

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](#)



The Construction of $\phi\chi\varsigma\iota\beta\tau$

W. G. Rutherford

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 01 / February 1896, pp 6 - 6

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00202849, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00202849

How to cite this article:

W. G. Rutherford (1896). The Construction of $\phi\chi\varsigma\iota\beta\tau$. The Classical Review, 10, pp 6-6
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00202849

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 *ὥς*. 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 *ὥς*, 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 ἔροιο, φήσαιτε*. In the other

three the construction with *ὅτι* or *ὥς* 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 ὥς ταῦτα μὲν ἐστὶν ἐλεγχος, ἃ δ' οὗτος ποιεῖ 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' ὥς 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' ὥς πρέσβεις πέπομφεν ὥς 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