Identity and Society within 'Landscapes of Memory': Iron Age Cult at Bronze Age Ruins (1000-700 BC)

Christopher James Adamson

St Cross College

Doctor of Philosophy

Classical Archaeology

Hilary Term 2018

Abstract: *In the aftermath of the Late Bronze Age 'Collapse' many Mycenaean and Minoan sites were left destroyed, abandoned, or diminished. In the Early Iron Age the vestiges of the Bronze Age at these sites formed 'landscapes of memory' in which communities engaged with the past through practices such as 'tomb' and 'hero' cult. An additional practice, to which previous scholarship has dedicated less attention, was cult practised at or amongst Bronze Age ruins.*

This thesis is a study of such cults in Crete, the Argolid, and Attica. In each case we explore the site's development in the Bronze Age, through the 'Collapse', and during the Early Iron Age in order to recreate its 'landscape of memory' when cult activity was initiated. In turn we examine the finds, features, and practices of the cult itself.

Thirteen instances of Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins are included. In Crete: Knossos, Amnisos, Phaistos, Agia Triada, Palaikastro, and Kommos. In the Argolid: Mycenae, Tiryns, Asine, Argos, and the Argive Heraion. In Attica: Athens and Eleusis.

From this study it is argued that a cultic engagement with the Bronze Age past was an attractive prospect to Iron Age communities in Greece. The thesis uses the assembled evidence to make four particular claims: that Bronze Age ruins inspired a cultural memory of a glorious past represented in Homer and other oral tradition; that the commemoration of cultural memories fostered a common sense of identity; that in some communities cultural memories were a useful tool in the acquisition and consolidation of power; and that cultural memory was malleable, and 'invented' memories could be powerful in early Greece.

Acknowledgements

It is with great pleasure and sincere gratitude that I would like to mention a number of people without whom this thesis would not have been possible.

First, my thanks go to my supervisor, Prof Irene S. Lemos. When I first came under her supervision in 2011 I was a recent Classics graduate attempting to find my feet in archaeology. She was a magnificent teacher during the steep learning curve of an MPhil in Classical Archaeology. From discussing the germ of an idea for a doctoral thesis in Thessaly in the summer of 2012, to several years of researching and writing and the seemingly interminable editing and re-editing that eventually produced what lies within these pages, Prof Lemos has been a stalwart mentor and guide throughout.

My thanks too to Prof Robert Parker – his interest in and advice on my thesis when it was in its earliest stages have shaped my approach to the research ever since. My thanks to Prof Rosalind Thomas, Dr Maria Stamatopoulou, Dr Linda Hulin, and Ms Lucia Nixon who each provided invaluable feedback at different stages of the thesis' progress. I am grateful for the thoughts and advice of Dr Alkestis Papadimitriou and Prof Joseph Maran – to discuss Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins with them on site at Tiryns and elsewhere in the Argolid was a privilege. My thanks to Dr Floris van den Eijnde who kindly allowed me advance viewing of his forthcoming article on Eleusis in addition to sending me a copy of his own doctoral thesis. This thesis has been proof-read in part or in total by Mrs Katrina Cooke, the late Dr Michael Adamson, and especially by the tireless and critical eye of Mr Derek Adamson. For this too I express my thanks.

In the time I have been writing this thesis I have benefitted from being part of three different academic communities: St Cross College, the School of Archaeology, and the summer study teams at Lefkandi-Xeropolis. I have learnt from friends and colleagues in all three of these communities. Dr Matthew Lloyd, Dr Artemis Georgiou, Dr Alexander Vacek, and particularly Dr Caroline Thurston have taught me a great deal. Friendly but whole-hearted debate with Ms Kira Hopkins refined many of my arguments. Dr Abigail Tompkins and Mr Edward Peveler have been on hand on countless occasions to offer advice and support, particularly in the final stages of writing. Of all these friends and colleagues, my most heartfelt thanks to Ms Hannah L. Ringheim. In our time in Oxford she has often been

my sounding board, sometimes my translator, occasionally my commiserator, but always my dependable friend.

My penultimate thanks go to two teachers from before my time in Oxford, but without whose influence I would never have pursued this thesis. Prof Rebecca Sweetman of the University of St Andrews was the first to encourage me to pursue archaeology and walk in the footsteps of the ancients. Mr Stan Owen of King Edward's School, Birmingham, introduced me to the great breadth of learning that the Classics had to offer. His eclectic and seemingly boundless knowledge was a wonder to behold.

Finally, my greatest thanks go to my family. Jonathan Adamson and Katrina and Edward Cooke have been a source of unending support and encouragement throughout the process. In particular, I offer my supreme gratitude to my parents, Derek and Jeanette. It will never be possible to repay their immeasurable and selfless generosity and their unwavering moral support. I dedicate this thesis to them.

Table of Contents

Abstract *ii*
Acknowledgements *iv*
Table of Contents *vii*
Abbreviations *ix*

Introduction and Hypotheses 1
PART I 5
Theoretical Considerations, Context, and Methodology 5
Memory, Landscape, Ruins, and Ritual 7
The Past During the Early Emergence of the Polis 25
Homer 39
Bronze Age sites without Iron Age cult 49
Methodology 55
PART II 59
Iron Age Cults at Bronze Age Ruins 59
Crete 61
Knossos 63
Amnisos 75
Phaistos 81
Agia Triada 87
Palaikastro 93
Kommos 103
The Argolid 115
Mycenae 117
Tiryns 133
Asine 143
Argos and the Argive Heraion 157
Argos 157
The Argive Heraion 165
Attica 173
Athens 175
Eleusis 189

PART III 205
Analysis and Conclusions 205
Analysis and Conclusions 207
Identifying Regional Patterns 209
Assessing Regional Patterns 221
Testing the Hypotheses of the Thesis 227
Explaining the Research Results 235
Final Remarks 239

Bibliography *241*
Tables and Figures *275*

Abbreviations

LBA	Late Bronze Age
EIA	Early Iron Age
EM	Early Minoan
MM	Middle Minoan
LM	Late Minoan
SMin	Subminoan
EH	Early Helladic
MH	Middle Helladic
LH	Late Helladic
SMyc	Submycenaean
PG	Protogeometric
EPG	Early Protogeometric
MPG	Middle Protogeometric
LPG	Late Protogeometric
G	Geometric
EG	Early Geometric
MG	Middle Geometric
LG	Late Geometric
SG	Subgeometric
O	Orientalising
EO	Early Orientalising
A	Archaic
EA	Early Archaic
PC	Proto-Corinthian
BC	Before Christ
AD	*Anno Domini*

AA	*Archäologischer Anzeiger*
AAA	*Athens Annals of Archaeology*
AE	*Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίς*
AJA	*American Journal of Archaeology*
AM	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung*
APS	*Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*
AR	*Archaeological Reports*
ASAtene	*L'Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente*
BCH	*Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*
BIAL	*Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology, University of London*
BSA	*Annual of the British School at Athens*
BSAS	*British School of Athens Studies*
BSASP	*British School of Athens Supplementary Papers*
CIM	*Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia*
CP	*Classical Philology*

Ergon	*Το Έργον της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*
Hesperia	*Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*
JdI	*Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
KCh	*Κρητικά Χρονικά*
LS	*Lakonikai Spoudai*
MonAnt	*Monumenti Antichi*
Opuscula	*Opuscula: Annual of the Swedish Institutes at Athens and Rome*
PDIA	*Proceedings of the Danish institute of Archaeology*
Πεπραγμένα	*Πεπραγμένα του διεθνούς Κρητολογικού συνεδρίου*
Πρακτικά	*Πρακτικά της εν 'Αθήναις 'Αρχαιολογικής 'Εταιρείας*
TLS	*Times Literary Supplement*
WA	*World Archaeology*

Introduction and Hypotheses

The focus of this thesis is Iron Age cult practised at Bronze Age ruins, several examples of which are known, in Crete, the Argolid, and Attica (Fig. 1). These 'Ruin' cults are, in conjunction with 'Hero' and 'Tomb' cult, part of a broader practice of cultic engagement with the past in the Protogeometric (1000-900 BC)[1] and Geometric (900-700 BC) periods. Previous scholarship has to some extent examined this kind of cult activity: Prent assessed a number of examples in Crete,[2] Martin has investigated the reuse of ruins in the Argolid more generally,[3] and archaeologists have recognised such activities at individual sites, for example Klein at Mycenae, amongst others.[4] There has not yet, however, been a comprehensive investigation into regional patterns of Iron Age cults at Bronze Age ruins, their social and political significance, or the changing roles of 'landscapes of memory' in early Greece.

To produce a methodical analysis of Iron Age cults at Bronze Age ruins it is necessary to establish a precise definition of the sites the thesis will examine. The following criteria will be used, selected to ensure that at each site there is a clear link between the cult and the ruins:

1. The site has surviving monumental Bronze Age ruins. This thesis defines 'monumental' ruins as those which remain prominent and impressive, even in their ruined state, such that they would be visible and recognisable parts of the landscape.
2. The site has undergone some form of desertion in the closing stages of the Late Bronze Age or the start of the Early Iron Age. This need not be absolute abandonment (most of the sites maintain at least some small population through the Late Bronze Age-Early Iron Age transition), but there must be a general hiatus of usage and occupation. This is to avoid straying into the separate phenomenon of Bronze Age-Iron Age continuity, as may be discernible at sites such as Thermon and Kalapodi.
3. Cult activity was established at the site in the Protogeometric (1000-900 BC) or Geometric Period (900-700 BC).
4. This cult activity was not merely in the vicinity of surviving monumental Bronze Age ruins, but actively incorporated the 'landscape of memory' as the focus or as an integral part of the cult.

---

[1] All dates are BC unless otherwise stated.
[2] Prent 2003.
[3] Martin 2008.
[4] Klein 1997.

The sites which have been selected according to these criteria are as follows: Knossos, Phaistos, Amnisos, Ayia Triada, Palaikastro, and Kommos in Crete; Mycenae, Tiryns, Asine, Argos, and the Argive Heraion in the Argolid; and Athens and Eleusis in Attica (Figs. 2-4).

The thesis will address the following questions: what are the regional and chronological patterns of behaviour at these cults? How was cultural memory manipulated, and with what purpose? To what extent may cultural memories be 'invented', and why? What do the changing patterns of behaviour at these sites indicate about Greek communities in different places and at different stages of the Early Iron Age? What outcomes were achieved by linking ritual activity to cultural memory?

In examining the above points of discussion, this thesis intends to test the following hypotheses:

1. Cultural memory of the Bronze Age was attractive to the Iron Age Greeks, who understood the ruins to belong to the glorious past represented in Homer and other oral tradition.
2. In a period of social and political change, the commemoration of cultural memory through cult at ruins could unify growing communities through the sense of a common past and identity.
3. When cultural memory forms an integral part of a society's 'ritual time'[5], it can become a powerful tool in the creation and reinforcement of hierarchy.
4. Cultural memory is fluid and variously malleable. It had versatile properties in Iron Age Greece, and even 'invented' memories inspired and influenced cult activity.

The thesis begins by establishing a series of theoretical principles regarding the relationship between cultural memory and landscapes, ruins, and ritual. Then there is an overview of other contemporary cultic engagement with the past such as tomb and hero cult. There follows a discussion of Homer and oral tradition in the Early Iron Age in order to gain a limited but useful insight into the cultural memories that early Greeks may have had of their past. The introductory section concludes by highlighting significant Bronze Age sites and regions that do not have Iron Age cult associated with their ruins, and by setting out a methodology of approach for the remainder of the thesis.

---

[5] Bloch 1977: 288.

The main part of the thesis is a thorough investigation into the archaeological evidence at each of the cult sites, before finally assessing the gathered evidence, exploring the questions mentioned above, and testing the outlined hypotheses.

PART I

Theoretical Considerations, Context, and Methodology

Memory, Landscape, Ruins, and Ritual

This chapter follows four interrelated themes which are of particular relevance to Iron Age engagement with the Bronze Age past: memory, landscape, ruins, and ritual. The discussion seeks to identify principles by which we may assess the sites included in this thesis.

. . .

The Past

"The past is a scarce resource",[6] states Appadurai in a 1981 article which argues that societies are defined and even constrained by the relationship to their past. But rather than being constrained by the past, to what extent do people recall, reuse, and manipulate it?

The past can be a political tool. In the Greek Revolution of 1821 AD the 'memory' of Classical Greek opposition to Persian invasion was used as a rallying call for the fight against Ottoman rule.[7] In the subsequent two centuries there has been a gradual stripping of the Athenian Acropolis to eradicate Byzantine, Mediaeval, and Ottoman structures in order to exclusively promote the Classical buildings, and by extension the memories associated with them. In this "struggle for control" over a memorable place, "the loser, characteristically, becomes invisible".[8] Throughout history, ruling regimes have used the memories of their predecessors to "create and promulgate structures of political identity."[9]

But the past is also both personal and cultural. The "physical trace of the past"[10], that is, the ruins of old walls, buildings, and cities, instigate a personal and shared connection with the past.[11] Our personal memories and experiences are absorbed into a public narrative of a society's shared history.[12] These memories become a "store of knowledge" by which a community is able to define its sense of identity.[13]

---

[6] Appadurai 1981.
[7] Alcock 2002: 5.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid: 7.
[10] Ibid.
[11] Jonker 1995: 177.
[12] Boric 2010: 8.
[13] Assmann 1995: 130.

Assmann asserts that the memory of the past is "reflexive".[14] Using his terms, it is "practice-reflexive": commemorative practices may be based on a cultural memory of the past, but these practices also help to create new memories and traditions. It is "self-reflexive": cultural memories are constantly reinforced or re-established through the continuous acquisition of new experiences and memories. And finally, it is "group-reflexive": the collective identity of the community is forged, reinvented, or perpetuated through the commemoration of select memories.[15]

Cutting through these terminological distinctions, what this really means is that memories are not static and objective, but continuously developing cultural perceptions of the past. In contrast to Appadurai's assertion, the past, as accessed through collective cultural memory is not a "scarce resource" at all. The past is powerful and political, it is personal and cultural, and it is versatile and changeable.

Alcock declares that in previous scholarship there have been two approaches used to respond to the idea of the memories of the past held by ancient peoples. The first has been to reject the premise that such memories can ever be recreated and to treat the archaeology and history of ancient societies without regard to them, whilst the second has been to attempt to reconstruct only those memories that are enshrined in the more concrete source of literary and documentary evidence.[16]

Alcock offers a third approach, in which archaeology is used to assess the "matrix" of material culture in which memories are embedded.[17] Typically, the archaeologist investigates physical evidence in order to establish demonstrable historical facts. Assmann uses the term 'mnemohistory' to denote a distinct discipline in which we try to discover how things were *remembered* in the past rather than how they actually were historically.[18] Alcock proposes a combined term, 'mnemoarchaeology', to describe the endeavour of attempting to discover how things were remembered in the past by investigating the tangible evidence of objects, places, and monuments.[19]

---

[14] Ibid: 132.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Alcock 2002: 2.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Assmann 1997: 202-3.
[19] Alcock 2002: 27.

Mnemoarchaeology requires a sociological understanding of memories, their formation, and their individual and collective manifestations, and it is this which we shall discuss in the first part of this chapter.

The formation of memories

Memories are formed in two main stages. The first, more straightforward, stage is 'communicative' memory.[20] These are memories acquired through direct interaction with a person, place, or event. These can range from entirely banal, such as simple conversations and everyday activities, to events of great social and historical significance. The French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs identified that such memories are held both by individuals and by social groups.[21] A memory is a log of something which has been experienced personally, but it is also cannot be separated from the shared experiences of the groups to which an individual belongs. All memories are formed by the "currents of collective thought" within these groups.[22] The groups can be family, friends, a neighbourhood or town, even, Assmann states, "up to and including nations".[23] These groups need not be based on straightforward proximity, but can be made up of religions, races, social classes, political parties, or indeed any groups in which individuals have shared experiences, externalised and communicated within that group.[24]

Communicative memory, however, belongs to a limited time frame. By definition, it cannot exceed the period of time in which it is possible for an individual's memories to be communicated within the group. This is at most around eighty years, that is to say, three or perhaps four generations.[25] An individual may communicate their memories to their children and grandchildren,[26] but only for the duration of their life.

Halbwachs argues that when a memory ceases to be directly communicable, the individual's experience may become either 'histoire', general knowledge of the past, or 'mémoire', in which the group recalls a lived experience.[27] Memories which outlive the

---

[20] Assmann 1995: 126.
[21] Halbwachs 1992: 200.
[22] Halbwachs 1980: 33.
[23] Assmann 1995: 127.
[24] Assmann 2011: 6.
[25] Assmann 1995: 127.
[26] And indeed to others of younger generations with whom he or she shared a social group.
[27] Halbwachs 1950: 118; Russell 2006: 797.

individual who experienced them become 'cultural memory', recollections of the past which have significance and meaning for the society which remembers them. Assmann describes this as a process of "concretion" in which an individual's lived experiences are preserved as "islands of time".[28]

Recent scholarship has sought to apply some provisos to Halbwachs and Assmann's explanations of the formation of cultural memory: Riceour argues for a middle ground between the personal experience of the 'ego' and the collective experience of the group. This middle ground is made up of 'close relations'.[29] For the close relations of an individual, the lived experience of the individual's past is both a personal and a collective memory, and they become the formative agents in the transition from the more personal communicative memory to the more collective cultural memory. Similarly, Boric has argued against Halbwachs' structuralist interpretation that characterises the individual as passive to the overarching influence of the collective.[30] The active agency of individuals in framing the "narrativity" of their experiences for the group is not to be underestimated.[31]

Despite these criticisms, a broad consensus may be found in previous scholarship: human beings experience people, places, and events both as individuals and as part of social groups. The memories of these experiences are communicated within these social groups. Upon the death of an individual, their experiences cease to be communicable, but are remembered by the collective as cultural memories.

The perpetuation of cultural memories

It is easy to see how the lived experiences of an individual outlive them in the memories of their 'close relations' and social groups, but how do memories survive generations, even hundreds of years, after the individual who experienced them? Alcock and Van Dyke identify four 'media' of cultural memory,[32] through which collective memories of the past are perpetuated, and which, to varying degrees, are archaeologically visible.

---

[28] Assmann 1995: 129.
[29] Riceour 2004: 131.
[30] Boric 2010: 8.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Although, as discussed above, there are distinctions between types of memory such as 'collective', 'communicative', 'cultural', Alcock and Van Dyke tend to use the broader term 'social memory'. For the sake of clarity we will use the more specific terms as far as possible.

The first of these is "ritual behaviour".[33] Alcock and Van Dyke offer examples such as "processions, mortuary treatments…feasting, and votive deposition",[34] but ritual behaviour can take a wide variety of forms. Whatever the particular activity, when it is performed with a repetition that allows later generations to feel a sense of continuity with the past then it is engaging with, and perpetuating, a collective and cultural memory. These behaviours may or may not be archaeologically visible. A ritual feast could leave behind bones and bowls, but the particular features of a traditional dance, for example, may be impossible to reconstruct.

The second of the media of cultural memory is "narrative".[35] Stories and information about the past which permeate a social group, and are passed on through generations within social groups, contribute to that society's collective vision of the past, its cultural memory. These narratives may be written histories, myths, drama, or oral tradition. In literate societies this medium of cultural memory is highly accessible to the archaeologist or historian through epigraphic or manuscript evidence. In pre-literate societies, however, narratives of memory may be extremely difficult to ascertain. Particularly interesting in the study of Iron Age Greece is that its societies were on the cusp of literacy. The oral traditions of the Iron Age would in turn be written and preserved, allowing the historian of this period a unique, though very limited, insight into the narratives of a pre-literate age.

The third medium is "representations and objects": like behaviours, these can be a wide-ranging variety of items, from "paintings, masks, figurines, rock art", to even the most simple and straightforward, everyday objects, as long as they provide a physical or graphic connection to the past.[36] Once again, many of these items are archaeologically visible, allowing us the opportunity to analyse and interpret the nature and transmission of the cultural memories of past peoples.

The final medium of cultural memory is "places": places can be imbued with great social significance through an association with past activities, events, or people. Often there is some kind of marker for such places, whether natural, such as a tree, mountain, river or cave, or constructed, such as a building, shrine, tomb, or a set of ruins.[37] A collective

---

[33] Alcock and Van Dyke 2003: 4.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Alcock and Van Dyke 2003: 5; Rowlands 1993: 144.
[37] Alcock and Van Dyke 2003: 5.

connection to a place combined with a cultural memory of its significance to previous generations creates what Basso and Feld term a "sense of place", a recognition of a renewed and long-standing relationship with a site which reinforces a collective association with it.[38]

Fundamental to the understanding of the media of cultural memory is that these four are far from mutually exclusive. Artistic representations may commemorate events which are also recorded in narrative form; traditional or ritual activities may take place at specific places remembered as historically significant; ritual activities canonised in writing can also be considered 'narratives', and so on. All of these form what Nora terms "Les Lieux de Mémoire", the "medallions and monuments" in which "memory crystalizes".[39]

Places

The commemoration of places, and the practices associated with it, will be of particular importance to this thesis, and as such further distillation of these ideas is required. Places which act as media of cultural memory may be divided into two different but connected categories: monuments and landscapes. The distinction between the two is not as simple as man-made versus natural.

- A monument is any marker, construction, or indeed natural feature which is "deliberately designed, or later agreed, to provoke memories".[40] These can consist of an almost endless array of variations, from buildings and tombs, to tumuli, standing stones, and even trees and mountains.
- Landscapes are the geography of human experiences. They are the settings of our individual and collective experiences and those of past people.[41] They are of course related to monuments – every monument must be part of a landscape – but have a distinct relationship with cultural memory, which will be discussed in more detail later.

The practices related to cultural memory also require further elaboration and definition. These may be divided into 'inscribed' practices and 'incorporated' practices:[42]

---

[38] Basso and Feld 1996.
[39] Nora 1989: 7-9.
[40] Alcock 2002: 28.
[41] Bender 1993: 3.
[42] Connerton 1989: 72-73.

- Inscribed practices involve the establishment of a physical and tangible link between the past, the present, and the future.[43] They can make use of the different media of cultural memory:[44] the creation of an artistic representation, the construction of a monument, and the recording of information are all inscribed practices. As the name suggests, an aspect of a society's cultural memory is 'set in stone'.
- Incorporated practices, on the other hand, first distinctly identified by Paul Connerton,[45] can only make use of the media of traditional and ritual behaviour. They are "performative ceremonies which generate bodily sensory and emotional experiences, resulting in habitual memory being sedimented in the body".[46] Cultural memories are perpetuated by the repeated experience of an activity. Assmann[47] highlights that such behaviours are never "comprehensively developed" or "completely codified".[48] Instead they constantly evolve through the adoption, adaptation, and conversely the discontinuation of remembered activities.

Often inscribed and incorporated practices are complementary. In the context of the cultural memory of places, a monument is an inscribed practice whilst the ceremonies and activities associated with it are incorporated practices. Inscribed practices are more likely to be archaeologically discernible, as a result of their finite and tangible nature, but their interpretation cannot be disconnected from their associated incorporated ones. Whatever the original inscribed meanings, the activities which take place at physical monuments are what define its function at any particular time in its history.

Alcock offers the example of Stonehenge as a monument whose function as a commemoration of cultural memory has changed dramatically through the ages: it seems to have had various functions in its prehistoric incarnations, was revered in the Middle Ages as the work of mythical Pre-Saxon wizard Merlin, and is now a National Trust and World Heritage Site.[49] What is perhaps even more interesting is how different incorporated practices taking place in the modern day instil the stones with multiple and varied functions as a monument today. To many visitors it is a remarkable piece of prehistoric engineering, and for some of these it may also be of interest as a setting of Arthurian legend. Their behaviour at the monument (exploring, admiring, discussing) reflects their relationship with

---

[43] Alcock 2002: 28.
[44] Excluding traditional and ritual behaviour.
[45] Connerton 1989: 72; Connerton proposed the terms 'inscribing' and 'incorporating' practices, though 'inscribed' and 'incorporated' have since become more established.
[46] Hamilakis 1998: 117; also Rowlands 1993: 117; Alcock 2002: 28; Connerton 1989: 72.
[47] Assmann uses the term 'mimetic memory'.
[48] Assmann 2011: 6.
[49] Alcock 2002: 29.

the particular cultural memories which are enshrined in the stones for them. For the modern day druids who celebrate the solstice at Stonehenge, the 'traditional' ceremonies which they perform reflect a different cultural memory, that of a shared place of worship with their prehistoric co-religionists.[50]

This example serves to highlight the impossibility of finding a uniform understanding of a monument. Alcock describes this as the "inescapably dialogical quality" of commemorative practices.[51] Collective memories, she argues, were not necessarily any more straightforward in the past than they are today. We must not relegate the cultural memories of the people of past societies to a 'single story',[52] but instead seek to recognise and identify the "spectrum" of cultural memory which was reflected in commemorative practices.[53]

Memory and archaeology: methods of approach

Having established in the above discussion that memory plays a central role in cultural and community identity, in social and political structure, and in individuals' relationships with the collective, it is necessary also to outline what methods of approach will be employed when applying the concepts of cultural memory to the archaeological material which will be outlined in this thesis.

This approach will take the form of two main stages, and then a potential pitfall which must be negotiated. First it is necessary to identify the "point de départ", a significant societal change which forms a "social crux", defining a particular period of time.[54] In times of "rapid and confusing social change"[55] societies may seek a connection with the past. This may be invasion, colonisation, religious changes, or political upheaval. Our first question about any community commemorating cultural memories must be: what was it in their own society which caused them to seek a connection with the past?

The second stage is to identify what cultural memory is being evoked.[56] Are multiple memories evoked concurrently in the same monument? We must examine whether

---

50 Carr-Gomm 2006.
51 Alcock 2002: 30.
52 For the term 'single story' see Adichie 2009.
53 Alcock 2002: 24.
54 Alcock 2002: 32.
55 Whitley 1995: 49.
56 Alcock 2002: 32.

competing memories are defined by different subsections of a community, by historic cultural divisions, or by the unity and disunity of different 'imagined' communities in the present.[57] What was it in the past that they sought a connection with?

In short, in this approach to the commemoration of cultural memories by past societies, we must start in their present – what made them look to the past? We can then turn to their past – what was it about this past that appealed to them in their present day?

The third stage is to pause for caution. On the one hand, we must make full use of previous scholarship of the sites and periods which are being studied in order to understand context and acquire a depth of discussion. On the other hand, however, this inevitably means that our own investigation and interpretation stem from the inscribed framework in which they have been studied before. This is a potential problem.

Alcock gives an example of how this problem may lead our analysis astray: the modern scholarship of Crete, she argues, has until very recently almost universally seen the Minoan period as the height of Cretan achievement, taking a step down in the Final Palatial period with the incoming of Mycenaean influence, suffering a final collapse and a descent into the fundamentally unremarkable remainder of its history.[58] In this context, a study of the Iron Age Cretan commemoration of monumental Bronze Age architecture may be affected by our own cultural attachment to a period of the past which *we* may feel ought to be commemorated. Geary uses the expression "phantoms of memory" to refer to the way in which some memories which were revered and commemorated in the past are almost certainly unknown to us, whilst conversely we place great value on the culture of some ancient periods and peoples for which subsequent societies may have had little concern.[59]

As archaeologists, therefore, we must endeavour to engage in what we might call a 'metamnemonic'[60] investigation, that is to say, one in which we are as aware as possible of our own cultural memory in an attempt to combat its influence in our interpretation. To borrow Hobsbawm's metaphor, "We swim in the past as fish do in water, and cannot

---

[57] Anderson 1982.
[58] Alcock 2002: 32; In the years since Alcock cited this example there have been moves to address this perception (eg Wallace 2010), but in principle the point stands.
[59] Geary 1994: 181.
[60] Following the terminological style of 'mnemohistory' and 'mnemoarchaeology'.

escape from it. But our modes of living and moving in this medium require analysis and discussion".[61]

Landscape and Memory

In the above discussion, a distinction was made between monuments and landscapes, in which monuments are markers of various kinds which are "deliberately designed, or later agreed, to provoke memories".[62] Landscapes, like monuments, are inextricably linked to cultural memory. They are a "rich deposit of myths, memories, and obsessions", through which a shared culture and identity becomes "a geography as much as a history".[63] In contrast to monuments, however, their role in cultural memory is less conscious and deliberate.

'Landscape' is not a synonym for 'area', 'region', or 'section of land'. A landscape requires human interaction. It is an "external world mediated through subjective human experience".[64] Peters observed that the suffix '-scape', "posits the presence of a unifying principle which enables us to consider part of the countryside or sea as a unit and as an individual, but so that this part is perceived to carry the typical properties of the undivided whole".[65] They are not simply objectively definable pieces of terrain, but "ego-centred" entities, perceived and defined by human beings in a variety of "views and vistas".[66] It is a coherent setting for human experiences, and as such is defined by its place in human perception.

As the subject and setting of human experiences, landscapes inevitably also become the subject and setting of individual and group memories. Tilley observes that human activities "become inscribed within a landscape", with the result that every topographic feature, not only monuments and buildings, becomes equally inscribed in an individual's personal experience and a group's cultural memory.[67]

---

[61] Hobsbawm 1997: 23.
[62] Alcock 2002: 28.
[63] Schama 1995: 14.
[64] Cosgrove 1998: 13.
[65] Peters 1948: 2; see also Tilley 1994: 29.
[66] Bender 1993: 1.
[67] Tilley 1994: 27.

Küchler asserts that landscape is "the most generally accessible and widely shared *aide-mémoire* of a culture's knowledge and understanding of its past and future."[68] She identifies two distinct concepts, "landscapes of memory" and "landscapes as memory", which she describes respectively as the "inscription of memory" onto a landscape on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the landscape as the "process of remembering"[69]

There is a parallel here with the distinction between inscribed and incorporated practices. The former is portrayed as static and permanent whilst the latter is fluid, expressive, but intermittent. As discussed earlier, however, inscribed and incorporated practices are complementary and reflexive rather than mutually exclusive. In the same way, 'landscapes of memory' and 'landscapes as memory' need not be mutually exclusive either, but complementary aspects of the same phenomenon.

Gaston Bachelard was an early advocate of the link between landscapes and memory. The 'knowledge',[70] he argues, that one's predecessors occupied the same space, the same places, the same topography as oneself forges a cultural memory of connection to them. Though the terminology had not yet entered common usage, Bachelard does in fact demonstrate the transition of communicative to cultural memory, explaining how lived experiences of a landscape are remembered and recounted within the social group and in turn are retold (and re-experienced) long after the original individual is gone. He uses the example of his grandfather who, as a young man, decades before Bachelard himself was born, got lost in a certain forest. Bachelard explains how, writing as he was at the age of 73, surely over a hundred years after the original incident involving his grandfather, the forest still represented a lived experienced, a now established cultural memory of the forest as an historic and "ancestral" landscape.[71]

The experiential nature of human interaction with landscape leads it to play a key role in the formation of identity, both for individuals who experience it and the groups which share it.[72] This experiential nature was explored in depth by Christopher Tilley in his seminal work, *A Phenomenology of Landscape*.[73] He argues that gaining a phenomenological

---

[68] Küchler 1993: 85.
[69] Ibid: 86.
[70] Whether or not this knowledge is in fact accurate is not important.
[71] See the extended discussion in Bachelard 1994: 188.
[72] Bender 1993: 3.
[73] Tilley 1994.

understanding of the landscape experienced by a particular society requires an approach which engages in a "continuous dialectic between ideas and empirical data."[74] That is to say, it is not enough to observe and detail inscribed and incorporated practices without an appreciation of how these were experienced together by participants. This approach is in keeping with Alcock's warning not to impose modern expectations or perspective on the experiences of people in the past.

Basso and Feld support and develop this idea, emphasising that human relationships with landscapes are both "experiential and expressive", passive and active, "remembered" and "struggled over".[75] In order to demonstrate the central importance of experience in this relationship Tilley draws a distinction between two understandings of "space": on the one hand "scientific space", and on the other hand "humanised space".[76] A scientific understanding of space is objective, measurable in the abstract, and analyses topography without recourse to human agency. Humanised space on the other hand is subjective, interpretative, and measurable entirely through its relationship with human interaction.

Tilley offers a useful metaphor to demonstrate the difference between the two. Scientific space is a "container" in which human activity takes place, whilst humanised space is a "medium" for human activity, inseparable from the practices which take place through it and the experiences and memories of the individuals and groups which use it. [77] A scientific approach to landscape would be invalid, overlooking its fundamentally human nature.

The particular type of humanised space most relevant to this thesis is architectural space, which marks the most "deliberate attempt to create and bound space", to make space "tangible, visible, sensible".[78] Architectural space heavily overlaps with the inscribed commemorations of cultural memory discussed earlier, but is also phenomenologically inseparable from landscape. The effect of a particular building may be more influenced by its architecture than by the local topography, or the topography may have a profound impact on the architecture. In any case, architecture and topography engage in a "dialogue" which creates the landscape. The clearest demonstration of this is in Athens. The architecture of

---

[74] Ibid: 11.
[75] Basso and Feld 1996: 11.
[76] Tilley 1994: 8.
[77] Ibid: 10.
[78] Tilley 1994: 17.

the Parthenon is inextricably linked to the natural landscape of the Acropolis; neither could fully be understood without the other, to the extent that in the popular imagination the two words are virtually interchangeable. A structure cannot be understood without acknowledgement of its setting, whilst in return architecture provides the landscape with a "focus for social activity and for the channelling of visual perception".[79]

In a tradition already widely accepted in the disciplines of aesthetics and art history, we must remember that sight is the primary, though by no means exclusive, medium through which the landscape is experienced by individuals and groups.[80] Visuality must therefore be recognised as fundamental to the manner in which buildings or monuments have an impact on the landscape. How a monument can be seen, from where, and from how far, determine the nature and extent of its impact on the topography. A highly visible monument imposes itself upon a larger landscape, taking on a significance which exists beyond its physical dimensions.

To explain this idea, Tilley employs the useful metaphor of synecdoche. This is a linguistic and metaphorical device in which a part of something is used to represent the whole. He offers typical literary examples, such as 'sail' being used to in fact signify a ship, or 'tree' used to refer to a forest as a whole. In a similar way, Tilley argues, specific spaces with meaning and significance can come to represent the landscape as a whole.[81]

This metaphor could in fact be applied further. Significant monuments or architectural spaces are able not only to represent the landscape as a whole. They can also represent the collective identity of the communities which inhabit that landscape, and even the cultural memory of those who inhabited it in the past. The Acropolis of Athens is again a perfect example of this. It is a feature of the landscape that is recognised as representing the Athenian landscape as a whole, even Greece as a whole. It is a celebrated symbol of the collective identity of Athenians and Greeks, and it is the primary focus of the cultural memory of those who inhabited the city in the past.

---

[79] Tilley 1993: 79-80.
[80] Schama 1995: 18; Cosgrove 1998: 30.
[81] Tilley 1994: 29.

Ruins

Let us briefly examine ruins as a particular category of monument. As commemorations of cultural memory, all monuments may be considered representations of "permanence in the face of loss".[82] They commemorate and remind of a past which is lost, but which survives in cultural memory. Ruins as monuments are a particularly pertinent example of this. Their original inhabitants and functions are gone, as well as the physical integrity of their structure, and yet they exist. They are creations of the past intruding on the present landscape. Their state of preservation creates a "juxtaposition of the hard monumentality of things with their vulnerability to time's passing", with this fundamental tension forming what Porter calls a "sublime aura…where monuments and ruins meet".[83] There is a natural fascination with these paradoxical phenomena.

Ginsberg attempted to define the particular characteristics of ruins in their interactions with individuals and groups. Three aspects of these are relevant for our discussion. These are: ruins as "symbol", ruins as "political", and ruins as "sentimental".[84]

Ruins can be versatile symbols. They are able to represent a landscape, a community identity, a cultural memory of the past, even specific cultural memories of people, events, and places.[85] Their dual role as both lost and permanent, as having existed in the past and existing now in the present, make ruins powerful symbols in the commemoration and perpetuation of memories.

Ruins can also be political, and Ginsberg highlights, with some similarity to Tilley's synecdoche, how ruins are subjected to "proprietorship", through which the ruins are claimed to 'belong' to a society, to a particular identity, to a ruling class, an ideology, or a religion.[86] These groups can then claim various kinds of authority through the symbolic power of the ruins.

Ginsberg cautions us, however, that ruins cannot simply be reduced to dispassionate and cynical manipulation of the past. Ruins are also 'sentimental', in the sense that they

---

[82] Porter 2011: 685.
[83] Ibid: 686.
[84] Ginsberg 2004: 109-114.
[85] Ibid: 109.
[86] Ibid: 114.

inspire personal and collective emotions: loss, pride, wonder, kinship, or suffering – the particular response would depend on the context of the ruins and their associated cultural memories.[87] Fundamentally, ruins and other monuments are powerful because they make people *feel* something.

Ritual and liminality

The anthropologist Maurice Bloch asserts that different societies display different types of engagement with time and with the past. Some societies function in "mundane" time, in which there is the "absence of the past as a subject matter in their discourse". Others function in "ritual" time, "where the past and the present are so fused that the present is a mere manifestation of the past."[88] Bradley has continued the tradition, arguing that mundane time dictates the parameters and norms of everyday life, of the here and now, whilst ritual time, concerned as it is with repeated and traditional activities, links the past, the present, and the future.[89]

Those societies that function in mundane time, Bloch argues, have fewer hierarchical roles and delineations of social structure, whilst those that function in ritual time have more established structures and hierarchies, recognise them as permanent and timeless, and express them through organised and repeated ritual activities.[90] Rituals are given authority and meaning as a result of their formalised, unchanging, nature,[91] and this relationship with time can be politically manipulated. Whatever is considered to represent continuity from the past will be assumed inevitably to continue in the future. There is a link between the perceived timelessness of ritual and the maintenance of the existing social order.[92]

These proposals certainly reflect the Marxist influence upon Bloch, a manner of interpretation which fundamentally equates religion and ritual with intransigent hierarchy. Indeed, he states that ritual does not just show correlation with hierarchy, but in fact "*that is what it is about*"[93] [his emphasis]. Whilst this argument may have some merit, it does not

---

87 Ibid: 109.
88 Bloch 1977: 288.
89 Bradley 1991: 211.
90 Bloch 1977: 288.
91 Gosden and Lock 1998: 4.
92 Bradley 1991: 211.
93 Bloch 1977: 289

justify the categorical division of mutually exclusive mundane and ritual societies. Even in Bloch's own example of the pinnacle of a mundane society, that of the Hadza people of Tanzania, there is still an engagement in some ritual activities.[94] Instead of seeking to catalogue societies as either 'mundane' or 'ritual', we should recognise that these are in fact two differentiated 'realms of activity' which exist *within* societies.

But how are these two realms of activity navigated by societies? Liminality, from the Latin 'limen', 'threshold', refers to the point of negotiation between two contrasting states. Liminality can be literal: just as the threshold of a building is the point of passage from outside to inside, so borders and boundaries can represent the liminal space between territories. But it is often related to less tangible transitions: birth, adolescence, and death; twilight and eclipses. In each case, the 'limen' is a period or place of transition.

Turner expresses the liminal as part of a three-stage process of *rites de passage*, the "rites which accompany every change of place, state, social position, and age"; these are "separation", "limen", and "aggregation".[95] 'Separation' may be literal or symbolic, indicating the detachment of the individual or group undertaking the rite from their regular state, whether that is physical separation from a location or social group, or a symbolic cessation of usual behaviour. The liminal phase is the time of transition. The participating individual or group is of ambiguous status as they undergo a process of social or cultural transformation. Finally, in 'aggregation' the individual or group is reincorporated into society. The *rite de passage* is over and the participants are returned to, or given a new form of, social and cultural stability.[96]

When we compare Bloch's theory of the opposing systems of mundane and ritual time with Turner's explanation of the liminal state as being "neither here nor there", and "both in and out of time",[97] we may recognise the liminal as the stage of transition from the mundane to the ritual, from the everyday 'here and now' of the present, to the perceived timelessness of ritual.

---

[94] Ibid.
[95] Turner 1969: 94.
[96] Ibid: 95.
[97] Ibid.

A further feature of the liminal phase recognised by Turner is that of 'communitas'. Through the process of separation and liminal ambiguity, the restraints of normal social structure are removed, and all are equal in the shared experience of the *rite de passage*. This is 'communitas', the sense – Bloch might argue illusion – of common social purpose, shared identity, and equal status, of equality through liminality.[98]

Bloch would perhaps be correct to call it an illusion. The abandonment of normal social order is transitory, and after emerging from the liminal state normal social structure resumes. Whether illusory or not, Turner suggests that although hierarchy and social structure are restored, participants nonetheless have the perception of having taken equal part in an experience, resulting in the "essential and generic human bond" of shared identity.[99]

The relationships, demonstrated above, which exist between time, ritual, and liminality allow us to link them to commemorations of cultural memory. Ruins and commemorative monuments are themselves liminal and ambiguous, belonging to both the present and the past, lost but nonetheless permanent, both mundane and timeless. They are the catalyst of the transition from mundane time to ritual time. The unifying influence of 'communitas' reinforces the shared identity of the community, with each other and with those of whom they have a cultural memory of kinship.

[98] Ibid: 96.
[99] Ibid: 97.

The Past During the Early Emergence of the Polis

It is impossible to approach the subject of the past in Iron Age Greece without considering the role of tomb and hero cult, the primary ritual engagements with the past which took place in the period. Antonaccio's influential work, "An Archaeology of Ancestors", provides a detailed analysis of the phenomena, but her conclusions, as well as those found in other previous scholarship, require probing and questioning. Additionally, the consideration of tomb and hero cult requires an acknowledgement of the social and political context in which such activities were taking place, namely the first stages of the emergence of the polis as an organisational model for communities in early Greece, and the importance of land, territory, identity, and power to emerging poleis. Furthermore, it is necessary to relate our observations regarding tomb cult to the previous theoretical discussion of the role of landscape and memory in societies.

. . .

The early emergence of the Polis

Hansen, founder of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, suggests that a polis may be understood as a settlement which has developed a sense of "state and society",[100] whilst Morgan emphasises the role of the polis as a focal point for a community's ethnic identity as its most definitive characteristic feature.[101] Whitley identifies a number of features which may indicate that a settlement is developing into a "state and society". One of these is the planned arrangement of urban space: a typical polis may have had fortification walls, a temple for public worship, an agora, and a supply of drinking water accessible to the public.[102] Such a checklist is not definitive, however, and a polis may have had a widely dispersed population which was not confined to city walls, such as at Sparta or early Corinth.[103] City walls are a particularly striking example of an organised social structure manifested in architecture,[104]

[100] Hansen 2006: 1.
[101] Morgan 2003: 5.
[102] Whitley 1991: 168.
[103] Ibid: 169.
[104] The literal division between the city and the countryside can stand for the political division of the polis from its environs (Lang 2007: 191).

but even in their absence, the polis was characterised to some extent by the organisation of urban space, and the delineation of public and private space.[105]

Public space may be subdivided into two main categories: political and religious.[106] In the Archaic and Classical polis, the political activities of the citizens were conducted in specific spaces, such as a *bouleuterion*, the meeting place of the council, and whilst the role and importance of the council varied enormously from polis to polis, it was nonetheless typical to ascribe areas of public space as political zones.[107]

Religious space too was often distinguished as separate from private space: temples did not exist in the Mycenaean Era, and the distinction between ritual and non-ritual space could often be blurred.[108] In contrast the use of a particular space as a specific site for cult was a key feature of the polis, with temples becoming the "most conspicuous type of monumental architecture".[109] Indeed, Morris suggests that it was the construction of distinct temple buildings within an urban centre, as well as the establishment of rural sanctuaries associated with it, "which defined the polis".[110] To these features we can add that tomb and hero cult were particularly prevalent in areas such as Attica and the Argolid where the polis was emerging most prominently, and may be indicative of political developments in these new kinds of societies.[111] This is a proposal which will be further addressed later.

Private space was also characterised by relative order. Settlements of the Early Iron Age were relatively unplanned in their layout, with individual houses generally constructed as and when required and in whatever space was available and convenient.[112] In the Archaic and Classical periods, the construction of private and domestic structures was arranged in advance, with "the conscious decision of the community", and was designed to complement the establishment of items of infrastructure such as streets and drainage.[113] Such ordered

---

[105] Lang 2007: 191.
[106] Spaces for leisure such as theatres and gymnasia would also come under 'public space', but are not so vital when considering the very essence of a polis (Lang 2007: 190).
[107] Hansen 2004: 26.
[108] Ibid: 18.
[109] Ibid.
[110] Morris 1991: 37.
[111] Morgan 2003: 189; Antonaccio 1995: 254; Osborne 2009: 97.
[112] Lang 2007: 190.
[113] Ibid.

construction may indicate the "organisation of the civic body".[114] The polis was not simply a group of people who live in the same area, but an ordered community.

The emergence of the polis was the result of a series of changes which affected the communities of 8th century Greece. De Polignac proposes that the most important was a dramatic population boom.[115] He argues that reformed agricultural techniques such as a shift towards organised arable farmers instead of roaming hunters and herders resulted in higher food production, higher fertility, and longer survival.[116] However, it is not unreasonable to suggest that more regimented allocation of arable land may have been the result of an increased population rather than the initial cause of it. Whatever the precise cause of the proposed boom, Snodgrass nonetheless agrees with its existence, arguing that the increase in Attic burials indicates that the population may have multiplied by as much as seven between 780 and 720 BC.[117]

There are, however, problems with this interpretation. Morris doubts the existence of a population boom. Certainly, he recognises an increased population in urban centres, but prefers to interpret this as a nucleation of the population at larger towns.[118] Additionally, in contrast to De Polignac, Osborne points out that, despite the absence of geographical evidence, artistic representations of granaries in the 10th and 9th centuries suggest that fixed arable farming must have played a role previously.[119] A compromise is the best solution: in response to population increase and the nucleation of the population at urban centres in the 8th century, the arrangement of land dedicated to agrarian cultivation, though not necessarily a new development, took on a greater importance.

When growing communities began to place greater emphasis on farming and therefore to acquire their food more exclusively from settled arable land, they also, for the first time, acquired fixed non-urban territory. A "common and sustained effort to ensure permanent possession of the land" was required.[120] This collective sense of territory in a community and the mutual responsibility for its protection were the driving forces behind the shared

---

[114] Ibid.
[115] De Polignac 1995: 34.
[116] Ibid.
[117] Snodgrass 1980: 22.
[118] Morris 1991: 33.
[119] Osborne 2009: 25-26.
[120] De Polignac 1995: 49.

cultural and ethnic identity which would be a defining feature of the polis. In time this would lead to hoplite warfare, in which a citizen army protected the territory and interests of the polis, but in the early stages of the emergence of the polis, sanctuaries and other cult sites were often used as symbolic signifiers of ownership. Extra-urban sanctuaries, for example, often represented the boundaries of a community's claimed territory, and by extension the ethnic and cultural dominion of a polis.[121]

Tomb and hero cult, as well as, in turn, cults at architectural ruins of the Bronze Age, must be considered in this context, investigating how these activities reflect the political and cultural developments of the period.

'Tomb' and 'Hero' cult

The existence in early Greece of a form of cult venerating heroes of the distant past was first recognised by Farnell in 1921, who proposed a distinction between, on the one hand, a general behaviour of respect towards the dead and towards one's immediate ancestors, and, on the other hand, the worship of long-dead heroes with whom there is no direct genealogical link.[122] The idea of hero cult was embraced by Cook in his reports from Mycenae in the 1950s,[123] but it was Coldstream, who, in a 1976 article, brought the idea more prominently into modern archaeological scholarship: he revived Farnell's proposition that when a tomb is left unused for generations before ritual activity is initiated, then we must understand the cult as directed towards a hero, rather than an ancestor.[124]

Coldstream's article begins with an understated *caveat*: "Greek hero-worship has always been a rather untidy subject, where any general statement is apt to provoke suspicion".[125] In accordance with this warning, we shall endeavour to give a brief précis of hero and tomb cult, whilst highlighting some of the 'suspicions' which have been raised in response to the previous scholarship of the subject.

---

[121] Ibid: 35.
[122] Farnell 1921: 4.
[123] Cook 1953a; Cook 1953b.
[124] Coldstream 1976: 9.
[125] Ibid: 8.

What are hero cult and tomb cult?

Coldstream's article was largely based on the reinterpretation of old evidence, such as the excavation of the Mycenaean tombs at Prosymna, in the vicinity of the Argive Heraion, by Blegen in the 1930s. Blegen discovered fifty chamber tombs, of which thirteen contained votive deposits dating to the 8th century. The ceramic finds consisted of jugs and hydriai suitable for libations as well as cups and kraters implying that some kind of drinking or feasting activity took place.[126] Blegen interpreted this as evidence that "the cult of the dead…was still flourishing in the cemetery at the Heraeum long after the Mycenaean Age had passed away", and that this was the veneration of ancestors, demonstrating the "racial continuity" of the inhabitants of the Argolid across the Early Iron Age.[127]

Coldstream correctly points out the central flaw in this interpretation, namely that Blegen is "unable to fill the long Dark Age gap".[128] In its place he promoted the interpretation offered by Cook in his analysis of the similar phenomenon at Mycenae, who highlighted that the cult activities were "instituted by people who preserved no continuity of memory (and little enough of blood) some centuries after the occupants of the tombs had passed into oblivion".[129] These were not known (or even imagined) ancestors, but anonymous heroes of a distant and different past.

Another significant sea-change in the scholarly discussion of tomb and hero cult came about with Antonaccio's *An Archaeology of Ancestors* in 1995. Cook and Coldstream had both concluded that the ritual activity which took place at Mycenaean tombs in the Geometric period was hero cult. Antonaccio, however, sought to rehabilitate an aspect of Blegen's interpretation by reintroducing the concept of ancestors. Furthermore, she argues that 'tomb cult' must be understood as a separate phenomenon from 'hero cult'.

In justifying the separation of tomb and hero cult she identifies three main distinctions between the two: constructed shrines to heroes may be found at or near Mycenaean settlement sites, but none exist at the tombs which receive votive offerings; tomb cults are always anonymous, and have relatively modest offerings, as opposed to

---

[126] Coldstream 1976: 9; Blegen 1937: 263.
[127] Blegen 1937: 263.
[128] Coldstream 1976: 9.
[129] Cook 1953a: 115.

wealthier cults dedicated to named heroes; and finally, votive offerings at tombs tend to be single deposits, in contrast to the tendency for repeated activity at hero shrines.[130]

Antonaccio's argument for the reintroduction of ancestors as the recipients of cult at Mycenaean tombs is based on what she describes as a "clear link" between funerary practices and tomb cult in the late 8th century:[131] the ceramic finds at tomb cults usually indicate the pouring of libations but rarely is there evidence of animal sacrifice, in a pattern which mirrors contemporary funerary practice. She also highlights that sometimes earlier tombs were reused for new burials in this period, and that graves were increasingly grouped together in enclosures determined by kin groups and family ties, an apparent recognition of the significance of ancestors.[132]

Both Antonaccio and Whitley highlight the introduction of the *opferrinne*, or offering trench, at numerous Attic cemeteries in the Late Geometric period. These trenches were not directly related to any individual grave, but received ceramic offerings in a manner reminiscent of cult.[133] Outside Attica a similar activity seems to have taken place at circular stone platforms which have been found at multiple Early Iron Age cemeteries across the Aegean, and where ritual activity took place involving libations and ceramic deposits, directed at groups of graves, often within enclosures.[134]

Antonaccio weaves these pieces of evidence together to create a broader picture of the attitude to the dead in this period, one in which family ties were valued and preserved after death. Funerary practices acknowledged and celebrated the continuing kinship of the recently dead, the immediate ancestors of the living, and these practices were closely related to similar contemporary ones which were taking place at Mycenaean tombs. Therefore, she proposes, we should understand that the occupants of the Mycenaean tombs were recognised as ancestors just as much as the recently dead.[135]

Whitley also suggests that the term 'hero cult' should be broken down with more precise categorisation. He identifies four types of hero cult. The first group is "cult at the

---

[130] Antonaccio 1995: 6; Martin 2008: 159.
[131] Ibid: 250.
[132] Ibid: 250-251.
[133] Antonaccio 1995: 250; Whitley 1994: 217.
[134] Antonaccio 1995: 250; Aslan 2011; Martin 2008: 127.
[135] Antonaccio 1995: 249-251.

tombs of the recently heroized".[136] The clearest examples of these come from the colonies where oikists would often be venerated in local cults after their deaths, but the triangular structure over a number of Late Geometric burials at Eretria could be a similar practice. The second type is "cults to named heroes".[137] These are more prevalent in the Classical period, though the Agamemnoneion at Mycenae and the Menalaion at Therapne may have already been established with named recipients in earlier periods. The next group is a variation on the previous one, and is made up of cults to named heroes who only had local relevance or were minor figures in epic tradition. An example of this may be the proposed early hero shrine to Phrontis at Sounion, dedicated to the helmsman of Menelaus who drowned at the cape.[138]

Whitley's final category is most relevant to our discussion and concerns cult at tombs which have been out of use for a considerable intervening period. Though he follows a similar principle to Antonaccio in seeking greater precision in the discussion of different hero cults, in contrast to her position he maintains that the occupant of the tomb, though unnamed, would often have been considered a hero.[139]

Of course there are overlapping categories, but Whitley, in a manner true to Coldstream's earlier warning, sums up the ambiguities which are inherent in any attempt to neatly categorise these inter-related cults: "Some (but not all) hero cults were tomb cults; some (but not all) tomb cults were cults of ancestors; and some (but not all) ancestors were also heroes".[140] Whilst it is worthwhile to extract the different features and types, they remain inextricably linked as part of a broader 8th century phenomenon of engagement with the past.

Why did it happen?

We have discussed the difficulties in properly and precisely classifying hero and tomb cult, and examined some of their key features, but what was it that attracted the Greeks of the 8th century to the tombs of the Mycenaean period in the first place? First and foremost we must not forget that many of the Mycenaean chamber tombs and tholoi were impressive

---

[136] Whitley 1994: 220.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Whitley 1994: 221; Abramson 1979.
[139] Whitley 1994: 222.
[140] Ibid: 214.

structures, intended to survive as prominent markers within the landscape.[141] Furthermore, they would have been noticeably different. Across much of Greece burial practice changed significantly at the end of the Mycenaean period. Collective inhumation in chambers or tholoi was generally replaced by cremation and individual burial in cist graves.[142] As a result, Coldstream invites us to imagine the amazement of an 8th century Athenian or Argive, being accustomed to simple individual graves, were he to come across a monumental tomb from half a millennium earlier: "the great size of a Mycenaean tomb, and the richness of offerings, would fill him with superstitious awe".[143] Parker concurs with this suggestion, arguing that due to the dramatic difference in burial customs it is "intuitively plausible" that the people of the 8th century BC "imagined impressive Mycenaean tombs as harbouring individuals from the age of demigods".[144]

Certainly this must be true. The Greeks lived in landscapes of the past: tumuli, just as much as ruined citadels, would have been highly visible and prominent landmarks, constant reminders of a glorious but distant and perhaps little understood past.[145] But this would have been as true at any point in the Early Iron Age as it would have been in the 8th century. We require further explanation as to why there was such a surge of interest from around 750 BC.

Coldstream strongly advocated the influence of Homer on hero cult, arguing that it was the spread of Homeric epic which predicated a renewed interest in the tombs, as people sought to discover and connect with the heroes of the legendary past.[146]

We should be wary of such a statement. He is surely not wrong to state that the spread of Homer's epics, or at least the popularity of the epic tradition within which Homer became the most prominent figure, would have piqued an interest in the heroes of the earlier age. However, in order for this to be the primary cause of an increase in tomb and hero cult we must assume two things: first, that the heroes of the epic stories were not already widely known through the oral tradition before the canonisation of myth by Homer;

---

[141] Coldstream 1976: 14.
[142] Antonaccio 1995: 3.
[143] Coldstream 1976: 14.
[144] Parker 2011: 288.
[145] Morris 1988: 758.
[146] Coldstream 1976: 14.

and, secondly, that there were not other more pressing social factors encouraging the establishment of the cults.

Nonetheless, despite the difficulties with ascribing too much credit to the influence of epic, Homer cannot be ignored. As Antonaccio argues, "All considerations of early Greek society, history, and culture refer to Homer".[147] But, for her, a slightly more nuanced interpretation is required. She argues that the significance of Homer and the epic tradition is most clearly seen in two ways: first, the Mycenaeans, and the Bronze Age in general, were linked in the minds of the Greeks with the heroes of the poems (despite the discrepancies discussed in the following section between the Mycenaean Period and the world described by Homer); and, secondly, Homer encouraged a sense of dichotomy between the 'real' world of his own day and the idealised mythical age of heroes.[148] The monuments and landmarks of the past became value-laden and vibrant symbols.[149] The historical veracity of the poems is considerably less important than the "ideology and society which produced them".[150] The "ideology and society" first beginning to emerge in Late Geometric Greece was of course the polis. Our Homeric questions will be returned to in greater depth in the following chapter.

The nature of the polis system is of key importance in understanding the motivation behind tomb and hero cult. It was characterised in part by the enfranchisement of a broader class of citizens, nucleating at urban centres whilst the land around was increasingly used for fixed arable farming. Both within poleis, and between poleis, "the struggle for land and political power" was fraught.[151] Antonaccio proposes that the veneration of tombs and heroes was an attempt to "link rights to the resource of land with descent".[152] According to her line of argument this is of course further evidence that the occupants of the tombs were literally considered ancestors: the 8th century inhabitants of an area could lay claim to land if they could claim descent from those buried in it.

We may again be wary of the idea of claiming direct descent, but the practising of ritual activity at an ancient monument within a landscape does nonetheless produce an

---

147 Antonaccio 1995: 4.
148 Ibid: 4-5.
149 Morris 1988: 758.
150 Antonaccio 1995: 5.
151 Ibid: 254.
152 Ibid: 261.

ideological link between its current inhabitants and those of the past. In the opening chapter we used the term *point de départ* to refer to an event that prompts the engagement with the past and the evocation of cultural memory. In times of rapid social change, communities tend to seek a sense of permanence through 'memories' of the past.[153] The emerging poleis were new and different communities, within which and between which struggles for power were taking place. These times of uncertainty were the *point de départ*, in response to which the fiction of permanence would have been an attractive and powerful prospect.

Snodgrass proposed that a connection between the emerging polis and tomb and hero cult is discernible on the basis that regions which were slower to develop poleis did not engage in these kinds of cults.[154] Lakonia, Thessaly, Achaia, and Crete, he argues, did not display, or were slower to display, early signs of the emergence of the polis. He claims that in the absence of the ensuing struggle for land and power associated with the emergence of this political form tomb cults were never instituted. Meanwhile, in the Argolid, where "independent communities were in competition continuously", and in Messenia, "where the threat of Spartan conquest may have anticipated the actual conquest", the legitimation of claims to the land through links to the past were more important.[155] Equally, in Attica, during the process of Athens' gradual "internal colonisation", individual communities may have sought to declare their own long-standing and non-Athenian connection to the landscape.[156]

Snodgrass' argument that the absence of tomb cult in those regions which were slower to adopt the polis, or did not at all, demonstrates that the cults were directly linked to the emergence of the polis has, however, increasingly come under attack. Wallace, for example, maintains that some examples of tomb cult exist in Crete, with Geometric pottery deposits discovered at monumental tombs in Achladia and Kamilari, and within Late Minoan cemeteries at Mochlos and Avia Fotia.[157] Antonaccio similarly doubts the complete absence of tomb cults in Achaia, and highlights that the earliest examples of tomb cult predate the

[153] Whitley 1995: 49; Alcock 2002: 32.
[154] Snodgrass 1980: 38.
[155] Osborne 2009: 97.
[156] Ibid.
[157] Wallace 2003: 270-271.

emergence of the polis.[158] Despite these exceptions, though, the general trend for these regions to lack tomb cult remains true.

Morgan also questions the relationship between tomb cult and the polis, but particularly with regard to the assumed contrast between citizenship, on the one hand, and kinship, often considered the binding identity in alternative political structures such as ethne, on the other: citizenship and kinship, she argues, like all "constructed statements of group identity" are "subject to change in nature and meaning".[159] Rather, the construction of "localised place and wider regional communities" which took place in ethne regions was "dynamic, parallel, and continuing".[160] In short, she proposes, there is no reason to suppose that a society that was not developing into a polis would have any less desire to identify and define itself through tomb cult and other connections to the past. Another explanation may be required.

The alternative offered by Morgan is that the variations in burial practices between different regions led to different responses to the discovery of Mycenaean tombs. In Thessaly and Achaia, for example, multiple burials in chamber tombs or tholoi continued through the Early Iron Age. As a result, the 8th century inhabitants of these regions would not have considered Bronze Age burials within their landscape as something particularly exotic or distant, since they were not so dissimilar to contemporary burials, and as such would not have found tomb cult to be as powerful a cultural statement or signifier of identity.[161]

As is often the case, a degree of compromise will be necessary to find a coherent solution. Certainly, it makes sense that in the regions which continued with multiple burials in chamber tombs or tholoi a Mycenaean tomb may not have been as powerful a symbol as elsewhere. However, we must still recognise that in regions where the polis was emerging in the latter half of the 8th century tomb cult was considerably more widespread.

Morris highlights that "the new polis ideology of the eighth century bound the community together through the creation of the citizen estate", and follows Bérard's line of

---

[158] Antonaccio 1995: 254.
[159] Morgan 2003: 7.
[160] Ibid.
[161] Ibid: 190.

argument that hero cult was an extension of this, providing places of communal activity in which the distinctions between ranks of the aristocracy and citizenry were downplayed as they shared in the veneration of a hero belonging to the city as a whole.[162]

De Polignac also emphasised the somewhat ambiguous role that the hero played in the emerging polis: "all these heroes are located at the meeting point of two worlds, of two ideologies, of two sets of military and political values".[163] Heroes were from the past, but existed in the present, and they were all-powerful kings revered in an age of expanding enfranchisement. In short, they were fundamentally liminal figures.

In these arguments we may recognise the theories of Bloch and Turner which were discussed earlier: Bloch argues that ritual activities were designed to link the past and the present – in tomb and hero cult this is certainly the case – and that the pretence of permanence and continuity lends authority not only to the rituals themselves but also to those who control them. As such, Bloch suggests, ritual may be exploited as a means of preserving social hierarchies.[164] Turner, meanwhile, in examining the *limen* as the threshold between the mundane and the ritual identifies *communitas* as the sense (or illusion) of shared experience, common identity, and common purpose which is produced even between people of entirely different social status.[165]

This offers a different perspective on the power struggles which were taking place in the 8th century. Not only was there the enfranchised citizen class seeking to gain power, and the city as a whole seeking to gain land for its citizens, but there were also the ruling elites. These were the 'big men' who had dominated their communities throughout the Early Iron Age through the personal employment of violence and competitive display, but rarely through lineage.[166] Using the same principle as Assmann's theory that communicative memory can only survive three or four generations,[167] Antonaccio proposes that in a non-literate society power lineages would not be able to last beyond an immediate family.[168]

---

[162] Morris 1987: 193; Bérard 1982: 97.
[163] De Polignac 1984: 147.
[164] Bloch 1977: 288.
[165] Turner 1969: 96.
[166] Antonaccio 1995: 255.
[167] Assmann 1995: 127.
[168] Antonaccio 1995: 253.

If we follow our interpretation of Bloch and Turner's anthropological theories, namely that communal ritual activity within liminal contexts usually serves to preserve a social hierarchy, we may find another way of understanding tomb cult: ruling elites sought to link the wealthy and powerful heroes of the past with the common cultural identity of their community in the present. Morris describes it as the "attempt to legitimate a vanishing ideal".[169] Whitley notes in a discussion about cultural memory that "the fiction as much as the fact of continuity is widely held to be desirable".[170] For the ruling elites faced with a changing society in 8th century Greece, the 'fiction of continuity' attempted in the veneration of heroes must have been very desirable indeed.

This particular interpretation demonstrates a principle which Morris highlights above all else: that instead of attempting "uniformitarian reconstructions of the worshippers' attitudes" we should rather recognise "the plurality of readings of the rituals available to competing groups".[171] Cults to heroes at Bronze Age tombs "simultaneously evoke the new, relatively egalitarian ideology of the polis and the older ideals of heroic aristocrats who protected the grateful and defenceless lower orders, while standing far above them".[172]

. . .

In this chapter we have approached two main areas of discussion. First, the terminological disputes which have been central to this subject throughout the history of its scholarship: Coldstream saw no difficulty in considering the 8th century ritual activity at Mycenaean tombs as hero worship, whilst Antonaccio sought to distinguish between the commemoration of 'ancestors' in tomb cult and true hero cult, which she considers largely a later development. Whitley prefers a compromise in which the roles of heroes, ancestors, and the occupants of Mycenaean tombs are different but overlapping, in what Parker considers an inevitable "pick and mix" in the absence of really definitive evidence.[173] This is certainly the most practical way forward, recognising that there are different aspects to a broader ritual engagement with the past which was taking place in this period.

---

[169] Morris 1987: 194.
[170] Whitley 1995: 49.
[171] Morris 1988: 758.
[172] Ibid: 750.
[173] Parker 2011: 292.

Secondly, we investigated the factors which led to such engagement with the past, and sought to identify the varying functions of tomb and hero cult, both in different regions of Greece and also for different sections of individual communities. In short, it is impossible to distil a single interpretation of tomb and hero cult in this period. What appears superficially (both to us and perhaps also to the contemporary participants) to be an exercise in group identity and commemoration, is in fact made up of a multitude of power struggles, both within and between communities.

These two central principles, then, must be taken into the investigation of Iron Age cult at ruins of the Bronze Age, to which considerably less attention has been paid in previous scholarship. That is to say, we must examine ruin cults in the context of the broader spectrum of engagement with the past that Whitley identifies, rather than as a phenomenon in isolation, and we must seek to identify the difference in significance of such cults both in different regions and to different groups within individual communities.

Homer

The previous chapter noted how Homer and his poems may relate to the commemoration of the past in this period, and here we shall explore this question further. We shall investigate when Homer may have produced his poems and what time period or periods are the subject of Homer's poems, before summing up how this affects our understanding of the role of cultural memory in early Greek societies. It should be noted that a comprehensive analysis of Homer and his work is far beyond the scope of this chapter or indeed this thesis. Rather, the intention is to acknowledge the importance of Homer and the epic tradition, and recognise the extent to which they may have been influential on cultural memory in the Early Iron Age.

. . .

When did Homer write?

There are two main types of evidence which can used to date the time at which Homer's poetry was first written down: there is internal evidence, that is, features of the poems themselves which can used to identify a time of writing; and there is external evidence, that is, other historical developments that indicate or imply the existence of the poems. Both types of evidence have, however, been interpreted in different ways.

Powell proposes that the most fundamental piece of internal evidence is the very existence of the poems. He proposes that the alphabet was invented specifically in order to record the poems of Homer. When Homer's epics were written down they were more or less in their canonical form from the start, he suggests, allowing for minor alterations, additions, and mistakes in transmission. In writing down the poems, a decision was made to break with oral tradition and formalise one collected version of these stories. This was quite a development and could perhaps have been the stimulus for the creation of a new writing form more suited to Greek hexameter.[174]

It is sometimes possible to identity what period a piece of poetry was written in through its writing style. Powell warns, however, that attempting to date Homer solely through the language used in the poems is problematic. Certain features or expressions

[174] Powell 1991: 187.

might be attributed varying degrees of antiquity, as is inevitable in poems that are the product of an oral tradition, but amongst the "strata in the archaeology of Homer's language" it is not possible to define precisely the most recent layer.[175]

Powell turns, however, to external evidence in an attempt to narrow down a margin of years in which the writing probably took place. He notes the conventionally accepted understanding that Homer narrowly predated Hesiod. With Hesiod's supposed *floruit* around 730-700, we may therefore conclude that the recording of Homer's poems took place in the first half of the 8th century.[176] Similarly, Kirk highlights the existence of other poems which were certainly written after at least the *Iliad*. For example, Hellenistic scholiasts dated the composition of the *Aethiopis*, a lost poem of the epic cycle which continued the story where the *Iliad* left off, to the late 8th century. This requires Homer to have been at least contemporary with, but most likely earlier than, this time.[177]

Another proposed piece of external evidence is the arrival in the Late Geometric period (c.760-c.690 BC) of pictorial and narrative decorations on pottery which were possibly (and in a number of cases probably) inspired by epic scenes or themes. It suggests that there could have been a widespread dissemination of the formalised collection of stories by the middle of the 8th century.[178]

There is one particular piece of external evidence that arguably narrows down most effectively the margin of years in which Homer's poems first took on canonical form. This is the 'Nestor's Cup', a small Rhodian kotyle inscribed with three lines of verse, and found in the grave of a small boy at Pithekoussai. It reads: "Nestor's cup is good to drink from;/but he who drinks from *this* cup, forthwith him/will seize the desire of fair-garlanded Aphrodite".[179] It is an ironic message. The cup is a small and not particularly luxurious item scratched with these lines and deposited in a child's grave. And yet it is compared to the mythical golden cup of the great Nestor, King of Pylos.

Powell argues that it is reasonable to assume that at the time it was deposited, c. 740 BC, Homer's poems, at least the *Iliad*, were canonised and known in the Greek world,

---

[175] Powell 1991: 207-8.
[176] Ibid.
[177] Kirk 1962: 268.
[178] Powell 1991: 209.
[179] Watkins 1976: 40.

and even claims to associate the "subtle humour" with the influence of the story-telling style of Homer.[180] This is a step too far perhaps, and it is certainly possible that the resident of Pithekoussai who scratched these words would have known at least one version of a story involving Nestor and his cup, without it necessarily being Homer's. A more straightforward line of argument stems simply from the fact that it is written in verse, which may imply that these lines were inscribed after a written form of poetry had already been developed. By this argument the time at which Homer's poems were recorded narrows towards the middle of the 8th century.

It is worth noting that Kirk, amongst some others, prefers to place the composition of the *Odyssey* at a later date towards the end of the 8th century, and in the hands of another poet.[181] Certainly there are stylistic and thematic differences between the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*, but this seems understandable since they are two completely separate works. Whatever the status of the *Odyssey*, the *terminus ante quem* which the 'Nestor's Cup' seems to provide for the characters of the *Iliad* nonetheless seems to place the emergence of written epic poetry in the middle of the 8th century.

There are, however, problems with the arguments offered by Powell and Kirk. There is no evidence to suggest that the arrival of writing prompted a "reverence for the written word" and made oral poetry obsolete.[182] Improvised and performed poetry continued well beyond the introduction of writing, with improvised performances at symposia and non-canonical versions of the tragedies attested into at least the 4th century BC. Thomas observes that rather than being introduced specifically as a way to record poetry, the evidence in fact suggests that writing was primarily adopted for more pragmatic purposes. The marking of property and 'signatures' inscribed by craftsmen are common. It is worth noting that the poetic reference to a heroic figure in the inscription on Nestor's Cup was still ultimately used to mark property.[183]

Jensen observes that it is only towards the end of the 7th century that writing seems to have been used to record longer reams of information, such as the laws from Dreros or the laws of Draco and Solon in Athens. Furthermore, she notes that a piece of work the

---

[180] Powell 1991: 15, 209.
[181] Kirk 1962: 300.
[182] Thomas 1992: 48.
[183] Ibid.

length of Homer's poems could surely only have been recorded on papyrus, rather than on animal hide or as an inscription, and that it is unlikely that papyrus was available in Greece until at least 650 BC.[184]

Some restraint should additionally be shown regarding the evidence of pictorial decoration on pottery. The identification of epic scenes in Late Geometric pictorial pottery is by no means certain, and it is not until the early 7th century in the Orientalising period that there are representations of what may be specific myths.[185] Even then there is no definitive evidence that the scenes on decorated pottery were taken directly from Homer, rather than being based on a broader shared oral tradition. Indeed, the appearance of non-Homeric heroes such as Herakles and Jason indicate other influences.[186] This is an argument expounded by Snodgrass who sees shared themes between Homer and Late Geometric artists, but a disconnect when it comes to specific subject matters. He declares that he has not been able "to detect, in the art of the eighth century, a single clear and incontrovertible reflection of the impact of Homer's poems".[187]

Jensen further notes that contemporary lyric poetry emerging from around 700 BC also often concerned itself with non-Homeric stories such Herakles, Jason, and the Theban cycle. The art and literature of the 7th century does not give the impression of having been culturally overpowered by Homer in the way that Powell suggests. In short, Jensen argues, a canonical and codified *Iliad* and *Odyssey* seem to be a later, 6th century, phenomenon.[188] Despite these powerful arguments, Thomas nonetheless makes a simple but effective point that if Homer had indeed produced the poems in the 6th century, we might expect to know more concrete information about him, rather than him being the mysterious, possibly mythical, figure that he is.[189]

As the above précis demonstrates, the time at which Homer produced his epics has been debated for decades, and it is far beyond the scope of this thesis to provide an answer to this question. The precise answer, however, of whether Homer produced a canonical

---

[184] Jensen 1980: 97-98.
[185] Kirk 1962: 284; for example see Mylonas 1955: 63 for the blinding of Polyphemus depicted on a Proto-Attic amphora from Eleusis, c.675 BC.
[186] Jensen 1980: 104.
[187] Snodgrass 1998: 38-39.
[188] Ibid: 106.
[189] Thomas 1992: 46.

version of his epic poems in the 8th, 7th, or 6th century is not actually vital to this thesis. This is what we do know: from the late 8th century narrative scenes were depicted on painted pottery; in the same period inscriptions that refer to specific heroic characters, sometimes in verse, were made on vessels; and by the start of the 7th century figures that may arguably be recognised as specific characters from lyric poetry and epic tradition began appearing in decoration. In Jensen's words, Greek culture during the emergence from the Dark Ages was becoming "characterized by a wealth of oral art in ever-changing forms".[190] Whether or not 'Homer' himself had created the canonical Trojan cycle of epic poetry by this point, an oral tradition of a heroic past was nonetheless undoubtedly becoming a dominant force in Greek culture in the late 8th century.

What period did Homer write about?

In early modern scholarship it was long assumed that the stories in Homer's poems were myths and nothing more. This all changed in 1871 when Heinrich Schliemann began excavating at Hisarlik in Western Anatolia and uncovered the ancient city that he identified as Troy.[191] With self-made modern myths of Schliemann finding the site with no more than a compass and a copy of the *Iliad*, and with further excavations in Mycenae and Tiryns, the veracity and historicity of Homer's account of the Trojan War was suddenly in vogue.[192] The evidence seemed to fit: the gold assemblage known as Priam's Treasure would have been typical of the renowned wealth of Troy, and the militaristic warrior graves of Mycenae would have suited the Greek heroes.

This interpretation would not last, however, and increased and improved excavation at Bronze Age sites began to call the historicity of Homer back into question. The more was discovered, the less the Bronze Age seemed to match up with the world described in Homer. An important repeated trope of heroic behaviour in the *Iliad* is the cremation of the warrior after death. And yet the primary funerary rite of the Late Bronze Age is inhumation. In the 13th century, the supposed time of the Trojan War, it was inhumation in monumental tholos tombs. No such practice is described by Homer. Cremation on the other hand

[190] Jensen 1980: 105.
[191] Van Wijngaarden 2012: 132.
[192] Powell 2007: 55.

would not become widespread in the Aegean until after the collapse of palatial society, with its use continuing into the 8th century.[193]

There is little indication in the *Iliad* of any knowledge of the over-riding feature of Mycenaean elite life, namely elaborate palaces housing the kings and their Linear B-writing scribes as they oversaw lucrative economic enterprises.[194] A faithful representation of the Mycenaean elite would include references to their palaces as administrative and economic centres. This argument must be treated with caution, however. The *Iliad*, after all, is a story of war. Homer's legendary walls of Troy do correlate with the finely built walls which were discovered at the site dating to the 13th century, and indeed are reminiscent of Cyclopean fortification walls at palatial sites across Greece. It may well be a literary rather than historical consideration that led to the omission of any discussion of the economic circumstances of palatial society.

Indeed, a number of features of Homer's account are highly reminiscent of actual Late Bronze Age material culture. Weapons, for example, are always described as being bronze, as of course was the case in the Late Bronze Age and had ceased with the onset of the Early Iron Age. Homer also refers to boar's tusk helmets,[195] made up of cut strips of tusk sewn into a leather or felt cap, which have been found in a number of burials dating to the Late Helladic and Submycenaean periods (16th-11th century), as well as being portrayed in 13th century frescos at Pylos. Interestingly the boar's tusk helmet which Odysseus wears in Book 10 is said to have been passed down through several generations before it is given to him. As Powell highlights, "even in Homer the boar's tusk helmet is an antique", as indeed they may well have been in the 13th century.[196]

The most demonstrative example of the Homeric portrayal of historical periods is shields. Most often, Homer describes the typical round shields which were growing in popularity in the final centuries of the Bronze Age, as seen on the 12th century 'Warrior Vase' from Mycenae,[197] but occasionally he describes variants, such as Ajax's shield which

---

[193] Cavanagh and Mee 1998: 93; Kirk 1985: 9.
[194] Powell 2007: 56.
[195] *Iliad* 10.260-5.
[196] Powell 2007: 57.
[197] National Archaeological Museum, Athens (http://www.namuseum.gr/collections/prehistorical/mycenian/mycenian08-en.html)

was "like a wall",[198] and Hector's shield which reached from his neck to his ankles, much longer than a usual round shield.[199] The round shield would remain popular throughout the Early Iron Age and into the Archaic period, but the taller types, such as the 'tower' shield or the 'figure-of-eight', were much earlier creations, appearing from the 16th century. Powell describes this as "confusion between old and new" and argues that it is a phenomenon that permeates Homer's poetry.[200]

Identifying the mixture of "old and new" in Homer has been part of the scholarly discussion at least since Nilsson's seminal guest lecture series at the University of London in 1929, subsequently expanded and published in print in 1940.[201] He highlighted the description of Nestor's Cup in Book 11 of the *Iliad*, which aside from its legendary enormous size closely resembles a golden cup found in Shaft Grave IV at Mycenae dating to the 16th century.[202] Nilsson additionally notes that simply recognising Mycenae as a wealthy and well-built city, and "its position as the kingly seat of the leader of the Greeks", harks back to circumstances that were long over in Homer's own time.[203] These, however, were alongside repeated references to the city of Sidon and to the Phoenicians as traders, sailors, and craftsmen, which would have been of present day relevance to a poet of the 8th century BC when Greek and Phoenician interaction was at its peak.[204]

In the mixture of "old and new" we must acknowledge two things: first, that "historical circumstances compel us to seek the origin of the Greek epics in the glorious Mycenaean Age"[205] – there can be no doubt that aspects of the stories are very ancient indeed; and, secondly, that in every age since the time of those original tales there have been additions, adaptations, and omissions, each of which would have been influenced by the particular historical circumstances of the time.[206]

---

198 *Iliad* 7.219.
199 Powell 2007: 57; Nilsson 1940: 143.
200 Powell 2007: 58.
201 Nilsson 1940.
202 Hood 1994: 159; Nilsson 1940: 137-8.
203 Nilsson 1940: 158.
204 Ibid: 131-2.
205 Ibid: 206.
206 Sherratt 1990: 821.

Oral tradition

The accruement in Homer of practices, peoples, and material cultures of different periods can be explained by identifying a long tradition of oral transmission and performance. We can be sure that the first versions of the stories of Homer were sung long before his own time, presumably in a Mycenaean time in which the settings, themes, and perhaps even the names of some individuals, would have been familiar. Each performance by each performer over hundreds of years was unique, incorporating new ideas and forgetting old ones. "The songs were ever in flux and were crystallized by each singer only when he sat before an audience and told them the tale".[207]

These songs were passed down from poet to poet through the generations, made both memorable and malleable by the use of formulae. Perhaps the most obviously formulaic feature of Homeric verse is the epithet: "Goodly Odysseus", "Agamemnon, King of Men", "Lofty Ilium", "Well-built Mycenae, rich in gold", and so on.[208] These allowed the poet to take up perhaps half a line with phrases that would have followed certain names instinctively, a reflex reaction which barely required remembering. Lord estimates that around 90% of Homer's lines contain, or are entirely made up of, formulaic phraseology. The long length of hexameter lines, he argues, allowed Greek oral poets to find a useful balance between ease of memorability and the scope for originality and variety in the use of composite formulaic phrases.[209]

It would be wrong, though, to reduce Homer to being just another poet in the oral tradition. Rather he was the instigator of what Lord calls "one of the greatest events in the cultural history of the West, the writing down of the Iliad and the Odyssey".[210] Classical and Hellenistic scholiasts describe other works of the epic cycle as being at most around seven thousand verses, which is half the length of either the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, which together come to around twenty-seven thousand lines.

They are considerably longer than could have been performed publicly, even over the extended time of a festival. It seems certain that the Homeric poems must have been

---

[207] Lord 1960: 151.
[208] Kirk 1976: 4.
[209] Lord 1960: 151.
[210] Ibid: 152.

composed from the poet's extensive collection of smaller poems, compiled into much longer works than would ever realistically have been publicly performed in full, perhaps for the express purpose of dictating them to a scribe.[211] In turn, once rendered in the Greek alphabet, the propagation of the now extensive Homeric epics was rapid.[212]

Of course the very specific reason why a certain scribe and a certain poet chose to record these epic poems can never be known exactly. Lord speculates that the scribe could have been inspired by the increasing formalisation of the creation myths of the Jewish people (with some documents of the Torah thought to have first been written down in the 9th and 8th century), by the canonisation of the Epic of Gilgamesh, and by the gradual establishment of the Assyrian library at Ninevah.[213]

These particular suggestions can never be substantiated, but what seems clear is that there was a change in attitude to the traditional tales which had been passed down by generations of poets. The history of the lost heroic age of Greece would no longer be tinkered with, but set in stone. Previously, the stories of the Bronze Age had been heard, enjoyed, and adapted for re-telling with free rein, but from the time of Homer onwards, there would be an unchanging, canonical version of the mythical telling of the past. The past was made official.

. . .

The past may have been "made official" by Homer, but, as mentioned above, the precise period in which he did this remains the subject of fierce debate. The significance and influence of Homer cannot be underestimated, but it is important to keep in mind the broader context. As Thomas notes, oral tradition did not end with Homer. As Jensen points out, oral tradition, both Homeric and non-Homeric, was being represented and explored in a variety of forms – in narrative art, in the humour of the Nestor's Cup inscription, and in lyric and epic poetry. The breadth of the tradition may be supported by the presence of the hero cult to Phrontis at Sounion, which Abramson suggests was established in the late 8th century.[214] Phrontis appears in one single passing reference in the *Odyssey*.[215] A hero cult

---

211 Kirk 1976: 2; Lord 1960: 152.
212 Kirk 1976: 3.
213 Lord 1960: 155.
214 Abramson 1979: 14.
215 *Odyssey* III: 282.

dedicated to him must surely have drawn on a more thorough account in a non-Homeric tradition.

This is not, of course, to argue that Homer's influence is overestimated. But it is necessary to challenge Coldstream's supposition that Homer was the *point de départ* for hero cult and other engagements with the past.[216] Homer is not the cause of the engagement with the past in early Greece. Rather, he is its most prominent example. Tomb cult, hero cult, varied artistic and literary representations of oral and epic tradition – these are all symptomatic of early Greek communities that were "swim[ming] in the past as fish do in water".[217] It is in this context that we must assess Iron Age cults at Bronze Age ruins.

[216] Coldstream 1976: 14.
[217] Hobsbawm 1997: 23.

Bronze Age sites without Iron Age cult

In contrast to the selected examples, many prominent Late Bronze Age sites do not have later Iron Age cult amongst their ruins. In order to provide balance, to avoid confirmation bias, and to provide a broader context for our regional comparisons, these sites must be acknowledged and their exclusion from the thesis justified.

Messenia

Pylos in Messenia was a major Mycenaean palace, in myth the home of Nestor, destroyed by fire in the 'Collapse'. The possibility of a Geometric cult amongst the ruins was raised by Brenningmeyer, who saw it as part of a broader reoccupation of the palace site.[218] This proposal has not been accepted by other scholars, however. Griebel and Nelson note that across some 20% of the area of the former palace, including the throne room, there was a thin layer of black soil containing Geometric sherds and iron "utensils", but that there was no sign of any specifically cultic behaviour.[219] The work of the Pylos Regional Archaeological Project has demonstrated that there was certainly an Iron Age reoccupation of the site, but Davis and Lynch claim that it is "far from obvious that the ruins of the palace were a focus for it". Furthermore, they suggest that where there was activity amongst the ruins it was for shelter and possibly for some industrial use such as metallurgy and oil-pressing, but "we have found no evidence for the practice of cult". In addition, they note that this matches the pattern across Messenia, where there are no known examples of Iron Age cult amongst Bronze Age ruins.[220]

The Argolid

In the Argolid, Midea is unique amongst the major citadels in not having significant Iron Age activity. Late Geometric vessels in the vicinity of the nearby Dendra cemetery indicate that there was a population present in the area, though it is not clear where they were living, and they were not making use of the former citadel in any archaeologically

[218] Brenningmeyer 2003.
[219] Griebel and Nelson 2008: 97ff.
[220] Davis and Lynch 2017: 61; Hogue 2016: 156.

visible way.[221] Walberg reports that a bronze disc and a single Late Geometric sherd are the only Geometric objects that have been recorded at Midea.[222]

Attica

In Attica a prehistoric settlement existed on the north and south-eastern slopes of the hill overlooking the site of the later sanctuary at Brauron. Before the 6th century cult activities focused not on the Artemis temple and its related structures, but instead on a spring which received votive deposits from the 8th century. The only connection between the sanctuary and the prehistoric settlement is that the spring may have been in use in the Late Helladic period, though "not necessarily with a cultic function". Themelis identifies the cult at the spring as a hero cult to Iphigeneia, thought to be buried nearby. There does not seem to be evidence of either cult continuity or of any relationship between the cult and any ruins of an earlier period.[223]

Boeotia

Thebes in Boeotia raises a number of possibilities but the evidence provides few answers. Keramopoullos identified six Late Helladic tombs underneath the foundations of the temple in the sanctuary of Apollo Ismenios: the first temple of the sanctuary was an 8th century construction of poros stone, wood, and mudbrick, "probably without columns", which was destroyed at the end of the 8th century, as shown by a thick layer made up of burnt building materials and an abundance of Late Geometric and Protocorinthian pottery. Keramopoullos suggested that the site of the sanctuary marked the continuity of a Mycenaean ancestor cult, though admitted that "we have no proof that they were even aware of the tombs".[224] Later scholarship has either not supported[225] or not acknowledged[226] the possibility of a relationship between the Iron Age cult and Bronze Age remains.

---

221 Walberg 1998: 178.
222 Walberg 2007: 198.
223 Themelis 2002: 109.
224 Keramopoullos 1917: 33, 77-79.
225 Symeonoglou 1985: 237.
226 Antonaccio 1995: 130-131.

Pausanias makes an explicit reference to Bronze Age ruins as the focus for later cult at Thebes: "The Thebans say that on the part of their acropolis where the agora is located there is the ancient house of Kadmos" and there he describes a tree trunk covered in bronze which they called Dionysos Kadmeios, alongside a cult statue and an altar.[227] Symeonoglou argues that the open air cult of Dionysus Kadmeios continued the tradition of a Mycenaean cult. He argues that Pausanias' account implies long-standing tradition and that the burnt ruins of the palace would have been a fitting setting for such a cult; he additionally proposes that, though Pausanias witnessed the cult in the 2nd century AD, the cult must have been established soon after the 12th century BC 'Collapse' in order that the Mycenaean tradition could have survived.[228] Despite Symeonoglou's proposals, Pausanias' suggestion of a cult tradition stretching back to the Mycenaean era of Thebes remains unexplained as there is simply no archaeological evidence for such reuse or continuity in activity in the former palace.

A cult to Herakles beginning in the late 8th century and located near to the Elektran Gates provides a final possibility of a cultic engagement with the past in Iron Age Thebes. Unfortunately due to the limitations of excavating as part of a rescue project the potential association of the cult with any Bronze Age ruins remains unanswered.[229]

There is no evidence for cultic engagement with ruins in the extensive Bronze Age fortress at Gla in Boeotia. From the destruction of the fortress in the closing stages of the Bronze Age to the construction of a chapel at the site in the Byzantine period "there was never any systematic inhabitation of the citadel",[230] and the sum total of the post-Mycenaean and pre-Mediaeval ceramic material is limited to around thirty Hellenistic sherds and two fragments of a Late Geometric vessel.[231]

Phocis

Inhabitation of Delphi in Phocis resumed in the 9th century over the area that had been the Mycenaean settlement, with some Bronze Age walls reused and new structures following the orientation of the remains. Cult activity is attested from the 8th century but

---

227 Pausanias 9.12.3-4.
228 Symeonoglou 1985: 57-59.
229 Aravantinos 2014: 154-155.
230 Iakovidis 1989: 276.
231 Iakovidis 2001: 87, 112.

Morgan notes that "it is hard to establish the spatial relationship between settlement and cult activity".[232] Evidence for 8th century cult largely comes from an extensive dump deposit that included charred bones and ash as well as pottery and tripod fragments. There is no indication whether this material was related to a specific shrine or cult setting within the settlement, or any suggestion that the cult activities that were taking place incorporated any engagement with the ruins.[233]

Thessaly

Dimini in Thessaly was a significant Mycenaean citadel with six separate megara, the largest of which was located at the top of the citadel surrounded by the ruins of earlier Neolithic houses.[234] The site did not survive the Late Bronze Age 'Collapse', going into decline after an earthquake in the 12th century and with no ceramic evidence later than Late Helladic IIIC Early. Nearby Pefkakia similarly experienced steady decline in the closing stages of the Bronze Age and shows no sign of reoccupation after an earthquake in the 12th century.[235] In contrast, another Thessalian site, Volos-Palia, did not experience a destruction, and continuous occupation is attested from the Mycenaean period to a flourishing settlement in the 8th century. There is no evidence, however, for any cult activity associated with remains of earlier phases.[236]

Lakonia

Cult activity at the Menelaion at Therapne in Lakonia seems to have begun in the late 8th century, though the sanctuary became more thoroughly established in the 7th or 6th century.[237] The hill on which the Menelaion was constructed had also been the site of a Late Bronze Age mansion. Catling describes the state of the ruins of the mansion in the Archaic period as "this rather unprepossessing heap of rubble", but nonetheless suggests that their presence may have inspired the hero cult.[238] Antonaccio rejects this by pointing out that the "focus of the monumental architecture is the natural rock, not Bronze Age remains".[239]

---

232 Morgan 1990: 126-127.
233 Ibid: 108, 127-129.
234 Adrymi-Sismani 1994: 44.
235 Morgan 2003: 97-98.
236 Malakasioti 1994: 54.
237 Antonaccio 1995: 160, 164.
238 Catling 1986: 210-211.
239 Antonaccio 1995: 165.

Indeed, the location of the shrine on the opposite side of the hill suggests that it had been deliberately constructed away from the ruins. Remaining in Lakonia, the Mycenaean palace at Agios Vasileios-Xerokampi shows no signs of reoccupation in the Iron Age. Rather, Vasilogamvrou's excavation reports repeatedly detail that after the Bronze Age the next occupation of the site was Byzantine.[240]

Crete

A number of significant Minoan sites in Crete provide no evidence of Iron Age cult activity amongst their Bronze Age ruins. Vandenabeele suggests that an 8th century settlement "probably" existed at Malia, where there had been a major Minoan palace, due to the presence of Geometric graves on the nearby island of Christos, but acknowledges that the first post-Bronze Age remains at the site itself are Byzantine.[241] Prent makes no reference to Iron Age activity there.[242]

A "ruin cult" has been proposed at the palace at Zakros in East Crete.[243] In the original excavation report Hogarth describes "painted Geometric ware…terracotta animals…[and] plaques with Archaic 'Apollo' reliefs", before going on to note that "the foundations of a considerable building in the smaller and regular megalithic style exist on the southwest slope of the hill".[244] There is no indication of what association there was between the Geometric finds and the megalithic building, which remained unexcavated. Nikolaos Platon, in his excavation report from the building, which was confirmed as a Minoan villa, makes no mention of any Iron Age activity,[245] and more recent reports from Eleftherios Platon similarly give no indication of Geometric or other post-Bronze Age activity at the villa.[246]

At Chania in West Crete, Room E of the Late Minoan palace was reused when the site was repopulated in the 8th century, though the function of the room in this period is far from clear. Fragments of drinking vessels were found, as well as slag, some bronze, a bronze

---

240 Vasilogamvrou 2011: 29; 2012: 53; 2013: 27-30; 2014: 22-24.
241 Vandenabeele 1992: 32.
242 Prent 2005.
243 Whitley 2009: 281.
244 Hogarth 1901: 148.
245 Platon, N., 1964: 165-167.
246 Platon, E., 2007: 80-82; 2010: 61-62.

pin, obsidian, animal bones, and spindle whorls made of reused Late Minoan kylix stems.[247] The excavators succinctly describe the combination of finds as "not immediately understandable".[248] A best guess might point towards some kind of combination of industrial activities, but it is not an assemblage that indicates cult activity.

Tsipopoulou gives a full outline of the chronology of the palace at Petras, noting that no areas of the site have post-Bronze Age activity until the 12th century AD.[249] The Minoan palace at Monastiraki, meanwhile, was not reoccupied until the Hellenistic period.[250] In contrast, a Geometric settlement reoccupied the former palace at Archanes, though there is no evidence of cult activity associated with the ruins.[251]

It should additionally be noted that Tylissos in north central Crete is a likely example of Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins, with Geometric votives reported at a Minoan stoa and paved court.[252] Unfortunately the excavation and publication of the site are limited, and therefore it has not been deemed suitable for inclusion in this thesis.

[247] Hallager and Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997: 213.
[248] Ibid: 215.
[249] Tsipopoulou 2012: 45-66.
[250] Kanta 2006: 32.
[251] Sakellarakis and Sakellarakis 1991: 14; 1997: 36.
[252] Prent 2003: 85.

Methodology

The selected sites are arranged into the three regions in which they are located: first Crete, then the Argolid, and finally Attica. To be able to investigate later engagement with Bronze Age ruins, we must first outline the architecture, material culture, and human activity at each site in that earlier era. We will then examine the impact at each site of the Late Bronze Age 'Collapse' in the 12th century and its immediate aftermath, before looking at what took place during the so-called 'Dark Age' of the Early Iron Age.

Providing this thorough context allows us to recreate a 'landscape of memory' at each site, the geography and history of a shared culture and identity.[253] This requires following Tilley's phenomenological approach to landscape, in which the landscape is recognised as a medium through which lived experiences took place and shared memories were formed.[254] In practical terms: what vestiges of the Bronze Age remained visible to the site's Iron Age inhabitants? Would the original functions of individual ruins have been apparent? How prominent were the ruins within the Iron Age landscape, and what might they have signified to a site's Iron Age inhabitants? Understanding the answers to these questions is vital to investigating the cultic engagement with the ruins that followed.

For each site we will provide an archaeological account of the cult activities that took place amongst Bronze Age ruins, drawing on original excavation reports, on the analysis of later scholarship, and on our own critical assessment of both of these sources. In doing so, we seek to establish a series of facts: what was the physical engagement with the ruins? What was the nature of the cult activities taking place amongst them? Who were the participants in the cults, and just as importantly who had restricted access to participation?

Establishing these facts, however, does not complete the task. Rather, they help us in the pursuit of our most important question: why? Why were the cult participants interested in the ruins? What purpose did they ascribe to their rituals? Why did they find cult to be the appropriate engagement with the ruins? And what does this tell us about society and identity in Greek communities of the Iron Age?

---

[253] Schama 1995: 14.
[254] Tilley 1994: 11.

Each site is able to provide only one piece of the overall puzzle. In the concluding analysis chapters we will attempt to draw together the complete picture, examining the different patterns within and amongst the regions discussed and investigating the different ways in which memory was manipulated, 'invented', and commemorated in Iron Age Greek communities. Finally, our findings will then be placed back into the broader context of the social and cultural changes taking place in Greece in the Protogeometric and Geometric periods, and in doing so testing the hypotheses proposed in the opening chapter.

PART II

Iron Age Cults at Bronze Age Ruins

Crete

Crete is the largest and most southerly of the Aegean islands, with a varied topography incorporating coasts, lowland plains, and inland mountains. In the Middle and Late Bronze Age it was the centre of the Minoan civilisation. Large palatial centres like Knossos, Phaistos, or Malia were the most important sites in the island's complex settlement hierarchy, whilst smaller sites like Amnisos and Agia Triada were part of an array of sub-palatial regional centres which had "high concentrations of commodity wealth and their own administrative systems".[255]

The wide distribution of Linear A administrative texts within several different levels of the settlement hierarchy, from the largest palaces to the smaller villas, indicates that administration was not limited to the major palatial centres.[256] Connections beyond the island were common, as trade with Egypt, the Levant, the Cyclades, and the Greek mainland flourished at sites such as Kommos and Palaikastro.

This arrangement was brought to an abrupt end by the widespread series of destructions which took place across Crete at sites of all sizes at the end of LMIB, around 1490.[257] A centralisation of power at Knossos followed, accompanied by the spread of 'Mycenaeanising' material culture. Trade flourished, the population grew, and the Knossian elites ran almost the entire island as an "economic enterprise",[258] but the extremely centralised structure of Cretan palatial society made it vulnerable. The fate of individual sites in the closing stages of the Bronze Age varied: earthquakes and fire were responsible for some destructions, such as Knossos in LMIIIA2, whilst violence or the apparent threat of violence led to the abandonment of other major centres. This was the end of the Final Palatial period in Crete.

Previous scholarship has framed the discussion of Crete's response to the 'Collapse' as a direct debate between emphasising mountainous 'refuge settlements'[259] and arguing that

---

255 Wallace 2010: 42.
256 Wallace 2010: 42.
257 Hatzaki 2004: 122; Rehak and Younger 2001: 441.
258 Driessen 2001: 99.
259 Nowicki 2000.

the formation of new and organised settlements in a period of conflict and upheaval constituted a 'successful collapse'.[260]

Instead, the primary characteristic of the Cretan response to the Collapse of 1200 BC was improvisation. When the palaces were destroyed or abandoned, many people moved inland. Groups of people, sometimes no more than a few families, sought refuge in inland mountainous areas, perhaps fearing attack from the sea, and nestled small settlements in the nooks and crannies of rocky peaks or cliff faces. Other people did not flee inland at all, but reoccupied the former palace sites.

At many of the palatial and sub-palatial sites that were reoccupied in the post-Palatial period and the Early Iron Age, prominent and monumental ruins formed 'landscapes of memory'. Some of these 'landscapes of memory' became the setting for cultic engagements with the past, and these shall be examined in this section.

[260] Wallace 2010.

Knossos

The excavations undertaken at Knossos by Sir Arthur Evans in the early 20th century uncovered a large and architecturally complex palace and prompted the first studies of the Minoans as a distinct culture. Amongst the discoveries, Evans unearthed evidence of cultic activities in the south-west corner of the Central Court and in the West Wing of the palace (Fig. 5). These are now recognised as Iron Age cult taking place at Bronze Age ruins.

The contribution of Evans and the early excavators to our understanding of the site and the Minoans more broadly is unparalleled, but it is important to acknowledge before proceeding further that his persistent and pervasive influence can cause problems for modern scholarship. McEnroe explains that it is not only his physical reconstructions at the site that have permanently shaped our understanding. It is also his language: "phrases like 'Throne Room', 'Queen's Megaron'…not to mention the term 'Minoan'", are "laden with implied meanings" and "irrevocably embedded in the discipline".[261] It is necessary for the modern scholar to proceed with caution, and this chapter will endeavour to do so, resisting the temptation to accept Evans' assertions uncritically.

It is not possible or necessary here to produce an exhaustive account of the palace's Bronze Age history. Instead what follows is an overview of its development highlighting the spaces and activities that will prove key to our understanding of later periods.

. . .

The Bronze Age: the palace's early stages

The earliest discernible settlement at Knossos dates to the Late Neolithic, when a small community occupied the summit of a tell in the centre of the site. This tell was levelled and paved perhaps as early as EMIIB to form the Central Court.[262] Evans dated the first construction of the palace to the Middle Minoan IB period. In the outermost sections of the western part of the palace he discovered a line of large slabs over an undisturbed layer with Early Minoan and Middle Minoan I sherds. When considered in conjunction with similar lines of slabs outside the northeast entrance, along the southern wall line, and on the east slope,

[261] McEnroe 2010: 79.
[262] Driessen 2004: 78.

Evans identified this as the first enceinte wall of the palace. Though he recognised the presence of earlier activity at the site, including an Early Minoan hypogeum underneath the later South Porch, and fragments of Middle Minoan I Early storage vessels underneath the later West Magazines, he considered the Middle Minoan IB enceinte wall, along with the filling in and levelling of the hypogeum, to be the foundation of the palace.[263]

Within this wall, at the northern edge of the Central Court was a structure that Evans termed "The Keep". It measured around 20m from East to West and around 15m North to South in an angular rectilinear shape. Within it were six deep walled shafts descending almost 7m. The name "Keep" and Evans' interpretation of the shafts as "dungeons" are not helpful here.[264] There is little to suggest a precise purpose of the building. The pertinent details are that this was a large, well-built, and sturdy structure close to the northern access point of the palace area.

There are scant traces of Middle Minoan I buildings in the West Wing of the palace. Amongst them is a curved corner in the frontage facing the Central Court, indicating that there was not a continuous face surrounding the court. Another curve, turning eastward, is discernible at the southern end of the outer wall of the West Wing buildings. Together these may be part of a single structure incorporating the area of the later magazines,[265] though it should be noted that this is impossible to confirm.

What is certainly apparent from both the Keep and from the sections of curved wall is that in this first stage the palace was not a single unified structure but instead made up of individual "insulae" within the encompassing enceinte. They did, however, follow the later orientation of the palace, and though it was not completely enclosed the Central Court does appear to have been a reserved open space.[266] The fact that the Middle Minoan I buildings did not form a continuous frontage around the court, and yet respected its boundaries, suggests that the court was already a defined space rather than being created by the position of the buildings.

---

[263] Evans 1921: 127-131.
[264] Ibid: 136-138.
[265] Ibid: 139.
[266] Ibid: 141.

This is a hypothesis supported by Driessen, who proposes a date for the levelling of the tell, including the Early Minoan hypogeum, in Early Minoan IIB. He claims that the Central Court must have been conceptually demarcated by Early Minoan III, even if the surrounding structures that defined its outline were not built until Middle Minoan I.[267] Driessen and Manning both emphasis that the Central Court was of immense importance from the very earliest stages of the formation of the palace, and indeed a little before, as the place in which to "formalize increasingly large communal ceremonies and events".[268]

In the Middle Minoan II period, the insulae surrounding the court went through a "unifying process", gradually incorporating into a connected complex in what Evans called "a process of organic fusion".[269] The Keep was absorbed into a larger insula in Middle Minoan II Early. The gangways and alleys between the emerging structures were gradually converted into interior corridors, growing the complex piece by piece. In this period the West Wing was equipped with magazines for the storage of large pithoi. The eastern part of the palace underwent what Evans called the "Great Cutting", in which a deep rectangular cutting was made into the east side of the hill to provide the space used to construct the domestic quarters. This was an ambitious undertaking, and reflects "the more grandiose ideas of the Minoan builders".[270]

The Bronze Age: Neopalatial Knossos

The end of Middle Minoan II was marked by destruction[271] and a new period of construction. The interior of the domestic quarters in the eastern part of the palace underwent a complete redesign. Two particularly significant halls were installed. The larger was the Hall of the Double Axes, named for the carved symbols on a number of stone blocks. It was divided into three parts, with each threshold comprising a line of doorways, first a small porch then a slightly large room, and finally a main room with a wooden throne against the north wall. To the south was a slightly smaller hall, the so-called "Queen's Megaron", divided into a porch and main room by a wall with an offset door. The two halls

---

[267] Driessen 2004: 78.
[268] Driessen 2004: 78; Manning 2008: 111.
[269] Evans 1921: 203.
[270] Ibid: 204.
[271] The destruction is clearest in the West Wing, where a number of buildings have a stratum of carbonised debris.

were connected by a crooked passageway, the "Dog's Leg Corridor", which also gave access to a private staircase leading to the upper floors.[272]

In the West Quarter, the approach via the West Court became more clearly defined. Sherds found beneath the pavement of the Corridor of the Procession, which led from the West Court to the south-western entrance of the Central Court, date to Middle Minoan IIIB, and as such we may see, if not the initiation, at least the formalisation of this route in the post-destruction reconstruction. The importance of the western edge of the Central Court likewise becomes more apparent in this period. In the middle of the West Wing were the Pillar Crypts, a religious centre dedicated to the double-axe cult. To its north was the insula that would later become the throne room, though its function at this date is not clear.[273]

The end of Middle Minoan IIIB was marked by another destruction. On the upper terraces of the north-eastern and southern slopes ceramic vessels in storage rooms were found buried under collapsed earth and masonry, and in the West Quarter destruction debris was cleared and dumped into large pits and cists to the west of the palace.[274]

Reconstruction was swift. The West Court was expanded, with an impressive façade made up of "huge well-dressed orthostates".[275] The West Court approached the West Porch, the interior of which was decorated with a fresco of a bull, introducing the visitor to one of the primary visual motifs of the palace.[276] There was a two-stage narrowing of space progressing into the palace from the west. From the open area of the court the visitor progressed into the half-light of the porch. The visitor was then plunged into the relative darkness of the Corridor of the Procession, producing a "shifting rhythm of motion and stillness", of light and dark, which McEnroe considers an example of the "arrest and movement" identified in Cretan design by Groenewegen-Frankfort.[277]

---

[272] Evans 1921: 318-318, 328-330.
[273] Ibid: 424-425.
[274] Evans 1928: 288.
[275] McEnroe 2010: 69; Niemeier 1994: 76.
[276] McEnroe 2010: 71.
[277] Groenewegen-Frankfort 1951: 191ff; McEnroe 2010: 71.

The Central Court was clearly defined in the reconstruction of the palace. The buildings around it were unified by a "screen of columns and pillars" that presented a unified façade.[278] Whilst the eastern parts of the palace resumed their function as living quarters, the West Wing came to further prominence as a place of more public activities, including the so-called Central Palace Sanctuary and the Throne Room. The Throne Room was at the northern end of the western side of the Central Court, made up of an anteroom in front of a main room, each of which had a throne against the side wall. The Central Palace Sanctuary was made up of the Pillar Crypts and the Temple Repositories. The crypts, as outlined previously, were decorated with double-axes, and were thought to have housed an associated cult, whilst the repositories contained the famous snake goddess figures.[279]

Panagiotaki, however, proposes that, like the Temple Repositories, the primary purpose of the Pillar Crypts was storage. She suggests that the presence of pithos fragments indicates a space too cramped for the performance of rites.[280] Rehak and Younger similarly suggest that cultic items and supplies were kept there, but brought out into the open space of the court for use.[281] The importance of the Central Court as the setting of formalised activities is again apparent.

The Bronze Age: Final Palatial Knossos

There was another destruction in Late Minoan IB, which was followed by the Final Palatial Period, a new era at Knossos with a reconstruction of the palace, evidence of centralised administration, the arrival of Linear B, and a new tendency towards monumental tombs.[282] The reconstruction was substantial after the thorough destruction, but MacDonald highlights that overall there was very little remodelling of the architectural plans and layout.[283] Of particular interest in the new period of construction was an extensive project of fresco decoration. Amongst the frescos dating to Late Minoan II-III are the Cup Bearer

278 McEnroe 2010: 73.
279 Ibid.
280 Panagiotaki 1999: 240.
281 Rehak and Younger 1998: 128-129.
282 Hatzaki 2004: 122.
283 MacDonald 2002: 52-53.

fresco in the South Propylaeum,[284] the bull and griffin in the Throne Room complex,[285] and the Bull-Leaping fresco.[286]

McEnroe highlights that the subject matter of the frescos is somewhat narrow in the period, consisting of what he calls the "bare essentials": "bulls, tribute-bearing processions, heraldic devices, and decorative friezes".[287] The bull appears in around a third of the frescos in the Final Palatial period, particularly at key entrances such as the West Porch, the North Entrance, and the anteroom of the Throne Complex. In conjunction with the other common motifs of axes and shields, McEnroe sees the Final Palatial occupants of the palace "focusing like a laser on the single concept of power".[288]

The 'Collapse'

At the end of LMIIIA2 the palace at Knossos was abandoned and there was no immediate reoccupation. Instead a new phase of settlement in the western part of the town was established in LMIIIB Late-LMIIIC Early. This was located in the 'Little Palace', the 'Unexplored Mansion', and in the area excavated during the construction of the Stratigraphical Museum.[289]

The Stratigraphical Museum excavation revealed what seems to be only part of a more extensive settlement area incorporating both the Little Palace and Unexplored Mansion.[290] New buildings were constructed over the abandoned ruins of the LMIIIA town which were entirely different to those of the earlier settlement. A full architectural plan of the area is not possible due to the intrusion of Roman and Hellenistic construction, but it is clear that a wide space was occupied.

The northernmost building in the area was a single long room, 9.5m from east to west, and 3.4m from north to south. It was rectangular at the western end and apsidal at the eastern end, with a single entrance on the long southern side.[291] Warren speculates that

---

[284] Immerwahr 1990: 84-89.
[285] Ibid: 76.
[286] Ibid: 84-89.
[287] McEnroe 2010: 125.
[288] Ibid.
[289] Hatzaki 2005: 87.
[290] Ibid: 85.
[291] Warren 1983: 70-71.

there may be a link with earlier apsidal buildings found on the Mycenaean mainland but acknowledges that this is unlikely as these most commonly date to the Middle Helladic period, a gap of one thousand years.[292] Instead, the unusual design seems to indicate that the builders of this structure were improvising around the available construction space and making use of surviving earlier walls and foundations where possible. Other LMIIIC structures in the area are irregular groups of small rooms, but the builders of this structure seem to have been intent on producing a single large room.

It had previously been assumed by Evans that the Little Palace and Unexplored Mansion experienced a final abandonment at the end of LMIIIB in the same manner as the main palace. Recent excavations, however, suggest that in contrast to the main palace they were in fact reoccupied and formed part of the same new settlement as the Stratigraphical Museum excavation area.[293] In the north-eastern area of the Little Palace buildings have been found with a similar 'improvised' design to those of the museum excavation area, in which LMIIIC Early sherds were abundant. Similarly numerous LMIIIC sherds were found in the north-west corner of the Little Palace's outer wall, which was reused as part of a small building and had a hearth constructed into one corner.

Hatzaki proposes that the excavation of the Stratigraphical Museum area has forced a reinterpretation of this entire western part of Knossos. Rather than dismissing the presence of LMIIIC pottery in the Little Palace and Unexplored Mansion as an anomaly best explained by the transitory presence of squatters taking stones, we instead have evidence of a new and extensive settlement in the 12th Century in the area west of the former palace.[294] Warren argued that we should use this picture as an opportunity to challenge the then-common interpretation of 12th century Cretans fleeing to highland refuge settlements, instead recognising a significant continued occupation at Knossos in LMIIIC-SM, a position which is becoming widely accepted.[295]

---

292 Warren 1983: 74; Coldstream 1977: 304.
293 Hatzaki 2005: 85.
294 Ibid: 86.
295 Wallace 2010; Warren 1983: 83.

The Early Iron Age

Evidence of continued occupation of the local area into the Early Iron Age was found in abundance in the Knossos North Cemetery.[296] Over 100 tombs received over 600 interments from the 11th to 7th centuries. The cemetery was newly established in the late 11th century, but the burial practices, including warrior burials in pit-caves, and family burials in pit-caves, shaft graves, and chamber tombs, were a broad continuation of LMIII practices. In earlier phases of the Protogeometric Period, there was a growing tendency towards cremation in chamber tombs, and by the mid-9th century, corresponding with the Protogeometric B period, the deposition of urn cremations in chamber tombs had become established as the typical practice for adult burials.[297] This coincided with an increase in the number of tombs, and by supposition a growth in the settlement population. Surveys and excavations carried out by the Knossos Urban Landscape Project have supported the hypothesis of a growing settlement at Knossos in the Early Iron Age, with a "wide scatter of Early Iron Age material" indicating a settlement area of around 40 hectares.[298]

Many of the tombs coming into use in the latter half of the 9th century were of a larger size than was really required, even for the deposition of numerous cremation urns. Coldstream proposes the possibility that at least five of the tombs were not in fact new, but were LMIII tombs, previously used for inhumations, emptied of all contents and reused. If the other tombs were indeed newly cut, then they at least imitated the design of the Late Minoan types. This, Coldstream suggests, may additionally offer an explanation for a distinctive group of items found in the tombs, namely LMIIIA-B larnakes reused for child inhumation (Fig. 6).[299] Coldstream posits the emergence of a small group of powerful families wishing to "associate themselves with the 'heroic' past", and doing so through burial practices.[300] Furthermore, it seems the inhabitants of Knossos in the mid-9th century were approaching remnants of the Minoan past, not with reverent hesitation, as might be demonstrated through a respectful tomb cult deposit, but with what Prent describes as

[296] Coldstream and Catling 1996.
[297] Coldstream 1998: 58.
[298] Kotsonas et al 2012: 7-8.
[299] Ibid.
[300] Ibid: 60.

"purposeful curiosity", eager to engage with the past through discovery, reuse, and imitation.[301]

A 'landscape of memory' at Knossos

The Early Iron Age inhabitants of Knossos lived amongst the remnants of the Bronze Age. The main settlement area to the west was amongst the ruins of the 'Little Palace' and the 'Unexplored Mansion', and their tombs in the North Cemetery imitated and re-used those of the Late Minoan period. The Central Court and the palace itself, though, were not extensively reoccupied. Evans identified that they seemed to have been left deliberately undisturbed in the Early Iron Age, even as peripheral buildings were being reused and reoccupied. He interprets this as indicating a recognition of the palace as sacred in some way.[302] Prent emphasises the "prolonged visibility" of Bronze Age monuments in the palace, citing Evans' observation that fragments of Late Bronze Age frescos were found in Geometric strata.[303]

The 'landscape of memory' at Knossos therefore seems to have had two particular distinct aspects, one past that was lived in and experienced with "purposeful curiosity", and another that was out-of-bounds. It is possible that there was a specific memory of the Central Court as the primary arena for public ritual in the Late Bronze Age, but it is more likely a cultural memory of the court's significance was prompted by the remarkable setting of an 'untouched' space surrounded by extensive ruins.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins

It is possible to assess the changes in cult practices at Knossos through an analysis of three separate shrines, the last of which, as a 'cult amidst the ruins', is most significant for our discussion. The Shrine of the Double Axes was the main cult centre in the 13th century, following the LMIIIA2 fire. It was a small shrine, 1.5m by 1.5m, with a bench displaying the cult objects, amongst which were stone horns of consecration and a 'Goddess with Upraised Arms' (Fig. 7).[304] The Shrine of the Double Axes went out of use at the end of

[301] Prent 2005: 518.
[302] Evans 1928: 7.
[303] Evans 1930: 171; Prent 2003: 82.
[304] Evans 1928: 332; Prent 2004: 413.

LMIIIB,[305] but some similar practices seem to have begun almost immediately in the Spring Chamber, a fountain within a Neopalatial complex a little to the south of the main palace (Fig. 8).

This complex was entirely abandoned at the end of LMIIIB, except for the Spring Chamber, which throughout the LMIIIC-Subminoan periods received votive offerings. These included clay figurines, but most numerous were kalathoi, often found still containing traces of olives (Fig. 9).[306] The votive assemblage is generally humbler than that found in the Shrine of the Double Axes, but the discovery of a small model, in which a figurine with upraised arms was attached to the bottom of a cylindrical vessel, is interpreted by Prent as indicating "not only a prolonged sanctity of the Knossian Palace, but also a continuous association with a similar deity and cult" (Fig. 10).[307]

By the end of the Subminoan period the Spring Chamber shrine was out of use. There perhaps followed a short time in which there was no principal religious centre in the palace area, before new cult activity was initiated amidst the ruins of the Central Court and the West Wing in the Protogeometric period. Evans noted in the first reports from the excavations that in the Central Clay Area, part of the Propylaeum of the West Wing of the palace, there was an accumulated layer of ash and bones, "possibly of a sacrificial nature".[308] This has come to be associated with deposits discovered in the south-west corner of the Central Court, the closest area of the court to the West Wing Propylaeum, with votives dating from the Protogeometric to the Classical period.[309] Coldstream notes with regret that in his efforts to restudy the material the early votives remained "elusive".[310] Nonetheless, Evans reports the discovery of Geometric pottery, whilst Hartley notes in a review of the material that Protogeometric and Geometric sherds were identifiable, including a Geometric krater and Protogeometric drinking vessels.[311] Hartley further reports the presence of two animal figurines, thought to be Late Geometric in date, whilst

---

[305] Popham 1964: 7.
[306] Evans 1928: 134; Prent 2004: 415.
[307] Prent 2004: 416.
[308] Evans 1900: 17.
[309] Coldstream 2000: 286; Prent 2004: 416.
[310] Coldstream 2000: 286.
[311] Evans 1928: 5-7; Hartley 1931: 92-93.

Coldstream includes a Middle Geometric bird askos found in the area, which he considers to be of votive character.[312]

Some inferences may be deduced from the evidence that is available. The layer of ash and bone is a clear indication that the cooking and consumption of meat was a part of the activities, and the discovery of fragments of cups and a krater show that this was duly accompanied by communal drinking. Furthermore, it seems that deposition of votive offerings was of secondary importance. Regardless of the "elusive" nature of the material today, the fact that Hartley only recorded two animal figurines suggests that if any other early votives were found, they seem neither to have been numerous nor noteworthy. Rather, it was drinking and the cooking and eating of sacrificial meat that were the primary features of these rites. A further consideration is that the respective locations of the ash layer and the ceramic deposit imply a two-stage process. The animal sacrifice took place deeper within the actual ruins of the West Wing of the palace, whilst the consumption that followed was in the more visible open space of the Central Court.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins at Knossos: preliminary observations

This was the first reuse of the main palace site since the end of the Palatial Period. Prent proposes that the Spring Chamber shrine showed an attempt by the surviving population of the 12th century to maintain some aspects of the earlier cult within the palace, whilst the ritual activity in the Central Court beginning in the Protogeometric Period marks a break with that continuity.[313] There were no Goddesses with Upraised Arms or kalathoi as in the Spring Chamber shrine. The rituals were performed in the open air, and as such the performance of the cult within the ruins cannot be considered a utilitarian decision. This was a deliberate choice to return to the midst of the ancient palace, and to associate the cult with its ruins.

The motivation behind this return may be indicated by the changing burial patterns discussed above. Prent proposes that the cult of the Central Court may have been established by the same emerging elites forging a connection with the past through their reuse and imitation of Minoan tombs and burial practices. It is well established that ritual

---

[312] Coldstream 2000: 286; Hartley 1931: 108.
[313] Prent 2005: 516.

dining and drinking serves as a tool both to forge bonds between elites and also to reinforce elite exclusivity. A "privileged association with the past" would engender the unity and exclusivity of emerging aristocratic families.[314] Furthermore, the progression from secrecy to conspicuity implied by the locations of the two stages of the rites would have served to reinforce the distinction between participants and non-participants.

[314] Prent 2004: 417.

Amnisos

Amnisos is a coastal site that in Minoan times was a significant harbour in the territory of Knossos. After abandonment at the end of the Bronze Age, an open air ash altar was established in the Protogeometric period against the remains of a monumental Minoan ashlar wall.

. . .

The Bronze Age

In the absence of survey data or more extensive excavation it is impossible to say when Amnisos was first settled. The major structures excavated begin in MMIIIA. Systematic excavations of the architectural remains first took place at Amnisos under Marinatos in the 1930s, beginning with the 'Villa of the Lilies' on the eastern slopes of the Palaiochora Hill. There were two main architectural phases at the Villa of the Lilies. The first building, constructed in MMIIIA, was a significant structure built with ashlar masonry, with dimensions measuring over 20m by 20m. At its centre was a wide hall accessed from a porch with two columns in antis. There were smaller rooms behind the hall, and in one was found the remains of a staircase to an upper storey.[315] The frescos after which the villa was named were considered by Marinatos to have fallen from this upper storey.[316] To the north-east of the central hall was a room equipped with a lustral basin, and to the south-west an entrance to the building via a partially-roofed court. The building appears to have housed some kind of industrial activity, with the discovery of thirteen boars' tusks and a piece of ivory perhaps indicating a specialised ivory workshop.[317]

This phase of use ended with a destructive earthquake in MMIIIB.[318] The quality of the reconstructed building is inferior to the earlier phase: the lustral basin went out of use, and a paved corridor running between the west court and the central hall was boxed in by new rubble walls. Driessen and MacDonald additionally emphasise the short-lived nature of

315 Driessen and MacDonald 1997: 134.
316 Marinatos 1933: 294.
317 Schäfer 1992: 219-222.
318 Sturmer 1992: 148.

the second phase of the villa, with its reconstruction and a subsequent second destruction both taking place within the Late Minoan IA period.[319]

A little to the north was a large well and spring house constructed with ashlar masonry in the Middle Minoan III period, and then in use throughout the Late Minoan period. The interior of the springhouse formed a collecting pool 3.85m wide. It is roughly rectangular, with three walls built with ashlar masonry and the natural rock of the Palaiochora slope forming the fourth side. Schäfer proposes a staircase on the south-west corner giving access to the top of the pool, though nothing of this is preserved.[320]

Thirty metres west of the springhouse was a megaron-style building constructed in LMIA, shortly after abandoned, and then reoccupied in LMIIIA.[321] The building was oriented east-west, 6m in length, and built with blocks of the local ammuda stone. Marinatos' excavation found a small amount of gold leaf and a fragment of faience inside.[322]

On the north-western foot of the hill lies a monumental ashlar wall, 44m in length (Fig. 11). The structure to which it belongs is yet to be fully excavated and therefore the function of the building is not entirely clear. Driessen and MacDonald identify three phases of construction in the Bronze Age: the first is the building of the monumental wall itself in Middle Minoan IIIB; the second phase, dated to Late Minoan IA, saw the installation of the podiums which flanked the central steps; and the third phase was a later reuse in Late Minoan III from which there are traces of rooms on the terrace.[323] Marinatos associated a small nearby dump containing Middle Minoan pottery and bull figurines with the structure, proposing that it indicated a cultic function, though this identification is not certain.[324]

The 'Collapse'

The settlement grew in LMIIIA, and rescue excavations to the west of Palaiochora Hill suggest that Amnisos had developed into an extensive town.[325] Though there are no indications of violence or destruction, the settlement fell into a sharp decline at the end of

---

319 Driessen and MacDonald 1997: 134-135.
320 Schäfer 1992: 152.
321 Driessen and MacDonald 1997: 135.
322 Marinatos 1933: 79; Schäfer 1992: 155.
323 Driessen and MacDonald 1997: 135.
324 Marinatos 1933: 95-96; Prent 2005: 529.
325 Kanta 1980: 38.

LMIIIB and was largely abandoned at the end of LMIIIC Early.[326] As Schäfer points out, the end of palatial authority at Knossos must inevitably have precipitated the end of prosperity for Amnisos in its role as satellite to the larger site.[327]

The Early Iron Age

There is little evidence of occupation at Amnisos in the Subminoan period and Early Iron Age, though it should be acknowledged that regional surveys have yet to be carried out. Nonetheless, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, it may be that the re-establishment of settled inhabitants engaging in arable farming did not take place until as late as the 7th century.[328] No urban settlement, and certainly no polis, is associated with Amnisos at any point. Prent suggests nonetheless that Amnisos may have gradually re-emerged in the Protogeometric Period as a trading outpost of Knossos, essentially a "border area" rather than a distinct or permanent settlement of its own, but increasingly important during a period of growing overseas interaction and exchange.[329]

A 'landscape of memory' at Amnisos

It is not certain how much of the former settlement would have been visible after several centuries of abandonment. It is likely that only the largest structures, such as the 'Villa of the Lilies', the megaron, and certainly the monumental ashlar wall, would have survived as prominently visible ruins. In the absence of a resident population it is unlikely that anyone maintained a cultural memory of ancestors at Amnisos. Rather, the scattered ruins, away from any current settlement, must have seemed like the remnants of a lost people of a distant age to those who increasingly made use of Amnisos as a trading post.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins

From the 9th century an Ash Altar was created where sacrificial remains of ash and bone were "heaped up against" the 44m long ashlar wall at the north-western foot of the Palaiochora Hill (Fig. 12).[330] Throughout the Protogeometric and Geometric periods, votive

326 Bennet 1985: 241; Schäfer 1992: 349.
327 Schäfer 1992: 349.
328 Prent 2005: 527; Schäfer 1992: 351.
329 Prent 2005: 527.
330 Schäfer 1992: 253.

offerings were deposited with the sacrificial remains, with a significant proportion of these being bronze items. In the Protogeometric period these included tripods and figurines, joined in the Geometric period by bronze vessels and small metal discs. Other offerings included clay shields, bull figurines, chariot models, a bronze male figurine, two miniature bronze double axe blades, and a limestone sculpture of a man's head, complete with bone and ivory eyes, which Adams identifies as a North Syrian production of the late 8th century (Figs. 13-17).[331] Fragments of Geometric skyphoi, amphorae, and kraters were also found.[332]

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins at Amnisos: preliminary observations

The pottery shapes and the layers of ash and bone indicate that drinking and the cooking and eating of sacrificial meat featured amongst the cult activities, but the number and variety of votive objects deposited at the altar suggest that it was these offerings that were the most important aspect of the rituals. Large and valuable bronze votives such as the tripods were display items which highlighted the wealth of the person making the offering. Votive shields, axe blades, and chariot figurines indicate an interest in military imagery amongst the participants. The North Syrian sculpture, with its bone and ivory accessories, displays an exotic sophistication. This was an extensive and significant deposit, and the votives offered indicate competitive display amongst wealthy male elites.

A small dump of Middle Minoan pottery and bull figurines, mentioned above, was ascribed by Marinatos to a clearing of the monumental platform by the founders of the Early Iron Age cult. We may wonder in this case whether there was a lasting cultural memory of the structure as a cult place,[333] or on the other hand whether the discovery of a lost Minoan sanctuary happened in the Early Iron Age and prompted renewed interest.[334] In truth, though, this distinction is not of great importance; there is no evidence that the Early Iron Age participants made any attempt to preserve or imitate the practices, votives, or deity of the proposed Middle Minoan sanctuary. In any case, the identification of the ashlar wall as part of a Minoan sanctuary is far from certain. The monumentality of the surviving wall, and the visually striking nature of the ruins in their topographical setting, would have been the

331 Prent 2005: 335, 528, Cat. Table 4, B.60; Adams 1978: 6-7.
332 Stürmer 1992: 236-237.
333 Kanta 1980: 42.
334 Prent 2005: 529.

greatest attraction to the participants in the cult, providing them as it does with the perfect stage for their displays.

A final point must be raised for discussion with regard to the participants in this cult. We have already established that the nature of the votive deposits suggests that the participants in the cult, or at least those who are archaeologically discernible, were most likely wealthy elite men. And yet, despite this apparently thriving community in the 9th and 8th centuries, we have no evidence at all for an actual settlement, let alone rival elite dwellings or burials in the area. The most straightforward explanation for this is must be that those taking part in the cult were not living in the local area. This being the case, it is surely appropriate to conclude that Knossian elites are the most likely candidates and were establishing an 'extra-urban' sanctuary at Amnisos.

'Extra-urban' sanctuaries were situated outside the urban area, often at the border of a community's territory. They represented not only a literal appropriation of land, but also a more metaphorical or political appropriation of a landscape. De Polignac proposes that an extra-urban sanctuary should be understood as a frontier against "otherness", either "warding it off or rehabilitating it".[335] The presence of elites from Knossos at a site that was formerly firmly within their territory may be understood in this way. They were both re-establishing an authority over their former landscape, and also, through the link of cultural memory, establishing a new relationship between Knossos and its territory.[336]

[335] De Polignac 1995: 36.
[336] Prent 2005: 527.

Phaistos

Phaistos was a major palatial centre of the Bronze Age located in the western Mesara plain in southern Crete (Fig. 18). After abandonment during the Collapse a reduced population occupied a nearby hill in the Early Iron Age. In the Geometric period, a new series of houses were constructed to the southwest of the former palace. Contemporary with this, votive offerings were deposited against the foot of two ashlar walls which had formed part of supporting structures at the southern end of the Central Court of the former palace.

. . .

The Bronze Age

Phaistos was first settled in the Late Neolithic period when, with perhaps only sixty inhabitants, it was already the largest settlement in the western Mesara.[337] The early phases of the palace comprised only very gradual expansion. In the Early Minoan I period Phaistos was oriented around an open central area, and Watrous and Hadzi-Vallianou suggest that, as at Knossos, there was an early tendency for reserved areas designated as ceremonial spaces. Furthermore, they note that Phaistos was the only settlement in the Mesara with such spaces and propose that this indicates a distinct role as the primary settlement in the region, with the inhabitants of other settlements occasionally gathering there and making use of the ceremonial spaces, perhaps in some kind of communal celebration of common origins. By Early Minoan II the population may have grown to as many as five hundred people.[338]

McEnroe highlights that in contrast to the somewhat organic development of the palace at Knossos, the early palace at Phaistos was planned and built deliberately following the form of slightly earlier palaces. There was a massive reshaping of the landscape, with the tell levelled into three large flat paved courts ascending from south to north up the slope.[339] The bulk of what remains of the early palace is on the western side, since the central and eastern sections were built over by later Neopalatial structures. Multiple entrances allowed access to the palace from the west: a central access point, Room II, was a wide entrance

[337] Watrous and Hadzi-Vallianou 2004: 221.
[338] Ibid: 230-231, 245.
[339] McEnroe 2010: 48.

divided by a central column, and marked the middle of the western façade. The northern and southern sections of the façade are known as 'Pernier's Façade' and 'Levi's Façade' respectively: Levi's Façade had its own impressive entrance at Room LIX, flanked by "massive bastion-like" walls, whilst the corresponding section of Pernier's Façade had a recess in place of an entrance. The broad symmetry of the two façades is offset by "a more complicated and varying rhythm of alternating projections and recesses".[340] As at Knossos we may recognise hints of the "arrest and movement" which Groenewegen-Frankfort identifies as crucial to Minoan design.[341]

Entering through the access points at Room II or at Room LIX the visitor made his way into the palace; the full route from this point on is not discernible due to later construction, but the start of a corridor leading to the east from Room II suggests that there was some kind of processional walkway to the Central Court. The court itself was of monumental proportions and would have been deeply impressive, with at least twelve columns lining its western edge.[342]

In the Neopalatial period the open area west of the palace was enlarged, with the floor level of the entire court raised to cover the orthostates of the earlier façade. Room II continued to function as an entrance and a new paved processional route led directly into the Central Court.[343] North of the Central Court two further courts were constructed. The first, 'Room' 48, was a small paved rectangular court that formed part of the processional route into the palace from the north. The second, to the west of 'Room' 48, but unconnected to it, was a square peristyle court with four columns on each side. The Central Court itself was covered with new flagged paving and was flanked by a line of columns on its east and west side.[344]

At the centre of the western edge of the Central Court was Room 25, accessed through a façade of three large columns, and supported by two interior columns. It was the largest room on the palace's ground floor. The function of this room is not clear: the excavators termed it the "vestibolo", a vaguely defined anteroom to a series of magazines to

---

340 Ibid.
341 Groenewegen-Frankfort 1951: 191ff.
342 Ibid: 48-49.
343 Graham 1987: 36; Pernier and Banti 1952: 41.
344 Graham 1987: 36.

its west.[345] It may be comparable to the palace at Knossos, however, where the Pillar Crypt on the western edge of the Central Court may have been a storage area for cultic objects.

To the west, in addition to the entrance at Room II, the Neopalatial period also saw the construction of a new grand reception area. The stairway of the Grand Propylon was over 13.5m wide, rising to an upper storey. Here the visitor emerged onto a flat area, Room 67, and then passed through a threshold marked by a single central column into a porch, Room 68. A larger rectangular column of stone blocks marked the threshold into a further room, Room 69. At the back of Room 69, a row of three columns marked the threshold of Room 69A, a large light-well and a dead-end. To the right (south) a guardroom controlled access to the ground floor magazines, and to the left (north) two flights of interior stairs led up to what Graham terms the "state reception halls".[346] The route from the grand stairway, to a single column threshold, to a larger column, to a row of three columns formed a progression of increasingly grand architectural features. At the peak of this crescendo there was an anti-climax as the visitor was forced to turn away from the dead-end and enter the darkness of an interior staircase to the north or south. Again we see an example of architectural movement interrupted.

The 'Collapse'

Phaistos did not experience destruction at the end of the Bronze Age, but a relative scarcity of finds from the transition to LMIIIC suggests that the palace may have been been largely abandoned around 1200.[347] Some LMIIIC sherds were found in the palace area, but the main areas of occupation were a large house to the west of the palace and a group of houses a little further to the west on the Acropoli Mediana hill. There is evidence of dramatic depopulation in the rural areas around Phaistos, but this does not indicate that people moved to the regional centre as there is no evidence that the settlement at Phaistos grew, and many areas of the site were not reoccupied.[348]

---

[345] Pernier and Banti 1952: 69.
[346] Graham 1987: 41; Pernier and Banti 1952: 305-310 (stairway), 311-320 (Rooms 67-69), 321-326 (Room 69A, and staircases to north and south).
[347] Kanta 1980: 101.
[348] Watrous and Hadzi-Vallianou 2004: 307-309.

The Early Iron Age

Cucuzza does not believe that there was a significant population in the Subminoan and Protogeometric periods. He argues that in this period the only settlement area was on the Acropoli Mediana hill and that there was no reoccupation of the palace site.[349]

In the Geometric period a new settlement area was established at the western edge of the former palace. The largest structure within the 'Geometric Quarter' was Building AA-EE-P-Q-R3, henceforth referred to as Complex AA (Fig. 19). It stands out for its size, particularly Room AA at its centre, which was between 6.80m and 7.15m long, and between 5.80m and 5.20m in width and equipped with a large hearth. Levi notes that an open area to the east was associated with the complex, and Cucuzza identifies an open area to the south of Room AA as a small court from which the complex was accessed.[350]

Vessels found in Room AA suggest that part of its function was as a storage space. Room P contained a large pithos, but also had a bronze figurine, a female terracotta figurine, animal bones, and krateriskoi, suggesting some kind of ritual function, or at least that the room provided storage for cultic objects.[351] An industrial function was suggested by a stone sluice for oil extraction found in Room Q, and the small Room EE was equipped with a hearth and has been identified as a kitchen.[352] Finally, R3 had a hearth and a bench, as well as storage and drinking vessels, and contained a house model.[353]

It is clear that there was a great variety of activities taking place in Complex AA, with storage, cooking, and some industry. If we interpret Complex AA as a ruler's dwelling, then its inhabitant also controlled access to a possibly communal dining area in Room R3 and to cultic objects in Room P.

A 'landscape of memory' at Phaistos

Phaistos was partially abandoned in the closing stages of the Bronze Age and what population remained seems to have been confined to the settlement on the Acropoli

---

[349] Cucuzza 1998: 64-65.
[350] Cucuzza 1998: 65; Levi 1961-1962: 416.
[351] Coldstream 1968: 235; Lefèvre-Novaro 2007: 481.
[352] Cucuzza 1998: 65.
[353] Levi 1961-1962: 404.

Mediana hill. The palace itself was relatively undisturbed until the 'Geometric Quarter' was built, partially over the westernmost ruins of the former palace. At the time this new settlement area was being established prominent and monumental ruins would have remained visible across the area of the former palace.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins

Votive deposits contemporary with the 'Geometric Quarter' were discovered at the foot of two ashlar walls, several metres high, which had formed part of supporting structures at the southern end of the Central Court of the former palace (Fig. 20). This area is associated with the 7th century temple constructed there, identified as dedicated to Rhea or a 'Magna Mater' goddess. Beneath the temple ("just below the floor surface")[354] and in pits placed against the wall, however, bronze tripod and shield fragments were found, indicating an earlier open air cult associated with the ruins themselves.[355]

The assemblage of bronze fragments was published in two parts, first shields and bronze sheet fragments by Pernier in 1910, and then tripod fragments by Canciani in 1970. Pernier catalogues 12 shield fragments and 3 pieces of bronze sheets. Lion imagery was exhibited on fragments 1-3 and 8-9 representing three separate shields, and on fragments 13-15 representing two separate sections of bronze sheet. Fragment 4 depicted a nude woman facing the front in an apparently religious form, fragment 7 was decorated with oxen and rosette motifs, and fragment 5 with diamond patterns. The remaining shield fragments, 6 and 10-12, representing 4 separate shields were decorated with running friezes of grazing deer. Pernier did not offer dates for these items.[356] Canciani reported numerous fragments of bronze which he identified as belonging to four separate tripods. Fragment 9 depicted a naked female figure between two lions, whilst Fragment 55 had a frieze of winged bulls and lions. Fragments 60 and 62, identified as two separate tripods, each featured a frieze of grazing deer. Canciani dates these fragments to a little after the middle of the 7th century.[357]

In 1997, La Rosa undertook a re-examination of these fragments in order to clarify their dates more thoroughly. The lion imagery on a number of the fragments certainly

---

354 Pernier 1902: 18 (author's translation).
355 La Rosa 1992: 235.
356 Pernier 1910: 245-249.
357 Canciani 1970: 22, 26.

points towards an orientalising influence, and for these a date in the 7th century was retained. He highlights, however, that the friezes of grazing deer found on two of the tripods and on four of the shields is highly reminiscent of painted decoration on ceramic vessels of the Late Geometric period. La Rosa correctly concludes as a result that part of the assemblage should be firmly dated in the late 8th century.[358] Furthermore, a Late Geometric to Early Orientalising date for the cult activities taking place next to and against the Minoan ruins coincides with Coldstream's dates for Complex AA. Their proximity and concurrent date clearly indicate a connection between the ruler's dwelling and the cult.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins at Phaistos: preliminary observations

Large bronze items such as tripods, shields, and sheets were conspicuous and valuable. Combined with the monumental backdrop of the Minoan walls, with the corner of the two walls providing a visually striking focal point, the votives indicate a cult dominated by elite display. The absence of ash, bones, or drinking vessels may indicate that feasting and dining did not play a role in the cult at the ruins.

Complex AA may have housed a complementary cult. The cult at the Minoan walls consisted of public and conspicuous elite display of high-value votives, whilst in Complex AA a private and exclusive area for ritual dining and drinking in Room R3 incorporated ritual objects stored in Room P and food prepared in Room EE.

What could be the motivation for the establishment of a pair of nearby complementary cults in this manner? Wells has proposed that building deposits, which are usually votive offerings associated with newly built walls or placed under the foundations of new buildings, may warrant a broader definition, and consist of votives "offered to the resident spirit to appease it", and "to assure its protection".[359] Just as building sacrifices may be interpreted as appeasing a resident spirit, it is possible that these offerings at the ruins were intended to appease the spirit of the palace's past inhabitants. Respect and reverence for these monumental remnants of the past, linked by a complementary cult in the nearby ruler's dwelling, may be interpreted as a means of 'justifying' the encroachment upon the former palace by the ruling elite in the Geometric Quarter.

---

[358] La Rosa 1997: 79-80.
[359] Wells 1988a: 264.

Agia Triada

Agia Triada was a significant settlement in the Western Mesara. A Royal Villa functioned here as a major administrative centre in the Neopalatial period. In the Final Palatial period a series of major structures, including a stoa, were built around an open court in the upper part of the settlement. The discovery of a large votive assemblage revealed that ritual activities were taking place around the ruins of the Bronze Age stoa in the Protogeometric and Geometric periods.

. . .

The Bronze Age

The ceramic record indicates that the settlement at Agia Triada began in the Early Minoan period, with scattered remains found across the site in domestic, ritual, and funerary contexts.[360] The first significant expansion of the site, however, took place in the Middle Minoan period, and is marked by increasing social stratification discernible in the settlement. An Early Minoan tomb, Tholos A, is the focus of ceremonies of ancestor cult in this period, which Carinci suggests indicates a consolidation of power amongst powerful families in the Middle Minoan. He proposes that they may be the same families emerging in control of Phaistos. The settlement in Middle Minoan I-II extended over the western slopes of the hill on which a monumental villa would later be built. Cucuzza notes that even in these earliest stages there is the apparent demarcation of a reserved open space, the *Piazzale dei sacelli,* which, whilst not a 'Central Court' in the manner of the palaces proper, remained a place of communal activity throughout the history of the site.[361] Middle Minoan IIB saw a major destruction at the site, and the settlement was greatly reduced in Middle Minoan III.[362]

The Middle Minoan III-Late Minoan IA transition was a period of recovery and reconstruction which included the building of the Royal Villa, and a domestic area to the north called the "villaggio".[363] The Royal Villa was a large multi-roomed complex with a series of distinct "quarters": in the south-west were servants' quarters; a royal residence was in the north-west; two sets of magazines were located in the northern part of the villa;

---

360 Todaro 2004: 89-91.
361 Cucuzza 2013: 32.
362 Carinci 2004: 142.
363 Puglisi 2004: 198.

a second set of royal residences was located in the eastern quarter; and the far eastern end consisted of a large porch and reception area. The existence of two royal residential quarters was interpreted by Halbherr, Stefani, and Banti as representing separate megara reserved for men and women.[364] The lower court to the north and the upper court to the south were both accessible from the villa, and next to the reception area at the east end was a monumental staircase allowing access between the two courts.[365]

The interpretation of the complex as a single villa divided in half into men's and women's areas has been subject to prominent criticism by Watrous, who suggested that the two royal residences in fact indicate the presence of two distinct villas. He observes that Villa B, to the east, did not contain as wealthy an assemblage as Villa A, to the west, with fewer storage vessels, bronze items, and Linear A tablets. As such, Watrous interprets Villa A as the primary administrative centre at the site.[366] The villas were subject to destruction in Late Minoan IB.[367]

Following this destruction, and after a brief hiatus in the site's occupation, three major monumental constructions took place in Late Minoan IIIA2. These were as follows:

1. Building ABCD was a large rectangular building with four rooms, built with large ashlar blocks. It had a small porch on its southern side which opened out to the east with a threshold marked by a central column in the stylobate. The entrance faced the open upper court and a contemporary stoa.[368] The unusual design meant it was mistaken in early excavations for a megaron[369] or a temple.[370] The large ashlar walls suggest some kind of public purpose, but the precise function, however, remains unidentified.
2. To the east of Building ABCD was a stoa with a seven-columned portico and measuring 6m by 21m. It was highly decorated with fine frescos, of which fragments depicting a bull's leg were discovered. Two of its column bases remain in situ, and stone bases for freestanding double axes were found, one of which was coated with stucco and painted with a griffin's head. The building provided a sheltered area from which it would have been possible to observe activities taking place on the upper court. Both the stoa and Building ABCD were "set into the fill in the destroyed

364 Halbherr, Stefani, and Banti 1980: 31-33.
365 Watrous 1984: 131.
366 Ibid: 131-132.
367 Puglisi 2004: 156-157.
368 McEnroe 2010: 128-131.
369 Mackenzie 1904-1905: 220-222.
370 Dörpfeld 1905: 271-280.

Neopalatial buildings", that is, the Royal Villas, and the eastern end of the stoa was partly built over the monumental staircase that linked the lower and upper courts.[371]

3. Building H was constructed on the south-eastern side of the upper court. Building H was a rectangular building with a main room, equipped with a bench against the back wall, accessed via a smaller anteroom whose entrance faced the court. Three floors have been identified. The first was a plastered floor with a painted marine scene contemporary with the building's ashlar walls in Late Minoan IIIA. This phase yielded three snake tube bases, gold leaf, glass, and three bowls. The second phase came after a destruction by fire, and yielded another snake tube, whilst three more snake tubes were found dating to the third and final phase.[372] No 'Goddesses with Upraised Arms' were found in the building itself but examples found in nearby parts of the site are assumed to have been associated with it.[373] In any case, the cultic function of the building is quite clear.

The 'Collapse' and the Early Iron Age

All three buildings go out of use in Late Minoan IIIC, and at the same time new cult activities start to take place in the upper court around which the Late Minoan IIIA structures had been built. The votive offerings including horns of consecration, animal figurines, and particularly terracotta bull figurines. No votives of this period were found inside Building H.

Prent emphasises the difference from the cult activities that had previously been taking place in Building H. The terracotta animal figurines and horns of consecration deposited in the upper court in the 12th century were not found in Building H in the 13th century, and the snake tubes and Goddesses with Upraised Arms associated with Building H are not to be found amongst the votives deposited in the court. The animal figurines of the upper court votive deposits were part of a new cult, and do not represent any kind of attempt at continuity.[374]

The cult in the upper court ceased at the end of the Subminoan period and there were then perhaps 150 years in the Early Iron Age in which Agia Triada was unused.[375]

---

[371] McEnroe 2010: 131.
[372] Gesell 1985: 75.
[373] Ibid: 41-42.
[374] Prent 2005: 201-202.
[375] La Rosa and D'Agata 1984: 161-172.

A 'landscape of memory' at Agia Triada

The monumental structures that stood around the upper court had been spared destruction in the closing stages of the Bronze Age, and they were not used in the Subminoan cult. Undisturbed in the intervening years, by the 9th century the upper court would have been an open space surrounded by the prominent ruins of the earlier period. Bronze Age tombs remained a visible part of the 'landscape of memory', with tomb cult attested at Tholos A in the Archaic period.[376]

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins

From the late 9th to the early 7th centuries, votive offerings in both bronze and teracotta were deposited against and in front of the northern wall of the stoa and on and around a monumental staircase on its eastern side that led up towards the court on a higher level (Fig. 21).[377] The bronze finds comprised: 66 bovine figurines; six ram figurines; a sphinx, perhaps a cauldron attachment; two miniature wheels; and 13 human figurines, of which one was identifiable as female, and six as male, including a boxer and a helmeted warrior.[378] The terracotta assemblage comprised: 78 human figurines, a mixture of male and female, and many of which preserved only the head (Fig. 23); six bovine figures; 44 animal figurines, including bovids, horses, birds, rams, and one item tentatively identified by D'Agata as a two-headed mythical creature; 12 fragments of vase attachments, including horses, oxen, birds, and humans; seven miniature wheels or wheel parts, perhaps from chariot models; and a boat model.[379] Finally, a number of ceramic vessel lids appear to have been repurposed as miniature shields.[380] No votives were recovered from within the stoa itself. Just to the east of the monumental staircase, there was a large pit of burnt bones and kernos fragments, which "seems to have been dug with the orientation of the large LMIII building in mind".[381]

---

376 Cucuzza 2013: 32.
377 D'Agata 1998: 23-24.
378 D'Agata 1999: 74 (sphinx), 166-173 (human), 177-194 (bovine), 194-195 (rams), 195-196 (wheels).
379 Ibid: 112-140 (human), 149-150 (bovine figures), 151-158 (animal figurines), 159 (boat), 163-166 (vase attachments).
380 D'Agata 1998: 23-24.
381 Ibid: 19, 22.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins at Agia Triada: preliminary observations

So what can we determine about the nature of the cult taking place around the remains of the Minoan stoa? First of all it is clear that human and animal figurines, and to a lesser extent military items such as chariot models and miniature shields, play a central role as votive offerings. This does not, however, tell the whole story. The pit with burnt bones and kernos fragments offer a clear indication that animal sacrifice and most likely some kind of communal feasting also took place. In contrast to Phaistos there are no expensive large bronze items. The bronzes that were found were smaller items, largely similar to the terracotta offerings.

Two possible concerns seem to be reflected in the votive assemblage. First, 'rural' concerns: other than the uncertain two-headed beast and a number of birds, the animal figurines can all be associated with agriculture. It is possible that this reflects the desire to make some kind of territorial claim over the surrounding agricultural lands. The ritual consumption of likely locally-reared meat would add an extra element of this.[382]

Secondly, parts of the votive assemblage seem to reflect 'military' concerns, namely the chariot models and miniature shields. Typically we might ascribe military imagery to elite participants. As Prent correctly highlights, however, this perception is changed by the fact that the 'shields' were ceramic lids reused as substitutes for the real thing. Instead they may be better ascribed to emerging or "aspiring" elites with perhaps a slightly higher social status than most, but without the authority or wealth to establish an exclusive cult.[383] When taken in conjunction with the evidence from Phaistos, an interesting pattern seems to emerge. Ritual activity at Phaistos was tightly controlled by the inhabitant of Complex AA, whilst the cult at Agia Triada seemed more loosely restricted. Perhaps the re-establishment of control in more peripheral territory such as Agia Triada was a particular role played by these provincial elites.

Finally, the absence of finds from within the building itself is a clear sign that this was not a utilitarian reuse of a surviving building, but rather the deliberate employment of the

---

382 Ibid: 23-24.
383 Prent 2005: 522-523.

ruins as the monumental setting for an open air cult. If the cult at Agia Triada does indeed reflect the presence of minor elites establishing Phaistian territorial claims, it seems that engaging with the cultural memory of the site's monumental past was a valuable tool in their endeavours.

Palaikastro

Palaikastro was the most significant Minoan settlement in East Crete, first occupied in the Early Minoan period, and continuously inhabited until Late Minoan IIIC. In the 8th century, and perhaps first beginning a little earlier, an ash altar was in use over parts of the Minoan town, an area which would become associated with a sanctuary of Diktaean Zeus (Fig. 24).

. . .

The Bronze Age

The earliest dwellings at Palaikastro date to Early Minoan IIA. No architecture was found, but fragments of domestic pottery shapes and ossuaries on the south slopes of the coastal Kastri peak indicate the presence of a small resident population.[384] This small population was maintained until in Middle Minoan IB-IIA when the settlement expanded into what MacGillivray and Driessen call the first "proper town", with a series of walls and pottery deposits underneath the later house Blocks X, Γ, E, and O providing evidence of more extensive occupation.[385] The continuous use of the area and repeated phases of construction resulted in a "maze of early walls beneath the main town".[386]

In Block X, part of which would be covered by the Iron Age ash altar, there was a network of walls dated to Middle Minoan IIB-IIIA. These formed a collection of rooms for which a general ground plan could be restored, and which was demarcated to the south by a street running east-west.[387] The end of Middle Minoan IIIA saw a "wholesale destruction",[388] probably from an earthquake, after which, in Middle Minoan IIIB-Late Minoan IA, the site underwent a substantial rebuilding project and settlement expansion. There was no sign of a palace or other large civic administration building like those that existed at other similarly sized Minoan sites, and Cunningham highlights the prevalence of private storage facilities in the individual housing blocks, perhaps indicating a different type of political structure to that

384 MacGillivray and Driessen 1990: 395.
385 Ibid: 401.
386 Ibid: 403.
387 Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: 274.
388 Bosanquet and Dawkins 1923: 18.

which existed elsewhere on the island.[389] Nonetheless, the layout of large regular blocks of houses, paved streets, and drainage systems in Middle Minoan IIIB-Late Minoan IA indicates the existence of some kind of "central authority or communal agreement".[390]

In this busy period of construction and expansion two large houses were built in Block X. The earlier was House X.51-66. This was an angular free-standing building, roughly square, and over 225m^2 in size,[391] bound by paved streets to the south and west, a possibly unpaved street to the north, and the remains of disused walls to the east. All the walls of this building were found destroyed down the level of their foundations other than the long wall along the main paved street to the south, whose square blocks of limestone remained partially-standing to a height of 1.5m. It was clearly a wealthy dwelling and was richly stocked with a large assemblage of stone bowls, oinochoai, and fine cups and bowls.[392]

Slightly later than X.51-66, another large house, X.1-17, was built at the eastern end of Block X. This house was larger than X.51-66, nearly 300m^2 in size,[393] built on a rectilinear plan with two broadly symmetrical wings to the east and west divided by a central set of three rooms running north-south. The wealth of this dwelling is revealed by more than simply size, with ivory items such as a comb and a carved plaque depicting a flying peacock found in the western rooms of the house.[394]

To the south of Block X, separated from it by the street running east-west, was Block Π. In the northern part of Block Π stood Π.38-42, a house facing the street, and, like the Block X houses, dating to the busy period of construction in Middle Minoan III-Late Minoan IA. Amongst the finds were a large pithos and a "mass of mostly broken pottery".[395] In the Iron Age the area of Π.38-42 would partly be covered by the ash altar.

The settlement continued expanding in this way until a general conflagration destroyed the entire town at the end of Late Minoan IB.[396] Reoccupation of the site was

---

389 Cunningham 2007: 99.
390 MacGillivray and Driessen 1990: 403.
391 Calculation based on Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: 278, Fig. 9.
392 Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: 277-279.
393 Calculation based on Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: 282, Fig. 13.
394 Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: 283-284.
395 Ibid: 287.
396 Bosanquet and Dawkins 1923: 22; MacGillivray et al 1984: 137; MacGillivray and Driessen 1990: 404.

immediate but only partial through Late Minoan II-IIIA1, but in Late Minoan IIIA2-B there was a new phase of significant reoccupation of the settlement as well as a wave of new construction characterised by ashlar masonry used in the various blocks of houses.[397]

Blocks X and Π were affected by this phase of construction, with a slight shift in focus apparent in both. In Block X, the eastern rooms of X.1-17 were reoccupied and refurbished with paved floors and doorways that did not exist in the earlier phase of the building's use. Whilst the west wing lay in ruins down its foundations, the east wing's walls were restored with ashlar masonry. Furthermore, a portico with four columns facing the street was attached to the front of the eastern wing of the house.[398] This change may hint at a desire for a Mycenaeanising style: rather than a wide rectangular building, the restored sections of X.1-17 instead produce a long rectangular building with an entrance through the portico on the narrow front side, a design with echoes of the megaron style. In addition new smaller houses were built in the northern part of the central section of Block X.[399]

In Block Π the focus of activity seems to have moved to the south-western section, with the construction of Π.7-16, a large house with a central hall, storage rooms, and stairs to a second storey.[400] Meanwhile, Π.38-42 went out of use, with rooms Π.38-40 destroyed and the foundations of Π.41-42 partially built over by new thick walls.[401]

Beyond Blocks X and Π, the settlement was expanding in size, with new blocks of houses reaching the seashore to the north. In Late Minoan IIIB, however, the settlement was struck by a "substantial earthquake". Despite the evidence for damage, MacGillivray and Driessen emphasise that the houses were "abandoned, not destroyed" in Late Minoan IIIB.[402] It was, however, permanent, and the main part of the settlement would never be populated again.

---

397 MacGillivray and Driessen 1990: 406.
398 Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: 283.
399 Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: Pl. X.
400 McEnroe 2010: 105.
401 Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: Pls. XII-XIII.
402 MacGillivray et al 1988: 274-276; MacGillivray and Driessen 1990: 407.

The 'Collapse' and the Early Iron Age

The only evidence for any continued settlement is on the very nearby rocky promontory of Palaikastro Kastri which was briefly occupied from LMIIIC Early and destroyed towards the end of LMIIIC Middle.[403] The pottery from these domestic contexts suggests that the inhabitants of the settlement on Kastri were not the same people who had lived in and then abandoned the main town area. The deep bowls and kylikes are of a shape not found at the earlier settlement, and the decoration reveals a marked break from previous styles.[404] Perhaps the inhabitants of Kastri in the 12th century were new inhabitants from a more strongly 'Mycenaeanising' culture in central Crete. Alternatively, rich material wealth, poor living quarters, a defensible coastal site, and a newly arrived population may together be indicative of the semi-itinerant plundering behaviour of pirates.[405] In any case, after the abandonment of Kastri in Late Minoan IIIC Middle there was no subsequent settlement at Palaikastro until modern times.[406]

A 'landscape of memory' at Palaikastro

The ash altar which forms the focal point of the sanctuary in the Geometric period was positioned in the midst of the earlier Minoan settlement, over parts of Blocks X and Π and over the section of street which separated them. The examination of the Bronze Age development of the area allows us to recreate the 'landscape of memory' that provided the setting for the activities taking place at the altar.

Prent notes that the paved Minoan street is at a lower level than the ash layer that formed the altar, and as such we may ascertain that the street surface was no longer visible when the altar first came into use in the 8th or perhaps 9th century.[407] However, the state of preservation of the houses in Blocks X and Π suggests that substantial parts of the surrounding ruins would have remained visible.

As discussed above two large houses were built in Middle Minoan IIIB-Late Minoan IA in the western and eastern sections of Block X, leaving the central section with only

---

[403] Nowicki 2000: 51.
[404] Sackett, Popham, and Warren 1965: 280.
[405] Nowicki 2000: 51.
[406] MacGillivray and Driessen 1990: 409.
[407] Prent 2005: 351.

foundations surviving from the earlier network of walls. At the same time construction of houses in the northern section of Block Π took place. After a destruction, Late Minoan IIIA2-B saw the restoration of the eastern section of X.1-17 and the construction of new houses in the northern part of the central section of Block X. It was also noted that in the destruction of X.51-66, the southern wall facing the street survived to a height of 1.5m. Meanwhile, there was a shift in focus in Block Π away from the northern section, which included Π.38-42 and was not restored, to the newly built house Π.7-16.

How does the area of the later ash altar (Rooms X.25-26 and Π.38-40) fit into this sequence of destructions and constructions?

1. Rooms X.25-26 were in the southern central part of Block X (Fig. 25). They were built in Middle Minoan IIB-IIIA but were not part of the subsequent Bronze Age phases that saw reconstruction to their north, west, and east.
2. Rooms Π.38-40 were in the northern central part of Block Π (Fig. 26). They were reduced to their foundations in the Late Minoan IB destruction and were not part of the subsequent Bronze Age phases that saw construction to their south and southwest.

In short, there was an area clear of ruins. To the north-west, north, and east stood surviving ruins of Block X, and to south-west, south, and south-east stood surviving ruins of Block Π. The pattern of the final Minoan building phases had unintentionally created a space that after the settlement's abandonment would become an open area with ruins all around it.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins

During the excavation of Blocks X and Π and the road dividing them, a number of post-Minoan discoveries were made. Excavators found an assemblage of Geometric pottery, including cups, a pyxis lid, and a jug, scattered amongst the rooms of the Minoan houses and on the road.[408] A number of bronze items were discovered, as well as terracotta architectural fragments, in a post-Minoan stratigraphic layer a metre thick.[409] A wall was constructed over the destroyed remains of north-western part of Block X.[410] Finally, and

[408] Hutchinson 1943: 40.
[409] Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: 272; Benton 1943.
[410] Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: Pl. X.

most significantly, a "bed of grey wood-ash", 3m long, and 0.25m thick, was found, covering parts of rooms X.25-26 and Π.38-40, as well as "across the full width of the underlying main street" between them.[411]

Some of these post-Minoan discoveries fall outside the scope of our discussion. Bosanquet notes that "Hellenic" objects "lay thick" against the wall, which the excavators identified as a tenemos wall demarcating a sanctuary, but Prent highlights that the scattered find spots of Geometric pottery do not seem delineated or restricted by the wall, and therefore suggests a later construction in the 6th century.[412] The architectural terracotta fragments also belong to a later period, with the earliest dating to the Late Archaic period, and many Classical and later.[413] Bosanquet speculates that a temple may even have partially survived until modern times before being broken up and used for new building material, a practice known to have taken place across the site, related to him by local villagers and visible in their houses.[414]

Though these structures came later, it is nonetheless clear that ritual activity was taking place amongst the ruins of the Minoan houses from the 8th, or perhaps even 9th, century. Fragments of between eight and ten bronze tripods were found. The exact find spots of each fragment is not recorded, but Benton explains that all were found in the vicinity of the ash altar, "outside and in front" of the proposed site of the later temple.[415] There were eight tripod leg fragments: four of them Benton categorises as the "simple" type, without decoration, and of these she suggest three may be the legs of the same tripod; the other four leg fragments she categorises as the "fancy" type, one of which seems to have formerly had a decorative appendage, perhaps depicting a lion's foot, another which had a shaft for the attachment of a wheel, and two others with decorations such as spirals. A further fragment was described as part of the leg of a tripod stand, which Papasavvas suggests was produced in Knossos,[416] whilst three other bronze fragments were parts of tripod handles.[417] Benton proposes that, whilst the precise dates of each individual fragment

411 Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: 300.
412 Prent 2005: 351.
413 MacVeagh Thorne and Prent 2000: 173.
414 Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: 299.
415 Benton 1943: 51.
416 Papasavvas 2012: 134.
417 Benton 1943: 51-52.

may not necessarily be possible to determine, the parameters for the dates of the collection as a whole are "firmly fixed – from proto-Geometric times to the end of the 8th century".[418] More recently, Prent has supported Benton's dates, with the clarification that it is perhaps only one fragment that belonged to the Protogeometric period.[419]

Benton also catalogued five bronze shields from the area of the altar. She dates these to the 7th century, seemingly in a Late Geometric-Orientalising transition phase.[420] Two of the shields, however, are decorated with running friezes of grazing deer, which may stylistically push them further towards the Geometric period than the Orientalising, whilst, in contrast, the three other shields seem more firmly Orientalising, with prominent lion imagery (Fig. 27).

Further bronze items of the Geometric period included thirteen miniature shields. These are round with embossed centres. Small piercing punctuate the rim, apparently for the attachment of a fabric lining, and each also has two holes with which they could be hung up. Benton does not provide dimensions for the miniatures, though she does describe them as similar to a miniature shield found at Vrokastro which has a diameter of 9.3cm. Furthermore, though the miniatures are not precisely datable, the comparable example from Vrokastro was found in a Geometric context.[421]

A bronze sphyrelaton lion figure was found in the sanctuary area, subseuqently filled with lead, which may originally have been an attachment for a tripod, dated by Benton to the start of the 7th century, a date supported by Prent.[422] Finally, in addition to the bronze items catalogued by Benton, Bosanquet reported two early bronze bull figurines which he associated with the sanctuary, as well as "many previously found by a peasant",[423] a collection succinctly described by Prent as "a bucketful".[424]

---

[418] Ibid: 51.
[419] Prent 2005: 351.
[420] Benton 1943: 52-54.
[421] Benton 1943: 54; Hall 1914: 102.
[422] Benton 1943: 54; Prent 2005: 351.
[423] Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: 307.
[424] Prent 2005: 352.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins at Palaikastro: preliminary observations

Let us briefly summarise the information that has been presented above. Block X and Block Π were amongst a number of blocks of houses in Minoan Palaikastro. A series of destructions and reconstructions took place in these blocks during the Middle and Late Bronze Age before the area was abandoned in the late 13th century. In the aftermath of the Collapse, only the rocky Kastri outcrop had any occupation. This was short-lived and the total abandonment of Palaikasto followed, after which there was no settlement until modern times.

Rooms X.25-26, Π.38-40, and the section of road between them, were in the middle of an open area with ruins of the Minoan town visible on all sides. It created a kind of arena, a visually striking landscape of memory. In the 9th century, this open area became the focus of votive offerings, particularly of bronze items. Ritual activity seems to have increased in the 8th century, and continued to flourish in the 7th century as the Late Geometric period transitioned into the Orientalising period. In the Archaic period, the site may have acquired a temple and more formal sanctuary boundaries, but that is beyond the scope of our discussion.

But what more information can this evidence provide us with? First, let us look at the nature of the cult. Most importantly, there was an ash altar. It is unfortunate that no details were recorded about the contents of the ash layers other than the ash itself. We can, however, safely assume that the ash altar indicates the burning of meat from sacrificial animals. Cups and jugs were prominent amongst the Geometric pottery assemblage from the sanctuary area. From the burning of sacrificial meat and the presence of cups and jugs we may deduce that the ritual activities incorporated communal eating and drinking.

The types of votive offerings deposited in the sanctuary area, and the changes to the types of votives over time, can provide more information about the nature of the cult and its participants. The earliest votive items that can be relatively precisely dated are the tripods. The earliest dates to the 9th century and the rest to the 8th century. Though the finds themselves are fragmentary, they belonged to large and expensive items, and indicate that the participants in the cult, or at least some of them, were attempting to demonstrate their wealth and status.

The same principle also applies to the large bronze shields deposited at the sanctuary in the early 7th century. These too are large and expensive, intended as a display of status. It is interesting, however, to note that these two types of votives, the tripods and the shields, were not being offered at the same time: there was over a century in which tripods were the primary large votive offerings at the site before a shift to shields in the closing stages of Late Geometric and in the transition into the Orientalising period. If the bronze and lead lion figurine is correctly identified as an attachment on an early 7th century tripod, it is the only chronological overlap between the two types of votives. This suggests a change in the concerns of the cult participants. They were still participating in the competitive display of status, but now it was with a distinctly militaristic character.

A militaristic element to the sanctuary is also suggested by the thirteen miniature shields deposited at the site. Being miniatures, it might be inferred that these offerings would not have been intended as prominent display items, but rather as more personal votives.[425] The date of the miniature shields is not known precisely enough to establish whether they were contemporary with the tripods, the shields, or both, but in any case they could suggest that although military items were being used for display, they could also be less prominent and more personal. It may be that, as proposed at Agia Triada, these miniatures reflect a rite of initiation for junior or aspiring elites. On the other hand, the shields were all pierced with holes for hanging them on display. Given the similarity in design amongst them it is feasible that the shields were part of a set. Suspended together as a set they become a more significant offering. In this case we might consider these offerings, as well as the tripods and full-size shields, to be displays of wealth and status.

Finally we have Bosanquet's "bucketful" of bronze bull figurines. The presence of animal figurines as votive offerings may suggest another possible concern of the cult participants: agriculture, the health and well-being of their animals, and, in the case of oxen, the fields which they plough. A further question arises, however: why are they all in bronze, and none in clay? The absence of terracotta figurines is not unique to Palaikastro in the Geometric period. Prent observes that whilst urban sanctuaries tend to have terracotta-dominated assemblages, and suburban sanctuaries mixed bronze and terracotta, it is typical

[425] Flognfeldt 2009: 89.

at extra-urban and "(inter-)regional" sanctuaries for bronze votives to have a "dominant presence".[426]

Snodgrass sees a dominance of bronze offerings as typical in particular of the Panhellenic sanctuaries of mainland Greece, such as Olympia and Delphi. The elite members of various communities were offered an opportunity to engage in competitive displays of status amongst themselves, and a consistent use of bronze over terracotta was an important part of it.[427] Prent also sees correlations with Panhellenic sanctuaries, in particular Olympia where there is a similar abundance of tripods and shields, as well as bull figurines.[428] She sees both sites as examples of De Polignac's "ritualised competition", a formalised means of interaction for rival elites.[429]

The identity of the elites participating in the cult at Palaikastro is not immediately obvious, unlike, for example, the suggested Knossian elites at Amnisos. Of the two major settlements in East Crete in the Protogeometric and Geometric periods, Praisos and Itanos, neither seems to have had been taking economic interest in Palaikastro – no imports were being brought into the harbour there, and the agricultural use of the surrounding lands cannot have been any more than animal grazing. In fact, Prent proposes that it was precisely this remoteness that would have made it an attractive location for a shared neutral setting. The establishment of the cult amongst the ruins of East Crete's most extensive Minoan town would have emphasised a shared landscape of memory, belonging to all of them and none of them, where the elites of various East Cretan communities could engage in ritualised competition, displays of wealth and status, and interact formally on neutral ground.[430]

---

426 Prent 2005: 355.
427 Snodgrass 1980: 52-58, 62-64.
428 Prent: forthcoming.
429 De Polignac 1994: 11; Prent 2005: 356.
430 Prent 2005: 539-540.

Kommos

There are signs of settlement at Kommos dating back to EMI, but the following 1500 years seem to have progressed with little growth of the sparse population.[431] The first major expansion of the site began in the Middle Minoan period, after which there were three major phases of monumental construction at the site. After abandonment during the Collapse, the site re-emerged in the Early Iron Age as a significant trading port. A Protogeometric temple built over monumental Minoan ruins hints at Phoenician influence, whilst a successor temple in the 8th century displays clear signs of Phoenician participation in a cult amongst Minoan ruins.

. . .

The Bronze Age

The first phase of major monumental building at Kommos dates to Middle Minoan IIB and the construction of Building AA. The remains of Building AA were not found with a complete plan, but rather in various find spots underneath later constructions. Taken together these reveal an impressive levelled platform set into the slope that leads west down to the sea. A sturdy wall to the south ran east to west, composed of thin upright slabs with a fill of stone and clay, and preserved to a height of 1.2m. On the eastern side of the levelled platform were two parallel walls running north to south. The open area in the centre of the levelled platform, referred to as the Central Court, seems to have been covered over with a floor of pebbles. In the southern area of the court excavators found a series of circular column bases set onto large blocks which would in turn have been covered by the pebble surface of the court. These column bases indicated a stoa facing into the court.[432]

The excavators estimate that by the time Building T was constructed at the end of Middle Minoan III, Building AA was in ruins, and that Building T formed part of a general rebuilding project after an earthquake (Fig. 28).[433] Building T reused the elevated platform of the earlier period, maintained some of the general dimensions of the Central Court, and

[431] Shaw, J.W., 2006: 11.
[432] Shaw, J.W., and Shaw, M.C. 2006: 11-15.
[433] Ibid: 17.

used several stretches of earlier walls as foundations. Large ashlar blocks were used for all "exposed" areas such as the court and the external façades. From the sea the west wing of Building T, rising two storeys from the most prominent part of the levelled platform, would have seemed particularly monumental in scale and form.[434]

A series of long low walls divided the eastern part of the Central Court into ten long rectangular rooms side by side. These served a variety of industrial functions such as metalworking and oil extraction.[435] In the north-western part of the building was Room 5. Its particular function is uncertain, but it seems to have been an important space as it was constructed first, and with special attention, made up of courses of ashlar without the base orthostats that supported the other walls.[436] By the end of Late Minoan I Building T had fallen to ruins. Collapsed walls indicate that an earthquake was probably responsible. After intermittent signs of attempted reoccupation, the building was abandoned at the end of Late Minoan II, and in Late Minoan IIIA2 two new buildings reused or replaced most of the earlier structure.[437]

Overlying the north-western area, reoccupying and restoring Room 5 of Building T, was Building N. A series of small rooms were added, arranged around a small court in front of Room 5. The rooms could only be accessed from within the small court and access to the court could be easily controlled. These apparent 'security' concerns are reflected in the finds from Building N which included bronze items, a copper ingot, and ceramics from the Cyclades, Cyprus, and Egypt. Room 5 itself contained a wealthy but undoubtedly domestic assemblage. The excavators suggest that Building N functioned as a combination of secure storage, administrative centre, and the living quarters for some kind of official.[438]

Building P was constructed roughly over the ten long rectangular rooms of the eastern part of Building T. Divided by walls of recycled ashlar blocks and rubble six galleries were arranged running east to west, side by side. The walls were also supported by timber frames, suggesting to the excavators that measures were being taken to alleviate the risk of further earthquake damage. No traces of walls have been found at the western end of these

---

[434] Ibid: 17-18.
[435] Ibid: 52.
[436] Ibid: 20.
[437] Ibid: 60.
[438] Ibid: 60-69.

long galleries, suggesting they were open at the end facing the sea. Each gallery was about 5.50m wide, and averaged 38.50m in length. No comparable structure has been found anywhere in the Minoan world.[439] Their distinctive shape and proximity to the sea led Maria Shaw to identify the galleries as shipsheds.[440]

The 'Collapse', the Early Iron Age, and a 'landscape of memory' at Kommos

Around 1200 BC Kommos was abandoned, and for almost two centuries there was little sign of activity.[441] The sanctuary site was established around the end of the 11th century BC with the construction of a small shrine, Temple A, which was in use until around 800 BC when Temple B was constructed above it.[442] Since Kommos was not subject to a destruction in the closing stages of the Bronze Age, the inhabitant of the 11th century would have been presented with a landscape still marked by Buildings N, P, and T, the monumental structures that had formed the Late Bronze Age town.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins: chronology of sanctuary development

Temple A had two phases of construction: In Phase 1 the most primitive structure was erected. It consisted of a basic rectangular building, between 4m and 6.70m from east to west, and around 5.5m from north to south, with low benches attached to the north and south walls.[443] There was an open courtyard area to the east of the building, and it is in the eastern end of the structure that a sill was found, set about 17cm above floor level, which functioned as the threshold of the shrine.[444]

The Phase 1 structure reused walls from the monumental Late Minoan Building T: the north wall reused parts of the northern facade of the earlier building and the south wall was built from recycled blocks of the same structure.[445] The gradual raising of the floor level as a result of ritual use is demonstrated by several levels of soil, as many as eighteen, some of

---

439 Ibid: 38-39.
440 Ibid: 851.
441 Shaw, J.W. 2006: 11.
442 There was, after a period of limited occupation, a further construction, Temple C, built over Temple B in the Late Classical Period, but this falls outside the scope of our discussion.
443 Shaw, J.W., 2000: 11; Precise measurements of these dimensions are difficult to assess as the earliest shrine was found underneath the remains of the subsequent structures.
444 Ibid: 9.
445 Ibid: 10.

them burnt.[446] In Phase 2 of Temple A, the floor had risen by around 33cm both inside and outside the building.[447]

Temple B underwent three phases of construction between 800 BC and 600 BC (Figs. 29-31), and was built almost directly over Temple A: the northern wall, for example, corresponds almost exactly with that of the earlier structure.[448] In total, however, the dimensions of Temple B are slightly larger than Temple A, with a north to south width of around 6.40m and an east to west length of 8.08m.[449]

The eastern end was still open, though now, it is thought, with a central pillar: a long thin slab, nearly a metre tall, was found at the entrance of the temple, and two or three of these together could have constituted a pillar to support a flat roof.[450] This appears to be an innovation as there is no evidence for such a structure in Temple A.[451] Inside the temple, to the west of the threshold pillar, there was a hearth which was made up of a set of stones placed in a circle.[452] Behind the hearth, but still fairly central to the temple, was an unusual shrine, composed of three short stone pillars set into a stone base, behind which was found the remains of charred wood.[453] This 'Tripillar Shrine' and the accompanying wooden remains will be discussed in greater detail below. Around the Tripillar Shrine the walls were adorned with low benches.[454]

No major amendments were made during Phase 2 of Temple B. The rise in the floor level in the courtyard was greater than that inside the temple, and for this reason a slight step crossing the threshold was formed.[455] The floor level inside had risen sufficiently that the stone slab in which the three pillars of the shrine were placed was now buried within the floor.[456] In Phase 3 of Temple B this slab is covered over completely, and the pillars themselves form part of a rectangular hearth which replaced the earlier stone circles.[457]

---

[446] Ibid: 91.
[447] Ibid: 10.
[448] Ibid: 14.
[449] Shaw, J.W., 2006: 41.
[450] Shaw, J.W., 2000: 14; Shaw, J.W., 2006: 42.
[451] Pappalardo 2002: 264.
[452] Shaw, J.W., 2000: 20.
[453] Ibid.
[454] Ibid: 14.
[455] Ibid: 22.
[456] Ibid.
[457] Ibid: 23.

Phase 3 of Temple B was the last phase of construction before the site went out of use around 600 BC.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins: the Tripillar Shrine and wooden cult object

The Tripillar Shrine appears to have been in use throughout Phases 1 and 2 of Temple B (Fig. 32).[458] It consisted of four stone parts: the largest part was a stone slab, triangular in shape, which lay flat upon the floor of the temple. This slab was incised with three sockets, placed alongside each other from north to south. In these sockets stood three stone pillars. Only the northernmost pillar survives intact, built into the much later construction of Temple C. It is the same height as the central pillar, though we may assume from the rough top of the central pillar that it did once rise slightly higher but has been broken. The southernmost pillar is slightly shorter than the others, at 20cm, but also appears to have been broken and probably would have matched the northern pillar.[459] As far as can be inferred from the evidence, the shrine was without any offerings in the first phase of Temple B in the first half of the 8th century BC.

But where could this unusual plan have suddenly come from? Shaw highlights that the concept of pillar-worship is found in certain contexts within Greece, but that these tend to postdate this shrine.[460] On the other hand, the worship of 'triads' of various kinds is actually fairly common on Crete at this time, particularly the worship of Apollo accompanied by Artemis and Leto.[461]

In Price's catalogue of such triads, the primary example is of three bronze statuettes from the Temple of Apollo at Dreros in northern Crete which date from the late 8th or early 7th century.[462] She argues that the depictions of the Apollonian triad have such similarities with those of Egyptian triads that there may be a direct correlation between the worship of Nepthis, Isis, and Horus, and Apollo, Artemis, and Leto, and that this correlation may have been established in the 8th century at a time when the Phoenicians were actively trading between Egypt, the Levant, and the Aegean.[463] As such, whilst triad worship did exist

---

458 Ibid: 14-22.
459 For all this description see Shaw, J.W., 1989: 165-170.
460 Ibid: 172-173.
461 Ibid.
462 Price 1971: 58.
463 Ibid: 59.

in Crete, it should not be thought that the inspiration for the Kommos shrine was indigenous tradition.[464] Rather, the concept of triad worship appears to have grown in popularity in Crete in the 8th century as a result of orientalising influence.

With regard to pillar-worship, Shaw offers as a comparison the Phoenician temple dedicated to Tanit-Ashtart in Sarepta.[465] In the 8th century BC the cult featured a stone pillar, one metre tall, in the middle of a small temple building furnished with benched walls.[466] Since there is no Cretan parallel for this, it could be argued that the placement of low benches around a central divine pillar indicates the implementation of a distinctly Phoenician design in the construction of Temple B.[467] We find evidence for similar designs not only in the Phoenician homeland but also at sites which are known to have been Phoenician colonies in the west. A stele from Nora in Sardinia, for example, carries a Punic depiction of a tripillar construction in what appears to be a shrine setting.[468]

Shaw argues strongly that until any evidence should come to light that the worship of pillars has indigenous Cretan origins, it is necessary to look to the abundant evidence of Phoenician influence.[469] Negbi takes Shaw's evidence further, highlighting that the examples from the west, such as the stele from Nora and other similar items are mostly found in funerary contexts, and those from the east in straightforward sacral contexts.[470] Kommos is the most western example of what she calls 'Phoenician cult at home'.[471] Negbi suggests that, taken with the evidence of the pottery finds in Temple A which shall be discussed below, this is indicative of the 'foundation of a permanent post at Kommos' by Phoenicians as early at the 10th century BC.[472]

Hoffman, on the other hand, offers a word of caution. She warns that we cannot assume that the erection of a distinctly Phoenician cult object in the temple of a Cretan town would have been accepted willingly by the indigenous population.[473] With regard to

---

464 Shaw, J.W., 1989: 173.
465 Ibid: 174.
466 Ibid.
467 Ibid: 175.
468 Ibid: 177.
469 Ibid: 181.
470 Negbi 1992: 609.
471 Ibid.
472 Ibid.
473 Hoffman 1997: 176.

the Tripillar Shrine, 'it seems odd to conceive of a local cult permitting foreigners to build ritual structures within their temple walls'.[474] However, whilst Hoffman urges hesitation in assuming the presence of a resident Phoenician population, the evidence of the Tripillar Shrine nonetheless does indicate a strong Phoenician influence.

Moreover, the charred wooden remains which were found behind the Tripillar Shrine suggest further links to the east. The remains were made up of a low oval area of burnt wood, 25-34cm in diameter and 26cm deep.[475] It is possible that it was a bowl, but more likely it was the base of a burnt wooden pillar or tree trunk.[476] Similar to pillar worship, the placement of trees or tree trunks at sacred sites has an eastern origin. The royal palace at Hama, in Syria, featured an open air square which was used as a private shrine in the second half of the 9th century BC. Here, between two altars, the remains were found of a wooden pole or pillar, which functioned as the cult figure of the shrine.[477]

Likewise, a sanctuary found at the Bronze Age site of Qatna was split into two parts, one of which housed three small pillars and the other a large tree trunk – here the parallel with the Kommos shrine is striking.[478] Pappalardo concludes from such parallels that the wooden remains in Temple B are a feature of distinctly Urartian origin.[479] This is perhaps a claim too far. Certainly, eastern influences are visible in the new temple, but the seemingly anomalous Urartian feature of the shrine would require that the Phoenicians brought the practice of a specific Levantine neighbour with them to Kommos. This seems an unlikely scenario.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins: the shrine figurines

In Phase 2 of Temple B, in the second half of the 8th century, two faience human figurines and a bronze horse figurine were wedged between the pillars.[480] The bronze horse figurine, 12cm tall and 13.3cm long, was placed facing east between the southern and central pillars.[481] Above it, also forced into the space between the pillars, was a faience female

---

474 Ibid.
475 Shaw, J.W., 2000: 20.
476 Ibid.
477 Pappalardo 2002: 266.
478 Ibid: 267.
479 Ibid.
480 Shaw, J.W., 2006: 139.
481 Shaw, J.W., 2006: 139; Shaw, M.C., 2000: 188.

figurine, 14.3cm tall, lion-headed and bearded, holding an ankh[482] in the right hand and a staff in the left, and accompanied at the right foot by a small cat.[483] Between the central and northern pillar was found a male faience figurine, less than half the height of the other at 6.3cm, with a triangular face and beard, standing with the left foot forward and fists clenched at the sides.[484]

The human figurines have been identified as the Egyptian goddess Sekhmet and her son Nefertum, and are not local copies, but original Egyptian productions.[485] Interestingly, these two Egyptian divinities, when accompanied by Ptah, Sekhmet's husband, form the Theban, or Memphite, Triad.[486] We discussed above how the Egyptian worship of triads had influenced Cretan cult, perhaps through a Phoenician intermediary. It is clear that the dedication of these figurines is the introduction of an actual Egyptian triad into the sanctuary at Kommos in the late 8th and early 7th century.

For this to have taken place there must have been a sufficient level of exchange and an adequately far-reaching network of trade links for expensive, exotic, items such as these Egyptian figurines to make it to a small sanctuary in southern Crete. In addition, the local population must have had a certain level of familiarity with eastern imagery and cult practice to allow it to take such a central place in their temple. That said, the figurines are somewhat randomly placed, they are crammed into the gaps between the pillars, and they are of uneven size. One of the triad was missing, and there was an otherwise unrelated bronze horse thrown in for good measure. The people in Kommos may have been familiar with eastern images, but that is not to say they still knew what they were supposed to do with them. When the Tripillar shrine was first constructed there was a visible eastern presence at work, but that was the case no longer.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins: the pottery evidence

Ceramics found at the site can provide useful clues as to who was participating in the cult. Pottery has been found inside the temple structures, but more come from the courtyard area to the eastern front of the temples; most were found slightly downhill to the

---

[482] A stylised Egyptian key.
[483] Shaw, M.C., 2000: 189.
[484] Ibid.
[485] Shaw, J.W., 2006: 139.
[486] Ibid.

south, presumably discarded during the sanctuary's clear-outs.[487] There are 339 sherds from the vicinity of the sanctuary which have been identified as Phoenician, of which 308, because of the thickness of the pottery and the presence of jar-rims and handles, are believed to belong to heavy-duty amphorae.[488]

The first Phoenician pottery found at the site dates to the first phase of the temple's construction. A Phoenician amphora fragment was discovered in the floor of Temple A, Phase 1.[489] This is the solitary piece of Phoenician ware which was found at this stage of the temple's construction, but this does not lessen its importance: indeed it is one of the earliest Phoenician finds anywhere in the Aegean.[490] It cannot be assumed that the discovery of this amphora indicates an eastern presence at the sanctuary,[491] but what it does tell us is that at the end of the 11th century or beginning of the 10th century BC, Kommos was at least 'on the radar' of Phoenician traders.

In turn, there were 48 groups of sherds (indicating individual pots) found in Temple A, Phase 2, and eighteen from Temple B, most of which were found in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 levels, with far fewer in Phase 3.[492] As mentioned above, the vast majority of these sherds were from heavy-duty amphorae.[493]

It is worth noting that these numerous sherds are from a relatively small number of individual pots for the length of time. Whilst there is certainly a lot of evidence here for active exchange with Phoenicians, let us not make the mistake of assuming that this was an overwhelming level of trade.[494] On the other hand, the fact that these sherds can be grouped together into a few common fabrics[495] does indicate that these jars (and the goods which they presumably contained) were not simply finding their way here by chance through

---

[487] Shaw, J.W., 1989: 181.
[488] Bikai 2000: 302.
[489] Shaw, J.W., 2000: 8.
[490] Bikai 2000: 303.
[491] After all, this piece of Phoenician pottery could have been brought to Kommos through an intermediate trading partner, or indeed via a more extended succession of exchanges.
[492] Bikai 2000: Table 4.2.
[493] Ibid: 302.
[494] Pappalardo 2002: 269.
[495] Bikai 2000: 302.

an intermediate network of trade links, but were arriving at Kommos in bulk on Phoenician ships.[496]

What this really means with regard to our discussion is that as early as the end of the 11th and the beginning of the 10th century there is evidence of Phoenician influence at Kommos. It is in the 9th century BC, however, when evidence for exchange with Phoenicia becomes greater, with the height of activity seemingly running through to the middle of the 8th century, during which time Phoenicians were more frequently visiting Kommos as part of this exchange. The indications also seem to be that as the 8th century progressed, these trade links became less active, and that throughout the later 8th century and 7th century, they disappeared entirely.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins: other finds

Fragments of seven faience vessels from Temples A and B were found.[497] The earliest are rim fragments of two shallow bowls of blue faience from Phase 2 of Temple A, dating to the later 9th or 8th century, and a base fragment dating from the foundation of Temple B in the early 8th century.[498]

Dating to the later 8th century, there are fragments of a green-blue bowl, and of two white faience vessels.[499] The final example is a collection of over 25 non-joining fragments of another bowl from the end of Phase 3 of Temple B, which is dated as such to the later 7th century.[500]

In addition two scarabs were found in Phase 3 of Temple B dating to the later 7th century.[501] 'Scarab 2' bears a hieroglyphic inscription on its underside which translates as 'Every Just Thing', a variation of an Egyptian good-luck wish which is only found at sites in the Aegean, suggesting that such scarabs were produced at a known workshop on

496 Ibid.
497 Schwab 2000: 396.
498 Ibid: 397.
499 Ibid: 398.
500 Ibid.
501 Skon-Jedele and Dabney 2000: 351.

Rhodes.[502] 'Scarab 1', on the other hand, of whitish-yellow faience, appears to be a genuine product of the Egyptian Delta.[503]

The significance of faience items is that they are very strong indicators of foreign trade with Egypt.[504] At Kommos, the faience fragments are mostly found alongside Phoenician sherds, and from this we may suppose that the Phoenicians were the intermediaries in this exchange.[505] Again we can see an eastern culture with which the Phoenicians have contact being transferred by them to Kommos. We can also see that at Kommos, however, that the desire for eastern faience did not cease when Phoenician trade subsided, but continued into the later 8th and 7th centuries.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins at Kommos: preliminary observations

Kommos provides a unique example amongst all the case studies in this thesis. Here a cult was established amongst the ruins of the Bronze Age in which non-Greeks seem to have participated actively. At other sites with Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins, the participants in the cult could feasibly understand themselves as the descendants of those who built the monumental buildings whose ruins they commemorated. This is not the case with Phoenicians at Kommos. Rather, Phoenician influence on the sanctuary and subsequently their participation in its cult reflect the malleable nature of cultural memory.

The mixed ethnicity of those practising cult at Kommos is indicated in the haphazard manner in which different influences – Phoenician, Egyptian, possibly even Urartian – were melded together, to the point where in the latter half of the 8th century there seems little coherence to the sanctuary's cult practices. Modern anthropological studies of inter-community conflict have examined the role of ecumenism and the fluidity of religion in alleviating tension between different ethnic and religious identities.[506] Perhaps the same effect may be discernible in Geometric Kommos. Practising a form of religion that incorporated disparate elements may have helped facilitate cooperation between Cretans and Phoenicians. Furthermore, practising such a cult in the midst of the ruins of a distant

---

502 Ibid.
503 Ibid.
504 Schwab 2000: 396.
505 Ibid.
506 Appleby 2000; Power 2007.

monumental past could have helped foster an invented tradition[507] of longstanding friendship and cooperation.

[507] Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983.

The Argolid

The Argolid centres on a broad fertile plain in the eastern Peloponnese, surrounded to the north, east, and west by mountains, and to the south by sea. At least from Pausanias onwards there have been times when Corinthia and the Argolid have been treated as one entity.[508] Following Morgan and Whitelaw, however, this thesis will not consider Corinthia as part of the region: they recognise the Argolid as a natural and "readily definable" geographical region created by the boundary of mountain and sea around the communities of the Argive plain.[509]

Mycenae, Tiryns, and Midea[510] are amongst the most prominent Bronze Age sites in the region, where imposing Cyclopean fortifications of the 14th and 13th centuries surrounded monumental palaces.[511] At Asine and Argos the presence and possible character of large fortifications is unclear due to later constructions, but significant occupation of the acropoleis of Kastraki (Asine), and Larissa and Aspis (Argos), is attested in the Middle and Late Helladic periods.[512]

Around 1200 BC, the Argolid, like many regions of the Eastern Mediterranean experienced a period of instability which saw the destruction of a number of sites, in what has become known as the 'Collapse'. The 'Collapse' was not a single occurrence, and sites such as Mycenae and Tiryns sustained repeated instances of damage and destruction of growing severity in the 14th and 13th centuries.[513] By the late 13th century, however, profound destructions were taking place at a number of sites. Almost the entire citadel at Mycenae was burned around 1200 BC,[514] and likewise an intense fire ravaged both the Upper and Lower Citadels at Tiryns at around the same time.[515] In contrast, Asine and

[508] Pausanias II.1.1.
[509] Morgan and Whitelaw 1991: 79-80
[510] As discussed in Part I, Midea does not have evidence of Iron Age cult activity and is not discussed further in this section.
[511] Mylonas 1966: 19-33; Müller 1930.
[512] Styrenius 1998: 56; Vollgraff 1906: 7.
[513] Middleton 2010: 14.
[514] Thomas and Conant 1999: 16.
[515] Müller 1930: 215; Mylonas 1966: 48.

Argos seem to have escaped any violent destruction during the transition from the 13th to the 12th century.[516]

The destructions which marked the 'Collapse' did not, however, herald a period of total abandonment. At Mycenae there are signs of continued occupation in the citadel,[517] whilst at Tiryns the Megaron was adapted to construct Building T in the 12th century and a Northern Lower Town expanded with new dwellings.[518] Asine, despite not undergoing a violent destruction, experienced a brief decline in activity in the early 12th century before embarking on a number of major building works in the latter half of the century.[519] Argos, on the other hand, seems to have flourished in the transition from the 13th to the 12th century, with signs of a growing population and a discernible cultural independence from Mycenae in LHIIIC and the Submycenaean period.[520]

The resurgences at Mycenae, Tiryns, and Asine, were nonetheless followed by a more significant decline. There was limited occupation of Mycenae and Tiryns in the Protogeometric period, and little of that activity was within the citadels themselves.[521] At Asine the former areas of occupation on Kastraki and the Lower Town generally depopulated, with a gradual relocation to the lowland plain.[522] Argos, meanwhile, expanded, with numerous areas of settlement dispersed across the plain below the acropolis.[523]

In accordance with the methodology set out in the introductory chapters, this section will examine the development of these sites in the Bronze Age and in the transition to the Early Iron Age. For each site, we shall endeavour to recreate the 'landscape of memory' experienced by their inhabitants in the Iron Age. In turn, we shall investigate Iron Age cult activity at the Bronze Age ruins, in order to determine the manner in which later inhabitants engaged with these landscapes. Finally, it will be possible to draw some preliminary conclusions regarding patterns of activity in the Argolid region.

---

516 Kelly 1976: 22-23; Sjöberg 2004: 41.
517 Wace 1949: 90.
518 Maran 2001: 115.
519 Frödin, Persson, and Westholm 1938: 74.
520 Papadimitriou 2006: 532ff; Kelly 1976: 15; Desborough 1964: 225-230; Mylonas 1966: 229-233.
521 Lemos 2002: 160; Kilian 1988: 107.
522 Dietz 1982: 57.
523 Touchais and Divari-Valakou 1998: 15; Hägg 1974: 28.

Mycenae

The citadel of Mycenae is located at the northern edge of the Argive Plain. It is a roughly triangular hill, flanked by two higher mountains, Profitis Ilias and Mount Zara, at 750m and 600m above sea level respectively. The citadel, at 278m, is therefore in a location that is both nestled amongst the natural protective fortification of the landscape behind it, and also elevated above the plain below (Fig. 33).[524]

Mycenae was a formidable fortified palace in the Late Bronze Age, but suffered a series of destructions during the 'Collapse', and in the Early Iron Age had a much reduced population. In the 8th century cult activity began on the citadel amongst the ruins of the former palace, and was later formalised by the construction of terraces.

. . .

The Bronze Age

The site was occupied as early as EHIII, but the extensive citadel largely dates to three main phases of construction in the 14th and 13th centuries, each of which consisted of a major expansion of its defensive fortifications.[525] First, in the mid-14th century, an enceinte was built, of which the northern section and part of the south-eastern survive. In the mid-13th century the south-western section of the enceinte was extended to bring Grave Circle A and a number of buildings within the walls. It was during this project that the famous Lion Gate was installed. Finally a smaller extension of the wall to the north-east shortly before 1200 BC incorporated access to the water cistern into the citadel.[526]

The original wall used megalithic, 'Cyclopean', limestone blocks cut out of the rocky outcrops of the hill. The line of the wall followed the natural contour of the rock with "total consistency…not the slightest deviation".[527] The foundation course was laid directly onto the bare rock. Inconsistencies in the surface were hammered or chiselled away in order to

---

[524] Iakovidis 1983: 27.
[525] Wace was the first to make a systematic attempt at dating the walls, and stated that apart from the north-east extension, the fortifications were the result of a single phase of construction in the early 14th century (Wace 1921-1923: 13). Mylonas, later supported by Iakovidis, rejected Wace's findings and instead identified three main stages of construction during the 14th and 13th centuries (Mylonas 1966: 19-33; Iakovidis 1983: 27-37).
[526] Iakovidis 1983: 27; French 2002: 52-57; Mylonas 1966: 19.
[527] Iakovidis 1983: 27.

create level ground to build on without the need for foundation substructures. Joins between blocks were dressed and packed with earth and stones, but not clay. The face of the wall was not generally dressed.[528]

Construction onto the bare rock would not only have added to the defensive attributes of the fortification, as even the foot of the wall is raised up high by the slope, but would also have accentuated the grandeur and monumentality of the structure. The average thickness of the walls which formed the original enceinte was 7-7.5m, but Iakovidis advocates some restraint, noting that the individual blocks were, though "imposing", not of "enormous" size.[529]

Iakovidis' description of the blocks as "imposing" but not "enormous" perhaps seems a little inappropriate – French notes that these blocks "averaged two tons"[530] – but it is relative to the ambition displayed by the citadel's architects in the next phase of fortification in the mid-13th century, when Mycenae was enjoying its greatest power and prosperity.[531] In this second phase there was a considerable extension of the western part of the enceinte, with the line of the wall moved by 50-60m to the south and west, increasing the fortified area by 40%.[532] Following the completion of the wall, this additional area would be filled with buildings, as well as incorporating the Middle Helladic Grave Circle A and its Late Helladic additions.

This wall was also in the Cyclopean style with loose packing stones rather than binding material, but this time using local conglomerate stone, cut into larger and more regular blocks than before.[533] The installation of the Lion Gate changed the route of approach to the citadel, with a ramp rising from the north rather than from the south as earlier. The ascent up the ramp is flanked on the left by the enceinte wall and on the right by a strong bastion, whilst the passageway of the gate itself is formed by four enormous individual blocks: a threshold stone, a lintel, and two uprights (Fig. 34).[534]

---

528 Iakovidis 1983: 27; Wace 1949: 49-50; Mylonas 1966: 17.
529 Iakovidis 1983: 27-29;
530 French 2002: 56.
531 Iakovidis 1983: 29.
532 Iakovidis 1983: 29.
533 Wace 1949: 49; Mylonas 1966: 16.
534 Iakovidis 1983: 30.

The gate was framed on each side by the blocks of the newly-extended enceinte, other than directly above the lintel, where a relieving triangle held a thin slab of limestone bearing the famous relief.[535] Two lionesses rampant face each other, with front legs raised on a carved depiction of two low altars on which a tall column stands. The heads were made separately of an unknown material and are now lost.[536] There has been ongoing debate about the meaning of the design: it is perhaps purely decorative, though this is unlikely; it may have religious symbolism, combining the altars with an aniconic representation of a deity in the form of a column. Most likely it is some form of heraldic image, the precise symbolism of which can only be speculated, representing the ruling elite of Mycenae.[537]

More recently, Blackwell has re-examined the Lion Gate and proposes a discernible overseas influence. The style of the stone-cutting, in particular the marks of having been worked by tubular drills, suggests the influence of Anatolian stone-working, perhaps even the use of actual Hittite tools.[538] There is no indication of Hittite iconography, however – the image of two animals flanking a central object is common in the Aegean. Rather, the use of innovative "foreign" techniques in the depiction of Aegean iconography would have been recognised as a symbol of wealth and importance: "monumental display, foreign stone-working techniques, and familiar iconography communicated Mycenae's cultural and political reach and was meant to impress commoners and dignitaries from the mainland and elsewhere".[539]

The position of the gate at an oblique angle and the construction of the bastion to the right of the approaching ramp demonstrate the typically "Mycenaean principle" of forcing attackers to expose their right-hand, unshielded, side.[540] When someone approached the Lion Gate, he or she would have been consumed into a kind of court, with huge fortifications enveloping him on either side. Climbing up the ramp he or she would have seen nothing but enormous blocks of stone and the passageway guarded by the imposing lionesses. It would have been an impressive experience.

---

535 Mylonas 1966: 17-18.
536 Iakovidis 1983: 31; Wace 1949: 52.
537 Iakovidis (1983: 31) and Fields (2004: 28) both give a brief list of various theories.
538 Blackwell 2014: 477.
539 Ibid: 483-484.
540 Wace 1949: 51; Mylonas 1966: 17.

Inside the gate, and immediately to the right was Grave Circle A, a series of shaft graves dating to the Middle Helladic period. The new layout of the enceinte and entrance gate placed Grave Circle A in a prominent position inside the fortification and near to the entrance, but there were further revisions in addition to this. A circular parapet was constructed around the graves made up of two concentric walls with rubble fill and roofing slabs between them. This ran all the way around the Grave Circle except for one gap where an entrance facing the Lion Gate allowed access inside.[541] The ground encircled by the parapet was artificially raised as part of the same building phase and brought to higher prominence with the construction of a retaining wall, level with the height of the entrance through the Lion Gate, and dated by Wace to LHIIIB.[542]

The 14th century wall had excluded Grave Circle A from the fortified citadel. In the developments of the mid-13th century, on the other hand, the extension of the new enceinte wall, the elevation and formalisation of the Grave Circle, and the installation of the Lion Gate all took place as part of the same construction project. As is apparent in the description above, all must be considered directly related pieces of monumental architecture.[543]

Amongst the other buildings in the west of the citadel, and to the south of Grave Circle A, was the 'Cult Centre'. This consisted of four main building complexes arranged around a small and irregular open area: the House of the Frescos, the House of the Idols, the Tsountas House, and a two-roomed rectangular structure adjacent to the Tsountas House, now referred to as the Tsountas Shrine.[544] Following the entrance through the Lion Gate, there was the steep 'Great Ramp'. Before this turns away left towards the higher central part of the citadel, there is also a processional path leading ahead, then right, and down into the irregular court facing the 'Temple'.[545] The front room of the temple was open

[541] Gates 1985: 265; Mylonas 1966: 90.
[542] Iakovidis 1983: 38; Wace 1921-1923: 108-109; Mylonas 1966: 91.
[543] Morgan 2005: 159.
[544] Iakovidis 1983:45; Morgan 2005: 162; Taylour 1969: 91; Tsountas 1886: 74; In the initial excavations, Schliemann (1878: 130ff) identified these buildings as the probable location of the royal palace, though this interpretation was refuted by subsequent excavators.
[545] Iakovidis 1983: 44-45; Morgan 2005: 159.

to the court, and had a small altar at the entrance. The surrounding soil was found to be full of ash.[546]

The palace complex was situated at the highest point of the citadel. A ramp approached from the lower western part of the citadel and split into two paths, one, to the north, navigating the steep sides on the north and west of the summit, the other branching to the south east and leading to the Grand Staircase.[547]

In its 13th century form, the palace was "an extensive complex of buildings covering an area of at least 2.5 acres".[548] It was divided into three main areas: the north, south, and west terraces. Architectural remains on the north terrace are minimal, though outline traces of a series of rooms running east-west are discernible. These were protected from the southern sun and, in conjunction with a small open air court, may have formed the more private royal residential quarters.[549]

The south terrace, on the other hand, supported the state rooms of the palace. In the first half of the 13th century, access was only possible using the path that approached the northern side of the palace. From the north, it edged around the summit. Having passed through the propylon on the west terrace, the path proceeded forward then turned left through a narrow corridor and into the 'Great Court'.[550] The court lay in front of the most important building of the palace: the Megaron. Its large area of 23m long and 11.5m wide was divided into a porch, a small ante-chamber, and the main hall itself. [551]

The hall had a raised circular hearth in the middle, which was surrounded by four wooden columns, probably decorated in bronze, the stone bases of which survive.[552] Impressive, though often fragmentary, frescos survive from the Megaron, depicting battle scenes of warriors and horses, and women standing in front of a building, possibly watching the battle and forming part of the same composition.[553]

---

546 Iakovidis 1983: 45; Wace 1951: 254.
547 Wace 1949: 69.
548 Iakovidis 1983: 57
549 French 2002: 59; Mylonas 1966: 59-60, fig. 15 (nos. 12-14, 30-33).
550 Iakovidis 1983: 55-56; Mylonas 1966: 59-60; Wace 1949: 70.
551 Mylonas 1966: 60; Tsountas 1888: 29.
552 French 2002: 98; Iakovidis 1983: 62; Mylonas 1966: 60, fig. 58b.
553 French 2002: 98; Hood 1953: 88; Iakovidis 1983: 62; Rodenwaldt 1922: 69; Wace 1921-1923: 164.

In the final phase of Palatial Period, in the late 13th century, the south terrace was embellished with the 'Grand Staircase', which allowed an approach to the state rooms from the southern side of the rocky summit rather than via the usual path which passed through the propylon.[554] The entrance to the staircase passed between large dressed poros blocks which formed an impressive doorframe within an ashlar wall. There were two flights over two floors which the excavators reconstructed with an impressive central balustrade of columns.[555] It is clear that this was a monumental and impressive point of access to the palace in its final decades.

The 'Collapse'

The Late Bronze Age at Mycenae was characterised by a series of destructions which took place at varying intervals and with varying severity from the 14th to the 12th century. The first took place in LHIIIA1, early in the 14th century, when there is evidence of a house next to the Great Ramp being rebuilt after some kind of disturbance.[556] Similarly, in LHIIIA2, in the late 14th century, there are signs that some parts of the palace were damaged, probably by seismic activity.[557]

The severity of such occurrences escalated as the 13th century progressed. At the end of LHIIIB1, in the late 13th century, there are signs of structural damage in the Cult Centre.[558] The Great Staircase up to the southern part of the palace was damaged, not actually long after its construction.[559] Signs of earthquakes in the area were noted by French, who points to the evidence of a woman's skeleton found under fallen stones in Panagia House I, a short distance outside the walls.[560]

In the transition from LHIIIB to LHIIIC, around 1200 BC, a mere quarter of a century after the previous disturbance, there was a far more profound destruction at Mycenae. The cult centre was destroyed by fire, having seemingly gone out of use in the mid-13th century, with a uniform layer of ash found across the House of the Idols, the House

554 Wace 1949: 73-74.
555 Wace 1921-1923: 149-153; French 2002: 60.
556 Middleton 2010: 14.
557 French 2002: 59-61; Mountjoy 1993: 15.
558 Middleton 2010: 14.
559 Ibid.
560 French 1996: 51.

of the Frescos, and the Tsountas Shrine.[561] Such evidence was discovered across the site and it seems that fire ravaged large swathes of the citadel. The destruction was not, however, absolute. Some areas seem to have escaped relatively unscathed, such as the 'Granary' in the western area and the buildings of the north-east extension.[562] Wace details considerable destruction in the palace area, with the Grand Staircase, the Throne Room of the Megaron, and the Great Court all presenting fire damage.[563] Indeed, "there is hardly a section of the citadel which has not yielded a layer of ash deposited around 1200 BC".[564]

Despite the fire, there is evidence that parts of the palace remained in use. The Throne Room was redecorated, and the floor of the Great Court was overlaid with painted stucco,[565] though Iakovidis highlights that the restored parts of the palace were "without their former splendour or grandeur".[566]

It is not to be assumed, however, that the 12th century was entirely a period of decline at Mycenae. Mylonas emphasises that there was still a functioning society living within the walls during these years. Indeed, the people who remained at Mycenae were capable of continuing Mycenaean material culture in the pursuit of high artistic creation, as seen in the Warrior Vase of LHIIIC Middle.[567] Mountjoy also points to their production of fine pictorial pottery of LHIIIC Middle as a demonstration that these remnants of the population of Mycenae were able to produce one last flourish.[568] Around 1100 BC the killer blow arrived as the hitherto resilient Palace was "well looted and then wantonly burned".[569] A final note to observe is that the mighty enceinte, including the Lion Gate, survived all of these destructions essentially untouched, and remains very nearly complete to the modern day.[570]

---

561 Morgan 2005: 163.
562 Middleton 2010: 15; Thomas and Conant 199: 16.
563 Wace 1949: 90.
564 Thomas and Conant 1999: 16.
565 Wace 1949: 90.
566 Iakovidis 1977: 140.
567 Mylonas 1966: 230.
568 Mountjoy 1993: 22; Thomatos 2006.
569 Wace 1949: 90.
570 Iakovidis 1983: 23; a small section in the south-east seems to have collapsed down the steep slope of the Chaos ravine at an unknown date.

The Early Iron Age

French proposes that after the 'final' destruction of the citadel around 1100 BC, Mycenae experienced its most significant and dramatic depopulation.[571] This was not an absolute abandonment, however, and the discovery of graves amid the destroyed buildings and debris of the western area of the citadel suggests some limited occupation of the area continued into the Submycenaean and Protogeometric period.[572]

Lemos agrees, based on the small amount of burial evidence, that there was certainly some re-occupation of the area, though not necessarily in the citadel, but that it was very limited in scale, especially in comparison with other contemporary sites in the Argolid.[573] In addition, Foley notes that whilst some small form of occupation is attested in the Submycenaean and Protogeometric periods, it was not until the Geometric period that a greater amount of archaeologically visible evidence for settlement returns.[574] The main evidence for occupation of the citadel in the Geometric period is a series of walls found over the remains of the floor of the Great Court, forming a small complex of five square rooms, described by Wace as "huts" (Fig. 35).[575] The walls were thinner than others in the area and built of smaller stones without mortar. The different construction technique, the absence of any fire damage, and the divergence from the orientation of earlier structures indicate that this complex was added after the 'final' destruction of the palace at the end of LHIIIC. This is confirmed by Geometric sherds discovered by Tsountas within its walls.[576]

A 'landscape of memory' at Mycenae

We may draw on all the information gathered above in an attempt to recreate the 'landscape of memory' at Mycenae as it approached the 8th century BC, engaging with a phenomenological approach which acknowledges the individual and collective experience of a landscape.

---

[571] French 2002: 140.
[572] Ibid: 141.
[573] Lemos 2002: 160.
[574] Foley 1988: 26.
[575] Wace 1921-1923: 201.
[576] Klein 1997: 250; Tsountas 1886: 60-62; Wace 1921-1923: 201; Wace 1949: 75.

First of all, however, the bare facts are as follows:

- After 1100 BC, the vast majority of structures within the citadel were destroyed, with the possible exception of some buildings in the north-east extension and Grave Circle A, itself a monument of an even more distant past, of which there is no direct sign of disturbance.
- The possible occupation of parts of the citadel and any other limited activity in the area in the Submycenaean and Protogeometric periods did not restore, hide, or in any other way significantly alter the ruined state of the citadel.
- Though in ruins, the size and number of the structures ensure that the remains of the destroyed citadel would have been highly visible in the Geometric Period. Indeed, the construction of the "huts" in the Great Court even avoided the surviving walls of the palace.[577] It is not clear whether the "huts" themselves constituted a significant aspect of the 'landscape of memory', though their less impressive remains would likely have been overshadowed by the more monumental ruins of the former palace.
- Significantly, the most monumental structures at the site, namely the Cyclopean enceinte and the Lion Gate, survived the destructions of the Late Bronze Age more or less intact.

It is possible, then, to recreate the experience of this landscape in the Geometric period. The thick and tall Cyclopean walls would have been an impressive and formidable sight, as they are to this day. Furthermore, they would have been objects of wonder to people whose own societies lacked either the will or the capacity to build on such a scale and with such enormous materials. The same strategic layout that placed a fortified wall and a bastion on either side of anyone attacking the Lion Gate would, centuries later, have produced an experience of being enveloped by the immense architecture on all sides. The precise meaning of the triangular relief would surely have been lost after centuries of only the most minimal continuity of occupation, but it would certainly still have been recognised as impressive and significant.

Within the walls, the topography of the citadel naturally draws one's attention to the summit as the most important location. The terraces and palace complex on the summit were substantial, and the archaeological discovery of various architectural features, such as the numerous column bases *in situ* in the Megaron, Great Court, and Grand Staircase,

[577] Klein 1997: Fig 2; Tsountas 1886: 60-62, Fig 4.

suggests that even in their ruined state these would have remained impressive and intriguing structures.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins

The presence of later religious activity on the Mycenaean summit has been clear since the earliest excavations. In Tsountas' first season (1886) he recorded three aligned walls and their corresponding foundations running roughly north-south over the former megaron and court.[578] He correctly identified the foundations as the *krepidoma* of a rectangular temple, but incorrectly placed its construction in the 6th century (Fig. 35).[579] In Wace's subsequent excavations in 1920-23, the repeated discovery of evidence of Hellenistic settlement in the citadel led to a reconsideration of the temple building, which was correctly dated to the 3rd century BC when Mycenae was resettled by Argos (after destruction at Argive hands in 468 BC).[580] Further investigation in the 1939 excavation, however, revealed that the summit may have functioned as a cult location long before the Hellenistic sanctuary.[581]

Wace was eager to investigate the Mycenaean palace beneath the temple's foundations and therefore removed them, partly in 1920,[582] and then completely in 1939. The results were summarised briefly in a bulletin, mentioning that "the sanctuary had existed throughout Geometric times",[583] and were little expanded upon in the full publication other than to specify that the earliest pottery dates to the 9th century, and that amongst the Geometric pottery there was an abundance of "Pie Ware"[584] dated to the second half of the 8th century (Fig. 36).[585] The 'Pie Ware' sherds are not catalogued, but those photographed for publication include partial profiles of rims and handles from two closed jugs, and several rim fragments from open vessels. Similarly, the Geometric pottery is not catalogued, but the photographed sherds include skyphoi decorated with concentric circles, a strap handle most likely belonging to a closed jug, and numerous rims from open vessels. It is only since the more comprehensive publication of the material by Klein in 1997 (Figs. 38-41), however,

---

578 Tsountas 1886: 59-62.
579 Klein 1997: 250; Tsountas 1886: 61.
580 Klein 1997: 257; Wace 1949: 84.
581 Wace 1949: 84.
582 Wace 1920: 530.
583 Wace 1939: 210.
584 So named for the incised lines on rims and handles which were thought to resemble pastry.
585 Wace 1949: 84-85.

that we are able to establish a more precise chronological narrative for the establishment of cult on the summit.[586]

North Terrace I was the first major Iron Age construction on the citadel, and marks the first "formalization of the cult at Mycenae" (Fig. 37).[587] No traces of the structure that the terrace was originally built to support survive, but the terrace in itself was a considerable undertaking at 2.26m in height and 18.45m in its east-west width.[588] The ceramic finds from the underlying layers of the terrace include Protogeometric skyphoi and conical cups with high feet, Early Geometric sherds, and Late Geometric sherds.[589] The Middle Geometric Period is unrepresented. The pottery of these different periods was found mixed together within the fill beneath the terrace, apparently deposited together, and therefore Klein rightly proposes a *terminus post quem* for construction in the Late Geometric Period (730-690 BC).[590]

North Terrace II was an even larger construction than North Terrace I, with a width of 22.85m. It was lower than North Terrace I, and was built onto the bare bedrock. Furthermore, it is a later construction, since it was built up against the retaining wall of its predecessor. It cannot, however, have been much later, since the latest pottery discovered in its construction fill was Argive Late Geometric II and Protocorinthian, providing a *terminus post quem* of 730-690 BC, the same period as North Terrace I.[591]

The construction and destruction of the Hellenistic Temple negates the opportunity to investigate the nature and extent of cultic activity on the summit after the terraces were built. It is possible, however, to attempt to reconstruct the kinds of activity that were taking place there at the time of the construction of the terraces and before.

Hall proposes that there is evidence of cult activity from the Protogeometric period, not only noting the Protogeometric ceramic material but also associating with it seven bronze rings, an iron ring, a bronze disc, two broken iron nails, and two bronze pins, one of

---

586 Klein 1997.
587 Ibid: 277.
588 Ibid: 278; the north-south length of the terrace is unknowable.
589 Hall 1995: 599.
590 Klein 1997: 279.
591 Klein 1997: 279.

which can be dated to the Early Geometric period.[592] The presence of skyphoi and cups with conical feet suggests that in the early stages drinking may have played a central and significant role in the cult. This was prior to any Iron Age construction on the summit, and so this communal drinking would have been taking place in the open, amongst the ruins of the former palace. This state of affairs may have been little changed in the Early Geometric period.

Klein, on the other hand, highlights that the bulk of the ceramic material found with the metal objects is made up of Late Geometric skyphoi and other "bowls". She argues that it is most likely, therefore, that the metal items were heirlooms from the Protogeometric and Early Geometric periods deposited in the late 8th century.[593]

Three possible explanations emerge:

1. Limited cult activity began in the 10th century involving open-air drinking and the deposition of Protogeometric drinking vessels and small metal votives. This continued into the Early Geometric period. After a hiatus in the Middle Geometric, activity resumed in the latter half of the 8th century.
2. Cult activity began in the Late Geometric period, including communal drinking and the deposition of small metal votives. The metal votives, as well as some of the drinking vessels, were heirlooms from perhaps two centuries earlier.
3. Cult activity began in the Late Geometric period. When the terraces were built, votive material was mixed in with soil from elsewhere in the site to form the architectural fill beneath and within them. The metal items may have been accidental redeposits from graves on the citadel.[594]

All three are arguably consistent with the evidence, and therefore an interpretation must be drawn on likelihood. It is possible that the metal items were accidental redeposits when soil was gathered for the terraces' fill from parts of the citadel with forgotten graves. We might, however, expect to find further indicators that graves had been inadvertently disturbed in the terrace construction, such as bones. These are not forthcoming.

Hall's conclusion that a small number of identifiably Protogeometric items indicates cult activity began in the 10th century is perfectly consistent and entirely logical. It remains, however, to account for the gap in the ceramic assemblage, with no material at all datable to

[592] Hall 1995: 599; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1984: 91.
[593] Klein 1997: 279; Foley 1988: 143.
[594] A possible explanation offered by Klein 1997: 279.

the Middle Geometric period. The reason for this hiatus is not apparent, and it is unreasonable to seek to identify continuity of cult at a site that shows no sign of activity for perhaps a century.

Klein's proposition that the metal items and the small number of Protogeometric fragments represent heirlooms deposited in the 8th century seems the most reasonable. It corresponds with the more numerous Late Geometric ceramic assemblage, it avoids inserting an inexplicable Middle Geometric hiatus, and it is perhaps particularly appropriate that open-air cult activities taking place over and amongst the ruins of the former palace should involve the deposition of heirlooms, 'living' elements of the past.

The deposition of rings and pins at sanctuaries is often interpreted as reflecting either female participants or a female deity.[595] There is no way of knowing whether there was a specific deity associated with cult activity on the summit, or, if so, who that deity might have been. Attempts have been made to identify the early cult with specific deities associated with later sanctuaries at Mycenae,[596] but this retroactive identification of a deity is completely speculative. Based on the evidence available for the late 8th century we cannot name a deity. The rings and pins may therefore be better understood as the votive offerings of female cult participants. The function of the bronze disc is unclear, though in a deposit devoid of any prestigious votives it may have been a small attempt to offer a relatively valuable item.

The broken iron nails defy easy interpretation. Nails may sometimes have formed part of larger items, such as a wooden chest, the rest of which has perished,[597] but this cannot be the case here, with the two nails having been broken. They are clearly intended as votive items in their own right. Alfayé Villa, whilst discussing the deposition of nails in graves of the Roman period, highlights that the breaking of nails serves to destroy their "utilitarian" nature, in a way that may be comparable with the 'killing' of swords.[598] We may speculate that the breaking of nails may be the craftsman's equivalent, a humbler means of rendering

[595] Baumbach 2004: 38; Morgan 1990: 35; Morgan 1999: 331; Whitley 2001: 141.
[596] Hall 1995: 600.
[597] Alfayé Villa 2010: 428.
[598] Ibid: 443.

the useful useless as a votive offering. Ultimately, however, the precise significance of the nails remains unknown.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins at Mycenae: preliminary observations

Though we cannot trace the structures that stood on the Late Geometric terraces or what took place there, finds from their architectural fill provide an insight into the activities taking place over and amongst the ruins of the former palace prior to their construction.

In the second half of the 8th century BC cult activity began on the summit of the citadel of Mycenae. The location was within the Cyclopean fortification walls, which remained standing tall, and access to the citadel interior would still have been through the magnificent Lion Gate. The open-air cult activities took place amongst the ruins of the former palace buildings. Participants engaged in communal drinking, depositing both their drinking vessels and small metal votive items. Some of these metal items, and perhaps some of the vessels, despite their lower value, were heirlooms from the 10th and 9th century, and their antiquity perhaps made them seem appropriate offerings at a cult taking place amongst ruins. As the cult grew in popularity the sanctuary was formalised at the end of the 8th century with the construction of the substantial ritual terrace, North Terrace I, and shortly thereafter an extension, North Terrace II.

Identifying the participants of the cult on the summit is not straightforward. The deposition of pins and rings is sometimes taken as an indication that women were participating in the cult, but there is not really enough evidence to distinguish exclusively male or female participants. The votives deposited were small items, and though the rings may have been somewhat valuable, they were certainly not intended as an ostentatious display of status. There is nothing to suggest that access to participation was restricted to those of elite status. Indeed, in the absence of wealthy graves or substantial domestic architecture, there is little from Mycenae in the 8th century to suggest the existence of a definable elite group within the settlement.

Popular participation in the cult is reflected in the construction, within a couple of generations, of a terrace on which structures could be built and cult activities take place. Presumably the available space over and amongst the ruins had become limiting, and it was necessary to construct a dedicated space for cult. The construction of North Terrace I, and

of North Terrace II perhaps less than a generation later, would have been a considerable undertaking, requiring significant resources of materiel and manpower. There is little else at Mycenae to indicate that the community had such resources on which to draw easily, which leads to two possible conclusions: either that the cult amongst the ruins of the former palace was of such importance that its expansion warranted a construction project that utilised the full extent of the community's means; or that there was an outside influence, we may speculate Argos or another community in the Argolid, that provided the means with which to undertake the project.

Whatever structures were built on the terraces have not survived, nor are the activities that took place there archaeologically discernible. As a result it is not possible to make many comparisons or draw many contrasts between the cult before the terraces and the cult upon the terraces. It is evident, though, that the engagement with the ruins of the former palace must have been different. The terraces were situated atop the summit, over the ruins of the former palace and at the centre of a landscape of memory, surrounded by the remnants of the Late Bronze Age citadel and within the still-mighty enceinte visible below. But the terraces also elevated the participants away from the ruins. The terrace surface was over 2m above the ground, and after the completion of North Terrace II may have covered an area around the size of a tennis court. This is in contrast to before the terraces, when the cult was taking place down amongst the ruins, when the ruins must have seemed a much more tangible part of the activities taking place. The personal immersion of participants amongst the ruins was an incorporated practice that would have ceased with the construction of the terraces. We may therefore conclude that, whilst the construction of the terraces at the end of the 8th century may have constituted the first "formalization of the cult",[599] it may also have marked a significant change in practice, after which the personal physical engagement with the past was less prominent.

[599] Klein 1997: 277.

Tiryns

The citadel at Tiryns is located on a low rocky hill at the southern end of the Argive plain, on the shore of the Argolic Gulf. It stands out in the landscape, an area of 20,000 square metres elevated up to 18m above the plain.[600] Tiryns was a well-fortified citadel with Cyclopean walls and the Upper Citadel was the site of a palace. Intense scholarly debate has focused on the date and function of Building T, a structure which partially reused the Great Megaron of the palace after the destruction of the citadel in the 'Collapse'. Cult activity began on the Upper Citadel in the 8th century, and the relationship between the cult, Building T, and the broader 'landscape of memory' at Tiryns will be explored below.

. . .

The Bronze Age

The hill was occupied from as early as the Early Helladic period, though the palace and fortifications which dominate the site today were the result of three major construction projects in the 14th and 13th centuries (Fig. 42).[601] The first phase of construction took place in the early 14th century, in the LHIIIA period: a fortified enceinte, forming an "irregular quadrilateral" of around 67m by 70m, encompassed the area of the palace in the Upper Citadel.[602] Access to the court was via a gate on the east side, initially flanked by bastions, and later reinforced with two interior towers overlooking the passage.

The second major phase of fortification took place around 1250 BC, when the citadel area almost doubled in size with the construction of a number of additional features. To the north a new set of retaining walls created a roughly square platform known as the *Mittelburg*, or Middle Citadel, a terrace of around 3000 square metres, around 2.5m lower than the Upper Citadel.[603]

The main developments, however, were on the eastern side of the Upper Citadel. In front of the earlier east gate a rectangular terrace was built and walled to create a courtyard, whilst the terrace previously running alongside the northern part of the east wall

---

600 Iakovidis 1983: 3; Mylonas 1966: 11.
601 Iakovidis 1983: 3; Müller 1930: 88; Mylonas 1966: 12.
602 Iakovidis 1983: 5; Mylonas 1966: 12.
603 Iakovidis 1983: 6; Müller 1930: 35-39; Mylonas 1966: 12.

was converted into a long approaching ramp. The security of the ramp was strengthened with the addition of an outer wall creating a long enclosed passageway, and two sets of gates with formidable stone thresholds were incorporated into the ascent.[604]

The third and final phase of construction of the citadel fortifications was undertaken towards the end of the 13th century. The most striking modification was the addition of the entire Lower Citadel, a fortified area 130m in length, and 60m in width, though narrowing to 28m at the southern end.[605] On the west side of the Upper and Middle Citadels an impressive bastion was constructed protecting the postern gate.[606]

The palace itself was located on the elevated plateau of the Upper Citadel. At its centre was the Great Megaron, a rectangular building oriented north-south and made up of three rooms: a porch, a vestibule, and finally, the largest, the throne room.[607] The porch was a distyle portico in antis, 9.65m across but only 4.80m deep, from which three doorways led north into the vestibule, which was approximately the same size (9.70m by 4.72m).[608] From the vestibule one doorway opened through the west wall providing access to the rooms in the western part of the palace, whilst another opening, with no traces of door-leaves, connected the vestibule to the throne room to the north.[609] The throne room was the "largest roofed space in the entire palace", a roughly square room (9.75-9.86m by 11.81m),[610] at the centre of which was a round hearth, surrounded by four columns.[611] The throne stood against the east wall supported by a "low, rectangular pedestal".[612]

Between the Great Megaron and the main point of access to the citadel in the east wall of the enceinte were a series of courts, thresholds, and gateways. Indeed, the east gate was the first of eight gates or thresholds guarding the route from outside the citadel to within the throne room (Fig. 43). The visitor was repeatedly forced through narrow

---

604 Iakovidis 1983: 5; Müller 1930: 25-33.
605 Iakovidis 1983: 10; Mylonas 1966: 12.
606 Iakovidis 1983: 8; Müller 1930: 40.
607 Müller 1930: 139, 145.
608 Iakovidis 1983: 14; Mylonas 1966: 46.
609 Iakovidis 1983: 14; Müller 1930: 143; Mylonas 1966: 47.
610 Iakovidis 1983: 14.
611 Müller 1930: 144.
612 Iakovidis 1983: 14.

passages which opened out into wide courts, was made to turn corners, and was offered half-blocked views through the colonnaded court in front of the Great Megaron.

This series of gates and thresholds produced what we might term the 'intrigue of separation'. The architectural spaces would play games on the visitor: each of the thresholds created increasing anticipation of the Megaron, and, at its heart, the throne room. The enlarging spaces from narrow corridors to gradually larger courts would leave the visitor repeatedly wondering what more expansive scene might be beyond the next threshold.[613] The visitor would go through such a process of expectation, and suspended realisation of that expectation, that the Great Megaron at the heart of the palace would be conceptually elevated. The 'intrigue of separation' bestowed importance upon the structure as both physically and symbolically the pinnacle of the citadel as a whole.

The 'Collapse' and the Early Iron Age

The manner of the destruction of Tiryns during the 'Collapse' has, in the past, been highly disputed. Müller notes evidence for destruction by fire, stating that the first part of the citadel to fall victim was the west bastion and the stairway which it protected, but observing that there had been attempts at repair there before the entire palace was destroyed by "der grosse Palastbrand", the great palace fire, with a layer of burnt soil uncovered across the Upper Citadel.[614] Mylonas emphasises the intensity of the fire: the wooden beams in the walls of the palace buildings and wooden columns provided ready fuel, resulting in a fire which left "calcined ruins" that "fused into a solid mass that looks like concrete covered with lime".[615]

In order to explain the re-use of the area in the 8th century, Müller dated the burning of the entire palace to around 750 BC.[616] This was a slight adjustment of the previous conclusion of Frickenhaus, who dated the burning of the palace to the mid-7th century.[617] This date has not stood up to scrutiny. Blegen argued in 1921 that the Great Megaron simply could not have survived from the 13th century until a proposed fire in the 8th century,

[613] Wright 1994: 54-56.
[614] Müller 1930: 211.
[615] Mylonas 1966: 48.
[616] Müller 1930: 215.
[617] Frickenhaus 1912: 2.

and that the fire must have taken place closer to the time of its construction, and suggested a Late Mycenaean date instead.[618]

Dating the fire to the end of LHIIIB, around 1200 BC, contextualised it within the wider series of destructions taking place as part of the 'Collapse' of palatial society in the Aegean. In the later 20th century (and early 21st century), excavations have confirmed both a destruction at the end of LHIIIB and also the reoccupation of the Upper Citadel in the 12th century (LHIIIC), focusing particularly on Building T, a narrow rectangular structure built over and partly re-using the south-eastern part of the ruined Great Megaron (Fig. 44).[619]

Building T was both shorter and narrower than the Great Megaron, measuring 20.9m by 6.9m.[620] It was a two-roomed structure, with a long main room accessed via a porch which was furnished with benches on the interior of the east and west walls.[621] The entire east wall of the building was directly laid over the east wall of the former megaron, re-using the ruined wall up to a height of 0.65m.[622] The west wall was built directly upon the earlier floor, positioned deliberately and precisely to incorporate two of the megaron's column bases on the central axis of the new building.[623] Furthermore, the position of Building T incorporated the place of the throne in the former megaron.[624]

The construction of the building was dated by Frickenhaus, who undertook the first full inquiry into it, to the middle of the 7th century, after his proposed palace destruction.[625] Blegen, in addition to rejecting a 7th century destruction date, also disagreed with Frickenhaus' date of construction for Building T. As mentioned above, he did not believe that the Great Megaron could have survived intact for over 400 years, but he also argued that the similarity in form and the active incorporation of earlier features, such as the position of the throne, indicate that the architects of Building T must have been familiar with

---

618 Blegen 1921: 130-134.
619 Kilian 1988; Maran 2000; Maran 2001.
620 Frickenhaus 1912: 2-3; Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 159.
621 Frickenhaus 1912: 3.
622 Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 159: Mylonas 1966: 49.
623 Frickenhaus 1912: 3-4; Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 159.
624 Maran 2001: 113.
625 Frickenhaus 1912: 31; Schliemann and Dörpfeld (Dörpfeld 1886: 229) uncovered Building T in their excavation of the palace, but it was of little interest to them, leaving Frickenhaus (1912: 2-46) to make the first detailed study.

the Great Megaron before its destruction: by moving the date of the fire to the end of LHIIIB, he is required to place the construction of Building T in the 12th century.[626]

In 1982 Wright attempted to revive Frickenhaus' theory, claiming it to be "approximately correct", and outlined an amended interpretation.[627] Wright agreed with a destruction date at the end of LHIIIB, but argued that there was not enough evidence to show that the Upper Citadel was occupied in LHIIIC.[628] He proposed that the area lay abandoned from the 12th century until the construction of Building T in the late 8th century, coinciding with the earliest dates of votive deposits found by Müller in a bothros to the east of the building. He also proposed similarities in design between Building T and contemporary "rectangular slightly monumentalizing" early temple buildings, such as the Hekatompedon on Samos.[629]

Wright's position, however, has been convincingly refuted by Maran, who in evaluating both his own and Kilian's excavation results may have definitely established the chronology of the Building T.[630] During a conservation project in 1998, two post holes were discovered in the southern part of Building T's main room, that is, in the former vestibule of the Great Megaron. These postholes were part of the central colonnade which had re-used the column bases from the porch and throne room. Maran reports that there were "only few finds" from inside the postholes, though these include a horn from a Late Mycenaean terracotta bull and fragments of an LHIIIB/C date.[631] It was not necessary, however, to rely on ceramic dating since small remnants of the wooden posts were discovered in situ in the holes. C14 analysis provided dates ranging from 1520-1120 BC, but with a strong trend grouping in the 12th century, and with 95.4% confidence that no material was later than 1130 BC.[632]

Wright suggested that the Upper Citadel may have been left unoccupied as a sign of respect to the fallen palace,[633] but in light of this clear evidence of re-occupation Maran

---

626 Blegen 1921: 132-133.
627 Wright 1982: 195.
628 Ibid.
629 Müller 1930: 214; Wright 1982: 196-197.
630 Maran 2000; Maran 2001.
631 Maran 2000: 9; Maran 2001: 114.
632 Maran 2001: 114.
633 Wright 1982: 195.

suggests that in the aftermath of the palace's destruction there may have been an active attempt "to reutilize the place of the throne" and to maintain a "continuing focus of social hierarchy on one person".[634] Stockhammer prefers to envisage not the home of one new ruler, but rather a meeting place for the heads of "influential families".[635] In either case the nature of power at the top of society in Tiryns, however, had nonetheless changed. Whilst the location of the throne was preserved, there was no longer a central hearth, indicating "fundamental changes to the staging and performance of ritual".[636] It is apparent, however, that open air ritual continued, with a round altar in the Great Court restored with a square stone platform contemporary with the construction of Building T.[637] Furthermore, the change to a two-roomed structure rather than three and the inclusion of a long main room may indicate a more accessible hierarchy, a new social order in which more people were physically and conceptually included in the ruler's *inner sanctum*.[638]

At the end of LHIIIC there are no signs of destruction at Building T, and therefore it may be assumed that its use continued into the Early Iron Age. It is impossible to determine precisely when it ceased to function as a ruler's dwelling or meeting place, but Mazarakis Ainian proposes that by the time the Upper Citadel took on a new function as the site of cult activity in the 8th century it was "probably in a ruinous condition".[639]

The Lower Citadel was also destroyed by fire at the end of LHIIIB, and re-occupation and re-construction began immediately in LHIIIC Early.[640] Some attempts were made at continuity: Casement 7 was a niche chamber cut into the west fortification wall, and though this was filled in to strengthen the wall in LHIIIC Early there followed three successive cult rooms in the open area in front of the earlier chamber, showing, according to Albers, a continuing tradition of "public communal cult".[641] Attempts were made to rebuild one of the corridor-houses, Bau VI, though on a smaller scale, occupying one terrace

634 Maran 2001: 115.
635 Stockhammer 2011: 215.
636 Ibid: 117.
637 Maran 2001: 115; Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 159; Müller 1930: 136-138.
638 Thomas and Conant 1999: 29.
639 Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 161.
640 Mühlenbruch 2007: 244.
641 Albers 2004: 117; Lemos, Livieratou, and Thomatos 2009: 67; Mühlenbruch 2007: 244.

rather than two, and probably only consisting of one storey rather than two.[642] As on the Upper Citadel, the desire for continuity is not entirely matched by the capacity for it.

The evidence for a continuing population at Tiryns in the Early Iron Age comes almost exclusively from outside the fortified citadel, in the so-called Lower Town. Submycenaean pottery was discovered to the west and south of the Upper Citadel, and eight pit and cist graves of the same period have been found to the south and south-east. An Early Protogeometric apsidal building was found to the west of the Lower Citadel, whilst to the west of the Upper Citadel house remains of the same period have been discovered.[643] Furthermore, there are clusters of Geometric cist, pithos, and pit burials to the west and south-west of the citadel.[644]

A 'landscape of memory' and Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins

Frickenhaus reported in 1912 on the architecture and finds associated with Building T in the Archaic and Classical period, understanding the structure to have been a built-for-purpose temple of the mid-7th century.[645] This was amended by Müller in the 1930 report after a bothros filled with votive offerings was unearthed in Court 30, 22m to the east of Building T. The contents of the bothros were not published but he noted the similarity of the finds to those from the later sanctuary, which included clay and terracotta figurines of standing and seated women, as well as drinking vessels and some metal finds.[646]

Müller dated the assemblage as spanning 750-650 BC, and proposed that the deposit in the bothros may have taken place in response to damage to Building T (perhaps due to an earthquake). After the votives were buried, he suggests, the 'temple' was renovated and cult activity recommenced with the archaic cult discovered by Frickenhaus.[647]

Foley supports Müller proposals, and indeed adds some details with regard to the make-up of the deposit, noting that there were "many miniature bowls, skyphoi and other

---

642 Lemos, Livieratou, and Thomatos 2009: 67; Mühlenbruch 2007: 245.
643 Kilian 1988: 107; Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 98; Papadimitriou 2006: 532.
644 Gercke and Naumann 1974: 15-24; Lemos, Livieratou, and Thomatos 2009: Fig. 6.4; Maran and Papadimitriou 2006: 97-133.
645 Frickenhaus 1912: 31, 1-126.
646 Frickenhaus 1912: 47-107; Müller 1930: 214.
647 Müller 1930: 214; Müller goes on to use the date of this deposit to estimate a date in the 8th century for the destruction of the palace. As discussed above, this is not correct. Nonetheless, his estimate for the initiation of the cult is sound.

shapes, terracotta figurines of the usual Archaic types as well as a few bronze rings, pins and fibulae." Furthermore, she notes that "most of the pots had a pierced bottom and were partially burnt".[648] Brüggemann expands a little further in the most recent *Tiryns* volume: she gives more specific ceramic dating, placing the greater part of the diagnostic pottery in the Late Geometric II and Sub-Geometric I periods (740-690 BC), but unfortunately there are no more precise details regarding the figurines, jewellery, and miniature vessels.[649]

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins at Tiryns: preliminary observations

The information gathered above can give an indication of the kinds of activities that were taking place on the Upper Citadel at the initiation of the cult in the late 8th century. Skyphoi and other open vessels suggest that the participants were engaging in communal drinking. The detail that some vessels were partially burnt suggests that cooked meals were consumed, though in the absence of ash and bone it cannot be known whether larger-scale offerings of cooked sacrificial animals were part of the rites.[650] The pierced bases of many vessels seem to reflect a particular ritual practice, perhaps a means of pouring out libations, whilst the presence of miniature vessels may suggest the participation of children.[651] Finally, the presence of pins, rings, and fibulae may indicate female participants or a female deity (see below), or indeed both.[652]

Foley is somewhat reluctant though to assume that Building T housed the cult, in part because of the lack of Iron Age pottery from the floor of the Great Megaron/Building T. Instead she suggests that we should primarily associate the votive offerings with the altar in front of Building T, the cultic nature of which is clear. Archaeologists working at the site today profess divergent opinions on the role of the building: Papadimitriou believes that Building T housed the cult, whilst Maran does not believe that it could still have been standing by the 8th century.[653] Alternatively, it is feasible that even in a relatively dilapidated state Building T may have provided a focal point and a hypaethral setting for ritual gatherings

---

[648] Foley 1988: 145; It should be noted that 'bowls' are a shape typically associated with the Bronze Age rather than the Iron Age, but it seems that Foley is using the term to refer generically to open vessels, including "skyphoi and other shapes", and not specifically the Late Helladic deep bowl.
[649] Brüggemann 2015: 240.
[650] Cf Morgan's discussion of the burning of meat and bones at Isthmia and other sanctuaries (Morgan 1999: 316).
[651] Langdon 2013: 183.
[652] Baumbach 2004: 38; Morgan 1990: 35; Morgan 1999: 331; Whitley 2001: 141.
[653] Papadimitriou 2015, Maran 2015: personal correspondence.

and activities. Whatever the particular function and state of preservation of Building T at this time, the rituals were taking place in a striking location on the highest point amidst a mass of impressive remains.

Though his suggestion that Building T was a specially constructed 8th century temple is now known to be incorrect, Wright also sought to establish the identity of the deity worshipped at the site. A cult to Hera at Tiryns is mentioned by Pausanias[654] and the base of a pot from the Classical period bears an inscription of her name.[655] Whilst no such evidence is attested in this early stage of the cult on the Upper Citadel, Wright suggests that a cult to Hera would not only offer an origin for the later cult, but would also adhere to a pattern across the Argolid, in which Hera was locally revered as the traditional protector of Argive cities, and indeed of Argive heroes in the *Iliad*.[656] Wright proposes that it was Hera who provided the link between the 'present-day' cult of the 8th and later centuries, and the heroic and historic setting amongst the ruined palace and within the mighty walls.[657] Nonetheless, as ever, the identification of a specific deity at a cult as early as the 8th century remains speculation.

[654] Paus. 2.17.5.
[655] Naumann 1975: 105.
[656] Drews 1979: 125-130; Wright 1982: 197.
[657] Wright 1982: 197.

Asine

Asine is located on the southern coast of the Argolid, to the south-east of Tiryns, in a bay sheltered by the islands of Rhodi and Koronisi.[658] The site is on an elevated rocky promontory known as Kastraki, which protrudes into the sea, and extends to the north-west on a higher hill called Barbouna (Fig. 46). There was also occupation of the low plains surrounding the areas of higher land.[659] Asine was first excavated by archaeologists from the Swedish Institute from 1922-1930, directed by Persson and Frödin, and Swedish teams conducted various further investigations at the site from 1970-1993.[660]

Many of the most prominent remains visible today date to the Hellenistic and Roman periods, though inhabitation of Kastraki is attested from at least the Early Helladic period. The site was occupied throughout the Early and Middle Helladic periods, the Mycenaean Age, and the Protogeometric and Geometric periods, before being left abandoned in the Archaic and Classical periods after the destruction by Argos at the end of the 8th century BC.[661]

Three distinct examples of Iron Age cultic engagement with the past are attested at Asine: funerary ritual, 'building sacrifices', and a sanctuary in the midst of the Bronze Age necropoleis. Together they represent a multi-faceted cultic engagement with a 'landscape of memory'.

. . .

The Bronze Age: the Lower Town

Remains on the top of the acropolis of Kastraki are limited, as erosion of its exposed rocky terrain has left scarce evidence.[662] Rather, the most extensively excavated part of the settlement is the Lower Town on the north-west slope of the acropolis, sheltered by both Kastraki and the Barbouna Hill (Fig. 47). Detailed Hellenistic and Roman structures were uncovered, but beneath these a series of terraces with layers of Geometric occupation,

---

658 Nordquist 1987: 23.
659 Styrenius 1998: 56.
660 Frödin, Persson, and Westholm 1938; Styrenius 1998: 55.
661 Morgan and Whitelaw 1991: 79; Styrenius 1998: 56.
662 Nordquist 1987: 23.

"large Mycenaean building complexes", extensive Middle Helladic foundations, and traces of Early Helladic buildings, in a chronological sequence which Sjöberg described as "a gigantic, uncompleted, jigsaw puzzle."[663]

Westholm identified eight prehistoric phases of construction in the Lower Town.[664] Period 5 was the first Late Helladic phase, identified in House F, a building of which only part of two rooms may be reconstructed. Though this was the first Late Helladic phase the excavators dated Period 5 to LHIII. LHI-II pottery, though present in the ceramic assemblage, is not greatly represented, and there were no structures discovered with associated strata dating to these periods.[665]

Period 6 was marked by significant constructions: four houses (Houses G, I, K, and L) were built. A wide passage separated Houses I and K from Houses G and L, whilst narrow passages also separated House I from House K, and House G from House L. The organised arrangement and planning of the settlement is evident. House G (Fig. 49) was the largest of these buildings. It was constructed over House F, but did not follow the same plan or orientation. This was an entirely new construction project. The foundations of the north-eastern part of the house are fairly well preserved, allowing a reconstructed plan of nine rooms, though it is possible that further rooms may have been located to the south, where the remains are less well preserved.[666]

Rooms 35 and 32 are the centrepieces of the structure, with Room 32 in particular considered to have been the "predominant position" within the house. Two columns divided the room into two, and rubble masonry along the foundations of the north wall may indicate a threshold support.[667] A doorway in this north wall would face out onto the houses below, and onto the lower plain, and in turn be visible from these places.

In the northern corner of Room 32 was a low bench which has been identified as a small altar. A jug was wedged between the stones of the bench, upside down, and with the bottom of the vessel missing. Deep bowls, goblets, a kylix and a globular amphora were also

---

663 Frödin, Persson, and Westholm 1938: 46; Sjöberg 2004: 29.
664 He termed these phases Periods 1-8; Frödin, Persson, and Westholm 1938: 88-89.
665 Frödin and Persson 1938: 89, 296.
666 Frödin, Persson, and Westholm 1938: 74.
667 Ibid.

found in front of the altar.[668] In addition, a large terracotta head was discovered, 12cm in height and 7cm across, in a thick layer of ash and charcoal in front of the altar. It has a flat-topped head wearing a crown, a wide forehead with a projecting nose, large bulbous eyes, clearly defined ears, long hair hanging down the back of the neck, and a prominent chin which Persson interpreted as a beard. The male identification and his "noble" appearance prompted the excavators to dub it the "Lord of Asine."[669]

This interpretation did not go unquestioned, however, and there has long been debate over assigning gender to the figure. Evans proposed that traces of white paint may indicate a female, in accordance with Minoan pictorial convention,[670] whilst Alexiou categorised the head as part of the tradition of goddesses with upraised arms as are found in Late Minoan Crete.[671] Laviosa proposed neither a masculine nor feminine identification, instead suggesting that it may have been the head of a sphinx or other similar fantastical creature.[672] Gradually a general consensus came to accept a female identification, particularly after discoveries at other Mycenaean cult centres, such as that at Mycenae,[673] indicated that goddesses with upraised arms were not limited to Crete.[674] D'Agata, however, subsequently offered her support to Laviosa's theory, highlighting that the long locks of hair running down the back of the head and neck are not known in female figurines from the mainland, but are in fact found on fantastical creatures.[675]

The dating of the 'Lord' of Asine, and the associated pottery from Room 32 in House G has also been a matter of extended debate. The initial dating of the house to LHIIIB by the excavators was questioned as early as 1944 when Furumark proposed a new date in LHIIIC.[676] The dating of the ceramic assemblage was subsequently refined to LHIIIC Late.[677] In turn, D'Agata sought to date the figurine itself: she noted the motif of semicircles on the crown which could apply to the end of LHIIIB and all of LHIIIC, as well as the lozenge accompanied by pennants at the centre of the forehead, which does not appear earlier than

---

668 Frödin, Persson, and Westholm 1938: 298-300.
669 Frödin, Persson, and Westholm 1938: 308; D'Agata 1996: 39.
670 D'Agata 1996: 40.
671 Alexiou 1958: 216.
672 Laviosa 1967: 87-90.
673 Taylour 1969: 91-97.
674 Desborough, Nicholls, and Popham 1970: 29.
675 D'Agata 1996:45.
676 Furumark 1944: 206, 210-211.
677 Rutter 1977: 4; Mountjoy 1986: 181.

LHIIIC. Furthermore, she pointed out that such a motif is also seen on stirrup jars from Asine and Perati, which can be dated specifically to LHIIIC Middle.[678] D'Agata therefore proposed that the 'Lord' of Asine was installed in the shrine perhaps a generation after its production, probably, but not certainly, after the body was damaged or removed.[679]

In her 2004 monograph dedicated to Asine in the LHIII period, Sjöberg made a final chronological refinement, highlighting that of the ten most complete pieces of datable ceramic evidence from Room 32, six are LHIIIC Middle, two are LHIIIC Late, one is LHIIIC Middle-Late, and a final fragment is broadly datable to LHIIIC. As a result, Sjöberg amends the previous chronological interpretations, and emphasises that Room 32 of House G, and the shrine within it, were in use throughout LHIIIC Middle and Late. Finally, she highlights the presence of coarse and cooking ware amongst the unpublished material from Room 32, indicating the multi-functional nature of the house.[680] The final Mycenaean phase was Period 7, in which House H followed the same general plan as House G, and respected the same 'street' layout, suggesting that the settlement arrangement of the previous phase remained intact.

The Bronze Age: Kastraki

The identification of Bronze Age fortifications at Asine has proven incredibly difficult due to the extensive defensive walls later constructed in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, as well as by the Venetians, and indeed, for the excavations in the later 20th century, as a result of the use of Kastraki by the Italian Army in the 1940s. Only on the eastern side of Kastraki were traces of walls associated with Late Helladic pottery discovered by the excavators.[681]

The Bronze Age: east of Kastraki

In 1970-1974, excavations took place in an area around 30m to the east of the edge of Kastraki in response to proposed building work by the owners of the land.[682] A Middle Helladic tumulus cemetery was discovered, though it became clear that by the Mycenaean

[678] Mountjoy 1986: 168; Mountjoy 1988: fig. 3; D'Agata 1996: 45.
[679] D'Agata 1996: 46.
[680] Sjöberg 2004: 32-34.
[681] Frödin, Persson, and Westholm 1938: 32.
[682] Dietz 1982: 19; Styrenius 1998: 62.

period, the funerary role of the area was forgotten or ignored, and a number of houses were constructed throughout the Late Helladic and Submycenaean periods.[683]

The Bronze Age: Barbouna Hill

North-west of Kastraki is Barbouna Hill, where two Mycenaean necropoleis were discovered in the excavations of the 1920s: Necropolis I, on the eastern slopes of the hill was made up of 26 chamber tombs, whilst Necropolis II on the north slope included 24 chamber tombs.[684] Of these, only eight have been fully excavated and published.[685] Most of the chambers were used for multiple burials in the Late Bronze Age.[686]

The 'Collapse'

There is no evidence of a violent destruction or conflagration at Asine in the closing stages of the Bronze Age, in contrast with a number of other sites in the Argolid. Instead there is a discernible period of decline in LHIIIB, during which the settlement yields considerably less ceramic evidence and no definitive building projects took place.[687] The chamber tombs on Barbouna Hill, most of which receive burials throughout LHIIB-LHIIIA, are generally inactive during LHIIIB, with only three of the published tombs providing just eight vessels dated this period in total.[688]

Furthermore, there is a notably minimal amount of material dated to LHIIIC Early. Sjöberg speculates that after a period of decline in the late 13th century, the transition to LHIIIC at the start of the 12th century may have been marked by an earthquake, which destroyed, but did not burn, the LHIIIB settlement. The site would then have been abandoned for a generation in the early 12th century, before the settlement was cleared and rebuilt in LHIIIC Middle.[689] This, however, seems unlikely. Such a sequence of events would still have left some evidence of destruction.

---

683 Dietz 1982: 57.
684 Styrenius 1998: 60.
685 Sjöberg 2004: 91.
686 Ibid: 91-104.
687 Sjöberg 2004: 41.
688 Ibid: 91-106.
689 Ibid: 42

Sjöberg offers another possibility: she proposes that through LHIIIB and LHIIIC Early Asine was not herself the victim of destruction or conflagration, but declined in response to such events taking place at other sites in the region. If Asine, being a port settlement, was functioning as a trade intermediary between centres like Mycenae or Tiryns and overseas trade contacts, then instability or collapse at other Mycenaean centres may have had a dramatic impact on her economy and prosperity. By LHIIIC Middle, the recovery experienced at larger Mycenaean centres would instigate some renewed prosperity for Asine.[690]

The Early Iron Age: the Lower Town

Westholm records that scattered wall remains in the Lower Town belong to 'Period 8', the final phase of occupation, which he broadly terms "'Geometric", before a general abandonment of the site at the end of the 8th century.[691]

The Early Iron Age: Kastraki

As mentioned above, few remains survived on the exposed rocky promontory of Kastraki, but the excavators did find some settlement evidence on a terrace constructed on the southern part of the acropolis. They uncovered the foundations of two houses dating to the Geometric period which re-used some of the foundations of a Late Helladic house built on the same orientation. In the north-western part of the terrace was a courtyard, where a series of flat stones were found which Frödin identified as the remains of a Geometric street. The house complex seems to continue to the south and south-west, but the possible extent could not be established due to later Hellenistic construction.[692]

The Early Iron Age: east of Kastraki

In the Protogeometric period inhabitation continued in the area east of Kastraki. The excavators found curved walls which they identified as two apsidal houses built on the same location one after the other. They are almost identical in plan, with one wall just inside the other, giving projected sizes of 6.2m and 7.8m in width. Dietz proposes that the ceramic evidence from within the houses belongs to the floor of the 'inner' house, dating its

690 Ibid: 41.
691 Westholm 1938: 89.
692 Ibid: 40.

construction to the Late Protogeometric. He argues that the floor of the outer house was destroyed during the construction of the inner, meaning that it must be assigned an earlier date. The presence of an abundance of Middle Protogeometric pottery in surrounding trenches led him to conclude that this was a sequence of two similar buildings in MPG (outer house) and LPG (inner house).[693]

Mazarakis Ainian disagrees with this proposal. He suggests that the two walls were not two different houses of two different phases, but rather that the wall of the 'inner' house was in fact a bench, and that there 'outer' foundations correspond to the actual walls of a single apsidal house of LPG date, which he identifies as a 'ruler's dwelling'.[694] Certainly this seems logical, as it would not make sense for the builders of the 'inner' house to follow the earlier plan so closely and not actually re-use the earlier foundations. A single building is more probable. Another apsidal house was found which has been dated to the Middle Geometric II period, measuring c.12m by 5m, with traces of cross-walls dividing it into three or even four individual rooms.[695]

The Early Iron Age: Barbouna Hill

Antonaccio highlights that four of the eight published Mycenaean tombs on the slopes of Barbouna Hill contained material indicating re-use in the Protogeometric and Geometric periods. In particular this took the form of niches in the walls of the *dromoi* of the tombs, which she proposes would often have held infant burials, and in which skeletal remains do not necessarily survive.[696]

A 'landscape of memory' at Asine

The transition from Bronze Age to Iron Age appears to have coincided with changes in the settlement patterns at Asine. The Lower Town, which had previously been the centre of habitation, particularly elite dwellings such as the 'palace' of House G, scarcely experienced any redevelopment in the Early Iron Age. Meanwhile the lowland plain, which had not been a prominent part of the settlement in the Bronze Age, was the location of new elite (possibly rulers') dwellings in the Protogeometric and Geometric periods. The

693 Dietz 1982: 49-51.
694 Mazarakis Ainian 1988: 116.
695 Dietz 1982: 53.
696 Antonaccio 1995: 22-24.

presence of Geometric houses on top of Kastraki and the Iron Age pottery found in the Lower Town are potent reminders, however, that the rocky promontory remained an active part of the landscape for the inhabitants of Asine.

Barbouna Hill was surrounded by 50 Mycenaean chamber tombs, and the slopes of Kastraki, so visible both from Barbouna and from the plain, were covered with the remains of the Late Bronze Age city, of the prosperous final flourish of the Mycenaean Age in the 12th century. It is in the context of this 'landscape of memory' that Iron Age cult activity at Asine must be investigated.

Iron Age cult within a 'landscape of memory'

There are three main types of Iron Age cult activity at Asine which require examination: first, funerary ritual; second, 'building sacrifices'; and finally, the sanctuary on Barbouna Hill. Together they illustrate a multi-faceted engagement with a 'landscape of memory' at Asine.

Funerary ritual

Antonaccio highlights two instances of Iron Age funerary cult. The first is in the Lower Town, where three circles, measuring 50-80cm in diameter, made up of groups of stones, were placed alongside 11th century graves.[697] The stones were packed with animal bones, ash, and broken pottery. The second is on Barbouna Hill, where again three circles of stones, this time measuring 1.0-1.5m in diameter, were placed near (though not directly next to) tombs. Again the stones were packed with burnt earth, ash, and animal bones. Around the southernmost circles of stones was a considerable ceramic deposit: around forty vessels were discovered, including amphorae, oinochoai, skyphoi, one-handled cups, and a single large krater. Many of these pots were complete, and some appeared to still be standing upright. A stone apparently carved into the shape of an axe was found wedged between the necks of two amphorae. The assemblage dates to Late Geometric and Proto-Corinthian periods.[698]

[697] Antonaccio 1995: 199.
[698] Ibid: 200.

The presence of ash and animal bones suggest that the stone circle platforms were used as the site of animal sacrifice, cooking, and feasting. The abundance of drinking vessels, at least at the Barbouna Hill deposit, indicates that drinking was clearly very much a part of the activities taking place there. Furthermore, the fact that such a large assemblage was found on Barbouna Hill suggests that these were not isolated events but repeated activities. The stone apparently carved into the shape of an axe does not provide a great deal of information. Its identification as representing an axe is tentative and not at all certain, and it is not clear what function was served by being wedged between two amphorae. Antonaccio, supporting Hägg's earlier interpretation, argues that despite being from different periods, both sets of platforms indicate ritual ceremony related to the dead, perhaps in the form of funerary meals, through which the deceased, other ancestors, and perhaps 'heroes' were honoured and commemorated.[699] This was taking place in the Lower Town in the 11th century, and was revived in a similar manner but on a much grander scale on Barbouna Hill in the latter half of the 8th century.

'Building sacrifices'

The second type of Iron Age cult activity to be discussed is a phenomenon which Wells calls "building sacrifices".[700] There are two instances of this at Asine, both dated to Late Geometric. First, a fortification wall was installed on the northern slope of Barbouna Hill in the late 8th century. Immediately next to it was a deposit of pottery: the most completely preserved vessels were two kraters, a handmade amphora, and a cup that acted as a lid for the amphora. Two other much more fragmentary kraters were also found.[701] All are datable to the Late Geometric period.

One of the kraters was found still in an upright position. It is interesting to note that the two less fragmentary kraters are each about half complete. The krater found upright had a complete base and lower part of the body, whilst the other krater had a profile from rim to base, but only one side of the vessel. Wells proposes that this indicates that the vessels were never buried or covered over but rather remained visible on a more permanent basis. Wells emphasises that the stratigraphy recorded during the excavation confirmed that these

---

699 Hägg 1983: 189-190; Hägg 1992: 19; Antonaccio 1995: 200.
700 Wells 1988a.
701 Ibid: 261.

vessels were deposited on virgin soil, and as such were contemporary with the first construction of the wall. Wells dates the deposit and the construction of the wall at c.725-720.[702]

A new circuit wall was also constructed on Kastraki, and similarly an assemblage of vessels was deposited directly against the wall, at the natural entrance to the acropolis. The assemblage included a large decorated amphora, four oinochoai, a kantharos, two skyphoi, and several cups – a "veritable wine service". As was the case on Barbouna, these were all dated c.725-720.[703]

The nature of the activities taking place at these sites is quite clear. On Barbouna Hill, the selection of kraters clearly point to the communal consumption of wine, and at Kastraki the drinking function of the assemblage is quite apparent. Wells rightly interprets these deposits as 'sacrifices' to mark new building constructions, carried out to appease any "resident spirit" and seek protection for the new construction.[704]

The discovery of upright vessels at both sites, and the indication, particularly on Barbouna Hill, that that the kraters and other vessels were not actually covered over but left on display, suggests that they were to be revisited and reused repeatedly. Repeated communal drinking events at these sites possibly undermine the interpretation that they were building sacrifices. You would not return to re-perform a building sacrifice when the construction was no longer new. Instead we may recognise simply the venues of repeated ritual communal drinking, without seeking to ascribe a particular cultic function for which the evidence does not exist. The locations have particular significance, situated at new constructions on the hill cut with dozens of Bronze Age tombs and at the approach to the extensive Bronze Age settlement. The sites may have been selected, not for any apotropaic cult or building sacrifice, but as a ritualised recognition of the 'new' amongst the 'old'. They could be considered an example of what Scully calls "'man-centred' design", in which the physical manifestation of the cult represents a human interaction with the "sacred character

[702] Courbin 1966: 221-223; Wells 1988a: 262.
[703] 'Deposit D'; Frödin, Persson, and Westholm 1938: 32, 331-332; Courbin 1966: 221-223; Wells 1988a: 262-263; Styrenius 1998: 56.
[704] Wells 1988a: 262.

of the landscape itself".[705] The 'landscape of memory' and the landscape of the present become forged and inextricably linked.

The sanctuary on Barbouna Hill

The final feature of cult activity to be discussed is the sanctuary of Apollo Pytheas. Pausanias records the existence of the sanctuary, stating that in Asine's destruction at the hands of Argos at the end of the 8th century[706] it was the only building spared.[707] It has been accepted that this sanctuary was on Barbouna Hill.

West and north-west of the highest point on Barbouna Hill is a plateau which Frödin describes as a "partially artificial terrace", roughly square, c.40m by 40m (Fig. 48). The terrace was supported on the south-western and south-eastern sides by natural rock formations, to the north-west, north, and east by a 75m curved buttress of "large undressed stones", and to the south by a 20m buttress.[708] Wall foundations were discovered in 1924 and investigated further in 1926, revealing a rectangular building, oriented north-south. It measured 4.3m by 9.6m, with the wall remains standing to a height of 0.6m. The southern end had a central doorway 1.2m wide, with a threshold of ashlar blocks not bonded to the main walls.[709]

The building was divided into two rooms. The larger back room measured 5.2m by 2.7m whilst the smaller front room was roughly square, with dimensions of 2.4m by 2.7m. The divide was discernible in a thin partition wall, around 20-30cm thick, with a slightly offset door, only surviving to around half the height of the main walls. The interiors of the main walls of the larger back room were lined with low benches of flat stones, around 30cm tall, and 30cm from front to back.[710]

On the terrace close to the rectangular building a small lead figurine was found. It measured 2.7cm in height, and 1.3cm across, and depicted a male with straight shoulder-length hair, in what Persson described as "the so-called Apollo type". In addition there were

---

[705] Scully 2013: 78-79.
[706] Courbin 1966: 14, 26.
[707] Paus. 2.36.4-5.
[708] Frödin, Persson, and Westholm 1938: 148.
[709] Ibid: 149.
[710] Ibid: 150-151.

"sundry" small ceramic figurines, with arms and legs splayed, and with "plastically modelled" features such as eyes, hair, and other ornaments added separately.[711] Furthermore, Late Geometric and Proto-Corinthian sherds were found inside the building (Fig. 50),[712] as well as ash from a presumed hearth.[713] The clear cultic implications of the ash and figurines, and the precisely dateable ceramics, led De Polignac to identify the building and the terrace as a typical early suburban sanctuary from the end of the 8th century.[714]

In addition to the rectangular building dating to the end of the 8th century, a 7m long curved wall was discovered on the western side of the terrace. Wells proposed, with Hägg's subsequent support, that the curved wall belonged an earlier apsidal cult building.[715] In the initial excavation report, Frödin states that at the western end of the terrace there was a "great accumulation" of fragmentary sherds from very large Geometric vessels.[716] Wells expanded on the details of this deposit, reporting that the assemblage included "at least two giant pyxides, several big kraters, as well as jugs and bowls".[717] Furthermore, joining sherds were found both in the deposit and within the restored plan of the apsidal building. This in particular makes clear the link between the structure and the cultic deposit near to it. Wells dates this earlier cult building to c. 750.[718]

The evidence provides a fairly clear narrative of the activities and developments taking place in the area. In the middle of the 8th century, an apsidal cult building was erected. Inside the building cult practices centred around communal drinking, as demonstrated by the kraters, jugs, and open vessels. After use these were deposited in front of the terrace. It seems that there was ongoing discarding of used items rather than a single clear out at the end of the building's use, in which case we might expect to find a greater infusion of material dating to the later construction. The giant pyxides also indicate that there was a storage function, perhaps simply of wine for communal drinking, or else perhaps of some other perishable good that formed part of the rites. There is no indication of a specific deity associated with this cult. After perhaps a generation, this building fell out of use and a new

711 Frödin, Persson, and Westholm 1938: 333.
712 Hägg 1992: 18; Foley 1988: 142.
713 Wells 1988b: 349.
714 De Polignac 1995: 22.
715 Wells 1988b: 352.
716 Frödin, Persson, and Westholm 1938: 149.
717 Wells 1988b: 352.
718 Ibid.

rectangular building was constructed. Here we may recognise the establishment of a specific cult dedicated to Apollo, as is attested by the Apollo-type male figurine, and corroborated by literary sources noting the existence of such a cult. Votive offerings played a more central role in this phase of the cult, as demonstrated by the collection of figurines. It is unfortunate that great details have not been recorded about these figurines. The ash of the hearth suggests that cooking and feasting on sacrificial meat was taking place. By the end of the 8th century we have a conventional sanctuary of De Polignac's suburban type. Furthermore the terrace and sanctuary took centre stage atop and amongst the Late Bronze Age necropolis.

Iron Age cult within a 'landscape of memory' at Asine: preliminary observations

In some respects, Asine fits neatly into a regional pattern for the Argolid: as at Mycenae, a terrace was constructed on high ground as the setting of cult activity; as at Tiryns the cult building itself was a rectangular 'megaron' style, two-roomed building; in common with both of these sites, the cult activity was established in the middle of, and latter half of, the 8th century BC, the Late Geometric period.

Beyond these similarities, however, there is something quite different taking place in Asine. Mycenae and Tiryns both had hugely impressive Cyclopean fortifications, and the palaces at their centres were deemed the natural places in which to establish a cult amongst the ruins. The inhabitants of Asine, however, took a much broader approach. Barbouna Hill and Kastraki are topographically impressive landmarks by themselves, but they also represent two different aspects of the Bronze Age past: Barbouna the Mycenaean necropolis, both literally and metaphorically embedded with the past, and Kastraki the fortified citadel.

It seems that the settlement of the 8th century was on the plain, and yet the new fortification walls, and their associated votive deposits were positioned on Barbouna and Kastraki. This is understandable at Kastraki, the most defensible part of the settlement, but the new wall on Barbouna Hill was not a full encircling wall, and could have been circumnavigated in the event of an attack. Rather, it is a symbolic engagement with the landscape of memory, linking the past and the present. This is reinforced by the positioning of the cult building on Barbouna Hill. The building faces south, towards Kastraki and the slopes on which the Lower Town would have remained visible. What Asine lacked in terms

of monumental ruins the 8th century inhabitants made up for through careful use of topographical space, positioning their cult building so as to engage with a naturally monumental 'landscape of memory'.

Argos and the Argive Heraion

Argos was not a major site in the Mycenaean period when compared with Mycenae or Tiryns. It probably did not have a palace, but it does seem to have had a fortified citadel and its Late Bronze Age necropolis contains some seventy tombs. Argos avoided destruction or decline in the transition to the Early Iron Age. In the 8th century cult was practised within the former fortified citadel, as at Mycenae and Tiryns, though the extent to which ruins of the citadel had survived is not entirely clear.

The Argive Heraion, on the other hand, is a unique case. It was once thought that the cult began at the ruins of a monumental Bronze Age terrace or fortification built in the Cyclopean style. The terrace is now known to be a creation of the 8th century, deliberately reminiscent of Mycenaean architecture that was by then long-obsolete. These were 'fake' ruins built as the setting for cult. The other sites in this thesis are examples of cult practised within a 'landscape of memory'. At the Argive Heraion the 'landscape of memory' was artificially created as the setting for cult.

. . .

Argos

The Bronze Age

Argos, on the western edge of the Argive Plain is dominated by two peaks, the higher, Larissa, reaching over 300m, and the lower, Aspis, to a little less than 90m, which provided two natural acropoleis from which the entire plain could be observed, from the citadel of Mycenae to the north to the bay of Nauplion to the south.[719] The discovery of the fortified citadels on the eastern edge of the Argive Plain at Mycenae and Tiryns led early scholars to assume the existence of a similar citadel at Argos on the western edge of the plain, initially taking the Aspis peak as the probable location of a royal residence.[720] French excavations at Argos in fact found evidence of Bronze Age occupation across a number of areas of the site.

[719] Touchais and Divari-Valakou 1998: 9.
[720] Kophiniotis 1892: 47; Vollgraff 1904: 5.

Some Early Helladic pottery was found on Aspis and on Deiras, the ridge that runs between the Larissa and Aspis peaks.[721] In addition, Early Helladic strata were found under parts of the modern city in the low land on the plain beneath the peaks.[722] An Early Helladic tomb was also discovered at the foot of Larissa.[723]

The Middle Helladic period was better represented than Early Helladic, with Vollgraff reporting an abundance of ceramic material from the slopes of Aspis.[724] The pottery from the Deiras necropolis, first identified by Vollgraff, was published by Deshayes, with the majority of pottery dated to MHI, suggesting to the excavators that in MHII-III, when sites such as Mycenae were in the ascendancy, Argos may have been experiencing a steady decline.[725] Indeed there are occasional signs of fire dated to the Middle Helladic in the lower city, which may indicate some level of unrest,[726] though a general destruction or abandonment is not attested. There may instead have been a movement of the population within the settlement, with house foundations found in the lower city in MHI, but more commonly on the upland areas in MHII-III.[727]

The architectural remains at Argos do not suggest that it was as important a centre as Mycenae or Tiryns in the Late Helladic period, but nor do they indicate an impoverished settlement, with signs of prosperity similar to many other sites in the Argolid.[728] The precise extent of the settlement in the Mycenaean era is not clear, though Vollgraff identifies it as having at least extended from the slopes of Aspis down into the plain of the modern city.[729] There has yet to come to light any clear evidence of a palace, tholos tombs, or Linear B tablets, but nonetheless Vollgraff claims that other evidence indirectly suggests the existence of a royal residence on Larissa: amber and gold leaf were found on the peak, as well as traces of possible Late Helladic Cyclopean fortification, and a large block in a medieval fortification that may have been re-used from a Cyclopean wall.[730] Touchais and Divari-

---

721 Deshayes 1966: 112-115; Kelly 1976: 5; Vollgraff 1906: 8-11.
722 Daux 1959: 758.
723 *BCH* 78: 176.
724 Vollgraff 1906: 5-45.
725 Kelly 1976: 7.
726 Daux 1969: 989-991.
727 Touchais and Divari-Valakou 1998: 11.
728 Kelly 1976: 10.
729 Vollgraff 1906: 7.
730 Vollgraff 1928: pl IX, pl XI; unfortunately the construction of the Venetian fortress on the peak of Larissa would have destroyed whatever evidence of Late Helladic fortification there may have been.

Valakou recognise in these finds "l'existence d'un établissement important", but are reluctant to employ the terminology of 'palace' or 'Mycenaean citadel' due to the inherent limitations of the evidence (Fig. 51).[731]

On the Deiras ridge between Larissa and Aspis around seventy tombs have been found spanning LHI-LHIIIC.[732] Only one tomb is dated to LHI, with none from the early phases of LHII, whilst the rest date to the later phases of LHII and throughout LHIII. This suggests that, despite not being on a par with Mycenae or Tiryns, Argos was nonetheless flourishing between LHIIB and LHIIIB, around 1450 to 1200 BC, similar to other sites in the region.[733]

The 'Collapse'

In contrast to many sites in the Argolid, Argos seems to have gone through the LHIIIB-LHIIIC transition without a discernible destruction, and funerary evidence gives no other indications of decline. 13th century chamber tombs in the Deiras necropolis continue to be used for inhumations, and indeed new chambers are constructed in the 12th century. Additionally, inhumations and amphorae, amphoriskoi, and jugs containing cremated remains were interred in a tumulus throughout the 12th century.[734]

Considerably more Submycenaean pottery was found at Argos than at other sites in the Argolid. This came mostly from tombs: in the Deiras necropolis, Tomb 18 was newly opened in the Submycenaean period, whilst Tomb 17 continued in use from LHIIIC to SM, and four other tombs from earlier phases of LHIII have continual use through to the 11th century.[735] In addition, seven cist tombs were found in the modern city along Tripolis Street, which Styrenius dates to the Submycenaean period.[736]

In the Submycenaean period at Argos, we see the emergence of two different methods of burial in use simultaneously: on the one hand, there was the re-use, and indeed new construction, of chamber tombs in the Deiras necropolis, whilst, on the other hand,

---

731 Touchais and Divari-Valakou 1998: 11.
732 Ibid.
733 Kelly 1976: 10-11.
734 Piteros 2001: 111-113; Ruppenstein 2013: 190-191.
735 Kelly 1976: 22.
736 Styrenius 1967: 132-133.

new necropoleis comprised of cist tombs emerged in the Lower City.[737] Kelly frames this divide as representing a possible split between "Dorians" and "non-Dorians" within the settlement, terminology which we would rightly shy away from now. Whilst we may be wary of assigning new funerary behaviour to the influx of a new external population, he and others, including Hägg and Desborough, rightly suggest that such practices may at least indicate some kind of shift in the dynamics of the community, with some people adhering to and attempting continuity with Late Bronze Age practices, and others engaging in new and different ones.[738]

In light of this, we may deduce a basic narrative of the final stages of the Late Bronze Age at Argos:

1. The site seems to have avoided the kind of destructions that afflicted a number of other sites in the Argolid.
2. There was continued occupation of the settlement, with a steady, or possibly even slightly expanding, population.
3. Diverging funerary practices may offer some initial indications of the changing dynamics within the community.

The Early Iron Age

The settlement area in the Protogeometric period extended over a much larger area than during the Submycenaean period, whilst also overlapping much of it. The main new areas of inhabitation are attested in the southern part of the city at the foot of the Larissa slopes. Whilst there were some traces of Late Bronze Age occupation here, there were considerably more in the Protogeometric. Touchais and Divari-Valakou describe this area as "le centre de gravité de l'agglomération", whilst nonetheless emphasising that evidence of Protogeometric occupation was discovered across the extent of the modern city.[739]

The development of the settlement during this period should not, however, despite this growth, be overestimated. As Hägg emphasises, Argos did not develop into a complex and organised urban space in the Protogeometric Period, but rather consisted of a

[737] Hägg 1974: 26-27.
[738] Desborough 1964: 19-20; Kelly 1976: 23; cf Hägg 1974: 80-82.
[739] Touchais and Divari-Valakou 1998: 14.

collection of habitations dispersed across the area of the plain below the Larissa and Aspis slopes.[740]

Burials consisted of individual cist tombs, and occasionally pit or pithos burials, grouped around areas of inhabitation. A slight concentration of such tombs may be discernible in the central part of the city, particularly in the areas excavated in the vicinity of the modern museum, where rich assemblages of ceramic and metal finds commonly occurred. Persistent attempts at some form of continuity must still be recognised, however, with new and re-used tombs in the Middle and Late Helladic cemeteries east and south of Aspis.[741]

The finds discovered across the site dating to the Geometric period do not indicate a dramatic expansion of the site, despite being of greater number than those belonging to the Protogeometric. Evidence of Geometric occupation has been found dispersed throughout the site, from the Deiras ridge and the eastern foot of Aspis in the north, to the Southern Quarter of the Lower Town, and the east slopes of Larissa, as well as throughout numerous areas in central parts of the city.[742]

Few individual locations within the settlement had uninterrupted occupation through the Protogeometric and Geometric periods. Touchais and Divari-Valakou explain this as the result of the ready availability of open space between the clustered areas of settlement within the site. They suggest that there was repeated movement and new construction within a broad area of occupation in the 10th and 9th centuries.[743]

Burial with weapons was a new practice of the Late Geometric period observed in a number of cist tombs of almost monumental proportions.[744] They were used for successive inhumations, and found with rich funerary offerings of arms, armour, and pottery. Two such tombs were discovered in the north of the city in the 1970s, whilst another was found in the 1990s in the centre of the city.[745] The most significant example, however, remains Tomb 45, discovered in 1953 in the Southern Quarter of the city, and in which was found an

---

740 Hägg 1974: 28.
741 Touchais and Divari-Valakou 1998: 15.
742 Ibid.
743 Ibid: 16.
744 Lemos 2002: 158.
745 Deïlaki 1982: 39; Touchais and Divari-Valakou 1998: 18.

impressive array of decorated pottery including skyphoi, kraters, and amphorae, as well as the 'Argos Panoply', a military assemblage incorporating a two-part cuirass and a helmet, all in bronze.[746] Various iron items were also found, including two double-axes and twelve spearheads.[747]

Impressive 'warrior' burials such as Tomb 45 indicate that in the late 8th century there was a wealthy and militarised elite section of society at Argos, overseeing a prosperous settlement with a developed capacity for ceramic and metal production.[748] Burial with weapons did not necessarily always indicate the individual tomb of a male warrior, as is sometimes assumed. Pappi and Triantapyllou have asserted that weapons were sometimes also found with the burials of women and mixed groups in Late Geometric Argos. Even if weapons were not entirely exclusive to male burials, it is, however, nonetheless apparent that elites at Argos, particularly men, were concerned with representing the "heroic ideal", indicating the emergence of a hierarchical and stratified society in which formal burial was a sign of high social status.[749] Furthermore, the size of the larger cist graves and the successive inhumation of multiple bodies may indicate "family vaults",[750] used by the kin groups that formed this emerging aristocracy.[751]

A 'landscape of memory' at Argos

The above précis of Argos in the Late Bronze Age, during the 'Collapse', and in the Early Iron Age allows us to recreate a 'landscape of memory' at the site. Whilst there may not have been a palace at Argos, the traces of Cyclopean fortification at Larissa indicate that there was at least a citadel stronghold, whilst the gold and amber found there suggest that it was occupied by wealthy individuals. The refortification of the citadel by the Venetians makes it impossible to determine the state in which the fortifications survived in the Early Iron Age. The Aspis peak, and the Deiras ridge that connects it to Larissa, was the site of the extensive Late Helladic necropolis and the reuse of some of its tombs in the Protogeometric period indicates that it continued to be remembered as such. These peaks

---

[746] Courbin 1957: 333-339 for the pottery, 340ff for the bronze items.
[747] Ibid: 367.
[748] Touchais and Divari-Valakou 1998: 18.
[749] Pappi and Triantapyllou 2011: 719-720.
[750] Hägg 1998: 134.
[751] Snodgrass 1971: 194-196.

rise above the Lower City of Argos. They are and were distinct and dominant aspects of the landscape and were visible throughout the Iron Age settlement.

Iron Age Cult within a 'landscape of memory' at Argos

Within the Venetian fortress on Larissa, and also within the possible Late Helladic Cyclopean walls, Vollgraff uncovered the foundations of two temples, thought to be archaic in date.[752] Near them within the fortress he found a votive deposit, first published in part by Roes,[753] and later slightly expanded upon by Courbin (Figs. 52-53).[754] More than 300 small vessels were found in the deposit, including a Late Geometric krater, oinochoe, and many cups, as well as Proto-Corinthian skyphoi, kotylai, aryballoi, pyxides, and kalathoi. The figured motifs used on the decorated pottery include horses, fish, and men and women carrying branches.[755] There were a great number of very small unpainted cups with diameters of 5cm at the most.[756] Many vessels contained items: hundreds of rings and other small objects of bronze were found, including a small Geometric horse figurine, fibulae, as well as small axes and spearheads of iron.[757] There are fragments of at least three terracotta pomegranates, in addition to a handle from a pyxis lid that may represent a pomegranate.[758] Finally, there was a droplet of glass, and a small faience figurine of the Egyptian god Bes.[759] Altogether the assemblage was dated as mid-8th to mid-7th century, though with the bulk of material being late 8th century.[760]

The krater, oinochoe, cups, skyphoi, and kotylai clearly indicate that drinking must have played a significant role in the activities taking place on Larissa, whilst the aryballoi, pyxides, and kalathoi point to other practices. It is likely that these shapes in particular were the vessels said to contain the numerous metal items. The pomegranate-shaped handle of a pyxis lid may have indicated that it contained pomegranates. The iron weapons suggest the participation of a military class, perhaps the same people whose arms and armour were

---

752 Vollgraff 1928; Martin 2008: 80-81; Hope-Simpson and Dickinson 1979: 43-45; Bintliff 1977: 328.
753 Roes 1953: 90-104.
754 Courbin 1955.
755 Ibid: 314.
756 Roes 1953: 103.
757 Courbin 1955: 314.
758 Roes 1953: 103-104.
759 Courbin 1955: 314.
760 Courbin 1955: 314; Martin 2008: 80-81.

found in some Geometric burials. The exotic items, namely the glass droplet and the Egyptian figurine, indicate that some participants in the cult had access to overseas trade.

These finds, however, do not give the complete picture. The unpainted miniature vessels identified by Roes may suggest that the cult included more humble participants, as these would have been inexpensive items.[761] This might explain them being undecorated, but it does not account for their size, and Langdon suggests that they may alternatively represent appropriate votive offerings to be given by children.[762] The iconography of pomegranates may suggest that Hera was worshipped the cult,[763] though as ever we should be wary of trying to ascribe a deity in such an early period. More generally the seed-rich fruit may represent fertility. The presence of fertility-related iconography alongside votive offerings associated with children may indicate that some participants in the cult were women either with or hoping for children. There are no known traces of Geometric structures on Larissa, and as such we may assume that the activities were carried out in the open air on the settlement's most prominent peak and amongst what remained of the Late Bronze Age citadel.[764]

[761] Roes 1953: 103.
[762] Langdon 2013: 183.
[763] Cf pomegranate iconography found at Samian Heraion, in O'Brien 1993: 63.
[764] Foley 1988: 140-141; Hägg 1992: 11.

The Argive Heraion

The Bronze Age

The Argive Heraion is located on the eastern side of the Argive Plain, opposite Argos. The site, referred to as Prosymna when talking about the time before the sanctuary was founded, consisted of an acropolis standing out on the foothills of the eastern edge of the plain, as well as a series of hills and ravines behind the acropolis.[765]

Waldstein[766] was the first to systematically excavate the site with an investigation into the sanctuary, located on the acropolis (Fig. 54).[767] He and his colleague Tilton discovered a series of wall foundations which they identified as belonging to the earliest dwellings at the site.[768] In the 1920s and 1930s Blegen set out to investigate these further, and to explore the surrounding areas, prompted by the much earlier discovery of a tholos tomb nearby.[769]

In the lower western part of the acropolis, a number of wall foundations were interpreted by Blegen as belonging to two or three small houses. To the east of these were more walls which may have formed part of two long narrow buildings. In the southern part of the acropolis he found more walls, including what may have been a single large house. In all of these cases he reports finding Late Helladic III pottery amongst and below the foundation stones, but offers no more precise dates.[770]

On the highest point of the acropolis Blegen found a mixed stratum of Middle Helladic and Late Helladic pottery together with what appeared to be housing debris, but beneath this a "fairly thick undisturbed Early Helladic stratum".[771] He emphasised that Early, Middle, and Late Helladic finds seemed to be uncovered "wherever among the outcropping rock we found an accumulation of earth that could be tested".[772] There appears to have been a population occupying the site, but evidence for substantial or extensive architecture is

---

765 Antonaccio 1992: 86.
766 Known from 1918 as Walston.
767 Published in two volumes in 1902 and 1905 with the title *The Argive Heraeum*.
768 Waldstein 1902a: 27ff; Tilton 1902: 108.
769 Blegen 1937; Stamatakis 1879.
770 Blegen 1937: 11-12.
771 Ibid: 13.
772 Ibid: 16.

lacking. There is certainly no trace of a palace and fortifications such as might have been the residence of the person buried in the tholos tomb.[773]

In the slopes and ridges to the north and north-west of the acropolis, however, Blegen discovered fifty Late Helladic chamber tombs in a necropolis that stretched almost a kilometre along the slopes (Fig. 54). Twelve were dated to Late Helladic I, thirteen to Late Helladic II, and twenty-seven to Late Helladic III, of which he dated four in the earlier phases of LHIII, and six in the later phases.[774]

The Early Iron Age

Blegen also highlighted different types of post-Mycenaean interaction with the Prosymna tombs. In the case of six tombs the presence of Geometric sherds and the paucity or absence of funerary remains in the chamber indicated looting. He does, however, propose that in each case the discovery of the tomb was accidental and the looting opportunistic, rather than systematic.[775]

In contrast, he observes eleven cases of tombs in which there was a different kind of Geometric intrusion. Rather than scattered sherds there were deliberate deposits of Geometric oinochoai, Geometric and Proto-Corinthian skyphoi, and bronze bowls and pins. These were similar deposits, he proposes, to those found at sanctuary sites in the 8th century BC, and indicate that there was a "cult of the dead" flourishing at the Prosymna necropolis.[776]

Antonaccio describes it as "tomb cult" rather than "cult of the dead". As with Blegen's examples of looted tombs, Antonaccio believes that these tombs were discovered accidentally, but that once breached they were treated with respect and votive offerings.[777] The oinochoai and skyphoi specifically indicate that (wine-)drinking was a central tenet of this process.

---

[773] Antonaccio 1992: 89.
[774] Blegen 1937: 261; the dating refers to the first use of the chamber – almost all were re-used regularly; Blegen included in these numbers two tombs earlier discovered by Waldstein.
[775] Ibid: 262.
[776] Ibid: 263.
[777] Antonaccio 1995: 54-64.

Iron Age cult at 'Bronze Age ruins'

On the acropolis Tilton discovered a large retaining wall which he interpreted as the earliest construction at the sanctuary (Fig. 55). The retaining wall supported a terrace measuring 55.8m by 34.4m and is a colossal structure (Fig. 56). Large conglomerate blocks (the largest measuring 5.2m by 2m) were put together with little or no dressing in a "rubble" style, with no mortar but rather small stones used to fill in the gaps between blocks.[778] Tilton described the masonry as "Cyclopean" and proposed that it was contemporary with the earliest fortifications at Tiryns, due to an apparent similarity in style.[779]

His initial instincts, however, proved incorrect. Blegen discovered Geometric pottery fragments lodged into the gaps between blocks, or even underneath the structure as a whole, so deeply embedded that it was "impossible to believe that they could have reached their place after the building of the wall".[780] As a result, he ascribed a Geometric date to the 'Cyclopean' wall, and furthermore noted that despite the "massive grandeur" of the wall, "the jointing is loose and open…and the general aspect is very different from that of the compactly articulated Tirynthian and Mycenaean structures".[781] This interpretation led Morgan and Whitelaw to coin the term "mock-Mycenaean" to describe this Geometric imitation of the Late Bronze Age building style.[782]

Wright argues that the construction of the temple whose foundations survive on the terrace must have come at a later date than the construction of the terrace itself.[783] The stylobate on which the temple stood was made up of a layer of limestone blocks, around 50cm in height, resting directly on top of the paved flagging of the terrace. The top halves of the limestone blocks were dressed stone, whilst the bottom 25-30cm was rough and unworked.[784] Wright argues that the rough unworked section of the blocks would not be intended to be seen. The stylobate was laid in foundation trenches with a layer of earth around 25-30cm in depth, which would hide the rough section of stone. For this layer of

---

778 Tilton 1902: 109-110.
779 Ibid: 109.
780 Blegen 1937: 19.
781 Ibid: 20.
782 Morgan and Whitelaw 1991: 84.
783 Wright 1982: 188.
784 Tilton 1902: 110.

earth to have built up and covered the terrace paving, it must have been built at an earlier date than the temple.[785]

Perhaps confirming Wright's interpretation, Tilton reported finding a "hard level" of earth around 30cm above the paved flagging of the terrace.[786] Since the hard level is at the same height as the top of the unworked section of stone, we may deduce that this was in fact the floor of the temple.[787] Beneath this floor was a stratum of ash and black soil, which Tilton wrongly identified as representing the burning of the temple.[788] However, if we are to take the hard level as the floor of the temple, then the 30cm thick burnt stratum below it actually preceded the temple's construction.[789]

Tilton did not specifically record the content of this stratum, but Hoppin notes that "on the Old Temple Terrace…Geometric fragments were much more numerous than any other kind", and that this was also where Proto-Corinthian pottery "was found in greatest quantity".[790] Unfortunately Hoppin also neglects to give a full catalogue of the pottery from the burnt stratum on the terrace, suggesting frustratingly that "little advantage is to be gained from the knowledge (in the case of the vases, at least) whence each separate fragment came".[791] Some information can be gleaned from the stylistic catalogue, however, where some shapes are listed as being found on the Old Temple Terrace. These include Proto-Corinthian kalathoi, skyphoi, and pyxides, and amongst the Late Geometric ceramics, which formed "by far the largest" portion of the Geometric assemblage, were fragments of "bowls", small jugs, pinakes, trays, plates, and amphorae.[792]

Through comparison of the stylobate with buildings from Olympia, Isthmia, and Corinth, Wright assigns the construction of the temple to 650-625 BC. If the Late Geometric and Proto-Corinthian pottery indicates that the terrace was constructed in the

---

[785] Wright 1982: 188-189.
[786] Tilton 1902: 110.
[787] Wright 1982: 189.
[788] Tilton 1902: 110.
[789] Wright 1982: 189.
[790] Hoppin 1905: 61, 121-141; Wright 1982: 189.
[791] Hoppin 1905: 61.
[792] Ibid: 107-118 (Late Geometric), 125, 132-134, 137 (Proto-Corinthian).

late 8th century, this means that the terrace was in place for 75-100 years before the temple was built.[793]

So what was the terrace built for, and what was happening there for this intervening time? Examination of the Geometric finds from the sanctuary area provide a clear indication: the excavators found Geometric terracotta figurines including a human figurine with incised and painted decorations, and a horse with broken legs;[794] they also found Geometric bronze figurines of horses, deer, sheep, bulls/cattle, and birds.[795] Strøm notes Geometric bronze earrings and arm-rings, as well as 419 finger rings, of which the few datable examples belong to the late 8th and early 7th century.[796] 5 tripod legs and 5 tripod handles were dated to the 8th and early 7th century.[797]

Finally, many fibulae and over 3000 pins were discovered (Fig. 57).[798] Two of these were Protogeometric, and the 9th century saw an increase in pin deposits, but the vast majority belong to the Geometric III type, dating from the 8th to the early 7th century. [799] Snodgrass assigned 88 fibulae and 3070 pins to the late 8th and early 7th century.[800] Despite the indication of some early offerings, the dramatic increase in numbers in the Late Geometric period suggests a flourishing new cult.[801]

Wright interprets a Sub-Geometric terracotta model of a porched building found at the sanctuary as representing a shrine on the terrace, of which there are no surviving traces (Fig. 58).[802] Though this is a possibility, it cannot be verified by any physical remains, and it is just as feasible that the model is of a house. Other examples have been found at Perachora and over thirty at Samos, though without any verifiable correlation with architectural remains from sanctuaries, giving further credence to the suggestion that the models represent domestic rather than ritual structures.[803] Proper adherence to the available

---

793 Wright 1982: 191.
794 Waldstein and Chase 1905: 23.
795 De Cou 1905: 197-200 (horses), 201 (deer, sheep), 202 (bulls/cattle), 204-206 (birds).
796 Strøm 1995: 69-70.
797 Ibid: 41-50.
798 De Cou 1905: 207ff; Coldstream 1976: 9; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1984: 318-319; Strøm 1995: 78.
799 Strøm 1995: 78-79.
800 Snodgrass 1980: 53.
801 Hägg 1992: 15.
802 Wright 1982: 191.
803 Larson 2007: 31; O'Brien 1993: 40-41.

evidence leads to the conclusion that ritual activities took place in the open air. Skyphoi and oinochoai indicate that drinking played a role in the rites, but the abundance of pins, fibulae, and figurines suggest that it was the deposition of votives that was of central importance.

Argive control over the sanctuary in the Classical period and the tradition of the festival procession that would cross the plain from Argos to the Heraion have long led to the assumption that the sanctuary was Argive from its earliest times.[804] This is not unanimously accepted, however, and most prominently Hall has sought to overturn this interpretation. He seeks to downplay the dominance of Argos in the late 8th century,[805] and to emphasise the links between Mycenae and the sanctuary,[806] highlighting that roadside shrines on the route between Mycenae and the sanctuary are active in the Late Geometric period, indicating traffic between the two sites.[807]

Whilst Hall's points act as useful caveats against underestimating the role of other sites in the region, they do not necessarily negate the accepted interpretation of the sanctuary as Argive. Most of the Geometric pottery found at the sanctuary seems to be of a fabric produced at Argos, whilst the road across the plain between the settlement and the sanctuary is known to be in use at the time.[808] It is also worth noting that the monumental long side of the "mock-Mycenaean" terrace faced west across the plain towards the approach from Argos. Argos was a highly populated and prosperous settlement, with an emerging elite whose tombs suggest an interest in militarism and social hierarchy. Indeed, the late 8th century destruction of Asine historically attributed to Argos may be a further indication that they were attempting some form of hegemony over the whole of the Argolid.

Morgan and Whitelaw do not refute the suggestion that other communities in the Argive Plain took part in cult activities at the sanctuary. It is most likely that they did. But by creating and controlling a sanctuary on the other side of the plain, not far from Mycenae and Tiryns, and allowing others to participate with their consent, Argos was engaging in what

---

804 Morgan and Whitelaw 1991: 84.
805 Hall 1995: 581ff.
806 Ibid: 596ff.
807 Ibid: 601.
808 Morgan and Whitelaw 1991: 84.

Morgan and Whitelaw term "aggressive diplomacy", and staking a claim to dominance over the entire region.[809]

The decision to build such an extravagant and monumental terrace indicates that some special significance was being ascribed to this sanctuary. Wright highlights the similarities between the cult on the terrace and that taking place in the Late Helladic tombs during the Late Geometric period, particularly the common deposits of pins, fibulae, and figurines.[810] Strøm meanwhile notes the absence of weapons, in contrast to the deposit at Larissa in Argos.[811] An abundance of pins and fibulae is often taken to indicate the participation of women and the possibility of a female deity (perhaps Hera, given the later association of the sanctuary), but taken in conjunction with the number and variety of animal figurines, including horse, deer, sheep, and cattle, and the absence of any military items or imagery, a slightly different picture may emerge. The combination of household items such as pins, figurines of domesticated agricultural animals, and indeed one possible house model, may reflect the Argive understanding of their claim over the plain not as conquered territory but as 'domesticated' space. In this the Argive Heraion is fulfilling a typical function of De Polignac's 'extra-urban' sanctuary, acting as frontier against "otherness", and "rehabilitating it".[812]

In light of this, we may reconsider the cultic engagements with the past at Prosymna. Whilst the cult at the tombs emphasises a hereditary connection with the past, the Geometric terrace, with its mock-Mycenaean Cyclopean architecture, imitates the impressive fortifications of the Late Bronze Age to stake a visible and artificially historic claim to the area as part of an Argive homeland.

. . .

809 Morgan and Whitelaw 1991: 85.
810 Wright 1982: 193.
811 Strøm 1995: 88-89.
812 De Polignac 1995: 36.

Iron Age cult within 'landscapes of memory' at Argos and the Argive Heraion: preliminary observations

It is possible now to draw together the evidence gathered above and draw some initial conclusions about how the inhabitants of Argos were practising a cultic engagement with the landscape of memory in which they lived.

It is difficult to ascertain the extent to which visible remains of the Mycenaean period survived on Larissa, the most prominent candidate for an elite fortified residence. The establishment of parallel open-air cults on Larissa and Aspis, readily recognisable landmarks within a landscape of memory, suggests that the two had complementary cultural memories attached to them – a past space for the living and a past space for the dead.

The cult practices exhibited at Prosymna and the Argive Heraion to some extent mirror those at Argos. The tomb cult at the Mycenaean necropolis honoured and celebrated the dead, whilst the cult on the Geometric terrace commemorated the past in a reclaimed and domesticated space of the living.

No monumental ruins existed at the Heraion and as such we may interpret the mock-Mycenaean terrace as an attempt to invent a more impressive memory to commemorate. Argos, a growing power in the 8th century, did not have any ruins comparable with those at Mycenae and Tiryns. With Mycenae and Tiryns both reusing their fortified citadels, Argos sought to compete, and did so in the most conspicuous manner possible, by taking control of a sanctuary frequented by several communities and there staking their own monumental, though artificial, claim over a landscape of memory.

Attica

Attica was a relatively modest part of the Mycenaean world. Significant centres existed at Eleusis and Brauron, and there were burials in tholos tombs at Thorikos, Marathon, and Menidi, but nowhere has a true palace been discovered, even at Athens, where the evidence for a palace within the fortified citadel remains disputed.

In the final stages of the Bronze Age the pattern in Attica was not one of destruction – neither Athens nor Eleusis, discussed in this section, seem to have suffered a destruction during the 'Collapse' – but rather one of gradual abandonment and relocation. A reduced settlement at Athens continued throughout the Early Iron Age, though the precise location of the settlement areas is uncertain.

During this period Athens re-emerged as the predominant settlement of the region and undertook a process of "internal colonisation" in which a growing numbers of sites were settled or resettled in the Protogeometric and Geometric periods.[813] Many of these sites, Eleusis included, would retain some form of political independence from Athens into the Archaic period,[814] but a common sense of Attic ethnic identity is proposed from as early as the Geometric period, an integration that Parker describes as "cultural and economic", rather than "narrowly political".[815]

Tomb cult was practised at certain Attic sites from the mid-8th century, with rich deposits of pottery in the dromos of the Mycenaean tholos tomb at Menidi and, from the 7th century, similar deposits at the tholos tomb at Thorikos. The ceramic assemblage at the tomb cults has parallels with the deposits at offering trenches in the Kerameikos in the late 8th and 7th century.[816] It seems that a connection was made between the 'immediate' ancestors at the Athenian cemetery and those 'ancestors' separated by "long and quasi-empty centuries".[817]

---

[813] Whitley 1991: 58.
[814] Cosmopoulos 2015: 11.
[815] Parker 1996: 23.
[816] Whitley 1994: 223.
[817] Hölscher 1991: 361.

In the 8th century Attica was grappling with political, economic, and cultural change, while increasingly engaging with both their mythical and immediate pasts, and it is in this period that cults were established among Bronze Age ruins at Athens and Eleusis.

This section will follow our established method of approach for these sites, beginning with an outline of the Bronze Age development of the sites and their experience of the 'Collapse' and the Early Iron Age. We shall then attempt to recreate the 'landscape of memory' at each site before investigating the cult activities taking place amongst Bronze Age ruins and making some preliminary observations and analysis.

Athens

The Acropolis of Athens was the primary fortified citadel in Late Bronze Age Attica, and may have been the site of a palace. The Acropolis did not suffer destruction during the 'Collapse' but Athens nonetheless entered a period of decline. In the Early Iron Age the population may have occupied the Acropolis. In the 8th century cult activity began on the Acropolis within the Bronze Age citadel.

. . .

The Bronze Age

At the beginning of the Late Helladic period it does not appear that Athens had yet become the single significant regional power. The tholos tombs at Thorikos, Marathon, and Menidi indicate the existence of a number of rivals in Attica.[818] Evidence for occupation on the Acropolis in LHI is limited to some pottery and a white clay floor to the north of the Erechtheion with possible traces of an associated wall. Hurwit emphasises how modest the evidence is in comparison with sites like Mycenae, which at the time was depositing vast wealth with the dead in Grave Circle A.[819]

No architectural remains have been identified dating to LHII, though Mountjoy notes that the prevalence of locally produced Marine Style pottery and the first construction of chamber tombs in the Lower Town suggest that Athenian elites were beginning to participate in aspects of mainstream Mycenaean palatial culture.[820] By LHIIIA the further establishment of a Mycenaean, or Mycenaeanising, local elite is shown by the emergence of the Agora as a major burial ground with nearly 50 chamber tombs (Fig. 70), in addition to four chamber tombs on the north slopes of the Areopagus, one of which, the Tomb of the Ivory Pyxides, was particularly large and wealthy.[821]

LMIIIB saw the construction of a series of terraces on the citadel. Traces of walls were discovered on the northern part of the citadel, in the area that would later be occupied by the Old Athena Temple and the Erechtheion. The walls of the terraces were 1-1.5m in

[818] Pelon 1976: 413-414.
[819] Hurwit 1999: 71.
[820] Mountjoy 1995: 70.
[821] Hurwit 1999: 72; Immerwahr 1971: 158-169.

thickness, "too thick to be foundation walls but not thick enough to be fortifications", with regular outer faces but irregular inner ones.[822] They were in a very damaged state but survived in enough places that it is possible to determine a general outline.

Terrace III was the largest of the terraces. Though the remains of its retaining walls are scanty, enough have been found for an estimation of its extent to be traced. It was 95-100m long from east to west, around 25m wide at each end, and due to a curve in the north wall a wider 35m in the middle. On the south side the surface of the terrace seems to have merged with the higher bedrock.[823]

Iakovidis proposes that Terrace III existed "into historical times" and that the foundations of the Archaic Hekatompedon were built into it.[824] Hurwit, furthermore, suggests that the route of the Panathenaic Way was determined by the location of the terrace.[825]

The result of the terrace construction was that the "natural plateau" of the southern part of the Acropolis was artificially extended into a much broader generally flat and even surface. This surface may then have supported "most, if not the whole, of the palace complex", none of which survives. Iakovidis dates the terraces to LHIIIB, citing datable ceramic evidence found in the construction fill and in joints between blocks. Mountjoy, however, proposes that the ceramic evidence could place the construction anytime from LHIIIA1 to LHIIIB, but that LHIIIA1 or early LHIIIA2 would correspond best with other Mycenaean palaces and would reflect the most precisely datable examples from the ceramic assemblage.[826]

The architectural remains of the proposed palace are almost entirely non-existent, but the few pieces of evidence that exist confirm the assumption that structures would have been located atop the terraces. Kavvadias and Kawerau discovered a stone column base above the eastern sections of Terraces II and III, which they note was not found in situ.[827] It is a slightly conical worked cylinder, 11cm in height, with a flat stop surface. The lower part

---

[822] Iakovidis 1983: 77.
[823] Ibid: 77-78.
[824] Ibid: 78.
[825] Hurwit 1999: 73.
[826] Iakovidis 1983: 79; Mountjoy 1995: 24.
[827] Kavvadias and Kawerau 1906: 89

of the stone is rugged and unworked. Iakovidis notes that "in material, construction, form and dimensions" the base is comparable with those from other palaces.[828] Apparently excavated but not recorded by Kavvadias and Kawerau were two large sandstone slabs which Iakovidis found near to the northern fortification wall in the vicinity of the Northeast Ascent. Iakovidis identifies these, as well as five slabs which formed part of Kavvadias' proposed reconstruction of walls east of the Erechtheion, as steps from a Mycenaean building, arguing that there were worn marks where each slab would have overlapped with others above and beneath it. He suggests a similarity to the two-step threshold to the ante-room of the Tiryns Megaron.[829] These finds, however, do not provide any dates more precise than does the ceramic evidence associated with the terraces.

What is certain, however, is that, as at Mycenae and Tiryns, the fortification of the citadel happened at a relatively late date. The Northeast Ascent, which provided access from the northern slopes to the terraces on the Acropolis was blocked off by the Cyclopean wall, indicating that the terraces preceded the wall.[830] In total, Hurwit estimates the restored circuit wall at around 760m in length, with walls ranging from 3.5-6m in thickness, enclosing an area of around 25,000sqm.[831] As with the other Late Bronze Age architecture on the Acropolis, little actually survives of the wall itself. It can be traced using what Iakovidis calls "indirect indications", such as cuttings made into the rock on which blocks were laid.[832] Where sections of wall do survive they reveal a similar construction style to those at other palaces, incorporating two thick walls of roughly dressed irregular blocks with an internal fill of small stones and earth. Iakovidis and Hurwit both propose a single phase of construction for the entire enceinte, with Iakovidis describing the ceramic assemblage found under wall foundations as "completely homogenous", providing a construction date in the late 13th century, in the latter stages of LHIIIB.[833]

Balanos, in his investigation into the later Temple of Athena Nike at the western end of the citadel, revealed the remains of a Mycenaean bastion within a Classical tower supporting the temple. It was not incorporated into the circuit wall but was rather an

---

828 Iakovidis 2006: 191.
829 Iakovidis 2006: 191-192; Mountjoy 1995: 42.
830 Iakovidis 1983: 76.
831 Hurwit 1999: 74.
832 Iakovidis 1983: 79
833 Hurwit 1999: 75; Iakovidis 1983: 86-88.

independent free-standing tower. Its disconnection from the circuit wall prompts Hurwit to suggest the possibility that it had an administrative function in addition to, or even rather than, a military one.[834]

Hurwit's suggestion that the bastion had an administrative function, however, remains speculative and there is no certain evidence that the Athenian citadel had palatial status. Nonetheless, the trace of fortifications and the surviving sections of Cyclopean wall attest to its role at least as a military stronghold. Lemos suggests that there may have been non-palatial "megaron style complexes" within a fortified citadel as there was at Gla.[835] Though development at Athens may have lagged behind its equivalent at the likes of Tiryns and Mycenae at each stage, it is fair for Hurwit to claim that by the final years of the 13th century the fortified Acropolis was "as physically imposing and formidable as any palatial citadel in Mycenaean Greece".[836]

The 'Collapse'

There is no evidence of any kind of destruction at the end of LHIIIB, though it should be noted that given the limited availability of undisturbed Mycenaean contexts a violent destruction cannot be ruled out definitively. In any case the 12th century seems to have brought about certain changes. The former burial ground in the Agora largely went out of use and the first tombs were dug at the Kerameikos. In several places there were "clusters of modest stone and mudbrick houses" built "within and against the Cyclopean walls" and a fountain on the north side of the Acropolis yielded discarded LHIIIC pottery.[837]

There still seems to have been a resident population in and around the Acropolis but the intrusion of humble dwellings into the former fortified area suggests that the power of the citadel's ruling elite had passed. A warrior burial on the south slopes of the Acropolis may have belonged to a newly established local leader.[838]

The last sherds in the north fountain date to the beginning of LHIIIC Late, and other than the modest houses mentioned above no 12th century architectural remains survive on

---

834 Balanos 1937: 789; Hurwit 1999: 76.
835 Lemos 2006: 508.
836 Hurwit 1999: 79.
837 Hurtitt 1999: 83; Mountjoy 1995: 55-56.
838 Hurwit 1999: 83.

the Acropolis. New graves were dug on the Acropolis in the Submycenaean period, with 14 cist graves on and around the surviving terraces on the citadel, and pit and cist graves scattered in parts of the Lower Town, the south slopes of the rock, and in the Kerameikos. Mountjoy argues that the relatively widespread distribution of Submycenaean graves suggests the existence of a number of small hamlets on and around the Acropolis in this period.[839] Ruppenstein and Gauss concur, noting that the burials, particularly those of infants, would only be expected if the Acropolis was occupied.[840]

The Early Iron Age

Evidence from the Acropolis is scarce in the subsequent periods. Graef and Langlotz report only two Protogeometric krater fragments from their excavations, as well as an uncatalogued high-footed cup.[841] Desborough likewise draws particular attention to the absence of PG pottery.[842] Early and Middle Geometric finds are similarly minimal, and it is only in the mid-8th century that significant renewed activity is attested with the arrival of "definite" votive material.[843]

It has been proposed by Papadopoulos that, contrary to these claims, the Acropolis was in fact the main settlement area in Protogeometric Athens. He argues that a scatter map of Protogeometric burials in Athens reveals the Acropolis as the geographical centre.[844] He also notes that some Protogeometric burials on the Acropolis itself are of children, a practice that usually takes place within a settlement.[845] Ultimately, however, the evidence for a Protogeometric settlement on the Acropolis itself remains circumstantial. Van den Eijnde argues that it is unlikely that the Acropolis was a settlement, but rather that it provided a place of refuge in times of danger.[846] Lemos, similarly, notes that whilst it is possible that the Acropolis remained inhabited there is "little evidence" on which to base this assertion, and

839 Mountjoy 1995: 63-68, 73.
840 Ruppenstein and Gauss 1998: 24.
841 Graef and Langlotz 1925: cat. nos. 212, 273.
842 Desborough 1952: 93, 98.
843 Glowacki 1998: 80.
844 Papadopoulos 2003: 298.
845 Ibid: 299.
846 Van den Eijnde 2010: 313.

prefers the interpretation that settlement areas were clustered around the Acropolis in "an agglomeration of houses and burials".[847]

A 'landscape of memory' at the Acropolis

Given the apparent scarcity of occupation in the PG-EG periods, what scene would have greeted the Athenians of the 8th century as they began renewed activity on the rock? As Hurwit emphasised, by the time of the 'Collapse' the Acropolis was a formidable and well-fortified citadel. The Cyclopean walls were certainly still standing after the fall of palatial authority and provided shelter to 12th century inhabitants, and they would survive into the historic period. Indeed, the incorporation of Balanos' bastion into the later Nike temple suggests that the well-built fortifications survived visibly for a considerable time.

Though architectural remains are very limited, the series of terraces created a large flat area that we may fairly safely assume formed the foundation of an extensive complex. It is impossible to estimate how long and how much the buildings would have survived, but it does seem that the terraces, impressive undertakings in their own right, remained visible into historical times.

In short, the people using the Acropolis in the 8th century encountered a landscape brimming with markers of the past, some of which were monumental in scale. The walls and terraces were far beyond the capacities of their own community, and as such would have been deeply impressive to them. The circuit of walls would have added to the effect of the natural geography of the Acropolis, towering over the surrounding area in a space demarcated by the monuments of the past. There can be little doubt that the 8th century community would have recognised the Acropolis as a place of special and historic significance.

[847] Lemos 2006: 513-514.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins

The evidence for cult on the Acropolis in the 8th century can be broken down into three main types: pottery, bronzes, and architecture. Each of these will be outlined below, followed by a discussion of what the evidence tells us about the activities taking place.

The bulk of the Late Geometric ceramic assemblage comes from the excavations carried out by Graef and Langlotz in the early 20th century, though subsequent studies have been conducted by Glowacki and Hurwit.[848] The catalogue produced by Graef and Langlotz is organised by style rather than context so it is not possible to be precise regarding find spots. They explain in an earlier report that the pottery came from the "Perserschutt", the destruction debris left over after the Persian sack of 480 BC, which accounts for the lack of original contexts.[849]

Graef and Langlotz present 69 sherds that they identify as belonging to the Dipylon Style of the Late Geometric period, around 760-750 BC (Fig. 59). A military theme is prevalent amongst the decorative motifs: eight sherds feature images of warriors, many of them carrying Dipylon shields and spears, and other with bows;[850] four sherds feature chariots and riders;[851] six feature ships.[852] One portrayed a warrior on a ship. Four fragments portrayed women dancing, and a single sherd featured a tripod.[853] Finally, eight further fragments display prothesis scenes including mourners holding their heads in their hands.[854]

Bronzes from the Acropolis dating to the 8th century (Figs. 60-62) have been published by Karouzou and Touloupa.[855] Touloupa outlines the turbulent modern history of these finds. After excavation by the Greek Archaeological Society in 1885-1889 many smaller and early bronze finds were deemed unimportant and packed away in storerooms. A cleaning process under the auspices of the British School at Athens in 1891-1892 used a chemical treatment that damaged some of the more delicate finds. The bronzes were then

---

848 Graef and Langlotz 1925; Glowacki 1998; Hurwit 1999.
849 Graef and Langlotz 1909: 23.
850 Graef and Langlotz 1925: cat. nos. 257, 281, 283, 285, 290, 291, 292, 294.
851 Ibid: cat. nos. 279, 293, 296, 307.
852 Ibid: cat. nos. 259, 260, 276, 277, 290, 300.
853 Ibid: cat. nos. 282, 286, 303, 305, and 298.
854 Ibid: cat. nos. 251-256, 289, 295.
855 Karouzou 1952; Touloupa 1972; Touloupa 1991.

stored, unexamined, in a National Museum warehouse until the Second World War when further damage was sustained in the haste to evacuate the museum's collections. Touloupa urges that all this be borne in mind when considering the relatively scarce bronze finds compared to some contemporary sanctuaries.[856] In short, the published bronzes are almost certainly only part of a larger assemblage originally excavated in the 19th century.

70 fragments of tripod legs belonging to the 8th century have been preserved. The fragments do not feature any figured decoration but rather are fairly uniformly decorated with the same pattern of zig-zags and connected concentric circles.[857] Three fragments of ring handles were decorated with the same decorative motifs as the legs.[858] Karouzou published a small selection of figurines which were originally attached to tripod handles (Fig. 60). They are tall slim male figurines with long hair and pointed beards. Their arms are raised in front (holding the handle), their heads turned to the side to face away from the tripod's bowl, and their feet are attached to small bronze plates which were nailed to the side of the bowl. Karouzou identified these as demons linked to metallurgy, though Touloupa more realistically suggests that they may represent athletes who competed for the tripod prior to its dedication.[859] Finally, Zimmerman reports 16 bronze horses which would have adorned tripod ring handles (Fig. 62).[860]

Glowacki cites Homer as secondary evidence for a cult building on the Acropolis in the Geometric period, namely a reference in the *Iliad*'s Catalogue of Ships to Athena having "her own rich temple" ("ἑῷ…πίονι νηῷ"),[861] but archaeologically discernible architectural remains are minimal.

Two poros stone column bases were found beneath the Dörpfeld foundations. Each base was a cube, worked in the top part to form a cylindrical section that served as the support for a column. The southern base is 94cm by 76cm, 27cm in height, and its cylindrical section had a diameter of 55cm and a height of 8cm. The northern base is 94cm by 70cm, 31cm in height, and the cylindrical section has a height of 14cm. The absence of

---

856 Touloupa 1991: 241.
857 Ibid: 242.
858 Touloupa 1972: 74-75.
859 Karouzou 1952: 137-149, Fig. 4, Fig. 9; Touloupa 1991: 242.
860 Zimmerman 1989: 135, 269-292, cat. nos. 3, 5, 26-28, 30, 34, 35, 42, 43, 45-47, 52, 53, 167.
861 Glowacki 1998: 81; Iliad 2.549.

joints suggests that the columns which they supported were wooden. The southern base is complete, while the northern one is not, hence the lack of a measurable diameter. It seems that in the construction of the Archaic temple a hammer was used to crack off part of one side which was apparently in the way.[862]

The bases, as found, were not level, but rather the northern one was 2cm higher than the southern one. In addition to the northern block being taller than the southern one, this places the surface of the bases at a difference of 6cm. This, along with the damage to the northern base, suggests that they were not found in situ, and no attempt may be made to reconstruct a plan of the structure to which they belonged. Iakovidis notes that the design of the bases is not one that exists in Mycenaean architecture and argues that the tool-marks on the stones indicate a post-Mycenaean date. In short, we may definitively say that these bases belonged to a building constructed after the Mycenaean period but before the Dörpfeld foundations. Seeking greater precision, both Iakovidis and Glowacki look to the similarities with column bases at Prinias and Dreros which likely point to a date in the late 8th or early 7th century.[863] These bases represent the extent of surviving architectural remains from the Late Geometric period.

Using the evidence outlined above, what can we determine about the timeline and nature of cult activity on the Acropolis in the 8th century? The ceramic evidence shows that after the Submycenaean period there was minimal activity on the Acropolis until the Late Geometric period when Athenians began depositing vessels there in far greater numbers than previously.[864] Warrior imagery dominates the decorative motifs with shields, spears, bows and arrows, chariots, and ships appearing repeatedly. All of these, Glowacki notes, are "appropriate for a votive context",[865] but beyond this the imagery reveals that the mid-8th century Athenians were taking a particular interest in fighting and heroic themes, and choosing to express that interest in a cult context here on the Acropolis.

The prothesis scenes depicted on a number of fragments would typically be associated with funerary contexts. What is their purpose amongst an assemblage that otherwise seems votive in nature? Glowacki considers a few possible explanations. If these

---

862 Iakovidis 2006: 65-66.
863 Glowacki 1998: Iakovidis 2006: 67-68.
864 Ruppenstein and Gauss 1998: 32, Fig. 19.
865 Glowacki 1998: 80.

fragments were actually from other parts of the settlement and used here only as architectural fill, could we be seeking patterns in an assemblage that is simply random? This is an unsatisfying solution; the Late Geometric assemblage does not seem random, but rather seems fairly coherent, and it seems unlikely that pottery would be gathered from a funerary context and transported all the way up onto the Acropolis purely to act as architectural fill.[866]

Ruppenstein and Gauss propose that funerary imagery was found because the Acropolis was also functioning as a burial ground in the Late Geometric period. If there are vessels depicting funerary scenes as well as typical votive items, the straightforward solution is that the Acropolis was functioning both as a cult place and as a burial ground independently from each other and with neither taking over the whole area.[867] This seems an elegant solution, but Glowacki dismisses the possibility, noting that whilst the funerary imagery might be more suited to a burial context there simply isn't any evidence for Late Geometric burials on the rock.[868]

In the absence of any other reasonable explanation, we should recognise that prothesis and mourning scenes must have had some particular relevance to the cult activity taking place on the Acropolis. One simple solution may be to argue that prothesis scenes need not be considered categorically separate from the warrior imagery found on many other fragments. Death is as much a part of heroic warrior narratives as swords and shields and sailing. There does not necessarily need to be a separate funerary function for these vessels, as their decoration is part of an overall heroic theme. Indeed, it is not unheard of for prothesis scenes to be found in non-funerary votive contexts, such as at Isthmia[869] and at the Samian Heraion.[870]

The citadel was remembered by Homer as the home of Erechtheus.[871] Could it be that the warrior imagery indicates a cult dedicated to Athens' Homeric hero? Certainly there would later be cult activity associated with the tradition of the Acropolis as the home

---

[866] Glowacki 1998: 80.
[867] Ruppenstein and Gauss 1998: 40.
[868] Ibid.
[869] Morgan 1994: 118.
[870] Technau 1929: 15-16.
[871] *Iliad* 2.546-551; *Odyssey* 7.80-81.

and burial place of Erechtheus,[872] but in this period there is no evidence to indicate a specific deity or hero.

The bronze finds give additional clues to the activities taking place on the Acropolis. The dozens of bronzes found are all fragments of tripods. There are two main points which may be drawn from these finds, with different degrees of certainty. First, it is possible that there were games associated with the cult, perhaps a forerunner for the Panathenaic Games. Tripods were typical prizes awarded to athletes at Olympia; Morgan proposes that the Athenian bronzes fulfil a similar function, and Touloupa suggests that the male figurine attachments may represent the athletes themselves.[873] A second, more certain, point is that the deposition of large and expensive bronze items provides an opportunity for competitive display. Those who won tripods, or could otherwise afford to dedicate them, had an opportunity to display their renown publicly and prominently. In these bronze finds we can recognise the presence in Athens of an elite stratum of society. Indeed, the Dipylon decorative style is typical of large vessels such as amphorae, and these too would have been prominent items of display. In the absence of smaller and humbler votives we may even speculate that the cult activity on the Acropolis was exclusively for elites.

As mentioned above, the architectural evidence on the Acropolis in this period is a little scarce. Though they are the only remains, the poros stone column bases are nonetheless a fairly clear indication that a formal cult building was constructed in the late 8th, or possibly early 7th, century. It is probable that these bases were not found in their original position so unfortunately we are not able to determine the precise location of the structure. We may safely assume, however, that on the Acropolis, perhaps most likely on one of the surviving terraces, there was a cult building with stone foundations and a wooden superstructure.

But was the building with the stone bases the first cult building on the Acropolis? There are no earlier architectural remains, but there may be some indirect evidence of an earlier structure. Among the Graef and Langlotz assemblage is a fragment of a mid-8th century painted terracotta plaque depicting a woman, part of a horse's head, and a threshing

---

872 Hölscher 1991: 360.
873 Morgan 1990: 207; Touloupa 1991: 242.

fork.[874] The plaque has a pierced hole by which it could be hung up. As Coldstream points out, a plaque with a suspension hole would require at least a wall on which it could be suspended.[875] Though it is indirect evidence, this suggests that there was some kind of cult structure even in the mid-8th century. The proposed structure in which the plaque hung has not left any trace and therefore must have been made with materials that are now not archaeologically visible, most likely wood and mud.

Ultimately, when it comes to architecture, we are not presented with a great deal of evidence. What evidence we have is either limited or indirect – a plaque that would require a wall on which to hang, bronze items requiring a place to be displayed, references in Homer, and at the end of the century two column bases – providing only "tantalizing glimpses" of a structure.[876] This structure is often referred to, using a phrase originally coined by Dinsmoor, as the "hypothetical but necessary" cult building.[877] We don't have the remains of the building in the 8th century, but other indications suggest there must have been one.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins at Athens: preliminary observations

In the Late Bronze Age the Acropolis was a well-fortified citadel, encircled by a Cyclopean wall and other impressive fortifications, and with an extensive network of terraces on the summit. After the 'Collapse', despite no indication of destruction on the citadel, the area seems to have been largely abandoned, save some improvised dwellings in LHIIIC and some cist burial in SM. The Protogeometric period has few signs of occupation or activity on the Acropolis.

The mid-8th century saw a sudden boom in activity, with the deposition of large numbers of impressive bronze tripods and large decorated vessels indicating an exclusive elite cult, perhaps centred around a cult building of wood and mud, rebuilt or refurbished with stone foundations a generation or two later. An association of the cult with athletic games is indicated by the nature of some of the bronze offerings,[878] and elite interest in heroic themes and ideals is reflected both in the participation in games and in the imagery

[874] Graef and Langlotz 1925: cat. no. 286.
[875] Coldstream 1977: 332.
[876] Glowacki 1998: 85.
[877] Dinsmoor 1947: 109-110.
[878] Morgan 1990: 207; Touloupa 1991: 242.

depicted on decorated pottery. It would be speculation to suggest that the participants in the cult used the Acropolis in commemoration of specific Attic heroes, but the remains of impressive fortifications and other architectural features would certainly have provided a vivid landscape of memory indicative of a significant and powerful past.

No other site in Athens, or indeed Attica as a whole, comes anywhere near the Acropolis for the number and wealth of offerings in this period. As Hurwit notes, "The Acropolis had become, without much archaeologically visible preparation, the major sanctuary of Attica – its religious focus, its symbolic center, and the center of its symbols…It had become a display".[879] But what was the purpose of this display? In his seminal work on the birth of the Greek city-state, De Polignac links the rise of urban and rural shrines to the rise of the polis.[880] Glowacki sees this idea as applicable here: a communal or 'national' shrine at the centre of a settlement provided a "focus and a religious sanction for the emerging state"; in this context the deposition of wealth in graves becomes eclipsed by the public display of votive offerings in religious settings.[881] Hurwit, furthermore, argues that such a centralised cultic focus was a necessary prerequisite of Athens' establishment as the primary Attic city-state.[882]

Certain caveats must be applied, however. In the 8th century it is too early to talk of true poleis, and it would be a mistake to argue that this sanctuary in some way 'reveals' that the emergence of the city-state was already underway in Athens. Additionally, it is not appropriate to suggest that this cult was a "communal" activity, since the discussed evidence instead indicates that participation in the cult on the Acropolis may have been reserved for elite members of the community.

Morgan emphasises that De Polignac's analysis need not be confined solely to the polis, but can also be applicable to early emerging communities. In the same way that urban, suburban, and extra-urban sanctuaries can mark the physical boundaries of a city-state, cult was also used to mark cultural boundaries, "splitting 'wild' and 'civilised' space".[883] Such a dichotomy may be discernible in this cult. It is safe to assume that athletic games associated

[879] Hurwit 1999: 93.
[880] De Polignac 1995.
[881] Glowacki 1998: 85.
[882] Hurwit 1999: 94.
[883] Morgan 1990: 7.

with the cult did not take place on the rocky plateau of the Acropolis. Games taking place somewhere in the Lower Town would have involved a broader segment of the community as spectators, though probably not as participants. This more communal event is in contrast to the more restricted dedication of offerings that took place on the Acropolis. Exclusive access to the activities on the Acropolis was a claim of cultural ownership of the landscape of memory, of Athens' own past.

What purpose did this serve? Glowacki and Hurwit are not wrong to suggest that the cult provided a communal identity and would have provided a centralised focus for Athens' emergence as the primary power of Attica. In addition, though, elite-controlled access to the sanctuary ensured that the power accrued both through participation in the primary central cult and through association with the cultural memory of a powerful Mycenaean past remained firmly in the hands of the emerging Athenian elite.

Eleusis

Eleusis is located in western Attica, close to the coast, facing the island of Salamis. It occupies a strategic location, with a hill offering good views over the sea and surrounding fertile land, and placing it on a route between Athens and Boeotia. The Megaron B complex was a significant ruler's dwelling in the Mycenaean settlement. In the Late Geometric period cult activity began at the ruins of the Megaron B complex with the offering of burnt votive items and the construction of a series of retaining walls that supported the ruins.

. . .

The Bronze Age

The first evidence of occupation at Eleusis dates to the Early Helladic period, though this is limited to a few sherds from EHII and a handful more from EHIII. Little can be said about Eleusis at this stage. It is impossible to determine the nature, duration, or extent of inhabitation.[884]

Middle Helladic I saw the start of a slightly more substantial settlement, with a series of ceramic deposits at various find spots on the southern and eastern slopes of the hill, but in MHII and MHIII Eleusis began to expand more rapidly. Seven two-roomed houses and 108 graves belonging to this period have been discovered.[885] LHI deposits were found in the same areas as those from MHIII, in the settlement on the south and east slopes. The distribution of ceramic deposits became wider in LHIIA, and in LHIIB the construction of Megaron B, an important building which will be central to our discussion, was begun.[886]

Megaron B was a large rectangular building with a small porch (Fig. 63). It measured 10.40m by 6.50m. The long side walls, Wall 6 and Wall 7, running east-west, were 0.60-0.65m wide and built with courses of large stones with a packed fill of smaller stones. Larger stones at the east end of each walls formed antae at the front of the building.[887] Mylonas reports that a column base was found in situ in the main room, and he proposes that for the even distribution of weight there must have been a second column on the central axis of the

[884] Cosmopoulos 2015: 43-45; Mylonas 1961: 23-24.
[885] Cosmopoulos 2015: 48-52; Mylonas 1961: 30-31.
[886] Cosmopoulos 2015: 78-80.
[887] Ibid: 82.

building.[888] Van den Eijnde, however, raises a note of scepticism regarding the central columns, implying that the existence of a column base may have been reported mistakenly. No trace of a central column base exists today, and the original excavators' report states that the columns were their own restoration and no interior features were found.[889]

The floor of the porch was around 0.30m lower than that of the main room, and the area of the porch measured approximately 2m by 6m. In front of the porch, two stairways led down to the courtyard in front, divided by a protruding platform. The southern steps are preserved, consisting of four stone slabs, and incorporate a drain channel, D1, that drew excess water from both the porch and the main room. The central platform is made up of three walls with the fourth side abutting the porch. It measured around 2.80m across, 2.46-2.50m from front to back, and survives to a height of 1.30-1.40m above the level of the surrounding courtyard floor.[890]

Again, Van den Eijnde raises a note of caution: the flight of steps on the northern side of the platform has not been found. The excavators proposed that they must have been subsumed into or reused in later constructions as without them the assumed symmetry of the front of the building is lost.[891] Van den Eijnde argues that this is not a safe assumption to make given that the platform and flanking stairways that they propose would be an unparalleled architectural feature.[892]

South of Megaron B, in the lower part (D2) of the drain that channels water away from the porch and main room, a collection of LHIIB-LHIIIA1 sherds were found amongst a deposit of ash and bones. The bones belonged to "non-meaty" parts of at least three pigs and had been thoroughly burned, to an extent indicating that they had been "left for several hours in a fire burning at high temperatures". The use of "non-meaty" parts and thorough burning suggest that this was not part of a meal but rather constitutes a burnt animal sacrifice. In the absence of any evidence for a hearth within the main room, it stands to

---

[888] Mylonas 1961: 35.
[889] Van den Eijnde 2010: 141; Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933: 275.
[890] Cosmopoulos 2015: 84-85.
[891] Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933: 276.
[892] Van den Eijnde 2010: 143; Van den Eijnde does acknowledge that the platform seems to end precisely where the second set of steps would be expected in a symmetrical design. His note of caution, however, serves to highlight the manner in which the assumptions of the excavators affect the interpretation of adjacent buildings, namely the B1-3 annex buildings, discussion of which follows below.

reason that the platform was the place where this burning had taken place prior to the remnants washing away down the drain.[893]

The Megaron and its protruding platform were situated within a courtyard surrounded by four walls creating a rectangular enclosure measuring approximately 19m by 16m. Only the north and south walls survive (i.e. those running east-west), preserved to a height of 1.50-1.70m, and 0.65-0.84m in width. Access was via a gate on the north side, 4.5m wide, with a flight of three ascending steps. Pottery found in the foundations of the Megaron and the enclosure walls date their construction to LHIIB, though additional ceramic finds from the floor of the Megaron and courtyard indicate that they remained in use through LHIIIA and LHIIIB.[894]

In LHIIIB, according to the chronology put forward by Mylonas, and supported by Mazarakis Ainian and Cosmopoulos, a complex of three rooms was added abutting the northern side of Megaron B.[895] The three rooms, B1, B2, and B3, were parallel rectangular buildings oriented perpendicular to Megaron B. B1 is the only room whose plan survives in its full dimensions, measuring 7m by 4.40m. Its front door faces south directly onto the platform, which it now shared with Megaron B. B2 is to the west of B1; the northern wall of Megaron B serves as its southern wall. B3, which is also incomplete, joined onto the east side of B1 (Figs. 63-64).[896]

The precise function of Megaron B and B1-3 annex complex has been a matter of much debate. Mylonas proposed that Megaron B represents a Late Helladic origin for the Eleusinian mysteries and functioned as the first temple to Demeter.[897] Travlos suggested that the Megaron served as the residence of a leading local family who inhabited the house from the Mycenaean period to the Early Iron Age, at which point it became a cult building.[898] Mazarakis Ainian takes something of a middle approach, arguing that Megaron B was indeed the residence of an elite family in the Late Bronze Age but that it was subsequently

---

[893] Cosmopoulos 2015: 86-87.
[894] Ibid: 87-89.
[895] Cosmopoulos 2015: 108ff; Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 147; Mylonas 1961: 34.
[896] Cosmopoulos 2015: 108-111.
[897] Mylonas 1961: 34.
[898] Travlos 1970: 60; 1983:329-333; Travlos suggests the Eumolpids as a suitable aristocratic family.

abandoned in the 12th century and reoccupied as a ruler's dwelling in the 9th century, before becoming a cult centre in the 8th century.[899]

There can be little doubt that Megaron B did indeed have a residential function in the Mycenaean period. Cooking, storage, and drinking vessels were all found in the main room.[900] But was there also a specialised religious function? Mylonas and the other early excavators proposed two reasons why there must have been. The first is location: Mylonas sees it as significant that the Telesterion of the subsequent sanctuary was built directly over the Megaron. He also argues that a true elite or ruler's dwelling would be on the summit of the hill as at other Mycenaean sites, rather than on the open southern slopes.[901] The second reason relates to the special architectural features of the Megaron: a walled enclosure is not typical for Mycenaean Megaron-residences and Mylonas describes it instead as a peribolos wall, using terminology more usually applied to sanctuaries of the historic period. He further claims that the platform was a unique feature and proposes that it was the location of an altar.[902]

For a time the identification of Megaron B as a temple was broadly accepted, even if there was some reluctance to recognise it specifically as the beginning of the mysteries and the cult of Demeter. In a 1981 article Darcque challenged the consensus. He rejected the identification of Megaron B as a temple, claiming that it did not in fact have special features that should specifically distinguish it from other larger dwellings of the period. He based this claim on his disagreement with a key element of the excavators' analysis: that the long walls running east-west were two sides of a rectangular peribolos wall. In the absence of the adjoining walls running north-south, there is no reason to assume a closed rectangle. Rather we may instead recognise the walls of multiple rooms making up a larger complex similar to elite, but not quite palatial, dwellings elsewhere. In the absence of a certain identification of a peribolos there is little else to demonstrate a religious function.[903]

Votive items are generally lacking. The small number of animal figurines and of anthropomorphic 'phi' and 'psi' type figurines are "isolated fragments", too few and far

---

899 Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 149-150.
900 Cosmopoulos 2015: 90.
901 Mylonas 1961: 42.
902 Ibid: 48.
903 Darcque 1981: 601-604.

between to identify a temple.[904] Larger wheel-made figures such as might be expected at a Mycenaean shrine or temple are completely absent. Van den Eijnde, in support of Darcque's criticism, prefers not to use the term 'Megaron'. Rather than encourage the quasi-religious connotations of the word 'Megaron', he instead suggests 'Mansion' to emphasise the similarity to other elite dwelling complexes found near to, but not integrally as part of, the palaces at Knossos and Mycenae.[905] In sum, for Darcque and Van den Eijnde at least, the idea of a Mycenaan temple at Megaron B should be completely abandoned.

Darcque's article marked a sea change in opinion regarding Megaron B and since then, Cosmopoulos notes, its interpretation as a Mycenaean cult building has generally been rejected.[906] In recent years Cosmopoulos has, however, sought to provide a modified position. He reasserts the notion that Walls 5 and 8, the long walls running east-west, were in fact part of a single enclosure wall. These walls were built on the same orientation. The depths of their foundations are aligned with each other. Furthermore, pottery found in the foundations of the walls dates to LHIIB-LHIIIA1, suggested not only that they were built at the same time, but also that their construction was contemporary with that of Megaron B itself. In contrast, walls which Darcque associated with Wall 5 (Walls 3 and 3X) have pottery dating to LHIIIA2-LHIIIB, putting them in a later phase of construction. In short, the enclosure wall does seem to have been a genuine special architectural feature. In conjunction with the platform in front of the Megaron, which Mazarakis Ainian describes as an "unparalleled feature indeed", we are in fact presented with a rather unusual building complex.[907]

Furthermore, Cosmopoulos suggests that the deposit in Drain D2, apparently washed off the platform and porch, essentially settles the matter. Following Renfrew's criteria for the identification of cult, he argues that in the platform we have "attention-focusing" architecture, in the admittedly limited number of figurines we have the "presence

---

[904] Darcque 1981: 600; Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 149; Nicholls 1970: 3; contra Cosmopoulos 2015: 120.
[905] Van den Eijnde 2010: 145; whilst I am somewhat in agreement with Van den Eijnde on this point, for the sake of clarity and consistency in this thesis I will maintain the use of 'Megaron'.
[906] Cosmopoulos 2015: 90.
[907] Ibid: 90-92.

of the transcendental and its symbolic focus", and in the ash and bones of burnt animal sacrifice we have "participation and offering".[908]

This argument does not completely negate Darcque's criticism, however. Votive items, though present, are few and far between, and certain items that would typically be thought necessary for a Mycenaean cult centre are absent entirely. Cosmopoulos does not seek simply to reassert Mylonas' old position. Rather, he sees it as a "reasonable conclusion" that Megaron B, whilst certainly primarily an elite residence, nonetheless was also the site of some religious rituals for which the platform provided a highly visual setting.[909] Though he takes a 'cult-sceptic' approach overall, Van den Eijnde ultimately comes to a similar "reasonable conclusion": "even if it is not inconceivable that a part of the complex at Eleusis was reserved for some kind of domestic cult, clearly this was not the mansion's main purpose".[910] In short, the presence of cult activity does not make the complex a temple or prevent it being an elite dwelling.

The 'Collapse'

Though there is no particular evidence of any kind of destruction at Eleusis, the scarcity of post-Palatial and Early Iron Age finds led to a general understanding of the site having a gap in occupation between around 1200 and 1000 BC at least. Previously unpublished pottery presented by Cosmopoulos in 2014, however, overturns this interpretation somewhat. While provenance is often unknown, they "paint a different picture" of the overall settlement pattern of the site. LHIIIC sherds, Submycenaean sherds, and a complete Submycenaean vase found amongst the earlier pottery indicate a continued presence at the site in the transition from the Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age.

The assemblage is only around 50 sherds but includes at least two Submycenaean sherds known to have been found "on the floor of Megaron B". Coupled with a small number of Protogeometric sherds from the Megaron B area, Cosmopoulos suggests that we can say that the complex remained in use at least to some extent through into the 10th century.[911] We cannot accept this claim though. 50 sherds covering a 300 year period is a

[908] Cosmopoulos 2015: 92; Renfrew 1985: 18-21.
[909] Cosmopoulos 2015: 92.
[910] Van den Eijnde 2010: 146.
[911] Cosmopoulos 2014: 419-420.

very small assemblage and does not necessarily indicate a significant resident population or extensive activity or negate the possibility of total abandonment of the site. In any case, the few Protogeometric sherds reported from Megaron B were Late Protogeometric.[912] We should consider Eleusis abandoned after the Sub-Mycenaean period.

The Early Iron Age

The first certain evidence of a resident population at Eleusis in the Iron Age is the presence of graves from the Late Protogeometric period. A few LPG sherds found underneath E1-2, a Geometric retaining wall in the vicinity of Megaron B, are mentioned but not published by Mylonas.[913] Mazarakis Ainian is perhaps the most prominent promoter of an early reuse of the Megaron complex. He does not propose that there was continued use from the Late Bronze Age into the Early Iron Age, but he does claim that it is "practically certain" that the complex was being reused "perhaps as early as c. 900 BC".[914]

He makes two main arguments to support his claim. First, he argues that the settlement as a whole was experiencing accelerated reoccupation: the scattered presence of PG sherds and the presence of PG and EG graves indicate a re-established and growing settlement. It is perhaps to be expected that the inhabitants would be drawn to the remains of the most impressive structures of earlier periods. Secondly, and more specifically, two Late Geometric handles were found in Room B1,[915] PG sherds were found in the Megaron area, and he claims, following Travlos, that a 'propylon' was installed in the north wall of Room B2 in the 8th century.[916]

There are, however, flaws in his argument. Van den Eijnde notes that the LG sherds often described as having been found "*on* the floor" of B2 were actually found 0.05m above the level of the floor. This doesn't seem to indicate a clearing and reuse of the room. The sherds may in fact belong to a terrace fill. The Protogeometric sherds found underneath Wall E1-2 are few in number, and indicate only the presence of a population in the area and not any particular reuse of the Megaron complex. The claim of a 'propylon' in B2 stems from Travlos, who used it to explain a gap in the north wall of the room and proposed an

912 Van den Eijnde 2010: 149.
913 Van den Eijnde 2010: 149; Mylonas 1961: 56-57.
914 Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 347.
915 Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933: 277.
916 Mazarakis Ainain 1997: 347.

8th century construction. Van den Eijnde notes that the gap in the wall does not actually need an explanation as it is the location of a later intrusion, a column base from the 6th century Telesterion.[917] In spite of Mazarakis Ainian's claims, we should consider the Megaron area to have been largely, if not entirely, undisturbed prior to the late 8th century.

A 'landscape of memory' at Eleusis

What scene would the 8th century inhabitants of Eleusis have been presented with? In the Mycenaean period there had been a substantial building complex around Megaron B within a large 'peribolos' enclosure, itself constructed of tall thick walls, incorporating at its centre a quasi-monumental or at least highly visual platform. This had most likely been the setting of religious activity involving burnt animal sacrifices, but also served as the residence of an elite figure and his family.

As the population shrank from the 12th century onwards there was some limited continued occupation of the area but not enough to have had any discernible significant impact on the Megaron area. Even as the population grew again from the 9th century activity in the Megaron area remained minimal. By the latter half of the 8th century, when there was renewed interest in the building complex, the area would certainly have been in disrepair, but the remains of the large 'peribolos' walls and of Megaron B, the B1-3 annex, and the protruding platform would have been significant and highly visible aspects of the landscape.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins

The first certain evidence of the reuse of the Megaron area is the construction of a retaining wall supporting the area of the earlier complex in the Late Geometric period. This was Wall E3, a short section of slightly curved wall (Fig. 65). Mylonas speculated that it was a trace of an apsidal temple of the Late Geometric period which he erroneously claimed continued the Megaron's unbroken use as a cult site.[918] This identification was an attempt to establish cult continuity and in the absence of any non-circumstantial evidence has now largely been dismissed.

---

[917] Van den Eijnde 2010: 147; Travlos 1983: 330.
[918] Mylonas 1961: 57-59.

Travlos instead identified E3 as a retaining wall.[919] It has a length of 5.50m and a width of 0.60-0.70m. The wall was partly built over the southern wall of the 'peribolos'. Only the south face of the wall is dressed, a clear sign of a wall supporting a terrace of some sort. Its top course of stones is around 0.40m lower than the top courses of the long side walls of Megaron B. Cosmopoulos highlights that this means that when E3 was constructed the walls of the Megaron complex were still visible, and indeed that after its construction they remained visible. He continues that "it seems, therefore, that [E3][920] and the Megaron B complex were used concurrently and that [E3]'s planning and construction took into account the Megaron B complex".[921] This assertion is only half true. The retaining wall clearly was constructed with care to take into account the presence of the earlier complex, but that does not necessarily mean that the buildings themselves were being reused. What it does do is confirm that the remains of the complex were visible and that the inhabitants of Eleusis saw some purpose in preserving them.

In fact, Van den Eijnde notes that the evidence actually points away from the rooms themselves being specifically reused. He highlights the two previously mentioned Geometric handles that were found 0.05m above the Late Helladic floor of B2. The handles were shaped as a gryphon head and as a bird, and would be appropriate as votive items in the late 8th century. Their stratigraphical separation from the floor of B2 suggests that they were not deposited after a clear-out and reuse of the room. Rather, Van den Eijnde proposes, they may have been part of cult activity taking place a little prior to the construction of the retaining wall and then formed part of the terrace fill that the wall supported.[922] The nature of this first cult activity may be indicated by the layer of ash, burned soil, and carbonised wood found over B1-3:[923] it is likely these handles were votives deposited within an ash-altar that spread across and among the ruins of the B1-3 annex. With the construction of the retaining wall E3, these items formed part of the fill for the supported terrace. Van den Eijnde dates these handles to the Late Geometric II period. As they are the earliest finds that can be confidently ascribed a cultic function, he proposes 735 BC as the earliest

---

919 Travlos 1983: 330.
920 Cosmopoulos refers to the retaining wall as "Wall K", the designation it was given in the initial excavations. Wall K and Wall E3 are one and the same and therefore for the sake of clarity I have replaced his use of "Wall K" with "[E3]".
921 Cosmopoulos 2014: 412.
922 Van den Eijnde 2010: 154.
923 Cosmopoulos 2015: 108-111.

possible establishment of the cult, with the construction of retaining wall perhaps taking place sometime shortly after.[924]

It is impossible to imagine that after nearly five centuries of almost total disuse the buildings would have been properly intact. It is safe to assume that rituals were taking place in the open air over and amongst the ruined walls. Activity amongst the ruins is likely to have caused them some damage, and indeed the mere regular presence of people on the uneven ground would have caused some erosion of the earth around the remains. It seems that the construction of Wall E3 was an active attempt at preservation. A terrace was created, incorporating but not hiding the ruins, and using some of the earlier votives as fill.[925]

Three further sections of wall have been identified as belonging to a second retaining wall. The sections, E1, E2, and E5 seem to have belonged to the same wall, initially thought to have been the peribolos of the Geometric sanctuary,[926] but later understood to be the retaining wall for a second terrace, since only the outer faces of the walls are dressed.[927] E1 and E2 are connected, with E1 consisting of a stretch of wall immediately to the south of the earlier retaining wall, and E2 comprising three steps that led up to the level of the terrace and presumably acted as the point of access from the southern side (Fig. 66). A non-existent but proposed wall, nominally called E4, would connect E1 to E5, a stretch of wall 25m to the northeast. Mylonas and Kourouniotis note the presence of "Sub-Geometric" sherds among the foundation stones, and Van den Eijnde as a result offers a date of construction no earlier than 700 BC.[928] Furthermore, it was recorded in their initial excavation that the height of E3 was lower than the substantial E1-2/5 walls. At this point it is possible that the ruins themselves were covered over by the raised level of the new terrace.[929]

The construction of this wall marked a significant expansion of the cult and the establishment of Sacrificial Pyre A. In front of and against the wall a layer of ash and carbonised wood, 0.80-1.00m thick contained a large number of "burnt, handmade bird-faced figurines". Around the thick main layer of ash, ash and charcoal were mixed with burnt

---

924 Van den Eijnde 2010: 152.
925 Ibid: 155.
926 Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933: 274.
927 Mazarakis Ainian 1997: 148.
928 Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933: 279; Van den Eijnde 2010: 155.
929 Noack 1927: 11ff.

and broken Protocorinthian aryballoi and alabastra, terracotta plaques, gold sheet and jewellery.[930]

In 1999 Kokkou-Vyridi published a catalogue of finds from Pyre A. Finds from the duration of Pyre A's use are included, from the late 8th to the early 6th century. By focusing on the items that are dated to the late 8th and early 7th century it is possible to assess the nature of the cult in its earlier stages and seek to identify the motives for its initial establishment.

Among the pottery are ten conical oinochoai dating from the end of the 8th to middle of the 7th century. All are Argive Monochrome, seven of them handmade and adorned with impressed decoration, and three wheelmade and undecorated. In addition there were two Protocorinthian aryballoi and an "aryballos-shaped oinochoe". All of the above were largely complete, though some were missing necks. One oinochoe was pieced together from many smaller sherds but overall the vessels do not give the indication that they were smashed deliberately. Many had signs of burning.[931] Two plaque fragments date to the early 7th century, one with part of a wheel decoration and the other with part of a four-leaved rosette. Both were pierced and show signs of burning.[932]

Two figurines date to the late 8th century. A70 is a possible charioteer, 10.8cm in height, with a pointed nose and chin (or beard), and with arms outstretched, perhaps as if to hold reins. A71 is a female figurine with a 'bird-like' face, sitting on a stylised 'throne' in the shape of a two-headed horse. In addition there are 54 figurines broadly dated to the 7th century: these include 33 'bird-faced' figurines, ranging from 5.5cm to 21cm in height, seven headless figurines torsos, two 'bird-like' heads without bodies, and 12 seated figurines, also with 'bird-like' heads (Fig. 69). With so many examples it is probable that some were part of the earlier deposits in the pyre.[933]

Kokkou-Vyridi also catalogues a number of gold items. Eight pieces of gold sheet were found dating to 750-725 BC. They had embossed decoration, many were pierced, and all had clear signs of burning. Two gold spirals, possibly from a pin, date to 750-700 BC, a

---

930 Kokkou-Vyridi 1999: 262.
931 Kokkou-Vyridi 1999: Cat. nos. A1-11, A13-14.
932 Ibid: A49-50.
933 Ibid: A70-100, A106-108, A111, A118-120, A122-124, A126-128, A136-148.

gold coil, perhaps an earring or hair-ring, date to 750-725 BC. Two matching gold earrings with granular decoration date to 725-700 BC (Fig. 67). Finally, dating to the 7th century, there are three small gold rings connected by hooks which may have been an accessory to an earring with a small golden pomegranate as decoration (Fig. 68).[934]

There were no bones found amongst the ash. This was not animal sacrifice but specifically the burning and deposition of votive items.[935] Traces of burning on the wall confirm that this was the location of the ash altar in situ and that the ash and votives had not been dumped there after a cleaning of the terrace.[936] Deposition at the retaining wall continued through to the end of the 7th century, though that goes beyond the scope of this project.

Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins at Eleusis: preliminary observations

The inhabitants of Eleusis in the latter half of the 8th century began to take a keen interest in the substantial remains of the former Megaron complex. Perhaps around 735 BC preliminary cult activity began with the burning and deposition of votives over and amongst the ruins of the B1-3 annex. Fairly soon this was formalised by the construction of a retaining wall that supported a terrace at a level that left the Megaron complex ruins highly visible and allowed more space for cult participants.

Around 700 BC a second, more substantial, retaining wall was constructed at such a height that its fill likely covered over the ruins of the earlier buildings. At this point the focus of the cult shifted from the top of the terrace and amongst the ruins to the retaining wall itself, with the deposition and burning of votives, some of high value, up against the wall. In the absence of animal bones and typical open-shaped drinking vessels, it seems that animal sacrifice, feasting, and drinking played little or no role. Rather, the oinochoai and aryballoi "point to libations".[937]

Despite the later tradition of secretive and exclusive ritual activity at Eleusis, proceedings in the late 8th and early 7th century seem to have been somewhat unrestricted. Valuable gold jewellery was found alongside relatively modest terracotta figurines and

---

934 Ibid: A175-189.
935 Cosmopoulos 2014: 422; Van den Eijnde 2010: 156; Kokkou-Vyridi 1999: 156-157.
936 Van den Eijnde 2010: 156; Kokkou-Vyridi 1999; Mylonas 1961: 57.
937 Kokkou-Vyridi 1999: 265.

plaques. Furthermore, the valuable votives were small objects which would disappear quickly into the ash. Competitive display seems not have been a priority.

Kokkou-Vyridi instead characterises the ritual activity at Pyre A as more personal. She believes the pyre represents 'enagismoi' rituals. These are "the burnt, or occasionally unburnt offerings made by mortals to the dead, to heroes, and to chthonic deities, the purpose of which was to secure their favour, in order to ensure personal well-being, or for the fertility of the earth and a good crop."[938] The burning of votives at Pyre A is not alone sufficient to identify 'enagismoi', and at the earliest stages of the cult we cannot assume a connection to the later significance of crops, fertility, and chthonic deities at Eleusis.

Kokkou-Vyridi continues, however: 'enagismoi' are "mournful rites of a purificatory character, for they contained within them the agos (pollution) of communication with the dead in the Underworld; they were accordingly held in an isolated area (enclosure, room) and the offerings made were destroyed and the remains covered with stones, slabs, or tiles, or buried".[939] Again, we cannot assume specific beliefs about "communication with the dead in the Underworld", but Kokkou-Vyridi is right to highlight some correlations between 'enagismoi' and the rites taking place at Pyre A.

The importance of the burial of votives provides an interesting parallel with the cult at Pyre A. Votives were not strictly buried, other than within the ash of the pyre, but it is interesting to note that the construction of the second retaining wall buried the remains of the Late Bronze Age building complex. It is possible that the burial of the ruins was itself a kind of 'enagismos' ritual. E1-2/5, in burying the ruins, perhaps represents both the preservation of the ruins but also the disposing of them. The continuation of cult activity up against the retaining wall clearly shows that the ruins were not forgotten once they were covered over. Instead, Van den Eijnde suggests, the retaining walls became the "symbolic successors of the ruins that had been removed from sight".[940] In an example of Tilley's "synecdoche", one part of the landscape came to represent a greater part of it.[941] In this

[938] Ibid: 264.
[939] Ibid.
[940] Van den Eijnde 2010: 375.
[941] Tilley 1994: 29.

case, in fact, the synecdoche applies not only to the wall representing the whole ruin complex, but also representing the Eleusinian past associated with it.

We cannot precisely identify 'enagismoi' rituals here, but the activities at Pyre A may represent some kind of related phenomenon. Votive items were burnt and left deposited within the ash. They were not for competitive display but acted as a personal offering. Similarly, the ruins of the earlier building complex were no longer for display but were preserved beneath the earth, a kind of collective offering, perhaps to a chthonic deity or to unspecified 'ancestors'. In short, the ruins themselves were a votive offering. Their preservation and burial marked the ultimate link between the inhabitants of Eleusis and the past.

Since the first excavations of the Megaron area debate has often focused on the question of continuity of cult. Comparing the Mycenaean cult activity with that of the Geometric period, we see they are almost completely divergent. Earlier a platform/altar, later a pyre; earlier animal sacrifices, later votive deposits. Cosmopoulos comments that "despite the continuity in the habitation of the site, there is no evidence to suggest continuity in religious rituals and beliefs and therefore continuity in function".[942]

This continuity in location, however, is significant. Cosmopoulos, following Mylonas, observes that the not inconsiderable slope and occasional emerging outcrops of hard bedrock meant that construction there "necessitated considerable and, from the practical point of view, unnecessary investment in labor and expense". Yet this is where was chosen to establish their cult in the late 8th century. The choice to pursue a continuity of location in the face of severe inconvenience cannot "be easily brushed aside".[943]

Cosmopoulos proposes that the Megaron complex acted as a *lieu de mémoire*, a place in the landscape which represents a recognisable link with the past: "That in the eight century BCE the inhabitants of Eleusis enclosed or supported the complex with the curved Wall [E3] suggests a deliberate effort to preserve it, which in turn indicates a fixed relationship between the Mycenaean past and the Early Iron Age present and a "will to remember" on behalf of the inhabitants".[944] This is a good point. Faced with impressive and

[942] Cosmopoulos 2014: 422-423.
[943] Cosmopoulos 2014: 423; Mylonas 1961: 44.
[944] Cosmopoulos 2014: 423.

mysterious ruins the "will to remember" led the inhabitants of Eleusis to preserve and engage ritually with the remains of buildings from which they were separated by 500 years and by long periods of near-abandonment of the settlement.

Cosmopoulos, however, goes on to pursue a more dubious point: "Within this framework, the Megaron B complex functioned as a lieu de mémoire that, combined with the local oral traditions, preserved the memory of a previously sacred site. The choice, then, of that particular location for the eight-century cult was the result of a deliberate process of preserving the cultural memory of earlier religious activity".[945]

There are two major problems with this suggestion. First, it has been effectively demonstrated above that in the Mycenaean period, though cult activities took place at Megaron B, it was primarily an elite residence and not a cult centre. If oral tradition maintained any knowledge of the Megaron complex it would likely not have been as a religious site but as an elite dwelling. Secondly, a distinction must be drawn between "the will to remember" and "the ability to remember". If oral tradition and cultural memory had indeed maintained knowledge of the complex as a setting for cult, it is remarkable how little they seem to have remembered about the nature of the cult activities. A much more straightforward explanation for the attraction to the Megaron complex is simply that it consisted of large impressive remains in the midst of their settlement.

[945] Ibid.

PART III

Analysis and Conclusions

Analysis and Conclusions

Part III is the analysis and conclusions section of the thesis, and consists of four sections:

1. Identifying regional patterns:

This section draws together the evidence gathered in Part II to determine whether particular patterns are discernible on a regional basis, noting variations in 'landscapes of memory', architecture, finds and features, and the dates at which the cults were established.

2. Assessing regional patterns:

The second section uses the patterns identified in the first section to make a series of key observations about the differences that may be found between the regions.

3. Testing the hypotheses of the thesis:

In this section we use the patterns identified in the first section and the key observations made in the second section to test the four hypotheses of the thesis, in each case establishing its veracity and its applicability to the different regions.

4. Understanding the research results:

Having identified a number of regional patterns, drawn key observations from the evidence, and used them to assess the role and significance of cultural memory and the commemoration of 'landscapes of memory', we must seek to find an explanation for the results. Why did people in Crete, the Argolid, and Attica practise cult at Bronze Age ruins in the different ways they did?

The thesis then concludes with some final remarks summing up the results of the research, noting its context within scholarship of the period, and suggesting possible avenues of future research.

Identifying Regional Patterns

This chapter will draw together the evidence gathered in the study of each site in Part II, identifying the patterns that may be identified in Crete, the Argolid, and Attica with regard to variations in 'landscapes of memory', architecture, finds and features, and the dates at which the cults were established.

. . .

Crete

Starting with Crete, there were different aspects to the 'landscapes of memory' at each of the sites. Both Knossos and Phaistos were major palaces. Their ruins were widespread, in many places monumental, and known to have survived extensively into historic times. Furthermore, both sites had large courts at their centre.[946] In these cases, arguably the most distinctive feature of the 'landscape of memory' was the area which was not covered with ruins, the Central Courts, which remained large open spaces, surrounded by ruins but themselves mostly unchanged. At both Knossos and Phaistos the ruins of the palaces had been left largely undisturbed while a continuing population occupied peripheral areas of the site. At Knossos Evans proposed that this was "in honour of the goddess Rhea, protectress of the 'city'".[947] We should be sceptical of the particular attribution of this goddess, but the fact that the palaces were largely left alone does suggest that there was some kind of continuing reverence for them. The inhabitants' "purposeful curiosity"[948] about the past did not extend to actually reoccupying the palaces. A Knossian and Phaistian memory of their importance is quite apparent.

Amnisos and Agia Triada were 'Villas', a site-type lower down in the hierarchy of Minoan settlements, and had been under the authority of their neighbours Knossos and Phaistos respectively. Their ruins were not as extensive as at the palaces, but individual monumental structures remained prominently visible. Occupation of these sites was minimal or non-existent in the Early Iron Age but they seem to have increasingly attracted visitors

946 Driessen 2004: 75.
947 Evans 1928: 7.
948 Prent 2005: 518.

from Knossos and Phaistos, to whose control they had returned, from the Protogeometric period onwards.

At these sites the 'landscape of memory' was not one of undisturbed reverence, but of abandonment. The existence of monumental ruins in the midst of an abandoned place represents what Porter calls "permanence in the face of loss", in which their state of preservation creates a "juxtaposition of the hard monumentality of things with their vulnerability to time's passing".[949] There is a human fascination with such sites. For the Knossians and Phaistians who encountered Amnisos and Agia Triada, the ruins may have inspired what Ginsberg terms "proprietorship".[950] Laying claim to the ruins commemorated a cultural memory of the "permanence" of Knossian and Phaistian authority.

Palaikastro was an extensive settlement and ruins of houses, blocks, and streets were dispersed over a wide area. The most prominent topographical feature of the area was Kastri, the seaside peak which was occupied in the aftermath of the 'Collapse', but it seems not to have warranted attention in the Iron Age, and the site as a whole was never "substantially reinhabited".[951] The ruins at the abandoned site would have had similarities with Amnisos and Agia Triada, their discovery highlighting 'permanence in the face of loss'. A significant difference in the respective 'landscapes of memory', however, is that unlike Amnisos and Agia Triada, which had prominent ruins of individual and isolated monumental structures, Palaikastro would have been a carpet of foundations, fallen stones, and low walls, with their state of preservation undulating across the flat seaside plain.

At Kommos, the 'landscape of memory' was different from any of the other examples. In the theoretical considerations at the beginning of this thesis it was noted that landscapes are not simply areas of terrain. They are "ego-centred".[952] A landscape is a section of land as experienced by people,[953] an "external world mediated through subjective human experience".[954] At Kommos the identification of how and by whom the landscape was experienced is particularly significant. At the other Cretan cults the participants would have had some plausible sense of 'ancestral' connection to the ruins, either through living near

---

[949] Porter 2011: 685-686.
[950] Ginsberg 2004: 114.
[951] MacGillivray and Driessen 1990: 395.
[952] Bender 1993: 1.
[953] Tilley 1994.
[954] Cosgrove 1998: 13.

the ruins or through a memory of former regional territorial control. This would also have been true of some of the participants in the cult at Kommos, who were Cretans themselves, but not of the Phoenicians who took part in the cult. The question of whether Phoenicians could commemorate cultural memory within a landscape to which they had no 'ancestral' connection is explored in the assessment of the fourth hypothesis.

Other than Kommos, none of the Cretan sites had any Iron Age architecture associated with cult at Bronze Age ruins. Open air shrines were the most common, with deposits placed on, against, or in front of ruins. This was the case at Phaistos, where votive items were deposited in front of two large walls at the southeast corner of the former palace, at Amnisos against the monumental ashlar wall, and at Agia Triada in front of a Minoan stoa and on a monumental staircase. At Palaikastro the cult site was amongst the ruins of the former settlement in a patch that was relatively free of surviving structures. Knossos is unique in having a two-stage spatial relationship, one part reoccupying a room in the west wing of the former palace, and one part located in the southeast corner of the Central Court. Only at Kommos was a cult building constructed. Temple A was built at the end of the 11th century and subsequently replaced by Temple B in the 8th century. In both phases the temple partly reused the walls of the Middle Minoan Building T, and was situated amongst the ruins of Late Minoan administrative buildings and ship-sheds.

There are no finds or features that were common to every example of Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins in Crete, though some patterns may be drawn (Tables 1-4):

- Phaistos stands out for the lack of variety in the votive offerings, consisting only of conspicuous bronze items such as tripods and shields.
- Ash or signs of burning were found at Knossos, Amnisos, Agia Triada, Palaikastro, and Kommos.
- Animal figurines were found at Knossos, Amnisos, Agia Triada, Palaikastro, and Kommos.
- Weapons or military imagery were found at Amnisos, Phaistos, Agia Triada, and Palaikastro. Despite this, overt militarism did not have an especially strong emphasis at the cults. The shields at Phaistos and Palaikastro were highly decorated bronze items, while those at Amnisos and Agia Triada were terracotta miniatures. Human figurines, drinking vessels, small bronze items, and large bronze items were each found at half of the sites.
- Large bronze items, such as tripods and shields, were found at Amnisos, Phaistos, and Palaikastro.

Certain items were only found at individual sites. Fragments of boat models were found only at Agia Triada, for example. A limestone head with bone and ivory eyes, thought to have been from Syria, is a distinctive item at Amnisos, but Kommos had by far the most unusual finds and features of any of the Cretan cults. The Tripillar Shrine, the burnt wooden item behind it, the scarabs, and the Egyptian faience figurines are all found nowhere else amongst the Cretan cults at ruins.

Despite its idiosyncrasies, Kommos nonetheless still adheres to some of the general trends. In particular, it shares some parallels with Amnisos and Agia Triada. All three had ash and burning, animal figurines, human figurines, chariot models, and small bronze votives such as miniature shields.

The Argolid

In the Argolid, Iron Age cults at Bronze Age ruins took place within a series of slightly different 'landscapes of memory', though most of the sites were linked by mutual visibility and together formed a broader single 'landscape of memory' around the Argive Plain. Mycenae and Tiryns were heavily fortified Late Helladic citadels and their enormous Cyclopean walls and gates survived more or less intact. Inside the walls were palaces, and at the heart of the palaces were megara. At both Mycenae and Tiryns the palaces had been destroyed by fire. At Mycenae the ruins of the palace remained relatively undisturbed and the limited occupation of the palace area after the 'Collapse' seems to have deliberately avoided the ruins. At Tiryns the post-palatial reoccupation of the palace was more significant, with the Great Megaron partly reused and reoccupied in the construction of Building T as a ruler's dwelling or elite meeting place. As the Early Iron Age progressed Building T fell out of use, and in the Geometric period Building T would have stood semi-ruined amongst the calcined remains of the palace.

Mycenae and Tiryns, furthermore, had continuing, though somewhat reduced, populations living in the vicinity of the citadels, though not often in the area of the former palaces. In the Late Bronze Age visitors to the citadels progressed through a series of thresholds, repeatedly passing through fortified gates from narrow spaces and corridors and into open courts, gradually ascending to the megara at the heart of the palaces. Though the palaces were in a ruined state, the integrity of the fortifications, the gates, and the general layout of the citadels meant that this spatial arrangement was largely preserved. The

topography and remaining architecture reinforced a memory of the megaron area as the pinnacle of importance.

The 'landscape of memory' at Argos was somewhat different. Though it is likely that Larissa was a fortified citadel, and the wealth found within it hints at the possibility of a palace, it cannot have been close to the scale of Mycenae or Tiryns. The citadel seems to have avoided destruction in the 'Collapse', so it is likely that in the Early Iron Age fortifications from the Bronze Age still stood there. Argos differed from Mycenae and Tiryns not only in that these surviving fortifications were on a smaller scale, but also in that the Iron Age settlement was on a larger scale than at the former palatial centres. There was no significant decrease in population discernible at Argos in the Submycenaean, Protogeometric, or Geometric periods. Rather, in the Early Iron Age Argos steadily developed into the largest settlement in the region. In Homer's Catalogue of Ships the city provides 80 ships, fewer only than Pylos' 90 and Mycenae's 100.[955] The evidence from the Bronze Age does not suggest that Argos would in fact have been comparable to Pylos and Mycenae in this way, and it is likely that Homer was influenced by the relative importance of the city in the Iron Age. In short, without the ruins of a major citadel the 'landscape of memory' at Argos fell short of what might have been expected.

This may account for the unusual building project that took place at the Argive Heraion in the 8th century. The terrace at the Heraion was built with Cyclopean masonry, in what Morgan and Whitelaw call a "mock-Mycenaean" style.[956] It was a monumental structure, visible from a wide part of the Argive Plain, and indeed from Argos itself. The terrace deliberately imitated the style of the major Late Helladic citadels of the region. The early excavators even claimed to recognise the hand of the same architect as the enceinte at Tiryns.[957] The terrace was in fact built in the late 8th century. As an Iron Age example of such construction it is unique. In its construction we see the creation of an artificial 'landscape of memory', an imitation of the historic landscapes at Mycenae and Tiryns.

Whether monumental (Mycenae, Tiryns), less monumental (Argos), or artificial (the Argive Heraion), the examples thus far from the Argolid all have the ruined citadel, or the

---

[955] *Iliad* II.559ff.
[956] Morgan and Whitelaw 1991: 84.
[957] Tilton 1902: 109

palace within it, as the most prominent feature of the 'landscape of memory'. At Asine there was a more multi-faceted 'landscape of memory'. The slopes of the Kastraki peak were covered with the remains of the Late Helladic Lower Town which had not been extensively reoccupied, while Barbouna Hill was embedded with and surrounded by fifty Late Helladic chamber tombs. From the Early Iron Age settlement area in the eastern part of the site the twin peaks stood out as the most prominent features of the landscape and reflected two complementary aspects of the 'landscape of memory', the former settlement and the former necropolis.

Iron Age architecture associated with cult at Bronze Age ruins was found at Mycenae, the Argive Heraion, and Asine. At Mycenae the budding cult was formalised when two large terraces were built over the ruins of the former palace in the late 8th or early 7th century. At the Argive Heraion the same process took place with the construction of the monumental terrace in the late 8th century. In both of these cases it is possible that cult buildings stood on the terraces. No architectural remains exist, though a terracotta building model discovered at the Heraion is plausibly but not conclusively claimed as evidence for the existence of such a structure.[958]

At Tiryns no new structures were built associated with the cult on the Upper Citadel. It is worth noting, however, that the construction of a terrace and possibly a cult building would have been unnecessary. The court of the Upper Citadel remained functional after the 'Collapse' and provided ample space in which participants could gather. The matter is disputed amongst the current excavators, but it is also possible that Building T remained standing, at least to some extent, and provided a usable venue for cult activities.

At Asine, the uneven peak of Barbouna Hill at the heart of the Bronze Age necropolis was levelled into a plateau, partly by utilising the natural rock of the hill and partly by building sections of terrace. An apsidal building was constructed on this plateau, followed in the Late Geometric period by a two-roomed rectangular building with benches lining the walls of the back room.

No Iron Age architecture has been found on the Larissa peak at Argos. We may, however, see some similarity with Tiryns here. In the Iron Age the location of the votive

[958] Wright 1982: 191.

deposit within the citadel remained a flat terrace-like area. The construction of a terrace would have been superfluous.

In sum, whether through new construction or the survival of appropriate architectural space from the Late Bronze Age, the cults at Mycenae, Tiryns, Argos, the Argive Heraion, and Asine all took place on flat terraces at the highest or one of the highest points within the 'landscape of memory'. With varying degrees of certainty cult buildings are known or proposed at each of them but Argos.

Drinking vessels were found at all of the Iron Age cults at Bronze Age ruins in the Argolid. Drinking was clearly a central part of the proceedings at each site, but there were other finds and features found at multiple sites. Small bronze votives were found at every site but Asine; other metal items at Mycenae, Asine, and Argos; human or animal figurines at every site but Mycenae. Ash was found at Tiryns and Asine. The deposit at Argos was distinctive as the only one to contain weapons. It also had terracotta pomegranate models and decorated pottery depicting pomegranate branches, items and motifs not found at the other sites.

Attica

At the two Attic sites the 'landscapes of memory' are quite different. The existence of a palace at Athens is disputed, but remains of a series of extensive terraces on the Acropolis are thought to have survived into historic times. In addition, the Acropolis was fortified with monumental defensive walls which remained prominent and visible into the Iron Age and indeed in places up to the present day. Furthermore, it is impossible to assess the 'landscape of memory' at Athens without noting the natural topography of the Acropolis. The rock looms large from every part of the city and is the clearest example of the "dialogue" between architecture and topography. Neither the monumentality of the fortifications nor the dominant presence of the rocky plateau would be complete without the other. Together they would have formed the most powerful and central feature of the 'landscape of memory'.

In contrast, the 'landscape of memory' at Eleusis was focused on the surviving ruins of a particular building complex with Megaron B at its heart. The complex was not in a topographically prominent position, but it was nonetheless a highly visual structure, with

surviving sections of thick walls and surrounding 'peribolos' walls, and with the remains of the protruding platform on which burnt sacrifices likely took place in the Late Helladic period.

Evidence for Iron Age architecture on the Acropolis is limited but useful. Coldstream notes that a decorated terracotta plaque with a pierced suspension hole implies the existence in the mid-8th century of some structure on which or in which it could have been hung,[959] and dating to the end of the 8th century we have two poros stone columns bases. These bases are the only architectural features of the period to have been discovered and were not found in their original position. Little can therefore be said about the building. All in all the architectural evidence is rather thin, and we are left with what Glowacki calls "tantalizing glimpses" of a structure,[960] Dinsmoor's "hypothetical but necessary" cult building.[961] In short, there was possibly a cult building of wood and mud in the mid-8th century, of which nothing survives, and most probably a cult building at the end of the 8th century, of which we only have two column bases.

The constructions that took place at the ruins of the Megaron B complex at Eleusis are unique amongst Iron Age cults at Bronze Age ruins. A retaining wall which supported the area of the Megaron B complex was built in the Late Geometric period. The extent to which the ruined complex was reused prior to the wall's construction is not entirely certain, but it is quite apparent that the ruins remained visible, and that the Eleusinians saw some purpose is preserving them. It is likely that votive offerings were already being deposited at the ruins and that the construction of the wall was an attempt at preventing damage caused by the presence of cult participants. Around the end of the 8th century there followed a set of further retaining walls. The height of these walls suggests that after their construction the ruins were now covered by earth. The focus of the cult moved to a pyre against and in front of the new retaining wall.

The finds associated with the cults at Athens and Eleusis have some similarities as well as some significant differences. Both sites had drinking vessels, animal figurines, human figurines, and small metal votives. In Eleusis, however, the figurines were clay whilst those at

[959] Coldstream 1977: 332.
[960] Glowacki 1998: 85.
[961] Dinsmoor 1947: 109-110.

Athens were bronze. The small metal votives at Eleusis were gold whilst those at Athens were again bronze. Athens additionally had large bronze tripods and large vessels with figured decoration. No such items were found at Eleusis. The sacrificial area at Eleusis was covered with ash, burnt soil, carbonised wood, and charcoal, whilst there is no evidence of burning at Athens.

A clear contrast may be drawn between the two cults. At Athens visuality was key. Large decorated pottery, plaques, and tripods were designed for conspicuous display. They were meant to be seen. At Eleusis, on the other hand, figurines and plaques, as well as valuable but small pieces of gold jewellery, would disappear into the ash and flames. Even the ruins themselves were hidden after the construction of the retaining walls in the second phase of the cult. This 'hiddenness' contributed to Kokkou-Vyridi's interpretation of the cult as 'enagismoi'.[962]

Chronological Patterns

11th Century

The cult at Kommos began at the end of the 11th century with the construction of Temple A, and the Submycenaean funerary cult at Asine is an early example of a cultic engagement with the past in the Argolid.

10th Century

Drinking-related activity in the southwest corner of the Central Court at Knossos began in the 10th or 9th century, though without precise details of the Protogeometric material we cannot establish a narrower date. Specifically votive items from the 10th century remain "elusive".[963] The deposition of votive offerings at the Argive Heraion began in the 10th century.

9th Century

Votive items at Knossos are attested in the PGB and Geometric periods, and Prent notes that by the 9th century cult was "consolidated" amongst the ruins.[964] At Amnisos,

---

962 Kokkou-Vyridi 1999: 264.
963 Coldstream 2000: 286.
964 Prent 2005: 518.

votive deposits at the ashlar wall began in the 9th century. Larger bronze items such as tripods particularly date to the 9th century whilst smaller bronze items were deposited later. Deposits at Agia Triada began in the late 9th century and continued to the early 7th century. At Palaikastro the ash altar may have been established by the late 9th century. The 9th century saw a steady increase in votive deposits at the Argive Heraion. New practices and increased and renewed focus came about at Kommos at the end of the century with the construction of Temple B around 800 BC.

8th Century

At Phaistos the cult at the ruins was perhaps established as early as the late 8th century, the last of the Cretan cults to begin receiving offerings.

Cult activity amongst the ruins of the former palace at Mycenae began in the latter half of the 8th century with drinking and the deposition of votives, some of which were heirlooms from the 10th and 9th centuries. At the end of the 8th century the cult was formalised with the construction of the two large terraces shortly after one another.

The dramatic increase in offerings at the Argive Heraion in the late 8th century indicates a new phase of flourishing cult activity, the same period in which the monumental 'mock-Mycenaean' terrace was built.

At Asine, other than the Sybmycenaean funerary cult in the Lower Town, the various instances of cultic engagement with the past began in the mid-8th century. At the sanctuary on Barbouna Hill the cult had two phases: first an apsidal building dating to around 750 BC, and then a rectangular two-roomed cult building at the end of the 8th century.

At Argos the votive offerings date to the late 8th and early 7th century, whilst at Tiryns votive offerings began from the late 8th century but were buried in the bothros at a later date and with later material.

At Athens the deposition of tripods, large vessels, and other votive items began suddenly and in earnest in the mid-8th century. It is possible that a cult building existed at that time which was made with materials that have not been preserved, but it is known that in the late 8th or early 7th century a structure was built.

At Eleusis the first cult activity amongst the ruins of Megaron B took place a little after the middle of the 8th century, formalised around 735 BC[965] by the construction of the first retaining wall around the ruins, and then transformed by the covering of the ruins with the additional retaining walls and the establishment of Pyre A at the end of the 8th century.

. . .

The above summary of the chronological development of the cults reveals a very clear pattern amongst the regions. In Crete, Iron Age cults at Bronze Age ruins began earlier. Almost all the examples began between 900 and 750 BC. There was drinking in the Central Court at Knossos from the 10th or 9th century, but a decidedly cultic nature is not clear until the 9th century. Temple A at Kommos was built in the 11th century, but there was a significant renewal around 800 BC when Temple B was erected, with the new structure a venue for new cult practices. The cults at Amnisos, Agia Triada, and Palaikastro all commenced in the mid or late 9th century. Only the cult at Phaistos, beginning in the late 8th century, lies outside the 900-750 BC bracket.

In the Argolid and Attica Iron Age cults at Bronze Age ruins began later, and within a shorter time period than in Crete. The cults at Athens, Eleusis, Mycenae, Tiryns, Argos, and on Barbouna Hill at Asine all started receiving offerings between 750 and 700 BC. Only the Argive Heraion began earlier, though its dramatic boom in activity and the construction of the terrace also date to the late 8th century.

965 Eijnde 2010: 152.

Assessing Regional Patterns

The summary of the gathered evidence and identification of regional patterns in the previous chapter allows us to make a number of key observations regarding the differences between Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins in Crete, the Argolid, and Attica.

. . .

There is no single typical 'landscape of memory' with which cult participants engaged, but the Argolid provides the most coherent set of examples.

The similarities between the 'landscapes of memory' at Mycenae, Tiryns, Argos, and the Argive Heraion may reflect their proximity, but it is also significant that there are several lines of mutual visibility and that all four are visible from the Argive Plain. Visuality is the primary way in which people experience the buildings, monuments, and topography that form landscapes. How something can be seen, from where, and from how far determine the nature and extent of its impact on the landscape. A highly visible monument imposes itself upon a larger landscape, taking on a significance which exists beyond its physical dimensions.[966] In the Argolid this is a key concept. The fact that the four sites display a number of similarities, and that all four sites were visible from the plain, indicates that whilst each is within its own 'landscape of memory', together they form a broader and fairly coherent 'landscape of memory'. It is a perfect demonstration of Tilley's synecdoche metaphor. The highest point within each site became a prominent focal point for the 'landscape of memory' of the site as a whole, and through wide visibility became representative feature of the 'landscape of memory' across the whole Argive Plain.

In the Argolid cult sites were designed to be impressive from a distance; Cretans sought to be impressive at closer quarters.

Topography is the clearest contrast between the examples in Crete and the Argolid. To some extent this is straightforwardly explained by the differences between Minoan and Mycenaean palaces, essentially that Minoan palaces were often only slightly elevated over low plains whilst Mycenaean palaces were typically elevated citadels. We cannot, however, remove agency from the Iron Age occupants of these sites. Landscapes are, after all, "ego-

[966] Schama 1995: 18; Cosgrove 1998: 30.

centred",[967] and whilst people in the Iron Age could not change what had survived from centuries ago (with one exception), their choices about which aspects of an historic landscape to engage with reflect their own perspectives of, and intentions for, the 'landscape of memory'.

Mycenae and Argos were both fortified citadels on high peaks overlooking the plain. Tiryns was an elevated citadel within the plain. Even within this context, however, cult activity took place at the highest and most visible point at each site. Arguably more impressive ruins, such as the Lion Gate, were bypassed in favour of maximum height and visibility. The occupants of Mycenae, Tiryns, and Argos could not change what was left to them by their predecessors, but they made clear choices with what they had. The one exception to this is the Argive Heraion. Here the cult participants did in fact change what was left to them by creating their own artificial ruins. The priorities they displayed in their construction of fake ruins were the same ones displayed at other sites around the plain when choosing which real ruins to engage with: elevation and visibility.

The Minoans did not have a tradition of building palaces on high peaks with large fortifications, but that need not have made them any less monumental. Driessen has written eloquently on the different approaches. At Mycenaean palaces "topography and architecture symbiotically act to deliver messages of supremacy and control". At Minoan sites, on the other hand, "the natural, physically unaltered landscape as such acts like a 'monument'". They "are not particularly prominently located on hill-tops", but, "to the contrary, they merge into the landscape or rather, they **are** a type of landscape".[968]

Rather than selecting a single topographical feature to act as a focal point for each site, Cretans instead picked out particular ruins to act as specific focal points. These focal points were not on elevated or otherwise particularly topographically prominent locations that would be visible from afar, as in the Argolid. Instead emphasis was placed on their visuality at close quarters. At Amnisos and Agia Triada individually monumental structures were chosen. The wall at Amnisos formed a kind of wide stage, with the rising slope behind it acting as a backdrop. The monumental staircase at Agia Triada achieved a similar result. Votives were also deposited at Agia Triada in front of and against the Minoan stoa, but not

[967] Bender 1993: 1.
[968] Driessen 2004: 74 (Driessen's emphasis).

inside. This was not the reuse of a building in which to practise cult, but a stage and a visual setting for it.

At Phaistos, the two walls at which votives were deposited met at a junction that created a corner as a natural focus point. At Knossos a similar choice was made, though in this case as one of two complementary cult locations, the relatively hidden space within the ruins of the west wing on the one hand, and the more visible focal point in the southwest corner of the Central Court on the other. At Palaikastro the ash altar was not situated in front of the most monumental ruins. Rather it occupied an area that seems to have had relatively low-lying ruins in the midst of the extensive and undulating 'carpet' of ruins in the former settlement. This created negative space, a kind of 'stage in the round'. In each of these cases the chosen ruins were co-opted to represent the 'landscapes of memory' as a whole.

Kommos is something of an anomaly. Temple A partly reused and reoccupied a large Minoan building, but does not seem to have used the ruins as a particular focal point in the way other cults in Crete did. After the temple's renovation, however, its successor, Temple B had a very specific focal point, the Tripillar Shrine and the wooden pillar behind it. It may be significant that the focal point of a temple set amidst the ruins of monumental buildings was a shrine representing architectural features.

Conspicuous display is emphasised in Crete; participation is emphasised in the Argolid.

The visual aspect of the 'stages' at the Cretan sites is reflected in both the practices and the votive offerings. At Phaistos, Amnisos, and Palaikastro large and valuable items such as bronze shields and tripods were deposited. These offerings were conspicuous, and, since they would not have been affordable for many, they were status symbols. They represent competitive displays in which elite cult participants were making a statement about their position.

The desire to make a competitive statement with votive offerings was not fully realisable for all participants. Whilst large valuable bronze shields went on display at Palaikastro and Phaistos, the votive shields at Amnisos and Agia Triada were clay miniatures. Worshippers at Kommos in the mid to late 8th century put their exotic goods on display but did so unknowledgeably, with a non-matching and incomplete Egyptian figurine triad placed

at random on the Tripillar Shrine. Amnisos and Agia Triada may have served as an arena for more junior, emerging, or aspiring elites from Knossos or Phaistos at a time when the larger centres were once again staking claim over peripheral territory.

There were no large bronze votives at Knossos, but the two-part cult seems to reflect a level of exclusivity and restricted participation. The cooking or burning of sacrificial meat took place in the relatively hidden space of the west wing ruins, whilst drinking took place in the more visible and open space of the Central Court. The progression from secrecy to conspicuity implied by the locations of the two stages of the rites would have served to reinforce the distinction between participants and non-participants, and reflected a "privileged association with the past" for those allowed access.[969]

In the Argolid on the other hand large and valuable items suitable for conspicuous competitive display are much less common. At Mycenae, Tiryns, Argos, and the Argive Heraion the bulk of offerings form a fairly coherent assemblage indicating broad participation, including bronze pins, fibulae, and other small pieces of jewellery, clay and bronze animal and human figurines, and drinking vessels such as skyphoi and oinochoai.

Wider participation is reflected in the architecture at the cult sites. At Mycenae and Asine large terraces that could hold a good number of people were built. At Tiryns and Argos large open courts survived as the setting for cult. And at the Argive Heraion, of course, a terrace was built on which the cult could be practised that was monumental in size.

The Attic sites take divergent approaches from Crete, the Argolid, and each other.

There are similarities and differences between Athens and the cults in both Crete and the Argolid. Like in Crete, the bronze offerings at Athens reflect an interest in competitive display, and large vessels with intricate figured decoration were symbols of wealth and status. The competition taking place at Athens may have been of a different kind, however, with Morgan proposing that the bronze tripods deposited on the Acropolis had been

[969] Prent 2004: 417.

awarded to athletes for victories in a forerunner of the Panathenaic Games, and Touloupa's suggesting that the tripod-attachment figurines found there were depictions of athletes.[970]

On the other hand, Athens seems partly to fall into a similar pattern to sites in the Argolid, with cult activity taking place high on the heavily fortified citadel, with the Late Bronze Age terraces, and possibly a former palace, providing a setting comparable with Mycenae, Tiryns, or Argos.

Athens was appropriating the historic landscape of the Acropolis as the cultural and religious centre of a community, but restricting access to and control of this centre to an emerging aristocracy. In the Argolid and in Crete the affirmation of communal identity and the reinforcement of hierarchy seem to be mutually exclusive. In Athens we are presented with both taking place at the same time.

In Eleusis there were highly valuable votives, but in contrast to Athens they were not for display. There were specific impressive ruins, but they were hidden by the retaining wall. We may recognise in this contrast between Athens and Eleusis the distinction between 'inscribed' and 'incorporated' practices, first identified by Connerton, and the related distinction between 'landscapes *of* memory' and 'landscapes *as* memory' proposed by Küchler.[971]

'Inscribed' practices involve the establishment of a physical and tangible link between the past and the present, whilst 'incorporated' practices are "performative ceremonies which generate bodily sensory and emotional experiences".[972] At Athens we may identify 'inscribed' practices. Highly visual votive offerings created a display that remained highly visual for an extended period of time. The Athenians, perhaps specifically Athenian athletes, were conspicuously marking their connection to the 'landscape of memory'. At Eleusis, on the other hand, we may identify 'incorporated' practices. Votive offerings did not remain visible but disappeared into the ash. The significance of the offerings was not in their display but in their deposition amongst the flames. The votive offering was not an object but an act.

---

970 Morgan 1990: 207; Touloupa 1991: 242.
971 Connerton 1989: 72-73; Küchler 1993: 86.
972 Hamilakis 1998: 117.

Küchler describes 'landscapes *of* memory' as the "inscription of memory" onto a landscape whilst 'landscapes *as* memory' are landscapes as the "process of remembering".[973] The distinction may be discernible in Athens and Eleusis. In Athens the cult participants added to the 'landscape of memory' of the Acropolis with their conspicuous votive offerings. A memory of the site as an historic place was inscribed upon it. At Eleusis, the primary feature of the 'landscape of memory', the Megaron B complex, was not added to, but rather hidden away and subsumed within the landscape. Complemented by the incorporated practices associated with the cult, it became 'landscape *as* memory'.

Eleusis seems to defy the application of either hypothesis. It does not sit atop an elevated citadel as a kind of beacon projecting a declaration of communal identity to the surrounding area. Nor does it have display items indicative of an elite group projecting its status within a hierarchy. Its valuable but small gold votives and the collection of humble figurines all deposited within the ash altar seem rather to be personal. When the construction of the retaining walls covered over the ruins, it does not seem that the ruins became less important, as is arguably the case at Mycenae, but more. It is the one site where the ruins do not seem to be part of a 'landscape of memory', but are actually 'landscape *as* memory'. For the individual participant at the cult at Eleusis the ruins, the landscape, their memory, and their identity are fused.

[973] Ibid: 86.

Testing the Hypotheses of the Thesis

The chapter uses the analysis above to test the four hypotheses proposed in this thesis: that the ruins of the Bronze Age inspired a cultural memory of a glorious past represented in Homer and other oral tradition; that the commemoration of cultural memories fostered a common sense of identity; that cultural memories were a useful tool in the acquisition and consolidation of power; and that cultural memory is malleable, and 'invented' memories could be powerful in early Greece. We examine the extent to which each of these hypotheses has been demonstrated by the evidence that has been gathered.

. . .

First Hypothesis: Cultural memory of the Bronze Age was attractive to the Iron Age Greeks, who understood the ruins to belong to the glorious past represented in Homer and other oral tradition.

Coldstream attributed hero and tomb cult to the influence of Homer, suggesting that the creation and propagation of his epic poems led to an interest in finding and engaging with the Bronze Age past.[974] Part I noted, however, that we should look beyond Homer, at the broader oral tradition, which particularly in the 8th century began to be expressed through a variety of media, not only artistic, such as narrative pottery decoration, and of course lyric and epic poetry, and also religious, namely hero and tomb cult.

These examples align with the media of cultural memory identified by Alcock and Van Dyke and outlined in Part I.[975] Tomb and hero cult perpetuate cultural memories through ritual, poetry through narrative, and decorated pottery through artistic representations of the past. The fourth and final medium of cultural memory is place. The ruins of the Bronze Age, particularly those that were architecturally or topographically monumental, provided the perfect candidates for a perpetuation of memory through the medium of historic places.

These ruins were not necessarily newly discovered and in many of the sites we know that there had been populations residing near Bronze Age ruins in the Early Iron Age and

[974] Coldstream 1976: 14.
[975] Alcock and Van Dyke 2003: 4-5.

leaving them undisturbed. We must identify the *point de départ*,[976] the aspect of people's own time that inspired them to turn to the past and commemorate and engage with cultural memories. The 8th century was a period of social and political change. As discussed in Chapter Two, the population of Greece was both booming and nucleating at urbanising settlements. Organised arable agriculture, though not new, was becoming increasingly vital in feeding more people. The spread of organised arable agriculture led to more settlements acquiring and delineating swathes of fixed non-urban territory for the first time since the 'Collapse'.

This collective sense of territory in a community and the mutual responsibility for its protection were the driving forces behind the shared cultural and ethnic identity which would be a defining feature of the polis. The search for this collective identity may provide the *point de départ* for the renewed interest in commemorating a common past and engaging with cultural memory. It manifests in oral tradition, in tomb and hero cult, and indeed in cult at ruins.

Second Hypothesis: In a period of social and political change the commemoration of cultural memory through cult at ruins could unify growing communities through the sense of a common past and identity

In the Argolid the tendency is towards wider participation in cults in which monumental topography is the spatial focus and a variety of smaller items with lower value are deposited. The shared participation in communal drinking and other cult activity at the heart of a shared 'landscape of memory' would have highlighted and strengthened the identity of the community through a commemoration of their common past. It is clear that women were very much part of the proceedings, as may have been children at Larissa and Tiryns. In a commemoration of communal memory this would have been essential. On a more conceptual level, the participants in these cults were associating images of domestic and everyday life – cloaks and pins, sheep and cattle, perhaps even childbirth and children –

[976] Alcock 2002: 32.

with the memories resonating in the ruins and the landscape. The authentication of your family, your home, and your land through a connection with the past was desirable.

The fact that these same developments were happening at around the same time at nearby settlements suggests that they may be cases of competitive emulation as part of peer-polity interaction amongst communities around the plain.[977] This interpretation is strengthened by the construction towards the end of the 8th century of two large terraces in quick succession at Mycenae and of the 'mock-Mycenaean' terrace at the Argive Heraion. The terrace at the Heraion is most obviously competitive emulation, seeking to rival the mighty ruins of Tiryns and Mycenae. The quick succession of the two phases of the North Terrace at Mycenae further indicates the sense of 'one-upmanship' that is characteristic of peer-polity interaction.

A further point may be raised with regard to the competitive developments at communities around the Argive Plain. Prior to the construction of the terraces at Mycenae, cult activity was taking place immersed amongst the ruins of the former palace. The individual and group experience of the connection with the past was clear. This may have only been the case for around a generation, after which North Terrace I and soon after North Terrace II were built. These large, flat, open, and elevated platforms raised cult participants away from the actual physical ruins of the former palace. The personal physical and spatial interaction with the palace ruins was gone. At the Heraion, of course, there never really was a personal interaction with any 'real' Bronze Age ruins, as the terrace was a contemporary structure. Other concerns – competition, rivalry, space for communal participation – were more important than the ruins.

With the discontinuation of the cult at Argos, cult amongst fake ruins at the Heraion, and the elevation of the cult area away from the ruins themselves at Mycenae, we must also recognise that, effective as the association with the ruins was, its usefulness was somewhat brief. The common identity reinforced by their commemoration was the reverse of the coin to the inter-community rivalry engendered by competitive emulation. There were two parallel developments in the formation of identity, identifying with one's own community, and *not* identifying with rival communities.

---

[977] Renfrew 1986: 6ff.

Third Hypothesis: When cultural memory forms an integral part of a society's 'ritual time'[978], it can become a powerful tool in the creation and reinforcement of hierarchy.

In Part I we discussed a number of ways in which ritual activity and power are connected. Bloch identifies a dichotomy between "ritual time" and "mundane time". Some societies function in "mundane" time, in which there is the "absence of the past as a subject matter in their discourse". Others function in "ritual" time, "where the past and the present are so fused that the present is a mere manifestation of the past."[979] Those that function in 'ritual time', he argues, place greater value on established structures and hierarchies and reinforce them through ritual, which is perceived as a greater authority through its apparently timeless and unchanging nature.

The transition between the mundane and the ritual is described by Turner as the 'liminal' stage of *rites de passage*. In the *rite de passage*, a select group is first subject to 'separation', literal or symbolic, in which participants are detached from their usual place, role, or status. The 'liminal' stage follows, in which participants are of ambiguous status, "neither here nor there", "both in and out of time".[980] Finally, participants undergo 'aggregation', in which they are returned to society with a new social status.

The ambiguous status of ruins has been discussed a number of time in the thesis. They represent "permanence in the face of loss";[981] they belong to the past and the present simultaneously; they are physical and concrete but also timeless and symbolic. We may therefore recognise cult at ruins as an appropriate setting for the 'liminal' phase of a *rite de passage*. Applying the theories of both Bloch and Turner, we might expect to see selective access to the liminal space of ruins used in the reinforcement of status. This is certainly the case in Crete.

At Knossos cult was practised in the liminal space of the former palace, away from the settlement areas. Restricted access to the ruins indicates that some kind of special status

978 Bloch 1977: 288.
979 Bloch 1977: 288.
980 Turner 1969: 94.
981 Porter 2011: 685-686.

was associated with participation in the cult. At Amnisos and Agia Triada cult was practised at abandoned sites at the limits of newly regained Knossian and Phaistian territory. Palaikastro probably represented some kind of neutral space between the territories of East Cretan communities. These too were clearly liminal spaces. In the process of separation and 'aggregation' we may recognise the cults at Amnisos and Agia Triada specifically as *rites de passage*. Elites from Knossos and Phiastos were separated from their community by going to Amnisos and Agia Triada at the edge of their respective territories. There they participated in cult activities that incorporated the competitive display of their social status, before presumably returning to home. Upon their return and their 'aggregation' with society they renewed or reinforced their elite social status.

Participation in the Cretan cults amongst the ruins reflected, and perhaps conferred, social status. The restriction of access to participation and the highly visual manner in which votives indicating high status were displayed indicate that the cults were furthermore a means of reinforcing and consolidating this hierarchy. Through its privileged association with the cultural memory of a glorious past represented in Homer and oral tradition, this hierarchy was subsumed into the 'ritual time' of Cretan communities. Ruins represent a timeless quality, and by linking the ruins with status, some of this quality could be appropriated. The power of the elites could be perceived to be as timeless as the ruins, and therefore gain greater authority.

Fourth Hypothesis: Cultural memory is fluid and variously malleable. It had versatile properties in Iron Age Greece, and even 'invented' memories inspired and influenced cult activity.

In Part I we discussed how 'landscapes of memory' can inspire a "spectrum" of cultural memories.[982] Using the example of Stonehenge we explored how different memories and different practices could even be applied to the same monument. In addition, we raised the point that cultural memories are not limited by actual historical fact. Bachelard notes that when it comes to 'knowledge' of the past, subjective perception is more important that objective historical fact,[983] whilst Bradley recognises that it is the perceived timelessness of

[982] Alcock 2002: 24.
[983] Bachelard 1994: 188.

ritual and memory that is powerful.[984] Whitley makes the point succinctly when he observes that "the fiction as much as the fact of continuity is widely held to be desirable".[985] The past can be perceived differently by different individuals or groups. These memories may have little or no historical basis, but if they are believed by people in the present and perceived as important by them, then they can have real effect and influence.

At the Argive Heraion we clearly see the commemoration of a cultural memory that has no historical basis. Argos was one of the most powerful cities in Homer, its contribution to the Catalogue of Ships only bettered by Mycenae and Pylos. In the 8th century Argos was indeed establishing itself as the foremost power in the region, but a similar importance in the Late Bronze Age is not reflected in the archaeological record. Extensive and monumental ruins like those at Mycenae and Tiryns did not exist at Argos. A cult amongst the ruins on Larissa must have felt somewhat inadequate by comparison, and certainly not reflective of the community's contemporary status.

The construction of the terrace at the Argive Heraion invented two memories. First, it masqueraded as a monumental Bronze Age fortification comparable with other citadels, creating a memory of Argos as having been more powerful and important in the Bronze Age than was actually historically the case. Secondly, it fabricated an historic connection between Argos and the slopes on the opposite side of the plain. There was a later Argive tradition in which cult participants would process from Argos to their extra-urban sanctuary at the Heraion, reasserting their symbolic claim on the territory of the plain.[986] Even in the 8th century, though, the construction of this terrace facing out across the plain to Argos, measuring 55.8m by 33.4m and with some blocks as large as 5.2m by 2.0m, was a statement of intent. At the Heraion the demarcation of territory was given authority through the invention of an historic claim to the plain.

We may see at the Argive Heraion an example of "reflexive" memory.[987] Assmann explains that cultural memory is "practice-reflexive": commemorative practices may be based on a cultural memory of the past, but these practices also help to create new memories and traditions. It is "self-reflexive": cultural memories are constantly reinforced

---

[984] Bradley 1991: 211.
[985] Whitley 1995: 49.
[986] De Polignac 1995: 41; Hall 1995: 578.
[987] Assmann 1995: 132.

or re-established through the continuous acquisition of new experiences and memories. And finally, it is "group-reflexive": the collective identity of the community is forged, reinvented, or perpetuated through the commemoration of select memories.[988]

The people of Argos had a cultural memory of a glorious past, one that was reflected in oral tradition but not in their landscape. The construction of the terrace demonstrates "practice-reflexive" memory in that it commemorates this tradition, but in doing so creates an 'historic' landscape appropriate to such a memory. These memories are "self-reflexive" in that the cultural memory of Argos enshrined in oral tradition is reinforced by the new experience of Argos' own 'ruined citadel'. Finally, the memories are "group-reflexive" in that the collective identity of those who held them was reinforced by the shared commemoration of the invented 'landscape of memory' at the Heraion. Just as with oral tradition, the 'invented' memories commemorated at the Cyclopean terrace were not static and objective, but continuously developing cultural perceptions of the past.

The 'invented' nature of the cultural memory commemorated at the Heraion should not, however, negate the fact it was powerful. The construction of the terrace in the late 8th century coincided with a boom in cult activity at the sanctuary.[989] Ginsberg asserts that ruins and the memories associated with them could be symbolic, political, and sentimental.[990] The evidence from the Argive Heraion suggests that artificial ruins and invented memories could be too.

Temple B at Kommos was set amongst and partly reused the ruins of monumental Late Bronze Age buildings. Whilst the rectangular temple building itself was not particularly unusual, its contents certainly were. Phoenicians had been trading at Kommos since the 10th century, with some perhaps seasonally resident there from the 9th century, and the tripillar shrine and the wooden cult object placed behind it clearly indicate the influence of eastern cult practices. The shrine, in Negbi's words, represents the most western example of "Phoenician cult at home".[991]

---

[988] Ibid.
[989] Hägg 1992: 15.
[990] Ginsberg 2004: 109-114.
[991] Negbi 1992: 609.

At all the other examples of Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins the participants in the cult had some plausible sense of 'ancestral' connection to the ruins, by living near them or having a cultural memory of territorial control over their location. At Kommos this would have been the case for the Cretans who practised cult there, but for the Phoenicians there can have been no memory of an 'ancestral' connection to the ruins. How would they have experienced the 'landscape of memory' at the site? It may have been the case that common ground with the Cretans was found in a memory of the monumental ruins as belonging to trade-related administrative hubs – a unifying 'landscape of memory' based on function rather than 'ancestral' ownership, in which monumental ruins were significant for their former roles rather than their former occupants. That is to say, perhaps they did not see themselves as Phoenicians practising cult amongst Cretan ruins, but seafaring traders practising cult amongst ruins belonging to seafaring traders.

Studies of inter-community conflict find that ecumenism and other forms of shared religious worship are effective tools in alleviating tensions between rival ethnic and religious identities.[992] It may be that combining religious elements of the Cretans and the Phoenicians and practising cult together was a method of ensuring that the two communities enjoyed friendly cooperation in trade and tension-free coexistence at Kommos.

At Kommos we cannot necessarily identify the 'invention' of memories, but we see the manner in which cultural memory can be fluid and malleable. Ruins to which Phoenicians had no 'ancestral' connection are commemorated by them, and they take on some kind of shared significance to both Phoenicians and Cretans.

[992] Appleby 2000; Power 2007.

Explaining the Research Results

Having identified and assessed regional patterns, and applied them to the hypotheses of the thesis, it remains only to seek an explanation for the differences displayed.

. . .

The proof of the second hypothesis in the Argolid and of the third hypothesis in Crete begs the questions of why Iron Age communities in the two regions took different approaches to cult at Bronze Age ruins. As outlined in Part I, when analysing a community's commemoration of a cultural memory, we must look not to their past but to their present. What was the *point de départ*? That is, can we identify anything about their own time, their social, cultural, or political circumstances, that motivated them to look to the past?

The 9th and 8th centuries were a time of growing populations, the expansion of arable farming, and nucleation at larger settlements with increasingly fixed territory, developments that laid the foundations for the subsequent emergence of the polis. In the Argolid, this is easily discernible as the largest settlements of the region evolved into independent and rival communities. This independence was despite close proximity, and the mutual visibility of the settlements perched on elevated ground around the edges of the Argive Plain would have presented each community with a continual reminder of the near presence of their rivals. It produced what we may term a 'claustrophobic' region, with multiple communities vying for dominance in a restricted landscape.

In this 'claustrophobic' region, the late 8th century commemoration of Bronze Age ruins and the reoccupation of a 'landscape of memory' was a means of "authenticating" each city's individual identity and "establishing a sense of unity in the community".[993]

The political context of our Cretan examples is rather different from the Argolid. The Cretan cults began earlier than in the Argolid, and in the 9th century Crete was not experiencing the emergence of independent communities with rival identities but rather had broader regional ethnic groups within which 'aristocratic' families retained power and between whom interaction could be relatively limited.[994]

---

[993] Foley 1988: 140.
[994] Prent 2005: 226.

Compared with the Argolid, Crete was a distinctly 'un-claustrophobic' region, and this is apparent in the cults examined in this thesis. Knossian and Phaistian expansion to Amnisos, Agia Triada, and Kommos does not seem to have been at the expense of rivals, and, rather than being crowded, neighbouring communities in East Crete even had room for unclaimed and neutral places like Palaikastro. In this context, the motivation behind the engagement with the past was not to seek a celebration of communal identity in competition with other communities, but for the ruling elites to reinforce and consolidate their status.

In Attica, Van den Eijnde highlights the pre-eminence of Athens amongst settlements of the Early Iron Age,[995] and, borrowing Morgan's term, he identifies it as a regional "Big Site".[996] "Big Sites" are defined by their "stability and size", and are places that "hold a special symbolic significance because of the historic monuments and common traditions that were part of its physical and symbolic morphology".[997] It is not apparent that Eleusis was under the formal control of Athens at this stage, but Van den Eijnde nonetheless sees it as a community that "simultaneously stood in a relationship of dependency and autonomy with regard to Athens".[998]

As a result, he argues, the cult at the ruins of Megaron B should be interpreted as a direct response to Athens, where, less than a generation earlier, cult activities had been initiated on the Acropolis. The use of terraces may have been an attempt to mirror the activities at Athens where it is thought the cult, at least at first, took place in the open air on the Late Helladic terraces that had formerly supported the palace.[999] According to Van den Eijnde, in a demonstration of competitive emulation in peer-polity interaction, Eleusis established a cult "closely modeled" on the cult on the Athenian Acropolis.[1000]

This thesis, however, has demonstrated the individuality of the cult at Eleusis. The burial of ruins, a pyre at a retaining wall as the focus of cult, the deposition of valuable but small votives – these features are all quite distinct from the cult at Athens, Rather than pursuing emulation, Hodder argues that at times of inter-community competition,

---

[995] Cavanagh 1991: 8; Van den Eijnde 2010: 330.
[996] Van den Eijnde 2010: 331; Morgan 2003: 45ff.
[997] Van den Eijnde 2010: 331.
[998] Ibid: 411.
[999] Ibid: 375.
[1000] Ibid.

differences in material culture can be highlighted and even exaggerated in order to emphasise a distinct identity.[1001] It is possible that in the face of a rival, more powerful, nearby community first starting to flex its muscles, the inhabitants of Eleusis were asserting their own local communal identity through deliberately distinctive practices.

[1001] Hodder 1982: 186-190.

Final Remarks

In testing the four hypotheses of the thesis, we find that only the first, that Bronze Age ruins were attractive to Iron Age Greeks who recognised in them a cultural memory of a glorious past, is applicable to all of the sites. The second hypothesis, that cultural memory could unify communities through the commemoration of a common identity, was found to be the case with the sites around the Argive Plain, where local identities competed within a broader 'landscape of memory', but does not appear to be the emphasis in other regions. The third hypothesis, that the commemoration of cultural memory could be an effective tool in reinforcing hierarchy, was found to be the case in Crete, where cults at ruins were characterised by elite competitive display and restricted access to transformative liminal spaces. The fourth hypothesis, that cultural memory is fluid and malleable, is demonstrated at the Argive Heraion, where an artificial commemoration of the past coincided with a dramatic increase in activity at the sanctuary, and at Kommos, where communities without an obvious shared identity were able to find common ground and practise cult together.

The scope of this thesis was Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins between 1000 and 700 BC. Every one of the cult sites investigated has a longer history of activity going beyond 700 BC, with almost all becoming fully-fledged sanctuaries in later periods. We have observed, however, that at certain sites the direct personal immersion of cult participants amongst the ruins became less important even in the early stages of the sanctuary's development. An opportunity for future research would be a diachronic study that sought to track the changing relationship between the cults and the ruins from the Early Iron Age into the Archaic period and beyond.

This thesis has examined a series of sites that exhibit Iron Age cult at Bronze Age ruins, and found that in a period of great social and political change the ritual engagement with the past was a powerful representation of identity, whether shared civic identity, exclusive elite identity, or some kind of 'ecumenical' identity, as at Kommos. Cults at ruins may be considered alongside tomb and hero cult as part of a broad cultic engagement with the past in the period. All draw on communities' cultural memories of the past and in doing so reflect their contemporary societies.

When investigating the motivations of cult participants to commemorate the past, analysing the effects of their doing so, and attempting to do so with an entirely dispassionate

approach, it is tempting to ascribe the same dispassionate approach to the cult participants. Parker notes, however, that in the assessment of such cult activities "one mustn't forget that they did actually believe in it".[1002] It is an important point. Iron Age Greeks did not pursue a cultic engagement with ruins *because* it was effective in creating community cohesion or in reinforcing and consolidating hierarchy. They did so because the ruins, the sense of 'permanence in the face of loss', of being part of something that belongs simultaneously to the present and to the distant past, made them *feel* something, and it is this that made them both attractive and powerful.

[1002] Parker 2013, personal correspondence.

Bibliography

Abramson 1979: Abramson, H., 1979, "A Hero Shrine for Phrontis at Sounion?", *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 12, pp 1-19.

Adams 1978: Adams, L.G., 1978, *Orientalizing Sculpture in Soft Limestone from Crete and Mainland Greece*, Oxford.

Adichie 2009: Adichie, C.N., 2009, "The Danger of a Single Story", *TEDGlobal 2009*.

Adrymi-Sismani 1994: Adrymi-Sismani, V., 1994, "Η μυκηναϊκή πόλη στο Διμήνι: Νεότερα δεδομένα για την αρχαία Ιωλκό", in Koliou 1994, pp 17-43.

Albers 2004: Albers, G., 2004, "Re-evaluating Mycenaean Sanctuaries", in Wedde 2004, pp 111-149.

Alcock 2002: Alcock, S. E., 2002, *Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscapes, Monuments, and Memory*, Cambridge.

Alcock and Osborne 1994: Alcock, S.E., and Osborne, R., (eds), 1994, *Placing the gods: sanctuaries and space in Ancient Greece*, Oxford.

Alcock and Van Dyke 2003: Alcock, S.E., and Van Dyke, R.M., (eds), 2003, *Archaeologies of Memory*, Oxford.

Alexiou 1958: Alexiou, S., 1958, "Η μινωική θεά μεθ' υψωμένων χειρών", *KCh* 12, pp 179-299.

Alfayé Villa 2010: Alfayé Villa, S., 2010, "Nails for the dead: A polysemic account of an ancient funerary practice", in Gordon and Simón 2010, pp 427-456.

Anderson 1982: Anderson, B., 1982, *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*, London.

Antonaccio 1992: Antonaccio, C.M., 1992, "Terraces, tombs, and the early Argive Heraion", *Hesperia* 61.1, pp. 85-105.

Antonaccio 1995: Antonaccio, C.M., 1995, *An Archaeology of Ancestors: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece*, Lanham, MD.

Appadurai 1981: Appadurai, A., "The Past is a Scarce Resource", *Man New Series* 16.2, pp 201-219.

Appleby 2000: Appleby, R.S., 2000, *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation*, Lanham MD.

Aravantinos 2014: Aravantinos, V., 2014, "The sanctuaries of Herakles and Apollo Ismenios at Thebes: new evidence", in Charalambidou and Morgan 2014, pp 218-27.

Aslan 2011: Aslan, C.C., 2011, "A Place of Burning: Hero or Ancestor Cult at Troy", *Hesperia* 80, pp 381-492.

Assmann 1995: Assmann, J., 1995, "Collective Memory and Social Identity", *New German Critique* 65, pp 125-133.

Assmann 1997: Assmann, J., 1997, *Moses the Egyptian: the memory of Egypt in western monotheism*, Cambridge.

Assmann 2011: Assmann, J., 2011, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilisation*, Cambridge.

Bachelard 1994: Bachelard, G., 1994 [1957], *The Poetics of Space*, Boston.

Backe-Forsberg and Risberg 2002: Backe-Forsberg, Y., and Risberg, C., 2002, "Archaeometallurgical methods applied to remains of iron production from the Geometric Period at Asine", in Wells 2002, pp 85-94.

Baikie 1910: Baikie, J., 1910, *The Sea-Kings of Crete*, London.

Balanos 1937: Balanos, N., "'Η νέα ἀναστήλωσις τοῦ ναοῦ τής ' Αθηνάς Νίκης", *ArchEph* G (1956), pp 776–807.

Basso and Feld 1996: Basso, K.H., and Feld, S., 1996, *Senses of Place*, Santa Fe.

Baumbach 2004: Baumbach, J.D., 2004, *The significance of votive offerings in selected Hera sanctuaries in the Peloponnese, Ionia, and Western Greece*, Oxford.

Beloch 1910: Beloch, J., 1910, *Saggi di storia antica e di archeologica*, Rome.

Bender 1993: Bender, B, (ed), 1993, *Landscape, Politics, and Perspectives*, Oxford.

Bennet 1985: Bennet, J., 1985, "The Structure of the Linear B Administration at Knossos", *AJA* 89.2, pp 231-249.

Benton 1943: Benton, S., 1943, "Bronzes from Palaikastro and Praisos", *BSA* 40, pp 51-59.

Bérard 1982: Bérard, C., 1982, "Récupérer la mort du prince. Héroisation et formation de la cité", in Vernant 1982, pp 89-105.

Bikai 2000: Bikai, P.M., 2000, "The Phoenician Ceramics from the Greek Sanctuary" in Shaw, J.W., and Shaw, M.C., 2000, pp 302-321.

Bintliff 1977: Bintliff, J.L., 1977, *Natural environment and human settlement in prehistoric Greece, based on original fieldwork*, Oxford.

Blackwell 2014: Blackwell, N.G., 2014, "Making the Lion Gate Relief at Mycenae: Tool Marks and Foreign Influence", AJA 118, pp 451-488.

Blegen 1921: Blegen, C.W. 1921, *Korakou: A Prehistoric Settlement near Corinth*, Boston.

Blegen 1937: Blegen, C.W., 1937, *Prosymna: The Helladic Settlement Preceding the Argive Heraeum*, Cambridge.

Bloch 1977: Bloch, M., 1977, "The Past and the Present in the Present", *Man New Series 12.2*, pp 278-292.

Boric 2010: Boric, D., (ed), 2010, *Archaeology and Memory*, Oxford.

Bosanquet and Dawkins 1923: Bosanquet, R., and Dawkins, R., 1923, "The Unpublished Objects from the Palaikastro Excavations, 1902-1906", *BSASP* 1, pp 1-160.

Bradley 1991: Bradley, R., 1991, "Ritual, Time, and History", *World Archaeology* 23.2, pp 209-219.

Bradley and Williams 1998: Bradley, R., and Williams, H., 1998, "The past in the past: the re-use of ancient monuments", *WA* 30(1), pp 13-22.

Branigan 1998: Branigan, K., 1998, *Cemetery and Society in the Aegean Bronze Age*, Sheffield.

Brenningmeyer 2003: Brenningmeyer, T., 2003, *Post Bronze Age Architecture at Ano Englianos: Architectural Commemoration of a Bronze Age Site*, PhD Thesis, University of Minnesota.

Brüggemann 2015: Brüggemann, N., 2015, *Tiryns XVIII: Kult im Archaischen Tiryns*, Wiesbaden.

Buitron-Oliver 1991: Buitron-Oliver, D. (ed), 1991, *New Perspectives in Early Greek Art. National Gallery of Art*, London.

Cadogan, Hatzaki, and Vassilakis 2004: Cadogan, G., Hatzaki, E., and Vassilakis, A., (eds), 2004, *Knossos: palace, city, state: proceedings of the conference in Herakleion organised by the British School at Athens and the 23rd Ephoreia of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities of Herakleion, in November 2000, for the Centenary of Sir Arthur Evans' excavations at Knossos*, London.

Canciani 1970: Canciani, F., 1970, *Bronzi orientali e orientalizzanti a Creta nell VIII e VII sec. a. C.*, Rome.

Carinci 2004: Carinci, F.M., 2004, "Haghia Triada nel periodico Medio Minoico", *Creta Antica* 4, pp 97-144.

Carr-Gomm 1996: Carr-Gomm, P., 2006, *What do druids believe?*, Granta (http://www.druidry.org/druid-way/teaching-and-practice/druid-festivals website retrieved 12/2/2014).

Catling 1986: Catling, H., 1986, "Excavations at the Menelaion: 1985", *LS* 10, pp 205-216.

Cavanagh 1991: Cavanagh, W.G., 1991, "Surveys, Cities, and Synoecism", in Rich and Wallace-Hadrill 1991, pp 97-118.

Cavanagh and Curtis 1998: Cavanagh, W.G. and Curtis, M. (eds), 1998, *Post-Minoan Crete: proceedings of the First Colloquium on Post-Minoan Crete held by the British School at Athens and the Institute of Archaeology, University College London, 10-11 November 1995*, London.

Cavanagh and Mee 1998: Cavanagh, W., and Mee, C., 1998, *A Private Place: Death in Prehistoric Greece*, Jonsered.

Charalambidou and Morgan 2014: Charalambidou, X., and Morgan, C. (eds), 2014, *Interpeting the Seventh Century BC. Tradition and Innovation*, Oxford.

Coldstream 1968: Coldstream, J.N., 1968, *Greek Geometric Pottery. A Survey or Ten Local Styles and their Chronology*, London.

Coldstream 1976: Coldstream, J.N., 1976, "Hero-Cults in the Age of Homer", *JHS 96*, pp 8-17.

Coldstream 1977: Coldstream, J.N., 1977, *Geometric Greece*, London.

Coldstream 1998: Coldstream, J.N., 1998, "Minos Redivivus: some nostalgic Knossians of the ninth century BC", in Cavanagh and Curtis 1998, pp 58-61.

Coldstream 2000: Coldstream, J.N, 2000, "Evans's Greek Finds: The Early Greek Town of Knossos, and Its Encroachment on the Borders of the Minoan Palace", *BSA 95*, pp 259-299.

Coldstream and Catling 1996: Coldstream, J.N., and Catling, H.W., (eds), 1996, *Knossos North Cemetery: Early Greek Tombs,* London.

Connerton 1989: Connerton, P., 1989, *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge.

Cook 1953a: Cook, J.M., 1953, "Mycenae 1939-1952, Part III: The Agamemnoneion", *BSA* 48, pp 30-68.

Cook 1953b: Cook, J.M., 1953, "The Cult of Agamemnon at Mycenae", in Keramopoullos 1953, pp 112-118.

Cosgrove 1998: Cosgrave, D., 1998, *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*, Wisconsin.

Cosmopoulos 2014: Cosmopoulos, M., 2014, "Cult, Continuity, and Social Memory: Mycenaean Eleusis and the Transition to the Early Iron Age", *AJA* 118, pp 401-427.

Cosmopoulos 2015: Cosmopoulos, M., 2015, *Bronze Age Eleusis and the Origins of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, New York.

Courbin 1955: Courbin, P., 1955, "Argos: Quartier Sud", *BCH 79*, pp 312-314.

Courbin 1957: Courbin, P., 1957, "Une tombe géométrique d'Argos", *BCH 81*, pp 322-386.

Courbin 1966: Courbin, P., 1966, *La céramique géométrique de L'Argolide,* Paris.

Cucuzza 1998: Cucuzza, N., 1998, "Geometric Phaistos: a survey", in Cavanagh and Curtis 1998, pp 62-68.

Cucuzza 2003: Cucuzza, N., 2003, "Il volo del grifo: osservazioni sulla Haghia Triada 'micenea'", *Creta Antica* 4, pp 199-272.

Cucuzza 2013: Cucuzza, N., 2013, "Minoan Ruins in Archaic Crete", in Niemeier, Pilz, and Kaiser 2013, pp 31-41.

Cullen 2001: Cullen, T., (ed), 2001, *Aegean Prehistory: A Review*, Boston.

Cunningham 2007: Cunningham, T., 2007, "In the shadows of Kastri: an examination of domestic and civic space at Palaikastro", in Westgate, Fischer, and Whitley 2007, pp 99-109.

D'Agata 1996: D'Agata, A.L., 1996, "The 'Lord' of Asine reconsidered: techique, type and chronology", in Hägg, Nordquist, and Wells 1996, pp 39-46.

D'Agata 1998: D'Agata, A.L., 1998, "Changing patterns in a Minoan and Post-Minoan sanctuary: the case of Agia Triada", in Cavanagh and Curtis 1998, pp 19-26.

D'Agata 1999: D'Agata, A.L., 1999, *Haghia Triada II. Statuine minoiche* e *post-minoiche dai vecchi scavi di Haghia Triada (Creta)*, Padova.

D'Agata and Moody 2005: D'Agata, A.L., and Moody, J., (eds), 2005, *Ariadne's Threads: Connections between Crete and the Greek Mainland in Late Minoan III (LM IIIA2 to LM IIIC). Proceedings of the International Workshop Held at Athens, Scuola Archaeologica Italiana, 5-6 April 2003,* Athens.

Darcque 1981: Darcque, P., 1981, "Les vestiges mycéniens découverts sous le Telestérion d'Eleusis", *BCH* 105, pp 593-605.

Darcque and Trueil 1990: Darcque, P., and Trueil, R. (eds), 1990, *L'Habitat Egéen Préhistorique*, Athens,

Daux 1959: Daux, G., 1959, "Chronique des fouilles", *BCH* 83, pp 567-793.

Daux 1969: Daux, G., 1969, "Chronique des fouilles", *BCH* 93, pp 955-1067.

Davis 1977: Davis, E.N. (ed), 1977, *Symposium on the Dark Ages in Greece*, New York.

Davis 2008: David, J.L. (ed), 2008, *Sandy Pylos: An Archaeological History from Nestor to Navarino (2nd Edition)*, Princeton.

Davis and Lynch 2017: Davis, J., and Lynch, K., "Remembering and Forgetting Nestor: Pylian Pasts Pluperfect?", in Sherratt and Bennet 2017, pp 53-73.

Dawkins, Hawes, and Bosanquet 1904-1905: Dawkins, R.M., Hawes, C.H., and Bosanquet, R.C., 1904-1905, "Excavations at Palaikastro IV", *BSA* 11, pp 258-308.

De Cou 1905: De Cou, H.F., 1905, "The Bronzes of the Argive Heraeum", in Waldstein 1905, pp 191-342.

De Polignac 1984: De Polignac, F., 1984, *La naissance de la cité grecque. Cultes, espace et societé VIIIe-VIIe siècles avant J.-C.*, Paris.

De Polignac 1994: De Polignac, F., 1994, "Mediation, Competition, and Sovereignty. The Evolution of Rural Sanctuaries in Geometric Greece", in Alcock and Osborne 1994, pp 3-18.

De Polignac 1995: De Polignac, F., 1995, *Cults, territory and the origins of the Greek city-state*, Paris (/Chicago – Janet Lloyd translation).

Deger-Jalkotzy and Zavadil 2007: Deger-Jalkotzy, S. and Zavadil, M., (eds) 2007, *LHIIIC Chronology and Synchronisms II, LHIIIC Middle: proceedings of the international workshop held at the Austrian Academy of Sciences at Vienna , October 29th and 30th, 2004*, Vienna.

Deïlaki 1982: Deïlaki, E.P., "Από το Άργος από του 8ο και 7ο αι. π.Χ.", *ASAtene 60*, pp 33-48.

Desborough 1952: Desborough, V.R., 1952, *Protogeometric Pottery*, Oxford.

Desborough 1964: Desborough, V.R., 1964, *The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors. An Archaeological Survey c. 1200-1000 B.C.,* Oxford.

Desborough, Nicholls, and Popham 1970: Desborough, V., Nicholls, R., and Popham, M., 1970, "A Euboean Centaur", *BSA* 65, pp 7-11.

Deshayes 1966: Deshayes, J., 1966, *Argos: Les fouilles de la Deiras*, Paris.

Dietz 1982: Dietz, S. (ed), 1982, *Asine II: Results of the Excavations East of the Acropolis*, Stockholm.

Dinsmoor 1947: Dinsmoor, W.B., 1947, "The Hekatompedon on the Athenian Akropolis", *AJA* 51, pp 109-140.

Dörpfeld 1886: Dörpfeld, W., 1886, "The Buildings of Tiryns", in Schliemann 1886, pp 177-308.

Dörpfeld 1905: Dörpfeld, W., 1905, "Die kretischen, mykenischen und homerischen Paläste", *AM* 30, pp 257-297.

Drews 1979: Drews, R., 1979, "Argos and the Argives in the Iliad", *CP* 74, pp 127-135.

Driessen 2001: Driessen, J., 2001, "Centre and periphery: some observations on the administration of the kingdom of Knossos", in Voutsaki and Killen 2001, pp 96-113.

Driessen 2004: Driessen, J., 2004, "The Central Court of the Palace at Knossos", in Cadogan, Hatzaki, and Vassilakis 2004, pp 75-82.

Driessen and MacDonald 1997: Driessen, J., and MacDonald, C.F., 1997, *The Troubled Island: Minoan Crete before and after the Santorini Eruption*, Liège.

Driessen, Schoep, and Laffineur 2002: Driessen, J., Schoep, I., and Laffineur, R. (eds), 2002, *Monuments of Minos. Rethinking the Minoan Palaces. Procedings of the International Workshop "Crete of the hundred Palaces?" held at the Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, 14-15 December 2001*, Liège.

Evans 1900: Evans, A.J., 1900, "Knossos I: The Palace", *BSA 6*, pp 3-70.

Evans 1921: Evans, A., 1921, *The Palace of Minos at Knossos, Vol. I: The Neolithic and Early and Middle Minoan Ages*, London.

Evans 1928: Evans, A.J., 1928, *The Palace of Minos at Knossos II*, London.

Evans 1930: Evans, A., 1930, *The Palace of Minos at Knossos, Vol. III*, London.

Evely, Hughes-Brock, Monigliano 1994: Evely, D., Hughes-Brock, H., and Monigliano, N. (eds), 1994, *Knossos: A Labyrinth of History. Papers in honour of Sinclair Hood*, Oxford.

Farnell 1921: Farnell, L.R., 1921, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, Oxford.

Fields 2004: Fields, N., 2004, *Mycenaean Citadels c. 1350-1200 BC*, Oxford.

Flognfeldt 2009: Flognfeldt, Y.T., 2009, *Sanctuaries and Votive Offerings from the Early Iron Age – A comparative study of votive offerings from the Eastern Peloponnese*, Thesis, University of Bergen.

Foley 1988: Foley, A., 1988, *The Argolid, 800-600 BC: an archaeological survey, together with an index of sites from the Neolithic to the Roman period*, Göteborg.

French 1996: French, E.B., 1996, "Evidence for an Earthquake at Mycenae", in Stiros and Jones 1996, pp 51-54.

French 2002: French, E.B., 2002, *Mycenae: Agamemnon's capital: the site and its setting*, Stroud.

Frickenhaus 1912: Frickenhaus, A., 1912, *Tiryns I: Die Hera von Tiryns*, Athens.

Frödin, Persson, and Westholm 1938: Frödin, O., Persson, A., and Westholm, A., 1938, *Asine: Results of the Swedish Excavations, 1922-1930*, Stockholm.

Furumark 1944: Furumark, A., "Mycenaean IIIC Pottery and it Relation to Cypriote Fabrics", *OpArch* 3, pp 194-265.

Gates 1985: Gates, C., 1985, "Rethinking the building history of Grave Circle A at Mycenae", *AJA* 89, pp 263-274.

Geary 1994: Geary, P.J., 1994, *Phantoms of Remembrance: memory and oblivion at the end of the first millennium*, Princeton.

Gentili and Perusino 2002: Gentili, B., and Perusino, F. (eds), 2002, *Le orse di Brauron. Un rituale di iniziazione femminile nel santuario di Artemide*, Pisa.

Gercke and Naumann 1974: Gercke, P., and Naumann, U., 1974, "Tiryns-Stadt 1971/1972", *AAA* 7, pp 15-24.

Gesell 1985: Gesell, G.C., 1985, *Town, Palace, and House Cult in Minoan Crete*, Göteborg.

Ginsberg 2004: Ginsberg, R., 2004, *The Aesthetics of Ruins*, New York.

Glowacki 1998: Glowacki, K.T., 1998, "The Acropolis of Athens before 566 BC", in Hartswick and Sturgeon 1998, pp 79-88.

Google Earth 2018: Data SIO, NOAA, U.S. Navy, NGA, GEBCO, Landsat/Copernicus.

Gordon and Simón 2010: Gordon, R.L., and Simón, F. (eds), 2010, *Magical Practice in the Latin West: papers from the international conference held at the University of Zaragoza 30th Sept.-1st Oct. 2005*, Leiden.

Gosden and Lock 1998: Gosden, C., and Lock, G, 1998, "Prehistoric Histories", in Bradley and Williams 1998, pp 2-12.

Graef and Langlotz 1909: Graef, B., and Langlotz, E., 1909, *Die antiken vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen. Vol I.1*, Berlin.

Graef and Langlotz 1925: Graef, B., and Langlotz, E., 1925, *Die antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen, Vol. 1*, Berlin.

Graham 1987: Graham, J.W., 1987, *The Palaces of Crete (Revised Edition)*, Princeton.

Griebel and Nelson 2008: Griebel, C., and Nelson, M.C., 2008, "The Englianos Hilltop after the Palace", in Davis 2008, pp 97-100.

Groenewegen-Frankfort 1951: Groenewgen-Frankfort, H., 1951, *Arrest and Movement: An Essay on Space and Time in Representational Art in the Ancient Near East*, Chicago.

Grubbs and Parkin 2013: Grubbs, J.E., and Parkin, T., 2013 (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Childhood and Education in the Classical World*, Oxford.

Hägg 1974: Hägg, R., 1974, Die Gräber der Argolis in submykenischer, protogeometrischer und geometrischer Zeit, Uppsala.

Hägg 1983 (ed): Hägg, R. (ed), 1983, *The Greek Renaissance of the 8th Century BC: Tradition and Innovation*, Stockholm.

Hägg 1983: Hägg, R., 1983, "Funerary Meals in the Geometric Necropolis at Asine?", in Hägg 1983 (ed), pp 189-194.

Hägg 1992: Hägg, R., 1992, "Geometric Sanctuaries in the Argolid", in Piérart 1992, pp 9-23.

Hägg 1998: Hägg, R., 1998, "Argos and its neighbours: regional variations in the burials practices in the Protogeometric and Geometric Periods", in Pariente and Touchais 1998, pp 131-134.

Hägg, Marinatos, and Nordquist 1988: Hägg, R., Marinatos, N., and Nordquist, G. (eds), 1988, *Early Greek Cult Practices: proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 26-29 June, 1986*, Göteborg.

Hägg, Nordquist, and Wells 1996: Hägg, R., Nordquist, G., and Wells, B. (eds), 1996, *Asine II: Supplementary Volumes on the Swedish Excavations 1922-1930*, Stockholm.

Halbherr, Stefani, and Banti 1980: Halbherr, F., Stefani, E., and Banti, L., 1980, *Haghia Triada Nel Periodo Tardo Palaziale*, Rome.

Halbwachs 1950: Halbwachs, M., 1950, *La Mémoire Collective*, Paris.

Halbwachs 1980 [1950]: Halbwachs, M., 1980 [1950], *The Collective Memory*, New York.

Halbwachs 1992 [1952]: Halbwachs, M., 1992 [1952], *On Collective Memory*, Chicago.

Hall 1914: Hall, E., 1914, *Excavations in eastern Crete: Vrokastro*, Philadelphia.

Hall 1995: Hall, J.M., 1995, "How Argive was the 'Argive' Heraion? The Political and Cultic Geography of the Argive Plain, 900-400 BC", *AJA* 99, pp. 577-613.

Hallager and Andreadaki-Vlasaki 1997: Hallager, E., and Andreadaki-Vlasaki, M., 1997, "The Geometric Period", in Hallager and Hallager 197, pp 213-239.

Hallager and Hallager 1997: Hallager, E., and Hallager, B.P. (eds), 1997, *The Greek-Swedish Excavations at the Agia Aikaterini Square, Kastelli, Khania 1970-1987: results of the excavations under the direction of Yannis Tzedakis and Carl-Gustaf Styrenius*, Jonsered.

Hamilakis 1998: Hamilakis, Y., 1998, "Eating the Dead: Mortuary Feasting and the Politics of Memory in the Aegean Bronze Age", in Branigan 1998, pp 115-132.

Hansen 2004: Hansen, M.H., 2004, "Introduction", in Hansen, M.H., and Nielsen, T.H., 2004, pp. 1-156.

Hansen 2006: Hansen, M.H., 2006, *Polis: And introduction to the ancient Greek city-state*, Oxford.

Hansen and Nielsen 2004: Hansen, M.H., and Nielsen, T.H., (eds.), 2004, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford,

Harris 1970: Harris, B. (ed), 1970, *Auckland Classical Essays Presented to E. M. Blaiklock*, Oxford.

Hartley 1931: Hartley, M., 1931, "Early Greek Vases from Crete", *BSA 31*, pp 56-114.

Hartswick and Sturgeon 1998: Hartswick, K.J., and Sturgeon, M.B., 1998, *Stephanos. Studies in Honor of Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway*, Philadelphia.

Hatzaki 2004: Hatzaki, E., 2004, "From Final Palatial to Postpalatial Knossos: a view from the Late Minoan II to Late Minoan IIIB town", in Cadogan, Hatzaki, and Vassilakis 2004, pp 121-126.

Hatzaki 2005: Hatzaki, E., 2005, "Postpalatial Knossos: town and cemeteries from LMIIIA2 to LMIIIC", in D'Agata and Moody 2005, pp 65-97.

Hobsbawm 1997: Hobsbawm, E., 1997, *On History*, New York.

Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983: Hobsbawm, E., and Ranger, T., 1983, *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge.

Hodder 1982: Hodder, I. (ed), 1982, *Symbols in Action: Ethnoarchaeological Studies of Material Culture*, Cambridge.

Hoffman 1997: Hoffman, J.L., 1997, *Imports and Immigrants, Near Eastern Contacts with Iron Age Crete*, Michigan.

Hogarth 1901: Hogarth, D.G., 1901, "Excavations at Zakro, Crete", *BSA* 7, pp 121-149.

Hogue 2016: Hogue, S.L., 2016, "New Evidence of Post-Destruction Reuse in the Main Building of the Palace of Nestor at Pylos", *AJA* 120, pp 151-157.

Hölscher 1991: Hölscher, T., "The City of Athens. Space, Symbol, Structure", in Molho, Raaflaub, and Emlen 1991, pp 355-380.

Hood 1953: Hood, M.S.F., 1953, "A Mycenaean Cavalryman", *BSA* 48, pp 84-93.

Hood 1994: Hood, S., 1994, *The Arts in Prehistoric Greece*, London.

Hope-Simpson and Dickinson 1979: Hope-Simpson, R., and Dickinson, O.T.P.K., 1979, *A Gazetteer of Aegean Civilisation in the Bronze Age*, Göteborg.

Hoppin 1905: Hoppin, J.C., 1905, "The Vases and Vase Fragments", in Waldstein 1905, pp 57-184.

Hurwit 1999: Hurwit, J.M., 1999, *The Athenian Acropolis. History, Mythology, and Archaeology fom the Neolithic Era to the Present*, Cambridge.

Hutchinson 1943: Hutchinson, R.W., "Unpublished objects from Palaikastro and Praisos. II.", *BSA* 40, pp 38-50.

Iacovou 2012: Iakovou, M. (ed), 2012, *Cyprus and the Aegean in the Early Iron Age: The Legacy of Nicolas Coldstream*, Nicosia.

Iakovidis 1977: Iakovidis, S., 1977, "The Present State of Research at the Citadel of Mycenae", *BIAL* 14, pp 9-144.

Iakovidis 1983: Iakovidis, S.E., 1983, *Late Helladic Citadels on Mainland Greece*, Leiden.

Iakovidis 1989: Iakovidis, S., 1989, *Γλάς Ι: Η Ανασκαφή 1955-1961*, Athens.

Iakovidis 2001: Iakovidis, S., 2001, *Gla and the Kopais in the 13th Century*, Athens.

Iakovidis 2006: Iakovidis, S., 2006, *The Mycenaean Acropolis of Athens*, Athens.

Immerwahr 1971: Immerwahr, S.A., 1971, *The Athenian Agora VIII: The Neolithic and Bronze Ages*, Princeton.

Immerwahr 1973: Immerwahr, S.A., 1973, *Early Burials from the Agora Cemeteries*, Princeton NJ.

Immerwahr 1990: Immerwahr, S.A., 1990, *Aegean Painting in the Bronze Age*, London.

Jantzen 1975: Janzten, U., 1975 (ed), *Fuhrer durch Tiryns*, Athens.

Jensen 1980: Jensen, M.S., 1980, *The Homeric Question and Oral-Formulaic Theory*, Copenhagen.

Jonker 1995: Jonker, G., 1995, *The Topography of Remembrance: the dead, tradition, and collective memory in Mesopotamia*, Leiden.

Kanta 1980: Kanta, A., 1980, *The Late Minoan III Period in Crete: a survey of sites, pottery and their distribution*, Göteborg.

Kanta 2006: Kanta, A., 2006, "Monastiraki, a Minoan Palatial Centre in the Valley of Amari, Crete", in Kanta and Marazzi 2006, pp 13-34.

Kanta and Marazzi 2006: Kanta, A., and Marazzi, M. (eds), 2006, *Monastiraki I. Missione Monastiraki. Campagne 2002/2004*, Naples.

Karouzou 1952: Karouzou, S., 1952, "Χάλκινων αγαλματων εκ της Ακροπόλεως", *AE* 1952, 137-149.

Kavvadias and Kawerau 1906: Kavvadias, P., and Kawerau, G., 1906, *Die Ausgrabung der Akropolis vom Jahre 1885 bis zum Jahre 1890*, Athens.

Kelder et al 2012: Kelder, J., Uslu, G., and Şerifoğlu, O.F., (eds), 2012, *Troy: City, Homer, Turkey*, Zwolle.

Kelly 1976: Kelly, T., 1976, *A History of Argos to 500 BC*, Minneapolis.

Keramopoullos 1917: Keramopoullos, A., 1917, "Θηβαϊκά", *AD* 3, 1-503.

Keramopoullos 1953: Keramopoullos, A. (ed), 1953, *Γέρας Αντωνίου Κεραμοπουλου, Athens.*

Kilian 1988: Kilian, K., 1988, "Ausrabungen in Tiryns 1982/1983", *AA* 1988, pp 105-151.

Kilian-Dirlmeier 1984: Kilian-Dirlmeier, I., 1984, *Nadeln der frühhelladischen bis archaischen Zeit von der Peloponnes*, Munich.

Kirk 1962: Kirk, G.S., 1962, *The Songs of Homer*, Cambridge.

Kirk 1976: Kirk, G.S., 1976, *Homer and the Oral Tradition*, Cambridge.

Kirk 1985: Kirk, G.S., 1985, *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume I: Books 1-4*, Cambridge.

Klein 1997: Klein, N.L., 1997, "Excavation of the Greek Temples at Mycenae by the British School at Athens", *BSA* 92, pp 247-322.

Kokkou-Vyridi 1999: Kokkou-Vyridi, K., 1999, *Πρώιμες πυρές θυσιών στο Τελεστήριο της Ελευσίνος*, Athens.

Koliou 1994: Koliou, N. (ed), 1994, *Νεότερα δεδομένα των ερευνών για την αρχαία Ιωλκό*, Volos.

Kophiniotis 1892: Kophiniotis, J., 1892, *Ἱστορία τοῦ Ἄργους*, Athens.

Kotsonas et al 2012: Kotsonas, A., Whitelaw, T., Vasilakis, A., and Bredaki, M., 2012, "Early Iron Age Knossos: An overview from the Knossos Urban Landscape Project (KULP)", *11th International Congress of Cretan Studies (Rethymno 21-27 October 2011)*, web publication.

Küchler 1993: Küchler, S., 1993, "Landscape as memory: the mapping of process and its representation in Melanesian society", in Bender 1993, pp 85-106.

La Rosa 1992: La Rosa, V, 1992, "Phaistos", in Myers, Myers, and Cadogan 1992, pp 232-243.

La Rosa 1996: La Rosa, V., 1996, "Per la Festós di età arcaica", in Picozzi and Carinci 1996, pp 63-87.

La Rosa and D'Agata 1984: La Rosa, V., and D'Agata, A.L., 1984, "Haghia Triada", *Creta Antica: cento anni di archeologia italiana (1884-1984)*, pp 161-201.

Laffineur and Hägg 2001: Laffineur, R., and Hägg, R., (eds), *POTNIA. Deities and Religion in the Aegean Bronze Age. Proceedings of the 8th International Aegean Conference, Göteborg 2000*., Aegaeum 22, Brussels.

Lang 2007: Lang, F., 2007, "House – Community – Settlement: The new concept of living in Archaic Greece", in Westgate, Fischer, and Whitley 2007, pp 183-194.

Langdon 2013: Langdon, S., 2013, "Children as Learners and Producers in Early Greece", in Grubbs and Parkin 2013, pp 172-194.

Larson 2007: Larson, J. 2007, *Ancient Greek Cults*, New York.

Laviosa 1967: Laviosa, C., 1967, "Il Lord di Asine è una 'Sfinge'?", *CIM* I, pp 87-90.

Lefèvre-Novaro 2007: Lefèvre-Novaro, D., 2007, "Les débuts de la polis (l'exemple de Phaistos - Crète)", *Ktema* 32, pp 467-495.

Lemos 2002: Lemos, I.S., 2002, *The Protogeometric Aegean*, Oxford.

Lemos 2006: Lemos, I.S., 2006, "Athens and Lefkandi: A Tale of Two Sites", in Lemos and Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, pp 505-531.

Lemos and Deger-Jalkotzy 2006: Lemos, I.S., and Deger-Jalkotzy, S. (eds), *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer*, Edinburgh.

Lemos, Livieratou, and Thomatos 2009: Lemos, I.S., Livieratou, A., and Thomatos, M., 2009, "Post-Palatial Urbanization: some lost opportunities", in Owen and Preston 2009, pp 62-84.

Levi 1961-1962: Levi, D., 1961-1962, "Gli scavi a Festòs negli anni 1958-1960", *ASAtene* 39-40, pp 377-504.

Lochner and Ruppenstein 2013: Lochner, M., and Ruppenstein, F. (eds), 2013, *Brandbestattungen von der mittleren Donaubis zur Ägäis zwischen 1300 und 750 v. Chr.,* Vienna.

Lord 1960: Lord, A.B., 1960, *The Singer of Tales*, London.

MacDonald 2002: MacDonald, C.F., 2002, "The Neopalatial Palaces of Knossos", in Driessen, Schoep, and Laffineur 2002, pp 35-54.

MacGillivray and Driessen 1990: MacGillivray, J.A., and Driessen, J., 1990, "Minoan Settlement at Palaikastro", in Darcque and Trueil 1990, pp 395-412.

MacGillivray et al 1984: MacGillivray, J.A., Sackett, L.H., Smyth, D., Driessen, J., Lyness, D.G., Hobbs, B.A., and Peatfield, A.A.D., 1984, "An Archaeological Survey of the Roussolakkos Area at Palaikastro", *BSA* 79, pp 129-159.

MacGillivray et al 1988: MacGillivray, J., Sackett, L.H., Driessen, J.M., MacDonald, C., and Smyth, D., 1988, "Excavations at Palaikasto 1988", *BSA* 83, pp 259-282.

Mackenzie 1904-1905: Mackenzie, D., 1904-1905, "Cretan Palaces and the Aegean Civilization", *BSA* 11, pp 181-223.

MacVeagh Thorne and Prent 2000: MacVeagh Thorne, S., and Prent, M., 2000, The Sanctuary of Diktean Zeus at Palaikastro: A Re-Examination of the Excavations by the British School in 1902-1906, *Πεπραγμένα* 8, pp 169-178.

Malakasioti 1994: Malakasioti, Z., 1994, "Νεότερα δεδομένα για την αρχαία Ιωλκό στα Παλιά του. Βόλου", in Koliou 1994, pp 47-55.

Manning 2008: Manning, S., 2008, "Protopalatial Crete: the formation of the palaces", in Shelmerdine 2008, pp 105-120.

Maran 2000: Maran, J., 2000, "Das Megaron im Megaron: Zur Datierung und Funktion des Antenbaus im Mykenischen Palast von Tiryns", *AA* 2000, pp 1-16.

Maran 2001: Maran, J., 2001, "Political and Religious Aspects of Architectural Change on the Upper Citadel of Tiryns. The Case of Building T.", in Laffineur and Hägg 2001, pp 113-122.

Maran and Papadimitriou 2006: Maran, J., and Papadimitriou, A., 2006, "Forschungen im Stadtgebiet von Tiryns 1999-2002," *AA* 2006, pp 97-169.

Marinatos 1933: Marinatos, S., 1933, "'Ανασκαφή 'Αμνισού Κρήτης", *Πρακτικά* 87, pp 93-100.

Martin 2008: Martin, M., 2008, *Dwelling Among Ruins: Landscapes in the Late 8th century BC Argolic Plain*, PhD Thesis, University of Glasgow.

Mazarakis Ainian 1988: Mazarakis Ainian, A., 1988, "Early Greek Temples: Their Origin and Function", in Hägg, Marinatos, and Nordquist 1988, pp 105-119.

Mazarakis Ainian 1997: Mazarakis Ainian, A., 1997, *From Rulers' Dwellings to Temples: architecture, religion and society in Early Iron Age Greece (1100-700 B.C.),* Jonsered.

Mazarakis Ainian 2011: Mazarakis Ainian, A. (ed), 2011, *The "Dark Ages" Revisited. Acts of an international symposium in memory of William D.E. Coulson, University of Thessaly, Volos, 14-17 June 2007*, Volos.

McEnroe 2010: McEnroe, J.C., 2010, *Architecture of Minoan Crete: Constructing Identity in the Aegean Bronze Age*, Austin TX.

Melas 1970: Melas, E. (ed), 1970, *Tempel und Stäatten der Götter Griechenlands*, Cologne.

Middleton 2010: Middleton, G.D., 2010, "The Collapse of Palatial Society in LBA Greece and the Postpalatial Period", *BAR* 2110, Oxford.

Molho, Raaflaub, and Emlen 1991: Mohlo, A., Raaflaub, A., and Emlen, J. (eds), 1991, *City States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy*, Ann Arbor.

Morgan 1990: Morgan, C., 1990, *Athletes and Oracles: the transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the eighth century BC*, Cambridge.

Morgan 1994: Morgan, C., "The evolution of a sacral 'landscape': Isthmia, Perachora, and the early Corinthian state", in Alcock and Osborne 1994, pp 105-142.

Morgan 1999: Morgan, C., 1999, *Isthmia VIII: The Late Bronze Age Settlement and Early Iron Age Sanctuary*, Princeton.

Morgan 2003: Morgan, C., 2003, *Early Greek States Beyond the Polis*, London.

Morgan 2005: Morgan, L., 2005, "The Cult Centre at Mycenae and the duality of life and death", *BSAS* 13, pp 159-171.

Morgan and Whitelaw 1991: Morgan, C., and Whitelaw, T., 1991, "Pots and Politics. Ceramic Evidence for the Rise of the Argive State", *AJA* 95, pp. 79-108.

Morris 1987: Morris, I., 1987, *Burial and Ancient Society. The Rise of the Greek City-State*, Cambridge.

Morris 1988: Morris, I., 1988, "Tomb Cult and the Greek 'Renaissance': The Past in the Present in the 8th Century BC", *Antiquity* 62, pp. 750-761.

Morris 1991: Morris, I., 1991, "The early polis as city and state", in Rich and Wallace-Hadrill 1991, pp 25-58.

Mountjoy 1986: Mountjoy, P.A., 1986, *Mycenaean Decorated Pottery: A Guide to Identification*, Göteborg.

Mountjoy 1988: Mountjoy, P.A., 1988, "LH IIIC Late versus Submycenaean", *JdI* 103, pp 1-37.

Mountjoy 1993: Mountjoy, P.A., 1993, *Mycenaean Pottery: An Introduction*, Oxford.

Mountjoy 1995: Mountjoy, P.A., 1995, *Mycenaean Athens*, Jonsered.

Mühlenbruch 2007: Mühlenbruch, T., 2007, "The Post-Palatial Settlement in the Lower Citadel of Tiryns", in Deger-Jalkotzy and Zavadil 2007, pp 243-251.

Müller 1930: Müller, K., 1930, *Tiryns III: Die Architektur der Burg und des Palastes*, Augsburg.

Mulliez 2013: Mulliez, D., 2013 (ed), *Actes du colloque international organisé par la IV EPKA et l'École française d'Athènes, 25-28 Septembre 2003*, Athens.

Myers, Myers, and Cadogan 1992: Myers, J.W., Myers, E.E., and Cadogan, G. (eds), 1992, *The Aerial Atlas of Ancient Crete*, London.

Mylonas 1955: Mylonas, G.E., 1955, "The Cemeteries of Eleusis and Mycenae", *APS* 99.2, pp 57-67.

Mylonas 1961: Mylonas, G., 1961, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Princeton.

Mylonas 1966: Mycenae, G.E., 1966, *Mycenae and the Mycenaean Age*, Princeton.

Mylonas and Kourouniotes 1933: Mylonas, G. and Kourouniotes, K., 1933, "Excavations at Eleusis, 1932. Preliminary Report", *AJA* 37, 271-286.

Naumann 1975: Naumann, U., "Die Archaische und Klassische Zeit", in Jantzen 1975, pp 102-106.

Negbi 1992: Negbi, O., 1992, "Early Phoenician Presence on the Mediterranean Islands: A Reappraisal", *AJA* 96.4, pp. 599-615.

Nicholls 1970: Nicholls, R., 1970, "Greek Votive Statuettes and Religious Continuity", in Harris 1970, pp 1-37.

Niemeier 1994: Niemeier, W., 1994, "Knossos in the New Palace Period (MM III-LM IB)", in Evely, Hughes-Brock, and Monigliano 1994, pp 71-88.

Niemeier, Pilz, and Kaiser 2013: Niemeier, W.-D., Pilz, O., and Kaiser, I., 2013, (eds), *Kreta in der geometrischen und archaischen Zeit. Akten des Internationalem Kolloquiums am Deutschen Archäologischen Institut, Abteilung Athen 27.-29. Januar 2006*, München.

Nilsson 1940: Nilsson, M.P., 1940, *Homer and Mycenae*, London.

Noack 1927: Noack, F., 1927, *Eleusis. Die baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des Heiligtumes*, Berlin.

Nora 1989: Nora, P., 1989, "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire", *Representations* 26, pp 7-24.

Nordquist 1987: Nordquist, G.C., 1987, *A Middle Helladic Village: Asine in the Argolid*, Uppsala.

Nowicki 2000: Nowicki, K., 2000, *Defensible sites in Crete c.1200-800 BC*, Liège.

O'Brien 1993: O'Brien, J.V., 1993, *The Transformation of Hera: a study of ritual, hero, and the goddess in the Iliad*, Lanham, Maryland.

Osborne 2009: Osborne, R., 2009, *Greece in the Making (Second Edition),* London.

Owen and Preston 2009: Owen, S., and Preston, L. (eds), 2009, *Inside the City in the Greek World: Studies of Urbanism from the Bronze Age to the Hellenistic Period*, Oxford.

Panagiotaki 1999: Panagiotaki, M., 1999, *The Central Palace Sanctuary at Knossos*, London.

Papadimitriou 2006: Papadimitriou, A., 2006, "The Early Iron Age in the Argolid: Some New Aspects", in Lemos and Deger-Jalkotzy 2006, pp 531-547.

Papadopoulos 2003: Papadopoulos, J.K., 2003, *Ceramicus Redivivus: The Early Iron Age Potters' Field in the Area of the Classical Athenian Agora*, Athens.

Papasavvas 2012: Papasavvas, G., 2012, "Cretan bronze stands of Cypriot types from sanctuaries and cemeteries: Cretan society in the Early Iron Age", in Iacovou 2012, pp 129-154.

Pappalardo 2002: Pappalardo, E., 2002, "Il 'Tripillar Shrine' di Kommos: alcune considerazione", in *Creta Antica* 3, pp. 263-274.

Pappi and Triantapyllou 2011: Pappi, E., and Triantapyllou, S., 2011, "Mortuary practices and the human remains: a preliminary study of the Geometric graves at Argos, Argolid", in Mazarakis-Ainian 2011, pp 673-688.

Pariente and Touchais 1998: Pariente, A., and Touchais, G. (eds), 1998, *Argos et l'Argolide*, Athens.

Parker 1996: Parker, R., 1996, *Athenian Religion: A History*, Oxford.

Parker 2011: Parker, R., 2011, *On Greek Religion*, New York.

Pelon 1976: Pelon, O., 1976, *Tholoi, tumuli, et cercles funéraires. Recherches sur les monuments funéraires de plan circulaire dans l'égee de lâge du bronze, IIIe et IIe millénaires av. J.-C.*, Athens.

Pernier 1902: Pernier, L., 1902, "Scavi della Missione Italiana a Phaestos 1900-1901: Rapporto preliminare", *MonAnt* 12, pp 5-131.

Pernier 1910: Pernier, L., 1910, "Memorie del culto di Rhea a Phaestos", in Beloch 1910, pp 241-253.

Pernier 1935: Pernier, L., 1935, *Il Palazzo Minoicò di Festòs I,* Rome.

Pernier and Banti 1952: Pernier, L., and Banti, L., 1952, *Il Palazzo Minoicò di Festòs II*, Rome.

Peters 1948: Peters, W.A.M., 1948, *Gerard Manley Hopkins*, Oxford.

Picozzi and Carinci 1996: Picozzi, M.G., and Carinci, F. (eds), 1996, *Studi in memoria di Lucia Guerrini : vicino Oriente, Egeo, Grecia, Roma e mondo romano, tradizione dell'antico e collezionismo di antichità*, Rome.

Piérart 1992: Piérart, M. (ed), 1992, *Polydipsion Argos: Argos de la fin des palais mycéniens à la constitution de l'état classique : [actes de la table ronde], Fribourg, Suisse, 7-9 mai 1987*, Athens.

Piérart and Touchais 1996: Piérart, M., and Touchais, G., 1996, *Argos: Une Ville Grecque de 6000 Ans,* Paris.

Piteros 2001: Piteros, C., 2001, "Ταφές και τεφροδόχα αγγεία τύμβου της ΥΕ ΙΙΙΓ στο Άργος", in Stampolidis 2001, pp 99-120.

Platon, E., 2007: Platon, E., 2007, "Zakros", *Ergon* 2007, pp 80-82.

Platon, E., 2010: Platon, E., 2010, "Zakros", *Ergon* 2010, pp 61-62.

Platon, N., 1964: Platon, N., 1964, "Zakros", *Πρακτικά* 119, pp 142-168.

Popham 1964: Popham, M.R., 1964, *The last days of the Palace at Knossos. Complete vases of the Late Minoan IIIB period*, Lund.

Porter 2011: Porter, J. I., 2011, "Sublime monuments and sublime ruins in ancient aesthetics", *European Review of History* 18.5-6, pp 685-696.

Powell 1991: Powell, B.B., 1991, *Homer and the origin of the Greek alphabet*, Cambridge.

Powell 2007: Powell, B.B., 2007, *Homer*, Oxford.

Power 2007: Power, M., 2007, *From ecumenism to community relations: inter-church relationships in Northern Ireland 1980-2005*, Dublin.

Prent 2003: Prent, M., 2003, "Glories of the Past in the Past: Ritual Activities at Palatial Ruins in Early Iron Age Crete", in Alcock and Van Dyke 2003, pp 81-103.

Prent 2004: Prent, M., 2004, "Cult activities at the Palace of Knossos from the end of the Bronze Age: continuity and change", in Cadogan, Hatzaki, and Vassilakis 2004, pp 411-419.

Prent 2005: Prent, M., 2005, *Cretan Cults and Sanctuaries*, Amsterdam.

Price 1971: Price, T.H., 1971, "Double and Multiple Representations in Greek Art and Religious Thought", *JHS* 91, pp 48-69.

Puglisi 2004: Puglisi, D., 2004, "Haghia Triada nel periodo Tardo Minoico I", *Creta Antica* 4, pp 145-198.

Raaflaub and Van Wees 2009: Raaflaub, K.A., and Van Wees, H., 2009, *A Companion to Archaic Greece*, Chichester.

Rehak and Younger 1998: Rehak, P, and Younger, J.G., 1998, "Review of Aegean Prehistory VII: Neopalatial, Final Palatial, and Postpalatial Crete", *AJA* 102, pp 91-173.

Rehak and Younger 2001: Rehak, P, and Younger, J.G., 2001, "Neopalatial, Final Palatial, and Postpalatial Crete", in Cullen 2001, pp 383-465.

Renfrew 1985: Renfrew, A.C., 1985, *The Archaeology of Cult: The Sanctuary at Phylakopi*, London.

Renfrew 1986: Renfrew, C., 1986, "Introduction. Peer-polity interaction and socio-political change", in Renfrew and Cherry 1986, pp 1-18.

Renfrew and Cherry 1986: Renfrew, C., and Cherry, J.F. (eds), 1986, *Peer-Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change*, Cambridge.

Rich and Wallace-Hadrill 1991: Rich, J., and Wallace-Hadrill, A., (eds.), 1991, *City and Country in the Ancient World*, London.

Ricoeur 2004: Ricoeur, P., 2004, *Memory, History, Forgetting*, Chicago.

Rodenwaldt 1922: Rodenwaldt, G., 1922, *Der Fries Des Megarons Von Mykenai*, Halle (Saale).

Roes 1953: Roes, A., 1953, "Fragments de poterie géométrique trouvés sur les citadelles d'Argos", *BCH 77*, pp 90-104.

Rowlands 1993: Rowlands, M., 1993, "The role of memory in the transmission of culture", *World Archaeology* 25.2, pp 141-151.

Ruppenstein 2013: Ruppenstein, F. 2013, "Cremation Burials in Greece from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age: Continuity or Change?", in Lochner and Ruppenstein 2013, pp 185-196.

Ruppenstein and Gauss 1998: Ruppenstein, F., and Gauss, W., 1998, "Die Athener Akropolis in der frühen Eisenzeit", *MDAI(A)* 113, pp 1-60.

Russell 2006: Russell, N., 2006, "Collective memory before and after Halbwachs", *The French Review* 79.4, pp 792-804.

Rutter 1977: Rutter, J., 1977, "Late Helladic IIIC pottery and some historical implications", in Davis 1977: 1-20.

Sackett, Popham, and Warren 1965: Sackett, L.H., Popham, M.H., and Warren, P.M., 1965, "Excavations at Palaikastro VI", *BSA* 60, pp 248-315.

Sakellarakis and Sakellarakis 1991: Sakellarakis, J., and Sakellarakis, E., 1991, *Crete. Archanes*, Athens.

Schäfer 1992: Schäfer, J., 1992, *Amnisos: nach den archäologischen, historischen und epigraphischen Zeugnissen des Altertums und der Neuzeit*, Berlin.

Schama 1995: Schama, S., 1995, *Landscape and Memory*, London.

Schliemann 1878: Schliemann, H., 1878, *Mycenae: A narrative of researches and discoveries at Mycenae and Tiryns*, New York.

Schliemann 1886: Schliemann, H., 1886, *Tiryns: The Prehistoric Palace of the Kings of Tiryns: the results of the latest excavations*, London.

Schwab 2000: Schwab, K.A., 2000, "Bronze, Lead, and Faience Vessels" in Shaw, J.W., and Shaw, M.C., 2000, pp 395-398.

Scully 2013: Scully, V., 2013 [1962], *The Earth, the Temple, and the Gods: Greek Sacred Architecture – Revised Edition*, San Antonio TX.

Shaw, J.W., 1989: Shaw, J.W., 1989, "Phoenicians in Southern Crete", *AJA* 93.2, pp. 165-183.

Shaw, J.W., 2000: Shaw, J.W., 2000, "The Architecture of the Temples and other Buildings" in Shaw, J.W., and Shaw, M.C., 2000 pp 1-100.

Shaw, J.W., 2006: Shaw, J.W., 2006, *Kommos: A Minoan harbour town and Greek sanctuary in Southern Crete*, Athens.

Shaw, J.W., and Shaw, M.C., 2000: Shaw, J.W., and Shaw, M.C., (eds), 2000, *Kommos IV: The Greek Sanctuary*, Princeton

Shaw, J.W., and Shaw, M.C., 2006: Shaw, J.W., and Shaw, M.C., (eds), 2006, *Kommos V: The Monumental Minoan Buildings at Kommos*, Princeton.

Shaw, M.C., 2000: Shaw, M.C., 2000, "The Sculpture from the Sanctuary" in Shaw, J.W., and Shaw, M.C., 2000, pp 135-209.

Shelmerdine 2008: Shelmerdine, CW, (ed), 2008, *The Cambridge Companion to the Aegean Bronze Age*, Cambridge.

Sherratt 1990: Sherratt, S., 1990, "Reading the Texts", *Antiquity* 84, pp 807-824.

Sherratt and Bennet 2017: Sherratt, S., and Bennet, J. (eds), 2017, *Archaeology and Homeric Epic*, Oxford.

Sjöberg 2004: Sjöberg, B., 2004, *Asine and the Argolid in the Late Helladic III period: a socio-economic study*, Oxford.

Skon-Jedele and Dabney 2000: Skon-Jedele, N., and Dabney, M., 2000, "Scarabs" in Shaw, J.W., and Shaw, M.C., 2000, p 351.

Snodgrass 1971: Snodgrass, A.M., 1971, *The Dark Age of Greece: an archaeological survey of the eleventh to the eighth centuries BC*, Edinburgh.

Snodgrass 1980: Snodgrass, A.M., 1980, *Archaic Greece: The Age of Experiment*, London.

Snodgrass 1998: Snodgrass, A.M., 1998, *Homer and the Artists: text and picture in early Greek art*, Cambridge.

Spencer 1995: Spencer, N., (ed), 1995, *Time, tradition, and society in Greek archaeology: bridging the 'Great Divide'*, London.

Stamatakis 1879: Stamatakis, P., 1879, "ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΡΑ ΤΟ ΗΡΑΙΟΝ ΚΑΘΑΡΙΣΘΕΝΤΟΣ ΤΑΦΟΥ", *AA* 3, pp 271-286.

Stampolidis 2001: Stampolidis, N.C. (ed), 2001, *Πρακτικά του συνεδρίου «Καύσεις στην Εποχή του Χαλκού και την Πρώιμη Εποχή του Σιδήρου», Ρόδος, 29 Απριλίου-2 Μαΐου 1999*, Athens.

Stiros and Jones 1996: Stiros, S.C., and Jones, R.E., (ed), 1996, *Archaeoseismology*, Athens.

Stockhammer 2011: Stockhammer, P.W., 2011, "Household Archaeology in LHIIIC Tiryns", in Yasur-Landau, Ebeling, and Mazow 2011, pp 207-236.

Strøm 1995: Strøm, I., 1995, "The early sanctuary of the Argive Heraion and its external relations (8th-early 6th cent. BC)", *PDIA* 1, 37-127.

Stürmer 1992: Stürmer, V. 1992, "Das Heiligtum des Zeus Thenatas", in Schäfer 1992, pp 226-285.

Styrenius 1967: Styrenius, C.-G., 1967, *Submycenaean Studies*, Lund.

Styrenius 1998: Styrenius, C.-G., 1998, *Asine: A Swedish Excavation Site in Greece*, Stockholm.

Symeonoglou 1985: Symeonoglou, S., 1985, *The Topography of Thebes from the Bronze Age to Modern Times*, Princeton.

Taylour 1969: Taylour, W., 1969, "Mycenae, 1968", *Antiquity* 43, pp 91-97.

Technau 1929: Technau, W., 1929, "Griechische Keramik Im Samischen Heraion", *AM* 54, pp 6-64.

Themelis 2002: Themelis, P.G., 2002, "Contributions to the Topography of the Sanctuary at Brauron", in Gentili and Perusino 2002, pp 103-116, 223-232.

Thomas 1992: Thomas, R., 1992, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.

Thomas and Conant 1999: Thomas, C.G., and Conant, C., 1999, *Citadel to city-state: the transformation of Greece, 1200-700 BC*, Bloomington, Indiana.

Thomatos 2006: Thomatos, M., 2006, *The Final Revival of the Aegean Bronze Age: A Case Study of the Argolid, Corinthia, Attica, Eubeoa, the Cyclades and the Dodecanese during LHIIIC Middle*, Oxford.

Tilley 1994: Tilley, C. Y., 1994, *A Phenomenology of Landscape: places, paths, and monuments*, Oxford.

Tilton 1902: Tilton, E.L., 1902, "The Architecture of the Argive Heraeum", in Waldstein 1902, pp 105-139.

Todaro 2004: Todaro, S., 2004, "Haghia Triada nel periodo Antico Minoico", *Creta Antica* 4, pp 73-96.

Touchais and Divari-Valakou 1998: Touchais, G., and Divari-Valakou, N., 1998, "Argos du néolithique à l'époque géométrique: synthèse des données archéologiques", in Pariente and Touchais 1998, pp 9-21.

Touloupa 1972: Touloupa, E., 1972, "Bronzebleiche von der Akropolis in Athen. Gehämmerte geometrische Dreifusse", *AM* 87, pp 57-76.

Touloupa 1991: Touloupa, E., 1991, "Early Bronze Sheets with Figured Scenes from the Acropolis", in Buitron-Oliver 1991, pp 241-271.

Travlos 1970: Travlos, J., 1970, "Die Anfänge des Heiligtums von Eleusis", in Melas 1970, pp 65-68.

Travlos 1983: Travlos, J., 1983, "Η Αθήνα και η Ελευσίνα στον 8° και 7° π.Χ. Αιώνα", *ASAtene* 61, pp 323-338.

Tsipopoulou 2012: Tsipopoulou, M. (ed), 2012, *Petras, Siteia: 25 Years of Excavations and Studies*, Athens.

Tsountas 1886: Tsountas, C.G., 1886, "Ανασκαφαί Μυκηνών του 1886", *Πρακτικά*, pp 59-79.

Tsountas 1888: Tsountas, C., 1888, "Ανασκαφαί Μυκηνών του 1886", *Πρακτικά* 41, pp 21-79.

Turner 1969: Turner, V.W., 1969, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*, London.

Van den Eijnde 2010: Van den Eijnde, F., 2010, *Cult and Society in Early Athens: Archaeological and Anthrolopological Approaches to State Formation and Group Participation in Attica, 1000-600 BCE*, PhD Thesis, University of Utrecht.

Van Wijngaarden 2012: Van Wijngaarden, G.J., 2012, "Heinrich Schliemann: scientist and romantic?", in Kelder et al 2012, pp 129-132.

Vandenabeele 1992: Vandenabeele, F., 1992, Malia: the palace of Malia and Chersonissos, Athens.

Vasilogamvrou 2011: Vasilogamvrou, A., "Ayios Vasileios (Xerokampi)", *Ergon* 2011, pp 33-40.

Vasilogamvrou 2012: Vasilogamvrou, A., "Ayios Vasileios (Xerokampi)", *Ergon* 2012, pp 50-53.

Vasilogamvrou 2013: Vasilogamvrou, A., "Ayios Vasileios (Xerokampi)", *Ergon* 2013, pp 27-30.

Vasilogamvrou 2014: Vasilogamvrou, A., "Ayios Vasileios (Xerokampi)", *Ergon* 2014, pp 22-24.

Vernant 1982: Vernant, G. a. J.-P., 1982, *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, Paris.

Vollgraff 1906: Vollgraff, W., 1906, "Fouilles d'Argos. B. Les établissements préhistpriques de l'Aspis", *BCH* 30, pp 5-45.

Vollgraff 1928: Vollgraff, C.W. 1928, "Arx Argorum", *Mnemosyne 56*, pp 315-328.

Vollgraff 1956: Vollgraff, C.W., 1956, *Le Sanctuaire d'Apollon Pythéen à Argos*, Paris.

Voutsaki and Killen 2001: Voutsaki, S., and Killen, J., (eds), 2001, *Economy and politics in the Mycenaean palace states: proceedings of a conference held on1-3 July 1999 in the Faculty of Classics, Cambridg*e, Cambridge.

Wace 1920: Wace, A.J.B., 1920, "Excavation at Mycenae", *TLS* 19th August 1920.

Wace 1921-1923: Wace, A.J.B., Hartley, W.A., Lamb, W, Holland, L.B., and Boethius, C.A., "The Report of the School Excavations at Mycenae, 1920-1923", *BSA* 25, pp 1-434.

Wace 1939: Wace, A.J.B., 1939, "Mycenae, 1939", *JHS* 59, pp 210-212.

Wace 1949: Wace, A.J.B., 1949, *Mycenae: an archaeological history and guide*, Princeton.

Walberg 1998: Walberg, G., 1998, *Excavations on the Acropolis of Midea. Results of the Greek-Swedish Excavations I: 1-2. The Excavations on the Lower Terraces 1985-1991*, Stockholm.

Walberg 2007: Walberg, G., 2007, *Midea. The Megaron Complex and the Shrine Area. Excavations on the Lower Terraces 1994-1997*, Philadelphia.

Waldstein 1902: Waldstein, C. (ed), 1902, *The Argive Heraeum: Volume I*, Boston.

Waldstein 1905: Waldstein, C. (ed), 1905, *The Argive Heraeum: Volume II*, Boston.

Waldstein and Chase 1905: Waldstein, C., and Chase, G.H., "The Terra-Cotta Figurines", in Waldstein 1905, pp 3-46**.**

Warren 1983: Warren, P.M., 1983, "Knossos: Stratigraphical Museum Excavations 1978-1982, Part II", *AR* 29, pp 63-87.

Wallace 2003: Wallace, S., 2003, "The Perpetuated Past: Re-Use or Continuity in Material Culture and the Structuring of Identity in Early Iron Age Crete", *BSA* 98, pp 251-277.

Wallace 2010: Wallace, S., 2010, *Ancient Crete: from successful collapse to democracy's alternatives, twelfth-fifth centuries BC*, Cambridge.

Watkins 1976: Watkins, C., 1976, "Observations on the "Nestor's Cup" Inscription", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80, pp 25-40.

Watrous 1984: Watrous, L.V., 1984, "Ayia Triada: A New Perspective on the Minoan Villa", *AJA* 88, pp 123-134.

Watrous and Hadzi-Vallianou 2004: Watrous, L.V., and Hadzi-Vallianou, D., 2004, "The polis of Phaistos: development and destruction (Late Minoan IIIC-Hellenistic)", in Watrous, Hadzi-Vallianou, and Blitzer 2004, pp 307-339.

Watrous, Hadzi-Vallianou, and Blitzer 2004: Watrous, L.V., Hadzi-Vallianou, D., and Blitzer, H., (eds), 2004, *The Plain of Phaistos: cycles of social complexity in the Mesara region of Crete*, Los Angeles.

Wedde 2004: Wedde, M., 2004 (ed), *Celebrations: Sanctuaries and the Vestiges of Cult Practice: Selected Papers and Discussions from the 10th Anniversary Symposium of the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 12-16 May 1999*, Bergen.

Wells 1988a: Wells, B., 1988, "Early Greek Building Sacrifices", in Hägg, Marinatos, and Nordquist 1988, pp 259-266.

Wells 1988b: Wells, B., 1988, "Apollo at Asine", *Πρακτικά* του Γ' *Διεθνούς* Συνεδρίου *Πελοποννησιακών* Σπουδών, *Καλαμάτα*, *1985*, pp 349-352.

Wells 2002: Wells, B. (ed), 2002, *New Research on Old Material from Asine and Berbati: in celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Swedish Institute at Athens*, Stockholm.

Westgate, Fischer, and Whitley 2007: Westgate, R., Fischer, N.R.E., and Whitley, J. (eds), 2007, *Building communities: house, settlement, and society in the Aegean and beyond: proceedings of a conference held at Cardiff University, 17-21 April 2001*, London.

Whitley 1991: Whitley, J., 1991, *The Archaeology of Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.

Whitley 1994: Whitley, J. 1994, "The monuments that stood before Marathon: tomb cult and hero cult in archaic Attica", *AJA* 98, pp 213-30.

Whitley 1995: Whitley, J., 1995, "Tomb cult and hero cult: the uses of the past in Archaic Greece", in Spencer 1995, pp 43-63.

Whitley 2001: Whitley, J., 2001, *The Archaeology of Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.

Whitley 2009: Whitley, J., 2009, "Crete", in Raaflaub and Van Wees 2009, pp 273-293.

Wright 1982: Wright, J.C., 1982, "The Old Temple Terrace at the Argive Heraum and the early cult of Hera in the Argolid", *JHS* 102, pp. 186-201.

Wright 1994: Wright, J.C., 1994, "The spatial configuration of belief: the archaeology of Mycenaean religion", in Alcock and Osborne 1994, pp 37-78.

Yasur-Landau, Ebeling, and Mazow 2011: Yasur-Landau, A., Ebeling, J., and Mazow, L.B., 2011 (eds), *Household Archaeology in Ancient Israel and Beyond*, Leiden.

Yioutsos 2017: Yioutsos, N.P., 2017, "The last occupation of Asine in Argolis", *Opuscula* 10, pp 164-189.

Zimmermann 1989: Zimmermann, J.-L., 1989, *Les chevaux de bronze dans l'art géométrique grec*, Geneva.

Tables and Figures