

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 Popilius 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.wilson@biola.edu](mailto:laurie.wilson@biola.edu)  
 doi:10.1017/S0075435819000467

Laurie A. Wilson

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

are and have constantly been mined for information about the ancient world. Likewise, his reception history is as varied as his own writings and began early on, shortly after his death, creating an image which changed and yet remained constant throughout the ages.

The present volume contains the proceedings of a conference which took place at the Warburg Institute in May 2015, dedicated to the 'Afterlife' of Cicero. Its focus is on a segment of this afterlife, beginning in the thirteenth century, that is at the onset of the Renaissance. The focus of the book is two-fold: the first six papers trace the impact of Cicero on Italian duecento to cinquecento politics, while the second group of papers goes beyond the Italian context to the Latin American, revolutionary French and Anglophone context. What is missing is a consideration of (the figure of) Cicero in the German-speaking world, which is only briefly referenced in the contribution by Matthew Fox. However, this gap might well be due to the fact that other case studies have already focused on this aspect, notably various essays in William H. F. Altman (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Cicero* (2015).

Manuwald's edited volume instead puts much stress on the political influence of Cicero in earlier centuries. That his influence was continuously great becomes clear in the case studies presented for the Italian context. Contrary to (possible) expectations, Petrarch figures only in the contribution of Laura Refe (ch. 2), where she discusses the marginalia in the Troyes codex on Cicero's *De natura deorum*, underlining the 'discussion' Petrarch engaged in with the ancient author. Focusing instead on lesser-known examples, the volume offers a rich variety of instances in which Cicero the man, the philosopher, the politician and the authority were used to bolster the claims of one or the other, or both sides, to rule.

The volume opens with Catherine M. Keen's contribution (ch. 1), in which she discusses the parallels Bruno Latini drew between himself and the Roman *homo novus* in the Guelf/Ghibelline conflict, drawing on the figure of the rhetor to stress the importance of speech and oratorical skills in the Florentine polity. Carole Mabboux (ch. 3) then moves to the changing political landscape of due- and trecento Italian towns, demonstrating how the necessity for speech and thus eloquence assigned prime authority to Cicero, while also citing him as moral authority, demonstrating a continuous Ciceronian presence in the writings of that time, even where his perception as historical person shifted.

The visual arts take centre stage in three contributions to the volume, the first of which is Virginia Cox's juxtaposition of Martino Filetico's 'textual portrait' of Battista Sforza with Piero della Francesca's 'visual portrait' at the palace of Urbino (ch. 4). In both cases, the figure of Cicero serves to underline the supposed and desired virtues of the ruling house of Montefeltro, depicting Battista as a *quasi* female Cicero while her husband is portrayed as the embodiment of the togate consul, learned and wise. These virtues also explain the absence of a portrait type of Cicero in the Renaissance, as L. B. T. Houghton states (ch. 6), with artists of the cinquecento rather developing a type of Cicero which personified or translated the qualities of an exemplary character, above all eloquence and erudition. The final paper considering Cicero in the visual arts, by Nina L. Dubin (ch. 11), considers the ambiguous role of letters in the context of the visual arts of the French Revolution. While documents in writing were supposed to provide proof, the introduction of the public postal service eroded trust in the written word, as letters were easily manipulated. By comparing various artwork of that time, the author outlines the crux of the revolution, 'grappling with what it meant to found a republic on contingencies of trust – that is, on paper' (196).

The question of style is central to Martin McLaughlin's contribution (ch. 5), which outlines the controversy between Ciceronianism and Apuleianism in the sixteenth century and links it to papal policies. By adopting a Ciceronian style for their briefs, questions of style became political statements. David Marsh's consideration of the Caesarian speeches throughout history establishes why this set of speeches was held up as a model despite the fact that the orator was perceived as opportunist, in that he provided a model for courtly, elite discourse in an increasingly monarchical Europe (ch. 7).

Andrew Laird (ch. 8) then outlines Ciceronian influence in Latin America, where the mission-centred education system, in which the *Societas Iesu* played an important part, led to a Cicero-centred curriculum proliferating in the universities of the 'new world'. Turning to lesser known texts to outline the development which divorced the figure of Cicero the man from the authority of Cicero the teacher of rhetoric and philosophy in the context of emerging historicism, Matthew Fox (ch. 9) traces a development which acknowledged Cicero as foremost orator, but which judged him – from a supposed higher, modern, moral ground – a deplorable philosopher.

The role of Ciceronian philosophy (that is, of his scepticism as expressed in *De natura deorum* and *De divinatione*) in the Freethinking controversy is the topic of Katherine East's paper (ch. 10), in which she demonstrates that the authority of Cicero had, after all, remained intact to such a degree that both sides easily referred to him and employed his writings to bolster their own case.

The final paper by Lynn Fotheringham (ch. 12) opens up another, little considered aspect of the afterlife of Cicero: she considers (English-language) biographies written between 1741 and 1894 as physical and commercial objects, introducing Cicero to a wider, non-specialist public with upwardly-mobile aspirations, stressing the authority the figure of Cicero still conveyed as a symbol of education and erudition.

The volume offers a number of intriguing case studies that draw a vivid picture of the interaction with Cicero in different centuries and various media, allowing for glimpses of the changing image of Cicero, while his (rhetorical) authority (though not the regard he was held in) was largely left intact throughout the centuries. The editor states in the preface that the volume was meant to give examples of the way in which Cicero was exploited over the centuries, without a claim to completeness (something that can hardly ever be done); but the reader misses a discussion not only beyond the Italian and Anglophone context, but also beyond the implicit temporal boundaries of the volume. While the expansive focus on the Italian context provides numerous examples of the variability and esteem in which Cicero was held, other areas remain unexplored, e.g. the (lack of) Ciceronian reception in the popular culture of the twentieth century.

However, M. offers a collective volume which introduces the reader to the wide realm of the Ciceronian afterlife, in which the different aspects under which the man from Arpinum may be considered are presented in beautiful and well-selected case studies.

The volume includes various illustrations and a brief index of names.

Max-Weber-Kolleg, Universität Erfurt  
[elisabeth.begemann@uni-erfurt.de](mailto:elisabeth.begemann@uni-erfurt.de)

ELISABETH BEGEMANN

doi:10.1017/S0075435819000339

N. HORSFALL, *THE EPIC DISTILLED: STUDIES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE AENEID*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Pp. xvi + 160. ISBN 9780198758877. £49.99.

Nicholas Horsfall died on 1 January 2019, just as I had finished reading his last book in preparation for this review. The death, at 72, and with so much learning lost, is a sad one for Latin studies. The book is appropriately valedictory, typically idiosyncratic and judgemental about friends and enemies; it is full of polemic, trenchantly expressed opinions, obscure bibliography, personal history, disorder, loose ends. As his 1991 book *L'epopea in alambiccò* tried to map the theoretical ground on which he would construct his five 'ponderous' commentaries on *Aeneid* 7, 11, 3, 2, 6, so this book reviews the same ground in the light of his experience, and shows with compelling insight how he was right (explicitly on 66, 88, 125), save on the few occasions where he has changed his mind, decisively (e.g. 68 n. 40, on *FRHist* 5F8; 70 n. 50, on Corythus; 71 n. 54, on 6.601–2). Despite the title, attention is sometimes paid to the *Eclogues* and often to the *Georgics*.

The book is not a long one, and it is an entertaining, if sometimes inconsequential read: research students beginning work on Virgil should certainly be encouraged to read it (preferably with access to the commentaries, which frequently provide the answers to puzzles left unsolved here, e.g. 35, on 7.741), and experienced Virgilians may enjoy the scholarship and the personality – but it is hard to see who else will benefit from the book as published. Though it contains many pointers towards valuable, and often recherché, scholarship, the gathered bibliography, which could immediately have made this a worthwhile purchase, is simply absent. There is no *Index locorum* either – a mind-boggling gap. Even the index is inadequate: no place here for 'allegory' (40–1), or 'Eclogues' (not even *Buc.*), or 'facts, historical' (despite the pointer on 98); and to find the fascinating count of graffiti (31–2), one must look not under 'graffiti', 'Pompeii', 'inscriptions', but 'public of V'. Perhaps OUP might consider issuing a second edition, *in memoriam*, with these deficiencies made good.

'Sources and the study of sources are wonderfully out of fashion in work on the *Aeneid*' (2): H. does not regard Apollonius or Ennius as a source – he rather has in mind prose treatises, authorities on myth, geography, religion, natural history. The neglect of poetry damages the