

JOHN BRISCOE

THE GRANDSON OF HORTENSIUS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 95 (1993) 249–250

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE GRANDSON OF HORTENSIUS

Towards the end of 1991 I sent to Professor Eck, for publication in ZPE, a short note concerning the recently discovered new fragment of the Fasti of the Arval brethren, recording a [...] Marcius Hortalus as praetor peregrinus in A.D. 25.¹ I argued that the praetor was to be identified with the grandson of the great orator Hortensius, who had been given the senatorial census by Augustus and whose appeal to Tiberius for further financial subvention in A.D. 16 was, after initial hostility from the Emperor, eventually granted.² He was, that is, a Marcius Hortalus, and not a Marcus Hortensius Hortalus, as had, on the basis of Tacitus' Marci Hortali always been assumed.³ Professor Eck, while accepting this last point, raised objections to the identification of the praetor and the suppliant on the grounds that it entailed a gap between quaestorship and praetorship of at least ten years.⁴ We eventually agreed that we should publish separate articles on the matter; Professor Eck's contribution was also to include a restoration of IGRR 3.944, an inscription from Paphos which I had largely left out of my argument.⁵

In the meantime, however, a long article on the problem has been published by Mireille Corbier in MEFRA 103,1991,655-701. She sent an offprint to Professor Eck, who kindly sent me a photocopy. Mme. Corbier agrees with me about the identification of the praetor and the suppliant, and discusses at length both the aforementioned inscription from Paphos and a fragmentary Latin inscription from Cypriot Salamis, where a [...]tensinus is mentioned.⁶ She believes that this should be supplemented as [Hor]tensinus and reads [᾽Ορ]τησεῖνου or [᾽Ορτ]ηνσεῖνου in the Greek inscription. Hortalus, in her view, had an additional cognomen Hortensinus and became proconsul of Cyprus after his praetorship.

Mme. Corbier's article clearly makes it inappropriate to publish my note in the form I had intended. It will, in particular, be right to defer defence of the postulated gap between quaestorship and praetorship until Professor Eck has published his objections. I would, however, like to make two comments now on Mme. Corbier's paper.

¹ P.Arnaud, MEFRA 98,1986,403 = AE 1987,46-7 no.163, Epigraphica 51,1989,16-18.

² Tac. Ann. 2.37-8.

³ Thus explicitly Kadlec, RE, 8.2470, PIR², H.210, Koestermann ad loc., J.Geiger, CR n.s. 20,1970,132-4, Goodyear, ad loc.

⁴ The suppliant made his request *loco sententiae* and was therefore a member of the senate; the latest date for his quaestorship is thus A.D. 15. Cf. R.J.A.Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, Princeton 1984,16,257-60.

⁵ Cf. T.B.Mitford, BSA 42,1947,208-12, who dated it to the reign of Titus.

⁶ J.Pouilloux-P.Roesch-J.Marcillet-Jaubert, *Salamine de Chypre* 13,1987,65 no.148.

1. Mme. Corbier postulates that the suppliant's father was a son of Hortensius by his second marriage, which took place after 56, to Marcia, the former wife of the younger Cato;⁷ the nomen Hortensius was lost by adoption, either of the suppliant's father by L.Marcus Philippus, consul in 56 and father of Marcia, or by his son, the consul of 38, or of the suppliant himself by the consul of 38. She does not realise that the story told by Valerius Maximus (5.9.2) implies that at the time of the trial of Hortensius' nephew M.Valerius Messalla (cos. 53) on a charge of ambitus, which took place in 51,⁸ the orator had only one son, the praetor of 45 who was executed by Antony after the battle of Philippi,⁹ and that was still the situation at the time of Hortensius' death in the following year.¹⁰ It seems to me more likely, therefore, that it was the suppliant's mother who was the daughter of Hortensius and Marcia, and that she married a Marcus. I would not exclude the possibility, however, that the suppliant's father was a son of Hortensius by his first wife, Lutatia, born in the 60s and given in adoption. In such circumstances the praetor of 45 would, legally, be Hortensius' only son.

2. The view supported by Mme. Corbier and myself means that Marci at Tacitus Annals 2.37.1 is the genitive of the nomen Marcus, not of the praenomen Marcus. Mme. Corbier has a footnote on the proper names in the first Medicean Manuscript, our only evidence for the Tiberian books of the Annals, but does not make the relevant facts clear.¹¹ They are as follows: the manuscript, whose practice has been generally followed by editors, normally abbreviates praenomina, but on this occasion has Marci. The point is not, however, decisive, since Marci, -o, -um occurs on nine other occasions, five of which refer to Marcus Agrippa.¹²

University of Manchester

John Briscoe

⁷ On Hortensius' marriage to Marcia and the latter's remarriage to Cato after Hortensius' death see Strabo 11 p.515C, Plut. Cat.min. 25.3-13, 39.5, 52.5-9, App BC 2.413; other references are cited by von der Mühl, RE, 8.2478.

⁸ Cic. Att. 5.12.2, Brut. 328, Cael. ap. Cic. fam. 8.2.1.

⁹ Liu. per. 124, Vell. 2.71.2.

¹⁰ On the date of Hortensius' death cf. Cic. fam. 8.13.2, Att. 6.6.2.

¹¹ P. 665 n.49. The reference to Syme there should read "JRS, 39,1949" (= Ten Studies in Tacitus, ch.6).

¹² Cf. D.R.Blackman-G.G.Betts, Concordantia Tacitea (Hildesheim-Zürich-New York, 1986), 2. 1008-9. I have checked all the occurrences of the full praenomen and a sample of those of the abbreviation in the facsimile of the first Medicean.