unfortunately the sources do not establish is whether this treatment was applied to all divine statues placed within sanctuaries or only to a subset, the true cult images.

New College, Oxford ROBERT PARKER

TREASURY LISTS FROM DELOS

R. HAMILTON: *Treasure Map: A Guide to the Delian Inventories*. Pp. xiii + 479, 3 pls. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000. Cased, £31. ISBN: 0-472-10968-5.

This is an impressive work of detailed scholarship, of a kind to which a short review cannot do justice. Hamilton studies the surviving temple inventories from Delos—and, for comparison, the inventories from the Athenian acropolis, from which the Athenians took to Delos the practice of inscribing such inventories—in order 'to address the apparently simple questions why the Delians (and before them the Athenians) inscribed inventories and why their inventories have so much variation in form and content' (p. vii).

Chapter I summarizes what is known of the Delian inventories. They are conveniently divided into three periods: Amphictyonic, reflecting the administration of the Amphictyons appointed by Athens before 314; Independence, from the period when Delos was independent of Athenian control, between 314 and 166; and Athenian, from the period after 166 when Delos was given to Athens by Rome and the Delian inhabitants were replaced by Athenian cleruchs. More treasuries published inventories in the second period than in the first, and more still in the third; in the first two periods only gold and silver but in the third period all the contents of the temples were listed. In the first period and again in the third there is a high degree of consistency in the order in which items are listed in the different inventories; the second period made a clean break from the first, and in its earlier inventories there is considerable variation, but its later inventories tended towards a new standard pattern.

Chapter II is devoted to the five major Delian treasuries, from which we have inventories in all three periods. The late-fifth-century temple of Apollo, originally known as the Temple of the Athenians but in the Independence period renamed the Temple of the Seven Statues, had contents which remained substantially the same in the first two periods and largely the same in the third. The sixth-century temple of Apollo, originally known as the Temple of the Delians but in the Independence period renamed the Poros Temple, at first contained gold, which was moved to the new Temple of Apollo when that received treasures in the third century; it then acquired new items, largely of silver. The Temple of Artemis contained a larger and more volatile treasure: it seems to have been the principal treasury until the opening of the new Temple of Apollo. That temple was begun in the early fifth century and never finished, but first produced an inventory in 279/8; the treasures which it acquired included the gold from the Temple of the Delians and silver 'endowment *phialai*', commemorative vases dedicated by benefactors who endowed sacrifices and festivals. Objects whose ultimate destination was elsewhere appear, sometimes for a considerable time, in the *hieropoion* in earlier lists or in the House of the Andrians in later lists (but there is an overlap in the first half of the third century, not a clean transition from one to the other). The discussion is followed by lengthy tables, listing for comparison the items recorded in the different inventories for the same treasury, showing the order in

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.113 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which they appear, the topographical and other rubrics used to organize the lists, and, where recorded, the weights of the objects.

A similar exercise is performed in Chapter III on the minor Delian treasuries, and in Chapter IV on the inventories from the treasuries on the Athenian acropolis. Chapter V presents a brief Conclusion; and there are eight appendixes and two indexes (one for the Athenian acropolis, one for Delos).

Hamilton makes a good case for rejecting the widely accepted view of J. Tréheux that the Delian inventories were intentionally incomplete documents, so that a systematic study of their contents would be fundamentally misguided. The inventories have some accidental omissions, and a number of copying errors (variations in recorded weights are frequently due to a mistake in one character), but it need not be doubted that the intention was to produce lists that were complete within the categories wanted. The lists and the changes are later in Delos than in Athens, but both places show a comparable development: the earliest lists follow a regular pattern, with new accessions listed at the end; then comes a period in which reweighing overrides the distinction between old and new items; then that system breaks down, to be followed in Athens by separate lists on separate stelai and in Delos by an extension in scope with no uniform treatment, before the publication of inventories ceases. Perhaps over-stressing the financial decrees of Callias, of 434/3(?), Hamilton argues that the purpose of the Athenian inventories was fiscal, to ensure that monetary reserves on which the state might need to draw were in good order, while that of the Delian inventories, which served no such function, was purely religious. Certainly in the late fifth century the Athenian treasures had a fiscal function, but I think he makes too much of this.

Readers who have themselves written books will know that publishers regard dust jackets as their concern, not the author's; but I have never before seen such a gross discrepancy between the jacket and the book which it contains. The jacket labels dates B.C.E. while the book labels them B.C.; more seriously, the jacket alleges that the book 'offers translations of the inventories in English for the first time', while in the book Hamilton states that he originally intended to do this but in the end did not (p. vii), and that 'it presents extensive notes . . . on aspects of Delian life and politics', not many of which the reader will find. I fear the publishers are trying to sell the book to readers of a kind not envisaged by the author.

University of Durham P. J. RHODES

PROTOHISTORIC ITALY

M. Harari, M. Pearce (edd.): *Il Protovillanoviano al di qua e al di là dell'Appennino. Atti della giornata di studio: Pavia, Collegio Ghislieri, 17 giugno 1995*. (Biblioteca di Athenaeum 38.) Pp. 359, ills. Como: Edizioni New Press, 2000. Paper, L. 60,000.

M. Pacciarelli: *Torre Galli. La necropoli della prima età del ferro (scavi Paolo Orsi 1922–23)*. Pp. 418, 45 text-figs., 189 pls, 7 loose tables in back pocket. Soveria Marinelli: Rubbettino, 1999. Cased, L. 80,000. ISBN: 88-7284-725-7.

The term 'Protovillanoviano' was coined by G. Patroni in 1937 to describe a number of artefact-types and decorative motifs of the Italian Late Bronze Age, and to do so

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.113 Published online by Cambridge University Press