PORTRAIT OF A *POLIS*: LATO PROS KAMARA (CRETE)
IN THE LATE SECOND CENTURY B.C.

The two Latoan Epigrams recently published in this journal¹ are a chance
find that not only adds to the corpus of Cretan metrical inscriptions but also prompts a
review of our knowledge of politically powerful individuals, families, and clans in the flour-
ishing city of Lato pros Kamara at the end of the 2nd century.² The present article first
addresses the information that inscriptions and other sources provide about civic life and
public organization there. Attention is then focused on the individuals who participated in
public life at Lato and their families and finally on the clans to which the leading families of
the *polis* belonged.

It is in this context that the significance of the two epigrams recently published can best
be assessed. For Kletonymos, son of Mnaostokles, now known from his gravestone as well as
from the official dedications in 10 and 11, was a magistrate who went on to serve on a post-
magistral advisory council and whose sons held lower magistracies at the time of his death.
Kletonymos is representative of many men, individual members of aristocratic families
which in turn belonged to the ruling clans of Lato. And Thiodotos son of Thiodotos,
grandson of Biannos, great-grandson of Euagoros, was the scion of an otherwise obscure
family, descended nevertheless from magistrates contemporary with Kletonymos. His sig-
nificance lies in his belonging to a family which, in and out of public office, can be traced
over six generations, from a burial at the early upland metropolis of Lato to the later mari-
time city.

At Lato, with its extensive set of official inscriptions, there is an unusual opportunity to
study the families and clans that held public office year after year. There is also a rare
chance to examine in detail some of the family lines that comprised the ruling clans of the
*polis*. The inscriptions permit the reconstruction of the yearly administration of Lato and its
territory, not only by the city’s chief magistrates but also by officials of lower rank and those

¹ Baldwin Bowsky, “Epigrams” (see footnote 2 below).
² I wish to thank Professor Henri van Effenterre for reading preliminary versions of the present article. All
dates are b.c. unless otherwise indicated, and texts are cited by their number in the Appendix. In the gene-
alogical charts, broken lines indicate hypothetical lines of descent; names in brackets are likewise hypo-
thetical; text numbers appear beside attested lines of descent.
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who held special appointments. The larger context for the individuals, families, and clans here discussed is Lato itself, a polis in transition from the turbulence of 2nd-century Crete to stability and prosperity at the end of the century. This happy state of affairs was apparently to continue throughout Rome’s “provincialization” of the island and the establishment of the pax Romana, which could only benefit a polis by the sea.

The names of a remarkable number of Lato’s magistrates are preserved from the last quarter of the 2nd century. Seventeen different boards of kosmoi are named in inscriptions that attest their activities in Lato and in the various sanctuaries of Lato and her territory. Kosmoi were the chief magistrates of the polis and served on annual boards filled by members chosen from certain ruling clans. Clans, in turn, were composed of households (oikoi) which included four generations traced through the male line back to a founder. The result of such a household-clan structure under which only some clans were privileged to govern was the monopolization of the kosmate, the chief magistracy, by an aristocratic elite composed of a few exclusive clans. This select group governed through clan chiefs and their colleagues, who were themselves clan elders. As the most senior of these clan elders on any one board of kosmoi, the clan chief is acknowledged in the preserved texts as the one “with whom” other kosmoi served (1–4, 10–15, 26, and 27) or else simply appears as the first named in a list of kosmoi (8, 9, 16–21, and 25). Another standard term in the literature on this magistry is protokosmos.

Restrictive as this kinship-based process was in determining the kosmoi of any one year, the magistrates were then asked to be multi-purpose officials in accordance with Jones’ principle of “general applicability” whereby an existing administrative apparatus such as the kosmate could be “employed across the whole range of governmental activity—legislation, the judiciary, financial administration, the armed forces, and so on.” The kosmoi of Lato pros Kamara were indeed called upon to be competent in foreign policy (1–4, 23, 24, 26); to preside over the induction of new citizens into their own body politic and to witness, through their preigistos, the swearing in of new citizens of Olous (4); and to oversee architectural projects (8–10, 12–17, 19–21, and 27).

There is, however, evidence that Lato’s kosmate was not quite a self-sufficient administrative body. The sepulchral epigram for Kletonymos indicates that Kletonymos’ sons served as oikonomoi, managers or administrators (almost certainly financial) second in rank to the kosmoi of Lato, as they were to those of Arkades and Chersonesos. 12 names an

---

1–4, IC I 16.22, 8–27.
3 Willetts, p. 59.
6 Willetts, p. 113.
individual who defrayed the cost (choragesas) of an architectural project at the Aphrodision, in Lato's territory.

In this same period, moreover, there appears to have been one delicate task for which annual boards of kosmoi were either not suitable or not acceptable. Three panels of Eunomiotai, members of a venerable college of magistrates called the Eunomia after their meeting place, are known to have fulfilled their predominantly religious function by building temples (5–7). This panel, composed of mature statesmen with the authority of age and position, also had a nominal head referred to as the one “with whom” other members served (again, 5–7). This special panel, perhaps called into existence by the terms of the Lato-Olous treaty of 4, concerned itself with public order and with investigating and judging questions related to religion and morals, and particularly to laws of hospitality.10 Its purpose was specifically the provision of a conciliating and mediating authority to ensure orderly process between Latoans and such citizens of other poleis as might find themselves in Lato’s territory.11 This seems to have been a particularly acute concern for citizens of Olous when at or on their way to Lato’s shrines, many of which lay in the disputed territory between Olous and Lato.

The inscriptions set up by Latoan boards of kosmoi, normally composed of five to seven magistrates and often naming their secretary as well, provide us with the names or partial names of some seventy-two kosmoi and secretaries, as well as the names of many of their fathers, and in one case the name of the kosmos’ grandfather. Panels of Eunomiotai, numbering six to nine, set up inscriptions that record the names of another sixteen individuals and their fathers, and again the name of one grandfather. These documents almost provide a census of two generations, or in some cases three, of the political elite of Lato.

The individuals named in the texts presented in the Appendix below can now be inserted into their proper family and social context. The magistral inscriptions of Lato not only attest a large number of individual names but also preserve information about the families and clans to which these men belonged. It is not just that kosmoi were the clan chiefs and elders of any given year and group. There were at times brothers who served on the same board of kosmoi (8, 16, and 27), and kosmoi had at their disposal a secretary who was chosen from the clan, sometimes even a brother or son of one of them (10, 11, 19–21).12 The fact that the five to seven men on any one board belonged to the same clan increases significantly the likelihood that they were related, sometimes quite closely. Homonymy, in circumstances so controlled by the ties of kinship and the brevity of the period in question, becomes an aid to prosopographical research rather than an obstacle.

At Lato, with its double set of inscriptions (one from the site of the temples and statues which the kosmoi dedicated or rededicated and one from the headquarters of the kosmoi in

11 Ibid., p. 204, and eadem, comments ad IC I 16.5, lines 34–38. See also H. van Effenterre, “Querelles crétoises,” REA 44, 1942 (pp. 31–51), p. 46.
12 Willetts, pp. 141–142.
there is an unusual opportunity to study the families and clans that held public office. Clan names are not always preserved, but even where they are not they may be recoverable, since certain names appear to be restricted to members of one particular clan, perhaps even to a few families within that clan. Kleanor, Koruptas, Pollias, Polytimos, Thiopheides, and Tymon are names which appear in inscriptions definitely or possibly listing boards of *kosmoi* drawn from the Echanoreis.\(^\text{14}\) Such distinctive nomenclature is not attested for the other clans in the surviving record. Rather, a pool of other names appears to have been common among members of the Echanoreis, Aischeis, Hylleis, and Synaneis. Androlas, Antipas, Bergis, Enipas, Kletonymos, Lattygos, and Mnastokles are names prominent in two or more of these clans.\(^\text{15}\) Pyron also appears to have been a popular name, paired as it is with Enipas, Mnastokles, Androlas, and Antipas (9, 17, 18, and 5).

Aristocrats from the four clans known at Lato administered the city’s affairs and policies during the last quarter of the 2nd century. Echanoreis are named as *kosmoi* certainly in 9, 16, and 27, and quite possibly in 17–20, to judge from the names Koruptas, Pollias, Polytimos, Pyron, and Tymon which appear therein. Aischeis filled boards of *kosmoi* whose names appear in 14, 15, and 22. Hylleis held the kosmate in the years represented by 10, 11, 25, and perhaps 12, to judge from the names Ikadion (father of Bergis in *IC* I 16.52) and Lattygos. Synaneis are known as *kosmoi* only in 21.

There is also a rare chance to reconstruct a certain number of family lines from among those that comprised the ruling clans of Lato. The period of time covered by the texts considered here is short, roughly twenty years for all but 9, which names individuals one generation older than those named in the other texts. These texts provide the names of one cohort of men who were the sons of a group of fathers who must, almost by definition, be fewer in number than their sons. By exploiting the onomastic convention which calls for an eldest son to be named after his paternal grandfather, and by concentrating on the filiations of the *kosmoi* rather than their own names, it is possible to reconstruct some family lines not just for three generations, but for four, five, and even six.

9, which preserves the names of the fathers and grandfathers of several later *kosmoi*, is the starting point for the reconstruction of five family lines within the clan Echanoreis. 9, 16, and 27, for instance, provide the names of a grandfather, father, and son: Chyrilos, Kleanor, and Sophios. Likewise 9, 19, and 20 together attest another three-generation line of *kosmoi*, again Echanoreis: Apellas senior, Pollias, and Apellas junior. More complex is an Echanoreis family named in 5, 9, 13, 16–18, and 27, which contain the names that appear in the following stemma:

13 Van Effenterre, 1943, p. 31.
14 Kleanor: 9, 16; Koruptas: 17, 5, and possibly 23, line 61; Pollias: 9, 19; Polytimos: 9, 16–20, as well as 5 and 6; Thiopheides: 9, 5; Tymon: 9, 18, and 5.
15 Androlas: 14 (Aischeis), 13 (unknown unless the name [Ty]mon is to be restored, so that the clan Echanoreis could be proposed), 16, and 18 (Echanoreis); Antipas: 10 and 11 (Hylleis), 5; Bergis: 10 and 11 (Hylleis), 17 (Echanoreis); Enipas: 9 and 16 (Echanoreis) but also 10 and 11 (Hylleis), 5; Kletonymos: 10 and 11 (Hylleis) but also 19 and 20 (Echanoreis); Lattygos: 10 and 11 (Hylleis) and 21 (Synaneis); Mnastokles: 10 and 11 (Hylleis), 17 (Echanoreis), and 21 (Synaneis).
A complete oikos, or at least several members of one, is visible in the four generations of men, members of the Echanoreis descended one from another, who are named in 5, 9, 19, and 20:

Since 19 and 20 name as secretary a son of one of the kosmoi, it is even possible to recover the genealogy of a rather large oikos in the Echanoreis, a household composed of individuals named in 5, 6, 9, 16–20, 25, and 27:
To judge from the names Polytimos and Tymon, as well as the fact that 5, 9, 16–18, and 27 are common to this stemma and the one traced from Pyron above, Tymon’s family could well be closely related to Pyron’s. Pyron and Tymon might even have been brothers, but we are unable to recover the name of their father from the names known for their sons.

In two or three cases, where private funerary inscriptions can be adduced, it becomes possible to trace five and even six generations in families belonging to the aristocracy of Lato. One such family could have been descended from Mnastokles son of Enipas, whose gravestone was found at Lato pros Kamara and is dated by Davaras to the 3rd century.\(^{16}\) When combined with 3, 5, 10, and 11, this inscription suggests that a family belonging to the clan Hylleis included individuals from the following six generations:

Likewise the double gravestone of Nemoneios son of Nikon and Nikon son of Damatrios (IC I 16.42), found in an unrecorded place but presumably at Lato pros Kamara rather than at the acropolis city and dated on the basis of letter forms to the 3rd century, just may reveal the point of origin for a family line, perhaps within the Synaneis, that led to Damatrios son of Kilix (5) and Nemoneios son of Lydos (21). Whether the anonymous son of Nemoneios named in 8 was part of this family must remain uncertain, since the board named there cannot be identified with the kosmate of any one clan, let alone the Synaneis. There is every likelihood that these two families descended from Enipas and from Nemoneios can be traced back to the late 3rd century, perhaps to just the time when Lato pros Kamara was becoming a civic center to replace its mountain metropolis. That an aristocratic family can be traced back to Lato’s acropolis is illustrated by a family already studied for the publication of the grave epigram of Thiodotos son of Thiodotos. This family, belonging to the clan Hylleis, may well have been descended from Thiodotos son of Lattygos, who was buried in the 2nd century at upland Lato (IC I 16.11):

```
```

It has been possible thus far to study the families and clans that laid claim to public office at Lato and even to reconstruct a certain number of family lines from among those that comprised the ruling clans of the Hellenistic city. The means are also at hand to extend this study to an examination of the annual administration of Lato and its territory. However brief our view of Lato’s society and politics, it nevertheless reveals in uncommon detail the identities, connections, and operations of one generation of local notables. It is nearly possible, in fact, to present the fasti, or roster, of kosmoi for the 12-year period 122/21 to 111/10. Earlier than that, only the board headed by Heraklitos son of Thiopheides is known (9), which included Pollias son of Apellas and Kleanor son of Chyrilos. Their sons
are named as *kosmoi* on boards dated here to 113/12 (19 and 20)\(^{17}\) and 111/10 (16 and 27). By comparison with 5 (where Thiopheides is named as Pagon’s grandfather), 16, 19, 20, and 27, Heraklitos’ protokosmate can be dated around 140–135. Beginning with 122/21, however, we know the names of different *kosmoi* for every year but one, thus confirming the notion that the kosmate was an annual magistracy.\(^{18}\) The roster of *kosmoi* and other relevant magistracies is presented here according to magistral years, which ran from the autumn equinox in one September to the next autumn equinox, so that modern dating shows magistral years spanning two calendar years.

**122/21.** At the end of this year Lato won a territorial war with her northern neighbor, Olous, and *kosmoi* drawn from the clan Aisheis set up a victory inscription at the old temple of Aphrodite at Sta Lenikà.\(^{19}\) If we look to 4, which records the original treaty between Lato and Olous,\(^{20}\) we see that Pyleros son of Tallaios is named as head *kosmos* at Lato (lines 1–2).

**121/20.** Lines 84–85 of 4 name a different chief *kosmos* of Lato, Mainaios son of Chairnetadas. It is reasonable to think that Pyleros son of Tallaios was the chief of the ruling clan Aisheis when Lato won the war and struck her agreement with Olous but that Mainaios son of Chairnetadas was head *kosmos*, from an unknown clan, when the treaty was actually inscribed. As long as one event took place before the autumn equinox and the other after, the names of two different *protokosmoi* would come down to us.\(^{21}\)

Lines 34ff. of this treaty include the provision that panels of *Eunomiotai* should act to investigate and set right wrongful acts against individual citizens, whether committed in either city or en route to the shrines in the Latoan territory which lay between them. The first year of the accord between Lato and Olous is the best date for the *Eunomia* headed by Aution son of Podaiathon, a panel which dedicated the epigram celebrating Kypros-born Aphrodite (7). While this epigram was probably set up at the headquarters of the *Eunomiotai* in Lato, a corresponding dedication was likely to have been inscribed at her temple, perhaps the one whose opening words appear on a stone found at Sta Lenikà: “To you, Kypros-born, this...”\(^{22}\) The fact that these dedications are to Aphrodite alone confirms the suspicion that these *Eunomiotai* were active before those who built the new double temple of Ares and Aphrodite at Sta Lenikà (5, here dated 120/19). *Kosmoi* would repair and rededicate the double temple beginning in 113.

**120/19.** Another of these panels, headed by Damatrios son of Kilix, can be tentatively assigned to this year, partially on prosopographical grounds. A grandson of Thiopheides is
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\(^{17}\) This relative chronology has been proposed by Van Effenterre ([1943] p. 38).

\(^{18}\) Willetts, pp. 76–77, 205.

\(^{19}\) See Van Effenterre and Bougrat, pp. 30–31, for this dating.

\(^{20}\) See Van Effenterre (footnote 11 above), p. 44, on *IC* I 16.5 and for his identification of this text (4) as the original treaty agreed upon by Lato and Olous.


included among the *Eunomiotai*, so that this inscription should be dated a generation later than 9.

It appears entirely possible that 12 records the *kosmoi* of 120/19, or else those of 119/18. This inscription names as head *kosmos* the anonymous son of Ikadion (perhaps Bergis by comparison with IC I 16.52) and records the board’s work on the temple of Eileithyia. The name of a *choragesas*, Lattygos, is shown after the names of the *kosmoi*, and the Aphrodision is mentioned at the end of the inscription, in an unknown context. A comparable text, naming *kosmoi* of Olous and their *choragesas* Taxylaos, comes from the Porös isthmus hard by Olous (IC I 22.8). If there is any significance in the naming of *choragesantes* in these two texts, it would suggest that we date these two boards of *kosmoi*, one at Lato and one at Olous, to a time when there were unusually costly, extensive temple repairs to be done. 120/19 was the magistral year immediately after the war between Lato and Olous had been concluded. At Lato, both the *kosmoi* and the *Eunomiotai* were involved this year in the rebuilding and rededication of frontier shrines, one at Istron and the other at Sta Lenikà.

119/18. A third panel of *Eunomiotai*, headed by Aristodamos son of Tharsymachos, may well have convened during this next year (6). Their project may have been in Lato itself rather than at one of the frontier sanctuaries. Aristandros son of Glaukias was a member of this panel and is known to have been the ambassador from Lato in 117/16, when Lato and Olous extended the deadline for the arbitration by Knossos of their disagreement (3, line 48).

118/17. This is perhaps the best date for 18, set up to record the unknown achievements of a board of *kosmoi* drawn from the clan Echanoreis and headed by Polytimos son of Tharsiphanes. This same individual had served as *Eunomiotes* in the panel of 5, here dated 120/19. His colleagues, Pyron son of Androlas, Danithales son of Ankyros, Tymon son of Charimyrtos, and Charimortos (sic), appear to have been slightly older than he and to have belonged to the generation of *kosmoi* after that of 9, here dated ca. 140–135 (see the stemmata above for individuals descended from Pyron and Tymon). I will suggest below that in the years immediately after 120 there was some shortage of clan elders to fill the kosmate at Lato and that members of the clan Echanoreis served unusually often. Perhaps Polytimos son of Tharsiphanes became *kosmos* only two years after he had been *Eunomiotes* by reason of the same shortage of qualified aristocrats.

117/16. The *kosmoi* of this year and the next two appear to have been occupied largely with resolving Lato’s dispute with Olous, which apparently continued despite any cessation of hostilities. 1 and 2 name Diokles son of Heroidas as *protokosmos* when Lato and Olous submitted their quarrel to Knossian arbitration. Knossos’ decision was due in six months from September/October 116.24

23 Cf. Van Effenterre and Bougrat, p. 31 for the relative date. See 5 and compare 9 for the *protokosmos* Heraklitos son of Thiopheides. The dating is confirmed by Van Effenterre’s suggestion that 9 is earlier by a generation than 20 (Van Effenterre, 1943, p. 38).

24 See Guarducci, 1947, p. 33.
116/15. Under the succeeding college of kosmoi, headed by Kydannos son of Enipas, a six-month extension was granted to Knossos (3).25 One curious feature of 3, both the version found at Delos and that found at Sta Lenikà, is that it can be dated October/November 116 by its mention of the Athenian archonship of Serapion and the month Pyanopsion. This mention and the fact that the opening section is written from a Delian rather than a Cretan point of view suggest that the two copies of 3 represent a decree set up not only at Delos but also at Lato, and perhaps also at Knossos and Olous, as was prescribed in 1. The Latoan text which has survived is from the disputed sanctuary, that of Ares at Dera also named in 1. The kosmoi with Kydannos son of Enipas also restored the common precinct enclosure of Lato’s temples to Athena Deramis and Eleuthyia (10 and 11).

115/14. The Knossian arbitration, commissioned by October 116 and delayed from April 115 to October 115, was concluded in the term of a new head kosmos, [Thar]siphanes son of Ko[ruptas].26 According to 23, Lato was to regain her pre-war territorial boundaries, and Olous to retain possession of movable goods but to pay Lato damages by the spring of 114, a payment which was to mark a definite end of the conflict between the two neighbors.

114/13. With the end of the territorial dispute, Lato’s kosmoi could begin in earnest their work of rededicating and restoring the shrines of the city’s reconfirmed territory. While sons of Koruptas, Polytimos, and Pyron had served as Eunomiotaí in 121/20 and 120/19, other sons now appeared in the college of kosmoi six to seven years later. 17 lists as protokosmos Antes son of Polytimos, together with his kinsmen-colleagues Mnastokles son of Pyron and Bergis son of Koruptas.

Yet the Knossian adjudication appears not to have settled the issue. An Athenian inscription may well refer to the next stage in the Lato-Olous quarrel. Meritt has published a text from the Athenian Agora which he characterizes as “remarkable for the appearance in it of Doric dialect.”27 Robert (Bulletin épigraphique 1962, pp. 144–146, no. 107) quickly proposed that it be connected with the Lato-Olous quarrel and the resolution thereof. The Agora text is nowhere comparable to 23, which records the Knossian arbitration. Instead, with its references to nomoi (lines 6, 9) and chremata (lines 7, 13), it may be an Athenian text from the time when Olous expressed her dissatisfaction with the terms of Knossos’ decision and apparently called for or caused the call for yet another arbitration. This conjecture can be supported by reference to the grave epigram of Kletynomas son of Mnastokles, which cites his support of the laws (ἐπ[εισ]χα νομον [sic], line 8) at a critical moment in Lato’s history; I have suggested elsewhere that Kletynomas died around 113, as did Polytimos son of a different Kletynomas.28 The sequence of events seems to have been this: Knossos handed down her decision in the fall of 115, and Olous was to pay damages by the spring

---

24 23, line 61. I have restored the protokosmos’ name by comparison with 5, 17, and 18, which contain the names Polytimos son of Tharsiphanes, Tymon son of Koruptas, and Bergis son of Koruptas, all apparently belonging to the clan Echanoreis.
of 114; Olountian disagreement with the arrangement resulted both in the erection of Meritt’s Agora inscription, perhaps during 114/13, and in an appeal for further arbitration, this time Roman.

113/12. Knossos’ confirmation of Lato’s territorial boundaries was upheld by a panel of Roman arbitrators, headed by Q. Fabius Maximus Q.f., in the region to intervene in a dispute between Itanos and Hierapytna (24). The kosmoi listed in 19 and 20 may well be those who received the Roman dictum.29 These kosmoi, under the leadership of the anonymous son of Eumelos, included Apellas son of Pollias and Kletonymos son of Polytimos, sons of men named as kosmoi themselves in 9. Van Effenterre, moreover, sees in the text of IC I 16.48 a reference to the Roman arbitration, during which [Polytimos] son of Kletonymos, identified with the secretary of the kosmoi of 19 and 20, met his end and was replaced by a second secretary, Dioskoridas son of Kleon.30

112/11. After the board headed by Eumelos’ son, Van Effenterre places that headed by Charisthenes son of Kostylos (21).31 Charisthenes and his colleagues continued a program of reconstruction and restoration begun by the kosmoi of the previous year at the double temple of Ares and Aphrodite at Sta Lenikà.

111/10. Kosmoi under the leadership of Aution son of Podaiithon continued to restore the Sta Lenikà temple (16 and 27) but also concluded a treaty with Hierapytna, Lato’s southern neighbor (26). This treaty seems to be linked to the Roman adjudication of Hierapytna’s quarrel with Itanos, which was not decisively implemented until 112.32 While Van Effenterre has dated Aution’s kosmate to 111/10 at the earliest,33 there seems to be no need to postpone it further since one of the kosmoi, Sophios son of Kleanor, is recognizable as the son of a kosmos who served on the board of 9, here dated around 140–135. It was a full ten years between Aution’s term as Eunomiotes and his year as kosmos, perhaps because there happened to be so many members of the clan Echanoreis available in his generation to serve on the annual magistral boards.

110/09. In the years 110/09 and shortly after, boards of kosmoi are likely to have completed Lato’s program of restoring territorial shrines as well as some of those in the city itself. [Ty]mon son of Andro[las] (13) might have headed the earliest of the boards thought to have functioned in the last decade of the 2nd century. Other sons of Androlas had served on boards of kosmoi here dated 118/17 (18) and 111/10 (16 and 27), so that Tymon’s kosmate should not be more than a few years later.

29 Van Effenterre and Bougrat, p. 31.
30 H. van Effenterre, “Inscription funéraire métrique de Lato,” Хретиκά Χρονικά 26, 1974 (pp. 23–31), p. 30, on line 4, where Van Effenterre reads τ’ ἐς κρίσιν ἀρ. ρωμα. This article was never published, but see now H. van Effenterre, “Inscription funéraire métrique de Lato,” Хретиκά Χρονικά 26, 1986 (pp. 89–98), pp. 92 and 97.
31 Van Effenterre and Bougrat, pp. 30–32.
33 Van Effenterre and Bougrat, p. 32.
Of uncertain date are four additional magistral inscriptions which record the names of Latoan kosmoi. For only one year from the period 122/21 to 111/10, perhaps 119/18 rather than 120/19, do we not know who was protokosmos. One of the following four inscriptions may belong to that year. It is quite likely that the other three belong to the last decade of the 2nd century. 14 attests the work of a board of kosmoi, drawn from the clan Aischeis and headed by Panthos son of Deitilos, under whom a temple, presumably in Lato itself, was repaired. 15 mentions work on a statue and probably a temple, again under the auspices of the Aischeis led by the son of Aristion, but we do not know whose temple and statue, nor do we know whether it was in Lato or in its territory. Neither of these can be identified with the board of Aischeis that served in 122/21 since Pyleros son of Tallaios was protokosmos then, according to 4. 25, found at Lato, likewise commemorated some religious reconstruction, but as preserved it tells us only the name of the clan (Hylleis) and the names of the first two kosmoi (one without filiation). Yet another board of uncertain date is that headed by Lirgos son of Pol- (8). This board included two sons of Damokartes, a son of Nemoneios, and a secretary who was a son of Damocharis. Unfortunately these names, while comparable with those of known kosmoi or fathers of kosmoi, are attested in three different clans: Damokartes in the Aischeis of 14, Nemoneios in the Synaneis of 21, and Damocharis among the Hylleis of 10 and 11. Homonymy in this instance obstructs our investigation.

This remarkable collection of inscriptions allows us to observe, for a brief time, the clans of Lato as they shared and monopolized intra-city government and inter-city policy. During the twelve-year period we have been able to examine in detail, the clan Echanoreis supplied kosmoi certainly in 111/10 and very probably in 118/17, 115/14, 114/13, 113/12, and for one year shortly after 110. The clan Aischeis provided kosmoi much less frequently: in 122/21 and in two unidentified years (14 and 15). Members of the clan Hylleis were certainly kosmoi in 116/15 and in one unidentified year (25), as well as possibly in 120/19 (or 119/18). The clan Synaneis is known to have held the kosmate only once in this period, in 112/11. There remain three boards of kosmoi for which clan membership is neither known nor open to speculation on the basis of the available evidence, the two critical years 121/20 and 117/16, and one unidentified year (8).34

Eunomiai, on the other hand, were just possibly composed of men belonging to a variety of clans, perhaps in an effort to promote more disinterested resolution of sensitive issues or to balance the power of kosmoi from one clan with that of Eunomiotai from others. The Eunomia listed in 5 includes men with names and patronymics like Koruptas, Polytimos, and Tymon, names indicative of the clan Echanoreis, but also men with the patronymics Damocharis and Mnastion which suggest membership in the clan Hylleis. The panel named in 6 contains one patronymic, Polytimos, which points to the clan Echanoreis, but the other names listed there are not attested frequently enough for any conclusions to be

34 See Guarducci, IC I, p. 115, ad I 16.3 (1), which lists the kosmoi of Knossos, from the clan Aithaleis, and then the kosmoi of Lato and Olous without clan indication. "It appears uncertain," Guarducci notes, "whether only the kosmoi of Knossos or also those of Lato and Olous were Aithaleis."
drawn about clan allegiance. In 7, only the name of the panel’s head is extant, and he belonged to the Echanoreis. Even if Eunomiai were drawn from all four of the ruling clans of Lato, the Echanoreis still appear to have held the greatest number of positions.

At this point one might well ask why in so short a period there were sometimes five, sometimes six, at other times seven kosmoi on a board, and whether any pattern can be perceived along chronological or clan lines. Only the Echanoreis fielded enough boards of kosmoi whose names have all survived to allow us a diachronic view of the size of the college of magistrates. This clan provided kosmoi numbering five in 140–135 (9), 118/17 (18), 114/13 (17); six in 113/12 (19 and 20); and seven in 111/10 (16 and 27). These statistics, taken together with the fact that boards of six or seven kosmoi (among the Aischeis, Hylleis, and Synaneis) began to be recorded in 116/15, suggests growth in the households which belonged to the ruling clans of Lato. This growth involved nothing more than an increase in the number of heads of households, a result of the fact that with the passage of time clans were more finely divided into oikoi than they had been in the period from ca. 140 to 116. It may be that in the last fifteen years of the 2nd century there were six or seven households in each of the ruling clans Hylleis, Echanoreis, Synaneis, and Aischeis. Thirty rather than twenty families, then, effectively governed the polis at century’s end.

By contrast, the two panels of Eunomiotai whose full membership is known numbered nine in 120/19 (5) and only five or six in 119/18 (6). Men of maturity, position, and authority, the Eunomiotai certainly were leading men in the clan just as the kosmoi were, although perhaps slightly younger. Polytimos son of Tharsiphanes served on the Eunomia of 5 two years before he was kosmos (18). Aution son of Podaiton was a Eunomiotes (7) ten years before he was kosmos (16 and 27). Aristandros son of Glaukias served on the Eunomia of 6 and then was ambassador to Knossos three years later (3). Eunomiotai were apparently somewhat younger than kosmoi and so were likely to have been mature men still of fighting age. The best explanation, in fact, for the decrease from nine Eunomiotai to five or six, in the single year between 120/19 and 119/18, is that Lato lost a significant proportion of her prospective leaders in the renewed conflict with Olous. The Olountians had retaken the frontier shrine of Aphrodite at Sta Lenikà and had defaced the inscription the Aischeis of Lato had set up in 120 (22). Whether the Eunomitai numbered nine or six or five, it would appear that more than one member could be drawn from any one of the four ruling clans known at Lato.

In the period after 120 it appears to have been the Echanoreis who were able to fill the annual magisterial boards until other clans could field a cohort of elders. The grandsons of Pyron (13, 16, 18, and 27) and Tymon (5, 6, 16–20, and 25–27) were particularly prominent in local politics for most of the next decade. It is clear that a relatively small part of the population of Lato dominated public office. There is clear evidence of an annual magistracy,

35 See Willetts, p. 113, for the general formulation that “the number of kosmoi might vary according to the number of wealthy and influential ‘elders’ available within the grouping from time to time.” There were five kosmoi on the boards mentioned in 9 (140–135 b.c., Echanoreis), 18 (118/17, Echanoreis), and 17 (114/13, Echanoreis). Six magistrates are named in 19 and 20 (113/12, Echanoreis) and 14 (undated, Aischeis). Seven names appear in 10 and 11 (116/15, Hylleis), 21 (112/11, Synaneis), 16 and 27 (111/10, Echanoreis), and 8 (undated, unknown clan).
yet there were as many as six years in the last twenty of the 2nd century when the same clan may have supplied six different boards of elders. In this brief but critical period of Lato's history, the Echanoreis appear to have been the favored few, while the Aischeis and Hylleis seem to have exercised somewhat less influence; the Synaneis are known to have enjoyed political power only once. Jones has recently suggested that boards of Cretan kosmoi rotated into and out of office according to a fixed, or at least generally known, sequence. This notion is certainly supported by the inscriptive record which often dates a text "in the kosmates of the (clan)," as in 8–11, 13–22, and 25–27. The lack of pattern apparent here for the years 122/21 to 111/10, however, leads us to suppose that any established sequence was temporarily overridden during this difficult time.

In the course of these critical years the governmental apparatus of Lato was disrupted by but survived the effects of the war with Olous, continuing territorial disputes, unsuccessful arbitration, and temporary loss of manpower. We have mounting evidence that there was a loosely defined public career for men born into particular families and clans. As young men, perhaps in their thirties, they might serve as secretaries to boards of kosmoi (8, 11, 14, 16, 19–21, and 27). Later on they might become oikonomoi, as did Kletonymos' three unnamed sons. Or they might, in this particular period, be selected to be Eunomiotai or ambassadors representing Lato to other cities (3, 5–7). Nor did men of such experience retire after a year as kosmos. Instead, ex-magistrates sat on the Boule, an advisory council consulted in matters of the greatest import.

The texts examined above illustrate in varying ways the vitality and continuity of aristocratic families at Lato through the turbulent 2nd century and into the 1st, as Roman interest and involvement in Cretan affairs mounted. Van Effenterre sees in the years following 110 a peaceful and prosperous period for Lato: the city's natural boundaries, confirmed by Knossian and Roman adjudication, remained remarkably fixed from then on; dilapidated sanctuaries in the high places along her borders and in the city center were restored; the seaside city was itself stable, enjoying a temporary respite from the piracy traditional along the island's shores.

Perhaps Lato benefited too from the apparent shift of tensions and attentions toward Hierapytna. When Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus waged war against and finally defeated the Cretan pirates, it was Hierapytna that he targeted and conquered in 66 B.C. The epigraphical record bears out this shift toward Hierapytna in Roman times. From Lato the inscriptions attest only one Roman name, a praenomen; stones from Olous record two or possibly three Roman nomina, along with praenomina and cognomina. IC I 16.36 honors Augustus, using the Greek equivalent of the formula Imperator Caesar divi filius Augustus.

36 Jones (footnote 7 above), p. 222.
38 Willetts, p. 156.
40 From Lato, IC I 16.43 (Quintus, father of Pomon); from Olous, IC I 22.35 (Quintus Puf[jius?]) and 64f and m (Annius); SEG XXIII, 551 (the proxenos Cn. Tudicius M.f. Hor. Aquila), and 555 (Annia Anniou); IC I 22.2 (Tiberius); P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews, A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, Oxford 1987, p. 14 (Hadrianos), s.v.
But at Hierapytta inscriptions preserve the names of 24 individuals who bore Roman names, many of them nomina derived from those of Roman emperors.41 This is not to say that Lato settled into peaceful oblivion once Crete became a province of Rome. The emergency excavation of a Roman cemetery at the Potamos location in 1978 yielded rich finds from 20 graves, which can be dated by the coins in them to the 1st century after Christ.42 Perhaps Davaras’ report on excavations in the Hellenistic portion of the same cemetery will evince the prosperity of Lato in the previous century as well.

APPENDIX

The texts included here are translated into English or paraphrased where unnecessarily lengthy or detailed. Bold numbers are those used in the discussion above.

1. IC I 16.3 (Delos). In the kosmates of the Aithaleis at Knossos, those with Kydas son of Kydas, in the month Elchanios, at Lato in the kosmates of those with Diokles son of Heroïdas, in the month Bakinthios, and at Olous in the kosmates of those with Telemachos son of Gnomis, in the month Agrianios. . . . The agreement is to be inscribed at Knossos in the temple of Apollo Delphidios and on a stele in the temple of Ares at Dera; at Lato in the temple of Eileithyia; at Olous in the temple of Zeus Tallaios; and at Delos in the temple of Apollo.

2. IC I 16.4A (Delos) = REA 44, 1942, p. 34, Text A (Sta Lenikà). In the kosmates at Knossos of those with Nennaios son of Mopseios, on the second day of Spermios, at Lato in the kosmates of those with Diokles son of Heroïdas, on the second day of Thiodaisios, and at Olous in the kosmates of those with Menontidas son of Akasson, on the second day of Eleusinios. . . . The Knossians are to render judgment in six months at the beginning of Karonios in the kosmate of Nennaios.

3. IC I 16.4B (Delos) = REA 44, 1942, p. 35, Text B (Sta Lenikà). In the archonship of Serapion, in the month Pyanopson. The delegate come from city of the Knossians, Agesipolis son of Agathandros, recorded the following vote as well, with the agreement of the ambassadors come from the city of Lato, Aristandros son of Glaukias, and from the city of Olous, Ikadion son of Archikomos. . . . The Knossians are to deliver judgment in twelve months at the beginning of Nekyïos in the kosmate of Agemon at Knossos, at the beginning of Thesmophorios in the kosmates of those with Kydannos son of Eneïs at Lato, and at Olous in the kosmates of those with Antikles son of Eubolos at the beginning of Appellaios.

4. IC I 16.5 (Lato). The Latoan and Oloumians agree on these things in the kosmates of those with Pyleros son of Tallaios at Lato, on the thirtieth day of Thiodaisios, and of those with Sophronichos son of Aristes at Olous, on the thirtieth day of Eleusinios. Lines 84ff.: In the kosmates at Lato of those with Mainaios son of Chairnetadas, on the tenth day of Thermolaios, and in the kosmates at Olous of those with Karinsons of Aristonymos on the tenth day of Heraíos. . . .

5. IC I 14.2 (Istron). Damatarios son of Kilix and the Eunomia with him built the temple of Ares and Aphrodite on the site; they repaired the well and the walkway around, and the lair of the sacred serpent. And from their own resources they laid out a dancing space: Damatarios son of Kilix, Polytimos son of Tharsiphanes,

41 IC III 3.7 (nomina Aelius, Ae[mi]lius, An[tonius], Claudius bis, Cornelius, Julius, Junius, Numerius; cognomina Titianus, Crispus, Romanus; praenomina Gaius, Lucius); 15 (Antonius); 18–21 (Flavius tris); 22 (Claudius); 23 (Larciius); Fraser and Matthews (footnote 40 above), pp. 158 (Varras), s.v. 'Επικτησίς and 456 (Claudius), s.v. 'Φασίων; L'année épigraphique 1964, p. 108, no. 262 (Claudius); ‘Ἀρχ’ Ἑφ 1980 (1982), p. 21, no. 23 (. . . ecnonius Flavius T . . . and Vipstanius).

Thion son of Damocharis, Antipas son of Pyron, Thikles son of Phylax, Enipas son of Mnastion, Tymon son of Koruptas, Pagon son of Pagon and grandson of Thiopeides, Pagon son of Euthyphron.


7. IC I 16.24 (Lato). To you, daughter of loftiest Dios and fair-haired Dione, Kypris, those with Aution established a temple in front of the Eunomia; this stone proves who (they were), lady, (those) to whom you, mother of all, gave favors; at life’s easy end you come to elders, all free from misery, Kypros-born goddess.


9. IC I 16.25 (Lato). In the kosmates of the Echanoreis, Heraklitos son of Thiopeides, Polytimo son of Tymon, Enipas son of Pyron, Kleanor son of Chyrilos, Pollias son of Apellas, secretary Lamyros son of Thiodotos, the city set up the statue to Aphrodite.

10. IC I 16.26 (Lato). In the kosmates of the Hyleis, those with Kydannos son of Enipas, Bergis son of Euagoros, Lattygos son of Damocharis, Porthesilas son of Antipas, Pheidon son of Dallos, Porthesilas son of Kleisippos, Kletonymos son of Mnastokles, secretary Mnaston son of Mnastokles, the city built the enclosing wall of the temples to Athena Deramis and Eleuthyia.


12. IC I 16.27 (Lato). . . . in the kosmates of those with . . . son of Ikadion, the city repaired the colonnade and the roof for Elouthyia, with . . . son of Lattygos financing . . . the Aphrodision.

13. IC I 16.28 (Lato). In the kosmates of the . . ., those with [Ty]mon son of Androlas, the city . . . the temple of . . . -thymios . . .

14. IC I 16.29 (Lato). In the kosmates of the Aischis, those with Panthos son of Deitilos, the city repaired the colonnade and the doorway for Zeus Melichios. These served as kosmoi: Panthos son of Deitilos, Melanos son of Thyos, Androlas son of Echedamios, Nikagoras son of Lusioneles, Dam- son of Oikostylos, Hippo- (son of) . . ., secretary Damokartes (son of). . . .

15. IC I 16.30 (Lato). In the kosmates of the Aischis, those with . . . son of Aristion, the city [set up the temple] and the statue. These [served as kosmoi]. . . .

16. IC I 16.31 (Lato). In the kosmates of the Echanoreis the city built the east-facing colonnade and put on the roof and the tiling. These served as kosmoi: Aution son of Podaithon, Thiaris son of Laston, Somantis son of Laston, Chenos son of Enipas, Sophios son of Kleanor, Praxon son of Kalakas, Polytimo son of Polytimo, secretary Polytimo son of Androlas.

17. IC I 16.33 (Lato). In the kosmates of the . . . Antes son of Polytimo, Mnastokles son of Pyron, Lykos son of Peteliagoras, Pratomenes son of Theotimo, Bergis son of Koruptas, . . . to the city . . .


19. IC I 22.2 (Sta Lenikà). . . . up to the . . . of Ares the . . . door and the window. [These served as kosmoi:]-on son of Eumelos, -as son of Pollias, [Klet]onymos son of Polytimo, -eides son of Agaglytos and grandson of
Byschos, -n son of Iaron, -s son of Orthokles, -rion son of Sosimenes, [secretary] Polytimos son of Kleonymos, . . . [Di]oskoridas son of Kleon.

20. BCH 62, 1938, p. 399, no. 3 (Sta Lenikà). . . Klet[onymos son of Polytimos], Thiophe[ides son of Aga-glytos son of Byschos], Telo[n son of Iaron], Bysch[os son of Orthokles], Bo[urion son of Sosimenes], secretary [Polytimos son of Kleonymos, second secretary? Dioskoridas son of Kleon].

21. BCH 62, 1938, p. 389, no. 1 (Sta Lenikà). In the kosmates of the Synaneis, the city rebuilt the shrines up to the height of the roof, twelve blocks high, and put up the porch and the roofs, the doors and the tiling, and refinshed the temples. The kosmoi were: Charisthenes son of Kostylos, Nemoneios son of Lydos, Pyrias son of Sarapion, Kypelos son of Ischolas, Mnastokles son of Lattygos, Agaklytos son of Stasagoras, Dorkas son of Boulias; secretary Lithos son of Kostylos.

22. BCH 62, 1938, p. 405, no. 4 (Sta Lenikà). The Latoans to Aphrodite on the occasion of the victory, in the kosmates of the Aischeis, over (?) the Olountians.

23. REA 44, 1942, pp. 35–36, Text C (Sta Lenikà). [The text records the Knossian arbitration concerning (a) the territory and shrine of Dera and (b) all precincts touching the shrine, (c) the island of Pyrrha and (d) the facing promontory, (e) the temple and (f) silver and bronze objects and coinage, and (g) many kinds of other objects, (h) the bodies of two free persons exported for sale as slaves, and (i) one slave. The four locations a–d, as well as Lato’s ancient mountain territories, marked by an elaborate series of boundary indications, are awarded to Lato; items e through i are awarded to Olous, but the city must pay an indemnity of 35 minas in the kosmate of -siphanes son of Ko-, in the month of Bakinthios.]

24. REA 44, 1942, p. 36, Text D (Sta Lenikà). [The verdict of the ambassadors from Rome, Q. Fabius Maximus Q.f., C. Fannius C.f., P. Rutilius P.f., Q. Plotius A.f., M. Domitius P.f. The text specifies that the Knossian adjudication be reinstated; that the boundaries dictated therein be established; and that the frontier shrine of Ares at Dera, along with its precinct, be administered by Lato.]

25. BCH 93, 1969, p. 841, no. 1 (Lato). In the kosmates of the Hylleis: Lattygos son of Komaros, Rhaukios (son of) . . .


27. Κρητικά Χρονικά 21, 1969, pp. 28–29 (Sta Lenikà). In the kosmates of the [Echanoreis], those with Auton [son of Podaiathon], the city put up the roof to the porch, plastered the doorways, and rebuilt the walkway around; and surveyors from Miletos, according to the decree of the senate, fixed the adjudicated territories of the mountain and the islands and the [shrine?], having followed the earlier decisions. These were kosmôi: Auton son of Podaiathon, Thiariis son of Laston, Somantes son of Laston, Che[no]s son of Enipas, Sophio[son of Kleanor, [Praxon son of Kalakas, Polytimôs son of Polytimos, [secretary Polytimos] son of Androlas.
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