

# Between God and man : status and function of heroes and their sanctuaries

Autor(en): **Kearns, Emily**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique**

Band (Jahr): **37 (1992)**

PDF erstellt am: **21.05.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660675>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

## II

EMILY KEARNS

### BETWEEN GOD AND MAN: STATUS AND FUNCTION OF HEROES AND THEIR SANCTUARIES

#### 1. Forms of the sanctuary

There is a paradox which is more than merely semantic which is evoked when we speak of «hero-sanctuaries». Starting from first principles, one might think that many of the enclosures connected with heroes could hardly be *sancta*, ἱερά, in any normal sense, for the close connexion with death would ordinarily place them far apart from the holy. When Sophocles makes Oedipus speak of his «holy tomb», ἱερὸς τύμβος, he is using a startling oxymoron to underline the puzzle of his character's end. Pausanias, summarising an important part of his subject-matter, speaks rather of θεῶν ἱερά καὶ ἡρώων καὶ ἀνδρῶν τάφοι. Yet ἱερόν, without an added word for «tomb», is commonly used of the places where heroes receive cult, and even if this were not so, such places have clearly enough in common with divine sanctuaries to be considered beside them. This paradox — that the hero-sanctuary may be both like and opposed to the divine sanctuary — must be central to an investigation of the dynamics of these places of cult.

While many hero-shrines are identified as tombs, the status of others is more ambiguous, and the traditions of some even

deny that the hero is physically present. There is a wide range of vocabulary used to refer to heroic cult-places. Τύμβος and τάφος are clear enough; more problematic is μνημα, which is often used to refer to a heroic tomb but also includes monuments with no claim to the hero's bones — perhaps a κενὸς τάφος, a structure made to look like a tomb but not fulfilling the tomb's main function. This form of monument evokes the idea and the paraphernalia of death without death's primary evidence, the corpse; noteworthy is the case of Achilles at Elis, where cenotaph is opposed to altar, and the most conspicuous feature of ritual is the lament.<sup>1</sup> Other words, of a more neutral flavour, seem to cover both the tomb-monument and other forms of cult-place where the fact of death is less emphasized: thus ἡρώϊον, but also the two words most commonly used for divine cult-space, ἱερόν and τέμενος. Again, as with gods, the place may be referred to by the neuter form of an adjective derived from the hero's name: Achilleion, Herakleion. Such nomenclature clearly suggests something more elaborate than a simple tomb. Thus Herodotus (IX 116) speaks of Πρωτεσίλειω τάφος τε καὶ τέμενος περὶ αὐτόν, and Pausanias, recording the μνημα of Kastor in Sparta, remarks: ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἱερόν πεποιήται (III 13, 1).<sup>2</sup> A «heroon» may also be constructed «on» a tomb (Hdt. V 47). In such cult-places, the tomb may still be the centre, literally or figuratively, but there is a wider area of more generally defined sacred space, so that the actual site of the dead body is not the only area connected with the hero. The tomb and the temple — normally incompatible — are held in

<sup>1</sup> Paus. VI 23, 3.

<sup>2</sup> Hdt. V 47; Strab. VI 3, 9, p. 284: ἱερόν may be roughly equivalent to τέμενος but may also be used in distinction to it, in which case, as here, it refers to a building; cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2499, 2501.

equal balance, and as such a hero-sanctuary contains elements of both human grave and divine place of worship.

A hero may also have a *ἱερόν* or *τέμενος* without any grave at all, the clearest example being perhaps Aiakos at Athens (Hdt. V 89), and the most widespread the many Herakleia where heroic, not divine, honours were paid. The cult of Herakles exhibits also small buildings evidently designed primarily for banquets, in which the hero was perhaps symbolically present, but certainly not entombed.<sup>3</sup> A particularly striking case, however, is that of Pelops at Olympia, where the ancient and well-known sanctuary did not evidently claim to possess the hero's bones — those were kept in a chest in a small building near the temple of Artemis Kordax at Pisa.<sup>4</sup> The Pelopion at Olympia, in Pausanias' account anyway (V 13, 2), was set apart by Herakles, the great-grandson of Pelops in the maternal line, who also made the first sacrifice. Despite the emphatically heroic elements in the cult — the black victim sacrificed into a pit, the ritual opposition to the worship of Zeus — this story-pattern corresponds exactly to the mythical and indeed real foundations of divine sanctuaries. In these heroic cult-places without tombs, the essential element would seem normally to be an altar; where a tomb was present, the tomb itself would often, though not always, function as the place of sacrifice. Typical of heroic sacrifice, though also of sacrifice to chthonic deities, was the altar in the form of a low *ἑσχάρα*, barely raised from the ground, or even simply of a pit. I say «typical» with some care, because these forms were far from universal, perhaps

<sup>3</sup> On these buildings, see O. WALTER, in *AM* 62 (1937), 41-44; F. DE VISSCHER, *Herakles Epitrapezios* (Paris 1962). Compare also the meal prepared for the Anakes (Dioskouroi) in the Athenian prytaneion (Chionides, Fr. 7, in *PCG* IV; Athen. VI 235 b), and *θεοξένια* elsewhere.

<sup>4</sup> Paus. VI 22, 1; cf. *schol. ad* Pind. *Ol.* I 149.



even far from the norm; numerous votive reliefs dedicated to heroes depict a more conventional upstanding altar, even if scarcely a monumental one. Where the tomb was absent, the altar would normally be the central feature of the *ἱερόν*, though here too there were probably exceptions; the plan of the Amyneion at Athens suggests that it was the well, often an ancillary feature, which was here central. This was an open-air shrine; other heroa possessed buildings of more or less elaboration. As with gods, statues of the hero seem to have been quite usual, at least in Attica, where Lykos in *Wasps* is the best-known example.<sup>5</sup> A spring or well, and a grove of usually fruit-bearing trees, are common natural features which are shared by heroic and divine sanctuaries. No sharp distinction, then, was necessary between the physical forms used in the two types of sanctuary, nor in the myths of their foundation. Heroes are diverse creatures, and often it is the individual cult which is important, rather than general categories and relative status of superhuman beings; some heroa show features which tend to point up the difference between hero and god, while others are almost indistinguishable from the divine sanctuary. There is one rather obvious distinction between the two which is often present, which is of course the question of size; the sanctuaries of heroes are commonly smaller than those of gods, in keeping with their lesser status (as it is usually perceived). This is a distinction which is all-important in cult complexes where the hero is linked to a particular god, since in these cases the hero is largely defined by that relationship. But a relative criterion is less significant to the «independent» hero, and in any case large heroa and small divine sanctuaries furnish numerous exceptions.

<sup>5</sup> Ar. *Vesp.* 819-823; cf. Harpocr. s.v. *δεμάζων*. Compare also Paus. I 35, 2; Hesych. s.v. *Πάνοψ*; outside Attica, Paus. I 44, 11; II 11, 7.

## 2. Siting: natural features

It is not only the form of the cult-place which is significant, but also its location. Whether there are discernible principles behind the siting of sanctuaries in general is one of the most debated questions in the study of Greek cult-places, and the evidence is as ambivalent for heroes as it is for gods. In fact, taken as a whole, hero-sanctuaries do not seem to display a radically different pattern from divine complexes. Both types of sanctuary are commonly sited at springs or wells, and surrounded by the trees which accompany the water; the water-supply has a clear practical importance at a place of worship, while the trees, which may also be a source of revenue, punctuate the landscape and emphasize the special nature of the space. Sometimes the water-source is important enough to the cult to receive special mention, and this is true not only of divine sanctuaries like that of Poseidon Erechtheus on the Athenian acropolis or the sacred complex at Delphi, nor indeed of the shrines of quasi-heroic figures like Asklepios or the nymphs, but also of unambiguous heroes of varying degrees of fame: Panops in Athens, Dorkeus in Sparta, Opheltes at Nemea.<sup>6</sup> Less universal, but still common, is the siting on a prominent hill or indeed in the midst of mountains. Near the two divine temples of Sounion, there was apparently also the heroon of Phrontis, and if the mountains of Arcadia can show the sanctuary of Demeter and Despoina at Lykosoura, they exhibit also the temenos of Telephos.

As with the form of the sanctuary, this coincidence of natural setting and features seems to suggest that there is more which unites divine and heroic cult than separates them. But the

---

<sup>6</sup> Panops: Plato, *Lysis* 203a; Hesych. s.v. Πάνοψ. Dorkeus: Paus. III 15, 1. Opheltes: Paus. II 15, 2.

meanings attached to such features were often different in the two cases. Divine cult on a wild mountain peak may carry a number of meanings: perhaps it indicates the sublimity of the God (Zeus Hypatos/Hypsistos), his closeness to the sky and weather phenomena (Zeus Hyetios or Ombrios), or rather a link with the wild, disordered world outside the city (Zeus Lykaeos, for instance). Some of these meanings may be present in the case of the hero who is worshipped on a mountain, but the primary connotation will likely be different. The temenos of Telephos on mount Parthenion was said to be the place where as an infant he was exposed by his mother, the παρθένος Auge, and where he was suckled by a deer.<sup>7</sup> Rather than commanding the wild domain like a God, the hero is here shown as pathetically vulnerable to it, even if in the end he survives.

A similar disjunction holds in the case of springs (which I consider here without regard to attestation of a formal sanctuary, since it is true to say that springs are intrinsically holy places). When divine associations are present at springs, the connotations are generally positive, suggesting the benefits which can reach the worshippers. The god's power caused the stream to flow or the well to appear — thus frequently with Poseidon. The spring itself possesses healing or oracular powers attributed to the deity in whose sanctuary it is situated. But for heroes and still more often heroines springs have often a lugubrious tone. Peirene's tears at the death of her son cause her metamorphosis into a spring; Glauke leaps into a well; Makaria's spring is connected with her self-sacrifice, or the severed head of Eurystheus, or both; the river Lophis springs from the body of a nameless sacrificed boy.<sup>8</sup> It does not matter that such stories may not

<sup>7</sup> Paus. VIII 54, 6.

<sup>8</sup> Paus. II 3, 2; II 3, 6; I 32, 5; Strab. VIII 6, 19, p. 377; Paus. IX 33, 4.

belong to the older mythopoeic strata; whatever their date, they conform among themselves. Similarly, sexual encounters at springs are only rarely positively depicted, as with Amymone; more often the woman is a victim of rape, like Auge or Alkippe, while Alope became a spring when killed by her father, angry at her giving birth. Different is the case of Amphiaraos, whose spring at Oropos is connected not with his death but with his *ἄνοδος* — but Amphiaraos is a figure whose status between hero and god is problematic, and it is precisely this status which is underlined by the tradition of the *ἄνοδος*. The healing and oracular spring was linked with the transitional event in the story of the the cult-figure.<sup>9</sup>

### 3. Siting: the human landscape

Enough has been said to indicate some of the ways in which natural features could alter their meaning in accordance with the status or type of being receiving cult. I shall turn now to some features of the human landscape, primarily that is to objects connected with the life of the polis. If, as I believe, the phenomenon of the hero is closely linked with the development of the polis, it would seem that such features would be very prominently marked with hero-shrines. Yet it is not really surprising that, just as *πολιοῦχοι θεοί* are conspicuous beside heroic city-protectors, so agoras, acropoleis, gates, and other areas of significant civic space display cults both divine and heroic. This is most obviously demonstrable in the case of the agora, where cults such as those of Zeus Agoraios, Hermes Agoraios and so

<sup>9</sup> Amymone: Eur. *Phoen.* 188; Apollod. II 1, 4. Auge: Paus. VIII 47, 4. Alkippe: Hellanicus, *FGrH* 323a F 1; Paus. I 21, 3-4. Alope: Hyginus, *Fab.* 187, perhaps ultimately from Euripides. Amphiaraos: Paus. I 34, 4.



on are commonplace, and so too are heroic cults, often though not always of founders or figures otherwise central to the city's traditions. Here there seems less scope for a difference between heroes and gods in the setting's «meaning» than was the case with natural features, in part because the mythical dimension is very much less. Heroes are buried in the agora because it is the agora, the civic centre; or alternatively, as at Megara, civic buildings are so placed as to incorporate heroic burials (Paus. I 43, 3). The meaning is clear enough, and not all that different from most of the agora's divine cults — Zeus who presides over its civilising, justice-dispensing functions, Artemis Eukleia who combines a strictly military function with an interest in childbirth as the process which produces the city's protectors, and so on. The major difference is simply that whereas the agora cult is one of the god's many manifestations, for the hero, citizen of one city in death as in life, it is generally unique. In other respects, the situation in the agora actually approximates the hero to the Gods and distances him from the ordinary human, at least in cities where extramural burial is the norm.

Although unlike the entirely manmade agora the acropolis, where it exists, is a natural feature, comparison of the divine and heroic cults of acropoleis yields similar results to the agora cults. There are some cults which apparently resemble forms found on mountains outside towns (Zeus Larisaios at Argos), some where the significance of the acropolis setting is unclear (Ganymeda at Phlious), and also cults like the widespread Athena Polias where the defensive aspect of the mountain seems to be important. Given the typical interests of heroes, we might expect them to be well represented in the last category, yet in fact we have convincing exemplification only in the case of Athens — and the Athenian acropolis is untypical in other respects. Kekrops, served by the suggestively-named *genos* of the Amyndridai, and even more Erechtheus, the warrior-king, have certainly some connexion with the military aspects

of the acropolis, yet they stand closer to gods than does the «typical» hero. Narrative patterns go some way towards separating hero and god: Athena and Poseidon compete for sovereignty of the acropolis, in a story-type known in many places outside Athens, while Erechtheus is killed by Poseidon himself, to whom he stands so close in cult, and among the daughters of Kekrops, at least Aglauros dies a spectacular death.<sup>10</sup> The hero is set apart from the god by the fact of his death, and in several versions the death is closely connected with the military and defensive aspects of the citadel. Yet the forms of cult suggest that these heroic elements may be secondary to the position on the acropolis among, and like, the gods.

More widely attested are the defensive functions of heroes at gates — periphery rather than centre. While the proximity of some heroa to gates may be coincidental, other cases are sufficient to reveal a pattern, exemplified for instance by the dead of Plataia.<sup>11</sup> Both one of the Amazons and those who fought against them had tombs near gates in Athens, for the defeated enemy-turned-protector can also take part in this pattern.<sup>12</sup> That the pattern was well understood is shown by the case of Menoikeus in Thebes — if we believe that this figure is a back-formation from literature; the tomb of the boy whose willing sacrifice assured victory was pointed out by the Νηί(σ)ται

<sup>10</sup> Athena and Poseidon: Hdt. VIII 55. Parallels outside Athens: Paus. II 1, 6 (Corinth); II 15, 5; 22, 5 (Argos); II 30, 6 (Troizen). Erechtheus: Eur. *Erechtheus* fr. 65, 60; *Ion* 281-282. Aglauros: Eur. *Ion* 267-274; Amelesagoras, *FGrH* 330 F 1; Philochorus, *FGrH* 328 F 105.

<sup>11</sup> Paus. IX 2, 5; cf. Thuc. III 58, 4.

<sup>12</sup> Thus Onesilos at Amathous, Hdt. V 114; see in general M. VISSER, «Worship your enemies: aspects of the cult of heroes in ancient Greece», in *HThR* 75 (1982), 403-428.



πύλαι.<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, divine sanctuaries near gates seem to be a more random bunch where situation is of less importance. An exception to this might be the sanctuaries of Eileithuia found beside gates in both Corinth and Argos — Eileithuia is the goddess who presides over the production of future soldiers, and her close connexion with matters defensive is seen for instance in her double temple shared with Sosipolis at Elis (Paus. VI 20, 2). But on the whole it is the hero, not the god, who protects the gate; the Gods' defensive power is perhaps more generalised, indeed the god has always the option of leaving the city. One reason for the clustering of heroes at gates may lie in the ambivalent status of the hero, who is both human and more than human. Of course, the heroic tomb is normally exempt from the polluting effect of ordinary burial-places, and as we have seen tomb-based heroa are commonplace within the city walls. Still, the normal place for tombs in most cities was along the roads leading away from the town area, and in most cities intramural burial remained anomalous. A burial position situated actually at the transition from outside the walls to the inner habitational area would perfectly express the peculiar status of the hero as a being situated between the divine and hence permanently pure, and the human and hence subject to pollution. Hence the gate as simple entrance and exit relates to the *status* of the hero, whereas in its role as city defence it is aligned with the typical *function* of the heroes situated near it.

#### 4. Hero-sanctuary and group

So far I have been considering the sanctuary purely as a special area in relation to its setting. But much of its real

<sup>13</sup> Paus. IX 25, 1; cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 911 ff.; 985 ff.

significance comes from what is done there, from the cult acts which place the sanctuary in its setting in relation to other sanctuaries and cult complexes, to the passage and perception of calendrical time, and to the life of the city and its sub-groups. We might begin by looking at the heroon as the meeting-place of a group. Such a function is well-attested for Athens, where the shrines of the tribal eponymoi acted to some extent as a kind of tribal centre — indeed, it was perhaps precisely this physical location which enabled a sense of tribal loyalties to be created *ex nihilo*. We can get some idea of what this involved from fourth-century tribal inscriptions, which taken together create a picture in which members of the tribes assemble for a larger, city festival where «their» hero plays a part (as Pandion in the Pandia).<sup>14</sup> Sacrifice is performed at the heroon, after which the *φυλῆται* hold a meeting; to us, the most visible business of the meeting is the promulgation of honorary decrees, since the record is then inscribed on stone and placed in the heroon, which thus reinforces group consciousness as sacrificial space, as agora, and as archive.

Outside Attica the relative paucity of documentation does not permit such detailed knowledge of the role of the sanctuary, but where we know of the existence of shrines of heroes eponymous to particular groups within the city, it is not hard to imagine that something roughly similar may have taken place. The Athenian tribal heroes are of course in a peculiar position as the eponyms of artificially created divisions, and it may well be that both in Athens and elsewhere the «heroic» eponyms of the older-established tribes and other groups had a much less definite existence in cult. But it seems unlikely that, for instance, the tomb of Hyrnetho in Argos had no special connexion with

<sup>14</sup> E.g. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1138-1155, and see E. KEARNS, *The Heroes of Attica*, BICS Suppl. 57 (London 1989), 81 n. 3.

the non-Dorian tribe Hyrnathioi, whose periodic lack of political privileges might in fact make a heroic focus of identity all the more appealing. Still clearer is the case of the Aigeidai or Aigidai in Sparta, linked by Herodotus (IV 149) with the hero Aigeus (a descendant of Kadmos, not the Athenian hero of the same name); it is stretching credulity to suppose that this group never met at the tomb of Aigeus which is mentioned in Pausanias (III 15, 8) as forming part of a cluster of heroa near the Lesche Poikile, where the complicated genealogical links between the heroes seem particularly suggestive of an interested descent-group, real or supposed.

But it is Attica again which furnishes our only detailed knowledge of «unofficial» groups whose activities centre on hero-sanctuaries. While tribes, genē, phratries and so on can be considered important if not in every respect comparable divisions of the citizen body, the groups of orgeones are small, more informal organisations, loosely but not exclusively based on kinship, whose essential purpose is simply to meet together to worship a hero or heroes, and which apparently have no reference to the city in general. This meeting, however, seems to take place only once a year and to last for no more than two days; documents drawn up by two different groups (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2499, 2501) record the leasing out of their τεμένη imposing, it is true, the obligation to «use it ὡς ἱερῶι» — meaning, presumably, to avoid introducing polluting objects and activities — but apparently demanding access only at the time of the festival, when the lessee had also to make certain preparations. Without exaggerating the importance of cult and sanctuary, which were thus in full operation for only a brief, though regularly recurring, period of time, we can still see that they had a special if limited importance for the orgeones; particularly by contrast with the lessee, who was obliged to preserve the special character of the sacred space but whose participation in the rites which were its *raison d'être* was, presumably, limited to the preparation.

These privately-owned sanctuaries, then, contrast with the sanctuaries of heroes connected with tribes and other such groups, where access seems to have been unrestricted, either by religious or by practical considerations. Further, the sanctuaries of the tribal heroes in Athens were not the exclusive property of the φυλέται, but as the repositories of a state cult were of potential interest to any citizen, and the same was probably true as a general rule of the sanctuaries, whether divine or heroic, with a particular relationship to other groups as well.<sup>15</sup>

## 5. Hero-sanctuary and divine sanctuary

It is convenient to consider together the spatial and temporal aspects which link the activities performed in the hero-sanctuary with a wider sacred and civic canvas. At the simplest and most frequent level, where two cult acts are performed on the same day or as part of the same festival, a connexion is generally perceived between the two areas of space where the acts take place. If the two are not contiguous and hence permanently linked, they will normally be joined by a procession which articulates a link given expression during the period when the areas display their greatest significance.<sup>16</sup> The general

---

<sup>15</sup> I should like here to correct my statement in *Crux: Essays presented to G.E.M. de Ste Croix*, *History of Political Thought*, 6 (Exeter 1985), 205-206, and *The Heroes of Attica*, 39, n. 139, that there is no evidence for cults exclusive to a genos in Attica; Hdt. V 61 is a clear example (the Gephyraioi). However, in view of Herodotus' emphatic language I still think it possible that this is very much the exception.

<sup>16</sup> One example of such a procession is that held at the Oschophoria, moving between the sanctuaries of Dionysos and of Athena Skiras at Phaleron. See in general M.P. NILSSON, *Opuscula selecta* I (Lund 1951), 172-174.



principle is the same whether heroes or gods are involved, but the appearance of heroes in the pattern allows the cultic links in space and time more easily to be underlined with links in myth or narrative (Greek mythology, or at least its more public parts, being of course predominantly a heroic mythology). Heroes, then, may be linked either with other heroes or with gods.

By far the better attested pattern is the link with the god. The phenomenon of the heroic cult-area either close to or enclosed by the divine sanctuary is such a widespread and complex one that its treatment here can no longer be postponed. Typically the cult pattern combines spatial proximity and, usually, subordination, with a temporal relation formed through sacrifice or other cult-acts, — often lesser and preliminary, sometimes identical — taking place on what is perceived as the same occasion, and equally typically the cult goes hand in hand with a narrative tradition linking hero or heroine to deity, most frequently as first priest or *πρῶτος εὐρετής* taught by the God. In very general terms, this is a pattern which confirms the view of the hero as intermediate — in more than one sense — between god and man. The independent heroon may to some extent do the same, in that while its form and function is in many, if not all, respects analogous to a divine place of worship, it is frequently smaller and less elaborate than a «typical» divine sanctuary; but where worship of a hero is carried out independently of divine cultus, the «meaning» of the heroic cult is obviously generated by reference to the whole background of cult activity, rather than receiving a special emphasis by juxtaposition. Where a small heroon exists alongside a large divine temple, where the sacrifice of a piglet precedes that of an ox, there can be no quarrelling with the relative ranking of the honorands. Heroes receive sacrifice — they are *χρείττονες*, greater than men — but they belong to a lower rank than gods. Yet proximity tends to express more than just status. The relationship between hero and god is not

one merely of comparative ranking, for since shrines do not move around it is necessarily one particular hero who is honoured next to one god, and this point is very often underlined by an appropriateness in myth. Thus the eponymous heroine of Plataia, linked with Zeus by the tradition of a mock wedding at the Daidala festival, had her heroon near the statue and altar of Zeus Eleutherios (Paus. IX 2, 7; cf. Plut. Fr. 157, 6); the tomb of Aphrodite's real lover Anchises was near her mountain sanctuary between Mantinea and Orchomenos; and beyond the extramural sanctuary of Amphiaraos at Argos were the shrines of his wife Eriphyle and of his charioteer Baton (Paus. II 23, 2). The heroon might be outside the divine sanctuary or actually within the precinct wall (in both cases, of course, connected sacrifices could be made) — thus a rather complicated sacred space at Argos, identified as a temple of Cretan Dionysos, contained the burial place of Ariadne (Paus. II 23, 7). Mythologically, the role of all these heroes and heroines lies in their human closeness to divinity, and the same is true of perhaps the commonest mythological link of all, the hero as institutor of a form of divine worship and founder of the sanctuary.

Almost every sanctuary seems to have a tradition of its foundation, and though the tradition does not always relate that the founder died and was buried on the spot — sometimes one person is responsible for several foundations in one locality, sometimes an alternative mythological tradition is too strong — it is safe to assume that the «evidence» for the tradition, in more cases than we know, would have included a nearby heroon. Indeed, the strength of the pattern is such that in some cases it is likely that an originally quite independent hero was drawn into the cultic and mythical orbit of the deity, simply by the accident of physical proximity. Certainly, it was not possible on every occasion to produce a convincing mythological link between the two; the fact that the bones of the eponymous hero of the Arcadians rested near the altar of Hera, at a place called



«Altars of the Sun», in Mantinea could only be explained by invoking an oracle. But the hero as cult-founder seems to be represented in every part of the Greek world, and indeed at a general level supplies a parallel to the better-investigated phenomenon of the hero as founder of a political grouping. Like the political founder, the cult founder establishes a pattern which will be followed by posterity, but unlike him in so doing he establishes a link between god and man. An equivalent role to founder is that of first priest or priestess (thus Orestes founds the cult of Artemis at Halai Araphenides, and Iphigeneia is her first priestess at Brauron: Eur. *IT* 1449 ff.), and there are several cases where it is clear that the main hero in a divine sanctuary in a sense represents and supplies the model for the priest (or more rarely, other cult personnel). This is a pattern particularly well seen in Attica, where such heroes are both priestly archetype and ἀρχηγέτης of the genos which supplies the priest.<sup>17</sup> We might expect that the cult focus of priest or founder would be situated inside the sanctuary, since in these cases the connexion between hero and God is explicitly cultic and the sanctuary is the locus of that connexion. There are indeed examples of such a situation, often incorporating something on a smaller scale than a full heroon — Boutes, ἀρχηγέτης of the Eteoboutadai in Athens, has his altar inside the Erechtheion, Alexanor the founder of the Asklepieion of Titane has his statue established there — but again, a separate heroon of this type of hero is as often found just outside the divine sanctuary. The unnamed hero who «led Dionysos to Sparta» has his sanctuary only «near» Dionysos Kolonatas, Palasgos who founded Demeter Pelasgis at Argos is again located near the divine cult

<sup>17</sup> An extra-Attic example is provided by Euangelos, *archegetes* of the Euangelidai who were the announcers of oracles of Branchidai as he had been (Conon, *FGrH* 26 F 1, 44).

area. In many, perhaps most, of these cases, the connexion through a founding myth is no doubt simply a response to this physical location, but the historical sequence does not affect the later picture: founding and priestly heroes are not necessarily worshipped within the divine sanctuary. On the other hand, there are a few instances of heroes within the sanctuary who have very little mythical or structural connexion with the God: the heroised Demosthenes in the precinct of Poseidon at Kalaureia, for instance (Paus. II 33, 3).

So we are forced to conclude that proximity is as significant as enclosure and seems to have a similar, if not necessarily identical, meaning. The significance perhaps lies not so much in the relative position of hero and god as it might be plotted on a map, but in the fact that the worshipper moves from one to the other. At festivals, it is common practice to prescribe a lesser *πρόθυμα* to one or more heroes before the god is given his due, so that the rite which from the hero's point of view is complete, at the same time forms an introductory stage in the whole act, viewed as centred on the god. As in myth the founding hero mediates between god and man by establishing the cult and thus setting up a form of communication, so in cult the sacrifice to the hero, situated at the beginning of the rite, provides a link between ordinary, profane time and the climactic sacred moment of the divine sacrifice. A similar effect can be seen in spatial terms particularly where the heroon is outside the precinct, although a situation just inside the wall would be equivalent; on non-festival days, too, the hero must be passed before the god is reached, and even on such less formal occasions it may well have been considered proper at least to greet the hero, perhaps to make a small offering.<sup>18</sup> Thus in many cases a liminal position

---

<sup>18</sup> Although the lexicographical/scholiastic tradition asserts that heroa were passed in silence (e.g. Hesych. *s.v.* *κρείττονας*), it is clear that this is an

in both space and time is fundamental to the hero's role as part of a larger, god-centred complex.<sup>19</sup>

Thus far the generalities. But we do have a few scraps of information which can give us some idea of the kind of variations possible in the pattern of the hero connected with the divine sanctuary. First and most obviously, perhaps, there are cases where the hero stands very close to the god and may seem more like a doublet or a consort than a votary — the sort of hero who gave rise to the once popular and not perhaps totally invalid idea of the «faded god». Thus for instance the sanctuary of Demeter Chthonia at Hermion contained as well as the temple of Demeter a temple dedicated to Klymenos, whom the local tradition available to Pausanias identified as a typical founding hero, though Pausanias himself, surely rightly in view of the scale of the construction and the style of sacrifice,<sup>20</sup> suggests

---

inaccurate extension into a general rule of what applied to the shrines of heroes considered to be dangerous. Many heroes were greeted on passing, as were gods: thus Pindar, *Pyth.* VIII 56-60, and see J. RUSTEN, Γείτων ἥρωας, in *HSCP* 87 (1983), 289-297.

<sup>19</sup> *IG* IV 768 and *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 297, third century altars from Troizen and Epidauros respectively, attest the title ἥρωας κλαίκοφόρος, making it likely that the hero could also have been seen as the doorkeeper or guardian of the sanctuary (cf. W.D. O'FLAHERTY, in C. BERKSON, *Elephanta: the cave of Shiva* [Princeton 1983], 27-31); a role of this sort would have obvious connexions with the prominence of heroes at city gates. Another possible heroic doorkeeper is known in the shape of Herakles the Idaian Dactyl, said to open and close the temple of Demeter at Boeotian Mykalessos every morning and evening — but here there is no sign of a cult, and as A. SCHACHTER (*Cults of Boeotia* I [London 1981], 157) suggests all this may indicate is an admission that the sanctuary had no regular cult personnel.

<sup>20</sup> Paus. II 35, 4; 9-10. The building sacred to Klymenos is described as ναός and is mentioned second after that of Chthonia, and while Pausanias is precise on the distinction between θυσία and ἐναγισμός here he says

that he is rather a form of the underworld god. Here a common divine cult combination has partially given way to the pattern of the subordinated hero; a similar ambiguity clings to the equally Demetriad figure Euboulos/Eubouleus. More complex — perhaps because we have more data — is the case of Erechtheus on the Athenian acropolis. In the long history of this cult, two distinct traditions on the nature of the relationship between Poseidon and Erechtheus are discernible, yet the chronological distinction between the two is not clear-cut, and there may have been several other versions current at one time or another. In Pausanias' description (I 26, 5 ff.) the building is called the Erechtheion, and sacrifice to Poseidon and to Erechtheus is performed on the same altar, in accordance with an oracular response not otherwise mentioned. We can also deduce that it is Boutes, not Erechtheus, who occupies the typical role of the priestly hero, and even if this description were our only source of knowledge for this cult it would be clear that the relationship between god and hero is unusually close. Fifth century evidence in fact suggests that at that date no separation was made in cult, since the title used is Poseidon Erechtheus,<sup>21</sup> and though «Poseidon *and* Erechtheus» appears as early as the first half of the fourth century (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1146), the earlier form survives alongside it. Originally no doubt Poseidon Erechtheus belonged to a pre-heroic class of beings and might best have been described as an ἐπιχώριος δαίμων<sup>22</sup>; his cult was closely connected with that of Athena, as is clear already from the Iliadic Catalogue (Il. II 547 ff.), and as continues to be the case in the plan of the fifth-century building. But his selection as one of the

---

that the people of Hermion θύουσιν to Klymenos. The existence of an associated χάσμα γῆς is also suggestive.

<sup>21</sup> Thus IG I<sup>2</sup> 580 and Eur. *Erechtheus*, fr. 65, 93-4 Austin.

<sup>22</sup> The phrase used by Pausanias (VI 20, 2) to characterise Sosipolis of Elis.



Cleisthenic eponymoi guarantees a position at least in some respects like that of a normal hero, and the tradition of his death was thus presumably familiar by this stage.<sup>23</sup> Here then we have a complex quasi-heroic figure who is both paired in some way with Athena, and linked with Poseidon both by identification and by traditions of hostility. The form of the sanctuary perfectly reflects what we can glean from other sources; a double temple, its two parts concerned respectively primarily with Poseidon Erechtheus and with Athena Polias, and a single altar for Poseidon and Erechtheus, reflecting either their identity or their very close connexion.

The original relationship between the Arcadian heroine Kallisto and the goddess Artemis Kalliste is generally thought to have been similar to that between Erechtheus and Poseidon: the two were once either identical or nearly so. But Pausanias' description of the cult-place at Trikolonoi (VIII 35, 8) suggests a different development; the major structure is a large mound of earth, known as the grave of Kallisto, containing a grove of various types of trees and topped by a shrine of Artemis Kalliste. There is no sign that the heroine received regular sacrifice, but the layout alone is a striking inversion of the norm making the heroic cult-place a smaller and subordinate part of the divine. It is possible that the identification of the tumulus as a tomb is relatively late, and that the heroine Kallisto at no stage had any «real», that is cultic, existence; yet as the mother of Arkas she ought clearly to be an important figure in myth, and once the

---

<sup>23</sup> It is often stated in modern works that Erechtheus had a tomb in the Erechtheion or temple of Athena Polias, assuming them to be the same thing; but what Apollodorus (III 14,7) and Clement (*Protr.* III 45, 1) actually say is that *Erichthonios* was buried in the temple of Athena Polias. The relationship between these two figures is certainly close, though they were not identical in myth; they *may* have been identified in cult, but this is far from certain.

separation of divine and heroic figures had occurred, the form of the relationship between the two must be considered significant.

But a more straightforward example, perhaps, of apparent subordination of the divine to the heroic is the case of the sanctuary of Hippolytos at Troizen. The large precinct contained besides the main temple of Hippolytos temples dedicated to Apollo Epibaterios, Damia and Auxesia, and Aphrodite Kataskopia, as well as a stadium, appropriate to Hippolytos' interests and ephebic status, and other structures, including the tomb of Phaidra and in some versions that of Hippolytos.<sup>24</sup> What is remarkable about this complex is how neatly it falls into the pattern of a major divine sanctuary, containing buildings for the cult of the main deity honoured and of subordinate, closely related gods and heroes (Aphrodite Kataskopia, Phaidra), as well as attracting other cults apparently not integrally connected (Apollo, Damia and Auxesia). In fact the sanctuary plan taken on its own would once more lead us to conclude that Hippolytos was not a hero at all, but a local divinity, and something of this sort appears to be confirmed by Pausanias' report of the local tradition that Hippolytos had no tomb, but was bodily translated to the aither. He is apparently like Erechtheus a pre-heroic figure later partially assimilated to the class of heroes, although unlike Erechtheus he is not also approximated to an Olympian God. However, the transformation to heroic status is not merely formal, since it is clear that in some versions Hippolytos had a tomb: «they know it but they do not show it» says Pausanias (III 32, 1, cf. 4), referring to a tumulus crowned with myrtle, near that of Phaidra, and the scholiast to Euripides

<sup>24</sup> Paus. II 32, 1-4. Hippolytos may have had a similar, if less elaborate, cult complex in Athens; Eur. *Hipp.* 31-32 links him in cult there with both Aphrodite and Phaidra, and *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 369, 66, 'Αφροδίτες ἐν Ἰππολυ[τείῳ], may suggest that as at Troizen the deity was topographically subordinated to the hero.



also records a tomb at Troizen; the use of the unusual word ἥρῳν may suggest a local tradition actually using that word for the tomb. As with the Erechtheion, then, the cult buildings express two clashing concepts, the hero and the divine figure, and in both cases the difficulty seems to have been felt: but whereas in Athens the mortal component came to predominate in people's minds, in Troizen Hippolytos seems to be viewed not quite as a god, it is true, but certainly as more than an ordinary hero.

These last-discussed cases also demonstrate that the mythological connexion between hero and god is not always a straightforward or expected one. Erechtheus defeats Poseidon's son in the Eleusinian war, and is killed by a blow from his trident: «he will be called Poseidon after the one who killed him», says Athena in Euripides (*Erechtheus*, fr. 65 Austin). And in one version Kallisto's destroyer was not Hera, but Artemis (Kalliste) herself.<sup>25</sup> Hippolytos of course rejects Aphrodite, and she retaliates by destroying him. Yet if any of these cult-complexes includes a ritual opposition corresponding to the mythical hostility, we do not hear of it. Such «negative links» are found in two well-known cases: Pelops and Zeus at Olympia, and Telephos and Asklepios at Pergamon. Pausanias, who makes the comparison (V 13, 3), tells us that in each case some type of participation in the cult of the hero renders the worshipper unfit to come before the god. Here, by contrast, a mythological dimension is lacking and the point seems to be an opposition between the *status* of hero and that of god, stressed to an unusual degree.<sup>26</sup> But whatever meaning is attached to such prohibi-

<sup>25</sup> [Hesiodus], Fr. 163 M.W.

<sup>26</sup> Elsewhere (III 26, 10) Pausanias tells us that the name of Telephos' son Eurypylos was not to be spoken in the Asklepieion, since he had killed

tions, they clearly establish a negative version of the link between sanctuaries formed by sacrificial processions. In the simple case, sacrifice at sanctuary A is followed by sacrifice at sanctuary B, as part of the same series of cult acts, part of the same festival; the throng of worshippers moves from one to the other. One testimony (*Schol. ad Pind. Ol. I 149*) even makes the sacrifice to Pelops a *πρόθυμα* to that for Zeus, but if this is true the movement is one marked out with conditions and incompatible with complete participation in the first rite. In fact generally in the negative pattern, the move to the God is the one direction marked out as forbidden to the worshipper, unless certain conditions are met. Other types of ritual opposition are known in non-heroic contexts, as for instance the rule requiring the absence of the priestess of Demeter at sacrifice to the mysterious Eleusinian figure Daeira; a possible parallel to this might be the remarkable ritual of the Asklepieion at Titane, where the statue of Koronis is removed from the sanctuary at the time of the greatest sacrifice to the god, and given honours instead in the temple of Athena.<sup>27</sup>

Clearly this last case must have had more significances than it seems now possible to recover. But when we simply consider the times and places at which the cult acts take place, it is equally clear that this sequence of events generates both a connexion and an opposition. In one sense, a positive connexion is established between two sanctuaries — but this is not the simple case where procession and sacrifice link A and B, hero and god: rather, the procession moves from sanctuary A to sanctuary B for the purpose of transporting a *tertium quid* — in other words, the

---

Asklepios' son Machaon; but since Telephos' own name occurred in the hymn used to Asklepios, this can hardly be the origin of the prohibition.

<sup>27</sup> Eust. *ad Hom. Il.* VI 648. Cf. also Plut. Fr. 157, 2 on ritual opposition between Hera and Dionysos at Athens.

heroine Koronis forms a link between two divine sanctuaries, between the cult complex of Asklepios and that of Athena. Further, the two climactic actions — the sacrifice to Asklepios and the honours paid to Koronis — are indissolubly connected, for they happen simultaneously, and the one cannot take place without the other. Still, this very simultaneity guarantees an incompatibility. This is not the widespread case of preliminary sacrifice to hero(ine) followed by sacrifice to god; rather, the two must be opposed, since their physical separation is emphasized and it is clearly impossible for the same person to participate in both sacrifices. Here, the presence of the heroine in the same sanctuary seems to be motivated by the need for her periodic absence.<sup>28</sup>

The ritual transportation of a cult statue, though not the norm of the Greek procession, is not uncommon,<sup>29</sup> and frequently serves to link two sanctuaries, perhaps drawing attention to former settlement or worship patterns, perhaps underlining a mythological connexion. Yet Koronis is, I think, the only case we know of a heroic statue being taken in procession between two sanctuaries. Of their nature, heroes are very much less freefloating than gods and in any one locality are normally worshipped in one place only. Indeed, the hero as link between two gods is, as we might expect, very much rarer than the hero connected with one deity. From mythological data,

<sup>28</sup> There seems to be no explanation for such an action in terms of myth or otherwise, unless we are to invoke an obscure tradition making Koronis the lover, not the mother, of Asklepios (*Schol. ad Hom. Il. IV* 195; *Hyg. Fab.* 97 — explained by U. v. WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Isyllos von Epidauros* [Berlin 1886], 49 n. 12, as resulting from a lacuna). If this is a genuine tradition it is possible that at Titane Koronis was thought to have betrayed Asklepios as elsewhere she did Apollo.

<sup>29</sup> See M.P. NILSSON, «Die Prozessionstypen im griechischen Kult», in *Opuscula selecta I* (Lund 1951), 174-175.



indeed from the apparent staging requirements of Euripides' play, we might expect that Hippolytos would act as a link between the loathed Aphrodite (with whom he *is* connected in cult) and the loved Artemis, but neither in Troizen nor in Athens is there an incontrovertible sign of a cultic connexion with Artemis.<sup>30</sup> In fact, the two best candidates for «link heroes» both come from Patrai; I do not know whether this is coincidence. The less definite case is that of Preuges (Paus. VII 20, 8-9), credited in myth as a typical founder-figure who brought a statue from Sparta and established the cult of Artemis Limnatis. In the city as it was in Pausanias' day, this goddess had two cult centres, one in Mesoa, where Preuges was said to have established the statue and where for most of the year it reposed, and the second opposite the agora, where the ancient statue was brought for the duration of the festival. This second centre was typical of the larger cult complex, being overall sacred to one deity — Artemis Limnatis — but containing as well as her temple the temples of assorted others, conspicuously Asklepios and Athena. It was in the stoa in front of Athena's temple that the tomb of Preuges was to be found, yet he received sacrifice not, apparently, in close connexion with that goddess but at the festival of Artemis Limnatis herself. Perhaps his juxtaposition with Athena was pure accident, but even so it might seem that the presence of the Artemisian hero next to Athena would have helped to integrate the other goddess within the cult complex.

At any rate, in the case of Eurypylos (Paus. VII 19, 1-10) we have enough information to see that there is nothing accidental

<sup>30</sup> The temple of Artemis Lykeia at Troizen was said to have been founded by Hippolytos (Paus. II 31, 4), but this would be an almost inevitable consequence of the classic form of the myth; it is not in itself evidence of cult.




about this important hero's connexion with both Dionysos and Artemis. These two deities are not uncommonly associated in cult and have in common a prominence in the cultic life of Patrai, but the figure of Eurypylos is also prominent in making sense of this joint prominence. The mythical tradition made him the founder of the cult of Dionysos Aisymnetes, the god whom he brought to Patrai in a chest, and a sort of second founder of that of Artemis Triklaria, for human sacrifice in that cult came to an end simultaneously with the establishment of Dionysos and the cessation of Eurypylos' madness. There is much which could be said about the motifs evoked by this myth; as far as cult goes, we might note that the god's title αἰσυμνήτης could perhaps have been understood to refer to a «correction» in the Artemis cult (though other interpretations are certainly possible), and less conjecturally that the festival of Dionysos involved a preliminary rite in which children were prepared as though for the Artemisian sacrifice, then abandoned their garlands of wheat to the goddess, whose temple was on the banks of the Meilichos, bathed and put on fresh crowns of ivy before proceeding to the temple of Dionysos. This would obviously be taken to refer to the superseding of the old form of the Artemis cult by the agency of the new cult of Dionysos (similarly the river was said to have been renamed, having previously been Ameilichos) and no specific reference to the hero Eurypylos is necessary in the ritual. Eurypylos does have a place in the festival, though, receiving annual ἑναγισμός at this time in the typical manner of the founding hero. What makes this rite unusual is the topographical position of his shrine and hence of the sacrifice. We would expect that Eurypylos would have his tomb at the sanctuary of Dionysos Aisymnetes, situated between the agora and the sea, but in fact it is on the acropolis — between the temple and the altar or Artemis Laphria. The position could hardly be more pointed, joining Artemis with Dionysos, but the complexity does not end here:

it is Artemis Triklaria and not Laphria with whom Eurypylos is connected in the story. Presumably Nilsson and Herbillon<sup>31</sup> were right to suppose that the Artemis sanctuary on the acropolis had once been attributed to the Triklarian goddess, who would thus have had two cult-places as the Limnatis continued to have. The Laphria cult was in Pausanias' account credited with having arrived from Kalydon, and the name is indeed found in northern Greece; but the peculiar form of sacrifice (if with Piccaluga we do not want to call it «cruel», we can surely agree to call it «wild»)<sup>32</sup> gives it something in common with the supposed former practice in the Triklaria cult, and it is not impossible that the holocaust of wild animals might have been seen as a less horrific — ἐλαφρότερον — but still unusual, substitute for the human sacrifice. Whatever we make of this, it is still clear that in Pausanias' day the sacrifice to Eurypylos performed at the festival of Dionysos entailed entering the precinct of Artemis Laphria on the acropolis, and hence for some at least of the participants involved the processional link between these two divine sanctuaries. At least three areas of the city were visited in the course of the festival, and Eurypylos has some connexion with all of them.

Thus the link which Eurypylos provided between the two Artemis sanctuaries is not a direct one, since he is connected by myth to one, and by location and hence cult-act to the other. The hero as link between two or more sanctuaries of what is perceived as the same divinity is a not uncommon pattern, but it is much more usually expressed in myth than in cult. So for

<sup>31</sup> M.P. NILSSON, *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung* (Leipzig 1906), 217; J. HERBILLON, *Les cultes de Patras* (Baltimore 1929), 41.

<sup>32</sup> The form of sacrifice and its implications are discussed by G. PICCALUGA, in *Le sacrifice dans l'Antiquité*, Entretiens Hardt, 27 (Genève 1981), 243-287.



Diagram

instance three sanctuaries near Megalopolis, of which at least two and possibly all three were dedicated to the Maniai (goddesses resembling the Eumenides), were said to have been founded by Orestes, and the contrasting cult prescribed in each of them was explained in terms of his madness and recovery (Paus. VIII 34, 1). But there is no sign of any worship of Orestes himself, though it may at one time have existed. There is, I think, one example of a genuine heroic cult connexion between two sanctuaries of Herakles, who in this context should be regarded as a god. This is the case of Diomos, the founder of the famous Herakleion at Kynosarges in Athens, who was claimed to have been the first to pay Herakles divine honours. We would expect him to have cult at Kynosarges, and yet his priest turns up in an inscription relating to the Herakleion at Bate (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1247), a sanctuary closely associated with the cult group



known as the Mesogeioi. It is possible that here we have an anomaly like that of Eurypylos, with Diomos linked in myth to one sanctuary and in cult to another; but a more elegant solution, as I have suggested elsewhere,<sup>33</sup> is to suppose that the celebrations of the Mesogeioi involved a procession (a πομπή is mentioned in this inscription and the related 1245) from the Kynosarges temple to that at Bate, in which the priest of Diomos took part. We could even conjecture that like Koronis Diomos might have been taken in statue form from one place to the other. What would seem to follow from this hypothesis is that the Mesogeioi were in a sense validating their own special sanctuary by associating it with one of the two best-known Herakleia in central Athens, the one with which the first perception of Herakles as god was connected. Perhaps it was intended to represent the Bate sanctuary as a direct offshoot of Kynosarges, or as connected in the founding myth. In any case, the presence of Diomos would be a distinctive and symbolic feature of the Kynosarges cult, and hence his worship in whatever form by the Mesogeioi would be an effective way of making the connexion between the two Herakleia.

## 6. Links between hero-sanctuaries

The basic form, then, of the hero and his sanctuary characterised by a connexion with a divine sanctuary was clearly capable of many variables — no doubt we can reconstruct only a fraction. But cult could also link two heroic sanctuaries, with

<sup>33</sup> *The Heroes of Attica*, 98 n. 92. In support of a link between two sanctuaries, we could further adduce the lexicographical tradition s.v. Κυνόσαργες: when Diomos made the sacrifice (at Bate?), a white dog ran off with the bones, and where it dropped them (at Kynosarges) an altar was founded.



or without divine reference. Whenever hero sanctuaries appear in a pair or a group, there is always the possibility that there is a cultic significance in the physical proximity; but it is only a possibility, unless confirmed by other evidence. Some of the pitfalls are illustrated by Plutarch's *forty-eighth Greek Question*: «Why is the heroon of Odysseus near that of the Leukippides at Sparta?» The question presupposes that some people will assume that proximity denotes connexion, but the answer indicates that in the view of Plutarch or his source the juxtaposition of the two heroa is accidental. Rather, Odysseus is present in the area because it is also near the Palladion, which an oracular response declared should be guarded by one of the original thieves. For the originator of this opinion, then, proximity may be significant, or it may not; the Leukippides had evidently a conspicuous shrine (unlike that of Odysseus, it is mentioned in Pausanias' description, III 16, 1), which is used here simply as a direction-marker. What we are not told is whether any cult practice linked whatever was taken to be the Palladion with the heroon of Odysseus, still less how many Spartans felt a connexion of any sort to exist.

Evidently Sparta was crammed full of heroa in the roman period, so the problem of significant/non-significant proximity is particularly acute here. Fortunately some other cities prove less intractable. Argos, for instance, displayed two sets of juxtaposed graves of homonyms: «Linos the son of Apollo and Psamathe, and Linos the epic poet», «Hypermetra the mother of Amphion, and Hypermetra the daughter of Danaos» (Paus. II 19,8; 21, 2). No doubt this represents a mythological rationalisation of some earlier cult complex, but the association must obviously have persisted in the minds of citizen and sightseer. A similar if not identical case preserves a connexion closer than the apparent coincidence of name: Perseus' daughter Gorgophone was buried near the mound which covered Medea's severed head, giving us Gorgon and Gorgophone

(Paus. II 21, 6-7). In none of these cases is cult actually attested, which is not of course to say that it never occurred. The more varied and earlier testimony available to us in the case of Attica, however, enables us to see some connected heroic sacrifices and hence connected heroa. The surviving sacrifice calendars of the state and of various groups within the state — whatever the scope of these calendars may have been — do suggest the existence of such groups, although normally the linked heroes are part of a pattern including divine sacrifice also. The most frequent difficulty in dealing with these documents is the ambiguity in the demarcation of sacrifice groups; often only the month rubric is actually expressed, and within this limit the reader is intended to be able to separate the festivals or cult groupings himself, sometimes but not always assisted by strategically placed spaces. Thus on many occasions we can only be sure of a connexion between heroic sacrifices when there is an obvious link anyway, whether mythological or other. So for instance the Thorikos calendar<sup>34</sup> begins the entry under Elaphebolion with sacrifices to Herakles (or the Herakleidai), Alkmene, the Anakes, Helen, Demeter... Alkmene's connexion with the circle of Herakles is obvious from myth, and confirmed with cult in three other regions of Attica. Helen's worship in Attica together with her brothers the Dioskouroi or Anakes is referred to by Euripides (*Hel.* 1666-1669) and plainly spelled out in Pausanias Atticista (*ap.* Eustath. *ad* Hom. *Od.* I 399). But the calendar does not reveal to us whether these two pairs are further connected with each other, or with Demeter and the following deities. A second major problem in using these documents to investigate the mutual relations of hero sanc-

<sup>34</sup> G. DAUX, «Le calendrier de Thorikos au musée J. Paul Getty», in *AC* 52 (1983), 150-174.

tuaries is that of getting a clear locality out of the truncated references in the calendars; the few toponyms we have from Marathon and Erchia are not really sufficient to enable us to construct a sacred geography of those demes, and even when we are presented with sacrifices taking place on the same day in different parts of Erchia we cannot know whether the link is of the «positive» or «negative» nature, whether the two take place consecutively and are linked by a procession, or whether they are opposed and mutually exclusive.

Simple location is not, of course, the only ingredient in the linking of heroa. They might in addition, or instead, be linked by each having a special connexion with a cult association, as for instance the orgeones of Asklepios, Amynos and Dexion at Athens took a special interest in two sanctuaries and placed their decrees in both (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1252; but only ἐ[ν] τῷ[ι] ἱερῷ in 1253). This may have been quite a common state of affairs among the Attic orgeones, another example being apparently the case of Echelos and the heroines. This case was perhaps more complex, involving the partial transfer of one of the heroic parties to the original sanctuary of the other — or perhaps, as Ferguson suggests, the worship of both in a precinct which originally belonged to neither. Here, then, the link involves the multiplication of cult-places in order to create proximity.<sup>35</sup>

As adjacent hero-shrines may lack any real connexion, so we might suppose that even quite distant sanctuaries depended for part of their significance on each other. One well-known example even crosses polis boundaries, and demonstrates also that hostility can be quite as important a link between hero and hero as between hero and god. This is the case of the tumulus of Amphion and Zethos in Thebes and that of Antiope and

<sup>35</sup> B.D. MERITT, in *Hesperia* 11 (1942), 282-287 = *LSS* 20. See W.S. FERGUSON, «The Attic Orgeones», in *HThR* 37 (1944), 73-79.



Phokos at Tithorea in Phokis (Paus. IX 17, 4-7). The hostility is acted out not by means of the honours which one normally associates with the word «cult», but by a fight between the Tithoreans attempting to steal earth from the Theban tomb to place on their monument and the Thebans trying to prevent them. Ritual fighting is of course not unknown elsewhere in the Greek world, but this form, which has clear affinities with the «talisman» approach to some sets of heroic bones, notably those of Orestes, seems to be unique. Phokos is clearly eponymous to Phokis, but it is especially during the period of the year when the conflict takes place that the two tombs become symbolic of their whole districts, since whichever side is successful (and one can imagine that in these circumstances both might have claimed victory) not only vindicates its honour but causes a good harvest in the city's territory. In mythological terms, of course, the hostility is unexpected; Antiope was the mother of Amphion and Zethos, and one might rather have expected a ritual enactment of hostility between the two brothers and their wicked stepmother Dirke. Heroic enmities are the lifeblood of myth, and elsewhere we see them reflected in cult in a more straightforward manner: Herodotus' account (V 67) of the attempt of Cleisthenes of Sikyon to drive out or at least dishonour Adrastus by introducing a cult of Melanippos is the *locus classicus*, and a literal, spatial element was certainly involved in the contrast between two heroes, even if we cannot see all the details. Elsewhere the hostility finds expression in taboos, such as that which forbids the entry of a flute-player or the mention of the name Achilles in the sanctuary of Tenes at Tenedos, which again has a justification in myth.<sup>36</sup> Whether or not two actual cult-places are involved, what these cases have in common is the sense of a dichotomy between aggressor and

<sup>36</sup> Plut. *Quaest. Gr.* 28; cf. 27 and Paus. III 26, 10.



victim, potential or actual. The heroic aggressor evidently desires contact, of a hostile type of course, with his victim; the victim, not surprisingly, shuns it. The concepts involved in cult acts or taboos of this sort are simple and naturalistic.

For my final example, however, I return to a more friendly kind of proximity, and I return to Sparta, where opposite the theatre the two graves of Pausanias son of Pleistoanax and of Leonidas the general of Thermopylae, his great-great-uncle, were to be seen (Paus. III 14, 1). The graves are not stated to have been elaborated into *ἱερά*, but cult certainly took place in connexion with them: every year they witnessed honorific speeches and games, presumably in addition to heroic *ἐναγισμός*. What is interesting here is the precise nature of the connexion between the two heroes, for it was Pausanias who was said to have brought back the bones of Leonidas from Thermopylae, and thus instituted his cult in Sparta. In other words, Pausanias is an institutor-hero parallel to the more widespread founders of divine cults, and like them he himself receives cult in connexion with the foundation. A similar case retrojected to the mythical period is that of the graves of Sisyphos and Neleus (Paus. II 2, 2); both were buried at the Isthmos, Neleus by Sisyphos who alone kept the secret of the grave's whereabouts, while the grave of Sisyphos himself was also known to few. The distinctive quality of the first cult, its secrecy, is thus extended to the cult of the founder, just as the ritual for Pausanias is apparently identical to that which he established for Leonidas. In distinction to divine foundations, the founder-hero is of potentially equal rank to the hero whose cult is founded; this is what the ritual expresses.

Yet in other respects, these examples show hero in the same relation to hero as elsewhere hero is in to god. In terms of function, the two groups of founding heroes are exactly equivalent; in terms of status, the two types of case differ in the relationship between founder and founded. Neither equivalence nor dif-

ference is left to be inferred from abstract principles; they are expressed in terms of the dynamic of sanctuary and ritual. Heroic *status* — between man and god, but also serving in some sense to define the difference between man and god — and heroic *function* — a much more variable factor, defined by each individual's particular relation to forms of human and divine activity — together form a sort of matrix in which each individual hero can be located. And in this the spatial metaphor is not an accident, nor merely a metaphor, since the space occupied by the sanctuary and its associated rituals plays a crucial role in defining and expressing the hero's meaning.

## DISCUSSION

*M. Tomlinson:* In considering the relationship between the hero and the type of sanctuary, it may be worth considering the reverse process, with the debased hero cults of the Hellenistic period, where the creation of the appropriate type of sanctuary is used as a means of establishing hero-status for an individual. I think in particular of two examples, at Kalydon where an individual called Leon is given a heroon, with dining room, a vaulted place of burial and so forth, and where he is worshipped as «The New Herakles» (and so associated with the cult of Herakles); the other, which is not known from archaeological evidence, but epigraphic (*IG* XII 3, 330), is the will of Epikteta, who set up a sanctuary of the Muses, again complete with a feasting ritual, in order to heroize her dead husband and her sons.

*M. Graf:* Ich frage mich, ob die Stiftung der Epikteta wirklich einfach als Heroenkult bezeichnet werden darf. Epikteta stiftet ja einen Kult der Musen, der kombiniert ist mit dem von vier Verstorbenen: ihr Mann, ihr Schwiegervater, ihr Sohn, sie selber. Im Grunde handelt es sich also um die geläufige Kombination von Gottheit plus Heros, wobei in diesem Fall der Götterkult als Stütze und Legitimation der Heroenkulte dient, die so allein also wohl undenkbar oder wenigstens schwieriger realisierbar gewesen wären; der Komplex von Μουσεῖον und ἡρώια hingegen ist akzeptiert. Vielleicht kann man also sogar gewisse Bedenken mithören, einen Kult allein von Verstorbenen zu stiften.

*Mme Kearns:* I agree that the two cases are not quite parallel, in that the first «hero», Leon, is formally identified with an established figure of cult, while in the case of Epikteta's inscription the new heroes are associated with

the Muses but subordinated to them, more in the usual earlier manner of the hero worshipped in association with a divinity. But they are clearly comparable, in that in both heroisation is legitimated by some kind of approximation to established divinity, as Professor Graf says. Such forms are of course extremely common in the hellenistic and later periods, but there are also apparent examples of heroisation without such divine reference, parallel to what I have called the «independent» hero of an earlier period. In such cases, as Professor Tomlinson suggests, we would have to look for legitimation to the use of the appropriate architectural forms in the sanctuary itself, or else — more difficult to establish — to the use of appropriate ritual. But of course the longer the heroisation of ordinary people had been established, the more it would be possible to diverge from the norm.

*Mme Bergquist:* You have described various properties characteristic of heroa. Would you be kind enough to indicate which, in your opinion, are the minimum criteria of a heroon?

*Mme Kearns:* The absolute minimum would I think be an enclosure of some sort, which need not of course be so permanent as a stone wall. One would expect also a place for sacrifice, whether altar, tomb, or simply a pit; but there is evidence to suggest that some heroes did not expect regular offerings and preferred to be left alone (e.g. Babrius, *Fab.* 63, part of a tradition which can be traced at least to Aristophanes, "Ἡρώες, *PCG* III 2 F 322, and perhaps Eur. *Heraclid.* 1040 ff.; see my *Heroes of Attica* [London 1989], 10-13, 49), so it is possible to imagine that in some cases a simple ἄβατον precinct could have been all that existed of a hero's abode. On the other side, it is also easy to suppose that sporadic, irregular heroic offerings could have been made at tombs and other places without a formal enclosure. But one could equally well argue that these two types of case do not constitute heroa.

*Mme Jost:* J'ajoute une hypothèse à celles que vous formulez à propos de Télèphe, sur les cultes héroïques dans les montagnes sauvages: l'isolement du héros-enfant que l'on cache sur le mont Parthénion a son parallèle chez les dieux (Hermès, né sur le mont Cyllène, ou Zeus, sur le mont Lycée), et l'on



peut se demander s'il ne s'agit pas dans les deux cas d'élever loin des hommes des êtres qui sont de nature différente.

*Mme Kearns:* Yes, the case of the hero seems to have more in common with that of the god than I allowed for, especially in the Arcadian context. Perhaps I could modify my statement and say simply that the mountain cult, mythologically connected with a human birth, is a factor setting the hero apart from the normal run of human beings. The difference may be positively or negatively construed — or, given the hero's paradoxical nature, both. Telephos is the bastard child of a disgraced priestess, born outside normal social structures, placed outside society, only just avoiding death; but he is also the son of Herakles, and a hero. Just so — if we set aside an actual mountain cult, for which there is no evidence — in Sophocles, Oedipus, exposed on mount Kithairon, is both the child disgraced (ἀρχαῖον καχόν, OT 1033) and put away at birth, and the hero, both the saviour and (nearly) the destroyer of Thebes. Before the revelation, Kithairon has the positive connotation of an exceptional birth, both to Oedipus (1080) and to the chorus (1086-1109), but by the end of the play it is the sign of misfortune and rejection.

*M. Bingen:* Il est légitime de chercher les raisons qui ont pu suggérer le choix de l'emplacement d'un hérôon en fonction de la spécificité du héros et du contexte géographique et religieux. Mais il y a certainement eu des cas où il faut inverser le processus: c'est le site qui crée le culte héroïque et fait identifier le héros. Ainsi, à Thorikos, la fouille d'une tombe à coupole de l'Helladique récent a révélé la présence d'un lieu de culte de la fin de l'époque archaïque et du début de l'époque classique: on y a laissé des offrandes, mais, surtout, on avait aménagé le passage des libations dans la fosse. D'autre part, quand on lit la description d'Argos dans le livre II de Pausanias, la multiplicité des tombes attribuées à des héros et des héroïnes jusque dans l'agora frappe d'autant plus que les fouilles ont mis au jour de nombreuses grandes tombes *intra muros* d'époque géométrique. Ici aussi on peut penser que, dans de nombreux cas, on est passé, par amplification progressive, de la tombe inconnue sur laquelle on était tombé, au culte d'un héros identifié en fonction du contexte mythique argien.

*M. Tomlinson:* There is also the Menelaion at Sparta. I remember discussing this problem with Hector Catling when he was excavating there. In this case, it seems that the Spartans were actively looking for a tomb at which to establish the cult, and chose a mound which appeared to be a tomb, though careful archaeological investigation has revealed absolutely no evidence that there ever was a tomb there.

*Mme Kearns:* I agree entirely with M. Bingen's point. Even if we don't want to ascribe the origins of hero-cult as a whole phenomenon to the discovery of Mycenaean tombs, the archaeological evidence from all over Greece leaves no doubt that there were many instances of the process described for Thorikos. Some idea of the thought-processes involved can be gained from Plutarch's description (*De genio Socratis* 5, 577 E-F) of the opening of Alkmene's tomb: a late source, admittedly, but one which must throw light on the original heroic identification of a presumably Bronze Age burial. With the account of Pausanias (I 43, 3) relating that the Megarians built their bouleuterion over «heroic» graves (rather than establishing heroa in the civic centre) we move one stage further on. Professor Tomlinson's example is a stage further still, but one which is already tending to return towards my original proposition that heroa are established at appropriate places. In the case of real tombs, I think it is possible that there is some selectivity exercised, no doubt at an unconscious level. Mycenaean and even later tombs become heroa, yes, but not all of them — it is mainly perhaps those which fit into a predetermined pattern of spatial organisation which are selected.

*M. van Straten:* On the subject of the ranking of heroes in relation to gods, where you referred to *leges sacrae* listing cheap and expensive sacrificial animals for heroes and gods respectively, I wonder how we may establish the relative importance of a deity to the ancient worshippers. Would not it depend on whom we asked and on what occasion? It appears that in *private* worship (as opposed to the communal cults reflected in the sacred laws) heroes were no less revered than gods. The votive reliefs dedicated to heroes are not smaller, nor less in number, than those given to the most popular gods. And in sacrificial representations on those privately dedicated reliefs,

the heroes' sacrificial animals are not cheaper, on average, than those given to the gods.

*Mme Kearns:* I suspect it may have depended more on what occasion than on whom. There is abundant evidence that heroes, as a class, ranked lower than gods: the sequence «gods, heroes, men» is standard. On the other hand, when one is sacrificing to heroes alone, their inferiority to gods is irrelevant — it is their superiority to human beings which is important. In the case of individual heroes it was also often no doubt the case that their specific function guaranteed them an importance and a ranking, in the view of either individual or group, higher than the general status of «hero», viewed in connexion with that of «god», would suggest.

*M. Schachter:* The preliminary ritual at the oracle of Trophonios, as described by Pausanias, provides an interesting example of sacrifices offered indifferently to both heroes and gods before the actual consultation of the hero. On the other hand, Trophonios, in the hellenistic period and later, was sometimes called Zeus Trophonios, so perhaps in this case too he is to be regarded as a god rather than a hero.

*Mme Kearns:* *Prima facie* Trophonios seems to be a case not unlike Hippolytos at Troizen, that is a figure who does not correspond particularly closely to a panhellenic deity and who is therefore identified as a hero, despite the fact that his importance seems on all occasions to outstrip the rank normally attributed to a hero, and despite the lack of a full heroic mythology. This leads to an apparent anomaly whereby divine figures are subordinated to a «hero» in the sanctuary at Lebadeia. The alternative identification with Zeus, comparable at least formally to «Poseidon Erechtheus», shows that this was not felt as entirely satisfactory.

*M. van Straten:* Are not we perhaps overexerting ourselves in trying to define a clear cut distinction between gods and heroes, considering the fact that the Greeks themselves were perfectly content to refer to the ἥρωας ἱατρός, in one and the same official inscription, alternately as a ἥρωας and as a θεός? (IG II<sup>2</sup> 839, which is admittedly post-classical, but not by much.)

*Mme Kearns:* There are also earlier examples of figures we would expect to be described as ἥρωες who are instead θεός: Hypodektes, apparently a typical «orgeonic» hero (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2501), the deme-hero Kolonos (*Soph.* *OC* 65), but your example is particularly clear in that both words are used. All the same, the *title* is clearly ἥρωες ἱατρός, never θεός ἱατρός, so there is a distinction of some sort. The problem is to discover in what circumstances a distinction is important.

*M. Graf:* Kann nicht die Unschärfe der Terminologie verstanden und die notwendige Differenzierung erreicht werden, wenn man auf die Verehrer schaut? Trophonios oder Asklepios, die als Zeus enden, der ἥρωες ἱατρός, der auch θεός ist — dies sind von Individuen verehrte Wesenheiten, und der Einzelne wünscht sich für seinen übermenschlichen Helfer möglichst grosse Machtfülle. Demgegenüber ist es die Polis (oder ihre Untergruppen), welche die *leges sacrae* mit ihren säuberlich differenzierten Hierarchien erlässt: bei diesen kollektiven Opfern sind keine individuellen Gefühle und Probleme im Spiel, es geht vielmehr um die Bestätigung der traditionellen Ordnung der Polis. Dass im Psephisma des Ἡρώος ἱατρός die Grenze durchlässig ist, widerspricht nicht notwendig: es ist ja keine Opfervorschrift, sondern ein Antrag eines Einzelnen zu einem Problem der sakralen Administration, und hier kann sich durchaus die Terminologie der individuellen Verehrung halten.

Ein anderer Punkt betrifft das Temenos des Hippolytos von Troizen. Darf hier wirklich die Dominanz des Hippolytos aus einer hypothetischen Vorstufe — ein «Vor-heros», der ein lokaler δαίμων sei — abgeleitet werden? Primär ist doch die Feststellung, dass Troizen ein Temenos besass, in dem Götter (Apollon, Aphrodite) und Heroen (Hippolytos, Phaidra; Damia und Auxesia) vereint waren, wobei die lokalen Verehrer die Emphase auf den einen Heros Hippolytos legten und vom Ἱππολύτου τέμενος (*Paus.* II 32, 1) sprachen; ein Grund für die Emphase mag die Bedeutung des vorhochzeitlichen Haaropfers gewesen sein (*Paus. ibid.*) — jedenfalls ändert dies nichts an dem im Mythos explizierten Status des Hippolytos als Heros. Gleich diachronische Schlüsse zu ziehen, halte ich für voreilig.



Die Frage führt auch sehr generell zum darin implizierten Problem nach der Entstehung des Konzepts ἥρως. Die mykenische Religion mag es bereits gekannt haben, wie der vielberufene τρισηρώς von Pylos (*ti-ri-se-ro-e*) nahelegt — jedenfalls aber ist es methodisch riskant, anzunehmen, mit dem archäologisch dokumentierten Einsetzen so vieler Heroenkulte im 8. Jhdt. sei auch das Konzept des Heros als eines kultisch verehrten Ahnen (im westen, bald panhellenischen Sinn) erst entstanden, und dann seien vorher undefinierte lokale δαίμονες zu Heroen geworden.

*Mme Kearns: To the first point:* The distinction between polis and individual is obviously a valid one, but how sharp is it? In particular, where is the dividing-line between a sub-group of the polis and a group of individuals? In my view also, the distinction lies in the type of document under consideration, but I would lay more stress on the worshipped than on the worshippers. The sacrificial inscriptions are normally concerned with a great variety of superhuman beings, gods as well as heroes, and in this context it is important that heroes should keep to their proper place and terminology. In the case of a single heroic cult, what matters is only that a hero is greater than a human being — his relationship to undisputedly divine figures is irrelevant, and may find expression only in a formal title.

*To the second point:* My I take the general aspect first? I agree completely that the eighth-century evidence cannot indicate the rise of a phenomenon *ex nihilo*. On the other hand, I am not sure that we can draw any definite conclusions from the *ti-ri-se-ro-e* of the Pylos tablets; the fact that it appears in a religious context does not prove that the concept is close to what is later understood by ἥρως, especially if we consider that Ἡρᾶ may also be etymologically related. The question is partly a semantic one — I was really, perhaps incautiously, using «hero» to denote not anything which the Greeks at any time might have called ἥρως, but to indicate the kind of being prominent in the archaic and classical periods, in the formation of which the Mycenaean phenomenon — whatever it was — presumably played a part, but which perhaps starts to become fully recognisable only in the eighth century. This kind of hero, characterised by a close association with death, is generally thought of as an exceptional human being on whom death has conferred a

status analogous to that of a god, if usually with more limited powers. Of course a diachronic, historicising explanation is not the only way to account for anomalies such as Hippolytos, Erechtheus and Trophonios existing within this category in the classical period, but I assume the concept will have seen some development, especially given that there is no very close equivalent to a class of heroes in other societies.

On the matter of Hippolytos in particular, I would suppose that his predominance in the τέμενος should be interpreted in connexion with the simultaneous existence of two traditions on his fate and whereabouts — both death and apotheosis. This to me suggests some difficulty in placing him in the category of a «normal» hero, which coincides with one possible explanation for the unusual prominence of a hero in a sacred complex.

*Mme Jost:* Une question générale: comment interpréter la *proximité* de deux sanctuaires? Quels critères peuvent autoriser à parler de *parenté* religieuse? Légendes (mais elles peuvent être étiologiques)? Culte commun?

*Mme Kearns:* The question is as important as it is difficult to answer. My example from Plutarch may console us by showing that the answer was not always obvious in the ancient world either; still, we would have an undoubted advantage if it were possible to «monitor» the movements of worshippers from sanctuary to sanctuary, instead of relying on scanty and chance scraps of information. From the theoretical point of view, it is worth stating that cult and myth (though often the two will go together) can establish different types of relationship, and that a mythological connexion is not necessarily on a lower plane of «reality»: an aetiological link can still have importance in the minds of those who frame it, and of others. Also we must recognise that a connexion may have a validity among one group of people but not another. But given our disadvantage looking back over this distance to antiquity, I think we must settle for a pragmatic approach, making use of such literary and archaeological evidence as we have, but bearing in mind the theoretical complexities involved.

