With his edition of D.L., the first since Huebner ¹) provided with a critical apparatus, Prof. Long has achieved a heavy task which during the last century was planned or undertaken more than once (by Nietzsche, Wachsmuth, Martini, v. d. Muehll, Biedl), but for one reason or another was never completed. Now we have at our disposal a text based on a fresh collation of those mss. which are generally acknowledged as the best (BFP), with the contribution of many recs., some of which have been completely collated afresh, others partly. Testimonia and passages of the editions of fragments are put together in a separate apparatus, and an index, printed in bold type wherever D.L. mentions his sources, facilitates the use of this edition, for which many readers will be rightly grateful; at least one knows the basis of our text, and this is the most important aspect of this work. In establishing his text Long is rather conservative; he offers only 22 corrections of his own ²), 10 of which are inserted in the text, not all of them equally necessary ³). On the whole, the critical apparatus varies in extent in the different books, but space is saved by leaving out those readings of BFP which are certainly wrong; from the recs. only the better ones are given (justly regarded as conjectures). More than once we are referred to other editions for a more ample statement ⁴).

Mainly two objections may be raised to this edition. In the first place, there is a good deal of carelessness and incompleteness ⁵); ¹) 1828/31. Cobet’s Didot-edition (1850) had only a text and a Latin translation, with information on pp. II/III, taken from his correspondence, about the mss. he used.
²) II 115 καταλαβὼν and IV 4 φιλοσόφων already Menagius; strange VII 175 “An γι;” and IX 88 “an transpondendum ante ὀς?” “ante πρὸς?” is probably meant.
³) E.g. V 68 αὐτῷ instead of αὐτῶν, cf. καταλαβὼν παρά (scl. αὐτοπρονόμον) Pl. Leg. 740B, Is. 9, 13; V 84 ἀμφόροι instead of Τίμων, cf. e.g. RE IV, 2847 (nr. 105); VII 67 <καί>; VIII 44 ἀφάντας ἐπεξεργάζεται, cf. the editions of A. Pal.; X 29 <δί>.
⁴) E.g. pp. 61, 26; 396, 3; 390, 2-3; 409, 18. Unsatisfactory p. 258, 23-4 (should be p. 258, 22-259, 1); „emendat G. Donzelli in RFIC N.S. 36 (1958), 240 sqq.”, without any mention of the correction itself.
⁵) Often the reader is uncertain whether the text is based on the mss. or simply due to a mistake, e.g. III 6 ἄτιον (also in Cob., but the other editions have ἄττη), III 22 παρεκάλεσθαι (has B-λης? cf. edit. Basil. 1907 ad loc.); III 74
especially one would have wished for the report of more conjectures on dubious passages 1). The editor’s Latin is far from faultless, sometimes even unintelligible, also in the praefatio, counting not more than five pages 2), which—and this is a second objection—refers for more accurate data concerning the mss. to the studies of Martini (1899; his second article Rh. M. 55, 1900, 612 ff. is not mentioned) and Biedl (1955); what actually is offered is very incomplete, obscure and quite insufficient for a good understanding of the mss.-tradition and the sigla. E.g.p. VI: "Codex B litteras unciales...praebet, ex quo conclusi potest archetypum ante saeculum nonum vix scriptum esse" (sic! cf. Biedl, p. 17: "Dieser Archetyp muss beträchtlich älter als das 9. Jh. gewesen sein", and Martini, p. 105/6. Not B, but the archetype was "unciaibus litteris exaratum" (Martini, p. 79, 133). Martini’s much disputed classification of the mss. into two branches (α and β) is not mentioned explicitly; on the other hand, by some comparative lists, Long tries to prove that of the three main mss. each one alternatively preserves the correct reading against the communes errores of the other two (amongst the quoted passages some simple orthographica do not prove anything: χγτονες, ἐκ- and ἐγγονις, γί(γ)νεται, κατελ(ι)πεν; the quotation is not accurate in many cases, and p. 76,23 αὐτοῦ is not to be found). Relating to one of the rec., q, the statement on p. VIII is obscure and incorrect: "q, qui exemplar est codicis P post aliquas correctiones scriptum et valde utile ad lectiones primas codicis P reperiendas". That δ, π, φ, λ, ψ are sigla for excerpt-mss. is not stated anywhere, no more than the fact that φ is the archetype of them all, and this makes the citing of the other ones superfluous 3).

1) E.g. those of Reiske (of his 27 conjectures on book I Gigante considers 11 worth of mention, Long 5), Richards (of his about 120 corrections Gigante mentions 80, Long 11, not even all these under Richards’ name), Hicks, and Madvig, whose Adv. Crit. I, 712/6 is missing in the list p. XVII ff. (5 times a correction of Madv. is attributed to another name, many others are omitted, e.g. IV 21 ἄνοδον, cf. L.-Sc. s.v. III, and the witty θετράδελφος IV 28).

2) Interpreavit (pp. 29, 10; 148, 11; 422, 9); the present cohaerescent (p. 171, 13); the dative solo (p. 38, 3); pro cruze ducit Bailey (p. 496, 11); ex quo demonstrari potest contaminatio in codicibus BFP iam adjuvisse (p. VII).

3) See Biedl, p. 105 with stemma (otherwise than Long, Cl. Ph. 44, 1949, 230/5, who, not mentioning his own article in his edition, seems to be convinced now by Biedl). On the interrelation of the rec. see now G. Donzelli, Maia 10 (1958), 317/23; St. I. F. Cl. 32 (1960), 156/99; Boll. Comit. 8