Deserted Delos: A Motif of the *Anthology* and Its Poetic and Historical Background

Maria Ypsilanti

ANTH.PAL. 9.408 = Antipater 113 G.-P., an epigram from Philip’s *Garland* attributed to Antipater of Thessalonica,¹ is a lament for the desolation of Delos, spoken by the island itself. Antipater was probably born around 40 B.C. and may have seen the situation of the Cyclades during a voyage from Cephalenia to Asia via the Aegean, as he followed Piso (cf. Anth.Pal. 10.25 = 40 G.-P.) possibly sometime after 11 B.C., perhaps between 10 and 8 B.C. Critics unanimously maintain that Antipater is referring to the island’s condition as this was formed after the Mithridatic wars of 88 B.C. and a pirate raid of 69: Delos declined after these events and was gradually abandoned.² The poet dealt with the sad fate of

¹ Or Apollonides; but the poem seems rather to belong to Antipater. For discussion see A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: the Garland of Philip and some Contemporary Epigrams* (Cambridge 1968) II 108; K. Hartigan, *The Poets and the Cities* (Meisenheim am Glan 1979) 16 n.10. Apart from critics’ usual arguments in support of Antipater’s authorship (above all Alpheus’ explicit reference to Antipater in his “response,” see below), the opposition to Callimachus discussed here, which Antipater repeats elsewhere (see n.3 below), is a further indication suggesting that the poem is by Antipater. In citing Antipater and Alpheus I print the text of Gow-Page.


---
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Delos also in Anth.Pal. 9.550 = 94 G.-P., a comparison between Tenos and Delos that confirms Delos’ decay and isolation, and in 9.421 = 28 G.-P., a lament for desolated islands that have copied the fate of Delos. In this paper I will discuss the Delos motif in Antipater’s epigrams and in an epigram by Alpheus (9.100 = 2 G.-P.), exploring their debt to Callimachus and to other literary sources. A reconsideration of the conventional view on the historical circumstances to which Antipater is supposed to refer will be also put forward.

Antipater Anth.Pal. 9.408 = 113 G.-P.:

```
eίθε µε παντοίοισιν ἐτι πλάξεσθαι ἀήταις
η Λητοῖ στήναι μαίαν ἀλωομένη
οὐκ ἀν χρησοῦν τόσον ἔστενον. οἱ ἐμὲ δειλὴν,
ός σοις ᾍλληνων νημοί παραπλέομαι
∆ῆλος ἐρημιαίρη, τὸ πάλαι σέβας. ὁψὲ πη "Ἡρη
Λητοὺς ἀλλ’ οἰκτρὴν τὴν ἐπέθηκε δίκην.
```

I wish I were still astray at the will of every wind, not stopped to serve as a midwife to wandering Leto; I should not have had all this desolation to bemoan. Alack, how many Greek ships sail past me in my misery, Delos the desert, once a holy place. Late but grievous is this penalty that Hera has laid on me because of Leto. (transl. Gow-Page)

The author converses with Callimachus’ Hymn 4 To Delos, where the Alexandrian poet described the wanderings of Leto and her reception by Delos so that she could bear her twins on the island. In this poem, as in his other epigrams on the fate of

never completely desolate, but continued to be inhabited even in Byzantine times; however, its desertion had become a literary topos, hence the exaggeration of writers, including Antipater whose three epigrams he cites (the three are also cited by Jebb 36–37 and P. Brun, Les Archipels égéens dans l’Antiquité grecque [Paris 1996] 22). For similar conclusions see W. A. Laidlaw, A History of Delos (Oxford 1933) 263–271, 274 n.15; Brun 22. For Antipater’s date of birth see L. Argentieri, “Meleager and Philip as Epigram Collectors,” in P. Bing and J. S. Bruss (eds.), Brill’s Companion to Hellenistic Epigram (Leiden 2007) 160. For his trip see G.-P. II 19, 43; M. Plastira, Antipater of Thessalonica, Select Epigrams (diss. Ghent 1986) 10; Waltz, Anthologie VIII 34, suggests that Antipater could also have seen the Cyclades during a voyage from Thessalonica to Rome.

Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 50 (2010) 63–85
Delos, Antipater refers to Callimachus but reverses his setting and spirit; this can be seen as one more literary expression of Antipater’s opposition to and disagreement with Callimachus and his extra-sophisticated art (followed too by Callimachus’ admirers), which the poet from Thessalonica attacks in Anth. Pal. 11.20 = 20 G.-P. In 113 G.-P. Delos is lamented for her misery which is presented as caused by the very act Callimachus extols, the island’s disobedience to the Olympian Queen. While in Callimachus Delos is praised for her benevolence to Leto and for her defiance of Hera, which, despite the rough weather to which the island is exposed (4.11–14, 25–26), resulted in her widespread fame through the birth of Apollo on her, Antipater pictures the pitiful condition into which Delos has finally fallen and explains it as due to the help she offered Leto.

Gow-Page (II 109) have already remarked that in lines 4–5 of the epigram there is an allusion to Callim. Hymn. 4.316 ff., “where we are told that mariners, however urgent their voyage, always stop at Delos to perform rites at the altar.” More specifically Antipater’s ὅσαις Ἑλλήνων νησὶ παραπλέοι is a variation of Callimachus’ ἔμπορος … παρῆλθε νηὶ θεοίσῃ (4.317). Now, further echoes of the Hymn can be traced in Anth.Pal. 9.408 = 113 G.-P. It opens with Delos recalling her previous state, when she wandered at the mercy of “all kinds of winds,” until she let Leto give birth on her. This concept and phrasing is a variation of Callimachus. It combines the image

3 Although Antipater does not name Callimachus (cf. G.-P, II 37: “there is no indication who used any of these words but the sneers are evidently directed, if not at Callimachus himself, at his followers and admirers”), he can be easily discerned in the description of poets who κρίνης ἐξ ἱερῆς πίνετε λητῶν ὕδωρ (11.20.4). For Antipater’s relative “distaste for Alexandrian refinement,” intensely presented in 11.20, see E. Magnelli, “Meter and Diction: from Refinement to Mannerism,” in Brill’s Companion 178, cf. M. Asper, Onomat Allotria (Stuttgart 1997) 131 n.110. Needless to say, the opposition extends only to a certain degree, as epigram, by Antipater or by anyone else, cannot be seen outside the general Alexandrian love for erudition, sophistication, and minute artistry.
of Delos’ wanderings in the sea presented in Callim. 4.36–50 and 191–194 with the account of her exposure to the winds either after her stabilisation (11) or before, while she is still travelling in the sea (194): note ηνεμόεσσα in 11 (stable but beaten by the winds), πλαζομένη πελάγεσσι in 192 (Apollo from within his mother’s womb referring to the wandering Delos), καὶ ἔσσομαι οὐκέτι πλαγκτῆ in 273 (Delos looking forward to the status she acquires with Apollo’s birth), and οὐχ οὕτω μεγάλοι μὲν ἐπιπνείουσιν ἀῆται in 318 (the sailors not stopped by the strong winds from offering honours to Delos).

So in the present epigram Delos is no longer πλαζομένη or πλαγκτῆ, as Callimachus has told us eulogising her new situation, but, unexpectedly and in opposition to the Callimachean account, wishes she had never changed her previous wanderings, rather than let Leto give birth on her and be ultimately punished by Hera with abandonment and loneliness. And while in Callimachus cities that had refused to help Leto were punished later, in Antipater the exact opposite happens: the only one that accepted her is punished later. Hera’s delayed wrath is a crucial element in Antipater’s reversal of the Callimachean story: in Delos Hera, albeit preventing all other places from accepting Leto, does not oppose Delos’ decision, in return for Leto keeping away from Zeus’ bed (247–248, cf. 244–245, 259).

The use of σέβας by Antipater is not coincidental. Delos is

---


5 Like Thebe, punished through the murder of the Niobids (4.88–98), Bura and Helice (4.101–102), destroyed by an earthquake and its tidal wave; see W. H. Mineur, Callimachus, Hymn to Delos (Leiden 1984) 112, 131.
here an island that once had everyone’s respect, but does not any more, because of Hera’s anger and belated revenge: this is a direct reversal of Callimachus, who had Hera declare that she respects Delos, ἀλλὰ μὲν ἐκπαιδήλον τι σεβίζομαι, οὕνεκ’ ἐμεῖο δέμιουν οὐκ ἔπάτησε (247–248). And Λητοὶ ... ἀλωομένη in line 2 of the epigram recalls Callim. 205 ἄλης ἀπεπαύσατο (sc. Leto). In Antipater Delos is ἐρημιαίη and suffers from χρησίμη, misery/destitution;6 Callimachus, on the contrary, had presented her negative geographical features (e.g. 4.11 ἀτρπος, “unmoved” or “unfit for cultivation,” in the second sense clearly a disagreeable characteristic,7 ἀλπλῆξ, beaten by the sea), as overcome by Apollo’s protection and by her prominent position among the other islands (16–27). Compare Delos’ own description of herself (268–269) as “not ploughable” (which is not uttered in any spirit of self-deprecation, however, but only as a factor magnifying her importance gained through Apollo’s birth on her): αὕτη ἔγὼ τοιῇ, δυσῆρϱοτος, ἀλλ’ ἀπ’ ἐµεῖο Δήλους’ Ἀπόλλων κεκκλῆσαι— with δυσῆρϱοτος corresponding to certain adjectives for Delos in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo which Callimachus playfully exploits.8

---

6 For this ἀπαξ λεγόμενον see Gow–Page II 109; Hartigan, Poets 17.
7 For discussion of the word see K. Kuiper, Studia Callimachea I (Leiden 1896) 113; Mineur, Delos 61; V. Gigante Lanzara, Callimaco, Inno a Delo (Pisa 1990) 72–73; Ukleja, Delos-Hymnus 263–264 with n.869. H. White (“Three Textual Problems in Callimachus’ Hymn to Delos,” CL 2 [1982] 197–198) suggests a deliberate ambiguity. For the meaning “unmoved” E. Cahen (Les Hymnes de Callimaque [Paris 1930] 158) compares Verg. Aen. 3.77 immotamque col diuit et contenere ventos (now that she is fixed she will be no longer afraid of the winds to which she is still exposed); cf. A. Barchiesi, “Immovable Delos: Aeneid 3.73–98 and the Hymns of Callimachus,” CQ 44 (1994) 439–442, for the Callimachean Delos as a model for this and other passages of the Aeneid (also for the influence of Callimachus’ Apollo on the Aeneid).
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And with ἀρϱαιή, “slender” (191), the island’s smallness is seen certainly not as a negative characteristic by Callimachus.  

Antipater’s ἔρηματι in particular, a self-variation on his νῆσοι ἔρηματι and ἔρηματο δαίμονος for Delos in 28 G.-P., seems to recall Hera’s picture of Delos in Callim. 4.243, where she refers contemptuously to the places where Zeus’ mistresses give birth as σπιλάδεσσαν ἐρήμους. Now, in addition to the Homeric Hymn to Apollo, Callimachus had also used Pindar for his account of Leto’s and Delos’ wanderings, both reaching their end with Apollo’s birth on the island. It is hard to deny that παντοίοισιν … αήταις in the epigram’s first line is a clear echo of Pindar fr.33d.1–2 ἦν γὰρ τὸ πάρϱοιθε φορϱητά κυμάτεσσαν παντοδαπῶν ἀνέμων. It is therefore evident that Antipater is aware of Callimachus’ poetic sources and does not fail to hint at them even in a condensed handling of the same material.

Another epigram of the Anthology, 9.100 = Alpheus 2 G.-P., is a response to Antipater 113 G.-P.:  

Hellenistica Groningana I Callimachus (Groningen 1993) 118–120; M. Depew, “Delian Hymns and Callimachean Allusion,” HSCP 98 (1998) 155–182; Ukleja, Delos-Hymnus 76–79, 109–117 and passim. Callimachus recalls the Homeric Hymn’s statement (Hom.Hymn.Ap. 48) that the other places rejected Leto, although they were rich, καὶ πιοτέρϱη περϱ ἐοῦσα (cf. Mineur, Delos 218), in a teasing spirit: he makes Delos defy her own disadvantage, show contempt for other places’ merits and say proudly (4.267–268) πίονες ἢπειροι τε καὶ αἳ περιναίετε νήσου, αὕτη ἐγὼ τοιήδε, κτλ. 9 For the sense see Kuiper, Studia I 156–157; Mineur, Delos 180. For the choice of the word, equivalent to λεπτή according to the scholia, as meaningful for Callimachus’ poetic program, see Bing, Well-Read Muse 119–120.  

10 Cf. Strab. 10.5.4 σαρέλαβον ἐρήμων οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι πάλιν τὴν νήσον, Paus. 8.33.2 ὁ Δῆλος … Δηλίων γε ἐνεκα ἐρήμῳ ἔστι τῶν ἀνθρώπων. But see n.2 above. Nonnus says that Delos is deserted because of Poseidon’s pursuit of her (cf. n.4), Dion. 42.410 ἀστερϱίην δ’ ἐδίωκϰε, καὶ ἐπλετο νῆσος ἐρήμη. Cf. Plastira, Antipater 71 (on Anth.Pal. 7.421).


11 Cf. Gow-Page II 95 with n.1, 108, 426; Hartigan, Poets 20. Of Alpheus’ date nothing is known, but from this epigram we assume that he was con-
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Holy nurse of Leto’s travail, whom the son of Cronos anchored unshakable in the Aegean sea, by your gods I vow, sovereign Lady, I shall not cry you miserable, or follow the words of Antipater. I count you happy that you took Phoebus in, and that Artemis, after Olympus, calls no other but you her fatherland.

(transl. Gow-Page)

Alpheus refutes overtly Antipater’s view, also basing his account partly on Callimachus with whom he naturally agrees. The opening is a variation of Callimachus’ opening, 4.1–2 τὴν ἱερήν ... Δῆλον Ἀπόλλωνος κουρστρόφον (κουρστρόφος also in 276), cf. 97 οὐ σὺ γ’ ἐμεῖό φίλη τροφός (Apollo addressing Thebe). 13 Alpheus’ emphatic reference to Delos’ stabilisation, absent from Antipater, for whom immovability did not turn out to be a benefit for Delos, reminds us of Callimachus’ stress on this feature which he sees as most welcomed by the nymph Asteria: cf. Apollo’s statement that the island’s feet are not yet fixed, πόδες δὲ οἷς ἐνὶ χώρῃ (4.192), her own proud as-

13 In 113 G.-P. Antipater had used μαῖαν, producing a variation of Callimachus. It is interesting to find the idea of acting as a “midwife,” expressed with a cognate word in the same context, in Nonnus Dion. 27.277, there denoting not Delos but the palm-tree against which Leto leaned to give birth: εἰσόκϰε Λητοὺς ὑδίνων ἱερὴ τροφή, τὴν ἀσάλευτον Ἀγαίᾳ Κρονίδης ὀφημίσατ’ ἐν πελάγει, οὐ νῦ σε δειλαίγη, μα’ τεοὺς, δέσποινα, βοήσω δαίµονας, οὐδὲ λόγος ἐφομαι Ἀντιπάτρον, ὁλβίω δ’ ὁτι Φοῖβον ἐδέξαο καὶ μετ’ Ὁλυμπον Ἀρτεμίς οὐκ ἄλλην ἂ σέ λέγει πατρίδα.
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sertion that she will no longer be πλαγκτή (273), 14 πόντῳ ἐνεστήρικται (13). In particular Alpheus’ τὴν ἁσάλευτον … πελάγει is a variation of Callim. 4.53–54 ἐνὶ πόντου κύμασιν Ἀιγαίου ποδῶν ἐνεθήκα κύσις. 15 Λῦσιν in 4.11 is given the sense “unmoved” (cf. the scholiast’s ἁκίνητος καὶ ἁσείστος· ἡ γὰρ Δῆλος οὐδέποτε κυσίς ἐνιαύσεται οἱ ἀγεώργητοι), 16 it corresponds directly to Alpheus’ ἁσάλευτος. Given the doubleness of the possible meanings of the adjective, it would be plausible to assume that Alpheus consciously offers his interpretation of the Callimachean word.

It is further possible to suggest that Alpheus might also be varying Pindar’s ἁκίνητον τέρας (fr.33c.4), in which case he probably sees Callimachus’ ἄτρϱός in the light of Pindar’s ἁκίνητος; if this is correct, the epigrammatist “reads” Callimachus with reference to the model he understands that the Alexandrian poet is referring to. Now, we have seen that Delos stabilised herself alone in Callimachus, while Alpheus has Zeus make her immovable, a view shared by Elym.Magn. s.v. Δῆλος, ὅτι κεκρυμμένην αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ Ζεὺς δήλην ἐποίησεν … ὅτι εἰς ἄδηλου ἐφείσσεται. In Pindar four columns rise from their “roots in earth” and support Delos when Leto lands on her (fr.33d.4–10), and in later authors other gods are responsible for fixing Delos. 17 It is further worth remarking that Alpheus’ Φοῖβον ἐδέξαο echoes Hymn.Hom.Ap. 47–48 οὐδὲ τις ἐπεί Τῆς ἐγώ γε γονὴν ἐκάτωτος δεξαίμην. So Alpheus too, like Antipater, uses Callimachus and shows consciousness of the

14 Cf. above with n.4.
15 Echoed also in Nonnus Dion. 33.340 κύμασιν ἄστυφέλικτον ἐνερρίζω-σει Άπολλων; see Gerlaud, Nonnos XI (Budé) 181–182 (on 33.340).
16 See above, with n.7. For the assertion of historians (Hdt. 6.98.1–3, Thuc. 2.8.3) that it is an exception to the rule when Delos is moved by earthquakes, see Mineur, Delos 61; Barchiesi, CQ 44 (1994) 442; Ukleja, Delos-Hymnus 139 with n.529, 262–264.
17 Apollo in Nonnus Dion. 33.336–40 and Vergil Aen. 3.77, Poseidon in Hyginus Fab. 140. See Hartigan, Poets 14–15; Barchiesi, CQ 44 (1994) 440–441; Ukleja, Delos-Hymnus 133–134 with n.511; Bing, Well-Read Muse 103.
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latter’s sources while conversing with the other epigrammatist; thus a multi-layered poetic dialogue between Antipater and Alpheus is formed through criticism of Callimachus, negative from the one side, positive from the other.

Particularly interesting for many reasons is one of Antipater’s other two poems on Delos, Anth.Pal. 9.421 = 28 G.-P. Here the poet is referring again to the Callimachean Delos, once more multiply reversing the spirit of the Alexandrian poet:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{νήσοι ἐρημαίαι, τρύφεα χθονός, ὡς κελαδεινός} \\
\text{ζωστὴρ Ἀιγαίου κύματος ἐντὸς ἔχει.} \\
\text{Σίφνον ἐμμῆσασθε καὶ αὐχμηρὴν Φολέγανδρον,} \\
\text{τλήμονες, ἀρχαίην ἔλεσατ ἀγλαῖν.} \\
\text{ἡ ρ' ὑμᾶς εἴδιδαξεν ἐοῦ τρόπων ἡ ποτε λευκὴ} \\
\text{Δήλος ἐρημαίου δαίμονος ἀρθαμένη.}
\end{align*} \]

Deserted islands, fragments of land which the Aegean wave’s loud-sounding cincture holds within, you have copied Siphnos and parched Pholegandros; poor wretches, you have lost your ancient splendour. Surely you have been taught her own ways by Delos, once so bright, the first to meet a doom of desolation. (transl. Gow-Page)

Karelisa Hartigan has already observed that “as in Callimachus’ Hymn Delos led the islands in circular dance [IV. 16–18], so now she teaches the others what she herself first learned, ‘a fate of desolation’.”\(^{18}\) Antipater is indeed reversing the Callimachean concept of Delos’ happy prominence among the other islands. In Callim. 4.16–22 Delos is in the lead of great islands: Corsica, Euboea, Sardinia, Cyprus; later on she is also compared to other places, and here too her distinction is underlined (269–273): “no other place shall be ever loved by any god, not Cerchnis by Poseidon, not Cyllene by Hermes, not Crete by Zeus, as I by Apollo,” she states proudly. These two sections of Delos form two priamels which elaborate Delos’ importance.\(^{19}\) So in Callimachus Delos is first in relation to

---

\(^{18}\) Hartigan, Poets 18.

\(^{19}\) See the analysis of W. H. Race, The Classical Priamel from Homer to Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 50 (2010) 63–85.
other places, either other islands or other areas associated with gods; in Antipater too she is first compared to other places, but in disaster. And the reversal becomes more poignant because in 4.16–22 Callimachus pictures her eminence among great islands, making her praise even greater, as tiny Delos leads major Mediterranean islands; on the contrary in Antipater she teaches sad fate to small islands like herself, among which are named unimportant Siphnos (once rich, like once glorious Delos) and Pholegandros, which are in sharp opposition to the distinguished islands forming the “foil” of Callimachus’ priamel. Antipater in all probability refers to deserted islands of the Cyclades, rather than to islands of other Aegean groups, as the lemmatist also understands. Before proceeding to the literary examination of Antipater’s poem, a historical seeming incongruity is worth pursuing. Peter Knox has noticed that Antipater cannot mean that Delos was the first Cycladic island to be abandoned (not much is known about Pholegandros apart from her generally poor condition; Siphnos was sacked by Cretans in the second century B.C., perhaps in 153). He proposes that λευκή hints at the oracle

---

Boethius (Leiden 1982) 102–104.

20 Aratus called Pholegandros σιδηρϱείη; for this and for the proverbial insignificance of the two islands (cf. Strab. 10.5.1, 10.5.4), see Gow-Page II 43; Hartigan, Poets 18; P. Brun, “Problèmes de la micro-insularité en Grèce égéenne: les exemples de Pholéandros et de Sifnos,” REI 98 (1996) 298, and Les Archipels 197–198, 200. However, as in the case of Delos, writers exaggerate (e.g. Hesych. s.v. Φολέγανδρος· νῆσος ἐρημη): Pholegandros too was never depopulated, as Brun, REI 98 (1996), shows (for the Imperial period see 299), cf. Les Archipels 20 with n.52. Siphnos had mines of silver and gold and was prosperous in Cycladic and later times as Gow-Page observe, cf. Hdt. 3.57; East. on Dion. Per. Oth.Desr. 525 (GGM II 319), λέγονται δὲ ποτε ἀκμαίειν τοὺς πράγμασιν οἱ Σίφνιοι, καὶ πλούτειν μάλιστα, διὰ τὸ χρυσὸν καὶ ἀργυρῷ ἐν τῇ νήσῳ εἶναι μέταλλα; Suda s.v. Σίφνιοι.

21 See Gow-Page II 43; Hartigan, Poets 18.


23 Diod. 31.45. See Gow-Page II 43; P. M. Nigdelis, Πολίτευμα και Κοινωνία των πόλεων των Κυκλάδων (Thessaloniki 1990) 217; Brun, Les
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given to the Siphnians at Delphi (Hdt. 3.57) alluding to the Siphnian agora and Prytaneion made of Parian marble and to the red ships of the Samians that sacked the island, and accordingly suggests that “once prosperous Delos … could have noticed a similar warning.” He reads νέον for (Heringa’s) ἑν (accepted by Gow-Page, P’s reading being ἑνα) understanding that “with the desolation of Delos all the Cyclades learned a new way, one not aptly characterized as her own,” and sees ἀρξαμένη as meaning that Delos began “her own fatal desolation.”

There is no reason, however, to put so much strain on the text in order to explain the wrong chronological order of desolation that necessarily follows if we assume, as critics do for this poem too, that Antipater is referring to the events of 88 and 69 B.C. The problem of ἐδίδαξεν and ἑρημιαίου δαίμονος ἀρξαμένη (being the first) in this epigram can be given a much simpler and more natural solution if we take the “doom of desolation” which Delos was first to meet as denoting the great blow to Delos’ economic and social life brought about by the displacement of its inhabitants, who settled in Achaia, by the Athenians to whom Roman Senate surrendered Delos, in 166.24

So by comparison at least to Siphnos, Delos precedes in

---

Archipel 18. The Cretans, however, retreated; the exaggeration is comparable to that with which writers speak of Delos and Pholegandros.

24 After exiling the Delians Athens sent to Delos her colonists, the κλη-ρῳχοί, see Laidlaw, Delos 132–134; Nigdelis, Πολίτευμα 312–313. Laidlaw (169) remarks that “the island was almost deserted on the enforced departure of the Delians.” For an appreciation of the importance of the events of 166 B.C. from an economic point of view see G. Reger, Regionalism and Change in the Economy of Independent Delos (Berkeley 1994) 270–271: although the declaration of Delos as a free port attracted many traders (especially after the sack of Corinth in 146), these traders were foreigners whose activity hurt the local trade and economy. Reger (271) goes on to conclude that “the failure of the sacred island to recover from the depredations of Mithridates and the pirates of the mid first century” is partly due to this situation which he describes as “the decoupling of Delos from its traditional Kykladic base.”
disaster; but what about the rest of the Cyclades? We have evidence of misfortunes suffered by Tenos, Naxos, Paros, Syros, Kythnos during the end of the second and mainly in the first century B.C., due to pirate invasions, the Mithridatic wars, and the Roman civil wars as well. Although these islands were never forsaken, as even Delos was not, “desertion” being a poetic exaggeration, ἀρξαμένη can be reasonably justified if we assume that Antipater is thinking of 166 as the staring point of Delos’ adversities, a quite early date compared to the time, much closer to his own age, when the evils that afflicted the other islands culminated. In fact the importance of the events

The phrasing and syntax do not yield an absolutely clear meaning, as ὑμᾶς, object of ἐδίδαξεν of line 5, could perhaps be taken as referring to all islands, including Siphnos and Pholegandros (cf. Brun’s rendering, Les Archipels 22: “Les désertées ... vous avez imité Siphnos et l’aride Pholegandros ... Certes, elle vous a donné le même exemple à tous, Delos”), which would be illogical if some of them preceded Delos in desolation. So, if we maintain that Antipater has in mind the events of 88 and 69, ὑμᾶς must be taken as referring to the other islands, not including Siphnos and Pholegandros, which Siphnos and Pholegandros were also models (ἐμιτιθήσασθε; Pholegandros was always desolated, and Siphnos’ affliction of 153 is an early event compared to the evils of the others, culminating in the first century B.C.), but for which Delos was still the greatest model. If, as I suggest, Antipater is thinking of Delos’ desolation of 166 B.C., there is no problem in taking ὑμᾶς as including Siphnos, but the problem remains for Pholegandros which has always been in a poor condition, thus is “deserted” necessarily earlier than Delos; this parameter together with the phrasing can be seen as suggesting that Siphnos and Pholegandros but above all Delos are the models for the other islands, so that Delos has taught, together with Siphnos and Pholegandros, desertion to the rest of the Cyclades. Cf. Plastira (Antipater 70), “a list of once prosperous Aegean islands which have been deserted, having followed the example of Siphnos, Pholegandros and mainly that of Delos.” Of course, the problem of ἀρξαμένη remains and makes obligatory the inclusion of Siphnos and Pholegandros in the islands following Delos. The difficulty is obviously caused by the fact that Pholegandros’ miserable situation preceded that of all the other Cycladic islands, including Delos. One reason explaining/justifying this chronological inconsistency is the historical insignificance of Pholegandros which allows a poetic inaccuracy in such an account; another is the reference to Aratus, see below.

For the exaggeration concerning the fate of Delos and Pholegandros, see above, nn.2 and 20. For the tribulations of the other Cyclades in the first
of 166 which altered the state of affairs not only of Delos but of
the whole of the Cyclades has been stressed and considered as
perhaps greater than that of the Mithridatic wars;27 the present
epigram can be seen as agreeing with this idea, since Antipater
is implying that Delos dragged with her the rest of the Cyclades
towards decline. In his rhetorical impetus he also includes the
ever-unfortunate Pholegandros in the islands “taught” by the
misfortunes of Delos. But this is not the only explanation for
this island’s appearance in the present poem (see below).

To return to the literary analysis. In Callimachus all
Cyclades are holy and εὔυμοι, but Delos surpasses them and
deserves more song (4.2–5); in Antipater all Cyclades are
deplorable, Delos again shows them the way. But one more
poetic allusion is traceable in Antipater’s priamelic juxta-
position between Delos and other Cyclades, especially notable
through his reference to poor Siphnos and Pholegandros. In a
fragment of Aratus preserved in Strabo, coming from a poem
which belonged to his work called Catalepton, as Strabo informs
us, and was perhaps a Hymn to Apollo, Delos addresses Leto:28

27 See Brun, Les Archipels 219. Reger, Regionalism 271, remarks that the
change brought about by the events of 166 impeded the island’s recovery
after the first century’s Mithridatic wars and the pirate invasions.

28 Strab. 10.5.3 (Supplementum Hellenisticum 109), Ἀρατός ἐν τοῖς Κατά
Λεπτόν. Cf. Al. Cameron, Callimachus and His Critics (Princeton 1995) 326. It
has been held that the Catalepton were short poems, like epigrams, perhaps
n.1]; a more or less short hymn can be a candidate (but U. von Wilamowitz-
Moellendorff, Hellenistische Dichtung II [Berlin 1924] 63; was sceptical about
ὦ Λητοῖ, σὺ μὲν ἦ γε σιδηρϱείῃ Φολεγάνδϱῳ,
δειλὴ γὰρ Πολιχθοῦσῃ αὐτίχ’ ὁμοίην;

Delos is here meekly judging herself as equal to unimportant Gyaros and Pholegandros. A literary dialogue between Aratus and Callimachus on the story of Leto’s accouchement on Delos seems likely, and Antipater is probably aware of both works which are echoed in his epigrams. Although safe conclusions cannot be drawn for Aratus’ poem, given the extremely slender evidence for it, Aratean Delos’ humility can be contrasted to the pride of Callimachean Delos who, even before Leto’s landing on her, is never presented in “sincerely” modest terms. In any case, Antipater’s use of Siphnos and Pholeganrdos in his sketching of the desolation of the Cyclades led in insignificance by Delos appears to be inspired by Aratus (read “against” Callimachus who has Delos lead major islands)

whether Aratus’ poem on Leto and Delos was in fact small). Cf. E. Maass, Aratea (Berlin 1892) 228–229; for a review of the (meagre) scholarship on Aratus’ Catalepton see Asper, Onomata 180 n.208.

29 For the poverty of Gyaros see Strabo 10.5.3, who cites Aratus to support this assertion.

30 For the probability of the two poets’ acquaintance, Callimachus being possibly a younger contemporary of Aratus, see Cameron, Callimachus 209–211; J. Martin Aratos, Phénomènes I (Paris 1998) xix–xx, xxvii–xxxi. In any case Callimachus admired the work of the poet from Soloi as is demonstrated in his famous epigram Anth.Pal. 9.507 = Pfeiffer = 56 HE, but also, according to Aratus’ Vita, in a passage of his Against Praxiphanes (Cameron 209–213; Martin xxix). For the λεπτότης, crucial for both Callimachus and Aratus who share the same artistic principles, see e.g. Cameron 321–328; Asper, Onomata 179–189.

31 Cf. Cameron, Callimachus 326: “there seems to be some sort of connection” between Aratus’ Hymn to Apollo and Callimachus’ Delos and the very title of Aratus’ book (Κατὰ Λεπτόν) points to the famous Callimachean notion of λεπτότης. Wilamowitz (Hellenistische Dichtung II 63) had already observed that the situation in this Aratean fragment and Callim. 4.203–204, where Delos summons Leto to come to her, is the same. Aratus is probably using the Homeric Hymn to Apollo as Callimachus also does, compare Aratean Delos’ statement that she is comparable to unfruitful islands and Hymn. Hom.Ap. 72 ἐπεὶ γὰρ κραναχῆπεδος εἶμι, used also by Callimachus (see above with n.8).
who uses Gyaros and Pholegandros as standards of unimportance to which Delos compares the unimportance of herself. αὐχηρή, “dry” Pholegandros, is a variation of Aratus’ σιδηρείη, “made of iron,” Aratus using a bolder term to express the island’s harshness and infertility; thus Pholegandros’ presence in Antipater, although the island was always unfortunate and ἀρξαμένη is not accurate for Delos, can be further justified through the reference to Aratus.

It could be further suggested that this Aratean image influenced Vergil in his presentation of Delos, stabilised by Apollo near Myconos and Gyaros (Aen. 3.75–76): quam pius arquitenens oras et litora circum errantem Mycono e celsa Gyaroque reuinxit.

The Vergilian couple Myconos and Gyaros can be seen as a variation of the Aratean Pholegandros and Gyaros, occurring also in an account about Apollo’s birth on Delos.32 It has been demonstrated that Vergil in this passage is reminiscent of Callimachus’ Delos;33 the Roman poet perhaps reads Callimachus with reference to Aratus, in which case he, exactly like Antipater, is conscious of the literary dialogue between the two.34


33 See n.7 above.

34 It is worth remembering a resemblance of phrasing between another poem by Antipater (Anth.Pal. 11.20 = 20 G.-P.) and “Vergil” (the inverted commas depending on the—unlikely—authenticity of the passage, for which see D. Clay, “Vergil’s Farewell to Education [Catalepton 5] and Epicurus’ Letter to Pythocles,” in D. Armstrong et al. [eds.], Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans [Austin 2004] 33 n.2), Catalepton 5, observed by Clay (28). Clay does not draw any conclusions about Antipater’s possible knowledge of “Vergil,” which would of course be unsafe, but notes the correspondence between the two texts. In the present discussion Antipater’s use of Callimachus together with Aratus is also, and interestingly, similar to Vergil’s use of the same authors on the same subject; however it should not be forgotten that Antipater’s and Vergil’s accounts, though based on the same “combination,” as it were, do not resemble each other.
A further interest of Antipater’s epigram is the use of the expression κελαδεινὸς ζωστήρ Αἰγαίου κύματος for the sea surrounding the Cyclades. The circling motif is dominant in Callimachus’ Delos, corresponding of course to the island’s central position in the Cyclades, as has been repeatedly observed by critics.\textsuperscript{35} Thus Delos is surrounded by the sea, (πόντος) ἀμφὶ ἐ πουλὺς ἐλλῶν (4.13); the swans fly around her and sing during Leto’s labour, ἐκυκλώσαντο ... περὶ Δῆλον (250–251); Theseus’ comrades dance the circular dance on her, κύκλιον ὠρχήσαντο (313); the islands form a circle around her as if to dance, σὲ ἐν περὶ τ’ ἀμφὶ τε νήσοι κύκλων ἐποίησαν καὶ ὦς χορὸν ἀμφεβάλοντο (300–301).

On a first level Antipater’s ζωστήρ can be seen as a remiscence of this Callimachean persistence on the centrality of Delos in regard to the natural elements found in her geographical proximity. But ζωστήρ is remarkable for a further reason: while the notion of a place enclosed by the sea that functions as a “girdle” is a quite common motif in literature,\textsuperscript{36}


\textsuperscript{36} Cf. the Homeric Ἀλίζωνας or Ἀλίζωνοι at \textit{Il.} 2.856, on which Eustathius comments: ἐτύμολογία δὲ τῶν Ἀλίζωνος τὸ γῆν οἰκεῖν ὑπὸ θαλάσσης ἐξωσμένην (I 570 van der Valk), cf. on \textit{Il.} 5.40 (II 18); Herodian \textit{Path.} 549 (Gram.Gr. III.2 350) ἡ γῆ αὐτῶν θαλάσσα διέζωσται καὶ οἰνεὶ ἀρχών στείνεος ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐξείνου τῆς Προποντίδος διεζωσμένη. Cf. also Dionysius Periegetes’ description of Oricia, \textit{Orb.} 400–401 (\textit{GGM} II 127) διοικῇ ζωσθεῖσα θαλάσσῃ, Αἰγαίη Σικελῆ τ’, and Callim. fr.384.9–10 ἀλλιζώνας ... στείνεοι for Isthmus, with R. Pfeiffer, Callimachus (Oxford 1949) I 312, citing more examples of ἀλίζωνος in poetry. Plastira (Antipater 72) compares Dion. Per. 513–514 (II 135) βαθὸς πόρος Αἰγαίοι ἐντὸς ἔχον ἐκατερθεῖν ἀπειρεῖσιν στίχων νῆσων and \textit{Supplementum Hellenisticum} 202.6 ὡς Αἰγαίοι ὦδωρ Κυκλάδας ἐνδέστησα.
the sea itself described as a ζωστήρ is very rare. This phrasing in a poem about the situation of the Cyclades and Delos above all can be seen as playfully alluding to Ζωστήρ, the place on the west coast of Attica where Leto loosened her girdle before arriving at Delos and giving birth, and to Ζωστήρ (or Ζωστήριος) as a title of Apollo himself. What is more, although κελάδος is often connected to the sea or rivers, in the use of κελαδεινός here an allusion to Apollo’s twin sister can also be traced. The adjective is a Homeric epithet of Artemis, Il. 16.183, 20.70, 21.511, Hymn. Hom. Art. 1, Hes. fr.23a.18. The Anonymi Exegesis in Hesiodi Theogoniam on Hes. Th. 918 uniquely associates the adjective with the noise that accompanied Artemis at her birth; Apollonius Sophistes (saec. I/II) in his Lexicon Homericum explains, as is more commonly held, that the epithet indicates the noise of hunting. κέλαδος is not irrelevant to Apollo, as it can

37 Gow-Page II 43 mention Secundus (Sext. 2 Mullach), who calls the Ocean ἀτλαντικὸς ζωστήρ ζωστήρ being a conjecture, as Plastira observes, Antipater ad loc.). Plastira further cites Nonnus Dion. 40.312 ὡς διερωτὸς ἤδεικτεν ἄλλο ζωστήριον ὀλίγα. Such a noise of plains, as is more commonly held, that the epithet indicates the objective with the noise Hesiodi Theogoniam 21.511, ad loc. However, the noise of plains, as is more commonly held, that the epithet indicates the objective with the noise. Hesiodi Theogoniam 21.511, ad loc. However, the noise of plains, as is more commonly held, that the epithet indicates the objective with the noise. Hesiodi Theogoniam 21.511, ad loc. However, the noise of plains, as is more commonly held, that the epithet indicates the objective with the noise. Hesiodi Theogoniam 21.511, ad loc. However, the noise of plains, as is more commonly held, that the epithet indicates the objective with the noise.

38 Cf. schol. Lyc. 1278.7 ζωστήρ τόπος, ἐνθα εἶναι ἡ Ἀτλήτα τοῦ ζωστήρα αὐτῆς, also Paus. 1.31.1. Apollo, Artemis, Leto, and Athena had altars there, see C. von Holzinger, Lycophron’s Alexandra (Leipzig 1895) 346. For a different explanation of Apollo’s title, viz. “armed for battle,” see F. Williams, Callimachus’ Hymn to Apollo (Oxford 1978) 75.


40 ὡς Λητῶ δὲ, φησάοι, ἵπποι οὐ νύξ, εἰς τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα καὶ τὴν Ἀρτέμιν, τὸν Ἡλίου δηλοῦσι καί τὴν σελήνην, ἣν κελαδεινήν φησὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῇ γεννήσει τούτης ἐγγυμονέαν κελάδαις.

41 See, κελαδεινή: ἐπίθετον Ἀρτέμιδος. σημαίνει δὲ τὴν κυνηγόν μετὰ γάρ κελάδου, ὅπερ ἐπί νυκτός, κυνηγή. Cf. Hesych. s.v. κελαδεινή: κραυνή, βοή, κυνηγόν ἐπίθετον ἡ Ἀρτέμις; Eym. Mag. s.v. κελαδεινή: Eust. on Il. 9.547 (II 801 Valk). R. Janko (The Iliad: a Commentary IV [Cambridge 1992] 343) comments on Il. 16.183 that “her noisy hobbies, listed at Ἑράφρος 18f.” (where we hear of Artemis’ love for arrows, killing of mountain
also denote the sound of singing (e.g. Eust. on II. 16.356 [III 861 Valk], mentions various uses), which is, needless to say, the god’s domain _par excellence_;

however, κελαδεωνις is above all an epithet of Artemis as Zoster is of Apollo.

So Antipater cleverly creates the phrase κελαδεωνις ζωστηρη for the Aegean Sea delicately hinting at Leto’s children, since the noun and the adjective can also signify Noisy Artemis and Zoster Apollo respectively; this respective allusion of the two words to the two siblings is further underlined by the enjambment in which they are placed, and the noun-adjective form of the phrase suggests the close relation between brother and sister. What is more, in two of the three Iliadic instances of the attribution of κελαδενη to Artemis, she is confronted/harassed by Hera. In 20.70 she stands before Hera in the conflict of the gods, and in 21.511 she is complaining to her father about her maltreatment by his wife; in both passages Artemis is accompanied by Leto.

It is therefore tempting to suggest that Antipater remembers the Homeric defeat of Artemis by Hera in a poem deploring the misery of the birthplace of both her and Apollo, all the

beasts, flutes, dances, joyful cries, groves and cities) “and _Hy._ 27, motivate κελαδενη.” Callimachus is reminiscent of these passages in the opening of his _Hymn to Artemis_, cf. F. Bornmann, _Callimachi Hymnus in Dianam_ (Florence 1968) 4–5. O. S. Due (“The Meaning of the Homeric Formula χρυσηλακελαδενη,” _CLMed_ 26 [1965] 1–3) has argued that κελαδενη should be seen not as referring strictly to the sounds of hunting, but to the sounds of wild nature in general.

42 Cf. _Eur._ _Ion_ 93 Ἀπόλλων κελαδήσῃ, _IT_ 1129 Φοῖβος θ’ ὁ μάντες ἔχων κέλαδον ἐπτάτων λύρας. Artemis has music as well, see previous note.

43 _Hymn.Hom.Ap._ 16 states that Artemis was born on Ortygia and Apollo on Delos. In other texts (Pindar, Apollonius) Ortygia is identified with Delos as also in Callimachus’ _Apollo_ (2.59), and the two siblings appear as working together to build the altar of horns on Delos (60–63). In _Delos_ Callimachus concentrates on the birth only of Apollo on the island, being silent about Artemis; the only hints of her are Leto’s mention in the plural of the children in her womb in (111, see Mineur, _Delos_ 137; for a different view, K. Sier, “Die Peneios-Episode des kallimacheischen Deloshymnos und Apollonios von Rhodos,” in _Hellenistica Groningana_ I 178 n.3, who holds that the plural is “emphatic-generalising” and does not mean two children) and
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more since in another poem (G.-P. 113, which probably forms a pair with the present one) he has explicitly attributed Delos’ misfortune to Hera’s hostility and revenge. It is further tempting to ask whether Antipater knows and has in mind the uncommon but attested explanation of κελαδεινή as denoting the noises accompanying Artemis’ birth. If this assumption is valid, one more playful connection of the epigram to the Callimachean Delos would be formed through the implications of κελαδεινός teasingly attributed not to Artemis but to Apollo (Ζωστήρϱ): in Delos 255–258 Delian nymphs sing after Apollo’s birth, and cry out a διαπρϱυσίην ὀλολυγήν (258), the exact phrase found in Hymn.Hom.Apfr. 19 (and nowhere else in extant literature), same sedes, to render the joyful cries which please κελαδεινήν Artemis.45 Antipater, then, intermingles implicitly the traditions involving thrilled cries associated with both twins, at their birth and/or afterwards. In a surrealistic way, as it were, Leto’s children, and especially Apollo (since Ζωστήρϱ, the noun, lays the weight on him rather than on Artemis), become in Antipater the “noisy girdle” surrounding the Cyclades, perhaps the reference to Artemis in the last line (Mineur 251–252; Ukleja, Delos-Hymnus 285–290). Inferring that for Callimachus, as for Pindar (frs. 33c.2, 52m.15–16), both children were born on Delos (cf. also Williams, Callimachus’ Hymn to Apollo 57–58), Ukleja (290–293) argues that with the plural of 111 Callimachus is reminiscent of the paradox of the twins’ separation in the Homeric Hymn; for a different view see Sier, and R. Hunter and Th. Fuhrer, “Imaginary Gods? Poetic Theology in the Hymns of Callimachus,” in F. Montanari (ed.), Callimaque (Vandoeuvres/Geneva 2002) 164, who maintain that Callimachus is completely silent about the place of Artemis’ birth. For Ortygia see T. W. Allen, W. R. Halliday, E. E. Sikes, The Homeric Hymns (Oxford 1936) 201–202 (on Hymn.Hom.Ap. 16); Williams 57–58 (on Callim. 2.59); Ukleja 290–291. Like Callimachus, Antipater identifies Ortygia with Delos: cf. Ὄρτυγιη for Delos in Anth.Pal. 9.550 = 94 G.-P., see Gow-Page II 94 and 96.44 Mineur (Delos 212) remarks that “the shout of joy evidently formed part of the song of the Deliads.”

45 The connection between Delos 258 and Hymn.Hom.Apfr. 19 is stressed by Ukleja (Delos-Hymnus 297).
which is a playful reversal of the Callimachean concept of the Cyclades surrounding Apollo, that is Delos, Apollo’s birthplace, echoing with jubilant shouts when he is born.\textsuperscript{46} The noise has been transferred from once resonant Delos, now deserted, therefore silent, to the Aegean Sea, its “natural” and eternal base.

It is finally worth looking more closely at the phrase ἀρχαίην δ’ ὀλέσατ’ ἀγλαίην. As critics observe, it is a Homeric reminiscence (\textit{Od}. 18.180–181 and 19.81–82);\textsuperscript{47} Antipater’s word-order echoes particularly the latter passage, μὴ ποτε καὶ σὺ, γίναι, ἀπὸ πᾶσαν ὀλέσασιν ἀγλαίην. Here Odysseus is threatening/warning the vile maid Melantho who abuses him, disguised as he is as a beggar, for the reversal of good fortune that is likely to afflict her when Odysseus returns: then she will loose her ἀγλαίην.\textsuperscript{48} In the \textit{Odyssey} this threat of course comes true with Melantho’s punishment (with the other disloyal maids: 22.446 ff.). The Cyclades too lose their old ἀγλαίην here having imitated Delos, who is, as we know from 113 G.-P., belatedly (as is, to a certain extent, Melantho) punished by Hera; Antipater’s ὀλέσατ’ ἀγλαίην is thus an indicator of punishment/revenge, in accordance with its Homeric use of the predicted end of Melantho. In a way the Cyclades of the present poem follow Delos in her punishment stated in 113 G.-P., so that the bond between 28 and 113 is further underlined, the one poem being a continuation of the other; note that the opening of 28, νῆσοι ἐρημαῖαι, takes up Δῆλος ἐρημαίη of the

\textsuperscript{46} ὀλόλυγη is borrowed from \textit{Hymn.Hom.Ap.} 119, where the goddesses scream in joy when Apollo is born, θεαὶ δ’ ὀλόλυξαν ἄπασαν, and appears also in Theoc. 17.64 where Cos shouts with delight for the newborn Ptolemy, Κόως δ’ ὀλόλυξεν ἰδοῖσα, cf. Allen-Halliday-Sikes, \textit{Homeric Hymns} 220 (on \textit{Hymn.Hom.Ap.} 119); Mineur, \textit{Delos} 212. Despite the omission of Artemis, Callimachus, followed in this by Antipater, probably does not mean to say that she was not also born on Delos.

\textsuperscript{47} See Gow-Page II 43; Plastira, \textit{Antipater} 73.

\textsuperscript{48} For the various meanings of the word (beauty, joy, glory) see W. B. Stanford, \textit{The Odyssey of Homer} II (London 1962) 306; in Antipater it rather means “prosperity” (Gow-Page II 43) and even “glory” (Plastira, \textit{Antipater} 73).
final couplet of 113, implying that desertion was “spread” from Delos to the other islands, which, we have seen, is in fact historically tenable. Moreover the use of δαίµων to indicate the desolation of Delos and of the other islands reminds the reader of Hera of 113: on a first level the word means πρόχη here, but it also implies a divine power.49

But if 113 and 28 are seen as belonging together, and the punishment of Delos of 113 is seen as spread to the other Cyclades in 28 (the order in the Anthology rather than the numbering of Gow-Page preserving the logical order of the events: desertion of Delos → desertion of other islands following her example),50 then the desertion of Delos in 113 should be also

49 See Gow-Page II 43 and Plastira, Antipater 74–75. Now, the idea of Hera’s wrath as responsible for the hard luck of all the Cyclades, through Delos, could perhaps be traced also in the phrase πρόφεα χθονός, which describes the Cyclades as “fragments of land”; for πρόφε, piece of rock (e.g. Od. 4.507–508) see Gow-Page II 43, Plastira, Antipater 71. In Antipater the phrase is placed before the bucolic diaeresis as well (roughly in the same sedes with the exception of the redundant syllable and in a reversed order of the two words) and sounds like Hera’s disdainful address to Zeus’ mistresses (implying Leto) as Ζηνὸς ὀνείδεα in Callim. 4.240. Can we suspect a deliberate hint of Antipater at the rage of Callimachean Hera, who immediately states, however, that she will not punish Delos? Antipater, disagreeing with Callimachus about the fate of Delos, describes here the islands who “accompany” Delos to her punishment by Hera with a term recalling the term which denotes Leto who suffers hardships by Hera in Callimachus. This reading can be supported by the use of ἐρηµαῖος for the islands here (as for Delos in 113 G.-P.), recalling Callimachean Hera’s description of Delos as σπιλάδεσσιν ἐρηµαῖοις (4.243), see above with n.10.

50 Of course the “correct” logical order of the appearance of the two epigrams in the Anthology is coincidental and due to another reason, irrelevant to their content and to the natural sequence of the events described in them: they belong to an extract from Philip’s Garland and, as Philip organised his material alphabetically (Al. Cameron, The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes [Oxford 1993] 33–40), 9.408 which happens to start with ε is necessarily placed before 9.421 which starts with ν. Regardless of this it can be argued that the two epigrams, one continuing the situation of the other, were placed together in Antipater’s collection. Two complementary epigrams in all probability juxtaposed in an individual collection and separated
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seen as pointing to the events of 166 B.C. rather than those of 88 and 69. In other words, if one of the poems of the pair (28) seems to refer to the events of 166, then it is likely that the other (113) does the same. This of course does not change things dramatically, as it can hardly be denied that Antipater saw the situation of both Delos and the other Cyclades in the late first century and was inspired by it, the abjection he witnessed being the result of the recent events of 88 and 69; however the interrelation of the epigrams and the indication of ἀρξαμένη in poem 28 suggest that in both epigrams Antipater thinks of the events of the previous century as the starting point of “Hera’s punishment” resulting in the decline of Delos and of the Cyclades which followed Delos, a degradation culminated and amplified with more catastrophes in his own time. Anth.Pal. 9.550 = 94 G.-P., a complaint that Delos is now more deserted than Tenos, closes the group of the (extant) three epigrams on the subject, being a thematic variation of 28, Delos here compared not with the various Cycladic islands but with just one of the others. Since there is no allusion here to Hera’s punishment and to the fate of Delos affecting the other Cyclades, history is

in the Anthology are for instance Callimachus’ epitaphs for his father (7.525) and for himself (7.415), cf. R. Kirstein, “Companion Pieces in the Hellenistic Epigram,” in Hellenistica Groningana VI Hellenistic Epigrams (Groningen 2002) 117–121. For the possible juxtaposition of a pair of poems on the same theme in an individual collection of poems of a Hellenistic or Roman author and for a review of scholarship on the arrangement of groups of poems on a topic within the collection see M. Ypsilanti, “Literary Loves as Cycles: from Meleager to Ovid,” AntCl 74 (2005) 97–98 with nn.27–28; also W. Johnson, “The Posidippus Papyrus: Bookroll and Reader,” in K. Gutzwiller (ed.), The New Posidippus, a Hellenistic Poetry Book (Oxford 2005) 79 n.31. Antipater’s third epigram dealing with the topic, Anth.Pal. 9.550 = G.-P. 94, a comparison of Delos to Tenos, is more likely to have stood together with the other two rather than at a distance from them. If the “cycle” consisted of more epigrams and one or more pairs could be traced in it, then it would be plausible that not all of the rest stood together (Ypsilanti 97–98); three, however, can stand more easily either all together or all separated rather than being arranged in one dyad and one alone elsewhere. Of course, it cannot be excluded that these three epigrams were not juxtaposed in Antipater’s collection.
not involved in the discussion and the poem can be read simply as Antipater’s reaction to what he sees during his voyage (τίς κεν ἐώρηκεν ὑβεβαιεν Τήνου Δήλου ἑρημοτέρην; lines 5–6) in the last decade of the first century B.C.

As is demonstrated by the epigrams of Antipater and Alpheus, Callimachus’ Delos was a constant point of reference for the authors who dealt not only with the mythological figure of Delos, but also with her historical fate, explained through mythology. In particular, Antipater disagrees with the poet from Cyrene and claims that Delos was finally a victim of Hera’s anger, in contrast to what we know from Callimachus’ Delos; to build up his thesis against the Callimachean account not only does he use the diction of this account dexterously but he also employs the purely Alexandrian (and of course Callimachean) means of allusion and double entendre. Antipater’s erudition and talent in a playful treatment of Delos and of literary tradition in general are impressively expressed in Anth.Pal. 9.421 = 28 G.-P., which exploits various sources in a highly skilful manner comparable to that of Callimachus who remains a master even for Antipater who explicitly distances himself from Alexandria’s school.
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