ABSTRACT

LEWIS, JESICA JAYD HARRISON. The Warrior’s Banquet: Syssitia in Ancient Crete. (Under the direction of Dr. S. Thomas Parker.)

Although the island of Crete is most famously known today as the homeland of the Minoan civilization of the second millennium BCE, during the Classical and Hellenistic periods in Greece (ca. 480 – 67 BCE), the island was famous in the Greek world as the homeland of a large number of independent poleis (Greek city-states). Ancient Greek literature portrays the Cretan poleis as sharing in a common socio-political and economic model of organization, called the Cretan politeia (constitution). The Cretan poleis were dominated by an aristocratic upper class of citizen-warriors ruling over dependent populations of slaves, serfs, and free non-citizens. Among the important institutions of the Cretan politeia were the distinction in class between citizen warriors and agricultural producers, the military education of the citizen youth, and the common meals in which adult male citizens and their sons participated, called the syssitia. According to the ancient literature, such a model of organization in the island was considered to be both very ancient (stretching back to the Heroic Age, the time of the legendary King Minos) and was also practiced throughout the island.

While many scholars over the last century and a half have pointed to epigraphic and archaeological evidence in support of the literary accounts of the island, recent scholarship has however brought the literary tradition regarding the Cretan politeia under question. Critics of the literary tradition (most notably, Paula Perlman) argue that on the one hand, it is a priori unlikely that such a large number of independent states (numbering at least 49 during the Classical period) would share an identical constitutional format. On the other hand, epigraphic evidence from the island may also demonstrate too great a degree of diversity to
warrant speaking of common Cretan constitutional format. Perlman suggests that the idea of a common Cretan *politeia* was not based in actual knowledge of the island’s socio-political and economic organization, but was rather a philosophical construct that developed amidst philosophical and political debates centered in Athens during the fifth century BCE.¹

Despite these objections, scholars continue to employ the ancient literary sources in studies of Cretan society during the Archaic (c. 750 – c. 450 BCE), Classical (ca. 480 BCE – ca. 320 BCE), and Hellenistic (ca. 320 BCE – 67 BCE) periods—collectively referred to in this thesis as the pre-Roman period. Acknowledging however that there was some degree of heterogeneity in the constitutional formats of the Cretan *poleis*, how might we define the value of the ancient literary portrayals on Cretan society?

Using the Cretan common-meal institution of *syssitia* as a case study, this thesis defines the value of the literary accounts of pre-Roman Crete as (albeit imperfect and perhaps not universal to the island as a whole) reflections of actual practices. This thesis analyzes the degree to which epigraphic and archaeological evidence upholds literary portrayals. This thesis shows that, despite a degree of variation in practices, civic communal dining (*syssitia*) was in fact a foundational institution of Cretan communities even prior to the formation of the *poleis* in the Early Iron Age (twelfth to eighth centuries BCE), and continued to play an important role in Cretan *poleis* in the central and central-east portions of the island throughout the later Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods. Further, this thesis proposes explanations for the apparent *koine* of communal feasting practices in Crete as related to the interconnections between Cretan communities established at an early period in both religious and economic spheres.

¹ Perlman 1992, 193-205.
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CHAPTER I. Introduction

ὑπὲρ τῆς Κρήτης ὁµολογεῖται διότι κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς χρόνους ἐτύγχανεν εὐνοµοµένη καὶ ζηλωτὰς ἑαυτῆς τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπέφηνεν…

In regard to Crete, writers agree that in ancient times it had good laws, and rendered the best of the Greeks its emulators…

—Strabo, Geography 10.4.9

Introduction

“On a fair and fertile sea girt in the midst of the wine-dark sea,” during the seventh century BCE a peculiar form of the Aegean-wide phenomenon of the polis (Greek city-state) began to take shape. The island of Crete is portrayed in later Greek literature (of the fourth to first centuries BCE) as home to a large number of poleis that were politically independent yet united under a common model of social, political, and economic organization during the Archaic (ca. 750 – ca. 450 BCE), Classical (ca. 480 BCE – ca. 320 BCE), and Hellenistic (ca. 320 BCE – 67 BCE) periods (collectively referred to in this thesis as the pre-Roman period). Important aspects of this model included the class distinction between warriors and agricultural laborers, the division of the citizen class into various associations, the military

---

3 Homer, Odyssey 19.172-173.  
4 Whitely 2014, 141-147. Whitely discusses that the identification of the Greek poleis as states is a matter of current debate.  
5 Perlman 2004, 1144-1196; Whitely 2014, 143. Perlman estimates at least 49 poleis in Crete during the Archaic and Classical periods. Whitely points out that there were likely more than the 49 poleis in the Hansen and Nielsen volume, since “only those political communities attested in the literary and epigraphic record of late Archaic and Classical times” are included. Many sites that perhaps could be classified as poleis—such as Prinias and Azoria—were abandoned by 500 BCE, so the number of poleis in the island likely changed over time.
education of the youth, and the civic communal dining institution called syssitia. This last item—the syssitia—receives a great deal of attention and is perhaps the most detailed aspect of pre-Roman Cretan society in the ancient literature. The Syssitia has also enjoyed a great deal of attention from modern scholars, in part because this singular practice was unquestionably entangled with many other important aspects of pre-Roman Cretan society—including the organization of property, inheritance, the socio-economic class system, the nature of serfdom and slavery, as well as the function and extent of the power of the state. Scholars wishing to examine these aspects of pre-Roman Crete rely on a combination of literary, epigraphic, and archaeological evidence from the island. However the degree to which these three distinct sources of evidence agree (or disagree) with one another remains a matter of unresolved debate.

Up until recent years, archaeological evidence has contributed very little to scholars’ understanding of pre-Roman Cretan society (due primarily to a lack of investigation of sites dating to this period). However the literary and epigraphical evidence have played a large role in the study of ancient Cretan society, and there are generally three schools of thought regarding the relationship between these two bodies of evidence for the pre-Roman period in Crete. On the one hand, what might be called the “traditional” view maintains that the epigraphic and literary accounts are essentially complementary—the epigraphic record is seen as providing testimony for the earlier Archaic period in which the later institutions described in Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman Imperial period (67 BCE – 284 CE) literature
took shape. On the other hand, some scholars argue that the epigraphic record to a large extent contradicts the literary accounts, and these scholars advocate a more critical approach towards the literary testimony regarding ancient Crete. A third, middle-ground approach is taken up by many scholars who write that, even though the epigraphic evidence (and the archaeological evidence, moreover) does not always seem to agree with the literature, there is something to be gained from including the literary accounts in discussions of pre-Roman Cretan society.

This thesis begins from the perspective of the third, middle-ground approach—assuming that there is value to the continued use of literary accounts in the examination of pre-Roman Cretan society. Yet scholarship has struggled to define precisely what that value may be. This thesis seeks to define that value in terms of the communal dining institution of syssitia. In the following chapters, I will compare the information regarding communal dining practices in Crete from the literary, epigraphical, and archaeological evidence. This analysis will show that, although the literary portrayals of Cretan practices such as the syssitia may not be 100% accurate or applicable to all of Crete’s city-states throughout the entire pre-Roman period, they are nevertheless reflections of actual practices that are epigraphically and archaeologically attested.

---

8 Erickson 2010, 308; Wallace 2014, 365-375.
Table 1. Chronological Table.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Minoan I (LM I)</td>
<td>ca. 1675 – ca. 1490 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Minoan II (LM II)</td>
<td>ca. 1490 – ca. 1425 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Minoan IIIA-B (LMIIIA-B)</td>
<td>ca. 1425 – ca. 1300 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Minoan IIIC (LM IIIC)</td>
<td>ca. 1300 – ca. 1100 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Dark Age”/Early Iron Age</td>
<td>ca. 1100 – ca. 700 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subminoan (SM)</td>
<td>ca. 1100 – ca. 970 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protogeometric (PG)</td>
<td>ca. 970 – ca. 835 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Protogeometric B’ (PG B)</td>
<td>ca. 835 – ca. 810 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Geometric (EG)</td>
<td>ca. 810 – ca. 790 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Geometric (MG)</td>
<td>ca. 790 – ca. 745 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Geometric (LG)</td>
<td>ca. 745 – ca. 710 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Transitional’</td>
<td>ca. 710 – ca. 700 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Orientalising’</td>
<td>ca. 700 – ca. 600 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>ca. 700 – ca. 480 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>ca. 480 – ca. 323 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
<td>ca. 323 – 67 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Roman/Roman Imperial</td>
<td>67 BCE – 284 CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis will require a varied methodological approach in order to properly analyze and compare such distinct types of data. Interdisciplinary work is already a quite common approach in historical and archaeological studies, and such combined approaches have yielded fresh insights into old problems (as will be discussed below). This first chapter will provide an introduction to ancient Cretan society and the role of communal feasting in anthropological and archaeological contexts. Chapter II will provide an in-depth discussion of the ancient literary evidence for syssitia and the arguments for and against the literary accounts’ reliability. Chapter III will overview the epigraphical evidence that has been linked to syssitia, particularly focusing on inscriptions that have been related to the practice due to their mention of key words associated with syssitia. Chapter IV will look in-depth at the archaeological evidence for syssitia focusing on buildings and sites identified as possible

---

9 Wallace 2010, Table I. With my modifications.
andreion (feasting halls), including the most recent investigations at Azoria in Kavousi as well as Praisos in eastern Crete. The concluding Chapter V will provide an analysis of the spatial distribution of locations associated with syssitia in the three bodies of evidence, showing that the practice appears to have been concentrated in the central and east-central portions of the island. Further, Chapter V will offer explanation for the widespread practice of communal dining as the result of interaction and inter-influence between communities in these regions in the religious and economic spheres. Upon this analysis, Chapter V will conclude with the suggestion that the later literary accounts’ assumption of an island-wide common constitution with shared practices such as the syssitia should not be disregarded as simply a philosophical construction, but rather they should be seen as reflections of an actual system of shared practices and institutions.

Historiographic Overview

The island of Crete is mentioned in a large number of ancient Greek literary sources. As early as the eighth century BCE in Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey, Crete is mentioned as a far-off place on the edge of the Aegean. Diodorus Siculus describes the island as having a mixed ancestry with a population made up of Eteo-Cretans (“True Cretans,” the descendants of the Minoans), Pelasgians (the original non-Greek inhabitants of the Aegean), as well as Greek Achaeans and Dories. The legendary King Minos of the Heroic Age is portrayed in many ancient accounts as the “lawgiver” of Crete who originally established the traditional beliefs.

---

10 Perlman 1992, 177-206.
11 Homer, Iliad 2.645-652; Odyssey 19.172-173.
12 Diodorus Siculus, Library of History 5.80.1.
Cretan institutions under the command of the god Zeus.\textsuperscript{13} Among the important traditional Cretan institutions in the interest of the current project were the distinction in social, political, and economic class between aristocratic warriors and lower castes of agricultural and other laborers, the military training of the youth, and the communal dining institution called \textit{syssitia}. With the later development of the \textit{poleis} and the institution of the state, the upper class of warriors became a class of citizens ruling over dependent populations of slaves, serfs, and free non-citizens. Citizens had rights and responsibilities in serving in their states’ armies as well as in various positions of government, and also in participating in the communal meals which were to some extent sponsored by the states.\textsuperscript{14}

Early modern scholarship of pre-Roman Crete beginning in the late nineteenth century employed literary accounts to a large extent in the interpretation of the growing body of newly discovered and published inscriptions from the island. Scholars of this period treated the Greek literary accounts and epigraphic record from the island as essentially complementary. This is seen in smaller works (such as for example Margherita Guarducci’s 1933 article “Intorno alla decima dei Cretesi,” discussing the development of the \textit{deka}\textit{t}e or “tithe” in Cretan society beginning as a social practice linked to communal dining and later developing into a state-mandated tax)\textsuperscript{15} as well as in larger works (such as R. F. Willett’s groundbreaking 1955 book \textit{Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete}, examining Cretan social, political, and economic organization by combining literary and epigraphical evidence, most

\textsuperscript{13} Homer, \textit{Odyssey} 19.178; Plato, \textit{Laws} 1.624a-b; \textit{Minos} 318d; Herodotus, \textit{Histories} 3.122; Aristotle, \textit{Politics} 2.1271b; Ephorus \textit{ap. Strabo}, 10.4.8; Apollodorus \textit{Library} 3.1; Diodorus Siculus, \textit{Library} 5.78.2-3; Pausanias 3.2.

\textsuperscript{14} Aristotle, \textit{Politics} 2.1271b-1272b; 7.1329a; Polybius, \textit{Histories} 22.15.1; Ephorus \textit{ap. Strabo}, 10.4.

\textsuperscript{15} Guarducci 1933, 488-491.
notably the Gortyn Code). Discrepancies between the two sources of evidence were attributed to the difference in the dates of compositions—Willetts in particular argued that one might see a progression of the Cretan institutions’ development from more tribal “primitive” foundations first formed in the post-collapse period in the Dark Age (ca. 1100 – ca. 700 BCE, now more commonly referred to as the Early Iron Age) developed into more formalized institutions with the development of the state beginning in the seventh century BCE as depicted in the epigraphic accounts. Meanwhile the later Classical and Hellenistic literary accounts depicted the institutions in their later stages of development. As such, scholarship of ancient Crete until recent years has tended to view these two bodies of evidence as essentially complementary and mutually illuminating.

In recent years, some scholars have adopted a more critical approach towards the ancient literary sources. Chief among these critics is Paula Perlman, whose 1992 article “One Hundred-Cited Crete and the ‘Cretan ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ’” raised important issues of discrepancies between the literary and epigraphic records regarding Crete, challenging the common conception of Crete as having a single constitutional form, or politeia. Problems with the literary accounts include on the one hand the fact that the majority are written by outsiders to the island for whom we have no evidence of their having visited Crete or having experienced its social, political, and economic structures and practices first hand. Even in the case of authors like Dosiadas, Pyrgion, and Sosikrates (Hellenistic authors who were purportedly from Crete and whose work is preserved in the first century CE Deipnosophistai of

---

18 Perlman 1992.
Athenaeus), the only surviving records of their writings occur in the form of quotations and paraphrases within a compilation written by the Athenian author Athenaeus of the second- to third-centuries CE—far removed from the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods on Crete which these authors discuss.\(^{20}\)

On the other hand, considering the great size of the island and the vast number of polities that inhabited it in the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods,\(^{21}\) Perlman writes that we should also be critical of any generalized assumptions regarding a common \textit{politeia} (“constitutions”) applying to all Cretan cities. Crete was an island described as having 90 to 100 \textit{poleis},\(^{22}\) which at no time until the Roman period (beginning in the first century BCE) was united under a single rule.\(^{23}\) Perlman writes that it would highly unlikely that each and every one of them would have the same constitution with shared institutions and practices.\(^{24}\) Furthermore, Perlman points to instances in which the epigraphic evidence appears to refute the literary accounts—particularly that of Aristotle, as Perlman discusses.\(^{25}\)

Despite these objections, scholars continue to employ the ancient literary sources in studies of Cretan society during the pre-Roman period. Most notably among current scholars who continue to employ the literary accounts in discussions of this period of the island is Angelos Chaniotis, who in 2005 published an article in response to Perlman’s criticisms

\(^{20}\) Athenaeus, \textit{Deipnosophistai} 4.143b-f, 6.263f.
\(^{21}\) See above Footnote 5.
\(^{22}\) Homer, \textit{Iliad} 2.615; \textit{Odyssey} 19.174.
\(^{23}\) Perlman 1992, 193; Strabo, \textit{Geography} 10.4.11. During the third century BCE, there was a league of alliance that included a large number (although not all) of the Cretan \textit{poleis} that was called the Cretan Koinon. It is important to note that although a large number of Cretan \textit{poleis} were allied under the Koinon, the alliance did not cover the island as an entirety and was only in place so long as Gortyn and Knossos (the two dominant cities in the league) were not fighting against each other.
\(^{24}\) Perlman 1992, 194.
\(^{25}\) Perlman 1992; 2005; 2014.
showing that despite the heterogeneity which Perlman’s research highlights in the Cretan poleis’ social, political, and economic organization, there are nevertheless common core principles by which Cretan communities were organized throughout the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods—and this, he argues, is attested in the epigraphic evidence.26 Chaniotis identifies these common fundamentals of Cretan social, political, and economic organization as:

- the preoccupation with status
- the focus on military training
- the preservation of the common meals, the men’s clubs (andreia), and the age classes
- the petrification of Cretan social and political institutions
- the effort to delimitate the rights and duties of foreigners, artisans, women, and various categories of dependent persons.27

While Chaniotis has made a strong case for a reconsideration of the literary sources’ value in terms of their perception of a common Cretan politeia, the broad strokes of this article provide little evidence or explanation in support for some of the core principles listed above as widespread in the island—little is discussed especially in support of the “preservation of the common meals, the men’s clubs (andreia), and the age classes.”28

This thesis seeks to take a more detailed look at the communal dining institution of syssitia as a test case in order to engage in the debate regarding a shared politeia in the island of Crete during the pre-Roman period. Looking not only at the epigraphic evidence, but also incorporating discussion of the archaeological evidence for communal feasting in Cretan communities from the EIA through the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods, I will test

---

27 Ibid., 177.
28 Ibid.
both Perlman’s and Chaniotis’s claims regarding the heterogeneity and homogeneity of Cretan practices in order to show that, despite a certain degree of variation, communal dining practices similar to those described in the ancient Greek literature do, in fact, appear to have been widespread and foundational for the development of the Cretan poleis.
CHAPTER II: The Literary Evidence

Introduction

This chapter will introduce and explain the major literary sources regarding the Cretan communal dining institution of syssitia, beginning with an introduction to the authors and their works in chronological order, followed by a discussion of the major characteristics of the institution as portrayed in the literature. Subsequent is a discussion of the problems with the ancient Greek literary accounts and the need to look beyond them to evidence intrinsic to Crete (namely, the epigraphic and archaeological evidence) in order to gain a better understanding of whether or not the syssitia occurred, as well as its extent and the details of its implementation that are left unclear in the literary tradition. Excerpts from the key passages can be found in both Greek and English translations in Appendix A.

1. Introduction to the Literary Sources

As early as the eighth century BCE, Crete is treated as an almost mythical far-off place on the edge of the Greek world—an island of one hundred cities sharing a Minoan heritage as well as laws and institutions stretching back to the Heroic age. It is not until the fifth century BCE, however, that detailed accounts of the social, political, and economic organization of the island begin to appear in the literature.

The earliest known commentary on Cretan institutions—particularly of the syssitia common meal—comes from Plato’s late dialogue, the Laws (written in the fourth century BCE). The Laws depicts a conversation between three strangers (an unnamed Athenian, a Spartan man named Megillos, and a Cretan man called Clinias) as they make the religious

\[\text{Homer, } \textit{Iliad} 2.649.\] In the Odyssey, the Homeric author says that Crete contains ninety cities. With either number, it’s clear that the island was perceived as having many independent cities.
pilgrimage from Knossos to the cave of Zeus on Mount Ida in Crete. According to Homer (Odyssey 19.178) and to Plato (Laws 1.624a) this is the same journey that the legendary Cretan lawgiver Minos is said to have taken every nine years, during which he met with and received laws for the island from Zeus.

A near contemporary of Plato, Ephorus of Cyme (born c. 405 BCE, died 330 BCE) wrote a description of the constitution of Crete in his *Universal History*; however, we have only the “principal points” of his description in Book 10, Chapter 4 of Strabo’s *Geography* (written in the early first century CE). Ephorus’s description of Crete as it appears in Strabo focuses on the connections between the *syssitia* practice and the military education of the youth (connections which Plato also discusses in his *Laws*).

Writing in the mid or late fourth century BCE, Aristotle also wrote a description of the Cretan constitution in his *Politics*, which agrees in many points with that of Ephorus—however Aristotle’s writing focuses more on the connections between the *syssitia* and the systems of socio-economic class structure and the organization of labor and property.

Perhaps the most detailed discussion of the *syssitia* common meal comes from the early third century CE *Deipnosophistai* of Athenaeus. The *Deipnosophistai* is a compilation of poetry, songs, literary passages, and folklore showcasing the variety of dining habits.

---

30 According to Homer (Odyssey 19.178) and to Plato (Laws 1.624a) this is the same journey that the legendary Cretan lawgiver Minos is said to have taken every nine years, during which he met with and received laws for the island from Zeus.

31 Avagianou 1998, 121; Parker 2004, 29-35. Avagianou writes that this monumental work in thirty books “was an account of the world as a Greek of the fourth century knew it,” including “the rise of the Greek states and their activities in the Mediterranean, and their relations with the neighbouring kingdoms.” Ephorus’s writing survives only the form of quotations and summaries in the writings of later authors such as Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Pausanias, Polybios, and Athenaeus. His work was also a likely source of many other later authors’ works, such as those of Plutarch and Aristotle.

32 There is also a brief mention of Ephorus in Athenaeus’s *Deipnosophistai*. See below for more details.

33 Aristotle’s *Politics* is a work of political philosophy focusing in its second book on the tenants of the ideal constitution. Aristotle looks to the Cretan *politeia* in comparison with the constitutions of two other states considered to be “well-ordered” in the fourth century (those of Sparta and Carthage).
practiced in the Greek world. In Book 4 of the *Deipnosophistai*, Athenaeus discusses the *syssitia* of the Cretans, quoting and summarizing the descriptions of the *syssitia* from the writings of Cretan authors Dosidas (author of the *Kretika* “Cretan History,” written in the late fourth- or middle third-century BCE) and Pyrgion (author of *Kretika Nomima* “Cretan Customs,” precise dating unknown, written sometime between fourth and first centuries BCE).

2. *Syssitia*

Although they vary in focus and in the amount of detail they provide regarding the *syssitia* of Crete, our literary sources all generally agree that the *syssitia* was an island-wide practice in which adult male citizens and the male children of citizens gathered in groups to share a common meal. This common meal practice had a number of functions and was intertwined moreover with many other aspects of Cretan society, as we shall see.

Before delving into the details of the literary portrayal of the Cretan *syssitia*, it is necessary to highlight a few general points made by Greek authors regarding Cretan society. Although the island of Crete is acknowledged as having a multitude of independent city-states, the literature portrays these communities as sharing the same *politeia* or constitutional format.\(^3\) This is not to say that the Cretan *poleis* were united politically, since at no point in historical times (until the Roman conquest of the first century BCE) was the island unified under one rule. Even if they were not politically united, the ancient literature does discuss the island’s cities as nevertheless sharing in a common set of laws and institutions.

---

\(^3\) Plato, Ephorus, and Aristotle all write of the Cretan *politeia* or constitution.
Many ancient authors point to similarities between the laws and institutions of Crete and those of Sparta. As Aristotle writes, both regions have a socio-economic class system distinguishing between citizens with the right and responsibility to bear arms and dependent servants responsible for agricultural production. Further, Aristotle writes that the governments of both Crete and Sparta are organized along very similar lines:

…οἱ μὲν ἔφοροι τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχουσι δύναμιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ Κρήτῃ καλομένοις κόσμοις, πλὴν οἱ μὲν ἔφοροι πέντε τὸν ἀριθμὸν οἱ δὲ κόσμοι δέκα εἰσίν: οἱ δὲ γέροντες τοῖς γέρουσιν, οὐς καλοῦσιν οἱ Κρῆτες βουλήν, ίσοι: βασιλεία δὲ πρότερον μὲν ἦν, εἶτα κατέλυσαν οἱ Κρῆτες, καὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν οἱ κόσμοι τὴν κατὰ πόλεμον ἔχουσιν: ἐκκλησίας δὲ μετέχουσι πάντες, κυρία δ᾽ οὐδενός ἐστιν ἀλλ᾽ ἢ συνεπιψηφίσαι τὰ δόξαντα τοῖς γέρουσι καὶ τοῖς κόσμοις.

…the ephors [in Sparta] have the same power as the magistrates called kosmoi in Crete, except that the ephors are five in number and the kosmoi ten; and the group of elders at Sparta are equal in number to the elders whom the Cretans call the boule (“council”); and monarchy existed in former times, but then the Cretans abolished it, and the kosmoi hold the leadership in war; and all are members of the ekklesia (“assembly”), though it has no powers except the function of confirming by vote the resolutions already formed by the elders and the kosmoi.35

In addition to the similar organization of the three major branches of government, Ephorus points to certain public offices which are the same in both name and function in Sparta and Crete, “as, for instance, the office of the gerontes, and that of the hippeis (except that the hippeis in Crete actually possessed horses, and from this fact it is inferred that the office of the hippeis in Crete is older, for they preserve the true meaning of the appellation, whereas the Lacedaemonian hippeis do not keep horses).”36 More importantly for the present discussion, Sparta and Crete are also compared in sharing a communal dining practice, which is called phiditia in Sparta and syssitia (or andreia) in Crete. Beyond the common meal

35 Aristotle, Politics 2.1272a.
36 Ephorus ap. Strabo, Geography 10.4.18.
institutions of both Crete and Sparta, Ephorus further points to similarities in the traditional
dances as well as “the rhythms and paean(s) that are sung according to law” in both Sparta and
Crete.\footnote{Ephorus ap. Strabo, \textit{Geography} 10.4.18.}

Many ancient authors attribute these similarities to a shared heritage between the two
regions—however there is disagreement regarding the source of that shared heritage in the
ancient literature. As Ephorus reports, some ancient authors argue that the Cretan customs
are Laconian in origin and were brought to Crete by Spartan settlers who established a
colony at the Cretan city of Lyttos.\footnote{Strabo, \textit{Geography} 10.4.17. The literary tradition regarding Lyttos includes a mythical foundation
tale as told by Plutarch, Polianus, and Herodotus, identifying the city as a colony of Sparta.}
However the dominant view within the ancient literature is that the original source of these laws and institutions was Crete. A frequently mentioned
figure in the ancient literature is the legendary King Minos living in the Heroic Age and
acknowledged as the “lawgiver” of Crete.\footnote{Chaniotis 2005, 175; Charon of Lamsakos (ca. 400 B.C.) described the laws established by Minos in
his now lost \textit{Kretica} (FrgrHist 262 T 1).}
Minos is mentioned as early as the eighth century
BCE by Homer as the son of Zeus and king of the island ruling from the city of Knossos. “By
the fifth century B.C.,” Perlman writes, “Minos was firmly established in the tradition as the
rule of all Crete under whose stewardship the island attained its greatest glory as a maritime
power.”\footnote{Perlman 1992, 199.}
Minos is also acknowledged as the source of Crete’s unique laws and institutions,
which according to Plato, he received from his father, meeting with Zeus in a cave on Mount
Ida every nine years.\footnote{Plato, \textit{Laws} 624a-625a.}

\textit{Minos is mentioned as the Cretan lawgiver not only in Plato’s \textit{Laws},
but also in Aristotle’s \textit{Politics}, and Ephorus’s \textit{Universal History}, Herodotus’ \textit{Histories}}
(written in the fifth century BCE) as well as in both the Libraries of Apollodorus (second century BCE) and Diodorus Siculus (first century BCE), among many others. Regardless of whether or not Minos was a real person who mandated laws for the entire island, it is important to keep in mind that many Greeks believed this was the case, including (as Plato and Ephorus note) the Cretans themselves. Further, Ephorus and Aristotle also point back to the literary tradition that Sparta’s own lawgiver, Lycurgus, visited the island of Crete prior to instituting his reforms for Sparta. These authors further point to linguistic evidence for Cretan origin of the shared customs of Crete and Sparta. Ephorus writes that many of the Spartan institutions, such as the above-mentioned dancing, rhythms, and paeans of the Spartans “are called ‘Cretan’ among the Lacedaemonians, as though they originated in Crete.” Both Ephorus and Aristotle write that in the past, the Spartans used to call their own common mess andreaia as the Cretans call their common meal, which, as Aristotle writes, “is a proof that they came from Crete.”

Modern scholars have continued this debate with their own hypotheses explaining the similarities between Crete and Sparta, but dismissing the idea of a single mythical lawgiver figure for either region. Like the ancient counterparts, modern writers have tended to disagree regarding a source for the shared practices between Crete and Sparta. Scholars
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42 Homer, Odyssey 19.178; Plato, Laws 1.624a-b; Minos 318d; Herodotus, Histories 3.122; Aristotle’s Politics 2.1271b; Ephorus ap. Strabo, 10.4.8; Apollodorus Library 3.1; Diodorus Siculus, Library 5.78.2-3; Pausanias 3.2. Minos is also mentioned as the lawgiver Pausanias’ Description of Greece (second century CE; 3.2), Flavius Josephus’ Against Appian (first century CE; 2.157), Cornelius Tacitus’ Annals (first and second centuries CE; 3.26), and in the various works of Epimenides (the seventh- or sixth-century semi-legendary writer, ap. Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers 1.10, written in the third century CE); King Minos is also mentioned in Thucydides as the first man in Greece to form a navy (1.4).

43 Plato, Laws 624a-625a; Ephorus ap. Strabo 10.4.19.

44 Strabo, Geography 10.4.17-19; Aristotle, Politics 2.1271b.

45 Ephorus ap. Strabo, Geography 10.4.18.

46 Aristotle, Politics 1272a.
arguing for an origin outside of Crete, such as Müller, have argued that the common meal and other shared practices were brought to the island by Dorian immigrants towards the end of the heroic age.\footnote{Müller 1824; Jeanmaire [1939] 1975, 422.} This view is in reference to the literary model of the so-called “Dorian invasion” or “Return of Heraclids” described by Thucydides, Apollodorus, and Diodorus Siculus.\footnote{Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War 1.12; Apollodorus, Library 2.8.4; Diodorus Siculus Library of History 5.80.3 and 7.9.} However scholars such as Willetts, Jeffery, and Huxley agree in essence with Aristotle and Ephorus, arguing that when the Dorians arrived in Crete, they adopted the system of laws already in place among the indigenous Cretans, situating themselves at the top of the socio-political and economic structure—first in the form of monarchy and later developing into oligarchic states.\footnote{Aristotle, Politics 2.1271b; Jeanmaire [1939] 1975, 423; Willetts [1955] 1980, 18; Jeffery 1961, 310; Huxley 1971, 505-506.} These customs later became exported to Sparta, if not by means of a lawgiver Lycurgus then perhaps through interaction between Sparta, her colony in Lyttos, and the rest of the island’s poleis with which the Peloponnesus was in contact.\footnote{Huxley 1971, 506. Huxley adds that the other non-Dorian Greek inhabitants of Crete, such as the Achaeans, reacted similarly to the Dorians, “responding in a concerted manner to the problem of absorbing the indigenous population into the society wherein they were to form the new ascendancy” by adopting the customs of the native Cretans and positioning themselves as rulers in their respective communities.}

This debate has been further complicated by the more recent trend in scholarship of questioning the literary model of the Dorian and other Greek migrations following the end of the Heroic Age, as will be discussed in further detail in the following chapter. For now, we can say that regardless of whether the Cretan practices like the common meal came originally from Sparta or from Crete, there is nevertheless a shared perception that the syssitia was among certain practices of both regions with roots reaching deep into the Cretan (and perhaps more generally, the Aegean) past.
Despite the similarities between the two regions, many ancient and modern scholars alike comment that the Cretan system is, as Aristotle writes, *koineteros* (“more communal”) than that of Sparta, particularly in regards to the arrangements for the common meals.\(^\text{51}\) In Sparta, as Aristotle writes, each male citizen must contribute a fixed amount of his produce in order to participate in the *phiditia*, and in “failing to do so he is prevented by law from taking part in the government.”\(^\text{52}\) This passage is often linked with Dosiadas’s description of the Lyttian *syssitia*, in which Dosiadas writes that the participants each contribute a tenth of their produce to their respective dining groups.\(^\text{53}\) Further, there also appears to be some amount of state funding for the common meals as well, “so that all the citizens are maintained from the common funds.”\(^\text{54}\) By requiring a portion, rather than a fixed amount, for participation in the *syssitia* (and further supplementing the provisioning with contributions from the state income), as Huxley writes, the Cretan “citizen-landowners were thus protected from impoverishment” as well as the loss of status and the rights of citizenship “if their crops failed when their neighbours’ did not.”\(^\text{55}\)

In fact, fostering equality among the citizen body is, according to Ephorus, one of the primary functions of the *syssitia* in Crete. As Ephorus writes, the ultimate goal of the traditional Cretan institutions was to secure liberty by abolishing greed and luxury, so that all citizens would be equal in living a “self-restrained and simple life.” Toward this goal, Ephorus writes that the lawgiver of Crete commanded that the adult male citizens eat

\(^{\text{51}}\) Link 2014, 159-176.  
\(^{\text{52}}\) Aristotle, *Politics* 1272a.  
\(^{\text{54}}\) Aristotle, *Politics* 1272a.  
\(^{\text{55}}\) Huxley 1971, 511.
together in the *syssitia* (also called the *andreia*). In the syssitia, he writes, all male citizens were fed at public expense so that the poorer citizens might have some equality with the more wealthy citizens.\(^5^6\) Dosiadas writes that within the event of the *syssitia* itself were measures to ensure equal treatment of participants regardless of wealth or socio-political status in the *andreion*. Dosiadas writes that all adult male participants received the same amount for their portion during the meal, and that the only distinctions made among the recipients were in regard to age—the younger boys receive a half portion of what the adult participants are served—and in regard to the quality of food served—the best portions are served not to the most wealthy nor to those holding certain positions of political power, but rather to those “who have distinguished themselves in war or in wisdom.”\(^5^7\) Pyrgion (the summary of whose account of *syssitia* follows that of Dosiadas in the *Deipnosophistai*) adds even more to this picture of inclusivity, for as he writes, included within the group of boys fed at the common meal are orphans. Rather than a half-portion like the other boys however, Pyrgion writes that orphans receive an equal portion to that of the adult men, and their portion is served *abambakeuta*. Although *abambakeuta* is often translated as “without seasoning [or sauces],” Strataridaki argues that the word refers to the absence of additional *opsa*—small amounts of plant and animal proteins (such as olives, vegetables, cheese, figs, meat, and fish) that “supplemented the basic, staple food of the Greeks, which was bread (or any type of cereal base food, such as barley cake).” The *opsa* might have been what the individual participants contributed to the *andreion*, so perhaps “it was this very type of food which the orphans’ meals lacked because of their fathers’ absence.” The extra half-portion of

---

\(^5^6\) Strabo, *Geography* 10.4.16.  
\(^5^7\) Dosiadas ap. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophitai* 4.143d.
the staple meal made up for absence of *opsa* in the orphans’ meals, likely coming from the public revenues, and “reflecting the state’s care for that group of minors at *syssitia*.” All of these measures would have created an environment stressing equality among the citizens as peers—both among the adult men as well as among the younger participants.

In addition to promoting feelings of equality, the ancient literary sources also indicate that another major function of the *syssitia* was that it served towards the militarization of the citizen body. In Plato’s *Laws*, the Cretan character Clinias explains that the laws and institutions of Crete were ordained by the lawgiver “with an eye to war.” Clinias says:

…ταῦτ᾽ οὖν πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἡμῖν ἄπαντα ἐξήρτυται, καὶ πάνθ᾽ ὁ νομοθέτης, ὡς γ᾽ ἐμοὶ φαίνεται, πρὸς τοῦτο βλέπων συνετάττετο: ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ συσσίτια κινδυνεύει συναγαγεῖν, ὡς πάντες ὁπόταν σπάσαντες στρατεύουσαν, τόθ᾽ ὡς αὐτὸ τὸ πράγματος ἀναγκάζονται φυλακῆς αὐτῶν ἔνεκα συσσιτεῖν τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον. ἄνοιαν δὴ μοι δοκεῖ καταγνῶναι τῶν πολλῶν ὡς ὀμανθανόντων ὅτι πόλεμος ἀεὶ μὲν διὰ βίου συνεχῆς ἐστὶ πρὸς ἀπάσας τὰς πόλεις...

…all these customs of ours are adapted for war, and, in my opinion, this was the object which the lawgiver had in view when he ordained them all. Probably this was his reason also for instituting common meals: he saw how soldiers, all the time they are on campaign, are obliged by force of circumstances to mess in common, for the sake of their own security. And herein, as I think, he condemned the stupidity of the mass of men in failing to perceive that all are involved ceaselessly in a lifelong war against all states. If, then, these practices are necessary in war (namely, messing in common for safety’s sake, and the appointment of relays of officers and privates to act as guards), they must be carried out equally in time of peace. For (as he would say) “peace,” as the term is commonly employed, is nothing more than a name, the truth being that every state is, by a law of nature, engaged perpetually in an informal war with every other state.

Here Plato relates the *syssitia* common meal among the Cretan citizen body to that of a unit of soldiers on campaign, serving to accustom the citizens to measure necessary in wartime.

Ephorus further writes that the *syssitia* was an important aspect of the military education of

---

58 Deipnosophistai 4.143e-f; Strataridaki 2009, 339-341.
59 Laws 1.625d-625e.
Cretan youth. Each *andreion* had a *paidonomos* “supervisor of education,” who was in charge of the “troops” of boys called the *agelai* (literally translated “herds”). Each *agela* attended the common meals together and were trained together under the charge of one of the boys’ fathers. As part of their education in the *agelai*, the boys were taught important skills for battle—such as archery and other weaponry—and they also were conditioned to endure discomfort, toils, and blows “in order that courage, and not cowardice, might prevail” among the citizenry. On certain days, different *agelai* would do battle with one another “marching rhythmically into battle, to the tune of flute and lyre, as is their custom in actual war.”

During their participation in the *syssitia*, the boys were taught a sense of duty and obedience in the service to their elders (as Pyrgion writes, the young men wait by the tables to serve the older men⁶¹), and they were taught about their community’s ideals of courage and virility when towards the end of the meal (as Dosiadas writes), the men “[called] up deeds of prowess in war and to praise the men of proved bravery, in order to encourage the younger men in the pursuit of virtue.”⁶² Another important aspect of the *syssitia* regarding the education of the youth relates to the Cretan practices regarding pederasty. As Ephorus writes:


---

⁶⁰ Strabo, *Geography* 10.4.16, 20
[The Cretans] have a peculiar custom in regard to love affairs, for they win the objects of their love, not by persuasion, but by abduction; the lover tells the friends of the boy three or four days beforehand that he is going to make the abduction; but for the friends to conceal the boy, or not to let him go forth by the appointed road, is indeed a most disgraceful thing, a confession, as it were, that the boy is unworthy to obtain such a lover; and when they meet, if the abductor is the boy's equal or superior in rank or other respects, the friends pursue him and lay hold of him, though only in a very gentle way, thus satisfying the custom; and after that they cheerfully turn the boy over to him to lead away; if, however, the abductor is unworthy, they take the boy away from him. And the pursuit does not end until the boy is taken to the andreion of his abductor.  

After this, the lover and his friends would take the boy to the countryside for a period of feasting and hunting. These affairs were highly regulated, only permitted to last two months, after which the boy was required by law to be given as presents “a military habit, an ox, and a drinking-cup.” From this point on, the boy would have a distinctive status as a parastathentos, receiving honors and being “allowed to dress in better clothes than the rest, that is, in the habit given them by their lovers.” Ephorus says that this distinction would continue even into manhood and that it was esteemed with high honor. Bringing the boy to the andreion was the confirmation of the beginning of the love affair between the adult abductor and the boy kleinos (“beloved”), demonstrating the role of the syssitia institution in regulating the interactions of both adult male participants and young boys. Link writes that the Cretan form of pederasty was “a core element of communal upbringing and the recruitment for new generations of citizens,” providing boys with an important mentorship in addition that provided by the leaders of their agelai. All of these passages serve to show
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63 Strabo, Geography 10.4.21.  
64 Ephorus ap. Strabo, Geography 10.4.21.  
65 Ephorus ap. Strabo, Geography 10.4.21.  
66 Ibid.  
67 Link 2014, 162.
that the *syssitia* played several key roles in the militarization and education of the citizen body.

Another important function of the *syssitia*, as Dosiadas and Pyrgion in particular write, was for the entertainment of strangers. Dosiadas writes that everywhere in Crete there are two main buildings for the *syssitia*—one in which the communal meals are taken and the other called the *koimeterion* (“resting place”), where the *xenoi* (“guest friends,” or visitors to the city) are lodged. 68 Both Dosiadas and Pyrgion write that special seating was provided for the *xenoi* at the *andreion*. 69 *Xenia* in the larger body of Greek literature is thought of as a reciprocal guest-host relationship that might exist between two individuals, an individual and a group, different groups and even larger communities (not only in Crete, but also in the larger ancient Greek world). The earliest literary attestations of *xenia* come from the eighth-century BCE epics of Homer, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Some scholars have even argued that the *Odyssey* itself is “a study in the laws of hospitality,” 70 and we see in various episodes of the poem that providing food and shelter for strangers is not only a matter of humanitarian consideration among ancient Greeks, but it is also an act of religious piety: Homer’s poems reflect a belief that the gods protected travelers and additionally might also disguise themselves as strangers. 71 A similar belief might be reflected in the Cretan practices of not only feeding and lodging strangers at public expense, but also of dedicating a special table to
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68 *Deipnosophistai* 4.143b-c.
69 *Deipnosophistai* 4.143b-f; Jeanmaire [1939] 1975, 423; Willetts [1955] 1980, 18. Jeanmaire has pointed out that the *koimeterion* might also have been the lodging of a portion of the male population, particularly the younger members of the *agelai* troops.
71 Thorburn 2006, 370-372.
Zeus at the *andreion*, as described by Pyrgion. Clearly the *syssitia* is an example of *xenia* on the community or state level in Crete, since the *xenoi* are fed and lodged at state expense.

3. Problems with the Literary Accounts

Despite the wealth of detail in the literary accounts regarding certain aspects of the *syssitia* in Crete, there are important questions concerning the practice that are left rather vague in the literature. For example, it is unclear how frequently the *syssitia* common meal would have occurred, or how many participants would have been dining together at once. Scholars usually assume that each Cretan city had just one building in which all the male Cretan citizens dined. As Erickson points out, it is difficult to imagine the existence of a building large enough to house the entire male citizen population at once—which might number hundreds, if not thousands in large poleis like Knossos and Gortyn. Ephorus seems to signal that there might have been some sort of separation of the dining groups, and that these groups might not have in fact eaten all together at once. For example, in regard to the troops of young boys called *agelai*, Ephorus writes that on appointed days, “those who eat together at the same mess join battle both with one another and with those from different messes.” If there really was just one central building for the *syssitia* in every city, then perhaps the different dining groups used the building on some sort of rotation (and therefore the *syssitia* was not, for everyone, an every-day occurrence). It might also be possible that several buildings might have existed for the common meals—either with each *hetairia* having its own building or with several *hetairiai* dining in groups together. This seems more
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72 Deipnosopistai 4.143c-f.
73 Link 1994, 181; 2014, 163.
74 Erickson 2011, 383.
75 Ephorus ap. Strabo, Geography 10.4.20; emphasis mine.
likely if scholars like Jeanmaire are correct in assuming the *syssitia* common meal is a daily occasion.\(^{76}\) This possibility of multiple *andreia* buildings and locations is further left open by the fluidity with which the term *andreion* is used in the literature. *Andreion* is used at times to indicate a building, and at other times it is used to indicate the event of the common meal itself, and in some cases may be a synonym for *hetairia.*\(^ {77}\) I will return to this point during my discussion of the archaeological evidence for *syssitia* in Chapter IV.

Connected to the institution of *syssitia* in the literature is also the question of the nature of servitude in Cretan society. Aristotle writes that provisions for the *syssitia* are supplied in part from tributes paid by a group of people called the *perioikoi.* Earlier in the *Politics,* Aristotle compares the *perioikoi* of Crete to the *helots* of Sparta in that both groups are responsible for agricultural production.\(^ {78}\) Sparta also had its own group of *perioikoi,* which were an entirely different socio-economic class to the *helots,* with a certain level of autonomy and self-governance. Were the Cretan *perioikoi* likewise semi-autonomous, or were they (like the *helots* of Sparta) state-owned slaves? Talamo has argued that we should think of the *perioikoi* of Crete as "something intermediary between Spartan *helots* and *perieci*"—a servile but locally autonomous community who worked the land for the Cretan

---

\(^{77}\) For example, Dosiadas writes that one of the two buildings for *syssitia* is called the *andreion* (4.143c), and later writes διῄρηται δ᾽ οἱ πολῖται πάντες καθ᾽ ἐταιρίας, καλοῦσι δὲ τὰ τῶν ἀνδρείας "and all the citizens are divided into brotherhoods, which they call *andreia*" (4.143b). Also, Aristotle writes that the common meals in Sparta used to be called *andreion,* “just as in Crete” (2.1272a).  
\(^{78}\) Aristotle, *Politics* 2.1272a; 2.1271b; Dosiadas ap. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophitai* 4.143b. This appears to be in agreement with Dosiadas who specifies that in Lyttos, τῶν δὲ δούλων ἐκαστὸς Ἀἰγιναῖον φέρει στατῆρα κατὰ κεφαλῆν “all slaves pay one Aeginetan stater per caput” in tribute towards the *syssitia.*
This appears to be confirmed by the Hellenistic writer Sosicrates as he is quoted in the sixth book of Athenaeus’s *Deipnosophistai*:

Σωσικράτης δ’ ἐν δευτέρῳ Κρητικῶν τ’ ἡμὲν κοινήν, φησί, δουλείανοι Κρῆτες καλοῦσι μνοῖαν, τὴν δὲ ἱδίαν ἁφαμιώτας, τοὺς δὲ ὑπηκόους περιοίκους. ’’τὰ παραπλήσια ἵστορεῖ καὶ Δωσιάδας ἐν δὲ Κρητικῶν.

But Sosicrates, in the second book of his *History of Cretan Affairs*, says, "The Cretans call public servitude mnoia, but the private slaves they call aphantai; and the periœci, or people who live in the adjacent districts, they call subjects. And Dosiadas gives a very similar account in the fourth book of his *History of Cretan Affairs*.

Here Sosicrates defines the *perioikoi* as a class of “subjects” living in the surrounding areas of what might be assumed as the city centers in which the citizens dwelled. Sosicrates further distinguishes between slaves that are owned publicly, called *mnoia*, and those that are owned privately, called *aphamiatae*. The division of the servile classes in Crete as described in the literature is not well understood. This is due in part to the fact that a bewildering variety of terms are used in reference to members of Crete’s servile classes. For example, in the section preceding Sosicrates’s description of the servile classes, Athenaeus includes the writings of other authors who use a variety of terms:

λέγει δὲ καὶ Καλλίστρατος ὁ Ἀριστοφάνειος ὅτι τοὺς Μαριανδυνοὺς ὄνόμαζον μὲν δωροφόρους ἁφαροῦντες τὸ πικρὸν τῆς ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν προσηγορίας, καθάπερ Σπαρτιᾶς μὲν ἐποίησαν ἐπὶ τῶν εἰλότων, Θετταλοὶ δ’ ἐπὶ τῶν πενεστῶν, Κρῆτες δ’ ἐπὶ τῶν κλαρωτῶν. καλοῦσι δὲ οἱ Κρῆτες τοὺς μὲν κατὰ πόλιν οἰκέτας χρυσωνίτους, ἁφαμιώτας δὲ τοὺς κατ’ ἀγρὸν εγχωρίους μὲν ὄντας, δουλευθέντας δὲ κατὰ πόλεμον διὰ τὸ κληρωθῆναι δὲ κλαρωτας. ὁ Ἐφορος δ’ ἐν γ’ [p. 186] ἱστοριῶν ‘κλαρώτας, φησί, Κρῆτες καλοῦσι τοὺς δούλους ἀπὸ τοῦ γενομένου περὶ αὐτῶν κλήρου, τούτοις δ’ εἰσὶ νεομισμέναι τινὲς ἐφετα ἐν Κυδωνίᾳ, ἐν αἷς οὐκ εἰσίασιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐλεύθεροι, ἀλλ’ οἱ δοῦλοι πάντων κρατοῦσι καὶ κύριοι μαστίγουν εἰς τοὺς ἐλευθέρους’ Σωσικράτης δ’ ἐν δευτέρῳ Κρητικῶν τ’ ἡμὲν κοινήν, φησί, δουλείαιοι

79 Talamo 1987, 22-23.
80 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophitai* 6.84.
Κρήτες καλούσι μνοίαν, τὴν δὲ ἱδίαν ἀφαμιώτας, τοὺς δὲ ύπηκόους περιοίκους.' τὰ παραπλήσια ἱστορεῖ καὶ Δωσιάδας ἐν δὲ Κρητικῶν.

And Callistratus the Aristophanean says that “they [the Heracleans] called the Mariandyni dophoroi, by that appellation take away the sting in the term slave, just as the [p. 414] Spartans did in respect of the Helots, the Thessalians in the case of the Penestæ, and the Cretans with the klarotæ. But the Cretans call those servants who are in their houses chrysoneti, and those whose work lies in the fields amphamiotæ, being natives of the country, but people who have been enslaved by the chance of war; but they also call the same people klarotæ, because they have been distributed among their masters by lot. And Ephorus, in the third book of his Histories, “The Cretans call their slaves klarotæ, because lots have been drawn for them; and these slaves have some regularly recurring festivals in Cydonia, during which no freemen enter the city, but the slaves are the masters of everything, and have the right even to scourge the eleutheros (freemen).”

A similar distinction between public and private property ownership is also indicated in Aristotle’s account of the provisioning of the syssitia, in which he writes that the syssitia are sustained ἀπὸ πάντων γὰρ τῶν γινοµένων καρπῶν τε καὶ βοσκηµάτων δηµοσίων “out of all the crops and cattle produced from the public lands.” It should be noted, as Talamo points out, that Aristotle’s text in this regard is unclear in the way in which it is transmitted in the codex, and is considered to be corrupted. It is difficult to know exactly what Aristotle is saying regarding the provisioning of supplies for the Cretan syssitia. There are several possibilities of interpretation. On the one hand, δηµόσια might be taken to mean a public assemblage of agricultural products and cattle, which would seem to entail a large state-run collection center for not only storage of agricultural goods, but also for livestock living (which would be βασκήµατα). On the other hand, δηµόσια might be interpreted in the sense of meaning “public lands.” This agrees with what Aristotle writes earlier in the text, namely

81 Athenaeus, Deipnosophitai 6.84.
82 Aristotle, Politics 2.1272a.
that land in both Sparta and Crete was held in common.\textsuperscript{83} Talamo observes that the existence of a quota to participate in the \textit{syssitia} for individuals (as mentioned in Dosiadas) may indicate a situation in which, although the public lands were communal, the products of the soil and livestock grazing on the public lands were the property of individuals, that is, of those citizens who had the right to use the public land.\textsuperscript{84}

This second interpretation certainly would explain the seeming contradiction between Aristotle’s and Dosiadas’s accounts regarding the provisioning of supplies for the \textit{syssitia} common meal. Aristotle seems to indicate that the \textit{syssitia} is maintained entirely through contribution from the state. Dosiadas reiterates the idea of state sponsorship for the \textit{syssitia}, however he also writes that the participants in the \textit{syssitia} are also responsible for contributing a tenth of their produce to their respective \textit{hetairiai}.\textsuperscript{85} There seems to be a discrepancy between these two accounts—on the one hand suggesting that the common meal was supported exclusively by the state, and on the other hand suggesting that the \textit{syssitia} participants contributed their produce to their \textit{hetairia} directly. In the situation that Talamo suggests—wherein the produce contributed by citizens is the same as that produced on public land—there would be no discrepancy between these accounts. Alternatively, some scholars have suggested that the divergence between these two sources reflects a linear evolution that can be traced throughout the ancient accounts regarding Crete’s \textit{syssitia}, in which the state assumed more and more control over the \textit{syssitia} over time from what were originally the private associations in charge of it, and the citizen’s contributions became funneled through

\textsuperscript{83} Aristotle, \textit{Politics} 2.1264a.
\textsuperscript{84} Talamo 1987, 17.
\textsuperscript{85} Dosiadas ap. Athenaeus, \textit{Deipnosophistai} 4.143a-b.
taxes paid to the state.⁸⁶ We will return to this matter in our discussion of the epigraphic data from Crete.

Although the ancient literary sources very clearly emphasize that the syssitia of Crete was marked for its inclusivity in relationship to Sparta, the extent of that inclusivity is not, however, clearly defined. Participation in the syssitia in Crete is usually regarded as a requirement for citizenship, as it apparently was in Sparta. If this is the case, it is worth pointing out, as Haggis writes, that the syssitia was in fact restricted to a small elite relative to the Cretan population as a whole. Restricting access to the syssitia might be seen as one of the mechanisms used by the elite citizenry in maintaining their distinct status and political power.⁸⁷ Jeanmaire points to the idea that there was only one building for the syssitia as evidence of how small the citizen body of the Cretan states was.⁸⁸ However Talamo suggests that the group of participants in the syssitia might have been even more exclusive than this—even though the fee for participation in the Cretan syssitia is more inclusive than that of Sparta in that it is only a fraction of the participants’ produce, Talamo points out that this nevertheless would not preclude the participation of some citizens for whom even ten percent of their produce is more than they could afford. Rather, Talamo suggests that the participants in the syssitia would have been the more wealthy and prominent members of the citizen class—those who would fill the most important positions in government such as the board of the kosmoi and the board of elders.⁹⁰ This would become even more so the case in later

---

periods when Guarducci argues that the Cretan citizens would have been paying their *syssitia* fees on top of taxes to the government, as will be discussed in further detail in the next chapter.  

However I am not so sure that we should think of the *syssitia* as either an exclusively citizen practice or that all citizens were members of the *hetairiai*. First of all, none of the ancient authors explicitly indicate that participation in the *syssitia* was a requirement for citizenship in Crete, nor do they explicitly say that the *syssitia* were exclusively practiced by citizens. In fact, Aristotle tells us that the *perioikoi* (who are regarded as the original inhabitants of the island) continued to follow the laws of Minos, among which according to the literary tradition was the *syssitia*. Guarducci and Müller agree that the the relative ἅς in Dosiadas’s passage should not be taken to correspond with the πρόσοδοι τῆς πόλεως, but should mean the one and the other tenth—one which was paid to the *hetairia* and the other paid in the public treasury. Talamo points to Willetts’ saying that the passage of the *Politics* attests to a period in which the *syssitia* retains only an administrative function, since in the *Politics* Aristotle says that the *syssitia* is maintained at public expense (rather than solely by the contributions of members). Talamo suggests that those the participants in the *syssitia* are the plethos of those *gene*, whence come the members of the council and the board of *kosmoi*, and as such affect the decisions to be taken. Those who would have made up the

---

90 Guarducci 1933, 490.
91 Aristotle, *Politics* 2.1271b. In his argument that the common practices between Crete and Sparta originated in Crete, Aristotle writes, οἱ περίοικοι τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον χρῶνται αὐτοῖς, ὡς κατασκευάζαντος Μίνω πρώτου τὴν τάξιν τῶν νόµων “the *perioikoi* even now use these laws in the same manner, in the belief that Minos first instituted this code of laws.”
92 Guarducci 1933, 490.
gerousia and the board of kosmoi—which is why they deliberate on public matters in the syssitia as distinct from the less powerful all-citizen body, the assembly. Rather than being an exclusively citizen practice, membership to certain dining groups—e.g. the hetairiai—might have been what marked full citizens from otherwise free people with reduced status (who may or may not have also been citizens). This seems to be supported by the epigraphic testimony as well, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

If the nature of servitude in Crete is unclear in the literature, so also is the nature of the citizens’ own contributions to their communities’ economies. Traditional scholarship has generally assumed that Cretan male citizens themselves knew no other occupation other than that of bearing arms. Otherwise their time was occupied by exercise and sports in the Cretan equivalent of the gymnasium called the dromos.\(^95\) This is at least indicated by Aristotle in Chapter 7 of his Politics. We should keep in mind, however, that Aristotle’s writing is a work of philosophical thought, focused on defining the tenants of the “ideal” constitution. In an ideal constitution, Aristotle writes that there ought to be a distinction in class between those who participate in the state government and bear arms on the one hand and those who till the soil and conduct trade on the other: “it is proper for the state to be divided up into castes and for the military class to be distinct from that of the tillers of the soil… In Egypt this arrangement still exists even now, as also in Crete.”\(^96\) How much might Aristotle’s description of the Cretan constitution is based in philosophical theory as opposed to events in actuality?

\(^{96}\) Aristotle, Politics 7.1329a-b.
This is precisely one of the major tenants of Perlman’s argument against the value of the ancient literature on Crete. One thing that is clear and reiterated by all our major ancient authors is that the Cretan syssitia was perceived as practiced throughout the entire island for the entirety of the pre-Roman period. But as some scholars have noted, in an island called ἕκατόμπολις hekatompolis (one hundred-citied),\(^{97}\) it seems remarkable that any of the ancient authors are “able to generalize at all about the Cretan city states.”\(^{98}\) For as Perlman points out, even throughout the entirety of Greece, “it would be surprising to find a hundred or ten or even two Greek πόλεις sharing the same constitution, particularly in the absence of what we might call a ‘hyper-polis’ organization.”\(^{99}\) Perlman argues the epigraphic evidence attesting to a much more diverse picture of Cretan social, political and economic organization than that portrayed in the ancient literature. Perlman suggests that the idea of a common Cretan politeia might have been “an artificial construct” serving the philosophical debates of late Classical authors.\(^{100}\) In order to fully examine Perlman’s argument, we must first look at the epigraphic evidence from the island, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

4. Summary

In summation, the literary sources portray the Cretan syssitia as an island-wide practice involving the participation of male citizens and their sons in a communal meal. This communal meal, or syssitia, took place in a place called the andreion, and the practice is portrayed as part of a larger complex of state institutions promoting ideals of military valor, equality, and comradery among the participants. The literary sources also express the (albeit

\(^{97}\) Iliad 2.649.
\(^{98}\) Huxley 1971, 505.
\(^{99}\) Perlman 1992, 194.
\(^{100}\) Perlman 1992, 195.
not uncontested) belief that the *syssitia* and other traditional Cretan institutions stretched very far back in time, and that Crete was perhaps the source of similar institutions seen in Sparta during the Classical period. We are unsure of how often these meals would have taken place, nor do we know how many men and children would have participated at once in a single event. It is also unclear from the literary evidence whether the venue for *syssitia* would have been held in just one location (perhaps a monumental civic dining hall), or in multiple locations (such as in houses of prominent group members). As will be seen in the next two chapters, the epigraphic and archaeological evidence throw some light onto some of these issues.
CHAPTER III. The Epigraphic Evidence

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the epigraphic evidence that has been linked to the practice of syssitia mentioned in the ancient literary sources for ancient Crete. In the first section, this chapter focuses on the problems that have been identified regarding the literary sources (particularly in their portrayal of a single Cretan politeia) in light of the epigraphic evidence. This section will also consider evidence for shared institutions attested in the inscriptions for multiple Cretan poleis to show that despite a certain degree of variety, there do seem to be common underlying principles of organization in the island’s various communities from an early period. One of the common principal institutions appears to be syssitia. Before looking in detail at the inscriptions linked to syssitia in the third section, the second section of this chapter will discuss a few of the difficulties in approaching the epigraphic evidence and how these difficulties play into our understanding of the inscriptions. Finally, an examination of the key inscriptions, their content, and the light which they cast on the literary accounts will be discussed in the third section. Although the word syssitia does not occur in the inscriptions per se, other key words associated with the practice such as hetairia (the groups of adult participants in the syssitia), agela (the troops of young males who receive their military training together and participate in the syssitia), and andreion (a word which may refer to the venue of the syssitia or may function as a synonym for syssitia or hetareia). Other inscriptions have been linked to the syssitia by virtue of the subject matter that they discuss. Illustrations and transcriptions from the key inscriptions can be found in Appendix B.
1. Epigraphic vs. Literary Portrayals of the Cretan politeia

As mentioned briefly in the previous chapter, Perlman’s criticisms of the literary accounts of Crete are based largely on an argument that the epigraphic evidence in a number of ways contradicts the accounts of the ancient authors—particularly that of Aristotle. First, Perlman writes that the epigraphic record shows the socio-political organization of Crete as too diverse to warrant speaking of a single Cretan politeia. For example, Aristotle and Ephorus both write of the Cretan poleis as each having a board of kosmoi numbering ten. However there is only one instance in which inscriptions from Crete testify to a board of kosmoi numbering ten—in most poleis the number is much less, varying between two and nine (with the exception of a second-century\textsuperscript{101} inscription from Gortyn in which the kosmoi number eleven).\textsuperscript{102} Further, Perlman points out that in some Cretan cities, other names appear to have been used in reference to the office of executive officials—in inscriptions from Olous and Polyrhenia the two chief executive magistrates are called δαµιοργοί damiorgoi, and inscriptions from Itanos and Praisos have ἀρχόντες archontes.\textsuperscript{103} Worth noting, however, is the fact that in public inscriptions from Polyrhenia, Itanos, and Praisos, the title κόσµος also appears in addition to damiorgos and archontes. Perhaps this is an indication that “each of these three city-states referred to the same magistrates by two different titles,” as Perlman

\textsuperscript{101} All dates from this point onwards will be BCE unless explicitly stated.
\textsuperscript{102} Most inscriptions enumerate a body of less than ten kosmoi. For example, in Arkadia in the fifth century BCE (IC 1.5.4), two kosmoi are counted; later in the second century BCE, an Arkadian inscription enumerates three kosmoi (IC 1.5.5); at various time in Gortyn, inscriptions enumerate nine (IC 4.195 b, early second century BCE), eleven (IC 4.259, second century BCE), and six (IC 4.260, end of second to early first century BCE); an inscription from Malla lists four(?) kosmoi (IC 1.19.3 A.) the only epigraphic example of the literary ten kosmoi occurs in a second century inscription from Hierapytina (IC 3.3.9).
\textsuperscript{103} Olous (IC 1.22.4; SEG 23.548, 549); Polyrhenia (IC 2.23.7); Itanos (IC 3.4.7); Praisos (IC 3.6.9).
suggests. It might also be possible that the use of two titles is in reference to two distinct members of the board of the kosmoi with separate specializations. We know that in some cities, certain members of the board of the kosmoi had special responsibilities—for example, some inscriptions indicate the specialized role of a leader or “president” of the kosmoi called the προτοκόσμος protokosmos. Another specialized role known as the κσενίος κόσμος xenios kosmos seems to have been charged with “look[ing] after the interests of non-citizens and περίοκοι,” meanwhile the ιαρουργός hiarorgos appears to be a kosmos whose chief responsibilities seem to be in regard to religious matters.

In addition to showing a diversity of political organization in the Cretan poleis, Perlman also points to epigraphic evidence refuting some of Aristotle’s criticisms of the Cretan constitution. For example, Aristotle disparages the Cretan constitution for restricting eligibility to the office of kosmoi to certain gene or “clans.” However inscriptions from several cities suggest that rather a system of tribal rotation was employed. In inscriptions like the Gortyn Code and a fourth-century inscription from Gortyn, a dating formula is provided as “in the year when tribe x supplied the kosmoi.” Perhaps Aristotle misunderstood the system of tribal rotation, misinterpreting yearly tribal eligibility as permanent restrictions to certain tribes. However, it might also be possible that Aristotle understood the tribal rotation

---

104 Perlman 1992, 195.
106 Willetts [1955] 1980, 109-110; Huxley 1971, 513. This official is often named in inscriptions from Gortyn, including the Gortyn Code (Col. XI 10-17), as well as others (IC 4.14 g-p; 4.30; 4.53 A; 72 XI; 78 (480-50 BCE), 89(?)).
108 Aristotle, Politics 2.1272a.
109 IC 4.72 Col. V lines 406, fifth century BCE; IC 4.236, fourth century BCE; Perlman 1992, 196.
to be exclusive to a certain handful of powerful tribes. Whether or not the system of tribal rotation was inclusive of all tribes in the Cretan *poleis* is as yet unclear.

Less understandable, however, is Aristotle’s criticism that the Cretans did not employ written laws to regulate matters of the state and the powers of public officials—Aristotle writes that that the *kosmoi* “do not render their decisions in accordance with a written code,” and elsewhere: “it would be better if all these expedients were put in force by law rather than at the discretion of individuals.” However we have numerous examples of written laws from Cretan *poleis* beginning in the Archaic period—the most famous being the Gortyn Code, which is in fact acknowledged today as the oldest complete law code of Europe. The earliest inscriptions from the island come from Dreros in the seventh century BCE, followed closely by those of Gortyn dating to the sixth or perhaps late seventh century BCE. In addition to these two cities, by the end of the sixth century, seven other Archaic Cretan *poleis* are known to have inscribed laws for public display—namely, Axos, Eleutherna, Eltynia, Knossos, Lyttos, Phaistos, and Prinias. These laws were inscribed in stone and displayed in public, and as Perlman writes, “provisions were undertaken to ensure that officials obeyed them.” Several examples of Cretan laws even regulate the offices of *kosmoi*—for example, in a seventh or sixth century BCE inscription from Gortyn, the title of

---

112 Perlman 2002, 187, 214. Perlman provides a short catalogue of early laws from Archaic Crete, including those from Dreros (SEG 23.530; SEG 27.620; BCH 70 (1946) 590-7, no. 2; 600-2, no. 4; 603-4, no. 6 (lex sacra [?])), Gortyn (IC 4.1; 2; 3 mid-seventh to late sixth century BCE) Axos (IC 2.5.1-14; SEG 23 565; Bile (1988): 36-7, no. 27,), Eleutherna (IC 2.12.3-5; 11; 13-16; SEG 23.571; SEG 41.739), Eltynia (IC 1.10.2), Knossos (IC 1.8.2), Lyttos (IC 1.18.1-6; SEG 35 991A; B), Phaistos (SEG 32 908), Prinias (IC 28.7).
113 Perlman 1992, 195-197. For example, Perlman points to the inscription SEG 27.620 which concerns the tenure of *kosmoi* in Dreros, and is an example demonstrating “that the office of the κόσμος was closely regulated by the Drerian polis and that the individuals who served as κόσμοι were scrutinized at least to the extent of determining their eligibility for office.”
titas is named as an official whose primary responsibilities seem to have been to supervise the kosmoi and call them to account when necessary.\textsuperscript{114} The office of the kosmos was also regulated in that a number of cities required certain intervals of time before an individual might be eligible to serve an additional tenure as kosmos.\textsuperscript{115} All of this rather definitively contradicts Aristotle’s criticism that the Cretans do not use laws in public matters or to regulate their officials. One wonders whether Aristotle is not projecting his understanding of the Spartan system onto Crete, since it could not have been informed by actual experience of the island’s governing systems nor by accurate accounts thereof. More importantly, as Perlman argues, these inaccuracies cast doubt on Aristotle’s portrayal of Cretan society as a whole.

While Perlman has certainly discredited much of Aristotle’s account of ancient Crete, Chaniotis writes that we should not be so quick to entirely dismiss the literary tradition. Regarding the conception of Cretan cities as sharing a common set of institutions, Chaniotis points out that the epigraphic evidence does confirm a surprising degree of homogeneity (surprising given the fact that there are so many Cretan city-states and that there was no overarching political unity for most of the historical period).\textsuperscript{116} Aristotle and Ephorus may have

\textsuperscript{114} IC 4.14 g-p 1.
\textsuperscript{115} For example, an inscription from Gortyn tells us that an interval of three years must pass before an individual is eligible to serve an additional time as kosmos (IC 4.14 g-p 2).
\textsuperscript{116} Chaniotis 1999, 289; Gallimore 2011, 13. In the third century, a large number of Cretan cities joined a confederation under the joint hegemony of Knossos and Gortyn, called the Cretan Koinon, or the Cretan League. As Chaniotis writes, “the Koinon consisted of autonomous poleis” and “had a council (synhedrion) and a general assembly which discussed subjects such as the recognition of the asylia of sanctuaries, the issuing of proxeny decrees, and military contributions by member states to foreign powers. There is no evidence for federal citizenship, federal magistrates, a federal army, or federal revenues.” This body also developed a procedure for resolving conflicts, which as Chaniotis writes “was recorded in an official document called τὸ διάγραµµα τῶν Κρηταιῶν. Apparently, the diagramma described judicial procedures and contained a list of offences and the resulting fines. The question of whether the diagramma envisaged legal
gotten the number of *kosmoi* wrong for individual Cretan cities, however Chaniotis emphasizes that we should not overlook the fact that the office of *kosmoi* is nevertheless epigraphically attested throughout the island. The earliest appearance of the office of *kosmos* occurs in an early inscription from Gortyn dated to between the mid-seventh and sixth centuries BCE, and by the second century BCE the term *kosmos* is widely used, appearing in forty inscriptions from Central Crete alone. As Chaniotis writes, “it is not so important whether Gortyn had ten *kosmoi* and another city only five. What is far more important is the fact that wherever we find *kosmoi*—and we do find them in almost every city—these officials represent the executive power.” In addition to the office of *kosmoi*, Chaniotis observes a number of other shared institutions demonstrated in the epigraphic evidence for many Cretan cities—for example, “the preoccupation with status, the focus on military training of the citizens, the preservation of the common meals, the men’s clubs (*andreia*),” distinctions of age classes, and also efforts “to delimitate the rights and duties of foreigners, artisans, women, and various categories of dependent persons.” While we may not speak of Crete as a single political unit in the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods, we cannot

119 Chaniotis 2005, 177; Link 1994, 97-112, especially 101-103, 108-111. Chaniotis further adds, “This can be inferred from the dating formula in Cretan inscriptions (“when the tribe NN provided the kosmoi”); e.g., IC 1.9.1; 4.181; SEG XXVI 1049; XLI 770; L 937.”
120 Chaniotis 2005, 177.
ignore the fact that there is some sort of cultural *koine*\textsuperscript{121} expressed in the institutions of various individual Cretan poleis. This point is particularly evident when considering the epigraphic evidence for the practice of *syssitia*, as will be discussed below.

2. Limitations of the Inscriptions

Before looking in detail at the epigraphic evidence, it is necessary to consider what limitations there may be in considering the epigraphic record of Crete. The main limitation of the inscriptions, as Perlman writes, is that they are “almost entirely public and legal in nature,” expressing “formal, state-sanctioned rules.” The problem in this case is that “we can have little idea how these rules were activated in everyday life.”\textsuperscript{122} Another problem with the inscriptions is that of uneven chronological and geographical coverage.\textsuperscript{123} Erickson points out that “Inscriptional evidence of Archaic and Classical date (ca. 625-325) is available only from the central part of the island, from Eleutherna in the west to Dreros in the east. As a consequence, we know little about the political arrangements of communities in the western and eastern sections of the island.”\textsuperscript{124} As Chaniotis points out, for the seventh, sixth, and fifth centuries, we have “rather limited material beyond Gortyn”—epigraphic evidence for these periods “is predominantly Gortynian.”\textsuperscript{125} A further difficulty in working with the inscriptions is that the state of preservation\textsuperscript{126} for many of the inscriptions is very poor and in some cases we have only a few words. In some cases, such words are unfamiliar vocabulary for which

\textsuperscript{121} I define cultural *koine* in the sense of common, shared principles of organization and some degree of shared institutions among the Cretan cities.

\textsuperscript{122} Perlman 2014, 178.

\textsuperscript{123} Perlman 1992, 194.

\textsuperscript{124} Erickson 2010, 312-313.

\textsuperscript{125} Chaniotis 2005, 178.

\textsuperscript{126} Perlman 2014, 178.
interpretation is quite difficult.\textsuperscript{127} A range of *hapax legomena*\textsuperscript{128} appear in some of the most important Cretan inscriptions relating to the present discussion. Furthermore, as Chaniotis writes, while the mention of key institutions in the inscriptions is important (as we shall see below), there is the difficulty that these inscriptions often “[do] not define any of the social, economic, legal and political institutions, for which norms are introduced, modified, or just written down.” Rather, these inscriptions “[presuppose] the understanding of all these institutions,” which leads to difficulties of interpretation of certain terms and clauses—for instance the Gortyn Code “does not explain what an *oikeus* and a *doulos* are; it does not define the *klaros* or the *pastas*.”\textsuperscript{129} Such limitations can often make interpretation of key inscriptions difficult at best, and impossible in the worst case.

3. Syssitia and the Epigraphic Evidence

Despite such difficulties, scholars have nevertheless been able to glean key information from Crete’s inscriptions regarding the *syssitia* practice and related institutions. Although the word *syssitia* does not itself appear in Cretan inscriptions, the practice is nevertheless attested in the appearance of key words associated with *syssitia* in cities throughout the island from the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods (See Figure 36). The word *andreion* (which in the literary evidence indicates either the building that the *syssitia* took place in, the event of *syssitia* itself, or sometimes as a synonym for the *hetairia*) is attested in inscriptions from Gortyn in the sixth, fifth, and third centuries, Axos in the sixth

\textsuperscript{127} Perlman 2014, 178. \\
128 A *hapax legomenon* is a transliteration of the Greek ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, meaning "(something) said (only) once" (therefore, a word that occurs only once within a context, either in the written record of an entire language, in the works of an author, or in a single text). \\
129 Chaniotis 2005, 178.
through fifth and third centuries, the Lyttos-Afrati region in the fifth century, and in Eltynia in the second century. The groups of adult male participants in the *syssitia* called *hetairiai* by Dosiadas are attested in Gortyn in the fifth century, Axos in the late fourth century, Dreros during the third to second century, and Malla in the second century. The associations of the younger male participants in the *syssitia* called *agelai* (mentioned by Plato and Ephorus) are attested in inscriptions from Dreros as early as the late seventh to early sixth as well as the third to second centuries, Hierapytna in the third century, Polyrhenia in the third or second century, Eltynia in the second century, and Eleutherna in the second century.

Although many of these inscriptions are quite fragmentary, several go beyond simply mentioning key words associated with the *syssitia* and further confirm other details regarding this and related institutions as understood from the literature. For example, in the so-called Spensithios decree (a fifth century inscription from the Lyttos-Afrati area), a group called the Datalousi and an unnamed city pledge to a man named Spensithios a salary as well as certain provisions and benefits as long as he serves to ποινικάζεν τε και μναμονευτίν poinikazen te kai mnamoneuwen “to write and remember/recite” the city’s documents in both civic and

130 Gortyn (IC IV 4, seventh or sixth century BCE; IC IV 75, fifth century BCE), Axos (IC II 5.1, between sixth and fifth century BCE; IC II 5.25, third century BCE), the Lyttos-Afrati area (SEG XXVII 631, i.e. “Spensithios Decree”, fifth century BCE), and Eltynia (IC I 10.2, second century BCE).
131 Gortyn (IC IV 42, fifth century BCE), Axos (SEG XXIII no. 566 & XXV no. 1024 end of fourth century BC), Dreros (IC I 9.1, third to second century BCE), and Malla (IC I 19.3, second century BCE).
133 Dreros (IC 1.9.1, third to second century BCE; SEG XXIII, no. 530, end of seventh – beginning of sixth c. BCE), Hierapytna (IC 3.3.1, third century BCE), Polyrhenia (IC 2.23.20, third or second century BCE), Eltynia (IC 1.10.2, second century BCE), and Eleutherna (IC 2.12.26, second century BCE).
Among the stipulations for Spensithios’s employment to the city is that he contribute 10 axes’ weight of meat to his andreion. Here we see not only the existence of the andreion, but also a state-mandated contribution of food to an andreion by one of its members.

Erickson has shown this inscription to be helpful also in regards to the question of how often the syssitia might have taken place. Erickson compares the archaic measure of 10 axes’ weight of meat to sacrificial calendars from Attic demes, demonstrating that the amount which Spensithios is required to his andreion is “comparable to the yearly consumption of a Classical Athenian demesman.” Erickson argues that if a similar amount were required from each of Spensithios’ hetairia fellow members, “the andreion must have been a regular, if not daily, occurrence.”

Erickson’s hypothesis may be problematic in consideration of the traditional view of the syssitia. If on the one hand we are to understand (according to the traditional view) that all male citizens—both rich and poor, as well as whatever might be in between—participated in the syssitia by contributing 10% of their income or produce (as Dosiadas says), then we should be cautious in extrapolating the contribution of a state official onto that of all other members of Spensithios’s hetairia. It may be, as Talamo argues, that the corpus of state officials was composed of members of the more wealthy land-owning clans. If that is the case regarding Spensithios, then we may assume that his 10% contribution would be much
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134 Jeffery and Morpurgo-Davies 1970, 126. Examples from elsewhere in Crete in IC 1.16.1 from Lato, IC IV. 78, [162], 165, 195 from Gortyn, BCH 1937 no. 1, BCH 1946 nos. 2, 3, 4 from Dreros.
135 SEG 27.631 B, line 11.
136 Erickson 2011, 384.
137 Talamo 1987, 26.
more than that of average syssitia participants. If on the other hand we consider Erickson’s interpretation in light of the hypothesis of this thesis that the hetairia were the exclusive dining clubs of the most wealthy and powerful citizens (with each contributing a comparable amount to the contribution of Spensithios), then perhaps we may say that Erickson is right. Perhaps we may go further and suggest that the frequency of the syssitia of the hetairiai was one of the special things that distinguished the hetairia from the dining groups of poorer, less powerful citizens.

Another instance of Cretan legislation demonstrating contributions given to a hetairia by one of its members is attested in the Gortyn Law Code. Column X lines 33-39 lay out the procedures to be followed in the instance of adoption. When a citizen wishes to adopt a son (and according to the Code “Adoption may be made from whatever source anyone wishes”), he must make a public declaration of adoption in the agora (“place of assembly”) when the citizens are assembled, “from the stone from which proclamations are made.” After this, the adopter must give a sacrificial victim and a measure of wine to his hetaireia.138 This is an interesting case of contribution not mentioned by the literary sources—not a repeated tithe but instead a one-time contribution, which we might understand to go towards some more private adoption ceremony and special syssitia within the father’s hetairia, or perhaps it serves in part to cover the meals of the new son in the andreion.

The Gortyn Code passage on adoption is one of many inscriptions confirming the connection that the literary accounts draw between the syssitia and state education of the youth. As mentioned in the previous chapter, in the literature, syssitia serves as one

component of a larger education system aimed at the militarization of Cretan youth and their preparation towards meeting their civic duties upon reaching adulthood. According to Ephorus, at a certain age, young members graduated from their respective agelai and became citizens of their respective poleis, after which it is assumed they joined ranks with the other adult members of the hetairiai.

Such a course of events is confirmed in several inscriptions connecting the graduation of boys from the agelai to citizenship by swearing oaths of loyalty (or citizens’ oaths) to their poleis. For example, a third or second century inscription from Dreros details the course of events and various responsibilities of those involved in the graduation ceremony of former agela members to citizenship in the polis of Dreros. According to the inscription, the youth must pledge their loyalty to both Dreros and its ally Knossos, with the ceremony administered under the majority of the board of the kosmoi. Special penalties are given for any acts of negligence on the part of the kosmoi, as well as for the Council (which supervises the kosmoi to ensure they conduct their duties in the ceremony properly; failure to properly ensure the kosmoi’s proper performance result in a fine twice that of the kosmoi for negligence). A similar provision is seen in a treaty between Malla and Lyttos, which shows that the kosmoi to be “subject to a large fine if they did not carry out their prescribed duties” in the annual ceremony of graduation of the youth from the agelai. These and other inscriptions demonstrating graduation of former agela members to citizenship by swearing

---

139 IC 1.9.1.
140 IC 1.19.1.
oaths\textsuperscript{142} are important because they not only confirm the literary accounts but also enlighten our understanding of the roles and importance of the agelai and hetairiai as not only dining groups, but as groups with civic rights and responsibilities.

Beyond confirming the existence of key groups associated with the syssitia, the epigraphic evidence also attests to the existence of certain groups seemingly defined socially and legally by their lack of membership in them. One group called the apetairia, is mentioned in two inscriptions from archaic Gortyn, one of which is the Gortyn Code—this long list of public legislations from the fifth century BCE polis of Gortyn includes several passages delineating the various punishments for crimes depending on the social class of the perpetrators or the victims. For example, in Column II, lines 2-16, the Code lists the different penalties for the crime of rape:

\begin{verbatim}
... αἱ καὶ τὸν ἐλευθὲρον ἐ/
    τὸν ἐλευθέραν κόρτει οἶπει, ἕκα-
    τὸν στατερᾶς καταστασεῖ· α-
[5]   ι δὲ κ᾽ ἀπεταῖρῳ, δέκα· αἱ δὲ κ᾽ ὁ δόλο-
    τὸν ἐλευθέρον ἐ τὰν ἐλευθέρα-
    ν, διπλὲι καταστασεῖ· αἱ δὲ κ᾽ ἐλε-
    θέρος φοικέα ἐ φοικέαν, πέντε
    δαρκνάν· αἱ δὲ κα φοικεύς φοικέα
\end{verbatim}

1. Against an ἐλευθέρος eleutheros (“free person”) 100 staters
2. Against an ἀπεταῖρῳ apetairos 10 staters
3. By a δόλος dolos (“slave”) against an eleutheros 200 staters
4. Against a Φοικεύς woikeus (“serf”) by an eleutheros 5 drachmas
5. Against a woikeus by a woikeus 5 staters
6. Against a virgin δόλα dola (“household slave”) 2 staters
7. Against a non-virgin dola 1 or 2 obols

\textsuperscript{142} Knossos, second century (IC 1.8.13); Lato, second century (IC 1.16.6); Malla, third century (IC 1.19.1); Lyttos, second century (IC 1.18.9 and 1.16.5); Olaus, second century (IC 1.18.9 and 1.16.5); Hierapytna, third century (IC 1.3.3.1 B).
Also demonstrative is the legislation regarding penalties for adultery in Column II, lines 21-28:

[20] … αί κα τάν ἐλευθέραν
μοικίον Αίλεξεί ἐν πατρός ε ἐν ἀ-
δέλπιο ἐ ἐν το άνδρος, ἐκατόν
στατερας καταστασεί· αἱ δέκ’ ἐ-
ν ἄλο, πεντέκοντα· αἱ δὲ κα τάν
[25] το ἀπεταίρο, δέκα· αἱ δὲ κ’ ὁ ὀδόλος τά-
ν ἐλευθέραν, δίπλεὶ καταστασε-
ἒιν. αἱ δὲ κα δόλος δόλο, πέν-

1. With an ἐλευθέρα eleuthera (“free woman”) 100 staters if in the
father’s, brother’s, or husband’s house; 50 staters if in any other
house
2. With the wife of an apetairo
3. A dolos with an eleuthera Slave pays double (200 or
100 staters)
4. A dolos with a dola 5 staters

Such passages provide enlightening glimpses into the social structure of the archaic Cretan

polis. Very little is known about the apetairia, since the term is known mainly from the

Gortyn Law Code and another fragmentary inscription from early fifth century Gortyn.\textsuperscript{143}

There are several possibilities for the identity of members of this group. The apetairia may
have been made up by citizens who lost their status and membership to the hetairiai.\textsuperscript{144} The
Code attests to certain circumstances in which a free man could lose his free status: he might
pledge his person as security for a debt (in which case he is called κατακείμενος
katakeimenos, which Willetts points to as the equivalent of the Roman nexus and the

\textsuperscript{143} IC 4.84.
δανεισάμενος ἐπὶ σῶματι of pre-Solonian Attica) or he may be seized and condemned for debt (in which case he is called νενικαμένος nenikamenos). Larsen also suggests that the apetairia might have been made up in part also by otherwise free men excluded from the highest class and membership to the hetairiai due to being unfit for military service, either through cowardice or physical unfitness.

Another possibility raised by Larsen is that the apetairia was made up in part by the perioikoi, who are mentioned in the literary sources. Although the literary term perioikoi is often translated as “serf” (according to Aristotle’s passage saying that the perioikoi till the soil) Larsen argues that the perioikoi “cannot be serfs,” since they have laws of their own (which Aristotle himself writes in another passage, saying that that they continue to observe the laws of Minos). Larsen points to several inscriptions that attest to the existence of the perioikoi in Crete as “a class of subject communities with local self-government similar to the perioeci of Sparta.” These include a fifth century document from Gortyn concerning sacrificial rites seeming to contain “special regulations” for a group of people called περιϝοι. Larsen also points to a Hellenistic treaty between Gortyn and Latus, wherein a similar term to perioikoi—the ὑπόβοικοι hupoboikoi—is used seeming to refer to “a class of subjects of Gortyn that can be sued by the citizens of Latus in the same manner as the Gortynians themselves.” Since the hupoboikoi can be sued directly, Larsen argues that the word “cannot possibly refer to serfs”—for although it seems that serfs could bring suit

145 Column I, line 56 – Column II line 1; Cf. Column IX line 25 and Column IX line 32; R. F. Willetts, Aristocratic Society, 36.
147 Larsen 1936, 12.
148 Larsen 1936, 11.
149 Larsen 1936, 12. Larsen cites AJA I (1897), 162 ff. = SGDI, 4990 = IC 4.65.
against their masters in certain cases, serfs and slaves were otherwise usually represented by their masters in court. If the *hupoboikoi* were serfs, there would be no need for this provision, since the Latusians would be more likely to bring suit against the serf’s master rather than against the serf himself. It is likely that the *perioikoi* and *hupoboikoi* were terms used in Gortyn at different times to refer to the same class of subject people. The dual terminology might have been used variously “depending on whether one wished to emphasize that the *perioeci* dwelt round about or that they were subjects.”

Larsen also points to a treaty between Gortyn and the island of Kaudos (second century), which is dated with the *kosmoi* of both communities—indicating that the Kaudians were to some degree autonomous and self-governing. However, as Larsen points out, the contents of the inscription show that the Gortynians had the upper hand in the treaty and were able to dictate whatever terms they wished. Among the treaty’s provisions, the Kaudians are permitted “to be free and autonomous and to have their own law courts for local suits on the condition that they abide by the arrangements dictated by [the Gortynians] and follow their leadership in war and peace.” Also, the Kaudians must contribute to Gortyn “a payment of tithes on all products of land and sea, except that Kaudos is to keep for its own use the taxes on the flocks and on herbs or vegetables, as well as all revenues derived from their harbor. In addition, the island is to supply Gortyn annually with a specified amount of salt and juniper berries.” The identification of the Kaudians as a *perioikic* community matches up well
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150 Larsen 1936, 12. Larsen cites *BCH*, XXVIII (1903), 219 ff. =SGDI, IV, p. 1032, No. 2 = IC 1.16.1.38.
151 Larsen 1936, 13.
152 Larsen 1936, 14.
153 Larsen 1936, 14.
with the majority of the literary evidence on the \textit{perioikoi}—they are self-governing but subject to the dominant Gortynian state, and perhaps most importantly in terms of the present discussion they are required to contribute a tithe of their income as well as certain amounts of salt and juniper berries. Such required contributions are likely related to both Dosiadas’s and Aristotle’s accounts that the state income—which in part or whole financed the \textit{syssitia}—came in part from the tribute paid by subject populations.\footnote{Dosiadas ap. Athenaeus, \textit{Deipnosophistai} 4.143b; Aristotle, \textit{Politics} 2.1272a.}

In addition to Kaudos, Larsen further identifies several other communities as \textit{perioikic} subjects of Gortyn, among which are Amyklaion, Leben, Bene, Boibe, and Rhytion.\footnote{Larsen 1936, 16. For Amyklaion, Larsen points to “a badly mutilated inscription \textit{[SGDI 5025]} of which just enough is preserved to show that it contained regulations governing the community,” which demonstrates Amyklaion as having some level of “corporate responsibility and hence some form of self-government is implied.” The port of Gortyn, Leben, “does not seem ever to have been independent and so probably was a perioecic community” (Larsen cites \textit{SGDI}, Vol. III, Part 2, p. 343). For the other towns, Larsen writes that they are known by their mention in the literary sources as dependencies of Gortyn. “For Bene,” Larsen writes “see Steph. Byz., \textit{s.v.} Βήνη; cf. Suidas, \textit{s.v.} Παυός. For Boibe, Steph. Byz., \textit{s.v.} Βοίβη. For Rhytion, Strabo x. 479. The latter community appears as a village in an inscription from the time of Trajan (\textit{Rivista del Reale Istituto d’Archeologia e Storia dell’Arte}, II [1931], 64, l. 8). After the destruction of Phaestus, Matalon, the port of the latter city, seems to have been added (FN: Strabo, \textit{ibid}. Cf. Creutzburg, \textit{s.v.} “Matalia” in Pauly-Wissowa, XIV, 2179.).”} Beyond Gortyn, other \textit{perioikic} communities can be identified both in the literary and epigraphic evidence (however the epigraphic evidence for Gortyn is much better than for the rest of the island). For example, the port at Heracleium and the other communities listed by Polybius in the second century dispute between Knossos, Gortyn, and Cydonia were almost certainly perioikic towns subject to Knossos.\footnote{Polybius, \textit{Histories} 22.15; Larsen 1936, 19.} A decree from Praisos imposes “certain duties” on a people called the Stalitai and also refers to “services required … from the Setaëtai.”\footnote{\textit{SGDI}, 5120=Dittenberger, \textit{Sylloge}, 524; Larsen 1936, 20.} The Stalitai appear to have been the residents of a port town on the southern coast of Crete, meanwhile the Setaëtai seem to have been the residents of a port town on the
northern coast. The status of these communities appears to be quite similar to that of the residents of Kaudos—they are subject communities to a dominant state (in this case, to Praisos). Larsen points to the similarity between the Praisos decree and the form of a Roman decree regulating the status of *dediti*: both port towns were “permitted to retain their land and city and to collect harbor dues and taxes on purple fisheries and other fisheries, but must give half of the income to Praesus.”\(^\text{158}\) Also, the Stalitai were to undertake voyages on behalf of the city of Praisos.

All of this evidence definitively proves that *perioikic* communities existed in Crete at least as early as the Archaic period and also that the *perioikoi* were responsible in part for the income of dominant states (part of which went towards financing the *syssitia*). Furthermore we also learn something about the processes involved in one community becoming the *perioikoi* of another. The inscriptions on the one hand show that *perioikoi* were sometimes communities with a long history of submission to the Greek *poleis*, as demonstrated by the Praisos document (which makes reference to earlier arrangements “concerning the taxes on fisheries,” suggesting that the Stalitai’s subjection by Praisos was not an entirely new arrangement).\(^\text{159}\) On the other hand, the treaty between Gortyn and Kaudos shows how one *polis* could become a *perioikoi* community of a dominant *polis*. This would have become more frequently the case in the Hellenistic period, when a handful of Cretan *poleis* came to dominate large stretches of the island, subjugating the weaker *poleis* in their expanded territory. Subjugations of this kind might have occurred as the result of conquest, or beginning as an alliance between a weaker and stronger *polis*, ending with the eventual

\(^{158}\) Larsen 1936, 20.  
\(^{159}\) Larsen 1936, 20.
subjugation of the weaker *polis*. As Larsen points out, “it often may have been a short step from a treaty of alliance with a stronger state to the reduction to the status of perioeci.”

This is an important point to consider, especially since the *perioikoi* of Crete are often defined as ethnically distinct from the citizens of the dominant state. This is due largely to Aristotle’s testimony, who not only writes of the *perioikoi* as indigenous Cretans who continue to keep their ancestral laws, but also Aristotle writes that in an ideal state, there should be not only a class, but also an ethnic distinction between those who have full rights of participation in the government and of bearing arms (the “citizens” of a state) and those who are subject to the state. Such an ideal class hierarchy, he writes, existed in Crete during his day. Aristotle’s identification of the *perioikoi* as serfs has also been linked to the testimony of other ancient authors, who refer to the serfs with other terms such as *mnoia*.

Regarding Hermonax’s testimony of the serfs (referred to as *mnoia*), Athenaeus writes:

> Ἐρμων δὲ ἐν Κρητικαῖς Γλώτταις μνῶτας τοὺς ἐγγενεῖς οἰκέτας.

As Willetts writes, if we accept the reading ἐγγενεῖς here, “as seems necessary, we must conclude that the *mnoia*…were native to Crete.” However we have seen that Aristotle’s identification of the *perioikoi* is demonstrated to be mistaken both for *a priori* reasons as well as through the
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160 Larsen 1936, 20.
161 Aristotle, *Politics* 2.1271b: ἕποικοι γὰρ οἱ Δοκτοί τῶν Δακώονων ἦσαν, κατέλαβον δ’ οἱ πρὸς τὴν ἀποικίαν ἔλθοντες τὴν τάξην τῶν νόμων ὑπάρχουσαν [30] ἐν τοῖς τότε κατοικοῦσιν. διό καὶ νῦν οἱ περίοικοι τὸν αὐτόν τρόπον χρώναι αὐτοῖς, ὡς κατασκευάσαντος Μίνω πρῶτου τὴν τάξην τῶν νόμων. “for the Lyctians were colonists from Sparta, and the settlers that went out to the colony found the system of laws already existing among the previous inhabitants of the place; owing to which the neighboring villagers even now use these laws in the same manner, in the belief that Minos first instituted this code of laws.”

162 Aristotle, *Politics* 7.1329a: φανερὸν δὲ καὶ ὅτι δεῖ τὰς κτήσεις εἶναι τούτων, εἴπερ ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τοὺς γεωργοὺς δοῦλους ἢ βαρβάρους περιοίκους. “And it is also manifest that the properties must belong to these classes, inasmuch as it is necessary for the tillers of the soil to be slaves, or serfs of alien race,” and in a following section (7.1329b) he writes that an ideal socio-economic class hierarchy exists in Crete.


epigraphic evidence. The *perioikoi* could not at once be both serfs and semi-autonomous communities, and also the inscriptions also show the *perioikoi* to be similar to the *perioikoi* of Sparta—living in separate yet subject communities around the *poleis* that dominated them. This is distinct from the serfs who are identified in the code as *woikeus*.

If the *perioikoi* made up as important a component of Cretan society as the epigraphic and literary evidence attests, why then are they not mentioned explicitly in the Gortyn Code? Several scholars have suggested that this is because the *perioikoi* made up in part the class mentioned as *apetairiai*. In many ways, the members of subject communities would have been ‘almost citizens.’ Larsen points to the Hellenistic treaty between Gortyn and Latus showing that the *hupoboikoi* (which Larsen identifies as synonymous with *perioikoi*) “could be sued in the same courts as the citizens,” which means that “they constituted a group with lesser rights but subject to the same jurisdiction as the citizens.”\(^\text{165}\) The distinction between a *perioikos* and an otherwise free man without membership in the *hetairiai* would have therefore been very close in social status, therefore the Code makes no distinction.

As we have seen already regarding the use of dual terminology in the case of *kosmoi* in Polyrrhenia, Itanos, and Praisos and *perioikoi* in Gortyn above, we should further consider a possible dual terminology regarding the *apetairia* class as well. It is significant that in the Code their status is marked for lacking membership in the *hetairia*.\(^\text{166}\) A related inscription from Gortyn discusses a group of people called \(\text{ἀπελευθέρων} \) living and working in a place called Latosion. This group is defined by its lack of membership in the

\(^{165}\) Larsen 1936, 18.  
class of *eleutheroi*, who are mentioned as the top social class in the Code.\(^{167}\) It is not too
great a stretch to suggest that the *apeleutheron* may be synonymous with the *apetairia*—
particularly since the *apetairia* are in the Code also explicitly distinguished from the
*eleutheroi*. Here perhaps is a similar situation—whereas above the terminology *perioikoi* or
*hupoboikoi* may have been used variously depending on whether the speaker (or inscriber)
wanted to emphasize the fact that this class lived in the area around the *polis* or that they
were subject communities—in the same way we might consider that *apetairiai* and
*apeleutheron* might have been variously used, depending on whether the speaker (or
inscriber) wanted to emphasize the fact that this class was excluded from the *hetairiai* or
distinct from the *eleutheroi* class in general. It remains unclear, however, from this this series
of inscriptions whether or not membership in a *hetairia* was for Gortynians (or Cretans in
general) a requirement for citizenship. Nevertheless it does indicate a strong connection in
association of status between *eleutheroi* who are members of the *hetairiai* and people of
lower status who don’t hold members in the *hetairiai* and yet who are distinct from the
servile classes called the *woikeus* and *doloi*.

This is an important point to consider, especially since scholarship has often
maintained that participation in the *syssitia* was a practice exclusive to the *eleutheroi*
“citizens.” However, as we have seen, not only does the literature attest to *perioikic*
communities keeping the laws of Minos—which we can assume included the *syssitia*—but
the epigraphic evidence further attests to the absorption of existing *poleis* (whom we can
further assume were also practicing their own version of *syssitia* to begin with) under the

\(^{167}\) IC 4.78.
dominance of another stronger polis. The question becomes, would the polis reduced to perioikic status (as in the case of Kaudos) continue conducting their own syssitia, even while in part sustaining the syssitia of their overlords? As Guarducci writes, it seems that the subjugated poleis certainly would have continued their own syssitia. Just as the members of hetairai within Gortyn would have continued to pay one-tenth of their produce to their respective hetairai on top of the tithe to the state, the Kaudians must have continued to do so as well since the syssitia was a deeply embedded practice set into their traditions from an early period.168

One further note to make in terms of the inscription regarding Kaudos is that it has been pointed to as the earliest evidence of citizens paying one-tenth of their produce to the state—for not only the Kaudians, but also the Gortynians themselves are required by the inscription to pay a dekate tithe of produce of the land to the Pythion of Gortyn (as the largest temple of the city, the treasury of the Pythion of Gortyn is the treasury of the state).169 Scholars agree that the origin of the tithe in Crete lies in the syssitia practice. As Willetts writes, at an early stage, before the existence of the “larger and more authoritative state apparatus,” there was a fixed amount contributed towards the syssitia in “mutually agreed amounts” by individuals to their respective hetaireiai. Later, as the institutions of the state consolidated, the syssitia came under the auspices of state sponsorship and organization. Under the “more advanced” state-controlled system, subject-classes as well as citizens “were obliged to contribute to the now state-organized syssitia.” Later, a tithe was required to be
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169 Guarducci 1933, 488.
paid by citizens of subject cities (as in the case between the Kaudians and the Gortynians) to larger dominant cities.\textsuperscript{170} By this point, as Guarducci writes, the tithe would be a tax justified by the tradition of the \textit{syssitia} as well as embellished by the religious concept of the offering to the divinity.\textsuperscript{171}

The question here is whether or not the citizens of Gortyn—in addition to the tithe given to the state—would have also continued to give a separate tithe to their respective \textit{hetairiai}, as the tradition would mandate. De Sanctis, Guarducci, and C. Müller argue that they would, and point further to Dosiadas’s account as literary testimony to this fact. Guarducci and Müller argue that the relative ἅς in Dosiadas should not be taken to correspond with the πρόσοδοι τῆς πόλεως, but rather should be taken to mean the one \textit{and the other} tenth—one tenth being paid to the \textit{hetairia} and the other paid in the public treasury. Therefore by the Hellenistic period, not only the Gortynians but also the Lyttians paid a tenth of their produce to the state; and it is probable that citizens would have continued to pay a tenth to their respective \textit{hetariai}, since, as Guarducci writes, it was set into the traditions from an early period.\textsuperscript{172}

We have already seen how the tithe to the \textit{hetairiai} in earlier periods might have excluded some members of the population, however by this point it becomes clear that there must have been some disparity between citizens who could afford a twenty-percent cut in their income and those who could not. This further signals to me a situation in which not all citizens would be participating in the \textit{syssitia} of the \textit{hetairiai}. Such a distinction in would

\textsuperscript{170} Willetts [1955] 1980, 139-140. \\
\textsuperscript{171} Guarducci 1933, 488-489. \\
\textsuperscript{172} Guarducci 1933, 490.
also explain the importance in the Gortyn Code in distinguishing between *eleutheroi*—upper-class citizens with membership in the *hetairiai*—from those who were *apetairiai*, outside of the *eleutheroi* clubs. This is not to say that not all citizens were practicing in the *syssitia*, but rather that not all male citizens could afford membership in the exclusive dining clubs called the *hetairia*.

Critics of this hypothesis would however point to the literary testimony that a portion of the state income went towards supporting the communal meals—Dosíadas writes that a portion of the state’s income was distributed among the households of the citizens, and Aristotle writes that the entire population was maintained at the expense of the state. This hypothesis is not, however, precluded by this evidence. Rather I suggest that the income that was distributed among the households of the citizens went towards “lesser” *syssitia*, and that the *hetairiai* were a special class of dining groups with a wealthier membership than the state-sponsored dining groups. This would of course also entail separate *syssitia* events and perhaps even separate venues, disagreeing with the notion of an every-day communal dining event involving all male citizens dining together at once. As we have already seen, the likelihood that the *syssitia* during the Archaic and later periods consisted of such an event is very low. However, as we shall see in the following chapter, the hypothesis of multiple dining facilities serving a variety of dining groups is up to the present well attested in the archaeology.

**Summary**

This chapter has shown that the communal dining institution of *syssitia* was an early component of the Cretan *poleis*—as attested by early inscriptions from Gortyn and Dreros—
and continued to play a role in Cretan society throughout the Archaic and early Classical period. In combination with the literary evidence, as Willetts has argued, we may say that *syssitia* was a foundational practice throughout the island’s post-Bronze Age and pre-Roman period. Not only do the inscriptions from the island suggest the existence of *syssitia*, but they further show the practice to be intertwined with other institutions of Cretan *poleis*—such as the socio-political class organization. We have also seen a hint of some degree of exclusivity in the practice as particularly shown in the Gortyn Code’s distinction between members of dining groups called *hetairiai* and those who do not hold membership. As will be discussed in the next chapter, the archaeological evidence also seems to corroborate many of these aspects of *syssitia* in regards to sites that have been identified as possible *andreia*. However as will be discussed, although the word *andreion* is well-attested in the epigraphic evidence, the identification of the physical building itself is more problematic. Nevertheless, we can say that at the very least, the inscriptions from the island seem to confirm the literary accounts’ portrayals of *syssitia* as both a very ancient (stretching at least as far back as the seventh century BCE) and widespread practice (attested among multiple Cretan *poleis*).
CHAPTER IV. The Archaeological Evidence

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the archaeological evidence—particularly the sites and buildings—that have been associated with the practice of syssitia. Scholars have pointed to evidence of communal dining attested at a variety of sites in Crete for the EIA, Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods as possibly functioning as andreia—the venues for communal feasting (or commensality) of the Cretan citizens called syssitia. Just as the ancient literature and epigraphic testimony point to an early development of the traditional Cretan institutions such as syssitia prior to the rise of the poleis, the archaeology likewise indicates the early importance of communal dining in Cretan communities. A variety of site types have been identified as andreia, the earliest of which include the so-called Hearth Temples of Central Crete as well as other buildings and open-air sites in which communal dining is thought to have taken place with possible connections to syssitia. Following a discussion of the problems and limitations associated with the archaeological identification of syssitia in the first section below, the second section will discuss the significance of commensality as a theoretical foundation for understanding evidence associated with communal dining. The third section will overview the early sites associated with communal dining that have been linked to syssitia—including the so-called Hearth Temples of Kommos, Dreros, Prinias, and Smari, as well as other early buildings such as those at Axos and Aphrati (see Figures 34 and 37). The following section will discuss the sites that have been linked to syssitia at later sites of the Archaic through Classical and Hellenistic periods.
at Praisos and Azoria. The last section will provide a discussion of the overall trends in the
archaeological evidence linked to communal dining in the Cretan communities.

1. Identifying andreia

The identification of andreia buildings as described in the literature has been more
difficult. One difficulty in identifying andreia has to do with the common assumption that
the syssitia involved the entire body of male citizens dining together at a single time.
However, as Erickson points out, it is difficult to imagine a building large enough to
accommodate such numbers—for in the larger poleis like Gortyn and Knossos, the number of
male citizens would likely have numbered hundreds or even thousands of individuals.173 For
this reason, we ought to consider some separation of the dining groups, either in the form of
distinct groups dining in rotation in the same building or dining in distinct locations (or
perhaps some combination of the two).174

In this case, we might further consider the possibility of distinction in status regarding
the different dining groups. Although the common assumption is that all male citizens would
have been members of hetairiai, some scholars have suggested rather that only members of
the top political and economic tiers of society would have held membership to these
groups—this would certainly reduce the number of participants dining in a single building.175
However this also brings up the question of distinction between the andreia and another type
of civic building called the prytaneia. According to the textual evidence, prytaneia are
mentioned as the buildings in which the boards of the kosmoi and Elders met, shared meals,

173 Erickson 2011, 383.
174 Contra Link 1994, 18, n. 36; 2014, 163.
175 Guarducci, 1933; Talamo, 1987.
and received distinguished foreign guests. *Prytaneia* are also in some inscriptions mentioned as the building in which inscribed treaties and legal documents ought to be displayed. Guarducci’s suggestion that the communal meal of the *hetairiai* was only open to participation by those holding economic and political power raises the question of whether the *prytaneia* and *andreia* might be one and the same.

I do not think, however, that this interpretation excludes the possibility that other members of the Cretan *poleis*’s citizen class would have also been conducting their own communal meals, perhaps at different locations in distinct groups (as, we shall see, is reflected in the archaeology). Yet as will be discussed below the archaeology does attest to a degree of exclusivity in many of the buildings pointed to as possible *andreia*. Furthermore, several of the sites discussed below feature include several distinct locations in which communal dining could have taken place—for instance this may be in the case in instances of multiple, separate buildings with communal dining activities attested, or in the case various nearby site types employing a combination of feasting in the interior of a building and open air sites.

As will be seen, a further difficulty lies in the fact that communal dining buildings almost always include evidence of cultic activity—making it sometimes difficult to distinguish whether a given site might be a sanctuary or dining hall. Nearly all the sites identified as candidates for *andreia* that are discussed below have some sort of cultic associations. Cultic functions may be indicated by the presence of permanent benches lining the walls—which may be interpreted as seating for dining participants, but also may be seen as a continuation of the so-called bench temple architecture from the Late Bronze Age.
period, particularly in some cases wherein benches were found with objects interpreted to be votive dedications (such as terracotta figurines and other objects, statuettes, miniature weaponry, etc.). Also, some scholars interpret the presence of a hearth as an indication of cultic activity, as will be discussed in further detail below. Perhaps most indicative of cultic function is in the discovery of terracotta figurines in or in the area around the communal feasting site—these often take the form of anthropomorphic and animal (especially equid and bovid) terracotta figurines and statuettes as well as bronze objects (especially weaponry and miniature weaponry as well as statues).

Evidence for cultic function in sites associated with communal dining often makes it difficult to distinguish whether the sites functioned mainly as a dining hall or as a sanctuary or temple. If we are to identify these buildings as andreia, a mixed function for “sacred” and “profane” activities would not be contradictory to the literary evidence—Dosias’s account attests to the pouring of libations prior to the start of the feasts, and he also attests to a table set up in honor of Zeus. If the syssitia were practiced throughout Crete according to this description, then we ought to expect a degree of cultic function for buildings associated with communal dining. This is particularly the case regarding the tentative identification of some so-called Hearth Temples as possible andreia in the early (EIA) periods, however the discussion affects other types of communal dining sites as well, as will be discussed below.

2. Commensality

Despite the difficulties discussed above, it is important to point out the early and prolific importance of communal dining in Cretan society both in the period proceeding of the formation of the poleis (the EIA) as well as in later periods. Although communal dining
took place in a variety of architectural formats, the archaeology quite clearly expresses the importance of communal dining in the Cretan communities. Not only this, but there is also evidence for a degree of exclusivity in dining activities for some sites—which may uphold the present hypothesis for the existence of special dining groups composed of more prominent and powerful members of Cretan societies (which I identify with the *hetairiai* as described in the literature). The activities of these groups would be similar to communal dining that would have taken place in more inclusive settings (such as in the open-air locations discussed below), however the exclusive setting for these groups’ communal meals would have highlighted their distinct group membership and perhaps elite status.

Before looking at the evidence for communal dining in EIA, Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Crete in detail, it is important to first consider the broader role that commensality plays in societies more generally. Commensality (or the practice of eating in groups) in a variety of formats plays a major part in the definition of social groups, as well as of institutions and civil society. Following Dietler,\textsuperscript{176} anthropologists and archaeologists often distinguished between two major types of feasting (or commensality). On the one hand, patron role feasts emphasize the prominence and generosity of the patron or host, who supplies the food and drink consumed during the event (either directly, as in the case of an actual person, or indirectly as in the case of feasts occurring in religious festivals, wherein the god is seen as the patron). On the other hand, diacritical feasting serves to mark out membership to a certain “in” group, as Whitley writes, by means of their “knowledge of, and participation in, certain styles of consumption, with distinctive material correlates such as

\textsuperscript{176} Dietler 2001.
feasting equipment, drinking vessels etc. The classical example of this kind of commensality is the *symposion*, which by the Classical period had become widely practiced among aristocrats of the Greek mainland.

As the evidence for Crete discussed below demonstrates, in practice it is not always so easy to distinctly separate these two forms of feasting. A religious feast in which the god might be seen as patron might also be attended by an exclusive group of participants defined by particular modes of behavior associated with the feast. Further, direct or indirect associations with a certain person, group of people, or god might also underlie a diacritical feast that primarily emphasizes “in” group membership. The evidence for communal feasting in Crete (both in the formative period prior to the rise of the *poleis* in the EIA and early Archaic period as well as in later periods) shows how these two functions might be blended, as will be discussed in further detail below.

3. Early Sites of Communal Dining

The early importance of communal dining and the institution of the *andreion* itself have been connected to the development in Crete of the so-called Hearth Temples of the Early Iron Age—some of which continued in use into the Archaic period. These buildings attest, as scholars argue, to the development of communal, yet exclusive and perhaps aristocratic, dining groups from an early period. So-called hearth temples “take their name from the centrally placed, rectangular stone-built hearths in the main room,” which are
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177 Dietler 2001, 85-8; Whitley forthcoming.
often—although not always—“flanked by columns at the short sides”\textsuperscript{179} (Fig. 15). So-called Hearth Temples are known from different parts of the Aegean (for example, the better-known examples at Asine and Perachora on the Mainland),\textsuperscript{180} however early examples in Crete include Temple B at Kommos on the southern coast (constructed around 800 BCE) and the Apollo temple at Dreros (constructed around 750 BCE), as well as later examples such as Temples A and B at Prinias, the large building on the West Hill at Dreros, and another building at Smari.\textsuperscript{181} Usually Hearth Temples in Crete are located within settlements, however this is not always the case as we shall see with Temple B at Kommos.

Although the function of these buildings is not always clear, large “monumental” buildings with central rectangular hearths are often interpreted as temples for several reasons. Often hearth temples are reconstructed to include permanent benches along the interior of one or multiple walls in the main room—invoking a connection to the architecture of earlier Bronze Age “bench sanctuaries” (which were “the primary focus for community cult activities in LM IIIA-B settlements in Crete.” These buildings employ “benches for the accommodation of cult images and votives,” a function which may continue in some later Hearth Temples with benches on which objects that may be interpreted as votives were found).\textsuperscript{182} Aside from the somewhat problematic connection with bench sanctuaries, as Sjögren points out, “the presence of a hearth inside the building and the absence of any altar

\textsuperscript{179} Prent 2005, 441.
\textsuperscript{180} Ibid.; Mazarakis Ainian 1997, 280, n. 64. Mazarakis Ainian provides a full list of EIA cult buildings with central hearths.
\textsuperscript{181} Prent 2005, 441. Prent includes the cult building at Sta Lenika as another possible Hearth Temple of Crete.
\textsuperscript{182} Prent 2005, 424-425.
have prompted scholars to assume that the hearth had a cultic use. Whether the use of the hearth was profane or sacred cannot, however, really be determined. Drerup argues that the hearths within the monumental buildings called hearth temples would have served a similar function to the central hearths found in domestic buildings—namely, as a focal point around which small, seated groups shared a meal. Rather than groups of family members, however, Drerup draws parallels between hearth temple feasting group and the aristocratic banquets described by Homer in order to argue that these groups would be made up of prominent or aristocratic male members of their respective communities. As discussed below, the archaeology seems to support this notion, given the prominence of finds interpreted as “elite” or warrior goods—namely bronze and faience objects, exotica, and weaponry (including weaponry in miniature).

One early example of the hearth temples in Crete comes from the harbor town of Kommos, located on the southern coast of Crete on the western edge of the Mesara plain. Excavations here led by J. Shaw of the American School beginning in 1976 revealed a one-room rectangular structure (measuring 8.5 m E-W x 6.5 m N-S, 35 m²) which was called Temple B. This structure, built ca. 800 BCE seems to have replaced an earlier smaller building—called Temple A. Associated finds for both buildings suggest that this site was a
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183 Sjögren 2003, 64; Mazarkis Ainian 1997, 280, no. 63.
184 Sjögren 2003, 64.
186 J. Shaw 1992, 148-53; Prent 2005, 323. Although the buildings under discussion here are from the Early through Late Geometric, Orientalizing, and Archaic periods, it is important to note that Kommos was earlier a Minoan port town. After a hiatus in which the site was abandoned before the end of the LM IIIB period (ca. 1250 BCE), human activity at the site appears to have resumed in later part of the Sub-Minoan period (ca. 1020-970 BCE).
communal cult and feasting site. Temple B’s identification as an early hearth temple is due to rectangular shape of the building and the placement of a hearth on its axis, in addition to associated finds connected with cult activities.

Prior to the construction of Temple B in the eighth century BCE, this site seems to have served as a meeting place for communal cult activities, including perhaps animal sacrifice. Excavators detected a layer of ash and bone (both burnt and unburnt) inside and immediately outside the Temple A in its earliest phase (ca. 900 – ca. 800 BCE), which suggests that some sort of animal sacrifice and/or cooking took place on the site, perhaps with use of either an exterior ash altar or an unbuilt hearth in the building’s interior. A bench platform was also included along the interior North wall of Temple A at this time—which some scholars have argued to be a continuation of practice from the earlier so-called “bench-temples” of the EIA period. Associated finds for this early period include a bronze arrowhead, a folded bronze strip, and fragments of pottery found scattered both inside and outside the building. The pottery found was associated with dining, composed largely bowls and bell skyphoi (krateriskoi).
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187 Prent 2005, 326; J. Shaw 2000a, 12-13; Callaghan and Johnston 2000, 222-24 (Deposit 7). Associated finds for this period (tenth to late ninth centuries BCE) were the presence of ash, burnt and unburnt bone both inside and outside the temple, as well as two dumps associated with the cleaning of the building which yielded pottery (including skyphoi and various types of cups, bell kraters and amphorae identified by the excavator as of both local and Phoenician origin) and votives (including a small bronze shield or disc, terracotta figures and figurines of animals like bovids and horses, miniature terracotta wheels). Temple A also included permanent stone benches during its earlier and later phases, suggesting communal meeting and perhaps feasting.
188 Prent 2005, 326; J. Shaw 2000a, 24-25. Temple A’s dimensions: 6.40 m North-South x 8.08 m East-West.
189 Prent 2005, 324.
190 J. W. Shaw 2000a, 675; M. C. Shaw 2000, 151 (table 3.1), 157; ); Callaghan and Johnston 2000, 212-222; Prent 2005, 324.
The cultic significance of this site at Kommos appears to have continued into the next phase of use (ca. 800 BCE), when a second floor was laid 0.34 m higher than the first in Temple A, covering the bench (however “a remaining slab may indicate the construction of a second bench”).\(^{191}\) Associated with this floor were several beads of stone and faience, a miniature terracotta chariot wheel, as well as pottery connected with the consumption of food and drink—including bell *skyphoi* and other cups, krater fragments, as well as some sherds identified as Phoenician and either Cycladic or Attic. More beads (fourteen of faience and one of glass), several terracotta wheel-made bovids in fragments, a bronze shaft, and a bronze arrowhead were also found outside the temple for this period. Two areas to the NE and S of the building were also identified by excavators as dumps associated with the cleanup of Temple A at this time. Deposits in these areas included large amounts of discarded pottery such *skyphoi*, various kinds of cups (including Attic/Cycladic cups), bell kraters, and amphorae (identified by the excavator as a combination of local examples and Phoenician imports). Additionally found were apparent votives such as terracotta and bronze animal figurines (mostly bovid and equid figures), miniature terracotta wheels, and various other bronze items (including a small bronze shield or disc, a bronze fibula and needle, a bronze male ithyphallic figurine).\(^{192}\)

Around 800 BCE, Temple A appears to have been replaced by a larger structure (Temple B), however the site’s communal and sacred functions appear to have continued (Fig. 16). The new building (6.40 m N-S x 8.08 m E-W) contained a bench running along the north and perhaps the south interior wall (0.40 m high and 0.44-0.54 m wide), a small
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\(^{191}\) Prent 2005, 324.

\(^{192}\) Prent 2005, 326; J. Shaw 2000a, 12-13; Callaghan and Johnston 2000, 222-24 (Deposit 7).
circular hearth made of cobbles on the axis of the building, as well as an installment of three upright cut stones placed behind the hearth—identified by the excavator as a ‘tripillar shrine’ of Phoenician inspiration (Fig. 17). The floor level outside the building was raised at the time of Temple B’s construction, covering over a Minoan road to the N-E and a small three-sided enclosure was added to the court on the eastern side.\(^{193}\) The dump to the South of the building continued in use at this time and included large numbers of Geometric pottery including drinking vessels and amphorae among patches of burning and limpet shells.\(^{194}\) At the lowest and earliest floor level of Temple B, excavators found items identified as votives—such as fragments of terracotta animal figures and figurines, weapons (like a bronze arrowhead or javelin point and shield), and other items such as a scaraboid bead, fragments of a faience bowl, a miniature kalathos, and a small bronze perforated disc. Pottery at this level included drinking cups and hydriae fragments, and there were also the indications of burnt animal sacrifice within the building evidenced by the presence of bunt and unburnt sheep and/or goat bones.\(^{195}\) A new building (called Building Z) was also added at this time to the southeast of Temple B, which contained fragments of cooking and drinking vessels (including kraters) as well as animal bones and shells and other items such as an iron arrowhead, four spearheads, and possible stone fishing weights.\(^{196}\)

During Temple B’s second phase, beginning after ca. 760 BCE a retaining wall was added to the Temple’s entrance, perhaps in order to keep accumulating debris out of the

\(^{193}\) Prent 2005, 326; J. Shaw 2000a, 24-25.
\(^{194}\) Prent 2005, 326; Callaghan and Johnston 2000, 200, 229-31 (Deposits 11-13).
\(^{196}\) Prent 2005, 26.
building’s interior. Also at this time, the floor level was raised as was the level of the hearth. The ‘tripillar shrine’ received additions of a leather and bronze shield (0.69 m in diameter), which placed behind the three pillars. Also, wedged between the two southern pillars at this time was a small bronze horse figure with a faience figurine of the Egyptian goddess Sekhmet lying horizontally on its back. Also, a male faience figurine was likewise wedged between the central and northern pillars. On and around the base slab of the shrine were also found other offerings, including two small bronze discs, an iron spearhead, a bronze bull figurine, bits of gold foil, faience and glass beads, and also fragments of terracotta horse figurine and other animal figurines.197 Pottery from this phase included Geometric/Orientalizing pottery, including cups and aryballoi as well as a significant number imports from Eastern Greece (including transport amphorae) and also some sherds identified by the excavator as Phoenician.198 Also at this time, a new court of packed earth was laid out to the east of the Temple (with an area of at least 12.10 m North-South by 50 m East-West), and an altar (Altar U) was built to the east of Temple B in the late eighth century BCE (measuring 0.50 m high and 1.50/1.74 by 1.35/1.47 m), inside which was found about 38 kg of burnt cattle and sheep/goat bones.199 North of this altar was also added an unusual double hearth built with upright slabs (2.0 x 0.85 m, 0.20 deep). In the Western compartment of this exterior hearth were found ash mixed with fish and pig bones, and around it were found

197 Prent 2005, 327; J. Shaw 2000a, 15-16 (table 1.4), 22-23 (with further cross refs.); 1989, 171-172, figs. 4-5.
198 Prent 2005, 327; Callaghan and Johnston 2000, 234-235 (deposit 17); Bikai 2000, 305 (table 4.2).
thousands of limpet shells and four iron knives. Additionally, in different spots on the court, new small three-sided enclosures of an unknown function were also built.

During Temple B’s third phase (beginning around 650 BCE), the floor within the building was raised again to the same height as the top of the bench and a new hearth was built in rectangular form made of carefully placed upright slabs (a departure from the form of its predecessors). An additional smaller hearth was added within the building to the west, covering to a large extent the ‘tripillar shrine’ (the central pillar may have been broken off during this time). Within this western hearth was found some sheet bronze, and nearby it was an iron bit. A large number of aryballoi cups were found in the building for this period, two of which were uniquely incised with warrior and running figures. Other items found included fragments of faience and terracotta animal figures and figurines, as well as fossilized oyster shells and other shells, a scarab, and a silver and bronze finger ring. In this phase, the court outside Temple B “consisted of a surface with chalky patches of lavender, lilac, orange and white colour,” and the eastern part of the court had “many small pits, small platforms and burnt surfaces, as well as a circular well (of 1 m in diameter).” During the seventh century, Building Q was constructed ca. 12 m south of Temple B. The purpose of this building seems to have been mainly that of storage of bulk goods. Koehl has suggested that Building Q functioned largely as a sort of pantry storing the foodstuffs and other items associated with
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202 Measuring 0.84 by 0.84 m.
204 Sjögren 2003, 63, 127.
the dining activities that apparently took place in Temple B during its third phase.\textsuperscript{205} This would seem to be supported by the finds from Building Q, which included a large number of transport amphorae, kraters, cups, hydriai, and jugs.\textsuperscript{206} Towards the end of the third phase in Temple B (during late seventh century BCE) the rising floor level began to cover over the bench as well as the upper part of the three pillars of the shrine. During this time, ritual meals or feasts continued to be held, however the Temple was cleaned out less regularly over time than in previous periods. Just before the abandonment of the building around 600 BCE, the building was apparently pilfered and many vessels were thrown out into the outside court. Finally, after 600 BCE, the Temple was apparently deserted, “although there are some signs of human activity in the E part of the court.”\textsuperscript{207} Around the same time that Temple B went out of use, Building Q also ceased in use.\textsuperscript{208}

Throughout this site’s use from the EIA to around 600 BCE, the site seems to have served as a venue for communal gatherings and feasts—indicated by both the large size of Temple B’s main room (ca. 35 m\textsuperscript{2}), the presence of stone benches and hearths, as well as the large numbers of drinking and dining equipment associated with each phase of the Temple’s use. The site also had an apparent cultic significance, indicated by the finds of votive figurines and other votive items and perhaps most significantly by the so-called Phoenician tripillar shrine. The form of the shrine as well as its associated finds including the Egyptian figures have suggested to scholars that Kommos functioned for a time as an “international”

\begin{flushleft}
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sanctuary. According to the excavator J. Shaw, the covering and abandonment of the tripillar shrine during the third phase of Temple B’s use represents a significant break in the traditions and practices associated with the site in earlier periods. Whereas in earlier periods, Temple B appears to have been either an “international” or “Orientalizing” cult site, during the third phase local tradition appears to have become “more dominant or even exclusive.”

Such a local tradition, Prent writes, “entailed the dedication of terracotta bovine figures (which continued into [Hellenistic] times) and of bronze animal figurines, discs, shields and smaller weaponry such as arrowheads.” From the time of Temple A onwards, animal sacrifice appears to have continued in importance, attested to by the presence of burnt bones in and around the temple buildings.

Sjögren writes that during its last phase of use, Temple B seems to have functioned exclusively for communal dining, attested by the removal of ‘cultic’ elements in the building—the new floor of this phase leveled the tripillar shrine and the altar U in front of Temple B was enlarged, suggesting that “some of the cultic activities connected with the earlier cultic installation inside the building had been moved outside.” Such evidence for seemingly exclusive use of Temple B for feasting during this last period has led scholars such as Samuelsson and Bergquist to question the interpretation of the building as commonly assumed to be a temple.

Although the evidence suggests that activities in Temple B were to some degree communal, the group of individuals participating in activities within the building would have
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been a group of limited size, owing to the limited size of the building’s interior. Prent points out that the nature of votive objects found within the Temple building (including “weapons, Oriental faience objects and a relatively large number of horse and chariot figurines”) suggests that participating individuals must have been a restrictive group of male aristocrats or perhaps male citizens (according to the andreon model).\textsuperscript{213} The members of groups participating in activities within the temple might have been a diverse group, composed of leading members of various communities in the Mesara region as well as “international” participants from outside Crete (such as other Greeks, Phoenicians, or Egyptians).\textsuperscript{214} While the group involved in activities within the Temple B building might have been relatively small, perhaps a larger group of more common people would have participated in cult activities outside the building in the large open-air court area—as suggested by the installment of Altar U and of the double hearth in court outside Temple B.

Another important site linked to the early development of communal and perhaps civic dining is at Dreros in the Northeastern Crete (Fig. 18). Excavations at Dreros began in 1917 on the West Hill in the area in which the earlier-discussed inscription recording the oath the Drerian youth was found in 1854.\textsuperscript{215} These excavations revealed a large monumental structure, which the excavator Xanthoudides identified as the archive of the town of Dreros and temple of Apollo Delphinios mentioned in the inscription (although no other inscriptions

\textsuperscript{213} Prent 2005, 475.
\textsuperscript{214} Watrous et al. 1993, 475, 523-27. At least two settlements in the Mesara might be associated with the sanctuary at Kommos—one of which was detected in the hills bordering the south of the Mesara plain above the modern village of Siva (founded in LM IIIC and occupied into the Geometric period), and the other being Phaistos (a site which traditionally has strong links to Kommos and became one of the most powerful poleis in the Mesara).
\textsuperscript{215} Prent 2005, 283; Van Effenterre 1937, 327-332; IC 1.83-88, late third or early second century BC.
were reported to have been found in the building). However the accidental discovery of three bronze statuettes in the saddle area between the two hills of Dreros in 1935 as well as the discovery of eight seventh century legal inscriptions in a Hellenistic cistern during later excavations in that area have led to a re-identification of the Temple of Apollo Delphinios as a separate structure lying downhill in the saddle (Figs. 19 & 20). Excavations beginning in 1935 revealed a much older structure that constituted one of the earliest cult buildings of Greece. Built around 750 BCE, the structure in the saddle consisted of a large rectangular room (ca. 7.20 x 10.90 m$^2$, 49.5 m$^2$) containing a central rectangular hearth on the building’s axis (owing to the building’s identification as a hearth temple). Because the side walls seemed to protrude towards the northwest, the excavator reconstructed a 1.20 – 1.40 m wide area in front as a narrow pronaos to the building with a flat roof supported by a number of columns. Inside the hearth on the building’s interior were found ash as well as “a thin iron plate with irregular hole (‘key-hole’) and some nails.” About a meter north of the hearth was found a stone column base (a second column was reconstructed for the south side, based on analogy with Temple A at Prinias, to be discussed below). The interior of the building also included a stone bench (1.34 x 0.76 x 0.95 m high) along the wall in the SW
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217 Prent 2005, 286; Sjögren 2003, 161. Sjögren provides alternate measurements for the building as ca. 9 x 5.5, 49.5 m$^2$.
218 Prent 2005, 286.
219 Prent 2005, 287; Marinatos 1935, 257-60, 269-73, fig. 22 (kalathos), fig. 28:7 (appliqués), fig. 22 (bases), fig. 34:1,3 (Daed heads), pl. XXIV (gorgoneion); Schiering 1964; Adams 1978, 80; Boardman 1961, 142- 43. The bronze gorgoneion, with a stand at the back and therefore not a shield, is dated to the late seventh century BC by Schiering, to the early sixth century BC by Marinatos and Adams and to 600-550 BC by Boardman.
220 Prent 2005, 287; Marinatos 1936, 227, 23-34.
corner. On the bench were found some bone and ash as well as several objects, including a bronze *gorgoneion* with incised decoration, two Daed heads, two clay bases for unknown objects, a clay *kalathos* with a female *protome*. Most of the objects have been dated to the seventh century BCE, with the exception of the *gorgoneion*, which has been dated to the sixth century BCE. At the base of the bench was discovered a layer of black substance in which were several small broken cups of Geometric date, bits of carbon, and animal bone (including bovid teeth and goat horns). Against the eastern side of the bench was also built a so-called horn altar or *keraton* about half a meter lower than the bench. Inside the *keraton* were found the horns of young goats, one horn of a calf, a round potsherd, two iron knives, and a fragment of one of the *sphyrelata* statues. An upright slab in front of the bench and *keraton* probably supported a nearby fragmentary round stone table (0.90 m in diameter). Other finds in the building included another stone table, a stone quern, two bronze rings that may have been attached to a mitra, as well as fragments of pottery and iron.

Finds associated with the building in the saddle point to the site’s cultic significance.

One indication of a sacred character for the building is the presence of a bench with cult
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221 Prent 2005, 287.
222 Prent 2005, 287.
223 Prent 2005, 287; Marinatos 1936, 257-60, 269-73, fig. 22 (kalathos), fig. 28:7 (appliqués), fig. 22 (bases), fig. 34:1,3 (Daed heads), pl. XXIV (gorgoneion); Schiering 1964; Adams 1978, 80; Boardman 1961, 142- 43. The bronze gorgoneion, with a stand at the back and therefore not a shield, is dated to the late seventh century BC by Schiering, to the early sixth century BC by Marinatos and Adams and to 600-550 BC by Boardman.
224 Prent 2005, 288; Marinatos 1935, 479-8 1; Marinatos 1936, 224, 243; 1936, 21b; Kirsten 1940, 135.
225 At the same level in which three bronze sphyrelaton statuettes had been discovered prior to the commencement of excavations.
226 Prent 2005, 288; Marinatos 1935, 208; 1936, 222-25, 24 1-44, 274, fig. 18, fig. 39 (metal finds); 1937, 244.
227 Prent 2005, 288; Marinatos 1936, 222, 225-26, figs. 10-1 2.
228 Marinatos 1936, 227-28, figs. 39-40; Prent 2005, 288.
images—especially the three bronze sphyrelata statues, whose chance discovery led to the excavation of the temple in the saddle, and which are commonly identified as images of Apollo, Lato and Artemis. The discovery near the box containing goat horns has been connected to the well-known keraton horn-altar for Apollo at Delos mentioned by Plutarch. The horns might also be taken in conjunction with the presence of the hearth (with evidence of burning) as well as the two stone tables to indicate that the building was a venue for communal feasting. Inscriptions associated with the site would seem to support the identification of the building as a sanctuary—seventh century legal inscriptions found in the adjacent Hellenistic cistern led to the identification of the building as the archive of the city of Dreros, and the excavator pointed to the oath of the Drerian youth inscription as evidence that the building served as the temple of Apollo Delphinios. However, as Sjögren points out, we cannot directly assume that the building was already the temple of Apollo Delphinios at this time, since the earliest evidence naming the building (the oath of the Drerian youth) is much later, belonging to the third century BCE.

With the identification of the building in the saddle at Dreros came a need to reconsider the function of the building on the West Hill. Following the identification of the Temple of Apollo Delphinios in the saddle, Marinatos suggested that the West Hill building

\[\text{Boardman 1961, 137; Beyer 1976, 20; Lebessi 1980, 92; Coldstream 1981, 346; Prent 2005, 285.}\]
\[\text{Theseus 2.1; Prent 2005, 288. Prent points out that the difference, however, is “that at Delos the altar itself was made out of the dedicated horns.”}\]
\[\text{Marinatos 1935, 209-10, figs. 9, 11; 1936, 255; 1937, 247; Prent 2005, 285-286. These inscriptions must have fallen from the building and into the Hellenistic cistern after the site went out of use after the Hellenistic period.}\]
\[\text{Sjögren 2003, 63.}\]
was an *andreion* instead of a temple.\(^{233}\) This monumental structure (10.70 x 24 m., with 1.25-1.35 m thick walls of large roughly hewn blocks) of Northwest to Southeast orientation has two main rooms—a ‘pronaos’ in the east and a larger ‘naos’ in the west—as well as an additional smaller room (4 x 4 m) set to the northeastern corner of the building. Roughly in the center of the main western room (or *naos*) was a pi-shaped hearth, within which were traces of fire and charcoal. Two stone column bases (0.40 m in diameter) were also found on the western side of the hearth, however they were not found *in situ*. Adjacent to the hearth were several paving slabs.\(^{234}\) The excavator Xanthoudides recognized an abundance of pieces of bronze in the interior of the building, including fragments of weaponry such as shields, mitrai, cuirasses, greaves, and helmets. Complete examples of three mitrai and a large helmet fragment “have been published and dated to the late seventh or early sixth century BCE.”\(^{235}\) A sparse amount of terracottas were found in and around the building, one of which included the upper half of a plaque of a female figure (likely of seventh century BCE date) as well as fragments of bull figurines (not dated) and spindle whorls.\(^{236}\) No pottery from the building was published, except for one Early Orientalizing lekythos and the excavator’s mention of some Late Geometric sherds.\(^{237}\)

The identification of the building on the West Hill of Dreros as an *andreion* has been proposed by several scholars. With a spacious interior and hearth, the West Hill building

\(^{233}\) Marinatos 1936, 254; Prent 2005, 284. Prent: “The issue of the identification and function of this and similar buildings will be discussed in section 6 of this chapter, p. 441-76.”
\(^{234}\) Prent 2005, 283.
\(^{235}\) Xanthoudides 1918, 28; fig. 12; Levi 1930-31, 78-82, figs. 28-29; J. Boardman 1961, 141-42; Hoffmann 1972, 45; Prent 2005, 284.
\(^{236}\) Xanthoudides 1918, 28; Prent 2005, 284. Unfortunately none of these are illustrated.
\(^{237}\) Prent 2005, 284; Xanthoudides 1918, 28; Levi 1930-31, 82, fig. 30.
would have served as an ideal location for communal feasting. Although the deposition of weapons in monumental buildings such as this is often associated with the dedication of votives to a deity, Viviers points out that we might alternatively interpret the presence of weapons as a practice connected with the *andreion*. As the literary sources stress the political and military character of the *andreion* as well as the association of the *andreia* with other aspects of military education of the youth, Viviers suggests that weaponry may have also been displayed within the *andreion* as visual component of the tradition of commemorating the deeds of valiancc in battle of those participating in the *andreion* common meal and those of their ancestors.\(^{238}\)

Some scholars have also argued that a civic function ought also to be considered for the building in the saddle. In 1936, to the east of the so-called temple was found a large stepped area (ca. 23 x 40 m) on the same floor level as the temple.\(^{239}\) Scholars have pointed to similarities between this site layout that of the later *agorai* of Cretan *poleis*, particularly that of nearby Lato (Fig. 21).\(^{240}\) Such similarities in layout have led some scholars to suggest an identification of the building not as a temple, but rather as a *prytaneion*. The *prytaneia* of the Cretan *poleis* are mentioned in inscriptions as the buildings in which the board of *kosmoi* formally met, and where they also dined and received foreign guests. The *prytaneia* are also commonly mentioned as containing the community’s central and sacred hearth, which as Prent points out, makes the so-called Hearth Temples (such as identified here at Dreros and elsewhere) perhaps the best candidates for identifying *prytaneia* in the archaeological
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\(^{238}\) Viviers 1994, 244-249; Prent 2005, 386.
\(^{239}\) Prent 2005, 285.
\(^{240}\) Prent 2005, 285.
record. Similarities in the layout of the building in the Drerian saddle to that of other later buildings elsewhere for which the identification as *prytaneia* are generally well accepted (namely, that of the Complex 36-39 in Lato) suggest a similar function for the Drerian saddle building. Also, Hellenistic inscriptions indicate the *prytaneia* as the places in which treaties should be installed for display, and the inscriptions found within the nearby Hellenistic cistern are generally considered to have fallen from the building under consideration. The excavator Marinatos originally did identify the building in the saddle as a *prytaneion*, however later re-identified the building as a temple based on similarities with Temples A and B at Prinias, to which we shall turn next.

On the steep Patela Hill about 1 km Northeast of the modern village of Prinias, between 1906-1908 excavations led by Pernier of the Italian School revealed two large buildings adjacent to one another (Fig. 22) within a large settlement occupied between the LMIIC and the Hellenistic period. The excavator Pernier called these two buildings, which appear to have overlapped in use, ‘Temple A’ and ‘Temple B.’ The building to the south, Temple B, “appears to be the older of the two,” probably build during the eighth or seventh century BCE (however Mazarakis Ainian proposes a possible Subminoan or Proto-Geometric date). Temple B is a large, nearly rectangular structure oriented almost east to
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241 Prent 2005, 460.
242 Prent 2005, 460-461.
243 Prent 2005, 456. Prent: “HL inscriptions indicate that [prytaneia] contained the public hearth (Vianos and Dreros), served as dining rooms for the kosmoi and as reception hall for kosmoi from other poleis (Malla), and as places to put up treaties (Gortyn and Lato, Phaistos).”
244 Marinatos 1936, 232-33; Prent 2005, 460-461.
west, converging on one end slightly more towards the east.\textsuperscript{247} There are two main rooms—a ‘pronaos’ on the southeastern end, a ‘naos’ in the center, and a smaller third room on the northwestern end (which seems to be a later addition, since its northern was is not bonded to the cella of the main building). The large main central room contained a large rectangular central hearth (2.75 x 1/0.9 m), lined with upright stone slabs ca. 0.10 m in height. The earth inside the hearth was reddened by fire, however there is no mention of bones or bone fragments.\textsuperscript{248} A 0.67 x 0.32 m slab to the east and adjacent to the hearth “may have served as a column base.”\textsuperscript{249} Pernier also suggested that a grooved conical stone (0.37 m high, 0.34-0.17 in diameter) against the west side of the hearth might also have served as an altar or offering table.\textsuperscript{250} In the northwestern corner of the main room was also found a stone basin (0.45 m in diameter and 0.20 m deep) beside a stone slab (1 x 0.65 m), which has been interpreted as a receptacle for libations or offerings.\textsuperscript{251} In the smaller room at the rear of the building the fragments of at least six relief-pithos were found, suggesting that this smaller room was likely used for storage.\textsuperscript{252} Many of the finds from this building have led to its common identification as a temple—the central hearth with a possible altar as well as a possible libation basin. However it is important to consider that no bones were mentioned in the excavation report, which leaves the question of animal sacrifice occurring in the building ambiguous. Also, relatively few object were found in the building, and as Prent notes, none

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{247} Prent 2005, 464, 253; Pernier 1908, 457-62; 1914, 19; Sjögren 2003, 62. With dimension of ca. 18 x 6/5 m, ca. 41 m\textsuperscript{2}, with walls ca. 0.53 m thick and preserved up to a height of 0.95 m. \\
\textsuperscript{248} Prent 2005, 254; Sjögren 2003, 62; Pernier 1914, 42, 95.\\
\textsuperscript{249} Prent 2005, 254.\\
\textsuperscript{250} Prent 2005, 254.\\
\textsuperscript{251} Pernier 1914, 42, figs. 15-16, 92; Prent 2005, 254.\\
\textsuperscript{252} Sjögren 2003, 62.}
of them can be definitively identified as votives.\textsuperscript{253} Mazarakis Ainian also points out that the round base found attached to the hearth (which the excavator identified as a possible altar) might have rather served some utilitarian purpose—and with the absence of finds associated with this base we cannot whether or not it did serve as an altar.\textsuperscript{254} Prent points out that the identification of this building as having a sacred and cultic function “is to a large extent based on the correspondences in plan with Temple A immediately to the N[orth].”\textsuperscript{255}

Temple A at Prinias was probably built during the seventh century BCE, and has a similar layout to Temple B, however it is considered to be the more monumental of the two. Like Temple B, it contains a ‘pronaos’ as well as a large central room (‘naos’, ca. 58 m\textsuperscript{2}) with a large rectangular central hearth, however unlike Temple B, the orientation of Temple A is slightly more tilted from the southeast to the northwest, and there is no smaller rear room attached at the northwestern end. In the main room, a short stone bench is built against the southern wall.\textsuperscript{256} Within the hearth in the main room, excavators found an abundance of animal bones and ash. Throughout the main room were also found fineware pottery as well as several fragments of clay cauldrons and also fragments of bronze weaponry. Although votive objects are scarce, one miniature bronze shield and two pins were found which “may pass as objects dedicated within the building.”\textsuperscript{257}

The exterior of the building was once decorated with architectural sculpture, which was found in front of the entrance (the original placement is uncertain). Such sculpture

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotesize
\item[253]{Prent 2005, 464.}
\item[254]{Mazarakis Ainian 1997, 224f; Sjögren 2003, 62.}
\item[255]{Prent 2005, 253-254; Pernier 1914, 91-92; D'Acunto 1995, 26-29.}
\item[256]{Sjögren 2003, 62; Prent 2005, 465.}
\item[257]{Sjögren 2003, 62; Pernier 1914, 74.}
\end{footnotes}
included nine mounted warriors that might have been part of a frieze on the eastern side of the building (Fig. 25), two seated female figures found on the lintel above the entrance, two standing female figures found on the underside of the lintel carved in relief (Figs. 23 & 24), as well as some stone fragments of deer, lions, and sphinxes. The sculptural style of the architectural decorations provided the basis for Temple A’s dating to the last quarter of the seventh century BCE. The sculpture has been taken in conjunction with the presence of the small bench against the south wall as evidence for the identification of the building as a temple—for example, the seated female figures found above the lintel are often interpreted as goddesses.  

Watrous has also interpreted the warrior frieze as representing the nine Kouretes (or Cretan mountain daemons) and relating to religious initiation ceremonies held within the temple.

However some scholars have suggested that Temple A may not have been a temple, but rather that it functioned as a dining hall or andreion. While very few items were found within the building that might be interpreted as votives, feasting is well attested by the large amount of animal bones and ash found within the central hearth of the main room as well as by fineware pottery found in the central room indicative of food serving and consumption. The warrior frieze that probably decorated the eastern exterior of the building has been interpreted by d’Acunto as representing the class of aristocratic warriors who would have
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258 Prent 2005, 118.
261 Sjögren 2003, 62.
participated in feasting activities within the building.\textsuperscript{262} Such iconography matches well with the function of \textit{syssitia} portrayed in the literature as celebrating and promoting militaristic values among participants. Carter compares the iconography of decoration around the lintel with that of ivory plaques that decorated the wooden couches of participants in the Syro-Palestinian dining practice of \textit{marzeah}.\textsuperscript{263} Carter suggests that the Prinian aristocrats consciously referenced Near Eastern dining practices in their feasts held in the building in order to enhance their status and perhaps give expression to their own held beliefs.\textsuperscript{264}

The buildings discussed above each share a fairly direct association with cultic activities. However on the summit of the Prophitis Elias hill near the modern village of Smari, excavators identified a large building complex (ca. 20 x 25 m, 500 m\textsuperscript{2}; Fig. 26) with evidence of communal dining, however with no evidence of cultic use within the building itself. Built at the end of the eighth century BCE, this complex is made of three house units, each with an area of about 126 m\textsuperscript{2}, and each containing a large central room as well as a small porch and small rear room. Inside the main room of Unit A, the presence of a hearth is indicated by an area of ca. 2 m\textsuperscript{2} covered with earth reddened by fire, encircled by upright slabs and stones. All four interior walls of the main room were lined with permanent benches, on top of which were found sherds of relief-pithoi. Unit B was attached to Unit A along its entire southern wall, and like A, it contains a large central room (36.5 m\textsuperscript{2}) with

\textsuperscript{262} D’Acunto 1995, 49f. D’Acunto points to the warrior frieze as representing the aristocracy of Prinias and serving as a conscious political statement in relationship to the formation of the Prinian \textit{polis}, however he maintains that the building did have a cultic function. He suggests that Temple A did nevertheless have more than a religious importance and also functioned additionally as a dining hall for aristocrats.

\textsuperscript{263} Prent 2005, 542-543. As Prent writes, “\textit{Marzeah} consisted of groups of prominent [Syro-Palestinian] men, who associated themselves with a particular deity.” These men dined together on wooden couches decorated to the sculptural decoration of the Temple A at Prinias.

\textsuperscript{264} Carter 1997, 74-95, 112.
permanent benches lining all four walls of the main room and a hearth. Unit Δ was likewise attached to Unit B along its southern wall, and like both A and B, it contained a hearth in the central room, however no permanent benches were found in the central room. Bones of animals such as sheep, pigs, and birds were found throughout the area, however an especially large amount of bones as well as burnt matter were associated with the prodomos of A. Pottery finds indicate that this building complex was in use through the Late Geometric and Early Orientalizing periods.  

Since the main complex itself contained nothing to indicate a cult function, excavator Chatzi-Vallianou suggested an identification of the building complex as a ruler’s dwelling. Sjögren however writes that the layout of the complex—with three large, consecutive rooms with built-in benches and large central hearths would also have “offered an almost ideal form of ‘dining house’.” These features have made the building complex another candidate for an andreion building housing the feasts of dining groups in this settlement. However, even though there were no obvious cultic activities within the complex itself, in 1995, excavators uncovered nearby a small (5.4 x 3.8/4 m) freestanding cult building between Building A and the northern peribolos. Within this building was a small construction made of four stone slabs stacked on top of one another, which may have served as an altar or offering table. Around this structure were found evidence of burning (charcoal and burnt animal bone), a large number of terracotta figurines, votive plaques, and pottery ranging in date from the EIA

\[\text{Footnotes:}\]

267 Sjögren 2003, 63.
to the Roman period, “indicating that cult continued until long after the abandonment of the [EIA] settlement.”

Hearth temples are not the only type of building that has been connected to communal dining in the EIA, Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods. However some of these buildings have been identified in connection to communal dining and andreia based on very scant evidence from early archaeological excavations in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Italian excavations during the late nineteenth century, for example, revealed part of a monumental building at the summit of the acropolis of an EIA settlement at Axos (Fig. 27). This building was excavated only partially, and therefore details regarding its dating and function are scant. In a nearby deposit directly to the southwest of the building were found terracotta animal figurines and a large number of relief-pithos fragments dating to the Orientalizing and Archaic periods. In a cistern directly west of the building, excavators found more pottery sherds as well as animal bones. While this evidence might suggest the building had a cultic function, as Prent writes, “the concomitant discovery of the A inscription… which refers to provisions for artisans in the andreion, adds the possibility that it served as a dining hall for hetereiai.” However with so little evidence, it is difficult to definitively assign any function to this building at Axos.

Another building for which an andreion function has been suggested, but for which it is difficult to definitively assign any function, is the large complex on the SE slope of the Ayios Elias or Aï-Lia hill near the modern village of Aphrati (in the eastern Mesara region of
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268 Prent 2005, 277-278.
269 Sjögren 2003, 148.
270 Prent 2005, 466-467.
Excavations under Lebessi commenced here in 1968 after a large number of bronze weaponry and relief pithoi began to appear on the international art market. After the robbers of the site confessed, Lebessi led excavations in the area indicated and uncovered the remains of an EIA complex that, although it had been much disturbed, still contained additional fragments of bronze weaponry.\(^{271}\)

The latest construction phase of the complex has a likely date of seventh century BCE, during which the complex consisted of a large (at least 12 x 22.5 m) rectangular space with a rectangular main room (12 x 6.8 m). Although the main room was disturbed down to the bedrock, “it was clear that a continuous bench (0.4 x 0.45 m high) had lined the walls.” An entrance to the building is indicated by an interruption on the southern wall, however this seems to have later been blocked and replaced by an entrance on the eastern side of the building complex.\(^{272}\)

Notable finds from the mixed fill of the building included an additional bronze mitra, a large number of Late Geometric to Early Orientalizing sherds (and additionally Late Orientalizing and Byzantine sherds as well as a Classical Attic “Bandschale”), animal bones, and agrimi (Cretan goat) horns.\(^{273}\) Among the bronzes that were stolen from this complex were five helmets (Fig. 29), eight cuirasses, and sixteen mitrai (fourteen of which were incised with decorations and inscriptions indicating the names of either owners or dedicators; Fig. 30). These items have been dated from between 650 – 625 BCE into the early sixth century BCE.

\(^{271}\) Lebessi 1969, 415; Prent 2005, 279.
\(^{272}\) Prent 2005, 279-280.
century BCE.\textsuperscript{274} Other items with likely provenance from this complex include the above-mentioned relief pithoi that were sold on the international art market as well as a clary antefix that appeared among the objects in a foreign collection which sharing similarities with a chance find handed over by local inhabitants in the form of a LDaed female head.\textsuperscript{275}

Lebessi originally identified the building complex as a sanctuary, based on its size, the presence of a bench (seemingly a continuation of bench sanctuary architecture), and the bronzes and other items interpreted to be dedicated votives.\textsuperscript{276} However Viviers has more recently suggested that the building might rather have functioned as an andreion. The large size of the main room (ca. 55 m$^2$) in combination with the continuous stone benches would make the room well suited for communal dining activities. Further, in connection to the large (ca. 248 m$^2$) enclosed nearby courtyard, as Sjögren writes, “the entire area constituted a good place for communal gatherings.” We have also already seen how the presence of the armor might not necessarily be interpreted as votives to a god, but might additionally or alternatively serve as a visual component of the promotion of military values detailed in the literary accounts of the andreion.\textsuperscript{277} However due to the disturbance and looting of the building, it is difficult to assign any function to the Aphrati complex.

4. Later Tentative andreia

While all of the examples discussed above have been pointed to as possible candidates as andreia buildings, their identification is (as we have seen) problematic and not

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{274} Prent 2005, 280.\textsuperscript{275} Prent 2005, 280; Hornborstel 1970; Alexious, Platon, and Guanella 1968, 216, 227; Hoffmann 1970, 292.\textsuperscript{276} Lebessi 1969, 417; Prent 2005, 280.\textsuperscript{277} Viviers 1994, 244-249; Prent 2005, 280.}
widely agreed upon among the large body of scholarship. Nevertheless, the above examples
do attest to the importance of spaces for communal dining from an early period preceding the
formation of the *poleis* in the EIA. There has unfortunately been very little work done
towards investigating how this and other practices continued as part of the later *poleis* in
Crete after the seventh century BCE. However two projects in eastern Crete (namely, at
Praisos and Azoria) have in recent years begun to unveil some interesting glimpses into the
ways in which communal dining continued to play a role in the later Archaic, Classical, and
Hellenistic Cretan *poleis*.

Excavations at Praisos began initially in the early twentieth century under Federico
Halbherr and Robert Bosanquet. In 1901, Bosanquet led excavations of a large monumental
building on the northwest slope of the First Acropolis of Praisos that came to be called the
“Almond Tree House” (Fig. 31). 278 The excavations revealed a massive building occupying
the better part of the 20 x 30 m area that was purchased for the project. 279 The building is
almost rectangular with the SW wall modified to accommodate a street, oriented roughly
NW-SE, and quite architecturally complex with nine rooms—the largest (room 9) measuring
10.40 x 8.70 m. 280 The size and complexity of the building immediately signaled to the
excavators that the building served some civic function. Coins found in the building range
from the fourth to the second century BCE, however the pottery found therein suggest a third
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278 Bosanquet 1901/1902, 260. Bosanquet notes that the nickname came from the fact that “[a]n old
almond-tree growing in the south-west angle afforded us shade during the midsummer heats. We were able to
preserve its roots unharmed, and for many years to come its green boughs, a rare sight on that arid plateau, will
guide the traveller to the monument which bears its name.”

279 Bosanquet 1901/1902, 260.

280 Bosanquet 1901/1902, 264.
rather than fourth century date for the building’s construction. Bosanquet suggested an identification of the building as an andreion—more specifically a koiometerion—a “public guest house” according to the passage in Dosiadas. However as J. Whitley writes, “very little of what [Bosanquet] excavated was saved” and most of the material from within the building “was dumped just in front of the building”—i.e., along the outer NW wall.

In 2007, a British team led by Whitley were able to test Bosanquet’s identification of the building by re-excavating the dump in front of the “Almond Tree House.” Although initially skeptical, Whitley eventually concluded that the building must have functioned as an andreion after considering a variety of factors including the nature of material recovered from the building’s fill. Among the notable finds were a large number of cup fragments making up at most 20% of the finds (calculated by the number of sherds, not by weight). The cups were mostly of Classical or Early Hellenistic date and were mostly of typical Cretan types (high-necked and low-necked cups). Overall, the cups seemed to the excavator “quite large” but “very thin” (having rim diameters of between 9 to 13 cm, and walls up to 2 mm thick). Three distinct cup fabrics were identified. Whitley identified the large cup assemblage as a “typical feasting assemblage,” which in combination with the large amount of animal bone—including an “unusually large proportion of rarely consumed species in the upper (re-deposited) levels,” among which were hare bones—attest to the building’s function as a dining hall for communal feasts.

---
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Also important in the identification of the Almond Tree building as an andreion were the discovery of two terracotta plaques of “emphatically masculine” or andriko iconography, dated to the Classical period (Fig. 32). One plaque depicts a young man of the type common in the sanctuaries of Praisos and another depicts “a warrior with a plumed helmet holding a shield in the form of a ram’s head, advancing from the left.” Whitley points to parallels between the warrior plaque and terracotta plaques found in sanctuary deposits in the area of Praisos dating to the late eighth century BC onwards. This iconography, Whitley writes, “had some particular significance for the community of Praisos.”

Beyond just a decorative element, Whitley suggests that perhaps the iconography of the ram’s head is “is meant to indicate that the hoplite warrior takes on, in part, some of the attributes of a ram – if only a willingness to “butt heads” in battle.” If Whitley’s identification of the Almond House Building as an andreion is correct, then perhaps there is also a connection in the ram’s head iconography in relationship to a passage in Plato’s Laws, wherein the Athenian character jokes that Cretan youth are “put out to pasture” like foals. This may also be a play on words, since the word for the Cretan youth groups, according to Ephorus, is agela—a world which may be literally translated as “herd.”

---

286 Forster 1905, 252-253; Halbherr 1901, 392, fig. 24.
287 Whitley 2014, 151.
288 Whitley 2014, 152.
289 Plato, Laws 666E. στρατοπέδου γὰρ πολιτείαν ἔχετε ἄλλ᾽ ὡς ἐν ἀστεσι κατωκηκότων, ἄλλ᾽ ὡς ὁδόν ἀθρόους πώλους ἐν ἀγέλει νεμομένους φορβάδας τοὺς νέους κέκτησθε. “For your civic organization is that of an army rather than that of city-dwellers, and you keep your young people massed together like a herd of colts at grass.”
*andreion*, then perhaps the importance of ram iconography in Praisos is a further reflection of adult male warrior identity—a representation of fully grown citizen warriors with full rights of participation in the *andreion* and other state institutions.

The identification of the Almond Tree house as an *andreion* is perhaps the most sound and important of the *andreion* identifications discussed so far—since it not only demonstrates the existence of a large communal dining building in the city center of Praisos, but is moreover representative of the later Classical and Hellenistic periods. However, Whitley argues that it is not the only *andreion* that served as venue for civic communal dining in the *polis* of Praisos. Whitley points to another large deposit of cups similar to those found in the Almond House fill at another location on the Prophitis Ilias hill. This site was formerly considered as a “possible location for the sanctuary of Dictaean Zeus.” Whitley points to the location of this site on the top of a hill and its deposit attesting to feasting activities as evidence for a possible identification as another *andreion* (this is, as Prent writes, a likely location for an andreion). As Whitley writes:

> One of the unanswered questions about the “*andreion*” is how many were there per *polis*. In several passages (X.4.16, 18, 20) Strabo (citing Ephoros) uses the term *andreion* consistently in the plural (*andreia*), which to me suggests that there was more than one *andreion* in each political community… if we bear in mind that the *andreion* is first and foremost an institution [as Prent suggests], then it need not follow that it would have taken a fixed architectural form (like a temple).

Perhaps these different locations of feasting represent different feasting groups. If the hypothesis of the current discussion is correct—namely that the more prominent members of

---
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the Cretan citizen class would have held exclusive membership to the *hetairiai* dining groups, meanwhile other dining groups existed for less prominent members of the citizen class and also the *perioikic* communities—then we might further expect that the more important groups might conduct their dining activities in the more architecturally elaborated and prominently placed venues in the center of the city.

Another important project yielding key insights into the communal dining practices of Cretan communities after the EIA is at Azoria on the eastern coast of the Mirabello Bay region of eastern Crete. Excavations began here in 2002 under an American team led by Donald Haggis and Margaret Mook. First established in the EIA, towards the end of the seventh century BCE, the settlement at Azoria absorbed much of the population of surrounding settlements (which became abandoned at this time) and the site developed into an urban center (what excavator Haggis has called a “protopolis” or nascent city-state). The protopolis of Azoria was occupied into the Archaic period until about the end of the sixth century.295

During the period following the influx of the surrounding population, the site underwent a major rebuilding phase at the end of the seventh century comprising the “reintegration, redefinition, and restructuring of domestic and communal spaces and activities.”296 EIA architecture was covered over with new structures that constituted a “drastic increase” in the scale of both public and domestic space (requiring also a dramatic intensification in the allocation and organization of labor towards this construction). Not only does this period see a distinct increase in the amount of space taken up by the new public and

295 Haggis 2013, 65.
296 Haggis 2014, 126.
domestic buildings, but there was additionally the introduction of entirely new building types and “new venues of suprahousehold interaction” (See Fig. 33). 297

In terms of changes affecting the form of public buildings, at this time several important civic structures appeared. In 2011, Erickson wrote that the core building (A800) of one civic complex at Azoria (called the Communal Dining Complex by the excavators) was “the most compelling case…for an andreion” in Crete. 298 As in the case of the Almond Tree building at Praisos, the Communal Dining Complex at Azoria is architecturally complex and compartmentalized, which Haggis writes attests to “the division of activities and the segregation of groups.” 299 Food processing appears to have been concentrated in the kitchens (A600, A1600) and storerooms (A1200, A1400–A1500) located on the lower terrace of the complex. These rooms are interconnected among themselves, yet physically distinct from the rooms in which dining would have taken place on the higher terrace (rooms A800 and A2000). 300 Access to the dining rooms is somewhat exclusive by means of a porch and vestibule (A1900S). 301 The two dining rooms are separated and spatially differentiated by the presence of a room with apparent cultic function (indicated by the presence of a ground altar; A1900N) lying centered between them. These spatially differentiated dining rooms likely served to accommodate distinct dining groups or perhaps “different modes or occasions of drinking and dining.” 302

298 Erickson 2011, 388.
299 Haggis 2013, 78.
300 Haggis 2013, 78.
301 Haggis 2013, 78. The dining rooms are identified as such by the presence of food remains suggesting prepared meals.
302 Haggis 2013, 78.
A800 and the larger Communal Dining Complex of which it is a part are just one site in which communal dining would have taken place in the urban center of Azoria. The Monumental Civic Building (downhill to the southwest of the Communal Dining Complex; D500, D900–D1000) was also an apparently important venue for communal feasting. In contrast to the Communal Dining Building however, The Monumental Civic Building has a less compartmentalized, more open plan with “a single undivided hall” with a stepped bench that runs along all four of the interior walls. Dining activities are attested by concentrations of pottery suitable for serving and dining as well as meat remains indicative of prepared meals. Haggis writes that this hall would have served to accommodate more openly communal assemblies—as opposed to the more segregated and restricted groups that would have participated in dining events in the Communal Dining Building. However “this is not to say that social distinctions did not exist in the context of communal consumption or that they could not have been expressed through differentiated portioning of meat, such as the leg segments, or other foods, or even by means of arranged seating within the building,” as is indicated in the literature. Yet both the more open floor plan as well as the ample permanent seating seem to indicate “a structured communal experience.” The Monumental Civic Building is also connected with some kind of cultic activity, as attested by a shrine

---

303 Haggis 2013, 78; Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 4. 143c-f; J. Whitley, “Citizenship and Commensality,” forthcoming. Whitley however points to the lack of large numbers of cups seen elsewhere in feasting contexts as a potential problem in the identification of this building as a venue for feasting. However he concedes that the adjoining of the Service Building with evidence of food preparation to the Monumental Civic building may be an indirect indication of feasting occurring in the latter.
(D900–D1000) directly connected to the main hall to the north—however access appears to have been restricted, suggesting perhaps hierarchical use.\(^{304}\)

Excavations at Azoria have also revealed an interesting arrangement for the provisioning of food for the communal feasting activities that would have occurred in both the Communal Dining Complex and the Monumental Civic Building. Preparation of the food destined for communal consumption in the civic buildings seems to have occurred in the so-called Service Building adjoining the Monumental Civic Building to the south. This building consists of a series of rooms, some with large rectangular hearths interpreted as kitchens (B1500, B2200–2300), others as storerooms (B700, B1200), and another as an olive press (D300). In addition to storage containers such as *pithoi* and amphorae, this building also contained a considerable amount of food processing equipment as well as vast quantities of drinking, dining, and serving vessels.\(^{305}\)

The Service Building appears to have been used for final preparations of food and drink for large communal dining events that would have occurred in the two other civic buildings above. The excavators noted that in both the civic buildings and houses excavated on the acropolis, there is a lack of evidence for primary food processing—meaning such activities must have occurred elsewhere (perhaps in the yet unexcavated houses further downhill). Houses within the urban center appear to have thus “functioned as estate managers and centers of economically complex and dispersed households.”\(^{306}\) The storage capacity of

\(^{304}\) Haggis 2013, 78.

\(^{305}\) Haggis 2013, 78-79.

\(^{306}\) Haggis 2013, 79.
the houses in the center exceeds that which would be expected to meet the needs of individual families. As Haggis writes:

The kinds of foods that survive in archaeological contexts, such as wine or must, oil (by inference of burning, cooking, lamps, and residues), olives, and perishables such as fruit, clean grains, and pulses, suggest that houses were cycling and managing such produce through their stores for personal consumption as well as for redistribution, perhaps in the form of payments or taxes owed to public or civic dining halls, such as the Communal Dining Building and the Monumental Civic Building.  

The increased storage capacity for these urban houses may be indicative of the elite status of their inhabitants. Such a status may further be indicated by the close spatial association of the dwellings to the monumental civic buildings—domestic architecture is woven directly into the city plan, “[showing] direct formal and spatial relationships to the communal or civic buildings.” Erickson points out that the extensive storage capacities of the center houses might have served towards the provisioning of private feasts held within these houses—perhaps in the style of the mainland practice of symposion. Whatever the destination of the surplus food stored in these houses, that both they and the kitchens of the civic building contained assemblages indicative only of final-stage meal preparation is an indication of larger economic networks in which these elite houses and the storage and kitchen areas of the civic buildings represented the center for consumption and perhaps redistribution.

---
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310 Haggis 2013, 76. Final-stage preparation is indicated by “the predominance of small querns, hand stones, and mortars for reducing whole clean grains and pulses; metal graters; terra-cotta strainers; and a wide range of small-scale storage, transport, cooking, and serving vessels are evidence of meal preparation. Moreover, storage vessels (amphorae, pithoi, and perishable containers) evidently held clean grains, wine, must, oil, and olives and other fruit, ostensibly prepared and gathered in the houses for use rather than for long-term or primary surplus storage.”  
311 Haggis 2013, 76.
Interestingly, as Whitley points out, one possible difficulty with the identification of either of the communal dining buildings at Azoria is the apparent lack of evidence linking feasting activities there with exclusively male groups, which we would expect for an andreion.312 Elsewhere, deposits of armor, decorative architectural sculpture depicting “warriors” as at Prinias, or terracotta plaques with “male” iconography as in the case of the Almond Tree Building at Praisos may provide indications of the gender of participants in activities at these sites. For both the Communal Dining Complex and the Monumental Civic Building at Azoria, such indications are lacking. I think it should be stressed however that the presence of such items is not itself a sure indication of exclusively male participation in activities at these sites. In the example of Prinias, for example, female figures are also represented in the architectural sculpture decorating the exterior of the building. Not only in the case of Azoria, but also elsewhere, we cannot be sure of the gender of participants in the feasts and other activities conducted in buildings and sites identified as tentative andreia.

Discussion and Summary

The archaeological evidence discussed above shows communal dining as an important component of Cretan communities from an early period. The evidence also attests to a variety of locations and venues for communal feasting. Not only this, but the venues for feasts may have been multifunctional in themselves. Scholars have pointed especially to the case of the early Hearth Temples—as Whitley writes “sometimes they acted as temples to the gods, and sometimes as clubhouses for citizen males.”313 Some scholars have also proposed that the repeated finding of armor in these buildings may be an indication of their use as

312 Whitley Forthcoming.
313 Whitley 2014.
armories (as the case of Aphrati, Dreros, and Axos).\textsuperscript{314} It is questionable, however, whether these cases could be seen as armories—namely the places in which armor of the citizens was kept. This is because of the large amount of armor in miniature—too small to have been actually used. Instead, these items may rather have functioned either for display or as votives to a deity.

The architectural variety of these buildings as well as their multifunctional nature do not necessarily preclude an identification as \textit{andreia}—for as Prent has established the \textit{andreion} should be seen primarily as an institution rather than as a building.\textsuperscript{315} As Whitely writes, perhaps Cretans did not have follow the mainland example of building specific architectural types corresponding to specific social or political institutions. Rather the archaeological evidence so far reflects a more flexible use of space for communal feasting and perhaps other activities.\textsuperscript{316}

While the feasting at these venues would have been to an extent communal, there is also a degree of exclusivity reflected in the archaeological evidence for Cretan commensality. Such exclusivity may be both logistical as well as socio-political. Logistically, as discussed at the beginning of this chapter, any enclosed area in which feasting would have taken place would necessarily exclude certain members of a \textit{polis’s} population—and the archaeological evidence attests to dining groups necessarily being smaller than what we can imagine would be the entire male citizen body. Also, in order for diacritical feasting to meet its purpose of fostering a sense of group identity, the number of participants must be

\textsuperscript{314} Whitley 2014. \\
\textsuperscript{315} Prent 2005. 441-76; 2007. \\
\textsuperscript{316} Whitley 2014.
necessarily restricted—at most one-hundred men dining together at once (however in the case of many of the buildings discussed above, dining groups must have been much smaller). 317

While the vast majority of the population might be excluded from any given dining group, that is not to say that people outside the dining group would not have participated in their own events of commensality. As Erickson suggests, multiple dining groups might have used monumental buildings in rotation. However as several of the sites discussed above demonstrate, multiple buildings or even open-air areas might have been employed for communal dining, and perhaps access to the most architecturally elaborated venues might have been restricted to certain privileged dining groups. In conclusion, the archaeological evidence indicates that commensality played a prevalent role in Cretan communities both before and after the development of the poleis.

317 Whitley 2014, 155.
CHAPTER V. Spatial Analysis and Conclusions

Summary

The evidence presented in this thesis shows that the practice of civic commensality, which may be identified as syssitia, does seem to have played an important function in pre-Roman Cretan society. Chapter II provided a detailed discussion of the literary sources regarding syssitia in ancient Crete. This discussion covers not only the content of the ancient Greek literary sources, but also these sources’ limitations that make them—apart from the epigraphic and archaeological evidence—difficult to trust. The facts that the ancient Greek literary sources date to later periods, are written largely by outsiders to the island, and that they tend to make grand-sweeping generalizations are all signals that we should be cautious in accepting the portrayals of Cretan society that they provide. For this reason, it is essential to look towards the evidence intrinsic to the island (the inscriptions and archaeology) to get a better sense of a) whether syssitia existed in Crete as a wide-spread institution both in earlier and later periods, and if so b) the extent of the practice as well as c) the role of the syssitia in larger Cretan society and its interaction with other aspects of Cretan socio-political and economic organization. Chapter III provided a discussion of the epigraphic evidence for syssitia in the inscriptions from Crete during the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods. This analysis demonstrated that syssitia is strongly suggested by the mention of key words associated with syssitia—such as andreion, hetairia(i), and agela(i). Although in many cases we have little more than the mention of these words to attest to the practice, in other cases we get a more detailed sense of how syssitia was interwoven with other institutions and structures of Cretan society—a testimony not only to its existence but also to its
embeddedness and importance. Chapter IV discusses the archaeological evidence for the early development of commensality in Cretan communities prior to the formation of the *polis* during the EIA (as attested in Hearth Temples and other early buildings) and its continued importance in the later Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic period (as attested in the cases of Praisos and Azoria).

**Spatial Distribution**

In considering the spatial distribution of the evidence for *syssitia* in ancient Crete, we notice a concentration towards the center and central-east areas of the island. As Perlman has pointed out, literary accounts regarding *syssitia* only make direct mention of the city of Lyttos in central-north portion of the island (indicated on Figure 35). Perlman writes that the ancient authors’ portrayal of the Cretan constitution was extracted from that of one city—Lyttos. Being largely foreigners, Perlman writes that most of our authors probably only heard about the city of Lyttos and generalized for the entire island practices that might have only occurred in this city.\(^{318}\) It is important to note, however, that despite the literary tradition’s exclusive mention of Lyttos in regards to the portrayals of *syssitia*, ancient authors were not completely unfamiliar with the other cities of Crete. While Perlman writes that we have no evidence that the authors of the literary tradition regarding Crete ever visited the island, some scholars have proposed that Plato’s description of the route from Knossos to the Cave of Zeus must have stemmed from personal experience.\(^{319}\) In Book 10, Chapter 4 of his *Geography* (in which extensive quotations and summaries of Ephorus’s description of Crete are preserved), Strabo mentions a number of cities. Strabo focuses mainly on what calls “the

\(^{318}\) Perlman 1992, 200-201.

\(^{319}\) Morrow 1960, 26-27; Perlman 1992, 198.
greatest and most famous” cities—namely, Knossos, Gortyn, and Cydonia.\textsuperscript{320} Strabo writes that he himself has a familial connection to the city of Knossos in particular (his grandmother, great uncles, and great-great uncle, Dorylaüs resided in the city for a number of years).\textsuperscript{321} In regards to the authors Dosiadas and Pyrgion (whose accounts are preserved in Athenaeus’s \textit{Deipnosophistai}) these authors are believed to be from the island themselves. Although Dosiadas’s account only names the city of Lyttos in particular (“The Lyttians pool their goods for the \textit{syssitia} in this way…”), two things must be considered regarding the applicability of Dosiadas’s account to other Cretan communities outside of Lyttos. First, if Jacoby is correct in identifying Dosiadas as a Cretan author from the city of Cydonia,\textsuperscript{322} then we may of course conclude that his knowledge of Cretan practices spanned more than just the city of Lyttos (and would have, at the very least, included that of his own city, Cydonia). This would lend even more credence to the second point, that Dosiadas writes that “\textit{everywhere} in Crete there are two houses for \textit{syssitia}” – speaking of the \textit{syssitia} as a more broadly practiced institution.\textsuperscript{323} Although none of these examples is definitive proof of the ancient author’s personal experience, they nevertheless suggest that we ought to be cautious in not dismissing the literary tradition as derived completely from second-hand accounts of one city.

As seen in Figure 36, the epigraphic testimony for \textit{syssitia} seems also to be concentrated in the center of the island. Central Crete provides our earliest epigraphic attestation of the \textit{andreion} in the Gortynian inscription \textit{IC} 4.4 (of the seventh or sixth century

\textsuperscript{320} Strabo, \textit{Geography} 10.4.7.
\textsuperscript{321} Strabo, \textit{Geography} 10.4.10.
\textsuperscript{322} Jacoby 1923ff, III B 458; Strataridaki 1988-1989, 137-194; footnote 68.
\textsuperscript{323} Dosiadas ap. Athenaeus, \textit{Deipnosophistai} 4.143b.
BCE). Throughout the Archaic period, andreon, hetairiai, and agelai continue to be attested at Gortyn and in other poleis mainly in central Crete (with Polyrhenia as an outlier in the West). This trend echoes the larger pattern of Cretan inscriptions more generally—as Erickson points out, “inscriptional evidence of Archaic and Classical date (ca. 625-325) is available only from the central part of the island, from Eleutherna in the West to Dreros in the East.”324 This is due in part to bias of research—studies in the island from the late nineteenth century to the present have largely focused on sites from the center of the island. Even more specifically, much of this evidence comes from just one city, namely that of Gortyn, which has benefitted from nearly continuous study by the Italian School from the early twentieth century onwards. The predominance of Gortynian inscrptional evidence is well attested in the compilations of published epigraphic material from Crete. In the four-volume publication of Inscriptiones Creticae (published between 1935 and 1950), the first three volumes include publication and analysis of inscriptions from cities all over the island, while the entirety of the series’ fourth volume is devoted to the hundreds of inscriptions from Gortyn alone. The predominance of Gortynian inscrptional evidence continues into the present, for example in Koerner’s more recent compilation of early legal inscriptions from Crete, forty-eight documents come just from the city of Gortyn, while only twenty-nine documents are listed from other Cretan cities.325 As a consequence of this concentration of

324 Erickson 2010, 312-313.
325 Koerner 1993, nos. 116-181 (48 documents for Gortyn), nos. 87-115 (29 documents for other Cretan cities); Chaniotis 2005, 178.
epigraphic evidence in the center of the island, as Erickson writes, “we know little about the political arrangements of communities in the western and eastern sections of the island.”326

Until the recent archaeological investigations at Praisos and Azoria, this concentration of evidence in the center of the island for the inscriptions seemed to be echoed in the archaeological evidence as well. Early sites attesting to commensality in the EIA and early Archaic periods like Hearth Temples and other buildings (indicated in orange and yellow on Figure 38) discussed in this thesis are concentrated in the central area (stretching between Kommos and Axos in the west and Dreros in the east). Again, this spatial distribution may be explained at least in part by the bias of archaeological research taking place mainly in this area. Support for this hypothesis may be lent by the investigations of Praisos and Azoria, which have drawn the eastern portion of the island into the picture.

It is possible that underlying this concentration of evidence in both the center and the central east areas of the island is an actual cultural koine shared by the communities in this region resulting from peer polity interaction (since, as we know, there was no hyper-polis organization spanning the entire island until the Roman conquest in the first century BCE). However, as Chaniotis has written, there is nevertheless a trend likely “[stemming] from a particular tendency to structure a community and from the need to face the same challenges in other cities in a similar way.”327 Chaniotis has suggested that a common set of principles of organization in these communities may have developed as a result of interaction between key community leaders at supra-regional sanctuaries like the Idaean Cave (located on Mount

326 Erickson 2010, 313.
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Ida)\textsuperscript{328} and the sanctuary of Hermes Kedtrites at Kato Simi\textsuperscript{329} (marked Kato Simi in Figures 34-38). Both of these sites as well as other regional and supra-regional sanctuaries in Crete would have functioned similarly to the way in which Snodgrass has argued the interregional sanctuaries at Olympia and Delphi would have functioned beginning in the eighth century BCE—serving as a venue for the exchange of knowledge, ideas, customs, and values for elite members of incipient poleis who would have met there.\textsuperscript{330}

Moreover, Wallace has demonstrated that Cretan communities particularly in the central part of the island weathered the Late Bronze Age collapse “successfully,” adapting relatively quickly to new conditions of the Early Iron Age. Wallace points to settlement patterns and the distribution of foreign goods from the early EIA period in the island as strong evidence “that the new communities were in regular and well-maintained contact with

\textsuperscript{328} Prent 2005, 158, 311, 314-315; Pindar, \textit{Olympian} 5.39-45; Callimachus, \textit{Hymn to Zeus} 6; Strabo, \textit{Geography} 10.3.7, 10.4.8, 16.2.38; Chaniotis 2005, 189. The Idaean Cave is the same destination towards which the three pilgrims in Plato’s \textit{Laws} are journeying, setting out from Knossos (1.625). See Prent for bibliography on the sanctuary’s periods of use and finds. The cave was identified initially in the late sixteenth century CE as the sanctuary of Zeus Kretagenes, Cretan-born Zeus, “a deity mentioned innumerable ancient epigraphical and literary sources in the CL period, when rites associated with the birth myth of Zeus were celebrated” (Prent 2005: 158). Excavations at the cave began there in 1885 under Halbherr and Aerakis, and again in the 1950’s under Faure and Marinatos, and once more in the 1980’s under Sakellarakis. The finds from this site range from the Late Neolithic period all the way into the fifth century CE (the cave was likely used as a dwelling from the Late Neolithic to the Early Minoan periods on a seasonal basis, and cult practice began there in the Middle Minoan III or Late Minoan I period and continued seemingly uninterrupted until late into the Roman period. In the eighth and seventh centuries especially, the Idaean Cave contained a vast number and great variety of votive offerings “making it the richest sanctuary of the island” (Prent 2005: 314-315). Like other sites identified as regional or supra-regional sanctuaries, the Idaean Cave is not connected with one particular settlement (Prent 2005: 311). Chaniotis writes that it is significant the early finds from the sanctuary (such as bronze shields, a small number of other weapons including arrow-heads, as well as a gold sheet depicting warriors) indicate that the participants in the cult here were of warrior status.

\textsuperscript{329} Prent 2005, 170, 173. Like the Dictaean Cave, the open-air sanctuary at Simi has a long history of cultic use beginning in the Middle Minoan and lasting until the sixth century CE. Cultic activities there “involved the lighting of bonfires, the sacrifice of animals, dining and the deposition of cult equipment and offerings, especially drinking vessels and anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines.” Inscriptions dating to the sixth century BCE and Hellenistic period as well as iconographical evidence from the Geometric and Orientalizing periods indicate a cult for Hermes and Aphrodite at Kato Simi for those periods.

\textsuperscript{330} Prent 2005, 355; Snodgrass 1980, 52-58, 62-64; 1986, esp. 54-55.
each other across sizeable regions from soon after their establishment.”\textsuperscript{331} In the period immediately following the collapse, archaeological survey has revealed the dispersal of population in the island and the establishment of a number of new settlements, often marked by extreme local inaccessibility (located on mountain and cliff-tops) and/or strategically located (with views from the new sites over major valleys or approaches from the sea).\textsuperscript{332} Another important characteristic of these new settlements, as Haggis has pointed out, is a concentration of new sites into stable clusters connected by ties of kinship and exchange.\textsuperscript{333}

After a brief period of interruption, Crete continued in its role as a stopping point along trade routes crossing the Mediterranean or entering the Aegean region, however with the disappearance of the highly controlled exchange system in the island controlled by elites in the Late Bronze Age centers. Even after the collapse, as opposed to the Greek Mainland, Crete maintained contact with the eastern Mediterranean sphere of exchange. Not only this, but Crete continued as a consumer of goods from outside the island from an early period as well: “From the tenth century onward…Crete’s economic focus remained on developing commodity production to supply the needs of increasingly complex societies \textit{within} the island.”\textsuperscript{334} From an early point—prior to the period of settlement nucleation in the early Protogeometric period (tenth to ninth centuries BCE) and formation of the \textit{poleis} in the seventh century—there appears to be a great deal of interaction between different settlements.

\textsuperscript{331} Wallace 2010, 193.
\textsuperscript{332} Wallace 2010, 59-60.
\textsuperscript{333} Haggis 1993, 159-60, 164-5; Wallace 2010, 60-68.
\textsuperscript{334} Wallace 2010, 169. Meanwhile other parts of the Aegean “were experiencing breaks in this connection and/or seeking connections with other supply cores, including the metal-rich south Balkans.”
and regions of Crete, which might also have played a role in the exchange of ideas for social, political, and economic organization.

Although the evidence appears to point to common practices shared among communities in the center and east of the island, *shared* should not be taken to imply *identical*—as the epigraphic and archaeological evidence show a variety of venues and associated practices with commensality for distinct communities. Even the literary accounts allow for diversity in the implementation of *syssitia* across the island—Strabo writes that in the period prior to the Roman conquest, certain cities including Lyttos, Gortyn, and “certain other small cities” continued to use the traditional institutions, while others (including Knossos) did so to a lesser extent.\(^{335}\) We also cannot ignore the diversity in socio-political organization implied by the fact that no two Cretan cities share the same calendar, nor do they share the same tribal divisions.\(^{336}\) Despite this diversity, there nevertheless does appear to be a key underlying principle of commensality for many Cretan communities beginning as early as the EIA and continuing to various extents into the Classical and Hellenistic periods, which may be what inspired the descriptions of *syssitia* in the ancient Greek literature.\(^{337}\)

**Further Research**

Due to restrictions on space and time, this thesis has only been able to provide a cursory overview of three major sources of evidence for *syssitia* and commensality in Crete for the EIA, Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods. Entire dissertations could

---

\(^{335}\) Strabo, *Geography* 10.4.17.

\(^{336}\) Chaniotis 2005, 176; Trümpy 1997, 188-197 (on month names); Mandalaki 2000, 34-40 (Cretan tribes); Jones 1987, 219-231 (also on Cretan tribes).

\(^{337}\) Chaniotis 2005, 177 (for a discussion on the shared fundamental commonalities among Cretan communities from the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic period).
concentrate solely on any one of the chief sources of evidence—literary, epigraphic, and archaeological. Further research should focus on the inclusion of more evidence for analysis and also consider questions of change in the communal feasting practices of Cretan communities over time.

In terms of the literary evidence, more work should be done to consider the implicit and explicit comparisons made by ancient authors of Cretan dining institutions with those of other contemporary Greek and Near Eastern societies. As discussed in Chapter II, Crete is often compared explicitly with the Spartan state and its organization. However, ancient authors also draw connections between the institutions of Crete (including the *syssitia*) with those of other non-Greek societies. For example, it may be significant that Athenaeus immediately follows the descriptions of Cretan *syssitia* of Pyrgion with a passage from Herodotus describing the dining habits of the Persians.\(^{338}\) In this passage, Herodotus describes a communal feast attended by prominent men who discuss state matters at the conclusion of the meal—although Athenaeus does not explicitly draw a connection between this and the Cretan *syssitia* described immediately above, the passages are parallel in their emphasis on the discussion of state matters as the concluding event of communal meals. Such a connection may also yield support to the suggestion in this thesis that the *syssitia* of the *hetairia* were attended by prominent men, and that the meal functioned as a meeting of the *prytaneia*. On the other hand, it may also yield interesting discussion of the perception of “other-ness” towards Cretan society in Atheno-centric literature, as Perlman discusses in her 2000 article, “Krētes aei lēistai? The Marginalization of Crete in Greek Thought and the Role

\(^{338}\) Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistai*, 4.143f.
of Piracy in the Outbreak of the First Cretan War.” This is only one example of the interesting insight that might be gained by considering the context of discussions of Cretan dining institutions in the ancient literature.

In terms of the epigraphic evidence, more work could be done to understand the role of the state in terms of the syssitia. With the literary and epigraphic evidence combined, we still have very little understanding of the role of the state as opposed to private individuals in funding of the event.

There is a great deal of further work to be done in terms of the archaeological evidence for civic communal dining in Crete. In continuation of the present work, I would like to study the pottery assemblages that led excavators and other scholars to identify given sites as feasting areas possibly connected to syssitia discussed in Chapter IV. It would also be useful to study similar contemporary feasting assemblages from outside the island (such as the tholos of Athens) in order to understand how Cretan feasting assemblages compare and contrast with those of other societies. If we may suppose that the ancient authors focused on Cretan customs because they were so peculiar, then perhaps such comparative study might yield specific information regarding what made Cretan feasting so distinctive and worthy of note. Also, it would be beneficial to consider comparisons with assemblages associated with symposia.

If the present paper has successfully shown that syssitia was at the foundation of the establishment of Cretan communities and continued to be an important institution of Cretan poleis as the literary, epigraphic, and archaeological sources indicate, then further research

---

339 Perlman 2000, 132-161.
should consider the question of its continued importance after the pivotal changes brought by the island’s conquest by Rome beginning in 67 BCE. It is often supposed that the syssitia went out of use (and that it was perhaps prohibited) under the new Imperial regime beginning in the first century BCE. However this claim is largely an argument ex silencio, as no direct indication of the practice’s prohibition exists either in the literary or epigraphic evidence. There is only the cryptic passage ending Strabo’s chapter on Crete, in which the geographer writes: “Not many, however, of these institutions endure, but the administration of affairs is carried on mostly by means of the decrees of the Romans, as is also the case in the other provinces.” Strabo leaves quite vague which institutions were the ‘lucky ones’ to endure under the new Roman government. Otherwise, we have no other literary mention to indicate that the practice was going out of use.

Although the key Greek words associated with the syssitia discussed in this thesis seem to taper off and disappear towards the end of the Hellenistic period, there remains some indication that civic commensality may have remained in at least two cities under the Romans. One second or third century CE inscription from the city of Lyttos may, in fact, allude to the continued practice of syssitia under the Romans at the very least in this singular city. The text of this inscription implies that a communal meal similar to the syssitia was organized in the city at this time, funded by the wealth of prominent citizens. Gallimore also points to a second century CE inscription from the city of Hierapetra that mentions a number of individuals associated with the city’s board of elders or board of kosmoi in

---

340 Strabo, Geography 10.4.22.
341 IC 1.18.11.
342 Pałuchowski 2005, 431-2; Gallimore 2011, 144.
correlation with a *sodalitas*, or dining club. As Gallimore writes, “perhaps this sodalitas is related to the new type of syssitia, although an alternative interpretation is that it was a private club organized by the city’s elite.” Such mentions provide tantalizing, albeit inconclusive, clues regarding the continuation of civic commensality among the elite in Crete under the Romans.

It seems, however, that the matter should be investigated archaeologically. Unfortunately, if we consider that excavations for Cretan sites in the Archaic and Classical periods are rare, we should not be shocked to learn that investigations of the Roman period are rarer still. One might look to the city of Gortyn (the capital of the joint Roman province of Crete and Cyrenaica) as a possible venue of investigation. The Roman periods in the cities of Knossos and Hierapetra have also recently been subject to new investigation. The recent growth of interest in the later periods of Cretan archaeology may yield promising opportunities to investigate the matter of commensality in Roman Crete.

Even if an understanding of how commensality may have changed (or disappeared) in the later periods is a long way off, I think that we can nevertheless say that in regards to this matter, the literary sources are not completely off base. The epigraphic and archaeological evidence indicates that commensality of the kind described as the *syssitia* in ancient Greek literary sources was an important component of Cretan communities. Although commensal dining events may not have functioned completely identically to one another throughout the island or with respect to their portrayals in the literary accounts, I think it is fair to say that

---

343 IC 3.3.7; Gallimore 2011, 144.
344 Archaeological excavation and study has occurred nearly continuously at Gortyn by the Italian School since the late nineteenth century.
the literary accounts preserve the impression of an institution (or series of institutions) that
did exist and play key roles in Cretan communities. Even if they only help us to frame
questions and hypotheses to test and interpret the available evidence, the literary sources may
continue to be useful to historians, epigraphers, and archaeologists investigating this and
other aspects of post-Minoan Cretan society.
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Aristotle, Politics 2.1264a

ei μὲν γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον κοινὰ πάντα πάντων, τί διοίσουσιν οὗτοι ἐκεῖνοι τῶν φυλάκων; ἢ τί πλέον αὐτοῖς ὑπομένουσιν τὴν ἁρχὴν αὐτῶν, ἢ τί μαθόντες ὑπομενοῦσι [20] τὴν ἁρχήν, ἐὰν μὴ τι σοφίζονται τοιούτοις οἶον Κρῆτες; ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ τάλλα ταύτα τοῖς δούλοις ἐφέντες μόνον ἀπειρήκασι τὰ γυμνάσια καὶ τὴν τῶν ὅπλων κτῆσιν. εἰ δὲ, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις πόλεσι, καὶ παρ’ ἐκείνους ἐσται τὰ τοιοῦτα, τίς ὁ τρόπος ἔσται τῆς κοινωνίας; ἐν μιᾷ γὰρ πόλει [25] δύο πόλεις ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι, καὶ ταύτας ὑπεναντίας ἄλληλαις.

-----

For if the Farmers are to have the same complete communism, what will be the difference between them and the Guardian class? or what advantage will they gain by submitting to their government? or what consideration will induce them to submit to [20] the government, unless the Guardians adopt some clever device like that of the Cretans? These have conceded to their slaves all the same rights as they have themselves except that they are forbidden gymnastic exercises and the possession of arms. But if the family life and property of the Farmers are to be such as they are in other states, what sort of communism will there be? For there will inevitably be two states in one, and these antagonistic to one another.

Aristotle, Politics 2.1271b-1272b
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τά μὲν οὖν τῶν συσσιτίων ἔχει βέλτιον τοῖς Κρησίν ἢ τοῖς Λάκωσιν. ἐν μὲν γὰρ Λακεδαίμονι κατὰ κεφαλήν ἐκκάτωτος ἐσφέρετε τὸ τεταχυμένον, [15] εἰ δὲ μὴ, μετέχεις νόμοι κολύτες τῆς πολιτείας, καθάπερ ἐξήρτατε καὶ πρότερον, ἐν δὲ Κρηθήν κοινοτέρως: ἀπὸ πάντων γὰρ τῶν γυναικῶν κυριεῖ τὸ καὶ συσσιτικὸν ὄντως καὶ πάλιν καὶ ἀνδρός· πρὸς δὲ τὴν οἰκογενεσίαν ὡς ὄψειμαι πολλὰ περιφορόθηκεν ὁ νομισμάτως, καὶ πρὸς τὴν διάμετρον τῶν γυναικῶν· ἄν μὴ πολυτεκνῶσιν, τὴν πρὸς τοὺς άριστοὺς ποιήσαντας [25] ὑμίλλιαν, περὶ ὃς εἰ φαύλος ἢ μὴ φαύλος, ἐτέρος ἐστιν τοῦ διασκέψεως καθής, ὅτι δὴ τὰ περὶ τὰ συσσιτία βέλτιόν τετάκτω συσσιτίας τοῖς Κρησίν ἢ τοῖς Λάκωσιν, φανερῶς· τὰ δὲ περὶ τοὺς κόσμους ἐπὶ χείρον τῶν ἑφόρουν· ὃ μὲν γὰρ ἔχει κακὸν τὰν ἑφόρον ἀρχεῖ, ὑπάρχει καὶ τούτοις [30] (γίνονται γὰρ οἱ τυχόντες), δὲ ἐκεῖ οὐκ ὠροῦν· ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ, διὰ τὸ τὴν αἰρέσειν ἐπὶ πάντων εἶναι, μετέχουσα δὴ τῆς μεγίστης ἀρχῆς βούλεθαι μένει τὴν πολιτείαν· ἐνταῦθα δ᾽ οὐκ ἔχει ἀπόλαυτον αἰροῦται τοὺς κόσμους ἄλλως· ἐν τοῖς γενόν, καὶ τοὺς γέροντας [35] ἐκ τῶν κεκοσμηκότων, περὶ ὃν τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἄν τις ἐπείπος λόγους καὶ περὶ τὸν ἐν Λακεδαίμονι γιαμιένον· τὸ γὰρ ἀνυπετήθην καὶ τὸ δίο βίου μείζον ἐστι γέρας τῆς ἄξιας αὐτοῖς· καὶ τὸ μὴ κατὰ γράμματα ἀρχεῖν ἀλλ᾽ αὐτογνόμονας ἐπισφαλεῖς· τὸ δὲ ἠσυχώσεις μὴ μετέχοντα [40] τὸν δήμον οὐδὲν σημεῖον τοῦ τετάχθη καλῶς· οὐδὲν γὰρ λήμματος ἐστὶν τοῖς κόσμοις ὀσπερ τοῖς ἑφόροις, [1272β] πόρρω γ᾽ ἀποκοινοῦν ἐν νῆσῳ τῶν διαφεροῦντων.

ἡν δὲ ποιοῦνται τῆς ἀμαρτίας τάτης ἰατρείαν, ἀτοπος καὶ οὐ πολιτικὴ ἀλλὰ δυναστευτικὴ. πολλακις γὰρ ἐξύπλωσι συσσαίντες τινὲς τοὺς κόσμους ἢ τῶν συναρχόντων αὐτῶν ἢ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν· ἐξεστὶ [5] δὲ καὶ μεταξὺ τοὺς κόσμους ἀπειπεῖν τὴν ἀρχήν· τάτα δὴ πάντα βέλτιον γίνεσθαι κατὰ νόμον ἢ καὶ ἀνθρώπων βούλησαν· οὐ γὰρ ἀσφαλῆς ἢ κανών. πάντων δὲ φαινότατον τὸ τῆς ακοσμίας τῶν δυνατῶν, ἢ καθίσταται πολλάκις οὐκ ἢ δίκαια κολύνης δούναι τῶν δυνατῶν· ἢ καὶ δήλον ὡς ἔχει τι [10] πολιτείας ἢ τάξεις, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ πολιτεία ἐστὶν ἀλλὰ δυναστεύεις αὐλλον. εἰ ὡσθα δὲ διαλαμβάνοντες τὸν δήμον καὶ τοὺς φύλους ἀναρχίαν ποιεῖν καὶ στασιάζειν καὶ μάχεσθαι πρὸς ἀλλήλους: καταί τὶ διαφέρει τὸ τοιοῦτον δὲ διὰ τοὺς χρόνους μηκέτι πολῖν εἶναι τὴν τοιαύτην, ἀλλὰ ἡμέραν τὴν Ποικίλαν· ἐστὶ δὲ ἐπικίνδυνος οὕτως ἢχουσα πόλις, τῶν βουλομένων ἐπιτίθεσθαι καὶ δυναμένων. ἀλλὰ, καθάπερ ἐρήμηται, σοφετα διὰ τὸν τόπον· ἀνθιάσασας γὰρ τὸ πόρρω πεποίηκεν. διὸ καὶ τὸν περιόδον μένει τοῖς Κρησίν, οἱ δὲ εἰλοτες ἀφίστανται πολλακίς. οὔτε γὰρ ἐξωτερικής [20]
The Cretan constitution approximates to that of Sparta, but though in a few points it is not worse framed, for the larger part it has a less perfect finish. For the Spartan constitution appears and indeed is actually stated to have been copied in most of its provisions from the Cretan; and as a rule old things have been less fully elaborated than newer ones. For it is said that when Lycurgus relinquished his post as guardian of King Charilaus and went abroad, he subsequently passed most of his time in Crete because of the relationship between the Cretans and the Spartans; for the Lyctians were colonists from Sparta, and the settlers that went out to the colony found the system of laws already existing among the previous inhabitants of the place; owing to which the neighboring villagers even now use these laws in the same manner, in the belief that Minos first instituted this code of laws. And also the island appears to have been designed by nature and to be well situated to be under Greek rule, as it lies across the whole of the sea, round which almost all the Greeks are settled; for Crete is only a short distance from the Peloponnese in one direction, and from the part of Asia around Triopium and from Rhodes in the other. Owing to this Minos won the empire of the sea, and made some of the islands subject to him and settled colonies in others, but finally when making an attack on Sicily he ended his life there near Camicus.

The Cretan organization is on the same lines as that of Sparta. In Sparta the land is tilled by the Helots and in Crete by the serfs; and also both have public mess-tables, and in old days the Spartans called them not 'phiditia' but 'men's messes,' as the Cretans do, which is a proof that they came from Crete. And so also did the system of government; for the Ephors have the same power as the magistrates called Cosmi in Crete, except that the Ephors are five in number and the Cosmi ten; and the Elders at Sparta are equal in number to the Elders whom the Cretans call the Council; and monarchy existed in former times, but then the Cretans abolished it, and the Cosmi hold the leadership in war; and all are members of the Assembly, though it has no powers except the function of confirming by vote the resolutions already formed by the Elders and the Cosmi.

Now the Cretan arrangements for the public mess-tables are better than the Spartan; for at Sparta each citizen pays a fixed poll-tax, failing which he is prevented by law from taking part in the government, as has been said before; but in Crete the system is more communal, for out of all the crops and cattle produced from the public lands, and the tributes paid by the serfs, one part is assigned for the worship of the gods and the maintenance of the public services, and the other for the public mess-tables, so that all the citizens are maintained from the common funds, women and children as well as men; and the lawgiver has devised many wise measures to secure the benefit of moderation at table, and the segregation of the women in order that they may not bear many children, for which purpose he instituted...
association with the male sex, as to which there will be another occasion 1 to consider whether it was a bad thing or a good one. That the regulations for the common mess-tables therefore are better in Crete than at Sparta is manifest; but the regulations for the Cosmi are even worse than those regarding the Ephors. For the evil attaching to the office of the Ephors belongs to the Cosmi also, as the post is filled by any chance persons, while the benefit conferred on the government by this office at Sparta is lacking in Crete. At Sparta, as the election is made from all the citizens, the common people sharing in the highest office desire the maintenance of the constitution, but in Crete they do not elect the Cosmi from all the citizens but from certain clans, and the Elders from those who have held the office of Cosmos, about which regulations the same comments might be made as about what takes place at Sparta: their freedom from being called to account and their tenure for life gives them greater rank than their merit deserves, and their administration of their office at their own discretion and not under the guidance of a written code is dangerous. And the fact that the common people quietly tolerate their exclusion is no proof that the arrangement is a sound one; for the Cosmi unlike the Ephors make no sort of profit, [1272b] [1] as they live in an island remote from any people to corrupt them. Also the remedy which they employ for this defect is a curious one, and less characteristic of a republic than of a dynasty: often the Cosmi are expelled by a conspiracy formed among some of their actual colleagues or the private citizens. Also the Cosmi are allowed to resign during their term of office. Now it would be preferable for all these expedients to be put in force by law rather than at the discretion of individuals, for that is a dangerous principle. And the worst expedient of all is that of the suspension of the office of Cosmi, which is often brought about by members of the powerful class who wish to escape being punished; this proves that the constitution has a republican element, although it is not actually a republic but rather a dynasty. And the nobles frequently form parties among the common people and among their friends and so bring about a suspension of government, and form factions and engage in war with one another. Yet such a state of things is virtually the same as if for a period of time the state underwent an entire revolution, and the bonds of civil society were loosened.

And it is a precarious position for a state to be in, when those who wish to attack it also have the power to do so. But, as has been said, it is saved by its locality; for distance has had the same effect as alien acts. A result of this is that with the Cretans the serf population stands firm, whereas the Helots often revolt; for the Cretans [20] take no part in foreign empire, and also the island has only lately been invaded by warfare from abroad, rendering manifest the weakness of the legal system there.

Let this suffice for our discussion of this form of constitution.

ὅν μὲν τοῖνυν ἄνευ [35] πόλεις οὐ συνίσταται καὶ οὐσίας, εἰρήται (γεωργοὺς μὲν γάρ καὶ τεχνίτας καὶ πάν το θητικῶν ἀναγκαῖον υπάρχειν ταῖς πόλεσιν, μέρη δὲ τῆς πόλεως τὸ
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te ὀπλιτικὸν καὶ βουλευτικὸν), καὶ κεχώρισται δὴ τούτων ἐκαστὸν, τὸ μὲν ἀεὶ τὸ δὲ κατὰ μέρος. [40]


-----

These matters having been settled, it remains to consider whether everybody is to take part in all of these functions (for it is possible for the whole of the people to be at once farmers and craftsmen and the councillors and judge), or whether we are to assume different classes corresponding to each of the functions mentioned, or whether some of them must necessarily be specialized and others combined. But it will not be the same in every form of constitution; for, as we said, it is possible either for all the people to take part in all the functions or for not all to take part in all but for certain people to have certain functions. In fact these different distributions of functions are the cause of the difference between constitutions: democracies are states in which all the people participate in all the functions, oligarchies where the contrary is the case. But at present we are studying the best constitution, and this is the constitution under which the state would be most happy, and it has been stated before that happiness cannot be forthcoming without virtue; it is therefore clear from these considerations that in the most nobly constituted state, and the one that possesses men that are absolutely just, not merely just relatively to the principle that is the basis of the constitution, the citizens must not live a mechanic or a mercantile life (for such a life is ignoble and inimical to virtue), nor yet must those who are to be citizens in the best state be tillers of the soil [1329a] (for leisure is needed both for the development of virtue and for active participation in politics). And since the state also contains the military class and the class that deliberates about matters of policy and judges questions of justice, and these are manifestly in a special sense parts of the state, are these classes also to be set down as distinct or are both functions to be assigned to the same persons? But here also the answer is clear, because in a certain sense they should be assigned to the same persons, but in a certain sense to different ones. Inasmuch as each of these two functions belongs to a different prime of life, and one requires wisdom, the other strength, they are to be assigned to different people; but
inasmuch as it is a thing impossible that when a set of men are able to employ force and to resist control, these should submit always to be ruled, from this point of view both functions must be assigned to the same people; for those who have the power of arms have the power to decide whether the constitution shall stand or fall. The only course left them is to assign this constitutional function to both sets of men without distinction, yet not simultaneously, but, as in the natural order of things strength is found in the younger men and wisdom in the elder, it seems to be expedient and just for their functions to be allotted to both in this way, for this mode of division possesses conformity with merit. Moreover the ownership of properties also must be centered round these classes, for the citizens must necessarily possess plentiful means, and these are the citizens. For the artisan class has no share in the state, nor has any other class that is not ‘an artificer of virtue.’ And this is clear from our basic principle; for in conjunction with virtue happiness is bound to be forthcoming, but we should pronounce a state happy having regard not to a particular section of it but to all its citizens. And it is also manifest that the properties must belong to these classes, inasmuch as it is necessary for the tillers of the soil to be slaves, or serfs of alien race. There remains of the list enumerated the class of priests; and the position of this class also is manifest. Priests must be appointed neither from the tillers of the soil nor from the artisans, for it is seemly that the gods should be worshipped by citizens; and since the citizen body is divided into two parts, the military class and the councillor class, and as it is seemly that those who have relinquished these duties owing to age should render to the gods their due worship and should spend their retirement in their service, it is to these that the priestly offices should be assigned.

We have therefore stated the things indispensable for the constitution of a state, and the things that are parts of a state: tillers of the soil, craftsmen and the laboring class generally are a necessary appurtenance of states, but the military and deliberative classes are parts of the state; and moreover each of these divisions is separate from the others, either permanently or by turn.

And that it is proper for the state to be divided up into castes and for the military class to be distinct from that of the tillers of the soil [1329b] does not seem to be a discovery of political philosophers of today or one made recently. In Egypt this arrangement still exists even now, as also in Crete; it is said to have been established in Egypt by the legislation of Sesostris and in Crete by that of Minos. Common meals also seem to be an ancient institution, those in Crete having begun in the reign of Minos, while those in Italy are much older than these. According to the historians one of the settlers there, a certain Italus, became king of Oenotria, and from him they took the name of Italians instead of that of Oenotrians, and the name of Italy was given to all that promontory of Europe lying between the Gulfs of Scylletium and of Lametus, which are half a day's journey apart. It was this Italus then who according to tradition converted the Oenotrians from a pastoral life to one of agriculture and gave them various ordinances, being the first to institute their system of common meals; hence the common meals and some of his laws are still observed by certain of his successors even today.
Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae 4.143a-f

perὶ δὲ τῶν Κρητικῶν συσσιτίων Δωσιάδας ἰστορῶν ἐν τῇ δ# τῶν Κρητικῶν γράφει οὕτως:

"οἱ δὲ Λύττοι συνάγουσι μὲν τὰ κοινὰ συσσίτια οὕτως. ἐκακοῦσας τῶν γινομένων καρπῶν ἀναφέρει τὴν δεκάτην εἰς τὴν ἑταίριαν καὶ τὰς τῆς πόλεως προσόδους, ὡς διανέμουσιν οἱ προσετήκτες τῆς πόλεως εἰς τοὺς ἐκάκοις οἴκους. τῶν δὲ δούλων ἐκακοῦσα Αἰγιναίων φέρει στατήρα κατὰ κεφαλήν. δηήρηται δὲ οἱ πολλὰ πάντες καθ᾽ ἑταίριας, καλούσι δὲ ταῦτας ἀνδρεία. τὴν δὲ ἐπιμέλειαν ἔχει τοῦ συσσιτίου γονῆ τρεῖς ή τέταρτας τῶν δημοτικῶν προσαληφθήσει πρὸς τὰς ύπηρεσίας. ἐκακοῦσα δ’ αὐτῶν ἀκολουθοῦσι δύο θεράποντες ἅλεσι καὶ Δωσιάς εἰς δυο ταῖς συσσίτιαις, ὅτι τῶν μὲν καλοῦσιν ἀνδρείαν, τὸν δ’ ἄλλον ἐν δ’ τούς ἐξόν τους κοιμήζουσι κοιμητήριον προσαγορεύοντο κατὰ τοῦ συσσιτικὸν οἴκον πρῶτον μὲν κεῖντα δύο τράπεζαι ξενικαί καλούμεναι, αἷς προσκαλίζουσιν τοῦτον οἱ παρόντες: ἔξις δ’ εἰσίν αἱ τῶν ἄλλων. παρατίθεται δὲ τῶν παρόντων ἵνα μέρος ἐκάκος: τοῖς δὲ νεωτέροις ἡμῖν δίδοται κρέος, τὸν δ’ ἄλλον οὐθένος ἀπτόνται. εἴτε ποτίριον ἐν ἐκάκος τραπέζῃ παρατίθεται κεκραμένων ὕδρος: τοῦτο κοινὴ πάντες πίνοντι οἱ κατὰ τὴν κοινὴν τράπεζαν καὶ δευτερνήσῳ ἄλλο παίνων τοῖς παίνων κέρατοι καρπητίας. τοῖς δὲ παισι κοινὸς κέρατας κρατηρίῳ τοῖς δὲ πρασβυτέροις ἐὰν βουλέωνται πλέον πιεῖν ἐξούσια δέονται. ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν τῶν παρακείμενων η προσετήματι τῆς συσσίτιας γονῆ φανερὸς ἀφαροῦσα παρατίθησι τοῖς κατὰ πόλεμων ή κατὰ σύνεσιν δεδοξάσμενοι. ἀπὸ τοῦ δείπνου πρῶτον μὲν εἰώδαι βουλεύονται περὶ τῶν κοινῶν, εἴτε μετὰ ταῦτα μέμνηται τοῖς κατὰ πόλεμον πράξεων καὶ τοὺς γενομένους ἀνδρας άγαθοὺς ἐπαινοῦσι, προτερομένους τοὺς νεωτέρους εἰς ἀνδραγαθίαν.

Πυργίων δ’ ἐν τρίτῳ Κρητικῶν Νομίμων ἐν τοῖς συσσιτίαις, φησίν, οἱ Κρήτης καθήμενοι συσσιτίᾳ: [καὶ ὅτι ἄβαμβακειοὶ τοῖς άραφοῖς παρατίθεται:] καὶ ὅτι νεώτατοι αὐτῶν ἐφεστάς διακονοῦντες: καὶ ὅτι μετ’ εὐφημίας σπείσαντες τοῖς θείοις μερίζουσι τῶν παρατιθεμένων ἅπασα: ἀπονέμουσι δὲ καὶ τοῖς νεώτεροι κατὰ τὸν θάκον τοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑριζάνουσιν ἐξ ἡμισίας τῶν τοῖς άνδρας παρατιθεμένων. τοῖς δ’ ἀραφοῖς ἀπομερεῖς εἴναι: παρατίθεται δ’ αὐτῶν ἄβαμβακειος τῇ κράσει καθ’ ἐκακοῦσα τῶν νεομεμισμένοιν. ἤσαν δὲ καὶ ξενικοὶ θάκοι καὶ τράπεζα τριτὴ δεξιὰς εἰσίόντων εἰς τὰ ἀνδρεία, ἢν Ξενίοι τ’ Δίως ξενιάν τε προσηγήρουν."
σφίσιν ἀπὸ δεῖπνου παραφορέεται οὐδὲν λόγου ἄξιον: εἰ δὲ τι παραφέροιτο, ἐσθίοντας ἄν οὐ παύεσθαι. οἶνῳ δὲ κάρτα προσκέαται: καὶ σφιν οὐκ ἐμέσαι ξέστιν, οὐκ οὐρῆσαι ἄντιν ἄλλου. ταῦτα μὲν νῦν οὕτω φυλάσσεται. μεθυσκόμενοι δὲ εἰώθασι βουλεύσθαι τὰ σπουδαῖότατα τῶν πρηγμάτων: τὸ δ’ ἂν ἂθι σφίσι βουλευομένοις, τούτῳ τῇ υστεραίῃ νήσους προτιθεὶ οἱ στεγέαρχος ἐν τούτῳ ἂν εὐντες βουλεύσθαι. καὶ ηὗ μὲν ἂθη καὶ νήσους, χρεόνται αὐτῷ: εἰ δὲ μὴ, μετείσιν. τὰ δ’ ἂν νήσους προβουλεύσωσται, μεθυσκόμενοι ἐπιδιαγινώσκουσι..’’

-----

Recording facts about the Cretan [syssitia] in the fourth book of his Cretan History, Dosiadas writes as follows: "The Lyttians pool their goods for the [shared/common] [syssitia] in this way: every man contributes a tithe of his crops to his club, as well as the income from the state which the magistrates of the city divide among the households of all the citizens. But all slaves pay one Aeginetan stater per caput. The citizens are distributed in clubs which are called Andreia ('halls of men'). The mess is in charge of a woman who has assistants, three or four men chosen from the common people. Each of them is attended by two servants who bring in the fire-wood; these are called faggot-bearers. Everywhere throughout Crete there are two houses for the public messes; one of these is called Andreion, the other, in which they entertain strangers, is called koimeterion ('resting-place'). In the house intended for the mess there are set out, first of all, two tables, called 'guest-tables,' at which sit in honour any strangers who are in town; next come the tables for the others. An equal portion of the food on hand is served to each person; but only a half-portion of meat is given to the younger men, and they get nothing of the other food. Then on each table is placed a cup filled with wine much diluted; this is shared by all who are at the same table, and a second cup is served after they have finished the meal. For the boys a mixing-bowl is prepared which they share in common, but permission is given the older men to drink more if they desire. The woman in charge of the mess takes from the table in the sight of all the best of everything that is served, and sets it before the men who have distinguished themselves in war or in wisdom. After dinner they are in the habit first of deliberating on public affairs; from that subject they proceed to call up deeds of prowess in war and to praise the men of proved bravery, in order to encourage the younger men in the pursuit of virtue."

Pyrgion, in the third book of his Cretan Customs, says that Cretans at the public mess eat together in a sitting posture. He further says that food without condiments is served to the orphans; that the youngest of the Cretan men stand by to wait at the tables; and that, after a silent libation and prayer to the gods, they proceed to the distribution of the food on hand to all present. They also apportion to the sons seated below their fathers' chairs only one half as much as is served to the adult men, but the orphans receive an equal share with the latter, Falthough in their case each of the customary foods is served without the admixture of any condiments. There were also chairs reserved for guests, and a third table at the right as one entered the halls, which they called 'the table of Zeus, god of strangers,' or 'the strangers' table.'’’
Athenaeus, Deipnosophitai 6.84

Ποσειδώνιος δὲ φησιν ὃ ἀπὸ τῆς στοὰς ἐν τῇ τῶν ἱστοριῶν ἐνδεκάτῃ 'πολλοὺς τινας ἐκατῶν οὐ δυναμένους προϊστασθαι διὰ τὸ τῆς διανοίας ἁσθενὲς ἐπιδοῦνα ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὴν τῶν συνετωτέρων ὑπηρεσίαν, ὅπως παρ’ ἐκείνων τυγχάνοντες τῆς εἰς τὰ ἀναγκαῖα ἐπιμελείας αὐτοὶ πάλιν ἀποδιδόντες ἐκείνος δι’ αὐτῶν ἀπέρ ἀν ὁσιν ὑπηρετεῖν δυνατοῖ, καὶ τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ Μαριανδύνοι μὲν Ἡρακλεώταις ὑπετάγησαν, διὰ τέλους ὑποσχόντες ἐπαύσειν παρέχουσιν αὐτοῖς τὰ δέοντα, τοῖς δὲ ὑπηρετεῖν δυνατοί καὶ τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ Μαριανδύνοι δωροφόρους κέκληκε:

δωροφόροι καλεοίδαθ’ υποφρίσσοντες ἄνακτας.

λέγει δὲ καὶ Καλλίστρατος ὁ Ἀριστοφάνειος ὅτι τοὺς Μαριανδύνοὺς ὡνόμαζον μὲν δωροφόρους ἀφαιροῦντες τὸ πικρὸν τῆς ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν προσηγορίας, καθάπερ Σπαρτιᾶται μὲν ἐποίησαν ἐπὶ τῶν εἰλώτων, Θετταλοὶ δ’ ἐπὶ τῶν πενεστῶν, Κρῆτες δ’ ἐπὶ τῶν κλαρωτῶν, καλοῦσι δὲ οἱ Κρῆτες τοὺς μὲν κατὰ πόλιν οἰκέτας χρυσωνήτους, ἀμφαμώτας δὲ τοὺς κατ’ ἀγρόν ἐγχωρίους μὲν ὄντας, δουλεύοντας δὲ κατὰ θέλειον διὰ τὸ κληρωθῆναι δὲ κλαρώτας. ὁ Ἕφορος δ’ ἐν γ’ [p. 186] ἱστοριῶν ἀνακτας, φησί, Κρῆτες καλοῦσι τοὺς δοῦλους ἀπὸ τοῦ γενομένου περὶ αὐτῶν κλήρου, τούτοις δ’ εἰσὶ νενομισμέναι τινὲς ἐσορταὶ ἐν Κυδωνίᾳ, ἐν αἰς οὐκ εἰσίασιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐλευθεροδία, ἀλλ’ οἱ δούλοι πάνταν κρατοῦσι καὶ κύριοι μαστίγον εἰσὶ τοὺς ἐλευθερούς’ Σωσικράτης ρ’ δ’ ἐν δευτέρῳ Κρητικῶν τὴν μὲν κοινήν, φησί, δουλείαν Κρῆτες καλοῦσι μνοίαν, τὴν δὲ ἐδιὰν ἀμφαμώτας, τοὺς δὲ ἔστηκους περιοίκους’ τὰ παραπλήσια ἱστορεῖ καὶ Δωσιάδας ἐν δὲ Κρητικῶν.

-----

And Posidonus, the stoic philosopher, says in the eleventh book of his History, "That many men, who are unable to govern themselves, by reason of the weakness of their intellect, give themselves up to the guidance of those who are wiser than themselves, in order that receiving from them care and advice, and assistance in necessary matters, they may in their turn requite them with such services as they are able to render. And in this manner the Mariandyni became subject to the people of Heraclea, promising to act as their subjects for ever, if they would supply them with what they stood in need of; having made an agreement beforehand, that none of them would sell anything out of the territory of Heraclea, but that they would sell in that district alone. And perhaps it is on this account that Euphorion the epic poet called the Mariandyni Bringers of Gifts, saying—

And they may well be call’d Bringers of Gifts, Fearing the stern dominion of their kings.

350 Ibid.
And Callistratus the Aristophanean says that "they called the Mariandyni δωροφόροι, by that appellation take away whatever there is bitter in the name of servants, just as the [p. 414] Spartans did in respect of the Helots, the Thessalians in the case of the Penestae, and the Cretans with the Clarotae. But the Cretans call those servants who are in their houses Chrysonetis, and those whose work lies in the fields Amphamiothae, being natives of the country, but people who have been enslaved by the chance of war; but they also call the same people Clarotae, because they have been distributed among their masters by lot.

And Ephorus, in the third book of his Histories, “The Cretans call their slaves Clarotae, because lots have been drawn for them; and these slaves have some regularly recurring festivals in Cydonia, during which no freemen enter the city, but the slaves are the masters of everything, and have the right even to scourge the freemen.” But Sosicrates, in the second book of his History of Cretan Affairs, says, “The Cretans call public servitude μνοία, but the private slaves they call aphamiothae; and the periœci, or people who live in the adjacent districts, they call subjects. And Dosiiadas gives a very similar account in the fourth book of his history of Cretan Affairs.

**Athenaeus, Deipnosophitae 6.93**

“Ερμων δὲ ἐν Κρητικαῖς Γλώτταις μνοταῖς τοὺς ἑγγενεῖς οἰκέτας, Σέλευκος δ’ ἡξοὺς τὰς θεραπαίνας καὶ τοὺς θεράποντας, ἀποφράσην δὲ τὴν δούλην καὶ βολίζην, σύνδρονα δὲ τὸν δουλέκδουλον, ἀμφίπολον δὲ τὴν περὶ τὴν δήσποιναν θεράπαιναν, πρόπολον δὲ τὴν προπορευομένην.

-----

Hermon in the Cretan Glossary defines mnote as indigenous slaves, while Seleucus says that a佐伊 (‘attendants’) are handmaids and caretakers, apophrases and bolizes are female slaves in general, sindron is one born of a slave, aphipolos is the maid who waits on the mistress, propolos the maid who walks before her.

**Athenaeus, Deipnosophitae 13.12**

Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ πρὸ τῶν παρατάξεων Ἕρωτε προθύονται, ὡς ἐν τῇ τῶν παρατάταιομένων φιλίᾳ κειμένης τῆς σωτηρίας τε καὶ νίκης. καὶ Κρῆτες δ’ ἐν ταῖς παρατάξεσι τοὺς καλλίστους τῶν πολιτῶν κοσμήσαντες διὰ τούτων θύουσι τῷ Ἕρωτε, ὡς Σωσικράτης ἱστορεῖ.

-----

---

351 Ibid.
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142
And the Lacedaemonians offer sacrifices to Eros before they go to battle, thinking that safety and victory depend on the friendship of those who stand side by side in the battle array. And the Cretans, in their line of battle, adorn the handsomest of their citizens, and employ them to offer sacrifices to Eros on behalf of the state, as Sosicrates relates.

Athenaeus, *Deipnosophitai* 15.695f-696a

σκόλιον δὲ φασί τινες καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ Ὑβρίου τοῦ Κρητῶς ποιηθέν. ἔχει δ’ οὕτως: [p. 230]

ἐστι μοι πλοῦτος μέγας δόρῳ καὶ ξίφος
καὶ τὸ καλὸν λαισήιον, πρόβλημα χρωτός.
τούτῳ γάρ ἄρῳ, τούτῳ θερίζω,
τούτῳ πατέω τὸν ἄδConn οἴνον ἀπ’: άμπέλῳ,1
τούτῳ δεσπότας μνείως κέκλημαι.
τοὶ δὲ μὴ τολμῶντ’ ἔχειν δόρῳ καὶ ξίφος
καὶ τὸ καλὸν λαισήιον, πρόβλημα χρωτός,
πάντες γόνο πεπτηῶτες ἐμὸν κυνέοντι, δεσπόταν
καὶ μέγαν βασιλῆα φωνέοντες.

-----

Some also call that a scolium which was composed by Hybrias the Cretan; and it runs thus—

I have great wealth, a sword, and spear,
And trusty shield beside me here;
With these I plough, and from the vine
Squeeze out the heart-delighting wine;
They make me lord of everything.
But they who dread the sword and spear,
And ever trusty shield to bear,
Shall fall before me on their knees,
And worship me whene’er I please,
And call me mighty lord and king.

---

Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History* 5.80

[1] toûntον δ’ ἣμιν διευκρινημένον λείπεται περὶ τῶν ἐπιμιχθέντων ἐθνῶν τοῖς Κρητικοῖς διελθεῖν. ὃτι μὲν οὖν πρότοι κατόχησαν τὴν νῆσον οἱ προσαγορευθέντες μὲν Ἐτεόρκιταις, δοκοῦντες δ’ ὑπάρχειν αὐτόχθονες, προειρήκαμεν: μετὰ δὲ τούτους πολλὰς γενεάς ὑστερον Πελασγοὶ πλανώμενοι διὰ τὰς συνεχεῖς στρατείας καὶ μεταναστάσεις καταντήσαντες εἰς τὴν Κρήτην μέρος τῆς νῆσος κατόκησαν.

[2] τρίτον δὲ γένος ψαφί τῶν Δωριέων παραβαλείν εἰς τὴν νῆσον ἤγουμένου Τεκτάμου τοῦ Δώρου: τούτῳ δὲ τοῦ λαοῦ μέρος τὸ μὲν πλέον ἀνθρωποθήναι λέγουσιν ἐκ τῶν πρῶτων Ὁλομοποιόν τόπων, τὸ δὲ τὸ μέρος ἐκ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Λακωνικὴν Ἀχαϊῶν διὰ τὴν ἀρμομην τῶν Δώρων ἐκ τῶν περὶ Μαλέαν τόπων ποιήσασθαι. τέταρτον δὲ γένος συμμετέχων τοῖς εἰς τὴν Κρήτην μιγάδων μεροεῖς τῶν διὰ τὸν χρόνον ἐξομοιωθέντων τῇ διαλέκτῳ τοῖς ἑγχωρίοις Ἔλλησι.


-----

[1] But now that we have examined these matters it remains for us to discuss the peoples who have become intermixed with the Cretans. That the first inhabitants of the island were known as Eteocretans and that they are considered to have sprung from the soil itself, we have stated before; and many generations after them Pelasgians, who were in movement by reason of their continuous expeditions and migrations, arrived at Crete and made their home in a part of the island.

[2] The third people to cross over to the island, we are told, were Dorians, under the leadership of Tectamus the son of Dorus; and the account states that the larger number of these Dorians was gathered from the regions about Olympus, but that a part of them consisted of Achaeans from Laconia, since Dorus had fixed the base of his expedition in the region about Cape Malea. A fourth people to come to Crete and to become intermixed with

---

the Cretans, we are told, was a heterogeneous collection of barbarians who in the course of time adopted the language of the native Greeks.

[3] But after these events Minos and Rhadamanthys, when they had attained to power, gathered the peoples on the island into one union. And last of all, after the Return of the Heracleidae, Argives and Lacedaemonians sent forth colonies which they established on certain other islands and likewise took possession of Crete, and on these islands they colonized certain cities; with regard to these cities, however, we shall give a detailed account in connection with the period of time to which they belong. 4 And since the greatest number of writers who have written about Crete disagree among themselves, there should be no occasion for surprise if what we report should not agree with every one of them; we have, indeed, followed as our authorities those who give the more probable account and are the most trustworthy, in some matters depending upon Epimenides who has written about the gods, in others upon Dosiades, Sosicrates, and Laosthenidas.
Our Cretan customs, Stranger, are, as I think, such as anyone may grasp easily. As you may notice, Crete, as a whole, [625d] is not a level country, like Thessaly: consequently, whereas the Thessalians mostly go on horseback, we Cretans are runners, since this land of ours is
rugged and more suitable for the practice of foot-running. Under these conditions we are obliged to have light armour for running and to avoid heavy equipment; so bows and arrows are adopted as suitable because of their lightness. Thus all these customs of ours are adapted for war, [625e] and, in my opinion, this was the object which the lawgiver had in view when he ordained them all. Probably this was his reason also for instituting common meals: he saw how soldiers, all the time they are on campaign, are obliged by force of circumstances to mess in common, for the sake of their own security. And herein, as I think, he condemned the stupidity of the mass of men in failing to perceive that all are involved ceaselessly in a lifelong war against all States. If, then, these practices are necessary in war,—namely, messing in common for safety's sake, and the appointment of relays of officers and privates to act as guards,— [626a] they must be carried out equally in time of peace. For (as he would say) “peace,” as the term is commonly employed, is nothing more than a name, the truth being that every State is, by a law of nature, engaged perpetually in an informal war with every other State. And if you look at the matter from this point of view you will find it practically true that our Cretan lawgiver ordained all our legal usages, both public and private, with an eye to war, and that he therefore charged us with the task of guarding our laws safely, [626b] in the conviction that without victory in war nothing else, whether possession or institution, is of the least value, but all the goods of the vanquished fall into the hands of the victors.

Athenian

Your training, Stranger, has certainly, as it seems to me, given you an excellent understanding of the legal practices of Crete. But tell me this more clearly still: by the definition you have given of the well-constituted State [626c] you appear to me to imply that it ought to be organized in such a way as to be victorious in war over all other States. Is that so?

Clinias

Certainly it is; and I think that our friend here shares my opinion.

Plato, Laws 2.666d-2.667a

Ἀθηναῖος
eἰκότως γε: ὅντως γὰρ ὁμὴν ἐπήβολοι γεγόνατε τῆς [666e] καλλίστης φύσες. στρατοπέδου γὰρ πολιτείαν ἔχετε ἀλλʼ ὁμὴν ἐν ἀστει καταρκηκτῶν, ἀλλʼ οὗν ἀθλοῦσα πόλιος ἐν ἀγάλη
νεμομένους φορβάδας τοὺς νέους κέκτησεν· λαβὼν δʼ ὑμᾶν ὑδεις τὸν αὐτοῦ, παρὰ τὸν
συννόμων σπάσας σφόδρα ἀγριαίνοντα καὶ ἀγανακτοῦντα, ἵπποκόμοιν τε ἔπεισησαν ἱδία καὶ
παιδεύει φηξὰν τε καὶ ἥμερὸν, καὶ πάντα προσῆκαν ἀποδίδοντός τη παιδοτροφία ὅθεν οὐ
μόνον ἀγάθος [667a] ἀν στρατιώτης εἰ, πόλιν δὲ καὶ ἀστή δυνάμενος διοικεῖν, ὅν δὴ κατʼ
ἀρχάς εἴπομεν τὸν Τυρταίου πολεμικὸν εἶναι πολεμικότερον, τέταρτον ἀρετῆς ἀλλʼ οὐ
πρῶτον τὴν ἀνδρείαν κτήμα τιμῶντα οἴκι καὶ πανταχοῦ, ἰδιώταις τε καὶ συμπάσχει πόλει.

356 Ibid.
Κλεινίας
οὐκ οἶδα ἡμῶν, ὦ ξένε, ὡς πάλιν αὖ τοὺς νομιθέτας φαυλίζεις.

-----

Athenian
Naturally; for in truth you never attained to [666e] the noblest singing. For your civic organization is that of an army rather than that of city-dwellers, and you keep your young people massed together like a herd of colts at grass: none of you takes his own colt, dragging him away from his fellows, in spite of his fretting and fuming, and puts a special groom in charge of him, and trains him by rubbing him down and stroking him and using all the means proper to child-nursing, that so he may turn out not only a good soldier, [667a] but able also to manage a State and cities—in short, a man who (as we said at the first) is more of a warrior than the warriors of Tyrtaeus, inasmuch as always and everywhere, both in States and in individuals, he esteems courage as the fourth in order of the virtues, not the first.

Clinias
Once again, Stranger, you are—in a sort of a way—disparaging our lawgivers.
Pollux, *Onomasticon 3.83*\(^\text{357}\)

Περὶ τῶν κατὰ χώρας θεραπόντων

Μεταξὺ δὲ ἐλευθέρων καὶ δούλων οἱ Λακεδαίμονίων Εἶλωτες, καὶ Θεταλῶν Πενέσται, καὶ Κρητῶν Κλαρόται, καὶ Μνωῖται.

-----

Regarding those who are servants of the land:

Between those who are free and those who are slaves among the Lacedaimonians are the *helots*, and among the Thessalians the *penestai*, and among the Cretans the *klarotai*, and the *mnoitai*.

Strabo, Geography 10.4

[1] ἐπεί δὲ πρῶτον περὶ τῶν τῆς Πελοποννήσου νῆσον τῶν τε ἄλλων διήλθον καὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ Κορινθιακῷ κόλπῳ καὶ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ, περὶ τῆς Κρήτης ἐφεξῆς ῥητοῦ (καὶ γὰρ αὕτη τῆς Πελοποννήσου ἐέτι) καὶ εἰ τις τῇ Εἰρηνῆς: ἐν δὲ ταύταις αἱ τε Κυκλάδες εἰσὶ καὶ αἱ Σποράδες, αἱ μὲν ἄξια μνήμης αἱ δὲ ἀσημέτεραι.


[3] μέγεθος δὲ Σωσικράτης μὲν, ὃν φησιν ἀκριβοῦν Ἀπολλόδωρος τὰ περὶ τὴν νῆσον, ἀφορίζεται μήκει μὲν πλευρῶν ἢ δισχιλίων σταδίων καὶ τριακοσίων, πλάτει δὲ ὑπὸ τὸ μέγεθος, ὡσθ’ ὁ κύκλος κατὰ τούτον γίνοιτ’ ἀν πλέων ἢ πεντακεχίλιοι σταδίων: Ἀρτεμίδωρος δὲ τετρακεχίλιοι καὶ ἐκατόν φήσιν. Ἐρώνυμος δὲ μήκος δισχιλίων φήσι τὸ δὲ πλάτος ἀνώμαλον, πλευρῶν ἀν ἐν λέγον τὸν κύκλον ἢ ὄσον Ἀρτεμίδωρος. κατὰ δὲ τὸ τρίτον μέρος τοῦ μήκους: ... τὸ δὲ ἐνθεὶν ἱσθμὸς ἐστιν ὡς ἐκατόν σταδίων ἔχον κατοικίαν πρὸς μὲν τῇ βορείῳ θαλάττῃ Ἀμφίμαλλαν, πρὸς δὲ τῇ νοτίῳ Φοῖνικα τὸν Λαμπέων: πλατυτάτη δὲ κατὰ τὸ μέσον ἐστι, πάλιν δ’ ἐνεσθεὶς εἰς στενότερον τοῦ προτέρου συμπέπτουσιν ἱσθμὸν αἱ ἱματες περὶ ἐξήκοντα σταδίων, τὸν ἀπὸ Μινώος τῆς Λυττίων εἰς Ἐράπανων καὶ τῷ Λιβυκῷ πέλαγος: ἐν κόλπῳ δ’ ἐστιν ἡ πόλις, ἐπὶ πρόσεισιν εἰς ὅξυ ἀκρωτηρίου τὸ Σαμωνίων ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀἰγύπτιον νεῦον καὶ τὰς Ῥωδίων νῆσους.

[4] ἔστι δ’ ὁρεινή καὶ δασεία ἡ νῆσος, ἔχει δ’ αὐλώνας εὐκάρπους. τῶν δ’ ὄρων τὰ μὲν πρὸς δύσιν καλεῖται Λευκά, οὐ λειπόμενα τοῦ Ταῦγέτου κατὰ τὸ ὄψι, ἐπὶ τὸ μήκος δ’ ἐκτεταμένα ὡς τριάκοσίων σταδίων καὶ ποιοῦντα ράχιν τελευτάδιν ποὺ ἐπὶ τῶν στενά. ἐν μέσῳ δ’ ἐστι κατὰ τὸν εὐρυχορότατον τῆς νῆσος τὸ Ἰδαιὼν όρος υψηλότατον τῶν ἔκει, περιφερεῖ δ’ ἐν κύκλῳ σταδίων ἐξακοσίων: περιοικεῖται δ’ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρίστων πόλεων. ἄλλα δ’ ἐστι πάρισα τοῖς Λευκοῖς, τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ νότων τὰ δ’ ἐπὶ τὴν ἦω λήγοντα.

[5] ἔστι δ’ ἀπὸ τῆς Κυρηναίας ἐπὶ τὸ Κριοῦ μέτοπον δυεῖν ἡμιρόδ καὶ νυκτὸν πλοῦς, ἀπὸ δὲ Κιμάρου ἐπὶ Ταῦναρον εἰσὶ στάδιοι ἐπτακόσιοι (μεταξὺ δὲ Κύθηρα), ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Σαμωνίου

καὶ ἑκάστῳ εἴκοσι κύκλον εἶτα τοὺς ἄποικον Παρνασσὸν εἶναι "πρὸς ἔµµοτης" ἐν μὲν Ἀχαιοὶ, ἐν δὲ Ἐπεδρίκτες μεγαλήτορες, ἐν δὲ Κύδωνες, Δωρίδες τε τριχάκεις διοί τε Πελασγοί."τούτων φησὶ Στάφυλος τὸ μὲν πρὸς ἐώς Δωρίδες κατέχειν, τὸ δὲ δυσμικὸν Κύδωνας, τὸ δὲ νότον Ἐπεδρίκτες, ἵνα εἶναι πολύχινον Πράσσον, ὅπου τοῦ τοῦ Δικταίου Διὸς ἱερὸν: τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἱσχύοντας πλέον οἰκήσαι τα πεδία. τοὺς μὲν οὖν Ἐπεδρίκτες καὶ τοὺς Κύδωνας αὐτοχθόνας ὑπάρξαι εἰκός, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς ἐπήλυδας, ὥσ᾽ ἐκ Θετταλίας φησίν ἔλθειν Ἀνδρὸν τῆς Δωρίδος μὲν πρότερον νῦν δὲ Ἐπιαιώντος λεγομένης: εἷς ἦς ἀρισμήθησα, ὡς φησίν, ὑπὲρ τὸν Παρνασσὸν οἰκήσαντες Δωρίδες καὶ ἐκτίσαν τὴν τε Ἐρινεὺς καὶ Βοΐνων καὶ Κυτίνων, ἀφ᾽ οὗ καὶ τριχακεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ λέγονται. οὗ πάντων τοῦ Ανδρῶνος λόγον ἀποδέχονται, τὴν μὲν τετράπολιν Δωρίδα τρίπολιν ἀποφαίνοντος, τὴν δὲ μητρόπολιν τῶν Δωρίων ἄποικον Θετταλῶν: τριχακας δὲ δέχονται ἦτοι ἀπὸ τῆς τριλοφίας ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ τριχίνου εἶναι τοὺς λόφους.

[7] πόλεις δ᾽ εἰσὶν ἐν τῇ Κρήτῃ πλείους μὲν, μέγιστα δὲ καὶ ἐπιφανεστάτα τρεῖς, Κνωσός Γόρτυνα Κυδωνία, διαφερόντως δὲ τὴν Κνωσόν καὶ Ὄμηρος ὑμεῖς μεγάλην καλῶν καὶ βασιλεύον τοῦ Μίνω καὶ οἱ ὡστροφος. καὶ δὴ καὶ διετέλεσα μέχρι πολλοῦ φερομένη τὰ πρῶτα, εἶτα ἐπανενόθη καὶ πολλά τῶν νομίμων ἀφρητή, μετέτοι δὲ τὸ ἀξίωμα εἰς τε Γόρτυναν καὶ Λύκτων, ὡστροφος δ᾽ ἀνέλαβε πάλιν το παλαιόν σχῆμα τὸ τῆς μητρόπολεως. κεῖται δ᾽ ἐν πεδίῳ κύκλων ἔχουσα ἢ Κνωσός τὸν ἀρχαίον τράκοντα σταδίων, μεταξὺ τῆς Λυκτίας καὶ τῆς Γορτυνίας, διέχουσα τῆς μὲν Γορτύνης σταδίους διακοσίους, τῆς δὲ Λύκτων, ἵνα ὁ ποιητὴς Λύκτων ὄνόμασεν, ἕκατον εἴκοσι: τῆς δὲ βαλάττις Κνωσοῦ μὲν τῆς βορείου πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι, Γόρτυνα δὲ τῆς Λιβυκῆς ἐνενήκτοντες, Λύκτων δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ τῆς Λιβυκῆς ὑγοθήκοντα. ἔχει δ᾽ ἐπίνειον τὸ Ἡράκλειον ἢ Κνωσός.

[8] Μίνω δὲ φασίν ἐπινείως χρῆσασθαί τῷ Ἀμνισώ, ὅπου τὸ τῆς Εἰλεθυίας ἱερὸν. ἐκαλεῖτο δ᾽ ἢ Κνωσός Καίρατος πρότερον ὄμονομος τὸ παραρρέων ποταμοῦ. ἵστορηται δ᾽ ὁ Μίνως νομοθέτης γενοῦν λαοῦ τὰς αὐτῶς διακρατῆσαι τὰ πρῶτα, τριχη δὴ διελὼν τὴν νήσου ἐν ἑκάστῳ τοῦ μέρει κτίσαν πάλιν, τὴν μὲν Κνωσόν ἐν τῷ Ἐστεόκρητος εἴς τῆς Ἑλείθυας τεττάρων ἔκατον διακρατῆσαι τοῦ ἄδελφου αὐτοῦ, ὡς πρῶτος τὴν νήσου ἐξημέρισε δοκεῖ νομίμοις καὶ συνοικισμοῖς πόλεων καὶ πολιτείαι, σκηνάμενος παρὰ Δίως φέρειν ἑκατά τῶν τιθεμένων δουμάτων εἰς μέσον. τούτων δὴ μιμούμενος καὶ ὁ Μίνως ὅτι ἐννέα ἐτῶν, ὡς ἐσκε, ἀναβαίνων ἐπὶ τὸ τοῦ Δίως ἄντρον καὶ διατρήσας ἐνθάδε, ἀπῆρ συντεταγμένα ἔχουν παραγγελματία τίνα, ἢ ἐφασκεν εἰς προστάματα τοῦ Δίως: ἢ ἢς αἰτίας καὶ τὸν ποιητὴν ὑπότης εἰρηκέναι" ἐνθάδε Μίνως ἐννέαρος βασιλεὺς Δίως μεγάλου ὁραστής."τοπίστα δ᾽ εἰπόντος οἱ ἄρχαιοι περί αὐτοῦ πάλιν ἄλλους εἰρήκασι λόγους ὑπεναντίοις τούτοις, ὡς τυραννικὸς γενόσι καὶ βίασι καὶ δασμολόγος, τραγῳδοῦντες τὰ περὶ τὸν Μινώταυρον καὶ τὸν λαβύρινθον καὶ τὰ Θησεῖ ςυμβάντα καὶ Δαιώλῳ.

[10] ζει περὶ μὲν οὖν Κνωσσοῦ ταῦτα, πόλεως οὐκ ἄλλοτρίας ἦμι, διὰ δὲ τάνθρωπινα καὶ τὰς ἐν αὐτῶς μεταβολὰς καὶ συντυχίας ἐκλεκτομεμένων τῶν συμβολῶν τῶν υπαρξάντων ἢμιν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν. Δορυλάος γὰρ ἦν ἀνὴρ τακτικὸς, τὸν Μιθριδάτου τὸν Εὐεργέτου φίλον: οὕτως διὰ τὴν τὴν ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ἐμπερίοις ἐξενολεῖσθαι ἀποδεχθεῖσιν πολεῖς ἦν ἐν τῇ Ἕλλαδι καὶ τῇ Ῥώμῃ, πολεῖς δὲ καὶ τοῖς παρὰ τῆς Κρήτης ἱοῦσι, οὕτως τὴν νήσον ἐκόντων Ρωμαίων, συνηγοροῦ δὲ ὄντος ἐν αὐτῇ τοῦ μισθοφορικοῦ καὶ στρατιωτικοῦ πλῆθους, εἷς οὐ καὶ τὰ ληστηρία πληροῦσθαι συνεβαίνει. ἐπιδημοῦντος δὲ τοῦ Δορυλᾶου κατὰ τὴν ἐνέστη πόλειμοι τοῖς Κνωσσοῦνδρος πρὸς τοὺς Γερμανίους: αἰρέθησι δὲ στρατηγὸς καὶ κατορθώσας διὰ ταχέως ἦρατο τιμᾶς τὰς μεγίστας, καὶ ἐπειδὴ μικρὸν ὥστερον ἐπίβουλῆς δολοφονηθέντα ἦσον τὸν Εὐεργέτην ύπὸ τῶν φιλῶν ἐν Σινώπῃ, τὴν διαδοχὴν δὲ εἰς γυναίκα καὶ παιδία ἤκουσαν, ἀπογονοῦ τῶν ἐκεῖ κατέμεινεν ἐν τῇ Κνωσσῷ: τεκνοποιεῖται δ’ ἐκ Μακέτιδος γυναικὸς Στεφόπους τοῦ νομίμου δύο μὲν υἱὸς Λαγήταν καὶ Στρατάρχον, ὅτι τὸν Στρατάρχαν ἐςγατόγηρον καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐξονεμόμεθα, θυγατέρα δὲ μίαν. διεισδυόμεθα δ’ ὄντος ιδίων τοῦ Εὐεργέτου διεδέχετα τὴν βασιλείαν Μιθριδάτης ὁ προσαγορευθεὶς Ἐπικατὰ τοῦτο γεγονός: τοῦτο σύντροφος ὑπήρξεν ὁ τοῦ Φυλεταίρου δορυλάος: ἵνα δ’ ὁ Φυλεταίρος ἅδελφος τοῦ τακτικοῦ Δορυλᾶου, ἀνδροθεὶς δ’ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτο ἦρημο τῇ συντροφίᾳ τῇ πρὸς τὸν Δορυλάον ὥστε οὐκ ἔκεινος μένον εἰς τιμᾶς ἦγε τὰς μεγίστας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν συγγενέων ἐπεμείλειτο καὶ τοὺς ἐν Κνωσσῷ μετεπέμπτε: ἦσαν δ’ οἱ περὶ Λαγήταν, τοὺς μὲν πατρὸς ἢδη τετελευτηκότος, αὐτοὶ δ’ ἤνδρωμενοι, καὶ ἦσαν ἀφέντες τὰ ἐν Κνωσσῷ: τοῦ δὲ Λαγήτα θυγατέρα ἦν ἡ μήτηρ τῆς εἰς ἐπιβουλῆς εὐσυνεργοῦσας. εὐσυνεργοῦσας δὲ ἤκουσεν τούτως καὶ τούτως συνεβαίνει, καταλυθέντος δ’ ἐφοράθη ἄφτας τοῖς Ρωμαίοις τὴν βασιλείαν ἐρ’ ὃς αὐτὸς εἰς τὴν ἄρχην καταστήσει (συγκαταλήθη καὶ τὰ τούτων καὶ ἐταπεινωθήσατο: ὠλιγορηθῆ δὲ καὶ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς Κνωσσοῦς συμβόλαια καὶ αὐτῶς μυρίας μεταβολὰς δεξαμένους).

[11] ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὁ μὲν περὶ τῆς Κνωσσοῦ λόγος τοὐδότος. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτην δευτερεύσα δοκεῖ κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν ἢ τῶν Γερμανίων πόλεις, συμπράττοσας τε γὰρ ἀλλήλαις ἄπαντας ὑπόκουσι εἰσόν αὐτοὺς ἄλλους, συστάσασαι τε διέστησαν τὰ κατὰ τὴν νήσον: προσθήκη δ’ ἦν ἡ Κυδωνία μεγίστη ὁποτέρως προσγενός. καίτη δ’ ἐν πεδίῳ καὶ ὑ τῶν Γορτυνίων πόλεις, τὸ παλαιὸν μὲν ἰδίως τετειχισμένη (καθάπερ καὶ ὁμηρός εἴρηκε“ Γορτυνά τε τειχήσεσαν”), ὥστερον δ’ ἀποβαλοῦσα τοῦ τείχους ἐκ θεμελίων καὶ πάντα τὸν χρόνον μείνασα 152
κατασκαφῆναί Ἐφορὸς τὸ πρὸς ἑσπέραν Δίκτη Πράσιοι πεντήκοντα σταδίους ἀτείχιστος ἐκ τῶν µαυτῆρας καὶ ἐκ τῆς Χερρονήσου πρὸς τὴν Γόρτυνος µεταξὺ τοῦ Κυδωνία καὶ τῆς Χερρονήσου πρὸς τὴν Γόρτυνος ἐπὶ τῶν ἄθλων. Κύνα Άρατος τὸν σταδίους τὴν Μάταλον εἶναι εἰς τὴν Κυδωνίαν τοὺς διέχοντες τὴν Ἀλθαι Δικταίων. 

[12] ἐκ δὲ Λεβήνος ἦν Λευκοκόμας τε καὶ ὁ ἐραστὴς αὐτοῦ Εὐζύνθετος, οὔς ἰστορεῖ Θεοφραστὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ ἐρωτὸς λόγῳ, ἀθλῶν ὅν ὁ Λευκοκόμας τῷ Εὐζύνθετῳ προσέταξεν ἐνα φήσας εἶναι τούτων, τὸν ἐν Πρᾶσῳ κύνα ἄναγγελν αὐτῷ: ὁµοροί δὲ εἶσιν αὐτῶς οἱ Πρᾶσιοι, τῆς µὲν θαλάττης ἐβδομήκοντα Γόρτυνος δὲ διέχοντες ἐκατὸν καὶ ὀγδοίκοντα.

Εἰρήνη δὲ ὦν τῶν Ἐπεκρήτην ὑπήρχεν ἡ Πρᾶσος καὶ διότι ἐνταῦθα τὸ τοῦ Δικταίου Δίως ἱερὸν καὶ γὰρ ἡ Δίκτη πλησίον, ούχ ὃς Ἀρατος ὃς σχεδὸν Ἰδαιοῦ, καὶ γὰρ χαίλως ἡ Δίκτη τῆς Ἰδῆς ἀπέχει, πρὸς ἀνίσχοντα ἥλιον ἀπ ἀυτῆς κειμένη, τοῦ δὲ Σαμωνίου ἐκατόν. 

Μεταξὺ τοῦ Σαμωνίου καὶ τῆς Χερρονήσου η Πρᾶσος ἰδρυτὸ ὑπὲρ τῆς θαλάττης ἐξήκοντα σταδίους: κατέσκαψαν δὲ Ἰεραστύνιοι, οὐκ εἰ δὲ ύπερ τὸν Καλλιμαγὸν λέγειν φασὶν, ὡς ἡ Βριτύμαρτις φεύγουσα τὴν Μίνω βιάν ἀπὸ τῆς Δίκτης ἀλόιτο εἰς ἀλώνιον δίκτυα, καὶ διὰ τούτῳ αὐτῆ µὲν Δίκτυννα ὑπὸ τῶν Κυδωνιατῶν προσαγορευθεῖτι, Δίκτη δὲ τὸ ὅρος: ύπὲρ γὰρ ὦλος εκ γειτόνων ἐστὶν τοὺς τόπους τούτους ἡ Κυδωνία, πρὸς δὲ τῶς ἐσπερίους κεῖται τῆς νήσου πέρασα. τῆς µέντοι Κυδωνίας ὅρος ἐστὶν Τίτυρος, ἐν ὂς ἱερὸν ἐστὶν οὐ Δικταίον ἀλλὰ Δικτύνναιον.


[15] τοῦ δὲ ποίητο τὸ µὲν ἐκατομπολεῖν λέγοντος τὴν Κρήτην τὸ δὲ ἐνενηκοντάπολιν, Ὅφος µὲν ύποεπον ἐπικτείθησαν τᾶς δέκα φησὶ µετά τὰ Τροϊκά ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀλθαιμένε τῷ Ἀργείῳ συνακολουθησάντων Δωρίσεων: τὸν µὲν οὖν Ὁδυσσέα λέγει ἐνενηκοντάπολιν ὁνομάσα: οὕτως µὲν οὖν πιθανὸς ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος, ἄλλοι δ’ ύπο τῶν Ἡδομένως εἰρήν κατασκαφῆναι φασὶ τᾶς δέκα: ἀλλ’ οὕτε κατὰ τὰ Τροϊκὰ φησίν ὁ ποιητῆς ἐκατοντάπολιν
οὐκ εἶναι τινα τοξικῇ καὶ πενέστεροι λιτῶς ἀλλ᾽ χώρας οὔτε ὑπάρξαι ὀνήν δὲ λέγεσθαι γὰρ οὐχὶ καὶ δὲ ζῶσιν οὓς ἔεχεν καὶ ασι εὑρῆσθαι δὲ καὶ µκατὰ: τὴν ἐνοπλίῳ πόνοις πολιτείας πάθους αἰρο κακωθεισῶν, ἐν δ᾽ ἐπάνοδον νῦν οὕτω τελείους ἐν ποιήσει οὐκ Ὑπάρξαι σωματείως τῶν Ἐλλήνων µήτε κατὰ τὴν πλάνην µήθ᾽ ὐστερον, ὁ δὲ καὶ συστατεύσας τῷ Ἰδομενεῖ καὶ συνανασοθείς οὐκ ἔγνω τὰ συμβάντα οἰκί αὐτῷ. ἀλλὰ µὴν οὐδὲ µὴν εἰς τὴν ἐπάνοδον: εἰ γὰρ µετὰ πάντων ἑσώθη τῶν ἐταίρων, ἱσχυρὸς ἐπανήλθεν, ὡστ᾽ οὐκ ἔμελλον ἵσχυσεν οἱ ἐρθοὶ τοσοῦτον ὑπὸ δέκα αφαιρεῖσθαι πόλεις αὐτὸν. τῆς µὲν οὖν χώρας τῶν Κρήτων τοιαύτα τὶς ἤ περιοδεία.


[17] λέγεσθαι δ᾽ ὑπὸ τίνων ὡς Λακωνικὰ εἶπα τὰ πολλὰ τῶν νοµίζοµενον Κρητικῶν, τὸ δ᾽ ἄλλθες εὑρίσκει· µὲν ὑπ᾽ ἐκείνων, ἤκριβοκένα δὲ τοὺς Σπαρτιάτας, τοὺς δὲ Κρήτας ὀλγυρήσας, καθοµεῖσαι τῶν πολεοδοµῶν καὶ µάλιστα τῆς Κυνοσίων, τῶν πολεµικῶν· µεῖναι δὲ τίνα τῶν νοµίζον µὴ µατίσατε καὶ Πολιτικοῖς καὶ ἄλλοις τισὶ πολιοχίς µᾶλλον ἢ παρ᾽ ἑκείνως· καὶ δὴ καὶ τῶν Λυττίων νόµιµα ποιεῖσθαι μαρτύρα τοὺς τὰς Λακωνικὰ πρεσβυτέρα ἀποφαινόντας· ἀποίκους γὰρ ἔοτεν φυλάττει τὰς τῆς µητροπόλεως ἔθη, ἑπὶ ἄλλως γε εὐθές εἶναι τὸ τοὺς βέλτιον συνεστώτατα καὶ πολιτευόµενος τῶν χερών ἡλικοῖς ἀποφαινεῖν· οὐκ εὖ δὲ ταύτα λέγεσθαι· οὔτε γὰρ ἐκ τῶν νῦν καθεσθητὸν τὰ παλαιὰ τεκµηριούθεια δεῖν, εἰς τάνατα ἐκκείσθαι καὶ συνεστῖν καὶ καὶ γὰρ ναυκρατεῖν πρὸς τοὺς Κρήτας, ὡστε καὶ παροιμιάζεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς προσποιοµένους· µὴ εἰδέναι· ἢ Κρήτης ἄγνοι τὴν θάλασσαν· τῶν δ᾽ ἀποβεβληθήκαν τὸ ναυτικόν: οὔτε ὃποιοι τίνες τῶν πόλεως γέγονασιν τὸν τὴν Κρήτη Σπαρτιατῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἑκείνων νοµίµοις διαµένειν ἐπηναγκάζειαν.
πολλάς γοῦν τῶν ἀποικίδων μὴ φυλάττειν τὰ πάρτια, πολλάς δὲ καὶ τῶν μη ἀποικίδων ἐν Κρήτῃ τὰ αὐτὰ ἦχειν τοῖς ἀποικίδιοις ἔθη.


ἄναγραφῆς συνέδριον τε πολυτελῆ νο ἐραστοῦ ἐρω

[21] ἱδιὰν δ’ αὐτοῖς τὸ περὶ τοὺς ἔρωτας νόμιμον: οὐ γὰρ πειθοὶ κατεργάζονται τοὺς ἐρωμένους ἀλλ’ ἀρπαγῇ: προλέγει τοὺς φίλους πρὸ τριῶν ἢ πλειόνων ἤμερων ὁ ἔραστής ὁτι μέλλει τὴν ἁρπαγὴν ποιεῖσθαι: τοῖς δ’ ἀποκρύπτειν μὲν τὸν παιδὸ ἢ μὴ ἐὰν πορεύεσθαι τὴν τεταγμένην ὁδὸν τῶν αἰχμῆτων ἐστίν, ὡς ἐξαμολογουμένως ὁτι ἀνάξιος ὁ παῖς εἰ ἄυλου ἐραστοῦ τυγχάνειν: συννόντες δ’, ἄν μὲν τὸν ἵστον ἢ τὸν ὑπερεχθὲν τῆς ἢ τοῦ παιδὸς τιμὴν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὁ ἁρπαζόν, ἐπιδιόκοντες ἀνθήγαγον μόνων μετρίω τὸ νόμιμον ἐκπληροῦντες, τάλλα δ’ ἐπιτρέπουσιν ἄγεν χαίροντες: ἄν δ’ ἀνάξιος, ἀφαιροῦνται: πέρας δὲ τῆς ἐπιδιώξεως ἐστίν ὡς ἄρηθ ὁ παῖς εἰς τὸ τοῦ ἁρπασταντὸς ἀνδρείαν. ἔραψομεν δὲ νομίζοσιν οὐ τὸν κάλλεσ διαφέροντα, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀνδρεία καὶ κοσμίουτί ... καὶ δορσῆσομεν ἄπαγε τὸν παιδὸ τῆς χώρας εἰς ὅν βούλεται τόπον: ἐπακουοῦσι δὲ τῇ ἁρπαγῇ οἱ παραγενόμενοι, ἐστισθέντες δὲ καὶ συνθηρεύσαστες δίμην (οὐ γὰρ ἔξεστι πλεῖον χρόνον κατέχειν τὸν παιδὸ) εἰς τὴν πολίν καταβαίνονσιν. ἀφίεται δ’ ὁ παῖς δώδε λαβὼν στολῆν πολεμικὴν καὶ βοῶν καὶ ποθήριον. ταῦτα μὲν τὰ κατὰ τὸν νόμον δώρα ... καὶ ἄλλα πλεῖον καὶ πολυτελῆ, ὡστε συναριθμεῖν τοὺς φίλους διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τὸν ἀναλομπόν. τὸν μὲν οὖν βοῦν θύει τὸ Δή καὶ ἐστὶ τοὺς συγκαταβαίνοντας, εἰτ’ ἀποφαίνεται περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν ἐραστὴν ὁμιλίας εἰτ’ ἀσμενίων τετύχηκεν ἐπε μή, τὸ νόμον τοῦτ’ ἐπιτρέψαντος, ἵν’ εἰ τις αὐτῷ βίᾳ προσένεικται κατὰ τὴν ἁρπαγήν, ἐναῦθα παρῆ τιμωρεῖ ἐαυτό καὶ ἀπαλλάττεσθαι. τοῖς δὲ καλοῖς τὴν ιδέαν καὶ προγόνων ἐπιφανήν ἀψευδόν ἀραστόν μὴ τυχεῖν, ὡς διὰ τὸν τρόπον τοῦτο παθοῦν. ἔχουσι δὲ τιμᾶς οἱ παρασταθέντες (οὕτω γὰρ καλοῦσθαν τοὺς ἁρπαγέντας): ἐν τῇ γὰρ τοῖς χρόνοις καὶ τοῖς δρόμοις ἔχουσι τὰς ἐντιμῶτας χώρας, τῇ τε στολῇ κοσμεῖσθαι διαφερόντος τῶν ἄλλων ἐφίεται τῇ δοθείᾳ παρά τὸν ἐραστόν, καὶ οὐ τότε μόνον ἄλλα καὶ τέλειοι γενόμενοι διάσειμον ἑσθήτα φέρουσιν, ἄρ’ ἣς γνωσθῆσεται ἐκαστὸς κλείνος γενόμενος: τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἐρώμενον καλοῦσθαν κλείνον τὸν δ’ ἐραστὴν φιλίτορα.

[22] ταῦτα μὲν τὰ περὶ τοὺς ἔρωτας νόμιμα. ἀρχοντας δὲ δέκα αἰροῦνται: περὶ δὲ τῶν μεγίστων συμβουλῶν χρωνίζουσι τοῖς γέρουσι καλουμένοις: καθίστανται δ’ εἰς τὸ τὸ συνεδρίον οἱ τῆς τῶν κόσμων ἀρχής ἤξιωμενοί καὶ τάλλα ὀφέκμοι κρίνομενοι. ἄξιον δ’ ἀναγραφῆς τῆς τὸν Κριτίων πολιτείαν ὑπέλαβον διὰ γα τὴν ἴδιότητα καὶ τὴν δόξαν: οὐ πολλὰ δὲ διαμένει τούτων τῶν νομίμων, ἄλλα τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις διατάγμασι τὰ πλεῖστα διοικεῖται, καθάπερ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις συμβαίνει.
(for it, too, belongs to the Peloponnesus) and any islands that are in the neighborhood of Crete. Among these are the Cyclades and the Sporades, some worthy of mention, others of less significance.

[2] But at present let me first discuss Crete. Now although Eudoxus says that it is situated in the Aegaean Sea, one should not so state, but rather that it lies between Cyrenaea and that part of Greece which extends from Sunium to Laconia, stretching lengthwise parallel with these countries from west to east, and that it is washed on the north by the Aegaean and the Cretan Seas, and on the south by the Libyan Sea, which borders on the Egyptian. As for its two extremities, the western is in the neighborhood of Phalasarna; it has a breadth of about two hundred stadia and is divided into two promontories (of these the southern is called Criumetopon, the northern Cimarus), whereas the eastern is Samonium, which falls toward the east not much farther than Sunium.

[3] As for its size, Sosicrates, whose account of the island, according to Apollodorus, is exact, defines it as follows: In length, more than two thousand three hundred stadia, and in breadth, . . . , so that its circuit, according to him, would amount to more than five thousand stadia; but Artemidorus says it is four thousand one hundred. Hieronymus says that its length is two thousand stadia and its breadth irregular, and therefore might mean that the circuit is greater than Artemidorus says. For about a third of its length . . . ; and then comes an isthmus of about one hundred stadia, which, on the northern sea, has a settlement called Amphimalla, and, on the southern, Phoenix, belonging to the Lampians. The island is broadest near the middle. And from here the shores again converge to an isthmus narrower than the former, about sixty stadia in width, which extends from Minoa, city of the Lyctians, to Hierapytna and the Libyan Sea; the city is situated on the gulf. Then the island projects into a sharp promontory, Samonium, which slopes in the direction of Egypt and the islands of the Rhodians.

[4] The island is mountainous and thickly wooded, but it has fruitful glens. Of the mountains, those towards the west are called Leuca; they do not fall short of Taÿgetus in height, extend in length about three hundred stadia, and form a ridge which terminates approximately at the narrows. In the middle, in the most spacious part of the island, is Mount Ida, loftiest of the mountains of Crete and circular in shape, with a circuit of six hundred stadia; and around it are the best cities. There are other mountains in Crete that are about as high as the Leuca, some terminating towards the south and others towards the east.

[5] The voyage from Cyrenaea to Criumetopon takes two days and nights, and the distance from Cimarus to Taenarum is seven hundred stadia, Cythera lying between them; and the voyage from Samonium to Egypt takes four days and nights, though some say three. Some state that this is a voyage of five thousand stadia, but others still less. Eratosthenes says that the distance from Cyrenaea to Criumetopon is two thousand, and from there to the Peloponnesus less . . .
“But one tongue with others is mixed,” the poet says; “there dwell Achaeanach, there Eteo-Cretans proud of heart, there Cydonians and Dorians, too, of waving plumes, and goodly Pelasgians.” Of these peoples, according to Staphylus, the Dorians occupy the part towards the east, the Cydonians the western part, the Eteo-Cretans the southern; and to these last belongs the town Prasus, where is the temple of the Dictaean Zeus; whereas the other peoples, since they were more powerful, dwelt in the plains. Now it is reasonable to suppose that the Eteo-Cretans and the Cydonians were autochthonous, and that the others were foreigners, who, according to Andron, came from Thessaly, from the country which in earlier times was called Doris, but is now called Hestiaeotis; it was from this country that the Dorians who lived in the neighborhood of Parnassus set out, as he says, and founded Erineüs, Boeüm, and Cytinium, and hence by Homer are called "trichaïces." However, writers do not accept the account of Andron at all, since he represents the Tetrapolis Doris as being a Tripolis, and the metropolis of the Dorians as a mere colony of Thessalians; and they derive the meaning of "trichaïces" either from the "trilophia," or from the fact that the crests were "trichini."

There are several cities in Crete, but the greatest and most famous are three: Cnossus, Gortyna and Cydonia. The praises of Cnossus are hymned above the rest both by Homer, who calls it "great" and "the kingdom of Minos," and by the later poets. Furthermore, it continued for a long time to win the first honors; then it was humbled and deprived of many of its prerogatives, and its superior rank passed over to Gortyna and Lyctus; but later it again recovered its olden dignity as the metropolis. Cnossus is situated in a plain, its original circuit being thirty stadia, between the Lyctian and Gortynian territories, being two hundred stadia distant from Gortyna, and a hundred and twenty from Lyttus, which the poet named Lyctus. Cnossus is twenty-five stadia from the northern sea, Gortyna is ninety from the Libyan Sea, and Lyctus itself is eighty from the Libyan. And Cnossus has Heracleium as its seaport.

But Minos is said to have used as seaport Amnisus, where is the temple of Eileithuia. In earlier times Cnossus was called Caeratus, bearing the same name as the river which flows past it. According to history, Minos was an excellent law-giver, and also the first to gain the mastery of the sea; and he divided the island into three parts and founded a city in each part, Cnossus in the . . . And it, too, lies to the north. As Ephorus states, Minos was an emulator of a certain Rhadamanthys of early times, a man most just and bearing the same name as Minos's brother, who is reputed to have been the first to civilize the island by establishing laws and by uniting cities under one city as metropolis and by setting up constitutions, alleging that he brought from Zeus the several decrees which he promulgated. So, in imitation of Rhadamanthys, Minos would go up every nine years, as it appears, to the cave of Zeus, tarry there, and come back with commandments drawn up in writing, which he alleged were ordinances of Zeus; and it was for this reason that the poet says,"there Minos reigned as king, who held converse with great Zeus every ninth year.” Such is the statement of Ephorus; but again the early writers have given a different account of Minos, which is contrary to that of Ephorus, saying that he was tyrannical, harsh, and an exactor of tribute, representing in
tragedy the story of the Minotaur and the Labyrinth, and the adventures of Theseus and Daedalus.

[9] Now, as for these two accounts, it is hard to say which is true; and there is another subject that is not agreed upon by all, some saying that Minos was a foreigner, but others that he was a native of the island. The poet, however, seems rather to advocate the second view when he says, “Zeus first begot Minos, guardian o'er Crete.” In regard to Crete, writers agree that in ancient times it had good laws, and rendered the best of the Greeks its emulators, and in particular the Lacedaemonians, as is shown, for instance, by Plato and also by Ephorus, who in his Europe31 has described its constitution. But later it changed very much for the worse; for after the Tyrrenhians, who more than any other people ravaged Our Sea, the Cretans succeeded to the business of piracy; their piracy was later destroyed by the Cilicians; but all piracy was broken up by the Romans, who reduced Crete by war and also the piratical strongholds of the Cilicians. And at the present time Cnossus has even a colony of Romans.

[10] So much for Cnossus, a city to which I myself am not alien, although, on account of man's fortune and of the changes and issues therein, the bonds which at first connected me with the city have disappeared: Dorylaüs was a military expert and one of the friends of Mithridates Euergetes. He, because of his experience in military affairs, was appointed to enlist mercenaries, and often visited not only Greece and Thrace, but also the mercenaries of Crete, that is, before the Romans were yet in possession of the island and while the number of mercenary soldiers in the island, from whom the piratical bands were also wont to be recruited, was large. Now when Dorylaüs was sojourning there war happened to break out between the Cnossians and the Gortynians, and he was appointed general, finished the war successfully, and speedily won the greatest honors. But when, a little later, he learned that Euergetes, as the result of a plot, had been treacherously slain in Sinope by his closest associates, and heard that the succession had passed to his wife and young children, he despaired of the situation there and stayed on at Cnossus. There, by a Macetan woman, Sterope by name, he begot two sons, Lagetas and Strarchas (the latter of whom I myself saw when he was an extremely old man), and also one daughter. Now Euergetes had two sons, one of whom, Mithridates, surnamed Eupator, succeeded to the rule when he was eleven years old. Dorylaüs, the son of Philetaerus, was his foster brother; and Philotaerus was a brother of Dorylaüs the military expert. And when the king Mithridates reached manhood, he was so infatuated with the companionship of his foster brother Dorylaüs that he not only conferred upon him the greatest honors, but also cared for his kinsmen and summoned those who lived at Cnossus. These were the household of Lagetas and his brother, their father having already died, and they themselves having reached manhood; and they quit Cnossus and went home. My mother's mother was the sister of Lagetas. Now when Lagetas prospered, these others shared in his prosperity, but when he was ruined (for he was caught in the act of trying to cause the kingdom to revolt to the Romans, on the understanding that he was to be established at the head of the government), their fortunes were also ruined at the same time, and they were reduced to humility; and the bonds which connected them with the Cnossians,
who themselves had undergone countless changes, fell into neglect. But enough for my account of Cnossus.

[11] After Cnossus, the city of the Gortynians seems to have ranked second in power; for when these two cooperated they held in subjection all the rest of the inhabitants, and when they had a quarrel there was dissension throughout the island. But Cydonia was the greatest addition to whichever side it attached itself. The city of the Gortynians also lies in a plain; and in ancient times, perhaps, it was walled, as Homer states, “and well-walled Gortyn,” but later it lost its walls from their very foundations, and has remained unwalled ever since; for although Ptolemy Philopator began to build a wall, he proceeded with it only about eighty stadia; at any rate, it is worth mentioning that the settlement once filled out a circuit of about fifty stadia. It is ninety stadia distant from the Libyan Sea at Leben, which is its trading center; it also has another seaport, Matalum, from which it is a hundred and thirty stadia distant. The Lethaeus River flows through the whole of its territory.

[12] From Leben came Leucocomas and his lover Euxynthus, the story of whom is told by Theophrastus in his treatise On Love. Of the tasks which Leucocomas assigned to Euxynthus, one, he says, was this—to bring back his dog from Prasus. The country of the Prasians borders on that of the Lebenians, being seventy stadia distant from the sea and a hundred and eighty from Gortyn. As I have said, Prasus belonged to the Eteocretans; and the temple of the Dictaean Zeus was there; for Dicte is near it, not "close to the Idaean Mountain," as Aratus says, for Dicte is a thousand stadia distant from Ida, being situated at that distance from it towards the rising sun, and a hundred from Samonium. Prasus was situated between Samonium and the Cherronesus, sixty stadia above the sea; it was razed to the ground by the Hierapytnians. And neither is Callimachus right, they say, when he says that Britomartis, in her flight from the violence of Minos, leaped from Dicte into fishermen's "nets," and that because of this she herself was called Dictynna by the Cydoniatae, and the mountain Dicte; for Cydonia is not in the neighborhood of these places at all, but lies near the western limits of the island. However, there is a mountain called Tityrus in Cydonia, on which is a temple, not the "Dictaean" temple, but the "Dictynnaean."

[13] Cydonia is situated on the sea, facing Laconia, and is equidistant, about eight hundred stadia, from the two cities Cnossus and Gortyn, and is eighty stadia distant from Aptera, and forty from the sea in that region. The seaport of Aptera is Cisamus. The territory of the Polyrhenians borders on that of the Cydoniatae towards the west, and the temple of Dictynna is in their territory. They are about thirty stadia distant from the sea, and sixty from Phalasarna. They lived in villages in earlier times; and then Achaeans and Laconians made a common settlement, building a wall round a place that was naturally strong and faced towards the south.

[14] Of the three cities that were united under one metropolis by Minos, the third, which was Phaestus, was razed to the ground by the Gortynians; it is sixty stadia distant from Gortyn, twenty from the sea, and forty from the seaport Matalum; and the country is held by those
who razed it. Rhytium, also, together with Phaestus, belongs to the Gortynians: “and Phaestus and Rhytium.” Epimenides, who performed the purifications by means of his verses, is said to have been from Phaestus. And Lissen also is in the Phaestian territory. Of Lyctus, which I have mentioned before, the seaport is Cherronesus, as it is called, where is the temple of Britomartis. But the Cities Miletus and Lycastus, which are catalogued along with Lyctus, no longer exist; and as for their territory, the Lyctians took one portion of it and the Cnossians the other, after they had razed the city to the ground.

[15] Since the poet speaks of Crete at one time as "possessing a hundred cities," and also at another as "possessing ninety cities," Ephorus says that the ten were founded later than the others, after the Trojan War, by the Dorians who accompanied Althaemenes the Argive; he adds that it was Odysseus, however, who called it "Crete of the ninety cities." Now this statement is plausible, but others say that the ten cities were razed to the ground by the enemies of Idomeneus. However, in the first place, the poet does not say that Crete had one hundred cities at the time of the Trojan War, but rather in his own time (for he is speaking in his own person, although, if the statement was made by some person who was living at the time of the Trojan War, as is the case in the Odyssey, when Odysseus says "of the ninety cities," then it would be well to interpret it accordingly). In the second place, if we should concede this, the next statement could not he maintained; for it is not likely that these cities were wiped out by the enemies of Idomeneus either during the expedition or after his return from Troy; for when the poet said, “and all his companions Idomeneus brought to Crete, all who escaped from the war, and the sea robbed him of none,” he would also have mentioned this disaster; for of course Odysseus could not have known of the obliteration of the cities, since he came in contact with no Greeks either during his wanderings or later. And he49 who accompanied Idomeneus on the expedition to Troy and returned safely home at the same time could not have known what occurred in the homeland of Idomeneus either during the expedition or the return from Troy, nor yet even after the return; for if Idomeneus escaped with all his companions, he returned home strong, and therefore his enemies were not likely to be strong enough to take ten cities away from him. Such, then, is my description of the country of the Cretans.

[16] As for their constitution, which is described by Ephorus, it might suffice to tell in a cursory way its most important provisions. The lawgiver, he says, seems to take it for granted that liberty is a state's greatest good, for this alone makes property belong specifically to those who have acquired it, whereas in a condition of slavery everything belongs to the rulers and not to the ruled; but those who have liberty must guard it; now harmony ensues when dissension, which is the result of greed and luxury, is removed; for when all citizens live a self-restrained and simple life there arises neither envy nor arrogance nor hatred towards those who are like them; and this is why the lawgiver commanded the boys to attend the "Troops," as they are called, and the full grown men to eat together at the public messes which they call the "Andreia," so that the poorer, being fed at public expense, might be on an equality with the well-to-do; and in order that courage, and not cowardice, might prevail, he commanded that from boyhood they should grow up accustomed to arms and toils, so as to
scorn heat, cold, marches over rugged and steep roads, and blows received in gymnasiums or regular battles; and that they should practise, not only archery, but also the war-dance, which was invented and made known by the Curetes at first, and later, also, by the man who arranged the dance that was named after him, I mean the Pyrrhic dance, so that not even their sports were without a share in activities that were useful for warfare; and likewise that they should use in their songs the Cretic rhythms, which were very high pitched, and were invented by Thales, to whom they ascribe, not only their Paeans and other local songs, but also many of their institutions; and that they should use military dress and shoes; and that arms should be to them the most valuable of gifts.

[17] It is said by some writers, Ephorus continues, that most of the Cretan institutions are Laconian, but the truth is that they were invented by the Cretans and only perfected by the Spartans; and the Cretans, when their cities, and particularly that of the Cnossians, were devastated, neglected military affairs; but some of the institutions continued in use among the Lyctians, Gortynians, and certain other small cities to a greater extent than among the Cnossians; in fact, the institutions of the Lyctians are cited as evidence by those who represent the Laconian as older; for, they argue, being colonists, they preserve the customs of the mother city, since even on general grounds it is absurd to represent those who are better organized and governed as emulators of their inferiors; but this is not correct, Ephorus says, for, in the first place, one should not draw evidence as to antiquity from the present state of things, for both peoples have undergone a complete reversal; for instance, the Cretans in earlier times were masters of the sea, and hence the proverb, "The Cretan does not know the sea," is applied to those who pretend not to know what they do know, although now the Cretans have lost their fleet; and, in the second place, it does not follow that, because some of the cities in Crete were Spartan colonies, they were under compulsion to keep to the Spartan institutions; at any rate, many colonial cities do not observe their ancestral customs, and many, also, of those in Crete that are not colonial have the same customs as the colonists.

[18] Lycurgus the Spartan law-giver, Ephorus continues, was five generations later than the Althaemenes who conducted the colony to Crete; for historians say that Althaemenes was son of the Cissus who founded Argos about the same time when Procles was establishing Sparta as metropolis; and Lycurgus, as is agreed by all, was sixth in descent from Procles; and copies are not earlier than their models, nor more recent things earlier than older things; not only the dancing which is customary among the Lacedaemonians, but also the rhythms and paeans that are sung according to law, and many other Spartan institutions, are called "Cretan" among the Lacedaemonians, as though they originated in Crete; and some of the public offices are not only administered in the same way as in Crete, but also have the same names, as, for instance, the office of the "Gerontes," and that of the "Hippeis" (except that the "Hippeis" in Crete actually possessed horses, and from this fact it is inferred that the office of the "Hippeis" in Crete is older, for they preserve the true meaning of the appellation, whereas the Lacedaemonian "Hippeis" do not keep horses); but though the Ephors have the same functions as the Cretan Cosmi, they have been named differently; and the public messes are, even today, still called "Andreia" among the Cretans, but among the Spartans they ceased to
be called by the same name as in earlier times; at any rate, the following is found in Alcman: “In feasts and festive gatherings, amongst the guests who partake of the Andreia, 'tis meet to begin the paean.”

[19] It is said by the Cretans, Ephorus continues, that Lycurgus came to them for the following reason: Polydectes was the elder brother of Lycurgus; when he died he left his wife pregnant; now for a time Lycurgus reigned in his brother's place, but when a child was born he became the child's guardian, since the office of king descended to the child, but some man, railing at Lycurgus, said that he knew for sure that Lycurgus would be king; and Lycurgus, suspecting that in consequence of such talk he himself might be falsely accused of plotting against the child, and fearing that, if by any chance the child should die, he himself might be blamed for it by his enemies, sailed away to Crete; this, then, is said to be the cause of his sojourn in Crete; and when he arrived he associated with Thales, a melic poet and an expert in lawgiving; and after learning from him the manner in which both Rhadamanthys in earlier times and Minos in later times published their laws to men as from Zeus, and after sojourning in Egypt also and learning among other things their institutions, and, according to some writers, after meeting Homer, who was living in Chios, he sailed back to his homeland, and found his brother's son, Charilaus the son of Polydectes, reigning as king; and then he set out to frame the laws, making visits to the god at Delphi, and bringing thence the god's decrees, just as Minos and his house had brought their ordinances from the cave of Zeus, most of his being similar to theirs.

[20] The following are the most important provisions in the Cretan institutions as stated by Ephorus. In Crete all those who are selected out of the "Troop" of boys at the same time are forced to marry at the same time, although they do not take the girls whom they have married to their own homes immediately, but as soon as the girls are qualified to manage the affairs of the house. A girl's dower, if she has brothers, is half of the brother's portion. The children must learn, not only their letters, but also the songs prescribed in the laws and certain forms of music. Now those who are still younger are taken to the public messes, the "Andreia"; and they sit together on the ground as they eat their food, clad in shabby garments, the same both winter and summer, and they also wait on the men as well as on themselves. And those who eat together at the same mess join battle both with one another and with those from different messes. A boy director presides over each mess. But the older boys are taken to the "Troops"; and the most conspicuous and influential of the boys assemble the "Troops," each collecting as many boys as he possibly can; the leader of each "Troop" is generally the father of the assembler, and he has authority to lead them forth to hunt and to run races, and to punish anyone who is disobedient; and they are fed at public expense; and on certain appointed days "Troop" contends with "Troop," marching rhythmically into battle, to the tune of flute and lyre, as is their custom in actual war; and they actually bear marks of the blows received, some inflicted by the hand, others by iron weapons.

[21] They have a peculiar custom in regard to love affairs, for they win the objects of their love, not by persuasion, but by abduction; the lover tells the friends of the boy three or four
days beforehand that he is going to make the abduction; but for the friends to conceal the boyl, or not to let him go forth by the appointed road, is indeed a most disgraceful thing, a confession, as it were, that the boy is unworthy to obtain such a lover; and when they meet, if the abductor is the boy's equal or superior in rank or other respects, the friends pursue him and lay hold of him, though only in a very gentle way, thus satisfying the custom; and after that they cheerfully turn the boy over to him to lead away; if, however, the abductor is unworthy, they take the boy away from him. And the pursuit does not end until the boy is taken to the "Andreium" of his abductor. They regard as a worthy object of love, not the boy who is exceptionally handsome, but the boy who is exceptionally manly and decorous. After giving the boy presents, the abductor takes him away to any place in the country he wishes; and those who were present at the abduction follow after them, and after feasting and hunting with them for two months (for it is not permitted to detain the boy for a longer time), they return to the city. The boy is released after receiving as presents a military habit, an ox, and a drinking-cup (these are the gifts required by law), and other things so numerous and costly that the friends, on account of the number of the expenses, make contributions thereto. Now the boy sacrifices the ox to Zeus and feasts those who returned with him; and then he makes known the facts about his intimacy with his lover, whether, perchance, it has pleased him or not, the law allowing him this privilege in order that, if any force was applied to him at the time of the abduction, he might be able at this feast to avenge himself and be rid of the lover. It is disgraceful for those who are handsome in appearance or descendants of illustrious ancestors to fail to obtain lovers, the presumption being that their character is responsible for such a fate. But the parastathentes (for thus they call those who have been abducted) receive honors; for in both the dances and the races they have the positions of highest honor, and are allowed to dress in better clothes than the rest, that is, in the habit given them by their lovers; and not then only, but even after they have grown to manhood, they wear a distinctive dress, which is intended to make known the fact that each wearer has become "kleinos," for they call the loved one "kleinos" and the lover "philetor." So much for their customs in regard to love affairs.

[22] The Cretans choose ten Archons. Concerning the matters of greatest importance they use as counsellors the "Gerontes," as they are called. Those who have been thought worthy to hold the office of the "Cosmi" and are otherwise adjudged men of approved worth are appointed members of this Council. I have assumed that the constitution of the Cretans is worthy of description both on account of its peculiar character and on account of its fame. Not many, however, of these institutions endure, but the administration of affairs is carried on mostly by means of the decrees of the Romans, as is also the case in the other provinces.
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**IC 1.9.1**

**Provenance:** Dreros, found in the ruins of the archaic city

**Dating:** third to second century BCE

**Key Words:** agelai (A, line 11; C lines 98-99; D line 154), hetaireiai (C, line 124; D, line 135)

**Text:**

A.


B.

dικὰν δὲ καὶ πρ[α]ξί- [45] ων μὴθὲν ἐνορκόν ἡ(µ)ην. καὶ τέλομαι φιλοδήριος καὶ φιλοκόνισος. καὶ μήτε ταῖ πό- [50] λιν προδωσεῖν τὸν τὸν Δηρίων, μήτε οὐρεία τὰ τὸν Δηρίων μηδὲ τὰ τὸν Κν[ω- [55] σιόν, μηδὲ ἄνδρας τοῖς πολεμίοις προδωσεῖν μήτε Δηρίους μήτε Κνο- [60] σίοις- μηδὲ στάσισις ἀρχεῖν, καὶ τοῖς στατιζόμενοι ἄντίς τέλομαι, μηδὲ συνο(µ)οσι- [65] σαναξεῖν μήτε ἐμ πόλει μήτε ἑξοί τὰς πόλεως, μήτε ἄλλου συντέλε- [70] σθαι· εἰ δὲ τινάς καὶ πόλῃς καὶ οὐρεῖοι συναναίνοντας, ἐξαγγέλω τοῦ κόσμου τοῖς πλί

[75] σανι· εἰ δὲ τάδε μὴ κατέχομη, τοῦς (τ)ε μοι θεοὺς τοὺς ὀμοσα ἐμμάνιας ἣμη[[1]]ν [80] πάντας τε καὶ πᾶσας καὶ κακίστων<·> ὀλέθροι ἠξολοθοῦσαν αὐτός τε καὶ χρήμα τάμα, [85] καὶ μήτε μοι γὰν καρπὸν φέρειν.

---

359 Guarducci 1935, 84; Manganaro 1966, 11-12; Sokolowski 1969, 245-247, no. 145.
360 Guarducci 1935, 84.
361 Guarducci 1935, 84-86.
C.


D.

IC 1.10.2

Provenance: Eltynia

Dating: second century BCE

Key Words: kosmon (l. 3), kosmos (l. 8); andreioi (l. 6); agelai (l. 6), agelaos (l. 7); synboletrai (l. 6)

Text:362

1. - - τοις Ἐλτυνιοῖσι· άκτα νάκας· ἀποτεισεῖ ὁπέκ δεκάς· ὀπικ αν πολύν· τιμὰν· "περος· αἴδραν· αἰδές· κοσμόν νάδεν· τάν ες πόλιν· τιμὰν· "περος· - -

2. - - ἀμεράν· αἰ ανθαζήπη· ὑστερον δὲ μή· κόσμον δὲ πράδεν· τάν ες πόλιν· τιμὰν· "περος· - -

3. - - θον θερημένον· ῆν θειπόν· αἰ δὲ κ᾿ ἀλεκσομενος π[α]ιη· ανατον ἦμεν· τοι· ἀλεκσομένοι - -

4. - - τον θερημένον· όν θειπόν· αἰ δὲ κ᾿ ἀλεκσομενος π[α]ιη· ανατον ἦμεν· τοι· ἀλεκσομένοι - -

5. - - τιμὰν· κατιστάμεν· τὸν τρόδο[ν]τὸν· [αι] δὲ κ᾿ ἀνήρ· τὸν πη[σκον]παίη· μή· - -

6. - - τον· ἡν ἀνθαιδίοι· ἡν ἀγ[ε]λαι· ἡ συν[β]ολὴται· ἡ πικ κορδί· ἡ πικ γη· ἡ· - -

7. - - αἰ δὲ κ᾿ ἀγέ[λα]ος· τὸν πη[σκον]όνη[δη] · ἡ ἄγρατει· αἰ ες καιρὸν ἦμεν· - -

8. - - κόσμος· γα[ν]θόσκεν· ὑμνύντας· τὸν ἐπὶ πόλεος· τὸν τ᾿ ἄγ· - -

9. - - τριοδέ[λο]ς· θεη· ἀποτεισεί· πέντε δαρκάς· ὀ[π]ε νίν κα παίσει· α[ι] κα 1· - -

10. - - ἦ· παίσει ἀποτεισεί· πέντε δαρκάς· ὀθά[κις] κα π[αίσει]ς· - -

11. - - ὀπαθών· πανσα - -

Figure 2. IC 1.10.2 (Guarducci 1935, 91).

362 Guarducci 1935, 90.
IC 1.18.11
Provenance: Lyttos
Dating: second or third century CE
Key Words: None of the key words associated with syssitia in earlier inscriptions is mentioned in this inscription, however the content seems to indicate a similar meal to the syssitia being practiced in Lyttos under the Roman administration
Text:

τῆς δόσεως τοῖς στάρτοις κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ Θεοδασίας καὶ Βελχανίους τὸν δὲ πρωτόκοσμον κατ’ ἔτος ἢ ἐπιμελουμένον διδόναι διανομήν Θεο(δα)ι-ίαις Καλ. ἐκ τῶν ταῖς φυλαῖς δι-δομένων χρημάτων, τὸ ἐνδέον


Figure 3. IC 1.18.11 (Guarducci 1935, 190).

Guarducci 1935, 191.
IC 1.19.3
Provenance: Malla
Dating: second century BCE
Key Words: hetairiai (A line 41); dromos (A line 41)
Text in excerpt:\(^{364}\)

... ἄγεν δὲ καὶ εὐάμερον τὸς κόσμος τὸς [ἀεὶ κοσ-
[40] μίοντας κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν εν ταῖ ἐκταὶ τὸ Βακ[ινθίω
μὴνός καὶ δρόμον καὶ τ ἄ ἡ θαρής συνάγεν
ὁποί καὶ τοίς ἐπιγινομένοις ὑπ[άρχη ...
IC 2.5.1
Provenance: Axos
Dating: between sixth and fifth century BCE
Key Words: andreioi (l. 8)
Text:

- - - - ] ϰος | ïναντι το γι[ - -
- - δοκεν άκσια ήμεν τας τροπας
kai tas æteleias a têkna to [π]ινυμε[ν]ο -
- - κατ’ άμεραν žαμιθμουν. | ai δ’ ἐπέλ-
θουεν in tași pênnte ai μη λεοi -
- - [η | ταν’ άμεραν | πεντ’ άμερας fερφαχμεν-
μένοις tai póli õμιστος. to δε μισ[το -
- - τα|ς in ἀντρηιδι διάλειοι · i dia
λοι ἐπὶ σπορθδαν | ἐκσοαι - -
[10] - - ἀ]μετος | fεχάστος μη ἐνθεμεν |
tai πο[λ]οι, περι δε το μιστο | ai πὸν[ιο -
- - τα|δε δε τελιοντι · | ἵς τε ταν ἐκατόβαν
ταν μεγάλαν | και το θόμα | και · δ · · γ -
- - ]ρηον διδόμεν | τον δ’ ἀλὸν πάντον
[15] ἀτελειαν και τροπα in ἀντρηιδι κα - -

Figure 5. IC 2.5.1 (Guarducci 1939, 49).

365 Guarducci 1939, 48.
IC 2.5.25
Provenance: Axos
Dating: third century BCE
Key Words: andreioi (l. 3)
Text:

A
-- -- ιρακ[ --
-- ]ν πταισ[ --
-- εξ ἀνδήθιο επ[ --
-- αι μη πειξοιτ[ο --
[5] -- μεν πλα[··]αν' --
-- πραισει κοσμ[--
-- ανηβδο ταν' --
-- ανηβδο ταν' --
-- ιρακ[ --

B
-- ὁμυνυ[τ]δ μη ἐκ[κόν --
-- ὁμυνυ[τ]δ εκ[κόν --
-- ἀλαθείας ὄρκο[ --
-- ὁ ἐπιβάλλον τι[--
-- θύων μη ἐκόν θ[[-
-- ]εοι ἀπομνυμεν --
-- ή]γραμένας --
-- --

Figure 6. IC 2.5.25 (Guarducci 1939, 70).
IC 2.12.26
Provenance: Eleutherna
Dating: second century BCE\textsuperscript{368}
Key Words: *agela* (*agelatai*, I. 4)
Text:\textsuperscript{369}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>οσ η ουην αγχῳ. Δόρκος ϕαν(α)ξ(α)γόρα.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\textsuperscript{368} Guarducci 1939, 165.
\textsuperscript{369} Guarducci 1939, 165.

Figure 7. *IC* 2.12.26
(Guarducci 1939, 165).
IC 2.23.20

Provenance: Polyrhenia
Dating: third or second century BCE

Key Words: agela (l. 1)

Text:

Κλητον ἀγέλας [σε] πολύστονον εἰς Ἀχέρωνα, Ἀδραστε, στυγερὰ μοῖρα καταγάγετο. μάτηρ δ᾽ οὐχ’ ἕμεναιον ἀπὸ στομάτων Πολυμήδα ἤκε πρὸ νυμφίδιῳν <ν>σταμένα θαλάμων.


Guarducci 1939, 253.
IC 3.3.1

Provenance: Hierapytna

Dating: third century BCE

Key Words: agelai (B, line 18; line 29)

Text in excerpt:

Guarducci 1942, 25.

Guarducci 1942, 28.
Figure 9. IC 3.3.1 (Guarducci 1942, 28).
IC 4.4

Provenance: Gortyn—archaic acropolis

Dating: seventh or sixth century BCE

Key Words: andreioi (l. 4)

Text:

[1] - - ὁπερ οἱ ἄλοι | μὴ πρίασθαι | μὴ ἄμελεσθαι | ὀζο[- -
[2] - - τυτυ | ἡτὶ δὲ θορο[1] | τέτορες | καὶ γαρίν - -
[3] - - τὸ | ὀμοῖοτος | μὴ Ἀπορθήμεν | ποκα - -
[4] - - τῷ | καὶ τῷ | ἐν ἀνδρῆιοι πι[- -

vac.

Figure 10. IC 4.4 (Guarducci 1950, 47).
Provenance: Gortyn
Dating: fifth century BCE
Key Words: hetaireia I (B l. 12)
Text in excerpt:

$B$

... ἦ δικάκσαι. vac. αἱ δαμόσιόν τι κολύσ- [10] αἱ ἡθάνατος οἶος διακόλυσα, μηδατ- ἐρ<ο>ν ταύταις καταβλάπεθαι. vac. τὸ δ- ἐ τὰν ἐταιρηθὰν δικαστὰί κ' ὡς κα τ- δὲν ἐνεκύρον δικάδη, αἱ αὐταμέριν δι- δικάκσαι ἢ ἐς τὰν αὔριον ἀπατον ἣμην.

---

374 Guarducci 1950, 40.
IC 4.72 (i.e. the Gortyn Code/“The Great Code”)

Provenance: Gortyn

Dating: fifth century BCE

Key Words: apetairoi (Col. II, ll. 5, 25, 41); hetaireia (Col. X, l. 38)

Text in excerpt:376

Col. II

... αἱ κα τὸν ἑλευθερὸν ἐ
tὰν ἑλευθέραν κάρτει οἴπει, ἐκα-
tὸν στατερανς καταστασεῖ ἀ-
[5] ἕ
dὲ κ’ ἀπεταίρῳ, δέκα· αἱ δὲ κ’ ὁ δόλο-
ς τὸν ἑλευθερὸν ἐ
tὰν ἑλευθέρα-
ν, διπλεὶ καταστασεῖ· αἱ δὲ κ’ ἑλε-
ὐθερὸς ροικέα ἐ ῥοικέαν, πέντε

darknánς· αἱ δὲ κα ῥοικεῦς ροικέα

...

[20] ... αἱ κα τὸν ἑλευθέραν
μοικίον αἰλεζει ἐ
πατρός η ὁ ἀ-
δελπιο ἐ ἐν τὸ ἀνδρος, ἐκατὸν

[25] τὸ ἀπεταίρῳ, δέκα· αἱ δὲ κ’ ὁ δόλος τά-
ν ἑλευθέραν, διπλεὶ καταστασε-

[40] τὸν θὲν αὐτοὶ ἐκατστὸν ἐπ-

[45] θαι δὲ μέ. vac. ...

Col. X

...

376 Willetts 1967.
ἀνπανσιν ἔμεν ὃπο κά τιλ λ- ἐτ. ἅμπαινεθαι δὲ κατ’ ἀγοράν καταφελμένον τῷ πολιατ- ν ἄπο τῷ λάδῳ ὃ ἁπαγορεύοντι. vac. ὃ δ’ ἅμπανάμενος ἄτό τα- ι ἐταιρεία ταῖ ραῖ αὐτό ἱαρέ- ιον καὶ πρόκοον ροίνδ. vac. ...
IC 4.75
Provenance: Gortyn
Dating: ca. 480 – ca. 450 BCE\textsuperscript{377}
Key Words: andreon (B 1.7-8)
Text in excerpt:\textsuperscript{378}

\textbf{B}

\begin{verbatim}
- - - - - - - -
\text{ἵππα ἀνδρός}
\text{ἐλευθέρῳ ἐπὶ ἐν πόλεμον}
\text{ἰσχεὶ, πλὴν δέμας κ' ἀντιδέμας, ἱστός, ἐρίς καθίθεκνα,}
\text{ἀ, ἑργαλεία σιδάρια, ἀρατρον, δυνὸν βοῦν, κάπετον, μυλανς, ὄνον ἄληταν, ἕ(κ)ς ἀν-
\text{δρεῖῳ ὅτ(ε)} ὁ ᾠρχος παρέκει}
\text{κατ' ἀνδρέιον, εὔνα ἄνδρος}
\text{kai γυναικός[ς], ἔλευθερός ὁ-
\end{verbatim}

Figure 12 IC 4.75 (Guarducci 1950, back matter).

\textsuperscript{377} Guarducci 1950, 40.
\textsuperscript{378} Guarducci 1950, 174.
**IC 4.78**

Provenance: Gortyn

Dating: between ca. 480-ca. 450 BCE

Key Words: This inscription does not include key words associated with *syssitia* but rather its importance from its content discussing a community of (laborers?) living in a place called Latosion; Willetts suggests these could be the *apetairia* mentioned in the Gortyn Code and in IC 4.84.

**Text:**

\[\text{Θωλ. τάδ’ ἔραξε τοὺς Γορτυνίους ποτίδονον[ι] μακ. τὸν ἄπελευ[θέρου -- }
\] 
\[\text{καὶ καταδρύθειαν Λατόσιον ἐπὶ ταῖς πλαταί } [κ-
\] 
\[\text{αἱ τῷ ὀψιαί, καὶ μέτικα τούτων μὲτε καταδίδο[θαὶ μὲτε συλὲν.}
\]
\[\text{αὶ καταδιὸ[οίτο, τὸν καένον κόσμον μὲ λαγαῖν. αἰ δὲ [συλ-
\] 
\[\text{μεν, ἐκατόν στατέρας πέκαστον τὸν τίταν][δημαρδέθ-
\] 
\[\text{θαὶ, καὶ τῶν δ]πλείαν τὸν κρήματον ἐστελαντας ἀποδόμ[ε-
\] 
\[\text{ν]. αἰ δ’ αἰ τίταν μὲ πέρασεν ἢ έγγαται, τὰν διπλείαν ἢ[ταν πέκαστο-
\] 
\[\text{ν αὐτῶν τῷ μ]εμπομένῳ ἀποδόμεν καὶ τῷ πόλι Θέμεν.}
\]

![Figure 13. IC 4.78 (Guarducci 1950, 79).](image)

---

*Guarducci 1950, 40.*

*Guarducci 1950, 78.*
**IC 4.84**

**Provenance:** Gortyn

**Dating:** ca. 480–ca. 450 BCE

**Key Words:** apetairoi (l. 6)

**Text:**

---

Figure 14. *IC 4.84* (Guarducci 1950, 193).

---

Guarducci 1950, 40.

Guarducci 1950, 193.
SEG 27.631 ("Spensithios Decree")
Provenance: Unknown (Central Crete: Lyttos-Afrati area?)
Dating: late Archaic (ca. 500 BCE)?
Key Words: andreion (B, l. 11)
Text in excerpt:\(^{383}\)

B

τὸ ἄραν λακέων τῶν ποινικαστάν καὶ παρήμε
ν καὶ σύνημεν ἐπὶ τε θητὶῶν καὶ ἔπει ἀνθρωπί
νων πάντε ὡς καὶ ὁ Θόσιος εἶν καὶ τῶν ποινι
καστάν, καὶ ὅτιμεν καὶ ἱώδια ἱερεὺς μὴ ἱδιαλο

[5. 1–2] θύει τα δαμόσια δύσματα τὸ ἄρας ποινικαστά

καὶ το τεμένια ἔκεν, μήδε ἐπάγαγαν ἰμὲ[ε]-

[ν] μήδε ὅτι οἱ ἄλλοι τῶν ποινικαστάν, δι

ικα δὲ διὰ τῶν καὶ λυλητά ὁ ποινικασ[τ]-

[ε]ς αἱ περιοικοπηστάτην Φόσ-

[10] μοι αἴδικα ὑπὶ τελεσθαί, δὲ δὲ σώθος

ἐν ἑν. ἄδικα ἐς ἀνδρήμον δώσει δι

[έ]κα τέλεσθεν κρέων, αἱ κα ὡς ἔλο[ε]̣

[άπι?] ἄρθρονται, καὶ τὸ ἐπενεάντιον, τὸ

δὲ λάκασιν συγκατεῖ, ἄρο δὲ μ[ηδ]-

[15] [ε]ν ἐπάναφθεν ἡμέν αἱ κα μὴ λήμ

δομεν. ἡμέν δὲ τὰ τείχα τ[ε]̣ 2]

[ε. 5–6] ἔστωθι.

---

SEG 23.572 (Bile no. 32)
Provenance: Eleutherna
Dating: fifth century BCE
Key Words: dromos (l. 3)
Text:384

- -]Ι ονε[- -
- -]συνπαρε[- -
- -]ν δρόμο ι[- -

- -]ολυ[- -
[5] - -]εκα[- -
- -]σ[- -
- - -

384 Bile 1988, 40-41.
SEG 23.530
Provenance: Dreros
Dating: end of seventh – beginning of sixth century BCE
Key Words: agela
Text: 385

εταρημιαν ἔφαλε ὁ θέλασι τὸ ὑπερθολο μηνος ἐν ἱκαδι ὁρον ἦμεν ναε.

SEG 23.566 and 25.1024
Provenance: Axos
Dating: End of fourth century BC
Key Words: hetairiais (l. 17)

385 Bile 1988, 30.
Figure 15. Hearth Temples in Crete discussed in text (Prent 2005, fig. 81).
Figure 16. Kommos Greek Sanctuary Site Plan (Prent 2005, fig. 63).
Figure 17. Kommos Temple B (Prent 2005, fig. 65).
Figure 18. The Two Acropoleis of Dreros and the Saddle (Prent 2005, fig. 41).
42. Dreros, saddle with cult building (B.32) and agora; after Tiré & Van Effenterre 1978, fig. 25.

Figure 19. The Saddle of Dreros (Prent 2005, fig. 42).
Figure 20. Temple of Apollo Delphinios in the Saddle at Dreros (Sjögren 2003, fig. 49).
Figure 21. Site Plan of Lato showing the agora near the Prytaneion (Prent 2005, fig. 44).
Figure 22. Prinias Temple B and Temple A (Sjögren 2003, fig. 19).
Figure 23. Reconstruction of Temple A at Prinias, showing temple entrance with architectural sculpture (Prent 2005, fig. 23).

Figure 26. Building Complex at Smari (Sjögren 2003, fig. 25).
Fig. 7. Axos. Acropolis (W37a) with remains of a cult building and a cistern. The scale is not indicated (after Levi 1930-31, Fig. 3)

Figure 27. Acropolis of Axos showing Cult Building (Sjögren 2003, fig. 7).
Figure 28. Aphrati (Sjögren 2003, fig. 37).
Figure 29. Bronze helmet from Aphrati (Left: Prent 2005, fig. 38; Right: Metropolitan Museum of Art Online, accessed 4-16-2015, <http://www.metmuseum.org/collection/the-collection-online/search/256978>).

Figure 30. Bronze mitra from Aphrati (Left: Prent 2005, fig. 40; Right: Metropolitan Museum of Art Online, accessed 4-16-2015, <http://www.metmuseum.org/collection/the-collection-online/search/255930>).
Figure 31. Plan of the “Almond Tree House” of Praisos (Whitley 2014, fig. 7.2).

Figure 32. Terracotta plaques from Almond Tree House dump (Left: terracotta number A-202.6 Object 5; Whitley 2014, fig. 7.4; Right: terracotta number A-205.7 Object 6; Whitley 2014, fig. 7.5).
Azoria and Archaic Urbanization

3. Settlement structure at Azoria

To demonstrate discontinuous structuring of settlement on the site level, I want to consider how this plays out on the ground at Azoria (fig. 6.5), which I think represents a good example of an Archaic phase change, or phase transition, in a distinctly non-linear developmental process. Azoria became a large aggregated settlement by the 6th c. BC. The evidence derived from both survey and excavation indicates small, dispersed villages and cemeteries populating the valley linking the plain of Kavousi with the Siteia mountains – a settlement pattern constituting an axis of communication or heterarchical corridor between the mountains and the coastal plain. A change at the end of the 7th c. involved both the abandonment of most of these sites, and physical movement of people to Azoria. The site expanded to about 15 ha in size. What we see by 600 BC is a very different idea and configuration of what the settlement had been before, how it was structured physically, the nature of its economy, and its arenas for social interaction. The date of this event coincides with the abandonment of the Kastro, and associate collective tombs at Vronda, Skala, Skouriasmenos, Chondrovolakes. Sites in use for the better part of 500 years were abandoned, with population relocating to Azoria (Haggis & Mook 2011).

The radical rebuilding of Azoria at the end of the 7th c. presents a dramatic picture of reintegration, redefinition, and restructuring of domestic and communal spaces and activities; changes in the agricultural economy; a drastic increase in both the scale of building and the allocation of labor, and the organization required to implement it; and finally the introduction of new kinds of architecture for entirely new venues of supra-household interaction, that is the conceptualization and reification of a new physical form. These are the conditions that suggest the site’s urban status. We began a second phase of excavation at Azoria in 2013, with the specific goal of exploring the foundations of Archaic buildings, and the character of the architectural and stratigraphic transition that marks the rebuilding of the settlement.

Figure 33. State Plan of Azoria (Drawing by R. D. Fitzsimons and G. Damaskinakis, Azoria Project; Haggis 2014, 126).
APPENDIX D. Maps

Figure 34. Map of Crete. This map shows the major sites discussed in the text. (After Erickson 2010, fig. 1.1; I have altered the map slightly to show additional locations not included in the original).
Figure 35. Map of Crete: Literary Locations. This map shows the locations associated with *syssitia* in the ancient literature indicated in green (After Erickson 2010, fig. 1.1; I have altered the map slightly to show additional locations not included in the original).
Figure 36. Map of Crete: Epigraphic Evidence Locations. This map shows the locations associated with *syssitia* in the epigraphic evidence indicated in blue (After Erickson 2010, fig. 1.1; I have altered the map slightly to show additional locations not included in the original).
Figure 37. Map of Crete: Archaeological Locations. This map shows the locations associated with communal feasting and possibly *andreion* in the archaeological evidence. Hearth Temples indicated in Orange. Other early buildings indicated in yellow. Later buildings in red (After Erickson 2010, fig. 1.1; I have altered the map slightly to show additional locations not included in the original).
Figure 38. Map of Crete: All Evidence Locations. This map shows the locations associated with communal feasting and *andreion*. Locations associated with *syssitia* in the ancient literature indicated in green, the epigraphic evidence indicated in blue, Hearth Temples indicated in orange, other early buildings indicated in yellow, and later buildings in red (After Erickson 2010, fig. 1.1; I have altered the map slightly to show additional locations not included in the original).