An unwilling separation.
A neglected supplement to Callimachus' *Coma Berenices*

Luigi Silvano*
Università degli Studi di Torino

Resumen:	Este articulo trata sobre una laguna al principio de la línea 40 del frg. 110 Pfeiffer (= 110 Harder [2012] = 213 Massimilla [2010]) de Calímaco, conocido como *El rizo de Berenice*. El autor tiene como objetivo de defender una integración propuesta por Lenchantin de Gubernatis y descartada por otros editores posteriores.
Abstract:	This article revolves on the initial lacuna in line 40 of Callimachus' frg. 110 Pfeiffer (= 110 Harder [2012] = 213 Massimilla [2010]), known as the *Lock of Berenice*. The author aims to defend a supplement proposed by Lenchantin de Gubernatis and discarded by all subsequent editors.
Palabras clave:	Calímaco, *Coma Berenices*, Catulo, *inuita*
Keywords:	Callimachus, *Coma Berenices*, Catullus, *inuita*

A fragment of what should correspond to line 40 of Callimachus' elegy on the *Lock of Berenice* has been preserved thanks to the first-century B.C. grammarian Philoxenus (fr. 102 in Theodoridis 1976) and the Byzantine etymologika which quoted the passage in question. Both the Alexandrian scholar and the medieval lexicographers were interested in the use of κάρη as a feminine singular. The *Etymologicum Gudianum* only cites εἴρεται δὲ γὰρ καὶ κάρη, φησὶν ὁ Καλλίμαχος θηλυκόν, while the *Genuinum* quotes the original text in full: εἴρεται γὰρ καὶ κάρη θηλυκόν, ὡς παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ·

σήν τε κάρην ὤμοσα σόν τε βίον.[1]

Philoxenus' quotation omits the beginning of the pentameter, which is lacking either a dactylic or a spondaic foot. This portion of the line is likely to have been discarded by the

---

[1] The edition in Chr. Theodoridis, 1976, p. 138 reads: "Et. Gen. AB s.v. θῆλυς (ex Orione), unde Et. Sym. [*immo* 'Magnae grammaticae'] cod. V ap. Gaisf. EM 1287 D, cf. EM 450, 30", and the apparatus *ad loc.* states that σήν is a correction by Sylburg of ἥν in the mss. On κάρη and on the expression "to swear by somebody's head", see G. Massimilla, 2010, pp. 472-473 and M. A. Harder, 2012, vol. 2, pp. 811-812. On this formula being a humorous variation of the official oath pronounced by queens, see R. Pfeiffer, 1932, p. 105; on the playfulness of this expression, see G. B. D'Alessio, 2018[4], p. 524 n. 38: "è naturalmente implicazione giocosa il fatto che a giurare per la testa siano i capelli, con meccanismo analogo a quello che fa giurare Apollo per se stesso in *Aitia* libro incerto fr. 114.5 [= 114.2 Harder]"; and M. A. Harder, *loc. cit.*, who adds that "the head could be thought to double as the lock's country".

grammarian (or its source) because it was not pertinent to the main focus of the quotation, i.e. the expression "to swear by someone's head and life". A suggestion to fill the gap in Callimachus' line was advanced by Lenchantin de Gubernatis (henceforth: Lenchantin), who proposed ἄκων, i.e. an equivalent of *inuita* in the corresponding line of Catullus' translation — therefore implying that the whole Latin pentameter consists in a *uerbatim* rendition of the Greek.[2]

In Catullus, these words are part of a solemn declaration pronounced by Berenice's tress with the aim of assuring its former mistress that its departure from her head was involuntary (c. 66.39-40):

> 39 inuita, o regina, tuo de uertice cessi,
> 40 *inuita*: adiuro teque tuumque caput.[3]

Given that the *persona loquens* in Callimachus as well is the queen's lock, Lenchantin's ἄκων would function as a predicative of that subject (be it expressed or not), elsewhere in the elegy referred to as βόστρυχος (v. 8) or πλόκαμος (v. 47, v. 62).[4]

Lenchantin's supplement, though not reprehensible from the point of view of signification, metrics and style (as we will see), was ignored by Pfeiffer and went unmentioned in all subsequent editions and commentaries.[5] In fact, it has been authoritatively dismissed by such scholars as W. Clausen and A. Barchiesi. Their main counter-argument was that such a way of supplementing a lacuna in a Greek text by means of what we read in its supposed translation is precisely the kind of old-fashioned and unproductive philological operation that should not be practised anymore,[6]

---

[2] M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis, 1928¹ (= 1933²), p. LXVI; note that the first publication ever of a papyrus copy of the *Coma* is G. Vitelli's 1929 edition of *PSI* 1092. E. A. Barber, 1936, p. 351 (and see the apparatus *ad loc.*) approved Lenchantin's supplement and included it in his own rewriting of the *Coma*. Joseph Justus Scaliger, who translated Catullus' poem into Greek in the 16ᵗʰ century, opted for ἀέκων as well (edition in F. Tissoni, 1993-1994, p. 206).

[3] Catullus' manuscripts do not bear any relevant variant for these verses. I reproduce the text and punctuation as given, e.g., by the authoritative editions of Mynors, 1958 (OCT), Thomson, 1997, and [Pérez Vega -]Ramírez de Verger, 2005.

[4] Though referred to in masculine terms, Callimachus' lock "seems to have suffered from" a sort of "(bi)sexual confusion" (R. Höschele, 2009, p. 150), in the sense that it is "enigmatically gendered" (B. Acosta-Hughes and S. A. Stephens, 2012, p. 233) and may be perceived as "a female rather than a male character" (M. A. Harder, 2012, vol. 2, p. 805, who suggests that the ambiguous references to masculinity might want to allude to "the more vigorous aspects of Berenice's character", as known, e.g., from Hyg. *Astr.* 2.24.2 and Justin. 26.3.2-8; see Harder, *ibid.*, pp. 810-811). L. Koenen, 1993, pp. 94-95 insists on "the almost sexual tension created by Kallimachos' male lock", whose "fate substitutes for, and replaces, the temporary separation of the queen from her brother and husband. Thus, the separation of the lock from the queen and the separation of the king from his sister-wife are functionally related". For a fuller treatment of this debated issue, see O. Vox, 2000; see also Hunter in M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter, 2005, p. 87; W. Hübner, 2018, pp. 130-133; and G. Massimilla, 2018, p. 466.

[5] R. Pfeiffer, 1949 (fr. 110), p. 114; G. Massimilla, 2010 (fr. 213), p. 148 (edition), p. 155 (apparatus), pp. 472-473 (commentary); M. A. Harder, 2012 (fr. 110), vol. 1, p. 290 (ed. and app.); vol. 2, pp. 810-811 (comm.). The same goes for the line by line comparison with Catul. 66 by J. Warden, 2006, pp. 102-103; and for the scholarly editions with translations by G. B. D'Alessio, 2018⁴ (fr. 110), p. 524; M. Asper, 2004 (fr. 125), pp. 174-175; and Y. Durbec, 2006 (fr. 110), p. 120-121. Given that line 40 does not survive in *POxy* 2258, it is absent in E. Lobel's 1952 edition.

[6] W. Clausen, 1970, p. 91; A. Barchiesi, 1997, p. 214; O. Vox, 2000, p. 178, elaborating on Barchiesi, also deems such an addition as illegitimate. Similar caveats are of course in principle indisputable, and are ubiquitous in recent scholarship on the *Coma*: see, for instance, E. Lobel, 1952, p. 70; S. West, 1985, p. 64 and n. 24; N. Marinone, 1997², p. 39 n. 18; P. Bing, 2009 [1997], p. 79 (and see n. 7 below); B. Acosta-Hughes and S. A. Stephens, 2012, p. 230; M. A. Harder, 2012, vol. 2, p. 794; M. S. Visscher, 2017, p. 219 (who however postulates, *ibid.* p. 220, the presence of Ἀσσυρίους in Callimachus based on Catul. 66.12 *Assyrios*: see also the discussion in M. S. Visscher, 2020, pp.143-147).

or that should be practised with "utmost caution";[7] furthermore, those sceptical of Lenchantin's supplement generally believe that Catullus' double *inuita* is likely to be an innovation by the Roman poet, whose "fondness for epanalepsis"[8] is well known, and does not prove the existence of a Greek counterpart, given that a similar repetition in *c.* 66.75-76 is unparalleled in the papyrus copy that preserves the correspondent verses of the Greek *Coma*.[9]

Not surprisingly, therefore, Lenchantin's conjecture found very few supporters in the following years.[10] Recently, it has received a timid endorsement by H. Pelliccia in an in-depth study that provides fresh material for discussion.[11] I too will try to argue in favour of Lenchantin's supplement, by briefly reconsidering (§1) the relationship between the Greek fragment and Catullus' translation, (§2) some parallel passages, and (§3) the suitability of ἄκων in relation to the meaning of the sentence and to the overall elegy, as well as to Callimachus' language and style.

§1. The problem of whether Catullus' *c.* 66 provides a faithful rendition of Callimachus' elegy, and to what extent it can be used to reconstruct the missing parts of the latter still remains open to debate. There is extensive literature on the subject,[12] and therefore I will limit myself to a few remarks thereon. Starting with Clausen's above-mentioned observation on Catullus' repetitions in *c.* 66.75–76 not being present in Callimachus, it has to be stressed that the whole passage appears to have been intentionally re-elaborated. Indeed, no-one, not even any among the supporters of the literal-rendition theory, denies that "Catullus does on occasion omit words or phrases, recast lines, and, though rarely, add something on his own".[13] This being said, if we look back at *c.* 66.40, we cannot but notice that it consists in a very close rendition of Callimachus'

---

[7] P. Bing, 2009 [1997], p. 82; see *ibid.*: "because of its astonishing accuracy in many places, Catullus' translation seems to offer a reliable guide to Callimachus' poem both as a whole and in particulars. Yet we have seen that reconstructions based on its authority have repeatedly proven badly mistaken" (see also *ibid* pp. 67 ff. for further observations on the issue). If used with caution, however, such an approach could lead to significant results in emending both texts, as shown for Catullus' in two recent contributions by K. M. E. Larsen (2017a and 2017b).

[8] H. Pelliccia, 2010-2011, p. 212; see also G. A. Sheets, 2007, pp. 204-205.

[9] W. Clausen, 1970, pp. 91-92. Compare οὐ τάδε μοι τοσσήνδε φέρει χάριν ὅσσον ἐκείνης / ἀσχάλλω κορυφῆς οὐκέτι θιξόμενος ~ *non his tam laetor rebus, quam* me afore *semper,* / afore me *a dominae uertice discrucior.*

[10] L. Koenen, 1993, p. 98 accepts it without discussion, as does R. D. Griffith, 1995, p. 48 n. 1, who knows it through E. A. Barber, 1936, p. 351.

[11] H. Pelliccia 2010-2011, with new supporting arguments, most of which I find convincing (see below).

[12] R. Pfeiffer ("by far the most forceful advocate of Catullus' accuracy in this century", as P. Bing, 2009 [1997], p. 70 puts it), was of the idea that "Catullus convertit non ut poeta sed ut interpres... fidelis interpres" (1932, p. 35). Pfeiffer's opinion was shared, among others, by J. Coman (1936, pp. 50-65), D. Braga (1950, esp. pp. 125-128), D. E. W. Wormell (1966, p. 196), O. Zwierlein (1987, pp. 274-275), N. Marinone (1997², esp. pp. 34-39 and 51-54), D. F S. Thomson (1997, p. 447); and finally by W. Clausen himself, who on the one hand underlines that Catullus does not hesitate "to depart from [his model] where he had to or wished to", but on the other admits that he "tends to follow Callimachus closely", and that at times provides "remarkably close translation[s]", as in the case of vv. 40 and 47-48, where striking rhythmic and lexical correspondences can be noted (1970, p. 88; for a similar view see B. Axelson, 1960 [1987], p. 313; I. K. Horváth, 1962; A. Spira, 1975). Others, as Th. S. Thorsen, insists on Catullus' as "artistic translations", but nonetheless characterized by the concern to remain close to the original, as demonstrated by the choice of reproducing even the metrical form of its models (2019, pp. 81 and 84). Other scholars prefer to underline the differences between Callimachus' *Coma* and *c.* 66, arguing in favour of a high level of re-elaboration in Catullus' rendition: see e.g. M C. J. Putnam (1960 [repr. 1982], p. 88), R. Avallone (1961, p. 24), A. Salvatore (1965, pp. 269-286), D. A. Kidd (1970, pp. 42-43), S. West (1985, p. 64), G. O. Hutchinson (1988, pp. 322-323), S. Jackson (2001, pp. 1-2), M. S. Visscher (2017, p. 220, who suggests that "Catullus' translation can be used to reconstruct the broad meaning, if not the precise wording, of Callimachus' text when the Greek is missing": but see above, n. 6). Finally, M. De Wilde (2008, pp. 165-166), based on quantitative data concerning word equivalences, similarities in metrical patterns and word order, and the extent of lexical alterations and cultural adaptations, argues that Catullus has followed "a *uia media*" between literalness and freedom.

[13] D. E. W. Wormell, 1966, p. 197 (see *ibid.* and p. 198 for a discussion of Catullus' innovations).

oath-formula as attested by Philoxenus: the three elements of the oath, i.e. the verb in the first person singular (ὤμοσα / *adiuro*),[14] the double accusative of the elements involved in the oath, i.e. the head and (the life of) the "you" addressed by the poetic voice, to whom it belongs: σήν... κάρην... σόν... βίον / *te... tuum caput*),[15] and the copulative coordination (τε... τε / *-que... -que*) all find their equivalent in the Latin text.

Let us now briefly examine the rest of the fragments and their treatment by Catullus. Looking at the scant remains of the Greek corresponding to *c.* 66.44, one might cautiously suggest that in this case the Roman poet might have transposed *uerbum e uerbo* an entire line of his model: cf. ἀμνά]μω[ν Θείας ἀργὸς ὑ]περφέ[ρ]ετ[αι ~ *progenies Thiae clara superuehitur* (again a pentameter, with the four terms in the same sequence and metrical pattern).[16] Moreover, in several instances Catullus placed a literal correspondent of the original Greek in the same *sedes* of his verses. This occurs especially in emphatic positions, such as at the beginning and at the end of a line, or in proximity to metrical pauses:[17] see 1 πάντα ~ *omnia* (first *sedes*); 7-8 με... / βόστρυχον ~ *me... / ...caesariem* (reproducing the hyperbaton, but dislocating the second word from the beginning to the end of the pentameter);[18] 46 Ἄθω ~ *Athon* (final *sedes*);[19] 47 τί ~ *quid* (first *sedes*), ὅτε ~ *cum* (after the caesura *katà tòn tríton trochàion*), τοῖα ~ *talia* (fifth *sedes*);[20] 48 Χαλύβων ~ *Chalybon* (before the caesura in the pentameter); 51 κόμαι ~ *comae* (before the caesura *semiseptenaria*), ἀδε[λφεαί ~ *sorores* (final *sedes*);[21] 53 Μέμνονος Αἰθίοπος ~ *Memnonis Aethiopis* (second half of the pentameter, with isometry[22]); 54 Λοκρικός[23] ~ *Locricos*[24] (after the caesura in the pentameter); 57 ⌊αὐτή⌋ ~ *ipsa* (first *sedes*), Ζεφυρῖτις ~ *Zephyritis*

---

[14] The present indicative in Latin introduces the action of swearing as simultaneous with the utterance, and can in addition convey a notion of timelessness (see e.g. H. Pinkster, 2015, pp. 395-399), just as the 'tragic' or 'instantaneous' aorist of the Greek, here used to express a non-past value, meaning 'I swear' (A. Nijk, 2016, p. 97) and representing "an event as bounded within the immediate scope of the here and now" (*ibid.*, p. 110). J. Warden, 2006, p. 103 instead sees an opposition between the two tenses in this passage, the aorist bearing the notion of "narrative of the event" and the present that of "a continuing asseveration".

[15] I agree with J. Warden, 2006, p. 103 that "Catullus' reversal of order with *caput* at the close brings [...] to our attention" the "particular significance" of the head in this passage, as the very place of origin of the *coma*. Conversely, R. Avallone, 1961, p. 29 insists on the variations (indeed "lievi variazioni") in the rendition of the verse (present tense vs Greek aorist; "your life" vs "you"; the different order of the elements).

[16] Note, however, that the line has been almost completely reconstructed based on Catullus; on its metrical pattern see M. De Wilde, 2008, p. 154.

[17] For a similar assessment, see again D. E. W. Wormell, 1966, pp. 196-197. On Catullus' tendency to maintain proper names, and to a lesser extent verbal forms in the same verse position as in the Greek, see J. Coman, 1936, pp. 59-61; *contra* P. Bing, 2009 [1997], pp. 72-73. In the following, I omit words or expressions translated literally but without a correspondence in word-order or position in the verse (see e.g. vv. 47-48, 77-78 etc.).

[18] As J. Warden, 2006, p. 101 points out, Catullus might have wanted to reproduce the alliteration of kappas and nasals in the Greek with recurrent *c*, *m* and *n*: ἦ με Κόνων ἔβλεψεν ἐν ἠέρι τὸν Βερενίκης βόστρυχον ὃν κείνη πᾶσιν ἔθηκε ~ *idem me... Conon caelesti in lumine... / ... Bereniceo uertice caesariem*. On *caesaries* not being a perfect equivalent of βόστρυχος see M. Lenchantin, 1933², p. LXXX (who argues that a more suitable rendition would be *cincinnus*) and A. Salvatore, 1965, p. 273.

[19] As noted by J. Warden, 2006, p. 104, "Μηδείων... Ἄθω brackets the pentameter" in Callimachus, whilst in Catullus *cum Medi... Athon* "brackets the whole couplet".

[20] Note the alliteration of τ in Callimachus and *t* in Catullus: τί... ὅτ... τοῖα ~ *...facient... talia... cedant*. J. Warden, 2006, p. 104 instead compares Callimachus' consonant template, insisting on κ χ ξ, to Catullus' *qu c f*.

[21] On the translation of this line in particular, see G. Massimilla, 2018; on the affinity of the respective patterns (Call.: dsdd; Catul.: ssdd) see M. De Wilde, 2008, p. 154.

[22] See M. De Wilde, 2008, p. 154.

[23] This is the reading of *PSI* 1092, adopted by N. Marinone, 1997² and M. A. Harder, 2012; G. Massimilla, 2010, opts for Λοκρίδος (however, p. 155, "dubitantissime").

[24] Catullus' mss. OG read *elocricidos*; *Locricos* is the emendation by Achilles Statius, adopted by N. Marinone, 1997² and others; several editors, among whom D. F. S. Thomson, 1997, prefer Bentley's *Locridos*.

(before the caesura *katà tòn tríton trochàion*); 58 Κ]ανωπίτου ναιέτις α[ἰγιαλοῦ[25] ~ *Canopitis*[26] *incola litoribus* (the last four feet of the pentameter); 70 πολ]ι̣ῆι Τη[θύϊ[27] ~ *canae Tethyi* (before and after the caesura in the pentameter); 73 ἀ[στ]έρες ~ *sidera* (fifth *sedes*); 75 ⌊οὐ⌋ ~ *non* (first *sedes*); 94 Ὑδροχ[οεῖ]... [Ὠαρίων][28] ~ *Hydrochoi... Oarion.*[29] For this reason, one cannot exclude that *inuita* at the beginning of line 40 might indeed represent a literal transposition of a corresponding word in the same *sedes* of Callimachus' elegy.

As previously mentioned, the first word in line 40 of Catullus' poem, *inuita*, represents an anadiplosis of the same word in line 39: such a repetition in strong position, at the beginning of two lines composing an elegiac couplet, gives much emphasis to the message which these words are meant to transmit, i.e. the lock's unwillingness to be severed from its former owner. Such a rhetorical device might well have been an innovation by Catullus, for, as mentioned above, epanalepsis was one of his favourite rhetorical devices,[30] and he might have introduced it to enhance the scene's pathos;[31] however, one cannot exclude that here too he reproduced something he found in the model,[32] given his treatment of the rest of line 40. Even some of the scholars who are sceptical about emending a corrupted text on the basis of a (presumed) translation of it admit that what is lacking here might precisely be a statement indicating the frustration of the lock at being separated against its own will from the head of Queen Berenice.[33]

§2. Not only there appears to be great consensus that such notion of unwillingness was expressed in some form by Callimachus in this line, but it is generally assumed that such an utterance might have resembled Sappho's fr. 94.5 Voigt Ψάπφ', ἦ μάν σ' ἀέκοισ' ἀπυλιμπάνω

---

[25] M. Dominicy, 2018, 1573-1574 proposes ναιέτις Ἑλλὰς ἄκρου (the adjective would correspond to Lachmann's *Graia* for the vulgate *grata* at the beginning of the line).

[26] *Canopitis* was suggested by Achilles Statius and is accepted by N. Marinone, 1997² and others (cf. *canopicis* GR, *conopicis* O); D. F. S. Thomson, 1997 and others prefer *Canopeis*.

[27] E. Lobel's (1952) tentative emendation was adopted by N. Marinone (1997²), but subsequently confined to the apparatus by G. Massimilla (2010) and M. A. Harder (2012).

[28] Instead of E. Lobel's Ὑδροχόος, accepted by all editors, I incline for Ὑδροχοεῖ, proposed by M. Dominicy, 2018, p. 1580 (and cf. pp. 1585-1586), who is perhaps also right in supplementing an elided ἄμα as an equivalent of *proximus* (*ibid.*).

[29] Literal correspondents of the vulgate *fulguret* (*fulgeret* V) to fill the beginning of the second hemiepes of the pentameter have been proposed by N. Marinone (1997²: φάε κ᾿) and M. Dominicy (2018, p. 1580: φλέγοι). A further parallel might result from 55 δι᾿ ἠέρα δ᾿ ὑγρόν ~ *per aerias... undas*, if we accept the emendation suggested by K. M. E. Larsen (2017b, p. 523), whilst the vulgate reading is *per aetherias... umbras* (as in D. F. S. Thomson, 1997; *per aetherias... undas* Zwierlein, *prob.* N. Marinone, 1997²).

[30] See above, n. 8.

[31] He made a similar choice in vv. 75-76, where K. Gutzwiller, 1992, p. 381 observes an "enhancement of the pathos of the lock's regret". On Catullus deepening the pathos and "making the lock's plight more urgent, more like that of the poet", see also R. Pfeiffer, 1932, p. 182; M C. J. Putnam, 1960 (repr. 1982), p. 88 (hence the quotation); M. Puelma, 1982, p. 241 n. 59; M. B. Skinner, 2003, p. 35.

[32] According to M. A. Harder, 2012, vol. 1, p. 44, "repetition of words... is quite rare in the *Aetia*, but one may point to e.g. fr. 1.33 ἵνα γῆρας ἵνα δρόσον and 25e.1f. ἄρνες τοι, φίλε κοῦρε, συνήλικες, ἄρνες ἑταῖροι ἔσκον. Since Callimachus makes use of these devices rather sparingly, it seems to be an effective means of drawing the reader's attention to something special". Such may have also been the case with an '*invitus*-statement' by the lock, given the significance of this concept throughout the elegy.

[33] See e.g. A. Barchiesi, 1997, p. 215: "non escluderei che Callimaco già avesse qualcosa come *invitus*"; O. Vox, 2000; B. Acosta-Hughes and S. A. Stephens, 2012, p. 232: "*adiuro teque tuumque caput* certainly renders fr. 110 Pf. [...]; therefore it is reasonable to assume that the first line [*scil.* of this couplet] existed in some form in Callimachus"; M. A. Harder, 2012, vol. 2, p. 810: "Since 40 shows that Catullus' oath followed Callimachus very closely it is likely that the notion of an involuntary departure was also in Callimachus". Others do not take a clear position (see e.g. M. J. Edwards, 1991, p. 261 n. 5: "it is usually assumed, perhaps on insufficient grounds, that the Callimachean original would have contained the Greek equivalent of the Latin").

("Sappho, truly I leave you against my will", perhaps spoken by a girl who is leaving the thiasos to get married).[34] Here the poetic situation, just as in the *Coma*, revolves around the unwilling departure of the *persona loquens* from her mistress.

As H. Pelliccia rightly points out, both in Callimachus' line and in other parallel passages that might be reminiscent of it and contain scenes of a forced and abrupt separation, expressions indicating unwillingness are associated with an oath-formula (or an "oath-like combination of particles", as in Sappho): such is the case in Verg. *A.* 6.458-460 (*...per sidera iuro, / per superos et si qua fides tellure sub ima est, / inuitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi*: Aeneas' farewell to Dido in the underworld)[35] and in Q.S. 10.285-286 (...σε πάρος λίπον ἐν μεγάροισι / χήρην οὐκ ἐθέλων περ...: Paris speaking to Oenone, whom he abandoned for Helen).[36] It is worth noting that in both instances separation is said to have happened through the will of the gods (just as the lock's *katasterismós* took place at the hands of Aphrodite).[37] Further comparanda are provided by E. *Andr.* 981 (σῶν δὲ στερηθεὶς ᾠχόμην ἄκων γάμων, says Orestes to Hermione) and *Alc.* 388-389 ([Αδ·] ...μὴ λίπῃς παῖδας σέθεν. / [Αλ·] οὐ δῆθ᾽ ἑκοῦσα γ᾽...: a dialogue between Admetus and Alcestis on the latter's deathbed), and by Ar. *Eq.* 1250-1251 (ὦ στέφανε, χαίρων ἄπιθι, σ᾽ ἄκων ἐγὼ / λείπω, says the Paphlagonian to his garland, which he must surrender to the sausage seller). What is significant in these three passages (for which there is no need to postulate intentional allusions to Sappho) is the presence of a recurrent "*inuitus*-language" that is typically used for episodes of coerced, harsh and inevitable departure occurring between lovers or beloved ones (be they human or not: in this respect, Aristophanes' garland anticipates Callimachus' lock).[38] A further argument, indeed less cogent, *pro* ἄκων would be the presence of an expression indicating "against my will" in A.R. 4.1021 (μή... ἐθέλουσα, pronounced by Medea to assure Queen Arete that she did not leave Colchis to follow Jason willingly, but rather because Hera had frightened her), again in a scene of involuntary separation which has been interpreted as echoing this verse of the *Coma*.[39]

---

[34] After O. Vox, 2000, pp. 178-179, interpreters tend to consider this derivation undisputable (see e.g. M. A. Harder, 2012, vol. 2, p. 811; R. Hunter, 2019, p. 51). According to B. Acosta-Hughes and S. A. Stephens, 2012, p. 232 the Sappho passage "encompasses the departure of one female figure from another, lament and tragic exclamation [...] memory of time spent together with imagery of flowers and perfume, some recollection of sexual intimacy" (see already B. Acosta-Hughes, 2010, p. 67). The same elements are present in the *Coma* (departure, lament, memory, perfumes and perhaps sexual relations as well, if one assumes the masculine nature of the lock as a substitute for the missing husband: cf. above n. 4, and below n. 44) and apply to the relationship between Berenice and her lock. On Sappho's fragment see now Neri, 2021, esp. pp. 726-727.

[35] On this passage being an "obvious imitation" of Catullus, see e.g. P. E. Knox, 2007, p. 163 (hence the quotation) and M. Puelma, 1982, p. 241 n. 60; for a more nuanced perspective, see A. Barchiesi, 1997, pp. 212-215; B. Acosta-Hughes, 2010, p. 76; and H. Pelliccia, 2010-2011.

[36] See H. Pelliccia, 2010-2011, pp. 152-154 also on the *uexata quaestio* whether Vergil influenced Quintus Smyrnaeus (an opinion toward which Pelliccia inclines) or vice-versa (on the issue, see also C. A. Maciver, 2011, esp. pp. 691-693, with further bibliography; and p. 600, with reference to Q.S. 14.156-158; 702-703); in addition, H. Pelliccia, 2010-2011, p. 153 n. 12 suggests a further possible parallel in Q.S. 4.388 (on Theseus' unwilling abandonment of Ariadne: Μίνωος κούρην ἐρικυδέα, τήν ποτε Θησεὺς / κάλλιπεν οὐκ ἐθέλων).

[37] See H. Pelliccia, 2010-2011, p. 154, with reference to Q.S. 10.268b and Verg. *A.* 6.460; see *ibid.*, *passim* for the theme of unwilling departure from Euripides to Hellenistic authors and for other examples in poetry of the '*invitus*/abandonment utterance' that Callimachus might have known, such as Archil. fr. 5 W. (κάλλιπον οὐκ ἐθέλων, said of the shield).

[38] H. Pelliccia, 2010-2011, p. 161; see here, *passim*, for a classification of possible reasons for the separation; further *loci similes* which I deem less significant for our purposes are discussed in M. Puelma, 1982, *passim*.

[39] This comparandum, firstly proposed by R. Hunter, 1995, pp. 24-25 (and again 2019, p. 51), seems pertinent to A. Barchiesi, 1997, p. 214; B. Acosta-Hughes, 2010, p. 48; and M. A. Harder, 2012, vol. 2, p. 811; *contra* O. Vox, 2000, pp. 178-170 observes that "sembra forzato il confronto proposto fra l'espressione callimachea, nella versione catulliana, e la smentita della Medea apolloniana, di fronte alla regina Arete, di aver seguito Giasone

§3. Another line of reasoning supporting Lenchantin's hypothesis comes from the analysis of the meaning, language and style of Calllimachus' passage. As has been observed, the main theme in the lock's "*Klage der Verlassenen*"[40] is its desire to be rejoined with the queen's head of hair;[41] if we trust Catullus' vv. 89-93, the elegy ended with a request to Berenice prompted by the lock itself, asking her to implore Venus to grant it to be restored as *coma regia*.[42] This key concept is reinforced by the rhetorical and pathetical question of vv. 46-47, by means of which the lock tries to find a justification for its incapability to resist the cutting iron (τί πλόκαμοι ῥέξωμεν...;),[43] as well as by lines 75-78, where the lock grieves for no longer having the chance to touch Berenice's head or to experience the perfumes and oils which are so common to married women (ἐκείνης / ἀσχάλλω κορυφῆς οὐκέτι θιξόμενος, / ἧς ἄπο, παρθενίη μὲν ὅτ' ἦν ἔτι, πολλὰ πέπωκα / λιτά, γυναικείων δ' οὐκ ἀπέλαυσα μύρων).[44] If reluctance plays such a central role in the elegy,[45] nothing refrains us from supposing that Callimachus might have begun line 40 with a statement corroborating such a feeling, which would then immediately be bolstered by the oath-formula that follows.[46]

Let us now focus on the adjective ἄκων / ἀέκων. It is found several times in Callimachus, though not as a verse-initial word,[47] both in the contracted (Attic) form supplemented by

---

[40] Cf. M. Puelma, 1982, p. 240.

[41] This may be interpreted, with Hunter in M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter, 2002, p. 111, as the "desiderio di voler tornare ad essere l'*aition* di se stesso (ossia parte della chioma della regina), e non più il fenomeno astrale che da quell'*aition* deriva" (see also Hunter in M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter, 2005, p. 88).

[42] The *constitutio textus* of Catul. 66.93 is highly problematic, but the final words, *coma regia fiam*, are certain; see the discussion and list of conjectures in N. Marinone, 1997², pp. 224-227 and the reappraisal in A. Fo, 2018, pp. 929-923. Further emendations are proposed by M. Dominicy, 2018, pp. 1580-1584.

[43] For more on this, see O. Vox, 2000, p. 180; G. Massimilla, 2010, p. 477; M. A. Harder, 2012, vol. 2, p. 818.

[44] I do not agree with H. Pelliccia 2010-2011, p. 191 n. 118 (elaborating on O. Vox, 2000) that here the lock would be playing the role of "the young husband who has not gotten enough" (a hypothesis not taken into consideration by G. Massimilla, 2010 or M. A. Harder, 2012, vol. 2, *ad loc.*).

[45] See also the statement by the sister-locks (and note the use of the feminine, whilst the *persona loquens* is masculine, at least grammatically), who are said to miss the *plokamos* that has been severed: line 51, ἄρτι νεότμητόν με κόμαι ποθέεσκον ἀδελφεαί (in the words of É. Prioux, 2011, pp. 207-208, here "the lock, which can play a double role as the absent royal husband lamenting his separation from his queen, significantly evokes the lament of his 'sisters', the other royal locks, thus doubling the motif of the love that Berenice II and Ptolemy III have for each other, the supposed brother and sister separated by the Third Syrian War"). As G. Massimilla, 2010, p. 481 observes, this expression seems to reflect the gesture of tearing out one's own hair typically associated – notably in funerary epigrams – with women's lamenting the loss of their dearest ones; according to M. A. Harder, 2012, vol. 2, pp. 822-823, the line may indeed "evoke the setting of an epithalamium, where girls mourn the loss of one of them who is getting married, as in Sapph. fr. 96.6 ff.". In addition, the iterative form of the verb would suggest "incessant mourning of the sister-locks", whereas ἀδελφεαί would point to "a close and affectionate community" (*ibid.*). Cf. also, as a further theme of the locks' lamentation, the curse on the Chalybes inventors of the iron tool (vv. 48-50).

[46] Cf. B. Acosta-Hughes and S. A. Stephens, 2012, p. 232.

[47] In Homer there are no examples of ἄκων at the beginning of a hexameter, but only after a *caesura*; however, ἄκουσαν can be found at the head of the verse in *hymn. Caer.* 413. Conversely, ἄκων is frequent in the tragic and comic poets: see the discussion in H. Pelliccia, 2010-2011, p. 211, who also points out a parallel for ἄκων at the beginning of a hexameter in a sepulchral epigram (*epigr.* 11.3 in É. Bernand, 1969 [*IMEGR*], p. 81 = *epigr.* 1002.3 in W. Peek, 1955 [*GVI*], p. 280), possibly from Naucratis or Alexandria and dating II-I c. B.C. (Wace, quoted by Bernand *ibid.*, judging by the style of the relief; Peek) or I c. A.D. (Jouguet, based on the script – quoted by É.

---

volontariamente [...]; anche lì si registra un colloquio da donna a donna, ma senza rapporti affettivi preesistenti, e Medea vi deve affrontare la questione ufficiale, legalistica, della responsabilità nell'essersi allontanata dai genitori, per giustificare il suo status di donna ancora non sposata". For a parallel between these verses by Apollonius Rhodius and Q.S. 10.284-285, see C. A. Maciver, 2011, pp. 697-698; on the dating of the *Argonautica* see J. Murray, 2014.

Lenchantin (in *Epigr.* 42.2 Pfeiffer) and in the non-contracted form.[48] Moreover, it is worth noting that a line beginning with ἄκων would result in a pattern of initial spondaic plus dactylic, which is well attested in the elegy's pentameters (at vv. 46, 48, 50, 76).[49]

If we suppose that in Callimachus, as in Catullus, an '*invitus* statement' in line 40 was a part of (or referred to) a preceding phrase concerning the separation from Berenice's head, we must then concur, that, as in Catullus, a pause would be required after that, before introducing the oath-formula. This would be in line with Callimachus' treatment of distichs, with "hexameter and pentameter [...] usually part of a syntactical unit, so that the elegiac couplets appear as an organic unity, in which the first half of the pentameter sometimes contains a syntactical break".[50]

§4. To sum up: (i) Even those scholars who are sceptical about the legitimacy of supplementing this lacuna agree on the possibility that the beginning of this line contained an '*invitus* utterance'. (ii) That Callimachus might have wanted to stress once again the concept of unwillingness on the part of the lock before introducing the oath-formula would be in line with the rest of the elegy, where this concept is expressed at various instances. (iii) The motif of unwilling departure belongs to a literary tradition that goes back as far as Sappho fr. 94 Voigt, and lexical resemblances among the *loci similes* to that passage attest from the (pre-)classical period onwards the spread of a common repertory of words and expressions, i.e. a "formulaic language of parting", comprised of the adjective ἀέκων / ἄκων.[51] (iv) The same adjective is used by Callimachus elsewhere. (v) Not only did Catullus translate the rest of line 40 *uerbum e uerbo*, even down to word-order, but in several instances he also placed a literal correspondent of the original Greek in the same *sedes* of the verse, especially in emphatic positions — such as at the beginning, at the end or in proximity to metrical pauses — and to stress important concepts, thereby allowing us to suppose that he might have done the same here. (vi) The possibility that Apollonius Rhodius knew Callimachus' verse with ἄκων at its beginning cannot be ruled out.[52] (vii) Finally, the presence of ἄκων, not syntactically or grammatically related to the ensuing oath-formula and possibly followed by punctuation indicating a rhythmic pause, would explain why Philoxenus decided not to include the beginning of the line in his quotation.

It is a commendable principle that one should "not [...] succumb to the lure of the empty space —and to conjecture";[53] thus, the modern editors of the *Coma* probably did well in leaving the lacuna of v. 40 unfilled. Nonetheless, perhaps it would be wiser for future editors of the fragment to at least mention Lenchantin's supplement in the critical apparatus *ad loc*.

Bibliography

Bernand, 1969, p. 81 n. 1). Here a deceased young man named Ἀπολλῶς (on this personal name, see *ibid.*, p. 82) complains about the sorrow he has unwillingly brought upon his parents with his premature departure from life.

[48] The feminine of the contracted form also occurs in fr. 228.62 Pfeiffer (ἄκουσα); the non-contracted form occurs twice (see Fernández-Galiano 1976, 10-11) in *Hymn.* 4 (*in Delum*), at v. 89 (ἀέκοντα) and at v. 167 (ἀέκουσα); and once in fr. 176.4 Pfeiffer (= fr. 257.4 Lloyd-Jones and Parsons = fr. 54b.4 Harder) (ἀέκων).

[49] See the analysis of the metrical patterns in N. Marinone, 1997², p. 236. For a comparison of the metrical patterns of the *Coma* and Catul. 66 see also J. Warden, 2006, pp. 118-119; and M. De Wilde, 2008, pp. 148-158. On spondees being common in the first hemistich of pentameters in the *Aetia*, see also M. A. Harder, 2012, vol. 1, p. 58.

[50] M. A. Harder, 2012, vol. 1, p. 47.

[51] H. Pelliccia, 2010-2011, pp. 161-162 warns that "the *invitus*-language on its own is unremarkable" and that "what makes the unwilling departure theme distinctive and traceable is not its phraseology but its phraseology in context".

[52] See above, § 2 and n. 39.

[53] P. Bing, 2009 [1997], p. 82.

B. Acosta-Hughes, 2010, *Arion's Lyre. Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry*, Princeton, N. J. - Oxford.

B. Acosta-Hughes and S. A. Stephens, 2012, *Callimachus in Context. From Plato to the Augustan Poets*, Cambridge - New York.

M. Asper (Hg.), 2004, *Kallimachos. Werke. Griechisch und deutsch*, Darmstadt.

R. Avallone, 1961, "Il carme 66 di Catullo e la *Chioma di Berenice* di Callimaco", *Euphrosyne* 4, pp. 23-48 (repr. in R. Avallone, 1964, *Catullo e i suoi modelli*, Napoli [*non vidi*]).

B. Axelson, 1960 [1987], "Das Haaröl der Berenike bei Catull und bei Kallimachos", in *Studi in onore di Luigi Castiglioni*, vol. 1, Firenze, pp. 15-21 (= Id., *Kleine Schriften zur lateinischen Philologie*, Hg. A. Önnerfors und C. Schaar, Stockholm, 1987, pp. 310-314).

E. A. Barber, 1936, "The Lock of Berenice: Callimachus and Catullus", in *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to Gilbert Murray on His Seventieth Birthday*, Oxford, pp. 342-363.

A. Barchiesi, 1997, "Otto punti su una mappa dei naufragi", *MD* 39 (= *Memoria, arte allusiva, intertestualità / Memory, Allusion, Intertextuality*), pp. 209-226.

É. Bernand (ed.), 1969, *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine (IMEGR)*, Paris.

P. Bing, 2009, "Reconstructing Berenike's lock", in Id., *The Scroll and the Marble. Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*, Ann Arbor, Mich., pp. 65-82 (updated version in *Collecting Fragments / Fragmente sammeln*, G. W. Most, [ed.], 1997, Göttingen, pp. 78-94).

D. Braga, 1950, *Catullo e i poeti greci*, Messina - Firenze.

W. Clausen, 1970, "Catullus and Callimachus", *HSPh* 74, pp. 85-94.

J. Coman, 1936, *L'art de Callimaque et de Catulle dans le poème "La Boucle de Bérenice"*, Bucarest.

G. B. D'Alessio (cur.), 2018⁴ [1996¹], *Callimaco. Opere. Introduzione, traduzione e note*, Milano.

M. De Wilde, 2008, "Catullus' *Coma Berenices*: An Investigation of a *True Interpreter*'s Poetic Licence and its Reception by Apuleius", in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XIV*, C. Deroux (ed.), Bruxelles, pp. 144-176.

M. Dominicy, 2018, "Critical notes on the *Lock of Berenice* (Callimachus 110 Pf., Catullus 66)", *Paideia* 73.3, pp. 1563-1587.

Y. Durbec, 2006, *Callimaque. Fragments poétiques*, Paris.

M. J. Edwards, 1991, "INVITUS, REGINA", *AC* 60, pp. 260-265.

M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter, 2002, *Muse e modelli. La poesia ellenistica da Alessandro Magno ad Augusto*, Roma - Bari.

M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter, 2005, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge *et al.*

E. Fernández-Galiano, 1976, *Léxico de los himnos de Calimaco. I. A-Δ*, Madrid.

A. Fo (cur.), 2018, *Gaio Valerio Catullo. Le poesie. Testo, traduzione, introduzione e commento (con interventi di A. M. Morelli e A. Rodighiero)*, Torino.

R. D. Griffith, 1995, "Catullus' *Coma Berenices* and Aeneas' Farewell to Dido", *TAPhA* 125, pp. 47-59.

K. Gutzwiller, 1992, "Callimachus' *Lock of Berenice*: Fantasy, Romance, and Propaganda", *AJPh*, 113.3, pp. 359-385.

M. A. Harder (ed.), 2012, *Callimachus. Aetia. Vol. 1. Introduction, Text and Translation*; *Vol. 2. Commentary*, Oxford.

I. K. Horváth, 1962, "La technique de traduction de Catulle à la lumière du papyrus de Callimaque retrouvé à Tebtynis", *AAntHung* 10.4, pp. 347-356.

R. Höschele, 2009, "Catullus' Callimachean hair-itage and the Erotics of Translation", *RFIC*, 137.1-2, pp. 118-152.

W. Hübner, 2018 ",,Katulla" – Geschlechtsumwandlung bei Catull", *Paideia* 73.1, pp. 117-138.

R. L. Hunter, 1995, "The divine and human map of the Argonautica", *SyllClass* 6, pp. 13-27 (repr. in R. L. Hunter, *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and its Reception*, Berlin - New York, 2009, pp. 257-277).

R. L. Hunter, 2019, "Notes on the Ancient Reception of Sappho", in Th. S. Thorsen and S. Harrison (eds.), pp. 45-59.

G. O. Hutchinson, 1988, *Hellenistic Poetry*, Oxford.

S. Jackson, 2001, "Callimachus: *Coma Berenices*: Origins", *Mnemosyne* 54.1, pp. 1-9.

D. A. Kidd, 1970, "Some Problems in Catullus lxvi", *Antichton* 4, pp. 38-49.

P. E. Knox, 2007, "Catullus and Callimachus", in Skinner (ed.), pp. 152-171.

L. Koenen, 1993, "The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure", in *Images and Ideologies. Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, A. Bulloch, E. S. Gruen, A. A. Long, A. Stewart (eds.), Berkeley - Los Angeles - Oxford, pp. 25-114.

K. M. E. Larsen, 2017a, "Catullus 66.53 and Virgil, *Eclogues* 5.5", *CQ* 67.1, pp. 304-307.

K. M. E. Larsen, 2017b, "Through the Airy Waves. Catullus 66.55", *Mnemosyne* 70, pp. 521-524.

L. Lehnus, 2000, *Nuova bibliografia callimachea (1489-1998)*, Alessandria.

M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis (cur.), 1933² [1928¹], *Il libro di Catullo veronese*, Torino.

E. Lobel, 1952, "*POxy* 2258", in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XX*, E. Lobel, E. P. Wegener, C. H. Roberts (eds.), London, pp. 69-107.

C. A. Maciver, 2011, "Reading Helen's excuses in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*", *CQ* 61.2, pp. 690-703.

N. Marinone, 1997², *Berenice da Callimaco a Catullo. Testo critico, traduzione e commento. Nuova edizione ristrutturata, ampliata e aggiornata*, Bologna.

G. Massimilla (cur.), 2010, *Callimaco. Aitia. Libro terzo e quarto. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*, Pisa - Roma.

G. Massimilla, 2018, "Il dolore delle chiome sorelle da Callimaco a Catullo", *Paideia*, 73.3, pp. 1727-1732.

J. Murray, 2014, "Anchored in time: the date in Apollonius' *Argonautica*", in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, G. C. Wakker (eds.), *Hellenistic Poetry in Context*, Leuven - Paris - Walpole, Mass., pp. 247-284.

R. A. B. Mynors (ed.), 1958, *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina*, Oxford.

C. Neri, 2021, *Saffo, testimonianze e frammenti. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*, Berlin - Boston.

A. Nijk, 2016, "How to control the present: a unified account of the nonpast uses of the aorist indicative", *JHS* 136, pp. 92-112.

W. Peek (Hg.), 1955, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften (GVI)*, 1. *Grab-Epigramme*, Berlin.

H. Pelliccia, 2010-2011, "Unlocking *Aeneid* 6.460: Plautus' *Amphitryon*, Euripides' *Protesilaus* and the referents of Callimachus' *Coma*", *CJ* 106.2, pp. 149-221.

A. Pérez Vega, A. Ramírez de Verger (eds.), 2005, *C. Valerii Catulli Carmina. Edición, traducción y comentario*, Huelva.

R. Pfeiffer, 1932, "Βερενίκης πλόκαμος", *Philologus* 87.1, pp. 179-228.

R. Pfeiffer (ed.), 1949-1953, *Callimachus. Vol. 1. Fragmenta; Vol. 2. Hymni et epigrammata*, Oxford.

H. Pinkster, 2015, *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Vol. 1. The Simple Clause*, Oxford - New York.

É. Prioux, 2011, "Callimachus' Queens", in *Brill's Companion to Callimachus*, B. Acosta-Hughes, L. Lehnus, and S. Stephens (eds.), Leiden - Boston, pp. 201-224.

M. Puelma, 1982, "Die Aitien des Kallimachos als Vorbild der römischen Amores-Elegie", *MH* 39.3, pp. 221-246.

M. C. J. Putnam, 1960, "Catullus 66.75–88", in *CPh* 55, pp. 223-228 (repr. in M C. J. Putnam, *Essays on Latin Lyric, Elegy, and Epic*, Princeton, N.J., 1982, pp. 86-91).

A. Salvatore, 1965, *Studi catulliani*, Napoli.

G. A. Sheets, 2007, "Elements of Style in Catullus", in Skinner (ed.), pp. 190-211.

M. B. Skinner, 2003, *Catullus in Verona. A Reading of the Elegiac* Libellus*, Poems 65-116*, Columbus, Oh.

M. B. Skinner (ed.), 2007, *A Companion to Catullus*, Malden, Mass. - Oxford - Carlton, Vic.

A. Spira, 1975, "Die Locke der Berenike, Catull c. 66 und Kallimachos fr. 110 Pf.", in *«Dialogos». Für Harald Patzer zum 65. Geburtstag von seinen Freunden und Schülern*, J. Cobet, R. Leimbach, A. B. Neschke-Hentschke (Hg.), Wiesbaden, pp. 153-162.

Chr. Theodoridis (Hg.), 1976, *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Philoxenos*, Berlin - New York.

D. F. S. Thomson (ed.), 1997, *Catullus. Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary.* Toronto - Buffalo - London (repr. with corrections 1998).

Th. S. Thorsen, 2019, "As Important as Callimachus? An Essay on Sappho in Catullus and Beyond", in Th. S. Thorsen and S. Harrison (eds.), pp. 78-93.

Th. S. Thorsen and S. Harrison (eds.), 2019, *Roman Receptions of Sappho*. Oxford.

F. Tissoni, 1993-1994, "L' Ἐλεγεία περὶ κόμης Βερενίκης di Giuseppe Giusto Scaligero", *Studi Umanistici* 4, pp. 199-257.

M. S. Visscher, 2017, "Imperial Asia: past and present in Callimachus' *Lock of Berenike*", in *Past and present in Hellenistic poetry*, M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, G. C. Wakker (eds.), Leuven - Paris - Bristol, pp. 211-232.

M. S. Visscher, 2020, *Beyond Alexandria: Literature and Empire in the Seleucid World*, New York - Oxford.

O. Vox, 2000, "Sul genere grammaticale della Chioma di Berenice", *MD* 44, pp. 175-181.

J. Warden, 2006, "Catullus in the grove of Callimachus", in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XIII*, C. Deroux (ed.), Bruxelles, pp. 97-154.

S. West, 1985, "Venus Observed? A Note on Callimachus fr. 110", *CQ* 35, pp. 61-66.

D. E. W. Wormell, 1966, "Catullus as Translator", in *The Classical Tradition. Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, L. Wallach (ed.), Ithaca, New York, pp. 187-201.

O. Zwierlein, 1987, "Weihen und Entrückung der Locke der Berenike", *RhM* 130.3/4, pp. 274-290.