

Attic Inscriptions in UK Collections

Mount Stewart, County Down

Peter Liddel and Polly Low



AIUK
VOLUME

13

2020

MOUNT
STEWART

AIUK Volume 13

Published 2020

AIUK is an *AIO Papers* series

ISSN 2054-6769 (Print)

ISSN 2054-6777 (Online)

AIUK

Attic Inscriptions
in UK Collections

Attic Inscriptions in UK Collections is an open access publication, which means that all content is available without charge to the user or his/her institution. You are allowed to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of the articles in this journal without asking prior permission from either the publisher or the author.



This paper is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International Licence. Original copyright remains with the contributing author and a citation should be made when the article is quoted, used or referred to in another work.



This paper is part of a systematic publication of all the Attic inscriptions in UK collections by **Attic Inscriptions Online** as part of a research project supported by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC): AH/P015069/1.



Arts & Humanities
Research Council

**PRINCIPAL
INVESTIGATOR**

Stephen Lambert

**PROJECT
TEAM**

Peter Liddel
Polly Low
Robert Pitt
Finlay McCourt
Irene Vagionakis

**AIO ADVISORY
BOARD**

Josine Blok
Peter Liddel
Polly Low
Angelos P. Matthaiou
S. Douglas Olson
P.J. Rhodes

For further information see atticinscriptions.com

PREFACE

The estate and house of Mount Stewart (“this villa by the sea”: Tinniswood, 4) adorns a picturesque setting along the east shore of Strangford Lough on the Ards Peninsula in County Down, Northern Ireland, fifteen miles east of Belfast. Mount Stewart has been the home of the Stewart family since the 1740s and was donated to the National Trust in 1976.

The mansion contains a single Greek inscription on stone, which is most likely of Attic provenance. It is, we shall see, a rather remarkable funerary monument, and we tentatively raise the possibility that it might belong to a wealthy family connected to the family history of the orator Demosthenes. In 1995, when its first edition was published by David Whitehead, the Mount Stewart stele (along with the rest of the contents of the house) was still owned by Lady Mairi Bury (1921-2009), the house’s last resident chatelaine. On Lady Mairi’s death in 2009, the contents of the house were accepted by HM Government in lieu of Inheritance Tax and were allocated to the National Trust in 2013. We are very grateful to the family of Lady Mairi’s descendants who continue to live in the house (Lady Rose Lauritzen, Peter Lauritzen, Frederick Lauritzen, Delphine Renaut and their son Alexander) for showing us their home and gardens and for their kind hospitality. The two anonymous readers offered helpful suggestions and comments for which we are grateful. In particular we offer our thanks to Frederick Lauritzen for taking photographs of the inscription. We would also like to acknowledge the valuable contributions of Neil Watt of the National Trust, David Whitehead, Angelos Matthaiou, P.J. Rhodes, Stephen Lambert and other members of the AIO team: Irene Vagionakis, Christopher de Lisle and Robert Pitt.

ABBREVIATIONS

In addition to the abbreviations listed at <https://www.atticinscriptions.com/browse/bysource/> the following abbreviations are used in this volume:

Agora XXXV: J. B. Grossman, *The Athenian Agora. Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume XXXV. Funerary Sculpture* (2013)

Astbury: R. Astbury, “Sir George Cockburn: an Irish Traveller and Collector”, *Classics Ireland* 3, 1996, 1-17

Bailey: F. Bailey, “Transformation and Resurrection”, in *Mount Stewart. National Trust Historic Houses and Collections Annual* (2017), 6-13

Bergemann: J. Bergemann, *Demos und Thanatos: Untersuchungen zum Wertsystem der Polis im Spiegel der attischen Grabreliefs des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. und zur Funktion der gleichzeitigen Grabbauten* (1997)

Bew: J. Bew, *Castlereagh: A Life* (2012)

Chambers: A. Chambers, *The Great Leviathan: The Life of Howe Peter Browne, 2nd Marquess of Sligo 1788-1845* (2017)

Closterman: W. E. Closterman, “Family Ideology and Family History: the Function of Funerary Markers in Classical Attic Peribolos Tombs”, *AJA* 111, 2007, 633-52

Crowther: C. Crowther, “Lord Dufferin’s Grand Tour and the Collection of Greek Inscriptions at Clondeboyne”, *Journal of Ancient Civilisations* 9, 1994, 14–32

Daehner: J. Daehner, *Grenzen der Nacktheit: Studien zum nackten männlichen Körper in der griechischen Plastik des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr* (2006)

Dunlop and Hartwell: W. M. Dunlop and B. N. Hartwell, “The Catalogue of the Archaeological Museum at the Queen’s University, Belfast, compiled by K.T. Frost in 1910”, *Ulster Journal of Archaeology* 63, 2000, 130-37

Ellis: H. R. Ellis, *The Elgin and Phigaleian Marbles of the Classical Ages, in the British Museum*, 2 vols. (1833-46)

Eustace: K. Eustace, *Canova Ideal Heads* (1997)

Garland: R. Garland, “A First Catalogue of Attic *Peribolos* Tombs”, *ABSA* 77, 1982, 125-76

Goodall: J. Goodall, “Mount Stewart, Co Down: How an Ambitious Restoration Transformed one of Northern Ireland’s Most Important Country Houses”, *Country Life*, 12th January, 2020

Grossman: J. B. Grossman, *Greek Funerary Sculpture: A Catalogue of the Collections at the Getty Villa* (2006)

Guilding: R. Guilding, *Owning the Past: Why the English Collected Antique Sculpture, 1640-1840* (2004)

Himmelman: J. Himmelman, *Ideale Nacktheit in der griechischen Kunst* (1990)

Hurwit: J. Hurwit, “The Problem with Dexileos: Heroic and Other Nudities in Greek Art”, *AJA* 111, 2007, 35-60

- Hussey: C. Hussey, “Mount Stewart. A Seat of the Marquess of Londonderry, KG”, *Country Life*, 5th and 12th October 1935, 356-62 and 380-86
- Jackson-Stops: G. Jackson-Stops, “Mount Stewart. A Property of the National Trust”, *Country Life*, 6th and 13th March 1980, 646-49 and 754-58
- Jackson-Stops and Montgomery Hyde: G. Jackson-Stops and H. Montgomery Hyde, *Mount Stewart, County Down* (1978)
- Johns: C. M. S. Johns, *Antonio Canova and the Politics of Patronage in Revolutionary and Napoleonic Europe* (1998)
- Lauritzen: P. Lauritzen, “The Marquesses of Londonderry at Mount Stewart”, in *Mount Stewart. National Trust Historic Houses and Collections Annual* (2017), 14-20
- Leigh: M. Leigh, *From Polypragmon to Curiosus: Ancient Concepts of Curious and Meddlesome Behaviour* (2013)
- MacDowell: D. M. MacDowell, *Demosthenes, Speeches 27-38* (2004)
- Marchiandi: D. Marchiandi, *I periboli funerari nell’Attica classica: lo specchio di una “borghesia”* (2011)
- Memoirs: Memoirs and Correspondence of Viscount Castlereagh, Second Marquess of Londonderry*. Volume 1 (1848)
- Michaelis: A. Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain* (1882)
- Oswald: A. Oswald, “Great London Mansions, Londonderry House, Park Lane. The Town House of the Marquess of Londonderry”, *Country Life*, 10th July 1937, 38-44
- Pologiorgi: M. I. Pologiorgi, “Παρατηρήσεις για την επανεπεξεργασία και την επαναχρησιμοποίηση αττικών επιτύμβιων στηλών,” *Arch. Delt.* 54 (1999) A [2003] 173-214
- Potten: E. Potten, ““...*The library whereof the librarian is deceit*”: Decoration and Double Meaning at Mount Stewart”, in *Mount Stewart. National Trust Historic Houses and Collections Annual* (2017), 48-55
- Prousis: T. C. Prousis, *Lord Strangford at the Sublime Porte (1821): The Eastern Crisis* (2010)
- Report: Report from the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Earl of Elgin's Collection of Sculptured Marbles; &c* (1816)
- Rigsby, *Asyilia*: K. J. Rigsby, *Asyilia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (1996)
- Robu: A. Robu, “Contribution à l’épigraphie mégarienne: les tablettes funéraires inscrites,” in D. Knoepfler, A. Robu, J. Bîrzescu, A. Avram, eds., *Megarika. Nouvelles recherches sur Mégare et les cités mégariennes de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin. Archéologie, épigraphie, histoire. Actes du colloque international de Mangalia, 8-12 juillet 2012* (2016), 333-75
- Rowell and Burchard: C. Rowell and W. Burchard, “The Congress of Vienna and its Legacy in the Londonderry Collection at Mount Stewart”, in *Mount Stewart. National Trust Historic Houses and Collections Annual* (2017), 21-29
- St Clair: W. St Clair, *Lord Elgin and the Marbles* (1998)
- Schmaltz and Salta: B. Schmaltz and M. Salta, “Zur Weiter- und Wiederverwendung attischer Grabreliefs klassischer Zeit”, *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 118, 2004, 49-203
- Stanford: W. B. Stanford, *Ireland and the Classical Tradition* (1976)

Stanford and Finopoulos: W. B. Stanford and E. J. Finopoulos, *The Travels of Lord Charlemont in Greece & Turkey 1749 from his own Unpublished Journals* (1984)

Threatte: L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*. 2 vols. (1980-96)

Thullier: J. Thullier, “La nudité athlétique (grèce, etrurie, rome)”, *Nikephoros* 1, 1988, 29-48

Tinniswood: A. Tinniswood, *Mount Stewart* (2018)

Whitehead, “Castlereagh”: D. Whitehead, “Castlereagh, Captain Hamilton and General Cockburn: an Ancient Greek (?) Tombstone in County Down”, *Hermathena* 159, 1995, 5-13

Whitehead, “Greek Tombstone”: D. Whitehead, “An Unpublished Greek (?) Tombstone in Northern Ireland”, *ZPE* 109, 1995, 46-54

Whitehead, “David Ross”: D. Whitehead, “David Ross of Bladensburg: a Nineteenth-Century Ulsterman in the Mediterranean”, *Hermathena* 164, 1998, 89-99

AN ATTIC(?) INSCRIPTION AT MOUNT STEWART (COUNTY DOWN)

The estate at Mount Stewart was acquired by the linen merchant and landowner Alexander Stewart (1700-81) of County Donegal in 1744.¹ The transformation of his dwellings and the gardens was initiated by his son Robert Stewart (1739-1821), who became the 1st Marquess of Londonderry in 1816. His grand scheme for a house led him to commission a design from James Wyatt.² Nothing came of these plans, and the main development of the house in the early nineteenth century proceeded under the direction of the neo-classical architect George Dance and the local builder-architect John Ferguson.³ Ferguson had been involved in the construction between 1783 and 1786 of a banqueting house in the form of a “Temple of the Winds”, which still today offers spectacular views across Strangford Lough. It was designed by James “Athenian” Stuart on the basis of his schematic drawings of the Athenian Tower of the Winds in the *Antiquities of Athens*.⁴ The House was remodelled again by Charles Stewart (1778-1854), the 3rd Marquess, in the 1840s; this refurbishment, including the classically-inspired Central Hall, is associated with the architect William Vitruvius Morrison.⁵

The stele seems to be the sole ancient object in the collections of Mount Stewart. It is currently displayed in the house alongside three eighteenth-century marble busts including Antonio Canova’s (1757-1822) Helen of Troy, a gift of the sculptor (who was the Pope’s emissary in Vienna) to Robert, Viscount Castlereagh (1769-1822), the 2nd Marquess.⁶ But despite his education (he spent a year studying Classics and English at Cambridge⁷) the 2nd Marquess was not a keen collector of antiquities. He was the first of the Londonderrys to hold high office, notably as British Foreign Secretary between 1812 and 1822 during which period he “negotiated the surrender and exile of Napoleon and the Peace of Paris” at the Congress of Vienna (1814-15) at the end of the Napoleonic Wars.⁸ Indeed, the main other signs of interest in classical antiquity at Mount Stewart are associated instead with the 1st Marquess. They consist in (a) the “Temple of Winds” (see above) and (b) the unique set of window shutters decorated with false book-spines, which purport to be those of lost works (such as those of Polemon and Anacharsis) and imaginary books of classical antiquity (for instance Hesiod’s “Heroogony”). Commissioned by the 1st

¹ For an overview of the history of the property, see Hussey; Jackson-Stops; Jackson-Stops and Montgomery Hyde; Goodall; Tinniswood.

² See Goodall. Wyatt was (in the period 1801-11) responsible for the design of the gothic “Sculpture Cloister” created at Wilton House in Wiltshire as a home for the antiquities collection of the Eighth Earl of Pembroke: see Guilding, 295-301. His nephew, Lewis Wyatt, was the architect for the refurbishment of Lyme Hall in Cheshire from 1814: see [AIUK 5 \(Lyme Park\)](#), 2.

³ Tinniswood, 5; Goodall.

⁴ Tinniswood, 6-7; Goodall.

⁵ Tinniswood, 13.

⁶ Lauritzen, 16; see below on the Pope’s gifts. The Helen of Troy bears a Latin inscription on its reverse: “VICCOMITI. CASTELREGHIO. VIRO. PRESTANTISSIMO/ ANTONIVS CANOVA/ FECIT. AC.D.D.” See Eustace, 84-85, cat. no. 4. Another version is at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

⁷ Bew, 28-29.

⁸ Tinniswood, 9; for the political career of Castlereagh, see Bew.

Marquess, they reflect his classical education and an Irish tradition of academic humour.⁹ Indeed, during the 1750s, the 1st Marquess had undertaken the Grand Tour, visiting The Hague, Turin, Florence, Rome, Venice and Paris, associating with James Caulfeild (Lord Charlemont, 1728-99) and other Irish dilettanti;¹⁰ he does not seem, however, to have accompanied Charlemont to Greece or Turkey. There is, therefore, no specific indication which associates the Mount Stewart stele with the life and travels of the 1st Marquess.

This leads us to discuss in more detail the route by which the stone came to Mount Stewart. The question was explored by David Whitehead in his *Hermathena* publication of 1995.¹¹ He drew upon the oral testimony of Lady Mairi, who recalled its discovery by her mother (Lady Edith: 1878-1959) in an attic room in Londonderry House (formerly Holderness House), Park Lane, London.¹² This house was bought by the family in 1819,¹³ and so it seems reasonable to suppose that the inscription arrived there after that date. An early photograph shows the relief “placed on the floor of the Londonderry House gallery”.¹⁴ Londonderry House was demolished in 1962.¹⁵ The Lauritzen family confirm that the stele was on display at Mount Stewart by the middle of the twentieth century, probably at least from the time of the death of the 7th Marquess in 1949; it seems likely, then, that it was brought to Mount Stewart at some point in the first half of the twentieth century, perhaps during its refurbishment in the inter-war period.¹⁶

We are reliant upon conjecture as to how the stone came to Londonderry House. In what follows we explore likely contexts of acquisition in the first half of the nineteenth century, though we cannot rule out a later date. One possibility, suggested by Jackson-Stops and Montgomery Hyde (11) is that it was acquired by “Fighting Charlie”, the 3rd Marquess of Londonderry (1778-1854), a known collector with at least some interest in classical sculpture: he purchased and installed at Londonderry House a statue by Antonio Canova, *Theseus and the Minotaur* (1782).¹⁷

But it is possible that the family may have acquired the stele around the time of, or even before, the purchase of the London house. Indeed, Whitehead proposed that Castlereagh, the 2nd Marquess, was connected with its acquisition. It is said that he received

⁹ Potten, 52; Stanford, 173-75.

¹⁰ See Potten, 52; on Charlemont, see Stanford and Finopoulos *passim*.

¹¹ Whitehead, “Castlereagh”.

¹² Holderness House had originally been designed in the 1760s by James “Athenian” Stewart for Robert Darcy, the 4th Earl of Holderness. See Oswald.

¹³ Bailey, 10.

¹⁴ *Non vidimus*: reported by Rowell and Burchard, 24.

¹⁵ Bailey, 11.

¹⁶ Hussey’s 1935 article on Mount Stewart includes a photograph of the West Staircase beneath which there is visible a panel-shaped white object in a dark frame. Certainty is impossible from the photograph, but this may be the Mount Stewart stele: see Hussey, 359, Plate 8. The stele was not mentioned in Oswald’s 1937 article on Londonderry House nor in H. Montgomery Hyde, *Londonderry House and its Pictures*, 1937. The temporary closure in 2020 of the National Art Library at the time of the Covid-19 crisis meant that we were unable to consult Royal Aero Club, *Londonderry House Inventory*, 1949. On the redecoration and modernisation of Mount Stewart in the inter-war period, see Tinniswood, 23.

¹⁷ Rowell and Bruchard, 24-25; Oswald, 43. It is now in the collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum (A.5-1962).

“presents of considerable value” from Pope Pius VII and “other testimonials of regard” from “the Sovereigns of Europe”¹⁸ in recognition of his role in the August 1815 discussions concerning the “restitution of the works of art collected by the plunder of Europe” from the museums of Paris in the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars.¹⁹ It is just possible that the stele was one of those gifts. Whitehead offers another hypothesis, that Castlereagh may have received the stele as a donation from his political ally Archibald Hamilton Rowan (1751-1834), the heir of Killyleagh Castle (located on the opposite, western, shore of Strangford Lough).²⁰

Castlereagh’s local aristocratic connections indicate other possible routes for the Mount Stewart stele.²¹ One is that it derived from the collection of another Irish peer of the political class, the Marquess of Sligo, Howe Peter Browne (1788-1845); he travelled in the Eastern Mediterranean, encountered Byron in Athens in 1810 and acquired a firman to excavate that summer at a number of sites in Athens, including the slopes of the Acropolis and at another site 200 yards from the city walls on the road to Thebes.²² Sligo’s collection of almost 100 Greek marbles is said to have included sepulchral monuments and a marble bas-relief.²³ He had been acquainted with Castlereagh since boyhood,²⁴ and it is not implausible that he presented this stele as a gift to his old friend. Castlereagh’s diplomatic connections with another Irish peer with an interest in antiquities may possibly also be relevant. Percy Clinton Smyth, sixth Viscount Strangford (1780-1855)²⁵ was ambassador to the Porte at Constantinople between 1820 and 1825 and developed a collection of antiquities, including a number of Attic inscriptions, in his London home.²⁶ Some of Strangford’s collection was sold to the British Museum on his death, but the history of the

¹⁸ *Memoirs*, 62. See also Whitehead, “Castlereagh”, 10-11.

¹⁹ Whitehead, “Castlereagh”, 10. On the repatriation, see St Clair, 223; Johns, 171-93.

²⁰ Archibald Hamilton Rowan’s eldest son, William Rowan Hamilton (1783-1834), a naval commander and philhellene, when posted to the Levant between 1820 and 1832, collected and brought home antiquities from the Aegean area. Most of these went to George Cockburn of Shanganagh Castle (on Cockburn see Astbury) in Co. Dublin, but the family of Hamilton Rowan may have presented this as a gift to the Londonderrys in recognition of their charity and assistance during and in the aftermath of the anti-British revolt of Wolfe Tone in 1798 (Whitehead, “Castlereagh”, 11).

²¹ It is, however, implausible that the acquisition of the Mount Stewart stele has anything to do with the Hellenistic Iasian theatre lists at the nearby Clandeboy House in Co. Down: these were acquired by the 1st Marquess of Dufferin in 1859; see Crowther. One significant collection of Mediterranean antiquities in Northern Ireland, that at the Queen’s University of Belfast, does not include any Greek inscriptions: see Dunlop and Hartwell. Another nineteenth-century Ulsterman with epigraphic interests was David Ross of Bladensburg (1804-1866): see Whitehead, “David Ross”.

²² See [AIUK 4.2 \(BM, Decrees of the Council and Assembly\)](#), 5 and no. 7.

²³ Chambers, 58.

²⁴ Chambers, 42.

²⁵ For diplomatic correspondence between Castlereagh and Strangford, see Prousis, 305, 312; cf. Bew, 531.

²⁶ Michaelis, 161-62. See [AIUK 4.2 \(BM, Decrees of the Council and Assembly\)](#), 4-5 and no. 16. See also [AIUK 4.3B \(BM, Ephebic\)](#), no. 4. Doubt has, however, been cast on Strangford’s claims about the provenance of his inscriptions: he probably never left Constantinople during the time of his ambassadorship. See Rigsby, *Asyilia*, 343-44.

whole collection is poorly documented, and we cannot therefore exclude the outside chance that this was the source of the Mount Stewart *stèle*.

Discussion of the matter with the Lauritzen family points to another possible route of acquisition, in which the diplomat and antiquarian William Richard Hamilton (1777–1859) plays a central role. In 1799 Hamilton was appointed Chief Private Secretary to Thomas Bruce, 7th Earl of Elgin, and was involved in the negotiation of the removal of marbles from the Athenian Acropolis.²⁷ From 1809 to 1822 he was Permanent Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs during the time when Castlereagh was Foreign Secretary; at Paris in 1815 with Castlereagh he had supported Canova's campaign for the repatriation of the Papal collections from Paris.²⁸ In 1816 he had provided evidence to the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Parliament's purchase of the Elgin marbles and recommended that Elgin be offered the sum of £60,800.²⁹ It is possible that the *stèle* found its way from the collection of Elgin to the possession of Castlereagh by way of Hamilton, but the exact lines this transfer might have taken are not traceable.³⁰

The absence of evidence for the acquisition of Mount Stewart *stèle* means that these theories remain no more than speculation. Details aside, the history of the *stèle* is a valuable legacy of the high esteem in which the politically-prominent owner family was held in the early nineteenth century.

²⁷ St Clair, 5, 25-27, 208-9.

²⁸ Canova represented the Pope, Hamilton the British Government: St Clair, 223-24.

²⁹ *Report*, 13, 54-57, 65. Lord Aberdeen proposed the purchase sum of £35,000 that Elgin eventually accepted: see *AIUK* 4.5 (*BM, Dedications*).

³⁰ Ellis, II 107, mentions that some of Elgin's marbles were stolen during winter 1815/16 when they were stored in the court-yard of Burlington House but gives details only of two votives from the *Pnyx* that were lost; cf. *AIUK* 4.5 (*BM, Dedications*).

1 FUNERARY MONUMENT DEPICTING FIVE INDIVIDUALS. NT 1220123. A plaque of white marble with some reddish-brown tinges. The top is smooth and flat; the back is roughly-hewn; the sides are more evenly worked. Five figures are depicted on the front, four carved in high relief, one (the second from the left) in low relief. The first and third figures engage in *dexiosis*, as do the fourth and fifth. The third and fourth figures stand back-to-back. The first figure (-sios) is a seated male with long beard draped in a himation, his raised right forearm clasping that of the third figure; the third figure (Phaino), a mature woman dressed in peplos and mantle, looks down at -sios as she clasps his arm; the smaller, second, figure (Kleno) stands to the left of the seated male; she wears a peplos and seems distracted by a small bird perched on her raised left hand. The fourth figure (Neophron), depicted with a short beard, shakes hands with the fifth and is draped in a himation; facing him is the fifth figure (Onomantos), a young man who is unbearded, naked and athletic in build. Beneath the relief is a rough-dressed area. The bottom corners have been cut away rather unevenly (during antiquity?), to form what appears to be a tenon. It is fixed upon a modern plinth. H. 0.482; w. 0.34-0.387; th. 0.079-0.09. The five inscribed names are cut along the cymation, above the heads of the figures. The letters of the second name are slightly more crowded than those of the other names. Plain lettering characteristic of the 4th cent. BC; splayed sigmas and mu; horizontals of epsilons slope gently downwards. There are traces of guide-lines above and below the letters and possible remains of paint in the letters on the left side. L.h. 0.007-0.010.

Ed. Whitehead, "Greek Tombstone" (*SEG* 46.300).

Cf. Jackson-Stops and Montgomery Hyde, 11; Whitehead, "Castlereagh". Autopsy Liddel 2020. On display, Mount Stewart, Co. Down (Northern Ireland). *Figs.* 1-5.

Ca. 400-350 BC [-¹⁻² -]σῖος. Κλενώ. Φαινώ. Νεόφρων. Ὀνόμαντος.

Relief

-sios. Kleno. Phaino. Neophron. Onomantos.

Though certainty is impossible in the absence of documented provenance, the style of the sculpture, the lettering and the orthography of Kleno are all consistent with an Attic origin for this monument.³¹

The *dexiosis* motif, signifying intimacy, is common on Attic funerary monuments,³² and the relief here preserves two instances of slightly different expressions of it: the two

³¹ Whitehead ("Greek Tombstone", 53; "Castlereagh", 6) is prudently cautious on the subject of provenance.

³² On the significance of *dexiosis*, see *AIUK* 5 (*Lyme Park*), 9-10. The *dexiosis* motif appears outside the epitaphic genre in the relief which appears on the decree concerning relations between Athens and Samos of 403/2 BC (*AIO* 796; *IG* I³ 127; *IG* II² 1; Lawton no. 12) in which Athena and Hera engage in *dexiosis*; on cross-genre links in relief sculpture, see *AIUK* 4.2 (*BM, Decrees of Council and Assembly*), 78 n. 266.

figures on the left clasp each other's forearms whereas those on the right shake hands. In his *editio princeps*, Whitehead's working assumption was, very reasonably, that this object was a funerary monument, but he declined to rule out that it was a part of a votive offering.³³ The tenon beneath the relief panel (see further discussion below) might indicate that it was designed to be mounted upon a pillar-base in the style of votive reliefs (such as the Telemachos relief from the Asklepion: [IG II³ 4, 665](#)).³⁴ However, the absence of deities or individuals posing as devotees, the lack of inscribed formulae suggesting a dedication³⁵ and the character of the scene (with double *dexiosis*) tend to support Whitehead's working assumption, which we follow.

Four of the five names are completely preserved. The first name on the left, however, has lost one or two letters at its beginning. Whitehead observes that the lacuna before ΣΙΟΞ is more compatible with two letters.³⁶ Possibilities suggested by Whitehead include Asios, Aisios, Gesios, Thasios, Iasios, Kasios, Kisios and Lasios.³⁷ Of these, Kasios is the name most commonly attested in Attica (the *Athenian Onomasticon* lists 17 individuals with this name, of whom 16 are Athenians); Aisios (2 known Athenians, both of ca. 400-350 BC and perhaps in fact the same man, see below), Asios (2), Thasios (4), Kisios (1, with a single sigma the result of archaic haplography), Iasios (1, a foreigner from Sinope) would also fit the gap. However, Asios, Gesios, Kasios, and Lasios are all names attested only much later than the fourth-century date of our inscription. Lasios is not attested at all in Athens. Accordingly, while we cannot exclude the possibility of -sios being a name otherwise unattested in Attica, Aisios and Thasios seem the best candidates. Thasios, given that it is attested from the middle of the third century BC, cannot be ruled out, but the date of the inscription and space available favours the restoration [Αἰ]σῖος.³⁸

This tentative reading is suggestive prosopographically given that there is a good possibility that the three certain attestations of this name at Athens all relate to the same member of a prominent family; for Aisios is best known as the brother of Aphobos, controversial co-guardian of Demosthenes and his brothers and their property (Dem. 29.15-16, 55). As Davies noted, this Aisios is identifiable as Aisios the son of Mnesiboulos of Sphettos, victorious *choregos* for the Akamantis and Pandionis tribes in the boys' dithyramb in the Thargelia of 365/4 BC ([IG II³ 4, 480](#); [PA 312 = 314](#); [APF](#) pp. 119-20). Davies noted more cautiously the possibility that it was this same Aisios who is said in Dem. 38.28 to

³³ "Greek Tombstone", 52. At the end of the final footnote of "Castlereagh" Whitehead offered the "intriguing alternative" interpretation that the Mount Stewart stele was a votive reflecting a marriage between Phaino and Neophron: "she bids farewell to her parents, he to his boy beloved (*eromenos*) Onomantos" (Whitehead, "Castlereagh", 13 n. 18).

³⁴ For other Athenian examples of inscribed votive relief tablets bearing tenons, see [IG II³ 4, 1477, 1480, 1483, 1485, 1493](#).

³⁵ It is conceivable that there might have been a dedicatory formula inscribed on the base into which the plaque of the Mount Stewart stele was inserted.

³⁶ David Whitehead observes (personal communication): "2 missing letters is more probable than 1: this because one letter would leave a gap at the beginning of the sequence of names asymmetrically a little larger than the one at its end".

³⁷ "Greek Tombstone", 51 n. 13.

³⁸ We are grateful to Angelos Matthaïou for discussion of this restoration and other onomastic matters.

have lost property to Nausimachos and Xenopeithes following litigation (*PA* 313).³⁹ In favour of the identification is the fact that Aisios in Dem. 38 is mentioned allusively by name only, which perhaps suggests that there was just one well-known individual, notorious for his involvement in property-related litigation, who bore this name in Athens at this time.

Davies describes Aisios as “a partner in some of Aphobos’ manoeuvres ... [who] lacked a strong enough nerve to carry them through” (*APF*, p. 120). According to Demosthenes in his third speech *Against Aphobos*, Aphobos fled to Megara to live as a metic and gave his *synoikia* to Aisios (Dem. 29.3). This is interesting, given the possible regional associations of the name Onomantos (discussed below). Did Aisios’ daughter and her husband deliberately give their son a name which had associations with the north-eastern Peloponnese in general and Megara in particular? The evidence is suggestive, but inconclusive.

The onomastics of the four fully-preserved names are consistent with Attic provenance without definitely implying it. Kleno appears in the form Κλεινώ in Athens as a dedicant at the Asklepieion in 329/8 BC (*IG* II² 1533, l. 26) and at the sanctuary of Artemis Brauronia (*IG* II² [1514, l. 70], 1517, l. 172, 1518, l. 88) and on a fourth-century grave marker (*IG* II² 8939). It appears elsewhere in the Greek world also as Κληνώ. The rendering of the diphthong “ει” with “ε” may well point to an Attic origin.⁴⁰ The name Φαινώ is attested on other fourth-century Attic grave monuments (*IG* II² 10217/18, 12854, 12855) and elsewhere in Greece. Νεόφρων is restored as the mid third-century AD dedicant of a statue-base at Eleusis ([Νεό]φρων: *IG* II² 3706); the name appears on a third-century BC tombstone from Akarnania (*IG* IX 1² 2, 496) and is the name of a fifth-century tragedian.⁴¹ Both recorded instances of Ὀνόμαντος are from the north-east Peloponnese (*IG* V 2, 343; *IG* V 2, 550, ll. 10-11) which might, but does not necessarily, imply a connection between this family and that area of the Greek world and perhaps the Megarid (see above). Indeed, the form Ὀνομάντιος appears as a patronymic of a Corinthian Eumelos on a recently-discovered funerary inscription from Megara (Robu, 347 no. 2). Moreover, an Attic form Ὀνόμαστος is attested in Athenian inscriptions, including a foreigner from Megara at the end of the fifth century BC (*Agora* XVII 544). The absence of patronymics, demotics or ethnics makes closer identifications impossible, though we should always, in such cases, bear in mind that the identity of the deceased could have been clarified on other monuments within the *peribolos* to which the monument belonged.⁴²

Each of the names is inscribed directly above one of the figures and appears to label them. The third and fourth figures stand back-to-back; their configuration perhaps implies the separation of their human engagements. However, the fact that the feet of the third and fourth figures are clearly touching suggests that all the figures belong to a single family group. A perusal of the six monuments depicting five individuals in Clairmont’s *CAT* offers

³⁹ Cf. MacDowell, 205 n. 38: the Aisios of Dem. 38 was “probably the brother of Aphobos who appears in Oration 29. Presumably he had borrowed money from Nausicrates and never repaid it”. Traill notes that each of the three attested Aisioi are “possibly the same” as the other two (*PAA* 114515, 114520, 114525). The *Athenian Onomasticon* identifies the brother of Aphobos with the *choregos* from Sphettos, but lists the Aisios of Dem. 38 as a separate individual.

⁴⁰ Cf. Threatte I, 318-19.

⁴¹ Whitehead, “Greek Tombstone”, 52; Diogenes Laertius 2.134.

⁴² On *periboloi*, see Closterman, Marchiandi; cf. also [AIUK 2 \(BSA\)](#), p. 30.

no straightforward parallels;⁴³ perhaps the closest comparandum in terms of the representation of two distinct engagements is *CAT* 5.650 (no inscription) in which a seated individual is depicted on each of the left and right sides of the scenes: each of them appears to be locked in a gaze with a standing male figure, while a fifth female figure appears to stare into the distance. However, the representation of two separate *dexioseis* is unparalleled. The Mount Stewart stele is, therefore, a unique monument and certainly a bespoke creation. The representation of the individuals deserves comment.

There is a clear attempt to distinguish between the elderly –sios (seated upon a chair with back of the *klismos* type, with long beard, haggard facial features, slightly hunched) and Neophron (with short beard and standing upright as if in the prime of life). Phaino appears as a mature but not elderly woman. The nudity of the young man Onomantos (whose smooth body is that of an athlete) alongside the clothed members of his family is striking: as on other funerary monuments this is best interpreted not so much as heroic nudity as an attempt to emphasise youthful athleticism and virility (and perhaps also unmarried status) at this point in time.⁴⁴ If this reflects Onomantos as he was at his time of death, the impression of premature death adds poignancy to the scene. While Onomantos is represented as someone who spent time in the gymnasium, his engagement in *dexiosis* with Neophron (perhaps his father) alongside other family members illustrates a bond with his family unbroken by death.⁴⁵

Kleno cuts a rather isolated figure. Whereas the four other individuals are engaged in *dexiosis*, her attention seems to be taken up by the bird perched on her raised left hand. Whitehead suggested that her features could be those of an elderly person,⁴⁶ but her face is perhaps not well-defined enough for a secure interpretation. Indeed, her double chin, while interpreted often as a feature of advanced age, could be that of a plump child; moreover, the way that her gaze is taken up by the bird most likely points to immaturity.⁴⁷ Two other aspects of Kleno are striking: first, that she is represented in lower relief than the other figures (we might compare the slave-woman represented on the stele for Epigenes and

⁴³ Clairmont, *CAT* 4, pp. 155-73, with Whitehead, “Greek Tombstone”, 53, adding a further example.

⁴⁴ For discussion of nudity as an idealised presentation of the male physique, “heroic” nudity, athletic nudity, and other interpretations, see Grossman, *Agora* XXXV pp. 41, 44 n. 199; Himmelman; Thullier; Daehner; Hurwit. On *loutrophoroi*, the nudity of a young male may allude to unmarried status: see *AIUK* 3 (*Fitzwilliam*), no. 5, p. 39. Unlike some other male nudes, Onomantos lacks even a himation draped over his shoulder, cf. *IG* II² 12090 = *AIUK* 4 (*BM, Funerary*), forthcoming.

⁴⁵ Nude males are rarely depicted with more than one other family member: other male nudes in funerary monuments include those depicted alone: *Agora* XXXV 85; Clairmont, *CAT* 1.100 (a young male raises his arms presumably during a sporting activity), 1.214 (nude youth with dog), 1.221 (nude youth with strigil), 1.348 (nude youth with dog, strigil and bird). Those alongside another individual include: *CAT* 1.865 (nude boy with other figure), 2.330 (nude youth with nude boy perhaps slave), 2.362a (nude youth with old man), 2.950 (nude young man with mourning child and dog and other figure), 2.954 (nude youth perhaps a slave with other figure), 2.957 (nude older male in *dexiosis* with a clothed female and next to child).

⁴⁶ “Greek Tombstone”, 50.

⁴⁷ Stroud in *SEG* 46.300 takes the view that her image was that of a child. Indeed, as Clairmont (*CAT* 2 p. 135) observes, such birds were attributes “mostly of the unmarried, such as children, youths and maidens”.

Melisto at Lyme Park, [AIUK 5 \[Lyme Park\], no. 2](#)); furthermore, the letters of her name are slightly more tightly packed than those of the others. This may all be part of the original composition – the lettering does not differ from the other names – but we cannot rule out the possibility that the representation and name of Kleno, perhaps a child (or, less likely, a slave), may have been added to the depiction at a later point to the others.⁴⁸

Apart from this, consistency of letter-forms suggests that the personal names were all added at the same time. It is, however, impossible to be certain in this case (as in others) which family members were deceased at the time when the monument was erected.⁴⁹ As already noted, the absence of patronymics or demotics means that the inscription does not help to determine their identity with any certainty. Their depiction in *dexioseis* makes it possible that –sios and Phaino are father and daughter (their relative ages make this plausible); Neophron and Onomantos could be a father-son pairing. Perhaps the touching feet of Phaino and Neophron suggest that they were married. If this is the case, the scene represents three generations of a family at a frozen moment in time: –sios (father of Phaino?), Phaino (daughter of –sios?), Neophron (husband of Phaino and father of Onomantos?), Onomantos (son of Neophron?) with Kleno (daughter of Neophron and Phaino?).⁵⁰ Overall, the stele gives the impression of a comfortably well-off family (on the liturgical status of Aisios, see above) engaged in different activities (old man on *klismos*; child/slave with bird; athletic young man); perhaps a positive representation of domestic *polypragmosyne*.⁵¹

As we have emphasised in previous volumes of *AIUK*, Attic funerary monuments had a specific function in terms of projecting claims to status in relation to inheritance of citizenship and property rights.⁵² It is tempting to speculate that the composition of our monument was intended to convey a specific message in this context, namely that Phaino was the sole heir (*epikleros*) of the *oikos* of –sios, who, lacking male offspring, may have betrothed his daughter to Neophron with a view to securing the passage of his property to his grandson, Onomantos.⁵³ Perhaps Onomantos later died prematurely, which meant that the *oikos* passed to Kleno (perhaps the daughter of Phaino and Neophron) as the next *epikleros*: this would account for the addition of her figure in the space between –sios and Phaino. Such an emphasis on inheritance would seem appropriate for a family who may have been involved in litigation about property and inheritance in the 360s (see above).

⁴⁸ For the modification of classical funerary *stelai* in antiquity, see Pologiori; Schmaltz and Salta.

⁴⁹ See Garland, 130, discussing Kirchner's identification of three methods of inscribing a funerary stele with the names of the dead: successively (one-by-one as they died); prospectively (before they died); retrospectively (after the death of the last-named).

⁵⁰ Other examples of three generations depicted on a single stele include Clairmont, *CAT* 3.172 (no inscription), 3.297a, 3.462a (no inscription), 4.280 (no inscription),

⁵¹ On *polypragmosyne* in Greek culture, see Leigh.

⁵² See [AIUK 3 \(Fitzwilliam\)](#), p. 33. The theme can be traced through our discussions of figurative funerary monuments in the already published [AIUK 5 \(Lyme Park\)](#), nos. 1, 2; [AIUK 6 \(Leeds City Museum\)](#), no. 1; [AIUK 7 \(Chatsworth\)](#), no. 1; [AIUK 8 \(Broomhall\)](#), nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; [AIUK 12 \(Great North Museum\)](#), no. 1; and will also feature in our treatments of funerary monuments in forthcoming volumes of *AIUK*.

⁵³ On *epikleroi* and their betrothal, see [AIUK 5 \(Lyme Park\)](#), p. 11 (with references to scholarly discussion).

As an anonymous reviewer points out to us, the fact that the sculpted figures (-sios and Onomantos) are flush with the sides of the relief panel may indicate that the stone was reshaped or cut down at some point, perhaps after its excavation, with the intention of facilitating its transportation, heightening the aesthetic effect of the relief or preparing it to be framed.⁵⁴ But the absence of any account of its discovery means that any interpretation on these lines must remain speculative.

The tenon at the bottom of the stele, which we believe was cut in antiquity, suggests that this part of monument would have been slotted into supporting column or a base with a recess cut into it.⁵⁵ The fifth-century monument for Pythagoras of Selymbria (*IG I³ 1154*) consisted of a stele bearing just the name of the honorand and a base with a four-line epigram: it is quite possible, then, that our stele's base may have borne another inscribed element. This may reflect considerable material and financial investment in the commemoration of this group of individuals, perhaps within the context of a family *peribolos*. The flat top bears no trace of cuttings for a fitting to be placed above the relief panel.

Whitehead suggested a date for this monument in the second half of the fourth or early third century BC.⁵⁶ The spelling of Kleno (for Kleino) points to a date in the period between 450 and 350 BC,⁵⁷ and the lettering suggests ca. 400–350 BC. The style of sculpture is in tune with this: for instance, the “rolled” hairstyles of Kleno and Phaino are paralleled in other funerary sculpture of the period 375–325 BC.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ For the possibility that the Mount Stewart *stèle* was once mounted in a wooden frame, see above, note 16. Examples of reshaped marbles can be found in the collection of Brocklesby Park: see *AIUK (Brocklesby)* (forthcoming), nos. 1, 2 and 4; no. 4 is currently mounted in a wooden frame. Other inscribed stones in European collections have had their backs sawn off: see, e.g., *IG II² 3669* (now at the Louvre); *IG II² 3838 = AIUK 4.5 (BM, Dedications)*, forthcoming.

⁵⁵ Tenons for bases are found in other funerary markers of the fourth century, e.g. *Agora XXXV 67* of the third quarter of the fourth century BC; Grossman no. 40 of ca. 275 BC.

⁵⁶ “Greek Tombstone”, 50.

⁵⁷ Threatte I, 189, notes that E instead of EI is “already unusual by the decade 360-350”; cf. Threatte I, 299-301.

⁵⁸ Rolled hairstyles of the period 375-325 BC: *Agora XXXV 9, 23, 28, 44, 165, 166, 169, 170, 171, 174, 184*. See also Grossman no. 15 of ca. 340 BC; Bergemann, plates 46-57.



Fig. 1. 1 = NT 1220123. Photograph: Frederick Lauritzen.



Fig. 2. 1 = NT 1220123 (illustrating depth of relief). Photograph: Frederick Lauritzen.



Fig. 3. 1 = NT 1220123 (illustrating depth of relief). Photograph: Frederick Lauritzen.



Fig. 4. 1 = NT 1220123 (detail, left-hand inscription). Photograph: Frederick Lauritzen.



Fig. 5. 1 = NT 1220123 (detail, right-hand inscription). Photograph: Frederick Lauritzen.