

*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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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'

<sup>1</sup> Suet. *Claud.* 11.3; 60.4.1, 60.4.6, 17.2.

<sup>2</sup> Dio 59.12.2.

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

Agrippa's authority in the domain bestowed by Gaius.<sup>4</sup> But elsewhere Josephus also made use of what seems to be, *at first sight*, a different tradition. In a passage of the *Bellum* he says that it was Claudius who *initially* granted the tetrarchy of Philip (and Antipas) to Agrippa. Moreover, both in this passage of the *Bellum*, and in that of the *Antiquities* just cited, he asserts that it was Claudius also who conferred on him Lysanias' tetrarchy. While it may often be a wasted effort to attempt to explain apparent contradictions and inconsistencies in Josephus, in this instance the cause can perhaps be determined. If the 'reconfirmation' of Agrippa's rule involved what was in strict legality an actual appointment (his previous appointment technically having ended), the uncertainty of Josephus in handling his sources is explicable.<sup>5</sup>

The pattern observed in the case of Agrippa can be detected elsewhere. Another king on very close terms with Gaius was C. Julius Antiochus (IV) of Commagene, who, along with Agrippa, was associated in the minds of the Romans as Gaius' 'tutor in tyranny'. While the sources say nothing about his early relationship with the emperor, it must surely have been a friendly one, since in 37 Antiochus, together with Agrippa, was one of the first to benefit from Gaius' accession. His father's old kingdom of Commagene, which had been organized into a Roman province by Germanicus, was restored to him, along with coastal territory in Cilicia. He also received a hundred million sesterces for the taxes and other revenues that had accrued to the imperial treasury during the twenty years that had elapsed since the kingdom's incorporation. By A.D. 69 Antiochus was reputed to be the richest of the client kings.<sup>6</sup> Antiochus and Agrippa are said to have visited Gaius in the north, probably in early 40, and their bond with the emperor would no doubt have been strengthened by their close mutual ties, since Antiochus' son, Epiphanes, was betrothed to Drusilla, the daughter of Agrippa.<sup>7</sup> There is no hint of any rift between Gaius and Antiochus, and it comes as something of a surprise to be informed by Dio, in his chapters dealing with Claudius, that Gaius deprived Antiochus of his kingdom, and that Claudius on his accession restored it (Dio does not mention the incident in the 'Gaius' chapters). The confusion appears to be further compounded by Josephus, who asserts that Claudius deprived Antiochus of the kingdom that he held and presented him with Commagene and part of Cilicia, the two very areas that Antiochus already in fact possessed.<sup>8</sup> Yet Josephus is probably technically correct. It must surely be the case that Claudius merely reappointed Antiochus as king, as he had reappointed Agrippa. It is, of course, important to appreciate that Claudius' initial deposition of Antiochus was not a specific measure but merely part of an all-embracing enactment, and implies no dissatisfaction with Antiochus' conduct. Dio, not understanding the process, clearly reconstructed events to find some explanation for what he no doubt saw as an actual grant of a kingdom by Claudius as a deliberate act of policy. Antiochus certainly appears to have performed faithfully under a succession of Roman masters, and went on to serve Claudius, Nero and Vespasian loyally. His kingdom was eventually annexed in 72, and he spent an honourable exile in Rome.

In the case of a third territory, the Bosphorus, the numismatic evidence points to the same type of arrangement. Roman policy had always sought to ensure that the

<sup>4</sup> Jos. *AJ* 19.274.

<sup>5</sup> Jos. *AJ* 18.237. 19.275, *BJ* 2.215 (where it is described as the *kingdom* of Lysanias), cf. *AJ* 20.138; see E. M. Smallwood, *The Jews Under Roman Rule*<sup>2</sup> (Leiden, 1981), p. 190.

<sup>6</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 2.81; Suet. *Cal.* 16.3; Dio 59.8.2. On his territory in Cilicia, see D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, 1950), pp. 1338 n. 24, 1368 n. 49.

<sup>7</sup> Jos. *AJ* 19.355; Dio 59.24.1.

<sup>8</sup> Jos. *AJ* 19.276; Dio 60.8.1.

Bosporus, an important supplier of grain, should be under the control of a ruler loyal to the Romans. One of the most enduring of such figures was Aspurgus, whose authority was first acknowledged by Augustus. He married a lady of the Bosporan nobility, Gepaipyris, by whom he had a son Mithridates, and apparently survived until at least the first year of Gaius' reign, since his last coins bear that emperor's head.<sup>9</sup> The numismatic evidence indicates that under Gaius the old regime of the Bosporus continued. Coins minted throughout his reign (37–41) suggest that at first Mithridates and his mother ruled the Bosporus conjointly, with the son becoming sole ruler in 39/40. Gold coins of Mithridates bearing the Bosporan dates of A.D. 39/40 and 41/42 show the head of the emperor on one side and the legend of Mithridates on the other.<sup>10</sup> This reconstruction of events seems on the surface to be contradicted by Dio, who asserts that on his accession Claudius granted the Bosporus to Mithridates, and gave Polemo (II) part of Cilicia in exchange. Now Pontus and the Bosporus had been closely linked since the time of Mithridates, and Polemo's grandfather, Polemo I had for a brief time ruled the two kingdoms together. It seems more than likely that when Dio read in his sources of what was, in fact, a *pro forma* reappointment of Mithridates in his kingdom he misunderstood the situation, just as he misunderstood the reappointment of Antiochus, and took the reference to be to an initial grant. In the apparent absence of a Bosporan ruler in the immediately preceding period Dio probably assumed that the territory had been ruled jointly with Pontus. Of course Polemo II may well have had legitimate expectations of a Bosporan award, in which case the grant of land in Cilicia could have represented a form of compensation for his disappointment.<sup>11</sup> The line of Gepaipyris and Aspurgus continued as loyal client-kings of Rome in the Bosporus for several generations, although Mithridates himself was betrayed by a brother Cotys in 45/46 and was taken to Rome where, it seems, he was eventually executed by Galba.<sup>12</sup>

There are thus clear indications that when on Claudius' accession, the *acta* of Gaius were rescinded by the senate, the client-kings he had appointed found themselves in a sort of constitutional limbo, and that Claudius moved quickly to make their situation regular, a procedure that caused confusion in Josephus and Dio. This provides further illustration that while at this period the client kings depended mainly on their personal relationship with the emperor their position was, all the same, a legal and formal one, confirmed by appropriate legal and constitutional procedures.<sup>13</sup>

University of British Columbia

ANTHONY A. BARRETT

<sup>9</sup> *BMC Pontus etc.*, 50; E. H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks* (Cambridge, 1913), p. 611.

<sup>10</sup> Minns, 597, Plate VII.10; *BMC Pontus etc.*, 51.5.

<sup>11</sup> Dio 59.8.2; see A. Barrett, 'Gaius' Policy in the Bosporus', *TAPA* 107 (1977), 1–9.

<sup>12</sup> Plut. *Galba* 13.15.

<sup>13</sup> On this general question, see Fergus Millar, 'Emperors, Frontiers and Foreign Relations, 31 B.C. to A.D. 378', *Britannia* 13 (1982), 4–5, D. Braund, *Rome and the Friendly King* (London, 1984), p. 26.

## RINGING WELKINS

### (i) 720 Paeans

The paradoxographer Apollonius (*Mirab.* 40, p. 53 Keller) preserves the memory of a singular occurrence which Aristoxenus (fr. 117 Wehrli) had recorded as having happened in southern Italy in his own time. A strange insanity afflicted women. They would suddenly leap up in the middle of dinner, hearing the call of a voice, and rush out into the country. *μαντευομένοις δὲ τοῖς Λοκροῖς καὶ Πηγίνοις περὶ τῆς*