

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](#)



***M. Manilii Astronomica.* Edidit Theodorus Breiter. Pars II. Commentary.**

H. W. Garrod

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 04 / June 1909, pp 137 - 138

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00003371, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00003371

How to cite this article:

H. W. Garrod (1909). The Classical Review, 23, pp 137-138 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00003371

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 *κακοῦθες* 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

Commentary in my hands every day for four months, together with other works upon Manilius, and I cannot see that it advances the study of its subject.

H. W. GARROD.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Divinatio in Q. Caecilium; in C. Verrem recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit GULIELMUS PETERSON. Oxford: Clarendon Press, n.d.

READERS of this journal will be familiar with the critical principles of Principal Peterson. In his Preface he refers amongst other articles to *C.R.* vol. xvi. pp. 401-406, and vol. xvii. pp. 162-164. No one who has given serious attention to the subject can doubt that he has established one contention at any rate, viz. that the excellent Cluny manuscript No. 498 is identical with that used by P. Nanninck in 1548, and by Franz Schmidt († 1573), and owned by Jean Matal (1520-1597), and that the first hand in Lg. 42 is in wonderful accord with it as a rule. The editor's work and that of Mr. A. C. Clark have undoubtedly laid more securely and scientifically than ever before the foundations for a trustworthy text, which will not be widely different from what Cicero actually wrote. The reviving interest in Petrarch's age is bearing fruit. Only there remains, and probably will long remain, room for difference of opinion, due to the character of editors—to the personal equation. Professor Peterson's can be estimated by one or two examples—all that there is room for in this notice.

In II. i. § 41 we have 'idem iste . . . idem in Cn. Dolabellam qui in C. Carbonem fuit. Nam quae in ipsum valebant crimina contulit in illum, causamque illius omnem ad inimicos accusatoresque detulit; ipse in eum cui legatus, cui pro quaestore fuit, inimicissimum atque improbissimum testimonium dixit. Ille miser cum esset Cn. Dolabella,—cum proditione istius nefaria, tum improbo ac falso eiusdem testimonio,—tum multo ex maxima parte istius furtorum ac flagitiorum invidia conflagravit.' The critical note runs, 'Cn. Dolabella *del. Naugerius, Jord., Kays.: malim* Ille miser (i. § 74) cum esset *conflictatus*, cum etc.' The interjectional use of *miser* is, of course, common; but it is an 'idol' to expect an author continually to use the same turns of expression. Here *miser* may very well be taken predicatively, 'to be pitied both for Verres' abominable treachery and for his shameless false evidence against him.'

In II. 4 § 26 all the MSS. give 'Vestranæ urbs electa est ad quam cum adirent ex Italia crucem civis Romani prius quam quemquam amicum populi Romani viderent?' except that Harl. 4852 has *cives Romani*. The editor inserts *cives* before *crucem* (cf. *C.R.* xviii. 210). Mueller added *quicumque* before *adirent*. But for the plural used without a subject expressed, cf. 2 Phil. § 105 *Casino salutatum veniebant, Aquino, Interamna*.

On the other hand, in II. 4 § 20, 'Res publica detrimentum fecit quod per te imperi ius in una civitate imminutum est: Siculi, quod ipsum non de summa frumenti detractum, sed translatum in Centuripinos. . . et hoc plus impositum quam ferre possent,' the editor rightly keeps *quod ipsum* of RS. (*quod hoc pδ*), and rejects the specious *quod id ipsum* of Richter. Similarly the passage in § 22 about the condemnation of C. Cato, the consul of 114 B.C., he very properly retains as authentic, merely adopting Rossbach's improvement of the punctuation. That Velleius ii. 8 is not the source of an interpolation, but is drawn from Cicero, is undoubtedly the correct view.

Lastly, to take a point of spelling. It is often taken for granted by editors that an author would not avail himself of two forms of a word, although the example of English writers might have shown that, for euphony even, an elegant or scholarly taste will sometimes vary the form of a word. In II. 4 § 1, we have (according to RSHp) in *Sicilia tota, tam locupleti, tam vetere provincia* (δ alone have *locuplete*). In § 29 RS give a *Phylarcho Centuripino, homine locuplete ac nobili* (δ 'ut semper' *locuplete*). In § 46 *L. Papinio, viro primario, locupleti honestoque equite Romano*, with no variant noted. The editor reads *locupleti* in all cases. It is sounder to follow the evidence of RS and to look for an explanation of the variation. Cicero appears to use *locupleti*, except when that form would give an unmusical iteration of *i*-sounds, when he substitutes *locuplete*, as in § 29, because of *nobili*.

These instances should suffice to give the reader an understanding of the editor's manner of working. His text is as little open to serious cavil as any probably could be, that could be constituted to-day, and his *apparatus criticus* is a solid contribution to knowledge, whether a reader disagrees in any case with his inferences from it or not.

T. NICKLIN.

Rossall, Fleetwood.

VERSIONS

He first deceased; she for a little tried
To live without him, liked it not and died.

SIR HENRY WOTTON.

ᾠχεθ' ὁ μὲν πρότερος· βαῖδν χρόνον ἦδ' ἀτὲρ
ἀνδρὸς
τλᾶσα βίον τρίβειν ἤχθετο κἀπέθανεν.

E. D. STONE.