

DIGITAL ACCESS TO
SCHOLARSHIP AT HARVARD

Callimachus, the Victoria Berenices, and Roman Poetry

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
[Please share](#) how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

Citation	Thomas, Richard F. 1983. Callimachus, the Victoria Berenices, and Roman poetry. <i>Classical Quarterly</i> 33(1): 92-113.
Published Version	doi:10.1017/S0009838800034327
Accessed	February 18, 2015 11:24:36 AM EST
Citable Link	http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:3775758
Terms of Use	This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA

(Article begins on next page)

CALLIMACHUS, THE *VICTORIA BERENICES*, AND ROMAN POETRY*

It is now five years since P. J. Parsons published the Lille Callimachus,¹ and the dust appears to have settled. The appearance of these fragments, which greatly increase our knowledge of the opening of the third book of the *Aetia*,² has been followed by no great critical reaction. Apart from the attractive suggestion of E. Livrea that the 'Mousetrap' (fr. 177 Pf.) may belong within the story of Heracles and Molochus,³ the episode has had somewhat limited impact.⁴ This is against the usual trend of over-reaction to the publication of new literary texts (witness the Cologne Archilochus and the new Gallus), and is in part a tribute to the thoroughness and clarity with which Parsons presented the fragments.

We might, however, have expected more of significance from the *Victoria Berenices*. Its placement, at the beginning of the third book of the most important poem of the most influential Alexandrian poet, should lead us to delve deeper. Callimachus was clearly attuned to the possibilities in structural organization and, as Parsons has noted,⁵ not only does the third book begin and end with epinician sequences (to Berenice, and to Euthycles of Locri, fr. 84–5 Pf.), but the entire second half of the *Aetia* is framed by tributes to the poet's queen (*Victoria* and *Coma*, fr. 110 Pf.). *Prima facie* the opening lines of Book 3 will not have constituted a casual or incidental *action*.

What follows is an argument for the importance of Callimachus, specifically for the influence of the new episode, together with other Callimachean verse, on the poetry of Virgil, and to a lesser degree on that of Propertius and Statius. If such influence can be shown, then it may be possible to reverse the procedure and to increase our knowledge of the *Victoria Berenices*. While such an approach may appear in part based on circular argument, I believe that in most parts the combination of demonstrable and circumstantial will be persuasive. Much, however, is speculative, and I do not conceal that fact. Nevertheless, in the light of the importance of this subject, it will be worth while to pursue certain possibilities in spite of their tentative nature.

I. THE PROEM TO THE THIRD *GEORGIC*

The first 48 lines of the third *Georgic* constitute Virgil's most extensive statement of literary purpose. The poet, after a couplet addressing the theme of the third book,

* Part of this paper was delivered in March 1980 at a conference on Alexandrianism held in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

¹ P. J. Parsons, 'Callimachus: *Victoria Berenices*', *ZPE* 25 (1977), 1–50; hereafter 'V.B.'.

² See Parsons, 'V.B.' 46–8 for lucid arguments on the placement of the episode.

³ 'Der Liller Kallimachos und die Mausefallen', *ZPE* 34 (1979), 37–40.

⁴ A number of scholars have in fact dealt with the fragments: R. Kassel, 'Nachtrag zum neuen Kallimachos', *ZPE* 25 (1977), 51; W. Luppe, 'Zum Anfang des Liller Kallimachos', *ZPE* 29 (1978), 36; id. 'οὐδείς εἶδεν ἀματροχιάς (Kallimachos fr. 383. 10 Pf.)', *ZPE* 31 (1978), 43–4; F. Bornmann, 'Zum Siegeslied des Kallimachos auf Berenike, P. Lille 79c III 6', *ZPE* 31 (1978), 35; E. Livrea, 'Nota al nuovo Callimaco di Lille', *ZPE* 32 (1978), 7–10; A. Barigazzi, 'Callimaco e i cavalli di Berenice (Pap. Lille 82)', *Prometheus* 5 (1979), 267–71; id. 'Per la ricostruzione del Callimaco di Lille', *Prometheus* 6 (1980), 1–20; E. Livrea, A. Carlini, C. Corbato, F. Bornmann, 'Il nuovo Callimaco di Lille', *Maia* n.s. 32 (1980), 225–53. Most of these works, however, are concerned with technical matters relating to the text of the new fragments. None deals with the impact of the episode, which will be our chief concern. ⁵ 'V.B.' 49–50.

turns aside from the immediate project to treat his own poetic destiny. In seeking a new path to immortality (8–9), he first rejects certain themes as being well worn – *iam uulgata* (3–8) – then turns to the alternative, the projection of his poetic future, metaphorically stated: victor in a pointedly Italian setting, Virgil will preside over games and construct a temple, complete with elaborate statuary, in commemoration of the exploits of Caesar Octavian (10–36). The perfection of this structure will quell the voice of *Inuidia* (37–9). Meanwhile the present task must be completed (40–8). All in all, then, an elaborate *recusatio*.

At what specific tradition, or to what poet, are these lines, particularly the opening ones, directed? The critics have been at odds. W. Wimmel claimed to find reminiscences and adaptations of Callimachean programme poetry.⁶ On the other hand, U. Fleischer,⁷ L. P. Wilkinson⁸ and S. Lundström⁹ have argued against this and in favour of the importance of Pindar, Wilkinson in particular concluding: ‘the influence of the whole is Pindaric’. As will emerge, I believe that each of these views contains a half-truth: the former is correct in the choice of poet (Callimachus), but incorrect on the type of poetry (programmatic purple passages); the latter proposes the right type of poetry (epinician), but the wrong poet (Pindar). New assessment of these lines is warranted, both as a result of the publication of the Lille papyri, and on more general grounds.

The third *Georgic* opens with an address to Pales, Apollo Nomius and the woods and streams of Mt Lycaeus – normal enough at the beginning of a book on the care and raising of animals. However, the manner of reference to Apollo is noteworthy: *pastor ab Amphryso* (2). This constitutes a gloss on Callim. *Hymn* 2. 47–9:

Φοῖβον καὶ Νόμιον κικλήσκομεν ἐξέτι κείνου,
ἐξότ' ἐπ' Ἀμφρυσῶ ζευγίτιδας ἔτρεφεν ἵππους
ἡθέου ὑπ' ἔρωτι κεκαυμένος Ἀδμήτιοι.

Virgil's wording is surely intended as a direct reference. As Servius noticed, *pastor* is a gloss on *Νόμιος*: ‘ἀπὸ τῆς νομῆς, id est a pascuis’ (ad loc.). More important is the supporting phrase, *ab Amphryso*. Richter rightly identified the manner as Alexandrian,¹⁰ but it is so in a special way: in connection with Apollo and his service to Admetus this river appears in Greek only at *Hymn* 2. 48.¹¹ The connection may be presumed to be original with Callimachus, and Virgil's periphrasis for Apollo Nomius must be an acknowledgement of the fact.

In justification of the change of direction that his poetic career is to take, Virgil proceeds to enumerate the topics which, through prior treatment, are no longer valid:

quis aut Eurysthea durum
aut inlaudati nescit Busiridis aras?
cui non dictus Hylas puer et Latonia Delos

⁶ *Kallimachos in Rom*, Hermes Einzelschriften 16 (1960), 177–87, *passim*.

⁷ ‘Musentempel und Octavianehrung des Vergil im Proömium zum dritten Buche der *Georgica*’, *Hermes* 88 (1960), 280–331.

⁸ ‘Pindar and the Proem to the Third *Georgic*’, *Forsch. zur römischen Literatur*, Festschr. zum 60. Geburtstag von K. Büchner (Wiesbaden, 1970), pp. 286–91.

⁹ ‘Der Eingang des Proömiums zum dritten Buche der *Georgica*’, *Hermes* 104 (1976), 163–91; Lundström is unaware of Wilkinson's article.

¹⁰ W. Richter, *P. Vergilii Maronis Georgica*, Das Wort der Antike 5 (1957), ad loc. Cf. such expressions as *incola Itoni* (= Athena) at Cat. 64. 228.

¹¹ Indeed, before Virgil, apart from the Callimachean instance, the only appearance of the river is at Apoll. *Arg.* 1. 54, where there is no connection with Apollo. Quite possibly Callimachus drew it from obscurity and dealt with it in his treatise on the world's rivers (*Frag. Gram.* 457–9 Pf.).

Hippodameque umeroque Pelops insignis eburno,
acer equis?

(4-8)

Three references to Hercules (or to characters associated with him), one to Delos, and one to Hippodamia and Pelops. To begin with the last, it has long been noticed that line 7 recalls Pindar, *Ol.* 1. 27: ἐλέφαντι φαίδιμον ὄμιον κεκαδμένον.¹² This, however, does not require that Virgil's concerns throughout the proem are Pindaric, and we should keep in mind that the ornamental reference to Pelops functions mainly as a transition to the theme of games (*acer equis*, 8 – an emphasis absent from the Pindaric context).¹³

The other references in Virgil's lines argue for Alexandrian influence, predominantly that of Callimachus. First, *Latonia Delos* (6) as the subject of a poem recalls exclusively the Fourth Hymn. And then there are the three allusions to Hercules (through Eurystheus, Busiris and Hylas, 4-6) – in fact the skeleton of a *Heracleis*.¹⁴ As Pfeiffer has noted, even in its fragmentary state the *Aetia* can be seen to have dealt considerably more with this figure than with any other: 'Herculis fabulae in omnibus Aetiorum libris' (*ad fr.* 698).¹⁵ Although Eurystheus does not appear in the extant fragments, he is implicitly present throughout the labours. Hylas, prominent for both Theocritus and Apollonius, although probably not the subject of Callimachus fr. 596 (see Pfeiffer, *ad loc.*), perhaps figured at least in passing in the *Aetia*,¹⁶ and the encounter with Busiris survives towards the end of the second book of that poem (fr. 44-7 – with Phalaris). More generally, each of Virgil's examples is Alexandrian, or Callimachean, in nature, in that they all betray an interest in aetiological concerns, and this even applies for the reference to Pelops.¹⁷

While this is not necessarily conclusive, it at least provides a basis for the suggestion that at the outset Virgil's proem in some way responds to Alexandrian and Callimachean poetry. It remains to be seen whether such a view is required and, if so, to determine the purpose of the proem. With this in mind we turn to the *Victoria Berenices*.

The episode is, as its title suggests, an epinician. Callimachus announces that he has just received the news of the victory of Berenice II, consort of Ptolemy III Euergetes, in the chariot race at Nemea. Pure epinician leads (although the transition is missing) to the bulk of the poem, an aetion on the founding of the Nemean Games – in effect an epyllion in the style of the *Hecale* leading to Heracles' killing of the Nemean lion. This panel, perceptively described by Parsons as a 'rococo exercise in rustic chic', focused mainly on the hero's stay with the impoverished Molorchus, a figure possibly invented by Callimachus, and at least lifted by him from total obscurity. A characteristic

¹² See Conington on *Geo.* 3. 7.

¹³ As we shall argue below, Pindaric elements may in fact have undergone a Callimachean transformation which is now lost to us. In this connection it should be noted that the First Olympian elsewhere influenced Callimachus (cf. Pfeiffer, *Index Rerum Notabilium*, s.u. Pind.).

¹⁴ See Richter (above, n. 10) on 3. 3 ff.

¹⁵ This, of course, is hardly surprising since, through his ubiquitousness, he was involved with numerous areas which came to be the subjects of aetiological studies.

¹⁶ Certainly the encounter between Heracles and the youth's father, Theiodamas, figured (*Aet.* 1 fr. 24-5), and it is unlikely that Hylas, in the light of the appeal he held for the Alexandrians, did not also appear.

¹⁷ Servius' commentary at this point is of interest; he seems to give weight to the aetiological associations of the myth: *qui* (sc. Myrtalus) *factis cereis axibus cum, victore Pelope, a puella promissum posceret praemium, ab eius marito praecipitatus in mare est, cui nomen imposuit: nam ab eo Myrtoum dicitur pelagus.*

of the genre, the lion was doubtless dispatched in summary manner, and there can be little doubt, as Parsons has suggested, that after mentioning Heracles' founding of the games (and possibly the second foundation by Adrastus) Callimachus returned to the celebration of Berenice's victory: 'epinician embraces epyllion'.¹⁸

We begin with a simple, but unstated, observation. Parsons noted that the only witness connecting Callimachus with the story of Molorchus is Probus on Virg. *Geo.* 3. 19 (*lucosque Molorchis*), that being also the first post-Callimachean reference to Heracles' host. It is plausible to suggest that the placement of Virgil's allusion, at the outset of the third book, may not be gratuitous – that is where he found it in the four-book poem of his Alexandrian predecessor.¹⁹

That the proem to the third *Georgic* is a modified epinician needs no argument.²⁰ This, however, should not necessarily lead, as it has done, to the conclusion that Pindar was Virgil's model. Two points: first, with the exception of Horace, Roman poets seem to show little interest in (or possibly little understanding of) Pindaric poetry.²¹ An even more important argument can be made against the presence of Pindar in this proem: 'epinician' and 'Pindaric' are not interchangeable terms. And, as Parsons has noted of the new fragments: 'In [them] Callimachus visibly borrows from Pindar and Bacchylides.'²² Given Virgil's preference among this group, it is fair to note that Pindaric elements in his poetry may be only apparently so.²³

The Lille papyri not only restore the framing epinicians to Callimachus' third book; they also add more generally to our awareness of that poet's interest in this type of poetry.²⁴ Of the actual epinician, addressed to Berenice, only 10 lines survive, in reasonably good condition, with interlinear scholia. However, the common elements between the openings of the third books of Callimachus and Virgil (epinician to queen or *princeps*, reference to Molorchus, and apparent dictional connection), together with clear reference to other Callimachean contexts at the beginning of the third *Georgic*, validate the attempt to define the nature of Virgil's entire proem, specifically by investigating the possibility of a more pervasive Callimachean influence.

The most extended portion of Virgil's proem, and the most striking, is his

¹⁸ 'V.B.' 39.

¹⁹ Since we are discussing structural similarities between the *Aetia* and the *Georgics*, I put forward the following observation, suggested by the anonymous referee of this article. *Aetia* 3 began (*Victoria Berenices*) and *Aetia* 4 ended (*Coma Berenices*) with encomiastic pieces. The opening of the third *Georgic* follows that of *Aetia* 3. What of the end of the fourth *Georgic*? Servius' comment is notorious: (*Gallus*) *fuit autem amicus Vergilii adeo, ut quartus georgicorum a medio usque ad finem eius laudes teneret* (*ad Ecl.* 10. 1; cf. also *ad Geo.* 4. 1). If there is any truth in this (and neither the reader nor I believes that there is), then the structural parallel that emerges between the proem to the third *Georgic* and the *Victoria Berenices*, together with the placing of the *Coma Berenices*, provides the first concrete support for Servius' claim.

²⁰ At lines 22–33 the theme of military triumph is conflated with the epinician material.

²¹ Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 276–85, 291–3, 426, 435–40, has best demonstrated Horace's interest in Pindar, but that interest is for Horace, the most eclectic of the Roman poets, a late one. A glance at D. E. Gerber's *Bibliography of Pindar*, 1513–1966 (APhA Monographs 28 [1969]) is instructive: 19 entries for Horace, seven for all other Latin authors.

²² 'V.B.' 45–6; also C. Corbato (above, n. 4), 238–45.

²³ On this point it may be worth noting that the Pindaric reference in the proem to the Third *Georgic* (*umeroque Pelops insignis eburno, 7*) may even have had a Callimachean intermediary – particularly since the ultimate source is *Olympian* 1, a poem which Callimachus surely knew and to which he appears to refer (fr. 194. 58 and Pfeiffer, ad loc.).

²⁴ Clearly the genre interested Callimachus both in the *Aetia* and elsewhere: fr. 84–5, Euthycles of Locri; fr. 98, Euthymus; fr. 384, Sosibius; fr. 666, Astylus of Croton; fr. 758, Milo of Croton. See Pfeiffer on fr. 85 for other possible instances; also, dealing with the founding of games, fr. 76–7, 'Eleorum Ritus', again from the third book of the *Aetia*.

description of the temple and statuary he will create (12–36), a metaphorical allusion, as most would now agree,²⁵ to a future poetic project. Again, the ‘model’ has been found in Pindar:²⁶

χρυσέας ὑποστάσαντες εὔτειχεῖ προθύρῳ θαλάμου
κίονας, ὡς ὅτε θαγρὸν μέγαρον,
πάξομεν.

(*Ol.* 6. 1–3)

While it is not out of the question that these lines, if Virgil knew them, could have been the ultimate impulse for his elaborately developed metaphor, it will be useful for now to confine the discussion to *Callimachean* epinician. The evidence is somewhat fragmentary, but it is sufficient: to an extent unparalleled in Pindar,²⁷ Callimachus, in his treatment of athletic victories, appears to have dealt with statues erected or adorned on the return of the victor. This is definitely the case with Euthycles of Locri (fr. 84–5), Sosibius (fr. 384) and Astylus of Croton (fr. 666).²⁸ Moreover, in the last two of these, it is stated that statues were placed in temples in commemoration of the successes. So Virgil:

in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit

(3. 16)

stabunt et Parii lapides, spirantia signa,
Assaraci proles demissaeque ab Iove gentis
nomina, Trosque parens et Troiae Cynthus auctor.

(3. 34–6)

This feature of Callimachean epinician reflects, I think, a heightened interest on the part of this poet, and of the Alexandrians in general, in the plastic and visual arts.²⁹ Most important for our purposes is the statue of Delian Apollo (*Aet.* inc. lib. fr. 114), which conducts a conversation with the poet. Virgil was to place a statue of this same god in his temple, referring to him with an epithet which is not only unmistakably Callimachean (*Troiae Cynthus*³⁰ *auctor*, 3. 36), but which Callimachus actually employed in his address to the statue (*Κύνθιε*, fr. 114. 8). Virgil used the word at the beginning of the second half of the *Eclogues* (6. 3) and of the *Georgics* (3. 36) – both are influenced by Callimachus, and stand as centrally placed acknowledgements of him. Also in the *Aetia* were two statues of Samian Hera (fr. 100, 101), and one of Diana Leucadia (*Dieg.* fr. 31 b–e [Addend. II Pf.]). Outside this poem, *Iambus* 6 (fr. 196) described in some detail the dimensions of Pheidias’ chryselephantine statue of Olympian Zeus, and in its sequel, *Iambus* 7 (fr. 197), a wooden representation of

²⁵ Whether or not the reference is specifically to the *Aeneid* is another matter. I personally have little difficulty reconciling that poem with the details in the proem to the Third Georgic, particularly with the final two lines: *Caesaris et nomen fama tot ferre per annos, | Tithoni prima quot abest ab origine Caesar*, *Geo.* 3. 47–8.

²⁶ Wilkinson (above, n. 8), pp. 287–8.

²⁷ Pindar, incidentally, specifically dissociates himself in one passage from the static art of the sculptor: *οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμι*, *Nem.* 5. 1.

²⁸ This is doubtless related to Callimachus’ general aetiological interests; statues are visible attestations of, and ensure the continuance of, cult practice.

²⁹ Such interest is best exemplified by the Greek Anthology, which abounds in epigrams describing, conversing with, or in some other way treating statuary. In most the poetic motivation is in the realism of the work of art. So the poems on Myron’s *Cow*, to take an obvious example (*Anth. Pal.* 9. 713–42) – thirty epigrams making much the same point: the realism is such that the observer (herdsman, calf, etc.) is deceived. They are not all Hellenistic, but the impulse is quintessentially Hellenistic. This feature of the Hellenistic mentality will be important when we come to consider the ephrasis.

³⁰ See W. V. Clausen, ‘Cynthus’, *AJP* 97 (1976), 245–7, for the demonstration that the formation of this epithet is Callimachean.

Hermes Peripheraeus gives a description of himself in the manner of a sepulchral epigram.³¹ Again, in *Iambus* 9 (fr. 199), we find an *ἐραστής* and an ithyphallic Hermes discussing the latter's condition. Finally, in the epigrams, there appear statues of a hero (*Epigr.* 24) and of Berenice herself (*Epigr.* 51), the latter included in effigy with the three Graces – just as Octavian mingles with other representations in Virgil's temple (3. 16).

And what of temples themselves? It is true that Pindar's sixth *Olympian* begins with an architectural simile, but it is extremely brief, and in spirit has little to do with Virgil's extended metaphor.³² The differences in the proem to the third *Georgic* are considerable, the context distinct. He treats a temple which is appropriate as a repository of statuary commemorating Octavian's victory, and as a metaphor for his future poem. For impulses we should rather seek real temples in epinician settings, and here again the Callimachean instances are illuminating. Both Sosibius (fr. 384) and Astylus (fr. 666) have statues placed in temples of Hera in commemoration of their victories. It would, I think, be a strange lapse if the victory of Berenice were not attended by some sort of celebration involving statues and/or a temple.³³ It would be even more peculiar if Callimachus (in the light of his usual practice) made no reference to such an event.

But Virgil's temple is also metaphorical. This was probably his own contribution, and yet, even here, there may have been a Callimachean impulse. Fr. 118 of the *Aetia* is an unplaced scrap, preserved in poor condition:

]. φ. ρεις οἷ τε μάλισ[τα	
]ν [λ]ειαινουσι. τὸ δ' ἱερ[όν]	
ἐξ ἀν]τροσχεδίδης κείνο τρεκ.[
]. σταφύλη[.].]ο[.]	
]. ν λειαιμε[.]	5
]. ιησι μελιχροτ[.]	
]ἀκριβές και τότε Λητο[ῖδ]	
]. τὸδε μέλλεν ἔσ[εσθαι]	
]. ἀμφιπερικ[.]	
]ωη.αν. . . ε[.]	10
].]	

Difficult to construe, but a sense, and certainly an emphasis, of sorts emerges. Callimachus is dealing with temples (τὸ δ' ἱερ[όν], 2) probably two of them, built with contrasting levels of workmanship.³⁴ The first is a polished, well-finished product ([λ]ειαινουσι, 2), while the other is of a hastily constructed nature (ἐξ ἀν]τροσχεδίδης, 3). The contrast is suggestive, and the diction, or what remains of it, evocative. The verb λειαινῶ can, at least from Dionysius of Halicarnassus,³⁵ be used in application to perfection of literary style – English 'polish' in fact.³⁶ The contrasting term, ἐξ

³¹ Statues which come to life in this manner are in fact artistically the equivalent of the tombstone which delivers an epitaph, either on behalf of the person buried beneath it, or in *propria persona*.

³² Apart from its brevity, and the fact that it is not strictly a metaphor (ὡς ὄτε), Pindar's treatment is distinct in that it refers very generally to a μέγαρον. Virgil's *templum*, and the elaborate details which accompany it, are qualitatively distinct.

³³ A curious coincidence: in *Epigram* 51 Callimachus included Berenice in a statue of the Graces, while in the *Victoria Sosibii* statues of the Graces are adorned in commemoration of the victory (*Ep. et Eleg. Min.* fr. 384. 44–5); on this, see below, p. 108.

³⁴ So Pfeiffer, ad loc.

³⁵ *De comp. verb.* 16; doubtless the formulation is earlier, almost certainly Hellenistic.

³⁶ F. M. Cairns ('Catullus 1', *Mnemos* 22 [1969], 155), treating this metaphor in Catullus (*pumice expolitus*, 1. 2) and Propertius (*exactus tenui pumice uersus eat*, 3. 1. 8), remarks: 'The

αὐτοσχεδίας, is likewise potentially significant, referring as it does to improvised (and therefore undesirable) construction.³⁷ In line 6 we find μελιχροτ[, presumably the remnants of the comparative or superlative of μελιχρός, which appears twice elsewhere in the fragments of Callimachus, both times in programmatic references to the 'correct' type of poetry: ἀ[ηδονίδες] δ' ὠδε μελιχρ[ό]τεραι, *Aet.* 1 fr. 1. 16; ἀλλ' ὀκνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον | τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Σολεύς ἀπεμάξατο· χαίρετε λεπταί | ῥήσιες... *Epiigr.* 27. 2–4.³⁸ Finally, in line 7, there is the likely reading, ἀκριβές.³⁹ If this is correct (and it is supported by the interlinear gloss above line 4: δι-ηκριβωσαν [sc. οἱ τέκτονες] τὸ ὕ[ψ]ος),⁴⁰ it is worth referring to *Iambus* 12 (fr. 202, Addend. II Pf.), where we find the only other form of ἀκριβ- in Callimachus:

ὑπὶ τῷ παίσαντες ἄνθρωποι ποδί
 χρυσὸν αἰνήσουσι τίμιον κ...[.
 τὴν Ἀθηναίης δὲ καὶ ἐτέρων δόσιν,
 καίπερ εὖ σμίλησιν ἠκριβωμένην,
 ὁ πρόσω φοιτέων ἀμαυρώσει χρ[ό]νος·
 ἡ δ' ἐμὴ τῇ παιδι καλλίστη δόσις,
 ...

(63–8)

Again the context is programmatic. Callimachus has written a poem in celebration of the new-born child of his friend Leon. He compares this event, and his participation in it, with the vying of the gods in their donations at the birth of Hebe: 'Apollo scorning to draw upon the treasures of his Delphic sanctuary (47 ff.) outdid them all with his glorious song – evidently the divine prototype of Callimachus' own gift for the child of his friend.'⁴¹ The gifts of the other gods, although finely carved (καίπερ εὖ σμίλησιν ἠκριβωμένην, 66), will be surpassed by the song of Apollo.⁴² Diction apart, we again find in these lines of *Iambus* 12 a poetic work presented in close proximity to, and in favourable contrast to, a sculpted object.

Ultimately the remains are not sufficient to support speculation that *Aetia* fr. 118

context of this sudden metaphor strongly suggests that it is part of the traditional material upon which Propertius is drawing in 3. 1 and therefore that Catullus in his own Alexandrian prologue was drawing on similar sources' (we should keep in mind that the chief influence in Prop. 3. 1 is Callimachean). Now Catullus dealt with a polished *libellus*, or rather polished ends (*frontes*) of the scroll, as seems clear from Ovid, *Trist.* 1. 1. 11, *nec fragili geminae poliantur pumice frontes* (cf. G. Luck, *P. Ovidius Nasonis Tristia*, II Kommentar [Heidelberg, 1977], ad loc.), but the poetic metaphor originates, I believe, in the polishing of marble or stone. *Polire* (λείαινειν) and *limare* (ῥυμνέειν), 'to polish' and 'to file down' are used together of polishing stone (Plin. *HN* 36. 53–4) and of polishing literary style (Cic. *Or.* 20; especially Quint. *Inst.* 10. 4. 4, *ut opus poliat lima, non exerat*; also Cic. *de or.* 3. 185, *Brut.* 294, *ad fam.* 7. 33. 2; Hor. *Sat.* 1. 10. 65, *A.P.* 291; Quint. *Inst.* 2. 4. 7, 2. 8. 4, 2. 12. 8, 11. 1. 3, 12. 10. 17, 50). So too *τορεύειν*, 'to work on a relief', can be used in a lapidary sense (*Anth. Pal.* 7. 274), as well as metaphorically (D.H. *Thuc.* 24). I have no doubt that the entire construct is Alexandrian.

³⁷ It is applied to poetry as early as Aristotle (*Poetics* 1448b23; also D.H. *Ant. Rom.* 2. 34), and acquires a pejorative force early: so Xen. *Lac.* 13. 5, *αὐτοσχεδιαστής* (contrasted with *τεχνίτης*) = 'bungler'.

³⁸ On this second instance see E. Reitzenstein, 'Zur Stiltheorie des Kallimachos', *Festschr. R. Reitzenstein* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1931), pp. 44–7. For other occurrences of the word in the same context cf. Pfeiffer on *Aet.* 1 fr. 1. 16.

³⁹ Although Pfeiffer (ad loc.) is tentative: 'ἠκριβι dispicere sibi visus est L(obel)'. The rest of the word is clear.

⁴⁰ For this compound as a term used for artistic precision, cf. Philostr. *imag.* 10; Philodem. *de mus.* p. 90 K (Pfeiffer on fr. 202. 66, Addend. II); also Gow ad Theoc. 15. 81.

⁴¹ C. Bonner, 'A New Papyrus of Callimachus', *Aegyptus* 31 (1951), 135.

⁴² So, in lines 56–7 of the same poem, even the craft of Hephaestus is to fall short in comparison to the art of the new Alexandrian god of poetry: *χρῶ σοφῆς ὦ Φοῖβε πε[ι]ρ[ε]ῖσθαι τέχνης, | ἥ τις Ἡφαίστεια νικήσει καλά.*

contains an architectural metaphor – that the poet made some connection between his own art and that of the architect or sculptor. Nevertheless, even without such intent on the part of Callimachus, even if fr. 118 is merely a contrasting depiction of actual temples, there can be little doubt that Virgil, familiar as he was with the programmatic diction of Callimachus, could have seen in these lines the potential for creating the metaphor that appears in the proem of the third *Georgic*.

In summary, it seems extremely probable that a temple and perhaps some statuary appeared in the *Victoria Berenices*. These are hallmarks of Callimachean epinician, and it is hardly conceivable that they would not have figured in this celebration of the victory of the poet's own queen. At the same time, somewhere in the *Aetia*, Callimachus wrote of the construction of temples in language which elsewhere he reserved for the polemical definition of literary style. Virgil, at the beginning of the third *Georgic*, presented a temple which is both real and metaphorical. It is appropriate to the epinician setting, and as a metaphor for poetry it, and the sculpture it is to contain, are marked by their lifelike perfection. At the conclusion of this section, Virgil referred to these statues: *stabunt et Parii lapides, spirantia signa* (3. 34). This is a thoroughly Alexandrian claim for the supremacy of the work of art, and through it for the excellence of the poem in which the objects appear.

In demonstrating that Virgil's epithet *Cynthius* (*Geo.* 3. 36) is a Callimachean coinage, W. V. Clausen pointed to the next line of the *Georgics*, which begins with *Inuidia*, 'a near relative of [Callimachus'] *Βασκανίη*'.⁴³ This personified Envy will cower in submission, rendered powerless by the greatness of Virgil's theme and, presumably, that of the poetry itself:

Inuidia infelix Furias amnemque seuerum
Cocyti metuet tortosque Ixionis anguis
immanemque rotam et non exsuperabile saxum.

(*Geo.* 3. 37–9)

Again the critics are divided about the source of this curiously worded claim. Wilkinson, favouring Pindaric influence, points to the eight or so instances of *φθόνος* in that poet, noting that it is a natural enough ingredient of epinician verse.⁴⁴ None, however, is in the Virgilian sense, for they all enjoin caution against excessive praise in the face of the destructive power of *φθόνος*.⁴⁵ What we need is triumph *over* Envy. Wimmel⁴⁶ mentions programmatic references to *Βασκανίη* in the *Aetia* preface (*Aet.* 1 fr. 1. 17) and in the epigrams (*Epigr.* 21. 4), and to *Φθόνος* at *Hymn* 2. 105, all contexts with which Virgil was thoroughly familiar.

Support for the influence of Callimachus emerges if we examine the actual manner of Virgil's reference: *Inuidia* will be subject to fear of and, it is implied, domination by the Underworld – in other words, that is to be the destiny of *Inuidia*. Now while Wimmel refers generally to Apollo's supremacy over *Φθόνος* at the end of *Hymn* 2, the reference needs more precision. Consider Apollo's final words: *χαίρε ἄναξ· ὁ δὲ Μῶμος, ἴν' ὁ Φθόνος, ἔνθα νέοιτο* (113). In general, then, an *ἀποπομπή*,⁴⁷ but one whose implications are clear: *ἐς κόρακας* – that is, to Hell.

⁴³ 'Cynthius' (above, n. 30), 245 n. 2.

⁴⁴ Wilkinson (above, n. 8), pp. 289–90; he concludes: 'it (*Inuidia*) is at least as likely to have been suggested by Pindar as by Callimachus'.

⁴⁵ The instance at *Pythian* 1. 85 is fairly close in sense to the Virgilian reference, but even there, in keeping with the archaic mentality, there is a caution which is wholly lacking from Virgil's attitude.

⁴⁶ *Kallimachos in Rom* (above, n. 6), 183–4.

⁴⁷ F. Williams, *Callimachus, Hymn to Apollo, A Commentary* (Oxford, 1978), *ad loc.*, has a useful discussion of this motif. On the final lines, now see also A. Köhnken, 'Apollo's Retort to Envy's Criticism,' *AJP* 102 (1981), 411–22. A. Henrichs alerts me to Timocreon 5, *PMG* 731.

As has been the case with other features of Virgil's proem, the critics, in seeking possible sources for the attitude towards *Invidia*, have neglected one crucial area – Callimachean epinician. The most extensively surviving epinician of this poet is the *Victoria Sosibii* (fr. 384). Just as the fragment breaks off, and at a point where praise of the victor is becoming excessive, Callimachus arrests himself:

οὔτε τὸν αἰνήσω τόσον ἄξι[ο]ς οὔτε λάθωμαι
– δειδία γὰρ δήμου γλώσσαν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροις –

(fr. 384. 57–8)

Although the word does not appear (and hence the passage has escaped notice), this is *φθόνος* pure and simple.⁴⁸ What follows these lines is unsure, but it seems very likely that the term actually occurred, and was not merely implicit.⁴⁹

Here then, in Callimachean epinician, is a traditional reference to epinician Envy, and for Virgil we are again dealing with the correct poet (Callimachus) as well as the correct genre. But while Callimachus, as befits the traditional encomiast, will temper his praises through fear of Envy (*δήμου γλώσσαν*), Virgil has no such fear: his song and the greatness of Octavian will render such moderation unnecessary. Sallust again provides a parallel; Micipsa, in praising his king, Jugurtha: *postremo, quod difficillimum inter mortalis est, gloria inuidiam vicisti* (*B.J.* 10. 2).⁵⁰ Nor was Callimachus elsewhere so humble; in his own epitaph, he claimed:

ὁ δ' ἤρσειεν κρέσσονα βασκανίης

(*Epigr.* 21. 4)

This, then, constitutes a part of the Virgilian claim, that the poet has performed beyond the reach of Envy.

Now for a final hypothesis. It seems reasonable, on the basis of the Callimachean, as well as the general epinician, evidence, to suggest that in the *Victoria Berenices φθόνος* received some treatment.⁵¹ If so, the attitude will have been clear: both the poetry of Callimachus (as in *Epigr.* 21) and the subject of the epinician (unlike Sosibius in fr. 384. 57–8) would have been presented as immune to Envy. There is, then, a strong case for suggesting that, against normal practice, in the case of Berenice's victory, Callimachus claimed that both her praises and his participation in them were unimpeachable, just as Virgil was to do in the case of Octavian and his own poetry.

It has been suggested, I believe correctly, that the third *Georgic* was originally intended to begin at line 49:⁵²

seu quis Olympicae miratus praemia palmae
pascit equos...

⁴⁸ Sallust's reticence with regard to the writing of history is curiously close to this: *in primis arduum uidetur res gestas scribere: primum quod facta dictis exequenda sunt; dein quia plerique quae delicta reprehenderit malevolentia et inuidia dicta putant, ubi de magna uirtute atque gloria bonorum memores, quae sibi quisque facilia factu putant, aequo animo accipit, supra ea ueluti ficta pro falsis ducit*, *Cat.* 3. 2.

⁴⁹ See Pfeiffer on fr. 384. 59–60 for possible supplements. *μ[εμφ]ομένω* (59) would be appropriate (cf. Sallust's *reprehenderit*, above, n. 48), as presumably would *οὐδέπ[οτ'] ἐ]σθλὸν ἔρεξεν* (vel *ἔλεξεν*); cf. Sallust's *ubi de magna uirtute atque gloria memores*. So, *ἀ]ψ[ε]υδῆς* is tantalizing (cf. *ficta pro falsis ducit*). Hunt's supplement for the whole line, rejected by Pfeiffer (but in sense what we need) is extremely close to Sallust: *μ[ῆ] τ]ὸ μὲν* (sc. *ἐὰν αἰνήσω*) *ὦδ' [ε]π]ησαν*: [*δ' οὐδέπ[οτ'] ἐ]σθλὸν ἔλεξεν* (vel *ἔρεξεν*).

⁵⁰ We find the same sentiment at 6. 1: *cursu cum aequalibus certare et, quom omnis gloria antiret, omnibus tamen carus esse*.

⁵¹ Presumably at the end, when Callimachus turned back from Heracles and Molochus to his praises of Berenice.

⁵² Wilkinson (above, n. 8), p. 287; although presumably the opening three lines, recalling, as they do, the opening of the second book, always stood there.

Later, the work virtually completed, and with his mind 'full of Caesar's triumph' (Wilkinson), he composed the proem as it now stands, blending an epinician to Octavian with a programme for his own poetry, possibly with the temple he was to build standing as a glimpse forward to the epic to which he would devote the remainder of his life.⁵³

If this proem is seen as having as its primary reference Callimachean poetry – epinician as well as purely programmatic – then Virgil's intent becomes clearer. By the twenties the Callimachean programme, as it is best stated by Virgil himself in the opening lines of the sixth *Eclogue*, had (at any rate for this poet) served its purpose. With the aid of Callimachus and the Alexandrian poets in general, and through the filter of the Roman neoterics, Roman poetry had matured. In its attention to detail, its refusal to emulate classical genres and its focus on exclusiveness, it had achieved artistic perfection. Without Virgil the story might have ended here, with the creed one of ever-increasing concern for detail, poetic metaphor and recondite reference.

It was Virgil, and Virgil alone, who saw from within the ultimate barrenness of such an art, and it is the tension created by this vision that finds expression in the proem to the third *Georgic*. *Cui non dictus Hylas* – the rejection of Alexandrian, and particularly of Callimachean themes – is a heartfelt plea of justification for the apparent change which the *Aeneid* was to represent.⁵⁴ That this transition was presented (as has been our claim) through reminiscence of the opening of the third book of the *Aetia* makes it all the more pointed. So we return to the lines with which we began:

cuncta mihi Alpheum linquens lucosque Molorchii
 cursibus et crudo decernet Graecia caestu.
 ipse caput tonsae foliis ornatus oliuae
 dona feram.

(*Geo.* 3. 19–22)

The new Italian setting, with the Italian Virgil himself supreme, argues for the supremacy of the poem he is to create, and for the freedom that a now matured Roman poetry may enjoy. His periphrasis for Nemea, and possibly even the reference to Olympia,⁵⁵ in part specifies Callimachus as the ultimate addressee of the lines. Callimachean themes were no longer valid, as in the face of a new classicism the poetry of rejection, its function fulfilled, was itself rejected.

II. PROPERTIUS 3. 1

Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae,
 in vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus.
 primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos
 Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros.

(1–4)

⁵³ We may, of course, see the proem to the third *Georgic* as a pure *recusatio*, no more implying that an actual epic will follow than does Propertius 3. 1. The details and extent of Virgil's lines, however, seem to resist such a reading (as does the existence of the *Aeneid*).

⁵⁴ This change is reflected at the opening of the second half not only of the *Georgics*, but also of Virgil's other two poems. The progression seems deliberate: *cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthia aurem | uellit et admonuit: . . . | nunc ego . . . | agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam, Ecl.* 6. 3–8; *dicam horrida bella, | dicam acies actosque animis in funera reges | . . . maius opus moueo, Aen.* 7. 41–4. Between the refusal to sing of kings and battles (a result of attenuated stylistic concerns) and the preface to such themes (with the exhortation for a loftier strain), comes the proem to the third *Georgic*, the exact middle point of Virgil's career, looking both ways. This is not the place for a defence of the phrase, 'apparent change', but few, I trust, would deny that the *Aeneid*, or much of it, continues to be Callimachean in spirit, if not in the letter.

⁵⁵ In the same third book of the *Aetia* (*Eleorum Ritus Nuptialis*, fr. 76–77a Pf.) there seems to have been treatment of Heracles' founding of the Olympic games (see Pfeiffer, *Dieg.* 1, fr. 77). In this book, then, we have Heracles involved in both the Nemean and Olympic foundings.

The first poem of the third book⁵⁶ of Propertius begins and ends with Callimachus,⁵⁷ just as the *Monobiblos* did with Cynthia (*Cynthia prima...*). The polemical nature of this poem has long been acknowledged. Abundant in references to the poetry of Lucretius, Virgil and Horace,⁵⁸ it proclaims the superiority of the poet's Callimachean verse in the typical style of the *recusatio*. For our purposes, the specifically Virgilian references (which, incidentally, are more numerous than any others in Propertius' poem) are clearly of primary importance. The allusions are all to the poem of the third *Georgic* and, in that they occur within the framework of Propertius' declaration of allegiance to Callimachus, they may be seen as the elegiac poet's assertion of the importance of Callimachus, and as his acknowledgement of the Callimachean impulse behind the opening of the Third *Georgic*.

Wimmel has conveniently indicated most of the relevant connections, and we need only list them here:⁵⁹

Virg. <i>Geo.</i> 3	Prop. 3. 1
primus ego...deducam (10–11)	primus ego ingredior... (3)
temptanda uia est, qua me quoque possim tollere humo (8–9)	quo me Fama leuat terra sublimis (9)
Aonio...deducam uertice Musas (11)	opus hoc de monte sororum detulit intacta pagina nostra uia (17–18)
uirum uolitare per ora (9)	maius ab exsequiis nomen in ora uenit (24)
illi uictor ego et Tyrio conspectus in ostro centum quadriiugos agitabo ad flumina currus (17–18)	a me nata coronatis Musa triumphat equis, et mecum in curru parui uectantur Amores... (9–11)
Inuidia infelix Furias...metuet... (37–9)	at mihi quod uiuo detraxerit inuida turba post obitum duplici faenore reddet Honos (20–1)

Beyond these reminiscences in Propertius' first poem, there is also the opening of the second:

carminis interea nostri redeamus in orbem,
gaudeat in solito tacta puella sono.

(3. 2. 1–2)

Interea has caused some commentators trouble, in that Propertius never left off the writing of elegy.⁶⁰ But such a reading of these lines ignores the fiction of *recusatio*.

⁵⁶ I follow Lachmann in the view that Book 2 of Propertius is in fact a conflation of two books, and Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen* (Berlin, 1882), pp. 422–6, that at least in terms of publication the *Monobiblos* is to be separated from the rest of the collection. If so, and few now have any doubts, then 3. 1 is still to be considered the opening poem of the third book. O. Skutsch, 'The Second Book of Propertius', *HSCP* 79 (1975), 229–33, has in fact removed any doubts on the matter, but for those who do not believe in a *Monobiblos* and in the fact that the second book is a conflation, 3. 1 will still be 3. 1.

⁵⁷ *Lycio...de* (38), as has been recognized (W. V. Clausen [above, n. 30] 246), is intensely Callimachean (*Aet.* 1 fr. 1. 22, *Hymn* 4. 304) – 'only the self-styled Roman Callimachus dared use it'. It is, I think, in part a restoration of the Callimachean *Λύκιος*, following Virgil's substitution of *Cynthia* at *Ecl.* 6. 3 (for *Λύκιος* at *Aet.* 1 fr. 1. 22).

⁵⁸ Generally, see W. R. Nethercut, 'The Ironic Priest', *AJP* 91 (1970), 385–407; his concern is mainly with Horace.

⁵⁹ *Kallimachos in Rom* (above, n. 6), 216–18; I shall include only the undeniable references, although Wimmel has more possible ones.

⁶⁰ Camps, *Propertius, Elegies Book III* (Cambridge, 1966), ad loc., has a long note on the word, and Richardson, *Propertius, Elegies I–IV* (Oklahoma, 1977), ad loc., gives it the meaning 'from time to time' (based on Sil. 7. 395). His refusal to allow a close connection between 3. 1 and 3. 2 exposes a modern prejudice in the attitude towards divisions of poems. Clearly within a book of poetry (and particularly within a connected group of poems such as Propertius 3. 1–3) there can be reference to a context outside the immediate poem. One thinks perhaps of the Roman Odes where the second poem begins (*pauperiem*) with a reference to the end of the first (*diuitias*), as does the third (*iustum*) to the end of the second (*scelestum*).

And, moreover, the difficulties vanish if we recognize Propertius' source:⁶¹

interea Dryadum siluas saltusque sequamur.

(*Geo.* 3. 40)

With *interea*, Virgil made the transition from discussion of his future poetic plans to the subject at hand,⁶² and Propertius followed suit. A final indication: a few lines later both Virgil (*Geo.* 3. 43) and Propertius (3. 2. 5) have references to Cithaeron, a word which appears only once elsewhere in the corpus of each.

Propertius, then, at the beginning of his third book, deliberately recalled the proem to the third *Georgic* in order to validate his own poetic fame, and to argue for the supremacy of elegiac verse. At the same time, certain features of his poem (the poet as victor, the reference to *Inuidia* and its ultimate subjugation) are those which we have suggested were possibly elements of the *Victoria Berenices*. Propertius, moreover, presented all of this within the framework of a poem that begins, ends and is imbued with Callimachean poetic theory.⁶³ It seems reasonable to regard Propertius' conflation of Callimachean and Virgilian verse as further evidence for the presence of the Alexandrian poet in the proem to the third *Georgic*.

III. STATIUS, *SILVAE* 3. 1

With the exception of a passing reference in the *Panegyric to Messalla* (*Alcides* . . . | *laeta Molorcheis posuit uestigia tectis*, 12–13), Hercules' lowly host is not found after Virgil until Statius, who has three references – more than any other author. Here Parsons' observation should be kept in mind: 'In principle, then, all later mentions (of Molorchus) look back to Callimachus.'⁶⁴ Statius is unusual, possibly even unique, in standing with the Augustans in his appreciation of Callimachus. At *Silvae* 1. 2. 253 he sets his poetry in a tradition that includes Philitas, Callimachus and the Roman elegists. Indeed, if we are to believe him, this interest is a legacy from his father, a *grammaticus* and poet to whom Statius ascribes an early training in the allusive art of Callimachean and other poetry:

tu pandere docti
carmina Battiadae latebrasque Lycophronis arti
Sophroneaque implicitum tenuisque arcana Corinnae.

(*Stat. Silv.* 5. 3. 156–8)

Statius was clearly familiar with the details of the story, which is to say that he was presumably familiar with Callimachus' version of it:

dat Nemea comites, et quas in proelia uiris
sacra Cleonaei cogunt uineta Molorchi.
gloria nota casae, foribus simulata salignis
hospitis arma dei, paruoque ostenditur aruo,
robur ubi et laxos qua reclinauerit arcus
ilice, qua cubiti sedeant uestigia terra.

(*Theb.* 4. 159–64)

The passage is far from ornamental. *Cleonaei* . . . *Molorchi* is original in Latin,⁶⁵ the

⁶¹ Wimmel briefly noted the connection (above, n. 6), 217.

⁶² Precisely the same pattern is found in the tenth *Eclogue*, where Gallus' future poetic project (*ibo et Chalcidico quae sunt mihi condita uersu* . . . 50–1; cf. *Geo.* 3. 10, *primus ego in patriam mecum* . . . | *deducam* . . . *Musas*) is interrupted by his present task (*interea mixtis lustrabo Maenala Nymphis*, *Ecl.* 10. 55).

⁶³ See Wimmel (above, n. 6), 215–16 for references in Prop. 3. 1 to the Aetia prologue and the Hymn to Apollo.

⁶⁴ 'V.B.' 43.

⁶⁵ Elsewhere we find the epithet applied to Hercules and to the lion (*TLL*, Onomast. 2. 490. 31 ff.)

adjective is Callimachean (*Κλεωναίοιο χάρωνος*, fr. 339 Pf.),⁶⁶ and so, no doubt, is its use with Molorchus.⁶⁷ Apart from this, the reference to the fame of the hut (*gloria nota casae*, 161), together with the details which follow, implies an acquaintance on the poet's part with the emphasis and details of Callimachus' treatment.⁶⁸

Of the other two appearances of Molorchus in Statius one (*Silv.* 4. 6. 51) comes in an ephrasis on a statue of Hercules owned by Novius Vindex.⁶⁹ The statue is praised for its artistry, its dimensions are given, and in many ways the poem has its source in the Callimachean interest in the plastic arts.

Potentially, then, reference in Statius to Molorchus is not merely casual. We can now turn to the final instance, which once again is found in the opening poem of a third book – *Silvae* 3. 1. Here the context is even more suggestive. The poem concerns construction of a temple of Hercules built by the wealthy Pollius Felix. Henceforth the hero will have no need of his former, dangerous haunts:

nec te Lerna nocens nec pauperis arua Molorchii
nec formidatus Nemees ager antraque poscunt
Thracia nec Pharii polluta altaria regis.

(*Silv.* 3. 1. 29–31)

Again, mere mention of Molorchus, together with allusive reference to Busiris (*Pharii... regis*), is sufficient to suggest Callimachus.⁷⁰ Other details are suggestive. The temple is contrasted with the lowly hut, once the seat of Hercules, which it is to replace:

stabat dicta sacri tenuis casa nomine templi
et magnum Alciden humili lare parua premebat.

(82–3)

One thinks of better-known *casae*, that of Molorchus (*gloria nota casae*, *Theb.* 4. 161), or, as relevant, the one which Baucis and Philemon exchanged for a temple:⁷¹

illa uetus dominis etiam casa parua duobus
uertitur in templum.

(Ovid, *Met.* 8. 699–700)

⁶⁶ It is used in Pindar as an epithet for the Nemean games (*Nem.* 4. 17) and for the local inhabitants (*Nem.* 10. 42), but the extension of its application seems to be Callimachean.

⁶⁷ A passage in Nonnus makes this certain; he is dealing with Brongus' hospitality towards Dionysus, and is reminded of a parallel situation:

τεύχων δείπνον ἀδειπνον ἀδαιτρεύτιο τραπέζης
οἶα Κλεωναίοιο φατίζεται ἀμφὶ Μολόρχου
κείνα, τὰ περ σπύδοντι λεοντοφόρους ἐς ἀγῶνας
ᾧπλισεν Ἡρακλήι.

(*Dion.* 17. 51–4)

Noun and epithet appear in the same position as at Stat. *Theb.* 4. 158, that is, at caesura and line-end. The last word of Callim. fr. 177 (The Mousetrap), which may be from the *Victoria Berenices*, is κλεωνί[. On this, see Livrea *et al.*, 'Il nuovo Callimaco di Lille' (above, n. 4), 234.

⁶⁸ See Parsons, 'V.B.', 43–4 and Bornmann (Livrea *et al.* [above, n. 4]), 247–51 for the tradition in which the *Victoria Berenices* belongs: gods or heroes entertained by humble hosts, with careful description of the details of the host's surroundings. Callimachus' own *Hecale*, Nonnus' Brongus and Ovid's Baucis and Philemon are the best examples. Parsons (44) urges some caution, in that Nonnus' reference to Molorchus (*Dion.* 17. 52) is immediately followed by a quotation from the *Hecale* (17. 55; Callim. fr. 248). Conversely, however, this may serve as additional evidence that Nonnus saw the two Callimachean episodes as parallel examples of the same tradition.

⁶⁹ The same statue (purportedly by Lysippus) appears in Martial (9. 43) where, once again, Molorchus also figures – one of two references in this poet.

⁷⁰ Busiris, we will recall, figured at the end of the second book of the *Aetia* (fr. 44–7), shortly before the *Victoria Berenices*.

⁷¹ The ultimate source is Eumaeus' κλισία, which he offers to Odysseus (*Od.* 14. 404, 408). Typically, Callimachus in the *Hecale* uses the word in the sense of 'cot' (fr. 256), while clearly

Hercules' temple is finely crafted, as befits the subject of an ecphrasis; indeed, it represents a *θαύμα* (*stupet ipse labores | annus, et angusti bis seno limite menses | longaeuum mirantur opus*, 19; *artifices mirantur opus*, 135).⁷² The structure, moreover, is treated in lofty, aetiological style, which perhaps recalls Virgil's metaphorical temple in the proem of the third *Georgic*:

sed quaenam subiti, ueneranda, exordia templi
dic age, Calliope. (*Silv.* 3. 1. 49–50)

Finally, again close in sense to Virgil's actual reference to Molorchus, the games held in the Italian arena around Hercules' temple will surpass their traditional Greek counterparts:

hos nec Pisaus honores
Iuppiter aut Cirrhae pater aspernetur opacae.
nil his triste locis; cedit lacrimabilis Isthmos,
cedat atrox Nemeae. (3. 1. 140–3)

We are back in the realm of epinician, and it is difficult to avoid recalling the Virgilian lines with which we began:

cuncta mihi Alpheum linquens lucosque Molorchi
cursibus et crudo decernet Graecia caesta. (*Geo.* 3. 19–20)

Synthesis is called for. Three Roman poets – Virgil, Propertius and Statius – each at the outset of the third book provide reference to Molorchus (Virgil and Statius), are influenced by epinician (Virgil, Propertius and Statius), allude to or mention Callimachus (Virgil⁷³ and Propertius), treat *Inuidia* and its failure to detract from the poet's art (Virgil and Propertius), or refer to an elaborately constructed *templum*, real or metaphorical, in a manner evocative of the Callimachean attitude towards the plastic arts (Virgil and Statius). In addition, in spite of the numerous points of contact between the passages of Virgil and Statius, there is no suggestion of any direct Virgilian influence on *Silvae* 3. 1. In short, an archetype seems to be indicated, and the one which potentially or in fact meets all the requirements is the *Victoria Berenices*.

IV. THE VICTORIA BERENICES

On the basis of Callimachean poetry, particularly of his epinician, and taking into account the influence of this poet on subsequent poets, we have suggested that certain elements will almost surely have figured in the entire episode. Doubtless the notion of *φθόνος* occupied some place in Callimachus' celebration of the victory, and it seems likely that Berenice's success was marked by some commemoration, possibly involving a dedication made in a temple, or possibly involving statuary. Here it may be relevant that the *Coma Berenices*, an episode which Callimachus intended to stand out as structurally parallel with the *Victoria*, contains a dedication, that of the lock itself: *τὸν Βερενίκης | βόστρυχον ὃν κείνη πᾶσιν ἔθηκε θεοῖς* (*Aet.* 4 fr. 110. 7–8). We are told, rightly or otherwise, that Berenice dedicated the lock in the temple of Arsinoë–Aphrodite at Zephyrium.⁷⁴ There are attested a number of offerings, both to and on

borrowing from the Homeric context. There can be no doubt that Molorchus' hut received extensive and literary treatment.

⁷² See below, p. 109 for this as a feature of ecphrasis.

⁷³ See above, pp. 93–101, for the implicit presence of Callimachus in the proem to the Third *Georgic*.

⁷⁴ *Aet.* 4 fr. 110. 54–8; *Cat.* 66. 54–8; Hygin. *Astr.* 2. 24; cf. Pfeiffer on *Dieg.* 5. 40.

behalf of Berenice, usually in the company of Euergetes, and sometimes with Isis, Sarapis and others.⁷⁵ At the same time, epigrams by Callimachus, Hedylus and Posidippus record dedications, real or fictional, to Berenice's dynastic mother, again in her capacity as Arsinoë-Aphrodite.⁷⁶ Such dedications, then, in connection with the Ptolemies, abound in literature as in fact, and it would be extraordinary if no such honour attended the queen's victory, more so if it were not treated by Callimachus in his epinician to her.

The proposition that there was indeed such a dedication leads to consideration of a difficult part of the *Victoria Berenices*, the opening fragment, which, although its context was not fixed, existed before the discovery of the Lille papyri. As *Ep. et Eleg. Min.* fr. 383 Pf. (= Parsons Text A) breaks off, the following text is preserved:⁷⁷

ημεν δὴ πο[
 και πάρος Ἀργεῖ[
 καιρωτούς τε[
 Κολχίδες ἢ Νεῖλω[ι
 λεπταλέους ἔξυσαν.[
 εἰδυῖαι φαλὸν ταῦρον ἠλεμίσαι
]υκων ὅτε[
 ]ν κομα[
]...[.]...[

15

(fr. 383. 11–18 Pf. = Parsons A 25–32)

This immediately follows the opening ten lines of the third book, lines in which the poet hails the actual victory of Berenice. The next point, either after an interval of one column or, more likely, straightaway,⁷⁸ places us *in medias res* with Heracles and Molochus (col. B(i)). Parsons notes on the above lines: 'Argos and Egypt in problematic context' (p. 7); and later: '25 ff. Argos; Colchian and Egyptian weavers. Callimachus may intend a simple parallel: formerly an Egyptian king (Danaus) ruled in Argos; now an Egyptian queen triumphs in the Argive games'.⁷⁹ While this is possible, it does not entirely account for what remains of the diction of these lines nor, if the epyllion followed immediately, does it help in recovering the means of transition from epinician to epyllion. What follows is a suggestion which, I trust, may fulfil both of these requirements.

Let us begin with the intuition of Pfeiffer: 'Call. de textilibus linteis antiquissimis Argivorum, ut de bugonia Nemeaea, ex libris *Περὶ Ἀργολικῶν*?'⁸⁰ The diction of these lines, fragmentary though they be, supports this suggestion, and it requires further examination. *καιρωτούς*, a hapax legomenon, appears to mean 'well woven'.⁸¹ Pfeiffer suggested as a supplement *τε[λαμῶνας]*;⁸² some form based on *τεχν-*

⁷⁵ For these see P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), ii. 194, 234, 263, 272.

⁷⁶ Callimachus, *Epigr.* 5 Pf.; Hedylus, *Epigr.* 4 (Page, OCT, ap. Athen. 11. 497d); Posidippus, *Epigr.* 12, 13 (Page, OCT). On these, see Gow–Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1965), ii. 168, 491.

⁷⁷ The line numbers are those of Pfeiffer (i.e. excluding the interlinear scholia of the Lille papyrus).

⁷⁸ On this question, see Parsons, 'V.B.', 39.

⁷⁹ Parsons, 'V.B.', 10; he also suggests, on p. 11, the possibility of a reference 'to Egyptian women or to formerly Egyptian (now Argive) women, who celebrate Berenice's victory'.

⁸⁰ Pfeiffer, on fr. 383. 16 – although we now know that the fragment is from the *Aetia*.

⁸¹ Pfeiffer, ad loc. The word occurs only here, although it is clearly related to an instance at *Od.* 7. 107 (*καιροσέων δ' ὀθονέων ἀπολείβεται ὑγρὸν ἔλαιον*) – *καιροσέων* also being unique. The Homeric lines will be dealt with shortly.

⁸² He compares adesp. *Anth. Pal.* 11. 125. 3: *ἀπ' ἐνταφίων τελαμῶνας*. Thus the reference would be to Apis' shroud. Now that we have a context for fr. 383, it is difficult to imagine how such a reference would operate.

(or even τευχ-) cannot be ruled out.⁸³ If so, the implications will have been that the weaving involved a high level of artistry. The same may be implied in line 14, *Κολχίδες ἢ Νείλωι*. As Pfeiffer has shown, the only known attribute shared by Colchian and Egyptian women is their ability and method in the working of yarn: *λίον... ἐργάζονται κατὰ ταῦτά*, Herod. 2. 105. And again, at line 15 of the fragment, we find the phrase *λεπταλέους ἔξυσαν*. For Callimachus the adjective (or its simple form, *λεπτός*) can have only one reference – to a highly finished object, in this case, presumably, to a finely spun piece of weaving.⁸⁴

Now the implications of these three lines should be clear.⁸⁵ Callimachus can hardly have been making a passing reference to weavers; what was obviously prominent, for it is what remains, was an emphasis on the excellence of the *product* of their industry. Support comes from Homer. At *Od.* 7. 86–111 the activities of Alcinous' serving women are described. Athena has given them supremacy in their art, weaving. Pfeiffer has suggested, correctly, that Callimachus had line 107 of this passage in mind when he wrote *καιρωτούς*.⁸⁶ But there appear to be further links with the entire passage:

ἔνθ' ἐνὶ πέπλοι
λεπτοὶ εὐνήητοι βεβλήατο, ἔργα γυναικῶν.
αἱ δ' ἰστοὺς ὑφώσιν καὶ ἡλάκατα στρωφῶσιν
ἤμεναι, οἷά τε φύλλα μακεδνῆς αἰγείροιο·
καιροσέων δ' ὀθονέων⁸⁷ ἀπολείβεται ὑγρὸν ἔλαιον.
ὄσσον Φαίηκες περὶ πάντων ἴδριες ἀνδρῶν
νῆα θοῖν ἐνὶ πόντῳ ἔλαυνέμεν, ὡς δὲ γυναικῆς
ἰστῶν τεχνῆσαι· πέρι γάρ σφισι δῶκεν Ἀθήνη
ἔργα τ' ἐπίστασθαι περικαλλέα καὶ φρένας ἔσθλας.

(Homer, *Od.* 7. 96–7, 105–11)

Both here, then, and in Callimachus, we find women, their activity (weaving), and diction (the first pair hapax legomena) suggesting the excellence of their art: *καιροσέων/καιρωτούς; λεπτοί/λεπταλέους*.

If, as I have argued, we are led to expect a dedication for Berenice's victory, then it seems plausible to suggest that it may have been the object whose vestiges appear at the end of Parsons' Text A, specifically that Callimachus in these lines referred to a peplos or tapestry of some kind offered in commemoration of the victory. Elaborately woven objects seem to have held a particular fascination for this poet. He clearly treated the most famous peplos of the ancient world, that of Athena, the centre of attention at the Panathenaic Festival.⁸⁸ Fragment 66, which also comes from the third book of the *Aetia*, deals with the prefatory rites to be performed by the young women who weave the robe of Hera at the Argive Heraeum.⁸⁹ In three other fragments (547, 640, 672) weaving appears in unclear contexts. This interest is doubtless connected with Callimachus' awareness of the metaphorical potential implied by this

⁸³ cf. in the same Odyssean passage containing *καιροσέων*: ὡς δὲ γυναικῆς | ἰστῶν τεχνῆσαι, 7. 109–10.

⁸⁴ In general, on the word, see E. Reitzenstein, 'Zur Stiltheorie des Kallimachos', *Festschr. R. Reitzenstein* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1931), pp. 25–40. It is perhaps of note that in the description of Achilles' shield (itself a well-crafted object) the adjective is twice used in reference to details presented by the poet: *λεπταλέη φωνῆ*, *Il.* 18. 571; *λεπτὰς ὀθόνας*, 595.

⁸⁵ The remaining lines, 12, 16 and 17, will be dealt with below.

⁸⁶ cf. above, n. 81.

⁸⁷ cf. also the garments on the shield: τῶν δ' αἱ μὲν λεπτὰς ὀθόνας ἔχον, *Il.* 18. 595.

⁸⁸ Fr. inc. sed. 520 and Pfeiffer, ad loc.

⁸⁹ Indeed, this may even have been the context of line 12 of the *Victoria Berenices*: καὶ πάρος Ἄργεϊ[(and before at Argos [the young women wove a robe for Hera]?). On this, see below, p. 111.

activity: elaborate weaving may stand for highly artistic poetic production.⁹⁰ Finally, there are preserved in the fragments two separate instances of robings of statues of the Graces.⁹¹ In the first the emphasis is on the beauty, and presumably the artistry, of these adornments: ἐν δὲ Πάρῳ κάλλη τε καὶ αἰδὸλα βεῦδε' ἔχουσαι (*Aet.* 1 fr. 7. 11 Pf.). The second instance is striking; it appears in Callimachus' only other extensively surviving epinician, the *Victoria Sosibii*:

“ἀμφοτέρων ὁ ξείνος ἐπήβολος· οὐκέτι γυμνάς
παῖδας ἐν Ἑραίῳ στήσομεν Εὐρυνόμης.”
(*Ep. et Eleg. Min.* fr. 384. 44–5)

Like Berenice, Sosibius has been successful in the chariot race, he however at both the Isthmian and Nemean games. In commemoration of this an unidentified speaker states that statues of the Graces in the Heraeum at Argos will receive robes or, more likely, that new statues, fitted out with robes, will be dedicated. Elsewhere in Callimachean epinician, then, we find *peploi*, possibly with statuary, dedicated in commemoration of the victor's achievement.⁹²

The suggestion is, then, that the woven object discernible at *Victoria Berenices* A 25–31 may have been a *peplos*, or other woven object, offered either on her behalf, or by the queen herself, in acknowledgement of her victory.⁹³

The obvious question remains: what has all of this to do with the epyllion on Heracles and Molochus? In other words, particularly if that portion of the poem followed immediately after Text A, how did Callimachus make the transition from epinician to epyllion? It is of course possible that he merely turned from the present to the mythical past, offering an action on the founding of the games. Yet other possibilities emerge which would, I think, account for the surviving fragments, particularly for the one with which we have been dealing. Could it be that the epyllion on Heracles and Molochus was an artistic ephrasis, an account in the manner of Catullus 64 of scenes woven into the fabric which was the subject of A 26–31? With our present state of knowledge this can only be a matter of hypothesis, and as we shall see there are serious objections, but since the 'source' ('impulse' is perhaps a more appropriate term) for Catullus 64 has been sought for two centuries, it is clearly a hypothesis worth pursuing.

As one critic has noted in a different and more general context, the style of ephrasis is often close to that of epyllion,⁹⁴ and in the case of Catullus 64 the two actually merge. This is true of our poem. The studied, artificial tone of the inner panel of the *Victoria Berenices*, what Parsons has referred to as a 'rococo exercise', and familiar from Theocritus' description of the cup or, again, Catullus' of the tapestry, may suggest an artificial setting. Callimachus' account of the devastated countryside, his description of Molochus' hut, aetiological treatment of the lion's affliction of Argos – all of these are consistent with poetic exegesis of a work of art.

So too with the structure of the *Victoria Berenices*. Under Parsons' reconstruction,

⁹⁰ cf. fr. 532: τῷ ἱκελὸν τὸ γράμμα τὸ Κώιον. On this question, see Reitzenstein (above, n. 84), *passim*; R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Ciris: a Poem Attributed to Vergil* (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 109–10.

⁹¹ And elsewhere (*Epigr.* 51) Callimachus in fact includes Berenice as the fourth Grace.

⁹² Pausanias reports that at the festival of Hera in Elis the women who weave the *peplos* hold a race and that the winning girls are entitled to dedicate statues of themselves: καὶ δὴ ἀναθεῖναι σφισιν ἔστι γραψαμέναις εἰκόνας, 5. 16. 3.

⁹³ Incidentally, Callixenus of Rhodes (*FGrHist* 627 fr. 2 = Athen. 196a–206c) recorded evidence of the Ptolemaic interest in elaborate tapestries, embroidered cloaks and the like. See Fraser (above, n. 75), p. 138.

⁹⁴ Lyne (above, n. 90), p. 110.

the entire episode was shaped thus: (a) outer story (Berenice's victory); (b) inner and prominent story (Heracles and Molorchus); (c) outer story (return to Berenice).⁹⁵ This pattern, where the inner section is presented as a digression, but in fact receives the focus and is intended to be predominant, is familiar from all other examples of extended ephrasis,⁹⁶ and can best be demonstrated from the most elaborate instance – again Catullus 64. The description of the tapestry is framed by the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, for Catullus the present narrative setting, with strictly responding diction supporting the structure, and bridging past and present: *haec uestis priscis hominum uariata figuris*, 50 (immediately before the ephrasis); *talibus amplifice uestis decorata figuris*, 265 (immediately after).⁹⁷ It is precisely this feature, or the traces of it, which appears in the *Victoria Berenices*: between (a) (Berenice) and (b) (Heracles and Molorchus) we find reference to an object woven with great artistry.

Elsewhere Callimachus seems to have realized the proximity of epyllion to ephrasis. In the *Hecale*, which of course shares more than a little with the account of Heracles and Molorchus, at one point the old woman appears to be relating to Theseus events from her past:

μέμνημαι καλὴν μὲν αἴ
ἄλλικα χρυσεῖησιν ἐεργομένην ἐνετῆσιν,
ἔργον ἀραχνάων...[

(*Hec.* fr. 253. 10–12 Pf.)

Not just any cloak, it seems. As Pfeiffer noted on *ἔργον ἀραχνάων*: ‘chlamys ita appellari posse videtur si est vestis “picturata” ut opera Arachnae *Ov. met.* VI 5 sqq., vel Verg. *A.* IV 137. V 250’.⁹⁸ As one critic has noted: ‘It seems...likely that what followed our fragment was an *ekphrasis*, put in the mouth of Hekale, of the scenes on this garment.’⁹⁹

The poetic ephrasis,¹⁰⁰ from Homer to Statius, and particularly from the Hellenistic period on, required two related features: first the claim, almost as a piece of advertisement, that the object in question is of outstanding artistry,¹⁰¹ and then the subsequent awe or amazement it evokes from those who are involved with it in the narrative. In each case, the object thus functions as a *θαύμα*, and it is usually specified as such. Here are some selective examples:

<i>Artistry</i>	<i>Marvel</i>
<p>πᾶν μὲν γὰρ κύκλῳ τιτάνῳ λευκῶ τ' ἐλέφαντι ἠλέκτρῳ θ' ὑπολαμπές ἔην χρυσῶ τε φαεινῶ</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Hes. <i>Asp.</i> 141–2)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>θαύμα</u> ιδέσθαι</p> <p>αἰπολικὸν <u>θάγμα</u>: τέρας κέ τυ θυμὸν ἀτύξαι</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Theoc. 1. 32)¹⁰² (56)</p>

⁹⁵ This sequence does not survive, but will certainly have figured (see Parsons, ‘*V.B.*’, 42).

⁹⁶ We need only mention the shields of Achilles and Aeneas.

⁹⁷ The responson does not stop here: at both ends there is admiration at the excellence of the artistry (*mira...arte*, 51; *spectando Thessala pubes | expleta est*, 267–8), together with parallel treatment of the arrival (31–44) and departure (267–77) of the mortal guests at the wedding.

⁹⁸ Pfeiffer, ad loc.

⁹⁹ H. A. Shapiro, ‘Jason’s Cloak’, *TAPA* 110 (1980), 270; he also points to Callimachus’ reminiscence of the description of Odysseus’ brooch at *Od.* 19. 226 ff. – itself a small-scale ephrasis.

¹⁰⁰ Still the best general treatment of this motif (and the only comprehensive one) is P. Friedländer, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentarius* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1912), pp. 1–103.

¹⁰¹ For most of the Greek examples of this feature see W. Bühler, *Die Europa des Moschos*, *Hermes Einzelschriften* 13 (1960), 85–6, 92–3.

¹⁰² In fact Theocritus here refers to the artistry of a single feature of the cup. Note too his variation of the *topos* at 15. 78–86 where the element of wonder (at the excellence of the tapestries) is contained within the general dramatic setting of the poem: τὰ ποικίλα πρᾶτων ἄθρησον, | λεπτά καὶ ὡς χαρίεντα· θεῶν περονάματα φασεις, 78–9.

<i>Artistry</i>	<i>Marvel</i>
ἐν δ' ἄρ' ἐκάστω τέρματι δαίδαλα πολλά διακριδὸν εὖ ἐπέπαστο (Apoll. <i>Arg.</i> 1. 728–9)	τῆς μὲν ῥηίτερόν κεν ἐς ἥλιον ἀνιόντα ὄσσε βάλοις, ἢ κείνο μεταβλέψειας ἔρευθος (725–6)
ἐν τῷ δαίδαλα πολλά τετεύχαστο μαρμαίροντα (Mosch. <i>Eur.</i> 43)	τάλαρον . . . μέγα θαῦμα (37–8)
tincta tegit roseo conchyli purpura fuco (Cat. 64. 49)	haec uestis . . . <i>mira</i> arte (50–1)
clipei non enarrabile textum ¹⁰³ (Virg. <i>Aen.</i> 8. 612–13)	postquam cupide <i>spectando</i> Thessala pubes <i>expleta est</i> (267–8)
	<i>expleri</i> nequit atque oculos per singula uoluit, <i>miraturque</i> (618–19)
	talia . . . <i>miratur</i> ¹⁰⁴ (730)

Returning to the *Victoria Berenices* with this tradition in mind, we find at the end of Text A (which is where the transition to ecphrasis would appear) traces of the first of these categories, that is the diction of artistic excellence: *καιρωτούς* (A 27); *λεπταλέους* (A 29).¹⁰⁵ What of the element of awe or wonder? The last intelligible line of Text A is independently preserved:

εἰδυῖαι φαλιὸν ταῦρον ἰηλεμίαι
(A 30)

‘Women who know how to wail for the bull (Apis)’, or, stated without the Alexandrian periphrasis, ‘Egyptian women’. This is merely a subject clause; it tells us nothing of the women’s present activity. We may get some help from Tibullus, whose reference to this line has long been realized:

te [sc. Nile] canit atque suum pubes miratur Osirim
barbara, *Memphiten plangere docta bouem*
(Tib. 1. 7. 28–9)

The Roman poet has taken Callimachus’ ornamental periphrasis and grafted it on to a new setting;¹⁰⁶ the Tibullan context, an aretalogy to Osiris, can hardly have been a part of the *Victoria Berenices*.¹⁰⁷ But there is a point of interest beyond Tibullus’ mere adaptation of the periphrasis: one of the activities of the women in his poem is their awe or admiration: *pubes miratur . . . | barbara*. If Tibullus took from Callimachus not only the periphrastic subject (Egyptian women) but also their activity (wonder), then the case for ecphrasis is strengthened, for in the vicinity of Callimachus’ women there appears to be a finely woven object. Again we think of those observing the tapestry in Catullus 64: *quae postquam cupide spectando Thessala pubes | expleta est* (267–8).

External arguments may be adduced for the possibility that Callimachus’ epyllion

¹⁰³ Virgil, perhaps as we would expect, is terse here, in fact applying the diction of artistic excellence not to the shield (which will speak for itself), but to Aeneas’ greaves: *tum leuis ocreas electro auroque recocto* (624) – a borrowing of the language Hesiod used of his shield (*Asp.* 142).

¹⁰⁴ In his use of *expleri*, and in framing the ecphrasis with a form of *miror*, Virgil is clearly acknowledging Catullus’ ecphrasis. So too of Dido’s temple murals: *miratur* (*Aen.* 1. 456); *miranda* (494) – both in framing positions.

¹⁰⁵ See above, nn. 81, 85.

¹⁰⁶ Tibullus’ reference is particularly learned in that only by recognizing the Callimachean source do we realize that *pubes* refers to a group of young women.

¹⁰⁷ On Tibullus’ poem, and particularly on the Egyptian elements in it, see L. Koenen, ‘Egyptian influence in Tibullus’, *Illinois Classical Studies* 1 (1976), 128–59.

was an ecphrasis.¹⁰⁸ In the case of Catullus 64, the fact that the story of Theseus and Ariadne was a popular theme in vase-painting doubtless helped the poet to conceive of a visual poem – that is an ecphrasis. The same can obviously be said of the encounter of Heracles with the Nemean lion.¹⁰⁹ Indeed, although Molorchus does not figure,¹¹⁰ an epigram ascribed to Damagetus (*Anth. Pl.* 95) is itself a miniature ecphrasis on the struggle between the hero and the lion. Moreover, Callimachus seems to have had Athena watching over the fight (*Victoria Berenices* fr. 57. 4 Pf.); as Parsons has noted,¹¹¹ vase-paintings often include the goddess as a witness.

As a coda I give a possible paraphrase of A 25–32 as the lines may have stood. Obviously the subjective element is increased, but I think respect is paid to the existing fragments: ‘Just as before at Argos [the young women] fashioned well-woven [pploi, sacred gifts for Hera,¹¹² and more skilfully than] Colchian or Egyptian women [who with great art] worked the slender [threads,¹¹³ so] the women who know how to bewail the bull [will marvel at your tapestry,¹¹⁴ Berenice,] when [the labour of the] silkworms (?)¹¹⁵ [is placed in commemoration of your victory].’

We noted that there are serious problems with this proposal. The first is that the body of the epyllion on Heracles and Molorchus is more in the nature of narrative than description, which militates against the possibility of its having been an ecphrasis. However, in the light of the audacity of the central panel of Catullus 64 (see below), it is not inconceivable that Callimachus could have departed radically from the traditional tone of ecphrastic description. As the reader for this journal has pointed out, we must also be able to conceive of a notional tableau accounting for the action

¹⁰⁸ It is again worth referring to the account of Callixenus of Rhodes (above, n. 93), dealing with a procession arranged by Ptolemy Philadelphus. His description of the details of the royal pavilion demonstrates that in actual life *uestes picturatae* abounded: . . . *καὶ χιτῶνες χρυσοῦφεις ἐφαπτίδες τε κάλλισται, τιῶες μὲν εἰκόνας ἔχουσαι τῶν βασιλέων ἐνφασμένας, αἱ δὲ μυθικὰς διαθέσεις* (Athen. 196f.). And the couch coverlets: *καὶ περιστρώματα ποικίλα διαπρηπῆ ταῖς τέχνας ἐπὴν* (197b). Finally the carpets: *ψιλαὶ δὲ Περσικαὶ τὴν ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν πόδων χώραν ἐκάλυπτον, ἀκριβῆ τὴν εὐγραμμίαν τῶν ἐνφασμένων ἔχουσαι ζῶδιων* (197b). With this as background, it is not difficult to imagine Callimachus setting the epyllion on Heracles and Molorchus in terms of an elaboration of a real or imaginary garment associated with the victory celebration of Berenice, dynastic daughter of Philadelphus. Gow (on Theoc. 15. 78) deals with the increase in elaboration of weaving at Alexandria, citing (*inter al.*) Plin. *HN* 8. 196: *plurimis uero licitis texere quae polymita appellant Alexandria instituit*.

¹⁰⁹ S. B. Luce, ‘The Nolan Amphora’, *AJA* 20 (1916), 460–73; Parsons, ‘*V.B.*’, 41.

¹¹⁰ It is, of course, the obscurity of the variant including Molorchus that appealed to Callimachus.

¹¹¹ Parsons, ‘*V.B.*’, 41.

¹¹² cf. above, n. 89 for this as a possible restoration (of sense at least). This possibility is perhaps strengthened by the fact that these women, or the prefatory rites they must perform, are the subject of an episode later in the same book of the *Aetia* (fr. 65–6).

¹¹³ See above, p. 107, for this as a skill shared by Colchian and Egyptian women.

¹¹⁴ If we have in this line Egyptian women admiring a tapestry, which is on display in commemoration of Berenice’s victory, then the situation has a fairly close parallel to the visit to the art-gallery in Theoc. 15.

¹¹⁵ I mention, with no real confidence, that line A 31 (. . .)*υκων ὄτε*() could possibly have referred, through periphrasis, to the material on which the scene appeared (*βομβύ*)*ύκων* . . . *ἔργον*). In the *Hecale*, the material on which an ecphrasis may have occurred is so referred to: *ἔργον ἀραχνῶν* (fr. 253. 12 Pf.). On the question of the working of silk (certainly under way by the Ptolemaic period), see G. M. A. Richter, ‘Silk in Greece’, *AJA* 33 (1929), 27–33. The *βόμβυξ* occurs as early as Aristotle (*HA* 5. 19); there is a full discussion of the creature and its product at Plin. *HN* 11. 75–7. Servius on Virg. *Geo.* 2. 121 is of interest: *uermes et bombyces. . . qui in aranearum morem tenuissima (= λεπταλέος, ‘V.B.’ A 29) fila deducunt, unde est sericum*.

of the epyllion. That, I think, is less serious. Heracles, Molochus, lion and possibly Athena would have to appear, as would the actual hut, and it is easy enough to imagine their having done so on a static picture. The rest would be up to the imagination of the poet.

Ultimately, however, the first of these objections may be overwhelming. And yet we are still left with the fabric of A 25–32. A final possibility remains: the poet may have mentioned the woven object offered for Berenice's victory, noting briefly that it contained the encounter of Heracles with the lion. This would then have provided a natural transition from epinician to epyllion ('For once upon a time...' [καὶ γὰρ ποτε...]) – elaboration of the subject matter of a work of art, if not an actual ecpheasis.

V. CATULLUS 64

Catullus 64 is a unique and curious poem. The events and scenes on the tapestry, which occupy more than 250 lines and constitute the central panel of the epyllion, are without precedent. In no other ecpheasis is the description of such proportions, nor do the figures involved in any other such work come to life and speak, acting as they do for Catullus like characters in a narrative poem. While the notion that Poem 64 is a 'translation' of a lost Hellenistic work has on the whole been laid to rest, *stylistically* a Hellenistic model does seem to be indicated. In short, the tone and attitude of the poem are Hellenistic, or rather, Alexandrian. As Friedländer noted: 'Es bedarf kaum eines Wortes, dass Catull diesen Stil nicht erfunden haben kann.'¹¹⁶ T. B. L. Webster, who thought Catullus 64 a translation, was otherwise perceptive in claiming: 'The source should therefore be sought in a poem which is certainly later than Apollonios and probably later than the *Hekale*.'¹¹⁷ Such a poem is the *Victoria Berenices*. It is from Callimachus that we would expect such influence on Catullus (the translator, after all, of the *Coma Berenices*, companion-piece of the *Victoria*), and it is from him that we would expect such extreme experimentation.¹¹⁸ The poet who presented himself in conversation with statues, and composed an *agon* between the olive and the laurel, will have felt at ease in allowing a work of art to come so fully to life. C. H. Whitman noted of the shield in *Iliad* 18 that the poet 'seems to stand a little bewildered between the realism of the finished panels, and the limitations of the material'.¹¹⁹ It is a mark of Alexandrian, and certainly of Callimachean, poetry that such bewilderment or discomfort has no place in the attitude towards art in poetry.

Ultimately the experiment failed to take hold. Whatever the source, this type of epyllion was a typical product of Alexandrianism – a thorough literary convention pushed to its extreme and thereby distinguished from earlier examples of the genre. Catullus attempted it as an experiment and, if my suggestion is possible, as a profession of his Callimachean allegiance. In this, as in other ways, he can be seen as transferring unaltered to Rome the essence of Alexandria.

Virgil, in spite of his deep admiration for Catullus' epyllion, drew only from its content, not from its stylistic peculiarities. Examples of the ecpheasis in his poetry, the murals in Dido's temple, Daedalus' doors, the shields of Turnus and Aeneas – and,

¹¹⁶ Friedländer (above, n. 100), 16.

¹¹⁷ T. B. L. Webster, *Hellenistic Poetry and Art* (Frome and London, 1964), p. 309.

¹¹⁸ On the late dating of the *Victoria Berenices*, see Parsons, 'V.B.', 50; C. Corbato (above, n. 4), 245.

¹¹⁹ *Homer and the Heroic Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), p. 205.

indeed, the temple of the third *Georgic*¹²⁰ – these, for all their claims for artistic perfection, represent a return to the more restrained convention. The Virgilian practice stands as an acknowledgement that the ephrastic epyllion of Catullus (and Callimachus?) was an experiment, an attempt to break from and surpass the inherited tradition, an attempt appropriate to Alexandrianism as to Roman neotericism, but one which was ultimately rejected by Roman classicism.

Harvard University

RICHARD F. THOMAS

¹²⁰ Indeed, among the objects in Virgil's temple, there is even a curtain into which human figures are woven: *uel scaena ut uersis discedat frontibus utque | purpurea intexti tollant aulaea Britanni*, 24–5. It is worth noting that Statius, *Silv.* 3. 1, for which we also claimed influence by the *Victoria Berenices*, is another ephrasis.