

JAN KWAPISZ

Institute of Classical Studies, Warsaw University
ul. Krakowskie Przedmieście 1, 00-927 Warszawa
Poland

A LESSON FOR THE KING: SOTADES' INVECTIVE AGAINST
PTOLEMY (FR. 1 AND 16 POWELL) AND CALLIMACHUS'
*EPIGRAM 1 PFEIFFER**

ABSTRACT. Kwapisz Jan, *A Lesson for the King: Sotades' Invective against Ptolemy (fr. 1 and 16 Powell) and Callimachus' "Epigram" 1 Pfeiffer*.

The paper discusses the fable-like form of Callimachus' *Epigram 1 Pfeiffer* and of Sotades' fragmentary *Invective against Ptolemy*, and suggests that the former poem may contain an allusion to the latter. In the light of this reading, both poems are to be viewed as playfully encouraging the Ptolemies' incestuous marriage.

Key words: Callimachus, Sotades, Hellenistic poetry, ancient fable.

Traditionally and almost instinctively one assumes Greek didactic literature to be a part of the great classical project of training in moral excellence. Although "didacticism" is a very capacious term when one speaks of Greek literature, and there is no easy definition of it, that traditional association with the *paideia* presupposes that at least some notions and qualities can be immediately excluded from consideration. For instance, if one were asked to name several characteristics of Greek didactic poetry, we would not expect to hear as an answer that such poetry is sometimes obscene, or vulgar, or aggressive, or vituperative in language and contents toward its addressee. The present paper aims at discussing an extremely abusive poem which I would nevertheless like to locate in the margin of didactic literature. This will be possible after I will have presented another poem, undoubtedly containing a moral lesson, which I hope to prove to be dependent upon the former one. The two poems under discussion are Sotades' famous invective

* I should like to thank my audience in Poznań for stimulating comments. I wish to acknowledge a grant from the Lanckoroński Foundation, which has enabled me to make some important bibliographical additions to the present discussion.

against Ptolemy, as it has been reconstructed by Roberto Pretagostini,¹ and Callimachus' *Epigram* 1.

Let us start from Callimachus' poem, which has to be quoted here in full length (Call. *Ep.* 1 Pfeiffer = Diog. Laert. 1.80, *Anth. Pal.* 7.89; the translation is by Kathryn Gutzwiller²)

Ξεῖνος Ἀταρνεΐτης τις ἀνείρετο Πιττακὸν οὕτω	
τὸν Μυτιληναῖον, παῖδα τὸν Ὑρράδιον	
“ἄττα γέρον, δοῖός με καλεῖ γάμος· ἡ μία μὲν δὴ	
νύμφη καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ γενεῇ κατ' ἐμέ,	
ἢ δ' ἐτέρῃ προβέβηκε. τί λῶϊον; εἰ δ' ἄγε σύμ μοι	5
βούλευσον, ποτέρην εἰς ὑμέναιον ἄγω”.	
εἶπεν· ὁ δὲ σκίπωνα γεροντικὸν ὄπλον ἀείρας·	
“ἠγίδε κείνοί σοι πᾶν ἐρέουσιν ἔπος	
(οἱ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὸ πληγῆσι θοὰς βέμβικας ἔχοντες	
ἔστρεφον εὐρείῃ παῖδες ἐνὶ τριόδῳ),	10
κείνων ἔρχεο, φησί, μετ' ἵχνια”. χῶ μὲν ἐπέστη	
πλησίον· οἱ δ' ἔλεγον· “τὴν κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔλα”.	
ταῦτ' αἶων ὁ ξεῖνος ἐφείσατο μείζονος οἴκου	
δράξασθαι, παίδων κληδὸνα συνθέμενος.	
τὴν δ' ὀλίγην ὡς κείνος ἐς οἰκίον ἤγετο νύμφην,	15
οὕτω καὶ σὺ γ' ἰὼν τὴν κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔλα.	

16 γ' ἰὼν *Anth. Pal.* Δίων Diog. Laert.

A stranger from Atarneus questioned Pittacus	
the sage of Mitylene and son of Hyrras:	
“Honoured sir, I have the choice of two marriages,	
with a bride who is my equal in wealth and rank	
or with a superior bride. What is better? Please	5
advise me which marriage I should pursue”.	
Lifting his staff, an old man's weapon, he replied,	
“Those boys there will tell you all you need to know”.	
(Using whips to turn their tops swiftly, the boys	
were spinning them in the wide crossroads).	10
“Follow their example”. The man stood near them	
as they repeated, “Follow your own course!”	
Hearing this, he avoided grasping the more prestigious	
marriage, since he understood the boys' message.	
And just as that man led the poor bride to his home,	15
so you, too, go now and follow your own course.	

The textual variant of the final line is: “so you too, Dion, follow your own course” (cf. my brief apparatus under the Greek text).

¹ R. Pretagostini, *Sotade poeta del biasimo e del dissenso*, [in:] idem, *Ricerche sulla poesia ale-sandrina. Teocrito, Callimaco, Sotade*, Roma 1984, p. 139-147.

² K.J. Gutzwiller, *Poetic Garlands. Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*, Berkeley 1998, p. 224-225.

Scholars used to feel disappointed by the story told in the epigram. Gow and Page had no mercy; in their commentary they wrote: “it must be said that if the ascription were absent nobody would suppose an anecdote so flat and straightforward to be Callimachus’”.³ But it seems today that a more reasonable approach would be to assume not that the wit is entirely missing, but that it takes some effort to discover it, and not because the poem is clumsy, but because it is very refined. Obviously two crucial questions about the ending of the epigram must be asked: To whom is the final line addressed? And what is the meaning of the metaphorical expression “to follow one’s course” when it is repeated at the end of the poem?

Two independent efforts to answer these questions and to restore the missing wit were recently made. Enrico Livrea proposed to establish a link between the metaphorical imaging in the epigram and Callimachus’ literary programme.⁴ The person addressed at the final line would be, depending on which textual variant one prefers, either a poet known as Dion or Callimachus himself. “To follow one’s own course” would mean “to walk the untrodden path” of Callimachus’ poetry – Livrea points at the famous programmatic *Prologue to the Telchines* in the *Aetia*. Livrea’s proposal has found some acceptance, notably from Kathryn Gutzwiller and Roberto Pretagostini.⁵ Nevertheless it is vulnerable to criticism; one scholar called it simply “overimaginative”.⁶ Indeed, the connection between the anecdote on a marriage and Alexandrian literary programmes does not appear obvious to modern scholars, nor, I suppose, it would have seemed such to Callimachus’ contemporary audience.

Another reading was proposed by Pamela Bleisch.⁷ She reads the variant οὔτω καὶ σύ, Δίῳ in the final line, and suggests that a clever anagram should be detected there. Once the order of several letters is altered (οὔτω καὶ σύ, Δίῳ), one can read the name of the true addressee: Διωνυσιακῶ, “the two Dionysians”. Those would be Ptolemy and Arsinoe, who have much to do with the cult of Dionysus in Alexandria. According to Bleisch, the epi-

³ A.S.F. Gow, D.L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, vol. 2, Cambridge 1965, p. 205.

⁴ E. Livrea, *From Pittacus to Byzantium: The History of a Callimachean Epigram*, CQ 45, 1995, p. 474-480.

⁵ See K.J. Gutzwiller (above, n. 2), p. 226, R. Pretagostini, *Vita e poetica negli Epigrammi 1 e 28 Pf. di Callimaco*, [in:] G. Lozza, S. Martinelli Tempesta (eds.), *L’epigramma greco. Problemi e prospettive*, Milano 2007, p. 141-147; cf. already G. Serrao, *La poetica del «nuovo stile»: dalla mimesi aristotelica alla poetica della verità*, [in:] R. Bianchi Bandinelli (eds.), *Storia e civiltà dei Greci 9. La cultura ellenistica: filosofia, scienza, letteratura*, Milano 1977, p. 225-226.

⁶ N. Hopkinson in an untitled review of Gutzwiller’s *Poetic Garlands...* (above, n. 2), CR 49, 1999, p. 257.

⁷ P. Bleisch, *On Choosing a Spouse: Aeneid 7.378-84 and Callimachus’ Epigram 1*, AJP 117, 1996, p. 453-472.

gram is a witty comment on the incestuous marriage of the Ptolemies. What Callimachus actually expresses at the final line is the encouragement for Ptolemy to the incest – “to keep all in the family”, as Bleisch puts it. The justification of the incestuous marriage is playfully put by Callimachus into the mouth of one of the Seven Sages.

I think that the alleged anagram is a mere delusion of the postmodern scholar. The idea is obviously forced; the anagram strangely uses only one letter of the word οὔτω, the dual form Διωνυσιακῶ with the epic lengthening in the second syllable seems very unusual, and the fact that in the text there is no hint for the reader of a hidden riddle-message raises further suspicion.⁸ Nonetheless, what I find attractive in Bleisch’s reading of the epigram is her suggestion that the poem is likely to allude to the Ptolemies’ famous incestuous marriage. The story in the epigram and Pittacus’ advice – “keep to one of your own sort” – fit Ptolemy’s situation so perfectly that I can hardly think of this fact as of a coincidence. As we will soon see, the royal marriage is a popular issue among the Alexandrian poets, and moreover often receives humorous treatment.

But does not the specific reference to some Dion in the final line prevent such an interpretation now, when I have done away with Bleisch’s anagram? One can hardly assume that the name “Dion” was somehow meant by Callimachus to make the reader think of Ptolemy. This apparently serious objection can be in fact easily dismissed, alongside of Dion himself. Δίων is just one textual variant, the reading preserved in Diogenes Laertius (1.80). The MS of the *Palatine Anthology* (7.89) provides us with another variant: γ’ ἰών. Δίων is usually preferred on the basis that it is supposed to be a *lectio difficilior*.⁹ Yet this is not a heavyweight argument, and that the other lection fits a more attractive reading appears a good enough reason to accept it.¹⁰ There is no need to assume that the obscure mention of an unknown individual must be retained at all costs.

That brings us to closer examination of the final line, which will enable us to place *Epigram 1* in its proper genre. After all, Gow and Page were not far from the truth when they stated that “neither inscriptional nor epideictic, [*Epigram 1*] has no claim to be called an epigram at all”.¹¹ Yet the composition of the poem is very typical – though not typical of an epigram – a fact that persists unnoticed despite a correct diagnosis having been given already in 1940 by Ben Edwin Perry. He recognized Callimachus’ poem as a

⁸ Cf. A. Cameron, *Ancient Anagrams*, *AJPh* 116, 1995, p. 477-484.

⁹ See P. Bleisch (above, n. 7), p. 457 n. 9.

¹⁰ This is what is done by K.J. Gutzwiller (above, n. 2), p. 224-225 with n. 84. See now esp. Pretagostini, *Vita e poetica...* (above, n. 5), p. 141-147.

¹¹ A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page (above, n. 3), p. 205.

fable,¹² but this suggestion seems not to be widely known. Perry is surely right. As any fable, *Epigram 1* contains the anecdote that serves as a moral lesson. Most significantly, the lesson is pointed by the final line of special character, which we can correctly recognize now as a form of the so-called epimythium. In its early form, as we can reconstruct it from fables or quasi-fables embedded in another narrative, the epimythium always made the application of the preceding anecdote personal and specific. The application was conventionally through a phrase the variant of which is already well-known to us from Callimachus: “so you too...”, cf. Stes., fr. 281 a Page (= Aristot. *Rhet.* 2.1393b), Soph. *Ai.* 1147, Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1432 (οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς/σέ/σύ).

In the course of evolution of the fable its application became general, but at first the form of the epimythium remained unchanged; as Perry notes, “[t]ransition from the strictly personal to the generic sense of the second-person pronoun is, of course, very natural”.¹³ It seems likely that *Epigram 1* is to be located at this stage of the evolution, and it is noteworthy that Perry intuitively favours the textual variant γ’ ἰών which, as he puts it, “would make the application general in meaning though personal in form”.¹⁴ What I suggest, in turn, is that the epimythium in *Epigram 1* is an essential element in Callimachus’ elaborate play on the narrative convention; the narrative situation which Callimachus creates is rich in allusive potential, and so is the epimythium, which therefore, though apparently general, at the end turns out to be applicable to a very specific person. The narratee which Callimachus constructs and to whom the anecdote is addressed is to be recognized as Ptolemy. This is not all there is to be said about restoring the poem’s missing wit, but for a moment let us leave *Epigram 1* aside.

Up till now we have speculatively established the text of the epigram, and more importantly placed the poem in its proper literary context. We have also observed that the situation to which the epimythium can be applied is the marriage of the Ptolemies. Now let us turn to Sotades’ invective.

Twenty five years ago all that was known of Sotades’ notorious poem was a single line. This is a very infamous and highly offensive comment on Ptolemy’s marriage with his sister (fr. 1 Powell = Athen. 14.621a, [Plut.] *De lib. ed.* 11a; the translation of the following three fragments of Sotades and Callimachus is by Alan Cameron¹⁵):

¹² B. E. Perry, *The Origin of the Epimythium*, TAPhA 71, 1940, p. 396.

¹³ Ibidem.

¹⁴ Ibidem.

¹⁵ A. Cameron, *Callimachus and His Critics*, Princeton 1995, p. 18-20.

εἰς οὐχ ὀσίην τρυμαλιῆν τὸ κέντρον ὤθει.

partim ὤθει partim ὠθεῖ codd. Athen. ὠθεῖς *De lib. ed.*

It's an unholy hole he's shoving his prick in.¹⁶

However, in 1984 Roberto Pretagostini came out with a proposal to see in this line a surprising ending of the poem which would begin with the verse in Sotadean metre that he found anonymously preserved in Hephaestion (fr. 16 Powell = Hephaest., p. 36.12 Consbruch):¹⁷

Ἦρην ποτέ φασιν Δία τὸν τερπικέραυνον...

They say that once upon a time Zeus who delights in thunder and Hera...

This line sounds like extracted from a fine encomium of the Ptolemies. One finds the same comparison of their marriage to the ἱερός γάμος of Zeus and Hera in Theocritus' *Encomium of Philadelphus* (*Id.* 17.131–4), and we are told by Plutarch (*Quaest. conv.* 736f) that such was the beginning of an epithalamium sung by a certain rhapsode at the Ptolemies' wedding.¹⁸ So, too, Sotades' poem surely proceeded safely and predictably as a conventional wedding poem, until at the end the reader was unexpectedly attacked with the insult clearly addressed to the king. Pretagostini's ingenious reconstruction of the invective is widely (and rightly) accepted, and so is his suggestion that a certain passage in Callimachus' *Aetia* should be viewed as an allusion to the poem of Sotades.¹⁹

¹⁶ During the discussion of my paper, Professor Jerzy Danielewicz interestingly proposed that "unholy" here may refer to an illicit sexual practice different from incest, i.e. to *pedicatio*. This might have numerous consequences for our understanding of the fragment; I suppose that the most radical (but not necessary) interpretation founded on this ground would be to assume that the line was erroneously taken to comment on the Ptolemies' wedding. Of course, Sotades' poetic strategy enables the reader to seek for new meanings (cf. R. Pretagostini, *Intelletuali e potere politico nell'età ellenistica: la duplice valenza metaforica di κέντρον in Sotade fr. 1 Powell*, [in:] idem, *Ricerche sulla poesia alessandrina II. Forme allusive e contenuti nuovi*, Roma 2007, p. 135–138). Yet I remain skeptical and would argue for the traditional reading. It appears to me that in the literary code that is well established in Greek literature at the time of Sotades the expressions such as οὐχ ὀσίη, when they are referred to sexual intercourse, immediately make the reader think of incest; cf. Aesop. 304 Hausrath-Hunger, *Soph. Oed. Col.* 945–946, Aristoph. *Ran.* 850, Plat. *Leg.* 838b (ἀνόσια / γάμοι ἀνόσιοι / μηδαμῶς ὄσια in reference to incest). I hope to treat this more fully elsewhere.

¹⁷ R. Pretagostini, *Sotade poeta...* (above, n. 1), p. 144–145.

¹⁸ See A. Cameron, *Callimachus...* (above, n. 15), p. 20. Something similar was perhaps contained in SH 961 (Posidippus' epithalamium for the Ptolemies' wedding?).

¹⁹ See esp. A. Cameron, *Callimachus...* (above, n. 15), who importantly "reformulates and develops Pretagostini's suggestion". Besides cf. J. K. Lynn, *Narrators and Narration in Callimachus*, diss., Columbia University, 1995, p. 203–215; P. Bleisch (above, n. 7), p. 466–467; A. Lorenzoni,

The suspected passage of Callimachus is from the elegy *Acontius and Cydippe*. The context (lines 1–3 of the fragment) suggests that the narrator is about to tell the story of the *ἱερός γάμος*, but he suddenly cuts it short (Call., fr. 75.4–5 Pfeiffer = *P. Oxy.* 1011):

Ἥρην γάρ κοτέ φασι – κύον, κύον, ἴσχεο, λαιδρῆ
 θυμέ, σύ γ' αἰείση καὶ τὰ περ οὐχ ὀσίη.

They say that once upon a time Hera – dog, dog, hold back, impudent soul! You would sing even what is not lawful.

One clearly sees that the beginning of the story is an almost exact quotation of what we have just recognized as the first line of Sotades' invective. In this light it can be plausibly argued that the expression οὐχ ὀσίη alludes to the analogous epithet in the abusive ending of Sotades' poem. Pamela Bleisch thinks that "Callimachus deliberately parrots Sotades' phrase ... to signpost his pointed rebuke of the tactless lampoonist", and suggests that Callimachus' *Epigram* 1 is "another retort to Sotades".²⁰ But her understanding of the allusion in the *Aetia* must be incorrect, and so is, as I will soon demonstrate, her reading of *Epigram* 1. For it would be extremely naïve to take seriously Callimachus' criticism of "singing what is not lawful". On the contrary, the passage is full of joyful sarcasm. Obviously the fact that the narrator hastily breaks off the quotation from Sotades not only does not conceal anything, but naturally such a *reticentia* puts a very strong stress on what is suggested but remains untold. The effect is not less forceful than if the whole poem were quoted. Hence, the passage of the *Aetia* is not a "retort

Eust. 1068,60-1069,23 (*su un comico e qualche alessandrino*), "Eikasmos" 12, 2001, p. 222-227; M. Fantuzzi, R. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge 2004, p. 62. But there are also opponents of Pretagostini's proposal. H. White, *Further Textual Problems in Greek Poetry*, "Orpheus" 21, 2000, p. 187-188, and following her lead G. Giangrande, *Sotades, fragmento 16 Powell, y Calímaco, fragmento 75.4 ss. Pfeiffer*, "Habis" 35, 2004, p. 105-108, and Y. Durbec, « Κύον, κύον » : *Lectures métapoétiques d'une apostrophe (Callimaque, Aitia, fr. 75, 4 Pfeiffer et Hymne à Déméter 63)*, REG 118, 2005, p. 602-603, think that κύον at Call., fr. 75.4 (which alludes to Sotad., fr. 16) is an obscene pun (= *mentula*), and that both Sotad., fr. 16 and Call., fr. 75 are about how Zeus and Hera indulged in *fellatio* (and – what follows as a necessary consequence, though it is missed by Giangrande – not about their incest and with no connection to Sotad., fr. 1). This is not the place for an extensive polemic, meanwhile I would like only to observe briefly that a) the same κύον, κύον is surely not *mentula* at Call. *Cer.* 63, nor even at Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1403; b) such a reading completely ignores the context of fr. 75, which is an allusion to a certain Naxian rite, by which a bride spends the night before her marriage with a boy whose both parents are alive (fr. 75.1–3) – the story of *ἱερός γάμος* is an aition of this rite (cf. *schol. in Hom. Il.* 14.296). The rite is very obscure, but a suggestion that Callimachus means the story of Zeus and Hera's secret marriage, but alludes to something different, or that *fellatio* was involved in the rite, would be either implausible or implausible and lacking taste.

²⁰ P. Bleisch (above, n. 7), p. 467.

to Sotades" – in fact, this is another instance of the assault on the king, although this time it is more elegant, and its humour is surely more refined.²¹

Before we think of the true nature of Callimachus' *Epigram 1*, let us consider for a while the text of Sotades' famous insult. The fragment is preserved in the works of Plutarch and Athenaeus. There are three transmitted variants of the grammatical form of the final word in this line to choose from, and four possible interpretations of it:

1) ὠθεῖς ([Plut.] *De lib. ed.* 11a) – the 2nd person present indicative. This variant was usually accepted in older editions and discussions of Sotades.²²

2) ὠθεῖ (Athen. 14.621a, variant A) – the 3rd person present indicative.

3) ὠθει (Athen. 14.621a, variant B) – this can be interpreted as the un-augmented 3rd person imperfect indicative. Such is the text and interpretation accepted by Pretagostini in accord with his reconstruction of the poem,²³ and either this or the previous one is printed by most recent students of the subject.²⁴

4) However, ὠθει can be also taken as the 2nd person imperative. This is my choice.

If we judge the reconstruction of Sotades' invective made by Pretagostini to be correct – and I see no reason not to do so – then we ought to think of this composition as of something with which we are already well familiar. The narrative part consisted of a mythical tale. This was pointed by the ending by which the story received its specific application. Again, this is the form of a fable. Such an observation is reinforced by the fable-like phrasing in what we suppose to be the first line of Sotades' poem; one will note *πότη* and *φασί*: "once upon a time, as they say..."

My conclusion is that I would expect to find some variant of the expression *οὐτῶ καὶ σὺ* in the lost line that once preceded the line rightly supposed by Pretagostini to be the end of the poem. It is convenient to note that such an expression in various forms can be easily conformed to the flexible Sotadean metre.²⁵ Hence I would like to hear something like "so you too go on and marry your sister, do as the gods do", a pungently ironic advice addressed to the king Ptolemy. Of course, that would be a rather perverse lesson. But it would not stand alone. If my reading of both Callimachus' *Epigram 1* and Sotades' invective is acceptable, what we have right now

²¹ Cf. A. Cameron, *Callimachus...* (above, n. 15), p. 21-23.

²² Cf. J.U. Powell (ed.), *Collectanea Alexandrina*, Oxford 1925, p. 238; M. Launey, *Études d'histoire hellénistique II: L'exécution de Sotadès et l'expédition de Patroklos dans la mer Égée (266 av. J.-C.)*, REA 47, 1945, p. 33 with n. 3.

²³ R. Pretagostini, *Sotade poeta...* (above, n. 1), p. 141 n. 9.

²⁴ Cf. A. Cameron, *Callimachus...* (above, n. 15), p. 18 with n. 100, Lynn (above, n. 19), p. 210 and 251-252 n. 54, Lorenzoni (above, n. 19), p. 220.

²⁵ On which see M. L. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford 1982, p. 144-145.

before us are the poems of the same composition, and of the same purpose. Both pretend to instruct Ptolemy in the traditional manner of didactic fable. The relationship between the two poems is evidently much closer than it was suggested by Pamela Bleisch. Besides, in this light *Epigram* 1 stands akin to the already discussed passage of the *Aetia*. They both repeat in a more elaborate form Sotades' act of "unlawfulness".

How is it possible that such poetry could ever be conceived in Ptolemaic Alexandria? And we speak not only of Sotades, a poet of the notoriously bad reputation, but also of Callimachus, the Ptolemies' favourite court poet. Moreover, I think that two or three more similar instances can be added to those already discussed, which however I will pass over now.²⁶ Modern scholars usually point at the symposium, since we are aware that sympotic conventions sanctioned several forms of violent verbal abuse.²⁷ But my explanation is different. It seems striking to me that one encounters each of the poems and passages under discussion in the context of the wedding. I think that what we have here are echoes of the ritual nuptial obscenity which is easily found in many different cultures, but has never been convincingly traced in Greece. This would be the case of the Greek Fescennines.²⁸ However, if this theory is to find acceptance, it has to receive a more extensive treatment than I can give at the present occasion.

A LESSON FOR THE KING: SOTADES' INVECTIVE AGAINST PTOLEMY
(FR. 1 AND 16 POWELL) AND CALLIMACHUS' EPIGRAM 1 PFEIFFER

Summary

The present discussion develops Roberto Pretagostini's proposal of reconstructing Sotades' invective against Ptolemy as beginning with fr. 16 and ending with fr. 1 Powell,

²⁶ Meanwhile see J. Griffin, *Augustus and the Poets: 'Caesar qui cogere posset'*, [in:] F. Millar, E. Segal (eds.), *Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects*, Oxford 1984, p. 193-194; A. Cameron, *Callimachus...* (above, n. 15), p. 22-23; P. Bleisch (above, n. 7), p. 468. I will limit myself to mentioning briefly Theocr. *Id.* 15.64 πάντα γυναίκες ἴσαντι, καὶ ὡς Ζεὺς ἀγάγεθ' Ἥραν – according to J. D. Reed, *Arsinoe's Adonis and the Poetics of Ptolemaic Imperialism*, TAPhA 130, 2000, p. 337, this is "a reference that in poetry written under Ptolemy II inevitably goes back to the royal couple". Note that the tone of the line seems ironic, and here, as in Callimachus, the well-known story of the union of Zeus and Hera is classified as a secret ("you can't hide anything from women, *not even* about the ἱερὸς γάμος"). Is there again the shadow of Sotades to be seen in the background?

²⁷ See A. Cameron, *Callimachus...* (above, n. 15), p. 98-99; K. Lennartz, *Zum ,erweiterten' Jambusbegriff*, RhM 143, 2000, p. 248 (Sotades in the iambic tradition); K. Gutzwiller, *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature*, Oxford 2007, p. 135-136.

²⁸ For a suggestion of a trace of the Greek Fescennines in Theocritus see D. Konstan, *A Note on Theocritus Idyll 18*, CPh 74, 1979, p. 234.

and his suggestion that Callimachus, fr. 75.4–5 Pfeiffer contains an allusion to Sotades' poem. An examination of Callimachus' *Epigram 1* shows on the one hand that it can be read as a jocular comment on the Ptolemies' marriage, and on the other that its form is conventional and typical of the early Greek fable. Since Sotades' invective appears to share these characteristics, it is argued that *Epigram 1* is another instance of when Callimachus alludes to Sotades.