

## FROM COMMUNAL SPIRIT TO INDIVIDUALITY: THE EPIGRAPHIC HABIT IN HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN CRETE

The subject of my paper is a comparison between the epigraphic habit in Hellenistic and in Roman Crete, from the third century B.C. to the third century A.D. We define as ‘epigraphic habit’ the position occupied by inscriptions in the public and private life of a particular period and area. Studies of the epigraphic habit do not focus so much on the specific content of inscriptions, but consider more general aspects, such as the number of inscriptions, the nature of the texts, their language, their distribution over time, space, and social strata. These aspects depend to a great extent on the particular characteristics of the community which produces and displays inscriptions, such as mentality, social stratification, ideology, and socio-political structure. Consequently, changes in these features often (but not always) reflect deeper changes in a community<sup>1</sup>. Studies of the epigraphic habit naturally have a quantitative component; but numbers never speak for themselves, and it would be meaningless to say, e.g., that more inscriptions or more epitaphs survive from Roman than from Hellenistic Crete. In order to give meaning to these or similar statements, one needs to take into consideration various parameters, especially the state of research; e.g., with regard to epigraphy, central Crete is better known than the eastern and western parts of the island. It is for this reason that I will focus on central Crete. The most important parameters in the study of the epigraphic habit are not quantitative, but qualitative:

- the character of the documents (laws, decrees, treaties, epitaphs, dedications, inscriptions on pottery and other instrumenta domestica, etc.); it is, e.g., significant that the majority of the Hellenistic inscriptions of Crete are *public legal* documents (see below);

---

<sup>1</sup> For some recent studies on epigraphic habit(s) see R. MACMULLEN, *The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire*, in *AJPh* 103, 1982, pp. 233-246; J.C. MANN, *Epigraphic Consciousness*, in *JRS* 75, 1985, pp. 204-206; R. MACMULLEN, *Frequency of Inscriptions in Roman Lydia*, in *ZPE* 65, 1986, pp. 237-238; F.A. MEYER, *Explaining the Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire: The Evidence of Epitaphs*, in *JRS* 90, 1990, pp. 74-96 (cf. the comments of H.W. Pleket in *SEG* XL 1654); W. LIEBESCHUETZ, *The End of the Ancient City*, in J. RICH (ed.), *The City in Late Antiquity*, London-New York 1992, pp. 4-6; H.W. PLEKET, *Greek Inscriptions in the Roman Empire: Their Strength, Deficiencies, and Inaccessibility*, in *Atti dell'XI*

*Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina*. Roma, 18-24 settembre 1997, II, Rome 1997, pp. 83-86. C.W. HEDRICK JR., *Democracy and the Athenian Epigraphical Habit*, in *Hesperia* 68, 1999, pp. 387-394. For Crete, see the studies of J. Whitley on the state of literacy as reflected by the epigraphic habit in Archaic Crete: *Cretan Laws and Cretan Literacy*, in *AJ* 1101, 1997, pp. 635-661; cf. *ib.*, *Literacy and Lawmaking: The Case of Archaic Crete*, in N. FISHER and H. VAN WEES (edd.), *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, London 1998, pp. 311-331; cf. my critical remarks in *SEG* XLVII 1377 and those of L. DUBOIS, *Bulletin épigraphique*, in *REG* 111, 1998, p. 568 no. 19.

- the spatial distribution of the inscriptions; roughly 1/4 of all the inscriptions of Roman Crete have been found in only three cities (Gortyn, Knossos, and Lyttos), whereas the Hellenistic inscriptions are more evenly distributed; this is certainly related to the fact that there were more than 40 independent poleis in Hellenistic Crete, but only 15 or 16 settlements with the status of a polis in Roman Crete (members of the provincial Koinon)<sup>2</sup>, also the specific status of these cities in Roman Crete results in this unequal distribution of texts: Gortyn was the provincial capital, Knossos the only Roman colony on the island, and Lyttos a city with a huge territory;

- the distribution of the texts in the territory of a community; particular attention should be paid to the reasons for the concentration of texts in particular areas, such as sanctuaries, cemeteries, the civic center, dependent settlements, forts, etc.;

- the gender and social position of the dedicators or the honorands; and

- textual aspects, such as the use of stereotypical or unique expressions, and the language (including the use of dialects or koine forms, spelling, etc.).

Changes in these features are the result of developments, such as socio-political reforms, the familiarity with writing, contacts with other regions, uniformity or heterogeneity, and the integration or the isolation of an area. Above all, one needs to relate the situation of the area under study to the broader picture, i.e., to the epigraphic habit in the rest of the Hellenistic and Roman world<sup>3</sup>. Studies of epigraphic habits are comparative studies, requiring comparisons between sites, regions, periods, types of documents, and different social groups. In the case of Roman Crete, we cannot detect peculiarities and evolutions if we limit ourselves to an endoscopic analysis which considers only inscriptions of the Imperial period and only the inscriptions of Crete. We need to compare the situation in Hellenistic and Roman Crete with the epigraphic habit of the Hellenistic and Roman world, in general, and we also need to compare the epigraphic behavior of the Cretans inside and outside of their island<sup>4</sup>. Here, I will have to concentrate on a few examples, beginning with a general characterisation of the epigraphic habit in Hellenistic Crete.

Its most striking feature is its predominantly public nature. From Hellenistic Gortyn (c. 300-50 B.C.) we have 77 public legal documents (decrees, laws, and treaties), but only 15 grave inscriptions<sup>5</sup>, and the situation is similar all over the island. We see how uncommon this

<sup>2</sup> For Hellenistic Crete see A. CHANIOTIS, *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in hellenistischer Zeit*, Stuttgart 1996, 12f. note 36; cf. P. PERLMAN, Πόλις ὑπάρκοος. *The Dependent Polis and Crete*, in M.H. HANSEN (ed.), *Introduction to an Inventory of Poleis. Symposium August, 23-26, 1995*, Copenhagen 1996, 282f.; for Roman Crete see A.-M. ROUANET-LIESENFELT, *Remarques sur l'assemblée provinciale crétoise et son grand-prêtre à l'époque du Haut-Empire*, in *Ktema* 19, 1994, 17f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Whitley's comparison between Archaic Crete, Athens, and Sparta (see note 1). This applies also to the onomastic habit. See the remarks of O. SALOMIES, *Contacts between Italy, Macedonia and Asia Minor during the Principate*, in A.D. RIZAKIS (ed.), *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East. Social and Political Aspects. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on*

*Roman Onomastics*, Athens, 7-9 September 1993, Athens 1996, 111-117.

<sup>4</sup> One of the reasons I think that J. Whitley (see note 1) reaches the wrong conclusions with regard to the state of literacy in Archaic and early Classical Crete is the fact that he has not considered the epigraphic behavior of Cretans outside of Crete; see my remarks in *SEG XLVII 1377*.

<sup>5</sup> *IC IV* 160-196, 199, 202-210, 212, 226-227 (N.B.: many of these inscriptions contain more than one document); *SEG XXXVIII* 900, 906; A. MAGNELLI, *Una nuova iscrizione da Gortyna (Crete): qualche considerazione sulla neotas*, in *ASAtene LXX-LXXI*, 1992-93 (1998), pp. 291-297. Epitaphs: *IC IV* 348-350, 352-354, 357, 361, 363-368, 372.

proportion between legal texts and epitaphs is, if we compare it with the situation in other areas. To give but a few examples from recent *corpora*, in Epidamnos the epitaphs make up 99% of the stone inscriptions (from the Archaic period to Late Antiquity), in Apollonia 72%, in Beroia 53%<sup>6</sup>. Within the group of the public legal documents of Hellenistic Crete three categories prevail, all three of them related to a military and diplomatic context: proxeny decrees for foreigners<sup>7</sup>; 59 decrees which concern the inviolability of sanctuaries and communities outside Crete (the largest group of *asylia* decrees in the entire Greek world)<sup>8</sup>, and more than 100 treaties or decrees concerning interstate agreements<sup>9</sup>. With the exception of the imperial power of Athens, no other Greek area has produced so many treaties in the entire ancient world as Crete in a period of only two centuries: treaties of alliance with foreign powers concerning the recruitment of mercenary soldiers, treaties concerning the settling of legal conflicts between persons of different citizenship, treaties of alliance between Cretan communities, treaties which aimed at improving certain economic activities (especially pastoral activities and trade), and treaties which delimited the territories of the Cretan cities. These documents reflect the primary concerns of the Cretan communities in this period: the occupation of land suitable for agricultural activities, the defence of inherited territory or the conquering of neighbours' territory, and the creation of new possibilities for economic activities especially for those citizens who did not own land. Many Cretans made a living as mercenary soldiers on the basis of interstate agreements, the seasonal pastoral activities were improved, and trade activities became the subject of detailed regulations<sup>10</sup>.

In this context it is necessary to underline the fact that, contrary to what many scholars maintain, the evidence for trade activities in Hellenistic Crete does not mean that the character

<sup>6</sup> Epidamnos: P. CABANES, F. DRINI, *Corpus des inscriptions grecques d'Illyrie méridionale et d'Épire I. Inscriptions d'Epidamne-Dyrrhachion et d'Apollonia. 1. Inscriptions d'Epidamne-Dyrrhachion*, Athens-Paris 1995: 505 epitaphs out of 510 stone inscriptions. Apollonia: P. CABANES, N. CEKA, *Corpus des inscriptions grecques d'Illyrie méridionale et d'Épire I.2. Inscriptions d'Epidamne-Dyrrhachion et d'Apollonia. 2A. Inscriptions d'Apollonia d'Illyrie*, Paris-Athens 1997: 264 epitaphs out of 367 stone inscriptions. Beroia: L. GOUNAROPOULOU, M.B. HATZOPOULOS, *Επιγραφές Κάτω Μακεδονίας μεταξύ του Βερμίου όρους και του Αξιού ποταμού. 1. Επιγραφές Βεροίας*, Athens 1998: 272 out of 512 stone inscriptions.

<sup>7</sup> See esp. Apta: IC II 3, 5-15; Eltynia: IC II xiii 1-2; Gortyn: IC IV 202-229; Kisamos: A. MARTINEZ FERNÁNDEZ, St. MARKOULAKI, *Decreto inédito de proxenia de Kisamos, Creta*, in *ZPE* 133, 2000, pp. 103-108; Knossos: IC I viii 10, 12; Lappa: ICref. II xvi 4-9; Olous: IC I xxii 4-7; SEG XXIII 549, 551; XXXIX 978; Polythenia: IC II xxiii 4; Sybrita: LE RIDER 1966, 258f. The military context is evident in the following honorary inscriptions: IC I xxii 4 I, V; III iv 2-3; IV 168, 195, 208 A, 215 C, 220; LE RIDER 1966, 258f. nos. 4-5; see also A. PETROPOULOU, *Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftsgeschichte Kretas in hellenistischer Zeit*, Frankfurt 1985, 33f.

<sup>8</sup> Collected and discussed by K.J. RIGSBY, *Asylia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1996, nos. 42-44, 55-60, 65, 118, 136-152, 154-157, 159-161, 175, and 187-209.

<sup>9</sup> For the treaties between Cretan poleis see Chaniotis, *op. cit.* (note 2); for the treaties between Cretan cities and foreign states and kings see *ibid.* 16f. note 57 and S. KREUTER, *Außenbeziehungen kretischer Gemeinden zu den hellenistischen Staaten im 3. und 2. Jh. v. Chr.*, Munich 1992.

<sup>10</sup> Mercenary service: PETROPOULOU, *op. cit.* (note 7), pp. 23-31. Seasonal pastoralism: A. CHANIOTIS, *Milking the Mountains: Economic Activities on the Cretan Uplands in the Classical and Hellenistic Period*, in CHANIOTIS 1999, esp. pp. 197-205 and 210-212. Trade: PETROPOULOU, *op. cit.* (note 7), pp. 61-74; D. VIVIERS, *Economy and Territorial Dynamics in Crete from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period*, in CHANIOTIS 1999, pp. 221-233; F. GUIZZI, *Private Economic Activities in Hellenistic Crete: The Evidence of the Isopoliteia Treaties*, in CHANIOTIS 1999, pp. 235-245; P. PERLMAN, *Kretes aei Leistai? The Marginalization of Crete in Greek Thought and the Role of Piracy in the Outbreak of the First Cretan War*, in V. GABRIELSEN ET AL. (eds.), *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, Aarhus 1999, esp. pp. 144-157.

of the island's economy changed dramatically from an economy primarily oriented towards subsistence to a production primarily oriented towards exports. The trade with slaves and with war booty is well attested<sup>11</sup>; there is evidence for imports to Crete (e.g., Rhodian amphoras, works of sculpture, and luxury objects)<sup>12</sup>; there can also be no doubt that the Cretans exploited the geographical position of their island for *transit* trade<sup>13</sup>; but there is no evidence for substantial exports of any *Cretan* product before the Imperial period. I have the impression that the scholars who underline the importance of trade for the Hellenistic economy of Crete tend to overlook the essential difference between transit trade and trade with local products and to overevaluate the evidence.

Since this issue is of some importance for understanding the Cretan particularities, I should comment on the recent views of two of the best specialists on Crete: Paula Perlman, who has presented a very stimulating study on the relations between Crete and Rhodes (note 10), and L. V. Watrous who has written a review of a volume I have recently edited on Cretan economy. Perlman has presented an impressive review of evidence which in her view is related to foreign trade; it includes the clause of the safe use of Cretan harbors in proxeny decrees, the privilege of the customs-free import and export of valuables in honorary inscriptions, the numerous Hadra vases and the few Cretan amphora stamps found in Egypt (see further below), the introduction of Egyptian cults into Crete, and the discovery of a workshop for wool production at Xerokampos<sup>14</sup>. This evidence is, however, not at all unequivocal and should be interpreted with caution. It is simply not true that every ship that was guaranteed safety when sailing to a Cretan harbor was a *merchant* ship; it is also not true that all the wares exported from Crete were *Cretan* products; and it is absolutely certain that many recipients of the privileges of inviolability, customs-free import and export, and the safe use of harbors were not traders. At Olous the recipients of these privileges include, e.g., a soldier (*IC* I xxii 4 XI) and a doctor (*IC* I xxii 4 XIII), at Knossos envoys of Magnesia on the Maeander and an epic poet (*IC* I viii 10 and 12). As a matter of fact there is not a single proxeny or honorary decree earlier than c. 100 B.C. which unequivocally reveals an economic context, whereas a military background is directly attested in many cases<sup>15</sup>. The rest of Perlman's evidence is equally problematic. Everything we know about the introduction of Egyptian cults into Crete reveals a military context (Cretan mercenaries returning from Egypt or Egyptian troops on Crete); and it is methodologically problematic

<sup>11</sup> Trade with slaves: PETROPOULOU, *op.cit.* (note 7), pp. 68-74. War booty: *ibid.*, 15; A. CHANIOTIS, *Vinum Creticum excellens: Zum Weinhandel Kretas*, in *Münstersche Beiträge zur antiken Handelsgeschichte*, 7.1, 1988, p. 70; CHANIOTIS, *op.cit.* (note 2), pp. 87, 93f., 120-122.

<sup>12</sup> Rhodian amphoras: PERLMAN, *art.cit.* (note 10), 154-157; N. P. PAPADAKIS, *Stamps on amphora handles from the Hellenistic town Tripitos near Sitia, Crete*, in *Tekmeria* 5, 2000, pp. 113-126. Luxury objects: e.g., St. MARKOULAKI, V. NINIΟΥ-KINDELI, *Ελληνιστικός λαξευτός τάφος Χανίων. Ανασκαφή οικοπέδου*

*Μαθουδάκη*, in *ADelt* 37 A, 1982 (1990), pp. 7-118.

<sup>13</sup> VIVIERS, *art. cit.* (note 10); PERLMAN, *art.cit.* (note 10), pp. 144-151.

<sup>14</sup> PERLMAN, *art. cit.* (note 10), pp. 146-151.

<sup>15</sup> See note 7. The relatively large group of honorary inscriptions for musicians and epic poets can be explained by the popularity of such performances on Crete: *IC* I viii 12; xxii 4 III, VI; LE RIDER 1966, 258f. nos. 2-3; A. CHANIOTIS, *Als die Diplomaten noch tanzten und sangen*, in *ZPE* 71, 1988, pp. 154-156.

to make out of a single workshop in Xerokampos a wool industry; Perlman may “see no reason to doubt” that its products were exported, but the fact remains that there is absolutely no evidence supporting this conclusion. If there were so many foreign traders on Crete or Cretan traders abroad they certainly succeeded in concealing their identity, because not a single one of them is known. I see similar problems with L.V. Watrous’ views<sup>16</sup>. Watrous correctly points out that there is recent archaeological evidence pointing to intensive agricultural exploitation in the Hellenistic period and to industrial activities at Matalon; he also draws attention to the doubling of rural sites in the Mesara “in the Hellenistic period (ca. 325-69 B.C.)”, to the numerous finds of stamped amphoras, and to Polybius’ statement on the greed of the Cretans (6.45-47). I very much doubt whether any of this can be regarded as evidence for an *export* economy in the *third and second* centuries B.C. The increased number of rural sites in the Mesara needs to be contextualised in order to become meaningful: it makes a huge difference if the new sites came into being before or after the destruction of Phaistos (c. 150 B.C.), since the late second and early first centuries B.C. form a distinct period in the history of Hellenistic Crete<sup>17</sup>. The stamped amphoras *imported* to Crete provide no evidence for export trade, and Polybius’ comment has nothing to do with export economy, but with the vices that the historian (in an exaggerated way) attributes to the Cretans: piracy and mercenary service.

Again it is only a comparison between Crete and other parts of the Hellenistic world that can reveal the Cretan peculiarities<sup>18</sup>. Many categories of evidence, so well represented in the source material of the areas which were integrated into the economic networks of the Hellenistic world, are entirely absent in Crete: we lack evidence for a long-distance trade with local products, for local manufacture (except for the Hadra vases), for Cretan merchants, and for the display of private wealth which characterizes big and small Hellenistic *poleis* (luxurious dedications, foundations, private dedications of public buildings, contributions to festivals, impressive funerary documents, honorific decrees for benefactors, etc.). This is not due to some coincidental gaps in our sources, but to the peculiarities of Cretan society and economy. Consequently, I see no reason, yet, to reconsider my view that the Cretan economy in the Hellenistic period continued to be primarily oriented towards subsistence and that the concentration of so many related treaties in a period of only 200 years (c. 300-110 B.C.) should be seen as a response to a crisis in Cretan society<sup>19</sup>. This evidence is not only unique in the history of Crete; in this density, it is also unique in the Hellenistic period and clearly bestows upon Crete a very distinctive character.

Hellenistic Crete is also unique in other respects. One of the most striking phenomena of the Hellenistic World is the prominent role played by benefactors; we know of their activities in cities as big as Athens or Ephesos and as small as Morrylos in Macedonia through hundreds of honorary decrees and honorary inscriptions which record their

<sup>16</sup> *AJA* 105, 2001, p. 133f.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. W.V. HARRIS, *Crete in the Hellenistic and Roman Economies: A Comment*, in CHANIOTIS 1999, p. 355.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. CHANIOTIS, *art. cit.* (note 10), p. 210f.

<sup>19</sup> CHANIOTIS, *op. cit.* (note 2), pp. 169-175.

activities<sup>20</sup>. They erected buildings, made dedications, repaired the fortification walls, made loans to their cities, cared for their supply with cheap corn, and they tended to monopolise the political life of their cities. Honorary decrees for benefactors, so abundant in mainland Greece, on the islands, and in Asia Minor, are entirely absent from Hellenistic Crete; the few honorary inscriptions which were set up for benefactors (*euergetai*) are always dedicated to foreigners: to foreign kings, Roman magistrates, and doctors (usually in periods of war)<sup>21</sup>. It is at the end of the period that we find a single reference to a benefactor, a *choregos*, who financed repairs of a temple at Lato (*IC I xvi 27*), and a posthumous funerary epigram for a statesman at Lato<sup>22</sup>.

In the rest of the Hellenistic world the activities of benefactors were also recorded in other types of texts which served their self-representation: building inscriptions, statue bases (sometimes with long lists of the offices they had occupied), dedications, and luxurious funerary monuments, consolatory decrees after their untimely death, sacred regulations concerning cults and sanctuaries founded by them.

Again, this type of evidence is either extremely limited or even entirely absent from Hellenistic Crete<sup>23</sup>; if we do find it, then only in the last part of the period, the last one or two generations before the Roman conquest, which should be regarded as a separate period (see note 17). Let us take the case of dedications and building inscriptions. In central Crete, i.e., the most representative area, covered by volumes I and IV of the *Inscriptiones Creticae*, we have a total of 78 Hellenistic dedications and building inscriptions, most of them from the last 50 years before the Roman conquest and almost one fourth of them from a single sanctuary at Sta Lenika (see table 1)<sup>24</sup>. Only 36% of them are dedications by private individuals, only four dedications were made by women, only four by foreigners. The overwhelming majority (59%) are records of building activities and dedications financed by the community and supervised by civic officials.

In a period which elsewhere is generally characterized by individuality and by the self-representation of strong personalities, the political and military leaders of Hellenistic Crete escape our knowledge because they have left no inscriptions which honor them for their public role or commemorate their dedications and benefactions.

<sup>20</sup> Fundamental: PH. GAUTHIER, *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (IV<sup>e</sup>-I<sup>er</sup> siècle avant J.-C.)*. Contribution à l'histoire des institutions, Paris 1985. See also F. QUAB, *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens. Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Stuttgart 1993.

<sup>21</sup> Kings: *IC II iii 4 A* and *C*; *II xii 25*. Roman magistrates: *IC II iii 5 A*; *xxiii 13-14*. Doctors: *IC II iii 3*; cf. E.I. DETORAKIS, 'Ιατρικές πληροφορίες από αρχαίες κρητικές επιγραφές', in Πεπραγμένα του Ζ' Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου, A1, Rethymno 1995, pp. 213-234. Unknown men: *IC II xiii 1 B*, *xxiii 4, 5* (two Chians and a Gortynian at Polyrhenia), *IV 230* (three Lappaian in Phaistos).

<sup>22</sup> M.W.B. BOWSKY, *Epigrams to an Elder Statesman and a Young*

*Noble from Lato pros Kamara (Crete)*, in *Hesperia* 58, 1989, pp. 115-129 (*SEG XXXIX 972*; *LXII 808*; *XLVII 1400*).

<sup>23</sup> For an exception see the epigram of a priest at Kydonia: *SEG XL 775*.

<sup>24</sup> Amnisos: *SEG XXXIII 718-729*. Arkades: *IC I v 5*. Chersonesos: *IC I vii 2-5*. Dreros: *BCH 61, 1937*, p. 30. Gortyn: *IC IV 237-240, 243-245, 248, 251, 254-255, 258-261*; *SEG XXIII 593*. Kalami: *IC I xxxi 7*. Klossos: *IC I viii 15-16*; *SEG XLIV 728*. Lasaia: *IC I xv 1*. Lato: *IC I xiv 2*; *xvi 2, 21-35*; *BCH 62, 1938, 389 no. 1, 405 no. 4*. Lebena: *IC I xvii 4-6, 19, 38, 44*; *SEG XLVII 1403*. Malla: *IC I xix 4-5*. Olous: *IC I xxii 8-11*; *SEG XLV 1329*. Phaistos: *IC I xxiii 2-4*. Pluti: *IC I xxxi 8*. Pyloros: *IC I xxv 2*. Tylisos: *IC I xxx 3-4*.

Site	Public	Private	Unknown
Amnisos	12		
Arkades	1		
Chersonesos	1	3	
Dreiros	1		
Gortyn	4	9	2
Kalami		1	
Knossos	1	2	
Lasaia		1	
Lato	17	2	
Lebena	4	3	
Malla	1	1	
Olous	1	3	1
Phaistos	2	1	
Pluti	1		
Pyloros	1		
Tylisos		1	1
<i>Total</i>	<i>46</i>	<i>27</i>	<i>4</i>

*Table 1. Hellenistic building inscriptions and dedications (not including honorary statues)*

In Hellenistic Crete the epigraphic habit is predominantly public, anonymous, impersonal, masculine, local, and limited with regard to the representation of social groups - and all this despite the fact that Crete was neither isolated nor egalitarian, despite the unequivocal evidence for social stratification, despite the indications of the strong position occupied by women. In Hellenistic Crete the epigraphic habit does not allow individual personalities to emerge beyond the anonymity of the public epigraphic record. We know about the life and personality of some Cretans *only* when they are part of the epigraphic habit of areas outside of Crete: we know of Eumaridas of Kydonia because he was honored in Athens, of Charmadas of Anopolis because of the biographical epigram written on his grave in Palestine, of the dream interpreter and poet Ptolemaios of Polyrrhenia because of the dedications he made on Delos, of Telemnastos of Gortyn because he was honored by the Cretan soldiers he had commanded, not in Crete, but in Epidauros<sup>25</sup>. The question is why the epigraphic behavior of the Cretans changed so dramatically when they were outside of their island. I will return to this question later.

In Crete itself the dramatic change occurs after the Roman conquest. The epigraphic habit of Roman Crete is predominantly an epigraphy of individuals, of men and women, of free persons and slaves, of Cretans and foreigners. The inscriptions concerning the most important individual in the Roman empire - the emperor - and the most important individual

<sup>25</sup> Eumaridas: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 844*; A. BIELMAN, *Retour à la liberté. Libération et sauvetage des prisonniers en Grèce ancienne*, Paris

1994, 119-121. Charmadas: *SEG VIII 269*. Ptolemaios: *IDélos* 2072-2073. Telemnastos: *IG IV 1<sup>2</sup>, 244*.

in Crete - the provincial governor - naturally take pride of place, but we also have inscriptions concerning members of the civic elite and representatives of all social strata.

These dramatic changes are apparent in the dedications and building inscriptions which become predominantly private (*Table 2*)<sup>26</sup>. Considering again central Crete, we see that out of 67 dedications and building inscriptions, only 11 were set up by a community (16% as opposed to 59% in the Hellenistic period). The dedications by women are more prominent (23% of the private dedications); we have for the first time dedications made by associations (*IC* IV 266-267), dedications made by slaves for the well-being of their masters (*IC* III iv 45; *SEG* XLI 745) and an increasing number of dedications financed (and not just supervised) by magistrates.

Site	Public	Private	Unknown
Amnisos		1	
Arkades		3	
Biannos			1
Chersonesos			2
Gortyn	8	17	1
Knossos		6	
Lasaia		2	
Lebena		14	1
Lyttos	2	1	
Marathokephala		1	
Matalon		1	
Phaistos		3	
Priantos		1	1
Pyloros		1	
<i>Total</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>51</i>	<i>6</i>

*Table 2. Late Republican and Imperial building inscriptions and dedications (not including honorary statues and dedications to the emperors)*<sup>27</sup>.

For the first time we also encounter honorary inscriptions and honorary statues set up by the cities for magistrates, members of the local elite, benefactors, and intellectuals<sup>28</sup>, honorary inscriptions initiated by associations (*IC* IV 290-291), and statues set up by individuals for

<sup>26</sup> Amnisos: *SEG* XXXIII 717. Arkades: *IC* I v 6-8. Biannos: *IC* I vi 7. Chersonesos: *IC* I vii 6-7. Gortyn: *IC* I xxxi 9; IV 241-242, 246-247, 249-250, 252-253, 257, 262-267, 327-335; *SEG* XXVIII 738. Knossos: *IC* I viii 17-20; *SEG* XXXIII 737; XLI 759. Lasaia: *IC* I xv 2-3. Lebena: *IC* I xvii 17-18, 21, 23-29, 31-32, 42, 54. Lyttos: *IC* I xviii 12-13, 59. Marathokephala: *IC* I xxxi 2. Matalon: *SEG* XXV 1018. Phaistos: *IC* I xxiii A-C. Priantos: *IC* I xxiv 3, 5. Pyloros: *IC* I xxv 3.

<sup>27</sup> I have not considered the dedications to the emperors because this dedicatory practice would distort the picture:

inscriptions were regularly dedicated to the emperor, by communities, magistrates, and individuals, often in the context of rituals, such as the celebration of the emperor's birthday: see A. CHANIOTIS, G. RETHEMIOTAKIS, *Neue Inschriften aus dem kaiserzeitlichen Lyttos, Kreta*, in *Tyche* 7, 1992, p. 32. For this reason dedications to the emperor cannot be compared and associated with the other types of dedicatory inscriptions.

<sup>28</sup> *IC* I v 25; viii 22-24; xvi 37; xviii 51-57; IV 289, 292-293, 297, 300, 303, 304?, 307, 309-311, 424, 444; *SEG* XXVII 634 = XXXII 904. For a posthumous honorary inscription



members of their family, for educators, patrons, and friends<sup>29</sup>. Honorary inscriptions dedicated by women or for women also appear for the first time in the Roman period<sup>30</sup>. Also the few decrees of this period allow us to recognize personalities, such as Symmachos of Lyttos, who initiated the revival of an old institution, the distribution of money to the tribal subdivisions (*startoi*) on the occasion of two festivals<sup>31</sup>.

Let us now turn to the grave inscriptions. The Hellenistic Cretans did not pay less attention to their dead than the other Greeks, but if one may trust statistics, it seems that they were less interested in inscribing the funerary monuments in the Hellenistic period than both other Hellenistic Greeks and their countrymen in the Roman period. In the territory of the Cretan Arkades, e.g., we have in the Hellenistic period seven grave inscriptions, among them only one epigram and not a single monument erected by a woman. In the Roman period not only the numbers increase (17), but also the content of the funerary texts is more diverse and assimilated to the epigraphic habit of the rest of the Greek world. We have two epigrams, longer texts, four texts set up by women for their deceased husbands, two for their deceased children, and a monument set up by a man to honor his educator<sup>32</sup>. The situation is similar in Chersonesos, with only six Hellenistic epitaphs and 17 in the Roman period (again four texts were set up by women)<sup>33</sup>. If we turn to Lyttos we are confronted with an extreme situation. We have 134 epitaphs from the Roman period as opposed to only 15 grave inscriptions of the Hellenistic period; epigrams and epitaphs set up by women appear for the first time in the Imperial period<sup>34</sup>; we also find for the first time a funerary imprecation<sup>35</sup>. In some other cities (e.g., in Lato, Olous, Gortyn, and Knossos) the material is more evenly distributed, but changes occur in the content of the texts: we find for the first time inscriptions which mention the age of a person at death<sup>36</sup>, epitaphs set up by foster children for the persons who had raised them and by women for their husbands or children<sup>37</sup>, and texts forbidding the violation of the

see C.T. NEWTON, *Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*, II, Oxford 1883, no. 378.

<sup>29</sup> For family members: *IC* I xviii 57; IV 292, 296-297, 299, 425; *L'Année Épigraphique* 1985, 841. For an educator: *IC* IV 295. For friends: *IC* I xviii 56, 59; IV 301-302, 305-306. For patrons: *IC* I xviii 55, 58; IV 289, 293.

<sup>30</sup> Honorary inscriptions for women: e.g., *IC* I v 25; xvi 37; xviii 52, 54; II iii 44-45; IV 290, 303; by women: *IC* I xviii 57; IV 292, 296-297, 299, 425.

<sup>31</sup> *IC* I xviii 11. On this text see more recently F. GUIZZI, *Sistizi a Creta in età imperiale?*, in *Il capitolo delle entrate nelle finanze municipali in Occidente ed in Oriente. Actes de la X<sup>e</sup> Rencontre franco-italienne sur l'épigraphie du monde romain*, Roma, 27-29 mai 1996 (Roma 1999), pp. 275-283.

<sup>32</sup> Hellenistic: *IC* I v 28, 30, 32, 34-35, 37, 40 (epigram). Roman: *IC* I v 12, 13 A/B, 14-18, 29, 31, 33, 38, 39, 41-42; *SEG* XLI 732-733. Epigrams: *IC* I v 41-42. Epitaphs set up by women: *IC* I v 12, 13 A, 33, 38.

<sup>33</sup> Hellenistic: *IC* I vii 14-16, 18, 25; *SEG* XXXIII 730. Roman: *IC* I vii 12-13, 17, 19-24, 30-32; *SEG* XLV 1249-1253. Texts set up by women: *IC* I vii 23-24, 31; *SEG* XLV 1249. In the case of Chersonesos one should be very cautious about statistics, however, since a lot of inscriptions

found in recent years remain unpublished.

<sup>34</sup> Hellenistic period: *IC* I xviii 73, 78, 101, 107-108, 110 A, 112, 119, 122, 130, 136, 143, 145, 181; *SEG* XXIII 543. Imperial period: *IC* I ix 2 (from Dreros, which was part of the Lyttian territory); I xviii 65-72, 74-77, 79-100, 102-106, 109, 110 B, 111, 113-118, 120 A-D, 121, 123-129, 131-135, 137-142, 144, 146-159, 161-167, 169-170, 172-180 (N.B.: several of these monuments contain two or three different epitaphs); *SEG* XXV 1014; XXXIII 544; XXXIX 976; LX 778; XLII 816 A/B. Epigrams: *IC* I xviii 177-180. Epitaphs set up by women: *IC* I xviii 72, 74, 76 B; *SEG* XXV 1014 (the word *kyrios* here designates the husband, not her master; cf. *SEG* XLVII 853).

<sup>35</sup> *IC* I xviii 64. For the funerary imprecations see J. STRUBBE, *Ἀρὰι ἐπιτύμβιοι. Imprecations against Desecrators of the Grave in the Greek Epitaphs of Asia Minor. A Catalogue*, Bonn 1997.

<sup>36</sup> E.g., *IC* I v 17; xvi 43; xviii 98 A/B, 120 A/B, 123, 128, 139 B; I xxiii 17; IV 356; *SEG* XXVIII 743; cf. *IC* II xxvi 4, 5, 9-13, 15-18, 23-25.

<sup>37</sup> Foster children: e.g., *SEG* XLI 732, 736. Women: e.g., *IC* III iii 32, 39, 42, 46; see also notes 32-34. I know of only one pre-Roman epitaph possibly set up by a woman: *SEG*

grave<sup>38</sup>. The epitaphs of Roman Crete also apply the standard funerary formulas known from the rest of the Greek world (e.g., the attributes, *heros*, *amemptos*, *anenkleto*s, *glykytatos* = dulcissimus, or the expression *aretas kai sophrosynas charin*)<sup>39</sup>.

My last example for individuality and diversity in the epigraphy of Roman Crete concerns the “inscribed *instrumenta domestica*”, i.e., inscriptions on pottery, tiles, weights, etc., which give us the names of producers, owners of workshops, owners of objects, traders, and eponymous magistrates. We have considerable numbers of *instrumenta domestica* from Hellenistic Crete:

- 1 - roof tiles inscribed with names (often those of magistrates)<sup>40</sup>;
- 2 - loom weights inscribed with the names of the women who owned the looms or with individual letters (probably numbers)<sup>41</sup>;
- 3 - amphora stamps, mainly from Rhodes and Thasos<sup>42</sup>; and
- 4 - outside of Crete the Cretan Hadra vases, used as funerary urns, often for Cretan envoys and mercenaries<sup>43</sup>.

Stamps or painted inscriptions on amphoras produced on Crete are almost entirely lacking, with the exception of only seven handles of wine amphoras stamped with the seal of Sosos of Hierapytna (third century B.C.) found in Alexandria (six pieces) and at Trypitos (one piece)<sup>44</sup>. The six Hierapytnian amphora stamps in Egypt cannot be seriously taken as

XLI 760 (c. 300 B.C.).

<sup>38</sup> IC II v 49; IV 437.

<sup>39</sup> *Amemptos*: IC I v 14; I xviii 149 B, 154, 163; *anenkleto*s: IC I vii 21; *glykytatos*: IC I v 14; I xviii 157, 161, 172; *heros/herois*: IC I xviii 148; II v 39, 45; *philandros*: IC I xxiv 4; *aretas/sophrosynas charin*: IC I vii 22.

<sup>40</sup> For references see A. CHANIOTIS, *Habgierige Götter - habgierige Städte. Heiligtumsbesitz und Gebietsanspruch in den kretischen Staatsverträgen*, in *Ktema* 13, 1988 (1991), p. 28 (Palaikastro), 33 (Symi Viannou); Id., *Oi Arxónes sta istoriká xróna (1000 π.Χ.-100 μ.Χ.)*, in *Archaiologia* 53, December 1994, pp. 68-74, in part. p. 71 (Archanes; cf. *SEG* XLIV 730 bis); Id., *Hellenistic Lasaiá (Crete): A Dependent Polis of Gortyn. New Epigraphic Evidence from the Asklepieion near Lasaiá*, in *Eulimene* 1, 2000, p. 57 (cf. *SEG* XLII 804). See also IC II ii 5; *SEG* XL 779; XLIII 612.

<sup>41</sup> A. CHANIOTIS, *Die Inschriften von Amnisos*, in J. SCHÄFER (ed.), *Amnisos nach den archäologischen, topographischen, historischen und epigraphischen Zeugnissen des Altertums und der Neuzeit*, Berlin 1992, p. 320f.; Id., *art.cit.* (cf. note 10), 206 note 36; CH. TSGOUNAKI, *Πήλινα ύφαντικά βάρη και σφρονδύλια*, in *KALPAXIS* 1994, σ. 158-167.

<sup>42</sup> For the Rhodian amphoras see note 12. PERLMAN, *art.cit.* (note 10), 151, is tempted to associate the amphora stamps with the trade interests of Rhodes. My impression is that Rhodian amphora stamps are found in similar or even greater numbers everywhere in the Eastern Mediterranean from Asia Minor to the Illyrian coast and from Thrace to Africa; therefore they alone cannot suggest a particular intensive export of Rhodian wine to Crete. For the methodological problems involved in the use of stamped amphora handles for studies of the Rhodian economy see the observations of V. GABRIELSEN, *The Naval*

*Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*, Aarhus 1997, pp. 64-71. Crete was undoubtedly part of the Rhodian strategy of maritime trade, but only because of its geographical position on the trade routes - as has been recently underlined by D. VIVIERS, *art.cit.* (note 10), p. 228 - and because of the dangers caused by the Cretan pirates; the treaties of Rhodes with Cretan cities concern themselves with mercenaries and piracy, not with trade; see KREUTER, *op.cit.* (note 9) pp. 65-89. For Thasian amphora stamps see, e.g., *SEG* XXXIV 914.

<sup>43</sup> See more recently P.C. CALLAGHAN, *Archaic to Hellenistic Pottery*, in SACKETT 1992, pp. 101-106, 130-132; P.C. CALLAGHAN, R.E. JONES, *Hadra Hydriae and Central Crete: A Fabric Analysis*, in *BΣA* 80, 1985, pp. 4-17; E. MANGOU, *Χημική ανάλυση με ατομική απορρόφηση 38 μελανόγραφων ύδριων τύπου Hadra και 12 μελαμβραφών ραβδωτών αγγείων με έκτυπα εμβλήματα (Plakettenvasen)*, in *Ελληνιστική Κεραμική από την Κρήτη*, Chania 1997, p. 149f.; I. ZERVOUDAKI, *Ραβδωτά αγγεία με έκτυπα εμβλήματα και μελανόγραφες υδρίες Hadra από τις συλλογές του Εθνικού Αρχαιολογικού Μουσείου*, *ibid.*, pp. 107-146; for further bibliography see also CHANIOTIS, *art.cit.* (note 10), p. 184, and PERLMAN (note 10) 147. For the export of ‘Plakettenvasen’ (probably produced in West Crete) see St. MARKOULAKI, *Αγγεία με ανάγλυφα εμβλήματα από τη δυτική Κρήτη*, in *Ελληνιστική Κεραμική από την Κρήτη*, Chania 1997, pp. 72-106; A. GEORGIADOU, *Θραύσμα έκτυπου εμβλήματος με παράσταση του Άκταίωνα*, in *KALPAXIS ET AL., op.cit.* (note 41), pp. 138-151.

<sup>44</sup> Alexandria: MARANGOU LERAT 1995, 124 E 1-3; Trypitos: *SEG* XLVII 1410. For wine production in Hellenistic Crete see now also J.C. SMITH, *A Late Hellenistic Wine Press at Knossos*, in *BΣA* 89, 1994, pp. 359-376. For amphora workshops in Hellenistic Crete see EMPEREUR ET AL., p. 519 and 522; MARANGOU LERAT 1995, pp. 61-63, 66f.

evidence for wine trade. A comparison with the thousands of amphora stamps of other producers of wine (Rhodos, Chios, Thasos, Knidos, Sinope, Chersonesos, etc.) is devastating<sup>45</sup>. Six or even six thousand amphoras filled with Cretan wine can easily find their way from Crete to Egypt aboard the ships which continually brought Cretan mercenaries to the kingdom of the Ptolemies for more than 150 years<sup>46</sup>. This is evidence neither for trade nor for a specialised production intended for massive export. Until new evidence which disproves this is published, I suggest that the aforementioned types of the Hellenistic *instrumenta domestica* are closely related to life in contemporary Crete: to pastoral economy and the production of textiles (loom weights), to public constructions (tiles), and to the presence of Cretan mercenaries in Egypt (Hadra vases).

Again, a comparison with the situation in Roman Crete shows an enormous difference. It is only from the late first century B.C. onwards, that we have evidence for a specialized production, for standardisation and for a massive export of local products, especially of wine<sup>47</sup>. Besides the identifiable centers of production of Cretan amphoras and the many references to Cretan wine in the literary sources, in the Roman period we have not only seven, but several hundred stamps and painted inscriptions on Cretan amphoras, found in Greece, Italy, Gaul, and Africa<sup>48</sup>. The texts refer to the type, quality, and provenance of the wine, e.g., from Lyttos, Gortyn, Kantanos, and Aptera. The dipinti also demonstrate a certain standardisation of production, using attributes for particular types of wine, such as *rubrum*, *athalassos*, *anthinos*, *passon*, *staphidites* etc. Thus, in the Roman period we do not have isolated items, but a wide distribution of inscribed Cretan amphoras. We know the names of individuals connected with this trade: producers, traders, and middlemen (cf. *SEG XLV* 1244). This is evidence for standardisation of production and for an organised massive export trade, for the commercialisation of production, and for the integration of the

<sup>45</sup> I mention only a few recent studies where one may find further bibliography. Rhodos: GABRIELSEN, *op. cit.* (note 42), pp. 64-71; Cities of the Black Sea: N. CONOVICI, *Les timbres amphoriques. 2. Sinope (tuiles comprises). Histria VIII*, Bucarest 1998; Y. GARLAN (ed.), *Production et commerce des amphores anciennes en Mer Noire. Colloque international organisé à Istanbul*, Provence 1999; Thasos: A. AVRAM, *Les timbres amphoriques. 1. Thasos. Histria. Les résultats des fouilles VIII*, Bucarest 1996; Y. GARLAN, *Les timbres amphoriques de Thasos. I. Timbres protothasiens et thasiens anciens*, Paris 1999. See also J.-Y. EMPEREUR, Y. GARLAN, *Bulletin archéologique. Amphores et timbres amphoriques (1992-1996)*, in *REG* 111, 1997, pp. 161-209 as well as the bibliographical bulletins which appear regularly in the journal *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*. For the questions of method see also M. DEBIDOUR, *Amphores, épigraphie et histoire*, in Y. LE BOHEC, Y. ROMAN (eds.), *Épigraphie et histoire: acquis et problèmes*, Lyon 1998, pp. 77-91; Y. GARLAN, *Les "fabricants" d'amphores*, in *Topoi* 8, 1998, pp. 581-590; M. LAWALL, *Ceramics and Positivism Revisited: Greek Transport Amphoras and History*, in H. PARKINS, CH. SMITH (eds.), *Trade, Traders and the Ancient City*, London-New York 1998, pp. 75-101.

<sup>46</sup> Cretan mercenaries in Egypt: ST. SPYRIDAKIS, *Cretan Soldiers Overseas: A Prosopography*, in *Kretologia* 11-12, 1981, pp.

49-83 (= *Cretica: Studies on Ancient Crete*, New Rochelle-New York 1992, pp. 55-82).

<sup>47</sup> CHANIOTIS, *art. cit.* (11); MARANGOU LERAT 1995; A. MARANGOU, *Wine in the Cretan Economy*, in CHANIOTIS (ed.), *op. cit.* (note 10), pp. 269-278; A. MATTHAIIOU, *Ὀῖνος ἀθάλασσοσ*, in *Horos* 10-12, 1992-1998, pp. 571-576; A. MARANGOU, *The Wine-Trade between Crete and Egypt, a First Account*, in *Κρήτη και Αίγυπτος*, pp. 250-253. Examples of other inscribed *instrumenta domestica* in Roman Crete: *ICI* xi 5; *SEG* XXXII 898.

<sup>48</sup> See the bibliography in note 47. For a new piece see DE CARO 1998. De Caro's reading of the inscription should be corrected to Ἐπιτυχάνοντος Καμπάνων (not ἐπιτυχάνοντος Καμπανῶν, 'del vino che spetta ai Capuani'). Ἐπιτυχάνοντος is not a participle, but the genitive of the common name Ἐπιτυχάνων; similarly, the second name is probably Καμπάνων (nominative), a name already attested on Crete (*ICI* xviii 62); C. CARRERAS MONFORT, *Miscelánea: Las otras ánforas del Monte Testaccio*, in J.M.A. BLÁSQUEZ MARTÍNEZ, J. REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ (eds.), *Estudios sobre el Monte Testaccio (Roma)*, Barcelona 1999, pp. 95-98.

island's production in economic networks that comprised the entire empire. We observe an analogous development in the case of lamps which bear the signatures of workshops. Signed lamps are unknown in Hellenistic Crete, although they are quite common in other areas. The signed lamps of Roman Crete bear to a large extent signatures of foreign workshops, but for the first time we can also identify Cretan workshops (e.g., the workshop of Gamos, the products of which were occasionally exported, e.g. to Kyrenaika)<sup>49</sup>. These categories of evidence reflect a change in the economic behavior of the Cretans: a more dynamic development of local production, a specialisation, the development of recognizable workshops, and a production aiming at exports.

In these examples Roman Crete presents itself as a thoroughly assimilated and integrated area of a unified empire. We reach the same conclusion, if we study the language of the inscriptions, the decreasing number of texts with dialectal features and the increasing number of inscriptions in the koine<sup>50</sup>, the fair amount of inscriptions in Latin, especially in the Roman colony of Knossos and in the provincial capital Gortyn<sup>51</sup>, and above all the imperial epigraphy, i.e., the large number of inscription related to the Roman emperor in his various capacities.

Let me sum up: The epigraphic habit of Hellenistic Crete is predominantly public, anonymous, impersonal, masculine, local, and limited with regard to the representation of social groups; the epigraphic habit of the late Republican and the Imperial period is predominantly initiated by private persons and by the representatives of the provincial administration - not by the civic communities (with the exception of honorary inscriptions and dedications for the emperors); it originates in and reflects the life of individuals: men and women, Cretans and foreigners, magistrates and private persons, free persons and slaves; it is socially diverse, assimilated to the practices of the rest of the Roman world. The question is why. Only some of the changes can be ascribed to political and economic changes, e.g., the existence of an emperor, the establishment of a provincial administration, the loss of independence, the coming of colonists from Italy, the existence of a new economic network<sup>52</sup>. The transformation of the epigraphic habit from collective to individual reflects a change of mentality, which is far more difficult to explain. Let me give an example: Competitions (*agones*)

<sup>49</sup> See most recently P. SAPOUNA, Προέλευση και εγκαστήρια των λύχνων του Ιδαίου Άντρου, in Πεπραγμένα του Διεθνούς Κρητολογικού Συνεδρίου, A2, Rethymno 1995, pp. 827-839; EAD., Die Bildlampen römischer Zeit aus der Idäischen Zeugrotte auf Kreta, Oxford 1998, pp. 95-108; cf. A. CHANIOTIS, Kretische Inschriften, in *Tekmeria* 1, 1995, p. 32f.; A. MARTIN, Lucerne, in *Gortina* II, p. 278.

<sup>50</sup> V. BUBENIK, *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Sociolinguistic Area*, Amsterdam 1989, pp. 79-90.

<sup>51</sup> For a catalogue of the Latin inscriptions of Crete see A. CHANIOTIS, Eine neue lateinische Ehreninschrift aus Knossos, in *ZPE* 58, 1985, p. 188.; later additions: ID., Kleine Beiträge zu kretischen Inschriften, in *ZPE* 62, 1986, p. 193f.; A. CHANIOTIS, G. PREÜß, Neue Fragmente des Preisedikts von Diokletian und weitere lateinische Inschriften aus Kreta, in *ZPE* 80, 1990, pp. 189-202; ID., Neue lateinische Inschriften aus Knossos, in *ZPE* 89, 1991, pp. 191-195; M.W. BALDWIN BOWSKY,

*Eight Inscriptions from Roman Crete*, in *ZPE* 108, 1995, pp. 263-267; EAD., *Of Two Tongues: Acculturation in Roman Knossos*, in *Coloniae romane nel mondo greco, Atti del Seminario*, Pisa, 3-4 novembre 2000 (forthcoming); S. CORCORAN, *A Fragment of a Tetrarchic Constitution from Crete*, in *ZPE* 133, 2000, pp. 251-255.

<sup>52</sup> For the coming of colonists, the creation of new economic networks, and the integration of Crete in the Empire see more recently the bibliography in note 47; see also BOWSKY 1994, pp. 1-44; EAD., *Knossos and Campania: the Critical Connection*, in *XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina*, Roma, 18-24 settembre 1997. Preatti, Rome 1997, pp. 479-489; EAD., *The Business of Being Roman: The Prosopographical Evidence*, in CHANIOTIS 1999, pp. 305-347; EAD., *When the Flag Follows Trade: Metellus, Pompey, and Crete*, in *Electrum* 51, 2001, pp. 31-72; PATON, SCHNEIDER 1999, pp. 279-304.

took place in Hellenistic Crete, but unlike the rest of Greece the names of the victors are not recorded in agonistic inscriptions<sup>53</sup>, friendship was an important factor of social life, but there is not a single honorary inscription set up for a friend in Hellenistic Crete; on the contrary we have several such texts in Roman Crete (see note 29); men proposed decrees in Hellenistic Crete as they did in every Greek city, but while the psephismata in other areas regularly mention the man who had proposed them, the Cretan decrees do not, demonstrating the same striking anonymity and a communal spirit. There must have been political leaders in Hellenistic Crete, but their deeds are not recorded in honorary inscriptions.

If all this changes in the Roman period, this must be the result of a change in the forms of self-representation and praise, from oral and introverted, to written and public. I suspect that the decisive factor for this change in mentality is the fact that the Cretans in the Imperial period, exactly as the Hellenistic Cretans who used the medium of inscriptions *outside* of Crete, were not bound to the peculiar forms of the internal organisation of the Cretan communities, i.e. the division of the citizens in groups (tribes, men's houses, *syssitia*, and military groups of the youth)<sup>54</sup>. These forms of organisation do not further individuality, but a collective spirit. They endorse competition, but they also provide a different framework for the praise and the honor of the victorious, the virtuous, and the prominent man: not the written record in the agora and the sanctuary, but the oral praise in the common meal, in the festival, in the assembly<sup>55</sup>. Whenever the Hellenistic Cretans were outside of their island, no longer bound to these forms of organisation, they adopted the epigraphic habit of the rest of the Hellenistic world. When these forms of organisation disappeared together with the abolishment of the military organisation of the Cretan cities after the Roman conquest, the new forms of self-representation became common and they also included all those social groups which had been previously either misrepresented (women, foreigners) or even excluded (slaves, freedmen, artisans). Changes in mentality are harder to grasp and explain than e.g., unequivocal changes in the constitution. But if we can detect them, it is with the application of more subtle methods, such as the study of epigraphic habits.

ANGELOS CHANIOTIS  
Heidelberg

<sup>53</sup> Evidence for agons in Crete: CHANIOTIS, *op.cit.* (note 2), pp. 126-128; I.Z. TZIFPOULOS, *Hemerodromoi and Cretan Dromeis: Athletes or Military Personnel? The Case of the Cretan Philonides*, in *Nikephoros* 11, 1998, pp. 156-158. An agonistic inscription from Roman Crete: *IC* IV 375.

<sup>54</sup> For *andrea*, *syssitia*, and *agelai* in Hellenistic Crete see PETROPOULOU, *op.cit.* (note 9), p. 252f. note 572; CHANIOTIS,

*op.cit.* (note 2), pp. 123-133; cf. M. BILE, *Les termes relatifs à l'initiation dans les inscriptions crétoises (VI<sup>e</sup>-I<sup>er</sup> siècles av. J.-C.)*, in A. MOREAU (ed.), *L'initiation. Actes du colloque international de Montpellier*, 11-14 avril 1991 (Montpellier 1992), pp. 11-18; GUIZZI, *art.cit.* (note 30).

<sup>55</sup> The importance of oral praise in the *syssitia* is underlined by Dosiadas, *FrGrHist* 458 F 2.