

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

suggest that *nitenti* has been lost between *frontem* and *ita*. For *nitenti* cf. 6.1 'id matrimonium ad maiora nitenti decus ac robur fuit'.

Keighley

R. SHAW-SMITH

NOCTES STATIANAE

I

hi praefixa solo uellunt munimina, at illi
portarum obiectus minuunt et ferrea sudant
claustra remoliri, trabibusque artata sonoro
pellunt saxa loco;

(*Theb.* 10. 525–8)

‡ariete

-que s.l. P¹ : *om.* N artata ω : artata Θ^c : ‡ariete P¹

These lines, which I cite according to Hill's forthcoming edition,¹ have caused scholars some difficulty of interpretation. *Trabibus* has generally been taken to refer to battering-rams and thus, for instance, we find in the Delphin edition as an interpretation of *trabibusque . . . loco* the words 'et strepenti ariete loco extrudunt lapides firme constrictos'. Certainly, if they drive stones from their place with a ram, it is the ram that is the best candidate for the epithet *sonorus* — a candidature every ω manuscript rejects, except two alleged by Barth. P, however, has *et ariete*, replacing the rather uninformative adjective *artata* and providing an explicit noun for *sonoro* to agree with; and P was followed by the early editors Lindenbrogius and Cruceus. 'Infeliciter', says Barth. Infelicitously indeed: *et* is deleted by P in the first hand and would not scan; without *et* the sentence does not construct and the line still does not scan — for the word is *ariēte* (see Hill ad 2.492).² Worse still, *ariete* which is only otherwise found as a variant in the hand of the corrector of Θ is transparently a gloss on *trabibus*, as Barth said, and has been drawn into the text of P by its accidental similarity to *artata*. It follows that amongst the manuscripts there is no significant deviation from the reading given at the head of this note (Klotz's 'trabibusque artata ω *interpolatione manifesta*' is hopelessly topsy-turvy) and that therefore curious conjectures like Kohlmann's *aut aere* or Postgate's *vel aere* (do they refer to hollow cannonballs?) can neither claim P's reading for support nor stand at all if we are able to interpret the reading of the manuscripts.

Barth reports the interpretation of a *Vetus Scholiasta*: 'saxa trabibus vincta, ut murum fortius contineant'. This he rejects without argument, but quite wrongly. The *trabes* are not the instruments with which the wall was attacked (the gloss *ariete* was mistaken) but the timbers with which the structure of the wall is packed (*artata*) and thereby strengthened. For in the preceding lines, which I have cited, there is likewise no mention of the instrument used, only of the object of attack; and there is another example of this sort of wall-building a few pages later, where

¹ Discussion of which with the author has led to these jottings.

Dilke, and others have wished to retain *arietibus* at 2.492.

² Mr. D. E. Hill observes that Klotz,