raised in this review, I welcome this commentary and I can only re-
peat what I said at the beginning: the author has earned the grati-
tude of students of Greek tragedy.
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M. CAMPBELL, *A commentary on Apollonius Rhodius Argonau-
tica III* 1-471 (Supplement to Mnemosyne, 141).

Malcolm Campbell’s is a famous name to all students of the Argo-
nautica. Next to a series of articles and reviews, he gave them two
indispensable tools: His *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden 1981) and an *Index verborum in Apollonium Rhodium* (Hildesheim 1983). In the book under review, the first part of a
commentary on the whole of the third book of the Argonautica, he
continues the work he started in his *Studies in the Third Book of Apollonius Rhodius’ Argonautica* (Hildesheim 1983), in some places (e.g.
on p. 96) offering his readers ‘a modified version of the discussion’
in the Studies. The book consists of a preface (pp. VII-IX), a list of
abbreviations and a remarkably extensive bibliography (pp. X-
XXI), the commentary proper (pp. 3-382) and very full and useful
indices (pp. 383-424).

The book deserves praise in many ways. The author’s com-
mentary is more or less exhaustive. On many points it gives us, apart
from the author’s own interpretation, a discussion of other scholars’
views. One gets the impression that virtually no relevant secondary
literature has escaped the author’s attention. He can be considered
the most richly documented *vir Apollonianus* of our time. Moreover,
he tries to strike a balance between philological and literary com-
ment (if I may permit myself this dangerous dichotomy); compared
to Livrea’s work on book IV, this commentary never leaves its read-
ers in doubt about the author’s opinions on the questions they could
ask about the text as a whole and its constituting elements. Out of
many possible examples I mention his note on ἀμφαξανίθ (pp. 353-4) and his thorough explication of Eros’ ball (pp. 123-6). The author’s greatest interest has always been in the countless relations between the archaic epic, called by him the Homeric subtext, and the Argonautica. On nearly every page he is tracking down and analysing quotations, allusions and reminiscences, using a variety of terms for the processes involved. “Ap. is no doubt toying with” (p. 220), “Ap. must also be remembering” (p. 291); “Much here is plundered from ...” (p. 56), “rich pickings from the Homeric epics” (p. 101), “recycled by Nonnos” (p. 117), “Another rich crop from early epic” (p. 119), “lifted from the battlefield scene in II. 16. 110–1” (p. 356), “basic building-blocks” (p. 135). All this leads to “more fun for Homer enthusiasts” (p. 97). Sometimes C. is going very far indeed in this respect. To give an example: commenting on the words δοκή δε ἔχεν (l. 123) he remarks: “borrows language from yet another (122 n.) picture of a warrior on a winning streak: II. 12, 464-5 δοκὴ δὲ χερσὶ διῳρ ἔχεν.” Can we be sure the poet borrowed from this passage? This question is leading us to a second one: Can we be sure that ancient readers recognized the borrowing itself and knew exactly from what passage it had been borrowed?

As it is, as modern readers we have many tools at our disposal (among them the author’s Echoes and Index) which enable us to find a parallel in archaic epic for countless combinations of words, small sentences, situations and scenes in the Argonautica. Without underestimating the formidable memories of Apollonius’ first readers, I cannot believe their reading attitude can be compared with the attitude of modern scholars who can use the auxiliaries mentioned above. I am inclined to compare the way ancient readers heard or read, let us say, Hellenistic epic poetry, with the way an orthodox Protestant churchgoer listens to his favourite, old-fashioned preacher. He hears the language of the bible in its oldest translation, nearly as sacred as the text of the Bible itself. He recognizes pieces of biblical language in nearly every sentence he hears. He likes the traditional words and expressions and the old case endings—but more often than not he is not capable of indicating exactly the passage in the Holy Writ from which the speaker is quoting or which he is alluding to. Of course Apollonius’ readers were learned and erudite men (and some of them women, one may hope), who knew many epic texts by heart and could judge the aptness of many quotations and allusions they came across in the Argonautica. But they could not trace every borrowing from Iliad and Odyssey, as we can. We should,