

Asconius' Influence on the Bobbio Scholiast: Cicero's *Pro Milone* and its Ancient Commentaries
Jane W. Crawford (University of Virginia)

It has long been accepted that the Bobbio Scholiast, who wrote on Cicero's speeches in the 3rd or 4th century CE, had access to the work of Asconius Pedianus, who commented on some of Cicero's orations in the mid-first century of our era. But how extensively did the earlier writer affect the later one? How closely did the Bobbio Scholiast follow Asconius? In this paper, I will investigate the nature and extent of Asconius' influence on the Bobbio Scholiast by comparing their respective commentaries on Cicero's *Pro Milone*. To illuminate this question, I will consider similarities and differences in content, focus, style and language between the two writers.

Cicero's defense of Milo on charges *de vi* (specifically, the murder of Clodius) is famous, primarily for the fact that it was unsuccessful. The speech we have today is not the one which Cicero delivered in April of 52 BCE; that effort was, according to Asconius, not up to Cicero's usual standards, because the orator was disconcerted by the crowds of Clodius' supporters and the presence of armed soldiers in the Forum. A revised version was subsequently published by Cicero, and the commentaries on this edition are the focus of this paper.

Both commentators wrote at length on this important speech. Although the commentaries of both are fragmentary, in what remains, Asconius discusses 21 Ciceronian lemmata (on 19 sections), and includes a detailed introduction (12 OCT pages) to the speech. The Bobbio Scholiast examines 57 lemmata in 30 sections; only one page or so remains of his introduction. Remarkably, the commentaries as we have them overlap very infrequently; in only seven instances do the two authors cite the same Ciceronian passage, and in only four of those do they discuss the same lemma. These few exact matches will be the main focus of my paper, but because they are so rare, I will also examine unrelated passages for similar treatment of issues raised in the trial, as well as the two authors' evaluation of Cicero's defense tactics. In this area I will rely on a close reading of the texts and contexts, with particular attention to stylistic and verbal echoes which would indicate the Bobbio scholiast's dependence on Asconius.