

## 2 Philology

### The Editions of Festus

**Summary** 2.1 Introduction. – 2.2 Fulvio Orsini and the Codex Farnesianus. – 2.3 Editorial Evolution of Orsini’s Text. – 2.4 The Literary Fortune of Orsini’s Festus. – 2.5 The Last Renaissance Editions of Festus. – 2.6 Conclusion. – Appendix 1. – Appendix 2.

#### 2.1 Introduction

*De verborum significatione*, which was compiled, edited, and annotated by the Latin grammarian Sextus Pompeius Festus, was considered by Renaissance scholars to be among the most important classical sources. An epitome assembled from Verrius Flaccus’s *De verborum significatu*, it was essential to understand the essence of antiquity and antiquarian learning.<sup>1</sup> This work had been known only through an abridged eighth century version written by the Lombard monk Paulus Diaconus,<sup>2</sup> and was considered a reference for scholars from

---

An earlier version of this chapter was published in *Acta Classica* 59 (2016), 11-22.

**1** Even the titles *De verborum significatione* and *De verborum significatu* appear to be controversial, not only in contemporary scholarship, but also during the Renaissance (see “Appendix 1”).

**2** Claudia Villa proposed that Paul the Deacon was the author of the glosses to Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae* (housed at the Biblioteca Vallicelliana in Rome, codex Vall. A 18), today known as *Scholia Vallicellianae*. Festus featured among the authors used to explain Isidore’s text. See Villa 1984; Lanciotti 2000; Lendinara 2000. Other glossaries that transmit Festus’s excerpts appear in four manuscripts: two housed in the Biblioteca Monastica of Montecassino (Casin. 439, and Casin. 90), and two housed in the Vatican (BAV Vat. Lat. 1469, eleventh century, and BAV Vat. Lat. 3321, ninth century). This latter codex belonged to Panoramita and was later acquired by Fulvio Orsini. See Cavallo 1975; Bassetti 2003, 470; Ammirati 2007, 19-21.

early medieval times<sup>3</sup> until the rediscovery during the mid-fifteenth century of the *Codex Farnesianus* (Neap. IV.A.3), a badly damaged and mutilated manuscript that transmitted Festus's original.<sup>4</sup> This finding set in motion a renewed interest in this ancient author<sup>5</sup> that led to the reconstruction of a full-length version of *De verborum significatione* to restore its spirit, at least in part. This in turn prompted an extraordinarily complex philological effort to collate the material required to re-establish its original form and content.<sup>6</sup>

Significant differences between these two redactions were noticed immediately: in Paul the Deacon's epitome, for example, the original lemmas were reduced and simplified. This was for the purpose of creating a vocabulary of sorts, whereas the *Farnesianus* demonstrated Festus's intention to establish a historical perspective on Latin language and culture.<sup>7</sup> Although Renaissance scholars soon realised that Paul the Deacon's epitome was poorly equipped to provide even a rough outline of the original,<sup>8</sup> the two works were mutually supportive and complementary; with the *Farnesianus* damaged and incomplete, Paul the Deacon's epitome offered, if not a faithful reproduction, at least a stratigraphy of what could have been present in the original. This dual tradition therefore strongly influenced the

<sup>3</sup> Munk Olsen 2009, 237-8.

<sup>4</sup> The rediscovery of this manuscript should be dated to between 1444 and 1457 if it is proven that Lorenzo Valla used it to compose some of his marginal notes on Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*; see Cesarini Martinelli, Perosa 1996, LXVII; Rizzo 1997; Moscardi 2001, XIV-XVI; Ammirati 2007, 23; La Regina 2010, 216; Di Marco 2015, 35-6. Given the rediscovery of a letter by Francesco Barbaro addressed to Bartolomeo Baldana on 16 August 1448, additional assumptions could be made. This short text, which was published recently (Drusi 2016, 34-5), attests the Latin expression *si te censore lustrum (con)deretur*, where the combination of the censor's office and the ritual of *lustrum condere* echoes passages widely seen in Latin literature (Ogilvie 1961), including Festus as transmitted in the *Farnesianus* (Lindsay 1913, 144: *Minuitur populo luctus aedis dedicatione, cum Censores lustrum condiderunt, cum votum publice susceptum solvitur*). The letter was written in Gemona del Friuli, north-eastern Italy, which could be one of the areas in which the *Codex Farnesianus* passed through during its trip from Dalmatia to Rome.

<sup>5</sup> Many were the copies redacted by humanists of the Roman circle: see Bracke 1995, 190-5; Mancini 2007; Ammirati 2007, 22-7; La Regina 2010, 216. Currently, the clearest and most significant contribution to Festus's humanist tradition can be attributed to Alessia Di Marco, who worked on the *stemma codicum* of the apographs of the *Farnesianus* in the late fifteenth century. Since these copies are widely used by scholars to arrange, improve and complete the text transmitted by the antigraph, it is vital that they are studied (Di Marco 2015).

<sup>6</sup> Lindsay 1913, *praef.*; Grafton 1983, 134-6; Glinister 2007.

<sup>7</sup> Cervani 1978; Grafton 1983, 141-2; Ammirati 2007, 16-18.

<sup>8</sup> Paul was often considered to be responsible for the poor treatment of Festus's text (see "Appendix 2").

creation of the Renaissance editions of Festus, which was primarily achieved by merging the two versions.<sup>9</sup>

Some humanistic copies of the *Farnesianus* transmit only the text of Festus's work, e.g. the copy arranged by Angelo Poliziano (BAV Vat. Lat. 3368) and another arranged by Giuliano Ceci,<sup>10</sup> a disciple of Pomponio Leto (BAV Vat. Lat. 1549). However, an early combination of the works of Festus and Paul the Deacon also occurred in the manuscript tradition. For example, the late fifteenth century codex (BAV Vat. Lat. 3369), partially copied by Iohannes Nydenna da Coblenza<sup>11</sup> and later included in Fulvio Orsini's library,<sup>12</sup> features Paul the Deacon's epitome (ff. 1r-97v), followed by Festus's *De verborum significatione* (ff. 99r-157r). The two works are divided by one blank page (ff. 98r-98v), preserving their autonomy and authorial independence, and offer an extremely faithful witness of Festus's work.<sup>13</sup> Nonetheless, this manuscript begins with an index (ff. 1r-24v) by Francesco Buzzacarini,<sup>14</sup> which collects all the items attested in Paul the Deacon's abridgment and Festus's work, along with their page numbers, providing a double numbering system where the lemma was attested in both works. This approach reveals one of the trends that pervaded the entire editorial history of Festus's work: the need to examine both works to understand the nature of their traditions.

This merging process was often carried out indiscriminately, as demonstrated in the manuscript, which is also known as *Liber Achillis Mafaei*<sup>15</sup> (BAV Vat. Lat. 5958). There, the scribe, once again Giuliano Ceci,<sup>16</sup> blended the works of Paul the Deacon and Festus, but preferred to include only the lemmas featured in the *Farnesianus* and its apographs when they also occurred in the epitome.<sup>17</sup> Likewise, an analogous approach can be seen not only in the *princeps* arranged

<sup>9</sup> Sections of the *Codex Farnesianus* were included in some of the early incunabula of the sole abridgement of Paul carried out in the second half of the fifteenth century; there has still been no systematic research conducted on these editions (1471, 1472, 1474, 1475, 1477, 1478).

<sup>10</sup> Mancini 2007, 147 especially fn. 40, where reference is made to Pellegrin 1991 and Bertola 1942.

<sup>11</sup> Active in northern Italy between 1460 and 1484.

<sup>12</sup> At f. 1r a note reads: "Festus Pompeius epitoman et | il fragmento non epitomato | Ful. Urs".

<sup>13</sup> Lanciotti 1989.

<sup>14</sup> Grandi 2019, 34-6.

<sup>15</sup> Agustín 1559, *praef.*

<sup>16</sup> In this case, the epigram to the reader (f. 1v) explicitly mentions the name of the scribe who arranged the copy and dedicated it to Agostino Maffei: "Ad Lectorem C. IVLIANVS Caecius".

<sup>17</sup> Mancini 2007, 147.

by Giovanni Battista Pio and Conagus (1500, and reissued in 1502 and 1510), but also in other editions that followed. This was especially the case for those carried out by Aldo Manuzio (1513) and Jean Petit (1519), in which the contamination of the two authors' works generated a series of particularly compromising interpolations and omissions.<sup>18</sup>

It was only later, around the mid-sixteenth century, that a renewed philological approach was taken to tackling Festus's work, with Antonio Agustín (1559) taking up the challenge.<sup>19</sup> The need to distinguish between the entries, which had overlapped during years of sedimentation, prompted Agustín to find a page layout that would highlight the contribution of each author separately (Verrius, Festus, and Paul the Deacon). This also encouraged him to rethink the order of the work, striking a balance between Paul the Deacon's epitome and the ancient manuscript by adopting the practical solution of setting the lemmas in alphabetical order.<sup>20</sup> This arrangement did not fully respect the disposition of the ancient codex: once again, the original was blended with Paul the Deacon's work. However, this time the definitions were clearly marked with the name of each author in capital letters in the margins [fig. 1].

The impact of Agustín's text was so remarkable that he influenced the entire subsequent editorial tradition. Even his first and most celebrated successor, the French philologist Joseph Justus Scaliger (1575), accepted these editorial criteria without modification, proposing only new *ope ingenii* conjectures in his annotations.<sup>21</sup>

---

**18** Pio 1500 (which was reprinted in Venice in 1502 and in Milan in 1510); Manuzio 1513; Petit 1519. Antonio Agustín was aware that the first editions of Festus were arranged with the same scheme of BAV Vat. Lat. 5958; see Agustín 1559, *praef.*: "Per venerunt ipsae reliquiae libelli ad Aldum Manutium, qui conatus est cum Pauli epitome eas coniungere, et unum corpus ex duplicibus membris conficere. Sed tam multa ommissa sunt, tam multa aliter edita, ut alios emendatores desiderarit. Simili ratione ex utroque libro confectus alter liber extat apud Achillem Mafaeum Bernardini Cardinalis fratrem, qui Aldino locupletior est". See also Grafton 1983, 137.

**19** Agustín 1559 and 1560; see also Ceretti 1952-53; Bracke 1995, 201-3.

**20** Grafton 1983, 143. The intention to arrange Festus's entries in alphabetical order was declared in the title of the French edition (Petit 1519: *Sexti Po[m]pei Festi Fragmenta per Ordinem Alphabeti*) and reaffirmed in the colophon (xl: "Ad Festum alliciat qua te ratione Conagus | Lector adinvenit consilium ipse probes. | Fragmenta apposuit, quae nunc super addita cernes. | Canit et ut coheant, ordine quaeque suo. | Si qua Latina parum fuerint, seu dura fatetur, | Ne depravaret se variasse nihil"), even if it was often neglected.

**21** Scaliger 1575; 1576; see also Grafton 1983, 134-59.

plurimis auctorum exemplis manifestum est. PAVLVS.  
 Nequitum, & nequitur pro non posse dixerunt.  
 Nequitum, & nequitur, pro non posse dicebant, FESTVS.  
 5 Ut Pacuuius cum ait. Sed cum contendi nequitum, ut clam tendenda est plaga. Plautus in Satyrione. Retrahi nequitur, quoquo progressa est semel. & Cato originum libro primo. sana in eo loco compluria fuere. ca  
 10 exangurauit, praeterquam † quod termino † praequã  
 fanum fuit, id nequitum exangurari. V.C.  
 Neruum appellamus etiam ferreum vinculum, quo pedes impediuntur, quanquam Plautus eo etiam ceruices vinciri ait. perfidiose captus, eo aedepol † neruo ceruices probat. † eo epol v. C.  
 15 Neruum appellamus etiam ferreum vinculum, PAVLVS.  
 quo pedes, vel etiam ceruices impediuntur.  
 Nesi pro sine positum. FESTVS.  
 . . . Dianae Auentinen . . .  
 20 Neutiquam . . .  
 . . . cum ait sec . . .  
 . . . lorum aspect . . .  
 . . . neutiquam . . .  
 Neutiquam, pro nullo modo. PAVLVS.  
 25 Nexum est, ut ait Gallus Aelius, quodcumq. FESTVS.  
 per aes & libram geritur, idque necti dicitur. quo in genere sunt haec: testamenti fa- † datio)  
 ctio, nexi danto, † nexi liberanto. \* Nexum \* liberatio)  
 aes

Figure 1 Antonio Agustín, M. Verrii Flacci Quae extant et Sex. Pompei Festi De verborum significatione, lib. XX. In eundem Festum annotations. Index rerum obiter dictarum, Venetiis, apud Ioannem Mariam Bonellum, 1559, p. 201

Indicati duo loci Latinorum auctorum, aliorum industria subtiliter emendati.

## CAP. IX.



**M**AGNUM damnum Latinus sermo fecit, quod libri Sex. Pompeij de significatione verborum, vetustate paene consumpti sunt: diligens enim hic & eruditus grammaticus multa norarat, quae valde pertinerent ad rationem ipsius aperiendam ac veterum consuetudinem tradendam, cum & quae illa summo studio testimoniis optimorum auctorum confirmarat. declarant quanta vilitas inde capi potuerit reliquiae paucae ipsius, quae extant, licet mancae atque interruptae. Huic graui malo remedium, quod potuit adhibuit doctissimus & optimus vir Antonius Augustinus: vt enim vestigia ipsius, quae restant, curauit excudenda, cuiusmodi illa erant, ita locos complures eiusdem supplēuit atque interpretatus est. Cum autem in illis suo loco legatur.

Neuquam

cum ait sec

lorum aspect

neuquam

venit in mentem Riccardo Riccardio, probo & erudito adolescenti, & quem ego propter suauissimos ipsius mores valde diligo, legi debere, quod ad exemplum facit. Sed mihi neuquam cor consentit cum oculorum aspectu: qui versus antiqui tragici, apud eum ab Alcmaeone pronuntiat, legitur nunc in libro de academicis quaestionibus. qui vocatur Lucullus duobus locis, priore integer: posteriore dimidiatus, cum autem id verum omnino putem, volui ipsum in his meis libris memoriae prodere: faueo enim bonis ingenio: ipsaque quacumque ratione possum, orno. Sed redibo ad Augustinum: est ille quidem multo gratioribus litteris instructus: & iis demum omnibus, quae conueniunt personae episcopi, quam sustinet, sed tamen has quoque humaniores litteras enixe adiuit, vt notum omnibus studiosis ipsarum est. Norabo hic ego nunc, quod ille in epistola ad Laelium Taurellum voluit mihi per eum significari. se arbitrari locum hunc Ciceronis e iij. libro de natura deorum. Itaq; & fontis delabrum Marlo ex Corsica dedicauit, mendosum esse: legique debere pro Marlo, Maso vt C. Papirius Maso significetur, qui de Corsis triumphauit: id quod praeter factos capitulos, Plinius & Plutarchus memoriae prodiderunt. Sed hoc etiam cognomen, vnum e multis, fuisse Papiriorum intelligitur indicio Ciceronis, apud quem recte nunc studio meo illud scriptum est, quod ego inueni in optimo illo exemplari, quod secutus sum: prius enim perperam legebatur in excusis, Maso & Massones, cuius tamen lectionis integritatem quidam non videntes, ad vitiosam, quod eos facere non oportebat, redierunt. haec igitur verba ipsius sunt ex epistola ad Paetum: Deinde L. Maso aedilicis. inde multi Masones: quae cuncta sedulo Antonius Augustinus argumenta collegit, vt coniecturam suam confirmaret: & tamen in satis antiquo libro, qui custoditur in diui Marci bibliotheca Marlo scriptum est; quod ego testari volui, non, vt fidem illius emendationis minuerem, sed, vt acumen industriamque correctoris augerem. Sed etiam in nominibus illis fluuioforum, qui infra nominantur, apud eum discrimen nullum est: quae tamen nomina suspecta sunt aliquibus: putanturque mendii aliquid continere.

*Disputatum de dubia & incerta scriptura Ciceroniani loci, in quo agitur de Dionysij Siculi rogo.*

## CAP. X.



**M**AGNUS hic locus e iij. de natura deorum de Dionysio tyranno. Atque in suo lectulo mortuus, in tyrannidis rogam illatus est, non eodem modo in omnibus libris legatur, & non solum excusis, verum etiam calamo exaratis: sunt enim in quibus tympanidis pro tyrannidis scriptum sit, ipse sane olim malui tyrannidis in meis excudi, quia in fideliori exemplari, ita scriptum offendi: idem tamen fateor vidisse me librum litteris Longobardis exaratum, in quo erat tympanidis. Cum igitur de hoc dubij animi forem, & quid quid legerem, quod huc faceret, attente legerem, numquam potui penitus scrupulum hunc ex animo meo euellere. loci etiam, quos speraui hoc declaratos, me fefellerunt. ipsos tamen nunc notabo. Athenaeus igitur in v. libro, vbi disserit de admirabilibus quibusdam fabricis, citat Molchionem quendam, qui collegerat multos maxime laudatos ob constructionem ipsarum aut accuratam descriptionem, in quibus mentionem facit Timaei historici, qui de funere Dionysij, & rogo magnificentissimo, in historia sua locus fuerat. Verba haec ipsius sunt. Τίμαιος δὲ τῷ τῆ περὶ τῆ κατασκευασθῆσαν

Negibundum a-ntiqui pro negantē dixerūt. Cato in  
 ea, quā scripsit . . . . .  
 negibundus . . . . .  
 Neutiquam pronullo modo dici, testis est Cicero  
 cum ait, Sed mihi neutiquam cor consentit, cum oculo-  
 rum aspectu. Idē. Indissolubiles quidē eē nō potestis,  
 neutiquam tamen dissoluemini. Nepos luxuriosusā  
 Tuscis dicitur: nam nepotes sunt luxuriosae vitae  
 homines appellati; quōd non magis his res  
 sua familiaris curae est, quāms quib. pater auuſq.  
 viuunt. quod nomē ductū ab eo, qđ natus post patri  
 sit, quāms fil-ius. Quidam, inter quos Aristar-  
 ch' iter. pres Homeri, Graecū eē volūt, ad qđ  $\delta\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$   
 $\pi\acute{o}\delta\delta\iota\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ , efferunt ex Apollonio. Nephasti  
 dies not-abant. N. littera, qđ nēphas est Praetori  
 apud quem lege agitur, fari tria verba, do, dico  
 addico. Nep. nota designari solent qui nepasti p-  
 riores sunt, q- uorum pars anterior fas: his serui  
 liberati sunt, delectus habentur, exercitus scrib-  
 untur, & in prouin-cias ire licet, sacra quoque  
 instituta fiunt, & vota nuncupata solui,  
 & aedes sacrari, so-lent. Nepa Afrorum lingua  
 fidus, quod dī à nostris c-ancer, velut quidā volūt,  
 scorpios. Plautus in Cassina. Recesim dabo me  
 ad parietem, imita-bor nepam. Nepus, non purus.  
 Neli pro sine positum est in lege dedicationis arae  
 Dianae Auentinen-sis. Nauteam ait Opi-  
 lius Aurelius, herb-am esse granis nigris  
 qua coriarij vtuntur, cuius à nausea duc-  
 tū nomen, quia naus eam fa-cit, pmutationē. T. &  
 s litterarum interme-diam antiquis consuetam.  
 Plautus in Artemone. Vnguentū quod naribus mu-  
 lionum nauteam tecillet . . . . .

P. apud

Figure 2 Piero Vettori, *Petri Victorii Variarum lectionum XIII. noui libri*, Florentiae, excudebant filii Laurentii Torrentini, & Carolus Pettinarius ipsorum socius, 1568, p. 448

Figure 3 Fulvio Orsini, *Sex. Pompei Festi De verborum significatione fragmentum ex vetustissimo exemplari Bibliothecae Farnesianae descriptum*, Florentiae, apud Iunctas, 1582, p. 14

## 2.2 Fulvio Orsini and the Codex Farnesianus

The situation changed only in around 1580 when Fulvio Orsini decided to offer a new edition of Festus's work based exclusively on the *Codex Farnesianus*. Orsini changed the general exegetic perspective, proposing a new analytical method that recovered the centrality of the ancient manuscript conceived as the sole element worthy of attention.<sup>22</sup> He was the first and only editor in the Renaissance that felt the need for an 'autarchic' approach to Festus's work: he considered the *Farnesianus* to be capable of standing alone, without any apparent additions from the medieval tradition. He believed Paul the Deacon's epitome to be not only distant from the spirit of Festus's work, but also superfluous and unable to provide the elements required to understand the textual voids in the *Farnesianus*; and this was because the two versions handed down were incompatible.<sup>23</sup>

Orsini also possessed two apographs of the *Codex Farnesianus*. The first was a copy transcribed by Poliziano (BAV Vat. Lat. 3368),<sup>24</sup> and the second was annotated by Buzzacarini (BAV Vat. Lat. 3369), which also transmitted a fragment of the *Farnesianus* known as the *Schedae laetianae*.<sup>25</sup> He received the former at the end of the 1570s from Piero Vettori.<sup>26</sup> It emerges from a letter sent from Vettori to Orsini dated 15 January 1580 that Orsini had studied this manuscript and found it to be very reliable, even though he was able to use it on-

<sup>22</sup> Nohac 1887, 44-5; La Regina 2010, 218.

<sup>23</sup> This was only the case in theory. All Renaissance editors of Festus relied on Paul the Deacon's epitome to fulfil the lacunas of the text and to imagine the order of the glosses for the missing part of the fragment.

<sup>24</sup> BAV Vat. Lat. 3368, f. 1r: "Festo Pompeio scritto di mano | del Politiano, in papiro in 4° | Ful. Urs"; upon Orsini's acquisition of Poliziano's books, see Nohac 1886, 145-8 (republished with some additions in Nohac 1887, 213-16); Moscadi 1987; Di Marco 2015, 46.

<sup>25</sup> Fulvio Orsini had access to the *pagellae* or *schedae laetianae*, a part of the *Farnesianus* disassembled at the end of the fifteenth century, probably by Pomponio Leto, and later lost; see Poliziano 1489, LXXIII; Bracke 1995, 190-7; Moscadi 2001, XVI-XVII; Orsini was not in possession of the originals, but held a written copy produced by a *doctus chirographus* (learned scribe); see Lindsay 1913, 14; Bracke 1995, 191-3.

<sup>26</sup> Nohac 1889, 34 [XXIV]: "Se V.S. avesse notitia alcuna di certi fogli che hebbe oltre questi Pomponio Leto, dai quali credo haver letto nelle Varie di V.S. che 'l Politiano trasse copia, mi verrebbe a proposito haverne copia, non dico della colonna integra, che questa fu stampata da Aldo insieme con la epitome di Paolo, ma dico della colonna fragmentata, però ne ho voluto fare avvisata la S.V. accioche sapendo dove fosse tal cosa, o havendo in questo proposito cosa alcuna, si contenti di mandarmelo che io la riconoscerò da lei, come da affettionato, et da persona bene merita gia di questo grammatico" (1 December 1579); 35 [XXV]: "Hebbi l'altro giorni li quinterni del Festo, che cominciano dalla lettera P, sicche ci mancano l'M, N, O, che mi sarriano cari, se bene di esse non è copiata se non la colonna integra, et io harrei voluto la colonna fragmentata, per rispetto delle tre ultime carte, che mancano in nostro libro, che credo sieno quelle che hebbe Pomponio Leto" (15 January 1580).



ly on limited occasions.<sup>27</sup> It is also likely that the page layout of Poliziano's copy inspired Fulvio Orsini's idea of textual arrangement. Poliziano had, in fact, prepared this manuscript by maintaining the same page composition as the *Farnesianus*, repeating the same order and scheme, page by page, file by file, and starting with the word (or part thereof) that corresponded to the antigraph.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, Poliziano was the only scholar to register the gaps by extension and not abstractly, matching a measurement in points, since he realised that there was an indivisible link between the text and its support. In line with Poliziano's structure, Orsini faithfully reproduced the *Codex Farnesianus* as the central part of his philological work. Orsini positioned the text of the *Schedae laetianae* separately at the end: he was well aware that, although these pages derived from the lost part of the manuscript, he could not contaminate the original with them.<sup>29</sup>

Having first considered the *Farnesianus* manuscript in its physical layout, Orsini was able to see the full extent of the mutilations, thereby filling the gaps with greater awareness. The results were remarkable. All of the proposals, which had previously only been applied abstractly, sometimes very close to the textual reality, found their precise collocation in the defined space of the new page layout.

**27** In the introduction to his critical edition, Lindsay affirmed that Fulvio Orsini made limited use of Poliziano's apograph due to the difficulty deciphering it (Lindsay 1913, 14: "Ursinus, in cuius bibliothecam eae schedae venerunt, usus est iis, id quod infra demonstrabitur, sed paulo remissus, deterritus, credo, obscuritate scripturae, neque eas nominatim memorat"). Even Piero Vettori, in his *Variae Lectiones*, documented the difficulties he experienced reading Poliziano's calligraphy (Vettori 1568, XVII 2: "manu Politiani cognita. Tanta tamen ille celeritate in scribendo usus fuerat, litterisque adeo minutis, ac saepe etiam per notas totis vocibus indicatis, quod suum propriumque hominis erat, cum huiuscemodi aliquid, quod ipsius tantum usibus serviret, in commentariis adnotaret, ut vix intelligi possint"). However, at least in one case Orsini relied on this codex to arrange his text of Festus; see Nolhac 1889, 35 [XXV]: "Tuttavia ci sarà qualche guadagno, et ho tanto caro haver veduto nel *Tutulum* che 'l Politiano copiasse *forma metali*; nell'antico è *forma etali*, et monsignor. Ant°. Augustino stampò *forma e tali*, et così ritenne il Scaligero. Ma si vede che fu errore et deve leggersi *metali* per il luogo di Varrone, nel vj: *tutulati dicti hi qui in capitb. habere solent ut metali, id tutulus appellatur*. Appresso Tertulliano nel libro de Pallio, dove dice *superque omnes apices ac titulos*, questi fogli, che m'ha mandati, li quali sono della medesima lettera et forma di certi altri quinteri che io ho dove sono notate varie cose del Politiano" (15 January 1580).

**28** Nolhac 1887, 213-16; Moscardi 1987, 261-4.

**29** Orsini 1581: *praef.*: "Ab eo autem paravimus schedas illas, quas a Marullo habuisse dicitur Pomponius Laetus, quod earum archetypum exemplar non extet, et pars altera paginarum, quae margini proximior ab igne mutilate fuit, neglecta ab ijs, qui tunc fragmentum descripserunt, in praesentia desideretur. Quas autem nos edidimus, sunt illae quidem et doctissimi viri exscriptae chirographo, alijs editionibus non modo emendatiores, verum etiam aliquot locis auctiores; ut si qua praeter haec in vulgatis sint, ea plane non esse Festi credendum sit, sed e Pauli epitoma, aut aliunde petita. His omnibus ultimo loco addidimus perbreve quasdam notas earum tantum rerum, quae visae sunt ab alijs praetermissae".

In this light, the textual gaps became opportunities and no longer just empty sections:<sup>30</sup>

curavimus paginas ipsas, eo quo Festus scripsit ordine, numero versuum in singulis pagellis, et litterarum in uno quoque versu, nec aucto, nec diminuto, ita ut sunt in exemplari, qua potuimus diligentia, describendas. Hoc amplius, partem paginarum mutilam, habita spatij, quod supplendum fuit, ratione, infinitis locis refarcimus.

The effectiveness of the method was manifested in the page layout, which was arranged according to: (i) the order in which Festus wrote the text; (ii) the number of lines present in each page; and (iii) the number of letters in each line, neither increasing nor reducing them, keeping them just as they appeared in the manuscript. Thanks to the creation of a measurable spatial reference that could be completed, Orsini was able to amend the corrupted parts of the text and fill in the lacunas. This can be seen from a synoptic comparison of the editions. When comparing the same passages of *De veborum significatione* found in Antonio Agustín's editions against Piero Vettori's philological conjectures and Fulvio Orsini's print [figs 1-3], the evolution of the concept of the lacuna is clearly noticeable in Festus's work. While Agustín and Vettori left gaps in their texts, Orsini's new editorial grid meant he was able to include the supplements almost perfectly. His focus on the page layout allowed him to make philological and ecdotic advancements of great interest. In fact, by identifying the precise length of the lacuna, he formulated his amendments more confidently. This method was anticipated in his introduction, where he declared his intent to facilitate antiquarian scholars' understanding and to offer new textual hypotheses which would allow the lacunas to be interpreted more easily and with greater confidence: "omnes antiquitatis studiosi facilius ea, certiusque essent divinatori".<sup>31</sup>

This new approach prevailed over all the previous philological experiences on Festus's work: the faithfulness to the structure of the archetype ("eadem ratione servata") was precisely what had been missing in its precursors. Moreover, Orsini respected the ancient text by graphically differentiating between what was already contained in the manuscript and what was included in italics by the editor as a distinctive trait ("varijsque characteribus distinctum").<sup>32</sup>

**30** Orsini 1581, *prae*f.

**31** Orsini 1581, *prae*f.

**32** Orsini 1582, *ad lect*.

### 2.3 Editorial Evolution of Orsini's text

Orsini's edition, entitled *Sex. Pompei Festi De verborum significatione fragmentum*, was published three times. Each was issued in consecutive years by three different printers in three different cities: the first in Rome by Giorgio Ferrario in 1581; the second in 1582 by the Giunti in Florence; and the third in Paris in 1583 by Pierre de Saint André. However, the epistolary exchanges between Orsini and Piero Vettori immediately before and after the first print (1579-82) reveal that these publications did not take a linear course. These exchanges bring to light the complexity of the entire dynamic, highlighting how the editorial layout of Orsini's edition of Festus had to be constructed directly in line with his ideas.<sup>33</sup> In fact, in a letter to Vettori dated 1 December 1579, Fulvio Orsini provided the editorial criteria for his edition, which Cardinal Alessandro Farnese wanted published that month.<sup>34</sup> He made particular reference to the method he intended to follow, providing evidence for his choices on the layout of the text on the page, which should have been presented in two columns according to the appearance of the manuscript; and the gaps, which were eliminated to obtain more efficient assumptions.

Shortly afterwards, on 15 January 1580, having received Poliziano's material, Orsini asked Vettori if he could assist him with printing his version of Festus in Florence and act as his intermediary with Giunti's publishing house.<sup>35</sup> In his letter of 3 February 1580, he asked Vettori to supervise the publication directly owing to the difficulty of the text and the complexity of its outcomes. Orsini provided not only written guidelines, but also the sample copies to offer visual parameters on the orthography and page layout.<sup>36</sup>

**33** See the letters in Nohac 1889, XXIV-XXXVI; XXXIX-XL; XLII-XLIII.

**34** Nohac 1889, 34 [XXIV]: "Per ordine del signor Cardinale si stamparà qui fatto Natale, se a Dio piacerà, il fragmento del Festo Pompeio, che altre volte diede fuori Monsignor Ant° Augustino, nel quale libro sarà quello di più, che si stamparà secondo l'ordine che Festo le fece, con spatij giusti di quello che manca a la colonna bruciata, et con have-re li principij di molte parole, che Monsignor Ant° Augustino non intese, et potrà ognuno più sicuramente con questa nuova stampatura supplire li mancamenti, essendo in essa il giusto spatio che manca, il che non essendo nel libro del Monsignor Ant° Augustino ha causato che il Scaligero habbia fatto molti errori, siccome V.S. vedrà benissimo, perché insieme con questo libro, si darà fuori quel supplemento che ho fatto io, che credo haver-ne suppliti molti et con guadagno notabile, per quello che a me pare" (1 December 1579).

**35** Nohac 1889, 36 [XXV]: "Dovendosi ristampare il fragmento che ha il signor Cardinale mio di Festo, che comincia dalla lettera M per quasi tutto il T, col quale si vedono infiniti errori di monsignor Ant° Augustino et infinitissime temerarietà del Scaligero, dicami V.S. se fosse commodità di stamparlo in Firenze. Sono da dieci fogli in ottavo, cioè 8 pagine, et vi sarà guadagno di più di mille luoghi tutti bellissimi; et il signor Cardinale desidera che si stampi come cosa della sua bibliotheca" (15 January 1580).

**36** Nohac 1889, 36-7 [XXVI]: "Io ringratio V.S. dell'ufficio fatto con questi stampatori per conto del Festo, et riconosco tutto questo favore da lei; l'ho detto al signor Car-

Over the following months, the Roman scholar added further details on his Florentine edition and on the delivery of the copies.<sup>37</sup> However, it appears from his letter of 5 July 1580 that an agreement with the Giunti had not yet been reached and that the editorial outcome of the work was still uncertain. Nevertheless Orsini continued to send very precise directives and examples regarding the form of the text, reaffirming his intention to draw a distinction between the original and the philological additions.<sup>38</sup> In the postscript of this letter, Orsini added a further interesting detail: the manuscript he forwarded was written in black and red lettering - black for Festus's text, red for Orsini's supplements.<sup>39</sup> It is unclear if Orsini also intended to apply this same distinction in the print version; it is however likely that the choice to create a two-colour text, with the philological reconstructions in red, could be why he had opted for the Giunti

dinale mio et di più come V.S., per favorirmi maggiormente, pigliarà un poco di briglia ancor lei, accioché venga il libro più corretto, del che S. Signoria Illustrissima n'ha sentito piacere et credo che sarà bene, per sodisfattione del signor Cardinale, si metta nella fronte del libro la clausula *ex bibliotheca Farnesiani Alexandri Cardinalis*, o come parrà a V.S. Io ci farò innanzi una epistola latina diretta a V.S., nella quale le darò conto di questo fatto, et come sia stato necessario stampare questo fragmento come lo sta, et lei lo potrà poi consignare alla stampa. Mandarò fra pochi giorni la copia fatta da giovine assai accurato, nella quale sarà osservata la orthographia del libro, eccetto che dove sono errori manifesti, et prima che io mandi la copia integra, ne mandarò dui o tre fogli, accioché da essi possa far resolutione della forma del libro, et della lettera. Et io per me sono di parere, che si stampi in due colonne per facciata, come sta l'antico, et a questo modo non saranno più di 40 carte in quarto foglio, onde potrà V.S. assicurare li stampatori, che non sieno per perderci secondo me, sendo l'impresa molto nobile" (3 February 1580).

**37** Nolhac 1889, 37-8 [XXVII]: "Come io habbia in ordine la copia di questo libro, nel modo che io me ne soddisfaccia, subito la inviarò a V.S. per riceverne il favore che ne ha promesso di fare in essa" (27 February 1580); 38-9 [XXVIII]: "Io sono intorno a far copiare questo fragmento di Festo in forma che me ne soddisfaccia, et non potrà tardare molti giorni, che io spero di poterglelo mandare; et fra tanto la ringratio della cura che le piace tenere di me et delle cose mie" (16 March 1580).

**38** Nolhac 1889, 39-40 [XXIX]: "Il Cardinale mio è partito questa notte per Caprarola, dove starà questi tre mesi; io sono partito in Roma per le occupationi, et di settimana in settimana mandarò a S.V. li fogli del Festo, quali mi sarria carissimo che si stampassero dalli Giunti, se serà possibile, et se non faccia lei; ben desidero che così metta mano subito, per che io ho promesso al signor Cardinale che glieli mandarò de mano in mano a Caprarola, dove S. Eccellenza Illustrissima desidera di leggerli con otio; et però V.S., per favorirmi maggiormente, li farà cominciare subito, perché io non mancarò per ogni corriere mandargliene otto carte, le quali, se si stamperanno con le due colonne secondo che sta l'antico, saranno 41 carte, et se si stamperanno con una colonna per carta, seranno 82. Sarà sopra tutto d'avvertire, che si riconosca l'antico dal supplemento, sì come si manda nella copia, et in fine si mandarà l'epistola per il principio, et le annotationi brevissime per porle nel fine del libro, nelle quale annotationi si renderà conto de supplementi" (5 July 1580).

**39** Nolhac 1889, 40 [XXIX]: "Mando il principio del Festo, come sta nell'antico a due colonne, nelle quale tutto è supplemento quello che è scritto di lettere roscie, così sarà necessario che nella stampa si distingua l'antico dal moderno; però starò aspettandone qualche mostra, così intorno al figlio come alla lettera" (5 July 1580).

publishing house, which had specialised in this type of printing (consisting of two passages under the press) since the mid-sixteenth century.<sup>40</sup> Moreover, the black and red coloured text provided evidence of his model of reference: considering the antiquarian publications of the Renaissance, only the *Fasti Consulares* appears to have an analogous layout – both in Carlo Sigonio’s edition of 1550, and in the pirated version of Onofrio Panvinio published by Jacopo Strada in 1557.<sup>41</sup> In their editions, Sigonio and Strada adopted a letter-colouring system that used red for the original text of the *Fasti* and black for its reconstructions, which was the opposite of Orsini’s arrangement. In the later Renaissance editions of the *Fasti*, this two-colour printing approach was never repeated and was instead replaced by an easier roman-italic letter-type distinction [figs 4-5].<sup>42</sup>

Orsini not only dictated the publishing criteria, he also sought to verify first-hand how they were applied. However, the distance between Rome and Florence complicated matters. The dialogue between the two cities continued for many months until Orsini became impatient that his orders had not been followed through. On 5 August 1580, he wrote to Vettori protesting about the inadequate graphical outcomes and philological reconstructions of the work.<sup>43</sup> Nonetheless, Orsini continued to send drafts of his work on Festus to Vettori and Giunti throughout 1580,<sup>44</sup> even though his concerns regarding the quality of the publication had grown, mainly owing to the multiplication of errors on the proofs, as evidenced in his letter dated 2 September 1580.<sup>45</sup> His irritation, which manifested itself in sever-

<sup>40</sup> Infelise 2014,135-6.

<sup>41</sup> Sigonio 1550; Strada 1557a.

<sup>42</sup> Sigonio 1555b.

<sup>43</sup> Nolhac 1889, 40-1 [XXX]: “Questi portalettere ci la fanno troppo spesso, et non prima di due giorni fa ho hauto le lettere della settimana passata, et questa fin qui restò senza per diligenza che io habbia usata. Mando quattro fogli del Festo inchiusi in questa lettera, et rimando alli Giunti la mostra della stampa, dalli quali la S.V. si degnerà intendere quanto occorre. Solamente mi resta dirle che, se in qualche modo si può migliorare il riconoscimento dell’antico dal moderno, che si faccia, perché in vero malamente si conosce con queste forme di lettera. Credo che stampare di roscio il supplemento, non convenga nella correzione della stampa; prego V.S. per amor mio voglia fare che si stia avvertito. Il stampare le righe come le stanno, è necessarissimo et bisognerà haver pazienza che si può, dico però l’antico buono” (5 August 1580).

<sup>44</sup> Nolhac 1889, 41 [XXXI]: “Mando a V.S. sei fogli del Festo, et restano cinque solamente, che saranno il fine del libro, non so se li potrò mandare quest’altra settimana, perché il mio scrittore sta male, et io poco bene di questa malattia universale. V.S. fra tanto mi favorisca rivedere li fogli con suo commodo, et emendare tutto quello che le dispiaccia, perché questo è il maggior favore che sia per farmi. Li giunti mi scrissero che non ostante le difficoltà, volevano fra due mesi darmi stampato questo frammento. Penso che non mancaranno, massime sollecitati da V.S.” (16 August 1580).

<sup>45</sup> Nolhac 1889, 41-2 [XXXII]: “Ho veduti correndo questi due fogli, nelli quali sono molti errori, et non hanno osservato li stampatori quello che io scrissi nella mia a lo-

al other letters – especially one dated 17 September 1580, in which Orsini adopted a very harsh tone when asking Vettori to put pressure on the Giunti<sup>46</sup> – was to be the prelude to the inevitable dissolution of his editorial relationship with this printing house, but this would happen only several months later.<sup>47</sup> In fact, at the beginning of 1581, after a period of approximately two years, he decided to break ties with the Giunti and move everything to Rome, where he could supervise the work directly.<sup>48</sup>

ro, che ogni principio di voce si dovesse notare con qualche segno, come dire con la ¶ *Metonymia*, etc. Oltre di questo, quelle congetture che sono notate con la lettera *f*, hora è maiuscula *F* et hora minuscula *f*, et non so perché questa differenza, et quel che più importa, non rispondono; et fanno confusione tutta volta che la parola di dentro non è segnata con la linea sotto, ovvero con un asterisco in fine, come dire *speciosiora\* atque*, etc. nella prima carta. Doveva ancora la prima facciata lasciarsi bianca con lettere solamente SEX. POMPEI. FESTI. DE. VERBORVM. SIGNIFICATIONE. FRAGMENTVM, et così cominciandosi poi dalla facciata seguente, veniva ad apparire come sta l'antico, cioè le due colonne a una veduta. In somma, ci sono molte cose che io mandarò col primo. Fra tanto V.S. sia contenta di far fermare che la stampa non vada più innanzi, che se bisognerà mi consentarò io in questi secondi fogli che se ritireranno contribuire qualche cosa, perché vadino fuori, come si richiede all'honore di V.S. et mio" (2 September 1580).

**46** Nohac 1889, 42-3 [XXXIII]: "Questa settimana non ho lettere di V.S. et intorno al Festo le replico il medesimo, cioè che questo terzo foglio si può comportare, quelli due parmi sono pieni d'errori, sì come V.S. vederà. Io conosco che l'opra è fatigosa et che lei per amor mio ne piglia più briga di quello che doveria, ma l'honor suo et mio richiede che quelli fogli si emendino. Se a lei pare che si seguiti et parte dell'errori si corregghino in fine, parte nelle annotationi, così farò; se anco pare a V.S. che si ristampino quei primi due fogli, mi rimetto medesimamente a lei. Il più dell'errori è nelle margine, dove per non essere segnate le parole di dentro, sopra le quali se fanno le conietture, con la nota *f*, fanno una confusione et obscurità grande, oltre che anco in queste sono de mancamenti non pochi. De gratia V.S., poi che ha fatto tanto per me, pigli questo restante di cura, acciocché le resti maggiormente obligato, et si degni darmi avviso di quello che sarrà consertato con questi signori Giunti" (17 September 1580).

**47** Orsini continued working on the edition of Festus with Vettori during the fall of 1580 and the winter of 1581, as evidenced by at least two letters; see Nohac 1889, 43 [XXXIV]: "Ho veduto per la sua come fra sei giorni erano gli Giunti per repigliare l'opera del Festo, et come V.S. per favorirmi maggiormente la rivedeva, del che la ringratio come devo cordialmente, et piacemi che si levi la congettura *servus*, per che 'l *cervus* è la vera lettione, della quale farò mentione delle annotationi, trovandosi questa scrittura in un Martiale che io ho antichissimo di più de mille anni" (25 November 1580); 44-5 [XXXVI]: "Ho ricevuto due lettere di V.S. con li tre quinterneti del Festo, nel quale riconosco la diligenza et amorevolezza sua, et insieme ancora la fatica che dura nel rivedere et emendare l'originale. Il *vi depugnare* mi piace assai et più che il *valde pugnare*. A 138 starà bene *hostijs furulis*, et così a 139 *ariete nonu*; a 151 doverà scriversi *stillar*, et 153 *in morem*; a 159 *logaturum*, et nel verso seguente *praetextatam*, quali sono errori del scrittore" (16 February 1581).

**48** Nohac 1889, 44 [XXXV]: "Alle due lettere de V.S. che mi sono tate date, l'una da messer Bernardino de Medici, l'altra da messer Jacopo Gherardini, rispondo hora con questa, et le dico come io non saprei mai a bastanza ringratiarla del favore che mi fa in materia del Festo, il quale s'ella vede che non si possa finire, da Giunti, alla fine lasci starlo, che lo farò stampare qua in qualche modo, et se pure ella vede che costà si possa condurre, degnisi di mandarmi quanto prima li fogli stampati oltre li primi tre, acciocché io possa seguitare l'annotationi" (13 January 1581).

VNA CVM ACTIS TRIUMPHORVM.

**CCXC** Q. Fabius . M . F . K . N . Vibulanus . T. Quinctius Capitolin. Barbat. III. L. F. IX.  
 A. Postumius . A . F . P . N . Albus Regillensis . Sp. Furius Medullinus Fufus .  
 P. Scruilius . Sp . F . P . N . Priscus . L. Ebutius Eua .  
 L. Lucretius . T . F . T . N . Triclitinus . Sp. Veturius . Sp . F . P . N . Crassus .  
 L. Lucretius . T . F . T . N . Triclitinus . Cos. De Volscis . Et Aequis . Ann. CCXCI .  
 Sp. Veturius . Sp . F . P . N . Crassus . Cos . Ouans De Volscis . Et Aequis . Ann. CCXCI .  
 P. Volturnus . M . F . M . N . Ananin . Gallus . Ser . Sulpicius . Ser . F . P . N . Camerinus .  
 P. Valerius . P . F . Volusi . N . Poplicola . II . C. Claudius . M . F . Regillens . Sabinus .  
 In Mag. moribus est . In Eius . L . F . E .  
 L. Quinctius . L . F . L . N . Cincinnatus .  
 Q. Fabius . M . F . K . N . Vibulanus . III . L. Cornelius Ser . F . L . N . Maluginensis . L . F . X .  
 Q. Fabius . M . F . K . N . Vibulanus . Cos . III . De Aequis . An. CCXCIII . Non is Mai .  
 L. Cornelius . Ser . F . L . N . Maluginensis Cos . De Volscis Antianb . IV . Id . Mai . CCXCIV .  
 C. Nautius . Sp . F . Sp . N . Rutilius . II . L. Minucius Augurinus .  
 L. Quinctius . L . F . L . N . Cincinnatus . Coactus a Dictatore abdicauit .  
 L. Tarquinius . L . F . Flaccus . Mag . Eq . Rei Ger . Caussa .  
 L. Quinctius . L . F . L . N . Cincinnatus . Dict . De Aequis . Idibus . Septembr . An . CCXCV .  
 C. Horatius . M . F . M . N . Pulvillus . Q. Minucius Augurinus .  
 M. Valerius . M' . F . Volusi . N . Maximus . Sp . Verginius Coelimonatanus .  
 T. Romilius . T . F . T . N . Rocus Vaticanus . C. Veturius Cicurinus .  
**CCC** Sp. Tarpeius . M . F . M . N . Montancanus . A. Aeternus .  
 Sex . Quinctilius . Sex . F . P . N . Varus . P. Horatius Trigeminus .  
 P. Sextus . Q . F . Vibi . N . Capitulinus . T. Menenius . T . F . Agripp . N . Lanatus .  
 Ap. Claudius . Ap . F . M . N . Crassinus . T. Genucius . L . F . L . N . Augurinus .  
 Abdicarunt . Ut Designarentur Legum ferendarum caussa  
 Decemviri Consulars . Qui per . III . Annos sine Coss . Reip . praefuerunt .  
 Ap. Claudius . Ap . F . M . N . Crassinus . P. Postumius . A . F . P . N . Albus . Regillens .  
 T. Genucius . L . F . L . N . Augurinus . Ser . Sulpicius Camerinus .  
 Sp. Veturius . Sp . F . P . N . Crassus . P. Sextus . Q . F . Vibi . N . Capitulinus .  
 C. Iulius . C . F . L . N . Iulus . T. Romilius . T . F . T . N . Vaticanus .  
 A. Manlius . Cn . F . P . N . Vulsus . P. Horatius Trigeminus .  
 Ap. Claudius . Ap . F . M . N . Crassinus . II . Q. Fabius . M . F . K . N . Vibulanus .  
 M. Cornelius . Ser . F . L . N . Maluginens . M'. Robuleius .  
 L. Minucius Augurinus . Q. Poetelius .  
 T. Antonius Merenda . K. Duilius .  
 M. Sergius . Sp. Oppius . Cornicen .  
 Ap. Claudius . Ap . F . M . N . Crassinus . II . Q. Fabius . M . F . K . N . Vibulanus . II .  
 M. Cornelius . Ser . F . L . N . Maluginens . II . M'. Robuleius . II .  
 L. Minucius Augurinus . II . Q. Poetelius . II .  
 T. Antonius Merenda . II . K. Duilius . II .  
 M. Sergius . II . Sp. Oppius . Cornicen . II .  
 Abdicarunt ob libidinem Ap. Claudij . In Eorum locum facti sunt Coss .  
 L. Valerius . P . F . P . N . Poplicola . Potitus . M. Horatius . M . F . M . N . Barbatus .  
 L. Valerius . P . F . P . N . Poplicola . Potit . Cos . De . Aequis . Idibus Sextil . Ann . CCCIV .  
 M. Horatius . M . F . M . N . Barbatus . Cos . De Sabinis . Ann . CCCIV . VII . K . Septembr .  
 Lar Herminius . T. Verginius Coelimonatanus Tricoctus .  
 M. Ceganus . M . F . Macerinus . C. Iulius Iulus .  
 T. Quinctius Capitolin . Barbat . III . Agrippa Furius Medullinus Fufus .  
 M. Genucius . L . F . L . N . Augurinus . P. Curvatus .  
 TRIBVNI MILITVM CONSVLARI POTESTATE .  
 A. Sempronius . A . F . Atratinus . L. Atilius Longus .  
 T. Cloelius Siculus .  
 Vito Fassi Abdicarunt . In Eorum Loc . Fassi sunt Coss .  
 L. Papius Mugillanus . L. Sempronius . A . F . Atratinus .  
**CCCX** M. Ceganus . M . F . Macerinus . II . T. Quinctius Capitolin . Barbat . V .  
 B

Figure 4 Carlo Sigonio, Regum, consulum, dictatorum, ac censorum Romanorum Fasti, vna cum actis triumphorum. A Romulo rege vsque ad Tiberium Caesarem. Carolo Sigonio auctore. Eiusdem In fastos, et acta triumphorum explicationes propediem edentur. Qui liber erit tanquam totius Romanae historiae commentarius, Mutinae, excudebat Antonius Gadaldinus, 1550

VNA CVM ACTIS TRIVMPHIS.

	T. Veturius. T. F. P. N.	Geminus. Cicurin. Cos. Ouans De Volsceis. Et Aequcis.	Ann. CCXCI.////
	P. Voluminus. M. F. M. N.	Amintin. Gallus. Ser. Sulpicius. Ser. F. P. N.	Camerinus.
	P. Valerius. P. F. Volufi. N.	Poplicola. II. C. Claudius. M. F.	Regillus. Sabinus.
	In Mag. mortuus est. In	Eius. L. F. E.	
	L. Quinctius. L. F. L. N.	Cincinnatus.	
	Q. Fabius. M. F. K. N.	Vibulanus. III. L. Cornelius Ser. F. L. N. Maluginensis. Cossus. L. F. X.	
	Q. Fabius. M. F. K. N.	Vibulanus. Cos. I II. De Aequcis.	An. CCXCII III. Nonis Mai.
	L. Cornelius. Ser. F. L. N. Maluginensis. Cossus. Cos. De Volsceis Antiatib. IV. Id. Mai. An. CCXCIV.		
	C. Nautius. Sp. F. Sp. N.	Rutilus. II. L. Minucius.	Augurinus.
		Coactus	abdicauit.
	L. Quinctius. L. F. L. N.	Cincinnatus.	
	L. Tarquinius. L. F.	Flaccus.	Rei Ger. Causa.
	L. Quinctius. L. F. L. N.	Cincinnatus. Diff. De Aequis. Idibus. Septembr.	An. CCXCV.
	C. Horatius. M. F. M. N.	Paluillus. Q. Minucius.	Augurinus.
	M. Valerius. M. F. Volufi. N.	Maximus. Sp. Verginius.	Tricostus.
	T. Romilius. T. F. T. N.	Rocus Vaticanus. C. Veturius.	Cicurinus.
	Sp. Tarpeius. M. F. M. N.	Montanca. A. Aterius.	Fontinalis.
CCC	Sex. Quinctilius. Sex. F. P. N.	In M. M. E. P. Horatius.	Tergeminus.
	P. Sestius. Q. F. Vibi. N.	Capitolinus. T. Menenius. T. F. Agripp. N.	Lanatus.
	Ap. Claudius. Ap. F. M. N.	Crafsinus. T. Genucius. L. F. L. N.	Augurinus.
	Abdicarunt. Ut Designarentur Legum ferendarum causa		
	Decemviri Consulares. Qui per. II. Annos. Reip. praefuerunt.		
	Ap. Claudius. Ap. F. M. N.	Crafsinus. Sp. Postumius. A. F. P. N.	Albus. Regillus.
	T. Genucius. L. F. L. N.	Augurinus. Ser. Sulpicius. Ser. F. P. N.	Camerinus.
	Sp. Veturius. Sp. F. P. N.	Crafsinus. P. Sestius. Q. F. Vibi. N.	Capitolinus.
	C. Iulius. C. F. L. N.	Iulus. T. Romilius. T. F. T. N.	Rocus Vaticanus.
	A. Manlius. Cn. F. P. N.	Vulso. P. Horatius.	Tergeminus.
	Ap. Claudius. Ap. F. M. N.	Crafsinus. I. Q. Fabius. M. F. K. N.	Vibulanus.
	M. Cornelius. Ser. F. L. N.	Maluginensis. M. Rabulcius.	
	L. Minucius.	Augurinus. Q. Poetelius.	
	T. Antonius.	Merenda. K. Duilius.	
	M. Sergius.	Sp. Oppius.	Cornicen.
	Ap. Claudius. Ap. F. M. N.	Crafsinus. III. Q. Fabius. M. F. K. N.	Vibulanus. II.
	M. Cornelius. Ser. F. L. N.	Maluginensis. I. M. Rabulcius.	II.
	L. Minucius.	Augurinus. II. Q. Poetelius.	II.
	T. Antonius.	Merenda. II. K. Duilius.	II.
	M. Sergius.	II. Sp. Oppius.	Cornicen. II.
	Abdicarunt ob libidinem Ap. Claudij. In Eorum locum facti sunt Cos.		
	L. Valerius. P. F. P. N.	Poplicola. Potius. M. Horatius. M. F. M. N.	Barbatus.
	L. Valerius. P. F. P. N.	Poplicola. Potit. Cos. De Aequis. Idibus Sextil. Ann. CCXIV.	
	M. Horatius. M. F. M. N. Barbatus. Cos. De Sabinis.		Ann. CCCIV. VII. K. Septembr.
	Lar. Herminius.	T. Verginius.	Coelmontanus Tricoctus.
	M. Geganius. M. F.	Macerinus. C. Iulius.	Iulus.
	T. Quinctius.	Capitolin. IIII. Agrippa Furius.	Fufus.
	M. Genucius. L. F. L. N.	Augurinus. C. Curtius.	
	A. Sempronius. A. F.	Atratinus.	
	T. Cloelius.	Stenlus. TRIBVNI MILIT. CONS. POTEST.	
	L. Atilius.	Longus.	
	Vitio facti Abdicarunt. In Eorum Loc. Facti Sunt Cos.		
	L. Papirius.	Mugillanus. L. Sempronius. A. F.	Atratinus.
CCCX	M. Geganius. M. F.	Macerinus. II. T. Quinctius.	Capitolin. V.
	M. Geganius. M. F. Macerinus. Cos. De Volsceis.		Ann. CCCX. Nonis Sep temb.
	Censores Primi. L. Papirius.	Mugillanus. L. Sempronius. A. F.	Atratin. L. F. XI.
	M. Fabius. Q. F. M. N.	Vibulanus. Postumus Aebutius.	Elyia Cornicen.
	C. Furius.	Fufus Pacilus. M. Papirius.	Crafsus.
	Proculus Geganius.	Macerinus. L. Menenius. T. F. Agripp. N.	Lanatus.
	T. Quinctius.	Capitolin. Barbat. VI. Agrippa Menenius. T. F. Agripp. N.	Lanatus.
	L. Quinctius. L. F. L. N.	Cincinnatus. II. Diff.	
	C. Serullius. Q. F. C. N.	Axilla. Mag. Eq.	Seditiois Sedandae causa.

Figure 5 Carlo Sigonio, Regum, consulum, dictatorum, ac censorum Romanorum Fasti, vna cum Triumphis actis, a Romulo rege, vsque ad Ti. Caesarem, Carlo Sigonio auctore. Eiusdem De nominibus Romanorum liber. Kalendarium vetus Romanum, è marmore descriptum: & Pauli Manutij De veterum dierum ordine opinio, eiusdemque interpretatio literarum, quae in kalendario non ita faciles ad intelligendum uidebantur, Venetis, apud Paulum Manutium Aldi f., 1555



The decision was made and Fulvio Orsini's first edition of Festus's work was published in Rome in 1581 by Giorgio Ferrario. The key difference was that, instead of creating a red and black coloured text, as initially planned, he used roman-italic lettering to distinguish the original from its reconstructions; furthermore, each page featured one column of the manuscript (and not two as he had originally intended). Orsini also decided to allow the Giunti to publish his work on the proviso that it would be exactly the same as that printed by Ferrario, creating a very curious aspect in the editorial history of Festus's work. Four letters attest to this handover and show the path taken to achieve this result,<sup>49</sup> which included the delivery of a copy of his version of Festus, printed in Rome, as a template for them to use to arrange their own issue.<sup>50</sup>

The outcome of the Florentine edition of 1582 was positive because the text apparently adhered with its Roman counterpart.<sup>51</sup> This is evident from the preface written by the printers, in which the Giunti stated that they had received the fragment of *De verborum significatione* written by the ancient grammarian Pompeius Festus that had recently been printed in Rome: "Pervenit autem in manus nostras nuper Fragmentum Festi Pompei, veteris grammatici, de verborum

**49** Nohac 1889, 48 [XXXVIII]: "Quando la S.V. ha a ordine le sue osservationi sopra il Festo, le mandi che si metterà le mani subito, et questi Giunti l'aspettano con desiderio" (22 April 1581); 48 [XXXIX]: "Circa 'l Festo, io non ho ancor fatto le osservazioni, essendo nella purgatione mia ordinaria, nella quale m'è proibito da medici scrivere o studiare. Disegno intanto farlo stampare qui, perché in quel modo che è stampato costì, non è possibile che s'intenda, et lei lo vederà in faccia, et di mano in mano che si stamparà, mandarò li foglio, acciòché li Giunti possano emendare il suo, et mandarò anco a V.S. le osservazioni, in modo che in un medesimo il libro eschi fuori qua et costà, non volendo che in questa parte li Giunti si .... come nell'altra. So che harrano piacere che per honor mio il libro venghi fuori tale quale deve" (9 May 1581); 48-9 [XL]: "Ho veduto per la di V.S. delli 17 la resolutione de Giunti et piacemi che loro si sieno consentati, perché sarà meglio così. Ho parlato al libraio che vuole stampare qua il Festo, et ha me ne promesso che ci metterà mano quanto prima, et ne darò avviso a V.S. di quello sarà sequito. Circa le annotationi, accetto la commodità che mi offerisce massime in questi caldi et col detto ciò, se io haverò sanità, non mancarò, secondo si stamparanno li fogli, fare le annotationi" (27 June 1581).

**50** Nohac 1889, 50 [XLII]: "Mando a V.S. questi fogli che io me ritrovo del Festo ristampato, quali come che sono fatti per mostra, così sono in cattiva carta, et serviranno alli Junti per finire et correggere il loro in questo, mentre che qua si finisce quest'altro che manca, che doverà essere in questo mese et prima, non mancandovi altro che un foglio. Come sia finito del tutto ne mandarò a V.S. in buona carta, et di mano in mano questo poco restante secondo che si stamparà" (4 January 1582); 51 [XLIII]: "Circa il Festo, li Junti potranno nelle prime due carte del libro stampare la inscriptione o titolo del fragmento, et poi mettere quella prefazione che s'è fatta per avvertimento de lettori, et la potranno mettere come la sta a punto, senz'altro nome; il resto potranno seguire fino al fine come sta, avvertendo di emendare l'errori, coll'avisio di huomo diligente, et porne nel fine un foglio, sicome si farà in questo di qua, che ne anco esso è passato senza errori, con tutta la mia diligenza" (13 January 1582).

**51** In practice, there are many variants if compared with the Roman print.

significatione Romae impressum”.<sup>52</sup> However, no evidence was provided of the continuous exchange of information, the long struggles involved, and the great efforts that led to its publication.

Even the Paris edition of 1583 was presented in accordance with the Roman layout.<sup>53</sup> Finally, a new concept for Festus’s work began to circulate throughout Europe.

## 2.4 The Literary Fortune of Orsini’s Festus

The uniqueness of the edition proposed by Fulvio Orsini meant that it could not escape comment from his contemporary scholars and the public. Above all, it was unlikely to pass unscathed by the two most important former editors, Agustín and Scaliger, who were severe in their criticism of Orsini’s work. In order to better understand the nature of this dispute, it is important firstly to see what Fulvio Orsini wrote in his preface about his predecessors.

The intention behind Orsini’s preface can be understood from two letters sent to Piero Vettori.<sup>54</sup> In the first letter, he stated that he wanted to mention the two former illustrious philologists only once and draw attention to their merits, but also to their mistaken textual vision. Regarding Agustín, he said that his duties as archbishop had influenced the quality and result of his work, which in turn also affected the accuracy of Scaliger’s amendments. In the second letter, following Vettori’s advice, Orsini instead decided to avoid any misunderstanding by not mentioning Scaliger at all.

As already indicated by Pierre de Nolhac, Orsini made no direct reference to Scaliger in his preface, preferring an elegant circumlo-

<sup>52</sup> Orsini 1582, *ad lect.*

<sup>53</sup> Orsini 1583.

<sup>54</sup> Nolhac 1889, 37-8 [XXVII]: “Circa lo Scaligero, io non lo nominarò se non una volta nella prefazione, et all’hora con honore et laude, et così monsignor Antonio Augustino, dicendo in essa prefazione come monsignor Antonio Augustino, come huomo occupato all’hora in altre cose, non diede fuori quel Festo, con tutta quella diligenza che si poteva, et che il Scaligero havendo seguitato quella editione così poco fidele, et nella quale era condiso l’ordine di Festo et non era notato il spatio del mancamento, ha fatto miracoli a supplire così bene molti luoghi, et che si vede chiaramente quanto egli harria fatto meglio, se avesse hauto questa editione che noi hora damo fuori, nella quale però quello che harremo supplito noi nel copiare questo fragmento, non lo diamo fuori perché pensiamo che sieno cose vere et che Festo habbia scritto così, ma per esercitare l’ingegni d’altri, accioché faccino meglio, sì come son certo che faranno. Ecco, signor mio, quale io dirò di questi dui huomini; nelle annotationi io non li nominarò mai, ma renderò conto del fatto mio. Quelli che poi, conferiranno il Festo di monsignor Antonio Augustino et del Scaligero con questo nostro fragmento, conosceranno essi la differenza, et questo bastami” (27 February 1580); 45-6 [XXXVII]: “Circa poi quello che V.S. desidera, per rispetto del Scaligero, cioè de non essere nominato, si farà; ne anco io voglio nominare quell’huomo se non in bene, che non ho mai fatto professio di dire mala” (3 March 1581).

cution that would leave him anonymous (“doctissimi viri”).<sup>55</sup> In this way, Orsini ended up blaming only Agustín for having created an erroneous tradition. In fact, the Spanish archbishop was pointedly referred to negatively in Orsini’s publication. The reasoning was that his other commitments meant that he had neglected many aspects of the *Codex Farnesianus* which were worthy of additional investigation.<sup>56</sup> This carelessness was more precisely attributed to the fact that his duties had detracted from the reliability of his entire work, from conception to publication, which inevitably caused a negative reaction on his part.

Therefore, in a letter dated 8 March 1582, Antonio Agustín wrote to Fulvio Orsini in very harsh tones, criticising every aspect of his work:<sup>57</sup> he attacked him for his innovations, from the textual arrange-

**55** Orsini 1581, *praef.*: “Quam quidem editionem doctissimi viri postea secuti, tam multa in ea restituerunt; ut ex ijs, quae Lutetiae vulgarunt, intelligi facile possit, quid facturi fuissent, si emendatiorem codicem nacti essent”.

**56** Orsini 1581, *praef.*: “Vigesimus agitur annus, ex quo Antonius Augustinus Archiepiscopus Tarraconensis, Festi fragmentum, quod maiorum memoria ex Illyrico advectum in bibliotheca Farnesiana servatur, multo quam alij diligentius cum vulgatis contulit, et primus partem alteram eius libri mutilam exscripsit, commentariisque a se illustratam edidit Venetijs opera Caroli Sigonij. Sed ut tunc erat Romae stilibus iudicandis XIIIVIR, alijsque gravioribus curis impeditus, nonnulla clarissimo ciro, deque litte-ris optime merito, in eis schedis describendis exciderunt”.

**57** Carbonell 1991, 630-1: “Colla lettera delli XXVII di Genaro et con il fragmento di Festo (et perché non li fragmenti?) mi sono rallegrato multo ricordandomi di quel bel tempo quando si fece quel libro che V.S. chiama mio per darmi le sferzate colli vostri schogli o schedie, et pur il libro fu sempre vostro, et sarà al vostro dispeto. Et tanto più hora che lo tratate così come cosa vostra, non come fa il Turnebo, et il Scaligero, il quale Scaligero anchora nella seconda editione muta più cose dette male nella prima che non fa contra il nostro Festo. Et così vedo che V.S. anchora ha fatto stampando in Firenze altrimenti che in Roma. Et per dirvi il vero carissimo M. Fulvio parmi un chaos antiquo al quale riducete questo nostro Festo come fanno i philosophi que cercando le prime cause et origine di tutte le cose vengono alla materia prima et al nulla, et alli atomi et altre baie et a cognoscere *nihil se scire*. Che volete far di lambicarvi il cervello sopra le lettere che manchano in Festo? Che se indovinate quatro, ditte cento false? Meglio fece quel Paulo abbreviatore che copiò quelle che intese solamente, et alcuna che intese alla roversa, et pur il suo libro è più bello, più intero, più utile del vostro. Che capriccio fu il vostro a nominarmi parlando della parola *supernatus* dicendo che non sapete per che io dissi che il Politiano scrisse *expernata*, et così fu ripreso dal Marullo. Non posso darvi altra ragione se non la stampa del Gryphio delle opere del Politiano che così sta due volte et le parolle del Mureto sopra Catullo dove recita li versi del Marullo, benché esso Mureto dubita se Politiano scrisse *expernata* overo *supernata*. Se havete il originale della centuria del Politiano potreste allegarla nella terza editione del vostro Festo et non parlar delli amici a quel modo” (8 March 1582). Beyond the general concerns regarding Orsini’s work on Festus, Agustín appears to be disappointed by the way Orsini treated him, commenting the issue of the word *supernati* (Lindsay 1913, 396-7) and to a related emendation on Catullus. Orsini, in his edition, disclaimed Agustín’s critique of Poliziano’s conjecture on the Catullian verse (Catull. *carm.* 17.14: in fossa Liguri iacet supernata securi); see Agustín 1559, *Annotations*: “*Supernati*) Praeter Pauli epitomen referebat Festus Catulli versum ad Coloniam, ut Politianus olim animadvertit. Sed in duobus verbis ut arbitror, aliter scripsit Festus, atque hodie librarij edere soliti sunt. In fossa Ligari iacet supernata secure. Politianus expernata

ment to the printing layout, and for having relieved himself of responsibility for his conjectures. Agustín then attempted to free himself from the charge of having deceived Scaliger, affirming that Scaliger himself had been responsible for the errors he had identified. Finally, the Spanish bishop, demonstrating that he had not understood the spirit inspired Orsini's philological choices, questioned the appropriateness of his work, which was considered inferior even to that of Paulus Diaconus. By using the words 'complete' (intero) and 'useful' (utile), Agustín expertly explained the general perspective held by Renaissance antiquarian scholars on the role of Festus's work, where the quality of an edition of the Latin grammarian was measured on the basis of its 'usability' for potential readers.

Scaliger expressed his reactions in two letters dated 21 June 1582: the first was addressed to Pierre Pithou,<sup>58</sup> in which he stated that Orsini's version of Festus had not brought any new corrections to his previous version; in the second, which was addressed to Claude Dupuy, he affirmed that many of the corrections proposed as new had

---

maluit, quod Marullus irrisit: alij separata scripserunt. Pro Ligari autem Liguri, et Ligaris alij immutarunt. Nos quid opinamur Festum scripsisse tradere contenti sumus. Contentiones grammaticis relinquamus. Est etiam adamas supernas scriptum in Augusti ad Maecenatem epistula apud Macrobi. Lib. II Saturn. Orsini formulated his critique in Orsini 1581, *Notae*: "*Supernata*] Politianus in Miscellaneis cap. LXXIII Festi scripturam agnoscit, et supernata excipit, ut mirer Antonium Augustinus scripsisse, Politianum a Marullo irrisum, quod expnata, pro supernata apud Catullum reponerit". In fact, the position held by Poliziano in the first edition of his *Miscellany* coincides with Orsini's annotations, Poliziano 1489, LXXIII: "Vocabulum quod est expnata Catullianis videri exemplaribus reponendum. [...] Ex lectione igitur ea suspicatus utique sum: verbum me Catullianus: quasi postliminio in suas sedes revocaturum: Si quidem ubi exponitur in hoc compediario vocabulum supernati [...] In fossa Liguri iacet separata securi. Nam ut de carminis residuo nihil mihi arroget temere: videbar sane tum syllabatim quaeque olfactans: et pro explorato afferre posse, supernata legendum in eo non separata". However, according to the letter, it's clear that Agustín was not citing directly from this edition, but from the later one published in Lyon, where Poliziano's reading overlapped with the one he gave in his Festus; see Poliziano 1533, LXXIII: "Nam ut de carminis residuo nihil mihi arroget temere: videbar sane tum syllabatim quaeque olfactans: et pro explorato afferre posse, expnata legendum in eo non separata". The reference to Marullus appeared in the edition of Catullus carried out by Muret, which Agustín mentioned in the letter, but not in his edition of Festus, creating the misunderstanding; see Muret 1558, 28: "*Separata*] Excisa. Politianus legebat expnata, aut, quod magis suspicor, supernata, ut esset metaphora ducta ab ijs, quibus, in morem pernarum suillarum, femina excise sunt. Marullus autem, qui quasi dedita opera, omnes Politiani emendationes irridebat, hanc exagitavit hoc epigrammate: Quid separatam, insane, supernas, roge, | Alnum Catulli nobilem? | Plebi ociose scilicet risum parans | oblitus, ut soles, pedis [Marullus 1497, III 89 (*De Economus*)]. Non putavit igitur Marullus, in hoc versu, quarto loco spondaem recepi posse, in quo falsus est, ut infra docebimus. Usitata tamen lectionem sequendam puto".

**58** Botley, Van Miert 2012, 1.336-7: "Je pense qu'aies veu le Festus de Fulvius Ursinus qui n'est pas fort different du nostre quant aux corrections" (21 June 1582).

been fully drawn from his edition, even though they had not been attributed to him.<sup>59</sup>

These reactions reveal a peculiar perspective on the debate over this edition of Festus's work, even beyond the rhetoric of invective; it is clear that the innovations carried out by Orsini in his work were not really accepted. Agustín and Scaliger, in fact, remained tied to their specific points of view: the Spaniard had focused on organising a text he perceived to be chaotic; the Frenchman, instead, had been attracted mainly by the nature of the textual emendations, of which he partially claimed paternity. Nevertheless, both scholars were unable to see that the layout of the text could provide a new antiquarian perspective on it and, at the same time, breathe new life into a philological work which had until then been relegated to the endnotes.

## 2.5 The Last Renaissance Editions of Festus

Upon the publication of Orsini's Paris edition in 1583, an interesting phenomenon occurred regarding the literary fortune of the text and its analysis: a new crop of publications on Festus's work flourished. In fact, the new editions of Festus's work combined the contributions of all three humanists (Agustín, Scaliger, and Orsini), since they had been considered almost immediately part of the same editorial history.

In 1584, Festus was reissued by two editors, Jerome de Marnef and Arnault Sittart, in Paris.<sup>60</sup> In his preface, Sittart outlined the need to assemble all of the philological experiences that had occurred until that time regarding the text itself and the comments of the three exegetes (Agustín, Scaliger, and Orsini). This was done in order to give the readers a comprehensive overview of the studies undertaken. This procedure was justified by the fact that all three editions had their merits and had perhaps only developed through their synthesis. The structure of Agustín's work rendered the text legible, and the works of Festus and Paul could be identified and coexist easily; a positive aspect to the work carried out by Scaliger was that he made various qualitative philological castigations; Orsini, on the other hand, ensured that the various conjectures found a real collocation in the body of the text.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>59</sup> Botley, Van Miert 2012, 1.338-40: "C'est toujours le mien, sauf quelque peu de ses devinations, lesquelles il a entremeslé parmi les miennes, pour deguiser mon labeur et se l'attribuer. Aux annotations, il y a fait de mesmes" (21 June 1582).

<sup>60</sup> Sittart 1584; Marnef 1584; Sittart's editorial layout was used and re-proposed in Festus's last edition of the sixteenth century; Saint André 1593.

<sup>61</sup> Sittart 1584, *praef.*: "Antonius Augustinus Hispani generis doctissimus, qui tum litibus iudicandis Romae dabat operam, post Episcopus Allifanus, deinde Hilerdensis,

legi pecuniam, cuius respectu & nimia cupiditate homines ad peccandum adduci.

Nequam aurum est, auris quoduis vehementius ambit. PAVLVVS.

5 Hoc versu Lucilius significare videtur, nequam esse aurum, quod aures lædat, vel pondere in aurum cum molissima pars auris inciditur. vel etiam cupiditatem pecuniarum voluit significare.

Nequam, qui ne tanti quidem est, quam quod habetur minimi.

10 Nequeunt \* non eunt.

\* Nequiunt

Nequinates, Narnienses.

vel Nequunt

Nequinates Narnienses dicti sunt, qui è nequino oppido eius colonis veteri. b. ibi habitauerunt Cato in ea aduersus PAVLVVS.

15 x. hominibus

FESTVS.

Nequinont pro nequeunt, vt solinunt, ferinunt pro solēt, & feriunt dicebant antiqui. Lilius in Odyssia: Partim errant, neque nunc Græciam redire (nequinont.)

Nequinont, nequeunt.

PAVLVS.

Nequirquam, frustra.

20 Nequirquam significari idem, quod frustra, plurimis auctorum exemplis manifestum est.

FESTVS.

Nequitum, & nequitur pro non posse dixerunt.

PAVLVS.

Nequitum, & nequitur, pro non posse dicebant, vt Pacuvius cum ait: Sed, cum contendi nequitum, vt clam

FESTVS.

25 tendenda est plaga. Plautus in Satyrione: Retrahi nequitur, quoquo progressa est semel. & Cato Originum libro primo: Fana in eo loco compluria fuere. ea exauguravit, præterquam \* quod termino fanum fuit, id nequitum exaugurati.

\* præquã v.c.

30 Neruum appellamus etiam ferreum vinculū, quo pedes impediuntur, quāquam Plautus eo etiam ceruices vinciti ait: Perfidiose captus, eo ædepol \* neruo ceruices probat.

\* eo epol. v.c.

PAVLVS.

Neruum appellamus etiam ferreum vinculum, quo pedes, vel etiam ceruices impediuntur.

FESTVS.

35 Nesi pro sine positum est in lege dedicationis aræ Dianæ Auentinensis.

Neutiquam pro nullo modo dici testis est cum ait; sed mihi neutiquam cor consentit, cum oculorum aspectu Cice. indissolubiles quidā esse non potestis, neutiquā tamē dissoluentini.

Figure 6 Arnault Sittart, M. Verrii Flacci Quæ extant. Et Sex. Pompei Festi De verborum significatione, libri XX. Cum vetusto Bibliothecæ Farnesianæ exemplari Romæ nuper edito, collati: ex quo lacunæ pene omnes sunt suppletæ. In eos libros Ant. Augustini annotationes, ex editione Veneta, Ios. Scaligeri Castigationes recognitæ, ex Parisiensi, Ful. Vrsini notæ, ex Romana. Accesserunt nunc denique doctissimorum virorum notæ ex eorum scriptis hinc inde collectæ, Parisiis, apud Arnoldum Sittart, sub scuto Coloniensis monte diui Hilarij, 1584, p. 121

Figure 7 Denis Godefroy, Auctores Latinae linguae in vnum redacti corpus. M. Terentius Varro De lingua Latina. M. Verrii Flacci fragmenta. Festi fragmenta a Fulvio Vrsino edita. Schedae Festi a Pomp. Laeto relictæ. Sext. Pomp. Festus, Paulo diacono coniunctus. Nonius Marcellus. Fulgentius Plantiades. Isidori Originum libri XX. Notae Dionysii Gothofredi J.C. ad Varronem, Festum & Nonium. Variæ lectiones in Fulgentium et Isidorum. Index generalis in omnes superiores auctores, Geneva, apud Guilielmum Leimarium, 1585, coll. 127-128

pro solent, & ferunt dicebant antiqui. Livi in Odissia partem errant, neq. nunc i Graeciam redire. ¶ Nequitium & nequum, p. nō posse dicebat, vt Pacuius cū ait. Sed cū contendi nequitū, vt a clā tendenda est plaga. Plautus in Sartyrone. retrahi nequit, quoquo progressa est semel. & Cato Originum L. I. Fana in eo loco complura fuere: ea exaugurauit, praterquā quod Terminum sanum fuit, id nequitum exaugurari. ¶ Nequiquam significare [i. Opilius. 2. Nequimont. 3. tum]

pag. 13

idem p. frustra, plurimis auctorū exemplis manifestum est. ¶ Nectere, ligare significat, & est apud plurimos auctores frequēs, quod etiam in cōmentario sacrorum vsurpatur hoc modo. Pontifex minor ex stramentis naturas nectit, id est, funiculos facito, quib. sues adnectantur. ¶ Nectar Graece significat decorum potionem. Vnde Vergilius ait. Stipant & dulci distendunt nectare cellas, item Lucretius L. II. Et nardi florem, nectar qui florib. halet. ¶ Non pridē, aeque, & recte, & frequenter dicit, ac iam pridem, quam pridē. ¶ Neq. aurū est, auris quod vis vehementius ambit, hoc versu Lucilli significari ait Sinius Capito, nequam esse aurum q. auris laedat, vel pondere inaurium, cum mollissima pars auris inciditur, vel ex auro intelligi pecuniam, cuius respectu, & nimia cupiditate homines ad peccandum adduci. ¶ Nec mulieri, nec gremio credi oportere: prouerbum est, q. & illa incerti & leuis animi est, & plerumq. in gremio posita, cum in obliuionem venerit pro 3. exlurgentium, procidit. ¶ Nexū est, vt ait Gallus Aelius, quodcumq. p. aes & librā geritur, idq. necti dī. quo in genere sunt haec, testamenti factio, nexi dando 4. nexi liberantio 5. ¶ Neruū appellamus etiam ferreum vinculum, quo pedes impediunt. perquam Plautus eo etiam ceruices vinciri ait. perfidiose captus eo epol 6. nemo ceruices pro bar. ¶ Nexū aes, apud antiquos dicebatur pecunia, quae per nexū obligat. ¶ Negumate in carmine c. n. Marci uatis, significat, negate: cū ait. quamuis momentum duonum negumate. ¶ Negritu in auguriis significat aegritudo. ¶ Nebulo dictus est, vt ait Aelius Stilo, qui non pluris est, q. nebula, aut q. non facile peripici possit, qualis fit, nequam, nugator.

[i. napuras. 2. narib. 3. properce. 4. datio. 5. liberatio. 6. aed. pol.]

pag. 14

¶ Negibundum a - utique pro negante dixerunt. Cato in ea, quā scripsit negibundus. ¶ Neutiquam pro nullo modo dicit, testis est cum ait. Sed mihi neutiquam cor consentit, cum oculorum aspectu. Cice. Indissolubiles quidem esse non potestis, neutiquam tamen dissoluentini. ¶ Nepos luxuriosus a Tuscis dicitur: nam nepotes sunt luxuriosae uitae homines appellati: quod non magis his res sua familiaris curae est, quam iis, quib. pater auisq. viuūt. quod nomen ductum ab eo, quod natus post patris sit, quam filius. Quidam inter quos Aristarchus iter p. res Homeris, Graeci et volumt, ad quod caeteri

vis edierit troicus, afferunt ex Apollonio. ¶ Nephasti dies not. abatur. N. littera quod iis nephastis Praetori apud quem lege agitur, factoria verba, do, dico, addico. ¶ Nep. nota designari solent qui nephastiores sunt, q. uorum pars anterior fas: his seruū liberati sunt, delectus habentur, exercitus scribuntur, & in prouincias ire licet, sacra quoque instituta sunt, & nota nuncupata solui, & aedes sacrari, solent. ¶ Nepa Afrorum lingua fidus, q. dicitur a nostris c. ancer, vel ut quidā volunt, scorpis. Plautus in Casina. Recesim dabo me ad parietem, imita bor nepam. ¶ Nepus, non purus. ¶ Nesi pro sine positum est in lege dedicationis arae Dianae Auentinae. ¶ Nauteam ait Opilius Aurelius, herb. ae genus esse granis nigris, qua coriarij vtuntur, cuius uideri a nausea ductum nomen, quia nausea facit, permutatione T. & S. litterarum intermed. dia antiquis consueta.

10

20

apud.

pag. 15

lem atq. aromatum. Idem Curculione. Nam odor vnguentum omnium praetuo nautea est. In Casina. ei pro scorto supponetur hircus unctus nautea. Labeo in commentario iuris pontificij ait, nauream rubidum quiddam esse, quo Pontificum vestimenta quaedam colorant. Nationem, item apud antiquos natum. Cincius genus hominum, qui non aliunde uenerunt, sed ibi nati sunt, significare ait. qui & nationem ait non tantum uniuersim de omnibus, sed et de singularibus quoque hominibus seu iunctim dici solere. Sinius autem Capito, omnia ferre genera hominum per nationes diuidi, vt Curces Sabinos Hernicos, Aequos, item Volcos. In pecoriū, quoq. bonus pronentus futurae bona natio dicitur. ¶ Nauitiorum familia a Troianis oriunda est: nam fuit eorum princeps Nauetes, qui Romam deuulit simulacrum aeneum miuerna, cui postea Nauis sacris ficare soliti sunt. Vnde ipsa quoq. dea Nauitia uocabatur de causa. Alij quod duce Nauete acciti conductiq. a Brutis milites fuerint ad Messanam oppugnandam, contra quos a senatu sit missus L. Caecilius Metellus: qui cum ab illis interfectus esset, missi ad eos fuerunt expostulatum de foedere violato legati. us, P. Veturius, qui cum aliquis esset, ob refectionem corporis in oppido quodam infedissent, Brutij quibus foedus tunc Romanis erat, bello statim eo distiterunt: inde a principe Nauete, familia Nauitia appellata est. ¶ Natinatio dicebatur negotiatio: & ¶ Natinatores ex eo, scditiosi, negotia gerentes, M. Cato in

30

40

50

[i. sed. 2. hac. trium enim litterarum spatium in exemplari relicum est.]

pag. 16

60 truriam, Samnites, Lucanos, inter se natinari, atq. factio.

The most striking innovation is that Sittart's edition of Festus's work incorporated the conjectures proposed in Orsini's text with Agustín's page layout ("et ex Fulvij libro lacunas suppleri curavimus"),<sup>62</sup> filling the gaps, but losing the overall causes that had determined Orsini's original formulation. The roman-italics format utilised to draw a distinction between the ancient and modern texts was also taken from Orsini's edition. Therefore, it is clear that his choices had been followed, but simplified, readapted, and applied to a system that was not particularly suitable [fig. 6].

The last version of Festus to be defined as a 'Renaissance edition' was edited by the French jurist Denis Godefroy and published in Geneva in 1585 in a compilation of Latin grammarians entitled *Auctores Latinae Linguae in unum redacti corpus*.<sup>63</sup> Godefroy chose to republish Orsini's edition with a two-column layout divided by graphical signs. In order to maintain the structure of the *Farnesianus*, as handed down in the prints of the 1580s, he adopted the expediency

---

nunc summis suis in orbem terrarum meritis Tarraconensis pontifex fragmentum Festi, quod mutilum et sine capite ex Illyrico in bibliothecam Farnesianam apportatum fuerat, cum raris suis notis publicasset. Ex quo tempore viri docti per Italiam et Gallias fragmentum coniecturis et opinionibus, quando veribus libris deficiebantur, passim adiuvare et illud melius, quod in ijs erat, conari reddere non destiterunt, easque coniecturas. Varijs, Novis et Antiquis lectionibus, Adversarijs, Miscellaneis, aliisque id genus libris passim inserverunt, donec superioribus annis doctissimus Ios. Scaliger, Augustini vestigijs inhaerens, eundem scriptorem sibi edendum eruditisque castigationibus et annotationibus illustrandum esse existimavit: et defectus plurimos divini ingenij adminiculo feliciter supplere tentavit. Quo certes magno magni viri labore non parum sese adiutos esse, qui eidem post scriptori manus admoverunt, illi ipsi non inviti fatebuntur. Postremo Fulvius Ursinus, qui eruditione an humanitate et prompta rem litterariam iuvandi voluntate maior sit incertum est, cum Augustinum, vel operarum negligentia vel prae negotiorum multitudine, Farnesiani notas et apices codicis, non satis exacte videret expressisse, idem negotium denuo voluit agere librumque diligenter cum autographo collatum variisque et eruditis notis exornatum non ita pridem Romae in vulgus emisit". The role of each editor is also expressed in the dedicatory poem; see Sittart 1584, *Epigramma*: "Augustinus erat Neptunus, namque tabellas | Naufragio eripuit, quas superasse vides | Squallentes mendis, multoque errore scatenates | Seminecesque, deus ni ferat alter opem. | Scaliger ille deus, qui multa emendat et auget, | qui postliminij repetens redivivus honores | Urbis et antiquae pristina iura suae, | vindicias cuncti potius tribuere Minervae | Scaligeri, ut nomen debeat ille dare. | Romanus quamvis donarit Fulvius urbe | Orbeque Romano, municipiumque loco. | Cernere si quis avet, iam iam quid quisque laboris | Praestiterit, vel qua symbola cuique data est | Ut videat quisnam melius mereatur, et a quo | Impositum potius nomen et omen eat, | Tres simul atque semel codex hic continet unus, | Et facta haec ratis est, pluribus e tabulis".

**62** Sittart 1584, *praef.*: "Igitur Venetam Augustini editionem cum fide repraesentavimus, neque Antonij annotationes praetermisimus. Quin et Scaligeri castigationes ijs adiunximus, et ex Fulvij libro lacunas suppleri curavimus, illiusque notas alijs appendimus. Ne vero, nihil a nobis praecipuum (lector) haberes: eas, de quibus modo dixi, doctorum virorum coniecturas e libris illorum transcripsimus, et separatim in unum quasi fascem coniecimus ut uno intuitu quid unusquisque huic auctori contulerit facile sit volenti existimare, et tu, lector, hoc uno in libro habeas quod in infinitis diversorum librorum voluminibus sparsim necesse alioqui erat quaerere".

**63** Godefroy 1585, 127-8.



of ending each page with a line [fig. 7]. It is worth noting that Godefroy was the only editor of Festus's work after the sixteenth century to faithfully propose Orsini's original structure. However, a diacritic mark (¶) was added beside each entry to highlight each word for easier consultation, mirroring Orsini's original intention.<sup>64</sup> It would appear that, immediately after Orsini, the *Farnesianus* was perceived to be somewhat inadequate: in fact, Godefroy even accepted Agustín's and Scaliger's versions of Festus in his collection to give a complete overview of his work, but in a separate section.<sup>65</sup>

## 2.6 Conclusion

It is now clear that Fulvio Orsini's version of Festus's *De verborum significatione* was a revolutionary philological development. Orsini's main innovation was to consider the *Codex Farnesinus* to be the central ecdotic element. It is likely that he came to this conclusion thanks to the previous work carried out by Angelo Poliziano, the only scholar during the Renaissance to deal with the *Farnesianus* independently from the medieval tradition. Based on this example, Orsini first approached Festus's text from its codicological state, attempting to reproduce the actual conditions of the manuscript, its mutilations and lacunas; then, within a specific and measurable textual framework, he applied all of the conjectures that he and his predecessors had previously formulated. However, these innovations were not accepted in their original form, igniting controversy. In fact, the subsequent publications of Festus's work, starting from Sittart's edition of 1584, included all the amendments arranged by Orsini in accordance with his new page layout, but they were positioned in the editorial grid proposed by Antonio Agustín.

This new editorial situation reveals how Festus's work was understood and perceived during the Renaissance; although Orsini shifted the attention from the text to its support and back to the text itself at an early stage, providing substantial ecdotic progress, antiquarian scholars generally consulted Festus's work for the vital details it provided about classical antiquity. This implied that *De verborum significatione* was essentially conceived to be utilised as a whole, which still entailed the union of the works of Festus and Paul the Deacon. In this light, Orsini's layout did not fulfil this task. The editorial choices of Godefroy in 1585 appear to confirm this spirit: in fact, by marking the words within Orsini's format and then adding the versions creat-

<sup>64</sup> Nolhac 1889, 41-2 [XXXII]: "che ogni principio di voce si dovesse notare con qualche segno, come dire con la ¶" (2 September 1580).

<sup>65</sup> Godefroy 1585, 141-480.

ed by the other editors, he actually admitted the essential shortcomings of this structure. Thus, with Fulvio Orsini's edition, the bases for a new approach were set, even though they failed to create a faithful tradition, because they did not fully respond to the needs of scholars.<sup>66</sup>

---

**66** After the last Renaissance publication, almost a century passed before a new edition was proposed with Sittart's structure (see Dacer 1681). The humanists of the late sixteenth century contributed to a full investigation of the matter, even to the point of exhaustion; only a new philological direction and method could have pushed forward the results acquired until that point.

## Appendix 1

### Notes on the Title

No full title for the historical-linguistic compendium of Sextus Pompeius Festus can be found in his manuscript tradition. This is because the first half of the *Codex Farnesianus*, the only organic witness of this work, has remained missing since its discovery. Festus's text was an abridged version of *De verborum significatu*, the extensive treatise of Verrius Flaccus, and was subsequently abridged during the early Middle Ages by Paul the Deacon in an epitome known as *De verborum significatione*. These two titles and the lack of a reliable formulation for Festus's work brought about variations in the head titles used throughout its entire editorial history. This phenomenon began to emerge during the Renaissance, when some scholars appear not only to have perceived semantic differences between Paul the Deacon's epitome and the *Farnesianus*, but also attempted to represent these in the title. The purpose of this study is to investigate the reasons behind the different Renaissance titles for Festus's work, which could offer an interesting overview on how this author was perceived in the history of the Classical tradition.

The most recent critical editions adopted different solutions when naming this work: *De verborum significatione* by Karl Otfried Müller (1839) followed the model put forward in Paul the Deacon's epitome;<sup>67</sup> Emil Thewrewk (1889) and Wallace Martin Lindsay (1913) used *De verborum significatu* as the basis, evoking Verrius Flaccus.<sup>68</sup> This discordance received fresh attention years later (1979-2001), stimulating debate on the original title of Festus's work. Although this question remains open, some fascinating theories have been proposed thus far.

Since several different titles have been proposed throughout the editorial history of Festus's work, but were not in agreement with the nature of the *Farnesianus*, Alessandro Moscadi began raising questions about its title.<sup>69</sup> He argued that there were two different traditions regarding the title in Latin literature, both of which had been transmitted indirectly: the first, via Macrobius' *Saturnalia*, was *De verborum significationibus*, which represented the earliest reference to Festus's title in Latin literature;<sup>70</sup> the second, on the basis of Paul

---

An earlier version of this chapter was published in *Acta Classica* 60 (2017), 162-72.

**67** Müller 1839.

**68** Thewrewk 1889; Lindsay 1913.

**69** Moscadi 2001, 1999 and 1979.

**70** Macr. *Sat.* 3.8.9: "Iulius Festus de verborum significationibus libro tertio decimo"; in the Oxford Classical Texts, the editor, Kaster, defines the nomenclature 'Iulius' Festus as *lapsus nostri* (see Kaster 2011, 184).

the Deacon's abridgement, was *Excerpta Pauli ex libris Festi Pompeii de significatione verborum*.<sup>71</sup> Moscadi hypothesised that a metaplasm had occurred in the title *significationibus* → *significatione*, offering an intriguing interpretation of the spirit in which Paul the Deacon had dealt with the text of the Roman grammarian. He assumed that all of the changes carried out by Paul in Festus's original had been intentional, calculated and were intended to simplify the work to make it structured like an encyclopaedic dictionary. It is likely that the title also received the same treatment. In fact, a comparison between Paul the Deacon's epitome and the *Codex Farnesianus* clearly demonstrates how Festus had sought to offer an overview that ranged from the study of language to the history of culture, whereas Paul the Deacon limited his exposition merely to a lexical level. When taken from this perspective, the singular form of the title (*significatione*) provided by Paul the Deacon would explain the one-to-one interaction he had sought to establish between the lemma and its definition; the intention behind the plural form (*significationibus*) found in Macrobius, however, was for each term to act as a doorway to an understanding of the plurality of meanings they had gained over time.

Upon their publication, Moscadi's views were immediately and more fully criticised. Giuseppe Morelli<sup>72</sup> led the way by attempting to diminish the relevance of Macrobius's authority in the debate on Festus's title, using as his philological basis the fluctuation of the singular and plural forms in the title of an analogous work, *De significatione verborum quae ad ius civile pertinent*, which was written by another Roman grammarian, Gaius Aelius Gallus. Morelli proposed that a similar variation of the title could also have been possible for the citations of Festus's work in other ancient sources (including Macrobius's). In this way, he defended the singular form, as transmitted by the epitome of Paul the Deacon, who is highly likely to have had the opportunity to access a full and entire version of Festus's work.

Mario De Nonno<sup>73</sup> then added further palaeographical arguments, making reference to the *explicit/incipit* between Books 18 and 19 of the *Farnesianus*, the only part in which a script in red lettering refers to the abbreviation of the title: SEX POMPEI FES/TI DE VERBOR(um) SIGNIFICAT · LIB XVI/II · INCIPIT LIB · XVIII. According to De Nonno, the abbreviation SIGNIFICAT must not be read as *significatu*, since there is little sense in abbreviating only one letter - V; it should instead be read as *significatione*, given the fact that Festus himself used the word in this text: in the *Farnesianus*, the term *significatio*

<sup>71</sup> Moscadi 1999, 11.

<sup>72</sup> Morelli 1984, 23 fn. 1; 1988.

<sup>73</sup> De Nonno 1992.

appears eleven times, but *significatus* only once – and this increases the credibility of the formulation *De verborum significatione* handed down by Paul the Deacon. Moreover, De Nonno assumes that the title *De verborum significatu* adopted by Thewrewk and Lindsay was not directly inspired by Verrius Flaccus’s work, but that it derived from an incorrect reading of the word SIGNIFICAT. On the mutilated manuscript, this may have appeared as SIGNIFICATV to the two editors in question, as well as others who worked exclusively on photographic reproductions.

• • •

A similar level of attention to Festus’s title also occurred during the Renaissance, but with different dynamics, which could be perceived as a forerunner to more modern ideas. It is now clear that the *Codex Farnesianus* had circulated for at least 20 years prior to the publication of Festus’s first incunabula between 1471 and 1478 (approximately 14 editions). However, these works reproduced only the abridged version of Paul the Deacon’s text; and only two, which were edited by scholars who were part of the Academia Romana and certainly had access to the *Codex Farnesianus*, bear a title other than the general eponymous attribution. The first, *De interpretatione Linguae Latinae*, which was edited in 1471 by Giulio Pomponio Leto, had perhaps been inspired by Varro’s *De lingua Latina*.<sup>74</sup> The second, *Collectanea priscorum verborum*, which was published in 1475 by Manilius Romanus, apparently referred to a passage from the *Codex Farnesianus* that reports the same syntagma (“priscorum verborum cum exemplis”), even though no influence from this manuscript can be identified in the text.<sup>75</sup>

Just over ten years later, a new and original title for Festus’s fragment can be recorded, evoking this later occurrence: at the very beginning of the apograph of the *Farnesianus* arranged by Angelo Poliziano (BAV Vat. Lat. 3368), Festus’s work is entitled *priscorum verborum cum exemplis* in a marginal gloss on the lower-left side of the page.<sup>76</sup> This gloss should be attributed to Poliziano, and it must

<sup>74</sup> Pomponio Leto 1471; Accame Lanzillotta 1980; 1998.

<sup>75</sup> Manilius 1475; Bracke 1995, 196. This formulation derived from Fest. 242.15: “cuius opinionem, neque in hoc, neque in aliis compluribus refutare minime necesse est, cum propositum habeam ex tanto librorum eius numero intermortua iam et sepulta verba atque ipso saepe confitente nullius usus aut auctoritatis praeterire, et reliqua quam brevissime redigere in libros admodum paucos. Ea autem, de quibus dissentio, et aperte et breviter, ut sciero, scribta in [h]is libris meis invenientur, <qui> inscribuntur ‘priscorum verborum cum exemplis’”.

<sup>76</sup> The marginal gloss reads: “Cη(μείων) | de his libris | qui inscribuntur | priscorum verborum | cum exemplis”; just above, the same hand of the heading writes: “Festi li(bri) de p(ri)scis v(er)bis cum ex(em)plis”.

have influenced the denomination “Ex Fragmento Festi Pompei | de p(ri)scis v(er)bis cu(m) exe(m)plis” located at the top margin of the page.<sup>77</sup> This script cannot be entirely ascribed to the same hand, and it was very likely written during two different periods: its first segment (*Ex Fragmento Festi Pompei*) is by Poliziano, and displays a stronger intensity of ink, apparently closer to the main body of the text; the second segment, which is also preceded by a vertical dash, ostensibly separating it from the first, is by Pietro Crinito, and presents different abbreviations, a lighter tone of ink and a faster cursive style.<sup>78</sup>

Poliziano arranged his apograph in 1485.<sup>79</sup> However, in 1489, in a famous passage of his *Miscellanea*, he argued that the antigraph from which he had transcribed his copy (the *Codex Farnesianus*) bore no title and was simply referred to by the name of its author (“fragmentum quoddam Sexti Pompej Festi – nam ita erat in titulo”).<sup>80</sup> Even if Poliziano’s statement could be interpreted in various ways,<sup>81</sup> it shows that up to 1489 he still had considered the fragment of Festus’s work to be untitled. In this light, it is reasonable to assume that Poliziano reverted to the problem of Festus’s title after the publication of his *Miscellanea*, i.e. in 1489. This means that Pietro Crinito had added the second part of the heading even later, when he acquired the manuscript.<sup>82</sup> This new caption (*De priscis verbis cum exemplis*) had per-

<sup>77</sup> In this regard, see also Ammirati 2007, 24 fn. 58.

<sup>78</sup> For Crinito’s work on this manuscript, see Marchiaro 2013, 158-9.

<sup>79</sup> According to the annotation made by Poliziano himself (f. 7r): “Ex vetustissimo fragmento Sexti Po(m)pei Festi: que(m) Rom(ae) descripsi | Kal(endis) Jan(uariis) 1485”.

<sup>80</sup> Poliziano 1489, LXXIII: “Ostendit mihi Romae abhinc quadriennium Manilio Ral-lus, graecus homo sed latinis litteris adprime excultus, fragmentum quoddam Sex-ti Pompej Festi (nam ita erat in titulo) sane quam vetustum, sed pleraque mutilatum, praerosusque a muribus”.

<sup>81</sup> Alessandro Moscadi suggested that Poliziano may not be referring to the *Farnesianus*, which was burnt and not gnawed by mice (“praerosusque a muribus”), but instead to the so called *Schedae Parisienses* (BNF Rés. X 96); see Moscadi 2001, XVI; Di Marco differs from this opinion, and places the copy arranged by Poliziano (BAV Vat. Lat. 3368) in a different branch of the *stemma codicum*, directly depending from the *Farnesianus*; see Di Marco 2015, 39-40.

<sup>82</sup> As of today, there are four known owners of BAV Vat. Lat 3368: Poliziano him-self; Crinito, who probably received it from Poliziano; Vettori, who rescued it over fifty years after Poliziano’s death (Vettori 1553, 253 [XVII, ii *Restituitur locus Sex. Pompej Festi, ubi qui vocavit fuerint ludi priscatorij docet, in excusis libris mancus et maculosus*): “Cum vero supra ipse affirmarim me librum habere Sex. Pompeii, ex scrip-tum de antiquissimo exemplari, totam rem accuratius ut fides eius auctoritasque au-geatur, commemorare volo. Angelus Politianus in LXXIII capite Miscellaneorum nar-rat se Romae accepisse a Manilio Rallo fragmentum quoddam Sex. Pompeii, sane quam vetustum, nonnullasque itidem pagellas eiusdem exemplaris a Pomponio Laeto, quae omnia ut ostendit illic, com descripsisset, paucis ab hinc annis ego incidi in adversa-ria quaedam ipsius in taberna libraria, quibus continebantur etiam hae reliquiae Fes-ti, atque emi, manu Politiani cognita. Tanta tamen ille celeritate in scribendo usus fue-

haps been included because it was rooted in the humanistic tradition of Festus's work. This also found parallel occurrences in the two apographs arranged by Giuliano Ceci (BAV Vat. Lat. 1549 and BAV Vat. Lat. 5958), both adopting the formulation *Priscorum verborum cum exemplis*,<sup>83</sup> and was judged, at least in the early 1500s, to be very reliable. Crinito himself reused it many times in his *De honesta disciplina*. He also occasionally adopted *collectanea* and, in one case, *de verborum significationibus*.<sup>84</sup>

Beyond the accuracy aspect, these attempts to establish a new title for Festus's work apply to the nature and tradition of the text itself, and this phenomenon represents a noteworthy shift in the perspective towards Festus's work, where the philological approach to his title demonstrates how scholars sought to cast the work in a different light after the rediscovery of the *Farnesianus*. In fact, the *editio princeps* that combined the works of Paul the Deacon and Festus, which was published in 1500 by Giovanni Battista Pio and Conagus, featured no title; there was simply a note to the reader at the end stating that the text included fragments of Festus's work (*Fragmenta Sexti Pompei Festi*), alluding somehow to the discovery of the *Farnesianus*.

The first title that intentionally revealed the combination of the *Codex Farnesianus* and Paul the Deacon's epitome was published in

---

rat, literisque adeo minutis, ac saepe etiam per notas totis vocibus indicatis, quod sum propriumque hominis erat, cum huiuscemodi aliquid, quod tantum usibus serviret, in commentariis adnotaret, ut vix intelligi possint"); and Fulvio Orsini, who received it from Vettori (Nolhac 1889, 34-5).

**83** According to recent studies, codices BAV Vat. Lat. 1549 and BAV Vat. Lat. 5958 belong to branch **d** of the stemma, which derived from a sub-archetype **b** of the *Farnesianus*; see Di Marco 2015, 39-40. The title in the former reads (f. 58r) *SEXTI POMPEI FESTI | PRISCORVM VOCABV | LORVM LIB XVIII* and (f. 76v) *SEXTI POMPEI FESTI | PRISCORVM VERBORV(m) | CVM EXEMPLIS LIBER | XIX* - moreover, a marginal gloss (f. 32r) reports: "Inscriptio huius | Libri", which is attested beside the passage "inscribuntur autem prisco(rum) vocabulo(rum) cu(m) exemplis". The latter (f. 2r) *SEXTI POMPEI FESTI PRI | SCORVM VERBORVM CVM | EXEMPLIS LIBER PRIMVS*, which opened instead Paul the Deacon's abridgement - a marginal gloss (f. 108r) also reports "Inscriptio huius librj" whereas Festus reads "inscribuntur enim priscoru(m) verboru(m) cu(m) exemplis".

**84** Crinito *Hon. VIII xiii* [Angeleri 1955, 209]: *de hac lege annaria, et in collectaneis Sexti Pompeii mention habetur*; IX xiii [225]: *Quod Sextus Pompeius in libro de priscis verbis undivigesimus insinuate*; XI x [254-5]: *ut Pompeius Sextus in libro de verbis priscis XVII tradit*; XV ix [311]: *Nam et locum unc Sex. Pompeius signavit in libro de priscis verbis XVI*; *tum prolatis veterum exemplis exponit*; XIX viii [381]: *docet etiam Sextus Pompeius, cuius verba ex libro verborum significationibus XIX subiecimus*; XX vii [397-8]: *ac penitus diversa a Pompeio Sexto referuntur libro XVI de verbis priscis*; XXIII xiii [445]: *sicut ex Festo. Collectaneis ab Hermolao etiam notatum est*; XXIV ix [458]: *Quod abunde pratur, cum ex antiquis auctoribus, tum ex collectaneis Sexti Pompeii*. This relationship between the annotations present in Poliziano's apograph and Crinito's *De honesta disciplina* can be further enriched with IX xii [223]: *Sex. autem Pompeius leges recuperatorem ab Aelio Gallo sic accepta tradit* [Fest. 342.9]. This passage corresponds with a manuscript gloss written in the lower margin of the first page of BAV Vat. Lat. 3368 (f. 1r): "Gallus Aelius l(ibr)os significationu(m) q(uae) ad ius pertinent".

1513 by Aldo Manuzio.<sup>85</sup> This is the only printed edition that divided Festus's work into books (*libri*), with each corresponding to an alphabetical entry (19 letters in all). The general title given to the book was *Sexti Pompeij Festi undeviginti librorum fragmenta*, while each book had the same subtitle, *Sexti Pompeii Festi De verborum veterum significatione*; however, this did not apply to Books 4 and 6, which were referred to as *Antiquitatum Romanarum libri*. As was the case in the previous edition, this text was an indiscriminate blend of Paul the Deacon's epitome and the *Codex Farnesianus*, with the double title indicative of how the work was conceived: the word *Fragmenta* implied the existence of the *Farnesianus* and expressed its difference to the abridgement; the second title, *de verborum (veterum) significatione*, evoked the work of Paul the Deacon, indicating that the two traditions coexisted according to a dual scheme. *Antiquitatum Romanarum libri*, on the other hand, which was probably an interpolation and could be interpreted as an alternative title, was almost certainly developed for the purpose of casting Festus's work in a new light, given the new information transmitted in the *Farnesianus*.

The repercussions of this formulation are also evident in a letter sent by Ottavio Pantagato to Onofrio Panvinio dated 28 May 1558. Pantagato supported *De verborum significatione* over Aldo Manuzio's *Antiquitatum Romanarum*, arguing that the former was more reliable while the latter was neither credible nor suitable:<sup>86</sup>

In Festo è più proprio il titolo e più vero *De verborum significatione* che *Antiquitatum Romanarum* il quale non è né vero né proprio. Vi ho ditto in altre mie per che non ci ho pensato che fu perché è incerto qual sia suo e qual di quel Paolo et io non vorrei granchi in libri.

Pantagato believed the first formulation to be more compatible with tradition than *Antiquitatum Romanarum* (hence the adjective 'vero') and therefore more suitable for this type of work (hence 'proprio'), highlighting that it was uncertain what should be attributed to Festus and what to Paul the Deacon. This epistolary exchange was probably related to the editorial work on Festus's text that had been carried out in the last part of the 1550s by Antonio Agustín, and brings to light the vitality of the debate on the title and its potential solutions.<sup>87</sup>

Agustín entitled his edition *Sex. Pompei Festi De Verborum Significatione, lib. XX*, not drifting away from tradition; however, owing to

<sup>85</sup> Manuzio 1513; no title is reported in the French edition (Petit 1519).

<sup>86</sup> Soler i Nicolau 2000, 199-201.

<sup>87</sup> For the collaboration between Panvinio and Pantagato and the role of Gabriel Faerno in Agustín's edition of Festus see Ceretti 1952-53.



the nature of the *Farnesianus*, he also sought to propose an alternative formulation that would reveal the clear discrepancies between the ancient manuscript and the epitome. As demonstrated by Pantagato's concerns, Agustín may have perceived that his edition of Festus's work required a new title, which drew attention to the cultural content the work may have included. It displayed a polysemy which was so distinctive that it modified the perception of the work itself and represented a break point with tradition. In fact, at the very beginning of the introduction of his edition, he gave credence to a reliable second possibility, taken directly from the *Farnesianus*, stating that Festus had written a book entitled *De verborum significatione sive Priscorum verborum cum exemplis*.<sup>88</sup> By using the conjunction *sive*, he observed a mutual link between the two titles, suggesting that they could be interchangeable. *Priscorum verborum cum exemplis* was therefore considered to be an appropriate replacement for *De verborum significatione*, with Agustín perhaps alluding to the spirit perceived by Aldo Manuzio in his *Antiquitatum Romanarum*: the examples accompanying the entries could have offered an opportunity for antiquarian digressions and cultural analyses to be made. This editorial possibility was also supported by the title featured in a manuscript possessed by Agustín that he considered extremely reliable, the so-called *Liber Achillis Mafaei* copied by Giuliano Ceci (BAV Vat. Lat. 5958). As mentioned earlier, this codex was actually entitled *Priscorum verborum cum exemplis liber* and represented a key factor in the textual transmission. Although Agustín did not use *Priscorum verborum cum exemplis* as a title, it may have struck him as being worthy of consideration, at least from a methodological perspective, since it derived directly from the *Codex Farnesianus* and had further attestations in the manuscript tradition.

However, Agustín did not realise that these two titles referred to two different works, of which the only survivor was *De verborum significatione*; this only became known a few years later thanks to the critical analysis carried out on Festus's work by Joseph Scaliger.<sup>89</sup> Scaliger rejected Agustín's opinion on different grounds, arguing

<sup>88</sup> Agustín 1559, *praef.*

<sup>89</sup> Scaliger 1575, cxxxv: "In fine ita lego: ea autem, de quibus dissentio, et aperte, et breviter, ut sciero, scripta in his libris meis invenientur, qui inscribuntur: PRISCORVM VERBORVM CVM EXEMPLIS. Neque dubium est, quin ita scripserit Festus. Sed libri ii interciderunt. Nam quod docti viri Festus de his, quos in manu habemus, luqui, et peccant ipsi, et alios in errorem inducunt. Nam neque Festus hos libros, qui extant, vocasset suos, cum sint Verrij, neque in istis libris instituit reprehensionem Verrij, praeter quam in locis admodum paucis, idque obiter, neque haec est horum librorum inscriptio, cum a Macrobio vetere auctore, de verborum significatione citentur. His, et pluribus rationibus, atque adeo tenore verborum Festi inductus quilibet potest advertere libros PRISCORVM VERBORVM CVM EXEMPLIS non esse eosdem cum his nostris de verborum significatione".

that there was insufficient evidence to link *Priscorum verborum cum exemplis* with the version transmitted to his times, which probably carried the original title of Verrius Flaccus's work that had been abridged by Festus. As part of the philological analysis undertaken, the Frenchman also alluded to the passage by Macrobius which clearly referenced Festus's work as *de verborum significatione*, presenting this reference as evidence for his position.<sup>90</sup>

Almost a decade later, in 1584, the philologist and editor Arnault Sittart raised the matter again,<sup>91</sup> and agreed with Scaliger in arguing that the title *De verborum significatione* had derived directly from Verrius Flaccus's work, as confirmed by many ancient authors. However, Sittart appears to have also revived and accepted Agustín's hypothesis for the alternative title *Priscorum verborum cum exemplis*, affirming that Festus collected not only the words in use, but also several archaic and obsolete words, from Verrius that were explained through literary examples, following the method adopted by grammarians. This implied that Sittart did not take Scaliger's rejection of this title into account. In fact, Sittart considered the version *Priscorum verborum cum exemplis*, taken directly from the *Codex Farnesianus*, to be a credible alternative to *De verborum significatione*. To support this position, he added that an analogous title, *Expositio sermonum antiquorum cum testimoniis*, found in a short glossary compiled by Fabius Planciades Fulgentius in the fifth to sixth centuries,<sup>92</sup> used Festus's example as a basis. In this light, *Priscorum*

**90** However, it is worthy of note that he cited Festus's title taken from Macrobius in singular form, in contrast to what is actually attested in Renaissance and modern editions of this author. It is difficult to say whether Scaliger referred to a variant in the manuscript tradition or if he deliberately amended Macrobius' plural tense, converting it into the better-known singular form; this led to him adopting the same title used in Paul the Deacon's epitome, *De verborum significatione*, which also appeared in his second edition (Scaliger 1576). An analogous formulation, *Sex Pompei Festi De verborum significatione fragmentum*, was applied in each of the three editions published by Fulvio Orsini (see Orsini 1581; 1582; 1583).

**91** Sittart 1584: *praef.*: "Inter varia M. Verri Flacci ingenij monumenta, quae insignis ille Grammaticus sub Augusti obitum non posteriora consecravit, libri DE VERBORVM SIGNIFICATIONE, habentur non incelebres, quippe quo siam olim Gellius, Carisius, Diomedes, Velius Longus, Plinius, Priscianus, alijque veteres in testimonium advocarunt. Libri erant, testante Pompeio, valde multi. In ijs non tantum ea quae notionis erant vulgariae explicabat, sed alia etiam intermortua et sepulta, adeoque nullius, ut ipse quidem existimabat, usus verba, scriptorum antiquorum adductis exemplis, quod Grammatici erat, interpretari conabatur. Accessit Sex. Pompeius Festus, de cuius quidem aetate certi quod dicam non habeo. Ei visus est Verrius aequo prolixior, ideoque libros illius, intermortuos ommissis, in epitomen contraxit, et censoris critici munus arrogans, nonnulla iure, plura tamen iniuria reprehendit, suosque libros Priscorum verborum cum exemplis inscriptis. Quo sane exempli Fabius Planciades Fulgentius, Expositionem sermonum antiquorum cum testimoniis, librum suum ad Chalchidium Grammaticum vocavit".

**92** Pizzani 1968, 18-19; Lersch 1844.

*verborum* and *Sermonum antiquorum* were considered correspondent forms in the same way that *cum exemplis* matched *cum testimoniis*, inferring that the definitions of the words had all been acquired from literary sources and that a parallel method could have generated a parallel title.

However, the titles of Fulgentius's work, which was published during the Renaissance did not correspond to what was reported by Sittart; nevertheless, there are at least two versions which may have inspired it, both edited by Giovanni Battista Pio:<sup>93</sup> *Voces antiquae cum testimonio* (1498) and *Expositio sermonum antiquorum* (1513). It is therefore likely that Sittart blended these two titles to draw a direct link to *Priscorum verborum cum exemplis*, thereby strengthening support for an alternative title to Festus's work.<sup>94</sup>

• • •

All of these titles pave the way for further considerations to be made. In the antiquarian culture of the late-sixteenth century, there seems

93 Pio 1498; 1513; Vitali 1505; Herwagen 1535; Plantin 1565; and Godefroy 1586.

94 The same denomination of Fulgentius's work was taken from Dacer, whose views were more in line with Scaliger than Sittart; in this regard, see Dacer 1681: *praef.*: "Hic Verrii de verborum significatione libros breviavit, ibique intermortua et sepulta verba praeteriit. Cave tamen istos de verborum significatione libros eosdem esse credas ac eos qui discuntur priscorum verborum cum exemplis. Viros doctos qui ita existimarunt in errorem induxit hic Festi locus male intellectus in voce profanum: cuius (Verrii) opinionem, neque in hoc, neque in aliis compluribus refutare minime necesse est, cum propositum habeam ex tanto librorum eius numero intermortua iam et sepulta verba atque ipso saepe confitente nullius usus aut auctoritatis praeterire, et reliqua quam brevissime redigere in libros admodum paucos. Ea autem, de quibus dissentio, et aperte et breviter, ut sciero, scribta in his libris meis invenientur, qui inscribuntur priscorum verborum cum exemplis. Sed haec tantum innuunt Festi consilium fuisse in hisce libris de verborum significatione, Verrii Flaccii ejusdem argumenti libros in epitomen redigere, praeteritis tantum verbis intermortuis, et sepultis. Tum et alterum volumen conficere priscorum verborum cum exemplis, ubi ea tantum referre cogitabat quae in prioribus hisce de verborum significatione praeteriisset, et breviter ea de quibus dissentire exponere. Et haec aliter intelligi non posse fatebuntur qui attendent Festum in hisce de verborum significatione libris, neque Verrii reprehensionem instituere praeter quam in locis admodum paucis, neque multa verba intermortua aut sepulta referre, quae scilicet in alium locum reservabat, quod et ipse testatur alicubui. Audi illum in voce Tatium [Fest. 496.8-12]: Tatium occisum ait Lavinii ab amicis eorum legatorum, quos interfecerant Tatiani latrones, sed sepultum in Aventino Lauro. Quod ad significationem verborum non magis pertinet, quam multa alia et praeterita iam et deinceps quae referuntur. Ubi cum dicat Festus se jam multa praeteriisse quae deinceps relaturus esset, aperte significat se ea omnia in libros priscorum verborum reservasse. Neque enim multa adhuc in libros de verborum significatione, relaturus erat cum jam ad eorum metam pervenisset. Necesse est igitur scripsisse de verborum significatione, et de verbis priscis. Posteriores eius lucubrationes plane interciderunt, nescio etiam an umquam in publico visae sunt. Dubitari certe potest an eas autor absolverit, vel e minibus suis emiseric, quamquam ad earum exemplum Fulgentius Placiades librum unum inscripsisse videtur: *Expositio sermonum antiquorum cum testimoniis*". See also Lindemann 1832, 285-6.

to have been an awareness that the title transmitted in Paul the Deacon's epitome (*De verborum significatione*) did not fully represent the spirit of Festus's work. Therefore attempts were made to follow other pathways in order to restore the essence of the original. In the apographs of the *Farnesianus*, scholars actually felt free to propose alternative solutions – basically rearranging the formulation *priscorum verborum cum exemplis* (in the manuscripts copied by Poliziano and by Giuliano Ceci). However, since there was no textual evidence to support possible alternatives, no further emendations were made to the printed editions. It is possible that the citation made by Sittart to Fulgentius represented an important confirmation in favour of *Priscorum verborum cum exemplis*, even if it was not taken into consideration in the editions that followed. However, given that it was applied at least once in Paul the Deacon's abridgment of Festus, the *Collectanea priscorum verborum* by Manilius (1475), this formulation has proven to be a credible alternative to *De verborum significatione*. This demonstrates how the title of *Codex Farnesianus* had been debated since its very discovery. Regarding the title *Collectanea priscorum verborum*, it would actually be more difficult to explain Manilius's formulation if the role of the *Farnesianus* had been excluded from consideration (*Priscorum verborum cum exemplis* → *Collectanea priscorum verborum*). This was not only because he had read the *Farnesianus* manuscript himself (the only incunabula that added an original title were those of Manilius and Pomponio Leto, both of whom could access the *Farnesianus*), but also because the genitive form (*priscorum verborum*) of the syntagma *prisca verba* | *verba prisca* rarely features in Latin literature,<sup>95</sup> and one of these occurrences is found referring directly to a title in the *Farnesianus*.

95 Suet. *Gramm.* 14.3: “de eodem Asinius Pollio, in libro quo Sallustii scripta reprehendit ut nimia priscorum verborum adfectatione oblita, ita tradit”.

## Appendix 2

### Identifying *Paulus Diaconus*

It is commonly accepted that the epitome of *De verborum significatione* written by Sextus Pompeius Festus, which was in circulation in medieval times, was an abridged and re-invented version written by *Paulus Warnefridus*, generally known as Paul the Deacon. A Benedictine monk of Lombard origins, he not only lived under the reign of Charlemagne (between the eighth and ninth centuries), but also played an active role in the Carolingian Renaissance and was the author of *Historia Romana*, *Gesta Episcoporum Mettensium*, *Vita Gregorii Magni* and *Historia Langobardorum*.<sup>96</sup> However, it proved to be a protracted and challenging process to discover who this figure was, and to attribute his historical and lexicographic works to him. In fact, the manuscript tradition of Paul the Deacon's *De verborum significatione* provides no direct proof of his authorship, nor in the dedicatory letter addressed to Charlemagne is it possible to find explicit data which helps the author to be identified – here the epitomist referred to himself as *Paulus ultimus servulus*, without specifying his full name, place of origin or profession.<sup>97</sup>

Final confirmation of Paul the Deacon's paternity of the epitome of Festus emerged only centuries later, precisely when Festus's medieval work was discovered to have strong textual links with the works of a Lombard monk and historian named *Paulus*. During the nineteenth century, scholars such as Karl Otfried Müller (1839) and Ludwig Bethmann (1851) had vigorously rejected this identification – founding their primary argument on the fact that *Paulus* was never mentioned as a *diaconus* in the manuscript tradition of *De verborum significatione*, and only sporadically as a *pontifex* or *sacerdos*. They believed that this eliminated any possible association between the Lombard monk Paul and the historian.<sup>98</sup> It was the studies of Georg

---

An earlier version of this chapter was published in *Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology* 3 (2016), 26-30.

<sup>96</sup> Cervani 1978; Villa 1984; Dionisotti 1996; Zecchini 2011.

<sup>97</sup> Müller 1839, 1: "EPISTOLA PAULI PONTIFICI AD CAROLUM REGEM. Divinae largitatis munere sapientia potentiaque praefulgido Domino Regi Carolo regum sublimissimo Paulus ultimus servulus".

<sup>98</sup> In his edition of Festus, Müller focused on the manuscript tradition of Paul the Deacon's epitome to disclaim his authorship; see Müller 1839, 32: "Tam veniendum ad Paulum, qui eius culpa, quam Festus in Verrio mutilando meruerat, amplas ab eo repetit poenas. Qui ille homo fuerit, non quaerimus: nisi quod id certum et testatum habemus, fuisse eum Christianae ecclesiae sacerdotum non infimi gradus, nam in epistola ad Carolum Regem pontificem se dicit, Caroloque Magno fuisse aequalem. Hic Paulus quod dicit non solum superflua se praetergressum esse, sed etiam penitus abstracta stilo proprio enucleasse, in eo vanus deprehenditur nugator, cum difficilioribus ex-

Waitz (1878) and Karl Neff (1891) which established beyond reasonable doubt that *Paulus* the epitomist was also *Paulus* the historian (known as *Paulus Diaconus*).

Waitz was the first scholar to attempt to frame Paul the Deacon's literary and philological work within the cultural context of the late eighth century, establishing bonds between his biography and the imperial Court.<sup>99</sup> He suggested that the label *ultimus servulus*, adopted in the dedication of his *De verborum significatione*, echoed a letter addressed to Paul the Deacon by Charlemagne himself, in which

pediendis ita esset impar, ut etiam vitia librariorum pleraque aut improvidus describeret, aut male callidus omitendis verbis evitaret. Quod autem in iis articulis, quos recipere non dedignatus est, plerunque ipsa Festi verba in brevius redacta reddidit, ei sincero affectu plaudimus. Paucissima addidit, ut semel Pauli apostoli mentionem, et in universum antiqui grammatici sententias non aliter suis temporibus accommodavit, nisi ut praesentis temporis significatus in praeterita convertet, ac de multis rebus dicebatur poneret pro dicitur. Integros articulos nunquam addidisse videtur: quae enim vocabulorum interpretationes in eius libris reperiuntur, quibus locus in Festo deest: eae aliunde videntur esse transvectae. Nam quamquam in universum Paulus eundem quem Festus verborum ordinem sequitur, interdum tamen eam legem violavit, ita maxime, ut vocabula, quae in excerpto iam praeterierat, mutato consilio ex superioribus repeteret. Müller's edition accepted the denomination *Paulus Pontifex*. Theodore Mommsen also challenged the attribution of this work to Paul, but with more caution; see Mommsen 1864, 57: "Sex. Pompeii Festi de verborum significatione libri XX integri extiterunt non solum saeculo post Christum nono, quo Paulus, sive diaconus is fuit sive alius quispiam, eorum epitome a se confectam dedicavit Carolo regi, sed etiam saeculo undecimo, quo scriptum esse codicem, cuius pars hodie adsevatur Neapoli in bibliotheca publica" and Mommsen 1880, 55. However, the manuscript tradition acknowledged *Paulus*, the abridger of Festus, as *Diaconus*, on at least one occasion; see Neff 1891, 33-4: "Ac Bethmann quidem sententiam suam confirmat his argumentis: primum quod inscriptio epistolae, quam Paulus illis excerptis praeposuit, in nonnullis codicibus haec est: Epistola Pauli pontifices ad Carolum regem, in alio codice Pauli Atheniensis, in nullo Pauli Diaconi; deinde quod numo illius aetatis scriptor Paulo Diacono hanc epitomam addidit; [...] Is [Waitz] demonstravit in vetustioribus codicibus, ut in illo Monacensi, nomina pontifex sive sacerdos deesse et Bethmannum errare, quod putaret nullo testimonio antiquorum temporum illud Paulo Diacono addidi, nam in antiquo catalogo bibliothecae Lareshamensis glossas Pauli Diaconi commemorari". Furthermore, Bethmann added that Paul the Deacon's Festus was too poor stylistically when compared to his other works. Bethmann 1849, 276: "Seine Sprache ist im ganzen richtig und rein von Barbarismen, die wenigen ausgenommen, welche dadurch, dass die lateinische Sprache im Mittelalter keineswegs eine tote war, sondern als eine wirklich lebende eine eigentümliche, nicht zu hindernde Entwicklung hatte, gewissermassen unvermeidlich und zur Regel geworden waren".

**99** Waitz affirmed that Paul composed the abridgement of Festus after the year 783, when Charlemagne's wife Hildegard died; see Waitz 1878, 10-11: "Tunc etiam excerpta ex libris Pompei Festi facta crediderim, quae Karolo transmissa; sine causa alteri cuidam Paulo recentiores tribuere voluerunt: noster certe in Historia Langobardorum iis usus est. Sed etiam majus opus 'Paulo diacono familiari clientulo nostro' rex inunxit, 'quo tractatus', ut ait epistola ipsius nomine scripta, 'atque sermones diversorum catholicorum partum perlegens et optima quaeque decerpens, in duobus voluminibus per totius anni congruentes cuique festivitati distinctae et absque vitii obtulit lectiones'". Waitz identifies some parallel occurrences featuring in Paul the Deacon's dedication of his Festus (10 fn. 5): "'Urbs Romulea' etiam Hist Lang. II. 23 et G. Mett. P. 265 dicitur; extremus b. Benedicti servulus scribit Paulus in Homilia, Migne XCV p. 1577".

Paul was defined “*diacono familiari clientulo nostro*”.<sup>100</sup> In this light, *servulus* and *clientulus*, two hypocorisms expressing endearment, represented two different views of the same dynamic: the close relationship between the two.<sup>101</sup> Moreover, Waitz pointed out that in the same letter Charlemagne talked about Paul the Deacon’s work as an abridger, mostly of sacred texts (“*sermones diversorum catholicorum Patrum perlegens, et optima quaeque decerpens*”): this inclination was perfectly compatible with what Paul the Deacon declared regarding Festus’s text and what he actually did with it.<sup>102</sup>

Neff acknowledged the fundamental role of Waitz in the progress of the debate on the authorship of the epitome of Festus. This was despite believing that his forerunner had not solved the question, merely reopening it, paving the way for more thorough investigations to be conducted.<sup>103</sup> Thus, Neff devoted special attention to Paul the Deacon’s works (historical, religious, poetic and epistolographic), analysing their grammar, syntax and phrase structure in order to understand his *usus scribendi*.<sup>104</sup> Afterwards, having delineated exact

**100** PL 98 0896C [Carolus Magnus, *Epistola IV, De Homiliario Pauli Diaconi, monachi Casinesi (anno 788)*]: “Denique qui ad nocturnale officium copulatas quorundam caso labore, licet recto intuitu, minus tamen idoneo, reperimus lectiones, quippe quae et sine auctorum suorum vocabulis essent positae, et infinitis vitiorum anfractibus scaterent, non sumus passi nostris in diebus, in divinis lectionibus, inter sacra officia, inconsonantes perstreperere soloecismos, atque earumdem lectionum in melius reformare tramitem, mentem intendimus, idque opus Paulo Diacono familiari clientulo nostro elimandum injunximus: scilicet, ut studiose catholicorum Patrum dicta percurrens, veluti e latissimis eorum pratis certos quosque flosculos legeret, et in unum, quaeque essent utilia, quasi sertum aptaret. Qui nostrae celsitudini devote parere desiderans, tractatus atque sermones diversorum catholicorum Patrum perlegens, et optima quaeque decerpens, in duobus voluminibus, per totius anni circulum, congruentes cuique festivitati, distincte et absque vitiis, nobis obtulit lectiones”.

**101** Waitz 1878, 11 fn. 2: “Extrema epistolae verba, haec in primordiis initae cum Karolo familiaritatis ponenda esse, ostendunt”.

**102** Lindsay 1913, 1: “Sextus denique Pompeius Romanis studiis affatim eruditus, tam sermonum abditorum, quam etiam quarundam causarum origines aperiens, opus suum ad viginti usque prolixa volumina extendit. Ex qua ego prolixitate superflua quaeque et minus necessaria praetergrediens et quaedam abstrusa penitus stilo proprio enucleans, nonnulla ita, ut erant posita, relinquens, hoc vestrae celsitudini legendum compendium optuli”.

**103** Neff 1891, 3 fn. 2: “Paulus Diaconus, quem Festi librum in epitomen contraxisse ut olim plurimi putaverunt ita post O. Muller, Bethmanni, Mommsenii dubitationes Georgius Waitz optime demonstravit [Goetz 1887, 7]. Equidem Waitz nihil monstrasse, sed viam ad solvendam quaestionem monstrasse; see also Neff 1891, 34: Sed Waitz non solum Bethmanni sententiam refutavit, sed viam nobis monstrare conabatur, qua controversia in perpetuum tolli posset”.

**104** This analysis was extremely detailed and complex, involving a plethora of aspects of Paul the Deacon’s work (see Neff 1891, 4-33), including the disposition of words featured in the phrase (*de verborum collocatione* [4-5]), the disposition of pronouns (*de pronominum collocatione* [5]), the disposition of adverbs (*adverbia* [5-6]), some rhetorical aspects, such as chiasm and parallels (*chiasmus et parallelismus* [6]), the use of locutions, idioms and metrics within the phrase (*ad verborum ambitus* [6-9]), the use of

parameters in terms of style and methodology, Neff cross-referenced the results of his survey with *De verborum significatione* and noticed, thanks to a granular comparison, that many phenomena occurring in the works universally attributed to Paul the Deacon very often resurfaced in his abridgement of Festus, sometimes in the form of literal quotations, and vice versa.<sup>105</sup> This confirmed beyond doubt his authorship of Festus's epitome.

The nineteenth-century debate on the attribution of Festus's medieval epitome to Paul the Deacon appears to find its prefiguration in the Renaissance. In fact, it was only after the rediscovery of the *Codex Farnesianus* around the mid-fifteenth century that some scholars began to cast doubts on which *Paulus* had abridged Festus's original, having noticed substantial differences between the medieval text and the surviving *Codex*. In French erudite circles around the 1570s, the epitomist was first believed to be Paul the Deacon. It is likely that the antiquarian studies conducted on Charlemagne and the origin of the French monarchy in late-sixteenth century France made this connection possible.<sup>106</sup> The purpose of this appendix is to understand the dynamics and reasons behind the Renaissance identification of Paul the Deacon as the author of the abridgement of Festus's *De verborum significatione*. In this way, the cultural path carried out by the antiquarians and philologists who were able to make this important discovery *ante litteram* will be followed.

• • •

synonyms and repetitions (*abundantia sermonis* [9-11]), the variations (*varietas dicendi* [11-14]), the nature of the syntax (*de syntactica ratione* [14-19]), the disposition of complements and their function within the phrase - such as interrogative clauses (*de enuntiativis interrogativis* [19-20]), relative clauses (*de enuntiativis relativis* [20]), conditional clauses (*de enuntiativis conditionalibus* [20-1]), temporal clauses (*de enuntiativis temporalibus* [21]), concessive clauses (*de enuntiativis concessivis* [21]), casual clauses (*de enuntiativis causalis* [21]), comparative clauses (*de enuntiativis comparativis* [21]) - prepositions (*de praepositionibus* [21-3]), other language particles (*de particulis* [23-5]), negative forms (*de negationibus* [25]), numeral adjectives (*de numeralibus* [26]), pronouns (*de pronomibus* [26-8]), nouns (*de substantivis* [28-9]), adjectives in general (*de adiectivis* [29-30]), and verbs (*de verbis* [30-1]).

**105** Neff 1891, 35-7: "Haec de quaestione universa locutus primum omnes illos locos colligam, unde cognoscitur Paulum Diaconum haud ignarum fuisse Festi excerptorum. [...] His locis satis demonstrator Paulum penitus pervenisse Festi epitomam. Praeterea autem illius opera referta sunt locis, unde elucet, quando fuerit studio etymologiam significationemque verborum interpretandi. Atque raro invenitur vocabulum minus notum, quod non interpretetur. Quo fit, ut collectis illis glossarium ante oculos habeamus. Unde sumperit illas interpretationes non semper constat, pleraque sunt ex Isidoro sumptae. [...] Hoc quasi parvulo glossario satis demonstravisse mihi vereor, quam penitus pervenit Paulus Diaconus Festi epitomam, quantopere delectatus sit vocabulorum interpretatione".

**106** Regarding the French erudite environments and their antiquarian investigations, see Cooper 2013.



In all the early incunabula of the epitome of *De verborum significatione*, Paul was never acknowledged as the author of this work. He was systematically replaced by Festus, even when the text of the *Codex Farnesianus* was not included in the publications.<sup>107</sup> The first to give an articulated opinion on the still unidentified epitomist was Manilius Romanus.<sup>108</sup> In his prefatory letter dedicated to Pomponio Leto, which was found in his edition of *De verborum significatione* (1475), Manilius did not refer to the author's name, instead alluding to him only as the person responsible for irreparably damaging the original. Here, he described Paul as a figure of no value, with no name or culture, who had transformed the extensive and rich volume of Festus into a sterile compendium. He added that the discovery of the *Farnesianus* had made it possible to understand several aspects which had been rendered unclear for the abridgement of the text. In his view, these were fundamental to understanding antiquity, and Renaissance scholars somehow had to manage the disparities with the original created by this epitome.<sup>109</sup>

A similar position was also taken by Angelo Poliziano, who declared in the first book of his *Miscellanea* (1489) that Festus's work had been abridged and damaged by a despicable and ignorant interpreter whose name was not worthy of mention.<sup>110</sup> Furthermore, neither the *editio princeps* of Festus published by Giovan Battista Pio (1500) nor the subsequent editions carried out by Aldo Manuzio (1513) and Jean Petit (1519) made any direct or indirect reference to Paul the

**107** This happened in all the early incunabula.

**108** Sometimes identified as the Greek scholar Manilius Cabacius Rhallus, but more likely Sebastiano Manilio; see Lamers 2013, 144 and fn 62.

**109** Lindsay 1913, 11; Manilius 1475, *praef.*: “Manilius Romanus Pomponio Leto salutem. Nuper cum legissem Pompei Festi mutilatos libros qui priscorum uerborum inscribuntur, uehementer dolui quod tantum opus integrum non remanserit. Scripsit ille quidem ad totius antiquitatis cognitionem et posteritatis utilitatem, sed puto inscitia superioris etatis tam preclarum munus nobis eripuit. Nam quidem nullius momenti sine nomine sine litteris ad Carolum Regem uolumen diffusum et copiosum in sterile compendium redegit et credibile est reliquisse que magis necessaria erant, ut sepe numero tu mecum questus es. Quod superest imprimendum curauit, ne alius forte audax et temerarius in peius reddat, et pro uirili parte emendari castigarique euigilauit, ut saltem si non integer fidelis tamen legatur. Vale. De Romaulis”.

**110** Poliziano 1489, LXXIII: “Ostendit mihi Romae abhinc quadriennium Manilius Rallus, Graecus homo, sed Latinis litteris adprime excultus, fragmentum quoddam Sexti Pompeij Festi (nam ita erat in titulo) sanequam uetustum, sed pleraque mutilatum praerosumque a muribus. Quod me magnopere tenuit, siquidem reliquiae illae qualescunque ex integro ipso uolumine superabant, quod autor Festus composuerat, non ex hoc autem compendiario, quod nunc in manibus coactum uiolenter et decurtatum, scilicet ab ignobili et indocto quodam, nec isto quoque nomine satis bene de litteris merito. Nonnullas quoque ex eodem fragmento Pomponius Laetus, uir antiquitatis et litterarum bonarum consultissimus, sibi pagellas retinuerat, quas itidem legendas mihi describendasque dedit”.

Deacon.<sup>111</sup> In these cases, the work appears to have been again attributed entirely to Festus (even the parts belonging to the epitome). This was perhaps because the philologists of the time had sought to diminish the value of the medieval tradition and to increase the importance of the ancient manuscript. Ostensibly this was to strengthen the link between *De verborum significatione* and the ancient world.

In the preface to his editions, the Spanish archbishop and scholar Antonio Agustín was the first to make direct reference to Paul the Deacon's name, but still referred to him generically as an unspecified figure ("Paulus nescio quis"), perhaps somewhat reproachfully.<sup>112</sup> As declared in a letter to Fulvio Orsini dated 24 January 1559, Agustín was unable to uncover the identity of Paul the epitomist, especially after his studies on the manuscript tradition of the abridgement, in which Paul was generally addressed with no title, or only sometimes referred to as *pontifex*.<sup>113</sup> However, Agustín was the first to consider this epitome from a historical perspective. In fact, he stated that Paul the Deacon's intention when abridging Festus's work was to create a more successful epitome of the original. He then added that the general success of the abridgement had led to Festus's work gradually being replaced by a more simplified version, since the public was no longer able to accept or even understand the original form.<sup>114</sup> Therefore, the transformation and consequent deterioration of Festus's original was not only caused by the actions of one person, but instead converged with the cultural spirit of the period, generating unexpected consequences as a result.

This situation changed only with the 1575 edition of the French philologist, Joseph Juste Scaliger. In his preface, he referred to Paul as a deacon and a Lombard for the first time ("Paulum Diaconum Longobardum"), broadening the historical context in which he lived.

<sup>111</sup> Pio 1500; Manuzio 1513; Petit 1519.

<sup>112</sup> Agustín 1559, *praef.*: "Cumque liber ipse totus extare Caroli Regis tempore, Paulus nescio quis operaepretium fore ratus est, si epitomen quandam efficeret eorum, quae ipsi magis placuerunt".

<sup>113</sup> This approach anticipated the critique that Waitz and Neff moved to Müller's edition. Soon after, Agustín rejected the identification of Paulus the Pontiff with Pope Paul II, denying any possible identification between the epitomist of Festus and the Roman Pope; see Carbonell 1991, 301: "Del Festo sono senza pensiero, pure vederò volentieri la stampa et vorrei che fossi finito, non che comenziato. Avisate il Sigonio che stampando la lettera di Paolo abbreviatore di Festo, come credo li avisai che la stampassi avanti le parole sue di Paolo et Festo, non bisogna chiamarlo Pontefice perché non si trova in molti libri scritti, quel titolo et in vero penso che più presto sia detto così, volendo dir altro cognome, ovvero nome di patria, perché non so qual vescovo christiano si chiama pontefice, se non il Romano, et Paolo II fu posteriore assai, et non badava a questo" (24 January 1559). Indeed, Paul is not referred to as a *pontifex* in Agustín 1559: EPIS-TOLA PAVLI AD CAROLVM REGEM.

<sup>114</sup> Agustín 1559, *praef.*: "Is liber indoctis viris adeo placuit, ut pro Festo in omnibus bibliothecis substitueretur".

Scaliger set Paul the epitomist in the reign of Charlemagne and stated that, after the fall of Desiderius – the last of the Lombard kings – he attempted to win the approval of the new king by offering him an abridged version of Festus’s text, which resulted in irreparable damage being caused to posterity.<sup>115</sup>

It remains unclear how Scaliger identified Paul the Deacon as the author of Festus’s epitome. The first known Renaissance allusion to Paul as an epitomist can be found in Marco Antonio Sabellico’s *Enneades sive Rhapsodia Historiarum*,<sup>116</sup> in which he briefly described Paul as a historian who also composed a number of works that were similar to the originals (“Traduntur et alia in simili figura ab eo edita”).<sup>117</sup> This last statement perhaps referred to his abridgements and commentaries, and probably relied on the abovementioned letter in which Charlemagne referred to Paul the Deacon’s homilies (“optima quaeque decerpens”).<sup>118</sup> However, Scaliger could not have uti-

**115** Scaliger 1574, *praef.*: “De veteribus enim epitomarum concinnatoribus loquor, quos ut ego valde improbo, ita etiam ut omnibus modis improbandum inter eos pono Paulum Diaconum Longobardum, hominem, meo iudicio, confidentissimum, ac, viti res ipsa docet, ineptissimum. Is victo ac profligato Desiderio, qui ultimus Longobardorum Rex fuit, captus a Carolo Magno Imperatore, magnam et a victore, et a posteritate se initurum gratiam putavit, si Sex. Pomp. Festum, quo scriptorem utiliorem lingua Latina non habet, mutilaret, et tanto posteritatis damno se a victore redimeret”.

**116** Sabellico 1498, cxcviii: “Viri ingenio clari, ea tempestate fuerunt. Paulus Aquileiensis ecclesiae Diaconus qui Langobardorum scripsit Historia. Hunc Carolus ever-so Desyderii regno in Galliam duxit: fuitque regi ab initio charus donatusque est ab eo libertate, compertus inde novarum rerum, et quia de Desyderii regis fuga consilia agitare, in Diomedis insulam relegatus post aliquos annos ad Arachim se contulit, ubi Adelpergae, eius coniugis, rogatu (fuerat haec Desyderii filia) Eutropii historiae duos adiecit libros; historiae filo a Iuliano Principe ad primi Iustiniani tempora extenso. Caeterum Arachi defuncto in Cassinensi Coenobio reliquum vitae egit, unde saepe ad Carolum dedit litteras et accepit. Huius illud est in divinis. Ut queant laxis resonare fibris, tradunt et in alia simul figura ab eo edita”.

**117** The same formulation was also reused by Josse Bade in the introduction of the *De origine et gestis Regum Langobardorum*; see Petit 1514, *praef.*: “Qualis autem Paulus ipse vir fuerit cum alii tum M. Antonius Sabellicus Rhapsodiae historiarum enneadis IX lib. IX ita nobis praescribit”; Sabellico’s description of Paul the Deacon’s life was also the source of Maffei 1506, ccl: “Paulus Diaconus Aquileiensis patria genere longobardus. Desiderio regi ob ingenium ac doctrinam admodum carus a Carolo magno captus unacum vita libertate est donatus ac in honore apud eum habitus est, verum cum postea Carolus illum comperisset Desideri libertatem quaerere, in Diomedis insulam relegavit, unde post aliquot annos aufugiens et ad Arachim perveniens, rogatu Adilperge Desideri filae et Arachis uxoris, historiae Eutropi duos addidit libros a Iuliano principe usque ad primi Iustiniani tempora perscribens. Defuncta deinde Arachi, Casinense Coenobio reliquum vitae tempus monachum egit, litterasque ad Carolum regem plenas humanitatis scripsit gratias agens quod ab eo a quo prius fuerat conservatus rursus vitam accepit”; however, Maffei omits the reference to the abbreviations.

**118** PL 98 0896C [Carolus Magnus, *Epistola IV, De Homiliario Pauli Diaconi, monachi Casinesi (anno 788)*]. Moreover, Sabellico affirmed that Paul the Deacon was a close friend of Charlemagne (“fuitque regi ab initio charus”); this statement derived from this letter as well, in consideration of Charlemagne’s words (“Paulo Diacono familiari clientulo nostro”).

lised the information contained in Sabellico's short biography with any confidence in his introduction since it does not provide sufficient data or any explicit connection between Paul the Deacon's works and *De verborum significatione*.

One hypothesis could be that Scaliger obtained this information from his friend, Pierre Pithou, who in his *Adversariorum subsecivorum libri* referred to a *Paulus monachus* as the author of both the *De gestis Langobardorum* and the *De verborum significatione*. Regarding the latter, Pithou did not directly refer to the title as proof of this identification, but instead alluded to the word *burrum* (red vest), which among all of Paul the Deacon's works can be found only in the abridgement of Festus's work.<sup>119</sup> In 1569 Pithou edited and published

**119** Pithou 1565, *Index: Pauli Diaconi lib. I cap. 1, 14, 16; 2* [I, 1 *Filius per arma, per capillos, per sacras preces*]: "Paulus Monachus lib. VI de gestis Langobardorum; 23 [I, 14 *Clusurae, Burgiae, Lusoriae*]: Dicuntur et Burgi, a quibus olim Burgundiones Paulus monachus, Liutprandus diaconus, et Isidorus episcopus tradiderunt"; 68 [I, 20 *Bantum, Heribannum, Bandum, Rerum prolatio*]: "Paul. Monachus lib. I Histor. Longobard. cap. XIII"; 26 [I, 16 *Burra, Beri, Bera, Colobum, Campagus regius, calcei aurati et sericeï*]: "Paulus monachus, Cyprianum byrro indutum fuisse refert cum ad supplicium duceretur". It is unclear why Pithou mentions *Paulus monachus* as the source for the episode of Cyprian's life; in fact, the passage of Cyprian comes from Pontius the Deacon of Carthage's *Vita Cypriani*, attested in *PL* 3 1503B [*Acta Proconsularia Sancti Cypriani Episcopi et Martyris* (C,S) V. *Coram magna populi turba decollatur. Ejus corpus a fidelibus noctu sublatum sepelitur*], and reads: "Et ita idem Cyprianus in agrum Sexti productus est, et ibi se lacerna byrro expoliavit". This version, which is accepted for example in Desiderius Erasmus's edition published by Froben (Erasmus 1521), does not correspond to the gloss from *De verborum significatione* [Paul. Fest. 28.5-7: "Ballenae nomen a Graeco descendit. Hanc illi φάλαιναν dicunt antiqua consuetudine, qua πυρρόν burrum, πύρον buxum dicebant antiqui, quod nunc dicimus rufum; unde rustici burram appellant buculam, quae rostrum habet rufum"]. It rather echoes Pontius the Deacon's edition arranged by Paolo Manuzio and published shortly before Pithou's *Adversariorum Libri*; see Manuzio 1563, *Actus passionis*: "Perductus autem gloriosus martyr, exiit se lacernum birrum, quem indutus erat: complicans, et posuit ad genua sua". This may imply that Pithou attributed the quotation of Pontius the Deacon to Paul the Deacon (*Paulus monachus*), which was sometimes repeated by scholars during the seventeenth century (Hofman 1698, 538<sup>b</sup>); a more precise interpretation was given by Fell 1700, 14-15 and Du Cange 1883-87, 1:664<sup>a</sup>. In his work, Pithou also refers generally to a *Paulus* when citing the epitome of Festus, creating a bond between this *Paulus* and the *Paulus monachus*; see Pithou 1565, 5<sup>b</sup> [I, 6 *Ver sacrum*]: "Ver sacrum quid si Paulus ex Festo sic explicat [Paul. Fest. 519.31-2]. Ver sacrum vovendi mos fuit Italis. Magnis enim periculis adducti vovebant quaecunque vere proximo nata essent apud se animalia immolatuos. Sed cum crudele videretur pueros ac puellas innocentes interficere, perductos in adultam aetatem vebant, atque ita extra fines suos exigebant. Idem Sex. Pompeius in Mamertin. [Fest. 150.13] ut si vellent (inquit) eo malo liberari ver sacrum voverent, id est, quaecunque vere proximo nata essent immolatuos. Quem locum librorum incuria in Augustiniana editione corruptum arbitror"; 15 [I, 8: *Baro, dux*]: "Ut autem Barones sive Varones, ita et Ambactos apud Ennium lingua Gallica servos dictos ex Sex. Pompeio, Paulus scripsit [Paul. Fest. 4.20]"; and 17-18 [I, 10 *Spinturnicia, Resecro, apud Plautum et Marcellinum*]: "Resecrare ex Festo, Paulus sic exponit. Resecrare solvere religione, utique cum reus populum comitiis oraverat per deos, ut eo periculo liberaretur, iubebat magistratus eum resecrare [Paul. Fest. 353.9-11] id est, populum religione absolvere: scilicet, ut ita demum populus religione teneretur, si qui per Deos oraverat insons innocensque esset. Ita Festum sensisse Farnesiani li-

the *Historiae miscellae*, a historiographic dissertation begun by Paul the Deacon (“a Paulo Aquilegenſi diacono primum collectae”) and completed by Landulfus Sagax;<sup>120</sup> he also worked on French medieval history, focusing on the reign of Charlemagne and on legislation (the works he published included the volumes of *Annales et historiae Francorum* in 1588 and *Historiae Francorum* in 1596, in which he collected primary sources on the matter). This implies that he was well acquainted with many of Paul the Deacon’s works, and that he may have been aware of all the complex parallel occurrences within the epitome of Festus’s work, and consequently verified their common authorship. It is therefore likely that the cultural environment shared by Pithou and Paul the Deacon, with the information passed from the former to the latter, triggered the realisation that Festus’s epitome should be attributed to Paul the Deacon.

Unfortunately, this hypothesis is not yet supported by tangible evidence. However, after Scaliger’s edition, Renaissance scholars ascribed the authorship of *De verborum significatione* to the Lombard monk. For example, in 1576, only one year after the publication of Scaliger’s edition of Festus (1576), the Flemish philologist, Louis Carrion assigned the extended name of Paul the Deacon to the epitomist of Festus in his *Antiquarum Lectionum commentarii III*.<sup>121</sup> This acknowledgement was also accepted by the French printer, Arnault Sittart, in his 1584 edition of Festus’s work. Paul was identified as the historian of the Goths and Lombards and as a scholar who had commented on many ancient authors, aiding comprehension of their works but at the same time creating a series of interpolations.<sup>122</sup>

---

bri vestigia indicant [Fest. 352.31] [...] Plautus in Aulularia, Nunc te obsecro | Fac mentionem cum avunculo mater mea | Resero quod dudum obsecraveram [Plaut. Aul. 681-3]. Sic vulgo legitur in libris a doctissimo Camerario editis, sed reseco omnino legendum Pauli locus indicat, hoc sensu”.

**120** Pithou 1569, *praef.*: “Paulus Longobardus (quem Eghinardus Pisanum Diaconem, plures Aquilegensem vocant)”; see also Pithou 1609, 700: *Praefatio in Paulum Diaconum*; 1588; 1596.

**121** Carrion 1576, 16 [I, 6 *Libertatem perdimus*]: “neque ea quam vel Festus habet, vel eius depravator Diaconus”; 16-17 [I, 7 *Exilia et ilis unde dicta ina. Festus castigatus*]: “Scribit Festus ex Verrio seu potius ex Festo Paulus Diaconus, homo, quod cum bona istorum pace dicere liceat, bonis libris corrumpendis natus”; 103 [III, 1 *Ius trium librorum in V.V. capiunda legis Papiae verba correctae*]: “Festus, seu potius, Diaconus”.

**122** Sittart 1584, *ad lect.*: “Et haec quidem Verrij epitome a Festo concinnata passim omnibus tantisper in usu fuit, dum Paulus Diaconus Longobardus, quem praeclari facinoris huius auctorem esse viri docti iamdudum sunt subodorati, Desiderio Longobardorum rege victo in Caroli magni potestatem redactus captivitate, ad novum Dominum beneficio demereret, historias antiquiores rerum Gothicarum et Longobardicarum narrationis accessione auget, et scriptores alios partim interpolaret, partim pro suo suiſque ſeculi captu tamquam meliores et ad intelligendum faciliores faceret, inepto nescio quo compediti genere depravaret”.



The rediscovery of the *Codex Farnesianus* changed the perception of the authorship of the *De verborum significatione* among the Renaissance antiquarian scholarship. The editions of this work were initially ascribed to Festus, marginalising the Lombard monk and his impact on the tradition. It is in fact evident from the first opinions on *Paulus* that his role, which was strongly criticised, diminished the interest of scholars in discovering his real identity. This was the case not only for the editions that included the *Farnesianus*, but also for those which reproduced only the epitome. It is likely that this situation began to change when Antonio Agustín combined the works of Festus and Paul the Deacon in his innovative editorial layout, clearly marking each definition with the name of each author in the margins. The Spaniard was the first scholar to raise doubts over the identity of the epitomist of Festus but was unable to find a conclusive answer. Nevertheless, along with the studies carried out on the historical works of the Lombard monk, this new perception may have led Pierre Pithou to believe that the epitomist of Festus was in fact Paul the Deacon. This is probably how Joseph Scaliger connected *Paulus* to Festus from the information passed on to him from Pithou, which was then repeated in later editions.<sup>123</sup> This perception of the authorship that had developed during the Renaissance eventually influenced and prefigured the debate over the authorship which reopened during the nineteenth century.

**123** Dacer 1681, *praef.*: “Libri de verborum significatione integri extitere usque ad tempora Caroli Magni, queis Paulus Diaconus Longobardus, homo confidentissimus et ineptissimus eos mutilavit, corrupuit. Victo enim ac profligate Desiderio qui ultimus Longobardorum rex fuit, captus a Carolo Magno Imperatore, magnam et a victore et a posteritate se initurum gratiam putavit, si Sexto Pompeio Festo faceret quod ipse Verrio Fecisset. Sed homo barbarus hunc scriptorem quo utiliorem lingua Latina non habet, ita accepit, foede laniavit, et inhonestis volneribus confecit, ut cadaver pro homine, truncum pro corpore, semianimem pro vivo nobis reliquerit”.