reading public for a live audience' (p. 76). B. concludes that the publication of these undelivered speeches allowed Cicero to renegotiate his image in this trial, from the extraordinarily efficient investigator of account books (a somewhat equestrian skill) to the eloquent senator. The sixth chapter turns to the Catilinarian conspiracy, and especially to the scene of Cicero confronting the conspirators with their own letters, a scene recounted to the Roman people in the third *Catilinarian*. B. argues in this chapter for the status of documents in the eyes even of the illiterate populace, evidence for a world in which 'written texts, previously subject only to . . . rigorous linguistic analysis . . . make themselves available to a more general discourse of signs' (p. 101). The final chapter is devoted to Cicero's writing after the Ides of March, the anxieties surrounding Antony's possession of Caesar's *commentarii*, and, finally, to the *Second Philippic*. B. here reads across the letters and philosophical works to illuminate his image of Cicero drafting 'a reflection of the man he had not yet quite become' (p. 117). Within the ever-proliferating copies of Cicero's speeches, already in use as school texts, B. sees Antony 'trapped by Cicero's words' (p. 122). The force of B.'s final reading returns us to Cicero's disembodied hand as if we were seeing it for the first time: 'a bloody pictogram for a life inseparable from the written word' (p. 123).

This is simply the best book on classics I have read in a long time. It is compellingly written, and repopulates the city of Rome with much of its lost paperwork. Unlike so many studies which seek to relate the literature of antiquity to its everyday material culture, B.'s work offers original interpretations of the texts he examines. This is a fine example of how historicism can illuminate, indeed transform, literary analysis. In showing how Cicero's literary output itself effected changes within the documentary culture of Rome, he also provides the reader with a dynamic interaction of text and context. I would recommend this book to students and colleagues for many reasons, but not least because B. conveys so vividly why Cicero matters. His readings bring out all the wit of Ciceronian invective, persuasion, and self-deprecation, and sympathetically point to the hard work behind the wit. In efficient (albeit equestrian) grasp of detail and elegant command of narrative, B. does Cicero ample justice.

University of Bristol ELLEN O'GORMAN

DE CONSOLATIONE

F. Lillo Redonet: *Palabras contra el dolor. La consolación filosófica latina de Cicerón a Frontón*. Pp. 383. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas, 2001. Paper. ISBN: 84-7882-423-5.

This study, a revised version of a doctoral dissertation written at the University of Salamanca under the direction of Carmen Codoñer Merino, seeks to define the Latin philosophical consolation as a separate genre of Latin literature, and provide an account of its history and development, with particular attention to the rhetorical tropes it uses to create its effects. The study is, therefore, an entry into a field hitherto dominated by studies devoted to individual authors (especially Seneca); consolations in both Greek and Latin (R. Kassel, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur* [Munich, 1958]); and consolations in Latin literature defined

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.347 Published online by Cambridge University Press

more broadly to include the *epicedion*, or poetic consolation (M. E. Fern, *The Latin* Consolatio *as a Literary Type* [St Louis, 1941]).

The study is divided into five chapters, plus an introduction. The Introduction (pp. 19–27) reviews earlier studies of ancient consolation literature, which L.R. faults for failing to define the philosophical consolation with respect to other genres, especially *vis-à-vis* the *epicedion*, and for giving insufficient attention to the rhetorical roots and devices of the genre. L.R. proposes to remedy this in Chapter 1 (pp. 29–69) by attempting to extract definitions of the consolation from Latin and late Greek rhetoricians, as well as from Cicero's *Tusculanae*. Finding these ancient sources valuable but ultimately inadequate, L.R. devotes Chapter 2 (pp. 71–104) to establishing a definition of the genre using modern literary theories of genres, a process that leads to a definition of the *consolatio* as a genre philosophical in nature, because of its function and the tropes used to effect its purpose. In this way, L.R. separates the philosophical consolation from the *epicedion*, which employs tropes that are more literary than rhetorical or philosophical in character, though he concedes that some *epicedia* contain elements of the philosophical *consolatio* and thus have a place in his study.

This definition paves the way for L.R.'s establishment, in Chapter 3 (pp. 105–22), of a corpus of philosophical *consolationes* that will be the object of his study. The list begins with prose consolations: the consolatory letters of Cicero, Seneca, Pliny the Younger, and Fronto; the consolatory treatises by Seneca as well as Cicero's fragmentary *Consolatio* on the death of Tullia; and consolatory elements in prose works (such as Cicero's rhetorical and philosophical works, Seneca's *Naturales quaestiones* 6, and the epilogue of Tacitus' *Agricola*). In regard to consolations in verse, L.R. divides them into 'true' philosophical consolations (Ovid, *Ex Ponto* 4.11; *Fasti* 1.479–96) and philosophical consolations existing within *epicedia* (Ovid, *Amores* 2.6 and 3.9; the *Consolatio ad Liviam*; and Statius, *Silvae* 2.1, 2.6, 3.3, 5.1, and 5.3).

L.R. analyzes this corpus of consolations in Chapter 4, which is by far the longest (pp. 123–336) of the book. L.R.'s method is what he calls an 'análisis semántico-formal' of the consolations, in accord with his interest in the rhetorical basis of the genre announced in Chapter 1. In practice, this method can be a bit ponderous, as L.R. goes over each text and provides an account of its structure and the various tropes used to effect the consolation. As a result, readers making their way through Chapter 4 may feel lost in a forest of citations and descriptive detail. But L.R.'s analysis of the texts produces results as it goes forward. He makes a good case for the Latin *consolatio* as a genre with its own identity, its own store of rhetorical tropes, and a certain level of intertextuality, a conclusion supported by L.R.'s detailed comparisons of individual passages. Chapter 5 (pp. 337–53) wraps things up with a brief conclusion.

The resultant book contains a good deal of information about a fairly large and diverse corpus of texts. Fortunately, the format of the book makes it easy to use. There is an index of subjects and modern authors mentioned, an *index locorum* of ancient authors, a bibliography, and a table of contents that breaks each chapter down into its various subdivisions, useful for those who may need help navigating the mammoth fourth chapter. The book is well produced, with relatively few typographical errors. Though some readers may argue with L.R.'s focus on rhetoric and the conclusions he derives therefrom, on the whole his study, in its careful analysis of a wide range of texts, is a very useful contribution to the study of the *consolatio* in Latin letters.

University of Pennsylvania PAUL CARRANZA

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.347 Published online by Cambridge University Press