



# Genealogical and dynastic behaviour in archaic and Classical Greece: two gentilician strategies

Alain Duplouy

## ► To cite this version:

Alain Duplouy. Genealogical and dynastic behaviour in archaic and Classical Greece: two gentilician strategies. Hans van Wees; Nick Fisher. Aristocracy in Antiquity, pp.59-84, 2015, 10.2307/j.ctvvn9xw.5 . hal-02404420

HAL Id: hal-02404420

<https://paris1.hal.science/hal-02404420>

Submitted on 11 Dec 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# ARISTOCRACY IN ANTIQUITY

*Editors*  
**Nick Fisher**  
and  
**Hans van Wees**

*Contributors*  
Guy Bradley, Alain Duplouy, Thomas J. Figueira,  
Nick Fisher, Stephen Lambert, Olivier Mariaud,  
Antoine Pierrot, Noboru Sato, Gillian Shepherd,  
Laurens E. Tacoma, Hans van Wees, James Whitley



The Classical Press of Wales

First published in 2015 by  
The Classical Press of Wales  
15 Rosehill Terrace, Swansea SA1 6JN  
Tel: +44 (0)1792 458397  
[www.classicalpressofwales.co.uk](http://www.classicalpressofwales.co.uk)

Distributor  
I. B. Tauris & Co Ltd,  
6 Salem Rd,  
London W2 4BU, UK  
Tel.: +44 (0) 20 7243 1225  
Fax: +44 (0) 20 7243 1226  
[www.ibtauris.com](http://www.ibtauris.com)

Distributor in North America  
ISD,  
70 Enterprise Drive, Suite 2,  
Bristol, CT 06010, USA  
Tel: +1 (860) 584-6546  
Fax: +1 (860) 516-4873  
[www.isdistribution.com](http://www.isdistribution.com)

© 2015 The authors

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

ISBN

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Typeset by Louise Jones, and printed and bound in the UK by Gomer Press, Llandysul, Ceredigion, Wales

---

*The Classical Press of Wales, an independent venture, was founded in 1993, initially to support the work of classicists and ancient historians in Wales and their collaborators from further afield. More recently it has published work initiated by scholars internationally. While retaining a special loyalty to Wales and the Celtic countries, the Press welcomes scholarly contributions from all parts of the world.*

The symbol of the Press is the Red Kite. This bird, once widespread in Britain, was reduced by 1905 to some five individuals confined to a small area known as ‘The Desert of Wales’ – the upper Tywi valley. Geneticists report that the stock was saved from terminal inbreeding by the arrival of one stray female bird from Germany. After much careful protection, the Red Kite now thrives – in Wales and beyond.

## CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	vii

## INTRODUCTION

- 1 The trouble with ‘aristocracy’ 1  
*Nick Fisher (Cardiff University) and Hans van Wees  
(University College, London)*

### PART I: ELITES IN THE ANCIENT MEDITERRANEAN: APPROACHES AND MODELS

- 2 Genealogical and dynastic behaviour in archaic and classical Greece: two gentilician strategies 59  
*Alain Duplouy (Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne)*
- 3 Investigating aristocracy in archaic Rome and central Italy: social mobility, ideology and cultural influences 85  
*Guy Bradley (Cardiff University)*
- 4 Roman elite mobility under the Principate 125  
*Laurens E. Tacoma (University of Leiden)*

### PART II: HEREDITY AND SOCIAL MOBILITY AT ATHENS

- 5 Who were the Eupatrids in archaic Athens? 147  
*Antoine Pierrot (Université de Montpellier 3)*
- 6 Aristocracy and the Attic *genos*: a mythological perspective 169  
*Stephen Lambert (Cardiff University)*
- 7 ‘Aristocracy’ in Athenian diplomacy 203  
*Noboru Sato (University of Kobe)*

*Contents*

PART III:  
COMPETITION AND STRATIFICATION IN THE AEGEAN

- |    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| 8  | 'Aristocratic' values and practices in ancient Greece:<br>Aegina, athletes and coaches in Pindar<br><i>Nick Fisher (Cardiff University)</i>                           | 227 |
| 9  | Honour and genealogy: Megas, his ancestors and<br>strategies of social differentiation in Samos<br><i>Olivier Mariaud (Université Pierre Mendès-France, Grenoble)</i> | 259 |
| 10 | Agonistic aristocrats? The curious case of archaic Crete<br><i>James Whitley (Cardiff University)</i>   | 287 |

PART IV:  
GREEK ELITES OVERSEAS

- |    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 11 | Modes of colonization and elite integration in<br>archaic Greece<br><i>Thomas J. Figueira (Rutgers University, New Jersey)</i> | 311 |
| 12 | The emergence of elites in archaic Sicily<br><i>Gillian Shepherd (La Trobe University, Melbourne)</i>                          | 347 |
|    | Index and Glossary   | 378 |

## PART I: ELITES IN THE ANCIENT MEDITERRANEAN: APPROACHES AND MODELS

### 2

#### GENEALOGICAL AND DYNASTIC BEHAVIOUR IN ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL GREECE: TWO GENTILICIAN STRATEGIES

*Alain Duplouy*

It is a widely accepted idea that archaic Greek elites consisted of ‘aristocrats’ who ruled by hereditary right and enjoyed a life of leisure thanks to their riches. It is said that in the archaic age only these ‘aristocrats’ possessed full citizenship-rights, allowing them to rule their cities. Their leading position was jealously guarded by means of a gentilician social structure, until the lower social ranks, the *dēmos*, challenged their right to control every political office and the whole process of decision-making. Hesiod, Solon and Theognis are seen as witnesses of this long struggle, which eventually ended, at least in Athens, with Cleisthenes’ reforms and the victory of the *dēmos*.<sup>1</sup>

Various studies have deeply challenged, however, this definition of aristocracy by rethinking its relationship to political authority, nobility and wealth.<sup>2</sup> In all these fields, ‘aristocrats’ actually seem to hold an unstable position, which has to be constantly built up. Elaborating on these milestone studies, I developed in my book *Le prestige des élites* the notion that enterprising individuals create and perform their own status through various strategies of distinction (*modes de reconnaissance sociale*). Adopting an anthropological perspective, I tried to demonstrate that social status in archaic and classical Greece was achieved rather than ascribed. Among citizens, individual status was generally the result of continuous investment in forms of behaviour which required a great deal of time, money and energy.<sup>3</sup>

According to Oswyn Murray, such practices as the symposium, athletics, homosexuality, horse-breeding, hunting or guest-friendship were essential features of an ‘aristocratic lifestyle’.<sup>4</sup> They are to be conceived as status symbols. However, the relationship between status and behaviour is a major issue. Is the lifestyle a mere status symbol? Or does it contribute actively to establishing social status? Engaging in these social practices can serve to establish a privileged position, rather than simply display it.<sup>5</sup> This is my core hypothesis: in ancient Greece, status has to be defined by performance.

At the origin of my hypothesis lay the observation that in ancient Greece, public esteem, granted by the community, was an essential tool in the shaping of the social order. As Oswyn Murray himself puts it, ‘In the shame culture of early Greece, honour and the possibility of dishonour are closely related to social and political status with their attendant rights and duties’.<sup>6</sup> Social esteem and the fear of shame were thus constant preoccupations for the Greeks. In the *Odyssey*, Penelope’s suitors fear the gossip that men and women will spread among the Achaeans if the beggar manages to string Odysseus’ bow after their own failure (*Od.* 21.321–329). Hesiod gave this advice to his brother: ‘Avoid the talk of men. For Talk is mischievous, light, and easily raised, but hard to bear and difficult to be rid of. Talk never wholly dies away when many people voice her’ (*W&D* 760–4). I could multiply examples. All would testify that many actions in ancient Greece aimed at promoting one’s standing in the eyes of others or avoiding the devastating consequences of being shamed before them.

Moreover, status in the community was the object of competition. The agonistic mentality is certainly one of the most significant features of ancient Greek civilisation. ‘Always be the best and be superior to others’ is a Homeric principle (*Il.* 6.208; 11.784) widely adopted. No study demonstrates this as well as Jacob Burckhardt’s *Griechische Kulturgeschichte* and his concept of the *agonale Mensch*,<sup>7</sup> even if I prefer Nietzsche’s conception of the Greek agonistic mentality.<sup>8</sup> Whereas Burckhardt conceived it as a specific feature of archaic oligarchies that faded away in classical times with the rise of democracies, Nietzsche defined the *agōn* as a fundamental feature of Hellenism, a constant characteristic of Greek history, found across a wide social spectrum. Nietzsche’s text, *Homers Wettkampf*, is certainly open to criticism due to the author’s background as a philosopher rather than a historian, but his description generally fits our evidence much better. With some regional or individual exceptions, this agonistic mentality governed social behaviour throughout the Greek world and continuously shaped social hierarchy.

From the Geometric to the classical age, there were many kinds of prestige-enhancing behaviour. Each city favoured specific strategies, which were constantly renewed. In my book, I studied six categories of behaviour involving a wide variety of social arenas, from sanctuary to necropolis, and from birth to death via marriage. Raising one's rank was an obsession for the Greeks. Since status had to be performed and constantly re-negotiated, and since it mostly depended on public esteem which had to be constantly built up, the result of these dynamics was intense social mobility. Of course, there were privileged people who inherited land and status from their fathers, but there was no safeguard against social decline. Some sons of aristocrats never achieved high position in the city. On the other hand, there were what we may call *homines novi*, 'new men' without famous ancestors or a large patrimony, who achieved a respectable position in society. The elite was permanently being shaped and re-shaped. From one generation to another, some of its members lost their prestige and privileged position, while others rose by successfully deploying new social strategies. There was no closed 'aristocratic' group in ancient Greece, and access to elite status remained fundamentally open to all enterprising individuals.

Here, I will complement this general outline with an analysis of one specific category of status-related behaviour: gentilician strategies.

### **False aristocratic gentilician structures**

First, I must stress that the whole aristocratic gentilician structure that once was attributed to archaic societies has been widely criticised for more than thirty years and revealed as a historiographical chimera. For many historians, the existence of a nobility, well defined and protected by specific criteria, is an essential feature of archaic society. Greek political thought never used the word *aristokratia* for a social class, only for a specific type of constitution, but modern historians have nevertheless assimilated the archaic aristocracy to a kind of *Ancien Régime* nobility. The *genos*, defined as an extended family, has long been regarded as the core structure of this nobility. Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges and Eduard Meyer theorised this social structure at the end of the nineteenth century, modelling it on the better-documented examples of the Roman *gens* and medieval lordship.<sup>9</sup> The *genos* was thought to be a group of families who worshipped a common ancestor. The members of the *gene* occupied a prominent position in the social structure and held all political, military, and religious offices in archaic cities until several reforms eventually deprived them of all their privileges. This gentilician conception of aristocratic leadership enjoyed great success among historians during most of the twentieth century.

The slow decline of the gentilician city-state was identified as the dominant social and political dynamic of the archaic period.

In 1976, however, two French historians, Félix Bourriot and Denis Roussel, concurred in demolishing the whole theory.<sup>10</sup> They each convincingly demonstrated that the social features once attributed to the *genos* and the privileges reportedly granted to its members never existed in the archaic period. The *genos* as conceived by nineteenth-century historians is not attested by any ancient Greek source, but is a historiographical construction based on later Greek or Roman evidence with a regressive methodology. Fustel de Coulanges and Meyer were wrong to postulate that the *genos* was once a dominant social structure which had been progressively deprived of all its attributes. Of course the *genos* existed in archaic and classical Greece but the word never had the meaning attributed to it by so many modern historians. It mostly concerns groups which possess a technical skill, often in the cultic sphere, such as the Eumolpidai, the Krokonidai or the Kerykes to whom belong religious offices in Eleusis. But their members were not necessarily aristocrats, since their priestly duties were mostly humble. From the fourth century on it also happened that prominent families, formerly known as simple *oikoi*, were retrospectively given the name of *genē*. But if we want to understand something of the archaic social structure, the loose meaning of the late classical and Hellenistic period should not be applied to the archaic period.<sup>11</sup>

For thirty years historians have welcomed Bourriot's and Roussel's thesis, but have found it difficult to build on their insights and reinterpret the whole archaic social structure.<sup>12</sup> Ways of thinking about Greek aristocracy have nevertheless changed forever. It is now clear that there was no gentilician barrier in the social structure of Greek cities that would have protected 'noble families' from social decline or prevented the rise of others. If the former elites experienced bitterness, like Theognis of Megara, their laments were useless to the preservation of any supposed gentilician order.<sup>13</sup> In no way were archaic cities ruled by a nobility.

In addition, I have recently offered a general reinterpretation of all names ending in *-ides* and *-ades* (pl. in *-idai* and *-adai*) in the archaic and classical periods, with specific reference to the case of the Athenian Eupatridai.<sup>14</sup> These names are indeed commonly thought to indicate the existence of an ancestral Greek nobility: the Alcmeonidai, Peisistratidai, Philaidai of Athens, the Bacchiadai in Corinth, the Basilidai of Ephesos and Erythrai, the Penthilidai of Lesbos, and so forth. Although we generally know no more about these groups than their name, they have been credited with all the typical features of aristocracies. There are about 3,000 names ending in *-ides* and *-ades* in Greek literature and inscriptions.

Among them, only a very small number actually concerns lineages (such as the Alcmeonidai). The majority of them belong to other categories, which have nothing to do with aristocracy: patronymics, personal names, toponyms, sub-ethnics and names of professional associations. According to this analysis, the Eupatridai of Athens are not the old Athenian nobility, whose members were holders of all public offices before the time of Solon – which is Plutarch's definition. They were rather the members of a political group of opponents to Peistratos and his sons, active at the end of the sixth century, who were known as 'defenders of the fatherland' and whose descendants were proud to commemorate their fathers' deeds in this way.<sup>15</sup>

This brings me to my main point: *eugeneia*, that is nobility of birth, is of course not a genetic legacy, and was never conceived of as such in ancient Greece. As it appears in most of our sources, it is a constructed quality to which some people pretended. Similarly, Jonathan Hall has demonstrated that ethnicity was never thought of in antiquity as a genetic feature of a population, but was a discursive and behavioural construct.<sup>16</sup> In ancient Greece, gentilician strategies were thus aimed at stating and at creating this nobility of birth.

We must in fact distinguish between two different strategies: on the one hand *genealogical* behaviour which uses the family past to influence present social structure, and on the other hand *dynastic* behaviour which tries to project present status into the future and to ensure its continuity. Both retrospective and prospective strategies are important aspects of the gentilician system constructed by the Greeks.

### **Basic genealogical strategies**

Genealogical strategies are powerful tools for building or asserting one's position in society. Three of the most common genealogical strategies, as detailed in my book, are pretending to *eugeneia*, citing a genealogy, and erecting an image of an ancestor. They all concern the quality of one's ancestry. Let me present them briefly.<sup>17</sup>

#### *Pretending to eugeneia*

'To be *eugenēs*, *gennaios*, *diogenēs*, *eupatōr*, *esthlos*' or sometimes simply 'to be *agathos*' were ways of describing noble birth. Such epithets were not frequent in archaic Greece. They mainly occur during the classical period, that is during a time when aristocrats are supposed – according to the general view – to have been deprived of political power. According to Walter Donlan, this phenomenon can be explained as a defensive strategy by noblemen who stressed an inborn quality that common people would

never have.<sup>18</sup> By emphasising this ancestral quality, noblemen justified the preservation of their position at the head of the city. According to Donlan, this genetic legacy had been so self-evident in the early archaic period that there was no need to mention it. The *e silentio* argument is that the near-absence of gentilician pretensions in Archaic Greece implies the existence of a nobility. This is skewed reasoning.

I would argue that *eugeneia* was commonly claimed by enterprising people in both archaic and classical Greece. But we must recognise that this supposed quality also had many critics, not confined to fifth- and fourth-century democrats. Even in archaic cities there were detractors of noble birth. If *eugeneia* was for Theognis of Megara an essential quality now threatened by wealth, it was on the contrary a useless claim for Callinos of Ephesos (fr. 1 West) and Phocylides of Miletos (fr. 3 West), who strongly preferred bravery on the battlefield or rhetorical skill in the Assembly. This debate was still alive in classical Greece: the essential qualities of a citizen were a matter of continuous discussion among poets, philosophers, historians, tragedians and orators. *Eugeneia* never gained the status of an exclusive distinguishing criterion. It remained a contested pretension, which could help raise one's rank but was never strong enough to protect anyone from downward mobility.

#### *Citing a genealogy*

One of the most efficient gentilician strategies has always been the stating of a genealogy. At the end of the sixth and during the fifth century professional genealogists promoted the first genealogies of mortal men: among them Hecataios of Miletos, Acousilaos of Argos, Pherecydes of Athens and Hellanicos of Lesbos were the most prominent. For example, at the request of Cimon, Pherecydes (*FGrHist* 3 F 2) stated that the lineage of Miltiades the Elder went back to the Salaminian hero Philaios. This pedigree was directly relevant to Cimon's social and political propaganda. Such genealogies became so common during the classical period that Plato soon mocked all those people who 'pride themselves on a list of twenty-five ancestors and trace their pedigree back to Heracles' (*Theaet.* 175a).

Modern prosopography normally uses these lists to construct family trees.<sup>19</sup> However, an ancient genealogy has nothing in common with a modern register of births, marriages and deaths. Ancient genealogies were not aimed at recording the past with accuracy, but at aggregating the name and renown of famous ancestors, whether they were real, mythical or even false. Discrepancies with the genetic reality – when the latter is known – are seldom unintentional or randomly constructed. They generally serve specific purposes or needs, such as replacing an embarrassing ancestor by

a more glorious man. For example, since the Philaidai were suspected of tyranny in early fifth-century Athens, they conveniently substituted in their pedigree Cypselos, Miltiades' real father as we know from Herodotos (6.34), with Hippocleides, his cousin. Cypselos was probably the grandson of the Corinthian tyrant, whereas Hippocleides was archon when the Panathenaic festival was reorganised. The latter certainly was a much more convenient ancestor than the former in democratic Athens.<sup>20</sup> Genetic accuracy is not to be sought in this kind of document. In sum, genealogies are not evidence of actual long lines of descent, but they are evidence that claiming high birth was useful in asserting a high social position.

#### *Erecting an image of an ancestor*

According to the generally-accepted definition of the concept, the portrayal of likenesses of individuals begins in Greek art during the fifth century, both in sculpture and painting. Some images were made during the lifetime of the individual portrayed and sometimes commissioned by himself. Others were posthumous portraits commissioned by a son or a grandson.<sup>21</sup> Putting up an image of one's father therefore serves the same purpose as citing a genealogy: it is a means of presenting oneself as the heir of a famous ancestor.

Cimon commissioned two images of his father Miltiades the Younger, victor of the battle of Marathon: the first was a painting in the Stoa Poikile in the Athenian Agora, the second a bronze statuary group by Phidias erected in Delphi. In Athens Miltiades had to share the 'front cover' with the polemarch Callimachos, who died on the battlefield, and Cynegeiros, Aischylos' brother, who had his hand cut off by the Persians. In Delphi, by contrast, Miltiades was associated with the familial heroes Philaios and Theseus and, in the absence of other *Marathōnomachoi*, he alone was praised for the victory. Of course Cimon directly benefited from this familial strategy.<sup>22</sup>

In the early fourth century the successful *stratēgos* Conon was the first Athenian to be honoured by the city with a bronze statue since Harmodios and Aristogeiton (cf. Demosthenes 20.70 ; 23.196). His statue was erected in the Agora in front of the Stoa of Zeus. Some time later his son Timotheos also obtained from the Athenians a bronze image, which was set up beside his father's. Cornelius Nepos (*Timoth.* 2.3) states that for the first time in Athens a father and a son were honoured side by side, adding that 'the new statue of the son, placed close by, revived old memories of the father' (*sic iuxta posita recens filii veterem patris renovavit memoriam*). No doubt Timotheos insisted that his fellow citizens should make this connection.<sup>23</sup>

The juxtaposition of a new image with an older monument in order to compose and present a family group is also a commonplace of Greek athletic statuary. Several monuments in Olympia were erected by athletes and their sons, each victorious in successive Olympiads. Some of them eventually gained the status of a genealogical monument through successive dedications by father, sons and grandsons. Other statue-groups were end-of-the-line commissions by a dedicator who proudly commemorated a series of victorious ancestors.<sup>24</sup> Both mechanisms were probably at work in the monument of the so-called Diagoridai (a name coined by Pausanias (4.24.3; 6.6.2) but previously unattested), which represents three generations of Rhodian athletes victorious at Olympia between 464 and 404.<sup>25</sup>

### **Further genealogical strategies**

According to Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1390b), *eugeneia* corresponds to any ‘display’ of ancestors (ἢ δ' εὐγένεια ἐντιμότης προγόνων ἔστιν). There are indeed many ways of mobilizing ancestors for the glory of a progeny. Here I will continue my inquiry with another trilogy of genealogic strategies: recycling a famous personal name, adding a patronymic, and recalling one’s *proxenoi*.

#### *Recycling a famous personal name*

No name was ever randomly chosen. Even Odysseus, who claims to be Nobody (Οὐτίς) when asked by the Cyclops Polyphemos, chose with care. Onomastics has long proved to be a relevant and fruitful auxiliary discipline for the study of ethnic or social groups. Some personal names have a ring of high social status, like the compounds with *-hippos*, *-klēs* or *-kratēs*, which suggest wealth, fame and power.<sup>26</sup> Giving a well-chosen name to a newborn son was both a good omen and a useful tool for the future. If it was the name of an ancestor we enter the field of gentilician strategies.

Herodotos (5.65) stresses that ‘Hippocrates gave his son the name Peisistratos as a remembrance, calling him after Peisistratos the son of Nestor’ for they claimed to be descended from the house of Pylos and Neleus. Similarly he explicitly states that Miltiades the Younger got his name from his step-uncle Miltiades the Elder, oecist of Chersonese (οὕνομα ἔχων ἀπὸ τοῦ οἰκιστέω τῆς Χερσονήσου, 6.103). According to the same historian (6.131), the Athenian lawgiver Cleisthenes was named after his mother’s father (ἔχων τὸ οὕνομα ἀπὸ τοῦ μητροπάτορος), the tyrant from Sicyon, and his own brother had a daughter named after Agariste daughter of Cleisthenes of Sicyon (ἀπὸ τῆς Κλεισθένεος Ἀγαρίστης ἔχουσα τὸ οὕνομα). Thucydides (6.54.6) also notes that Peisistratos son of Hippias was named after his grandfather (τοῦ πάππου ἔχων τούνομα). Last, Pindar (*Isthm.* 7)

remembers that Strepsiadas of Thebes took his name from his uncle on his mother's side (μάτρωΐ θ' ὁμωνύμῳ), who valiantly died on the battlefield but still bolsters the glory of his fellow-citizens.

Of course Greek tradition expects the first-born son to receive the name of his paternal grandfather, and there are many reasons for this, starting with homage and reverence for the elders. But the aforementioned examples clearly show that particular names have a specific value in a family history. Homonymous descendants of famous men were expected not to be inferior to the previous bearers of their name. Such an onomastic strategy is a blatant attempt to force destiny and conveniently recalls the renown of ancestors through their names.

Sarah B. Pomeroy noted this phenomenon in families of artists, whose members practised the same profession and bore the same name(s) over several generations, such as the lineage of the sculptor Praxiteles son of Cephisodotos. If ancient authors generally credited the success of descendants to inherited skill, Pomeroy stressed that 'sometimes people deliberately created a fictitious genealogy. Although they were not related to the famous bearers of the name, they assumed it, or gave it to their children, expecting to enjoy the fame and fortune of the earlier homonymous practitioner'.<sup>27</sup> Through a naming fiction they tried to establish a convenient link with glorious individuals of the past.

#### *Adding a patronymic*

Adding a patronymic to one's name has the primary function of distinguishing homonyms within a large community of male citizens, that is to identify the person as an individual different from everybody else.<sup>28</sup> But the reference to a father, especially if he was famous, is also a very simple and valuable strategy for improving one's status, particularly for young adults who are yet to establish their position in the community.

This interpretation arose from Cleisthenes' reforms or rather from their Aristotelian and modern reading. According to the *Athenaion Politeia* (21.4) the lawgiver wanted membership of a deme to become part of an Athenian citizen's full name, 'in order that they might not call attention to the newly enfranchised citizens by addressing people by their fathers' names' (ἴνα μὴ πατρόθεν προσαγορεύοντες ἐξελέγχωσι τοὺς νεοπολίτας, ἀλλὰ τῶν δήμων ἀναγορεύωσιν). If adding a patronymic could be a means to express citizen status,<sup>29</sup> it also helped to create a hierarchy within the citizen body. That is why patronymics did not consequently vanish in Athenian society. Since Alfred Körte's study we know that fifth-century ostraca mention patronymics as frequently as demotics.<sup>30</sup> And even in the fourth century, when the use of demotics had increased, the most common formula in

epitaphs remained the combination of demotic and patronymic.<sup>31</sup> According to David Whitehead, ‘many Athenians, particularly amongst the upper classes, refused to abandon the patronymics which proclaimed their famous name’.<sup>32</sup> In democratic Athens the choice between demotic and patronymic is thus supposed to be an expression of political values.

Demotics in the strict sense are found only in Attika, Euboea, Rhodes and a few other places. Aside from demotics there are other supplementary names corresponding to other civic subdivisions, for which Mogens H. Hansen has coined the term ‘sub-ethnics’. The significant fact here is that, except for the Athenian demotic, these sub-ethnics are scarcely used as part of the (full) name of citizens. ‘In most Hellenic *poleis* the name of a citizen inside his *polis* seems to have consisted of an *onoma* to which, especially in public documents, was often added a patronymic, but hardly ever a sub-ethnic’, writes Hansen.<sup>33</sup> Consequently the ideological opposition between patronymic and demotic in classical Athens has no meaning in other Greek cities, where mention of the patronymic alone was the norm in the onomastic formula for citizens.

Adding a patronymic to one’s name, though a common feature throughout the Greek world, was not necessarily a neutral act. First of all, it had not always been common. Among dedications, the first occurrence is on the so-called Artemis of Nikandre (c. 630), which remains the only instance in the entire seventh century. In fact, on dedications patronymics did not become common until the second half of the sixth century.<sup>34</sup> Secondly, there are several types of patronymic, some with a higher social profile than others.

The adnominal genitive (Περικλῆς Ξανθίππου) – with all its variations (ό δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνος, ὁ δεῖνα ὁ τοῦ δεῖνος, ὁ δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνος νιός or παῖς, ὁ δεῖνα ὁ τοῦ δεῖνος νιός or παῖς) – is most common in classical Greece. Alongside it, an old patronymic adjective also occurs; it is formed by the addition of a suffix to the idionym. A first suffix, -ιος (sometimes -ειος or -αιος), is traceable in Mycenaean texts and in Homer: Αἴας Τελαμώνιος, Ajax son of Telamon (*Il.* 2.528). It then only survived in Aeolic dialects (Lesbian, Thessalian and Boeotian). A late example is the *sema* of Asclepiades son of Maiandros (Ἀσκληπιάδην Μαιάνδριον), which proudly adds that the deceased had inherited the *aretē* of his father (CEG 666, Amorgos, c. 350). A second suffix, -ίδης or -ίδας (and its variants -ιάδης and -άδης), is commonly used in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. It pertains to heroes, Achaeans or Trojans, and to gods: Πάτροκλός...Μενοιτιάδης, Patroclos son of Menoetios (*Il.* 16.760), Κρονίδης Ζεύς, Zeus son of Cronos (*Il.* 2.375), Ὀρέστης Ἀγαμεμνονίδης, Orestes son of Agamemnon (*Od.* 1.30), and so forth. The more frequently mentioned characters in the Homeric poems are even named simply by

the patronymic adjective used as a substantive and substituted for the idiom: so Achilles is often named Πηλεῖδης. Later, in archaic poetry and classical literature, such names in -ίοντος or -ίδας remain solely associated with gods or heroes. Very few exceptions to this rule are attested. I know only two examples. Theognis, whose gentilician bias is well known, three times addresses Cyrnos by the vocative patronymic Πολυπατῶν, son of Polypaos (25, 57, 191). And there is a Delphic oracle, quoted by Herodotos (5.92ε), which names Κύψελος Ἡετίδης, Cypselos son of Eëtion. The Homeric formula certainly conveys a distinctive attribute, normally absent in a common patronymic.<sup>35</sup>

There are also patronymic circumlocutions and other more complex expressions. The formulae οἱ τοῦ δεῖνος παῖδες (mostly in the Cycladic world and in Miletos) or simply οἱ τοῦ δεῖνος (in the Argolid) sometimes occur in archaic dedications.<sup>36</sup> It pertains to common dedications of brothers, whose personal names are sometimes not even given, τὰ ἀγάλματα τάδε ἀνέθεσαν οἱ Πύθωνος παῖδες το Ἀρχήγο, Θαλῆς καὶ Πασικλῆς καὶ Ἡγήσανδρος καὶ Ἐ[..]ιος καὶ Ἀναξίλεως δεκάτην τοι Ἀπόλονι (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 3a, sixth c.), but simply οἱ Ἀναξιμάνδρο παῖδες το Μανδρομάχ[ο ἀνέ]θεσαν (*SGDI* 5505, c. 600–575), both from Didyma. At the 68th Olympic festival (508), the sons of Pheidolas, himself victorious in the previous Olympiad, won the horse-race, and made an offering with this inscription: ‘The swift Lycos by one victory at the Isthmos and two here crowned the house of the sons of Pheidolas (Φειδώλα παίδων δόμους)’, alluding to both family victories but omitting the names of Pheidolas’ offspring (Pausanias 6.13.9–10). The same formula also appears on the famous cenotaph erected by οἱ Βρέντεω παῖδες for Glaukos the founder of the Thasian colony (*SEG* 14.565, late seventh century). In all these cases the dedicators considered the patronymic a very significant detail, certainly alluding to an illustrious father.

Furthermore, there are several attestations of the grandfather’s name being recorded after the patronymic. If the paponym recorded on some Athenian ostraca – particularly in the case of Megacles son of Hippocrates and grandson of Alcmeonides (Μεγακλες ιηπτοκράτος τάλκμεονίδο or Μεγακλες ιηπτοκράτος το Ἀλκμεον[ίδο]) – aimed at distinguishing homonymous persons with the same personal name and patronymic,<sup>37</sup> such cases are extremely rare. The addition of a paponym generally has the obvious genealogical connotation of celebrating a whole lineage. In the aforementioned examples from Didyma we have in fact dedications by the children of Python son of Archegos and those of Anaximandros son of Mandromachos. In Epidauros we find an offering to Asclepios by the sons of Philomelos, himself son of Milteus (τοι Φιλομέλο το Μιλτέος, *IG IV*<sup>2</sup> 1, 143, c. 500), and in Delos an offering to the local hero Anios by

Therseleides son of Philarchos son of Charmophon (Θερσελείδης Φιλάρχος το Χαρμοφῶντος, *ID* 10, second half of the sixth century). The next step is the recording of a whole genealogy, such as the Chian Heropythos who proudly mentions his fourteen ancestors on his tombstone: ‘Ηροπύθος το Φιλαίο το Μικκύλο το Μανδροκ(λ)έος το Αὐτοσθένεος το Μανδραγόρεω το Ἐρασίω το Ἰπποτίωνος το Ἐκαίδεω το Ἰπποσθένος το Ὀροικλέος το Ἰπποτίωνος το Ἐκάο το Ἐλδίο το Κυπρίο, ‘(Stela) of Heropythos, son of Philaios...’<sup>38</sup> (second quarter of the fifth century).

Finally, one can add to a mere patronymic an adjective or other expression specifying the quality of one’s father in order to enhance still further the value of the genealogical link and thus one’s own renown. For example, the Athenian Alcimachos made this dedication on the Acropolis: Ἀλκιμαχός μ’ ἀνέ{σ}θεκε Διὸς κόρει τόδ’ ἄγαλμα εὐχολέν, ἐσθλο δὲ πατρὸς ἡνὸς Χαιρίονος ἐπεύχεται <ἐ>να[ι], ‘Alkimachos dedicated this statue as an offering to the daughter of Zeus and praises himself for being the son of Chairion, a noble father’ (*IG I<sup>3</sup>* 618, c. 520–510). Even if we have here a common epic formula (e.g. *Od.* 1.115, 2.46, 3.379), there is no doubt that Alkimachos’ pride was significant.<sup>39</sup> Similarly, Socrates alludes to some lost elegy celebrating the fame of the progeny of Ariston: παῖδες Ἀριστώνος, κλεινοῦ θεῖον γένος ἀνδρός, ‘sons of Ariston, whose race from a glorious sire is god-like’ (Plato *Rep.* 2.368a).

### Recalling one’s progonoi

Perhaps the simplest way to use the prestige of one’s ancestors is to recall their glorious deeds. In every family history there are episodes worth being proud of for generations.<sup>40</sup>

In his victory odes Pindar often remembers the principal achievements of his clients’ ancestors, especially when he works for victorious boys who do not enjoy the benefit of a long athletic career. This is true for the young Aristomenes of Aegina who ‘follows in the footsteps of his mother’s brothers’ (*Pyth.* 8.35–37) or for the Thessalian Hippocleas whose ‘heredity has stepped into the footprints of the father’ (*Pyth.* 10.12). In both cases, the victor’s ancestors have already won several panhellenic prizes. Besides athletic prizes, family recollection also concerns civic or military accomplishments. Celebrating the Olympic victory of the Rhodian boxer Diagoras, ‘who knows clearly the sound prophetic wisdom of his good ancestors’ (*OI.* 7.91), Pindar also praises his father Damagetos, ‘a man pleasing to Justice’ (*OI.* 7.17). Similarly, Theaios of Argos benefited from ancestral agonistic glory with at least two victorious ancestors on his mother’s side, but the poet can also remind us that ‘since Castor and his brother Polydeuces came to Pamphaës to receive a hospitable welcome, it is no wonder that it

is innate in their family (ἐγγενὲς) to be good athletes' (*Nem.* 10.49–51), strengthening the link – as incongruous as it may seem to us – between ritual friendship and athletics. Congratulating Megacles of Athens on his victory in the Pythian four-horse chariot race, Pindar does not fail to mention, besides a list of the family's athletic prizes, the investment of the Alcmeonidai in the rebuilding of Apollo's temple (*Pyth.* 7).

In fifth-century Athens Herodotus gathered two illustrious stories told about the Alcmeonidai and introduced them as follows (6.125–30): 'The Alcmeonidai had been men of renown at Athens even in the old days (τὰ ἀνέκαθεν λαμπροί), and from the time of Alcmeon and then Megacles their renown increased (κάρτα λαμπροί)'. The encounter between the Lydian king Croesus and Alcmeon, and the wedding of Agariste, whose hand had been won by Megacles after a one-year contest, are well-known.<sup>41</sup> Most of all, Herodotus takes special care to attach the fame of the Alcmeonidai to Pericles, although linked to them only through his mother (6.131). Maternal ancestors are never forgotten when they can enhance a family prestige. This was also true for Alcibiades the Younger. Inheriting his father's trial, he sought the mercy of the jurors by reminding them of his lineage on his father's and on his mother's side, and of the civic achievements of his ancestors (cf. Isocrates 16.25–31). Thucydides had already written, when presenting Alcibiades son of Cleinias for the first time in his work, that he was 'a man yet young in years for any other Hellenic city, but distinguished by the splendour of his ancestry (ἀξιώματι δὲ προγόνων τιμώμενος)' (5.43.2). Similarly, in the Homeric epics, in order to promote the merits of his opinion, Diomedes balanced his youth with the deeds and the qualities of his ancestors (*Illiad.* 14.113–27). The remembrance of ancestors was a commonplace in fifth- and fourth-century court speeches, even if it had no relationship with the case, as Lysias put it frankly: 'There have been cases, gentlemen of the jury, of persons who, when brought to trial, have appeared to be guilty, but who, on showing forth their ancestors' virtues (τὰς τῶν προγόνων ἀρετάς) and their own benefactions, have obtained your pardon' (30.1). Thus, for example, Andocides appealed for clemency for his role in the profanation of the Mysteries and the mutilation of the Herms: 'I beg you one and all, then, to hold towards me the feelings which you hold towards my ancestors (περὶ τῶν ἐμῶν προγόνων), so that I may have the opportunity of imitating them' (1.141) and further 'for my own forefathers themselves (τῶν προγόνων τῶν ἐμῶν) played no small part in those very exploits to which Athens owed her salvation, and I therefore have the right to expect from you the mercy which you yourself received from the Greeks' (1.143). Recalling one's *progonoi* was thus an obvious strategy for an Athenian litigant.

In death, too, a famous ancestor could make a difference for a common man or woman. A funeral epigram attributed to Simonides (*AP* 13.26) says: ‘I shall mention her: for it is not fitting that the glorious wife of Archenautēs lie here unnamed in death, Xanthippe, great-grandchild (ἀπέκυονος) of Periander who once gave orders to the people of high-towered Corinth where he held sway’. In this case, the husband of the departed mentions his wife’s ancestor to glorify her, but also to praise himself. The recollection of a famous man can also extend to mere friendship or an even more distant relationship. So, for example, Critias claimed that Solon was a friend of his great-grandfather Dropides, who had been praised in the poet’s verses (cf. Plato, *Tim.* 20e; *Charm.* 157e = Solon fr. 22 West). And one of the suitors of Agariste, Laphanes, was proud to recall that his father Euphorion once offered hospitality to the Dioscouroi (cf. Herodotus 6.127).

This remembrance of a glorious family past could also be generic, without recalling a specific ancestor. On a fourth-century bronze tablet dedicated to Zeus in Dodona the Zakynthian Agathon remembers that his family (*γενέα*) had held the proxeny of the Molossians for thirty generations (*γενεάς*).<sup>42</sup> This was certainly an overstatement. But the proxeny nevertheless tended to be granted on a hereditary basis, as a guarantee of stability for both partners: long-term assistance for citizens of the foreign city and renewed honour for the host. Indeed proxeny decrees generally insist on the continuity of the relationship, starting from ancestors (*καὶ νῦν καὶ ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνῳ*) and intended to last into the future.<sup>43</sup> In private matters, too, a family’s continuous fame was a highly prized quality. In Athens, at the beginning of the fourth century, a Callias of Skambonidai, bearing the same name as several famous ancestors, praised himself as ἀγαθὸς ἐκ ἀγαθῶν προγόνων (*CEG* 484). Similarly, at the end of the century, the Cypriot physician Paidan son of Damassagoras claims that ‘his ancestors were famous since the dawn of time, as progeny of the Atreidai, commanders of Greece’, πρόγονοι δ’ ὄνομαστοί ἀπ’ [ἀρχῆς] ἔκγονοι Ἀτρειδῶν Ἐλλάδος ἀγεμόνων (*CEG* 717).

To attach one’s genealogy to the Atreidai was similar to pretending to be members of this lineage. Some names in *-idai* or *-adai* were coined precisely to evoke in one simple, highly effective word the prestige and deeds of a whole ancestry. Indeed, it should be stressed that the few lineages which bear such a name have nothing to do with an ancestral *nobilitas*: in most cases, the generic name is a gentilician strategy building on some ancestor’s name, not an inherited family name denoting a very old and highly prestigious dynasty. This is particularly obvious for the Bouselidai, as they called themselves in the fourth century, that is the

progeny of Bouselos of Oion, an almost unknown citizen of fifth-century Athens (cf. Dem. 43.79).<sup>44</sup> The name does not indicate aristocrats; it is simply a naming strategy, possibly adopted to lend prestige. The same may be true for the famous Alcmeonidai, who apparently began to call themselves by this generic name not before the late sixth or early fifth century (cf. Pindar *Pyth.* 7.2). At this time indeed they exploited the fictitious (because anachronistic) adventure of Alcmeon in Croesus' treasury – which was supposed to have considerably enriched them – in order to counter the charge of dishonest self-enrichment from their commission to reconstruct the temple at Delphi.<sup>45</sup>

The artificial – that is, constructed – quality of these gentilician names becomes evident when the name in *-idai* or *-adai* actually brings together both the paternal and maternal ancestors, when it crosses the line of the patrilineal genealogy. For instance, both Pericles and Alcibiades claimed to have a share in Alcmeonid history. Similarly, Pindar often defines ‘family groups’ by including the victor’s relatives on the mother’s side: Aristomenes of Aegina and his maternal uncles (*ματραδελφούς*) belong to the Midylidai (*Pyth.* 8.35–8); Timasarchos of Aegina, his maternal uncle (*μάτω*) and his forefather (*προπάτωρ*) belong to the Theandridai (*Nem.* 4.71–90); Phylacidas and Pytheas, their father Lampon and his own father Cleonicos, but also their maternal uncle (*μάτως*) Euthymenes, and a certain Themistios, who according to the scholiasts was their maternal grandfather (*πάππος πρὸς μητρός*), belong to the Psalychidai (*Isthm.* 5.55–63, 6.57–69, *Nem.* 5.43–54). This bilateral construction was not peculiar to victorious athletes, for Pindar also applies this schema to epic heroes: Thersander son of Argia, daughter of Adrastus, is counted among the Adrastidai (*OI.* 2.47–49), to whom the tyrant Theron of Akragas, recipient of the second Olympian ode, is also linked. In genealogical strategies, both paternal and maternal ancestors are useful.<sup>46</sup>

### **Dynastic strategies**

Gentilician strategies are not restricted to genealogical behaviours. Of course, the deeds and qualities of the ancestors are at the core of the system of enhancing prestige. But, just as cities tended to ensure the continuity of a proxy relationship by projecting it into the future, people who achieved the position in the community to which they had aspired usually sought to transfer it to their children, in order to spare them the hard work of social climbing. For the Greeks knew that social status does not automatically pass to progeny. Pindar holds that ‘hereditary qualities are like the fruitful fields, which, in alternation, at one time give men yearly sustenance from the plains, and at another time gather strength from repose’ (*Nem.* 6.8–11).

Stressing that deterioration of the race is the norm, Aristotle notes: ‘highly gifted families often degenerate into maniacs’ and ‘those that are stable into fools and dullards’ (*Rhet.* 2.15.3, 1390b), giving as examples the sons of Alcibiades, Cimon and Pericles. A father should thus be concerned with his children’s fate.

Dynastic behaviours are, then, to be distinguished from genealogical practices. If the latter put the emphasis on ancestors in order to promote one’s rank, dynastic strategies are rather ‘processes of social reproduction’ – in Bourdieu’s terminology – intended to maintain at the same level the status of one’s children. This kind of strategy has long been identified in Greek political thought as a characteristic feature of oligarchies. According to Aristotle (*Pol.* 1292b), ‘another variety of oligarchy is when son succeeds father in office’. The same strategy is relevant to everyone who cares about his children’s fate.

According to Adolf Borbein and Brigitte Hintzen-Bohlen, gentilician strategies, both retrospective and prospective, are a characteristic feature of Hellenistic kingdoms.<sup>47</sup> One of the first examples was the family monument commissioned by Philip II of Macedon at Olympia in celebration of his victory at Chaironea. The so-called Philippeion presented gold and ivory statues of Philip, his father Amyntas and mother Eurydice, his wife Olympias, and his son Alexander. The presence of the latter, who would become Philip’s successor, was clearly a dynastic feature, intended to establish the status of Alexander as his legitimate heir. But we are not absolutely sure that the whole family monument was finished before Philip’s death, nor that it was realised exactly according to Philip’s wishes. Alexander could have completed his father’s project and even altered the initial programme, precisely by adding his own image.<sup>48</sup> The dynastic purpose is however absolutely obvious for the family monument dedicated by the Thessalian Daochos in Delphi in the 330s.<sup>49</sup> Besides the statue of Apollo, there were eight figures: the dedicator Daochos, six ancestors, and his son Sisyphos. Six generations in the direct family line (stretching back into the late sixth century), as well as two collateral ancestors, were represented. The military, political and athletic achievements of his ancestors were recalled to stress the status and prestige of Daochos. The addition of his young son, still a boy at the time, was naturally aimed at transmitting to him the glory of his forefathers and at ensuring the future of this dynasty.

Was this gentilician strategy really restricted to the Hellenistic period? Was dynastic behaviour less tempting than the many forms of genealogical behaviour which we have found in pre-Hellenistic Greece? Contrary to the accepted view, there were in fact earlier incarnations of this particular pattern.

Among the most ancient examples are some rich Geometric tombs for children which are, oddly, more lavishly furnished than contemporary adult burials. This signals an emphasis on the progeny, who should have inherited a privileged position in the society if they had not died prematurely. Tomb 168 from Pithekoussai (c. 730–720), best known for containing Nestor's Cup, is the burial of a ten-year-old boy who received an adult funeral and a complete drinking set.<sup>50</sup> And since we know that the so-called Rich Athenian Lady (c. 850) was pregnant,<sup>51</sup> the extraordinary wealth of her burial is perhaps more likely to be related to the (future) child than to the woman.<sup>52</sup> Of course emotions will also have played an important part in motivating these lavish burial customs.

A direct ancestor of the Daochos dedication is the mid-sixth-century ‘-ilarches’ monument in the Heraion of Samos,<sup>53</sup> at least from a dynastic perspective – for there is no genealogical purpose here. This family monument, which is better but inaptly known as the ‘Geneleos group’ after the name of the sculptor, presented six ‘portraits’, each with a name in the nominative: the dedicator -ilarches, his wife Phileia, their three daughters (only two are preserved, Ornithe and Philippe), and their young son (not fully preserved). This is the presentation of an archaic Samian family, with father, mother, and their four children. There may be, of course, a religious purpose to the composition of this group. But the intention to associate the children with the monument and all that it means (including prestige) is obvious.

Fathers and children not infrequently make common dedications in classical Greece as well. Most examples can be identified as a subspecies of the family offerings which have been collected by Christoph Löhr in his most interesting book on *Griechische Familienweihungen* (I will give here, in square brackets, references to his catalogue).<sup>54</sup> The dedicatory inscription of the Nike of Archermos in Delos, although extremely difficult to reconstruct, may be one of the earliest examples: Μικκιά[δης τόδ' ἄγα]λμα καλὸν π[οίησε καὶ] ινιός] Ἀρχερμωσο[φ]ίεστιν ήεκηβώ[λωι ιοχεαίρηι] [h]οι Χῖοι, Μέλανος πατρόιων ἄσ[τυ νέμοντες], ‘Thanks to their skills, Mikkiades and his son Archermos made this fine statue for the Farshooter, men of Chios, who dwell in the fatherland of Melas’ (*CEG* 425, c. 550–530?). This dynasty of Chian sculptors is well known (cf. Pliny *NH* 36.11), and this Nike appears as a common dedication by a father and a son, who praise their family craft. In Delphi, at the end of the sixth century, Philon offered a *dekatē* of himself and his children (δηκάταν αὐτῷ καὶ παιδῶν) [16]. In Delos again, Eupolis dedicated a statue to Artemis in consequence of a vow he and his children collectively made (αὐτὸς καὶ παῖδες εὐχσάμενος) [19]. Similarly, a century later, Antiphilos offered several statues as offerings by

himself and his children (αὐτῷ καὶ παιδῶν δῶρα) [70]. In late fifth-century Eretria, Prexiades and his children (καὶ οἱ παιδεῖς) made an offering to the goddesses Demeter and Persephone [64]. To the same deities and at the same time an offering was consecrated in Catania by a man, his wife and their children (-ιων καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Αριστόντας... καὶ τὰ τέκνα) [65]. As recorded in the Lindian Chronicle for the archaic period, Aretos and his children (καὶ παιδεῖς) once dedicated a crater to the goddess Athena [2], and Amphinomos consecrated the statues of an ox and a calf as a tithe in association with his children (καὶ παιδεῖς) [8]. The formula actually appears on preserved inscriptions from the Lindian sanctuary, such as the offering made by Telestas and his children in the second half of the fourth century [158]. At Athens, the most ancient example seems to be a tithe to Apollo around 500 [18], followed by a small but continuous series during the fifth and the fourth centuries [16, 32, 34, 81, 99]. Finally, in light of these examples, it is most probable that the word γενεά also refers to children in the following late-sixth-century dedication: Αἰσχύλο[δε]ς μ' [ἀνέ]θεκε[ε] Αθηναῖαι τόδ' ἄγαλμα] αὐτὸν καὶ γένεας μν[εμα (IG I<sup>3</sup> 635). In none of these examples are the children individually named. They would nevertheless long benefit from the paternal connection by simply stating their patronymic.

In other instances, the offspring's names are given. From the early-fifth-century Athenian Acropolis, we have the *aparchē* of an unknown man – his name has not been preserved – and his five sons (Epichares, Opholonides, Charinos, Charisios, and ...kles) [25], and another by Metylos and his son Chremes (καὶ Χρέμες οὗντος) [30]. In Ceos in the fourth century, Theotelides associates his five named sons with the dedication [121]. We can deduce it also from the patronymic for Πανοίας Δέξιος καὶ Δέξικλῆς Πανοία (Lindos, c. 400), even if the word παῖς is not explicit [72]. Sometimes the dynastic strategy even extends to a third generation: in Lindos, in the middle of the fourth century, Euphranor, his son Damagetus and the latter's children (καὶ παιδεῖς) offered a tithe to Athena Lindia [123]. At the same time in Athens, Autophilus made an offering to Athena with his children and grandchildren (Αὐτόφιλος καὶ οἱ παιδεῖς καὶ παῖδες παιδῶν ἀνέθεσαν). Since the votive inscription gives the name, patronymic, and demotic of all the dedicators, we can see that Autophilus actually involved his sons and the sons of his daughters, but not the latter themselves [107]. As always, the sons are more important than the daughters, even if through the latter the lineage can also in a way – survive. This is an exact parallel to the recollection of maternal uncles in Pindar. In a few other examples girls are also associated with their father's offering: besides the monument of -ilarches in Samos, we know of a common offering made by Chairigenes and his daughter Eudene (Χαιριγένες καὶ Εὐδένη θυγάτερος) in Eretria, c. 450 [54].

Two early-fourth-century Athenian dedications celebrate the choregic victory of a father and his sons. They belong to memorials for victories at rural Dionysia: Ergasos and his sons Phanomachos and Diognetos [82] at Ikarion, Timosthenes and his sons Meixonides and Kleostratos [90] probably at Aigilia.<sup>55</sup> One wonders: does the collectively dedicated tripod commemorate the successive victories of several individuals or a single common victory?<sup>56</sup> The explanation for shared *chorēgiai* in the demes, which is relatively unusual, may be poverty (Pickard-Cambridge) or family members wishing to share the honour (Whitehead). It may indeed have seemed a fine opportunity to associate one's heirs with the commemoration.

A similar trend could be at work in a fourth-century offering celebrating a victory at the Anthippasia, the Athenian contest in which the ten tribal cavalry units competed in two rival groups (cf. Xenophon, *Eq. Mag.* 3). Demainetos and his sons, Demeas and Demosthenes, all celebrated a victory as phylarchs of Pandionis (φυλαρχοῦντες) [108]. Since members of the same family cannot have simultaneously commanded one and the same tribal unit (cf. *Ath. Pol.* 21.5), the monument (a tripod-base) is generally ascribed to three successive victories.<sup>57</sup> If so, the last one would have brought in the two earlier family victories at the Anthippasia on a common monument commissioned from a famous sculptor – Bryaxis, no less. But why would the father and his first son have waited to celebrate their victory? As we have seen, such family offerings normally develop by addition of new items to an original monument (see above for the Diagoridai or Conon and Timotheos). We should then suppose that this new monument by a famous sculptor stood beside – or even replaced – one or two earlier memorials, traces of which have not survived. An alternative solution may be that the father, a victorious phylarch himself, wanted to associate his two sons with the offering, whether or not they actually had been phylarchs, let alone victorious at the Anthippasia.

Christoph Löhr distinguishes between representations of a group of relatives (*Familiengruppen*), dedications for (the benefit of) relatives (*Weihungen für Verwandte*), and offerings collectively erected by a group of relatives (*von mehreren Verwandten errichtete Anatheme*). Of course a single monument can belong to more than one category. This useful taxonomy does not, however, distinguish between the various dedicators of a family monument: for example, the formulae οἱ τοῦ δεῖνος παῖδες and ὁ δεῖνα καὶ παῖδες both belong to the final category of offerings erected by relatives, but the former denotes a genealogical strategy and the latter a dynastic strategy. This distinction is of course vital to my point for the two types of dedication do not convey the same values.

\* \* \*

Gentilician strategies are a dialogue between the past, present and future of the social group called ‘family’. For analytical purposes it has been useful to distinguish between retrospective and prospective practices. Of course, there is a close connection between the two categories, and some behaviours have a double dimension. For example, giving the grandfather’s name to a newborn son is a tribute to an ancestor as well as a means of using his renown; it then also becomes a useful tool for the future of the boy. In this sense, recycling a famous personal name within the family was both a genealogical and a dynastic behaviour.

The two categories, however, affect the general social structure differently. Genealogical strategies normally generate social mobility by attempting to alter the actual hierarchy. They allow individuals to rise in the hierarchy and substitute for a former elite. It must be stressed that in archaic and classical Greece social mobility was the norm. It generated a ranked social order in which positions were continuously re-negotiated. Dynastic behaviours, by contrast, tend to temper mobility by crystallising the present state of society for the time to come. The latter thus favour the retention of social capital within the same lineage, and consequently lead to the establishment of a much more stratified social order.<sup>58</sup>

This temptation was certainly as old as the Greek city. When Tyrtaeus explains why the warrior who falls among the front ranks on the battlefield will remain immortal, he stresses that ‘his tomb and his children are pointed out among the people, and his children’s children and his line after them’, καὶ παῖδες καὶ πατέρων παῖδες καὶ γένος ἔξοπλοι (fr. 12.29–30 West). This was of course a strong stimulus in Spartan society to demonstrate bravery or even to sacrifice oneself on the battlefield in order to ensure fame and status for one’s progeny. Dynastic strategies remain frequent in classical societies and probably become, as argued by Borbein and Hintzen-Bohlen, even more common in Hellenistic Greece. This general increase of dynastic strategies from the fifth century onwards may therefore denote a more widespread desire to transmit social status to one’s offspring.

Despite their potential to stabilise society by preventing the social decline of one’s heirs, dynastic strategies never succeeded in annihilating Greek social mobility. Hellenistic society may have entered into a process of ‘aristocratization’, but did not achieve a completely stratified social order.<sup>59</sup> The reason may lie in what Nietzsche once thought to be ‘the womb of everything Hellenic’, ‘the eternal source of life for the Hellenic state’: the agonistic mentality. As he saw it, ‘the Greek was unable to bear fame without further struggle, and fortune at the end of the contest’.<sup>60</sup> Gentilician strategies were part of this struggle.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> For example Donlan 1980; Stein-Hölkeskamp 1989; Starr 1992.
- <sup>2</sup> Since Davies 1971 and 1981; for a full discussion of the historiography, see Duplouy 2002, 2005.
- <sup>3</sup> Duplouy 2006.
- <sup>4</sup> Murray 1980, 192–208.
- <sup>5</sup> See, for example, Fisher 1998 on athletic competitions and training in classical Athens.
- <sup>6</sup> Murray 1990, 142.
- <sup>7</sup> Burckhardt 1902, 61–168, 213–19, Burckhardt 1998, 160–213.
- <sup>8</sup> Nietzsche 1973 (unpublished original 1872).
- <sup>9</sup> Fustel de Coulanges 1864; Meyer 1893, 291–320. See also Toepffer 1889 for a list of Attic *genē* (such as the Philaidai or the Alcmeonidai), which has long shaped reconstructions of Athenian history.
- <sup>10</sup> Bourriot 1976; Roussel 1976. See also Humphreys 1982 and Patterson 1998, 5–43.
- <sup>11</sup> On this point, see also the chapter by Lambert in this volume.
- <sup>12</sup> Schneider 1991–1992 recalls the strong objection offered by Marxist historians to a theory denying the reality of class struggles in archaic society.
- <sup>13</sup> See van Wees 2000, which is the only satisfactory reading of Theognis' poems.
- <sup>14</sup> Duplouy 2003; Duplouy 2010.
- <sup>15</sup> For a reaffirmation of the traditional view, see Pierrot in this volume.
- <sup>16</sup> Hall 1997.
- <sup>17</sup> For full details of the following examples, see Duplouy 2006, 37–77.
- <sup>18</sup> Donlan 1973; Donlan 1978.
- <sup>19</sup> For example, Wade-Gery 1952.
- <sup>20</sup> Viviers 1987, 302–6.
- <sup>21</sup> For a historical approach to Greek portraiture, see especially Krumreich 1997.
- <sup>22</sup> For full details, see Duplouy 2007.
- <sup>23</sup> For other examples, see Löhr 2000, 202 ('Erneuerung eines Denkmals'), no. 40, 51, 86.
- <sup>24</sup> See the classic study of Amandry 1957.
- <sup>25</sup> Löhr 2000, no. 68 (Diagoriden), with full bibliography.
- <sup>26</sup> Dubois 2000. In general Bechtel 1917.
- <sup>27</sup> Pomeroy 1997, 154–8 (quotation, 156–7).
- <sup>28</sup> Cf. Hansen and Nielsen 2004, 58–9. I leave out of the discussion the status of women, whose onomastic formula normally refers to a father or a husband; cf. Vestergaard *et al.* 1985.
- <sup>29</sup> See the chapter by Mariaud in this volume.
- <sup>30</sup> Körte 1922, 6–7. See also Lang 1990, 8–9.
- <sup>31</sup> Meyer 1993, 111.
- <sup>32</sup> Whitehead 1986, 69–75 (quotation, 71).
- <sup>33</sup> Hansen 1996 (quotation, 179); Hansen 2004.
- <sup>34</sup> Lazzarini 1976, 65, 170–1.
- <sup>35</sup> Duplouy 2010, 311–15.
- <sup>36</sup> On this formula, Kontoleon 1964, 67–9; Lazzarini 1976, 61, 177; Löhr 2000, 207 ('namenlosen (aber nicht anonymen) Weihungen'). One cannot however infer from

this fact that the worshippers of Ionian sanctuaries in the sixth century are mainly ‘aristocrats’; *contra* Lazzarini 1991, 846 (“frequentazione strettamente aristocratica dei santuari della Ionia Asiatica nel VI secolo”).

<sup>37</sup> General discussion of this case, cf. Duplouy 2010, 326. Megacles’ papponym is not a *hapax* in ostraca; see Siewert 2002, 71 ([—] Gnathonos Echekleous).

<sup>38</sup> Wade-Gery 1952, 8.

<sup>39</sup> For a possible explanation of the pride of Alkimachos, see Duplouy 2003, 11–12.

<sup>40</sup> On the other hand, there are also episodes worth forgetting, while they are remembered by one’s opponents, such as the Kylonian *agos* for the Alcmeonidai, under which Cleisthenes and even Pericles still suffered (cf. Herodotos 5.71; Thucydides 1.126–7). Cf. Jacoby 1949, 186–8; Thomas 1989, 272–81.

<sup>41</sup> For a full exegesis, see Duplouy 1999, 9–16; 2006, 80–5 (with complete bibliography).

<sup>42</sup> Athens, NM 803 (Coll. Carapanos): Carapanos 1878, 39–40; Greifenhagen 1964, 636; Löhr 2000, 197, 204.

<sup>43</sup> Veligianni-Terzi 1997, 228–34. See further the chapter by Sato in this volume.

<sup>44</sup> On this example, Bourriot 1976, 568–9; Roussel 1976, 56.

<sup>45</sup> For a full discussion, Duplouy 2010, 323–4.

<sup>46</sup> See also Wilgaux 2011.

<sup>47</sup> Borbein 1973, 88–90; Hintzen-Bohlen 1990.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Löhr 2000, no. 137.

<sup>49</sup> Jacquemin 1999, no. 391; Löhr 2000, no. 139.

<sup>50</sup> Buchner and Ridgway 1993, 212–23.

<sup>51</sup> Liston and Papadopoulos 2004.

<sup>52</sup> On these examples, see also the chapter by Shepherd in this volume.

<sup>53</sup> Löhr 2000, no. 10 (with bibliography).

<sup>54</sup> To establish a full catalogue, see Lazzarini 1976, 62 and Löhr 2000, 206–12. I leave out of the discussion the few cases of a mother making a dedication with or for her children ( $\bar{\nu}\pi\bar{\epsilon}\rho\ \pi\alpha\bar{\iota}\delta\omega\bar{\nu}$  or  $\bar{\nu}\pi\bar{\epsilon}\rho\ \pi\alpha\bar{\iota}\delta\bar{\delta}\zeta$ ), for this perhaps mainly concerns, apart from religious purposes, the legal status of a widowed woman whose eldest son becomes her guardian; cf. Löhr 2000, no. 27, 47, 63, 83 ( $\bar{\nu}\pi\bar{\epsilon}\rho\ \tau\bar{o}\ \bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\o}\bar{s}$ ), 101, 102, 129, 168.

<sup>55</sup> For other examples of shared *chorégiai* at Ikaria and elsewhere, see A. W. Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 48; Whitehead 1986, 216–7; Wilson 2000, 249.

<sup>56</sup> Löhr 2000.

<sup>57</sup> So Löhr 2000, 92–3 (no. 108). See also Davies 1971, no. 3276 (s.v. Demainetos); Wilson 2000, 49.

<sup>58</sup> On the distinction between ranked and stratified societies, see the chapter by Whitley in this volume. The contrast between the two types of strategy may not be absolute, for genealogical strategies may also simply help to stabilise a position by keeping at a high level investment in diversified social strategies.

<sup>59</sup> On the process of ‘aristocratization’ in Hellenistic Greece, see Hamon 2007.

<sup>60</sup> Nietzsche 1973 (unpublished original 1872).

## Bibliography

Amandry, P.

- 1957 ‘À propos de Polyclète: Statues d’olympioniques et carrière de sculpteurs’, in K. Schauenburg (ed.), *Charites. Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft*, Bonn, 63–87.

Bechtel, F.

- 1917 *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, Halle.

Borbein, A. H.

- 1973 ‘Die griechische Statue des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.’, *JDAI*, 88, 43–212.

Bourriot, F.

- 1976 *Recherches sur la nature du génos. Étude d’histoire sociale athénienne (périodes archaïque et classique)*, Lille.

Buchner, G. and D. Ridgway

- 1993 *Pithecoussai I. La necropoli: Tombe 1–723*, Rome.

Burckhardt, J.

- 1902 *Griechische Kulturgeschichte*. Band IV. *Der hellenische Mensch in seiner zeitlichen Entwicklung*, Berlin.

- 1998 *The Greeks and Greek Civilization*. Translated by Sheila Stern. Edited with an Introduction by Oswyn Murray, London.

Carapanos, C.

- 1878 *Dodone et ses ruines*, Paris.

Davies, J.K.

- 1971 *Athenian Propertied Families. 600–300 BC*, Oxford.

- 1981 *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*, Salem.

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*, Pennsylvania State University, 63–78.

- 1978 ‘Social vocabulary and its relationship to political propaganda in fifth-century Athens’, *QUCC*, 27, 95–111.

- 1980 *The Aristocratic Ideal in Ancient Greece. Attitudes of Superiority from Homer to the End of the Fifth Century BC*, Lawrence. (Second edition 1999.)

Dubois, L.

- 2000 ‘Hippolytos and Lysippos: remarks on some compounds in ‘Ιππο-, -ιππος’, in E. Matthews and S. Hornblower (eds), *Greek Personal Names: Their value as evidence*, Oxford, 41–52.

Duplouy, A.

- 1999 ‘L’utilisation de la figure de Crésus dans l’idéologie aristocratique athénienne. Solon, Alcméon, Miltiade et le dernier roi de Lydie’, *AC*, 68, 1–22.

- 2002 ‘L’aristocratie et la circulation des richesses. Apport de l’histoire économique à la définition des élites grecques’, *RBPb*, 80, 5–24.

- 2003 ‘Les Eupatrides d’Athènes, « nobles défenseurs de leur patrie »’, *CCG* 14, 7–22.

- 2005 ‘Pouvoir ou prestige ? Apports et limites de l’historiographie politique à la définition des élites grecques’, *RBPb*, 83, 5–23.

- 2006 *Le prestige des élites. Recherches sur les modes de reconnaissance sociale en Grèce entre les X<sup>e</sup> et V<sup>e</sup> siècles avant J.-C.*, Paris.
- 2007 ‘Du voisinage à la sphère internationale. Cercles de collectivité et niveaux d’énonciation des modes de reconnaissance sociale dans l’Athènes classique’, in J.-C. Couvenhes and S. Milanezi (eds), *Individus, groupes et politique à Athènes de Solon à Mithridate*, Tours, 35–55.
- 2010 ‘Observations sur l’usage des noms en *-ides* et en *-ades* aux époques archaïque et classique’, in Y. Lafond and L. Capdetrey (eds), *La cité et ses élites. Pratiques et représentations des formes de domination et de contrôle social dans les cités grecques (VIII<sup>e</sup> s. a.C. – I<sup>e</sup> s. p.C.)*, Bordeaux, 307–344.
- Fisher, N.
- 1998 ‘Gymnasia and the democratic values of leisure’, in P. Cartledge, P. Millet and S. von Reden (eds), *Kosmos: Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Classical Athens*, Cambridge, 84–104.
- Fustel de Coulanges, N. D.
- 1864 *La cité antique*, Paris.
- Greifenhagen, A.
- 1964 ‘Hermiae pentelici cum capitibus aenis’, *A4*, col. 628–38.
- Hall, J.M.
- 1997 *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- Hamon, P.
- 2007 ‘Élites dirigeantes et processus d’aristocratisation à l’époque hellénistique’, in H. Fernoux and C. Stein (eds), *Aristocratie antique: modèle et exemplarité sociale*, Dijon, 79–100.
- Hansen, M.H.
- 1996 ‘City-ethnics as evidence for polis identity’, in M. H. Hansen and K. A. Raaflaub (eds), *More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, Stuttgart, 169–96.
- 2004 ‘The use of sub-ethnics as part of the name of a Greek citizen of the classical period: the full name of a Greek citizen’, in T. H. Nielsen (ed.), *Once Again: Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, Stuttgart, 117–29.
- Hansen, M.H. and T.H. Nielsen (eds)
- 2004 *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford.
- Hintzen-Bohlen, B.
- 1990 ‘Die Familiengruppe. Ein Mittel zur Selbstdarstellung hellenistischer Herrscher’, *JDAI*, 105, 129–54.
- Humphreys, S.C.
- 1982 ‘Fustel de Coulanges and the Greek “genos”’, *Sociologia del diritto*, 9, 35–44.
- Jacoby, F.
- 1949 *Atthis. The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford.
- Jacquemin, A.
- 1999 *Offrandes monumentales à Delphes*, Athens.
- Kontoleon, N.M.
- 1964 ‘Archilochos und Paros’, in O. Reverdin (ed.), *Archiloque*, Vandoeuvres-Geneva, 37–73 [*Entretiens Fondation Hardt X*].
- Körte, A.
- 1922 ‘Zum attischen Scherbengericht’, *AM* 47, 1–7.

*Genealogical and dynastic behaviour in Archaic and Classical Greece*

- Krumeich, R.
- 1997 *Bildnisse Griechischer Herrscher und Staatsmänner im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Munich.
- Lang, M. L.
- 1990 *The Athenian Agora XXV. Ostraka*, Princeton.
- Lazzarini, M.-L.
- 1976 *Le formule delle dediche votive nella Grecia arcaica*, Rome.
- 1991 ‘Iscrizioni votive greche’, in G. Bartoloni, G. Colonna and C. Grottanelli (eds), *Anathema. Regime delle offerte e vita dei santuari nel Mediterraneo antico*, Rome.
- Liston, M.A. and J.K. Papadopoulos
- 2004 ‘The “Rich Athenian Lady” was pregnant. The anthropology of a Geometric tomb reconsidered’, *Hesperia*, 73, 7–38.
- Löhr, C.
- 2000 *Griechische Familienverbindungen*, Rahden.
- Meyer, E.
- 1893 *Geschichte des Alterthums*. Zweiter Band. *Geschichte des Abendlandes bis auf die Perserkriege*, Stuttgart.
- Meyer, E.A.
- 1993 ‘Epitaphs and citizenship in classical Athens’, *JHS*, 113, 99–121.
- Murray, O.
- 1980 *Early Greece*, Brighton.
- 1990 ‘The Solonian law of *hubris*’, in P. Cartledge, P. Millet and S. C. Todd (eds), *Nomos: Essays in Athenian Law, Politics and Society*, Cambridge, 139–45.
- Nietzsche, F.
- 1973 ‘Homer’s Wettkampf’, in G. Colli and M. Montinari (eds), *Friedrich Nietzsche. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. III, 2. *Nachgelassene Schriften 1870–1873*, Berlin, 1973, 277–286 (Five Prefaces to Five Unwritten Books: Fifth Preface: Homer’s Contest).
- Patterson, C.B.
- 1998 *The Family in Greek History*, Cambridge.
- Pickard-Cambridge, A. W.
- 1988 *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. Second edition (1968) revised with a new supplement (1988) by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis, Oxford.
- Pomeroy, S.B.
- 1997 *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece. Representations and Realities*, Oxford.
- Roussel, D.
- 1976 *Tribu et cité. Études sur les groupes sociaux dans les cités grecques aux époques archaïque et classique*, Besançon.
- Schneider, T.
- 1991–1992 ‘Félix Bourriots ‘Recherches sur la nature du génos’ und Denis Roussels ‘Tribu et cité’ in der althistorischen Forschung der Jahre 1977–1989’, *Boreas*, 14–15, 15–31.
- Siewert, P. (ed.),
- 2002 *Ostrakismos-Testimonien I. Die Zeugnisse antiker Autoren, der Inschriften und Ostraka über das athenische Scherbengericht aus vorhellenistischer Zeit (487–322 v. Chr.)*, Stuttgart.

*Alain Duplouy*

- Starr, C.G.
- 1992 *The Aristocratic Temper of Greek Civilization*, Oxford.
- Stein-Hölkeskamp, E.
- 1989 *Adelskultur und Polisgesellschaft. Studien zur griechischen Adel in archaischer und klassischer Zeit*, Stuttgart.
- Thomas, R.
- 1989 *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge.
- Toepffer, J.
- 1889 *Attische Genealogie*, Berlin.
- van Wees, H.
- 2000 'Megara's Mafiosi. Timocracy and violence in Theognis', in R. Brock and S. Hodkinson (eds), *Alternatives to Athens. Varieties of Political Organisation and Community in Ancient Greece*, Oxford, 52–67.
- Veligianni-Terzi, C.
- 1997 *Wertbegriffe in den attischen Ehrendekreten der Klassischen Zeit*, Stuttgart.
- Vestergaard, T. et al.
- 1985 'A typology of the women recorded on gravestones from Attica', *AJAH*, 10, 178–90.
- Viviers, D.
- 1987 'Historiographie et propagande politique au V<sup>e</sup> siècle a.n.è.: les Philaïdes et la Chersonèse de Thrace', *RFIC*, 115, 288–313.
- Wade-Gery, H. T.
- 1952 *The Poet of the Iliad*, Cambridge.
- Whitehead, D.
- 1986 *The Demes of Attica, 508–7–ca. 250 BC. A Political and Social Study*, Princeton.
- Wilgaux, J.
- 2011 'Les groupes de parenté en Grèce ancienne: l'exemple athénien', in P. Bonte, E. Porquieres, I. Gené and J. Wilgaux (eds), *L'argument de la filiation. Aux fondements des sociétés européennes et méditerranéennes*, Paris, 327–348.
- Wilson, P.
- 2000 *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: the Chorus, the City and the Stage*. Cambridge.