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At the beginning of the sixteenth century, it was not at all clear whether the luxury humanist book had a future. An artifact both learned in content and elegant in appearance was unusually difficult to sell on the open market. Only a few readers valued highly the combination of erudition and fine typefaces, or balanced layout. In fact, the humanist scholars themselves, the editors and producers of the texts and the ostensible core of the readership, were sometimes ambivalent about printing and not necessarily willing to support, or even seek support for, extravagant printing projects. Although many humanists took great delight in lettering and layout, the advantages of mechanical replication were not self-evident. Printers of humanist books, meanwhile, needed capital or patronage if they wished to innovate. They could not afford to speculate with expensive materials or design talent.

The most beautiful humanist books were the earliest ones, for example the editions of Nicolaus Jenson printed in Venice in the 1470s. These books had to be funded by private subscription. They were not so much commodities taking their chances on the market as cooperative projects dependent on elite investment or even outright patronage. Small printers quickly folded; eventually Jenson did as well. The novelty had worn off, evidently. Already by the 1480s humanist publishing was in the doldrums. The enterprising Venetian printer Aldus Manutius made a great success in the 1490s with his affordable but well-edited, pocket-size classics. But generally the imprints that made money were school texts, vernacular classics, often illustrated, and liturgical books for the Church.

This essay is about a highly innovative experiment in printing that tried to swim against this trend: Conrad Peutinger's publication of the Roman inscriptions in Augsburg, the Romanae vetustatis fragmenta of 1505. Peutinger had studied in Italy and knew the editions of Aldus. He had his
collection or sylloge of local inscriptions printed by Erhard Rartdolt, a native of Augsburg and a giant of early printing, back home after a decade in Venice, apparently discouraged by the collapse of the trade in the 1480s. Peutinger got Rartdolt to design a new typeface for his anthology of inscriptions, a roman majuscule so large that it almost simulated the lettering of the inscriptions themselves. Together they made an extraordinarily simple and elegant book, a series of near-facsimiles of twenty-three epigraphic texts, essentially, with brief notations of their location.

An Italian scholar might have asked, What was the point of publishing an anthology of ancient inscriptions? Print technology was emerging primarily as a device for reaching new and broader audiences. For serious scholarship, the old—literally ancient—system of circulating manuscripts worked well. And in fact Peutinger’s Romanae vetustatis fragmenta was the very first sylloge grounded in original research to be put in print. Nor did any Italian printer bring out a comparably sophisticated sylloge until 1521: Jacopo Mazzocchi’s Epigrammata antiquae urbis.

Peutinger did not publish his sylloge because he wanted to introduce antiquarian scholarship to a new readership. Rather, Peutinger saw that the form of an inscription—the lettering, the spacing and lineation, the missing and illegible passages—was essential to its value as a historical document. One of the key steps in the early history of modern archaeology was this expanded sense of the eloquence of the artifact, this conversion of its apparently contingent features—like lettering and layout—into constitutive features. Furthermore, Peutinger saw that these formal features could be at least partially preserved in print. Manuscript syllogai, by contrast, rarely rendered the often fragmentary inscriptions exactly as they were found. Even the textual content—the language of the inscription—was commonly emended and supplemented, often by subsequent copyists. A printed text would stabilize the text and the form of the inscription.

Peutinger saw, in other words, that the printed page could do more than transmit textual content. Letters on a page are perfectly efficient notations of textual content. The fundamental identity of a book survives intact from copy to copy, even from edition to edition, unaffected by variations in script, typeface, or page design. But for epigraphic texts, lettering and layout were themselves aspects of content. Peutinger saw the printed page not only as a transparent notational system, but also as a graphic artifact in its own right.

For an epigrapher, then, the great advantage of print was not the expansion of the audience. Rather, it was consistency: control over the
authorized form. The classical precedent for publication, in Peutinger's mind, was in fact the *inscription*—an imperial decree, for instance, cut in marble in a public place. The printing press was simply an updated technology for inscription, except that the press put the monument into the hands of the individual, instead of asking the individual to walk up to the monument. Lettering and layout were of course crucial and carefully monitored features of the ancient inscription.

Objects like the *Romanae vetustatis fragmenta* belong to the history of art as much as to the history of printing. Such a book stood alongside the fine, collectible engraving or woodcut; or even alongside the bronze statuette, whose reemergence in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries almost exactly parallels the rise of print. In Germany, the first years of the sixteenth century were a moment of intense inventiveness in the technologies and functions of image-replication. Artists experimented with media and formats, rapidly creating new classes of artifacts and enticing new audiences. Huge woodcuts imitated tapestry; the chiaroscuro woodcut imitated the drawing on colored paper; iron etchings imitated pen drawings. Peutinger's sylloge belonged squarely to this episode. The only problem was that this conception of the book wanted financing.

Peutinger's approach to publishing, I believe, owes as much to his association with the humanist and poet Conrad Celtis as to his contact with his townsman Ratdolt. And for a time, the idea of the book as graphic artifact was fostered by Emperor Maximilian. Peutinger may have tried to get Maximilian to pay for the *Romanae vetustatis fragmenta*. It can be shown that two presentation copies of the book, now in Chicago and Vienna, printed in gold on parchment and presumably destined for the emperor, postdate the main print run. Ratdolt recomposed and corrected the text before printing it in gold. But in the event, Peutinger's enterprise had no immediate legacy. The visual or graphic approach to antiquarian publishing did not become part of the mainstream of book history, at least not for a long time.

In 1486 Erhard Ratdolt returned to his native Augsburg after a decade in Venice. He had been invited by Bishop Johann von Werdenberg, possibly on the strength of an Augsburg Breviary he had published the year before with a coat of arms printed in three colors, black, red, and yellow. Ratdolt was the outstanding technical innovator of his day. He saw the power of woodcut and became a pioneer in format, illustration, and the use of colored inks. Already in his first imprint, an edition of the Calendar by the Franconian astronomer Regiomontanus, he used red ink in some of the titles.
and diagrams. The large woodcut initials of this Calendar were the first in Italy, and the bordered title page the first ever. In his 1482 Euclid—the first edition—Radtolt introduced the geometrical diagram.3 When he arrived in Augsburg, Radtolt circulated a broadsheet advertisement and type specimen, the earliest such advertisement known.4 Here he offered samples of ten gothic, three roman, and one Greek type.

But over the next decades in Augsburg Radtolt ended up using overwhelmingly his gothic types.5 The commission from Bishop Johann and his successor Friedrich von Hohenzollern was to print liturgical texts. Radtolt put out more liturgical books than any other German printer, sixty-seven titles between 1487 and 1522.6 In effect, Radtolt declined to submit himself to an open market. He had a steady source of income and accumulated a good deal of money; in 1498, according to the tax lists, only 116 citizens in Augsburg were wealthier.7

Radtolt did little for humanists in these years. Generally, book production in southern Germany in the 1480s and 1490s was dominated by vernacular literature (hagiographical and profane), often illustrated with woodcuts; Bibles; practical and technical manuals; and devotional, theological, liturgical, and school texts. There were very few classical authors published in Latin. In Augsburg in these decades, for example, only nine out of 889 imprints were editions of classical authors.8 There were virtually no publications reflecting contemporary humanist scholarship in any field, historical, philological, or antiquarian; or publications of original humanist literary works. The few original humanist books published in the major printing centers around 1500 were mostly thin, cramped, homely editions, and mostly in gothic type. For example, the Poema Nymphicon by the Ingolstadt humanist Jacob Locher (posing here as a Greek poet, “Phocyllidis”) was printed in Augsburg by Johannes Froschauer in 1500, in gothic type.9 Northern humanists seemed to have had increasing difficulties convincing printers to use roman type. Many printers had no roman font at all.10

The economics of printing discouraged experimentation with type and layout.11 A printed book entailed a capital commitment. A new typeface, one that offered a peculiar graphic effect, was a major investment in cast metal. A new font had to be used to print many books before it repaid itself. And to design a page was in effect to design hundreds or thousands of pages; a great deal of paper got staked on that design. The printing industry could not afford to treat each new edition as a new case, a new problem in the philosophy of printing.

The printer in pursuit of graphic perfection would have to suspend
his pursuit of profit, unless he could find patronage. But the important printing centers of Augsburg, Nuremberg, and Ulm had neither universities nor princely residences. Even in Basel, the university did not take the lead in humanist publishing.\textsuperscript{12} The printer’s personal allegiance to the humanist project would make a difference. But in Augsburg, printers were even less likely to have a university education than in Basel or Strasbourg.\textsuperscript{13} Erhard Ratdolt had no academic background. His son Jörg matriculated at Ingolstadt, however, and in 1502 acted in a play by Jacob Locher. It is not possible to say what sort of personal, noncommercial ties Erhard had to humanist circles.

To make matters worse, not even scholars agreed that scholarship required printing. It was taken for granted that scholarship could survive without the printing press, just as it always had, by circulation of manuscripts among select circles. Some scholars actually mistrusted printers. They feared that textual errors set in type would be rapidly and uncontrollably amplified and difficult to reverse.\textsuperscript{14} If a manuscript committed an error, a later reader or copyist could correct it and set things straight.

Antiquarian scholarship was especially conservative. By 1500, Italian epigraphic scholarship was far advanced. The corpus of transcribed ancient Roman inscriptions numbered in the thousands, collected in hundreds of overlapping manuscripts.\textsuperscript{15} But there are several striking negative features of this tradition. First, few Quattrocento syllogists made any clear distinction in their presentations between inscriptions known from autopsies and inscriptions copied from other syllogai. Even the best syllogai were contaminated by transcriptions from faked stones and by phantom inscriptions plucked from literary texts. Second, Quattrocento syllogists almost never reproduced the original lineation of the inscriptions. They gave the texts in ordinary run-on lines. This was partly because proper lineation would have taken up a lot of valuable page space, and partly because the scholars were mostly copying the texts from other scholars and therefore did not know the original format of the inscriptions. The third negative feature of this tradition is that the syllogai were not published.

Why were Quattrocento syllogai not published? If the corpus of inscriptions was a classical text like any other, why not make an edition? It is possible that some syllogists tried and failed to get their work into print. But there is no evidence of this. On the contrary, there were several disincentives.

Above all, the early syllogai were not published because the readership was too small. It was more economical to distribute handmade copies
to other scholars. A second reason was that the syllogists did not normally think of their handwritten anthologies as finished, definitive corpuses, but rather as living collections, constantly growing and changing shape, like a coin collection. There was no reason to halt the accumulation and fix the boundaries of the collection. The early syllogai lacked unifying principles that would have placed them in parallel to other kinds of editions. The concept of an “author” of a collection was poorly developed; syllogists preyed freely on previous collections. Local topography did provide structure for some syllogai; and indeed the first published sylloge was the collection of inscriptions that the humanist Desiderio Spreti (1414—ca. 1474) appended to his history of Ravenna. Spreti’s treatise was completed in the 1460s and printed in Venice in 1489. Another incentive to complete a sylloge was a patron’s interest. One of the earliest syllogai was a collection of epitaphs given to Niccolò III d’Este. In 1495 a pupil of Pomponius Leto presented a collection of early Christian inscriptions to King Charles VIII. But such patrons wanted a manuscript in their hands, not a printed book.

There were also aesthetic reasons to keep the syllogai handmade. Some of the fair copies were exceedingly beautiful, with fine, sensitive script, different colored inks, ruled lines in chalk or lead, and drawings. Figure 1 is an opening from an Italian sylloge, probably Bolognese, from the beginning of the sixteenth century. The page on the left, curiously, converts the famous invented inscription *Huius nympha loci* into a Roman epitaph with a relief of a recumbent corpse. Graphic features like these were difficult to translate into print. It should be noted, however, that the aesthetic at work here was not grounded in the antique stones, the inscriptions themselves, but rather in medieval manuscript culture and in the conventions of the court chancelleries. Finally, as we saw, some scholars mistrusted print. They felt they could not rely on printers to attend to textual detail.

Textual content was what mattered to most syllogists. Text was easily and reliably transmitted by handwritten copies. Wild variations in script and layout would still leave the content intact. That is the virtue of a discontinuous notational system like an alphabet. As a result, type’s revolutionary role was not so much the stabilization of texts—which only mattered to a few professional philologists— but the sheer increase in numbers of copies.

However, mechanical replication really did make a difference to the consistency of transmission of nontextual content, for example, pictures, but also to the transmission of any material features of the textual notation sys-
tem provisionally endowed with significance, such as letter forms or layout. Such information was not notated alphabetically, but rather by dense representation or analogy, in other words, by drawing. The transmission of this material information was almost impossible to control. Small variations in drawing technique, the tools and medium used, blunders, idiosyncrasies, mannerisms could all drastically alter the content and meaning of the representation.

All these conventional ideas about publication were inherited by the outstanding German syllogist of Peutinger’s time, Hartmann Schedel, the city physician of Nuremberg. Schedel’s ambivalence about publishing is well known. As a young man in Italy he made notes to himself about book prices. He owned many printed books. He was particularly interested in printed images. He pasted hundreds of woodcuts and engravings into his manuscripts and imprints. But Schedel also had many printed books copied by hand.23
For years Schedel collected inscriptions. He may have been inspired by the historian Sigismund Meisterlin. Schedel inserted several medieval inscriptions from Nuremberg and nearby monasteries into his manuscript copy of Meisterlin’s *Nuremberg Chronicle*. In his inscription-collecting he was assisted by his friend Lorenz Behaim and others. In 1504–5 he wrote out a fair copy of his sylloge and had it bound. It included Italian and German material, as well as many drawings of images and pasted-in engravings by Jacopo de’ Barbari and others. Again, although Schedel was generally content to leave textual content in handwritten form, he was quick to incorporate mechanically replicated images.

The Augsburg inscriptions in Schedel’s sylloge were copied directly from Conrad Peutinger’s publication of 1505. Peutinger had broken with tradition by having his inscriptions published. I am arguing here that he took this step in part because he understood the inscriptions as material documents and not merely as bits of text, and because he saw that print could preserve that materiality more reliably than multiple handmade copies.

The patrician youth Conrad Peutinger studied law at Bologna and Padua between 1482 and 1486. Later in life he would speak of his teacher Pomponius Leto, a major Roman antiquarian, although this encounter is not strictly documented. Peutinger returned to Rome on city business in the summer of 1491. In 1497, at the age of thirty-two, he was given the post of city secretary. At some point he began transcribing the Roman inscriptions of Augsburg.

There was a local tradition of epigraphic research. Sigmund Gossembrot and Hermann Schedel (father of Hartmann), both Augsburg patricians with Italian educations, were among the pioneers of humanism in Germany in the 1440s and 1450s. Antiquarian studies and colloquies in Augsburg had flourished without the support but also without the interference of a university. Gossembrot encouraged the historical researches of the young Augsburg Benedictine, Sigismund Meisterlin. By using inscriptions and other material artefacts as sources, Meisterlin broke the chain of medieval chronicles.

But no one before Peutinger ever systematically gathered the Augsburg inscriptions. Transcriptions were rare and unreliable. For example, the chronicler Burkhard Zink reported the discovery of a Roman funerary monument during excavations at St. Ulrich and St. Afra in 1467. But his transcription of the text (in a minuscule hand) is nonsensical because he was not
familiar with the conventional abbreviations and truncations of the Roman epitaph. Important stones were transcribed but then left unprotected and later lost or ruined. The inscription described by Zink was already lost by Peutinger’s time.

When Peutinger returned to Augsburg from Italy in the late 1480s, the antiquarians of the previous generation were all dead. Meisterlin died around 1491. Peutinger had a clear field. Not much is known about his antiquarian researches before the 1505 publication. One fair copy contains mostly Roman material, including many modern epitaphs. Another manuscript contains Roman material from the syllogai of Fra Giocondo and German material collected by various local antiquarians. The fair copy (probably 1504) of Peutinger’s Kaiserbuch, his never-completed history of the emperors, contains many relevant inscriptions including one from Augsburg.

By 1505 Peutinger had transcribed twenty-three local epigraphic texts, including thirteen funerary altars, four votive altars, and a temple donation. The slow rate of discovery of inscriptions in the following years suggests how thorough Peutinger’s initial survey was. By 1511 he had found two more local inscriptions. By 1520 five more had come to light, plus a group of four now recognized as modern forgeries. This makes a grand total of only thirty authentic Roman inscriptions known to Peutinger. Peutinger made some effort to protect the inscriptions as well as to transcribe their texts. By 1505 he had two in his own house, and six more by 1520. Four others, he reported in 1505, were to be found in the homes or gardens of other Augsburg citizens.

On 24 September 1505, Peutinger published the texts of the twenty-three Augsburg inscriptions, in a half-folio with eight leaves. The words of the title, “ROMANAE.VETVSTA / TIS.FRAGMENTA.IN. / AVGVSTA.VINDE / LICORVM.ET. / EIVS.DIOE / CESL.” are printed in large roman majuscules on the first page, in six lines of regularly diminishing length. Title pages were still far from standard; this was another luxurious Radvoltz touch. On the verso of the first page appears Peutinger’s fifteen-line preface in a smaller roman font:

Augustanae: tam maioris ecclesiae Canonicorum: quam Con-
ciuium nostrorum opera nobis perquisita et conlecta. Erhardo
Ratoldo Conciui nostri artis impressoriae: opifici diligenti: et
doctor: dedimus imprimenda qui cura et impensa sua: nouis
formis atque majoribus iucundissimo litterarum charactere:
cedem impressit: ut tu candide lector facile diiudicabis:
addenda et aliae [sic] fuissent: sed diuturnitate temporum:
lapides ipsi imaginibus atque inscriptionibus vetusti sculpti:
plerumque detriti: conlapi: obruti: et quod iniuriae veterrum
accedit insicia et negligentia nostrorum hominum: vel igne
in calcem soluti: vel a fundamentis edificiorum positi sunt:
docent haec Portae Porticus Horti Domus quoque plurimae
Vale ex Tarberna [sic] nostra libraria Anno Christianae Salutis
M.D.V.XV kalends Octobres.

[By order of the pious, faithful, august, invincible, and most
happy prince Emperor Maximilian, I researched and collected
the fragments of the ancient Roman inscriptions in this city of
Augsburg and its diocese, on marble stones, displaying ancient learning and traces of nobility; not without the help of the worshipful Literary Sodality of Augsburg, as well as of the cathedral canons and my fellow citizens; I gave them to be printed to my fellow citizen Erhard Ratdolt, diligent and learned artisan in the art of printing, who printed them by his own trouble and expense and with new majuscule letter-forms of most beautiful character; as you, reader, will plainly and easily judge. There would have been more, but by the long stretch of time the ancient stones themselves, carved with images and inscriptions, had for the most part worn away, fallen, or collapsed; and because injuries of the ancients were followed by the ignorance and negligence of our people; or they were reduced to lime by fire; or placed in the foundations of buildings. Many doorways, porches, gardens, and homes teach us this. Farewell from our bookshop, in the year of Christian Salvation 1505, 15 Kalends October (i.e., September 17).]

On that same page are printed two four-line epigrams: an homage to Peutinger by Johannes Foenisca (Mader), a local humanist scholar; and a versified explanation of the etymology of the Perlach, the medieval tower next to the town hall in Augsburg. The preface and the two epigrams are each preceded by a one-line heading printed in red.

Folio 2r repeats the title then gives the first inscription, from a stone found “at the Cathedral above the cemetery,” as the heading in red reports (see fig. 2). The inscription itself is given in the same large roman majuscules used for the title; this is the typeface designed by Ratdolt especially for this edition. The words are separated by triangular interpuncts.

This system—headings giving the location, printed in red, in an ordinary roman typeface; inscription in large capitals—is maintained throughout the volume. There are usually two inscriptions per page, but sometimes one and as many as four. The last folio, 7v (see fig. 3), contains the last inscription; a short Latin address delivered to the emperor by Peutinger’s daughter Juliana, aged three years, ten months, twenty-four days; and a colophon in large capitals giving the date of publication, 8 Kalends October 1505 (i.e., September 24).

What is remarkable about this publication is how much accurate information is given about how the inscriptions actually look on the stones. Above all, the inscriptions are given in their original lineation.
Abbreviations, truncations, and missing letters are usually given as is, rather than conjecturally expanded. This was anything but an obvious procedure in this epoch. It demanded careful first-hand inspection and transcription of the monuments. Most syllogists were interested instead in collecting examples from as far afield as possible. They collected texts, in other words, transmitted by the authority of others. This was how Peutinger himself pro-
ceed in his epigraphic manuscripts at Augsburg, Stadt- und Staatsbibliothek, MSS H. 23 and H. 24.

To take an example, on folio 5r, Peutinger gives a text found on one side of a stone in the home of the merchant Georg Mülich in Augsburg (see fig. 4):
This stone still exists (see fig. 5). It was moved at some point after 1505 to the home of Simon Imhof, and by 1511 was in Peutinger’s own home where it eventually ended up in the kitchen. In 1833 it was transferred to the
museum in Augsburg where it remains. The stone is a memorial to a woman named Julia, wife of Aelius Crispinus. Their portrait busts appear above the inscription.37

This example illustrates both the reach and the limits of Peutinger’s attentiveness to epigraphic form. His publication respects the original lineation, even devoting a separate line to the single, dangling letter T (in fact, there are remains of two Ts as well as OR in the final line). He includes triangular interpuncts much like those in the actual stone. But he also adds two interpuncts where they do not occur: before and after the M in the first line; and after the MA in the third line. DM is spaced widely as it should be, but not quite widely enough. The second and third lines are nearly flush with each other on the original stone, but not in Peutinger’s version. There is a reason for this: the publication, curiously, expands the NI on the stone into TENTI. This appears to have been a conjecture on Peutinger’s part. It is very hard to say why he did it, since TENTI makes no sense. Possibly he read the N as a liga...re NT. Today it is difficult to see the inscription as Peutinger did. The lettering on such stones was often strengthened with black paint in modern times, in accord with the accepted reading of the text.38 Sometimes the cutting of the letters was even sharpened.

The next step in the reproduction of the material artifact would be a border or outline around the lettering. Peutinger did draw pen borders around the Augsburg inscriptions in the fair copy of the Romanae vetustatis fragmenta, possibly the very manuscript used by the printer.39 Some of these borders reproduce features of the actual stones. For example, the border around one inscription, the verso of the Aelius Crispinus epitaph, is topped by a triangular gable (fol. 4r). But the Aelius Crispinus inscription is itself put in a plain rectangular frame, with no indication of the portrait busts or the gable above.

There was certainly no technical barrier to printing borders. Some early printed inscriptions did have woodcut borders, although these were mostly fictional inscriptions. For example, the first edition of the ancient epigraphic handbook by Valerius Probus, edited by Michael Ferrarinus and published in Brescia in 1486, included several inscriptions in woodcut borders. The title of the book itself appears in xylographic letters on a woodcut grave monument, complete with the heading D.O.M.S., a Christianized version of the pagan D.M., or dis manibus (see fig. 6). But Peutinger and Ratdolt decided to omit frames or borders in their 1505 publication. Whether this was a matter of design or cost is impossible to say.

In his expanded edition of the Augsburg inscriptions, the Inscrip-
Figure 6.
Fig. 7. Peutinger, Inscriptiones vetustae Romanae (Mainz, 1520), fol. 6r. Courtesy, The Bancroft Library, University of California at Berkeley.

In Inscriptiones vetustae Romanae of 1520, Peutinger did have woodcut frames printed. Here on folio 6r the tablet is shown broken off at the lower edge, and the busts are rendered above (see fig. 7). Surprisingly, N I is still given as TENTI, even though the stone was at this point lodged in Peutinger’s own home and he had ample opportunity to inspect it. This was a tenacious misconception.40
In his handwritten sylloge of 1505, Hartmann Schedel almost never respected lineation, even for the inscriptions he copied directly from Peutinger. The Aelius Crispinus epitaph is an exception, however. Schedel (fol. 64r) gave the text as

D.M.
AELI.CRIS.
TENET.I.VL.MA.T.

In other words, he was willing to reproduce the lineation, although not to the point of granting the T a line of its own. He also introduced an interpretation of TENTI as TENETI. This is a good example of how conjectural departures from the data not only get repeated but go further astray. Schedel, incidentally, gave the NE as a ligature.

But respect for lineation is altogether exceptional in a manuscript. The usual practice is illustrated by Peutinger himself, or his wife Margareta, in a manuscript letter they apparently coauthored in 1511 reproducing the inscriptions in the 1505 publication together with the results of their other antiquarian researches. This letter gives the texts of the inscriptions in ordinary humanist minuscule with no concern for lineation.41

The Romanae vetustatis fragmenta reproduces many other material, non-textual features of the Augsburg inscriptions. In several cases Ratdolt leaves blank spaces in the text to denote missing or damaged letters (in the 1520 edition these letters are indicated by actual pieces of broken type).42 In three cases he prints black ivy leaves at the points where they appear in the inscriptions.43 In several inscriptions Ratdolt prints smaller capitals in superscript, where they were used at the end of a line to abbreviate a word.44 In one inscription, an unusual symbol possibly meaning “centurion” is rendered as T with a kind of comma above it.45 Numerals are rendered, contrary to medieval practice, with a bar over them.46 A nearly illegible letter on another stone is given as an upside-down V.47

One should not overlook the most important formal feature of the publication: the extensive use of the large majuscules (actual size in fig. 8). Capitals were commonly used in titles and headings in Venetian books, handwritten and printed. Epigraphic texts were occasionally given in all capitals. They were always in capitals when surrounded by frames, for example in the occasional drawn monument in the handmade syllogai; in the fictional examples in the first edition of the Probus handbook or in the Hypnerotomachia Poliphili; or on the fantastic tablets and cippi on title pages of
humanist manuscripts. When printed, these majuscule inscriptions could be done either in type or in woodcut.\textsuperscript{48}

Of course Ratdolt’s typeface registers no distinctions among the various alphabets found on the Augsburg stones. But then neither had the scripts used in the manuscript syllogai. The features of the Roman epigraphic alphabets had been scrutinized by architects, sculptors, and calligraphers since the 1430s.\textsuperscript{49} Eventually the alphabet used for the best inscriptions in the late second century, the time of Trajan, was chosen as the standard. The rules for generating the individual letters were distributed in lettering manuals from the 1460s.\textsuperscript{50}

Meanwhile, the antiquarian scholars developed a rapid majuscule hand which they used to notate ancient Roman epigraphic texts, that is, if they bothered to use majuscule at all. When Peutinger added a newly discovered inscription to a copy of his printed sylloge, he wrote it in majuscules.\textsuperscript{51} The stone was discovered in the foundations of the choir of St. Ulrich and St. Afra. Later he had it moved to his own house; today it is lost.\textsuperscript{52} Peutinger laid down faint vertical and horizontal guidelines but made no effort to respect the original lineation. He made three errors in transcription. He tried to draw a strange mark that looks like a bunch of grapes but may have been a damaged ivy leaf. The letters conform to some epigraphic conventions but not all. The bowl of $P$ is open, for example, as it is in all Roman inscriptions. But the middle bar of $E$ extends to the left of the upright; and the $I$, $L$, and $C$ have points at their midpoints. The inscription is the first listed in the Margareta Welser letter of 1511, and with all three errors corrected.\textsuperscript{53} It appears correctly lineated in the 1520 edition of the Augsburg inscriptions (fol. 6r).

In one remarkable case we have a glimpse of Peutinger doing actual field work. On the last, blank page of his copy of the Probus handbook of abbreviations, Peutinger wrote out the text of an inscription he found near the town of Biberbach three miles outside of Augsburg.\textsuperscript{54} This is certainly
his on-the-spot transcription of the stone. Peutinger carefully respected the original lineation. But he wrote in a rapid minuscule hand, in some places barely legible. As a result, he made no less than six serious errors which all got printed in the 1505 edition (fol. 5v); for example, the letters DEC in the original stone appeared as DESIG. Either Conrad or Margareta took a second look at the stone at some point after 1505, for the errors are all emended in Margareta's manuscript letter of 1511. And the inscription is correct in the 1520 edition (fol. 11v).

Some of the Augsburg inscriptions have highly unusual lettering. The cursive letters on the epitaph of Julius Macrianus in the wall of St. Ulrich and St. Afra, for example, are found on only two other Augsburg stones. But Peutinger makes no notation of the peculiarities of the script, not in his manuscripts any more than in the printed version.

Did Ratdolt consult the local Augsburg stones in designing his new font? It has been argued that the square capitals in the earliest Roman fonts were grounded in high medieval epigraphical alphabets. But there is no special reason to believe that Ratdolt in 1505 inspected inscriptions. Most of the features of his new majuscule font were already present in his earlier, smaller Roman types.

Ratdolt brought four Roman fonts with him from Venice, as we saw. But the new font was all capitals and measured 8 mm in height. In fact it is one of the largest of all early types, too large to be combined efficiently with a lower case. It is large enough that Ratdolt could introduce several nuances in the serifs and shading. On the whole, this is a rather skinny, sharp-elbow alphabet basically respectful of the conventions of construction, proportion, and weight of Imperial epigraphic lettering. One of the exceptions is the A, which has a short cross-bar on top and serifs at the bottom pointing inward. These are features present already in Ratdolt's own Type 1 although not in Type 8, the ordinary Roman font used in the Romanae vetustatis fragmenta. In the M there are serifs at the top as well as a right bottom serif that tilts slightly up and in. The bottom serifs on C and E also tilt upward at skewed angles. In T the two top serifs both tilt to the right. Such details were barely visible in an ordinary upper case font. Ratdolt took advantage of the size of his new capitals to exaggerate the serifs. Two further exceptions to the classical canon are the closed P, which he used in Types 1 and 8 as well (the ancient epigraphic P is always open, as Ratdolt probably knew and could have confirmed from the Augsburg monuments); and the straight leg on the R (rather than lightly concave as was customary on stones and common in types, for example in his own Type 8 used in this publication).
Type and layout in the Romanae vetustatis fragmenta amounted to an extravagant waste of space. The large capitals and the scrupulous attention to original lineation left plenty of blank paper. In an ordinary font, with ordinary run-on lines, the same twenty-three inscriptions could have been printed on about three or four quarto pages and combined with other miscellaneous material. In an industry where small economies made the difference between ruin and success, this was luxury. As Ratdolt well knew, the humanist press of Aldus succeeded because it printed the classics in huge editions of a thousand or more, and because the narrow italic font allowed Aldus to cram in more words per page than ever before.

Peutinger and Ratdolt’s quasi-pictorial presentation of the inscriptions had two effects. The passivity in the face of truncated or missing words allowed other scholars to make up their own minds about how to decipher the texts. And the care to reproduce extremely minor features, like the dangling ơ in the last line of the Aelius Crispinus inscription, generated the strong connotation that the texts were known to Peutinger by autopsy and that he had recorded them faithfully. The material and contingent features of the epigraphic text, in other words, were offered as potentially constitutive features; and even if they did not in the end yield answers to historical questions, they served at least as markers of authenticity and good faith.

Other scholars did not understand Peutinger’s book as a definitive, closed edition of the epigraphic texts. Its contents were pirated and absorbed into manuscript syllogai. Nor did Peutinger establish any proprietary rights over the texts. Hartmann Schedel immediately copied the inscriptions from the 1505 imprint into his own manuscript syllogae. He seems to have been somewhat resentful of Peutinger’s experiment, since he omitted to credit the younger scholar or even mention his name. Normally Schedel was happy to acknowledge the help of Nuremberg colleagues like Lorenz Beheim or Willibald Pirckheimer, or give the names of other Augsburg citizens with inscriptions in their homes. But when he got to the Augsburg inscriptions that were actually mounted in Peutinger’s home, Schedel grudgingly gave their locations as “apud virum doctum.” Interestingly, when Conrad and Margareta came to write their letter to Christoph Welser in 1511, bringing him up to date on the latest developments in Augsburg antiquarianism, they went to the trouble of copying out all the inscriptions from the 1505 imprint, even though Welser (as well as the other recipients of the letter like Michael Hummelberg) must have already owned copies of the book.
What inspired Peutinger to put his collection of inscriptions into print? The German scholar who most enthusiastically embraced publication and illustration was Conrad Celtis, the poet laureate and itinerant philologist. Celtis’s enthusiasm for printing and for woodcuts is well documented. His own publications began to exploit the woodcut around the turn of the century. Celtis was also reputed an expert in roman lettering.

Celtis was six years Peutinger’s senior. He had Augsburg connections: his second book was published by Ratdolt in 1492, the Panegyris ad duces bavarie, containing several poems and the famous Ingolstadt oration. Celtis was in contact with Peutinger by 1502 at the latest. By 1503 Celtis had established the Sodalitas litteraria Augustana, the local chapter of his national humanist network.

In the fall of 1505, Celtis was in Augsburg and in Peutinger’s own home wrote a dedicatory letter for the sylloge. This letter is preserved in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 4028, the fair copy of the Romanae vetustatis fragmenta. Here Celtis reminds Peutinger that he had earlier encouraged him to edit and publish his inscriptions, “so that they would not lie hidden any longer.” He mentions his own Germania illustrata, a collaborative encyclopedia of German history and topography to which all the regional literary societies that he had founded would contribute. Celtis expresses his hopes that Peutinger would contribute his own antiquarian researches to the project, including the Kaiserbuch, a history of the emperors meant to be illustrated by woodcut portraits. Peutinger responds by describing his collection of inscriptions and Ratdolt’s new typeface. He insists that the Kaiserbuch is nearly finished, but that he will not publish it until Celtis and others have reviewed it. Clm 4028 also gives the texts of epigrams by thirteen members of the Sodality, the last of which are the Foenisica epigrams that eventually got printed. It is as if these verses were singled out for publication merely because they were the last. But for some reason Peutinger decided not to publish Celtis’s letter. Instead he printed only an edited version of his own response which mentions neither Celtis nor the Kaiserbuch.

This fact, together with a curious fact about the edition of the high medieval text Ligurinus that they published together in 1507, leads me to believe that Celtis and Peutinger had some sort of falling out. Possibly Peutinger resented the flamboyant Celtis’s tendency to commandeer other scholars’ projects and fit them into his own schemes. The Ligurinus of Gunther the Poet belonged like the plays of Hrosvita to the humanists’ nationalist publication program. Celtis saw it serving as a kind of textbook.
edition was sponsored by the Sodalitas litteraria Augustana and printed in Augsburg by Erhard Oeglin. Celtis took control by inserting two woodcuts by Dürrer and Hans von Kulmbach that had been used in the 1502 publication of his own Libri quattuor amorum, the “Philosophia” and the “Apollo.” It turns out that the woodcuts have been removed from some ample proportion of the copies of the book. In each of these copies, moreover, one of the woodcuts is carefully replaced by a substitute sheet, with one side blank and with the text on the other side—a dedicatory letter by Peutinger identical but reset.68 The best hypothesis is that Peutinger himself collected as many copies as he could and had the surgery performed, presumably after Celtis’s death in 1508. Peutinger may have seen the woodcuts as an impertinent imposition on the text—just as an Italian humanist might have. His sense of the purity of the edition was stronger than Celtis’s.

None of this rules out the possibility that Celtis in 1505 had some role in the genesis of the Romanae vetustatis fragmenta. The possible fourth player, beyond Peutinger, Ratdolt, and Celtis, was the emperor. Maximilian recognized—perhaps more than any other potentate of the period—that print technology had permanently altered the way information got disseminated, and not just quantitatively but qualitatively. He also valued antiquarian studies. Maximilian’s secretary Johann Fuchsmagen collected coins and antiquities on his behalf.69 But on the whole Maximilian tried to turn the humanists to his own private genealogical and promotional projects. Moreover, he could not be relied on for funding. Maximilian expressed enthusiasm for a variety of projects in this period, and no doubt many authors and printers were hopeful of his financial support. But monarchs do not pay in advance. And Maximilian had enough difficulty funding his own publishing projects.

Maximilian had a special relationship with Augsburg and clearly encouraged Peutinger’s researches. He visited Augsburg seventeen times, and in 1500 lived there for six months. In 1504 Maximilian sent Peutinger the text of a medieval German inscription he had found at Kufstein.70 Peutinger may have counted on Maximilian funding the publication of his Kaiserbuch. And according to the preface to Peutinger’s sylloge, Maximilian had encouraged the local epigraphic project.

There are two extant copies of the Romanae vetustatis fragmenta printed on parchment, one in the Newberry Library in Chicago and the other in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna. Moreover, in these copies all the text in large capitals—the inscriptions themselves, plus the title and colophon—is printed in gold. The small headings giving the
locations of the inscriptions are printed in black instead of red. Seven surviving copies of Ratdolt’s edition of Euclid (1482) have the dedication page with a letter to Johannes Mocenicus printed entirely in gold.\textsuperscript{71} Ratdolt did the same thing for the \textit{Chronica Hungariae} of Johannes Thurocz (1488).\textsuperscript{72} It is very possible and even likely that the Newberry and Vienna copies were made for Maximilian.

The gold printing in these books is a technical marvel. A study of the 1482 Euclid has suggested that Ratdolt created the lettering by affixing a sheet of gold leaf to his page of type, and then printing onto vellum coated with a powdered adhesive. The excess gold was then brushed away. The process was thus similar to gold tooling on book-bindings.\textsuperscript{73} Ratdolt’s feat may have helped inspire the competition between Cranach and Burgkmair in 1507 and 1508 to print woodcuts in gold.\textsuperscript{74} Just as with the colored woodcut, Ratdolt’s innovation—and Peter Parshall and David Landau have made this point clearly—had more impact on the history of printmaking than on the history of book publishing.

It has been observed that the gold-printed texts in Ratdolt’s 1482 Euclid are differently set from the black-printed texts in the ordinary copies. And it turns out that the presentation copies of the \textit{Romanae vetustatis fragmenta} in Chicago and Vienna also differ slightly from the ordinary copies, in both typesetting and text. They were prepared after the main print run. Several typographical errors have been corrected in the presentation copies. For example, the words \textit{aliae} and \textit{Tarberna} that appear in all the ordinary copies on folio 1v should read \textit{alia} and \textit{Taberna}. In some of the ordinary copies the extra letters are actually crossed out by hand, in red pen, probably by Peutinger himself (fig. 2).\textsuperscript{75} In the presentation copies the errors are gone. Many small adjustments are made to the headings in the presentation copies. For example, the heading of the first epigram on folio 1v is moved flush left to match the second heading. But new errors creep in: \textit{Ioann} in that line becomes \textit{Iann} in the presentation copy; and the final \textit{er} of Peutinger drops below the line. The inscriptions are emended in similar ways. For example, the three-line inscription \textit{CLAVIDIA.LAVIANA.FHERED} on folio 5r is moved flush left. Some \textit{N}s and \textit{S}s that had been struck upside-down are righted in the presentation copies.\textsuperscript{76} Some triangular interpuncts are removed and added, and evidently not completely randomly.\textsuperscript{77}

Maximilian was well aware of Ratdolt’s technical accomplishments. Ratdolt had been printing official proclamations for him since 1491, although after 1496 he did only four more, in 1504, 1506, 1511, and 1512.\textsuperscript{78} Maximilian is justly famous for his imaginative exploitation of the woodcut,
as illustrations to his writings _Theuerdank_ and _Weiskunig_, or in the great
tapestries, the collaborative _Triumphal Arch_ and _Triumphal Procession_.
Radtolt was involved with one imperial woodcut project, in fact the earliest
of them: the _Genealogy_. This was a series of woodcut portraits by Burgkmair
of Maximilian’s ancestors back to Noah. The genealogy itself was worked out
by several scholars in Maximilian’s employ. Burgkmair began designing the
woodcuts in 1509, and by the following year at least ninety-two blocks had
been cut. The series was almost ready for final printing— in Radtolt’s shop—
in 1512. But it was never completed, possibly because of scholarly objections
to the content raised by Johann Stabius, one of the advisors. One set of
proofs from 1512 bears the names of the ancestors printed in Radtolt’s large
capitals, the font devised for the _Romanae vetustatis fragmenta_ (see fig. 9).
Maximilian did not abandon his strange vision of printed propaganda in sub-
sequent publications, but he did move decisively away from roman type. He
hired a new printer, Johann Schönperger of Augsburg, and had his clerks
design the new gothic typeface that came to be known as _Fraktur_.

After 1505 Radtolt had little further involvement with humanist
publishing projects. He found few uses for his large majusculc font. He used
it only once after the _Genealogy_ : in the _Historia horarum canonica de S.
Hieronymo et S. Anna_ of 1512, edited by the Tübingen cleric and humanist
Heinrich Bebel. Folios 2v and 3r of this imprint closely imitate the layout of
the _Romanae vetustatis fragmenta_. Ratdolt boasts in the colophon of hav-
ing used thirteen different typefaces. But after 1512 Radtolt began to cede
control of the shop to his son Jörg. Between 1515 and 1522 the shop only
produced eight titles. There is no evidence of any ill feeling between Rat-
dolt and Peutinger in this period, nor any evidence that the sylloge was seen
as a failure. Peutinger seems to have supervised the printing of Maximilian’s
_Genealogy_ woodcuts in 1512. He was closely involved in the publication of
Bebel’s _Historia_. Nevertheless, in 1506 Peutinger had his _Sermones convivales
de mirandis Germaniae antiquitatis_ published not by Radtolt, and not
even in Augsburg, but in Strasbourg by the university-educated printers
Johann Prüss and Matthias Schürer. The _Sermones_ was the humanist book
par excellence: learned table talk on questions of etymology, topography,
German history, and the recent voyages of discovery. The book is of course
printed in roman type (although the title page is gothic). There are several
woodcut initials but no illustrations. The publication venture was connected
to Peutinger’s visit to the Alsatian humanist Thomas Wolff in Strasbourg in
April 1505. But one imagines it would have been more convenient to use
a local printer. Augsburg was after all a major publishing center. Peutinger’s
turn to Wolff, Prüss, and Schürer suggests that it meant a lot to him to have the right printer.

In the following year Erhard Oeglin, who had studied at Tübingen, emerged as Augsburg’s leading humanist printer. The Sodalitas hired him to print their edition of the *Ligurinus* in 1507. In 1510 Peutinger mentioned Oeglin to Maximilian in connection with a roman font, “wälischer schrift.” But at the same time Oeglin was having trouble getting the emperor to pay him. He complained to Peutinger that if he did not immediately receive the
fourteen guilders owed him he would be ruined. As always, there was little margin for error or accident in book printing.85

In 1520 Peutinger published the updated edition of his sylloge, entitled *Inscriptiones vetustae Romanae et earum fragmenta in Augusta Vindellicorum*. It included eleven new inscriptions. As we saw, this publication went a step further than the 1505 imprint: the inscriptions are nested within woodcut frames, sometimes even with woodcut renderings of sculptural features (fig. 7). And damaged or worn letters are represented not by blank spaces, but by broken type. Here Peutinger turned to the publisher Johannes Schoeffer of Mainz (son of the pioneer Peter Schoeffer), university-educated and something of an antiquarian in his own right. Johann Schoeffer had printed the first German translation of Livy in 1505, illustrated with 214 woodcuts. Later his tastes became more scholarly. Together with Peutinger’s sylloge he printed an edition of the Roman inscriptions of Mainz, *Collectanea antiquitatum in urbe atque agro Moguntino repertarum*. This sylloge was compiled by Johann Huttich, at least in part on the basis of the researches of the antiquarian Dietrich Gresemund, who died in 1512 without seeing his manuscripts into print.

Schoeffer printed the two syllogai of 1520, Peutinger’s and Huttich’s, in uniform format. Both title pages have the same woodcut border with scenes and figures from Roman history. Both use the same small and large majuscule fonts. Some of the woodcut frames for the inscriptions are used in both books. The main typeface used for the inscriptions is as large as Ratdolt’s, 8 mm.86 The difference is that Schoeffer’s letters are thicker and in a number of cases more true to ancient epigraphic convention. The bowl of the P is open, for example, and the cauda of the R is concave. Peutinger in his preface described the letters as even “more refined” in character than before.87

Schoeffer’s 1520 sylloge with their woodcut frames were the models for the most comprehensive published sylloge of the period, the *Inscriptiones sacrosanctes vetustatis* by the Ingolstadt professors Petrus Apianus and Bartholomäus Amantius, printed in 1534. A dedicatory letter is addressed to the Augsburg banker and antiquarian Raimund Fugger. The *Inscriptiones* is a massive compilation of epigraphic texts from all over Europe. Much of the material is pirated directly from other scholars, for example the texts of the Peutinger and Huttich imprints. The Aelius Crispinus inscription is given on page 423 with a woodcut of the frame and the sculptures. The woodcuts in both the Schoeffer editions of 1520 and the Apianus of 1534 serve both rhetorical and decorative functions.88 They purport to provide information about the material artifacts. But this is highly unreliable information. The
frames usually bear no relation to the actual frames. They are chosen mostly for their fit on the page and in fact are often repeated from page to page. And since the inscriptions in the Apianus sylloge are gathered from all over Europe, the editors could not possibly have known what the original frames looked like. At best they generate a connotation of authenticity. The second function of the woodcut supplementary material was simply decorative effect.

Financing the Apianus publication was an entirely different matter from financing the pioneering 1505 sylloge. The Apianus could draw an international and much broader readership. By that time antiquarianism had escaped from the tight network of humanist friendships and sodalities, with their precious, refined, and usually unrealizable projects. Humanism had begun to adapt itself to market conditions. That meant making peace with the woodcut illustration. A comparable contemporaneous publication was the first edition of Alciatus’s Emblems that Peutinger saw through the press at Augsburg in 1531.89

The trade-off was that these later publications never matched the refinement of the 1505 Radvolt sylloge. The addition of the woodcut frames and images amounted to a loss in graphic effect. Radvolt’s type was more elegant than Schoeffer’s, less like epigraphy, perhaps, but more like type. The balance between text and blank paper on Radvolt’s pages was more even and more generous. The idea of the printed page as graphic artifact, a dream of the first years of the century, was in many ways lost. In Augsburg, the old culture of script, type, and page was extinguished all at once. Maximilian died in 1519. His printer Johann Schönspurger died in 1520. Although Radvolt lived to 1528, the shop closed in 1522.90 More importantly, the Reformation massively altered the economics of publishing. The number of titles issued per year in Germany doubled between 1518 and 1520, and then doubled again over the next five years.91 During the thirty-seven years before the Reformation, 1,474 titles were published in Augsburg; 2,161 titles were published in the succeeding twelve years. Four hundred fifty-four works by Luther alone were published in Augsburg before 1525. 87.5 percent of the post-Reformation titles published in Augsburg were German, up from 62 percent in the preceding period (already an unusually high proportion).92 After 1520, there was less economic incentive than ever to devote paper to graphic effects. The Romanae vetustatis fragmenta and Maximilian’s Genealogi woodcuts provide a glimpse of a mechanically replicable—and yet intractably elitist—Renaissance that never quite got off the ground.
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