

A. S. HOLLIS

THE NUPTIAL RITE IN CATULLUS 66 AND CALLIMACHUS' POETRY FOR
BERENICE

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 91 (1992) 21–28

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE NUPTIAL RITE IN CATULLUS 66 AND CALLIMACHUS' POETRY FOR
BERENICE

nunc vos, optato quas iunxit lumine taeda,
 non prius unanimis corpora coniugibus
 tradite, nudantes reiecta veste papillas,
 quam iucunda mihi munera libet onyx,
 vester onyx, casto colitis quae iura cubili.
 sed quae se impuro dedit adulterio,
 illius a mala dona levis bibat irrita pulvis:
 namque ego ab indignis praemia nulla peto.
 sed magis, o nuptae, semper concordia vestras,
 semper amor sedes incolat assiduus.

(Cat. 66, 79-88)

The absence from P.Oxy. 2258 C fr. 1 Back - fr. 2 Back (vol. XX, 1952, pp.86-89) of any counterpart in Callimachus' Greek to these lines of Catullus is notorious.¹ In this article I would like to ventilate afresh what seems to me still an unsolved problem, and, very tentatively, to develop a less favoured alternative² to the two solutions which have attracted most support. Definite conclusions are hardly possible in view of the nature of the evidence, but, if my line of argument proved correct, the question of these disputed lines would expand to embrace other poems which Callimachus wrote for Queen Berenice in the 240's B.C., bringing in issues of contemporary history and dynastic politics in Cyrene and Alexandria.

Pfeiffer, in 1949, believed that, when Callimachus incorporated the *Coma Berenices* (originally an occasional poem) in *Aetia* book 4 (fr. 110 Pf.), he added the Nuptial Rite: P.Oxy. 2258 represents the original form of the poem (immediately followed in that papyrus by another occasional elegy, the *Victory of Sosibius*, fr. 384 Pf.). Catullus, on this view, would be translating the later version. The fact that in P.Oxy. 2258 the *Coma* appears to end with a two-line invocation of the deified Queen Arsinoe (fr. 110, 94^a χαίρε, φίλη τεκέεcci),³ not rendered by Catullus, might be taken to support Pfeiffer. We know now that substantial poems in honour of Berenice opened *Aetia* book 3 and closed *Aetia* book 4

¹ Of course one must not forget that the scribe of P.Oxy. 2258 could have omitted the passage accidentally.

² See n.40 below.

³ Pfeiffer saw the correct interpretation of these words in his *Addenda et Corrigenda*, vol. II p.116.

(Victoria Berenices and Coma Berenices respectively);⁴ to end the latter with an invocation of Arsinoe might seem to diminish the glory of Berenice.

Lobel, when publishing P.Oxy. 2258, remarked (vol. XX, 1952, p.98) '79-88 [of Catullus] are easily separable, and to my taste their equivalent is gladly to be dispensed with. A poem of which the αἴτιον is the forming of the constellation Βερενίκης πλόκαμος is not improved by the superposition of an αἴτιον concerning a marriage custom.'⁵ An increasing number of scholars⁶ now seems to believe that Catullus added the nuptial rite of his own initiative, a possibility which Pfeiffer (vol. I, p.121) had rejected as 'veri dissimillimum'. Surely those who cite the unsatisfactory connexion of Cat. 66, 79-88 with their surrounding context in the Latin poem as an argument against the existence of corresponding lines in the Greek model need all the more to supply a convincing reason why Catullus should have made such an addition to what he himself describes as 'expressa carmina Battiadae' (65, 16). I am not sure that this has yet been achieved.⁷

Looking at the ten lines of Catullus, I am struck by the very Callimachean nature of the motif 'non prius/quam' (80-82), occurring in a ritual context.⁸ We can cite two parallels from the Aetia. In fr. 63, 9ff. Attic girls are not allowed to witness the Thesmophoria πρὶν νόμφια λέκτρα τελέεσθαι (11),⁹ while in fr. 66, 2ff. οὐδὲ μὲν Ἴηρος ἰάγνον ὑφαινόμεναι τῆσι μέμηλε πάτος ἰκτῆναι πὰρ κανόνεσσι πάρος θέμις ἢ τεὸν ὕδωρ ἰκάκ κεφαλῆς ἰρὸν πέτρον ἐφεζομένας ἰχεύεσθαι.¹⁰ Many older scholars¹¹ believed that a commentator of Aratus had actually preserved some words of Callimachus' Greek (fr. 35d Schneider, πρὶν ἀκτέρῃ τῷ Βερενίκης), corresponding to Catullus' 'non prius

⁴ P.J.Parsons, ZPE 25,1977, particularly pp.46-50

⁵ Sentiments quoted with approval by Stephanie West in CQ NS 35,1985,65 n.24. One may note, however, that, to judge from fr. 75 Pf., Callimachus liked to include several incidental aetia as well as the main one.

⁶ Among them Gregory Hutchinson, Hellenistic Poetry, 1988, p.323 with n.91, comparing Germanicus' Aratea for a combination of close translation with original insertion.

⁷ General references to Catullus' interest in marriage (shown particularly in poems 61, 62, 64 and 68) do not, in my view, provide a wholly satisfying explanation for the addition of the disputed passage in poem 66. M.C.J.Putnam in CP 55,1960,223 sought to demonstrate 'the very Catullan qualities of these lines, qualities which are apparent in content, style and that subtle imagery which can only result from the imaginative processes of one particular poet'. Even if one accepts Putnam's analysis in toto, he would have demonstrated merely that Catullus has infused his own poetic personality into the Latin lines, not that they lacked a Greek model. Putnam is equally insistent on the Catullan qualities of lines 75-78 in the Latin, to which the counterparts in Callimachus' Greek have been preserved.

⁸ This is not to claim that Catullus was incapable of introducing a favourite Callimachean motif into a passage for which there was no model in Callimachus.

⁹ Pfeiffer failed to mention the echo of this phrase in Nonnus, Dionysiaca 48, 619 νομφίε, λέκτρα τέλεεσθον. Call. fr. 63 Pf. (which I hope to discuss elsewhere) is puzzling for many reasons. But Maas' suggestion (ap. Pfeiffer vol. I p.500) that the whole aetion should be rejected as spurious was surely extravagant.

¹⁰ Cf. hymn. 4, 320ff. (on sailors of the Aegean sea) καὶ οὐ πάλιν αὐτίκ ἔβησαν/ πρὶν μέγαν ἢ κέο βωμόν ὑπὸ πλεγήϊκιν ἐλίξαι κτλ.

¹¹ Starting with Naeke, Callimachi Hecale, 1845, p.162.

quam mihi'. This point seems to have dropped out of some recent discussions, perhaps because Pfeiffer (1949) did not mention it explicitly in his notes on fr. 110,¹² but the parallel, in itself, seems quite plausible.¹³

In 1922 the words πρὶν ἄκτερι τῶι Βερενίκης were published in a very badly damaged papyrus¹⁴ (P.Oxy. 1793 col. iii = fr. 387 Pf., line 2):

]...κα...ώ...έ.[...].!.[.]άμεναι
]...μς κλεί... πρὶν ἄκτερι τῶι Βερενίκης
]...ἴα βου[.]μ'π[.]ε.[...].γ.
]...[.]τα.α...[...].εθήσειν

Could this be from the *Coma Berenices*? Slight encouragement was offered by]άμεναι in line 1, which could be the end of a participle¹⁵ corresponding to 'nudantes' in Cat. 66, 81; κλεί in line 2 might be reconciled with the Latin,¹⁶ and note the high point at the end of line 3. Accordingly Pfeiffer in 1923 (*Callimachi fragmenta Nuper Reperta*, pp.93-94) ascribed the first three columns of P.Oxy. 1793 to the *Coma Berenices*.¹⁷ If so, this papyrus would seem to contradict any notion that the Nuptial Rite was added by Callimachus when he

¹² On fr. 110, 92 Pfeiffer rightly says that, even if ἄκτερι can be read in the marginal scholia to this line, fr. 110, 92-94^a can not be identical with fr. 387, 1-4. The reader who follows instructions on fr. 110, 3 ('v. fr. 385') and on fr. 110, 27sq. ('v. fr. 386') will be baffled in both cases - these are vestigial survivals of Pfeiffer's earlier ideas on P.Oxy. 1793 (see his *Callimachi fragmenta Nuper Reperta*, 1923, pp.93-94). In vol. I *Addenda et Corrigenda* p.502 we are indeed referred from fr. 110, 80 to fr. 387.

¹³ Two objections have been made, neither of which I consider very weighty: (a) A.S.Hunt in P.Oxy. vol. XV, 1922, pp.106-107, wrote 'If that is correct, it seems strange that πρὶν was included in the citation, in which, as it stands, the natural sense of πρὶν is rather *quondam*'. This is a matter of instinct; mine points in the opposite direction, suggesting that, in the citation, πρὶν would more naturally be a conjunction, or, if an adverb, would more naturally mean 'beforehand' than 'in former times' (cf. Barber's attempt at a Greek version, quoted in n.17 below); (b) Pfeiffer on his fr. 387, 2 commented, 'Call. illud sidus iam notum (ἄκτερι τῶι Β.) commemorare videtur'. But the lock could be looking forward with pride to a future time when it would have become honoured and well-known (I shall later suggest that these lines may indeed have been Catullus' model, but, in the original Greek, not necessarily spoken by the lock).

¹⁴ Of which cols. vi-x contain the *Victory of Sosibius* (fr. 384 Pf.).

¹⁵ E.g. κόλπον ἀνηκάμεναι Pfeiffer, though he later abandoned this, commenting on fr. 387, 1 'in litterarum et accentuum vestigia quadrare non videntur'.

¹⁶ E.g. cὺν γαμέταις κλίνεσθε (Barber, see n.17 below).

¹⁷ E.A.Barber laboured mightily to accommodate P.Oxy. 1793 into his reconstruction of the Greek, attempted without the benefit of P.Oxy. 2258 (*Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray*, 1936, p.353), admitting (pp.361-363) the particular difficulty of this part of his task. For the lines covered by the papyrus (corresponding, as Barber believed, to Cat. 66, 80-83) he came up with μήτι πρόκ' ἀνθώδη κόλπον ἀνηκάμεναι [these last two words supplied by Pfeiffer in 1923] | cὺν γαμέταις κλίνεσθε· πρὶν ἄκτερι τῶι Βερενίκης | βηγίον αἰεὶ δὴ βούλομ' ἐπιστέφμεν | ὑμέτερον, ταὶ μέλλετ' ἀχραέες οἰκουρήσειν. A heroic endeavour, though (as Barber himself recognised) achieved by disregarding some spaces, traces, accents, punctuation marks and even indisputable letters in this (admittedly unsatisfactory) papyrus. I will say only that if Barber's βού[λ]ομ' in the penultimate line were correct (for the elision of -αι at this point of the pentameter, cf. fr. 43, 55 Pf.), and if, as I shall suggest, these lines were indeed the model for Catullus 66, 80-83 but not from the *Coma Berenices*, the speaker of βούλομ' might be e.g. the poet rather than the lock of hair.

incorporated the Coma in Aetia bk 4, since cols. vi-x¹⁸ represent the Victory of Sosibius. But by 1949 Pfeiffer (on fr. 387, 2) had turned against the idea that πρὶν ἄκτερι τῷ Βερενίκης, and hence P.Oxy. 1793 cols. i-iii, belonged to the Coma Berenices, even if his final comment 'certa vestigia Comae desunt' does not appear entirely to rule out the possibility.

Supposing that P.Oxy. 1793 cols. i-iii do not come from the Coma Berenices, but rather from a different elegy honouring the young queen, we may wonder whether or not cols. iv-v¹⁹ = fr. 388 Pf. (note the mention of Berenice again in line 11) belong to the same poem:

]ἴδιον πολύπαλτον ὑπὲρ ἀλ. αἰ. αἰ. γάμος ητ...
]. τηλοκομην εὐ... εἰρητιαι
]. νη βασιλῆα ζέ... πρ.[.]. δ' ἀκρω[.....
]. . πάντων πάν[υ]τα τελειότατε
 5]ου μετ[.]. νου..[]χιςτον

 ..]μμα μὲν αἰδ[.]. αυταπ...[....]ια
 τόσσα Μάγαν βασιλῆα τ.. εἰ λ.....[...].
 τόσσα τὸν ἐν μη.[.]. τευ.[.....]υνηαγ ἔτι,
 Φωκαέων μέχρις κε μέγη μέγας εἰν ἀλὶ μύδρος,
 10 ἄχ]ρι τέκη Παλλά[ς κῆ γάμος] Ἄρ[τ]έμιδι,
]ς ἀεὶ πανάριστ[α μέ]γην α[.....] Βερενίκη

In line 1, the unique compound πολύπαλτον, 'much brandished', suggests a martial context.²⁰ Pfeiffer suspected that πάντων πάντα τελειότατε (4) is addressed to Zeus. The appearance of Berenice's father Magas, with the title of king (7), shortly before Berenice herself (11), seems to indicate that the reference to Magas too is complimentary.

At this point I would like to move on to the wider question of Callimachus' poetry for Berenice, and to quote some earlier lines from Catullus 66 (25-28):

at <te> ego certe
 cognoram a parva virgine magnanimam.
 anne bonum oblita es facinus, quo regium adepta es
 coniugium, quod non fortior ausit alis?

setting this alongside a passage from Hyginus (Astr. 2, 24) which follows the catasterism of the Coma Berenices:

¹⁸ For discussion of cols., iv-v = fr. 388 PPF., see below.

¹⁹ The gap (probably of 16 lines) between the two columns comes after fr. 388, 5 (marked by the first dotted line in the text below).

²⁰ Pfeiffer tried λογγ]ἴδιον πολύπαλτον. For reasons to be explained later I doubt whether the spear is that of King Magas of Cyrene (named in line 7, after the break between the columns).

hanc Berenicen nonnulli cum Callimacho dixerunt equos alere et ad Olympia mittere consuetam fuisse. alii [aliud Schneider] dicunt hoc amplius Ptolemaeum²¹ Berenices patrem multitudine hostium perterritum fuga salutem petisse, filiam autem saepe consuetam insiluisse in equum et reliquam exercitus copiam constituisse et complures hostium interfecisse, reliquos in fugam coniecisse, pro quo etiam Callimachus eam 'magnanimam' dixit.

Since Catullus uses the word 'magnanimam' in 66, 26, it is natural (not, however, inevitable)²² to refer 'Callimachus eam "magnanimam" dixit' to the corresponding part of the *Coma Berenices* in Greek (fr. 110, 26).²³ But a heroic deed performed on the battlefield during her father's lifetime would not have gained for Berenice her royal wedding (Cat. 66, 27-28, quoted above). It is much more plausible²⁴ to interpret these lines of Catullus in the light of the following episode, recorded by Justin (26, 3):

per idem tempus rex Cyrenarum Magas decedit, qui ante infirmitatem Berenicen, unicam filiam, ad finienda cum Ptolemaeo fratre certamina filio eius desponderat. sed post mortem regis mater virginis Arsinoe,²⁵ ut invita se contractum matrimonium solveretur, misit qui ad nuptias virginis regnumque Cyrenarum Demetrium, fratrem regis Antigoni, a Macedonia arcesserent, qui et ex filia Ptolemaei procreatus erat. sed nec Demetrius moram fecit. itaque cum secundante vento celeriter Cyrenas advolasset, fiducia pulchritudinis, qua nimis placere socrui coeperat, statim a principio superbus regiae familiae militibusque impotens erat, studiumque placendi a virgine in matrem contulerat. quae res suspecta primo virgini, dein popularibus militibusque invisita fuit. itaque versis omnium animis in Ptolemaei filium insidiae Demetrio comparantur, cui, cum in lectum socrus concessisset, percussores inmittuntur. sed Arsinoe, audita voce filiae ad fores stantis et praecipientis ut matri parceretur, adulterum paulisper corpore suo protexit. quo interfecto Berenice et stupra matris salva pietate ulta est et in matrimonio sortiundo iudicium patris secuta.

Many scholars²⁶ have been prepared to accept that, despite the error over Berenice's father, the account in Hyginus, *Astr.* 2, 24 (above) may reflect something in Callimachus.

²¹ Of course Berenice was daughter of Magas, not of Ptolemy. As many scholars have observed, the confusion may arise from the fact that, according to the Egyptian custom adopted by the Ptolemies, the previous rulers were said to be 'parents' of their successors; thus Arsinoe is 'mother' of Berenice in the *Coma* (fr. 110, 45). See also note 25 below.

²² In ZPE 25,1977,45 P.J.Parsons prudently adds a question mark after 'fr. 110, 26'. and I shall end by suggesting very tentatively that Hyginus here may have in mind not the *Coma Berenices* but another poem of Callimachus closely linked to it.

²³ Pfeiffer conjectured that the Greek epithet in fr. 110, 26 might have been *μεγάθυμον*.

²⁴ An interesting fragment of unattached scholia from P.Oxy. 2258 (fr. 12 front, in vol XX p.107, cf. Pfeiffer vol II, *Addenda et Corrigenda*, pp.114-115) mentions Berenice and a Ptolemy. If *ἀνεῖλεν* (line 4) is a single word, and means 'murdered', the possibility arises that the scholiast is commenting on fr. 110, 25-28, and giving the correct explanation of the 'bonum facinus', sc. the murder of Demetrius the Fair.

²⁵ An error for Apama, no doubt to be explained in the same way as Hyginus' mistake over Berenice's father (see note 21 above).

²⁶ Including Pfeiffer (see below) and Parsons (ZPE 25,1977,45).

We have seen, however, that if 'Callimachus eam "magnanimam" dixit' refers to the 'bonum facinus' of Call. fr. 110 = Cat. 66, 27 (or even to a mention of the same 'facinus' in a different poem), the alleged incident in Hyginus would hardly fit the bill, while the story in Justin (see previous paragraph) seems much more appropriate. There might be other awkward points about Hyginus' narrative, as it stands. Magas' military operations could be an embarrassing subject for Callimachus, since the only war of Magas about which we have certain knowledge was his attempt to invade Egypt in the 270's B.C., giving rise to a situation in which the king of the poet's homeland was attacking the poet's royal patron.²⁷ Hyginus' words obviously could not be connected with that campaign - no doubt Magas waged other wars.²⁸ Also the personal action which Hyginus ascribes to Berenice during her father's lifetime stretches one's credulity, even for a panegyric poem. Possibly, however, Hyginus might be confusedly alluding to events which took place after the death of Magas, during the intrusion of Demetrius the Fair. This would enable us to refer 'pro quo etiam Callimachus eam "magnanimam" dixit' at least to the same incident as fr. 110 = Cat. 66, 25-28 (whether to the *Coma Berenices* or to a related poem). Justin is primarily interested in the dramatic scene with Berenice standing at the entrance of the bedchamber, and calling upon the assassins to spare her mother. But it seems conceivable that there was fighting in Cyrene between the proponents of a Macedonian alliance and those who favoured an Egyptian marriage for the princess; Callimachus in another poem might have portrayed Berenice as playing a more substantial role than we would gather from Justin.

Pfeiffer in 1923 (*Call. frag. Nuper Reperta*, p.94) wrote of P.Oxy. 1793 cols. iv-v (= fr. 388 Pf., 1949) 'Elegiae argumentum incertissimum; nihilominus conicere audeo quae in Hygin. Astr. 2, 24 ... narrantur nequaquam commenticia esse, sed ad hanc Call. elegiam spectare'. If, as conjectured in the previous paragraph, Hyginus' words confusedly reflect violent dissension in Cyrene over the politics of Berenice's marriage, we might have found a context for the apparently favourable mention of Magas in fr. 388, 7-8.²⁹ However awkward for Callimachus Magas' military operations might have been, the poet would be able to endorse enthusiastically Magas' betrothal of his daughter to the future Ptolemy III Euergetes, which was designed to end the rupture with Egypt.³⁰ Callimachus had celebrated the wedding of Arsinoe to Ptolemy II Philadelphus (fr. 392 Pf.);³¹ one would expect him to

²⁷ The Gauls whose death is described in hymn 4, 185-187 were in fact rebellious mercenaries, originally hired by Philadelphus to combat Magas.

²⁸ See P.M.Fraser, *JEA* 46,1960,100-101. The chronology of Magas' long reign (either c. 308-258 or c. 300-250 B.C.) was regarded by Fraser in *JEA* 43,1957,108 as an insoluble problem.

²⁹ Shortly followed by his daughter in line 11.

³⁰ Cf. Justin 26, 3 (quoted in full above) 'Magas Berenicen ad finienda cum Ptolemaeo fratre certamina filio eius desponderat'.

³¹ Also the deification of Arsinoe in a lyric poem (fr. 228).

do no less for Berenice and Euergetes³² - the *Coma Berenices* is not exactly a marriage poem. Such a poem would naturally praise Magas, who had made the betrothal, and allude to the dramatic events which intervened before Berenice was able to confirm her father's choice (Justin 26, 3 'in matrimonio sortiēdo iudicium patris secuta').

We can not be sure that P.Oxy. 1793 col. iii = fr. 387 Pf. (including πρὶν ἄκτερι τῶι Βερενίκης) belongs to the same poem as cols. iv-v = fr. 388. But the following consideration perhaps makes it more likely that it does. Supposing that fr. 387 came from a different poem, the one represented by fr. 388 would probably have contained fewer than 70 lines.³³ That would be surprisingly short measure for a separate elegy (whatever its precise contents) in honour of Queen Berenice. Even Sosibius got 100/110 lines. Parsons estimates some 200 lines for *Victoria Berenices*;³⁴ *Coma Berenices* has 94 in Catullus' version.³⁵ The incorporation of col. iii = fr. 387 (and perhaps earlier columns of P.Oxy. 1793) would make a more substantial poem, such as we might expect. A consequence, of course, would be that, since the piece mentions the catasterism, it would have to be written not before the marriage but at much the same time as *Coma Berenices*; Ptolemy's departure for the Syrian war followed very shortly upon his marriage.³⁶

Now I would like to bring back into consideration the possibility that fr. 387, 2 πρὶν ἄκτερι τῶι Βερενίκης (even if not from the *Coma Berenices* or spoken by the lock in its own person) might nonetheless be part of the model for the Nuptial Rite in Catullus 66. Mention of a ritual to be performed henceforth by women on their wedding day³⁷ would be particularly appropriate in a wedding poem. Since they are only just married, Cat. 66, 84-86 may seem a little odd:

sed quae se impuro dedit adulterio
illius a mala dona levis bibat irrita pulvis;
namque ego ab indignis praemia nulla peto.

If anything like this appeared in a poem which dealt with the background to Berenice's marriage, contemporary readers might have been tempted to see an allusion by Callimachus, 'tecte, secundum consuetudinem suam',³⁸ to the scandalous liaison of Queen Apama with

³² The word γάμος occurs in fr. 388, 1, but I would not lay any weight on that, since the context is obscure and one can not be wholly certain that the word belongs to that line (see the notes of Hunt and Pfeiffer).

³³ i.e. P.Oxy. 1793 cols. iv and v (= 42 lines), plus an indeterminable proportion of col. iii, plus a maximum of 16 lines from col. vi (even supposing that the *Victory of Sosibius* followed without break or heading).

³⁴ ZPE 25,1977,44.

³⁵ If we subtract the Nuptial Rite and add the final invocation of Arsinoe, the total would be 86.

³⁶ 'paucis post diebus' (Hyg. Astr. 2, 24).

³⁷ Gregory Hutchinson (*Hellenistic Poetry*, 1988, p.323 n.91) is (rather to my surprise) troubled by the implausibility of such a ritual 'either as a historical reality in Alexandria, or as a fiction by Callimachus'.

³⁸ I borrow the phrase from Pfeiffer, 1949, p.321 (with reference to the 'bonum facinus').

Demetrius the Fair, together with a rejection of Apama's pro-Macedonian politics (and perhaps some solace to the wounded dignity of Berenice).

The elegy which I have outlined would be a close relative of the *Coma Berenices*, but stress different aspects of the young queen's history. *Coma Berenices* has just three lines (26-28) on the 'bonum facinus', which might have figured more prominently in the other piece. Perhaps both poems (if we attribute to the latter Hyginus, *Astr.* 2, 24 'Callimachus eam "magnanimam" dixit') applied to Berenice the epithet which Catullus and Hyginus translate 'magnanimam'; if so, *Call.* fr. 110 = *Cat.* 66, 26-28 would act as a kind of literary sign-post to the companion piece. No doubt the mention of Berenice's new constellation would be much briefer in the postulated poem (fr. 387, 2). Victoria Berenices has shown us that, towards the end of his life, Callimachus wrote a considerable amount of poetry for the young queen who came from his own homeland. P.J.Parsons leaves open the possibility that *Hyg.*, *Astr.* 2, 24 'hanc Berenicen nonnulli cum Callimacho dixerunt equos alere et ad Olympia mittere consuetam fuisse' might point to yet another composition.³⁹

Although the above reconstruction is highly speculative, it would, to my mind, have some advantages for our view of *Catullus* 66, 79-88. One could reconcile Pfeiffer's unease (which I share) about the notion of *Catullus*, in a poem avowedly translated from Callimachus, adding ten lines entirely on his own initiative, with the feeling of Lobel (and others) that the superposition of the marriage custom does not improve the poem. If, as I have suggested, frs. 387-388 contain the remnants of an elegy which had several points of close contact with the *Coma Berenices*, *Catullus*' decision to incorporate a passage based upon one of these poems in his translation of the other could be more easily comprehended.⁴⁰

Oxford

A.S.Hollis

³⁹ *ZPE* 25,1977, 45 'if Berenice won at Olympia (Hyginus speaks only of competing), that victory will have rated a full-scale epinician, not a passing mention.' G.Coppola's idea (*RFIC* n.s. 8,1930,285), that Berenice's Olympic horses might have been combined with her martial exploit in a single poem, does not attract me.

⁴⁰ That we might have a case of 'contaminatio' with another Callimachean elegy (represented by fr. 387) was suggested briefly by H.J.Mette in *Hermes* 83,1955,501-502, but without supporting argument (the idea rejected by Putnam in *CP* 55,1960,228 n.3).

I am most grateful to Professor Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones for commenting on a previous draft of this article.