scholarly world at large.

The next meeting of the IACS is to be planned to take place in Europe in three or four years. The details are to be worked out by the Board of the IACS.

Persons who join the IACS before the end of 1977 will be considered charter members. Persons wishing to join should address themselves to the Editor of the Newsletter and Treasurer:

Prof. Tito Orlandi
Via Filippo Civinini, 24
00197 Rome, Italy

Bishop Gregorius concluded with his blessing the founding meeting of the International Association for Coptic Studies.

Appreciation for the careful planning and execution of the practical details of The First International Congress of Coptic Studies are due to the Cairo Secrétaire, especially to the tireless and efficient work of Stephen Emmel.94

---

94 The Congress was well covered by the press. Among newspaper and magazine articles are the following: *Al-Kirazah*, 3 xii 76, 1; *The Egyptian Gazette*, 8 xii 76; 12 xii 76, 3; *Watani*, 12 xii 76, 1, 4; 13 xii 76, 4 by Adil Kamil and Mahir Aiyad; *Al-Ahram*, 15 xii 76, 16; *Al-Mussawar*, 17 xii 76, 12–13; and, both by Labib Habachi, in *October*, 9 i 77, 58–59, and “The Meaning of the Meeting of the Members of the International Congress for Coptic Studies in Cairo,” in *Watani*, 3 vii 77.
On 10 December 1970 F.C. Wieder, Jr., Director of Brill, and on 14 December 1970 Krause and myself, Editors, signed a contract to publish *Nag Hammadi Studies*, and on the same dates the three signed a contract to publish the sub-series, *The Coptic Gnostic Library*. Then I signed a contract with F.C. Wieder, Jr., Director of Brill, and Harper & Row, dated 29 August 1977, to publish *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, based on the contract of 14 December 1970 between myself and F.C. Wieder, Jr., Director of Brill, to publish *The Coptic Gnostic Library*.

By 1977, Codices I, IX, and X were the only codices that had not yet been published in the *Facsimile Edition* and thus brought into the public domain, upon which the publication of *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* depended. The publication of two final volumes of *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices*, bringing the last three codices, I, IX, and X, into the public domain, was planned for 1977, so that the English translation could be published that same year. Stephen Emmel, the last member of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project still working with the codices themselves at the Coptic Museum in Cairo, wrote on 2 September 1977 that, while carrying out a systematic comparison of our photographic archives with the originals, he had identified a small fragment belonging on leaf [17]/18 of Codex IX. Emmel found the fragment only on a microfilm that had been made by Søren Giversen on 9 January 58, since the fragment itself had subsequently been lost. This was later acknowledged in the volume of the *Facsimile Edition* itself:95

The photographs of ... several otherwise unattested inscribed fragments from Codex IX were supplied by the courtesy of Søren Giversen: a fragment of IX, [17], 20.21; 18, 22.23 ... 

I immediately telephoned this information to Birger A. Pearson, Volume Editor of *Codices IX and X* in the Coptic Gnostic Library critical edition. On 28 September 1977 he confirmed the correctness of the placement, even

---

95 *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Codices IX and X*, published under the auspices of the Department of Antiquities of the Arab Republic of Egypt in conjunction with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, James M. Robinson, Permanent Secretary (Leiden: Brill, 1977), xxv. On pp. 21–22 one finds the facsimiles of Coptic pp. [17]/18 with the fragment spliced in place. It can be identified by the fact that it is somewhat darker than the rest of the photograph.
providing a transcription to validate it. On 30 September 1977 I telephoned this information to Frederik Wisse, the Project member posted in Tübingen (with funding provided by Alexander Böhlig), in order to work in Stuttgart with the collotype printing firm Schreiber, which had been engaged by Brill to print the plates for the Facsimile Edition. Although by that time Schreiber was already producing the plates for the last two volumes, one of which was Codices IX and X, Wisse saw to it that the fragment was inserted before the plates were finalized and forwarded to Brill in Leiden for publication. This was acknowledged in the volume itself:

Stephen Emmel, Research Associate of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, completed the conservation and combed the photographic archives for no-longer extant materials. Frederik Wisse has seen the volume through the press in Stuttgart.

Since The Nag Hammadi Library in English was already in the press at Brill, and second proofs had already been corrected, I also forwarded this minor adjustment on to Leiden for inclusion. The addition of a small fragment in the translation of a very fragmentary leaf is of course minimal: ‘aeon’ was added to The Nag Hammadi Library in English on p. 403, line 3, at [17],20, and ‘there’ on p. 403, line 12, at 18,23. But no matter how minimal, we had always tried to reassemble the codices down to the smallest detail. Fragments that were subsequently placed, mostly by Emmel in Cairo, were published in a final volume of the Facsimile Edition designed to serve this purpose. Emmel even provided a list of corrections to the final volume itself.

---

96 28 ix 77: Letter from Birger A. Pearson to Robinson.
100 14 i 85: Letter from Stephen Emmel referring to the list, itself dated 24 i 85.
The transcription and translation of the small fragment on IX, [17]/18 subsequently appeared in the relevant volume of the critical edition, with the note: ‘This material is attested in an early photograph.’

On 9 December 1977, only seventy days after inserting the fragment into the Facsimile Edition and the English translation, a first copy of The Nag Hammadi Library in English, including this final minor revision, reached the New York office of the American co-publisher, Harper & Row. Twenty days thereafter at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, on the evening of 29 December 1977, I presented a long-since scheduled Plenary Address, ‘The Nag Hammadi Library in English.’ This was followed, in the Vista auditorium of the San Francisco Hilton Tower, by a “Gala Reception in Honor of the Translators of the Nag Hammadi Codices,” to quote the invitation composed in Leiden but printed in Claremont, “on the occasion of the Public Presentation of all the Nag Hammadi Codices: The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices by E.J. Brill and The Nag Hammadi Library in English by E.J. Brill and Harper & Row.” On this august occasion F.C. Wieder, Jr., Director of Brill, actually presented the stack of volumes of the Facsimile Edition of all thirteen codices, to mark the breaking of the monopoly, and immediately thereafter the English translation. It is hence no coincidence that the publication of the last two volumes of the Facsimile Edition, Codices IX and X and Codex I, occurred simultaneously with the only-now-permissible publication of The Nag Hammadi Library in English.

Gerd Lüdemann identified this as a turning point in the discipline:

It was apparently a historical moment when at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in San Francisco in December 1977 this pioneering work of North American biblical scholarship was presented to the public. It made symbolically clear that the former predominance of German exegesis had come to an end forever.

---


102 Gerd Lüdemann, Ketzer. Die andere Seite des frühen Christentums (Stuttgart: Radius, 1955), 232, n. 9:


David Noel Freedman, an editor of Qumran texts, recognized this as a rôle model to be followed in the case of other manuscript discoveries.\textsuperscript{103}

The publication of the Nag Hammadi library in photographic form and also in an English translation has provided a fine example of what can be done when scholars, international organizations (in this case, UNESCO), and the responsible national government (in this case, Egypt) cooperate.

One need only contrast this with the strikingly different comparison made a decade earlier by Gérard Garitte (see Chapter 7, Part 5):\textsuperscript{104}

In 1960, that is to say, fifteen years after the discovery, of the some 1,100 pages that the Gnostic manuscripts involve, only 48 had been published in the original language. Certainly, this desolate situation (one need merely think of the fate, so different, of the manuscripts of the Dead Sea) was due in good part to a chain of exceptionally unfortunate circumstances. Nonetheless, the procedural sluggishness, the political instability, and the war may not only be incriminated. Around the Gnostic manuscripts was woven a paralyzing network of personal rivalries, scholarly lusts, and pretensions to “firstmanship,” as Hans Jonas wrote ...

When in January 1975 we were leaving Cairo at the end of the seven months of work placing fragments, Hedrick expressed concern that in the next year or so someone would come and place the numerous small fragments the size of a fingernail that we had not succeeded in placing. I replied with the converse concern that no one would come to do this thankless task, and hence probably few if any fragments we left unplaced would ever be placed. Stephen Emmel did stay on in Cairo, working indefatigably for more than a year at the Coptic Museum and made a number of placements reflected in the “Addenda et Corrigenda” published in the Introduction to The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices,\textsuperscript{105} and in an essay marking

---


\textsuperscript{105} The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices: Codices IX and X, published under the auspices of the Department of Antiquities of the Arab Republic of Egypt in conjunction with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, James M. Robinson, Permanent Secretary, (Leiden: Brill, 1984), 110.

The addenda et corrigenda were primarily compiled and edited by Stephen Emmel, Research Associate of the Institute for Antiquity and Christiani.
the conclusion of our work.\textsuperscript{106} He also published a series of articles itemizing each instance where an earlier photograph preserved something that was no longer extant.\textsuperscript{107}

I did actually solicit information on any further fragment placements:\textsuperscript{108}

Users are requested to submit to the secretary any suggestions for possible inclusion among \textit{addenda et corrigenda} in the final version of the introduction to the facsimile edition.

Nonetheless, my prediction in this regard of the inactivity of the generation to follow unfortunately proved to be correct. For this reason I take real satisfaction in the fact that Wolf-Peter Funk emailed me of 30 August 2007 to report that, on the basis of the parallel text from the Codex Tchacos, he has placed fragment 5 of Codex V at 39,4–5 / 40,5–6. Furthermore, on 29 December 2007 he emailed me that he had placed fragment 17 of Codex VIII at 33, 5–6 / 34, 6–7, a placement that had just been published.\textsuperscript{109}

This reading results from the placement by W.-P. Funk of fragment 17 of Codex VIII.

Funk's email of 29 December 2007 also mentioned a misplacement:

The large fragment that has been sitting at the top of pp. 21/22 in Codex XI (half \textit{The Interpretation of Knowledge}, half \textit{A Valentinian Exposition}) ever since the Facsimile volume, has over time repeatedly met with some doubt, as to its belonging to this very leaf. It’s not only me but all collaborators we have had for editing or re-editing these two texts—nobody really believes that the words and phrases that could possibly be imagined around this fragment could have any business in these particular places. As a result, we shall throw it out in our editions and present it only in an appendix.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[109] Jean-Pierre Mahé and Paul-Hubert Poirier, eds., \textit{Écrits gnostiques: La bibliothèque de Nag Hammadi} (Paris: Gallimard, 2007), 1281:
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}

Cette lecture résulte du placement, par W.-P. Funk, du fragment 17 du codex VIII.
Indeed, the fragment had been omitted from the complete German translation of *The Interpretation of Knowledge* by Uwe-Karsten Plisch and of *A Valentinian Exposition* by Wolf-Peter Funk, with a note from Funk to that effect:\footnote{110}

The editions (inclusive of *The Facsimile Edition*) present in the upper part of the page still one fragment, whose placement nonetheless does not seem assured; besides, the few vestiges of writing permit no clear meaning and are hence hardly translatable.

Similarly in the complete French edition, with a note to this effect by Jean-Pierre Mahé:\footnote{111}

The words that the edition of Turner (1990) give as belonging in lines 1–5 of p. 22 are no longer considered to be part of this tractate.

Thus far, these are the only adjustments to *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices* that to my knowledge have been noted. It has served its purpose of providing a solid basis for ongoing Nag Hammadi scholarship.


Die Ausgaben (einschließlich der Faksimileausgabe) bieten im oberen Teil der Seite noch ein Fragment, dessen Zuordnung jedoch nicht gesichert erscheint; die wenigen Schriftreste lassen im übrigen keinen deutlichen Sinnzusammenhang erkennen und sind daher kaum übersetzbar.

\footnote{111} Jean-Pierre Mahé and Paul-Hubert Poirier, eds., *Écrits gnostiques: La bibliothèque de Nag Hammadi* (Paris: Gallimard, 2007), 1512:

Les mots que l’édition de Turner (1990) donnent comme appartenant aux lignes 1 à 5 de la page 22 ne sont plus considérés comme faisant partie de ce traité.
CHAPTER TWELVE

THE NAG HAMMADI EXCAVATIONS

1. Preliminary Visits to the Site of the Discovery

My First Visit to the Site of the Discovery

My first visit to the site of the discovery began when I was Annual Professor at the American Schools of Oriental Research, later renamed the Albright Institute, in Jerusalem, Jordan for 1965–1966, in whose Newsletter I made a first published report of my trip. It is here conflated with the part of a letter of 22 March 1966 to Claremont’s coptologist and librarian, Ernest Tune, which had to do with my visit to Nag Hammadi. The references in it to the literature available to me at the time have not been updated with more complete bibliographical information, since their function here is merely to indicate the sparse published material with which we began:

Readers of the Newsletter are probably well acquainted with a remarkable manuscript discovery in 1945–1946 at Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt. A number of Coptic Gnostic Codices were found in an exceptional state of preservation; these are as important for the study of early Christian Gnosticism as the Dead Sea Scrolls are for Biblical scholarship. (For a survey of the story as known in 1952 see Victor R. Gold, *The Biblical Archeologist*, Volume XV, pages 70–88.) While in the Near East as Annual Professor at the Jerusalem School, I was determined to visit the place where the books were found. On 27 February 1966 I flew to Luxor, as a point of departure for a visit to Nag Hammadi.

In Luxor I visited one evening Dr. Nims, in charge of the Chicago House that has since 1920 (Breasted) been excavating Medinet Habu in Thebes on the West side of the Nile facing Luxor. Dr. Nims showed me maps of the Nag Hammadi region, which however contributed no relevant information beyond the map of Doresse *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte* 1958 pp. 152 f. (upon which van Unnik’s map, *Evangelien aus dem Nilsand*, seems to be based).

On my inquiry, Dr. Nims assured me that no Coptic Gnostic materials had been found in connection with the Chicago excavations at Medinet Habu,

---

a Pharaonic temple complex at Thebes near Luxor which had been turned into a village (named Djeme) by the Copts. He had not been aware of the fact, however, that the first discovery of a Coptic Gnostic manuscript was at Djeme: Codex Brucianus, acquired by the well-known Scottish archaeological explorer James Bruce in 1769. This manuscript, now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, consists actually of two Codices, the first containing the two books of Jeu, and the second usually referred to as an “unknown early Gnostic work” (cf. the third edition of Carl Schmid’s translation, revised by Walter Till, Koptisch-gnostische Schriften, Volume 1, 1959, published by the Akademie Verlag in the series Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte).

I may add that Dr. Nims reported an important collection of Coptic papyri (not from his site) was shown to him in view of finding a purchaser, and that he sought to find funds, by writing an old Chicago hand, currently Vice-President of Emory University, E.C. Colwell, but received no further encouragement in terms of an American purchaser. You might inquire if Pomp [E.C. Colwell, then in Claremont] can find the letter of Nims in his files and get more specific information there.

Before leaving Luxor for Nag Hammadi, I went again to the Chicago House to find out whether there was any personal danger. For I had asked the local Coptic Evangelical pastor if he would accompany me as translator, and after consulting with a layman in his church he had declined, and recommended I not go, since the peasants in the region were hostile to foreigners. ... At the Chicago House I found Dr. Nims out, but was able to talk to Prof. Wente of the Oriental Institute Chicago. Dr. Nims had mentioned that Giversen had gone to Nag Hammadi after visiting the Chicago house some decade ago. Dr. Wente informed me he had accompanied Giversen, that there was no danger from the friendly peasants, Bedouin, but that there was not much to see at the site. He suggested, since I had neither guide nor interpreter, that I go to the police station at Nag Hammadi and ask their help. A girl had traveled all through Egypt using this procedure and had had no difficulties. ...

The next morning, 3 March, 5 AM, I took the train from Luxor to Nag Hammadi. Although the train was a local, and stopped in Dishnā and Fāw, I did not get out at these places, since they are smaller, and probably would not have taxis. The Guide Bleu says one gets cars from Nag Hammadi. From about Fāw one can see from the train window the Jabal al-Ṭārif, to the North—the Nile is here running in a west-north-west direction, making a U-shaped curve around the Jabal al-Ṭārif—I took a good color slide from the train window, with lush green sugarcane in the foreground, palms and other trees behind, then the cream-colored Jabal al-Ṭārif behind, with the right (north-east) segment separate from the bulk, and it is in that segment, i.e. at the foot of it, that the site of the discovery is located \(^2\) (it lies 129 kilometers by road north-west of

Luxor). At 8 AM I got out at Nag Hammadi. The many horse-cart drivers at the entrance who wanted my trade found an English-speaking station master to whom I gave instructions that I was to be taken to the police station, which I was. I was ushered into the civilian-dressed chief’s office—he was a hearty person, who spoke some English, but promptly sent out and had a uniformed police officer who spoke English quite well come in and handle me. Meanwhile the chief finished having his shoes shined by a lackey, and then, with a clap of the hands, had a saluting second lackey come in and receive his order for coffee for me and all the brass that was gathering to see the news of the day (me). I explained what I wanted to see, showed them plates of the Codices, and so on, and penciled place names near the site I had copied from Nim’s map—which incidentally were not useful, but also caused no problem with the police.

Nag Hammadi is on the left bank of the Nile River, where it curves in such a way as to create a five-mile wide U to circumvent the Jabal al-Ṭārif. The cliffs of the mountain run east-west across the top of the U, and, at the eastern tip of the U, turn north-east, then north-northeast. (It is at the base of this last segment of mountain that Doresse located the place of the discovery of the Codices, presumably in a jar in a Hellenistic-Roman cemetery.) Thus the area within this U forms something of a unit, green and fertile. Nag Hammadi comes into the picture only as the larger modern town just below and outside the U, where the road and railroad cross the Nile. The ancient site on the left bank was Diospolis Parva, the modern village Hiw (spelling of the map), or Hu (spelling of the excavator Petrie), or Heou (spelling of Doresse), pronounced Hiou. The area inside the U is cluttered with hamlets, and two monasteries, Deir Malak (Doresse: Deir el-Malak), near el-Dabba (the map's spelling) or ed-Debbah (Doresse's spelling), preferably al-Dābbah, and Deir Balamun (Doresse: Deir anba-Palamoun) at el-Qasr and el-Saiyad (the map's spelling) or es-Sayyad (Doresse's spelling) or Kasr el-Sayad (Guide Bleu), preferably al-Ṣayyād. (I was once told that el-Qasr and el-Saiyad are two villages under one mayor, and hence treated as a single entity; on another occasion I was told that there is simply one village.) The spelling of the monasteries is that of Otto Meinardus, Atlas of Christian Sites in Egypt, published by the Société d’Archéologie Copte in Cairo in 1962. The small scale of his map III, however, made it necessary to place them north of the U, whereas in reality Deir Malak lies slightly northeast of the center of the U, Deir Balamun some 2 miles further southeast.

Since there is some variation in the literature on the spelling of Nag Hammadi, I took special note of the fact that “Nag Hammadi” is the spelling used on the train station, not Hamadi, and not Naga, as the pronunciation sometimes suggests.  

---

5 This proved useful at the first meeting of the International Committee for the Nag
The police readily agreed to get a rented car. Indeed one of the persons who
had come along in the horse cart turned out to be a chauffeur. They told
me he would take me and bring me back to the police station, and that
I was to pay him in their presence, so they could see he did it correctly.
(On the return, the policeman said that the chauffeur asked 5 £. He asked
what I thought. I said it was a bit stiff, so he said to pay 4, which I did.) I
asked for an interpreter. The policeman said the chauffeur would drive me
down town and there we would pick up a school teacher who spoke English,
which we did. (They had previously mentioned they might have the guard
of the 6th dynasty tombs—for which reason the site has touristic value, not
for the Greco-Roman cemetery where the Codices were found,— but this
seemed to be replaced or supplemented by the school teacher. But they may
have in any case telephoned the guard that I was on the way. He did in fact
later materialize.) The teacher of math, currently Inspector (Principal) of the
elementary school, named Ḥilmī Ṣahyūn Jaddīs, was very nice and spoke
English well.

One goes northeast from Nag Hammadi across the Nile bridge to the right
bank. I proposed we go first to the Deir al-Malāk that Doresse (p. 154 of his
French edition) gives as the location of the Abūnā Dāʾūd that he talked to,
and who had seen and tried to read the Codices when the peasants first found
them, and who may have written the modern jottings Doresse found on the
mss. Abūnā Dāʾūd al-Qiss Yuwakim was not there, but rather at the Madresset
et Kiriki (Church School), Shariʿ Ramses, Cairo, but we went into the church,
observed a mid-morning Lenten service attended by some 20 women and
children, which we more or less broke up by having more appeal than the
liturgy. We were admitted behind the altar and greeted in English by the
officiating priest. We went back into the courtyard where an old monk on
a bench had first greeted us. He now gave each of us (for a contribution) a
round roll with a Christian symbol molded into it, which he blessed. (This
is standard Christian Sunday dinner.) We told them what we wanted to ask
Abūnā Dāʾūd about, but they had no information. This monastery is called
Deir Malak by Meinardus, Atlas of Christian Sites in Egypt, 1962, published at
the French Institute by the Coptic Archaeological Society, map number III,
of which I only got a copy on my return to Cairo, but which is not much
better than Doresse’s map. It is at al-Dābbah, i.e. a few miles northwest of
where Doresse locates it (at al-Qaṣr), nearer where Meinardus puts it. (When
in the afternoon I was put up in a small hotel to await my midnight train, a

6 Hammadi Codices in 1970 (see Chapter 11, Part 3 above), when the question arose as to how
we should spell Nag Hammadi in the minutes I was taking of the meeting. I settled the issue
by reporting the way it was spelt on the train station in Nag Hammadi.

6 Later I determined that the only surviving Arabic writing in the Nag Hammadi Codices
was in Codex II, where the (inaccurate) pagination had been inserted by the Curator of
Manuscripts at the Coptic Museum, Yassah ‘Abd al-Masiḥ. He considered a broken leaf as
two leaves, thus producing in most of the Codex numeration two digits higher than it should
be (see Chapter 6, Part 3 above).
priest from Deir al-Malāk visited me to get bibliographical references to the publication of the Coptic Gnostic materials.)

We then proceeded to al-Ṣayyād, sometimes referred to (e.g. Nims' map) as al-Qaṣr al-Ṣayyād, which according to Doresse’s map consists of two villages. It was explained to me that these hamlets are under one mayor, hence the tendency to call them one. (Guide Bleu, p. 289: Kasr el-Sayad). This is Chenoboskeia, the “park of geese.” My interpreter told me that there were geese in the region. Here we visited the Deir Mari Girgis adjoining the Deir Anba-Balamūn (Guide Bleu, p. 289: Palemiou). …

Deir Anba-Balamūn was named after the Palamon who began the anchorite movement; his follower Pachomius set up the first monastic communities in this region early in the fourth century. Al-Ṣayyād is the location of the ancient town of Chenoboskeia, a name that Doresse has also used to designate the Coptic Gnostic Codices. However, since he maintains that Christian burials would be adjoining the monasteries (as still today), the proximity of Deir Anba-Balamūn to Chenoboskeia would not associate this location with the Gnostic community, which in Doresse’s view preferred the pagan cemetery; indeed Doresse argues that the Church was, at the time the Codices were buried, on a heresy hunt against Gnostics. Doresse was apparently attracted to Chenoboskeia by its Egyptian name Shenesit, which he translates as the acacias of Seth. He rejects as a confusion the interpretation of Chenoboskeia as meaning a place where geese are raised (Guide Bleu also gives this meaning for the Egyptian name), because Alexander Polyhistor noted there was a veneration of crocodiles by the populace of this place, rather than of geese.

At al-Ṣayyād we picked up at a crossroad the antiquities guard, ‘Abd al-Majīd Muḥammad Badārī, ghafīr (Guard) for the Department of Antiquities at al-Qaṣr from 1949–1967,—how we found him so readily I do not know—he may have been notified by the police to be on the corner waiting for us. He was a caricature of the bad guy in a Western movie, complete with fear/hate-ridden eyes, a double-barreled shotgun slung over his shoulder, and a sullen attitude. He rode in the front seat, the translator and I behind. The guard had been said by the police to speak some English, but it turned out to be no more than a few disconnected words—and he understood practically no English.

I had during the drive already told the translator what I was looking for, so he could ask information to reach the site and explain to the guard. The translator mentioned that eight or nine years ago a book had been found there recounting how Christianity entered Egypt. It was now at the Ministry of Education in Cairo. I replied that I did not know if this was the same document I was referring to, since our material was found 20 years ago. He corrected himself by saying Yes, it might be that long ago, since his father was still living.

then. His father had seen the book, but was not interested, because he thought he could find his religious needs in Arabic books. An Italian had the Codex and tried to sell it for 10,000 £É, but the Ministry of Education got an order from King Farouk to confiscate it without any money going to the Italian, and that is hence where it now is. (I conjecture: Miss Dattari, cf. Doresse, p. 139, who tried to sell eleven Codices, but ended by having them confiscated by the government. Of course the Codices of Miss Dattari are actually at the Coptic Museum.) The Coptic Museum got another such Codex. (I interpret: The Coptic Museum originally had, according to Doresse, only one Codex, = Doresse: Codex I, Krause: Codex III. There is no rôle in this rumor for the Jung Codex.) Ḥilmī Ṣahyūn said the Codex his father saw was in Coptic, and in good condition.

After picking up the guard, an Arabic discussion followed. The interpreter asked if I had a ticket to see the Pharaonic tombs. No. More Arabic. Did I want to telephone to Qinā (provincial capital 60 miles upstream) to the regional Department of Antiquities to get permission to see the tombs. Well, if I had to, but otherwise I have no zeal, just want to see the tombs. More Arabic. No further mention of ticket or phone call. (At the end of the tour, after the guard got out at al-Ṣayyād, I asked the interpreter if he knew the guard previously. No, why did I ask? Because at first he seemed so hostile, uncooperative. Answer: He just wanted your money—please don't ever tell anyone about him.) The dirt trail the car followed moved along through the flaky stone ground some 100 to 200 yards from the face of the cliff of the Jabal al-Ṭārif from South to North. As we rode along I watched the profile of the cliff and Doresse's 4th picture facing p. 137, and when we reached the position from which this picture, entitled "the site of the discovery," was taken, I told the car to stop. I then proposed to walk nearer the cliff, since the car was further away than the site from which the picture was taken or what the picture shows. The guard told me I could not go that way. I must stay on the trail parallel to the cliff, moving north toward the pharaonic tombs. I complied, zig-zaging off and on the trail, picking up potsherds as I went. We were some 500 yards from the pharaonic tombs, and as we walked we collected a train of young Bedouin men (as one always does on a tell in the Arab world). Their tents were about 200 yards out from the pharaonic tombs. The name I was initially given, probably by the guard for the tombs, was Malāk Qaṣr al-Ṣayyād, (tomb of) King Qaṣr the Hunter. However when at the tombs I asked the Bedouin, who lived within walking distance, what they called where we were, the guard repeated the name he had given, but they claimed that name did not exist. They said the local name was Makām Ḥamrah Dūm, ‘tomb Ḥamrah Dūm.’ The hamlet Doresse's map places one mile due east of the site is spelled Hamra Doum. I found that French ou is locally pronounced long o, hence the spelling Doam was proposed by my translator. I am inclined to think "cemetery of Ḥamrah Dūm" is about as exact a designation for the site as can be obtained. For the Greco-Roman cemetery was (Doresse, p. 151) used both by the city of Diospolis Parva (across the Nile on the left bank) and the hamlet of Chenoboskeia, so that to refer to the Codices as those of
Chenoboskeia is not very exact. The prominence of Chenoboskeia due to its Coptic monasteries does not help its case, for as Doresse says (p. 151), Christians used the immediate vicinity of these monasteries as their cemetery. Doresse does not think the Codices were written by monks, and that they were intentionally buried in the pagan cemetery (in AD 367 a pastoral letter was read in the churches damning the Gnostics). Hence one cannot identify with any certainty Chenoboskeia as the place where the Gnostic group lived (see below). All one can say with certainty is that they buried the Codices. This site had no ancient name, as far as I know, but only the modern name of the cemetery of Ḥamrah Dūm, the nearest hamlet, the name used by the Bedouin living between that hamlet and the site.

Hence neither Nag Hammadi nor Chenoboskeia nor al-Dābbah seems to provide an adequate designation for the site of the discovery. One may recall Father de Vaux’s remark that the Dead Sea Scrolls were not found in the water—although one might reply that Cave 1, where the first big hoard of Essene manuscripts was found, is not in Wādi Qumran either. There is a comparable problem with finding a satisfactory name for the Codex containing The Gospel of Judas, currently named after the owner, Codex Tchacos.  

As we walked along parallel to the cliff more or less following the path, I took a number of pictures, mostly of the not very photogenic ground around me, which was basically shale rock, though quite flat and not mountainous. It was not solid rock, but rocky-sandy, such that it could be dug in. The lush green nearer the Nile was now replaced by barrenness  with only tufts of weeds (called camel weed, since the camels did eat it). The ground had little hillocks usually about a foot high or less, like grave mounds or piles from grave robbing. Sometimes a depression a yard deep with relatively straight walls, i.e. a clear indication of digging, was evident. There is indeed nothing inspiring to see. The cloth that Doresse seemed to find frequently in these depressions I did not see—perhaps he had time to dig around, whereas I always had to scurry back to the path. But I did identify the big broken boulder in the foreground of Doresse’s picture of the site, and have a picture of it. Hence I was undeniably at the site Doresse is talking about. He tells that the discovery was made when peasants were digging sabakh—French engrais, which my dictionary translated as either manure or topsoil. I find that in the slight depressions in the flanks of the hillocks there is a kind of shale rock, dirt (of which I brought back samples), and it is no doubt simply this dirt in an otherwise rocky ground

---


9 When I visited the site in 1996, I noted that the improved irrigation resulting from the construction of the High Dam had moved this border between green and barrenness nearer to the talus of the cliff.
that was worth mining for its value in providing a soil for crops in the field. The local men told me this was *sabakh* and was so used.

The men gathered sherds for me, most of which I rejected (tactfully), some of which I kept—i.e. they did for me, in their sleeves. The path led gradually toward the cliff and up the incline of fallen stone at the base of the cliff, along a series of dromos-like square-shaped tunnels slanting down at about a 45 degree angle, usually filled in with stone. These would be the entrances to pharaonic tombs. We stopped at one that did not have such a long thin (usually about two yards square) entrance passage, but was instead a cave with a larger opening, and just inside it a large room, e.g. five yards square (but rather round in shape). On it were high-relief pictorial writing such as one finds on tombs and temples of the pharaohs. More interesting to me were the few lines on the back of the cave in Greek, graffiti in red paint, not too legible. *Guide bleu*, p. 289, refers to "cinq ou six graffitis grecs (proscynèmes à Sérapis)." Doresse, p. 150, says:

More to the north, in the finest of the pharaonic tombs, a pagan pilgrim, at some date hardly more ancient than the period of the first Coptic monks, has inscribed a series of Greek invocations to Sarapis.

I was only able to read a bit, but this bit included:

ΤΟ ΠΡΟϹΚΥΝΗΜΑ … ΖΕΥϹ ΨΑΡΑΠΙϹ

There is a second instance of τὸ προσκύνημα on the left in line 5 and on the right in lines 2 and 4, as well as a reference to Antioch on the right in line 3, but it was not possible to read the bulk of the largely effaced text. Προσκύνημα is (Liddell-Scott) an 'act of worship.' I was later told in Cairo that it was a technical term for an offering theoretically presented to the god but intended for the person buried at a place—the god would feed the offering to the dead person.

Some eight of us sat in the cool of the cave and one served us tea—he must have lived in the Bedouin tents some 100 to 200 yards away. We were served in order of rank: me (!), the guard, the interpreter, and meanwhile some of the local persons drank water from a tin can. Meanwhile I, via the interpreter, inquired of them about the manuscript find. The interpreter reported that one said 8 books had been found, but he really meant eight parts of one book, for, as the interpreter had previously said, it was one book that had been found. But he repeated that the local person had actually said eight books. I asked whether there were any fragments of the books still around. For the guard had said something of fragments. I asked the interpreter to tell me what the answer of the guard was, and he said the guard had changed the subject. I

---

asked if any of those there had seen the books or been in on the find, and none had (they were all young men in their 20s, except for the guard and the interpreter). None knew the exact spot of discovery. (In all this gleaning of oral tradition I wondered to what extent they were really giving me a purely local tradition, and to what extent they were giving me material that went back to talks with Doresse and/or Giversen and/or others. At least the interpreter's information that the government in Cairo had refused to pay 10,000 £É and instead seized the book and put it in the Department of Education is not purely local tradition.)

I was shown a second and perhaps third pharaonic tomb with pharaonic reliefs. I did not see the one “furthest south” that according to Doresse had in Coptic the beginning of Old Testament psalms—partly because it was overcast and the sun was not available to orient us, and the direction I claimed was south—the direction from which we had come—was contested by the interpreter, until he finally conceded that he might be turned around, since at this point on the Nile upstream is north, and probably the Egyptian identification of upstream with south is so strong that he was turned around, took my question as to the direction of south as a question as to the direction of upstream, and hence argued for what a compass would call north. By this time we were beyond—south of—the tombs on our way back toward the car, and I did not return to see this inscription.

As we rode south I asked the guard via the interpreter if he knew where the books were found. He said yes. I asked if he would show me. The chauffeur refused to leave the trail, for the direction was off the trail to the right (west) nearer the face of the cliff—i.e. the guard was now taking me precisely where at the very beginning he had refused to let me go. ... So the car stopped and the guard led me afoot—actually half running. The chauffeur and interpreter stayed behind. It was now about 1 PM and we were tired, and they no doubt felt I was overdoing it. The guard finally took me to a position I think somewhat further south than where Doresse's picture had initially led me; it is the place in the face of the cliff where the right (northern) third of the cliff is separated off from the rest by a cleft, as can be readily identified from pictures and Doresse's map. He showed me a boulder some two yards in diameter and said they were found under it, and claimed the sherds nearby were from the jar. I do not think the boulder could have been lifted without mechanical equipment, so I assume the stone is an aide-memoire, a marker in his mind—if indeed he was not making up history, derived conceivably from my initial desire to go in that direction. At this point he began talking to me in Arabic with very few garbled English words, giving me the impression that he had three units for sale (it was not clear whether it was books, parts of books, pages, or fragments of pages—he used the small notebook in my wallet on which I was taking notes as an illustration), that if I would give him my address he would send them to me and I would send him money. About the only English phrases that I recall really understanding were an initial question whether I wanted real antiques and a concluding remark not to tell the police. (I do not know whether he had told the interpreter any of this, and the pious
Coptic interpreter refused to tell me what he had said, but I assume the guard had not told the interpreter.) He asked for my Cairo address, after I gave him the Jerusalem address, but I did not have it on me. When we got back to the car, he was as silent as a clam. When we got back to al-Ṣayyād where we had picked him up, the guard said he wanted to go to Nag Hammadi, but the interpreter said he had told him he did not need to. So I gave the guard a good tip and he got out.

I subsequently wondered if the manuscripts were at Nag Hammadi and that is why he had wanted to go along. For he had proposed to mail them to me—he had communicated that idea by taking an envelop out of his pocket and gesturing that he would put them in it and send them to me and I would put money in such an envelop and send it to him, which incidentally could speak more for fragments—about which I had asked in the cave—than for books; yet when he gestured to my notebook to illustrate he grabbed the whole thing rather than an individual page. I thought he might want to get them at Nag Hammadi, for I had contested with him why use the mail, why could I not go to his house and see them now. However since we were heading back to the police, I did not see a way to pursue the matter further, and wondered if the thing might end with him reporting me to the police as the consolation prize of at least showing his alertness as a guard. It is because of the inconclusiveness of this story of the guard that I am wondering if I should e. g. take the night train from Cairo to Abydos (modern name: Baliana), a bigger tourist archaeological site 40 kilometers downstream from Nag Hammadi, get there a taxi (rather than at Nag Hammadi, to avoid raising the suspicions of the Nag Hammadi police), go directly—after a diversionary visit to the ruins of Abydos—to al-Ṣayyād, ask for the guard, and see if he would talk with me in the presence of an Abydos chauffeur, who would I hope be able to speak English. Of course if there is some manuscript material, it probably does not belong to the guard, if it is at Nag Hammadi, not at al-Ṣayyād, where the guard lives. If 10,000 £É is the price talked about in Nag Hammadi, I might not have funds to buy something even if I saw it. I had less than 10 dollars on me, without access to more short of Cairo. (I had not gone to Nag Hammadi intending to buy anything.) And I did not know whether the double-barreled shotgun was loaded.

We returned the interpreter Hilmi Šahyüd to Nag Hammadi. He refused a tip, and when I reported this to the police, they replied that he was a gentleman. That evening, while I waited for my midnight train back to Cairo, he took me to his church (not the Orthodox Coptic Church) to hear a sermon from a preacher who had just arrived from Alexandria.

**My Second Visit to the Site of the Discovery**

After the Messina trip, I wrote Tune in May 1966 the following memorandum about my passing via Cairo to Messina and then again via Egypt to Jerusalem on my return from Messina:
At 4 PM Meinardus arrived, and we went to tea with the pastor of the German Lutheran Church of Cairo and his vicar—the latter having studied under me in Zürich in 1960. All three had picked me up at the airport. I mentioned to Meinardus my interest in visiting again Nag Hammadi on my return through Cairo, to talk again to the guard about the Codices. Meinardus himself could not go, because he had to preach on Sunday and was also concerned for his future relations in Egypt. I inquired if the young vicar might come in question, he sounded him out, and also mentioned it to the pastor (who had just been in Cairo a few weeks, so was less relevant than the vicar, who had been there two years and knew some Arabic). They took to the idea, so at tea I showed my slides, and we made plans. They were to pick me up at the airport on 22 April at 4:20 PM in the pastor’s car and drive directly overnight to Nag Hammadi, do what could be done there, and then drive back to Cairo in time for my 2:45 PM flight to Jerusalem Sunday on 24 April.

On my arrival in Cairo [from Messina] on 22 April, the pastor Johannes Unkrig met me in his car, together with Olaf Schumann, a German theology student studying missions by studying Arabic (and Coptic) at the Coptic Institute (next door to the Coptic Society). Unkrig explained that the vicar was sick with an inflamed appendix and so was unable to accompany me. I assume they had gotten cold feet. But Schumann was prepared to go, though by train, not having a car. He had gotten us tickets for 8 PM to Luxor that evening. …

At the train station we found that the train stopped at Abydos, and decided to get out there. It is supposed (Guide Bleu) to have taxis and a rest house. I thought it would attract less attention if we did not get out at Nag Hammadi, since I did not know how to find my previous taxi without going again to the police. We had Pullmann 2nd class, were awakened by the porter about 3:30, got out at 4:20 at Baliana = Abydos. A taxi was there. We asked to be taken to a place to get breakfast—Schumann had not provided picnic and water for the trip, as Unkrig had planned to do, but insisted one could find such things, over my protests to the contrary. Since he had to get our tickets changed from Luxor to Baliana at Cairo, we almost missed the train, and had no time to get supper, much less provide anything for the coming day. The taxi took us to what must have counted as a hotel, since, after knocking long enough to wake up the inhabitant, he took us to a room with beds. We explained we did not want to sleep but to eat. He had no food. So the chauffeur said he would get something from home, ran away and returned in ten minutes with two bowls of cookies, one too sweet to eat, the other providing our solids for some 36 hours that we were away from Cairo. Meanwhile the innkeeper ran down the street and returned with 2 glasses of hot tea, which we drank in spite of our reservations about hygiene. The innkeeper then sold us 6 Coca Colas for the day. (They were finished by 9 AM, by which time the temperature was probably 90 degrees.) At 5:30 AM we left Baliana by taxi with the chauffeur, accompanied by the car owner, the latter Muslim, the former Copt. The owner was much less cooperative throughout the day, especially when we requested to see Deir al-Malāk (in hopes of finding ‘Abūnā’ Dā‘ūd),
and he flatly refused, since we had already taken him places not listed in our original bargaining (eight £É for the day). At 6:40 AM I took the first picture of the site where Doresse says the Codices were found, but from a distance.

We went to al-Ṣayyād to find the guard. It was a holiday when everyone was streaming into town to the market with various produce to sell—a quite colorful scene. We stopped someone, gave the guard's name, and he went and brought him in ten minutes. He got in and we drove to the 6th dynasty tombs, which he showed us. The two men from Baliana stayed in the car. The guard opened the discussion by mentioning (with Schumann in Arabic) the fact that he and I had talked about buying books on my previous visit. Schumann had two occasions, without the other Egyptians being present, to talk with the guard about it. The outcome of these talks was to the effect that there were two (not three) big books (not fragments—apparently bound books with covers, i.e. about what the Nag Hammadi Codices are like), which the guard had not personally seen. They belonged to a man in al-Ṣayyād [Rāghib Andarāwus al-Qiss ‘Abd al-Sayyid] who had been out of town for three-fourths of a year to a year, though he expected him to return, since his house

and wife were still in town. The guard refused to go talk to the wife, to give us the man's name, or to show us which house. We gave him at his request a Cairo address (Meinardus), in case the man returned. We said that if he would write that the books were available, someone would come down to see about them. Schumann will probably be in Middle Egypt next autumn, and, if so, will try again to visit the guard.

I had a flash attachment, and so made color photos of the Greek Sarapis inscription in the main cave, and also of the Coptic Psalm inscriptions in the other cave. (Actually it is the highest in a group some 200 yards south of the more important ones, and there is a quite small cave a few meters south of this which Doresse called the most southern cave.) We returned the guard to al-Ṣayyād, then (about 9 AM) went to Nag Hammadi for gas, stopped at an outdoor café for soft drinks, where at the next table, playing dominos, a native inquired in English if I had not been in town before—he worked the night shift at the train station, had seen me then. We went next to Hiw (spelling on the map we borrowed from the German Archaeological Institute in Cairo, the same map I think that Mims had shown me at the Chicago House in Luxor previously), Hu (Pétrie), Heou (Doresse), pronounced Hιou, the modern name for Diospolis Parva (not to be confused with Diospolis Magna = Thebes near Luxor). Hiw is on the left bank, at the base of the U the Nile makes there, i.e. some 5 kilometers east of Nag Hammadi, just where there is an island in the Nile, and due south of where the manuscripts were buried. Since Diospolis Parva had its own cemeteries on the left bank, one cannot necessarily argue that Diospolis Parva would use the site from which

---

the manuscripts came as its burial grounds. Doresse makes this claim, but I do not know how to verify it. ...

We drove back to Abydos, stopped about 3 PM at the Rest House for a big meal, found they served only liquids, had a beer (cokes by now turned our stomachs). We then went through the main temple and adjoining tomb of Osiris there. We returned to the train station, left about 6 or 7 PM, sat up in a filthy first class compartment all night (actually, we put the cushions on the floor, after trying various other alternatives, and thus made something approaching a bed ...). At about 5:30 AM we reached Cairo, went to Schumann’s apartment for a shower and tea, arrived at 7:50 AM at Unkrig’s for breakfast.

Our taxi got us to Meinardus’ church just at the moment of his shaking hands with his parishioners at the church door. I told him briefly of our experience. He will get a fuller narration from Schumann. We hurried back to Unkrig’s for dinner and then to the airport. I left at 2:45 PM.

What these memoranda do not include were such dubious details as my searching unsuccessfully Rome’s Leonardo de Vinci Airport for anything, even just a trowel, that might be used to excavate cloth or even papyrus that might be seen on my return trip via Nag Hammadi. Nor do they mention the treasury of the Cairo German Lutheran Church that Schumann had with him in case a purchase became possible. We were very much amateurs. For the actual excavations almost a decade later, I saw to it that we had the leadership of distinguished field archaeologists.

2. The First Season of the Nag Hammadi Excavations, 17 November–19 December 1975

In the report that I turned in to my employer at the completion of the sabbatical semester (1 July 1974–31 January 1975), which had to do primarily with the work of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project team in the Coptic Museum in Cairo, there was also a summary of the planning that was underway for an archeological excavation of the site of the discovery:

In addition to the work at the Coptic Museum in Cairo, we made two field trips of four days each to Nag Hammadi. There we surveyed the caves in the cliff of the Jabal al-Ṭārif where the Codices are reported to have been discovered, collected sample potsherds, made extensive photographs, produced a map, collected local reports, and made advance plans for an archeological excavation. An excavation was planned and funded through the Smithsonian Institution seven years ago, but the Six Day War led to this part of Egypt being put off limits to foreigners before the excavation could take place. This limitation was lifted 1 November 1974, whereupon plans for the excavation were renewed.

Jean Doresse in his volume of 1958, \textit{Les livres secrets des gnostiques d’Égypte}, identified the site of the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices as the obviously pillaged flat desert land within a hundred meters of the Jabal al-Tārif at its southern end in a cemetery attested by cloth no later than the Greco-Roman period. The Jabal al-Tārif was previously well-known as the location of the Sixth Dynasty tombs usually referred to as the tombs of “al-Qaṣr wa-al-Ṣayyād (Khenboskion)”—so Porter and Moss\footnote{14}{B. Porter and R.L.B. Moss, \textit{Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings, V. Upper Egypt: Sites} (Oxford: Clarendon, 1937).}—some six kilometers away.

The primary purpose of the excavation is to locate and interpret the context of the site of the burial of the Codices; a secondary purpose is to excavate the Sixth Dynasty tombs. An auxiliary objective is to identify persons in the region involved in the discovery and the transmission of the Codices so as to write the history of the discovery. A further objective of the first season has been to explore the region for areas related to the Pachomian monastic movement with which the Codices are in some way associated, such as the basilica of St. Pachomius, in view of the possibility that the expedition may in subsequent seasons wish to expand.

I first visited the site on 3 March 1966, and in April 1966 proposed an excavation.\footnote{15}{Reported in \textit{Newsletter} 4 of the American Schools of Oriental Research for 1965–1966.} On 11 July 1969 Paul Lapp, eminent field archaeologist of the American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, and I applied successfully to the Smithsonian Institution through the American Research Center in Egypt for the funding of a three-year campaign to begin the following winter; on 17 July 1969 Gamal Mehrez, then Director General of Antiquities, wrote that “the license will be postponed for the time being,” and so plans were made for a year later. But Paul Lapp died 26 April 1970; Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, the Swedish representative on the International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices, agreed in 1972 to assume the role of Field Director. When this part of Egypt was reopened to tourism in November 1974, members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project visited the site together with Labib Habachi, Pahor Labib, and Victor Girgis on 19–21 November 1974,\footnote{16}{http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/633.} and returned on 11–13 January 1975; Säve-Söderbergh had visited the site briefly on 1 January 1975. We all
agreed that there was no evidence for the existence of a cemetery in the flat land in front of the talus to be seen on the surface or in the various pits and a ditch cut by the quarrying of gravel. We located many of the caves, climbed down a number of the shaft tombs, and made a preliminary map, all in preparation for an excavation.

A concession to excavate in the region bounded by Ḥamrah Dūm on the north, ‘Īzbat al-Būṣah on the south, the Jabal al-Ṭārif on the west and the dirt road bordering the cultivated fields on the east was granted on 3 June 1975 to the American Research Center in Egypt as concessionaire and James M. Robinson as its agent for the year beginning September 1975.

A proton-magnetometer and resistivity survey was conducted on 10–18 September 1975 by Philip C. Hammond, assisted by Justin Brydson and Francesca Xiaz, all of the University of Utah, accompanied by myself, to provide general orientation, to number the caves with black paint, and to track down the discoverer. The boulder at which Doresse stood when making the photographs labeled “site of the discovery” in the French and English editions of his book was chosen as the marked SW point of the base line. The survey began thirty meters east of this point, since the stony hillocks nearer the cliff were not suited to the instrumentation, and moved north. A strip 60 meters from west to east and 270 meters from south to north was marked off, of which area 12,600 square meters were surveyed. “Hot spots” indicating sub-surface disturbance were plotted on a preliminary map that had been prepared in January 1975 by Bentley Layton and Stephen Emmel. Hammond summarized the results of the survey as follows: “The survey produced negative evidence—i.e., no orderly patterning of detected sub-surface abnormalities emerged which would suggest the presence of a necropolis.”

Meanwhile the discoverer of the Codices had himself been discovered: Muhammad ʿAlī Khalīfah al-Sammān. After he had avenged the murder of his father by killing Aḥmad ʿĪsmāʿīl Ḥusayn al-Sayyid from Ḥamrah Dūm (which is only a few hundred meters from the Jabal al-Ṭārif) a month after the discovery, he had not visited the site of the discovery for thirty years for fear of his life. A clandestine drive past the cliff led by Dr. Hanny M. el-Zeiny, Director General of the Nag Hammadi Sugar Factories, resulted in the
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identification by Muhammad ‘Ali of the tomb of Thauty, as the cave just inside of which he had discovered the Codices in a sealed four-handled jar some 60 cm. high and 30 cm. wide, buried beside a corpse or mummy which he reburied where he found it. By this time I had numbered the caves in black paint 1–158, from south to north. The cave in question is T 73 (although many caves are not tombs, they are cited in the excavation’s records as T ...).

The excavation was oriented both to the sites that had been identified with the discovery, and to the Sixth Dynasty tombs and other burials. The areas excavated are here reported not in the chronological order of their excavation but from south to north through the concession.

‘Abd al-Majīd Muḥammad Badārī, ghafīr (Guard) for the Department of Antiquities at al-Qaṣr, identified in November 1974, as the place under which the jar with the Codices was found, a boulder at the southern end of the concession, 633 meters south of the south-west corner of the base line, well south of the quarry toward which the dirt causeway points. This was designated Area A. A trial trench was cut. The surface debris produced mixed sherds—Byzantine, Roman and Old Kingdom. Below this layer of gravel and stones, there was a sterile sand layer. No artifactual evidence emerged, nor does the sandy soil seem a likely location for a cemetery. When shown the trial trench on 11 December, ‘Abd al-Majīd conceded that this identification had been a mistake on his part—the site was further north. Just north of the entrance to the Wādi and in front of the white scar of the quarry, 425 meters north of his first identification, 212 meters south of the southwest corner of the base line, ‘Abd al-Majīd had located another boulder in March 1966 and September 1975 as that under which the jar had been discovered. Here the four trial trenches of Area B were cut with equally negative results. When confronted with these trial trenches, ‘Abd al-Majīd hesitated at confirming that it was the correct boulder, with the remark that he did not want to put us to unnecessary work. He was certain, however, on the basis of the contours of the cliff at this point, that it was the boulder or some of the others in the immediate vicinity, rather than the one in Area A, which was in his mind the place of the discovery.

Area C is the area of Hammond’s survey. In order to test the area inaccessible to that instrumentation, a trial trench was cut at the boulder from which Doresse photographed, the south-west point of the base line, designated Area C, square 1, again with negative results. Two locations identified by the survey as places of sub-surface disturbance were also probed, Area C, squares 2 and 3, again with negative results. The flat land in front of the talus was judged not to be a Greco-Roman cemetery.

On 3 December 1975 ‘Abd al-Naẓīr Yāsīn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm of Ḥamrah Dūm reported that he was with Muhammad ‘Alī at the time of the discovery (although Muḥammad ‘Alī later denied that anyone from Ḥamrah Dūm was with him at the time); as the site of the find he pointed out an area littered with boulders and thoroughly pitted, the continuation southward of the stone hillocks west of the boulder from which Doresse photographed. Apparently this was the site of the illicit Ḥamrah Dūm dig reported to have been conducted by Abū Hindāwī, Mayor of Ḥamrah Dūm until his death some three years ago. ‘Abd al-Naẓīr was not able to pinpoint the site exactly, but said it was in the area some 50 meters southeast of the fallen broken boulder visible in the picture captioned “site of the discovery” in the French edition of Doresse’s book, an area itself visible in that picture. A trial trench 7 by 2 meters and 100 meters south of the south-west point of the base line in front of the talus in this area, designated Area D, square 1, proved sterile. A second trial trench 6 by 3 meters, Area D, square 2, near the base of the talus, just southeast of Cave 1 and of the boulder in Doresse’s photograph, had a gravel layer before reaching bedrock at a depth of about one meter without indication of human disturbance. Just north, Area D, square 4, a further trial trench, 5 by 5 meters, was equally unproductive. Cave 1 was nearby, cut into the bottom of the talus, and was also excavated, Area D, square 3. It involved an extensively disturbed burial with many bones in the debris in front of the cave. The cave itself was small and undressed, with bones in the west and south alcoves. The few sherds found in the cave were Byzantine and perhaps New Kingdom.

Since the excavation of the floor of Cave 73 to bed rock (see below) had not provided any confirming evidence of Muḥammad ‘Alī’s identification of it as the site of the find, he was asked on 30 November to reconsider his identification. He conceded that he had given false information, and described the site of the discovery by leaning two sherds together to indicate an angular area not like a cave’s flat roof. On a clandestine visit on 11 December 1975 at dusk during Ramadan when the villagers would be feasting at home, he was let out of the car at the southern end of the area near the quarry; without hesitation he walked several hundred meters and identified the northern side of the fallen broken boulder visible in Doresse’s photo, where the boulder forms an overhanging slab of some 45 degrees, which he explained was what he had sought to explain with the sherds. On 14–16 December this and the adjoining meters, Area D, square 5,25 was cleared thoroughly without finding evidence of burial or reburial, or of sherds from the jar.

The excavation of places associated with the site of the discovery (Areas A–D, T 1 and T 73) included the sifting of the debris26 first with a 1 by 1 cm. mesh, then by the finer mesh of a window screen, in view of the reports by Muḥammad ‘Alī that he broke the jar near the site of the discovery and saw

flying into the air what must have been papyrus fragments; none were found. Nor were sherds found that could be readily associated with the jar in which the Codices were discovered. According to the memory of Rāghib Andarāwus al-Qiss ʿAbd al-Sayyid, a neighbor of Muhammad ʿAli who acquired Codex III, Muhammad ʿAli told him at the time that a staff lay beside the jar, a detail later denied by Muhammad ʿAli; in any case it was not found. BahijʿAli, another neighbor who had acquired Codices, had been told that there was a staff and a rug under a corpse, also not found. Thus the excavation produced no archaeological confirmation of the precise site of the discovery. However the many local reports agree on the identity of the discoverer and of the site of the find at the Jabal al-Ṭārif, specifically the same southern part of the foot of the cliff that had been pointed out to Doresse in 1950. Thus the collecting of such local reports, carried on throughout the first season and thereafter, tends to confirm that the Codices did in fact come from this part of the concession area. The large broken boulder on the talus, where burials were possible (as in the case of T 1), could not have been pointed out to the villagers by Muhammad ʿAli, since he was afraid to return to the Ḥamrah Dūm area; the boulders in the flat land nearby where they dug and identified sites could well be misunderstandings of oral descriptions he may have given. There are no indications that others with him at the time of the discovery identified the location to anyone—from their point of view it was not a location with any importance.

T 8,27 some 340 meters north of the south-west point of the base line, has on the east wall, south of the entrance to the main room, a Sahidic inscription in red paint dated by M. Manfredi to the Sixth Century AD.28 Since the photography used in the publication of the inscription in 1931, much of the inscription has been broken off; a number of the smaller fragments were found strewn around the room among the upper layer of debris. The inscription was transcribed in September 1975 and the transcription collated in December, so as to correct minor errors in the published text and to record which parts are no longer extant. The height of this inscription indicates that it was made when the surface of the floor was approximately as it was found, some two meters above bed rock. The excavation first removed a layer of stones that had peeled off the ceiling and the walls and then a layer of dirt.29 Here were found 41 Byzantine coins, in part located by means of a metal detector. They were provisionally identified by Frank J. Yurco of the University of Chicago Epigraphic Survey as follis pieces of the reign of Anastasius I, AD 491–518, probably from AD 503–508, and pieces of 12 nummia, introduced by Justinian, several of which seem to be from the reign of Heraclius, AD 610–641, indicating a use of the cave as late as the Seventh Century. Then there was a thick stratum,
some 75 cm. deep in part of the undulated stratigraphy, consisting of animal bones (camel, water buffalo, etc.), covered with a lime layer (in some places two layers). Below this there emerged a rather even and packed surface that appears to be an occupational level. The first season cleared the main room only down to this level. In the northeast part a fire pit occurs, just west of which, directly above the ash, the partial remains of a human skeleton were found without any significant artifacts. On the west side of the main room a long dromos leads to lower chambers; the shaft itself, but not the lower rooms, has been cleared. On the south side of the main room a smaller dromos appeared just below the bone and lime layer; it is almost filled with debris and has not been excavated. No explanation is yet forthcoming for the huge accumulation of bones in the cave, treated with the lime covering, prior to the occupation indicated by the coins and the Coptic inscription. The sherds mixed with the bones are late Roman. The Egyptian Antiquities Organization has been requested to supply a locked gate for T 8, so that it will remain intact for the completion of the excavation in a second season. But no such gate has been put in place.

Some 390–420 meters north of the Psalms cave (T 8) are found the Sixth Dynasty tombs of Idu (T 66), 30 720 and 750 meters north of the south-west point of the base line, in an area of the talus honeycombed with more simple shaft tombs and caves. Just a few meters south of T 66 is a cave, T 65, 31 with large crosses in red paint on the north and east walls. 32 T 66 contained Byzantine, Roman and Old Kingdom sherds. On the west side of the
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main room a dromos leads to a lower chamber; just before the dromos reaches that chamber, it has an opening into another chamber to the south. Though the shaft itself has been cleared of all but a large stone, the lower chambers are half filled with debris that has not been cleared. In the main room along the west wall south of the dromos there is a rectangular pit that was partially cleared to a depth of three meters; a sub-balk was left in the northern part of the pit. About 2.5 meters down in the pit there is an opening all along the west side, apparently an alcove or burial niche extending about a meter under the west wall. The contents of the pit have been disturbed, since the sherds are mixed, from Byzantine to Old Kingdom. The bottom of the pit has not yet been reached.

T 73, the tomb of Thauty, was cleared to bed rock in the three rooms of the main floor; the stones in the chambers at the bottom of the shaft in the west wall were not removed, but only piled toward the center of the chambers so that the hieroglyphs were fully visible on the walls. The hieroglyphs on the upper level have been published by Lepsius, though it was possible to improve and complete the transcriptions; those in the chamber at the foot of the shaft were previously unpublished. They were transcribed for the first time in December. Small broken pieces of hieroglyphs were found on the floor of the upper rooms of T 66 and T 73.

T 104 is a small tomb with the remains of an unpublished hieroglyphic inscription on the lintel just above the entrance; it had been discovered in September 1975. It is a small tomb without dressed or decorated walls, containing skeletal remains and potsherds. It was fully excavated.

Just west of T 104, one-fourth the way between it and T 125, higher up on the talus, an unpublished fallen slab with part of a hieroglyphic inscription was found, designated T 104A. Just between it and T 125 a small stele still in situ was located and, though apparently not a cave opening, was designated T 84.

Just north of this location lies T 117, from which samples of cloth had been removed in November 1974 and September 1975; through the good offices of Jiri Frel, Curator of Antiquities, and Sue Waller, Assistant Conservator, of the J. Paul Getty Museum of Los Angeles, they were tentatively dated by carbon 14 on 14 November 1975 to the Fifth Century AD. The disturbed condition of this small cave prevented adequate interpretation. The excavation produced, in addition to skeletal remains and Old Kingdom, Roman and Byzantine potsherds, many small painted fragments, some on wood, some on a fresco base. On 3 August 1976 Sue Waller analyzed the colors; all are mixed in egg tempera, using chalk for white, carbon for black, azurite for blue, orpiment for yellow, oxide for red, and chrysocolla for blue green.
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North of a *ghor* that occurs just north of T 117 and 900 meters north of the south-west point of the base line are further shaft tombs in line with each other along a ledge. T 152 has hieroglyphs on the lintel that have been cited in earlier publications, although on the left a small unpublished area was detected. A small remnant of unpublished hieroglyphs was also found on the lintel above the entrance of T 154.

A cave near T 73 was mentioned by Lepsius as containing hieroglyphs, but was not found by P. Montet. Apparently it was covered by landslides. The position of such a hidden cave with hieroglyphs was pointed out by local persons, but this report could not be tested by excavation during the first season.

All the hieroglyphs were transcribed by Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, assisted at times by Labib Habachi, at times by C. Wilfred Griggs.

With the help of a theodolite, Hans-Åke Nordstrom and Stephen Emmel prepared a more exact map of the concession area.

The members of the expedition were James M. Robinson, Principal American Investigator, Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, Field Director, Bastiaan van Elderen, acting Field Director after the departure on 4 December of the Field Director, Hans-Åke Nordstrom and Stephen Emmel, Cartographers, Douglas Kuylenstierna, Photographer, S. Kent Brown, C. Wilfred Griggs, Brita Säve-Söderbergh and Charles and Peggy Hedrick, Area Supervisors. The expedition enjoyed the hospitality of Dr. Hanny M. el-Zeiny, Director General of the Nag Hammadi Sugar Factories, in whose Guest House “Reception One” we were very comfortably accommodated. His counsel, together with that of Dr. Labib Habachi, immeasurably improved the expedition’s work. Mahmoud ‘Ali of Nag Hammadi, Inspector for Islamic and Coptic Antiquities for the Qinā region, represented very helpfully the Egyptian Antiquities Organization. Shargawi Mahmoud Ahmad of Ḥamrah Dūm and Ahmad Muḥammad (Jod) of ‘Izbat al-Būṣah were the *ghafīr* (Guards) for antiquities. The *reis* (Head) Muhammad Hassan Aweis with two workers from al-Lahun and the *reis* Hag Hussein el-Sawway and seven workers from Quṭ were the staff of skilled workers, assisted by up to sixteen local workers.
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42 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/1049.
The expedition was funded through the ARCE Nag Hammadi Codices Editing Project's Smithsonian Institution supplemental grant for 1975–1976, together with the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity of Claremont Graduate School and the Institute for Ancient Studies of Brigham Young University.

3. The Sixth Dynasty Burial Caves at the Jabal al-Ṭārif

Jean Doresse’s association of the site of the burial of the Nag Hammadi Codices with the Sixth Dynasty caves has meant that they of necessity were included in the excavation.

The central member of our archeological team was the distinguished Coptic archaeologist, Labib Habachi. He not only organized the local workmen on the dig, but also participated with us in the actual supervision of the excavation. Hence he contributed an essay on the Sixth Dynasty caves to the issue of the Biblical Archeologist devoted to the Nag Hammadi Codices:

There are pharaonic reliefs and inscriptions still extant—though damaged—on the façade or walls of at least five caves at the Jabal al-Ṭārif, as well as on a stone slab found lying exposed on the talus. The tombs have been published over the past century, most recently by Pierre Montet ..., whose transcriptions were collated during the first season of the Nag Hammadi excavation by Torgny Säve-Söderbergh. In the case of the largest of these, the tomb of Thauty (T 73), only the three chapel rooms at the level of the entrance had been published, whereas the dromos at the back of the main room leads down to sarcophagus rooms at a lower level that also turn out to be inscribed in part. Over the three seasons of the excavation a layer of debris about a meter deep at this lower level has been removed (with the exception of a few very large stones) so as not to impede the transcription and photography of the walls.

The final publication of the pharaonic texts of the Jabal al-Ṭārif has been entrusted to Säve-Söderbergh, but by way of preliminary report we wish to draw attention here to some new and interesting details.

The reliefs on the walls of the lower chambers of the tomb of Thauty depict various offerings and precious objects accompanied by prayers addressed to Osiris or Anubis, the gods of the dead, for the welfare of the owner of the tomb. His name is always preceded by titles, sometimes complete, which correspond to those in the upper chambers ... . Thauty is described as the

governor of the nome, with all the titles borne by officials holding such a position, such as ruler of the mansion, the overseer of Upper Egypt. On the other hand, he seems to have been considered more distinguished than the usual nomarch, for such tombs usually have reliefs of inferior quality, unless the nomarch was closely related to the royal family, as in the case of the tombs of Dayr al-Gabrawi, to which that of Thauty compares favorably. Furthermore, the lower rooms are more lavishly and extensively decorated than the tombs of quite important personalities of Saqqāra, such as the vizier Mereruka. Although the scenes in the latter are in a better state of preservation, more precious objects and materials are portrayed in the tomb of Thauty ...

The examination of the Sixth Dynasty reliefs was the primary responsibility of Torgny Säve-Söderbergh. He returned repeatedly to the Sixth Dynasty burials, so as to complete his transcriptions after the Nag Hammadi excavations were formally completed. He then published a detailed and definitive analysis of what remains from the Sixth Dynasty. His “Abstract,” published on the page facing the table of contents, is as follows:

The cemetery at Ḥamrah Dūm, as a rule called al-Qaṣr wa al-Ṣayyād after two villages in the neighbourhood, is one of the “classical” provincial cemeteries from the 6th Egyptian Dynasty. The majority of the hieroglyphic texts has been made accessible to scholars by P. Montet and E. Edel, but the older copies are not always correct, nor have the reliefs of the tombs, with few exceptions, been published. The present publication is based on a documentation made by the author in 1975 and later in connection with an exploration of the area by an expedition, funded by the Smithsonian Institute, the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity at Claremont (California), and the Institute for Ancient Studies of Brigham Young University (Utah), with the primary aim to obtain full information on the archaeology of the area where the famous Gnostic library was found by peasants in 1945.

The reliefs of the Old Kingdom tombs are rendered in line drawings by the author, based on photographs and collated in the tombs. A number of selected photographs is included to show the style. Older copies made some 150 years ago, when the tombs were in a better condition, have also been consulted and supplement the records, especially concerning the now lost tomb of Nefertai, a lady belonging to the same family as the two nomarchs, Thauty and Idu, the owners of the other more important tombs [T 73 and T 66].

The subterranean chambers of the tomb of the nomarch Thauty [T 73] had never been cleared before and their texts and reliefs were unknown. They have close parallels in the contemporaneous burial chambers in the necropolis at Saqqāra but are of a type not known elsewhere in the Upper Egyptian province.
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51 Torgny Säve-Söderbergh, The Old Kingdom Cemetery at Hamra Dom (El-Qaṣr wa es-Saiyad) (Stockholm: The Royal Academy of Letters, History, and Antiquities, 1994).
The texts and the scenes are fully analyzed and a number of important problems concerning both provincial administration, art and religion are treated. The records yield valuable information on the family of the nomarchs of the seventh Upper Egyptian nome, on the reign of king Pepi II, and throw light on the administration of the province. But their titles and the style of their tombs show close interrelations with the Memphite capital and with the artists of its tombs in the famous necropolis at Saqqâra.

Some interesting finds made during the clearance of the tombs are also published in the volume.

It became clear early on that the Nag Hammadi Codices were not buried in one of the Sixth Dynasty caves. Yet the presence of inscriptions in red paint from the early centuries of the common era indicate the presence here both of non-Christian religions and of Christians making use of the caves.

The Greek inscription to Zeus Sarapis in T 75 indicates the presence of Greek-speaking devotees, perhaps from the Roman army stationed nearby.\(^{52}\)

It is especially T 8\(^{53}\) that is of significance, due to a Christian inscription in the same crude red paint. The large well-cut room\(^ {54}\) at the opening of the tomb originally was decorated with Sixth Dynasty high reliefs. But they had all been cut off in early Christian times to make way for a red-paint inscription of the opening lines of Psalms 51–93.\(^ {55}\) The floor was cluttered, in part with the chiseled remains of the Sixth Dynasty high reliefs. The littered floor was cleared and the contents sifted for valuable items.\(^ {56}\) Only coins of the period was found, published by James Goehring.\(^ {57}\) This may indicate
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that T 8 was over a period of time a center of Christian worship, a chapel, but whether it was actually used by the Gnostic community that buried its Codices a few hundred meters away remains indeterminate.

After Torgny Säve-Söderbergh had to leave before the end of the first season of the excavation, and during the second season when Säve-Söderbergh could not participate, Bastiaan van Elderen functioned as acting Field Director.

4. The Second Season of the Nag Hammadi Excavations, 22 November–29 December 1976

Jean Doresse’s interest in associating the site of the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices with the nearby Pachomian monasteries has produced quite a debate. Clemens Scholten argued that the Codices were Pachomian, whereas Alexandr Khosroyev has subsequently argued that they were not. Therefore the inclusion of the basilica of St. Pachomius in the Nag Hammadi excavations is understandable, though inconclusive regarding the Nag Hammadi Codices.

We had the good fortune to be able to enlist Peter Grossmann, the distinguished expert on Coptic church architecture, to lead the excavation of the ruins of the basilica of St. Pachomius in the headquarters monastery of the Pachomian federation, Pbow or Pabau, today Fāw Qibli. He first contributed to the issue of Biblical Archeologist devoted to Nag Hammadi, and has continued both to excavate at the basilica and to publish his results. The report on the second season of the Nag Hammadi excavation held in 1976 is primarily a report on the excavation of the basilica of St. Pachomius that he led. The report on that second season is presented here in slightly edited and abridged form, also omitting the drawings and photographs:
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61 James M. Robinson and Bastiaan van Elderen, “The Second Season of the Nag Hammadi Excavation, 22 November–29 December 1976,” American Research Center in Egypt Newsletter
From mid-November to the end of 1976 a second season of archaeological work in the vicinity of Nag Hammadi was conducted. ... The work of the 1976 season concentrated primarily on the excavation of the ruins of the monastery-basilica complex of St. Pachomius, located in the modern village of Fāw Qiblī, 9 km. east of the Jabal al-Ṭārif or 18 km. northeast of Nag Hammadi (as the crow flies), on the north side (right bank) of the Nile River. Secondary objectives were the continuation from the previous season of the clearing of tombs in the Jabal al-Ṭārif, a survey of al-Qaṣr (Chenoboskeia), and a survey of the Wādis north of these locations where some of the Bodmer papyri seem to have been discovered.

The staff of the 1976 season consisted of Dr. James M. Robinson, principal American investigator; Dr. Bastiaan van Elderen, acting Field Director; Dr. Peter Grossmann of the German Archaeological Institute in Cairo, architect (with Mark Lehner and Stephen Emmel as assistants); Douglas Kuylenstierna, photographer. The following served as square supervisors: R. Scott Birdsell, S. Kent Brown, Michael B. Fiske, Hugh E. Haggard, Charles W. Hedrick, and Marvin W. Meyer. The expedition again enjoyed the full cooperation of Prof. Gamal Mokhtar, President of the Egyptian Antiquities Organization, and of Paul Walker, Director of the American Research Center in Egypt. Dr. Hanny M. al-Zeiny, Director General of the Nag Hammadi Sugar Factories and Distillery, was again most helpful and hospitable in providing housing facilities, contacts, advice, and assistance in the organization and completion of the season’s work. MahmoudʿAlī of Nag Hammadi, Inspector for Islamic and Coptic Antiquities of the Qinā region, again represented very helpfully the Egyptian Antiquities Organization; for part of the season he was assisted by Inspector Ḥusayn of Qinā. Finally, a word of especial appreciation is due to Dr. Labib Habachi, the dean of Egyptian archaeologists, whose counsel and support have been invaluable in the mounting of this excavation, though his responsibilities in connection with the International Congress on The Future of Coptic Studies kept him in Cairo. Although Prof. Torgny Säve-Söderbergh likewise could not participate in the field work this season, he greatly assisted in the planning and execution of the project while in Cairo.

Dr. Grossmann’s unpublished Field Report has provided valuable data for this preliminary report. As architect and consultant for this project, he brings a wealth of experience and expertise in early Christian architecture in Egypt for the interpretation and integration of the architectural remains uncovered. Indebtedness to him permeates this report—far more than the instances where he is overtly cited. Furthermore, through his excellent instruction and kind guidance, he is training his assistants on the staff.


THE PACHOMIAN MONASTERY-BASILICA COMPLEX: BACKGROUND

The village of Fāw Qiblī is where the ruins of the basilica of St. Pachomius are located. The name of Pachomius (ca. AD 292–346) is directly associated with the formation and development of monasticism in Upper Egypt. While serving in the military forces, Pachomius came in contact with some Christians whose example attracted him to Christianity. First, he became a disciple of a famous hermit called Palamon at Chenoboskeia. Shortly thereafter (ca. AD 320) Pachomius organized his own monastic community at Tabennesi, whose rules and code of disciple became a model for many other communities. A picture of the life and disciple of these communities can be found in the Life of Pachomius readily accessible in the Vita Prima Graeca translated by Apostolos A. Athanassakis and published with the text edited by F. Halkin in the Texts and Translations: Early Christian Literature Series, edited for the Society of Biblical Literature by Birger A. Pearson (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), which some suggest provides a glimpse in the probable Sitz im Leben of the Gnostic papyri. See John Barns, “Greek and Coptic Papyri from the Covers of the Nag Hammadi Codices: A Preliminary Report,” Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts: In Honour of Pahor Labib (NHS 6; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 9–18.

A Coptic legendary text extant in Arabic translation published with a French translation by Arnold van Lantschoot, Muséon 47 (1934): 13–56 reports that Pachomius built a church at Pbow with other installations for the monastic community. During Pachomius’ later years, the monastery at Pbow became the chief center for all the monasteries in the area. Frequently in the Life of Pachomius it is referred to as ἡ μεγάλη μονὴ Παβοῦ (Sec. 78). It is in this monastery that Pachomius spent the closing years of his life. The management of all the monasteries was located here with the appointment of Theodore as εἰκόνομος at Tabennesi, who had the responsibility of inspecting all the monasteries and reporting to Pachomius at Pbow. This brief survey demonstrates the important rôle of the Pbow monastery during and after the lifetime of Pachomius.

[Grossmann has explained: Pachomius built his first little church when his community at Tabennesi grew to more than a hundred monks. When he began a second monastery at Pbow, he began immediately to build a church.]

The destruction of the basilica has been attributed to Khalif al-Ḥakim in the eleventh century, and ruins were observed by Abū Salih about 1208 AD (see Evett’s Oxford edition of 1895, The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt and Some Neighbouring Countries Attributed to Abu Salih the Armenian). In the early years of the 20th century certain modern travelers visited the ruins. One may consult early reports by Michel Jullien, “À la recherche de Tabenne et des autres monastères fondés par Saint Pachôme,” Études 89 (1901): 238–258, with a photograph of the ruins in Les missions catholiques 35 (1903): 283, and Louis Massignon, “Seconde note sur l’état d’avancement des études archéologiques arabes en Égypte,” BIFAO 9 (1911): 89–90 and plates I and II. But the point of departure for research today, since based on a thorough study of the Pachomian literature as well as a survey of the region, is by L.Th. Lefort,

The first archaeological soundings at the site were undertaken in January 1968 by Fernand Debono. See his report, “La basilique et le monastère de St. Pachôme: Fouilles de l’Institut pontifical d’archéologie chrétienne, à Faou-el-Qibli, Haute-Égypte—Janvier 1968,” *BIFAO* 70 (1971): 191–220, with three drawings and plates 45–59. His excavations were located west of the basilica proper in the domestic installations of the monastery. Among his discoveries relating to this area was an aqueduct system bringing water into the complex. In his report Debono discusses (pp. 201–202) a pharaonic inscription upon a stone which Serge Sauneron thought came from Diospolis Parva (Hiw), whose deity is mentioned, although such a reference could be made on a structure anywhere within the area under the supervision of Diospolis Parva, e. g., Pbow; in any case it has been re-used as a pillar base. Debono suggests that the re-use of the stone must post-date 381, the date when Emperor Theodosius officially abolished paganism. This would be a *terminus post quem* for the major basilica whose ruins are seen today. The text was transcribed and translated by Frank Yurco and William Murname, Jr., on a brief visit to the ongoing excavation from the Oriental Institute’s Chicago House at Luxor: “Beloved of the great God [who lives by righteousness] Lord [of] Hutsekhem, given life like Re forever.”

[Grossmann has explained: The consecration of the large church in Pbow by Timotheos II (AD 457–460) can be precisely fixed on 7 November 457.]

Today in an open area of about 6,000 square meters between the village of Faw Qibli and the cultivated land, the ruins of a large colonnaded building are evident. No wall structures are visible, but about 90 column sections are lying on the surface or partially buried in the debris. In addition, numerous pillar bases (some *in situ*), pediments, foundation stones, and some capitals can be seen. From the general position and accumulation of these ruins, the basic orientation of a large basilica can be ascertained. A massive ridge of column fragments and building debris running from east to west appears to be the location of the row(s) of columns surrounding the north aisle(s). A corresponding ridge, but less pronounced, suggests the location of the south aisle(s) of the basilica. The depression between these ridges, which is devoid of architectural remains *in situ* on the surface, seems to be the nave of the church. This suggested orientation is also indicated by remains of a return aisle on the west ends of the ridges of debris, noted above.

---

THE PACHOMIAN MONASTERY-BASILICA COMPLEX: THE 1976 EXCAVATIONS

The first operation at the site was the removal of the surface debris, consisting of sugar cane stalks, loose soil, and manure. Some additional architectural members were uncovered, such as traces of pillar bases and foundation blocks.

The architectural team first established a north-south axis and an east-west axis and prepared a ten-meter grid of the area on which all the surface architectural remains were plotted. This same grid plan was used for the positioning of the excavation squares. The basic procedure followed was the stratigraphic method of excavating, as developed and perfected by archaeological expeditions associated with the American Schools of Oriental Research. This technique focuses upon the separation and identification of strata exposed in the excavation of a square, with the preservation, as long as possible and feasible, of balks between the squares. In this way, the occupational history of a site can be adequately and accurately recovered without necessarily clearing the entire site.

With the use of one-meter wide balks, it was possible to employ the surveyor’s grid as the excavating grid—making possible the formation of 9 m. × 9 m. squares (generally too large), 9 m. × 4 m. “squares,” or 4 m. × 4 m. squares. The actual size of the squares was generally determined by such factors as time, manpower, architectural remains, and objectives.

Since the 1976 season was restricted by limited funds and time, it concentrated on two objectives: (1) to ascertain the dimensions of the basilica; and (2) to ascertain the stratigraphy of the site. Squares were positioned in the area in alignment with the major axes in order to achieve these objectives. The east balks of Squares 4, 5, and 6 and the west balk of Square 1 provided a north-south cross-section through most of the nave and the aisles to the north and south. This represents the stratigraphic contours of the middle of the basilica to the depth excavated. About two meters down one reached the water-table, which in the area fluctuates according to the time of irrigation in the fields nearby. Deeper penetration of the site will require pumping or draining of this water seeping into the squares, unless it is carried out in the month when the irrigation canals are closed (January). Squares 2, 3, and 7 were positioned in order to locate the west and east limits of the basilica.

A feature about the excavation site that became evident with the removal of the surface debris and top soil was the annual inundation of the area for almost two months by the flooding of the Nile until 1968, when the Aswan High Dam began to function. The two steps usually leading up to the thresholds of doors were explained as having been required by the recent level of the inundations, while a darkening of the bricks on facades up to a height of

---

64 http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/nha/id/461.
one or two meters was explained as caused by the dampening of the bricks to this height by osmosis during the inundation. Depressions in the ruins, such as suggested above regarding the nave, naturally became settling basins for the mud and silt as the water receded. As a consequence, a deep layer of mud has accumulated, estimated by some to have taken place at the rate of 2.5 mm. per year.

SQUARE 1

Square 1 (4 m. × 9 m.) was placed across the approximate middle of the nave of the basilica where there is a minimum of exposed architecture, thus facilitating a deep penetration to ascertain the stratification. The upper layer in the square, approximately one meter deep, was mud and silt deposited by the flooding Nile. A destruction level was found below this mud layer, with some sherds dating in the eleventh to twelfth century. This represents the final destruction of the basilica, since the lower end of a column section lying at an angle in the south part of the square rested on this layer, whereas the rest was leaning on the debris of a collapsed wall and superstructure. This would agree with the report of the destruction of the basilica under Khalif Hakim.

Between this destruction level and the water table two buildings apparently antedating the basilica were identified. The upper one was represented by two parallel east-west walls (constructed of fired bricks), with a possible third one partially visible in the north balk. Portions of a north-south wall were also uncovered. This structure predates the basilica, since its features do not integrate with its architectural plan. Preliminary dating of the pottery in context with these walls suggests a fourth century AD date. Below these features, at the water table, a layer of fine brick dust was found in portions of the square. This appears to be the remains of partially-robbed and partially-disintegrated walls of a second structure. Further probing and recovery of contextual potsherds were not possible because of the water seeping into the square at this level. Just above the water level a beautifully-decorated stone block was found which apparently was part of the superstructure of this lower building.

Square 1 thus revealed evidence of two buildings pre-dating the basilica proper. The actual floor level of the basilica seems to have been either destroyed or robbed out, as traces of it in other excavated squares indicate.

SQUARE 2

Square 2 (4 m. × 9 m.) was located just to the west of the identifiable remains of the basilica. Debono’s excavation of the domestic complex of the monastery was about 15 meters west of Square 2. As in Square 1, a mud layer covered the upper one meter of Square 2. In this layer were found traces of some late burials. A segment of a water channel was found, which is part of the aqueduct

---

system Debono identified. As in Square 1, two building phases anteceding the basilica were identified—the upper one by walls of fired brick and the lower one by a layer of brick dust.

Along the east balk of Square 2, remains of a massive (1.50 m. wide) north-south wall of large ashlars built on a brick foundation were identified (the eastern face of this wall was found along the west balk of Square 3 directly east of Square 1). This founding level was parallel to the north-south colonnade of the return aisle of the basilica. This wall, though it has suffered extensive robbing, appears to be the foundation of the major western wall of the basilica.

SQUARE 3

Square 3 (4 m. × 4. m.) was placed east of Square 2 with its east balk along the stylobate of the return aisle of the basilica. The foundation of one square stone block of this stylobate on which the pillar base must have stood was exposed—a layer of fired brick on edge over a fill of small stones in the foundation trench. In the bottom of the foundation trench a heavy concentration of late fourth and early fifth century sherds was found. Traces of brick walls and installations were uncovered which predate the stylobate along the east balk. Dr. Grossmann suggests that a north-south wall in the western part of the square may be “the stylobate of an earlier colonnade, since two regular blocks of limestone were placed carefully between the masonry of the bricks at a distance very suitable for the placing of columns.” He also identifies other brick installations in Square 3 as burial cases (which were found empty).

SQUARE 4

Square 4 (4 m. × 4 m.) was positioned to expose a portion of the stylobate (three bases of which were visible) along the south side of the basilica. Below a thin layer of surface soil was an undulating layer of building debris (from the collapse of the superstructure) crowning over the stylobate and adjoining walls. Traces of the basilica floor could be identified in parts of the square. This consisted of some limestone slabs in situ and the leveling layer of sand below. Below the floor and on both sides of the stylobate four burials were found. The best preserved skeleton had metal bracelets on the arm bones. It appears that this stylobate and its row of columns separated the two side aisles on the south side of the basilica.

SQUARES 5 AND 6

Square 5 (4 m. × 4 m.) was located just to the north and west of Square 1, and cut across the ridge of building debris along the north side of the nave of the basilica. Square 6 (4 m. × 4 m.) was placed north of square 5 in order to have a 4 m. × 9 m. probe through the ridge.

Evidences of the basilica were identified in these squares. A few limestone slabs of the floor were found and large portions of the leveling layer of sand identified in various parts of the squares. A thick layer of black mud below these remains appears to be an earlier floor of the basilica. As in Square 4, skeletal remains were found below these surfaces. Regarding the remains of the stylobates of the basilica, Dr. Grossmann observes:

In Sqs. 5–6 the first and second stylobate were robbed down to the lower packing of rough stones that remained. This was clearly indicated by the fill of robber trenches that appeared in the balks on line with the stylobate. Between the two robber trenches, two floor levels of the basilica were preserved, the first [lower] being a thick layer of black mud while the second was of limestone slabs placed on a bed of sand (not to be confused with an even lower mud floor from an earlier building plan ...). Because of the difference between the elevations of these floors and the surface of the stylobate in Sq. 4, one has to assume that the stylobate was about 40 cm. exposed over the lower level floor and correspondingly about 30 cm. over the limestone floor. Some small rectangular depressions at the side of the stylobate seem to have served as steps for passing over it.

Below these remains of the basilica two parallel east-west walls of fired brick were uncovered. Concerning these walls, which he identifies as perhaps part of an earlier church, Dr. Grossmann writes:

The northernmost of these two walls, which is probably the outer wall of the building, has a foundation of mud bricks with a facing of fired bricks on the north side which extends down several courses. Thus, ... the floor inside the building was elevated above the outside ground level. It is possible that the [inside] was built on an original higher level and/or raised due to fill during the time of construction. ... The inner, southernmost wall ... did not have as deep a bedding of mud brick. It is not to be excluded that this inner wall once served as the stylobate of the earlier church. During the erection of the large basilica, ... these ... walls were pulled down to the level of the earlier floor [from an earlier building plan].

The foundation trenches for these walls cut through the contents of an earlier structure—a room filled with large storage jars. The upper portions of the jars were sheared off apparently to accommodate the new building. The south wall of this magazine was a deeply founded wall in Square 5.

SQUARE 7

Square 7 (2 m. x 9 m.) was placed 33 m. east and just north of Square 1 in an attempt to intersect the eastern limits of the basilica. An exposed stone block suggested traces of a north-south wall. Although this block proved not to be in situ and thus not part of a wall, it was a beautifully decorated stone and part of an interior sculptured wall. Directly under the stone, traces of the surface were found onto which it had fallen—limestone slabs on a sand bed, i.e. the basilica floor. The potsherds found in context with these remains date them in the late 4th and early 5th centuries, as in other squares. At the
termination of the season's work other architectural remains were appearing, but were insufficiently exposed to identify or integrate with evidence from other squares.

SUMMARY

The first season of work at Fāw Qibli did not ascertain the size of the large basilica. The western limit was identified, but the south and east walls have not been located (in fact, there is fear that the modern village may have encroached upon the southern and eastern sides of the basilica). Dr. Grossmann thinks that possibly the position of the north wall may be indicated by the "standing-block of the outside portico on the north which remains in situ [between squares 2 and 6 in line with their north balk] and gives a certain limit to the extension of the basilica." He concludes that the basilica was a five-aisle church—"the position of all four inner colonnades, as well as the western colonnade which separates the return aisle from the rest of the nave, could be conclusively established."

The results of the 1976 season indicate that the basilica at Fāw Qibli was large, although its maximum dimensions were not determined. It was possibly 35 to 40 meters wide and at least 75 meters long. If this projected length is correct, the major part of the apse may be under the modern building to the east of the excavation site. In addition to this large basilica, the earliest structure identified (appearing at the water level) also seems to have been a sizeable and important building. Concerning it, Dr. Grossmann writes: "Judging by the thickness of the walls, [this earliest structure] must have been an important building and it is not to be excluded that the tall, well-carved columns which were used in the large basilica were originally used in this earlier building." This judgment is also confirmed by the beautifully decorated stone found in this stratum in Square 1.

ANCILLARY PROJECTS OF THE 1976 SEASON

During the last ten days of the 1976 season, work resumed at one of the tombs in the Jabal al-Ṭārif, partially cleared in 1975. This was the Sixth Dynasty tomb of Thauty (T 73). In 1975 lower chambers of the tomb were discovered. The walls of the central chamber at the lower level were covered with hieroglyphic inscriptions, now being prepared for publication by Prof. Torgny Säve-Söderbergh. The work in 1976 focused on the removal of about one-fourth of the debris (over 1.25 m. deep) in this chamber. The potsherds were mixed (Old Kingdom to Byzantine). Numerous fragments of hieroglyphs (broken off the walls) were found in the debris. Salt crystals protruding through the face of the walls are seriously damaging the hieroglyphs. A sizeable fragment of a statuette of a Sixth Dynasty Egyptian couple was also recovered (the head and the bust of the male). Work will be continued in this tomb in a future season in order to make possible the photographing and conserving of the inscriptions.

This season's program involved a survey of al-Qaṣr (Chenoboskeia). This is the site where Pachomius was converted to Christianity and lived with his
spiritual father Palamon in an anchorite cave. (“Pachomius came directly to the Upper Thebaid and visited the church of a little town called Chenoboskeia. There he became a catechumen and was baptized. ... After it was explained to him that there was an anchorite named Palamon, he went to him to become his fellow-anchorite.” Life of Pachomius, para. 5–6.) After founding a first monastery at Tabennesi (whose location Lefort was not able to identify) and a second at Pbow, an independent monastery at Chenoboskeia joined the movement as the third Pachomian monastery. (“After a time an aged ascetic named Eponychus, father of another monastery of older brothers, came to Pachomius and asked him to accept his monastery into the community of brothers. The name of the monastery was Chenoboskeia.” Life of Pachomius, para. 54.)

The survey of al-Qaṣr was carried out with the assistance of Dr. Hanny M. al-Zeiny and the mayor of al-Qaṣr on the one hand and the priest of the Monastery of St. Sufein and St. Palamon on the other. Near the center of the village there is a well in the middle of the main street that is lined several meters down by ashlars that suggest an archaeological site; a tunnel leads off from the bottom of the well that is rumored to lead to the monastery on the edge of town. Just beside the well is a walled-in field belonging to the mayor in which he keeps his cattle. In it are a few stone artifacts of the Roman or Byzantine period. It is said to be the site of a former mosque; the Copts maintain that there are ruins of a church beneath those of the mosque. The village made plans a decade ago to build a new mosque here, but lack of funding made it impossible to construct the mosque. Just outside the wall (on another side from the well) is an Islamic shrine to a holy man (called a Sheikh or Wali) whose name the Copts interpret as a form of the name of a Coptic saint. This small structure is on a sharp elevation reached by stairs; a couple of meters of ground outside the structure on each side is also at this higher level. The mayor reports that until a generation ago this was a more gradual hillock, but that the flanks were cut away so that the main road would not have to go up and down; only the shrine was left at the original height. Thus it may be the remains of a tell (see Lefort, “Les premiers monastères pachômiens,” p. 383). After the excavation of the empty walled field, the shrine is to be moved into it and the area under the shrine later excavated.

Photographs and drawings were made of a number of stones from columns, mills, statues, and the like; villagers report that in the past boats with foreigners would carry off quantities of ancient stones. A coin of Vespasian (AE 35) found in the village was seen. The most important surface evidence of a town of the Roman period was a Greek inscription reused as the threshold of a modern doorway. The overall length of the stone is 1.39 m. and the preserved width is 43 cm. The door jambs are placed on the ends of the stone and cover about 12–14 cm. on each end. The inscription contains two lines, of which the central portions (about 50 cm.) have been obliterated by continuous use of the threshold. However, the beginnings and endings of each line, except where covered by the door jambs, can be read:
ΠΕΡΑΥΤΟΚΡ ΤΡΑΙΑΝ
ΔΡΙΑΝΟ ΤΥΧΗϹ

The restoration of the text proposed by van Elderen reads as follows:

ὑπὲρ Αὑτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τραιανοῦ Ἀδριάνου Σεβαστοῦ ἀγαθῆς τύχης

In behalf of the good fortune of Emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus

This inscription dates from the early second century and is evidence of the Roman occupation of the area.

The second survey area of this season was that of the wādis in the face of the cliffs of the right bank to the north of the Nile valley, from ‘Izbat al-Būṣah on the west, at the Jabal al-Ṭārif, to Dishnā on the east. In one of these wādis [Wādi Sheikh ‘Alī 67] an area was located in September 1975 where the face of the cliff on the left side of the wādi as one hikes up it had been eroded out at the level of the wādi floor, thus producing a shaded overhang, 68 where Coptic prayers, names, and drawings in red paint (similar to the Psalms inscription in T 8 at the Jabal al-Ṭārif) indicated some monastic use in about the sixth century. The person who was instrumental in locating this site also reported a manuscript discovery in the mid-1950’s, and referred to an antiquities dealer from Dishnā in Alexandria who had acquired some of the find. Through the son of this (deceased) dealer photographs were obtained of written material the father had sold. The photographs could be identified as Bodmer Papyrus XXIV (Psalms, LXX) and a Bodmer unpublished Sahidic Song of Songs.

The editiones principes of the Bodmer papyri leave the provenance undetermined (often given as somewhere between Luxor and Sohag), and also are imprecise as to whether the plurality of lots have to do with separate manuscript discoveries or simply different dealers having parts of the same discovery. (With regard to Bodmer Papyrus XXIV: “We do not know from what part of Egypt Bodmer Papyrus XXIV comes. Only one thing is sure: It is not part of the lot comprising the Greek or Coptic Bodmer Papyri II to XVI and XVIII to XXIII, and, furthermore, it is not of the same origin as Bodmer Papyrus I or Bodmer Papyrus XVIII.” Rodolphe Kasser and Michel Testuz, eds., Papyrus Bodmer XXIV: Psalumes XVII–CXVIII: [Papyrus Grec] [Cologny-Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1967], p. 7.) The most precise statement is by Kasser, “Fragments du livre biblique de la Genèse cachées dans la reliure d’un codex gnostique [Nag Hammadi Codex VII],” Muséon 85 (1972): 80:

“I have serious reasons to believe that [the Bodmer papyri] were found, like
the Gnostic Codices mentioned above, in a place near Nag Hammadi; if hence
our manuscript of Genesis was copied at a place near Nag Hammadi and the
same was the case with the Gnostic Codices and the Bodmer manuscripts, it
is possible that our ‘volume II of Genesis’ comes from the scriptorium where
the Gnostic Codices were copied or the scriptorium from which the Bodmer
manuscripts derive. These are of course simply possibilities, but in any case
they deserve being envisaged.” Kasser (note 22) does not think the Gnostic
and the Bodmer manuscripts come from the same find, a suggestion made by
Gilles Quispel in view of the fact that the same dealer Phocion J. Tano was in
possession of much of both collections (“Jung en de Gnosis,” Jung—een mens
voor deze tijd [Rotterdam: Lemniscaat, 1975], 85–86). No biblical, classical or
Greek texts are among the Nag Hammadi Codices (other than the vestiges
of Genesis in the cartonnage of Codex VII) and no Gnostic texts among the
Bodmer manuscripts (although Kasser has suggested that Bodmer Papyrus III
may have been produced by Gnostics, Papyrus Bodmer III: Évangile de Jean
et Genèse I–IV,2 en bohairique [CSCO 177, Scriptores Coptici 25; Louvain:
Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1958], 3). ...
5. The Basilica of St. Pachomius

The Stratigraphy at the Basilica of St. Pachomius

The stratigraphy of the site of the basilica of St. Pachomius, as determined in the third season of excavation (23 December 1977–25 January 1978), has been summarized as follows:71

Islamic Building: 11th to 12th century (Phase V)

Evidence of this building appeared in Square 12 located in the northeast part of the basilica. The lower courses of a wall made of fired bricks were uncovered. This is part of the east wall of a building with part of the northeast corner preserved. It was built over the remains of the basilica and can be dated to the 11th or 12th century on the basis of the sherds found near the south and east walls of the basilica. The architecture from this period does not appear extensive, since it has been found in only one part of the site.

The Large Basilica: 5th to 7th century (Phase IV)

The existence of a major building on the site is evident from the extensive architectural remains on the surface and from the archaeological work in 1976. The work of the third season confirmed these preliminary conclusions through the location of the outer walls of the building.

The North Wall. Square 8 was placed north of Squares 5 and 6 (excavated in 1976) where the two stylobates on the north side of the basilica had been identified. In this new square the north wall was found. One course of large limestone blocks laid on a layer of fired bricks was uncovered. The width of the founding level of this wall is 2.3 m. This is unusually wide, although the actual exposed wall may have been about 1.8 m. wide.

The South Wall. Square 9 was placed south of Square 4 (excavated in 1976) where the outer south stylobate had been identified. The laborious task of digging through a 2-meter deposit of debris from the modern village in addition to the usual 2-meter layer of alluvial deposit and destruction debris of the basilica was rewarded with the discovery of the fired-brick foundation of the south wall. In this section of the wall the blocks were robbed out with the exception of one in the west balk of the square. Traces of a brick structure in the south balk suggest the possibility of a porch or anteroom on the south side of the basilica. Squares 13 and 15 were located in the southwest part of the basilica in order to ascertain the relation of the western row of columns (of the return aisle) and the south wall. Traces of the south wall were found along the south balk of Square 13. In Square 15 clear traces of the south wall were

found—the fired-brick foundation, then two courses of limestone blocks with bricks in turn laid on the blocks, possibly suggesting an alternation of stone masonry and brickwork.

The East Wall. Squares 14 and 16 were placed east of Square 7 (excavated in 1976) in order to locate the east wall. This east wall was identified in Square 14; in Square 16 the northeast corner with a portion of the north wall was uncovered.

In addition to the identification of the outside walls and the method of their construction, some internal features of the basilica also were uncovered. Square 11 was located between the two stylobates on the north side of the nave ca. 10 meters west of the apse. In this square a portion of the basilica floor was uncovered. In the 1976 season scattered limestone slabs were found in Squares 4, 5, and 6 (sometimes bedded in a layer of sand) and tentatively identified as fragments of the basilica floor. This was confirmed in Square 11 where a number of slabs were found in situ. Connected with this section of the floor was the foundation of a small brick structure. A decorated stone found in the debris apparently came from this structure—possible the ambo (pulpit).

The Apse. Through the integration of the surface remains with the excavated architectural remains, it became more and more evident that most, if not all, of the apse of the basilica was under the modern houses on the east end of the site. Squares 10 and 17 were placed along the north side of these buildings in order to uncover any possible architectural remains of the apse and its adjacent area outside the modern buildings. In the eastern part of Square 10 a north-south wall of limestone blocks was found; it was also identified in Square 12 north of Square 10. Peter Grossmann judges this to be the western wall of the sanctuary which on the north side had two chambers. Bricks on the edge of the blocks suggest that this wall was faced with a skin-wall of brick. In the western part of Square 10 there was a stratum of lime with some deposits of sand—the underlayment for the basilica floor. The absence of the inner northern stylobate in this part of Square 10 suggests to Grossmann that it had here been discontinued to make place for a secondary triumphal arch before the apse. In Square 17 the founding levels of an east-west wall were uncovered. This appears to be the northern sidewall of the apse.

Although the superstructures of the large basilica have been demolished and/or robbed out, the traces that have been uncovered have provided the basic architectural pattern. They also give promise of more extensive evidence regarding the basilica on the site, especially where there are sizeable amounts of building debris and stratification. Hopefully, the modern construction on the east end of the site has not greatly disturbed the antiquities. In the squares that have been dug, numerous sherds were found in the strata relating to the basilica. Unfortunately, robbing activity in connection with the walls often disturbed the strata and contaminated the pottery. However, where strata clearly could be delineated as undisturbed (and in a few instances as sealed) the upper strata contained 7th-century material and the lower,
5th-century. This suggests that the basilica was built in the 5th century and possibly abandoned in the late 7th or early 8th century. Tradition and some archaeological evidence place its final destruction in the 11th century.

The Earlier Church: 4th to 5th century (Phase III)

The evidence for the earlier church was found in Squares 5 and 6 during the 1976 season. Further evidence of this structure appeared in Square 11 below the level of the basilica floor. Uncovered here was the northeast corner of a building whose walls were made of fired bricks in regular courses. The north wall of this earlier building agrees with that identified in Square 6 in alignment and construction.

The ceramic evidence from Square 11 confirmed the 4th-century date for the earlier church, as suggested in 1976. Such a date places this construction contemporaneous with or shortly after the time of Pachomius. This building may be the oratory built by Pachomius.

Earlier Building: Late 3rd or Early 4th century (Phase II)

In squares 5 and 6 it was ascertained in 1976 that the walls of the earlier church were built over a still earlier structure in which one large room contained many large storage jars. Many of these had been sheared off to accommodate the floor and walls of the later building. In the 1977–1978 season numerous sherds of large storage jars were found in Square 8 adjacent to Square 6. No other walls of this storage room were identified. Some architectural remains, partly disturbed in the building of the basilica wall, were uncovered in the northwest corner of Square 8.

Large Building: 3rd century (Phase I)

The remains of this building, identified in 1976, were in scattered parts of the site and suggested rather extensive architecture of the 3rd century. No further evidence of this phase was uncovered in the 1977–1978 season.

The existence of still earlier occupation in the area, untested at the basilica itself, was accidentally exposed in the excavation of a new irrigation drainage canal by the local authorities ca. 750 m. north of the basilica site. The dragline exposed remains of walls ca. 2 m. below the present cultivated land. These walls, made of limestone blocks and fired brick, were visible in the canal for more than 250 m. The numerous sherds and some intact pottery uncovered by this digging date from the 1st century AD. This evidence suggests a very large Roman settlement in the area, which also may have been the source of some of the architectural elements used in the basilica. This evidence has clarified some problems with regard to the environment of the basilica. Until 1968 the village and fields of Fāw Qiblī were flooded for about six weeks each year as the Nile overflowed its banks. This annual flooding left an alluvial deposit each year—an accumulation of over 2 m in 2000 years. This suggests that the site of the basilica would have had to have been an island during the flood season
at the time of its use. *The Life of Pachomius* (chap. 60), which refers to going to the monastery by boat, may reflect such a situation.

Further evidence regarding the previously unknown provenance of the bulk of the Bodmer papyri was obtained in 1976 and 1978, tending to confirm earlier conjectures that this collection also may have come from the vicinity of the Jabal al-Ṭārif and Fāw Qiblī. In this way three major indications of early Christianity are located in the vicinity of Nag Hammadi—the Gnostic Codices, the Bodmer papyri, and the Pachomian monastic movement. These phenomena provide some challenging and interesting problems of integration and historical sequence.

**Grossmann’s Final Reports on the Basilica of St. Pachomius**

Grossmann’s most recent and revised analysis of his excavations of the basilica of St. Pachomius follows, first concerning Phase I of the building:72

---


Was die Beweggründe für diese apsidenlose Bauweise gewesen sind, wissen wir nicht. Ein Hinweis läßt sich vielleicht aus dem Tatbestand gewinnen, daß der Bau in den koptischen Quellentexten, in denen von seiner Gründung die Rede ist, nicht als ‘Kirche’ sondern als ‘Ort des Feierns’ (Quecke), *petite salle de fête* (Lefort), *little celebration room* (Veilleux) bezeichnet wird. Zwar hat der betreffende koptische Terminus
Among the oldest monastery churches of Egypt that have been identified thus far are to be reckoned the first two construction phases of the church in the main settlement of the Pachomian monastic federation in Pbow (Latin Pabau), today Fāw Qiblī. The older church of the two was apparently erected still during the lifetime of Pachomius († AD 346). If one can trust the statements in the Vitae of Pachomius, it is even to be dated to the years AD 336–337, the time when Pachomius moved from Tabennesi, the first settlement, to Pbow.

The building of this church is mentioned in several Greek and Coptic variants of his Vita. From excavations, only a few remains that are above floor level, but all sorts of parts of the foundations, could be identified … . They depict a five-aisle ambulatory basilica of fired bricks, of the type that was identified already in the church of the southern cemetery of Antinoopolis … and contained a three-aisle middle part, which is surrounded on all sides by a narrow passageway. Walled fired-brick columns served as supports, two examples of which could be located on the south side. They have survived only to a small height, and could also have been bases for columns resting on them. The actual central nave is only slightly emphasized in its width, which suggests a covering of the church with a flat roof. In addition, this church also lacked at first an apse. It was only later inserted into the middle of the eastern ambulatory section, and was carried out in simple unfired mud brickwork. Indications of cancelli, as well as also indications of the position of an alter, could not be identified.

We do not know what the reasons for this form of construction without apses may have been. Perhaps an indication can be derived from the fact that in the Coptic written texts in which there is talk of its being founded, the building is designated not as “church” but as “place of celebration” (Quecke), “small room of celebration” (Lefort), “little celebration room” (Veilleux). Of course the Coptic term in question has to function as a synonym for “church,” yet it is used only very rarely. Also in the Greek Vitae one avoids naming the church by als synonym für “Kirche” zu gelten, doch wird er nur höchst selten verwendet. Auch in den griechischen Viten scheute man sich die Kirche beim Namen zu nennen. Sie heißt fast immer σύναξις, was eigentlich nur “Versammlung,” im kirchlichen Verständnis “Feier der Eucharistie” bedeutet, aber der Sprachregelung in den koptischen Viten weitgehend entspricht. Vielleicht erschien den pachomianischen Mönchen der Ausdruck ἐκκλησία als zu anspruchsvoll, vom Alltäglichen ablenkend und der geforderten Demut und Bescheidenheit der Mönche nicht gemäß. Wie Pachomios für sich selbst wie auch für jeden seiner Mönche es ablehnte, die priesterlichen Weihe zu empfangen, um jegliche Art der daraus möglicherweise sich entwickelnden Überheblichkeit von vornherein auszuschließen, wollte er vermutlich auch das Kirchengebäude innerhalb des Klosters, das jeder Mönch ständig vor sich sah, nicht als ein bauliches Monument, was der Ausdruck “Kirche” vielleicht vermittelt haben mochte, sondern als einen reinen, für liturgische Funktionen bestimmten Zweckbau verstanden wissen, den Ort oder die Stätte, wo man am Samstagabend und Sonntagmorgen zur Feier der Eucharistie zammenstraf.
name. It is almost always named σύναξις, which actually only means “assemblage,” in church usage, “celebration of the Eucharist,” but largely corresponds to the language usage in the Coptic Vitae. Perhaps the term ἐκκλησία seemed to the Pachomian monks to be too presumptuous, distracting from the daily life, and not suitable for the humility and simplicity of the monks. Just as Pachomius rejected for himself, as well as for each of his monks, the receiving of priestly ordination, so as to exclude in advance any kind of superiority complex from possibly developing out of it, he perhaps also wanted the church building inside the monastery, which every monk constantly saw before his eyes, to be understood not as an architectural monument, which the expression “church” might have suggested, but only as a mere practical building meant for liturgical functions, the place or the location where one came together Saturday evenings and Sunday mornings to celebrate the Eucharist.

Grossmann’s report on Phase II is as follows:  

---

73 Grossmann, Christliche Architektur in Ägypten (Handbuch der Orientalistik 1, 62; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 549–551: B. 32. II fig. 162 II. Pbow (Fāw Qiblī): fünfschiffige Klosterkirche, Phase II:

Die in dem beschriebenen Erstbau der Kirche von Pbow zum Ausdruck kommende räumliche Gliederung mit einer dreischiffigen Mittelpartie, die auf allen vier Seiten von einem Umgang (ambulatorium) umgeben ist, wurde auch in den beiden Nachfolgebauten dieser Kirche übernommen ... Beide sind räumlich vergrößert und jetzt mit einem auf der Ostseite des Ostumgangs angefügten mehrräumigen Sanktuarium versehen mit einer mittleren, nach Osten ausgreifenden Apsis, deren Aussenabschluss wie bei fast allen ägyptischen Kirchen auf derselben Höhe wie der der Nebenräume liegt. Die Apsiden gehören hier also jeweils deutlich zum originalen Bauprogramm der betreffenden Kirchen.


Schwierigkeiten bereitet die Datierung dieses Bauwerks. Eine Erwähnung in irgendeinem Quellentext wurde bisher nicht gefunden. Zwar konnten bei den Grabungen zahlreiche, auch in guten ungestörten Schichten enthaltene Gefässerschiben geborgen werden, was unter normalen Bedingungen gute Voraussetzungen zur Erstellung einer absoluten Chronologie der Bauabfolge gewährt hätte, doch lassen sich diese Keramikfunde nur sehr schlecht datieren, da es sich bei ihnen nicht um Scherben aus freien Markt erworbenen Gefässen handelt, sondern um Sonderanfertigungen, die offensichtlich grösstenteils im Kloster selbst in klostereigenen Werkstätten hergestellt wurden und nur entfernt der allgemeinen Entwicklung der Keramik im
The spatial arrangement that comes to expression in the already-described first construction of the church of Pbow, with a middle part of three aisles, which is surrounded on all four sides by a passage (ambulatorium), was also taken over in the two subsequent constructions of this church ... . Both are spatially enlarged, and now provided with a sanctuary of several rooms added on the east side of the east walkway, which has a middle apse extending toward the east, whose external completion lies, as in almost all Egyptian churches, at the same height as that of the side-rooms. Hence in each case the apses here belong clearly to the original construction program of the churches in question.

In the first construction that followed ... the passage is differentiated still more strongly that in the original construction from the inner side aisles, on the other hand the latter in their clear width are related to the width of the...

Landes entsprechen. So können auch günstige stratigraphische Bedingungen nicht weiterhelfen.


central nave in a ratio of about 4 : 5 : 4. The form of the apse of the sanctuary is not semicircular, but rather imitates a pointed oval on the east. Yet it is misleading to see in this form a particular architectural intention. Rather one will have to trace this form back to the mechanical inability of the workmen involved in the construction. On the sides of the apse there are a number of apse side-rooms (pastophoria) that were intended for secondary liturgical functions. Indications of cancelli and the position of the altar could again not be determined.

The dating of this construction presents difficulties. A reference in any sort of text as a source has not been found thus far. Of course, in excavating, numerous sherds of vessels were recovered, also in good, undisturbed layers, which under normal circumstances would have provided good presuppositions for establishing an absolute chronology of the sequence of construction. Yet these pottery finds can be dated only very poorly, since in their case it does not have to do with sherds of vessels acquired on the free market, but rather of special productions, which were apparently in large part produced in the monastery itself, in workshops belonging to the monastery, and only have a distant relation to the general development of ceramics in the region. Hence even favorable stratigraphic conditions do not provide further help.

Yet general considerations suggest that the building was erected already before the turn of the 4th to the 5th century. As the most probable time frame there comes in question the long period in office of Horsiesios (Coptic Horsiêse) as the General Abbot of the Pachomian monastic federation, who shared the leadership of the federation in the first decades with Theodore, whom Pachomius himself had in view as Abbot. Only after Easter 368, once Theodore had died, did he carry out the oversight alone. Horsiesios was no person to indulge in great deeds. He was more concerned with maintaining what the venerated founder Pachomius had created. Hence he hardly decided on his own the new construction of the churches in Pbow. Yet toward the end of his life he came into personal contact with the Patriarch Theophilus I (AD 386–412), who, in human terms, belongs to the most contested leaders of the Alexandrian church, but—if it had to do with the expansion of the church's positions of power—was exceptionally active, and also displayed an unusual passion in the constructing of church buildings. To be sure, also in his case the tradition reports no building of a church in any of the Pachomian monasteries, yet, as no other, he had reason in various regards to show gratitude to the Pachomian monks for faithful service in opposing the paganism in Kanopos, one of the eastern suburbs of Alexandria, with an important Sarapis temple, and nearby (at Menuthis) a famous Isis shrine, also still much visited in Christian times .... Commissioned by him, already at the beginning of his time in office, they had founded there an annex of their monastery, and garrisoned it with a number of monks from Tabennesi. Even more, in 387 Horsiesios performed personally an important service for him, in carrying through his Easter dating, which in that year he had set at the 25th April, contrary to the calculations of the Roman Patriarchate. Since both events fall already in the first years of Theophilus' time in office
(the steps in Kanopos admittedly hardly prior to the destruction of the Sarapeion of Alexandria in 391), may—if our conjecture is valid, that the second construction of the church in Pbow has to do with a foundation by the Patriarch Theophilus, or he had contributed significantly to carrying it out—this building would have been built in the last decade of the 4th century.

Grossmann's report on Phase III is as follows:74

74 Grossmann, Christliche Architektur in Ägypten (Handbuch der Orientalistik 1, 62; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 551–552: B.32.II fig. 163. Pbow (Faw Qibli): fünfschiffige Klosterkirche, Phase III:


Nach den vorhandenen Quellen wurde diese Kirche am 7. November 459 durch den monophysitischen Patriarchen Timotheos II Ailuros (457–460, sowie 475–477)
Also the third phase of the construction ... of the large church at the main Pachomian monastery of Pbow (Pabau) still corresponds in its basic outline fully and completely to the two constructions that preceded it, and consists, as did these, of a five-aisle ambulatory basilica, which itself, as were they, consisted of a three-aisle middle part and a walkway on all sides, whereby also in the area of the middle part a stricter differentiation of the width of the three inner aisles was not carried through. Hence the church must on all aisles have still been covered with a horizontal ceiling of wooden beams. Hence in type nothing new was created with this church. But it is more than a third enlarged, over against the preceding construction of Phase II of this church. The apse, which unfortunately was not accessible for archaeological research because of a few modern houses erected over it, seems, according to the recognizable masonry bond on the north side, to have had a rather more regular rounding. In addition, it had on the north side two adjacent rooms of different sizes. Because of the discrepancy between the width of the middle section and the considerably smaller apse, one can reckon here with two recessed columns that intervene to clarify the eastern walkway. A row of columns was put in front of the church on the western outer side, with supports placed very far from one another, which belong to the existence of an outer narthex. From it there led, as can be inferred from the irregularities in the positioning of the columns of the inner western ambulatory, three doors into the inner part of the Naos.

Only in a few places are parts of the rising extant. The covering of the floor showed in the side aisles a pavement of sawed limestone slabs. On the south side of the church one could recognize that the stylobates were raised above the floor to make room for banks to sit on. Small steps cut into it offered the possibility of conveniently changing over from one side to the other. Furthermore, the almost straight-line conclusion of the pavement throughout, for example in the middle of the inner northern side aisle, suggests that here too a bank for sitting was once to be found. How the presbytery was laid out and where the altar stood cannot be determined, since, here too, these areas are built over by modern houses.

The architectural decoration of the church is relatively simple. Low pedestals decorated only in outline were used as the base of pillars. The capitals of the columns and the pilasters follow in principle the composition of the Corinthian capitals, but display an unusual decoration of large leaves.

According to the extant sources, this church was dedicated on 7 November 459 by the monophysite Patriarch Timothy II Ailuros (AD 457–460, and again AD 475–477). The building had been completed a few weeks before, a date to which the extant pottery [shards] also correspond.

___

geweiht. Der Bau war wenige Wochen davor fertiggestellt worden, ein Datum, dem auch der keramische Befund entspricht.
Grossmann has also published an explanation of the Pachomian reticence to use the term "church" for their place of worship, with the following abstract:  

It is striking that in the Coptic Pachomian writings having to do with the churches located in the Pachomian monasteries (apart from the first building in the earliest settlement of Tabennesi), they are never named directly as such, but always only as "place of celebration" (H. Quecke). In the parallel Greek texts even any direct mention of a monastery’s own church is absent. Nevertheless that there were some, can be inferred in each case only from the context. The absence of mention of any Pachomian monastery churches is all the more striking, in that church buildings in other monasteries, and, to the extent they are part of the church out in the world, are designated as such without hesitation. The reasons for this regulation of language are unclear. Possibly the reticence to name their own churches by name is to be interpreted as an expression of the monks' humility, or has a pedagogical significance. Any pride that might arise among the monks for having in the monastery a monument that is to be characterized as ἐκκλησία should be prevented straight away by the use of the designation listed above, which negates any distinctiveness of this building.

Grossmann has subsequently published a report concerning the relative position of the basilica of St. Pachomius within the general development of Egyptian church architecture.  

---


Thus Peter Grossmann has, in the case of the Basilica of St. Pachomius, much as Torgny Säve-Söderbergh in the case of the Sixth Dynasty inscriptions, derived valuable information from the very limited excavations that were possible. Both returned after the third season to complete their assignments for publication. We are hence quite indebted to both for their willingness to provide their expertise to the Nag Hammadi excavations.

With regard to the point of departure for the excavations, the location of the site of the discovery, those carried on at the Jabal al-Ṭārif itself did not produce any evidence other than what we learned from the discoverer, Muḥammad ʿAlī Khalifah al-Sammān. But his willingness to walk us straight to the spot beneath the broken boulder on the talus where he had dug up the jar was confirmed by other considerations to be the actual site of the discovery (see Chapter 1, Part 2 above). It is within the area of the photograph of Doresse that he designated “the site of the discovery.” It is within the area that ʿAbd al-Naẓīr Yāsīn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm from Ḥamrah Dūm pointed out to us as the site. It is where the pitting in the talus indicates that the illegal excavation following the discovery took place. The fallen boulder itself was a significant landmark visible from a great distance, and hence would have served as an aide-mémoire to those who buried it, in case they later wished to recover it. No other location, such as a cave, has retained any credibility.
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