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P. OXY. XII 1561: DEMOSIOSIS OF A LOAN

This papyrus, only partially transcribed by Grenfell and Hunt and here published in full, preserves the lower part of an application for the public registration (demosiosis) of a loan. A creditor (the reading of his name is uncertain; see below, 7 n.) had lent to Aurelius Sarapion alias Apollonius the relatively substantial sum of 5225 drachmas, with the usual 12% annual interest and on the security of the debtor’s property. The creditor submitted this agreement through an intermediary to the archidikastes for registration in the public record offices at Alexandria. Through this process, known as demosiosis, a private contract (χειρόγραφον) acquired the authority and force of a public document and could be used for the recovery of the debt.1 The request for demosiosis is followed by the signature of Aurelius Alexander, an official styled ὁ πρὸς τῇ διαλογῇ from the bureau of

the archidikastes, which presumably confirms the receipt of the requisite fees and the public registration of the contract (Alexander is attested in two other Oxyrhynchite papyri of the same period; see 20 n.). The appearance of the signature of ὅ πρὸς τῇ διαλογῇ at the foot of the text indicates that the application to the archidikastes did not include a request to communicate the publicly registered document to other officials such as the
strategus. When complete, *P. Oxy.* 1561 would thus have contained only a prefatory notice to the *archidikastes,* a copy of the contract (its concluding part is preserved in ll. 1–10), the request for *demosiosis* (ll. 11–19), and the dated signature of ὁ πρὸς τῇ διαλογῇ (ll. 20–21).

The papyrus is complete on the left, lower, and right sides, but is beset by numerous holes of varying sizes. The left margin measures 1.8 cm, the lower one 4.4 cm, with writing running to the edge of the right side. The writing is along the fibres and the back is blank. Minor divergences from the partial transcription in the *editio princeps,* such as the placement of brackets and dots, are not indicated in the commentary below.

Bodl. Ms. Gr. class. e 122 (P) 16.9 x 17.3 cm 269/270

...........] α[...
...........], τη[...], [ c. 20 ]...........]...........]πρα[...]
...........], κύρια τά τού ὕπο[...], [γ]ρα[μμ]α[τα τp]
ότι[η]νικα ὅπερ ἐὰν αἱρή δημοσι-

4 ὡς εἰ διά τοῦ καταλογίου οὐ προκείμενος μεταλήμφεω(ει) μοϋ
οδὲ ἐτέρας εὐθὸς κήσεως
διὰ τὸ ἐντεῦθεν εὐδοκεῖτε με τῇ ἐκομένῃ ὕπο [ε] ν δημοσιώσετε.

καὶ[ως] γενέθιαι ἐπερωτηθεῖσι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐμολογη[τα]

Κλαυδίου Σεβαστοῦ, Θώθ.

2 See BENAÏSSA, “Two notes” (cit. n. 1), pp. 17–18. If such a communication (*metadosis*) had been requested, the signature would have appeared “as an endorsement following the *archidikastes*’ instruction to the concerned official at the top” (ibid., p. 18).

3 Something along the lines of N.N. ἀρχιδικαστὴ καὶ πρὸς τῇ ἐπιμελείᾳ τῶν χρηματιστῶν
καὶ ἄλλων κριτηρίων παρὰ Αὐρήλιου... a *k各类 patrogrmy (status) origin* τῆς προειμένης μοι


4 The photograph, made by the International Photographic Archive, is reproduced courtesy of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.
Αυρήλιος [Ca]βασίσων ὁ καὶ Ἀπολλωνίως ἔχει[ν] παρὰ ἰέως τὰς τοῦ δανίου


4· 1. καταλόγου || 7· 1. δανείου || 8· 1. πεντακισχιλίας, πέντε || 9· 1. πρόκειται || 15· 1. τοῦ in place of ὑμοῦ (see n. below) II 16· 1. εὐπορικ[α]ς ταχυρ[ι]ς καὶ αὐτή[ν] ὑπὸ τὸ μένειν μοι τὰ ἀπὸ αὐτῆς δίκαια ὡς ἀπὸ δημοσίου χρηματισμο[ν] ἐ[νεκ]α τοῦ αὐτῶν ἐχεῖτε εἰδοκηκέναι τῇ δημοσιώσει.

... the triplicate bond of the ... is normative, you may publish it through the record-office whenever you choose without requiring my concurrence nor
any further concurrence, because I hereby consent to the publication to be made by you; and having been asked by you the formal question whether this is done rightly and fairly, I have given my assent. Year 2 of Claudius Augustus, Thoth.

I, Aurelius Sarapion alias Apollonius, received from Sarapion the five thousand two hundred (and) twenty-five drachmas of the loan at the interest of the drachma, and shall pay back as aforesaid; and I have mortgaged my aforesaid house upon all the aforesaid conditions, and I consent to the publication to be made (by you), and in answer to the formal question I have given my assent.

Wishing that one copy of this triplicate bond be made public, I pay to the city the prescribed twelve drachmas and the prescribed dues. I request that, on receipt of the bond from the person dispatched by me, Aurelius Apollonius, with his attestation that the signature under the bond is the autograph of Aurelius Sarapion alias Apollonius, you register it with this application in the Library of Hadrian, and a copy in that of the Nanaeum too, in order that the rights derived from it may be assured to me as from a public deed, because he has consented to the publication.

(2nd hand) The examiner-in-chief of the city, through me, Aurelius Alexander(?), has signed. Year 2 of Claudius Augustus [month]}.

3. vσο[...]. Not νπομνήματος, whatever the distribution of brackets and dots.
6. ἔτους β Κλαυδίου Σεβαστοῦ, Θώθ. On the evidence of the reign of Claudius II in Egyptian papyri, see J. R. Rea, P. Oxy. xi, pp. 18–21, and D. Rathbone, ‘The dates of the recognition in Egypt of the emperors from Caracalla to Diocletianus’, ZPE 62 (1986), pp. 120–121. The Julian year given by Grenfell and Hunt (268) is wrong, for ‘year 1’ of Claudius II is 268/269. Thoth 1 of year 2, therefore, is equivalent to 29 August 269.
7. Αὐρήλιος [Σα]ραπίων ὁ καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος. This individual, who is presumably from Oxyrhynchus, does not appear to be otherwise attested in the published papyri. The Alexandrian exegetes and bouleutes of same name in PSI iv 303.3–4 (245–302; see BL viii 397) is probably a different person.

8. αἴνιγμα τῆς ἐκκλήσιας. The letter between alpha and iota is probably nu or pi, but we have not been able to match such an ending with a known personal name.

9. πνύτη (l. πέντε) ἐκοινοποιήσας τέλη καὶ ἀριθμόν. There is no room for κα in the break, and there is only one iota after it.

10. χρίσων δέκαδύο καὶ τὰ ώραμένα τέλη. The 12 drachmas were the standard fee for the registration of the document in Alexandria (cf. the phrase ἐνέκα τοῦ μοναχον δημοσίωθαι in P. Mich. x1 614.35, with J. Shelton’s note); but the nature and purpose of the additional ώραμένα τέλη remain uncertain (in some other documents the expression is το/τα τιμηματω τέλη/τέλη or το ὑπὲρ τῆς δημοσίωσεως ὀρισμένα; cf. Sänger, ‘Bemerkungen zu δημοσίωσις-Urkunden’ (cit. n. 1), p. 224). See in general Wolff, Recht ii (cit. n. 1), pp. 47–48.
17. ἀντε[folio] (1. ἀντεγράφον). For the spelling cf. P. Col. x 279.15 (111) ἀντεγράφον, P. Oxy. viii 1069.32 (111) ἀντεγράφον.

20. ὁ πρ[ο!] τῆ διαλ(ογής) τῇ[π]άς). The διαλογή was a sub-department of the καταλογεία (cf. l. 4 διὰ τοῦ καταλογ(ε)ίου), the notarial office at Alexandria under the charge of the archidikastes; see Wolff, Recht 11 (cit. n. 1), pp. 28, 249–250, n. 127.

In such signatures, the article before πρ[ο!] τῆ διαλογῆ varies between the singular (ὁ) and the plural (οί); see Benaissa, ‘Two notes’ (cit. n. 1), p. 17, n. 4.

δι’ ἐμ(ου) Αὐρηλίου Αλεξάνδρου χρη(ματίζοντο!) ed. pr. On these signatures, typically written in a heavily ligatured chancery hand, see Benaissa, ‘Two notes’ (cit. n. 1), pp. 17–19, with discussion of further instances. The same Aurelius Alexander appends his signature to two Oxyrhynchite demosioseis of sales of land involving different individuals: P Oxy. IX 1200.4 (266) and XII 1475.3 (267). These are second applications to the archidikastes requesting the communication of the completed demosiosis to the keepers of the record-office (βιβλιοθήκη έγκτή!εων) of Oxyrhynchus. The signature of Aurelius Alexander at the top is an endorsement to this effect on behalf of the archidikastes.

21. [ ] α. Θ[ώθ] α ed. pr. On the impossibility of restoring the month Θ[ώθ], see Benaissa, ‘Two notes’ (cit. n. 1), p. 16, n. 3. All we can tell with certainty is that the demosiosis took place within a year from the conclusion of the contract.