



LUND UNIVERSITY

Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex

Wasserman, Tommy

Published in:
New Testament Studies

DOI:
[10.1017/S0028688505000081](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688505000081)

2005

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Wasserman, T. (2005). Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex. *New Testament Studies*, 51(1), 137-154. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688505000081>

Total number of authors:
1

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

Papyrus 72 and the *Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex**

TOMMY WASSERMAN

*Centre for Theology and Religious Studies, Lund University, Allhelgona
Kyrkog. 8, S-223 62 Lund, Sweden*

The *Bodmer miscellaneous codex* contains not only P72 (Jude, 1–2 Peter), but eight other biblical and Christian writings as well. Three independent sections (I–II–III) of the codex have been identified, and a different sequence from the traditional is suggested as original. There are strong connections between sections I and III and they probably followed in sequence. The most significant connection is P72, copied by one single scribe who displays both a liturgical and a theological tendency. This scribe may have been the final collector of the codex, a miscellany of an apologetic character, bearing the marks of incipient orthodoxy.

Introduction

In the 1950s the Swiss banker Martin Bodmer acquired a collection of ancient Egyptian papyri in Greek and Coptic. As these manuscripts were published their tremendous historical value was soon acknowledged.¹ Most biblical scholars are familiar with the Bodmer Papyri, which were to give NT textual study a new boost: P66 (around 200), P72 (3rd–4th century), P74 (7th century), P75 (early 3rd century) and P73 (a tiny fragment from the 7th century).

P72 contains the entire text of 1–2 Peter and Jude and is the earliest known manuscript of these epistles.² However, these biblical texts designated as P72 are bound with other works into a single codex (henceforth called the *Bodmer codex* for convenience). Unfortunately, NT scholars have tended to focus only on the text of P72, disregarding the rest of the codex. Something similar has been true for the other works contained in the codex as well. In fact, when we consider the history of this codex as a whole, a consistent pattern of division and specialization

* A portion of this article was presented to the Working with Biblical Manuscript section at the 2004 International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Groningen, the Netherlands.

1 From 1954 onwards, the University of Geneva has published a number of these MSS in the series *Bibliothèque Bodmer*.

2 In addition, a few verses of Jude are extant in a fragment, P78, dated to the 3rd–4th centuries. 137

is observable, a pattern that conceals the comprehensive picture of the historical context in which the codex once existed. First, the codex has been disassembled; second, today the manuscript is divided between Geneva and the Vatican; third, it took decades before the provenance of the discovery was made known; fourth, the texts of the codex were given nine different designations (*P. Bodmer V*, *P. Bodmer VII*, etc.), edited and dispersed in five different publications; and, finally, the specialization among scholars of different fields and interests has made the situation worse.

Few scholars have attempted to examine the codex as a whole in order to get as complete a picture as possible of its historical context. Therefore it will be our aim to examine the codex from several aspects –codicological, palaeographic, text-critical, literary and theological – and, hopefully, this investigation will allow us to get a glimpse of that context: the scribes involved in the production, the person(s) who collected the different writings of the codex, the kind of purpose it served, and in what kind of community it existed. For considerations of space, however, an extensive examination of the theological themes of the codex will be treated elsewhere.³

1. The context of the Bodmer codex

Today, the Bodmer codex is disassembled, but originally it must have comprised at least 190 written pages in an almost cubic format, 15.5–16 x 14–14.5 cm.⁴ The small format along with other clues led the first editor of the majority of the texts, Michel Testuz, to conclude that it was originally produced by Egyptian Christians for private use, probably for the private library of a rich member of the community rather than for public reading in the church.⁵ Testuz also found evidence in P72 (specifically in 1–2 Peter) that made him attribute it to a Christian Coptic scribe working in the neighbourhood of Egyptian Thebes. The scribe had added marginal notes in 1–2 Peter in rather haphazard Greek, usually summarizing the meaning of the text, introduced with the preposition *περί* followed by a variety of cases (mostly the nominative and not the required genitive).⁶ On one occasion, in 2 Pet 2.22, the note is in Coptic where the scribe has glossed the word

³ A chapter devoted to the subject is planned for a forthcoming publication, *New Testament Manuscripts and Their World* (ed. T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas; Leiden: Brill).

⁴ The *Apology of Phileas* is quite fragmentary, and some other leaves from the codex are missing. Today only 172 pages are extant (K. Junack & W. Grunewald, *Die katholischen Briefe, Das Neue Testament auf Papyrus 1* [Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1986] 17; M. Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX* [Cologny-Geneva: Bibliothèque Bodmer, 1959] 8).

⁵ Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX*, 9–10.

⁶ The Coptic has numerous loanwords from the Greek in the nominative. There are no case endings in Coptic. Cf. B. M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977) 141–52.

αληθου with the Coptic word πμεῖ.⁷ Moreover, there are particular orthographic features – in particular the interchange of γ and κ – which indicate sound confusions by a Coptic ear, such as were common around Thebes.⁸ Gordon D. Kilpatrick, however, was more cautious since he found sound changes typical of other parts of southern Egypt, e.g. Panopolis, and, thus, he suggested a less precise localization somewhere between Panopolis and Thebes.⁹

James M. Robinson devoted much effort to tracing the provenance of the Bodmer Papyri, to which this codex belongs. He found that the manuscripts had apparently passed through the hands of numerous intermediaries before they arrived at Geneva.¹⁰ Robinson eventually learned that they were part of a find of manuscripts stuffed in a jar that was discovered in 1952 about 5.5 km north-west of the town of Dishna in Egypt (between the ancient Panopolis and Thebes). The jar, found within a stone's throw of the Pachomian headquarters (situated at the foot of the mountain Jabal Abu Mana), contained a collection of some 50 MSS, among which were several copies of Pachomius's letters. Hence, Robinson identified the find as a 'Pachomian monastic library'.¹¹ Apart from Pachomian letters, this library consisted of various biblical and Christian writings, literary works such as Homer and Menander, and non-literary material, for example a schoolboy's Greek exercises, a Greek grammar, and a Greek–Latin lexicon for deciphering the Pauline epistles. According to the records of the monastery, funeral processions moved from the monastery up to higher ground where the monks buried their dead; apparently, they had also secreted their library there. Today, this original find is referred to as the *Dishna Papers* and the material is scattered among eight different repositories, of which the Bodmer Library and the Chester Beatty Library are the most important.¹²

7 Testuz refers to another marginal note in 2 Pet 2.8, ορασις that may count as Coptic here, since, unlike the word it glosses, βλεμματι the same word is used in Coptic (Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX*, 33).

8 Ibid., 30–3. For the specific location of Thebes, Testuz reports R. Kasser's opinion that the sound errors can be localized to this region. A 'sound' error does not necessarily mean that the scribe took the text from dictation, since he may have read his text aloud (contra F. W. Beare, 'Some Remarks on the Text of I Peter in the Bodmer Papyrus (P72)', *Studia Evangelica III*, Part II [= TU 88; ed. F. L. Cross; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964] 263–5, 263). Numerous corrections of the same scribe point to a written original for P72.

9 G. D. Kilpatrick, 'The Bodmer and Mississippi Collection of Biblical and Christian Texts', *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 4 (1963) 33–47, 34.

10 J. M. Robinson, *The Pachomian Monastic Library at the Chester Beatty Library and the Bibliothèque Bodmer* (Occasional Papers of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity 19; Claremont: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, 1990).

11 It will be noted that the oldest MSS among the discovery predate the Pachomian Order and must have entered the library from outside (this would also explain the several non-Christian texts in the monastic library).

12 For a full list of the contents of the discovery and current location, see Robinson, *The Pachomian Monastic Library*, 19–21.

2. The contents of the codex

The codex contains eleven writings, which were copied by a number of different scribes. Testuz included a useful overview (here somewhat modified) of the contents:¹³

Table 1: The contents of the Bodmer miscellaneous codex

TEXT	COPYIST	PAGINATION ¹⁴	LINK ¹⁵
1. <i>Nativity of Mary</i> (P. Bodmer V)	A	1–49	certain
2. <i>Apocryphal Correspondence</i> (X) (between Paul and the Corinthians)	B	50–57	
3. 11th <i>Ode of Solomon</i> (XI)	B	57–62	certain
4. Jude (VII)	B	62–68	certain
5. Melito's <i>Homily on the Passion</i> (XIII)A	1–63		certain
6. A fragment of a liturgical hymn (XII)A	64		uncertain
7. <i>Apology of Phileas</i> (XX)	C	129–146? ¹⁶	certain
8. LXX Psalms 33.2–34.16 (IX)	D	147–151?	uncertain
9. 1–2 Peter (VIII)	B	1–36	

¹³ Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX*, 8.
¹⁴ The codex contains three or four different (ancient) pagination complexes. Testuz supposed that the *Apology of Phileas* and Psalms 33–34 continued complex 1 (pp. 1–68) and complex 2 (1–64), but that the scribe made a miscalculation starting the *Apology* with p. 129 instead of p. 133 – or p. 132, since there is a pagination error within the *Ode of Solomon* (Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX*, 9). See below.
¹⁵ ‘Link’ refers to the establishing of a codicological connection between the different writings so as to decide the order of the writings in the final form of the codex (a work of reconstruction since the codex is disassembled). For example, the link between the 11th *Ode of Solomon* and Jude is certain since the same scribe (B) concludes the *Ode* on the same page as Jude commences.
¹⁶ Page numbers are found in one folio of the *Apology* which enable a reconstruction backwards.

3. The production of the codex

The question of how the codex reached its final form has been a matter of controversy, and the answer will have implications for a number of aspects, such as dating, isolation of scribal tendencies and detection of possible motifs behind the collection of these particular texts. Regarding the specific dating of P72, it is necessary to look for evidence beyond the copyist's (or copyists') handwriting, because of its very personal and informal character. Moreover, it should be pointed out that the *Apology of Phileas* offers a *terminus post quem*, since this work has been securely dated to the first decade of the 4th century – the trial against Phileas took place somewhere between 303 and 307 CE. The date for this text, however, may have different implications depending on the identification of its links with the other texts. The discussion to date may be summarized by three different viewpoints, represented in turn by Testuz, Eric G. Turner and Winfried Grunewald.¹⁷

1. Depending on his identification of four scribes at work, and the links between the writings (see Table 1), Testuz argued that the codex contains three different collections which once existed separately, corresponding to the scribes A, B (both dated to the 3d century by Testuz) and, finally, the combination C + D (!), dated to the 4th century (post 304–7), when the codex reached its final form. Testuz found traces of two sets of binding throughout the whole codex.¹⁸ Moreover, he argued that the scribe of the *Apology* and the Psalms (the latest writings) was responsible also for the pagination of the fragment of a hymn, and that the pagination of this section was a continuation of the two preceding pagination complexes. Hence, Testuz assumed that the Epistles of Peter, constituting a new pagination complex, concluded the codex. In his reconstruction, he stated that a blank folio followed the last numbered page of this complex. The blank folio had, apparently, served as an outer protection.

2. Turner identified six hands behind the texts: hand 1: the *Nativity of Mary*; hand 2: the *Apocryphal Correspondence*, the 11th *Ode* and Jude; hand 3: Melito's *Homily on the Passion*; hand 4: the *Apology of Phileas*; hand 5: Psalms 33–34 (LXX); hand 6: 1–2 Peter (information is missing about the hymn fragment). Turner concluded that (a) the codex was probably produced within a short period of time, not much earlier than the 4th century; (b) all of the links between the texts were certain (except that between Jude and Melito); and (c) the parts of this 'composite codex' were probably copied intentionally in the above order – especially so,

¹⁷ Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX*, 8–9; E. G. Turner, *The Typology of the Codex* (Pennsylvania, PA: University of Pennsylvania, 1977) 8, 79–80; Junack & Grunewald, *Die katholischen Briefe*, 16–25.

¹⁸ Cf. the plate (unpag.) in M. Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer XIII* (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliothèque Bodmer, 1960).

according to Turner, if scribe B really had copied P72, found in two separate sections. Behind Turner's designation *composite* lies his suspicion that scribes did not care to waste any writing material and would wish to fill any free pages left over at the end of a codex. According to Turner, this gradual process of growth explained the existence of codices like 'P. Bodmer Composite', containing 'heterogeneous material'. The composite codex would be distinguished from the *miscellany* in which several texts of different authors, but more or less homogenous (e.g. sharing a common theme), would be organized in a single container.¹⁹

Turner did express some hesitation, since one section of the codex, *P. Bodmer XIII + XII*, is 0.5 cm larger in size compared to what would have been earlier and later sections, thus giving the impression of what could have been an earlier and distinct collection. However, Turner allowed for this discrepancy in size, since 'in c. iv A.D. in such an ancient papyrus book small differences in page or sheet sizes were readily tolerated'.²⁰ Another apparent problem with Turner's assumption of gradual growth over a short period of time is the odd pagination.

It is important to bear in mind that the Bodmer Library, to Turner's great regret, did not give him the opportunity to examine the physical codex, so he had to account for evidence derived from Testuz, whose information was incomplete in several aspects, e.g. the palaeographic evidence for his identification of scribes. Turner came to his different conclusions after examining the very few photographic reproductions of the codex (approximately one plate per book).²¹

3. Grunewald could offer a correction of Turner's analysis after a correspondence with the current holders of the codex, the Bodmer Library (except for 1–2 Peter, today kept in the Vatican Library in Rome). The new codicological data had to do with the make-up of the quires.²² Grunewald concluded that the link between Jude and Melito was certain (contra Turner) and thus belonged to 'series I'. In this connection, however, it should be pointed out that the last gathering of series I concludes with a folio containing the end of Jude (verso) and an unpaginated page (recto) with only the title, *Μελιτωνος περι πασχα*.²³ The actual text of

19 For definitions and discussion of the composite and miscellaneous book, see A. Petrucci, *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy: Studies in the History of Written Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1995) 1–2.

20 Turner, *Typology*, 8. It will be noted that many of the pages are damaged, especially at the top of the page. K. Aland estimates the reconstructed format as 16 x 14.5 cm (K. Aland, *Repertorium der griechischen christlichen Papyri* [2 vols; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1976–95] 1.303). Naturally the edges of the larger section would be more liable to damage.

21 Earlier, J. Duplacy, in 'Bulletin de critique textuelle du NT', *RSR* 50 (1962) 242–63, 253, had also questioned Testuz's identification of the same scribal hand at work in Jude and 1–2 Peter.

22 A quire refers to one papyrus (or parchment) sheet folded, producing two leaves and four pages. A double quire (quaternio), then, was formed by sewing one page upon another and vertically down the middle, three sheets formed a ternio, and so forth.

23 See the first plate (unpag.) in Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer XIII*.

the *Homily* begins in the next gathering, of which the two first pages are now lost. There is, therefore, the possibility that the *Homily* once constituted an independent section, which, at a later stage, was placed after Jude – the new pagination and the different size favour this possibility.²⁴

To continue with Grunewald's view, the *Apology of Phileas* and the Psalms formed a distinct set of quires ('series II'), as did also the Epistles of Peter ('series III'). In Turner's reconstruction, on the other hand, he had assumed a secure link between Melito and the *Apology*, since he reckoned that the title of the latter appeared on the last leaf of the preceding quire. To be sure, there are traces of text below the end of the hymn, but the defective state of this text makes Turner's assumption uncertain, which perhaps is indicated by his own question mark in the table displaying his reconstruction.²⁵ (As we have seen, the different size of this section also caused him to express some hesitation.)

In a similar way, Turner had indicated a secure link between the Psalms and the Epistles of Peter, since he assumed that the text of 1 Peter began in the same quire as the Psalms (although he put a question mark here too). Grunewald could not receive decisive information from Geneva concerning this part of the codex, since it is now in Rome, but he pointed to an important 'Material-Beweis', mentioned by Testuz, which disproved Turner's reconstruction of the quires, and favoured Testuz's original view of an uncertain link: 'Bei den Petrusbriefen ist noch teilweise der Faden der Heftung vorhanden, ebenso in der Mitte jeder Lage ein Pergamentstreifen zum Schutz gegen die Heftung; auch im Judasbrief ist ein solcher in der Lagenmitte (zwischen Seite 65 und 66) noch zu sehen.'²⁶ Here we may add that a similar parchment strip is visible in the only plate of the *Apocryphal Correspondence* in the *editio princeps*, which is that of page 50 (in the first pagination complex of the codex) – also found in the middle of a quire.²⁷ Nevertheless, the report from Dr Braun of the Bodmer Library made Grunewald question Testuz's reconstruction of the last gathering of the Epistles of Peter (pp. 31ff. of this pagination complex). Testuz had assumed that two single sheets followed after the two first quaternios, i.e. four quires making up a total of 40 pages (16 + 16 + 4 + 4). (The first two pages of the first gathering are lost and do not belong to the pagination complex.) As mentioned above, Testuz had found a blank folio, which he assumed had been a protective cover and he placed it at the end of the last gathering. According to Braun and Grunewald, however, pages 31ff. (= pp. 33ff. including the first two pages that are lost) must have been a

²⁴ See the last plate in Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer XIII*.

²⁵ Turner, *Typology*, 79–80 (Table 12).

²⁶ Junack & Grunewald, *Die katholischen Briefe*, 20. Cf. Testuz: 'Au centre de chaque cahier, se trouve une petite bande de renforcement en parchemin' (*Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX*, 29).

²⁷ M. Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer X–XII* (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliothèque Bodmer, 1959) (unpag. after p. 6).

‘Mehrblatts-lage’, i.e. a quaternio, or at least a ternio. If we consult the facsimile edition of Carlo M. Martini, it is possible to decide this by looking at the fibre-direction of the pages.²⁸ If Testuz had been correct, pages 32–33 would have been the inside of a single folded sheet with the fibres running in the same direction. However, since this is not the case we must confirm the conclusion of Braun and Grunewald. Although Grunewald was not explicit on the matter, this state of affairs means that another text, now lost, probably followed 2 Peter. Furthermore, the blank folio that Testuz placed right after the last paginated page of this gathering must have belonged elsewhere – it may still have been at the end of the last gathering but not immediately after 2 Peter.²⁹

The established distinction of three series seems to speak in favour of Testuz’s hypothesis of earlier collections brought together. On the other hand, Grunewald pointed out that the separation of series I and III is disturbing for Testuz: why would a later collector separate the works of the same scribe (Testuz’s ‘B’) and squeeze in a distinct later collection? (Turner would have interpreted this as conclusive evidence that the whole codex was produced in a short period of time, had he agreed with Testuz’s identification of scribe B.) Do we have to assume a different scribe for 1–2 Peter, then? Grunewald offers an alternative explanation. He sees the *Apology* and the Psalms as originally part of another collection (thus the odd pagination), and this detached part came to form the nucleus of a new collection, so that the other seven texts of scribes A and B, written at a later stage, were then grouped around this nucleus in a conscious order for certain theological-dogmatic reasons.³⁰

It is true that theological motivations could explain any order in the final collection, and scholars have indeed found evidence of theological motivation behind the collection (see below). However, we must first ask ourselves: Is there any evidence for the assumption that the writings of the codex followed in the actual order originally suggested by Testuz, and accepted by other scholars like Turner and Grunewald? Grunewald presented conclusive evidence that there were three separate sections, but his data says nothing of the original order of these sections – in this regard, he seems to take Testuz’s reconstruction for granted, and the position of section II, separating P72, was one of the main reasons for his ‘nucleus theory’. But in fact, Grunewald questioned two of Testuz’s very reasons for this order, i.e. first, the assumption that the pagination of the *Apology* and Psalms (section II) was a continuation from section I (with a miscalculation of four pages), and, secondly, Testuz’s reconstruction of the last gathering of the

28 C. M. Martini, *Beati Petri Apostoli Epistulae ex papyro bodmeriana VIII transcriptae* (Mediolani: ex Hamilcaris Pizzi officina libraria, 1968); Martini’s transcription is accompanied by a replica of P72 (1–2 Peter).

29 Cf. Junack & Grunewald, *Die katholischen Briefe*, 19–20.

30 Ibid., 23–4.

codex.³¹ We know that the blank folio that Testuz placed at the end of the codex did not follow immediately upon the last page of the Epistles of Peter, but it could still have been present at the end of the codex. On the other hand, this unpaginated folio may represent the two missing pages at the beginning of the Epistles of Peter, since the pagination starts on the page where the text commences. This folio could still have functioned as a protective cover – at the beginning of 1–2 Peter. It would be interesting to know more about the state in which the codex reached Geneva before it was disassembled. However, Victor Martin’s description of *P. Bodmer XX* (*ed. pr.*) confirms that section II was combined by Testuz with the other sections found among the material at the Bodmer Library in the first place, solely because of the similar format and because of his theory concerning the pagination.³²

In conclusion, it is not necessary to retain the reconstructed order of sections I–III. On the contrary, there are signs that connect sections I and III, and it is likely that they followed in sequence, whereas section II was placed either at the beginning or the end in the final collection. The first and obvious connection is P72, provided that it was produced by one and the same scribe – a question to which we will return. However, we find another piece of evidence in the remarkably similar colophons in some of the writings, the *Nativity*, Melito’s *Homily* (both section I) and 1–2 Peter (section III), while the *Apology* (section II) has a distinct and more common colophon:

ειρηνῇ τῷ γραψάντι καὶ τῷ ἀναγινώσκοντι (the *Nativity*, 1 and 2 Peter)

ιρηνῇ τῷ γραψάντι καὶ τῷ ἀναγινώσκοντι καὶ τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν κν ἐν ἀφελότητι καρδίας (Melito’s *Homily*)

ιρηνῇ τοῖς ἀγείοις πασεῖ (the *Apology of Phileas*)

These colophons strengthen the impression of section II (the *Apology* and the Psalms) as being a ‘Fremdkörper’ (to use Grunewald’s designation); and, at the same time, the difference speaks against Turner’s hypothesis of one single production. If section II with the *Apology* were the nucleus of the collection (so Grunewald), one would perhaps have expected assimilation to the colophon in the *Apology* on the part of the other scribes. Moreover, Grunewald’s hypothesis is open to another important reservation – Testuz stated that he had found traces of two different bindings in the entire codex, not only in Grunewald’s series II, and,

31 ‘Überzeugender [than a miscalculation] ist aber die Ansicht, daß die Phileas-Apologie Teil eines anderen „Sammelcodex“ gewesen ist, dessen Reste wir nicht mehr haben’ (*ibid.*, 18).

32 V. Martin, *Papyrus Bodmer XX* (Cologne-Geneva: Bibliothèque Bodmer, 1964) 8–9. Martin did express some hesitation: ‘La liaison de plusieurs d’entre eux est assurée par des indices physiques. Toutefois, précisément pour l’Apologie de Phileas, cette certitude fait défaut.’ Nevertheless, he identified a theological connection between all of the writings, and he pointed out that the odd pagination did not have to be original and that an extensive work like the *Apology* would more naturally comprise a codex of its own had its inclusion in the collection not been conscious.

if this is true, it follows that the other seven texts had formed at least one, but possibly two or three, earlier collections (three if the title-page of Melito's *Homily* was not original). Of course, there is also the possibility that a second binding represents a repair of a damaged original binding.

Hence, according to our view, sections I and III were probably produced over a short period of time, and included in sequence in the final codex (possibly also in an earlier collection). At the end of section I we find a fragment of a hymn that gives the impression of being unfinished, or demanding some sort of continuation (other than Phileas's *Apology*).³³ Below line 6, where the text ends, we find traces of what Turner interpreted as the title of the *Apology*. If we then turn to the beginning of section III, Grunewald confirms Testuz's reconstruction of the first gathering (a quaternio) of *P. Bodmer VIII*. The text of 1 Peter commences on the third page of the reconstructed gathering (a quaternio), but with a new pagination, and the two preceding pages, now lost, could have contained another short text, perhaps a psalm (so Testuz).³⁴ If section III followed section I, it would be possible that the text below the short hymn was a title of another hymn or psalm that followed in Grunewald's section III (within the same pagination complex?).³⁵

There is another important clue that connects sections I and III: there is a liturgical connection between the 11th *Ode*, Melito's *Homily*, the hymnal fragment and 1 Peter.³⁶ This is not to say that the Bodmer codex was actually used in church services. The strong liturgical connections between some of the writings could be explained by the fact that these texts were transmitted in a liturgical context and, therefore, could have been brought together earlier on in the manuscript tradition and continued to travel as a unit within the stream of transmission.³⁷

33 Cf. O. Perler, *Ein Hymnus zur Ostervirgil von Meliton?* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg, 1960) 9: 'Die 6 Zeilen geben einen vollständigen Sinn, der aber eine Fortsetzung verlangt.'

34 Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer VII-IX*, 29. Cf. Junack & Grunewald, *Die katholischen Briefe*, 19.

35 It will be noted that this sequence would exclude the possibility that the title-page of Melito was originally empty. If that were the case, the sequence III-I-II seems more likely.

36 Significantly, another papyrus codex, originally belonging to the Dishna Papers, the Crosby-Schøyen codex, contains Melito of Sardis's *Homily on the Passion*; 2 Macc 5.27-7.41 (a martyrology section); 1 Peter; Jonah; and a homily or hymn. This codex is the only comparable item to our Bodmer codex among the Dishna Papers; it is approximately of the same cubic format, 15 x 15 cm; it has been identified as the oldest Christian liturgical MS; and it would be defined as a miscellany since at least the four first texts probably have a common denominator in the theme of Easter. For a description, see J. Goehring, ed., *The Crosby-Schøyen Codex MS 193 in the Schøyen Collection* (CSCO 521; Leuven: Peeters, 1990).

37 Cf. Petrucci's observation: 'It [the miscellaneous book] was influenced by the liturgical model, characterized by a succession of different passages handsomely laid out in sequence for uses extraneous to their origins (homilies, Gospels, etc.). In short, the miscellaneous book corresponded to a conception of texts that was both global and hierarchical, in whose circle the individual textual segments, rather than being considered autonomous, were seen as parts of a whole' (Petrucci, *Writers and Readers*, 9).

In conclusion, we may at this stage firmly reject Turner's gradual-growth view and accept a collection-hypothesis. As to section II, the odd pagination, traces of two bindings and the different colophon suggest that it was once part of a different collection. At some point this section was probably added to another collection (sections I and III), possibly at the beginning of the codex. Hence, this explanation enables an earlier dating of P72 (3rd century), but the question remains open when exactly this part of the codex was produced. However, the hands of the other scribes who copied the *Nativity* and Melito's *Homily* cannot be dated much earlier than 300 CE.

From the text-critical point of view one could look for possible harmonization on the part of the scribes, which could reveal dependence in any direction: 1 Peter contains citations and allusions from Ps 33 (LXX), and there are also citations of and allusions to both Jude and 1–2 Peter in the *Nativity* and Melito (the latter also cites Ps 34 LXX).³⁸ However, a survey of these passages shows that there are no overall traces of textual harmonization on the part of the scribes in any direction. On the other hand, the rich amount of scriptural cross-references and common theological themes in the codex does support the notion of a consciously theologically motivated collection, even on the part of the final collector.

Theological reasons for the composition of the codex were suggested early on by Martin in the introduction to his edition of the *Apology of Phileas*, where he pointed to the theological and apologetic character of the writings.³⁹ Recently, however, Kim Haines-Eitzen expressed a slight dissatisfaction with Martin's 'rather general explanation' of the motive behind the collection, and she singled out the theme of the *body* as 'perhaps the most pervasive' in the texts of the codex and offered several examples from the texts.⁴⁰ The body is certainly an important theme in the codex; however, one may well hesitate to call it 'the most pervasive'. Since the final codex is probably made up of earlier collections, an identification of one single pervasive theme seems problematic. The final collector may have had one particular theme in mind, but more probably this person somehow found a common denominator in the texts, and, therefore, Martin's original proposal of an apologetic collection does not have to be dismissed as being too general a characterization. In fact, several characteristics typical of incipient orthodoxy are prominent in the texts, especially in the area of Christology. This not only applies to the writings themselves, but is also an observable tendency even on the level of scribal transmission, as far as singular readings can be identified (especially in P72 – see

38 1 Pet 2.3 (Ps 33.9 LXX), 3.10–12 (33.13–17 LXX); *Nativity of Mary* 3.2 (2 Pet 2.12; Jude 10), 7.2 (2 Pet 3.3), 9.2 (Jude 11), 15.4 (1 Pet 5.6), 25.1 (2 Pet 3.15); Melito's *Homily on the Passion* 12 (1 Pet 1.19), 22 (Ps 34.5 LXX), 68 (1 Pet 2.9), 72 (Ps 34.12 LXX).

39 Martin, *Papyrus Bodmer XX*, 9.

40 K. Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2000) 103–4.

below). For example, Jesus is typically identified as God, which means both that Jesus as pre-existent worked in the history of Israel, and, conversely, that it was God who suffered on the cross (see e.g. the *Nativity of Mary* 15.4; *Ap. Corr.* 2.10; Jude 5; the *Apology of Phileas* cols 7–8; Melito's *Homily on the Passion* 96; 1 Pet 1.11; 5.1).

It is clearly impossible to know who the final collector was. If all of the writings were first part of earlier collections, it would not necessarily have to be any of the scribes involved. However, there is at least one good candidate among them: as we shall see, the scribe of P72 has been ascribed a theological (or Christological) tendency, and this could well be in line with those theological reasons that may have led him to collect all of the writings in the codex (it would, of course, imply a later dating of P72, post-Phileas's *Apology*). There is good reason for a more detailed survey of the literary and theological connections between the writings of the codex, as well as a search for possible tendencies on the part of each individual scribe involved in the production, but such a survey will require separate treatment. In the following we will confine ourselves to a detailed examination of P72, since the result will have a number of implications for the question of the origin of the codex and its parts.

4. The production of P72

The first question we must deal with is the number of scribes responsible for P72. We have seen that Turner argued for two different scribes. If he is correct, it would of course enable a differentiation of the dating of P72, and, moreover, the question of the origin of the codex would be even more complex. Haines-Eitzen devotes a chapter in her study to an analysis of this codex.⁴¹ She refers to Turner's description of the codex and provides some more arguments for his identification of six scribes in all. In her own examination of the handwriting and textual characteristics she notices significant differences between the *Nativity of Mary* in comparison with Melito's *Homily* and the fragment of a hymn (the different style of sigmas and omicrons, differences in the abbreviations of *nomina sacra* and in punctuation, etc.). Secondly, she adduces similar arguments in favour of different scribes for Jude and the Epistles of Peter. However, Haines-Eitzen admits that she, like Turner, has worked from the few photographic reproductions that Testuz provides for these texts, and that they are more problematic than for the *Nativity* and Melito since 'the one plate provided of the Epistles of Peter is one in which the original hand was traced over'.⁴²

⁴¹ Ibid., 96–104.

⁴² Ibid., 98. In n. 87 she mentions her failed effort to obtain a microfilm of the texts from the Bodmer Library, but that they planned a full photographic reproduction – one that has now appeared: *Bibliotheca Bodmeriana: La collection des papyrus Bodmer* (Munich: K. G. Saur, 2000).

It is not necessary to doubt the judgement of different scribes for the *Nativity of Mary* and Melito.⁴³ However, in the following we shall examine more closely Haines-Eitzen's arguments concerning different scribes for Jude and the Epistles of Peter. Haines-Eitzen had complained that she could not obtain microfilms of the texts from Geneva, but that is unnecessary since the part containing 1–2 Peter has been kept in the Vatican since the early 1960s. In 1968 a facsimile edition of the Epistles of Peter was published along with a transcription of the text edited by C. M. Martini.⁴⁴ Moreover, Michael Lattke published a facsimile edition of *P. Bodmer XI* (the 11th *Ode of Solomon*; same scribe as Jude).⁴⁵ These two publications provide sufficient material for a detailed palaeographic analysis.

4.1 *The hand of the scribe*

Firstly, Haines-Eitzen starts with a description of Jude's hand that 'tends toward cursive', while 'by contrast, the Epistles of Peter are written in a hand that attempts to avoid (quite painstakingly) cursively formed letters and ligatures'.⁴⁶ For example, α, υ and η are made in one stroke, whenever possible, in Jude, and ligatures like λη or αι appear frequently. In the Epistles of Peter, on the other hand, she finds multistroke letters, e.g. in the formation of υ (the standard uncial form Y is used), and ligatures like those in Jude are absent.

Haines-Eitzen is quite correct in her analysis, except for one thing: she refers to the palaeographic data of 'the Epistles of Peter' although she had access to only one plate. However, if we consult Martini's facsimile edition we find a gradual shift towards an increasingly cursive hand, and the scribe does indeed use the same type of ligatures (λη, αι, etc.) and letters (e.g. not only the uncial Y) as in Jude. Significantly, this gradual shift corresponds to the error rate of the scribe (see below). The varying form of individual letters, ligatures and other textual features gives an overall impression of an inexperienced and careless scribe displaying all sorts of irregularities. Hence, the informal and personal character of this

43 Testuz himself later admitted this: see È. De Strycker, *La Forme la plus ancienne du prot-évangile de Jacques: Recherches sur Le Papyrus Bodmer 5 avec une édition critique de texte grec et une traduction annotée* (Subsidia Hagiographica 33; Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1961) 22 n. 4.

44 Martini, *Beati Petri*; a plate showing the last page of 1 Peter is also available in F. V. Filson, 'More Bodmer Papyri', *BA* 25 (1962) 50–7, 53, and in K. & B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., rev. edn 1989) 92 (plate 25).

45 M. Lattke, *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für neues Testament und Gnosis* (4 vols; OBO 25; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979–98) 1980 (note that this is vol. 1a).

46 All citations in this discussion are from Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians*, 98–9. In an earlier chapter Haines-Eitzen refers to only one copyist of P72. This probably reflects an earlier stage of her research, and at this point she wrongly attributed the edition of the text to Victor Martin (*ibid.*, 67, 159 n. 78).

hand makes a comparison with dated papyri difficult and in itself allows any date ranging from the second to the fourth centuries.⁴⁷

4.2 *The orthography*

In her discussion of the orthography, Haines-Eitzen states that the itacisms are different, for example the interchange of ι/ει in the title of Jude, ιουδα επειστολη, does not occur in the Epistle of Peter: ‘the title appears (four times!) as πετρου επιστολη (at the beginning and end of the first and second Epistles). The consistency with which these scribes spell the titles is significant.’ We can assume that Jude and 1–2 Peter were copied on two different occasions (also indicated by the codicological evidence), and we do not know how much time elapsed between the occasions, but a simple explanation is that the scribe made a single error in Jude. During the period that he was copying the Epistles of Peter he consistently spelled επιστολη correctly. However, in a number of places the scribe still has general difficulty with the interchange of ει/ι: αρτει (1 Pet 1.8), περει x 2 (1 Pet 1.10), επειθυμειαις (1 Pet 1.15), πειστειν (1 Pet 1.21) and τεις (1 Pet 2.19); θιας (2 Pet 1.3), διγμα (2 Pet 2.6) and δι (2 Pet 3.11, for δει). Other examples of itacisms include the interchange of αι/ε, χειρειν (*Ap. Corr.*, Corinthians to Paul v. 1), κε (Paul to Corinthians, v. 32, for και), παλε (Jude 4), Εγυπτου (Jude 5), κε (1 Pet 1.17, for και), ε (1 Pet 3.1, for the article αι), βεβεαν (2 Pet 1.10) (more rarely αι for ε).

We could go on and list a number of other orthographic features, some of which are isolated and others that occur regularly, but that would make this discussion too long. However, we must consider Haines-Eitzen’s argument that the particular orthographic features that indicate a Coptic scribe are only applicable to 1–2 Peter, not to Jude. She explicitly mentions the sound confusion between γ and κ, but this type of error does occur in Jude 5 (εγ for εκ), although it is certainly more frequent in the Epistles of Peter. In any case, the different frequency of certain sound confusions can be due to all sorts of factors surrounding the different occasions on which the texts were copied.

4.3 *Errors and corrections*

According to James Royse, who studied the scribe of P72, there are 52 corrections, most of which are misspellings and obvious blunders, only two of which appear to be by a hand other than the scribe’s (2 Pet 1.8; 3.9).⁴⁸ Regrettably, Royse did not examine the other two writings copied by the same scribe, i.e. the *Ap. Corr.* and the 11th *Ode*. This symptom, as described earlier, is true also of the latter two

47 Cf. K. Aland’s description: ‘unliterarische Hand mit Unregelmässigkeiten in den Abständen der litt und auch der Zeilenführung; Tendenz zur Kursive; gegen Ende der Briefe grössere Nachlässigkeit der Schrift’ (*Repertorium*, 1.303).

48 J. Royse, ‘Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri’ (ThD diss., Graduate Theological Union, 1981) 476.

works, but in examinations of scribal tendencies scholars have tended to focus exclusively on the writing that has taken their particular interest.⁴⁹

There are approximately a dozen corrections in the *Ode*, and about as many in the *Ap. Corr.* Missing letters are placed supralinearly, while the scribe has either marked superfluous letters/words by supralinear dots, e.g. in οναυτος, εντυπον (*Ap. Corr.*, Corinthians to Paul v. 6 and Paul to Corinthians v. 7), κυματα (Jude 13), κοσμος (2 Pet 3.6), or else they are bracketed, erased, crossed out or overwritten – there is absolutely no regular system (cf. the word αντιτασσεσται in 1 Pet 5.5 marked with both dots and a bracket). Two corrections involving larger omissions (in Jude 16 and *Ode Sal.* 11.16) are marked with a so-called ‘ancora’, a small arrow in the margin of the line and again at the bottom of the page, followed by the missing words. Most of the time, however, the errors are left uncorrected, some of which are irregular and others consistent, e.g. ζοη for ζωη (Jude 21; 1 Pet 3.10; 2 Pet 1.3; *Ode Sal.* 11.6), and even more significant, ζοη εωνιου (1 Pet 3.7) and ζοη εωνιας (*Ode Sal.* 11.16).

Royse, in his study of the singular readings of P72, noted that ‘the significant percentage of nonsense readings in P72 and the very large percentage of singulars resulting from non-standard spelling show that the scribe of P72 was extraordinarily careless’, but that the scribe ‘can also be seen to have increased the rate of production of nonsense as he went farther with his copying’.⁵⁰ This textual pattern is true for both the Epistle of Jude and the Epistles of Peter, and it actually corresponds to the palaeographic data – the hand is more careless towards the end of each epistle.

4.4 *Nomina sacra and non-Greek proper names*

Haines-Eitzen also appeals to the difference in nomina sacra: ‘in Jude, Ιησου Χριστου is always abbreviated as $\overline{\iota\eta\nu}$ $\overline{\chi\rho\nu}$; by contrast at the very opening of 1 Peter, the scribe offers $\overline{\iota\upsilon}$ $\overline{\chi\rho\nu}$ (1 Pet 1.1, 2)’. However, in the light of the fact that either $\overline{\iota\eta\nu}$ or $\overline{\iota\eta\varsigma}$ occur at all other places in 1–2 Peter (17 times), this argument loses its force completely. More significantly, in both Jude and the Epistles of Peter we find that certain non-Greek proper names are marked with a stroke that does not cover the whole width of the name: $\overline{\epsilon\nu\omega\chi}$ (Jude 14), $\overline{\Sigma\alpha\rho\rho\alpha}$, $\overline{\text{Αβρα}\alpha\mu}$ (1 Pet 3.6), $\overline{\text{Ν}\omega\epsilon}$ (1 Pet 3.20). Other names are marked with an apostrophe or left unmarked.

49 Besides the *editio princeps* for each work, cf. Lattke, *Die Oden*, 1.10–23 (the 11th *Ode*); V. Hovhannessian, ‘Third Corinthians: Reclaiming Paul for Christian Orthodoxy’ (PhD diss., Fordham University, 1998) 211–27 (the *Ap. Corr.*); Junack & Grunewald, *Die katholischen Briefe*, 20–3 (P72); Royse, ‘Scribal Habits’, 470–510 (P72).

50 Royse, ‘Scribal Habits’, 475.

4.5 *Diaresis, apostrophe, spiritus and punctuation*

Some other textual features are regular and not isolated to any of the scribe's writing, e.g. the diaresis used mostly over initial vowels ι and υ, or the apostrophe utilized to separate two similar neighbouring letters (mostly γ'γ or γ from a guttural). On the other hand, there are rare features like the apostrophe after a Hebrew name (only in *Ap. Corr.*, Paul to Corinthians v. 32; 2 Pet 2.7, 15). There is virtually no punctuation (only in *Ode Sal.* 11.1; Jude 20; 1 Pet 4.9; 2 Pet 1.16). Hence, when Haines-Eitzen mentions that there are no breathing marks in Jude while such appear with some frequency in 1–2 Peter, this could be readily explained by reference to the irregularity of the scribe.

4.6 *The marginal notes*

In our estimate, Haines-Eitzen's strongest argument for a differentiation of the scribes is the existence of marginal notes in 1–2 Peter only, and in particular those notes that are introduced with a περι and serve to highlight themes in the text. Apparently they have nothing to do with the later use of *kephalaia*, and, like many other features described above, they occur irregularly. We have already mentioned that the preposition περι is often not followed by the genitive, which could be explained either by reference to the case in which the word is found in the text, or by the fact that we have to do with a Coptic scribe.⁵¹ More surprising is the difference in spelling on a number of occasions when the same word occurs in the note and in the text, e.g. ιερατευμα (1 Pet 2.5, 9; ειερατευμα in the text), βασιλιον (1 Pet 2.9), ψεδοδιδασκαλοι (2 Pet 2.1). Why did the scribe not attempt to correct the discrepant spelling in the text? Most likely, the marginal notes were added at a later stage when the scribe read the text and formulated a proper thematic note, and this was simply not the time for proofreading and making additional corrections. We do not know why such marginal notes were not added to the other writings: perhaps these particular notes had something to do with the use of these epistles (didactic, apologetic?), or perhaps he simply did not find an occasion to add marginal notes elsewhere.

4.7 *The theological and liturgical tendencies of the scribe*

Finally, we must consider the text itself. Marchant A. King commented upon three unique readings in P72, one in each of the epistles, 'giving evidence of the fullest acceptance of the deity of Christ by the scribe (or one of his predecessors) and the church in his area'.⁵² These are Jude 5b, 1 Pet 5.1a, and 2 Pet 1.2b. In Jude 5b, the usual reading is 'the Lord' (who saved the people from Egypt): some MSS have 'Jesus' (A B 33 pc) or 'God' (C2 vg^{ms} syr^{ph} arm geo sla), while P72 reads 'θεος Χριστος' ('God Christ'). This cannot be a conflation since no MS reads

⁵¹ Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX*, 33.

⁵² M. A. King, 'Notes on the Bodmer Manuscript', *BSac* 121 (1964) 54–7, 57.

‘Χριστός’. Moreover, in 1 Pet 5.1, P72 reads ‘the sufferings of God’ (instead of Christ) and in 2 Pet 1.2 it omits ‘and’ after ‘God’ so that the resulting text reads ‘in the knowledge of God our Lord Jesus’. This could be a mere omission but it fits very well with the two previously discussed readings, so that we have here a conscious theological change through which Jesus is identified as God.

Haines-Eitzen was well aware of these textual data since she refers to these particular changes in another chapter under the heading ‘singular readings indicating ideological modifications’.⁵³ Bart Ehrman (who was the supervisor of Haines-Eitzen’s dissertation on the same subject) has described these changes of P72 under the heading ‘anti-adoptionistic corruptions’.⁵⁴ We may well ask ourselves if it is justified to speak of a *Tendenz* if the scribe of Jude did not copy 1–2 Peter. It is of course possible that a specific theological tendency was shared by two scribes in the same community which led them both to modifications of their texts – this possibility is increased when we recall that the very collection of the codex seems to have been theologically motivated. However, if we apply the principle of Occam’s razor, the simplest explanation is a theological tendency on the part of one singular scribe. In addition to the three unique theological or, more specifically, Christological readings mentioned, we may also note 1 Pet 2.3: ‘εἰ ἐγευσασθαι [itacism] ἐπειστεύσατε οὐ $\overline{\chi\rho\omicron\varsigma}$ $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ ’. The substitution Χριστός for χρηστός is shared by other witnesses (K L 049 33 al), and is in line with a common wordplay in early Christianity, i.e. the referring of LXX quotations in which God is called χρηστός to Christ. P72 further inserts ἐπειστεύσατε, which specifies the ‘tasting’ as believing in Christ. In this way the scriptural allusion is now turned into a confessional formula, ‘Christ is Lord’, that is to be believed. (Note also the use of nomen sacrum in this passage in P72.)

Another category of singular readings in P72 that Haines-Eitzen discusses is that of harmonization.⁵⁵ Surprisingly, she has not drawn any conclusion on the question of the number of scribes for P72 from this discussion, which in turn builds on Royse’s aforementioned study.⁵⁶ Having stated that scribes of the early papyri harmonized their texts *infrequently*, she appeals to a high and significant frequency of harmonization in P72: ‘What is particularly striking in this copy [P72] is the number of harmonizations that appear to be influenced by “liturgical” usage of “texts”.’ She then refers to a number of readings that Royse had isolated

53 Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians*, 113.

54 B. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University, 1993) 85.

55 Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians*, 72–3.

56 Royse, ‘Scribal Habits’, 481–3. In the 11th *Ode of Solomon* and the *Apocryphal Correspondence*, it is difficult to identify any scribal tendencies since these texts have been preserved in very few textual witnesses and, in Greek, we have only the texts in this codex.

as harmonizations to remote parallels, in contrast to the more common harmonization to the immediate context. For example, in Jude 24a the scribe of P72 has replaced φυλαξαι with the στηριξαι found in the doxology of Rom 16.25. In Jude 25b he has added the phrase αὐτῷ δοξα κρατος τιμη (to the effect that αὐτῷ δοξα is repeated twice in the same verse). The scribe seems to be influenced by Rev 5.13 (the only appearance in the NT of these words together). In 1 Pet 3.7c the scribe replaces ζωης with ζοης εωνιου (we have noted that this combination and spelling occur also in *Ode Sal.* 11.16), and the latter expression was embedded within the liturgical hymns and prayers of the early church. Furthermore, in 2 Pet 1.20 the scribe writes προφητια και γραφη instead of προφητεια γραφης, which Haines-Eitzen suggests is an influence from literary and liturgical customs to make the distinction ‘prophets and scripture’. Haines-Eitzen thus finds support for an identification of the scribe as ‘a member of a Christian community, whose participation in church services is evident in the text’.⁵⁷

5. Conclusions

The Bodmer codex was discovered at a site near the town of Dishna, in Egypt, and was probably part of a Pachomian monastic library. The codex contains eleven writings that probably stem from several earlier collections. Three independent sections have been identified, and there is reason to believe that the original order of the writings as suggested by Testuz is wrong. There are strong connections between sections I and III and they probably followed in sequence. The most significant connection is the fact that one single scribe is responsible for the copying of P72.

This same scribe displays examples of liturgical harmonization, a trait that places him in the context of church worship. On the other hand, the informal and personal character of the scribe’s hand, and the many errors and irregularities in his text, suggest that at least these parts of the codex were probably produced for private, rather than liturgical, use. Moreover, the scribe of P72 displays a theological tendency, and this, in fact, qualifies him as a good candidate for the person responsible for the whole collection. Several scholars have suggested that there were certain theological reasons for the composition, and, indeed, the texts of the codex betray the influence of incipient orthodoxy, but to single out one specific theme is problematic, since the codex is made up of several earlier collections. We have also detected a liturgical connection between some of the writings. These texts were probably brought together earlier on in the manuscript tradition (cf. the Crosby-Schøyen codex), so, again, it is not necessary to conclude that the codex or its parts were actually used in church services.

⁵⁷ Cf. also the singular reading in Jude 20b: εν πνευματι αγιω προσευχομενοι, to which the scribe of P72 adds εαυτοις, probably referring to communal prayer.