

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,