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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 Agustin 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 significacione 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,¹ which was considered a reference for scholars from early medieval times² until the rediscovery during the mid-15th century of the

¹ 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.
**Codex Farnesianus** (Neap. IV.A.3), a badly damaged and mutilated manuscript that transmitted Festus' original.\(^3\) This finding set in motion a renewed interest in this ancient author,\(^4\) 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.\(^5\)

Significant differences between these two redactions were noticed immediately.\(^6\) 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.\(^7\) Although Renaissance scholars soon realised that Paulus' epitome was poorly equipped to provide even an outline of the original,\(^8\) 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.\(^9\)

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.\(^10\)

---

\(^3\) 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.

\(^4\) Many were the copies redacted by humanists of the Roman circle: see Bracke 1995:190-95; Ammirati 2007:22-27; La Regina 2010:216.


\(^7\) Grafton 1983:141-42.

\(^8\) Paulus was often considered the textual critic responsible for the poor treatment of Festus' text.

\(^9\) 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.

\(^10\) 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. 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. 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.

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.

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), which he received at the end of the 1570s from Piero Vettori. It emerges from a

---

11 Agustín 1559, 1560; see also Ceretti 1952-1953; Bracke 1995:201-3.
12 Grafton 1983:143.
13 Scaliger 1575, 1576; see also Grafton 1983:134-59.
14 La Regina 2010:218.
16 Nolhac 1886.
letter dated 15 January 1580 between Vettori and Orsini, that Orsini had studied this manuscript and considered it very reliable. 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. 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. 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.

17 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 eae 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 proprietatem hominis erat, cum huiusmodi aliquid, quod ipsius tantum usibus servaret, in commentariis adnotaret, ut vix intelligi possinti), see Vettori 1568: XVII.2. From the letters of Fulvio Orsini, his interest in Poliziano’s MSS emerges; see Nolhac 1889:III, VII, XXII.


19 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.

20 Orsini 1581: praef.
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 vocabum significatione found in Antonio Agustín's editions are compared with Piero Vettori's philological proposal and Fulvio Orsini's print (fig. 1-3).

While Agustin 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’).21

This new approach prevailed over all the previous philological experiences on Festus: the faithfulness to the structure of the archetype (eaedem 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 (varijisque characteribus distinctum).22

---

21 Orsini 1581: praef.
22 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.23

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.24 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 spatio 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.25 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 frammento 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

23 Nolhac 1889:XXIV-XXXVI, XXXIX-XL, XLII-XLI II.
24 Nolhac 1889:33-34.
mandarò due o tre fogli, accioché da essi possa far risoluzione della forma del libro, et della lettera').

Over the following months, the Roman scholar added further details on his Florentine edition and on the delivery of the copies. 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').

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. 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. In this 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).

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

---

26 Nolhac 1889:36-37.
27 Nolhac 1889:XXVI, XXVIII, XXX.
30 Sigonio 1550.
31 Sigonio 1555.
malamente si conosce con queste forme di lettera'). Nonetheless, Orsini continued to send drafts of his work on Festus to Vettori and Giunti throughout 1580, 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 scrisi nella mia a loro’).

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’) – 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’).

The decision was made and Fulvio Orsini’s first edition of Festus was published in Rome in 1581 by Giorgio Ferrario, 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, 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’).

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

---

32 Nolhac 1889:40-41.
33 Nolhac 1889:XXXI.
34 Nolhac 1889:41-42.
35 Nolhac 1889:42-43.
36 Nolhac 1889:44.
37 Nolhac 1889:48.
38 Nolhac 1889:XXXIX-XL, XLII-XLIII.
39 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.40

Even the Paris edition of 1583 was presented in accordance with the Roman layout.41 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, Agustìn 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’hora con honore et laude, et così monsignor Antonio Agustino’) and draw attention to their merits, but also to their mistaken textual vision.42 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’hora 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 Scaligo 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*).43 In this way, Orsini

---

40 Orsini 1582: *ad lect.*
41 Orsini 1583.
42 Nolhac 1889:37-38.
43 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: [...] *aliaque 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:44 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 edizione 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,45 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

devinations, lesquelles il a entremeslé parmi les miennes, pour deguiser mon labeur et se l’attribuer. Aux annotations, il y a faict de mesmes).

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. 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.

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

---

47 Sittart 1584; Marnef 1584; Sittart’s editorial format was used and reproposed in Festus’ last edition of the 16th century; Saint André 1593.
48 Sittart 1584: praed.; see also Sittart 1584:121.
layout (et ex Fulvij libro lacunas suppleri curavimus), 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. 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.

Conclusion

It is now clear that Fulvio Orsini’s version of Festus’ De verborum significatone 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

---

49 Sittart 1584: praef.
51 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.

Bibliography
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52 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.


damiano.acciarino@unive.it
APPENDICES

Figuræ 1: Agustin 1560:201. Biblioteca Oliveriana, Pesaro
Variarum Lectionum

CAP. IX.

Additamentum

CAP. X.

Vetusta haec scripsit et invenit Philippus Ciceronii lati, in quo, agit de Dionysii Bacdo regis.

Figure 2: Vettori 1582:448. Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venice
Negibundum a-ntiqui pro negant' dixerit. Catu in
an, quae scriptur...
ne gibundus... Neutiquam promulgo modo dici, tesiis est Cicero
cum ait, Sed mibinentiquam cor senserit, cum scu-
lor.spectum. Idie. Indissolubiles quidem e' nó possitis,
neutiquam tamen dissolvemini. Nepos luxuriosus,
Tucis dicitur: nam nepotes sunt luxuriosis vitae
homines appellati; quod non magis her relig
fem iatriis curae est, quam hie qui, pater aut siq
vivunt, quod nomé dulcit ab eo, quæ natus post patri
sit, quàm filius. Quidam, inter quos Aristar-
ch'iter pres Homerii, Graeci g'è volui, ad quæ 
'stigmo i' sorio i'ti's, effertunt ex A'pollo
'Nephas-
ti dies not-abant. Nlittera, quæ nephas est Praetor 
ap quæm lege agitur. Sari i's verba, do, dico
addico. Nepis. Vota designati solent qui nephasi p-
riores sunt, qurum pars anterior fas: bis s'éri
liberati sunt, dele'tus babentur, exercitus scriba
untur, & in prouin-cias ire licet, facru quaque
instituta sunt, & vota nuncupata solvi,
& aedes sacrati, solent. Nepis A'fro'mus lingua
futis, quod dè à nostris c'ancier, velut quidà volui,
scorpios. Plantus in Cassina. Rece'stim dabo me
in parietem, imita bor nepam. Nepus, non purus.
Nelì pro fine postumè est in legé dedications arae 
Dianae Augu'tinæ. Nautem ait Opì-
lius Aurelius, herb'am esse gravis migris
qua coiri'ì vuntur, cuinis à nauta du-
ti nomen, quia nauta cum fa'ci, in mutatione. T.
& s'letterum intermediae antiquus conjunctam.
Plantus in Artemone. Vuncto quod maribus nu-
lionum nautam tecilet.
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