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Guizzi’s (hereafter G.) revised doctoral dissertation is a welcome and much-needed contribution to Cretan studies, in particular to the island’s micro- and macro-history. Everyone familiar with Margarita Guarducci’s ‘Inscriptiones Creticae’, I–IV (Roma 1935–1952) finds extremely helpful her introductions to each polis where she collected all the information available at the time and presented it in sections on modern topography, name of the polis, geography, history, res pubblica, res sacrae and coinage. This method is not very different from what L. Robert proposed and practiced (not least his students) with fruitful results.1 In a like manner, G. has chosen one important polis, Hierapytana, and has presented an up-to-date and in-depth analysis of all available evidence – except the res sacrae – for the history of this Cretan polis from its foundation until the Roman conquest.

The book is clearly structured and easy to follow. It comprises an English abstract (pp. 277–8), an Introduction (pp. 279–82), where the method followed and the goal achieved are stated, five chapters, which are divided in numbered smaller sections and subsections, and a (Re)epilogo (pp. 409–11) of all the certain and probable historical facts for Hierapytna. There follow a List of Abbreviations (p. 413), which could be incorporated in the bibliography; an extensive and complete Bibliography (pp. 415–27); three very useful Indices on literary sources (pp. 429–33) and inscriptions (pp. 433–6), on geographic and ethnic names (ancient Cretan pp. 437–8, ancient non-Cretan pp. 438–9, and modern Cretan pp. 439–40), and on personal names (p. 441) and Hierapytnians (p. 441–2); and finally two maps (fig. 1–2) whose mediocre printed quality is facilitated by the use of red and blue color for the names of the sites discussed.

The book is carefully produced and all the ancient texts are followed by Italian translations. The typographical errors, mainly accents in the Greek texts, are very few and not serious, except the one in p. 288 Χτιστής instead of Χτιστήν.

Chapter 1 (pp. 283–303) deals with the name(s) and origins of the polis (1.1) and takes as its point of departure the lemma in Stephanus of Byzantium and the polis’ previous names Kyriba (1. 1. 1, pp. 283–4), Pytyna (1. 1. 2, pp. 284–5) and Kamiros (1. 1. 3, pp. 285–7). For the foundation of the polis (1. 2), the starting point is an important, albeit problematic passage from Strabo (10. 3. 19, lines 16–25) where Kyribas, one of the Kouretes who are said to be offspring of Athena and Helios, is mentioned as Χτιστής of Hierapytna. In line 21 (pp. 288–98) the evidence for Kyribas and other Kouretes who founded poleis in Crete are examined as well as Kyribas as one of the Korybantes who are sometimes assimilated with the Kouretes but also connected with the Phrygian Rhea-Cybele, and are related to the Telchines. In 1. 2. 2 (pp. 298–302) G. speculates on the origins of such a tradition and correctly places it in the early Hellenistic period, the terminus ante being 145 BCE, the year that Ptolemy VI died and the year when Hierapytna annexed Praisos, the important Eteocretan polis of eastern Crete. The Appendix on the Eteanoridai of Hierapytna (pp. 302–3), attested in an inscription (IC III. iii [Hierapytna]. 8) which Guarducci dated in the first century BCE, serves as an example of an Hierapytnian following the lead of his polis in projecting his lineage back to a time of heroes, if not divinities. The text records the genealogy of a gens which goes back to the time when Eteanor, ‘the true man/Cretan’, son of Melanthyros, ‘the black-shield or door’, and Pyrrha participated in the polis’ foundation.

Chapter 2 (pp. 304–22) is devoted to the territory of Hierapytna and its frontiers. In 2. 1 (pp. 305–6) the first territorial expansion of the polis is discussed, as well as the synoicism of Larissa or Larission pedion (2. 2, pp. 306–10) whose location is unknown and has been placed in various sites (E, W and F of the isthmus. 2. 3 (pp. 310–7) examines the northern expansion of Hierapytna, which includes the acquisition of Oleros and its territory, situated in the NW (2. 3. 1, pp. 310–2), and the area around Minos on the N coast (2. 3. 2, pp. 312–4, perhaps modern Pachia Ammos), which appears to have been an enclave of Lyttos within Hierapytnian territory. In the end of the second century BCE, two treaties set the frontiers between Lato and Hierapytna (2. 3. 3, pp. 314–7), but the many micro-toponyms

---

1 One important item missing is: M. W. Baldwin Bowsky, Cretan Connections: the Transformation of Hierapytna, Cretan Studies 4, 1994, 1–44.
2 The toponym appears also in Macedonia as Pydna and the Troas and morphologically and semantically is connected with pyshmen, lat. fundus ‘a plain surface’, and perhaps, I would add, at the sea level, or lower than the sea level.
3 See also F. Bechtel, Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit, Halle 1917, s. vv.
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mentioned in the treaties defy secure identification. Turning to the western frontier (2. 4, pp. 317–9), Hierapytna reached the territories of Biannos and Priansos, with the latter of which she signed a treaty for an agreed borderline at the end of the third century BCE. Finally, Hierapytna gradually extended her eastern frontier (2. 5, pp. 319–22) and incorporated, one way or another, all the eastern part of the island, except for Itanos in the NE. The first step eastwards was the conquest of Praisos which had already annihilated Dragmos on the eastern shore and Stalai probably on the S. Once Praisos was conquered by Hierapytna, the only polis remaining in the E was Itanos who had to agree for a third time with Hierapytna (the other two agreements being with Dragmos and Praisos) about their borderline, especially the disputed territory around the sanctuary of Dictaean Zeus.

Chapter 3 (pp. 323–39) focuses on the institutions and society. In 3. 1 (pp. 323–8) G. adduces information from inscriptions and emphasizes the conflict between the literary sources, which speak of one Cretan constitution, and the epigraphic record, which reveals differences from polis to polis. Hierapytna and Gortyn are the only poleis where epigraphic evidence record ten σύνομα. The Hierapytian constitution with the cosmate, a boule and the demos appears to have been a moderate democracy in that the magistracies were controlled by an aristocratic elite – a political system that may also have been influenced by the polis’ relations with Rhodes and its constitution. In 3. 2 (pp. 328–30) the known σύνομα and the possible family relations are presented, which leads to the probable hypothesis that members of the powerful families could elect to the cosmate one or more of their members. 3. 3 (pp. 330–7) studies the social system of Hierapytna, a system which in the Hellenistic period changed with the concentration of land and resources in the hands of a few citizens. This forced the inhabitants either to become mercenaries or emigrate to poleis of Asia Minor. In 3. 3. 1 (pp. 331–5) G. offers a brief overview of the Cretan citizen and the other social groups and of the Cretan δημοσίη, including a discussion of a fragmentary inscription from Vasiliki (SEG 39. 967), dated in the late second or early first century BCE, where he accepts the editors’ interpretation as an ‘obituary’ for an ἕγγυς, young Cretans serving their military duty on Hierapytna’s frontiers. 3. 3. 2 (pp. 335–7) examines the other social groups: free citizens with little or no land-property, serfs, slaves, and the phenomena of piracy and mercy-service which may have been two solutions to the social problem that arose in relation to an elite group controlling the polis’ resources. There follows an Appendix on the monetary magistrates of Hierapytna (pp. 337–9), published by O. Masson (BCH 103, 1979, 74–82 = BullEp 1991, 204). Of fourteen names in this Appendix, seven also appear in the inscription from Vasiliki mentioned above, a coincidence which may also indicate that the important magistracies in Hierapytna, as elsewhere in Crete, were controlled by influential and rich or well-to-do families.

Chapter 4 (pp. 340–56) deals with the «economic activities» as evidenced in the οἰκονομικός treaty between Hierapytna and Priansos (IC III. iii. 4, lines 12–52), dated in the last years of the third century BCE. This important document lays out three important areas of economic activities: 1) agriculture, 2) trading and 3) pasture. The polis’ economic activity in its specifics became a private, citizen-oriented economy which – given the social and political reality in Crete – interested mainly but not exclusively the aristocratic elite. This picture is also supported by the Pseudo-Aristotelian ‘Οἰκονομίκος – nearly contemporary with the treaty – and other οἰκονομικοί treaties between Cretan po-


leis. G. examines the clause of the treaty on agriculture, particularly taxes which could be levied on both public and private land, or rent which may have included, or was in addition to the sum for the συσσύστιον. In the other ισοπολιτεία treaty between Arkades and Hierapytna the clause on imports and exports of cereals suggests that the poleis were very careful in anticipating alimentary crises and finding ways for resolving them. Pastoralism is the subject discussed in 4. 1. 2 (pp. 346–50). In the ισοπολιτεία treaty the έννόμισμα, rent paid for using pasture-land, is waived and G. suggests that this was one way of achieving seasonal exchange of pasture-lands in the plains and in the mountains, as may be surmised from the treaty between Hierapytna and Praisos, the latter eventually being conquered on account of Hierapytnian economic expansionism. In 4. 2 (pp. 350–5) the clause pertaining to trading is examined which exempts the ισοπολιτεία from customs and taxes for export or for using the ports, unless the transaction is effected with a third party (normally trading by land was free and by sea taxed). As is to be expected, the basic products for trading would have been the agricultural products, one important item being wine, but wool, fish and purple as well. 4. 3 (pp. 353–5) examines aspects of public and private 'finance', an anachronistic term used for lack of a better one. What is meant is that private needs for loans and contracts of various kinds were effected by the polis serving as an intermediary, as one of the clauses in the treaty implies (the treaty between Lato and Olaus even mentions a χρωσφάλησσα, a kind of public-land registry and bank, IC I. xvi. 5). In the Appendix the revenues of the polis from extra-economic private activities, such as piracy, mercenary activities, booty from raids and wars which was taxable are touched upon. Although every Cretan polis was striving for autarchy, nevertheless the limited resources forced them either to form interstate relations ratified by treaties, or to try to conquer new territories.

Chapter 5 (pp. 357–408) is by far the longest and concentrates on Hierapytna’s relations with poleis in Crete and the Mediterranean and with Hellenistic kings. This is achieved thanks to the great number of surviving treaties whose political and diplomatic nature facilitate the reconstruction and provide a rather clear picture of a polis gradually aligning itself with almost all the neighboring poleis and within a century and a half (a little after 145 BCE) becoming an important power in the eastern part of the island and the eastern Mediterranean.

5. 1 (pp. 357–9) is a list of the surviving documents with their dates and 5. 1. 1 (pp. 359–66) examines the oldest surviving ισοσύλλογον treaty between Hierapytna and Praisos, located in the NE, dated in the beginning of the third century BCE. Then follows an examination of the documents in chronological order, starting with the third century BCE. These are: the treaty of Cretan poleis with Miletus from which Hierapytna is absent; Hierapytna’s, together with Istron and Phaistos, οἰσπολίτεια decree for the sanctuary of Asclepius at Kos; Hierapytna’s rather indirect involvement and marginal participation in the Lyttian War as an ally mainly of Gortyn; the treaty with Arkades and then the early second century treaties with Gortyn, Lyttos and Priansos, in the latter of which mention is made of the ξενοδοχεῖον which is compared with the ξενοδοχεῖον; finally, towards the end of the second century, the treaties with Lato and Itanos and the long struggle with the latter for control of the frontier sanctuary of Diktaeus Zeus. 5. 1. 2 (pp. 366–73) discusses the expansion of Hierapytna and examines: a fragmentary document mentioning Hierapytnians living (συσσύστιοντες) in the territory of Arkades and the problems arising from such an arrangement (pp. 366–9); and the relations between Hierapytna and Praisos (pp. 369–71), the most important polis in the eastern part of Crete which controlled or conquered most of the poleis and disputed Itanos’ control of the Diktaeus Zeus’ sanctuary. In the beginning of the third century BCE Hierapytna signed a treaty with the Eteocretan Praisos, but a little after 145 BCE she conquered the polis and her territory,
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thus becoming a local power, a fact which eventually led Hierapytna to raise the old claims of Praisos against Itanos’ control of the frontier sanctuary of Diktaean Zeus. 5. 1. 3 (pp. 373–82) is devoted to this famous dispute and its prolonged arbitration first between Itanos and Praisos and then Itanos and Hierapytna by judges from Magnesia on the Meander and finally the Roman senate and the consul Lucius Cornelius Piso in 114 BCE in favor of Itanos. In 111/0 BCE another Roman embassy settled the disputed borderline between Lato and Olous upon which followed the treaty between Lato and Hierapytna settling their borderline. 5. 1. 4 (pp. 382–4) presents the relations between Hierapytna and Cnosos which are very sketchy, because Hierapytna was traditionally an ally of Gortyn, the enemy of Cnosos; the latter, however, seems to have become the dominant polis in the last part of the second century BCE – when Hierapytna entered into conflict with Itanos – and to have led the opposition against Metellus and the Romans in 67 BCE.

Hierapytna’s Aegean and Mediterranean relations (5. 2, pp. 384–5) begin with the fragmentary text (IC III. iii. 1A) preserving the treaty of συμμαχία with the Macedonian king Antigonus most probably Doson dated before 222/1 BCE, which stipulates sending a detachment of Hierapytnians for the Macedonian army (5. 2. 1, pp. 385–93); this is compared to the similar treaty signed between the king and Eleutherna (IC II. xii [Eleutherna]. 20). Both are συμμαχία which ratify the mercenary service of Hierapytnians and Eleutheraeans in the Macedonian army, a custom that has a long history. 5. 2. 2 (pp. 393–402) is devoted to eastern relations: the alliance signed with Rhodes and dated ca 204–202 BCE, in which Rhodes has the upper hand and appears distrustful towards an ally experienced in trading and piratical activities; the relations with the Dodecanese, mainly Hierapytna’s attack on Kalymnos; and the relations with the Pergamene kingdom in the beginning of the second century BCE. Finally, 5. 2. 3 (pp. 402–8) examines Hierapytna’s relations with Rome which began with the arbitration for the sanctuary of Diktaean Zeus and ended in 67 BCE with Metellus’ conquest of the polis.

This rather long overview of the chapters has tried to present G.’s main arguments. Because the evidence for ancient Crete is rather limited (mainly inscriptions and passages in ancient non-Cretan authors), reconstructing Crete’s past, let alone one of her poleis, presents always a challenge. In this effort G. is successful and achieves his aims. All the available evidence – literary, epigraphic, archeological and numismatic – is utilized in order to create a sensible synthesis of the history of Hierapytna.

Hierapytna’s myth-historic tradition seems to imply that the polis shared cultural characteristics and interests both with the Eteocretan past and present of the area to the N–NE – where Praisos and the sanctuary of Diktaean Zeus were situated – and with Rhodes and Asia Minor. G. rightly emphasizes the unique position of Kyrbas, as Koure/Koryband and perhaps Telchin, who symbolizes and facilitates Hierapytnian aspirations, and reasonably suggests that, given the other foundation stories of Cretan poleis by Kouretes, there must have existed in Crete «un corpus di fondazioni ‘curetiche’» (p. 289). The geographical discussion reveals that G. is not an arm-chair historian. He has direct knowledge of the area and its topography and presents critically the issues, being fully aware of the limitations of identifying the ancient micro-toponyms mentioned in the treaties, which have supported much speculation. Even his own careful proposals are presented as working hypotheses to be accepted or rejected by new future evidence. As with other areas, so with the eastern part of Crete, conclusions about matters topographical must performe remain tentative.

The discussion of Hierapytna’s society, institutions and economy, for the most part, repeats what is already known for Crete in general. It is, however, worth restating the arguments, as more corroborating evidence is presented
which conforms with the general picture of the island. The aristocratic elite of
Hierapytna controlled the magistracies of the polis (as in Lato and Amnisos/
Cnosos) and its resources. The interaction between political/social institutions
and economic concerns are evident in the ōσopoliteýa treaties of Hierapytna
through which the elite was able to establish economic relations with, and social
privileges in other Cretan poleis. This was one of the ways in which economic
pressures for new lands for agriculture and pasture and for facilitating trading
practices were alleviated, along with mercenary-service, emigration and piratical
activities.

Finally, Hierapytna’s interstate relations are also evident in the treaties, which,
following G. reconstruction, show that the polis’ ‘orientation’ was eastwards:
Hierapytna pursued a prudent and cautious policy towards the western, more
powerful neighbours – Gortyn, Priansos, perhaps Biannos, Cnosos, Arkades and
Lato – and after securing her western and northern frontiers, she gradually turned
to the E, first ally ing herself with and then conquering Praiso and threatening
Itanos almost until the Roman conquest in 67 BCE. In the eastern Mediterranean
piracy became a major issue, which G. rightly calls ‘parasitic’ to trading, while
also stressing the difficulty of distinguishing between piracy and brigandage.
Hierapytna and Rhodes shared common cultural elements in their mythical
history and there appears to have been Rhodian influence on Hierapytna’s politi-
cal and constitutional praxis. Relations between Rhodes and Rome, however,
forced the latter to intervene and to deal a decisive blow to Rhodian and Cretan
commercial activity, by making Delos a free port in 167/6 BCE. The Roman pe-
riod of Crete conventionally begins in 67 BCE, the Metelian conquest of the last
Cretan polis, Hierapytna, but Roman presence and intervention in the island has
a much longer history since 195 BCE. Hierapytna is mentioned among the major
poleis from W to E that fell into Metellus’ legions, but G. cautiously leaves the
matter open: it is not clear whether Hierapytna’s conquest resulted from her ac-
tive opposition and resistance against the Romans with Cnosos, or from her
being the last refuge for, and site of resistance of Aristion and Pompey’s envoy
Octavius.

One important element missing from G.’s reconstruction of Hierapytna’s hi-
story, as he himself admits (p. 282), is the religious matters of the polis, for which
there was no comprehensive treatment at the time and which present great diffi-
culties. The study of Hierapytna’s cult places is almost impossible, but this is also
true of all Crete, with very few exceptions. This ground is now covered by Katja
Sporn’s, Heiligtümer und Kulte Kretas in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit
(Studien zur Antiken Heiligtümern, 3), Heidelberg 2002, 52–60. There is also a
tendency for repetition, especially among chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5; but perhaps this
is unavoidable, as the same limited evidence, on which the discussion is based, is
used of necessity for the topography, the political, social and economic practise
and interstate relations, all of which interact with each other in varying degrees.

G. has presented with acuteness and critical judgement a well-balanced and
sensible overview of the evidence for Hierapytna, an important polis in the
eastern part of Crete during the third, second and first centuries BCE. For the
island of Crete, it is the first book of its kind and a solid piece of careful scholar-
ship which will facilitate students of the Hellenistic Period. This reviewer hopes that others will soon follow suit.

Rethymno

Yannis Z. Tzifopoulos


Willems nahm an, bei bestimmten Anliegen seien die Sitzungen einem Quorum von einem Drittel (in seltenen Fällen gar der Hälfte) unterworfen gewesen; Mommsen hingegen postulierte ein ständiges Quorum. Balsdon hat 1937 dafür pladiert, den Ausdruck ‘frequens senatus’ als terminus technicus für das Quorum aufzufassen. Bonnefond-Coudry hielt in ihrer Studie 1989 diesen Ausdruck für nicht-technisch, doch sie schloß sich der Meinung Balsdons insofern an, als sie mit umsichtigen Überlegungen Willems Position gegen Mommsen stärkte: das Quorum – üblicherweise 1/3 der Senats, bei seltenen Anlässen sogar 1/2 – war anlabbedingt. R. weigert sich brüsck, sich mit ihren Argumenten auseinanderzusetzen (S. 13, Anm. 7) und bleibt – was die Erklärung der unterschiedlichen