

the reader of a relevant book or article is usually none the wiser as to the present status of the law, despite the fact that all the relevant case law has been aptly cited and explained. The editors have done well in not recruiting an army of contributors but have instead relied on a small, but distinguished, cohort of enthusiastic authors, and as a result there is a large degree of uniformity and coherency underlying the final product. This is a real commentary, in the sense that each provision of the 2004 Convention is set out as a distinct chapter, each organised around in a way that clearly describes historical evolution, *travaux préparatoires*, developments through the courts, etc. The reader, therefore, understands not only what the current law is but also how it came about as a result of consistent practice. Clearly, attention has been paid to detail, and the editors have done an excellent job in ensuring that each contributor flesh out the relevant principles by not falling into the trap of simply amassing citations that ultimately yield little, or no, visibility.

This book, and its analysis of the 2004 Convention, should set the standard for legal reform of statutes and orders dealing with the jurisdictional immunities of states in the domestic sphere. No doubt, states that ratify the convention and which do not already possess adequate statutes in place will have to transpose the convention into their domestic law, and they will have to do so effectively. The problem remains, however, that no matter how detailed the convention is, the commentary demonstrates that it is wrought with so many complexities that any drafter will still have to consult a commentary of this nature in order to clarify certain provisions. I have no doubt, therefore, that this book is the yardstick for any future discussion of the relevant law and that it will be indispensable to any lawyer, practitioner, or academic working in the field of jurisdictional immunities. Hats off to the editors and contributors for their brilliant work.

Ilias Bantekas

Brunel Law School

***Jowitt's Dictionary of English Law*, 3rd edn., General Editor Daniel Greenberg, Barrister and Parliamentary Counsel, Vol. I (A to I) and Vol. II (J to Z and Bibliography), London, Sweet & Maxwell/Thomson Reuters 2010**

Jowitt's is for English law what *Black's Law Dictionary* is for the US legal system. In fact, while *Black's Law Dictionary* is updated every couple of years under the able guidance of Bryan Garner, this is the first new edition of Jowitt's in more than 30 years. Thus, while the two volumes have a list price of 555£ or close to 1000\$, they will last the user for a while. To accomplish the monumental task of updating this classic after such a long time, Daniel Greenberg assembled a mid-size army of highly qualified 'Specialist Contributing Editors' from private practice and academia in the United Kingdom. The result is rather marvelous, indeed. On 2472 pages, Jowitt's provides definitions and explanations for every conceivable term that ever played a role in English law and, of course, for every term and expression, including thousands of abbreviations, that are of great importance for anyone who is practising today in England and Wales, as well as anyone who is

drafting contracts or doing arbitration or doing any other form of business that does not exist outside the law in and with England or Wales. While some may think that in the day and age of ubiquitous access to the Internet, traditional dictionaries and encyclopedias are doomed, this would seem to be the case, if at all, only for general knowledge works. First, explanations and definitions for highly specialized legal terminology are not easily found online. Second, and more importantly, for those that are found online, more often than not, the definitions are neither precise nor consistent across different sites. This is exactly the strength of Jowitt's: It is comprehensive, precise, and authoritative. As long as an excuse along the lines of 'well, I found it somewhere on the Internet' does not absolve a lawyer from a case of professional malpractice, this reviewer would go for Jowitt's every time when it comes to looking up a term of English law.

Frank Emmert

Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law