

contemporary Roman politics: these circumstances combine to make Philodemus' *De bono rege secundum Homerum* a work of considerable interest. Potentially, one must add, because of the tantalizing fact that the Herculanean scroll preserving it (PHerc. 1507) consists mostly of fragments of isolated columns amounting to perhaps one-fourth of the whole book.

The chief merits of Dorandi's edition, which I hope to review more fully elsewhere, consist in his elaborate commentary (135–214) and of course in his meticulous re-examination of the papyrus itself with the aid of the binocular microscope – for years now a standard equipment of the *Officina dei papiri Ercolanesi*. He thus establishes new readings and also suggests some good supplements; I single out as excellent κηλ[ῶν]ται col. XVIII 4–5 and δύ[στηνο]ν col. XXI 9.

The technical presentation of the text and apparatuses ('parallel' and critical), apart from some typographical confusion on pages 92 and 102, is clear but not complete: A. Olivieri's fine Teubneriana of 1909 (whose division in columns D. has altered) remains in many ways indispensable. Dorandi's translation tries to do what can be done for a fragmentary text.

There is an unusually long errata list (1½ pages) which must, however, be supplemented. Apart from simple misprints there are wrong or missing spiritus signs and accents as well as a number of mistakes in vowel quantity. And in addition to the 32 listed corrections to the *Index verborum*, I have noted at least a dozen more, not all of them mechanical mistakes.

Dorandi has certainly worked with great interest on his subject. He has produced a serviceable annotated edition (if one uses it critically and has Olivieri at one's elbow), but he should have devoted more attention to his philological groundwork.

*Rolf Westman*

*Longus: Daphnis et Chloe.* Edidit Michael D. Reeve. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1982. XIX, 105 S. M 39,50.

The text of *Daphnis and Chloe* has suffered more than many others over the centuries: this is seen in the many wilful discrepancies between our main manuscripts, which probably reflect the copyists' indifference towards the text of such a frivolous genre (cf. Reeve, *Praefatio* XI with note 7) – not to speak of the carelessness of Courier with his ink. The appearance of a new, critical and careful edition of this little pearl of ancient literature is therefore to be greeted with warm welcome. In his preface, Reeve traces the history of the text from the archetype down to recent discussion about the possibility of author's variants in Longus (which he vehemently denies), often with biting comments on his predecessors' work. It is not to be denied that in his edition we have by far the best basis for Longus' text and the most accurate critical apparatus available. A full index of words closes the edition.

*Maarit Kaimio*