

**The Fragment of Cicero's *De amicitia* in Codex  
Vat. Lat. 5207**

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

In a catalogue of *Libri manuales* published in 1924 by Dr. Eva Matthews Sanford the following brief entry is included under the date saec. ix-x: "Vaticanus 5207: Cicero, de amicitia; Macrobius, Saturnalia i-ii."<sup>1</sup> Despite the relatively early date attributed to this codex by Sanford, however, the portion containing the *De amicitia* of Cicero (folios 61<sup>v</sup>-64<sup>v</sup>) has consistently been overlooked by editors. In fact, so far as this writer has been able to determine, nothing about this Cicero manuscript has appeared in print anywhere except the brief statement in Sanford's article quoted above. This is perhaps to be accounted for by the fact that the codex is contained in a portion of the Vatican Library not yet covered by printed catalogues. Furthermore, contrary to the impression made by Sanford's reference, the text of *De amicitia* included in the manuscript is not complete but embraces only approximately the first third of the work, extending from the beginning through *Pyrrho* (28.9),<sup>2</sup> and is preceded rather than followed by Macrobius, *Saturnalia* i-ii (folios 2<sup>r</sup>-61<sup>r</sup>).<sup>3</sup>

Manuscripts of *De amicitia* dating from the tenth century or earlier are comparatively rare. Those employed by Simbeck<sup>4</sup> in the preparation of his critical edition are: Parisinus Didotianus, saec. ix-x (= P); Monacensis Lat. 15514, saec. ix-x (= M); Vat. Reg. Lat. 1762, saec. ix-x (= K); Erfurtensis-Berolinensis fol. 252,

<sup>1</sup> Eva Matthews Sanford, "The Use of Classical Latin Authors in the Libri Manuales," *TAPA* 55 (1924) 210.

<sup>2</sup> The second numeral in the citations of the text of *De amicitia* is the line number within the chapter calculated according to the line divisions in K. Simbeck, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato Maior et Laelius* (Leipzig 1917). This will doubtless vary slightly for other editions.

<sup>3</sup> This study of Codex Vat. Lat. 5207 is based on a microfilm copy of the manuscript contained in the holdings of *The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University*. Citations from Codex Reg. Lat. 1762 (K) are taken from a microfilm made available by the same institution.

<sup>4</sup> Simbeck (above, note 2) 44.

saec. x-xi (=E); Gudianus 335, saec. x or possibly xi (=G); Laurentianus 50, 45, saec. x (=L); and frag. Monac. Lat. 29001, saec. x or possibly xi (=m). Laurand<sup>5</sup> and Venini<sup>6</sup> both list G as a tenth century manuscript without further qualifications. Venini also lists E as being of about the eleventh century and L as tenth or eleventh. Thus only three manuscripts—P, M, and K—are credited by one or more of the above mentioned editors with possibly being as early as the ninth century.

One of these three manuscripts, K, is of relatively little importance for establishing the text of *De amicitia* since it is comprised of the extracts of Hadoard from Cicero and other writers and so contains only brief passages from the work under consideration. Furthermore, it has been convincingly argued by Beeson<sup>7</sup> that K is to be dated no earlier than the tenth century. If this argument is to be accepted, only two of the previously studied manuscripts of *De amicitia* can be dated saec. ix-x. One of these, M, contains only the portion of the text extending from *haec igitur prima lex* (44.1) to the end, or approximately the second half of the work. Hence, the only ninth century source which has thus far been utilized for the first 43 chapters of *De amicitia* is P—a manuscript which has had a very strange history. The existence of this document was first called to the attention of the scholarly world by Mommsen, who discovered it in 1863 in Paris in the private library of Firmin Didot and published a collation of it in *Rheinisches Museum* 18 (1863) 593-601. Müller made use of this collation in the preparation of his Teubner text, which was published in Leipzig in 1879. Later the manuscript made its way to London, where it was examined by Reid in 1883 while in the possession of Quaritch. Soon thereafter the document disappeared from sight and for many years defied all efforts of Ciceronian scholars to bring it back to light. In 1918 the editor Bassi expressed the fear that P may have been taken to America. Doubts about the fate of P persisted until 1926, when C. H. Beeson<sup>8</sup> and L. Laurand<sup>9</sup> announced almost simultaneously that

<sup>5</sup> L. Laurand, *Cicéron, L' Amitié* (Paris 1928).

<sup>6</sup> P. Venini, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato Maior de Senectute Laelius de Amicitia* (Torino 1959) xxiv-xxv.

<sup>7</sup> Charles H. Beeson, "The Collectaneum of Hadoard," *CP* 40 (1945) 201-22.

<sup>8</sup> Charles H. Beeson, "The 'Lost' MS of Cicero's '*De Amicitia*,'" *CP* 21 (1926) 120-31.

<sup>9</sup> L. Laurand, "Où est le Parisinus Didotianus?" *REL* 4 (1926) 61-62.

the manuscript had been rediscovered in the Royal Library of Berlin. Laurand's announcement was contained in a very brief article; but in making his announcement Beeson provided a detailed account of the manuscript based on a photostatic copy which he had secured from Berlin. In the same article he also listed a number of instances in which readings of P had been wrongly cited by Müller, and hence by Simbeck, who had taken his P readings from Müller. Thus control of the text of *De amicitia* was placed on a much sounder basis. The joy, however, which was doubtless felt by Ciceronian scholars at the rediscovery of such an important manuscript, was destined to be of short duration. When P. Venini attempted to secure a photographic reproduction of P for use in the preparation of her 1959 edition of *De amicitia*, she received word from Berlin that the manuscript had been destroyed in World War II.<sup>10</sup> Hence, it must be concluded that this source for *De amicitia*, which was regarded by Beeson as dating from the early ninth century,<sup>11</sup> is lost for all time.

The permanent loss of P renders the existence of Codex Vaticanus Latinus 5207 (henceforth designated A) all the more important. Although A was dated by Sanford as saec. ix-x, there are good grounds for assuming that it was produced during the second half of the ninth century. The text was copied by three apparently contemporary Carolingian scribes (designated X, Y, and Z) in single columns of 34 lines each. Since the manuscript in its present form comes to an end at the bottom of the verso of folio 64 in the middle of a sentence, it is obvious that the document originally contained additional portions of *De amicitia*—perhaps the entire work. The title is written in rustic capitals in the form M. TULLII CICERONIS DEMICITIA, with A inserted above M in the last word, apparently by the original scribe. Names of interlocutors are sometimes inserted in rustic capitals, sometimes in Carolingian characters. A few corrections have been made in the text by the original scribes (A<sup>1</sup>), and some by a contemporary corrector (A<sup>2</sup>). The portion produced by scribe X includes folios 61<sup>v</sup>, 62<sup>r</sup>, and the first seven lines of 62<sup>v</sup> (*De amicitia* 1.1-10.7) and 63<sup>r</sup> (*De amicitia* 13.2-16.9). The part of folio 62<sup>v</sup> extending from line eight to the end (*De amicitia* 10.7-

<sup>10</sup> The facts about the history of P recorded here are taken from Beeson (above, note 8) 120-21 and Venini (above, note 6) xxiii-xxiv.

<sup>11</sup> Beeson (above, note 8) 124.

13.2) was copied by scribe Y. Folios 63<sup>v</sup>, 64<sup>r</sup>, and 64<sup>v</sup> (*De amicitia* 16.9–28.9) were produced by scribe Z, whose work was marred by several serious omissions. Clubbing of the stems of tall letters such as *b*, *d*, *h*, and *l* is pronounced in all three hands, but especially in X. Open *a* resembling double *c* is very common in both X and Y. Angular *n* is used frequently, especially by scribe X. Words are occasionally run together by all three scribes, and word division is often faulty. Scribes Y and Z refrain from using abbreviations for the *-tur* ending, but X occasionally uses *t* with a hook resembling an apostrophe above it, as in the case of *videbatur* (4.6), or, in certain other instances, *t* surmounted by a symbol resembling the numeral 2, as in the case of *interponeretur* (3.8). Under ordinary circumstances, use of both of these symbols in the *-tur* abbreviation in the same document by the same hand would be regarded as an indication that the manuscript was copied around the year 820.<sup>12</sup> In the portion of the Macrobius text copied by scribe X (folios 57<sup>r</sup>–61<sup>r</sup>), however, the 2-symbol, which points to a date after 820, is consistently used in the abbreviation of *-tur*. This suggests that scribe X possibly copied both Macrobius and Cicero after 820, but slavishly followed his exemplar while copying Cicero, thus retaining a few examples of the apostrophe-symbol beyond the time when this abbreviation had ordinarily ceased to be used. The fact that both loops of *g* are closed by scribes X and Y is another feature tending to point to a later date. But instances in which both loops of *g* are closed in early ninth-century manuscripts may be cited. A good example is Codex 14468 of the Royal Library in Munich, which was copied in 821.<sup>13</sup> The *g* of scribe X very closely resembles that found in Codex 672 of St. Gall, which was copied around 888.<sup>14</sup> In view of the circumstances just cited, therefore, it is doubtful whether A should be dated as early as 820 in spite of the use of both the apostrophe-symbol and the 2-symbol in the *-tur* abbreviation. The palaeographical evidence taken as a whole, however, seems to point definitely to the ninth century—probably to the second half of that century. Hence, since P is lost and since M contains only

<sup>12</sup> Edward Kennard Rand, "On the Symbols of Abbreviations for *-tur*," *Speculum* 2 (1927) 52.

<sup>13</sup> A facsimile of this manuscript can be found in Edward Maunde Thompson, *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Oxford 1912) 408.

<sup>14</sup> For a facsimile of this codex see Thompson (above, note 13) 416.

the second half of *De amicitia*, A is probably the earliest existing copy of the first third of this work and, as such, certainly deserves to have its readings recorded.

The manuscripts of *De amicitia* fall into two families: x and y. A belongs to family x and is very closely related to P, as is indicated by the large number of cases in which it shares errors with P against all other manuscripts. In the following list of such instances most readings ascribed to P are taken from the *apparatus criticus* of Simbeck's edition.<sup>15</sup> In those cases, however, in which Beeson<sup>16</sup> has indicated that Simbeck's edition is in error in its citations from P, Beeson's readings have been substituted with the name Beeson appearing in parentheses to indicate the source. The first entry in each case is the reading adopted by Simbeck:

- 9.8        *hi in pueris Cato in] hi in iueris Cato in PA*
- 12.7       *quom] quam PA*
- 13.11      *ut in] ut im PA*
- 14.7       *per om. PA*
- 14.12-13   *veriora ut] vereor aut P<sup>2</sup>A*
- 14.13      *interitus] intentus P(Beeson)A*
- 23.11      *coniunctionem] iuntionem P(Beeson)A*
- 24.8       *efferat] eferat PA*
- 24.11      *uter Orestes <esset Pylades> Orestem se esse diceret]*  
              *uter Orestes esse diceret PA*
- 26.8       *recipiendis] recipendis] PA*
- 26.12-13   *princeps est ad] princeps et ad PA*
- 27.12      *nacti] nati PA.<sup>17</sup>*

The following are cases in which A agrees in error with P and K against all other manuscripts:

- 22.11      *colare] colere P(Beeson)KA<sup>18</sup>*
- 23.1       *quomque] quamque PKA*
- 23.14      *atque ex discordiis] id et excordis PKA*
- 27.13      *aliquod] aliquid PKA.*

<sup>15</sup> Simbeck (above, note 2).

<sup>16</sup> Beeson (above, note 8) 128-29.

<sup>17</sup> Another possible instance in which P and A are in agreement in error is in the omission of *quos* (28.4). The word is definitely omitted by A, but is not reported by Simbeck as omitted by P. On the other hand, *quos* (28.6), which is present in A, is reported by Simbeck as omitted by P. It seems probable that the *quos* omitted by P is the same as that omitted by A, and that Simbeck by a clerical error reported the wrong *quos* as being absent from P. The fact that in both instances *quos* is followed by *numquam* would cause the error to be made all the more readily.

<sup>18</sup> Simbeck ascribes the reading *colere* to P<sup>2</sup>, but Beeson (above, note 8) 131 argues that it is the reading of the first hand.



Other examples in which P is correct where A is in error could be cited, but the omissions listed above are sufficient evidence to indicate that A, even if it were earlier than P, could not possibly be considered as P's source.

At the same time it is quite unlikely that A was copied from P in view of the following list of instances in which A has the correct reading where P is in error:

- 8.1    *multi* A, *multum* P
- 10.12    *suis* A, *sivis* or *suus* P(Beeson)
- 12.4    *dictu* A, *dictum* P
- 13.12    *excessissent* A, *excessisent* P(Beeson)
- 13.14    *cuique* A, *quique* P
- 15.3    *fuera*t A, *furatae* P
- 15.10    *sapientiae* A, *sapientiam* P
- 16.4    *quaeruntur* A, *quaeritur* P
- 20.2    *ex infinita societate* A, *ex infirmitas otietate* P
- 22.12    *ut laudere* A, *laudere* P
- 25.4    *diceres* A, *dicere* P.

While it is possible that the scribes of A, if copying from P, would have been able to correct some of these errors by conjecture, it is highly unlikely that this would have happened in all the instances listed above. The more probable explanation of the similarities between A and P is that these manuscripts are *gemelli*, copied from some common source.

From the cases of agreement between A and K listed earlier it is apparent that K is closely related to A, which in turn is closely related to P. Since, as indicated by both Simbeck<sup>21</sup> and Beeson,<sup>22</sup> in the second half of *De amicitia* K is closely related to M, which in turn is closely related to P, this poses the question of whether A and M are different parts of the same manuscript. The text of *De amicitia* between the end of A and the beginning of M occupies 113 lines in the Teubner edition, or about 1200 words. The average folio of A contains about 825 words. If it is to be assumed that the lost portions of A had the same format as the portions still in existence, it is obvious that the material intervening between the end of A and the beginning of M is too much to be accommodated by one folio and too little to occupy two complete

<sup>21</sup> Simbeck (above, note 2) 44.

<sup>22</sup> Beeson (above, note 7) 217.

folios. Hence it may be assumed that A and M are parts of two entirely different manuscripts.<sup>23</sup>

Incidentally, A cannot be regarded as the source of the *De amicitia* excerpts in K since at 20.16–17, where A omits *et gignit et continet nec sine virtute amicitia*, K retains the entire passage except the first *et*. At 26.8 K has the correct *recipiendis* where both P and A have *reciperandisque*.

Since, as indicated above, A was almost certainly copied from the same source as P, its readings occasionally serve as a valuable supplement to P for determining the readings of the common source. Beeson<sup>24</sup> expresses the belief that many of the corrections made by P<sup>2</sup> were based on the archetype from which P was copied. This belief is confirmed by A. In 13.13, for instance, P, according to Beeson,<sup>25</sup> originally read *iustissimoque*. Simbeck cites its reading at this point as *iustissimo*, presumably because *-que* has been erased. Hence it is Beeson's contention that the reading *iustissimo* should be credited to P<sup>2</sup>. Since A reads *iustissimo* (without *-que*), it seems probable that this was the reading of the common archetype, and that the person who erased *-que* from P, whether this was the original scribe or P<sup>2</sup>, was making a correction based on the archetype of P and A. Another instance is found in 26.15 where *coluntur* is written *uoluntur* by P and corrected to *coluntur* by P<sup>2</sup>. Since A reads *coluntur*, it is almost certain that this was the reading of the PA archetype, and that the correction in P was derived from this source. At 16.4 where *cum*, the reading of the y family of manuscripts, is accepted by editors (*quom* in Simbeck), P has *quam* and ED, two other members of x family, have *quae*. Since A agrees with ED in reading *quae* at this point, this was certainly the reading of the archetype of the x family of manuscripts and probably should be accepted as the correct reading.

At first sight it may appear that A differs sharply from P in including *feci* after *Maiores* in 4.5 where Simbeck reports P as omitting *feci* against all other manuscripts. Beeson<sup>26</sup> points out, however, that Müller and Simbeck are in error in stating that *feci*

<sup>23</sup> The writer has no photographs of M at his disposal, but the evidence based on the format of A seems adequate to establish the fact that A and M are from separate manuscripts.

<sup>24</sup> Beeson (above, note 8) 126.

<sup>25</sup> Beeson (above, note 8) 131.

<sup>26</sup> Beeson (above, note 8) 128.



is absent from P, since this manuscript, like all others, has *feci* after *Maiore*. Hence P and A are in full agreement at this point.

In the collation of A with Simbeck's text appended below minor variations in orthography (such as *e* or *e-caudata* for *ae*, *c* for *t*, etc.) are ignored.

## COLLATION

1.1	<i>Q.] Quintus</i>	7.8	<i>affricani</i>
1.4	<i>ita</i> om. A, added by A <sup>1</sup>	7.11	<i>illud] illut</i>
2.1	<i>emiciclyo</i> A, <i>hemiciclyo</i> A <sup>2</sup>	8.1	<i>Scaevola</i> om.
		8.4	<i>amicissummi</i>
2.6	<i>Pompeio] pompeo</i> , corrected by A <sup>2</sup>	8.7	<i>causae</i> (with most other manuscripts)
2.7	<i>desideret</i>	9.3	<i>adcognosco</i>
2.9	<i>querela</i> A, <i>querella</i> A <sup>2</sup>	9.4	<i>mihi</i> om.
3.3	<i>lelii</i>	9.5	<i>nemo] nomo</i> , corrected by A <sup>2</sup>    <i>quide</i>
3.4	<i>Marci filio] .m. filio</i>		
3.8-9	<i>ut tamquam a praesentibus coram haberi sermo</i> om.	9.8	<i>hi in pueris Cato in] hi in iueris Cato in</i>
		9.10	<i>Catonii</i>
4.2	<i>cognitione</i>	10.11	<i>angi] angui</i>
4.4	<i>in Catone] catione</i>	10.12	<i>si quid accidit</i> om.
4.5	<i>Maiore] maiore feci</i>	11.2	<i>minimi</i>
4.7	<i>loqueretur] loqueret</i> , corrected by A <sup>2</sup>	11.4	<i>obtare</i>
		11.7	<i>consul est bis] est consul bis</i>
4.10	<i>laelii</i>		
4.11	<i>laelii</i>	11.8	<i>rei publicae] rei p̄</i>
4.13	<i>sermonem</i>	11.9	<i>duabus] duibus</i>
4.15	<i>plus] plos</i> , corrected by A <sup>2</sup>	11.10	<i>delavit</i>
		11.11	<i>in in matrem</i>
5.2	<i>de] a</i>	11.12	<i>sorores] sororis</i> , corrected by A <sup>2</sup>
5.4	<i>ferre</i>		
5.6	<i>loqueretur</i>	11.14	<i>iudicatum</i> (with most other manuscripts)
5.9	<i>affricani</i>		
6.1	<i>laedi</i> , corrected to <i>laeli</i> by A <sup>1</sup>	12.3	<i>celeritas] celeritatis</i>
		12.5	<i>P.] p̄.</i>
6.4	<i>et</i> (second) om. A, added by A <sup>2</sup>	12.7	<i>quom] quam</i>
		12.9	<i>populo Romano] p̄r    socis</i>
6.8	<i>multaque</i> (with first <i>et</i> of next line omitted)	13.1	<i>adsentior] adsertior    iis]</i>
			<i>his</i>
7.1	<i>suptilius</i>	13.9	<i>erudiuerunt</i>
7.4	<i>existimant</i>	13.10	<i>tum] dum</i>
7.6	<i>inferioresque</i>	13.11	<i>ut in] ut im    sed] set</i>

13.12	<i>iisque]</i> <i>hisque</i>	18.6	<i>ea***m</i>
14.2	<i>qui quidem]</i> <i>quique idem</i> (with the other manuscripts)    <i>prae-</i> <i>sagitare</i>	18.10 18.11 19.2 19.3	<i>M<sup>o</sup>.]</i> <i>M.</i>    <i>Ti.] .T.</i> <i>maiores]</i> <i>madores</i> <i>sit om.</i> <i>audcia</i>    <i>sintque]</i> <i>sitque</i> (with other manu- scripts)    <i>ii]</i> <i>hi</i>
14.3	<i>adessent</i>		
14.5	<i>re publica]</i> <i>reque</i>		
14.7	<i>per om.</i>	19.8	<i>natos]</i> <i>n*tos</i> , corrected by A <sup>2</sup>    <i>interer</i>    <i>esset]</i> <i>esse</i>
14.11	<i>quocirca]</i> <i>quocita</i>		
14.12	<i>autem]</i> <i>autem aut</i> (with most other manu- scripts)	19.13	<i>propinquitati</i>    <i>benevo-</i> <i>lencia</i>
14.12-13	<i>veriora ut]</i> <i>vereor aut</i>	20.4	<i>aut inter duos om.</i>
14.13	<i>interitus]</i> <i>intentus</i>	20.7	<i>humanaque</i>    <i>benevolentia</i>
14.15	<i>quasi natus</i> written twice	20.8 20.9	<i>haud</i> <i>diis</i>
15.2	<i>optume</i>	20.12	<i>superiora]</i> <i>superior</i>
15.3	<i>aequius]</i> <i>equus</i>	20.14	<i>virtute]</i> <i>veritate</i>
15.7	<i>cur*</i>    <i>de om.</i> , added by A <sup>1</sup>	20.16-17	<i>et gignit et continet nec sine</i> <i>virtute amicitia om.</i>
15.8	<i>communis]</i> <i>commonis</i> , corrected by A <sup>2</sup>	21.3 21.3-4	<i>eam]</i> <i>enim</i> <i>magnificentia metiamur</i> <i>virosque]</i> <i>magnificen-</i> <i>tiam etiam virosque</i>
15.10	<i>tam]</i> <i>tamen</i>		
15.14	<i>quattuor]</i> <i>IIII</i>    <i>nomi-</i> <i>nantur]</i> <i>nominant</i> , cor- rected by A <sup>2</sup>	21.5	<i>Galos]</i> <i>gaios</i> (with the other manuscripts)    <i>Scipiones]</i> <i>scipios</i>
15.16	<i>laelii</i>		
16.3	<i>quem]</i> <i>quidem</i>	22.1	<i>viros]</i> <i>uoros</i>
16.4	<i>quom]</i> <i>quae</i>	22.2	<i>tantas]</i> <i>tatas</i>
16.5	<i>Scaevola</i> inserted in rus- tic capitals before <i>sic</i> , but omitted from 16.7	22.4 22.7 22.10	<i>in om.</i> <i>aequae</i> <i>sunt]</i> <i>s</i> (obviously with abbreviation sign omitted)
16.6	<i>existimes</i>		
16.7	<i>Scaevola om.</i> (see above 16.5)    <i>gratum]</i> <i>gra-</i> <i>tiam</i>	22.11 22.13	<i>colere</i> <i>fungare]</i> <i>fungere</i> , cor- rected by A <sup>2</sup>
16.8	<i>antevertit</i>	22.16	<i>molesta]</i> <i>molecta</i>
17.5	<i>iis ponatur]</i> <i>his ponat</i>	22.20	<i>nominantur]</i> <i>nominentur</i> , corrected by A <sup>2</sup>
17.8	<i>petatis]</i> <i>pietatis</i>		
17.10	<i>humana*nis</i>	22.21	<i>partiens]</i> <i>paciens</i>
18.2	<i>id ad vivum]</i> <i>ad vium</i>	23.1	<i>quomque]</i> <i>quamque</i>    <i>com-</i> <i>moditantes</i>
18.4	<i>naegant</i>		

23.7-9	<i>et quod difficilius dictu est mortui vivunt tantus eos honos memoria de- siderium prosequitur amicorum om.</i>	26.7 26.8	<i>adque recipiendis] reciperan- disque    quod quisque] quoquis vicisimque esset] etē</i>
23.9	<i>beata] beatos</i>	26.10	
23.11	<i>coniunctionem] iuntionem</i>	26.12-13	<i>princeps est ad] princeps et ad</i>
23.12	<i>nec agri (with the other manuscripts)</i>	26.14	<i>iis] his    percipiuntur] perciuntur    saepe] sae</i>
23.14	<i>atque ex discordiis] id et excordis</i>	26.17	<i>id est] id .e.</i>
23.16	<i>civita est</i>	27.2	<i>or[ta] (with -ta con- cealed in the bind- ing)</i>
24.2	<i>carminibus] carnibus</i>	27.6	<i>anima adverti    se natos] enatos</i>
24.8	<i>ecferat</i>	27.7	<i>quodam    eis] heis</i>
24.11	<i>uter Orestes &lt;esset Pyla- des&gt; Orestem se esse diceret] uter Orestes esse diceret</i>	27.8	<i>aearum</i>
24.16	<i>altero] alterum, correc- ted by A<sup>2</sup></i>	27.10	<i>dirimi] dimmi    detesti- bili    [sce]lere (with sce- concealed in the binding)</i>
24.19	<i>dic[ere] (final -ere con- cealed in binding)</i>	27.12	<i>nacti] nati</i>
24.20	<i>iis] his</i>	27.13	<i>in eo] meo    aliquod] aliquid</i>
25.1	<i>Fanius</i>	27.14	<i>virtutis] ***tistis    vide- mur</i>
25.2	<i>saepae    Scaevola in- serted before non, but omitted from 25.4</i>	28.1-2	<i>nihil est enim virtute amabilius om.</i>
25.4	<i>Scaevola om. (see above 25.2)    tum] tam    fani</i>	28.2	<i>adliceat</i>
25.5	<i>hortis] hostis</i>	28.4	<i>quos om.</i>
25.7	<i>Phili] pili</i>	28.5	<i>fabricii .m. curii</i>
25.8	<i>Fannius om.    iustitia</i>	28.7-8	<i>quis autem est qui Tar- quinius Superbum qui Sp. Cassium Sp. Mae- lium non oderit om.</i>
25.10	<i>Scaevola om.</i>	28.9	<i>pyrro.</i>
25.12	<i>coeperit</i>		
26.2	<i>ratione] natraone</i>		
26.6	<i>illud] iilud</i>		