



XVII CONGRESSVS INTERNATIONALIS EPIGRAPHIÆ GRÆCÆ ET LATINÆ

BONONIÆ MMXXVII | 30th August – 4th September 2027

Panel 08: Epigraphy and the Manuscript Tradition

Chairs: Alejandra Guzmán Almagro, William Stenhouse

The pioneering nineteenth-century editors of *CIL* and *IG* made clear the importance of earlier copyists of inscriptions to their work. They included lists of *auctores* – previous *testimonia* – both for individual regions or sites and at the beginning of volumes, and recorded details of previous witnesses in the apparatus for each entry. For monuments that are now lost or damaged, the evidence preserved by these earlier witnesses – whether in handwritten copies, drawings, or printed works – is often invaluable.

Despite the priorities of the original corpora editors – or, perhaps, because of their success in combing the work of their predecessors – questions of reception and transmission became less central to the work of epigraphers in the course of the twentieth century. In the last generation, however, scholars have increasingly returned to the study of how inscriptions were recorded, circulated, edited, and reused across time, showing how attention to earlier phases of transmission can reveal new details of individual texts and illuminate broader methodological issues.

This section proposes to approach epigraphy's history by focusing particularly on the importance of handwritten copies in the transmission of information about inscriptions. Why, for example, did the copyists consulted by nineteenth-century editors make their transcriptions? How can we relate hand-copied texts to their appearance in print and other media? What has been the role of artists and professional draftsmen in preserving inscriptions? Were the editors of *CIL* right to focus on handwritten material from the early modern period and less on the eighteenth century? Can we identify valuable handwritten copies made after *CIL* and *IG* began to be published that have gone unstudied? More generally, what pitfalls do contemporary epigraphers face when working with earlier witnesses who operated under different intellectual, aesthetic, or methodological assumptions?

We welcome proposals ranging from focused case studies of individual inscriptions, copyists, or publications to broader reflections on method and historiography. By situating epigraphy within its wider history of transmission and reception, this panel aims to build on recent work on the lifecycle of inscriptions and to highlight how the history of the discipline can continue to generate questions of approach and purpose relevant to epigraphers today.

