mainly prosopographical in its outlook. Much reference is made to the names of Romans and native tribes, and the many manoeuvres and fights are very carefully analyzed on the basis of the literary sources.

The author's analysis of the concept of *provincia* is of general interest. He states (p. 4ff. and 178ff.) that this term did not cover a geographical area, but just denotes a command. When magistrates were given one of the two Spanish *provinciae*, the Senate just conferred the command but did not have annexation in mind. Thus the Senate played a passive rôle, and we are back to “the men on the spot”. Their search for glory, triumphs etc. was the prime mover in the process that finally led to the Romanization of the peninsula. The author does not deny economic motives, but takes a stand against William Harris, who “believes that the Roman senate was determined, for motives of greed and the exercise of military power, to annex any territory it could” (p. 2).

In a very thorough review of Harris' well-known work (War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327—70 B.C., Oxford 1979) Walter Eder comments upon the treatment of the annexation policy (Gnomon 54 [1982] 549—54). While he gives Harris full credit for emphasizing the “ideology of *laus* and *gloria*” and for pointing to the vast economic gains the expansion brought the state and the individual, he is not satisfied with Harris' explanation for the non-annexation of many territories during the II century B.C. Eder stresses the more or less open conflict between the interest of the Senate as a body, and the potential governors of annexed provinces, who could grow very powerful in their office. But the policy of non-annexation did not mean non-involvement.

Mr. Richardson's book thus provides a useful perspective on the Harris-Eder debate, both as an illustration of the “ideology of *laus* and *gloria*”, and because it gives much space to the treatment of the relations between the Senate and “the men on the spot” in Spain.

*Christer Bruun*


This is an interesting and well-written book. Apart from introductory remarks, it consists of two parts. The first deals with Galilean society in the second century: population, the relationship of Jews to gentiles, and village life; the second is an attempt to locate the position of the rabbis within Galilean society with special focus on their lack of jurisdiction competing with local and Imperial jurisdiction (the problems of local and Roman administration are also discussed at some length). Goodman draws on rabbinic as well as nonrabbinic sources and tries to demonstrate that Galilean villages resembled the contemporary villages of Syria. But that statement should be questioned. Nothing like the emergence of rabbinic authority among the Jews seems to be noticeable in other Semitic populations of Palestine or Syria. The authority of the rabbis was indeed limited, but even with all its limitations this authority over the local population must have differed radically from the situation in other part of the Semitic Levant. But when the author concludes that
"Greek and Semitic elements were combined within a Jewish framework to produce a coherent culture" one cannot but agree.

I have made no attempt to check the wealth of information the author exploits. As to the rabbinic sources, I do not consider myself competent to judge the reliability of Goodman's interpretations, but my Semitist colleagues call my attention to some inaccuracies in the translations. In the rich bibliography I miss a reference to the important contribution ‘Die Sprachsituatiom im römischen Palästina’ by Haiim B. Rosén, in Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit, Köln-Bonn 1980, 215—239. For the Roman governors see now B. Thomasson, Laterculi praesidum I, Göteborg 1984, 321ff.

Heikki Solin


È sempre un’atto piacevole pubblicare una raccolta, anche se limitata, di scritti di un grande studioso. I contributi del Mingazzini che qui si presentano sono scelti in modo da mettere in evidenza le doti dello studioso e le sue varie attività nel campo dell’archeologia antica. Pensando ai suoi interessi particolari, è ben motivato che una parte cospicua del presente volume sia dedicata alla ceramica e alla scultura. Tutto il materiale è stato diviso in sei gruppi (Scultura, architettura e topografia, ceramica e pittura, antichità, epigrafia e religione) seguendo un’ordine cronologico all’interno dei singoli gruppi. I presenti Scritti vari certamente terranno viva la memoria del grande maestro.

Mika Kajava


Il presente volume è una raccolta di 45 studi minori di Enrico Paribeni. L’impresa di offrire ai lettori un buon taglio cronologico della sua attività scientifica fin dagli anni 30 è specialmente piacevole, tanto più che si tratta di un grande maestro della Storia dell’arte antica. La pubblicazione di un volume di questo tipo è anche motivata dal fatto che pubblicazioni che coprono un lungo periodo di ricerca sono troppo spesso disperse in diverse riviste, non sempre facilmente accessibili. Oltre alla comodità di questa raccolta, dobbiamo sottolineare la continua capacità del Paribeni di proporre le sue idee con parole critiche e lucide. Particolarmente lodevole risulta la sua esposizione breve e logica, una virtù che viene spesso trascurata dagli studiosi dell’arte antica.

Mika Kajava