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Abstract

This thesis explores the transmission of information about classical inscriptions and their use in historical scholarship between 1530 and 1603. It aims to demonstrate that antiquarians' approach to one form of material non-narrative evidence for the ancient world reveals a developed sense of history, and that this approach can be seen as part of a more general interest in expanding the subject matter of history and the range of sources with which it was examined.

It examines the milieu of the men who studied inscriptions, arguing that the training and intellectual networks of these men, as well as the need to secure patronage and the constraints of printing, were determining factors in the scholarship they undertook. It then considers the first collections of inscriptions that aimed at a comprehensive survey, and the systems of classification within these collections, to show that these allowed scholars to produce lists and series of features in the ancient world; the conventions used to record inscriptions and what scholars meant by an accurate transcription; and how these conclusions can influence our attitude to men who reconstructed or forged classical material in this period.

It then examines the sorts of information about the classical past scholars derived from inscriptions are then, with two works as case studies: the Commentariorum Reipublicae Romanae libri published by Wolfgang Lazius in 1551 and Marcus Welser's 1594 Rerum Augustanarum Vindelicarum commentarii. The examination of the citations of inscriptions in these two historical works demonstrates how Welser derived more information from inscriptions than his predecessor and reflected technical advances in epigraphic scholarship that had taken place in the preceding years. The thesis reveals that scholars showed an increasing interest in the agencies involved in producing classical inscriptions, and argues that this led to an increasing scepticism of the value of epigraphic evidence. Finally, it surveys contemporary work on classical coins, to consider how this differs from that on inscriptions, suggesting general conclusions for the nature of antiquarian scholarship in the period.
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A Note on Transcriptions, Citations and Names

Many of the sources for this thesis are scholars' unpublished papers and letters, written in both Latin and the vernacular. The handwriting of the scholars involved, and the state of preservation of the paper they used, presented many difficulties in reading what they wrote. In transcribing material of this sort, I have endeavoured to preserve the orthography of the original, while generally expanding abbreviations and repunctuating for clarity, but where the original was unclear there has inevitably been a degree of interpretation. Printed sources also occasionally posed problems of a similar nature, and I have tried to follow the same procedure.

In citing material that exists in both manuscript and a printed edition, I have given both references where I know them, in an effort to be as comprehensive as possible. In some cases, the manuscript reference is limited simply to the number of the manuscript, or to a folio number without specifying recto or verso.

I have referred to scholars by the names used most commonly in contemporary scholarship, rather than giving them all in Latin form, or in the vernacular. Thus I refer to Pighius using the Latin form, but Agustín using the Spanish.
Introduction

In his thesis I examine scholars' uses of, and responses to, classical inscriptions between 1530 and 1603. I consider the environment and conditions in which men came to work on inscriptions, and how they collected, classified, and represented them. I then examine how they cited these inscriptions as historical evidence, and how they came to be increasingly interested in the agencies involved in the production of inscribed texts. Finally I compare epigraphic scholarship with numismatic scholarship, before concluding by showing how work on inscriptions should be connected with wider intellectual trends in this period. The sixteenth-century study of inscriptions is not a subject that has attracted much attention over the past hundred years, either from those people interested in the history of epigraphy,¹ or from intellectual historians working on historiography. In this study I demonstrate that this lack of attention is undeserved. Not only is this a period of considerable importance in the development of epigraphic techniques, but the sophistication and insight these scholars show in dealing with inscriptions represent important stages in the broadening of the range of sources used to write history, and in moves to question the reliability of those sources.

While there has been little recent research on inscriptions in general, the past two decades have seen an increasing interest in the influence and effects of the study classical antiquities in the Renaissance, a movement conventionally known as antiquarianism. Research in this area was common at the end of the nineteenth century, spurred no doubt by the work to assemble corpora of information about the classical world, but was largely been neglected from the early years of the twentieth century. Recent interest, however, has resulted in illuminating studies on individual scholars, notably Carlo Sigonio, Onofrio Panvinio, ¹

¹ The compilers of the Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum (CIL) consulted a huge range of epigraphic manuscripts in their efforts to collect details of all Latin inscriptions, and their comments on individual collectors (particularly those at the beginning of volumes II, VI and IX) are still invaluable, if little consulted. More or less the only work that attempts to survey this area is the Epigrafia Latina of Ida Calabi Limentani, which includes a survey of the history of epigraphy by theme (pp. 39-124). Isolated scholars of classical antiquity have shown more interest in the history of the discipline, particularly Heikki Solin, the publication of whose new edition of part of CIL X is imminent, and Ginette Vagenheim.
Antonio Agustín, and Pirro Ligorio,\(^2\) as well as in general studies of the antiquarian movement.\(^3\) This thesis synthesizes these approaches: by examining a particular scholarly strand within the movement, I will show how scholars interacted to share material and problems, as well as demonstrating how antiquarian research resulted in historical scholarship.

By pursuing this project, I hope to challenge the received notion of the antiquarian, a term which, at least in English language scholarship, has tended to be used rather dismissively of anyone interested in the past in an unsystematic way. More subtly, my picture of these scholars also modifies that painted by Arnaldo Momigliano 50 years ago, in an article ('Ancient History and the Antiquarian') which is still regularly cited as the basis for discussions of this sort of scholarship. Momigliano was concerned with the writing of history (a point often lost upon those who cite the article) and its difference from antiquarian writing, defining their respective practitioners as follows: 'historians', he claimed, 'write in a chronological order; antiquaries write in a systematic order' and 'historians produce those facts which serve to illustrate or explain a certain situation; antiquaries collect all the items that are connected with a certain subject, whether they help

\(^2\) On Sigonio, see W. McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio*; on Panvinio, see the various studies of Karl Gersbach, and now Jean-Louis Ferrary's *Onofrio Panvinio*, which contains a wealth of material, not just on Panvinio but on the antiquarian tradition; on Agustín the collection of essays edited by M. H. Crawford; and on Ligorio the collection of essays edited by R. W. Gaston, and now Anna Schreurs, *Antikenbild und Kunstanschauungen des Pirro Ligorio*. I only saw the last of these in the final stages of completing this work, and so I have not been able to take full account of it. Schreurs' position on Ligorio's scholarly output does not seem to have altered significantly since she wrote her 'Das antiquarische und das kunsttheoretische Konzept Pirro Ligorios'. Ligorio was one of the few scholars to receive continuous attention, in studies including that of Erna Mandowsky and Charles Mitchell, *Pirro Ligorio's Roman Antiquities* (which should be read with the review by Carlo Dionisotti). There has been more work on scholars of coins than scholars of inscriptions in this period, as we shall see in chapter 6.

\(^3\) E.g. Philip Jacks, *The Antiquarian and the Myth of Antiquity*. Jacks's account is rather confused, and vitiated by printers' errors: see the reviews by Paul Gwynne and Ingrid Rowland. Margaret Daly Davis's *Archäologie der Antike* is a thorough catalogue of antiquarian works, mostly from this period, with details of their authors. Despite its seventeenth-century focus, Ingo Herklotz's *Cassiano dal Pozzo* has a very useful summary of the sixteenth-century antiquarian background.
to solve a problem or not.* He went on to emphasize the importance accorded to non-narrative evidence in the seventeenth century, and connected this with the rise of historical Pyrrhonism. My study of epigraphic scholarship suggests that the selective use of such evidence existed in the later sixteenth century to a much greater degree than has previously been appreciated, and, I would suggest, a knowledge of this development is important to understanding changes in the seventeenth century. As a result, I believe, we should not distinguish 'historian' and 'antiquarian' so absolutely in these periods.

Whereas Momigliano discussed antiquarian writing, the men known as antiquarians to be discussed in this study did not necessarily put their thoughts on paper. Rather, they were defined by the material they were interested in, classical antiquities. There is no doubt that a man collecting all the information about a particular aspect of the ancient world in the sixteenth century and then writing about it would have been described as an 'antiquario'; but the term was also applied in the sixteenth century more generally to all those participants in a culture described by Ginette Vagenheim as 'située au carrefour de plusieurs mondes incluant celui des artistes, des érudits et des princes.'* It is men in this milieu that I shall examine in this study.

The first two men on record as describing themselves as *antiquarii* were Felice Feliciano (1433- post 1479) and Andrea Fulvio (c.1470-1527). Feliciano was a wide-ranging scholar whose collection of transcriptions of inscriptions was only one aspect of his interests in the ancient world; Fulvio was particularly known for his topographical guidebook to the city of Rome, and probably also a contributor to Mazochi’s *Epigrammata antiquae urbis.* These two men were certainly scholarly, and the term *antiquarius* continued to be used to describe scholars of coins, inscriptions, statues and classical buildings later in the century. So, for example, when castigating Bartolomeo Marliani, the author of a topographical guidebook to

---


* Momigliano quotes a letter of Annibale Caro from the definition of the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, 'e poichè io mi avveggo al vostro scrivere che siete in ciò piuttosto istorico che antiquario.' (*Ancient History and the Antiquarian*, p. 290 n. 1).

* G. Vagenheim, 'Lettre inédite de Pirro Ligorio', p. 235. This accords with the more general definition of the *Dictionarium Latinogallicum* (1552), p. 104, as 'Antiquarius: Un homme curieux d'avoir ou scavoir choses antiques', if we take 'chose' to mean objects.

* See the discussion of both these scholars below, ns. 21 and 53.
Rome, for the inaccuracy of his transcriptions of inscriptions, Benedetto Egio describes him as 'ineptissimus antiquariorum'. Georg Fabricius referred to those men investigating Rome's remains as 'antiquarii' in his *Roma*. The term was often used of students of ancient coins, probably reflecting the fact that coins were the most accessible Roman remains. In Robert Estienne's *Lexicon trilingue* of 1586, an 'antiquarius' is defined as someone who loves to be surrounded by coins and medals. Tomaso Garzoni's *Piazza universale di tutte le professioni del mondo*, published in 1589, has an entry entitled 'De' professori di medaglie e d'altre anticaglie, antiquari detti'.

Alongside this general definition, the term could also refer more particularly to dealers whose primary function was the identification, evaluation and purchase of antiquities. This was a well established profession at Rome: princes outside the city were anxious to acquire material discovered there to enhance their collections, and employed their own agents, or men living at Rome, to buy it for them. In account books, such men were usually referred to as *antiquarii*. So, for example, Gerolamo Garimberto in his reports from Rome to Guglielmo Gonzaga in Mantua refers to an 'anticario del Signor Cardinale di Ferrara', and more generally to 'questi antiquarii di Roma' who might provide ancient material for Gonzaga's new gallery. Similarly, Giulio de Grandi, the agent of Ippolito II d'Este (the 'Cardinale di Ferrara' Garimberto mentions) wrote that 'delle statue si è trovato un antiquario che n'ha alcune de belle come lei intenderà per l'inclusa lista'. At Rome, Paul III employed a man known as 'Pellegrino' or 'Peregrino', referred to as an 'antiquario' or 'gioiellere', who travelled around Italy in the late 1530s and early 1540s acquiring antiquities for him. Thus when men received the title 'antiquario' or 'antiquarius' within a court, their role probably involved, at least in part, curating and developing their patron's collection of antiquities, where the recognition of material was vital. We should not therefore be surprised that one such figure, Jacopo Strada, could be described as 'tenuto per

---

8 BAV Ross. 1204, unnumbered prefatory folio.
12 C. Brown, 'Bishop Gerolamo Garimberto', pp. 41-43 (the 'anticario' is identified by Brown as Giovanni Antonio Stampa) and 50.
13 V. Pacifici, *Ippolito II d'Este*, p. 126-7 n. 1. There are frequent other references to *antiquarii* acting in the role of dealers in R. Lanciani, *Storia degli scavi*, e.g ii pp. 51, 92 and 188.
uno de' primi antiquarii intelligenti di Europa' while apparently taking little part in scholarly debates over the actual interpretation of coins beyond their identification: his primary value to his patron, Maximilian II, lay in his appreciation of the value of his collection of antiquities.\textsuperscript{15}

The time frame in which I will examine the activities of these men interested in antiquities is basically determined by developments in the study of epigraphy. The end date is easily explained: in 1603, the second volume of the corpus of inscriptions prepared by Jan Gruter was published at Heidelberg. With this, a remarkably comprehensive collection, many of the inscriptions discussed by sixteenth-century scholars were made available to a book-buying public. Some, at least, of the technical innovations of the previous 70 years were apparent in it. The start date does not have so definite an event to recommend it, and is not so definitely adhered to. In choosing 1530, I have been sensitive above all to the position of the city of Rome. The sack of the city in 1527 resulted in the death or dispersion of many of the scholars who had made it their home, and was seen by humanists writing about the event subsequently as a clear dividing point.\textsuperscript{16} Although this event marked a break, however, scholarly activity soon recovered. In a letter probably datable to 1530, Fabio Vigili, the bishop of Spoleto, wrote to Benedetto Egio, a scholar at Rome, to thank him for sending a sylloge of inscriptions and to illustrate the dangers of forgery.\textsuperscript{17} Soon after, in 1534, Paul III was elected pope and stimulated a period of cultural renewal which drew to the city many of the scholars this study examines. It was their discussions and proximity to a wide range of inscriptions that resulted in many of the innovations I shall consider below. Also in

\textsuperscript{15} Strada was described thus by Niccolò Stopio in a letter to Johann Jakob Fugger, quoted by D. Jansen, 'Jacopo Strada's Antiquarian Interests: A Survey of his Museum and its Purpose', p. 59 n. 1. In the context of Strada's dispute with the Viennese imperial historiographer Wolfgang Lazius over the interpretation of a coin, Jansen comments that 'This passage is one of the rare instances showing Strada engaged in really erudite discourse, and the only one in his correspondence that I have found to date - rather a modest result for someone who was regarded, at least by some of his contemporaries, as one of the greatest antiquaries of his age.' (Antonio Agustín and Jacopo Strada', p. 214).

\textsuperscript{16} For details of four humanist accounts written shortly after the sack, see K. Gouwens, Remembering the Renaissance. One of these, Pierio Valeriano's De infelicitate litterarum, is edited with commentary by J. Haig Gaiser, Pierio Valeriano on the Ill Fortune of Learned Men.

\textsuperscript{17} The letter was copied by Matal into his edition of Mazochi's Epigrammata, BAV Vat. lat. 8495, fol. [189]. M. Crawford prints and comments on the letter in 'Tavole Iguvine e Pseudo-Iguvine'; see also M. Crawford, 'Benedetto Egio', pp. 134-5, and ch. 2 n. 17 below.
1534, Petrus Apianus and Bartholomaeus Amantius published their collection of inscriptions at Ingolstadt. This was a book of impressive length, but less impressive scholarly acuity, and in its organization and concerns provides a useful standpoint from which to examine changes in the presentation and ordering of inscriptions in the following decades.

As we can see from the collection of Apianus and Amantius, as well as Vigili's letter to Egio, epigraphic study was well-established by 1530. I shall now briefly examine the key features of work on inscriptions before this point, in order to put later developments in perspective.

Large-scale collecting of records of inscriptions seems to have begun in the early years of the fifteenth century. At Rome, the relative stability offered by the papacy of Martin V (1417-31) gave early humanists a chance to examine antiquities, notably the Florentine Poggio Bracciolini. At this time, the merchant Cyriac of Ancona was recording inscriptions from northern Italy and the Greek east. For the latter he was virtually alone — travel for scholarship to the eastern Mediterranean was curtailed with the fall of Constantinople — and his influence proved considerable. Cyriac's material reappears in collections of the second half of the century, including those made by a new generation of scholars, Giovanni Marcanova, Felice Feliciano, and Michele Ferrarini. The most impressive fifteenth-century collection of material is that of the polymath Fra Giovanni Giocondo, who as well as working on inscriptions edited the text of Vitruvius and was an architect. Giocondo began to distinguish those inscriptions he had seen himself from those given him by others, and thus tried to establish stemmata for the manuscripts of inscriptions that he saw.

---

18 A useful survey of epigraphic work up to the sack is given by R. Weiss, *The Renaissance Discovery*, ch. 11 with pp. 209-10.

19 On Poggio's collections, the best survey of the evidence is that of Peter Spring, *The Topographical and Archaeological Study*, ch. 6. In ch. 5 he demonstrates that the collections attributed to Niccolò Signorili, who is often regarded as an epigraphic pioneer, probably mostly came to him at second hand.

20 There is an extensive literature on Cyriac. A good starting point is the collection of essays edited by G. Paci and S. Sconocchia, *Ciriaco d'Ancona e la cultura antiquaria*.


22 M. Koortbojian, 'Fra Giovanni Giocondo and his Epigraphic Methods'.
At the beginning of the sixteenth century, we start to see collections focusing on particular areas, notably those of Benedetto Giovio, who collected inscriptions from Como, and Andrea Alciato, whose manuscripts of inscriptions from Milan were widely copied. These scholars tended to rely on autopsy (although Alciato certainly used Cyriac's material as a source), and Alciato tried to collect as many inscriptions as possible from his native city, rather than assembling material piecemeal, as his predecessors had done. Local collections like those of Giovio and Alciato also tended to be those that were printed. The first of this sort was that of Desiderio Spreti, whose assemblage of inscriptions from Ravenna was published at the end of his 1489 history of that city. Conrad Peutinger's *Romanae vetustatis fragmenta in Augusta Vindelicorum*, first published in 1505, included just inscriptions from Augsburg; and Johann Huttich, as well as reediting Peutinger's compilation in 1520, produced his own collection from Mainz, explicitly based on that of Peutinger, in the same year. One exception was Nikolaus Marschalk's 1502 *Epitaphia mirae vetustatis*, which included a small number of inscriptions from further afield.

As well as collecting inscriptions, scholars also produced works to explain them, and particularly to spell out the abbreviations they contained. In 1486 Ferrarini published a version of the *De litteris antiquis* attributed to the first-century Roman grammarian Marcus Valerius Probus, a list of the abbreviations commonly used in Latin inscriptions, together with their explanations. Humanists tended to include other versions of this work at the beginning of their sylloges, to which they frequently added their own interpretations of particularly arcane examples. At the beginning of the 1490s, the Dominican friar Annius of Viterbo produced commentaries on six texts from Viterbo, which Roberto Weiss described

---

23 On Alciato's inscriptions, see F. Vuilleumier and P. Laurens, 'Fra storia e emblema', and I. Calabi Limentani, 'L'approccio dell'Alciato all'epigrafia milanese'.

24 Because Alciato's collection was copied at different stages, we can observe its gradual development.

For a summary list of manuscripts, see CIL V, i pp. 625-6; B. Cassi, *I codici epigrafici di Andrea Alciato*, provides a more detailed analysis. Alciato's collection gradually contained more texts, and the final version, which Alciato seems to have begun in the mid-1520s and maintained up to his death in 1550 (Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek MS F82b: see M. Daly Davis, *Archäologie der Antike*, pp. 82-3), is divided into inscriptions from the city and those from the *ager Mediolanensis*.

25 D. Spreti, *De amplitudine, de vastatione et de instauratione urbis Ravennae*.

26 See J. Ramminger, 'The Roman Inscriptions of Augsburg'.

27 J. Huttich, *Collectanea antiquitatum in urbe atque agro Moguntino repertarum*.

28 See C. Hülsen, 'Die Inschriftensammlung des Erfurter Humanisten Nicolaus Marschalk'.
As 'the first epigraphic tract'. Annio gives the texts themselves, their Latin translations where required, and a brief commentary on points of interest. More impressive were the Antiquarii libri duo of Girolamo Bologni, written around the turn of the sixteenth century. The work took the form of an epigraphic manual for the author's son. Bologni gave the texts of inscriptions, first from north-eastern Italy, and then from Rome, appending a commentary after each. He began by citing inscriptions that allowed him to show basic details of the abbreviation and formation of Roman names, and then moved on to examples with more obscure problems, regularly citing parallels from a wide variety of other inscriptions. For example, he gave the text of a dedication of Atimetus Anterotianus, of which he claimed to have seen copies before witnessing it himself in Rome, and then explained 'L. L.' in this as 'latinus libertus', a slave freed by the lex Iunia Norbana, mentioned in the Code under the title 'de latina libertinitate tollenda'. He then cited another inscription, the epitaph of a Palaemon, which includes 'L. L. L.', which he interpreted as 'latina libertinitate libertus'. He did not see this inscription himself, but was given a copy of it by a 'Bartholomaeus Paarinus' (probably Bartolomeo Partenio, a teacher at the La Sapienza in Rome) who claimed that it was once near Vicenza. In fact, it seems to be a humanist fake based on Suetonius's record of the man.

Bologni's approach to the texts is essentially a literary one, and this reflects the main use to which inscriptions were put, as a guide to ancient orthography. It was with this idea in mind that Ferrarini presented his sylloge to Ludovico Roduno in 1477 urging him to absorb the correct spelling of the texts. Poliziano in his Miscellanea cited inscriptions for the details that they revealed about diphthongs; while only four types of diphthong survive in vulgate Latin, he found evidence of three more from inscriptions and coins. Similarly, Ermolao Barbaro used inscriptions in his Castigationes to correct the text of the elder Pliny. He emended 'Secusii' to 'Secusani' on the basis of an inscription from Lugdunum, and preferred the reading 'Septimuleius' of some codices to 'Saepius Claudius', citing an

---

29 R. Weiss, 'An Unknown Epigraphic Tract.'
31 G. Bologni, Antiquarii libri duo, pp. 130-1 (CIL V.341*); Suetonius, De grammaticis xxiii.
32 Vatican City, BAV Vat. lat. 5243, preface.
33 A. Poliziano, Opera omnia, pp. 261-2 (Miscellanea, i ch. 43).
inscription to show that such a name was in use. In his *De aspiratione* of 1481, Giovanni Pontano argued that words are formed through practice (*usus*) rather than theory (*ratio*). Epigraphy therefore was an important source: to prove that the letter ‘y’ could be aspirated, he quoted an urn found in Naples celebrating a ‘Hygia’.

Scholars turned to the testimony of inscriptions not only for orthographic evidence, but also for their work on local history. Spreti, for instance, drew on his collection of inscriptions to prove Ravenna’s Roman past. Elia Capreoli, in his history of Brescia which was published in 1505, claimed that so many inscriptions and Roman remains were found there that the city could be regarded as the sister of Rome. He stressed the links that Brescia enjoyed with Julius Caesar, quoting several inscriptions that he claimed referred to the period, including one found there which mentions a ‘Divi Iuli praef(ectus)’.

In his account of the city under the emperors, he digressed to examine which pagan gods were worshipped there, citing an inscription for each. Alciato’s history of Milan, begun in the first decade of the sixteenth century, gives some idea of the range of uses made of inscriptions. Alciato cited epigraphic evidence frequently. For example, he used inscriptions to back up a letter from Pliny the younger which indicated that the Roman general Verginius Rufus came from Milan, by quoting three memorials to members of the Verginia *gens* in and around the city. He also confirmed details of administrative structure with epigraphic material, digressing from his chronological framework to examine various individuals. Alciato explained the offices in the careers of various figures, including the decurion C. Valerius Petronianus, nicknamed ‘εὐθυδόμος’ (swift-footed), reflecting the rapidity of his rise: as well as decurion, he had been *pontifex* and *sacerdos*

---

34 E. Barbaro, *Castigationes Plinianae*, i p. 308, on Pliny, NH, iv.18 (*CIL XIII.1943*); iii p. 1068, on *xxxiii.14* (*CIL IX.2668*).
35 G. Pontano, *De aspiratione*, sigs. e2v and d1v, on *CIL X.2148*. For complete details of Pontano’s use of epigraphic evidence in this work, see G. Germano, ‘Testimonianze epigrafiche nel De aspiratione di Giovanni Pontano’.
36 D. Spreti, *De amplitudine, de vastatione et de instauratione urbis Ravennae*, sigs. aiiiiv and biiiiir.
38 E. Capreoli, *Chronica*, fol. VIIv (*CIL V.4459*).
40 A. Alciato, *Rerum patriae libri*, pp. 101-2 (*CIL V.5899, 6256, 6184*).
IUovenalis, and had completed five embassies for his city before dying at the age of twenty-three. Only rarely, however, was Alciato willing to adduce events not attested elsewhere from inscriptions. In one instance, for example, he concluded from the existence at Morimundus of the tomb of L. Magius Varus, a veteran of the legio XIII Gemina, that the legion — whose commander was praised by Tacitus, the detail that provoked the digression — passed through Milan or had been camped there.

Especially at Rome, inscriptions could be used for topographical detail, in the task of identifying buildings or other sites mentioned in the literary sources. Poggio saw the potential of this sort of application: as well as collecting inscriptions, he also cited them in part of his De varietate fortunae dealing with the city of Rome. Poggio's work was written in around 1430, but was released in 1448, shortly after the Roma instaurata of Flavio Biondo, a much longer treatment of the city's ancient remains. Biondo seems to have been less comfortable using epigraphic evidence than Poggio, and there is little evidence that he collected inscriptions from the city himself. The fact he did cite some, however, shows a general acceptance that they could be a resource. Giovanni Tortelli was inspired by Biondo's work to include a topographical treatment of the city in his De orthographia, a work probably completed in 1451. Here too, although they are not an important source, inscriptions are cited for information about buildings. The work of these early- and mid-fifteenth century scholars on the city continued, especially with the group of men who met under the aegis of Pomponio Leto's academy in the second half of the century, notoriously

---

42 A. Alciato, Rerum patriae libri, pp. 91-2 (CIL V.5894, illustrated in A. Alciato, Antiquae inscriptiones, fol. 1r). Petronianus was clearly an attractive model for Alciato; at the beginning of the Paradoxa (fol. 55v), highlighting the fact he produced the work so precociously young, he cites the Roman as a precedent.

43 A. Alciato, Rerum patriae libri, p. 117 (CIL V.5586; the reading in the Dresden manuscript, Sächsische Landesbibliothek MS F82b, fol. 228r, and CIL, is L. Gellius Varus).


45 P. Spring, The Topographical and Archaeological Study, ch. 8, esp. p. 347; J-Y Boriaud, 'Biondo et l'inscription'.

46 E.g., G. Tortelli, Roma antica (a modern edition of the section on Rome from the De orthographia), pp. 40, 44 and 55.
suppressed by Paul II in 1468 but allowed to proceed by his successors. Leto worked on the text of the regionary catalogues of the city, guided visitors around the sites, and, importantly, not only maintained a manuscript sylloge of inscriptions but included them in his growing collection of antiquities.

Leto's combination of a collection with an academic gathering proved hugely influential on future antiquarian practice in the city, and it seems plausible that as collections of antiquities developed in his lifetime (he died in 1498), his offered a model to potentates in the city of access and openness to scholars. Other collections burgeoning at this time included those of the della Valle and Massimi families, as well as the papal collection: the influence of this last seems to have spurred princes in the city to emulation. After Leto's death, in the early years of the sixteenth century, antiquarian research flourished in Rome. Angelo Colocci, born in Iesi, and in Rome nominally as one of the town's ambassadors to the papal court, seems to have inherited Leto's property and collection: certainly, Colocci was in possession of them soon after Leto's death. He also took over leadership of Leto's academy, which continued to be one obvious forum for antiquarian research in the city. The results of this research soon became clear. In 1509 the printer Giacomo Mazochi seems to have printed a copy of an inscribed calendar at Rome; the following year, he printed both a *De vetustate Urbis* attributed to Leto (in fact a series of notes taken by a student on one of Leto's guided tours), and the *Opusculum de mirabilia novae et veteris Urbis Romae* of Francesco Albertini, a Florentine. Of these 1510 works, the latter is more impressive. Albertini's professed aim was to update the medieval guide books to Rome (the *Mirabilia*), and he lays considerable stress on classical monuments. From our point of view, the importance he attributes to inscriptions is particularly noteworthy.

---

47 See R. Palermino, 'The Roman Academy', with previous references.


50 On Colocci, see the collection of essays by Vittorio Fanelli, *Ricerche su Angelo Colocci*, and I. Rowland, *The Culture of the High Renaissance*.

51 See D. Rhodes, 'Further notes on the publisher Giacomo Mazzocchi'.
If we judge by the works that were printed, therefore, antiquarian scholarship seems to have flourished in the papacy of Julius II (1503-1513). If anything, it received even more support under Julius’s successor, Leo X (1513-1521). Leo supported the cultural undertakings of men he thought were experts in a variety of fields: the best example is his commission to Raphael to produce a representation of Rome on paper, a project in which Colocci and Baldassare Castiglione collaborated. Andrea Fulvio, who seems to have worked with Albertini, published his description of Rome’s classical remains in 1513, the *Antiquaria Urbis*, and then in 1517, a collection of ancient coins, the *Illustrium imagines*. Mazochi printed both of these: it is not surprising that he styled himself ‘bibliopola Academiae Romanae’. As well as antiquarian works he also published neo-Latin verse, and the acts of the fifth Lateran council.

Something of the scholarly regard for inscriptions at this time can be gathered from the commentary of Pierio Valeriano on the works of Vergil, published in the summer of 1521. Valeriano had been born in the Alpine town of Belluno, but came to Rome and received considerable support from Leo. In his commentary, he claimed that in inscriptions the ‘antiqua scribendi ratio sese fidelius quam in libris ostentat’. In the same year as Valeriano’s work on Vergil, Mazochi published his most impressive antiquarian work, the *Epigrammata antiquae Urbis*. In fact the work received its privilege from Leo X in 1517, and probably represents a summary of research carried out over the previous twenty years: both Fulvio and Albertini probably had a large hand in it. The work was a collection of inscriptions from the city, and its immediate surroundings. It begins with those from monumental structures, and continues through the fourteen regions of the city, ordering the material by current site, rather than find-spot. Some of the settings on which the

---


53 On Fulvio, see R. Weiss, ‘Andrea Fulvio antiquario romano’.

54 F. Ascarelli, *Annali tipografici di Giacomo Mazochi*.


56 See Matal’s comments on the compilation of the work, attributing it to Francesco Albertini and another epigraphic scholar, Mariangelo Accursio, in his annotated edition, BAV Vat. lat. 8495, fol. 11v [=frontispiece]. These comments are printed by T. Mommsen, ‘De fide Leonhardi Gutenstenii’, pp. 76-7; D. Giorgetti, ‘Silloge Archinto’, pp. 266-70, points to Albertini’s probable significance; Fulvio’s contribution is suggested by R. Weiss, ‘Andrea Fulvio’, pp. 5 and 10 and I. Calabi Limentani, ‘Andrea Fulvio alter homo doctus’.
inscriptions appeared are illustrated, and the work includes around 3,000 examples. The large number of copies that survive today suggest that it was extremely popular.

At Rome, at least, the publication of the Epigrammata seems to have marked something of a high water mark. Leo’s successor, Adrian VI, elected at the end of 1521, had a well-deserved reputation for austerity, and in 1522 and 1523 scholars started to leave the city to find support elsewhere, something Clement VII, who took over in September 1523, slowed but did not halt. As the revolt begun by Luther’s publication of the 95 theses in 1517 took hold, the untroubled times at the beginning of Leo’s reign seemed very distant. Scholars continued to work in Rome, however. Raphael had died in 1520, but something of his project to draw the city may be seen in a collection of engravings published by Fabio Calvo in 1527, the Antiquae Urbis Romae simulachrum. Also in 1527, Fulvio produced a prose version of the Antiquaria Urbis, entitled the Antiquitates Urbis.

As well as these topographical works, two annotated editions of the Epigrammata (now in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana) demonstrate that epigraphic research continued. One features the dedication ‘Felici Trophimo, Episcopo Theatinorum sano, donum dedit Antonius Laelius Podager’. Felix Trophimus (Felix Troffinus) was bishop of Chieti between 1524 and 1527, which dates the gift; Antonio Lelio, ‘the gouty’, a humanist active in the papacy of Leo X, died in 1527 or 1528. Underneath is the note, ‘A. Colotii impensa’, which is more cryptic: it is not clear if Colocci sponsored the gift, or later acquired the book. The latter is perhaps more likely when we consider its contents. Lelio has annotated the work in red and brown ink, in general using red to correct texts and add new ones, and brown to give the find-spots of these new texts. Colocci also makes annotations, but in his barely legible hand, and less precisely. Lelio’s annotations are neat, although his sentiments are not always so restrained. Next to an epitaph supposedly to a Marcus Pacuvius (a poet mentioned in Aulus Gellius), he wrote ‘Quis credat vetustiss. poetae epigramma extare?’. He refers to himself in the third person, at one point relating the story of a barber, who had the misfortune of having the base of an obelisk turning up in his garden during the papacy of Julius II. Lelio himself went to see it, and read the inscription on it. Julius had

58 BAV Vat.lat. 8492, fol. 1r.
59 BAV Vat.lat. 8492, fol. 70r = LXr.
other things on his mind at the time, however, and so the barber, no doubt relieved, was able to rebury the monument. Colocci alone annotated the second copy of the Epigrammata, and much more frequently. There is not obvious duplication of content between the two.

Although the exact sequence in which the material was annotated is not clear, the first manuscript suggests that there was interest in epigraphy in the mid-1520s, even if Lelio was transcribing notes that he had made before this point. Also, both manuscripts show Colocci’s interest in epigraphy. Colocci was one bridge between Rome before the sack and the city after: although he fled the city, and lost many of his belongings, he did return. He does not feature particularly prominently in the accounts of antiquarian scholars who arrived in the 1530s and 1540s, although we learn that he did inspire one key scholar, Fulvio Orsini, in his early antiquarian research. The copies of the Epigrammata, however, suggest that he may have had a crucial role in communicating the learning of pre-sack Rome to the scholars that arrived after 1527. Another annotated copy of the Epigrammata, which belonged to Giovenale Manetti, made Commissioner of Antiquities by Paul III in 1534, includes, among others, the same annotations as those Lelio had made. Although there are some changes in the wording, the closeness suggests that either the two scholars were using the same archetype (Manetti had become secretary to Alessandro Farnese, the future Pope, in the 1520s), or that one copied from the other. Had he held on to this

---

60 BAV Vat.lat. 8492, fol. 21r = XIr: ‘Sub Julio II Pont Max, in regione Campi Martii, post aedem divi Laurentii in Lucina & prope domum, Cardinalis huius Crassi, in domunculae cuiusdam Tonsoris hortulo, dum in eo pro conficienda latrina foderet, detecta est basis obelisci, omnium qui in Urbe extent, ut conspicari erat, maximi. Obeliscus iacebat, nec videri poterat an totus integer esset; quippe cuius ima tantum pars cernebatur. In basi erat inscriptio quam ego legi. Non recte de ea memini; quamquam de nomine divi Augusti, & de his verbis AEGYPTO IN POTESTATEM POPVLI ROMANI REDACTA SOLI DONVM DEDIT memini probe. In hoc obelisco Gnomon olim ille erat percebris, de quo Plinius meminit... Julio principi in bellis nunc ut & semper implicatissimo, ut obeliscum hunc iterum erigi, & in pristinam formam, una etiam cum Gnomone, restitui faceret, suasure quidem permulti, persuasit autem nemo... Ideo tantum antiquitatis miraculum a Tonsore illo iterum sepultum est. Ant. Laelius Podager.’

61 BAV Vat.lat. 8493.

62 Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, KK 15 17.

63 L. Dorez, La Cour du Pape Paul III, i p. 121.
text, therefore, Manetti would have preserved some details of pre-sack antiquarian scholarship in his annotated *Epigrammata*.

More striking, however, is that the same annotations common to Lelio and Manetti also appear in the copy of the work that belonged to Jean Matal, who did not come to Rome until 1545. Matal seems to have begun epigraphic research in the city by working through the inscriptions in this collection, and the fact that he decided to include notes used in the 1520s not only shows that they were available, but also that he thought that they were worthwhile, and that perhaps he saw himself in a tradition established by scholars before the sack. Matal was clearly aware of whose material he was using: he prefaces many of the notes he takes from Lelio with phrases like 'Ant. Lael. Podager ait'. He went on to add many more comments and notes to his book, but it is clear that Lelio's material was a valued source.

These manuscripts are a tangible demonstration that although cultural life at Rome was interrupted by the sack, all learning was not lost. In fact, the that drove humanists away — the attitude of Adrian VI and then the imminent threat of the imperial armies — probably served to disseminate ideas from Rome to a wider audience. Valeriano, for example, went back to Belluno where he delivered various lectures on the history of the city. He began these with an explicit assertion that he would use both literary sources and the testimony

---

64 For example, the two works share the 'Quis credat vetustiss. poetae epigramma extare' comment (fol. LXr), as well as 'Excribenda quae sculpta sunt in ipso marmore' (fol. XXXVIIr), 'Epigrammata haec monstrose atque omnino capitali noxa indigesta permixtaque sunt sed et reliqua omnia quae sunt in hac pagina convellenda. Referuntur enim alibi suo loco' (fol. XCr; the position of one 'sunt' is slightly different), and 'explodendum quia nec Latinum est nec vetus' (fol. IIr).

65 Matal varies the wording slightly. So, for example, on fol. Ilv he writes 'Neque latinum, neque vetus'; on fol. XCr 'Perperam admodum confusa sunt tria haec epigr et indigesta, permixtaque. Sed et reliqua omnia quae continentur haec pagina, convellenda submovendaque. Referuntur enim alibi, suisque locis'.

66 So for example, in Matal's copy (BAV Vat.lat. 8495, fol. LXXXVv), he writes, 'Ant. Lael. Podager ait; se vidisse hoc epigr. in Celsi aede antiqua, ante, quam aequaretur solo'. Lelio (BAV Vat.lat. 8492 fol. 94v = LXXXVv) had written, 'memini me vidisse hoc Epigramma in Aede divi Celsi antiqua, antequam solo aequaretur. A Laelius Podager'.

of inscriptions. He had no doubt, he said, of the reliability (fides) of the latter as evidence, a claim that is backed up in the text, which at times resembles an epigraphic manual. Even more important than the dispersion of individuals like Valeriano was the dispersion of books containing antiquarian research, both to scholars like Alciato in northern Italy, and beyond. Printing allowed the work of scholars to be read across Europe, and in the following chapters I will consider scholars from, and sites of scholarship in, various centres in western and central Europe. These chapters do not claim to offer a comprehensive view of epigraphic research in the period. I am conscious that more research on scholarship printed in certain areas, especially Lyon; on certain figures, like Piero Vettori or Joseph Scaliger; or on manuscripts contained in particular archives, notably Brussels, Berlin and Munich; would broaden the picture. The men and work that I have examined, however, provide a rich illustration of the new techniques developed between 1530 and 1603, as well as the ways that inscriptions could be used in scholarly research. It is these techniques and uses that form the fundamental contribution of this dissertation. To understand how they came about, we must first consider how scholars' material concerns affected their scholarship, and it is to this that I will turn in the first chapter.

---

68 P. Valeriano, Antiquitatum... sermones, p. 4. 'quae... dicturi sumus, non scriptorum tantum testimonio comprobantur; verum etiam antiquorum monumentorum inscriptionibus atque operibus testatissima reliquuntur. Ut nulla mihi reliqua fit dubitatio, quin haec fidel faciant...'.
Chapter 1: Scholars of Inscriptions and their Milieux

The collection, study and publication of inscriptions was an international enterprise, and this chapter will consider the principal institutions that allowed it to take place: the university, in which young scholars could meet like-minded contemporaries; the court, where the patronage of a prince attracted talented men from all over Europe and gave them leisure to pursue their studies; and the printing-house, through which their work could be disseminated. These institutions, along with a consideration of the pressures of religious factionalism in the sixteenth century, provide an important backdrop for understanding why and where epigraphic scholarship took place, how the collaboration which is a mark of such scholarship came about, and for explaining the form of the sources through which we study it.

The intellectual formation and training of scholars of inscriptions

The most common training for men who became interested in inscriptions was the university. Most took a degree in arts, an essential preparation for a subsequent degree in medicine, and useful for one in law. In the course of the fifteenth century, the arts degree began to include more and more elements of the new, classically-oriented humanistic learning, under pressure from students, who had received a humanistic schooling and who wanted a training that qualified them to work as a diplomat or scholar at court, where the ability to compose attractive Latin was highly valued. The first reference to an 'umanista' in an Italian university is in a letter from the rector of the University of Pisa in 1490, and the chair of litterae humanitatis was established at Bologna in 1512.1 This meant that students passing through the university system were exposed to a wider range of classical culture than their predecessors, and were more at ease working with it.

In response to the students' pressure, we see two men in particular promoting the new learning at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Cardinal Ximenes refounded the University of Alcalá which offered Greek and Hebrew, alongside Latin, and set up a university press, with the aim initially of printing a trilingual bible. For him, humanistic studies could serve theology. Jérôme de Busleyden provided for the establishment in 1517 of a small 'Collegium trilingue' at Louvain

to train students as masters of arts, again focusing on Greek, Hebrew and Latin. Although small (initially, only eight students were to be enrolled) this rapidly became one of the main centres of humanistic learning.² It is remarkable how many of those who were later directly connected with epigraphic research studied there: Martin Smet, the compiler of a substantial collection of inscriptions, printed in 1588, after his death; Antoine Morillon, who collected material for Smet; Stephanus Pighius, another compiler of a sylloge, and the author of a compendious annotated list of Roman magistrates; Nicolas Florentius, who supplied Pighius and others with transcriptions of inscriptions from Rome, and Justus Lipsius, who edited Smet's work for publication.³ In addition, as we shall see, many of those who supported scholars also studied there: Antoine (later Cardinal) de Granvelle, who employed Morillon, Pighius, Florentius and Lipsius; the brothers Guy and Mark Laurin, who prompted Smet to recompile his sylloge after his first version had been damaged by fire, and enlisted Pighius's support for the venture; and Johann Jakob Fugger.⁴

The college also created a network of men less directly involved with, but still sympathetic to epigraphic projects. So, for example, Augerius Busbequius, when ambassador of the Holy Roman Empire to the Ottoman empire, transcribed the *monumentum Ancyranum*, the inscribed copy of the Roman Emperor Augustus' *res gestae*, along with Antonius Verantius, whose copy eventually reached Carolus Clusius.⁵ Clusius, who trained as a doctor and was later employed by Maximilian II in Vienna as director of the imperial botanical garden, had sent Smet details of inscriptions from Spain, and gave Lipsius his copy of the *monumentum Ancyranum*.⁶ Graduates of the university were supportive of one another across Europe. When Laevinus Torrentius

---

² Fundamental for the study of the institution and its students up to 1550 is H. De Vocht, *History of the Foundation and Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense*.

³ For connections of the first four of these scholars with the Collegium, see H. De Vocht, *History of the Foundation and Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense*, iii pp. 316-22, 305-12, iv pp. 197-208 and 177-80. Although Florentius's name does not appear in the list of those who graduated, he later wrote to Pighius reminiscing about their common professors. Lipsius matriculated at Louvain in 1562.


⁵ Z. von Martels, 'The Discovery of the Inscription of the Res Gestae Divi Augusti'.

arrived in Rome in 1552, he was able to meet up with Pighius and Andreas Masius; Masius and then Torrentius in turn tried to help Pighius secure a canonry at Xanten.

As well as Louvain, another important centre for future antiquarian scholars was the University of Bologna, attractive for students who wanted a second qualification in law. It was to here that Antonio Agustin, a graduate of Alcalá and then Salamanca for the first stage of his legal studies, came in 1535 to hear the lectures of the renowned Andrea Alciato. Alciato, famous for his publications applying humanist textual scholarship to Roman law, drew students from all over Europe to Bologna. He had shown an early interest in classical inscriptions, and although little of this comes through in the printed versions of his legal lectures, he may have inspired Agustin. Certainly by 1542 Agustin was aware of the value of inscriptions for legal work: when examining the fifth-century Florentine codex of the Digest, he compared the shape of the letters with those of inscriptions in a letter to a friend. In Bologna in 1538 Agustin also met the Burgundian Jean Matal, whom he made his secretary and commissioned first to look for legal manuscripts, then collect records of inscriptions, as well as the future numismatic writer Costantino Landi. As at Louvain, so at Bologna future patrons of epigraphic work were students, including Alessandro Farnese and Johann Jakob Fugger.

The expensive universities were not the only source of an academic education. Private tutoring of various sorts often provided the education for promising scholars. Two of these who went on to work with inscriptions were Onofrio Panvinio and Fulvio Orsini. Panvinio became an Augustinian in 1541 at the age of eleven, and was discovered in Verona in 1545 by Girolamo Seripando, then the Prior Generale dell’ordine Eremitano. Seripando suggested that he leave the monastery to study in the convent of San Agostino in Naples, and then invited him to the studium generale of the order in Rome, presumably having recognised his talents. Here Panvinio immersed himself in antiquarian circles, and enjoyed the patronage of Cardinal Marcello Cervini,

---

9 A. Agustin, Epistolario, no. 84 pp. 116-7, letter of 16 June 1542 to Petro Ruicio Moro (= A. Agustin, Opera omnia, vii p. 175), ‘Litterae tamen ipsae et si quantitate a veteribus illis monumentorum inscriptionibus non differant, aliquarum tamen in alias figuram forma deflexa est.’ It is not clear precisely what Agustin means by quantitas here: perhaps proportion.
11 For Panvinio’s biography, see D. Perini, Onofrio Panvinio, pp. 1-50.
and then Cardinal Alessandro Farnese. Fulvio Orsini was also taken under a protector’s wing. He was born in 1529 to a branch of the Orsini family, but was disinherited and became a choirboy in 1539 at San Giovanni Laterano in Rome under the protection of a canon, Gentile Delfini. Delfini was a major collector of antiquities, and a friend of Angelo Colocci. Orsini was inspired to study ancient finds and classical literature by both men, and on Delfini’s recommendation became a canon at San Giovanni Laterano in 1554, and then shortly afterwards a member of Ranuccio Farnese’s household as librarian, a post he took with Alessandro Farnese on Ranuccio’s death.

These were not the only men to become interested in inscriptions, however. For example, the Tuscan Giovanni Antonio Dosio, who had trained as a goldsmith, came to Rome in 1548 at the age of fifteen. As well as designing architectural works, he copied Roman remains, and also helped excavate the *forma urbis*, the Severan marble plan of Rome. Many of his drawings of antiquities were used in a guide book to Rome, Bernardo Gamucci’s *Le antichità della città di Roma* (1565) and he published his own set of illustrations with Giovanni Battista De’ Cavalieri, the *Urbis Romae aedificiorum illustrium quae supersunt reliquiae* (1569). This variety of roles is typical. Increasingly those with a practical artistic training were drawn to Rome and elsewhere to copy ancient remains, stimulated both by the desire to incorporate classical themes in their own work and by the growing market for reproductions of ancient material. The Spanish publisher Antonio Salamanca and his French successor Antoine Lafréry were especially well known for marketing engravings of views of Rome, from their base in the city, and many plates survive collected within the album entitled *Speculum romanae magnificentiae*. One of the artists whose designs Lafréry published was Etienne Du Pérac, who was born in Bordeaux but who came to Rome in 1559. There he worked as an architect and engraver, and was commissioned by

---

Panvinio to produce illustrations for his work. Another was Enea Vico, who had come to Rome from Parma and stayed between 1540 and 1542 before leaving for Florence, then Venice, and finally to the court of Alfonso II d'Este at Ferrara. Vico had trained as a painter, possibly with Parmigianino, and while in Venice had produced the illustrations for a collaborative work with Antonio Zantani, *Le imagini con tutti i riversti trovati et le vite de gli Imperatori* (1548). This experience appears to have suggested to him that he could write about the coins as well as draw them. In 1555 he published the *Discorsi sopra le medaglie degli antichi*, which does not include illustrations at all except for one of the author, and included a discussion of the origin of money, derived from ancient literary sources.

Vico's progress from illustrator of to commentator on ancient remains is not unparalleled in the period. The most famous example is Pirro Ligorio, who trained as a painter and enjoyed the patronage of the Carafa family in Naples before coming to Rome in 1534, where he worked as a painter and architect. He rapidly became well known, and succeeded Michelangelo as architect of St Peter's in 1564, as well as designing the Casino of the Belvedere for Pius IV. He published two maps of the ancient city of Rome, but he did not restrict himself to simple visual reconstructions of the ancient city. He also published a *Libro delle antichità di Roma* in 1553, which dealt with the ancient theatres and circuses of Rome (with an appendix called the *Paradosse* on particular topological controversies), although his major project, a voluminous encyclopaedia of the ancient world, combining commentary with illustration, remained unpublished in two separate versions. Almost as prolific was Jacopo Strada, who was originally from Mantua, where he had trained as a goldsmith in Giulio Romano's workshop as well as receiving a humanist training in the environment of the

---

18 H. Burns, 'Pirro Ligorio's Reconstruction of Ancient Rome'.
19 For a description of Ligorio's project, see M. Madonna, 'Pirro Ligorio e l'Enciclopedia del Mondo Antico'. There is a list of the manuscripts in E. Mandowsky and C. Mitchell (eds.), *Pirro Ligorio's Roman Antiquities*, pp. 130-9; A. Schreurs, *Antikenbild und Kunstanschauungen des Pirro Ligorio*, pp. 325-33 provides more details, and tries to date the manuscripts.
In the mid 1540s, he was artistic advisor to Johann Jakob Fugger in Augsburg, where he helped him assemble a collection of coins and other antiquities; he then moved to Rome in the early 1550s, and finally ended up in the Habsburg court in Vienna where he was initially employed as an architect. In 1553 Strada published an *Epitome thesauri antiquitatum*, including illustrations and descriptions of Roman imperial coins. As its title suggests, this was only part of a larger envisioned project to catalogue as many Roman coins as possible, including both illustrations and commentary, some of which is preserved in manuscript.  

An example of a similar career in the Low Countries was that of Hubert Goltz. Goltz was born in Venlo in 1526, the son of a German artist, and sent as an apprentice painter and engraver to Lambert Lombard at Liège. Lombard was a keen collector of antiquities, and seems to have inspired Goltz to become a dealer in this material. In 1556 Goltz toured the coin cabinets of the Low Countries, and published drawings of the coins he saw in a work entitled *Vivae omnium fere imperatorum imagines*. As a result of the success of this venture, he was sponsored to visit other collections in Europe, between 1558 and 1560, and published a volume of the coins of Julius Caesar. Like Vico, Goltz was not content with simply illustrating the coins. His work on Caesar includes a long commentary on the dictator's life, and he later published an edition of the Roman Fasti in 1566, and in 1579 the *Thesaurus rei antiquariae huberrimus*, a set of lists and indexes of terms from the ancient world.  

The training received in a university and that in a artists' studio were very different. Although both artists and university graduates worked together on inscriptions their collaboration was not without some tension. In his *Dialogos de medallas, inscripciones y otras antiguedades*, Antonio Agustín wrote of Ligorio that he was 'conocido muy gran antiquario y

---

20 On Strada see R. von Busch, *Studien zu deutschen Antikesammlung*, pp. 193-219; and various articles by D. Jansen, including 'Jacopo Strada's Antiquarian Interests: A Survey of his Museum and its Purpose', 'Gli strumenti del mecenatismo' (revised as 'The Instruments of Patronage') and 'The case for Jacopo Strada as an Imperial Architect Private'.


24 For Ligorio's case, see E. Mandowsky and C. Mitchell (eds.), *Pirro Ligorio's Roman Antiquities*, pp. 29-34.
pintor, el cual sin saber Latin ha escrito mas de quarenta libros de medallas y edificios y de
otras cosas.' When his interlocutor asks how he could write without that knowledge, Agustín went to reply: 'Como escriven Humberto Volzio y Enea Vico y Iacomo Estrada y otros que quien lee sus libros pensara que han visto y leido todos los libros Latinos y Griegos que hai escritos. Ayundase del trabajo de otros, y con debuxar bien con el pinzel, hazen otro tanto con
la pluma.' In private, Agustín was harsher. In a letter to Orsini of 1573, he claimed that 'Huberto [Goltz] è solamente artifice come Pirro [Ligorio] et Enea [Vico].' In another letter to Panvinio he referred to Ligorio as 'Mr. Pyrrho Pittor', suggesting that he thought that painting was his primary role, and there are echoes of the same attitude in the remark attributed to Cardinal Iacomo Savello that Ligorio was a 'huomo manuale e non di savere.' It is also the basis for Bartolomeo Marliani's insulting description of Ligorio as Strepsiades, after the untutored character in Aristophanes's *Clouds*; Ligorio's response, in partnership with Benedetto Egio, was to describe Marliani as 'Socratidion', a diminutive version of the otherworldly Socrates in the play.

---

25 A. Agustín, *Dialogos*, pp. 131-2. There are some indications that Agustín did not wish his *Dialogos* to have a wide readership, and so avoid causing too much offence. He chose to write it in Spanish, for which he gave three reasons in a letter to Orsini of 12 January 1583: because the subject was little known in Spain; in three books he discussed Spanish coins; and because it was easier for him to express some ideas in the vulgate ('molte cose che al vulgare si permette, ma non in latino ad un par mio', Agustín, *Opera omnia*, vii no. 56 p. 262). Andreas Schott sent a copy of the printed text to Ortelius commenting that it was rare, as Agustín only wanted the (extremely low) number of one hundred copies printed (J. Hessels, *Epistulae ortelianae*, no. 146 p. 337). It was only after Agustín's death that two Italian translations were published, in 1592.

26 A. Agustín, *Opera omnia*, vii no. 39 p. 252. Both this passage and the one above are cited by J-L. Ferrary, *Onofrio Panvinio*, p. 38. See also the comments of E. Mandowsky and C. Mitchell (eds.), *Pirro Ligorio's Antiquities*, pp. 29-34.


29 See M. Laureys and A. Schreurs, 'Egio, Marliano, Ligorio', pp. 396 and 399-400.
It is notable that Vico, Ligorio and Strada all received the title of ‘antiquario’ or ‘antiquarius’ from their employers.\textsuperscript{30} As I showed in the introduction, this was used of dealers in antiquities in this period, something for which Strada was particularly renowned.\textsuperscript{31} The curating of princely collections was the main role of the position, but the title seems to have carried considerable prestige. Strada called himself ‘Antiquario’ in a periphrastic self-description to Maximilian II in 1559, responding to an attack on him by Wolfgang Lazius that he was a mere goldsmith.\textsuperscript{32} Titian’s famous portrait of Strada, made at Venice in the winter of 1567-8, when Strada was negotiating the purchase of antiquities in the city, certainly depicts an important man involved in a variety of fields.\textsuperscript{33} Strada is pictured opulently dressed, holding a classical statue and rising from a table. On the table are a sculpted torso, a letter, and several coins, and above his head, on top of a cupboard or shelf, are two books. His pose is dynamic, suggesting an active involvement with the objects around him.\textsuperscript{34} His pose in this painting can be

\textsuperscript{30} Ligorio was employed as an ‘antiquario’ by Cardinal Ippolito d’Este between 1549 and 1555, presumably acquiring antiquities for him (D. Coffin, \textit{The Villa d’Este}, p. 92 n. 35), and later had this title from Alfonso II d’Este, inheriting a position that Vico had held between 1563 and 1568 on that man’s death (E. Corradini, ‘Le raccolte estensi’, esp. p. 168). Strada was made ‘Röm. khaiss. Maj. Antiquar und Aufseher für die Kunstkammer’ of Maximilian II in 1566 (R. von Busch, \textit{Studien zu deutschen Antikesammlung}, p. 202).

\textsuperscript{31} D. Jansen, ‘Jacopo Strada et le commerce d’art’. R. Pieper, ‘The Upper German Trade in Art and Curiosities before the Thirty Years War’, sets his role in the context of other dealers of the period.

\textsuperscript{32} D. Jansen, ‘Antonio Agustin and Jacopo Strada’, p. 233 (from Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 9216 fols. 1r-2v), ‘E ben vero che essendo io conossiuto per mondo provisionato da la Cesarea < Maestà > per Jacomo Strada Antiquario, si dovea anchor egli contentar di con tal no < me no > minarmi, essendo che, se egli per caso ha per cosa vituperosa, come mostra d’h< aver > il sapper et intender l’arte del’orefice, non era conveniente ne a la servitù < che > deve a la Cesarea et Vostra Maestà, ne al debito del viver civile, il volermi chiamar ne < suoi > scritti di tal nome, quando che a tutti è manifesto, che l’honor et la v < ergogna > de servidori di pari passo ridondono in honor et vergogna de lor signore...’

\textsuperscript{33} The portrait is now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna. See H. Wethey, \textit{The Paintings of Titian}, ii pp. 48-9 and 141-2. Strada was negotiating to buy the collection of Andrea Loredan (R. von Busch, \textit{Studien zu deutschen Antikesammlung}, pp. 119-22).

\textsuperscript{34} The variety of details, which reflects both Strada’s practical involvement with objects as well as his publications, is unusual in Titian’s oeuvre, and has aroused some critical discussion, without any clear consensus. L. Freedman points out that sculptors were usually portrayed holding statues, and argues that Strada’s pose, with his arm across his body, was ‘meant to invoke an atmosphere of spirituality’ (‘Titian’s Jacopo Strada’, pp. 30-1 and 33). J. Cunnally, on the other hand, stresses the books above
contrasted with that of Onofrio Panvinio in a portrait by Jacopo Tintoretto, in which Panvinio is depicted in the robes of the Augustinian order, standing unmoving and holding a book, representing the tools of his trade.\(^{35}\)

However, we should beware of assuming that differences in background erected indissoluble barriers between these men and their university-educated peers. One thing that links Agustin with Goltz, Strada, Vico and Ligorio, as well as Paolo Manuzio, was his desire to be given the honorific title of *civis romanus*.\(^{36}\) This title, as a recognition of service to, and interest in, the city of Rome, seems to have conferred some sort of status within an international scholarly community devoted to mainly Roman antiquity. We can judge how much this meant to Goltz from the fact that he was awarded it after he had dedicated his edition of the Fasti to the senate and people of Rome, rather than the customary prince. Ligorio’s self-description evolves from ‘pittore Napoletano’ in his first written works to ‘cittadino romano, et patritio Napoletano’ in his later treatises.\(^{37}\) In the edition that he published of Panvinio’s Fasti, Strada combines both titles, describing himself as ‘civis romanus, antiquarius’. Strada, Ligorio and Vico came from minor noble families and were anxious to demonstrate that their talents were as valuable as those of their more learned contemporaries whose learning they might have hoped to have

---

\(^{35}\) 'Images of the Illustrious, p. 31).

\(^{36}\) Given that Panvinio rejected Strada’s edition, as we shall see below, this celebration seems unlikely.

\(^{37}\) See C. Dionisotti, review of Mandowsky and Mitchell, pp. 139-40.
shared. Vico's autobiographical note that he studied *litterae* from an early age, but abandoned them, 'vel educorum negligentia, vel quod ita erat in fatis' seems to suggest that he wished that that had not been the case. Agustín decided that he would like to receive the title after he left the city, musing in letters he sent to Orsini on the type of coat of arms he should receive. Agustín's tone in these letters seems slightly sardonic, but there is no doubt of his desire to receive the honour, which he was subsequently awarded.

Indeed, Agustín and Ligorio seem to have had an amicable relationship when both were in Rome together, and the correspondence between Agustín and Orsini includes slighting remarks about other members of their circle. Orsini described Panvinio as a 'piantatore di carote' in a discussion of men interested in pagan antiquity left in Rome in 1566, suggesting that he invented material. Moreover, we should be wary of pigeon-holing individuals too rigidly. Two graduates of Louvain, Antoine Morillon and Jean-Jacques Boissard, both went on to illustrate material. Morillon matriculated at Louvain in 1532, and became known as a medallist, while he continued to study classical authors. Pighius described Morillon as a self-taught artist, and there are records of his travels around Italy from 1547 to 1550 copying inscriptions and other antiquities, details of which he sent to Smet. This was with the support of


39 A. Agustín, *Opera omnia*, vii no. 40 p. 253, letter of 10 April 1573, 'Hora vi voglio dire una bella fantasia mia, che hò bisogno per certo disegno mio farmi Cittadino Romano, ma vorrei che fosse con clausule alla antiqua, narrando la verità che sono di famiglia equestre di Cesearae Augusta Colonia antiqua deducta di Augusta, & che il cognome mi pare, hò potria essere che fossi di esso, hò vero altri Augusto; come da Marcello Marcellino, da Paullo Paullino, da Fausto Faustino, &c.' In a subsequent, undated letter (no. 45 p. 256) he wrote, 'Tant'è bisogno gran pazienza, pure ho saputo della Cittadinanza con una poliza vostra piu presto che lettera; fate le gratie à nome mio omnibus, & singulis, & mandatemi quanto prima la formula di privilegii.' On Agustín's irony, see R. Bizzocchi, *Genealogie incredibili*, pp. 144-5.

40 J. Wickersham-Crawford, 'Inedited Letters of Fulvio Orsini', no. 1 p. 583, letter of 12 October 1566 (= Madrid, Escorial MS 5781, fols. 42v-43v). On this passage see S. Tomasi Velli, 'Gli antiquari intorno al circo Romano', p. 87 n. 82.


42 S. Pighius, *Themis Dea*, p. 4, 'magna namque in eo [Morillon] vis ingenii erat, qua picturam sculpturarumque difficiles alioquin artes puer sua sponte, atque αὐτοδιδάκτος ad excellentiam usque perceperat.'
Employment and remuneration for Scholars of inscriptions

Princes' courts in particular provided a place where all the men discussed above could find employment. From the late fifteenth century it became established practice for temporal and ecclesiastical rulers to include talented scholars and artists in their retinues. Such men had a practical function. Architects designed palaces, for example, and scholars worked on and delivered diplomatic addresses for their employers. Increasingly, however, a prince's magnificencia was also reflected in his more general cultural interests and support. Palaces were filled with paintings or collections of various other objects, which required understanding and management. It was not enough for the prince merely to own such objects, and demonstrate his power and wealth, but also to understand them, and demonstrate his taste and discretion. The ideal arose of the learned prince, who patronised cultural production per se and employed skilled individuals to paint, collect, and particularly advise. Thus Francesco Priscianese, in his 1543 treatise Del governo della corte d'un signore in Roma, recommends the employment of four litterati, who should be 'di costumi e di letteratura, quanto piú si potesse, eccellenti', and who

---

Boissard was born in Besançon in 1528 and studied at Louvain as well as under Melanchthon at Wittenberg and Camerarius at Leipzig. He was in the household of Cardinal Carafa at Rome between 1556 and 1559 and made copies of the monuments that were to be the basis of the six volumes of his Romanae urbis topographia et antiquitates, published at the end of his life. Despite Boissard's education, however, his publisher, Theodore de Bry, may have had some concerns about his ability to write about the material he had drawn. In 1594 he wrote to Clusius asking him to provide Latin explanations for the work, without Boissard's knowledge.

---

should teach their master.\textsuperscript{46} At Rome, members of the college of cardinals were expected to be such learned princes, both representatives of the church, the glory of which was emphasised by their high standard of living, and often members of noble Italian families whose prestige they advertised.\textsuperscript{47} In a work written specifically for cardinals in 1591, Fabio Albergati takes a similar line to Priscianese, arguing that such a man should employ 'letterati' in order to converse with them and become learned.\textsuperscript{48} The importance of this patronage on the work of artists has been widely discussed. As the case of scholars has not been examined in such detail, I shall do so briefly here.

For those patrons who wished to demonstrate their interest in the ancient world, collections of antiquities, and classical books and manuscripts, were the best way to advertise such an appreciation. As well as men with the title of 'antiquarius' surveyed above, men who worked on inscriptions were also employed as librarians to curate manuscripts and printed books.\textsuperscript{49} Agustín reveals why such men are in demand at the beginning of his Dialogos: 'yo he visto muchas personas deleitarse de tener muchas antiquallas y gastar en comprarlas muchos reales y entender muy poco dellas: pero seguiase cierto prouecho de su curiosidad, que los hombres dotos hallauan en aquellas casas recogidas muchas medallas y antiguallas las quales ellos no pudieran juntar por su pobreza'.\textsuperscript{50} Similarly, at the start of his De vita et victu populi Romani, a series of essays on various aspects of the Roman world, Francesco Robortello suggested that it would be of interest to those people 'qui Romae vivunt in aulis Principum, & Cardinalium', who may have to discuss various monuments in the city.\textsuperscript{51} Theirs were prestigious posts.

\textsuperscript{46} F. Priscianese, Del governo della corte, p. 70. Priscianese was a Tuscan humanist and printer employed in the court of Cardinal Niccolò Ridolfi from 1540, and so he may stress the role of intellectuals at court at the expense of other members, although the general picture is unlikely to be too inaccurate. See D. Redig de Campos, ‘Francesco Priscianese stampatore e umanista fiorentino’, esp. pp. 162 and 166.

\textsuperscript{47} On the standards of living expected of cardinals, see D. Chambers, ‘The Economic Predicament of Renaissance Cardinals’ and on the possible differences between secular princes and other cardinals his Postscript on the Worldly Affairs of Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga'; and G. Fragnito, ‘Cardinals' Courts in Sixteenth-century Rome’.

\textsuperscript{48} F. Albergati, Il Cardinale, pp. 270-3.

\textsuperscript{49} On the importance of libraries in cardinals' palaces, see P. Falguières, 'La cité fictive', pp. 243-6. For interesting parallels in the careers of scientific scholars who worked with natural history collections, see W. Eamon, 'Court, Academy, Printing House', and P. Findlen, Possessing Nature, ch. 8.

\textsuperscript{50} A. Agustín, Dialogos, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{51} F. Robortello, De vita et victu, fol. 6v.
usually ensuring a position among the *familiares*, the men closest to the prince. Even more intimate was the secretary, a role to which patrons also appointed classical scholars. Here they were trusted and valued for their advice and ability to compose Latin as well as their knowledge of the ancient world.

For the scholars, a key potential advantage of employment by a prince was the leisure it gave for research. In Pighius’s *Themis Dea*, Agustín’s character bemoans the fact that his judicial duties as Auditor of the Roman Rota did not give him time for scholarly work, in an implicit comparison with Pighius and Morillon, two other speakers. This probably explains why he employed Matal, as his secretary, to travel to research manuscripts and inscriptions. As scholars were in their employ, patrons could, however, exert a strong influence over what the subject of research was. This could take the form of direct instruction. At the beginning of the period under review, the Sienese scholar Claudio Tolomei was told by Ippolito de’ Medici to collect the main details of the life of Julius Caesar, which, Tolomei wrote, he did in seven days out of desire to please his master and from his delight in the material. Cardinal de Granvelle seems to have commissioned material from Morillon directly, and Pighius subtitled his inscription collection ‘opus inchoatum absolutumque anno 1554 iussu auspiciisque Marcelli Cervini’. Cervini seems to have been particularly energetic in sponsoring scholarly projects, and so it is not surprising that it is to him that Panvinio attributes his decision to write about ecclesiastical history in his supplement to Platina’s *De vitis pontificum*. Marc Laurin wrote to Pighius that Smet had compiled his inscription collection ‘meo potissimum hortatu & instigatu’; Paolo Manuzio suggests that he first dedicated himself to research on ancient Rome

---

53 C. Tolomei, *Lettere*, fol. 12v, ‘Il diletto ch’io di leggere, e contemplare i fatti di Giulio Cesare, e’l comandamento vostro Signor mio Illustissimo, m’hanno non solo stimolato, ma costretto a raccoglier que capi de la vita sua che mi comandaste; e ciò ho fatto in sette di soli, cotanto mi sono, e de la materia dilettato, e del disiderio d’obbedirvi invaghito.’
55 Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, MS Lat. fol. 61h.
56 See P. Paschini, ‘Un cardinale editore’ for details of Cervini’s attempts to publish Greek texts from the Vatican.
under the influence of the ecclesiastical dignitaries Bernardino Maffei and Pietro Bembo. Although his title was that of librarian, Orsini’s role with Farnese also included organising the publication of material from the collection of antiquities.

The means of attracting a patron involved a process of assiduous courting and flattery. In general, it was important initially to cultivate a member of the court rather than the prince himself, who would act as broker and promote an individual’s cause with his master. The means by which scholars made themselves known to potential patrons was invariably the book dedication, and it was important to have a contact within a sovereign’s inner circle to present the work and draw it to his attention. The very act of dedication could result in a payment. So, for example, Goltz had entrusted his edition of the coins of Julius Caesar to Johannes Sambucus to be presented to Archduke Maximilian. Sambucus was a Hungarian scholar who knew members of Christoph Plantin’s circle in the Netherlands, and who had joined Maximilian’s court in 1557 or 1558, which meant that he would have access to the man himself and be able to ask for payment, as he wrote to Ortelius in 1563.

One prince could provide a recommendation to another on behalf of a client. Panvinio had asked Agustín whether he should dedicate his Romanorum principum [...] libri IIII to Philip II or the Hapsburg Archduke Maximilian, to which Agustín replied that he should choose the one ‘che hora è piu sublime, et piu amico del uostro patron, idest il Re di Spagna. ben che l’altro sia piu propinquo al imperio’. Panvinio chose Philip, and clearly had the blessing of his ‘patron’, Alessandro Farnese. In his preface he wrote, ‘lucubrationes has meas, quum tandem

---

59 P. Manuzio, De legibus, sig. Aliiiiv-[Av], quoted by J-L. Ferrary, ‘Rome et Venise dans la pensée politique’, p. 493, ‘ego olim ... auctoribus duobus eximiis viris, Petro Bembo Cardinali, et Bernardino Maffeo ... dederam me ad res Romanas, illas veteres, observandas, & ex omnibus antiquorum monimentis omni studio colligendas.’ Without their support he was unable to continue: ‘Sed accidit iniquo meo fato, ut horum utrunque, Bembum primo iam senem, cuius in benevolentia ornamenti mihi erat plurimum, deinde Maffeum non aetate minus, quam virtute, florentem, in quo mei spes oeci sita omnis erat, a quo pendebam totus, importuna morte ereptum amiserim.’


61 J. Hessels, Epistolae ortelianae, no. 13 p. 29 (= H. Gerstinger, Die Briefe des Joannes Sambucus, no. 10 p. 64), ‘quoniam ego ipse, deo volente, intra duos menses omnino Viennae in curia Caesareae majestatis ero, ipsemet offeram postea, et de premio urgebo suam Majestatem et Regem Maximilianum.’

ex omni antiquitatis memoria erutas absolvissem, illud feci libentissime, ut Alexandri Farnesii cardinalis amplissimi, patroci mei, Maiestati tuae valde dediti hortatu, vel mandato potius ad te mitterem. In fact, Panvinio had Farnese make sure that the work was delivered, but even so Philip made no reply and he had to write in 1560 to ask what he thought of the dedicated work.

More established scholars were able to exploit the potential glory that they could bring to their patrons’ courts. In the 1550s, Paolo Manuzio was anxious to move his printing operation to Rome, and wrote to Cardinal Pio da Carpi in May 1556 exploring the possibility. Such a position, Manuzio pointed out, would allow him to complete his ‘notabile, et laboriosa impresa delle antichità di Roma’ (an expensive undertaking as it required the employment of two letterati as research assistants). As well as offering the carrot of supporting such a great work, Manuzio let Pio know that he had received other offers, including one from Ippolito d’Este. Perhaps more worrying for a cardinal like Pio, involved in the reform of the church, was Manuzio’s announcement that he had received a offer of employment from the protestant Count Palatine Ottheinrich.

---

63 O. Panvinio, Romanorum principum libri, sig. [a6]r.
65 H. Fletcher, ‘Paulus Manutius In aedibus Populi Romani’, p. 312, citing New Haven, Yale University, The Beinecke Library Medieval and Renaissance MS 692 no. 3 fol. 4r, ‘Et conchiuse che sapeva che’ Cardinale di Ferrara mi haverrebbe fatto ogni partito se havesse sperato di potermi trarre di Venetia. E che gli dava l’animo, s’io mi contentassi, di conchiudere in pochi giorni cotal prattica con grandissima mia sodisfattione, dovendosi contentare il Cardinale solamente dell’honore di havermi presso di lui, o fosse in Ferrara, o fosse in Roma, et di vedersi esaltato et glorificato da miei componimenti.’ This letter is with five others in the Beinecke Library, including three (31 May 1555 (no. 2), 18 February 1558 (no. 4) and 12 August 1559 (no. 6)) unknown to Ester Pastorello when she compiled her index of the letters of the Manuzio family, L’Epistolario Manuziano. For this letter, her source was a copy in BAV Vat. lat. 7201, fols. 9r-16v (Inedita Manutiana, no. 641). All six letters are edited with notes by Fletcher.
66 Manuzio enclosed the details of what the elector was offering with his letter (H. Fletcher, ‘Paulus Manutius In aedibus Populi Romani’, p. 313), ‘Aureos italicos sex centos vel tantumdem germanicae pecuniae, et aedes gratis, in singulos annos, pro mansione apud principem, cum fideiussione decem annorum praedictae pecuniae solvendae vel Venetiis, vel Argentineae, vel Basileae, vel in aliis Italiae urbibus. Aureos italicos pro reficienda masseritia ducentos. Centum pro ducenda familia.’ Fletcher (p. 301) argues that the German script suggests that the enclosure was what Manuzio had himself received.
Manuzio here refers to an attractive and secure position for scholars, in which they were appointed to a specific position within the court and given a salary. Priscianese's litterati would fall into this category. In the retinue of a less wealthy individual, we see antiquarian scholars employed specifically as tutors. It was as tutor to the elder of the von Werthern brothers, Wolfgang, that Georg Fabricius was able to visit Italy and record inscriptions in 1539, and after excusing himself from Granvelle's service Pighius became tutor to Frederic-Charles, the son of the Duke of Cleves, probably on the recommendation of Masius, who was a counsellor to the Duke. Pighius wrote an account of his trip to Italy with his pupil after his death in Rome in 1575, the Hercules Prodicus. When his patron Cardinal Salviati died in 1553, Pantagato became tutor to Pope Julius III's great-nephew, Cardinal Roberto de' Nobili. Salaries varied according to the prestige of client and patron. Priscianese recommends that 'Ai quattro litterati, l'anno tra tutti scudi 400'. By way of comparison, a cook was to be paid 36 scudi; Cardinal Ippolito d'Este had an estimated income of 70,000 scudi in 1571 and Cardinal Alessandro Farnese of 80,000 scudi in 1572 and 120,000 on his death. Ottavio Pantagato received the recommended figure of 100 scudi in 1540 from Cardinal Giovanni Salviati for his 'victum et domicilium' and 'pensio integer'. A better-known scholar with a richer cardinal stood to receive more. Paolo Manuzio was offered 300 scudi a year by Ippolito d'Este in 1556 (the lesser-known Uberto Foglietta had a salary of 220 scudi from d'Este in 1568), and 600 scudi by the Count Palatine. Ligorio received 25 scudi a month from Ippolito's heir, Alfonso II d'Este, as 'antiquario' in 1569.

Positions at universities could offer a more secure position than at court, although these did not necessarily suit all antiquarians. Paolo Manuzio, for example, wrote to Pio that he felt that

---

68. On this work see M. Laureys, 'Theory and Practice of the Journey to Italy'.
70. The figures given here can only be a rough guide: accounting for inflation in the sixteenth century across Europe is not easy.
71. F. Priscianese, Del governo della corte, pp. 22-3
72. J. Delumeau, Vie économique et sociale, i between pp. 452-3, and p. 455.
73. Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS J29 inf., fol. 147v.
74. H. Fletcher, 'Paulus Manutius In aedibus Populi Romani', p. 312, citing New Haven, Yale University, The Beinecke Library Medieval and Renaissance MS 692 no. 3 fol. 4r.
75. E. Corradini, 'Le raccolte estensi', pp. 172-3.
his gifts lay elsewhere, in writing rather than speaking.26 The methods of appointment at universities were not dissimilar to those at courts, and we should beware of distinguishing them too rigidly. In the course of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries universities tended to become less independent of the temporal powers around them, and often a position as a lecturer was as much in the power of a prince to bestow as the membership of his familia. The Pope seems to have had influence over the University of Perugia, in the Papal States. When Guglielmo Sirleto was offered the chair of Greek there, his salary of 150 scudi was to be supplemented by a 48 scudi Papal subvention.27 The Hapsburgs had a say in appointments to chairs at Vienna university, and the same was true in Florence with the Medici dukes, where Pietro Vettori held the chair of Latin then Greek, and then moral philosophy from 1538.28 Jan Gruter was made professor at Wittenberg by the prince-elector Christian de Sachsen in 1590, and then at Heidelberg in 1592 by the Palatine prince-elector there before becoming librarian of the Palatine library. Positions at both Venice and Padua, where Sigonio taught between 1552 and 1563, were under the jurisdiction of the Riformatori dello Studio of the Venetian republic.29

Some institutions were more independent, and this may have been their attraction. Lipsius held chairs in two of these, Louvain and Leiden, despite entreaties to teach in Bologna or to join a court from, among others, the Medici Duke in Florence.30 One advantage of his position at Leiden was the ability to shape the young university, although this seems to have restricted

26 H. Fletcher, 'Paulus Manutius In aedibus Populi Romani', p. 310, citing New Haven, Yale University, The Beinecke Library Medieval and Renaissance MS 692 no. 3 fol. 1v, 'Ho di poi havuti altri partiti, come la lettura di Milano con 400 ducati, questa di Padova con 300, et altre simil. et a simil carichi non è mai inchinata la volontà mia, parendomi che la mia vocatione fosse piu tosto all'adoperare la penna, che la lingua.'

27 G. Denzler, Il Cardinale Guglielmo Sirleto, p. 35, citing a letter of Sirleto to Cervini of October 1545 (BAV Vat. lat. 6177, fol. 185).


29 On Sigonio's period in Venice and Padua, see W. McCuaig, Carlo Sigonio, pp. 13-54.

30 On Lipsius, see, most recently, R-J. van den Hoorn, 'On Course for Quality': According to Ortelius (J. Hessels, Epistulae ortelianae, no. 218 p. 525, in a letter to Emanuel Demetrius of 18 August 1592), Lipsius was offered the amazing figure of 2000 'gouden cronen' by Medici. Clusius wrote to Ortelius (J. Hessels, Epistulae ortelianae, no. 231 p. 555, letter of 8 April 1593) that Lipsius was being sought for the University of Padua.
his research. Joseph Scaliger, who was to collaborate with Gruter in collecting inscriptions, succeeded Lipsius at Leiden. Salaries at universities were similar to those of court members. Again, the most famous scholars could command more, such as the 400 ducats (around 7 per cent more valuable than scudi) Manuzio claimed to have been offered from Milan. Sigonio moved from Padua to Bologna for a salary of just less than 300 scudi initially, raised to 400 in 1578. Only two other professors had higher salaries.

A more attractive form of remuneration than either employment at court or at the university, however, was the benefice or sinecure, which provided insurance against the instability of changing regimes. These benefices were at the disposal of cardinals, and they were the means by which they rewarded loyal familiari. Cardinal Giovanni Salviati, for example, awarded around a third of those in his power to his members of his familia. Pantagato received 72 scudi, nearly doubling his income, when Salviati awarded him the benefice from an abbey in Sicily in 1548, the income from which rose to 340 scudi in 1556. A list made by a client of Cardinal Colonna of the benefices of the textual scholar Latino Latini shows how much could be made. From five benefices, four of which are explicitly noted to be 'senza cura', Latini received an income of 275 scudi and 350 ducats. It is easy to understand why Panvinio wrote

81 See above, n. 76.
82 For Sigonio in Bologna, see E. Costa, 'La prima cattedra d'umanità', pp. 37-47 and W. McCuaig, Carlo Sigonio, pp. 55-93.
83 The philosopher Federico Pendasio and the jurist Giovanni Angelo Papio; W. McCuaig, Carlo Sigonio, p. 62.
84 P. Hurtubise, 'Familiarité et fidélité', p. 347 (17 out of a total of 48).
85 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS J29 inf., fols. 155v and 163v.
to Philip II’s secretary and Cardinal Vitellozzo Vitello asking if they could secure Spanish citizenship for him (and offering to pay 500 scudi for the privilege) so that he would be eligible for a particular benefice worth 300 scudi.87

Other scholars were paid according to the work they did. Antiquarian scholars could also find work editing texts for publication: Panvinio, along with Orsini, also worked as a corrector for the Vatican library, a role which paid 10 ducats a month in 1562.88 In Florence, Vincenzo Borghini made his name as an editor, before being appointed Priore dello Spedale degli Innocenti in 1552 by Cosimo I.89 Strada did receive a salary, but a relatively modest 100 gulden (florins, approximately equivalent to the scudi) in 1563 for his role as antiquarius, in addition to the 200 that he already earned as architect. Comparing this with the 500 at the same time that Clusius was paid as imperial botanist, Dirk Jansen argues that ‘Strada was given his annuity as an antiquary partly to secure his presence at court...; partly as a stipend to enable him to continue his studies; and partly for his expertise’, and that ‘his more concrete services were remunerated separately: one finds records of payment for manuscripts produced in his workshop [and] for various books, antiquities and works of art provided to Maximilian.90

Onofrio Panvinio provides us with some good examples of how much scholars could command for their ‘more concrete services’, books and manuscripts. As we saw, he gave up the monastery to earn his keep as a scholar, which, to judge by the records that he kept of his financial dealings, was not always easy.91 He did make large sums, however, from his work: he received 100 scudi from Pius V for his De primatu Petri et Apostolicae sedis potestate,92 300 ducats from Philip II for the De comitiis imperiis, 100 florins from Ferdinand I for the Reipublicae

87 K. Gersbach, ‘Onofrio Panvinio’s “De comitiis imperiis”’, App. 1 nos. 10 and 12, quoting BAV Vat. lat. 6412, fols. 333a and 359.
89 See B. Richardson, Print Culture in Renaissance Italy, ch. 11.
90 D. Jansen, ‘The Instruments of Patronage’, p. 188.
91 For example, Panvinio’s accounts for January and February 1550 are preserved in BAV Vat. lat. 7205, fols. 87v-95v (see K. Gersbach, ‘The Books and Effects of Onofrio Panvinio’, p. 54). Gersbach suggests that Panvinio’s financial preoccupations are due to the fact that he had to provide for his family as well (‘Onofrio Panvinio’s brother’, p. 255), although some details, such as records of how much various cardinals earned in certain years (e.g. BAV Vat. lat. 6277, fol. 16v-v) point to a more obsessive interest.
Romanae commentarii, and 100 florins from Maximilian for a manuscript edition of the De comitiis. Letters from Johann Jakob Fugger as well as Panvinio’s copies of his own replies are preserved from 1562 and 1563, when Panvinio had interested Fugger in buying manuscript copies of his work. These show that Fugger was prepared to commission copies from Panvinio of works which Panvinio advertised to him, including one on the arms of the popes and cardinals. For this he paid Panvinio 50 scudi in advance for the costs of textual copyists and 100 for the services of an illustrator. The entire work, Panvinio wrote, cost ‘poco più di quattro cento scudi, et son certissimo che quando lei vedra questo libro stimera la manifatura di mille ducati.’ Fugger seems to have tried to create a visual archive of sorts: as well as Panvinio’s material, he also collected drawings of coins made by Strada.

Because he supported himself in part from the sales of manuscripts of his writings, Panvinio was particularly susceptible to problems of authorship and intellectual property. We know of two cases of plagiarism involving him. In 1567 he wrote a letter addressed jointly to Laurin and Goltz complaining that Goltz’s 1566 edition of the Fasti had plagiarised his work. His first complaint was that there was no mention of him, that ‘me non posse non vehementer

93 K. Gersbach, ‘Onofrio Panvinio’s “De comitiis imperiis”,’ pp. 414-8; Panvinio later claimed to have received 200 scudi and an annual pension of 70 scudi from Maximilian (p. 418).
94 On the negotiations between Panvinio and Fugger, see W. Maasen, Hans Jakob Fugger, pp. 75-7. J-L. Ferrary (Onofrio Panvinio, pp. 218-9) prints a list of works Panvinio made in 1562 or 1563, presumably similar to that sent to Fugger, copied from BAV Vat. lat. 3451, fols. 1-17r.
95 Fugger’s originals are in BAV Vat. lat. 6412, printed by W. Maasen, Hans Jakob Fugger, pp. 96-119; Panvinio’s copies of these and his draft replies in BAV Vat. lat. 6277. Panvinio asked for the money for illustrators on 7 November 1562, ‘credo VS restara sodisfatta et della diligentia mia et delle opere del pittore, et per questo rispetto feci scriver da M. Pietro a VS che fosse contenta di farmi risponder cento scudi per potere pagar quelle simil gente...’ (Vat. lat. 6277, fol. 5r); he acknowledged receipt of the 50 scudi for the copyists in response to a letter from Fugger to his agent granting this request of 21 November (Vat. lat. 6277, fol. 15v). We have evidence of Panvinio’s expenses in 1565 from a letter to Alessandro Farnese (A. Ronchini, ‘Onofrio Panvinio’, no. 11 pp. 220-1, 17 July 1565) ‘essendo io hora carico di cinque bocche (tre scrittori, et un pittore, et un cuoco) per dar fine al libro mio dell’Historia ecclesiastica, quale al sicuro spero che sarà finito quest’anno.’
96 BAV Vat. lat. 6277, fol. 26r. The work, Pontificum Romanorum imagines [...] eorumdem et cardinalium insignia, is preserved in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm.155-60.
98 I am indebted to the account of J-L. Ferrary, Onofrio Panvinio, pp. 117-20, who surveys both cases.
conqueri et dolere de omnibus illis qui fucorum more alienos labores sine fronte raptos, nulla germani auctoris facta mentione suos fecerunt... Nec quod nostra acceperitis queror, sed quod a quibus eos labores acceperitis, vestro nomine apposito, taceatis." Second, he claims that he was slighted in the commentary, although his tone suggests that this was the lesser of his complaints.

Panvinio was also guilty of the same offence, however. In the preface to his 1558 *Reipublicae Romanae commentariorum libri*, he included a summary of those who had written on the subject before him, which bears clear similarities to a similar passage in Fabricius's *Roma*. In the 1560 edition of his work Fabricius complained about this, to which Panvinio responded in his essay *De his qui romanatas antiquitates scripto comprehenderunt*, writing, 'Fateor id ita esse, et iuste de me conqueri potuisse, qui eos a quibus longe minora accepi nominaverim, ipsum vero neglexerim, ni me gravissimae causae a meo instituto revocassent.' These *caussae* are Fabricius's Protestantism and his appearance on the index, but Panvinio here is disingenuous. Only two of Fabricius’s works had appeared on the Roman index of 1557 and none on that of 1554 at Venice (where Panvinio was writing his *Commentarii*), and in any case by referring to Fabricius as ‘Hermundurus quidam’ in the *De his qui romanatas antiquitates scripto comprehenderunt* he found a way of citing him while not naming him. Panvinio goes on in the essay to argue that he did not borrow many details, in any case: 'Ea porro sunt eiusmodi, ut ego ipse vix trium dierum labore sine ulla eius libri ope constituere potuissem.' It is an embarrassed excuse: it seems that Panvinio had not paid much attention to borrowing material from a man whose works he thought were all about to be banned.

**Scholarly Interaction and the Influence of the Papacy**

Panvinio's cases notwithstanding, in general the relations between antiquarian scholars of this period are strikingly amicable. Scholars were very willing to share material with one another,

---

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Onofrio_Panvinio

---

\(^99\) The letter is quoted by A. Mai, *Spicelegium Romanum*, ix pp. 541-7 (the quote here is from pp. 541-2), from BAV Vat. lat. 6783, fols. 396-400. Although Panvinio claimed in the letter that he was writing privately, it does seem to have had some circulation: there are also copies in BAV Vat. lat. 3933, fols. 396-400, and Siena, Biblioteca Comunale, MS C.X.19 fols. 274-279 (a collection of antiquarian material copied from Vatican codices). Panvinio also included most of the text, without naming Goltz and Laurin, in the preface to the reader in a version of his 1568 *Chronicon eclesiasticum* (J.-L. Ferrary, *Onofrio Panvinio*, p. 118).
particularly in comparison with the fractious humanist world of the fifteenth century or the more professionalised one of later periods. This spirit of cooperation was crucial to the collecting of inscriptions, as well as to the technical insights scholars made in using this material, as I shall outline in the following chapters. Scholars cooperated with one another in two main ways: in person, and by letter. Interaction by letter is easier to trace today, but we can get some idea of personal links by studying the notebooks that epigraphers maintained as well as through contemporary accounts of gatherings. What is clear from combining these sources is that major technical developments in the study of epigraphy took place at Rome between around 1540 and 1555, and that these developments came about as a result of the patronage of a number of well-trained scholars and artists in a city with unparalleled collections of inscriptions and other antiquities. We know of another subsequent site where antiquarians gathered in a similar atmosphere, at the court of Maximilian II in Vienna, but in this case they had relatively few antiquities to study. After 1555, antiquarians still visited Rome and studied in the city, but without the widespread institutional support of before. After this point, letters become an increasingly important means of communicating about inscriptions, in many cases between scholars who had met in person at Rome before.

At Rome, cardinals' promotion of cultural activity and employment of scholars were heavily influenced by the tastes of the pope of the day. When a pope was well-disposed to the study of classical antiquity, its study tended to flourish in the city at large. We have seen in the introduction that this was strikingly true in the papacy of Leo X (1513-21), where Raphael and Colocci could work together, and where there was considerable other antiquarian activity in this period, including the publications of Fulvio's *Antiquaria urbis* and Mazochi's *Epigrammata antiquae urbis*. After the sack of Rome, despite humanists' self-conscious belief that the golden age had come to an end, we soon see evidence of attempts to continue cultural patronage. Cardinal Ippolito de' Medici, Leo X's nephew, tried to emulate his uncle by establishing a court. Ippolito de' Medici died in 1535, but the accession of Paul III Farnese to the papal throne the year before meant that such endeavours would be encouraged at Rome. He had been a pupil of Pomponio Leto and his interest in classical monuments is demonstrated by his creation of a *Commissario delle antichità* in the first year of his papacy to protect monuments in the city and control the export of antiquities, a post to which he appointed his secretary

---

Latino Giovenale Manetti, a man who had previously worked as a diplomat for Leo X.\textsuperscript{101} We have other evidence that the promotion of the study of classical antiquity can be seen as an important part of the regime's policy. For example, Bernardino Maffei, who encouraged Manuzio to come to Rome, and Marcello Cervini, supporter of Pighius and Panvinio among others, were both secretaries of Paul.

The effects of Paul's interests can be seen in a variety of spheres. Collections of antiquities in the city continued to burgeon. As we saw in the introduction, the tradition of collecting antiquities was well-established in the city, but the continued acceptability of this practice meant that although ancient sites were regularly disturbed as foundations of new buildings were made, objects from these sites were incorporated in collections around the city. Important well-attested collections from this period include those of Cardinals Federico Cesi, Achille Maffei, and perhaps most impressive of all, that of Rodolfo Pio da Carpi. In addition, Alessandro Farnese began to collect avidly on the accession of his uncle to the papal seat, and his elevation to the cardinalate soon afterwards. Collections of this sort attracted educated tourists, eventually reflected in the production of guide books to Rome which included details of cardinals' collections, of which that by Ulisse Aldrovandi was most conspicuous.

Collections of this sort also made work for dealers and curators, as well as providing material for scholars to work with. We have early evidence of a group of men interested in antiquity who gathered under the umbrella of a group known as the \textit{Accademia della Virtù} established by Claudio Tolomei, and dedicated to scholarly discussion.\textsuperscript{102} Marcello Cervini encouraged this informal academy to meet, under the auspices of Alessandro Farnese.\textsuperscript{103} His influence seems to have persuaded Tolomei to try to organise his fellow-discutants to construct an illustrated encyclopaedia of the ancient world based on the text of Vitruvius, which Tolomei outlined in a letter of 1542. For such a project artists were vital, as Tolomei noted; that he could conceive of its execution shows that he envisaged draughtsmen and scholars working together, and


\textsuperscript{102} L. Sbaragli, \textit{Claudio Tolomei}, pp. 47-51.
suggests that the collaborative atmosphere established by Leo X existed again. Pighius's
Themis Dea, a dialogue set on New Year's Day 1551, idealises one scholarly gathering, in which
Agustín, Morillon, and Pighius himself joined together with Cardinal Pio da Carpi in his
palace to discuss an ancient relief in his collection of antiquities. As well as collecting the
objects themselves, Pio also owned a sylloge of inscriptions; it is no surprise to learn that he
employed Martin Smet between 1545 and 1551. Smet is usually assumed to have been Pio's
secretary, but the evidence of Pighius's Themis Dea suggests he held a more lowly post. In
Pighius's work, describing the discussion of a statue in Pio's collection, he mentions a
'Martinus', who is 'provincialis noster', and who fetches the statue for Pio's visitors to admire,
and later is sent by Pio to get a book. This seems to be Smet.

Another event, which must have taken place shortly afterwards, is recalled by Latino Latini in
his short essay De pede Romano. Latini describes a gathering of scholars, including Agustín,
Pantagato, Achille Maffei, Achilles Statius, Egio, Orsini, a Giovanni Battista Sighicelli, as well
as Latini himself, who measured the size of a Roman pes from a monument in the Vatican
collection, in order to try to work out the relations between Roman measurements of length
and volume. Jean-Jacques Boissard, who came to Rome slightly later again, paints an idyllic
picture of conditions for scholars of antiquities, stressing the international nature of the
community, and the encouragement offered by inhabitants of Rome, particularly Orsini and
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104 M. Daly Davis, 'Zum Codex Coburgensis'. Daly Davis's vision of the gathering probably overstates
the fixedness of membership and the seriousness of its organisation; see D. Jansen, 'Antonio Agustín and
105 L. Sbaragli, Claudio Tolomei, p. 75.
106 Carpi's sylloge was copied by Matal, BAV Vat. lat. 6039, fols. 321-328v.
107 S. Pighius, Themis Dea, pp. 21-2, '...finito deinde hilariter prandio, dimissisque ceteris convivis, in
interius cubiculum à Cardinale ducimur, qui accersito Martino suo elegantis ingenii iuvene,
provinciali nostro (qui tum erat ex Atriensibus illius) mandat, uti signum ex Musaeo depromat.'
Later (p. 43), in order that the discutants can quote a Greek phrase, Pio says, 'Adfer librum Martine,
ut eum nobis praelegas.' The description continues, 'Allato libro Morillonus locum indicavit, quem
Martinus ito legit...'.
108 The De pede romano ex Latini Latinii observationibus is printed at the end of a posthumously-
published collection of Pedro Chacón's works, the Petri Ciaconii Toletani Opuscula.
Mario Delfini. He tells one story of being locked in Pio’s garden overnight after a tour of the collection, the potential veracity of which must be balanced against Boissard’s aim to convince his readership of his dedication to his art. He spent the evening and early morning copying monuments. When the cardinal discovered him, rather than denouncing him as an intruder, he laughed it off, and asked to see the drawings.

It was in this climate of openness and collaboration that scholars were able to work on antiquities in the city. Even here, however, traditional humanist enmity still had its place. Our main evidence for one dispute is an annotated 1544 edition of Bartolomeo Marliani’s *Topographia*. The hand of this was once assumed to be that of Orsini, but has recently been identified as that of Benedetto Egio. Egio’s annotations mainly correct Marliani’s transcriptions of inscriptions and query his interpretation of literary texts, but the tone in which they do so is unusually fierce. It was at the start of this book that Egio called Marliani ‘Meridianus ineptissimus antiquario rum’, and the invective continues, for example with a direct address to the author over the identification of an amphitheatre, ‘Merliane. dic rogo, quo autore id esse Statilii amphitheatrum astipuleris’. The title page in particular is covered in insults: to Marliani’s claim that ‘Errores nonnulli sublati’ (the first edition was full of mistakes in the transcription of inscriptions) Egio adds ‘immo errores innumer prope coniuncti’ and then ‘Tituli, inscriptionesque non aliter, quam ipsis inerant marmoribus, emendatissime expressi, qui ab aliis haec tenus neglecto ordine, & perperam in lucem editi inveniuntur.’ One reason for Egio and Marliani’s rivalry may be the fact that in the late 1540s they seem to have been the two most competent Greek scholars working in Rome. Egio is regularly cited in

---


112 See above, p. 9.

113 BAV Ross. 1204, p. 8.
syllogai of inscriptions for his translations of Greek material, and Marliani's manuscripts, now in the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome, included many Greek texts.114

Another remark of Egio on the title page, next to Marliani’s dedication to Francis I, King of France, that ‘avaritiae ergo Regi opus dedicatur’, makes it tempting to posit a political dimension to the quarrel between the two. Egio’s motivation does not seem to have been spiteful envy: although he goes on in his annotation to point out that Marliani received nothing from the king as reward for the dedication, Marliani seems to have been independently wealthy, and Egio probably did quite well out of benefices as a priest.115 Marliani does express pro-French sentiments elsewhere: the first edition of the Topographia was dedicated to Cardinal Giandomenico de Cupis, a member of the French faction at Rome, and a version edited by Rabelais was printed in Lyons in the same year.116 But other scholars at Rome who can be identified with a French faction in the city do not seem to have aroused Egio’s odium, particularly Ligorio, who worked as antiquario to the pro-French Cardinal Ippolito d’Este from 1549. It is notable that Egio’s stance was supported by other antiquarians working at Rome in the early 1550s, including Ligorio, Pantagato and Panvinio,117 while printed attacks with the tenor of Egio’s private comments do not seem to exist, with the exception of some passages in Ligorio’s Libro delle antichità di Roma. Marliani seems to have preferred to work independently, and may have simply antagonised Egio and thus alienated himself from Egio’s collaborators.

Paul III was succeeded by Julius III (1550-1555) and then by Marcello Cervini, for 22 days, as Marcellus II. Both these pontiffs seem to have shared Paul’s inclinations towards cultural patronage. Strada, for one, claims to have been in Julius’s service.118 But the accession of Paul IV (1555-9), a member of the Carafa family from Naples, marks a sea change in the atmosphere

117 J-L. Ferrary (Onofrio Panvinio, pp. 169-70) interestingly points out that when Pantagato emended a text of Suetonius which supported Marliani’s contested view on the site of the Forum at Rome, Ligorio forged an inscription to confirm the original reading of the text. See G. Vagenheim, ‘La falsification chez Ligorio’, pp. 81-5.
118 D. Jansen, ‘Jacopo Strada’s Antiquarian Interests’, p. 60.
of the city. Paul's vision was for a more austere church, including the establishment of the Index at Rome. One of the very few examples of sympathy to students of classical antiquity in his reign was the patronage of Boissard by his nephew, Carlo Carafa. Boissard's account of arriving back after a trip in Rome, where Paul IV had died in the meantime, nicely illustrates the unpopularity of the dynasty in the city: fearful for his life, Boissard turned tail and fled. Most importantly, in the climate of Catholic reform that Paul's papacy inaugurated, writers on pagan material were no longer sure of the acceptability of their work. Some thought that provided it did not present explicit lessons for the present, it would pass unnoticed. This seems to be the tenor of the advice Carlo Sigonio offered Panvinio in 1558, shortly before the institution of the first Roman index, in which he tried to dissuade him from writing church history and recommended that 'impariamo a vivere et non stucchiamo i vespai, et parliamo di quel furfante di Catilina a nostro modo... Alia tempora nunc, alii mores.' Others do not seem to have been as confident. In early 1559, Ottavio Pantagato wrote from Rome to Panvinio in Venice, saying that he had been unable to see his new books, and that he suspected that Panvinio's printer may have been placed on the index. Crucially, living in Rome, Pantagato does not seem to know, and this is to be a mark of the uncertainty that marks the new era, which may well have resulted in a certain hesitancy towards support for work on classical subjects.

After Paul IV, humanists enjoyed a brief respite in the papacy of Pius IV, prompting a rather embarrassing preface from Sigonio in 1560 in which the historian urged him to support classical studies, which had recently been neglected in Italy. It was under Pius that Paolo

19 The basic reference for the papacy of this period is still L. von Pastor, Storia dei papi, vols. 6-11.
20 J-J. Boissard, Romanae urbis topographia, i p. 49.
22 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 66r (7 January 1559), 'Aspetto il vostro libro De imperio Ro. et de Electorib. con gran sete e tanto magiore perche dubito che lo stampatore non sia interditto ne la nuova bolla degli autori, opere e stampatori prohibiti.' Later (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 69r, 28 January 1559), he had found out more, commenting that the books of banned printers could be sold if their insignia were removed, and that 'Non credo che e Fasti vostro siano prohibiti, ma non si vendono per ordine de librari, li quali si favoriscon o fanno contra l'un l'altro.'
23 C. Sigonio, De antiquo iure, sig. a3r-v, 'me vero... litterarum praeterea, quas iampridem negligi atque contemni in Italia coeptas esse constabat, non levis quaedam cum paucis aliquot bonis viris
Manuzio achieved his goal of establishing his printing house at Rome in 1561. But the situation soon worsened in the reign of Pius V (1566-72), who had worked in the Inquisition under Paul IV. He wanted to remove pagan statues from the Vatican, and proposed to seize the Colosseum and triumphal arches in Rome, angered that tourists were drawn to these rather than church sites. The practical effect of these policies was that humanists looked for support elsewhere. In 1566 Orsini wrote to Agustín that Ligorio was about to leave Rome, and that other antiquarians in the city were no longer functioning as well as they once had done (it was in this context that he called Panvinio a ‘piantatore di carote’), which left him dispirited about the future of classical studies. In the same year, Latino Latini wrote to Agustín that he would be forced to leave Rome from the lack of a patron, another indication of a changed cultural climate. Ligorio, as Orsini writes, was negotiating to go elsewhere. Francesco Priorato wrote

cogitatio commovebat. Quamobrem cum Christianis omnibus atque Italiae universae, tum is praecipue, qui de antiqua litterarum laude solici sunt, etiam atque gratulor, quod is, quem optabamus, ac votis a Deo perpetuis poscebamus... nobis sit tandem... concessus. This passage is quoted and discussed by W. McCuaig, Carlo Sigonio, pp. 40-1. See also Sigonio’s letter to Panvinio of 6 January 1560 (Opera omnia, vi col. 1009), ‘Qui è venuta nuova, che il Papa vuole abbracciar i letterati: Dio il voglia, anche noi potressimo sperar qualche cosa.’

For Manuzio’s period in Rome, see M. Lowry, Facing the Responsibility of Paulus Manutius. Lowry includes an edition of the contract between Manuzio and the papacy in this work, which records that the printer was to receive 500 scudi a year, in order to print ‘libri ben corretti et emendati cosi della sacra scrittura com e d’ogn’ altra sorte, massime in questi tempi che le stampesi trovano in molti luoghi corrotte dagli heretici’ (p. 78), although he seems to have enjoyed considerable editorial freedom. L. Baldacchini (‘Il mercato e la corte’, esp. pp. 292-3) argues that the size of Manuzio’s salary was not conducive to efficient work and contributed to Manuzio’s lack of success in the role.


L. Latini, Epistolae, coniecturae, et observationes, ii p. 121 (from BAV Vat. lat. 6201, fol. 17v), ‘Retinuit me adhuc Romae partim componendarum rerum mearum ratio, quae litium quarumdam impeditissimis labyrinthis implicatae erant, partim etiam Sirletii Card. maior erga me benvolentia, studiumque sublevandi, quam spes. Nam quam initio Pontificatus Pii V spem amplissimam illam quidem, et quodam
to G. B. Pigna, the secretary of Duke Alfonso II d'Este, on Ligorio's behalf in 1568 as follows: ‘essendo quelli, solo estimati et honoratì hora quali sotto ombra, de continenza, et humiliată, auanzano la magg' parte de le loro entrate, senza non solo spender’ in cosa alcuna ma ne anco con intertener’ le persone ualorose, et d'intelletto come lui [Ligorio] ... questa corte era ridotta in tale estremità, che l'huomini pari suoi, doveuan procacciar' altr'onde il uitto, et la fortuna loro...” Finally, Manuzio also left in 1570, apparently disillusioned by the pope's anti-humanist rhetoric.128

In this climate, only one cardinal seems to have continued actively collecting antiquities as well as acting as patron to scholars, Alessandro Farnese. Farnese had become spectacularly wealthy in the papacy of his uncle, and was thus sufficiently independent to resist prevailing cultural trends.129 Farnese employed both Panvinio and Orsini, among others, as librarians.130 As Christina Riebesell argues, after he inherited the family palace on Ranuccio's death he seems to have conceived of his collections of books and antiquities situated in Rome as a study centre, to attract scholars from across Europe interested in the ancient city and its civilisation.131

modo certam, ut est vir summa benignitate, conceperat; ea paulatim in dies extenuata est ut omnem prorsus iuvandi mei spem ut nunc quidem est abiiciendam esse fateatur.'

127 Quoted by D. Coffin, The Villa d'Este, p. 5 n. 1, from Archivio di Stato Modena, Cancelleria ducale, estero: Ambasciatori, agenti, e corrispondenti Estensi, Italia, Roma, busta 45.

128 Camillo Paleotti wrote approvingly to Manuzio following his decision to leave the city, commenting that 'Deerat libertas, qua sine sapienti homini nulla potest esse iucunda vita', quoted by P. Prodi, Il Cardinale Gabriele Paleotti, ii p. 245.

129 On Farnese's artistic patronage, see C. Robertson, Il Gran Cardinale; on his collections of books, F. Fossier, La bibliothèque Farnèse, esp. pp. 19-25; on his collection of antiquities and support of scholars, C. Riebesell, Die Sammlung des Kardinal Alessandro Farnese. Ein 'Studio' für Künstler und Gelehrte, and C. Riebesell, 'Die Sammlung des Kardinal Alessandro Farnese (1520-1589) als Stellvertreterin für das antike Rom'.

130 That Panvinio had the title of librarian, as conjectured by R. Mouren ('La bibliothèque du Palais Farnèse', pp. 8-9) is proved by a reference written for him by Farnese in 1562 (BAV Vat. lat. 6412, fol. 324r): 'L'Apportator di questa, viene alla Corte, per presentare à S. M.ta due opere composte da un Padre del ordine di S.o Ag.no chiamato Maestro Nofrio Panvino [sic] veronese il quale è gia molti anni mio Bibliotechario...'.

131 C. Riebesell, 'Die Sammlung des Kardinal Alessandro Farnese (1520-1589) als Stellvertreterin für das antike Rom', esp. pp. 410-13. On Alessandro Farnese's death, Orsini wrote to the younger Alessandro Farnese, Duke of Parma and Piacenza, asking for his employment to be continued, 'Alla qual cura io non mancarò di fede e di diligenza debita, così per rispetto delle cose che vi sono rare et pretiose, come
Paradoxically, Farnese's success in his attempts to gather together the major antiquities at Rome, despite the fact that much material continued to be exported from the city, seems to be due to the fact that he was increasingly isolated in the form of his patronage at Rome in the last third of the century. The only other major patron for scholars at Rome in the second half of the 1560s was the itinerant Cardinal de Granvelle. His patronage seems to have been concentrated on Low Countries scholars in the city, including his secretary Lipsius and Nicolas Florentius, although he was on very good terms with Orsini and may have supported Panvinio.  

Subsequent popes were not as hostile as Pius V, but especially after the discovery of the Christian catacombs at Rome in 1578, support for scholarship tended to go towards scholars of the early church, who may or may not also have been interested in classical antiquity. Any single-minded study of pagan antiquities could be called into question, for example in the work of Pompeo Ugonio, who relied on the studies of previous antiquarians in his study of the city of Rome, but advocated a focus on Christian remains.  

Latini was employed by Gregory XIII (1572-85) to work on his project to print ecclesiastical writings and with the Index, giving up working on the pagan classics, which prompted Agustín in 1577 to write angrily to Orsini that previously many churchmen had studied both. Interestingly, a year later Latini wrote to Matal to complain that he, Orsini, a Georgius Ticinius and Antonio Vacca were the only antiquarians left in the city. At the end of 1583, he complained to Camillo Paleotti that foreign scholars came to Italy to learn, but that there were no native students. Latini may have had in mind the recently-deceased Pedro Chacon, a Spaniard who probably visited Rome and Italy in the 1560s, and seems to have settled in Rome from 1572 at the beginning of the
papacy of Gregory XIII, before dying in 1581. Chacón's printed output and surviving manuscripts show that he had a wide range of interests, including inscriptions and the textual criticism of classical authors, but his main role in the city seems to have been to work on the texts of the church fathers. Another Spanish Chacón, Alfonso, actually came to Rome under Pius V, in 1567, to work at St Peter's. He too had epigraphic interests, and even produced a study, with engravings, of Trajan's column, published in 1576. His main published work lay in ecclesiastical history, however, and he was one of the pioneers of the study of the early church. Under Gregory, he was a member of the Congregation of the Index.

Without the opportunity for support at Rome, an increasingly popular destination was the Hapsburg court in Vienna. Whereas the Spanish Hapsburgs seem to have preferred to support Spanish scholars, the courts of Ferdinand I (1556-1564), Maximilian II (1564-1576) and Rudolph II (1576-1612) were marked by their international nature and openness to confessional ambiguity. The first prominent scholar to leave Italy for Vienna was Jacopo Strada in 1556, whose book dedications testify to an aggressive campaign to secure Hapsburg patronage. The measure of Strada's influence within the family is shown by the fact that he felt able in 1558 to criticise severely the work of Wolfgang Lazius, court historian to Ferdinand I since 1546, when it was shown him by the imperial envoy Martin de Guzman. Strada's claim that Lazius had misattributed a coin of Mark Antony to Manius Acilius seems to have persuaded Maximilian; no further volumes of Lazius's commentary were added to his one 1558 work dealing with the silver coins of Caesar, Augustus and Tiberius, and the Italian, first recorded receiving a salary as architect in 1559, worked for Maximilian throughout his reign.

---

137 See E. Ruiz, 'Los años Romanos de Pedro Chacón.'
139 See P. Godman, The Saint as Censor, pp. 80-1.
140 See Jansen, 'Gli strumenti del mecenatismo.' Jansen notes (p. 719) that Strada was dedicating his books to the Hapsburgs at the same time as Panvinio was asking Agustín whether it was better to dedicate to Philip II or Maximilian (above, n. 62), a reflection of the fact that Roman patronage had dried up in the papacy of Paul IV.
142 The letter, from Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 9216 fols. 1r-2v, is printed in D. Jansen, 'Antonio Agustín and Jacopo Strada', pp. 233-5. See above, n. 32.
There is no doubt that Strada, whose attitude to orthodox Catholicism seems to have been problematic, was attracted by the Maximilian’s religious tolerance.\textsuperscript{143} The emperor’s open attitude is demonstrated by his coronation of the Protestant Georg Fabricius in 1570 as a poet, when, as we saw, Fabricius’s \textit{Opera omnia} had been included on the Roman index in 1559.\textsuperscript{144} Many Low Countries humanists also came to Vienna in this period, also attracted to the city as a haven from religious violence. It was here that Pighius worked for the Duke of Cleves from 1570, Sambucus was appointed court historian after Lazius in 1564, Clusius was imperial botanist and Lipsius made an extended stay in 1572.\textsuperscript{145} Sambucus, Clusius and others were friends with Plantin, a member of the ‘family of love’, a heterodox movement based around Antwerp which promoted irenicism.\textsuperscript{146} The group was particularly attractive to scholars and merchants, and Lipsius may have been a member. Unfortunately for these men, the balance Maximilian promoted did not last, and his successor Rudolph does not seem to have promoted much antiquarian scholarship in the new court at Prague. He was more interested in other forms of learning, although he did appoint an antiquarian, Jacopo Strada’s son Ottavio. The elder Strada asked Francesco de’ Medici for patronage in 1577, and resigned the post of antiquary with Rudolph in 1579. When he saw his son appointed in his place, he disinherited him in 1584.\textsuperscript{147}

The potential of Vienna as a place for antiquarian research was limited, however, by the scarcity of remains of antiquity there. Increasingly, debate and discussion on epigraphic matters was conducted by letter. Epistolary contact had always been important to the antiquarian community — some of our information about what was going on at Rome in the 1540s and 1550s comes from letters written from Rome to friends outside the city — but this seems to be increasingly true towards the end of the century. We can follow the process in the epigraphic manuscripts of Aldo Manuzio the younger, son of Paolo, who began to collect records of inscriptions in the 1560s, and to a large degree relied on his father’s contacts for

\textsuperscript{143} See H. Louthan, \textit{The Quest for Compromise}, p. 124: in 1567 Strada was linked by the Inquisition with Mantuan women accused of heresy, in 1569 had to avoid Mantuan and Milanese territory for fear of persecution, and in 1581 he was burnt in effigy at Mantua.

\textsuperscript{144} Details of the coronation are in Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek MS Pal. Lat. 1914, fol. 20f.; J. M. De Bujanda, \textit{Thesaurus de la littérature interdite au XVle siècle, Index des livres interdits X}, pp. 178-9.

\textsuperscript{145} For contacts between Lipsius and Pighius in this period, see M. Laureys, ‘Lipsius and Pighius’, pp. 330-3.

\textsuperscript{146} On Plantin and the ‘family of love’ in general, see A. Hamilton, \textit{The Family of Love}, esp. ch. 3.

\textsuperscript{147} H. Lietzmann, ‘War Jacopo Strada als Antiquar Rudolfs II. in Prag tätig ?’, p. 236.
information about epigraphic discoveries. Fulvio Orsini, who had participated in gatherings of the 1550s and remained based at Rome until his death in 1600, took on an important role in disseminating details of discoveries made in the city, which can be observed through letters he wrote to his friends, and those his friends wrote back to him. Much of the discussion about the contents of the collection assembled by Jan Gruter which was printed in 1602-3 took place by letter between Scaliger and Gruter, and these scholars assembled most of the material that was included either from previously published works, or from members of the growing ‘republic of letters’.

This community does show some signs of having been affected by increased factionalism of the last third of the century. Its members frequently referred to studies on classical material as a refuge from their day-to-day troubles. So, for example, Laevinus Torrentius wrote to Orsini

148 Letters containing inscriptions are included among Aldo Manuzio's epigraphic material, now in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (and not included in Ester Pastorello's L’Epistolario Manuziano), particularly in BAV Vat.lat. 5237.

149 Many of Orsini’s letters are collected in BAV Vat.lat. 4103-4; the collection of Orsini’s letters to the Paduan intellectual Gianvincenzo Pinelli in Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D422 inf. and D423 inf. give a good idea of the information Orsini could provide from Rome to one of his closest friends.

150 Most of Gruter’s letters were lost with the capture of the Palatine library in 1622; some of Scaliger’s advice to Gruter, however, is preserved in his Epistolae omnes. The loss of these letters and papers means that we are not very well informed about the exact methods used in the preparation of the collection: in particular, the role of Marcus Welser, given as much prominence as Gruter and Scaliger in the introduction, is not clear. Scaliger seems to have begun collecting inscriptions, and then handed his papers to Gruter to complete the compilation, probably when he learnt of Gruter’s interest in producing an edition. Gruter had written as early as 14 April 1592 to William Camden asking for information, saying ‘estque animus mihi intra annum alterum dare Inscriptionum editionem’ (W. Camden, Epistolae, no. 38 p. 47). An example of the transfer of information from Scaliger to Gruter is a manuscript now in London (BL MS Sloane 3266), which contains inscriptions collected at Nîmes on Scaliger’s behalf, which then passed to Gruter, according to the note at the beginning (fol. 1r): ‘Inscriptiones Nemausenses collectae ab aliquo mandatu Scaligeri extant autem in iis centum fere quae non comparent in Antiquitatibus Nemausiensium Joh. Poldi [Jean Poldo d’Albenas, Discours historial de l’antique et illustre cite de Nismes (Lyon: Roville, 1560)]. Ego lanus Gruterus Smetianis omnis inmissuci.’ The notes beside the inscriptions record differences from Poldo d’Albenas’s work as well as that of Smet.
from Liège in 1581, asking him to send details of coins as a salve 'in hac tempestate'.

Religious differences seem to have raised barriers between them, however. Jean Matal, one-time fellow researcher and secretary to Agustín, lost contact with him after ten years of collaboration, and ended up in Cologne, a noted centre for freedom of expression. It is possible that Agustín, who made his career in the church, and was made Archbishop of Tarragona in 1576, felt distanced from Matal's attitudes. Similarly, Orsini and Lipsius, despite their common interests and having met when Lipsius came to Rome, do not seem to have enjoyed a significant correspondence, perhaps because of Lipsius's heterodoxy and conversion to Protestantism.

Patrons, Antiquarian writing, and Censorship

As well as instructing their clients to work on certain subjects, patrons could also intervene in their work in a more direct financial way, by paying for the printing of their works. The market for antiquarian works does not seem to have been a large one, and authors or patrons frequently had to pay printers to produce their works. Adolph Occo paid Plantin 100 thalers to print his work on medals: in fact, as Leon Voet shows, a large proportion of Plantin's printing work was commissioned by third parties, who paid for the printing and then distributed the works themselves. On other occasions the author would agree to purchase and then distribute a proportion of the print run. Plantin also seems to have sought patronage for the printing of works himself. He wrote to Pighius assuring him that he would print Pighius's *Annales*, 'neque puto mihi defuturos socios qui me juvent in sumptibus faciendis.'

Illustrations in particular were expensive, as they involved the employment of an artist as well as a typesetter. As well as including inscriptions, usually surrounded by generic borders which

---

151 BAV Vat. lat. 4103, fol. 58r (23 September 1581). See also fol. 96r, a letter of 27 August 1583, 'Tanto majorem enim inde [from res antiquaria] percipiam voluptatem quanto magis haec me tempora nostra contristant, ut saepe nesciam quo me vertam, dolorem non laturus nisi solatium aliquod a Musis interim accederet.' (this letter is printed in L. Torrentius, *Correspondance*, i no. 10 p. 19).


153 A few letters of Lipsius to Orsini, but none from Orsini to Lipsius, survive. See W. Bracke, 'Giusto Lipsio e Fulvio Orsini'.


presumably were in the stock of the printer,156 Petrus Apianus and Bartholomaeus Amantius's 1534 collection of inscriptions also includes at the end some illustrations of statues, which they thank their patron Raymund Fugger for providing, not just in the introduction, but also before the illustrations themselves.157 Sambucus had to pay for the engravings for his work on emblems,158 while Boissard could not afford to do the same for his collection of Roman monuments, which partly explains why drawings he made in the late 1550s were not published until the end of the century.159

Owing to the difficulties of having material published, any opportunity to do so was seized upon. It was probably for this reason that Panvinio chose to print his Fasti and Epitome pontificum romanorum with Jacopo Strada, perhaps under some pressure from Alessandro Farnese to produce the edition.160 Farnese had initially claimed the inscribed fragments, before

---

156 Some of the eight varieties of decorative border that Mazochi used in his 1517 edition of Fulvio's Illustrium imagines reappear in his 1521 Epigrammata. Although the Epigrammata was not printed for four years, Mazochi received privileges for the two works on the same day from Leo X. See J.Cunnally, Images of the Illustrious, pp. 61 and 73-4.

157 P. Apianus and B. Amantius, Inscriptiones sacrosanctae vetustatis, sig. [Ciiii]r, 'Ultimum locum tribuimus imaginibus veterrimis, quae non parvo dispendio a Magnifico domino Remundo Fuggero, vetustatis maximo amatore & huius libri edendi unico autore, praeterea a Doctis. viro Bilibaldo Pirckhamero Norimbergensi patricio sunt congestae, & longissime accersitae'. The preface to the statues is on p. CCCCCXII, which indicates that the cost of the illustrations would also be reflected in the price of a book: 'Porro & hoc te latere nolui preter has veteres imagines quas subiunximus fini libri antiquitatum, & quas D. Raymundus liberaliter communicavit alias quamplurimas superesse apud eum, Sed quia verebamur, ne in nimis magnum modum liber ex crescet, Praeterea ne praecii magnitudine emptorem oneraremus, si omnes adiceremus visum est in praesentia omittere & differre in librum quam instituimus de Numismatis veterum Imperatorum...'.

158 As Ortelius wrote to Emanuel Demetrius in 1586 (J. Hessels, Epistulae ortelianae, no. 148 p. 343).

159 Boissard wrote to Ortelius in 1589 that 'Habeo quoque hic amplissimam saxorum antiquorum quae Romae passim videntur descriptionem: quorum numerus millesimum superat: sed editionem illorum suprimo, quod in iis sculpendis sumptus facere nec libet nec licet.' (J. Hessels, Epistulae ortelianae, 167 p. 401; see also no. 194 p. 466).

160 In the preface to the work, which Strada likens to a house in which the Fasti are the foundations, Panvinio's work the walls, and his own efforts the roof, Strada described the process of its creation as follows (Fasti et triumphi romani, [*3v*]), 'ego Serenissime Rex, etsi cum illis minime sim comparandus, antiquitatis me tamen usqueadeo studiosum profiteor, ut cum ante treis annos Romae
giving them to the people of Rome, and although Bartolomeo Marliani had produced a small edition, Farnese no doubt wanted one of his clients to produce a more lavish production. Strada was awarded an imperial privilege in 1556. Certainly Strada’s edition was handsomely printed, including numismatic illustrations and printing the Capitoline fragments in red with Panvinio’s supplements in black. Unfortunately, Strada muddled the chronology, rendering the edition more or less useless as a work of reference, and Panvinio was forced to produce another edition the following year with Valgrisi, this time with some financial support from Farnese. It was only with the help of such a rich patron that more lavish volumes could be published: for example, Agustín wrote to Orsini in 1566 to suggest that Farnese help Ligorio publish his material.

Given the expense and conditions involved in printing, it is not surprising that one patron funded a press to produce his client’s antiquarian works to ensure that they reached a market. Marc Laurin contacted Goltz through Ortelius and offered him a stipend for life if he came to Bruges and worked for him, which Goltz did in 1558. It was Laurin who paid for Goltz’s trip which took most of the next two years to visit and record details of the coin cabinets of Europe. On his return, the two set up a printing press, which received a license in 1562, mainly to print biographical and historical details found in Roman coins, although they also issued an edition of Bion and Moschus, and a biography of Goltz’s master Lombard. In 1564 Laurin wrote to Pighius inviting him to print with them any numismatic material that he may have, stressing that he would not have to pay, and that Goltz would engrave any coins. The arrangement meant that Laurin could have contributed heavily to Goltz’s work, and in fact

in Illustriiss. Cardinalis Alexandri Farnesii Domini, ac patroni mei aula, tanquam eius familiaris versarer: & eius libri copia mihi esset facta, voluptatem non mediocrem.’

D. Perini, Onofrio Panvinio, pp. 61-70.

A. Agustin, Opera omnia, vii no. 32 p. 248, ‘Bisogna che il vostro Patron ad ogni modo agiuti M. Pirrho per poter mandar fuori tante belle fatiche dell’antiquità...’


did: it is interesting to note that Goltz claims that Laurin was the 'auctor' of his presentation of the texts of the inscribed Fasti together with information from coins. Goltz and Laurin’s venture did not last long, however. The two had trouble with the censors and then seem to have squabbled over money and ownership of the equipment. Goltz printed his 1579 *Thesaurus rei antiquariae heberrimus* with Plantin in Antwerp.

The difficulty of having epigraphical material printed separately meant that many inscriptions were printed for the first time in the sixteenth century in books that were not devoted to epigraphic or antiquarian material. The commentaries to literary texts, which had a larger market, offered some possibilities. So, for example, Orsini wrote to Vettori in 1570 with a copy of a *senatusconsultum* asking him to include it in his forthcoming edition of Cicero’s letters to Atticus. Aldo Manuzio the younger printed a work called the *Orthographiae ratio*, the second 1566 edition of which, a small octavo volume, ran to over eight hundred pages and included many inscriptions as examples to illustrate the orthography of the classical Latin writers. The work seems theoretically to have been aimed at textual critics, but the sheer number of inscriptions (citing over fifty examples for certain words) meant that it could be considered an inscription collection. For Rome, another forum in which inscriptions

---

163 H. Goltz, *Fastos magistratuum et triumphorum ... Hubertus Goltzius... dedicavit*, sig. Ciiir. Some of Laurin’s letters to Pighius also indicate he made a considerable contribution.

164 Goltz had already had close ties with Plantin, who marketed and sold most of the publications that came from Goltz’s press: see C. Dekesel, *Hubertus Goltzius*, who gathers the evidence for each of Goltz’s own books.

167 P. De Nolhac, ‘Piero Vettori et Carlo Sigonio’, no. 14 p. 109, quoting BAV Vat. lat. 9063, fols. 174c-d, ‘me sarria favore grandissimo che V. S. lo stampasse in questi scholie che farà nel libro ad Atticum, perche in vero è bello, ne si vede senatusconsulto più antico di questo.’ The inscription was *CIL* I 1 p. 58e = VI.2014.

168 As indeed it was: Panvinio includes the work in his section on collections of inscriptions in his *De his qui romanus antiquitates scripto comprehenderunt*, printed by A. Mai, *Spicelegium Romanum*, viii p. 659 and J.-L. Ferrary, *Onofrio Panvinio*, p. 57. Aldo produced the first edition of this work suspiciously young, in 1561, when he was only born in 1547: Agustin certainly refers to Paolo Manuzio, Aldo’s father, as having a large hand in the work (*Dialogos*, pp. 340-1); in a letter of August 1562 to Orsini soon after the work was published, Agustin wrote (BAV Vat. lat 4104, fol. 317r), ‘Ho visto un libretto di orthographia del figluolo di M. Paolo, anzi del padre come credo, mette alcune inscrizioni false, ma mi piace il argumento, et vorrei che fussi piu copioso, et piu tenace della antiquita.’
appeared were guide-books, of which there was a large number in the sixteenth century. Many of these were specifically devoted to the ancient city, of varying degrees of originality, such as Marliani's Topographia, Fauno's Delle Antichità della Città di Roma, Fabricius's Roma, or the Libri quattro delle Antichità della Città di Roma by Gamucci.

As well as the cost of printing, we should consider one further important factor governing what could be published. I argued above that the institution of the Inquisitions and Index at Rome in the 1550s ushered in an atmosphere of uncertainty, partly as a result of the haphazard nature of the nascent Index. As well as restricting the range of patronage available for scholars of classical antiquity, the system of pre-publication censorship that was developed also resulted in direct control over what could be published. One antiquarian work that was placed on the index in 1559 was Georg Fabricius's guide to Rome, the Roma (which, as we saw, Panvinio seems to have expected when he borrowed from the book), allegedly because it contained a reference inimical to Papal power, but this was in the same year that his Opera omnia were included, because of his Protestantism. Other cases involving Catholic writers were not likely to be as clear cut, and once the machinery of censorship was established, it became clear that decisions on whether a particular author's work was heterodox were personal ones. So, for example, when Panvinio's ecclesiastical history was examined after its author's death, it seems that Robert Bellarmine's hostility to Panvinio meant that Panvinio's work was censored for not citing the vulgate correctly, whereas this fault in Bartolomeo Platina's Liber de vita Christi was regarded as venal. Carlo Sigonio underwent a sort of pre-publication trial by the inquisitors to persuade him to defend and revise his historical works on late antiquity and the early middle ages, including his history of Bologna.

In general, works that confined themselves to classical antiquity did not suffer too greatly at the hands of the censors. The secretary of the censors at Brabant wrote to Moretus at the Plantin press allowing publication of two books, the second of which, Stephanus Pighius's

170 On the early development of the Index at Rome, see P. Godman, The Saint as Censor, ch. 1.
Annales, had been passed without being read. The secretary said that to do this would have taken another two or three months, clearly time the censors thought would be better spent elsewhere. One area that could have caused difficulty with the censors, however, was the inclusion of naked statues or any other potentially lascivious material, after the censure of nudity in Christian images in the twenty-fifth session of the Council of Trent in 1563. When recommending in 1566 to Orsini that he try to have Ligorio’s works printed, Agustín wrote, ‘purche lasci da canto la sua Faustina, se qualcuna habbia che hor mai è tempo.’ As a solid counter-reformation churchman, however, Agustín went on to suggest that exhibited statues themselves could bring Rome ill repute: ‘Io dubito che bisogni sotterrare tutte le statue ignude, perche non venga fuori qualche informazione di esse: & certo parevano male quelli termini maschii della vigna di Cesis & di Carpi, & quel Hermafrodito col Satiro nella Capella... Che se bene alli studiosi giovano, e alli artefici, li Oltramontani si scandalizzano bestialmente, & “fama malum vires acquirit eundo”.’

Boissard wrote to Ortelius of his copies of statues at Rome, ‘quia multa sunt nuda vereor ne parum multis placeant: Nolem tamen mutilata sculpi. Si in marmoribus et status formam naturalem superantibus, publice spectentur, possunt depicta clausis voluminibus videri. Scio non deesse censores, qui Curios simulant et Bacchanalia vivunt. Quibus ut placeam non conduxi meam operam: censurae doctorum subjici mihi satis est.’

Censorship was the bluntest and most insidious instrument to shape what scholars of this period wrote. I have shown, however, that it was not the only influence: the requirements of printers and patrons also played their part. In addition, it is not only writers’ printed output that provides us with evidence for epigraphic scholarship in this period. As I mentioned above when discussing cooperation between antiquarians, to understand how these men thought and discussed inscriptions, their notebooks and letters are of vital importance. It is by combining these different types of evidence that we can trace what they did, as I shall show in the coming chapters.

---

175 A. Agustín, *Opera omnia*, vii no. 32 p. 248.
Chapter 2: Inscriptions and the Cataloguing of the Classical World

The most lasting accomplishments of the sixteenth-century epigraphic scholars were the collection, classification and publication of corpora of inscriptions. The crowning achievement was the collection edited by Jan Gruter, published in 1602-3, which included over 12,000 examples and remained a standard reference work until the nineteenth century. The list of scholars and books consulted in the preface to Gruter's work provide an example of how important the collaboration between scholars I examined in the previous chapter was to epigraphic scholarship of the period. In this chapter I will examine Gruter's and prior collections in order to demonstrate the compilers' preoccupations with where the value of epigraphic evidence lay, and to demonstrate the sort of scholarship that could result from the documentation of the ancient world in this form. There are very few examples of scholars defining their reasons for compiling such collections, or suggesting what they think that they could be used for, but an examination of what they did in practice provides some clear examples.

Until around 1540 syllogai of inscriptions were nearly always composed with geographical concerns foremost. Manuscript collections of material had tended to be arranged along geographical lines, according to where the inscriptions were discovered by the humanist who had transcribed them, and if nothing else included brief details of where the inscription was found. As we saw in the introduction, both manuscript and printed collections focussed on particular places, rather than on themes. The main motive of these local collections, which continued to be produced well into the seventeenth century, was to reflect civic pride, proving Roman origins or even confirming that famous figures from Rome's past came from their city. In his history of the early development of Milan, Alciato refers to a letter of Pliny the younger to show that the general Verginius Rufus came from Milan, and follows this up by quoting three memorials to members of the Virginius gens in and around the city to support Pliny.

\[1\] Good examples of collections of inscriptions of this sort made in the period under review include those in Bernardo Scardeone's *De Antiquitate Urbis Patavii, & claris civibus Patavinis, libri tres* (1560), Jean Poldo d'Albenas's *Discours historial de l'antique et illustre cité de Nismes* (1560) and Guillaume Paradin's *Memoires de l'Histoire de Lyon* (1573). All three end their works with extensive collections of inscriptions.

It is this scholarly environment that the collection of inscriptions published in 1534 by Petrus Apianus and Bartolomaeus Amantius represented, ambitiously entitled *Inscriptiones sacrosanctae vetustatis non illae quidem romanae, sed totius fere orbis.* Although later critics have pointed out the lack of critical acumen that went into the collection, the number of texts collected from earlier manuscript sources represents an impressive achievement. It runs to over 500 pages of inscriptions, and includes both those from Europe, as well as a few purporting to be from Africa and Asia. The order of inscriptions is geographical: they are divided by country, which the compilers claimed had not been done in their sources. Whereas earlier humanists had collected material to show the Roman origins of their cities, Apianus and Amantius had a greater aim, to reflect the scope of the ancient Roman empire. But their motives for this were patriotic, just as the earlier humanists’ were. By demonstrating the scale of the ancient Roman empire they drew explicit attention to the extent of the dominions of Charles V (to whom Apianus had been tutor and astronomer), the modern Roman emperor. Their reason for starting the collection with inscriptions from Spain was not due to the quality of the material, but rather ‘Quod totius Imperii caput illhic habemus, videlicet invictissimum, foelicissimum, piissimum Carolum Quintum Romanum Imperatorem, cuius admiranda pietas foelicitas ac Clementia uti est prima & maxima.’

A sea change in attitudes towards the potential value of epigraphic evidence seems to have occurred shortly after the publication of Apianus and Amantius’s volume. Our first clear evidence for a change of thinking is contained in the letter Claudio Tolomei sent to Count Agostino de’ Landi in November 1542 outlining a proposal from the Accademia della Virtù, an encyclopaedic project stemming from the text of Vitruvius. His summary of this undertaking is sufficiently detailed to suggest that it was not entirely hypothetical: indeed, the appearance of Guillaume Philandrier’s commentary on Vitruvius in 1544 should be seen as the first part of it. The encyclopedia was to be in twenty books: the first seven of these would deal with the text of Vitruvius.

---


4 P. Apianus and B. Amantius, *Inscriptiones sacrosanctae vetustatis*, sig. c iiiiv, ‘...Antiquitates quas hoc libro certo ordine impressimus, apud alios ita praepostere ac perverse positas invenimus, ut quae in Cycladibus vel in Tracia erant inventae, cum Romanis aut Hispanicis promiscue iungerentur’.

5 P. Apianus and B. Amantius, *Inscriptiones sacrosanctae vetustatis*, sig. c iiiv.


7 Philandrier revised his commentary and accompanied it with the text of Vitruvius in 1552: see the edition of F. Lemerle, *Les annotations de Guillaume Philandrier*.
Vitruvius; the eighth would compare what the text said with ancient remains; the ninth would examine literary sources for the topography of Rome, the tenth archaeological sources; the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth ancient sculpture, statues and reliefs, the fourteenth architectonic decoration; the fifteenth and sixteenth ancient vessels and instruments; the seventeenth inscriptions, the eighteenth painting, the nineteenth coins, and the twentieth machines and aqueducts. Tolomei's description of the collection of inscriptions within this plan reveals a different system of organising the material than that which had come before, according to 'tempi' and 'materie'. It is this division of types of inscription and the suggestion that the material should be ordered on chronological grounds, that show the change from Apianus and Amantius's collection.

Tolomei's letter does not reveal his intellectual influences, but the letter probably represents the fruits of several years of discussion with his fellow academicians in the late 1530s at Rome. We can attempt to identify some of the sources for his ideas. The first is the humanist desire to create encyclopaedias of learning. Anthony Hobson has identified the owner of books bound with the Apollo and Pegasus \textit{impresa} as Giovanni Battista Grimaldi, and shown that these works were recommended by Tolomei as the constituents of an ideal library to Grimaldi, probably after 1543. The number of these books that survive and their bindings, colour-coded by language, suggest that the library was to have been a finite collection, and it seems that Tolomei recommended to the young banker a sort of encapsulation of knowledge. Other examples from around this time are the record of Cardinal Pietro Bembo's (d. 1547) classification of his learning, his 'methodus studiorum,' and Jean Matal's 'Index meliorum auctorum', which seems to have what Stephanus Pighius was referring to when he recorded that Matal kept a note of what he read organised by \textit{loci communes}.

\begin{itemize}
  \item[8] P. Barocchi (ed.), \textit{Scritti d'arte}, iii p. 3044, '...si congiugnerà uno altro libbro di tutte le iscrizioni che siano in Roma o intorno a Roma, così di leggi come d'ornamenti e di sepolcri o d'altre memorie, ritraendole appunto come stanno ne l'antico, non solo le pubbliche, ma ancor le private; distinguendole per ordine di tempi e di materie, e aggiugnendovi appresso le figure che vi si trovasseno, con la dichiarazione ancora di alcuni dubbi che vi nascesseno, o per conto d'istoria, o per conto d'esser posto in quella iscrizione lettera per parte.'
  \item[9] An example of such discussions is given by Philandrier (\textit{In decem libros M. Vitruvii Pollionis de architectura annotationes}, pp. 24-5) who records discussing numerals from inscriptions with Tolomei. See M. Daly Davis, 'Notes to Guillaume Philander's "Annotationes" to Vitruvius', pp. 94-5.
  \item[10] A. Hobson, \textit{Apollo and Pegasus}, esp. chs.4 and 5.
\end{itemize}
We can also suggest specifically antiquarian influences on Tolomei. As we saw in the introduction, antiquarian studies flourished under Pomponio Leto’s guidance in the last third of the fifteenth century. This movement is reflected in the inclusion of details of coins and inscriptions in Raffaele Maffei’s compendious survey of information, the 1506 *Commentariorum urbanorum libri*, a thousand page encyclopaedia of all that the austere Maffei thought was necessary to know, divided into three sections, *geographia, anthropologia* and *philologia*. The scale of this work may have influenced Tolomei; we know of at least one attempted encyclopaedia in Rome in the 1530s, which also would have been influential, the sponsorship of Paolo Manuzio by Cardinal Bembo and Cardinal Bernardino Maffei (from a different branch of the family to Raffaele) in the 1530s to write a work of *Antiquitates*. Tolomei would also have been well aware of the discrete products of antiquarian erudition that appeared in the papacies of Julius II and Leo X. His description of a collection of inscriptions from Rome and her surroundings specifically recalls Mazochi’s *Epigrammata antiquae urbis*, and appears to suggest that it should be replaced. This work had included inscriptions from public monuments, as well as the texts of laws and inscriptions mentioning various ‘praestantes Romani’ at the beginning of the collection, but then ordered the inscriptions by the region of the city in which they were to be found, followed by inscriptions found on the roads leading from Rome. Tolomei’s proposal of a different ordering system seems to be a reaction to Mazochi’s.

A more particular impulse to the thematic ordering of material, and the prominence given to laws in Tolomei’s proposal for his inscriptions, probably came from legal humanists. Alciato’s combination of interests in the text of the law and antiquarian material was not unique in the early sixteenth century. The form of legal research that he did most to popularise, which aimed to put the text of the law in its historical context, required that legal scholars had a firm grasp not just of the Roman law and its medieval glossators, but also of classical authors, who

---

13 P. Manuzio, *De legibus*, sig. AiiiIiI[Av], quoted by J-L. Ferrary, ‘Rome et Venise dans la pensée politique’, p. 493, ‘ego olim ... auctoribus duobus eximis viris, Petro Bembo Cardinali, et Bernardino Maffeo ... dederam me ad res Romanas, illas veteres, observandas, & ex omnibus antiquorum monimentis omni studio colligendas.’ Without their support he was unable to continue: ‘Sed accidit iniquo meo fato, ut horum utrunque, Bemmum primo iam senem, cuius in benevolentia ornamenti mihi erat plurimum, deinde Maffeum non aetate minus, quam virtute, florentem, in quo mei spes ocii sita omnis erat, a quo pendebam totus, importuna morte ereptum amiserim.’
provided details of institutions mentioned in the law as well as linguistic evidence. The conjunction of interests in the law and wider classical culture is demonstrated in the *Geniales dies* of Alessandro d'Alessandro, jurist and one-time friend of Pomponio Leto, published in 1522.14 D'Alessandro's work was a six-book miscellany of various short discussions of aspects of antiquity, particularly law and religion, on the model of Aulus Gellius's *Attic Nights* and Macrobius's *Saturnalia*. His main sources are the writings of the jurists, although he cites a wide variety of other classical authors and shows some interest in the topography and buildings of Rome.15

There are tantalising examples of legal material and epigraphic material being found together, such as an edition of Probus published in Venice in 1525 which included some inscriptions as well as a collection of references to the Twelve Tables.16 Certainly at Rome shortly after the sack, we see interests in inscriptions and the law overlapping. As we saw in the introduction, Fabio Vigili, the bishop of Spoleto, wrote to Benedetto Egio at Rome in 1530 to thank him for sending a sylloge of inscriptions and to warn him of the dangers of forgery.17 Vigili had worked on the legal manuscripts contained in the Vatican Library in 1508, and later worked on a commentary on parts of the title 'De verborum significatione' of the *Digest*.18 This is not an isolated example of Vigili's interest in inscriptions: after he was made bishop of Spoleto, in 1540, he wrote to Angelo Colocci to explain the symbols used for centurion and to indicate the freedman of a woman.19 It is very likely that Tolomei would have known of Vigili, and been aware of his interests.

With the exception of the commentary of Philandrier, Tolomei's great proposed work initially came to little. Some parts of his project, however, were developed in the 1540s without his immediate supervision. His letter was published in 1547 (when he had left Rome for Parma), but already his vision of a thematically-ordered collection of inscriptions had been taken up in Rome.

---

14 On d'Alessandro, see D. Maffei, *Alessandro d'Alessandro*, esp. pp. 77-174 for the *Geniales dies*.
15 Chs.1.16 (pp. 120-3) and 4.25 (pp. 1191-9); D. Maffei, *Alessandro d'Alessandro*, pp. 95-6.
16 M. Valerius Probus, *De notis roma*. 1525.
17 The letter was copied by Matal into his edition of Mazochi's *Epigrammata*, BAV Vat. lat. 8495, fol. [189]. M. Crawford prints and comments on the letter in 'Tavole Iguvine e Pseudo-Iguvine'. See above, introduction n. 17.
19 Quoted by M-H. Laurent, *Fabio Vigili*, p. XLV from BAV Vat. lat. 3410A, fol. 3. In his annotated edition of Mazochi, Colocci copied these symbols into the margins next to inscriptions which featured them, suggesting that he was puzzled: BAV Vat. lat. 8493, e.g. fols. XLIIv = 58v and LXIr = 77r.
by scholars enjoying the fertile atmosphere for collaboration that I described in the first chapter. Here Pirro Ligorio and Benedetto Egio were working; they were joined by the two pupils of Alciato, Antonio Agustín, who arrived in 1544, and Jean Matal, who followed in 1545, and by Martin Smet and Stephanus Pighius, in 1545 and 1547 respectively. Over the coming years, these men and other correspondants collected material in Rome, as well as sharing with one another transcriptions of material from elsewhere in Italy and beyond, and then in turn passing on details. Their efforts produced the first collections of inscriptions that surpassed Apianus and Amantius’s work in the quantity of material, and brought their rigorous scholarly backgrounds to surpass it in quality too.

As these scholars assembled this bulk of inscriptions, they were faced with the problem of how to present it. At one point, probably in the early 1550s, Ligorio chose to include his material within a treatise more ambitious than that proposed by Tolomei, the multi-volume Antichità. The inscriptions are within two manuscript volumes, divided into six separate books: inscriptions from monuments to gods and heroes in Rome, those in Latium and Campania, those in Tuscany, Greek inscriptions, Greek epitaphs, and then epitaphs in general. Within the first four books, Ligorio organised the inscriptions by the god to which they referred, and so gives the impression of selecting the inscriptions as a vehicle for discussing a particular deity. The last two books, dealing with epitaphs, are divided at a basic level by occupation, offering Ligorio the opportunity to discuss individual roles. Ligorio later seems to have rejected this method of ordering the material: the second version of his encyclopaedia is organised according by alphabetical entry, rather than by type of evidence.

Other scholars did not try to engage with the difficulties Ligorio faced in incorporating a large collection of inscriptions within a treatise, but chose to try to present the material alone. Ordering inscriptions was a widespread preoccupation among antiquarians of the period. Scholars’ notebooks show various attempts and proposals for classification, including those of Aegidius Tschudi, a Swiss scholar who visited Rome in 1546-7, of Aldo Manuzio the younger (at Rome in the 1560s, and with access to many of the inscription collections made before) and of Celso

---

20 R. Cooper, 'Epigraphical Research in Rome', surveys the collection of Matal and demonstrates the large number of people who supplied him with material, including, among others, Piero Vettori, Simon Vallambert, Louis Budé, Guillaume Philandrier, Antoine Morillon, Pierre Varondel, Abel Portius, Antoine Lasréy, Lelio Torelli and Ottavio Pantagato.

21 Naples, BN MSS XIII.B.7 and XIII.B.8.
Cittadini (born at Rome in 1553).\(^{22}\) We also have proposals for printed collections which tackle the issue of classification, by Onofrio Panvinio (whose notebooks survive) and Jacopo Strada (whose do not).\(^{23}\) Smet produced a presentation manuscript for his patron, Cardinal Pio da Carpi, which formed the basis for the text used in the printed version of his collection edited by Justus Lipsius in 1588.\(^{24}\) This in turn heavily influenced the collection edited by Jan Gruter.

At the beginning of his collection, Smet makes it clear why he rejected the principles of organisation favoured by Apianus and Amantius, in contrasting his collection with those which came before, and in doing so seems to sum up the feelings of his fellow researchers. The main problem with geographical organisation, he writes, is that inscriptions are liable to be moved. Therefore he decided to adopt a different scheme.\(^{25}\) As Tolomei had proposed, Smet claims that he will be attentive to the *argumenta*, the contents of the inscription, and not its site. In doing so, he reflects the concerns of his contemporaries, as we can see from their collections. The systems of organisation adopted by the antiquarians of the period consisted of three separate, but not mutually exclusive, principles of classification: by the individual person or god referred to in the inscription, in a chronological scheme, and by the function of the monument on which the

\(^{22}\) On Tschudi’s collection, see S. Voegelin, *Aegidius Tschudi’s epigraphische Studien*; a useful summary of information about Aldo Manuzio’s attempts to amass epigraphic material is given by J.-L. Ferrary, ‘La Lex Antonio de Termessibus’, p. 426 n. 31. Cittadini’s epigraphic interests have not been studied in any detail.

\(^{23}\) Panvinio advertised the existence of an ‘antiquarum totius terrarum orbis inscriptionum liber I’ in 1559, and proposed to include inscriptions as part of his *Antiquitates*: see J.-L. Ferrary, *Onofrio Panvinio*, pp. 133-8. Strada applied for an imperial subvention for an inscription collection in 1573, and sent a proposal to Plantin of a slightly different work in 1575 or 1576: see D. Jansen, ‘Antonio Agustin and Jacopo Strada’, Annexes 3 and 4 pp. 236-8.

\(^{24}\) Smet’s manuscript (Naples, BN MS V.E.4) is divided into six sections, compared to the printed version’s four. Smet reduced the number before 1558, as he mentions the four-fold division in a letter to Pighius of that year (H. De Vocht, *Stephani Vinandi Pighii epistolarium*, no. 6 pp. 36-7). Interestingly, the Naples manuscript does not include the individuals who provided Smet with the information, who are included in the printed edition.

inscription appeared. The first of these was the most popular. Inscriptions with the same god’s name were easily collected together, and if they included any details apart from the name of the deceased, funerary inscriptions tended to state his trade, role or office, which provided a simple method for grouping individuals together, from craftsmen to emperors. Smet describes the third and fourth of the four sections in the printed version of his manuscript thus: ‘Tertio loco, hominum illustrium, videlicet Imperatorum Caesarumque, Consulum atque aliorum magistratum maiorum cum Romanorum, tum provincialium elogia monumentaque posui. In quartum ultimumque ordinem, militum & eorum qui officia publica minora gesserunt, artificum & ministrorum domus Augustae...’26 He followed his distinction in practice, and within each section, he divides the material further, so in the third section, emperors come first, followed by consuls, and in the fourth, inscriptions mentioning men who held positions in the Roman army are followed by those recording artisans etc. Gruter, who divides the material into eighteen sections, includes, for example, ‘Magistratum toto imperio Rom. majorum minorumque Honoratorum S.C.torum &c’, ‘Militaris rei &c’, and ‘Officiorum domus augustae & privatorum.’27 Strada’s collection was to include one book devoted to, among others, ‘mechanici, opifices, artifices, negociatores, mercatoresque’ and another to priests, major magistrates, and soldiers. For those monuments which did not specify a role, another method of classification was to divide funerary monuments by the relationship of the dedicator to the deceased: it is this method that was originally adopted by Fabricius for a selected edition of inscriptions, the Antiquitatum monumenta, and it is also adopted by Gruter, who has seven different categories of relationships for dedications made by spouses, family members, and freedmen, slaves and their owners.28

The concerns of these scholars find a reflection in at least one contemporary Roman collection of the inscriptions themselves. In general, cardinals were particularly interested in inscriptions that mentioned a Roman form of their name: so, for example, the collection of Cardinal Federico Cesi

26 M. Smet, Inscriptionum liber, sig. [+3]v,
27 Smet and Gruter’s classification systems are surveyed by I. Calabi Limentani, ‘Note su classificazione ed indici epigrafici’, pp. 183-5 and 191-3.
28 Fabricius’s first edition of the Antiquitatum monumenta, published in 1549, included only a small selection of legal inscriptions. Subsequent editions of 1555, 1560, and posthumously in 1587 were gradually expanded, and included a selection of epitaphs (on Fabricius’s works, see W. Stenhouse, ‘Georg Fabricius and Inscriptions as a Source of Law’). Gruter’s work is based closely on that of Smet, and he indicates that this is one of the only differences in his classification of the inscriptions (J. Gruter, Inscriptiones, sig. e4v).
included inscriptions featuring the Caesii, Caesonii or Caesellii gentes and that of Alfonso II d’Este an inscription featuring an ‘Atestia Ide’. Indeed, Ioannes Baptista Fonteius later wrote a lengthy discussion of inscriptions connected with the Cesi family, which he dedicated to a younger member of the family, Donato Cesi. Pio da Carpi, however, acquired and organized his inscriptions with a more sophisticated intent, according to the account of Ulisse Aldrovandi, who wrote in 1550 that a particular feature of that collection was the number of inscriptions featuring offices, some of which did not appear in literary accounts. Pio was particularly interested in collecting together inscriptions that recorded individuals in the imperial household, and they may have been classified according to the office mentioned.

In the collections on paper, within the classification categories some chronological division was possible, especially for emperors and their families, inscriptions to whom are invariably ordered according to their reigns. In 1546 and 1547 fragments of chronological lists of republican magistrates, particularly consuls, and generals who had received a triumph, were found at Rome, known as the Capitoline and Triumphal Fasti. These provided the information necessary for ordering inscriptions to consuls in the same way, and both Smet and Gruter include these Fasti

---

29 For the Cesi, see C. Hülsen, Römische Antikagrten, pp. 5-8 and H. Wrede, ‘Römische Antikenprogramme’, pp. 87-91; the Este inscription was CIL V.5148: see E. Corradini, ‘Le raccolte estensi’, p. 167. On an even more basic level, Panvinio was commissioned by Francesco de’ Medici to purchase for him inscriptions mentioning ‘Florentia’: see K. Gersbach, ‘Onofrio Panvinio, OSA, and his Florentine Correspondents’, pp. 224-37.

30 Io. Baptista Fonteius, De prisa Caesiorum gente commentariorum libri duo (expanded for publication by Iulius Iacobonius in 1582). This work should also been seen in the context of genealogical work produced by scholars for other families such as Panvinio’s De Fabiorum familia, De Maximorum familia, De gente Sabella, and De gente Fregepania, which survive in manuscript copies (for details, see J-L. Ferrary, Onofrio Panvinio, p. 215, and R. Bizzocchi, Genealogie incredibili, esp. pp. 17-18). For promotion of a gens in earlier collections, see P. Falguières, ‘La cité fictive’, p. 255.

31 U. Aldrovandi, Di tutte le statue antiche, p. 208, ‘In diverse parti di detta stantia & studii, vi è grandissima quantità di epitaoffi, dove si vegono molte sorte di Caratteri che dinotano il numero antico, & vari nomi di uffici non più veduti appresso li authori, ci sono anco gran quantità de mani, braccia, teste, gambe, & piedi, dove si vedono diverse sorti di calciamenti, che vi usavano in quel tempo, con molti altri fragmenti.’

32 H. Wrede, ‘Ein imaginierter Besuch im Museo da Carpi’.
after inscriptions to emperors, with other dedications mentioning consuls. Within two broad categories of material mentioning living people and that mentioning dead people, Justus Lipsius tried in his addendum to Smet to order his inscriptions entirely chronologically. Lipsius's task was made easier by the fact that he was selective: he did not include all the material at his disposal, he wrote, 'sed electa maxime & edecumata, quae usum & momentum habere visa ad Historiam aut mores antiquos.' According to these criteria, his selection of inscriptions tended to include a large proportion mentioning the emperor, making chronological ordering simple, but even here, Lipsius found the task difficult, and asked for his readers' understanding.

One problem compilers seem to have encountered when focussing on the individual person or god mentioned in an inscription was where to put inscriptions from public buildings. Invariably, these mentioned the name of the individual who erected the buildings on which they were placed, but we see in collections of the period a tendency to classify inscriptions from major buildings separately. In his first category of material, Smet wrote, he would include 'quicquid ad rationem locorum, operum atque aedificiorum, seu publicorum seu privatorum pertinere videbatur,' which included inscribed laws. Gruter maintained the prominence of inscriptions of this type, classifying them second, after inscriptions to the gods; Panvinio, on the other hand, in the twelve-fold division of inscriptions of his *Antiquitates*, based closely on Smet's classification in the Carpi manuscript, places these inscriptions last. Scholars may have been following the lead of Mazochi's compilation in giving prominence to this sort of material. The fact that they do so also seems to show that they are sensitive to the purpose of the monument: while emperors are regularly mentioned in the inscriptions from public works that they commissioned, the fact that these are dedications of buildings seems to have encouraged compilers to treat them separately from dedications to the emperors in question. Although

---

33 In Smet’s Naples manuscript, the Fasti were classified separately, along with inscribed calendars. The discovery of and scholarly reaction to the Fasti are examined below in chapter 5.
35 M. Smet, *Inscriptionum liber*, auctarium p. 56, 'In his monumentis, Lector, curae mihi fuit, ut temporum seriem (quatenus liceret) sequer: idque maxime in iis quae ad Vivos. ita ut quae libera rep. posita, seorsim; quae sub Imperatoribus, seorsim item collocarem, & quaeque sub suo Principe. Sed dum tener sum & μαιλακιζω a gravissimo morbo: non ego, non ii quibus opera haec commissa, satis ubique fuius mente intenta.'
37 For the influence of Smet on Panvinio, see G. De Rossi, ‘Delle sillogi epigrafiche dello Smezio e Panvinio’.
evidence for attention to this aspect of the inscription is not common, it does recur in a record of the organisation of Celso Cittadini’s collection, preserved in the papers of his friend, the seventeenth-century architectural writer Teofilo Gallaccini. According to an extract ‘Ex Romanarum Antiquitatum lib. Dom. Ce[l]si Citt.’ copied by Gallaccini, Cittadini divided his inscriptions into private laws, public laws, epitaphs (divided by the person involved), inscriptions from buildings, dedications of temples, and prayers.\(^{38}\) Lipsius’ s division of inscriptions into those mentioning the living and those which refer to the dead avoids the problem of how to classify inscriptions mentioning emperors: buildings with inscriptions recording the emperor’s contribution to their construction could be classified separately from posthumous dedications.

A consideration of how inscriptions in Greek, and early Christian inscriptions, were classified in these collections provides some clues as to the preoccupations of the compilers and their principles of inclusion. The study of Greek inscriptions from Greece was in its infancy in this period: with the exception of the voyages of Cyriac of Ancona in the mid-fifteenth century, little recording of material had taken place on the Greek mainland and islands. But a considerable number of inscriptions written in Greek from Rome and the southern Italian peninsula had been found, inscriptions which often referred to Roman emperors and other offices. An important point to bear in mind is that antiquarians of this period in general were far less confident in their handling of Greek material than Latin. Ligorio cites Egio, along with Pantagato, an ‘M. Philippo’ and an ‘M. Costantino Rale’ as translators of Greek material into Latin, and of these Egio appears most often, in nearly all collections made in Rome from the

\(^{38}\) Siena, Biblioteca comunale, MS C.III.27, fol. 95r: ‘Leges, decreta, constitutiones, sententiae, et aliae res ad publicum spectantes

Testamenta, fidei commissa, ultimae voluntates, et aliae privatae dispositiones

Epitaphia, tituli honorarii et tumuli imaginum vivorum et defunctorum. Haec

Principum et eorum familiarum; senatorum, et exterorum nobilium; Virginum Vestalium, et aliorum

Deorum sacerdotum; Ministrorum et servorum publicorum; Parentum, maritum, filiorum, cognatorum, et affini; Amicorum, patronum, libertorum, et servorum; mulierum; militum

Inscriptiones aedificorum publicorum et privatorum

Dedications templorum, ararum, statuarum deorum et hominum

Vota, votorum redditus, [legatorum] solutiones, et gratiarum actiones
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1540s to the 1560s, either providing transcriptions or translations of Greek material. In Smet's collection, Greek inscriptions were integrated with Latin ones by category, and this also seems to be what Panvinio envisaged for the inscriptions in his Antiquitates, following Smet. Strada went further in his proposals for a collection of inscriptions. The first of these was to include ‘latinae, etruscae, graecae, hebraicae, arabicae, chaldeae’ inscriptions, while the second more modestly was to contain inscriptions from Europe, Asia, and Egypt, of which many were to be Greek.

The collections of Smet and Strada contrast with the notes of Aldo Manuzio the younger and Cittadini, in which Greek inscriptions were collected separately, as well as Lipsius’s addenda to Smet, and Panvinio’s own inscription collection, in which the linguistic separation is so clear that only the Latin of two bilingual inscriptions is given. It is notable that the first three of these were primarily textual scholars, and thus their classification is based on their own desire for a linguistic resource; Smet, on the other hand, employed non-linguistic criteria. Gruter’s work falls somewhere between these two. On the advice of Scaliger, Greek inscriptions for each category were to appear together at the end of each category: thus Greek inscriptions relating to emperors were separated from other Greek inscriptions, but not integrated with Latin inscriptions in that category.

Both Smet and Gruter (the latter on Scaliger’s recommendation again) classified Christian material in separate sections, and in a note to two inscriptions, Smet indicates that his principle for their inclusion is the inscriptions’ antiquity: ‘Videntur haec duo, esse Christianorum hominum epitaphia: valde tamen antiqua, quantum ex characteribus atque scribendi forma.

39 See M. Crawford, ‘Benedetto Egio’, p. 141, with n. 51; as well as providing material for Smet and Aldo Manuzio the younger, Egio also transcribed Greek for Matal (BAV Vat. lat. 8495, fol. IXr).
40 Quoted by J-L. Ferrary, Onofrio Panvinio, p. 136.
42 BAV Vat. lat. 5241, pp. 356-68 (Aldo Manuzio); BAV Vat. lat. 5253, fols. 320r-333r (Cittadini); M. Smet, Inscriptioonum liber, auctarium pp. 57-9 (Lipsius); BAV Vat. lat. 6036, fols. 112r-113r (Panvinio). Panvinio includes only the Latin of CIL VI.3082 = IGUR 902 (BAV Vat. lat. 6035, fol. 105v) and of CIL VI.20201 = IGUR 618 (BAV Vat. lat. 6035, fols. 109r and 117r, BAV Vat. lat. 6036, fol. 77v).
43 J. Scaliger, Epistolae omnes, no. 405 p. 755, ‘Ordinem Smetianum servandum censemus; hoc uno excepto, quod omnia Graeca separatim in fine cuiusque capitis poni, magis e re nobis fore videtur, nisi tu aliter censes.’ See also no. 406 p. 756.
nominumque ratione colligi potest."" Fulvio Orsini offers a good later parallel, when he commented on some Christian inscriptions to Piero Vettori that they were 'di tempi assai posteriores', and therefore 'non si debba far conto alcuno, non essendo in esse ne antichità, ne erudizione.' Despite his belief in the importance of the age of an inscription as the determining factor, Smet does not include Christian inscriptions with the rest of the material, which suggests he thought that the Christians should be treated separately within the Roman world. Smet and Gruter's approach can be contrasted with that we see in the notes of Panvinio, in which he included a letter of Oratio Orsini from Rome. Orsini wrote to Panvinio that Pantagato 'mi ha fatto parte d'un Epitaphio, il quale dice essere il piu anti[ca] c'hhabbia veduto di Christiani, e così ne fa parte anch'io a VS,' suggesting that Panvinio's principle of inclusion too was known to be the material's antiquity. Panvinio includes the material with other Latin inscriptions. That sent by Orsini is in the 'Ministri magistratum' section, and others are with pagan funerary epitaphs. Panvinio's interest in chronology and the history of the early church is reflected here.

As well as thematic organisation, Smet's and Gruter's printed editions introduced another important innovation not present in the works of Mazochi and Apianus and Amantius, indices to the inscriptions. As Smet notes in his preface, indices provided a more thorough means of assembling like material, and would also deal with the problem of duplication." In Smet's work, there are seventeen indices, including some categories close to those used in classifying the order in which the inscriptions appeared, such as 'officia domus augustae privataque' and 'artes et negociations' and some which were new, including lists of cognomina and nomina, and geographical names. There is a similar overlap in the work of Gruter, not surprisingly given that

45 P. De Nolhac, 'Piero Vettori et Carlo Sigonio', no. 29 p. 125 (5 July 1580 = London, BL MS Add. 10270, fol. 49r).
46 BAV Vat. lat. 6036, fol. 33v.
47 M. Smet, Inscriptionum liber, sig. [+3]v, 'Plurima [monumenta] enim sunt, quae ob rerum quas notant varietatem, pluribus iisque diversis locis collocari non inepte possent. Ceterum ne id fieret, ac ne eadem saepius scribendo, & mihiipsi molestiam, & lectori nauseam parerem: malui illi incommodo, confectis variis secundum argumentorum diversitatem elenchis seu locis communibus, quos ad calcem libri apposui, mederi. In quibus praecipua quaque & observatu inprimis digna, per totum librum quomodolibet dispersa, in certas classes, capitataque digessi, ad quae singula ad idem argumentum pertinentia, ordine, ut puto, haud incommodo referuntur.'
the order of the new work and the compilation of the indices was based closely on that of Smet. Just as two of the categories used to classify the material are 'Militaris rei &c.' and 'Officiorum domus Augustae & privatorum', so two of the indices are 'Quae ad rem militarem & bellicam pertinent' and 'Officia domus Augustae & privatae'.

Indeed, with thorough indices, there was no real need for scholars to classify their collections at all. Matal, for example, seems to have begun his epigraphical research annotating an edition of Mazochi and adding indices to it. These include those which deal with the contents of the inscription, such as references to Republican dignitaries and to emperors, arranged chronologically; those that deal with the type of building from which the inscription comes, such as arches and bridges; and details of the modern collection or church in which the inscription was kept. Other papers from Matal do not reveal any attempts at classification, and provided he maintained an index, he would have been able to find what he wanted in the material. Similarly, Tschudi compiled indices to the inscriptions he had transcribed himself from the Italian peninsula and the south of France as well as including references to printed collections. Among other categories these indices included legions, tribes and geographical names.

Scaliger seems to have realised the importance of an index to the collection of inscriptions being ordered by Gruter while Gruter was compiling it; although he complained that the work was a 'Herculei labor' before beginning, later he wrote to Casaubon that 'Index ipse est anima illius corporis'. He seems anxious to make sure that it would stand on its own as a piece of work,

---

48 On Smet's indices, see I. Calabi Limentani, 'Note su classificazione ed indici epigrafici', pp. 185-7 and 193-5. On Scaliger's use of Smet's work in compiling his indices, see A. Grafton, 'J. J. Scaliger's Indices'.
49 R. Cooper, 'Epigraphical Research in Rome', pp. 98-9; M. Crawford, 'Appendix II: Matal's Papers in the Vatican Library', pp. 283-4 prints details of the Matal's indices which appear in a separate codex (BAV Vat. lat. 6039, fols. 1r-2v). Matal meant this second codex to be a continuation of his work on the Mazochi edition, as he foliated it from 200 onwards after these indices (Matal added 10 extra numbered folios to the 189 numbered sheets in his Mazochi); see J-L. Ferrary, Onofrio Panvinio, p. 241 n. 21.
50 BAV Vat. lat. 8495, fols. 6v-9v [=195v-98v], 1r [=190r] and 2r-3r [=191r-192r] respectively.
51 S. Voegelin, Aegidius TschudPs epigraphische Studien, pp. 7-10 and 12-13, giving details of St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek MSS 661 and 1083. See also H. Triumpy, 'Zu Gilg Tschudis epigraphischen Forschungen'.
52 J. Scaliger, Epistolae omnes, no. 412 p. 764 and no. 73 p. 224; see A. Grafton, 'J. J. Scaliger's Indices', p. 109. Although Scaliger handed over his material to Gruter, to allow him to compile the illustrations, he
and that what differences it showed in organisation from the classification of the inscriptions themselves would be highlighted, writing to Gruter that 'hic ordo in excudendo, non qui est in contextu ipsius voluminis, sequendus est.' In fact, when sending them, Scaliger encouraged Gruter to write a commentary around the indices. Once the volume appeared, however, he urged Gruter to write a more general accompaniment to the whole work: 'Potes etiam et de lectione Inscriptionum, et de utile, et alis, quae languentes lectorum stomachos reficere solent, commentari.' In December 1604, two months later, his ambitions for the other man's work had increased further: 'In primo capite, quae de Diis, de dedicationibus, de votis dici possunt! In capite de militia, et in illo de sepulchris, quae miranda ex adytis juris depromi possunt... In capite de officiis Augustae domus et Magistratibus, putasne aut materiam deesse, aut ingenium non sufficere, aut corpus labori non superesse?

Scaliger went on to suggest that Gruter add inscriptions from coins too; his reply to Gruter's response to this gives a clear indication of how the men thought that the indices would be used. Gruter evidently proposed a separate edition of the index, similar to Hubert Goltz's 1579 Thesaurus rei antiquariae huberrimus, of which Scaliger approved. Goltz's work was a compilation of the twenty-four different lists of terms used in the Roman world, such as epithets maintained a close interest in the project, and took over the responsibility for the index. On the difficulties involved in studying how Gruter's compilation was made, see above, chapter 1 n. 150.

53 J. Scaliger, Epistolae omnes, no. 413 p. 766.

54 J. Scaliger, Epistolae omnes, no. 413 p. 767, 'Itaque eiismodi est index iste, ut opportune eruditum commentarium admittere possit, modo ab erudito viro et praeeritum juris peritissimo conficiatur.' There is some evidence that Gruter may have contemplated a work of this type. A manuscript with notes by Pighius referring to Gruter's collection exists in the British Library (MS Sloane 3269, described as (fol. 2v) 'Scholia in antiquas inscriptiones per Stephanum Vinandum Pighium. Manu Iani Brouwchusi ex Autographo descriptae'), with brief orthographical commentary to some inscriptions and records of different readings. This manuscript was given to Gruter (fol. 1v, 'Iani Gruteri ex dono auctoris, cujus antidotum aureos quatuordecim cum volumine mearum inscriptonum').


56 J. Scaliger, Epistolae omnes, no. 424 p. 780; no. 425 p. 781, 'Admodum probo consilium tuum de Indicum editione seorsim a corpore Inscriptionum, cum accessione eorum, quae ex Thesauru et nummis Goltii ac aliorum, tum et ex Antoniniano, Peutingeriano colligi potuerunt, item ex Notitia Imperii Romani; see I. Calabi Limentani, 'Note su classificazione ed indici epigrafici', pp. 195-6. Scaliger refers to the tabula Antoniana, the tabula Peutingeriana, and the Notitia dignitatum: the last of these is discussed below.
of the gods or legions, which appeared on coins or in inscriptions. As Ida Calabi Limentani has shown, Goltz took much material and his principle of organization from Smet's manuscript, which he freely admits in the preface. Goltz shared a patron with Smet, Mark Laurin, and it may be that after Smet's death, probably around this time, he felt that he could publish some of his work, if not the whole inscription collection. Scaliger's approbation shows that such works of compilation were seen to have an independent value, and the desire to produce an exhaustive summary of various features of the Roman world was characteristic of the work of scholars throughout the century. It was for tasks of this sort that the testimony of inscriptions, as opposed to that of classical authors, was particularly important.

Typical of the scholarship of this sort were the efforts to produce a comprehensive list of the Roman legions. Ancient literary historians, interested as they were in details of battles, provided considerable quantities of information on the topic, but mostly in anecdotal form. One exception was Cassius Dio, who in his narrative of Augustus's reign gave details of the positions of the legions then, and went on with an account of the subsequent changes down to his own day. Also useful was the recently-popularised *Notitia dignitatum*, the fifth-century account of the situation of the Roman empire, which included details of the position of the legions at that point. With these accounts could be compared the names of legions included in inscriptions that recorded individuals' careers, as well as the widely-copied texts from two columns found at

---

58 Cassius Dio, *Roman History*, lv.23-4
59 The eastern section of the *Notitia dignitatum* was first published by Alciato in the appendix to his 1529 *De magistratis*. Although he did cite it in earlier works, it was only after 1529 that other humanists became interested in it: see P. Girard, 'Alciat et la *Notitia Dignitatum*', esp. pp. 74-83. The western section was printed as part of Alciato's *Opera omnia* that was completed in 1549, although volume 2, in which the *Notitia dignitatum* appears, has a colophon dated 1546. For details of sixteenth-century editions of the text, see I. Maier, 'The Barberinus and Munich Codices', pp. 962-6. There also are records of a manuscript edition in the Maffei collection at Rome early in the century, and it seems that Fulvio Orsini owned a manuscript copy, which was made before 1549: see I. Maier, 'The Giessen, Parma and Piacenza Codices', p. 103 nn. 1 and 4. M. D. Reeve provides a brief description of the textual tradition in his entry on the *Notitia Dignitatum* in L. Reynolds (ed), *Texts and Transmission*, pp. 253-7, including (pp. 254-5, n. 10) the tart comment that 'Though Maier's two articles offer new information in their 122 pages, they labour simple or trivial points and yet have holes like this [discussing Maier's failure to see the derivation of one manuscript from another].'
Rome in 1546, which featured lists of legions' names in isolation. Inscriptions recorded more legions than were mentioned in the historians and the *Notitia dignitatum*, but as the textual sources indicated that legions did change under the empire, most scholars were content merely to list the extras. Thus Panvinio, after his description of the legions, in which he provides literary evidence as well as an inscription featuring a member of the legion in question, merely included a list of those legions mentioned in inscriptions and not elsewhere. In Goltz's section devoted to legions, he includes a very long list, most of which he notes are recorded in inscriptions rather than coins. In his indices, Smet is more circumspect, drawing attention to four legions recorded in inscriptions in the collection and suggesting that they did not in fact exist, and that there was a mistake, although he does not say whose.

A more difficult problem were Roman voting tribes, since here there was explicit literary evidence that they numbered 35. Romans in the *comitia tributa* of the republic voted according to which tribe they were in, and membership of a tribe was a requirement of Roman citizenship. In reforms attributed to the king Servius Tullius, these were replaced with a four-fold division in the city, and the addition of a fifth tribe for those living in the immediate surroundings. Subsequently others were added. In 495 BC Livy records that the Clustumina

---

60 *CIL* VI.3492a,b = 32901. Matal had copies of both columns (BAV Vat lat. 6039, fol. 202r and 203r = 5r and 6r), compared the readings (one column included the names of three more legions than the other), and recorded details of the discovery (fol. 203r = 6r): 'Romae repertum in duabus ead. inscriptione columnis MDXLVI in foro Ro. in eo loci, ubi saxa coss. [the Capitoline Fasti]'. He also included a list of legions 'Ex indice officiorum magistratumque civilium Orientis et Occidentis qui Scoto tribuitur' (the *Notitia dignitatum*, fol. 202r = 5r), and a list of the legions in numerical order, along with the province where they were to be found and the position they appeared on the column, in a table (fol. 203r = 6r). Tschudi was also interested in listing the numbers of legions: he included an index of legions in his annotated Apianus and Amantius (H. Trümky, ‘Zu Gilg Tschudis epigraphischen Forschungen’, p. 499), and later wrote out his own list (St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek MS 661 pp. 305-83; see S. Voegelin, *Aegidius Tschudi's epigraphische Studien*, p. 9).


62 M. Smet, *Inscriptionum liber*, sig. Bbv, including legio III Cyrenica, 'forte mendum est', legio IIII Gallica 'Forte & hic mendum est', legio IIII Italica 'et hic erratum esse suspicor' and legio XXXX, 'sed mendum esse suspicor'. This may be an example of an error being attributed to the ancient stonecutter, a phenomenon that I will examine in chapter 5 below.

63 E.g. Livy 1.43.14 (Suburana, Esquilina, Collina, Palatina).
tribe was created, with one other, to bring the total to twenty-one; after this date, Livy records the creation of a further fourteen, which he names as they were founded. Therefore the total came to 35, of which the names of the first five and the last fourteen, along with Clustumina, were reasonably clear, barring a few textual corruptions in the manuscripts of the literary sources. The problem was establishing correctly the middle fifteen. The testimony of inscriptions helped, but inscriptions seemed to record more than 35 tribes. Scholars of the 1540s and 1550s were deeply exercised by the problem, and their responses provide good examples of their technical abilities in handling inscriptions, their increasing use of epigraphic evidence, and application of it in examining the historical development of an institution. Their treatment of tribes also illustrates the benefits of the newly-made collections of inscriptions and the sort of collaboration by letter that they enjoyed, as well as introducing problems of representation and reliability that we shall consider in subsequent chapters.

It was only in the 1540s that scholars first realised that inscriptions could provide evidence for the tribes, when they saw that an individual’s full nomenclature included their tribal affiliation as well as praenomen, nomen, father’s praenomen and cognomen. Previous treatments of abbreviations, like those surveyed in the introduction, did not resolve the problem. In the editions of Marcus Valerius Probus’s De notis, edited by Michele Ferrarini in 1486, and included as the preface to Mazochi’s Epigrammata, abbreviations for tribes such as COR, CAM, and FAB are expanded as if they were nomina (Cornelius, Camillus, and Fabius). In the discussions of tribes in Maffei’s Commentariorum libri and d’Alessandro’s Geniales dies, no epigraphic evidence is cited. One abbreviation that did not allow for this treatment was OVF which Ferrarini expanded as ‘omnibus viris fecit’, and Mazochi as ‘omnia vivens fecit, vel optimo vivens [sic]

44 Livy 2.21.7. Most manuscripts of Livy in fact read ‘triginta et una’ rather than ‘viginti et una’ in this passage, but a comparison with Dionysius 7.64.6 (who says that there were 21 tribes at the time of Coriolanus, c.490 BC) and the fact that Livy goes on to record the next fourteen additions, meant that the passage could be emended.

45 Livy 6.5.8 (Stellatina, Tromentina, Sabatina, Arnensis), 7.15.12 (Pomptina, Pobilia), 8.17.11 (Maecia, Scaptia), 9.20.6 (Ouventina, Falerna), 10.9.14 (Aniensis, Teretina), Per 19 (Quirina, Velina).

46 Discussions and lists of tribes occur frequently in manuscript notes, letters, and printed sources throughout the period: the following discussion does not pretend to be comprehensive, but rather to illustrate how inscriptions could be used to solve any difficulties.

47 M. Valerius Probus, De notis 1486, sigs. [aiiiijr-ciir; Epigrammata, sigs. 1v-[8]v.

48 R. Maffei, Commentariorum libri, fol. LXXIIIr; A. d’Alessandro, Geniales dies, ch. 1.17 (pp. 124-35); on the lists of tribes in these two authors, see G. Forni, ‘Tribù romane e problemi connessi’, pp. 20-5.
This abbreviation occurred particularly frequently in inscriptions from around Milan, and it is instructive to see how Alciato treated it, and exactly when he connected it with a tribe. In the version of his sylloge of inscriptions which he compiled between 1515 and 1520, he wrote in the commentary to one inscription that the interpretation given in his edition of Probus, 'omnibus vivens fecit', made no sense in the context, and so he proposed 'omnium votis factus', believing the abbreviation to refer to the Roman practice of adoption into a gens. The abbreviation also appears in the celebrated inscription recording the will of Pliny the younger, which Alciato discussed with Benedetto Giovio. Giovio rejected Alciato's suggestion that the abbreviation referred to adoption in this case, but did not offer his own solution. In the final version of the sylloge, however, which he maintained until at least 1545, he expanded the abbreviation as the tribe 'Oufentina', an interpretation which also appears in the second volume of his Parerga, published in 1547.

Alciato's success in interpreting the abbreviation may well have been as a result of having read Paolo Manuzio's commentary to Cicero's Epistolae ad familiares, first published in 1544. In his notes to one letter (viii.8), in which Cicero gives a list of senators, Manuzio describes the order followed in the nomenclature of a Roman, including details of the man's tribe. He writes that as others had made mistakes on this subject, it would be worthwhile to append a list of tribes. Manuzio gives preference to literary sources that give details of each tribe, but for 26 he also gives references to inscriptions in the Epigrammata, and to those that he has seen himself, from Ferrara, Gaeta and Venice. He is thus the first to assert the value of such evidence for research into tribes. As the inscriptions in the work published by Mazochi came mainly from Rome, and Manuzio's own citation of inscriptions was not particularly extensive, his coverage is not complete. He also includes a thirty-sixth, Veturia, which had clearly been suggested to him for inclusion, but he claims that of this one 'mentionem in autoribus fide dignis nondum inveni'.

---

69 M. Valerius Probus, De notis 1486, sig. [bv]r; Epigrammata, sig. 6v.
70 A. Alciato, Antiquae inscriptiones veteraque monumenta patriae, fol. 55v (CIL V.5851).
72 E.g. Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek MS F82b, fol. 141 (CIL V.5884). On the manuscript and its dating, see most recently M. Daly Davis, Archäologie der Antike, pp. 82-3. A. Alciato, Parergon iuris libri VII posteriores, p. 88.
73 P. Manuzio (ed.), M. Tullii Ciceronis epistolae familiares, fols. ccccir to [cccv]r. Although 1543 is the date on the title page, the colophon dates the work to January 1544.
Manuzio's list became the standard reference for scholars dealing with tribes in the late 1540s and early 1550s, and it was reprinted in his edition of Cicero's philosophical works and other letters in 1552. It was Manuzio's list that Matal used as his index for tribes in his annotated Mazochi, recording where they appeared in the work. Matal also noted, for the first time in this context, it seems, an inscription printed in Mazochi from Trajan's period which records 'TRIBVS XXXV', showing that the institution continued into the imperial period with the same number of tribes. But he also drew attention to a problem that had hitherto not been confronted, that the inscriptions in fact included five further abbreviations where the name of the tribe should be. Georg Fabricius recorded the problem in print in the treatment of tribes in his 1551 *Roma*. Although asserting that he used Manuzio's list, he replaced Manuzio's Sapinia with Veturia, and also drew attention to the existence of other tribes in epigraphic sources, suggesting that they were added by the emperors. He did not attempt to explain why the number of tribes in the inscription remained at 35, however, but went on to give inscriptions featuring four extra tribes.

---

76 P. Manuzio (ed.), *M. Tul. Ciceronis de philosophia tomus tertius*, fols. 4v to [7]r. Manuzio's version was used, for example, by Nicolas de Grrouchy in his *De comitiis romanorum*, fols. 64v to 66v, and Carlo Sigonio refers his readers to it in his discussion of Roman names published in 1555, *De nominibus Romanorum*, sig. Or-v; see G. Forni, 'Tribù romane e problemi connessi', pp. 27-34.
78 *CIL* VI. 955 (*Epigrammata*, fol. XCIr). The inscription was known from the time of Pomponio Leto, and had been found at the Circus Maximus.
79 These were CAM, HOR, MEN, PROB and VOT.
80 G. Fabricius, *Roma* 1551, pp. 55-61, in a section entitled 'De regionibus et tribubus'.
81 G. Fabricius, *Roma* 1551, p. 59, 'De Sapinia, quam aliqui ex Livio (si correctus liber est) addunt, nihil habeo dicere, sicuti de Menia apud Ciceronem in epistola ad Crassipedem: de Camilla, Flavia, Ulpia, quos in antiquis marmoribus reperi. Vel igitur a posterioribus plures sunt adiectae, quod ego mihi sine auctoritate persuadere non possum, vel ex illis aliquae diversi nominibus appellatae... aut, quod vero similius est, a Imperatoribus qui tribus ampliabant. Ut a gente Domitiani Flavia, a Traiani Ulpia fuerit dicta.'
82 G. Fabricius, *Roma* 1551, pp. 60-1, including MEN (which he interprets as Menia, in *CIL* IX.2353, X.1087), CAM or CAMIL (Camilla, VI.15268 and VI.2649), FLAVIA (VI.2689) and VLP (Ulpia, VI.18878).
Matal and Fabricius's discovery was a puzzling one, especially in the 1550s when several scholars were researching the institutions of the Roman state. We have evidence that Manuzio was continuing to work on the problem, as Ottavio Pantagato wrote to him discussing tribes in 1552. Pantagato still assumed that the total was 35, despite the new evidence, but his approach shows that he was more favourable to the importance of epigraphic evidence than Manuzio. He provided a list of 42 tribes which he found recorded in 'auctori' or 'marmi'. Of these, he rejected any that were recorded in literary texts alone in contrast to the attitude Manuzio expressed in his commentary on the letters of Cicero. To explain the fact that he was left with more than 35, he claimed that one tribe changed name in the imperial period, and that in two cases two abbreviations were used for a single tribe. Manuzio may still have been working on the De comitiis, a volume of his Antiquitates, at this point, and may have asked Pantagato for help, although if so he does not seem to have been convinced by Pantagato's stance. In his note on tribes he includes three specifically rejected in Pantagato's letter.

Pantagato's implicit assertion of the value of epigraphic evidence is reflected in the correspondence of Agustín and Carlo Sigonio with Panvinio, when Panvinio was away from Rome preparing his Reipublicae Romanae commentariorum libri. The second of three books was to deal with the institutions of the Roman republic. Panvinio seems to have written to both with the same problems: we have letters of each from the middle of 1557 discussing tribes. Initially, he seems to have sent both a list, to which they replied suggesting alterations. In the third of his letters, Sigonio revealed that for him the discussion had immediate relevance. His academic rival, Francesco Robortello, had entered the debate; and his attacks too, along with Sigonio's responses, show that knowledge of epigraphic material was now seen as vital for scholars dealing with Roman institutions, and especially tribes. In a set of refutations of Sigonio's work on the Fasti and Livy, Robortello made particular fun of Sigonio's notes to two

84 J-L. Ferrary, 'Rome et Venise dans la pensée politique', pp. 494-5, argues that the De comitiis (printed after Paolo's death by his son Aldo), was completed between 1547 and 1553.
85 P. Manuzio, De comitiis, col. 484, 'Id autem imperatorum aetate factum esse crediderim; nam Camillae, Horatiae, Votinia, Cluentiae, Cluviae, Dumiae, Flaviae, Juliae, Minuciae, Papiae, Ocruculanae, Ulpiae, quorum nullam in Rep.uisse quisquam scripsit, in antiquis lapidibus, Juliae etiam in Dionem mentionem invenimus.' Pantagato had rejected Camilla, Horatia and Ocruculana.
86 C. Sigonio, Opera omnia, vi cols. 994-7 (3 May, 22 July, 28 July, 16 August and 21 August 1557); Agustín, Epistolario, nos.179, 182 and 186, pp. 260-1, 263-4 and 270-1(3 July, 24 July and 28 August 1557).
passages in Livy, where Sigonio had assumed that Galeria and Veturia were the names of *centuriae* (other groups in the Roman voting system). Robortello argued that Sigonio assumed that this meant that they were not tribes, and quoted an inscription from Spain featuring the abbreviation GAL, which he interpreted as Galeria. He does not seem to have found one featuring VET, although he does say that of the manuscripts he has seen, none features 'Veturia' in the passage where Sigonio inserted the word in place of 'centuria'. Sigonio was anxious to be able to reply to Robortello as soon as his material was printed. He wrote first to Panvinio on Veturia in July, and then asked for information in two increasingly desperate letters before the end of August. Sigonio had received the information he needed to reply to Robortello by September or October, when his reply, the *Emendationum libri*, appeared. He responded to Robortello's criticisms chapter by chapter. On Veturia and Galeria, he denied that he had implicitly argued that they could not have been tribes, but claimed that they could refer to *centuriae* as well. He goes on to demonstrate his knowledge of the epigraphic material: 'Dices fortasse, unde Veturiam tribum esse accepisti? Unde, nisi ex veteribus lapidum monumentis? [citing five inscriptions] Quarum inscriptionum tres ad me misit Onofrius Panvinius vir et doctrina, et fide singulari praeditus, quarta est in libro Antiquarum inscriptionum, quinta in Iucundi.' Despite the fact that the older scholar had cited inscriptions, Sigonio, armed with the opinions of Panvinio, went on to impugn Robortello for his ignorance of such matters.

---

87 Livy 26.2, 27.6. See C. Sigonio (ed.), *T. Livii Patavini, historiarum ab urbe condita, Libri*, fols. 228v-229r with Scholia fol. 49r (Veturia), fol. 239r with Scholia fol. 51v (Galeria).
88 F. Robortello, *De convenientia supputationis Livianae*, fols. 47v-48r (on Galeria, citing CIL II.3865), fols. 48v-49r (on Veturia). He also refers to what he saw as Sigonio's mistake when quoting an inscription featuring two members of the same family attached to different tribes, fols. 51v-52r (CIL XIV.2523). Robortello's work was printed in May and June 1557; Sigonio received proof copies, which meant that he could begin work immediately on a reply: see W. McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio*, pp. 30-1.
89 Sigonio, *Opera omnia*, vi cols.996-7 (28 July 1557, 16 August, 21 August 1557).
90 C. Sigonio, *Emendationum libri*, fols. 72r-74v. By 'Antiquarum inscriptionum' Sigonio refers to Apianus and Amantius's compilation, and by 'Iucundi' a manuscript of Fra Giocondo.
91 C. Sigonio, *Emendationum libri*, fol. 74v, 'Nam quod ais, te ab ira continere non posse, quia studiosorum antiquitatis utilitati est consulendum, vide ne iustius irascaris, quod id aetatis vir nullum adhuc studii, atque ingenii parere tibi aediumentum potueris, quo recondita, atque obscura haec Romanarum literarum monimenta cognosceres.'
The next relevant letters are from the following year, when it seems that Panvinio circulated parts of the final draft of his *Commentariorum libri*, shortly before its publication. Agustín and Ottavio Pantagato wrote back with comments in late June, and both addressed the tribe abbreviated by MEN. In a passage from Josephus (xiii.260) one Republican senator appeared as Λουκιου Μαννιου Λουκιου υιοθ Μεντινα (Lucius Mannius [Manlius ?], son of Lucius, of the Mentina tribe) and so it was usually assumed that this was the correct form of the name of the tribe. However, antiquarians at Rome had received reports of an inscription from Feltre that featured the abbreviation MENEN, and both Agustín and Pantagato addressed this problem. The way they did so shows that both had stepped beyond simple assertion of the value of inscribed evidence: presented with this inscription, they swung round to suspect its reliability. Agustín suggested that the problem may have lain with the source of the information: ‘Della tribu Menenia desidero che mi scriviate tutta la inscrizione et avertite non sia di quelle di Pyrrho [Ligorio], che qualche volta scrive sua interpretazione per vincere qualche contentione come fu quella deli fasti di Verrio Flacco.’ He here refers to a debate in the antiquarian circles at Rome in the 1550s which we will consider in chapter 5: in order to prove his contention that the Capitoline Fasti were displayed on the same hemicycle monument as those at Praeneste, some scholars suspected that Ligorio had devised an inscription to the classical Roman antiquarian Verrius Flaccus, to argue that Flaccus was the author of both lists.

Although in this case the inscription survives today and appears to be genuine, in general Agustín’s scepticism was not misplaced, as we shall see in the next chapter. Ligorio’s own treatment of tribes comes in his manuscripts now in Turin, in which he discusses each tribe in order of its foundation, quoting many inscriptions as supporting evidence. These manuscripts were written after he left Rome in 1568. His work has many idiosyncracies. To support his assertion that some extra tribes were created after the Social War, he includes a number of tribes that had not previously been mentioned, like Cluvia, Cluentia, Dumia, Minucia, Nucerina,

---

92 The dedicatory letters of each of the three books in Panvinio’s *Commentariorum libri*, all to Ferdinand 1st, are dated 1 August 1558.
93 *CIL* V.2071.
95 On this debate, see G. Vagenheim, ‘La falsification chez Pirro Ligorio’.
96 Turin, Archivio di Stato a.II.2.J.17, fol. 181r-187v, 190r-208v.
Petilia and Vibia, all of which are supported by inscriptions. Moreover, Ligorio cites evidence that would have been crucial to the debate, but which is unique to him. Contrary to other scholars, who believed that the tribe Horatia was only recorded in literature, he claims to have seen a mention of it in a manuscript of ‘Marcus Fronto’ (Frontinus) at Rome. It seems unlikely that this would have been overlooked by other scholars, but that is more probable than his subsequent claim that a list of the middle sixteen tribes was preserved in an inscription at Rome in the Maffei collection. Given that such an inscription would have solved scholars’ problems with regard to the identity of the first nineteen tribes, it seems strange that it would not have been noticed by anyone else. After his list of the 35, he asserts that Sapinia (which had appeared in Paolo Manuzio’s original list of 1544, but which Pantagato had rejected in 1552, as it only existed through literary testimony) existed, quoting an inscription he claims was brought to Rome by Benedetto Egio although not cited by anyone else.

Ligorio’s work as we have it is definitely in draft form. There are certain inconsistencies: for example, he lists Cluvia as a tribe named after an emperor, but then when examining tribes individually he claims it refers to a Samnite town. He gives a list of ten tribes made during the Social War, but only illustrates seven of these separately. It is more difficult to put other features down to an unrevised manuscript. Some details, especially the inscription quoted as belonging to Maffei, and that given him by his friend Benedetto Egio (who died between 1568 and 1570),

---

97 Turin, Archivio di Stato MS a.II.2.J.17, fol. 206v: CIL XIV.275*, XIV.258* (Cluvia), XIV.296*, XIV.204* (Cluentia); fol. 207r: VI.18104 (in this genuine inscription, Ligorio acknowledges that Dum. could be a name), VI.1670*, VI.2578* (Dumia or Dumentia); fol. 207v XIV.2991, XIV.152*, VI.1109* (Minucia), fol. 208r: VI.2699*, VI.2943* (Vibia), VI.1589*, VI.2837* (Nucerina), VI.1307*, VI.2315* (Petilia).

98 Probably Colocci’s manuscript of the Gromatici, attributed to Frontinus, now BAV Vat. lat 3132. See J.-L. Ferrary, Correspondance de Lelio Torelli, appendix 6 pp. 259-70.


100 Turin, Archivio di Stato MS a.II.2.J.17, fol. 203r (CIL VI.135*).

101 Turin, Archivio di Stato MS a.II.2.J.17, fols. 204v and 206v.

102 For the date, see M. Crawford, ‘Benedetto Egio’, p. 142.
would presumably be aimed at an audience unfamiliar with antiquarian circles at Rome, who would have been able to disprove the evidence. But Ligorio had worked on the subject earlier, as he indicates that some people had used his material. These included Panvinio, who included in his 1558 *Commentariorum libri* some tribes not otherwise attested outside Ligorio’s manuscripts. Panvinio had no doubts about the reliability of his source, commenting for the tribe beginning ‘Taur...’, that ‘Tribum Taur. neque ego umquam vidi, neque qua ratione interpretari possit nisi Tauria dicamus, scio. Vir tamen doctus, et fide plenus se hanc in antiquis tabulis marmoreis vidisse pro certo affirmavit.’ The ‘Taur.’ seems to be a Ligorian invention, yet Panvinio did not share the scepticism of his 1558 correspondent Agustín.

At about the same time as Agustín cast doubt over Ligorio, Pantagato also wrote to suggest that the inscription with MENEN could be a forgery. He thought that the object itself (rather than the manuscript record of it) could have been invented, noting that the practice of forging antique coins had been applied to inscriptions and statues. He goes on, however, to suggest that the stonecutters themselves could have made mistakes: ‘sassi anchor veri antichi si trovan mendosi’. Pantagato wrote to Panvinio again shortly afterwards, commenting that if the

---

10 Turin, Archivio di Stato MS a.II.2.J.17, fol. 205v, ‘...se bene sono alcuni corsi a stampare quello che seco havemo ragionato non e che noi non siamo stati di primi a fam e studio e raccolletta, et insegnare et avertire a loro dele cose che pria non le guardavano et con darle delle miglie fatiche della vicolletta delle inscrizioni de luoghi da noi cercati con tempo e con spesa, si sono fatti belli, con certe parole adolatorie: me hanno voluto sadisfare...’.


10 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 46r (28 June 1558), ‘Se il sasso è veramente antico, è da credere piu a lui che a Josepo, perché M Tullio col suo MEN è commune a Mentina e Menenia; ma si vede che l’alchimia de le medaglie di far parere le nuove antiche pel guadagno, è entrata anchor ne marmi, e statue, o parti loro, che mettrà una gran seditione in questa materia e ambiguità... E de sashi anchor veri antichi si truovan mendosi, come lo CAM CES DVM VOT TAVR e con le tribu inteire come AELIA CLVENTRIA CLVVIA PAPIA e di piu di una syllaba, come HORAT PVPIL POPIL POBLIL PVBLIL, che se tutti fusser veri sarebbon piu di XLV... non vi posso dir altro qui, se non che parlando di Tribu ambigue ne le cose da publicare, non preponderate ne di qua, ne di la, ma diciate quel che havete trovato, e lasciate giudeza a lettori.’ In this letter Pantagato sticks to his earlier belief that there were 35 tribes, a position he also makes clear in a letter he wrote to Paolo Manuzio or his son Aldo at around this time (BAV Vat. lat. 5237, fols. 359r-360r, quoted in part by G. Vagenheim, ‘Appunti sulla tradizione manoscritta’, p. 207 fig.17 and Appendix 2 p. 213), in which he lists the 35, with some differences from those he sent to Paolo six years earlier. The addressee is not clear from the letter: Vagenheim assumes that it is probably Aldo. In this period, Paolo was probably working on his *De civitate Romana*, which
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inscription is genuine, it is not surprising that the reduplication of a syllable should occur in ‘un marmo municipale’ or an ‘indotto municipe’. Pantagato’s assertion here, that antiquity did not necessarily confer accuracy, was a novelty in the discussion, and revealed a new level of scepticism toward material evidence. Writing subsequently on the subject, Agustín suggested that stoncutters could be wrong, but only grudgingly, ‘Il VOT si trova in doi marmi bellissimi, si è error, diceva VET. overo VOLT. Se non è errore, che cosa poteva dire?’ In this letter, Agustín agreed with a suggestion of Panvinio that one answer to the problem of the superfluity of tribal names was that some individuals had two, one named after a gens and one from a place, for which he quotes two inscriptions as evidence, and claimed that other extra names were added to former tribes to honour the emperors.

When Panvinio’s Commentariorum libri emerged, it reflected the concerns shown in his correspondence with Agustín and Sigonio, and acknowledged fulsomely the assistance they had offered. As Ligorio was to do (and as Panvinio was to do with the names of legions), he went through 35 tribes individually, as attested in literary texts and inscriptions. He was left with fifteen extra tribes in addition to his 35, four of which were named after emperors’ gentes. Of the eleven others, he rejected two, which were not recorded in inscriptions, and commented of the others (most of which seem to be derived from Ligorio), ‘Reliquarum novem vel decem tribuum nomina, si modo vel tribus fuerint, vel error fabricis non sit (omnium enim in vetustis marmoreis inscriptionibus mentionem extare didici) diu multumque me torserunt.’ While he did not follow up Agustín’s hint that he should scrutinise the material from Ligorio, Panvinio introduced the possibility of a stoncutter’s mistake.

---

106 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 48v (2 July 1558).
107 CIL V.4443 and VI.3094*, a forgery apparently devised from a passage where Suetonius records that Augustus made gifts to both the Fabia and Scaptia tribes (Augustus, c.40). Agustín had made the same point about origins in a letter to Panvinio of a few days before: Epistolario, no. 206, p. 298 (25 June 1558) = Ambros., MS D501 inf., fol. 125.
108 See A. Agustín, Epistolario, p. 304 n. 6.
109 O. Panvinio, Commentariorum libri, sigs. Oo3v-Oo4r. On Agustín, Panvinio wrote ‘nihil enim paene de his rebus scripsi quod non cum eo contulerim.’
110 O. Panvinio, Commentariorum libri, p. 539.
Agustín’s, Sigonio’s and Pantagato’s deliberations, as reflected in Panvinio’s work, had a clear impact. Paolo Manuzio, the publisher of Sigonio’s edition of Livy and the Emendationum libri, was probably writing another volume of his Antiquitates, the De civitate romana, at around the time these deliberations were going on. The draft nature of this work as we have it is reflected by the fact that Manuzio only mentions thirty-four tribes, the same as Panvinio’s without Veturia, but he had clearly been influenced by the new stress on inscribed evidence to provide the names, and admits that his thinking had changed. All the same, Manuzio seems to have regarded the extra tribes as a distraction: ‘Nullam deinde in rep. factam tribuum accessionem [ie beyond 35] legimus. Nomina tamen aliarum reperiuntur, quas constat esse additas imperatorum aetate. Omissimus vero iam nomina, rem agamus’. Sigonio slightly altered the list in his De antico iure of 1560, and for those names of tribes outside the 35, he adopted Agustín’s theory of double tribal names, one named after a gens and one from a place, and noted that three of them are connected to gentes of the emperors. But like Manuzio, he clearly believed that the exact details fall outside his theme: ‘Qua tamen causa, aut quo tempore hoc factum sit, cum ne divinatione quidem assequi me posse confidam, in aliorum suspicione malo relinquere, quam in oratione mea ponere’.

Goltz used Panvinio’s list in his 1579 Thesaurus, as did Johannes Rosinus in his Antiquitatum Romanarum corpus absolutissimum. For the extra tribes, he cites Fabricius, Panvinio and Sigonio, before deciding that some had two names, and that Iulia, Flavia, and Ulpia were named

---

111 J-L. Ferrary, Onofrio Panvinio, p. 232 nn. 12-13 and ‘Rome et Venise’ p. 495 n. 16, argues that the De civitate Romana was completed in the late 1550s. Like the De comitiis, it was published posthumously by Aldo.

112 Manuzio (De civitate Romana, p. 16) acknowledges the change in his thinking, although without mentioning any other scholar, ‘Haec ordine sunt agenda: ut haec tota res, quam vigesimo fere ab hinc anno primo, ut opinamur, paullo accuratius tractare coepimus, hoc tempore, quatenus per ingenii nostri vires progredi licebit, absolvatur.’

113 P. Manuzio, De civitate Romana, p. 52.

114 C. Sigonio, De antiquo iure civium Romanorum libri duo, pp. 14-20. Sigonio had Oriculana for Panvinio’s Horatia, despite the letter he wrote to Panvinio in 1557 suggesting that he thought that Oriculana could not have been one of the first twenty-one.

115 C. Sigonio, De antiquo iure civium Romanorum libri duo, p. 20.

after emperors. The indices to Smet's corpus of inscriptions included seventy-seven separate entries, with all abbreviations that come where one would expect the name of the tribe in the nomenclature. At the beginning of the work, however, various abbreviations are expanded, and thirty-four tribes feature in this list. This section seems to reflect thinking at the beginning of the 1550s: the result is closest to that of Pantagato in 1552, and omits the Menenia favoured by the humanists of the late 1550s. Finally, for Gruter's compilation of inscriptions at the end of the century, in his indices Scaliger adopted the same policy as that in Smet's volume, including all possible references to tribes. This work lacked any introductory material explaining the expansion of abbreviations, and so the editors did not commit themselves to a set number of 35 tribes. This work contains 161 different types of abbreviations.

The new collections of inscriptions that began to appear from the 1540s (themselves, in general, products of scholarly collaboration) allowed scholars to work on legions and tribes. These scholars' efforts to produce a list of 35 tribes, and to account for the extra ones attested in the epigraphic record, reveals some key aspects of the study of inscriptions which I shall examine in subsequent chapters: first, the importance of having transcriptions made which could convey the information required to answer scholarly problems, and the dangers of forgeries when used in such problems; second, scholars' facility in using inscriptions to provide historical evidence; and lastly, indications that they began to question the testimony offered by inscriptions, attributing some errors to agencies involved in producing them.

117 The uncontroversial Maecia is omitted, presumably by oversight, from the list of abbreviations.
Chapter 3: The Representation and Reconstruction of Inscriptions

Throughout the period, men who transcribed inscriptions claimed to have done so accurately. They regularly invoked the virtues of *fides* and *diligentia* when they described the care they took over the copies they had made. So, for example, in a letter Johannes Choler sent to Apianus and Amantius enclosing inscriptions for their collection (which the two editors included before giving the details), he wrote that ‘has vetustatis inscriptiones ea fide & diligentia exscriptas vobis mitto, qua ab archetypo depromptae sunt, vestrum erit dare operam, ut pari cura & studio excudantur.’ Similarly, underneath his copy of an inscription, Francesco Ciceri, sending the material to Aldo Manuzio the younger in 1567, wrote, ‘optima fide descripta est.’ Another favourite topos was to claim that the inscriptions were copied ‘as they were’ on the stones. So, for example, Donato Giannotti wrote to Piero Vettori in 1546 with certain inscriptions, commenting that ‘Elle mi sono state date da persona che le haveva trascritte diligentemente et io mi sono ingegnato di copiarle appunto come elle stavano, et non credo havere errato.’ Similarly, Giovanni Antonio Paglia wrote to Aldo Manuzio the younger that in the transcriptions of inscriptions he enclosed ‘non sarà errore alcuno, havendole io trascritta al modo istesso, che stanno ne’ sashi.’

At the same time, however, scholars were regularly criticised for the inaccuracy of their transmissions. We have already seen that to Marliani’s claim for the accuracy of the second edition of his *Topographia*, ‘errores nonnulli sublati’, Egio added ‘Tituli, inscriptionesque non aliter, quam ipsis inerant marmoribus, emendatissime expressi, qui ab aliis hactenus neglecto ordine, & perperam in lucem editi inveniuntur.’ Fulvio Orsini wrote to Gian Vincenzo Pinelli

1 P. Apianus and B. Amantius, *Inscriptiones sacrosanctae vetustatis*, p. XXV.
2 BAV Vat. lat. 6040, fol. 84v. Another example is a letter from Valerio Palermo to Paolo Manuzio of 26 September 1565, in which Palermo includes inscriptions of which he claims that ‘ho copiato di mia mano con diligenza tutte le lettere’ (BAV Vat. lat. 5237, fol. 273v).
4 BAV Vat. lat. 5237, fol. 284v (11 March 1564).
5 BAV Rossi. 1204, titlepage. See ch. 1, p. 46 above. At least one reader of Marliani’s first edition thought it worth his while to highlight what Marliani called his ‘errores’. In his copy of the work (now New Haven, Yale University, The Beinecke Library 1992.790), Pietro Corsi added to and altered over three quarters of the inscriptions cited by Marliani as evidence. Corsi was active as a humanist at Rome
in 1585 that Panvinio’s transcriptions of inscriptions ‘erano tanto mal scritte, et con tanta
negligentia rappresentate delli marmi, che era vergogna di vederle...

Although the degree of cooperation epigraphic scholars demonstrated was unusual, Orsini’s comment showed that
they had not entirely abandoned their vituperative humanist roots.

In such an environment, reliable sources for information were highly valued. As we saw,
already by the end of the fifteenth century, Fra Giovanni Giocondo applied the familiar
humanist distrust of manuscript copyists to his epigraphic transcriptions, distinguishing those
that he had seen himself from those he had copied from others’ collections, and trying to
establish a manuscript stemma for the texts of inscriptions that he had not seen at first hand.

Collectors of inscriptions came to value particular copyists. Smet wrote to Clusius thanking
him for some material, that ‘Velim sane omnes ea fide atque integritate, qua tu pauculas aliquot
excerpsisti, descriptas esse.’ In the printed editions of the sixteenth century, the collectors of
inscriptions gave details of who supplied them with the material. So in his Orthographiae ratio,
Aldo Manuzio inserted certain details of these individuals to reassure his readers of his
 correspondants’ accuracy, for example writing of an inscription from Puteoli, ‘hanc
inscriptionem una cum aliis habui ab Iosepho Bongianello ... in antiquitate pervestiganda
admodum diligenti.’ Marcus Welser sent details of an inscription to Paolo Merula in 1598,
with the approbation ‘fide Federici Ceruti’.

For the task of copying inscriptions, experience and practice were important. Orazio Orsini
wrote to Panvinio saying that he had a copy of an inscription, but he was worried about his
copyist’s accuracy, saying that the man ‘non è molto pratico in simil faccende, et secondo mi
pare [the inscription] e molta scorretta, non vi la mando, aspettando con la occasione di veder

---

6 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D422 inf., fol. 179r (14 June 1583).
7 M. Koortbojian, ‘Fra Giovanni Giocondo and his Epigraphic Methods’.
8 F. Hunger, Charles de l’Ecluse: Carolus Clusius, p. 409 (15 November 1565). Clusius later wrote to
Lipsius describing his practice (ILE 88 03 26, iii pp. 89-90): ‘habeo enim, quae in his regionibus collegi
quaepiam fideliter descripta, nam meis oculis plus fidere soleo quam alienis, praeertim in veterum
inscriptionum exceptione.’
9 A. Manuzio, Orthographiae ratio, p. 180.
10 M. Welser, Opera, no. 21 p. 830 (17 November 1598).
quel luoco, copiarla, et mandarvela." On another occasion he was more confident, when he was able to compare his version with that of Pantagato. In a letter to Baccio Valori, the Florentine Vincenzo Borghini referred to 'persone poco pratiche in questa particolare professione delle pietre,' suggesting it was an acquired skill. In 1575 Agustín wrote at length to Fulvio Orsini questioning details of a copy of the *lex agraria* which the latter had sent: at the end of the letter, Agustín rather apologetically adds, 'tutte queste inetie mi bisogna perdonare, perche io credo che fu diligente vostro copista...'. Nicolas Florentius reveals the effort that could go into the correct rendering of a text in a letter to Pighius. Florentius describes his practice of going back to check his transcriptions if he made them alone. For this reason, he assumes that Pighius would not mind the wait for some inscriptions he has recently seen, so that he can check the result. It seems to have been a general assumption that the copying of inscriptions required a knowledge of the language it was written in: copying involved not only representing the letters, but also verifying that what was written made sense. Ambrosius Nicander wrote to Piero Vettori in 1546 that he had copied the letters of a Greek inscription 'exactissime', but there were some that he did not understand.

Given the general belief that transcribing inscriptions was a skilled task, and one that could easily be performed badly, Nicander was not the only copyist anxious to give proof of his care.

---

11 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 261v (1 October 1558).
12 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 262r (13 January 1559), '...l'assiguro bene che non vi sono errori in la scrittura, per che mi son guidato dalle copie del mio padro Ottavio [Pantagato], et se egli ha errato mi contento haver errato con lui.'
13 *Prose fiorentine* part 4 vol.4, no. 52 p. 95 (30 April 1576).
14 A. Agustín, *Opera omnia*, vii no. 51 p. 259 (11 November 1575).
15 H. De Vocht, *Stephani Vinandi Pighii epistolarium*, no. 80 pp. 152-3 (15 July 1567), 'Nec aegre feres, spero, quod inscriptiones non correctas nequiquam transmitto, cum eas insuper non modo ad alium quemvis, sed ne Cardinali tuo Illmo Granvellano inspiciendas exhibeo, antequam eas correxerim, aut secunda vice inspexerim.' In an earlier letter of 11 April 1567 (H. De Vocht, *Stephani Vinandi Pighii epistolarium*, no. 74 p. 143), Florentius described how he went to check an inscription for Pighius in the Porcari collection in Rome with a friend and fellow graduate of Louvain, Gerard Falckenberg: 'ad aedes Porcariorum me contuli, una cum quodam viro docto, Valkenburgio, Noviomagensi, & cum iam descriptum haberemus illud epitaphium, praesente eo contuli, & dein domi descriptum, denuoque cum eodem collatum, ad te mitto, penitus ita, uti se in marmore habet.'
16 A. Bandini, *Epistolae ad Victorium*, no. 19 p. 50, '...characteres exactissime in hac charta descripsi, sed sunt quaedam minus mihi ibi intellecta, quae sunt versiculö XV et XVI....'
Some scholars in the period, particularly Pantagato and Ligorio, wrote ‘sic’ above individual words, which presumably they thought were uncommon and liable to be interpreted as mistakes. This could cause confusion: in his copy of a monument to a flute-player with a Greek inscription, Ligorio wrote ‘sic’ over the word MYPOIPNOYI. He then copied the word in the margin without including the iota at the end, with the result that a copy from his manuscript gives the inscription as MYPOIINOY. Even in such a climate, however, there still seems to have been an attitude among certain scholars that some information was better than no information. Copying the *sententia Minuciorum*, an inscription from Genoa recording a boundary dispute, had caused problems for Orazio Orsini, as he wrote to Panvinio in 1559. Three or four words presented difficulties: Orsini suggested that if he needed the copy, Panvinio should supply these from the printed version, which Orsini had previously described as ‘scorretta e falsa’. In his *Dialogos*, Antonio Agustín criticises Aldo Manuzio for including in the *Orthographiae ratio* an inscription recorded in the notoriously corrupt text of Pliny the elder. Agustín makes the point that Aldo should not have used this to establish the spelling of the word *proelium*.

---

17 For examples of Pantagato’s practice, see BAV Vat. lat. 5237, fols. 132r and 164.
18 Naples, MS B.XIII.7 p. 460, copied at BAV Vat. lat. 3439, fol. 126r (*IG XIV.1865 = IGUR 798*). See E. Mandowsky and C. Mitchell (eds.), *Pirro Ligorio’s Roman Antiquities*, no. 110 pp. 110-1, pl. 65.
19 *CIL* V.7749.
20 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 267r (11 March 1559): ‘vi sono tre o quattro parole, le quale mi pare impossibile legerle, et mi vo immaginando che siano manche nell’orizina; se V. R. la vole me n’avisse, che ne gli mandarò subito, et quelle parole che vi mancano vedra di cavarle da quella stampata; di questo ben gli assiguro, che’l resto della mia è correttissimo, e son certi che la sodisfarà...’ There is a printed copy of the inscription at BAV Vat. lat. 6034, fol. 26, which is probably the edition to which Horatio Orsini refers here; he subsequently told Panvinio that Sigonio had a copy: ‘Ho preoccupato quanto V. R. mi chiede, la copia di quella tavola di Genua, l’ha el Sigone nelle mani e ne gli darra...’ (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 268r, 1 April 1559). This was not known to the editors of *CIL*, and may well have been rare in the sixteenth century. Certainly Fulvio Orsini was not able to get hold of a copy, asking Gian Vincenzo Pinelli ‘che mi faccia venir un impronta in carta stampata sopra la istessa tavola di Genova, et quanto prima, per questo rispetto; il Statio [Achilles Statius] n’ haveva una, ma non si trova, et forse che V. S. n’ havra ancora lei, et così si possa aver più presto.’ (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D423 inf., fol. 253r, 10 February 1582, quoted by M. Crawford, ‘Appendix II: Matal’s Papers in the Vatican Library’, p. 280).
These general comments do not reveal what was required of a transcription, however, and in this chapter I shall show that although the terms in which accuracy was described remained similar throughout the century, scholars' practice and their requirements of copies did vary. I shall examine conventions of representation, the restrictions placed on them by the printing process, and the implications these processes have for our understanding of forgery in the period.

Transcriptions of text

We can get a clearer idea of what was required of a transcription from examining the copies themselves and the purposes to which inscriptions were put. The most prevalent of the latter was to provide examples of orthography from the classical world. As we saw in the introduction, from the middle of the fifteenth century, it became increasingly common for scholars to cite instances of words from classical inscriptions in their commentaries on Latin texts, to support or oppose manuscript readings. This practice was reflected in the way that inscriptions were presented. Early humanists' syllogai tended to include texts in lower case, with scant regard for the line divisions on the stone and none for the shape of the letters. What were important were the words of the inscription, and the inscriptions themselves were treated similarly to classical texts. They were often copied in humanist script, with only details of the findspot distinguishing them from other literary remains of antiquity. Verse inscriptions especially are often found alongside classical poems in manuscripts from the late fifteenth century onwards.²²

Citation of epigraphic testimony remained an important part of the textual critic's repertoire throughout the sixteenth century, and we see collections of inscriptions designed to reflect this need. For example, the Portuguese humanist Achilles Statius (Estaço) maintained an alphabetically-ordered notebook of inscriptions designed to serve as a reference for orthography. Each page was headed by a letter. Under each one, he wrote words beginning with that letter, and either the text of the inscription that featured the word in question, or a reference to where the inscription could be found.²³ He copied the inscriptions in capitals,

²² E.g. Oxford, Bodleian Library MS D'Orville 167, a manuscript including works by Tibullus and Ovid, as well as verse inscriptions on fol. 78.
²³ Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana MS B104, fols. 1-137v.
although without any indication of the letter-forms themselves or the monument on which they appeared.

Statius’s practice can here be contrasted with that of Aldo Manuzio the younger, who collected inscriptions initially to serve as illustrative examples in his work on orthography, the second edition of which, as we saw in the first chapter, was regarded as a collection of inscriptions in its own right. Manuzio’s notes show that the words contained in the inscriptions are his predominant concern. Most of the entries in the printed *Orthographiae ratio* are given in capitals, in general with line divisions preserved and some brief indication of where the inscriptions were to be found. There is some evidence of concern for letter shapes: one inscription, for example, includes an M with an extra stroke as an abbreviation for Manius; another has an N and T run together. On one occasion, there are wood-cuts of the side of an altar. But Manuzio usually preferred to record inscriptions himself in lower case. For example, in March 1567 he copied the manuscript of inscriptions Smet left in Rome, dedicated to his patron Cardinal Pio da Carpi, in which letter forms are in general carefully represented, and although here Manuzio did include sketches of the monuments, he copied the words themselves in lower case. This was not necessarily true of his sources: the letters his correspondents sent him (such as that from Ciceri mentioned above) usually gave the inscription in capitals.

Manuzio’s citation of his sources and ostensible concern for accuracy did not satisfy his critics. As we saw above, Agustín criticised Aldo’s unquestioning citation of material from Pliny. Borghini’s comments to Onofrio Panvinio in 1566, urging him to collect his inscriptions ‘con estrema diligentia’, reveal what he wanted from a collection of inscriptions, and what Manuzio’s book did not provide. He wrote that inscriptions ‘hanno per la maggior parte tutta la forza loro nella orthographia, nè se ne aspetta o vi si attende per lo più o historia o scientia, dove una lettera più o meno non importi.’ In Manuzio’s work, he found some inscriptions

---

26 Most of Manuzio’s considerable epigraphic notes are now contained in BAV Vat. lat. 5234-5253. The difficulty in reading these transcriptions of Manuzio is notorious: A. Ferrua, (‘Giovanni Zaratino Castellini raccoglitore di epigrafi’, p. 135) refers to Manuzio’s ‘terribile cacografia che tutti sanno’. Manuzio did leave some manuscript material with inscriptions in capital letters, e.g. BAV Vat. lat. 6038, fol. 17r.
written incorrectly, with the result 'che io non ardisco a fidarmi di nessuno degli altri; et cosi quanto a me tutta quella fatica è gittata via.'

Where they did trust their material, the scholars were able to observe through inscriptions that the Latin language developed, and this is an important indication of the historical consciousness that they applied to the material. This is particularly true of Agustín, whose interest in the Latin language is illustrated through his commentaries on Varro and Festus. In a long letter he wrote to Latino Latini on 31 August 1567, Agustín showed that he was well aware that ways of representing vowel sounds changed, using the evidence of coins and inscriptions. He noted that in older material 'EF was used for words later spelled with an 'I' and 'OU' for 'U', and that 'vetustius est, ut Latini longas litteras vocales duplicarent, ut multi testantur, exstantque monumenta Tullianis temporibus, vel eis vicinis conscripta, in quibus AA pro A, & EE pro E, & OO pro O, & VV pro V agnoscimus.'

The inscription Agustín refers to in his criticism of Manuzio was an *elogium* of Gaius Duilius discovered in the forum at Rome in 1565 and assumed to be from a *columna rostrata* mentioned by the elder Pliny (*NH* 34.20). Initially it was believed to be an example of a third-century B.C. inscription, and thus it excited considerable interest among scholars of the period. Agustín had received information about it from Onofrio Panvinio and Fulvio Orsini,
who were writing from Rome. Orsini wrote to Agustín on 18 March 1567, pointing out that this was an inscription that Quintilian referred to in a discussion of orthography: 'Nel rivedere che lei farà l'iscrizione di C. Duilio, vederà Quintiliano nel primo libro, cap. de orthographia, che fà mentione dell'antiquità di quella iscrizione ch'era in una colonna rostrata...'. Panvinio sent a complete copy of the inscription, which he described as 'antichissima', with his proposed supplements, to Agustín on 22 March 1567. The inscription allowed scholars to compare Quintilian's account of the changes in the language with one of his key sources, which clearly gave them encouragement as they pursued a similar undertaking.

Scholars' work on language and pronunciation led them to examine the representation of letters in inscriptions further. In his letter to Latini, Agustín also commented that the size of the letter 'I' came to represent a diphthong, 'Non ignoro Augusti tempore coepisse pro hac diphthongo i litteram maiorem scribi, quae ordinem aliarum litterarum excederet; uti in nummis, & titulis Augusti animadvertimus Augustum DIVI. appellatum, eique civicam esse donatam ob CIVIS servatos.' In his De recta pronunciatione Latinae linguae dialogus, Justus Lipsius came to a similar conclusion, although without specifying a particular time in which the development took place. There were three ways of pronouncing the letter I, he argued: 'Primum eius longae: & vere longae. Quia non, ut ceterae, geminatur aut apice insignitur: sed productior fit, & longitudine velut dupla.' He went on to give some epigraphic examples.

commented to Vettori of the inscription that 'si pensa che sia dal tempo de la prima guerra punica, che, se così è, e la più antica di quante hoggi si trovano di Romane...'.

34 J. Wickersham-Crawford, 'Inedited Letters of Fulvio Orsini', no. 3 p. 588 (= Madrid, Escorial MS 5781, fols. 35-6).

35 J. Carbonell et al., 'Las inscripciones de los Adversaria', pp. 188-90 (= Madrid, Escorial MS 5781, fol. 38). Panvinio's version appeared in his De triumpho of 1571, and was that used by Lafréry in his engraving of the inscription, produced in 1575.

36 Anecdota litteraria, ii pp. 320-1. Agustín's notebook from the 1550s, the so-called Alveolus, also has this point (p. 91, from Madrid, Escorial MS S-II-18, fol. 385r), suggesting the theories Agustín expresses to Latini are the product of much reflection.

37 J. Lipsius, De recta pronunciatione, p. 32; on this work, see D. Sacré, 'Juste Lipse et la prononciation du Latin'. Lipsius's conclusions bear considerable similarities to those Agustín espoused in his letter to Latini, and it is likely that Agustín indirectly influenced Lipsius here. The characters in Lipsius's dialogue are the author and Marc-Antoine Muret, and the work is set in Rome during Lipsius's stay there, between 1568 and 1570. It is likely that Lipsius is recreating the tone and subject of discussions
Reflecting on this, Clusius wrote to Lipsius in 1587 commenting on the *monumentum Ancyranum*, the inscription including Augustus’s description of his *res gestae* found in Turkey:

‘Nam illa omnes litteras I producit, et longitudine velut duplas facit, quod tamen magis factum sculptoris arbitrio quam ista observatione, cuius meministi, cum et omnes vocales O reliquis minores et contractiores sculpserit.’ Although Clusius’s conclusion on the importance of this feature here is negative, it shows that he, like Lipsius, was attentive to the size of the letters on the stone, and believed that it could have some influence on the pronunciation of the words that the letters made. For such an investigation, as well as for anyone trying to conclude from the language and shape of letters the approximate date of an inscription, Manuzio’s method of representing letters was inadequate; other scholars, had, as we shall see, already employed more detailed methods of representing inscriptions that men such as Clusius could use.

**Beyond the text**

That simply recording the text of the inscription was only one way of representing a monument had long been clear to humanists. The records left by Cyriac of Ancona, which were copied and transmitted relatively widely, showed monuments from which inscriptions came. More pertinent for scholars working in Italy was the example of Andrea Alciato, who produced collections of inscriptions which featured a drawing of the monument on one page, and a commentary on the next, which mainly focussed on the inscription. This was a clear innovation on what had gone before, but their example does not seem to have been followed by those compiling collections of inscriptions. While they did not necessarily represent monuments themselves regularly, scholars did react against inaccurate presentation. As well as some illustrations of monuments, the *Epigrammata antiquae urbis* printed by Mazochi included

that he had with Muret, who probably reflected ideas circulating in the period, such as those Agustin had sent to Latini in 1567. Another example of Lipsius’s experience in Rome being reflected in his work is a passage of the 1575 *Antiquarum lectionum libri* (bk.2 ch. 14; *Opera omnia* i, p. 90). Here Lipsius discusses the inscription to Duilius from the *columna rostrata*, to emend a passage of Quintilian in which the Roman author was thought to refer to a column erected to Julius Caesar, when in fact, Lipsius showed, he referred to one erected to C. Duilius. As we saw above, Orsini connected the inscription with Quintilian’s reference in 1567. Lipsius thanks Pighius for his help in deciphering the inscription.

38 *ILE* 87 03 22/04 01, ii p. 344 (1 April 1587).

some inscriptions surrounded by decorative woodcut frames. In the annotated copy of this work that he dedicated to the bishop Felix Troffinus in the mid-1520s, Antonio Lelio crossed out these frames, and beside one wrote "Excribenda sunt quae sculpta sunt in ipso marmore." He also drew some monuments from which inscriptions included in the Epigrammata without their settings came, and in one case pasted a drawing of a monument over the version in the book.

By the early 1540s, the sensitivity to some monuments that Lelio showed in his copy of the Epigrammata seems to have become established. Claudio Tolomei proposed that the book of inscriptions which was to be part of his Vitruvian encyclopedia should include 'le figure che vi si trovasseno,' and we have some evidence that his interests were reflected in work of at least one scholar before Tolomei wrote his letter to Landi. Inscriptions in Pirro Ligorio's work, which he began to compile in the 1530s, are often recorded as part of the whole monument. As we saw in the first chapter, artists interested in depicting the city's remains began to gravitate to Rome in the period. While many of the prints marketed by Salamanca and Lafréry were general views, other artists were producing drawings of individual pieces of statuary or reliefs. Our best example of these are the folios that make up a manuscript now called the Codex Coburgensis, after its current resting-place. The majority of the drawings are of objects connected to the worship of the gods, and so the motive behind the collection of the illustrations seems to have been thematic rather than based on aesthetic criteria. A minority of the pieces drawn are inscribed, but we can connect the collection with epigraphic scholarship of the period, as copies of the drawings appear in Pighius's collection of inscriptions. Pighius also produced a collection of inscriptions relating to the pagan gods for Marcello Cervini, and it seems that he was connected somehow with the production or selection of the drawings. Pighius's own collection of inscriptions is organised on thematic lines similar to those used by

---

40 BAV Vat. lat. 8492, fol. 47r = XXXVIIr.
41 E.g. BAV Vat. lat. 8492, fol. 39r = XXIXr and fol. 112v = CIIIv; fol. 158r = CILr.
42 Printed in P. Barocchi (ed.), Scritti d'arte, iii p. 3044.
44 On this manuscript, see H. Wrede and R. Harprath, Der Codex Coburgensis.
45 See H. Wrede, 'Die Codices Coburgensis und Pighianus'.
his friend Smet, although within his classes it appears that he was aware of the iconographic content of the illustrated monuments.\textsuperscript{46}

The \textit{Codex Coburgensis} dates from 1550-5, and Pighius's collection for Cervini was completed in 1554. Another visually-aware scholar working at Rome at the same time was Jean Matal: although the last dated entry by him in his papers is from August 1551, he remained in the city until 1555.\textsuperscript{47} Most of Matal's material came from other sources, which led him to be attentive to others' inaccuracies: beneath one inscription, for example, he wrote 'Martin Flan. [Smet] et Pygh. [Pighius] exsc(ripserunt), ex quo Pyghio emendavi sed alter [corre]ctior est', and included the variants in the inscription, putting dots under disputed letters and giving the alternate version above.\textsuperscript{48} Most interesting are the notes on inscriptions that he saw himself. His sketches show that he was not a proficient artist, but in some cases, he gave instead long descriptions of the monument from which the inscription he copied came.\textsuperscript{49} In other cases, he may well have had artists copying monuments for him: we have two drawings of the four faces of a calendar from a collection in Rome in a hand that is not Matal's but includes extensive annotations by him.\textsuperscript{50} Matal's main interest was not in the iconography of monuments, however, but in the individual letters of the inscription: he often recorded their size, both relative to one another, and in other cases by providing a scale on the page.\textsuperscript{51} On the other side

\begin{footnotes}
\item[48] BAV Vat. lat. 6034, fol. 10r.
\item[49] E.g. for two monuments from Ostia, BAV Vat. lat. 6039, fol. 33. On the recto, Matal describes the first (\textit{CIL XIV.439}) thus: 'Fastigium in fronte cuius latera sinistrum et dextrum rosam habent. Corona; fastigii media parte, a duob(us) geniis utrinq. sustinetur. Sub quo fastigio, vir et uxor, una ad pectus expressi. Dein, subscribuntur haec, paginis lineola divisis, litteris antiquiss(imis).'
\item[51] E.g. BAV Vat. lat. 8495, fol. CLXIIIv, describing the letters of an inscription: 'Versus XIV. sex primi latini ; quor(um) prior magnus litt(eris) et quinque sequentes quo ab hoc longiores, eo minoribus litt(eris) scripti: subsequuntur deinde (spatio quattuor versuum relictco) sex graeci, ut nos eos reddidimus; iisdem litt(eris) sed multo minutorib(us) quam sextus superior proximus latinus: Postea interiecto duorum versuum spatio, subiciuntur duo versus latin: prior, ut quintus superior latinus; ultimus, ut
\end{footnotes}
of one copy of an inscribed law, several letters are depicted, with the note that, 'Exemplum
versuum, iisdem quibus litteris scripti sunt, ex ipsa tabula, eadem forma, et magnitudine,
quantum possimus, ob oculos posita.' He noted various peculiarities of the script,
representing the erasure of a line of an inscription, for example, with an oblong filled with
horizontal lines.

Matal makes clear his belief in the historical importance of examining the appearance of letters,
arguing that their shape was an important tool for their dating. He seems to have come to this
conclusion early, as details of dating come near the beginning of his annotated edition of the
_Epigrammata_, probably where he started his work for Agustín. His analysis was based on a
belief that the quality of script deteriorated from the end of the first century A.D. Next to one
inscription he wrote 'Hoc epigramma seculi barbariem refert inconditis formis litterarum,'
arguing from the form of the 'A', that this was the case. In coming to this conclusion, Matal
was probably influenced by attempts to make stylistic distinctions between various styles of
Roman art that began with the letter on the antiquities of Rome addressed to Leo X, usually
attributed to Raphael, but on which Baldassare Castiglione and Angelo Colocci also worked.

In the letter's discussion of the Arch of Constantine, the sculptures on the arch are
distinguished from the actual structure: the former are 'schiochissime, senza arte o disegno
alcuno', while the former is 'bello et ben fatto in tutto quel che appartiene all'architettura.'
The letter clearly argues for a change and decline in style, also referring to the 'perfetta
maniera' of the columns of Trajan and Antoninus Pius. Marliani put similar ideas into print in
the second edition of his _Topographia_, a work it is likely that Matal knew.

The quality of the script did not provide a hard and fast rule, however. In his notes to an altar
dedicated to Vespasian, he noted that the script on the front and right-hand side was different
from that on the left, which left him curious: 'Sed ego miror, quomodo eodem saxo, ab eodem
sextus'; and fol. CLXXv, with a key representing 'magnitudo versuum atque litterarum huius
inscriptionis'.

---

32 BAV Vat. lat. 6034, fol. 8r.
33 BAV Vat. lat. 6037, fol. 24r.
34 BAV Vat. lat. 8495, fol. IIIr.
35 On the letter see F. de Teodoro, _Raffaelo, Baldassar Castiglione e la lettera a Leone X._
36 Quotes are taken from Ingrid Rowland's transcription of the latest version of the letter, from
Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS It. 37b, in her 'Raphael, Angelo Colocci', p. 101.
37 B. Marliani, _Topographia_ 1544, p. 68; see I. Campbell, _Reconstructions of Roman Temples_, p. 77.
artifice, tam diversi litterarum characteres efficti sint, ut maiores qui fronte et dextro latere habentur, elegantiores optimique sint; ceteri, hoc est minutissimi, deformes, inaequales, inepti, et Antoninum saeculum referentes... Elsewhere, he suggested that the very difficulties of carving smaller letters caused the difference in quality. On the back of a copy of a calendar found at Rome, known as the Fasti Maffeiani after its owner, he wrote 'Maioribus litteris quae scripta sunt, antiquiora videntur. Minores enim characteres, maioribus ineptiores multo. Sed, ex utraque scriptura, quantum ipsae litterae formae indicant, cognosci potest, vel ipsa Antonini aetate, vel paulo post, nec multo, hoc marmor, suisse scriptum. Ego vere deprehendi saxis et aere minutores characteres magnis multo inconditiores fere exprimi. quod nulla in his proportionis ratio haberii consuevit.

It may have been Matal's interest in letter shapes and their historical importance that inspired the first attempts to make squeezes (impressions) of the letters of inscriptions. Agustín includes a theoretical account of how to do this in his notebook, known as the Alveolus. Here (interestingly in a section entitled 'Grammatica') he discusses emendation, and then forms of script in ancient manuscripts. He then goes on to give his technique, with the title 'Per cavar di una tavola di rame o di pietra bene una scrittura con le medesime figure di lettere et punti'. He recommends putting red or black ink over the bronze tablet or stone, so it fills the inscribed area but not the raised surface, then pressing paper over the area. We have some evidence that Agustín and Matal tried to put the theory into practice. In the letter Orazio Orsini sent to Panvinio about the sententia Minuciorum, which I mentioned above, Orsini seems to suggest that Agustín had given him a squeeze of the inscription, but made with oil rather than ink: '...Monsignor d'Allife già molti mesi mi dette la copia [i.e. the squeeze] di quella tavola di Genua, la quale è in stampa, ma di modo scorretta e falsa, che havendo letto questa non la ricogno; ma quello che la forma nella medesima tavola, quel che dovea far con l'inchiostro, la fece con olio, di modo che si dura grandissima fatiga a poter legere quelle lettere. In addition, one copy of an inscription among Matal's papers certainly seems as though it could have been made in this way.

58 BAV Vat. lat. 6039, fol. 235r = 35r.
59 BAV Vat. lat. 6034, fols. 1v-2r.
60 A. Agustín, Alveolus, p. 91 (from Madrid, Escorial MS S-II-18, fol. 385v).
62 BAV Vat. lat. 6034, fols. 6-7 (CIL IX.3429).
Matal's research led him to point out that inscriptions did not necessarily date from the time of the events that they recorded. After examining the inscribed copy of the *Lex Cornelia de XX quaestoribus*, he concluded that the style of the lettering postdated the law described. Luckily, Suetonius provided a possible reason for this, who recorded that after the fire on the Capitoline Hill in the civil wars of 69 A.D., Vespasian restored the tablets that had been destroyed. Thus Matal could conclude that, 'Videtur haec tabula, ab Vespasiano, cum Capitolium conflagrasset, una cum trib(us) illis millib(us) restituta; quam admodum prior illa Thermensium Pisidarum Maiorum, a cuius characterib(us) nihil, vel paulum admodum, neq(ue) aeris forma, differt aut materia. Sciendum certe est; tabulas legum, in aede Saturni reconditas fuise, et aereas fuise.'

Matal's influence proved important. When he departed from Rome, he left his manuscripts behind, and so evidence of his working methods was available to scholars in the city. For example, the same notes Matal wrote to his copy of the *Lex Antonia de Termessibus*, in which he argued that this tablet had also been reinscribed under Vespasian, appear with a copy now in Paris, with other material collected by Claude Dupuy, who stayed at Rome in the winter of 1570-1. A scholar that Dupuy may well have met at this time was Pedro Chacón, active in the city from the mid 1560s to his death in 1581. His work on the inscription of Gaius Duilius exemplifies the coming together of the two strands in scholarship that we have identified so far, the textual tradition and the visual awareness of scholars working on texts. As we saw above, by 1567 the Duilius inscription had been circulated in print and connected with a passage of Quintilian. In the early 1570s, scholars were still examining the inscription. Agustín wrote to Geronimo Zurita on 25 June 1572, saying that he had certain doubts about the inscription, from the copies that he had seen of it: 'quanto a mis sospechas yo tenia algunas, no en ser antigua, mas en ser la misma del tiempo del primer bello Punico, y dudava si era, como otras, restaurada, ó renovada en tiempo de Augusto, o de Trajano, ó de otros, porque en los Foros d'ellos pusieron las estatuas con sus titulos de los principales hombres antiguos... sean d'estas que dixe renovadas, y no de su mismo tiempo.' Zurita responded by sending him a copy of this law, see J-L. Ferrary, 'La Lex Antonia de Termessibus', pp. 421-3.
copy of the inscription with the supplements of Chacón, which he had received from Piero Vettori, and Agustín found this more satisfactory.46

While Agustín continued to express doubts about the exact dating, he was content to wait for the work of Chacón on the inscription, as he wrote to Orsini and Zurita in October 1572.47 Although his treatment was not printed until 1594, Chacón probably completed his work in 1572.48 He shared Agustín’s suspicions, and argued both from lexical grounds and from the evidence of the letters on the inscription itself that the inscription was in fact inscribed in the early imperial period: ‘Verum sitne ea ipsa, quam Plinius Quinctilianusque viderunt, non facile dixerim: certa antiqua illa, quae ipsius Duillii aetate, hic est quingentesimo fere P.R.C. anno collocata fuit, non esse videtur. Nam & litterae elegantiores sunt, quam ut illo rudi harum artium saeculo incisae videri possint; & scribendi ratio, qua illa aetate Romani utebantur, non ad amussim in ea servata reperitur.’49 He goes on to illustrate the latter point by showing that while the inscription contains some old forms, such as ‘NAVEBOS’, it also includes the letter ‘X’, a double consonant not attested before the Augustan period. Therefore Chacón, without referring to a single historical reason for the reinscription as Matal did, argues that this was what had happened. An awareness that letter shapes and the orthography used could date inscriptions seems to have spread quite quickly. Certainly Michel de Montaigne, for example, when confronted with a statue base in Terni in 1581, could write ‘la statue n’y est pas, mais je

---

46 Agustín wrote both to Zurita to thank him (on 16 August 1572: Opera omnia, vii pp. 211-3), and to Orsini (Opera omnia, vii no. 36 p. 249 = BAV Vat. lat. 4104, fol. 153), that, ‘mi vien mandata una copia di Castiglia molto più copiosa, e elegante, che non era quella del quondam F. Onofrio.’ J. Carbonell (‘L’identification des papiers d’Antonio Agustín’, pp. 123-26) examined this correspondence and identified the copy Vettori sent to Zurita as Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional MS 3610, fol. 288.

47 A. Agustín, Opera omnia, vii p. 213 (to Zurita, 20 October 1572) and no. 37 pp. 250-1 (to Orsini, 22 October).

48 Chacón’s work on the inscription is described by E. Ruiz, ‘Los años Romanos de Pedro Chacón’, pp. 223-30; J. Carbonell (‘L’identification des papiers d’Antonio Agustín’, p. 126 n. 48) notes that Chacón’s autograph manuscript is BAV Vat. lat. 6319, fols. 75-96.

49 P. Chacón, In columnae rostratae inscriptionem commentarius, p. 6.
jugeai la vieillesse de cet écrit, par la forme d'écrire en diphthongue *periculeis* et mots semblables.\(^\text{70}\)

Matal’s attention to detail in his representation of the lettering of inscriptions is not only seen in scholarship of this sort but also paralleled in other manuscripts of his contemporaries and successors. No single convention was developed in the period, and different scholars found different ways of showing where the inscription ended, which parts of their transcriptions were their supplement, and where there was a gap.\(^\text{71}\) Most were careful to show the edge of an inscription with a line; some showed supplements in lower case letters, others by underlining their additions, or by using coloured shading on the supplied text.\(^\text{72}\) Where there was a gap in the inscription, some used dots to show this, others diagonal slashes, while others estimated the number of letters that would fit into the gap.\(^\text{73}\)

**The problems of printing**

Scholars’ assiduous efforts did not necessarily transfer easily to the printed page, however. They regularly blamed printers for misrepresenting details of inscriptions. Thus Borghini, for example, when discussing theatres in his *Discorsi*, claimed that an inscription to Quintus

---


\(^{71}\) I have found no discussion on the variety of symbols used by humanists of this period to annotate texts. For example, Guillaume Budé uses a method similar to that of Matal: see the illustrations of pages of his annotated Homer printed to accompany A. Grafton, *Commerce with the Classics*, ch. 4, ‘How Guillaume Budé Read His Homer’, esp. figs. 4-5. Claude Dupuy used a wide variety of symbols to annotate his library: see J. Delatour, *Une bibliothèque humaniste*, p. 73. Symbols also appeared in printed editions, for example in Agustin’s Festus: *M. Verri Flacci quae ext st*, sig. [v vijv]; see the discussion of A. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, i p. 141.

\(^{72}\) The first method was particularly common in transcriptions of laws, e.g. Paris, BN MS Dupuy 461, fols. 42v-43r (a copy of the *senatus consultum* de Asclepiade, *CIL* I.588); the second is employed by Cittadini, e.g. BAV Vat. lat. 5253, fol. 250v, and Panvinio, in his copy of the Duilius inscription that he sent to Agustin (J. Carbonell et al., ‘Las inscripciones de los Adversaria’, p. 189); the third appears in a copy of the the same inscription, BAV Vat. lat. 6038, fol. 124r = 127r.

\(^{73}\) Eg. BAV Vat. lat. 6037, fol. 24r; BAV Vat. lat. 5237, fol. 147r; BAV Vat. lat. 7721, fol. 62v, with the note in the inscription that ‘ci mancano littere 3 o 4’. The last manuscript is edited by M. Micheli, *Giovanni Colonna da Tivoli*; see pp. 92-3 for this folio.
Fabius Maximus from Rome was printed ‘molto scorretta’, thanks to the ‘ordinaria negligenza, e poca intelligenza de gli stampatori.’ He gave another version, apparently satisfied by his own printer’s competence. When advising Panvinio on the care he should take in collecting inscriptions, Pantagagto reminded him of the ‘infiniti errori’ in the Epigrammata, and recommended that he seek out a printer carefully, to avoid being branded negligent by his readers. Writers self-consciously alerted their readers to the difficulties of representation. Bartolomeo Marliani, in the second edition of his Topographia, pointed out that the length of the lines in one inscription that he quoted meant that they would not fit on the page, and used a symbol to indicate that the lines had been artificially broken in the printed representation.

A more serious difficulty was the problem of including illustrations. While Aldo Manuzio’s Orthographiae ratio more or less reflected the details of inscriptions that he had collected, transcriptions that went beyond gathering simple details of the preserved text were hampered by the necessity to use woodcuts or engravings, which, as we saw in the first chapter, was an expensive business. This inevitably affected any attempts to transfer the contents of manuscripts to books. Alciato wrote on 13 January 1520 to his friend Francesco Calvo that he was ready to print his collection, were it not for the prohibitive cost of creating illustrations. After this came the Epigrammata printed by Mazochi, which did include some wood-cut illustrations to reflect the shape of the monuments, unlike the others with decorative borders rejected by Lelio. Not just the monuments, but also the shapes of the letters proved a problem. In his copy of the Epigrammata, Matal noted that the printer had used the same lettering for all the inscriptions, and thus he could not date them. The same was true of Apianus and Amantius’s work, in 1534.

---

74 V. Borghini, Discorsi, i p. 185.
75 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 71r (25 February 1559).
76 B. Marliani, Topographia 1544, pp. 8-9. When Panvinio came to quote the same inscription (recording the restoration of the walls after barbarian incursions by Arcadius and Honorius, ILS 799 = CIL VI.31987) in his Commentariorum libri (p. 45), he gave the text a whole separate page, so that it should be ‘integra’.
77 A. Alciato, Lettere, no. 5 p. 12, ‘Quod ad volumen antiquitatum attinet, illud in praesentia penes me hic est... Non possunt ea elogia imprimi nisi magnu cum impendio, quod omne auferrent tessellarii, iaque genus diatretarii lignique sculptores propter iconas’. For the date of the letter, see R. Abbondanza, ‘A proposito dell’epistolario dell’Alciato’, p. 478.
78 BAV Vat. lat. 8495, fol. 11v [=frontispiece], ‘cum enim ipsum characterum formam non expresserit typographus, e qua fere monumenti seculum animadverti potest, sed iisdem omnia litteris perscripterit,
The next major epigraphic publications were those devoted to the Capitoline Fasti, discovered in 1546 and 1547, and here we see scholars experimenting with different methods of representing a monument without any iconographic content. The problem was that the inscriptions were fragmentary, but that evidence from literary sources allowed what was there on the stone to be supplemented. The first publication was the edition of Bartolomeo Marliani, which was printed in 1549. Marliani chose not to include any supplements, but to give the texts of the Consular and Triumphal Fasti separately in chronological order. To indicate where he could not read what was on the stone because of damage, he used diagonal slashes, and he used the same symbol to indicate the edges of the fragments. The result was a work that was presumably cheap to produce, but which did not indicate where the stones ended and where they were damaged. Carlo Sigonio followed this with an edition of 1550, in which he combined the consular and triumphal lists to produce a single chronological table, giving the texts in lower case. His supplements, printed in the same list, appeared in red. This may have been costly: in subsequent editions in 1555 and 1556, the text of the inscriptions was printed in normal type, with the supplements in italics. The two colours of Sigonio’s edition clearly had some admirers. It was this scheme that Jacopo Strada used in his edition of Panvinio’s work on the Fasti, reversing the colours so that the texts from the inscription appeared in red. As we saw in the first chapter, Panvinio rejected Strada’s edition and produced his own in the following year. In this, as well as his reconstructed consular list, Panvinio gave a list of the fragments in his appendix.

These strategies were responses to the problem of how to represent a textual monument, inscribed in regular epigraphic capitals. The difficulties scholars faced could be resolved without resort to elaborate engravings or woodcuts. This was true of the presentation of most inscriptions in printed work of this period, in which they were cited for the information provided by texts, mainly for orthographical scholarship. As was the case in manuscripts, no one set of conventions for representing gaps and breaks had been devised when printing inscriptions. Unlike the Fasti of Marliani where slashes were used, dots were the most

quae vetustiora sunt vix secerni queunt. Quaeque reliquis itaque praestant antiquitate, quaeque seculo minus felici facta sunt, nequaquam possimus adgnoscere.'

79 For a survey of the editions and the scholarship they contained, see W. McCuaig, 'The Fasti Capitolini'.

80 See above, p. 104.
common method of showing gaps in inscriptions, for example in Fulvio Orsini's *Imagines et elogia virorum illustrium*, which quotes several inscriptions, or Panvinio’s *Commentariorum libri*. There does not seem to have been a convention that the author would use one dot for each letter he thought was missing, however.

The requirements were different when Justus Lipsius came to edit Martin Smet’s manuscript of inscriptions to be published by Plantin. Smet’s preface, which he wrote in 1565, shows that he shared the ideas of Matal, his contemporary at Rome. He rejected the practice of some of his predecessors who restored incomplete examples, preferring to leave inscriptions as they were.\(^{11}\)

He also stressed the value of being attentive to the shape of letters. ‘Nonnulli,’ he wrote, ‘praeterita omni temporum atque aetatum ratione, omnes inscriptiones, eadem characterum forma delineaverunt: & ea quae deformibus litteris, in ipsis marmoribus antiquitus sculpta erant, speciosis reddiderunt: & contra. Quod equidem non probo; quum ex ipsa literarum forma, tempus seu aetas, qua quaeque res scripta est, cognosci fere possit.’ He went on to chart the changes in letter forms, giving examples of inscriptions from his collection. Republican letters were very simple, those from inscriptions from Augustus to the Antonine period the most elegant and proportioned, and then there was a steady decline as letters lost their proportions. As a result, he wrote, he would try to preserve the variety (‘diversitas’) of shapes: ‘Quam sane ego, in iis potissimum quae ipsemet vidi ac legi, genuinas characterum formas et versuum ordines quam potui proxime passim imitando, perpetuo servare conatus sum.’\(^{42}\)

In addition, he devised a series of ways of representing accidental erasures, deliberate erasures, and letters where he was unsure of the reading.\(^{81}\) Although clearly sensitive to the letters, Smet does not comment on the iconography of monuments or changes in visual decoration.

Smet also reflects concerns about the problems of transmission. After his four sections, he has a break, and a second section, with inscriptions from the *Epigrammata* Apianus and Amantius’s collection, and Panvinio’s edition of the Fasti and his *Commentariorum libri* of


1558. He writes that he cannot vouch for the accuracy of these.

This is reflected in his note beside one verse inscription, from the Epigrammata, supposedly from Caesar's tomb: 'Ubi sit ignoratur. Et ego numquam in marmore ullo extitisse puto.' Even in the first section, he shows that he is not completely confident of his information. Beside a gap in one inscription, of which he had received details from Morillon and Pighius, he wrote 'in alio exemplari hie nihil desideratur.' In another example from Morillon, he inserted a 'sic' above one reading. Despite his claims, he was not above supplementing himself, even if the additions were clearly represented, with a line to show the break in the inscription, and the supplementary letters in lower case.

Smet's editor, Lipsius, shared his beliefs: underneath one law in his addenda to the collection, Lipsius wrote that 'Tota haec tabula superior aut parum accurate sculpta fuit, aut certe neglegenter descripta. Multa in ea ex sensu facile corrigam; sed in hoc genere nefas.' In practice, however, the supplement was not the only compromise made in the process of transferring Smet's manuscript's contents to the printed page. The constraints of printing meant that the letter forms of inscriptions were not reproduced individually. Most are in the same type, with the exception of some notable examples of early or late lettering, for which woodcuts were made. The printer seems to have made considerable efforts to represent letters of different sizes. The importance of the printer and amount of money available for the presentation is illustrated graphically in the two editions of Marcus Welser's collection of inscriptions from Augsburg, published shortly after Lipsius's edition of Smet, in 1590 and 1594. The first appeared from the Manuzio press in Venice. The inscriptions are given in capitals, with dots to show gaps, and where Welser makes supplements for these gaps, the letters are in lower case. Welser's collection was printed again as a supplement to his history of Augsburg, the Rerum Augustanarum Vindelicarum Commentarii, printed in Frankfurt in
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84 M. Smet, Inscriptionum liber, fol. CXLIIIr, 'Manifestum enim est, confusa ac perversa fere omnia, & non pauca etiam depravata in illis esse. Ideoque alium plerumque, & antiquo illo quam potui simillimum describendi modum mihi commentus sum: quo tantisper utar, donec certius aliquid de singulis inscriptionibus accepero.'


86 M. Smet, Inscriptionum liber, fol. LXXXIIIv, no. 4.

87 M. Smet, Inscriptionum liber, fol. XXXIIIr, no. 4.

88 M. Smet, Inscriptionum liber, auctarium, p. 16.

89 M. Welser, Inscriptiones antiquae Augustae Vindelicorum, e.g. fol. 14v no. 32 and 16v no. 34.
1594 by the heirs of Christian Egenolff. In this case, some of the inscriptions are represented in their monumental settings.

Given this climate, Jean-Jacques Boissard's attempts to print his collection of inscriptions were ambitious. He wrote to Ortelius describing how he included not only inscriptions but also their monuments, 'ut simul cum utilitate jucunditas recrearet lectorem.'^9 Two years later, in 1591, he wrote again, saying that he thought that his proposal for an edition had been rejected by Raphelengius, Plantin's heir, perhaps because it sounded too similar to Smet's work. Boissard was anxious to persuade Ortelius that there were differences: 'Sed hoc fortasse a Smetii libro differt meus quod accurate (quantum a me fieri potuit,) depinxi lapidum formas, cum suis signis et imaginibus, quod a nemine antea factum esse puto.'^10 Eventually, Boissard found a printer in Frankfurt for his work, Theodor de Bry, who printed it with other works of Roman topography and history in six volumes. This is an impressive set: Boissard's drawings are engraved, in what must have been an expensive undertaking. Boissard's sponsor from Metz, Petrus Lepidus (Pierre Joly), provides an ad lectorem which emphasizes the importance of de Bry's skill in representing Boissard's drawings in the first volume; Boissard himself writes in the preface to the fourth that de Bry worked 'tanta industria, tam concinna picturae delineatione, ut doctissimis quibusque ars illius mirifice probetur, iucundaque delectatione passim excipiatur.'^11 Indeed, as we shall see when I consider coins, by the time that Boissard had written his prefaces, a tradition had developed of writers of coin books blaming artists for misrepresenting their work, in the same manner as they attacked their printers.^^ In fact, a comparison of Boissard's first manuscript drawings with the final printed result shows considerable embellishments and inaccuracies.^^ As we do not have the manuscript Boissard sent to de Bry, we cannot be sure that this was not Boissard's fault, but I think we can suggest that Boissard was not concerned by the adaptations. This lack of concern for accuracy also extended to the reconstruction and invention of classical monuments, and it is to attitudes towards forgery that I shall now turn.

---

^9 J. Hessels, Epistulae ortelianae, no. 167 p. 401 (20 September 1589).
^10 J. Hessels, Epistulae ortelianae, no. 194 p. 466 (28 March 1591).
^11 J-J. Boissard, Romanae urbis topographia, i sig. [*4]r-v; iv sig. )r.
^^ See J. Seznec, 'Érudits et graveurs', and ch. 6 below.
^^ For example, a comparison of Boissard's drawing of a memorial to a Greek dwarf flautist (IGUR 798 = IG XIV.1865; Stockholm, Royal Library MS S68, fol. 83r) with the printed version (Romanae
Reconstruction and forgery

In the sixteenth century, a period where cultural products were often produced as a result of a dialogue and rivalry with the classical past, works emulating or reconstructing antiquities were common. As well as classical scholars, sculptors were regularly recorded in cardinals' courts, whose role was to restore classical material or devise new pieces *all'antica*. The results of their labours of restoration, on pieces such as the Laocoon or the Apollo Belvedere, are well known. Alongside these practical restorations, scholars produced theoretical reconstructions of the ancient world. Fifteenth-century attempts were in the main fanciful; Giovanni Marcanova, for example, in two codices of views of sites and buildings from Rome, frequently reconstructs these, including one elaborate Gothic rendering of the baths of Diocletian. In the sixteenth century, increased awareness of the methods of Roman construction meant that such attempts became more restrained, the most ambitious example of which is Pirro Ligorio's view of the ancient city, including reconstructed illustrations of the surviving monuments surrounded by what he imagined had not survived. Later, Etienne Dupérac produced a series of parallel illustrations to complement Onofrio Panvinio's *De ludis circensibus* and *De triumphis*, with records of the ruins as they were to be seen in the sixteenth century, and restored views.

The atmosphere of reconstruction and emulation affected the production of inscriptions. Many modern inscriptions were made on ancient models adapting the ancient letter forms and diction, whether on large monuments, as funerary dedications, or for example in the form of

---

*urbis topographia*, vi pl.103) shows that the dwarf has grown considerably in stature, rendering the Greek inscription, recording that the man was a dwarf, nonsensical.


88 Published by Michele Tramezzini at Rome in 1561; see H. Burns, *Pirro Ligorio’s Reconstruction of Ancient Rome*.

laws designed to protect gardens with collections of antiquities. In addition, epitaphs were devised for historical figures, particularly in the fifteenth century. It is not always clear if these were actually inscribed on stones, but a classical marble *cippus* now in the Vatican Museums which was recorded in the Renaissance features an inscription that seems to have been engraved then, which is clearly not antique. At the same time, ancient texts seem to have been reinscribed on a new stone. In the printed edition of his syllode, Smet suggests in a note to one inscription that this practice is not uncommon: ‘Hoc epigamma recenti marmori nuper incisum...: sed an vere antiquum sit, et in vetusto marmore alibi olim extiterit, nescio’.

This environment has led some scholars to downplay the existence of forged inscriptions in the epigraphic record: the practice of inventing material should, they argue, be understood in the context of a time when such behaviour was common. This position sits ill with the scrupulous attention to detail we have observed in most sixteenth-century epigraphic scholars. Here I shall argue that we can identify forgeries that were accepted as genuine by epigraphic scholars, indicating that these scholars had been deceived. In many cases we can identify a source for this material, and so attempt to draw some conclusions about the motives of the forger.

---

100 For garden inscriptions, see D. Coffin, ‘The “Lex Hortorum”.

101 An example is that to Julius Caesar, *CIL VI.23*.

102 *CIL VI.3625*. It was recorded by Jean-Jacques Boissard, indicating that it had certainly been produced by the late 1550s.


105 The most regularly-cited defence of this position is C. Mitchell, ‘Archaeology and Romance in Renaissance Italy’. The first large-scale examination of forgeries in the epigraphic record was undertaken by the editors of *CIL* in the second half of the nineteenth century, who uncovered thousands of what they argued were forgeries.

106 As Anthony Grafton writes in *Forgers and Critics*, his essay on the tradition of forgery, the notion of deceit is central: ‘Forgers have produced thousands of documents that deceived the readers for whom they were intended’ (p. 6); ‘in the end, forgery is a sort of crime.’ (p. 37).

107 Here I follow the definition of Eberhard Paul ‘Falsificazioni di antichità in Italia’, p. 417), who argues that since we cannot usually determine the motives of the forger, our criterion for judging whether a work is a forgery is whether it was first accepted as genuine, and then revealed as fake, where the style of the period it purports to come from and the style of the era in which it was made
By the middle of the sixteenth century, forgery of classical inscriptions was both widespread, and well-known to epigraphic scholars. The most famous example is probably Annius of Viterbo, who at the end of the fifteenth century falsified a variety of forms of evidence to prove his thesis that a golden age Viterbo ruled over by Noah was the cradle of civilisation.\textsuperscript{108} Not only did Annius cite inscriptions in his work, he also had them inscribed.\textsuperscript{109} Other less exotic examples included an attempt to claim Pliny the elder as a Veronese native by forging a dedication to him, or the cippus which still stands in the middle of Rimini recording that after crossing the Rubicon, Caesar addressed his soldiers in that town, a text which includes a resolutely anachronistic reference to civil war.\textsuperscript{110}

These examples did not fool many people for long. Heavyweight critics such as Pietro Crinito and Raffaele Maffei attacked Annius’s work in print. In his *De honesta disciplina*, published in 1504, Crinito asserted that Annius ‘pleraque omnia impudentissime confixit’; Maffei claimed that ‘libelli quidam infaci et nuper falsis editi titulis lectitentur ut ex stilo & multis pugnantibus deprenditur’, giving examples of mistakes in Annius’s texts of Xenophon, Cato and Berosus.\textsuperscript{111} By the late 1520s and early 1530s, there seems to have been a widespread awareness of epigraphic forgery among scholars, given the references to falsarii as a well-established category. In his copy of the *Epigrammata*, for example, Latino Giovenale Manetti (who, given his position as Commissario dette anticloità, would probably have had a good idea of the market for fakes) wrote appreciatively beside one inscription that: ‘Astute commentum ab his can be shown to differ: ‘Dal punto di vista metodologico, pertanto, si potranno trattare le “falsificazioni” soltanto servendosi, come base, dall’esegesi storico-scientifica del materiale, vale a dire limitatamente a quelle operè che l’analisi ha in un primo tempo indebitamente accettato come “autentiche” e che ha più tardi scortato in quanto “false”.


\textsuperscript{109} R. Weiss, ‘An Unknown Epigraphic Tract by Annius of Viterbo’, demonstrates Annius’s efforts to pass off his forgeries.

\textsuperscript{110} *CIL* V.365* and *CIL* XI.34*. On the latter, see A. Campana, *Il cippo riminese di Giulio Cesare*.

antiquitatum falsariis'. Our best example for awareness of forgery, however, is the letter that Fabio Vigili wrote to Benedetto Egio in 1530, transcribed by Matal at the end of his copy of the Epigrammata. Vigili thanks Egio for a copy of his inscription collection, but warns him of the dangers of forgery. For these, he wrote, 'Praecipua machinae officina Patavii est... Domus una Livii Bassianatis magis falsaria est quam Viterbium tota Joannis Anni Berosiani praestigiis referta.' Vigili implies that the forgeries of Annius were well-known, at least to Egio. He goes on to outline some other culprits, Giovanni Pontano and Fabrizio di Varano, and his suggestion that the perpetrators should be punished indicates that the practice is widespread: 'At ego si in manu mea esset, falsarios bonarum litterarum Cornelia lege punirem ut desinenter ceteri esse tam audaculi, vel magis dicam, scioli et putiduli.' 

Matal seems to have taken Vigili's critical attitude to heart. Underneath Vigili's letter in his edition of the Epigrammata, he includes a note summarizing the letter's contents, and adding to the list of forgers Pomponio Leto and an 'Eugubinus quidam Episcopus', whose identity is not clear. Above the dedication at the beginning of the work, Matal gives a brief account of the history of epigraphic study, with special attention to the dangers of forgery. He cites Leto again as a source of fake material, as well as Niccolò Perotti ('Sipontinus'), and adds that Apianus and Amantius's collection also contained much that was suspect. He suggests that Spain was a particularly fruitful source of forged material, and that the Hypnerotomachia Poliphili should be treated with great caution. In the text of the Epigrammata itself, as well as in his other papers, he dismisses various material as forged, particularly materials that he believed came from the collection of Fabrizio da Varano. Matal's attitude seems to have been shared by his colleagues at Rome. In the printed version of Smet's collection, beside one

112 Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, KK.15.17, fol. XCVIv.
113 BAV Vat. lat. 8495, fol. [189]; See ch. 2 n. 17.
114 Vigili refers to Livio Bassiano: on this collector of antiquities, see G. Bodon, 'Studi antiquari fra XV e XVII secolo', pp. 49-55.
115 See M. Crawford, 'Tavole Iguvine e Pseudo-Iguvine'.
116 BAV Vat. lat. 8495, fol. 11v ['frontispiece], printed by T. Mommsen, 'De fide Leonhardi Gutenstenii', pp. 76-7. The Hypnerotomachia Poliphili was an erotic novel published in 1499 by Aldo Manuzio the Elder. It was set in a mythical ancient world, which included antique inscriptions, and Matal clearly thought that some readers would have thought that they were genuine. On the work see, most recently, I. Rowland, The Culture of the High Renaissance, pp. 60-7.
inscription from Pontano’s collection at Naples he has the note, ‘Pontani ipsius commentum hoc esse et ab aliis ex illius archetypo male descriptum facile crediderim.’

Scholars of inscriptions also worked in a wider atmosphere of forgery and scholarship. On one hand, there was a market of saleable antiquities; on the other, literary texts were also devised and passed off as genuine. The most famous example of this is the complete *Consolatio Ciceronis* printed in Venice in 1583, a work built around previously known fragments of this work. The manuscript of the entire treatise was supplied by Carlo Sigonio, and it seems that it was composed by Sigonio himself or one of his protégés. Certainly Sigonio defended its genuineness in his lectures at Bologna and in print, against the immediate criticisms of Antonio Riccoboni. Earlier, Marc-Antoine Muret had given Joseph Scaliger two poems written in what seemed to be archaic Latin: Scaliger printed them in his edition of Varro’s *De re rustica*, before Muret revealed that they were fake, in a printed collection of *Orationes*.

It is in this environment that Pirro Ligorio worked. As we saw in the first chapter, Ligorio was trained as a painter, and he was not treated as an equal by Agustín or Orsini. On the other hand, he does seem to have enjoyed an amicable relationship with both men, and Agustín valued Ligorio’s work sufficiently highly to urge Orsini to have his patron Cardinal Alessandro Farnese print it. Onofrio Panvinio’s tribute seems sincere, when he wrote the following of Ligorio: ‘Accuratiore enim diligentia antiquitatem illam reconditam a ceteris antiquariis praeteritam, XXXV annorum spatio quibus in urbe vixit, investigavit, et inventam iudicavit, multosque antiquariorum errores diligenter prudenterque animadvertit et emendavit.’ On the other hand, as we saw in the second chapter, Agustín would have mistrusted an inscription relating to tribes if he thought Ligorio was the only witness. In addition, he wrote to Panvinio that ‘si il vostro padrone [Farnese] ha i libri del Pirro nostro, li trovarete ogni cosa a tutto pasto, ed a merenda, e colazione,’ suggesting less than whole-hearted

---

119 The work and Sigonio’s defence of it are discussed by W. McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio*, ch. 5, who prints letters relating to the affair in an Appendix.
approval. Agustín’s suspicions were not misplaced. Many inscriptions surviving from this period for which Ligorio is our first witness have since been revealed as forgeries. It seems strange that Ligorio should be praised so highly, and not categorised among the falsarii by his contemporaries. I shall now argue that Ligorio’s practice was not innocent, but that he did set out to deceive his peers, and that it was not the case, as Anna Schreurs has recently argued, that Ligorio’s ‘rekonstructierende Tätigkeit wurde vor dem zeitgeschichtlichen Hintergrund neu und positiv bewertet.’

As we saw above, Ligorio was responsible for two reconstructed views of the city of Rome; another similar project that survives was his reconstruction of Varro’s villa. In both these cases, Ligorio’s practice was obvious, just as Dupérac’s was in the drawings he made for Panvinio. In the volumes of his Antichità, on the other hand, Ligorio employs a variety of methods of representation, crucially without always distinguishing them. In some cases it does seem as though he took care to represent an inscription in a fragmentary state, following a similar method to Matal or Smet. In other cases, he simply develops fragments of material, explicitly supplementing them as other recorders of inscriptions did. He restores a fragmentary statue of Diana over a complete inscription, saying that he followed the example of other complete statues of the goddess. In the case of an altar to Fortuna Redux, discovered in 1547 or 1548, which was missing its top left hand corner, Ligorio shows the break and does not restore the acanthus border, so we can guess (although he does not say so explicitly) that he is...

---

122 Anecdota litteraria ii, p. 359 (10 February 1567 = BAV Vat. lat. 6412, fol. 246r). E. Mandowsky and C. Mitchell (Pirro Ligorio’s Roman Antiquities, p. 32) assume that the phrase suggests that Ligorio’s scholarship was arbitrary; I think that it includes connotations of deceit.

123 The editors of CIL at the end of the nineteenth century tried to operate a principle of rejecting all material for which our only record was derived from Ligorio: CIL VI.5 contains nearly 3,000 examples from the city of Rome alone. Recently scholars have suggested that some genuine material may have been among that rejected: see, e.g., L. Moretti, ‘A Proposito di Pirro Ligorio’; O. Salomies, ‘Ligoriana’; G. Vagenheim, ‘Les inscriptions ligoriennes’, pp. 210-47; H. Solin, ‘Ligoriana und Verwandtes’.

124 A. Schreurs, ‘Das antiquarische und das kunsttheoretische Konzept Pirro Ligoriōs’, p. 70. See also her Antikenbild und Kunstanschauungen des Pirro Ligorio, pp. 33-6.

125 There is a copy of the latter, which was published by Tramezzino in 1558, in BAV Vat.lat. 5234, p. 8a.

restoring the two left-hand words of the inscription, at the beginning of the first and second lines.127

Other reconstructions of ancient monuments offer no clear guides to his procedure. His drawings of the *columbaria* (literally 'dove-cotes', niches cut to contain the urn of the deceased and a dedicatory inscription) found between the Via Appia and the Via Latina at Rome do not show the appearance of the monuments as found, but rather present Ligorio’s reconstructions of what he imagined the monument would have looked like. He includes what appear to be genuine inscriptions alongside ones that he has invented; one inscription appears in two different *columbaria* reconstructions.128 Here, contemporaries who had seen the excavations would have known what he was up to. In other cases, there is less reason to believe that this is so. For example, sometimes he devises a new inscription based on a genuine example. In one Naples manuscript he copies a genuine dedicatory inscription to Lucius Fabius Cilo Septimus. In a Turin manuscript he has another, which includes the honours that Fabius Cilo won recorded in the first, but also gives names of men dedicating the statue. The forms of these names are unparalleled, and unlikely ever to have existed.129 In other cases, he simply adds to an existing inscription without indicating that he has done so, or adapts others’ records of material.130 As well as records on paper of forged material, Ligorio also organised for invented inscriptions to be carved on stone, many of which seem to have been presented or sold to the Carpi collection. As we saw, Carpi seems to have been particularly interested in the various

127 Naples, BN MS XIII.B.7 p. 113 (*CIL VI.197*); E. Mandowsky and C. Mitchell (eds.), *Pirro Ligorio’s Roman Antiquities*, no. 36, pp. 72-3. A contemporary drawing by Boissard (Stockholm, Royal Library MS S.68, fol. 56r, illustrated in E. Mandowsky and C. Mitchell (eds.), *Pirro Ligorio’s Roman Antiquities*, pl.23) which does not show any restoration confirms that this is the case.


129 Naples, BN MS XIII.B.7 p. 149 (*CIL VI.1409, now in the collection of the Villa Albani at Rome)*; Turin, Archivio di Stato MS a.II.2.J.15, fol. 45v (*CIL VI.1819*; the dubious names are the *nomina* ‘Bravianus’ and ‘Fuffuleius’).

130 E.g., *CIL VI.1160*; *CIL XIV.2865*, with Ginette Vagenheim’s (‘La falsification chez Ligorio’, p. 98) demonstration that Ligorio adapts Smet’s version, comparing Naples, BN MS V.E.4 fol. 102r with Naples, BN MS XIII.B.7 fol. 211r.
office of the imperial household recorded in inscriptions, and Ligorio apparently created new examples for the collection.\footnote{131}

When we consider the commentaries that Ligorio wrote to accompany his drawings of antiquities, his motive become clearer. These commentaries are studded with allusions to various classical texts, and in some cases it seems that he invents inscriptions to tie in with a recondite text. For example, he creates a memorial to a trumpeter, which he claims was found at Rome, including the obscure word 'liciten', only found otherwise in inscriptions in the phrase 'collegium licticum cornicinium'.\footnote{132} In his commentary to the inscription, Ligorio refers to the definition of the grammarian Charisius (\textit{Ars grammatica} i c.10 p.28 Keil), where 'liciten' it is derived from 'lituus', a trumpet. The decoration of the tomb, which shows a hunting-horn, is not otherwise paralleled and also seems to be forged. Ligorio also relied on literary testimonies in his images of figurative monuments. For example, he combines a Greek inscription to Isis with a figure of the Dea Syria, which is clearly modelled on the description of this goddess by Lucian (\textit{Dea Syria} c.31).\footnote{133} Ligorio goes as far as to devise texts that not only accord with certain literary texts, but also resolve textual difficulties in them. He cites two Greek inscriptions which include the word 'Ἀρτιμασια' as an epithet of the goddess Venus, a formula which does not appear elsewhere.\footnote{134} In his commentary to the two, he notes that the only place where the epithet appears elsewhere is in a disputed passage of Herodotus (iv.59), where the Greek historian is describing the gods of the Scythians. Some editors, he wrote, had

---

\footnote{131}{See C. Huelsen, 'Miscellanea epigrafica. XIX Falsificazioni lapidarie ligoriane'. Several are preserved in the Museo Nazionale, Naples: see G. Camodeca et al., \textit{Le iscrizioni latine}, pp. 182-5.}
\footnote{132}{Naples, BN MS XIII.B.8 p. 65 (\textit{CIL VI}.1419*).}
\footnote{133}{Naples, BN MS XIII.B.7 p. 439; E. Mandowsky and C. Mitchell (eds.), \textit{Pirro Ligorio's Roman Antiquities}, no. 106 pp. 108-9; for other examples, see A. Schreurs, 'Das antiquarische und das kunsttheoretische Konzept Pirro Ligorios', pp. 59-64. Next to a depiction of an arch to Consus in his \textit{Libro delle antichità} (fol. 11r, cited in S. Tomasi Velli, 'Gli antiquari intorno al circo Romano', p. 77), Ligorio writes 'Alcuno potrebbe qui domandare, perché, essendo l'ara di Conso sotto terra, io l'habbia disegnata e posta sopra terra. Rispondo, che ne' marmi antichi et nelle medaglie e negli intagli di gioie quell'ara si trova in quel luogo, ove anco la dinota essere Tertulliano, et forse come per simbolo di quella, che di sotto era nascosta.' In her discussion of this passage, Silvia Tomasi Velli points out that Ligorio's representation is only based on the passage in Tertullian, not any of the material remains he mentions, which do not exist.}
\footnote{134}{Naples, BN MS XIII.B.7 p. 419 (\textit{IG XIV}.85*); E. Mandowsky and C. Mitchell (eds.), \textit{Pirro Ligorio's Roman Antiquities}, no. 92 pp. 102-3.}
chosen to render the word "Ἀργίνωσα", but Ligorio’s new evidence is able to prove that "Ἀρτίμπασα", the reading of ‘good texts’, is correct. It is not clear how much Greek Ligorio knew, but it seems certain that here his evidence was designed to resolve a dispute between antiquarians at Rome on Herodotus’ text. His target may well have been Bartolomeo Marliani, who, as we saw in the first chapter, was an enemy of Ligorio’s friend Benedetto Egio as well as being, like Egio, a proficient Greek scholar.

Crucially for our examination of whether his material was accepted, Ligorio passed the details of these two monuments to Smet, who included them in his sylloge. Had Smet been aware that Ligorio was in the habit of inventing material, or even suspected that this was the case, he would not have included these examples in the main body of his text (from which he excluded inscriptions from the work of Panvinio and Apianus and Amantius, as he could not vouch for the accuracy of their transmission). Smet’s note to the inscriptions states that Ligorio copied them down shortly before they were destroyed in order to make cement (a common enough occurrence for ancient inscriptions) and so any chance anyone else had of checking the veracity of Ligorio’s account was lost. The inclusion of circumstantial details about the stone

135 Naples, BN MS XIII.B.7 p. 419, ‘Ma per che vi è uno nuovo epiteto dato à Venere, il quale è molto raro et ne mai più veduto da me nelle marmi, che è questo, Artimasa... le quali seriano d’utilita presso gli scrittori, per ciò che per caggion di queste dedicationi si può corregere quel che ha altrui scorretto; per che molti, in vece di scrivere come si legge nelle buoni testi di Herodoto, ΑΡΙΜΠΑΣΑ scrivono à lor modo ΑΡΓΙΝΩΣΑ. il che è falso per l’affermatione di questi sassi scritti dagli antichi.’

136 Robert Gaston (‘Ligorio on Rivers and Fountains’) argues that Ligorio was able to translate Stephanus Byzantins; cf. M. Crawford, ‘Benedetto Egio’, p. 141.

137 The reading Ligorio sets out to disprove does not appear in any contemporary texts of Herodotus: the edition of Aldo Manuzio the Elder, first published in 1504 (‘ἩρΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΛΟΓΟΙ ἙΝΝΕΑ ὙΠΕΡ ἙΠΙΚΑΛΟΥΝΤΑΙ ΜΟΥΣΑΙ, Basle 1557, p. 125) and that of Henri Estienne (‘ἩρΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΆΛΙΚΑΡΝΑΣΣΕΩΣ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ, [Geneva] 1570, p. 152) both have "Ἀρτίμπασα", as does the translation of Lorenzo Valla, first published in 1460 but reprinted in the sixteenth century (Herodoti Halicarnassei historiographi libri VIII, L.Valla (tr.), Leiden 1542, p. 298). There does seem to have been an increasing interest in Herodotus after 1541: A. Momigliano, ‘The Place of Herodotus in the History of Historiography’, pp. 42-3. The most recent editor, H. Rosén (Teubner, Leipzig 1987) has "Ἀρτίμπασα’ on the testimony of a manuscript of Hesychius; cf. C. Hude (Oxford Classical Texts, Oxford 1908) who follows the manuscript reading "Ἀργίνωσα’.

138 M. Smet, Inscriptioin liber, fol. XXVI, no. 6: ‘Reperta fuerunt haec duo in agro Tusculano, et postmodum in calcem redacta; sed Pyrrhus Ligiorius prius escripterat e cuius archetypo ego postea descripsi’.
is typical of Ligorio’s assimilation of the apparatus of scholarly reports to give his work plausibility. In other cases where he illustrated reconstructed or invented material, he includes dimensions of the stone in question, and shows invented material with cracks, or in a fragmentary state.\(^{139}\) Smet was not alone in including material from Ligorio in his collection: Matal also used him as a source, as did Panvinio.\(^{140}\)

These examples do not prove that Ligorio deliberately misled his contemporaries, but Agustín suggested as much in his letter on the inscription with the abbreviation MENEN, writing to Panvinio that Ligorio ‘qualche volta scrive sua interpretazione per vincere qualche contentione.’\(^{141}\) The details of an inscription that Ligorio sent to the Paduan scholar Gianvincenzo Pinelli and subsequent correspondence make clear that he aimed to deceive.\(^{142}\) Ligorio wrote to Pinelli from Ferrara on 15 January 1582, with a copy of and commentary on a Roman milestone from the time of Trajan, which details the names of tribes through whose territory the road passed.\(^{143}\) The letter is bound in a manuscript in Milan with other material

\(^{139}\) E.g. (with dimensions) Naples, BN MS XIII.B.8 p. 266 (CIL VI.2671*), where the dedicator, supposedly a slave, has the titles of a freedman, indicating that that part of the text at least is devised by Ligorio; (cracked) Naples, BN MS XIII.B.8 p. 109 (CIL VI.1665*), where the cases of the names do not make grammatical sense in the inscription as it stands, although Ligorio may have combined fragments of two genuine pieces; (fragmentary) Naples, BN MS XIII.B.7 p. 112 (CIL VI.369*).


\(^{141}\) A. Agustín, Epistolario, no. 206, p. 298 (25 June 1558). Agustín was here referring to a debate in antiquarian circles at Rome in the 1550s, which I will examine in the next chapter: in order to prove his contention that the Capitoline Fasti were displayed on the same hemicycle monument as those at Praeneste, some scholars suspected that Ligorio had devised an inscription to the classical Roman antiquarian Verrius Flaccus, to argue that Flaccus was the author of both lists.

\(^{142}\) Cf. the verdict of Ginette Vagenheim (in M. Jones (ed.), Fake? The Art of Deception, no. 138 p. 135), that Ligorio ‘tended to complete fragmentary inscriptions and sculptures, not to mislead or deceive.’

\(^{143}\) Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS R97 sup., fol. 60r-60v. The text of the inscription is as follows: EX AVTORITATE/ IMP CAESARIS DIVI NERVAE FIL/ NERVAE TRAIAI AVG GERMA/ NICI DACICI PARTHICI PONTIF/ CI MAXIMI TRIBVNIC POTEST V/ COS V P P CVRAT VIARVM/ L LICINIVS C F SVRA III VIR IT/ M IVLIVS M F FRONTO III VIR/ T LAELIVS Q F COCCEIANVS III VIR/ SEX PLAVIVS L F FALTO III VIR/ CIPP TERM.../ VIAM TRAIAI......./ BRTVT../ SALENTIN..... PVBL.......... / BRTTIEI SALENTINEI OPPIDAN../ NAPETINAEI HIPPONIATA..... / RHEGINEI SCYLAC.......... / LAOMETICI TERINAEI TEMSA/ NAEI LOCREN.... THVRIAT../ CVR......MILL P.....
which belonged to Pinelli, including two other copies of the inscription. Pinelli then must have written with details of the inscription to Fulvio Orsini in Rome, as we have Orsini’s reply of 10 February 1582, thanking Pinelli, with a few comments on the form of the inscription. A letter of the Spanish Protestant humanist Pedro Galés to Antonio Agustín in September of the same year also mentions that Pinelli had given him an inscription of Trajan from Ligorio, apparently the same text. Orsini’s comments are incorporated in another copy from Pinelli’s papers, with other suggestions in what seem to be two separate, unidentified hands. One of these refers to suggestions by Pinelli himself, and so that does not seem to be his.

Ligorio’s comments on the inscription show that he was particularly interested in the names of the tribes and the area through which the road passes, and his treatment is typical of the way he showed his erudition. He notes the name ‘Napetinaei’, and concludes that these people inhabited the gulf of Santa Euphemia in Calabria, called ‘Napetino’ in his time. In Strabo it is called “Ἰππονιάτης” (vi.1), like the ‘Hipponiate’ of the inscription, the elder Pliny (Natural History iii.72) refers to the gulf as ‘Terinaeus’ (the word ‘Terinaei’ comes in the inscription) after the city Terina Legeia, and Ptolemy (iii.1.9), like Strabo, names it after the town Hipponia or Hippona. Aristotle (Politics vii.10.3), on the other hand, calls it ‘Lametico’; Ligorio assumes that the letter ‘o’ has been lost in the textual transmission, since Aristotle names it after the city of ‘Laos’ and the river ‘Laon’, and the word ‘Laometicei’ appears in the inscription. This detail allows him to make sure of the reading in a text of Stephanus of

It is edited as CIL X.1008 where the commentary from the letter is reprinted, without the final eight lines. For details of the epigraphic content of this manuscript, see L. Montevecchi, ‘Spogli da codici epigrafici Ambrosiani’, 1938, pp. 30-5. Ginette Vagenheim (‘L’épigraphie: un aspect méconnu de l’histoire de la philologie’, p. 100 n. 19) is planning an article on this letter.

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS R97 sup., fols. 66r and 69r.

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D423 inf., fol. 253r.

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS R97 sup., fol. 49v: ‘me dio el Sor Pinello una inscription de Traiano, q. sela imbio Pyrrho Ligorio’. It is not clear why Pinelli had a copy of this letter between the two Spanish scholars.

Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS C61 inf., fols. 133 and 134. For details of the epigraphic content of this manuscript, see L. Montevecchi, ‘Spogli da codici epigrafici Ambrosiani’, 1937.

Ligorio’s representation of this word in capitals shows that his Greek was probably not secure (above, n. 136). He gives ‘ἩΠΠΟΝΙΑ Theta’, with an eta at the beginning of the word to show the aspiration, and an omicron in place of the omega in Strabo’s text.
Byzantium who quotes Apollodorus (Ethnika ad loc.) as deriving the name of the city, 'Laos', from the river, 'Laon'. He then quotes Stephanus again on the city of Terina (Ethnika ad loc.). He concludes thus, 'Et questo è quanto havemo potuto sapere del detto seno, più chiaramente dall'antica memoria, che havemo havuta fragmentata, trovata nella via che da Capua andava a Rhegio oltre nelli Lucani, havuta dal Signor Lucio Serleti et si come è, così ve la offero.'

But elements in the inscription do not appear to be antique. At the beginning of line six Ligorio shows a small lacuna. In this we would expect further numerals to record the number of times Trajan had held tribunician power, since other records show that when he had been consul for the fifth time, he held tribunician power for the seventh, eighth and ninth times, not the fifth, as the inscription shows as it stands. Also in this space we would expect the number of salutations as imperator he received. The form of his name, with the detail that he was son of the emperor Nerva before his own nomen (also Nerva), is unusual, but does appear in another inscription to Trajan from this area. In this, genuine, example, Trajan is recorded as having tribunician power for the ninth time and the consulship for the fifth time: it is very similar to the inscription Ligorio sent, was recorded by Pighius, and may have been a model for Ligorio. The cognomen of the last curator viarum, who maintained the road, 'Falto', is not recorded elsewhere, although this may be a mistranscription of 'Falco', an attested cognomen. The list of names that follows is unprecedented, and it is hard to avoid the conclusion that Ligorio has produced it from his reading of the geographical authors he cites. For our purposes, however, what is more important is how Pinelli, Orsini and the anonymous commentator deal with the inscription, assuming that Ligorio has not altered the text in any way. Orsini suggests that 'ID' would be a better reading for the end of the seventh line, and makes some effort to fill in the lacunae in the names of the various peoples. Crucially, he also suggests that in place of 'Napetinaei', about which Ligorio wrote, 'Mamertinaei' would be the reading he would expect for this area. Had he believed that the text was devised by Ligorio to fix the etymology of the sixteenth-century name of the gulf, as Ligorio concludes from the name 'Napetinaei' in the commentary, Orsini would not have made this suggestion, which he adduces from Greek coinage from the area.

The two anonymous commentators go further. The first, in notes written next to the copy of the inscription, questions the order of the first line of Trajan's name, and beside line twelve

148 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS R97 sup., fol. 60v.
writes 'si dubita sull'orthographia di questi popoli, sed in Ligorio etc.' The second, in notes on the reverse of the sheet featuring the inscription, also draws attention to the strange form of Trajan's name, and the fact that he cannot have been described as holding the consulship for the fifth time and tribunician power for the fifth time. He also suggests that Trajan only received the title 'Parthicus', in the fourth line, once he had held the consulship for the sixth time, on the basis of other inscriptions and coins that he has seen. It seems that both Orsini and the first of these commentators assume that they are dealing with an accurate record of a text. The second, however, introduces the possibility that it may not be, saying when dealing with the name that: 'Similis huic inscriptio immo vero genuina est in A[uctorun] V[ariorum] epigram[mata]. fol. ix. pagina altera, unde etiam suspicium mihi in hac est, quod ait TRIBVNIC. POTEST. V.'

Ligorio was not alone in forging material, but he is unusual in that we have sufficient information to document his deceit. Boissard's practice seems similar, but in an atmosphere of reconstruction we cannot be as sure about his motives. He includes forged material in the manuscript copies of his work, probably inventing a source for inscriptions which he in fact adapted from printed sources, as well as devising inscriptions for patrons in Metz. One manuscript includes a copy of what seems to be a genuine inscription as part of the base to a statue (although Boissard is the only witness to this fragment), but also a funerary inscription which features the fragment. A correspondent of Gruter's at Rome, Leonard Gutenstein, gave details of some inscriptions that were clearly modelled on genuine examples, again apparently misjudging what was required. The most elaborate forgery of the sixteenth


151 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS C61 inf., fol. 134v: The reference is to the Epigrammata, which gives a dedication to Trajan on fol. 9v (CIL VI.1239). This inscription also has the unusual order of Trajan's nomenclature, but with him having held tribunician power seventeen times and the consulship six times.

152 Boissard's life and forgeries are documented in a little-known article by J. Keune, 'Fälschungen römischer Inschriften zu Metz'. See also his 'Jean Jacques Boissard', C. Huelsen, 'Un nouveau recueil manuscrit de Jean-Jacques Boissard', and C. Callmer, 'Un manuscrit de Jean-Jacques Boissard.'

153 Paris, BN MS Lat. 12509 p. 702 (CIL VI.25247) and p. 662 (CIL VI.3169*).

154 See CIL VI nos.3199*-3297* pp. 222*-227*. Gruter realised that some of the inscriptions Gutenstein supplied were not genuine, and included them in his appendix of spurious material. See T. Mommsen, 'De fide Leonhardi Gutenstennii', pp. 67-75.
century, however, were the so-called 'acta antiquissima', which recorded the events of seven
days in the Roman republic. These were printed in the second, posthumous volume of
Pighius's *Annales*, but Marcus Welser had already discussed them in letters to Joachim
Camerarius in 1596 and 1597. Welser noticed that they were forged, writing that 'haec
fragmenta neque coloris neque succi esse pro aetate, quum affectant.' Here we cannot
identify the perpetrator. Pighius (who did not seem to suspect its veracity) writes of his version
of the inscription, which he received from Iacobus Susius, that it was 'exscriptum inter schedas
Lodovici Vivis olim repertum,' a source Pighius also referred to elsewhere. It seems very
unlikely, however, that the forgery of the sophistication of the *acta* originated with Juan Luis
Vives, who died in 1540: rather, it seems that Vives's name was attached to something that may
have originated in Spain. This is what Welser seems to suspect, when he writes: 'Interim
excerpta ex linteis Pontificum libris, Ortelii [Abraham Ortelius], aut Vivis, aut cu jus vis potius
fide mitto, fide, ut ego, vereor non optima: scis quam vani Hispani, praeter alias omnes gentes,
in confingendis inscriptionibus quas antiquas credi volunt.'

Welser's vague suggestion that there was something anachronistic about the *acta*, and the
anonymous commentator's comparison of the Ligorio text with another dedication to Trajan,
show that scholars of the late sixteenth century did use their knowledge of inscriptions to
compare material. Those with wide knowledge were confident of their abilities. Vincenzio
Borghini, in his *Discorsi* published in 1584, defends his use of epigraphic evidence, in contrast
with the practice of some historians who have been deceived by false testimony on one
occasion and consequently are suspicious of citing any inscriptions as evidence. He is
confident, he writes, that 'quanto all'inganno, che costoro temono, non ci è questo pericolo, ne

---

155 CIL VI.3403*. A. Lintott, 'Acta antiquissima: A week in the History of the Roman Republic', has the
text and a discussion. Lintott suggests that the text could date from the Augustan period, and be an
attempt to recreate Republican *acta*, although this is very unlikely: see D. Fowler, 'Notes on Pighius',
pp. 262-3.

week in the History of the Roman Republic', p. 221) mentions a reference to the Acta in Lipsius's 1581
edition of Tacitus: I have not seen this edition, but the reference does not seem to be present in the 1585
edition.


exemplum ex schedis Ludovici Vivis, ut dicebat, exscriptum' (p. 46).

159 M. Welser, *Opera*, no. 51 p. 851 (17 December 1596).
Only one practical guide to the detection of forgeries was printed in the period, however, as part of Agustin's Dialogos. The eleventh dialogue is devoted to discerning false coins and inscriptions from genuine examples. Although his work was printed in 1587, Agustin's advice on forgery actually reflects practice in Rome forty years before. His list of suspect sources is virtually the same as that of Matal in his annotated Epigrammata: Annius, Pontano, Leto, 'Juan Camerte' (who seems to be Matal's Fabrizio da Varano, bishop of Camerino), and the printed works of Apianus and Amantius and the Hypnerotomachia Poliphili. The only new name is Cyriac of Ancona (of whom Matal approved), long dead by 1540. The examples he discusses were also well known, and suspected, in the 1540s, and in general he rejects them on linguistic grounds, although also with attention to the source of the information. One text from Spain supposedly delivered by Cato is a forgery, he argues, because the source is of little reliability; the language, supposedly from the period of Cato, is anachronistic, half in verse and half in prose; the word 'ergo' does not appear in other inscriptions; and in any case, Cato is supposed to have spoken briefly and to the point. He reveals anachronisms in the language of the inscription at Cesena on the Rubicon, but also notes that only one consul is mentioned without the details of any other magistrates. Agustin does not recommend being attentive to the nomenclature in inscriptions, or descriptions of the offices, the tools that the anonymous commentator used to reveal Ligorio's materials were forged. In addition, there is no suggestion that the techniques of dating inscriptions by letter form could be applied to reveal anachronisms. Nothing of the sceptical attitude towards Ligorio that he expressed in private letters comes through in his discussions in the Dialogos.

A practical example of inscriptions rejected as forgeries comes in the section devoted to fake testimony in Gruter's collection. Scaliger's letters to Gruter when Gruter was working on the collection show that he was well aware that some of those furnishing them with texts did not
do so in good faith. He seemed confident that he and Gruter were sufficiently critical to notice
the forgeries, writing that: '... tam bonos artifices non esse eos, qui nobis ea obtrudunt, ut
imponere nobis possint. Neque nos tam levis ingenii sumus, ut illis fidem accomodemus, quos
scimus nunc non primum incipere ludere de credulitate nostra... Id in Elegia ineptissima
nomine Cornelii Galli fecerunt, in qua lacunas relinquuerent et versus integros omitterent, ut
fidem vetustatis ex lituris et obsoleta lectione facerent.\(^{164}\) In a subsequent letter Scaliger goes on
to suggest that those of doubtful merit should be included in a separate section, so that the
main body 'sanctissimae vetustatis sacrarium erit, ad quod tο δεμυηκ αdmitti non debent...
Multa prave, perversa, praepostera in Apiano, Aldo, et aliis leguntur.\(^{165}\) His proposals are
adopted in the edition of the inscriptions: after the main body of the text follow 27 separately
numbered pages, where the inscriptions are depicted in the same way as in the main body of
the text, with details of the individual or work that was the source for each.\(^{166}\) As in the case of
other features of the inscription collection, here too Scaliger seems to have been influenced by
Smet. Whereas Smet put in a separate section material from the *Epigrammata*, Apianus and
Amantius’s collection, and Panvinio, to indicate that he was not prepared to vouch for it,
Scaliger went further in actually denouncing material as fake. But certain inscriptions were
included that had previously been printed in the main text, showing that Scaliger’s hopes of
entirely separate material were not fulfilled.\(^{167}\)

The inscriptions that Gruter and Scaliger reject include many texts from the late fifteenth and
early sixteenth century (such as those discussed by Agustín), and some that originate in the

\(^{164}\) J. Scaliger, *Epistolae omnes*, p. 760 (12 February 1600). He refers to the epigrams wrongly attributed
to the Roman elegist Cornelius Gallus but published under his name by Aldo Manuzio the Younger in
1588 as the *Asinii Cornelii Galli elegia*. Presumably his deception at the hands of Muret was still too
painful for him to refer to that.


\(^{166}\) The section does not have a title, but the following introduction: 'Opere iam absoluto nihil
restabat, quam petere Lectoris plausum ac faventiam: nisi viderem pluribus eam iudicii esse modum,
ut percurris Inscriptionibus superioribus, statim exclamaturi essent, praeteritas nobis fere reciectasve
Epigraphas bonitatis edecumatae, & notae tantum non, si vinum essent, Opimianae. Talibus labris
ut etiam suae essent lactucae, en farraginem istam: quam ego tamen, unaque mecum non pauci, hoc
est Senatus Criticus sententiae melioris, merito suspicant spurias, adulterinas, suppositias, fictitias,
& quid non? At the top of each page is the heading 'Spuria ac supposititia'.

\(^{167}\) E.g. J. Gruter, *Inscriptiones*, Spuria ac supposititia p. VI, no. 8 (CIL VI.1*4q) = p. CCCI, no. 1; Spuria
ac supposititia p. X, no. 1 (CIL VI.1*4f) = p. CCCLXXVII, no. 4.
work of Boissard, but only one that first seems to appear in the work of Ligorio, clearly
devised from a letter of the younger Pliny.\textsuperscript{164} The editors' source for this is in fact given as
Aldo Manuzio the younger, and Ligorio appears nowhere as a source in the section of rejected
material. It seems that Agustín's quiet warnings did not receive wide currency, and concerns
such as those of the anonymous commentator were not widely shared. The case of Annius is
instructive here. Although he was rejected early, his works continued to be studied, in the
hope that they contained some useful material. Annius's presentation of his material was
persuasive, including a wide body of supporting evidence and annotation, which presumably
made it difficult to reject the whole edifice.\textsuperscript{165} Ligorio's presentation of his material is similarly
persuasive: we have seen how he used 'sic' indications, gave dimensions of stones and
represented cracks on them.\textsuperscript{170} Ligorio had another element in his favour, which was not true
of Annius, that he was a member of a collaborative group of scholars. Ligorio's ability to
sketch what he saw would have been valued, especially by those men like Matal who do not
seem to have been able to draw, and in a climate where monuments were regularly destroyed.
Secondly, some of Ligorio's work could easily be checked against surviving monuments. In
such a group, it is understandable that even if on occasions Ligorio had been known to falsify
evidence, other members would not have been anxious to reject all his testimony. Hence
Agustín was anxious for his notebooks to be published. In an age where some scholars believed
that some information was better than no information, Ligorio was not subjected to systematic
scepticism. In the next chapter, I will examine further the historical uses to which epigraphic
material was put.

\textsuperscript{164} J. Gruter, \textit{Inscriptiones}, Spuria ac supposititia p. X no. 3 (\textit{CIL VI.1635*}) after Pliny the Younger,
\textit{Epistolarum}, vii.29.

\textsuperscript{165} On the fortuna of Annius's work, see W. Stephens, \textit{Berosus Chaldaeus} and R. Bizzocchi, \textit{Genealogie
incredibili}, pp. 26-49. As recently as 1965, Annius has found a (Dominican) defender in M. Signorelli,

\textsuperscript{170} Ligorio's presentation certainly impressed a later reader, Edward Gibbon, who saw Ligorio's
Turin manuscripts in 1764 and wrote: 'Le reproche qu'on a toujours fait à Ligorio c'est le défaut de
fidélité, et d'avoir supposé des monuments qu'il ne connoissoit point. Cependant j'y ai vu des traits
de candeur qui me préviennent en sa faveur. Je vois un homme qui doute souvent s'il a bien lu, qui
laisse des fautes grossières dans les monuments, en avertissant seulement par un sic qu'il les ait
remarquées, et qui laisse des endroits en blanc qu'il lui eut très facile de remplir', quoted in A.
In the second chapter I argued that the decision of Tolomei and his contemporaries to classify inscriptions by their content, rather than by where they were found, was indicative of a growing interest in the information that this form of evidence could provide about the ancient world. When assembled together, as we saw, inscriptions could provide details of the number and variety of voting tribes or legions which did not occur in literary sources. In addition, scholars did not simply treat such subjects synchronically, but were also interested in the chronological development of institutions. They argued that the number of legions could change over time, and tried to supply reasons for the fact that more than 35 tribes were attested in inscribed sources. Scholars’ attempts to order inscriptions chronologically reflect these concerns, and, as we saw in the last chapter, they also tried to date inscriptions through their language and orthography, and the shape of the letters in them. In this chapter I will examine further what sorts of historical information scholars believed could be derived from inscriptions, and how they cited inscriptions in tracts about the ancient world.

While scholars regularly examined and cited inscriptions in their historical discussions of the ancient world, they were not particularly concerned with the theoretical implications of their practice. The real only exception to this is a growing interest in the agency responsible for the creation of inscriptions, which I will examine in the next chapter. The occasional citations of inscriptions as historical evidence by ancient authors do not seem to have excited particular comment: rather, the practice was taken at face value and not discussed. Authors mentioned these inscriptions as they did ones they had seen themselves. In fact, the only manual that examines the interpretation and application of inscriptions from this period is Agustín’s eleven Diálogos de medallas, inscripciones y otras

---

1 An exception is a reference by Francesco Robortello (De historica facultate, p. 26) to Thucydides, who had used the testimony of an inscription (vi.54-5) for information about the genealogy of the Athenian Hippias.

2 See, for example, Onofrio Panvinio’s citation of passages from Pliny the younger, Livy and Flavius Vopiscus which mentioned inscriptions: Commentariorum libri, pp. 85, 102 and 134.
antiguedades. Despite its title, most of this work is devoted to coins: apart from the remarks on forgery in the eleventh dialogue that I considered in the last chapter, Agustín only examines inscriptions in the ninth and tenth sections. It is clear from the discussions here that his main interest in epigraphic texts is linguistic. The first and most important use of inscriptions, he claims, lies in their contribution to orthography, and their value is that unlike other written records made at the same time, they have survived since the classical period. Were the written records of that period to have survived, he claims, at least as far as orthography is concerned we would not need to look at inscriptions or coins. It was in this context that Agustín claimed that he would accord more faith to inscriptions than written materials.

Agustín did not see the benefit of studying inscriptions solely in terms of the information they provided about the ancient language, however. He also tells his interlocutors that they record many features of the ancient world that are wrongly or obscurely described in literary sources, like names or administrative offices, and refers them to Onofrio Panvinio’s Commentariorum libri for an example of how the material could be exploited. A similar passage appears in the Alveolus, the notebook he maintained recording his questions and problems, in a section entitled ‘Che utile si cava de li pitafii o inscritioni?’, in which he first

---

3 Scholars had previously suggested that such a manual was needed: Ottavio Pantagato wrote to Onofrio Panvinio (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 70r, 28 January 1559) that ‘le inscrittioni antiche... desideran una methodica expositione.’

4 A. Agustín, Dialogos, pp. 341-2, ‘Esta escritura de aquel tiempo no ha quedado en sus libros originales, para que los pudiessemos cotejar con las medallas y piedras; ... y los papeles o pergaminos o ceras donde sus palabras se escriuieron, las consumio el tiempo; las piedras y tablas de bronze y las medallas de plata o de cobre estan en pie y son estas mismas, y no sus traslados de traslados, antes los mismos originales de sus palabras.’

5 A. Agustín, Dialogos, p. 377, ‘Yo mas fe doi a las medallas y tablas y piedras, que a todo lo que escriuen los escritores.’

6 A. Agustín, Dialogos, p. 343, ‘Hai sin esto infinitos otros prouechos para entender muchas cosas que en libros estan faltas y escuras, como son los nombres y prenombrs y familias de los Romanos, las tribus, las legiones, los magistrados, los sacerdocios y sus ministros, los officios, el gouiero de las prouincias, el cargo de la gente de guerra, y muchas particularidades de los soldados, y otras cosas infinitas. Los exemplos destas cosas se veran en los libros de frai Onofrio Panuinio, y otros que se siruen de inscriciones para descubrir muchas cosas, con la quales se declaran los autores antiguos.’
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expounds the benefits of their use for orthography. In fact, the clearest evidence for Agustín’s attitude to inscriptions comes at the end of this passage from the notebook, rather than the printed Dialogos, when he concludes ‘et in somma sono li libri di marmo o rame, dove li altri sono di charta molto fallace.’ In the individual examples that Agustín subsequently considers in the Dialogos, his interest is primarily in the orthography of the inscriptions — the inscriptions he examines are all, he believes, from the Ciceronian period, reflecting the golden age of classical Latin — and he only refers occasionally to other information that can be derived from them.

Agustín’s focus on orthography when dealing with inscriptions, and his decision to spend more space discussing coins, reflect the practice of the period. As we have seen, an interest in inscriptions as records of spelling from the ancient world is reflected in manuscript collections, as well as in Aldo Manuzio the younger’s manual. The testimony of inscriptions was regularly cited in commentaries on classical texts written at this time, and of the possible uses of epigraphic testimony, this was the most widespread by far. Agustín’s division of his Dialogos mirrors the volume of contemporary scholarship on coins and inscriptions. As we shall see in chapter six, there were many more collectors of coins than inscriptions and more books were printed that dealt with them: as well as books illustrating coins, several manuals devoted to outlining their uses and explicating individual examples were published.

A contrast between the presentation of coins and inscriptions demonstrates an important point about their interpretation. The collections of material we surveyed in the last two chapters in general tend to present the inscriptions without any commentary, whereas, as we shall see, illustrations of coins were often accompanied by commentaries explaining the inscriptions, and especially the figurative details, on them. Scholars seem to have felt more comfortable with inscriptions, as they offered fewer problems of interpretation. The main

---

difficulties were abbreviations, which, as we saw in the introduction, had been explicated in various works before the period under examination here. That said, inscriptions could still provide problems, particularly when they included vocabulary that occurred infrequently in literary sources, or not at all. It is presumably with an eye to the explanation of individual problems that Scaliger suggested that Gruter contemplate adding commentaries to his collection of inscriptions. Particular inscriptions of interest did receive more extended discussions, but these tended not to be included in collections of inscriptions, but published separately: so, for example, Fulvio Orsini included his discussion of inscriptions dedicated by the Arval Brethren and an inscribed calendar (the *menologium Colotianum*, in the Farnese collection at Rome) with a selection of commentaries on literary texts.

The infrequency with which inscriptions turned up that did pose interpretative difficulties can be seen in the excitement with which the scholarly community greeted a dedication to ‘SEMONI SANCO DEO FIDIO’ discovered at Rome in July 1574. Orsini communicated details of this discovery to Vettori and Agustín outside Rome, as well as writing about it to Cardinal Guglielmo Sirleto in the city; we have Agustín’s reply to Orsini, and a letter from Carlo Sigonio to Gianvincenzo Pinelli discussing it; and an anonymous commentary appears in a Vatican manuscript, along with the discussion of Pedro Chacón that was printed posthumously in 1608. The problem this inscription posed was a delicate one: on its discovery, it had been identified with the dedication from a statue at Rome to Simon Magus mentioned by some of the church fathers, which featured the inscription ‘SIMONI DEO SANCTO’. This had aroused the interest of the

---

8 A. Agustín, Alveolus, p. 152 (from Madrid, Escorial MS S-II-18, fol. 596r).
9 J. Scaliger, Epistolae omnes, no. 413 p. 767; see above chapter 2, p. 75.
10 As well as the discussions of the inscriptions, Orsini’s *Notae* to Cato, Varro and Columella of 1587 also included Philargyrius’ notes to Vergil’s *Eclogues* and *Aeneid*, Orsini’s own comments on Servius’s scholia to Vergil, and Velius Longus’s *de Orthographia*.
11 CIL VI.567; the full text runs SEMONI/SANCO/ DEO FIDIO/ SACRVM/ SEX POMPEIVS SP F/ COL MVSSIANVS/ QVINQVENNALIS/ DECVR/ BIDENTALIS/ DONVM DEDIT.
12 See, respectively, P. De Nolhac, ‘Piero Vettori et Carlo Sigonio’, no. 21 p. 116 (22 September 1574 = London, BL MS Add. 10270, fol. 7); that Orsini wrote to Agustín is implied in the latter’s reply; BAV Reg. lat. 2023, fols. 399-400, undated; A. Agustín, Opera omnia, vii no. 46 pp. 256-7 (26 September 1574); C. Sigonio, Opera omnia, vi col.1029 (14 September 1574); BAV Vat. lat. 6040, fol. 17v; P. Chacón, *Opuscula*, sigs. [*3]*v-[*4]*v.
ecclesiastical authorities. In his letter to Vettori, Orsini refers to the interpretation of
‘questi nostri’, and Agustin replied to him mentioning ‘la interpretazione del Theologo’,
but the clearest indication is what Orsini wrote to Sirleto, who had been appointed the
Praefectus of the Congregation for the Index of Prohibited Books three years before.
Orsini seems to have responded to a request by Sirleto for information, beginning the
letter with ‘Mi son risoluto sopra l’iniscrittione antica, che à V.S.Ilma recito l’altro giorno il
S.or Abbate Posio[?].’ Using a variety of literary sources, including Livy, Varro, Festus
and Ovid, Orsini argues that the dedication is to Hercules, and that ‘sancus’ is the Sabine
word for this god, also known as Deus Fidius, and that ‘semo’ suggests that Hercules is a
non-Olympian god. He then adduces a coin with the head of Hercules, and the legend
DSS, which he interprets as Deus Sancus Sanctus, or Semon. The latter seems to be on the
suggestion of Agustin, who mentioned the coin, and that Gentile Delfini had thought the
abbreviation was for ‘Deo Semoni Sango’ — Orsini had argued earlier in his reply that the
sangus that appeared in some of his literary sources should be emended to sancus. That
Orsini adopted Agustin’s interpretation of the coin here suggests that he wrote to his
friends in order to answer a request from Sirleto. He may also have discussed it with his
fellow antiquarians at Rome. Certainly, in his interpretation Chacón quotes the same
sources as Orsini adduced, with a slightly different concluding detail: rather than suggest
that the inscription discovered at Rome had nothing to do with Simon Magus, Chacón
argued that Justin Martyr, lacking the necessary knowledge of Latin, saw the inscription at
Rome and mistranscribed it, assuming that it referred to Simon Magus.14

13 BAV Reg. lat. 2023, fol. 399r. The name of the man who read the inscription is not easily legible:
it seems to read ‘Posio’, for Antonio Posio O.F.M., a theologian at the Council of Trent and then
670-1 for references on this figure.
14 P. Chacón, Opuscula, sig. [*4]v, ‘Ceterum videant docti viri, an Iustinus Martyr, utpote externus,
& Latinae linguae non admodum peritus, ex ea inscriptione deceptus, in Apologia secunda ita
scribat: “[Simon Magus]... in hac urbe regia deus est habitus, & quasi deus honoratus statua posita in
Tiberi inter duos pontes cum hoc titulo Latino, SIMONI DEO SANCTO.” haec Iustinus, qui
existimasse videtur Semonem esse Simonem.’ In the Annales Ecclesiastici (vol.1, pp. 330-2, for 44
A.D.) Baronio had accepted that the inscription which was discovered was dedicated to Hercules,
but rejected absolutely the possibility that Justin had been deceived. Sigonio (Opera omnia, vi
col.1029) took a slightly different line from Orsini and Chacón, agreeing that the dedication was to
Hercules, but arguing that ‘sancus’, ‘sancus’ and ‘sangus’ were all the same word, and the variations
merely reflected pronunciation. Ercole Ciofani (In P. Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum libros observationes,
In the absence of many commentaries on inscriptions, we need to turn to treatises scholars wrote to see what sort of information they extracted from this sort of evidence. From looking at these, it is clear that the main use of inscriptions was as a means of confirming what was recorded in literary sources. They are most frequently cited at the end of the examination of a particular institution or place, as additional proof that it existed, rather than at the beginning as the starting point of the discussion. Within this explanatory system, however, their testimony was clearly valued. In 1572, Daniel Rogerius wrote to Ortelius asking for information for a work about the Romans in Britain, outlining his planned search for sources as follows: 'omniaque ex graecis et latinis, iisque antiquissimis authoribus haurienda sint, veritate nugis et mendaciis recentiorum fere abruta et deleta, ad quam eruendam, dici non potest, quantum lucis et numismata et aliae marmoreae inscriptiones attulerint.' Rogerius was going to examine literary sources first, but recognised that then coins and inscriptions could contribute considerably. We have already seen, and will consider in more detail in the next chapter, that Agustin wrote that Ligorio forged an inscription 'per vincer qualche contentione.' Later in the period, in his Admiranda of 1598, Lipsius cited an inscription as follows: 'Lapis vetus (quid contra eum dixerim?) affirmat...'. As well as confirming ancient accounts, inscriptions could also clarify or correct what they said. Most interestingly, they also supplied information not found elsewhere, as Agustin noted in his Dialogos, whether simply of the names of tribes and legions, or of offices giving some details of what they involved, or of achievements of individuals.

Probably the most common use of inscriptions was as support for topographical argument, especially for authors dealing with the city of Rome. Thus inscriptions on cippi dedicated by consuls of the time were used by Panvinio in the first part of his Reipublicae Romanae

---

15 J. Hessels, Epistulae ortelianae, no. 42, p. 102 (20 October 1572).
16 A. Agustin, Epistolario, no. 206, p. 298; see above, chapter 2, p. 83 and below chapter 5, p. 164.
17 J. Lipsius, Admiranda, p. 25. Lipsius was discussing the number of Praetorian cohorts at Rome, comparing Tacitus's testimony (Annals 4.5) that there were first nine, then more in the reign of Vitellius (Histories 2.93), with Dio's statement (55.24.6) that there were ten, and quoting an inscription (CIL V.7005) mentioning a man in the twelfth cohort who had been decorated by Claudius.
commentariorum libri, dealing with the ancient city, to confirm Tacitus's claim that Augustus extended the pomerium of the city. Knowledge of the exact place of the discovery of an inscription allowed Marliani to confirm an account in Suetonius that Domitian was born in a house near a place called 'Ad malum Punicum', belonging to Flavius Sabinus, as an inscription recording that his house was there was found on the spot. The importance of inscriptions as confirmation is shown by Orsini's use of a dedication to Cornelius Sulla including the words VICVS LAC FVND to illustrate a passage of Tacitus referring to this site. Marliani was also confident enough to correct an ancient source on the basis of inscribed information. On the basis of the inscription from the bottom of Trajan's column, which recorded that the monument was erected by the senate and people in his honour, he claimed that 'hunc titulum Dion non satis animadvertisse videtur', apparently because Dio wrote that Trajan himself put the column up.

More often, inscriptions could provide additional information to complement what was found in ancient accounts of the city. Pirro Ligorio, followed by Panvinio, was able to identify the site of the Praetorian camp, mentioned in ancient authors, as a spot previously known as the 'vivarium', since various lead pipes were dug up in the area featuring 'CASTR PRAET' or similar abbreviations. Panvinio located the aerarium, another building frequently recorded by classical writers, at the church of S. Salvatoris de Statera 'praeter omnium antiquariorum sententiam' because an inscription was found there.

---

18 O. Panvinio, Commentariorum libri, p. 33, introduced as follows: 'idem quoque confirmant antiqui lapides...'. He dated the consuls who made the dedication by the Fasti Capitolini. Later (p. 40) he cites an inscription of Claudius to confirm that he too did the same.

19 B. Marliani, Topographia 1544, p. 89.

20 Orsini wrote to Vettori with details of this inscription (CIL VI.1297) on 27 July 1574 (P. De Nolhac, 'Piero Vettori et Carlo Sigonio', no. 20 p. 116, citing London, BM, Add. MS 10270 fol. 31), saying it had been recently discovered, and connecting the abbreviation FVND with Varro's father-in-law, Gaius Fundanius, which he felt able to do because this man was 'quasi nelli medesimi tempi' as Cornelius Sulla. In his notes to Tacitus (A. Agustin, Fragmenta historicorum, p. 457), he simply wrote, 'Lacus Fundani sit mentio in antiqua apud me inscriptione, in Quirinali reperta eo loco, quo Dei Fidii, sive Sanci Sabinorum lingua, templum erat.'

21 B. Marliani, Topographia 1544, p. 93, citing CIL VI.960.

22 P. Ligorio, Delle antichità, pp. 77-8; O. Panvinio, Commentariorum libri, pp. 35-6.
recording its repair. Marliani argued that the 140 warehouses of the Roman people were between the Tiber and Monte Testaccio on the basis of an inscription found there. He was even prepared to state that a site uncovered in excavations under the temple of Concord was where public acts were recorded, citing an inscription that recorded a schola and various curatores who worked there. Scholars’ use of inscriptions to provide topographical information could also apply to the structure of individual buildings. Justus Lipsius, for example, when looking at amphitheatres, cited three inscriptions mentioning a ‘podium’ to prove that it was built on top of these structures’ walls. The reliance on inscribed evidence to assert the existence of particular places was more common outside Rome, where ancient literary sources were less likely to mention a variety of sites. A good example is the work on the ‘Arx Britannica’ undertaken by several northern European humanists, including the Laurin brothers, Abraham Ortelius and Hubert Goltz in the 1560s. Through examining an inscription on this structure, Guy Laurin was able to conclude that it was first built by Claudius, and hence that it was from here that he sailed to invade Britain.

As records of individuals’ careers, inscriptions provided information about the offices that they held, which could again confirm literary accounts or add to them. In the second part of his Commentariorum libri, Panvinio shifted his focus from the city of Rome to the empire, which led him to examine when certain offices originated. In the section on priesthoods, to confirm the existence of those recorded in literary sources he cites various inscriptions, usually at the end of the discussion. For some flamines, his only evidence is epigraphic. He later looks at civic magistrates, following the same procedure. Again,

---

21 O. Panvinio, Commentariorum libri, p. 181.
22 B. Marliani, Topographia 1544, p. 63.
23 B. Marliani, Topographia 1544, p. 29.
24 J. Lipsius, De amphitheatro, p. 42.
26 For example, for a mater flaminia (Commentariorum libri, p. 345), or a flamen martialis (Commentariorum libri, p. 346).
27 O. Panvinio, Commentariorum libri, p. 350, ‘Flaminem Virbialem deo Virbio, idest Hippolyto consecratum, nullus quod sciam antiquus scriptor commemorat. Eius ego mentionem extare vidi Romae in antiquo inscriptione...’. As Panvinio was finishing the work, Agustín wrote to him discussing the question of flamines and asking whether he could supply the names of the fifteen
such inscriptions were particularly valuable for historians trying to determine the offices and form of government of towns in the Roman empire. Guillaume Paradin, for example, in his history of Lyons published in 1573, wrote that 'Semblablement ilz y erigerent plusieurs grandz estatz & offices: dont se trouvent encorees des vestiges & brisees, par les inscriptions des pierres. Comme estoient ceulx, qui avoient toute la superintendence sus les marchans de la province Lyonnoise: lequel estoit nommé Summus Curator, qui se pourroit auiourd’huy dire vn Conservateur. Et de cestuy est faite mention en plusieurs inscriptions...'. Paradin went on to argue that the town had a senate of 60 members on the basis of an epitaph to a man described as 'primus de Ix'.

As well as information about individuals’ careers, inscribed epitaphs also gave their full names, from which general rules for the formation of names could be established. The work of Giuseppe Castiglione, a humanist at work in Rome at the end of the sixteenth century, reveals how widely inscriptions could be exploited in this work. Castiglione’s Variae lectiones include several works examining nomenclature, including essays on the praenomina of boys and women, how children take their parents’ names, as well as a discussion of the meaning of the term alumnus in a person’s title. In the essay on the

flamines which Festus mentioned existed. He was not sure whether two types evidenced in inscriptions were priesthoods in the city of Rome or from elsewhere (A. Agustín, Epistolario, no. 211 p. 313, 29 July 1558 = Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 133): ‘Un Virbiale et un Ligulare trovo in sassi, ma non ho authori da confirmarli, et potria esser che fossero Municipali’. Shortly afterwards, Agustín wrote discussing the question again in response to Panvinio’s reply, arguing that ‘Ligulare’ was a mistranscription of ‘Luculare’ (A. Agustín, Epistolario, no. 213 p. 315, 14 August 1558 = Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 135): ‘La parolla Ligulare credo sia venuta di varieta di scrittura nel copiar questa inscrittione. Tanto che questo Flamine sara municipale.’

Commentariorum libri, pp. 580-621; he ends this discussion detailing those offices attested in inscriptions (p. 617): ‘Hi omnes ut scribae, accensi, praecones, lictores, viatores uno nomine apparitores vocabantur sive statures quod apparerent et praeusto essent ad obsequium magistratum confundi tamen omnia haec nomine ex his inscriptionibus animadverti.’

G. Paradin, Memoires, pp. 11-12.

G. Paradin, Memoires, p. 12.

Castiglione (Latinised as Iosephus Castalio) is a relatively obscure figure, and has not merited an entry in the Dizionario biografico degli Italiani. He wrote commentaries on the inscription from the
praenomina of boys, Castiglione takes a different position to that of two earlier scholars, Francesco Robortello and Panvinio. In his essay, the 1548 *De cognominibus et appellationibus Imperatorum*, where he made little use of inscriptions as evidence, Robortello argued that boys did not receive a praenomen before they received the toga *virilis* as a mark of adulthood. Panvinio, who did cite considerably more inscriptions than Robortello, followed him on this question in his *De antiquis Romanorum nominibus* of 1558. Robortello had relied on the evidence of a treatise attributed to Valerius Maximus on names, which Castiglione claimed was a forgery, and in this he had the support of Aldo Manuzio the younger. Castiglione decided to reexamine the question relying on the testimony of inscriptions, from which he was able to prove that even those who had died before the age of 17 had received praenomina. After giving some literary testimony, the bulk of his proof consisted in printing 48 epitaphs to children from around Rome one after the other in his treatise. His approach to the problem is thus clearly different from that of his predecessors: as he wrote in the dedication to the work, 'Necessario autem faciendum mihi fuit ut nimius fortasse in antiquis inscriptionibus congerendis viderer. Nam et res per summos homines in dubium revocata multis erat testimoniis confirmanda...' In his treatment of women's praenomina, part of an essay on the correct way to write Vergil's name, Castiglione used the same form of evidence to argue that women did not have praenomina at all. Here, he is in accord with Robortello, and takes a position contrary to that of Robortello's rival Carlo Sigonio on the problem.

---

34 Robortello's essay appeared in his *De historica facultate*, Panvinio's in his *Fastorum libri V*.
35 G. Castiglione, *De antiquis puerorum praenominibus*, in *Variae lectiones*, separately paginated.
36 G. Castiglione, *De antiquis puerorum praenominibus*, in *Variae lectiones*, separately paginated, sig. A2r.
37 G. Castiglione, *De Vergili nominis scribendi recta ratione commentarius et adversus feminarum praenominum assertores disputatio*, in *Variae lectiones*, separately paginated. After citing various inscriptions, Castiglione concludes (p. 27) that 'nullum esse in tanta veterum monumentorum copia feminarum praenomina a nobis repertum, praeter Caiae, idque in duobus tantum lapidibus gentilicio nomini praefixum: quod tamen ipsum omnium mulierum commune fuisse dixeram.'
38 Sigonio's treatise on names, the *De nominibus Romanorum*, was printed in the second edition of his *Fasti* in 1555. It includes several attacks on Robortello. See W. McCuaig. *Carlo Sigonio*, p. 29 with n. 79.
When he tried to explain the term *alumnus* in a legal text, Castiglione turned to the same source material, alongside literary evidence, to make his point. Castiglione's main target was the medieval glossator Accursius, who had not defined the term consistently, arguing at one point that *alumnus* was equivalent to the *filius* of a concubina, and elsewhere that an *alumnus* was someone who feeds, as well as someone who is fed. Castiglione believed the last of these was correct, arguing from literary testimony that the word was used of slaves. He then turned to various inscriptions to see what happened when an *alumnus* was freed.

He quoted an inscription of a Marcus Livius Secundio that showed that this man was a freedman of Augustus, an *accensus* (attendant) of Drusus, and an *alumnus*, and hence had retained his title. He had been taken by Drusus as his attendant before being manumitted by Drusus's father Augustus. Castiglione also looked at the case of *vernae*, slaves born in their masters' houses, who were raised separately from other slaves. He argued that the title of *verna* could similarly be retained, so that it was not necessarily indicative of slave status. To prove this, he cited various inscriptions. One of these was a dedication to a *verna* who was an *Augustalis* and had a *gens* name, which Castiglione claimed showed that he could not have been a slave; in another case, he suggested, it was not clear whether the dedicatee, a *verna* named Euhemeros, was a slave or a freedman: his nomenclature suggested the former, but the dedication was placed by his mother, who had a *gens* name.

---


... Secundionem servum Drusus Caesar, Ti. Augusti filius, sibi educaverat eundemque postea manumissionem Ti. August. patre, libertumque Augusti dicitum, Accensum esse suum voluit.'


Libertum fuisse Augustalem, non autem servum intelligo, quem Satriae gentis nomine, ex Numerii praenomine auctum video. N Numerium significat.'


Libertum potius puto, cuibus mater ex gentilicio nomine libera cognoscitur, quique tum matris commendatione, tum suis meritis facile libertatem ab indulgentissimo Principe impetrare potuit.'
In this example, Castiglione extended his knowledge of names to examine Roman legal texts, using inscriptions as his evidence.

Attention to the names in Roman inscriptions could also reveal genealogical details not revealed by ancient literary historians, particularly about members of the Roman imperial family. Writing to Onofrio Panvinio in 1557, Antonio Agustín drew his attention to two inscriptions, one featuring the mother of the emperor Nerva, and one fragmentary example dedicated to Paulina, who, he suggested on the basis of the inscription, was the sister of Hadrian.42 Earlier in the same letter, Agustín dealt with a thornier problem of another member of the imperial family. Panvinio had written that Matidia had the title 'diva', and that she was the niece and Marciana the sister of Trajan. Agustín cited two inscriptions in reply, one from between Capua and Minturnae which read 'Matidiae Aug. Fil. Divae Marcianae Aug. nepti Divae Sabinæ Aug. Sorori Imp. Antonini Aug. Pii P.P. materterae Minturnenses' and one from Capua to 'Matidiae Aug. Fil. Divae Sabinæ sorori. Imp. Antonini Aug. Pii P.P. materterae Invessani'.43 These inscriptions showed that Matidia did not have the title 'diva'. They created more problems than they answered regarding her descent, but did indicate that she was the daughter rather than the niece of someone with the title 'Augustus'. Agustín acknowledged that they 'hanno qualche difficoltà et contraditione, se non le salvamo con adottioni.'44

Members of the imperial family were not the only individuals for whom inscriptions could supply genealogical details. The most significant epigraphic find of the sixteenth century was the mass of inscribed fragments of the Fasti from the Forum at Rome, and I will deal in more detail with scholars' response to these in the next chapter. These fragments supplied names from two lists, one of Roman consuls along with some other magistrates

43 CIL X.4744 and X.3833.
44 A. Agustín, Epistolario, no. 177 pp. 256-7 (5 June 1557; see n. 42 above for date).
up to the time of Tiberius, and the other of those who had received triumphs. These lists
gave full names, and hence details of the immediate family, of the individuals recorded.
Agustín wrote to Orsini asking him to check a newly-found fragment of the triumphal
Fasti in 1566, because he had noticed a discrepancy in one individual's name from that in
others' records. According to his transcription, the inscription included L. CAECILIVS L F Q N DELMATICVS, and hence son of Lucius: another inscription, the so-called
sententia Minuciorum from Genoa, recorded that he was Q F (son of Quintus), as did 'tutti
l'autori'. Similarly, Agustín showed Orsini that the father of Julius Caesar the dictator
was not the Julius Caesar, son of Lucius, attested in an inscription from Rome, as the
dictator was called C F (son of Gaius) C N (nepad, grandson of Gaius) in the Fasti.

Equally important was the chronological information that the Fasti supplied, which gave a
considerable impetus to the study of Republican history in this period. Other inscriptions
could provide similar details for the imperial period. One discovery was that of the
fragments detailing the members and activity of a priesthood, the fratres Arvales at Rome.
Some fragments were known earlier in the sixteenth century, but it was the discovery of
several together in 1570 that allowed scholars to appreciate the potential benefits of the
series. As Agustín wrote to Geronimo Zurita, 'parecen todos una cosa continuada como en
historia, de las veces que sacrificaron, y por qual ocasion.' Fulvio Orsini managed to
acquire the material found in 1570, and it was he who edited 19 fragments with a
commentary in 1587. Orsini's notes here are not very revealing — he writes rather
dissmissively that 'non est consilium singula fragmenta supplere; praesertim cum ex

---

44 A. Agustín, Opera omnia, vii no. 31 p. 247 (6 August 1566).
45 A. Agustín, Opera omnia, vii no. 10 p. 237 (13 May 1559). Agustín was discussing the elogium to a
C. IVLIVS L.F. CAESAR STRABO [CIL VI.1310]. He repeated his point to Orsini later after the
latter's edition of Caesar had appeared (A. Agustín, Opera omnia, vii no. 36 p. 249, 23 August 1572),
'due cose mi danno noja, l'una che nel principio li fragmenti di C. IVLIO L F CAESARE
STRABONE si confunden con quelli del Dittatore...'. Agustín repeated the point in his Dialogos
(p. 384), dealing with the inscription, pointing out that Cicero mentions this Julius Caesar Strabo
and distinguishes him from Caesar's father.
46 See W. McCuaig, 'The Fasti Capitolini'.
47 A. Agustín, Opera omnia, vii p. 207 (12 February 1571).
48 On the first discovery of the fragments, see now the introduction to J. Scheid, Commentarii
fratrum arvalium qui supersunt. Details of the fragments in Orsini's collection are in P. De Nolhac,
'Les collections d'antiquités de Fulvio Orsini', pp. 180-1.
collatione similium locorum possit unusquisque sibi ea nullo negotio concinnare — but
the inscriptions provided useful confirmatory material for the text of Suetonius, to which
Orsini wrote notes: he was able to connect a reference to the conspiracy of Lepidus and
Gaetulicus in the life of Claudius with a fragment which he says suggests that the *fratres
Arvales* sacrificed after its detection, and he confirms Suetonius’s account that Nero had
great honours decreed to his father with another reference to a sacrifice. A more simple
example of inscriptions providing chronological confirmation can be seen in Castiglione’s
use of epigraphic evidence to confirm the testimony of literary evidence as he tried to
determine the length of a *lustrum*, a word that came to denote a period of several years,
used in literary sources. Dio wrote that Augustus took the ‘reipublicae constituendae
potestas’ for five years, then five years again, and then ten years. Inscriptions, one
mentioning CAESARVM/ DECENNALIA, show that these ten year periods were the
norm for emperors in their calculations; and Castiglione argued therefore that it was
imperial practice to work in five year segments which were called *lustra*.

This survey has given some idea of the areas in which inscriptions were employed as
historical evidence: for topography, especially at Rome; to provide details of offices held
and administrative systems; for details of nomenclature, which could be applied for
example to illuminate legal texts; to establish genealogical relations; and to confirm
chronological sequences. Outlining the range of uses in this way helps to show the variety
of scholars working with inscriptions in the period, and their importance to research on
the ancient world. In particular, scholars’ work on the Fasti and the fragmentary records of

51 In A. Agustin, *Fragmenta historicorum*, p. 484, dealing with Suetonius’s ‘Cum vero detecta esset
Lepidi & Gaetulici coniuratio’ (Claudius, ch. 9), ‘Ad hunc locum pertinet fragmentum Lapidis
Fratrum Arvalium, in quo est: .. A. D. VI. K. NOVEMB./ ..OB DETECTA NEFARIA. CO.../
..VM. CN. LENTVL. GAE... Apparet autem ex his reliquis, Fratres Arvales, ob detecta nefaria
consilia Cn. Lentuli Gaetulici in Claudium, immolasse hostias alicui Deo, cuius nomen in eo lapide
incisum erat.’
52 In A. Agustin, *Fragmenta historicorum*, p. 487, dealing with Suetonius’s ‘Memoriae Domitii patris
honores maximos habuit’ (Nero, ch. 9), ‘Cuiusmodi honores expressi sunt in fragmento lapidis
Fratrum Arvalium, in quo ita incissum est:
...IDVS DECEMB/ ... M. ARVALIVM NOMINE IMMOLAVI IN SACRA VIA/ ... MORIAE.
CN. DOMITI AHENOBARBI. B. M.’
53 G. Castiglione, *Variae lectiones*, pp. 41-3, citing *CIL* VI.1203 = 31261.
the fratres Arvales demonstrated the importance of combining individual pieces to construct a series. Most of the uses had already been recognised, however, if not exploited, by pioneers in epigraphic research such as Alciato and Valeriano whom we surveyed in the introduction. While comparing the practice of Castiglione with Robortello shows that the former was more confident in his citation of epigraphic evidence, it does not reveal the increasing sophistication with which inscriptions were cited. This I shall attempt to demonstrate now, by comparing a work written towards the beginning of the period under review, Wolfgang Lazius’s *Commentariorum Rei publicae Romanae libri* of 1551, with one from the end, Marcus Welser’s *Rerum Augustanarum Vindelicarum commentarii* of 1594. Although the scope of their two works is different — a large part of Lazius’s work deals more generally with the administration of provinces, the army, games and religion — both writers are interested in the history of areas north of the Alps under Roman dominion, colonies in the ancient provinces of Pannonia and Noricum in Lazius’s case, and more particularly the colony of Augusta Vindelicorum (Augsburg) and its surroundings in Welser’s. Beyond the city of Rome and her hinterland, these areas were not covered with any degree of comprehensiveness by ancient literary sources, and so both scholars were forced to turn to material evidence for details of the areas in the Roman period.

Although his work was published in 1551, Lazius does not seem to have been privy to the researches undertaken by men at Rome in the 1540s, when, as we saw, scholars became increasingly interested in the classification and representation of inscriptions. Lazius was born in 1514, and received a doctorate in medicine at Ingolstadt, where both Apianus and Amantius were professors. Although he practised privately in Vienna, medicine was only one of his interests: he also began work on the history of the city itself, and in 1546 published a work on the subject, the *Vienna Austriae*, that led to his appointment as court historian by Ferdinand I. It was in research for this work that he started to travel round various libraries and archives in the region collecting material, and he went on three further separate expeditions to gather more, in 1548, 1549 and 1551. Lazius’s interests

---

34 On Lazius, see E. Trenkler, ‘Wolfgang Lazius, Humanist und Büchersammler’, and H. Louthan, *The Quest for Compromise*, pp. 27-42 and 67-9. Trenkler estimates that Lazius donated 90 manuscripts to the Imperial Library on his death, the products of his expeditions to collect material. A printed catalogue by Lazius, the *Tituli ac catalogi*, dated by Trenkler (p. 194 n. 17) to around 1551, gives some idea of his haul, mainly medieval chronicles, salvaged from monasteries. Louthan (p. 30) stresses the difference between Lazius, ‘a solid, upstanding burgher of Vienna’ and Jacopo
therefore seem more focussed on the region than the ancient world as a whole, and when he wrote his *Commentarii*, the structure of the work, in which he discusses the features of the Roman empire before looking at evidence for colonies in the particular area in which he is interested, seems designed to suggest to the reader how the empire functioned in those colonies. The sequel to the work, the *De gentium aliquot migrationibus*, published in 1557, examines the later history of the region, and Lazius left unfinished on his death a history of Austria more narrowly defined, from the Roman period to the present.55

Although Lazius was based in a city that was yet to become a centre of humanist scholarship, his work is by no means simplistic. His acknowledgements and references to predecessors show that he was well read in some recent scholarship, including the work of Alciato and Johannes Aventinus (Johann Turmair), who had written a history of Bavaria. He owed a particular debt, he recognised, to the approach of Beatus Rhenanus, whose *Rerum Germanicarum libri* had been printed in 1531. Perhaps the most impressive historical feature of his *Commentarii* is the fact that he repeatedly stresses change in what he describes over time. As he writes in the introduction, he distinguished his sources according to the periods they described, which allowed him to understand that the Roman empire and its offices did not remain constant, and that officers fulfilling similar functions had different titles at different times.56 Not surprisingly, he was not content merely to recycle details from ancient literary accounts but searched more widely for sources, among

---

Strada, as portrayed by Titian, 'a sophisticated antiquarian belonging to a select international circle of humanist scholars.' When he arrived in Vienna, Strada brought with him knowledge of antiquarian research on the Italian peninsula which Lazius would not otherwise have known, and, as we saw in the first chapter, a rivalry soon rose up between the two.

55 See M. Mayr, *Wolfgang Lazius*.

56 W. Lazius, *Commentarii*, pp. 13-15, 'Qua quidem comparatione inter se habita temporum atque aetatum, qua quisque autorum scripsisset, hoc est, ante Imperium, ut Polybius, Salustius, Livius, incipiente Imperio, florente, & declinante: factum est tandem, ut non eandem semper faciem Romanae Reipub. fuisse deprehenderimus. ... [he goes on to give examples] Ex quibus sane extricare se nemo poterit, qui non illos Imperii gradus atque aetates pressius considerarit. Per quas rursus & magistratum nomina variabant. Notum est enim, incipiente Imperio, provinciis non nisi ex senatorio ordine praeuisse proconsules, praetores, praepostraores, quaestores, & legatos: quum inclinante ipso, equestres etiam praefecti fuerint, aliaque a supradictis nomina usurparint, consularium, correctorum, praepositorum, praesidium, tribunorum, ducum, & comitum. Quorum neque habitus idem omnibus temporibus fuit... '.
which were ancient inscriptions. Lazius makes widespread use of this form of evidence. Epigraphic research was well-established in southern Germany, with the publications of Huttich and Peutinger before the corpus of the Ingolstadt professors Apianus and Amantius, and Lazius collected inscriptions to adorn his house in Vienna, including several pieces from the ruins of Carnuntum. Later in his life, he wrote notes to a collection of inscriptions made by a Viennese dignitary, Hermes Schallauczer. In citing inscriptions regularly, he marks a considerable advance on the work of his model Rhenanus, who, while he did quote epigraphic material, did so rarely.

Lazius clearly thought that his use of epigraphic material was important. In the introduction, he wrote that one of the uses of his work would be as a guide to interpreting inscriptions. In the text he sometimes explains abbreviations. When discussing the votorum nuncupatio, a rite undertaken by a magistrate before going out to a province, he wrote that the abbreviation V.S.L.L.M. found in inscriptions refers to this practice, which he interprets as 'votum solvit, locum legit memoriae'. Here he demonstrates his distance from contemporary epigraphic scholars, who interpreted the abbreviation as 'votum solvit, laetus libens merito'. In other cases, he does not spell out the interpretation he makes of an abbreviation, but this interpretation forms the key to his citation. For example, when discussing the office of quaestor castrensis, he writes (rather confusingly), 'Denique ad quaestorem castrensem alludit & illa Antiquitatis inscriptio, quae in Hungaria prope Budam extat: IVL. ATHENI. LIBERTO ET HEREDI IVLIA. CRESCENTIS Q.S. LEG.

---


58 E. Trenkler, 'Wolfgang Lazius, Humanist und Büchersammler', p. 192. The work, which I have not seen, was Exempla aliquot S. vetustatis Rom. in saxis quibusdam, opera... Hermetis Schallauczeri... cum interpretatione Wolfgangi Lazii (Vienna: Raphael Hofhalter, 1560).

59 For example, he gives an inscription from Dacia to demonstrate that Trajan established a colony there (Rerum Germanicarum libri, p. 69, quoting CIL III.1443). See J. D’Amico, Theory and Practice, pp. 191-2. Rhenanus’s own epigraphic manuscripts are surveyed in F. Fuchs, Beatus Rhenanus als Inschriftensammler’.

60 W. Lazius, Commentarii, p. 12, ‘...altera Commentariorum nostrorum utilitas apparent, ad interpretationem videlicet epitaphiorum Rom. ut exampli gratia, ubi incisae hae fuerint literae, H.S.E. STIP. XVI.’

61 W. Lazius, Commentarii, p. 214.
X GEM. He collected details of material he cites himself, as well as using other printed material and the testimony of others. His list of epigraphic sources at the end of the work includes the works of Apianus and Amantius, Peutinger, ‘Monumentorum inscriptiones per ditionem Austriacam repertae per Lazium; Monumenta Transylvaniae a Verbero & Vranto collecta’ and ‘Inscriptiones Veronensis civitatis’ (probably a reference to Torello Sarayna’s 1540 De origine et amplitudine civitatis Veronae). As well as these sources, he occasionally introduces inscriptions in the text with ‘Romaenuper a cardinale Farnesio erutum’. These are references to extracts from the Capitoline Fasti, which suggests that he had at least some access to contemporary epigraphic research on the Italian peninsula, probably Marliani’s 1549 printed edition of the fragments, but Lazius does not indicate his source for this material. In general, he does not always distinguish between the various sources of epigraphic information listed at the end of the work, and so it is not clear which of his inscriptions come from autopsy and which do not. He seems not to have questioned the accuracy of his sources: for example, he accepts an inscription (presumably from Apianus and Amantius) recording where Caesar crossed the Rubicon, which Agustín was to dismiss as a forgery. Later scholars complained about inaccuracy: Clusius, for example, wrote to Lipsius, ‘Non credas, quam turpiter Lazius interdum sit lapsus.

Lazius’s main use of inscriptions was to confirm accounts in literary sources, and he reminds his readers regularly of this, with phrases like ‘Caeterum quia nobis consuetudo est, omnia non solum locis authorum, verum etiam monumentis Vetustatis confirmare, placet ... inscriptionem adferre’ and ‘Sed iam Vetustatis inscriptionibus, quod proponimus, confirmabimus, ut consuetudo nostra in hocce Opere ubique est.’ In his systematic accounts of Roman institutions, inscriptions are frequently cited at the end of treatments of particular features, to back up the evidence of literary sources. Lazius is not, however, afraid to accept the testimony of inscriptions alone where he cannot find mention of a particular feature elsewhere. For example, he is quite happy to add the following to his list of types of proconsul: ‘Proconsulatus Cypri, cuius quidem in nullo authore historiarum

---

62 W. Lazius, Commentarii, p. 494.
63 W. Lazius, Commentarii, p. [1321].
64 E.g., W. Lazius, Commentarii, p. 222.
66 ILE 88 03 26, iii p. 90.
67 W. Lazius, Commentarii, pp. 234 and 585.
novimus nos mentionem legisse, excepta hac sola vetustatis inscriptione, quae Salonae in Dalmatia est eruta, in arca quadam lapidea,' before citing the inscription.\textsuperscript{64}

As these examples suggest, the majority of inscriptions quoted simply demonstrate the existence of a particular office or \textit{colonia}. On some occasions, Lazius did pay more attention to the content of the inscription. For example, he concludes that for emperors, the position of praetorian prefect was more distinguished than that of consul, proconsul, or holding \textit{tribunicia potestas} as he has a record of one inscription from Dacia in which only that office is mentioned, one where it appears with the consulate, and one with the consulate and \textit{tribunicia potestas}.\textsuperscript{65} Elsewhere, he points out that two of the people celebrated as \textit{duumviri} (local magistrates) in the inscriptions he cites are women, and so they must have been eligible for this office.\textsuperscript{66} His testimony for the variety of types of \textit{quattuorviri} is entirely epigraphic, and he outlines their various responsibilities as recorded in the inscriptions.\textsuperscript{67} Only rarely does he come to a more substantive conclusion from the contents of an inscription. When discussing soldiers' privileges, he argues that their

\textsuperscript{64} W. Lazius, \textit{Commentarii}, p. 228.

\textsuperscript{65} W. Lazius, \textit{Commentarii}, p. 132, 'Denique ut nihil deesse videatur ad splendorem & magnificentiam Praefecti praetorio declarandam, invenio hunc ipsum titulum Augustos perinde ut Consulis, Proconsulis, Tribunitiaeque potestatis usurpasse. Id quod pius lector ex hisce inscriptionibus Vetustatis, apud Transylvanos intra fines Veteris Daciae inventis, deprehendet, quas fidei ergo subiecimus. In quibus P. P. Praefectum praetorio insinuat.' He then cites three inscriptions.

\textsuperscript{66} W. Lazius, \textit{Commentarii}, p. 355, where he comments after quoting the inscriptions, 'Ex quibus apparat, Duumvirorum & nomenclaturam & dignitatem sexui femineo communem extitisse: quod huius munere autoritatem cum primis declarat.'

\textsuperscript{67} W. Lazius, \textit{Commentarii}, p. 379, 'Quatuorvlororum magistratum extitisse Romanis, a numero eorum qui in huissmodi collegio erant, inscriptiones passim Antiquitatis demonstrant. In quibus nunc iuris dicundi quatuorviri, nunc viarum curandarum, nunc aedilitii, nunc rursus Quinquennales & Flaminales, & postremo adiutores provinciae, leguntur expressi: ut credendum sit, iuris dicendi iudices fuisset ex decurionibus ad rem transigendam selectos: reliquos vias curasse, & domos. Atque ex hist quosdam ad quinquennium prorogatos, alios flaminum collegio adfuisse, & provincias administrasse, vel in administrando atque republica regenda adiutores passim praesidibus adiectos, & ob id Adiutores dictos, his expressos literis scilicet ADI. Sed placet fidei ergo rhapsodias illius Antiquitatis subiicere.' He goes on to quote 12 inscriptions.
immunity from taxes extended to veterans on the basis of an inscription recording a decision of Marcus Aurelius, with no supporting literary evidence.22

Lazius was also sensitive to the importance of combining knowledge of the find-spot with the contents of the inscription. Most simply, he shows that the legio XXII Germanica was located between Heidelberg and Mainz because he found ‘innumera monumenta’ there with the name of the legion.23 He argues that the legio XIII Germanica was the same as the legio XIII Dacica: Germanica was the legion’s first cognomen, but it was moved to Dacia by Trajan after the defeat of Decebalus, as various inscriptions discovered in the region show. Due to its being stationed in the province, it acquired a new cognomen, Dacica.24 He cites evidence in a similar fashion when examining coloniae, to prove that a town mentioned in the ancient authors was where he said it was. Here, he is prepared to combine material evidence with post-classical literary texts. He found no record of Sicambria, he writes, in any ‘historicus’ or ‘geographus’, but only in an annalistic record of the victory of Attila the Hun over the Romans. Ruins exist near the city of Buda, on the site where this victory was supposed to have taken place, with inscriptions, one of which records that members of a legion built a settlement there. Lazius suggests that the town was built in the late empire, on the ruins of an older settlement.25

---

22 W. Lazius, Commentarii, p. 441, ‘Sic denique milites non solum qui castra sequebantur, verum veteranos etiam ab omnibus vectigalibus immunes fuisse, coarguit ista Antiquitatis inscriptio.’
23 W. Lazius, Commentarii, p. 696, ‘Equidem dubium nullum est, hanc [legionem] in Germania praesidium agitasse, eo loco, ubi hodie ab Haidelberga Moguntiacum via instituitur, ut eo tractu reperta innumera testantur monumenta, quorum rhapsodias aliquot subiecii.’
24 W. Lazius, Commentarii, pp. 678-80.
25 W. Lazius, Commentarii, pp. 1123-4, ‘Tametsi hoc nomen in nullo (quod equidem sciam) aut Geographo aut historico extet, est tamen obiter in annalibus Hungariae animadversum, cum Athiae Hunnorum regis victoriam adversus Romanos enarrant... Caeterum supersunt adhuc veteris Budae, ubi Sicambrium fuisse dictum est, vestigia, haud procul a nova Buda, e regione insulae divae Margarethae. Non enim solum inscriptiones istihic Romanae innumerae (quia magna sunt ex parte novam Budam transvactae) edificiurumque ruinae supersunt: sed pagus adhuc proximus, vetus nomen Sicambriae retinuit, tametsi barbare Schambry Hungari appellent, & monumentum eo loco cum tali est inscriptione erutum:

**LEGIO SICAMBRIORVM HIC PRAESIDIO COLLOCATA CIVITATEM AEDIFICAVERVT, QVAM EX SVO NOMINE SICAMBRIAM VOCAVERVT [CIL III.183*, in fact a forgery from Apianus and Amantius]**
Lazius's *Commentarii* were an impressive work of scholarship, and included a huge quantity of well-ordered evidence for the working of the Roman empire. They seem to have been recognised as such: they are referred to by other scholars, and the Wechel publishing house in Frankfurt thought it worthwhile to print a second edition after Lazius's death, in 1598. Combining the contents of the printed sources available to him, along with examples seen by himself and his friends, Lazius had a large number of inscriptions at his disposal. The frequency with which he cites them in his work shows that he believed that they were an important form of evidence for the type of research that he was undertaking. Most of the time, he cites them to demonstrate the existence of a particular feature, although he points out when an inscription contains details not found elsewhere. Notably, he does not in general try to date those he cites; nor does he question his sources of information, as we saw scholars doing in the last chapter. In addition, while he compares literary accounts of a particular event or feature, he does not compare inscriptions. Welser's account of the early history of Augsburg from near the end of the century, demonstrates how these techniques benefit a historical reconstruction.

While Lazius was educated relatively near his birthplace, north of the Alps, Marcus Welser received an elite humanist training. He was born in 1558 into a prominent banking family in Augsburg, but was sent to read law in Padua at the age of ten, and also visited Paris before travelling to Rome to study with Marc-Antoine Muret between 1575 and 1578. He worked in Venice before returning by 1584 to his native city, where he became a notable civic dignitary as well as starting a publishing house, before dying in 1614. While in Italy, Welser established contacts that allowed him to play an important part in the burgeoning republic of letters, and during his life he was in epistolary contact with scholars such as Scaliger, Casaubon, and Lipsius. Through this network and his own interest in printing he was kept well up to date with scholarly developments. He had a particular interest in inscriptions: he collected examples from Augsburg, the surrounding area, as well

---

Ex qua inscriptione liquet, Sicambriam, inclinante iam Romanorum imperio, forte sub Valentiniano secundo fuisse conditam, ut ego reor, in ruinis veteris municipii, vel prope illud quod Herculiam, vel castra ad Herculem Antoninus appellat...'

76 On Welser's life and scholarship, see B. Roeck, 'Geschichte, Finsternis und Unkultur'.

77 See R. Evans, 'Rantzau and Welser'.

78 See J. Papy, 'Lipsius and Marcus Welser'. Some of Welser's letters are edited in his *Opera omnia*. 
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as inscriptions from elsewhere that made mention of the city, and wrote commentaries to them. Aldo Manuzio the younger (presumably a friend made during his time in Italy) printed the inscriptions and commentary as the *Inscriptiones antiquae Augustae Vindelicorum* in 1590. Welser went on to be an important contributor to the Gruter's corpus of inscriptions.

Given this interest in inscriptions, it is not surprising that Welser tries to exploit them as evidence for his *Rerum Augustanarum Vindelicarum commentarii*. The work examines the general area of Raetia and Vindelicia and the earliest inhabitants, before looking at the establishment of the colony of Augusta Vindelicorum and the rites followed, and then giving a chronological account of the colony's development up to its conquest by the Franks in 552. Welser is anxious to stick to his theme, apologising at the end of one book for quoting a coin which simply links an emperor to the area, but claiming that he has tried to gather all the available evidence relating to Augsburg, and that a fuller chronological account of the deeds of various emperors would not be relevant to his theme.\(^7\) He is keen to demonstrate the documentary support he has for his arguments, and includes a series of appendices, first editing textual sources referred to in his narrative, including extracts from the Antonine Itineraries and the *Notitia Dignitatum*, a fragment attributed to Velleius Paterculus which Lazius had claimed to have found, a 'libellus provinciarum Romanarum', and material relating to St Afra.\(^8\) He then reedits the *Inscriptiones antiquae Augustae Vindelicorum* and includes cross-references in the commentaries to where he discussed particular inscriptions in the narrative text. Welser thus provides both his interpretation and the sources on which he bases it.\(^9\) In the case of the inscriptions, his extra analysis in the commentary both explains any difficulties in their

\(^7\) M. Welser, *Commentarii*, p. 110, 'Video ieiunam & sterilem hanc scriptionem plerumque videri posse, multorum Imperatorum nudis propemodum ascriptis nominibus, sed eius in nobis culpa nulla residi: cum de Augustanis Raeticisque rebus plura quae proderemus non essent, neque profecto erat cur de cetero copiosi haberii vellenus; Cui enim bono Caesarum historiam, qua ad res nostras nihil pertinent, inani ostentatione exequeremur?'.

\(^8\) Welser was deeply suspicious of this fragment: he wrote to Joachim Camerarius (*Opera omnia*, no. 36 p. 840, 29 November 1590) that '...totum fragmentum antea non multa secula confictum esse, ne persuadear, certa argumenta obstant.'

\(^9\) B. Roeck, 'Geschichte, Finsternis und Unkulur', pp. 133-6 stresses the importance of the documentary aspect of Welser's history. M. Vökel, 'Marcus Welser und die Augsburger Baukunst' looks at the value of the *Commentarii* as a source for buildings in the city.
content and helps to show why he has used them in his narrative. As we saw in the last chapter, the presentation of the inscriptions in this edition of the Inscriptiones antiquae shows Welser’s attentiveness to current practice: as well as demonstrating breaks in the stone and gaps in the text where he could not read words, he records his supplements in italics, and engraved illustrations show more unusual scripts.

Although he does not give a list of sources for the inscriptions he quotes at the end of the work, Welser provides annotations, printed in the margin, which indicate his printed sources for epigraphic material quoted in the text that does not come from Augsburg. These annotations reveal that he was familiar with much antiquarian scholarship, including, among others, Smet’s collection, Panvinio’s Commentariorum libri and the inscriptions included by Adolph Occo in his Imp. Romanorum Numismata of 1579. He does not accept their evidence, however, without question. In the text, he refers to a coin given by Goltz in his Thesaurus, but notes that ‘aliéna fide scribo’, indicating that he does not wholeheartedly endorse its testimony. At the end of the collection of inscriptions, we see more clearly his reasons for expressing scepticism about this coin, when he examines certain features which Goltz and Panvinio claim are attested in coins and inscriptions. Welser introduces this material by saying that his general policy is to try to confirm their material with evidence from elsewhere, as he believes that these two scholars did not always record exactly what was on the object, but tried to restore it or explain it according to their own ideas. He then examines individual examples, to show how they disagree with other sources, or supply information that is surprising in another way.

Like Lazius, Welser uses inscriptions simply to demonstrate the existence of a particular feature in Augsburg. Inscriptions mentioning a NEGOTIATOR or with the abbreviation NEGOT. demonstrate that there was a collegium of negotiatores; another inscriptions

---

82 E.g., M. Welser, Commentarii, pp. 188-9, with the comment ‘Litterarum informis species, quam proxime ad lapidis fidel exercendam curavimus, a non optimo seculo est.’
83 M. Welser, Commentarii, p. 234, ‘Sed praemoneo, ut neutrius fidel accuso; ita cum quid ex istis frustulis producitur cuius aliunde auctoritas non constat, assensum consuevi sustinere, quippe qui perspectum habeam , cum Panvinium tum Golzium, litteras non semper ad marmoris exemplar reddidisse, sed supplesse interdum, & explicasse ex ingenio verba contractius per compendium scripta. Cui instituto si tantillum audaciae accedat, magno antiquae puritatis periculo fiat necesse est.’
suggests that within this, there were at least two different types. When examining the roles performed by various officers attested in inscriptions, he is happy to use analogies from other colonies to explain them. He argues that quaestors held office for a year, and were in charge of the public purse on the basis of evidence from elsewhere. When looking at the decurions of the colony, he considers various methods by which they could have been selected: by censors, as Pliny the younger describes at one point; by members of the order itself, as one inscription from Siena has it; or by decurions, *augustales*, and the plebs, as attested in an inscription from Suessa. When giving examples of the decisions made, he argues that just as SC appeared in inscriptions to record decisions of the Roman senate, so DD, for 'decurionum decreta', fulfilled a similar purpose in Augsburg.

Also like Lazius, Welser exploited the topographical information that knowledge of an inscription's find-spot could offer. When discussing the site of the first colony, and trying to demonstrate that it is the same as that of the Augsburg he lived in, Welser quoted what accounts of St Afra had to say about the site, before introducing the evidence of milestones

---

44 M. Welser, *Commentarii*, p. 84, 'Negotiatorum certe collegium aliquod extitisse credibile, nisi eos in multa collegia divisos credibilius; Meminere lapides nostri negotiatorum aliquoties, MVNICIPI. AEL. AVG. NEGOTIATOR. [CIL III.5800] quantumvis huius nomen vetustate evanuit, FLABIA. CVNANIO. SERENO. NEGOT. item VICTORio. VICTORiANO. neGOTIATORI. Aug. (III.5833) In duobus negotiorum genus expressum, IVL. VICTOR. NEGOTIATORI. QVONDAM. VESTIARIO. (III.5816) TIB. CLEVPHAS. IIIIII. VIR. AVG. NEGOTIATOR. ARTIS. PVRPVRARIAE. (III.5824) In the third example, Welser confidently restores the inscription, and demonstrates where he has done so.


46 M. Welser, *Commentarii*, p. 75, '[decuriones] vacantibus ... locis allecti vel a Censoribus, quod minoris Plinii auctoritate afferro, vel ab ordine ipso, uti lapis antiquus habet, HVIC. ORDO. SENIENSIVM. ORNAMENT. DECVR. PRIMO. DECREVIT. [CIL III.3017] siquidem Decurionum ornamenta decernere ad eos qui legerent pertinuit: vel a Decurionibus, Augustalibus, & Plebe, sic est in Suessana inscriptione, HONOREM. DECVRIONATVS. GRATVITVM. DECREVIT. ORDO. DECVRIONVM. ET. AVGVSTALVM. ET PLEBS. VNUMERVS. [CIL X.4760]'

(which he calls 'sanctissimi testes') to demonstrate that they must have been measuring
distance from where he thought the colony was. In the commentary, he relies on the
content of an inscription for information about the place in which it was found. The
inscription, a dedication to Mercury, was found near the modern 'forum et curia', but
Welser argues that such a dedication would not have appeared in the ancient main forum,
as Mercury was a deity celebrated by merchants. Its place of discovery was probably
therefore a forum of fishmongers, bakers or vegetable sellers. In the main text, Welser
suggests that a dedication found to Jupiter was originally from the main forum.

Welser was also aware of the chronological information that could be derived from
inscriptions. One passage in his chronological account of the early city simply gives the
record of several inscriptions, which can be dated from the records of the emperors on
them, recording the dedications made and restorations to roads and bridges in the
surrounding area. To date one inscription, featuring the letters BASSO CO, which
Welser interpreted as a reference to a consul Bassus, Welser examined the possible
candidates, ruling some out because the quality of the script meant that it was not from the
late empire. His conclusion was that the inscription could be dated to 203 AD, and he
includes it at that point in his account, along with a reconstruction of the inscription.

88 M. Welser, Commentarii, p. 27, 'Antiquiores Afra quatuor milliares lapides L. Septimio Severo &
filiiis inscripti, quos merito tot sanctissimos testes appellem: Eorum tres prope Ursinium ante hac
extabant, nunc in monasterium illud translati, sic habent; [he quotes them] Cum haec spatia
Augustae hodie quoque conveniant, non video quis de veteri situ ambigendi locus supersit.'
89 M. Welser, Commentarii, p. 170, 'Audio inventam baud procul eo loco ubi nunc visitur ante
annos LX. Id quamquam antiquitus forum magnum coloniae fuisse neutiquam opinemur, potuit
esse forum aut piscarium, aut pistorium, aut holitorium, aut quodvis aliud, nam in foris fere cultus
Mercurius, unde & nonnulla apud graecos cognomina accepit.'
92 M. Welser, Commentarii, p. 194, citing CIL III.5806, 'Ceteros post annum CMLXIV [dating from
the foundation of the city of Rome, = 211 AD] excludit litterarum elegantia, nam ex hac lapidum
aetates periti diiudicant.'
93 M. Welser, Commentarii, p. 109, 'Anno CCXIII Q. Epidius Rufus Lollianus Gentianus, &
Pomponius Bassus Consules fuere, ad quos iam olim suspicatus sum pertinuisse litteras pergrandes
& pulcherrimas marmori insculptas, & sic integritati reddendas, gentianO. ET. BASSO. COs. ex
Zophoro aedificii alicuius publici, si recte aestimamus, Augustae reliquas.'
his discussion of the mid-second century AD, Welser argues that the province of Vindelicia became known as a second Raetia. The *Notitia Dignitatum* recorded two separate provinces known as Raetia, and Welser supposed that this change occurred under Hadrian, asserting that there were no major changes in the structure of the empire between his reign and that of Constantine.\(^{44}\) Certainly, authors writing before the time of Hadrian only mentioned one, but Capitolinus and Vopiscus after him (but before Constantine) referred to two. An inscription found at Verona caused problems for this hypothesis, to a Caecilius Cisiacus Septicius Pica Caecilianus, who was *PROCVR. AVGVSTOR. ET. PROLEG. PROVINCIALI. RAETIAL ET. VINDELIC. ET. VALLIS. POENIN*.

The inscription shows that this man served under at least two emperors simultaneously as a *procurator Augustorum*, but names the provinces of Raetia and Vindelicia separately. As Welser notes, the first joint emperors were Marcus Antoninus and Lucius Verus, well after the reign of Hadrian. His rather tendentious conclusion to the dilemma was that the dedicator was an ‘antiquitatis ... affectator’, basing his interpretation on the archaising diphthong AI for AE, which meant that he preferred the old name of Vindelicia.\(^{45}\) Here, therefore, Welser uses his knowledge of the development of Latin to override the more obvious interpretation of the inscription, that the province had yet to be renamed, unwilling to adapt his rigid view that the structure of the empire was not changed after Hadrian until Constantine.

\(^{44}\) Onofrio Panvinio had previously argued this in the *Reipublicae Romanae libri*, bk.3 chs.23 and 24.

\(^{45}\) M. Welser, *Commentarii*, p. 101, ‘In agro Veronensi lapis extat, quem inter externa monumenta quae ad res Augustanas pertinent retulimus, inscriptus Q. CAICILIO. CIASICO. SEPTICIO. PICAL. CAICILIANO. PROCVR. AVGVSTOR. ET. PROLEG. PROVINCIALI. RAETIAL ET. VINDELIC. ET. VALLIS. POENIN. [CIL V.3936] is Hadriano posterior, siquidem Augustorum meminit, nec omnino anterior M. Antonino & L. Vero, qui primi Augusti pariter appellati, indicat Caecilium Raetiam, Vindeliciam, & vallem Paeninam simul rexisse (nam singulas deinceps rexisse vereor nemini probare posse) sed eum in modum indicat, ut distinctis nominibus tres provincias significet, ... nam C. Ligurius qui inscriptionem posuit, antiquitatis uti videre est affectator, prisco Vindeliciae vocabulo, pro Raetia altera, non aliter ac AI diphthongo pro AE usus. Atque huic in illas connectitas sum propensor, quae Raetiam secundam iisdem, aut plane non multum diversis terminis, quibus olim Vindeliciam constituisse volunt.’ This discussion takes place in Welser’s account of Hadrian; he later suggests (p. 105) that the procurator could have taken office in 163 or soon after, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, commenting that ‘Etsi enim saepe posthac duo pluresque simul Augusti, antiquaria tamen scribendi ratio, quam in istius elogio notavimus, inferioris seculi vix videtur.’
This final example shows that while Welser was aware of the possible applications of epigraphic evidence, he was unwilling to uproot a theory based on literary sources on the basis of one inscription. Elsewhere in his history of the city, he shows that he was aware of the limits of what could be known from inscriptions then available, for example writing of the early settlers ‘Colonorum nomina nemo expectabit... Indicabo tantum, monumenta antiqua quae nostros commentarios sequentur, videri nonnulla ad primos colonos pertinuisse, nonnulla ad eorum posteros’. Should more material be unearthed, however, its historical application should be better appreciated. When discussing temples Welser regrets that we cannot now know where many were: ‘Viam eo munirent lapidum inscriptiones, si quibus locis singulae erutae, annotassent maiores, nunc eo auxilio deficimur.’ His reference to the ‘maiores’ here indicates that he feels that, with their greater understanding of the benefits that knowledge of a find-spot can bring, he and his contemporaries would be sure to record this detail for any inscriptions that they found.

In this chapter I have shown the areas in which sixteenth-century scholars felt inscriptions could provide information about the ancient world, and how this information was cited in practice. In his history of Augsburg, Welser uses comparative material from elsewhere to suggest how that colony was run, as well as questioning the reliability of his contemporaries’ transmission of evidence, and trying to date individual inscriptions. The difference in his application of epigraphic evidence from that of Lazius, working just over 40 years before, is striking, and demonstrates how developments in this field over the period could affect historical interpretation. Another key development in this field from when Lazius wrote is a growing interest in the reliability of inscriptions as evidence for what they describe. Welser’s decision to discount the testimony of the dedication to the Caecilius based on the inclinations of the dedicator is an example of this, which I will examine in the next chapter.

96 M. Welser, Commentarii, p. 48.
97 M. Welser, Commentarii, p. 70.
Chapter 5: The Manufacture of Inscriptions and the Reliability of Epigraphic Evidence

As we saw in Ottavio Pantagato’s discussion of whether the abbreviation MEN for a tribe represented ‘Mentina’ (which appeared in a passage of Josephus) or ‘Menenia’, he felt able to dismiss the testimony of one inscription (if indeed it was not a modern forgery) on the basis that its unusual reading of ‘MENEN’ might be due to the mistake of the person who inscribed it.¹ In 1558 he wrote to Panvinio that ‘sassi anchor veri antichi si truovan mendosi’, and addressing him, recommended that he ‘diciate quel che havete trovato, e lasciate giudicetta a lettori.’² In a subsequent letter discussing the inscription, he expanded on his reasons, suggesting that inaccurate inscribed texts were widespread. Those men who devised inscriptions could have been ignorant, he argued, and those who inscribed them negligent. He believed that Josephus’s version was more reliable, as it was less likely that the Greek text had been altered than that the inscription had either been composed or inscribed wrongly.³ Repeating his point two weeks later, he commented that ‘Posso ben credere che potesser errare gli auttori de marmi e scalpellani e molti de li uni e tutti gli altri fusser ignoranti.’⁴ As we saw, Panvinio was to include an echo of Pantagato’s scepticism in the account of tribes in the Commentariorum libri. Although he accepted ‘Menenia’, when he came to the names of

¹ See above, ch. 2, pp. 85-6. The inscription, from Feltre, is CIL V.2071.
² Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 46r (28 June 1558).
³ Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 48v (2 July 1558), ‘... dunque, che sia antico veramente, non si puo per questo negare che molti antichi fussero ignoranti componitori di tali epigrammi, ovvero che essendo egli periti havessero negligenti fabri ... non mi pare che prepondere l’ auttorita d’ un marmo municipale a quella di un Greco [Josephus] forzato a distender la parola e non a compendiarla a modo de Latini. Anzi credo che in tutti li publici diplomi si scrivesse disteso e non compendiosio e che compendii fussero usati da scribi solamente ne registri, e non ne diplomi che si trascrivavan de essi... Lo MENENIA intiero puo essere interpretatione de lo MEN di un indotto municipe, a cui era piu noto la gente Menenia che Mento luoco. Ma il Greco vide lo distesso a trascrisselo e non è stato cosi facile alterar la scrittura greca come a lo municipe poco pratico aggiunger una syllaba o finir la parola secondo gli pareva di sapere.’ Later in the letter Pantagato also referred to ‘la negligenza di molti antichi nel comporre le loro inscrizioni e de le fabri oltra la prima.’
⁴ Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 52v.
attested tribes surplus to his list of 35, he suggested that stonecutters' errors may have accounted for the surplus.  

Pantagato's response here, to rely on the testimony of a literary source over that of an inscription containing an unexpected abbreviation, is unusual, but by no means unique. Pantagato himself, in a commentary on an inscription in Greek on bronze that is roughly contemporary to his letters to Panvinio, wrote that one reading could be a result of an 'errore del intagliatore'. On a stylistic level, literary scholars had previously noted the poor Latinity of some inscriptions from the classical period. In his Ciceronianus, one of the examples Erasmus gave for rejecting the derivative culture of classical scholarship at Rome was the unsuitability of the epigraphic models that some of these Ciceronians admired for imitation. It is important to note that programmatic statements on the value of epigraphic evidence for orthography from before the beginning and at the end of the period under investigation both say that epigraphic evidence is more reliable than that of texts, rather than absolutely reliable.

As we saw above, in 1521 Pierio Valeriano wrote that in inscriptions the 'antiqua scribendi ratio sese fidelius quam in libris ostentat'. In his Dialogos Agustín wrote in his discussion of orthography and pronunciation that 'Yo mas fe doi a las medallas y tablas y piedras, que a todo lo que escriben los escritores.'

That Pantagato should express doubt over the ability of stonecutters is not surprising when we consider the climate of suspicion towards the reliability of contemporary transmission of epigraphic evidence, both in copyists' ability to reproduce texts accurately, and the general

---

9 O. Panvinio, Commentariorum libri, p. 539, 'Reliquarum novem vel decem tribuum nomina, si modo vel tribus fuerint, vel error fabrilis non sit (omnia enim in vetustis marmoreis inscriptionibus mentionem extare didici) diu multumque me torserunt.'

8 BAV Vat. lat. 5237, fol. 164r, discussing IG XIV.952 = IGUR 2. The commentary can be dated by a reference to the death of the 'Car.le d' Inghilterra' (Reginald Pole), which occurred in November 1558.

7 Erasmus, Ciceronianus, pp. 646-7, 'Ut admiramur epigramma, seu epitaphium in corroso saxo repertum: Luciae coniugi clarissimae, ante tempus extinctae, Marcellus posuit diis manibus scarum. o me infellicem. Quur vivo? In huiusmodi quum saepenumbero non solum sensus inepti et paganici, verum etiam insignes reperiantur soloeismi, tamen ea exosculamur, veneramur ac propemodum adoramus antiquitatem, et apostolorum reliquias deridemus.'

4 P. Valeriano, Castigationes, p. 39; above, introduction p. 17.

9 A. Agustín, Dialogos, p. 377.
belief in the prevalence of forgery of antique objects. In addition, as we saw in the first chapter, scholars were conscious of the inaccuracies imported into their work through the medium of printers and illustrators. Perhaps aware of the influence these third parties could have on their work, they started to consider what effects the means of production of inscriptions could have on the final product. It is in this context that we should see Francesco Robortello’s comments on the inaccuracy of stonecutters in his notes to the second edition of Bartolomeo Marliani’s Fasti Capitolini, the Consulum, dictatorum, censorumque Romanorum series. This appeared in 1555, three years before Pantagato’s comments to Panvinio. Robortello defended the accuracy of the edition, writing ‘Velim scias amice lector, si qua tibi legenti occurrerint nomina quae perperam scripta videantur, ut GALVS & VERVCOSVS et alia nonnulla, ita esse in ipsis marmoribus Romanis descripta; nec voluisse nos quidquam immutaret [sic], quamvis ratio suaderet, ut omnia magis expressa ederentur, & sculptorum antiquorum errata cognoscerentur, quis enim credat ipsos interdum errare non potuisse.’

Rather than blame his copyists for the idiosyncracies in the inscriptions, he argues, we are better to place the blame with mistakes in the original. His rhetorical flourish at the end of this extract may indeed indicate that his ideas were widespread, although it seems rather to be a way of showing his own cleverness. For example, in the work of Matal on inscriptions between 1546 and 1551, there do not seem to be traces of this attitude. Matal tended to attribute peculiarities of language to modern forgers.

But by the last quarter of the century, we see concerns about the role of the stonecutter raised regularly. Justus Lipsius shows the sophistication of his approach in his work on the pronunciation of Latin, the De recta pronunciatione Latinae linguae dialogus. Arguing that the French ‘bien’ was derived from the Latin ‘bene’, and that this may teach us how the Latin was pronounced, he quoted an inscription featuring the phrase BIIANII MERENTI, for ‘bene merenti’. This, he suggested, revealed that pronunciation changed and that the carvers of inscriptions would sometimes work phonetically. As we saw, in his response to Lipsius’s dialogue Clusius argued that the large ‘I’s in the monumentum Ancyranum could be as a result

10 B. Marliani, Consulum, dictatorum, censorumque Romanorum series (1555) p. 40.
11 J. Lipsius, De recta pronunciatione, p. 29, ‘Nam Bien, a Bene, habet hanc stirpem. Quae corrupta enunciatio tamen iam olim: ut discas e lapide (enimvero sculptores illi aut marmorarii plerumque imperiti, & ideo in scriptura sonum attendentes modo & expressumes)’, citing CIL VI.19813.
of the 'sculptoris arbitrium'. It is clear both these scholars are attentive to the influence of the carver on the finished product. Another example is Fulvio Orsini, who in his commentary on the inscriptions of the Arval Brethren in 1587, pointed out one inscriber's error, as well as claiming that there were many others in the series. Another example is that of Johannes Baptista Fonteius, in his 1582 work on the Cesi family. On one inscription featuring a T Caesius Hilarus and a Sex Cassius Hilarinus, he writes, 'In qua inscriptione plene intelligimus, non ita semper fidendum marmoribus, quin cogitemus Scalptores olim & ipsos errasse. Quis enim non videt T. Caesii Hylari, & Caesiae fratrem Sextum Hilarinum Caesium, non Cassium scribi oportere.'

A belief that inscriptions could include mistakes had clear implications for their citation as historical evidence. On a basic level, it could affect the interpretation of abbreviations, such as in the case of the inscription featuring MENEN dismissed by Pantagato. So, for example, when discussing an inscription from Arezzo, Pedro Chacon assumed that the stonecutter failed to repeat an abbreviation (and asserted that that was not the only mistake that he had come across). In a more polemical context, the belief of scholars that they were not beholden to the evidence of individual inscriptions could be more telling. A good example is the dispute over the status of Florence in the Roman period, whether it was a municipium or the less prestigious colonia. An inscription discovered by Piero Vettori featured the letters COION, which were to be interpreted as an abbreviation for 'colonia', according to Vincenzo Borghini. In his Discorsi, this inscription was his most important piece of evidence for asserting that Florence was, in fact, a colonia. He claimed that 'per niente è da lasciare a

---

12 P. Burmannus, Sylloges epistolae, i no. 309 p. 312 (22 March 1587). Lipsius's argument on the large T's and this comment are examined above, ch. 3 p. 96.
13 F. Orsini, Notae ad M. Catonem, p. 228, commenting on 'STRVIBVS EFFERTIS': 'Erratum fabrile, ut multa alia in hoc lapide, nam infra mendose positum est, PRAELENTIBVS, pro, PRAESENTIBVS, nisi forte fuit, PRAEENVNTIBVS.'
14 J. Fonteius, De prisca Caesiorum gente commentatorum libri duo, p. 156.
15 BAV Vat. lat. 6038, fol. 27r, 'Illud propemodum affirmare ausim, inter reliqua errata fabrilia et hoc esse quod LEC X pro LEC LEC X idest legato legionis decimae scriptum est. ita enim passim in antiquis inscriptionibus legitur,' discussing CIL XI.1836. Chacón's commentary is not dated or signed; the inscription was found in 1575, and Chacón seems to be responding to his first sight of the inscription.
16 The Discorsi were published in 1584, after Borghini's death in 1580, but his description of Florence as a colonia reflects a debate that had taken place in the city earlier, after Vettori's
questo proposito l' autorità delle pietre antiche', and after asserting his faith in his ability to uncover forged material, he quoted and translated the inscription. He went on to comment that 'È quel che vi si legge COION è certamente errore, ma per la simiglianza fra se di queste due lettere I. & L. molto frequente ne' marmi antichi, tanto che puo parer maraviglia.' Borghini acknowledges that the inscribed text could be wrong, but on the basis of his experience is prepared to correct it. Indeed, he cites a classical source to support his belief that there could be mistakes: 'Et è questo di quella sorte, che Cicerone suol chiamare errore di Fabbro, o a dire a modo nostro, di scarpellino'. Borghini's attempt to justify his practice by citing an ancient author is not in itself surprising, but it is striking that Cicero's evidence for fallible stonemasons does not seem to have been quoted in this context before to explain any anomalies.

It is perhaps due to his knowledge of the controversy at Florence that Aldo Manuzio the Younger felt it necessary to defend the testimony of an inscription from Vicenza, dedicated to the emperor Gordian, which provided evidence on the status of this city as a civitas. It contradicted the statement of Tacitus that the city was a municipium, but Manuzio claimed that in general we should accept the evidence of inscriptions. This was particularly true, he argued, of those 'qui cum ad publicam Imperatorum memoriam inciderunt, doctos uiros in consilium adhiberi solitos, credere par est.' Manuzio clearly believed that to persuade his discovery of the inscription. We have letters from Borghini discussing the problem from 1566 and 1567 (see the letters to Panvinio in Prose fiorentine, part 4 vol.4), as well as some written by Girolamo Mei to Vettori in the same years. Mei clearly wanted to uphold Florence's reputation against the testimony of the inscription, arguing that an isolated piece of evidence was not to be relied upon: 'io sarò sempre d' oppenione, che si debba far fondamento vie più sopra il testimonio degli scrittori, che sopra qualunque altro vestigio, che apparisca senza questo; per che ne' casi dell' antichità non si possono confermar le cose con più certo argumento...' (Prose fiorentine, part 4 vol.2, p. 107, letter of 'il sabato dell'Ulivo' (ie 6 April, the day before Palm Sunday) 1566).

17 As quoted above, ch. 3 pp. 123-4.

18 V. Borghini, Discorsi, i pp. 59-61. The inscription (CIL XI.1617) seems to have been discovered in the mid-1560s.

19 V. Borghini, Discorsi, i p. 61, referring to Cicero, Ep. ad Atticum, vi.17. Borghini mentions Cicero's discussion of the 'erratum fabrile' to explain an ungrammatical phrase in another inscription later in the Discorsi, i p. 186.

20 BAV Vat. lat. 6040, fol. 26v. This is a three folio printed commentary, that never seems to have been published, discussing CIL V.3112. Tacitus referred to Vicenza as a municipium at Histories 3.8.
readers it was necessary to assert that steps would have been taken to prevent mistakes entering the inscribed record. Manuzio's commentary dates from after 1587, when he received the inscription,21 but it seems that scholars felt it necessary to defend their use of the inscribed record at least ten years earlier, when Orsini introduced the coins and inscriptions to be cited in his Familiae Romanae thus: 'quod enim in publicum, & a publicis populi Romani magistratibus ederentur, nihil poterat in iis fucatum, nihil adulterinum admisceri, quod non statim argueretur.'92

Not surprisingly, given what we saw of his historical use of inscriptions in the last chapter, Marcus Welser also engages with this problem, and suggests that concerns about the impact of the carver on the production of an inscription had become commonplace. In his Commentarii Welser argues that a 'fabrile... erratum' was responsible for an inscription in which the name of the province Raetia was spelled with an 'e' in place of the 'ae' diphthong, but goes on to suggest that this mistake can allow us to date the inscription to the late imperial period.23 Later in the work, he shows that he is prepared to emend an inscription on the basis of an inscriber's error. Dealing with two mileposts which feature the title of the emperor Septimius Severus as holding tribunicia potestas for the ninth time, the title 'imperator' for the twelfth time, and the consulship for the second time, Welser argues that the middle honour is a mistake, and that it should state that Severus held 'imperator' for the eleventh time.24 Welser clearly believed that others shared his scepticism. In 1604 he wrote to Scaliger, with some inscriptions sent to him by Filippo Pigafetta for inclusion in a second edition. Reporting Pigafetta's description of the material, Welser wrote, 'Recens inventas esse addit, & cum fide descriptas marmorarii erroribus non dissimulatis.'95

21 The inscription was discovered in 1586 and sent to Aldo by Paolo Ramusio in a letter of 9 June 1587 (BAV Vat. lat. 5249, fol. 37r).
22 F. Orsini, Familiae Romanae, sig. *2r.
23 M. Welser, Commentarii, p. 165, 'Quod vero RETIE simplex E pro diphthongo AE bis habet, fabrile procul dubio erratum, & sequioris seculi indicium est.'
24 M. Welser, Commentarii, p. 210, referring to two columns from 'Ursinii', 'In numeris IMP XII fabrile peccatum haeret, tum hic, tum lapidibus Insensi & Vilthaimensi, eodem modo inscriptis, quos omnes ab unius sculptoris manu existimo. Ratio temporum TRIB. POT. VIII. IMP. XI. COS. II. rescribendum docet.' He goes on to cite evidence for his belief.
25 M. Welser, Opera, no. 34 p. 806 (Ash Wednesday 1604).
Based on these examples, therefore, we can identify increasing scepticism towards the accuracy of the stonemasons, perhaps inspired by scholars’ involvement in attempts to reproduce epigraphic material in their own time. This interest in the actual production of the inscribed material is also evidenced in a concern to identify the author of the Capitoline Fasti among many scholars of the period.

The large quantity of fragments from the inscribed chronological records of magistrates and triumphantators found at Rome in 1546 and 1547 was the most influential epigraphic discovery of the period, and was immediately recognised as such. Initially, the Cardinal-nephew Alessandro Farnese, who had paid for the excavation, removed the fragments for his private collection, in whose possession they were copied by Matal. Farnese then presented them to the city in a well-remembered display of generosity for the public good of scholars. The fragments were placed on the Capitol (and hence were referred to as the Fasti Capitolini) and formed part of Michelangelo’s new architectural project for the site. The first problem was to order the existing fragments for display in this project, which the city assigned to Gentile Delfini and Tommaso Cavalieri. This was relatively easy, since on many of the fragments dates _ab urbe condita_ were visible.

---

26 For a useful summary of information on the discovery of this material, see G. Vagenheim, ‘La falsification chez Ligorio’, pp. 70-1 with notes. The basic survey of information remains A. Degrassi, _Fasti consulares et triumphales_, pp. 1-4 and 12-16, and his earlier articles ‘Le sistemi inizi del Fasti Capitolini’ and ‘L’edificio dei Fasti Capitolini’.

27 BAV Vat. lat. 6039, fols. 204-12. Matal records that some additional material was supplied by Egio and Smet.

28 See the account of Onofrio Panvinio, who had enjoyed Farnese’s support, dedicating his edition of the Fasti to his patron: ‘Sub felicissimo avtui Pauli III pontificis maximi principato, ruderibus inter forum et sacram viam impensis tuis eggestis, saxorum illorum fragmenta, omni thesauro praetiosiora, quae beati illius pontificatus saecula exornarunt, felici litterarum fato eruta essent ... Diligentissime omnibus circumvicinis locis longo-que intervallo distantibus perquisitis, multis doctissimis viris rogantibus actum est, ut lapides inventi ab eodem cardinali populo Romano donarentur et in aliquam honestam formam redacti in Capitolium publicae studiosorum commoditatis ergo conlocarentur.’ (O. Panvinio, _Fastorum libri V_, sig. [a4]r, quoted in G. Vagenheim, ‘La falsification chez Ligorio’, p. 110 appendix II).

29 Vagenheim (‘La falsification chez Ligorio’, p. 110 appendix III) quotes the text of the city’s decree of 13 June 1548, after Farnese’s gift, which as well as authorising Delfini and Cavalieri to put the material in order also required them to look for other fragments in private collections.
The fragments posed more problems than simple ordering, however. It rapidly became clear that even when all the pieces were assembled, there were still considerable gaps in the record, and scholars' first instincts were to try to supplement the list from other sources. Bartolomeo Marliani edited the existing fragments in chronological order in a small, cheap edition in 1549, which could serve as a reference for those unable to visit Rome to see the material.\(^{30}\) This category included the young Carlo Sigonio, whose edition with supplements appeared rapidly, in 1550.\(^{31}\) But this process of supplementation brought its own problems, not readily soluble: the gap between Sigonio's edition of the supplemented fragments and his commentary on them was six years.\(^{32}\) At the same time, Onofrio Panvinio was working on the same difficulties: he finished a version of his efforts earlier, by 1554, but they were only published in 1557 (by Strada, in the unauthorised edition), and Panvinio's revised edition

\(^{30}\) B. Marliani, *Consolum, dictatorum censorumque series quae marmoribus scalpta in foro reperta est* (1549). For an account of the representation of the fragments in this and subsequent editions by Sigonio and Panvinio, see above, ch. 3 p. 106. Marliani's work does seem to have enjoyed some success as a work of reference, and was reprinted with an introduction by Francesco Robortello in 1555 (in which the latter pointed out a mistake in Sigonio's edition, although without naming him: B. Marliani, *Consulum, dictatorum, censorumque Romanorum series* (1555), sig. Aiir; reprinted in F. Patetta, 'Appunti su Carlo Sigonio', pp. 42-3): see W. McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio*, pp. 28-9.

\(^{31}\) C. Sigonio, *Regum, consulum, dictatorum ac censorum Romanorum fasti*. Pighius's account of his youthful examination of the fragments as a result of Michaelangelo's work gives some idea of the excitement the project caused among scholars, and their desire to complete the fragmentary record: 'Quapropter incredibile dictu est, quantis votis optarim fastorum illorum integritatem, quanta mihi mox incesserit cupidio tentandi, num veterum scriptorum aliorum auspiciis, et auxilio in suum ordinem genuinum illa fragmenta dirigere, atque suppletis (quoad in tanta materiae coaevae inopia fieri posset) eorum lacunis, in priscae formae tabulas concinnare possem. Quales olim ipasaki sisse peritissimus ille Michael Angelus Bonarotus architecetonice ratione collegerat ex fragmentis ipsis, et distinctas columnis suis triumphatibus in Capitolio posuerat. In quo studio cum indefesso labore iam aliquamdiu cecurissem, video me praeventum esse a doctissimo, totiusque Romanae historiae peritissimo viro Carlo Sigonio...' (S. Pighius, *Annales* (1599), i sig. [**]v).

\(^{32}\) The commentary was published in 1556, along with a third edition of the list (C. Sigonio, *Fasti consulare[...] Eiusdem [...] commentarius*). In the dedication of this work, Sigonio records his debt to Marliani's edition: 'in quibus haec fere magistratum ratio, quam ipse animo designaveram, iamque inchoaveram, erat incisa, quorum fragmentorum exemplum satis accurate, quantum ego intelligere poteram, a Bartholomeo Marliano descriptum cum legissem' (fol. 2r). The second edition had been published in 1555.
came out in 1558.\textsuperscript{33} The problems these scholars had was that the chronology of the discovered list did not match that of the literary sources hitherto known, especially that of Livy. As William McCuaig has shown, Sigonio concluded that the chronology preserved in the inscribed Fasti should be treated separately from that of Livy, and other literary sources including Cassiodorus; Panvinio, who tried to set the events of the classical Roman period within a larger frame, reconciled the dating of the inscribed list with that of Varro (Varro placed the date of the first consulate in 245 \textit{ab urbe condita}, the inscribed list in 244).\textsuperscript{34} It is interesting to note that the one significant difference between Panvinio's and Sigonio's chronologies was based on Panvinio's interpretation of a fragment of the stone itself. Following the Gauls' capture of Rome in 390 B.C., the sources diverged in their account of the next twenty years. To resolve the difficulties, Panvinio argued that an inscribed horizontal line between the names of tribunes and dictators on one fragment represented a division between two years, and then suggested another line of text that did not appear on the stone in his own completed list of magistrates. Sigonio accepted Panvinio's argument about the horizontal line, bowing to Panvinio's first-hand knowledge of the stone. Marliani's edition was not sufficiently precise to record such incisions as well as the text. Had Sigonio seen the stones himself, he would perhaps have seen that Panvinio's argument was inconsistent, as the Veronese scholar did not suggest that other horizontal incisions marked the end of years. Sigonio did not, however, adopt Panvinio's new line of text, recognising that this had nothing to do with what was on the stone.\textsuperscript{35}

While Panvinio and Sigonio were investigating the chronology represented by the inscriptions, other scholars were asking different questions about the newly-discovered fragments, and in particular the exact position of their discovery and the type of monument from which they had come.\textsuperscript{36} Pirro Ligorio includes a polemical attack in his \textit{Libro delle antichità} on the 'bugia expressissima' of those who stated that the fragments were found in

\textsuperscript{33} O. Panvinio, \textit{Fasti et triumphi romani} and \textit{Fastorum libri V}. BAV Vat. lat. 3451, unnumbered fols. after 62, records that Strada had Panvinio's manuscript in 1554 (G. Vagenheim, 'La falsification chez Ligorio', p. 72 n. 13), which accords with what Strada wrote in the preface (see above, ch. 1 pp. 56-7).

\textsuperscript{34} W. McCuaig, 'The Fasti Capitolini', provides a very full analysis of Sigonio and Panvinio's efforts to solve the problem.

\textsuperscript{35} For this, see W. McCuaig, 'The Fasti Capitolini', pp. 155-6.

\textsuperscript{36} For the details of these disputes, I am indebted to the thorough examination of G. Vagenheim, 'La falsification chez Ligorio'.
the middle of the forum; the target of his attack is revealed as Bartolomeo Marliani in the manuscript version of this work. Ligorio stated that the fragments were found by the temple of Faustina at one side of the forum, and this was generally accepted by subsequent writers. The rancour of his rejection of what may simply have been a simplification on Marliani’s part can be explained in the context of the deep personal dislike Ligorio and his friend Benedetto Egio felt for Marliani, and the scholarly dispute they were having more generally over the topography of the forum. The second problem bore some relation to the first, but in this case Ligorio’s conjecture was not shared by the scholars with whom he was usually on good terms. Ligorio argued that the Fasti were displayed on a ‘lano quadrifonte’, an arch structure with four feet, on the basis of remains where the fragments of inscription were found. Others, however, argued that the inscriptions appeared on a hemicyclical structure, and the evidence they cited for this assertion led them to consider who had devised the lists inscribed as the Fasti.

In his work on the grammatical writers of classical Rome, Suetonius seemed to write that the Augustan antiquarian scholar Verrius Flaccus had composed some ‘fasti’ which were inscribed at Praeneste: ‘Verrius Flaccus... statuam habet Praeneste in inferiore fori parte contra hemicyclium, in quo fastos a se ordinatos et marmoreo parieti incisos publicarat...’. This version of the text, which Agustín quoted in a letter of May 1557 to Panvinio (who was then in Parma), was open to emendation, according to the Spanish scholar. If Suetonius had meant to write Praeneste, he would not have had to specify which part of the forum the statue was situated in; and it was unlikely that Verrius Flaccus would have composed a daily calendar of events (the primary meaning of ‘fasti’) for Praeneste. Agustín reminded Panvinio that Julius Caesar had established the calendar at Rome, and according to Ovid and

38 See above, ch. 1, p. 46-7, and the article by M. Laureys and A. Schreurs, ‘Egio, Marliano, Ligorio’.
39 This second dispute is examined by G. Vagenheim, ‘La falsification chez Ligorio’, pp. 78-93.
40 P. Ligorio, Libro delle antichità, fol. 31v, ‘[...] in un luogo, dove facevan capo piu strade si come mostravano le ruine stesse de gli edificii cavate, che quivi erano, guaste poi da i moderni: le quali erano d’un Iano (o vogliam dire Aeano) di quattro fronti, nei confini di tre Regioni, cio è del Foro Romano, del Palatino, & della Via Sacra.’
41 Suetonius, De grammaticis ch. 17. The editor of the most recent text gives ‘Statuam habet Praeneste in superiore fori parte circa hemicycilium in quo fastos a se ordinatos et marmoreo parieti incisos publicarat’ (R. Kaster (ed.), De grammaticis, ch. 17.3).
Macrobius, he thought, it had been established at Praeneste before that. He reported the proposals for emendation made by scholars at Rome: Pantagato suggested 'pro Vestae', the textual critic Gabriele Faerno 'prope aedem Vestae', and Agustín himself 'pedestrem'. Were any one of these changes to be adopted, the consequences would be that Suetonius was writing about the Roman forum, that Verrius Flaccus composed the inscribed Fasti that had recently been found there, and that these inscriptions would have appeared in a hemicyclical monument.

This would have had the result of establishing a textual source to contradict Ligorio's proposal for the form of the monument containing the Fasti. Ligorio's response was to devise an honorific inscription to Verrius Flaccus, supposedly from the base of the statue that Suetonius mentions. It was this inscription that Agustín remembered when discussing evidence for tribes: [Ligorio] qualche volta scrive sua interpretazione per vincer qualche contentione come fu quella deli Fasti di Verrio Flacco. More interesting for our purposes here are the scholars' attempts to secure testimony for the authorship of the inscription. This seems to be an innovation, and here, as in the case of the discussion of the role of the stonemason in transmitting the inscribed text, Pantagato seems to have been an important proponent of the idea.

We first hear of the idea of an author in a letter to Panvinio of 1555, in which Pantagato makes an oblique reference to a discussion he seems to have been having with the Veronese scholar before he left Rome, presumably connected with Panvinio's research on chronology: 'De l' autore de Fasti vi dico che non fu mai verità così vera che fusse exenta [?] da qualche


\[\text{CIL XIV.278*}.

\[\text{A. Agustin, Epistolario, no. 206 p. 298 (25 June 1558) = Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 125; quoted above, ch. 2 p. 83.} \]
contradittione, e tutte le contradizioni non sono vere, ma molte di loro verisimili." If so, their discussions do not seem to have been common knowledge, as Agustín introduced his discussion of the Suetonius passage, in his letter of 1557, as follows: "Una cosa vi voglio advertire, che so la havrete carissima: il prenoto P Ottavio si è persuaso, che Verrio Flacco sia stato autore et compositore di questi Fasti, et secondo il luogo, dove furon trovati, et secondo i tempi che fu Verrio..." In fact, in his letters to Panvinio, Pantagato showed that he was not dogmatically attached to Verrius Flaccus. "Ma sia cui si voglia, non lo [i.e. Verrius] tengo da più che molti altri de l'età sua e prima', he wrote in the letter of 1555. Later, in June 1557, he mentions that he has discussed with Agustín Panvinio's response to the idea that Verrius was the author, but dismisses Panvinio's concern: "Mi disse il dubbio nostro Mons. [Agustín] sopra l'auttore de Fasti, il quale non mi parve di momento ne degno di voi. Non importa che sia quello over un altro. Certo se è un altro, non sarà ne più dotto ne più grave di quello."  

These remarks of Pantagato are interesting. He was less concerned that Panvinio should state that the author was Verrius, despite his suggestion for an emendation to the text of Suetonius, than that Panvinio should appreciate that the author was roughly contemporary to Verrius. On the same day in May as Agustín sent Panvinio the details of the Suetonius passage in 1557, Pantagato had written to spell out the implications of his own beliefs: 'e speriamo di havere ritrovato l'auttore d'e Fasti marmorei le cui scritture anchore che fusser in marmo, non furon pero mai appresso da me di maggior autorità, che le charte di Polybio, Varrone, Livio e Dionysio così male trattate da tempi, come sono.' In July of the same year, he made the point again in another letter. After discussing some details of the contents of the inscribed Fasti, he wrote, 'a li quali non mi parve mai di dever credere più che a Varrone over a qualunque altro celebre dotto di quel tempo o più antico.' In fact, Pantagato felt able to reject the authority of both Varro and the Fasti if a problem required, as he later wrote, 'Non

---

45 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 1v (5 June 1555).
47 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 1v (5 June 1555).
44 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 5r (26 June 1557).
49 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 4r (22 May 1557).
50 Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 7r (27 July 1557).
posso tener con Varrone ne co Fasti, se ben volessi, anzi mi son forzato di truovar e fondamenti di quella opinione e li rincontri.\textsuperscript{61}

The implications of Pantagato's argument that the inscribed text does not \textit{prima facie} have more authority than the literary chronological sources is not reflected in subsequent sixteenth-century scholarship. There is no doubt that Pantagato's failure to publish his ideas affected their influence. Sigonio, for example, writing to Panvinio at the beginning of May 1557 about Pantagato's idea that Verrius was the author, commented 'Udendo la fantasia del Padre Ottavio intorno agli Autori dei nostri Fasti, non sono rimaso ne morto, ne vivo, così mi è quadrata.'\textsuperscript{62} Panvinio accepted Pantagato's arguments for authorship, and it is interesting to note that he also alerted his readers to the fact that he thought that the inscriptions were made by different carvers: 'Verum P. Octavii Pantagathi viri doctissimi auctoritate... omnes tabulas... sub Augusti Imperio incisas fuisse existimo, etsi a variis lapicidis, atque ea de caussa varias litterarum species ibi videri; eiusque auctorem fuisse Verrium Flaccum nobilem Grammaticum...'.\textsuperscript{63} He does not seem to have been entirely convinced, writing to Gentile Delfini in the preface to book 5 of the work of the Fasti that, 'Quae sive a Verrio Flacco, sive a quovis alio certe doctissimo viro editae, maximam praeter ceteris omnibus vetustis monumentis historiae romanae lucem attulerunt.'\textsuperscript{64} He went on to describe the proposed emendation of Suetonius' text, but did not explicitly suggest that the weight he placed on epigraphic testimony should be questioned. The attribution to Verrius was accepted, however, presumably from the influence of Panvinio's edition. The French jurist François Baudouin, for example, attributes the Fasti to Verrius in passing, as does Agustín in a letter to Latini, and when Philemon Holland introduced his 1600 English translation of Livy, he wrote that Verrius 'collected a catalogue and register of the chiefe rulers of Rome, how they were chosen successively, and how they governed from time to time.'\textsuperscript{65} Borghini supported

\textsuperscript{61}Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS D501 inf., fol. 9v (28 August 1557).
\textsuperscript{63}O. Panvinio, \textit{Fastorum libri V}, sig. br.
\textsuperscript{64}O. Panvinio, \textit{Fastorum libri V}, p. 93.
\textsuperscript{65}F. Baudouin, \textit{De institutione historiae universae}, pp. 131-2, '...illas [fragmentas] dico, quas Verrius Flaccus (sic enim doctissimi homines coniciunt) temporibus Augusti vel Tiberii, in foro publicavit, marmoreo paletii incisas in hemicyclo...'; \textit{Anecdota litteraria}, ii p. 320 (= BAV Vat. lat. 6201, fol. 2-3, 31 August 1567): Agustín, writing of the use of the diphthong 'ei', commented 'Hac ratione
the attribution, writing of the Fasti that ‘si credono opera di Verrio Flacco, più credo io, perché si sà che e’ fece una tal fatica, che pel sicura certezza che ce ne sia...’. Pighius was more circumspect, however, referring to the Fasti as ‘fragmenta sub Verrii Flacci, nescio quam recte, titulo.’

Scholars who discussed the Fasti show some sensitivity to the circumstances of their production. In his 1560 commentary on the fragments, Marliani opposed the ‘historia’ provided by Livy and Dionysius to the testimony of the inscriptions, and suggested that the former could be corrected. He gives cogent reasons for his faith, however, arguing that the Fasti were a more official production, offering similar reasons to those Manuzio cited to defend his use of the Vicenza inscription: ‘Verisimile enim est, cum auctore Senatu, vel aliō Principe, eos [fastos] ordinarit, omnium historicorum, annalium, commentariorum quorumcunque magistratum copiam sibi fuisse, non item Livio viro privato, praesertim quod magno sumptu, atque labore tunc libri describentur.’ Borghini argued that the Fasti must have been official, because they were displayed in so famous and public a place. More concretely, in his Annales, Pighius argued for the superiority of the Fasti to written sources, but because they were uncorrupted by scribal error. With their help, he wrote, ‘infinitos librariorum errores depraehendos notaram, in annales redigerem exactiores.’ To back up this point, countering any potential objection that a stonecutter could have influenced their accuracy, he wrote that they were ‘correctissima sculpta’. His arguments for preferring their record of individuals’ names to that of Cassiodorus are also historical, when he comments

56 V. Borghini, Discorsi, p. 466.
57 S. Pighius, Annales (1599), i sig. **2r. Without giving a reference, Ginette Vagenheim (‘La falsification chez Pirro Ligorio’, p. 85) asserts that Pighius attributed the Fasti to Pomponius Atticus, perhaps mistaking a reference Pighius (Annales (1599), i sig. **3r) makes to Pomponius’s Annales for a reference to the Fasti.
59 V. Borghini, Discorsi, p. 467, ‘E questo tale uso [followed by the people] chi può dubitare che è fosse quello che in queste pietre publicate nel più celebre, e frequentato luogo di Roma: qual era il foro Romano; o Verrio, o altri che ne fusse l’Autore: che in vero ne fù, che ben la pensa, l’uso corrente; accio che i cittadini, notai, e gli altri tutti, n’havessero il conto facile, e pronto...’.
60 S. Pighius, Annales (1599), i sig. **2l.
61 S. Pighius, Annales (1599), i sig. **1v.
that 'Capitolini Fasti, ut antiquiores, et florentissimi sane temporis: ita praeceliores sunt, et maximo in precio habendi...'. While asserting the value of the Fasti as evidence, therefore, Marliani, Borghini and Pighius felt that it was necessary to justify their practice.

Another great epigraphic discovery of the sixteenth century, the Res gestae of the emperor Augustus, had considerably less immediate impact. On 28 March 1555, three envoys from Ferdinand I of Austria, Augerius Busbequius, Antal Verantius and Franz Zay, arrived at Ankara on their way to the Ottoman court at Amasya. There members of the party found and copied a long inscription in six columns on the inner walls of an ancient building. The earliest surviving transcription we have, made by Johannes Belsius, Verantius's secretary, for Hans Dernschwam, a German merchant with the ambassadors, seems to derive from an archetype copied at this time.

S. Pighius, Annales (1599), i sig. [**4]v. Pighius here suggests that the date of creation of the Fasti is an important factor in assessing their reliability. Elsewhere, he seems to have also considered this theme. In a letter of 1566 that Cardinal Granvelle wrote to Fulvio Orsini (BAV Vat. lat. 4105, fol. 44r, as an attachment to a letter of 20 August 1566 (fol. 42-3), quoted by P. De Nolhac, 'Lettere inedite del Cardinale de Granvelle', p. 251 n. 4), he enclosed a note Stephanus Pighius had made on a recently-discovered extra fragment of the Fasti. Pighius pointed out that it included a record of two triumphs not mentioned in other sources, and went on, 'de quibus cum apud alios auctores expressam mentionem non reperiem, silentium potius agere, quam meris niti coniecturis volui; in tanta enim historiae eius temporis penuria palpitare velut in tenebris necesse fuisset.' His use of the pluperfect subjunctive here seems to refer to the time in which the Fasti were originally inscribed, and if so, demonstrates Pighius's sensitivity to the conditions in which the contents of the Fasti were researched.

For the details of the discovery and transmission of the inscription, I am indebted to Z. von Martels, 'The Discovery of the Inscription of the Res Gestae Divi Augusti' and W. Couvreur, 'Le déchiffrement du monument d'Ancre'.

The copy made for Dernschwam is preserved as fol. 24-9 of his Tagebuch in the Fürstl. und Gräf. Fuggersches Familien- und Stiftungs-Archiv, Dillingen. See W. Couvreur, 'Le déchiffrement du monument d'Ancre', esp. pp. 81-5; Z. von Martels, 'The Discovery of the Inscription of the Res Gestae Divi Augusti', n. 33; Ead. Augerius Gislenius Busbequius, cols.394-8. T. Mommsen, Res gestae divi Augusti, pp. xviii-xix, attributes this copy to Busbequius. Belsius does seem to have tried to make a copy direct from the stone himself, having recognised that the inscription contained details of Augustus's achievements, but wrote that he was prevented by crowds from transcribing the whole. His copy for Dernschwam preserves some parts of the text in detail, indicating how many lines had been destroyed, and noting the large T's; other parts are not in capitals, and he admits that
Despite the efforts made by members of the embassy to copy the inscription, knowledge of it did not reach the scholarly community until nearly twenty years later. In fact, it was only when he was a member of Maximilian I’s court in Vienna that Busbequius appears to have appreciated the importance of any transcription made on the embassy. Busbequius was in Vienna from 1566 to 1570 and again from 1571 to 1574, and, as we saw in the first chapter, the court attracted a number of scholars interested in the classical world in this period, including Strada, Lipsius and Pighius. It seems that it was in talking to the last of these that Busbequius remembered the inscription that his party had transcribed in Ankara. In 1574 Pighius wrote to Karel Rijm, then the imperial ambassador in Constantinople, but also a fellow-graduate of the Collegium trilingue at Louvain and with Pighius at Rome in the 1550s. He described his work on what was to become the Annales, and reminded Rijm that Suetonius had mentioned that Augustus had ensured that a record of his achievements was inscribed at Rome. A copy of this would clearly be useful for his research, and he had heard that it might exist. Pighius inquired of Rijm whether a copy might be acquired, ‘Cum igitur ornatissimus ac bonarum artium amantissimus vir, D. Augerius a Busbecke mihi persuaserit Ancyrae, - in Galatia, - adhuc temporis extare et se vidisse magnas breviarii rerum gestarum D. Augusti reliquias antiquissimis marmoris parietibus insculptas; spemque fecerit eas descriptas haberi inde posse...’ Rijm replied to Pighius in November of that year, mentioning that Busbequius had also asked for a copy, but that the two men’s requests had not reached him before his preparations to depart from his post: he would willingly have sent his own ‘pictor’, he wrote, but instead had passed the request on to two merchants and his successor.

the copy was made in haste. See Z. von Martels, ‘The Discovery of the Inscription of the Res Gestae Divi Augusti’, p. 150; L. Tardy and É. Moskovszky, ‘Zur Entdeckung des Monumentum Ancyranum’, abb. 1a, illustrate the first page of Belsius’s transcription.

65 Busbequius’s written account of the discovery, in the form of a letter, does not date from his time in Turkey, but rather from between 1581 and 1589, as von Martels shows (Augerius Gislenius Busbequius, pp. 52-102 and ‘The Discovery of the Inscription of the Res Gestae Divi Augusti’, p. 150). In that account, Busbequius is well aware of the inscription’s significance.

66 On Rijm, see the notes of S. de Vriendt in the edition of Rijm’s Reyse van Brussele.


68 H. De Vocht, Stephani Vinandi Pighii epistolarium, no. 206 p. 340 (6 August 1574).

69 H. De Vocht, Stephani Vinandi Pighii epistolarium, no. 220 p. 361 (1 November 1574), ‘Quod ad Ancyranas reliquias attinet, de quibus & ipse quoque clarissimus, omnique virtutum genere
Pighius and Busbequius were not the only men to appreciate the importance of the inscription in Vienna. Later, Carolus Clusius, another scholar there at the time, recalled that he had asked Busbequius for a copy of the inscription when he was in the city: ‘Cum Illustris Heros Augerius Bousbequius Viennae ageret, meo rogatu omnes schedarum fasciculos evolvit, ut Ancyranarum Tabularum exemplar ab ipso... exceptum, inveniret, quod mihi traderet, sed frustra: postea enim succurrì, id alicui, cuius nomen excidisset, mutuo datum, et non restitutum.’ The recipient of Busbequius’s copy may have been Sambucus, also at Vienna: the latter wrote to Pighius at the end of August 1574 promising to that a copy of the ‘Ancyranarum’ would arrive within four days; when Pighius replied shortly afterwards, he had not had a copy, and reminded Sambucus that he would like it before he left the city. Clusius claimed to have seen a copy in Sambucus’s possession.

Even with this new scholarly attention, knowledge of the inscription did not circulate widely. Laevinius Torrentius, for example, another Collegium trilingue graduate, resident in Rome between 1552 and 1556, and in epistolary contact with classical scholars from the Low Countries, did not mention the inscription in his commentary on Suetonius of 1578. By the same year, however, Busbequius had managed to recover his copy. Andreas Schott went to live with him in Paris that year, and included a copy of the inscription Busbequius had

---


72 M. Smet, *Inscriptionum liber*, auctarium, p. 22, ‘...exemplar quod apud D. I. Sambucum ... vidi, nullum versuum numerum, nihil quidquam simile observatum habere comprehendi.’

73 Laevinus Torrentius, *In C. Suetonii Tranquilli XII. Caesares commentarii.*
supplied him with in his 1579 commentary on Aurelius Victor. Lipsius then included it in his appendix to Smet's collection of inscriptions using a copy that Verantius (an original member of the embassy to the Ottomans) had acquired. Lipsius had this copy through the offices of Clusius, who had received it from Verantius's nephew in 1576. Clusius's sensitivity to the line divisions and sizes of the letters in the inscription are evident in the note he sent to Lipsius with details of the inscription, and, as we saw in chapter 3, he drew Lipsius's attention to the relevance of the inscription for the latter's work on pronunciation. He had even managed to have Verantius's copy checked by a new ambassador to the Ottomans against a version made by two Germans who had been in Ankara, despite the violence which was inflicted upon the inscription by Turkish soldiers.

This rather lengthy account of the history of the discovery of the text shows that in comparison with the Fasti, the inscription of the res gestae did not receive rapid dissemination, despite being first discovered by western scholars less than ten years after the

---

74 Andreas Schott, De vita et moribus Imperatorum romanorum, pp. 69-77. This work was dedicated to Busbequius, and Schott wrote that he composed it 'hortatu tuo', while he was in Busbequius's 'familia' (pp. 4-5). Of the inscription, he wrote that, 'Augerius Busbequius, V. C. in Byzantina legatione Ancyrae in lapides incisum, quantum à Turcica vastatione reliquum factum est, describendum curavit; & nobiscum humaniter communicavit.' (p. 69).

75 See ch. 3, p. 97 above.

76 See the letter given by Lipsius under the inscription (M. Smet, Inscriptio liber, auctarium, p. 22): 'Antonii Verantii, Archiepiscopi Strigoniensis examplar... sequutus sum, uti ab eius nepote Fausto Verantio... accepi anno 1576: propterea versuum in singulis paginis numerum, characterum formam, vocabulorum divisiones, atque interdum repetitiones, ut in ipsius exemplari erant, observavi, existimans expressum esse ad normam Tabularum quae Ancyrae sunt.... Anno autem 1584, profiscicenti Constantinopolim, C. V. Lewenclawio cum Mag.co Dn. Henrico de Liechtenstain Caesareo Legato, Verantii exemplar dedi, ipsum pro nostra amicitia obnixe orans, ut si per occasionem Ancyram proficisceretur, diligenter cum Tabulis illis conferret, et an per omnia responderet, observaret. Ille quidem, ob gravem Legati morbum, quo etiam istic extinctus est, id praestare non potuit: sed binos Nobiles Germanos Byzantii invent, qui superiore hieme Ancyrae fuerant, et quae in Tabulis incisa diligenter excepserant.' Clusius compared the two, concluding that 'Alloqui eorum exemplar minus integrum fuit Verantiano: corrumpuntur enim quotidie Tabularum characteres Turcarum militum insolentia, praesertim cum Christianos eas Inscriptiones excipere conspiciunt, quod binis illis Nobilibus Germanis describentibus accidit.' Lipsius thanked Clusius for his copy when announcing the publication of his edition of Smet's work in a letter of 14 January 1588 (ILE 88 01 14).
The Fasti. The reflects the inaccessibility of the site and the fact that it was not discovered by publishing antiquarian scholars, but also demonstrates the importance of epistolary contact. Until a scholar who regularly wrote to others got hold of a copy of the text, or until it was printed, information about it was not spread. What are interesting for our purposes here are the terms used to refer to the inscription when it was cited in scholarly works. Unlike the Fasti, for the res gestae there seemed to be explicit testimony in a classical text. The passage of Suetonius, of which Pighius had reminded Rijm, referred to an 'indicem rerum a se gestarum, quem [Augustus] vellet incidi in aeneis tabulis, quae ante Mausoleum statuerentur.' The inscription began with the words RERVM GESTARVM DIVI AVGVSTI [...] INCISARVM IN DVABVS AHAENEIS PILIS QVAE SVNT ROMAE POSITAE EXEMPLAR, and there seemed to be no doubt that the inscription was a copy of what Suetonius mentioned. Lipsius proposed that the text of Suetonius be emended on the basis of the inscription, since the inscription refers to 'pili' where Suetonius had 'tabulae'. In addition, it seemed that the circumstances in which the inscription was made were recorded. In works of 1583, both Ludovico Carrio and Joseph Scaliger refer to a passage in Josephus, where Ankara is called the common gift of Asia, and both assume that the town was dedicated to Augustus to explain why the inscription was made.

More importantly, the text of Suetonius identified an author for the text of the inscription, and it was cited as Augustus's words. The text itself confirmed this impression, as it was in the first person. As well as editing it for Smet's collection, Lipsius made regular use of the inscription, beginning in works published in 1580, and referred to Augustus as the author. He argued that in his reign the emperor increased the number of recipients of the corn-dole, writing 'Id, praeter in Dione, diserte scriptum aut sculptum in lapidibus priscis qui Ancyrae

77 J. Lipsius, Ad Annales commentarius, p. 10, having quoted the beginning of the inscription, 'Ex quo haud temere collegerim dixerimque, in Suetonio scribendum, in aeneis pilis, non tabulis. De eadem re loqui utrumque, id quidem clarum est.'

78 L. Carrio, Emendationum et observationum liber, ii fol. 51r; J. Scaliger, De emendatione temporum, p. 234. Carrio had earlier mentioned that he had acquired a copy in a letter to Lipsius of 15 May 1581 (ILE 81 05 15); see Z. von Martels, 'The Discovery of the Inscription of the Res Gestae Divi Augusti', n. 29. In his account of the trip (Itinera, p. 80), published in 1581, Busbeq claimed that the city had been dedicated to Augustus, but did not refer to Josephus, when writing that the damage to the inscription was to be deplored the more 'quod urbem illam ab Asiae communitate Augusto dicatam fuisse constet.' Lipsius may have communicated the detail with Scaliger.
conspicuintur...'. His comment that the inscription was either written or carved suggests that he was thinking of it in terms of an authored book. This is confirmed by what follows in which Lipsius compares Dio's account with that of the inscription: 'Ait ibi de se Augustus CONSVL TERTIVM DECIMVM [...] FVERVNT Vide quam haec convenienter ad Dionem, etiam in pecuniae summa, quam tamen ut ambiguam ponit Dio. Tempus etiam eius recensus ex lapide clarum, videlicet in XIII consulatu Augusti. at Dio aliquot annis ante posuit. C. Antistio Vetere, & D. Laelio consulibus. Mirum, nisi Augusto de se credendum, prae Dione.' Unlike Pantagato in his assessment of the reliability of the author of the inscribed Fasti, Lipsius seems to have accepted Augustus's account of his own reign, although on some occasions he does use the verb 'gloriari' to describe Augustus's practice.

Other authors who referred to the inscription of the res gestae did so in similar terms. In his De emendatione temporum, to solve a problem of the chronology of Augustus's reign, Joseph Scaliger asked 'Sed cui melius de ea re, quam Augusto ipsi de se loquenti credemus?', before discussing the inscription. Isaac Casaubon included the inscription, and a full commentary, in his 1595 edition of Suetonius. Casaubon follows his predecessors in treating it as a work of Augustus, but seems in one case to be more sceptical of the account than before. On the phrase 'Principem [lacuna] hastis argenteis donatum appellaverunt.', he commented, 'Miro ita Augustum loqui quasi alter tantum filiorum eo honore fuerit affectus: nam certum est ambos principes iuventutis esse appellatos. etiam de hastis argenteis dissentit Dio, qui aureas vult fusisse lib. LV.' Casaubon's surprise that the inscribed account seems to contradict what he believes is 'certum' suggests that he does not explicitly prefer it to Dio's account here. Casaubon also complained about the latinity of the inscription, but rather than blame Augustus invoked the ignorant stonecutters so beloved of Pantagato: [index rerum gestarum], quem manu Graecorum linguae Latinae prorsus imperitorum fusisse vel Romae descriptum, vel postea sculptum, res clamat ipsa: adeo multa sunt perperam & contra omnem Latinitatem expressa.

79 J. Lipsius, Electorum liber I, p. 61.
80 For example, when discussing the honours Augustus received as imperator, Lipsius noted that in the res gestae Augustus claimed, 'QVOTIESCVMQVE. IMPERATOR sum appellatus, AVRI CORONARIVM. NON. ACCEPI,' and commented, 'Gloriatur vere': J. Lipsius, Admiranda, p. 68.
81 J. Scaliger, De emendatione temporum, p. 234.
To scholars trained in the examination of literary texts, for whom an important weapon in detecting interpolations in the manuscript tradition was an attentiveness to the authors' style, the notion that the inscription had an identifiable author could be a weapon in detecting forgery. As we saw in the last chapter, Agustín argued that one inscription supposedly recording the words of Cato was a forgery: as well as indicating that the text had a doubtful provenance, he rejected it 'porque no hab'avan de aquella manera en aquel tiempo, ni aquel es lenguaje de Caton,' and because 'no se guarda bien el decoro, como se dice, de Caton.' The rarity of inscriptions attributable to a known author meant that Agustín's is more or less the only example of this technique, however.

In this case as elsewhere, Agustín's techniques show that scholars were happiest dealing with inscriptions where they could examine the language of the inscribed words. In their attention to the manufacture of inscriptions, the effects of the stoncutters commissioned to produce them and the authors of the words that were inscribed, the sixteenth-century scholars reveal a more nuanced view to these inscriptions' status as records of antiquity than has previously been noticed. But as in other cases of epigraphic scholarship, the impulses to examine inscriptions in this way may well have come from techniques of textual criticism: the distorting effect of copyists of the manuscripts finds an analogy in the role of the stoncutter, while attribution of a text to an author meant that it could be compared with other literary texts as a relic of a particular historical moment.

A. Agustín, *Dialogos*, pp. 456-7 (*CIL II.164*).
Chapter 6: Coins and Coin Scholarship

Inscriptions were not the only forms of material evidence to be examined for the information they could provide about the ancient world. In this chapter I will examine the collection, classification, representation and historical citation of coins to provide a comparative view against which to measure attitudes to inscriptions. Modern scholars have been more attracted to work on coins in the sixteenth century than on inscriptions, and a variety of treatments of individual collectors and scholars exist, as well as more general studies. It is important to note that the interests of a sixteenth-century coin scholar were not the same as those of a numismatist today. We possess a selection of lists (written from the 1560s onwards) of men defined as scholars of coins, which have sufficient overlap to suggest the formation of a canon. These men's works are concerned with representing

---

1 For the sake of clarity, inscriptions on coins will be referred to as legends in this chapter.
2 Works on particular scholars include studies by Edith Lemburg-Ruppelt, Federica Missere Fontano and Giulio Bodon on Enea Vico, by Dirk Jacob Jansen on Jacopo Strada and by Christian Dekesel on Hubert Goltz. Richard Cooper looks at coins collecting and scholarship in France in his 'Collectors of Coins', Dekesel provides a voluminous bibliography in his Biblioteca nummaria, and John Cunnellly gives a general survey of sixteenth-century coin books and the milieu in which they were produced in his Images of the Illustrious. Finally, Francis Haskell considers how coins were used in historical scholarship in the first three chapters of his History and its Images. I am very grateful to Brian W. Ogilvie for letting me see his unpublished paper, 'On Numismatics and Antiquarian Method in the Sixteenth Century'.
coins, and interpreting their obverses and reverses, and it is on them that I shall focus here.
There were sixteenth-century scholars interested in metrology, but these men tended in
general to base their researches on literary texts rather than the measurement of objects.¹

Interest in the historical application of coins and inscriptions gathered pace at the same
time, and many of the scholars whose work we have examined so far took an equal or
greater interest in coins than inscriptions. The correspondence of Antonio Agustín with
Fulvio Orsini devotes much more space to discussion of coins. While all scholars of
inscriptions seem to have showed some interest in coins, the reverse is not true: the
correspondence of the Farnese courtier Annibale Caro, for example, shows that he had a
great interest in coins — he owned a considerable collection — but none in inscriptions.²

When Tomaso Garzoni wrote his chapter on antiquarian scholars in his Piazza universale
di tutte le professioni del mondo of 1589, he entitled it 'De' professori di medaglie e d'altre
anticaglie, antiquari detti', and discussed in it only coins.³ The reason for this trend is the
greater availability and collectability of coins. The weight and size of inscriptions on stone
at least meant that they could only really be collected by the very rich, or surveyed in situ.
Coins, in contrast, were easily moved, and frequently discovered. When Hubert Goltz, in
his edition of the coins struck under Julius Caesar, appended a list of the owners of coin
collections in Germany, Italy and France that he claimed to have visited in his research, it
included nearly 1,000 names.⁴ This wider circle of interested collectors also contributed to
the relatively large number of coin books printed in the sixteenth century, compared to

---

¹ A useful list of sixteenth-century works on metrology, a discipline popularised by Guillaume
Budé's De ase of 1515, is given by P. Berghaus, 'Die deutsche Anteil', pp. 12-13. An exception to the
mainly literary approach of such scholars is provided by the work of Pirro Ligorio: see M. Gulletta,
'La terminologia vascolare' and D. Gasparotto, 'Ricerche sull'antica metrologia'. It is interesting to
note that interest in metrology seems to have preceded that in the iconography of coins: before
Budé's work, Jacobus Aurelius Questenberg wrote an unpublished De sestertio, talento, nummis et id
genus in 1499, Afonso de Portugal published a 1510 Tractatus de numismate, and roughly
contemporary to Budé, Leonardo da Porto wrote a De sestertio and G. Biel a Tractatus de potestate et
utilitate monetarum. Andrea Alciato's Libellus de ponderibus et mensuris, replying to Budé, was
printed in 1530.

² Caro's correspondence is edited as Lettere familiari. On his interests as a numismatist, see G.
Castellani, 'Annibale Caro numismatico' and M. Romano, 'Gli interessi numismatici'.

³ T. Garzoni, La piazza universale, ii p. 1444.

⁴ H. Goltz, C. Iulius Caesar, sigs. aa iir - ccv; see J. Cunnally, Images of the Illustrious, pp. 41-4.
those devoted to inscriptions. A large number of these books were written in vernacular languages, or translated into the vernacular, again in contrast with works on inscriptions. This too points to a wider audience, as does the fact that we see practical manuals dealing with coins as objects, especially Enea Vico's 1555 *Discorsi sopra le medaglie*. By far the greater part of Antonio Agustín's 1587 *Dialogos de medallas, inscriciones y otras antiguedades*, the only real manual dealing with inscriptions from the period, is devoted to coins. These works usefully contain the sort of theoretical statements on the historical interpretation of coins which in the case of inscriptions only really occur in the two chapters dealing with them in Agustín's work.

Petrarch is the first large-scale coin collector of whom we know. Although he was not alone in this practice, it does not really seem to have taken off until the second half of the fifteenth century, when we hear of considerable collections belonging to Ercole d'Este, Lorenzo de'Medici, and Pietro Barbo (later Pope Paul II), an inventory of whose collection was made in 1457. Petrarch tried to compare the evidence of coins with historical accounts, for example writing in the margin of his text of the *Scriptores historiae Augustae* next to the claim that the emperor Gordian was handsome, 'si hoc verum fuit, malum habuit sculptorem'. But as in other areas, his insights were not explored by his contemporaries or immediate successors, and it is only with the rise of the fifteenth-century collectors that we see evidence of humanists trying to exploit the evidence of coins in understanding the ancient world. Giovanni Tortelli, for example, cites coins in his work on orthography in the middle of the century, and Andrea Santacroce wrote a tract on the abbreviations used in coins in 1464. By the time that Poliziano came to write his *Miscellanea*, the frequent references to coins as well as to inscriptions demonstrate his familiarity with both forms of evidence. The first book purporting to illustrate coins appeared in 1517 at Rome, printed by the same publisher as the *Epigrammata antiquae urbis*, Giacomo Mazochi, and now attributed to Andrea Fulvio, although later sixteenth-

---


century scholars sometimes assumed that Jacopo Sadoleto, the book’s dedicatee, was the author. This was popular, but not immediately imitated. The real expansion in interest in numismatic material took place in the middle of the sixteenth century, stimulating the publication of many books. This is the same time as we have seen widespread interest in inscriptions reflected in the work undertaken on them. It was in this period that scholars of coins confronted the same problems of classification and representation as those dealing with inscriptions were facing.

The Classification of Coins

The classification of coins, and the order in which they were presented in printed collections, posed more problems for scholars than did inscriptions. More criteria could be applied: as well as the geographical, chronological, thematic and linguistic divisions explored in the classification of inscriptions, coins could also be distinguished by metal, and both obverse and reverse had to be considered. Furthermore, unlike in the case of inscriptions, relatively more Roman republican coins survived, which showed more fundamental differences from those struck under the empire than did inscriptions from the two periods. Also, in relative terms there were more coins in Greek and struck in Greece in western Europe than Greek inscriptions from Italy, or recorded inscriptions from other parts of the classical Greek world. Claudio Tolomei included a volume devoted to coins in his 1542 proposal for the encyclopedia accompanying Vitruvius to be produced by the Accademia della Virtù. This gives some idea of the variety of possible ways of classifying coins, although his list suggests that he does not seem to have considered in depth the problems that would arise: ‘con ogni diligenza si farà una opera de le medaglie, distinguentole per li tempi e per i luoghi e per la qualità degli uomini, dichiarando a pieno la persona e l’occasione di far la medaglia, e di più il rivercio, con tutte le cose ch’appartenesseno a qualche bella o riposta dottrina.’

---

12 See J. Cunnally, Images of the Illustrious, pp. 52-87 and R. Weiss’s preface to the 1967 facsimile edition of Fulvio’s text.

13 For the general trends of publication of numismatic books in the century, see C. Dekesel, “The “Boom” in Numismatic Publications’ and the introduction to his Biblioteca nummaria.

A second key difference is that the sheer number of surviving examples was such that we
have only one proposal envisaging a printed edition to include all of them. In 1558 a work
by Wolfgang Lazius appeared, with the title Commentariorum vetustorum numismatum
maximi scilicet operis et quatuor sectionibus multarum rerum publicarum per Asiam,
Africa, & Europam antiquitatis Historiam nodosque Gordianis difficiliores
comprehendentis, specimen exile. This volume dealt with the silver coins of Julius Caesar,
Augustus and Tiberius, but in the dedicatory letter Lazius claimed to be ready to produce
further volumes presenting 700,000 more coins, with commentary.\textsuperscript{15} On the basis of the
specimen exile, John Cunnally estimates that such a work would have been 800,000 pages
long.\textsuperscript{16} Not surprisingly, perhaps, it has left no trace. Even the boldest of other scholars
limited themselves to proposals to collect Roman imperial coins. We know of two such
projects, the results of which fell considerably short of the grandiose hopes held out for
them. In 1553 Jacopo Strada produced an Epitome thesauri antiquitatum, hoc est,
imperatorum Romanorum orientalium & occidentalium iconum, an abbreviated version of a
proposed work in four volumes, none of which subsequently appeared. Hubert Goltz's
proposal was equally ambitious, and two volumes devoted to Julius Caesar and Augustus
survive, comprising illustrations of their coins, followed by an account of their lives, and
various other material relevant to the men's careers.

By choosing to focus on coins of the imperial period, and to divide them by the emperor
they mention, Strada and Goltz already made a selection that removed some problems of
classification. To examine how scholars tried to classify coins without first selecting a
particular focus, it is worth looking at examples of the actual collections made in this
period, to see what criteria determined the way they were ordered for display. We have
evidence for the classification of a variety of coin cabinets from the period, including those
of the Este and Farnese collections, Fulvio Orsini, and Laevinus Torrentius.

The most important system of classification was by metal, and this seems to have been
long established: according to the will of Giovanni Marcanova, the fifteenth-century
antiquarian who died in 1467, his coins were kept in a container, divided by sections for
gold, silver, bronze and lead material.\textsuperscript{17} This remained true in the sixteenth century: a

\textsuperscript{15} On the work, see J. Cunnally, Images of the Illustrious, pp. 123-8

\textsuperscript{16} J. Cunnally, Images of the Illustrious, p. 128.

\textsuperscript{17} J. Cunnally, Images of the Illustrious, p. 28.
catalogue Celio Calcagnini produced of Ercole II d'Este between 1538 and 1541 only included d'Este's gold coins.\textsuperscript{18} Similarly, metal was the most important instrument Fulvio Orsini used to classify his collection, grouping Greek and Roman gold coins together, then separating the silver coins from the bronze, and only then trying to divide them by language.\textsuperscript{19} In the Farnese collection, the size of the coin as well as the metal was the most important consideration.\textsuperscript{20}

After a preliminary division by metal, collections were then ordered as far as possible chronologically. In practice, this meant that Roman imperial coins were gathered together in order of emperor. This is true of the Farnese collection, and of Calcagnini's catalogue of the gold coins belonging to the Este. In Torrentius's collection, he divided imperial coins by metal, but within these sections, the individual examples were ordered chronologically.\textsuperscript{21} Collectors were anxious to form complete sets, either simply of representations of the twelve emperors whose lives were written by Suetonius, or, more ambitiously, of all the Roman emperors. So, for example, in the late sixteenth century we learn that Ercole Basso thought that it was worth buying a modern reproduction of an aureus of Didius Julianus for the collection of Francesco de' Medici, to fill a gap in his collection before a genuine example came on to the market.\textsuperscript{22} For non-imperial and Greek coins, such chronological ordering was not so easy. Torrentius grouped together republican and Greek coins, regardless of metal; in Calcagnini's catalogue, gold republican and gold Greek coins are grouped together. Interestingly, Fulvio Orsini's collection had a separate section for Christian coins.

We know of one collection which seems to have been ordered slightly differently from these common metal and chronological models, that of the Este. After Calcagnini's

\textsuperscript{18} The catalogue (in Modena, Biblioteca Estense MS. Lat. 152 = a. T.6,16) is printed in Documenti inediti per servire alla storia dei Musei, pp. 100-55; for analysis, see G. Missere and F. Missere Fontana, Una silloge numismatica, esp. p. 21 for the importance to the author of thinking in terms of the type of metal used.

\textsuperscript{19} See P. De Nolhac, 'Les collections d'antiquités', p. 185-229.


\textsuperscript{21} V. Tourneur, 'La collection Laevinus Torrentius', esp. pp. 302-16.

\textsuperscript{22} M. McCrory, 'Domenico Compagni', p. 117, referring to (but not dating) Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Mediceo del Principato MS. 785, fol. 90r.
catalogue a slightly later classification was produced, probably between 1560 and 1580, giving brief details of a proposed order for the collection. After medals of the emperors, divided by type of metal and ordered chronologically, imperial coins were to be displayed showing their reverses, again ordered chronologically, and this would include coins depicting an emperor but struck after his death. Then were to come coins featuring Roman emperors, but struck in Greece, then coins of other famous Romans, ordered chronologically. This seems to reflect the scholarly interests of Enea Vico, who, as we shall see, wrote works dealing with the reverses of coins and applying them to events in the reigns of emperors. Vico was ‘antiquario’ at the Este court from 1563 until his death in 1567, a period coinciding with a considerable number of coin acquisitions by Alfonso II.

As well as actual inventories of collections, we know of one letter outlining the requirements of a coin collection. Fulvio Orsini wrote to Gianvincenzo Pinelli in 1580, with details of what he thought an ideal collection should comprise. First he recommends that Pinelli collect all the coins from the republic, totalling around 1,000, which should be ordered by family, then those of emperors, their wives, fathers and sons, to total around 200. But Orsini here shows interests similar to those expressed in the Este proposal, suggesting that Pinelli would need more coins were he to be interested in the their reverses: ‘...eccetto che Lei non volesse entrare nella varietà de rovesci, che sono notabili, come mi pare necessario, et all’ hora cresceria il numero fino a 500 medaglie non ci computando quelle di bronzo, che sarebbono più di altretante le buone.’ Orsini goes on to recommend

---

23 See F. Missere Fontana, ‘Raccolte numismatiche... Gli stati estensi’, pp. 230-1, and the transcription of the inventory (Modena, Archivio di Stato, Archivio di Stato Estense, Archivio per materie, Antichità, b. 7/1,3/1) at p. 250.

24 F. Missere Fontana, ‘Raccolte numismatiche... Gli stati estensi’, p. 250, ‘Una successione d’Imperatori simile, pigliando ciascuno con tutti i rovesci da lui fatti, uno per sorte, col metter innanzi le Medaglie che mostreranno l’effigie di minor età, o, che per l’ordin de l’Istoria di quel che sarà nel rovescio, si potrà far giuditio che fossero battute prima, ponendo in ultimo quelle che saran battute doppo la morte, così Consecrationi, come restituite da’ successori; una successione simile di Medaglie battute da’ Provincie di Grecia in honor d’Imperatori Romani, con ampliarla piu che si può, perché sarà nuova et al mio parer assai rara; Consoli, Pretori, Questori di Provincie, Consolari, Parenti d’Imperatori, et altri illustri Romani, disposti secondo l’ordine de l’Istoria piu che si potrà; L’altre Medaglie si lasseran come stanno.’

that Pinelli acquire coins of the kings of Syria, Macedonia, and Bithynia, and order those Greek coins that he could get in alphabetical order of place.  

With the exception of the preliminary division by metal, the selection of coins and their presentation in published works reflect the interests demonstrated in this letter and in the collections surveyed above. First, coin books featured a series of coins of emperors, often as well as other famous men. This was the most popular genre of coin publication by far, beginning, as we have seen, with Andrea Fulvio’s *Illustrium imagines*. Fulvio did not restrict himself to Roman emperors, including 205 illustrations with brief biographies. The format was slightly adapted (and most of Mazochi’s woodcuts borrowed) by Johannes Huttich for his *Imperatorum Romanorum libellus una cum imaginibus ad vivam effigiem expressis* of 1525; Huttich’s illustrations were subsequently taken for Johannes Cuspinianus’s *De Caesaribus atque imperatoribus Romanis* and an *Icones imperatorum...* published in 1544. Further collections of portraits appeared in Guillaume Rovillé’s *Promptuarium iconum insigniorum* (1553), Goltz’s *Vitae omnium fere imperatorum imaginum* (1557) and Strada’s *Imperatorum romanorum omnium... verissimae imaginum*. Vico compiled a similar work for female members of the Roman imperial house, his 1557 *Le imagini delle donne Auguste*. Later in the century appeared Laevinus Hulsius’s *XII. primorum Caesarum et LXIII. ipsorum uxorum et parentum... effigies* (1597).

These works present portraits in a medallic form, although, as we shall see when we consider standards of accuracy, this did not necessarily mean that the portraits were based on original coins. In most of these, accounts of the person illustrated are taken from literary sources, and no attempt is made to connect the written account with the illustration. These works are to be connected with the sixteenth-century craze for books of portraits of famous people, immortalised through their *vita* and *effigies*: others include a collection of famous lawyers by Marco Benavides and doctors by Abraham Ortelius.  

These books were intended as inspirations to their readers, and coins were illustrated

---


27 For a list of such works, see P. Berghaus, ‘Die deutsche Anteil’, pp. 14-17.

simply to provide a portrait of the individuals involved. It is interesting to note that the
first scholar to develop the genre, by attempting to provide more than one image of a
particular individual, was Orsini, who combined the evidence of coins with that of herms
and other monuments in his *Imagines et elogia virorum illustrium et eruditor*. of 1570.
Orsini focussed less on Roman emperors, than on other famous men, including poets,
orators, and historians, and organised them by profession.29

Books like Orsini’s used coins primarily as illustrations. Others dealing with emperors
more interestingly actually engaged with the coins that were illustrated. To a certain
extent, both Strada’s and Goltz’s works show some evidence of this engagement, providing
more than one image of a particular emperor and making some effort to connect what
appeared on the coin with what was known of that emperor’s reign from literary sources.
Another proposed corpus, by Enea Vico went further. He published his *Ex libris XXIII
commentariorum in vetera imperatorum Romanorum numismata liber primus* in 1560. This
first book dealt with Julius Caesar, but rather than trying to include all the issues made
while Caesar held power, Vico simply chose to focus on a few that reflected events in his
reign, order them chronologically, and provide commentaries. In this work, Vico also gives
details of how he would fit the remaining emperors into a proposed 23-book scheme. A
more comprehensive single volume work is Adolph Occo’s *Impp. Romanorum Numismata
a Pompeio Magno ad Heraclium*, in which Occo does not provide illustrations of the coins,
ordered chronologically by Republican leader and then emperor, but simply descriptions
and transcriptions of the legends on the coins, along with commentaries.30

Other works reflected the interest in reverses shown by the proposal for the classification
of the Este cabinet, and Orsini’s letter to Pinelli. The first published book to make a point
of illustrating reverses was Vico’s and Antonio Zantani’s 1548 *Le imagini con tutti i riveris
trovati et le vite de gli imperatori*,31 but we have evidence of earlier interest in the material,
especially a manuscript of Guillaume Du Choul now in Turin, the first volume of a work

29 On this work of Orsini, and its groundbreaking nature in offering comparative views, see J.
“*Imagines virorum illustrium* e gemme Orsini’.

30 On Occo and coin collecting see P. Arnold, ‘Adolf III. Occo (1524-1606) und das Dresdner

31 On this work, see G. Bodon, *Enea Vico*, pp. 97-104.
Calcagnini’s descriptions of the coins in the Este collection also show that he had a keen interest in reverse types. After the publication of Vico’s and Zantani’s work, illustration of the reverse became the norm. Goltz made a point of illustrating first the obverse of coins in his works on Julius Caesar and Augustus, then giving several plates of reverses, with a complex system of cross-reference to connect the two; Vico preferred to illustrate obverse and reverse together, a pattern which other works tended to follow; Occo described both sides of the coin as a matter of course. One important scholar who used the Este collection, but whose works were not published, is Pirro Ligorio. The unfinished nature of Ligorio’s manuscript work meant that his categories are not rigourously enforced, but along with a chronological examination of coins struck in the republic and then under emperors, he also has separate sections dealing with reverses.

The most important printed collection of republican coins to appear was that of Orsini, the *Familiae romanae*, in 1577. This book divides the coins by family, and arranges the families alphabetically, as Orsini was to recommend in his subsequent letter to Pinelli. The work included an appendix by Antonio Agustín of details of 32 families, without illustrations and not based on the evidence of coins. Erizzo had already included a ‘Dichiaratione delle antiche monete consulari’ in the third (1571) edition of his *Discorso*, with descriptions, but no illustrations of republican coins. Occo, too, was interested in producing an edition of republican coins comparable to his work on imperial ones, but if he did attempt to do so, it has not survived. One major attempt to collect the coins of Greece was undertaken by Goltz, although his *Graecia sive historiae urbium et popullorum Graeciae ex antiquis numismatibus restitute libri quatuor* in fact only includes the first book, with coins of Sicily and Magna Graecia, organised by city, and no more appeared in his life. Lazius included two plates of coins from the places he described in his *Commentariorum rerum Graecarum libri*. Selections of coins made for printed editions,

---


34 Ligorio’s material on coins is spread between three manuscripts in the Naples collection, BN MSS XIII.B.1, XIII.B.5 and XIII.B.6. For details of the titles of individual books within these, see E. Mandowsky and C. Mitchell (eds.), *Pirro Ligorio’s Roman Antiquities*, pp. 129-31.

therefore, often reflected the criteria used to display physical collections of coins. But the editions surveyed above were not the only printed collections of coins. The coins illustrated in Agustín’s Dialogos, Erizzo’s Discorso, or Antoine Le Pois’s Discours, for example, were chosen to illustrate points made in the text. In his In veterum numismatum Romanorum miscellanea explicationes, for example, Costanzo Landi simply commented on a miscellany of coins; the selection printed by Johannes Sambucus at the end of his Emblemata represents those he sent as a gift to Jean Grolier.36

The Representation, Reconstruction, and Forgery of Coins

As we saw above, coins were collected by a wider range of individuals than were inscriptions. This meant that those men trying to provide comprehensive surveys of coins could potentially encounter more practical problems than those collecting inscriptions. Indeed, we have evidence of complaints that some collections were barred to antiquarian researchers, something that does not seem to have been true of the rich princes’ collections that housed inscriptions.37 Paradoxically, however, the collecting of information about coins seems to have been a more individual effort than investigating inscriptions. Whereas the collections of inscriptions made by Smet or Panvinio, for example, were the fruit of the efforts of a network of scholars, the large corpora of coins examined above tended to be the work of single researchers. The list Goltz included in his Caesar is an account of the collections he visited, rather than of individuals who sent him material. Similarly, the material included by Enea Vico in his work reflects in the main the contents of collections

36 On Sambucus’s work, see M. R-Alfoldi, ‘Zu den frühen Illustrationen numismatischer Werke’.
37 See, for instance, Goltz’s note to his dedicatee Marcus Fugger, praising him for making his collection known, in his compendium of citations from coins and inscriptions, the Thesaurus rei antiquariae huberrimus, on the difference between the two types of evidence: ‘extare comperimus, idque eo magis quod cum inscriptionum usus semper fuerit publicus, numismatum vero privatus, haec quam illa in vulgus proferri maioris liberalitatis, adde etiam utilitatis esse videatur’ (sig. [*5]r). In his Explicationes, a selection of essays interpreting various coins, Costanzo Landi seems to complain that some collectors did not make their material available, although he may be referring to their not taking any notice of his explications: ‘sunt enim quidam plebei homines sic pecuniae antiquae monetaeque Romanae domi retinentissimi, & adeo superstitosi, ut eam vix permittant lucem, instar Euclionis Plautini, aspicere’ (sig. [A4]r).
he knew and visited in the Veneto, and later the coin cabinet of the Este and collectors near Ferrara.

These individual researchers are indicative of a key difference in the representation of numismatic and epigraphic material. Whereas in the sixteenth century scholars were mostly content with transcriptions of the text of inscriptions, in some cases with attention to the shape of the letters and an idea of the monument on which they appeared, in the case of coins a picture seems to have been deemed a more important component. This required an artist. Both Vico and Goltz were competent draughtsmen, unlike many other antiquarian scholars of the period. It is noticeable that when Agustín and Orsini, for example, communicated details of coins to one another, they described them, with details of the legends, rather than trying to illustrate them. Scholars were aware of the limitations of such an approach. In a letter to Silvio Antonian, Caro described the best way of making sure that he could assemble details of the coins that he had seen, in terms reminiscent of the care recommended in transcribing inscriptions: 'scriverei tutte le medaglie che mi venissero a le mani o de le quali io potessi aver notizia, e i diritti e i rovesci loro diligentemente con tutte le lettere, così come stanno appunto, segnando quelle che non ci sono o non appaiono con intervalli e con punti...'. In general, however, the practical consequences of scholars’ belief in the importance of illustrating the designs but their inability to do so are two-fold: we do not now have a wide variety of manuscript collections of representations of coins, as we do of inscriptions; and in the process of representing coins, the figure of the artist — less significant in transcriptions of inscriptions — becomes prominent.

The printing of books in the sixteenth century was an expensive business, and this was especially true of illustrated books, as we saw in the first chapter. While most sixteenth-century coin books were illustrated, some, such as Vico’s Discorsi or Occo’s Imperatorum Romanorum numismata (the printing of which Occo subsidised), were not, and it seems

---

38 F. Missere Fontana provides a useful list of these collectors in her ‘Raccolte numismatiche... Gli stati estensi’ and ‘Raccolte numismatiche... Enea Vico a Venezia’.

39 A. Caro, Lettere, ii no. 374 p. 110; see M. Romano, ‘Gli interessi numismatici’, p. 295, where the letter is reprinted at 301-2.

that cost was one reason for this. Certainly, Costanzo Landi suggests that this was one reason for the lack of illustrations in his *Explicationes*, writing to the reader that 'nec illa [miscellanea] imaginibus suis ostentata a me nunc expectabis: quod scio a plerisque factitatum. Non enim id nos efficere valuitmus, licet omni cura studuerimus: tum inopia angustiaque temporis...'.^ C. Landi, *Explicationes*, sig. [A4]r. This cost was passed on to the buyer. In his translation of Agustin's *Dialogos (Antiquitatum Romanarum Hispaniarumque in nummis veterum dialogi XI)*, which was published in 1617, slightly after the period under consideration here, Andreas Schott wrote that he had not included inscriptions, 'Cum ne sumptibus onerem non necessariis eos, qui hoc Antiquitatis studio non capiuntur, aut certe alio respectum habentes ut minus quaestuosum fastidiunt...' (sig. *3r).^ C. Landi, *Explicationes*, sig. [A4]r.

Sambucus may have included illustrations of coins in his *Emblemata* for the same reason that Orsini recommended to Piero Vettori that he include a transcription of an inscribed law in a commentary on Cicero, as we saw in chapter one: including more arcane material in what had the potential to be a popular book was one way of getting it published, and books of emblems were certainly sixteenth-century bestsellers.^ In addition, suitable artists were not always available, another reason Landi claimed for the lack of illustrations in his book, referring to the 'periti artificis delineatorisque carentia'.^ Agustin wrote to Orsini about the problem in 1583, when preparing his *Dialogos*, and suggested that he would probably have to send his drawings to Rome as he could not find a suitable artist in Spain.^ This shortage of artists was not limited to those prepared to illustrate coins. Abraham Ortelius, in the introduction to his collection of illustrations of deities from coins, the *Deorum deorumque capita*, wished that there was a suitable artist prepared to draw statues.^ Once plates had been produced for a

---

^ C. Landi, *Explicationes*, sig. [A4]r. This cost was passed on to the buyer. In his translation into Latin of Agustin's *Dialogos (Antiquitatum Romanarum Hispaniarumque in nummis veterum dialogi XI)*, which was published in 1617, slightly after the period under consideration here, Andreas Schott wrote that he had not included inscriptions, 'Cum ne sumptibus onerem non necessariis eos, qui hoc Antiquitatis studio non capiuntur, aut certe alio respectum habentes ut minus quaestuosum fastidiunt...' (sig. *3r).

^ Sambucus's work was a clear success. After its publication in 1564, it was reprinted in 1566, 1569, 1576 and 1599 by the Plantin press: see M. de Schepper, 'Numismatic Publications of the Plantin Press 1561-1588', pp. 33-34.

^ A. Agustin, *Opera omnia*, vii no. 57 p. 263 (10 September 1583), 'Manco male sarà mandarvi il disegno e farli far in Roma.'

^ A. Ortelius, *Deorum deorumque capita*, sig. [Aiiijv, 'Vellem sane hoc fieri, at non a quibusvis sculptoribus, qui tantum ut rem faciant quodvis male imitatrum evulgant: sed a peritissimo eius rei artifici: illique praeesse cuperem virum multiuiga eruditione praeditum, & in hic genere studii imprimis diligenter versatum, qui interdum pictoris manu (ut sic dicam) duceret: Nam uti scientiarum peritum ad quodvis penicillo delineandum minime aptum esse non ignoramus, ita
work, they could be reused, which made it relatively cheap to translate the numismatic publications.\footnote{C. Dekesel, "The "Boom" in Numismatic Publications", pp. 218-20. The best example of a printer exploiting the market for coins books is Guillaume Rovilé. He printed his own \textit{Promptuarium} initially in Latin, Italian and French, in 1553, and issued a Spanish edition in 1561. His best-seller, however, was Alciato's \textit{Emblemata} of which he printed 35 editions: see J. Cunnally, \textit{Images of the Illustrious}, pp. 96-8.}

Just as copyists of inscriptions were keen to stress the diligence and accuracy with which they transcribed material, so the authors of coin books impressed both their reliability, and their reliance on genuine coins, upon their audience. The latter was true of the first coin book, Fulvio's \textit{Imagines}. In the dedicatory letter, the printer Mazochi wrote that he took care to illustrate 'diversorum vultus ex probatissimis miraeque vetustatis numismatibus.'\footnote{A. Fulvio, \textit{Imagines illustrium}, sig. [Aiiijv.}} The titles of most subsequent portrait books went on to state that their contents were taken from ancient coins. Strada and Goltz also emphasized the accuracy with which this was done. Strada's \textit{Epitome} was made up of 'antiquitatum... ex antiquis numismatibus quam fidelissime deliniatarum'; and Goltz's \textit{Vitae... imagines} were 'ex antiquis veterum numismatis solertissime, non ut olim ab aliis, sed vere ac fideliter adumbratae.' Another feature that authors emphasized, just as copyists of inscriptions did, was the importance of autopsy. Occo distinguished certain coins which 'his meis oculis vidi & probavi' from those which 'vel ex aliorem observatione congestos, vel graphiche depictos, vel ex autorem libris excerptos, rariores dumtaxat... additis scriptorium nominibus diligentier annotavi'.\footnote{E. Vico, \textit{Ex librjs XXIII... liber primus}, pp. 26-7, 'Neque vero satis habui, nummos ipsos diligenter intueri; (siquidem nullus in his libris nummus erit, quem non viderim) sed eorum etiam ectypa apud me habere volui. quorum numero sunt praeeritii ii tum aerei, tum argentei, atque aurei, qui in nobilissimo quoque Musaeo custodiuntur, quorum a dominis eorum liberaliter mihi copia facta est.'}

Vico pointed out that he made sure not only that he had not just seen the coin himself, but also had 'ectypa' available as he wrote about them.\footnote{E. Vico, \textit{Ex librjs XXIII... liber primus}, pp. 26-7, 'Neque vero satis habui, nummos ipsos diligenter intueri; (siquidem nullus in his libris nummus erit, quem non viderim) sed eorum etiam ectypa apud me habere volui. quorum numero sunt praeeritii ii tum aerei, tum argentei, atque aurei, qui in nobilissimo quoque Musaeo custodiuntur, quorum a dominis eorum liberaliter mihi copia facta est.'}
Despite such efforts, the lack of communication or understanding between the author and artist chosen to illustrate the books could undermine the authors’ efforts. Antoine Le Pois, for example, apologised for having Roman and Greek material mixed together in his Discours, writing that, ‘la chose estant ainsi advenue, que ie n’ay peu estre present à la taille de toutes les tables de ce premier livre, estant la demeurance du sculpteur bien esloigne de moy, s’est faite une meslange de telles medailles, outre l’ordre non gardé, à mon grand regret.’ Later in the work, he had to point out that the legend given in one illustration was incorrect. Similarly, Erizzo blamed the engraver for errors in the first edition of his Discorso. Jacopo Strada, in the introduction to his Epitome, described images in other books, ‘inverecunda temeritate, ac ignorantia sculptorum corruptas, & libros ipsos, quantumvis docte scriptos inquinantes potius, quam exornantes’, and went on to comment on his own: ‘paucas tantum imagines proposui, & eas verissimas, fideque dignissimas, quas utinam sculptor tam bene sit aemulatus, quam ego recte mea ipsius manu depinxeram, cum alium nemen magis sedulo id curaturum existimarem.’ Vico claimed that it was because he was a skilled artist that he was the right man to produce a book about coins.

It is worth recalling at this point that one of the reasons scholars of inscriptions recommended that the epigraphic material was accurately presented was because they

---

50 For general remarks on the distrust between illustrators and authors in this period, see J. Seznec, ‘Érudits et graveurs’.
51 A. Le Pois, Discours, fol. 73v.
52 A. Le Pois, Discours, fol. 84v, ‘L’inscription est MAG PIVS IMP ITER qui veut dire, Magnus Pius Imperator iterum. Car le sculpteur ne regardant point de pres, a mis MAGNVS pour MAG PIVS, comme la medalle & toutes les semblables portent, si on y prend bien garde.’
55 E. Vico, Ex libris XXIII... liber primus, dedication, ‘Nam cum ego in omni antiquitatis genere, ubicumque pictura ad referendas imagines requiritur, multa quotidie inscintius et absurde committi animadverterem, quia non, cuius ingenio rerum antiquarum imagines exponerentur, eiusdem quoque nam pingerentur, ac sase incidere, ut longe aliter, ac res esset, imitatione rudis artifex redderet, necessarium esse duxi, ut ipse omnes nummos mea manu, (neque enim in hoc munere mediocriter sum versatus) describerem, atque ita artificis opus ad interpretis consilium accomodarem,’ quoted by G. Bodon, Enea Vico, p. 144. The edition of the Ex libris XXIII... liber primus I have used (British Library C.24.b.23) lacks the dedication to Pius IV in which this statement appears.
believed that the shape of the letters was one means by which the inscriptions could be dated. Roman imperial coins were in general very easy to date, when they featured the emperor's name and then a list of the yearly offices that he held. As Orsini's letter to Pinelli indicates, the same ease of dating was not true of Roman republican or Greek coins. Vico and Agustin seem to be the only scholars who expressed an interest in the style of Roman coins, however. Vico's model is that same as that used by scholars of inscriptions, believing that Roman artistic skill reached its zenith in the early principate before declining until the Gothic invasions. Hence the coins from the principates from Caligula to Nerva were the most fine. Agustín's model was more vague, simply positing a decline from the reign of Gallienus in the third century. Vico's interest may have been spurred by his artistic inclination, but scholars do not seem to have exploited the historical implications of what he wrote, unlike in the case of inscriptions.

As with inscriptions, we must ask what scholars meant by the accuracy they advertised. There were in fact as many complaints about the inaccuracy of the representations of coins in books as there were claims for their accuracy, and it seems that the subject was a source of some debate. On one hand, authors of portraits taken from coins professed their fidelity to their sources; on the other, they were obliged to produce a complete series of emperors. When these portraits are compared with surviving coins, it becomes clear that often the images were simply made up, and it is estimated that only 40 per cent of the illustrations in Fulvio's work were taken from original coins. Books derived from the Imagines illustrium continued its faults, but we can see that there is a change of attitude around the middle of the century. Rovillé's Promptuarium appeared in 1553, a collection of images that started with Adam and Eve; but in the same year, Strada tried to demonstrate his fidelity to his sources by leaving blanks in his Epitome for those emperors whose coins he claimed he could not find. He thus suggests that he will not invent coins. A clear split seems to have developed between more and less 'scholarly' publications, and so Strada in his Epitome apparently aimed at the latter. Le Pois criticised the illustrations in Fulvio's work, writing that 'les images et portraits ne sont guere bien faicts, voire y a de l'erreur quelquefois', but he simply dismissed Fulvio's followers, 'Car le petit livre intitulé, Insignium aliquot

---

56 F. Haskell, History and its Images, p. 112; see also his 'Studiosi e cacciatori di tesori', pp. 228-9.
57 E. Vico, Discorsi, p. 53.
58 A. Agustin, Dialogos, p. 15.
Strada seems to have held double standards, however. After the publication of the *Epitome*, he entered into a dispute with Lazius in Vienna over the best way to present the coins of Emperor Ferdinand I. Hans Lautensack, a Nuremburg artist, began to make engravings of the coins, while Lazius began to write the commentary. As we saw in the first chapter, Strada criticised this publication in his bid for ascendancy at court. Part of his attack was on Lazzius’s lack of erudition, and his misattribution of coins. But he also commented on the presentation of the material, writing that ‘Ancor che una medaglia si alquanta frustra, imperò non perde la perfetion del disegno. Loro [Lazius and Lautensack] non osserva altro che li dintorni di fora, con farle guaste: et chi le vedra farà giuditio che Sua Maestà habbia le più goffe medaglie che sia al mondo.’ Here, therefore, exact depiction of the object is not his priority. Dirk Jacob Jansen’s examination of some of Strada’s large-scale drawings of coins in manuscript shows that it is not true of these, either. In fact there is a considerable degree of arbitrariness in Strada’s efforts. The same is true of Goltz’s *Vivae imagines*, the images for which seem to have been compiled from the features on a variety of coins. Later, however, Goltz’s efforts to demonstrate the reliability of his images in his *Julius Caesar* and his *Augustus* led him to adopt similar principles as had been used to represent inscriptions. We know that he had access to Smet’s manuscript of inscriptions, and this may have been his inspiration. He used lettering made up of broken dots to represent the legends on coins where the coin had been worn, rather than write what he thought was there in complete letters.

---

59 A. Le Pois, *Discours*, fols. 2r and 3v.


63 H. Goltz, *C. Julius Caesar*, sig. [cv], ‘Porro si quibus in nummis characteres ipsos inscriptionum non omnino expressos aut perscriptos, sed vestigia tantum litterarum minutissimis punctis leviter annotata animadvertes, intellige archetype ipsum ex quo nummus ille primum descriptus est, verustate ipsa, temporisque aut alia aliqua iniuria vel intertrimento ita labefactatum fuisse vel erosum, aut aerugine aliiive sordibus tenacius inhaerentibus obductum, ut litteras caducas fugientes aut latenties legere vel impossibile vel difficile admodum fuerit. Quod ipsum sic in exemplaribus istis numismatum exacte reddere, fidei meae esse credidi; potius quam ex coniectura quantumvis probabilis & versimili, id quod defecisse effluxisseque videretur substituere.’
The example of coins shows, therefore, that the same scholars seem to have written works in different genres. This is also true of Vico. In his *Discorsi*, published in 1555, Vico wrote that Fulvio and his followers ‘... infedelmente hanno poste molte effigie, pronte piu tosto dalla Idea del loro animo, che dalla naturale somiglianza tratta da coloro, i volti de’quali egli promessero assomigliando dimostrare: cio facendo con non minor biasimo di chi prima errò, anzi con maggior assai; conciosia, che piu grandi si stimino quelli di coloro, che seguendo gli altrui, non si sono ingegnati di giamai correggergli...; che di colui, che prima v’incorse.’ But then in the introduction to his 1557 *Le imagini della donne Auguste* he admitted to have taken some images from Fulvio’s work. Agustín’s bewildered comment in his *Dialogos* is not surprising: ‘y Eneas Vico publico en mi tiempo un libro de medallas de mugeres, y porque no podia henchir el libro con solas las verdaderas, anadio todas las que hallo en aquel libro que dixe [Fulvio’s *Imagines*]. En una cosa acerto, que confesso ser tomadas del otro libro, y no de medallas por el vistas.’

Agustín did not simply consider collections of portraits. He also scrutinised Goltz’s more ‘scholarly’ works, his editions of the coins of Julius Caesar and Augustus, of the Fasti, and of the coins of Greece. He mentioned coins contained in Goltz’s works, and clearly used them as reference, but warned his correspondents to treat them with care. Commenting to Orsini on Goltz’s coin books, he produced the divisive formulation we considered in chapter 1: ‘Come Huberto Goltzio nelle medaglie di Fasti facilmente agionte in molte, & intendo che Huberto è solamente artefice, come Pirro [Ligorio] & Enea [Vico], & un altro del Prontuario [Rovillé].’ Orsini communicated Agustín’s suspicions to Pinelli, writing that ‘V.S. veda d’ haver li libri d’ Uberto Goltzio, se bene in quello de Fasti, la metà delle medaglie sono finte.’ Orsini’s choice of the term ‘finte’ here is important. While it is easy to accept that collections of portraits were not necessarily used by scholars as sources for historical research, Goltz aimed his works at a scholarly audience. For example, the subtitle of his *Caesar* was ‘historiae imperatorum Caesarumque Romanorum ex antiquis

---

46 See, for example, A. Agustín, *Opera omnia*, vii p. 202 to Zurita, pp. 248 and 251 to Orsini.
47 A. Agustín, *Opera omnia*, vii no. 39 p. 252 (20 February 1573).
numismatibus restitutae*. Whether Orsini thought that Goltz had devised the forged coins himself, or had been taken in by others, is not clear: what is clear, is that forged coins were common, and that scholars were extremely anxious to avoid being taken in by them.

One problem with examining the market for modern versions of ancient coins is that both reproductions and forgeries were made. We have already seen that Basso recommended the purchase of what he clearly recognised as a modern reproduction for Francesco de' Medici; Annibale Caro had what he knew was a modern reproduction of a coin illustrating Sappho.* Ancient coins were sold for far more than modern reproductions, however, and so the temptation to pass off reproductions or imitations as authentic must have been considerable. Basso's coin cost three scudi; a figure of 75 scudi was not unheard of for an ancient coin.70 We have evidence of the techniques for making coins look old. Niccolò Gaddi wrote to Francesco de' Medici that modern coins could be varnished.71 Ligorio referred to coins 'ne hanno fatto delle moderne con nuovi rovesci..., consumandole col fuoco et con acqua forte facendole parere corrose dal tempo, han vendute per antiche buona quantità de danari.'72 Our fullest evidence is from Vico's Discorsi, which deals in some detail with the methods forgers used to create antique coins.73 He identifies a variety of methods, from the restriking of ancient coins to the creation of an entirely new coin.74 New dies were required, some of which survive today, giving us an idea of the prevalence of the practice: Andrew Burnett points out that although the makers of these dies were identified by Vico, they lack signatures, suggesting that they could be used to create coins that could be passed off as antique.75

---

70 See A. Burnett, 'Coin Faking', p. 17.
71 M. McCrory, 'Domenico Compagni', p. 117, referring to (but not dating) Archivio di Stato di Firenze, Mediceo del Principato MS. 673, fol. 383r.
72 Naples, BN MS XIII.B.4 fol. 16v.
73 E. Vico, Discorsi, pp. 61-7, book 1 chapter XXII, 'Delle fraudi che si fanno intorno alle medaglie moderne per farle parere antiche, e delle Patine diverse di colori'.
74 See A. Burnett, 'Coin Faking', p. 16 and E. Lemburg-Ruppelt, 'Der systematische Ausbau der Numismatik', p. 65 n. 23.
75 A. Burnett, 'Coin Faking', pp. 16-17; for details of a particular artist, see M. McCrory, 'Domenico Compagni'.
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Scholars were anxious to reassure their readers that they were not taken in by such fakes. In a family tree of the Julio-Claudians, illustrated with coins, Vico wrote that it would have been 'indecens' to include forgeries, and that he was sure he had not done so. Strada expressed a fear of being taken in by forgeries, in his Epitome, referring to the skill of those who had made them: 'Quod ut effugere quis possit, iudicium adhibendum certum, ne pro veris adulterinos & falsos accipiat: hac enim tempestate tam ingeniosi & excellentes inveniuntur sculptores, ut cum illis veteribus sint comparandi, quique notiores sunt, quam ut hic nominare necesse sit.' In reply to his interlocutor reminding him of the existence of forgeries at the beginning of the Dialogos, Agustín wrote that they were rarely so good as to be the same in every detail. Le Pois is unusual for admitting that he may have been fallible, in being deceived: 'ie ... sy autresfois achetté una medalle de cuivre, à l'inscription de Scipion l'Africain, quatre ecus d'or, la matière de laquelle eust esté payee de quatre deniers tournois: jount encore l'opinion que l'avoit qu'elle estoit falsifiee, & non veritamment antique.'

These comments reveal the clearly deceptive intent of coin forgers. As in the case of inscriptions, we can also identify a scholar who invented material on paper, apparently to deceive his contemporaries. In fact, this is the same man, Pirro Ligorio. In a study of Ligorio's illustrations of coins used for information about temples in the set of manuscripts now in Turin, Ian Campbell has shown that for the imperial coins Ligorio cites, around one third do not seem to have been based on any existing example, and that of the remaining two thirds, only twelve out of 45 are faithful reproductions. For Republican coins, Ligorio seems to have given himself more freedom: four of the coins he cites are traceable, 32 not. Ligorio has clearly manipulated images to suit his purposes. To reconstruct one temple, for example, he changed the torches on a coin illustrated by Vico.

76 I have not seen this family tree: see G. Bodon, Enea Vico, p. 109, 'Indecens enim nobis undecumque visum esset falsi quicquam sue ficti inserere, sed syncera duntaxat rei veritate, veras, omni qua potimus diligentia ab antiquis aereis, argenteis, aureisque numismatibus desumptas imagine, a quibus nulla in re nos potuisse decipi certo scimus.'
77 J. Strada, Epitome, sig. A4r.
78 A. Agustin, Dialogos, p. 16, 'Pocas vezes se hallan medallas tan bien facadas que sean las mismas en todas cosas.'
79 A. Le Pois, Discours, sig. e iv.
Again there is the problem of Ligorio’s proposed audience for the Turin volumes, and we do not have the same evidence of Ligorio’s letter to Pinelli where he described a forged inscription to demonstrate his fraudulent intent, but his practice seems to be the same for both inscriptions and coins. Ligorio was also in fact known as a striker of coins. Pompeo Ugonio wrote of him that ‘Si dilettava delle medaglie antiche, e ne fece imprimar molte di nove dandoli una ruggine verde, o altro suco accì paressero antiche, delle quali ne fece, o contrafece gran quantità che hanno ingannato molti. Tali medaglie stampò anche de Papi e Cardinali, tanto de’ tempi antichi come de’ tempi Bassi. Et questo mi disse il detto Jacomo Card. Savello un giorno, che io giovane li portai una medaglia di Jacomo Savello Cardinale Antico di questa casa, che fu Papa Honorio quarto dicendomi, non è antica, deve essere di Pirro Ligorio.’

The techniques Vico recommended for detecting the existence of forgery were more specific than those regarding inscriptions. After describing the various methods of making forgeries in his Discorsi, Vico suggests how they could be noticed. So, for example, after giving details of the practice of filing away one side of a coin and restriking it, Vico writes, ‘Nella cognizione di questa, tre particularità avvertirà il giudice, ciò è, lettione d’ historia, maniera di scoltura, e commessura della medaglia. Il primo avvertimento insegna per le imprese, & opere dall’ imperador fatte; per i magistrati ottenuti, e per gli anni regnati. Il secondo, per le figure, ciò è con qual artificio, e proportione elle sono scolpite; e per la maniera ancora delle lettere. Il terzo è, che intorno all’ orlo della medaglia, si vede biancheggiare un sottile filo d’argento.’ This practical advice reinforces the impression that the Discorsi were designed as a manual for collectors. In the Dialogos, however, Agustín is less precise, simply indicating that with practice and skill forgeries can be uncovered, much as he recommended in the case of inscriptions.

---

81 Ugonio wrote this comment on the frontispiece of his copy of Ligorio’s Libro delle antichità, now in the Vatican Library: see Giovanni Ramilli, ‘Un giudizio di Bartolomeo Borghesi’, pp. 496-7. The passage is also quoted by H. Dressel, ‘Pirro Ligorio als Münzfälscher’. See ch. 1, n. 28.
82 A. Agustín, Dialogos, p. 453, ‘Estas son muy conocidas, por ser muy diferentes en su forma y labor de las de los Romanos y Griegos.’ In this he takes the same position as he had in his Alveolus (p. 153): ‘Come si prova essere le medaglie monete di antiqui? alle cose scolpite, alle lettere, al peso, alla quantità.’
The Interpretation of Coins

The men who worked with coins were eager to stress their usefulness as historical evidence, as we saw in Goltz’s subtitle quoted above, and they did so more explicitly than in the case of inscriptions. Scholars particularly stressed the fact that coins could be compared with written accounts of events. Vico referred to coins thus: ‘delle cose con verità narrate sono testimonio, e delle falsamente scritte sono correttici, & argumentatrici.’ Erizzo argued that written histories were often biased, so coins (as well as other material remains from antiquity) could verify claims made, and Occo wrote that coins ‘ipsis historiis quasi lumen quoddam addant: cum paene affirmare ausim, historias ex nummis potius, quam nummos ex historiis corrigi & emendari posse.' Vico included coins along with inscriptions and gems in his list of ‘Autorità citate’ used at the beginning of his work, making a programmatic statement of their value by raising them to the status of written texts. In such claims for the value of the testimony of coins, Agustin seems to strike a quiet note of caution, writing about what could be learned from them: ‘in somma la antichita si impara così bene come da i libri, et come dalle tavole, statue, colonne, et edificii. Ma bisogna congiunger queste alle altre cose.’

In extracting historical information, scholars went about the interpretation of the textual element in coins in much the same way as they approached inscriptions. As we saw, the first manual interpreting the abbreviations used in coins appeared in 1464, and examples

---

83 E. Vico, Discorsi, p. 49.
85 E. Vico, Discorsi, pp. 15-16; see E. Lemburg-Ruppelt, ‘Der systematische Ausbau der Numismatik’, p. 59
86 A. Agustin, Alveolus, p. 151 (from Madrid, Escorial MS S-II-18, fols. 595r-596v). Agustin’s list of the potential uses of coins that comes just before this passage is a useful reminder of how valuable he thought they were to artists: ‘Che utile si cava delle medaglie di oro, argento ovo bronzoo Greche o Latine o d’altrine nationi? Li pittori, scultori, et funditori cavano di quelle che son ben fatte, utile quanto a la peritia, et perfection dell’arte la qual si toca con mano fusse piu perfetta nelle tempi di buoni mastri Greci et Latini. et tutti imparano. La inventione di disegni, il isplicar i suoi concetti, il ritrato di tanti uomini et donne celebrate, l’habito, li edificii, instrumenti, vasi, et altre cose di antichi. Come facevano le virtu, li vitii, li affeti, li dei, le province, li fiumi. La historia, le fabule, li animali rari, la orthographia. La varieta delle monete di antichi, il peso, et la materia in ciascun tempo.’
continued to be printed, while men corresponded with each other to find solutions to unusual examples. Texts on coins tended to be shorter than other inscriptions, so that there was less information contained in them, but one particular area in which scholars found them useful was the nomenclature and titles of emperors. Thus Occo claims that the emperor some scholars call Pupienus and some Maximus is in fact the same person, attested in a coin as Pupienus Maximus, and that the praenomen of Otho was Salviorus, rather than the Silvius preserved in literary texts. Coins preserved the offices held by the emperor in the year in which they were struck, and so could be used in conjunction with other sources to reveal a more precise record of the sequence of honours. On the basis of the legends of coins Goltz refuted Panvinio’s belief, expressed in his Fasti, that Augustus received the title of ‘pater patriae’ in his thirteenth consulship. Goltz believed that it came in his fifth consulship. Similarly, Vico argued in the Discorsi that he could produce a more accurate chronology of the reign of the emperor Nero from coins than written accounts. As in the case of inscriptions, scholars also were aware that coins could provide details of many parts of the Roman world that were simply not recorded in literary sources. Vico, for example, entitled the chapter following his discussion of Nero’s reign ‘Che nelle medaglie si trovano piu luoghi fatti Colonie de’Romani, i quali nelle historie antiche non si leggono.’

More interestingly for the purpose of comparison, scholars who looked at coins men were far more responsive to their figurative elements than they were to the monumental setting on which inscriptions were carved. Coin scholars seem always to have believed that the iconography of coins was produced for a purpose, and that their interpretative techniques could reveal its message. Coins were often compared to Egyptian hieroglyphs, and scholars felt that it should be possible to read both. The interpretation of small images was an

87 See, for example, Agustin’s joy at being able to send a solution to Orsini (Opera omnia, vii no. 11 p. 239, 29 May 1559), ‘Volete una più bella fate sonar le campane, accender lumí e le girandole, e paghatemi la mancia, che hò trovato l’interpretazione delle lettere dove P. Ottavio [Pantagato], & io andassimo à Capitulo. M. LEPIDVS AN. XV. PR. H.O.C.S. (vedete che voglio une bella medaglia delle rare) M. Lepidus annorum quindecim Populi Romani hostem occidit civem servavit.’
89 H. Goltz, Augustus, pp. 215-6.
90 E. Vico, Discorsi, pp. 73-4.
91 See, for instance, Pighius’s comment (Annales (1599), i p. 451), ‘His [Romanis] visum fuit, & nomina & titulos, curasque suas singularibus notis tanto cum ingenio in nummis exprimere; ut hieroglyphicis Aegyptiorum cum literis certare non solum, verum etiam in multis illas elegantia &
extremely popular pastime during this period, reflected in the invention of personifications in artistic schemes, as well as of imprese and emblems. The former consisted of a word and image, designed to reflect the essence of a particular person; the latter of the word, image, and also a poem deriving moral instruction from what was depicted. It is noticeable that there seems to be a clear overlap between men interested in emblems and coins. As we saw above, Sambucus included some illustrations of coins in his collection of emblems. Scholars working with ancient coins believed that a similar system of encryption to that used in emblems went on when images were devised to appear on coins.

Probably the most common work on the images from coins dealt with the identification of deities depicted on them. Often figures were depicted on the reverse with a title underneath, and from these and literary sources figures without titles were identified. By the middle of the century, works following this method had been published. In both Lilio Gregorio Giraldi’s 1548 De deis gentium varia & multiplex historia and Vincenzo Cartari’s 1556 Le imagini de i dei degli antichi some coins are cited for the information they provide about the representation of the gods. We know that Giraldi collected coins himself, and was attentive to various or contradictory imagery for a particular figure. Other scholars, such as Caro, Agustin and Aldo Manuzio the younger produced lists of abstract qualities and the iconography used to represent them.

---

93 On these works, see J. Seznec, The Survival of the Pagan Gods, pp. 246-7 and D. Allen, Mysteriously Meant, pp. 221-5 and 228-33.
94 F. Missere Fontana, ‘Raccolte numismatiche... Gli stati estensi’, p. 218.
95 Caro wrote to Orsini with examples of the representation of ‘hilaritas’, ‘pax’ and other qualities from coins in a letter of 15 September 1562 (Lettere familiari, iii no. 671 pp. 123-7). Agustin has separate lists of gods and moral qualities in his notebook, the Alveolus, with the headings ‘deorum notiones’ (pp. 35-39 = Madrid, Escorial MS S-II-18, fols. 50r-54r) and ‘ethica’ (pp. 73-88 = Madrid, Escorial MS S-II-18, fols. 335r-338v). Manuzio’s list appears at the end of one of his manuscript collections of inscriptions, BAV Vat. lat. 5237, fols. 480r-501r.
While works like Cartari's provided rich source material for artists anxious to represent personifications, they did not in general ask why a particular deity was represented on a particular coin. Other scholars pursued these questions, particularly for republican coins, where it was believed that the choice of design for the reverse could reflect the gens of the magistrate responsible for striking it. Thus Orsini explains the depiction of the Penates on the reverse of a coin struck in the magistracy of a member of the Antia gens as follows:

'Deorum autem Penatium imagines in altera secundi denarii parte expressae fortasse sunt, vel quod Antia Restionum familia Lavinio, ubi Penatium simulacra servabantur, ut ex Varrone, & Pediano, in Sulpicia gente scripsimus, oriunda fuerit; vel quod legem Restio tulerit, quae ad augendam religionem Penatium deorum pertinuerit."

This process could be reversed, so that an unidentified figure on the reverse could be identified by considering the magistrate responsible for the coin. On this basis, Agustin tried to interpret the figure on the reverse of a coin struck in the magistracy of M. Plaetorius Considius. He suggested to Orsini that it was a depiction of the god Consus: 'diremo che sta in faccia, perche in buon consiglio non si vergogna, ne lascia per rispetti di dimostrarsi; mostra la testa & il petto dove è il sito di consigli, & il governo dell'anima, e dell'huomo: li altri membri sono instrumenti.' M. Plaetorius Considius could therefore be demonstrating the supposed etymology of his name.

Other figures on the reverse were believed to have been chosen to make a more specific point. One coin Landi examined featured an image of pietas on one side, and on the other an image of Aeneas supporting Anchises and holding the penates, with the legend CAESAR beneath. He explained this in terms of the Vergilian story of the departure from Troy and the filial devotion shown there, but rather than simply connecting this with the

---

97 A. Agustin, *Opera omnia*, vii no. 4 p. 233 (17 February 1559).
gens Iulia, of which Caesar was a member and Aeneas supposedly the founder, he concluded that the coin was struck either by Caesar or his adopted son.99

Le Pois inverted this line of argument to explain the reverse of a coin of Cnaeus Pompeius Magnus, which featured a central figure flanked by two others, each carrying another person, and the legend PRAEF CLAS ET ORAE MAR. He interpreted the central figure as Neptune, as god of the sea, connecting this with the Pompey’s title ‘praef(ectus) clas(sis)’, and originally thought, he wrote, that the figures to the side were pirates, to commemorate Pompey’s success over them. But a friend had subsequently shown him a poem of Claudian, which described a statue of a pair of brothers, one carrying their mother and one their father. Le Pois then came to the conclusion that it was this statue depicted on the coin, as an exemplification of the virtue of pietas, since Pompey had the cognomen ‘pius’, and this was indicated alongside his office in the fleet.100 This last example shows clearly how ingenuity and learning were valued in the interpretation of reverses. Scholars devoted a great deal of energy to the explanation of more arcane or complicated examples, something not lost on their contemporaries.101

The notion that reverses were struck to make a specific point was particularly applied to imperial coins. Depictions of buildings were frequently interpreted as illustrations of something recently built by the emperor whose name appeared on the obverse, or depictions of triumphs, or subjugated provinces. For example, Stephanus Zamosius (Szamosközy István), a Hungarian humanist writing in 1593 about material remains connected with the Roman province of Dacia, interpreted two Trajanic coins featuring the legends ‘VIA TRAIANA’ and ‘SECVRITAS DACIAE’ and a female figure as referring to the bridge Trajan built over the Danube, and his conquest of the province.102 The textual

---

99 C. Landi, Explicationes, p. 6, 'ut lector studiosus antiquitatis sciat Caesarem Iulium, vel Augustum in honorem patris hoc tale numisma cudi mandasse.'
100 A. Le Pois, Discours, fols. 84v-86v.
101 In his conclusion to a discussion of a coin featuring a female figure with what seemed like ears or horns on her head, Occo wrote wrly (Impp. Romanorum Numismata, p. 35), 'Apices illi duplices acutissimi, quales in Flaminis pileo cernuntur, & gemini, forte ad religionem referendi sunt, aut ad duo numina qua in his ludis in primis colebantur, Apollinis & Diannae. Viderint doctores & iudicent.'
102 S. Zamosius, Analecta lapidum, p. 15, 'Altera numi pars, muliebre simulacrum habet, vestem magna ex parte humi fusam, manus utrinque exporrectas. Eam sequuntur quadrigae currentes,
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information on the coins could help to identify buildings depicted, and situate them chronologically. Le Pois commented on a coin of Nero with a building and the legend 'MAC AVG' as follows: 'L'inscription est MAC AVG. qui veut dire, Macellum Augusti. Le marché & lieu à Rome faict & dressé par l'Empereur Auguste Neron, pour vendre chair & poisson, & toutes autres choses pour le nourrissement de l'homme. ... L'entree de tel lieu ou edifice basti somptueusement par ledit Neron, est representee icy, ayant esté ceste medaille frappee en l'honneur du Prince & memoire de ce bien qu'il fit au peuple Romain. De quoy fait mention Dion en la vie dudit Neron.' Using this method, Le Pois felt confident in emending the text of Livy. One republican coin with Marcus Porcius Cato on the obverse featured a reverse showing a seated female figure with VICTRIX beneath. Le Pois commented as follows: 'Or qu'en faveur de M. Cato ait plustost esté icy empreinte la figure d'une Victoire que d'autre chose, la raison peut estre, que ledit Marcus Porcius Cato dedia à Victoire la vierge, une chapelle proche du temple de Victoire (ja auparavant faict à Rome par Lucius Posthumius) ainsi que tesmoigne Tite Live: auquel lieu le Lecteur savant advisera s'il seroit point meilleur de lire, Victoriae victrix dedicavit aediculam, en lieu de Victoriae virginis, ainsi qu'il se peut tirer & prouver de cestuy nostre revers.'

Scholars' interpretation of reverses as referring to particular events allowed them to make typological links. For example, when Occo considered a reverse struck in the reign of Augustus, with the legend AVGSTVS DIVI F. LVDOS SAEC. F, a female figure holding a shield and a caduceus, and what seemed to be two ears or horns on her head, he

\[\text{iunctae biroto, in senos radios distincto, infra literae rem interpretatur: VIA TRAIANA. pontem hunc Danubii haud dubie ostendentes. Muliebre simulacrum Nymphæ est, Danubii typus: manus eius discapedinatae, latam fluminis voraginem, birotum & quadrigae tutum super aquas inter denotant. Sed in alio eiusdem numo, manifestus haec eadem indicatur: ubi cameratus ac in semicirculum duxit forinix, aquæ in fluctus glomeratae, ac subterlabenti impositus est, cui Nymphæ virgineo habitu superinsidet, totam curulem genibus impositam sustinens, cum his in margine notis: SECVRITAS DACIAE. Et inferius S.C. id est, Senatusconsultum. Pons nimirum denotatur, quem ob securitatem Dacie possidendæ, & sui exercitus commoditatem, Traianus erigendum curaverat, metuens ne Danubio conglaciato frigoribus, Romanis qui trans flumen essent, bellum inferretur, quod si eveniret, nec pontones transitum praebenter, ut posset per eum copias suas Traianus in Daciam traducere.' On Zamosius see the introduction to his \textit{Analecta lapidum} (1992).

103 A. Le Pois, \textit{Discours}, fol. 88r-v.
commented ‘Talis praecise in Domitiani ludis saecularib. cernitur.’ Occo here links the coin mentioning Augustus’s celebration of the ludi saeculares (LVDOS SAEC(ulares) F(ecit)) with one of Domitian. Scholars also believed that a personification could appear in more than one pose. In a response to Erizzo’s Discorso, Vico attacked the earlier work for not identifying the figure on the reverse of a coin of Nero correctly. Erizzo had written that one female figure was climbing a stair to receive something from another, standing on top of the platform. Vico criticised his inability to be more specific, and his failure to identify a scribe passing on a record of the emperor’s generosity, whether of money, food, or some other gift. Vico goes on to name the emperors in whose reign the type appeared. It is noticeable that Vico does not here actually suggest that the figure appeared to celebrate a particular gift from the emperor, and in general scholars seem to have been wary of taking that step. For example, Landi compared two coins of Nero with the legend ‘CONGII DAT. POP.’ with one of Titus featuring ‘CONG. TER. P.R. IM. DAT.’ All three coins, he assumed, referred to congiaria, gifts made by the emperors to the people. Suetonius wrote that Nero had made such a gift, but made no reference to one in his life of Titus. Rather than simply assert the validity of the coin’s testimony, Landi still felt he had to appeal to Suetonius: ‘solum id illum [Titum] dedisse congiaria testari potest, quod nulli civium quicquam ademit: abstinuit alieno, ut si quis unquam, ac ne concessas quidem ac solitas collationes recepit. & tamen nemine ante se munificentia minor. innuit enim quasi his verbis Tranquillus, eum liberalissimum fuisse, ut etiam superiores Caesares liberalitate vicerit.’

The examples referred to so far are taken from discussions of particular coins, rather than thematic treatments of particular aspects of the ancient world. The coin collector Guillaume du Choul’s 1556 Discours de la religion des anciens romains, which includes many woodcuts of individual coins, is a good example of a thematic approach. The work betrays

105 A. Occo, Impp. Romanorum Numismata, p. 35.
106 F. Missere Fontana, ‘La controversia “Monete o medaglie”’, p. 78, citing Modena, Archivio di Stato MS b. 8/2, 4, fols. 52v-53r, ‘non sa, che quella figura, che porge la destra mano, è lo scrivano, e la cosa, che riceve l’altra figura, esser la poliza, è riscontro, su la quale era notato il numero de’ danari, è la misura del grano, del vino, è dell’oglio, è d’altra cosa, che ricevere doveva per liberalità del Principe il cittadino Romano secondo la condizione sua. Non sapendo similmente nella medesima una di quelle altre figure, che stanno in piedi essere la statua della liberalità, la quale si vede stampata in molte altre medaglie di piu Imperadori per se sola...’.
107 C. Landi, Explicationes, p. 76.
close similarities with the manuals of representations of gods that were being produced at
the same time. Du Choul is anxious to give iconographic examples from coins of as many
deities as possible, and although he includes depictions of temples and some other objects
used in religious worship, the work's structure is primarily that of a selection of coins and
their interpretations, similar to Landi's *Explicationes* or Le Pois's *Discours.*

More common are works in which occasional reference is made to individual examples, particularly for the
information the text contains, a useful list of which is contained in Goltz's *Thesaurus.* Some
scholars did use the images from coins to support their research, particularly, for example,
those interested in topography at Rome, in work on the Mausoleum of Hadrian (Castel Sant'Angelo), and the Circus Maximus.

Citations in topographical works were usually made simply to provide visual evidence of
the appearance of a building in antiquity. There are fewer uses of numismatic evidence to
provide details of a particular event in biographical or chronological accounts. It is striking
that Lazius does not cite anything like as many coins as inscriptions in his 1551
*Commentariorum Reipublicae Romanae libri* that we examined in chapter 4, even though he
was a collector: indeed, at one point, dealing with the *colonia* of Laurocium, he writes, 'Sed
venio ad Antiquitatis exempla, quae eo adhuc in loco supersunt: ut de numismate, quod
frequens quotidie variorum Caesarum ex agris proximis eruitur, nihil dicam.'

Lazius's attitude changes slightly for the second edition, published posthumously, but which takes
into account some of Lazius's further notes on the subject. The new version includes
some illustrations of coins, as well as making occasional references to coin types, especially
in a new section called 'De signis' in which Lazius describes how *Fortuna* is represented,
among other types. It also includes a trenchant response to Strada, in which Lazius

---

108 F. Bourriot, 'Un ouvrage lyonnais de la Renaissance', vastly overstates the methodological
importance of this work.

109 See S. Bajard, 'Topographie antique sous Paul III' and S. Tomasi Velli, 'Gli antiquari intorno al
circo Romano'; for Ligorio's use of coins for his reconstruction of the whole city, H. Burns, 'Pirro
Ligorio's Reconstruction of Ancient Rome', esp. pp. 27-30, and for temples, I. Campbell,
*Reconstructions of Roman Temples*, pp. 103-31.


111 The publisher points out the change in the preface (W. Lazius, *Commentarii* (1598), sig. (2r):
'Additae sunt praeterea ab ipso multae novae icones ex vetustis numismatibus desumtae, quas suo
operi lucem aliquam afferre posse animadvertis.'

argues that the *aediles curules* had responsibility for what he calls 'Cererem at Annonam', presumably the corn dole. Denying this point, Strada seems to have attributed a coin to Romulus (apparently with the support of Agustín), which Lazius argues is impossible.¹³³

Whereas Lazius did not really engage with numismatic evidence to write his survey, Goltz gives the coins struck in an emperor’s reign, and an account of that reign, without integrating the two parts at all. In his works on Julius Caesar and Augustus, plates of the obverses and reverses of coins made during Caesar’s adult life, and in Augustus’s reign, are followed by long biographies. Before the biography in the *Caesar*, Goltz writes that this section is included because the ‘numismata’ and the ‘historia’ shed light on one another,¹³⁴ but it is clear that he views this ‘historia’ and the information that coins offer separately. Indeed, in the written account, he makes no reference to the coins that he has illustrated before, but derives his information from literary historians.¹³⁵ The pattern in the *Augustus*


¹³⁴ H. Goltz, *Caesar*, sig. [K II]v, ’...ut numismatibus & historia inter se collatis, dum alterum alteri plurimum & lucis & intellectus conferet, primum nummi ipsi fructiosius a te spectentur, quorum argumenta, alioquin obscura, ex historia adiuncta facilius a te intelligentur. Rursus, historia maiori cum fide simul & voluptate tibi lectitabitur, postquam videris antiqua illa numismata, non sine publicae auctoritatis suffragio signata, cum historia ipsa per omnia fere convenire, fideque adeo ipsi historiae plurimum astruere. Dumque quod historica narratio animi sensibus factum aut gestum aliando proponit, idem elegantissimis appositissimisque argumentis, rerumque simulachris & symbolis, in ipsis numismatibus oculis representauntum, coram tanquam nunc gereretur, tibi spectare videberis.’

¹³⁵ For this point, see E. Lemburg-Ruppelt, ‘Der systematische Ausbau der Numismatik’, p. 70 n. 37.
is similar. He refers to a coin struck by Brutus in Thrace, with the legend EIDVS MARTIAS, but this is in fact mentioned in Dio's account.\textsuperscript{116}

Vico's approach in his work on Caesar is different. As we saw above, he chose not to try to illustrate all the issues. Rather, he gave a brief life, eight plates of coins, and then a commentary, which takes the form of a discussion of one or two coins for each year between 49 and 31 B.C., ordered by year, and relating the evidence of the coins to the events of the years. The title of each entry includes the event to be discussed and the date (e.g. 'Belli civilis initio anno ab urbe condita DCCIII'; 'Devictis Pompeii liberis, anno ab urbe condita DCCVIII' etc.), and the offices held by Caesar in that year ('C. Iul. Caesare Cos. Dict.', 'Caesare Cos. III. Dict. III' respectively). In this third part of the work, Vico seems to have tried to devise a chronological account starting from the testimony of coins, writing in the preface that he tried to link these together in explaining 'historia' year by year.\textsuperscript{117} In the commentaries to individual coins, Vico's starting point is the evidence of the coins, rather than literary sources for the year to which he thinks they refer. These explanations do not necessarily refer to any particular event. For one coin, with a head of Caesar on the obverse, and a globe, caduceus, cornucopia and what Vico describes as a 'pileus sacerdotalis', he writes that these symbolise peace, concord, wealth, and an abundance of good things, which he believes represent human happiness, quoting a definition of Saint Augustine and Boethius. Thus, he argues, Caesar wanted to show that he would bring human happiness to the Romans. Vico then goes on to suggest that this should be the aim of all leaders, and holds Pope Pius IV up as a model in this respect.\textsuperscript{118}

In other cases, he does try to refer the evidence of the coin to recent events. One coin he illustrates features a legend asserting that Caesar was consul for the second time, and dictator for the second time. He interprets the figures on it as a head of victory, and an illustration of a trophaeum. The only literary reference he can find to the raising of a

\textsuperscript{116} H. Goltz, Augustus, p. 21.

\textsuperscript{117} E. Vico, Ex libris XXIII... liber primus, p. 27, '...nobis etiam curae fuit, numismata ita inter se nectere, ut quasi cathena quadam se deinceps inter se traherent. Quod idem in explananda per singulos deinceps annos historia institutum servavi. Qui quam molestus, ac difficilis labor sit, qui se post me ad hoc studium contulerint facile iudicare poterunt: quam autem utilius, ac fructuosus, res ipsa declarat; quippe cum ad notitiam historiae consequendam nihil esse ordine accommodatus constet.'
trophaeum was in Dio, after the defeat of Pharnaces, a king of Pontus, and so he assumes that that is what is featured here. He describes the victory, and provides literary references to other peoples who celebrated triumphs. He returns to Pharnaces when commenting later on a coin with a legend attesting that it was struck in Caesar's third dictatorship and consulship. Vico interprets the figures on it as a head of Victory, and a depiction of Rome bearing a trophaeum and a dragon by her side. He believed that victories both in Pontus and subsequently in Africa, over Iuba, were symbolised. He cites a passage from Servius's commentary on Vergil, showing that Caesar received spolia after his defeat of Pharnaces, before arguing that the serpent could simultaneously represent both victories in Asia, on the basis of coins of Augustus, as well as in Africa, using coins of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius and Septimius Severus, and claims in Aristotle and Solinus that Africa was rich in snakes. These examples show that Vico was trying to marry the dense symbolic explanations favoured by scholars of the time with specific historical events, in a chronological framework. He may not have been entirely successful, and his attempt does not seem to have been influential, but it is interesting to note the difference in his methodological approach to that of his contemporaries.

Not surprisingly, if we remember his sophisticated use of inscriptions, Marcus Welser employed the figurative and textual evidence of coins confidently in his work on Augsburg. He argued that a coin of Augustus recording that the emperor was holding tribunician power for the ninth time was contemporary to the founding of the colonia of Augusta Vindelicorum, and given that there are no records of other coloniae being founded in that year, suggested that the image on the coin might have referred to this new colony. On the reverse are an illustration of a bull and the names of Publius Quinctilius Varo, Marcus Titius Rufus, and Lucius Cornelius Balbus, whom Welser identifies. On the basis of these men's consular and triumphal rank, he suggests that these were the men sent to set

118 E. Vico, Ex libris XXIII... liber primus, pp. 84-6.
119 E. Vico, Ex libris XXIII... liber primus, pp. 54-6.
120 E. Vico, Ex libris XXIII... liber primus, pp. 63-4.
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up to colony, and that the bull may have been its first symbol. As Welser acknowledges, this is an assertion he cannot prove, but the fact that he attempts to connect a coin with his subject, using his knowledge of the chronology of Augustus's reign alongside the testimony of the Fasti to identify the three magistrates named on the coin, shows the extents of his confidence with material evidence and his ambition.

The Manufacture of Coins and the Reliability of Numismatic Evidence

In the last chapter we identified two trends connected with scepticism towards the value of epigraphic evidence: the possibility that the stonecutter could have made mistakes in the carving of the inscription, and the identification of a particular author for an inscription. Here I shall examine notions of the agencies involved in the production of coins, and how these notions affected scholars' ideas of coins' status as historical evidence.

In the study of coins, scholars were far more interested in their origins and the details of their manufacture than they were in the case of inscriptions. This difference seems largely due to the fact that ancient authors discussed the origins of coinage and the circumstances of its production at Rome. Pliny the elder, in particular, gave an account of the first coins

122 M. Welser, Commentarii, p. 47 (discussing a coin with the legend 'AVGVSTVS TRIBV POT IX COS XI CAESAR' on the obverse), 'Tribunitia potestas cum anno DCCXXXI V.K. Iulii primum instituta sit, fit ut annus eius IX nummno inscriptus, ex iisdem K. anni DCCXXXIX quo Augustam deductam diximus, sumat initium. Id temporis coloniam aliam deductam, nemo opinor certe testimonio approbabit; eo minus leviter conceicer, si ad hanc coloniae symbolum bovem [on the reverse] retulero. Notae IIV IR de P. QVIN VARO. M. TITIO. L. COR. BALBO. a quibus coloniam deductam suspiccor, accipi neque debent, neque possunt, qui enim tres Duumviri? Verum nummum auctoritate Duumvirum, qui princeps coloniae magistratus, signatum ostendunt. Quod idem vestigium (an aemulatione Romani moris, quo Senatus auctoritas hisce notis S.C. ascripta?) in multis praeterea colonicis nummis, nec tamen omnibus, varie spectatur. [he gives various examples] Et ut ad nostra revertar, P. Quinctiliun Varum, qui post biennium ordinarius consul cum Tiberio inuit, M. Titium Rufum, qui ante annos XVI. ex Kal. Maiis suffectus est, & L. Cornelium Balbum, sive maiorem, qui suffectus extremono anno DCCXIV sive minorem, qui ex Africa triumphum egit Procos. anno DCCXXV. VI. K. Aprilis, III. Viros Coloniae deducendae agrisque assignandis, a colonis Augustanis hoc nummno posteritatis memoriae pie & grate commendatos interpretor. Nam consularia & triumphalia singulorum ornamenta, de legatione quae diximus probabiliter confirmant.'
made at Rome, which was regularly cited. Fulvio Orsini's brief account of the offices of striking money in his prefatory note to the reader at the beginning of the Familiae Romanae serves as a good example of what could be discovered. He used the testimony of the individuals named on coins as well as literary sources such as Cicero, tracing a chronological progression from Curatores denariorum flandorum to triaumviri monetales, to quattuorviri monetales, and back to triaumviri monetales with the accession of Augustus. Orsini also examined how the images on coins changed over time in the civil war, as living persons were depicted on coins for the first time. His account ended with the beginning of the imperial period, but writers who discussed the emperors' coinage assumed that they continued the trend established in the late republic. Vico, for example, wrote that coins were able 'esprimere non solamente de' Principi la vera effigie, ma ancora le imprese per lor fatte.' There was some interest in the actual manufacture of coins in the empire. Le Pois, for example, refers to a mint at Lyons mentioned in Strabo and Tacitus, and connects it with what he calls 'moules de terre cuite' with the images of various emperors found recently in the area. He believed that these were used to shape coins before they were struck. In general, however, writers do not seem to have been particularly interested in

123 Pliny, N.H. 33 esp. ch. 13.
124 F. Orsini, Familiae Romanae, sig. [*4r]. Orsini had tried out some of the details on Augustin: see Agustín's letter in response (Opera omnia, vii no. 44 pp. 254-6, 25 January 1574). Laziu (Commentarii, pp. 362-70) had given an earlier account of the development of coinage, and Pighius included a similar discussion in his Annales (1599), p. 451.
125 F. Orsini, Familiae Romanae, sig. [*3v], '...magistratuum, quibus cudendae monetae munus commissum erat, paulatim crescente ambizione, ultimis Reip. temporibus, privati etiam familiarum honores ex sacerdotiis, magistratibus, triumphis alisique actionibus... in nummis ut signarentur, permissione fuit, praeter ipsis viventium imaginibus, quod unum tantum Caesaris concesserunt: nam Bruti caput, eius qui Caesarem interfecit, in ipsa bellorum civium licentia percussum in iis denariis reperitur, quis in transmarinis, ut opinor, provinciis, non Romae signati fuerunt.'
126 E. Vico, Discorsi, p. 31.
127 A. Le Pois, Discours, sig. 10v. It is worth quoting the whole passage with details of Le Pois's theory: 'Tels moules semblent avoir esté faicts pour ietter en fonte plusieurs medailles dedicts Empereurs, que nous avons encore auiourd'hui lequelle, apres ce premier ict en fonte, tires de ces petits moules, on venoit a frapper & coigner: qui les faisoit ainsi belles & nettes que nous les voyons encore a present. Cecy est bien vraysembleable, a scavoir, qu'entre tant de medailles, plusieurs ont esté premierement iettes en fonte, puis apres frappes au coin, pour estre plus naïfues & plus belles, ainsi qu'entendent ceux qui sont usitez au faict de battre monnoye.'
minting arrangements, and certainly did not argue that they would change what was represented.128

Scholars believed that coins struck under the empire were public documents, and represented an officially sanctioned point of view. This was a standard assumption, although some writers cited Dio’s record (lx.22.3) of a decree made by Claudius after his accession to deface the image of Caligula on coins. Occo’s view seems typical; he wrote that the ‘Romani, Imperii sui vim, molem & potentiam nummis illis à se signatis, toti orbi & universae posteritati notam ac testatam esse voluerunt.’129 He argued that this began even under Caesar, although in this case he did allow that Caesar wished to promote himself as well as the empire as a whole.130 This view was reinforced when scholars considered the letters ‘SC’ which appeared on imperial copper coins. Vico argued, for example, that they were made ‘per Senato consulto, cio è per decreto preso, si concedeva, che in honore dell’ Imperadore si stampasse, e si publicasse quella nova moneta con quel segno.’131 This indication that the coins were made with the sanction of the senate along with the fact that they were public documents gave them authority. It is perhaps a reflection of trends in numismatic scholarship that the writers on inscriptions whom we examined in the last chapter, such as Aldo Manuzio discussing the inscription to Gordian in Vicenza, defended the validity of their material by pointing to its public role.

In fact, there is some evidence that the testimony of coins was valued more highly than that of inscriptions. In is interesting that in the debate on the status on whether Florence was a Roman colonia, Vincenzo Borghini wrote to Panvinio about a coin which apparently featured the legend ‘COL FIOR’ to ask whether he was sure it was ‘sincera et non artificiata’.132 As we saw in the last chapter, Borghini was prepared to believe that an

128 Erizzo argues that magistrates in individual cities were allowed to mint coinage (see his restatement of this position in a letter to Ligorio of 23 May 1570 printed by G. Melchiorri, ‘Lettere inedite’, pp. 231-4): but he believed that coins illustrated with the emperors’ features were not in fact coinage, but celebratory medallions, as we shall see below.
131 E. Vico, *Discorsi*, p. 31.
132 BAV Vat.lat. 6412, fol. 251r (18 February 1567).
inscription featuring 'COION' was antique, but included a stonecutter's mistake, a possibility that does not seem to have been entertained for the coin. Hubert Goltz in fact asserted this idea definitively, at least when compared to the Fasti Capitolini. In the context of a chronological discussion he wrote that 'tum aliis rationibus permotus, tum potissimum antiquorum numismatum auctoritate, quam non inferiorem, imo vel potiorem existimo, quam sit Fastorum Capitolinorum vel aliorum, aliter censeo.' More usually, however, the two forms of evidence were classed together. Orsini, for example, asserted the validity of both as public documents, writing that 'illud praecipuum, maximique ad fidem faciendam ponderis semper duxi, quod veteribus tum lapidum tum nummorum testimoniiis niteretur: quod enim in publicum, & a publicis populi Romani magistratibus ederentur, nihil poterat in iis fucatum, nihil adulterinum admisceri, quod non statim argueretur."

It was a belief in the public nature of coins that led to the best-known numismatic debate of this period. Erizzo argued that Roman imperial coins illustrating the emperor were in fact medallions designed to record the achievements of the emperors, and not money at all. He believed that the types of coins that Pliny described as originating in the republic — the bronze as and the bigatus, quadrigatus and victoriatus — continued to be used as currency under the empire. His belief in this position led him to argue that certain imperial coins were struck by the emperor's opponents in order to show their dissatisfaction with his reign. They therefore used the same means to subvert his achievements as he used to promote them. The reverse of one coin of Nero featured a variety of sea creatures. Erizzo argued that these were used as symbols by the Egyptians for a hateful person, and so Nero could not have been trying to demonstrate his own accomplishments by these signs. Erizzo was not the only scholar to use an argument of

---

133 H. Goltz, Caesar, pp. 209-10. Goltz was examining the evidence for when Caesar held his third dictatorship and consulship. Literary sources asserted that he held them in the same year, but the Fasti Capitolini featured a line between the two. On the basis of numismatic evidence, Goltz argued that Caesar began his third dictatorship after already beginning his third consulship, as he had seen coins which featured Caesar holding his third consulship and third dictatorship, fourth consulship and third dictatorship, and fourth consulship and fourth dictatorship.

134 F. Orsini, Familiae Romanae, sig. *2r.

135 S. Erizzo, Discorso, esp. pp. 7-12.

136 S. Erizzo, Dichiaratione, pp. 228-30; see F. Haskell, History and its Images, p. 88. Erizzo's position is not as ridiculous as Haskell argues if we take into account Erizzo's idea that coins were not
this sort. Jean Poldo d’Albenas included a chapter on coins found at Nîmes in his history of the city. Some of these had the heads of Marcus Antoninus Pius as well as Verus on the obverse, and Poldo suggested that the coin could have been designed to represent opposing characters: ‘peut estre, que les deux testes, qui sont leurs pourtraictz au naturel, ainsi opposites l’une à l’autre, designent la contrariété, & diversité des meurs, & honnesteté de vivre de l’un à l’autre: estant M. bon, & saige Prince, & Verus adonné à toute volupté demesuree, & corruption de vie.”

The position Erizzo articulated in his 1559 *Discorso* had already been attacked by Vico in his 1555 *Discorsi*, and it seems that the topic was fiercely debated in Venice in this period. To prove that imperial coins were used as currency, Vico argued that the goddess of money could also be referred to by the names of metals; that literary sources showed that there were monetary relationships between different types of coins; that some surviving coins were worn through use; and that some copper coins featured the legend *MONETA NOVA* to distinguish them from previously struck coins. Subsequently, both Le Pois and Agustín dealt with the problem, and came to similar conclusions as Vico. But although other scholars believed that the coins were used as currency, they still considered coins to have been clear reflections of the emperor’s glory. As Vico pointed out, ‘Ma quanto grande fosse la dignità delle medaglie ancor per le effigie de’ Cesari, comprendere si può da gli scritti di Suetonio ... il quale narra, che fu pena capitale il portare adosso il danaio con l’effigie del Principe ne’ luoghi immondi, e ne’ bordelli...’ Erizzo was by no

---

140 E. Vico, *Discorsi*, pp. 50-1, citing Suetonius, *Tiberius* ch. 58, with the detail that to carry a coin with the image of Augustus into a brothel was an offence.
means discredited: in his letter to Pinelli, Orsini wrote, 'Sopra le medaglie il migliore che habbia scritto è l'Erizzo.'

Coins were therefore not subjected to the same degree of scrutiny as inscriptions. Coins from the Roman republic were assumed to convey the messages the magistrates who struck them wanted to convey, and the same was true of the emperors, even if they were not directly in charge of the production. As Vico wrote in discussing a coin celebrating Caesar, 'Victorem Pontici, & Africi belli C. Caesarem, tertium iam Consulem cum M. Aemilio Lepido, itemque tertium Dictatorem, C. Clovius [the officiating magistrate], alter eius Praefectus, hoc aerei nummi monumento decorare voluit.' In addition, although scholars argued that these messages were a form of celebration, and, in the case of Erizzo dealing with the coin of Nero, argued that they could convey a dissenting message, they did not subject the information conveyed to systematic scepticism; rather, they argued that whatever historical event was conveyed did in fact occur.

---


Chapter 7: Concluding Remarks

I have shown in this thesis how scholars came to be in a position to work on epigraphic material, the ways in which they classified and represented the material, the sorts of ends to which epigraphic evidence was put in studies on the ancient world, and how reliable a source it was considered to be. In the last chapter I examined coins, to compare scholars' approaches to this form of evidence. These men's interest in inscriptions and coins, and the information they could provide about the ancient world, did not take place in a vacuum. In order to conclude, I will place these developments in a broader setting, to show how interest in these forms of evidence is linked to two connected intellectual movements of the sixteenth century: first, an attempt to put the texts of Roman law into their historical context; second, a wider interest in what constituted the subject of history, and what sources could be used to reveal it.

As we saw in the first chapter, several of the men who worked on inscriptions had enjoyed a legal training, particularly Antonio Agustín and Jean Matal, who met at Bologna while attending the lectures of Andrea Alciato on texts of the law. By the 1530s, Alciato was renowned as a scholar and teacher of law. He was interested in the application of humanist methods of textual criticism to legal texts, and he published several works of critical notes as well as longer commentaries on individual titles, most notably his De verborum significatione libri quattuor. He was also responsible for introducing some of these methods to university lecture theatres — although, as a pragmatist, he was careful to make sure that his tuition was still useful to lawyers about to begin practice, and he noted that students simply expecting to hear similar expositions to those he had published were disappointed.¹

Alciato was not the first scholar to examine texts of the law in this way.² Already in the fifteenth century, Lorenzo Valla had tried to explicate various titles of the Digest in his Elegantiae using classical Latin authors, rather than the medieval glossators, whom he attacked with characteristic relish. He argued that the only way to understand legal terms was to examine them using the evidence of the historical period in which they were in use.

¹ He made this comment in the preface to his 1530 commentary on the De summa trinitate, sig. A2v.
His example was followed by Angelo Poliziano who started more systematic work on the *Codex Pisanus*, the late sixth- or early seventh-century manuscript of the *Digest* in Florence taken as loot from Pisa in 1406, which he used to correct a printed edition. He devoted several chapters of his *Miscellanea* to philological aspects of the legal corpus, and had travelled with Lorenzo de' Medici to hear Giasone del Maino lecture at Pisa, one of the foremost legal professors of his day.³ Pietro Ricci (known as Pietro Crinito) was heavily influenced by Poliziano, and in his *De honesta disciplina*, finished by 1503 and printed in 1504 at Florence, he includes chapters both emending the text of the *Digest*, and explaining terms used in the law.⁴ Shortly afterwards, Guillaume Budé published the most extensive collection so far of emendations and explanatory notes, the *Annotationes in Pandectas* of 1508.⁵ It was Alciato whom Budé anointed as his heir, suggesting that he was a man able to wash out the Augean stables of the texts of the law.⁶

What Alciato added to the work of his predecessors was an interest in inscriptions. As we saw in the introduction, his collection of inscriptions made at Milan while he was working on the classical history of the city was a pioneering work. He updated this throughout his life, as well as collecting a codex of material from elsewhere. He included some of this epigraphical material in his printed commentaries and notes to individual texts and clearly recognised that they had some value in investigating the ancient world as an aid for lawyers. He claimed that he had written his *De magistratibus* (an introduction to the first printed version of the eastern part of the *Notitia dignitatum* which appeared in 1529) because previous treatments of the subject contributed nothing to the legal profession.⁷ In

---
³ E.g., A. Poliziano, *Miscellanea*, ch. 41, fol. 14r and ch. 93, fol. 31r; M. Gilmore, 'Lawyers and the Church', p. 68.
⁴ P. Crinito, *De Honesta Disciplina*, e.g. viii.10 pp. 205-6 (emending the text); x.12 p. 239 (explaining *indices recuperatores*).
⁵ L. Delaruelle, *Guillaume Budé*, esp. chs. 3-4.
⁶ Cited in N. Barker, 'Antonio Agustin's Letter', p. 23 n. 16.
⁷ A. Alciato, *De magistratibus*, sig. *5v*. At the same time as the *De magistratibus*, Alciato was compiling a *De formula Romani imperii*, on the changes in the Roman empire from the invasion of the Italian peninsula by the Goths until the accession of Charles V. While the *De magistratibus* would be of more interest to lawyers, the other work, he wrote to his friend Francesco Calvo in 1523, would be of more interest to historians (A. Alciato, *Lettere*, no. 31 pp. 57-8). The work only appeared posthumously, in 1559, and it includes the citation of a Carolingian inscription (*De formula*, pp. 8-9).
this work he mentions various inscriptions, like a record at Milan of the younger Pliny's career, picking up on the fact that Pliny was awarded proconsular power to function as governor in the province of Bithynia-Pontus, when such power was not normally required. From an inscription in Corinth dedicated to a Theoprepon, procurator under Severus Alexander, which outlines the man's specific responsibilities, he argued that emperors' procurators were not simply assigned to a province, but to carry out specific tasks. The inscription, which he quoted, was his only evidence. Beyond Alciato's work, there are other contemporary traces of links being made between legal material and inscriptions. A manuscript in Uppsala dating to 1516 includes both legal material and inscriptions; an edition of Probus published in 1525 contained, among other miscellaneous material, some inscriptions and a collection of references to the Twelve Tables, although no explicit connection was made between the two.

The most interesting evidence of the importance attributed to inscriptions are the printed editions of inscribed legal material that begin to appear at this time. We know of two published versions of the will of aCUSPIDIUS, one probably from Italy, and one from Louvain which date from around this point, as well as a contract of sale, probably printed by Francesco Calvo at Rome, before 1531. François Rabelais combined both documents in an
edition printed by Gryphius at Lyon in 1532. What is remarkable about this is that in his dedication Rabelais claimed that the extremely large number of 2,000 copies were to be printed. He assumed that these relatively recondite documents would have a large market, presumably made up of practising lawyers and students. In this dedication, he also described to Amaury Bouchard his reasons for producing the work: ‘Sic enim cum stipulanti tibi factum fuerit satis, tum studiosis omnibus te auspice provisum, ne diutius nesciant, qua prisci illi Romani, dum disciplinae meliores florerent, in condendis testamentis formula usi sint.” He clearly believed that such information would be valued by legal scholars of his own day.

While Alciato maintained his interest in epigraphic material throughout his life, he did not collect inscriptions systematically or really develop their application to his legal studies. The printed versions of his legal lectures, the bulk of his published output, contain virtually no references to inscriptions. But it may well have been memories of Alciato’s work that, at least in part, inspired Agustin to commission Matal to examine inscriptions from 1546. Agustin did not decide to collect inscriptions immediately. After receiving his doctorate at Bologna in June 1541, he went to Florence to examine the Codex Pisanus with Matal later that year, a project which resulted in the 1543 Emendationum et opinionum libri quattuor. He did not exploit inscriptions in this work, nor does he betray any interest in this form of evidence in his letter of 1544 to Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, in which he outlined what had been achieved in the recovery of Roman legal texts, and what needed to be done.¹⁴ When Agustin moved to Rome in 1544, Matal continued to work on legal manuscripts. But from 1546, Matal’s papers reveal that he was devoting his time to inscriptions and, given Agustin’s interests, it seems that the motive for doing so was to examine what support these inscriptions could provide for his work on legal texts. As well as being aware of Alciato’s work, Agustin and Matal would also have known of men in Roman circles who shared an interest in the law and epigraphic material, notably Benedetto Egio and Fabio Vigili.¹⁵ As we saw in chapter two and three, Vigili had worked

¹³ Ex reliquis venerandae antiquitatis Lucii Cuspidii testamentum, verso of title page.
¹⁴ For the background to this letter, see N. Barker, ‘Antonio Agustin’s Letter’; for the text, M. Crawford, ‘Appendix 1’.
¹⁵ On these two figures, see M. Crawford, ‘Benedetto Egio’, pp. 135-6.
on legal texts, wrote to Egio in 1530 discussing forged inscriptions, and later in 1540 wrote to Angelo Colocci about symbols in inscriptions.\textsuperscript{16}

Around this time other scholars also began to stress the value of inscriptions for lawyers. Georg Fabricius, a German scholar who had visited Italy as a tutor at the beginning of the 1540s, published in 1549 a short collection of inscriptions entitled \textit{Antiquitatis monumenta insignia}. In the dedication to this work, notably to a practising lawyer, Johann Fichard, he wrote that he thought it would be of use to both 'literati homines' and 'lureconsulti eruditi'.\textsuperscript{17} The inscriptions were not a miscellaneous selection, but like Rabelais's edition of the will and contract of sale, apparently aimed at a legal audience. Fabricius gave only seventeen inscriptions, including wills, emperors' edicts and decrees, and then one example each of a contract, a law determining the form of a building, and a decree resolving a border dispute. Authors suggested that legal scholars would not just be interested in the raw material, but also treatises that employed it. When Lazius wrote his \textit{Reipublicae Romanae commentarii} in 1551, he wrote that he had two aims in writing his histories: one, to recall the deeds of famous men, and the other, to explain the works of classical authors. The second of these aims, he thought, would be of particular interest to lawyers, as well as to 'antiquitatis studiosi'.\textsuperscript{18}

Agustín and Matal's investigations into epigraphic material revealed to them not just the value of assembling together and indexing inscriptions to see what they could contribute to their work on the texts of the law, but also that it was worth collecting together inscribed laws themselves. Matal proposed to Agustín that in a four or five book work on Roman laws, the

\textsuperscript{16} See above, ch. 2 p. 65 and ch. 3 p. 113.

\textsuperscript{17} G. Fabricius, \textit{Antiquitatis monumenta insignia}, sig. Aiiir, 'Non igitur dubitavi quin gratum facturus esse multi et literatis hominibus, et lureconsulis eruditissi, si et [inscriptiones] collectas a me ederem, et ab aliis inventas emendarem.'

\textsuperscript{18} W. Lazius, \textit{Commentarii}, p. [3], 'Duplex est in scribendis historiis scopus, Rex longe omnium clementissime: quorum alter ad res illustrium virorum adnotandas, & ab oblivione vendicandas, sumitur: alter in explicandis veterum autorum commentariis, qui in eo genere claruerunt, vertitur.

... Ad alteram vero, quod etiam contendimus, tametsi tua eius nihil plane intersit, atque extra limites & memoriae & muneris nostri posuitum, ad lureconsultos potius, & antiquitatis studiosos pertineat...'.
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third book should contain laws recorded on bronze or stone. This suggestion seems to have been made to Agustín as he began to revise a discussion of laws in alphabetical order (entitled De legibus) between 1554 and 1557. Agustín had certainly begun this work by 1544, and probably earlier, when he was working on the Emendationum... libri, but seems then to have left it and only thought to include epigraphical material in his second version. It is not clear whether he took this decision to include inscriptions as a result of Matal’s suggestion, or whether Matal’s note is simply a record of what Agustín had decided. Certainly the prospect that epigraphical material might contain new texts for legal scholars was in the air at this time.

In around 1552, when preparing his own De legibus (to be published in 1557), Paolo Manuzio wrote rather desperately from Venice to Agustín at Rome, saying that he was sure that he had seen such material at Rome but had forgotten where: could Agustín give him the details? When the De legibus of Agustín was finally published, in 1583, it contained an epigraphical appendix, but it was supplied by Fulvio Orsini (relying heavily on the work of Pedro Chacón). Orsini had been assembling his own collection of inscribed laws for some time.

The study of inscriptions and humanist endeavours with the texts of Roman law were therefore closely connected in this period. The historicisation of legal texts also led scholars into different fields of enquiry. While Agustín undertook his investigations of legal texts in Italy, in France legal scholars had been inspired differently by the leads of Budé and Alciato. Here, the humanists’ efforts to place the texts of the law in their historical context encouraged subsequent legal thinkers to develop ideas of historical relativism: if the texts of the law were considered to be historical documents and representative of legal thought

19 J. Matal, Epistolae, p. 61, ‘Tertius habebit eas leges quarum auctor ignoratur, et quaedam legum fragmenta ex aere saxisque eruta.’

20 For these arguments, and more details of the origins of the work, see J-L. Ferrary, ‘La genèse du De legibus’, esp. pp. 50-2.


22 On evidence for the stages of preparation of this appendix, see J-L. Ferrary, ‘La genèse du De legibus’, p. 42. For Orsini’s collection of inscriptions, see P. de Nolhac, ‘Les collections d’antiquités de Fulvio Orsini’, pp. 179-85, which included fourteen of the laws printed in the appendix to Agustín’s work.
over a particular period, they could been seen to have been devised for particular circumstances. When these circumstances changed, so the law changed. The most extreme exponent of this school was François Hotman, who famously stated that of all subjects, the study of Roman law was least useful to a Frenchman of his time. The efforts of these scholars to understand the texts of Roman law in context led them to examine the links between legal scholarship and history, and to examine the techniques the disciplines held in common. They began to question the value of traditional humanist history writing: in particular, they believed that the traditional range of subjects treated by historians should be expanded, and that the range of sources historians should use to do so should also consequently be enlarged.

A key figure in this movement was François Baudouin, who studied briefly at the Collegium trilingue at Louvain, and lectured at Paris in 1546, and then at Bourges from 1548. In 1561 he published a work entitled *De institutione historiae universae, et eius cum iurisprudentia coniunctione*. In it, he looked at concepts shared by the two disciplines, and how they could benefit each other. As his title suggests, he aimed to provide a theoretical blueprint for a universal history, expanding the range of material covered in historical writing. The key criteria for inclusion of material was that it should be ‘vera’. Baudouin discusses how to assess the veracity of sources at some length, and here he found important similarities between the practice of the lawyer and the historian: just as lawyers place more weight on the testimony of witnesses rather than written accounts of events, so, he argued, historians should seek sources chronologically close to what they record. To illustrate the process of the dilution of truth, he used the image of a glass of wine. The more the wine is decanted, he argued, the more it dissipates, and so the more the *fama* of an event is told.

---

23 French legal scholars of this school have received particular attention from American writers: as well as D. Kelley, *Foundations*, see G. Huppert, *The Idea of Perfect History* and J. Franklin, *Jean Bodin*. For a useful critique of these works, see Z. Schiffman, ‘Renaissance Historicism Reconsidered’ and his subsequent book *On the Threshold of Modernity*.  
24 For Baudouin’s early life, see M. Erbe, *François Bauduin*, pp. 27-42.  
25 F. Baudouin, *De institutione historiae universae*, esp. p. 53, ‘Iurisconsulti & leges civiles aiant, aliam esse testium, qui rogati audiuntur: aliam testimonorum, quae leguntur aut recitantur, auctoritatem: & testibus potius quam testimoniiis esse credendum admonent. Quid nos in historiae causa? Certe in ea, presertim quae nostrae aetatis non est, testimonia legere possimus, testes praeentes audire non possimus.’ Before this passage, he laments that historians accepted the testimony of Annius’s Berosus (pp. 48-9).
the less resemblance it bears to the truth.\textsuperscript{26} He then went on to examine the reliability of sources for information about the ancient world — as we would expect from someone with his education, this is his area of expertise. He devoted a lot of time to outlining the merits of the works of Cicero, and went on to point out the historical value of studying Cicero's letters (as, in fact, Cornelius Nepos had written before him).\textsuperscript{27} This idea led him to examine the range of suitable sources other than books and paper, recommending statues, pictures, inscriptions on stone and coins, and tapestries.\textsuperscript{28}

We have seen that by the time that Baudouin wrote, antiquarian scholars had developed sophisticated techniques for extracting historical information from inscriptions and coins. It is worth noting here briefly — to do so thoroughly would require a longer study — that they had begun tentative attempts to investigate other surviving sources for the ancient world, including some of those Baudouin mentions. As was true of other material, Flavio Biondo had recognised the potential of figurative monuments as sources, commenting in the \textit{Roma Triumphans} that he thought the depiction on the Arch of Titus gave a better impression of the spoils taken from sack of Jerusalem than did the account of Josephus.\textsuperscript{29} In the sixteenth century, scholars were particularly aware of Trajan's column. Costantino Landi and Stephanus Zamosius, for example, used scenes from it as evidence of Trajan's Dacian conquest when discussing Trajan and Trajanic coins.\textsuperscript{30} Matal compared a figure from a relief

\textsuperscript{26} F. Baudouin, \textit{De institutione historiae universae}, pp. 55-6, ‘Sed iterum dico, quo posterior & magis nova est rei antiquae narratio, tanto mendosiorem eam esse solere. Nam & ut vinum quo magis transfunditur, evanescit magis, tandemque sit vappa: utque fama ipsa, quo longius progreditur, longius recedit a vero, plusque colligit vanitatis: sic & persaepe historia, quae a pluribus repetita varie iactatur & aliis atque aliis verbis recitata spargitur, tandem contaminatur & in fabulam degenerat.’ It is interesting to note that Baudouin's model does not make any distinction between primary and secondary sources.

\textsuperscript{27} F. Baudouin, \textit{De institutione historiae universae}, p. 70, ‘Sed nonne ex aliis eius scriptis quae supersunt, repeti illa expositio utcunque poterit? Dixit olim Cornelius Nepos, eum, qui legit Ciceronis epistolae ad Atticum, non multum desiderare historiam contextam eorum temporum.’

\textsuperscript{28} F. Baudouin, \textit{De institutione historiae universae}, p. 72, ‘Nonne & veteres statuae ac picturae, & lapidibus aut nummis insculptae inscriptiones, & denique quae aulaeis vel peristomatibus intexta sunt, historiae argumentum undique nos suppetitant?’

\textsuperscript{29} F. Biondo, \textit{Roma triumphans}, p. 214; see M. Tomassini, 'Per una lettura della Roma Triumphans', p. 42.

from Ostia with one on Trajan’s column, which suggests that he thought that the latter was relatively well known.31 In his Discorsi Enea Vico referred to the column, on which, he wrote, were ‘intagliate le imprese da Traiano fatte.’32 A contemporary Italian historical theorist, Francesco Patrizi, agreed, asking, ‘Et che altro è in Roma scolpito nella colonna di Traiano, & d’ Antonino, & ne gli archi di Costantino, & di Severo, che le historie, delle vittorie & de trionfi loro?’33 The investigation of figurative sources with no textual content was relatively undeveloped, however, in this period, and only really gathered momentum, at least in a Roman context, in the middle years of the seventeenth century.34

Baudouin has usually been studied as a lawyer in a French national context, and despite their shared intellectual background, his links with earlier historical writing, or the epigraphical scholars we have examined earlier in this thesis, have not been stressed.35 In Italy, Baudouin’s suggestions for broadening the historians’ range of sources had already been hinted at several years earlier, specifically for the ancient world, by Francesco Guicciardini, in the Ricordi, his set of maxims which he began in 1512 and revised between 1528 and 1530. Here the Florentine historian noted that classical Greek and Roman historians did not include many details, such as the range and authority of magistrates, that their audience already knew; had these classical writers been aware that their world would have fallen, they should have included such details, as recording details for perpetuity is the proper aim of the historian.36

31 BAV Vat.lat. 6038, fol. 33v, ‘Alter famulus, equitem sequitur; et galeam, veluti loricam (est enim alia forma prorsus, quam aliae) retro, ad equitis caput porrigit. Apparent in Traiani columna, quidam non dissimilis; qui Caesari, umbram aliqua quapiam re, praesolis fervore, facerent.’
33 F. Patrizi, Della historia, fol. 14r.
34 See I. Herklotz, Cassiano dal Pozzo, for this development.
35 See e.g., J. Franklin, Jean Bodin, ch. 8; D. Kelley, Foundations, ch. 5. Baudouin himself does not mention many contemporaries, although he does praise the work of Sigonio (De institutione historiae universae, pp. 111-2): ‘Equidem (cur enim dissimulem?) nuper legebam perlubenter novos de antiquo Iure civium Ro. & Italicae commentarios doctissimi hominis Caroli Sigonii, qui de historia Ro. praeclare meritus est. Illam autem antiquitatem renovatam memoria magna cum voluptate legens dolebam, multos, qui Iuris civilis interpretes & doctores se esse gloriantur, secure contemnere totum illud literarum genus.’
36 F. Guicciardini, Ricordi, no. C143 p. 155, ‘Parmi che tutti gli istorici abbino, non eccettuando alcuno, errato in questo: che hanno lasciato di scrivere molte cose che a tempo loro erano note,
In the case of antiquarian scholars, Baudouin provides a theoretical justification for what they were already trying to put into practice. Like Patrizi in fact, another writer on history, Francesco Robortello, who had more direct links to contemporary antiquarian scholarship, had earlier made similar points, albeit with less force and less directly than Baudouin. In his *De historica facul
tate, disputatio* (dedicated, it is interesting to note, to Lelio Torelli, the lawyer and collaborator with Agustín on the Digest), Robortello mainly concerned himself with rhetorical aspects of the composition of historical writing. He also dealt, however, with the *materia* of such writing. He suggests that on the model of Thucydides’s description of Sicily, the historian should turn ‘ad mores, ad victum antiquorum, ad urbium exaedificationes, ad populorum commigrationes’ and in doing so, he should exploit a variety of sources, including the remains of buildings and inscriptions on stone and coins. In fact, as Robortello points out, Thucydides himself cited an inscription, as we saw above. In Robortello’s case, when he came to put his ideas into practice, the results are slightly disappointing. He took more notice of his recommendations on content that he had made in the *De historica facul
tate*, than on sources, and does not seem interested in the material remains of the Roman world. His *De

presupponendo come note. Donde nasce che nelle istorie de' Romani, de' Greci e di tutti gli altri, si desidera oggi la notizia in molti capi: verbigrazia, delle autorità e diversità de' magistrati, degli ordini del governo, de' modi della milizia, della grandezza delle città e di molte cose simili, che a' tempi di chi scrisse erano notissime, e però pretermesse da loro. Ma se avessino considerato che con la lunghezza del tempo si spengono le città e si perdono le memorie delle cose, e che non per altro sono scritte le istorie che per conservarle in perpetuo, sarebbono stati più diligent! a scrivere, in modo che così avessi tutte le cose innanzi agli occhi chi nasce in una età lontana come coloro che sono stati presenti: che è proprio el fine dell'istoria.'

37 F. Robortello, *De historica facul
tate*, p. 25.

38 F. Robortello, *De historica facul
tate*, p. 26, 'Et quoniam ad hanc antiquitatem cognoscendum multum nos iuvant vetustorum aedificiorum reliquiae, atque aut marmoribus, aut auro, aut aere & argento incise literae, haec quoque tenesit oportet. Idem Thucydides (quid enim opus est ab huius tam praeclassi historici authoritate discedere?) ex inscriptione marmoris, quod in arce fuerat positum, ut posteris esset monimentum; probat, quod multi aliter recensebant. Hippiam Atheniensium fuisse tyrannum, & liberos quinque suscesisse.' See above, ch. 4 n. 1. Responding to Robortello’s arguments, Dionigi Atanagi disagreed (*Ragionamento della istoria*, p. 75): 'La istoria dunque primieramente molto meglio, & più diffusamente, che gli archi, & che le statue, sparge, & conserva la memoria delle cose passate...'.
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vitae et victu populi Romani, published in 1559 with various other essays, provided the sort of material he had asked for from historians. For each emperor from Julius Caesar to Hadrian, he gave information relating to administrative, religious and legal affairs under eight headings. The sources he used for this information were all literary, however — mainly the biographies of Suetonius — and the end result is not very substantive, mainly providing information about the imperial household.

Conclusion

I have suggested here that the research of antiquarian scholars into inscriptions and coins and the historical work they produced would thus have been of interest to men outside their immediate circle: lawyers dealing with Roman law, and historical theorists anxious to investigate what subjects could be examined in historical work, and what sources should be used to go about it. Traditionally, the label 'antiquarian' has been used to sideline these scholars' activity, and to divorce it from historical writing, and as a consequence, from historical scholarship. The antiquarian scholars certainly saw themselves as working in a historical field: Panvinio, for example, after outlining Ligorio's achievements in gathering and copying inscriptions, wrote 'quo labore historiam omnem Graecam, et Latinam ab urbe condita usque ad Justiniani imp. tempora peritissime et accuratissime illustravit'. I have demonstrated in this thesis that they certainly practised historical scholarship; and these concluding remarks have suggested that their efforts did not go unnoticed in a wider scholarly community. Conrad Gesner, in his influential classification of scholarship first published in 1548, placed 'Antiquitates' in his section on history, which included the inscription collections of Mazochi and Apianus and Amantius, among other works, and there is no reason to believe that 'antiquitates' would have been treated differently in the subsequent fifty years. The work of these antiquarian scholars should, therefore, receive a more prominent place in accounts of historical scholarship than has previously been the

39 The headings were as follows: Magistratus, ac Potestates, tam in urbe, quam extra urbem; Forensia, seu Judicilia; Sacra; Coloniae, & Municipia, simul & provinciae; Leges, ac Constitutiones; Militaria, & Castrensia; Mores, & Consuetudines tam in victu privato, quam in publicis negociis [including material on burials and games etc.]; Familiae, affinitates, & cognationes ipsarum; Libertorumque, & servorum nomina.

case. Their detailed and patient efforts to collect material, represent it so that what they thought was important was revealed, and share it with others revealed the potential of this important material. Later scholars reaped the benefit of their important and largely overlooked research.
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