Eos CXII 2025
ISSN 0012-7825
DOI: 10.34616/e.2025.244.251

Dennis Pausch, Christoph Pieper (eds.), ***The Scholia on Cicero's Speeches: Contexts and Perspectives***, Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2023, VIII + 287 pp., ISSN 0169-8958, ISBN 978-90-04-51644-1.

The volume under review originates from the proceedings of a digital workshop on the Ciceronian scholia held at Leiden University in 2021. Thanks to funding from the Dutch Research Council (project Mediated Cicero) and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (project Invektivität. Konstellationen und Dynamiken der Herabsetzung), it has also been made available in open access. As the editors explain in the "Introduction" (pp. 1–21) – which includes a concise overview of the preserved corpus of scholia,[1] sections on "The Genre of (Ancient) Commentaries" and "The Ciceronian Commentaries and Scholia as Part of the Cultural Discourses of Their Times", along with summaries of the individual chapters – the idea of compiling such a volume arose naturally from a renewed scholarly interest in the scholia on Cicero's speeches, which, as they note, "have long been neglected in modern scholarship" (p. 3). In tracing this revival, they highlight a paper and two monographs published shortly before the workshop, whose authors also contribute to the volume under review.[2] Given this overlap, the dedication of an entire volume to the scholia indeed "seems timely" (p. 4), and I fully share the editors' confidence that "it will stimulate [...] future research" (p. 15). Beyond the "Introduction", the volume comprises ten chapters (one in German and the rest in English), followed by an Index Nominum and an Index Locorum. The chapters are grouped informally into four thematic sections: Chapters 1 and 2 provide general introductions to the scholia Ciceroniana and Asconius Pedianus; Chapters 3 and 4 address the didactic uses of Cicero's speeches; Chapters 5 and 6 consider the models on which the Ciceronian scholia may have drawn; and Chapters 7–10 present case studies that illustrate the potential of the scholia for research on Cicero and Roman Republican oratory.

The first contributor, Giuseppe La Bua (henceforth "LB"), in his chapter "Teaching Cicero through the Scholia: The 'Active Reader' in Late Antique Commentaries on Cicero's Speeches" (pp. 22–40), examines the pedagogical strategies embedded in the *scholia Ciceronis*. He shows how these commentaries reflect a collaborative practice between teacher and student in the interpretive process. Drawing on Jerome's *Apology against Rufinus* (1.16), LB introduces the concepts of a *variorum* commentary and the *prudens lector* ('prudent reader'), both of which underscore the didactic function

---

[1] Their discussion is based on J.E.G. Zetzel, *Critics, Compilers, and Commentators. An Introduction to Roman Philology, 200 BCE–800 CE*, New York 2018, pp. 143–148, 257–259.

[2] C. Bishop, *Roman Plato or Roman Demosthenes? The Bifurcation of Cicero in Ancient Scholarship*, in: W.H.F. Altman (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Cicero*, Leiden–Boston 2015, pp. 281–306 (in the "Bibliography", for which there are separate entries for each chapter, they instead quote: C. Bishop, *Cicero, Greek Learning, and the Making of a Roman Classic*, Oxford 2019); T.J. Keeline, *The Reception of Cicero in the Early Roman Empire. The Rhetorical Schoolroom and the Creation of a Cultural Legend*, Cambridge 2018; G. La Bua, *Cicero and Roman Education. The Reception of the Speeches and Ancient Scholarship*, Cambridge 2019.

of the scholia. He situates Asconius' historical commentary, the *Scholia Bobiensia*, and the pseudo-Asconian commentary on the *Divinatio in Q. Caecilium* and the *Verrines* within this framework. Before turning to the scholia themselves, LB discusses a key passage from Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* (2.5.5–11),[3] which he regards as fundamental for understanding their didactic role. In this passage, Quintilian lays out step by step how a teacher should explain Cicero's rhetorical strategy and how the student should actively participate in the process. LB argues that the authors of the *Scholia Bobiensia* and *Scholia Gronoviana*, by employing the first person singular, adopt the persona of the teacher, while their use of the first person plural identifies them with their students, thereby inviting collaboration in reading and interpreting Cicero. Another technique used to foster "an active involvement of his [i.e., the scholiast's] readers in the learning process" (p. 32) was to present alternative interpretations and encourage reflection on the historical circumstances of each case. This pedagogical stance results in a kind of self-fashioning on the part of the scholiast, who positions himself as an exegetical guide for the ideal *prudens lector*. A further aim of "teaching Cicero" was to encourage aspiring orators to imitate him as the paragon of eloquence. According to LB, the scholiasts pursued this objective by commenting on Cicero's rhetorical strategies – such as manipulation of the *status causae*, *dissimulatio*, rhetorical irony, and wit. LB concludes that the "student envisaged in the scholia is" indeed "the 'active agent' of Quintilian's *Institutio*". Unlike Asconius, whose commentary is primarily historical, "the *Scholia Bobiensia* and the *Scholia Gronoviana*" are "eminently rhetorical commentaries, the purpose of which was to promote linguistic and rhetorical knowledge" (pp. 37–38).

The purpose of Q. Asconius Pedianus' commentary is the subject of the next paper, "The Working Methods of Asconius" (pp. 41–68) by Thomas J. Keeline (henceforth "K."). K. begins by scrutinising and challenging several widely accepted 'facts' about Asconius and his work, taking as his point of departure Peter Marshall's[4] *OCD* entry. On Asconius' dates, for instance, K. proposes simply "the first century CE" or, at the very least, "c. AD 3–88" (p. 44). Before turning to Asconius' working methods, K. cautions against accepting at face value some basic background information often repeated in handbooks – such as Asconius' place of origin, the title and date of his work, and its intended scope. Of particular interest to him (pp. 48–49) is the commonly held view that the commentary was written "for his two sons, in preparation for public life". K. rejects this interpretation as oversimplifying in some respects and outright erroneous in others. On the format of the work, he emphasises Asconius' consistency, selectivity, and, strikingly, his almost complete neglect of Cicero's rhetoric and diction. According to K., the commentaries can only be called 'historical' in the limited sense that they aim to clarify puzzles of chronology or prosopography (p. 51). K. then provides a detailed analysis of Asconius' notes on the *In Pisonem* and the *Pro Milone*, categorising them under headings such as 'dating', 'prosopography', 'other historical allusions', and 'topography'. From this typology, he distills five working principles: (1) solve puzzles, (2) defend Cicero and his text wherever possible, (3) get the details right, (4) cite sources, and (5) be selective. More speculatively, K. adds that Asconius' working methods suggest heavy reliance on Fenestella (whom he cites by name only in cases of disagreement), consultation of multiple sources when a point in Cicero intrigued him, and, remarkably, that "he

[3] On Quintilian's prescription for how to read a speech, cf. Keeline, *op. cit.* (n. 2), pp. 22–28.

worked much more quickly than a typical modern commentator" (p. 61). K. concludes that Asconius' primary motivation was curiosity rather than pedagogy (though he does not entirely exclude the latter). His audience was probably not his sons or students – the address to *filii* at *Mil.* 43.27 C being a conventional formula – but rather, as a *scriptor historicus*, Asconius followed his own interests in much the same way as Pliny the Elder.

Fernanda Maffei's (henceforth "M.") contribution, "Cicero in Egypt: The Ciceronian Papyri and the Teaching of Latin in the East" (pp. 69–86), addresses a topic only tangentially related to the scholia: papyri from Egypt containing Ciceronian texts that were apparently used in teaching. Out of some 1,500 extant Latin papyri, M. has identified only 12 that transmit Cicero's writings, and just one of these predates the 4th century CE. A comprehensive overview is provided in a table (p. 71), listing their dates, format, material, contents, and typology. For detailed analysis, M. focuses on "the items which are immediately related to an educational environment due to their palaeographic and bibliological features" (p. 72). Among these is *P. Iand*. V. 90 (containing *Verr.* 2.2.3–4) from the Julio-Claudian era, which, with its punctuation marks (including *i longae* and *apices*), may have served schoolboys who were learning "how to declaim a speech in public" (p. 75). Equally notable is *P. Ryl*. III 477 from the 5th century CE (*Div. Caec.* 35–37, 44–46), the only Ciceronian papyrus with annotations. M. argues that such papyri were intended for intermediate-level students, who were often non-native speakers of Latin; the notes assist with prosopography, figurative language, and legal terminology. Four papyri dating from the mid-4th to 5th centuries CE (*P. Vindob*. G 30885 a+e + *P. Vindob*. L 17; *P. Vindob*. L 127; *PSI* Congr. 21.2; and *P. Ryl*. I 61), all containing the *Catilinarians*, include bilingual glossaries, some of which may have been prepared "for didactic use by a man born in the Eastern part of the Empire" (p. 79). A further example, *P. Monts. Roca* Inv. 129–149 + *P. Duke* Inv. 798, which transmits both Christian and pagan works (including *Cat.* 1.6–9, 13–33, and *Cat.* 2), provides evidence "for the interest in Cicero's speeches among Christians" (p. 81). Finally, a papyrus codex (*P. Oxy*. VIII 1097 + *P. Oxy*. X 1251 + *P. Köln* I 49) containing a seemingly random selection of Cicero's speeches may, in M.'s view, have been a teaching tool, allowing a schoolmaster to introduce students to different types of orations. M. concludes that after Diocletian's reforms, Cicero's orations became especially valuable as teaching texts for Latin as a second language in the Greek East. A comparison with Ps.-Asconius' commentaries further suggests that, in contrast to the West, Cicero was used in Eastern classrooms primarily for teaching Latin and Roman law rather than rhetoric.

Thomas Riesenweber (henceforth "R."), in his chapter "Ciceros Reden bei den *Rhetores Latini Minores*", examines how commentaries on Cicero and rhetorical handbooks such as Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* reflect broader trends in the use of Cicero's speeches in the Roman classroom. As comparative material, R. draws on a range of Latin rhetorical handbooks from the imperial period (2nd–6th centuries CE), collected and edited by Karl Halm in his 1863 *Rhetores Latini Minores*. R. begins with a summary of basic information about the authors of these handbooks, followed by a discussion of their structure, which broadly parallels Cicero's *De inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. He observes that authors most heavily influenced by Greek theory – such as Ps.-Augustine, Sulpicius Victor, Priscian, and to some extent Fortunatianus – draw on Cicero's speeches only sparingly. The *Rhetoric* attributed to Augustine (2nd/3rd century CE), for instance, derives from the precepts of his teacher Democrates, which were otherwise unknown.

Although the author occasionally substitutes Cicero for the original Greek examples (mainly Demosthenes), declamatory material predominates. A similar pattern is evident in Sulpicius Victor (4th century CE) and Consultus Fortunatianus (late 5th century CE). The former uses Cicero primarily to illustrate status theory, though he clearly knew the orations firsthand, while the latter cites Cicero chiefly for examples of the *exordium* and *narratio*. Priscian's *Praeexercitamina* – essentially a Latin translation of the *Progymnasmata* attributed to Hermogenes – contains only two Ciceronian examples (for *prosopopoeia* and *eidolopoeia*),[4] which replace the original Greek ones to suit a Roman readership. With Marius Victorinus (4th century CE) and the Latin commentaries on *De inventione*, R. identifies a turning point: Cicero's speeches begin to be used far more frequently as examples in rhetorical handbooks. Victorinus himself draws extensively on Ciceronian material (especially from the *Verrines*), though he struggles to find suitable illustrations for status theory. In Grillius' commentary, the frequency of Ciceronian examples nearly doubles (59 quotations over 97 pages, compared to 58 over 212 pages in Victorinus). The difference is also methodological: Victorinus is more concerned with philosophy and logic, whereas Grillius emphasises technical aspects of rhetoric. R.'s final group comprises the compendia and compilations of Iulius Severianus, Martianus Capella, and Iulius Victor (all from the 5th century CE). These works illustrate the growing reliance on Cicero's speeches in rhetorical pedagogy after the publication of Victorinus' commentary. In conclusion, R. argues that the true "rediscovery" ("Wiederentdeckung", p. 121) of Cicero's speeches for Latin rhetorical instruction came with Victorinus in the 4th century. The absence of status theory in Asconius Pedianus, and its appearance only in later scholia, can, however, be explained by the fact that Asconius had different aims, as Keeline has shown (cf. above). R. helpfully appends a table (pp. 122–125) listing all quotations of and allusions to Cicero's speeches in the *RLM*.

In his chapter "The Canonization of Cicero in Ancient Commentaries" (pp. 130–153), Joseph Farrell (henceforth "F.") develops ideas from his earlier research on Vergil's engagement with Greek scholarship on the poets he imitated, especially the Theocritean and Homeric scholia. There he argued that Vergil sought to attain canonical status comparable to his Greek models by pursuing "a scholarly reception that would be recognizably similar to theirs" (p. 130). Building on Caroline Bishop's recent work, F. suggests that Cicero, too, was engaged in a process of self-canonisation – one that "inspired Vergil's fashioning of his own career" (p. 131). F. begins with Cicero's playful remark that Atticus was the Aristarchus of his speeches (*Att*. 1.14.3), interpreting this as an allusion to Atticus' role in editing Cicero's orations in a manner analogous to the Alexandrian scholar's editorial work on Homer. He then considers Cicero's ambitions first to present himself as a Roman counterpart to Aratus and later, more seriously, as the Latin Demosthenes.[5] In this latter case, F. argues, Cicero had not in fact read the commentaries

---

[4] On these rhetorical figures, cf. B. Dufallo, *The Ghosts of the Past. Latin Literature, the Dead, and Rome's Transition to a Principate*, Columbus 2007, p. 130, n. 16 and *passim*, and my discussion in D. Pierzak, *Ab inferis ad rostra. Przywoływanie zmarłych w retoryce rzymskiej okresu republikańskiego*, Katowice 2019 (esp. ch. 2, pp. 71–82).

[5] On Cicero's engagement with the commentary tradition on Aratus, as well as his reception of Demosthenes – both of which can be seen as strategies through which he sought to secure his own canonisation – see C. Bishop, *Cicero, Greek Learning, and the Making of a Roman Classic*...,

on Demosthenes or other Attic orators. Turning to reception, F. notes that the first true "Aristarchus" of Cicero's speeches was Asconius Pedianus, although Asconius' interests were almost exclusively historical. Unlike Vergil, who entered the canon of Roman poetry and whose works were already being commented on in his lifetime or shortly thereafter, Cicero – for largely political reasons – for a century remained little more than a symbol of eloquence. F. further contends that it was the exegetical and critical activity surrounding Vergil that, paradoxically, paved the way for a comparable scholarly reception of Cicero. In conclusion, F. highlights once again the dynamics of canonisation in both cases and tentatively characterises the relationship between Cicero and Vergil as at once complementary and competitive.

Caroline Bishop (henceforth "B."), whose work is frequently cited throughout the volume, contributes the chapter "The Influence of Greek Commentaries on the Bobbio Scholia to Cicero" (pp. 155–175). In her introduction, B. recalls Cicero's ambition to establish himself as a Roman "classical" author (cf. n. 5 above), comparable to the status Demosthenes enjoyed in Greece. In a discussion that partially overlaps with Farrell's contribution, she highlights the influence of the Homeric scholia on Vergilian commentary, proposing that the author of the Bobbio scholia on Cicero drew on commentaries on Demosthenes in a similar way. B. acknowledges, however, that the parallels are fewer and less direct for two main reasons: the different aims and character of poetic versus rhetorical exegesis, and the more fragmentary state of preservation of both the Ciceronian and Demosthenic scholia compared to the Vergilian and Homeric material (p. 158). She classifies the parallels into three groups: "lexical cross-references to other classical authors", "contextual cross-references", and "the use of specialized Greek rhetorical terminology to describe an orator's skill" (p. 160), illustrating each category with numerous examples. These, she argues, also reinforce her earlier conclusion that both the Ciceronian and Demosthenic scholia most likely originated in the same period, the 2nd century CE. In closing, B. maintains that "Cicero's commentator was familiar with the tradition of Greek rhetorical commentary, and that he subscribed to the Roman attitude that the classical texts of both cultures could and should be interpreted in the same fashion" (p. 174).

Gesine Manuwald (henceforth "M."), herself a prolific commentator on Cicero's speeches,[6] contributes the chapter "The Ciceronian Scholia and Asconius as Sources on Cicero and Other Republican Orators" (pp. 176–189). Her aim is to highlight the information the scholia provide about orators other than Cicero, on the assumption that a full appreciation of Cicero's rhetoric requires some knowledge of the practices of his contemporaries. As editor and translator of the *Oratory* volumes in the *Fragmentary Republican*

---

pp. 41–84 and 173–217, respectively. Bishop shows how Cicero drew on the authority of Greek models and their scholarly reception to position himself within a comparable tradition of classical status.

[6] See G. Manuwald (ed.), *Cicero, Philippics 3–9*, Berlin–New York 2007; *eadem*, *Cicero, Agrarian Speeches. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford 2018; *eadem*, *Cicero, Post reditum Speeches. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford 2021. Cf. recent commentaries by other contributors to this volume: T.J. Keeline (ed.), *Cicero, Pro Milone*, New York 2021, and C. Schwameis, *Cicero, De praetura Siciliensi (Verr. 2,2). Einleitung und Kommentar*, Berlin–Boston 2019.

Latin series (Loeb Classical Library 540–542), M. is well positioned for this task. She observes that about twenty passages in the scholia (chiefly the *Scholia Bobiensia*) preserve *testimonia* and fragments for *ORF*/*FRL*. Of these, she focuses on two especially illuminating cases: one revealing Cicero's compositional practices through his borrowing from C. Sempronius Gracchus at *Sull.* 26, and another concerning the speech composed by M. Iunius Brutus as a rhetorical exercise connected with the trial of T. Annius Milo in 52 BCE. By comparison, Asconius' commentaries contain nearly forty such passages, which primarily provide historical detail and include "hardly any verbatim quotations" (p. 184). The few *testimonia* in Ps.-Asconius (all on the *Verrines*) offer some contextual background but little material of substance about oratory itself. Ultimately, M. concludes, the scholia and Asconius function mainly as supplements to Cicero's texts, but they nonetheless supply valuable evidence for aspects of Roman oratory that would otherwise have been lost.

In the chapter "'Cicero Cannot Be Separated from the State': In Search of Cicero's Political and Moral Exemplarity in Asconius Pedianus and the *Scholia Bobiensia*" (pp. 191–214), Christoph Pieper (henceforth "P.") examines how Asconius and the scholia portray Cicero's political and moral qualities, and whether these texts contribute to his enduring reputation as a statesman and ethical role model. At the outset, P. acknowledges his debt to La Bua's 2019 study (cf. above, n. 2), which suggested that these commentaries encouraged readers to emulate Cicero not only as an orator but also as a politician. P. begins with an overview of Cicero's posthumous reputation in the Imperial period, noting that he quickly became an exemplary figure. Yet because larger narratives such as Tiro's biography and Livy's books on the Late Republic are lost, surviving accounts tend to focus only on select episodes from Cicero's career. As P. argues, this gap in the tradition can be partially filled by the evidence of Asconius and the *Scholia Bobiensia*. He further suggests that these commentaries may once have covered all of Cicero's speeches in chronological order, and that they were possibly designed for use not only in rhetorical training but also in teaching history and politics. Several examples illustrate this claim: the scholiasts' remarks on Cicero's enemies and major political struggles, their tendency to whitewash his character, and their efforts to excuse his failings. Both Asconius and the Bobbio scholiast thus presuppose an implied reader willing to endorse Cicero's own project of self-fashioning. Moreover, the occasional criticisms of Cicero, as P. notes, ultimately reinforce his positive image by giving the impression of impartiality. Although some problems of chronology and composition remain unresolved, P. concludes that "Asconius and the *Scholia Bobiensia* contain enough elements of exemplary discourse[7] to be relevant evidence for the afterlife of Cicero as a political *persona* in Late Antiquity" (p. 211).

The paper by Christoph Schwameis (henceforth "S."), "*Deinceps haec omnia non dicta, sed scripta contra reum*: The Fictional *Verrines* in the Ciceronian Scholia and

[7] Although P. never clarifies his use of the term "exemplary discourse", I assume he employs it in a broad sense, similar to the definition offered by M. Roller in *The exemplary past in Roman historiography and culture*, in: A. Feldherr (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Cambridge 2009, pp. 214–230 (at p. 216): "a (loosely) coherent system of symbols that organizes and represents the past in a particular way, and thereby facilitates a particular way of knowing it".

beyond" (pp. 216–242), tackles the crucial question of the fictional status of Cicero's longest extant oration.[8] Given the significance of the claim that the *Actio secunda* was never actually delivered, it is striking that the chief evidence for its fictionality derives from the scholia attributed to Asconius (now generally cited as 'Ps.-Asconius'). S. begins with a review of the evidence from other sources, including Pliny the Younger, Cassius Dio, and the *Scholia Gronoviana*, all of which he deems inconclusive since they provide no clear explanation for why the *Actio secunda in Verrem* would not have been delivered (p. 219). In contrast, S. argues that the testimony of Ps.-Asconius presents a more complex case. Their evidentiary value, he notes, has often been either overstated or downplayed depending on a scholar's position regarding the theory of fictionality. Before turning to the central issue, S. outlines the general character of these scholia, observing that their author – though often mistaken and poorly informed – nonetheless shows a degree of scholarly competence and occasionally cites sources which would have otherwise been lost. What distinguishes Ps.-Asconius from other witnesses is that, while closing his remarks on the *Actio prima*, he explicitly offers an explanation for the fictional character of the *Actio secunda*. Even if his phrasing sometimes merely paraphrases Cicero's own words about Verres' hypothetical absence, the claim itself is distinctive. In his analysis of the scholiast's introduction to the *Actio secunda*, S. underscores that "it is only with Ps.-Asconius that we find the assertion that Cicero had to invent this speech in order to gain oratorical renown and to bring an end to his career as an accuser at the same time" (p. 229). Beyond these extended passages, Ps.-Asconius also includes notes in the *enarratio* that highlight the points where Cicero cleverly misleads his readers into believing that the speech was actually delivered. In conclusion, S. draws an important distinction between ancient and modern notions of a "fictional" (i.e., undelivered) speech. For Ps.-Asconius, he argues, "the fictionality of the *Actio secunda* was apparently only a proof of how well Cicero succeeded in making the speech come across as genuine" (p. 234). At the same time, the scholiast presents himself as an expert keen to expose Cicero's art of illusion. S. closes his chapter with a discussion of Ps.-Asconius' later reception and his influence on modern scholarship and commentaries on Cicero's speeches.

The final chapter of the volume, "Reading the *Scholia Gronoviana*: Ambiguity and Veiled Language in the Interpretation of Cicero's *Caesarian Orations*" (pp. 243–266), by Giovanni Margiotta (henceforth "M."), examines the long-debated issue of figured speech (*oratio figurata*) in the *Caesarian Orations*. M. seeks to trace this debate back to the late antique commentary known as the *Scholia Gronoviana* and to "cast more light on the reception of" these speeches "in the rhetorical environments of Late Antiquity" (p. 245). Beginning with the *Pro Marcello*, M. analyzes the scholiast's introduction to the speech, which covers the *genus orationis*, the historical background, and its connection to status theory. Before turning to the key passages on *oratio figurata*, he surveys earlier Latin treatments of figured speech in Quintilian, Iulius Rufinianus, and Iulius Victor. The latter two, drawing on the *Institutio Oratoria*, likewise identify three main purposes for employing this figure: safety, decency, and elegance. According to the scholiast, many readers took the *Pro Marcello* as an example of rhetorical dissimulation, interpreting

[8] S. touches upon this subject in Schwameis, *op. cit.* (n. 6), pp. 6–7. The topic has also been recently discussed by T. Ricchieri, *Prima della Sicilia. Cicerone, Verrine 2,1 (De praetura urbana), 1–102. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento*, Pisa 2020, pp. 24–31.

Cicero's praise of Caesar as covert invective. Yet the scholiast explicitly rejects this reading, insisting that it does not fit either the circumstances or the addressee. As M. shows, "the scholiast rejects a figured reading of the *Pro Marcello* although he is aware that behind Cicero's eulogies subtler political implications lurk" (p. 255). The discussion then moves to the *Pro Ligario* and *Pro rege Deiotaro*. Here the Gronovian scholiast shows more openness to rhetorical ambiguity. On the *Pro Ligario*, he comments extensively on irony, a related mode of expression, which Cicero strikingly employs in the *exordium* – precisely where one versed in rhetorical theory would least expect it. In the *Pro rege Deiotaro*, Cicero makes use of *insinuatio*, "another rhetorical device based on ambiguity and veiled language," to win his audience's goodwill indirectly (pp. 258–259). The scholiast perceptively compares Cicero's proem to the speech of Sinon in Book 2 of Vergil's *Aeneid*, a comparison M. further develops by noting that the composition of their audiences was also similar in certain respects. Taken together, the commentary on the *Pro Ligario* and *Pro rege Deiotaro* shows that, despite rejecting the figured-speech interpretation of the *Pro Marcello*, the Gronovian scholiast was highly attuned to Cicero's rhetoric of ambiguity. As M. concludes, "Cicero emerges as a brilliant orator who can resort to the sophisticated resources of his rhetoric [...]" (p. 262).

The volume as a whole has been edited with great care,[9] showing that a digital conference held during the COVID-19 pandemic (*temporibus covidianis*, as aptly phrased in the "Acknowledgements") could generate discussion every bit as fruitful as an in-person event. This success may owe something to the fact that, beyond the contributors themselves, numerous other specialists were able to participate remotely, and their input is duly acknowledged in the footnotes. Another strength of the book is that, despite its seemingly narrow focus, every chapter proves relevant, as the many cross-references between contributions make clear. While some of the arguments advanced may at times seem a little speculative, the authors are usually aware of this and present their ideas with due caution. This is hardly surprising, given that serious scholarly engagement with the Ciceronian scholia was rekindled only about a decade ago – a trend one hopes will continue. Overall, the volume is an excellent introduction to the subject, and I am confident it will stimulate further research in the years to come.

Damian Pierzak
University of Silesia
damian.pierzak@us.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0002-4140-842X

[9] Apart from a few repetitions, e.g. p. 192: "he was an enemy of the (new powerful men in) the state," p. 193: "so that that it was only natural," p. 207: "This becomes visible in in the"; a misspelling (p. 74: "*Praefectus Egypti*"), and an incorrect accent (p. 78 should read ἀκατακριθείς instead of ἀκατακριθεῖς), I have not noticed any major typographical errors.