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/52.1.114 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in such a way as to underline the derivation from them of certain features that were typical of the Iron Age cultures of Villanovan type. The subsequent conceptual history of the word to 1975 was reviewed for English readers by M. A. Fugazzola Delpino (in D. and F. R. Ridgway [edd.], *Italy before the Romans* [London and New York, 1979], pp. 31–51); suffice it to recall here that 'Protovillanoviano' emerged in 1962 (M. Pallottino) as an essentially cultural definition associated with the Italian chronological period known as the Final Bronze Age (conventionally dated from the twelfth to the tenth century B.C.: *CAH*^{2} IV, 786). Further exegesis (e.g. R. Peroni [ed.], *Il Bronzo finale in Italia* [Bari, 1980]; cf. *ProcsPrehistSoc.* 47 [1981], 342–4) has confirmed the significance of this period as crucial to the understanding of the ethnogenesis of the Italic peoples, while 'il Protovillanoviano' itself has come to represent, however faintly, the first manifestation of cultural unity in the Italian peninsula—a diagnosis that has been supported by new discoveries in areas as far apart as Calabria (Broglio di Trebisacce) and the Veneto (Frattesina di Fratta Polesine). It is thus of considerable interest not only to *paletnologi* like Pearce (Nottingham) but also to *etruscologi* like Harari (Pavia); and the conference papers they have edited amount to a decisive step forward for us all, and one that is entirely worthy of the distinguished series in which it appears.

That said, I do not believe that readers of *CR* will wish to concern themselves with the mass of detailed information, technical illustration, and discussion contained in the five *relazioni* (pp. 15–171)—two devoted to the Veneto, as is an awesome typological and theoretical appendix (pp. 259–357), and one each to the Apennine passes, Central Italy, and the South—and in five of the six shorter *interventi* (pp. 175–249), of which Pacciarelli's account (pp. 175–200) of Calabrian warrior élites and their Mediterranean contacts is a partial synthesis of findings that he has since published in L. Costamagna and P. Visonà (edd.), *Oppido Mamertina* (Rome, 1999), pp. 35–80. Since the factual information in these items inspires confidence, I turn to the three brief pieces in which wider issues are ventilated in their own right: the model proposed under the engaging title of N. Negroni Catacchio's *intervento* ('Dai Protovillanoviani ai Protoetruschi', pp. 241–8); and the conclusions offered by M. Bonghi Jovino (pp. 251–3) and R. Peroni (pp. 255–8).

Of these, Negroni Catacchio concludes from her recent work in central Etruria that it is legitimate to think of 'Etruscans' already in the Final Bronze Age, on the understanding that in Etruria and Latium the supra-regional '*facies* culturale definita Protovillanoviano' underwent a process of 'coagulazione e differenziazione' around 1050 B.C. This allows us to define the inhabitants of those parts henceforth as respectively 'Proto-Etruscans' and 'Proto-Latins'. Or does it? Peroni points out (p. 258) that at the time in question Etruria was deeply divided in its affinities with other areas of the peninsula; and I myself would like to know more about the processes that prompted the 'componente di sostrato, autoctona' firstly to adopt 'la cultura protovillanoviana' at the beginning of the twelfth century and then to modify it around the middle of the eleventh—Negroni Catacchio's passing reference to 'un elemento nuovo, probabilmente collegato al mondo greco-egeo' (p. 245) is not enough. Bonghi Jovino's conclusion is brief but concrete: the Protovillanovan levels that she has encountered on the Civita at Tarquinia (cf. *CR* 49 [1999], 530–1; *JRA* 12 [1999], 441–4) demonstrate not only a human presence in the affected parts of the site from the late tenth century, but also 'ritualità e sacralità', and hence (surely) the 'formarsi di una "disciplina" ' in the context of a differentiated social structure. This is important; and so too is Bonghi Jovino's conclusion that further progress in interpretation must come 'dall' interno della stessa realtà tarquiniese'. Finally, Peroni (who now prefers to think of 'il

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.114 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Provillanoviano' as a statistically definable taxonomic entity rather than as a culture) distinguishes two socioeconomic formations, both Protovillanovan: 'di tipo tribale' in the north; and 'di tipo gentilizio-clientelare' in the south (which means that the upper classes there are more closely involved in the production of the means of subsistence: 'ecco i magazzini di pithoi, ecco l'olio, ecco il vino' [p. 256]), with Frattesina as a unique example of the southern type in the north.

In sum, these are deep waters. As it happens, an encouraging glimpse of what awaits us in the immediately succeeding period is afforded by the second item listed above.

In all, Paolo Orsi excavated 334 graves in the Torre Galli cemetery near Tropea in Calabria; his report (*MonAnt* 31 [1926], cols. 5–212, pls. 1–8), though efficient, is no longer adequate. Pacciarelli (P.) makes good the deficiency for the 277 graves, mainly single inhumations with *corredi* (sets of grave-goods), that belong to the early part of the Early Iron Age. The basic procedures of modern definitive publication are here admirably carried out, and the result (pp. 143–206, pls. 12–189) has permanent reference value; and although P. will not be the last specialist to interrogate this major assemblage, it will be some time before the answers that he has elicited will be superseded. Briefly, typological classification of the grave-goods (pp. 107–41) leads to basic seriation of the *corredi* (loose Table 1); this yields two sub-phases (IA, IB: pp. 35–44), absolute dates for which are obtained by comparing the Torre Galli sequence with those available at other sites in South and Central Italy and elsewhere in the Mediterranean (pp. 44–62). But what sets P.'s work apart is his correlation of the Torre Galli and other southern sequences with the contexts in Switzerland that can now be dated independently by dendrochronology. He concludes, I believe reasonably in the present state of the evidence, that the early part of the Italian Early Iron Age should be assigned to *c*. 960–850 B.C. rather than, as hitherto, to *c*. 900–800 (pp. 62–3, with Fig. 15; and cf. *JRA* 12 [1999], 438–9).

P.'s new chronology will have to be considered in future publications of Iron Age assemblages, new and old; its local significance is meanwhile by no means negligible. The contents of the Torre Galli graves provide unequivocal indications of ongoing contacts with the outside world: a handful of scarabs and other *aegyptiaca* (pp. 213–7; F. De Salvia), the earliest of their kind in Italy, suggest the presence in the vicinity of Phoenician or Cypriot seafarers from the second half of the tenth century; and a lump of Sicilian amber (pp. 219–22) hints at exchanges in another direction. Finally, analysis of ritual practices and of the *corredi* prompts sensible discussion (pp. 67–106, loose Tables 2–7) of hierarchical divisions between both individuals and families.

The picture that emerges from these two unremittingly specialist publications has little in common with the traditional image of Western barbarians patiently waiting to be Hellenized. 'And if there are still scholars who protest that such things are not worth knowing, they can no longer have any excuse for asserting them to be unknowable' (D. Randall-MacIver, *Italy before the Romans* [Oxford, 1928], p. 12).

University of Edinburgh DAVID RIDGWAY

THE ETRUSCANS

M. TORELLI (ed.): *The Etruscans*. Pp. 672, 800 ills. London: Thames and Hudson, 2001. Cased, £48. ISBN: 0-500-51033-4.

This was a big show in Venice during 2000–1, and it duly yielded a mega-catalogue. However, the object chosen as leading motif for both exhibition and tome is a

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.114 Published online by Cambridge University Press