reception of Clodia. The chapters do not cohere, nor do they claim to, but each is interesting in its own right. Indeed, there is much that is interesting in W.'s latest work, and much that is frustrating. He warns us that he has written this book in a hurry, and the sense of urgency is apparent throughout. As a longstanding fan of W.'s scholarship, who has benefitted consistently from it throughout my career, I wish that he had slowed down now and then.

University of Washington SARAH STROUP
scstroup@uw.edu
doi:10.1017/S0075435824000388

© *The Author(s), 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.*

THOMAS J. KEELINE, *CICERO*. PRO MILONE (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2021. ISBN 9781107179738 (hbk) £74.99, 9781316631447 (pbk) £24.99.

Cicero's *Pro Milone* is unique in that it is only extant defence speech of Cicero for which we have a full and independent account of the case in the commentary written by Asconius in the mid-first century C.E. (pointed out by D. H. Berry, *Cicero: Defence Speeches*, 2000, 162). According to Asconius, the facts weighed against Milo: when he and Clodius unexpectedly met on the Appian Way, on 18 January 52 B.C.E., Milo's gladiators started a skirmish with Clodius' slaves; Clodius was wounded and subsequently killed, when Milo ordered him dragged out of an inn where he had been taken. In Cicero's published speech, we can see the stratagems a skilled advocate used to overcome these facts. Keeline's superb new edition makes Cicero's achievement accessible to advanced students of Latin while also offering researchers a valuable resource.

The thorough introduction lucidly covers all the topics an instructor may wish to pursue with students, historical and philological. K. introduces first Cicero and his career up to *Pro Milone,* then Clodius' death and Milo's trial. The historical timeline (19–22) is an excellent feature. (Also to be consulted for events of 52 B.C.E. is the table in John T. Ramsey, *Historia* 65.3 (2016), 298–324, which indicates on which days elections could be held to fill the vacant consulship, a key detail.) K. then moves on to the structure of the speech and Cicero's rhetorical strategy. Famously, Cicero follows the textbook arrangement for a speech (another reason this is a good text to teach in my view), and as K. (23) remarks, Cicero may have chosen that form to compensate for a weak case. A slightly fuller description of the concept 'conjectural case' (introduced at 24) would have been helpful, but this, and *status* theory in general, is well covered in the commentary itself. I like K.'s explanation of why the prosecution tried to argue that Milo ambushed Clodius, just as Cicero argued that Clodius ambushed Milo: 'because these accusations had been leveled over months of very public debates, the terms of the dilemma were fixed in the public's mind' (24). K. gives a good discussion of Cicero's style, including word order and prose rhythm. He shares with students 'an inconvenient truth: if you do not know 95–8 percent of the vocabulary in a given passage, you almost certainly cannot read and understand it' (28). Next, K. turns to the question of publication, joining the camp of those who have concluded that the first two-thirds of the speech (sections 1–66) are close to what Cicero said in court, while the last third (sections 72–105) is an addition (sections 67–71 are 'harder to judge', 43). Finally comes 'Text and Transmission', with a clear description of the pertinent manuscripts. K. here states his view that intrusive glosses are 'fairly frequent' in the transmitted text (48).

The commentary itself guides the reader expertly through the speech. K. introduces each major section of the speech (e.g. *exordium*, *narratio*) with a discussion of relevant rhetorical theory and Cicero's own strategy in *Pro Milone*. Longer sections are divided into subsections (e.g. argument from motive, sections 32–35). The notes thoroughly identify all the persons, places, events and institutions to which Cicero refers and give much guidance on translating Cicero's language. This is a commentary that really teaches Latin. K. discusses favourite expressions of Cicero's and notes words and phrases inadequately covered in standard references (e.g. *nec enim*, 87; *iam* in concessions, 280; *mediusfidius*, 293). He makes helpful comparisons to English, sometimes humorous, e.g. 'The comparative here adds a note of vagueness … cf. Engl. real estate argot, "a

newer kitchen"' (126). Many good observations on word order complement the discussion in the introduction.

K. presents his own Latin text and abbreviated *apparatus criticus* and explains his choices in the commentary. He makes a good case for removing glosses or other intrusions at a number of points, some previously undetected. For instance, he prints: ... *tu spoliatum imaginibus,* [*exsequiis,*] *pompa, laudatione, infelicissimis lignis semiustilatum nocturnis canibus dilaniandum reliquisti* (*Mil.* 33). In the accompanying note, he justifies his excision. Another example occurs at *Mil.* 94, where, on the basis of Ciceronian parallels, K. opts for *ubi nunc senatus* [*est*]... *ubi* ... ... *ubi* ... ... *ubi* ... ... *ubi.* As he acknowledges, sometimes there is room for debate. At *Mil.* 55, he prints *Milo qui numqum, tum casu pueros symphoniacos* [*uxoris*] *ducebat et ancillarum greges*. In his note on that passage, he observes that the instrumentalists might have been there 'to entertain [Milo's wife] Fausta during the journey, as *uxoris* would imply, but it seems more likely that they would perform at the religious ceremony in Lanuvium ... an explanatory interpolation seems more likely, perhaps originally a note on *ancillarum*' (247). But even if the enslaved musicians were to perform at the ceremony, they could have been Fausta's. K.'s text and commentary together alert students to the problems of textual editing, while also making a major contribution in their own right.

Finally, to cap it all, there are two generous indexes, one for Latin words, the other 'General', covering the persons, places, events and institutions (such as the terrifying *eculeus*); rhetorical terms; features of language and style; prose rhythm; textual editing; and more. This edition of *Pro Milone* is a brilliant piece of work. It will handsomely serve students, teachers and researchers alike.

Georgetown University JOSIAH OSGOOD
jo39@georgetown.edu
doi:10.1017/S0075435823000874

© *The Author(s), 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.*

NATHAN GILBERT, MARGARET GRAVER & SEAN McCONNELL (EDS), *POWER AND PERSUASION IN CICERO'S PHILOSOPHY.* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2023. Pp. ix + 268. ISBN 9781009170338 (hbk), £85.00; 9781009170352 (ebook).

Writing his treatise *De senectute* in the aftermath of civil war, Cicero (speaking through the persona of Cato the Elder) draws on a rustic metaphor to flesh out an argument about intergenerational obligation. A wise Roman farmer plants trees whose fruit he will never taste: 'and in truth a farmer, however old, does not hesitate to reply to those asking for whom he is planting, "For the immortal gods, who have wished not only that I should receive these things from my ancestors, but also that I should hand them on to posterity"' (*Sen.* 25).

In isolation, that passage strikes me as an effective deployment of a rhetorical commonplace. But in context — as Sean McConnell argues in this volume's concluding essay — it is something more: a link in an argumentative chain joining Cicero's response to Plato on the political duties of the wise, a defence of the institutional primacy of the Roman Senate and a call 'for a return to traditional norms of senatorial politics' (239). In Cicero's philosophy, in a sort of collective claim that emerges from this important new book, rhetoric does not remain 'mere' rhetoric for long.

Of course, Cicero himself is something handed on from ancestors to posterity. Counterintuitively, I think, that fact increases the pressures of coherence and timeliness on an edited volume like this one: with so many generations of commentary to learn from, what, beyond chronological coincidence, unifies these ten essays as a distinctive and new contribution to our understanding of Cicero's thought?

I see two unifying claims at work in *Power and Persuasion in Cicero's Philosophy* — which, in combination, more than earn it a place as a significant contribution to the study of Cicero and of Roman political and social thought. The first claim is that Cicero was more than a transmitter or populariser of existing philosophical ideas. That view of Cicero, as essentially intellectually passive, once secured a high enough degree of scholarly consensus that it was itself popularised. My own first encounter with Cicero came in Anthony Everitt's general-audience biography, which bluntly states that 'Cicero was not an original philosopher' (*Cicero* (2001), 322). *Power and*