The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Claudius and the Quaestura Gallica

H. F. Pelham

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 01 / February 1896, pp 6 - 7
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202850, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202850

How to cite this article:

H. F. Pelham (1896). Claudius and the Quaestura Gallica. The Classical Review, 10, pp 6-7
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202850

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

that held their tickets or to the whole brigade of which they are a contingent, it implies that Beta is an eponym of the box or of the brigade. The text, speaking of an

Eponomos as having arbitrated, shows that the 42 Eponymous Heroes were homonym-eponyms of the arbitrators and hoplites.

E. POSTE.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF φάναι.

THE last number of the *Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses* contains an article which purports to be 'Quaestiones de Elocutione Demosthenica,' but is in effect rather a careless analysis of the Index Demosthenicus of S. Preuss. Its compiler is Bruno Kaiser.

In the catalogue of *Verba dicendi et declarandi* on pp. 5 ff. the following passages are quoted: 16, 20; 19, 88; 20, 135; 22, 23; 24, 204 as supplying examples of φάναι with its sense completed by *ὅτι*, while other three passages are cited, viz. 4, 48; 21, 98; and 27, 19 as furnishing instances of φάναι followed by *ὡς*. Here are eight instances in all of a most abnormal construction. But any one who will look the passage out will find that Kaiser has misinterpreted 21, 98. As for 16, 20 and 19, 88, he does not appear to understand that a *τοῦτο φῆ* is a very different thing from a simple *φῆ*. Thus the examples are reduced to three of *ὅτι* and two of *ὡς*, and these are all most instructive, but not in the way which Kaiser imagines. In two of them the *ὅτι* clause begins the sentence: 20, 135 *ὅτι μὲν τοίνυν τοῦτο ἐν τι τῶν αἰσχυρῶν ἐστὶ, πάντας ἀν' ἡγοῦμαι φῆσαι*. 24, 204 *καὶ μὴν ὅτι μὲν προσήκει πάντας κολάζειν τοὺς ἀδικούντας, εὖ οἷδ' ὅτι πάντες ἄν, εἴ τις ἔροιτο, φήσαιτε*. In the other

three the construction with *ὅτι* or *ὡς* is used at a distance from the verb either to increase the orderliness of the sentence, or to add to it the suggestiveness which a late Greek would have called *πανουργία*. Perhaps I had better quote them: 22, 23 *ὅταν μὲν λαιδορίαν ταῦτα καὶ αἰτίαν εἶναι φῆ, ὑπολαμβάνετε ὡς ταῦτα μὲν ἐστὶν ἐλεγχος, ἃ δ' οὗτος ποιῇ λαιδορία καὶ αἰτία· ὅταν δ' ὅτι πρὸς τοὺς θεσμοθέτας προσήκεν ἐπαγγέλλειν ἡμῖν, ἐκείνο ὑπολαμβάνετε ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*; 27, 19 *οὗτος δὲ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα ἐπιμεληθεὶς οὐδ' ὅτι οὐκ ἀποδείκνυσιν, ἀλλ' ἐνίοτε μὲν φησὶν ἀργῆσαι τὸ ἐργαστήριον, ἐνίοτε δ' ὡς αὐτὸς μὲν οὐκ ἐπεμελήθη τούτων, ὃ δ' ἐπίτροπος Μιλύας, ὃ ἀπελεύθερος ὃ ἡμέτερος, διψήσεν αὐτὰ καὶ παρ' ἐκείνου μοι προσήκει λόγων λαβεῖν*; 4, 48 *ἡμῶν δ' οἱ μὲν περιϋόντες μετὰ Λακεδαιμονίων φασὶ Φίλιππον πράττειν τὴν Θηβαίων κατάλυσιν καὶ τὰς πολιτείας διασπᾶν, οἱ δ' ὡς πρέσβεις πέπομφεν ὡς βασιλέα, οἱ δ' ἐν Ἰλλυρίοις πόλεις τειχίζειν, οἱ δὲ λόγους πλάττοντες ἕκαστος περιερχόμεθα*.

It has seemed to me worth while to point out this mistake, on the one hand because it is characteristic of Kaiser's method, and on the other because any work upon Demosthenes coming from Halle at the present time is presumably deserving of confidence.

W. G. RUTHERFORD.

CLAUDIUS AND THE QUAESTURA GALLICA.

WE are told by Suetonius that Claudius not only transferred the supervision of the harbour at Ostia and of the cornships from one of the quaestors of the year to a procurator of his own, but also abolished the quaestura Gallica (Suet. *Claud.* 25). What this Gallic quaestorship precisely was is matter for conjecture, but the following view is at least possible. The duties of a quaestor were always more or less financial. As long as Cisalpine Gaul continued to be a separate province under the government of a

proconsul, there must have been a quaestor stationed there, who may very well have been known as the quaestor Gallicus. When Cisalpine Gaul was incorporated with Italy by Augustus, it shared of course in the immunity from direct taxation which all Italy enjoyed, and thus one important part of the Gallic quaestor's duties must have come to an end. It is however conceivable that Augustus may have thought it expedient still to keep a quaestor in Cisalpine Gaul to look after the extensive

state domains in that district (*saltus publici*), just as in the reign of Tiberius (Tac. *Ann.* 4, 27) a quaestor seems to have been stationed in South Italy to look after the great public grazing lands of Apulia and Calabria. Claudius, when he abolished this Gallic quaestorship, must have made some provision for the supervision of the state domains, and it is natural to assume that in Cisalpine Gaul, as at Ostia, the quaestor was replaced by imperial procuratores. That such a change was made may perhaps be inferred from the language of Claudius' edict about the Anauni (Wilmanns, *Inscr. Lat.* 2842). In that edict Claudius refers to the extensive domains (*saltus*) in North Italy 'which,' as he says, 'I learn belong

to me' [*mei juris esse*]¹—and which it is clear from the language of the edict were under the management of imperial procuratores. It may also be worth while to notice that after this period no further traces are found of a quaestor in South Italy, but, on the other hand, the traces of the presence of imperial procuratores become increasingly numerous. In the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the great public grazing lands of Samnium and Apulia were under the supreme control of the procurator a rationibus (Wilm. *Inscr. Lat.* 2841) and from a passage in Statius (*Statius, Silv.* 3, 3, 92) we gather that the same was the case as early as the reign of Nero.

H. F. PELHAM.

ON THE WORD ἀντηρίδες IN THUCYDIDES VII. 36, 2.

καὶ ἀντηρίδας ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὑπέριπαι πρὸς τοὺς
τοίχους ὡς ἐπὶ ἐξ πῆχους ἐντός τε καὶ ἐξώθεν.

It would be difficult to mention any sentence in Thucydides the interpretation of which is in a more unsatisfactory condition than the one which I propose to discuss.

It is not necessary to quote what has been written on the subject by commentators or translators from Stephanus downwards. Most of the explanations given are obscure, and some that are not obscure are absurd. And they all proceed on the assumption, which I believe to be wrong, that the ἀντηρίδες were of the nature of props or stays, and were intended to strengthen the ἐπωρίδες. This is the view taken in Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities* and in Baumeister's *Denkmäler*; and a similar view is accepted, though with hesitation, by Grote and Freeman. Grote indeed says: 'The words which Thucydides employs to describe the position of these ἀντηρίδες are to me very obscure; nor do I think that any of the commentators clear them up satisfactorily.' And Freeman says: 'I hope I may be forgiven for not risking myself in the mysteries of ἐπωρίδες and such like.' Thirlwall contents himself with saying that the Syracusans did as the Corinthians had done before the battle of Erineus, that is, they 'strengthened the bows of their galleys by solid timbers'; and afterwards, when describing the action, he says: 'the solidity of the Syracusan

bows overpowered, as had been foreseen, the slighter frame of the enemy's galleys.' He does not say a word about strengthening the ἐπωρίδες with spars, and so far as his language goes I think it is not impossible that he may have held the view which I am going to put forward.

I believe that the commentators have all missed the meaning of the passage, first, through putting a wrong interpretation on the word ἀντηρίδες, secondly, through the more serious mistake of giving a wrong and, as I think, impossible meaning to the preposition πρὸς.

I will first give my own rendering of the sentence, and I will then try to support it by arguments on both these points.

Thucydides describes three peculiarities in the construction of the Syracusan galleys: (1) short, stumpy prows; (2) strong, heavy ἐπωρίδες; (3) extra thick sides, or, as we should say, bows (τοίχους). And he denotes the whole arrangement collectively, in chapter 40, by ἐμβόλων παρασκευή. It is the third of these peculiarities which I believe Thucydides is describing in the sentence with which we are concerned. And this third peculiarity, though by no means the least important of the three, is omitted altogether in the explanations of the passage which have been given hitherto. I render the sentence as follows: 'And they strengthened the bows (τοίχους) both inside and outside with additional thicknesses of timber for a length of nine feet from the