

THE OLD TEMPLE TERRACE AT THE ARGIVE HERAEUM AND THE EARLY CULT OF HERA IN THE ARGOLID

(PLATES VII–VIII)

A RECENT article by Dr H. Plommer ('Shadowy Megara', *JHS* xcvi [1977] 75–88) has once again brought to our attention one of the many unresolved architectural problems at the Argive Heraeum—the date of the megalithic terrace on which the archaic temple was built.* This terrace has been variously assigned to the Mycenaean, Geometric and Archaic periods and its role in the foundation of the cult has never been ascertained. In view of this continuing lack of consensus among modern scholars and the murkiness of the history of the origins of the Hera sanctuary, a restatement and re-examination of the evidence are in order. In this article I will first consider the date of the terrace and then attempt to place it in the perspective of early cult activity in the Argolid. This will require a survey of the proposed dates for the terrace and a close look at the remains of the Archaic Hera temple and its stratigraphic and architectural relation to the terrace. An inquiry into the form of the terrace will lead to an explanation of its unique architectural form and to a hypothesis for the reason for its construction. Inspection of the remains and a reconstruction of the original form of other early cult centers, notably Mycenae and Tiryns, will provide a context for understanding the origin and architectural form of the early Heraeum. In conclusion I will suggest that the presence of Mycenaean monuments in the Argolid, more than elsewhere, played a crucial role in the formation and architectural organization of the principal cults.

THE TERRACE: DESCRIPTION AND DATE (FIG. 1, PLATE VIIa,b)

The Heraeum terrace measures 55.80 m by 34.40 m (FIG. 1). In plan it is a long rectangle with a western wing projecting at the rear into the slope of the acropolis. The terrace wall blocks are megalithic slabs of conglomerate ranging in size from 2.80–3.20 m w. to 3.00–6.10 m l. (PLATE VIIa). Similar massive blocks of this stone are still to be found naturally split away from the bedrock at the north-east end of the acropolis, no more than 50 m from the terrace. The blocks employed in the terrace are unworked and of irregular shape, but their top surfaces were sometimes trimmed to receive the hard limestone flagging that forms the terrace surface.

The western half of the southern face of the terrace rests on high ground (PLATE VIIa); the largest blocks were laid down at intervals and smaller ones were placed between. The eastern half (PLATE VIIa) is on lower ground; smaller blocks fill the dip in the bedrock and provide a level surface for the placement of the larger blocks of the upper courses. Only occasionally are small chinking stones evident between the blocks.

The flagstones forming the surface of the terrace are of the hard light-gray to blue limestone that is the principal limestone formation of the Argolid (PLATE VIIb). In thickness they range from 0.30 m to 0.50 m and average 1.00 m by 1.00 ± 0.25 m in surface dimensions. Two layers can be identified throughout, though beyond the western end of the stylobate of the archaic temple of Hera at least three are observable. Some of the blocks there are only 0.20 m thick and of smaller surface dimensions, c. 0.60 × 0.60 m. All of the limestone flagging slabs are of extremely irregular shape and only the top and bottom bedding surfaces are parallel.

* The following article grew out of an analysis of the Argive Heraeum terrace in my unpublished dissertation (see n. 28). A shorter version of the article was presented in Boston at the 81st General Meeting of the AIA, December 1979, and appeared as an abstract in *AJA*

lxxxiv (1980). I wish to thank K. Wright, M. Lang, M. Mellink, B. Ridgway, L. and H. Watrous and M. Dabney for reading the manuscript in draft and making useful suggestions about form and content, as well as for useful references.




FIG. 1. Plan of Old Temple terrace from *AH I*, Pl. viii.

When Tilton first studied the terrace at the turn of the century, he quite naturally understood its massive conglomerate wall blocks as Cyclopean construction of Mycenaean date (PLATE VIIa).¹ Although evidence to the contrary was offered by A. Frickenhaus and W. Müller in 1911,² this was the accepted view until 1937 when C. W. Blegen published the results of his investigations of the prehistoric remains at the site. He tried to establish the date of the wall. Most of his probes were fruitless:

our fourth and fifth holes, however, yielded some Geometric fragments at so great a depth from the surface of the terrace that it seemed to me impossible to believe that they could have reached their place after the building of the wall.³

Thus he concluded that the wall was constructed in the Geometric period.

This date has been questioned by H. Drerup in his chapter in *Archaeologia Homerica* (n. 52) 57–9, because in his estimation the monumentality of the terrace was foreign not only to the architecture of the Geometric period, but also to the locale. He suggested that the pottery recovered from the terrace provided only a *terminus post quem* for its construction and proposed that it was actually built at the time of the erection of the old Hera temple, late in the seventh century B.C.

While reviewing Drerup's work, Plommer rejects both Drerup's interpretation and Blegen's evidence and returns the terrace to Mycenaean times. Despite Blegen's unequivocal statements to the contrary, Plommer believes that the Geometric sherds recovered from inside the terrace 'must have dropped through its chinks' (76). Furthermore, he compares the masonry to the 'wide jointing of the Bronze Age', even though Blegen had pointed out that the

jointing is loose and open . . . very different from that of the compactly articulated Tirynthian and Mycenaean structures, such as the ramp wall above the Grave Circle, with its close jointing and the meticulous packing of small stones in the interstices.⁴

There are, then, three things to consider when reviewing this problem. First is Drerup's contention that the terrace and temple are contemporary. Second and third are Plommer's lack of faith in the excavated evidence and his belief in the similarity of the masonry of the terrace to Mycenaean Cyclopean construction.

We may examine Drerup's proposal first. The primary surface of the terrace is formed by a level of flagging of light gray–blue limestone. Directly atop this flagging rest the remains of the archaic temple, a stylobate *c.* 0.50 m high of a single course of poros limestone blocks (PLATE VIIb). The sides of the stylobate are dressed vertically about 0.20 m down from the upper surface; the remaining 0.25–0.30 m down to the paving was left rough (PLATE VIIb,c).⁵ Such evidence normally indicates that only the upper dressed portion was intended to be visible,⁶ and

¹ E. Tilton in C. Waldstein, *The Argive Heraeum* i (New York 1902) 110. (Hereafter *AH*.)

² A. Frickenhaus and W. Müller, 'Aus der Argolis', *AthMitt* xxxvi (1911) 21–38 and esp. fig. 2, illustrating two sherds said to be of Late Geometric and Early Protocorinthian date (see also A. Frickenhaus, *Tiryns* i [Berlin 1912] 114–20) but they are actually Late Geometric. (Hereafter all Tiryns vols are cited as *Tiryns* i–viii.)

³ C. W. Blegen, *Prosymna* (Cambridge 1937) 19–20.

⁴ Blegen (n. 3) 20.

⁵ See Tilton *AH* i 110. A late date of *c.* 550 B.C. for the temple has been proposed by B. Bergquist, *The Archaic Greek Temenos*, *Skrifter Utgivna av Svenska Inst. i Athen*, 4 xiii (Lund 1967) 19–21. She recognizes that the stylobate of the temple was set into the terrace and on the basis of that hypothesizes an earlier temple built directly on the stylobate. She proposes a mid-sixth century date on the basis of the votive dump of that

period discovered by Caskey and Amandry in 1949 (p. 20) along the eastern slope of the lower terrace. I do not accept this date because of the technical features of the temple discussed below.

⁶ I. Beyer, 'Die grossen Reliefgiebel des alten Athenatempels', *AA* (1977) 53, accepting Tilton's conclusion that the stylobate was completely visible resting as it does on the terrace paving, sees the unworked lower portion of the stylobate as an example of an early masonry style also visible on the north foundation of the Old Athena Temple on the Acropolis. There is, however, no legitimate basis for comparison of this terrace foundation with that of the Heraeum stylobate, nor even with the old Hera temple terrace as Beyer does, for the Old Athena Temple terrace consists of two different masonry styles—the lower courses of roughly worked and coursed Kara limestone blocks with projecting faces and the uppermost of longer, more regularly cut and coursed ashlar of the same stone. At

that the undressed portion of the stylobate lay below floor or ground level. One concludes that at the time of the construction of the temple the flagging of the terrace was covered with earth and that the builders placed the stylobate blocks in a foundation trench dug through the earth to the stone flagging; subsequently they trimmed the sides of the stylobate blocks to floor level. Tilton in fact reported a hard level 'similar in texture and appearance to caked limestone' 0.30 m above the flagging, and this may have represented the remains of the pavement of the temple.⁷ Unfortunately we do not know when the temple was set into this fill because Tilton removed it without recording its content, but the pottery studied from the old temple terrace was largely Geometric and Protocorinthian in date.⁸ In any event it is certain that the construction of the archaic temple followed that of the terrace by some considerable interval of time. The temple's date can only be determined by analysis of its architectural correspondence with other early temples.

The archaic temple at the Argive Heraeum is one of a number of proto-Doric temples in the north-eastern Peloponnesos. Others are the earliest temple of Poseidon at Isthmia and a predecessor of the temple of Apollo at Corinth. Elsewhere are the important remains of the temple of Apollo at Thermon and that of Hera at Olympia.⁹ Only two of these temples are dated securely: that of Hera at Olympia belongs c. 600 B.C.,¹⁰ and the Apollo temple at Thermon belongs to the decades 640–25 B.C.¹¹ The temple at Isthmia has been placed by Broneer in the first half of the seventh century, although a mid-century date is better demonstrated,¹² and the Corinth temple also belongs early in the century, although recent

least in classical times the central portion of the north terrace, abutting the Erechtheion, was covered by earth, for there was the Kekropeion which was entered from the stylobate of the Old Athena Temple. (I wish to thank Dr Judith Binder for examining this terrace for me and clarifying my observations.) Surely the method of dressing the stylobate seen on the Heraeum stylobate is a normal and logical means of dressing the stone down to the intended or actual ground level? The Mycenaean did this regularly for their thresholds and column bases (see K. Müller, *Tiryas* iii 187–8 and C. Nylander, 'Die sogenannte mykenischen Säulenbasen auf der Akropolis von Athen', *Opuscula Atheniensa* iv [1963] 14–45), and it was standard procedure in classical times: see for example the stylobate of the archaic temple of Apollo Daphnephoros at Eretria; P. Auberson, *Eretria: Temple d'Apollon Daphnéphoros* (Bern 1968) 16, photographs 14, 15.

⁷ Tilton *AH* i 110; it is curious that this feature has gone unobserved, particularly since Waldstein concluded at the end of his campaign of 1893 that the stylobate was not visible below its dressed portion: *AH* i 74. The caked limestone layer lay over a 'stratum of black burnt earth matter and charcoal' (Tilton 110); its position 0.30 m above the pavement places it at the juncture of the smoothed and roughened faces of the stylobate making the caked layer an obvious candidate for a floor. This layer was also observed around the temple but, unfortunately, precisely where was not recorded. However, C. Brownson, 'Excavations at the Heraeum of Argos', *AJA* iii (1893) 213–14 and pl. xii, reported that the trenches cut into the terrace surface disclosed a layer of black earth upon dark red soil which he took to be burnt debris from the temple; below this layer at the west and the south he reported discovering slabs of the terrace paving; see also Waldstein, *AH* i 74. Even without these reports, the smoothed sides of the stylobate indicate that it projected above ground or floor level both inside and outside the pteron. Following

Pausanias ii 17.7 (*cf.* Thuc. iv 133) Tilton reported that the archaic temple was burned; there is, however, no archaeological evidence that the caked limestone or the burnt stratum below it represent the remains of that conflagration: see n. 8.

⁸ J. C. Hoppin observed in his contribution to the Heraeum report, 'The Vases and Vase Fragments' *AH* ii 61, that many baskets of material were recovered from the old temple terrace, predominantly of Late Geometric and Protocorinthian date; perhaps these originally came from the ash layer above the paving.

⁹ Isthmia: O. Broneer, *The Temple of Poseidon, Isthmia*, i (Glückstadt 1971) 3–55. Thermon: G. Soteriades, 'Ἀνασκαφαὶ ἐν Θέρμῳ', *ArchEph* (1900), cols 173–4, plan on col. 175. Olympia: A. Mallwitz, 'Das Heraion von Olympia und seine Vorgänger', *JdI* lxxxii (1966) 310–76. Dörpfeld, *Alt-Olympia* i (Berlin 1935) 182, would add the stylobate remains inside the cella of the Athena Alea temple at Tegea on the basis of the moon-shaped cuttings on the rough, archaic looking stylobate within the fourth-century temple; Clemmensen, however, (*Le Sanctuaire d'Alea Athena à Tegée au iv^e Siècle* [Paris 1924] 12–13 and Pls III–IV, VI–VIII) believes they represent the remains of a Byzantine church. The question will remain moot until the site is re-examined.

¹⁰ Mallwitz (n. 9) and *Olympia und seine Bauten* (Munich 1972) 138.

¹¹ H. Payne, 'On the Thermon Metopes', *BSA* xxvii (1925–26) 124–32; L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford 1961) 226, no. 2, which is c. 625 B.C.

¹² Broneer (n. 9) i 55, prefers a date of the first half of the seventh century on the basis of the pottery, the type of roof tile and the marble perirrhanterion. The pottery of course neither indicated a construction nor destruction date in this context; the perirrhanterion and roof tiles cannot be closely dated at present for no examples have been found in well-stratified contexts. J. Ducat,

research has argued for a slightly higher date.¹³ All of these temples have architectural features which can be compared. Where preserved they all had a simple stylobate of a single course of blocks and no paving of the pteron. With the possible exception of the Argive Hera temple (see below) they all had wooden colonnades.

The ratio of the lower diameter of the columns to their interaxial distance is one indication of the early position in the development of the order that these temples shared:

Argive Heraeum (flank)	1:4.375 ¹⁴
(Isthmia [flank])	1:3.217 ¹⁵
Apollo, Thermon (flank)	1:3.91-4.15 ¹⁶
Hera, Olympia (flank)	1:3.75 ¹⁷

These high ratios do not persist after the seventh century when the order became more canonical and monumental.¹⁸

Comparison of the Argive Hera temple to the Isthmia and Corinth examples offers some evidence for a narrower range of dates than these ratios afford. The Isthmia and Corinth temples are recognized as the products of one local group of masons and coroplasts.¹⁹ The temples shared common systems of roofing as well as ashlar masonry technique, which includes a cumbersome arrangement of grooves on the undersurface for setting the ashlar in place, and both temples bore painted decoration on the cella wall. At the Argive Heraeum no tiles or other elements of the superstructure that could be compared to these temples were recovered. There are, however, three technical features observable on the stylobate and among the remains in an adjacent stone pile that may help to fix the position of the temple relative to the others.²⁰ First is the presence of roughly U-shaped bosses visible on the lower projecting edges of many of the stylobate blocks (PLATE VIIa). Their presence in this position was presumably unobtrusive, since, as has been demonstrated above, they would have been below ground level. They represent an obvious advance on the grooves of the Corinthian blocks; presumably they were used to aid

'Perirrhanteria', *BCH* lxxxviii (1964) 585-6, 604, has suggested a stylistic date of 650-40 B.C. for the Isthmia example. We should not imagine the temple to have been erected much before the installation of this central piece of ritual furniture: Broneer 12 points out that the chronological relationship between the perirrhanterion and an iron tripod next to it cannot be established, although he preferred that the tripod, which was not preserved, be the earlier of the two. As there is no secure evidence for its date, the temple will best be dated in consideration of its relationship to earlier and later Greek temples. I believe another indication against a high date for this temple is the close relation of its tiles to those of the early sixth-century temple of Aphaia on Aegina. The latter with their decorative element set at the middle of the edge of the eaves tiles and the lack of a developed antefix on the cover tiles are a direct development of the Isthmia tiles: see E.-L. Schwandner, 'Der ältere Aphaiatempel auf Aegina', *Neue Forschungen in griechischen Heiligtümern*, ed. U. Jantzen (Tübingen 1976) 110-13; cf. E. Buschor, *Tondächer der Akropolis* ii (Berlin 1933), 'Traufziegel II, Stirnziegel I, II', 6-7, 26-9.

¹³ M. C. Roebuck, 'Excavations at Corinth: 1954', *Hesp.* xxiv (1955) 147-53, did not propose a date but left open the possibility of one during Late Protocorinthian on the basis of pottery from the area. H. S. Robinson's recent attempt to place the temple in Late Geometric times is not supported by his stratigraphic observations (see 'Excavations at Corinth: Temple Hill, 1968-1972',

Hesp. xlv [1976] 211-12, 218 and 224-35 and cf. Roebuck 135), and the Early Protocorinthian jug provides a *terminus post quem* for construction: perhaps the building was erected in the first quarter of the seventh century.

¹⁴ P. Amandry, 'Observations sur les monuments de l'Héraion d'Argos', *Hesp.* xxi (1952) 225-6, and n. 14; see also E. Buschor, 'Heraion von Samos: Frühe Bauten', *AthMitt* lv (1930) 11-20, 38, fig. 14 and Beilage II, and G. Gruben, 'Die Südhalle', *AthMitt* lxxii (1957) 52-62.

¹⁵ Broneer (n. 9) i 54.

¹⁶ G. Soteriades (n. 9) 174.

¹⁷ E. Curtius and F. Adler, *Olympia*, plate vol. i, (Berlin 1892), Pl. xviii.

¹⁸ W. B. Dinsmoor, *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*³ (London 1950), 'Chronological list of Greek Temples' 340-1; see also J. J. Coulton, *Ancient Greek Architects at Work* (Ithaca 1977) 37-8.

¹⁹ Coulton (n. 18) ch. 2, and his review of Broneer's publication of the Isthmia temple in *JHS* xcv (1975) 271.

²⁰ The existence of these features was not noticed by Tilton nor remarked upon by Amandry (n. 14) but they are widely known to those who frequent the remains: I was first shown them by Dr C. K. Williams II, in 1972. They have never been published nor has a systematic study of them been made. I note them here for the record.

manipulation of the irregularly shaped blocks. This may have been accomplished by levers rather than by the ropes Broneer believes were used on the Isthmia blocks. These bosses are, however, much different in form and, presumably, in function from the U-shaped channels in ashlar orthostate blocks of the temple of Hera at Olympia.²¹ Second, the blocks of the stylobate have a primitive kind of anathyrosis by which the adjacent faces are cut concavely leaving only the narrow finished edges in contact. Third, a surviving column drum fragment with a diameter of 0.78 m, exactly that of the traces on the stylobate, appears to belong to this temple (PLATE VIII*b*). It has a U-shaped lifting hole in its center upper face; fragments of several other such blocks are visible in the adjacent stone pile. This drum fragment shows no trace of a cutting in its upper surface to receive a wooden post; indeed, the U-shaped lifting cutting prohibits this. Furthermore the drum, although not fluted, has a slight inward inclination which in combination with other similarly cut drums would give a tapering columnar shape. Last of all striations around the exterior face of the drum show that it was probably turned on a lathe (PLATE VIII*c*).²²

The summary evidence of these indications leads to the conclusion that the temple was undoubtedly technically further advanced than the Isthmia and Corinth temples. The presence of the lifting devices brings it into association with the Hera temple at Olympia while the local peculiarities of Thermon offer no points of comparison. How close the date of the Argive Hera temple is to these latter two we cannot tell until a better assessment of the evidence of the single column base can be made. By taking all of the evidence into account we may be justified in proposing a date between the Corinth–Isthmia group and the Thermon–Olympia one, that is in the third quarter of the seventh century B.C. Indeed, we may wonder if this was a daughter of the eponymous temple of Dorus, dedicated to Hera in Argos ‘cum etiamnum non esset symmetriarum ratio nata’ (Vitr. iv 1.3).

The temple, however, certainly was not the earliest shrine building at the Heraeum: the sub-Geometric terracotta model shrine with porch may represent the first building on the terrace, set up shortly after its construction.²³ By how many years did the terrace precede this temple? On the basis of the stratigraphic relation of the two, as analyzed above, and the ceramic remains from the area of the terrace, the answer would be at least 75–100 years, if the terrace were placed in the late eighth century.

But the striking similarity of the terrace to Mycenaean Cyclopean construction which caused Plommer to reject Blegen’s Geometric sherds requires some explanation. Previous discussion of this terrace focused on its ‘Cyclopean’ qualities and their similarity to Mycenaean masonry. The description given at the beginning of this article provides a basis for a more detailed comparison with Mycenaean constructions.

Mycenaean terraces of similar size are best known as platforms for palatial buildings at Gla, Tiryns, Mycenae and Pylos (the Southwestern Building).²⁴ All of these differ substantially in plan and construction from that of the Argive Heraeum. They are never as long as the Argive terrace; instead they are segmented with offsets in the wall face at intervals usually not in excess of 15 m. Because of the offsets Mycenaean terraces are irregular in shape whereas the Heraeum one is rectangular.

The surfaces of the Mycenaean terraces are formed by plastered pavement covering an

²¹ J. J. Coulton, ‘Lifting in Early Greek Architecture’, *JHS* xciv (1974) 1–19, esp. 1–3 and n. 8.

²² Coulton (n. 21) 3, points out such lifting holes for columns at Delphi in the Athena Pronaia and early Apollo temples. The lathe is said to have been introduced for the first time at Samos where it was the invention of Rhoikos for the third Hera temple of the sixth century (Pliny *NH* xxxvi 90); H. Johannes, ‘Die

Säulenbasen vom Heratempel des Rhoikos’, *AthMitt* lxxii (1937) 13–37.

²³ Amandry (n. 14); G. Oikonomos, ‘*Ὁ ἐκ τοῦ Ἀργείου Ἡηραίου πῆλινος οἰκίσκος κατὰ νέαν συμπλήρωσιν*’, *ArchEph* (1931) 1–53.

²⁴ See my article, ‘Mycenaean Palatial Terraces’, *AthMitt* xciv (1980) 59–86.

earth-and-gravel fill,²⁵ whereas the limestone flagging of the Argive terrace must have formed its principal surface.

Nowhere in Mycenaean construction are such massive and irregular blocks employed as those in the Heraeum terrace. The immense block at the west end of the Heraeum terrace (6.10 × 3.00 m, PLATE VIIa) contrasts sharply with the largest known Cyclopean block at the corner of the Third Citadel ramp at Tiryns (c. 3.5 m long by 1 m high). Numerous other blocks of nearly equal magnitude were employed in the Heraeum terrace: 1 to 1.5 m high blocks are not exceptional.

The immensity of these blocks and the irregularity of their placement in the wall face contribute to the almost total lack of coursing in the terrace, to the wide, hollow interstices and to the stacked placement of some of the blocks in the eastern half. In contrast Mycenaean terrace and Cyclopean wall construction is coursed in segments 10–15 m long. Blocks were selected for size and shape to facilitate coursing and fit without requiring shaping or extensive chinking.

The corners of Mycenaean Cyclopean constructions were built up with large regularly shaped blocks, which carried the coursing around the corner as well as strengthened it (PLATE VIII d). They were further reinforced on the interior by extra courses of blocks that substantially thickened the wall.²⁶ At the Argive Heraeum the eastern corner of the terrace does have a large upright block, but it is irregular in shape and its relation to the adjacent block and to the one above it is not close; the corner, therefore, appears less rigid than Mycenaean ones (PLATE VIIa). The western corner is even less well integrated where a number of blocks are stacked together to form the corner. They appear clumsy next to the single massive block east of them, which itself could have been an admirable cornerstone, and the informal appearance of the wall detracts from its monumentality.

On the other hand Mycenaean Cyclopean terraces and circuit walls have a distinct monumental appearance. At Mycenae this even took the form of a masonry style in conglomerate—the same material used at the Heraeum (see below). Comparison of the careful conglomerate coursing used at Mycenae to the casual-appearing work of the Heraeum terrace brings out the differences in style and technique; especially useful for comparison are the carefully worked and irregularly coursed masonry of the walls flanking and forming the Lion and Postern gates, the supporting terrace at the end of the Treasury of Atreus dromos and the roughly coursed slabs and blocks of the bridge at Aghios Georgios.²⁷ That this is a local style which originated and developed over the centuries at Mycenae will be demonstrated below. But the terrace at the Argive Heraeum falls outside this style. At best the Heraeum terrace could be considered an imitation of the Mycenaean.

In the light of this technical and stylistic comparison complementing the archaeological evidence of Blegen's excavation, a Mycenaean date for the Heraeum terrace is unacceptable. A date much later than the end of the Geometric period is excluded by the proposed date for the temple and on the basis of its relation to the terrace. If the two sherds published by Frickenhaus and Müller are now admissible evidence, a Late Geometric date is most likely. As Drerup pointed out, however, the terrace is a stranger to the architecture of the Argolid at this time. Some attempt then must be made to reconcile its unusual form to its late eighth-century date.

²⁵ See especially, G. E. Mylonas, 'Mycenae's Last Century of Greatness', Australian Humanities Research Council, Occasional Paper xiii (1968) 15–17.

²⁶ See examples at Tiryns, Pylos and Gla discussed in my article cited in n. 24.

²⁷ This bridge is often misunderstood as later in date, i.e. Geometric or Hellenistic; this seems primarily due to

a confusion of a reference by Blegen, 'Prosymna: Remains of Post-Mycenaean date', *AJA* xliii (1939) 427–30, to a bridge in the Kastraki ravine slightly west of the Heraeum tholos, which he cleaned and described as part of a renovation activity in the area, perhaps as a part of a renovation of the original Mycenaean road that connected Mycenae with the Heraeum.

HERO AND HERA CULT

Let us begin the explanation of the appearance of this terrace in Late Geometric times by emphasizing (in contrast to our immediately previous comparison) its similarities to Mycenaean Cyclopean construction. Comparison to the special Cyclopean style in conglomerate mentioned above gives rise to the suspicion that the terrace was a conscious imitation of Cyclopean construction.

First we may observe that during the last great phase of building at Mycenae in the thirteenth century a Cyclopean style exclusively employing conglomerate stone was developed. The style had been evolved in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries as an offshoot of tholos tomb construction and was then adapted for the monumental gate constructions of the Lion and Postern Gates and their flanking walls.²⁸ It was also employed for the bridge below Aghios Georgios, the terrace of the Atreus tholos and the Atreus and Klytemnestra facades, all of which further attest the popularity of this style at Mycenae. It was in fact a hallmark of the citadel and was exported to Tiryns for the construction of the Steintor, and to Argos, where a massive conglomerate lintel on the Larissa testifies to the presence of a monumental structure.²⁹ All of these monuments in this style in the environs of Mycenae were visible in Geometric times and were splendid paradigms of the past.³⁰

In his reports of the excavation of the prehistoric tombs at Prosymna, Blegen drew attention to the frequency of Late Geometric deposits in the tombs.³¹ He pointed to the similarity of this material to that from the sanctuary of Hera and argued that its presence in the tombs was not fortuitous but evidence of intentional hero or ancestor worship. He even considered the possibility that this worship had been continuous from the end of the Mycenaean era through the Dark Age.³²

This material has recently been reassessed along with similar finds from other areas of Greece by N. Coldstream. Taking up a position suggested earlier by Farnell,³³ Prof. Coldstream argues for the widespread existence of hero-cults in Homeric times and supplies abundant, well-dated evidence for the establishment of the majority of them in the eighth century B.C. The Prosymna tombs represent one of the focal points of this expression of piety. At the same time, however, pottery and votives of Late Geometric date discovered at the Heraeum site testify to the establishment of the Hera cult. On the basis of the votives from the tombs and the sanctuary, it is impossible to tell which came first, hero cult or Hera cult, but it is apparent that the two were closely linked since types of votives from each are the same: bronze fibulae and straight pins, rings and mesomphalic phialae, terracotta images and spools and various ceramic types.³⁴

²⁸ See my doctoral dissertation, *Mycenaean Masonry Practices and Elements of Construction* (Bryn Mawr 1978) unpublished, pp. 228–36; copies available at the Bryn Mawr College library and the library of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

²⁹ G. Vollgraff, *Mnemos.* lvi (1928) 6.

³⁰ The Klytemnestra tholos apparently received Geometric and Archaic votives (Wace, *BSA* xxv [1921–23] 284, 364, 366) but this cannot be established for the other tholoi at Mycenae because the sherd material may have fallen into the tomb (dromos and tholos) from above (Wace, *passim*). Note, however, that Coldstream, 'Hero-cults in the Age of Homer', *JHS* xcvi (1976) 9, n. 12, has drawn attention to Desborough's identification of a bronze pin of Geometric type from the Bothros of the Treasury of Atreus.

³¹ C. W. Blegen, 'Post-Mycenaean Deposits in Chamber tombs', *ArchEph* c (1937) 377–90.

³² *Ibid.* 390.

³³ N. Coldstream (n. 30) 8–17; see also A. Snodgrass, *The Dark Age of Greece* (Edinburgh 1971) 192–4,

394–401, 429–36.

³⁴ Blegen (n. 31) 377–90; *id.*, *AJA* xliii (1939) 410–14. It is commonly suggested that Hera and hero were in fact related, but linguistic analyses are not entirely convincing, although they deserve serious consideration, particularly in the present context: see W. Pötscher, 'Hera und Heros', *RhM* civ (1961) 302–55. The arguments for their connection are weakest when traced back into Linear B (Pötscher 328–30), particularly when Hera is functionally linked with the 'wanax', as by M. L. West in his commentary on Hesiod, *Works and Days* (Oxford 1978) 370–3 (I wish to thank M. Lang for this reference). But many scholars are agreed that the etymological relation between 'Hera' and 'hero' is likely (Pötscher 328). The religious position of the 'wanax' is not well defined: see the Fr tablets, Ventris and Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*² (Cambridge 1973) 119, 408; J. T. Hooker, 'The Wanax in Linear B Tablets', *Kadmos* xviii (1979) 100–11; E. Bennett's useful warning against the assumption of a priest-king, 'The "Priest King" in Minoan Studies',

Certainly the same persons who worshipped Hera paid reverence in the tombs. In fact the worship at the tombs was in one case probably formalized in a manner similar to that of the sanctuary. About 75 m west of the tholos tomb Blegen uncovered a large terraced platform c. 12.50 × 8.50 m which he considered as an ancillary altar of the Hera sanctuary.³⁵ The altar's proximity to the tholos, however, suggests that it may as well have been designed for worship at the tomb. The votives are Late Geometric through Protocorinthian in date and among them was the famous early seventh-century relief in repoussé of two women, one stabbing the other with a short sword, usually interpreted as Clytemnestra slaying Cassandra.³⁶ Although this subject need have no specific meaning as a votive at this spot, it shows that the heroic myths were alive and would have been iconographically an appropriate offering.

The rise of cults on the basis of heroic legend, with or without the discovery of an ancient tomb, is more forcefully demonstrated by the Agamemnoneion which lay farther west of the Prosymna tholos, just south of Mycenae on the east bank of the Chaos ravine.³⁷ This temenos of the king of Mycenae was founded late in the eighth century and graffiti on pottery secure its identification. Its proximity to the citadel is proof that the legend of the king was firmly fixed in the area, but we do not know why the cult spot was located about a kilometer outside the walls of the citadel; perhaps some story unknown to Pausanias and to us circulated at that time and provided a topographic description of Agamemnon's tomb or place of murder.³⁸ Whatever the reason for these associations, they show that early Greek religious activity in this area was centered around the habitations of heroes and was wont to use the iconography of their legends as a part of the liturgy.

We are told by Homer that Hera was especially associated with the Argolid;³⁹ she became the primary deity of the city of Argos, which administered her cult at the Heraeum,⁴⁰ but she was also worshipped at Mycenae, Tiryns and elsewhere.⁴¹ At Mycenae the nature of the cult is unknown: a single inscription of the early fifth century B.C. from the Perseia fountain house documents the boundaries of some precinct of Hera.⁴² A passing reference in the *Iliad* mentions Mycenae along with Argos and Sparta as a favored city of the goddess (*Il.* iv 51–2). Her cult in the eighth century, however, is not attested and there were few people living at Mycenae at that time.⁴³ None the less there is some evidence of cult activity (usually associated with Athena) at this time at the top of the acropolis; activity which was formalized by the erection of a terrace wall for a temple in the seventh century.⁴⁴

Kret.Chron. xv–xvi (1961–62) 1. 327–35, and C. G. Thomas' review of the religious position of the 'wanax' in 'The Nature of Mycenaean Kingship', *SMEA* xvii (1976) 903–13, with comprehensive bibliography and review of views expressed.

³⁵ Blegen, *AJA* xliii (1939) 412; a black-glaze sherd inscribed to Hera was found in the excavation of the altar.

³⁶ *Ibid.* 415 and fig. 6; K. Schefold, *Frühgriechische Sagenbilder* (Munich 1964) 44–5; cf. H. Bartels, *VIII. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia* (1967) 198–205, Pl. 32c.

³⁷ J. M. Cook, 'The Agamemnoneion', *BSA* xlviii (1953) 30–68; *id.* 'The Cult of Agamemnon at Mycenae', *Geras Ant. Keramopoullou* (Athens 1953) 112–18.

³⁸ Cook, *Geras Keramopoullou* (n. 37) 113.

³⁹ *Iliad* iii 51; iv 908.

⁴⁰ *Thuc.* ii 2; iv 133; see also T. Kelly, *A History of Argos* (Minneapolis 1976) 60 and n. 20 with refs; Waldstein, *AH* i 4–10 with literary refs; and R. Drews, 'Argos and Argives in the *Iliad*', *CPh* lxxiv (1979) 127–35, for a useful discussion of references to Argos and Argives in this period; I wish to thank Professor Drews for bringing this article to my attention.

⁴¹ Nauplia: *Paus.* ii 38.2; see also *Tiryns* i 42–6; R. A. Tomlinson, *Argos and the Argolid* (Ithaca 1972) 203–4; also possibly on the Larissa at Argos where Pausanias (ii 24.1) reports a sanctuary of Hera Akraia—some Geometric material has been recovered from there (A. Roes, 'Fragments de poterie géométrique trouvés sur les citadelles d'Argos', *BCH* lxxvii [1953] 90–104) but cannot be used to certify the existence of a cult there at that time.

⁴² A. G. Woodhead, 'The Boundary Stone from the Perseia Fountain House', *BSA* xlviii (1953) 27–9.

⁴³ R. Hägg, *Die Gräber der Argolis, Boreas* vii. 1 (Uppsala 1974) 64–71, 92–6.

⁴⁴ A. J. B. Wace, 'Mycenae, 1939', *JHS* lix (1939) 210 for the Geometric remains; *id.*, *BSA* xxv (1921–23) 245, for the Protocorinthian date of the fill of the temple terrace. The temple was discovered by Ch. Tsountas, *PAE* 1886, 59–61, and is often ascribed to Athena on the slender evidence of a bronze plaque found in the south-western corner of the area above the palace court: see *IG* iv 492; Jeffery (n. 11) 172 (2), with bibliography. For arguments about the so-called metopes of the seventh-century temple see F. Harl-Schaller, 'Die archaischen "Metopen" aus Mykene', *JÖAI* 1 (1972–3) 94–116.

At Tiryns considerably more about the cult of Hera is known. A cult seems to have been established as early as the mid-eighth century, a date secured on the basis of a votive deposit found in court xxx of the Upper Citadel.⁴⁵ Pausanias (ii 17.5) says that a *xoanon* was dedicated by Peirasos, an early Argive noble.⁴⁶ Here more than anywhere else the worship of Hera can be connected with the Mycenaean citadel and, in fact, with the remains of the Mycenaean palace. Strong arguments can be adduced to show that the cult was consciously placed in the ruins of the main megaron which had been uncovered in the Dark Age, probably in the eighth century B.C.

In 1912 A. Frickenhaus argued that the building within the megaron (FIG. 2) was built in the seventh century B.C. shortly after the megaron, which had stood for some 400 years, burned down.⁴⁷ This argument, although approximately correct regarding the date and function of the building, was seriously flawed, and was effectively countered by C. W. Blegen in an appendix to his publication of Korakou in 1921.⁴⁸ Since then, however, much new evidence has come to light which has clarified the problem, and, in my opinion, the arguments for the reoccupation of the megaron area can now be rephrased as follows:

(1) When the citadel was burned at the end of LH IIIB, the Upper Citadel was abandoned and not reoccupied until historic times. There is virtually no trace of LH IIIC occupation from the Upper Citadel, whereas both the Lower Citadel and the Lower City were occupied in the LH IIIC period.⁴⁹ It is consequently difficult to accept Blegen's argument that the building within the megaron is a reconstruction of the megaron on a less grand scale immediately after its destruction.

(2) That the Upper Citadel was not reinhabited while other areas were may indicate that at least during LH IIIC, and perhaps later, the palace area was held in respect,⁵⁰ although it must be admitted that some more mundane reason for this lack of rehabilitation cannot be excluded. Whatever the case the site remained in abandonment and virtually undisturbed: Schliemann reports that when he began work on the Upper Citadel the walls of the palace were still visible in outline; indeed, he points out that these had been mistakenly assumed by earlier investigators to be Byzantine remains!⁵¹ But in one area the palace remains had been disturbed; the burnt walls of the Great and Small Megara had been cleared at some time in antiquity to the level of the

⁴⁵ *Tiryns* iii 214; P. Grossmann in *Führer durch Tiryns*, ed. U. Jantzen (Athens 1975) 97–9, 159–61. Tiryns: W. Dörpfeld in Schliemann, *Tiryns* (1886; repr. New York 1967) 293–4. A. Frickenhaus, *Tiryns* i 2–25; U. Naumann in Jantzen, *Führer* 126–9.

⁴⁶ See also the testimony of local Argive historians as analyzed by F. Jacoby, 'Io Kallithuessa', *Hermes* lviii (1922) 366–74.

⁴⁷ *Tiryns* i 2–13, 31–41.

⁴⁸ C. W. Blegen, *Korakou* (Cambridge 1921) 130–4.

⁴⁹ P. Alin, *Das Ende der Mykenischen Fundstätten auf dem Griechischen Festland*, SIMA i (1963) 33–4, discusses this problem and lists a few sherds of probable LH IIIC date from Schliemann's excavations (n. 168). He follows Blegen's dating of the building within the megaron and adds the two small wall fragments over corridors Xa, b as well as the cross wall in Room XXI. Excavation since Schliemann has not discovered LH IIIC on the Upper Citadel. The West Wall deposit is LH IIIB:2 at latest and clarifies the destruction date of the citadel—although see W. Voigtländer, *Tiryns* vi 243, who sees this material as dumped fill from the Great Court (II), a conclusion contrary to all the detailed architectural and archaeological analysis of K. Müller (*Tiryns* iii 21–2, 119–27) and countered by F. Schachermeyr (*Die Ägäische Frühzeit* ii: *Die Mykenische Zeit* [Vienna 1976] 123). Schachermeyr, however, goes too

far in the other direction by suggesting that the epichosis is merely Schliemann's dump: see N. Verdelsis, *ArchEph* (1956) 5 and figs 7, 8, or *ADelt* xx.A (1965) pl. 65, which show beyond doubt that the dump and epichosis are independent units lying side by side. E. Slenczka, *Tiryns* vii 156–9, has shown that although pictorial style pottery of LH IIIC date was preserved on the Lower Citadel and City, none was found from the Upper Citadel (see also Schachermeyr 128–9), thus reinforcing the evidence for an abandonment of the Upper Citadel consequent upon its destruction. Alin's contention that the wall fragments in Xa, b and XXI are LH IIIC along with the building in the megaron is not stratigraphically verifiable. Furthermore, those in Xa, b could have been supports for the stairway in those rooms: cf. C. W. Blegen, *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Southwestern Messenia* i (Princeton 1965) 168, where stairway 36 is partially supported by a cross wall. Also the wall in XXI is a part of the stairway, which would hardly have been a necessary construction after the destruction of the palace, cf. *Tiryns* iii 158–9, 209–10.

⁵⁰ Müller, *Tiryns* iii 20, fig. 15, 210 and n. 1, observed that in an upper level at the north side of the outer forecourt were many Mycenaean type votive animals and also some Geometric sherds.

⁵¹ Schliemann (n. 45) 8.

socle. It was upon the east socle of the Great Megaron that the building Frickenhaus calls a temple of Hera was installed. Further clearing occurred in the court in front of the megaron as we shall see below, but first let us examine the architecture of the so-called temple.

(3) This building fits comfortably into the series of rectangular slightly monumentalizing buildings known from many Greek sites dating to the later eighth and into the seventh centuries (FIG. 2).⁵² Although these buildings cannot be closely compared, there having been no established architectural form and plan at this time, they are distinguishable by characteristics which are products of the rubblework tradition from which they derived and which reflect




FIG. 2. Plan of Megaron and Hera Temple, Tiryns, from *Korakou*, Fig. 135.

formalizing impulses in the architecture of the end of the Dark Age. First, in contrast to the earlier ninth and eighth centuries which tended towards apsidal plans, these of the eighth to seventh centuries are rectangular. Second, they are elongated in response to demands for a larger, more formal structure and often have a central colonnade.⁵³ Last, many of these buildings bear some degree of relation to the megaron plan.⁵⁴

The similarity to the megaron plan is especially remarkable at Tiryns since the building is in such direct relation to the Mycenaean megaron. A reasonable conclusion (even admitted by

⁵² H. Drerup, 'Griechische Baukunst in geometrischer Zeit', *Arch. Homerica* ii O (1969) 1-21; N. Coldstream, *Geometric Greece* (New York 1977) 321-7.

⁵³ Particularly the first Hekatompedon at Samos (E. Buschor, 'Heraion von Samos: Frühe Bauten', *AthMitt* lv-lvi [1930-31] 10-17; H. Walter, *Das Heraion von Samos* [Munich 1976] 41-53); the early Artemis temple at Sparta (R. M. Dawkins, *The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta*, Soc. for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, Suppl. Paper v [London 1929] 9-14; J.

Boardman, 'Artemis Orthia and Chronology', *BSA* lviii [1963] 1-7, for the early seventh-century date); the 'Megaron Hall' at Emborio (J. Boardman, *Excavations at Chios 1952-1955*, *BSA Suppl.* vi [1976] 31-4); cf. the elongated eighth-century apsidal 'Hekatompedon' at Eretria (P. Auberson, K. Schefold, *Führer durch Eretria* [Bern 1972] 117-18); see also J. J. Coulton, *Ancient Greek Architects at Work* (Ithaca 1977) 74.

⁵⁴ Drerup (n. 52) 123-33; Pernier, 'New Elements for the Study of the Archaic Temple of Prinias', *AJA* xxxviii (1934) 174; Snodgrass (n. 33) 422-4.

Blegen) is that this building copies the plan of the megaron in an abbreviated form.⁵⁵ The broad double colonnaded megara of Mycenaean times are not found among post-palatial examples; presumably with the loss of the technique of half-timbering at the end of the palatial period such spans were no longer attempted.

(4) Associated with the building within the megaron are two phases of what is generally regarded to be an altar.⁵⁶ An original circular phase is made of cut poros blocks and is embedded in the plaster paving of the court of the Mycenaean megaron. The second and third phases are rectangular and built of rubble. Their contemporaneity with the building within the megaron is suggested by the discovery of a few blocks of the round altar built into the socle of that building.⁵⁷ This is further evidence of the extent of clearing of destruction debris for the construction of the building.

(5) Although it has not yet been published in full, the material from a deposit in court xxx has been judged to extend from 750 to 650 B.C. and is evidently votive in character.⁵⁸ A deposit of dumped material found by Schliemann at the south-eastern corner outside the circuit wall is later in date,⁵⁹ and may in part be material originally dedicated to Hera. This group contains a large number of female figurines, some of which are definitely representations of Hera,⁶⁰ while others are common to other Hera sanctuaries, notably the Argive Heraeum and Perachora, and are known even farther abroad as votives at Paestum.⁶¹ The archaeological evidence, therefore, calls for the initial dedication in the sanctuary to have been made in Late Geometric times; a cult building, such as the first Hekatompedon at Samos, enclosing the image may well have been built during the half century 750–700 B.C. In all likelihood this building is that within the megaron (FIG. 2), which on its architectural form and style is unlikely to have been constructed at any time later.

The discovery of authentic relics and monuments of the heroic past may have provided justification for the founding of these cults at Mycenae, Tiryns, the Argive Heraeum and elsewhere.⁶² Since Hera was the protectress of the Argive heroes of the *Iliad*, she may have been worshipped at places associated with them.⁶³ Thus her worship at Mycenae and Tiryns could be readily understood: both sites were obvious habitations of the heroes with their great circuit walls, palatial Cyclopean terraces and palace remains. Mycenae as well possessed numerous monuments, from tombs to bridges, which would have been visible in the Dark Age. Tiryns had the extensive remains of her citadel for recognition, and this suggests that the top of the citadel was regarded as the proper site for the shrine of a local deity, particularly Hera.⁶⁴ Such a suggestion agrees generally with the siting of cults in the eighth and seventh centuries on the citadels of Mycenae, Argos and Tiryns, as well as Asine and Athens.⁶⁵

Likewise at the Argive Heraeum the cult was established around the crest of the small

⁵⁵ For Blegen see *Korakou*, 130–2; for the abbreviated plan see Drerup (n. 52) 108–10, where he discusses the inclusion of posts and pilasters on socles along the insides of walls of a number of early temples in order to help support the roof; cf. Building H at Eretria in Auberson, 'La reconstitution du Daphnéphoreion d'Eretrie', *AntK* xvii (1973) 60–8. Such modest megara also occur for reasons of technical economy in LH III.

⁵⁶ *Tiryns* iii 136–8.

⁵⁷ *Tiryns* iii 214 and Dörpfeld in Schliemann (n. 45) 223–4; G. E. Mylonas, *Mycenae and the Mycenaean Age* (Princeton 1966) 162–3 has doubted the identification of this structure as well as its purported Mycenaean date. Dörpfeld and Müller's identification of 'altar' blocks built into the socle of structure T (the Hera temple) probably exclude the round phase of the 'altar' from a Late Geometric date. Furthermore the dowel cuttings on the upper surface of the blocks, the tooling of the surfaces and the material (poros limestone) all bespeak a Mycenaean date.

⁵⁸ *Tiryns* iii 214; Gercke in Jantzen (n. 45) 97–9 and esp. 159–61.

⁵⁹ Schliemann (n. 45) 357; Frickenhaus, *Tiryns* i 14–18.

⁶⁰ *Tiryns* i 14–18, 28–30 and Part II on the finds, esp. pp. 57, 65 and no. 37, Pl. v 6.

⁶¹ *Tiryns* i 47–106; *AH* ii 3–44 and Pls XLII–XLVI; R. H. Jenkins in H. Payne, *Perachora* i (Oxford 1940) 195–6, *passim*; B. Neutsch, 'Archäologische Grabungen und Funde in Unteritalien', *AA* (1956) 429–32, figs 146–8.

⁶² *Contra* Kelly (n. 40) 62; see below.

⁶³ Drews (n. 40) 125–30. ⁶⁴ Cf. *Tiryns* i 26.

⁶⁵ For Athens see C. Nylander (n. 6) 31–77 and W. B. Dinsmoor, 'The Hekatompedon on the Athenian Akropolis', *AJA* li. (1947) 109–11; for Asine see the tentative identification of a temple foundation attributed by the excavators to Apollo and resting at the top of the Barbouna ridge: O. Frödin, A. Persson and A. Westholm, *Asine* (Stockholm 1938) 148–50.

citadel. Presumably the sanctuary was located around the Mycenaean settlement rather than down among the tombs, although we should remember the terrace-altar west of the tholos tomb (above n. 34). But without palace and fortifications the settlement cannot truly be called a citadel, and apparently no monumental remains as at Mycenae and Tiryns were exposed that could have been pointed out to authenticate the site as a habitation of the heroes, although it may have been known as the site of Prosymna.⁶⁶ There were only the tombs. It was therefore necessary to establish some architectural monument that suitably identified the citadel at the Heraeum. This was accomplished by the construction of the massive terrace in its pseudo-Cyclopean style. Hence it was no accident that the Old Temple Terrace bore such a close resemblance to the principal Cyclopean monuments in the neighborhood. When finished it presented the approaching visitor with as imposing and monumental an aspect as did the citadels, and very much the same: the cult building, and eventually the archaic Temple of Hera, would have been seen from below supported by the massive terrace with its immense blocks. Thus the Heraeum was given an architectural pedigree.

Regarding these observations we are reminded of the passage in the *Odyssey* (vii 79–81) where Athena leaves Odysseus on Scheria and returns to the stronghold of Erechtheus on the Acropolis, or of Pausanias' report (ix 16.5–7) that the sanctuary of Demeter Thesmophoros at Thebes was located in a building said to have been the house of Kadmos and his descendants. These passages (and the actual remains on the Acropolis of Athens—above, n. 65) led Nilsson and Lorimer to raise the question of the replacement of a political seat by a religious cult.⁶⁷ Both were constrained to regard continuity of cult as a necessary hypothesis and in this case the continuous occupation of the house of a Homeric hero by a Greek divinity. Both of these literary references may be understood as beliefs originating in the recognition of Mycenaean remains during the Homeric era and passed down as a part of the tradition of worship at these places. The evidence we have been discussing for Tiryns—and also for Mycenae, the Heraeum and elsewhere—provides archaeological corroboration of the validity of this tradition. We may, however, wonder how these deities came to be worshipped in these places.⁶⁸ There is no evidence that is generally applicable here. The answer may be sought in local relations between legendary characters, such as Kadmos or Erechtheus, and the deities worshipped in their place. Thus Hera as protectress of the Argives and with her epithet of 'Argeia' would be appropriate on the citadels of the Argolid.

Whatever the true mechanism of Hera's establishment at Tiryns, the rediscovery of the megaron must have given the site and the Hera cult special status and set the rule for the establishment of citadel cults in the Argolid. Thus at Mycenae where the location of the megaron was not known an eighth-century cult and a seventh-century temple were located at the very top of the citadel, actually over the palace but not over the megaron.⁶⁹ This represented a guess as to the location of the megaron for the founding of the shrine. Similarly at the Heraeum a citadel on a par with Tiryns and Mycenae was fabricated on the small acropolis of the site.

⁶⁶ Strabo (viii 6.11) identifies Prosymna adjacent to Midea; a lacuna in the text does not permit a secure association between Prosymna and the following statement that the site had a temple to Hera. For Pausanias (ii 17.2) Prosymna was the region below the Heraeum. See discussion of this topographical problem in Frickenhaus, *Tiryns* i 118–20; Waldstein, *AH* i 13–14; Blegen (n. 3) 10; H. L. Jones in the Loeb edn of Strabo, vol. iv (1927) nn. to pp. 169–71. As for remains of a Late Helladic settlement see: Tilton, *AH* i 108–9, who reports the remains of a 'peribolus' of early date ('possibly pre-Mycenaean') just behind the South Stoa (*AH* i Pl. vii) and of some prehistoric houses, all of which were further explored by Blegen (11–21, esp. 12 on the peribolus). These remains are scrappy and much

disturbed by the later building activity of the sanctuary. There are no traces of any monumental or even large structures and the peribolus is not classifiable as a Cyclopean circuit wall. Additional remains were uncovered by J. L. Caskey and P. Amandry, 'Investigations at the Heraeum of Argos', *Hesp.* xxi (1952) 1701.

⁶⁷ M. P. Nilsson, *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion* (Lund 1951) 488, 473–82. Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments* (Cambridge 1950) 433–9; on the relation of Homeric description and the Geometric house with respect to the archaeological evidence see Drerup (n. 52) 128–33.

⁶⁸ Lorimer (n. 67) 439.

⁶⁹ A. J. Wace, 'Mycenae', *JHS* lix (1939) 210; Tsountas (n. 44) 59–79.

Although several aspects of the inception of the cult at the Heraeum and of Hera cults in the Argolid are better understood on this analysis of the archaeological data, we have not focused on the reasons for the location of the cult at the Heraeum. We have seen that the association of a Mycenaean citadel and its remains with a specific deity is well attested. We have argued that the identification of a citadel as a former habitation of Bronze Age heroes was of enough importance that it was considered necessary to build a pseudo-Cyclopean wall to give a properly monumental setting for the cult at the Heraeum. But why was the Heraeum site chosen?

This question spawns another: Who chose the site? The simplest answer is that it was those who worshipped at the tombs, but this is unsatisfactory since the dedications at the tombs and at the site began contemporaneously. Strabo (viii 6.10) tells us that at one time the inhabitants of Mycenae worshipped at the Heraeum, but in concert with the citizens of Argos. From Thucydides (ii 2; iv 133) we learn that the Argives reckoned time by the priestesses of Hera at the sanctuary. This might indicate that the site was from its earliest formation under the control and administration of Argos, although it is possible that Mycenae may have had a hand in the original dedication of the sanctuary.⁷⁰ Herodotus's story about Cleobis and Biton is auxiliary evidence of the early control of the Argives of this sanctuary. A reasonable conclusion is that the Argives founded the cult in the eighth century and this is supported by the finds from the sanctuary which from earliest times are largely of Argive manufacture.⁷¹

That the Argives took the initiative here is easy to understand. Neither Mycenae with her monuments nor Tiryns with her early cult in the megaron needed to look elsewhere to establish cult centers. Argos, however, seems to have been notably lacking in heroic monuments. We have mentioned the one lintel block on the Larissa, but very little evidence supports the location of a cult of any importance up there.⁷² In the Deiras cemetery a number of tombs (3) were known and paid respects,⁷³ but compared to the number known at the Heraeum or at Mycenae they are few. The choice of the Heraeum, therefore, may have been a natural outcome of a need to authenticate the heroic past of this city for its Dorian inhabitants. This view is reinforced by Pausanias's testimony (ii 17.5) that the Argives removed the *xoanon* of Hera from Tiryns to the Heraeum. He recorded no other early Hera image at the Heraeum and it is likely that this was the earliest of its kind.⁷⁴ There is in this passage a certain hint of conflict between the cults at Tiryns and the Heraeum.⁷⁵ The rapid growth of the population of Argos as demonstrated by the numerous burials from the city is evidence of its rise as a polis,⁷⁶ and, although a population rise at Tiryns is similarly documented, it was not, based on the number and frequency of burials, of the size and stability of Argos. The dispute between these towns was probably concerned with the authenticity of the cult. The need to demonstrate such a pedigree may also have promoted Argos' bid to secure hegemony over the plain and beyond in the eighth and seventh centuries.

The question then remains: Why did the Argives choose this location for the Hera cult? Kelly has recently reviewed this problem and maintains that although no definite answer can be given, the presence of the rediscovered Mycenaean tombs should be ruled out, there being no evidence to support the view that they were known earlier than the construction of the sanctuary.⁷⁷ He proceeds to suggest that the central geographic location of the Heraeum in the plain may have been of influence by providing a position easily accessible to all the inhabitants of

⁷⁰ See Frickenhaus' useful discussion of this problem: *Tiryns* i 119–20; note that today there is evidence of a Hera cult at Mycenae, above n. 42.

⁷¹ C. Waldstein *et al.*, *AH* ii; Blegen, *AJA* xliii (1939) 410–13; Caskey and Amandry (n. 66) 165–221.

⁷² See n. 41, above.

⁷³ Coldstream (n. 30) 10.

⁷⁴ It is remarkable that Pausanias did see at the Heraeum a relic of the Age of Heroes, the shield of Euphorbos (Paus. ii 17.3). Was this a souvenir from one of the Mycenaean tombs?

⁷⁵ Diodorus (xi 65.2) also mentions a dispute

between Argos and Mycenae over the Heraeum in connection with a quarrel over the games at Nemea; this is, however, an event much later than that with which we are concerned, see also Kelly (n. 40) 51–93.

⁷⁶ Hägg (n. 43) 13–17; an increasing population can be postulated from the number of burials during the course of the Dark Age: Geometric graves make up about 60% of the total (p. 17) but in gross numbers Argos has over 186 EG–LG graves compared to 69+ at Tiryns.

⁷⁷ Kelly (n. 40) 62.

the plain. Thus Argos capitalized on her role as the dominant city of the area by setting up a pan-Argolid cult center.⁷⁸ But this answer, though perhaps an adequate secondary explanation, does not sufficiently answer the question of the primary reason for the choice of site.

Admittedly there is no evidence that the tombs were known prior to the eighth century, but that may be because there was no probable reason to leave any votives at the tombs before the renaissance consequent upon the rise of the polis at the end of the eighth century. It is not unreasonable to assert that in all likelihood the tombs had been known prior to the founding of the cult; after all they are susceptible to collapse and to discovery by the plow. They may have been the catalyst for Hera worship on this spot; finds from the tombs and, as Coldstream has pointed out, their unusual form, would have insured their value as curiosities, if not their immediate recognition as remnants from the heroic past. The large number of tombs revered at the Heraeum in Late Geometric times (13 of 50) attest the frequency of their discovery and recognition.⁷⁹ The relation between the recognition of the tombs and the foundation of the cult of Hera will, however, remain unproven until some demonstrable association between the worship of Hera and that of heroes is produced, but it finds support in the conscious location of the cult around the acropolis of the Mycenaean settlement. As argued earlier the location of the cult on a citadel seems to have been an important element in these early cults of Hera and the precise location of the Heraeum terrace around the Mycenaean acropolis tends to confirm the supposition that the place was known as a site of the heroes, perhaps primarily as a burial ground, but also as a settlement of some kind. Surely any suggestion that the site was chosen arbitrarily and landed by chance on the settlement and cemetery is unsatisfactory?

Leaving aside these questions, the evidence presented here supports the conclusion that the recognition of the Heroic Age in the Argolid was a much more fundamental phenomenon in its early history than has usually been recognized. Although the hypotheses generated by the evidence may not in every instance stand up to scrutiny or to new discoveries, there should be no doubt that the impact of the discovery and recognition of heroic monuments played a major role in the establishment of religious centers and religious practices during this first century in the formation of the polis. In fact the arguments adduced here show that the amount of interplay between ancient monuments and newly founded cults was great enough to have directly affected the form of Greek religious architecture, the iconography of votive material and the religious beliefs of the inhabitants. Perhaps one of the most lasting effects of this interplay was in the relationship forged between hero and divinity: on the one hand is their intimate relationship in epic and on the other the superposition of the places of worship on those of habitation. It is little wonder then that Hesiod described the Age of Heroes as one intermediary to the immortal gods and mortal men:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ γαῖα κάλυψεν,
αὐτὶς ἔτ' ἄλλο τέταρτον ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ
Ζεὺς Κρονίδης ποίησε, δικαιότερον καὶ ἄρειον,
ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῖον γένος, οἳ καλέονται
ἡμίθεοι, προτέρη γενεῇ κατ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν.

Works and Days 156–60

JAMES C. WRIGHT

Bryn Mawr College

⁷⁹ Blegen (n. 31) 377; the evidence for Mycenae, Argos and elsewhere is summarized with bibliography by Coldstream (n. 30) 9–10 and nn. 12–15.

⁷⁸ Kelly (n. 40) 62–3 and 66–8, where he raises the question of a league, which if it existed, would have been controlled by Argos with the Heraeum as its center.

ADDENDUM

Since submitting this article for publication, several discussions of the material treated here have appeared in print.⁸⁰ Of these B. Schmaltz' 'Bermerkungen zu Thermos B' in *AA* (1980) 334 n. 54 is particularly relevant because he has made coincidental use of Schliemann's account of the visibility of the ruins of Tiryns before excavation. He argues, as I have, that the remains would have been equally visible in the eighth century B.C.

Reports by K. Kilian and C. Podzuweit on their excavations at Tiryns have drawn attention to the problem of LH IIIC reoccupation of its Upper Citadel. Podzuweit has published LH IIIC pottery excavated by K. Müller from the Upper Citadel in 1926 ('Ausgrabungen in Tiryns 1976', *AA* (1978) 497–8, fig. 36: 7, 9, 12, 13). This material comes from the eastern corner of the Great Court, north of the propylon, and from an unknown source designated 'A6, 407'. Dr Podzuweit also informs me that he has recognized LH IIIC among the material from the *Bothros*, dug in 1926 in Court XXX (*cf.* Jantzen [n. 45] 159–61, figs 69–71). Although this evidence alters the view expressed above, p. 195, that the Upper Citadel was abandoned during LH IIIC, it does not, unfortunately, provide evidence for the date of Structure T within the megaron.

The question of the date of Structure T has been restated by K. Kilian in his report of the work in the Lower Citadel ('Ausgrabungen in Tiryns 1978, 1979', *AA* [1981] 159–60). Extensive reutilization of LH IIIB remains of the Lower Citadel during LH IIIC, the discovery of the LH IIIC sherds on the Upper Citadel and of settlement remains outside it, and repairs on the Lower Citadel fortifications leave no doubt in his mind that the Acropolis was also rebuilt. Indeed, he observes that the location of Structure T along the west side of the megaron over the position of the former throne is yet one more indication of the respect accorded traditional cult locations during LH IIIC. This is not inconsiderable evidence for this point of view, and one may hope that continuing excavations at Tiryns will provide yet more decisive evidence for a resolution of this old controversy. Yet we should be careful to evaluate this evidence in consideration of the nature of LH IIIC occupation at Tiryns.

In this regard I would like to draw attention to a neglected piece of evidence. Dörpfeld (n. 45) 340–1 reports that Philios in 1885 observed and pointed out to him twelve circles in the floor along the rear of the megaron. Dörpfeld's investigation of them showed that they were set into a coarse plaster laid over the painted megaron floor. He thought the impressions were made by pithoi but could not decide if they belonged to the original megaron or the later Structure T within it. Some of these circles were later observed by Hackl (G. Rodenwaldt, *Tiryns* ii 223, n. 2). The location of them along the interior of the north wall of the megaron places them outside Structure T. Is it possible then that the impressions and their plaster floor belong with the megaron rather than with Structure T? Would this, presumably, final phase of the megaron be contemporary with the placement of the mudbrick dividing wall in the adjacent Small Megaron? Should these adjustments have been made before or after the fire destruction assigned to the end of LH IIIB? On the present available evidence these questions seem unanswerable, but they emphasize the difficulty we face in arriving at a date for Structure T, which would according to this line of reasoning post-date the above-mentioned remodellings.

There is also a difficulty in thinking that any structure placed over the throne and aligned to the megaron is necessarily a re-establishment during LH IIIC of the sanctity of the megaron. Should one also argue that it was a re-establishment of central authority, then it would be necessary to demonstrate the evidence of that authority at work in the settlement. Instead, the radical social change customarily postulated in the change from LH IIIB to LH IIIC is reflected in the architectural organization of the Lower Citadel. From an integrated architectural complex of LH IIIB date characterized by interconnecting corridors and suites of rooms set on terraced levels (plan in *AA* [1979] 398 fig. 20), the plan is altered in LH IIIC to one of isolated two- or three-room, multi-purpose buildings surrounded by open courts. Furthermore, what little order there is in this plan is subjected to continual alteration as structures are abandoned, new ones built, and annexes made (plan in *AA* [1981] 155 fig. 5). Thus it must be established that there was need during LH IIIC for a megaron in terms of its use in the palaces before it is argued that one was re-erected on the Upper Citadel.

⁸⁰ See: A. Mallwitz, 'Kritisches zur Architektur Griechenlands im 8. und 7. Jahrhundert', *AA* (1981) 599–642, which focuses on the stylobate of the Archaic temple at the Argive Heraeum as being among the


earliest sure examples of a peripteral temple. A more detailed discussion of this temple by A. Kalpaxis, *Früharchaische Baukunst in Griechenland und Kleinasien* (1976) has not been available to me.



(a) The Old Temple Terrace.



(b) Limestone flagging of the Terrace and the Archaic temple stylobate.



(c) Detail of stylobate: top and side surfaces.



(a) Lifting boss at base of stylobate.



(b) 'U'-shaped lifting hole in column drum.



(c) Striated surface of column drum.



(d) Mycenaean terrace of the megaron at Gla.