

the notes to his 1808 English translation of the *De anima*. In short, ps.-Simplicius' Greek commentary has a place in the modern British reception of the *De anima*. The present translation, similarly, should inform contemporary work on the *De anima*, and on the Neoplatonists' appropriation and transmission of Aristotle.

Ps.-Simplicius' text is of course too dense to reprise here, but there is much that is of interest in his negotiation of time-statements in the last pages of the *De anima*, since it is in these pages – not the last paragraphs of *Physics* 4 – that Aristotle investigates the problematic link of 'time' to the 'soul'. (And when Plotinus takes up the question of time in *Enneads* 3.7, he – like contemporary philosophers – turns to *Physics* 4, not *De anima* 3.) Those who are interested in Neoplatonic conceptions of time – and more generally, in the concept of time in Late Antiquity – would do well to consult this commentary, and the other surviving Greek commentaries on *De anima* 3.

There is a single, colourful passage that indicates how ps.-Simplicius' commentary on the soul also opens onto the terrain of the body – sexuality, and so on – in Late Antiquity. In *De anima* 3.9 Aristotle writes that 'the heart' is moved when we think of menacing things, whereas 'if the object is pleasant, *some other part*' is moved. It is a pleasure then to see ps.-Simplicius' gloss: 'The heart, for instance, may be set in movement among fearful things and the generative organs [γεννητικὰ μέρη] upon the thought of sexual pleasure [ἀφροδισιαστικῶν ἡδονῶν]' (p. 102). This is doubtless the sense of Aristotle's euphemistic text, and ps.-Simplicius sees the deeper import of sexual excitation with perfect clarity: 'The intellect is *not wholly master* [οὐ τὸ ὅλον κύριος] of the movement of the living being' (p. 102). How far removed are we, here, from Augustine's discussion of post-paradisiacal arousal in his *City of God against the Pagans*? Or from Proclus' refusal of a disciple who was 'pursuing philosophy, but at the same time devoting his life to the pleasures below the belly [τὰς ὑπογαστρίας ἡδονάς]', as Damascius reports?

The early modern *sectatores Simplicii* likely misattributed their *De anima* commentary, but in this they were correct: Averroes is not 'the Commentator on Aristotle's *De Anima* III'. Ps.-Simplicius' reading of the book is still challenging, at places suddenly illuminating. And it is no small thing for us to have access now – in conscientious English, and in full – to this methodical, lexically sensitive commentary on the soul from the immediate circle of the last representatives of a 'Platonic succession' in Athens.

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium

DAVID VAN DUSEN
david.vandusen@gmail.com

PETRA PAPYRI VOL. 4

ARJAVA (A.), BUCHHOLZ (M.), †GAGOS (T.), KAIMIO (M.) (edd.) *The Petra Papyri IV*. Pp. xx+214, ill., map, pls. Amman: American Center of Oriental Research, 2011. Cased, US\$60. ISBN: 978-9957-8543-5-5.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X14000742

Volume 4 of the Petra papyri represents the third volume published by a joint US–Finnish team in a projected 5-volume series.¹ These documents hardly need an introduction. Found

¹Since the appearance of the 4th volume, the 2nd has also been published: L. Koenen, J. Kaimio, M. Kaimio and R.W. Daniel (edd.), *The Petra Papyri II* (2013).

in a Byzantine church in 1993 at Petra, Jordan, the former capital of the Nabataean Arabs, the sixth-century Greek papyri quickly gained international attention. In the two decades since they were uncovered, the carbonised papyrus remains have been meticulously conserved by the Finnish team and the fragmentary rolls have been photographed using different techniques, including multi-spectral imaging. The result is an impressive corpus of material attesting a little-known period in the history of Petra. In fact, prior to the discovery of the papyri, which date from 537 (and perhaps even earlier) until the last decade of the sixth century, Petra was thought to have been destroyed by an earthquake that occurred in the mid-sixth century.

Thus far 49 discrete documents have been published. Nos 37–49 appear in vol. 4; they include tax receipts, deeds of sale, a marriage contract and a settlement of a dispute by arbitration. The dispute settlement (no. 39) dated to 8 August, 574 is of particular interest: it is one of the largest surviving Greek papyrus rolls written *transversa charta*, with a length of 620–50 cm and an estimated 523 total number of lines. Nine separate hands have been identified in the document. The settlement distinguishes itself from similar texts from Egypt by its extensive use of direct speech and by the non-formulaic nature of the language. The dispute involves Theodoros, son of Obodianos, a person who figures prominently in the Petra papyri, and Stephanos, son of Leontios. The two men owned adjacent properties, and at issue appears to be a longstanding disagreement over the exact boundaries of these properties. The papyrus includes numerous terms related to buildings and architectural space, some of which are difficult to understand in the context of the dispute, and J. Kaimio offers a good survey of the terms in the introduction (pp. 9ff). Also noteworthy is the fact that the papyrus mentions a phylarch named Abu Karib, who acted as arbitrator in a previous dispute between Theodoros and Stephanos' father Leontios. This person is most likely Abu Karib ibn Jabala, son of Jabala ibn Harith, the Ghassanid phylarch known also from historical sources. It is unclear if Abu Karib was still alive at the time the document was composed. If he was, then he may have been in his seventies by then. Given its remarkable size and other notable features, it is perhaps not surprising that no. 39 has earned a special place among the Petra papyri: already in 1995 it was dedicated to H.M. King Hussein bin Talal and H.M. Queen Noor al-Hussein, and in March 2012 it was entrusted to the Department of Antiquities of Jordan, so that it could be put on display in the new Jordan Museum.

The rest of the documents are of smaller size but contain various items of interest. Nos 37 and 38 were discovered tied together. The latter is too fragmentary to offer much information, while 37 is a receipt for taxes on part of a property that had changed hands without the new owners being immediately registered in the tax rolls. This situation is known from other Petra papyri: the registered owner would handle tax payments for the new owners, who for their part would pay the previous owner. Sometimes this went on many years after the sale of the property until the tax register was updated (in this document the previous owner has apparently been submitting payments on behalf of the new owner for 25 years). No. 40, less than half of which has survived, is identified by the editors as an example of a *defensio*, a document referred to several times in no. 39. In it, a seller defends his ownership of a piece of property and by doing so establishes his right to sell it. No. 41 is a highly fragmentary deed related to the sale of a house accompanied by supporting documentation concerning rightful ownership. Nos 42 and 43 concern the marriage of a certain Kyra and Thomas. The former papyrus is the marriage contract; it is poorly preserved, but must have been quite long originally. Of interest is its reference to the military status of *embathmos*, a term that may refer to a new recruit and is otherwise attested only at Nessana, also in Palestine. More of 43 survives: it is a contract related to the newlyweds' property and is one of the latest surviving Petra papyri, dated to 592 or 593. The remaining

texts are for the most part quite scrappy. Nos 45–7 are tax receipts submitted by Theodoros, son of Obodianos, and 48–9 are fragments that also mention Theodoros but are related to the Petra church in which the papyri were found. They refer to ministers' wages, the lighting of candles, the ancient mining site of Phaeno, which was located 45 km north of Petra, and to a hitherto unattested place called al-Sarkia.

Because of the uneven distribution of papyri surviving in the ancient world it is natural to compare anything originating outside Egypt with documents from Egypt.² M. Buchholz provides a nice introductory essay (pp. 1–8) that examines legal terminology in the extant Petra texts against the background of Greek documents from Egypt. He concludes that, while there is no sign of discrepancies in legal institutions in the two places, linguistic differences (both legal and non-legal) suggest that at Petra legal language adhered more closely to Roman law and Latin terminology. He even goes so far as to say that the place experienced 'deeper "Romanization" compared to Egypt' (p. 4). Whether this is true is perhaps debatable, but it can hardly be disputed that the Petra papyri offer us an important body of material that reflects customs, language and cultural influences not observed in texts from elsewhere.

University of Heidelberg

RODNEY AST
ast@uni-heidelberg.de

THE LATIN LANGUAGE

ADAMS (J. N.) *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Pp. xxii + 933. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Cased, £110, US \$180. ISBN: 978-0-521-88614-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X14000584

With this massive volume, A. continues his decades-long mission to uncover and explain aspects of the Latin language that have remained hidden to specialists for generations. More than any scholar of the modern era, A. has revealed features of Latin which bring the language to life as a dynamic vehicle of communication among everyday speakers, and not just a device of elite literary or formulaic presentation. Of particular note in A.'s perspective on the history of Latin is the time span he treats (conservatively, from the late second century B.C.E., when the fragments of Ennius and the Plautine scripts offer sufficient data for analysis, to the time of proto-Romance, around the beginning of the eighth century C.E.), and the type of material he deals with, much of which would be considered corrupt from a classical viewpoint, but constitutes a treasure trove of data that provide insight into the deepest corners of colloquial Latin. Such a comprehensive account requires a special methodology which exploits techniques of sociolinguistic analysis developed since the 1960s to study language change in progress.

The present study reflects A.'s mastery of an extraordinary range of Latin texts. That mastery has been well on display in his comprehensive studies – *Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (1982); *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*, co-edited with M. Janse and S. Swain (2002); *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (2003); *Regional Diversification*

²For a more detailed comparison of Petra and Egyptian documents than is offered here, see my review article, 'The first two volumes of Petra Papyri', *JRA* 23 (2010), 788–92.