

GENEALOGICAL WRITING AND EPIGRAPHIC LAYOUT: SOME PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Daniela Marchiandi

1. GENEALOGICAL THINKING AND THE *ARISTOI*: MILTIADES AND THE OTHERS

Genealogein is a tool to measure time using human generations as unit of measurement, possibly three generations per century, if Herodotus is to be trusted.¹

Of course, this conception of time on a human scale is not peculiar to the Greek world. Before the priests of Amun at Karnak, Hecataeus of Miletus boasted an ancestry traceable back to an unspecified divine forebear through sixteen generations. In response, his interlocutors showed him a series of three hundred and forty-five statues representing the high priests who had been in office up until then: in practice, an unbroken chain of fathers and sons going back to a much more remote era.²

Certainly, the Greeks habitually used *genealogein* to measure the time of heroes: Homeric poems preserve many examples of pedigrees, mostly consisting of *one* line of descent expressed in a list-like style, that is, a father/son sequence without lateral branches, from the origins to the hero's present.³ Consequently, Greek historians used heroic genealogies to attempt to order the more distant past.⁴ For instance, in order to date some ancient bronze tripods in the temple of Apollo Ismenios at Thebes, Herodotus resorts to the genealogies of the heroes who dedicated them.⁵

¹ Hdt. 2.142.2; cf. Mitchel 1956; Ball 1979; Mosshammer 1979, 105–112; Brehm 2013, 3–39. Except where otherwise indicated, all dates in this chapter are BCE.

² Hecat. *FGrHist* 1 F 300 = *EGM* 4 *ap.* Hdt. 2.143; cf. West 1991; Moyer 2002; Fowler 2013, 661–664; Condilo 2017.

³ Brulé 2007, 453–478; Varto 2015; Kyriakidis 2021.

⁴ I will not be able to explore here the major and controversial issues concerning the relationship between genealogies, heroic and familiar, and the origin of historiography. On this point, see, *inter alia*, Fowler 1996 and 1998; Bertelli 2001; Zunino 2015; Varto 2015; Condilo 2017.

⁵ Hdt. 5.59–61; cf. Inglese 2023.

Daniela Marchiandi, University of Torino, Italy, danielafrancesca.marchiandi@unito.it, 0000-0001-9676-9356

Referee List (DOI 10.36253/fup_referee_list)

FUP Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing (DOI 10.36253/fup_best_practice)

Daniela Marchiandi, *Genealogical Writing and Epigraphic Layout: Some Preliminary Remarks*, © Author(s), CC BY 4.0, DOI 10.36253/979-12-215-0456-9.05, in Davide Amendola, Cristina Carusi, Francesca Maltomini, Emilio Rosamilia (edited by), *Text, Layout, and Medium. Documents from the Greco-Roman World between Epigraphy and Papyrology*, pp. 27–51, 2024, published by Firenze University Press, ISBN 979-12-215-0456-9, DOI 10.36253/979-12-215-0456-9

Genealogein, however, was also a tool to measure the time of men, first of all kings, who claimed their right to rule through their lineage.⁶ At the beginning of the 5th century, the genealogies of the Spartan kings Leonidas and Leotychidas were entirely comparable to the pedigrees of heroes, with the crucial difference that they bridged the divide between the mythical and historical periods: through twenty generations, both traced their descent back to Heracles without lateral branches.⁷ In the same period, the Macedonian dynasty boasted Heracles as its forefather: if Herodotus is a reliable storyteller, Alexander I was able to recite *impromptu*, before the *Hellenodikai* at Olympia, the names of the six ancestors who separated him from the Heraclid Temenos, thus silencing the malicious tongues who questioned his Greek origins.⁸

Lastly, *genealogein*, was a tool to measure the time of men who were not kings, again bridging the divide between mythical and historical periods, as Hecataeus did for his own lineage.

But how widespread was this kind of time-counting in the practice of historical Greek society? I am referring in particular to that part of Greek society that considered *genea* as an identity value, namely the *aristoi*.⁹ It is well known, however, that Greek aristocracies have recently fallen victim to a new sort of revolution,¹⁰ which downplays the importance of genealogical lists as a deep-rooted practice among Greek aristocrats, taking advantage – it must be admitted – of the fact that the evidence is objectively scanty.¹¹

The most famous and discussed genealogy from ancient Greece is that of Miltiades the *Oikist*: indeed, it is the sole example of a complete genealogy of a historical individual surviving in literary sources.¹² The passage is by a renowned genealogist,

⁶ The landmark study on genealogies in Greek society is Thomas 1989. I will refer to it repeatedly in the following pages.

⁷ Hdt. 7.204 and 8.131.2-3; cf. De Vido 2001; Cartledge 2002, 293-298; Varto 2015.

⁸ Hdt. 8.137-9 and 5.22; cf. Koulakiotis 2017.

⁹ Donlan 1973; Thomas 1989, 155-195; Gotteland 1998; De Vido 2012; Settapani 2017. For an *excursus* on the theme of the *eugeneia* in Greek literature see Henze 2015.

¹⁰ Duplouy 2006, 2015, 2018; Giangiulio 2016. In general, the idea that Greek aristocracies were not closed circles, but were continually renewed over time through the entry of new individuals, who, by virtue of acquired wealth, assumed the *modus vivendi* and status symbols of the *aristoi*, is persuasive and historically plausible. This does not exclude, however, that some families, under special (and essentially random) conditions, may have maintained the status of *aristoi* for a longer time, preserving some memory of their past and perhaps, under specific circumstances, using that memory to distinguish themselves from the “new” aristocrats.

¹¹ Duplouy 2006, 56-64 and 2015; *genealogein* would have been rarely practiced, preferably by those who wanted to claim ancestry they did not have, thereby legitimizing their claims. At any rate, by pointing out the incomplete and inaccurate nature of the preserved genealogies, Thomas 1989, 157-161, 180-181 facilitated the subsequent radical criticism.

¹² Pherecyd. *FrGrHist* 3 F 2 = F 13 Dolcetti = *EGM* 2 ap. Marcellin. *Vit. Thuc.* 2-4 (cf. Piccirilli 1985, 66-76); cf. Thomas 1989, 161-173; Möller 1996; Zaccarini 2017, 267-275. For further bibliography on the historical interpretation of this list see n. 16 below.

Pherecydes, from the first book of his *Histories*, but has come down to us through two intermediaries, the late Hellenistic version by Didymus (1st c.) and the late antique one by Marcellinus (6th? c. CE).¹³ This lineage was only one branch among many others in a larger genealogy, but it is impossible to determine who the original forefather was.¹⁴ What matters here is its structure: a linear genealogy referring to the male members of the house and expressed in a list-like style without lateral branches. In effect, what is commonly known as the Philaids' genealogy focuses only on *one* line of descent. Notwithstanding numerous textual problems, this sort of catalogue lists (probably) twelve generations between Philaeus son of Ajax, the eponym of the Philaids, and Miltiades: from a hero to a fully historical individual, whose main exploit is briefly remembered (the colonization of the Chersonese). Aside from the quotation from Pherecydes, Marcellinus also notes that, through Aeacus, and so through three further generations, Philaeus descended from Zeus.

It is very difficult to assess the origin of this genealogy. Rosalind Thomas thought that it was a historiographical product, that is, the work of Pherecydes, who would have drawn the names of some individuals from the memory of the Philaids' family and organized them in an arbitrary chronological sequence to cover the time span between the most distant past and the present.¹⁵ In doing so, the historian would have worked in the service of Cimon, as numerous Cimonian connections in the list show.¹⁶ Alternatively, we should assume that Pherecydes took the entire generational sequence from family memory, already "packaged" in the order we know it. This does not affect the possibly fictitious nature of the list. Simply, the responsibility for the manipulations could be attributed to the family, which would have reshaped its past over time to fit the changing needs of the present.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to say how often Pherecydes, Hellanicus or other historians sensitive to this kind of approach also elaborated genealogies that pertained to the world of men. Many scholars consider Miltiades' genealogy to be an exception. Personally, I suspect that only its intact preservation is exceptional. Indeed, other literary sources occasionally preserve genealogical material ascribed to

¹³ The original narrative context of this passage both in Pherecydean *Histories* and in the work of Didymus is unknown. Likely Didymus quoted Pherecydes *verbatim*, according to the *habitus* he usually adopted with earlier authors: Harding 2006. To Marcellinus, on the other hand, this passage would have served to trace the origins of Thucydides back to Ajax; therefore, it cannot be ruled out that he omitted parts of Didymus' text.

¹⁴ Likely that of Asopus, since Marcellinus says that Hellanicus dealt with the same matter in his *Asopis*. Not by chance, the passage is also recorded in the *corpus* of the fragments of Hellanicus *FGrHist* 4 F 22 = F 66 Ambaglio = *EGM* 22; cf. Varto 2015, 138; Condilo 2017, 240.

¹⁵ Thomas 1989, 161-173; cf. 181-186. The hypothesis has been almost unanimously accepted.

¹⁶ Cimonian connections have been explored by a number of scholars in addition to Thomas 1989, 161-173. See e.g.: Davies 1971, 294-295; Möller 1996; Dolcetti 2001 and 2004, 9-16; Duplouy 2006, 58-64; Dolcetti 2011; Di Cesare 2015, 202-205; Varto 2015, 139-140; Zaccarini 2017, 272-274.

historical individuals. I already mentioned the case of Hecataeus. No name from the sixteen previous generations is given,¹⁷ but it is likely that, if questioned by the Egyptian priests, Hecataeus would have been able to present a list, as Alexander was at the Olympic Games. Usually, instead, what we have are relicts of genealogies, preserved not in the works of genealogists, but in narrative sources that would seem to draw their information directly from family memory.

Like the Philaids, for instance, the paternal branch of the family of Alcibiades traced its descent back to a son of Ajax, the brother of Philaeus, Eurysaces, and from him, through three generations, to Zeus: Alcibiades himself remarks on this in a Platonic dialogue where he is represented as talking to Socrates.¹⁸ A passage from the court speech Isocrates wrote for the son of Alcibiades, Alcibiades IV, shows that the family kept a memory also of the most recent generations, in particular of the alleged exploits of Alcibiades I, who is said to have collaborated with Clisthenes in the expulsion of the tyrants and the establishment of democracy.¹⁹ It is noteworthy that a substantial data gap corresponds to the period between Eurysaces and Alcibiades I. This is more or less the same gap covered, in the case of the Philaids, by the twelve generations which, according to Pherecydes, separate Philaeus from Miltiades the *Oikist*, who lived at the time of Pisistratus, namely in the generation before that of Alcibiades I. This case is a good illustration of the practice that Thomas calls “telescoping”, i.e., the tendency to directly connect the present and the near past with the more distant time of family origins, leaving out the middle links in the chain.²⁰ A number of other examples, again from narrative sources, shows that this peculiar way of looking at the past was widespread.

A well-known example is the genealogy of Critias (and therefore of Plato’s family) evoked in the Platonic dialogue *Timaeus*.²¹ Also Lysis from Aixone, the eponym of another Platonic dialogue and member of a family of *hippotrophi*, boasted a genealogy going back to Zeus, which Plato presents as common knowledge.²² To conclude with Athens, in a famous passage from the *Theaetetus*, Plato (who had a true pedigree, as just noted) testifies in a mocking tone that the Athenians loved to boast about their long genealogies, up to twenty-five generations, in order to reach a hero, preferably Heracles (certainly because of his many peregrinations in

¹⁷ Elsewhere Herodotus mentions the name of his father Hegesander: Hdt. 5.125 e 6.137.1.

¹⁸ Pl. *Alc.* (1) 121a; cf. Plu. *Alc.* 1.1. Note that Plato’s Alcibiades was making a comparison between his own genealogy and those of the Spartan and Persian kings. On the tradition concerning the two sons of Ajax see Dolcetti 2011.

¹⁹ Isoc. 16.25–27; cf. Thomas 1989, 116–117; Steinbock 2013, 74.

²⁰ Thomas 1989, 157–158 and 2001.

²¹ Pl. *Ti.* 20d–21b; cf. Davies 1971, 324–326; Thomas 1989, 170.

²² Pl. *Ly.* 205c–d. Marchiandi 2019 and 2022.

the human world).²³ There is no doubt that a part, at least, of the Athenian society was pedigree-addicted!

Leaving Athens aside, the praise poetry of Pindar shows a number of historical individuals who connected themselves to mythical ancestors through a variable number of generations.²⁴ Again, these genealogies are not complete. Seemingly, Pindar selected them according to a strictly context-dependent criterion: only those ancestors who achieved a victory in the past are remembered, including, if necessary, ancestors on the maternal side. Significantly, these literary lists are reflected in victory monuments erected in panhellenic sanctuaries, whose inscribed dedications sometimes mention a selected ancestry of the victor.²⁵ In one case in particular, an exceptional victory monument at Delphi, that of the Thessalian Daochos, shows a sort of 3D, all-human genealogy.²⁶

To sum up, I wonder whether the incomplete nature of most of the surviving pedigrees can only be explained by assuming that all the missing generations were actually forgotten. In particular, how much does the source from which we draw the information matter? We mentioned only one genealogist (Pherecydes) against many narrative sources. Certainly, Pindar made a context-oriented selection. Is it possible that the patchy, incomplete genealogies we have were perceived as sufficient and absolutely suitable to the narrative contexts in which they were evoked? It is unlikely that someone – let us take Alcibiades, who notoriously loved to publicly mention his lineage²⁷ – would remember the whole list of his ancestors in sequence, included more obscure figures.²⁸ Could we rule out, however, that he would be able to produce such a list if asked?

The same question applies to a certain Agathon, son of Echephylos from Zacynthus, otherwise unknown. In the late 4th/early 3rd century, on a bronze plaque dedicated to Zeus at Dodona, he claimed that his ancestors had been *proxenoi* of the Molossians for thirty generations, precisely since the Trojan Cassandra, who was the first priestess at Dodona according to the Molossian tradition.²⁹ Is this a totally

²³ Pl. *Thi.* 174e–175a; cf. Thomas 1989, 174–175; Gotteland 1998, 379.

²⁴ E.g., Pi. *O.* 2.35–48; *O.* 6.24–25 and 28–73; *O.* 7.20–38 and 92–94; *P.* 4.247–262; *N.* 11.33–37; *I.* 3.13–17b.

²⁵ For the epigraphic class in general see now Nobili 2016. For the development of the victory monuments: Smith 2007.

²⁶ Day 2019.

²⁷ Harris 2016.

²⁸ The case of Hippias of Elis, who was able to remember by heart a list of fifty names after hearing it only once, was exceptional: *FGrHist* 6 T 3 *ap.* Pl. *Hp.Ma.* 285d. As already mentioned, however, the Macedonian king Alexander was able to recite by heart the list of his ancestors all the way back to Perdica I, who had probably reigned two centuries earlier: *Hdt.* 5.22. On recitative and performative aspects of name lists, albeit not genealogical, see Petrovic 2016.

²⁹ Athens, NM 803 = *IG IX.1*² 1750; cf. *SEG L* 543. Fraser 2003 suggested that the family of Agathon traced his ancestry back to either Helenus or Agathon, brothers of Cassandra, since Pausanias (2.16.7) excludes that there were any surviving offspring of Cassandra.

fictitious number, possibly arrived at by calculating, in generations, the time that separated Agathon from the Trojan War? Or would Agathon, if asked, have been able to provide a list?³⁰ I believe that both Alcibiades and Agathon, just as Hecateus, would have been able to do it. My conviction stems in particular from a tiny, but not irrelevant dossier of genealogical funerary stelae, which may point the right way in this difficult matter.

2. GENEALOGICAL WRITING: ANCESTRY AND LAYOUT ON FUNERARY MONUMENTS (HEROPYTHOS AND THE OTHERS)

The gravestone of a Chian named Heropythos is often compared to the case of Miltiades the *Oikist* as the sole epigraphical example of the complete genealogy of a historical individual.³¹ However, scholars forget – too easily in my view – that, unlike Miltiades and like the Agathon we just mentioned, Heropythos is otherwise unknown.

The stele dates to the early or middle 5th century, according to the different scholarly opinions, and consists of a list of ancestors similar to the one ascribed to Pherecydes (Fig. 9; Appendix, no. 1). Since this is a funerary monument, however, the pedigree is preceded by the name of its owner, the deceased, which is expressed in the genitive of possession, according to a very common usage: “(*sema* or *mnema*) of Heropythos”. A list of fourteen ancestors follows: the format is the genitive patronymic introduced by the article, just like in Miltiades’ genealogy. In this case too, there are no lateral branches.

Visual analysis clearly indicates the *mise en page* as the most characteristic aspect. The layout is carefully conceived to communicate the genealogical message in the most effective way, with particular emphasis on the length of the list. After each name the stonemason changes line, although sometimes he would have space available on the right-hand side of the slab, so that the names result perfectly one below the other, in a column. The regular and very controlled *stoichedon* arrangement strengthens the desired result: the inscription is built on a grid system that deploys

³⁰ Note that *proxenia*, like *xenia*, founded its stability on the continuity over time of the relationship between the members of the families involved, as proxeny decrees clearly show, often mentioning hereditary transmission of the office; so *proxenia* was part of the political capital of a family and, consequently, one of the matters of which family memory held firm remembrance: Veligianni-Terzi 1997, 228–234; Sato 2015; Mack 2015, 33, 164; Harris 2016 (with a list of the Athenian proxeny decrees mentioning the services of the honoree’s ancestors).

³¹ *SGDI* 5656; cf. Wade-Gery 1952, 8–9; Forrest 1963, 56 with n. 10; Miller 1970, 153–155; Thomas 1989, 156, 159, 169, 190–191; Chanotis 1987, 43; *LSAG*² 338, 344 no. 47; Duplouy 2006, 60; Mac Sweeney 2013, 82–83; Varto 2015, 141–145; Delattre 2021, 83. Note that the *SGDI* transcription is not correct because it leaves out a generation; this error, already marked by Wade-Gery, still occurs occasionally in more recent scholarship. A new edition of the gravestone is about to be published in *IG* XII.6.3.

its letters directly below each other, in strict vertical alignment, according to the style Patricia Butz defined as “rectified” *stoichedon*.³² Heropythos’ stele, therefore, is a clear example of how modes of display, layout in particular, may affect the way in which an inscription conveys its message even visually: the arrangement emphasizes the direct filial relationship between one individual and the next.

Using Herodotus’ unit of measurement, fourteen generations make it possible to go back approximately to the 9th century, when the beginnings of Greek colonization on Chios have been established on an archaeological basis. Since our knowledge of remote Chian history is far from complete, we are unable to assess whether Heropythos’ forefather, a certain Kyprios, was a historical individual or a hero related to the island’s foundation history or mythology.³³ Without going into details, scholars notoriously recognize ethnic mixture as characteristic of Chian origins.³⁴ Although no Cypriots are mentioned by the sources, a Cyprian *oikistes* for a subdivision of the *polis* or a small local community cannot be excluded, considering the widespread presence of Phoenicians in the early archaic Aegean. Moreover, it has already been noted that, unlike all other names in the list, Eldios, the name of Kyprios’ son, is not Greek, but probably Semitic.³⁵ Unfortunately, the context in which the stele was set up is unknown,³⁶ as well as the reasons that induced Heropythos’ family to erect such a memorial. It might be worth investigating a possible connection with the political struggles that raged on the island during the 5th century, between the pro-Athenian democrats and the oligarchs: it is clear that for the latter, in particular, displaying such a genealogy could have had a strong legitimizing value.³⁷

³² Butz 2010, 115–116 for the definition adopted here. Butz 2012 considers the stele of Heropythos as an outstanding example of “rectified” *stoichedon*.

³³ Unlike some scholars (e.g. West 1997, 620; Delattre 2021, 83), I tend to rule out that Kyprios is the ethnic of Eldios, the previously mentioned ancestor. In terms of layout, it would be an anomaly in the sequence of Heropythos’ lineage: in fact, it would be the only case of an ethnic being mentioned, moreover in the following line. Clearly, Kyprios is a personal name, although it derives from an ethnic.

³⁴ The Chian historian Ion, in his *Founding of Chios*, referred that at first, before the arrival of the Greek king Amphiklos from north Euboea, the island was occupied by mixed settlers, Cretans, Carians and Abantes: *FGrHist* 392 F 1 = *EGM* 1 = F 1 Federico *ap.* Paus. 7.4.8–9. According to a concurrent tradition, Chios was founded by Pelasgians: Strabo 13.3.3. At any rate, fluidity and change are recognized by scholars as characteristic of early Chian history: Mac Sweeney 2013, 83–4; Thomas 2019, 207–13.

³⁵ West 1997, 620.

³⁶ The stele was found by a church near the village of Vounos, certainly not *in situ*: Paspatis 1888, 401–402 no. 1. We do not know whether it originally decorated a family burial plot or an isolated tomb.

³⁷ The 5th century is a rather troubled period in the history of Chios. On the topic see Blanchard 2007, who cites Heropythos’ stele, but does not consider it in a political perspective. Mac Sweeney 2013, 82–84, on the other hand, is tempted by such an interpretation but does not elaborate on it. Duploy 2006, 60 thinks that the lineage display was functional to the political career of Heropythos’ probable son Mikkylos, whose name with the patronymic is attested in a Chian mutilated list of names (*SGDI* 5657).

Regarding the author of Heropythos' genealogy, the list could be the historiographical product of a local Pherecydes or, more probably in my view, an extract from the family's memories, preserved through generations and delivered to the stonemason to be inscribed on the stone, so that the complete ancestry of the deceased was displayed in front of his fellow citizens.

How widespread were funerary stelae like that of Heropythos? Unfortunately, the family tomb of the Philaids, which Herodotus placed in Koile, is unknown.³⁸ There Miltiades the Younger, the future victor of Marathon, buried his father Cimon *Koalemos*. Cimon, his half-sister Elpinice and the historian Thucydides occupied the same tomb.³⁹ Recently, Lin Foxhall suggested that this tomb and its funerary monuments contributed to the coagulation of the Philaid genealogical memory, which flowed into Pherecydes' list.⁴⁰ However, as seen above, Pherecydes preserves the genealogy of Miltiades the *Oikist*, not that of the Philaids' family. Miltiades died and was buried in Chersonese.⁴¹ It is there that a stele similar to that of Heropythos should possibly be sought, if one ever existed.

A Samian monument, however, contemporary to the alleged gravestone of Miltiades, could help to remove Heropythos' stele from its apparent isolation.⁴² In the North Necropolis of Samos a tumulus was erected in the third quarter of the 6th century for an otherwise unknown Megas. The monumentality of the ensemble is stressed by the (unusual) presence of a *kouros* and a column, probably surmounted by a bronze vessel, the prize for an athletic victory.⁴³ Also belonging to the monument is a massive base inscribed with a genealogical list (Appendix, no. 2).⁴⁴ The name of the deceased, in the nominative, is followed by the name of four ancestors in the genitive. The layout appears less effective if compared to Heropythos' stele, perhaps depending on the shape of the medium. Four generations form a relatively brief pedigree; it is nevertheless sufficient to trace the descent of Megas to the first half/middle of the 7th century, when, according to the tradition, Samos was governed by the so-called *Geomoroi*, an elite of landowners. Perhaps it is not a coincidence that the third quarter of the 6th century, when the tumulus was erected, is the period when Polycrates

³⁸ Hdt. 6.103.3, cf. Zaccarini 2017, 283–284. Identification proposals remain entirely speculative: see Monaco 2011.

³⁹ Plu. *Cim.* 4.3; Paus. 1.23.9; Marcellin. *Vit. Thuc.* 17.

⁴⁰ Foxhall 2012, 190–192. In general, according to Thomas 1989, 101, 105, tombs had a marginal role in transmitting family memory; but cf., for a partial change of mind, Thomas 2007, who however does not thoroughly explore the topic. On the tombs as *lieux de mémoire* see now Harris 2019, 93–99.

⁴¹ Hdt. 6.38.1.

⁴² Mariaud 2015.

⁴³ The comparison with the tomb of the *olympionikes* Megacles at the Athenian Kerameikos is illuminating: see Knigge 2006; cf. Marchiandi 2012, 231–233.

⁴⁴ *IG XII.6* 626, where K. Hallof significantly improved the previous reading of the text.

succeeded in taking control of the island: contrasts between the tyrant and the old Samian aristocracies are well known and re-exploded after his death.⁴⁵

One last funerary stele, much more recent, is similar in form as well as in purpose to Heropythos' stele. I am referring to an impressive gravestone belonging to a monumental family tomb erected in the Southern Necropolis of Cyrene and dating from the 2nd century (Fig. 10; Appendix, no. 3).⁴⁶ The shape of the letters, however, indicates for the stele a later date, variously placed between the 1st and early 2nd century CE, when the tomb was probably reoccupied by a descendant of the family that originally owned it.⁴⁷ The deceased is a certain Klearchos son of Klearchos, an individual otherwise unknown who traced his descent, through seven generations, to a certain Aladdeir son of Battos. Forefather onomastics show a blatant attempt to combine local Lybian ethnicity with the Greek colonists, in particular attaching the family ancestry to the founder of the city, the Therean Battus, and to his dynasty.⁴⁸ Using Herodotus' unit of measurement (three generations per century), Aladdeir, the eighth ancestor, should have lived more or less in the 2nd century, that is, probably not by coincidence, the time when the tomb was built. If the later chronology of the stele were to be accepted, it would be tempting to link such a genealogical display to the re-foundation of Cyrene by the Emperor Hadrian after the Jewish revolt at the end of Trajan's reign (115/16–117 CE).⁴⁹ As recently pointed out, this was a

⁴⁵ See e.g. Hdt. 3.142.5–143.1 on the attack led by Telesarchos, a member of the ancient Samian aristocracy, against Maiandrios, a member of the tyrant's close circle: *eugeneia* is the argument used; cf. Roisman 1985; in general, for Polycratean Samos, Carty 2015. Megas, therefore, presents himself as a sort of Samian Eupatrides.

⁴⁶ *SGDI* 4859 = *IR Cyrenaica 2020* C.515; cf. Masson 1974, 1975; Chaniotis 1987, 43–44; Chevrollier 2016, 52–53. This is tomb S4, on which see Beschi 1969–1970, 201–203; Cherstich 2006a, 103–120; Thorn and Thorn 2009, 206–207. Two bases of female statues found *in situ* and dating from the 2nd or 1st c. (lettering) belonged probably to the original, Hellenistic phase of the monument: *IG Cyrenaica*² 007900 and *IG Cyrenaica*² 008400. In general, for the Southern Necropolis see Cherstich 2006b and 2008.

⁴⁷ Roueché (*IR Cyrenaica 2020* C.515) proposes “first to second centuries CE”. Rosamilia, however, points out to me the possibility that the stele dates from the full 1st c. CE (Neronian or at most Flavian age) on the basis of close paleographic parallels with some inscriptions from the sanctuary of Apollo; cf. Rosamilia 2021, 138. Other earlier or later scenarios appear far less likely: 3rd c. (Chaniotis 1987, 43); 2nd–3rd c. CE (Masson 1974). For the reoccupation of pre-existing funerary monuments in Cyrenean cemeteries see Cherstich *et al.* 2018; for some similar Athenian cases, cf. Marchiandi 2011, 37.

⁴⁸ It is difficult to determine the identity of the Battos who figures as the forefather of Klearchos' family. Onomastics evidently link him to the *oikist* and first Cyrenaean king, the namesake Battus I. As is well known, the last king of the Battiadae dynasty to bear the founder's name was Battus IV, who reigned in the early 5th century. Some have looked to him, but the calculation of generations does not allow us to go back that far. Perhaps it is not necessary to look for a Battos who was king. Moreover, it should be considered that in the 5th century memories connected with the Cyrenean royal house underwent significant reworking; see Giangiulio 2001.

⁴⁹ On the *tumultus judaicus* and its strong impact on the city's monuments see Chevrollier 2019.

moment of systematic reappraisal of the city's history in an antiquarian key.⁵⁰ In this context, it is likely that an individual who boasted Klearchos' lineage claimed a role.

Once more, this genealogical inscription emphasizes a sole, patrilinear line of descent. The format, however, is original and perhaps conceived specifically to give the visual impression of a longer lineage. Instead of the usual formula constituted by a personal name followed by a sequence of patronymics (A son of B, of C, of D and so on), the list repeats the nexus personal name/patronymic (A son of B, B son of C, C son of D and so on) at each generation. As in Heropythos' gravestone, layout contributes significantly to the final result: letters are less regular, but the search for vertical alignments between *stoichoi* is evident.

To conclude, genealogical gravestones are not a widespread phenomenon, but, significantly, the few known specimens date from crucial moments in respective local histories, delicate turning points where one's ancestry could become a decisive argument in the political arena. The fact that individuals who were otherwise unknown – Heropythos, Megas, Klearchos – were able to display more or less long lineages when needed clearly shows that the case of Miltiades is not exceptional and cannot be dismissed *tout court* as a historiographical product invented by historiographical professionals. Perhaps we should look with different eyes at the shreds of genealogies of otherwise well-known individuals occasionally evoked in narrative contexts (Alcibiades, Critias, Lysis of Aixone and so on). What if they were extracts, selected on context-demand, of complete genealogies preserved in family memorial heritages? In short, I argue that the leading role in the production of this genre of intentional history should be given back to families, although many aspects are destined to remain elusive, starting with the way in which memory was preserved through the many generations and branches of a family.⁵¹ “Domestic” production in no way implies that the final products were more truthful than the works of professional historians: I believe it was quite the opposite.⁵²

Certainly, on the rare occasions when genealogical lists were inscribed on gravestones and displayed in public, their format and layout were carefully planned in order to convey the significance of the ancestry line: long sequences of names arranged in columns emphasize the antiquity of the lineage and the direct filial relationships linking the deceased to a (presumably) illustrious forefather, without lateral branches. However, it was in classical Attica that the phenomenon of genealogical gravestones assumed unprecedented proportions as well as quite peculiar forms.

⁵⁰ Giudice 2015; Rosamilia 2021.

⁵¹ The existence of familiar forms of “archiving” must be further investigated. They are clearly hinted at by the preservation of copies of honorific/citizenship/*proxenia* decrees even long after they were issued: Mack 2015, 108-109; Boffo and Faraguna 2021, 25 with n. 65.

⁵² It is well known that family traditions are intrinsically prone to distorting reality: Thomas 1989, *passim*; Steinbock 2013, 73-75.

3. GENEALOGICAL WRITING: DYNASTY AND LAYOUT ON THE ATHENIAN FAMILY-TREE STELAE (MEIDON AND THE MANY OTHERS)

Notoriously, from the late 5th century onwards, radical changes occurred in Athenian funerary practices in general.⁵³ After a gap in the documentation lasting approximately fifty years, between the disappearance of grave markers from Attic cemeteries at the end of the Archaic Age and their reappearance during the Peloponnesian War (or a little earlier), the focus seems to dramatically shift from the individual to the family, in all its possible age and gender alternatives. Children, young people, adults and old people, both males and females, all appear on funerary monuments in variable numbers and the deceased is rarely depicted alone (hence the difficulty in recognizing him/her). Family tombs, mainly in the form of monumental precincts, the so-called *periboloi*, gradually take over the funerary landscape, both in the *asty* and in the *chora*: 4th-century *periboloi* numbers are impressive and continue to grow thanks to new discoveries.⁵⁴ It is in this context, probably in the early 4th century, that a new genre of genealogical stele was invented.

The genealogical gravestones described above show a mono-linear and ascending (or ancestral) approach to the lineage, from the present to the more distant past, going back from son to father without lateral branches. In contrast, Athenian classical stelae reverse the perspective: the approach is pluri-linear, including collateral branches, and descending (prospective), from a forefather to a variable number of descendants (with this number obviously depending on luck and fate). Therefore, we can rightly define them as “family-tree stelae”, although the graphic representation adopted is not a tree but a list, a format particularly congenial to the Greek catalogue mentality, as is well known.⁵⁵

It is a radical change: the focus shifts from *engonoi* to *progonoi*, from ancestry to dynasty.⁵⁶ Whereas the aim of genealogical stelae was to display an existing genealogy (or one presented as such), that of Athenian family-tree stelae is to create a new genealogy, mostly showing it in the making by progressively adding the names of the most recently deceased. Nonetheless, genealogical thinking remains as an element of strong continuity between the two typologies.

The main difference, however, lies in the numbers. Although not so many, family-tree gravestones are much more numerous than genealogical stelae.⁵⁷ They at-

⁵³ For a *status quaestionis* with reference to the extensive literature on the topic see Marchiandi 2011, 25–29 and De Vido and Marchiandi 2023.

⁵⁴ Closterman 2007; Marchiandi 2011; Breder 2013; Closterman 2013.

⁵⁵ Marchiandi 2011, 53; Karila-Cohen 2017. On the lists in general see now Kirk 2021 and Laemmle *et al.* 2021.

⁵⁶ Duplouy 2015 appropriately highlights the difference between “genealogical behavior” and “dynastic behavior” in gentilician strategies.

⁵⁷ The *corpus* awaits to be precisely established, but is not as scanty as Humphreys believed (1980 and 2018, 361–382). In particular, the new discoveries at Rhamnus have significantly changed the pic-

test to an unprecedented pervasiveness of the genealogical attitude in 4th-century Athens. The impressive spread of family tombs is a blatant expression of the same mood. Since I investigated elsewhere the historical reasons for this phenomenon, which emerges clearly in several areas of the life and culture of classical Athens, I will not dwell further on this aspect of the topic.⁵⁸

Compared to linear catalogues on genealogical stelae, where the strict father/son sequence left no room for ambiguity, the representation of collateral branches posed a new problem for stonecutters, since the general scheme did not evolve into a new form of graphic representation, but remained as a list, as noted above. Thus, layout strategies needed to be rethought.

A gravestone at the National Museum of Athens, dating from the late 5th century, shows the essence of the problem (Fig. 11; Appendix, no. 4).⁵⁹ The medium is not a plain slab, but the moldings of the entablature of a figured *naiskos*, where, apparently, there was the compelling need to inscribe the names of two successive generations of a family over time (a father, Aristeas, two sons, Aristonymos and Aristomachos, plus a woman, Timariste).⁶⁰ The hands of (two, possibly three) different stonecutters and a *rasura* at l. 2 testify to the progressive remodeling of the inscription, but the final outcome is infelicitous: the names do not have the desired centrality in the overall economy of the monument, and the family genealogy is not entirely clear. We note the attempt to communicate to the observer the succession of generations according to the usual layout strategy, that is, by inscribing the sons' names under that of the father, one line for each in a column, reserving the leading place on the lintel for the father. The insertion of the woman's name in a resulting space, between the father's name and the sons' names, however, makes it difficult to identify her familiar role: onomastics shows that she was acquired by marriage, but whose wife was she?

After experiences like this, it must have quickly become evident that the most suitable medium for this kind of inscription was a smooth, unadorned slab, possibly a high slab, in the hope, certainly shared by every forefather, that the lineage would be long and numerous.

The stele of the family of the *mantis* Meidon of Myrrhinus shows that such a hope could sometimes come true (Fig. 12; Appendix, no. 5).⁶¹ It is one of the most

ture: Marchiandi 2011, 35–36. Moreover, one must also take into account the so-called “aborted” family-tree stelae, on which see below, 39–40.

⁵⁸ This is the focus of Marchiandi 2011.

⁵⁹ Athens, National Museum Γ 712 = IG I³ 1283bis = Clairmont, *CAT* 3.075 (ca. 430–390).

⁶⁰ Note that the text is full of inconsistencies: Timariste's name is expressed, quite abnormally, in the accusative case (Τιμαρίστην *pro* Τιμαρίστη); the patronymic of Aristeas' sons is spelled differently although hardly another person is meant (Αριστάϊου *vs* Ἀριστέου).

⁶¹ Brauron Museum BE 1 = ΣΕΜΑ 453 (late 5th–early 4th c.); cf. Mastrokostas 1966; Hildebrandt 2006, 282 no. 125. For the *peribolos* see Marchiandi 2011, 526–531 Cat: Myrr.10. Humphreys (1980,

famous and “crowded” example in the series: on a slab more than 2.5 m high, eleven names are recorded, males and females, belonging to five generations and inscribed by at least six different hands. The first hand engraved three names at the top of the slab above the *rosae*, in a prestigious position usually reserved for the family forefather: the names of Meidon and his son Meidoteles (I) with his wife; below the *rosae*, the names of the grandson Kalliteles (I) and his wife are inscribed by a second hand. At the bottom of the slab, a third hand inscribed an epigram celebrating the mantic powers of Kalliteles, the one who probably had the stele erected. Later, on the smooth surface between the second group and the epigram, three different hands added another six names divided into three clusters, according to a criterion that is not easy to interpret. The final outcome is a sort of column: a sequence of names carefully lined up one below the other, in which stonemasons strove to make use of the full width of the slab (c. 0.5 m), adjusting the letter spacing accordingly. The layout strategy emphasizes the sequence of generations, as in the genealogical stela, but in the reverse, descending direction. The precise order in which the names were inscribed is unknown, but it certainly does not reflect the order in which Meidon’s descendants died.

In this kind of stele, in fact, the ordering criterion was generational, as we said above, starting from the forefather and moving down following the order father/sons/grandsons and so on. Even within each generation, the names of any siblings were usually written in a sequence that reflected that of their births (firstborn, secondborn, thirdborn and so on). Occasionally, the age criterion may intertwine with the gender criterion. Women, when mentioned as in the stele of Meidon, were recorded after their husbands, whether they were women acquired by marriage or women of the family who married family members, according to the well-known rules of Greek marriage practice.⁶² In the rare cases where unmarried women of the family appeared, as we shall see in the Euphranor’s stele, their names were recorded in generational order, on a par with the names of their male siblings.

A less crowded stele, belonging to the category of the “aborted” family-tree stela, may contribute to better illustrate the point. By “aborted”, I mean those grave-stones that were originally conceived as family-tree stela to be filled in over time, but remained empty due to the premature extinction of the family that owned the

115-116; cf. 2018, 358) considers this stele exceptional as belonging to a family of *manteis*. Certainly, such a profession was traditionally transmitted from father to son, as some well-known lineages of seers show (see e.g. Flower 2008 on the Iamidae). *Techne* may have contributed to Meidon family’s particular interest in preserving a firm memory of its past, but recent data show that families not consisting of diviners (at least as far as we know) also had the same ambition; cf. Marchiandi 2011, 35-46.

⁶² This is probably the case with the last woman mentioned on the stele at issue, Mnesiptoleme (II) daughter of Meidoteles (II), recorded not after her brother Kalliteles (II), but after her cousin on the paternal side Kallimedes, to whom she was probably married. For the family stemma see Marchiandi 2011, 529 and 607 (Σ 37).

tomb, a possibility obviously unforeseen and unforeseeable, but not so remote in classical Attica.⁶³

The case in question comes from a famous *peribolos* of the Athenian Kerameikos, that belonging to Agathon and Sosikrates, two brothers from Heraclea Pontica probably living in Attica as metics.⁶⁴ Their family-tree stele is almost 3.5 m high and was erected at the center of the facade (Appendix, no. 6).⁶⁵ At the top of the slab, the names of the brothers were engraved one below the other at the same time by a single hand, probably as co-founders of the *peribolos*. The statement of their full onomastics is clearly intended to avoid any ambiguity regarding the family relationship between the deceased. At any rate, below the brothers' names, the slab is tragically smooth. It is no coincidence that excavations inside the *peribolos* clearly show that neither of them had any surviving offspring.⁶⁶

The stele of Agathon and Sosikrates shows another possible layout strategy adopted to communicate the internal order of the family: in spite of the apparent equality between the two brothers, the greater spacing of the letters of Agathon's name, in the first line, shows unequivocally that he was the firstborn. So, in addition to the order of the entries, other strategies pertaining to the materiality of the writing may contribute to differentiating the firstborn.

It is worth noting that the age criterion was already the strategy adopted in the so-called stele on the tyrants' *adikia*, a bronze stele known only thanks to a mention by Thucydides, set up by the Athenian *demos* on the Acropolis, probably in the 480s, to prevent the crimes committed by the tyrants from being forgotten.⁶⁷ Thucydides, in fact, in order to prove that Hippias was the firstborn, cites as evidence the fact that his name was inscribed immediately under the name of his father Pisistratus and before that of his brother Hipparchus. He adds that seniority was confirmed by mention of the names of the five sons of Hippias with no name of sons by Hipparchus or Thessalus, who were younger and not yet married. Therefore, this sort of "memory stele" seems to be the prototype of classical family-tree stelae, although it may be ascribed to the different category of defamatory writing.

⁶³ Demographic studies have shown that in classical Attica the extinction of *oikoi* was not a remote phenomenon. Concerns frequently expressed in courtroom speeches about the risk of *eremia*, and the consequent spread of the two main strategies aimed at averting it by legal means, i.e. adoption and epicleate, seem to me indicative in this regard; on this point see Marchiandi 2011, 35-46 with further literature. Therefore, "aborted" family-tree stelae must be taken into account when establishing the *corpus* of attestations, contrary to current opinion. From this perspective, the *corpus*' size increases considerably.

⁶⁴ For the *peribolos* see Marchiandi 2011, 324-326 Cat. W.Ker.vt.15 and now Guicharrousse 2019.

⁶⁵ Athens, Kerameikos Museum = JG II² 8551 (second half of the 4th c.); cf. Hildebrandt 2006, 305-306 no. 170.

⁶⁶ Marchiandi 2011, 79-82, part. 82; 325 (with a review of the excavations carried out by A. Brückner in 1910).

⁶⁷ Th. 6.55.1-2; cf. Lavelle 1983, 81-120.

The stele on the tyrants' *adikia* was simultaneously inscribed, but, in the case of family-tree stelae, as I have already pointed out, it is very difficult, if not unrealistic and over-ambitious, to establish the order in which the names were inscribed. In fact, the shape of letters is not a safe criterion if the deaths are separated by only a few years.

This is evident for a stele coming from the *peribolos* of the Rhamnusian Euphranor. It is a canonical family-tree stele: a slab about 1.75 m high that was filled in over time with the names of seven deceased individuals belonging to three generations (Fig. 13; Appendix, no. 7).⁶⁸ Below the forefather, there are two sons, Euphranor and Euthyphron, and a grandson, Archedemos. There would have been room for other names which, however, were never inscribed, probably because of the lack of offspring.⁶⁹ In addition to the male members, the family of Euphranor also chose to record the names of women acquired by marriage, perhaps because they belonged to illustrious Rhamnusian families: Habrylla and Phainarete are included in the sequence. Their onomastics does not need to be complete because the position of their names, after those of their respective husbands, left no room for ambiguity. Separately, a daughter of Euphranor is recorded, who probably died unmarried. Her onomastics, instead, is complete (personal name, patronymic and the demotic of her father), to avoid any ambiguity.

Individual entries show seven hands for seven deceased: therefore, names were added on the stele after the burials. It is impossible to establish the order, but visual analysis gives the impression that there was some planning in the distribution of the epigraphic surface to the various family clusters. This planning seems to have been respected, even at the cost of squeezing in some letters: Habrylla's name, for instance, looks like it was inserted into a space that is too small, between her husband's name and that of her brother-in-law. It is difficult to go any further, since the spaces have all been filled in.

This brings us to a further problem that stonecutters had to face when engraving this genre of genealogical inscription. It is clear that these gravestones were intend-

⁶⁸ Rhamnus Museum 222 + 205 = *ΣΕΜΑ* 820 + 821 (second half of the 4th c.); cf. Hildebrandt 2006, 360 no. 304. For the *peribolos* see Marchiandi 2011, 467–469 Cat: Rhamn.9.

⁶⁹ Family stemma shows that after Archedemos the lineage becomes more complicated with an *epikleros* and a grandson, a second Archedemos. The fact that Archedemos (II) bore the name of his maternal grandfather and especially that he was buried, quite anomalously, in the *peribolos* of his maternal family would seem to indicate his adoption into the *oikos* of his maternal grandfather Archedemos (I), who does not appear to have had any male offspring, according to a practice well attested by courtroom speeches. That Archedemos (II) retained the patronymic of his biological father Demosthenes, however, seems to argue against adoption, as does the fact that he was commemorated on an individual *kioniskos* (*ΣΕΜΑ* 813) and his name was never inscribed on the family-tree stele; cf. Marchiandi 2011, 468–469 and 595 (Σ 25). In general, the case well exemplifies the difficulty of reconstructing family microhistory: on this point see Marchiandi 2011, 35–46.

ed to communicate to the readers the hierarchical order of the family, both between generations and within each generation, but it is equally clear that people did not die in that order: a son might die before his father, a secondborn brother before the firstborn, a wife before the husband, and so on. The issue is not insignificant. Evidently, there could only be one solution: an appropriate division of space had to be provided, possibly reserving vacats for individuals who were still alive. It was a sort of provisional layout.

The choice of this strategy is confirmed by at least two stelae that preserve such vacats. The first one is the imposing stele of Phormos of Kydantidai, a colossus exceeding 4 m, from an unlocated *peribolos* in the Kerameikos (Appendix, no. 8).⁷⁰ It records seven names, males and females, belonging to only two generations and separated by two large vacats. The first sequence mentions the founding couple (Phormos and Stratonike) and their two sons. It is followed by a vacat ca. 1 m high, then by the name of a woman acquired by marriage, whose familiar identity is uncertain, then by another vacat almost 0.5 m high. Finally, we have the names of the wives of the two sons of Phormos, inscribed in the same order as the names of their respective husbands. Their redundant onomastics – constituted not only by their father's full name but also by their husband's full name – is justified in the light of the fact that their names were inscribed at some distance from those of their husbands. Who was the first vacat intended for? Perhaps for the male grandchildren of Phormos. But, in spite of the grandfather's hope, apparently there was no third generation.

The second example is even more telling. The small stele of Themyllos of Oe, from an unlocated *peribolos* in the deme of origin, records seven names, males and females, belonging to four generations and forming one bloodline without lateral branches (Fig. 14; Appendix, no. 9).⁷¹ Each generation is made up of a married couple and all the names were inscribed at the same time by the same hand. In the last couple a one-line vacat was intended for the name of Archestrates' husband, who evidently survived his wife and was the one who erected the stele. This slab may have been intended to replace an older one, or perhaps the *peribolos* had lacked one until then: we cannot know. At any rate, the anonymous husband of Archestrates (an ambitious man judging by the size of the space left blank below the inscribed list) does not seem to have had any offspring and, perhaps for this reason, his name was never inscribed on the stele.

To conclude, both genealogical stelae and Attic family-tree stelae, albeit with the significant differences I have attempted to highlight, offer excellent examples of

⁷⁰ Athens, Kerameikos Museum I 217 = IG II² 6609 (second half of the 4th c.); cf. Hildebrandt 2006, 369–370 no. 328. For the *peribolos* see Marchiandi 2011, 332–334 Cat: [W.Ker.1].

⁷¹ Athens, Goulandris Museum 553 = ΣΕΜΑ 469 (first half of the 4th c.); cf. Hildebrandt 2006, 235–236 no. 42; Karila-Cohen 2017. For the *peribolos* see Marchiandi 2011, 522 Cat: [Angel.3].

how aspects inherent in the materiality of writing, and layout in particular, strongly affect the communicative strategy of an inscription: *mise en page* plays a crucial role in conveying the genealogical message.

On the rare occasions when the pedigree of full historical persons was inscribed on genealogical gravestones, the layout involves lists of father/son names carefully arranged in column without lateral branches to emphasize the antiquity of the lineage and the direct blood link between the deceased and his more or less distant ancestor.

In the far more frequent cases of the Attic dynastic stelae, the need to represent the family as a whole, including collateral branches and possibly women, and to take into account the hierarchical order between generations as well as within each generation, although deaths did not necessarily occur in the same order as births, posed to stonecutters unprecedented and difficult problems with regard to layout. Without abandoning the list-format, traditionally congenial to the Greeks' catalogue mentality and deeply rooted in their approach to the past, they elaborated forms of organizing the epigraphic surface that tried to cope with the unpredictable nature of human vicissitudes reserving for family clusters spaces that were then gradually filled in with the names of those who died over time.

APPENDIX

1. *SGDI* 5656⁷² – Chios, stele of Heropythos (early or middle 5th c.); Fig. 9.

1 Ἡροπύθο
τῷ Φιλαιό
τῷ Μικκύλο
τῷ Μανδροκ<λ>έος
5 τῷ Αὐτοσθένης
τῷ Μανδραγόρεω
τῷ Ἐρασίω
τῷ Ἴπποτίωνος
τῷ Ἐκαίδεω
10 τῷ Ἴπποσθένης
τῷ Ὀρσικλέος
τῷ Ἴπποτίωνος
τῷ Ἐκάο
τῷ Ἐλδίω
15 τῷ Κυπρίω.

3. *IR Cyrenaica* 2020 C.515 – Cyrene, stele of Klearchos (1st–early 2nd c. CE?); Fig. 10.

1 Κλέαρχος
Κλεάρχω,
Κλέαρχος
Κλεάρχω,
5 Κλέαρχος
Παρευβάτα,
Παρευβάτας
Φιλοξένω Υ,
Φιλόξενος
10 Καλλίπω Υ,
Κάλλιππος
Ἀλεξιμάχω Υ,
Ἀλεξίμαχο[ς]
Ἀλαδδειρο[ς],
15 Ἀλαδδει[ρ]
Β[ά]ττω.

2. *IG* XII.6 626 – Samos, base of Megas (third quarter of the 6th c.).

1 Μέγας τῷ Ε//
τὸξάκω τῷ Ξ-
ένο τῷ Πυρραίθ-
ο.

4. *IG* P 1283bis – Athens, stele of Aristeas' family (ca. 430–390); Fig. 11.

I.1 Ἀριστέας Ἰφιστιάδης.

II.1 Τιμαρίστην (!) Ἰφιστιάδης Λαμπυρέως.
Ἀριστόνυμος Ἀρισταίου Ἰφιστιάδης. (*in rasura*)
Ἀριστόμαχος Ἀριστεύου Ἰφιστιάδης.

⁷² For some caveats on the text of *SGDI* 5656 see n. 31 above.

5. ΣΕΜΑ 453 – Attica (Myrrhinus), stele of Meidon’s family (late 5th–early 4th c.); Fig. 12.

- 1 Μείδων Ἐπιτέλος,
Μειδοτέλης Μείδωνος,
Φαναγόρα Μειδοτέλους
γυνή,
duae rosae
- 5 Καλλιτέλ[ης]
Μειδοτέλ[ου]ς,
Μνησιπτολέμη
Καλλιτέλους
γυνή,
- 10 Μείδων
Καλλιτέλους
Μυρρινούσιος,
Μνησιστράτη
Καλλίου
- 15 Μυρρινουσίου
Μείδωνος γυνή,
Μειδοτέλης
Καλλιτέλους
Μυρρινούσιος,
- 20 Καλλιτέλης
Μειδοτέλους
Μυρρινούσιος,
Καλλιμήδης
Μείδωνος
- 25 Μυρρινούσιος,
Μνησιπτολέμη
Μειδοτέλους
θυγάτηρ.
Μάντεος ἐντίμο μάντιν, σοφὸν
ἄνδρα, δίκαιον,
- 30 κρύπτω Μειδοτέλος ἐνθάδε
Καλλιτέλην.

6. IG II² 8551 – Athens (Kerameikos), stele of Agathon and Sosikrates’ family (second half of the 4th c.).

- duae rosae*
- 1 [Ἀ]γάθων
Ἀγαθοκλέους
Ἡρακλεώτης.
Σωσικράτης
- 5 Ἀγαθοκλέους
Ἡρακλεώτης.

7. ΣΕΜΑ 820 + 821 – Attica (Rhamnus), stele of Euphranor’s family (second half of the 4th c.); Fig. 13.

- 1 Εὐφράνωρ
Εὐφρονος
Ῥαμνούσιος
duae rosae
Εὐφρων
- 5 Εὐφράνορος
Ῥαμνούσιος
Ἀβρύλλα
Εὐθύφρων
Εὐφράνορος
- 10 Ῥαμνούσιος
Φαιναρέτη
Κλεοφῶντος
Φαιναρέτη
Εὐφράνορος
- 15 Ῥαμνουσίου
θυγάτηρ
Ἀρχέδημος
Εὐφρονος
Ῥαμνούσιος.

8. IG II² 6609 – Athens (Kerameikos), stele of Phormos' family (second half of the 4th c.).

- duae rosae*
- 1 Φόρμος
Προκλείδο
Κυδαντίδης.
Στρατονίκη.
- 5 Προκλείδης
Φόρμου
Κυδαντίδης.
Δεινίας
Φόρμου
- 10 [Κ]υδαντίδης.
vacat 0.99
Μνησιπτολέμ[η]
Θεοξένου
Μαραθωνίου
θυγάτηρ.
vacat 0.438
- 15 Ἱερὸν Στρατωνίδου
Βατήθεν, Προκλείδου
Κυδαντίδου γυνή.
Θεοδοσία Εὐφήμου
Κηττίου θυγάτηρ,
- 20 Φόρμου Κυδαντίδου
γυνή.

9. ΣΕΜΑ 469 – Attica (Oe), stele of Themyllos' family (first half of the 4th c.); Fig. 14.

- 1 Θέμυλλος Θεμύ[λλο] Ὀῆθεν.
Ναυσιστράτη Λυκίσκο Ὑβάδο.
Ἀντιφάνης Θεμύλ[λο] Ὀῆθ[εν].
Ἀθηνυλλίς Διονυ[σίο] Ἀ[γ]γεληθεν.
- 5 Θέμων Ἀντιφάνους Ὀῆθεν.
Κλεοपाσις Κλεοχάρ[ους] Ἀγ[γε]ληθεν.
vacat
Ἀρχεστράτη Μελήτο Ἀγγεληθ[εν].

REFERENCES

- EGM = R.L. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography, 1: Text and Introduction*. Oxford 2000.
- Ambaglio, D. 1980. *L'opera storiografica di Ellanico di Lesbo. Introduzione, traduzione delle testimonianze e dei frammenti, commento storico*. Pisa.
- Ball, R. 1979. "Generation Dating in Herodotus", *CQ* 29, 276–281.
- Bertelli, L. 2001. "Hecataeus: From Genealogy to Historiography", in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Oxford, 67–94.
- Beschi, L. 1969–1970. "Divinità funerarie cirenaiche", *ASAA* 47–48, 133–341.
- Blanchard, A. 2007. "Trapped between Athens and Chios. A Relationship in Fragments", in V. Jennings and A. Katsaros (eds.), *The World of Ion of Chios*. Oxford.

- Boffo, L., and M. Faraguna. 2021. *Le poleis e i loro archivi. Studi su pratiche documentarie, istituzioni e società nell'antichità greca*. Trieste.
- Breder, J. 2013. *Attische Grabbezirke klassischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden.
- Brehm, J. 2013. *Generationenbeziehungen in den Historien Herodots*. Wiesbaden.
- Brulé, P. 2007. *La Grèce d'à côté: réel et imaginaire en miroir en Grèce antique*. Rennes.
- Butz, P. 2010. *The Art of the Hekatompedon Inscription and the Birth of the Stoichedon Style*. Leiden.
- Butz, P. 2012. "Rectified" vs "offset" stoichedon: Visual evidence for a new definition. Unpublished poster presented at the XIV Congressus Internationalis Epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae (Berlin, 27.-31. August 2012). Abstract available online at: <<https://congressus2012.aiegl.org>> (consulted on July 4, 2022).
- Cartledge, P. 2002. *Sparta and Laconia: A Regional History 1300-362 BC*. London - New York (1st ed. 1979).
- Carty, A. 2015. *Polycrates, Tyrant of Samos: New Light on Archaic Greece*. Stuttgart.
- Chanotis, A. 1987. "Ein neuer genealogischer Text aus Milet". *EA* 10, 41-44.
- Cherstich, L. 2006a. "S4: la tomba di Klearchos di Cirene", in E. Fabbriotti and O. Menozzi (eds.), *Cirenaica: studi, scavi e scoperte. Parte I: nuovi dati da città e territorio. Atti del X convegno di archeologia cirenaica* (BAR I.S. 1488). Oxford, 103-120.
- Cherstich, L. 2006b. "Ricognizione nella necropoli sud di Cirene: la strada per Balagrae", in E. Fabbriotti and O. Menozzi (eds.), *Cirenaica: studi, scavi e scoperte. Parte I: nuovi dati da città e territorio*. Oxford, 391-408.
- Cherstich, L. 2008. "From Looted Tombs to Ancient Society: A Survey of the Southern Necropolis of Cyrene", *Libyan Studies* 39, 73-93.
- Cherstich, L., O. Menozzi, S. Antonelli, I. Cherstich, M.C. Mancini, M.G. Di Antonio, A. Abdalrahim Sherif Saad, and S. Farag Abdel Hati. 2018. "A 'Living' Necropolis: Change and Reuse in the Cemeteries of Cyrene", *Libyan Studies* 49, 121-152.
- Chevrollier, F. 2016. "Conscience gentilice et processus d'aristocratisation chez les notables de Cyrénaïque à l'époque impériale", in V. Michel (ed.), *De Leptis à Derna, de la Tripolitaine à la Cyrénaïque. Travaux récents sur la Libye antique*. Paris, 39-66.
- Chevrollier, F. 2019. "Pour une archéologie de la rébellion. Bilan matériel et bilan humain de la révolte juive de Cyrène à la fin du règne de Trajan", in E. Nantet (ed.), *Les Juifs et le pouvoir dans l'Antiquité. Histoire et archéologie*. Rennes, 189-207.
- Closterman, W.E. 2007. "Family Ideology and Family History: The Function of Funerary Markers in Classical Attic *Peribolos* Tombs", *AJA* 111, 633-652.
- Closterman, W.E. 2013. "Family Groupings in Classical Attic *Peribolos* Tombs", in K. Sporn (ed.), *Griechische Grabbezirke klassischer Zeit: Normen und Regionalismen*. Munich, 45-53.
- Condilo, C. 2017. "Agonistic Intertextuality: Herodotus' Engagement with Hecataeus on Genealogies", *JAH* 5, 228-279.
- Davies, J.K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families. 600-300 BC*. Oxford.
- Day, J.W. 2019. "The 'Spatial Dynamics' of Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram: Conversations among Locations, Monuments, Texts, and Viewer-Readers", in A. Petrovic, I. Petrovic, and E. Thomas (eds.), *The Materiality of Text: Placement, Perception, and Presence of Inscribed Texts in Classical Antiquity*. Boston - Leiden, 73-104.
- Delattre, Ch. 2021. "Textual Webs: How to Read Mythographic Lists", in R. Laemmle, C. Scheidegger-Laemmle, and K. Wesselmann (eds.), *Lists and Catalogues in Ancient Literature and Beyond*. Berlin - New York, 81-106.

- De Vido, S. 2001. "Genealogie di re spartani nelle Storie erodotee", *QS* 53, 209-227.
- De Vido, S. 2012. "Definizione e natura dell'eugeneia. Riflessioni tra V e IV secolo", in *Incontri di Filologia Classica* 10. Trieste, 97-120.
- De Vido, S., and D. Marchiandi. 2023. "La città dei morti", in M. Bettalli and M. Giangiulio (eds.), *Atene. Guida alla città della democrazia (V-IV sec. a.C.)*. Rome, 239-262.
- Di Cesare, R. 2015. *La città di Cecrope. Ricerche sulla politica edilizia cimoniana ad Atene*. Athens.
- Dolcetti, P. 2001. "Le genealogie di Ferecide di Atene e i Theseia cimoniani", *Quaderni del Dipartimento di Filologia Linguistica e Tradizione Classica Augusto Rostagni* 17, 67-75.
- Dolcetti, P. 2004. *Ferecide di Atene, Testimonianze e frammenti*. Alessandria.
- Dolcetti P. 2011. "Fileo ed Eurisace: i figli di Aiace tra Salamina e Atene", in A. Aloni and M. Ornaghi (eds.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali: nuovi contributi*. Messina, 349-363.
- Donlan, W. 1973. "The Role of eugeneia in the Aristocratic Self-Image During the Fifth Century BC", in E.N. Borza and R.W. Carrubba (eds.), *Classics and the Classical Tradition. Essays Presented to R. E. Dengler on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*. University Park, PA, 63-78.
- Duploux, A. 2006. *Le prestige des élites. Recherches sur les modes de reconnaissance sociale en Grèce entre les Xe et Ve siècles avant J.-C.* Paris.
- Duploux, A. 2015. "Genealogical and Dynastic Behaviour in Archaic and Classical Greece: Two Gentilician Strategies", in N. Fisher and H. van Wees (eds.), *'Aristocracy' in Antiquity. Redefining Greek and Roman Elites*. Swansea, 59-84.
- Duploux, A. 2018. "Élites, cités et citoyens dans la Grèce archaïque. Apports récents et mise au point historiographique", in C. Moatti and C. Müller (eds.). *Statuts personnels et espaces sociaux: questions grecques et romaines*. Paris, 19-43.
- Federico, E. 2015. *Ione di Chio. Testimonianze e frammenti*. Tivoli.
- Flower, M.A. 2008. "The Iamidae: A Mantic Family and Its Public Image", in B. Dignas and K. Trampedach (eds.), *Practitioners of the Divine. Greek Priests and Religious Officials from Homer to Heliodorus*. Washington, DC, 187-206.
- Forrest, W.G. 1963. "The Inscriptions of South-East Chios, I", *ABSA* 58, 53-67.
- Fowler, R.L. 1996. "Herodotus and his Contemporaries", *JHS* 116, 62-87.
- Fowler, R.L. 1998. "Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's Catalogue and the Creation of the Hellenes", *PCPhS* 44, 1-19.
- Fowler, R.L. 2013. *Early Greek Mythography, 2: Commentary*. Oxford.
- Foxhall, L. 2012. "Family Time. Temporality, Materiality and Gender in Ancient Greece", in J. Marincola and L. Llewellyn-Jones (eds.), *History without Historians*. Edinburgh, 183-206.
- Fraser, P.M. 2003. "Agathon and Cassandra (IG IX.12 4.1750)", *JHS* 123, 26-40.
- Giangiulio, M. 2001. "Constructing the Past: Colonial Traditions and the Writing of History. The Case of Cyrene", in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Oxford, 116-137.
- Giangiulio, M. 2016. "Aristocrazie in discussione. Verso un nuovo modello per la società greca arcaica?", *IncidAntico* 14, 305-316.
- Giudice, A. 2015. "La (re)fondation de Cyrène à l'époque d'Hadrien: utopie constitutionnelle et idéalisation urbanistique", in M. Coudry and M.T. Schettino (eds.), *L'utopie politique et la cité ideale, Politica Antica* 5, 193-208.

- Gotteland, S. 1998. "Genealogies mythiques et politique chez les orateurs attiques", in D. Auger and S. Saïd (eds.), *Généalogies mythiques*. Paris, 379-393.
- Guicharrousse, R. 2019. "Athéniens dans la mort? Proclamer ses identités dans les cimetières attiques: le cas des étrangers au Céramique", in R. Guicharrousse, P. Ismard, M. Vallet, and A.E. Veisse (eds.), *L'identification des personnes dans les mondes grecs*. Paris, 125-138.
- Harding, P. 2006. *Didymos: On Demosthenes*. Oxford.
- Harris, E.M. 2016. "Alcibiades, the Ancestors, Liturgies, and the Etiquette of Addressing the Athenian Assembly", in V. Liotsakis and S. Farrington (eds.), *The Art of History: Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography*. Berlin - Boston, 145-156.
- Harris, E.M. 2019. "Herodotus and the Social Contexts of Memory in Ancient Greece: The Individual Historian and his Community", in Z. Archibald and J. Haywood (eds.), *The Power of Individual and Community in Ancient Athens and Beyond. Essays in Honour of John K. Davies*. Swansea, 79-113.
- Henze, S. 2015. *Adel im antiken Drama. Eugeneia bei Aischylos, Sophokles und Euripides*. Tübingen.
- Hildebrandt, F. 2006. *Die attischen Namenstelen. Untersuchungen zu Stelen des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Berlin.
- Humphreys, S.C. 1980. "Family Tombs and Tomb Cult in Ancient Athens: Tradition or Traditionalism?", *JHS* 100, 96-126 (reprinted in S.C. Humphreys, *The Family, Women and Death. Comparative Studies*, London 1983, 79-130).
- Humphreys, S.C. 2018. *Kinship in Ancient Athens: An Anthropological Analysis*. Oxford.
- Inglese, A. 2023. "Fra scrittura e oralità: la memoria culturale nelle iscrizioni dei tripodi del santuario di Apollo *Ismenios* a Tebe (a proposito di Hdt. V 56-81)", *MediterrAnt* 26, 159-167.
- Karila-Cohen, K. 2017. "Quand les familles s'affichent sur les pierres (à partir de l'exemple athénien)", in *Famille et société dans le monde grec, en Italie et à Rome du Ve au IIe siècle avant J.-C. (Pallas hors série)*. Toulouse, 91-117.
- Kirk, A. 2021. *Ancient Greek Lists: Catalogue and Inventory Across Genres*. Cambridge.
- Knigge, U. 2006. "Ein Grabmonument der Alkmeoniden im Kerameikos", *MDAI(A)* 121, 127-163.
- Koulakiotis, E. 2017. "The Hellenic Impact on Ancient Macedonia. Conceptualizing Origin and Authority", in S. Müller, T. Howe, H. Bowden, and R. Rollinger (eds.), *The History of the Argeades: New Perspectives*. Wiesbaden, 199-214.
- Kyriakidis, S. 2021. "Looking Backwards to Posterity: Catalogues of Ancestry from Homer to Ovid", in R. Laemmle, C. Scheidegger-Laemmle, and K. Wesselmann (eds.), *Lists and Catalogues in Ancient Literature and Beyond*. Berlin - New York, 245-271.
- Laemmle, R., C. Scheidegger-Laemmle, and K. Wesselmann (eds.). 2021. *Lists and Catalogues in Ancient Literature and Beyond*. Berlin - New York.
- Lavelle, B.M. 1983. *Hipparchos. Studies in Pisistratid History, 528-514 B.C.*, PhD Diss. Univ. of British Columbia.
- Mac Sweeney, N. 2013. *Foundation Myths and Politics in Ancient Ionia*. Cambridge.
- Mack, W. 2015. *Proxeny and Polis. Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*. Oxford.
- Marchiandi, D. 2011. *I periboli funerari attici dell'età classica: lo specchio di una 'borghesia'*. Athens.
- Marchiandi, D. 2012. "Le consuetudini funerarie dell'élite ateniese: i lebeti bronzei di Myrina (Lemnos)", *ASAA* 88, 221-236.

- Marchiandi, D. 2019. “La lekythos funeraria di Lysis di Aixone e le Nuove Istmiche degli Argivi (a partire da SEG 57, 2007, 270)”, in *Epigrafia e Storia. Omaggio a Luigi Moretti (MediterrAnt 22)*, 49-76.
- Marchiandi, D. 2022. “Funerary Monuments and Family Memory: The Lekythos of Lysis from Aixone and the Agonistic Exploits of his Ancestors (SEG 57, 270)”, in L. Balandat and K. Opitz-Pohl (eds.), *GrabDenkMal. Workshop am Institut für Klassische Archäologie der Universität Tübingen, 17.-19. November 2017*, (Tübinger Archäologische Forschungen 36). Rahden/Westf, 67-91.
- Mariaud, O. 2015. “A Samian Leopard? Megas, his Ancestors and Strategies of Social Differentiation in Archaic Samos”, in N. Fisher and H. van Wees (eds.), ‘Aristocracy’ in Antiquity. *Redefining Greek and Roman Elites*. Swansea, 259-286.
- Masson, O. 1974. “L’inscription généalogique de Cyrène (SGDI 4859)”, *BCH* 98, 263-270.
- Masson, O. 1975. “Quelques épitaphes grecques”, *BCH* 99, 219-227.
- Mastrokostas, E. 1966. Ἐπιστήματα ἐκ Μυρρινούδωντος, in *Χαριστήριον εἰς Ἀναστάσιον Κ. Ὀρλάνδου*, 3. Athens, 281-299.
- Miller, M. 1970. *The Sicilian Colony Dates*. Albany.
- Mitchel, F. 1956. “Herodotus’ Use of Genealogical Chronology”, *Phoenix* 10, 48-69.
- Möller, A. 1996. “Der Stammbau der Philaiden. Über Funktionen der Genealogie bei den Griechen”, in M. Flashar, H.J. Gehrke, and E. Heinrich (eds.), *Retrospektive. Konzepte von Vergangenheit in der griechisch-römischen Antike*. Munich, 17-35.
- Monaco, M.C. 2011. “La Tomba di Zosimiano (cd. di Cimone)”, in E. Greco (ed.), *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C., Tomo 2: Colline sud-occidentali – Valle dell’Ilisso*. Athens, 359.
- Mosshammer, A.A. 1979. *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition*. London.
- Moyer, I.S. 2002. “Herodotus and an Egyptian Mirage: The Genealogies of the Theban Priests”, *JHS* 122, 70-90 (reprinted in I.S. Moyer, *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism*, Cambridge 2011, 42-83).
- Nobili, C. 2016. *Corone di Gloria. Epigrammi agonistici ed epinici dal VII al IV secolo a.C.* Alessandria.
- Paspatis, A.G. 1888. *Τὸ Χιακὸν γλωσσάριον: ἦτοι ἡ ἐν Χίῳ λαλούμενη γλῶσσα μετὰ τινῶν ἐπιγραφῶν ἀρχαίων τε καὶ νέων καὶ χάρτου τῆς νήσου*. Athens.
- Petrovic, A. 2016. “Casualty Lists in Performance. Name Catalogues and Greek Verse-Inscriptions”, in E. Sistikou and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Dialect, Diction, and Style in Greek Literary and Inscribed Epigram*. Berlin – Boston, 361-390.
- Piccirilli, L. 1985. *Storie dello storico Tucidide. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento delle Vite tucididee*. Genoa.
- Roisman, J. 1985. “Maiandrios of Samos”, *Historia* 34, 257-277.
- Rosamilia, E. 2021. “Foundation Stories, and Civic Identities in Second-Century-CE Cyrene”, in L. Gallo and S. Gallotta (eds.), *Administration, politics, culture and society of the ancient city*. Rome, 135-159.
- Sato, N. 2015. “‘Aristocracy’ in Athenian Diplomacy”, in N. Fisher and H. van Wees (eds.), ‘Aristocracy’ in Antiquity. *Redefining Greek and Roman Elites*. Swansea, 203-226.
- Settipani, C. 2017. *Les prétentions généalogiques en Grèce: de l’époque byzantine à l’époque archaïque*. Paris.

- Smith, E.E.E. 2007. "Pindar, Athletes, and the Early Greek Statue Habit", in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals from Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*. Oxford, 83-139.
- Steinbock, B. 2013. *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse: Uses and Meanings of the Past*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Thomas, R. 1989. *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
- Thomas, R. 2001. "Herodotus' Histories and the Floating Gap", in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Oxford, 198-210.
- Thomas, R. 2007. "Fame, Memorial and Choral Poetry. The Origins of Epinician Poetry – An Historical Study", in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals from Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*. Oxford, 141-166.
- Thomas, R. 2019. *Polis Histories: Collective Memories and the Greek World*. Cambridge.
- Thorn, D.M., and C.J. Thorn. 2009. *A Gazetteer of Cyrene Necropolis*. Rome.
- Varto, E. 2015. "Stories Told in Lists: Formulaic Genealogies as Intentional History", *JAH* 3, 118-149.
- Veligianni-Terzi, C. 1997. *Wertbegriffe in den attischen Ehrendekreten der klassischen Zeit*. Stuttgart.
- Wade-Gery, H.T. 1952. *The Poet of the Iliad*. Cambridge.
- West, M.L. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.
- West, S.R. 1991. "Herodotus' Portrait of Hecataeus", *JHS* 111, 140-160.
- Zaccarini, M. 2017. *The Lame Hegemony: Cimon of Athens and the Failure of Panhellenism, ca. 478-450 BC*. Bologna.
- Zunino, M.L. 2015. Γενεαλογίαι, in C. Ampolo, U. Fantasia, and L. Porciani (eds.), *Lexicon Historiographicum Graecum et Latinum (LHG&L)*, 3. β-ζ. Pisa, 20-33.