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.[9] 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.[10] 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.[11] 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.[12]

   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were rescinded by the senate, the client-kings he had appointed found themselves in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.[13]

University of British Columbia   ANTHONY A. BARRETT

   [9] *BMC Pontus etc.*, 50; E. H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks* (Cambridge, 1913), p. 611.
   [10] Minns, 597, Plate VII.10; *BMC Pontus etc.*, 51.5.
   [11] Dio 59.8.2; see A. Barrett, 'Gaius' Policy in the Bosporus', *TAPA* 107 (1977), 1–9.
   [12] Plut. *Galba* 13.15.
   [13] 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 'Ρηγίνοις περὶ τῆς

ἀπαλλαγῆς τοῦ πάθους 'εἰπεῖν τὸν θεόν, παιᾶνας ἄιδειν ἐαρινοὺς †δωδεκάτηςt
ἡμέρας ξ'.

C. Müller, followed by Keller, deleted what appeared to be an unwanted ordinal
numeral, 'twelfth'. But why should this figure have intruded? Surely we must read
δώδεκα τῆς ἡμέρας ⟨ἐπὶ ἡμέρας⟩ ξ', 'twelve a day for sixty days'. For prolonged
paean-singing to achieve purification we recall *Il.* 1.472,

> οἱ δὲ <u>πανημέριοι</u> μολπῆι θεὸν ἱλάσκοντο
> καλὸν ἀείδοντες παιήονα κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν.

When it comes to a dozen a day for two months, we may fairly comment that Apollo's
demands have escalated. The text concludes, as well it may, ὅθεν πολλοὺς γενέσθαι
παιανογράφους ἐν τῆι Ἰταλίαι.

(ii) Ethiopian war signals

Heliod. 9.17.1 ἀρθέντων δὲ ἐκατέρωθεν τῶν σημείων, καὶ τοῦ μὲν Περσικοῦ διὰ
σαλπίγγων, †βόμβοιςt δὲ καὶ τυμπάνοις τῶν Αἰθιόπων τὴν μάχην ἐπισημαινόντων,
κτλ.

For the unsuitable βόμβοις one of the later manuscripts, M, gives ῥόπτροις, which
would mean cymbals or metal clappers. This is at least imaginable, and Plutarch,
Crassus 23.9, says of the Parthians that οὐ κέρασιν οὐδὲ σάλπιγξιν ἐποτρύνουσιν
ἑαυτοὺς εἰς μάχην ἀλλὰ ῥόπτρα βυρσοπαγῆ καὶ κοῖλα περιτείναντες ἠχείοις χαλκοῖς
ἅμα πολλαχόθεν ἐπιδουποῦσι, τὰ δὲ φθέγγεται βύθιόν τι καὶ δεινόν, ὠρυγῆι θηριώδει
καὶ τραχύτητι βροντῆς μεμιγμένον. However, ῥόπτρα used without such resonators
would be very different in effect, and the parallel may be only superficial. βόμβοις
must be taken as the paradosis.

Most editors adopt Amyot's ῥόμβοις, 'bull-roarers'. (There is no basis for the
alternative meaning 'tambourine' or 'kettle-drum' given by LSJ s.v., I.3.) Again, this
is imaginable. ῥόμβοι and τύμπανα are associated in Bacchic cult.[1] But it is precisely
in cult and magic that the bull-roarer normally plays its part,[2] and I have not come
across a parallel for its use in battle. In any case, while it might be used to frighten
the enemy, it would not be well suited for giving signals.

I think it likelier that Heliodorus wrote στρόμβοις, 'conchs'. Lycophron 250 speaks
of Ares

> στρόμβωι τὸν αἱματηρὸν ἐξάρχων νόμον,

and his scholiast and Tzetzes explain that the ancients used the conch in battle before
the (Etruscan) invention of the σάλπιγξ. (Cf. sch. Nic. *Al.* 393.) The most telling
parallel, however, is Sext. Emp. *adv. Musicos* 24, εἴ γε καὶ <u>στρόμβοις</u> τινὲς τῶν
βαρβάρων βουκινίζουσι <u>καὶ τυμπάνοις</u> κτυποῦντες πολεμοῦσιν. The Taurian cow-
herds in Eur. *I. T.* 303 use κόχλοι to summon reinforcements for battle, and κόχλοι
do not seem to be distinguishable from στρόμβοι (see Gow on Theoc. 9.25). Shell-
trumpets are used in battle by Indian epic heroes.[3] Thracians used animal horns for
military signals (Xen. *Anab.* 7.3.32).

M's ῥόπτροις, if not a mere conjecture, might possibly go back to στρ
ρομβοις.

Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, London   M. L. WEST

---

[1] Diog. Ath. *TrGF* 45 F 1, A.R. 1.1139, Phalaecus, *A.P.* 6.165; cf. Aesch. fr. 57, Pind. fr. 70b.9,
Phot. s.v. ῥόμβος.
[2] See my *The Orphic Poems* (1983), p. 157 with nn. 59 and 60 and literature there cited.
[3] cf. M. Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (1899), p. 1047 s.v. Śaṅkhá; C. Sachs,
The History of Musical Instruments (1940), p. 152.