

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Wibier, Matthijs (2019) Orenius / Erennius / Herennius Modestinus in a Lost Manuscript of Isidore: A Reappraisal of the Problem. *Philologus - Zeitschrift für antike Literatur und ihre Rezeption*, 163 (2). ISSN 0031-7985. (In press)

DOI

Link to record in KAR

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/72618/>

Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

Matthijs Wibier

Orenius / Erennius / Herennius Modestinus in a lost manuscript of Isidore: a reappraisal of the problem

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the ascription of a passage in Isidore's *Differentiae* to the jurist Modestinus. A collection of philological notes by Barthius reports the existence of a (now lost) manuscript that credited lemma 1.434 Codoñer to one Orenius, which has ever since usually been emended into Herennius (sc. Modestinus). It is possible to locate this witness in the stemma of the *Differentiae*. Careful study of Barthius' reported readings from the manuscript indicate that it was not only peripheral to the tradition, but it also allows us to point out the (skilful) hand of an editor/interpolator, who may have been responsible for the addition of the name Orenius.

KEYWORDS

Roman jurists, Herennius Modestinus, Isidore of Seville, transmission

The survival of the writings of the Roman jurists is a very complicated affair. In addition to the philological challenges posed by Late Antique collections such as the *Collatio* and Justinian's *Digest*, there are a few very puzzling cases in which a single juristic opinion survives merely because it was added to an individual manuscript some time during the Middle Ages. An example is an otherwise unattested passage from Ulpian's commentary *Ad edictum* in a collection of Christian doctrinal statements in a manuscript now kept at

Paris.¹ Further cases are a fragment ascribed to Papinian in another Parisian manuscript,² and an excerpt from Herennius Modestinus' *Regulae* in the so-called *Codex Pithoeanus*, a now largely lost manuscript of the *Lex Romana Visigothorum*.³ Although it remains obscure how these passages exactly reached later scribes and manuscripts,⁴ it is at least reasonably clear that they were available and marked as juristic around the tenth century. All this has been much less taken for granted for a fragment ascribed to Herennius Modestinus that is known primarily through a report of the German philologist Caspar Barthius (Caspar von Barth, 1587–1658). Barthius claims to have found a reference to Modestinus in a manuscript of Isidore of Seville's *Differentiae* that was in his possession but that has never been seen since.⁵ Barthius' discussion is as follows:⁶

Quod nunc sequitur ad J(uris)C(onsul)tos pertinet, et est insigne fragmentum Herennii Modestini, cuius nos nomen sagaciter odorati sumus, cum ita scriptum cascae literae prae se ferrent. Inter eum qui in insulam relegatus est, et eum qui deportatur magna est differentia, ut ait Orenius; primo, quia relegatum bona sequuntur, nisi fuerint adempta alio modo. Deportatum non sequuntur, nisi palam ei fuerint concessa. Ita sit in relegato mentionem * bonorum, non homini possit deportato noceat. Item distant etiam in loci qualitate, quod cum relegato humanius transigitur, deportatis vero hae solent insulae adsignari, quae asperrimae, quaeque sunt paullo minus summo supplicio comparandae. Haec est Scriptura membranarum; in qua quod mendosum est ita debet reduci in suum ordinem: Ita in relegato si mentio non sit bonorum, homini prosit, deportato noceat. Clara res sic erit.

¹ BnF, latin 12309, fol. 48v. (10th century, France?).

² BnF, latin 4414, fol. 147v. (10th century, Southern France). This passage is often considered spurious. See Krüger (1890) 296–297.

³ See on this Coma Fort (2014) 140–146, esp. 145. The Modestinus fragment survives as a marginal note by Pierre Pithou the Elder in his copy of Sichardus' edition of Alaric's *Breviary*. This copy is kept as BnF, Rés. F 380. From surviving parts of the codex (such as Berlin, Staatsbibliothek-Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 270), it seems to have been produced in the 9th century (France).

⁴ This means that questions about authenticity are not off the table.

⁵ Barthius' mansion, which included a large library, was destroyed by fire and plundering in the 1630s. See Barthius' letter of 1 August 1634, of which a copy is preserved at Hamburg, Staatsbibliothek, Uffenbach-Wolfsche Briefsammlung, 4° LIX, 28.

⁶ Barthius (1624) coll. 1783–1784 (= book 39, chapter 14; identical in the edition of 1648). Brackets indicate my resolution of an abbreviation; I have rendered J as I and left out diacritics; I have kept capitals and the asterisk, which marks a corruption for Barthius. His possession of the manuscript is indicated by the remark *quae apud nos in antiquissima membrana manuscriptae extant* (col. 1782). Regarding *antiquissima*, a possible date is discussed below.

What follows now pertains to the jurists, and it is a remarkable fragment of Herennius Modestinus, whose name we have keenly sniffed out, although the antique script carried it forth written as follows: “Between someone who has been relegated to an island, and someone who is being deported, there is a big difference, as Orenius says; first, because possessions accompany someone who has been relegated, unless they have been taken away in some way. They do not accompany someone who has been deported, unless this has been publicly and expressly allowed. So, if in the case of a relegated person there should be * mention of his goods, it will not be possible for a man [sic], it will harm the deportee. Similarly, there is also a difference in the nature of the location, because, while a relegated person is dealt with more humanely, for deportees on the other hand those islands tend to be assigned that are very inhospitable and are to be put on a footing very slightly below capital punishment”. This is the reading of the parchment leaves; and that which is corrupt in there should be corrected into the right form as follows: So, in the case of a relegated person, if there should be no mention of his possessions, this will be to the person’s advantage, yet it will harm a deportee. The matter will thus be clear.

The passage that Barthius ascribes to his parchment witness corresponds to Isidore’s *Differentiae* 1.434 (200) in the edition of Codoñer. A quick glance at this edition’s apparatus reveals that Barthius’ version has several striking textual variants. The phrase *ut ait Orenius* is arguably the most intriguing one. It functions on the one hand as a source reference in Isidore’s lemma, yet it is clear that this tag is extremely marginal to the textual tradition of the *Differentiae*. Lemma 1.434 (200) occurs in all 16 manuscripts used by Codoñer and should therefore be considered archetypal, but the addition *ut ait Orenius* appears only in Barthius’ mysterious witness. Several questions quickly emerge on this scenario. One of these concerns the value of Barthius’ testimony to begin with. Given that scholars have repeatedly cast doubt on his philological competence and his good intentions,⁷ we might wonder whether there is any way to establish that his manuscript existed in the first place. If this can indeed be done, a next question is whether we can form a more precise impression about the background of this particular witness, its phrase about Orenius, and its possible importance for the text of Isidore. These questions are the subject of this paper and occupy the pages below. Throughout the discussion, I take it as established that the correction of Orenius into Eren(n)ius (hence Herennius) is overwhelmingly plausible; for not only is the name Orenius so far unattested for Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, but shifts between O and E are also paleographically very tiny

⁷ Agnati (2012) 139 has collected some of the most caustic dismissals of Barthius in the scholarship.

steps.⁸ I shall return briefly to the question which Herennius this might be at the end of this paper.

When it comes to the philological aspects of Barthius' fragment, the main questions are as follows. First of all, did Barthius indeed see a manuscript with the name Orenius, or did he make up either the entire manuscript or perhaps simply the Orenius reference, in order to promote a hoax or even a forgery? By way of preliminary remark, we should note that Barthius prints a text with grammatical oddities, and that he proposes a correction of the most problematic one in the lines after the quote. He follows the same procedure in at least seven of the other lemmas from Isidore's *Differentiae* that he includes in his discussion.⁹ This is a first indication that he has given the text that he found in the manuscript without adding (major) corrections of his own. Among the textual oddities that Barthius considers in need of repairing is the reference to Orenius (rather than Erennius, which a forger might have inserted without raising too much suspicion). Be these speculations as they may, the second question is whether it is possible, on the basis of the text Barthius gives, to say anything about the place of this manuscript in the transmission history of Isidore's *Differentiae*. We will see shortly that this is possible with considerable precision. This finding is important for several reasons. On the one hand, the fact that the variants of Barthius' version can be accounted for entirely by the assumptions underlying the stemmatic method indicates strongly that Barthius really saw a manuscript. To put it differently, those who favour the hypothesis of a forgery will need to prove that Barthius, in making his forgery, was largely aware of the stemmatic method, that he used several manuscripts from all over the tradition, and that he had a clear view of the stemma of Isidore's *Differentiae*. While nothing can be proven or disproven conclusively here, the most plausible assumption is that Barthius, two and half centuries before Lachmann, was unaware of how to exploit the stemmatic method for purposes of falsification. The other

⁸ E and O in some Late Antique and Early Medieval scripts, especially in half-uncials, looked very similar, much like Ć and C, respectively. Furthermore, the dropping of initial H is very common too, such as Codex Ermogenianus. An illustration of this is offered at Berlin, Staatsbibliothek-Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 269, fol. 172r (Ermogenianus). Finally, the single n can be easily accounted for by the dropping out of a horizontal bar to indicate a nasal: Creñius.

⁹ Overall, Barthius prints several dozen lemmas from Isidore that he found in his manuscript. In the cases he points to a (perceived) corruption, he proposes corrections in notes that are added after the lemma. Furthermore, he mentions some minor details about oddities in the writing in the codex in at least two cases.

advantage of being able to situate the manuscript with considerable accuracy is that it offers us some basis for discussing when the Orenius reference might have entered Isidore's tradition, and how far we may push back its existence. Let us now turn to the details.

It is fortunate that Barthius' version of the lemma (**Ba**) contains enough textual variation to locate it quite precisely in Codoñer's stemma. Most important here is that **Ba** has several variants in common with the witnesses **ALD**, which form a rather late sub-family in the alphabetical branch of the main stemma (the so-called χ -family).¹⁰ Note in particular the following:

- 2 quod] quia **ALD Ba**
- 4 ut] in **AL Ba**, et **D**
- 5 in sententia] omittunt **AL Ba**, ut **D**
prosit] possit **MALD Ba**
- 7 quidem] omittunt **ALD Ba**

The two shared lacunae are especially meaningful, since they are exceedingly unlikely to be the result of chance. The other cases are less crucial on their own, because it is not impossible that more than one scribe independently (1) resolved a nota such as *q'* into *q(uia)* instead of *q(uod)*; (2) expanded *p̄sit* or *p'sit* into *p(os)sit* rather than *p(ro)sit*; and (3) might have misread *ut* for *in* or *et*. Nonetheless, these three shared variants do have great value in confirming the pattern established by the other cases. This affiliation is, moreover, overwhelmingly supported by collating the thirty odd further excerpts from Isidore that Barthius gives.¹¹

Barthius' witness is thus closely related to **ALD**. An obvious question at this point is whether Barthius or his manuscript copied off one of these manuscripts. Although it is hard to prove definitively, it looks like this is not the case. To begin with, the following few readings indicate that **Ba** is not directly dependent on **A**, **L**, or **D**; in all these case **Ba** preserves the "correct" reading against "corruptions" in the others:

- 3 fuerint] fuerit **MAL**
non] omittit **A**

¹⁰ I add readings of **M** where they coincide with **ALD** for completeness' sake, even though **M** belongs to a very different corner of the stemma. For the sigla and the stemma, see Codoñer (1992) 82–83 and (2005).

¹¹ See the table at the end of this paper.

6 quod] quia **D**, omittit **L**

It needs to be said that some of these cases may be considered “correctible” at first, thus potentially reducing their heuristic value. An obvious counterargument, however, is that in none of the three cases above do the variants in **ALD** create a syntactic tangle or a semantic problem. The balance thus tips slightly in favour of **Ba**’s independence of **ALD**.¹²

Furthermore, there is some evidence, but by no means conclusive evidence, to suggest that **Ba** was not a copy of the latest common ancestor of **ALD**. The most important indications here are two shared “corruptions” in **AL** (and one in **D**), which must have come down to them from a hyparchetype. In both places, **Ba** has the reading of the rest of the manuscript tradition and as such does not seem to depend on that same hyparchetype:

6 relegato] legato **ALD**

9 comparandae] comperende **A**, comperande **L**

The value of these shared variants is once more limited, because I am not persuaded that they are not correctible. That is, it is imaginable that a scribe who found these corruptions was able to guess the correct reading from them. There is thus a slim chance that the scribe of **Ba** was faced with these corruptions and corrected them by himself. This is, however, about the evidence we have. Not fully decisive but worth considering are the following:

3 sententia adempta] adempta sententia **ALD**, adempta **Ba**

8 sunt asperrimae] asperrimae sunt **ALD**, asperrimae **Ba**

It is not clear why **ALD** have inverted the word order in these two places. That they all do so, however, must be due ultimately to a shared source, i.e. some common ancestor. In both cases, it is possible that the scribe of that common ancestor skipped a word (sententia and sunt) and then added it after adempta and asperrimae, respectively, as soon as he noticed his slip. But the fact that **Ba** shows anomalies at precisely these two places as well is suspicious. It is exceedingly hard to believe that the scribe left out a word by coincidence in exactly two places where closely related manuscripts invert the word order (an anomaly but not a “mistake” that would alert or trip up a scribe). Rather, it is much more plausible that a

¹² Collations of the other excerpts seem to be in line with this hypothesis. See the table at the end of this paper.

common ancestor of all these four manuscripts had anomalies or was damaged at both places. While the exact nature of the irregularities must remain unclear, they then passed down in the form of lacunae to **Ba** and as identical corrections to **ALD** through a common ancestor. Note that, while *sunt* may have been guessed by a scribe to complete the sentence, the presence of the “uncorrectible” reading *sententia* shows that both “repairs” in **ALD** are in line with the manuscript tradition. They are no chance “corrections”; but since **Ba** missed out on them, they were probably added after **Ba**’s lineage had branched off.

Finally, while the above already suggests that **Ba** was itself not the common ancestor of **ALD**, this can also be excluded formally. None of **ALD** was a direct copy of **Ba**, nor was their latest common ancestor. The reason is that **Ba** preserves several unique readings where **ALD** have readings in common with the rest of the manuscript tradition, and which they must have received through textual ancestors that were clearly not **Ba**:

- 1 relegatur] relegatus est **Ba**
- 2 *differentia: primo*] *differentia, ut ait Orenius: primo* **Ba**
- 3 deportatum] alio modo deportatum **Ba**
- 5 *haberi*] *homini* **Ba**

In sum, while not every step in the argument above could be supported with truly compelling evidence, there is very good reason to conclude that Barthius’ manuscript of Isidore (1) had an ancestor in common with **ALD** that (2) in turn must be positioned on the line that goes down and left from (b) in Codoñer’s stemma. The date of that ancestor is difficult to establish, but following Codoñer it could be anything between the tenth and the twelfth century. But since her dating of stemmatic nodes is necessarily very approximate, earlier or later dates cannot be excluded. Like this common ancestor, the date of **Ba** itself can also not be established with any precision, since it falls in a window spanning several centuries from the common ancestor to Barthius’ publication. What can be said is that this manuscript had several variants in common with **ALD**, and that it preserved several readings that are unique in the entire manuscript tradition. This includes the phrase *ut ait Orenius*, if we accept, as seems the most plausible scenario, that Barthius did not invent it himself. Its absence in **ALD** does not allow us to conclude that the reference was present in the common ancestor of **ALD** and **Ba**, even though from a stemmatic point of view the odds on the present evidence are one (the consensus of **ALD**) to one (**Ba**). An optimist might therefore hold it for possible that this common ancestor had the *Orenius* reference. Its

absence in **E**, however, indicates that we cannot push the reading further back up the stemma. In stemmatic terms, the phrase must have entered the tradition after node (**b**). In other words, the present evidence leads us to consider the reference a rather late interpolation, and it prevents us from entertaining the idea that it might go back to Isidore's *Differentiae* themselves.

This discussion does not and cannot solve the enigma of the Orenius reference completely. Even if we were in a position to get more certainty about the date of Barthius' source, many of the most interesting questions remain. What, for example, inspired the individual who inserted the phrase to do so? What source did he draw from? Are we indeed dealing with the jurist Herennius Modestinus? And if so, why was he referred to as Erennius rather than Modestinus, the way he was commonly designated in the Roman legal tradition?¹³

Without wanting to engage in wild speculations, I would like to offer the following reflections. One of the other Isidore passages that Barthius includes indicates quite strongly that his manuscript preserved traces of editorial intervention that involved at least one further source. **Ba** (col. 1783) has a lemma featuring the words *ebrius*, *ebriosus*, and *ebriositas*. Apart from being lacunose, the second part of the lemma corresponds quite neatly to the lemma *inter ebrietatem et ebriositatem*, which is found throughout the manuscript tradition and must be considered archetypal. This is 123(183) in Codoñer's edition. The first part in **Ba**, however, mixes this lemma with the spurious lemma 205 (*inter ebrium et ebrosium*) by drawing diction from both.¹⁴ Neither the spurious nor the combined lemma occurs in **ALD PE**, and hence not in node (**b**), according to the apparatus.¹⁵ The first sentence of **Ba**'s lemma is thus probably an interpolation that drew from a manuscript containing the spurious lemma *inter ebrium et ebrosium*, perhaps a manuscript of Isidore quite removed from **ALD** or perhaps a different text altogether. It is possible that the

¹³ On the significance of including a possible juristic lemma in seventh-century Visigothic Spain, see the discussion of Agnati (2012).

¹⁴ Most importantly, *aliquando* appears in the archetypal lemma, while *qui semper* draws from the spurious lemma (followed by *potat* in **Ba**, *multum bibit* in Codoñer's appendix of spurious lemmas)

¹⁵ I have been able to verify this for **A** via digital photos and for **P** through autopsy of the original.

information ut ait Orenius derived from a similar, probably lexicographical source.¹⁶ The scenario of a lexicographical source would also sit well with the reference to Erennius. Since the lemma is written in Latin and concerns a legal distinction, the jurist Herennius Modestinus, who was well known for his *Differentiae*, is the most likely candidate here.¹⁷ But it is very unlikely that an interpolator working in the tenth century (if not later) availed of a copy of Modestinus' *Differentiae* in which he found the source of Isidore's lemma. It is simply very implausible that the survival of that work through and beyond the Carolingian period would not have left more traces. On the other hand, we may imagine a lexicographical collection that included a reference to Erennius. Perhaps the reference at first featured the name Erennius Modestinus,¹⁸ from which a non-legal scribe or compiler eventually removed the redundant cognomen, possibly in the hope of avoiding confusion.¹⁹

¹⁶ Editorial intervention is also visible at **Ba**'s version of 412(242) *inter frameam et macheram*, but in this case it there is not enough evidence to show that the adaptation process involved an additional source rather than simply a process of abridgment.

¹⁷ In the Western Middle Ages known from for example *Collatio* 1.12 and 10.2 (but simply as Modestinus). Because the Early Imperial Herennius Philo of Byblus, author of a *Περὶ διαφορῶν σημασίας*, appears to have written in Greek, he is a less likely candidate. His work survives in a later revision by one Ammonius and is related to several similar epitomes. See Dickey (2007) 94–96.

¹⁸ Needless to say, it is different question whether the source was factually correct in ascribing the lemma to Erennius. This is the subject matter of a forthcoming paper on the lemma by Ulrico Agnati.

¹⁹ Alternatively, one might speculate that a scribe at some point wanted to show off his legal knowledge by crediting a legal lemma to Herennius Modestinus, whose *Differentiae* were a renowned legal work in Late Antiquity. There are, however, serious obstacles to the plausibility of this scenario. First and foremost, knowledge of the name Herennius cannot be explained on the basis of the *Collatio* (or, as far as I am aware, other legal sources with a Western circulation). It rather appears to presuppose Justinian's *Digest*—something that is possible but cannot simply be assumed for the West before the late-eleventh/twelfth century. For this reason, it is extremely intriguing that a ninth-century witness of the *Collatio* survives that has an interfoliated quire carrying the end of Justinian's *Institutes* and the beginning of the *Digest*, and that has been inserted in the middle of the text of the *Collatio* (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek/PKB, lat. fol. 269; from South-Eastern France or Northern Italy). This ms.' fol. 190v preserves *Digest* 1.5.22 from Modestinus' *Responsa* book 12, which opens with the words *Herennius Modestinus respondit*. One might, therefore, speculate that a reader, by simply reading the *Collatio*, encountered the additional information that the *Collatio* itself does not preserve. It goes without saying that this scenario will have to make rather specific (i.e. heavy-handed) assumptions about specific individual scribes and their access to a very specific ms. that found itself in a very specific place (etc.). I am not convinced the present evidence allows us to be sufficiently confident.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Ulrico Agnati, Serena Ammirati, and Marco Fressura for discussing an earlier draft of this paper with me. I am also grateful to the anonymous readers and the editors of *Philologus*. The research for this paper has been supported by the ERC (FP7/2007–2013, nr. 341102, Redhis).

Department of Classics and Archaeological Studies
Cornwallis
University of Kent
Canterbury CT2 7NZ
United Kingdom

m.h.wibier@kent.ac.uk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- U. Agnati, “Un frammento delle *Differentiae* di Modestino nelle *Differentiae* di Isidoro?”, in: G. Bassanelli Sommariva/S. Tarozzi (eds.), *Ravenna Capitale. Uno sguardo ad Occidente. Romani e Goti - Isidoro di Siviglia, Santarcangelo di Romagna 2012*, 129–145.
- C. Barthius, *Adversariorum commentariorum libri LX*, Frankfurt 1624.
- C. Codoñer, *Diferencias 1. / Isidoro de Sevilla ; introducción, edición crítica, traducción y notas*, Paris 1992.
- C. Codoñer, “De *Differentiis* libri duo”, in: P. Chiesa/L. Castaldi (eds.), *La trasmissione dei testi latini del medioevo/Medieval Latin Texts and Their Transmission/Te.Tra 2*, Firenze 2005, 308–312.
- J. M. Coma Fort, *Codex Theodosianus: historia di un texto*, Madrid 2014.
- E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Oxford/New York 2007.

P. Krüger, “Supplementa ad tomum alterum”, in: P. Krüger/Th. Mommsen/W. Studemund (eds.), *Collectio librorum iuris anteiustiniani* 3, Berlin 1890, 283–301.

APPENDIX: collations of Ba's other fragments with Codoñer's apparatus

The order is the order in which Barthius presents these passages (col. 1782–1785)

Ba shares variants, including lacunae, with ALD

232(99).2	conscribere inquit] inquit conscribere EALD Ba
232(99).4-5	adscribere adsignationis] om. ALD Ba
337(109).1	enim] etiam PALD Ba
337(109).3	interim] interdum ALD Ba
361(113).2	post pinguetudinis (pingui est Ba) inseruerunt grassum vero (non AL) furiosum dicimus ALD , grassus furiosus significat, idque antiqui a grassari acceperunt Ba
414(120).1	cassidem] cassidem et classidem (classide A) LD , cassidem et cassidam Ba
62(120).2	sine mente] om. ALD Ba
62(120).4	lira] a lira ALD Ba
62(120).4	est enim] enim est ALD , autem est Ba
306(159).1	in epistola sua Codoñer] in libro epistolarum ALD Ba
306(159).5-6	ut ... admittunt] om. ALD Ba (om. E sed add. in margine)
39(179).1	loquacem] eloquacem LD , eloquacia Ba , eloquentem A
39(179).4	disertum] facundum vel disertum ALD , facundus vel disertus Ba
123(183).5	describeret] conscriberet PEAD Ba
123(183).7	eum fuisse] om. ALD Ba
74(210).2	homo] om. VPEALS Ba
74(210).5	et omnes fere] pene omnes EALD Ba
74(210).5	iocantur] vocantur AL Ba
118(220).2	verum non] falsum EALD Ba
118(220).3	et] om. NALD Ba
118(220).3	supprimis] comprimis ALD Ba
131(218).1	virtutum] virtutis ALD Ba
131(218).3	pro bene parta] pro bono facto ALD Ba
315(235).1, 2	funereum] bis om. ALD Ba
315(235).3	pollutus] inquinatus ALD Ba
262(---).1	forfices et forcipes] forfices forcipes et forcipes PE Ba] forfices forcipes et forcipes ALD
332(270).3	qualitatem] quantitatem AD Ba
194(285).2-3	honustus ... ferat] transposuerunt post lineam 5 ALD Ba
194(285).3	onus ipsum] ipsum onus VEALD Ba
20(290).2	dici iudicium] dici id iudicium ED Ba , dici iudicium id L

ALD and/or LD have variants that Ba does not share

232(99).4	transit] sic A Ba , transcripsit LD
414(120)	corio] sic Ba , corio fit (est L) classis (classidem E) multitudo navium EALD

79(211).2	et ... recedit] om. L
262(---).1	forfices et forcipes] forfices forcipes et forpices PE Ba] forfices forpices et forcipes ALD
20(290).3	iniqua] in qua FV , * qua Ba , numquam AL
440(41).3	et meracam] sic Ba , meracam et AD
440(41).3	merosum] sic Ba , et merosum LD

Ba has unique variants

232(99).3	transferre] quod verbum medicorum est Ba
337(109).3	pulcrum] pultum A , uultum Ba
358(111)	lacunosissimus est Ba
361(113).1-2	crassum corporis est pinguetudinis] crassus est qui corpore pingui est Ba
361 (113).2	nam grassari animi et crudelitatis est] omittere videtur Ba
414(120).1	et galeam] nihil interest Ba
414(120).1-2	cassis ... corio] galea vero cassis est quae de corio fiebat Ba
62(120).3	ita eo] om. Ba
62(120).4	enim] autem Ba (et γ verbis transpositis)
306(159).2-4	binas ... nam] om. Ba
306(159).4	ea] om. Ba
306(159).5	numerus] om. Ba
39(179).1	inter eloquentem et] omittere videtur Ba
39(179).2	eloquentium] eloquaciam Ba
39(179).2	loquacium] loquendi Ba
39(179).3-4	unde ... disertum] eloquax locut. *** eloquens facundus vel disertus Ba
123(183).6	quodam modo] quod eum a modo A , quod eum amo L quod eum a vino D , ipsum Ba
74(210).2	fallatur] fallatur et decipiatur Ba
74(210).3	multa] ulla Ba^{ac} , nulla non Ba^{pc}
117(215).1	videtur distinguere] distinguit Ba
117(215).2-3	multis verbis transpositis Ba
117(215).4-5	et haec ... quae] om. Ba
117(215).6	cum] cum flagiositas Ba
118(220).1	inter falsitatem et mendacium] falsitas et mendacium differunt Ba
131(218).1	quippe] enim Ba
315(235).2	oritur] oritur aut constat Ba
332(270)	lacunosus est Ba
194(285).5	ab honore] ad honorem ALD , ad * horem Ba
54(294).1-2	turpitudinem flagitii] flagitium Ba