

and no less, Syme here imputes to Tacitus. *imperium proconsulare* is a standard term which Tacitus unhesitatingly employs several times, and once (*Ann.* 13.21.3) varies slightly to *proconsulare ius. nomen imperatoris/imperatorium* or in reverse order (*Cic. Phil.* 14.12, *Plin. Pan.* 12.1) is also a standard term, used regularly of imperial salutation for some two hundred years before Tacitus, and by Tacitus himself at *Ann.* 1.9.2 'nomen imperatoris semel atque uicies partum', 1.58.5 'nomen imperatoris auctore Tiberio accepit', and (a little more freely) 2.26.4 'adsequi nomen imperatorium et deportare lauream'. Hence *imperatoria nomina* for *imperia proconsularia* at *Ann.* 1.3.1 would be no mere avoidance of a technicality, but replacement of one technical term by another very different in meaning, and one which in its own proper sense is intelligible and, I submit, unobjectionable in the context. That Tacitus should thus wilfully confuse his readers seems in the highest degree improbable.

It remains to show that *imperatoria nomina* = 'imperial titles' is acceptable in the context. Dio 54.33–4 states that Drusus and Tiberius received *imperium proconsulare* at about 11 B.C., but did not then receive *imperatoria nomina*. Nothing 'emerges' beyond this. In particular it does not emerge that they did not get the titles at other times (for Tiberius' receipt of them see Dio 55.6.4, Ehrenberg–Jones 39) or that Tacitus is alluding to this occasion rather than any others. Apart from adding 'integra etiam tum domo sua' Tacitus does not indicate when the conferments were made. Nor is there any apparent reason why reference to *imperium* should be more appropriate at *Ann.* 1.3 than reference to titles. *imperium proconsulare* may indeed be a more substantial matter than *imperatorium nomen*, but is scarcely more honorific. Tacitus gives us a varied sample of honours bestowed on Augustus' likely successors, not their most important powers. Thus he mentions Agrippa's *geminati consulatus*, but not his *tribunicia potestas*, described at 3.56.2 as 'summi fastigii uocabulum'.

Bedford College, London

F. R. D. GOODYEAR

TACITUS—LIBRARIAN?

Mr. Reed has performed a distinct service by reminding us (*CQ* 26 (1976), 309 ff.) of the odd statement by Guglielmo da Pastrengo that Tacitus was once the director of Titus' private library: if authentic, the information is too precious to be neglected. We cannot deny that Guglielmo may have had ancient sources now lost. When we know that a short epic, probably by Rabirius, one of the most admired poets of the Augustan age, disappeared after 1466, although it was protected by a false ascription to Virgil, it would be foolhardy to claim that any loss after 1350 was impossible. On the other hand, we all know that instant erudition was a speciality of many Medieval sciolists whom admirers of the Middle Ages now call 'Humanists' and 'scholars', e.g. Arnulf of Orleans, whose recondite learning enabled him to inform us that Lucan was called Annaeus because bees settled on the infant's lips, and that he was brought to Rome as a captive after Nero stormed Cordova. Furthermore, strange short circuits may occur in the synapses of even disciplined minds, and in a time when men had to rely largely on memory, even scholars who strove

for accuracy were subject to strange misrecollections. One would suppose a priori that no one who had read Book XV of the *Annales* could confuse Lucan's mother, Acilia, with the heroic *libertina*, Epicharis, but that is what was done by the conscientious author of the first modern history of Latin literature, Sicco Polenton, in the fourth book of *Scriptorum illustrium libri* (1437). The second part of Guglielmo's statement about Tacitus ('Augusti gesta descripsit atque Domitiani') sounds much more like a similarly confused recollection of Jerome's famous mention of Tacitus than like anything that could have been derived or inferred from a lost manuscript of the *Historiae*, as Mr. Reed suggests.

There remains Guglielmo's statement, 'quem Titus imperator suae praefecit bibliothecae.' It will be otiose—it will be nugatory to waste space in learned journals on arguments about the likelihood that Tacitus held such a post. If Guglielmo had access to a source of authentic information—or if he relied on some professorial quack like Arnulf of Orleans—it is highly improbable that he derived from that source only one small, isolated datum. If his evidence is to be weighed, the only thing that can be done profitably is to perform the tedious, laborious, and perhaps thankless task of making a thorough analysis of *all* of Guglielmo's statements about classical authors and tracing them to their sources. The truth will then appear, and we can answer the question that Sabbadini asked about Guglielmo.

University of Illinois

REVILO P. OLIVER

THREE NOTES ON TACITUS

Annales 14.29

Q. Veranius, the governor of Britain who died in office, assured Nero in his will that he would have subjugated Britain 'si biennio proximo vixisset'. *Proximo* is suspect; if he had lived two years longer they were bound to be the next two. Read *si biennio provixisset*. For the verb *provivere*, to live longer, see *Ann.* 6.25; for the confusion of *proximo* and *pro*, see Capelli, p.299; and cf. *Iul. Cap., M. Aur.* 27 'si anno uno superfuisset, provincias ex his fecisset'.

Agricola 23.2

If the glory of Rome and the valour of its armies had permitted it, 'inventus in ipsa Britannia terminus'. In the *Agricola* Tacitus once uses the phrase *finem Britanniae* (33.3) and twice *terminus Britanniae* (27.1, 30.3); restore it here: *inventus in ipsa Britanniae terminus*, and for the turn of phrase see 37.2: 'consilium Britannorum in ipsos versum'.

Agricola 33.5

'Nam ut superasse tantum itineris, evasisse silvas, transisse aestuaria pulchrum ac decorum in frontem, ita fugientibus periculosissima quae hodie prosperrima sunt'. The drift of the sentence is: 'To have come so far is a fine thing if we push on, but disastrous if we turn and run'. A participle in the first limb to balance *fugientibus* in the second and to accompany *in frontem* is needed, and I