

Standard works on Tacitus are nearly unanimous in authenticating *Annals* 15.74.3 (*reperio in commentariis senatus*) as the only citation of the *acta senatus* in the *Annals* (e.g. Syme 1958, 282; Martin 1981, 209; Sage 1990, 1008; Woodman 1998, 220; not Mendell 1957, 212). However, the text of *Annals* 2.88.1 is corrupt and should be restored in accordance with Goodyear's conjecture (1981, 445-6) to include another citation: *reperio apud scriptores senatoriaque eorundem temporum acta* ('I find from authors and the senatorial record of the time').

Since J. Gruterus (ed. 1607), editors have printed *reperio apud scriptores senatoresque eorundem temporum Adgandestrii principis Chattorum lectas in senatu litteras*, which is usually taken to mean "I find from contemporary authors, who were members of the senate that a letter of Adgandestrius, prince of the Chatti, was read out in the senate." This paper shows a) by means of photographic enlargements that an error exists in the *Mediceus Primus* at *Ann.* 2.88.1; b) that *scriptores senatoresque* has no MS support, is nonsensical and paleographically indefensible; c) that even Gruterus himself noted that the passage implied Tacitus' use of public records; d) that senators' *commentarii* is unlikely to be implied by the context, which calls for mention of the *acta senatus*; e) that *Ann.* 3.3.2 (*non apud auctores rerum, non diurna actorum scriptura reperio*), in which Tacitus cites a literary and a documentary source with the words *apud ... reperio* is a parallel offering guidance as to the correct reading; f) that Goodyear's conjecture has better paleographical support than even he thought; and g) that G. Alföldy's (1995, 252) restoration of *CIL* 6.1574 now shows that Tacitus was *quaestor Augusti*, probably under Titus, which means that he needed to be familiar with the *acta senatus* in a way that is implied by this passage's context. The scribe's error is similar to others in the *Mediceus Primus* and can be explained as originating from the need to turn pages. Goodyear's conjecture makes the best sense and ought to be adopted.

Like writers on Tacitus' sources, most editors and commentators have overlooked this textual problem. In the last 150 years, however, some have variously argued that the received text implies Tacitus' use of either the *acta senatus* or of senators' *commentarii*. Of the former, most acknowledge a problem with the text but few have suggested emendation, while none of the latter has ever reckoned with the errors in the *Mediceus Primus*. Since the act of acknowledging a source is meant to eliminate any doubt as to the origin of a story, past disagreements over the proper understanding of *Ann.* 2.88.1 raise the question of what constituted citation for ancient Roman historians and their readers.