



Review

Reviewed Work(s): La tombe aux Erotes et la tombe d'Amarynthos. Architecture funéraire et présence macédonienne en Grèce centrale. Vol. I — Texte. Vol. II — Catalogue et planches. (Ecole suisse d'archéologie en Grèce. Eretria. Fouilles et recherches. 19.) by Caroline Huguenot

Review by: Julia Valeva

Source: *Gnomon*, 83. Bd., H. 6 (2011), pp. 519-526

Published by: Verlag C.H.Beck

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23033795>

Accessed: 28-02-2018 16:16 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Verlag C.H.Beck is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Gnomon*

auf sowjetische und DDR-Autoren beruft (136 Fnn. 61 f). Unergiebig sind seine Ausführungen zu den Interpretationen, die mitnichten nur im Breviar vorkommen;¹ Verf. verkennt ihre Herkunft aus Rechtsunterricht, weshalb er Passagen wie *hic de iure addendum* gründlich missversteht (176); sein Tadel (177), IT 5, 1, 2 habe CJ 8, 58, 1 (in Betracht kommt allenfalls CTh 8, 17, 3) übersehen, ist unberechtigt.²

Die Anlehnung an Mommsen beim Grundtext geht so weit, daß auch sein kritischer Apparat unverändert abgedruckt ist, aber nicht auch seine Angabe zu jeder Konstitution, welche Handschriften er jeweils benutzt hat, so daß der Leser den Apparat nur entziffern kann, wenn ihm gegenwärtig ist, daß er dazu in der Handschriftentabelle (Tableau 5 52 f; s. a. Annexe 2 202–5) nachschlagen kann. Andererseits sind auch Mommsens Korrekturen der überlieferten Daten schlicht übernommen, doch stehen sie auf den ungeraden Seiten bei der Übersetzung, so daß der Eindruck entsteht, die nach heutigem Brauch ausgedrückten Daten seien Angaben der Übersetzer. Am Ende der Übersetzung einer jeden Konstitution erörtert Roland Delmaire, soweit angebracht, Datum und Empfänger. Auch eine – meist kurze – Bibliographie ist jeder Konstitution beigegeben. Die Übersetzung scheint im Ganzen geglückt, wenn sie auch ausführlicher als der Grundtext ausfällt, weil dort nur Mitgemeintes in Worte gefaßt wird. Aber weder sind schwierige Stellen durch eine glatte Übersetzung übertüncht noch sind die Übersetzer der Versuchung erlegen, ihre Interpretation der Texte in die Übersetzung hineinzuschmuggeln. An schwierigen Stellen helfen erläuternde Anmerkungen weiter.

Ein Quellenregister fehlt, doch gibt es ein geographisches, ein Namens- und ein knappes Sachregister.

Freiburg i. Br.

Detlef Liebs

*

Caroline Huguenot: *La tombe aux Erotes et la tombe d'Amarynthos. Architecture funéraire et présence macédonienne en Grèce centrale.* Vol. I – Texte. Vol. II – Catalogue et planches. Gollion: Infolio éditions 2008. 279. 149 S. 91 Taf. 4°. (Ecole suisse d'archéologie en Grèce. Eretria. Fouilles et recherches. 19.).

This important monograph goes far beyond the problems of a single monument (in this case, two), and its analyses and conclusions range over a whole topic of scholarly interest: the Macedonian tomb. The reason for this overview lies especially in one of the graves, the Tomb of the Erotes, whose present state and fortunate preservation of its contents give the opportunity to study its architecture, interior furnishing, and offerings – the whole complex as a physical and ideological entity. It is a method of research that fortunately is increasingly frequent nowadays and is often carried out by a team. Caroline Huguenot (henceforth cited as H.) has, however, undertaken by herself alone «the honourable and pleasant task» (as P. Ducrey wrote in the Preface to the book) to research the body of offerings from the Ere-

¹ So aber Verf. 175. Dabei übersieht er die Bruchstücke der CTh-Hs. Vat. reg. 520 Bl. 94/95 (11./12. Jh.) mit elf breviarfremden Konstitutionen: CTh 4, 8, 8; u. 4, 10, 2 bis 4, 12, 2, und zehn Interpretationen dazu; ebenso die Antiqua summaria zum CTh; s. schon P. Krüger, ZRG 26 (1905) 330 Fn. 3; u. Liebs, Gallien (o. S. 516 Fn. 1) 149 mit Fnn. 147–49.

² Siehe M. Kaser, Das römische Privatrecht II (München 1975) 222 mit Fn. 8 u. 533.

trian Tomb of the Erotes held by the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, and subsequently the tomb itself as well as the comparable Tomb of Amarynthos, also located in the territory of Eretria. During her work, which took the form of a Master's (mémoire de licence) and Doctoral theses (2005), she was helped by many colleagues and by her supervisor, Professor C. Berard, all of whom she thanks warmly. It is, nevertheless, obvious that H. has achieved her purpose because of her own perseverance and ambition and through field trips and hard work in the library.

The structure of the text is standard: there are descriptions and analyses of both tombs, accompanied by an integrated catalogue of the findings from the Tomb of the Erotes. A considerable part of the book is contextual, discussing the Macedonian type of tombs. There is also a bibliographical catalogue of known Macedonian tombs and tables with corresponding statistical data, as well as a list of the main historical events involving Eretria from the 4th to the 2nd century BC. A good and enlightening set of illustrations complements the publication.

In the Introduction H. states the purpose of her research: a new analysis of two graves of Macedonian type in the Euboean city of Eretria: the Tomb of the Erotes and the Tomb of Amarynthos. Since they were already published by K. G. Vollmoeller more than a century ago (in AM 1901), H. justifies her renewed scholarly attention on several grounds. The first is the possibility of adding new evidence to the documentation on both tombs through a new archaeological survey *in situ* and, in the case of the Tomb of the Erotes, through the study of the funerary offerings once deposited in it, which are now in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston. The second is the belief that this new evidence, illuminated by the modern progress of studies on Macedonian tombs, will contribute to such research fields as the history of Hellenistic art and architecture, the history of Eretria, and the history of religion.

In the First Chapter H. provides a significant introduction to the problematics of the Macedonian type to which the two Eretrian tombs belong (pp. 37–51). It is a well structured account both of the progress made in this field since L. Heuzey and of the questions that still remain open. The author stresses the important contributions of A. Adriani, A. K. Orlandos, D. Pandermalis, and M. Andronicos for the classification of this type of monuments, their cataloguing and interpretation. The studies by B. Gossel and S. Miller are justly considered of prime importance and are often cited throughout the book. In working with numerous publications of Macedonian tombs and doing field trips, H. soon discovered the usual shortcomings, that is, lack of topographic analyses and only summary descriptions of the offerings. Preliminary publication of many burials without detailed description or interpretation is the weak point in studies not only of Macedonian tombs but of many other monuments throughout the Mediterranean. The book by H. is a brilliant example of how a monument should be studied and published. Within this contextual chapter the keystone vault is declared the major criterion for identifying a Macedonian tomb, in accordance with S. Miller's observations.

The description of the Tomb of the Erotes (53–136) begins with a topographical survey. H. recounts the history of the accidental discovery of the tomb in 1897, which proved unfortunate for its interior furnishings and offerings, as usu-

ally happens in such cases. The Greek archaeologist K. Kuruniotis was able, however, to stop further destruction by closing the tomb after collecting the few objects left by the robbers; he brought the finds to the National Museum in Athens and produced a preliminary publication of the discovery. A legal proceeding was initiated for tracking down the looted finds, most of which, nonetheless, reached the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston through the antiquarian market.

The special attention paid by the author to the tumulus (58–61) that covers the Tomb of the Erotes conforms to new methods of complex investigation of tombs underlying tumuli. Her task was not the archaeological exploration of the tumulus itself, but she summarizes the results of the soundings by K. Kuruniotis, K. G. Vollmoeller and J.-M. Gard. The mound had no peribolos, neither was it supported by a crepis (encircling curb) as is sometimes encountered in Asia Minor and Etruria: we would add here the examples from the interior of Thrace (Mezek, Starosel).¹

One of the most interesting features of this complex is the element built at the summit of the mound. It was discovered by Kuruniotis but it has now almost completely deteriorated, as shown by photographs taken in 1971 and 2000 (Pl. 3). Therefore, the attempt to collect all evidence and to express an opinion is a clear contribution of the present study. H. supports the view that the structure was meant as a pedestal for a monument that served as distinctive marker. The statement (63) that monumental *semata* have not so far been discovered in Thrace could be qualified; there is one telling example from Mezek: the bronze statue of a boar, found near a monumental tomb, which was presumably part of a statuary group depicting a hunt.²

The tomb of the Erotes consists of a horizontally covered dromos and a chamber roofed by a keystone barrel vault. H. describes the dromos and elucidates its function, explaining the mode of its closing after periodic burials. A detailed description of the entrance follows, with the imaginary reconstruction of a wooden double-leaf door which would have closed it. To it may belong some items in the Museum of Eretria, now attributed by H. (cf. Pls. 44.2, 44.3a–c, 43.4).

The description of the funerary chamber is as detailed as possible. A niche on the rear (main) wall gives the opportunity to see that the tomb was not entirely built but was partly cut into the rock. The function of the niche was to hold offerings. The description of the painted decoration is also given in detail, as regards iconography and materials employed (72–85). The author defines the dromos decoration as in the Masonry or Structural Style and gives examples from other Macedonian tombs. The figural decoration is relatively modest, consisting of wreaths, ribbons, garlands and some small objects (patera?), painted as if hanging from nails hammered into the walls. I could find no major omissions in the relevant bibliography. The painting technique in the chamber is defined as tempera applied a-secco. Its difference from the al-fresco technique used in the dromos is explained by the author as dictated by special colouring materials or

¹ For Mezek-Mal-tepe see B. Filov, The tombs with corbelled vaults in Mezek (in Bulgarian), Bulletin of the Bulgarian Archaeological Institute IX/1 1937, 9, fig. 3; for Starosel see G. Kitov, Starosel – centre culturel thrace (préliminaires), Orpheus 11, 2001, 5–60.

² O. Hamdy in RA 1908.1, 1–3, Pls. VIII, IX and Filov op. cit. 1937, 36.

simply by a later decoration of the chamber. Despite H.'s attempts, she was, however, unable to obtain a chemical analysis of the plaster.

The description and analysis of the furniture in the Tomb of the Erotes comprise some of the most interesting pages of this study (85–121). The furnishing of the tomb includes two almost identical beds (*klinai*), two thrones without backs, and a chest. All pieces, made of marble, have functional sizes. Throne A was fortunately not plundered. All items served as cinerary urns. They were used for family burials at least for three generations. The names on the front of the furniture show that men were buried in the *klinai* and women in the thrones. The careful analysis of the furniture parts and decoration draws on a considerable number of comparisons from other tombs in Macedonia and other regions of the Hellenistic world. Here, it would be appropriate to compare the legs of *kline* II with the almost identical ones (although roughly worked) in the Acroteria Tomb in Chipka, most probably dating from the 4th century BC (this tomb however is not published in detail).

According to the author, the arrangement of the *klinai* and thrones in the Tomb of the Erotes betrays inspiration from banquet rooms in elite mansions and bespeaks a privileged social status of the dead. Guided by the existence of *klinai*, thrones and a chest (a genuine feature of the feminine sphere in the *gynēkaion*) the author proceeds to an interesting discussion about the status of elite women in public life, including their possible presence at symposia. An onomastic analysis (121–130) shows that two of the female names written on the furniture are so far unique: Airippe (throne B) and Evagreia (chest). The third name, Kratesipolis (throne A), is attested for both men and women, but here it corresponds apparently to women: Kratesipoleis, daughter of Aristion and Kratesipoleis – daughter of Menelaos. Interestingly, the name is first known for a Molossian queen, wife of Admetus (ca. 472–470); another instance is the wife of Alexandros, the son of Polyperchon, a former lieutenant of Alexander the Great, regent of Macedon in 319. H. is inclined to connect the Kratesipolis of the Eretrian tomb with the latter: since, however, her identity with Alexandros' wife, who entered the political and military scene after her husband's death in 314 BC, can not be proved and seems overstated, the author would accept that the tomb received the remains of one of her descendants. Her argument is based on throne A, located in a central place, just in front of the door. The main reason for this choice is the discrepancy between Kratesipolis, Alexander's wife's lifetime and the author's own suggested dating for the Tomb of the Erotes, the second quarter of the third century BC. A table with two hypothetical genealogical reconstruction of the family buried here, the first one suggesting four generations, the second one five, is a contribution to the history of Eretria and to prosopography (125). The analysis of the masculine names leads H. to assume a Macedonian descent of the family as well. The personal names and the patronymics clearly reveal the lineal character of the tomb: in *kline* I are buried Paramonos, son of Eukleides and Eukleides, son of Paramonos, together with another Paramonos and Archemachos, both sons of Euktaios; in *kline* II the buried men are Archemachos, son of Eukleides and Alexandros, son of Archemachos. Archemachos and Eukleides are believed by the author to be the «patriarchs» of the family (125).

Discussion of the offerings starts with the terracotta figurines of the 'Erotes' (137–153), a name cited within quotation marks because H. will ultimately identify them as images of souls, *daimones*. In so doing, she actually separates them from Eros and, on the basis of iconography, relates them to the winged figurines representing the souls of the dead (*psychai*) in funerary art. The Eretria statuettes, 28 in total, not higher than 10 cm each, are not identical. They have different but usually enveloping clothing and varied attributes, such as music instruments, vases, a theatre mask, garlands. The author is certain that these figurines were suspended from the vault and contributed a lighter touch to a generally grave atmosphere.

Among the offerings of the Tomb of the Erotes was a series of miniature shields with relief representations (153–175). They were suspended on the walls, as traces of strings on their back suggest. There are two types of shields, round and elliptical. The round shields carry images of Helios with radiating crown (cat. nos. 29–35), busts of a young man with *causia* (cat. nos. 36–38), Medusa's heads on the aegis (cat. nos. 39–45), and a central decorative motif shaped like a 'Macedonian shield' (cat. nos. 46–49). The oval shields show the winged gorgoneion on the aegis placed against their longitudinal axis (cat. nos. 50–53) or on the thunderbolt (cat. nos. 54–61). Six items have a dog's head on the longitudinal axis (cat. nos. 62–67). H. explores at length the funerary and votive function of these small objects, with good knowledge of the problematics and the bibliography.

H. points to the influence of Alexander's iconography on the type of Helios, preconditioned by the identification of Alexander with Ammon Râ for political reasons. It is very probable, as the author remarks, that the images on the miniature shields were also influenced by numismatic types of Helios, especially those from Rhodes (162). H. gives a good number of examples of images of Helios in funerary context. It is certainly a matter of interest why the God of light and life was represented in a tomb. She finds the explanation in his role as military protector. Recently an un plundered monumental tomb was found in the Kazanlak valley in Bulgaria, belonging presumably to the Thracian king Seuthes III. The two leaves of the marble door to the circular chamber are decorated on their inner faces with relief shields: one bears the radiate head of Helios and the other the face of Medusa. Both shields face toward the interior of the tomb, that is, toward the realm of the underworld. Helios was the only one who saw the rape of Persephone by Hades and in this respect his presence in a tomb should be related to the expected resurrection from the dead imitating the cycle of Persephone's reappearance into the world of the living. On the other hand, if we accept the identification of the image of the young man with *causia* as Alexander, as suggested by K. G. Vermoelle and accepted by H., a military protective significance of Helios is also likely. The problem is that depictions of Alexander wearing the *causia* are so far unattested, despite the evidence from written sources (Str. XV 1, 64). With regard to the *causia* and its relation to the dating of monuments, we should recall the frieze in the dromos of the Kazanlak tomb, where this distinctive Macedonian hat is worn by military men who meet a group of soldiers protected by helmets. This should represent a meeting between Thracian and Macedonian detachments which took place around 300 BC.

A well informed discussion of the Medusa faces on the miniature shields stresses the popularity of the gorgoneion as *episema* throughout Antiquity. The closest

analogy the author cites is a stucco medallion from Ai-Khanoum of the first half of the 2nd century BC, which gives her ground to date the miniature shields from the Eretrian tomb to the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the 2nd century BC. The astral symbolism of Medusa suggested by H. and still not discussed in the literature, could be explained on the one hand through Pegasos, who emerged from Medusa's neck at her decapitation and ascended to Olympus where he was meant to bring thunders and lightning to Zeus (Hes. *Theog.* 285–6). The connection of Medusa to the Moon is a question that deserves further research.¹

In the Tomb of the Erotes a figurine of Tanagra type was also found (175–179). H. suggests it is Aphrodite, who was very popular in funerary contexts during the Hellenistic period, alluding to marriage and death.

Fortunately most of the gold jewellery from the Tomb of the Erotes was recovered during the legal proceeding following the plundering of the tomb (179–191). The most valuable object is the diadem decorated with scrolls, so similar to that from the tomb of Philip II that H. believes they were manufactured in related workshops (187).² Among the adornments from the tomb is a golden ring with a gem-seal probably depicting Aphrodite arming herself, signed by the engraver Gelon. According to the analysis of the jewellery its chronology ranges from the last quarter of the 4th century to the end of the 1st century BC.

The bronze vessels from the tomb, hydriai and kalpides are partially lost: the author reckons the hydriai to have been five. She relates them to the funerary cult, especially as containers for the ashes of the dead. Morphological analysis places them in the 5th to 4th century BC. The other item of interest among the vessels is the lid of a ceramic box (pyxis), whose unusual size (diam. 42 cm) suggests its function as a *cinerarium*. Finally, among the grave goods was a solid gold pseudo-coin (cat. no. 98), today lost.

H. summarizes (199) her research on the offerings. She underlines the importance of the collection (almost one hundred pieces), as well as the fact that it was here studied in its totality and its archaeological context. The analysis of the offerings is particularly revealing for the dating of both the tomb and its findings. In two tables H. reconstructs the chronological correspondence between offerings and furniture-*cineraria* (200–201). H. admits that the epigraphic evidence situates the throne A in the first quarter of the 3rd century BC. Since all items of furniture in her opinion are contemporary, the beginning of the 3rd century seems justifiable for the date of the construction of the tomb. Strangely, however, the author prefers to take as chronological basis the historic fact of the establishment of the Macedonian garrison in Eretria in the second quarter of the 3rd century BC. This is her final dating for the construction of the tomb. The offerings were deposited respectively in accordance with successive burials. One wonders, however, about the terracotta 'Erotes', which are dated from the second half of the 4th to the first quarter of the 3rd century BC, as well as the Tanagra figurine of a woman, whose dating is difficult but finds parallels around 325–275 BC. These clay statuettes could not have waited

¹ See, e.g., R. Graves, *The Greek Myths*, 1957, v. 1, 129; later tradition, cf. K. Ziegler, in: RE VII, 1912, cols. 1630–1655, s.v. Gorgo, esp. cols. 1644–1646.

² H. adds a survey of the already abundant literature concerning the Macedonian diadem and the symbolism of the scroll motif; an article on this topic in: Kalathos. *Studies in Honour of Asher Ovadia* (2006) would be pertinent.

for a quarter century to be deposited in the tomb. Moreover, on the basis of epigraphic evidence H. suggests that relations between Macedonia and Eretria (and Euboea in general) were persistent from the last third of the 4th century to the end of the 3rd century BC (243). They began at the time of Philip II, saw a marked Antigonid presence in the second half of the 3rd century and ended with occupation by the Romans in 198 BC.

The analysis of the Tomb of Amarynthos is much shorter than that of the Tomb of the Erotes (203–225). Discovered in 1897, this tomb was also looted but the offerings could not be retraced. After a period of oblivion, the tomb was rediscovered by J.-M. Gard in 1971. He excavated, cleaned the tomb, did small restoration work and produced valuable plans and drawings of the furniture. The description of the architecture by H. is precise in all respect: measurements, state of preservation, execution, type of supports, style. The author shows a very good knowledge of the elements of the klinai and the related terminology. Her research leads her to date the Tomb of Amarynthos to the second half of the 3rd century BC.

In the final chapter H. discusses the burial customs reflected in the two Eretrian tombs. Compared to Greek rites and monuments, the Eretrian tombs of Macedonian type testify to an ideological complex related to death that is different and apparently more positive than the Greek one. The offerings, consisting of valuable personal objects, the furniture and its arrangement in the tomb imitating a banquet room bespeak ideas of a pleasant existence in the world beyond.

The historical interpretation of the archaeological evidence was viewed by the author as the logical end to her research. She gives an account of the dynamic history of Eretria and in general of Euboea during the age of the Diadochs. In the second half of the 3rd century BC Eretria remained under the rule of the Antigonids and this period is seen by the author as the most probable time for the construction of the Tomb of Amarynthos and the continuous use of the Tomb of the Erotes. Proxeny decrees and other inscriptions related to citizenship reveal a strong Macedonian presence within the high strata of Eretrian society and their diplomatic role between Eretria and Macedon.

The second volume of the publication contains two well elaborated catalogues. The first one lists the finds from the Tomb of the Erotes that are now in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston. The items are grouped according to their material and form: terracotta figurines, jewellery, bronze vessels, ceramics, a pseudo-coin, some bones, and several other items. To this is added a catalogue of objects supposed to come from the tomb but kept in different collections. The other catalogue consists of bibliographical references for the Macedonian tombs in modern Greece arranged alphabetically according to location. It is probably the right place here to point to the somewhat peculiar use of the designation 'Thrace', which often in the book comprises only Aegean Thrace, that is, the territories in modern Greece and Turkey. The larger part of the territory of the Thracian tribes lies, however, in modern Bulgaria where there is a great number of chamber tombs of prime interest for the topic under consideration. Likewise the designation of Macedonia (or the territory of Macedon) as Northern Greece is not correct.

There are two other appendixes, the first one devoted to the origin of the Macedonian tomb type. Tombs from other regions, like Asia Minor, Thrace, Cyprus and South Russia, are also briefly mentioned (49–50).

The book has a wealth of visual information. The author has provided new architectural plans, drawings and new photographs, which in principle are useful and necessary especially in view of possible future deterioration of the monuments. I would like to emphasize the high quality of certain photographs, namely nos. 40–41 (A. Skiadaressis) and 46–49 (E. Skiadaressis). Larger pictures of some miniature shields would be convenient for iconographic and stylistic comparisons. The drawings by J.-M. Gard and by the author herself are of very good quality and highly informative.

The bibliography is certainly impressive. It includes the majority of the most important publications on the subject under investigation, whether architecture, clay figurines, or paintings. One has the impression that priority is given to modern contributions (from the last decades). Although earlier scholars are cited, some names should not be omitted even when a problem is only touched upon: e.g., in relation to the mystery tablets G. Zuntz and F. Graf should be mentioned. There is also a thematic bibliography, which is already needed in modern studies because of the large amount of literature that exists and continues to accumulate. Moreover, in this book a thematic bibliography is justified by the variety of research fields concerned.

By all accounts, Huguenot's work can be considered highly informative, rich in ideas, and likely to be mined for further speculations and study in years to come.¹

Sofia

Julia Valeva

*

Monika Trümper: *Die 'Agora des Italiens' in Delos.* Baugeschichte, Architektur, Ausstattung und Funktion einer späthellenistischen Porticus-Anlage. 2 Bde. (1. Bd.: Text. 2. Bd.: Abbildungen und Tafeln.). Rahden/Westf.: Verlag Marie Leidorf 2008. XV, 531 S. 162 Abb. 222 Taf. 1 Beil. 4°. (Internationale Archäologie. 104.) 129,80 €.

Depuis plusieurs décennies, trois édifices déliens suscitent des débats intenses et, parfois, polémiques: l'Oikos des Naxiens, la Synagogue et l'Agora des Italiens. C'est à ce dernier que la littérature la plus abondante a été consacrée. Elle s'est développée autour d'une hypothèse avancée par M. Cocco en 1970 (PP 25, 1970, p. 446–449), selon laquelle l'édifice aurait été un marché aux esclaves, et s'est organisée autour de l'affrontement entre deux grands archéologues: F. Coarelli, qui continue à soutenir cette thèse (en dernier lieu JRA 18, 2005, 196–212), et Ph. Bruneau qui, sa vie durant, n'a cessé de la combattre (articles rassemblés dans BCH Suppl. 47, 2006). D'un côté se sont rangés les défenseurs d'une destination unique, de l'autre les partisans d'une diversité fonctionnelle.

La publication de référence du monument a été fournie par Ét. Lapalus dans le dix-neuvième fascicule de l'«Exploration archéologique de Délos» paru en 1939.

¹ I want to thank Professor Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway for revising the English text of this review.