

# 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](#)



---

**L.-A. Constans: *Gigthis*. Étude d'Histoire et d'Archéologie sur un Emporium de la Petite Syrte: avec 14 planches hors texte et 3 figures dans le texte. (Extrait des Nouvelles Archives des Missions Scientifiques. 14° fasc). Pp. 113. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1916.**

N. H. B.

The Classical Review / Volume 36 / Issue 1-2 / February 2012, pp 43 - 44  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00015961, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00015961](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00015961)

**How to cite this article:**

N. H. B. (1922). The Classical Review, 36, pp 43-44 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00015961

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

dispensable companion—a sort of lucky bag into which to dip for enjoyment and useful suggestion. Sixth-form masters will find the book a very handy means of initiating their more brilliant pupils into the art and science of textual emendation. It consists of a series of some five hundred suggestions for the emendation of the text, not only where the MSS. is obviously corrupt, but also where a reasonable change will improve a line which clearly fails to do its author justice, and the weakness of which is, as likely as not, due to a careless copyist. There is a fine quality of taste as well as of scholarship informing the whole work. A few examples will best indicate its scope. Take Meleager's well-known description of Eros in A.P. V. 178 (Mackail's *Select Epigrams*, i. 52). The fifth line runs:

πρὸς δ' ἔτι λοιπὸν ἀτρεπτον ἀείλαλον ὄξυ δεδορκός.

λοιπὸν is weak, as Mr. Lumb says, and he claims that Meleager is too economical to use four words to express 'besides.' Mr. Mackail notes the redundancy as a colloquial one, and contents himself with referring to the Latin *nec non etiam*. But Mr. Lumb happily suggests that the true rendering is πρὸς δ' ἔτ' ἀλιτρόν, the latter being used of Eros in V. 188-5, and as an illustration of the confusion between π and τρ he quotes the τραῦμα for πνεῦμα in V. 197. Less acceptable perhaps, as less necessary for the full meaning of the epigram, is his suggestion to read αὐτοθελής for ὡς ἐθέλεις in the last line of A.P. VI. 30 (Mackail ii. 7), Macedonius' *Old Fisherman to Poseidon*. Mr. Mackail ends the previous line with a comma, and connects ὡς ἐθέλεις directly with μεδέων, 'O ruler of both earth and sea as thou wilt.' Mr. Lumb says 'there should be some reference to the will or power of the god, not of the man.' But is there not, even if we leave ὡς ἐθέλεις alone? Equally caustic and happy is the note on A.P. IX. 169. 5, 6, Palladas on *The Uselessness of Teaching*:

ἀλλ' ἴν' ἀφαρπάξῃ Βρισηίδα πρὶν Ἀγαμέμνων  
τὴν Ἑλένην δ' ὁ Πάρις πτωχὸς ἐγὼ γενέμην.

Palladas' scansion, says Mr. Lumb, is certainly weak, but if he wrote πρὶν, he certainly deserved to be a poverty-stricken lecturer (in a country, we may

add, where no Burnham scale obtained). He probably wrote Βρισηίδ' ἀβρήν.

Besides the notes on the *Anthology* the book submits a series of emendations of the Tragic and Epic Fragments (Ed. Wagner, *Didot*).

J. G. L.

L.-A. CONSTANS: *Gigthis*. Étude d'Histoire et d'Archéologie sur un Emporium de la Petite Syrte: avec 14 planches hors texte et 3 figures dans le texte. (Extrait des Nouvelles Archives des Missions Scientifiques. 14<sup>e</sup> fasc.). Pp. 113. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1916.

GIGTHIS in Tunis, discovered by V. Guérin in 1860, excavated by Reinach and Babelon (1884), and later by Gauckler and Sadoux (1901-1906), is of interest, not because of its importance in history—its history is lost to us—but as an example of a provincial town which grew prosperous under the Pax Romana of the Empire. Originally a Punic settlement, it is never mentioned in literature, save in the *Periplus* of Scylax and the Roman itineraria. From its inscriptions we learn that it was raised to the rank of a municipium by Antoninus Pius; it later acquired the Latium maius, while in the third century of our era its municipal aristocracy entered the Roman Senate, held Roman magistracies, and were even given provincial governorships. Gigthis furnishes us with another example of those provincial fora of which several have been excavated in recent years. It is not yet certain to whom the great temple in the forum was dedicated: one might have expected to see in it a Capitolium, a temple of Jupiter, Juno and Minerva. M. Constans, however, concludes that it was dedicated to the divinities of Alexandria in view of the discovery on the right of the temple of a fine head of Zeus Sarapis; but he has not convinced M. Cagnat (*cf. Journal des Savants*, N.S. XV. [1917], pp. 289-299). The task of the excavator is rendered more difficult by the fact that a Byzantine restoration used the materials of earlier buildings and thus caused much confusion on the site. The market-place of Gigthis was originally

(second century) constructed with rectangular porticoes, but when rebuilt in the third century the interior court was surrounded by a portico which terminated in a semicircle. M. Cagnat has suggested that this change may have been general in the towns of Roman Africa in the third century.

The student has every reason to be grateful to M. Constans; it is only on careful monographs such as this that the comparative study of the development of provincial towns under the Empire can be securely based.

N. H. B.

S. KOPERBERG: *Polybii Historiarum Liber XXX quoad fieri potuit restitutus*. Dissertation. Pp. 99. Amsterdam: Campis apud J. H. Kok, 1919.

BELOCH recently expressed the view that an attempt must be made to reconstruct, so far as possible, the lost books of Polybius; the author of this dissertation has made that attempt for the thirtieth book. For this purpose the text of Diodorus is printed by the side of Livy's account and the parallel passages from Plutarch (*Life of Aemilius Paulus*) are added to the 'excerpta' from the text of Polybius which have been preserved to us. Points of special difficulty are discussed in an appendix, where the author gives reasons for his contention that Plutarch did not consult Polybius directly, but drew his Polybian material from some intermediary source. The dissertation should be of real service to students of Polybius. N. H. B.

*Auguralia und Verwandtes*. By EDWIN FLINCK. Crown octavo. Pp. 74. Helsingfors: Drucherei der Finnischen Litteratur-Gesellschaft, 1921.

THIS is an interesting pamphlet, and contains many suggestions worth consideration on rather obscure points connected with Roman augury. Dr. Flinck expresses his dissatisfaction on philological grounds with the traditional derivation of *augur* from *avis* and *gero* (*quia per avium gestus edicitur* Festus), and prefers to derive the word from the

root of *augere*, seen also in the cognate adjective *augustus*. So far there is nothing new, for this connexion is suggested in antiquity and has been supported by modern philologists. Dr. Flinck's contribution is a careful analysis of the augur's functions, in which he shows that his only duty at the taking of the auspices (by the magistrate) was one of interpretation, and that the *augurium* is not, like the *auspicium*, an observation of omens to see what will occur, but a direct prayer for blessing to be answered by a sign. It was only later when *auspex* and *augur* were confused in practice that similarity of derivation was insisted on, and popular modern ideas have perpetuated the confusion. This is a valuable point. Dr. Flinck goes on to show that the augur was originally connected with fertility (cf. the *augurium canarium* and *auguria vernisera*), and especially with fruit-trees, and among them particularly with the vine. Here his evidence becomes slighter, and it is even precarious when he proceeds to derive *vindex* from *vinum* ('the man who knows about the vine-staff'), and then to claim that the augur's *lituus* was a staff of the same kind as the *vindicta* with which he blessed (*litare*) the fruit-trees. Once launched on fruit-trees Dr. Flinck becomes almost reckless: *strenae* are the twigs of fruit-trees given as presents for luck, for which small coins were subsequently substituted; *stips* is the same (if *stipula* is a wisp of straw, he argues, *stips* is a larger thing like it—i.e. a twig), and if you ask why there are two words with the same meaning and the same history, it is because *strena* is Sabine, and *stips* is Latin. All this is hazardous, and Dr. Flinck's logic is shaky. A proposition once established as 'wahrscheinlich' becomes the premise of the next syllogism, and so on. Nevertheless, this second part of the thesis is valuable too as calling attention to the religious significance of the fruit-tree (*arbor felix*) in Roman thought—a point frequently overlooked.

C. BAILEY.