


EULIMENE

Vol 10 (2009)

EULIMENE 10-12 (2009-2011)



Book Review, M. Cross, The Creativity of Crete City States and the Foundations of the Modern World

Martha W. Baldwin Bowsky

doi: [10.12681/eul.32806](https://doi.org/10.12681/eul.32806)

ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ

ΜΕΛΕΤΕΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΚΛΑΣΙΚΗ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΑ,
ΤΗΝ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΙΚΗ, ΤΗ ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑΤΙΚΗ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΠΑΠΥΡΟΛΟΓΙΑ

Τόμος 10-12
Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία
Ρέθυμνο 2009-2011

ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ

ΜΕΣΟΓΕΙΑΚΗ
ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ
Π. Μανουσάκη 5–Β. Χάλη 8
GR 741 00–Ρέθυμνο

PUBLISHER

MEDITERRANEAN
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY
P. Manousaki 5–V. Chali 8
GR 741 00–Rethymnon

ΔΙΕΥΘΥΝΣΗ–ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΙΑ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ

Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας (Ρέθυμνο)
Επικ. Καθ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης (Ρόδος)

PUBLISHING DIRECTORS, EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymnon)
Assist. Prof. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Rhodes)

ΒΟΗΘΟΙ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ

Δρ. Δήμητρα Τσαγκάρη (Αθήνα)
Δρ. Σταυρούλα Οικονόμου (Αθήνα)

ASSISTANTS TO THE EDITORS

Dr. Dimitra Tsangari (Athens)
Dr. Stavroula Oikonomou (Athens)

Η Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία και οι Εκδότες του Περιοδικού ευχαριστούν θερμά το Fujian White Crane Kung Fu Club για την χορηγία του στη δαπάνη της έκδοσης.

Mediterranean Archaeological Society and the Editors wish to thank
The Fujian White Crane Kung Fu Club for their sponsorship.

ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 2009-2011
EULIMENE

ISSN: 1108–5800

ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΟΝΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΗ

Ομ. Καθ. Πέτρος Θέμελης (Ρέθυμνο)
Καθ. Νίκος Σταμπολίδης (Ρέθυμνο)
Ομ. Καθ. Alan W. Johnston (Λονδίνο)
Καθ. Mariusz Mielczarek (Τορούη)
Καθ. Άγγελος Χανιώτης (Princeton)
Επικ. Καθ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης (Ρόδος)
Δρ. Ιωάννης Τουράτσογλου (Αθήνα)
Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας (Ρέθυμνο)
Καθ. Αναγνώστης Αγγελαράκης (Adelphi)
Καθ. Σταύρος Περεντίδης (Αθήνα)

ADVISORY EDITORIAL BOARD

Em. Prof. Petros Themelis (Rethymnon)
Prof. Nikos Stampolidis (Rethymnon)
Em. Prof. Alan W. Johnston (London)
Prof. Mariusz Mielczarek (Toruń)
Prof. Angelos Chaniotis (Princeton)
Assist. Prof. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Rhodes)
Dr. Ioannis Touratsoglou (Athens)
Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymnon)
Prof. Anagnostis Agelarakis (Adelphi)
Prof. Stavros Perentidis (Athens)

Η ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ είναι μία επιστημονική περιοδική έκδοση με κριτές που περιλαμβάνει μελέτες στην Κλασική Αρχαιολογία, την Επιγραφική, τη Νομισματική και την Παπυρολογία εστιάζοντας στον Ελληνικό και Ρωμαϊκό κόσμο της Μεσογείου από την Υστερομινωική / Υπομινωική / Μυκηναϊκή εποχή (12^{ος} / 11^{ος} αι. π.Χ.) έως και την ύστερη αρχαιότητα (5^{ος} / 6^{ος} αι. μ.Χ.).

Η ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ περιλαμβάνει επίσης μελέτες στην Ανθρωπολογία, Παλαιοδημογραφία, Παλαιοπεριβάλλον, Παλαιοβοτανολογία, Ζωοαρχαιολογία, Αρχαία Οικονομία και Ιστορία των Επιστημών, εφόσον αυτές εμπίπτουν στα προαναφερθέντα γεωγραφικά και χρονικά όρια. Ευρύτερες μελέτες στην Κλασική Φιλολογία και Αρχαία Ιστορία θα γίνονται δεκτές, εφόσον συνδέονται άμεσα με μία από τις παραπάνω επιστήμες.

Παρακαλούνται οι συγγραφείς να λαμβάνουν υπόψη τους τις παρακάτω οδηγίες:

1. Οι εργασίες υποβάλλονται στην Ελληνική, Αγγλική, Γερμανική, Γαλλική ή Ιταλική γλώσσα. Κάθε εργασία συνοδεύεται από μια περίληψη περίπου 250 λέξεων σε γλώσσα άλλη από εκείνη της εργασίας.
2. Συντομογραφίες δεκτές σύμφωνα με το *American Journal of Archaeology*, *Numismatic Literature*, J.F. Oates *et al.*, *Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets, ASP*.
3. Οι εικόνες πρέπει να υποβάλλονται σε μορφή αρχείου .jpg ή .tiff και σε ανάλυση τουλάχιστον 1,200 dpi (dots per inch) προκειμένου για γραμμικά σχέδια και 400 dpi για ασπρόμαυρες εικόνες (στην κλίμακα του γκρι). Όλα τα εικονογραφικά στοιχεία πρέπει να είναι αριθμημένα σε απλή σειρά.
4. Οι εργασίες υποβάλλονται σε ένα εκτυπωμένο αντίτυπο, συνοδευόμενα από το κείμενο και τις εικόνες σε ηλεκτρονικό μέσο αποθήκευσης δεδομένων (CD ή DVD).

Είναι υποχρέωση του κάθε συγγραφέα να εξασφαλίζει γραπτή άδεια για την αναπαραγωγή υλικού που έχει δημοσιευτεί αλλού ή είναι αδημοσίευτο.

Οι συγγραφείς θα λαμβάνουν ανάτυπο της εργασίας τους ηλεκτρονικά σε μορφή αρχείου .pdf και έναν τόμο του περιοδικού.

Συνδρομές – Συνεργασίες – Πληροφορίες:

Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία, Π. Μανουσάκη 5 – Β. Χάλη 8, Ρέθυμνο – GR 74100

Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας, Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης, Τμήμα Φιλολογίας, Ρέθυμνο – GR 74100 (litinas@phl.uoc.gr)

Επικ. Καθ. Μανώλης Ι. Στεφανάκης, Πανεπιστήμιο Αιγαίου, Τμήμα Μεσογειακών Σπουδών, Ρόδος – GR 85100 (stefanakis@rhodes.aegean.gr)

web: <http://www.eulimene.eu/>

EULIMENE is a refereed academic periodical which hosts studies in Classical Archaeology, Epigraphy, Numismatics, and Papyrology, with particular interest in the Greek and Roman Mediterranean world. The time span covered by EULIMENE runs from the Late Minoan / Sub Minoan / Mycenaean period (12th / 11th cent. BC) through to the late Antiquity (5th / 6th cent. AD).

EULIMENE will also welcome studies on anthropology, palaeodemography, palaeo-environmental, botanical and faunal archaeology, the ancient economy and the history of science, so long as they conform to the geographical and chronological boundaries noted. Broader studies on Classics or Ancient History will be welcome, though they should be strictly linked with one or more of the areas mentioned above.

It will be very much appreciated if contributors consider the following guidelines:

1. Contributions should be in either of the following languages: Greek, English, German, French or Italian. Each paper should be accompanied by a summary of about 250 words in one of the above languages, other than that of the paper.
2. Accepted abbreviations are those of *American Journal of Archaeology*, *Numismatic Literature*, J.F. Oates *et al.*, *Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets, ASP*.
3. Illustrations should be submitted in .jpg or .tiff format of at least 1,200 dpi (dots per inch) for line art and 400 dpi for halftones (grayscale mode) resolution. All illustrations should be numbered in a single sequence.
4. Please submit one hard copy of your text and a version on a digital storage media (CD or DVD).

It is the author's responsibility to obtain written permission to quote or reproduce material which has appeared in another publication or is still unpublished.

Offprint of each paper in .pdf format, and a volume of the journal will be provided to the contributors.

Subscriptions – Contributions – Information:

Mediterranean Archaeological Society, P. Manousaki 5 – V. Chali 8, Rethymnon – GR 74100

Dr. Nikos Litinas, University of Crete, Department of Philology, Rethymnon – GR 74100 (litinas@phl.uoc.gr)

Assist. Prof. Manolis I. Stefanakis, University of the Aegean, Department of Mediterranean Studies, Rhodes – GR 85100 (stefanakis@rhodes.aegean.gr)

web: <http://www.eulimene.eu/>

Περιεχόμενα
EΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 10-12 (2009-2011)

List of Contents
EULIMENE 10-12 (2009-2011)

Περίληψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen / Sommaires / Riassunti	6
Anthi Dipla , The beginning of narrative art in attic vase painting: A review of proposed theories.....	11
Γιάννος Κουράγιος , Ο αρχαίος δήμος των Αιξωνιδών Αλών Αττικής (σημ. Βούλα –Βουλιαγμένη).....	33
Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης – Βασιλική Πατσιαδά , Η αρχαιολογική έρευνα στον Αρχαίο Δήμο των Κυμισαλέων (Ρόδος) κατά τα έτη 2006-2010: μια πρώτη παρουσίαση	63
Αναστασία Δρελιώση-Ηρακλείδου – Νίκος Λίτινας , Ροδιακό όστρακο με ερωτικό επίγραμμα.....	135
Βιβλιοκρισίες / Book Reviews	
Giuseppe Guzzetta (a cura di), « <i>Morgantina a cinquant'anni dall'inizio delle ricerche sistematiche</i> ». <i>Atti dell'Incontro di Studi (Aidone, 10 dicembre 2005)</i> . Caltanissetta: Salvatore Sciascia Editore, <i>Triskeles</i> , 4, 2008 (Paolo Daniele Scirpo).....	157
Ιωάννης Τουράτσογλου, <i>Συμβολή στην οικονομική ιστορία του βασιλείου της αρχαίας Μακεδονίας (6ος-3ος αι. π.Χ.)</i> . Αθήνα: ΚΕΡΜΑ ΙΙ, 2010 (Στέλλα Δρούγου).....	159
Malcolm Cross, <i>The Creativity of Crete: City States and the Foundations of the Modern World</i> . Oxford: Signal Books, 2011 (Martha W. Baldwin Bowsky).....	162

Περίληψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen /

Sommaires / Riassunti

Anthi Dipla, The beginning of narrative art in attic vase painting: A review of proposed theories, *EΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ* 10-12 (2009-2011), 11-32.

Η αρχή της αφηγηματικής τέχνης στην αττική αγγειογραφία: Μια επισκόπηση των προτεινόμενων θεωριών. Το άρθρο αυτό διερευνά διάφορες θεωρίες των τελευταίων 60 χρόνων σχετικά με την αρχή της αφηγηματικής τέχνης στην αττική αγγειογραφία (και την ελληνική τέχνη γενικότερα). Το διηγηματικό περιεχόμενο μιας σκηνής συνδέεται κλασικά με τη δυνατότητα ανασύνθεσης μιας συγκεκριμένης ιστορίας ή τουλάχιστον μιας συγκεκριμένης πράξης ή δραστηριότητας, ενώ μια πιο στρουκτουραλιστική προσέγγιση το αναγνωρίζει ακόμη και ελλείψει ιδιαίτερων ή συγκεκριμένων στοιχείων, δηλαδή ακόμη και σε σκηνές γενικού περιεχομένου.

Μετά το τέλος της μυκηναϊκής εποχής και ύστερα από μια μακρόχρονη περίοδο ανεικονικής τέχνης αρχίζουν και εμφανίζονται στα αττικά αγγεία, σταδιακά από τη μεσογεωμετρική περίοδο, εικονιστικές σκηνές, με αποκορύφωμα πολυπληθείς παραστάσεις πρόθεσης, εκφοράς και μαχών σε μνημειακά αγγεία της ύστερης γεωμετρικής περιόδου, τα οποία φαίνεται ότι προορίζονταν ως σήματα σε τάφους αριστοκρατών.

Το περιεχόμενο αυτών των σκηνών έχει προσελκύσει αλληπάλληλες συζητήσεις με διάφορους άξονες: είναι γενικό ή ειδικό, συνδέεται δηλαδή στην αντίληψη των αγγειογράφων και των σύγχρονων θεατών με συγκεκριμένα πρόσωπα, τόπο και χρόνο, δηλαδή με την εκφορά και τα κατορθώματα των νεκρών, με τους οποίους συνδέονται τα αγγεία, οι οποίοι ζούσαν στην Αθήνα του τέλους του 8ου αι. π.Χ.; Ακόμη και αν είναι όμως γενικό το περιεχόμενό τους, αυτό σημαίνει απαραίτητως ότι δεν μπορεί να είναι διηγηματικό; Είναι ιστορικό και συγκεκριμένο, αναφέρεται σε γεγονότα της ζωής των νεκρών, ή γενικά στο στυλ μιας ζωής τμημένης και περιπετειώδους; Ή είναι ίσως μυθικό-ιστορικό, αναφέρεται δηλαδή στους ένδοξους προγόνους των νεκρών; Ή μήπως πρόκειται εν τέλει για μυθικές σκηνές; Με γενικό ηρωικό ή συγκεκριμένο περιεχόμενο; Αν ναι, συνδέονται με γνωστά γραπτά έργα, για παράδειγμα το ομηρικό έπος, ή και με έργα που δεν μας έχουν παραδοθεί, ή απηχούν μήπως τρέχουσες προφορικές ιστορίες, που δεν μπορούν μοιραία να ανιχνευθούν; Τελικά μπορούμε να περιμένουμε μυθικές σκηνές στην ελληνική τέχνη πριν από τον 7ο αι., τουλάχιστον σε ό,τι αφορά ορισμένες, λιγοστές σκηνές σε υστερογεωμετρικά αγγεία, που δεν ακολουθούν την εικονογραφία της πρόθεσης και της εκφοράς, λ.χ. μιας σκηνής ναυαγίου, ή αποχαιρετισμού (ή απαγωγής;) γυναίκας από πολεμιστή, που την κρατά από τον καρπό, ένδειξη γαμήλιου δεσμού (ή απαγωγής) κ.ο.κ.; Κάποιες σκηνές πάλης με λιοντάρι, που κατά τεκμήριο ακολουθούν συριακά πρότυπα, έχουν ήδη κατά τα ύστερα γεωμετρικά χρόνια συσχετισθεί με τον Ηρακλή ή αποτελούν αντικείμενο μηχανικής αντιγραφής;

Διάφορες θεωρίες αντιπαραβάλλονται και αποτιμώνται (Carter, Ahlberg-Cornell, Webster, Boardman, Snodgrass, Stansbury-O'Donnell), υπό το φως νέων δεδομένων, αρχαιολογικών (λ.χ. σχετικά με τη φύση και την έκταση των επαφών Ελλάδας και Ανατολής, τον προορισμό ή όχι των αγγείων στη γεωμετρική -ή και

άλλες εποχές- για συγκεκριμένους πελάτες), εικονογραφικών (λ.χ. για τους τρόπους της αφήγησης μιας ιστορίας ως εικόνας σε τόσο πρώιμες εποχές, την αλληλεπίδραση ή όχι τέχνης και λογοτεχνίας και με ποιους όρους) και φιλολογικών (λ.χ. για τον τόπο και τον χρόνο σύνθεσης των επών).

Στην πορεία της συζήτησης αναλύεται ακόμη η σημασία δυο επίμαχων μοτίβων α) της ασπίδας του Διπύλου, που κρατούν ορισμένοι πολεμιστές, κάποτε και σε σκηνές εκφοράς, και έχει συνδεθεί με την οκτάσχημη μυκηναϊκή ασπίδα, ως υποτιθέμενο σύμβολο αναφοράς στο έπος ή εν γένει στην ηρωική εποχή (θεωρία που ανασκευάζεται συστηματικά, με αρχαιολογικά και εικονογραφικά επιχειρήματα) και β) των λεγόμενων Ακτοριώνων/Μολιόνων, μιας παράξενης διπλής μορφής με κοινό σώμα, αλλά και με δύο κεφάλια και ζευγάρια άκρων, που έχει ερμηνευτεί ως οι γνωστοί μυθικοί δίδυμοι ή ως καλλιτεχνική σύμβαση για την απόδοση μορφών που τοποθετούνται δίπλα-δίπλα, ή ως συμβολική αναφορά σε μορφές αχώριστες ή εξαρτώμενες η μία από την άλλη (υποστηρίζεται βάσει εικονογραφικών και άλλων στοιχείων η μεγαλύτερη πιθανότητα της τρίτης άποψης, χωρίς να αποκλείεται εντελώς και η δεύτερη).

Από τα πιο βασικά συμπεράσματα που συνάγονται είναι καταρχάς ότι οι πρώτες μυθικές σκηνές πιθανώς δεν χρονολογούνται πριν από το τέλος της ύστερης γεωμετρικής Ι, αν όχι της ύστερης γεωμετρικής ΙΙ, και κατά τεκμήριο πληθαίνουν από τις αρχές του 7ου αι. π.Χ. Η μετατόπιση του ενδιαφέροντος από τη σύγχρονη στην ηρωική πραγματικότητα ίσως σχετίζεται με τις αξιώσεις της αριστοκρατίας της εποχής για καταγωγή από ηρωικές ή μυθικές μορφές. Το έπος, προ-ομηρικό, ή αργότερα και το ομηρικό, φαίνεται να προλείανε το έδαφος για τη χρήση μυθικών προτύπων. Η δε εισροή μοτίβων από την Ανατολή, όπως της πάλης ήρωα με λιοντάρι ή της σφιγγας, που εντείνεται κατά το δεύτερο μισό του 8ου αι. π.Χ., πρέπει να ενθάρρυνε την ταύτισή τους με μορφές της ελληνικής μυθολογίας, ή πιθανότερο να ενέπνευσε γενικά τη δημιουργία εικονογραφικών τύπων για την απεικόνισή τους, όπως επίσης ίσως και η ανεύρεση μυκηναϊκών τεχνουργημάτων με ανάλογες σκηνές. Είτε πραγματική, είτε μυθική, ωστόσο, το σημαντικό είναι ότι τα αττικά αγγεία του τέλους της γεωμετρικής εποχής διηγούνταν μια ιστορία, σημειώνοντας την αυγή μιας διηγηματικής τέχνης, που έμελλε να αναπτυχθεί και να μεγαλοουργήσει κατά την ανατολιζούσα και, κυρίως, κατά την αρχαϊκή περίοδο.

Γιάννος Κουράγιος, Ο αρχαίος δήμος των Αιξωνιδών Αλών Αττικής (σημ. Βούλα – Βουλιαγμένη), *EΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ* 10-12 (2009-2011), 33-62.

The ancient deme of Aixonides Halai, Attica (the modern deme of Voula – Vouliagmeni). The article deals with the reconstruction of the history of the ancient deme of Aixonides Halai, Attica, through the recent rescue-excavations, which were conducted by the Archaeological Service.

The ancient deme included the south part of the modern deme of Voula and the modern deme of Vouliagmeni. It constituted the coastal trittys of the Kekropis tribe after the Kleisthenian reform. The first legal excavation was conducted in 1927 at the Laimos peninsula, Vouliagmeni, where the temple of Apollo Zoster (the cult center of the deme) was discovered. The inscriptions from the temple and the funerary stele and inscriptions from the cemetery, which were discovered later at the site Pigadakia in Voula, identified the whole area with the ancient municipality of Aixonides Halai. Since then the archaeological research has revealed the continuous occupation of the region through the Neolithic, Mycenaean, geometric,

archaic and classical times. Because of the intense building activity in the areas of Voula and Vouliagmeni in the past decade, hundreds of rescue-excavations have been conducted by the archaeologists of the 21st Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities. They have brought to light numerous ancient remains: Part of an extensive early Helladic settlement, Geometric graves, parts of the ancient Classical town, including public structures (e.g. roads and towers), a public building (which is considered to be the Agora), houses of the settlement and graves with rich offerings.

Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης – Βασιλική Πατσιαδά, Η αρχαιολογική έρευνα στον αρχαίο δήμο των Κυμισαλέων (Ρόδος) κατά τα έτη 2006-2010: μια πρώτη παρουσίαση, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 10-12 (2009-2011), 63-134.

The archaeological research at the ancient Demos of Kymissaleis (Rhodes) during the years 2006-2010: A preliminary report. The archaeological research in Kymissala (Rhodes) started in 2006 as a combined project of the Department of Mediterranean Studies, University of the Aegean and the 22nd Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities in collaboration with the School of Rural and Surveying Engineering of the National Technical University of Athens. The region, already known in Medieval Times for its antiquities, has suffered great damage during the last two centuries, mainly caused by unprecedented tomb raiding, while only limited scientific research was carried out in the course of the twentieth century. The main object of the new archaeological research in Kymissala is to determine, for the first time, the spatial organisation and the development of a country-side Demos of Rhodes, as well as to look at the way the community exploited natural resources of the area through time. So far parts of the acropolis and the vast central necropolis have been systematically explored through excavation, while a number of sites, comprising the Demos of Kymissaleis, have been located and surveyed.

Αναστασία Δρελιώση-Ηρακλείδου – Νίκος Λίτινας, Ροδιακό όστρακο με ερωτικό επιγράμμα, ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 10-12 (2009-2011), 135-155.

An Erotic Epigram on a Rhodian Ostrakon. During excavations on a plot in the central cemetery of Rhodes a deep filling of black earth with evidence of burning was explored. It contained disintegrated skeleton remains, clay urns, pottery fragments, stamped amphora handles, many small artifacts and a large number of inscribed potsherds. All seem to be transferred there from elsewhere to settle the area probably after a natural disaster. As far as the contents of the inscribed texts are concerned, apart from one literary ostrakon, which is edited in this article, all the other ostraca are documentary and their edition is under preparation.

Based on the palaeographical details the ostrakon can be dated to the end of the third and the first half of the second century B.C. The scribe does not write breathings, accents and other diacritics. Some phonological interchanges are justified as local linguistic characteristics. Lines 1-10 preserve two elegiac distichs and lines 11-14 contain one pentameter and one incomplete hexameter. Two hypotheses can be advanced: (a) The epigram consisted of (at least) four elegiac distichs. The hexameter of the third elegiac couplet and the pentameter of the fourth elegiac couplet have been omitted, either deliberately or by mistake. (b) The

epigram consisted of three elegiac distichs and the scribe wrote the pentameter of the last distich before the hexameter.

The content of the epigram(s) is that Glykera, perhaps a Samian hetaira, managed to be freed from her *eros* by vowing to dedicate a painting of a *pannychis* that had taken place on some occasion. Now a deity is asked that a *thiasos* already offered should also function as a *lysis* from *eros* for Papyrides. However, the kind of the *thiasos* and the way it is dedicated are not clear. Also, there are some questions concerning the corresponding elements between the two stories of Glykera and Papyrides. Since there are missing verses or the verses are reversed, as said above, it is uncertain whether the text constitutes one or two different epigrams. In the first scenario, it is most likely that the epigram belongs to the category of erotic ones, in which the poet refers to a past event and now asks the deity to act likewise in a parallel situation. However, it is not certain whether Glykera and Papyrides were involved in the past. The name Glykera is characteristic for *hetairae*, while the name Papyrides, which derives from Papylos, is attested only in a Byzantine inscription in Bithynia. The deity involved in this story may be Dionysus (because of the *thiasos*) or Adonis (because of the *pannychis*).

The verses preserved on the Rhodian ostrakon are not included in the *Anthologia Graeca*. It would be tempting to assume that the surface of the ostrakon was used for writing down a hasty and incomplete draft of a poet's original creation. However, it seems more likely that we are dealing with the copy of an already existing text. The style and content of the Rhodian erotic epigram, which is written in the Ionic dialect, do not offer internal evidence concerning the poet's identity. The phrase *τὴν τότε παννυχίδα* is found in Posidippus, the phrase *ἀνέθηκεν ὀρᾶσθαι τοῖς φιλέρωσιν* finds a good parallel in the Callimachean *ἀνέθηκεν ἐπεσομένοισιν ὀρᾶσθαι*, the word *φιλέρωσ* was used by Meleager, and the phrase *καὶ οὐ δέχου* is found in two Byzantine epigrams (Julian and Agathias). But these phrases alone could not indicate Posidippus or Callimachus as the potential composer of our epigram. Besides, the metric sequence dddsd in the third verse, where a spondee occurs before the bucolic diaeresis (Naeke's law), is almost prohibitive in the Hellenistic epigram, with the exception of one verse of Asclepiades of Samos, one verse of Posidippus and another of Leonides. Moreover, a word-break after the first short syllable of the fourth foot is rare. Therefore, it is more likely that the composer of our epigram is either a poet of the third century B.C., from whom Posidippus borrowed the phrase *τὴν τότε παννυχίδα*, or a poet of the third or the early second century B.C., who borrowed that phrase from Posidippus.

We might be entitled to conclude that the reference to a Samian *hetaira* could indicate a Samian epigrammatist, such as Asclepiades or Hedylus. First, Asclepiades influenced Posidippus, Hedylus and Callimachus. The metrical sins in l. 1 and 3 present a strong counter argument to our hypothesis that Asclepiades could be the poet in question, even though the violation of Naeke's law occurs once in Asclepiades' poems. However, there exist some other evidence that fits Asclepiades' vocabulary, style and themes: he had composed another erotic epigram on Samian *hetairai* (*AP* 5.207), he had used phrases that refer to Homer (cf. for instance the Homeric *ἐν πίνακι* on the Rhodian ostrakon), and to other lyric poets (cf. the phrase *ἀποίθεμαι ἔρωτα*, which refers to Theognis, the adjective *ἠδύπικρος* and the participle *θέλουσα*, which refer to the Sapphic *γλυκύπικρος* and *κῶκ θέλουσα*

respectively). Moreover, Asclepiades includes technical terms that have a poetic dimension (such as the legal phrase *τάσσω λύσιν* in the Rhodian epigram) and creates new words by changing one component of an already existing known poetic word (for example the word *ἡδυπίκρους* instead of *γλυκυπίκρους*). Finally, some words of our epigram are placed in the same metrical position as in other epigrams of Asclepiades. More precisely, in the *AP* 5.207, *αἱ Σάμιαι* are cited in the beginning of the epigram at the start of the first verse, just like *ἡ Σαμίη* in the Rhodian epigram. In the case of *AP* 5.202, 6, attributed to Asclepiades or Posidippus, the pronoun *τήνδε* occurs in the same position in the pentameter of the third elegiac couplet. The composer of our epigram creates an alliteration of Δ *καὶ σὺ δέχου θάσσον τῆς ση... τάξας Παιπυλίδη τήνδε λύσιν δακρύων* (which becomes stronger if we restore *Ἄδωνι* or *Διόνυσε* in the missing part). Alliteration is a characteristic feature of Asclepiades, such as the alliteration of Λ in the epigram *AP* 5.164, 3 and the alliteration of X in the epigram *AP* 5.162, 2-3. Moreover, the way Asclepiades treats love can be traced in the Rhodian epigram: there is no sign of erotic lust, heterosexual love dominates the epigram and the intense erotic feelings are ridiculed. Finally, the composition of short epigrams (usually of two distichs, but also some of three distichs) is characteristic in Asclepiades. In addition, the adjective *ἡδυπίκρους* combined with the name *Παιπυλίδης* might suggest a word play with the name Hedylyus. This could support the hypothesis that either Hedylyus, also from Samos, was the composer of the epigram, if we accept that he made a word play with his name, or one of his circle and friends (e.g. Asclepiades) played with his name.

All these observations do not exclude the assumption that the epigram on the ostrakon was a composition which imitated well known Hellenistic themes (e.g. of *hetaira*) and styles (e.g. of Asclepiades, Hedylyus or Posidippus).

Finally, the archaeological context of the ostrakon is not indicative of its use and purpose and cannot explain why and how a Samian woman could be of interest in Rhodes.

από την καλλιτέπεία του και το θέμα του, η εποχή των Μακεδόνων, επίσης τίποτα από τη λάμψη της.

Είναι αξιέπαινη η προσπάθεια της Εταιρείας Μελέτης Νομισματικής και Οικονομικής Ιστορίας «Λυδία Λίθος» να υποστηρίξει αυτό το έργο και να βοηθήσει στην έκδοσή του. Η έρευνα έχει αποκτήσει ένα εργαλείο υψηλής πιστότητας και χρησιμότητας. Εύχομαι στον συγγραφέα και στους εκδότες αυτού του βιβλίου να συνεχίσουν με το ίδιο θάρρος και τη σοφία.

Στέλλα Δρούγου

Καθηγήτρια Κλασικής Αρχαιολογίας
Τμήμα Ιστορίας και Αρχαιολογίας
Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης
drougou@hist.auth.gr

Malcolm Cross, *The Creativity of Crete: City States and the Foundations of the Modern World*. Oxford: Signal Books, 2011.

Malcolm Cross should be heartily congratulated for conceiving and presenting a much-needed synthesis of the legal, political, and economic achievements of Crete in the “Age of the Polis” (650 -067 BCE), an overarching period that unifies the traditional divisions into Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic. This book does not adopt a standard archaeological approach, despite its being inspired by John Pendlebury’s *Archaeology of Crete* (1939), nor a classicist’s approach to the epigraphical record of Crete. It is conceived instead as an essay in social science, and so aims both to discover commonalities and to construct valid generalizations about Crete in this period, and further to consider Cretan achievements in light of the modern world and contemporary issues. It is written to encourage archaeologists to draw upon the theories and methods of social and cultural anthropology, theories and methods Cross presents in a highly intelligible fashion. For archaeologists and classicists, it is written with a combination of in-text and foot-of-the page notes and with as little technical language as possible. For these scholars and for social scientists, the *Gazeteer* (205-49) describes the sites discussed in the text, and presents relevant research findings as well as the all-important spatial context for each site. After a discussion of the sources, the inclusion or exclusion of sites, and toponyms, Cross gives an alphabetical list of the sites on the north, east, south, and west coasts of Crete, plus a composite map of the primary, secondary, and independent city states to be identified in Chapter 3 and 4. The *Gazeteer* is accordingly presented in three parts, devoted to the primary *poleis*, secondary settlements, and independent *poleis*, followed by mapping information for the location of sites. A *Glossary* (254-58) defines unavoidable technical words and phrases. *References* (162-94) are preceded by a consideration of the sources and how to gain access to them, in print or electronic form.

The central proposition of this study is that Crete did not enter a period of dormancy and cultural exhaustion by the beginning of the 7th century BCE, as asserted by scholars in the fields of ancient history, classics, and archaeology. Cross presents the topographical and chronological evidence –synthesized from archaeological publications and geographical information together with photographic records, the collection of mapping data, and site visits– for the opposite case, argued by scholars in political science and legal history: that Crete’s early forms of democracy were praiseworthy and that the inscriptions at Gortyn constitute the earliest instance of codified civil law. He identifies the innovative responses Cretan city states invented to three challenges – social, political, and legal– all societies face: (1) how to establish a community that coheres as an entity; (2) how to make and implement decisions; and (3) how to survive materially. He credits the success of Crete to three correlating factors, albeit in a different order: economic progress that was not imposed from outside, and success in accommodating ethnic divisions in a form of power sharing, all enmeshed in an agreed framework of rules.

The first chapter, entitled “Introduction: Seven Myths” (1-16), lays out three methodological issues as well as seven myths and fallacies to be set forth and then debunked in succeeding chapters. The first methodological issue is spatial, as Crete is an island apart from the Greek mainland, with sites located between mountains and the sea. The second issue is broadly

chronological, encompassing the island's long history from the Neolithic Period to the domination of the Ottoman Turks (before 3650 BCE-AD 1898). The third is more narrowly chronological, focused on the relative chronology of Minoan and post-Minoan Crete. Once the critical questions of topography and chronology are established, Cross is ready to begin presenting his case for the creativity of Crete.

The first half of the book consists of three chapters devoted to three fundamental myths and fallacies about Crete, beginning with the myth of cultural exhaustion and arguing for cultural renaissance instead (Chapter 2, 17-27). The myth that Crete was a backward and impoverished island –given to internecine warfare and piracy, exporting only mercenaries, and adopting coinage relatively late– is the cumulative work of historians and philosophers in antiquity, modern historians and archaeologists writing after the discovery of Knossos, and economic historians. Cross identifies three additional factors that contributed to the neglect of post-Minoan Crete: (1) assumption of Dorian ascendancy on the Spartan model (to be further explored in Chapter 5 rather than in the first half of the book); (2) the fact that archaeology as a field tends to use material remains to understand the creators of artifacts, while classicists tend to document rules for political and administrative office, as well as monetary fines, but not to offer revisionist interpretations; and (3) the need to rethink definitions of such familiar concepts as “law”, “democracy”, and “monetary system” (undertaken in the second half of the book). Cross encourages scholars to be more inclined to consider cultural continuities from Minoan to Post-Minoan Crete and to appreciate the creativity of the city state civilization that emerged in the mid-7th century BCE and afterward. He later argues that Cretans may have recognized the significance of their past, and may have seen themselves as continuing traditions, specifically a unity between city states and countryside (22, 199). At the same time he perceives change – during an inward-looking period– that led to the development of complex societies with a mercantile class as well as secondary city states and to internal social stability rather than conflict or foreign adventures.

From the argument for internal social stability, Chapter 3 probes the myth of internecine strife and a counter-argument for peer-polity networks between city states (28-44). This myth is laid at the doorstep of the tendency –ancient as well as modern– to regard events outside Athens or Sparta as either unimportant or as a microcosm of the Athenian story, with warring city states on Crete acting out Aegean struggles. Such a myth distracts from the achievements of Cretan city states and precludes the application of analytical approaches. After presenting the case that not all Cretan city states were the same (or opposite), Cross considers three theories that can contribute to a typology of settlements: central place theory, core-periphery models, and peer-polity interaction. In a non-Athenocentric view of the ancient Mediterranean core-periphery models are judged inapplicable. Central place theory enables scholars to identify nodal points, measure their size, and assess their importance in terms of transport links or trade routes. Peer polity interaction allows Cross to focus on real and symbolic exchanges between polities in more or less equal relationship. By utilizing these two theoretical frameworks and adding a chronological dimension to the spatial distribution of city states, Cross is able to begin constructing a typology of Cretan settlements: primary city states founded inland between about 650 and 400 BCE, and dependent or secondary city states established on the coast in the 4th century BCE. He links the institution of the Cretan city state with the spatial distribution of city states to show that change was endemic and endogenous, and that city states evolved in such a way as to create networks out of autonomous political units and to make these networks function in terms of generating greater wealth.

From this typology of primary and secondary city states, Chapter 4 is focused on the myth that Cretan city states inhabited an unchanging world, frozen in time, and that they were conservative and backward, resistant to change (45-63). Cross replaces this myth with the evolutionary transformation of Crete from a world dominated by isolated and traditional city states to one in which some city states flourished and some faded, due to a new economic logic that depended on trade as much as on subsistence agriculture. This chapter securely locates Cretan city states and other settlements in both space and time, and shows how patterns of settlement were dynamic rather than static over a period of nearly 600 years. In this chapter Cross considers not only the primary and secondary city states identified in Chapter 3 but also so-

called independent (or “non-dependent”?) city states on the coast, which rapidly outgrew and absorbed primary city states or larger settlements. He identifies three phases in the evolution that transformed Crete: a foundation phase (ca. 8th-6th centuries BCE) when primary city states emerged on secure upland locations from which they could control large hinterlands; an integration phase (ca. 500-300 BCE) when coastal settlements featured a greater division of labor, a monetary economy was consolidated, and an infrastructure of trade established; and a consolidation phase (ca. 300-67 BCE), when the nodal points in networks of primary city states disappeared and coastal sites overtook their inland counterparts, economically and politically.

Carefully plotting the location of primary, inland city states on a topographical map of the island enables Cross to show that they had many features in common, especially in relation to their topography, and their relatively even distribution in circles on the foothills of the three mountain ranges that form the background of Crete. In the center of the book color maps show the whole island (Map 1), and the particular locations of Dreros and Praisos (Map 2). Establishing this ideal type for a primary city states allows Cross to examine three exceptions (Lachania and Aradena/Anopolis) and to exclude seven non-autonomous city states from an analytical table that presents the basic characteristics of primary city states (Table 4.2). Secondary, coastal city states of a markedly different type are both evenly distributed along the coasts of Crete (Map 3) and topographically connected with primary, inland city states (Maps 5-8). Primary and secondary city states appear together on a non-topographical map (Map 4). Again Cross is able to identify city states that are exceptions to the characteristics of secondary settlements analyzed in Table 4.3: Kydonia and Hierapytna which completely replaced their respective inland centers (Lachania and Oleros) to become major trading centers, while Phalasarna and Itanos possessed a mixture of the features of primary and secondary city states. These four city states, in the far west and far east of the island, commanded each of Crete’s four coasts and were focused on trade relationships with different parts of the Aegean and Mediterranean (Maps 9-10). A map at the end of the Gazetteer shows the full range of Cretan city states and settlements, primary, secondary, and independent (250). Cross then analyzes types of network links between coastal sites and primary, inland city states, the result of economic as well as spatial associations. Of five types of network links, Cross identifies two as suggestive of a strong commitment to economic development: straightforward connections between a primary city state and a port that was usually in its own territory, and a double connection when a primary city state established port functions to the north and south at the same time.

In the second half of the book Cross analyzes the legal, political, and economic achievements of the type of city state that evolved on Crete. Chapter 5 is entitled “Dorian ascendance or an ethnic mosaic?” and presents the legal achievements of Crete that resulted from ethnic diversity (64-98). This reviewer might have preferred one chapter devoted to the myth of Dorian dominance –identified as a modern assumption in Chapter 2 (25)– and placed in the first half of the book to be followed by a separate chapter on the legal achievements of Crete, at the beginning of the second half. Cross questions Dorian dominance on Crete and the traditional idea of Cretan society from the Archaic period onward as rigid, socially divided, hierarchical, and class-based, with the Dorians constituting an aristocracy dominant over indigenous ethnic groups. He argues that Crete’s emerging mercantilism (to be further explored in Chapter 7) was more like that of Corinth, Rhodes, or Argos, than the militarism of Sparta. He also contrasts Cretan society with both Sparta –where tribes (*phylai*) gave way to territorial divisions– and Athens – where individual loyalties to a common culture superseded ethnic identities. The epigraphic evidence clearly records the ethnic complexity of classical to Hellenistic Crete, as chief magistrates were both Dorian and non-Dorian in ethnicity.

The central argument of this compound chapter is that the laws of at least some Cretan city states, from the Archaic period onward, were intended to reflect the ethnic composition of the island by ensuring that no tribe dominated others. Cross traces the distinctive way Cretan city states maintained social order, by the early adoption of written law and by the writing and display of those laws to proclaim that no ethnic group would monopolize power. In Sparta, by contrast laws were not displayed publicly and may not have been written down at all. First Cross credits Crete with a pioneering role in using written Greek and breaking a scribal monopoly on literacy. Then he addresses the significance of the abundance of written laws on Crete, by surveying the

debate over whether literacy was widespread and connected with governmental form. Later in the chapter he concludes that Crete's laws were intended to be read by some (97), but that literacy might not have been as critical if law performed an integrating function across tribes and laws were displayed to clarify that any dominance was temporary (94). For the prevalence of written law in Crete Cross credits the law's affirmation of political unity in a society divided vertically into ethnic segments. In the particular case of the laws and law codes of Gortyn he sees a form of case law, as judicial interpretation both systematized and continuously amended law over a 150-year period, to help preserve an ordered agrarian community based on private property and accepted social inequalities.

Cross then assesses the distinctiveness of Cretan law by locating it in the context of Greek law –which shared great similarities in legal procedures even though the organization and the practice of writing laws down varied– and the role of written law as an elite, aristocratic instrument or as a non-elite, democratic instrument. In Crete he sees the role of written law as an expression of the people's authority as a group, as city states expanded to embrace geographically dispersed communities that might not share the customs and traditions of the urban center. Despite some similarities between Athenian and Cretan law, Cross identifies differences in three areas that make it clear that Athenian and Gortynian/Cretan legal systems were not even remotely similar. First, in the Cretan legal system justice was delivered in court proceedings based on a formal set of legal principles interpreted by judges. Second, in discussing differences in law and administration, Cross focuses on the reasons ancient philosophers from Plato onward might have praised Cretan law, for not being prey to the vicissitudes of the Athenian law with its individualistic and unpredictable nature. Third, in assessing the social function of the laws, Cross identifies a form of powersharing in which offices were rotated on behalf of the tribe or ethnic grouping. Cross concludes that Cretan and Athens evolved laws that were strongly linked to political systems that were unlike. In Crete written law ruled and all –differentiated socially rather than ethnically so as to avoid the tyranny of sectarian domination– were subject.

From this argument for Cretan multiethnicity and an avoidance of tyranny by the rule of written law, Chapter 6 goes on to address the myth of aristocratic governance and argues that the political achievement of Crete was a new form of democracy (99-125). The conventional wisdom assumes that an antiquated Dorian aristocracy prevailed, politically as well as ethnically. The numerous inter-state treaties of Crete have explained by regular conflict, rather than the ethics of reciprocity within and between cities. The Cretan form of democracy identified in Chapter 5 was representative, hierarchical, and focused on group rights (86). In a recognizably Cretan set of political institutions adopted by all or most Cretan city states, not only was no one ethnic group permanently dominant, but periods of office holding were limited, and political officers were accountable to the body of male citizens. Again, a comparison with Athens highlights the representative nature of the Cretan form of democracy, which –in a clear break from conventional wisdom– just may have been earlier and was of an entirely different type from the Athenian form. Cross credits Crete with inventing the city state with its institutions and representative democracy, which gave the citizen body an opportunity to assent to proposed laws and policies. While there may have been more than fifty self-governing city states, Cross identifies common features of political life, such as the contribution of an assembly of the citizenry to the decision making process, a board of magistrates that led in peace and war, and an advisory board of elders that was filled on an honorary basis for life. Political power was widely shared as three systems operated together –annual office holding, limitations on return to office, and rotation of office holding among tribes– and office holders were subject to popular accountability. Cross argues that the numerous inter-state treaties can provide evidence not of conflict but of avoiding outright warfare; of co-operation in military, religious, and political fields; and of ways to enhance Cretan involvement in trade. The ultimate example of political relations between city states is the Cretan *Koinon*, which brought order, stability, and a sense of identity to a larger terrain by having its own officials, constitution and currency from the mid-3rd century BCE onward, and could enter into diplomatic relations with overseas administrations to provide the services of Cretan mercenaries. By comparison, Athens again offered a different solution, in which individual participation was maximized and ethnic differences supplanted. The Cretan form of

democracy accommodated pre-existing loyalties, penalized non-rotation of offices, and explored the benefits of participation in the *Koinon*.

From the argument for the evidence of ways to enhance Cretan involvement in trade, Chapter 7 is devoted to the myth of fractured subsistence and explores emerging mercantilism as the economic achievement of Crete (126-71). Cross presents the case for a very early monetary system on Crete, not just as a convenient means of exchange but as an economic development within a framework of rules and institutions to promote it, that is, a political economy. In Cross's analysis Crete came closer than Athens to having a capitalistic economy, one in which prices and the flow of goods and services were shaped by supply and demand alone. Cross first assesses where the island might fit in the debates about commonalities/differences in the economies of the ancient Mediterranean that were characteristic there and nowhere else. Crete has traditionally been seen as an example of a region stuck in primitive modes of accumulation (negative exceptionalism). This myth portrays Crete as retarded in the Aegean context, simply backward, primitive, and inward-looking; having a subsistence economy based on farming and animal husbandry with primary city states controlling barren and infertile uplands, and no surplus extracted; engaging in visible intra-island trade but not in exporting massive amounts of any product; and failing to compete with Rhodes in the wine trade and amphora production. Cross suggests that one look to different places such as the fertile plains and valleys overlooked by primary city states and possibilities for the extraction of surplus given greater rainfall in the Age of the Polis; invisible trade, e.g., trade-related services and specialist military service; the evidence of imported amphoras and amphora production workshops in Crete before the Roman period; the mints of Cretan city states; and evidence for public wealth.

Cross demonstrates that Cretan city states were not only in the Hellenic mainstream but that the Cretan economy also had peculiar characteristics such as the absence of a link between militarism and visible trade, as at Athens, and the balance between visible and invisible trade. An intra-island trade network –involving the coastal cities of Kydonia, Itanos and Hierapytna, together with the inland cities of Eleutherna, Knossos, Arkades, and Gortyn– developed in the period between 600 and 400 BCE. Cross also presents the evidence that in the same period foreign coinage arrived on Crete in connection with seafaring and trade as early as the second half of the 6th century BCE, some 200 years before local coinage came to be minted. In the invisible economy Cretan mercenaries constituted a form of temporary migrant labor, men who sent or brought home wealth that boosted local economies. In the visible economy trade followed networks of contacts generated by overseas military service. Growth in the invisible and then visible economies of Crete had a particularly profound effect on two pairs of city states that provided mercenaries and were also nodal points for emerging trade relations –Phalasarna and Kydonia, Itanos and Hierapytna– and Cross suggests that the 2nd century BCE conflicts involving them might have been conflicts over trading contacts and routes. He argues that Crete was not isolated but embedded, at a cultural, personal, material and economic crossroads among Athens, Egypt, and the Middle East. Cross then presents the evidence for a consolidated currency in Crete, a currency in which more than 40 mints produced silver coinage in the same denominations and to common standards, and steadily debased the value of coins in an island-wide policy meant to enhance trading possibilities. In order to show that Crete not only adopted and standardized coinage but had a monetary system, Cross assembles the evidence for the duration of coin use; the adoption of coinage in market exchange and its use in payment for labor; the adoption of coin as a medium for taxation and payment of dues; private property and wealth creation; and state support for economic institutions both to achieve social solidarity and cohesion and to sustain a market-based economy.

Cross then examines the “Athenian debate” (also called the “Finley debate” or the “substantiveness debate”) concerning the autonomy of economic life as a useful yardstick for comparison with Crete. To the profile of Athens he adds the relationship between Athens and Piraeus, and the possibility of identifying of an Athenian monetary system. He concludes that Athens nearly but didn't become a market economy, as values of politics, honor, and war inhibited economic development beyond a precapitalist start. Cross also examines the economy of Sparta as an ancient economy outside Athens, to show how it differed markedly from Crete's despite a similar culture of egalitarianism: in the absence of an emerging trade sector or

orientation to the sea as a way of building relationships with trading partners; in a disinclination to adopt local coinage; and in the use of activities of egalitarian ideology such as equestrian pursuits and funding victory monuments to display private wealth. Considering the “Athenian debate” allows Cross to entertain the possibility of positive rather than negative exceptionalism for Crete, i.e., the proposition that Crete possessed unusual potential for economic advancement. Ultimately he concludes that the Cretan economy was no more advanced than others but not a frozen backwater either. Rather, it was a promising, protocapitalistic economy: new public wealth meant that land owned by a city state could support buildings or rooms in which common meals were taken (*andreia*); and trade was promoted as a means of maintaining employment, increasing public revenue, and promoting economic revenue.

From the argument sustained over three chapters –for the legal, political, and economic achievements of Crete in the Age of the Polis– Chapter 8 explores the myth of Roman liberation – from pirates and lawlessness– and argues for a lost inheritance instead (172-88). The myth – propounded by Polybius, the Romans themselves, and by 19th century studies of the Roman world that focused on the civilizing mission of Rome– credited Rome with liberating Crete. This myth continues to color analysis of important archaeological sites like Phalasarna. Piracy has in fact been a leit motif in this book, beginning with Chapter 1, where Cross cites traditional interpretations of piracy as a way of coping with population pressures on subsistence resources (21). In Chapter 4, he asked whether the piracy allegedly characteristic of Crete could have been an attempt to take over or retain trade routes instead (57). In Chapter 6, he considered ways inter-state treaties can provide evidence of measures to enhance Cretan involvement in trade rather than to control piracy (112). In Chapter 7, he suggested that customs dues were an important source of revenue for Cretan city states, a source that would have been undermined by piracy (170). In the post-colonial period rethinking about the Roman accession in the Mediterranean has come to emphasize not the civilizing mission of Rome but her orientation toward expansion and subjecting weaker territories. Romans could use the term “piracy” to justify intervention and oppressive treatment of those who were not their friends or allies, or even opponents in conflicts instigated to defend trade routes.

Cross offers an alternative, threefold explanation of the so-called Roman war against piracy in the eastern Mediterranean: the real threat to Roman hegemony posed by Crete’s fighting men and Mithridates as the leader of an anti-Roman bloc; economic interests, particularly in access to grain from Cyrenaica south of Crete, which had its own wealth and prosperity; and the increasingly negative depiction of Rome’s enemies together with an increasingly positive portrayal of Roman conquest as beneficial. The consequence of using the term “piracy” was both the loss of Cretan independence in antiquity and a modern failure to appreciate the wealth and sophistication of Crete in the Age of the Polis. Cross goes so far as to hypothesize that the Antikythera Mechanism –found in the wreck of a Roman vessel carrying treasures of war off the coast of northwestern Crete– could have been acquired on Crete to judge from an inscription from Itanos that refers to a *heliotropium* dedicated to Zeus Eposios (now *I.Cret.* III.iv 11, bearing letters dated by Guarducci to the 4th century BCE).

This reviewer wishes that Cross had offered a third way as an alternative to the loss of Cretan independence, as he did in assessing the economic achievement of Crete in Chapter 7 (165-70). After a book-length quest to debunk myths about Crete in the Age of the Polis, it is curious that he accepts without question the negative evaluation of scholars writing before the discovery of Knossos, that Crete lost all she had achieved together with her liberty (22). Yet Cross himself cites a powerful sense of Cretan identity that was inspired rather than abraded by the presence of others (2). To use some of the very criteria Cross has identified for the creativity of pre-Roman Crete, one could begin by applying to Roman Crete his typology of settlements and the evolutionary transformation that led to three broad types of Cretan city state and to examine patterns of interaction between them in the Roman period (Chapters 3 and 4). One could also extend his profile of a multiethnic society to include discussion of the dynamics of the Cretan assemblies and councils in the Roman period, and the Cretan elite who served as *protokosmoi* and other civic officials as well as archons in the Panhellenion, a supra-provincial imaginary community of bona fide Greeks. One could take note of the fact that the Law Code of Gortyn was still so significant in the early imperial period as to be displayed in the Augustan-Trajanic Odeion

of the city, as well as later phases of this otherwise modest structure. One could examine the continued vitality of the Cretan *Koinon*, an island-wide body with its own officials, coinage, and membership in the Panhellenion through the participation of two primary city states (Gortyn and Lyttos) and one or two independent city states (Hierapytna if not also Kydonia). One could examine the economic achievements of Roman Crete, from the wine trade and amphora production, to coinage minted by the Roman colony at Knossos and the free cities of Lappa and Kydonia as well as the Cretan *Koinon*, and Roman denarii brought to the island by trade and military service. Roman Crete lay not on the periphery to Rome's core, but at the crossroads of a "globalized" Mediterranean, between Achaia, Cyrenaica and Egypt, and between Italy and Asia Minor and as far east as the Levant. But that would be another book.

Chapter 9, finally, is devoted to the implications of a new appreciation for the achievements of Crete in the context of the modern world (189-204). Cross presented Crete's distinctive answers to questions of social order and stability (regulation and the rule of law) in Chapter 5; of direction, leadership and administration (ethnic divisions and a form of democracy) in Chapter 6; and the problem of material survival (regulated markets and trade networks) in Chapter 7. To his discussion of the form of democracy pioneered in Crete he adds the concept of a consociational democracy, a form that involves government by elites who are politically accountable, compromise through coalition, and the neutralization of threats to stability at the elite level. To his discussion of regulated markets and trade networks he adds the argument that Crete was actively involved in re-inventing its past, as city states emerged as an organic whole together with their countryside and that they were the political force from which administration and trade emerged. Cross credits Crete with developing an early form of a capitalist economy in a pre-industrial world where markets were unpredictable and specialization could spell disaster. Change in post-Minoan Crete was from within, and Cretan isolation can be seen not as a negative phenomenon but as a positive one that enabled the city states of the island to avoid monarchy, tyranny, and uprisings, and to give central place to the rule of law. Cross then asks whether Crete's distinctive answers to the questions of antiquity might not be incipiently modern, in terms of regulated state institutions and markets that came slowly and surely to work together. In the Age of the Polis Crete, with its organization in small cooperative communities – commu(ni)tarianism– in politics, and individualism in law and economics, was not the backward cousin but the opposite of Athens, legally, politically, and economically.

Martha W. Baldwin Bowsky
University of the Pacific
Stockton, California, 95211, USA
mbowsky@pacific.edu