



---

Marcus Verrius Flaccus' *De Significatu Verborum* in den Auszügen von Sextus Pompeius Festus und Paulus Diaconus. Einleitung und Teilkommentar (154,19–186,29 Lindsay) by P. Pieroni

Review by: Fay Glinister

*The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 96 (2006), pp. 251–252

Published by: [Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20430521>

Accessed: 12/11/2012 09:47

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Roman Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

P. PIERONI, *MARCUS VERRIUS FLACCUS' DE SIGNIFICATU VERBORUM IN DEN AUSZÜGEN VON SEXTUS POMPEIUS FESTUS UND PAULUS DIACONUS. EINLEITUNG UND TEILKOMMENTAR* (154,19–186,29 LINDSAY) (Studien zur Klassischen Philologie 147). Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2004. Pp. 180. ISBN 3-631-51720-3. €39.00.

Grappling with the text of Festus' epitome of Verrius Flaccus' 'encyclopaedia' is no easy matter. As well as demanding from its editors knowledge of anything from Roman grammar and topography to fish and fowl, the sole surviving manuscript (the *Farnesianus*) is severely damaged. Supplemented in parts by humanist apographs (complete with their own problems), the text has endured centuries of learned fiddling from some of classical scholarship's best textual critics, which must all be assimilated. Individual excerpts have long been the subject of discussions in books and articles, but there has been no collection of this bibliography and until recently few modern attempts to look at the work or the information it provides as a coherent whole. Astonishingly, Pieroni's work, based on his 2001 thesis, is the first proper stab at a commentary. The book falls into two main sections. In the first part, P. discusses the history of the text and its authors; his commentary takes up the second part of the book.

The introduction (9–37) provides a clear and concise survey of scholarship on the multiple problems of the text and its author(s) — Verrius, Festus, and Paul the Deacon. It begins with a brief survey of the origins of the Roman glossographical tradition, and the early interest in etymologies apparent from authors such as Naevius, Ennius, and Accius. P. then discusses (12–15) the life and career of Verrius Flaccus. Verrius' status as a freedman and as an imperial employee sets him apart from late Republican antiquarian scholars such as Varro, and is important for understanding the context and (Augustan?) agenda of his work; it is a pity that P. did not choose to expand on this topic. P. goes on to discuss the epitomators of Verrius, and the relationship between their work. He rightly rejects (21–2) the view of A. Moscati, 'Verrio, Festo e Paulo', *GIF* 31 (1979), 17–36, that Festus had created, not merely an epitome, but an independent work.

Having discussed the complicated compositional stages of the text, P. continues with the story of its transmission and reception. He rightly observes (31) that the date 1475, long accepted as the year in which the manuscript was rediscovered by the Greek Manilius Rhallus, must now be back-dated by about twenty years, since the humanist Lorenzo Valla made use of Festus for his notes on Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*. P. also discusses the less well-known manuscript tradition of Paul the Deacon, through whose brutal epitome we are forced to approach the lost sections of the text of Verrius/Festus' work. P.'s history of interventions on the text presents the results of centuries of scholarship in a lucid manner.

P.'s commentary (39–168) discusses only the lemmas beginning with the letter N, the first letter to survive in full in the *Farnesianus*. Light is shed on the usual rag-bag of Festan material: the mysterious *di Nixi*; pontifical rituals and calendrical matters; military honours; types of container; glosses of African and Etruscan words; and various elements of archaic terminology, including fragments from the *lex* of the temple of Aventine Diana, from the Latin *foedus*, and from the Twelve Tables. For each lemma discussed, P. gives a bibliography for questions of a textual and historical nature. Where relevant, he provides full quotations from authors with material comparable to or derived from that of Festus (e.g. on the term *nefrendes*, at 47) — helpful as many of these sources are scattered and/or obscure.

P.'s text follows Lindsay's 1913 Teubner edition, flawed in various ways and in need of reassessment, as P. himself notes (34; 35, n. 143). P. lists forty instances (35–6) where his readings or supplements diverge from those of Lindsay, mostly minor and readily acceptable changes. Several of these readings derive from Renaissance and later scholarship, and had already been taken up by Lindsay in his *Glossaria Latina* edition of Festus (1930), e.g. in the lemma *niger lapis*, where P. supplements <Hos>*tilium* (i.e. Hostus Hostilius, grandfather of Rome's third king), rejecting the untenable <Quinc>*tilium* of Lindsay 1913 (who there followed Orsini and Müller). Since the whole lemma is not printed, only the few words on which P. has chosen to focus, his commentary must be read in conjunction with Lindsay's Teubner. This format is perfectly acceptable for an easily-available work (Livy, for instance), but more problematic for Festus, which few will have readily at hand, and where the context and layout of each lemma is so important to our understanding of the work as a whole.

P.'s work is early confirmation of the recent resurgence of interest in the text of Festus. He offers his readers a competent, solid, and sensible, if conservative, work. The book has adequate

indices and an up-to-date bibliography, and is well-produced. Typographical errors are few (e.g. Fuanioli instead of Funaioli (139 n. 279); Shackelton Bailey instead of Shackleton Bailey (13 n. 33)). P. comments upon the difficulties in providing an elegant translation of a work which is so concerned with etymologies; nevertheless, as the only translation of Festus is the obscure and idiosyncratic French version of Savagner (1846), it is a great pity that he chose not to translate the text.

*University College London*

FAY GLINISTER