The book's only major weakness as a comprehensive introduction to Beneventum is the limited amount and poor quality of illustrative material provided in support of the text, which detracts from its usefulness as a guide to much of the evidence in question. For example, T.'s account of the urban structure of Beneventum (pp. 103–15) presents what is known of the topography of the city and refers the reader to a plan so poorly reproduced that it will be of little use to anyone not already familiar with the archaeological record of the site. Furthermore, no photos or even drawings are offered to allow the reader to come to an independent conclusion on the significance of the material in question. The lack of illustration is also felt in the discussion of early inscriptions: the date of epigraphic attestations of Fortuna (p. 85) and Vesta (pp. 96–7) is central to T.'s account of the cults of the Latin colony, yet readers will have to look elsewhere for images of the relevant inscriptions. A book of this quality (and price) deserves better. Nevertheless, provided readers have simultaneous access to legible maps, plans, and photographs published elsewhere (e.g. Giampaola, in *Studi sull' Italia dei sanniti* [Milan, 2000], pp. 36–46), as well as a copy of *CIL* IX, they will find T.'s book an excellent resource for the study of Roman Beneventum.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology WILL BROADHEAD
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni339

LUCANIA AND BRUTTIUM

L. Cappelletti: *Lucani e Brettii. Ricerche sulla storia politica e istituzionale di due popoli dell'Italia antica*. Pp. xiii + 296. New York, etc.: Peter Lang, 2002. ISBN: 3-631-37712-6.

The aim of this book is to study what are known to modern scholars as the Lucanian and Brettian leagues. The mode is ruthlessly empirical, with little awareness of evidence or methodologies outside a narrowly ancient historical range. The principal problem, however, of which C. is insufficiently aware, is that almost everything we (think we) know about the two peoples depends on the perceptions of outsiders at particular moments, transmitted by a variety of intermediaries; interestingly, the outsiders are not only, or even principally, the Romans, as is the case with many of the peoples of Italy. It is only in the period of the Second Punic War that we have any evidence from inside for either Lucanians or Brettians.

The Brettii are happily there in the fifth century B.C., in Antiochus and Aristophanes; in these circumstances, to take the stories in Diodorus 16.15.1–2; Strabo 6.1.4 (p. 255), or Justin 23.1.4–14 literally is unwise. The ancient (and medieval and modern) worlds are full of charter myths; but there are also what one may call anti-charter myths. And in this case the stories have their origins written all over them, in Lucanian attempts to deny the legitimacy of a Brettian entity. The 'historical reality' to emerge from the stories is not the origin of the Brettians, but the black propaganda of the Lucanians.

C. argues on pp. 186–7 that an issue of coins with the types of Metapontum, of the early third century B.C., was produced by the Lucanians, on the basis of a monogram consisting of the letters *ΛK*; C. cites Marina Taliercio Mensitieri (*DdA*, 3rd ser., 7, 2 [1989], 52), but has not read her with sufficient care: the monogram is one of three different monograms or letters that appear on the issue in question (*HN*^{3} 2680 lists only two), all of which must be those of monetary officials of one sort or another. *ΛK*

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni340 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cannot be an ethnic. On the subject of coinage (pp. 198–9), the only people to believe that the coins with ΓΡΥ are from Grumentum are local antiquarians; and the coins of Ursentum may be from a city in Bruttium, rather than Lucania.

C. looks for cities in Lucania and Bruttium, and on the whole does not find them (pp. 189–90), but never discusses what 'strutture insediative' based on villages might be like (p. 197). In any case, cities are not so thin on the ground as all that. It is unreasonable to deny the equation of Nerulum and Castelluccio; and C. should have known of the evidence for the location of the city of Blanda at Tortora.

The discussion of the evidence from Rossano di Vaglio is all from secondary works; whether the sanctuary is a federal one or not—and C. neither proves that it is nor analyses what that might mean—there is a rich institutional story to be told on the basis of the epigraphic and other evidence. There is also a story to be told about the Brettii, who burst into the limelight in the Second Punic War. What were the aims of what was at that juncture a rich, cohesive and powerful, and presumably not stupid, *ethnos*? Whatever Hannibal's hopes may have been, it was surely—at any rate in the early stages—rational for the Brettii to hope to acquire Rhegium, which had always looked to Sicily, in addition to Locri and Croton; and to hope for a world in which Sicily and the Brettii were in the Carthaginian sphere.

University College London M. H. CRAWFORD
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni340

THE CLAUDIAN *FASTI*

A. Tortoriello: *I fasti consolari degli anni di Claudio*. (Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche: Memorie, Serie 9, Vol. 17, Fasc. 3.) Pp. 303 (391–693), figs. Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 2004. Paper, €13. ISBN: 88-218-0917-X.

The discovery of the Tabulae Herculanenses and the Tabulae Pompeianae Sulpiciorum (now re-edited by G. Camodeca) has been a well-known boon to historians of Roman law, but the archives have also yielded valuable evidence for ancient historians working in other fields. Take the consular *fasti*, for example. When P. A. Gallivan published his study of the *fasti* of the reign of Claudius in *CQ* in 1978, the evidence available allowed only this comment on the consuls of 47: 'Claudius resigned after two months (Suet. *Claud*. 14) but it is not known whether [L.] Vitellius also resigned nor indeed who were the other consuls in this year.' T.'s new study of the Claudian *fasti* shows that Claudius and Vitellius held the fasces for two months and were then relieved by the following *suffecti*: C. Calpetanus Rantius Sedatus and M. Hordeonius Flaccus (March to, probably, June); Cn. Hosidius Geta (July to December); T. Flavius Sabinus (July to August); L. Vagellius (September to October); and C. Volasenna Severus (November to December). The tablets are largely responsible for enlarging the *fasti* for 47, and indeed for the period between Tiberius and Vespasian, and in particular for Claudius' reign, they have changed the face of the consular year: we now know of more consuls and better understand the structure of the consular year.

Prosopographical studies appear to be the obvious winner here, but the new evidence allows greater insight into Claudius' relations with the senatorial order. This

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni340 Published online by Cambridge University Press