

BRUCE E. NIELSEN

A CORRECTION TO *P.MICH.* XV 720

aus: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 108 (1995) 193–194

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

A CORRECTION TO *P.MICH.* XV 720

In *P.Oxy.* XLV 3246.7 (297/98) Κλαυδία Ἡλιοδόρα θυγάτηρ Κανωπίωνος γενομένου ὑπομν(ηματογράφου) ἀπὸ στεφάνου "Claudia Heliodora daughter of Canopion formerly crowned hypomnematosgraphus" is one of five litigants in a petition to the logistes concerning a piece of the litigants' property, i.e. land. Canopion is otherwise unknown and the presence of the name does not help further identify Heliodora except to suggest her status as a substantial landowner and therefore a member of the Alexandrian socio-economic elite (since the office of hypomnematosgraphus at this time was reserved for Alexandrian citizens). The socio-economic status of Claudia Heliodora daughter of Canopion is paralleled in the identification below.

The name Heliodora is not common in the papyri, in fact there are fewer than two dozen attestations in the DDBDP on PHI CD R0M #6 (and only four additional attestations in Preisigke *Namenbuch*) and it is especially rare in documents from the Oxyrhynchite nome. In addition to *P.Oxy.* XLV 3246.7 (297/98) there are only three other attestations of the name Heliodora in Oxyrhynchite documents within sixty years on either side of 297/98. Of these only *P.Mich.* XV 720.6 (308) is dated but all four are clustered within a short span of time at the end of the third and the first decade of the fourth century.¹ I suggest that while positive identification of the Heliodora in the other two documents in this cluster is at best only tentative,² surely *P.Oxy.* XLV 3246 and *P.Mich.* XV 720 refer to the same woman and therefore offer a correction to *P.Mich.* XV 720.

The attestation in *P.Mich.* XV 720.6 (308) does not have Heliodora's patronymic, but a woman's patronymic need not always be given [e.g., Aurelia Ptolemais, Bagnall *CP* 87 (1992) 137-40; the women in *P.Col.* X 284/*P.Heid.* V 344 (310/11); also the women included in the list in *P.Oxy.* XII 1515]. It is clear that the Heliodora of *P.Mich.* XV 720.6 is responsible for a monthly tax payment of between 4250 dr. and 4650 dr., which extrapolated for a year is equivalent to between 8 tal. 3000 dr. and 9 tal. 1800 dr. Although the name of the tax is not preserved, any monthly tax payment of over 4000 dr. in the year 303 was a significant amount irrespective of the

¹ Α Πομπεία Ἡλιοδόρα appears in *P.Oxy.* XLVIII 3428.8, an undated fourth century text in the archive of Parnuthis and Dorotheus. Concerning this archive the editors claim "it is likely that all the undated items fall roughly between AD 345 and 380, and most of them between 360 and 375" (p. 76). Their arguments for that range of dates are persuasive and therefore Πομπεία Ἡλιοδόρα cannot be the same woman of *P.Mich.* XV 720 or *P.Oxy.* XLV 3246.

² *P.Oxy.* XII 1515.12-13 (ca. 299) is a list of payments by twelve individuals, both men and women, of an unnamed tax in amounts ranging from 8 dr. to 70 dr. Included among the taxpayers is Κλαυδία Κλεοπάτ(ρα) ἢ καὶ Ἡλιοδόρα who paid 40 dr. Unfortunately we do not know the nature of the tax, though we can rank Claudia Cleopatra's payment in comparison to the others in order to estimate her status. The prytanis paying on behalf of the town Oxyrhynchus paid only 10 dr. 2 ob. and only four payments were higher than 40 dr. (one each paid 40+, 100, 100+ and 230+), while the next known amount below Claudia Cleopatra's is 16 dr. This comparison indicates that Claudia Cleopatra was a member of the landowning elite. Because a known alias for a person was not always given, and because the nature of an alias allows that the names Cleopatra and Heliodora could have been interchanged, she could also have been referred to simply as Κλαυδία Ἡλιοδόρα. Since the Heliodora in *P.Oxy.* XII 1510.12--13 is 1) a substantial landowner, 2) is dated circa 299, that is, within ten years of *P.Oxy.* XLV 3246, and 3) claims the *nomen* Claudia, she could be the same woman as in *P.Oxy.* XLV 3246. In the other document *SB XVI* 12326 (late third century) too little is known to make a positive identification of the woman, but nothing in the letter excludes that she may be the same Heliodora.

tax for which it was paid. Whether it was a personal assessment, personal arrears, or the result of a liturgical collection, it is clear that Heliadora was the owner of a substantial piece of property and was a member of a socio-economic group that was not very large in number. In *P.Mich.* XV 720.6 the editor supplies the *nomen* Aurelia in a lacuna, probably *exempli gratia*: ... Αὐρηλίῳ] Ἡλιοδώρα. Given 1) the rarity of the name in Oxyrhynchite documents, 2) the clustering of the name in a short span of time, 3) the attestation of the *nomen* Κλαυδία in *P.Oxy.* XLV 3246.7, and 4) the fact that she is a substantial landowner in each of these texts, I suggest that these documents refer to the same woman. Consequently we would be on safe ground in the restoration in *P.Mich.* XV 720.6 in substituting Κλαυδία for Αὐρηλίῳ.

New York

Bruce E. Nielsen