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Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.
of names used in Kerkeosiris alone does not tell us very much. For instance the name Horos is probably found with equal popularity in all parts of Egypt, whereas that is probably not the case with the name Marres. Mrs Crawford’s conclusions as to the nationality of various people seem also to be rather too cautious. As for the “additional information” that can enable us to reach any conclusions on this subject, it would be better to seek this in the family and background of the given person (names, position, occupation, etc.), rather than in the kind of information the author herself thinks apt, such as the date of the papyrus, or type of document (p. 133). Double names, too, sometimes help us to make a fairly good guess as to whether we have to do with a Hellenized Egyptian or an Egyptianized Greek (see now W. Peremans, Sur l’identification des Egyptiens et des étrangers dans l’Egypte des Lagides, Ancient Society I, 1970, pp. 25—38).

At the end of the text we find an Appendix containing an edition of a fragment forming part of P. Tebt. 152, which was originally published, by description only, in Tebtunis Papyri I. The remaining part of the book consists of a bibliography, extensive indexes, and above all twenty-two tables. These tables, which are very clear and systematic, provide an indispensable illustration of the argument, and are integral part of the discussion in the text.

All in all Mrs Crawford’s book will make fascinating instructive reading for all who are interested in the life of Hellenistic Egypt. The tables enable the reader to follow the author’s argument with ease, while the text provides a really vivid picture of the Egypt of those times, with all its wealth of ancient tradition and its multitude of new neighbourly, administrative, and political interrelationships.

[Hans Hauben, Callicrates of Samos, A Contribution to the Study of the Ptolemaic Admiralty, with a Samian Inscription Published in an Appendix by Günter Dunst, Studia Hellenistica 18, Leuvense Universitaire Uitgaven 1970.]

Callicrates of Samos is a figure very characteristic of his epoch, one of the least well-known periods in the political history of the Greek-speaking world. As nauarch of Ptolemy II Philadephus he was undoubtedly one of the most powerful and influential men of the Egyptian empire. Yet all we know of him is of recent date, having come from the inscriptions and papyri, for the extant literary sources do not even mention his name. These inscriptions and papyri, however, are very meagre sources on which to build conclusions. For more definite conclusions about the career of Callicrates, son of Boiscus of Samos, we have
had to await a recent volume by a young scholar, Hans Hauben, written as an offshoot of a study he is making of the Ptolemaic admiralty.

This volume is extremely lucid and logical in construction. The first chapter examines the sources pertaining to all persons bearing the name of Callicrates at the end of the 4th century. The result of this search seems to have been negative, for none of these persons seems to fit the data we have about the nauarch of Philadelphus. But the author goes on to suggest that the philos of Ptolemy Soter, the adulator of that same monarch, and the donor of two wreaths at Delos, were one and the same person. At best, however, this identification is very doubtful, for Callicrates the adulator (I С 2) is an individual about whom our knowledge is very hazy, and the name is too common for us to be able to say anything really definite about him. As for Callicrates referred to as the donor (I С 3), only a very hypothetical attempt can be made to determine the date when he dedicated the wreaths at Delos.

Chapter II brings us an analytic discussion of each individual source pertaining to the Samian admiral. The dating of two inscriptions to a time before the death of Arsinoe II (II A) is perhaps not very reliable; in the case of the second inscription (II A 2 = OGIS I 29) the date rests on a restored and moreover very uncertain text. Another point is that in the author's discussion of the inscription II A 1 it seems to me rather risky to refer to Ptolemy II's marriage to his sister as "the marriage of the Philadelphoi" (p. 35); such a neologism seems to me to be of doubtful validity.

Yet much enlightenment can be gleaned from the following sections of this chapter, such as section B (Sources for Callicrates' Role in the Cult), section C (Other Inscriptions in which Callicrates Bears the Title of Nauarch), and section D (Sources Post-dating the Death of Arsinoe II). Section D, in particular, contains a very convincing and lucid discussion of the sources dating from the time of the Chremonidean war (II D 1 and 2), and also a reconstruction of Callicrates' role in those stormy years.

In section E we have an "account of uncertain traces" — unpublished papyrus fragments and a discussion of places supposed to be named after Callicrates.

In an extremely interesting part of this booklet Hauben expounds his views on Callicrates' nauarchy (II F), based on his analysis of the sources. Even if there is still some uncertainty as to the early part of Callicrates's career, and even if it is not quite sure that Callicrates' promotion was as rapid as Hauben would like to make out (since his conclusions are based on the very shaky date of OGIS I 29), and even if it is not proved absolutely that he did indeed receive one or more estates from the king (pp. 63—65), nevertheless Hauben must undoubtedly be commended for giving us a vivid picture of the Samian nauarch's great career and of the close relations between him and the Alexandrian court, including his attachment to Arsinoe II, both in her lifetime and after
her death. The supposition that Callicrates came to Egypt in her company (p. 67) is, in the author’s own words, “completely in the realm of conjecture” — but what an intriguing conjecture it is! It should be noted, however, that in his “loyal and almost pious sentiments toward Ptolemy and his sister-wife” Callicrates was by no means an exception at the Alexandrian court — as the reader might be inclined to believe after reading Hauben’s remarks (p. 66) on Sotades, who, however, was a specific case. While speaking of poets, we must not forget how close, for instance, were the relations between someone like Callimachus and the king and his sister-spouse.

Hauben is probably right about the range and scope of Callicrates’ powers. For I think we can now take it as proved that he was the supreme commander of the Ptolemaic navy, although there is nothing to indicate that he possessed extensive political and judicial powers, as did the plenipotentiary generals Philocles and Patroclus, who, in Hauben’s opinion, were not nauarchs (p. 69). Hauben believes that Callicrates held the office of nauarch for about 20 years, but this duration is not altogether sure, since neither the beginning nor the end of this period are dated definitely. Nevertheless the author is quite right in saying that Tarn’s theory of the ten years’ duration of the nauarchate may be definitely rejected (p. 69).

Although Chapter III, dealing with Callicrates of Samos’s family, establishes little that is definite, it is nevertheless good testimony to the author’s excellent choice of method and his caution in arriving at conclusions.

At the very end of this booklet there is an appendix in which Günter Duns t presents a very fragmentary inscription from Samos, mentioning Callicrates, son of Boiscus. It should be noted that in Chapter II Hauben had suggested a rather different restoration of the text (II C 5 p. 48/49).
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The title of his work exactly conveys the author’s aim, which is to examine carefully all the sources and literature on the history of Ptolemy I, up to the time of the Battle of Ipsos (301 B.C.). A point which one might be inclined to cavil at is his choice of time framework. On the one hand it is perfectly natural that the author should begin by considering the position and role of Ptolemy, son of Lagos, even as early as the time of Alexander’s expedition, while simultaneously attempting to assess him as a historian. Undoubtedly no history of