

## ARTICLES • ARTIKELS

THE RENAISSANCE EDITIONS OF FESTUS:  
FULVIO ORSINI'S VERSION

Damiano Acciarino  
Università Ca' Foscari, Venice, Italy

## ABSTRACT

During the Renaissance, with the rediscovery of the *Codex Farnesianus*, a new philological and editorial interest in Festus' *De verborum significatione* arose. Many famous scholars of the 15th and 16th century, *inter alios* Angelo Poliziano, Aldo Manuzio, Piero Vettori, Antonio Agustín and Joseph Scaliger, studied and published this work, focusing on various aspects of its tradition. A substantial watershed occurred around 1580 when Fulvio Orsini decided to propose a new edition of Festus: from a methodological perspective, this work emerged as a revolutionary text with the potential to modify our perception of its history, since it considered the *Farnesianus* as the central ecdotic element. The aim of this contribution is to retrace the pathway followed by Orsini in arranging his text, considering its complex transmission and showing the impact of its innovations and its controversial literary fortunes.

## Introduction

*De verborum significatione* of the Latin grammarian Sextus Pompeius Festus – an epitome of Verrius Flaccus' *De verborum significatu* – was considered by Renaissance scholars to be among the most important classical sources and one that was essential in order to understand the essence of antiquity and antiquarian learning. This work was known only through an abridged 8th century version written by the Lombard monk Paulus Diaconus,<sup>1</sup> which was considered a reference for scholars from early medieval times<sup>2</sup> until the rediscovery during the mid-15th century of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Claudia Villa established that Paulus carried out a more articulated copy of this text in a miscellany of work of ancient grammarians, today known as *Schedae Vallicellianae*; see Villa 1984; Lendinara 2000:237-50.

<sup>2</sup> Munk Olsen 2009:237-38; Ammirati 2007:17-22.

*Codex Farnesianus* (Neap. IV.A.3), a badly damaged and mutilated manuscript that transmitted Festus' original.<sup>3</sup> This finding set in motion a renewed interest in this ancient author,<sup>4</sup> which led to the reconstruction of a full-length version of *De verborum significatione* for the purpose of restoring, at least in part, his thought. This stimulated a highly complex philological effort in terms of collating the material necessary to re-establish its original form and content.<sup>5</sup>

Significant differences between these two redactions were noticed immediately:<sup>6</sup> in Paulus' epitome, the original lemmas were strongly reduced and simplified for the purpose of creating a vocabulary of sorts, whereas the *Farnesianus* testified to Festus' intention to establish a historical perspective on the Latin language.<sup>7</sup> Although Renaissance scholars soon realised that Paulus' epitome was poorly equipped to provide even an outline of the original,<sup>8</sup> the two works were mutually supportive and complementary; with the *Farnesianus* damaged and incomplete, Paulus' epitome offered, if not a faithful reproduction, at least a stratigraphy of what was initially present in the original. This dual tradition therefore became an important discriminant in building the Renaissance editions of Festus, which were primarily achieved by merging the two versions.<sup>9</sup>

Initially, this was carried out indiscriminately, as can be seen not only in the publications of Giovanni Battista Pio (1500), but also in other editions that followed (1502, 1510, 1519), as well as in the edition of Aldo Manuzio (1513), in which the *Codex Farnesianus* was contaminated with Paulus Diaconus' epitome, generating a series of interpolations and omissions that were particularly compromising from a philological perspective.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The rediscovery of this manuscript should be dated to at least 1457, when Lorenzo Valla used it to compose some of his marginal notes on Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*; see Cesarini Martinelli and Perosa 1996:LXVII; Rizzo 1997; Moscadi 2001:XIV-XVI; Ammirati 2007:23; La Regina 2010:216.

<sup>4</sup> Many were the copies redacted by humanists of the Roman circle: see Bracke 1995:190-95; Ammirati 2007:22-27; La Regina 2010:216.

<sup>5</sup> Lindsay 1913: *praef.*; Grafton 1983:134-36; Glinister *et al.* 2007.

<sup>6</sup> Mancini 2007:137-58.

<sup>7</sup> Grafton 1983:141-42.

<sup>8</sup> Paulus was often considered the textual critic responsible for the poor treatment of Festus' text

<sup>9</sup> In some of the early incunabula of the sole abridgement of Paulus carried out in the second half of the 15th century, sections of the *Codex Farnesianus* were included in the text; a systematic research on these editions (1471, 1472, 1474, 1475, 1477, 1478) is still lacking.

<sup>10</sup> Pio 1500; Manuzio 1513; Grafton 1983:137.

It was only later, around the mid-16th century, that Antonio Agustín (1559) approached Festus with a renewed philological spur.<sup>11</sup> The necessity to distinguish between the entries, which throughout years of sedimentation had overlapped, prompted Agustín to find a page layout that would emphasise the contribution of each author separately (Verrius, Festus and Paulus). This also encouraged him to rethink the order of the work and find a compromise between Paulus' epitome and the ancient manuscript, by adopting the 'practical' solution of setting the lemmas in alphabetical order.<sup>12</sup> However, this arrangement did not fully respect the disposition of the ancient codex: once again, the original was blended with Paulus' work, even though this time the definitions were clearly marked with the name of each author in capital letters at the margins (fig. 1).

The impact of Agustín's text was remarkable, to the extent 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>13</sup>

### Fulvio Orsini and the *Codex Farnesianus*

The situation changed only in around 1580 when Fulvio Orsini decided to propose a new edition of Festus 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>14</sup>

He was the first and only editor in the Renaissance that felt the need for an 'autarchic' Festus: he considered the *Farnesianus* to be capable of standing alone, without any additions from the medieval tradition. He considered Paulus Diaconus' epitome to be not only distant from the spirit of Festus, but also superfluous and unable to provide the elements necessary to understand the textual voids in the *Farnesianus*; and this was because the two versions handed down were incompatible.

Orsini was also in possession of an apograph of the *Codex Farnesianus* transcribed by Angelo Poliziano (BAV Vat. Lat. 3368),<sup>15</sup> which he received at the end of the 1570s from Piero Vettori.<sup>16</sup> It emerges from a

---

<sup>11</sup> Agustín 1559, 1560; see also Ceretti 1952-1953; Bracke 1995:201-3.

<sup>12</sup> Grafton 1983:143.

<sup>13</sup> Scaliger 1575, 1576; see also Grafton 1983:134-59.

<sup>14</sup> La Regina 2010:218.

<sup>15</sup> Moscadi 1987. On Orsini's acquisition of Poliziano's books, see Nollhac 1887.

<sup>16</sup> Nollhac 1886.

letter dated 15 January 1580 between Vettori and Orsini, that Orsini had studied this manuscript and considered it very reliable.<sup>17</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>18</sup> Poliziano, moreover, 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 tie 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.<sup>19</sup> Having first considered the *Farnesianus* manuscript in its physical layout, Orsini was able to see the actual extent of the mutilations, thereby filling the gaps with greater awareness. The result was remarkable. All of the proposals, which had previously just been abstractly applied, sometimes very close to the textual reality, found their precise collocation in the defined space of the new page layout. In this light, the textual gaps became opportunities and no longer just empty spaces.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> This statement seems to be in contrast with what was affirmed by Lindsay, in the introduction of his critical edition, where he reported that Fulvio Orsini made a limited use of Poliziano's apograph, due to the difficulty of deciphering it (*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*), see Lindsay 1913:14. Even Piero Vettori, in 1568 in the *Variae Lectiones*, documented the difficulties in reading Poliziano's calligraphy (*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*), see Vettori 1568:XVII.2. From the letters of Fulvio Orsini, his interest in Poliziano's MSS emerges; see Nollac 1889:III, VII, XXII.

<sup>18</sup> Moscadi 1987.

<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, Fulvio Orsini had access to the *pagellae* or *schedae laetianae*, a part of the *Farnesianus* disassembled at the end of the 15th century, probably by Pomponio Leto, and later lost; see Poliziano 1489:LXXIII; Bracke 1995:190-97; Moscadi 2001:XVI-XVII; Orsini was not in possession of the originals, but held a written copy by a *doctus chirographus* (learned scribe); see Lindsay 1913:14; Bracke 1995:191-93. Orsini positioned the *Schedae laetianae* separately at the end of the text; he was well aware that, although they derived from the lost part of the manuscript, he could not contaminate the original with a copy (without a precise stemmatic collocation); see Orsini 1581: *praef.*

<sup>20</sup> Orsini 1581: *praef.*

[...] *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.*

[...] using all the care required, we arranged the pages according to the order in which Festus wrote them, according to the number of lines in each page and to the number of letters in each line, neither increasing nor diminishing them, as they have to appear in the manuscript. Furthermore, we amended the mutilated part of the page with uncountable philological references, because we had a spatial measure that had to be completed.

The effectiveness of the method he applied can be seen from a synoptic comparison of the editions. The evolution of the concept of lacuna is clearly noticeable in Festus' work if the same passages of *De verborum significatione* found in Antonio Agustín's editions are compared with Piero Vettori's philological proposal and Fulvio Orsini's print (fig. 1-3).

While Agustín and Vettori left gaps in their texts, Orsini was able to fit in the conjectures almost perfectly owing to his new editorial grid. 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, in which he stated his intent to facilitate scholars' understanding and to offer new textual hypotheses: *omnes antiquitatis studiosi facilius ea, certiusque essent divinaturi* ('all the antiquarian scholars will interpret the textual lacunas more easily and confidently').<sup>21</sup>

This new approach prevailed over all the previous philological experiences on Festus: the faithfulness to the structure of the archetype (*eadem ratione servata*) was precisely what was missing in its precursors. Moreover, Orsini faithfully 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>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Orsini 1581: *praef.*

<sup>22</sup> Orsini 1582: *ad lect.*

### Editorial evolution of Orsini's text

Orsini's edition, entitled *Sex. Pompei Festi De verborum significatione fragmentum*, was published three times, each 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, these publications did not have a linear course, as can be seen in the epistolary exchanges between Orsini and Piero Vettori immediately before and after the first print (1579-82). These letters bring to light a more complex picture of the entire dynamic, highlighting how the editorial layout of Orsini's Festus had to be constructed exactly in line with his ideas.<sup>23</sup>

In fact, in a letter dated 1 December 1579, Fulvio Orsini discussed with Vettori the editorial criteria for his edition, which Cardinal Alessandro Farnese wanted published by December of that year.<sup>24</sup> In this letter, Orsini mentioned the philological experience of Poliziano (asking Vettori for his manuscript), the lost papers of Pomponio Leto and the print of Aldo Manuzio. However, he made particular reference to the method he intended to follow, evidencing his choices regarding the disposition of the text ('si stamperà secondo l'ordine che Festo le fece') and the gaps ('con spatij giusti di quello che manca a la colonna bruciata'), which were finalised in order to obtain more efficient assumptions ('et potrà ognuno più sicuramente con questa nuova stampatura supplire li mancamenti, essendo in essa il giusto spatium che manca').

Shortly afterwards, on 15 January 1580, having received Poliziano's material, Orsini asked Vettori if he could assist him with printing his Festus in Florence ('dicami V.S. se fosse commodità di stamparlo in Firenze') and act as his intermediary with Giunti's publishing house.<sup>25</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 outcome ('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'). Orsini provided not only written guidelines, but also exemplary copies ('mandarò fra pochi giorni la copia') to offer visual parameters on the orthography ('nella quale sarà osservata la orthographia del libro') and page layout ('ne

---

<sup>23</sup> Nolhac 1889:XXIV-XXXVI, XXXIX-XL, XLII-XLIII.

<sup>24</sup> Nolhac 1889:33-34.

<sup>25</sup> Nolhac 1889:35-36.

mandarò dui o tre fogli, accioché da essi possa far resolutione della forma del libro, et della lettera').<sup>26</sup>

Over the following months, the Roman scholar added further details on his Florentine edition and on the delivery of the copies.<sup>27</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 distinguish the original from the philological additions ('sarà sopra tutto d'avvertire, che si riconosca l'antico dal supplemento, si come si manda nella copia').<sup>28</sup>

In the postscript of this letter, Orsini added a further interesting detail: he wanted to print the work in black and red lettering ('tutto è supplemento quello che è scritto di lettere roscie, così sarà necessario che nella stampa si distingua l'antico dal moderno'). It is likely that this choice to create a two-colour text, with the philological reconstructions in red, is why he opted for the Giunti publishing house, which had specialised in this type of printing (consisting of two passages under the press) since the mid-16th century.<sup>29</sup> Moreover, the black and red coloured text gives evidence of his model of reference: considering the antiquarian publications of the Renaissance, only the *Fasti Consulares*, edited by Carlo Sigonio in 1550, appears to have an analogous layout.<sup>30</sup> In his edition, Sigonio adopted a letter-colouring system that used red for the original text of the *Fasti* and black for his reconstructions, which was the opposite of Orsini's arrangement. In the later Renaissance editions of the *Fasti*, this two-colour printing was never repeated and was instead replaced by an easier roman-italic letter type distinction (fig. 4-5).<sup>31</sup>

Orsini not only dictated the publishing criteria; he also sought to verify firsthand 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 carried out. On 5 August 1580, he wrote to Vettori protesting about the inadequate graphical outcomes and philological reconstructions of the work ('se in qualche modo si può migliorare il riconoscimento dell'antico dal moderno, che si faccia, perché in vero

---

<sup>26</sup> Nolhac 1889:36-37.

<sup>27</sup> Nolhac 1889:XXVI, XXVIII, XXX.

<sup>28</sup> Nolhac 1889:39-40.

<sup>29</sup> Infelise 2014:135-36.

<sup>30</sup> Sigonio 1550.

<sup>31</sup> Sigonio 1555.

malamente si conosce con queste forme di lettera').<sup>32</sup> Nonetheless, Orsini continued to send drafts of his work on Festus to Vettori and Giunti throughout 1580,<sup>33</sup> even though his concerns regarding the quality of the publication had grown, mainly owing to the multiplication of errors on the printed drafts, as evidenced in his letter dated 2 September 1580 ('ho veduto correndo questi due fogli, nelli quali sono molti errori, et non hanno osservato li stampatori quello che io scrissi nella mia a loro').<sup>34</sup>

This irritation, which manifested in several other letters – especially one dated 7 September 1580, in which Orsini adopted a very harsh tone when asking Vettori to put pressure on the Giunti ('ma l'honor suo et mio richiede che quelli fogli si emendino')<sup>35</sup> – preceded the inevitable dissolution of his editorial relationship with this printing house. In fact, on 13 January 1581, after a period of approximately two years, he decided to break his ties with the Giunti and move everything to Rome, where he could supervise the work without mediation ('s'ella vede che non si possa finire da' Giunti, alla fine lasci starlo, che lo farò stampare qua in qualche modo').<sup>36</sup>

The decision was made and Fulvio Orsini's first edition of Festus was published in Rome in 1581 by Giorgio Ferrario,<sup>37</sup> with the only difference 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.

Orsini also decided to guarantee his publication to the Giunti 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. Four letters from 1582 attest to this handover and show the path taken to achieve this result,<sup>38</sup> which also included the delivery of a copy of his Festus printed in Rome as a model to arrange their own issue ('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 corregere il loro in questo').<sup>39</sup>

The outcome of the Florentine edition of 1582 evolved positively in that the text coincided perfectly with its Roman counterpart, as can be

---

<sup>32</sup> Nolhac 1889:40-41.

<sup>33</sup> Nolhac 1889:XXXI.

<sup>34</sup> Nolhac 1889:41-42.

<sup>35</sup> Nolhac 1889:42-43.

<sup>36</sup> Nolhac 1889:44.

<sup>37</sup> Nolhac 1889:48.

<sup>38</sup> Nolhac 1889:XXXIX-XL, XLII-XLIII.

<sup>39</sup> Nolhac 1889:50.

seen from the preface written by the printers: *Pervenit autem in manus nostras nuper Fragmentum Festi Pompei, veteris grammatici, de verborum significatione Romae impressum* ('we have recently received the Fragment of *De verborum significatione* of the ancient grammarian Pompeius Festus that was printed in Rome'). However, what does not come to light is the continuous exchange of information, the long struggle and the great efforts that led to its publication.<sup>40</sup>

Even the Paris edition of 1583 was presented in accordance with the Roman layout.<sup>41</sup> Finally, a new conception of Festus' work began to circulate throughout Europe.

### The literary fortune of Orsini's Festus

The novelty of the edition proposed by Fulvio Orsini meant that it could not escape comment from contemporary scholars and the public. Above all, it was unlikely to leave the two most important former editors, Agustín and Scaliger, who were severe in their criticism of Orsini's work, indifferent. 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 in his letter to Piero Vettori dated 25 February 1580, in which he stated that he wanted to mention the two former illustrious philologists only once ('Circa lo Scaligero, io non lo nominerò se non una volta nella prefazione, et all'ora con honore et laude, et così monsignor Antonio Agustino') and draw attention to their merits, but also to their mistaken textual vision.<sup>42</sup> Regarding Agustín, he said that his duties as archbishop interfered with the quality and result of his work ('come monsignor Antonio Augustino, come huomo occupato all'ora in altre cose, non diede fuori il Festo, con tutta quella diligenza che si poteva'), which also, in turn, affected the accuracy of Scaliger's amendments ('et che il Scaligero havendo seguitato quella editione così poco fidele, et nella quale era confuso l'ordine di Festo et non era notato il spatio del mancamento, ha fatto miracoli a supplire così bene molti luoghi').

As already indicated by Pierre de Nolhac, Orsini made no direct reference to Scaliger in his preface, preferring an elegant circumlocution that would leave him anonymous (*doctissimi viri*).<sup>43</sup> In this way, Orsini

---

<sup>40</sup> Orsini 1582: *ad lect.*

<sup>41</sup> Orsini 1583.

<sup>42</sup> Nolhac 1889:37-38.

<sup>43</sup> Orsini 1581: *praef.*

blamed only Agustin for having generated an erroneous tradition. In fact, in his publication, the Spanish archbishop was pointedly referred to negatively: [...] *aliisque gravioribus curis impeditus, nonnulla clarissimo viro, deque litteris optimo merito, in eis schedis describendis exciderunt* ('due to other heavier commitments, in representing the manuscript certain things were neglected by this excellent man, meritorious in Literature'). The negligence with which Agustin had printed his Festus was attributed to the fact that his duties 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, Agustin wrote to Fulvio Orsini in very harsh tones, criticising every aspect of his work:<sup>44</sup> he attacked him for his innovations, from the textual arrangement to the printing layout, and for having relieved himself of responsibility for his conjectures. Agustin then attempted to free himself from the charge of having deceived Scaliger, affirming that Scaliger himself had been responsible for the errors he had fallen into ('il quale Scaligero anchora nella seconda editione muta più cose dette male nella prima che non fa contra il nostro Festo'). Finally, the Spanish bishop, demonstrating that he did not understand the spirit that animated Orsini's philological choices, questioned the appropriateness of his work ('parmi un chaos antiquo al quale riducete questo nostro Festo'), which was considered inferior even to that of Paulus Diaconus ('Meglio fece quel Paulo abbreviatore che copiò quelle che intese solamente, et alcuna che la intese alla roversa, et pur il suo libro è più bello, più intero, più utile del vostro'). By using the words complete ('intero') and useful ('utile'), Agustin expertly explained the general perspective held by Renaissance antiquarian scholars on the role of Festus, 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>45</sup> in which he stated that Orsini's Festus had not brought any new corrections to his previous version ('Je pense qu'aies veu le Festus de Fulvius Ursinus qui n'est pas fort different du nostre quant aux corrections'); in the second, which was addressed to Claude Dupuy, he affirmed that many of the corrections proposed as new had been fully drawn from his edition, even though they had not been attributed to him ('C'est toujours le mien, sauf quelque peu de ses

---

<sup>44</sup> Carbonell 1991:630-31.

<sup>45</sup> Botley and Van Miert 2012:1.336-37.

devinations, lesquelles il a entremeslé parmi les miennes, pour deguiser mon labeur et se l'attribuer. Aux annotations, il y a fait de mesmes').<sup>46</sup>

These reactions reveal a peculiar aspect to the debate on this edition of Festus, 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 focused on organising a text he perceived to be chaotic; the Frenchman, instead, was attracted mainly by the nature of the textual emendations, of which he partially claimed paternity. Nevertheless, both scholars were unable to see that the disposition of the text could provide a new antiquarian perspective of the text itself and, at the same time, breathe new life into a philological work which had until then been relegated to the endnotes.

### The last Renaissance editions of Festus

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

In fact, in 1584, Festus was reissued by two editors, Jerome de Marnef and Arnault Sittart, in Paris.<sup>47</sup> In the preface, Sittart outlined the need to bring together all of the philological experiences that had occurred to date in terms of the text and comments of the three exegetes, in order to give the readers a comprehensive vision of the studies undertaken. This procedure was justified by the fact that all three editions had their merits and may only have developed through their synthesis. The structure of Agustín's work rendered the text legible, and Festus and Paulus could be recognised easily; a positive aspect to the work carried out by Scaliger was that he made various qualitative philological castigations to the work; Orsini, on the other hand, ensured that the various conjectures found a real collocation in the body of the text.<sup>48</sup>

The most striking innovation is that Sittart's edition of Festus incorporated the conjectures proposed in Orsini's text with Agustín's page

---

<sup>46</sup> Botley and Van Miert 2012:1.338-40.

<sup>47</sup> Sittart 1584; Marnef 1584; Sittart's editorial format was used and repropoed in Festus' last edition of the 16th century; Saint André 1593.

<sup>48</sup> Sittart 1584: *praef.*; see also Sittart 1584:121.

layout (*et ex Fulvij libro lacunas suppleri curavimus*),<sup>49</sup> filling the gaps, but losing the overall causes that determined Orsini's original formulation. The roman-italics format used to graphically distinguish between the ancient and modern text was also taken from Orsini's edition. Therefore it is evident that, although simplified, readapted and applied to a system that was not particularly suitable, his choices were followed (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>50</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 expedient of ending each page with a line (fig. 7).

It is worth mentioning that Godefroy was the only editor of Festus after the 16th century to faithfully propose Orsini's original structure, but with a diacritic mark (¶) added beside each entry to highlight each word for easier consultation. It would appear that, immediately after Orsini, the *Farnesianus* was perceived to be somewhat inadequate: in fact, even Godefroy accepted in his collection Agustin's and Scaliger's Festus to give, although in a separate section, a complete overview of his work.<sup>51</sup>

## Conclusion

It is now clear that Fulvio Orsini's version of Festus' *De verborum significatione* was a revolutionary philological experience. 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' text from its codicological state, reproducing the real conditions of the manuscript, its mutilations and its lacunas; then, within a specific and measurable textual frame, he applied all of the conjectures that he and his predecessors had previously formulated.

However, these innovations encountered controversy as they were not accepted in their original form. In fact, the subsequent publications of Festus, starting from Sittart's edition of 1584, included all the amendments

---

<sup>49</sup> Sittart 1584: *praef.*

<sup>50</sup> Godefroy 1585:127-28.

<sup>51</sup> Godefroy 1585:141-480.

arranged by Orsini in accordance with his new page layout, but they were positioned in the editorial grid of Antonio Agustín.

This new editorial situation reveals how Festus was recognised 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 for the vital details about classical antiquity that it provided. This implied that *De verborum significatione* was essentially conceived to be utilised as a whole, which still entailed the union of Festus and Paulus. 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 adding thereafter the versions of 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 it did not entirely respond to the needs of scholars.<sup>52</sup>

### Bibliography

- Agustín, A. (ed.) 1559. *M. Verrii Flacci, Quae extant et Sex. Pompei Festi De verborum significatione lib. XX. [...] Ex bibliotheca Antonij Augustini*. Venice.
- Agustín, A. (ed.) 1560. *M. Verrii Flacci, Quae extant et Sex. Pompei Festi De verborum significatione lib. XX. [...] Ex bibliotheca Antonij Augustini*. Venice.
- Ammirati, S. 2007. 'Intorno al Festo Farnesiano (Neap. IV A 3) e ad alcuni manoscritti di contenuto profano conservati presso la Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.' *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae* 14:7-93.
- Botley, P. and Van Miert, D. (edd.) 2012. *The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger*. Vol. 1. Geneva.
- Bracke, W. 1995. 'La première "édition" humaniste du "de verborum significatione" de Festus.' *RHT* 25:189-215.
- Carbonell, J. 1991. *Epigrafia i numismatica a l'epistolario d'Antonio Agustín (1551-1563)*. Tesi doctoral. Barcelona.

---

<sup>52</sup> 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 16th century contributed to fully investigating the matter, up to the point of exhaustion, and only a new philological direction and method could have pushed forward the results acquired until that point.

- Ceretti, L. 1952-1953. 'I precedenti e la formazione dell' "editio" di S. Pompeo Festo di Antonio Agustin.' *AIV* 111:153-64.
- Cesarini Martinelli, L. and Perosa A. 1996. *L. Valla. Le postille all' "Institutio Oratoria" di Quintiliano*. Padua.
- Dacer, A. (ed.) 1681. *Sex. Pompei Festi et Mar. Verrii Flacci De Verborum significatione lib. 20, Notis et emendationibus illustravit Andreas Dacerius*. Paris.
- Glinister, F., Woods, C., North, J.A. and Crawford, M.H. (edd.). 2007. *Verrius, Festus, & Paul: Lexicography, Scholarship, and Society*. *BICS Supplement* 93. London.
- Godefroy, D. (ed.) 1585. *Auctores Latinae Linguae in unum redacti corpus*. Geneva.
- Grafton, A. 1983. *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in History of Classical Scholarship. I. Textual Criticism*. Oxford.
- Infelise, M. 2014. *I padroni dei libri. Il controllo sulla stampa nella prima età moderna*. Bari.
- La Regina, A. 2010. 'Mamertini in Festo.' *Quaderni di Archeologia d'Abruzzo* 2:213-30.
- Lendinara P. 2000. 'Gli Scholia Vallicelliana e i primi glossari anglosassoni.' In P. Chiesa (ed.), *Paolo Diacono. Uno scrittore fra tradizione longobarda e rinnovamento carolingio. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi. Cividale del Friuli-Udine, 6-9 maggio 1999*, 251-78. Udine.
- Lindsay, W.M. (ed.) 1913. *Sexti Pompei Festi de verborum significatu quae superstunt cum Pauli epitome*. Leipzig.
- Mancini, C. 2007. 'I codici vaticani latini 1549 e 3369 e le pagellae perdute del codex Farnesianus.' In F. Glinister *et al.* (edd.), *Verrius, Festus, & Paul: Lexicography, Scholarship, & Society*, 137-58. London.
- Manuzio, A. (ed.) 1513. *Cornu copiae linguae Latinae commentarij diligentissimè recogniti: atque ex archetypo emendati*. Venice.
- Marnef, J. (ed.) 1584. *M. Verrii Flacci Quae extant. Et Sex. Pompei Festi De verborum significatione, libri XX. [...] In eos libros Ant. Augustini annotationes, ex editione Veneta; Ios. Scaligeri Castigationes recognitae, ex Parisiensi, Ful. Vrsini notae, ex Romana*. Paris.
- Moscadi, A. 1987. 'Note sull'apografo poliziano di Festo (cod. Vat. Lat. 3368).' *Prometheus* 13:261-64.
- Moscadi, A. 2001. *Il Festo Farnesiano: (cod. Neapol. 4.A.3)*. Florence.
- Munk Olsen, B. 2009. *La reception de la litterature classique. Travaux philologiques*. Paris.
- Nolhac, P. 1886. 'Le "Festus" d'Ange Politien.' *RPh* 10:145-48.
- Nolhac, P. 1887. *La Bibliotheque de Fulvio Orsini: contributions a l'histoire des collections d'Italie et a l'etude de la Renaissance*. Paris.

- Nolhac, P. 1889. *Piero Vettori et Carlo Sigonio: correspondance avec Fulvio Orsini*. Rome.
- Orsini, F. (ed.) 1581. *Ex Pompei Festi De verborum significatione fragmentum, ex vetustissimo exemplari bibliotheca Farnesianae descriptum*. Rome.
- Orsini, F. (ed.) 1582. *Ex Pompei Festi De verborum significatione fragmentum, ex vetustissimo exemplari bibliotheca Farnesianae descriptum*. Florence.
- Orsini, F. (ed.) 1583. *Ex Pompei Festi De verborum significatione fragmentum, ex vetustissimo exemplari bibliotheca Farnesianae descriptum*. Paris.
- Pio, G.B. (ed.) 1500. *Nonius Marcellus, Festus Pompeius, Varro*. Milan.
- Poliziano, A. 1489. *Miscellaneorum centuria prima*. Florence.
- Rizzo, S. 1997. 'Glosse antroponimiche in una recente edizione del Valla.' *RFIC* 125:342-81.
- Saint André (ed.) 1593. *M. Verrii Flacci, Quae extant et Sex. Pompei Festi Deverborum significatione lib. XX. [...] In eos libros Ant. Augustini annotationes, ex editione Veneta. Ios. Scaligeri castigationes recognitae, ex Parisiensi, Ful. Ursini notae, ex Romana*. Paris.
- Scaliger, J.J. (ed.) 1575. *M. Verrii Flacci, Quae extant et Sex. Pompei Festi Deverborum significatione lib. XX. [...] Et in eos Iosephi Scaligeri castigationes*. Geneva.
- Scaliger, J.J. (ed.) 1576. *M. Verrii Flacci, Quae extant et Sex. Pompei Festi Deverborum significatione lib. XX. [...] Et in eos Iosephi Scaligeri castigationes*. Paris.
- Sigonio, C. 1550. *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*. Modena.
- Sigonio, C. 1555. *Regum, consulum, dictatorum, ac censorum Romanorum Fasti, vna cum Triumphis actis, a Romulo rege, vsque ad Ti. Caesarem*. Venice.
- Sittart, A. (ed.) 1584. *M. Verrii Flacci, Quae extant et Sex. Pompei Festi Deverborum significatione lib. XX. [...] In eos libros Ant. Augustini annotationes, ex editione Veneta. Ios. Scaligeri castigationes recognitae, ex Parisiensi, Ful. Ursini notae, ex Romana*. Paris.
- Vettori, P. 1568. *Variarum lectionum libri*. Florence.
- Villa, C. 1984. 'Uno schedario di Paolo Diacono. Festo e Grauso di Ceneda.' *IMU* 27:56-80.

damiano.acciarino@unive.it

APPENDICES

	CCI	
	plurimis auctorum exemplis manifestum est.	
	Nequitum, & nequitur, pro non posse dixe-	PAVLVS.
	unt.	
	Nequitum, & nequitur, pro non posse dicebant,	FESTVS.
8	De Pacuuius cum ait. Sed cum conrendi ne-	
	quitum, ut clam tendenda est plaga. Plau-	
	tus in Satyrione. Rerabi nequitur, quoquo	
	progressu est semel. & Cato originum libro	
	primo. sana in eo loco compluria fuere. ca	
10	exauguravit, praeterquam † quod termino	† praequā
	fanum fuit, id nequitum exaugurari.	V.C.
	Neruum appellamus etiam ferreum vinculum,	
	quo pedes impediuntur, quanquam Plautus	
	eo etiam ceruices vinciri ait. perfidiose ca-	† eo epol v.
15	ptus, eo aedepol † neruo ceruices probat.	C.
	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 nexi dici-	
	tur. quo in genere sunt haec: testamenti fa-	† datio)
	ctio, nexi danto, † nexi liberanto. * Nexum * liberatio)	
	acs	

Figure 1: Agustín 1560:201. Biblioteca Oliveriana, Pesaro

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 notarat, quae valde pertinerent ad rationem ipsius aperendam ac veterum consuetudinem tradendam, cunctaque illa summo studio testimonis optimorum auctorum confirmarat, declarant quanta utilitas inde capi poterit 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 eisdem supplendos atque interpretatus est. Cum autem in illis suo loco legatur.

Neutiquam

cum ait sec

lorum aspect

neutiquam

uenit in mentem Riccardo Riccardio, probo & erudito adolescenti, & quem ego propter suauissimos ipsius mores valde diligo, legi debere, quod ad exemplum facit. Sed mihi neutiquam 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: fuit enim bonis ingenijs: ipsaque quaecumque ratione possum, orno. Sed redibo ad Augustinum: est ille quidem multo grauioribus litteris instructus: & his demum omnibus, quae continentur personae episcopi, quam sustinet, sed tamen has quoque humaniores litteras enixe adiuuit, vt notum omnibus studiosis ipsarum est. Notabo hic ego nunc, quod ille in epistola ad Laelium Taurinum voluit mihi per eum significari, se arbitrari locum hunc Ciceronis e iij. libro de natura deorum. Itaque & fontis delabrum Marso ex Corsica dedicauit, mendo sum esse: legique debere pro Maro, Maso vt C. Papirius Maso significetur, qui de Corsis triumphauit: id quod praeter fastos capitolinos, Plinius & Plutarchus memoriae prodiderunt. Sed hoc etiam cognomen, vnum e multis, fuisse Papiriorum intelligitur iudicio Ciceronis, apud quem recte nunc studio meo illud scriptum est, quod ego inuenit in optimo illo exemplari, quod secutus sum: prius enim perperam legebatur in excusis, Maso & Massones, cuius tamen lectionis integritatem quidam non videntes, ad vtiliosam, quod eos facere non oportebat, redierunt. haec igitur verba ipsius sunt ex epistola ad Pactum: 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 Maso scriptum est: quo de ego testari volui, non, vt fidem illius emendationis minuerem, sed, vt acumen industriamque correctoris augerem. Sed etiam ipsa nomina suspecta sunt aliquibus: putanturque mendae aliquid continere.

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

## CAP. X.



**M** hic locus e iij. de natura deorum de Dionysio tyranno: Atque in suo lectulo mortuus, in tyrannidis rogo 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 speravi hoc declaratos, me tesellerunt, ipsos tamen nunc notabo. Athenaeus igitur in v. libro, vbi disserit de admirabilibus quibusdam fabricis, citat Moschionem 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 locutus fuerat. Verba haec ipsius sunt. *Τίμαιος δὲ ἦν ἡγεμὼν τῆς κατὰ Μόσχωνα Διονυσίου*

Figure 2: Vettori 1582:448. Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venice

Negibundum a-ntiqui pro negantē dixerūt. Cato in  
 ea, quā scripsit . . . . .  
 negibundus . . . . .  
 Neutiquam pro nullo modo dici, testis est Cicero  
 cum ait, Sed mihi neutiquam cor consentit, cum oculor.  
 aspectu. Idē. Indissolubiles quidē eē nō potestis,  
 neutiquam tamen dissoluemini. Nepos luxuriosus,  
 Tuscis dicitur: nam nepotes sunt luxuriosae vitae  
 homines appellati; quōd non magis his res  
 sua familiaris curae est, quā is quib. pater auusq.  
 viuunt. quod nomē ductū ab eo, qđ natus post patri  
 fit, quā filius. Quidam, inter quos Aristar-  
 ch<sup>us</sup> interpres Homeri, Graecū eē volūt, ad qđ *νεπίου-  
 νόσιον ἐπίου*, efferunt ex Apollonio. Nephas-  
 ti dies notabant. N. littera, q̄ys nephas est Praetori  
 apud quem lege agitur, fari tria verba, do, dico  
 addico. Nep. nota designari solent qui nephas-  
 tiores sunt, quorum pars anterior fas: his serui  
 liberati sunt, delectus habentur, exercitus scrib-  
 untur, & in prouincias ire licet, sacra quoque  
 instituta sunt, & vota nuncupata solui,  
 & aedes sacrari, solent. Nepa Afrorum lingua  
 fidus, quod dī à nostris c-ancer, velut quidā volūt,  
 scorpions. Plautus in Cassina. Recessim dabo me  
 ad parietem, imitabor nepam. Nepus, non purus.  
 Nesi pro sine positum est in lege dedicationis arae  
 Dianae Auentinensis. Nauteam ait Opi-  
 lius Aurelius, herb-am esse granis nigris  
 qua coriarij vtuntur, cuius à nausea duc-  
 tū nomen, quia naus eam facit, p̄mutationē. T. &  
 s litterarum intermediam antiquis consuetam.  
 Plautus in Artemone. Vnguentū quod naribus mu-  
 lionum nauteam tecillet . . . . .

p. apud

VNA CVM ACTIS TRIVMPHORVM.

Q. Fabius. M. F. K. N.	Vibulani.	T. Quinctius	Capitolin. Barbat. III. L. F. IX
A. Posthumius. A. F. P. N.	Albus Regillensis.	Sp. Furius	Medullinus Fufus.
P. Scruilius. Sp. F. P. N.	Priscus.	L. Eburus	Ena.
L. Lucretius. T. F. T. N.	Tricinatus.	Sp. Veturus. Sp. F. P. N.	Craffus.
L. Lucretius. T. F. T. N. Tricipitinus. Cos. De Volscis. Et Aequis.			Ann. CCXCI.
Sp. Veturus. Sp. F. P. N.	Craffus. Cos. Onans De Volscis. Et Aequis.		Ann. CCXCI.
P. Volturnus. M. F. M. N.	Aminius. Gallus.	Ser. Sulpicius. Ser. F. P. N.	Camerinus.
P. Valerius. P. F. Volst. N.	Poplicola. Ti.	C. Claudius. M. F.	Regillens. Sabinius.
In Mag. maris est. In Eius. L. F. E.			
L. Quinctius. L. F. L. N.	Cincinatus.		
Q. Fabius. M. F. K. N.	Vibulani. III.	L. Cornelius. Ser. F. L. N. Maluginensis. L. F. X.	
Q. Fabius. M. F. K. N. Vibulani. Cos. III. De Aequis.			Ann. CCXCLIII. Nonis Mai.
L. Cornelius. Ser. E. L. N. Maluginensis Cos. De Volscis. Anianob. IV. Id. Mai.			CCXCIV.
C. Nannus. Sp. F. Sp. N.	Rutilus. Ti.	L. Minucius	Augurinus.
		Cosibus a Diffatore	abdicavit.
L. Quinctius. L. F. L. N.	Cincinatus.	Diff.	
L. Tarquinius. L. F.	Flaccus.	Mag. Ej.	Rei Ger. Causa.
L. Quinctius. L. F. L. N. Cincinatus. Dite. De Aequis. Idibus. Septemb.			Ann. CCXCV.
C. Horatius. M. F. M. N.	Pulvillus.	Q. Minucius	Augurinus.
M. Valerius. M. F. Volst. N.	Maximus.	Sp. Verginius	Coeliontanus.
T. Romilius. T. F. T. N.	Rocus Vatiannus.	C. Veturus	Cicertinus.
Sp. Tarpeius. M. F. M. N.	Montanus.	A. Aternius.	
Ser. Quinctius. Ser. F. P. N.	Varius.	P. Horatius.	Trigeminus.
P. Sextus. Q. F. Vili. N.	Cabulinus.	T. Menenius. T. F. Agripp. N.	Lanatus.
Ap. Claudius. Ap. F. M. N.	Craffus.	T. Genucius. L. F. L. N.	Augurinus.
	Abdicavit. Ve Designarentur Legum ferendarum causa.		
Decemviri Consularis. Qui per. III. Annos sine Coss. Rep. praefuerunt.			
Ap. Claudius. Ap. F. M. N.	Craffus.	P. Postumius. A. F. P. N.	Albus. Regillens.
T. Genucius. L. F. L. N.	Augurinus.	Ser. Sulpicius	Camerinus.
Sp. Veturus. Sp. F. P. N.	Craffus.	P. Sextus. Q. F. Vili. N.	Capitolinus.
C. Julius. C. F. L. N.	Tricus.	T. Romilius. T. F. T. N.	Vaticanus.
A. Manlius. Cr. F. P. N.	Vulsi.	P. Horatius.	Trigeminus.
Ap. Claudius. Ap. F. M. N.	Craffus. II.	Q. Fabius. M. F. K. N.	Vibulani.
M. Cornelius. Ser. F. L. N.	Maluginensis.	M. Robulius.	
L. Minucius	Augurinus. II.	Q. Postulius.	
T. Antonius	Merenda. II.	K. Duilius.	
M. Sergius.	II.	Sp. Oppius.	Cornicen.
Ap. Claudius. Ap. F. M. N.	Craffus. III.	Q. Fabius. M. F. K. N.	Vibulani. II.
M. Cornelius. Ser. F. L. N.	Maluginensis. II.	M. Robulius.	
L. Minucius	Augurinus. II.	Q. Postulius.	
T. Antonius	Merenda. II.	K. Duilius.	
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. Potius.	M. Horatius. M. F. M. N.	Barbatus.
L. Valerius. P. F. P. N. Poplicola. Potius. Cos. De Aequis.			Libus Sextil. Ann. CCCIV.
M. Horatius. M. F. M. N. Barbatus. Cos. De Aequis.			Ann. CCCIV. VII. K. Septemb.
Lar Herminius.		T. Verginius	Coeliontanus. Trico. III.
M. Ceganus. M. F.	Macerinus.	C. Inlius	Iules.
T. Quinctius	Capitolin. Barbat. III.	Agrippa Furus	Medullinus Fufus.
M. Genucius. L. F. L. N.	Augurinus.	P. Ceriatius.	
TRIBVNI MILITVM CONSVLARI POTESTATE.			
A. Sempronius. A. F.	Atratinus.	L. Atilius	Longus.
T. Cloelius	Siculus.		
	Vitio Facti Abdicarunt. In Eorum Loc. Facti sunt Coss.		
L. Papirius	Magillanus.	L. Sempronius. A. F.	Atratinus.
CCCX M. Ceganus. M. F.	Macerinus. II.	T. Quinctius	Capitolin. Barbat. V.

B

Figure 4: Sigonio 1550. Biblioteca Comunale Augusta, Perugia

VNA CVM ACTIS TRIUMPHIS.

T. Veturius, T. F. P. N.	Genius, Cicurin, Cos. Ouans De Volscis, Et Aequis.	Ann. CCXCI, ///
P. Volumnius, M. F. M. N.	Amintin, Gallus, Ser. Sulpicius, Ser. F. P. N.	Camerinus.
P. Valerius, P. F. Volufi, N.	Poplicola, II.	Regillens, 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. III. De Aequis.	An. CCXCIII, Nonis Mai.
L. Cornelius, Ser. F. L. N. Maluginensis, Cossus, Cos. De Volscis Antiatib, IV. Id. Mai. An. CCXCIV.	Rutilus, II.	L. Minucius, Augurinus, abdicat.
C. Nautius, Sp. F. Sp. N.		
L. Quinctius, L. F. L. N.	Cincinnatus, Diff.	
L. Tarquinius, L. F.	Flaccus, Mag. Eq.	Rei Ger. Causa.
L. Quinctius, L. F. L. N.	Cincinnatus, DiG.	De Aequis, Idibus, Septembr. An. CCXCV.
C. Horatius, M. F. M. N.	Pulullius, Q. Minucius,	Augurinus.
M. Valerius, M. F. Volufi, N.	Maximus, Sp. Verginius,	Tricoftus.
T. Romilius, T. F. T. N.	Rocus Vaticanus, C. Veturius,	Cicurinus.
Sp. Tarpeius, M. F. M. N.	Montana, A. Aterius,	Fontinalis.
Sex. Quinctilius, Sex. F. P. N.	In M. M. E. P. Horatius,	Tergemius.
P. Sestius, Q. F. Vibi, N.	Capitolinus, T. Menenius, T. F. Agripp. N.	Lanatus.
Ap. Claudius, Ap. F. M. N.	Crafinus, T. Genucius, L. F. L. N.	Augurinus.
Abdicarunt, Vt Designarentur Legum ferendarum causa		
Decemviri Confulares, Qui per. II. Annos. R. P. praefuerunt.		
Ap. Claudius, Ap. F. M. N.	Crafinus, Sp. Postumius, A. F. P. N.	Albus, Regillens.
T. Genucius, L. F. L. N.	Augurinus, Ser. Sulpicius, Ser. F. P. N.	Camerinus.
Sp. Veturius, Sp. F. P. N.	Craffus, P. Sestius, Q. F. Vibi, N.	Capitolinus.
C. Iulius, C. F. L. N.	Iulio, T. Romilius, T. F. T. N.	Rocus Vaticanus.
A. Manlius, Cn. F. P. N.	Vulfo, P. Horatius,	Tergemius.
Ap. Claudius, Ap. F. M. N.	Crafinus, I. J.	Q. Fabius, M. F. K. N.,
M. Cornelius, Ser. F. L. N.	Maluginensis, I. J.	M. Rabuleius,
L. Minucius,	Augurinus, Q. Poetelius,	Vibulanus.
T. Antonius,	Merenda, K. Dullius,	
M. Sergius,	Sp. Oppius,	Cornicen.
Ap. Claudius, Ap. F. M. N.	Crafinus, III.	Q. Fabius, M. F. K. N.,
M. Cornelius, Ser. F. L. N.	Maluginensis, I. J.	M. Rabuleius,
L. Minucius,	Augurinus, II.	Q. Poetelius,
T. Antonius,	Merenda, II.	K. Dullius,
M. Sergius,	II.	Sp. Oppius,
Abdicarunt ob libidinem Ap. Claudij. In eorum locum facti sunt Cos.		
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.
L. L. Herminius,	T. Verginius,	Coelimonianus Tricoftus.
M. Geganius, M. F.	Macerinus, C. Iulius,	Iulus.
T. Quinctius,	Capitolin, III.	Agrippa Purius,
M. Genucius, L. F. L. N.	Augurinus, C. Curtius,	Fufus.
A. Sempronius, A. F.	Atratinus,	
T. Cloelius,	Skudus,	TRIBVNI MILIT. CONS. POTEST.
L. Atilius,	Longus,	
Vitis Facti Abdicarunt, In eorum Loc. Facti Sunt Cos.		
L. Papirius,	Mugillanus, L. Sempronius, A. F.	Atratinus.
M. Geganius, M. F.	Macerinus, II.	T. Quinctius,
M. Geganius, M. F. Macerinus, Cos. De Volscis.		Ann. CCCX. Nonis Septemb.
Censores Primi, L. Papirius,	Mugillanus,	L. Sempronius, A. F.,
M. Fabius, Q. F. M. N.	Vibulanus,	Postumus Aebucius,
C. Furius,	Fufus Paedus,	M. Papirius,
Proculus Geganius,	Macerinus,	L. Menenius, T. F. Agripp. N.
T. Quinctius,	Capitolin, Barbat. VI.	Agrippa Menenius, T. F. Agripp. N.
L. Quinctius, L. F. L. N.	Cincinnatus, II.	Diff.
C. Seruilius, Q. F. C. N.	Axilla,	Mag. Eq. Seditiois Sedandae causa.

B Mam. Aini

Figure 5: Sigonio 1555. Biblioteca Comunale Augusta, Perugia

CXXI

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

Nequam aurum est, auris quoduis vehementius ambit. P A V L V S.

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

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

10 Nequeunt \* non eunt. \* Nequunt  
vel Nequunt

Nequimates, Narnicenses. P A V L V S.

*Nequimates Narnicenses dicta sunt, qui e nequino oppido estis colonis veteri. b. ibi habitarent Cato, in ea aduersus* F E S T V S.

15 *x. hominibus.*

Nequinont pro nequeunt, ut solunt, ferunt pro solent, & ferunt dicebant antiqui. Lilius in Odyssia: Partim errant, neque nunc Græciam redire (nequinont.)

Nequinont, nequeunt. P A V L V S.

Neququam, frustra. F E S T V S.

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

Nequitum, & nequitur pro non posse dixerunt. P A V L V S.

Nequitum, & nequitur, pro non posse dicebant, ut Pacuvius cum ait: Sed cum contendi nequitum, ut elam tendenda est plaga: Plautus in Satyrione: Retrahe nequitur, quo quo progressa est semel. & Cato Originum libro primo: Fana in eo loco compluria fuerunt. ea exauguravit, præterquam \* quod termino sanum fuit, id nequitum exaugurati. \* præquã v.c.

30 Neruum appellamus etiam ferream vinculum, quo pedes impediuntur, quãquam Plautus eo etiam ceruices vinciri ait: Perfidiose captus, eo ædopol \* neruo ceruices probat. \* eo epol. v.c.  
P A V L V S.

Neruum appellamus etiam ferream vinculum, quo pedes, vel etiam ceruices impediuntur. F E S T V S.

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

Neutiquam pro nullo modo dicitur esse cum ait, sed mihi neutiquam cor consentit, cum oculorum aspectu Cice. indissolubiles quidã esse non potestis, neutiquã tamẽ dissoluemini.

Figure 6: Sittart 1584:121. Biblioteca Comunale Manfrediana, Faenza

