latines chez Térentianus le Maure: Bref chapitre d'histoire de la grammaire'. P. Flobert, 'Les observations d'Aulu-Gelle sur la syntaxe de l'accusatif latin': on a number of archaic constructions studied by Gellius, linked (accidentally, I suspect) by the fact that they contain an accusative. M. Lavency, ' "Régime" et "mutation" chez Despautère'; D. was the author of a treatise on Latin syntax published in 1509.

It would be a dull Latinist who did not find something of interest in this volume.

Royal Holloway, London J. G. F. POWELL

TABULA SIARENSIS

A. Sánchez-Ostiz (ed.): *Tabula Siarensis. Edición, Traducción y Comentario.* Pp. xxiv + 486, 7 ills. Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 84-313-1665-9.

The *Tabula Siarensis* is one of four great Roman historical documents brought to light in the last two decades of the past century, the others being the *SC de Cn. Pisone patre*, the *Tabula Irnitana*, and the *Lex portorii Provinciae Asiae*. It belongs to the same shattering historical episode as the *SC*, the death of Germanicus, each part of the 'ciclo epigráfico de Germánico', illuminating the other. Historians of the episode are also brought under scrutiny, especially Tacitus, whose account of Germanicus' honours the author agrees (p. 34) with predecessors in regarding as drawn from the *Acta Senatus*. So it has a twofold claim to attention, redoubled again when we recall that the text it embodies (*SCC* of A.D. 19, *Rogatio Valeria Aurelia* of A.D. 20) is that of the long-masticated *Tabula Hebana*, and again for its relationship with other measures honouring deceased *principes.* The *Tabula*, by far the shortest of the four great documents in its surviving form, thoroughly merits the depth of treatment that a book of this size promises.

The fact that the volume is in Spanish, like the earliest publications by J. González and F. Fernández (*Iura* 32 [1981 {1984}], 1–36; *ZPE* 55 [1984], 55–100), should not deter anyone with Latin and French or Italian and access to a dictionary. The author writes clearly. Indeed, overall the document has been fortunate in having him to work on it (as his doctoral dissertation in the first instance).

He begins conventionally and methodically with an introduction surveying previous work and thanking his coadjutors, passing to archaeological data and text. He offers other maps—sites of memorials to Germanicus in Rome, Syria, and the 'Gates', with a superfluous inset of the eastern Mediterranean; astonishingly, especially as there is a complex discussion (pp. 314–8) of Siarum and the Siarenses Fortunales, the area of the findspot 'en las cercanías de Utrera' is not illustrated; there is a scrap attached to the essay by M. M. Ruiz Delgado in J. González and J. Arce (edd.), *Estudios sobre la Tabula Siarensis. Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología* 9 (Madrid, 1988), pp. 75–89.

The annotated majuscule is underpinned by legible plates (no. 2 carelessly cut); slightly undermined by them in fr. I l. 5, where there is an obvious slip (ADSV[.] ẸṬẠ); and hardly sustained at the end of l. 6; but there the reading is supported by the author's inspection of the bronze. (Other slips are few, mainly foreign names and titles; something is wrong with the military treasury, p. 117, and M. Corvinus is *cos.* thirty years too early, p. 258.) The author then outlines the epigraphic and literary context of the monument, first other copies of the documents embodied in the text, notably *CIL* 6.31199a–c, the *Tabula Hebana*, and the Todi fragment, *CIL* 11.63322, identified by

© Oxford University Press, 2001

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.94 Published online by Cambridge University Press

M. H. Crawford as containing the end of the text, then other members of the 'ciclo' and related material (Pisan decrees and *Tabula Ilicitana*). A grid (p. 42) sets out the measures shared by the other sources, bringing out their close relationship to the *Tabula*. Analysis of the structure of the text exposes its cruelly fragmentary nature, but that does not hide the two aspects of the honours, sacred and profane.

The text is set out in sections, with apparatus conveniently below and translation on the facing page. A formidable list of abbreviations instantly reveals the debt owed by scholars to the work done since 1986 by W. D. Lebek. Throughout his edition the author gives due attention to that work, though he is never slavish. In the 223-page commentary he argues fully for favoured supplements and interpretations, his own or from earlier scholars, and well judged. Inevitably the state of the text means that there are passages in which he will not carry all his readers. Uncontroversially, on fr. I, ll. 14f. he prints *vindicata frauḍ[ulenta clade] / exercitus*, etc., after González and Fernández, though in 1996 González suggested *frauḍ[e foeda?]*. A *fraudulenta clades* seems strange, except when the *clades* is a person (*OLD* s.v. 4); if *fraudulenta* is correct, *caede* might be more appropriate. The lure of the familiar has also prevailed in fr. I, l. 5, causing the senate to enjoin *moderatio* on Tiberius; better, the list will make it possible for him to exercise his *prudentia/diligentia* (Lebek) or even his *consideratio*, notorious slowcoach that he was.

Next come physical characteristics. The jigsaw is of uncertain dimensions, only two large pieces surviving. The *Tabula Hebana*, although its dimensions and layout are different, plays a vital part in a convincing reconstruction, as do nail holes in the bronze; but the other 'juridical' bronzes from Spain (*Malacitana*, *Irnitana*, and so on) are relevant, and they too are shown schematically in a useful final table; these diagrams make the reader's task much easier, although I do not understand '*Lex Irnitana* (III–XII)' (p. 304).

The author next finds it necessary to probe a hoary question: provincial *municipia civium Romanorum*, involving the status of the place in which the inscription was displayed. This topic, though raised by the wording of the bronze, fr. IIb, ll. 25f., is an excrescence on a homogeneous discussion and might have been relegated to an appendix. (The author's conclusions seem sound.)

One of the merits of the edition is its attention to the other 'ciclo' documents. Particularly valuable is the substantial (pp. 363–434) list of shared expressions, which brings out startlingly the relationship between them. It is the first of the indexes (the other is 'Rerum, nominum et locorum') and aims to situate the words of the *Tabula* in their context and expose turns of phrase characteristic of this document and others in the 'ciclo'. The complex presentation is clearly explained and it will be much consulted. But in the final chapter, 'La Tabula . . . y Tácito', the author strays beyond his brief into 'La presentación de los personajes de Tiberio y Germanico en los *Annales*', and (worse) 'Inconsistencia y ambigüedad de la caracterización psicológica' and 'Retórica y estilo en la interpretación de los hechos'. There are crisp questions arising out of the text (Antonia's rôle in the obsequies), but a book subtitled 'Edición, traducción y comentario' is not the place for all this. The chapter ends with monumental lameness: 'Las valoraciones del historiador se muestran más imparciales y equilibradas que las impresiones que transmite el "ciclo epigráfico official" ' (p. 348).

St Hilda's College, Oxford B. M. LEVICK

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/51.1.94 Published online by Cambridge University Press