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/bni341 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is precisely where T.'s study is valuable. She exhaustively collects and analyses a wealth of prosopographical material, but is also concerned with the broader historical picture. In contrast to the negative historiography on Claudius, T. sees Claudius as thoughtful and careful in his use of power and in his handling of relations with the senate. Those relations were not particularly happy in the years following his accession. T. suggests that the make-up of the consular years 43 and 47 was a reaction to the rebellion of 42 and the conspiracy of 46: aside from the *ordinarii* Claudius and L. Vitellius, the *suffecti* were all *homines novi*, loyal and harmless (one, suffect late in 43, was the imperial creature Curtius Rufus of Tacitus *Annals* 11.21). More generally, T. sees Claudius trying to establish a support base in the senate by promoting plebeians to the consulship and imperial legateships, which they dominate throughout his reign. Similarly the *lectio senatus* of 48 may have been intended to engender loyalty to Claudius amongst the patricians as well as replenish the numbers of a group within the aristocracy whose star was generally waning; the additions to the patricians are strikingly reflected in the unusual composition of the consular year of 48: only four consuls from two families, the Vitellii and Vipstani, both coopted into the patricians by Claudius. Finally, Claudius' quest for loyalty within the senatorial élite would have been helped by the increase in the number of consuls holding office each year. Augustus had introduced a pair of *suffecti* into the consular year, and under Tiberius an average of three to four consuls held office each year. In the last two years of his reign Gaius increased the number of *suffecti* and this increase became the norm under Claudius, with about six consuls holding office each year; Claudius' practice of conferring office for about two months remained the formula, more or less, into the Flavian period. Although this increase in the number of consuls devalued the office, it permitted greater access for members of families that would not normally have risen so high in the *cursus* (e.g. the Hosidii, Mussidii, and Suillii) and allowed families close to the imperial house to be rewarded with second consulships (e.g. the Junii Silani, Statilii Tauri, and of course the Vitellii).

Scholars will find the historical orientation of the introduction easy and rewarding reading. The bulk of T.'s study is, however, prosopographical. Although greater now than ever before, our knowledge of the Claudian *fasti* is still not complete and gaps and uncertain attributions abound in the lists: we know of about eighty of the 100 possible, or ninety-two probable, consuls for the period 41–54. Commendably, T. warns the reader when the state of the evidence renders attribution difficult and general conclusions problematic. In the first part of the book each consular year is laid out in tabular format and briefly discussed. T. then analyses the prosopographical material thematically, and here for example we learn under 'geographical origins' that Claudius was keen to promote Italians (sixty-eight out of the eighty known consuls) but more cautious about bringing provincials into the fold (nine out of eighty). The second and largest part consists of a prosopographical catalogue of the eighty known Claudian consuls: each entry contains ancient and modern bibliography (the ancient evidence is conveniently quoted), and discussion of the career of the consul. T. has undertaken an impressive amount of research and this part of the book should become a valuable reference tool (though I did miss mention of some modern works; and each one of the stemmas should have been given a title). Finally, since the attribution of some consuls oscillates between the reigns of Gaius and Claudius, T. includes in an appendix a reconstruction of the *fasti* of the reign of Gaius that updates and modifies Gallivan's treatment in *Antichthon* 1979.

St John's College, Cambridge S. J. V. MALLOCH
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni341

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni341 Published online by Cambridge University Press