

HERRSCHEN UND VERWALTEN

Der Alltag der römischen Administration
in der Hohen Kaiserzeit

Herausgegeben von

RUDOLF HAENSCH

und

JOHANNES HEINRICHS

-Sonderdruck-
Im Buchhandel nicht erhältlich



2007

BÖHLAU VERLAG KÖLN WEIMAR WIEN

RICHARD J. A. TALBERT (UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL)

Author, Audience and the Roman Empire in the Antonine Itinerary

From the Middle Ages onwards, the anonymous collection misnamed the Antonine Itinerary (*Imperatoris Antonini Augusti Itineraria duo, Provinciarum et Maritimum*) has consistently attracted attention. This contribution¹ focuses on its substantial land part (1,1 – 486,17), which comprises 75 double-columned pages in the standard 1929 Teubner edition by Otto Cuntz.² It was eagerly exploited by the maker of the Hereford Map, for example,³ as well as by other medieval and Renaissance cartographers,⁴ and it survives in as many as fifty or so manuscripts.⁵ Today, as ever, it remains important to scholars with an interest in Roman travel, control of space, and related themes.⁶

It seems fair to claim that, after long debate, broad consensus has by now been reached about certain basic features of the collection – in particular, that it assembles individual itineraries of distinctly varied character and perhaps even date; that it was compiled around A.D. 300; and that despite the traditional title there is no secure connection to travel by emperors. All these points

¹ I appreciate the comments offered during discussion in Köln following delivery of the paper.

² For listing of the placenames (with etymological analysis of Celtic name-elements), note now G.R. ISAAC, *The Antonine Itinerary Land Routes* (CD-ROM, Aberystwyth, 2002), a work also appended to ID., *Place-Names in Ptolemy's Geography* (CD-ROM, Aberystwyth, 2004). There is no knowing whether or not the land and much shorter sea (487,1 – 529,6) parts were assembled by the same individual. For discussion of the latter part, see B. SALWAY, "Sea and river travel in the Roman itinerary literature," in R. TALBERT and K. BRODERSEN (eds.), *Space in the Roman World: its Perception and Presentation* (Münster, 2004), 43–96 at 68–85.

³ See S.D. WESTREEM, *The Hereford Map: a Transcription and Translation of the Legends with Commentary* (Turnhout, 2001), xxix–xxx, 429–31.

⁴ Nicholas of Cusa (1401–1464), for example. See J.B. FRIEDMAN and K.M. FIGG (eds.), *Trade, Travel, and Exploration in the Middle Ages: an Encyclopedia* (New York and London, 2000), s.v.

⁵ See R. HERZOG (ed.), *Restauration und Erneuerung. Die lateinische Literatur von 284 bis 374 n. Chr.* (Handbuch der Lateinischen Literatur der Antike, Munich, 1989), 94–97 = *Restauration et renouveau: la littérature latine de 284 à 374 après J.-C.* (Turnhout, 1993), 105–108. The earliest manuscript dates to the seventh century, the first of many printed editions to 1512 (Paris); for a review of these editions, see F. CABROL and H. LECLERCQ (eds.), *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie VII* (Paris, 1927), s.v. Itinéraires, cols. 1858–62.

⁶ Several aspects are now addressed by B. LÖHBERG, *Das "Itinerarium provinciarum Antonini Augusti": Ein kaiserzeitliches Straßenverzeichnis des römischen Reiches – Überlieferung, Strecken, Kommentare, Karten* (2 vols., Berlin, 2006).

have been convincingly established by Pascal Arnaud⁷ and others,⁸ and I have no wish to dispute them, nor indeed to deny the outstanding value of the collection from many perspectives.

This said, in my view there are further fundamental questions relating to the collection which seem to have been explored much less, if at all. The attempt that follows may serve to sharpen our insight into the day-to-day functioning and administration of the Roman empire. As with my ongoing study of the Peutinger Map,⁹ my approach here to the Antonine Itinerary consciously diverges from the prevailing fashion, which is to treat the collection as little more than a work of reference for issues of a very focused, specific type, such as the form of a placename, or the distance given between two points, or the choice of route followed.

My present concern is not so much to examine individual components of the collection, but more to reflect upon the work as a whole. What can be determined, if anything, about the likely status of its author or 'compiler'? Where and how did 'he' find his material? To what extent did he edit it? Who did he envisage as his audience – for extended reading, or for reference, or even both – assuming that he did intend the collection to go into circulation? What motivated him to make the collection, what needs did he see it as fulfilling? Was his idea of making it an exceptional piece of creativity (it is, after all, a unique survival), or are we to imagine that collections of this broad type were commonplace? In addition, what underlying grasp of geography can the compiler be reckoned to possess?

Any answers which may be formulated to these taxing questions must by definition depend upon a close reading of the entire collection; this is itself no light task. Invaluable aids for the purpose are Cuntz's index and his sketch map of all the routes in the collection, together with the relevant maps in the *Barington Atlas*.¹⁰ It is only right to assume, however, that no such aids were available in antiquity; hence any interpretation unduly influenced by the added insight which these modern tools may contribute is to be treated with caution. In particular, it should be stressed that Cuntz's sketch map – for all its intrinsic

⁷ "L' *Itinéraire d'Antonin*: un témoin de la littérature itinéraire du Bas-Empire," *Geographia Antiqua* 2, 1993, 33–47.

⁸ Note especially M. CALZOLARI, *Introduzione allo Studio della Rete Stradale dell' Italia Romana: L' Itinerarium Antonini, Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* (Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche) *Memorie Ser. IX* vol. VII fasc. 4, 1996, 369–520 (offering much analysis not confined to Italy in fact); more briefly, B. SALWAY, "Travel, *itineraria* and *tabellaria*," in C. ADAMS and R. LAURENCE (eds.), *Travel and Geography in the Roman Empire* 22–66 (London and New York, 2001) at 23–25, 39–43.

⁹ See especially my "Cartography and taste in Peutinger's Roman map," in TALBERT and BRODERSEN, op. cit. in n. 2 above, 113–41.

¹⁰ R. TALBERT (ed.), *Barington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World* (Princeton and Oxford, 2000) [= *BAAtlas*]. LÖHBERG's dissertation (see above, n. 6) plots the routes of the Antonine Itinerary onto base maps from this atlas.

merits – creates a most misleading distillation of what is to be gained from the work as a whole, insofar as this map by its very nature furnishes the clear synthesis that is emphatically absent from the written text.¹¹

No modern reader can fail to be struck by the uniform austerity with which each individual itinerary in the collection is presented. The four indispensable components are a statement of the starting- and end-points and a figure for the total distance between them, followed by a listing of successive intermediate points accompanied by the distance between each. Knowledge of distance is essential, therefore; in principle, if the distance to or from a place cannot be ascertained, then the place cannot be listed.¹² This is an established pattern for itineraries¹³ that dates back to the first century A.D. at least, when we find it in the *Stathmoi Parthikoi* by Isidore of Charax,¹⁴ for example, on the Vicarello Cups,¹⁵ and on the Claudian *Stadiasmus* from Patara.¹⁶ It would appear that the compiler of the Antonine Itinerary had neither the motive, nor perhaps the capacity, to change the pattern or to expand it. In consequence, he supplements the raw data with at most an occasional, stereotyped explanation or forewarning. Thus when he includes two or more alternative routes between a pair of points, they may be variously labeled *recto itinere*,¹⁷ *per compendium* ('by shortcut'),¹⁸ *alio itinere a....*,¹⁹ *per ripam*,²⁰ *per maritima loca*,²¹ *per medi-*

¹¹ This limitation is discussed further below.

¹² This is not to claim, of course, that each distance figure was necessarily accurate, even before copyists' slips were introduced. The combined point-to-point distance figures in each itinerary would, however, need to match the total figure that is always offered in addition. To this extent, distance figures were of greater concern to the compiler of the Antonine Itinerary than they were to the maker of the Peutinger Map, because the map offers no total figures, and for the most part does not lay out places in relation to the distance between them on the ground. It is just conceivable, therefore, that some of the route stretches without a distance figure on our copy of the map – Vadis Volateris to Aquas Volaternas, for example (3B2) – reflect, not a copyist's slip, but the lack of any figure even on the original, strictly speaking, completion of the map as we have it was not dependent upon the inclusion of these figures.

¹³ Note Pliny the Elder's complaint: "Onesicriti et Nearchi navigatio nec nomina habet *marionum nec spatia*" (NH 6.96).

¹⁴ JACOBY, *FGrH* 781.

¹⁵ *CIL* XI. 3281-84 with J.M. ROLDÁN HERVÁS, *Itineraria Hispana* (Universities of Valladolid and Granada, 1975), chap. VI.

¹⁶ See now S. ŞAHİN and M. ADAK, "Stadiasmus Patrensis – Ein zweiter Vorbericht über das claudische Strassenbauprogramm in Lykien," in R. FRER-STOLBA (ed.), *Siedlung und Verkehr im Römischen Reich* (Bern, 2004), 227-62. The absence of distance figures to accompany the routes listed on the damaged inscription of uncertain date from Junglinster is notable (*CIL* XVII.2, 676).

¹⁷ For example, 106.5. For this, and the usages immediately following, CALZOLARI, *op. cit.* in n. 8, 393-94 offers a full listing.

¹⁸ For example, 82.8-9.

¹⁹ For example, 419.7; cf. "Aliter a Roma Cosa" (300.1).

²⁰ For example, 207.10.

²¹ For example, 90.6.

terranea loca,²² or even *per medium*.²³ Even so, for travelers seeking to weigh the consequences of choosing, say, the *compendium* – steeper slopes, perhaps, and rougher surfaces – no further guidance is forthcoming.²⁴ That omission is liable to be felt even more keenly in the few instances where the compiler records as many as three or four alternative routes between a pair of points;²⁵ prospective travelers will search in vain for so much as a word to explain why they should even consider the lengthier options. In brief, the most obvious benefit to be derived from assembling alternative routes – the opportunity to elaborate upon their relative lengths and other relevant characteristics – is never exploited.

By the third century, if not long before, there were frequent stopping-points established at least along the empire's main routes; their presence is documented most extensively in the meticulous record of the so-called Bordeaux Pilgrim's long journeys in 333.²⁶ The more modest stopping-points – those that the Pilgrim terms *mutatio* as opposed to *mansio* – were not perhaps prime choices for an overnight stay, but his record shows that in a day's journey of 20 to 25 miles travelers could expect to encounter one, if not two. In general, by contrast, these more modest stopping-points are notably absent from the Antonine Itinerary collection, where the stops listed are more widely spaced, typically 15 to 30 miles apart, thus an entire day's journey.

How is the absence of the greater detail to be understood? It seems improbable that none of the individual itineraries assembled for the collection ever included more modest stopping-points; and the compiler of any collection intended for use would surely wish to retain such detail in the interests of assisting his audience as fully as possible. The surprising absence of this detail from the Antonine Itinerary collection could suggest, then, that it was deliberately excised by the compiler. If so, that is a remarkable piece of intervention, for no discernible purpose, by someone who (as we shall see) was a far from active editor in other respects. He can hardly have been striving to save space by this means, because he blatantly wastes space in other ways. Nor can his purpose have been to achieve uniformity of presentation, when in other obvious respects uniformity is of no concern to him. The question of his purpose in this regard is best set aside for now, however, and reopened later.

Instead, the two features just introduced – wasted space and lack of uniformity – merit closer attention. On any extended reading, both leave a lasting

²² Uniquely at 231.8-9.

²³ Uniquely at 258.2.

²⁴ Note by contrast how the Stadiasmus Patrensis (see n. 16 above) 30-31 records alternative routes from Oinoanda to Balbura, one δὲ τοῦ π[ε]δίου, the other δὲ τῆς οὐρεῶν.

²⁵ Two examples: Sebastia to Cocuso at 176.3; 178.6; 180.6, in effect repeated at 212.5. Bracara to Asturica at 422.2; 427.4; 429.5; and (placed last by Cuntz) 423.6.

²⁶ P. GEYER and O. CUNTZ (eds.), *Itinerarium Burdigalense*, pp. 1-26 in *Itineraria et Alia Geographica* (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 175, Turnhout, 1965).

impression. The collection constantly repeats routes in whole or in part, sometimes more than once.²⁷ In certain instances, to be sure, the second occurrence of a route comes long after the first, which may provide some justification for the repetition; but more commonly the interval between the two occurrences is short. In certain instances, moreover, on its second occurrence a route is offered in reverse direction to the first time; differences in the choice of intermediate stopping-points, not to mention in the names themselves, also occur. Such variations can be regarded favorably as contributing a welcome air of authenticity; they foster the impression – no doubt accurate – that the collection preserves the record of journeys actually made.

At the same time these variations can cause confusion and frustration. Without doubt, the South-North route Ponte Aeni to Ad Castra (259,3-6) merits its inclusion, but use of the latter name is distinctly unhelpful here, when on its previous appearance – three routes earlier – the place is called Regino (250,1, on an East-West route); only from another source of information can it be established that two different names are being used for the same place.²⁸ Equally, the traveler planning to go from Tarraco to Caesaraugusta, and concerned at the scanty information about this route offered at 391,1 – 392,1, is not forewarned that when the route recurs in reverse at 451,2 – 452,5 it is with twice the number of intermediate points listed. The compiler evidently lacked the knowledge, or confidence, or concern, to standardize either the presentation of each route or the form of placenames, let alone the case in which names are given.²⁹ He also declines to link routes by highlighting those stopping-points which are junctions or forks of note, even when a route from there³⁰ or through there³¹ is to occur later in the collection.

Without doubt, Romans did not expect written materials to be organized and edited to modern standards, so in all likelihood ancient readers of the Antonine Itinerary collection would be less perturbed than their modern counterparts by the differences it fails to reconcile. Even so, the excessive repetition of routes in whole or in part remains difficult to account for. This prominent feature cannot have escaped the compiler's notice as he was writing. It is a puzzle that he did not act to reduce it, if only to save himself much laborious copying in the process. What benefit did he believe was to be gained by retaining so

²⁷ For striking illustration of such repetitions, compare 210,5 – 217,4 with 177,5 – 210,4.

Cuntz's presentation of the itineraries ignores the element of repetition; I plan to issue his text in an alternative format which highlights it.

²⁸ Even an experienced mapmaker could be misled in this way: evidently the maker of the Peutinger Map did not become aware from the materials he assembled that Prusias and Cio, for example, are the same place, not two different ones (8B2).

²⁹ As is typical of itineraries, the form of most names is accusative or ablative (signifying motion to or from) rather than nominative: see further CALZOLARI, *op. cit.* in n. 8, 401-402.

³⁰ For example, note Ulbia at 79,4 and 80,8.

³¹ For example, note Aquis Regis at 47,3 and 54,2.

much redundant material? Eventually, on Cuntz's page 46, he does state that on the Via Lavicana from Rome, after reaching Fregellano, the route continues to Benevento "*mansionibus quibus et in Prenestina*".³² Even thereafter, however, he uses this handy formulation only four more times – once on a route from Mediolanum to northern Spain (387,6), and three times on routes within Spain.³³ If he was prepared to do so in these instances, then why not in many others?

The puzzle of repetition leads on to the puzzle of the collection's arrangement, and it in turn raises the issue of the character of the individual itineraries. A certain logic can be found in the arrangement, but its application is far from consistent. Reasonably enough, the start is the south-west of Mauretania Tingitana, through North Africa, to Libya (1,1 – 78,3); then Sardinia, Corsica, Sicily (78,4 – 98,1); then Italy, including the Via Appia, and southwards generally from Rome (98,2 – 123,7). There follows an astonishing trek Rome – Ariminum – Mediolanum – Aquileia – Byzantium – Antioch – Alexandria – Hiera Sicaminos, with several routes in Egypt appended (123,8 – 173,4). Next, Thrace very briefly, followed by central Asia Minor eastwards (175,1 – 217,4). From there, a shift into the Danube lands which eventually brings a return to Italy, especially the north and down to Rome, including several more named roads from the city (217,5 – 317,2). Then Greece sketchily, with a single no less sketchy foray into western Asia Minor (317,3 – 339,5). Then several Alpine crossings from Mediolanum into Gaul and Germany, and routes within those two regions (339,6 – 387,3). Finally, the Iberian peninsula (387,4 – 463,2), and Britain (463,3 – 486,17).

The most disruptive component here is the splitting of the routes in Italy between two widely separated sections; in principle these clearly merit combining into one, with some consequent elimination of repetition. It should be noted, too, that the collection's coverage is nowhere near complete (not that it makes any claim to be). Large areas barely feature or are altogether absent: among them, Palestine and Arabia; southern and western Asia Minor; Cyprus and Crete; the Balkan lands all the way from the Danube south to the Via Egnatia; the west of Gaul from south to north.

It is appropriate to wonder why there should be these particular substantial omissions. At the same time it should be recognized that coverage of those areas which do fall within the collection's scope varies immensely. Perhaps the most successful single section happens to be the penultimate, for the Iberian peninsula. It begins with two 'backbone' routes, the first from Mediolanum to Legio VII Gemina (387,4 – 395,4), the second from Arelate to Karthago Spartaria and Castulo (396,1 – 402,5). Then follows a variety of routes within the

³² 305,5. The Via Prenestina is in fact the immediately preceding route.

³³ 439,11-14; 446,2.

peninsula in a generally comprehensible sequence, with widespread coverage (albeit not complete) and relatively minimal repetition.

The practice of opening with a 'backbone' route and then branching out from there is to be found in several other sections of the collection, too. The first section, for North Africa, is a clear example, although its later part offers much less widespread coverage than there is for the Iberian peninsula.³⁴ Other limitations emerge in this first section. Circuitous routes are offered without warning. An egregious African example is Tacapae to Lepti Magna, which does duly warn that it will proceed along the *limes Tripolitanus* (73,4; i.e. rather than along the coast), but adds nothing about its opening stages which reach Agma after a 182 mile loop via Turris Tamalleni, when the direct route along the coast would be only 25.³⁵ Routes that in fact radiate from a single center are dispersed rather than grouped together, and not necessarily all offered in the same direction.³⁶ Some starting-points are obscure to modern experts, and must have been to most ancient readers too: Turres Caesaris,³⁷ for example, somewhere south of Cirta, or Assuras³⁸ south of a main junction at Musti, which would seem a more serviceable choice of starting-point.

Perhaps the least satisfying section of the collection is that for Thrace and central Asia Minor eastwards (175,1 – 217,4). All the limitations just cited recur there; as already illustrated [n. 27], the repetition of routes towards the end of the section is excessive; and there is not even a single 'backbone' route to give the section some cohesion.³⁹ Rather, the opening Thracian part comprises no more than two insignificant, disjointed routes, from Cabile to Hadrianopolis (175,1-6), and from Plotinopolis to Heraclea via (with no warning of the detour) Traianopolis (175,7 – 176,2); for an informed compiler to make the two into one (by linking Hadrianopolis and Plotinopolis)⁴⁰ should not have been difficult, but this is not done.⁴¹ Immediately following (!), readers are offered three different routes in succession for traveling from Sebastia (in Cappadocia) to Cocuso. This, too, is useful information in its own limited way, but still it can hardly have been a prime concern of most Roman travelers in Asia Minor, especially if they were in need first of guidance – never offered by the collection – into its interior. The next itinerary is a route from Arabissos – no

³⁴ Almost no coverage for the densely settled region south of Carthage, for instance.

³⁵ Cf. 59,7.

³⁶ Note, for example, four routes in and out of Theveste starting at 33,2; 46,2; 53,5; 54,8 (the last two arranged consecutively).

³⁷ 34,7. *BAtlas* Map 34 (*Director*), p. 527) is unsure of the location.

³⁸ 47,6; *BAtlas* 33D1.

³⁹ However, one such route – from Byzantium to Antioch (138,5 – 147,1) – does form part of the astonishing trek from Rome to Hiera Sicaminos.

⁴⁰ *BAtlas* 51H1-G2.

⁴¹ This instance of separate itineraries which could usefully have been combined is far from unique in the collection. For example, 90,5 merits adding to the end of the next itinerary at 93,1.

more than 52 Roman miles from Cocuso, although its relative proximity only emerges later –⁴² to Satala. Then two alternatives in succession for Germanicia to Edessa are offered. However, after two other, unrelated routes have been presented next,⁴³ there follows a third alternative from Germanicia to Edessa, which the compiler never troubled to marshal with the previous two.

Limitations of this type could be illustrated further, although to little purpose beyond reinforcement of the widespread opinion that the Antonine Itinerary collection is patchy in its coverage, loose in its organization, confusingly repetitive, and uninformative where it offers a choice of routes. It is more important instead to pursue questions which arise from the very negativity of the assessment.

From what sources might all these individual itineraries have been gathered, and for what purpose? At least some of the 'backbone' itineraries were no doubt 'official' Roman reference documents accessible without undue difficulty to staff in the service of the emperor or governors or procurators, as well as to soldiers.⁴⁴ Other itineraries may derive from locally authorized 'signposts' (the Latin technical term is unattested) that were erected at certain junction cities.⁴⁵ Perhaps such signposts were the source of the miscellaneous itineraries that are straightforwardly local,⁴⁶ in some instances even 'one stop'.⁴⁷

As suggested above, other itineraries bear the mark of an individual who made a particular journey. One plausible indicator is an untypical starting- or finishing-point.⁴⁸ Itineraries may also suggest an individual's record when the intermediate points on a route that is repeated differ (a feature mentioned earlier), or when the choice of stopping-points seems idiosyncratic. It is striking, for example, that once the long itinerary Mediolano – Ad Columnam⁴⁹ turns inland from the Adriatic coastroad,⁵⁰ there are at least three notable cities on the way that it omits to mention.⁵¹ Conceivably, this itinerary is the record of a traveler who (for whatever reason) sometimes preferred to stop for the night

⁴² 214,11-13.

⁴³ Antiochia – Hemesa (187,2 – 188,3), and Arbalisso – Muzana (188,4-6).

⁴⁴ It seems natural to imagine that official record-keeping was one reason for Trajan to order that certain roads be measured (*mensuris viarum actis*) and milestones erected (*AE* 1969/70. 589, milestone of 114/115 from the Peloponnese).

⁴⁵ Atuatuca Tungrorum, for example (*CIL* XVII.2, 675).

⁴⁶ For example, Aquis Regibus to Suifibus in 43 Roman miles with a single stopping-point (47,3-5); Litirno to Miseno in 12 Roman miles with two stopping-points (123,4-7).

⁴⁷ For example, "Item a Luca Pisis m. p. XII" (289,1), "Ab Hispani Italiam m. p. VI" (413,6).

For a 'one stop' itinerary on a very different scale, compare "A Salacia Ossonoba m. p. XVI" (418,6), where the figure is reckoned to be a scribe's slip for CXVI.

⁴⁸ The two routes in Thrace, for example, already mentioned; Dolica to Seriane (194,7 – 195,3; *BAtlas* 67E2 – 68E3); Eumari to Neapolis (195,9 – 197,4; *BAtlas* 68D5 – 69B5).

⁴⁹ 98,2 – 106,4.

⁵⁰ At Aterno vicus (101,5).

⁵¹ Corfinium (*BAtlas* 42F4), Aquilonia (45B2), Vibo (46D4).

at road stations rather than in cities, and thus had no reason to list the latter despite their significance in other respects.⁵² It is a frequent occurrence in the collection to discover – without warning, as usual – itineraries so roundabout as to be most ill-suited for travelers intent upon reaching one city from another with the least amount of difficulty and delay. Thus these itineraries, too, give the impression of being the record of individuals who – for whatever reason – diverged from a direct route.

Why did individuals record their journeys in this way, and where would the compiler have obtained such material to assemble into a collection? The individuals are perhaps most likely to have been officials or soldiers,⁵³ men dispatched on duties that involved a tour of cities, or a round of forts or the like, who thereafter submitted their itinerary to some headquarters office in order to document their absence or to claim expenses, or both. Evidently all that mattered for the purpose was a record of their principal stops and of the distance covered between each.⁵⁴ There was no call for this record to be notably full or accurate, nor were comments or explanations required.⁵⁵

At one time or another the compiler no doubt worked in such headquarters offices, and some of the journeys in the collection may have been made by his own acquaintances. He presumably made journeys himself, and in so doing copied down records of routes and distances that came to his attention. Conceivably, it was also part of his responsibilities to devise itineraries for journeys that had to be undertaken.⁵⁶ I see his aims in assembling his collection of itineraries as modest indeed. The sheer quantity and variety of information about routes, stopping-points and distances that he could gather simply intrigued him. It was of no concern to him that his collection comprised an incomplete jumble of components, poorly organized, almost unedited, remaining full of repetition and inconsistency. The collection was in any case not a finished

⁵² Compare the listing of Salerno as only “*in medio Salerno*” (with no distance figure), between Nuceria and Ad Tanarum in the itinerary headed “*Appia*” (109,4).

⁵³ In several instances, the military presence at a stopping-point on a route is noted briefly, in particular between Viminacio and Noviodunum at 217,5 – 226,1; compare the header 266,8–9: “*ab Acinquo Crumero que castra constituta sint.*”

⁵⁴ Compare the records to be found in the archive of Theophanes for the journey he made c. 320, especially *P. Ryl.* IV. 627–28 and 638.

⁵⁵ When a provincial boundary is crossed, for example, it is rare for that to be noted specifically. The references to the Malva river as the divider of the two Mauretaniae (12,1–2), to “*fines Marmariae*” and “*fines Alexandriae*” (70,7; 71,8), and to “*Sedisca, fi. Ponti*” (217,2) are exceptional. To be sure, the name “*Fines*” or a variant is common, but the significance of the boundary goes unexplained: see further Calzolari, *op. cit.* in n. 8, 416–17.

⁵⁶ Observe the role sketched for the commander (*imperator*) by Ambrose, *Expositio Psalmi CXVIII* 5.2. Certain routes in the Antonine Itinerary are unquestionably impressive for their ability to proceed to a distant destination through a succession of junctions, for example 356,1–363,2 Mediolano – Gesoriaco.

product, but open-ended, a work still in formation, which he might be able to supplement and improve from time to time in the future.

Such circumstances offer reason to consider whether it was ever the compiler’s intention to put his collection into circulation for use by others. Scholars have perhaps been too ready to assume that he planned it, and issued it, as a collection of routes designed to be useful to long-distance travelers on the pattern of other surviving itineraries.⁵⁷ As explained above, if that were the intention, then I think he failed badly. To be sure, the collection can be made to serve as a traveler’s guide, but it is a far from satisfactory one. Rather, its true character is that of a hobbyist’s assemblage. The compiler was enchanted by itineraries of various kinds and their associated data, and it became his hobby to collect them as best he could, arranging them in a rough order, but otherwise preserving each more or less just as he acquired it. Since all this was done with an eye to no more than private satisfaction (and perhaps personal reminiscence in certain instances), the collection’s multiple limitations were of no consequence to its compiler.

It is important to recognize that the manner in which many of the journeys are recorded is all too likely to disappoint the modern scholar who turns to the collection for information about geography and related topics. The fact is, however, that the records typically comprise just the minimum required for a timesheet or expenses claim, where thoroughness or accuracy count for little. Thus the record for Taurino to Vindobona (242,1 – 248,2) stands out for its unusual fullness in including many intermediate stopping-points – names followed by “*in medio*,” without a distance figure – between the main ones.⁵⁸ Generally speaking, as already mentioned, no warning is given of a significant detour within an itinerary,⁵⁹ nor is a transfer from land to water necessarily noted.⁶⁰

There has been much discussion of whether the compiler took material from a map, or related the itineraries that he assembled to a map. This method of working has most recently been advocated by Mauro Calzolari,⁶¹ but I remain skeptical. Reference to a map suggests a compiler with concerns for coverage, organization, and use by others, which are largely missing here. This is not to deny that the compiler possesses a grasp of geography, sketchy though it may be. He is at least aware of many of the empire’s principal regions and

⁵⁷ See the review of opinions by CALZOLARI, *op. cit.* in n. 8, 376–80.

⁵⁸ For sporadic instances elsewhere of “*In Medio*” as a stopping-point listed in its own right, with distance figure, note for example 188,5; 189,4; 212,6 and 8 (compare 180,6–181,2).

⁵⁹ For the long loop to Agma, see note 35 above; compare, for example, the detours through Hadrianopolim between Traianopoli and Perintho Erac. (322,4 – 323,5); to Mutina (282,1); to Germe (335,4).

⁶⁰ In Egypt, for example (152,4 – 171,4).

⁶¹ CALZOLARI, *op. cit.* in n. 8, 382–84.

provinces, as a glance through Cuntz's *Conspectus Itinerum A*⁶² soon demonstrates. Equally, the collection's arrangement, as well as the wording of many of its headings,⁶³ presuppose knowledge of the locations of regions and provinces relative to one another.⁶⁴ Likewise its compiler knows of the Alps and its Cottian, Graian, Maritime and Pennine ranges.⁶⁵ The same can be affirmed of four great rivers, Danube, Euphrates, Nile, Po. Even though only one of these is ever named – the Nile, once, in a heading –⁶⁶ large parts of the collection presuppose awareness of one or other of the four.⁶⁷

It seems only right to assume that the compiler recognizes, however hazily, the significance of major starting- or ending-points that have found a place in the collection's itineraries, but about which there is no further clue here: Clysmo, for instance, or Beronicen, or Trepezunta.⁶⁸ By the same token, a level of geographical awareness has to be associated with his specification of water crossings. An accurate map reveals that some of these crossings are unavoidable (as across the English Channel),⁶⁹ while others are practical rather than quite unavoidable (as along the coast of North Africa from Tingi to *Portus Divinos*)⁷⁰; whether the compiler always appreciated that difference is unclear.⁷¹ Likewise elusive is his grasp of the relative importance of stopping-points in areas which only a single itinerary in the collection traverses, so that no point's importance here can even be inferred from its recurrence in other itineraries. Consequently, in a listing such as “..... *Pompeis, Naissi, Remisiana, Turribus, Meldia, Serdica, Burgaraca*,,” any sense of how one point differs

⁶² Pp. 103-106.

⁶³ In general, I regard the headings as an integral part of the original work rather than additions by a post-Roman editor. See my contribution “Rome's provinces as framework for world-view,” in L. DE LIGT et al. (eds.), *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives*, 21-37 (Amsterdam, 2004) at 23.

⁶⁴ For example, “*de Pannonis in Gallias*” (231,8), “*a Durrachio per Macedoniam et Trachiam Bizantium usque*” (317,3-4). How such knowledge might be acquired remains an open question raised by my contribution cited in the previous note.

⁶⁵ See CUNTZ's index, s.v. Alpes.

⁶⁶ 164,1 (a notable omission from CUNTZ's index).

⁶⁷ In particular, the references to itineraries “*per ripam*” are otherwise mystifying: 207,10 (sc. Euphrates); 217,5 (Danube); 241,1 (Danube).

⁶⁸ 170,4; 173,4; 216,4 respectively.

⁶⁹ “*A Gessoriaco de Gallis Ritapis in portu Britanniarum*” (463,4-5). Also Ad Columnam to Sicily (“*Traiectum Siciliae*,” 98,4-5), Bizantio to Calcedonia (138,5 – 139,2), Brundisio/Hydruanti to Durachium/Aulonam (317,5; 323,9-10; 329,1-2), Callipoli to Lamsacum (332,2-3; 333,9).

⁷⁰ 9,1 – 13,7. Compare from Pola “*traiectus sinus Liburnici lader usque*” (272,1-2).

⁷¹ Comparison of his fourth route from Bracara to Asturicam (423,6 – 425,5, partly by water) with his third route immediately preceding (429,5 – 431,3, which proceeds by land where the fourth sails) clearly does confirm the water crossing in the fourth as an alternative. The same is true of the two successive routes for Isca to Calleva, the first of which proceeds entirely by land (484,10 – 485,7), while the second includes a “*Traiectus*” across the mouth of the Severn (485,8 – 486,7).

from another has to be sought from other sources.⁷² The descriptive phrase “*caput Germaniarum*” added to the starting-point Lugduno (368,3-4) stands out as unique. By it, the compiler reminds himself (or any readers) that this point is to be distinguished from Lugdunum Convenarum and Lugdunum *caput Galliarum*, both of which form part of other itineraries in the collection.⁷³

Who in the Roman world might be expected to have made this collection? Not an educated member of the upper classes, surely; to compile such an unpolished assemblage of tedious detail about unmemorable places would hardly engage anyone at that level. A scholar or teacher seems equally unlikely. There is no denying that, despite their learning, these men could produce writings of poor quality and muddle their facts,⁷⁴ but at least they were conscious organizers, concerned first to separate the important from the trivial, and then to present the results for others in an accessible form.⁷⁵ The compiler of the Antonine Itinerary, by contrast, displays no such talents or concerns. The business of assembling the collection may have enhanced his world-view, but it is hard to imagine that this was his principal motivation. He should be considered an individual of middle rank at best, whose career in the service of the Roman state involved administrative responsibilities, perhaps as a *beneficiarius*⁷⁶ or a centurion (or both in turn). He recalls one type of historian imagined by Lucian,⁷⁷ “a soldier or workman or peddler following the army,” whose written record was a bare collection of events, “pedestrian and plodding.” Equally, he recalls those individuals of various types who loved nothing better than to reminisce about their extensive travels both within the Roman empire and beyond,⁷⁸ and sometimes even had these publicly com-

⁷² 134,4 – 135,5. For whatever reason, a limited number of itineraries do gloss some or all their stopping-points as *castra, civitas, colonia, mansio, municipium, vicus*, and the like, but this is not the norm; see further CALZOLARI, op. cit. in n. 8, 398-401.

⁷³ See CUNTZ's index, s.v. Lugdunum.

⁷⁴ For a clear instance, note the *Liber Memorialis* by L. Ampelius (ed. M.-P. ARNAUD-LINDET, Budé, revised 2003).

⁷⁵ Those are the concerns of Vibius Sequester, *De Fluminibus, Fontibus, Lacubus, Memoribus, Paludibus, Montibus, Gentibus per Litteras*, for example, among other authors in A. RIESE (ed.), *Geographi Latini Minores* (Heilbronn, 1878).

⁷⁶ For the wide range of their roles, see J. OTT, *Die Beneficiarii: Untersuchungen zu ihrer Stellung innerhalb der Rangordnung des römischen Heeres und zu ihrer Funktion* (Stuttgart, 1995), especially Teil B.

⁷⁷ *Hist. Conscri.* 16 “*ἄλλος δὲ τις αὐτῶν ὑπόμνημα τῶν γεγενησάντων γυμνὸν συναγαγὼν ἐν γροσφῇ κομιδῇ πρὸς καὶ χαμαίπετές, ὄσον καὶ στρατιωτῆς ἂν τις τὰ καθ' ἡμέραν ὑπογραφόμενος συνέβηκεν ἢ τέκτων ἢ κἀπιπλὸς τις συμπερινοσῶν τῆ στρατιᾶς.*”

⁷⁸ As N. HORSEFALL, *The Culture of the Roman Plebs* (London, 2003), 114 observes, this predilection is recognized both by Plutarch, *Quaest. Conv.* 2.1.2 (630 B-C) and by Macrobius, *Sat.* 7.2.6, “*nec non et qui obierunt maria ac terras gaudent cum de ignoto multis vel terrarum situ vel sinu maris interrogantur, libenterque respondent et describunt modo verbis modo radio loca, gloriosum putantes, quae ipsi viderant aliorum oculis obicere.*”

memorated.⁷⁹ In addition, the Antonine Itinerary collection should perhaps be regarded as an unusually substantial survival among texts for which Romans of middle rank or lower were responsible.

The compiler was of course no innovator in assembling texts or extracts of a specific type into a collection. It is harder to say, however, what *collections* of itineraries had been made before he took up the idea. In the late fourth century, Vegetius' idealizing *De Re Militari*,⁸⁰ does at least urge that a commander (*dux*) ought to be able to consult a set of itineraries for relevant war zones; but there is no knowing to what extent such sets really were made, and (if so) how far back in time the practice dated. If prior to the fourth century there already existed a form that was acknowledged as standard for a collection of itineraries – as in the case of various types of *fasti*, for instance⁸¹ – the compiler of the Antonine Itinerary seems unaware of it or ignores it. While plenty of single itineraries survive (direct routes, without detours), and even regional groups as on the Claudian *Stadiasmus Patarensis*,⁸² no other Roman collection of them is extant, nor is one even attested, 'official' or private.⁸³ The term *itinerarium* itself seems to be attested in only one (non-official) instance before the fourth century.⁸⁴ On a memorial at Smyrna,⁸⁵ the Greek book-titles *Asias Stadiasmon* and *Europes Stadiasmon* feature among the historical and geographical output of Hermogenes, a prolific doctor and author, but their meaning remains elusive. If they are records of travel (by Hermogenes himself?)⁸⁶ – as opposed, say, to learned discussions of the length assigned to the stade by different com-

79 The outstanding example is the soldier Aurelius Gaius, who rose to be *optio comitum* under Diocletian; his travels are discussed, together with comparable instances, by T. DREW-BEAR, "Les voyages d' Aurélius Gaius, soldat de Dioclétien," in *La géographie administrative et politique d' Alexandre à Mahomet*, 93-141 (Strasbourg, 1979) at 114-36; cf. AE 1981.777.

80 3.6, "Primum itineraria omnium regionum, in quibus bellum geritur, plenissime debet habere perscripta, ita ut locorum intervalla non solum passuum numero sed etiam viarum qualitate perdiscat, compendia deverticula montes flumina ad fidem descripta consideret; usque adeo, ut sollertiores duces itineraria provinciarum, in quibus necessitas gerebatur, non tantum adnotata sed etiam picta habuisse firmentur, ut non solum consilio mentis verum aspectu oculorum viam profecturus eligeret."

81 See Brill's *New Pauly*, ss. vv. Calendar, Fasti.

82 See above n. 16.

83 For long after antiquity, too, itineraries more or less on the Roman model continued to be compiled, but whether they were deliberately collected is another matter. See in general FRIEDMAN and FIGG (eds.), op. cit. in n. 4, s.v. Itineraries and *Periplois*.

84 On three of the four Vicarello Cups (see above, n. 15): *itinerarium* (3281), *itinerar* (3282), *itinerare* (3283). The earliest attestation of *itinerarius* used adjectivally now seems to be AE 2000.1191, a second-century dedication to *diis itine[rariis]* discussed by A. KOLB, "Reisen unter göttlichem Schutz," in F. BEUTLER and W. HAMETER (eds.), "Eine ganz normale *Inschrift*" ... (Althistorisch-epigraphische Studien 5, Wien, 2005), 293-98.

85 *IK Smyrna* 23.1 no. 536 (ed. G. Petzl). The date of the memorial is uncertain (Petzl hazards no more than "1. Jh. n. Chr. (?)"), as is the identification of this Hermogenes with any of the known figures so named.

86 Jacoby's suggestion in *FGHHist* 579T1.

munities – measurement in stades might suggest sea voyages rather than land journeys. While we should never underestimate the huge amount of written material associated with Roman imperial administration that is now lost,⁸⁷ there is a case for claiming that in the present state of our knowledge the compilation of the Antonine Itinerary deserves to be regarded as a more original and untypical initiative than we might otherwise assume.

In consequence, greater caution may be called for on the part of those scholars who rely heavily upon the Antonine Itinerary to promote the sweeping generalization that Romans' world-view was primarily a 'hodological' one. To quote Charles R. Whittaker, "Space itself was defined by itineraries, since it was through itineraries that Romans actually experienced space; that is, by lines and not by shapes."⁸⁸ There are already other grounds for maintaining that Roman world-view was more probably moulded by a variety of means, among which itineraries featured, but did not dominate.⁸⁹ The prospect that the Antonine Itinerary may be an unusual compilation, not a routine one of a common type, only serves to reinforce this broader interpretation.

If the Antonine Itinerary is unusual, the creation of the Peutinger map – at around the same period perhaps – may seem all the more remarkable.⁹⁰ There is no clue to what individual or team made the map, or where their workplace was. Quite clearly, however, he (or they) was able to exploit a far more extensive set of itinerary data than the compiler of the Antonine Itinerary assembles; this set permits more or less comprehensive coverage of the entire Roman empire, together with some routes that even proceed beyond it into the Persian empire and India. How much trouble it was for the cartographer to assemble and organize all that data for his ambitious purpose is yet another open question. We cannot say how usefully the itineraries at his disposal were organized,⁹¹ nor can we be sure what previous maps of the Roman world had been made which showed land routes in this way, although none is attested.⁹² We should at least recognize, however, that if the Peutinger map's attention to

87 The point is well made by W. ECK, "Imperial administration and epigraphy: in defence of prosopography," in A.K. BOWMAN et al. (eds.), *Representations of Empire: Rome and the Mediterranean World*, 131-52 (Oxford, 2002) at 131-33.

88 C.R. WHITTAKER, *Rome and its Frontiers: the Dynamics of Empire* (London and New York, 2004), 76.

89 For discussion, see my "Rome's provinces as framework for world-view," op. cit. in n. 63 above.

90 See further my "Cartography and taste in Peutinger's Roman map," op. cit. in nn. 2 and 9 above.

91 For certain, however, these materials in turn had their shortcomings, and did *not* comprise a full, consistent listing of direct routes.

92 With such maps at his disposal, he might not have duplicated routes in the area beyond the eastern Mediterranean in the puzzling way that he does. Earlier maps, with or without routes marked, would have been one source able to assist him in establishing the relative importance of settlements.

these routes is innovatory, and if they had to be plotted from a mass of compilations as raw for the most part as those assembled in the Antonine Itinerary, then the cartographer's labor would have been immense and the result merits all the more admiration.

It is hard to envisage the Antonine Itinerary, with its manifest limitations and idiosyncracies, holding much attraction for any contemporary in antiquity beyond its compiler. Rather, its appeal only develops later, after the crumbling of the Roman empire and the collection's own miraculous survival. Then, from the Middle Ages onwards, the collection is esteemed as a uniquely informative evocation of the amazing journeys that had once been possible under Roman rule. As such, it is loosely comparable on an empire-wide scale to the mid-twelfth century *Mirabilia Urbis Romae*, which (among much else) brought ancient Rome itself back to life for visitors to the city's ruins.⁹³ It is ironic that posterity, with its thirst for detailed knowledge and its dearth of sources, has accorded the Antonine Itinerary a respect and a value far beyond the private interests of its compiler, who barely had any reader in mind beyond himself.⁹⁴ This personal, introverted quality of his terse and uneven record is overdue for recognition. The chance survival of the collection preserves for us an oblique and tantalizing glimpse into the routine administrative rhythm of Roman officialdom.

⁹³ See FRIEDMAN and FIGG (eds.), op. cit. in n. 4 above, s.v. *Marvels of Rome*.

⁹⁴ Of course, such generous reevaluation of an ancient text is far from exceptional. Compare the claim that in its surviving form the *Notitia Dignitatum* represents a nostalgic, ideological compilation, not one for practical use, made by P. BRENNAN, "The *Notitia Dignitatum*," in F. Paschoud (ed.), *Les littératures techniques dans l'antiquité romaine: statut, public et destination, tradition*, 147-78 (Fondation Hardt *Entretiens* XLII, Vandœuvres-Genève, 1996).