

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](#)



Πορφυρ xs1F77ου Αφορμα xs1F76 πρὸς τ xs1F70 νοητ xs1F71. Recensuit; B. Mommert. Teubner, 1907. Pp. xxxiii + 56.

R. G. B.

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 04 / June 1909, pp 137 - 137

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00003358, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00003358

How to cite this article:

R. G. B. (1909). The Classical Review, 23, pp 137-137 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00003358

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Die Bestimmung des Onos oder Epinetron.

By Dr. MARGARETE LÁNG. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ".
Pp. viii + 70. 23 illustrations. Berlin:
Weidmann, 1908. Mk. 2 40 pf.

THE chief interest of Dr. Margarete Láng's *brochure* is that it is an attempt to deal with the curious implement known as the *ónos* or *ἐπίνητρον* from the practical feminine point of view. It was apparently used for more than one purpose (Hesychius says that it was used for smoothing the thread for spinning), but was always placed on the knee, as depicted in vase-paintings. Probably it was of wood, a more practical material, the terracotta examples which we possess being either votive offerings (e.g. those found on the Athenian Acropolis), or wedding presents, afterwards placed in tombs.

H. B. W.

Πορφύριον Ἀφορμαὶ πρὸς τὰ νοητά. Recensuit
B. MOMMERT. Teubner, 1907. Pp. xxxiii
+ 56.

THIS is a carefully edited text of Porphyry's 'sententiae,' by a scholar whose name is not familiar to us. The 'praefatio' contains a lucid account of the manuscript upon which, together with Stobaeus, the text is based, and also, amongst other matters, a discussion of the title and design of the work. The work is designed,—so the editor concludes,—to serve as an introduction to philosophy, and its proper title is *ἀφορμαί*, not *ὑπομνήματα*, *κεφάλαια* or *ἐπιχειρήματα*. Under the text are printed, first, the parallels from or references to the philosophic sources (mainly Plotinus), and, at the foot, the critical notes. In the constitution of the text the editor is indebted for many useful emendations to Mr. G. Kroll, to whom the book is dedicated.

R. G. B.

Silanus the Christian. By E. A. ABBOTT, D.D.
London: A. & C. Black. Pp. 368.

THE doctrinal standpoint of the author of *Philochristus* is well known to students who interest themselves in theological questions. For the benefit of non-theological readers we may say that this doctrinal standpoint is, briefly: 'Non-miraculous Christianity.' Some would reply that this is impossible; and to these Dr. Abbott offers the present book by way of disproving their contention.

Naturally, such a book is in the highest degree contentious, though written with all Dr. Abbott's skill and tact. The book is in the form of a 'story'; but the story-telling part of it is very thin—little more than a background for the exposition of the writer's own views. No detailed proofs are given; these must be looked for in the supplementary volume of 'Notes.'

From the point of view of the classical reader, pure and simple, not the least interesting parts of *Silanus* are the sections devoted to Epicurus and his system.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

The King's School, Ely.

M. Manilii Astronomica. Edidit THEODORUS
BREITER. Pars II. *Commentary.*

THE first part of this work (the text only) I reviewed in the *Classical Quarterly*, ii. 2. 123 sqq., and I was able to speak of it in terms of commendation such as I am unable to give to the present volume. Breiter has been writing upon Manilius for more than half a century; but this *Commentary* is not worthy of his reputation. It leaves the reader under the impression that the editor has a real knowledge of Manilius, but little or no gift of exposition. Nor can I escape the suspicion that the work has been executed with haste: if B. had not been working so long upon Man. I should say it had been 'scamped.' Difficulties of reading are not discussed. *Certain* emendations are not even noticed. Interpretations other than Breiter's are wholly neglected. No attempt is made to illustrate or explain the Latin of M. And I marvel for what class of reader this work is intended. The *κακοήθης* of 'Quellenforschung' is everywhere apparent; and again and again B. obscures a difficult issue by seeking to interpret M. from every source save M. himself.

Nor are the faults of this *Commentary* merely negative. The number of really bad mistakes in it is startling. I select two for special notice: 2. 489 'consilium ipse suum est' is interpreted by B. as = 'amat se.' This is impossible not only as Latin but also as astrology; moreover, no previous commentator has ever made a mistake as to the meaning here. 4. 750-1 'laxo Persis amictu, uestibus ipsa suis haerens': B. interprets this to mean that the Persians wear loose outer garments and tight underclothing. Whence he derives his knowledge of Persian underclothing I do not know; but all that Manilius says is that the Persians are *bracati* (as Ovid, *Trist.* 10. 34 'pro patrio cultu Persica braca tegit'), and that their *bracae* are of wool, i.e. 'haerens = haerens Arieti ('belonging to Aries,' as 2. 443 'Mauorti haeret') qui laniger est.' Aries is *laniger*, and Persia belongs to him even in its garments: *uestibus* is ablative. Other mistakes I might notice of a like kind.

I am sorry not to be able to speak with greater respect of this book; for Breiter has in the past deserved well of Manilius. But I have had this