is a reasonable line to take, but the chapter might have benefited from some detailed engagement with Philodemus, who has much to say about the activities of Epicurean communal life.

Two chapters examine philosophical issues in Book 3. Margaret Graver critically assesses Cicero's translation of the Greek καλόν as *honestum*, stressing Cicero's preoccupation with the public or 'seen' element of moral life, in particular with the notion of 'honour' that was centrally important to the Roman elite. The Stoics focus most on the internal state of the agent: if a person has a virtuous soul then she is truly honourable regardless of what others see or do. Cicero's use of *honestum* keeps to the fore the notion that public visibility really does matter, and Graver illustrates well how the disconnect between what is honoured in society and what is truly honourable is rich ground for Cicero's own philosophical investigations in *De finibus* and elsewhere. Brad Inwood offers an engaging and insightful analysis of the Stoic cradle-argument in Book 3, arguing that it struggles to justify our social nature and the moral obligations we have to each other in the manner that the Stoics expect.

Two chapters focus on the critique of Stoicism in Book 4. Anna Maria Ioppolo traces the debate over the status of the so-called 'indifferents', showing how Cicero does well in exposing major problems for the Stoics, particularly the slide into a Peripatetic or Antiochean position regarding external goods. Thomas Bénatouïl offers a reassessment of the structure of Book 4, which has often been seen as repetitive and poorly organised. Bénatouïl uncovers the careful method Cicero employs when critiquing the Stoics, which unlocks the rationale behind the book's structure and leads to a much more satisfying experience for the reader of *De finibus*.

The final chapter by Christopher Gill discusses Antiochus' theory of ethical development in Book 5 against the Stoic alternative presented in Book 3. Gill evaluates the philosophical strengths and weaknesses of each account, concluding that both have their own peculiar problems. Gill suggests that Cicero is happy to leave the dialogue with things at a stand-off, rather than concluding that on balance Antiochus has the most persuasive position; the final chapter thus returns to the points made by Brittain in the first.

On the whole, this is a first-rate collection of papers, essential reading for specialists, and a great advertisement for the quality of contemporary philosophical work on Cicero.

University of Otago SEAN MCCONNELL
sean.mcconnell@otago.ac.nz
doi:10.1017/S007543581900039X

T. J. KEELINE, *THE RECEPTION OF CICERO IN THE EARLY ROMAN EMPIRE: THE RHETORICAL SCHOOLROOM AND THE CREATION OF A CULTURAL LEGEND*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. Pp. xi + 375. ISBN 9781108426237. £90.00.

In this book, based on the dissertation he wrote at Harvard, Thomas Keeline persuasively demonstrates that the declamatory classroom was central to Cicero's reception in the early Roman Empire. Like the imperial authors he studies, K. exhibits a comprehensive grasp of the Ciceronian corpus. His work is masterful in research, thorough in its attention to detail and provides a useful analysis of the ways in which the schoolroom portrayal of Cicero became embedded in the historical tradition.

The book consists of seven chapters. In ch. 1, K. begins with an intriguing account of how Cicero's texts were taught in the schools of the early Empire. Using the *Pro Milone* as a template, he brings the Roman classroom to life as he investigates the methods followed by Quintilian, Asconius and the scholia Bobiensia. Through his careful examination of sources, K. confirms that Cicero's dominant place within the classroom was predicated on his eloquence as an orator and that students' engagement with Cicero was essentially limited to his speeches as models for study and imitation. K. shows sensitivity in arguing for shared educational approaches throughout the Empire, while still recognising cultural differences between authors, and maintaining that earlier ones such as Pollio and Livy would not have been heavily influenced by the declamatory classroom. A minor issue in this chapter is K.'s over-statement of the point that truth was not a concern of rhetoric. On the contrary, Quintilian's extended defence of lying as a means of upholding justice (*Inst.* 12.1.34–45), which K. himself references, echoes Cicero's argument that

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435819000467 Published online by Cambridge University Press

even the strictest Stoics justify lying in some circumstances (*Off.* 2.14.51). For Quintilian, as for Cicero, the question is not simple *Realpolitik*, but rather an attempt to navigate the ambiguity between motive and action, between moving people toward the right decision and being a *vir bonus* whose word can be trusted.

Chs 2–4 discuss the imaging of Cicero that developed within the declamatory classroom and its influence on the historical tradition. K. argues that the classroom created simplistic depictions of Cicero. For instance, in designating Cicero as the archetype of eloquence, the *vox publica* and the courageous orator who defied Antony's tyranny, teachers ignored complexities of his character such as his adherence to the optimates' party and his opposition to one-man rule. Additionally, propaganda emphasising Octavian's distress at Cicero's proscription and myths such as Cicero's death at the hands of Popillius were first taught in the schools and later accepted and transmitted as fact by historians. At the same time, K.'s examination of pseudepigraphic texts illustrates that the declamatory classroom, through its rhetorical exercises of praise and blame, became the vehicle of nuanced and competing perspectives on Cicero. Thus his conclusion that the declamatory classroom stripped Cicero of 'complex contradictions' (336), does not flow inevitably from the evidence presented; nevertheless, K. successfully demonstrates that the political forces and rhetorical pedagogy of the early Empire formed and passed down a uniquely crafted image of Cicero.

K.'s subtle handling of texts is most evident in chs 5–7, when he addresses Ciceronian reception in the work of Seneca the Younger, Tacitus and Pliny. Seneca rejects Cicero and attempts to create his own stylistic model. Tacitus displays his ability to copy Cicero's style, but accepts the end of eloquence under the Empire, choosing to write history instead. Pliny tries to imitate and surpass Cicero, but faces insecurities regarding his ability to match Cicero's greatness. As K. shows in all these accounts, Cicero's influence from their schoolroom days lingers. Despite their differing reactions to Cicero, none of these writers can completely disregard him. Additionally, the decline of eloquence since the days of Cicero's oratory is central to the consciousness of the imperial authors, and Tacitus posits that this decay is inevitable under one-man rule. Although K. highlights this refrain to note their acceptance of Cicero's rhetorical supremacy, it also serves as another instance of imperial writers playing with and perpetuating a Ciceronian theme on the decline of eloquence, principally under Caesar's dictatorship (cf. *Off.* 2.19.67; *Brut.* 21–2).

One of K.'s strengths lies in including research that not only supports his claims, but also creates the possibility of alternative interpretations. For example, he argues that the role of Cicero within the schoolroom was limited to his oratory, but includes a passage from Seneca that mentions a *grammaticus* using *De republica* (204). He also comments on Tacitus' and Pliny's familiarity with Cicero's letters and philosophical dialogues. While these instances do not contradict K.'s findings, clarification would have been helpful on whether they point to the use of additional Ciceronian texts within the classroom, even on a limited scale, or whether they indicate alternate readings of Cicero that existed outside the classroom.

Any critiques of this book will be slight. Ultimately, K. proves his thesis that the declamatory classroom shaped Ciceronian reception not only within the early Empire, but also in the ages to come. His true skill, however, is seen in his method. By combining an engaging writing style with substantive research and linguistic depth, K. provides scholars of classical reception studies with an example worthy of imitation.

Biola University LAURIE A. WILSON
laurie.wilson@biola.edu
doi:10.1017/S0075435819000467

G. MANUWALD (ED.), *THE AFTERLIFE OF CICERO* (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement 135). London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 2016. Pp. ix + 218, illus. ISBN 9781905670642. £65.00.

Cicero is one of the most studied persons of antiquity. This status is based not only on the fact that he left a rich collection of writings, but that his speeches and letters allow for a detailed (elite and certainly biased) look at everyday life in late republican Rome. His writings, letters and speeches

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435819000467 Published online by Cambridge University Press