Vettulenus Marcianus (husband of Sextia Victoria) cannot be a member of the senatorial branch of the family.

Olli Salomies


This is the third fascicle of the second edition of the Spanish epigraphical corpus, covering the conventus Astigitanus in southeastern Baetica. As the first fascicle only came out in 1995, the prospects of the Spanish project clearly look good. There are 1350 inscriptions in this corpus, divided into 55 chapters, the chapters corresponding to ancient urban territories as reconstructed by the editors. Cities included here are, e.g., Tucci, Ucubi, Iliberri Florentia, Ilurco, Singili(a?) Barba, Urso, Astigi. Most of the city names seem pretty obscure to a reader not specializing in Roman Spain (but note the recent rise from obscurity to prominence, due to excavations in the last years, of sites such as Singilia(?), cf. p. 213), and there are many settlements the ancient name of which is still unknown. (By the way, it is notable how often in Spain one finds the phenomenon that different cities have the same name, cf., e.g., p. 366 on Segovia, p. 368 on Segida.) There is much of interest here, e.g., no. 789 (a most interesting honorific inscription from Singilia(?), AE 1989, 420), no. 900 (the senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone), no. 1022 (the lex Ursonensis), and note that the inscriptions of Iliberri "gravitate excellunt" (p. 165; the inscription in honour of P. Cornelius Anullinus is now no. 623). In general, one notes that there is an unusually large number of honorific inscriptions.

In the beginning, there is a "Praefatio editorum" followed (on pp. XVII-XX) by a historical introduction by A.U. Stylow and a 20-page bibliography. The inscriptions are presented on pp. 1-382. In each chapter, the edition of the inscriptions is preceded by a list of the miliarii pertaining to the territory in question and by the falsi (these sections do not, of course, appear in all chapters). There are photographs of the most interesting texts, whereas the illustrations of the other texts are to be found in microfiches included in the volume. As for the inscriptions themselves, of which there are (as already mentioned) 1350, there do not seem to be many inedita (but note e.g., 475, 901), and a considerable number of texts seem to have disappeared, being thus known only from older descriptions (cf. e.g., p. 288). Here and there one observes texts transmitted in older sources, but unknown to the first edition (e.g., no. 116).

Everything is of a very high quality, and one can only admire, and congratulate, the editors upon their achievement. It is also with great pleasure one finds that the commentaries to the individual inscriptions are kept on a sober level and stick to the essential. As for observations on individual texts, I shall present them at this point. No.
31: Perhaps the editors should have specified what exactly is transmitted in line 2 where we now read honorem *Vlivior(atus).* – No. 106: The editors say that, when Wiegels suggested, pretty vaguely, it is true, that the man, because of the tribe *Voltinia,* might have come from the Narbonensis, this was "sine idonea causa", but in fact there is something else that speaks for the Narbonensis, namely the fact that he is a Sex. Valerius Sex. f., the praenomen *Sextus,* if combined with *Valerius,* strongly pointing to that province (cf. my *Die römischen Vornamen* 50, 202ff.). – No. 489: The abbreviation *pup.* stands for *pup(illus),* not for *pup(us),* a vague expression not meaning very much (cf. op. cit. 62ff.). – No. 740: *Propinquus n(oster)* makes one think of the Valerii Propinqui, of senatorial status from the early second century onwards (R. Syme, *Roman Papers V [1988]* 577ff.); on the other hand, it must be conceded that there are also other Hispanic instances of *Propinquus* (Syme, ibid. 599). – No. 780: One wonders whether one could not interpret d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) instead of d(ono) d(at), because honorific statues are not very commonly referred to as 'gifts' to the honorand. – No. 840: In the commentary, it might have been added that this is one of the latest inscriptions in which suffect consuls are used for dating. – No. 1036: If the man is an adoptee, the adoptive father must have been D. Cornelius, not Virguleius Eutychus (not *Eutychius*). – Nos. 1102 and 1153: There seems to be a lack of coordination between these two editions of the text. – No. 1126: Could this be Etrilia Afra (625)? On the other hand, *Afra* is also attested for Lucretia Afra (1326). – No. 1307: It seems a bit hard to believe that L. Ful[vius] M. l. Philomusus could or should be dated to the early third century.

At the end, detailed indexes (p. 385ff.) and a map form the conclusion of a magnificent book which will be of great service to a variety of scholars. – The Latin used in this book (if I may touch upon this subject) is admirably clear and almost impeccable. The only solecism which struck me is "de concilio ... consideravit" (in the commentary on no. 69), where the author must have begun the sentence thinking that he was going to end it with "cogitavit". I am also a bit unhappy about the causal ablative of the type "lectione certa ... priorum errores omisi" (e.g., nos. 3, 25, 736, 780), which does not seem to be as clear as the use of a preposition. Finally, although there are some parallels, even from Cicero, for the use of *insolenter* in the meaning "contra consuetudinem" (*TLL;* used in this sense in the commentary on 772), I think that for most readers this expression has a somewhat different meaning and should thus possibly be avoided in the above sense.
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Yet another compelling contribution to the reconstruction of Latin inscriptions by Géza Alföldy, this time dealing with epigraphic materials from Spain: the inscription of the aqueduct of Segovia (p. 1-55) and two building inscriptions from the amphitheatre of Tarraco, modern Tarragona (p. 57-92). Some might say that dedicating an entire book to