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The new epigrams of Posidippus, published as P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309, cast a sudden dazzling light on an array of important topics in Hellenistic studies ranging from Ptolemaic patronage of the arts to the early form of the poetry-book.¹ Not least among the scroll’s attractions are previously unknown poems about Kallikrates of Samos and his famous foundation, the shrine of Arsinoe-Aphrodite Zephyritis at Cape Zephyrion near Alexandria. These provide fresh insight into the interests of this prominent Ptolemaic courtier, and so oblige us to consider anew some aspects of his career and objectives. That is what I propose to do in this paper. In light of both new evidence and old, Kallikrates will emerge as a figure who promoted a consistent agenda in his actions on behalf of his sovereigns, Ptolemy II and Arsinoe Philadelphus: an exponent of that “intercultural poetics” most recently described by Susan

Stephens, he sought to mediate between old Hellas and the sometimes strange new world of Ptolemaic Egypt, bridging the gap between the two whether by bringing Greek tradition to bear on his Egyptian milieu, or by spreading abroad his rulers’ novel cultural policies.

To start with what is known of his life: Kallikrates of Samos, son of Boiskos, was a man of power and influence. “Supreme commander of the Ptolemaic navy,” or nauarch, for some twenty years from the 270s into the 250s B.C., he belonged to the inner circle of the court and was described by Philadelphus himself as one of the philoi (Welles, Royal Corres. 14.9). His achievements and faithful devotion to the crown were such that Ptolemy chose him to be the first eponymous priest of the dynastic cult of Alexander and the Theoi Adelphoi in 272/1 (P.Hibeh II 199.ii.12), a signal honor. At Olympia Kallikrates made a lavish dedication to Zeus Olympios in honor of his king and queen, setting up statues of each atop a pair of ionic columns ten meters high (cf. infra). A new detail furnished by the Milan Posidippus is the information that Kallikrates was active also at another Panhellenic shrine, at Delphi, where, as we shall see, his colts won the chariot race. In consequence, Kallikrates made a grand statuary dedication to the Theoi Adelphoi (XI.33–XII.7 = 74 A.-B.). Further dedications by him are recorded in Samos (a statue of one Tinnis, daughter of Dionysodoros, to Hera, IG

2Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria (Berkeley 2003).

3In the following I rely on the compilation of sources in L. Mooren, The Aulic Titulature in Ptolemaic Egypt: Introduction and Prosopography (Brussels 1975) 58–60 no. 010.

4Cf. H. Hauben, Callocrates of Samos: A Contribution to the Study of the Ptolemaic Admiralty (Studia Hellenistica 18 [Leuven 1970]) 69. He appears as υαυαρχος during Arsinoe’s lifetime (i.e. before 268) in a Samian dedication OGIS 29, and in his own foundation on behalf of Ptolemy and Arsinoe of a temple of Isis and Anubis at Canopus (SB I 429). In about 257 he was probably still nauarch as he had his agent Zoilos write to Apollonios, Philadelphus’ chief financial officer, to collect a tax (τρητοράξημα) for the upkeep of the navy (P.Mich. I 100).
XII.6 446), and possibly at Kourion in Cyprus (a stele to Apollo, Mitford, *I.Kourion* no. 58).

In Egypt he dedicated a sanctuary of Isis and Anubis on behalf of Ptolemy and Arsinoe at Canopus. Most famously, at some point shortly before or after Arsinoe’s death he founded the shrine of Arsinoe-Aphrodite Zephyritis at Cape Zephyrion between Alexandria and Canopus. This shrine is unique in being the only edifice of the third century B.C. commemorated in multiple epigrams by various leading Hellenistic poets. As we shall see, the Milan Posidippus adds at least one more poem to the roster—I believe, however, that it in fact adds several. Both old and new epigrams show clearly that Kallikrates sought through this coastal shrine to identify the queen with the *maritime* Aphrodite, who held particular significance for sailors. As Louis Robert stressed, “we see a link” between the character of the cult and “the duties of the nauarch.” Through this foundation, “the queen became patron of the fleet and of the Ptolemaic maritime empire.”

Finally, Kallikrates was himself the object of numerous honors. At Olous on Crete he was acclaimed as “benefactor” and granted proxeny (*I.Cret.* Ixxii 4.A.35–38). He was honored

---

5 SB I 429. The attention to Egyptian gods may also be reflected in the offering of a rhyton in the form of Bes at the shrine of Aphrodite-Zephyritis, described in an epigram by Hedylus (4 G.-P.), see below.


with statues by the *nesiotai* at Delos (Durrbach, *Choix* 25.1–2), at Palai-Paphos (Mitford, *BSA* 56 [1961] 9 no. 18) and Kourion in Cyprus, as well as together with Ptolemy and Arsinoe—and on a strikingly equal footing—in his native Samos (*OGIS* 29.3–4 with II p.539).

In all, our evidence depicts a man who—befitting the mobility implicit in the office of *nauarch*—glides easily between the old Greek world and the new, and is at home in both. On the one hand, we find him linked with venerable Hellenic shrines, making offerings to traditional Greek deities such as Zeus at Olympia, Hera at Samos, Apollo on Cyprus, yet at the same time serving in the very untraditionally Greek role of priest of his divinized yet living sovereigns in their dynastic cult. Again, on the one hand, Kallikrates aimed his newly-founded cult of Arsinoe-Aphrodite Zephyritis at a mostly Greek constituency, for according to the testimony of the epigram by Posidippus 12 G.-P. it is Greek women and men who are its beneficiaries—the poem addresses them: ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τὴν Ζεφυρίτιν ἀκουσμένην Ἀφροδίτην / Ἐλλήνων ἁγναί βαίνετε θυγατέρες, / οἱ θ' ἀλλ' ἐργάται ἀνδρές, “but come to that Aphrodite who will be called Zephyritis, chaste daughters of the Greeks and men who work the sea”; yet at the same time he founded a cult of the Egyptian deities Isis and Anubis at Canopus, whose priest is recorded as being an Egyptian, Pasis.9

The important point is not that Kallikrates simply moved between these worlds, but that he actively sought to bind them together, establishing links from one to the other, integrating his adoptive homeland into the cultural fabric of old Greece. I believe that the new epigrams help illustrate this point. The first to be examined commemorates Kallikrates’ victory at the Pythian games in the chariot-race for colts (XI.33–XII.7 = 74 A.-B.):

9 SB I 429. Following P. Fraser, *OpAth* 7 (1967) 40, Hauben (*supra* n.4: 40 with n.7) believes that Pasis “usurped the proprietary rights to this temple” at a later time.
At Delphi this filly, when vying with the four-horse chariots, nimbly ran a dead heat against a Thessalian rig, and won by a nose. Great then was the uproar of the drivers, Phoebus, in the presence of the amphictyonic judges. But they at once threw their rods onto the ground, so that by lot the charioteers should carry off the crown of victory. But she, the right-hand trace-horse, bent down in the pureness of her heart, and lifted up the rod herself, a wondrous female amongst the males. The mingled throng then clamored with a single voice for the judges to proclaim the great crown hers. And amidst noisy applause the Samian man Kallikrates carried off the laurel. But here he set as vivid image of those former contests a bronze chariot with its team and charioteer for the Theoi Adelphoi.

With a vividness no doubt meant to match the εἰκὼν ἔναργής dedicated by Kallikrates (13–14), the poem describes the high drama of the finish-line at Delphi following this race. In bold strokes it evokes the tumult of the crowd—the πολὺς ... θροῦς ἐλατήρων (3), the shout of the mingled throng (9–10), its noisy
applause (ἐν θὸρ[ύβῳ 11). In between there is the powerful
gesture of the judges in flinging down their rods, signaling (as
was the norm in case of a dead heat) that the victory was to be
decided by lot, and so considered “sacred” (ἱερά), i.e. left up to
the god. Yet for all its dramatic immediacy the epigram leaves
no doubt that it is at a remove from the action. As Bastianini
and Galazzi recognized (ad XII 7), the opening words, ἐν Δελ-
φοῖς, show clearly that the dedication was not at Delphi, since
in that setting a reference such as this would be superfluous.
Further, the poem implies a temporal disjunction between the
dedication of the statue and the victory in “those contests back
then” (τῶν τότ’ [άγγισα]ν 13). To be sure, τότε may in part be
intended to speak to imagined viewers of future generations, but
that does not prevent it from referring in the first instance to
events already at a distance at the time of dedication. All this
raises the question of how to interpret the demonstrative ὅδε of
14. To what location does it refer? Where, if not at Delphi, did
Kallikrates set up his elaborate bronze statuary group?
To commemorate an agonistic triumph victors commonly dedi-
cated statues in their native cities. We may wonder, therefore,
whether the designation of Kallikrates as ἀνὴρ Σάμιος in 12
hints at a location in Samos. That, however, is unlikely since—as
Hauben points out in another context—it would be “peculiar
that a Samian would mention his ethnic in his own native
city.” Not Delphi, not Samos: where then?

10 Cf. L. Moretti, Iscrizioni agonistiche greche (Rome 1953) 201.
11 J. Ebert, Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen
Agonen (Berlin 1972) ad no. 38.4, cf. ad no. 26.1/2: “Die πότε historisch aus-
wertende Interpretation von H. T. Wade-Gery (JHS 53, 1933, 71ff.), der
vielfach aus πότε schliesst, dass jeweils zwischen dem im Epigramm an-
gezeigten Ereignis und der Abfassung des Epigramms geraume Zeit verflossen
sei, erscheint mir sehr fragwürdig.”
12 Cf. Ebert (supra n.11) 11–12.
13 Hauben (supra n.4) 37 n.4, referring to OGIS 29.
While we cannot be certain, I believe that the evidence points to Egypt. That is the inference I draw from the striking fact that it is not Kallikrates who is the honorand of the dedication (though it doubtless does him honor, too), nor even the god of Delphi—though he is the poem’s addressee with Φοῖβος (4)—but rather the Theoi Adelphoi. What have they to do with this victory?

An answer may lie in how that victory is presented. We already noted how the epigram stressed the thronging multitudes, their noise, and the judges casting away their rods (ῥάβδους ... χαμάδις βάλον 5). Juxtaposed to these in meaningful contrast is the silent solitary figure of the female colt who, answering the judges’ gesture, bent down to draw to herself—and so claim—the rod (χαμαι νεύσασσα σ’ ... ῥάβδον ἐφειλκόσσα [7–8]). Significantly, the colt’s deed derives ἀκεφαλίων / ἐκ στήθους (7–8). It is because she acts “out of the purity of her heart” that she is able to resolve the matter of the lots: for lots, by their very nature, involve divinity, nowhere more than at Delphi where we know there were lot-oracles. To gain the favor of the Delphic god (the poem’s addressee) the competitor in the race must be a match for him in purity, a quality here evoked in Apollo’s by-name Φοῖβος (4). Where human judgment fails, the god’s will is decisive. Here it is expressed through the action of this un

14 Both senses, “draw to oneself” and “claim for oneself,” are clearly in play here (cf. LSJ s.v. ἐφείλκω II.2 and 5).
16 Certainly the Hellenistic poets heard that meaning in the name. Cf. Cuypers’ comment on the use of the verb φοῖβω in connection with the seer Phineus at Ap. Rh. 2.302: “περί ... πάντη φοῖβησαντες, ‘having cleansed (the old man’s skin) all around’—but also ‘Phoebused,’ appropriate treatment for a seer ... There may be some truth lurking behind our scholiast’s φοῖβησαντες οὖν λαμπρόνας, καθάραντος: φοῖβον γάρ το καθαρόν, ἤθεν καὶ Φοῖβος ὁ Ἀπόλλων, διὰ το καθαρόν’: M. P. Cuypers, Apollonius Rhodius. Argonautica 2.1–310: A Commentary (diss. Leiden 1997). For this verb in a similar sense elsewhere in Hellenistic poetry, cf. Callim. Hymn. 5.11, Theoc. 17.134, Lycoph. 6 and 1166.
tainted creature, which constitutes a sign whose validity is at once acknowledged by all.\(^{17}\)

Up to this point, throughout this drama of decision, Kallikrates has remained discretely in the background, the text reserving any mention of him till near the end.\(^{18}\) Indeed, the poet has been at pains to take the outcome out of the hands of Kallikrates, and place it instead in the realm of the divine. Now when he enters it is as a modest ἄνὴρ Σάμιος (12), without titles or patronymic. He appears, rather, in a role analogous to that of his colt (or rather, in retrospect it appears that the colt was a stand-in for Kallikrates): he is likewise a solitary silent figure in the crowd (ἐν θορυβωί 11). And as the colt drew up to herself the rod (ῥαβδὸν ἐφειλκύσα[το 8]), so he bore aloft the laurel (δάφνην ἦρατ' 12). The actions of colt and master are clearly analogous, and imply that the god’s favor extended to Kallikrates. Perhaps in making his dedication to the Theoi Adelphoi, his patron-deities and real-life benefactors, Kallikrates sought to acknowledge that, in a larger sense that reached beyond the present victory, he owed his success to higher powers. The message is “not mine, the glory, but theirs.”

Bastianini and Galazzi argued that the terminus post quem of

\(^{17}\) Differently J. Bingen, “La victoire pythique de Callicratès de Samos,” ChrEg 77 (2002) 185–190, who argues that βραχές in the phrase ῥάβδους δὲ βραχές χαμάς βάλον (5) does not mean that the judges threw their rods to the ground “at once,” “in no time” (= βραχέως), as the original editors and Austin suppose, but means “too few”: “Trop peu de ceux-ci [sic. the judges] jetèrent à terre leur bâton pour que ce fût par tirage au sort que les cochers emportent la couronne de la victoire” (186). Though Bingen’s interpretation of βραχές is syntactically and lexically possible (cf. ὀλγον = “too few” at Thuc. 1.50.5, Hdt. 6.109), its meaning in the context is implausible. For on his view, the dramatic core of the poem embodied in the extraordinary act of the colt, which is taken as a sign by all present, is in fact superfluous: a sufficient number of judges was sure enough of the outcome that no decision by lot was actually necessary. Once the tumult died down—we infer from Bingen’s argument—the ordinary human decision-making process would have arrived at the right conclusion. This, however, is to make the sign, together with the poet’s implication that the god was responsible for it, quite pointless.

\(^{18}\) Ebert (supra n.11) 79 ad no. 19.2 notes the “in hellenistischer Zeit aufkommenden Sitte, gerade in längeren Gedichten, wohl um eine gewisse Spannung zu erzeugen, die Namensnennung hinauszuzögern.”
our poem must be the year 270. They noted that the dynastic

cult of the *Theoi Adelphoi* was founded in 272/1 (that is in the

14th year of Philadelphus’ reign as reckoned from his co-regency

with Soter in 285/4, *cf. P.Hibeh* II 199), and that the first

Pythian games thereafter fell in 270. Those, they argued, must

be the first for which our poem could have been composed.\(^{19}\)

Given, however, that by characterizing the games as \(\tau\omega\nu\ \tau\omicron\omicron\ \ \hat{\alpha}g\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\) (13) the epigram may point to a certain lag between

Kallikrates’ victory and his dedication, I would propose another

possible date. The Pythian games of 274 fell in August/

September of that year (*cf. B.-G. ad XII.6*), while the year in

which the cult of the *Theoi Adelphoi* first appears in operation

began in either March or May of 272.\(^{20}\) No doubt the decision to

create the cult, and to name Kallikrates its first official, went

back to the previous year. Thus Kallikrates’ eponymous priest-

hood commenced less than two years after those games, when

their memory might still be fresh. In this light I would suggest

that the admiral’s striking decision to commemorate his victory

with a dedication to the *Theoi Adelphoi* may have been related

to these circumstances: at no other time would he have had so

strong a motive, or have made so potent an impression, as

during that year when he was first eponymous priest of this

newly-established cult. Plausibly, then, we may ascribe Kal-

likrates’ offering for the *Theoi Adelphoi* to the year 272/1.

And where did he make it? What setting should we con-

template for the poem’s final words, \(\delta\sigma\ “\theta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron? Fraser stressed

that “unlike casual ruler-worship [the Ptolemaic dynastic cult]

was centered on the capital of the kingdom, and cult-centres

elsewhere were subordinate to this central administration.”\(^{21}\)

\(^{19}\) “270 dovrebbe dunque essere il terminus a quo per il fatto narrato e per

la composizione dell’ epigramma stesso” (*ad XII 6*).

\(^{20}\) It ran either from 15 March 272 to 4 March 271 or from 17 May 272 to 5


\(^{21}\) *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972) I 214.
Alexandria thus seems an obvious choice. But wherever Kallikrates made his offering, clearly its goal was to link the new Ptolemaic cult to the luster of Apollo and the prestige of a victory at his panhellenic shrine at Delphi. Not that this goal was unique or even novel. Greek city-states had long recognized the benefits that befell them when their citizens brought victory-crowns home from the games. But the hunger for prestige and the legitimation offered by such victories was particularly urgent among the ambitious Ptolemies, with their recently established kingdom and new-built capital. In his Victory of Sosibios (fr.384 Pf. with II pp.121, 125) Callimachus dramatizes this situation so as to highlight the somewhat embarrassing disparity between the kingdom’s grand presumptions and the little it at first had to show for them: the Nile itself declares that until Sosibios “no one had brought a trophy back to the city from these sepulchral festivals [i.e. the panhellenic games] and, great though I am, I, whose sources no mortal man knows, in this one thing alone was more insignificant than those streams which the white ankles of women cross without difficulty, and children pass over on foot without wetting their knees,” [... οὗ] γάρ πώ τις ἔπει τόλμην ἡγαγ’ ἄθλον / [... ] ταφίων τῶν δὲ πανηγυρίων / [...] καὶ ποιλός, ἧν οὐδ’ ἄθεν οἶδεν ὀδεύω / θνητὸς ἀνήρ, ἐνι γοῦν τῷ δὲ ἀττόερος / κε[ίνω]ν οὔδ’ ἀμογητί διὰ σφυρὰ λευκὰ γυναικῶν / καὶ παίζεις ἄβρεκτῳ γούνατι πεζὸς ἔβη (29–34). In a series of epigrams celebrating equestrian victories, the Milan papyrus makes clear that the Ptolemies’ pursuit of such prestige was far more determined than we had hitherto imagined. 22 With his conspicuous victory at Pytho Kallikrates doubtless helped his sovereigns attain their goal.

The same holds true of his dedication to Zeus Olympios in honor of Ptolemy and Arsinoe at Olympia. It is worth recalling

this remarkable monument here, for it helps us visualize on how grand a scale, and with what audacious and meaningful design, Kallikrates sought to glorify his sibling lords. Here too he made sure to present them in terms evoking divinity, specifically as a couple like Zeus and Hera. At the same time it is striking again by contrast how modestly he presented himself—just as in the epigram for his Delphic victory. The dedication consists of a monumental pedestal 20 m. long by 4 m. wide by 1.12 m. high, in the middle of which was an exedra 2.35 m. long by 1.68 m. wide, articulated with a bench. Bracketing the pedestal on either end a large stylobate block supported an 8.93 m. tall Ionic column, each crowned by a bronze statue resting on a statue-base atop the capital. As the texts symmetrically inscribed in four lines on the plinths at the base of each column reveal, one statue was of king Ptolemy Philadelphus, the other of his queen Arsinoe (OGIS 26–27).

Hoepfner (45–49) persuasively described how the columns with their statues dominate the eastern end of the broad plaza in front of, and facing, the great temples of Zeus and Hera. Indeed, as his site-plan indicates, they are carefully aligned so

---

23 The dedications appear to have no connection with specific victories, as the inscriptions make no mention thereof. However, the new epigrams reveal that both Ptolemy and Arsinoe won such victories. The 126th or 127th Olympiad (276 or 272 B.C.) are the only festivals overlapping Ptolemy’s marriage to Arsinoe II, which occurred sometime after 279, cf. Hauben (supra n.4) 35. It was evidently at one of these that Arsinoe won the triple Olympic victory celebrated by Posidippus in XII.26–27 = 78.7–8 A.-B. It was possibly at the same festival that Philadelphus won the Olympic chariot victory mentioned in the same poem (XII.24–26 = 78.5–7 A.-B.), though there can be no certainty about this. Another epigram of Posidippus (XIII.35–XIV.1 = 88 A.-B.) deals with a chariot victory of Ptolemy II, which he won while co-regent with Ptolemy I (i.e. before 283, prior to his marriage to Arsinoe).


25 The stylobate blocks are of white marble like the columns, and thus visually form a unity with these, distinct from the pedestal, which is built of limestone, cf. Hoepfner 15.
as to stand in relationship—at precisely the same angle—to the end-columns of the temples of Hera and Zeus. Thus Ptolemy and Arsinoe as king and queen, but also as brother and sister, become the visual counterparts to the divine couple, the brother-sister sovereigns Zeus and Hera. Theocritus made a similar analogy in his 17th Idyll (131–134). Further, the pair of columns serve quite literally to exalt the royal couple above the plane of the viewer, strongly suggesting their divinity. Philadelphus in fact established the cult of the Theoi Adelphoi within his own and his sister’s lifetime, making them gods on earth. The divinization of the brother-sister pair was a momentous step which Ptolemaic apologists sought to make intelligible and to legitimize through Greek precedent.26 The monument does just that. Finally, Hoepfner suggests that Kallikrates’ dedication injects a subtly Egyptianizing element into this most Greek milieu. On his view (47–48), the highly unusual double-columned monument deliberately evokes Pharaonic tradition, recalling the paired obelisks with which Egyptian rulers marked important occasions. It was about this time, he notes, that Ptolemy first brought an obelisk to Alexandria to be set in honor of his sister-wife before her shrine, the Arsinoeion (Plin. HN 36.68, 34.148). Certainly the inclusion of such an Egyptianizing component is consistent with Kallikrates’ attempts to mediate between the new world and the old.

But even as the monument exalts its Ptolemaic sovereigns to the skies, drawing the gaze of the viewer heavenwards, it also communicates the relative humility of its sponsor, Kallikrates of Samos—just as in the epigram celebrating his dedication to the Theoi Adelphoi on the occasion of his victory at Pytho. For the viewer encounters Kallikrates’ name at eye-level (Hoepfner 46), inscribed in lines of text each a mere 3 cm. high, and cut just 2–3

26 On this topic see most recently W. Huss, Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit (Munich 2001) 307–309, 325.
mm. deep into the stone (Hoepfner 15)—a strikingly unobtrusive, even self-effacing declaration of authorship, when set against the imposing size of the monument as a whole.

I turn now to some of the new epigrams concerning the shrine of Arsinoe-Aphrodite Zephyritis. Their appearance in the Milan papyrus adds new force to the old observation that Meleager was not interested in collecting poems about Ptolemaic monuments or occasions. For none of the poems on this shrine (including those by Callimachus and Hedylyus) are transmitted in the Palatine or Planudean anthologies, nor is the epigram by Posidippus about Sostratos of Knidos and the Pharos.27 I start with that new poem which is closest to the old Posidippan examples about this shrine (VI.30–37 = 39 A.-B.):

καὶ μέλλων ἄλα νηὶ περὰν καὶ πείσια καθάπτειν
χερσόθεν, Εὐπλοῖαι ἡχάρε ὁς Ἀρσινόη,
πόλτνιαν ἐκή νηπίαν καλέων θεόν, ἣν ὁ Βοῖσκος

ναυαρχῶν Σάμιος θήκατο Καλλικράτης,
ναυτίλη, σοὶ τὰ μάλιστα· κατ᾽ εὐπλοῖαι δὲ διώκει

τήσεθε θεοῦ χρῆζον πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλος ἀνήρ·
εἶνεκα καὶ χερσαία καὶ εἰς ἄλα δίαν ἕφιες
εὐχάς εὐρήσεις τὴν ἐπακουσμένη.

Whether you plan to cross the sea by ship or make fast the stern-cable

from the shore, say “hail” to Arsinoe of Fair Sailing,
and call the goddess-queen from her temple, which Boiskos’ son,
the nauarch, Samian Kallikrates dedicated especially for you, sailor. In pursuit of fair sailing often another man has called upon this goddess.
Therefore whether you’re on dry land or casting off for sea, you will find her attentive to your prayers.

We recall that in one of the previously-known epigrams by Posidippus about this cult (12 G.-P.), the shrine itself had taken voice to call upon two sorts of audience (7–9): “But come to that Aphrodite who shall be called Zephyritis, you chaste daughters of the Greeks, and men who work the sea.” The new poem addresses only the second of these groups. It tells the sailor that Kallikrates dedicated the temple especially for him (ναυτίλε, σοι τὰ μάλιστα 5), and that he should greet its goddess, Arsinoe, as Euploia (she of Fair Sailing). With this cult-title, the poem makes plain what was previously implicit when in the second of the earlier-known Posidippan poems on this shrine (13 G.-P.) we heard that Arsinoe-Aphrodite would grant fair sailing, εὐπλοήν δέσσει (5). The new poem thus confirms Louis Robert’s suspicion that Aphrodite was worshipped as Euploia at Zephylion, a title with important associations. For through it Kallikrates forged a link between Arsinoe and such celebrated old-world examplars of Aphrodite Euploia as the Knidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles28 and Konon’s temple in the Piraeus (Paus. 1.1.3). Indeed, Robert plausibly argued that the many humble private altars to Arsinoe Philadelphus, which cluster particularly in the far-flung port-cities of the Ptolemaic empire, and also the numerous ports renamed for Arsinoe, reflect Kallikrates’ activities as “ardent propagandist” for this cult,29 promoting its spread far beyond the confines of Egypt. In other words, the links Kallikrates forged went in both directions: from old Hellas to Egypt, and from Egypt back to old Hellas.

A final observation about this poem: the assimilation to Aphrodite is here so complete that, in contrast to the previously-known poems, Aphrodite is not even mentioned.

28 Posidippus himself appears linked to both the Knidian and Zephyrian cults of Euploia since he is said to have written about Praxiteles’ statue in a work entitled Peri Knidou (147 Α.-Β. = Suppl.Hellenisticum 706).
29 Robert (supra n.8) 201–202, 208.
Arsinoe is invoked as theos entirely on her own (πότνιαιν ἔκη νηοῦ καλέων θεῶν 3, τήσδε θεοῦ χρήζων 6). Scholars have argued on the basis of Posidippus’ description of Arsinoe as βασίλισσα in epigram 12.5 G.-P. that Kallikrates founded the cult at Zephyrion while Arsinoe was still the reigning queen, since that designation appears in inscriptions that presuppose Arsinoe alive.\(^{30}\) Be that as it may, the new poem addresses her as πότνια (3), a comparable term, but one customarily applied to divinities. By invoking her in this way, and by calling her theos without mention of Aphrodite, the new poem may suggest that we are dealing with the sovereign as she was divinized after her death.\(^{31}\)

That also seems to be the case in another poem (VI.10–17 = 36 A.-B.):

'Αρσινόη, σοὶ τοῦτο διὰ στολίδων ἀνέμουσθαι
βύσσινον ἄγκειται βρέγμ’ ἀπὸ Ναυκράτιος,
ὅτι σὺ, φίλη, κατ’ ἰδειρόν ὀμόρξασθαι γλυκύν ὡδῷ
ἡθελες ὀτρηρῶν παυσαμένη καμάτων·
ὁς ἐφανή(ζ), Φιλάδελφε, καὶ ἐν χερί δούρατος αἰχήμην,
πότνα, καὶ ἐν πήχει κούλον ἔχουσα σάκος.
ἡ δὲ σοι αἰτηθείσα τὸ λευ(χ)έανον κανόνισμα
παρθένος Ἑησώθ θήκε γένος Μακέτη.

Arsinoe, for you this gift is dedicated, to be swept by the wind
across your garment’s folds, a linen cloth from Naukratis,
with which in a dream, dear one, you wished to wipe your dulcet sweat

when you’d ceased from your busy labors.

Thus you appeared, O dear to your brother, in your hand the pointed spear,

\(^{30}\) For the pros and cons see Hauben (supra n.4) 44–45.

\(^{31}\) Probably in 268 (see supra n.6). The first kanephoros of Arsinoe Philadelphus is recorded in 268/7, i.e. after her demise, and thus speaks for the establishment of a separate cult for the divinized queen shortly after her death: cf. Hauben (supra n.6) 161.
queen, and on your arm a hollow shield.
At your request, this white strip of cloth
the maiden Hegeso, of Macedonian heritage, gave in offering.

What has this poem to do with Kallikrates or the cult he established at Cape Zephyrion? The poem records a dedication to the divinized Arsinoe Philadelphus with no apparent reference to Aphrodite, her cult-title, or to sea-faring such as we see in the other poems. Yet there may be grounds for making a connection. First of all, the mention of Naukratis as the source of the βύσσινον ... βρέγμα (2) evokes an Egyptian milieu. That squares with Hegeso’s proud insistence on her Macedonian roots: in a largely alien environment Greeks might appeal to their Greekness with particular emphasis.\(^{32}\) The affectionate bond evoked when Hegeso addresses Arsinoe as φίλη (3) suggests a relationship between the goddess and her maiden-worshipper defined by more than just her dream. Moreover, the goddess’ title “Phil-adelphos,” both “dear to-” and “loving her brother,” necessarily links her function to love and marriage. In one of the previously-known Posidippus epigrams (13 G.-P.), it is expressly as Arsinoe Philadelphus (\textit{i.e.} Arsinoe Who Loves Her Brother) that the queen is equated with Kypris (1–2). Most suggestive, however, is the specification that the offering is “to be swept by the wind / across your garment’s folds” (δύστολιδον ἄνεμον ἀνεμοσθει 1). Does this detail serve any purpose in the poem beyond the merely ornamental? So far as I can see, of the numerous literary instances we have of women dedicating textiles—from the Trojan women of \textit{Iliad} 6 offering the peplos to Athena in her temple (6.90–92, 271–273, 288–295) to the bride presenting her veil to Hera in an epigram by “Archilochus” (\textit{Anth.Pal.} 6.133 = \textit{Page FGE} p.147) to Nossis and her mother

\(^{32}\) See the similar insistence on the part of Apollonios, one of the Macedonian brothers connected with the Memphite Serapeum in the mid-second century B.C., as described by D. J. Thompson, \textit{Memphis under the Ptolemies} (Princeton 1988) 261.
dedicating a fine linen garment to Hera Lakinia at her shrine near Croton (3 G.-P. = Anth.Pal. 6.265)—none of them pictures the dedication billowing in the wind.\(^{33}\) I suggest that \(\dot{\alpha}νεμωνσθει\) hints at Arsinoe’s identity as Aphrodite Zephyritis.\(^{34}\) Indeed, the celebrity of this cult was such that perhaps the mere mention of wind in conjunction with Arsinoe could trigger the association.\(^{35}\) If this is so, then Hegeso, the Macedonian maiden, represents that other constituency to which Posidippus addressed himself in the earlier-known poem cited above (12.9 G.-P.). She is one of those “chaste daughters of the Greeks,” \(\'Ελληνοι \ αγαπήτεροι,\) who—together with the “men who work the sea”—were urged to come to the temple of Arsinoe-Aphrodite. And while sailors came to the shrine to pray for fair sailing, the young women came in the hope of a smooth voyage on the sea of love and marriage.\(^{36}\) Is that what Hegeso desires?

On the face of it, the idea does not look promising: Arsinoe appeared to the maiden equipped with spear and shield, and sweating from her labors. Bastianini and Galazzi note a dream recounted in Plutarch’s *Lucullus* (10) in which Athena sweats because of her efforts on behalf of Cyzicus in the Mithridatic War, and they wonder whether we should assume a comparable martial context here in connection with that same goddess. Specifically, they weigh the Chremonidean War which pitted

---


\(^{34}\) Note that the windswept garment accords with the iconography of Aphrodite generally, *cf.* *LIMC* II 936–950, 985.

\(^{35}\) Recall the \(\dot{\alpha}νεμωδέα \ χηλή\) which her temple is said to occupy in Posidippus 12.3 G.-P.

\(^{36}\) A point convincingly demonstrated by K. Gutzwiller with reference to Callimachus' epigram on the offering of the nautilus shell at the shrine of Aphrodite Zephyritis: “The Nautilus, the Halcyon, and Selenaia: Callimachus’s Epigram 5 Pf. = 14 G.-P.,” *CA* 11 (1992) 194–209, esp. 198–202. Thus in the closing words of Posidippus 12 G.-P., \(\pi\alphaντός \ κύματος \ ευλήμενον\) (10), the qualification \(\pi\alphaντός\) refers not just to a haven from every wave in a literal sense, but also from every erotic wave, *cf.* Theogn. 459–460 (of the \(\gamma\nu\nu\ η\ νέα\) \(\acute{\alpha}πορρή\'σσα\) \(\delta\τ\ ν\ ς\ / \pi\ολλάκις \ έ\kappa ν\ η\ τ\ ον \ \'\ άλλον \ \'ν\ χε\ι\ λι\μένα,\) and 1273–1274 \(\epsilon\kappa \ \delta\ \thetaυ\ελλά\ν / \ \hat{\eta}κ\α \ \gamma^{\prime} \ έ\νωρμ\'ισθη\τ\ η νυ\κτός \ \'ε\πει\γό\μενος.\)
Ptolemy Philadelphus against Antigonus Gonatas. It may be that Arsinoe’s weapons, toil, and sweat suggest something on these lines. But it is worth recalling that Aphrodite may be portrayed as armed quite apart from any overt military function at various well-known cult-sites, particularly on Kythera and in Laconia. As early as Sappho’s appeal to the goddess to “fight alongside” her, σύμμαχός ἕσσο (28 L.-P.), it is possible to speak of Aphrodite’s erotic activities in martial terms. But even if we accept a possible reference to a contemporary war, it would not preclude an erotic subtext. For why is Hegeso portrayed here as παρθένος? Could it be that the maiden was thinking about an armed Arsinoe-Aphrodite, even dreaming of her, because she cared about someone involved in a war, a prospective husband perhaps?

One other poem from the new epigrams, though poorly preserved, may refer to the shrine of Arsinoe-Aphrodite Zephyritis. If so, then the epigram suggests again how this cult could serve as a conduit through which the cultural heritage of Greece might enter the new terrain of Egypt (VI.18–25 = 37 A.-B.):

'Αρσινόη, σοι τῇ[ν] δε λύρην ὑπὸ χειρ[ῶς άοιδο]|δ
φθεγξαμ[ένην] δελφις ἦγαγ’ 'Αριόνιο[ς
ου., ἔλον[...].]ας ἕ κ κύματος ἀλλ.’ ὀτ[]
κείνος αν[...].]ς λευκὰ περὰι πελά[γη
πολλαπο[...].] τιτι και αιόλα τῆι [.]
φωνήι π[...]ακον κανον ἄὴδον[
ἄνθεμι δ’, [ὁ Φιλ]άδελφε, τὸν ἠλασεν [.... Ἀρ]ίων,
tόνδε δἐξ[χου,.] ὃσοι μ(ε)ήλια ναοπόλο[υ].

37 Cf. Nilsson, GGR P 490 n.7, who cites the temple of Aphrodite Areia, Paus. 3.17.5; Plut. Mor. 239α; IG V.1 602 Aphrodite ἐνόπλιος (early III A.D.); there was an armed xoanon of Aphrodite Ourania on Kythera, Paus. 3.23.1. Cf. E. Magnelli, Alexandri Aetolii Testimonia et Fragmenta (Florence 1999) ad fr.9 (= 8 Powell), and J. Flemberg, Venus Armata: Studien zur bewaffneten Aphrodite in der griechisch-römischen Kunst (Stockholm/Göteborg 1991) 29–42. For the armed Aphrodite in art cf. LIMC II 243–245.
Arsinoe, a dolphin like that of Arion brought you this lyre
which once resounded at the touch [of a singer]
... from the wave. But when [that one ... crossed the foaming sea
many things ... and various with [his voice ...]
But this offering, O Philadelphus, which Arion played
please accept it, a dedication of ... your temple custodian.

This poem records the dedication to Arsinoe Philadelphus by
her temple-keeper (ναοπόλος) of a lyre brought ashore by a
dolphin, and of this epigram which seems to represent itself as
a song of Arion, the seventh-century musician of Methymna. It
seems plausible to infer from the text that this sea-borne
offering was made in—perhaps even found near—the temple of
Arsinoe-Aphrodite Zephyritis, which (as Posidippus put it in
the epigram from the Didot papyrus, 12 G.-P.) occupied “the
windy headland among the encircling waves” (ἐν περιφαινομένῳ
κόμῳ τῷ χῶρῳ ἐχο ... ἀνεμώδεσα χελήν 2–3).38 If this is correct,
then the poem represents a striking example of how an object,
the lyre, may be made to embody the cultural/historical
heritage, and become (quite literally) the vehicle by which that
heritage is transmitted to a new place.39 For the epigram clearly
alludes to the legend of Arion as told by Herodotus (1.24). In
that account, upon being threatened with robbery and death by
the crew of the ship on which he was sailing, Arion, “the best

38 The identification of the site is also made by B.-G. in their introduction to
VI.18–25, though their characterization of the shrine as the “tempio di Ar-
sinoe a Canopo” is misleading.

39 In this it resembles the fragmentary epigram in the lithika about the signet
ring of the Samian tyrant Polykrates (II.3–6 = 9 A.-B.). Carved on that ring is
“the lyre of that singer-man who used to strum it at your feet,” most likely
Anacreon. By setting this ring in the context of the lithika, with its pointedly
Ptolemaic orientation, Posidippus links his monarchs with the lyric heritage of
Anacreon, as well as with Polykrates as a model of artistic patronage.
singer in the world,” leaped into the sea in full kitharodic regalia. He was saved, however, through the miraculous intervention of a dolphin, the most musical of creatures, who caught him up and carried him safely to shore at Cape Tainaron. There, a statue of a man riding a dolphin was dedicated in a temple of Poseidon to commemorate the singer’s deliverance. Clearly Posidippus’ poem evokes not just the story of the rescue, but also the subsequent dedication—both of them made at a coastal shrine on a rugged cape. By describing how this lyre, together with the tradition it evokes, came to Egypt, the poet links the third-century shrine of Arsinoe to one of great figures of Archaic poetry from the seventh century, and with him to the rich tradition of Lesbian lyric including Terpander, Sappho, and Alcaeus.

But a further, less obvious model may be floating just below the surface here as well. For the story of the lyre’s wondrous appearance on Egyptian shores may be intended to recall and provide a modern counterpart to a well-known Lesbian tale linked with Methymna, likewise about a wondrous poetic wind-fall—the story of Orpheus’ lyre which, after the legendary singer had been torn apart by the Thracian maenads, floated across the sea together with his severed head until running aground, as Ovid put it, “on Lesbian Methymna’s shore” (et Methymnaeae potiuntur litore Lesbi). This tale is memorably recounted in an elegy of Phanocles, plausibly of early Hellenistic date (fr.1.11–22 Powell):

τοῦ δ’ ἀπὸ μὲν κεφαλὴν χαλκῷ τάμον, αὐτίκα δ’ αὐτῆν
eἰς ἄλα Θηρηκίης ῥίψαν ὡμοὶ χέλων
 ἠλῳ καρποῦνασαι, ἵν’ ἐμφόρεϊντο θαλάσση
 ἂμφω ἄμα, γλαυκοῖς τεγόμεναι ῥοθίοις.
tάς δ’ ἱερὴν Λέσβῳ πολιῆ ἐπέκελεσε θάλασσας.
 ἡχῇ δ’ ὡς λιγυρῆς πάντον ἐπέσχε λύρης.

They cut off his head with a sword of bronze, and threw it at once in the sea along with the Thracian lyre binding them strongly with a nail, so they would both be carried on the sea together, soaked by the billowing surf. And the foaming sea drove them to sacred Lesbos. And the clear echo of the lyre spread across the sea and over the islands and sea-beaten shores, where men interred the clear-sounding Orphic head and set in the tomb the bright-ringing lyre, which used to persuade even mute stones and the hateful water of Phorkos. From that time forth, songs and lovely kithara music have occupied the island, the most musical of them all.

In effect this tradition about the lyre of Orpheus constitutes an aition of the poetry of Lesbos, lending the authority of one of poetry’s founding fathers to that island’s status as a great repository and source of song. Transmission and preservation of the lyre here function virtually as a charter. Inasmuch as this early Hellenistic text invests the geographic transfer of this instrument with such poetological significance, it seems plausible to take the tale in Posidippus’ epigram in a similar way—that is, to see it as emblematic of the Ptolemies’ claim to be the true inheritors and guardians of the literary legacy of Hellas, in particular here the great tradition of Lesbic song. The Lesbian lyre has been passed on; today its home is Egypt.

Simultaneously, the epigram may point to important political ties in the mid-third century between Egypt and Arion’s native Methymna on Lesbos. That city came to serve as an important strategic base for Ptolemaic interests in the northern Aegean,
and its third-century coinage included the image of the kitharodic dolphin-rider as its emblem. The extent of Egypt’s influence here is plain in epigraphic sources which attest, for instance, to a priest of the divinized Ptolemy there between 267 and 260 (IG XII Suppl. 115), worship of Arsinoe Philadelphus (IG XII.2 513), regular celebrations of the Ptolemaia on the model of those in Alexandria (XII Suppl. 115, also at Eresos XII.2 527 with Suppl. p.33) and perhaps a month named Ptolemaion. Hence, a poem commemorating Egypt’s acquisition of “Arion’s” lyre through the miraculous agency of a dolphin (“like that of Arion”) would certainly have conveyed a potent political message at just the time (most likely in the 260s) when Methymna had become a vital part of the Ptolemies’ maritime empire, and when the nauarch Kallikrates had recently founded his cult of Arsinoe Zephyritis to mark the deified queen’s special patronage of the Ptolemaic navy.

We see, then, how the shrine established by Kallikrates became a focal point into which might flow, and from which might spread, the broad political/cultural interests of the Ptolemaic court—interests that were far-flung both geographically and chronologically. In this respect, the poem about the lyre’s migration takes its place beside comparable epigrams concerning objects dedicated in this shrine such as Callimachus 14 G.-P. (Κότις ήγῳ, Ζεφυρίτι, = 5 Pf. = Ath. 7.318), which charts the

41 BMC Cat. Troas, Aelis, and Lesbos 179 no. 16 (note also the lyre and dolphin on no. 14), 180 no. 27, 181 no. 35. Cf. H. G. Buchholz, Methymna: Archäologische Beiträge zur Topographie und Geschichte von Nordlesbos (Mainz 1975) plate 12 nos. 16, 17, 38, 39.

passage to the land of Egypt of the roving nautilus shell, and its itinerant dedicator—a certain Selenaia from Aeolian Smyrna (12) who found the shell on the beach at Iulis on Keos, a way-station perhaps on her way from Smyrna to Alexandria. The poem conforms to what Selden has described with respect to Callimachean dedicatory epigram generally: it “locates the offering at the site of multiple displacements,” leaving “traces of ... alterity that make the dedication significant.” The lyre, like the shell and its dedicator, finds its way to the shrine from elsewhere and carries something of its origins into its new environment.

The same may be said about another offering in the temple of Arsinoe “to whom the West Wind is dear” (φιλοζεφύρου 1), i.e. Arsinoe Zephyritis, in an epigram of Hedylus (4 G.-P. = Ath. 11.497σ). Contrary to what we found in the previous poems, however, its alterity bears the exotic stamp of Egyptian culture—and here we recall Kallikrates’ interest in fostering Egyptian gods as well as Greek ones, manifested in his founding of a cult of Anubis and Isis on behalf of Ptolemy and Arsinoe at Canopus (see above, 245). The offering is a rhyton conceived and dedicated by the Greek engineer Ktesibios in the shape of an Egyptian god, the dancer Bes (ὁρχηστῆν Βῆσαν Αἰγύπτιον 3). When wine flows through its mouthpiece, the god seems to trumpet a shrill note (ὁς λιγνὸν ἤχον / σαλπίζει, κρουνοῦ πρὸς ρόσιν οἴομένου 4–5), which is “like the ancestral melody which Lord Nile produced from his sacred waters” (Νεῖλος ὁποῖον ἀναζή ... ἔφρε μέλος θείων πάτριον ἔξ ὑδάτων 8–9): in short, the

43 It has been observed that the nearby Kean town of Koresia became an important Ptolemaic port in the mid-third century, which (significantly) was renamed Arsinoe following the queen’s death, cf. L. Robert, “Sur un décret des Korésiens au musée de Smyrne,” Hellenica 11–12 (1960) 132–176. It is probably also important that Keos has literary significance as the birthplace of Simonides and Bacchylides.

poem represents an Egyptian melody played by an Egyptian god at a shrine in Egypt, but mediated by an epigram in Greek commemorating a Greek’s dedication to a deified Greek queen.

Even in those poems, then, in which Kallikrates is not actually named, his shrine remains true to that project which, as we have seen, the admiral seems to have set himself, namely to mediate between old world and new. Situated on the windswept frontier between those worlds, simultaneously a point of convergence and a clearinghouse, it continued to serve as a conduit through which political/cultural traditions of Greece could enter into Egypt, and from which the Ptolemies could broadcast their own peculiar contributions to that legacy.
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