

own 'pactus...consulto':¹² 'quippe eo ipso ridiculi et vecordes erant, quod paciscerentur, ut alter alterum magnifice laudarent; quasi gloriam et rem ex alternis laudibus apud populum aucupaturi.' Housman's only objection to this, apart from the question of *Romae*, is that 'the corruption is hardly to be explained' (!), while Brink prefers *fautor* (which does not suit a reciprocal arrangement) solely on the grounds of economy (and with the irrelevant observation that Bentley's emendation 'anyway did not satisfy him'). We would stress rather that the notion of a conscious pact between two parties is less satisfactory than that of a relationship in which the mutual flattery arises more unconsciously. The fact that Scaevola and Crassus were related (Crassus' wife Mucia would have been a second cousin of Scaevola: her great-grandfather Q. Mucius Scaevola P. f. was also Scaevola's great-grandfather) might support the presence here too of some relationship between the parties which would give a reason for mutual admiration but one which might still be criticised e.g. a marriage tie in which both parties had something to gain from mutual praise. This seems to rule out *frater* (to which the first objection is also decisive),¹³ but it is much harder to say what it supports, and we have to confess ourselves beaten. We wish others more luck.¹⁴

Jesus College, Oxford

EDWARD H. BISPHAM
DON P. FOWLER

¹² For the dative, see Bentley *ad loc.*, *TLL* x.1.19.36ff.

¹³ Contra M. J. McGann, *CR* 16 (1966), 266–7.

¹⁴ We are most grateful for comments and corrections to Dr R. O. A. M. Lyne and Professor R. G. M. Nisbet.

A PALAEOGRAPHICAL CORRUPTION IN OVID, *EX PONTO* 4.6

In lines 35–8 Ovid compliments the poem's recipient Brutus on his skill as a forensic orator. The transmitted text is as follows:

hostibus eueniat quam sis uiolentus in armis
sentire et linguae tela subire tuae,
quae tibi tam tenui cura limantur ut omnes
istius ingenium corporis esse negent.

The MSS. *ingenium corporis* could only mean 'so that all would deny that the talent of your body exists'; Ovid can hardly be identifying the *tela* of 36 with Brutus' *ingenium*. Wheeler translates 'On these [the missiles of your tongue] you use the file with such extreme care that none would recognize in them your real nature', and André 'que personne ne croirait qu'un tel esprit habite ton corps'; neither translation fits the Latin.

The correct reading is 'ut omnes / istius *ingenui pectoris* esse negent', meaning 'so that all would deny that they are the product of your kindly spirit'. In lines 27–30 Ovid has already described this apparent contradiction in Brutus' character:

lenem te miseris genuit Natura, nec ulli
mitius ingenium quam tibi, Brute, dedit,
ut qui quid ualeas ignoret Marte forensi
posse tuo peragi uix putet ore reos.

The corruption of *ingenui* to *ingeniū* is simple enough, and the interchange of *pectus* and *corpus* is a common error: the fifth-century codex Romanus of Virgil (*R*) gives

corpora for the correct *pectora* at *A.* 7.349, and Seneca when quoting *A.* 5.363 seems to have inadvertently substituted *corpore* for *pectore* (*Ep.* 92.30).

Toronto

MARK AKRIGG

CLAUDIUS, GAIUS AND THE CLIENT KINGS

When Claudius came to power in January 41 he did not hesitate to distance himself from his predecessor's behaviour and policies, and among other measures, Suetonius reports, he abolished all Gaius' *acta*. The precise implications of this move are not made clear. Certainly, the extremely unpopular taxes introduced in Rome near the end of Gaius' reign were annulled, several people convicted of *maiestas* were set free, and the monies previously confiscated from negligent, and possibly corrupt, road commissioners were returned.¹ But if the abolition of the *acta* was as sweeping as Suetonius seems to imply, a number of popular and useful measures must inevitably have been abrogated at the same time, and as a matter of routine they would need to be reintroduced by Claudius. The arrangements with the client kings may well have belonged to this general category, and if we assume that this was indeed the case we shall have an explanation for a number of apparent inconsistencies in the literary sources. It should be observed that in the early part of his principate Gaius went out of his way to be a 'constitutional' ruler. The appointment of the client kings would have been handled so as not to seem like the arbitrary exercise of power. Certainly, when the three sons of the murdered king of Thrace, Polemo, Cotys and Rhoemetalcès received new kingdoms in 38, Dio stresses that the act was legitimised by a formal senatorial decree.² If client kings had generally been established by a formal and legal process their appointments could quite well have come to an end with the abolition of the *acta* in January 41.

Of all the client rulers associated with Gaius none was on closer terms than 'Herod' Agrippa. He first cultivated the future emperor's friendship during their stay on Capri, and in 37 received his reward, when he fell heir to part of the old kingdom of Herod the Great. The latter's son, Archelaus, had been obliged in A.D. 6, after a period of mismanagement, to give up his domain, which was subsequently reorganized as the Roman province of Judaea. Herod's other two sons, however, were allowed to retain the tetrarchies they inherited. When Philip died in 33/4, his tetrarchy was put under the administration of the legate of Syria, with the revenues kept separate, and it was this territory that was initially bestowed on Agrippa as a kingdom. Josephus in the *Antiquities* states quite explicitly that Gaius granted the tetrarchy of Philip (Auranitis, Trachonitis, Batanaea and Paneas) to Agrippa to rule as king early in 37 (he would receive from Gaius the tetrarchy of the third son, Antipas, later, probably in 40). In the same passage Josephus adds that Gaius also granted him Abilene, a portion of Ituraea east of Antilebanon, which had not been part of Herod's legacy and had still been ruled by a Lysanias until at least 27/28. This ruler was probably the grandson of the Lysanias put to death by Cleopatra in 34 B.C., and son of the tetrarch Zenodorus. He must have died between 29 and 37, and his territory similarly held in 'cold storage', probably under the authority of the legate of Syria.³ This initial grant by Gaius, and also its renewal on Claudius' accession, is alluded to in another passage of the *Antiquities*, where Josephus speaks of Claudius in 41 'confirming'

¹ Suet. *Claud.* 11.3; 60.4.1, 60.4.6, 17.2.

² Dio 59.12.2.

³ Jos. *AJ* 18.237, cf. Dio 59.8.2. On Lysanias: Luke 3.1; *IGR* 3.1085.