**Genealogical data in MANTO**

The following ties describe **blood relationships:**

ENTITY is father/mother/grandfather/grandmother/child/son/daughter/grandson/ granddaughter/uncle/aunt/sister/brother/twin of ENTITY

ENTITY is divine father of ENTITY

ENTITY is mother by parthenogenesis of ENTITY

ENTITY is born [from]

**Note:** When we collect data, we don’t try to list all of the various possible reciprocal relationships (i.e. we capture only ‘a, b – is son of – x, y’; we do not add ‘a – is brother of – b’ and ‘x – is mother of – a, b’ and ‘y – is father of – a, b’ etc. These reciprocal relationships can be created by reversals within Nodegoat. The nature of our data means that we most typically use the father/mother/son/daughter ties; we use the other ones rarely – e.g. we record that two agents are sisters only where it is explicitly stated in a passage and we suspect that that information might not (yet) be captured elsewhere (i.e. where they are both listed as daughters of the same parents).

**Note:** We should capture gender as an attribute of agents but haven’t yet done so since this again can be done through reversals (i.e. if ‘a – is son of’ then ‘a – is male’). It’s also quite straightforward to identify gender by the name of the figure. In general, names that end -os, -us, -on, -es or -eus are masculine; names that end -e, -a or -is are feminine.

**Note:** Although passages sometimes specify which sibling is older, we don’t have a ‘is older brother’ (etc) tie. Where this fact is specifically mentioned, we can use the tie ‘is older than’.

The following ties describe **relationships by marriage**:

ENTITY is wife/husband of ENTITY

ENTITY marries ENTITY (i.e. reversal needed: ENTITY is husband/wife of ENTITY)

ENTITY(a) gives in marriage ENTITY(b) to ENTITY(c) (i.e. reversal needed: ENTITY(b) is wife of ENTITY(c)

**Note:** Each of these three different ties is used in relation to different kinds of data in our texts, but for the purposes of genealogical tables, they all convey relationships by marriage.

**Note:** In terms of gender, ‘ENTITY marries ENTITY’ says nothing about the possible gender of each entity. In instances of ‘ENTITY(a) gives in marriage ENTITY(b) to ENTITY(c)’, ENTITY(b) is typically female, ENTITY(c) is typically male, but there might be exceptions.

We also have one tie which captures a relationship by blood that is not otherwise specified:

ENTITY is a descendant of ENTITY

**Biological idiosyncrasies of Greek mythic genealogies**

The Greek mythic storyworld has its own laws of biology. These allow for some births which fall outside the typical ‘one mother + one father = baby’ norm. None of these idiosyncratic situations is terribly common in our corpus, but because there are prominent examples of all of them, and because they are difficult to communicate on conventional family trees, it’s necessary to consider them when working out a language for displaying genealogies in Greek myth.

**1. No parents (*autochthony*)**

Some gods and heroes are said to have emerged from the ground (i.e. they have neither mother nor father). In genealogical terms, an autochthonous ancestor is the first point on a family tree. Sometimes autochthony is paired with a strange or monstrous appearance (e.g. Orion: *Library* 1.4.3 = 1.25; Argos: *Library* 2.1.3 = 2.6). In other contexts, it has political functions: by tracing its origins to an autochthonous ancestor, an historical community is underlining their strong, unbroken connection to the land that they still inhabit (e.g. Pelasgos: *Library* 2.1.1 = 2.2; Cecrops: *Library* 3.14.1 = 3.177). These stories are not common in Greek myth, and they contrast markedly with the typical stories of the origins of cities, in which the founder is an immigrant who arrives from elsewhere.

Ex: **Cecrops**

*Library* 3.14.1 = 3.177: “Cecrops, an *autochthon*, had a body part man, part serpent. He became the first king of Attica and named the land, which had previously been called Acte, Cecropia after himself.”

In our database, this will appear as:

Cecrops - is born by autochthony - at Attica

**2. No parents (Birth from an object / body part)**

In a few cases, strange circumstances mean that gods and heroes are born from objects and body parts. In some instances, an agent essentially has normal parentage, but ends up being born in a strange way. In these instances, the strange circumstances of the birth can probably be ignored in the family tree since they don’t really affect the parentage.

Ex: **Athena**

*Library* 1.3.6 = 1.20: “Zeus slept with Metis […] and when she became pregnant, he swallowed her down quickly […]. When it was time for the birth, Prometheus […] struck Zeus’ head with an ax, and Athena, dressed for battle, sprang up out of his head near the river Triton”

In our database, this will appear as:

Athena – is daughter of – Zeus, Metis

Athena – is born – from Zeus – at River Triton – with the aid of Prometheus

In other instances, the object or body part *is* essentially the parent in that no other ones are mentioned. These probably *do* need to be conveyed in the family tree

Ex: **the Erinyes**

*Library* 1.1.4 = 1.3: “[The Titans] attacked [Ouranos], and Cronos cut off his father’s genitals and threw them into the sea. From the flowing blood the Erinyes were born, Alecto, Tisiphone, and Megaira”

In our database, this will appear as:

The Genitals of Ouranos – is part of – Ouranos

Alecto, Tisiphone, Megaira – is born – from the Genitals of Ouranos

**3. One parent (*parthenogenesis*)**

Some goddesses are said to have given birth to gods or heroes without having had sex with a male god. These are also quite rare; such stories sometimes stress how the child is particularly closely related to his mother, but are sometimes simply required by the mythical tradition (e.g. the goddess was arguing with her husband at the time of the birth; the goddess was a notable virgin).

Ex: **Hephaistos**

*Library* 1.3.5 = 1.19: “Hera bore Hephaistos without sexual intercourse”

In our database, this will appear as:

Hera – is mother by parthenogenesis of – Hephaistos

**Uncertainty and dispute in genealogical knowledge**

In addition to the situations which raise problems of biological possibility, it is very common to find that the genealogical information we have is uncertain, contested, or inconsistent.

**1. Only one parent named**

Sometimes we will only know the identity of the mother or father of a god or hero. We assume in these instances that the birth was biologically normal (i.e. not by parthenogenesis), but that the name of the other parent was simply not recorded. In some cases, the name of the other parent will be supplied from other passages, or other texts; in other cases it will remain unknown.

Ex: **Trojan heroes**

*Epitome* 3.14: “From Phylace [came] Protesilaos son of Iphiclos […]. From the Pheraians [came] Eumelos son of Admetos […]. From the Olizonians [came] Philoctetes son of Poias.”

In our database, this will appear as:

Protesilaos – is son of – Iphiclos

Eumelos – is son of – Admetos

Philoctetes – is son of - Poias

(NB – all of these agents are male)

**3. Three parents named (divine** **father / mortal stepfather pattern)**

This situation is very common. Many heroes are born after their mother has sex with a god (sometimes unknowingly – for the example of Heracles see *Library* 2.61), and so they have in practice two father-figures who are both symbolically important: the god, from whom they inherit a divine lineage, and a mortal stepfather (their mother’s husband) who raises them and from whom they inherit a kingdom, etc. Different ancient authors treat these situations differently. Some describe the god as the ‘real’ father, and the mortal stepfather as the person who raises the hero; others treat the mortal as the real father and either ignore the god’s role, or comment sceptically that the story about divine lineage was a false rumour. We don’t distinguish in the database between these various attitudes to the pattern.

Ex: **Tenes**

*Epitome* 3.23: “Tenes, the son of Cycnos (some say Apollo) and Procleia, was king of this island”

In our database, this will appear as:

Tenes – is son of – Cycnos, Procleia

Apollo – is divine father of – Tenes

**Note:** Where we noticed that a hero has both a mortal stepfather and a divine father during data collection, we used the ‘is divine father of’ tie. However, we typically use the ‘is son / daughter of’ interaction when capturing parentage, which doesn’t distinguish divine fathers specifically. It’s possible that this will make instances of the ‘divine father / mortal stepfather’ pattern quite difficult to spot in the dataset. One solution to this might be to make divinity an attribute of certain agents.

**5. More than two parents captured**

The most common scenario is where there are various different traditions about the parentage of a hero or god. Sometimes two (or more) different sets of parents are encountered in our sources, sometimes the identity of one parent is always the same, but several alternatives are given for the other.

Ex: **Scylla**

*Epitome* 7.20: ‘[Scylla] was the daughter of Crataiis and Trienos or Phorcos’

In our database, this will appear as:

Scylla – is daughter of – Crataiis, Trienos [dispute expressed]

Scylla – is daughter of – Crataiis, Phorcos [dispute expressed]

In the most complex situations, several different kinds of birth (parthenogenesis, autochthony etc) might be posited.

Ex: see the examples of **Orion, Argos, Cecrops, Hephaistos** listed above.

**Note:** We tag data with ‘dispute expressed’ or ‘uncertainty expressed’ to signal where a particular author either gives more than one version of a single piece of information (‘dispute expressed’) or records his uncertainty about the accuracy of a tradition (‘uncertainty expressed’). However, contested information will appear in our dataset and not be labelled in this way if two data contradict each other but these contradictions are not apparent in the text(s) we use to capture that data.

**Other general issues:**

**1. Incest**

There are specific, famous cases of incest in the Greek mythic tradition, most notably involving Oidipous (Oedipus) and his family: *Library* 3.49-56. Another example (involving disputed genealogy) is at *Library* 1.75 = 1.8.5.

We don’t treat instances of incest any differently in our data collection, since they should become obvious from the family data in general. Incest amongst the heroes (i.e. mortals) of Greek myth are not terribly common – when it does occur, it tends to be a theme of the myth (as in the case of Oedipous). Incest involving the gods is different: firstly, the early generations of the gods are incestuous since there isn’t any other way to generate more gods without sex between siblings! Secondly the male Olympian gods (esp. Zeus, Poseidon) are fathers of so many of the heroes that the fact that they will appear several times in a single family’s line is not really problematic.

**2. Legitimate and illegitimate offspring:**

The institution of marriage does exist in the mythic storyworld, and where two agents are explicitly said to be married, we capture that data. That said, just because we have not recorded that ‘x is wife of y’ does not mean that their offspring are to be treated differently – illegitimacy is not stigmatised in general, and the fact of marriage is frequently not mentioned in the source (and so not captured in the data). The facts of \*who\* someone’s parents are is more pertinent than the question of whether this pair were married or not. I think that the data about marriage will be more pertinent to the ‘filecard’ visualisations than to the genealogical tables. This is a long-winded way of saying that I don’t think that marking offspring as legitimate or illegitimate is crucial to the task of creating genealogical tables.

**3. Mortal and immortal generations:**

Our basic way of marking chronology in the mythical storyworld is via generations: i.e. the mythic storyworld does not have dates as such, but only the less granular ‘fact’ of certain heroes being alive at the same time as each other (or before, or after). Thus, the genealogical data that we capture is fundamentally important to our ability to mark time in the mythic storyworld.

The heroes (mortals) live and die as humans do, and so it will be their generations which underpin the idea of heroic time. Equally, uncertainly and dispute about where particular heroes fit into the genealogical tables are markers (often) of uncertainty or dispute about problems of mythic genealogy. (For example, because each city or region had its own mythic genealogies, problems emerge when heroes from one city interact with heroes from another since often the genealogies do not align properly.)

Gods function differently in relation to time. The early chapters of *Library* 1 show that there is a sense of divine ‘generations’ – e.g. a family tree of the gods would have several generations before the generation of Zeus, and then the subsequent one (in which almost all of the Olympian gods are born). But when the gods interact with heroes after that, their interactions don’t mark time in the same way. Thus a god like Zeus can father a hero in any generation, but a hero can only father another hero of the subsequent generation. To make this work in a digital space, it might be necessary to add the attribute of ‘divinity’ to certain gods.

**Note on Apollodorus passages:**

Apollodorus was a Greek writer working in (perhaps) the 2nd century AD. His work, the *Bibliotheca* (the *Library*) comes down to us in two ways. The first three ‘books’ of it (what we call ‘the *Library*’) were transmitted in complete form. The rest of it (what we call ‘the *Epitome*’) survives only in summaries by later (9th – 12th century) authors.

Prose texts from antiquity were divided into ‘books’, which essentially corresponded to the scroll of papyrus they were written on. So, *Library* 1 was the first scroll of papyrus, etc. Our modern convention is to use further subdivisions to precisely identify specific passages within these books. Unfortunately, there are two different ways of identifying passages in the *Library*. (This is why most of the references above are in the form x.xx = x.x.x: I’ve given you both kinds of references.) The translation by Smith & Trzaskoma has book number at the top of the page, then chapter number in bold in the text. In the margins, however, it also references another system in square brackets. This other system is the one we use in the database, because it is the basis for the CTS URN. In its fullest form (e.g. on Scaife viewer) this other system in fact has three numbers for each passage: book, then chapter, then section number. So you should be able to distinguish between the two systems depending on whether two or three numbers appear.

There is only one way of identifying passages in the *Epitome* – i.e. the system used in Smith & Trzaskoma is the same as what you’ll find in the Scaife viewer.