lità (attraverso l’espressione imperium romanum, attestato per la prima volta in Sallustio), e al potere dei popoli stranieri in comparazione con Roma. Non è presente dunque l’accezione dell’impero in senso territoriale, che non si trova nemmeno in Vitruvio o nelle declamazioni di Seneca, ma che emerge nei poemi tardi di Ovidio, oltre che nelle Res Gestae, in cui si impone la teorizzazione della conquista ecumenica da parte del princeps. Con estrema sobrietà Augusto registra l’annessione dell’Egitto nel suo testamento (R.G. 27,1), utilizzando un formulario oggetto di dibattito, soprattutto per l’assenza del termine provincia, problematica a cui però R. non accenna. Come è noto, assume grande rilevanza la testimonianza di Strabone che nel 17 libro ci offre una dettagliata descrizione dell’assetto provinciale augusteo, servendosi di espressioni che rinviano alla creazione di un’eparcheia, riflettendo la terminologia augustea ‘facere provinciam’.

L’indagine condotta nel quinto capitolo (After Augustus, pp. 146–181) sulla documentazione letteraria dall’età giulio-claudia a quella traianea evidenzia un importante mutamento relativo al linguaggio dell’annessione territoriale. Esempio è l’uso di provincia e provincialis, che, presente nelle Res Gestae nell’accezione di un’area dell’impero distinta da Roma e dall’Italia, diviene sempre più frequente nei decenni successivi. Strettamente connessa con i caratteri istituzionali e l’essenza del principato è la nuova valenza di imperium, in riferimento al potere e alla carica dell’imperatore, mediante le espressioni onus oppure munia imperii, socius, collega imperii.

Segue un capitolo conclusivo (Conclusion: imperial presuppositions and patterns of empire, pp. 182–193), in cui R. riassume le interpretazioni che costituiscono il filo conduttore di tutta la tematica trattata, e tre appendici, cui si è già accennato. Chiude l’opera un’aggiornata bibliografia (pp. 211–217) che annovera solo qualche contributo italiano, probabilmente per una scelta metodologica dell’A., a cui dobbiamo il grande merito di aver realizzato un prezioso contributo, curato con rigore, ricco di interessanti punti di riflessione, esposti in maniera convincente.

Lecce

Bernadette Tisé


The ‘Mycenae Atlas’ needs to be in the library of every Aegean prehistorian. It has problems though.

There are three main parts to the book, descriptions of the sites and features within the citadel walls (Part I) and outside the walls (Part II), and maps, plans, and photographs. The internal organization seems jumbled (e.g., Shelton discusses the cemeteries, pp. 35–38, but her concordance comes later, 64–68). There is also some ‘front’ material, a preface detailing the history of this book.

and a description of the ‘Early Accounts of Mycenae’. In 1887 King George I asked the German Imperial Archaeological School to create an archaeological map of Athens, which brought captain Bernhard Steffen to Greece. He later received a grant to conduct a survey of the Mycenae area, which resulted in ‘Karten von Mykenai’ (1884). In 1889, Elizabeth Wace French, director of the British School of Athens, initiated the present project, a complex joint operation involving primarily British, Greek, and American archaeologists.

Lavery and French’s ‘Early Accounts of Mycenae’ is a fascinating, brief summary (1–3, with bibliography and a list of visits, 1669–1883). Pausanias was the last in antiquity to visit the site (ca. A.D. 170), although it is correctly placed on the 5th century Tabula Peutingeriana – Kyriakus of Ancona mistakenly visited another site in 1447/8. Few visitors came to Mycenae before 1700, but none mentions the Lion Gate. In 1700, the Venetian engineer Francesco Vandeyk was commissioned to find building stone for Nauplion and he may have uncovered it (it was finally cleared in 1841). By the early 19th century, translations of Pausanias were available and more travelers visited the site: notably Philip Hunt in 1801 (he tried to remove the Lion Gate), Lord and Lady Elgin in 1802, Gell and Dodwell in 1805, Haller von Hallerstein in 1810, Charles Cockerell in 1810–17, Ernst Curtius and William Mure in 1838, Ludwig Ross in 1839, Friedrich Georg Welcker in 1842, Edward Lear in 1849, and Johann Bachofen in 1840.

From the accounts of these and other travelers, we know that the Ayios Georgios bridge may have been intact until 1805, the Tomb of Clytemnestra was damaged and looted by 1818, and the town of ancient Mycenae was apparently still visible in 1838. Steffan’s maps that appeared in the early Baedekers encouraged even more visitors in the late 19th century.

After a short account (9) of how the area was mapped and entered digitally, Part I describes «The Citadel as a Whole» (9–18). It begins with an historical survey, followed by descriptions of the major excavated areas. Iakovides writes of «the Palace proper and its associated buildings such as workshops, storerooms, a Cult Centre and the homes of the ruler’s entourage.»

Settlement began in the Neolithic (no sherds are mentioned) and Early Helladic periods and spread «over the whole hill» during the Middle Helladic period; the MH cemetery on the west slope was anchored, as it were, by the two «royal grave enclosures at each end.» MH and LH I–II structures were encountered in several areas of the Citadel, especially to the south of Grave Circle A. There is slight evidence for a «palace» on the summit. In LH IIIA:2 (late 13th century), the palace as we now have it was built.

In LH IIIB (early to middle 12th century), the fortification wall was extended to the west (around Grave Circle A, now raised and protected with a parapet) and incorporated «two gates» (presumably the Lion Gate and the gap leading

1 Poros blocks of this early building are found scattered over the top of the citadel and their reuse in the later palace allow some reconstruction: French & Shelton 2005; Younger 2005.

2 The reviewer disagrees. Grave Circle A was leveled and given a parapet very early on (the parapet is of the same oolithic limestone as the stelai): Younger 1997.

3 Stylistically, the Lion Relief must have been sculpted no later than LH II, probably decorating the gate in the early fortification: Younger 1987, and 1995: 346–47.
into the Cult Center now plugged by the Hellenistic Tower [see below]). It is at
this time, too, that the entire east wing of the Palace was constructed. Fires (large
areas of the Palace) and earthquakes (Tsountas’s House) did much damage, but
afterward the Northeast Extension was added to protect access to the Perseia
Spring and the palace was restored on a grander scale.

LH IIIC (late 12th and 11th centuries) saw some new building (the southwest
quarter) but at the end of the period fire destroyed just about everything (the
House of Columns was abandoned).

Though there was general decline, habitation continued: Geometric houses in
the Great Court, an Archaic temple on the summit, and two shrines in the out-
skirts, one to Enyalios (Map 2, B3;02) and one to Agamemnon (Map 7, F4;16).

Mycenaeans fought at Thermopylae and Plataiai (commemorated on the Serpent
Column). Medizing Argos, however, retaliated and depopulated the town in
468.

The Argives revived the town at the beginning of the Hellenistic period. How
long this settlement lasted is disputed by the authors: Lavery and French (1)
say «the site was again deserted or almost deserted by the 1st century BC» and
that Pausanias’s description «indicates that the site was deserted at the time of his
visit»; for Iakovides, however, it «continued to be inhabited, although on a re-
duced scale, to the time of Pausanias» (10).

The next section summarizes the major excavated areas within the Citadel.
«The Fortifications» (11) are all Mycenaean except for sections destroyed by the
Argives in 468 and restored in Hellenistic times. Iakovides specifies these, includ-
ing the Hellenistic Tower that plugs an obvious gap (16 m wide) in the southern
extension of the enceinte, opposite the Cult Center (Citadel Plan 4, upper left
corner). Yet this cannot be an area destroyed by the Argives since the fortifica-
tion wall abuts the tower with a clear fugue at the eastern end. Iakovides de-
scribes three phases of the Mycenaean wall: the early circuit (ca. 1350 BC) that
ran east of Grave Circle A with a main entrance east of the Lion Gate and en-
tered from the southwest. «From this period, only the N part of the wall has
survived» (11), yet its south and west wall can still be seen in the Great Gate and
wall-like terrace that runs south from it. The second phase (ca. 1250) includes the
present Lion Gate and the extension of the enceinte around Grave Circle A. In
the final phase (ca. 1200), the dog-head extension of the wall at the northeast was
built with rear gate, sally port, and corbelled gallery to the Perseia Spring outside
the walls. Though the wall has not survived anywhere to its original height,
Iakovides suggests that the height of the Hellenistic Tower (18 m) may approxi-
mate it.

«The Lion Gate» (11–12). Iakovides gives dimensions, a description of the
various cuttings, and a standard interpretation of the Lion Relief: two lions with
en face heads (probably of steatite) doweled into place stand rampant on two
incurved altars and flank a column that represents the Palace. «The relief is there-
fore more or less the equivalent of a coat of arms of later times.» Beyond the gate
is a small courtyard with a niche in the bedrock to the left; Iakovides interprets
this niche, not as a guard-station, but as a «gate sanctuary.»

«The North Quarter» (12–13). After a short section on the Great and Little
Ramps (those leading up from the Lion Gate and down from Grave Circle A),
Iakovides describes the structures to the northeast of the Lion Gate (Citadel Plan
1. From this area Tsountas had excavated two of the faience plaques bearing the cartouche of Amenhotep III. Iakovides dates the buildings to IIIB:1 advanced to B:2, at which time there was earthquake damage.

«The North Storerooms and Postern Gate» (1). Immediately to the south of the North (Postern) Gate (Citadel Plan 8) is an east-west row of magazines with pithoi in situ for the storage of dry goods. Iakovides mentions fragments of a Linear B document found fallen from the upper storey. The building was destroyed by fire in LH IIIB:2 and covered by a IIIC roadway. The North (Postern) Gate was purposely built in the second phase of the fortification wall. Into the ancient pivot holes, the Greek Restoration Service has constructed a two-leaf wooden gate barred with a horizontal wooden bolt. Instead of a relieving triangle, the Postern Gate employs two large, upright blocks on top of the lintel. Just inside the gate and to the left (south) is another «sanctuary niche.»

«The Northeast Extension» (13; Mycenae Citadel Plan 9). The underground cistern outside the walls is accessed by a large corbeled gallery «coated with hydraulic mortar»; the cistern itself was fed by pipes from a spring farther up the slope to the east. There are two small houses in this area: Alpha against the southern wall of the extension, and Beta to the north, between it and the circular cistern (surely Hellenistic), with developed IIIC pottery.

«The East Complex» (14; Mycenae Citadel Plan 8). This large area contains several buildings, the Artisan’s Quarter, Houses Gamma (near the north Wall) and Delta (against the east Wall), and the House of the Columns (built into south tip of the Wall, outside which is the Southeast Tower). House Delta has a notable feature, a «verandah» that runs the entire length of the house. The House of the Columns is known for its collonaded central court. To the west and south are deep basement rooms, in which were found another Linear B document and inscribed stirrup-jar. The Artisans’ Quarter consists of two wings of basement rooms; in them were found fragments of fresco and intact deposits of «whole pots, ivory chips, cuttings of gold leaf, slag from bronze smelting and fragments of semi-precious stones.»

«The Palace» (14–15; Mycenae Citadel Plan 7). Because of the unevenness of the terrain at the top of the hill, the palace was constructed on a series of separate terraces whose walls were constructed in sections with offsets. From the propylon in the northwest, the entrance way moves south to the Western Portal,

1 These plaques may have been made locally (Lilyquist 1999).
2 MY Fu 711 (Mylonas 1970), recording grain (HORD and FAR) being given to women.
3 Mylonas 1966: pl. 29.
5 Mylonas 1966: 78.
6 MY L 710 (Mylonas 1968) mentioning a type of cloth or cloak, pa-we-a; stirrup-jar MY Z 205.
7 Wright 1978. The walls of Tiryns were constructed similarly.
8 In the Pithos area below the terrace of the Western Portal were found fresco fragments (Immerwahr 1992: 191–3, MY Nos. 2, 10, 17, 18, and, 194, additional material no. 3): processional women (life-sized and half-life sized), a man and horse, female charioteers.
through which one entered the Megaron court past a staircase that led to a second storey. The court had a floor fresco.\(^1\) The north wall of the court is constructed of poros blocks whose swallow-tail cuttings Iakovides claims were for clamping the wall to the rubble backing by wooden tie beams.\(^2\)

The megaron’s porch was floored with gypsum slabs with a painted dado of half-rosettes.\(^3\) At its northern end a short flight of wooden stairs led to a room with «benches, a hearth and a staircase»; this was decorated with paintings of curtains.\(^4\) The vestibule of the megaron had a frescoed floor bordering with gypsum slabs and a raised platform to the right of the doorway leading into the main room, as at Pylos. The main room had a frescoed floor also bordered by gypsum slabs and frescoed walls.\(^5\) The large hearth in the center was painted with flames and spirals (again, as at Pylos). Flanking the hearth were four columns, «probably shod in bronze»; the bases for two of these columns were still in situ when excavated (northern bases), plus the foundations for a third (southwestern), but the southeastern column base had fallen into the Khavos ravine (Iakovides mistakenly calls it the northwest base, and says this base «has been replaced in its original position,» implying that Mylonas had found it intact in the ravine). Across the main courtyard to the west «is a square room with double doors» and court; this complex would have greeted the visitor coming up the Grand Staircase. Without explanation Iakovides identifies this complex as «the Guest Suite with a bathroom.»\(^6\)

The Southwest Quarter (15–16; Citadel Plan 4). The southern area (south of Tsountas’s House),\(^7\) was «densely occupied by at least 11 houses,» given Greek letters, A–Λ. As the houses straddled the slope they would have had one storey uphill and two storeys downhill (ground floor & basement). Probably from Tsountas’s House come frescoes including the helmeted woman with griffin; from House A (within which was the skeleton of a «young man» buried by the earthquake of LH IIIB) come more frescoes, including «La Mykenaia,» the seated goddess holding a girl, and two figure-eight shields, and in the corridor

\(^1\) Hirsch 1977: 28–30, pl. 6; Wace 1949, fig. 90c
\(^2\) These blocks, and blocks in the court’s west wall, are more likely reused from the early Palace: Younger 2005: 187–89.
\(^3\) Immerwahr 1990: 194, MY No. 19; Wace 1949: figs. 89d, 90a.
\(^4\) Iakovides does not mention the rooms beyond, one paved in cement (Wace 1949: 79, room 32) and another that may have supported a bathtub (room 26). Like Pylos and Tiryns, Mycenae must have had a bath near the megaron.
\(^6\) Square panels with zig-zags: Wace 1949: fig. 91b.
\(^7\) Wace 1949: 77.
\(^8\) Immerwahr 1990: 192, MY No. 11.
\(^9\) Tsountas had found scraps of bronze on the northwestern base: Mylonas 1966: 63; Wace 1949: 77.
\(^10\) This is Wace’s Throne Room (Wace 1949: 73, fig. 91a) or Mycenae’s Second Megaron (Younger 2005: 187–89): in the center of the north wall was a shallow throne emplacement (as at Tiryns and Pylos) bordered with blue and red stripes; the rest of the floor was painted in panels and bordered by rosettes.
between it and the Circuit Wall were found others, including the woman with the lily.  

«The Cult Center» (16–17; Citadel Plan 3). A ramp, called the Processional Way, was excavated to the southwest of the earlier enceinte; sections of it were roofed and decorated with a frescoed chariot scene. It may have led from the Citadel’s Grand Staircase to the Cult Center, a semicircle of five late buildings (LH IIIB:2–C) to the northwest of the Hellenistic Tower. At the northwest end is the Room with the Fresco; to the east is the House of the Idols (the «Temple»), above and directly east of which is the Megaron; southeast of the Megaron is Shrine Gamma; finishing the arc of buildings is Tsountas’s House to the southwest of Gamma. The Room with the Fresco is a small rectangular building, whose eastern room held the altar and fresco, which Iakovides does not describe. The rectangular Temple consists of an anteroom (hearth and bench) and a main room with wood columns along the east wall, a central platform, and a series of small platforms against the north wall; at the northeast corner, a flight of steps leads up to a storeroom in which were found many figurines. To the left of the entrance to shrine Gamma is a stone base perhaps for an altar; the outer room contains a horseshoe-shaped plaster «altar» with a hole perhaps for pouring libations.

«The Northwest Area» (17–18; Citadel Plans 2, 3). This area consists of the Granary just inside the Lion Gate, Grave Circle A, the House with the Warrior Vase and South House (both southwest of Grave Circle A), and Ramp House directly south of Grave Circle A. The two-storey Granary was built late and was destroyed in a penultimate destruction in LH IIIC early. Within the Grave Circle are six shaft graves and seven small and shallow graves. Iakovides characterizes the deceased as «family» groups, «nineteen people: nine men, eight women and two children.» The House of the Warrior Vase (fig. 15) now consists only of its basement rooms. «Schliemann’s finds ... may have originated in the house itself or the wash above it or even be associated with a later burial»; these include the famed Warrior Vase (LH IIIC) and a Naue II type sword. To the east of the House of the Warrior Vase is the Ramp House which abuts the Little Ramp leading up to Grave Circle A. Below the house were found MH graves and remains of an early Mycenaean building (LH II–IIIA:1), from which come well-known frescoes. The South House and Annex comprise the largest building in

---

1 Kritseli-Providi 1982; see Immerwahr 1990: 191–94, MY Nos. 3, 4, 5, 9, 14, 15.  
2 Kritseli-Providi 1982: 90–91, b/w pl. 27; Immerwahr 1990: 194, additional fragments no. 4.  
3 Mylonas 1981: fig. 29.  
5 Schuchardt 1974 presents an essentialist view of the sex of the deceased: «the contents of the graves show that men alone were buried in II and V, women alone in I and III, and in grave IV both men and women» (168). Angel 1973: 384 is concerned primarily with the men in the Grave Circles; he identifies three men and two women in Shaft Grave IV, three men in V, and two men in VI. Two children are inferred from the small gold «shrouds» (Karo 1930: pl. 53, no. 146 from Shaft Grave III).  
6 Schliemann 1880: fig. 221.  
7 Immerwahr 1990: 190, MY No. 1; Shaw 1996.  
8 For a more informative plan, see Taylour 1981, plan 2.
the area with well preserved mudbrick walls. It stands on a free-standing terrace (early thirteenth century).

Part II, «The Area Outside the Walls» (21–38). This part consists of several separate reports and leads directly to the Catalogue of sites located on the maps (39–65). In the Introduction (21), E. French notes how the lack of a topographical plan of the area around Mycenae «had left us without an accurate record of the position of most of the chamber tombs and of many buildings.»

«Topographical Commentary» (22–24). The Mycenae settlement covered some 32 ha to the north, west, and southwest of the Citadel (map, «Overall Area and Cemeteries»). Greater Mycenae covered some 350 ha (squares C2/F2–C6/F6).

A «Chronological Commentary» (26–27), by E. French, gives short descriptions of the major periods. An obsidian scatter north of Monastiraki may indicate EH presence, but otherwise the area was first inhabited in the MH period, according to the large MH cemetery southwest of the Citadel. On the Citadel little MH has been found (see above). Early Mycenaean is represented by LH II chamber tombs north of the Citadel and by the six early tholoi (and by the finds below the Ramp House). Habitation did continue after the major destructions of LH IIIB; there is evidence of settlement in LH IIIC (perhaps only until LH IIIC Middle, unlike Tiryns), and an «increased diversity in burial practices» (cremation burials in cist graves and in a tumulus at Khania). Following the destruction of the site in LH IIIC Middle, there are «elusive» Submycenaean remains and Protogeometric tombs. From the Geometric period onwards there is widespread habitation and evidence for cult (early shrines near the House of the Oil Merchant, over the House Megaron, the Agamemnonion, and the Shrine of Enyalios). Argos captured Mycenae in 468, but did not destroy it; rather, it «rendered ineffective the most strategic or important points.» In the early third century, Argos established a village on the site. On numismatic evidence the Hellenistic settlement may have ended in the early second century B.C.

Also see Hope Simpson 2002 and Jansen 2002.

The introduction gives a nice summary of road construction. Drains pass under the roads at 3 to 6 m intervals. Cyclopean bridges span the ravines (e.g., in D7). There are four main routes: M1 leads east from the Citadel towards Berbati (W. 3,58 m). M2 splits off from M1 northeast of the Citadel and travels west along the north side of Prophetis Elias (C5). M3 heads north from the Postern Gate, then crosses west over the Kokoretsa ravine and along the southern slopes of Prophetis Elias (D3). M4 runs south of the Citadel towards the Argive Heraion. Another main road is M6, leading northwest from Epano Pigadi (D2:04, D3:15).
Iakovidis’ section on «The Houses» (32–35) discusses the 28 houses investigated inside the Citadel, and 12 outside the Citadel to the west and north. He suggests that all walls were stuccoed and most were painted monochrome or occasionally with pictorial scenes. His final section contains a technical discussion of their «Building Methods and Materials» (34–35).

A general discussion of «The Chamber Tombs» (35) and a more detailed section on «The Cemeteries» (35–38) are both by K. Shelton. A «Concordance» (64–68) lists the 250 chamber tombs distributed over «27 multi-tomb cemeteries.» Most of the tombs were cut into outcroppings or ledges of conglomerate. Tsountas excavated 103 chamber tombs and these are the most problematic; few cannot be located, and only a small number of whole vases were kept and no sherds material at all. Many cemeteries begin in LH II and were used well into LH III; Kalkani 518 is the only one to date securely to LH I.3 Three of the tombs in the Epano Pigadi cemetery (D3–E3; e.g., tomb 53), and tomb 81 in the Ayios Georgios cemetery (E3:14) had painted doorways.4 Outlying settlements, like Monastiraki and Fikhtia, had their own cemeteries. Shelton draws some conclusions: the cemeteries in LH II and III were much more numerous than previously supposed; the majority of the better tombs, outfitted with special features like benches and side chambers, are LH II, while those constructed and used only in LH III are generally smaller and simpler; several cemeteries are located near resource areas like rock quarries and clay beds; and no new cemeteries were established in LH IIIC.

There is no separate discussion of the tholos tombs – for these, one needs to consult the Catalogue of sites numbered on the Maps.

There then follow separate, brief discussions of the features plotted on the 12 topographical maps (39–63, with little bibliography); each map includes six squares (e.g., A3/C2–A1/C1), some with detailed insets.

Map 1 starts the first (and northern) west-east pass through the area. Map 2, at the northwest corner of Greater Mycenae contains cemeteries, quarries, and two shrines, one Geometric (C3:24, 40) and one dedicated to Enyalios (B3:23, 39, fig. 27). With Map 3, north of the Citadel, we begin to see roads and bridges, houses, and sizeable cemeteries; limestone and conglomerate quarries lie on the south-west slope of Profitis Ilias. Map 4 is occupied mostly by the mountain, Profitis Ilias.5

Map 5 starts the second west-east pass through the area. Map 6 is dramatically within Greater Mycenae. The Catalogue gives pithy discussions of five tholoi (Kato Fournos, Cyclopean, Genii, Epano Fournos, Panagia, 46, E3:12). Map 7 contains the heart of Mycenae (especially D4/E4); there is no detailed inset map. There are interesting discussions of some of the buildings (Petsas’ House,6 the

---

1 Also see Xenaki-Sakellariou 1981.
2 Wace 1932: 75–87.
3 Tomb 53: rosettes decorate the doorframe: Tsountas 1891: pl. 1. Tomb 81 had a monochrome doorway with brown beam-ends across the top: Tsountas & Manatt: 133–144 figs. 49, 50.
4 The Mycenaean lookout tower, visible under the church at the summit of Prophitis Elias, is omitted; see Wace 1921–23, 1949: 3.
5 Shelton 2002–3 publishes three Linear B tablets (Ui 2 and X 1, 3) and one sealing (Wq 4).
House of the Wine Merchant, Plakes House [with skeletons of three adults and a child crushed in the earthquake at the end of III B:2], the «Ivory Houses» [destroyed by earthquake and fire in mid III B], and the House of the Tripod Tomb. There are descriptions of the Citadel tholoi (Aegisthus, Clytemnestra [“later than the Treasury of Atreus”], and the Lion Tomb) and the scanty remains of the Hellenistic city (theater [“largely unstudied”], and the nearby Persea Fountain House mentioned by Pausanias). Map 7 contains the three Panagia Houses (House I contained «The skeleton of a middle-aged woman whose skull had been crushed by a falling stone»), and the Treasury of Atreus with its decorated façade (studied by C.K. Williams II in 1955 but never published), and side chamber.

Maps 9–12 comprise the third, and southern, west-east pass through the area; they contain little of interest, except: a tumulus containing cremation burials (unique in the area); a bridge across the Vathyrema ravine south of the modern village of Mycenae (G2/H2:01), implying a road parallel to the modern secondary road that leads to Monasteraki; and poros and conglomerate quarries at Magoula.

I referred to problems at the beginning of this review, and I have mentioned several in the course of it: the dense, laconic text makes it difficult to find specific information; there is no index; while the individual sites outside the Citadel are numbered and discussed briefly in the Catalogue, the sites within the Citadel are neither numbered nor catalogued; the Citadel Plans give building and feature outlines and contour elevations but no identifications; and there are no schematic plans that restore and name buildings and roads. To find some buildings, I had to resort to plans published by Wace and Mylonas. There are two bibliographies, one for the early travelers (4) and the other for the main texts and catalogue (69–70). This general bibliography is deliberately brief. It was also out-of-date by the time the book was published (aside from some publications by the authors, it cites no work later than 1997).

In spite of its difficulties, the ‘Mycenae Atlas’ is indispensable, and its texts are informing, thought-provoking, controversial, and maddening – sometimes all at once.

---

1 French 1996.
3 French 1996.
4 Younger 1987.
5 Although French calls these quarries «not a unique source for these materials» (24), the poros quarries there are the only ones known in the Mycenae area for oolithic limestone, perhaps the quarries, therefore, for Grave Circle A’s stelai and parapet (Younger 1997).
In 1978 to 1981, the Swiss archaeological school resumed excavations at the sanctuary of Apollo Daphnephoros at Eretria to explore the northern and eastern limits of the sanctuary, with additional investigations undertaken in 1990. To the north of the temple of the god the excavations revealed an area of cult, l’Aire sacrificielle Nord, with an immensely rich votive deposit, consisting of several thousand miniature hydrias and other ceramic vessels, as well as objects from Italy, the Syro-Phoenician sphere and Luristan. The deposit also contained a large number of animal bones. The results of these investigations are published and analysed by Sandrine Huber in two excellent volumes of text and images. This study greatly enriches our knowledge not only of Geometric-Archaic Eretria, but also of Greek religion at large, as it consists of the earliest cult attested in an urban sanctuary in the Greek world.

The Introduction (p. 19–25) sets out the aims of the study: to place the Aire sacrificielle Nord within its larger context, and to try to determine its function, the rituals performed at the site, the identity of both the divinity and the worshippers, and its relation to the area dedicated to Apollo Daphnephoros. The sacrificial area was located on the northern bank of a small seasonal stream, facing the sanctuary of Apollo. In the middle of the 6th century, the stream was diverted to the west of the city and the stream bed transformed into a street, becoming the principal north-south route of the settlement, leading from the West Gate to the agora and the eastern harbour. To orient the reader, Huber also gives a precise description of the Geometric and Archaic remains under and around the 6th-century temple of Apollo.

Chapter 1 (p. 27–43) offers a detailed account of the excavations, presenting the stratigraphy and the structures found in a chronological sequence. The extent of the Aire sacrificielle Nord could not be established due to profound later disturbances and the cult area continues under the modern buildings. The area is small, 42 m², with a complex stratigraphy and containing the remains of a number of walls, many of which cannot be dated precisely. The cult place was established in the Late Geometric period (ca 750 BC) around a circular dry wall construction (no. 45) with a diameter of 2.85 m, filled with small stones and sandy clay. From its construction until the end of the 6th century, successive layers of clay and sand, heavily mixed with a high amount of votive offerings, organic matter, ash and charcoal accumulated around the structure, eventually covering it entirely. The material seems to have been deposited in intervals and levelled from time to time. In the Archaic period, a pit (no. 49), ca 1.5 m in diameter and 2.50 m