were private in the sense that only the judge and the parties concerned were present (this is the meaning of *iudicium privatum*); 2) the issues were typically *res pecuniariae*; 3) the *unus iudex* was (at least in principle) a person agreed on between the parties, which implies "that the *unus iudex* as a social phenomenon was embedded in a complex of notions like honour, respectability, and doing things decently"; 4) the task of the *unus iudex* was to settle the dispute rather than to conclude it by a judgement (there was no clear semantic difference between the words 'iudex' and 'arbiter' in this period).

The book consists of five chapters: one for each of the three judicatures, one on the statistics of Roman litigation, and one on fear of loss of face as a factor inhibiting litigation. For each judicature the problems of origin, composition and competence are dealt with, and the main theories put forward by Romanists on these questions are considered. In the chapter on statistics the author tries to evaluate the relative quantitative importance in the actual world of litigation of the three courts; this evaluation is based on Digest material (among other things, all *responsum*, *rescriptum*, and other "real" case passages of the Digest are listed). In chapter IV the author examines fear of loss of face as an essential ingredient of his argument.

Tapio Helen


Everyone is fully aware of the danger of large-scale archaeological excavations, which provide museums with their rich material, illuminate in many ways the ethnic, urban, social and cultural history of the sites, but then eventually being committed to complete oblivion after the deaths of the leaders of excavations and the common disappearance of the excavation protocols. In this respect, the present volumes are too good to be true: one can only enquire that if these three volumes containing altogether about one thousand pages of text, 233 tables of photographs and 17 folio maps represent the preliminary report, what will the final report be like? The publication was made possible apparently through the munificence of a bank: a similar attitude in the commercial world would promote many equally important projects. But above all our thanks and admiration are due to the leader of the team of fifteen contributors, Antonio Frova; having participated in several scientific teams myself, I find it impossible to understand how he has contrived to induce all members of his team to complete their work within the time limit of one or two years.

There seems to be very little to object to in the documentation of the excavations. The disposition is based on the excavation areas. In addition to the brief presentation of *cardo maximus*, there are three areas, the material of which is recorded separately and by different contributors. This could easily have lead to inconsistency in the recording and to a repetition of the discussion of similar materials, but these pitfalls have been avoided for the most part. But there is hardly any doubt that the usefulness of the work for one who does not care to read the entire thousand pages suffers a great deal from the absence of concluding chapters, which would bring together the strands of each group from the different areas.

The introductory chapter 'Note sull'urbanistica e la vita civile' has probably been intended to represent such a conclusion, but one remains somewhat disappointed with it. The importance of the excavations of Luni for a scholar of classical antiquity does not lie in the objects discovered — the results of these excavations do not offer anything remarkable in this respect. The main interest is historical: what is the special character of a Roman colony in the random territory of the Etruscans and the Ligurians, evidently founded
on unused ground. It could perhaps be acceptable for the excavators to leave the historical conclusions to other scholars, furnishing them only with the complete archaeological evidence. But why should they do so, since it is they who know the material and site better than anyone else, and must be constantly concerned with such questions during their work. And if they decide to do so, why have they done so little to facilitate the task of other scholars in this respect? In any case, one page devoted to the history of Luni in a work of this size does not provide an adequate background for the analysis of the archaeological material. One would perhaps also like to see the analysis itself used to give some account of the larger regional perspectives. I would consider that only this way would such an otherwise splendid work be worth its price.

Jorma Kaimio


Heikki Solin


This book is a well-written, well-illustrated introduction to Rumanian antiquities for the general reader. As such it is very rewarding, not only readable but inspiring. It is, however, not a book for the specialist, despite the publisher’s statement to this effect in his blurb. The text is written almost entirely without footnotes — although there are several referring to the author’s own books in the same series. Perhaps these were added to encourage us to buy them, too? The complete lack of references — not even the citations from Tacitus and the inscriptions are provided with the appropriate references — is not compensated by the bibliography, ample though this is. It is a great pity that Prof. MacKendrick did not make this a somewhat larger and more scholarly work. The theme itself would have been extremely interesting and worth while. If the present form of the book is what the publishers asked for, i.e. the publishers thought they may encounter an indifferent market with a book with more text and footnotes and less pictures of Trajan’s column, the author would have served his readers better had he asked for a grant to subsidize its publication elsewhere.

Eeva Ruoff-Väändänen


It is profitless to state that the theme chosen by Krauskopf is of very great importance for the understanding of Etruscan art and the whole of Etruscan culture in its relations to the other Mediterranean cultures. One can see