

THE BODMER 'MISCELLANEOUS' CODEX
AND THE CROSBY-SCHØYEN CODEX MS 193: A NEW PROPOSAL*

Brice C. Jones

McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada

In the early 1950s, a large cache of manuscripts was discovered in Upper Egypt near the town of Dishna. These finds are now referred to as the Dishna Papers or, more commonly, the Bodmer Papyri.¹ Found within this collection were several papyrus manuscripts that proved to be extremely important for the study of the text of the New Testament; the most important of these are P⁶⁶, P⁷², P⁷⁴ and P⁷⁵. In this paper, I wish to examine the codex of P⁷², known as the Bodmer Codex (hereafter, BC), and the Coptic Crosby-Schøyen Codex ms 193 (hereafter, CSC), both of which were part of the Dishna finds. These two early Christian codices share a few important characteristics: they were both part of the same ancient library, they both contain a collection of different texts, and they both include the text of 1 Peter and Melitos's *Homily on the Passover*. The BC has been given a good deal of attention recently due to its inclusion of 1–2 Peter and Jude (P⁷²).² However, in comparison, the CSC has received little attention. One opinion that has become the consensus among scholars is that both of these codices should be classed

* I wish to thank Jeremy Hultin, who allowed me to conduct research on the topic of this paper during a graduate seminar at Yale University that he directed in the fall of 2010, and Christian Askeland, for reading the manuscript and offering helpful suggestions, some of which are incorporated into the final version of this paper.

1. For a detailed summary of the discovery, see James M. Robinson, 'The Manuscript's History and Codicology', in James E. Goehring (ed.), *The Crosby-Schøyen Codex ms 193 in the Schøyen Collection* (CSCO, 521, Subsidia 85; Leuven: Peeters, 1990), pp. xvii-xxvii; and now *idem*, *The Story of the Bodmer Papyri: From the First Monastery's Library in Upper Egypt to Geneva and Dublin* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2011).

2. P⁷² was edited by Michel Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer VII-IX* (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliothéque Bodmer, 1959). See also the excellent article by Tommy Wasserman, 'Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex', *NTS* 51 (2005), pp. 137-54.

as ‘miscellaneous’ codices (i.e. they include heterogeneous texts with a common theme) as opposed to ‘composite’ codices (i.e. they include heterogeneous texts with no common theme). My goal in this paper is to test this consensus to see whether or not a composite designation might be preferred over miscellaneous. The conclusion will have implications for our understanding of how early Egyptian Christians viewed the texts of these two important manuscripts, and for our understanding of why these two codices were assembled.³

The Status Quaestionis

The designation ‘miscellaneous’ rests on the belief that the individual texts in each of the two codices share a common theme, which served as the initial impetus for the codices’ formation.⁴ This motivation would explain, it has been argued, why such a diversity of texts appears together in the same codex. There have been many attempts to detect a common theme throughout the BC, and at least one similar project has been conducted on the CSC. Therefore, it is in order to give a brief summary of what some have thought to be the common theme in each of these codices. I shall begin with the BC.

The Bodmer Codex

The Bodmer Codex is a Greek papyrus manuscript dated to the third to fourth century CE, which contains the following texts: *Nativity of Mary*, *III Corinthians*, *11th Ode of Solomon*, *Jude*, *Melito’s Passover Homily*, a liturgical hymn fragment, *Apology of Phileas*, LXX Pss. 33.2–34.1 and 1–2 Peter.⁵ Victor Martin, one of the codex’s editors, was the first person to suggest that there was a theological motivation for the makeup of the BC.⁶ While Martin observed that there did seem to be a theological and, more precisely, apologetic characterization of the texts, there was no

3. There is no historical evidence that suggests that early Egyptian Christians were aware of the modern miscellaneous/composite distinction.

4. See Armando Petrucci, *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy: Studies in the History of Written Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), pp. 1-2. See also the definition in C.H. Roberts and T.C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (London: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. 48-49.

5. For the full story of this codex and the rest of the Bodmer Papyri, see Robinson, *Story of the Bodmer Papyri*.

6. Victor Martin, *Papyrus Bodmer XX* (Cologny-Geneva: Bibliothéque Bodmer, 1959).

attempt on his part to identify any one specific theme. There is certainly a clear case to be made that the *Apology of Phileas* is apologetic (hence the title), but whether all the texts are of this nature is not entirely evident. Notwithstanding, Martin's nonspecific characterization provided a basis for future developments of theories about the BC's theme.

A critic of Martin's proposal of the single theme of the BC was Kim Haines-Eitzen.⁷ Haines-Eitzen's main criticism of Martin was that his conclusion—that the BC was of an apologetic nature—was too generic.⁸ Haines-Eitzen went on to propose a theme of 'body' in the texts, and stated that it is 'perhaps the most pervasive' theme in the codex. Haines-Eitzen is correct that a 'body' motif emerges in some of the texts. However, most have failed to see as strong a connection as Haines-Eitzen argues for vis-à-vis the body.⁹

Tommy Wasserman devotes much effort to explaining the codicological features of the BC as well as to highlighting the theological tendencies of \mathfrak{P}^{72} .¹⁰ Wasserman presents the attempts by both Martin and Haines-Eitzen to find a single theme, but claims that 'since the final codex is probably made up of earlier collections, an identification of one single pervasive theme seems problematic'.¹¹ He goes on to admit that the 'final collector may have had one particular theme in mind, but more probably this person somehow found a common denominator in the texts...'¹² Wasserman suggests that the common denominator in the texts is a high Christology. He provides several examples from both the earlier and later parts of the codex, not least of which are the christological variants of \mathfrak{P}^{72} (e.g. θεὸς Χριστός in Jude 5). On the one hand, Wasserman avoids a single-theme approach and allows room for the existence of multiple themes in the texts yet with a 'common denominator'. However, it is uncertain whether or not Wasserman's high christological 'common denominator' stands in opposition to a single-theme approach. In a footnote concerning the CSC, Wasserman presents what appears to be a conflation of the terms: 'it [the CSC] would be defined as a miscellany since at least the four first

7. Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

8. Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters*, p. 102.

9. E.g. Wasserman, 'Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex', p. 147.

10. Wasserman, 'Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex'.

11. Wasserman, 'Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex', p. 147.

12. Wasserman, 'Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex', p. 147.

texts probably have a *common denominator* in the *theme* of Easter'.¹³ Moreover, Wasserman's source for this phrase 'common denominator' is most probably a work he cites in his article, where the author there indubitably uses the phrase 'common denominator' to mean a single theme.¹⁴ So, although Wasserman states that discerning one single theme is 'problematic', he nonetheless argues for a general christological theme, perhaps in contradistinction to a specific theme such as body, etc.¹⁵

The Coptic Crosby-Schøyen Codex ms 193

Another manuscript that bears significantly on the present study is the Crosby-Schøyen Codex ms 193, not least because it was probably part of the same ancient library as the BC.¹⁶ The CSC, dated paleographically to c. 300 CE, is a single-quire papyrus codex written in Sahidic Coptic, and, like the BC, contains several heterogeneous texts: Melito's *On the Passover*; 2 Macc. 5.27–7.41; 1 Peter; Jonah; and one unidentified text.¹⁷ As noted above, two of the texts contained in the BC also appear in this codex—Melito's *On the Passover* and 1 Peter—though the text of 1 Peter

13. Wasserman, 'Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex', p. 146 (my emphasis).

14. Petrucci, *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy*, p. 5: 'And if the common denominator of the Crosby codex is the subject treated—Easter—that of the Hamburg codex is scriptural...'

15. Wasserman is more cautious, however, about the thematic coherence in the BC in a subsequent publication: Tobias Nicklas and Tommy Wasserman, 'Theologische Linien im *Codex Bodmer miscellani*?', in Tobias Nicklas and Thomas J. Kraus (eds.), *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and their World* (Boston: Brill, 2006), pp. 161-88.

16. For a full discussion of this codex, see Goehring (ed.), *The Crosby-Schøyen Codex*. It was first demonstrated by Victor Martin that the CSC and Bodmer Papyri were from the same provenance, and this was reaffirmed by William Willis, Rudolphe Kasser and James Robinson. For a treatment of the shared provenance of the CSC and BC, see William H. Willis, 'The New Collection of Papyri at the University of Mississippi', in L. Amundsen and V. Skånland (eds.), *Proceedings of the IX International Congress of Papyrology* (Oslo: Norwegian Universities Press, 1961), pp. 383-89.

17. For the dating of the codex, see Robinson, 'Manuscript's History and Codicology', p. xxxiii. The difficulties of Coptic paleography and the dating of Coptic manuscripts have been addressed by Bentley Layton, 'Towards a New Coptic Palaeography', in Tito Orlandi and Frederik Wisse (eds.), *Acts of the Second International Congress of Coptic Studies* (Rome: C.I.M., 1985), pp. 149-58.

in the Coptic CSC is considered by most to be earlier.¹⁸ The CSC has also been labeled a 'miscellany' on account of the supposition that it contains a common theme of Easter.¹⁹

There is a lengthy discussion of this manuscript and the BC in a recent article by David G. Horrell.²⁰ Horrell's primary interest is to highlight the themes of 1 Peter, so it is quite reasonable that he would choose to focus on the two earliest extant codices containing this New Testament document. Before we turn to Horrell's assessment of the CSC, it is important to mention briefly here his views on the BC's theme. In a similar fashion to what I have done above, Horrell lays out the various attempts to find a common theme in the BC, including those by Haines-Eitzen and Wasserman. At one point Horrell says, 'it is difficult, however, to see any close thematic connections to explain the bringing together of this collection of texts' and likewise, 'we cannot claim, then, that a single theme or theological motif unites every one of the diverse texts collected in the BMC'.²¹ On other occasions, however, Horrell inconsistently asserts that there are, in fact, thematic connections, and spends a great deal of time trying to draw thematic links. For example, he takes Nicklas and Wasserman's conclusion that the LXX Psalms 33 and 34 were probably included in the codex by coincidence (since they do not appear to relate to the rest of the texts), and attempts to make the connection stronger between them and 1 Peter. He says further that 'over a hundred pages of the [BC] codex (101 of the 183 that are extant) contain texts relating to the themes of the paschal suffering of Christ, and the related suffering of his people in a hostile world'.²² So Horrell gives us yet another proposal for the common theme in the BC—suffering.

Horrell's conclusion that the BC's theme can be identified as 'suffering' may have been influenced by his attempt to demonstrate the same conclusion in the CSC. Horrell reiterates Willis's assertion when he says, 'it is evident that C-S has a clear thematic coherence, focused around the

18. See William H. Willis, 'The Letter of Peter (1 Peter)', in Robinson (ed.), *The Crosby-Schøyen Codex*, pp. 137-215 (137). Willis mentions that the CSC is a translation from a Greek manuscript that was itself a copy. So, theoretically, the Greek *Vorlage*, twice removed from the CSC, would be considerably older than \mathfrak{P}^{72} .

19. So Willis, 'Letter of Peter', p. 137.

20. David G. Horrell, 'The Themes of 1 Peter: Insights from the Earliest Manuscripts (The Crosby-Schøyen ms 193 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex Containing \mathfrak{P}^{72})', *NTS* 55 (2009), pp. 502-22.

21. Horrell, 'Themes of 1 Peter', pp. 512, 518.

22. Horrell, 'Themes of 1 Peter', p. 517.

Easter themes of suffering and vindication'.²³ It is certainly true that there is a stronger case to be made for the CSC that suffering is a possible link among all the texts than it is for the BC. But is thematic uniformity as apparent as Horrell sees it? At one point he is quite vehement that Jonah, 2 Maccabees and 1 Peter clearly cohere thematically.²⁴ He goes on to say that 1 Peter 'is perhaps the central text in terms of the thematic coherence of the codex'.²⁵ Horrell's conclusion is that, since the theme of both the BC and the CSC is suffering, and since 1 Peter most clearly represents that theme, the early readers of the codices must have interpreted 1 Peter to be a text primarily about suffering. This is quite a bold claim, since there is no historical evidence outside of the text that would suggest that readers of the CSC did in fact view the codex in this way. Horrell's conclusion is also based entirely on the presupposition that a specific theme was intended from the outset. I see no reason to place as strict a connection of theme on all the texts. While there are in some cases broad thematic similarities between the texts of these two early Christian codices, I think there is more to be said about the common first assumption, that these codices are miscellanies.

Miscellany or Composite?

Not all scholars have considered the BC to be a miscellany. Very early on, Eric G. Turner, the famous English classicist and papyrologist, contended that the BC was a composite codex that grew rapidly because 'scribes did not care to waste any writing material and would wish to fill any free pages left over at the end of the codex'.²⁶ This position, however, has been rejected by subsequent scholars, as we have seen, on the basis of the identification of supposed thematic links that have dominated the discussion ever since.²⁷ However, I would like to return to

23. Horrell, 'Themes of 1 Peter', p. 508.

24. Horrell, 'Themes of 1 Peter', p. 508.

25. Horrell, 'Themes of 1 Peter', p. 508.

26. Eric G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia, PA: Pennsylvania University Press, 1977), p. 81.

27. G.H.R. Horsley, *New Testament Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1977* (North Ryde, Australia: Macquarie University Press, 1982), p. 135, was, however, one early advocate of Turner's composite theory: '[S]ome codices are known to have been made up of a variety of quite disparate texts. The "Apology of Phileas", *P. Bodmer* 20... belongs to a *composite codex* which includes some New Testament texts, Melito, a hymn

Turner's judgment because, although it has been jettisoned, there may be good reasons for reviving it.

To be sure, Turner's view of the composite codex was not limited to his analysis of the BC. In his section on composite codices, Turner identifies nine additional codices as composite.²⁸ Two of these are the CSC (mentioned above) and the BM Ms. Or. 7594 (see below). I wish to say more about these manuscripts here, because I believe they throw light on the question of whether or not miscellany is an appropriate term to be used in identifying the BC and CSC. It should be noted that the scholars mentioned in this paper leave out of their studies any real discussion of how the following manuscripts compare to the BC (excepting Horrell's comparison of the BC and CSC), so it is my hope that the following brief comparative analysis will move the discussion forward.²⁹

(1) The CSC bears on the present study because it, like the BC, consists of a mixture of texts, and therefore begs the question of why these particular texts were chosen for inclusion in a single codex. Remember that Horrell, who accepted the miscellaneous identification of this codex, wanted to argue for a single Easter theme linking all the texts. There is evidence, however, that suggests this codex was produced in the manner in which Turner had originally proposed, namely, a gradual-growth process of including heterogeneous material. Comments by one of the codex's editors confirm this:

The large average number of lines per column for the first text, Melito's *On the Passion*, suggests an initial concern by the scribe that the codex was of insufficient size to accommodate easily all four intended texts. As the copying proceeded, however, it became clear that the texts would fit, and as a result, the number of lines per column was reduced so as to produce a less cramped, clearer product. It is likely that the final fifth text was added to the others when it was discovered that a considerable number of blank pages would remain after the completion of the copy of Jonah. This is supported by the fact that the final text does not share the same two column format and does not, in distinction from the other texts for which the evidence survives, bear a superscript title.³⁰

fragment, OT verse texts and the *Nativity of Mary*' (my emphasis). The 'composite codex' referenced by Horsley is the BC, and Horsley supports this designation, citing Turner several times.

28. Turner, *Typology of the Early Codex*, p. 81.

29. Wasserman, 'Papyrus 72 and the Bodmer Miscellaneous Codex', p. 146, only mentions the CSC in passing in a footnote.

30. James E. Goehring, 'The Manuscript's Language and Orthography', in

It has been well established that most scribes probably calculated the approximate number of sheets that would be needed before the copying process began, and there was often an oscillation between small and large letters for the purpose of either compressing or expanding written material within the codex.³¹ But what is noteworthy is the following statement: ‘It is likely that the final fifth text was added to the others when it was discovered that a considerable number of blank pages would remain after the completion of the copy of Jonah’. This practice of filling remaining pages as seen here would complement Turner’s theory that ‘scribes did not care to waste any writing material and would wish to fill any free pages left over at the end of the codex’.³²

Two observations can be made from the above discussion of the CSC. First, as mentioned above, the scribe wished every page of the codex to be occupied with text, and so included a text probably unintended for inclusion at the beginning. This supports Turner’s gradual-growth theory. Secondly, although the extant text is considerably shorter than the other portions of the codex, the unidentified text, which was copied by the same scribe as the other texts, does not lend any support to the belief that the CSC contains a single theme. It is a generic homily about prayer, action and watchfulness that is unrelated to the themes of the other texts. Had the codex been put together based on a common theme, we would not expect to find in it a text like this one. What is also striking is that most of the texts in this codex were of considerable value to Egyptian Christians, owing to the fact that they appear in other codices that were likewise discovered in Upper Egypt. For example, both 1 Peter and Melito’s *Passover Homily* from the CSC appear in the BC, and the complete text of Jonah (also in the CSC) appears in BM Ms. Or. 7594 (discussed below). That these texts show up in more than one codex suggests that they were in high demand. It is quite possible, then, that these texts were copied and included together with other texts not because of their themes per se, but because of their high acclaim (I will return to this thought below).

(2) The second codex to be considered is the BM Ms. Or. 7594, which Turner also designates a composite codex. This Coptic papyrus codex, dated to c. 350 CE, contains Deuteronomy, Jonah, Acts and an unidentified

Goehring (ed.), *The Crosby-Schøyen Codex*, pp. li-lxii (lii).

31. See the discussion in Turner, *Typology of the Early Codex*, pp. 73-74.

32. Turner, *Typology of the Early Codex*, p. 81.

Christian text.³³ We see here, as in both the BC and CSC, the inclusion of an Old Testament and New Testament book, along with some kind of Christian text at the end. My primary interest for mentioning this manuscript here is to demonstrate that it is a codex whose heterogeneous texts show no pattern of thematic resemblance. Deuteronomy, Jonah and Acts have no real thematic connection, and this inevitably prompts the question of why *these* texts were included together. Moreover, we see Turner's theory reemerge. As in the CSC, we have in this codex yet another Christian text that was probably added at the end in order to use up the free space. And since the subjects of this unidentified text 'have nothing to do with the texts in it', it cannot be called a miscellany.³⁴ It would, however, comport with Turner's gradual-growth theory of heterogeneous material.

The BC, CSC and the BM Ms. Or. 7594 are codices that contain an odd mixture of texts, but they are by no means exceptional. We find other Coptic codices consisting of heterogeneous texts. A few other examples are P.Mich. 3992;³⁵ P.Berl. Or. 408 + BM Or. 3518;³⁶ P.Bodm. 3;³⁷ P.Mich. 3520;³⁸ P.Bodm. 19.³⁹

As I move now toward the close of this paper, some final thoughts are appropriate. In a 1995 article on the Coptic versions of the New Testament, Frederik Wisse listed four stages of the transmission history of Coptic versions: (1) Pre-Classical Stage (250–350 CE); (2) Classical Sahidic and Fayumic Stage (350–450 CE); (3) Final Sahidic and Fayumic Stage (450–1000 CE); (4) Bohairic Version (after 800 CE).⁴⁰ Commenting on the 'Pre-Classical Stage', Wisse says the following:

33. For the full introduction, text and analysis, see E.A. Wallis Budge, *Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (London: Oxford University Press, 1912). The dating of this manuscript is comparatively more secure than that of the CSC.

34. Budge, *Coptic Biblical Texts*, p. lvi.

35. John, 1 Corinthians, Titus, Psalms, Isaiah.

36. Revelation, 1 John, Philemon.

37. John, Gen. 1.1–4.2.

38. Ecclesiastes, 1 John, 2 Peter.

39. Matthew, Romans.

40. Frederik Wisse, 'The Coptic Versions of the New Testament', in Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), pp. 131-41. See also Rudolphe Kasser, 'Le Papyrus Bodmer III et les versions bibliques coptes', *Muséon: Revue d'études orientales* 74 (1964), pp. 423-33.

This period is characterized by a number of uncoordinated translation efforts into various dialects serving, it would seem, mainly the interests of private Greco-Egyptian Christians. This would explain the production of MSS that include a curious selection of, or excerpts from, several OT and NT writings.⁴¹

Wisse's comments contain a number of important points germane to the present study. For one, all the codices discussed in this paper are non-liturgical, intended most probably for 'private Greco-Egyptian Christians', which is a feature of Wisse's description of Coptic manuscripts from this period. Perhaps the most important element of this quotation is, however, the identification of certain manuscripts containing a 'curious selection, or excerpts from, several OT and NT writings' with early translation efforts. As an example of such manuscripts, Wisse lists the BC, CSC and BM Ms. Or. 7594.⁴² If Wisse's theory is correct, we can safely reject the identification of these manuscripts as miscellanies. The puzzle of why such a diversity of texts appears in a single codex can be explained, then, by the fact that there were early yet uncontrolled efforts to make translations of Old and New Testament books. Why certain texts were ultimately chosen and combined with other texts is a matter of mere speculation. For example, it does not seem coincidental that 1–2 Peter and Jude appear in the same codex, because these texts do share commonalities. However, 'it is not unusual for texts which came together for whatever reason to continue to travel as a unit within the manuscript tradition'.⁴³ It is quite likely that scribes found certain texts (like 1–2 Peter and Jude) already joined in their exemplars, and that this original textual bond was preserved. Furthermore, it may well be the case that 1–2 Peter were joined early on because they were considered to be authored by the same person, and that Jude was also attached because of its close textual affinities to 2 Peter. In any case, we will never know with any real certainty why particular texts were chosen over others; the question is really unimportant. This uncertainty, however, does not warrant the notion that certain texts were joined together because of a

41. Wisse, 'Coptic Versions', p. 134.

42. That the BC is written in Greek and therefore not a translation does not affect this theory much, because it is maintained fairly strongly that, on the basis of marginalia written in Coptic, at least one scribe, the scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{72} , was a Christian Coptic scribe, and that the BC was most probably used by Egyptian Christians.

43. James E. Goehring, 'Unidentified Text', in Goehring (ed.), *The Crosby-Schøyen Codex*, pp. 263-76 (263).

common theme. Wisse's translation theory helps us understand broadly why we find so many codices with heterogeneous materials.

Conclusion

In studies subsequent to Turner's work, the view that the BC and CSC are composite codices has been dismissed. Instead, the classification miscellany has been adopted based on the belief that a common theme exists within each of the codices. Yet, given the diversity of themes that many have opined, and given that there are disagreements as to what the real themes are, there is good reason to question whether or not theme was in fact a component at all in the composition of these codices. We have seen quite a diversity of purported themes for the BC, and I have argued that the attempt to find textual relationships on the thematic level is altogether unwarranted. The assumption that a common theme was detectable in the CSC led Horrell to conclude that early Egyptian Christians interpreted 1 Peter to be a document primarily about suffering. It is not at all clear, however, that this was the case historically, and so it is dangerous to jump so quickly to this conclusion when the foundation for it is so weak. One small detail would throw a conclusion like Horrell's into peril, namely, that the BC and CSC are composite codices, which have no common internal theme.

I accept Wisse's judgment concerning the socio-historical dimension of early Egyptian Christianity, that the reason why there are some strange selections of texts among the manuscripts discovered in Upper Egypt is because of a concerted effort to establish a better reserve of biblical texts within that region. There are a number of conclusions that can be drawn from Wisse's claim. First, we can at this point reject the idea that the BC and CSC were composed around a common theme, namely, that they are miscellanies. Furthermore, we can deny any claim based on this faulty assumption, such as Horrell's idea concerning the readers' interpretation of 1 Peter in the CSC. Secondly, we can adopt Turner's initial identification of both of these manuscripts as composite, signifying a codex containing heterogeneous texts that do not thematically cohere. I have demonstrated in this paper that scribes added material to a codex when they became aware that there would be enough space to do so, and it is clear that such was the case for the CSC and BM MS Or. 7594. Furthermore, Turner's gradual-growth theory would complement Wisse's judgment about the translation efforts of early Egyptian Christians. Since there was a demand

for such a large quantity of translated material, and since the efforts to meet that demand are considered to have been uncoordinated, we would expect to find a wide range of materials. Some codices seem to have ‘grown’ precisely in this manner, with the inclusion of a variety of texts. Codices like the BC, which consists of different sections and appears to include texts from earlier collections, can be interpreted as having been assembled for the purpose of having a codex with as much material as possible. In sum, all of the above is, in my opinion, a persuasive rationale for the dismissal of the identification of the BC, CSC and similar multi-text codices from Upper Egypt as miscellanies, a term that carries with it an association with thematic coherence. The term composite, in my opinion, better represents these codices for what they are—multi-text codices with no common theme.⁴⁴

44. Roberts and Skeat, *Birth of the Codex*, p. 49, identify the BC as ‘the Bodmer “composite” codex’.