

MARIA YOUNI (KOMOTINI)

COUNCILS OF ELDERS AND ARISTOCRATIC GOVERNMENT IN THE CRETAN POLEIS

According to Ephorus the Cretans had a Council of Elders with the same name and the same functions as the Spartan Gerousia. Its members were selected among those who had assumed the highest magistracy (*kosmos*) and were worthy and appreciated for their virtue. The Elders' tenure was life-long, and the Council's role in the constitution was advisory concerning the most important affairs of the city.¹ Again, drawing a parallel with the Spartan constitution Aristotle states that the Council of Elders, which the Cretans call βουλή, is composed by former *kosmoi*, and has the same authorities as the Spartan Council. Aristotle criticizes the Cretan Elders because their tenure for life and the fact that they do not give account for their administration 'privileges greater than their merit deserves', and their exercising their power not according to written laws but at their own discretion is dangerous for the state.²

Both Ephorus and Aristotle give general accounts of the fourth-century³ institutions of what they represent as a unified Crete without distinguishing among the different cities, as opposed to inscriptional evidence, which reveals a much more differentiated institutional setting as regards the archaic and classical *poleis* of Crete. On the subject of Councils in the cities of Crete before the third century, however, epigraphic testimonies are so scarce that the overall existence of Councils in archaic and even in classical Cretan *poleis* may be put in doubt. After all, did early Cretan constitutions possess an institutionalized Council? If they did, what was the Council's composition and what authorities did it have? Furthermore, what was the role of the Council in the political system of each *polis*? How was it related and how did it interact with the other authorities of the *polis*'s government? The answers to these questions have important consequences for our understanding of Cretan institutions. This paper investigates the scanty epigraphic evidence on Cretan Councils in the archaic and classical periods and tries to provide some answers to the above questions, so far as this is permitted by the extremely fragmentary condition of many Cretan inscriptions, and by problems of dialect. In the first part I

¹ Ephorus *ap.* Strabo 10.4.18, 22 (*FGrHist* 70 F149).

² Aristotle, *Politics* 2, 1272a 9, 34–39.

³ All dates are B.C.E. unless otherwise stated.

will examine the testimonies and in the second I will discuss aspects of the government of the Cretan cities in the light of the evidence.

I. The institutional vocabulary of Crete has its own particularities, which are more marked in the earlier sources. A notorious example is the earliest law from Dreros on the iteration of the office of *kosmos*,⁴ where a vast bibliography has attempted to interpret the nature of the boards of officials obliged to take an oath, not least because the names of the two of these boards appear only in this document. Despite the different opinions, the general consensus is that the *kosmos*, the *damioi* and the Twenty of the Polis were Dreros's governing bodies in the seventh century, and most scholars believe that the Twenty of the Polis composed some sort of an aristocratic Council.⁵

Apart from the phrase 'the Twenty of the Polis' which presumably denotes an early Council, the two terms used in Cretan inscriptions for Council are a) βολὰ/βωλὰ (the dialectal forms of the word βουλή, which is the usual designation of a Council in Greek antiquity), and b) πρεισγεία/πρησγήια (the dialectal forms of πρεσβεία, which is the Cretan equivalent for γερουσία). In non-democratic cities Councils were often called γερουσία and were composed of γέροντες (Elders), a term referring either to the actual age or to the authority and respectability of the Council's members.⁶

The earliest evidence of a Cretan βολὰ occurs in a late sixth- or early fifth-century inscription from Axos containing regulations about public sacrifices.⁷ The preserved final part of this statute imposes fines on priests, who keep for themselves parts of the sacrificial animals against the law, then sets the procedure in court, and directs the *kosmos* in charge to exact the fines or be liable to pay them himself. The last paragraph of the law sets the obligation for the Council to provide the sum of twelve staters for buying the sacrificial animals for the festival of Kydanteia, which was celebrated every two years:⁸ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ τοῖς Κυδαντείοις διδόμεν τρίτοι φέτει τὰν βολὰν ἰς τὰ θύματα δωδέκα στατήραν. The expression κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ('in the same way')⁹ probably indicates that the Council provided the funds for other sacrifices too. Apart from the information that sixth-century Axos had an institutionalized Council called a *bola* with the authority to provide the funds for

⁴ Demargne – Van Effenterre 1937, 333–48 (*ML* no 2; *IGT* no 90; *Nomima* I, no 81).

⁵ Ehrenberg 1943, 14–18; Beattie 1975, 14; van Effenterre 1986, 396; *IGT* 337; Hölkeskamp 1994, 148; Gehrke 1997, 59; Hölkeskamp 1999, 91; Seelentag 2009a; Youni 2011, 37.

⁶ For the importance of age in participating in public affairs cf. Plato, *Laws* 1, 634d–635a, stating that in Crete young men were not allowed to have an opinion on laws or to criticize them.

⁷ *IC* II v 9 (*IGT* 106+107).

⁸ *IC* II v 9 ll. 11–14: "In the same way, at the Kydanteia the *Bola* is to give every third year for the victims twelve staters."

⁹ For this expression cf. the Great Code of Gortyn, *IC* IV 72, VI ll. 1–2.

sacrifices in public festivals, all other aspects of this Council, e.g. its composition, number of members, duration of office, and competence remain obscure.

The second attestation of a βολά occurs in a treaty between the cities of Knossos and Tylissos with the mediation of Argos, dated ca. 460–450. Two inscriptions, one found in the Agora in Argos and the other found at the sanctuary of Artemis in Tylissos preserve some of the conditions of the agreement between the two Cretan cities.¹⁰ One of these provides that if a Knossian in Tylissos calls for an embassy from his own city, the Tylissians are obliged to satisfy his request and follow the embassy wherever needed; the same rule applies for a Tylissian's request in Knossos. If the city's officials do not provide the expenses for the maintenance of the ambassadors,¹¹ the Council (βολά) must immediately impose on the *kosmoi* an indemnity of ten staters. Thus any Tylissian complaining that the *kosmoi* had not acted in conformity with the law on hospitality—specifically, with the provision on covering the Tylissian ambassadors' maintenance costs—would turn to the Council. The Council had to investigate the claim and in case of infringement, it ordered immediately (αὐτίκα) the *kosmoi* to pay an indemnity of ten staters to the Tylissian ambassadors.

The fact that the text does not specify which city's Council is meant may create an ambiguity: it may be taken to mean either that the Councils of Knossos and Tylissos had the authority to impose the indemnity on their respective officials, or that this competence was bestowed on the Council of Argos. However it is very unlikely that the Argive Council had jurisdiction over foreign magistrates; moreover, on a practical level it would be very complicated for citizens of the two Cretan cities to refer to the Council at Argos, which would then impose the indemnity on the *kosmoi* of Knossos or Tylissos each time there was an infringement. The *interpretatio facilior* is preferable and we should assume that in the middle of the fifth century Knossos had an institutionalized Council called βολά.¹² The provision for a similar procedure in Tylissos implies that in this city there was also a Council, probably with the same name. The Council's authority over the *kosmoi* may have been part of a general competence in international matters and bilateral relations or of a general authority to oversee the financial activity of the *kosmoi*. It is noteworthy that in some Cretan cities in the Hellenistic period the competence of judging questions related to laws of hospitality belonged to a special board of Elders called the *Eunomia*.¹³

¹⁰ *IC I* viii 4 (Argos) and *IC I* xxx 1 (Tylissos) (*Nomima I*, no 54 I+II).

¹¹ For the 'ξένια τὰ ἐκ τῶν νόμων' cf. *IC I* v 53 ll. 47–48.

¹² *ML* 104; Wallace 2013, 196.

¹³ E.g. *IC I* xvi 5 (Lato) ll. 34–36: [αἱ] δέ τί κα ἔληται Λατίωι ἢ Βολοντί[ωι, ἐπιόντων οἱ πρεΐγιστοι]/ [οἱ ἐ]πὶ τα[ῖς] Εὐνομίαις οἱ ἑκάτερῃ ἐρευνίοντες καὶ ῥυθμίττον[τες ---]/ πρὸς ἀύσαντος καὶ τὰλλ[α] πάντα χρήμενοι, καθὼς κα ἐπεικ[ῆς ἦι ---]. On the *Eunomia* see Guarducci 1933, 204–205; van Effenterre 1942, 46.

A *bola* is probably attested also in a decree preserved in an inscription from Lyktos dated ca. 500. The decree sets a ban on receiving aliens in the city, with two exceptions: persons over whom a Lyktian himself has power, and the citizens of Itanos.¹⁴ The decree further provides that if anyone receives an alien, the sitting *κόσμοι* or the *ἀπόκοσμοι* shall exact a fine of a hundred cauldrons for each alien ‘by reason of enactment of the Council’: Αἱ δέ κα [δέκσεται]αι ἡ κοσμίων ἡ ἀπόκοσμο[ς ὑπὲρ] φωλάς φαδάς ἑκατὸν λέβητ[ας πράκσει] ἐκάστω ὄσος κα δέκσεται.¹⁵ The reconstruction of this passage is controversial but according to the more probable interpretation, fifth-century Lyktos had a Council involved in legislative activity, with the authority to exclude aliens from the city. If this interpretation is valid, it is an important piece of information, because it provides the unique attestation in Crete of a Council vested with legislative authority, which in this case probably concerned the enactment rather than the proposal or validation of the law.

Finally, two inscriptions from Gortyn may possibly attest to the presence of a Council; both occur in desperately fragmentary texts where *βολὰ* can be read but not much can be made in a missing context. The first inscription belongs to the earliest set of laws dated to the sixth century, which were inscribed on the walls of the sanctuary of Apollo Pythios.¹⁶ The preserved letters in the fourth line “--]νεσβολανημ[ε]ν” may refer either to a Council (*ἐς βολὰν ἡμ[ε]ν*) or to a removal (*ἐσβολὰν ἡμ[ε]ν*). In the second inscription, which is dated to the fifth century,¹⁷ the phrase *ἐ]μ βολὰι* (‘before the Council’) seems to be the most supported interpretation.¹⁸

The term *πρεισιγεία* is attested in an inscription of the beginning of the sixth century found at Prinias, a site identified with the ancient city of Rhitten. Only a few words survive from this archaic text which was inscribed on the four sides of a pillar,¹⁹ but the word *πρησιγήια* can be clearly read twice (and remarkably, with two different spellings). This term corresponds to the Attic *πρεσβεία* which may designate either an embassy or a panel of elders that composed the Council of the

¹⁴ *IGT* no 87 (*Nomima* I, no 12).

¹⁵ *Ibid.* ll. 4–7. The reconstruction of this passage is by Gagarin – Perlman (forthcoming). *Φαδά* is the feminine form of the epigraphically attested word *ἄδος* meaning ‘statute’. Previous editors read in l. 6 a koppa instead of a rho, and suggested two possible reconstructions: either *ἐ]ρ Φωλάς Φαδάς* (= by force of a law of the Council) or *ἐ]ρΦωλάς Φαδάς* (= by force of the law on *ἐκβολὰ*), but *ἐκβολὰ* is an otherwise unattested noun hypothetically equivalent to the Athenian *exoule*, and moreover one would expect instead *ἐσβολὰ*, in analogy with e.g. *ἐσδυσάμενος*. On previous readings and reconstructions see M. van Effenterre 1990; Chadwick 1987, 329–334; Bile 1988, 32–34 and *passim*; *IGT* no 87; *Nomima* I, no 12; Hölkeskamp 1999, 200.

¹⁶ *IC* IV 23 l. 4: --]ν ἐσβολὰν ἡμ[ε]ν.

¹⁷ *SEG* 49 (1999), 122 = Gagarin – Perlman (forthcoming), GOR3.

¹⁸ Gagarin in Gagarin – Perlman *ad. loc.*

¹⁹ *IC* I xxviii 7 (*Nomima* I, no. 63).

polis. The latter interpretation, generally accepted by scholars,²⁰ is compatible with the literary evidence on the name of the Council in Crete discussed above. The presence of a Council in this early inscription may be also supported by some indications in the text which suggest that it contained one or more enactments²¹ of constitutional nature.²²

The word *πρεισγήια* is also possibly restored in an inscription from Axos,²³ but there is no context to indicate the meaning of this word. If this word refers to the Council of Elders then we must presume that at Axos two alternative names were used to designate the Council since the previously discussed text from Axos employs the term *bola*.

Furthermore, the Rhittenian Elders are designated as *πρέιγιστοι* in an inscription of the beginning of the fifth century.²⁴ This text records an unequal treaty between Rhitten and its powerful neighbor Gortyn.²⁵ In lines 8–12 a prohibition is set against Gortynians taking security from Rhittenians; if a Gortynian is convicted for infringement of this law, he shall pay double the value of the security, and the Rhittenian *kosmos* is to exact payment. If the *kosmos* fails to exact payment, the *πρέιγιστοι* are directed to exact it from them. This provision recalls similar measures

²⁰ Guarducci in *IC I* xxviii 7; Van Effenterre – Ruzé in *Nomima I*, no 63.

²¹ On the basis of the direction of the lines in this peculiar pillar, Gagarin – Perlman (forthcoming) argue that it possibly contained two enactments.

²² For example the phrase “with all force” in l. A1, according to Guarducci’s suggested restoration *παν]σεφδὶ = πανσνδί* might be related to a decision of the Council. Another example is l. D2 where one possible restoration is *ἐνέα ἢ σὺν πλι[οσι]*, an expression known from other epigraphic texts, where it refers to the lawful composition of a city’s organ or to the majority provided for by the law for taking a decision in that body. For instance, a fifth-century constitutional law from Teos forbids the infliction of capital punishment on a citizen unless it is imposed by a board composed of at least 200 citizens (*ἄμ μὴ σὺν διακοσίοισιν ἐν Τέω ἢ πλέοσιν*: Youni 2007, 729–730). By analogy, the phrase ‘with nine or more’ in the text from Prinias could specify the quorum of the participants or the majority of votes of the Councilors for taking a decision, although these considerations are purely speculative.

²³ *IC II* v 7.

²⁴ The adjective *πρέιγυς* means ‘old’, cf. *IC IV 75 C ll. 3–4* (Gortyn, 5th century). The comparative occurs in *IC IV 72 XI l. 55*; also in *IC IV 248 l. 1* (Gortyn, 1st century) where it may denote a Council (Bile 1988, 341). The superlative *πρέιγιστος* is often used in the regulations about the *patroikos* in the Great Code of Gortyn, e.g. *IC IV 72 VII ll. 17–18, 20, 23–24, 27*. In Hellenistic and imperial inscriptions the term *πρέιγιστος* was a generic name for the members of a Council of elders or of the board of *εὐνομία* and also for other officials, e.g. *SEG 28* (1978), 753 (Rethymnon, 3rd/2nd century); *IC IV 294* (Gortyn, 1st century C.E.); *IC III iii 7* (Hierapytna, 2nd century C.E.). During the third and second century a Gortynian *πρέιγιστος* was stationed at the dependent island of Kaudos (*IC IV 184* and *SEG 23* (1973), 589, l. 24). One of his duties was to receive the stipulated amount of salt from the inhabitants in cooperation with another board of officials, the *ῥοι*. This *πρέιγιστος* was a specific official whose seat was at Kaudos rather than a member of the Council.

²⁵ *IC IV 80*. *Nomima I*, no 7; Hansen – Nielsen 2004, 1186.

found in other Cretan inscriptions that provide for the liability of officials with their personal property in case they fail to exact fines.²⁶ Although the text does not specify whether the Elders are Rhittenian or Gortynian we may hold it for certain that they were a Rhittenian panel, with the authority to oversee their own city's officials. If the term *πρησιγήια* in the previously discussed inscription from Rhitten denotes a Council then it seems that this name for the Council was preserved for at least one century. Although dependent on Gortyn, Rhitten still had her own administrative organs. In Gortyn control over the *kosmoi* for their financial administration was the task of specific magistrates called *titai*, and it is very likely that in Rhitten this was a duty of the Council.

Summing up the epigraphic sources pertaining to a Council in chronological order, a board of twenty citizens is attested in Dreros since the seventh century; a *βολὰ* is attested in Axos and probably in Gortyn since the sixth century and in Knossos, Tylissos, and Lyktos since the fifth century. Finally, a *πρεισιγήια* is attested in sixth-century Rhitten and its members, the *πρείγιστοι*, are attested in the same city about a century later. Despite the varying degree of certainty concerning these instances, even according to the most skeptical approach the undisputable evidence suggests that Councils of Elders must have existed also in other Cretan *poleis* since the archaic period.

The mere existence of a Council in a *polis*, however, does not advance substantially our knowledge of this city's institutions unless more information is provided about the Council's functions and tasks. More importantly, the presence of a Council in a *polis* does not imply per se that it had probouleutic competence, as it is sometimes assumed. We know that Councils existed in all types of constitution, whether they were democratic, aristocratic or oligarchic, and they already had a role in the Homeric society,²⁷ but their functions were highly differentiated according to their socio-political context. If seventh-century Dreros had a Council composed of twenty Elders, its obligation to take the oath about the *kosmoi* shows that it was placed among the most important administrative bodies of this city, but it does not imply anything about its duties. The role of Councils in the political system of the early Cretan cities cannot be clarified until some essential questions are taken into consideration, concerning a) the Council's authorities; b) the Council's composition, i.e., the number of its members, how these were appointed, the criteria for their selection, their length of tenure; c) the degree of the Council's formalization (for example: Were there scheduled meetings or did it meet occasionally to address specific issues and provide ad hoc solutions? Were its authorities specifically provided for by the law? Was its composition fixed or was it subject to a temporary consensus among powerful individuals or groups?). In examining the role of Cretan

²⁶ See Youni 2011, 170–72.

²⁷ Wallace 2013.

Councils some spatial and temporal parameters should also be taken into consideration.

Firstly, since each Cretan city had her own constitution and set of laws, many institutional differences are observed from one *polis* to another.²⁸ The population and the citizenry of each Cretan city were composed differently (for example the citizens of each city were distributed into a different number of *phylai*, which had different names; in the Eastern part of the island there was a marked Eteocretan influence). Alphabets and dialects had differences, and so did calendars, including different month's names and festivals.²⁹ From this we may infer that, at least in the archaic period, the administrative organs and the political groups probably did not develop in the same way and did not have the same authorities in all cities.

Secondly, we should keep in mind the progress of institutionalization from the archaic to the Hellenistic period as the organs of the city's government were progressively formalized and assumed a distinctive function in the constitution. The Hellenistic period marks a transition of Cretan institutions towards a uniform Greek model, under the influence of interstate relations with other Greek *poleis*. The legal and institutional vocabulary of Hellenistic Cretan decrees is much closer to that of decrees from other parts of the Greek world, a fact that is best illustrated in a number of imported formulas and terms.³⁰ By contrast, government in the Cretan cities during the archaic and classical periods had its own particularities which make comparison of the Cretan political organs with, for example, those of democratic Athens unfortunate.³¹ The processes of institutionalization in the early *poleis* are wholly unclear, and we should guard from assuming too much from later sources and considerations. For example, as regards the Drierian Council of the Twenty, it is very doubtful that it had acquired any specifically fixed competences in the seventh century. Most probably the tasks assumed by the Council were ad hoc, and were determined more by the personal authority of its members than by institutional rules, and in fact there is no evidence about the extent to which this situation had changed in the sixth or even in the fifth century.

There is some evidence about the duties of the Council in the cities of Axos, Knossos, Tylissos, Lyttos and Rhitten. As we saw, in sixth-century Axos the *bola* was responsible for the administration of the funds for sacrifices in at least one public festival, which may imply a more extensive competence of the Council in the administration of public finances. About Lyttos we are informed that in the

²⁸ Pointed out by Ephor. ap. Strabo 10.4.17. On the diversity of Cretan institutions see Perlman 1992; Link 2003; Chaniotis 2005.

²⁹ Chaniotis 1996.

³⁰ On 'imported' formulas such as the preamble 'βωλὰ καὶ ἐκκλησία' in Cretan decrees after the third century see Bile 1988, 321, who also points out the difference between the archaic βωλὰ of Axos and the βωλὰ in Hellenistic cities.

³¹ See Fröhlich's observation on the different nature of Cretan Councils as compared to those of other Greek *poleis* (2004, 517).

beginning of the fifth century the *bola* was responsible for enacting a statute, but we ignore the procedure that was followed and it is not clear whether this single attestation of the Council's legislative authority was part of its regular tasks or an exceptional duty. About the middle of the fifth century the respective *bolai* in Knossos and her dependent Tyliisos had the authority to oversee that the *kosmoi* complied with the laws on hospitality, and in case of infringement the Council exacted an indemnity. During the same period the *preigistoi* in Rhitten, which had become dependent on Gortyn, had financial control over the *kosmoi* in what concerns the collection of fines, and if these officials failed to exact the fines fixed by the treaty, the *preigistoi* made them pay the fines themselves. This authority of the Rhittenian Council may be paralleled to the authority of the Councils of Knossos and Tyliisos, as in both cases the Councils oversee the financial administration of the *kosmoi* in interstate affairs.

Thus the main authority attested epigraphically for early Cretan Councils is their involvement in the financial administration of their *polis*, especially in controlling the officials' conformity with the laws on exacting fines and indemnities. A parallel from Hellenistic Dreros may suggest that financial control over the *kosmoi* was a usual task of the Council. In the ephebic oath a heavy fine is imposed on *kosmoi* failing to administer the oath to each year's ephebes, and the Council is authorized to exact the fines from the *kosmoi* or else each one of its members is liable to pay double the fine. In its turn, the Council is controlled by another panel of magistrates called the ἐρευτὰ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων.³² On the other hand, there is no evidence from archaic or classical Crete about the Council's judicial competence, as opposed to information from other Greek cities about Councils judging specific types of cases. Among the numerous procedural enactments that are preserved from the Cretan *poleis* and especially from Gortyn, the Council is not implicated, although judicial authority of the *kosmos* and the *dikastas* (= judge) is well attested.³³

More importantly, there is no attestation whatsoever about a Cretan Council's involvement in preparing the bills for discussion and introducing them in the assembly (προβούλευσις), which was one of the most important duties of Councils in many Greek cities. The only probable involvement of the Council in legislation occurs in fifth-century Lyktos, but there, rather than having a probouleutic role, the

³² *IC I ix 1 ll. 128–134* (late 3rd or early 2nd century).

³³ An instance of the Council's judicial authority is attested later in Knossos, where a board composed of the *kosmos* and the Council had joined judicial authority in interstate matters. One of the clauses of a third-century treaty between Knossos and Miletus sets the prohibition for Knossians to buy a Milesian as a slave and vice versa, and gives the Knossian *kosmos* the authority to order any Knossian who was brought before him with this charge to release the Milesian. If however the Knossian has any counterclaims, competence to judge the case is with 'the *kosmos* and the Council'. *IC I viii 6 ll. 18–31*: ἐὰν δέ τι ἀντιλέγωσιν περὶ ὅτινός κα, κρίνειν ἐγ Κνωσῶν/ μὲν κόσμον καὶ βουλάν ἐμ Μιλήτῳι δὲ τοὺς τοῦ ἐμποροῦ ἐπιμελητὰς πέντε ἀμέραις, ἀφ' ἅς κα κατασταθῶσιν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρχεῖον.

Council seems to have had the authority to enact laws on its own right. In fact, the few surviving prescripts of decrees from Lyktos, Eltynia and Gortyn, where only mention of the people is made, suggest that the Council was not involved in *probouleusis*.³⁴ It is also very likely that *probouleusis* by the Council was neither systematically nor uniformly required in the Hellenistic period. In fact, the sources suggest that it was rather occasionally required. Cooperation of the Council with the Assembly does appear in the enactment formula of some decrees,³⁵ but the typical prescript of Hellenistic decrees from the majority of the Cretan cities mentions only the *kosmoi* and the *polis*.³⁶ Even inside a single city practice is not uniform. In third-century Praisos, for example, one decree is introduced as ‘the decision of the boule and the *koinon* of the Praisians, on the *kosmos*’ proposal’,³⁷ but another contemporary decree is introduced as an enactment of the magistrates (ἄρχοντες) and the *koinon*.³⁸ The term ‘archontes’ probably includes both the council and the *kosmoi*, but this does not imply a *probouleusis* by the boule; quite on the contrary, it appears more as an enactment agreed upon and introduced by a small governing group to the assembly for approval. By using Hellenistic examples I do not intend to draw conclusions about government and institutions of the archaic and classical periods, but the observation that προβούλευσις was not a uniform practice even in later times implies that this task was not among the Council’s authorities in the earlier periods.

In what concerns the composition of the Council, the terms πρεισιγία and πρρίγιστος suggest that its members were chosen among the elders of the elite, presumably among the *ex-kosmoi*³⁹ and, as Ephorus vaguely states, among those who were adjudged men of approved merit.⁴⁰ Unless new sources come to light we

³⁴ Lyktos, late 6th or early 5th century: van Effenterre – van Effenterre 1985, 157 A and 157 B (*IGT* nos 87 and 88; *Nomima* I, nos 12 a and B). Eltynia, late 6th or early 5th century: *IC* I x 2 (*IGT* no 94; *Nomima* II, no 84). Gortyn, mid-5th century: *IC* IV 78.

³⁵ E.g. *IC* III iv 2: Ἔδοξε Ἰτανίων τῶν βουλῶν καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν; cf. *IC* III iv 3, 4, 7 (Itanos, 3rd century).

³⁶ *IC* I viii 6: Ἔδοξε Κνωσίων τῶν κόσμων καὶ τῶν πόλεων (Knossos, mid-3rd century). *IC* I xviii 8: Δεδόχθαι Λυττίων τοῖς κόσμοις [καὶ τῆ] πόλει (Lyttos, 3rd century); *IC* IV 168: Γορτυνίων οἱ κόσμοι καὶ ἡ πόλις (Gortyn, 218); *IC* II i 1: Δεδόχθαι τοῖς κόσμοις καὶ τῶν πόλεων τῶν Ἀλαριωτῶν (Allaria, ca 204/3); *IC* II v 17: Ἔδοξε Φαξίων τοῖς κόσμοις καὶ τῶν πόλεων (Axos, ca 204/3); *IC* II iii 2: Ἀπτεραίων οἱ κόσμοι καὶ ἡ πόλις (Aptera, after 170); *IC* I v 52: Ἔδοξεν Ἀρκάδων τοῖς κόσμοις καὶ τῶν πόλεων (Arkades, after 170), to cite only a few examples.

³⁷ *IC* III vi 10: θεός, κόσμου γνώμα· ἀγαθὰ τύχαι· ἔδοξε Πραισιῶν τῶν βουλῶν καὶ τῶν κοινῶν, ἐκκλησίας [κ]υρίας γενομένης.

³⁸ *IC* III vi 9: Ἔδοξε Πραισιῶν τοῖς ἀρχουσι καὶ τῶν κοινῶν, ἐκκλησίας κυρίας γενομένης.

³⁹ As Arist., *Pol.* 2, 1272a 33–35 states for the fourth century.

⁴⁰ Ephor. *ap.* Strabo 10.4.22: περὶ δὲ τῶν μεγίστων συμβούλοις χρῶνται τοῖς γέρονσι καλουμένοις. Καθίστανται δ’ εἰς τοῦτο τὸ συνέδριον οἱ τῆς τῶν κόσμων ἀρχῆς ἡξιωμένοι καὶ ἄλλα δόκιμοι κρινόμενοι.

shall never know how the members of Cretan Councils were appointed or what their number was, if indeed their number was fixed by law, although the fact that the number of the *kosmoi* in each city was not fixed suggests that the same was probably true of the Council. The Twenty of the Polis were one of the three main governmental bodies in archaic Dreros, but it is not secure to infer from this that the number of the Drierian Council's members remained the same in later periods. In any case, it seems safe to suggest that the number of the Council's members in the Cretan cities was small, if we take into account the restricted number of citizens. Even in a *polis* as important as third-century Gortyn the quorum of the assembly was only three hundred citizens.⁴¹

II. The scarcity of evidence about Councils is in striking contrast with the abundant information on the authorities of the *kosmoi*, the supreme magistrates in Cretan *poleis*. The presence of the *kosmoi*, who were the omnipotent archons and administrators of political power in classical and Hellenistic Cretan *poleis*, is already striking in the archaic sources, beginning with the famous statutes regulating their tenure from seventh-century Dreros and sixth-century Gortyn. Clearly, they had general authority over all important state affairs. Especially the authority of the *kosmos* to pronounce judgment and inflict fines is amply attested in the early inscriptions;⁴² in fifth-century Gortyn their jurisdiction includes private law, as for example in the marriage of the *patroiokos* (the Cretan equivalent of the *epikleros*).⁴³ Competence of the *kosmoi* in the city's relations with her dependencies is attested in fifth-century Gortyn.⁴⁴ The well-known Spensithios decree from sixth-century Datalla shows that the chief magistrates were responsible for the administration not only of human (ἀνθρώπινα) but also of divine matters (θήια), i.e., they were involved in the city's cult.⁴⁵ This text reveals another important piece of information, namely that the authority of the *kosmos* could also be shared by other persons who did not bear this title, as in the case of Spensithios himself, who is

⁴¹ IC IV 162, ll. 2–3: [τάδ' ἔφαδε τᾶι [πόλι] ψαφίδδονσι τρια/[κατίων π]αριόντων (decree dated c. 250/200, imposing the use of the new bronze obols and banning the use of silver obols used until then). The number of three hundred is considered by scholars as the quorum of the assembly: Guarducci, *ad loc.*; Chaniotis 1996, 292; Rhodes – Lewis 1997, 311. The same quorum is attested in another Gortynian decree dated c. 168 (IC IV 181, l. B 7).

⁴² Some early examples are: Demargne – Van Effenterre 1937, 333–348 (Dreros); IC I x 2 (Eltynia); Van Effenterre – van Effenterre 1985, 157 B (Lyktos). Authority to inflict and exact fines in sixth- and fifth-century Gortyn: IC IV 14 g–p 1; IC IV 79; IC IV 80. Cf. IC IV 184, ll. 11–13. See Gagarin 2001.

⁴³ IC IV 74, VIII 53–56.

⁴⁴ IC IV 80 (*Nomima* I, no 7), ll. 4–7. There is more information about the *kosmoi*'s competence in interstate affairs in Hellenistic documents, e.g. IC I iii 1, ll. 5–8; IC I v 52, ll. 40–42; IC I vi 1; IC I viii 8, ll. 9–11.

⁴⁵ Jeffery – Morpurgo-Davies 1970, 118 (*Nomima* I, no 22 B) ll 1–3.

honored by the city with the life-time office of *poinikastas* and, at the same time, is allowed to the “same jurisdiction as for the *other kosmoi* for every kind of trial.”⁴⁶

Remarkably, a Lyktian law on aliens shows that the authority of the sitting *kosmoi* was also shared by the ‘*apokosmoi*’. The meaning of the term ἀπόκοσμος is not clear; it may be either ‘*kosmos-elect*’⁴⁷ or, more plausibly, ‘*ex-kosmos*’.⁴⁸ According to the traditional interpretation, the Lyktian law provided for heavy penalties in case a *kosmos* or an *apokosmos* received aliens against the law.⁴⁹ In a forthcoming corpus of Cretan archaic and classical inscription Gagarin and Perlman propose a new interpretation, according to which it was the sitting κόσμοι and the ἀπόκοσμοι who inflicted the penalties.⁵⁰ The plausibility of the former or the latter interpretation does not affect the core of my argument, and the same is true of the ambiguity of the term ἀπόκοσμος. However it may be, this passage has important consequences for our perception of the concept of power in early fifth-century Lyktian mentality, because it shows that *kosmoi* were grouped together with *apokosmoi* either as liable to or as those who inflicted fines. If the latter interpretation is correct, this would be the unique—to my knowledge—attestation of the competence of future (or ex-) magistrates to inflict penalties, which implies a conflation of the powers of sitting magistrates with the power of the rest of the ruling class, either potential or *ex-kosmoi*.

Epigraphic, literary and archaeological evidence points to the fact that the Cretan *poleis* from the archaic until the Hellenistic period were governed by small elites with privileged access to agricultural labor and pastoral land.⁵¹ Excavations currently conducted at Eleutherna have brought to light luxurious burials of the local aristocracy dated to the sixth century.⁵² Aristocratic government by an elite restricted in number continued during the Hellenistic period. A typical example of governance by a small group of aristocrats is provided by Lato, a *polis* flourishing in the second century.⁵³ A remarkable number of magistrates’ names from the last

⁴⁶ Ibid. B ll. 7–10: δίκαια δὲ ὄτερον καὶ ὀλιγώτεροι οἱ ποινικαστ[ὰ]ς αἱ περὶ οἱ ἄλλοι κρησεταιην.

⁴⁷ Manganaro 1966, 16; Bile 1988, 274, by analogy with ‘*apodromos*’ (an ‘adult male citizen-elect’).

⁴⁸ Gauthier 1977; Van Effenterre – van Effenterre 1985, 171–72; *SEG* 46 (1996), 1201. Perlman 2005, 1153 considers both possibilities. Papakonstantinou 1996, 93–96 argues that an ἀπόκοσμος was a κόσμος discharged for maladministration and compares this term with the ἄκρηστος of the early Drierian law, but his arguments are not convincing. Chadwick’s interpretation of the word as meaning “non-*kosmos*” (1987, 331) is also improbable. The term ἀπόκοσμος occurs once more in a later inscription from Axos (Manganaro 1966, 11–22).

⁴⁹ *Nomima* I, no 12.

⁵⁰ Gagarin – Perlman (forthcoming), Lyktos 1A.

⁵¹ For an example see Haggis et al. 2004 (Azoria in the 6th century).

⁵² Panagopoulos 2010.

⁵³ The analysis that follows is based on the sources and conclusions supplied by Baldwin Bowsky 1989b. See also Baldwin Bowsky 1989a; Tréheux 1984. Similar conclusions

quarter of the second century has been preserved which shows that the kosmate was monopolized by an aristocratic elite composed exclusively of a few families.⁵⁴ Baldwin Bowsky has assembled the prosopographic evidence and reconstructed a number of family lines from among those who composed the ruling gene of Lato, showing the vitality and continuity of this city's aristocratic families through the second century and into the first. During this period, not only the persons that held public office belong to the same families, but also there are the same persons who appear in the sources as officials of lower rank and later as chief magistrates. Sometimes brothers served on the same board of *kosmoi*⁵⁵, and these officials had at their disposal a secretary who was chosen from the family, often a brother or son of one of them.⁵⁶ Even six generations of a single family have been traced to have filled the kosmate or the college of *Eunomiotai* in third- and second-century Lato⁵⁷. Clearly, at that period, in Lato the members of the ruling class belonged to a restricted number of clans (γέννη), and only a relatively small part of the population of Lato dominated public offices.⁵⁸ The fact that members of the board of *kosmoi* were the heads of the powerful households explains the varying number of members of each year's *kosmoi*.

Aristocratic government by small elites was supported by a network of institutions shared by all cities and founded on the organization of the citizens in tribes and *hetaireiai*, as well as on collective activities such as warfare, hunting, exercise at the *gymnasion*, common messes at the *andreion* and rites of initiation. Significantly, all these domains of public life were the privileged subject of statutory regulation since the earliest period of Cretan legislation. In seventh-century Dreros some of the earliest laws pertain to the education in the boys' *agelai*, to the *hetaireiai* of the citizens and to the *phylai* which had a major role in politics.⁵⁹ In sixth-century Eltynia lengthy statutory rules governed behavior of every age class in the *andreion*.⁶⁰ In the early sixth century a Gortynian law on the *andreion* probably set the appropriate way to serve wine and the allowed quantities for participants

have been drawn from the analysis of prosopographic data from other Hellenistic Cretan cities. For Amnisos see Chaniotis 1988; idem, 1992, 305–309. For Hierapytna, Guizzi 2001, 328–30.

⁵⁴ Cf. Willetts 1955, 113 and passim.

⁵⁵ *IC* I xvi 23 and 31; Davaras 1963, 159 no 14.

⁵⁶ *IC* I xvi 26 and 32; *IC* I xxii 2; Bousquet 1938, 389.

⁵⁷ Baldwin Bowsky 1989b, 336.

⁵⁸ Baldwin Bowsky 1989b, 343.

⁵⁹ A law 'on the *hetaireiai*' set the 20th of the month Hyperboios as the final date for the graduation of boys from the *agela* and their enrollment in the men's *hetaireiai*: van Effenterre 1946, 597 no 3 (*IGT* no 92; *Nomima* I, no 68), Dreros, 7th/6th century. Role of the *phylai*: van Effenterre 1946, 590–97 no 2 (*IGT* no 91; *Nomima* I, no 64), Dreros, 7th/6th century. For the importance of the *phylai* as the essential group of citizens see Youni 2011, 127–34.

⁶⁰ *IC* IX 2. On this law see *IGT* no 94; *Nomima* II, no 80; Hölkeskamp 1999, 107–109; Mandalaki 2010; Youni 2011, 176–78.

according to their age class.⁶¹ A lengthy statute from fifth-century Gortyn, extending over at least three columns, regulated issues such as the quantities of each product destined for the citizens' contribution to the common messes, cases of failure to supply the fixed quantity, and torts relating to the contribution.⁶² A law from Eleutherna, dated to the late sixth or early fifth century probably contained similar provisions.⁶³ The goods that were part of a citizen's contribution to his *andreion* were considered as a distinctive part of his property and were protected by special provisions, as in a Gortynian law of the fifth century, which exempts from surety the essential supplies destined for the *andreion*.⁶⁴ At sixth-century Axos, dining at the *andreion* was also provided for foreign workers hired by the *polis* to carry out specific public work.⁶⁵ Legislation on the *hetaireiai* from the classical period survives from Gortyn, where a special 'judge for the *hetaireiai*' is attested, and from Axos, whereas laws on the *hetaireia* from the Hellenistic period are preserved from various cities.⁶⁶

It is of interest to observe that the essential activities of public life, although institutionalized and operating in a framework regulated by the laws, were penetrated by a parallel system of private initiative based on a culture of excellence, bravery, and the bonds of friendship. An example of a formalized institution where some aspects were left to private initiative exercised arbitrarily is the education of young citizens. In his detailed description of *ephebeia* in fourth-century Crete, Ephorus reports that the boys were assembled in the *agelai* by the most conspicuous and influential boys—not by a *polis* official—who chose their companions at their discretion. The leader of each *agela* was, again, not a person appointed by the *polis* but the father of the assembler, who had authority to lead them to hunting and running races and to punish anyone who was disobedient.⁶⁷ In this context it becomes evident that political power and influence do not necessarily pair with an office. Influential elite members did not have to be magistrates to exercise their power; influence could be exercised through sons, brothers or other members of

⁶¹ *IC* IV 4.

⁶² *IC* IV 77 B. Cf also *IC* IV 143, which probably treated the same subject. For contribution to the *syssitia* cf. Arist., *Pol.* 2, 1272a 12–21. See also *IGT* 430–432; Lavrencic 1988, 151–54; Chaniotis 1995, 44–45; Guizzi 1997.

⁶³ *IC* II xii 5.

⁶⁴ *IC* IV 75 B. A much later law from Lyktos (*IC* I xviii 11, 2nd or 3rd century C.E.) which refers to the distribution of fruits to the *startoi* "according to the *πάτρια*" shows how deeply rooted the common messes were in Cretan mentality.

⁶⁵ *IC* II v1.

⁶⁶ Gortyn: *IC* IV 42 B (early 5th century), *IC* IV 72 X ll. 33–39 (mid-5th century). Judge of the *hetaireiai*: *IC* IV 42 B. Axos: Manganaro 1966, 11–12 (4th century). Unknown city near Rethymnon: *SEG* 28 (1978), 753 (3rd or 2nd century). Malla: *IC* I xix 3 A (late 2nd century).

⁶⁷ Ephor. *ap.* Strabo 10.4.20.

kin.⁶⁸ On the other hand, an individual's authority could be so overwhelming as to allow him to usurp the chief office and 'act as *kosmos*' against the law, as implied by the early law of Dreros.

United by bonds of friendship and by communal life in the camps of war, in the ever-disputed borders of their *polis* or in the urban common messes and *gymnasion*, the group of *hetairoi* dominated over the rest of the population, formed by workers and cultivators, persons excluded from the *hetaireiai*.⁶⁹ The number of the *apetairoi* was so significant as to merit distinctive regulations in the code of Gortyn. In fact, lengthy provisions regulate rape and adultery when committed by or against a citizen (designated as ἐλεύθερος), an ἀπέταιρος or a slave and impose different indemnities accordingly.⁷⁰ In fifth-century Gortyn every citizen belonged to a *hetaireia*,⁷¹ as in seventh-century Dreros and plausibly in the other Cretan cities. Indeed, participation in the common messes symbolizes above all the equality of the participants,⁷² but it is also true that legal equality and social inequality can very well coexist.⁷³ Inside the group of *hetairoi*, the members of the *kosmate*, of the Council and of the lesser offices were selected not among all citizens but from the noblest and most powerful families. The examples of Lato and of other Cretan cities, strongly suggests that, as a general rule, in the Cretan *poleis* eligibility for the office of *kosmos* continued to be restricted to certain gene in the Hellenistic period as well.⁷⁴

It seems that Crete provides a rare exception to the generally sound observation that the culture of Greek elites was competitive and agonistic rather than cooperative.⁷⁵ Whereas constitutions in most other Greek cities experienced numerous and usually violent changes no such evidence exists concerning the *poleis* of Crete. We hear of no tyrannies, no revolts of the *demos*, no *staseis* or revolutions of any sort. It seems that the elites that governed the Cretan cities managed to contain opposition and to control dissent, not least because they proved successful in cooperating and obtaining the necessary degree of consensus which entailed the

⁶⁸ Cf. Link 2003, 144, who gives the example of Peisistratos in Athens. Cf. Gehrke 1997, 37.

⁶⁹ Cf. Chroust 1954, 280–82 who stresses the difference between membership in elite groups such as the *hetaireiai* and general citizenship.

⁷⁰ Rape: *IC IV 72 II 2–16*; Adultery: *ibid.* 20–45. The fact that citizens are designated as ἐλεύθεροι does not mean that technically the *apetairoi* were not of free status; it means that the only persons who are worth to be considered as free are the citizen members of *hetaireiai*.

⁷¹ Maffi 2003, 163. For the role of *hetaireiai* see also Link 1994, 22–27; Maffi 1997, 463; Montechi 2007.

⁷² Schmitt-Pantel 1992, 70. On the role of *syssitia* in the initiation of the youth see also Bremmer 1990, 135–38. On terminology see Bile 1992.

⁷³ Maffi 2003, 170.

⁷⁴ As Arist., *Pol.* 2, 1272 a 33–35 states about the fourth century.

⁷⁵ Wallace 2013, 196.

stability of their regime. The essential domain where consensus was necessary was the distribution of power, a theme that underlies numerous instances of Cretan archaic and classical law-making. An early system of distribution of power concerning the chief office of *kosmos*, providing for a certain period to elapse before a person could repeat tenure, was created in the seventh century⁷⁶ and lasted until sometime in the sixth. At that time it was substituted by a system that provided for the annual rotation of the *phylai* in the *kosmate*.⁷⁷ The former system concerned individuals whereas the latter laid importance on the tribes. This suggests that by the sixth century the focus on decision making was transferred from individual persons to groups with common interests. Evidently, the tribes in sixth-century Cretan cities had achieved coherence and internal concord to a certain degree. This entailed the central political role the tribes assumed as the essential units of negotiation of political power. At the same time, establishing hierarchies within the phyla could be perpetuated—or else disputed—in the context of such institutions as the *andreion*.⁷⁸

In fact, as inscriptional, archaeological and literary evidence suggests, the core of the Cretan *polis* was the *andreion*, not the assembly.⁷⁹ The *andreion* is the public place where civic life happens, discussion of civic affairs takes place, the future of the city is planned, and politics is negotiated.⁸⁰ There were specific rituals that provided for the exact order of activities in the *andreion*, including instructive stories about the war exploits and the achievements of the bravest men. The Cretan historian Dosiadas reports that in third-century Lyktos the best portions of meat

⁷⁶ Dreros: Demargne – van Effenterre 1937, 333–48. Gortyn: *IC* IV 14, p–g. Possibly also in Eleutherna: *IC* II xii 4, cf. *Nomima* I, no 83.

⁷⁷ Pace Perlman 1992, 194–95, the inscriptional evidence that reports a system of rotation of the tribes is not incompatible with Aristotle's statement that only members of a few *gene* were eligible for the office of *kosmoi*. Rotation of the phylai does not necessarily imply that each year's *kosmoi* were selected among all tribe members; on the contrary, reference to the *startoi* in the Code of Gortyn may suggest that *kosmoi* belonged to a subdivision of the phyla.

⁷⁸ Despite the attested stability, my intention is not to draw an ideal picture of the Cretan political system. Aristotle, *Pol.* 2, 1272a 27 asserts that even the sitting *kosmoi*'s authority could be disputed by a parallel system of power: conspiracies could be formed either by some members of the college of *kosmoi* or by private citizens to overthrow the sitting *kosmoi*, and the *kosmoi* could also resign during their term of office. This statement is in all fours with my analysis on the parallel function of institutionalized and non-institutionalized systems of power.

⁷⁹ Furthermore, recent bibliography has questioned the traditional separation between the cultic and secular aspects of dining, and suggested that buildings such as the Delphinion at Dreros may have also served the functions of an *andreion*. See Sjoegren 2001, 86–91 and 135; Carter 1997, 89; Koehl 1997, 142; Mazarakis Ainian 1997, 389.

⁸⁰ Cf. Papakonstantinou 2002, 140–41. On the *andreion* see Talamo 1987; Lavrencic 1988; Link 1994, 9–29. For *andreia* in third-century Lyktos see the description of Dosiadas ap. Athenaios 4, 143 a–b (*FGrHist* 458 F 2).

were reserved for those who had been distinguished for their bravery or wisdom.⁸¹ The armors hanging on the walls of the *andreion*, dedicated by the elite members,⁸² constantly reminded table-companions of the power and authority of these families. The strict ritual that governed life in the *andreion* reproduced traditional values and reinforced the authority of the powerful families, thus entailing the continuation of established hierarchies.

Concluding, in our investigation of the sources we saw that although Councils of some sort are attested on Crete since the seventh century, they are rarely mentioned in the sources and information about their duties is even scantier. The main activity attested for Cretan Councils in the fifth and fourth century is their involvement in financial administration (providing the funds for a public festival in Axos, financial control over the *kosmoi* in what concerned their exacting of fines in Knossos, Tylissos and Rhitten). Judicial authority of the Councils is not attested. With respect to legislative competence, it seems that in Lyktos the Council had enacted a law concerning aliens. On the other hand, Cretan Councils did not have probouleutic authority. It seems that, at least in the archaic period and possibly also in the classical period, political power and the governance of Cretan cities were exercised both inside and beyond the level of institutionalized public offices; they were rather negotiated in the context of communication, interaction and cooperation of the elites, whose primary concern was to achieve equality among their members and stability in their participation in government.⁸³ No doubt, the name Ἴσοκάρτης carved on a shield offered by a Cretan aristocrat to a sanctuary in the seventh century⁸⁴ implied the domination (κρατεῖν) of equality (ἴσον) not among the members of the (invisible) *demos*, but among the members of the elite. The main purport was an equal share in the administration of public affairs, such as this is attested in the constant pursuit of an effective strategy of alternation in the office of *kosmos*.

How are we to explain the shadowy appearance in our sources of Councils?⁸⁵ In a system which relied on hierarchies created in the interior of tribes and gene as much as it relied on the formal governing panels of the *polis*, and where models of civic behavior, everyday life and the administration of the city were informed by the significant political role of tribes, *hetaireiai*, common meals at the *andreion* and the preponderance of the *kosmate*, the authorities and competences of the Council may not have been extensively defined by law, and it is most likely that in the earlier

⁸¹ See the description of Dosiadas cited in the previous note. A ritual of the *hetaireiai* during the celebration of the Pythian festival is attested in fourth-century Axos (Manganaro 1966, 11–12; *SEG* 23 (1973), 566).

⁸² Viviers 1994, 248–49.

⁸³ Osborne 1996, 275–78; Seelentag 2009.

⁸⁴ Perlman 2002, 219 no 10 and 220 no 17.

⁸⁵ Also of assemblies, but this would be the subject of another paper.

period they were barely determined.⁸⁶ This does not imply that the Elders did not have a say in the city's administration, especially when serious matters of policy were at stake. After all, they were the same persons who alternated in public offices, and even when elite members did not hold offices, their influence could be exercised in a number of ways, either through other members of their kin who held an office or by using their power inside their group of *hetairoi* and tribe.⁸⁷

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baldwin Bowsky, M. W., 1989a: "Epigrams to an Elder Statesman and a Young Noble from Lato pros Kamara (Crete)", *Hesperia* 58, 115–29.
- Baldwin Bowsky, M. W., 1989b: "Portrait of a Polis: Lato Pros Kamara (Crete) in the Late Second Century B.C.", *Hesperia* 58, 331–47.
- Beattie, A. J., 1975: "Some Notes on the Spensithios Decree", *Kadmos* 4, 8–47.
- Bile, M., 1988: *Le dialecte crétois ancien. Etude sur la langue des inscriptions. Recueil des inscriptions postérieures aux IC*, Paris.
- Bousquet, J., 1938: "Le temple d'Aphrodite et d'Ares à Sta Lenika", *BCH* 62, 386–408.
- Bremmer, J. N., 1990: "Adolescents, Symposion and Pederasty" in O. Murray (ed.), *Symptica. A Symposium on the Symposium*, Oxford, 135–48.
- Carter, J. B., 1997: "Thiasos and Marzeah: Ancestor Cult in the Age of Homer" in S. Langdon (ed.), *New Light on a Dark Age: Exploring the Culture of Geometric Greece*, Columbia, 72–112.
- Chadwick, J., 1987: "Some observations on two new inscriptions from Lyktos" in *Eilapine. Honors N. Platon*, Heracleon, 329–34.
- Chaniotis, A., 1988: "Zu den Inschriften von Amnisos", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 71, 157–60.
- Chaniotis, A., 1992: "Die Inschriften von Amnisos" in J. Schäfer (ed.), *Amnisos*, Berlin, 287–322.
- Chaniotis, A., 1995: "Problems of 'Pastoralism' and 'Transhumance' in Classical and Hellenistic Crete", *Orbis Terrarum* 1, 39–89.
- Chaniotis, A., 1996: "Bemerkungen zur Kalender kretischer Städte in hellenistischer Zeit", *Tekmeria* 2, 16–41.
- Chaniotis, A., 2005: "The Great Inscription, its Political and social Institutions and the common Institutions of the Cretans" in E. Greco – M. Lombardo (eds.), *La*

⁸⁶ The fact that the functions of Cretan Councils were not specifically determined is probably reflected in the assertion of Ephorus and Aristotle that Councils had an essentially advisory role in government (above, n. 1).

⁸⁷ I wish to thank Michael Gagarin and Alberto Maffi for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

- Grande Iscrizione di Gortina. Centoventi anni dopo la scoperta. Atti del Convegno 2004*, Athens, 175–94.
- Chroust, A.-H., 1954: “Treason and Patriotism in Ancient Greece”, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 15, 280–88.
- Davaras, C., 1963: “Επιγραφαι εκ Κρήτης”, *Archaeologikon Deltion* 18, 141–60.
- Demargne, P. – H. van Effenterre 1937: “Recherches à Dréros II”, *BCH* 61, 5–32, 333–48.
- Ehrenberg, V., 1943: “An Early Source of Polis-Constitution”, *CIQ* 37, 14–18.
- Fröhlich, P., 2004: *Les Cités grecques et le contrôle des magistrats (IV^e–I^{er} siècle avant J.- C.)*, Genève-Paris.
- Gagarin, M., 2001: “The Gortyn Code and Greek Legal Procedure” in G. Thür (ed.), *Symposion 1997. Vortäge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, Köln, 41–52.
- Gagarin, M. – P. Perlman (forthcoming): *The Inscribed Laws of Ancient Crete*.
- Gauthier, P., 1977: *Bulletin Epigraphique (REG 90)* no 450.
- Gehrke H.-J. 1997, “Gewalt und Gesetz. Die soziale und politische Ordnung Kretas in der Archaischen und Klassischen Zeit”, *Klio* 79, 23–68.
- Guarducci, M., 1933: “Eunomia”, *Historia* 7, 199–205.
- Guizzi, F., 1997: “Terra commune, pascolo e contributo ai syssitia in Creta archaica e classica”, *AASA* n.s. 4, 45–51.
- Guizzi, F., 2001: *Hierapytna. Storia di una polis cretese dalla fondazione alla conquista Romana*, Roma.
- Haggis D. C., M. S. Mook, C. M. Scarry, L. M. Snyder, W. C. West III, 2004: “Excavations at Azoria, 2002”, *Hesperia* 73, 339–400.
- Hansen M. H. – Th. H. Nielsen, 2004: *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford.
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J., 1994: “Tempel, Agora und Alphabet. Die Entstehungsbedingungen von Gesetzgebung in der archaischen Polis” in H.-J. Gehrke (ed.), *Rechtskodifizierung und soziale Normen im Interkulturellen Vergleich*, Tübingen, 135–64.
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J., 1999: *Schiedsrichter, Gesetzgeber und Gesetzgebung im archaischen Griechenland*, Stuttgart.
- IGT*: R. Koerner – (K. Hallof), *Inscriptliche Gesetzestexte der frühen Griechischen Polis*, Köln-Weimar-Wien 1993.
- Jeffery, L. – A. Morpurgo-Davies, 1970: “Ποινικοστὰς and ποινικάζειν”, *Kadmos* 9, 118–54.
- Koehl, R. B., 1997: “The Villas at Ayia Triada and Nirou Chani and the Origin of the Cretan Andreion” in R. Hägg (ed.), *The Function of the “Minoan Villa”*. *Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 6–8 June 1992*, Stockholm, 137–49.
- Laurençic, M., 1988: “Ἀνδρεῖον”, *Tyche* 3, 147–61.

- Link, S., 1994: *Das griechische Kreta. Untersuchungen zu seiner staatlichen und gesellschaftlichen Entwicklung vom 6. Bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Stuttgart.
- Link, S., 2003: “Kosmoi, Startoi und Iterationsverbote. Zum Kampf um das Amt des Kosmos Auf Kreta”, *Dike* 6, 139–149.
- Maffi, A., 1997: *Il diritto di famiglia nel Codice di Gortina*, Milano.
- Maffi, A., 2003: “Studi recenti sul Codice di Gortina”, *Dike* 6, 161–226.
- Mandalaki, A., 2010: “Κριτικές παρατηρήσεις στην επιγραφή ICret I x (Ελτυνία) 2”, *Epeteris Kentrou Ereunes tes Historias Dikaiou Akademias Athenon* 42, 9–42.
- Manganaro, G., 1966: “Iscrizione opistografa di Axos con prescrizioni sacrali e con un trattato di ‘Symmachia’”, *Historia* 15, 11–22.
- Mazarakis Ainian, A. J., 1997: *From Rulers’ Dwellings to Temples. Architecture, Religion, and Society in Early Iron Age Greece (1100–700 B.C.)*, Jonsered.
- ML: R. Meiggs – D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford. 1969.
- Montecchi, B., 2007: “Alcune riflessioni sugli ἀνδρεία e sulle ἀγέλαι cretesi”, *ASAA* 85, 83–117.
- Nomima I: H. Van Effenterre – F. Ruzé, *Nomima. Recueil d’inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l’archaïsme grec I*, Rome 1994.
- Nomima II: H. Van Effenterre – F. Ruzé, *Nomima. Recueil d’inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l’archaïsme grec II*, Rome 1995.
- Osborne, R., 1996: *Greece in the Making. 1200–479 BC*, London-New York.
- Panagopoulos, P., 2010: “Τα μυστικά από τη γη της Ελεύθερνας”, *Kathimerine* 28/9/2010.
- Papakonstantinou, Z., 1996: “The Cretan Apokosmos”, *ZPE* 111, 93–96.
- Papakonstantinou, Z., 2002: “Written Law, Literacy and Social conflict in Archaic and Classical Crete”, *AHB* 16, 135–50.
- Perlman, P., 1992: “One Hundred-Citied Crete and the ‘Cretan Politeia’”, *CIPh* 87, 193–205.
- Perlman, P., 2002: “Gortyn: the first seven hundred years: part II: the laws from the temple of Apollo Pythios”, in T. H. Nielsen (ed.), *Even More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis: Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 6 (Historia Einzelschriften 162)*, Stuttgart, 187–227.
- Perlman, P., 2005: “Crete” in M. H. Hansen – S. Hornblower (eds), *Inventory of the Greek Poleis*, Oxford, 1144–1195.
- Rhodes, P. J. – D. M. Lewis 1997: *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford.
- Schmitt-Pantel, P., 1992: *La cité au banquet. Histoire des repas publics dans les cités grecques*, Rome.
- Seelentag, G., 2009a: “Regeln für den Kosmos. Prominenzrollen und Institutionen im archaischen Kreta”, *Chiron* 39, 63–97.
- Seelentag, G., 2009b: “Der Abschluss der ephebie im archaischen Kreta. Bemerkungen zu einer Gesetzesinschrift aus Dreros”, *ZPE* 169, 149–61.

- Sjoegren, L., 2001: *Sites, Settlements, and Early Poleis on Crete (800–500 B.C.)*, Stockholm.
- Talamo, C., 1987: “Il sissizio in Creta”, *Miscellanea Greca* 12, 9–26.
- Tréheux, J., 1984: “Les cosmes à Lato” in *Aux origines de l'hellénisme : La Crète et la Grèce. Hommages à H. van Effenterre*, Paris, 329–42.
- Van Effenterre, H., 1942: “Querelles crétoises”, *REA* 44, 31–51.
- Van Effenterre, H., 1946: “Inscriptions archaïques crétoises”, *BCH* 70, 588–606.
- Van Effenterre, H., 1986: “Damos, damioi et Damiorgoi”, *Actes du 5^{ème} Congrès d'Etudes Crétoises*, Chania, 394–96.
- Van Effenterre, H. – M. van Effenterre 1985: “Nouvelles lois archaïques de Lyttos”, *BCH* 109, 157–88.
- Van Effenterre, M., 1990: “Ein neues Gesetz aus dem archaischen Kreta” in G. Thür (ed.), *Symposion 1985. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, Köln, 23–27.
- Viviers D. 1994, “La cité de Dattalla et l'expansion territoriale de Lyktos en Crète central”, *BCH* 118, 229 – 59.
- Wallace, R. W., 2013: “Councils in Greek Oligarchies and Democracies”, in H. Beck (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, 191–204.
- Willets, R. F., 1955: *Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete*, London.
- Youni, M. S., 2007: “An Inscription from Teos concerning Abdera” in A. Iakovidou (ed.), *Proceedings of the 10th International Thracology Congress*, Athens, 724–36.
- Youni, M. S., 2011: *Η γένεση του γραπτού νόμου στη δωρική Κρήτη*, Thessaloniki.

APPENDIX — INSCRIPTIONS

1. DREROS (Law on the Iteration of the Kosmos, c. 650)

Demargne & van Effenterre 1937b = *SEG* 27, 620 = Bile 29–30 no. 2 = *IGT* 90 = *Nomima* I, 81 = GP Dr1

- 1 ← ἄδ' ἔφαδε | πόλι· | ἐπεὶ κα κοσμήσει, | δέκα φετίον τὸν ἀ-
 1a ← θιός· ολοιοιν
 2 → φτὸν μὴ κοσμεῖν· αἱ δὲ κοσμήσιε, ὅπε δικάκσιε | ἀφτὸν ὀπῆλεν |
 διπλεῖ | κάφτὸν
 3 ← ἄκρηστον | ἦμεν | ἄς δόοι, | κότι κοσμήσιε | μηδὲν | ἦμην. *vac.*
 4 → Σ ὁμόται δὲ | κόσμος | κοὶ δάμιοι | κοὶ ἴκατι | οἱ τὰς πόλ[ι]ο[ς].

2. AXOS (Law concerning sacrifices, 6th or early 5th century)

IC II v 9 = *IGT* 106+107 = GP A9

- [---]
 ον ἀποδόμεν η[---]
 συγγνοίη αὐτός, τοῖς δ' ἱαροῦς-
 ι, ὅτι κα πέρονται πὰρ τὰ ἡγ-
 ραμένα, αἱ μὴ τις αὐτὸς δοίη μ-
 5 ἢ ὑπ' ἀνάγκας, τιτουφέσθο σ-
 τατήρα κατὰν θυσίαν φεκάστ-
 αν καὶ τὸ κρίος τὰν διπλεία-
 ν· πορτιπονῆν δ' ἄπερ τὸν ἄλ-
 ον. αἱ δ' ὁ κοσμίον μὴ ἀποδοίη τ-
 10 ἂ ἐπιβάλοντα φίσανς τιτου-
 φέσθο. κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ τοῖς
 Κυδαντείοις διδόμεν τρίτο-
 ι φέτει τὰν βολὰν ἰς τὰ θύ-
 ματα δωδέκα στατήρανας.

3. LYKTOS (Decree on aliens, 5th century)

Van Effenterre – van Effenterre *BCH* 109 (1985), 157 B = *SEG* 35 991; *IGT* 87;
 Bile 12A; *Nomima* I, 12A = GP Lyktos1A

- [Θιοί. Ἔφ]αδε | Λυκτίοισι | ἀλ(λ)ο-
 ← πολιάταν | ὅστις κα δέκσ[εται . . .]
 [. . .]εν, | αἱ μὴ ὀσωφυτός τε | [καρτῆ]-
 ι | καὶ τὸνς Ἰτανίονς. | Αἱ δὲ κα [δέκσ]-
 5 [ετ]αἱ | ἢ κοσμίων | ἢ ἀπόκοσμο[ς ὕ]-

- [πέ]ρ φωλᾶς | φαδᾶς | ἑκατὸν λέβητ[ας πρ]-
 [άκσ]ει | ἐκάστω | ὄσος κα δέκσεται. | T[. . .]
 [. . . .] δὲ | οἱ ἐσζικαιωτῆρες | ἐπ' ὅτε [. . . .]
 [παύ]σεται | αἰ [. . . ἄ]γίνονται, | π[. . . .]
 10 [. . . .]ρῥωιο[---]δομεν
 [. . .]οκο[---]ται | τ[. . . .]

4. KNOSSOS – TYLISSOS (Treaty, mid-5th century)

IC I viii 4* = ML 42 B

fig. b.1

- ανον το πρ[α]-
 τομῆνιαν ἄγεν κατὰ ταύτ[ἄ] . *ho* ἄμ[φ]-
 στέρων. χρέματα δὲ μὲ ἔνπιπασκέσθῃ *ho* Κνῶσιο[ς]
 ἐν Τυλίσοι, *ho* δὲ Τυλίσιος ἐν Κνῶσοι *ho* χρέιζ[ῶ]-
 5 ν. μῆδὲ χῶρας ἀποτάμνεσθαι μῆδατέρονς μῆδ' ἄ[π]-
 ανσαν ἀφαιρίσθαι. ὄροι τᾶς γᾶς· *h*υδὼν ὄρος καὶ Α-
 ἰετοὶ κάρταμίτιον καὶ τὸ τὸ Ἄρχῳ τέμενος κα[ἰ]
ho ποταμὸς κῆλ Λευκόπορον κἀγάθιοι, *h*ἄι *h*υδῶ-
 ρ ρεῖ τῷμβριον, καὶ Λᾶος. *h*ῖ κα τῷ Μαχανεῖ θύομ-
 10 ες τὸνς φεξέκοντα τελέονς ὄφινς, καὶ τᾷ *h*<έ>ραι
 τὸ σκέλος φεκάστῳ διδόμεν τῷ θύματος. αἰ δὲ συ-
 μπλέονες πόλιες ἐκ πολεμίων ἔλοισιν χρήματα
*ho*πᾶι συνγοῖεν *hoi* Κνῶσιοι καὶ τοὶ Ἀργεῖοι
*ho*ύτῳ ἔμεν. τῷ Ἄρει καὶ τὰφροδίται τὸν Κνῶσι-
 15 ον ἰαρέα θύεν, φέρεν δὲ τὸ σκέλος φεκάστῳ. τὸν Ἄ-
 ρχὸν τὸ τέμενος ἔχεν τῶν Ἀχάρναι. τοῖς θύονσι
 ξένια παρέχεν τὸνς Κνῶσίονς, τὸνς δ' Ἀργεῖονς
 τῷ χορῶι ἐν Τυλίσοι. αἰ κα καλεῖ *ho* Κνῶσιος πρ-
 εσγέαν, *h*έπεσθαι *ho*πυῖ κα δέεται· καὶ χῶ Τυλίσι-
 20 ιος τὸν Κνῶσιον κατὰ ταυτά. αἰ δὲ μὲ δοῖεν ξέनि-
α. βῶλᾶ ἐπαγέτῳ ρύτιον δέκα στατέρων αὐτίκα ἐ-
πὶ κόσμος, κῆν Τυλίσοι κατὰ ταυτά *ho* Κνῶσιος.
ha στάλα ἔσστα ἐπὶ Μελάντα βασιλέος. ἀφρέτευ-
 ε Λυκοτάδας *h*υλλεύς. ἀλιαῖαι ἔδοξε τᾷ τῶν
 25 ἰαρῶν. ἄ(φρέτευε) βῶλᾶς Ἀρχίστρατος Λυκοφρονίδας.
 τοὶ Τυλίσιοι ποὶ τὰν στάλαν ποιγραψάνσθῃ τάδε·
 αἰ τις ἀφικνοῖτο Τυλισίων ἐνς Ἄργος, κατὰ ταυτά
 σφιν ἔστῳ *h*ἄιπερ Κνῶσίοις.

5. PRINIAS (=RHITTEN) (Fragment of constitutional laws, c. 600–575)

IC I xxviii 7 = *Nomima* I, 63 = GP Pr7

Text 1

- B2 [---]...νο[---] ←
 B1 [---]ι | τρὶς φε[---] →
 A4 [---]εν | ἐπεὶ τάδε [---] ←
 A3 [---] πέρηται | πσε.[---] →
 A2 [---]κα φέκτος | α.[---] ←

Text 2

- C1 [---] αὶ δέ τις [---] →
 D1 [---] πρεισγήια [---] ←
 D2 [---]μενεα ἢ συνπλι.[---] →
 D3 [---] πρεσγήια | ο.[---] ←
 A1 [---].σεφδι ἀποφει[π---] ←

6. GORTYN (Treaty Gortyn-Rhitten, c. 450–400)

IC IV 80 = *Nomima* I, no 7 = GP G80

- θιοί. ἐπὶ τοῖδε [P]ι[ττῆν]ι[οι Γ]ορ[τυνίοις αὐτ]όνομ[ο]ι κ' αὐτόδικοι
vac. τὰ θ[ύ]-
 ματα παρέκοντες ἐς Βίδαν τρί[τ]οι [φέ]τει τριακατίους
 <σ>[τ]ατέρων καὶ πεν-
 τέκοντα. στέγαν δ' ἄν κα φοικοδομέσ[ει]ς ἔ δένδρεα
 πυτεύσει, τὸν
 φοικοδομέσαντα καὶ πυτεύσαντ[α] καὶ πρίαθαι κ' ἀποδοθαι. *vac.*
 τὸν δὲ σταρτ-
 5 ἀγέταν καὶ τὸν κοσμίοντα ὅς κ' ἄγῃ[ι] P[ι]ττῆνάδε κοσμῆν πεδὰ τὸ
 Ριττῆνίῳ
 κόσμῳ τὸν μὲ πειθόμενον τῷ ἰπορίμ[ο, δ]αμιόμεν δὲ δαρκνὰν καὶ
 κατακρέθῃαι πεδ-
 ἀ τε τὸ σταρτὸ καὶ πεδὰ τὸν Ριττῆνίων· πλ[ί]ον δὲ μὲ δαμιόμεν· αὶ δὲ
 πλίον δαμιῶσ-
 αὶ ἔ μὲ κατακρέσαιτο, κσενείαι δίκαι[ι δι]κάδδεθαι. ἐνεκυραστὰν δὲ
 μὲ παρέρπε-
 ν Γορτύνιον ἐς τὸ Ριττῆνίῳ. αὶ δὲ κα ν[ικ]αθεῖ τὸν ἐνεκύρων, διπλεῖ
 καταστᾶσ-
 10 αὶ τὰν ἀπλόον τιμὰν ἧ ἐν τᾷ ἰπόροι ἔ[γρα]τται, πρᾶδδεν δὲ τὸν
 Ριττῆνιον κόσμ-
 ον. αὶ δὲ κα μὲ πρᾶδδῶντι, τὸνς πρειγ[ί]στονς τούτονς πρᾶδδοντας
ἄπατον

ἔμ̄εν ν. τὰ ἐγραμμέν', ἄλλα δὲ μέ. vac. ὅτι δέ [κα αὐ]τ[ι]ς
 ἀνπιπαίσοντι τὸ κοινὸν οἱ Ρι-
 ττένιοι πορτὶ τὸνς Γορτυνίον[ς . c.6 . .]γ τὸν κάρυκα Ριττένάδε ἐν
 ταῖδ <δ>έ-
 κα παρ῔μ̄εν ἔ αὐτὸνς ἔ ἄλλωνς π[ρ]ὸ [τούτων ἀπ]οκρίνεθθαι κατ'
 ἀγορὰν φ῔μ̄εν-
 15 αν τᾶς α[ι]τίας ᾶς κ' αἰτι[ά]σ[ονται, τὰν δ]ὲ κρίσιν ἔ[μ̄ε]ν ᾶπερ
 ταῖς ἀ[— — —]

7. GORTYN (c. 600–525)

IC IV 23 = IGT 125 = *Nomima* II, 25 = GP G23

1 --] . ς φίκα[τι.
 2 -- ᾶ]φυτὰν. vac.
 3 --] το φοικῆος |
 4 --]γ ἐσβολὰν ἤμ[ε]ν. |
 5 --]τεσθαι | . οτο . σ
 6 .]αι τῶ φῶ ἀποδόμην | [- -
 7-8a- -] αἰ μὴ φ' ὄπυστυῖ μὴ ἐ]νφοικεν. vac.
 8b -- τὸν Γ[ο]ρτυνίον
 9 --]τι. vac.
 10 --].ιβ [- -
 11 ὄς δέ κα [- -]

8. GORTYN (5th century?)

Magnelli 2008: no 3 = *SEG* 49, 1221 = GP Gortyn3

← --]δ . [- -
 → --]λοντο[- -
 --]δερ . . . [- -
 --].ε.ταιδ[- -
 5 --]ιενται[- -
 -- ε]μ̄ βολᾶι[- -
 --]ρηιοσ[- -
 --]δεκοδι[- -
 -- τὰ]εγραμ[(μ)ένα - -
 10 --]νος μ[- -
 --]ραι[- -