(Braun, pp. 34-6), we read a brilliant and lively, though very polymetric and uncertain, text; e.g. 162 ff. are scanned by Leo as a catalectic trochaic dimer, followed by six bacchei: haec eri immodestia | coegit me | qui hoc notcis a portu | ingratiis excitavit, and Braun agrees; but Lindsay calls these lines ionici and scans: haec eri immodesitia | coegit me | qui hoc notcis a portu | ingratiis excitavit. Sedgwick, who edited the play in 1960, says he does not know, but he can hardly see ionics in them. Ernot abstains from judgment (versus incerti). Where a text is metrically so uncertain, can it provide a sound foundation for conclusions such as the ones presented here? The same question may be asked in the case of numerous passages in the cantica where the text is unsound, e.g. Men. 571-603 or 966-989. Dr Braun knows the problems quite well and often has doubts himself, but, all the same, in my opinion he is too ready with statements like "deutlich", "treffend dargestellt"; etc. Although it is quite possible, even probable, that his general reasoning is correct, he should have been more reserved in his conclusions. For much has still to be done on Plautine metre, prosody, and style; even good modern editions of many plays are lacking, e.g. of the Poenulus, Pseudolus, Cistellaria, etc.

Nevertheless the book is useful, it reopens the discussion, it gives clear information on the literature at each canticum, and a good bibliography. But it is by no means the last word on Plautus' cantica.
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R. E. H. Westendorp Boerma


It is gratifying to have a new exegetical commentary on one of the liveliest Plautine plays with excellent cantica and vivid action on the stage. After Sonnenschein's and Schuster's modest efforts a modern edition in which recent literature on Plautus (esp. the work on metre, prosody and language) has been taken into account, was badly needed.

I am not so sure that the 'Collection Érasme', a series of uneven quality, is the right place for such an edition. Professor Collart, on the other hand, who already edited the Curculio in the same series in 1962, may be called well-qualified for his task; he has a thorough knowledge of old Latin, has an interest in linguistic problems and a keen feeling for Plautine playfulness and humor. As a matter of
fact a useful edition is the result, preceded by an introduction on the contents of the play, its sources, dating, tradition, and a short bibliography.

Nevertheless I have my objections; in the first place because of the hybrid design of the book: is it meant for schools, for undergraduate students, or has the author true scholarly aims? I have to elucidate this question. In his notes C. often gives his opinion on textual problems with a certain proximity, but they are seldom of real importance and therefore had better been left out; e.g. on l. 404 we read: "Laconiam: la corr. de Camerarius s'impose" (we do not hear why); on 445: "Le texte des mss est très altéré. On a adopté ici la corr. de Leo comme étant, semble-t-il, la plus simple" (this whole note is superfluous, for we had this information earlier, in the app. crit.) or on 418: "Ex se: heureuse corr. de Dousa, le texte des mss est inorganique" (superfluous too; besides, in the app. crit. C., like Ernout and Lindsay, correctly assigns the conjecture to Camerarius).

It is true that the text of the Most. is very badly transmitted and that there is every reason to give attention to textual criticism, but not in this way and not in an edition of this type.

Sometimes C. hazards a guess himself, in my opinion without much success: in 5 he proposes to read ni dolem cupis, which is rather dull; a serious mistake is his attempt to correct 73 by reading quod molestumst, forgetting that thus our iambic senarius obtains seven feet; nor is in 757 quid <ita> palaeographically recommendable.

Apart from these I found too many other shortcomings and even mistakes: unacceptable is the fact that, while on the whole misprints are scarce, sometimes whole words are missing from the text, e.g. in 15 uero, 78 huc, 402 natus, 466 mihi; similarly a carelessness such as 52 which gives male in stead of bene, 84 sum for multum, etc.

Another weak point in the book is its way of handling or omitting metrical problems; C. refers to Lindsay, Questa, and Maurach, but I am not so sure that he really used them where he should have; besides, Maurach's book does not have the final say in the matter of cantica (the new book by L. Braun, Die Cantica des Plautus, Göttingen 1970, often differs from him); C. could not yet know H. Drexler's Die Iambenkürzung (Hildesheim 1969) (the edition would have derived great profit from this book), but he might have known Drexler's previous works. C. often makes remarks on metre or prosody, but as often as not he leaves the reader (and once again: who will he be?) in the dark, e.g. in the comment on 235 we do not hear that dies must be read with synizesis, nor is there on 236 a word on the hiatus after parsimoniam, or in 237 after te; on 278 we get