## L. S. B. MACCOULL

## A NOTE ON THE SUBSCRIPTION OF THE VISION OF DOROTHEOS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 83 (1990) 292

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

## A Note on the Subscription of the Vision of Dorotheos<sup>1</sup>

Both the editio princeps<sup>2</sup> and the recent re-edition with translation<sup>3</sup> of the newly published poem *Vision of Dorotheos* record the *explicit* after line 343 as  $\overline{\tau}\phi$ , i.e.  $I(\eta co\hat{\upsilon}c) \theta(\epsilon \delta c)$ , "Jesus is God". This is unparalleled. Both the plate (Pl. V) in the edition and autoptic inspection of the papyrus with a magnifying lens reveal that the seemingly curved-plus-straight element to the left of the vertical hasta of what is read as the iota of  $I(\eta co\hat{\upsilon}c)$  is not the same as the other  $\beta$ -shaped elements that surround in four lines the words of the subscription  $\tau e \lambda o c \tau THC o p \lambda - C e \omega c | \Delta \omega p o \phi e o \gamma K \gamma i N T O \gamma T O I H T O [\gamma].<sup>4</sup> The element in question has two parts, made in$  $two strokes, unlike the other <math>\beta$ -shaped surround elements that are written in one stroke. Clearly the upper part belongs with the vertical hasta, while it is the lower part only that forms part of the surround. This gives a q, yielding the justifiable reading of  $\overline{q}\phi$  the common isopsephism  $\overline{q}\phi = 99 = \dot{\alpha}\mu\dot{\eta}\nu$ . "Amen. End of the vision of Dorotheos (son) of Quintus, the poet."

Washington Society for Coptic Archaeology L.S.B. MacCoull

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> I should like to thank the Bodmer Library, Dr. H. Braun, and the Fondation Hardt for making my autoptic study of the Codex of Visions possible; and Dominic Montserrat, Georgina Robinson-Fantoni, and Lucas Siorvanes for their helpful discussion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> A. Hurst et al., Vision de Dorothéos (P. Bodmer 29; Geneva 1984) 76-77, 90.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> A.H.M. Kessels, P.W. van der Horst, *Vig. Chr.* 41 (1987) 344-345. Nor was this fact noticed in the exhaustive critique of E. Livrea, *Gnomon* 58 (1986) esp. 706, 711.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The upsilon should really be bracketed, not dotted.