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Religion and family politics in Hellenistic Kalaureia

Three new inscriptions from the sanctuary of Poseidon

Abstract
This article presents three unpublished Hellenistic inscriptions from the sanctuary of Poseidon in Kalaureia (modern Poros): two found during archaeological excavations on the site and one recorded in a letter that was once part of Ioannis Kapodistrias’ official correspondence. All three inscriptions were dedicatory and carved on bases supporting portrait statues. Interestingly, they were offered to Poseidon by members of a single family already known from other documents in the Kalaureian epigraphic corpus. Remarkably, eight out of the 18 inscriptions discovered in Kalaureia make repeated references to men and women of this very family, which appears to have materially dominated Poseidon’s temenos and its environs during the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC through the careful placement of portraits of its members. Most of these statues were conspicuously placed by the entrance to the sanctuary, though at least one of them was erected inside of the god’s temple. In our article, we present in detail the three new inscriptions, one of them an epigram, and attempt an analysis of the religious behaviour of this prominent local family against the background of contemporary sociopolitical developments.

Keywords: Greek epigraphy, Greek inscriptions, dedications, Poseidon, Zeus Soter, Kalaureia, epigram, family, prosopography, statues

Introduction
The island of Kalaureia (modern Poros) was primarily famous in antiquity for its shrine of Poseidon (Figs. 1a & 1b). Archaeologically detectable from the 7th century BC, the shrine was administered by an amphictyony from at least the Archaic pe-

I had two splendid statues, a woman and a prince; intact, you could see their veins. Such was their perfection. When Poros was destroyed, they were taken by some soldiers who were going to sell them to some Europeans in Argos. They were asking for 1,000 thalers ... I took the soldiers aside, I spoke to them: “Even if they give you 10,000 thalers, don’t stoop to letting [these statues] leave our fatherland. These are what we fought for.”

* Yannis Makriyannis’ Memoirs, book 3, ch. 1; quote from the edition of Asdrachas 1957.
** For permission to study and publish inscription no. II we are grateful to Dr Eleni Konsolaki, Dr Maria Giannopoulou, and Dr Stella Chryssoulaki (Ephorate of Pireaus). For permission to study and publish inscription no. I, our gratitude goes to Dr Arto Penttinen, director of the Poros excavations. Nikolaos Papazarkadas would like to thank Professors Mark Griffith, Andy Stewart, and Mario Telò for fruitful discussions on the epigram and the statue bases, and the S.B. Aleshire Center of Greek Epigraphy for financial support. We are also grateful to the two referees for their valuable comments, one of whom, Professor Joseph Day, shed his anonymity. We have integrated into our text several of their suggestions, although responsibility for the final version of the article lies with us. Unless otherwise indicated, translations are our own. Finally, we warmly thank the editor of Opuscula Julia Habetzeder for her professionalism and patience.

https://doi.org/10.30549/opathrom-13-06
Post-antiquity, the site was known, visited, and described by travellers at least as early as the 18th century. The first organized archaeological investigation was undertaken by a Swedish team in 1894, when Sam Wide and Lennart Kjellberg conducted a brief campaign that focused on the sanctuary’s architectural remains. Unfortunately, there was no follow-up to this initial fieldwork. Apart from a limited study by the German archaeologist Georg Welter in the 1930s, and minor fieldwork carried out by members of the Greek Archaeological Service in 1979, it was not until the late 1990s that the shrine once again became the site of systematic excavations. In 1997, the Swedish Institute at Athens gratefully accepted an invitation from the Greek Ministry of Culture to initiate new work, and field campaigns have been regularly conducted ever since. Between 2006 and 2012, Kalaureia was the focal point of the large-scale scientific project The City, the God and the Sea, which aimed at further understanding the daily life in a major Greek sanctuary.

1 On the Kalaureian amphictyony, see below pp. 154. Although some scholars have argued for a Mycenaean cult of Poseidon at the site of the later sanctuary (Wide & Kjellberg 1895, 287; Hägg 2003; CGRN 106, 107; contra Kelly 1966), this cannot be corroborated by recent excavations. The Mycenaean remains found west of the peribolos of the later temple appear to belong to a single-period site of unknown extent, datable to a late stage of the Late Helladic (LH) period (perhaps founded in LH IIIC Early and abandoned already in LH IIIC Middle). The 2011 excavations showed that the temple was indeed built on top of the Mycenaean settlement, but evidence for a Poseidon cult, or even for indisputable cultic activities within the settlement, is lacking. Although scattered finds from the area include objects sometimes associated with religious rituals, e.g., fragments of Mycenaean human and animal figurines, two miniature bronze double axes and a Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age Reshef-figurine (Wells 2009), these should not be understood as indisputable evidence of religious activities. Rather, other finds suggest a domestic context: stone spindle whorls, obsidian blades, grinding stones, fragments of a bone awl, etc. (unpublished INSTAP report by Michael Lindblom, October 2011). For a Mycenaean cult of Poseidon in nearby Aghios Konstantinos on the Methana peninsula in the territory of Tropaion, see Konsolaki-Giannopoulou 2016.


3 Wide & Kjellberg 1895; see now Berg 2016.

4 Published in Welter 1941.

5 This project was initially directed by the late Dr Berit Wells and then by Dr Arto Penttinen. Full publication of the results is pending. Riksbankens Jubileumsfond provided funding, reference no. M2006-0814:1-PK.
Among the finds of the Swedish project there is a statue base with a verse inscription, which became the starting point of our treatment (inscribed monument no. I). While analysing this epigram in the context of other Kalaureian dedications, we came across references to what appeared to be two related monuments. The first one, a statue base, was found during excavations of the 2nd Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities in 1979 and is now stored in the Archaeological Museum of Poros (inscribed monument no. II). The second related monument appears to be lost (inscribed monument no. III). Its text was recorded in a letter that was once part of the official correspondence of Ioannis Kapedistrias, the first Governor of Greece; sadly, the letter is nowhere to be found today. This inscription too must have been carved on a statue base similar to the two monuments bearing the other two inscriptions. Interestingly, the three offerings, all portrait statues, were presented to Poseidon by members of one and the same family, whose pervasive influence in Kalaureia can be traced in other local documents from the sanctuary ground. The family in question appears to have materially dominated the temenos and its environs through the careful placement of portraits of its members. In our article we present and analyse these three inscriptions against the background of the religious behaviour of this prominent local family.

No. I. A new epigram from the sanctuary of Poseidon (Figs. 2–9)

The first monument of the present study was found in 2011, during the Swedish Institute’s excavation of the shrine of Poseidon, in front of the so-called Building E, which is traditionally identified as a propylaeum, and Stoa/Building F, which is generally thought to be a bouleuterion (Council House). It is now stored in the Archaeological Museum of Poros where it has been given the inventory number ΜΠ 2111.7

Description: Orthogonal crowning member of bluish limestone. The front side is smooth and bears a four-line inscription (Fig. 2a). The upper surface has two holes for the insertion of the feet of a slightly larger than life-size bronze statue (Fig. 3). The distance between the footprints is 0.35 m. The right footprint, which is fully preserved with a length of 0.23 m, is placed further back from the left footprint and slightly outwards. The left footprint is partly damaged but enough of the outline survives to show that it had a comparable length of almost 0.24 m. It is aligned straight towards the viewer. Both footprints are excavated to a depth of approximately 0.058–0.060 m below the upper surface. The underside is formed into a moulding that consists downwards of a narrow fillet, a cavetto, and an apophyge (Figs. 4 & 5). Two lengthy dowel holes connected the crowning to a lower member, probably an orthogonal base, that is now lost (Fig. 6). One dowel hole is placed near the right front of the underside running parallel to the inscription, whereas the second hole is placed to the left rear side of the underside running perpendicular to the front face. The back of the monument is also smoothly worked, and preserves a 0.003 m high Α (alpha, Fig. 7), placed off-centre at a distance of c. 0.20 m from the right edge of the rear side.

Dimensions: Height without the moulding 0.159 m, height with the moulding: 0.195 m; width 0.685 m; depth: 0.655 m; letter height 0.006 (omicron, theta)–0.015 m.

EPIGRAM

χάλκεος ἀλλὰ χρυσὸν ἀμύνεται οὐκέκεν καὶ θανάτοις ἀνήρ
τίμιος ἦμ παντῖ καὶ μέγας ἐκ πατέρων
τίμιος ἦμ παντῖ καὶ μέγας ἐκ πατέρων
υίός ὁ Σωφάνεος Σωσίστρατος· οὗ σύ, Ποσειδών,
4 τὰν ἀγαθὰν σώζεις ἀνδρός αἰε γενεάν.

TRANSLATION

It [scil. the statue] is bronze but recompenses (vel fends off?) gold because the son of Sophanes, Sosistratos, was in every way a precious man, and a great one from his forefathers. Poseidon, may you always preserve this man’s noble family.

EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

A break along the right end of the upper edge of the stone has resulted in some damage at the end of line 1. Thus, the last letters of οὐκέκεν and the alpha of θανάτοις have lost their upper parts, albeit not to the extent that the use of underdots is necessary. However, of the dotted nu only the leftmost stroke survives (the trace could also belong to a gamma, an eta, an iota, a mu, a pi, or even a rho).

8 According to Krumeich 2010, 368, one can calculate the size of a statue by multiplying the footprint’s length by a factor of 8 or 9. Taking the smaller, left, footprint (0.23 m) and using Ralf Krumeich’s minimum factor of 8, we can reach an estimated height of 1.84 m. For comparison, data collected by the health network NCD-RisC (http://www.ncdrisc.org) shows that the average height of a Greek man born between 1976 and 1996 is about 1.77 m, up from 1.62 m in 1896. The average height of a male individual in the Hellenistic Mediterranean would have been much closer to the 19th-century average, if that. A statue 1.84 m high could well be described as “larger than life”.

9 For the two alternative translations, see our analysis below (pp. 146–147).
The lettering is reminiscent of, albeit not identical to, the lettering of *IG* IV 840, 841, and 844, which are thought to date to the late 3rd century BC.10 The letters are carefully carved on (and thus also under) incised horizontal guidelines which are still visible, as is a vertical line to the left of the epigram (see Fig. 2b).11 Several letters show the inception of serifs. The horizontal stroke of alpha is for the most part straight, but occasionally shows a very slight curve. The middle horizontal of epsilon tends to be placed relatively high and to be shorter than the upper and lower strokes. Zeta consists of two horizontal strokes connected via a perfect vertical. The upper and lower strokes of sigma are slanting outwards, albeit very slightly so. Thetas, omicrons, and omegas are considerably smaller than other letters. In addition, theta has a central dot rather than a horizontal bar. The curved element of phi is a compressed oval.

Since there are no good datable parallels from Kalaureia itself, it is worth looking at the better-studied epigraphic tradition of Athens. Upon comparison the lettering of the Kalaureian monument looks in some respects similar to that of the so-called “Cutter of Agora I 6664”, whose *floruit* was

---

10 In fact, *IG* IV 844 should be dated to the early 2nd century BC on prosopographical grounds.

11 In fact, letters are carved not only on, but also between, guidelines, which together with the vertical on the left margin clearly delineate the layout of the text, see Fig. 2b.
Fig. 4. Inscribed monument no. 1: base profile. Photograph by authors.

Fig. 5. Inscribed monument no. 1: drawing of base profile by A. Hooton.

Fig. 6. Inscribed monument no. 1: dowel holes on underside. Photograph by authors.

Fig. 7. Inscribed monument no. 1: detail of rear side. Photograph by authors.
Fig. 8: Inscribed monument no. 1. Illustration by A. Hooton.
established by Stephen Tracy as c. 281/0–240 BC. We believe that on epigraphical grounds, the new inscription dates to the 3rd century BC, probably in its middle or late part, although our assessment should be considered provisional.

COMMENTARY

The epigram consists of two elegiac distichs. The language is typical of epigrammatic poetry, i.e. Ionic, with some Doric dialectal elements (line 2, παντὰς; line 4: τὰν ἄγαθὰν), which are explicable given the cultural milieu. Below we provide a line-by-line contextualized commentary.

Line 1. The first two words are identical to the inception of an epigram preserved in the Greek Anthology:

Χάλκεος, ἀλλ᾿ ἄθρησον ὅσον θράσος ἄνυσε κάπρου ὁ πλάστας, ἐμπνεον θῆρα τυπωσάμενος etc.

It is of bronze, but see what strength he contrived to show, the sculptor of the boar, moulding a living beast etc.

Just as in the case of the epigram above, which is attributed to Archias, the uncontracted adjective χάλκεος of the new text refers to a bronze statue. In our epigram the masculine form χάλκεος should be construed as a predicate adjective modifying either an assumed noun ἀνδριάς, or the depicted man, the ἀνήρ of line 1. As can been seen from Archias’ poem, the privileged mention of the material of the statue is not unusual. One is immediately reminded of the ἀνθρωποτοικά poems of the New Posidippus. Consider, for instance, the following verses from Posidippus’ praiseful epigram for the bronze statue of the Coan poet Philitas:

αὐθήσοντι δ᾽ ἔοικεν, ὅσωι πολλὸς ἐνδεικτὴ ἔμψυχος, καίτερ χάλκεος ἐών ὁ γέρων

Although made of bronze, the old man seems like one about to speak, with so much character is he decorated (alive?).

It has been noted that poems like this evoke another 3rd-century BC epigram, that has come down to us in the Planudean Anthology, namely Asclepiades’ (or Archelaos’) praise for Lysippus’ statue of Alexander:

τὸλμαν Αλεξάνδρου καὶ ὅλαν ἀπεμάξατο μορφὰν Λύσιππος· τίν᾽ ὁδὶ χαλκὸς ἔχει δύναμιν.

The boldness of Alexander and his entire form were imitated by Lysippus. What power this bronze has!

The brazen man, as he looks at Zeus, resembles someone about to say:

“I subject the earth to myself; Zeus, you keep Olympus!”

12 Tracy 2003, 99–111.
13 AP 15.51 = Archias 31 Gow & Page GPh; translation by Paton 1918, 155.
14 χάλκεος of course works well as a dactyl, but note that this uncontracted form was habitually employed in the prosaic building accounts of neighbouring Epidaurus in the 4th century BC; see the observations by Tod 1946, esp. 47–48.
Note the dynamics generated by the poet’s treatment of the bronze statue: such is the power of the bronze image that the man depicted is perceived as if he can claim secular power equal to the divine power of the Father of the Gods.

Lapidary poetry also preserved such notions. As concerns the new Kalaureian poem, the best parallel, in terms of diction, is offered by the Rhodian epigram Nuova Silloge 19, lines 6–13:

άθρήσας, ὥς ἔξειν, τὸν ἐμπυνοῦν ἐγγύθι χαλκὸν
μιᾶσαι τὰς ὁδίας τοῦδε δικαιούσας:
τρὶς δὲκα γάρ λικάβαντας ὅμων ἐξείνοις τε καὶ ἀστοῖς
χρυσὸν σὺν καθαρᾶι πάντ' ἐφύλαξε δίκαι·
10 οὐνεκ᾽ Ἀπολλοδότωι μίμει κλέος, ἀδε δὲ μορφὰ
ἐξ Ἡρακλείτου παιδὸς ἀναγράφεται.

One should pay attention in particular to the lexical similarities of χαλκὸν and χάλκεος, χρυσὸν and χρυσόν, οὐνεκ’ and οὐνεκε器具, γένος and γενεά, or even the similar wish for the future well-being of the families of the honorands (both expressed with optatives of wish; see our note on lines 3–4 below).

Close to the new inscription, not only conceptually, but also geographically and chronologically, stands the following epigram from the Epidaurian Asklepieion:

εἰ καὶ χάλκεος εἰμι κράτει δορὸς οὕνεκα
νάσωι Ἀπίδι τὰν ὀλοὰν ἄρκεσε δουλοσύνα,
10 τῶι καὶ νῦμ μ’ Ἐπίδαυροις ἀνέστασ’. ἀλλὰ φύλασσε,
Ζεῦ, τὸν ἀπὸ Σπάρτας ἐσθλὸν ἔχοντα] κλέος.

As long as the sun transverses both the great celestial sphere and the stars,
I proclaim the glorious leader of the Greeks,
even though I am bronze, because by the force of his spear he kept destructive slavery away from the island of Aphis, causing many ills to the Aetolians and the Eleians and countless afflictions to the Laconian land, which is famous for its foals.
For him has Epidaurus now set me up; but protect, Zeus, the man who draws his noble glory from Sparta.

Here the bronze statue takes pride in how, despite the fact that it is just that, a bronze statue, it actually proclaims the glory of the man depicted; the Macedonian king Philip V (reigned 221–179 BC), as it happens.

We have indulged ourselves in this long digression to emphasize that a strand of Hellenistic poetry, especially 3rd-century BC poetry, had an obsession with ideas of artistic representation and realism, a phenomenon closely connected with ecphrasis.20 It is in this context that we have to analyse the new epigram, in particular the crux of line 1.

To begin with, the middle ἀμύνωσαι does not equal the active ἀμύνω, unless it governs a genitive, which is not the case here: the first verse cannot be taken to mean that the bronze statue defends gold, i.e. the treasury of the shrine or something similarly valuable. One possibility is that ἀμύνεσθαι has here its usual meaning “to fend off”, and the composer of the epigram meant to say that the bronze statue wards off gold.21 One

20 Ecphrasis in the context of (primarily literary) epigram has received much scholarly attention. The bibliography is enormous: see, e.g., Manakidou 1993; Goldhill 1994; Männlein-Robert 2007; Bruss 2010; Floridi 2019. A well-known example is Myron’s cow, whose exceptional lifelike quality was celebrated in at least 36 epigrams that have come to us in the Greek Anthology: AP 9.713–742; 9.793–798, with Gutzwiller 1998, 245–250; Goldhill 2007; Squire 2010. Even more relevant to our discussion because of its material is the dedicated bronze rooster that was treated by Callimachus in a famous humorous ecphrastic epigram: AP 6.149 = Callim. 25 Gow & Page HE, with Meyer 2007, 200–201; Tucelier 2008, 191–192; Christian 2015, 67–71; Day 2019, 23. We owe several of the references in this footnote to Professor Day.

obstacle to such an interpretation is that it apparently forces us to assume that contrary to canonical use χρυσόν here has negative connotations. Alternatively, we ought to hypothesize that χρυσόν refers to something concrete, a golden object of a sort, which stood nearby and to which the bronze statue of the epigram is contrasted and/or favourably compared. Indeed, statues were often perceived as interacting with their immediate environment. The best known such instance is arguably the statue of the tyrannicide Philitas at Erythrae, which had its sword removed by oligarchs who felt its orientation targeted them. The restored democracy restored the sword as well, but the salient point is that the statue’s posture was felt as posing a threat to at least a segment of the Erythraean society. The hypothesis, therefore, that the ἀμύνεσθαι of the epigram denotes actual warding-off of a golden object should be kept in mind, even though it cannot be confirmed due to lack of specific archaeological evidence from the shrine of Poseidon itself.

The gist of the text would make us expect a slightly different verb, namely ἀμύνεσθαι. Interestingly there are a couple of occurrences of the middle ἀμύνεσθαι with a meaning that comes close to that of ἀμύνεσθαι, “to reciprocate”, “to repay”. This meaning was unusual enough to draw the attention of a most eminent ancient grammarian, Aristophanes of Byzantium: “σφυρ γάρ ὁ γραμματικός Ἀριστοφάνης τὸ ἀμύνεσθαι οὐ μόνον σημαίνειν τὸ κακῶς παύσαντα ἀντιδιατίθεναι, ἀλλὰ τεθείαι καὶ ἀντὶ φιλοῦ ἀμύνονται οἰς ὑπερ χρύσι τοῦ ἀλλίποντος.” And another lexicographer, Montanari 2015, s.v. “ἀμύνεσθαι”, “to reciprocate, to repay”.

This interpretation works particularly well if we take the verb ἀμύνεσθαι to mean “to reciprocate, to repay”, that is, the bronze statue reciprocated a man who was “gold” because he felt as posing a threat to at least a segment of the Erythraean society.

Still on the same verse, we interpret οὖνεκεν as introducing a causal clause: “because”, rather than “wherefore”. We subsequently restore ἀνήρ, a proleptic predicate to the subject Σωσίστρατος.

**Line 2.** The rather rare term τίμιος, attributable to the partly restored ἀνήρ in line 1, has here the meaning of “held in honour”, as in I. Simplic. 522b, lines 5–7: “τὸν ἐπ’ ἀλλοτρίας χάρις [ὁ πιστή ἔπειδε οὖν πολύς | χρυσόκομος, φιλίσκοντος δούλους] ἀμύνεται εὖ δρῶν.”

We feel that this might be an appropriate meaning for the verb ἀμύνεσθαι in the new epigram. If so, it is even conceivable that the poem’s unknown composer intentionally opted for this recherché verbal form, aiming to imitate the greatest of all elegiac poets, Simonides himself.

22 Syll. 1 284, with Ma 2011, 249–250 and Teegarden 2014, 142–145. Regarding this point, Professor Day has drawn our attention to the adversative force of the conjunction ἀλλὰ. We quote him: “Whatever the gold was, it would not normally be thought to be ‘warded off’ by a bronze.”

24 Diccionario Griego-Español II, s.v. ἀμύνεσθαι 3 2: “devolver el favor, agradecer”, Montanari 2015, s.v. ἀμύνεσθαι 2.mid. We have not included in our discussion above Callim. Hymn. 4 (In Delum) 226–227 (“ἀλλὰ, φιλί, δύνασαι γάρ, ἀμύνεο Πότνια δούλους | ὑμετέρους, οἳ σεῖο θεοῦ ἔμενεν ἁλλὰ ἀμύνεσθαι· Θουκυδίδης μὲν ἀποφάσις ὀνείδος, οὐδ᾽ ἀμυνόμενο ὑπὲρ χρυσί τοῦ ἀλλίποντος.”

25 And another lexicographical tradition associated the use of ἀμύνεσθαι in this specific Thucydidean passage with a use of the verb in a now lost verse by Simonides. Aristotle too used the middle in a fairly similar way in his Nikomachean Ethics: “τὸν γάρ φιλοῦντα καὶ εὖ ποιοῦντα οὐδές διασχειραίειν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐὰν ἦ χαρίειν, ἀμύνεται εὖ δρῶν.” The proverb goes back to the famous exchange “His father welcomed him in the bosom of a foreign land, a man adept in learning, graceful, beloved and held in honour amongst the townfolk”.


27 Arist. En 1162b: “Since nobody is angry with one who loves him and benefits him, but on the contrary, if a person of good feeling, requires him with service in return”; translation by Rackham 1934, 505.

28 “His father welcomed him in the bosom of a foreign land, a man adept in learning, graceful, beloved and held in honour amongst the townfolk”.

29 “But I know this, that when gold is plentiful, silver rises and gold falls in value”; translation from Marchant & Bowersock 1965, 209.

30 Pi. Symp. 219a: “ἀλλ’ ἀντὶ δόξης ἀλήθειας καὶ τιμῆς ἐξ αὐτῶς ἀχρείας ἄνωτερος ἀπειρέσθαι καὶ τῷ ἀποκρίνεται μετὰ τοῦ χρυσί τοῦ ἀλλίποντος.” (“You are trying to get genuine in return for repeated beauties, and in fact are designing to fetch off the old bargain of gold for bronze); translation by Lamb 1925, 229–231). The proverb goes back to the famous exchange of the gold and bronze weapons between Glaucus and Diomede: Hom. Ili. 6 234–236: “ἐνθ’ ἀπέκρινεν Πλατατίος Κρονίδης ἀκροβιός ἐξελέτο Ζεὺς, | ὅς πρὸς Τυδίδην Διομήδης τούτος ἀμβίει | χρυσία χαλκεῖαν,
quoting one of Professor Day’s insightful observations communicated to us: “In terms of ephorism in epigrammatic poetry, this is sophisticated and interesting: the epigram denies realistic representation (which would require a golden statue); rather, it insists that the bronze only provides a faulty, base-metal representation of that precious, golden man.”

ἡμι is the third person singular imperfect of εἰμί, i.e., ἦμι, with assimilation of the nasal consonant. The use of the imperfect suggests, we contend, that the subject was no longer alive: this is a case of posthumous honours. παντής is the Doric form of ἄτικος, “everywhere,”31 “in all aspects.” For the expression ἐκ πατέρων, cf. Thoc., Id. 17.13–14: “Ἐκ πατέρων ἡμῶν ἢ ἦν τελέσαι μέγα ἔργον | Λαγείδας Πτολεμαῖος.”32

**Line 3. Σωσίστατος, son of Σωφάνης, was previously allegedly unattested (see however next paragraph), but his father’s name allows us to identify him as a member of a prominent local family heavily involved in the administration of the shrine of Poseidon of Kalaureia over several generations. One of the crucial pieces of evidence is IG IV 840 (= LSGC 58), which is traditionally dated to the late 3rd century BC. IG IV 2.2 1236 records an endowment set up by a woman called Αγασίκρατις (variant of Αγασίκρατις) on behalf of herself, her husband Σωφάνης, her daughters Νικαγόρα and Ἀριστόκλεια, and her son, Σωφάνης. However, the absence of any reference to a son called Σωσίστατος makes it unlikely that Agasikles’ husband could be identified with the father of Sosistratos.33 A Σωφάνης is also attested as a treasurer in another similar text from Kalaureia, namely IG IV 841 (LSGC 59), the endowment of Agasikles and Nikagora, presumably the daughter of Sophanes and Agasigratis.34

More important turns out to be the fragmentary dedication IG IV 843, which is now unfortunately lost. In the *editio princeps*, Wide & Kjellberg provisionally provided the text “…ΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΣΩΦ. … | ΠΟΣΕΙΔΑΝΙ”, and went on to propose the restoration “Σωφ[άνηος]”,35 Max Fraenkel in the corpus printed “[Σωφ]τρατος Σωφ[άνηος] - - | Ποσειδανι”, simply noting in the *apparatus criticus* that Wide and Kjellberg’s “Σωφ[άνηος]” could well be correct. We believe that the new inscription commends a better restoration for IG IV 843: “[Σωσισ]τρατος Σωφ[άνηος] | Ποσειδανι” (“Sosistratos, son of Sophanes, to Poseidon”). If so IG IV 843 must be slightly earlier than the new epigram, in which, as we have already pointed out, Sosistratos is implicitly presented as having died.

**Lines 3–4.** We note οὗ (here demonstrative because in first position) with ἀμφότερος in hyperbaton, and the optative of wish οἶκος. Now, the onomastics of this family implies a preoccupation with ideas of preservation, and indeed it has been suggested that they had a special connection with Zeus Soter (Ζεὺς Σωτήρ, i.e., Zeus Saviour).36 The two personal names attested in the new epigram further emphasize such notions. Remarkably, the plea to Poseidon to preserve (οἶκος) the family nicely plays out a pun on the family’s onomastics.37

But whereas the temporality of Sosistratos’ actions was contingent upon his mortal nature—he was alive—anticipated divine protection is construed *ad infinitum*: Poseidon is implored to preserve Sosistratos’ family forever.

**Morphological Analysis**

The monument may belong to the type described in German scholarship as “Zusammengesetzte Quaderbasen—Haupttyp”, i.e. “main type of compound orthogonal base.”38 The form first appeared in the early Hellenistic period, but its popularity exploded after the 2nd century BC. The Kalaureian monument will then be a relatively early example. It is worth noting that in the majority of the known examples of this type the crowning block is not inscribed. On the contrary, inscriptions

---

31 For the form, see Pind. *Ol.* 9.23–25: “καὶ ἀγάνορος ἵππος | θάκου καὶ ναὸς ὑποτετέρων παντή | ἄγγελλα θεῶν τευτάν” (“More swiftly than either a high-spirited horse or a winged ship I shall send this announcement everywhere”; translation by Race 2012, 153).

32 “From his ancestors what a man for bringing to completion a mighty deed was Ptolemies, son of Lagos”; translation by Hunter 2003, 79.

33 There is, of course, a remote possibility that if Sosistratos was their son, he was already dead by the time of the endowment (see below our comments on the posthumous character of the epigram). However, this scenario runs into another serious problem: we would have expected the endowment to refer to Sosistratos’s bronze statue, given that other statues depicting members of the family are explicitly mentioned.
are carved on the main shafts of such bases. Amongst the rare examples of inscribed crownings, we should mention the early 3rd-century BC dedication of the statue of Pythoklea by her son Thrymondes, I.Oropos 375; the late 3rd-/early 2nd-century BC dedication to Amphiaroas I.Oropos 432; and the inscribed base for the statue of Phanos, priest of Amphiaroas, I.Oropos 405, of c. 240–180 BC. In Athens proper, IG II² 3860, the inscription commemorating the early 3rd-century BC dedication of an equestrian statue for Ischyrias, was also carved on a crowning block. In his treatment of IG II² 3860, John Makridy aptly observed: “The monumental inscription on the crowning course might have been completed by an epigram on the shaft of the base, making clear the exploits of Ischyrias.” We think that something similar is true in the case of the new Ka-lauri monument, with the epigram, however, having been inscribed on the crowning member rather than the other way around.

The textual and material evidence shows beyond doubt that the crowning member supported a single bronze statue. The traces of the feet suggest a rather static posture, with the right leg slightly behind the left one. This feature is evocative of statues of the so-called Aischines type. Finally, given that only one statue stood on the original monument, the letter A (alpha) at the back of the crowning appears, at first sight, to be tantalizing (Fig. 7). The two aforementioned endowments attest to the presence of multiple portrait statues of members of Sosistratos’ family in the shrine and its vicinity. It is therefore conceivable that the alpha was inscribed in order to pinpoint the position of the monument of Sosistratos in relation to the other family statues that lay nearby. It should be noted that with its horizontal stroke placed relatively high, the isolated alpha looks considerably different from the alphas of the epigram and it might be a later addition. It could then evince a later rearrangement, after more statues had been erected. With this observation we can move to the second inscribed statue base of our article.

No. II. A new dedication to Poseidon (Figs. 10–15)

In the Archaiologikon Deltion of 1980, which appeared belatedly in 1988, Eleni Konsolaki reported the discovery of a fragment of an inscribed monument, “βωμὸν ἀγάλματος”, at excavations of the 2nd Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities in the shrine of Poseidon at Kalauria. The fragment was found outside the house of Y. Makris, in the area between the so-called Propylaion (Building E) and the stoa usually identified as the Council House. On prosopographic grounds, Konsolaki aptly associated it with similar inscribed dedications from the same shrine. With her generous permission, we are offering here the long awaited editio princeps.

Description: Left (right for the viewer) part of a rectangular coping block of bluish limestone with ochre striations, likely to be of the same provenance as our monument no. I. On the top surface there is a cutting for the left foot of a bronze statue: its length, c. 0.305 m, shows that this was a larger-than-life statue (Fig. 11). The underside has been worked with a claw chisel. Two dowel holes are preserved, one completely, the other partly damaged in connection with the break on the right side of the stone: they are probably cuttings for the attachment of this block to another underneath (Figs. 12, 13). The inscribed stone is currently stored in the Archaeological Museum of Poros, inv. no. MI 628.

Dimensions: Height 0.24 m; width (preserved) 0.40–0.51 m; max preserved depth: 0.55 m; letter height 0.012 m (omicron)–0.026 m (phi).

INSCRIPTION

[ vac. Νικαγιόρα τ’ τοῦ υόν]
[Ἀγασικλῆς τὸν πτατέρα Σωσιφάνη]
[ vac. Ποσειδαῖν]

TRANSLATION

[ vac. Nikagiora (dedicated the statue of) her son,
[Agasikles (dedicated the statue of) his father Sosiphanes
 [ vac. to Poseid]on]

39 Ma 2013, 206.
41 IG IV² 1236, lines 7–8: “παρά τάυ εἰκόνα τοῦ ἀνδρός αὐτῆς τάς Σωσιφάνης” (“near the image of her husband Sophanes”), 12–14, “τάς τε εἰκόνας καθαρᾶς ποιεῖν τὰς ἐπὶ τὰς ἐξέδρας καὶ τάς ἐν τῶι ναοὶ τῶι Α’ γασικλῆς” (“to clean both the images on the exedra and the image of Agasikrat is in the temple”); IG IV 841, lines 23–24, “βωμὸν ἀγάλματος πρὸ τὰς εἰκόνας αὐτῆς τῶι υόν τοι τῆι υόν εὐκλείπτεις” (“after having set up an altar in front of their images that are next to the Council House”). There may have been a statue fixed on top of IG IV² 1236; see the commentary in CGRN 106. We have not been able to carry out autopsy of this stone, which is presumed lost.

42 Konsolaki 1980, 95–96; reported in SEG XXXVIII 324.
43 In exactly that area one can still see nowadays IG IV 846, the inscribed base for Agasikles. It is worth noting that Wide & Kjellberg 1895, 282, reported foundations for three statue bases.
Fig. 10. Inscribed monument no. II: front side. Photograph by J. Wallsten.

Fig. 11. Inscribed monument no. II: footprint. Photograph by J. Wallsten.

Fig. 12. Inscribed monument no. II: dowel holes on underside. Photograph by J. Wallsten.

Fig. 13. Inscribed monument no. II: side view. Photograph by J. Wallsten.
Fig. 14. Inscribed monument no. II. Illustration by A. Hooton.
EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

Although the text is incomplete, the preserved letters are easily legible. They are rather sloppy, often quite curved (alpha, upsilon). Most of them feature fairly pronounced wedge-shaped serifs. The right and middle strokes of nu do not reach the bottom line. Omicron is rather small and floating. Similarly, the curved element of rho is noticeably small. The curved element of phi is a compressed oval placed below the middle of the vertical stroke. The vertical strokes of the eta bulge slightly outwards. The middle horizontal stroke of epsilon is cut above the middle of the vertical hasta and considerably shorter than the other horizontals; its lower stroke is curved and does not rest on the line. The lower stroke of sigma leaves the line and both its upper and lower strokes splay out. In general, we think that the lettering suggests a date in the first half of the 2nd century BC, and more likely in the second quarter of the century, a date that accords well with our prosopographical analysis below.

COMMENTARY

The traces on the base indicate one single statue, i.e., one single honorand. There can be little doubt that this is Sosiphanes of line 2. This observation has guided our supplements below.

Line 1. We have restored with a great deal of confidence the name [Νικαγ]όρα. This woman belonged to a local family with a long record of active involvement in the shrine of Poseidon, as we showed above in our analysis of the epigram.45 In the late 3rd century BC, her mother Agasigratis set up an endowment (IG IV^2\:2 1236 = IG IV 840) for the god on behalf of her husband Sophanes, and her children Sosiphanes,

---

44 The alphas are quite similar to those of IG IV 844 (squeeze UASA 139, Museum Gustavianum Collections), for which see below.

45 See also the family stemma on p. 156 below.
Aristokleia, and (our) Nikagora. This Nikagora is almost certainly the homonymous woman who appears as the wife of Agasicles in *IG* IV 841, which must date to c. 200 BC. From yet another inscription, *IG* IV 844, we learn that a roughly contemporary Nikagora dedicated a statue of her daughter to Aphrodite, possibly presenting the gift in the company of a second dedicator. The new monument then makes a nice pair with *IG* IV 844.

**Line 2.** [τὰν θυγ]ατέρα or [τὰν μ]ατέρα are both logically untenable, and therefore [τὰν π]ατέρα is fairly certain. On the understanding that the honorand is one, the three accusatives refer to the same person, i.e. Sosiphanes. The inference is ineluctable: Sosiphanes is honoured by his mother [Νικαγ]όρα and by his unknown son or daughter, i.e. Nikagora’s grandson or granddaughter. This Sosiphanes is different from, but was almost certainly named after, Sosiphanes, brother of his grandmother Nikagora. The missing name of the second dedicator would have been written at the beginning of line 2, projecting slightly to the left of the inception of lines 1 and 3 in a pattern of symmetry. Thankfully, inscription no. III (see below) allows us to recover the missing name: we restore [Ἀγασικλῆς] in the appropriate dialectal form for the region.48

**Line 3.** The find-spot and the family’s known involvement in the local shrine do not leave any doubts that the divine recipient should be identified as Poseidon, hence [Ποσειδᾶ]νι in the appropriate dialectal form for the region.49

---

46 For the date see n. 34 above.
47 At the time of the discovery of *IG* IV 844 only the accusative ending -τίς survives of the name of Nikagora’s daughter. Wide and Kjellberg 1895, 294, naturally proposed to restore the daughter’s name as [Ἀγασικλῆς]τίς. The editors of *IG* restored a second dedicator on the missing left part of the statue base. Since the publication of *IG*, the inscribed monument has suffered further damage. A squeeze kept in the Museum Gustavianum in Uppsala preserves only the right part of the inscription. The squeeze indicates a crack between the words Νικαγόρα and τὰν θυγατέρα in line 1 and ταν θυγατέρα and Αφροδίται in line 2.
48 Μα 2013, 160–162: “In a multi-generational monument, a single individual is represented by a statue set up by several people, all listed, usually with indications of kinship.” [160]
49 For the form Ποσειδᾶνι, see *IG* IV 843 and 845, as well as the inscription published by Wallensten & Pakkanen 2009 (= SEG LXI 367). The same form appears in inscription no. III below.

**No. III. A lost dedication to Poseidon**

Vasilyos Petroskos, the Secretary General of the Archaeological Society at Athens, recently published an erudite three-volume work on Ioannis Kapodistrias, first Governor of Greece, and the archaeological work undertaken by his administration. Amongst the numerous pieces of evidence collected by Petroskos, there is one that unexpectedly bears on issues dealt with in this article. This is a letter sent to Kapodistrias on 1 November 1829. It is purported to be deposited in the Greek State Archives (Γενικά Αρχεία του Κράτους). The letter was written by Konstantinos Axiotis, who reported in passing the discovery of two inscriptions in the Palatial area, i.e., the ruins of the sanctuary of Poseidon. One of the inscriptions was readily, and correctly, identified by Petroskos as *IG* IV 844. With regard to the second inscription Petroskos prudently observed that it was either unpublished or a garbled version of *IG* IV 846.50 We are almost certain that this is an unpublished text, which has long escaped scholarly attention and has never been included in any epigraphical corpus. Since, despite systematic search in the Greek State Archives, we have been unable to locate the letter in question, we rely on the publication of the document by Protopsaltes and Petroskos, which we reproduce here:51

[ἈΓΑΣΙΚΛΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΝΙΚΑΓΟΡΑ] [ΤΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΥΙΟΥ ΥΙΟΝ ΑΓΑΣΙΚΛΗΣ ΩΣΙΦΑΝΕΟΣ... ΤΙΟΣ ΕΙΔΑΝΙ...]

**COMMENTARY**

Since the inscription is lost and Axiotis’ transcription is understandably very rudimentary, we cannot possibly comment on the letter-forms. Furthermore, it is questionable whether the format of the inscription was recorded accurately by Axiotis. Note in particular that the first letter of the name Sosiphanes appears to have been separated from the other letters of the name, even though the other lines clearly end in full words. Avoidance of word division, it should be noted, is a standard feature of all the other known dedications of the family from the sanctuary of Poseidon. In the local context of the shrine of Poseidon, a plausible arrangement of the inscribed text would be:

---

50 Petroskos 2015, 286 n. 1.
51 Protopsaltes 1967, 115 no. 89; Petroskos 2015, 286–287.
The recipient deity and the pantheon of Kalaureia

During the Classical period Kalaureia lay under the domination of Troizen, but at some point in the early Hellenistic period it became a city in its own right: *IG IV* 839 (late 4th century BC) makes explicit mention of the *polis* of Kalaureia, whereas *IG IV* 846 and 848 (securely dated to 197–159 BC) refer to the *polis*. These political changes, however, do not seem to have had any visible impact on the pantheon of Kalaureia, whose main deity had always been Poseidon. According to the extant literary sources he had acquired this status as a result of an exchange with Apollo or Leto, following which he received Kalaureia in return for Delphi or Delos.\(^{54}\) Poseidon's sanctuary was run by a seven-member amphictyony,\(^{55}\) and was widely known as a place of refuge for suppliants, among them, famously, Demosthenes.\(^{56}\) The small corpus of inscriptions from Kalaureia, including the three texts presented in this article, confirm Poseidon's role as the island's principal deity. One text refers to the "μνησία Ποσειδάνου", and all but one of the (admittedly few) inscribed dedications that have been found in the shrine honour Poseidon.\(^{57}\)

The character of Poseidon of Kalaureia is not well understood. Full publication of the votive material from the recent excavations is still pending, but we already know that it is variegated, including, *inter alia*, jewellery, arrowheads, miniature shields, pottery, fragments of large Archaic bronze tripods, etc. It additionally contains material traditionally associated with Poseidon, such as sea-shells, fishermen's tools, and horse figurines.\(^{58}\)

It has been tentatively suggested that Poseidon of Kalaureia was connected with seismic phenomena, but no evidence supports this contention.\(^{59}\) The situation is all the more complicated by the fact, noted above, that the cult epithet of Poseidon in Kalaureia is, surprisingly, not known, and has consequently long been debated by scholars. When mentioned in literary sources or addressed as the recipient of sacrifices and dedications, Poseidon is never specified through a byname. The Athenian state loans from the period of the Pelopon-

\(^{52}\) *IG IV* 3.1.247; *IG V* 2.535.

\(^{53}\) *IG IV* 846 (2nd century BC); "Αγασικλῆ Σωσιφάνεος ἁ πόλις | ἀνέθηκε | ἀρετᾶς ἕνεκεν καὶ εὐεργεσίας | τὰς εἰς αὑτὰν (lines 12–13), *Σωτηρίδας* (lines 19–20), i.e., the type of onomastics that, as we are arguing below, run through the family of the Kalaureian Agasikles. We are therefore wondering whether *SEG XI* 382 is a list of Kalaureians, and more specifically of members of the family treated in this article. A problem to this interpretation is posed by the fact that the first editor of the document, Werner Peek, dated it to the 4th century BC. Dating by letter-forms is a notoriously tricky business and fresh autopsy of *SEG XI* 382 is required in order to test the connection advocated here.

\(^{54}\) Paus. 2.33.2, 8.5.6; Strabo 8.6.14, with Constantakopoulou 2007, 137 and Kowalzig 2007, 149–150.

\(^{55}\) The main source is Strabo 8.6.14, who is following Ephorus. This account is confirmed by a single inscription, *IG IV* 842. Modern accounts of the Kalaureian amphictyony are inevitably based on this meagre evidence: see, e.g., Kelly 1966; Mylonopoulos 2003, 427–431; 2006, 133–136; Constantakopoulou 2007, 29–27; Funke 2013, 460–462.

\(^{56}\) On Kalaureia as an asylon and the supplication of Demosthenes (Paus. 2.33.3–5), see Sinn 1993; 2003; Schumacher 1993, 58.

\(^{57}\) Dedications: *IG IV* 843 and 845; Wallenstein & Pakkanen 2009; the inscriptions published in the current article; "Island of Poseidon": *IG IV* 842.

\(^{58}\) Horse and chariot figurines: Alexandridou 2013 112–113; fish-net sinkers: Penttinen et al. 2009, 111; sea-shells: Theodoropoulou in Penttinen et al. 2009, who argues that to a large extent this material indicates mollusc consumption and further notes (138–140) remains of inedible species, possibly from a ritual context.

\(^{59}\) Wells et al. 2003, 79. The area is highly seismic and, indeed, a large volcano was active in the Methana peninsula at least as late as the 3rd century BC.
Athena and Poseidon as her principal deities, and claimed have had an impact on the cult of Poseidon. Troizen counted periodically held Kalaureia in her firm grip and could potentially by Rob Schumacher, who also argued that there was a con-

Big too much of a stretch to believe that a similar story arised founded the sanctuary of Poseidon in Tainaron; perhaps is Geraistios (Basileus) in Troizenia, and it has even been suggested that it was this god who was worshipped in Kalaureia. Another suggestion for Kalaureian Poseidon’s cult epithet is Geraistios (Γεραίστιος). Stephanus of Byzantium tells the story of three brothers and sons of Zeus, Geraistos, Tainaros, and Kalauros. Geraistos founded a sanctuary of Poseidon in the Euboian village of Geraistos (named after him) and Tainaros founded the sanctuary of Poseidon in Tainaron; perhaps it is not too much of a stretch to believe that a similar story was told of Kalauros and Kalaureia. This idea was put forward by Rob Schumacher, who also argued that there was a connection between the three sanctuaries and that the cult spread from Euboea. The name of the month Geraistios, which

African War enumerate Poseidon Kalaureitas amongst the Other Gods, but as Robert Parker has pointed out, this need not have been his local cult epithet but rather a topographic description from the point of view of the Athenians.60 As already mentioned, the neighboring city of Troizen periodically held Kalaureia in her firm grip and could potentially have had an impact on the cult of Poseidon. Troizen counted Athena and Poseidon as her principal deities, and claimed to be the birthplace of Theseus, son of Poseidon, who might even have been conceived in Kalaureia.62 Troizen’s epigraphic output preserves only the epithet Phyalimios (Φυτάλμιος) for Poseidon.53 Pausianias mentions a cult of Poseidon Basileus (Βασιλεὺς) in Troizenia, and it has even been suggested that it was this god who was worshipped in Kalaureia.64

Another suggestion for Kalaureian Poseidon’s cult epithet is Geraistios (Γεραίστιος). Stephanus of Byzantium tells the story of three brothers and sons of Zeus, Geraistos, Tainaros, and Kalauros. Geraistos founded a sanctuary of Poseidon in the Euboian village of Geraistos (named after him) and Tainaros founded the sanctuary of Poseidon in Tainaron; perhaps it is not too much of a stretch to believe that a similar story was told of Kalauros and Kalaureia. This idea was put forward by Rob Schumacher, who also argued that there was a connection between the three sanctuaries and that the cult spread from Euboea. The name of the month Geraistios, which

has been related to festivals of Poseidon, is attested in both Kalaureia and Troizen. Schumacher further believes that the sanctuaries shared aspects of location (low accessibility) and function (places of refuge). Was this entailed in a common epithet Geraistios, once carried from Euboea? In the absence of literary or epigraphic evidence of Geraistios as a cult epithet on the island of Kalaureia, this must remain speculation.69 In any case, apart from Phyalimios, the epithets discussed above are all rather generic and cannot help us understand the character of Poseidon in Kalaureia.

We would like to close this section with a potentially important observation. Cultic trends very often leave their traces on local onomastics, yet despite its heavy involvement in the shrine of Poseidon, the illustrious family that is one of the main foci of our treatment seems to have no members with personal names based on the root Ποσεί-, Ποσή-. What their names do show (see next sub-section), is a fixation with ideas of safety and preservation, linguistically expressed by virtue of variants of the root Σωτ-, and Σωτήρ-, and even Σωτοτ.70 We have therefore wondered whether this onomastic trend could be taken to reflect the hitherto unattested epithet Σωτήρ of the Kalaureian Poseidon. According to Herodotus (7.192), the Greeks had called Poseidon by that name ever since the Persian fleet was badly damaged by storms off Cape Artemision. Nevertheless, Poseidon is rarely attested with this epithet in epigraphic sources.71 We only put forward this suggestion as a remote possibility, although, of course, indisputable proof is lacking. After all, it is much easier to attribute the personal names above to the cult of Zeus Soter, which the family demonstrably promoted.

60 IG I1 369.1-74: Ποσείδωνος Καλαυρε[άτο], with Parker 1996, 27–28, and especially Parker 2003, 176–178. We should like to note that, although the restoration Καλαυρε[άτο] has been unanimously accepted, a viable alternative could be Καλαυρε[άθεν]: cf. IG I1 1496: [νόμος | τεμένος | Ίονος | Αθένεθεν, and IG I1 1498: [νόμος | τεμένος | έποικονόμος | Αθένεθεν. This, however, would not affect at all Parker’s basic contention that the designation was topographical.62 See now the comprehensive analysis by Konsolaki-Giannopoulou 2016, esp. 57–74 for the post-Mycenaean period.

61 See Pausanias 2.32.1, but this depends on accepting the identification of Pausanias’ island of Sphaira with Kalaureia.

62 IG IV 797 (Imperial period); cf. Pausanias 2.32.8. SEG XLVII 330, a Hellenistic boundary stone from the area of Methana, also attests to Poseidon Phyalimios; see Konsolaki-Giannopoulou 2016, 57–59. It has recently been suggested that Methana might have originally been part of Troizen’s territory (Meadows 2018, 149). This would then provide yet another attestation of Poseidon Phyalimios in a Troizenian context.

63 This theory, first put forward by Meyer 1939, 650, has been accepted by, amongst others, Mylonopoulos 2003. Useful summary of the various theories in Konsolaki-Giannopoulou 2016, 59–63, who rejects the Kalaureian connection, and instead argues that the city-holding Poseidon of Plutarch’s Life of Theseus 6, was actually worshipped under two epithets, Basileus and Phyalimios (Basileus and Phyalimios).

64 Shaw 2001, 176; Schumacher 1993.

65 This tradition is late, but it is noticeable, in connection with the joint honours bestowed upon Poseidon and Zeus Soter in Kalaureia, that these men, founders of Poseidon sanctuaries, are sons of Zeus. Schumacher 1993, 64–65, suggests that the “sons of Zeus” element could be connected with Zeus as the protector of suppliants par excellence.66 Schumacher 1993, 63–65. For the spread of the cult, see also Nilsson 1906, 67–69. Miles 2016, 167, has recently hypothesised that the sibling relationship between Geraistos and Kalauros might have been part of the aetiology for the Archai amphictyony in Kalaureia.

66 Schumacher 1993. The month name and the epithet attested for Poseidon can be found in 3rd- and 2nd-century BC Kalymnos and Kos; see for example IG XII.4 1298, 302, 408; 21227, 1231. Sparta also had a month Gerastios (Schumacher 1993, 65).

67 It is worth noting that both Basileus and Phyalimios are also epithets of Zeus; see, for example, IG VII 3096 and IG XII 5.13, as well as Hesychius, Lex. s.v., Φυτάλμιος Ζεύς.

68 In IG IV 841 (= CGRN 107), line 6, the name of a certain Nikagora is followed by the sequence of letters ΣΩΤ. If these letters belong to her patronym, this Nikagora is different from the Nikagora of IG IV 840 (= IG IV 2.1236), although she may well be a homonymous member of the same family. In their recent edition of the inscription, the editors of CGRN wonder whether, instead of ΣΩΤ, we should be reading ΣΩΘ, in which case this Nikagora can be identified as Νικαγόρα Σωφ[άνεος]. Conversely, given that in the following line we can discern a sequence of two female names without patronymics, it is conceivable that lines 5–6 contained names of female slaves, Nikagora being one of them (perhaps named after her mistress)?

An élite local family and their (material) presence in the shrine of Poseidon

Kalaureia has yielded rather limited epigraphic material considering the importance of the sanctuary of Poseidon, its asylia function and its status as the seat of an amphictyony. These factors should have generated a plethora of publicly displayable administrative texts. The absence of such documents is probably attributable to the systematic use of the shrine, throughout the early 19th century, as a source of building material.\textsuperscript{72} IG IV includes only 14 inscriptions from Kalaureia (IG IV 839–852), to which we can now add four inscriptions found during recent excavations or by means of archival research (Table 1).\textsuperscript{73} It is remarkable that out of these 18 inscriptions, eight make reference to members of the same family stretching over several generations.\textsuperscript{74} These eight documents enable us to provide the following tentative stemma:

\begin{verbatim}
\text{Hagesias}
\text{Sophanes} \sim \text{Agasigratis}
\text{Sosiphanes} \sim \text{Nikagora} \sim \text{Agasikles} \sim \text{Aristokleia}
\text{Sosiphanes} \sim \text{Agasikles}
\text{Agasikles}
\end{verbatim}

Although the family manifests itself in sundry documents, such as endowments (IG IV 840 and 841) and honorary inscriptions (IG IV 846), it is first and foremost visible in dedications. The latter mention both family members and recipients as incentives for the dedications: tenures of priesthoods or political offices, are mentioned as such as endowments or as endowments, gifts to the sanctuary of Poseidon, and its status as the seat of an amphictyony. Considering the importance of the sanctuary of Poseidon, its presence in the shrine of Poseidon would have easily grasped a message of strong family ties and pride in previous generations. In order to gauge the anonymous visitor’s experience we need to acquire a sense of the distribution of the inscribed monuments in the wider area of the shrine (Figs. 1a & 1b). Moving towards the temenos, just before its entrance and fixed on a high pedestal, stood the costly, eye-catching bronze statue of Sosistratos, proudly celebrated by the accompanying epigram (our inscription no. 1). A second, slightly smaller, statue of the same man could be seen a few metres away to the west (IG IV 843). These and other similar bronze statues of men and women, for instance the effigy of Sophanes and those of his relatives on their family exedra (IG IV 2.2 1236),\textsuperscript{75} would have flanked the road that led past the Council House (Building F) towards the monumental entrance (”das Propylaion”) to the temenos.\textsuperscript{76} Amazed by this forest of bronze artefacts, our imaginary visitor would have further marvelled at the two

More importantly, the members of the family under examination are never designated by an ethnic, something that is easily explicable only if we assume, as we should, that the family was locally based and therefore well-known to worshippers from the vicinity. Yet, due to the status of Poseidon’s shrine as a regional or even international sanctuary, visitors certainly came from afar too.\textsuperscript{77} It is fair to assume that such visitors, unfamiliar as they were with the local population, would have at first found it difficult to see a connecting thread between the inscriptions. It was only the onomastics of the family, with the repeated So(si)- and Agasi- elements, that would have created some sense of coherence. Paradoxically the absence of an ethnic would have further underscored the familial aspects of the dedications and their unity.

In light of all this, we contend that the visitor to the sanctuary of Poseidon in the mid-2nd century BC would have easily grasped a message of strong family ties and pride in previous generations. In order to gauge the anonymous visitor’s experience we need to acquire a sense of the distribution of the inscribed monuments in the wider area of the shrine (Figs. 1a & 1b). Moving towards the temenos, just before its entrance and fixed on a high pedestal, stood the costly, eye-catching bronze statue of Sosistratos, proudly celebrated by the accompanying epigram (our inscription no. 1). A second, slightly smaller, statue of the same man could be seen a few metres away to the west (IG IV 843). These and other similar bronze statues of men and women, for instance the effigy of Sophanes and those of his relatives on their family exedra (IG IV 2.2 1236),\textsuperscript{75} would have flanked the road that led past the Council House (Building F) towards the monumental entrance (”das Propylaion”) to the temenos.\textsuperscript{76} Amazed by this forest of bronze artefacts, our imaginary visitor would have further marvelled at the two

\textsuperscript{72} Wells et al. 2003, 32–33.
\textsuperscript{73} Wallensten & Pakkanen 2009 (= SEG LIX 367) and the three inscriptions presented in the article at hand.
\textsuperscript{74} IG IV 840 (= IG IV 2.2 1236), 841, 843, 844, 846 and the three inscriptions published here. IG IV 849 mentions a Sostratos, but it is of a much later date (Imperial period).
\textsuperscript{75} Ma 2013.
\textsuperscript{76} A comprehensive overview of reasons for setting up private statues is given by Ma 2013, 168–187.
\textsuperscript{77} In the words of Constantakopoulou 2015, 274, “‘regional’ are those cults whose appeal transcended the borders of their immediate geographical surroundings, normally those of the city-state where the centre of the cult was located.”
\textsuperscript{78} The exedra is mentioned in IG IV 2.2 1236 (IG IV 840; CGRN 106), lines 12–13 (“τάς τε ἐκώνας καθάρας | ποιεῖν ταύς ἑταί ταύς ἔξθρας”; see n. 41 above). An exedra-like monument can still be seen on site, near Building E looking towards Building F. Wide & Kjellberg 1895, assumed, as did Welter 1941, 51, that this exedra still stood on its original location. Nevertheless, members of the modern archaeological team do not believe that the monument is in situ, but instead think that the assembled pieces come from three different exedras (pers. comm. Arto Penttinen & Robin Rönnlund); if so, this cannot be the exedra mentioned in IG IV 2.2 1236, although parts of it might have been built into the exedra-looking amalgam. The statue of Sophanes mentioned in IG IV 2.2 1236, line 7, might or might not have been standing among the statues of the exedra.
\textsuperscript{79} Identification of Building E as the propylaeum and Building F as the Council House: see Wide & Kjellberg 1895, 282–283; Welter 1941, 51. Mylonopoulos 2003, 77–78, is skeptical to the interpretation. A possible road leading to the propylaeum has been revealed by geophysical examinations: see Penttinen et al. 2009, 90.
portrait statues of Agasikles and Nikagora standing in front of the Council House, and might even have noticed an altar next to them.\(^80\) If adequately observant, she would have realized that it was this very couple who had nearby dedicated to Poseidon the beautiful statue of their grandson Agasikles (our inscription no. III), and she would have begun grasping the family’s special status in the area. The honorary statue of Agasikles the Younger, erected by the political community of the Kalaureians (IG IV 846), would have further underlined the political prestige enjoyed by the family,\(^81\) although the clever layout of the inscription on the base would have given an air of sanctity appropriate to the locale.\(^82\) Nor was the young Agasikles ungrateful towards his family; for, indeed, he had not neglected to honour his own father Sosiphanes with assistance from his beloved grandmother, the ubiquitous Nikagora (our inscription no. II).

Walking through the monumental gate into the main area of the shrine, the anonymous visitor must have been still feeling dazzled by the numerous dedications set up by what appeared to be members of the same family. She would have been removed from its find-spot where it can still be seen nowadays, the only Kalaureian inscribed monument remaining in situ.\(^83\)

---

\(^{80}\) IG IV 841, lines 23–24, “βωμὸν ἑσσάμενοι πρὸ τῶν εἰκόνων αὐτῶν τῶν ποι ἐκ τῶν βουλευτηρίων” (see n. 41 above).

\(^{81}\) The statue base was discovered in the late 19th century by the Swedish excavators: Wide & Kjellberg 1895, 294–295. Surprisingly, it was never

\(^{82}\) See Ma 2013, 41–42: “The similitude of the base for the honorific statue to bases for dedications to gods reinforced the effect of the dedicatory formula, by bringing out the sacred connotations of formula and space.”
momentarily side-tracked by two impressive antique statues: “King Ptolemy and Arsinoe” read the faded, old-fashioned inscription on the base (SEG LIX 367) and our proxy visitor remembered tales she had heard as a child about the munificent royal siblings of Egypt. Yet, the distraction would have been temporary. As she solemnly stepped into the god’s temple, she would have come across the portrait statue of Agasigratis (IG IV.2 1236), carefully polished by the superintendents as per Agasigratis’ request. The devout pilgrim would, by now, have been pleased with, perhaps even impressed by, the piety of Sosistratos’ clan.

The family’s special position in Kalaureia, both around and within the sacred space, and its close relationship to the resident gods were thus expressed materially through the placement of stand-ins for the depicted individuals. At this point, it should be stressed that the surviving evidence does not substantiate the existence of a family cult in Kalaureia, as often assumed.83 Eran Lupu refers to their endowment documents as private foundations for public cult, contending that they were commemorative.84 Yet, the cleansing and crowning of the statues of Sophanes and Agasigratis, as prescribed in IG IV.2 1236, arguably aimed at pleasing the gods, and should not be understood as a religious act vis-à-vis the portrayed humans. Likewise, the altars placed near the statues of Sophanes, Nikagora, and Agasikles were not meant for them but for Zeus and Poseidon, although, it has to be said, the dividing line between divine and human statues may have become blurred in the course of time, as an unintentional secondary effect.85

Other factors, however, appear to seriously problematize the overall effect of this spatial arrangement to our imaginary visitor. We have already brought attention to the striking, albeit not inexplicable, absence of ethnics. As noted above, the family’s onomastics emphasize their close association with Zeus Soter, something that is made explicit by the sacrificial provisions of the endowments. In these documents, Zeus’ epithet is almost highlighted by the concomitant absence of an epithet for Poseidon. Why is it then, that whereas Poseidon is the recipient of almost all dedications, Zeus Soter never appears in this capacity? This seems unfathomable, but one could argue that Poseidon, hospitable though he was to other gods, was perceived as the main deity of the site and as such received the lion’s share of dedications.

Another riddle is that concerning the placement of so many dedications, statues, and altars outside the sanctuary proper. As we saw, inscriptions nos. I and II of the article at hand, IG IV 846 and very likely the statues mentioned in the endowment IG IV 841, were all set up in the area flanked by the Council House to the west and the propylaeum to the north. Perhaps the location was chosen not as much, or not exclusively, because it readily provided access to the shrine, but because of its vicinity to the Council House, the administrative centre of the polis of Kalaureia.86 In turn, this observation might even explain the enigma of Zeus Soter.

Under the epithet Soter, Zeus was frequently invoked in the Greek world for both political and individual reasons, helping states in war, as well as saving sailors in times of need.87 From at least the Classical period onwards, cult centres of Zeus Soter were often located in agoras; a case in point is the agora of nearby Troizen.88 In this capacity Zeus Soter was a civic god.89 Already in the 4th century BC, a statue of Zeus Soter stood in the agora of Athens (Isocrates 9.57) and in the Hellenistic period the same god had particularly close ties to the Boule: IG II1.1903, from 272/1 BC, attests to the priest of Zeus Soter sacrificing for the health of the Athenian council.90 In this light, we contend that in Kalaureia’s special spa-
soter as the god binding these officials’ oath was dictated by endowment funds; it is therefore likely that the choice of Zeus pointed by a decree of the Kalaureians in order to manage the scale dedications, both sculpture and monetary endowments. But what made them act this way? Parker 1996, 157 argues that Eleutherios, in Athens and other cities, was "grafted" on an already existing cult of Zeus Soter. IG IV 841, lines 30–31: "καὶ ποτομοσοῦνται τὸν Δία τὸν Σωτῆρα, εἶ μὰν μηθὲν νοσφίζεσθαι" ("And they will swear to Zeus Soter, verily, to appropriate nothing.") There is nothing, for instance, connecting Euanor, the dedicant of IG IV 841, with the family of Soisistratos. The editors of the endowment CGRN 107 (= IG IV 841) have tentatively suggested that in the very fragmentary line 4 (α Εὐκλείαι [ ... ? ... ] there might be a reference to Artemis Eukleia. This is, however, doubtful both on epigraphical reasons (one would have expected ταῖς Εὐκλείαις, which is obviously not the case here) and because (Artemis) Eukleia is not enumerated as one of the recipients of offerings in the main, fully-preserved, text of the document. Otherwise, there is Nikagora's dedication to Aphrodite IG IV 844, found near the bay of Vayoni, site of one of Kalaureia's ancient harbours. On the basis of this inscription, Konsolaki-Giannopoulou 2016, 71, has now identified a building in the Vayonia bay with the temple of Aphrodite. If so, statues of our family would have welcomed visitors upon their disembarking on the island, way before they had reached the shrine. We do not know what triggered Kalaureia's move towards independence. Shipley 2018, 286, speculates that this might have something to do "with the aspirations of certain groups among the political active". If so, the family of Soisistratos might have been at the forefront of Kalaureia's independence movement, but these are admittedly speculations upon speculations.

during the Hellenistic period caused by the uncertainty felt by local elites faced with a new cosmopolitan competition. On this interpretation, the establishment of such foundations was a way of stabilizing one's ancestral prestige in a fluid society. Although family foundations of the traditional type are nonexistent in the case of Kalaureia, the endowment documents and the many portrait statues placed at strategic spots in and around Poseidon's shrine may well be seen in the same light, namely as a response to the new political realities. Or, alternatively, did a local Kalaureian family seize the opportunity to aggressively assert itself once Troizenian influence on the island had dwindled? Since we know very little of the exact socio-political context of Kalaureia, any attempt at answering has to remain speculative for the time being. Future excavations at Kalaureia are, however, likely to focus on the environs of the sanctuary and may in time provide us with information that will allow further contextual analysis.

Finally, there is a lingering question: where is the amphictyon? With the notable exception of IG IV 842, no documents found in Kalaureia allude to the famous administrative institution. There can be no doubt that most of the inscriptions originally set up in the Kalaureian sanctuary, dedications, decrees, or other documents, have disappeared during the millennia that have passed since the flourishing of the shrine. The invisibility of the amphictyon may well be an accident of epigraphic preservation rather than a reflection of historical reality. The recent discovery of the dedication of the statues of Ptolemy II and his wife Arsinoe to Poseidon by the city of the Peloponnesian Arsinoeans has offered a welcome corrective to the distorted view that the shrine was exclusively frequented by individuals and their families, by highlighting its function as a venue of display of political entities for propagandistic reasons. Here again, we can only hope that future
discoveries will allow for a more nuanced understanding of the shrine of Poseidon at Kalaureia. The foregoing analysis has been based on a chronologically circumscribed conception of the Kalaureian shrine and its surroundings. While methodologically expedient, this approach runs the risk of missing a potentially more enthralling diachronic perspective. With the demise of the sanctuary, the numerous cult, dedicatory, and honorific statues dotting its landscape—the images of Poseidon and Zeus, of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, of Sosistratos, Agasigratis, and Agasikles—would have gradually faded away. Detached from their inscribed bases, they would have become incomprehensible, almost irrelevant. Some might have been looted; others would have been reused as building material; yet others would have been melted into bronze metal or heated and slaked into lime. A few might have survived. The two statues from Poros mentioned by General Makriyannis in the famous passage quoted in the frontispiece of our article almost certainly came from the shrine of Poseidon. Whom did they depict? Nikagora? Agasicles? A goddess and a god? We may never know. Immortalized by a semi-literate war veteran, the sculptures in question were turned into symbols of freedom and markers of national identity; a good reminder that the shrine of Kalaureia outlived antiquity.
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IG = *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Berlin 1895–


SEG = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Leiden & Amsterdam, 1923–


terpreted as a political statement, which shows the city—as we would expect—firmly on the side of the Ptolemies."

99 This transformation owes much to the famous lecture “Ἐνας Ἑλλήνας, ὁ Μακρυγιάννης” (“A Greek: Makriyannis”), which was delivered by George Seferis (later Nobel laureate) in 1943, in the middle of World War II; the text can be found in Seferis 1981, 228–263.
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