7

THE SHAPING OF THE PAST: LOCAL HISTORY AND FOURTH-CENTURY DELIAN REACTIONS TO ATHENIAN IMPERIALISM[1]

Christy Constantakopoulou

Introduction

Stories about the past helped communities consolidate claims over territory or control over a valuable resource. In the case of Delos, the various versions of the Delian mythical past played an important part in Delians' attempts to reclaim ownership of their most valuable asset, the sanctuary of Apollo and Artemis. The history of classical Delos is intrinsically linked with imperial Athens. In the fifth century, Athens controlled the sanctuary. In the fourth century, although Athens did not have the same kind of imperial hegemony over the Aegean as it had had in the fifth, the Athenians still maintained control over Delos. The main question of this chapter is whether an examination of the local history of Delos and the shaping of the Delian past can help us understand the ways in which the Delians reacted to or resisted Athenian control.

My analysis of fourth-century Delian reactions to Athenian imperialism has two starting points. The first one is the processes through which local history was produced and performed in the ancient Greek city. This is certainly an important debate in the study of ancient historiography and its local contexts, and has as its centre Jacoby's monumental reconstruction and interpretation of local historiography and his positioning of fragmentary Greek historians writing local history (as opposed to 'national' or 'universal' history) within the development of Greek historiography.[2] Recent scholarship has shown that Jacoby's understanding of local history as a late reaction to the 'grand' historiography of the classical period was in many ways misleading.[3] And although one can argue that local historiography outside Athens is largely ignored by modern scholarship,[4] still recent works, such as Catherine Clarke's excellent reconstruction of time management and time policies in the writing of local history,[5] or Guido Schepens' article on the importance of local historiography for the creation of local identity,[6]

have shown that local historiography was an extremely important genre of history with particular importance for local audiences and for the creation and negotiation of local identity within the power struggles and changing notions of identity in the eastern Mediterranean in the classical and Hellenistic periods. I am not going to take a stand in the debate about the origins of local versus 'grand' historiography, though I do believe, with most modern scholars, that Jacoby's model was perhaps too rigid and did not allow for simultaneous contradictory developments.[7] I would like to turn my attention to some interesting, yet neglected, fragments of Athenian orators concerning Delos, as the *FGrH* entry lists them,[8] and attempt to reconstruct the context of the now lost local histories of Delos.[9]

My second starting point is my general interest in the Aegean island world. As *The Corrupting Sea* has shown, this is a world characterised by increased connectivity and geographical fragmentation,[10] prone to imperial subjugation from a power with a strong navy, such as Athens in the fifth century. I have argued elsewhere that the historical context of the fifth century Athenian empire and its control over the Aegean islands had an important impact in the understanding of the concept of insularity in ancient Greek thought.[11] Islands became synonyms for weak allies, poor and insignificant, and therefore ideal subjects for a sea power. We have abundant sources for Athenian conceptualizations of insularity, empire and power; what we lack is the island perspective. It is perhaps a topos to bemoan the lack of sources outside Athens for the classical period; but at the same time, the poor state of sources for the world outside Athens is something all classical Greek historians have to come to terms with.[12] I would like, once more, to turn my attention to the island world of the Aegean, and more particularly, Delos, and try to reconstruct some of its local history and its problematic relationship with Athens.[13]

Taking these two points, that is the writing of local history as an expression of identity, and the importance of examining the world outside Athens, as my initial context, I shall examine Delos and its local history in order to understand the processes through which a local community negotiated its position in the nexus of power and changes of power in the classical Aegean. Local history, religious history and mythical narratives, which are not always distinct categories, were extremely important in the creation and negotiation of local identity, and were recognised as such by local communities.

A (brief) historical outline[14]

Delos was the centre from an early period of a network of neighbouring islands engaged in the cult of Apollo Delios. The importance of the archaic

Delian sanctuary as an arena of competitive display for the island world of the Aegean becomes apparent in the sixth-century stories of attempted control over the sanctuary, the cult of Apollo Delios and its festivals by the proto-imperialistic powers of the era, such as the 'chaining' of the neighbouring island of Rheneia to Delos by the Samian tyrant Polykrates,[15] or the first purification by Peisistratos.[16]

In the fifth century Delos was chosen as the headquarters for the Delian league, which later became the Athenian empire.[17] The Athenians moved the treasury from Delos to Athens in 454,[18] and interfered massively with the sanctuary and its cult: in 426 they instituted a new festival of the Delia and purified the sanctuary.[19] The Athenians managed the sanctuary through a board of 'amphictyons', which consisted of Athenian officials alone.[20] In 422, they expelled the population of Delos but allowed them to return the following year.[21] Athenian control over the sanctuary and its administration ended effectively with the end of the Peloponnesian war. From 402[22] till 393, the Delians manage their affairs independently, but from 393 Athenian control resumes.[23] The Athenians remain in charge of the sanctuary until 314, when the Delians gain their independence. The period of independence lasted until 166, when the Romans allowed the expulsion of the population and the installation of Athenian cleruchs.

This is an extremely simplified version of the main events in the complex history of Atheno-Delian relations. It is the fourth century that mostly interests me, during which three events show that Athenian management of the administration of the sanctuary and therefore Athenian control over the most important resource of the island met with some resistance from at least a segment of the Delian population.

The first episode takes place in the 370s. In 377/6, the accounts of the Athenian amphictyons show that some Delians owed money as a penalty for their *asebeia* (*ID* 98b 24–30 = RO 28 = Chankowski 28).[24] The account reads: 'because they dragged out the amphictyons from the temple and beat them up'.[25] Our interest here is not only in the incident itself, though one must admit that it is pretty spectacular, but also in two of the names of the accused: Pyrrhaithos may have been the same Pyrrhaithos as the archon of Delos in 374/3,[26] after the event, and Epigenes may have been the archon for 377/6,[27] possibly the year when the incident occurred. Although it is impossible to be certain, if it is indeed the case that two of the named accused were also archons of Delos, then the beatings of the Athenian amphictyons were not simply a random act of violence, but one that involved the political leadership of the island.

Anti-Athenian sentiments are also evident in our second piece of information: a proxeny decree for a Delian from the 330s or the 340s: this

Delian had to leave the island, and the Athenians rewarded him and his descendants with citizenship and maintenance at public cost (*IG* II^2 222).[28] It is likely that this Peisitheides had to leave the island because of his pro-Athenian stance.

These two incidents may be used as evidence for anti-Athenian opposition within Delos; the first one, that is the beatings of the Athenian officials, shows that even if the act itself was not anti-Athenian (there may have been a personal motive behind the beatings),[29] the reaction of the Athenians, with its heavy penalties, implies that it was perceived as an anti-Athenian act; such an act could take quite a spectacular form and involve substantial segments of the population. These two incidents, therefore, show quite clearly that the Athenian treatment of Delos caused anti-Athenian opposition. Indeed, one can only imagine the impact on the Delian population of such Athenian decisions as the second purification of Delos (with the removal of the tombs), or the expulsion of the Delians in 422. The evacuation of the island in 422 must have been seen as a truly horrific act of interference, even if it lasted for one year only. The Delians in 422 could not have known that their ordeal would be over in 421. We lack the sources to provide a narrative of Delian reactions in the fifth century; in the fourth century, however, when we begin to have the relevant sources, we see evidence of Delian resistance and discontent.[30]

However, the most spectacular incident of anti-Athenian reactions was to take place in the 340s, when the Delians appealed to an external body in order to question Athenian authority over the administration of their sanctuary. The details of this particular episode are not well known. What we do have, however, is the fragments of Hypereides' speech in defence of Athenian authority.

Demosthenes provides us with information about the appointment of Hypereides as advocate of the Athenian defence. In a passage from his speech *On the Crown* (134), he is narrating the events of the late 340s. The Delians, it seems, have appealed to another body, possibly the Amphictyonic Council at Delphi (though this is never attested in any of our sources),[31] in order to expel the Athenian administration from their sanctuary. It is likely, as Chankowski suggested, that this Delian appeal was a reaction to the Athenian decision to build a Pythion on Delos, and to promote for their own purposes the cult of Apollo in his Delphic persona.[32] The Athenians initially elected Aeschines as their representative, but later the Areopagus removed him from this office and elected Hypereides instead. The dates of Aeschines' removal and Hypereides' defence are highly disputed, but most scholars agree that 343 is the most probable time.[33] The Delians chose Euthykrates, the traitor of Olynthos, as their representative, in a move that

shows that if the arbitration did take place in Delphi, and while Delphi was under Philip's influence, the Delians were trying to gain Philip's approval for a positive outcome.[34] But it was not to be: whoever judged the arbitration decided in favour of Athens and Delos remained under Athenian control.

It is in Hypereides' speech in defence of Athenian control over Delos that we first catch sight of a Delian narrative of local myth and history as a form of reaction and resistance to Athenian control. Hypereides' speech *On Delos* is fragmentary, but we can partly reconstruct a line of argument the orator may have followed.[35] Hypereides of course was providing the Athenian side of the story – a story that presented Athenian control over Delos as an entirely justified status quo based on the history and mythical links of Athens with the sacred island. Hypereides' speech heavily reworked myths and recent history, and for this reason this speech was greatly admired in antiquity.[36] Hypereides' reworking of myths gives us the opportunity to imagine what the counter-argument for the Delian narrative may have been. We lack Euthykrates' speech in defence of the Delians, but Hypereides' response, as well as one other fragment from another orator, is revealing.

The surviving fragments show how Hypereides applied mythological arguments in the historical debate.[37] By promoting Athens in the nexus of mythological connections with Delos, the claim for ownership of the sanctuary was presented as entirely justified. Let us look, for example, at the following fragment (F 67 Jensen = *FGrH* 401b F1):

> λέγεται γὰρ τὴν Λητὼ κύουσαν τοὺς παῖδας ἐκ Διὸς ἐλαύνεσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς Ἥρας κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν καὶ θάλατταν· ἤδη δὲ αὐτὴν βαρυνομένην καὶ ἀποροῦσαν ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὴν χώραν τὴν ἡμετέραν καὶ λῦσαι τὴν ζώνην ἐν τῶι τόπωι, ὃς νῦν Ζωστὴρ καλεῖται.
>
> for it is said that Leto, who was pregnant with the children of Zeus, was hounded by Hera on every land and sea; and when she was already heavy and in distress, she came to our country and loosened her girdle at the place which is now called Zoster.

Hypereides could not deny the *raison d'être* of the Delian sanctuary's fame, that is the birth of Apollo and Artemis, but he could present Athens and Attica as an important location in the process of Leto's giving birth: hence, he included Cape Zoster, in the south of Attica, as the place where Leto loosened her girdle. Indeed, Hypereides' speech is the first attestation of a link between Zoster and Leto; it may be the case that this was Hypereides' own invention.[38] Cape Zoster had a temple dedicated to Apollo, Athena, Artemis and Leto, of which the earliest phase dates from the sixth

century,[39] but it is not certain that the temple and the cult there were associated with the myth as Hypereides presented it. Cape Zoster was even presented as one of the many possible locations of the birth of Apollo according to Semos of Delos, but this seems to be an exaggeration based on Hypereides' version of events.[40] In this context, Hypereides also referred to Athena Pronoia (Foresight) as an assistant to Leto during the birth (F67 Jensen = *FGrH* 401b F2b):

> διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθη Πρόνοια Ἀθηνᾶ, ὅτι προενοήθη τοῦ τόκου τῆς Λητοῦς. καλῶς οὖν Ἀθηνᾶ προηγεῖται πρὸς τὸν τόπον συμβαλλομένη τῆι Λητοῖ, καὶ τὸ Σούνιον τὴν ἄκραν ἐπιτίθησι, καὶ πρὸς τὴν Δῆλον χειραγωγεῖ τὴν θεόν. τοῦτο καὶ Ὑπερ<ε>ίδης ἐν Δηλιακῶι, βουλόμενος δεῖξαι ὅτι αἱ νῆσοι ἐγγύς εἰσι τῆς Ἀττικῆς, εἶπεν ὅτι ἀπ' ἄκρας τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἡ Λητὼ ἐπέβη τῆς νήσου.
>
> For this reason she was called Athena Pronoia (Foresight), because she provided for Leto when she was giving birth. So Athena well led the way towards the place, meeting Leto, and setting out from (?) the promontory of Sounion, and she helped the goddess (i.e. Leto) to land on Delos. And this Hypereides in his speech *On Delos*, wanting to show that the islands are close to Attica, said 'from the edge of Attica, Leto stepped onto the island'.

Athena Pronoia had a temple in the deme of Prasiai, on the north-eastern coast of Attica[41] – Prasiai, as we shall see, is another important location in the Athenian re-tellings of Delian myths. The primary role of Athens in the mythical geography of the Aegean sea is even more evident in Hypereides' claim that Leto 'stepped onto Delos' from Attica itself. Attica is solid, whereas Delos, of course, was a wandering island until the birth of the twin gods.[42] In other words, in Hypereides' narrative the sacred island has to obey the solid geography of the Attic territory in order to fulfil its destiny.

But the case of Cape Zoster and Athena Pronoia was not the only reworking of established myths in order to promote Athenian interests. In the fifth and fourth centuries a whole arsenal of Athenian appropriation of Delian myths and narratives was used and abused. I cannot go into great detail here, but it is perhaps worth mentioning some aspects of three mythical narratives: the Hyperborean route, Theseus and Erysichthon.

One of the most important Delian narratives concerns the gifts that the Hyperboreans brought each year to Apollo. Herodotus mentioned the itinerary of the Hyperboreans on their way to Delos (4.32–5): first to Dodona, then across the Malian gulf to Euboea, then Carystos, Tenos (but not Andros, as Herodotus explicitly says) and finally Delos.[43] Pausanias (1.31.2) records an alternative route, one where Athens is the last stop and it is the Athenians who carry the gifts to Delos. The final stop in Attica is the deme of Prasiai, where, as we have seen, there was a temple of Athena

Pronoia who, according to Hypereides, assisted Leto in the birth. Prasiai had a temple dedicated to Apollo Delios,[44] and was also the place where Erysichthon, the first 'pilgrim' to Delos, and the one who built the first temple of Delos, according to one tradition, was buried and possibly received cult.[45] It is possible that one of the annual Athenian *theōriai* to Delos started from Prasiai, possibly that of the Marathonian tetrapolis.[46] It has been argued that the alternative version of the Hyperborean route, the one that emphasised the importance of Athens, was introduced during the second Athenian purification of Delos in 426.[47] It is impossible to resolve this with any certainty: what we can say is that Athens throughout her long and complicated history with the island exploited established mythical links and introduced new ones. The myth of Theseus and his *geranos* dance around the altar of Apollo on Delos (the famous 'altar of the horns') on the way back from Crete, after the killing of the Minotaur, is one of the established mythical narratives that could be exploited to promote Athenian myths and heroes within a Delian context.[48] Prasiai as an essential stop in the Hyperborean journey may have been a 'new' element of mythical narrative introduced by the Athenians, Cape Zoster may have been another one.

Hypereides used more recent events in order to substantiate Athenian claims over Delos. In the longest fragment from his speech, he alludes to the murder of some Aeolian pilgrims (F70 Jensen = *FGrH* 401b F5a):

> παρὰ Ὑπερίδηι ἐν τῶι Δηλιακῶι· ἐκθησόμεθα δὲ τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὲρ τοῦ γενέσθαι σαφὲς τὸ λεγόμενον. ἀφίκοντό τινες εἰς Δῆλον ἄνθρωποι Αἰολεῖς πλούσιοι, χρυσίον ἔχοντες πολύ, κατὰ θεωρίαν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀποδημοῦντες ἐκ τῆς ἑαυτῶν· οὗτοι ἐφάνησαν ἐν Ῥηνείαι ἐκβεβλημένοι τετελευτηκότες. τοῦ δὲ πράγματος περιβοήτου ὄντος, ἐπιφέρουσι Δήλιοι τοῖς Ῥηνεῦσιν αἰτίαν ὡς αὐτῶν ταῦτα πεποιηκότων, καὶ γράφονται τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν ἀσεβείας, οἱ δὲ Ῥηνεῖς ἠγανάκτηνταί τε τῶι πράγματι, καὶ προσκαλοῦνται Δηλίους τὴν αὐτὴν δίκην. οὔσης δὲ τῆς διαδικασίας, ὁπότεροί εἰσιν οἱ τὸ ἔργον πεποιηκότες, ἠρώτων οἱ Ῥηνεῖς τοὺς Δηλίους, δι' ἣν αἰτίαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀφίκοντο· οὔτε γὰρ λιμένας εἶναι παρ' αὐτοῖς οὔτε ἐμπόριον οὔτε ἄλλην διατριβὴν οὐδεμίαν· πάντας δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἀφικνεῖσθαι πρὸς τὴν Δῆλον ἔλεγον, καὶ αὐτοὶ τὰ πολλὰ ἐν Δήλωι διατρίβειν. τῶν δὲ Δηλίων ἀποκρινομένων αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ἱερεῖα ἀγοράσαντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι διέβησαν εἰς τὴν Ῥηνείαν, ' διὰ τί οὖν' ἔφασαν οἱ Ῥηνεῖς 'εἰ ἱερεῖα ἦκον ὠνησάμενοι, ὥς φατε, τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ἀκολούθους οὐκ ἤγαγον τοὺς ἄξοντας τὰ ἱερεῖα, ἀλλὰ παρ' ὑμῖν ἐν Δήλωι κατέλιπον, αὐτοὶ δὲ μόνοι διέβησαν, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις τριάκοντα σταδίων ὄντων ἀπὸ τῆς διαβάσεως πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τὴν Ῥηνέων, τραχείας οὔσης ὁδοῦ, δι' ἧς ἔδει αὐτοὺς πορευθῆναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἀγορασίαν, ἄνευ ὑποδημάτων διέβησαν, ἐν Δήλωι δ' ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι ὑποδεδεμένοι περιεπάτουν'.
>
> By Hypereides in his speech *On Delos*: 'we shall exhibit the accounts in order to make clear what is said. Some Aeolian men, who were rich, arrived at

> Delos, carrying a lot of gold, being away from their homeland on a pilgrimage of Greece; they were discovered cast up on Rheneia dead. As the affair became notorious, the Delians brought as a charge against the people of Rheneia that they had done this, and indicted their *polis* for impiety. The Rheneians were outraged with the affair and they summoned into court the Delians with the same charge. When the trial took place in order to find out which party was the one who had done the act, the Rheneians asked the Delians why the men had come to them; for they had no harbours, nor market nor anything else worth a visit. Everyone, they said, went to Delos, and they themselves often stayed there. When the Delians replied to them that the men crossed over to Rheneia to buy sacred victims, "if they came to buy sacred victims, as you claim", the Rheneians said, "why did they not bring the slaves who attended to them to take back the victims, instead of leaving them in Delos and crossing alone? Besides, why, when it is thirty stades from the landing place to the city of Rheneia, and the road is rough, through which they had to walk for the purchase, did they cross without shoes, when in Delos in the sanctuary they walked with shoes on?"'

Here we have the most explicit reference to a Delian argument: the Delians accused the Rheneians of *asebeia* because of the murder of some rich Aeolian pilgrims. The Rheneians counter-argued that the murder took place on Delos. This is a fascinating and rare insight into a disturbing event. We cannot date the event with any certainty. Hypereides possibly included this detail as part of the explanation of the *asebeia* committed by the Delians which led to their expulsion in 422.[49]

If the Delians were appealing to Delphi for control over the administration of their sanctuary, it is extremely likely that they included all incidents of Athenian brutality: their expulsion in 422 must have been high on that list. So Hypereides could have included a reference to the Delians murdering sacred pilgrims, a gross act of impiety in the eyes of the gods, as evidence not only of Delian impiety, whitewashing in this way the Athenian expulsion of the Delians, but also of the latter's general unsuitability for control over the sanctuary.

The appeal against Athens was unsuccessful for the Delians, who would have to wait until 314 to be granted independence in their administration of the sanctuary. But how did the incident of their appeal to a foreign body and their failure to establish control, as well as the complicated relations with Athens, shape their response and their creation of historical and mythical narratives? In other words, when the Athenian versions altered the established mythical narratives of the birth of Apollo, or the Hyperborean route, what was the Delian counter argument? The importance of Delos as the birthplace of Apollo was very well established in Greek mythology, as the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo* seems to show. But in

the changing contexts of political power-struggles in the classical Aegean, claiming to be the birthplace of the twin gods was not enough. The Delians had to construct their own narrative in order to establish their central role in the religious geography of the Aegean.

Here we come to a seriously neglected piece of evidence – a fragment of an unknown orator (Dion. Hal. *On Deinarchos* 11 = *FGrH* 401d T1):

> Δηλιακός. «᾽Απόλλωνος καὶ Ῥοιοῦς τῆς Σταφύλου»· οὗτος οὐ τοῦ ῥήτορος ἀλλ᾽ ἑτέρου τινὸς συγγραφέως ἐστί. δηλοῖ δ᾽ ἐκ τοῦ τρόπου καὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος, ἀρχαϊκὸς ὢν καὶ περιτρέχων τὴν τοπικὴν Δήλου καὶ †Λέρου ἱστορίαν.
>
> Speech *On Delos* (*Deliakos*): "of Apollo and Rhoio, the daughter of Staphylos". This is not by the orator but by some other writer. This is evident from the manner of writing and the character, as it is old-fashioned and surveys the local history of Delos and †Leros. († καὶ ᾽Ἀνδρου Adler).

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the source for this fragment, argued that this work was not composed by Deinarchos, the famous Athenian orator, but by some other Deinarchos. This could be the so-called 'Delian' Deinarchos, who wrote an epic poem on Dionysus in India and some other works.[50] The name Deinarchos is unattested in Delian nomenclature; it is always dangerous to make an argument from silence, but as the evidence of names from Delos is extensive, it is safe to argue that this Deinarchos was probably not a local Delian. Rather, it seems that the Delian nickname was the result of his association with this particular work, entitled *On Delos*. A second possibility is that this work was not related to Deinarchos, the Attic orator or the Delian, but that it was mistakenly attributed to Deinarchos and was a work by some other person. Indeed, Stephen Todd has suggested to me that what we have here is a fragment of Euthykrates' speech in defence of the Delians, which at some later point became associated with a tradition linked to Deinarchos.

This is the only fragment and information we have of this work, and as such it is really not very informative. It simply says that it dealt with local Delian and either Lerian or Andrian history, and that it started,[51] possibly, with the clause 'of Apollo and Rhoio, the daughter of Staphylos'. If this is indeed the start of the speech – and I see no other explanation of why Dionysius would have quoted the words – then we come across something significant. The author of this work chose to start his 'history' not from the birth of the twin gods, arguably the moment of glory of the island, which, as we have seen, was not even a fixed island before that time, but from the birth of the son of Apollo and Rhoio, the daughter of Staphylos, that is the local hero and king of Delos, Anios. How do we explain such a choice? Certainly, local histories which often included the stories of foundation,

frequently began with the first king or founder of a place. In this respect, Deinarchos' account did not differ from many other histories placing emphasis on the first founder, who usually gave his name to the locality or island. At the same time, however, Delos was no common island; no other island could claim to be the birthplace of not one, but two gods of the Greek pantheon. Delos' exceptionality, and the reason why the island and its sanctuary were such a contested space throughout its history, was the result of Apollo's and Artemis' birth. It is, therefore, striking that Deinarchos' *Deliakos* started with Anios and not with the gods' birth. Consequently, we need to examine who Anios was and assess his significance for the Delians.

Anios was the king of Delos, and was considered the 'founder', *archēgetēs* of the island.[52] He had three sons: Andros, who was then king of Andros,[53] Mykonos, similarly king of Mykonos,[54] and possibly Thasos, king of Thasos.[55] Delos via its king and *archēgetēs* Anios may be an unexpected place to find a colonial narrative with Delos in the role of the colonising power. But the traditions of Anios' sons as founder-kings of other Aegean islands certainly correspond to one of the primary conceptualisations of Delos in Antiquity as the centre of the island world, and particularly, as the centre of the Cyclades, which, as one tradition recalls, took their name because they 'danced around Delos'.[56] It was, however, Anios' daughters who were perhaps better known: they were the Oinotropes who had the ability to transform anything they touched into wine (Oino), grain (Spermo) or olive (Elais).[57] Anios, or rather his daughters, were associated with the Trojan war,[58] and in Roman times, links between him and Aineias were promoted.[59] He was associated with Apollo (as his son and the first priest of Apollo) but also with Dionysus, through his grandfather, Staphylos.[60]

As *archēgetēs*, Anios received cult in the Archegesion, located to the north of the main sanctuary on Delos.[61] The first phase of the building dates from the first half of the sixth century, when the central *oikos* was constructed. Other *oikoi* were added in the fifth century.[62] The construction of an Archegesion and the cult for Anios *archēgetēs* certainly correspond to an affirmation of local identity, and the construction dates from the same period as that at which the Delians dedicated a column to Athena Polias, outside a building, which may have been the Delian *bouleutērion*.[63] It is clear that Anios, in his capacity as *archēgetēs*, had an extremely important role for the Delian community as a personification of their communal identity.

What is even more interesting is the inscription that was set up on the lintel of the east gate to the Archegesion. It is dated to the end of the fifth century or early fourth and prohibits *xenoi* from entering the Archegesion (*ID* 68): ξένωι οὐχ ὁσίη ἐσιέναι.[64] This is one of the very few instances where *xenoi* are excluded from participation in cult, and one of only three

inscriptions from the classical Greek world which attest to such an exclusion.[65] Considering the relatively 'cosmopolitan' character of Delos, this prohibition is important. Butz believed that it was targeting particularly Athenian 'foreigners' and as such it was an attestation of Delian independence at the end of the Peloponnesian war.[66] I do not think that the lettering of the inscription can offer us such precision in terms of dating, i.e. a date between 402 and 394. A date in the 'short' period of Delian independence seems likely but we cannot exclude other periods of the late fifth or early fourth centuries. The wording of the inscription seems to imply that an Athenian audience was targeted, at least partly.[67] The inscription presents us with a combination of Ionian and Attic dialect: hence we have the Attic ξένωι (as opposed to the Ionian ξείνωι), but the Ionian ὁσίη (as opposed to the Attic ὁσία). The *xenoi* here, then, seem to be primarily the Athenian *xenoi*. We should keep in mind that the publication of the prohibition itself is highly indicative for the nature of Anios' cult.[68]

The *archēgetēs* Anios was the subject of a local Delian cult, linked intimately with local identity – the prohibition of foreigners simply highlighted this aspect of the cult.[69] Similarly, we should not necessarily link the colonial undertones of Anios' myth with a Delian attempt at local imperialism – Delos was too small and in this period too crushed by Athenian intervention to be in a position even to express such desires.

So, to turn back to our fragment, what are the implications of writing a local history of Delos starting with Anios, the son of Apollo and Rhoio, and not with the birth of Apollo and Artemis? If the birth of Apollo and Artemis was the seminal myth associated with Delos, it was also one which was heavily reworked in Athenian re-tellings of the story: we have seen such attempts in Hypereides' emphasis on Cape Zoster and on Athena Pronoia's role, in his defence of Athenian authority over Delos in the 340s. On the contrary, the myth of Anios was one which was indigenous to the island and exclusively associated with Delos. A local history that started with Anios created a mythical past to which no other power could lay claim. In that sense, one could see it as an affirmation of local identity in a context of contesting powers, and perhaps even resistance to outside (Athenian) pressure.

The date of this work, therefore, is significant. It must be in the fourth century, which explains the confusion with the Attic orator Deinarchos, who lived between c.360 and 290.[70] In fact, if the author of this work is the so-called Delian Deinarchos, then he was active before the orator Deinarchos, according to Demetrios of Magnes, who was Dionysius of Halicarnassus' source.[71] This would place this work in the late fourth century; it could be seen as a narrative reflecting the Delian claims to

independent administration in their appeal in the 340s, or the fight for independence, which became reality in 314 with the end of the Athenian control. If we follow the alternative suggestion for author of this work, namely that it was Euthykrates, the Delian representative in the appeal against Athenian control, then this fragment would reflect directly the Delian narrative supporting a claim of Delian independence.

Although Delos was such an important island we have very few fragments of its local history.[72] Authors who have dealt with the history of Delos are few: we know of Phanodemos, Demades of Athens, Philochorus, Antikleides of Athens, Nikochares, and of course, Semos of Delos.[73] For most of these authors we know next to nothing (for example, Antikleides, Nikochares or Demoteles). For the ones of whom we do know more, the fragments from their Delian works are very few (Phanodemos, Philochorus) or none (Demades). The one exception is Semos of Delos, whose work dates to the second half of the third century (and therefore belongs to the period of Delian independence). But even with Semos, most of the fragments deal with obscure details of Delian topography and cult and do not offer us a consistent and comprehensive narrative of Delian history.[74] Such evidence is extremely difficult to use in order to reconstruct the processes through which local identity was formed and re-formed. What can we do, for example, with a fragment that discusses how the Deliades offer to Brizo bowls (*skaphai*) full of all products, with the exception of fish, to thank her for everything and particularly the salvation of ships?[75] It cannot be a coincidence that so much of the work by the best preserved author of local Delian 'history', Semos, deals with such obscure details and cult. Rather than dismissing such 'trivia' as irrelevant, we should consider them essential for the kind of narratives that the Delians considered important; in other words, 'obscure' details of cult and topography were extremely important for the Delian audience, and that is why they are preserved in the evidence that we have.[76]

So what can we say about Delian reactions to Athenian imperialism and the importance of local history and myth for the creation of local identity from the above fragmentary evidence? First of all, I would like to say once more that we are indeed looking at an extremely fragmentary state of documentation; this state of survival of the evidence, however, does not imply that such writings of local history were not important and therefore became lost. On the contrary, the brief outline of important episodes in the history of relations between Delos and Athens, and more particularly the Delian appeal against the Athenian control of the sanctuary in the 340s, seem to imply that the past, including the distant mythical past, and the various narratives about the past were extremely important in the creation

of identity and instrumental in the forming of politics and policies in the Greek communities of the Classical and Hellenistic Greek world. Religious and mythical narratives became part of the argument for political control: in other words, even in the realm of interstate politics they mattered. Secondly, inscriptions once again come to our rescue. Honorary inscriptions for authors and poets writing and performing various forms of local history are far from uncommon.[77] An honorary inscription from the 280s–270s reveals the extent of Delian gratitude to the Andrian Demoteles, 'a poet who wrote the history of the sanctuary, and the *polis* of the Delians and the local myths' (*IG* XI.4 544).[78] Demoteles was writing a form of local history, but not native history as he was from Andros.[79] His performance (possibly in one of the religious festivals), perhaps under commission, shows that creating a narrative of the past, incorporating myths, the religious history of the sanctuary, and the 'political' (i.e. in the sense of the *polis*) history of the island, as the decree tells us, was extremely important for the local audience. On the other hand, one should not assume that local histories of this kind concerned local audiences only. Fowler's comment on the audiences of early Greek historians, such as Akousilaos of Argos or Hellanikos of Lesbos, that 'the implied audience is everyman',[80] may be applied, with some caution, to the kind of local histories I have been examining here. To put it differently, local histories written from a Delian perspective could not be simple endorsements of political, religious or cultural claims.[81] They had to be convincing narratives, especially, as narratives of this kind could be used for political purposes, as in the Delian appeal against Athens in the 340s.

The audiences, therefore, for such local histories may have been both local and non-local. The performance of such histories in the context of a religious festival, as is implied in the case of Demoteles from Andros, consolidated the formation of identity for local communities, but at the same time, it allowed the opportunity for a narrative of the glorious past of a community to be performed in front of an audience that did not consist only of local people.

Schepens rightly stressed that 'the writing of local histories acquires a special meaning for *poleis* whose histories are characterised by discontinuous developments'.[82] I have attempted to use one obscure fragment of a certain Deinarchos and the importance of hero Anios as *archēgetēs* of the Delians as a case study for the articulation of local identity in the form of resistance to outside Athenian pressure. In the fourth century, Delian communal identity was heavily influenced by the complex relations between Delos and Athens. These relations certainly caused what Schepens called 'discontinuous developments'. By reconstructing a

possible Delian answer to Athenian discourses of mythology and the early history of Delos, we come closer to deconstructing the monolithic Athenian voices, and we begin to see history from the point of view of the Delians.

Abbreviations

FGrH F. Jacoby (1923–), *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* (Berlin and Leiden).
ID *Inscriptions de Délos*
IG *Inscriptiones Graecae*
RO P. J. Rhodes and R. Osborne (2003), *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC* (Oxford).

Notes

[1] I would like to thank Katerina Meidani and Anton Powell, for their invitation and their splendid organisation of the conference which generated this volume, and Peter Liddel, Francis Prost, Brian Rutishauser and Claire Taylor for comments made on earlier drafts.

[2] See summary in Jacoby 1949, 199–202.

[3] See for example Toye 1995, Fowler 1996, Schepens 2001, Porciani 2006, Clarke 2008.

[4] See comments in Schepens 2001, 7. I am very grateful to Simon Hornblower for giving me a copy of Schepens' article.

[5] Clarke 2008.

[6] Schepens 2001. See also Orsi 1994.

[7] Lasserre 1976, Fowler 1996, Porciani 2006. See also Skinner 2012.

[8] *FGrH* 401.

[9] Much of the research for this paper originates from the work I have completed as part of the *Brill New Jacoby* (*BNJ*) project. For a fuller analysis of these fragments see my commentary on *BNJ* 401a (http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=bnj_a401a), 401b (http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=bnj_a401b), and 401d (http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=bnj_a401d).

[10] Horden and Purcell 2000.

[11] Constantakopoulou 2007. For the Aegean islands as a space of geographic fragmentation, but prone to maritime connectivity see also Brun 1996.

[12] See also Lenfant's contribution in this volume.

[13] Tuplin 2005, discussed in great detail some of the aspects of Delian reactions to Athenian imperialism, but he did not focus on the fourth century, nor did he discuss the fragments I shall be discussing here.

[14] History of Delos: Laidlaw 1933, Chankowski 2008 for the classical period, Vial 1984 for the period of independence (314–166 BC) and Roussel 1987 for the period of the Athenian cleruchy (post 166 BC). For the early archaic network of Delos see Constantakopoulou 2007, 38–58.

[15] Thuc. 1.13.6 and 3.104. See Constantakopoulou 2007 47–9, Chankowski 2008, 14–5.

[16] Hdt 1.64.2 and Thuc. 3.104. See Constantakopoulou 2007, 63–6, Chankowski 2008, 9–14.

[17] Delos as the centre of the 'Delian' league: Thuc. 1.96.2, Diod. 11.47.1. See Constantakopoulou 2007, 66–70, Chankowski 2008, 32–6.

[18] Diod. 12.38.2, Plut. *Aristeides* 25.3. See Constantakopoulou 2007, 69–70.

[19] Second purification in 426/5: Thuc. 1.8.1, 3.104, Diod. 12.58.6, Strabo 10.5.1 c485. See Constantakopoulou 2007, 71–3, Chankowski 2008, 53–6. Prohibition of birth and death on the island, which results in the Delians becoming '*polis*-less citizens': Plut. *Mor.* 230c–d, for which see Constantakopoulou 2007, 71 with n.38 and Chankowski 2008, 58–60.

[20] The *amphictyons* were Athenian officials: see Parker 1996, 88 with n. 87. See Chankowski 2008, 45–9, for an interpretation of the choice of name of amphictyons as a conscious emulation of the Delphic paradigm.

[21] Expulsion of the Delians in 422: Thuc. 5.1 and Diod.12.73.1. Restoration the following year: Thuc. 5.32.1. See Tuplin 2005, 27–8, Constantakopoulou 2007, 71–75, Chankowski 2008, 57.

[22] See *SEG* 39 170 = Chankowski n.8 (unpublished but transcribed by Lewis in *Gnomon* 47, 1975, p. 718), found in Athens, recording interest paid by Chians. This must be the last act of Athenian administration. Delian 'independence' in Spartan inscription *ID* 87 = Chankowski n.7.

[23] I am following here Chankowski's argument that the Athenian control was re-established in 393 and not lost as a result of the King's Peace, as previously thought: see Chankowski 2008, 169–74. Single act of the Delian *hieropoioi* in 398: *ID* 95 = Chankowski n. 9. First act of amphictyons for the period 393/2–390/89: *ID* 97 = Chankowski n.11.

[24] See Dreher 1995, 203–15, Tuplin 2005, 43–4 and Chankowski 2008, 249–51.

[25] *ID* 98b 24–30 = RO 28 = Chankowski 13: οἵδε ὤφλον Δηλίων ἀσεβείας [ἐπὶ Χ]αρισάνδρο ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησι, ἐν Δήλωι δὲ Γαλαίο, τ[ίμημα] τὸ [ἐ]πιγε[γ]ραμμένον [κ]αὶ ἀειφυγία, ὅτι [καὶ] ἐκ το ἰε[ρο το Ἀ]πόλλωνος το Δηλίο ἦγον τὸς Ἀμφικτύονας καὶ ἔτυπ[τον· Ἐ]πιγένης Πολυκράτος Μ, Πύρραιθος Ἀντιγόνο Μ, Πατρο[κλέ]ης Ἐπισθένος Μ, [14] Ἀριστοφῶν Λε[υκί]ππο Μ, Ἀντιφῶν Τύννω[ν]ος Μ, Ὀδοιτέλης Ἀντιγ[όν]ο Μ, Τηλ[εφά]νης Πολυάρκος Μ.

[26] *ID* 98b 9. This, as Rhodes and Osborne rightly observed (2003, 146), would make the Delians 'unrepentant'. Vial 2008, p. 119: Pyrrhaithos Antigonou: he was exiled, but if he is the same as the archon in 374/3, the perpetual exile mentioned as a penalty in the accounts must have been subject to amnesty. There are 13 further attestations of Pyrrhaithoi, but not all from the fourth century.

[27] See Vial 2008, 62: six attestations of the name Epigenes. It seems very likely that the Epigenes in the accounts is the same as the archon of 377/6.

[28] See Osborne 1974, 194, Chankowski 2008, 252–3.

[29] Argued by Dreher 1995.

[30] In this, I disagree with Chankowski's analysis (2008). Chakowski produces an exemplary account of the history of the administration of the Delian sanctuary; in this, she stresses continuities rather than abrupt changes, and argues that politics and political events in the history of Delian-Athenian relations did not cause any rupture in the administration of the sanctuary. Certainly, the administration of a religious space is almost by definition a conservative domain, and as such it should not necessarily reflect any political tension, which may have existed in the political community of the Delians. Chankowski is probably right in arguing that we should not see in the history

of Delian administration a struggle of power between Athens and Delos. But I do find that Chankowski's emphasis on a relatively friendly co-operation between the Athenians and the Delians during the long period of Athenian control over the affairs of the sanctuary is somehow misleading. She is right that we should not interpret the entirety of Delian documents in the light of certain anti-Athenian episodes, but at the same time there is no denying that such episodes do reveal some anti-Athenian tendencies from at least part of the Delian population.

[31] Wankel 1976, 727–30, noted that the only attestation of the Delphic amphictyony is the testimony of witnesses in Demosthenes 18.135, which is, strictly speaking, not direct evidence. Sanchez 2001, 247–50, followed by Chankowski 2008, 256–7, argued that the body to whom the Delians appealed for regaining control over their sanctuary was not the Delphic amphictyony. Part of the argument is that the term *syndikos*, which Demosthenes uses for the Athenian representative in the arbitration with Delos, is completely unknown in Delphic administration. It is difficult to imagine, however, which other body could have provided the arbitration: see my commentary in *BNJ* 401a T1a. For the term *syndikos* and its uses in classical Athens see Andriolo 2002.

[32] Chankowski 2008, 258–61.

[33] Engels 1989, 74–80; Harris 1995, 169–70.

[34] Euthykrates, the traitor of Olynthos in Dem. 8.40 and 19.432. Delian representative: Hypereides F 76 Jensen.

[35] Fragments 67–75 Jensen. See also *FGrH* 401b = *BNJ* 401b.

[36] This is what the anonymous author of *Peri hypsous* claims (Anon. *Peri hypsous* 34.2 = *FGrH* 401b T2a).

[37] See comments by Parker 1996, 224.

[38] That the episode on Cape Zoster was Hypereides' own invention was first argued by Jacoby in his commentary on Phanodemos (*FGrH* 325 F2). But see Bruneau, 1990, 590–1, against this position. In the fourth century the deme of Halai Axonides sacrificed in honour of Apollo Zosterios: see *SEG* 42.112, dated to the 360s. Pausanias 1.31.1 mentions a temple at Cape Zoster dedicated to Athena, Apollo, Artemis and Leto.

[39] Goette 2001, 197.

[40] Semos *FGrH* 396 F 20 = Steph. Byz. s. v. Τέγυρα· πόλις Βοιωτίας, ἐν ἧι Ἀπόλλωνά φασι γεννηθῆναι. Σῆμος δ' ὁ Δήλιος "τὴν Ἀπόλλωνος γένεσιν οἱ μὲν ἐν Λυκίαι, οἱ δ' ἐν Δήλωι, οἱ δ' ἐν Ζωστῆρι τῆς Ἀττικῆς, οἱ δὲ ἐν Τεγύραι τῆς Βοιωτίας φασίν".

[41] Anecd. Bekk. 1.299.6–7.

[42] Delos as a wandering island: Pindar *Paean* 7b and *Hymn to Zeus* F 33d, Callimachus *Hymn to Delos,* 36–52. See Montiglio 2005, 14–5.

[43] See Bruneau, 1970, 38–48, Chankowski 2008, 106–8.

[44] Kakavogianni 1986.

[45] Erysichthon: founded first temple of Apollo Delios: Plutarch F 158 Sandbach. Death on Prasiai: Paus. 1.31.2. Phanodemos seems to have explored some of the aspects of the myth of Erysichthon: see *FGrH* 396 F20. For Erysichthon see also Robertson 1984. The Athenian genos of Erysichthonidai had cultic links with Delos: see *IG* II^2 4991, with Roussel 1929.

[46] Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 75 discusses the cult of Apollo Delios and the sending of *theōria* from Marathon. See Bruneau 1970, 114, Parker 1996, 332.

[47] Bruneau 1970, 42–4; see also Bruneau 1990, 589.

[48] *Geranos* dance: Plutarch, *Life of Theseus* 21. See Bruneau 1970, 19–35; Calame 1996, 116–20.

[49] Argued by Hornblower 1996, 522, and Parker 1996, 225.

[50] *FGrH* 399 T1 = Dion. Hal. *On Deinarchos* 1: ὁ δὲ πρεσβύτερος μὲν ἀμφοῖν τούτοιν, Δήλιος δὲ τὸ γένος, πεπραγματευμένος τοῦτο μὲν ἔπος, τοῦτο δὲ πράγμα. See my commentary on Deinarchos in *BNJ* 399, on http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=bnj_a399.

[51] That the phrase 'of Apollo and Rhoio, the daughter of Staphylos' was the beginning of the speech was argued by Jacoby in his commentary on *FGrH* 401d.

[52] See Malkin 1987, 249, and Prost 2001b, 110–1. All testimonia on Anios are collected in Bruneau 1970, 413–30.

[53] Conon *FGrH* 26 F1, Steph Byz. s.v. Andros.

[54] Steph. Byz s.v. Mykonos.

[55] Ovid, *Ibis* 477–8 with scholia = Callimachus F 664 Pfeiffer. Of cult there is evidence on Thasos alone: see Pouilloux, 1954, 331, n.3, 335 and 358.

[56] The Cyclades dancing around Delos: Callimachus, *Hymn to Delos* 16–22 and 300–1. See also Aelius Aristeides 44.12–3. See Constantakopoulou 2007, 25–27.

[57] Schol. Lycoph. 570 = Pherekydes *FGrH* 3 F140.

[58] Schol Lycoph 581: Palamedes fetches the Oinotropoi from Delos to Aulis in order to stop the famine in the Greek army. See Gantz 1993, 577–8.

[59] On uses of the Anios story in order to create kinship links with the emerging power of Rome see Erskine 1997, interpreting *IG* XI.4 756. See also Buraselis in this volume.

[60] The various traditions about Staphylos' genealogy can be found in Plut. *Theseus* 20 (there he appears as the son of Theseus), Apollod. 4.1.9, and Scholia Apoll. Rhod. 3.997 (son of Dionysus). Staphylos as the grandfather of Anios further elaborates the 'colonial' aspect of Delos, as it creates links with another Ionian island, Chios. Staphylos' brother, Oinopion, was considered as one of the founders of Chios, according to Ion of Chios (*FGrH* 392 F1). According to this line of traditions, Delos becomes associated with Chios (and consequently, the Ionian world). On Staphylos and Chios see Olding 2007.

[61] Francis Prost is preparing the publication of the Archegesion. See preliminary results in Prost 1997.

[62] See Prost 2001b, 109–10, Bruneau and Ducat 2005, 247–8. See also Antonaccio 1995, 218–20.

[63] Building GD 21 in Bruneau and Ducat's numbering. The dedication is *ID* 15: this is a personal dedication, but its location, outside what may have been the Delian *bouleutērion*, reveals its civic importance. On the association between the Polias inscription and the Archegesion see comments in Bruneau and Ducat 2005, 248.

[64] See Butz 1994: it is difficult to establish whether the *xenoi* mentioned here have a political connotation or a religious one. Butz dates the inscription during the brief period of Delian independence, followed by Chankowski 2008, 272, n. 161. Furthermore, Prost 2001b, 110 and 2002 emphasizes the local character and Delian peculiarities in the archaic inscriptions found in the Archegesion.

[65] For exclusion of *xenoi* see Funke 2006. Exclusion in literary sources: Cleomenes on the Acropolis: Herodotus 5.72, for which see Parker 1998. Cleomenes attempting to sacrifice to the Argive Heraion: Hdt. 6.81. Epigraphic attestations of exclusion:

Paros *IG* XII.5 225 [1]: ξε(ί)νωι Δωριῆι οὐ θέμι[ς οὔ[τ]ε δ[ο(ύ)λ]ωι· ἀκο(ύ)ρηι ἀστῶι ἔ[στι]. [2]: χσένωι Δωριῆι οὐ θέμι[ς ἐσορᾶν]οὔτε δ[όλ]ωι, ἃ Κόρηι Ἀστῶι ἔ[ρδεται].

[66] Delian independence was established with Spartan help as *ID* 87 = RO 3 reveals: see Prost 2001a and Chankowski 2008, 169–74.

[67] I would like to thank David Langslow for this observation.

[68] For the term *xenos* indicating external citizenship see Fraser 2009, 76.

[69] Clement of Alexandria (*Protr.* II 40.2) stresses the 'indigenous' element of Anios' cult on Delos: among the δαίμονες ἐπιχώριοι, he lists παρὰ Δηλίοις Ἄνιον (see Cassola 1954, 345 and 352, who, however, interprets Anios' cult as a survival of Delian prehistoric cult).

[70] Worthington 1992, 3–9.

[71] The only piece of biographical information for the Delian Deinarchos is found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' treatise *On Deinarchos*. In the relevant passage (*FGrH* 399 T 1 = Dion. Hal. *On Deinarchos* 1), Dionysius is using Demetrios of Magnes and argues that the Delian Deinarchos must be placed chronologically before the Attic *rhetor* Deinarchos: Δημ<ήτρι>ος ὁ Μάγνης…ἐν τῆι Περὶ τῶν ὁμωνύμων πραγματείαι…ἔστι δὲ τὰ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γραφέντα τάδε· «Δεινάρχοις δ' ἐν<ε>τύχομεν τέτταρσιν, ὧν ἐστιν ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῶν ῥητόρων τῶν Ἀττικῶν, ὁ δὲ τὰς περὶ Κρήτην συναγήοχε μυθολογίας, ὁ δὲ πρεσβύτερος μὲν ἀμφοῖν τούτοιν, Δήλιος δὲ τὸ γένος, πεπραγματευμένος τοῦτο μὲν ἔπος, τοῦτο δὲ † πραγμα, τέταρτος δὲ ὁ περὶ Ὁμήρου λόγον συντεθεικώς.

[72] For a collection of the evidence see Lanzillotta 1996a, 282–4.

[73] Phanodemos (*FGrH* 325 F1) does not seem to have written a separate *Deliaka*; rather he dealt with Delos as part of his Atthis; Demades of Athens (*FGrH* 227 T1): Ἱστορίαν περὶ Δήλου καὶ τῆς γενέσως τῶν Λητοῦς παίδων; Philochorus wrote a *Deliaka* (*FGrH* 328 T1): Δηλιακά, βιβλία β; Antikleides of Athens wrote a *Deliaka* in at least two books (*FGrH* 140 F2): ἰδίως δὲ Ἀντικλείδης ἐν τῆι β τῶν Δηλιακῶν Ὕλλον φησὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέους υἱὸν ἀποβάντα ἐφ' ὕδωρ μὴ ὑποστρέψαι; Nikochares wrote a *Deliada* (*FGrH* 398); Semos of Delos *(FGrH* 396).

[74] On Semos see Lanzillotta 1996b and Ceccarelli 1989, 924–8. See now L. Bertelli's commentary in *BNJ* 396, available on http://www.brillonline.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=bnj_a396.

[75] Semos of Delos *FGrH* 396 F4: καὶ γὰρ ἐν Δήλωι φησὶ Σῆμος ὁ Δήλιος ἐν β Δηλιάδος «ὅταν θύωσι τῆι Βριζοῖ – αὕτη δ' ἐστὶν ἡ ἐν ὕπνωι μάντις· βρίζειν δ' οἱ ἀρχαῖοι λέγουσι τὸ καθεύδειν· ἔνθα δ' ἀποβρίξαντες ἐμείναμεν ἠῶ δῖαν –, ταύτηι οὖν ὅταν θύωσιν αἱ Δηλιάδες, προσφέρουσιν αὐτῆι σκάφας πάντων πλήρεις ἀγαθῶν πλὴν ἰχθύων διὰ τὸ εὔχεσθαι ταύτηι περί τε πάντων καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν πλοίων σωτηρίας».

[76] I would like to thank Tom Harrison and Joe Skinner for discussing this point with me.

[77] See Giovannini 2005.

[78] *IG* XI.4 544: ποιητὴς ὢν πεπραγ[μά]τευται περί τε τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τ[ὴν] [π]όλιν τὴν Δηλίων καὶ τοὺς μύθου[ς] τοὺς ἐ[π]ιχωρίους γέγραφεν. On Demoteles see Chaniotis 1988, 334–5. Semos too may have received honours, if we identify the author Semos with Semos, son of Kosmiades, a *hieropoios* in 216, who was honoured by Thyangela: *IG* XI.4 1024: the Delians issue a decree on where to set up the stele with honours for Semos given by Thyangela, and 1054: honours given by Thyangela.

[79] Point made by Clarke 2008, 346–7.

[80] Fowler 2001, 112.

[81] Point made by Schepens 2001, 22.
[82] Schepens 2001, 22.

Bibliography

Andriolo, N.
2002 'Syndikoi', *DHA* 28, 11–18.
Antonaccio, C.
1995 *An Archaeology of Ancestors. Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece*, Lanham.
Brun, P.
1996 *Les archipels égéens dans l'antiquité grecque*, Bordeaux.
Bruneau, P.
1970 *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique*, Paris.
1990 'Deliaca VIII', *BCH* 114, 553–91 = J.-C. Moretti ed., *Études d'archéologie délienne*, *BCH* Suppl. 47, 2006, 747–85.
Bruneau, P. and Ducat, J.
2005 *Guide de Délos*, 4th edn., Athens.
Butz, P.
1994 'The double publication of a sacred prohibition on Delos', *BCH* 118, 69–98.
Calame, C.
1996 *Thésée et l'imaginaire athénien: légende et culte en Grèce antique*, Lausanne.
Cassola, F.
1954 'La legenda di Anio e la preistoria delia', *Parola di Passato* 9, 345–67.
Ceccarelli, P.
1989 'Nesiotika', *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 19, 1989, 903–35.
Chaniotis, A.
1988 *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften: Epigraphische Beiträge zur griechischen Historiographie*, Stuttgart.
Chankowski, V.
2008 *Athènes et Délos à l'époque classique. Recherches sur l'administration du sanctuaire d'Apollon délien*, Athens.
Clarke, C.
2008 *Making Time for the Past. Local History and the Polis*, Oxford.
Constantakopoulou, C.
2007 *The Dance of the Islands: Insularity, networks, the Athenian Empire and the Aegean world*, Oxford.
Dreher, M.
1995 *Hegemon und Symmachoi: Untersuchungen zum Zweiten Athenischen Seebund*, Berlin.
Engels, J.
1989 *Studien zur politischen Biographie des Hypereides*, Munich.
Erskine, A.
1997 'Delos, Aeneas and *IG* XI.4 756', *ZPE* 117, 133–6.
Fowler, R. L.
1996 'Herodotus and his contemporaries', *JHS* 116, 62–87.
2001 'Early *historie* and literacy', in N. Luraghi (ed.) *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, Oxford, 95–115.

Fraser, P. M.
2009 *Greek Ethnic Terminology*, Oxford.
Funke, P.
2006 'Fremde und Nicht-Bürger in den griechischen Heiligtümern der antiken Mittelmeerwelt. Eine historische Einführung', in A. Nasso ed., *Stranieri e non cittadini nei santuari greci*, Florence, 1–12.
Gantz, T.
1993 *Early Greek Myth*, Baltimore.
Giovaninni, A.
2005 '"A la recherche des poètes disparus": poètes itinérants à l'époque hellénistique', in A. Kolde, A. Lukinovich, A.-L. Rey (eds) Κορυφαίωι ἀνδρί*, Mélanges offerts à André Hurst*, Geneva, 633–40.
Goette, H. R.
2001 *Athens, Attica and the Megarid*, London.
Harris E.
1995 *Aeschines and Athenian Politics*, New York.
Horden, P. and Purcell, N.
2000 *The Corrupting Sea*, Oxford.
Hornblower, S.
1996 *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, vol. II*, Oxford.
Jacoby, F.
1949 *Atthis. The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford.
Kakavogianni, O.
1986 'Δύο νέα μνημεία υστεροαρχαϊκής πλαστικής από τις Πρασιές', in H. Kyrieleis (ed.) *Archaische und klassische griechische Plastik*, Mainz, 171–5.
Laidlaw, W. A.
1933 *A History of Delos*, Oxford.
Lanzillotta, E.
1996a 'Note di storiographia delia', in E. Lanzillotta and D. Schillardi (eds) *Le Cicladi ed il mondo egeo*, Rome, 275–85.
1996b 'Semo di Delo', in E. Lanzillotta and D. Schillardi (eds) *Le Cicladi ed il mondo egeo*, Rome, 286–326.
Lassere, F.
1976 'L'historiographie grecque à l'époque archaique', *QS* 4, 113–42.
Malkin, I.
1987 *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, Leiden.
Montiglio, S.
2005 *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture*, Chicago.
Olding, G.
2007 'Ion the wineman: the manipulation of myth', in V. Jennings and A. Katsaros (eds) *The World of Ion of Chios*, Leiden, 139–54.
Orsi, D. P.
1994 'La storiografia locale', in L. Canfora *et al.* (eds) *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* III.1, Rome, 149–79.
Osborne, M.
1974 'Two Athenian decrees for Delians', *Eranos* 72, 168–84.

Parker, R.
1996 *Athenian Religion: A history*, Oxford.
1998 *Cleomenes on the Acropolis*. Inaugural lecture, Oxford.
2005 *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, Oxford.
Porciani, L.
2006 'Il problema della storia locale', in C. Ampolo (ed.) *Aspetti dell'opera di Felix Jacoby*, Pisa, 173–87.
Pouilloux, J.
1954 *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos, vol. I*, Paris.
Prêtre, C. *et al.* (eds)
2002 *Nouveau choix d'inscriptions de Délos. Lois, comptes et inventaires. Études épigraphiques* 4, Paris.
Prost, F.
1997 'Archégésion (GD 74)', *BCH* 121, 785–9.
2001a 'Sparte et les Cyclades au Ve siècle: à propos d' *ID* 87', *REA* 103, 241–60.
2001b 'Peuples, cités et fondateurs dans les Cyclades à l'époque archaique', in V. Fromentin and S. Gotteland (eds) *Origines gentium*, Bordeaux, 109–21.
2002 'L'alphabet des Déliens à l'époque archaique', in C. Müller and F. Prost (eds) *Identités et cultures dans le monde méditerranéen antique*, Paris, 305–28.
Robertson, N.
1984 'The ritual background of the Erysichthon story', *AJPh* 105, 369–408.
Roussel, P.
1929 'Deux familles athéniennes à Délos', *BCH* 53, 179–84.
1987 *Délos colonie athénienne*[2], Paris.
Sanchez, P.
2001 *L'amphictyonie des Pyles et de Delphes: recherches sur son rôle historique, des origines au IIe siècle de notre ère*, Stuttgart.
Schepens, G.
2001 'Ancient Greek city histories. Self-definition through history writing', in K. Demoen (ed.) *The Greek City from Antiquity to the Present: Historical Reality, Ideological Construction, Literary Representation*, Louvain, 3–25.
Skinner, J.
2012 *The Invention of Greek Ethnography. From Homer to Herodotus*, Oxford.
Toye, D.
1995 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the first Greek historians', *AJPh* 116, 279–302.
Trendall, A.
1986 'The daughters of Anios', in E. Böhr and W. Martini (eds) *Studien zur Mythologie und Vasenmalerei*, Mainz, 165–8.
Tuplin, C.
2005 'Delian imperialism', Αρχαιογνωσία 13, 11–68.
Vial, C.
1984 *Délos indépendante*, Paris.
2008 *Inscriptions de Délos*, *Index, tome II: Les Déliens*, Paris.
Wankel, H.
1976 *Demosthenes Rede* Für Ktesiphon, Über den Kranz, Heidelberg.

Worthington, I.
1992 *A Historical Commentary on Dinarchus: Rhetoric and conspiracy in later fourth-century Athens*, Ann Arbor.