about the overriding importance of life, and he is doing so in the presence of Odysseus, Phoinix, Aias, and of Patroklos. Why then, now that he is alone with his dearest friend, would he conceal the truth, in effect doing something which he abhors: saying one thing while thinking another? Does the narrator make him a liar in his final conversation with Patroklos? And must we assume that this lie remains intact throughout the final books of the *Iliad*, and that Achilles, even when reproaching himself for having failed Patroklos, persists in hiding his 'real' motive, and nowhere expresses regret at sending Patroklos to his death because he himself wanted to live? In short, when we explore the heart of Achilles, I think we would do better to rely on his words, rather than to take refuge in the possibility that, for one reason or other, he is lying. If he were, the narrator would have told us so; there may be gaps, but in telling his story, it is not his custom to suppress such crucial facts.

There are other examples, but I hope I have succeeded in making my objections clear. I said at the beginning that the book has been written with love, and that is to the author's credit. It is stimulating for readers who are thoroughly acquainted with the issues Z. deals with, but I would not recommend it to students who are approaching the subject for the first time.

1012 GC AMSTERDAM, Oude Turfmarkt 129, Klassiek Seminarium

A. MARIA VAN ERP TAALMAN KIP


In this study Rengakos (R.) discusses the achievement of Apollonius Rhodius (ARh.) as a learned poet, as a scholar. His conclusion is that in his *Argonautica* ARh. not only shows awareness of the philological interpretation of Homer's epics before him and in his time but also actively participates in the discussion about the meaning of many problematical words in Homer. R. first meticulously analyses the usage of 313 individual Homeric words which are also found in the *Argonautica* and in each case ascertains where and how it is being

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

explained in scholarly works, such as D-scholia and glossography. Then he compares them in groups with their usage and explanation in the “Dichterinterpretation” before ARh., the “Vulgärexegese” of the D-scholia and older or contemporary glossographers, and, thirdly, looks whether ARh. anticipates interpretation of post-Apollonian scholars, such as Aristophanes and Aristarchus.

R.’s discussion concerns the meaning of individual words and we see for each word how ARh. uses the word under discussion in the same sense(s) as Homer or in a different one and how it is used or interpreted in ancient poetry or scholia and modern studies. This first part of the book (“Homerische Wörter in den Argonautika”, pp. 21-150) is there to be consulted, not to be read as an ongoing argument, but one can find a lot of information. This part is not only informative on ancient interpretation but also on defective or wrong exegesis of modern scholars, e.g. about the usage of ἄγοράω, ἀπή, ματάω, and ὄνειρω.

In the second part (“Apollonius als Homererklärer”, pp. 151-78) R. first puts together those words used by ARh. which also occur in the “Dichterinterpretation” and summarizes the results of this section by stating that in many cases (I count 59) the poet’s usage is totally conform the pre-hellenistic and hellenistic tradition, in other cases (13) it is different and for a group of words (19) ARh. agrees partially with the tradition but uses also the same words in a sense different from the traditional one. He proceeds to do the same for the Glossographers and D-scholia (I did not do a count). So far, a first conclusion can be that ARh. is aware of the early and contemporary discussion on the meaning of Homeric words (cp. pp. 168-9)—a conclusion which no one who studied the Argonautica can disagree with—. To this comes that the poet often uses words in a sense not present in the corpora taken into consideration. Now, if agreement is explained by assuming the poet’s awareness of scholarly discussion, the negative result should also be taken in this way (not using words in the traditional sense implies disagreement and awareness), for the number of cases is too high to be accidental. The latter conclusion is not explicitly present in R.’s book but is, I think, implicitly there. In this connection I must add that the goals R. sets himself are not always clear, cp. pp. 10-1 with pp. 179-80. This lack of lucidity is also apparent when having dealt with the connection of ARh. with “Dichterinterpretation” and “Vulgärexegese” R. starts a discussion of his relationship with later exegesis and wishes to ascertain “inwieweit er [Arh.] Erklärungen der späteren Homerphi-