

toribus plures per annos gesta conjunxi, ne divisa haud proinde ad memoriam sui valerent. Ad temporum ordinem redeo.

It appears, then, that Tacitus, in chapters 31–40, instead of confining himself to the events of that year, on which he had entered in c. 25, *scil.* A.D. 50, includes those of several—*plures per annos gesta*—and under two governors of Britain. Horsley, believing that the years included by Tacitus were after, not before, that on which he had entered, assumes that Ostorius was *novus dux* in the consulship of Antistius and Suillius. But the authority of Dio, cited p. 305, cannot be neglected; and, if we accept it, we must necessarily place the commencement of the government of Ostorius in the same year of the ovation of Plautius, *i.e.* 47, unless, indeed, we assume that there was a considerable interval between the end of the administration of Plautius and the beginning of that of Ostorius. The notice, then, of British affairs by Tacitus in xii., 31–40, must be regarded as including years both before and after that in which Antistius and Suillius were consuls, *i.e.* both before and after that memorable scene of this year, in which Caractacus appeared before Claudius and Agrippina. There is, certainly, a difficulty in assigning this date to this scene, arising from the use of the term *nono*, in the words *nono post anno quam bellum in Britannia coeptum*; but the true explanation of this seems to be that suggested by Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, p. 34, that *Tacitus supposes the war to have commenced in A.D. 42, one year before the expedition of Plautius.

The death of Ostorius and the succession of Didius Gallus, are placed by Horsley at A.D. 53, whilst Orelli seems to give A.D. 50. Of the two opinions I prefer Horsley's, although, perhaps, the truth lies between the two. If Caractacus was in Rome in A.D. 50, it appears probable that at least another year must be allowed for the reverses of Ostorius, mentioned in c. 38.

In the other discrepancy, *viz.*: as to the end of the government of Suetonius Paulinus, and the beginning of that of Petronius Turpilianus, I believe Horsley's to be the correct view. See note, p. 305.

* There is a similar difficulty in the use of *octavus*, in *Agricola*, c. 33. Mr. Merivale, vii., p. 88, note, suggests the solution, that, "though it was Agricola's seventh, it might be called the eighth campaign of his army; for, in the year preceding his arrival, Julius Frontinus had led an expedition against the Silures.—*Agric.* 17." Orelli is of opinion, that Agricola counts from the year in which the province was assigned to him, *scil.* A.D. 77, immediately after his consulship, which he held from July 1st to September 1st. Either of these explanations seems preferable to the supposition of a mistake of viii. for vii. See Horsley, *Brit. Rom.*, p. 48.