

dates for the scannation of Reate, Venafrum, Sutri, Nepete, and Falerii in the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C., though it can equally well have taken place at the time of the triumviral assignments in the last century B.C. or even later, (see the appropriate references in the *Lib. Col.*). The subject is, of course, notoriously difficult, but then it is just inviting trouble to argue anything on the basis of mere assumptions, especially as some firm dates are in fact available. The case of Felsina would have been particularly interesting, as it was the site of the Latin colony of Bononia, and the Villanovan habitation at the site already seems to have followed the north-south axial arrangement. Neither is there any discussion of the areas of Cividale del Friuli, Forlì, and Forlimpopoli with centuriations of different orientations.

Shortcomings in the other chapters might also warrant mention. It is, indeed, a great pity that Dr. Hinrichs did not devote more time to preparing his book. In addition to the kind of omissions referred to above, a number of factual mistakes also mars the work. It is, of course, a lapse to write 'nachchristlich' instead of 'vorchristlich', but it is worse to call Aufidena an ally, when it was a praefectura (p. 30), and it is a serious blunder to argue in opposition to Frontinus that the Etruscans did not practise centuriation, since Frontinus has never said they did (p. 224). He merely stated that Etruscans laid their towns out on a north-south pattern — which is another thing — and the truthfulness of this statement is admirably attested by the excavations of the Etruscan colonies. How the towns in Etruria proper were built will only be known after they have been excavated. The great number of printing errors also seems to indicate that the author was somewhat harassed when working on this book.

Eeva Ruoff-Väänänen

H. Russell Robinson: The Armour of Imperial Rome. Lionel Lewenthal Ltd, Arms and Armour Press, London 1975. 200 p., 521 plates, 204 figures. £ 11.95.

An expert on ancient arms and armour, H. Russell Robinson, has recently published the results of his studies of Imperial Roman armour in this comprehensive and richly illustrated work. As far as one can see, the writer has created reliable typologies of helmets used by Roman legionary and auxiliary troops and their body armour. Some of his own reconstructions in particular are impressive and undoubtedly of great value for any classical scholar.

One is perhaps less impressed by the quality of some of the illustrations, such as the sketches made by Mr Robinson himself of monuments which could just as easily have been photographed (figs. 1, 14-18, etc.). Moreover, the quality of some of the photographs themselves leaves a great deal to be desired (plates 44, 154, 345-348, 407-410). Furthermore, the grounds on which the writer has based some of his datings are rather obscure. (That the gladiators "adopted the laminated arm-guard probably by the second half of the first century AD" cannot possibly be inferred from any of the Pompeian graffiti!)

Many of the helmets carry inscriptions recording the names of their owners and the centuries — or even legions — to which they belonged. These inscriptions have been cited by the writer in some cases only, although I should have thought they could have some value in dating the helmets, for instance, or in identifying the ranks of their owners. Moreover, many of these inscriptions have been quoted inaccurately by the writer, who does not reveal any profound knowledge of Latin onomastics or, surprisingly, of the way Roman soldiers recorded their names and ranks. An instance can be seen in the helmet illustrated in pl. 81-83 which in my opinion belonged successively to two soldiers, L. Cornelius and C. Atius (?), serving under the same centurion, Catulus.

Nonetheless one would welcome from the same pen an equally thorough study of the gladiatorial arms and armour and their development, with the assistance, perhaps, of an expert in classical literature and epigraphy.

Paavo Castrén

*

Gli arbitrati interstatali greci. Introduzione, edizione critica, traduzione, commento e indici. A cura di *Luigi Piccirilli*. Vol. I: Dalle origini al 338 a.C. Relazioni interstatali nel mondo antico, Fonti e studi (diretti da Giuseppe Nenci) 1. Edizioni Marlin, Pisa 1973. 349 p., XIV plates. Lit. 28000.

This collection is aimed at constituting a complete Corpus of texts, literary, epigraphical, and papyrological, relating to cases of interstatal (i.e. between sovereign states, princes or gods) arbitration or mediation in the ancient Greek world; mythical as well as historical, fictitious as well as real cases are included. The first volume contains 61 historical and 19 mythical arbitrations. — The full Greek text of each arbitration is given with a critical commentary, an Italian translation, an interpretation of the document, and with references to sources and studies. The Indices include a list of Greek and Latin legal terms appearing in the texts.

Tapio Helen

J. M. Kelly: Studies in the Civil Judicature of the Roman Republic. Clarendon Press: Oxford University Press 1976. 141 p. £ 5.75.

The aim of the author is to construct an organized picture of the Roman Republican civil judicature (more precisely in the time of Cicero) in such a way as to find a rationale for the co-existence of three separate judicatures or courts, widely different from each other in composition and sphere of competence. These are the collegiate courts of *centumviri* and *recuperatores*, and the single judge court of *unus iudex*. Mr. Kelly is not satisfied with the notion that the *unus iudex* was the "normal" civil judicature to whose sphere of authority, as a rule, the civil cases belonged, and to which the collegiate courts were mere accessories for special restricted areas. The period under consideration was one of transition in the history of civil procedure (from *legis actio* to the formulary procedure), but this does not offer an adequate explanation for the phenomenon. A more general explanation is to be sought among the conditions prevailing in Roman society at the end of Republican era. The writer advances the theory that it was the task of *unus iudex* to deal with the disputes that had their sources in the business world among those engaging in financial and commercial transactions. The distinction public/private constituted the boundary between the spheres of the collegiate courts (*centumviri* and *recuperatores*) on the one hand and that of the *unus iudex* on the other. The judicature of the *unus iudex* was a sort of system of arbitration put at the disposal of the business world by the Roman State; this sphere was regarded as private. According to this theory, the figure of *unus iudex* is intimately connected with the historical situation of the late Roman Republic, the era of the great *publicani* and their *societates*.

The field of the *centumviri* involved issues that concerned succession to family property on which (originally at least) the interest of many *gentes* was centered and which therefore required wide procedural publicity. The characteristic feature of *recuperatores* lay in their competence to execute as well as to pronounce judgements, they "must represent the Roman Republic's first move to assure the regular operation of the law against those who were impervious to disrepute or social pressure or the plaintiff's own efforts". — In the judicature of *unus iudex* the author isolates four "dimensions" which harmonize with his theory of the function of this court: 1) the proceedings