

it seems highly likely that the addition was made by Livy himself, to his source. If it is asked why Livy should add a qualification to shed, as he saw it, a better light upon Hamilcar, I would suggest that the desire for moral rectitude outweighs considerations of personality etc.

The University, Ibadan

N. HENRY

A NOTE ON PLINY'S IRESIA

In his account of the Northern Sporades, Pliny names the islands of Iresia, Solymnia, Eudemia, and Nea as lying off the Gulf of Salonica,¹ but gives no clue as to the individual identity of each island.

Iresia has been variously identified as Peathoúra,² Yioúra,³ and Pipéri.⁴ An unexpected source supports the identification with Pipéri. The Turkish chart of the Aegean by Mehmed reis ibn Menemenli, dated 1590/1,⁵ calls this island Hırsız (حیرسن), although his name does not occur in any other Turkish sources. Hırsız may be a corruption of the ancient name Iresia. If this is so, the original toponym has been corrupted so as to form a recognizable Turkish word, as 'hırsız' is the Turkish for 'thief'. This is not an uncommon feature in Turkish place-names, the change from Greek Monemvasia to Turkish Benefşe/Menekşe ('violet') being a better known example.⁶

University of Manchester

COLIN IMBER

¹ *Natural History*, iv.72.

² C. Burian, *Geographie von Griechenland* (Leipzig, 1862), 2.390; *RE*, Suppl. iii (1918), 'Iresia'.

³ G. B. Grundy, *Murray's Small Classical Atlas* (London, 1904), map no. 11.

⁴ H. Kiepert, *Twelve Maps of the Ancient World* (Berlin, n.d.), map no. 5.

⁵ W. Brice, C. Imber, R. Lorch, *The Aegean Sea-chart of Mehmed reis ibn Menemenli* (Manchester, 1977).

⁶ P. Wittek, 'The Castle of Violets: from Greek Monemvasia to Turkish Menekşe', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 20 (1957), 601–13.

IMPERATORIA NOMINA (Tac. *Ann.* 1.3.1)

'Tiberium Neronem et Claudium Drusum priuignos imperatoriis nominibus auxit [sc. Augustus]', i.e. honoured them with salutations as 'imperatores'. So I took it in my commentary (Cambridge, 1972), supposing argument needless. I must now defend my view against R. Syme, *Historia antiqua, Commentationes Louanienses in honorem W. Peremans* (Louvain, 1977), p.239. Syme asserts 'Avoiding a technical term, he [Tacitus] describes the stepsons of the Princeps as invested with *imperatorii nominibus* (3.1). That is, a grant of *imperium proconsulare* (after the campaigns of 11 B.C.).' He adds in a footnote 'As emerges clearly from Dio 54.33.5 (Drusus), cf. 34.4 (Tiberius). The matter must be stated firmly, since both Koestermann and Goodyear are totally inadequate.' Let me make amends.

If a Roman historian, tired of writing *consulatus*, substitutes *summus honor*, he plays the stylist. If he substitutes *praetura*, he plays the fool. Such foolery,

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