

Aislinn MELCHIOR
Twinned Fortunes and Cicero's *Pro Milone*

The *Pro Milone* is the exception that proves that Cicero might on occasion publish his failed orations (Crawford 1984:15). However, because it is the only speech in his *corpus* that we are certain was a failure, the purpose of its publication remains a tantalizing question. My paper will explore this issue by examining the interpenetrating identities of Cicero and Milo within the speech. I suggest that by twinning their identities Cicero was also attempting to twin their fortunes and thereby attempting to pave the way for Milo's eventual recall. I will argue that Cicero created a metaphorical double of himself in Milo and that this rhetorical move was aimed not at pedagogy or consolation but principally at political persuasion.

Milo's statement that --had Cicero delivered the published version of the *Pro Milone*-- he would not be enjoying the seafood of Massilia (Dio 40.54.3) has led to many speculations as to what Cicero changed before publishing the speech. Such reconstructions are based primarily upon the passage in Asconius that states that Brutus had favored a defense of Milo based upon the idea that the murder of Clodius had been a service to the state. Apparently the speech that Cicero had delivered in court had been based instead upon a claim of murder in self-defense (Asc. 41). This suggests that any material that celebrates Milo's actions as *pro re publica* must have been added to the speech after its delivery and prior to its public circulation. These are precisely the elements that correspond to the creation of Milo as a second Cicero.

Cicero uses multiple strategies to twin his own experiences with those of Milo. For instance, he proposes to elevate Milo to the ranks of a distinguished group of patriots -- Ahala, Nasica, Opimius, and Marius -- whose *exempla* had justified Cicero's own actions in suppressing the Catilinarian conspiracy (*Cat.* 1.3-4). This same group appears subsequently in the *Pro Milone*, but Cicero --in addition to himself-- now adds Milo to their number (*Milo* 72). Likewise, Clodius is said to wield Catiline's dagger, equating the rightful victims of this Cicero-Milo hybrid (*Milo* 37). Cicero also establishes his fraternity with Milo by the extraordinary and sustained use of *prosopopoeia*: "Overstepping the bounds of the rhetoric of advocacy, Cicero speaks as his client in the first person" (May 1988:133). By co-opting the voice of Milo and particularly the voice of Milo when claiming his own service to the state and his willingness to suffer for Rome's benefit, Cicero collapses his identity with that of Milo. What is there that I can do except to consider whatever fortune will be yours as my own? (*Milo* 100)"

When his defense of Milo failed, Cicero employed publication in an effort to retry the case in the court of *communis opinio*, stressing the parallels of Milo's service and unjust exile to his own. I will close the paper by speculating upon what Cicero stood to gain by attempting to share with Milo what he had so often described as an honor without parallel -- the glory of recall.