documents first set in; but even historians seem to have recognized the historical value of inscriptions only in specific cases: when other sources (oral memories or authoritative literary narratives) were unavailable or not entirely convincing; when they wished to dispute well-established opinions; or when they tried to push a local, partial or biased reconstruction of an event. Haake's chapter on the use of *psephismata* in Hellenistic biographies of philosophers explores a case in point: he offers fascinating insights into how biographers used (or created) documents to buttress controversial views.

Several contributors argue that inscriptions may have been used more widely than we realize. Tzifopoulos notes instances in Pausanias where his wording in the description of a monument implies that he did see the dedication even if he does not say so. Likewise, Kosmetatou argues that Herodotus consulted documents or archives on the donations of Croesus at Delphi. In an extremely rich paper on 'Archaic Latin Inscriptions and Greek and Roman Authors' (which includes an impressive table of early Latin inscriptions in literary texts), Langslow draws attention to a range of phenomena that complicate the picture further: allusive gestures to inscriptions most likely known only through oral tradition rather than autopsy; the use of inscriptional language in literary texts (such as the epigraphic idiom Cicero adopts when citing laws); and the influence of literary genre on the language of epigraphic texts, as shown by differences in spelling between the *titulus* (archaic) and the *elogium* (modernizing) in the funerary inscriptions for the Scipiones.

'Epigram' is another unifying concern of the volume. Petrovic offers an excellent discussion of the uses (and provenance) of epigrams in the Attic orators, which intriguingly all come from speeches composed in 330 B.C. While maintaining that epigrammatic collections were probably in circulation already in the fifth century, Petrovic suggests that collections of epigrams reflecting interest in local history began to emerge in the fourth century, roughly coinciding with the increasing habit of recording copies of public documents in more than one medium. In another impressive paper, Day scrutinizes epinician poetry for signs of epigraphic literacy. Fearn stresses once more the complementarity, rather than opposition, of epinician poetry and monumental dedication. LeVen analyses Aristotle's *Hymn to Arete* in terms of echoes of epitaphic language. And Morrison offers a fascinating close reading of the epitaph of Simonides in Callimachus' *Aetia* (fr. 64 Pf.), with reference to the tradition of epigrams commemorating great figures of the past.

Other genres, too, get a hearing. Lougovaya looks at Greek comedy (lots of decrees, *horoi*, *spondai*, *dikai*, *katalogoi*, typically brought on the scene and tampered with) and tragedy (only one epitaph, a dedication and an oath — all imaginary). Dinter explores intermediality in Latin literature. Damien Nelis and Jocelyne Nelis-Clement search for reflections of the *furor epigraphicus* that broke out under Augustus in contemporary poetry and other literary media, concluding that Augustan poets 'imbibed' the epigraphic habit and used it for a variety of purposes, from political commentary to authorial self-fashioning — a line of inquiry further pursued by Houghton, with specific reference to Roman love elegy. And Zadorojnyi's exciting *tour de force* through late antique references to (or mentions of) inscriptions offers a fitting conclusion to the volume, with its welcome focus on the relationship between inscriptions and power.

Not all of the papers are equally compelling: some are rather general, others verge towards lists or retrace familiar territory. But the volume as a whole certainly demonstrates how much both epigraphers and literary critics stand to gain from 'cross' engagement.

Newnham College, Cambridge PAOLA CECCARELLI
pc488@cam.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S007543581500009X

G. ALFÖLDY (ED.), *CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM LATINARUM, VOL. 2: INSCRIPTIONES HISPANIAE LATINAE. PARS 14, CONVENTUS TARRACONENSIS. FASC. 3, COLONIA IVLIA VRBS TRIVMPHALIS TARRACO (CIL II²/14, 3)*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012. Pp. lviii + 323, illus. ISBN 9783110265972. €199.95.

This fascicle of *CIL* II², the volume dedicated to the new edition of the Latin inscriptions of Hispania, is the posthumous work of Géza Alföldy. According to Stephen Mitchell, the former president of the Association Internationale d'Epigraphie Grecque et Latine, Alföldy 'contributed more to the progress of Latin epigraphy, and in particular to *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, than any other individual scholar since Mommsen' (http://www.aiegl.org/id-2012.html).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435815000350 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Géza Alföldy (1935–2011) dealt with the Roman epigraphy of Tarraco for nearly all his academic life. He first came into contact with it in 1965 when he was preparing the *Fasti Hispanienses* (1969); ten years later, he published his seminal *Die römischen Inschriften von Tarraco* (1975), a work which provided the model for a modern epigraphic corpus, inspiring a generation of scholars and exercising a profound influence on the subsequent fascicles of *CIL*. A. retained his interest in the inscriptions and history of Roman Tarraco, and, after recovering from the illness that unfortunately kept him away from research between 2006 and 2008, he devoted the last years of his life to preparing the new fascicles covering the Latin inscriptions of the city and its territory: fascicles *CIL* II²/14, 2–4. Of these, A. himself had the opportunity of presenting fascicle 2, in Tarragona in May 2011, before his death in Athens only six months later. Fascicle 3 was published the next year (2012) and fascicle 4 is expected to appear at the end of 2014, or beginning of 2015. As opposed to the 1,080 inscriptions gathered in A.'s corpus of 1975, the three *CIL* II² fascicles will collect 2,359, including those coming from the Ager Tarraconensis. Tarraco, a Roman colony founded by Caesar and the capital of Hispania Citerior since Augustus, thus offers one of the most important epigraphic sets from the Roman Empire, with an exceptional record from the initial Roman presence in Hispania (in the late third century B.C.E.) until Late Antiquity.

Fascicle 2 (noted by B. Salway and A. Cooley, *JRS* 102 (2012), 177) includes the religious inscriptions (*tituli sacri*) as well as those relating to the emperors, senators, equites, soldiers and members of the imperial administration and the impressive series of inscriptions, mostly statue bases, related to the *concilium prouinciae Hispaniae citerioris*, especially to the provincial *flamines* and *flaminicae* (14, nos 815–1199). Fascicle 3 (2012) brings together, amongst others, the inscriptions of the magistrates and priests of the colony; those relating to *collegia*, professions and foreigners; the *loca adsignata* of the theatre and amphitheatre; and finally funerary inscriptions (14, nos 1200–890). Finally, fascicle 4 will cover the smaller fragments: *tituli* on mosaics and *instrumentum*; the Christian inscriptions; those from the Ager Tarraconensis as well as an addendum to fascicle 14.1 by Juan Manuel Abascal (covering the southern part of the *conuentus Tarraconensis*); and the general indices.

Fascicle 3 contains 690 entries, all of them illustrated, as usual in recent volumes of *CIL,* with photographs or drawings, except those lost items lacking any pictorial documentation. Each entry contains a detailed description of the support, the conditions and place of discovery, conservation, a photograph (generally excellent) or drawing, a transcript of the text, illustration credits, a bibliography organized chronologically (truly comprehensive), a critical apparatus including *lectiones uariae* and different interpretations, a brief comment and a proposed dating.

Amongst the inscriptions found in the fascicle should be noted the remarkable series of statue bases (Tarraco has an impressive collection), funerary plaques and altars dedicated to magistrates (nos 1201–36) and *seuiri Augustales* (nos 1237–67); some *tituli* concerning *collegia* (not very common in Hispania; nos 1268–75a), such as those of the *centonarii* (no. 1273) and *fabri* (no. 1272); the inscriptions indicating the reserved seats (*tituli sedium*) for certain individuals or groups in the theatre (nos 1364–91) and amphitheatre (nos 1392–1432), including the *arkarii* of the *uicesuma hereditatium* (no. 1392) and the *seuiri* (no. 1393), and more than four hundred funerary inscriptions (nos 1433–890).

In this fascicle, the Republican inscriptions have not been differentiated from those from the Imperial period, a departure from the approach taken in *Die römischen Inschriften von Tarraco* (nos 1–18). This editorial decision obscures the important collection of inscriptions dated to the second and first centuries B.C.E. (no fewer than 21, recovered in the city), on which see now B. Díaz, *Epigrafía latina republicana de Hispania* (2008), nos C58–78. Several of these Republican inscriptions appear scattered throughout the volume (nos 1200, 1314, 1447, 1521, 1560, 1607, 1624, 1626, 1661, 1686 and 1703; also in *CIL* II²/14.2 nos 840, 865, 870, 977, 988 and 991), including three interesting 'bilingual' texts: no. 1778, and another two now lost, but preserved through drawings: no. 1284 (where *lintearia* is correctly understood, in my opinion, as an indication of job and not as a cognomen) and no. 1882. Unusually, in nos 1284 and 1882, A. did not include a transcript of the text, which in the Iberian part offers some variants not collected in the *apparatus criticus* (see now I. Simón, *Los soportes de la epigrafía paleohispánica* (2013), nos P36–7). In 1200, the interpretation, which is not fully convincing, of *Ephesius*(?) as the *magister* of a *conuentus ciuium Romanorum* and not a *collegium* remains controversial (see the literature cited at 1200).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435815000350 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In conclusion, the three *CIL* II[2] fascicles concerning Tarraco constitute an outstanding example of A.'s mastery in the edition of Latin inscriptions and one of his most illuminating contributions to the understanding of the Roman world.

University of Zaragoza FRANCISCO BELTRÁN LLORIS
fbeltran@unizar.es
doi:10.1017/S0075435815000350

F. DE ANGELIS (ED.), *REGIONALISM AND GLOBALISM IN ANTIQUITY: EXPLORING THEIR LIMITS* (Colloquia Antiqua 7). Leuven: Peeters, 2013. Pp. xvi + 362, illus., maps, plans. ISBN 9789042926691. €78.00.

Connectivity, movement, networks and globalization are all words that are very much in fashion. This edited collection of fifteen papers, resulting from a conference in Vancouver in 2007, ambitiously attempts to shed light on these phenomena by sampling research from across the field of Classical study. In the introductory chapter, De Angelis sets out the aims of the volume to examine the movement of ancient phenomena through time and space, and to address two well-entrenched yet problematic interpretive models: diffusionism from centres to peripheries, and Mediterraneanism. As D. points out (1–2), 'diffusionism' derives from European nineteenth-century colonial discourse, and ought to be replaced by models that allow for multiple centres — in other words, to conceive the ancient world as a 'polycentric periphery' (to borrow from the sociologist J. Nederveen Pieterse). Likewise, the notion of 'Mediterraneanism', which presents the Mediterranean as distinctive, unified and unchanging, is similarly critiqued (3–4) in light of P. Horden and N. Purcell's *The Corrupting Sea* (2000), which recognizes diverse micro-ecologies and distinctive forms of Mediterranean connectivity. D. goes on to make the case for studying globalization in the ancient world, which provides 'a more nuanced analytical framework, in which the temporal and spatial dimensions of the past are not viewed, as Mediterraneanism and diffusionism would have them, as entirely identical and always directed from a single favoured source' (4). According to D., the essence of ancient globalization was interconnectivity between regions, underpinning the relationship between globalism and regionalism, and allowing us to conceive of local developments in terms of regional and 'global' pictures. Crucially, a case is made for globalization as permitting the ancient world to be viewed from many more perspectives, promoting cross-cultural and comparative studies, and bridging disciplinary divides (4–5).

Following this opening statement, the content of the other fourteen chapters is rather puzzling. Only the final contribution by M. Sommer mentions globalization, leaving an impression that the remaining thirteen papers do not directly tackle the aims of the volume. Other relevant chapters include A. Nijboer on the varied influence of the Near–Eastern Marzeah on Mediterranean convivial practice, A. Nicgorski's consideration of the contemporary yet far flung use of the so-called Heracles knot in mid-fifth-century B.C. statues of Apollo, and J. Walsh's reading of patterns of ceramic consumer choice in ancient Sicily. These examples demonstrate that *contra* common perception, globalization, whether ancient or modern, is not simply about homogenization. Rather, it is a much more complex phenomenon, in which the spread of notionally 'global' or universal forms have equal potential to form the basis of shared cultural practices and/or be re-appropriated in local value systems. Globalization, then, is fundamentally about the 'universalization of the particular' hand-in-hand with the 'particularization of the universal'. These ideas resonate closely with M. Sommer's chapter, which uses the related concept of 'glocalization' in the examination of the Roman Empire in the third century A.D. This paper does, however, raise the question of whether the term 'de-globalization' (used by M. Sommer in his original conference paper title) is more appropriate to discuss the regionalization ushered in with Late Antiquity. While other relevant themes are also addressed, such as Z. Archibald's investigation of innovation networks in the ancient world, one is left with the impression that more radical approaches are missing, notably the application of Actor Network Theory, as demonstrated elsewhere in consideration of Gallic pre-sigillata production (A. Van Oyen, 'Towards a post-colonial artefact analysis', *Archaeological Dialogues* 20 (2013), 81–107).

Much of this volume suffers from a lack of engagement with the agenda set out by D. This is most notable in G. Tsetskhladze's essay on the origins of the Bosporan kingdom, which explores an interesting historical question, but seemingly offers little to the wider debate on globalism and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435815000350 Published online by Cambridge University Press