

1

The Bodmer Papyri

THEIR QUANTITY

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

—Louis Doutreleau in a letter to Victor Martin on July 26, 1956

Riyād counted out to the priest of Dishnā, “al-Qummuṣ” Manqaryūs, one by one thirty-three books . . .

—From an interview with Riyād Jirjis Fām in Heliopolis on January 15, 1980

When one tries to correlate the concept of the Bodmer Papyri with a concrete, physical reality, one realizes how abstract our thinking often is. This is true in several regards.

A number of the Bodmer Papyri are in fact not in the Bibliothèque Bodmer in Cologny near Geneva, but scattered rather widely around the world. The present investigation seeks to include all that were involved in the discovery, irrespective of their present repository.

The designation of them as “papyri” is quite misleading. Among papyrologists it has become common, if confusing, usage to refer to ancient manuscripts studied by “papyrologists,” whatever the writing surface may be, as “papyri.” Thus they no doubt came to be called “papyri”

quite casually without further reflection. But it would be inaccurate to assume that the Bodmer Papyri are all written on papyrus. Many are, but many are written on parchment. They could hardly be referred to as codices, as in the case of the Nag Hammadi Codices, in view of the fact that P. Bodmer I, XXVIII, XXXIX, XLVIII, and XLIX consist of what is left of rolls; and the Pachomian archives include rolls. Furthermore, the Bibliothèque Bodmer uses the term *codex* for the numeration system in its catalogue of Latin manuscripts, where the concept of codicology is at home.¹

The numeration of the monograph series *Papyrus Bodmer I*, et cetera, is misleading to the extent that one might be tempted to take the highest number in the series as a relevant quantity of something (XLVI among those published, L among those assigned a number). For the numeration is neither the number of ancient books, nor of texts written in such books, nor of modern books publishing the ancient material. The numeration of the series thus has unintentionally served to obscure the fact that there is no clear picture as to the size of the collection.

The first objective in what follows is hence to make a survey of the available information: to seek to establish just how many ancient books are involved, where they are, the material they are written on, the language, and the nature of their contents. This will be relevant as an indication of the size, contents, and variety of a collection buried in late antiquity, which is valuable information in its own right. It will also be relevant in seeking to correlate the Bodmer Papyri with reports emanating from Egypt as to the quantity and kinds of books involved in the discovery referred to there as the Dishnā Papers.

The number of ancient books that emanated from the same discovery is very difficult even to approximate on the basis of what has been published thus far. Appendix 2, a bibliography of Bodmer Papyri, will indicate what Bodmer Papyri have been published as well as what is not yet published but known to exist. The bibliography will make it possible to limit footnote references to these editions to the title and page references.

One may conjecture that the numeration of the monograph series *Papyrus Bodmer*² was originally intended to reflect both the number

1. Thus the Bodmer “Codices” are cataloged by Pellegrin in her *Manuscrits Latins*.

2. Initially the *Papyrus Bodmer* series was presented as a subseries within a larger series of publications of the Bibliothèque Bodmer listed at the end of each of the first

of ancient books and the number of volumes published in the modern *editiones principes*. This policy did apply when a codex contained only a single text: P. Bodmer II (though two supplementary volumes were required before this codex was more or less adequately published), VI, XVI, XVIII, XXI (the part at the Bibliothèque Bodmer), XXIII, and XXIV. But it was not carried through consistently in other instances.

Already in the first publication, a certain vacillation can be noted. For here a roll containing documentary texts on the front had been secondarily cut into two rolls containing on the back the *Iliad*, books 5 and 6. The two books of the *Iliad* were published with a comment in the introduction to the effect that, since they are distinct entities, “from a bibliographical point of view,” they would be designated P. Bodmer I and P. Bodmer II.³ But yet they were actually published in a single volume that was designated *Papyrus Bodmer I*. Perhaps this outcome resulted from the recognition that all that was left of the roll that had contained book 6 of the *Iliad* was a relatively few fragments, which did not call for a separate volume for their publication. The decision to publish both rolls in a single volume may thus have led to the decision to give them a single number, perhaps with the rationalization that the documentary texts on the front had been a single roll or that the *Iliad* is a single work. The documentary texts will, however, only be published in a concluding volume of miscellanea as *Papyrus Bodmer L*. Then, somewhat more simply, a codex containing only the Gospel of John was published as *Papyrus Bodmer II*.

A Coptic codex was ready next, as *Papyrus Bodmer III*. But, no doubt in view of the esoteric language, it was published in the Coptic subseries of the CSCO of Louvain, a series with the policy of publishing the transcription and the translation in separate volumes. The Bibliothèque Bodmer then adapted this policy to its own format: for its own distribution, it brought the two volumes together into a single

volumes (except at the end of the more recently published *Supplement to Papyrus Bodmer II: Évangile de Jean chap. 14–21*). For *Papyrus Bodmer I* and *Papyrus Bodmer II* were listed on a half-title page as *Bibliotheca Bodmeriana III* and *IV* respectively. But beginning with *Papyrus Bodmer III*, this broader series title, *Bibliotheca Bodmeriana*, was omitted, presumably because this codex, like *Papyrus Bodmer VI*, was published in the CSCO series of Louvain. Then beginning with *Papyrus Bodmer IV*, the listing of the broader Bodmer series at the end of the volumes was resumed but without numeration. This eliminated the double numeration, while still integrating the *Papyrus Bodmer* series into the whole listing of publications of the Bibliothèque Bodmer.

3. *Papyrus Bodmer I*, 9.

folder that was comparable in appearance to the covers of the volumes that had been published by the Bibliothèque Bodmer itself.

The next codex contained three plays by Menander. But the play that stood in first place in the codex (*The Girl from Samos*, P. Bodmer XXV) and the play that stood in third place (*The Shield*, P. Bodmer XXVI) were very fragmentary. Since rumors indicated that missing parts of them might ultimately be acquired,⁴ the second, relatively complete, play was published first, in a volume to itself, as *Papyrus Bodmer IV*. Thereupon the policy seems to have been adopted, at least for Greek texts, of publishing each and every text from a codex in a volume to itself, or if too small, at least with a distinct number. For this is the policy followed in the cases of the two other Greek codices containing more than one text: One codex was published in five volumes as *Papyrus Bodmer V*, *Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX*, *Papyrus Bodmer X–XII*, *Papyrus Bodmer XIII*, and *Papyrus Bodmer XX* (or, to follow the order in which the texts occur in the codex, as P. Bodmer V, X, XI, VII, XIII, XII, XX, IX and VIII); the other was published as *Papyrus Bodmer XIV* and XV (in two volumes).⁵ After the publication of P. Bodmer VI in 1960, Coptic codices were no longer included in the CSCO series of Louvain.⁶ The practice became to publish a whole Coptic codex, even though containing more than one text, in a single volume under a single number: P. Bodmer XVII, XIX, and XXII. As a result, the monograph series *Papyrus Bodmer I–XXVI*, which is the amount published prior to the hiatus marked by Bodmer's death in 1971, presents the *editiones principes* of sixteen ancient books containing thirty-nine ancient texts (or, if one remove from the calculation P. Bodmer XVII that is clearly from another provenience, fifteen ancient books containing thirty-one ancient texts). Thus, the numeration of the series itself is misleading on both accounts: It is considerably

4. *Papyrus Bodmer XXV*, 5 (and almost identically *Papyrus Bodmer XXVI*, 5): "These regrettable lacunae, and the hope that existed of seeing them filled, had motivated Mr. Martin Bodmer to delay for a long time the publication of the fragments that had come to his Library."

5. There is a vacillation in the case of P. Bodmer XIV (Luke)—P. Bodmer XV (John), the two texts of P⁷⁵. Luke is published in one volume as *Papyrus Bodmer XIV* and John in a separate volume as *Papyrus Bodmer XV*, according to the title pages. Yet the cover of each volume is inscribed *Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV: Evangile de Luc et Jean*, the one being distinguished from the other as *Tome I, XIV: Luc chap. 3–24*, and *Tome II, XV: Jean chap. 1–15*.

6. The suspension of that publication arrangement was reported in a letter of January 31, 1961, from R. Draguet, the editor of CSCO, to Jean Doresse.

higher than the number of ancient books published therein, but somewhat lower than the number of texts they contain.⁷

Bodmer Papyri of brief extent have also been published in articles. This has taken place only after the death of Martin Bodmer, and hence reflected a new policy of the Library when administered as a Foundation. Indeed, there was a lapse of six years between the last publication in book form (P. Bodmer XXVI in 1969) and the first in journal format (P. Bodmer XXVII in 1975), when the publication of three papyrus sheets from a Greek codex⁸ was begun in a Swiss journal *Museum Helveticum*. The article of 1975 contains Thucydides 6.1,1–2,6 (P. Bodmer XXVII).

7. The numeration of the series also does not conform to the number of modern volumes in the series. As in the case of P. Bodmer III, the Coptic P. Bodmer VI was published in two volumes in the CSCO series. In two cases, a single volume of the series *Papyrus Bodmer* contains more than one brief text but not a whole codex, though now each text is given a separate number (VII–IX; X–XII). This breaks down in the converse way from that of P. Bodmer III and VI the correlation between the numeration of the series and the number of modern volumes, in that one modern volume carries more than one number in the series. The correlation between the numeration and the number of modern volumes is also not retained in the case of P. Bodmer II, where an initial publication was followed by a *Supplément* and then a *Nouvelle Édition augmentée et corrigée* of the *Supplément*, with the result that three publications relate to one number.

8. Turner, *Typology*, 81, provided fuller information:

Parts of two or possibly three gatherings survive. Gathering 1 and the beginning of gathering 2 contain *Susanna* in Greek. It is followed by some other apocryphal work and then the beginning of Daniel, perhaps extending into gathering 3. After a blank page, Thucydides VI, 1–3 was copied, breaking off where the gathering ends. It is impossible to say whether the whole of Thucydides VI would have been copied in a series of subsequent gatherings.

Already in 1963, Willis, “Papyrus Fragment of Cicero,” 325, referred to a codex “containing a part of Thucydides.” In the *editio princeps* of this text in 1975, the contents of the four leaves are listed: Antonio Carlini, “Il papiro di Tucidide della Bibliotheca Bodmeriana (P. Bodmer XXVII),” 33:

In the Bibliotheca Bodmeriana of Cologny-Geneva there is conserved a fascicle [quire] composed of three bifolios [sheets] of papyrus without numeration, coming from an imprecise locality of Upper Egypt . . . The first two pages (pp. 1a, 1b) contain the biblical text “Susanna” (1:53 TOUS AITIOUS–end) in the version of Theodotion; pp. 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b contain, still in the version of Theodotion, “Daniel” 1:1–20 KAI TOUS. These two biblical texts were copied at a careful scriptorium attributable according to G. Cavallo and M. Manfredi to the Third Century A.D., according to E. G. Turner to the Fourth Century A.D. On p. 4a is found, in a heavy and irregular script difficult to date, moral exhortations. P. 4b is blank. The final four pages, pp. 5a, 5b, 6a, 6b, contain in a chancery hand the beginning of book 6 of the History of Thucydides (6.1,1–2,6 OI ELLHNES).

Then in 1981 Susanna 1:53–64 (in the translation of Theodotion) and Daniel 1:1–20 (also Theodotion) were published together as P. Bodmer XLV and XLVI. An “apocryphal work” (E. G. Turner), “moral exhortations” (Antonio Carlini) from these three sheets, is to be published as P. Bodmer XLVII. Also, six fragments from a papyrus roll of a satyr-play were published as P. Bodmer XXVIII in the same journal. Though not in the monograph series, these joined publications do continue the numeration of the monograph series. Thus the original numeration system came to apply no longer to the monograph series but rather to refer only to the publication of papyri that (mostly) belonged (at the time of publication) to the Bibliothèque Bodmer.

“With Papyrus Bodmer XXIX,” published in 1984, the first text of the so-called Codex Visionum, “the publication of Bodmer Papyri in book form resumes.”⁹ The rest of the Codex Visionum, P. Bodmer XXX–XXXVIII, is to be published.¹⁰

The presumably minor residue of still further materials at the Bibliothèque Bodmer from the same discovery, about which more precise information apparently must await their publication, includes the following:

- P. Bodmer XXXIX, a small parchment roll containing Pachomius’s Letter 11b in the Sahidic dialect of Coptic;¹¹
- P. Bodmer XL, leaves from a parchment codex containing the Song of Songs in the Sahidic dialect of Coptic, assigned to Roldophe Kasser for publication;¹²

9. *Papyrus Bodmer XXIX* 5.

10. See already Reverdin, “Les Genevois et Menandre,” as presented on the French-language Swiss radio on March 15, 1975, 1: “Vision of Dorothea, an unknown poem in epic verse by Quintus of Smyrna, for which three professors of the University of Geneva are currently preparing the edition.” E. G. Turner, in a letter of October 13, 1980, has clarified:

Smyrna is a guess, and in my view a bad one. The author simply calls himself Quintos. And he is obviously a member of the imperial bodyguard, and also a Christian. I have seen the original. My impression of date is c. iv or v; size I don’t have, but I don’t think it is the same size as any of the other Bodmer codices—that is, it is an independent book.

The volume that appeared in 1984 is titled *Papyrus Bodmer XXIX: Vision de Dorotheos*.

11. Veilleux, *Pachomian Koinonia*, 3:77–78. The Coptic text is to appear in a volume by Tito Orlandi, et al., *Pachomiana Coptica*.

12. Listed already by Till, “Coptic Biblical Texts,” 240. According to information

- P. Bodmer XLI, seven partially published papyrus leaves in the Sub-Achmimic dialect of Coptic containing the Ephesus episode from the *Acts of Paul*, assigned to Rodolphe Kasser for publication;¹³
- P. Bodmer XLII, Second Corinthians in Coptic, whose dialect and writing material has not been divulged, assigned to Rodolphe Kasser for publication;
- P. Bodmer XLIII, an unidentified apocryphon in Coptic, whose dialect and writing material has not been divulged, assigned to Rodolphe Kasser for publication;
- P. Bodmer XLIV, papyrus fragments of Daniel in the Bohairic dialect of Coptic;
- P. Bodmer XLVII, Greek “moral exhortations” an “apocryphal work” from the three papyrus sheets mentioned above; and
- P. Bodmer XLVIII, fragments of the *Iliad* and P. Bodmer XLIX, the *Odyssey* from papyrus rolls not belonging to P. Bodmer I.
- P. Bodmer L will contain the documentary texts from the recto of P. Bodmer I and miscellaneous addenda to the previous volumes, such as unpublished facsimiles.

THEIR PROVENIENCE

One knows what little credence one can give to the reports of antiquities dealers when they cannot be confirmed by any archaeological investigation.

—Rodolphe Kasser¹⁴

Shortly before his death, however, the antiquities dealer who had sold them lifted the secret. He revealed that these papyri came

obtained by Hans Quecke in the Bibliothèque Bodmer and transmitted by Tito Orlandi in a letter of June 9, 1976, the leaf containing 6:9b—7:9 was not included by Till since it was acquired later than the rest. The date on which Rodolphe Kasser prepared the inventory that he provided to Till for this purpose is not known. In various regards this inventory is less complete than that found in Kasser, *Compléments au Dictionnaire Copte de Crum*, xv. But the additional material may be due to further study rather than to further acquisitions.

13. Kasser, “Acta Pauli 1959,” 45–57. See also Kasser, “Anfang des Aufenthaltes,” 268–70. Note also the English translation, “Beginning of the Stay in Ephesus,” 387–90.

14. Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer VI*, viii, n. 1.

from a village near Nag Hammadi . . . It is to Mr. Rodolphe Kasser
 . . . that he made his confession.

—Olivier Reverdin¹⁵

. . . a little to the east of Nag Hammadi . . .

—Rodolphe Kasser¹⁶

The *provenience* of a book is its “place of origin.” However, this may be taken to refer either to the place where it was produced, or, in the case of discovered manuscripts, to the place where it was discovered. Internal evidence, such as the scribal hand or codicological details, would tend to point to the place where a book was produced, and only by inference to the place where it was discovered. External evidence, such as reports accompanying the material to the antiquities market, would tend to point to the place where a book was discovered and only by inference to the place where it was produced. Since books could be readily carried up and down the Nile, the two senses of *provenience* need not coincide. But the assumption has been, when there are no indications to the contrary, that they would be the same. As long as the two senses of *provenience* may reasonably be assumed to coincide, the discussion may be carried on in this inclusive sense. Yet, one should be aware of the theoretical possibility of a divergence in terms of *provenience* in order that evidence not be used in an inappropriate way. And when the dates, languages, writing material, cultural matrix, and other qualities of individual books diverge as much as is the case with the Bodmer Papyri, it is wisest to limit the term to refer to the place of discovery.

In the case of most manuscripts reaching scholarly hands through the antiquities market, the *provenience* is not known. Thus manuscripts discovered in the process of legitimate archaeological excavation not only have the advantage of being free from the shadows of impropriety in their acquisition and avoid the dangers of mishandling and loss at the hands of discoverers and middlemen, but also have the added value that inheres in an artifact found *in situ*. An instance would be the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, where knowledge of their *provenience* has made possible the reconstruction of the history of that location.¹⁷ Even when the manuscripts result from a clandestine discovery, an identification of

15. Reverdin, “Les Genevois et Ménandre,” 1.

16. Kasser, *Papyrus Bodmer XXIX*, 100, n. 2.

17. Turner, “Roman Oxyrhynchus,” 78–93.

the provenience would make them amenable to such a use. Father Louis Doutreleau urged Victor Martin (unsuccessfully) to prepare an inventory of the Bodmer Papyri, since he thought this would “make it possible to discover the *raison d'être* of Nag Hammadi” (see below). Indeed the thesis of this book as to the provenience of the Bodmer Papyri from the Pachomian Monastic Order provides the most important new information about the Pachomian Order to have emerged in recent times.

The knowledge of the provenience of a manuscript also augments what can be inferred about the manuscript itself. The lack of information concerning the provenience of the Bodmer Papyri early led to whimsical regret over this limitation of their usefulness: “The editor concludes that the [Bohairic] text was translated from an archaic Sahidic model by someone whose knowledge of Bohairic was not perfect. It is regrettable in this connection that there is no satisfactory information as to the provenience of BO [P. Bodmer III].”¹⁸

Rodolphe Kasser has similarly expressed the importance for the localization of Coptic dialects that would be attached to establishing the provenience of the Bodmer Papyri:

The *place* of discovery of a papyrus is an extremely important indication for the study of the text that it contains (and that all the more when it has to do with an ancient Coptic copy). But often, too often, this place cannot be known with certitude. Such is unfortunately the case with the Bodmer Papyri that have occupied us until now. And even if one would expect a bit that a copy like P. Bodmer XXI would come from Upper Egypt, it is impossible to prove what is only an assumption. Let us hope that one day we will be better informed on this point, capital for the study of Coptic linguistics, in particular with regard to what concerns the localization of the different dialects in Egypt, their geographic origin, their field of expansion, their zones of superimposition and reciprocal influences.¹⁹

Martin Krause has drawn attention to the greater usefulness of the Nag Hammadi codices over the Bodmer Papyri due to knowledge as to the provenience of the Nag Hammadi Codices and the lack of specificity concerning the provenience of the Bodmer Papyri, with the result that

18. Kuhn, “Review of *Papyrus Bodmer III*,” 364.

19. *Papyrus Bodmer XXI*, 7.

the two collections can hardly be fruitfully brought into interaction with each other:

Especially it is so important that both the place of discovery as well as the time of inscribing the texts be assured, because both form the presupposition for well-grounded work in the area of Coptic dialect research. But this presupposition is given in only the rarest cases with regard to early Coptic manuscripts. It is largely missing for the already mentioned manuscript discovery that R. Kasser has edited for the largest part: As place of discovery only quite generally Upper Egypt is known. The dating of the Coptic manuscripts is very crude: P. Bodmer XVIII and XXI, for example, are said to be “probably from the Fourth Century.” P. Bodmer XIX and XXII come from the “Fourth to Fifth Century.” Before these texts can be evaluated for the history of the Coptic language and dialects and compared with the linguistic situation of the library of Nag Hammadi, these manuscripts must first be more precisely dated and one must attempt to determine the place of their origin.²⁰

To be sure, such reasoning seems to assume that the location of the discovery is the same as that of the scribe or translator, whereas, in fact, the contrary seems to be the case, once the ensemble of the Bodmer Papyri is considered as a whole. For example, the plurality of dialects represented makes it difficult to assume the provenience of the discovery would help identify the nomes in which that dialect was spoken. But the striking divergence among the Bodmer Papyri with regard to the plurality of Coptic dialects and indeed of non-Coptic languages has been hard to appreciate, due to the lack of an overview of the whole of the Bodmer Papyri discovery.

Published information has been sparse and even then ambivalent concerning just what material in the Bibliothèque Bodmer is of a shared provenience. The Introduction of *Papyrus Bodmer* III of 1958 reported that P. Bodmer II and III were part of a batch of documents offered in a block, whose provenience, though unknown, is referred to in the singular.²¹ This would tend to suggest that a discovery of manuscripts had been kept together and sold together to the Bibliothèque Bodmer. Similarly the Introduction to *Papyrus Bodmer* XVI of 1961 spoke of a

20. Krause, “Zur Bedeutung des gnostisch-hermetischen Handschriftenfundes,” 73.

21. *Papyrus Bodmer* III, 3.

single provenience for the “ensemble” of the Coptic material;²² and the Introduction to *Papyrus Bodmer XXIII* of 1965 attributed to a single discovery the Greek and Coptic documents on papyrus and parchment that arrived together.²³

Yet the publication in 1956 of P. Bodmer II had been accompanied by a small green chit of paper reporting that a new batch of papyri containing fragments of P. Bodmer II had been acquired while the volume was in the press.²⁴ This tends to suggest that the material from the one discovery had been divided and was acquired by the Bibliothèque Bodmer in more than one transaction. The introduction to *Papyrus Bodmer XXII* of 1964 suggested that this manuscript, after passing by the Bibliothèque Bodmer only to be examined, was absent for over a year before it finally came back in altered condition, and, one might be led to infer, only then acquired.²⁵ However, the codex, after its first passage at the Bibliothèque Bodmer, seems less to have returned to the antiquities market than, in view of its balled-up condition, to have undergone a not fully successful effort to flatten and conserve it.²⁶ The inaccurate numeration written in

22. *Papyrus Bodmer XVI*, 7.

23. *Papyrus Bodmer XXIII*, 7: “the discovery of Greek or Coptic documents on papyrus or parchment that arrived together at the Bibliothèque Bodmer.”

24. The chit of paper was as follows:

Important Notice: The present volume was already in the press when the Bibliothèque Bodmer was able to acquire a new batch of papyri. On examining it, it became clear that it contained a good number of fragments, though of very small size, belonging to the last chapters of our manuscript of the Fourth Gospel. Since the identification and assembly of these scraps will require considerable time, it has seemed fitting not to delay the publication that was in progress, and to reserve the remainder for an appendix that will be prepared as quickly as possible.

25. *Papyrus Bodmer XXII*, 7: “In effect, the manuscript that must have been entrusted to the Bibliothèque only for examination, disappeared from it again for more than a year. When it returned, most of the folios had been separated the one from the other; furthermore they had been carefully unglued, flattened and polished, which had not taken place without altering the clarity of the script.”

26. William H. Willis has reported in a letter of June 8, 1980:

On a visit to the Bodmeriana in the course of Kasser’s and my collaboration (1962), I saw the Bodmer leaves and learned the story to which Kasser obliquely alludes . . . When the ball-shaped first half came to Geneva (along with all the rest from Tano), at the time when Testuz was the house scholar and before Kasser, still at Combas, had been recommended to Testuz by Draguet, Bodmer sent it to Zürich (where he had business interests) to have it

pencil on the pages during their absence has been explained as an error due to the fact that some of the material was in a different lot only later acquired by the Bibliothèque Bodmer,²⁷ which again suggests more than one stage in the acquisition process. (The parts of this same P. Bodmer XXII that were to become Mississippi Coptic Codex II, which were also originally in a balled-up state,²⁸ did not pass through the Bibliothèque Bodmer, but represent a completely independent transaction.) The preface to *Papyrus Bodmer XXV* of 1969 also suggested in a still different way a process rather than a single acquisition, in that its publication was deferred in 1958 in hopes that rumors of more to come would prove to be true, a hope that by 1969 had for all practical purposes been abandoned.²⁹ One may conclude that the acquisition extended over a period of years, which seems to have been largely limited to the 1950s rather than extending significantly over into the 1960s. One should,

relaxed and photographed; somehow Bodmer's son was involved. The relaxing and "consolidation" was very crudely done, with a hot iron in fact, with resulting splits in the parchment leaves; folds in some leaves were pressed into overlaps with resulting loss of letters; and the photos were made by a newspaper photographer, rather poorly. This is the "year of disappearance" to which Kasser later alluded, I believe. His allusion was purposefully obscure because he didn't want to offend Bodmer (or his watchdog Mlle. Bongard), whom he thought to have acted incompetently.

27. *Papyrus Bodmer XXII*, 7, n. 2: "If they [the penciled page numbers] do not correspond exactly to the actual position of the leaves, it is because other folios (e.g., pp. 1/2) were acquired later by the Bibliothèque Bodmer."

28. Willis, "New Collection of Papyri," 382–83: "While the papyrus codex [Mississippi Coptic Codex I = the Crosby Codex] was found flat and undistorted, the parchment one was on arrival so curled as to appear almost ball-shaped, suggesting it may have been preserved in the bottom of a small pot."

29. *Papyrus Bodmer XXV*, 5 (and almost identically, *Papyrus Bodmer XXVI*, 5):

Ten years have run past since V. Martin published the *Dyscolos* of Menander (*Papyrus Bodmer IV*), a comedy almost entirely unpublished until then, and conserved practically intact in this new document. The manuscript of the Third Century that has restored the *Dyscolos* to us contains also other pieces by Menander. However none of them is complete (several folios of the codex are still completely lacking). These regrettable lacunae, and the hope that there was of seeing them filled, had led Mr. Martin Bodmer to delay for a long time the publication of the fragments that had come to his library. But now, after so many years of largely fruitless patience, the decision has been made not to deny to papyrologists and Hellenists any longer the knowledge of texts that they have been awaiting with great impatience.

A footnote explained the hope: "The rumor was circulating that the pages still absent could be recuperated soon."

however, note the feeble and unfulfilled hope still expressed at the conclusion to the supplements to *Papyrus Bodmer IV*, published in 1969 with *Papyrus Bodmer XXVI*.³⁰

The very fact that parts of the same discovery emerged in so many other collections (see chapters 2–3 below) would suggest that the discovery was not sold as an ensemble but rather in a series of transactions, in which process the Bibliothèque Bodmer might be expected to have been involved more than once. It is this situation that is reflected in a parenthetical comment of 1969 to the effect that almost all of an ancient library finally reached the Bibliothèque Bodmer.³¹ Since the Bibliothèque Bodmer did not itself have an overview of the total contents of the discovery, this comment probably means no more than that Bodmer bought most of what was offered to him.

If thus the material reached the Bibliothèque Bodmer in a series of transactions, a shared provenience for all the material is not certain. Only when materials from different transactions belong to the same manuscript are the two batches in question thereby obviously related. Yet the statements cited above implying a shared provenience may be assumed to be intended to apply to all of the collection except where specific exceptions are made. An exception to the shared provenience is most probable in the case of P. Bodmer XVII, stated to be of unknown provenience, but with no relation to the other documents published in the series, and “different from them in every regard.”³²

In the introduction to *Papyrus Bodmer XXIV* of 1967, this codex was added to P. Bodmer (I and) XVII as having a separate provenience from the bulk of the Bodmer Papyri.³³ This separation of P. Bodmer

30. *Papyrus Bodmer XXVI*, 49: “Let us hope that other fragments of this codex will still appear and permit us to have a still more complete and precise picture of the work of Menander.”

31. *Papyrus Bodmer XXXVI*, 17: “Manuscripts that, almost all, have finally come to the Bodmeriana.”

32. *Papyrus Bodmer XVII*, 7: “P. Bodmer XVII (P⁷⁴) is a rather large papyrus codex whose exact provenience is unknown to us. In any case one cannot establish any relation between this document and the other ancient codices (Greek or Coptic, on papyrus or parchment) belonging to the Bibliothèque Bodmer and published in this same series. Besides, P⁷⁴ is different from them in every regard.”

33. *Papyrus Bodmer XXIV*, 7: “Only one thing is sure: It [P. Bodmer XXIV] is not part of the batch including the Greek or Coptic P. Bodmer II to XVI and XVIII to XXIII, and, furthermore, it is not of the same *origin* as P. Bodmer I or P. Bodmer XVII.”

XXIV from the main collection was apparently not based on specific information concerning a distinct provenience, since that is said to be unknown.³⁴ It may be because P. Bodmer XXIV was known to come from a different dealer (see chapter 4 below). In any case, in 1969, in the introduction to *Papyrus Bodmer XXV*, P. Bodmer XXIV was dropped from the list of exceptions to the shared provenience.³⁵ Similarly, in 1972 Rodolphe Kasser listed only P. Bodmer (I and) XVII as exceptions to the collection's having been copied (he must have meant discovered!) at the same place.³⁶ Thus, one may infer that the initial exclusion of P. Bodmer XXIV from the shared provenience was soon suspended.

In 1963, George D. Kilpatrick reported that "it has been questioned whether the Homer [P. Bodmer I] is part of the same find as the Biblical and Christian texts."³⁷ William H. Willis has also reported having been told early in the 1960s that only P. Bodmer I and XVII were of a distinct provenience.³⁸ The distinguishing of the provenience of P. Bodmer I from that of the bulk of the collection does not seem to have been published prior to the introduction to *Papyrus Bodmer XXIV* in 1967. The *editio princeps* of P. Bodmer I in 1954 did not affirm or deny a shared provenience, since what other papyri may have been at the Bibliothèque Bodmer at that time were unpublished; in any case no reference was made to them.

34. *Papyrus Bodmer XXIV*, 7: "We do not know from what part of Egypt P. Bodmer XXIV comes."

35. *Papyrus Bodmer XXV*, 7, the matter of provenience is relegated to: "Cf. *P. Bodmer XXIII*, p. 7; P. Bodmer I and XVII are of a different origin." The reference back to the equivalent passage in the Introduction to *Papyrus Bodmer XXIII*, rather than to that of *Papyrus Bodmer XXIV*, would also seem to suggest a tacit disavowal of the exclusion of P. Bodmer XXIV from the shared provenience maintained in the introduction to *Papyrus Bodmer XXIV*.

36. Kasser, "Fragments du livre biblique," 80, n. 23.

37. Kilpatrick, "Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," 34.

38. In a letter of May 27, 1980, from Willis:

In Geneva nearly twenty years ago I was told positively by both Mlle Bongard and Professor Kasser that P. Bodmer I and XVII had no connection with the other Bodmer codices . . . P. Bodmer I comprises two rolls (probably from Panopolis) which M. Bodmer purchased because he was interested in Homer, well before he had the opportunity to buy the subsequent find of codices; and well after he had bought the other codices, his agents turned up P. Bodmer XVII, a much later (seventh-century) papyrus codex of entirely different format, style and script from the Dishnā group. All the other codices, so far as I could learn, belonged to the big find.

On December 25, 1958, Victor Martin had written to Willis concerning the provenience of the Bodmer Papyri: “That they were found in Achmim, though probable, is by no means certain.”³⁹ Willis took this to refer in general to the Bodmer Papyri and hence inferred that it also applied to Mississippi Coptic Codices I and II. Yet the association with Achmim was at the time derived from P. Bodmer I.⁴⁰ Martin had recognized that once the land registry of Panopolis (Achmim), dated to 208–209 CE and inscribed on the recto of both rolls of P. Bodmer I, was no longer of value, it could have been moved elsewhere prior to the use of the verso to inscribe books 5 and 6 of the *Iliad*.⁴¹ Yet, in the absence of any reason to suggest a different provenience, Achmim seemed a logical conjecture.⁴² Thus the association of the Bodmer Papyri with Achmim presupposes the inclusion of P. Bodmer I in the same discovery as the bulk of the Bodmer Papyri. Hence as late as 1961, the introduction to *Papyrus Bodmer XVI* apparently still presupposed the inclusion of P. Bodmer I in the main collection, in suggesting that the scriptorium of the Coptic material was somewhere “between Achmim and Thebes,” though apparently for linguistic reasons tending to prefer Thebes.⁴³

39. Willis, “New Collections of Papyri,” 383, n. 1.

40. *Papyrus Bodmer I*, 21: “With regard to their provenience, the recto also furnishes indications. The administrative register that it contains concerns the nome of Panopolis in Upper Egypt. Hence one has every reason to think that it is at Panopolis (today Achmim) that the Homeric roll was created, and doubtless also discovered.” P. Beatty Panop., which has for similar reasons also been attributed to Panopolis, had not yet been published, much less associated with the Bodmer Papyri.

41. Turner, “Roman Oxyrhynchus,” 89–90, cited by Martin, *Papyrus Bodmer I*, 21, had drawn attention to such material found at Oxyrhynchus but originating from other nomes of Egypt. See also Turner, “Recto and Verso,” 102–6.

42. *Papyrus Bodmer I*, 21–22:

In any case nothing obliges us to disassociate the text of Homer here published from the land registry on the recto with regard to the place of their transcription. Panopolis was a provincial metropolis of a certain importance, where one knows that classical culture was in high repute. If this region became in the Fourth Century a center of monastic life, we also know that it remained until much later a center of resistance on the part of intellectual paganism to the new religion . . . We can hence, without mental reservations, see in our Homeric papyrus both a product of the local “bookstore” and a witness to the interest of the Panopolitans of the imperial epoch for classical Greek literature.

43. *Papyrus Bodmer XVI*, 7: “For the moment, in the absence of more precise indications, we can admit, as a possibility if not probability, that these texts were copied between Achmim and Thebes, and, by preference, in the neighborhood of the latter site.”

Achmim has hence been widely accepted as the provenience of the bulk of the Bodmer Papyri. In 1958, E. G. Turner advocated Achmim and, indeed, a single discovery as the provenience of all the Bodmer Papyri, as well as of other manuscripts that have emerged since 1930.⁴⁴ In 1970, Richard Seider listed as the site of the discovery of P. Bodmer IV “Panopolis(?)”.⁴⁵ In 1976, Joseph van Haelst listed Panopolis as the probable provenience of all the Christian codices among the Bodmer Papyri that had been published up to that time.⁴⁶ In 1979, Colin H. Roberts

44. Turner, *Greek Papyri* 52–53:

Classical scholars will think, however, of Panopolis as the possible source of another codex of Menander, P. Bodmer IV . . . Within the thirty-year period 1930 to 1960 a considerable number of intact or nearly intact papyrus books were acquired by collectors, some by M. Bodmer, some by Sir Chester Beatty, others by institutions which include the University of Mississippi and the papyrological Institutes of Cologne and Barcelona. The earliest of these texts are to be dated about A. D. 200, the latest are of the sixth and seventh centuries . . . It is an economical hypothesis that all these papyri, whether works of Greek literature, documents, or Christian texts, are from one source and constitute a unitary find . . . The proved connection of P. Bodmer I and P. Beatty Panop. with Panopolis (leaving P. Gen. Inv. 108 and P. Leit. 10 out of account) is not evidence that would be sufficient in a court of law to establish Panopolitan origin for either the Menander codex or the rest of the manuscripts enumerated. There may have been more than one find (it is said, for instance, that P. Bodmer XVII did not belong to the original find). With this find it may be wrong to associate P. Bodmer I and the Chester Beatty codex and the documents mentioned in (5) [P. Gen. Inv. 108 and P. Leit. 10]. Yet these points are worth bearing in mind, especially as Panopolis was noted for its monasteries.

In the Supplementary Notes of the paperback edition of 1980, page 201, Turner withdraws P. Gen. Inv. 108 and P. Leit. 10 from such a shared provenience, since they were acquired by Geneva in 1900 and 1922 respectively. However, he indicates explicitly that the Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri may also be from Panopolis, and casts doubt on the report of Rodolphe Kasser to the effect that the dealer said the Bodmer Papyri came from a village near Nag Hammadi. “I am skeptical whether the dealer got his details right.” However, in a letter of October 13, 1980, in response to an earlier draft of the present chapter, Turner has retracted this position: “You could help by slipping in a footnote to say that what I wrote in *Greek Papyri* 1968, 2nd ed. paperback, I am convinced is wrong, after reading your account.”

45. Seider, *Paläographie*, vol. 2, *Literarische Papyri*, 136.

46. Van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* 156, item 426 (P. Bodmer II); 212, item 599 (P. Bodmer V); 196, item 557 (P. Bodmer VII); 193, item 548 (P. Bodmer VIII); 69, item 138 (P. Bodmer IX); 217, item 611 (P. Bodmer X); 199–200, item 569 (P. Bodmer XI); 244, item 681 (P. Bodmer XII); 243, item 678 (P. Bodmer XIII); 148, item 406 (P. Bodmer XIV–XV); 258, item 710 (P. Bodmer XX); and 62, item 118 (P. Bodmer XXIV). This includes all the Christian Bodmer Papyri

supported Turner's pan-Panopolitan argument on the basis of similarities in the use of *nomina sacra*, including the attribution of the Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri to the same discovery as the Bodmer Papyri,⁴⁷ although he did recall Carl Schmidt's report of having been told that the Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri were found "in the ruins of a church or monastery near Atfih (Aphroditopolis)."⁴⁸

Thus the inclusion of P. Bodmer I in the same discovery as the rest of the Bodmer Papyri seems, at least indirectly, to have gained widespread acceptance, to judge by the trend to derive the bulk of the material from Panopolis. But this could also cut the other way: The ultimate provenience in Panopolis of material secondarily used for two books

that had at that time been published except P. Bodmer XVII, which he attributed to an "unknown provenience," p. 171, item 470. Haelst made the same statement for each of the other codices: "Uncertain provenience (purchase); probably Upper Egypt (the region of Panopolis)."

47. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief*, 28, n. 1.

48. *Ibid.*, 7, referring to Schmidt, "Die neuesten Bibelfunde," 292–93:

The determining of the location of a discovery is of course always very difficult, since the discoverer as well as the middleman has the greatest interest in erasing all traces, so as not to be called in to give account before the authorities or the administration of the museum. Nonetheless I have continued the investigation of the mysterious location of the discovery on my last visit, and could obtain from my old trusted contact man, who himself had possessed a number of leaves, first of all the admission that the Fayyum, of which one thinks first, did not come in question. A location of the discovery in Upper Egypt is excluded because of the group of middlemen into whose possession the leaves had come. In any case the location of the discovery could not lie far from the Fayyum. So I believe I possess an important pointer in the explanation of my contact man, when he described how to reach the site of the discovery, to the effect that I must go to the shore of the Nile east from Bush, a train station between El-Wasta and Beni Suef (115 km from Cairo), and cross over the Nile to the village Alalme. Alalme is the village from which a street leads to the monasteries of Anthony and Paul on the Red Sea, and from which toward the north the old Monastery of Anthony lies, and still further to the north, also on the east shore, the hamlet Atfih, old Aphroditopolis, from which Anthony, the founder of Egyptian monasticism, came. Here churches and monasteries must have existed that in old times possessed Christian sacred writings on papyrus and that copied them onto parchment after they were worn out.

Roberts also refers to Schmidt, "Evangelienhandschrift," 225: "Still this spring I interrogated the Fayyum dealer again and received the same information, to the effect that a locality Alame on the east bank of the Nile in the region of Atfih, old Aphroditopolis, is to be considered the location of the discovery."

of the *Iliad* (P. Bodmer I) need not mitigate against a shared secondary provenience near Dishnā, once one reflects upon the absorption of a monastic cluster near Panopolis led by Petronius into the Pachomian order, and the inclusion of Dishnā in the Panopolitan nome.

A somewhat similar situation obtains with regard to a Chester Beatty codex, where the quire was made of two rolls pasted together so that the writing surfaces faced each other, and the unscribed back sides of the rolls became the exposed sides that were the pages in the codex. For the text on the two rolls are administrative documents from Panopolis of 298 and 300 CE (whereas the pages of the codex, largely unscribed, do present a few tax receipts between 340 and 345 CE). Hence the codex has been designated P. Beatty Panop.⁴⁹ These tax receipts have to do in large part with a Panopolitan fairly prominent in documentary papyri at the Institut für Altertumskunde of the University of Cologne (see chapter 3 below). Thus one has to do with the three main repositories of the bulk of the Bodmer Papyri: Either these repositories share materials both from the main discovery near Dishnā and from a second provenience near Panopolis, or Panopolitan documentary papyri were in late antiquity incorporated among the Bodmer Papyri and were thus included in the shared burial near Dishnā (see chapters 2 and 3 below).

The assumption that P. Bodmer I (published two years before P. Bodmer II) was acquired separately and prior to the bulk of the collection does not necessarily indicate a different provenience. It was not a very early acquisition since it was not included by Bodmer among the papyri listed in *Eine Bibliothek der Weltliteratur* (1947). Bodmer had contacted the Cairo dealer from whom the bulk of the Bodmer Papyri were acquired as early as 1950, so that acquisitions made prior to the bulk purchases beginning in 1955 could have been from the same dealer and provenience. Bodmer had assembled the material conceded to be from the shared provenience in a series of transactions over a period of time, and the acquisition of P. Bodmer I could have been the beginning of this process.

Since nothing is reported from the antiquities market about a divergent provenience for P. Bodmer I, one may suspect that this view is a mere inference from perhaps misinterpreted circumstantial evidence. Doubt as to whether P. Bodmer I was of the shared provenience may have been increased by the observation that it was a roll, whereas the

49. Skeat, "Papyri from Panopolis," 194–99.

other books were codices. For when fragments of another roll, also with a classical text, were subsequently identified and published as *Papyrus Bodmer XXVIII*, this new fact was brought into conformity with the concept of a library exclusively of codices by the hypothesis of W. E. H. Cockle that the fragments may be from the cartonnage from the cover of a codex. Yet this view was put in question by Rodolphe Kasser's insistence that the removal of the fragments from a cover would have to have been done prior to the arrival of the material at the Bibliothèque Bodmer.⁵⁰ And now further fragments of rolls of the *Iliad* (P. Bodmer XLVIII) and the *Odyssey* (P. Bodmer XLIX) have been identified, in the residue of fragments that were among the various batches. If, therefore, fragments of rolls, and indeed rolls of Homer, accompanied the bulk of the Bodmer Papyri, the case for excluding P. Bodmer I from the shared provenience is correspondingly weakened.

It may have been that the publication of a New Testament text (P⁶⁶: John) next after Homer may have led to the assumption of a different provenience, especially since the editor of P. Bodmer II conjectured a monastery as its provenience. Thus Turner's pan-Panopolitan theory had to emphasize both the pagan and the monastic environment of Panopolis. But the investigations by Bodmer's secretary, Odile Bongard, had also produced what was in effect and probably in fact Tano's information that the material came from a monastery near Dishnā. This would have served to separate off the material thought to be from Panopolis: P. Bodmer I. But then Menander and other non-Christian material from the shared provenience may have led gradually to the abandonment both of the monastery hypothesis and of a divergent provenience for the non-Christian material, to whatever extent this played a role in the case of P. Bodmer I.

The absence or inaccessibility of information at the Bibliothèque Bodmer or from within the Bodmer family, together with the unwillingness of Mlle Bongard to divulge, prior to her testament, what she

50. Turner, "Papyrus Bodmer XXVIII: Satyr-Play," 2. Evidence that this might have been cartonnage had been seen in the condition of the fragments:

Clearly observable folds run obliquely down the height of the two large fragments A and D. In A the area on the upper right of this fold, in D that on the lower right is dirtyish, and covered by a whitish powder which could be remaining traces of paste; the areas on the other side of the fold are clean and bright golden in colour. A and D have in fact been put together to reconstitute the roll as here published. It might well have been torn up and the torn pieces folded to pack behind a leather outer cover.

knows, eliminates the more obvious sources of information concerning the relatedness of the Bodmer Papyri. The willingness on the part of the Chester Beatty Library to make Beatty's correspondence, the registry of accessions, and the other archival material accessible to scholarship produces in some cases a higher degree of certainty that some items in the Chester Beatty Library are Bodmer Papyri in the sense of a shared provenience (see chapter 2 below) than can be said of some items in the Bibliothèque Bodmer, for which such an assumption is quite reasonable but actually lacking any specific confirmation. And the same is true of the Institut für Altertumskunde of the University of Cologne, where willingness to make available the in-house reports on accessions and records about each accession has made possible a sifting between what is probable and what is merely possible in terms of a shared provenience (see chapter 3 below).

In addition to the association of P. Bodmer I with Achmim, the *editiones principes* of other Bodmer Papyri have assumed various positions with regard to provenience. Victor Martin's introduction to P. Bodmer II in 1956 proposed "a scriptorium attached to some monastery."⁵¹ But Kurt Aland pointed out that there were no Christian monasteries at the time.⁵² He suggested, as possibilities, a scriptorium at the catechetical school of Alexandria or one resulting from Bishop Demetrius's organization of the Egyptian church, but he pointed out that nothing is known of such scriptoria. The hand of P. Bodmer II makes it clear that it is the work of a professional scribe at the scriptorium of a publishing house.⁵³ Yet it is doubtful that such publishers at the time produced Christian texts for the public market, though it could have been commissioned by the church.

51. *Papyrus Bodmer II*, 10: "One can think of a scriptorium attached to some monastery that, without pretending to produce luxury copies, strove nonetheless for a certain quality."

52. Aland, "Papyrus Bodmer II: Ein erster Bericht," 180:

"That is in any case very unlikely. For Christian monasteries in the genuine sense did not exist around 200 either in Egypt or elsewhere." This judgment is not altered even if one were to date P. Bodmer II as late as 200–250 AD, as does Eric G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 108, item 63. E. A. Wallace Budge, *Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (London: British Museum, 1912) 1.xxviii, pointed out that when Anthony was a young man (around 270 AD) "there were no monasteries in existence."

53. *Ibid.*, 180–81: "That it comes from the hand of a professional scribe and hence from a workshop seems in any case to be certain based on the character of the script."

Aland also doubts that it was produced by a professional Christian scribe for his own use, in that the quantity of omissions and scribal errors would suggest that the scribe was not a Christian.⁵⁴ The idea of a monastery as provenience was dropped in the *editiones principes*.⁵⁵ In the introduction of 1958 to *Papyrus Bodmer IV*, a play by Menander for which a monastic provenience would not suggest itself, Victor Martin simply stated that the provenience was unknown.⁵⁶ Indeed the suggestion of a monastic provenience did not reemerge until information from the antiquities market began to be reported (see below).⁵⁷

Here one can already observe that the location of the scribe of one book would not necessarily be that of another, much less that of the whole collection. If the hand of P. Bodmer II (Greek!) reflects a professional scribe at a scriptorium, the hands of P. Bodmer III and VI (Coptic!) have been characterized as reflecting the reverse.⁵⁸

54. *Ibid.*, 181.

55. The introduction to *Papyrus Bodmer XIX*, 8, n. 2, in order to explain the rapid deterioration of the papyrus, postulated frequent use “by a Christian community, no doubt.” Even several communities are postulated, on p. 9: “One could ask oneself also if this decayed codex, venerable souvenir of a past epoch, was not divided, like a precious relic, between several Christian communities.” But it is not clear that such Christian groups were envisaged by the editor as monasteries rather than as local churches. Michel Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX*, 9, used the term *community* to refer to a congregation rather than a monastery, as is evident from the fact that he had in view a wealthy member of such a community: “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.” But Turner, *Greek Papyri* (1968), 53, used the association of Achmim with monasteries and the fact of manuscript discoveries in the White Monastery there as a final argument in favor of this provenience: “Yet these pointers are worth bearing in mind, especially as Panopolis was noted for its monasteries. Just across the river from Panopolis lies the White Monastery presided over by Schenute in the late fourth century. The stones of this monastery have already furnished the British Museum with a unitary find of a Coptic Psalter and homilies, and a number of other Coptic texts.” The concept of a monastic library would, however, reemerge in connection with the reports of antiquities dealers and middlemen (see below).

56. *Papyrus Bodmer IV*, 7: “The place and the conditions of the discovery of the papyrus of the *Dyscolos* are unfortunately unknown, as is almost always the case for pieces of this kind acquired on the antiquities market.”

57. Reverdin, “Les Genevois et Ménandre,” 1: It has to do, in all probability, with what survives of the library of a monastery.

58. *Papyrus Bodmer III*, CSCO, 178.i: “We have shown how, in our view, this private copy was made: Very probably it was the work of a rather awkward scribe . . .” Kuhn, Review of *Papyrus Bodmer III*, 364: “The erratic orthography and the many errors and corrections indicate that BO [P. Bodmer III] was copied privately and that it is not the

Rodolphe Kasser's introduction to *Papyrus Bodmer III* in 1958 also expressed ignorance as to the provenience, suggesting only that the papyri had all been found together in Upper Egypt and emanated from a private library,⁵⁹ a view also presented in his introductions to *Papyrus Bodmer VI* and *Papyrus Bodmer XVI* in 1960–1961, as well as in Jean Guiton's preface to the deluxe edition of *P. Bodmer VIII* in 1968.⁶⁰ Michel Testuz's introduction to *Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX* in 1959⁶¹ had provided the explanation for the conjecture of a private library: The small format of a codex has traditionally been so explained, in distinction from the large format used in the church.⁶² However, this is hardly a reliable indication. For other factors have come to be recognized as influencing the size, such as changing style and the material used.⁶³

Even if some specific use were in mind in choosing a format, that would apply to the original setting of the copying of the book rather than to the provenience of the discovery. If the collection covers more than

product of a scriptorium. *Papyrus Bodmer VI*, CSCO, 194.xxix: A scribe who had none of the professionalism of a scriptorium . . ."

59. *Papyrus Bodmer III*, CSCO, 177.iii: "This papyrus [P. Bodmer II] and ours were part of a group of Coptic and Greek documents that, offered in a block to the Bodmeriana, were acquired by the latter without their exact provenience having been revealed thus far. One said that all the pieces had been found together in Upper Egypt, and that it had to do with a private library. We do not know anything more."

60. *Papyrus Bodmer VI*, CSCO, 194.viii. *Papyrus Bodmer XVI* 7. Jean Guiton, "Preface," in Carolus M. Martini, *Beati Petri Apostoli Epistulae*, viii: "A rich and spiritual person of Egypt in the Third Century A. D., rather like the excellent Theophilus to whom Luke dedicated his work, commissioned his scribe to copy for him certain canonical texts of the New Testament." This is very similar to Father Louis Doutreleau's assumption that the Bodmer Papyri were the library of "an educated Christian." In a letter of August 29, 1980, L. Doutreleau stated: "In my view, NH II [the Bodmer Papyri] was a different library [from the Nag Hammadi codices], that of an educated Christian."

61. *Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX*, 9–10: "The content of this anthology shows that the book was produced by the Christians of Egypt, probably on the commission of a well-to-do member of their community, who intended it for his own library. The small format of the codex (about 15.5 x 14.2 cm) indicates that it had been made for private use rather than for reading in church."

62. Budge, *Coptic Biblical Texts*, 1.xxxiii–1.xxxiv: "It is tolerably certain that the Codex was not used as a service-book in a church, for it is not large enough, and the extraordinary selection of books of the Bible in it suggests that it was written for or by a private individual, most probably a monk who was a trained scribe, for private use."

63. Turner, *Typology*, 13–34. See also Drescher, "Review of *Papyrus Bodmer XXII*," 228: "The manuscript is a parchment one and, like other early parchment manuscripts, is of small format."

three centuries of scribal activity, the final situation at the time of burial would hardly be the same as that prevalent when at least the older books were produced. If size were a factor in determining the provenience, in terms of the place of manufacture, plurality of provenience would be evident from the wide divergences especially in height within the collection XXV–IV–XXVI: 12 cm broad by 27.5 or 28 cm high (though as a collection of Menander's plays, hardly a book for use in the church!); P. Bodmer VI: 12 cm broad by 14.5 cm high. It has also been noted that the earlier codices tend to be in Greek, the later ones in Coptic, indicative of the changing situation as Coptic wins out over Greek.⁶⁴ This tendency is also reflected in Coptic words written in the margin of a Greek text (P. Bodmer VIII) to facilitate comprehension.⁶⁵

The fact that the late material is only in Coptic, with its implications that Greek had died out in the community whose library is involved, may explain some oddities regarding the Greek material: The non-Christian materials may no longer be recognizable as such, since they are no longer read; the fact that they were known as part of the older holdings of the library would have given them a status as relics that would account for their burial with the Christian material. In fact the repairs made on some of the older Greek codices are such as to render them largely unusable, an observation which has led to the conjecture that, at least in their case, their final use was that of a relic.⁶⁶ P. Bodmer XIV–XV, though a canonical

64. Kilpatrick, "Bodmer and Mississippi Collection," 35:

Let us try to imagine the circumstances in which such a library might come into being. First, the oldest texts in the collection are, as we shall see, Greek, both Christian and Classical. Next, the later their date, the more Coptic predominates. I know of no Greek texts in the collection which can be dated to the fifth century though this seems a likely enough date for some of the Coptic items. This observation suggests that we have a monument of the gradual triumph of Coptic power in the Christianity of upper Egypt during the Byzantine period.

65. *Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX*, 66 (to P. Bodmer VIII). See p. 33: "A Copt has hence written this word to explain his Greek text, and this Copt seems to be the scribe who made the copy." See also *Papyrus Bodmer XIV*, 24; *Papyrus Bodmer XV*, 76–77.

66. *Papyrus Bodmer XXV*, 15–17, especially p. 17:

All of that is not without interest, and permits one to imagine a bit in what spirit in those times the books destined for this ancient library were assembled (manuscripts that, almost all, finally arrived at the Bodmeriana); this library was not only a place where one assembled works in good condition, usable for intellectual work. One also conserved there, preciously, old books very abused by time, use, and perhaps also the persecutions of the Third

text, was rebound before burial in such a way that part of the text became inaccessible, perhaps because as Greek it was unintelligible. Fragments of the text were pasted together into cardboard as the cartonnage lining the cover. And the binding thongs of the rebinding did not go through the center of the spine, as is usually the case, but through the front and back covers near the inner margin, making it impossible to open the book out wide enough to read the text at the inner margin. To treat Luke and John this way must mean their Greek texts were no longer read.

Michel Testuz also advocated in 1959 a provenience in the region of Thebes (= Luxor) on the basis of the confusion of /g/ and /k/ by Coptic scribes,⁶⁷ a trait to which already W. H. Worrell had drawn attention⁶⁸ and which Rodolphe Kasser had then noted in Papyrus Bodmer VI.⁶⁹

Century, books with which one could not do much, to be sure, but to which the memory of a prestigious past was attached.

The two codices classified as relics, P. Bodmer XXV–IV–XXVI and P. Bodmer XIV–XV, do not share a date prior to the Diocletianic persecution, but what they do have in common is that they are in Greek. At a time when Greek was becoming a dead language in Upper Egypt, in favor of Coptic, such codices would in any case tend to serve only as relics.

67. Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer VII–IX*, 32:

In a personal communication that he was kind enough to send me, and for which I wish to thank him, Pastor R. Kasser, the specialist who has to do with Coptic manuscripts at the Bibliothèque Bodmer, has given me the following information: It is a Coptic characteristic to confuse the sounds of /g/ and /k/, and also the /r/ and the /l/. But this phenomenon is very localized and is found only among the scribes of the region of Thebes. P. Bodmer VI, which contains the book of Proverbs in a quite distinctive Coptic dialect, makes this confusion regularly, to the point that he has completely omitted the use of /g/ in Coptic words, but not in terms of Greek origin. Our papyrus seems to us to present a beginning of the contamination of Greek words themselves with this habit of Coptic scribes of Thebes to replace the g's with the k's. Our copyist writes naturally a k, and he has to make an effort and correct himself, in order to reestablish the Gamma of correct orthography. We think then that this gives us a clear indication to determine the place where our codex was made: This would be at Thebes, by a Coptic scribe.

68. Worrell, *Coptic Sounds*, 106. “All three letters—Gamma, Kabba, and Schima—have the same value, /g/, in the Theban dialect.” See also Kahle, *Bala'izah*, 1:147: “Some early examples [of interchanging *Kabba* and *Schima*], it may be noted that all these examples are from Achmimic, semi-Achmimic or Theban manuscripts; nearly all the non-literary examples are likewise from Thebes . . . Several examples could be cited from the unpublished part of the Berlin Gnostic text.”

See also Nagel, “Der frühkoptische Dialekt von Theben,” 38–40, and Kasser, “Les dialectes coptes,” 81.

69. *Papyrus Bodmer XXIII*, 7, n. 1.