

THE TYNDALE OLD TESTAMENT LECTURE 1973*

THE WILDERNESS ITINERARIES:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY¹

By G. I. DAVIES

The title of this lecture requires clarification in two ways:

a. The word 'itinerary' is often used as an equivalent to 'route'. A person who has just returned from a touring holiday might be asked: 'What was your itinerary?', which would mean no more than 'Where did you go?' But there is another older use of the word, in which it refers to a written account of a route, either one already traversed by a particular individual or group or one that would be suitable for use in the future. It is in this second sense that I have used 'itinerary' in my title. In other words, this lecture will not, for the most part, be concerned with geographical questions connected with the route of the Exodus and the wilderness journeys, but rather with some literary aspects of passages in the Old Testament which purport to be records of the route of the Israelites.

b. I have described these passages as 'wilderness itineraries' out of deference to general custom. This is accurate in so far as most of the movements described are located in 'the wilderness'. But the places named both at the beginning and at the end of the itineraries are not in 'the wilderness'. The full itineraries open with references to important places in Egypt, the 'edge of the wilderness' only being reached at the third camping-place (Ex. 13:20, Nu. 33:6); while their closing stages are already set in land that was distributed among the Israelite tribes. There is nothing in the texts themselves which would justify us in regarding them as exclusively *wilderness*

* Delivered at Tyndale House, Cambridge, on 13 July 1973

¹ I am indebted to A. R. Millard and K. A. Kitchen, of Liverpool University, for help with the Akkadian and Egyptian texts discussed here. The following abbreviations have been employed, in addition to those in general use:

ARMT *Archives Royales de Mari*, ed. A. Parrot et G. Dossin, Imprimerie Nationale, Paris (1950-)

FGH *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, ed. F. Jacoby, E. J. Brill, Leiden (1926-1958)

GGM *Geographici Graeci Minores*, ed. C. Müller, Didot, Paris (1855-1861)

KAH *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur historischen Inhalts*

KAV *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts*

Noth, *Aufsätze* M. Noth, *Aufsätze zur biblischen Landes- und Altertumskunde*, ed. H. W. Wolff, Neukirchener Verlag (1971)

itineraries. It is therefore mistaken to argue that the limits of the 'wilderness theme' should be extended to take in, for example, the deliverance at the Red Sea (Exodus 14) and the narratives about Balaam, on the ground that these events are located at places mentioned in the itineraries.² On the contrary, the itineraries are to be seen as one of the elements in the Pentateuch as it stands which serve to bind into a single unit the whole complex of narratives from the Exodus to the Conquest.

It is desirable to define the term 'itinerary' a little more precisely. Some records of journeys (and descriptions of possible routes) do a great deal more than recount movements from place to place, and are better regarded as a particular type of historical narrative (or geographical treatise). The annals of Hittite and Assyrian kings provide many examples. An itinerary is something much more concise, in which interest is concentrated on the process of movement from place to place and other material is generally excluded. Formally, too, an itinerary is distinguished from other records of journeys, by the repeated use of a stereotyped formula and the continuity of its references to movement.³

THE OLD TESTAMENT ITINERARIES

There are several passages in the books from Exodus to Deuteronomy which can be described as itineraries in this restricted sense. Foremost among them is the comprehensive list of journey-stages from Egypt to the Jordan in Numbers 33:1-49. This almost certainly existed as a separate document before it was inserted in its present context. The itinerary has been placed in the middle of material dealing with tribal inheritances east and west of the Jordan (Nu. 32; 33:50-35:15),⁴ probably because of the references to Dibon of Gad in verses

² As is done by G. W. Coats in his article, 'The Wilderness Itinerary', *CBQ* 34 (1972) 135-152, esp. 149ff. This is not the place for a discussion of the other arguments adduced by Coats in support of his view, for which cf. also *VT* 17 (1967) 253-265 and *ibid.* 22 (1972) 138-141.

³ The importance of the latter point is emphasized by Coats, *CBQ* 34 (1972) 136. But the lack of continuity at some points in the 'chain' discussed by him constitutes an objection to speaking of it as a single itinerary which he does not deal with adequately.

⁴ Cf. M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*², Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen (1967) 192 n. 1.

45f., which presuppose the settlement of the tribe Gad in former Amorite territory (cf. 32:34ff.). The introductory אלה in 33:1 is characteristic of the beginning of an archival document (cf. 1 Ch. 2:1, etc.), and the explicit linking of the passage with what precedes by 'and' is missing in the Hebrew, only appearing in the Septuagint and Peshitta. Much shorter itineraries, which do not coincide at all points with Numbers 33:1-49, are to be found in Numbers 21:10-20⁵ and in Deuteronomy 10:6-7.⁶ In addition, there are at intervals in the main narrative of Exodus and Numbers verses or parts of verses which in form resemble, sometimes very closely, the itineraries already mentioned.⁷ Without comprising as full a description of the route as Numbers 33:1-49, these units do indicate the progress of the Israelites from Egypt through the wilderness to the neighbourhood of Jericho and they have been called an 'itinerary-chain'.⁸ This group of passages is, in its present form, but one part of a much fuller narrative, but it may once have existed independently or be based on itinerary-type source material.⁹ The fact that many of the place-names are common to the two sequences makes dependence on Numbers 33:1-49 a possibility, but the relationship between the 'chain' and that passage is usually

⁵ There is some discontinuity in this passage. Many commentators have suspected that verses 10-11 come from a different source from verses 12ff. The most cogent argument for this is the geographical one advanced by Noth, *ZAW* 58 (1940/1) 171ff. = *Aufsätze*, 1.84ff. Again, in the MT at least, there appears to be no connection between verse 16 and the following sequence of names. The LXX, to be sure, which has καὶ ἀνὰ φάραγος וּמִמֶּדְבָר (omitting 17) as part of the poetic fragment, and retain the MT. A connection between verses 16 and 19 can then be obtained either by supposing that וּמִמֶּדְבָר in verse 19 was introduced (in place of an original וּמִבְּאֵר, by a scribe who misinterpreted the last stich of the poem as a new beginning to the itinerary (so K. Budde, *Preussische Jahrbücher* 82 (1895), 491-500, summarized by G. B. Gray, *ICC Numbers*, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh (1903) 290), or by regarding Beer and Mattanah as alternative names for the same place (so W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan*, Athlone Press, London (1968) 39, apparently).

⁶ These verses interrupt the account of covenant-renewal in Dt. 10:1-5, 8-9 and are clearly alien to the present context. They were probably inserted here to safeguard the claim of the Aaronite priests to superiority over the Levites (and not, as is often supposed, to show the success (albeit temporary!) of Moses' prayer in 9:20).

⁷ Ex. 12:37a, 13:20, 14:2, 9, 15:22-23a, 27, 16:1, 17:1, 19:1-2; Nu. 10:12, 33a, 11:35, 12:16, 20:1, 22, 22:1, 25:1. Most of these verses recount arrivals and departures like Nu. 33:3-49, but Ex. 14:2, 9 locate the encampment by the sea by means of a divine command (verse 2) and a participial phrase (verse 9).

⁸ Coats, *CBQ* 34 (1972) 135.

⁹ Cf. M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*, Kohlhammer Verlag, Stuttgart (1948) 242-246; G. Fohrer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, SPCK, London (1970) 97; V. Fritz, *Israel in der Wüste*, Elwert Verlag, Marburg (1970) 116-117.

taken to be the opposite.¹⁰ The other accounts of the wilderness journey (Dt. 1:6–3:29; Jdg. 11:16–23) do not concern us here because they cannot be said either to be or to contain material of itinerary form.

In what follows my main aim will be to set these itineraries in the context of other examples of their literary genre. The starting-point for such an enterprise was already given by the Alexandrian Jew responsible for translating Numbers 33 from Hebrew into Greek. The Septuagint is, as is well known, not always an exact translation of its Hebrew original. Apart from straightforward errors of translation, it sometimes resorts to paraphrase or to the use of a more or less equivalent term from contemporary parlance. Numbers 33:2, part of the heading to the most complete of the wilderness itineraries, is one example of this. For the second half of the verse the Masoretic Text has **וְאֵלֶּה מַסְעֵיהֶם לְמִצְרָאִים**, which is literally rendered by the RSV: 'And these are their stages according to their starting places.' Corresponding to this in the Septuagint is **καὶ οὗτοι σταθμοὶ τῆς πορείας αὐτῶν** (so Codex Vaticanus: most mss. add **οἱ** after **οὗτοι**): 'And these are the stages of their journey.' Now from Athenaeus (*fl.* c. AD 200) it is known that one of the works which purported to record the route of Alexander the Great's conquering march through Asia was entitled **Σταθμοὶ τῆς Ἀλέξανδρου πορείας**—'The Stages of Alexander's Journey'. This title is identical in form with the Septuagint's paraphrase of Numbers 33:2b. It appears that the translator had noticed the resemblance between the biblical itinerary and some contemporary documents and consequently thought it legitimate to use a title typical of the latter in his translation, even though it was not an exact equivalent of the Hebrew before him.¹¹ At a later date Ambrose of Milan seems also to have been struck by the similarity between Numbers 33:1–49 and secular itineraries of his time.¹²

In this lecture we shall be able to illustrate this similarity, noted long ago, and to show that it is, if anything, more evident when the biblical texts are compared with extant

¹⁰ E.g. Noth, *PJB* 36 (1940) 5–6 = *Aufsätze* 1. 55–56.

¹¹ Athenaeus: *Deipnosophistae* 10.442b. Contemporary Alexandrian itineraries: Strabo, *Geography* 2. 1.6–8, Ps.-Aristeas, *ad Philocratem* para. 283, and further passages noted by P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford University Press (1972), I 535–536, 549.

¹² See his comments on Ps. 118 (119):33 (*Expositio Psalmi CXVIII* 5.2ff.).

documents from their Ancient Near Eastern environment. We need at the outset to focus our attention on the form which the biblical itineraries take. One feature that has already been referred to is the recurring use of a stereotyped formula. In Numbers 33:1-49 it is immediately noticeable (especially in NEB) that the itinerary is constructed according to a regular pattern: 'And they set out from A, and encamped in B.' There are forty-one such sentences (with a slight variation in verse 9—*cf.* the parallel in Exodus 15:27), and each is linked to the next by the fact that its B-name recurs there in the A-position. 'They set out from the Red Sea, and encamped in the wilderness of Sin. They set out from the wilderness of Sin, and encamped at Dophqah. They set out from Dophqah, and encamped at Alush' (verses 11-13), and so on. The pattern is disturbed by only a few statements of a different kind. Some give a more precise location of the encampment (*cf.* verses 7, 36, 47, 48-49). Another group seems intended to specify important transitions of a territorial nature (verses 6-8, 37, 44). Two statements show an interest in water resources. Finally, a small selection of narrative material from the story of the Exodus and journeys is included: the date and circumstances of the escape itself (verses 3-4); the crossing of the sea followed by a three-day journey for which no names are given (verse 8); the death of Aaron, its date and his age (verses 38-39); and the report of the Israelites' proximity given to the king of Arad (verse 40).

The itinerary begins with a heading (verses 1-2), which is worthy of special attention because it gives a clue to the original form of the list. Two factors make the style of this heading 'awkward and redundant' in Hebrew (G. B. Gray): the heaping up of prepositional expressions and the repetition of the title after the reference to the alleged Mosaic authorship of the original list. One of these can be overcome and the other clarified if it is realized that the Hebrew noun *מסע* could mean not only 'departure' (Nu. 10:2, 6, 28) but also 'a stage of a journey', perhaps especially 'a day's journey'.¹³ It is then pertinent to note that, whereas the list in its present form is said to consist of *מסעים* what Moses is supposed to have written

¹³ So Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* 60 n. 36; Akkadian *ḥarrānu* is used in a similar way (*cf.* EA (J. A. Knudtson, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*, J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig (1915) (166.26). The LXX, which uses *σταθμός* for *מסע* on each of its three occurrences in Nu. 33:1-2, would support this suggestion. The same meaning would be appropriate in Gn. 13:3, Ex. 17:1, 40:36, 38, Nu. 10:12.

is a list of the **מצאים** of the Israelites. It is probably correct to see in the reference to a Mosaic composition, as A. Dillmann already realized,¹⁴ evidence of a document which was utilized by the editor who put Numbers 33:1-49 into its present form. The verbal distinction observed above may be taken to mean that this document was not constructed according to the two-part formula employed in the present text, but consisted rather of a list of names, the 'departures' or 'starting-places' of the Israelites on their journey.¹⁵ Possibly verse 2a contains relics of its title.

As for the itineraries and related passages elsewhere in Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, a pioneering study of their structure was made by M. J. Lagrange in 1900,¹⁶ who noted that in Numbers 21:12-20 and in Deuteronomy 10:6-7 the methods of expressing movement are rather different from that used in Numbers 33:1-49. The two-part formula appears in full only in Numbers 21:12-13 and **וַיֵּצֵא** replaces the second occurrence of a place-name several times. The verb 'set out' (**וַיֵּצֵא**) is either used in the perfect (not the waw consecutive imperfect) or omitted altogether. References to events *en route* are found in these passages too (Nu. 21:16b-18, Dt. 10:6b), as is more precise geographical information (Nu. 21:11b, 13b, 20, Dt. 10:7b). The isolated travel-notes in the main narrative do not display the formal consistency even of these passages but this could be attributed to their association with material of a

¹⁴ *Die Bücher Numeri Deuteronomium und Josua*, Hirzel Verlag, Leipzig (1886) 202-203. The fullest development of this thesis is that of Noth, in *PJB* 36 (1940) 5-28 = *Aufsätze* 1.55-74.

¹⁵ There are not many references to allegedly Mosaic documents in the Pentateuch (cf. Ex. 17:14, 24:4, 34:27-8, Dt. 31:9, 24), and it is probable that in these instances the existence of a document that was believed to be Mosaic should be assumed. This need not imply that the belief was true.

¹⁶ *RB* 9 (1900) 64-70. A much more detailed analysis (which, however, ignores Dt. 10:6-7) is given by Coats in *CBQ* 34 (1972) 135-138, to which reference may be made for an exact specification of the variations in form which occur. But it is odd to find there a distinction made between an 'accusative of direction' and an 'accusative of place' (p. 135), apparently on the basis of the presence or absence of affixed **לְ**. The distinction is not between two different uses of the accusative, because in all the examples cited movement is involved; but rather between the use of an unmodified form of a name (which is customarily said to be in the accusative case: cf. *GK* 118d) and a modified one to do the same job, to indicate motion. The situation in Ugaritic has made it unlikely that the directional (or locative) ending **לְ** in Hebrew is to be explained as a relic of the accusative case-ending. It is clear in Ugaritic that the affixed *h* has consonantal force and is not merely an orthographic device after a final vowel. It is presumably deictic. Cf. E. A. Speiser, *IEJ* 4 (1954) 108-115 (esp. 110), R. J. Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, University of Toronto Press (1967) 15-16.

different origin. In fact a two-part formula is quite common (cf. Ex. 13:20, 15:22–23a (with fuller information about intervening terrain), 16:1, 17:1, 19:2, Nu. 10:12, 11:35, 12:16, 20:22); some movements are dated (Ex. 16:1, 19:1, Nu. 10:11, 20:1—cf. Jos. 4:19); and additional information about camping-places is given (Ex. 13:20, 15:27, 16:1, 17:1). While this does not amount to proof that an itinerary-source has been employed, it makes it highly probable, the more so in view of the occurrence of some place-names which do not appear in the surviving narrative tradition.¹⁷

ITINERARIES IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

We shall now proceed to an examination of comparable texts from outside the Old Testament, some brought to light by archaeologists and others drawn from the literatures of Greece and Rome.¹⁸ We begin with a group of texts from *Ancient Mesopotamia* which span nearly a millennium. The 'Old Babylonian Itinerary' has become well known since the publication of the first copies to come to light in 1953 and is, incidentally, an excellent illustration of the value of itineraries for the study of historical geography.¹⁹ Parts of no less than three copies of this text have come to light in the collections of two American museums. The three copies do not always agree where a comparison is possible, but the differences between them are such as to imply that the same journey was recorded in different ways for different purposes, rather than quite different journeys being involved—in other words, it is legitimate to speak of 'three copies of one text' rather than of 'three texts'. The largest tablet, UIOM 2134, describes a route from the neighbourhood of Babylon north via Assur to an

¹⁷ Cf. n. 9 above.

¹⁸ Within the Old Testament itself there is little comparative material. Coats (CBQ 34 (1972) 136, 148) refers to Gn. 46:1, Jdg. 18:11–13 and, in general, Gn. 14. But the only parallel of any extent is Jos. 10:28–39, on which cf. J. A. Soggin, *Joshua*, SCM Press, London (1972) 130–131. There is, to my knowledge, no existing survey of ancient itineraries in general. None is included in E. Posner's otherwise useful *Archives in the Ancient World*, Harvard University Press (1972). For studies with a limited scope cf. P. Garelli, *RA* 52 (1958) 117–127, W. W. Hallo, *JCS* 18 (1964) 62–63, E. Weidner, *A/O* 21 (1966) 42–46 (Mesopotamia); F. Gisinger, *RE* XIX 841–850 (Periplus-literature); H. F. Tozer, *History of Ancient Geography*, Cambridge University Press (1897) 306–312, W. Kubitschek, *RE* IX 2308–2363, *id.* *Itinerarstudien*, Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna (1919), summarized in *Philologische Wochenschrift* 41 (1921) 132–137 (Roman Empire).

¹⁹ On this cf. Hallo, *JCS* 18 (1964) 62.

unknown destination—the tablet is broken at this point—returning again to Larsa by, in part, a different way. UIOM 2370 is a much smaller tablet which exactly duplicates the large one, except for orthographical variations, over ten lines relating to part of the ‘return journey’. In what follows we shall refer to these two tablets as ‘A’ (with columns numbered I–IV) and ‘A¹’ respectively.²⁰ The third tablet, YBC 4499 (=‘B’), corresponds closely to the first part of A and records a journey to Emar, on the upper Euphrates near to Carchemish.²¹ Because of its good state of preservation it helps to fill some of the lacunae in A, and in particular makes it clear that the objective of the journey was Emar.

The majority of the entries on all three tablets are of the following regular form:

day X, place Y.²²

The numeral is most commonly ‘1’, but other figures are also found, the highest being ‘26’ (A III 23 = A¹ 1). The figures relate to the number of nights spent at each place, not to the time taken to travel from one place to the next.²³ The remaining entries are of three types. First, both A and B have headings. It is simplest to consider that of B first, because it survives intact. W. W. Hallo translates it: ‘From the month of Addaru, the 26th day having passed, to the month of Aiaru, 4th day, total 1 month and 8 days since the city was passed, and they girded themselves in Dur-Apil-Sin.’ Thus the text is dated (though no indication of the year is given), and the first part of the journey summarized. Although the beginning of A is damaged, it is certain that it was not identical to that of B, because part, and probably all, of what is summarized in B is given in full in A. On the basis of B, Hallo restores A I 1 to read: ‘[Month of Addaru, 2] 6th day having passed . . .’.²⁴

²⁰ Both were published, with a transcription and commentary, by A. Goetze in *JCS* 7 (1953) 51–72.

²¹ Published by Hallo, *JCS* 18 (1964) 57–88, with transcription, commentary and, on p. 65, a comparative table showing the relation of the new tablet to those published by Goetze. The location of Emar at Meskene is almost certain: cf. Hallo, *art. cit.* 81, D. Arnaud, *RA* 67 (1973) 191 § 6.

²² In Akkadian *u₄* (numeral) KAM (place name).

²³ So Goetze, *JCS* 7 (1953) 56 (on I. 17), Hallo, *JCS* 18 (1964) 64. Cf. the large figures given at the beginning of the text for places that are known to be very close together.

²⁴ Goetze held that II.4–5 probably contained the year-formula for Samsuiluna (Hammurabi’s successor) 28, thus making it possible to give at least a relative date for the journey described (*JCS* 7 (1953) 71). He also found in this date

The second type of non-formulaic entry gives the total time taken over the whole journey (A IV 13ff., B 45) or a part of it (B 21, 27, 43). The colophon of A, by its reference to 'my return' suggests that this copy at least derives from the traveller himself. Thirdly, there are brief accounts of incidents which occurred along the route (A I 18-19, II 8-9, B 42). The two in A have no parallel in the corresponding place in B, but it is quite possible that the narrative element in B 42 did also appear in the damaged portion of A.²⁶ All places where more than one night was spent, except for major cities, are connected with incidents, which suggests that the purpose of these reports was to explain unexpected delays.

A date for these tablets in the Old Babylonian period is indicated by their language and orthography, and one usage is so far attested only in texts of the reign of Rim-Sin from Larsa.²⁸ The mention of Dur-Apil-Sin (A I 13, B 5) requires a date after 1830 BC. There is some force in Hallo's argument that the journey must have been earlier than the fall of Larsa in 1763 BC. The routes employed need not necessarily imply that a single power controlled the whole area, as Babylon did for a few years at the end of Hammurabi's reign (from his 32nd year = 1761 BC).²⁷ More to the point is the fact that the outward journey, which bears all the marks of a forced march, avoided the most direct route to Emar up the Euphrates. This would be understandable if the middle Euphrates was under hostile control, as it was in the time of Iahdun-Lim and Zimri-Lim of Mari (1779-1761 BC) and of the Amorite-Kassite kingdom of Hana (c. 1740 BC). In a recent article W. F. Leemans has associated the journey with the flourishing trade in tin between Larsa and more northerly cities at a time close to the

support for his very high chronology for the Old Babylonian period, to which he adhered in 1964 (cf. *JCS* 18 (1964) 97-101). Hallo has pointed out that the dates in B and a revised reading of A I. 10 make it possible that the series of formulae began already in A I. 3 or 4, so that a quite different restoration of II.4-5 could be adopted. Goetze's is thus by no means certain.

²⁶ Cf. Goetze, *JCS* 7 (1953) 55.

²⁷ That is, outside lexical texts. On the question of dating cf. Hallo, *JCS* 18 (1964) 85. Rim-Sin reigned 1822-1763 B.C., according to the middle chronology which dates the accession of Hammurabi in 1792 BC. All Old Babylonian dates given here are reckoned according to this system. For a discussion of the chronological problems of the whole period see M. B. Rowton, *CAH* 1st.1, Cambridge University Press (1970) 231-233, where weaknesses in the 'low' chronology developed by Albright are outlined.

²⁸ As maintained by Goetze, *JCS* 7 (1953) 70-71.

earlier of these two periods.²⁸ If this attractive theory is accepted, then a date for the journey around 1770 BC would be appropriate.

Two different views about the purpose of the journey described in the text have been put forward. Goetze and Hallo agreed in seeing the contents of the brief narrative units as evidence of a military expedition: there appear to be references to an army and to troops.²⁹ This interpretation of the text has been contested by Leemans, who finds no convincing reason to believe that the travellers themselves were military personnel. He prefers to see them as a trade delegation of the king of Larsa to the northern cities.³⁰ The advantage of a view which takes account of economic factors is that it helps to explain why so long a journey should have been made for the sake of what seems, from B 44, to have been only a very brief stay at Emar. But military and commercial objectives need not be mutually exclusive, and there is more justification than Leemans allows for supposing at least the presence of some troops in the company that made the journey. The most likely explanation of all the data is that a military force was used either to clear a trade route of enemies who were interfering with trade,³¹ or to protect a particular caravan of traders, or even to escort a trade mission of the kind envisaged by Leemans.

²⁸ Cf. *Journal for the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 11 (1968) 171–226 (also published separately as *Old Babylonian Letters and Economic History*, E. J. Brill, Leiden (1968)), esp. 211ff. Leemans actually wants to date the itinerary in the early years of the 18th century BC, when the native dynasty of Mari had been temporarily replaced by the Assyrian Iasmakh-Adad, and can therefore offer no explanation for the avoidance of the Euphrates route. It is quite possible that the period of trading activity of which he writes extended beyond the narrow limits which he gives it, and in particular that attempts were made to protect the northern trade route after 'the period of reasonable quietness and peace' ended with the collapse of Assyrian hegemony in the north.

²⁹ Their difference of opinion over the reading of some words in A I 18–19 (cf. Hallo, *JCS* 18 (1964) 69, Goetze, *ibid.* 115 n. 15) does not affect the point at issue here. The key words are *šābum* (A I 18, = 'army') and *umm[ānā]tum* (A II 8, = 'troops'). One possible translation of B 42 would involve a reference to 'elite troops' (Hallo, *art. cit.* 80–81); and 'girded themselves' in B 5 might well have a military background.

³⁰ He argues that *šābum* could as well refer to a team of workmen as to soldiers and that 'the fact that in II 8 the traveller passed a place where troops (*ummānātum*) were assembled does not imply that the journey had a military character' (*art. cit.*, 211 n. 5). But Leemans fails to recognize that what is significant is not the fact that troops were stationed at a point *en route*, but that it should have been mentioned in our text.

³¹ Cf. Hallo's view: (The motive of the journey may have been) 'the assertion of Babylonian (*sic*) control over an alternate route to Aleppo and the West (and to Anatolia) in face of a blockade of the Euphrates by an independent Mari' (*JCS* 18 (1964) 86).

Finally, why does this text exist in (at least) three copies? Hallo's explanation is that it was 'on the way to becoming a piece of literature'. 'We are dealing, it would seem, not with a strictly archival but rather with a kind of canonical text.' He in fact concludes that the itinerary is 'part of a historical record of a royal campaign'.³² Against this theory it may be objected that Hallo does not give sufficient weight to the archival characteristics of the text in all its forms. He does, it is true, note that the interim totals in B are 'common enough in archival texts, but hardly to be expected in a finished canon'; but he lamely maintains that we must therefore be in the presence of 'an archival text that has not been completely canonised, or to put it another way, the canonical text as we have it is not far removed in time from the archival prototype'. It would be more logical to question whether it was in any sense at all a 'canonical' text. Hallo too readily assumes that only literary texts existed in more than one copy. In fact a careful study of the three copies and in particular of the differences between them strongly suggests that they were intended to serve different administrative purposes. It was already suggested by Goetze that the A-copy might well have been made by a combination of data from a number of smaller tablets like A¹.³³ A plausible, if speculative, reconstruction of the background to this can be offered. A is evidently a report, and one in which hold-ups on the outward journey have to be explained. It could well be the report of the commanding officer of the expedition to his superior, perhaps the king. The smaller tablet A¹ might be a record made during the section of journey which it describes. B contains, in the parts where comparison is possible, no information that could not have been derived from A, but differs from it by its abbreviation of the opening section of the journey, its omission of at least two narrative sections, and by the addition of the interim totals. It also contains no account of the return journey, though admittedly this could have been on a separate tablet. It was, perhaps, intended as a more permanent record of the journey, an archival text in the narrower sense of the word, in which explanations of delays were of less importance, and the well-

³² JCS 18 (1964) 84.

³³ JCS 7 (1953) 51. Professor D. J. Wiseman informs me that cuneiform accounts were often recopied in this way.

known early part of the journey could be 'taken as read'. One narrative section has of course been retained (B 42), but the reason for this exception to the general practice of B cannot even be conjectured until there is more certainty about the meaning of the line.

The other Mesopotamian texts to be considered here are closely related both in their date of origin and in their literary form. Among the surviving annals of ninth-century Assyrian kings there are two passages in particular which display a regularity of structure and a uniformity of contents which is quite unusual even in these formal royal inscriptions. They describe journeys made by Tukulti-Ninurta II (890-884 BC) and Ashurnasirpal II (883-859 BC), for the most part along the Tigris, Euphrates and Khabur rivers.³⁴ Both texts begin with a date, fixed by day, month and eponym-year, and the Assurnasirpal text also dates the arrival at the first named stop after the departure from the new capital at Calah. Its introduction is therefore closely parallel to that of the B-copy of the Old Babylonian Itinerary.

The accounts themselves are dominated by a recurring formula of the following pattern:

ištu ālA at-tu-muš ina ālB a-sa-ka-an be-dak

'From city A I departed, in city B I spent the night'

It follows from the nature of the formula that each stopping-place is mentioned twice in these texts, first in connection with arrival and then in connection with departure. In addition to the simple form, this formula also occurs with 'expansions' of various kinds, either specifying more precisely the location of the camping-place or recording some incident that took place

³⁴ The text of Tukulti-Ninurta's annals was published by V. Scheil, *Annales de Tukulti-Ninip, roi d'Assyrie 889-884*, Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, 4me section, 178, Paris (1909), and translated by D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* I, University of Chicago Press (1926) 126-133 (cf. esp. 128ff.). Part of the section treated here was examined by E. I. Gordon, *JCS* 21 (1967) 86-87; and a new edition of the annals by W. Schramm appeared in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 27 (1970) 147-160. The Ashurnasirpal annals may be found in cuneiform, with a transcription and translation, in E. A. Budge and L. W. King, *Annals of the Kings of Assyria*, The British Museum, London (1902) 346-353, and are also translated by Luckenbill, *op. cit.*, 138-171 (cf. esp. 159ff.). On the background and purpose of both expeditions cf. J. A. Brinkman, *A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia*, *Analecta Orientalia* 43, Rome (1968) 183-186. For a text of Adad-nirari II with a similar structure cf. *KAH* II. 84. 100ff. and Luckenbill, *op. cit.* 115. For details of these texts see now W. Schramm, *Einleitung in die assyrischen Königsinschriften*, II, Brill, Leiden (1973).

during the day. In the Tukulti-Ninurta text about half of the forty-seven instances of the formula are of the simple type, while the rest have 'expansions'. In the Ashurnasirpal text only two of fourteen instances are of the simple form. The incidents mentioned are just what might be expected in the course of a royal expedition: river-crossings, the problems of finding water, military exploits, hunting, the receiving of tribute. Tribute is particularly prominent in the Ashurnasirpal text. An extract from the latter will give an impression both of the underlying unity of form and of the possible variations.

'On the sixth day of the month of Dûzu
I departed from the city of Tabite,
 and I marched unto the district of the river Harmish,
I spent the night in the city of Magarisi.
From the city of Magarisi I departed,
 and I marched to the district of the river Habûr,
I spent the night in the city of Shadikanni.
 The tribute of Shadikanni—silver, gold, lead, vessels of
 copper, cattle and flocks—I received.
From the city of Shadikanni I departed.
I spent the night in the city of Qatni,
 and I received the tribute of the Qatnites.'³⁵

It is clear that in addition to the overriding concern to present the route taken by the king, these texts were intended to convey the significance of the journey recorded. Indeed their very inclusion among the annals, as well as the use of a narrative form in the regular formula, marks them off to some extent from strictly archival texts like the Old Babylonian Itinerary. Finally, neither account is complete, owing to the tendency of editors of later versions of Assyrian annals to abbreviate the records of earlier years of a king's reign.³⁶

A similar itinerary-pattern occurs in two fragments of text from Assur which have been brought together by E. Weidner.³⁷ One of these, VAT 9968, is divided into sections, each apparently dealing with a single day's march and beginning with an expression of the form:

³⁵ Luckenbill, *op. cit.* 159, with corrections by A. R. Millard.

³⁶ Cf. A. T. E. Olmstead, *Assyrian Historiography*, University of Missouri Studies, SocSci.III/1 (1916), esp. p. 64, and on these texts in particular, Gordon, *JCS* 21 (1967) 86-7.

³⁷ *A/O* 21 (1966) 43-45.

ištu A *it-tu-muš* = 'From A he departed'

What follows gives a more detailed description of the day's events than is usually found in the annalistic texts, but again with references to such things as water-resources and hunting. In addition an exact indication of the distances covered is included. The second fragment, KAH II. 145, is only briefly referred to by Weidner and he gives no full transcription.³⁸ It is less well preserved than VAT 9968, but again successive sections appear to have begun with a regular formula of departure and the details which follow, so far as they can be restored, read like the description of a journey. At one point an exact distance is mentioned. There is a clue to the date of these fragments—at least of VAT 9968—in what is likely to be a reference to an Adad-nirari,³⁹ the name of two kings of the New Assyrian period, to which the tablets appear, on linguistic grounds, to belong. Adad-nirari II reigned 911–891 BC, and Adad-nirari III 810–783 BC. A case can be made out for assigning the fragments to either reign: to Adad-nirari II, because the less rigid use of itinerary-formulae is paralleled in his annals (but also in those of Shalmaneser III, 858–824 BC), but not in the small number of extant inscriptions of Adad-nirari III; to Adad-nirari III, because it is in texts from his reign that exact enumeration of distances is found, contrary to the practice of the earlier annals. In neither case is the evidence compelling: the second argument is perhaps the stronger, in that it may reflect a technical development in the royal administration.⁴⁰

The information given about routes in all these texts must be derived from notes made as the journeys progressed, and the evidence of written texts is interestingly supplemented at this point by reliefs from a somewhat later period of Assyrian history. The portrayal of a Babylonian campaign of Tiglath-

³⁸ I am indebted to Mr. A. R. Millard for the following readings of the legible portions:

]muš ši-id [-di?
]ina ^{ai}ha-za (ša)[
i] t-tu-muš ^{ai}[
]sa? 1 bēru 20 MAL x[
]muḫḫi AMA? za-li šar
-]ni a-di ^{ai}šu[-

³⁹ VAT 9968 Rev. 12. In fact only *]nirari* is visible.

⁴⁰ Weidner writes as though the tablet must be from the reign of the king mentioned. But the text is damaged immediately before the mention of the king's name, so that a phrase such as 'in the days of' may have preceded it.

pileser III (744–727 BC) in the Central Palace at Nimrud included a scene in which two scribes are recording, it appears, the number of animals being taken from a captured city. One is writing on a tablet (in cuneiform) and the other on a scroll (in Aramaic?).⁴¹ It may be assumed that the same or similar officials were responsible for keeping a record of other aspects of the campaign.⁴²

In fact when we turn to texts of the *Egyptian New Kingdom*, we find evidence that sources of just this kind lie behind them. This evidence is clearest in the case of the annals of Tuthmosis III (1490–1436 BC).⁴³ Two passages from his reign indicate the existence of campaign records in addition to the annals inscribed on stone. The first, from the annals themselves, reads:

‘Now everything which his majesty did to this town and to that wretched enemy and his wretched army is set down by the individual day, by the individual expedition, and by the individual [troop] commanders. . . . They are set down on a roll of leather in the temple of Amon today.’⁴⁴

The other is part of the ‘Theban tomb biography’ of the scribe Tnn (Thaneni). He says:

⁴¹ R. D. Barnett and M. Falkner, *The Sculptures of Tiglath-Pileser III (745–727)*, The British Museum, London (1962), Plates V–VI (description on p. 11). The ‘tablet’ may be a writing-board (cf. D. J. Wiseman, *Iraq* 17 (1955) 3–13, esp. 12); clearer examples of writing-boards are found in reliefs of Sennacherib (cf. G. R. Driver, *Semitic Writing*, rev. ed., Oxford University Press (1954), Plates 23 and 24 (cf. p. 16)). An ivory writing-board in three hinged sections found in excavations at Nimrud is illustrated in J. B. Pritchard (ed.), *The Ancient Near East: Supplementary Texts and Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton University Press (1969) 8, 36 (cf. M. Howard, *Iraq* 17 (1955) 14–20).

⁴² Another text from Assur, *KAV* 141, which also includes distances, was regarded as an itinerary by Hallo (*JCS* 18 (1964) 62 n. 50). But Weidner has pointed out that deities are listed at the end of the second column, which are most likely to have been named as witnesses to a treaty (*A/O* 21 (1966) 45–46; for gods as witnesses in ancient Near Eastern treaties cf. G. E. Mendenhall, *BA* 17 (1954) 60). He would see both *KAV* 141 and two other fragments, *KAV* 139 and *VAT* 11537, as part of a treaty between Babylon and Assyria. All three texts contain place-names that may be associated with the mid-Euphrates region, and apparently describe an area rather than a route, albeit (as in *KAV* 92.1–29, on which see below, p. 70f) with the help of itinerary-type formulae.

⁴³ For a brief defence of the lower date used here against the higher 1504–1449 of *CAH* 1st 187–190 see K. A. Kitchen in M. Liverani, ed., *La Siria nel Tardo Bronzo*, *Oriens Antiqui* Collectio 9, Rome (1969) 78f. An English translation of the annals of Tuthmosis III appears in *ANET* 234ff., where a bibliography is given: for discussion of composition etc. see Noth *ZDPV* 66 (1943) 156–174 = *Aufsätze* 2.119–132, and H. Grapow, *Studien zu den Annalen Thutmosis des Dritten*, *Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (Phil.-hist. Klasse)* 1947/2, Berlin (1949).

⁴⁴ Cf. *ANET* 237.

'I was the one who set down the victories which he (sc. the king) achieved over every foreign country, put into writing as it was done.'⁴⁵

That such sources would form the basis for the annals is *a priori* likely; and is confirmed by certain features of the narrative. The first significant point is the frequency of dates, at least in the narrative of Tuthmosis III's first campaign. Following each date there occur one or more phrases in which the infinitive of a verb is used instead of the normal narrative tense, which appears elsewhere in the annals; in some cases the phrase has no verb at all. The association of dates with phrases of this kind points to the use of a journal-source, and is in fact typical of surviving Egyptian journals of the period.⁴⁶ Most of the entries of this form in the annals deal either with movements of the army or with matters of royal administration. The form of the source does not appear to have been greatly altered by the compiler of the annals. His work consisted rather in the combination with it of narrative material (and perhaps tribute-lists) of different origin.⁴⁷ We may therefore be reasonably certain that in reproducing those sections of the annals which are written in the style of a journal we are giving an accurate picture of the form, though not necessarily of the extent, of the source. The following example is taken from the account of the first campaign:

'Year 23, 1st month of the third season, day 4, the day of the feast of the king's coronation—as far as the town of 'That-Which-The-Ruler-Seized' of which the Syrian name is Gaza.

'[Year 23], 1st month of the third season, day 5, departure from this place. . . .

'Year 23, 1st month of the third season, day 16—as far as the town of Yehem. . . .

'Year 23, 1st month of the third season, day 19—the awaken-

⁴⁵ Cf. *ANET* 237 n. 39. For the context see J. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, University of Chicago Press (1906), II para. 392.

⁴⁶ Cf. Grapow, *Studien* 50. The keeping of diaries, official or unofficial, is obviously of considerable relevance to the study of itineraries and there is ample evidence for it in antiquity, especially in texts from Egypt (cf. Posner, *Archives in the Ancient World* 3, 126-8, 139-41, 172, 183, 200, 213-4). The most relevant Egyptian texts were published by J. J. Janssen, *Two Ancient Egyptian Ships' Logs*, E. J. Brill, Leiden (1961): these relate to journeys for purposes of trade. But formally speaking they are diaries, not itineraries, and notes of movement are but one of several types of information included in them.

⁴⁷ Cf. Noth, *ZDPV* 66 (1943) 158, 161ff. = *Aufsätze* 2.120, 123ff.

ing in life in the tent of life, prosperity, health at the town of Aruna. Proceeding northward by my majesty, carrying my father Amon-Re, Lord of the thrones of the two lands....⁴⁸ These excerpts describe in outline the Pharaoh's progress in the coastal plain of Palestine towards Megiddo. Continuity is achieved chiefly by means of the dates: place-names are not generally repeated; and some stopping-places are evidently omitted.⁴⁹

Items in the journal-style are also found in the annals of other Pharaohs, for example, in those of Ramesses II.⁵⁰ They too can probably be attributed to the reproduction of extracts from the campaign journal. The influence of such a source has also been discerned in the Palestine-lists of various Egyptian kings. It was a common practice in the New Kingdom and afterwards to inscribe on the walls of the great national shrines lists of defeated enemies. In most cases a king is represented by several such lists, dealing on the one hand with Africa and on the other with Asia, which included Palestine. There is no literary evidence to tell us what sources were known to the planners of these inscriptions, and since they are, apart from their headings, simple lists of names, there are no clues from formal characteristics either. Instead attempts have been made to show that the order of the names in some of the lists corresponds either to a route which the Pharaoh in question is known to have taken or to one which in view of his objectives he might well have taken.⁵¹ Important studies of several lists along these lines were made by M. Noth, and we shall take as an example his treatment of the Palestine-list of Sethos I (1309-1290 BC).⁵² The various copies of this list mostly agree in including a series of seventeen places, which appear to be enumerated in an intelligible order. The first four names

⁴⁸ *ANET* 235-236.

⁴⁹ The source may well have carried entries for some or all of the intervening days. That the editors of the annals were selective in the use of their sources is shown by a note in the tribute-list of the seventh campaign: 'They are set down in the day-book of the palace—i.p.h. That the list of them has not been put on this monument is in order not to multiply words' (*ANET* 239).

⁵⁰ Cf. Grapow, *Studien* 50; *ANET* 256.

⁵¹ For full details of the texts themselves see J. Simons, *Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists Relating to Western Asia*, E. J. Brill, Leiden (1937). A useful brief account of them was given by Noth in *Archaeology and Old Testament Study* (ed. D. Winton Thomas), Oxford University Press (1967), 29-33.

⁵² Or 1320-1304 BC. On the Sethos-list cf. Noth, *ZDPV* 60 (1937) 209-239 = *Aufsätze* 2.22-44; Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible*, Burns and Oates, London (1966), 166ff.

among which is Beth-shean, also appear on a victory stele of Sethos I,⁵³ and suggest connection of the list with the campaign there commemorated, which took place in the Pharaoh's first year. The next name is Acco (=Acre), followed by places in Phoenicia, including Tyre, and the list ends with Hazor and Raphia. Noth suggested that an Egyptian force, having dealt with a rebellion in the Beth-shean area, crossed by a well-known route through southern Galilee to the coast at Acco, and then proceeded north to Phoenicia, with a detour on the way back to Hazor. Raphia must have been mentioned because it offered some resistance to the returning Pharaoh.⁵⁴ Not all scholars would accept Noth's reconstruction, but it may well be along the right lines. It is of course impossible to know the form of the putative itinerary-source, but it would be a reasonable conjecture that it resembled that used in the annals of Tuthmosis III. A good case can also be made out for the derivation of the Palestine-list of Sheshonq I (945-924 BC) from an account of his army's route or routes.⁵⁵

There is considerable evidence of the use of itineraries and the forms which they could take in *Greek and Latin literature and inscriptions*. Here we shall treat only a few examples, mainly the better-known ones. Probably more research would bring out further information, particularly from historical writers. Xenophon's *Anabasis*, which describes the unsuccessful expedition of Cyrus the Younger against his brother Artaxerxes, king of Persia, in 401 BC, is a record of a journey but not an itinerary in the sense that we have defined. It does however

⁵³ Cf. *ANET* 253 for this text.

⁵⁴ Aharoni (*loc. cit.*) prefers a route through Upper Galilee which ignores the order of some of the names in the list. The hypothesis of an itinerary-source is considered unlikely in this case by W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend vor Chr.*, O. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden (1962) 203, although he is more favourable to Noth's suggestions about the origins of the other lists (*cf.* 122ff.).

⁵⁵ Noth, *ZDPV* 61 (1938) 277-304 = *Aufsätze* 2.73-93; B. Mazar, *SVT* 4 (1957) 57-66; Aharoni, *op. cit.*, 283-290; K. A. Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100-650 B.C.)*, Aris and Phillips, Warminster (1972) 432-447. The dates for Sheshonq's reign are taken from Kitchen's chart (*op. cit.*, 467). By contrast, it seems more likely that administrative divisions are responsible for the organisation of most of the names in the Palestine-list of Tuthmosis III: *cf.* S. Yeivin, *JEA* 36 (1950) 51-62, *id.* *Eretz Israel* 3 (1953) 32-38 (Heb.); Aharoni, *op. cit.*, 140-153; against Noth, *ZDPV* 61 (1938) 26-65 = *Aufsätze* 2.44-73, and Helck, *Beziehungen* 122ff. Already in 1937 Simons had objected to an anticipation of Noth's approach to the Tuthmosis-list, on the ground that it ignored the heading of the list, which implies that the rulers of all the cities named capitulated to Tuthmosis at Megiddo (*Handbook*, 37n.). The various forms of this heading are translated in *ANET* 242.

⁵⁶ The latter view was advocated by F. Jacoby, *FGH* IID 350.

contain, in its first part, a continuous series of notes of movements, which may have been derived from such a source. They are of a more or less fixed form, which is one important reason for supposing that they are drawn from an itinerary. A typical example from *Anabasis* 1.2.14 is: ἐντεῦθεν ἐξελαύνει σταθμοὺς δύο, παρασάγγας δέκα, εἰς Τυρρίδειον, πόλιν οἰκουμένην. It has generally been assumed that such data were taken either from notes made by Xenophon himself on the journey or even from a copy of the official *Lagerjournal* of Cyrus.⁵⁶ Recently two scholars, apparently working independently, have called this assumption in question and proposed an alternative explanation of the origin of this material. H. R. Breitenbach argued that it is not probable that Xenophon would have troubled himself to make or preserve information of this kind when, as is generally held to be the case, his literary ambitions only came to life some years later—the less so in view of the trying conditions experienced by the Greeks on their way home. Again he noted that the amount of detail given varies in different parts of the account. For example, distances in parasangs are given for the whole outward journey without a break, but in the narrative of the return journey they first appear only intermittently, and then cease altogether after the departure from Trapezus. This is supposed to be inconsistent with Xenophon using his own notes, but readily understandable if a road-book was available to him, as the information is fullest in just those areas where the troops were marching on regular roads.⁵⁷ In a similar way, G. L. Cawkwell pointed out the omission of any reference to the crossing of the Lower Zab, which would have posed serious problems for the returning Greeks. He also observed that the detailed measurements are limited to Persian-controlled areas, which reinforces the road-book hypothesis, since road-books giving information about routes and distances are known to have been in circulation in the Persian Empire.⁵⁸ Xenophon could perhaps have gained access to such a document through his close association with the Spartan authorities.⁵⁹

These arguments are however far from conclusive. It is, for example, possible that Xenophon kept a record of what at first seemed a great adventure for his own interest. The

⁵⁶ RE IXA. 2 1650–1.

⁵⁷ *Didaskalos* 2.2 (1967) 50–58, and p. 73 below on the road-books.

⁵⁸ Cf. Breitenbach, *art. cit.*, 1651.

unevenness of detail may be due to distractions on the return journey arising from the difficult conditions and Xenophon's newly assumed responsibilities of leadership. Furthermore, it is in every way likely that on the outward journey an official record of the march was kept by Cyrus' Persian staff, especially in view of the evidence presented earlier in this lecture for such a practice in the empires of the Ancient Near East. Xenophon could well have had access to this for the earlier part of his account, but it would have failed him after the defeat and death of Cyrus at Cunaxa. The view that Xenophon used an official source for the first part of his work, but not for the rest, derives some support from a comparison of his *Anabasis* with the fragments of that of Sophacetus, who also took part in the expedition.⁶⁰

In addition there are some positive reasons for holding to the older view of the nature of Xenophon's sources. Several recent studies of the *Anabasis* have concluded that Xenophon must have made notes if he was to reproduce the kind of detail which he does.⁶¹ The common tendency to see Xenophon's failure to give due credit to Cheirisophos of Sparta as evidence of bias has been questioned by H. Erbse, who suggests that it may after all be Ephorus, the source of Diodorus Siculus' account, who is misleading at this point.⁶² Finally, the regular form of the notes of movement on the outward journey deserves closer attention than it has been given. The verb in the formula is constantly 3rd person singular, the implied subject being Cyrus, who is actually named in the formula at least once.⁶³ What is striking is that this form is retained even when the preceding main verb is plural and there is no direct reference to Cyrus in the context. This strongly suggests that originally all these notes formed part of a single document, which Xenophon used as the framework for his fuller account, inserting longer narratives wherever they belonged. This document,

⁶⁰ FGH no. 109; Xen. *Anab.* 1.1.11. The two works agree in details about the outward journey, but disagree in one out of two references to the return journey, where each may be supposed to be using his own notes. J. Roy, *Athenaeum* 46 (1968) 44, sees in the disagreements with Sophacetus an objection to the view that Xenophon used the army journal, but he overlooks the possibility of an explanation like that suggested here.

⁶¹ Cf. C. Hoeg, *Classica et Mediaevalia* 11 (1950) 174; O. Lendle, *Gymnasium* 73 (1966) 452; Roy, *art. cit.*, 43. The statement of L. Pearson that 'No one has doubted that Xenophon's graphic story is due to his keen memory' (*Historia* 3 (1954-55) 436) is plainly untrue as a representation of scholarly opinion.

⁶² Cf. *Gymnasium* 73 (1966) 500-504.

⁶³ *Anab.* 1.4.9.

which bears some resemblance to the itineraries already considered (the regular form, its amplification, connection by means of *ἐντεῦθεν*) nevertheless differs from them in that each unit generally covers the journeys of several days rather than that of a single day. On the whole it seems preferable to attribute this element of Xenophon's source-material to Cyrus' Persian staff, so that it is evidence of Persian practice rather than Greek.

No examples of itineraries in the narrow sense are known to me from the Greek city-states themselves. Perhaps it was only when Greece, or rather Macedonia, came to dominate the Near East that this kind of document began to appear in the West.⁶⁴ At all events, Alexander the Great saw to it that his great journeys were carefully recorded. In both Greek and Latin literature from the 1st century BC onwards there are references to the *βηματισταί* or 'pacers' of Alexander, who are sometimes credited with works entitled *Σταθμοί* ('Stages').⁶⁵ We are fortunate enough to have a statue-base, discovered at Olympia, with a dedicatory inscription of Philonides: he describes himself as *Β[Α]ΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΛΕ[ΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ] ΗΜΕΡΟΔΡΟΜΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΒΗΜΑΤΙΣΤΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΑΣΙΑΣ*.⁶⁶ The *σταθμοί* known to later writers evidently combined the distances between important places on Alexander's route with what L. Pearson has referred to as 'unfamiliar legends, marvels of natural history, strange local customs, whether observed at first hand, reported by native guides or merely repeated from earlier writers'.⁶⁷ Pliny and Strabo reproduce some of the information relating to

⁶⁴ The only earlier example of which I know, the *Periplus of Hanno*, significantly comes from Carthage, the Phoenician colony in North Africa (text in *GGM* 1.1-14). This has been estimated to date from the 6th or early 5th century BC. It does not exhibit a formulaic structure comparable either to the real itineraries or to the later *Periploi* (cf. Tozer, *History of Ancient Geography* 104-109, J. O. Thomson, *History of Ancient Geography*, Cambridge University Press (1948) 73-76). S. Segert has argued recently that 'Semitisms' in the Greek lend support to the view that it is based on a Phoenician original, *Mélanges de l'Université S. Joseph* 45 (1969) 501-19.

⁶⁵ It is usual to list four *βηματισταί Αλέξανδρου*: Baeton, Diognetus, Philonides and Amyntas (cf. *FGH* nos. 119-122 for *testimonia* and fragments; and Pearson, *Historia* 3 (1954-55) 439-443 for a summary of what is known of this literature). There is in fact nothing to connect Amyntas with Alexander at all, and he is best regarded as the author of a travel guide to Eastern parts, which need not concern us here. He is not mentioned by any writer before the end of the 2nd century AD, and Pliny's omission of him from his very full list of sources (*Historia Naturalis* 1.5ff.) suggests that he belongs to either the late 1st or the 2nd century AD.

⁶⁶ M. N. Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* II, Oxford University Press (1948) no. 188, 1-3.

⁶⁷ *Art. cit.*, p. 441.

distances in terse formulaic sequences, which may reflect the form of the original records, *e.g.*:

inde Alexandriam Ariam, quam urbem is rex condidit
DLXXV

Prophthasiam Drangarum CXCVIII

Arachosiorum oppidum DLXV

Hortospanum CLXXV⁶⁸

This passage from Pliny is paralleled in Strabo (*Geography* 11.8.9), and a comparison between the two extracts is instructive. The two authorities do not always agree about the distances; for example, Strabo gives the distance to Hortospanum as 2000 stadia, which is considerably more than 175 Roman miles. Further, Strabo in particular is often aware of disagreements about the figures given in the *Σταθμοί*; he knows of a view that the distance to Prophthasia is not 1600 but 1500 stadia.⁶⁹ What all this shows is that in the period since the original compilation of the *Σταθμοί* a complex process of tradition had taken place, involving some textual corruption, which is particularly easy in the case of numbers, and probably some 'correction' from later measurements. Some of the more entertaining material may have come in in this way as well.⁷⁰ But there need be no doubt about the basic fact that Alexander had measurements of distance made: in addition to the inscription of Philonides we have a passage of Strabo (*Geography* 2.1.6) derived from Patrocles, who was close to the events, which states that an account of the country traversed was preserved among the royal records. There is also the fact that Nearchus, Alexander's admiral, who made the journey back from India by sea, kept a careful record of his voyage, which was used by the historian Arrian.⁷¹ The account begins with a date-formula giving the day, month and year of Nearchus' departure according to both the Athenian and the Macedonian calendars.⁷² Successive anchorages are named, and the distances between them given in stadia. The time spent at each anchorage is also noted. At any rate in Arrian's version, the introduction to each section

⁶⁸ Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 6.61. The figures denote Roman miles.

⁶⁹ For other examples cf. *Geog.* 2.1.7–8; 15.1.11, 2.8.

⁷⁰ Cf. E. Schwartz, *RE* III. 267; also II. 2779 on Bacton.

⁷¹ Arrian, *Anabasis* 6.28.6. A recent edition of the text is *Flavii Arriani Quae Exstant Omnia* (ed. A. G. Roos), Teubner, Leipzig (1968).

⁷² *Anab.* 8.21.1. *Anab.* 8 is often referred to as the *Indica*.

is varied considerably, but a good many begin, as is natural, ἐνθ' ἐνδε. . . . The closest Arrian comes to a formulaic structure is in *Anabasis* 8.29.1–7, where ἐνθ' ἐνδε is used four times within twenty lines or so. Plenty of incidental detail about the journey is included, so that Nearchus' log was evidently much more than a mere list of names and distances.

From the *Hellenistic* and *Roman* periods many more itineraries are known than these. In the Letter of Aristeeas (para. 283) one of the Jews tells Ptolemy that a king should spend most of his time reading and studying the records of official journeys (ἐν ταῖς τῶν πορείων ἀπογραφαῖς).⁷³ Official journeys continued to be recorded in Roman times: the same Arrian who wrote the history of Alexander's campaigns sent a letter to the emperor Hadrian, which begins with an account of a voyage which he had made from Trapezus on the Black Sea to Sebastopol,⁷⁴ while legate of Cappadocia about AD 130. But private individuals and groups also made records, which in a few cases are extant. At Dura-Europos in Syria a parchment shield-cover has been found, on which a list of the stages of a journey around the shore of the Black Sea, and probably continuing to Artaxata in Armenia, was written.⁷⁵ Intermediate distances were also given. The text probably dates from the first half of the third century AD. A monument found in the outskirts of Rome also has an itinerary inscribed on it. In this case no distances are given; each line begins with a date (in a consecutive series), opposite which is a place-name.⁷⁶ It has long been recognized that the names represent places on a route leading from Cilicia into Cappadocia.

Some activities of the early church gave rise to the production of itineraries. Foremost among these were the pilgrimages to the Holy Land which were often recorded.⁷⁷ Only the earliest need

⁷³ Further references to itineraries at Alexandria are given in n. 11 above. Cf. also Polybius 3.39.6–10 (with F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, Clarendon Press, Oxford (1957) 371f.) and 34.12.12.

⁷⁴ Text in GGM 1.370–401. Cf. also G. Marengi, *Arriano: Periplo del Ponto Euxino*, Libreria Scientifica Editrice, Naples (1958) and the review by D. M. Pippidi, *Athenaeum* 36 (1958) 264–268.

⁷⁵ Cf. F. Cumont, *Fouilles de Doura-Europos* (1922–3), P. Geuthner, Paris (1926) 323ff. and Plate 109; *id.* *Syria* 6 (1925) 1ff.; and Kubitschek, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* N.F. 3 (1926) 216ff.

⁷⁶ Published as CIL VI, 5076. There is no reason, as was once thought, to connect this itinerary with a Christian pilgrimage (cf. Kubitschek, *RE* IX 2361–2362 and n. 64).

⁷⁷ See the collections in *Itinera Hierosolymitana Saeculi IIII–VIII*, ed. P. Geyer (*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. 39), Johnson Reprints, New York

be mentioned here: the so-called *Itinerarium Burdigalense* (or *Hierosolymitanum*), which contains a list of stations, with distances, from Bordeaux in France to Jerusalem.⁷⁸ Dates are given for the departure from Constantinople on the outward journey and arrival there on the way back, which place the pilgrimage in the year AD 333.⁷⁹ Some information is given about places en route, chiefly in the section dealing with the Holy Land itself. This reveals how an itinerary may preserve the association of well-known events with particular sites by later generations. At an earlier stage of the history of the church, in the New Testament period itself, itineraries of a different kind may have been produced. While the view that the framework of Mark's Gospel was formed by an itinerary is hardly tenable,⁸⁰ it is quite likely that the author of Luke-Acts based his account of Paul's missionary journeys on an itinerary or a diary.⁸¹ The reasons for making such an assumption were set out by M. Dibelius in several essays,⁸² and he found a very plausible *Sitz im Leben* for such a text in the missionaries' need to keep some record of their travels with a view to future visits.⁸³ There is no need to suppose, as Dibelius did, that the 'we' of Acts 16:10-17, 20:5-21:18 and 27:1-28:16 is merely a literary device, for in all probability there was not one but several itineraries or travel-diaries for Luke to draw on,⁸⁴ corresponding both to times when he was with Paul and to those when he

and London (1964); and *Itineraria et Alia Geographica* (*Corpus Christiaanorum, Series Latina*, vols. 175, 176), Brepols, Turnhout (1965).

⁷⁸ Cf. Geyer, *Itinera* 3-33 and *Itineraria et Alia Geographica* 1-26 for the text; also Kubitschek, *RE IX* 2352-2363.

⁷⁹ Cf. Geyer, *Itinera* 13 ll.16-18, and A. H. M. Jones, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, Cambridge University Press (1971-), I 1043.

⁸⁰ This view was proposed by C. H. Dodd, *ET* 43 (1931-32) 396-400 (= *New Testament Studies*, Manchester University Press (1953) 1-11), and was still maintained by him in 1963 (cf. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge University Press, 233), despite damaging criticisms by D. E. Nineham in *Studies in the Gospels* (ed. Nineham), Blackwells, Oxford (1955) 223-39; cf. also J. M. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, SCM Press, London (1959) 35f., 56ff. These criticisms apply with equal force to Dodd's attempt to discern source-material of a similar kind in the Gospel of John (*Historical Tradition* . . . 235-44).

⁸¹ For a survey of the literature on this topic down to 1964 see J. Dupont, *The Sources of Acts—The Present Position*, Darton, Longman and Todd, London (1964), ch. 7 and 8.

⁸² Cf. especially 'The Acts of the Apostles in the Setting of Early Christian Literature', in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, SCM Press, London (1956) 192-206.

⁸³ *Art. cit.*, 199.

⁸⁴ Cf. A. D. Nock, *Gnomon* 25 (1953) 497-506 (a long review of the original German edition of Dibelius' *Studies*, reprinted in Nock's *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. Z. Stewart, Oxford University Press (1972) II 821ff.), esp. 502f.

was not.⁸⁵ The form of these itineraries cannot be reconstructed with confidence, since Luke's treatment of Mark shows that he was ready to reformulate the information found in his sources. For example, it is not necessarily the case that the participial phrases found in many of the travel-notes in Acts go back to the source-material (*cf.* Acts 14:24-5, 16:11, 17:1, 18:22-3, 20:13-15, 21:15). But it seems likely that information about Paul's hosts and the response to his preaching found a place in it.

There are clearly affinities between the texts described above and the wilderness itineraries, especially Numbers 33:1-49. But before we look at these affinities and their implications, there is another group of non-biblical texts to consider, which also have a claim to be called itineraries. These are those which describe a route either for a specific journey or for travel in general in the future. Clearly the situations in which such texts arise are closely connected with those in which the texts already considered were written, and it is quite likely that a text composed originally as a record might serve later as a guide to future travellers.⁸⁶ There are formal similarities between the two types of itinerary, but also some important differences, which will be noted after the texts themselves have been briefly described.

For the earlier periods of literary activity we have no extant examples of this kind of document. But there are four Mesopotamian texts which are to be seen as evidence either of the matrix out of which it developed or of the existence of older now lost examples on which they themselves were based. The first of them gives geographical data about the empire of Sargon of Akkad (*c.* 2371-2316 BC),⁸⁷ including the lengths of

⁸⁵ For this traditional view of the 'we'-passages *cf.* C. S. C. Williams, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 2nd ed., A. and C. Black, London (1964) 7, F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Tyndale Press, London (1951) 2-3. The objection often raised against it, that no companion of Paul could have portrayed him as 'Luke' does, does not convince me. The opposition to Dibelius' theory of an itinerary-source (for which see W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, SCM Press, London (1966) 126) fails to reckon with the evidence for near-contemporary private records of this kind (such as that cited by Nock, *art. cit.*, 500 n. 1), and, in my view, exaggerates the significance of Paul's eschatological expectation for questions of this kind.

⁸⁶ This appears to be the purpose of Arrian's letter to Hadrian (above, p. 68), *cf.* para. 17.

⁸⁷ *KAV* 92. For the date *cf.* *CAH* 1st, 219f. and 2.999 (chart); and on this text Albright, *JAOs* 45 (1925) 193ff., E. Weidner, *AJO* 16 (1953) 1-24 and *id.* *AJO* 21 (1966) 42.

several important roads or road-systems (lines 30–40). The extant copy is Neo-Assyrian in origin, but it undoubtedly preserves much older material, whether this be in the form of an older recension dating from the Isin period, as W. F. Albright held, or through the use of older geographical works, which was the view of E. Weidner. The purpose of the compilation appears to be literary: it served as a kind of commentary on the numerous legends which had grown up around the figure of Sargon. In addition to the distances given in lines 30–40, a connection with itineraries may also be seen in the use of the formula *ištu . . . adi* (= 'From . . . to . . .') to define areas that came under Sargon's control.⁸⁸

The other three texts relating to an early period are all parts of letters of Shamshi-Adad I of Assyria (d. *circa* 1780 BC),⁸⁹ two of them from the Mari archive and the other from ancient Shusharra (Tell Shemshāra). One of these deals with the movement of a consignment of wood from Mari to Shamshi-Adad's capital at Shubat-Enlil and names as intermediate points Sagaratim and Qattunan, with a change from river to land transport at the latter point (*ARM* 1.7.24ff.). In the other two, which are concerned with the movements of individuals, a formulaic structure is clearly apparent. One of them reads as follows:

'To Iasmah-Adad say this: thus (speaks) Shamshi-Adad your father. After the 20th day of the month [Mām]mitum, on the second day, I will leave for Mari. The day when I shall have sent this my tablet to you, on the second day from Shubat-Enlil, in the direction of Mari, I will depart. In the evening . . . from (*ištu*) Shubat-Enlil to (*ana*) Tilla, from Tilla to Ashihim, from Ashihim to Iyati, from Iyati, to Lakushir, from Lakushir to Sagaratim.' (*ARM* 1.26).⁹⁰

The remainder of the route is presumably assumed to be known. The formulae themselves are verbless; each place-name is written twice, once as a point of arrival and once as a point

⁸⁸ Cf. the biblical 'from Dan to Beersheba' (Jdg. 20:1, *etc.*) and also 'all the region west of the Euphrates from Tiphshah to Gaza' (1 Ki. 5:5).

⁸⁹ The date is according to Rowton's chronology (*cf.* n. 26). On the events of Shamshi-Adad's reign *cf.* J. R. Kupper, *CAH* II¹.1, Cambridge University Press (1973) 1–8.

⁹⁰ This translation is based on Dossin's French rendering in *ARMT*.

of departure.⁹¹ In all three cases a specific projected journey is involved. Knowledge of routes is presupposed but not necessarily the use of a written source of information. But the administrator's concern to specify the route to be taken certainly foreshadows the later development of such route-plans.

The only extant example of such a document from Mesopotamia is a badly damaged tablet from Nineveh of Neo-Assyrian date.⁹² The text was divided into at least ten paragraphs,⁹³ which have a regular form—this makes it possible to fill many of the lacunae with tolerable certainty. Individual stages were described with the use of the formula *ultu . . . adu . . .* (= 'From . . . to . . .'), so that again, as in the Shamshi-Adad correspondence, each place would be named twice.⁹⁴ No verbs occur in the text. Sometimes the length of an individual stage was given after it, in *bêru* and smaller units. At the end of each section there was a summary indicating the number of days needed and, in one case at any rate the distance to be covered.⁹⁵ Some other Assyrian texts that have survived may be based on

⁹¹ SH 809.49ff. is identical in structure. The text is unpublished, but the relevant extracts can be found in J. L. Lacoste, *The Shemshara Tablets: A Preliminary Report*, *Arkæol. Kunsthist. Medel. Dan. Vid. Selsk.* 4 no. 3, Copenhagen (1959) 98–99, 101.

⁹² Cf. C. H. W. Johns, *Assyrian Deeds and Documents* II, Deighton Bell, Cambridge (1901) no. 1096 for the cuneiform text. A transcription (with partial restoration of the damaged parts) was given by F. E. Peiser, *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen-ägyptischen Gesellschaft* 6 (1901) 134–140. Peiser's restorations are in general reliable, but one or two depend upon acceptance of his view that the text described a single continuous route which, while likely, is not certain. Two others appear unjustified: in the summary of the 6th *marditu* (p. 135) 'Banbala' is surely to be supplied instead of 'Ishdagur', and in the first line of text on p. 136 there is no real reason for inserting *napparu* (= 'total'), as distances are occasionally given for individual stages in this text.

⁹³ Each is designated as a *marditu*, i.e. 'section of route', cf. Akkadian *radû* = 'go' (W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, O. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden (1959–) 611). This seems preferable to other suggestions made by Peiser ('rest-day', 'resting-place', 'place for some unknown activity'). The use of *bit mardite* in a text discussed by A. Alt (in *ZDPV* 67 (1945) 153ff.) might seem to support 'resting-place' as a possibility, but *mardite* there too probably means 'journey'.

⁹⁴ The formula corresponds exactly to that in the letters, since from Middle Assyrian times onward, by a regular sound-change, *ultu* was used in place of *iltu* (cf. von Soden, *Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik*, *Analecta Orientalia* 33, Rome (1952) para. 195a).

⁹⁵ There has been some doubt whether this text really is a route-plan. Peiser (*art. cit.*) thought that it was the record of a cultic procession, because of the slow rate of progress. E. A. Speiser (*AASOR* 8 (1926–27) 14ff.) and Weidner (*AJO* 21 (1966) 43) both associated it with Ashurnasirpal's campaigns in the Zagros, the latter admittedly speaking of a 'survey'. In fact its formal characteristics favour the view that it was intended for use in planning journeys, not as a record. Throughout the text there is no narrative or date whatever, and information about distances is much more common in route-plans, in which it would serve an obvious purpose.

itineraries, but they do not themselves belong to this category and so cannot help our investigation directly.⁹⁶

No actual texts of this type are known to me from Egypt, Persia or Classical Greece. But there is indirect evidence of their existence, or at least of the careful transmission of information about routes, in each case. From Egypt there is a 13th-century BC papyrus containing a letter—probably a literary exercise—from a scribe Hori to his colleague Amen-em-Opet, in which the latter is berated for his faulty literary ability and his ignorance of active service in the Egyptian foreign administration. In describing Amen-em-Opet's geographical ignorance in great detail, Hori reveals his own knowledge, in particular of the main routes used by Egyptian officials in Palestine and areas to the north of it.⁹⁷ Even if it is not quite certain that 'Hori was basing his tirade on a written account of routes in Palestine, he evidently assumes that a well-qualified scribe could be expected to have information about routes readily at his disposal. As for Greece, the historian Herodotus, writing in the fifth century BC, was able to supply information about the royal road from Sardis to Susa, which is so detailed that it could

⁹⁶ Thus P. Jensen described VR 12.6 (= K.4312) + IIR 52.2 (= K.4379) as an itinerary leading from Assur to the sea (*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 15 (1900) 238). He was followed by F. Hommel, who repeatedly called it a 'Routenliste' or an 'Itinerar' (cf. *Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orients*, C. H. Beck, Munich (1926) 190, 257, 273, 296, 339, 459), and gave a useful transcription of it (*op. cit.*, 459–464). It is surprising, in view of his terminology, to find that Hommel held for geographical reasons that the text 'cannot deal with a direct north-south route, more or less running parallel to the east bank of the Tigris', but rather gives a list of the most important places between the Diyala and Adhaim rivers (*ibid.*, 465–6). He also noted that the list is in part organised according to lexical features (*ibid.*, 464 n. 6), which is against its reflecting a real succession of places on a route. In recent years it has become clear that the text is a commentary on tablets XIX and XX of the lexical series *HAR-ra* = *hubullu* (cf. Weidner, *AfO* 16 (1953) 23; Hallo, *JCS* 18 (1964) 61). A partial duplicate of it was published as *KAV* 183, and it has also been suggested that CT 18.24 (= K.11401) belongs to this commentary (R. Borger, *Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur I*, de Gruyter, Berlin (1967) 368). Of course the place-names may still, to some extent at least, be derived from an itinerary.—Weidner has also said of another group of texts (*KAV* 31–38, 131–132) that they 'can be used as itineraries' (*AfO Beiheft* 6 (= *Tell Halaf*) 11–12, with n. 39. Cf. also O. Schroeder, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 23 (1920) 155ff. and A. Alt, *ZDPV* 67 (1945) 147–150). These texts list the names of couriers, their locations and the transport available there. Weidner claimed that the names were in a geographical sequence, but in *KAV* 31 at least the same place is named in three separate sections, which is hardly compatible with the text's being designed as a guide to facilities available on a route. Possibly, as A. R. Millard has suggested to me, the order may be that of the inspector's visits to various couriers.

⁹⁷ The text appears on Papyrus Anastasi I and was published with a commentary by A. H. Gardiner, *Egyptian Hieratic Texts*, Series 1, Part 1, J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig (1911). An English translation appears in *ANET* 475–479. The routes have been identified by Helck, *Beziehungen* 328–333. Aharoni, *Land of the Bible* 170–171, has a briefer discussion of the text.

only have been derived from an itinerary (*History* 5.52–54). He knows the number of halting-places along the road, and in different sections of it, the lengths of these sections (given in parasangs, which suggests a Persian origin for his information) and important rivers and guard-posts. Evidence for the availability of such records in Persia in the following century is provided by Photius' summary of the *Persica* of Ctesias, which gives the contents of Book 23 as ἀπὸ Ἑφεσσοῦ μέχρι Βάκτρων καὶ Ἰνδικῆς ἀριθμὸς σταθμῶν, ἡμερῶν, παρασαγγῶν.⁹⁸ In the Hellenistic period the *Σταθμοί* of Alexander apparently served as a source of much geographical information, as they did later for such writers as Strabo and Pliny. In addition we have the earlier *Periplus*-literature and the 'Parthian Stations' of Isidore of Charax. The former embraces such works as the *Periplus* of Pseudo-Scylax,⁹⁹ an anonymous work on the Erythraean Sea, which includes the coastal routes to India and Zanzibar,¹⁰⁰ and the latter part of Arrian's letter to Hadrian which Arrian probably based on an older *Periplus*.¹⁰¹ These list coastal towns, give distances in stadia or days' sail and usually add information of a historical or geographical character about the places passed. A regular form of entry is employed, with the minimum of stylistic elaboration. Presumably these works were generally compiled for the benefit of traders—this is particularly likely for the *Periplus* of the Erythraean Sea, in view of its contents—and other travellers, though Arrian's reason for sending such information to Hadrian was the possibility of Roman military intervention. Isidore's work describes a route from the Upper Euphrates to Seleucia and then, in less detail, into the eastern provinces of the Parthian empire.¹⁰² Little information apart from names and distances

⁹⁸ Cf. *FGH* 688 F 33. If Breitenbach and Cawkwell's theory about the composition of Xenophon's *Anabasis* were to be accepted, it would of course be possible to specify more exactly the contents of such a document, and knowledge of it in Greece would have to be assumed.

⁹⁹ *GGM* 1.15–96.

¹⁰⁰ *GGM* 1.257–305; cf. W. Schoff, *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, Longmans, Green and Co., New York (1912) and A. Diller, *The Tradition of the Minor Greek Geographers*, Lancaster Press (USA) and Blackwell's, Oxford (1952).

¹⁰¹ Thomson thinks of the *Periplus* of Menippus (*History of Ancient Geography* 289) but in the section where it is possible to compare the two works the distances and intermediate stations are not always the same. Admittedly we only know Menippus' work at second-hand (*GGM* 1.563–573), and it is possible that these divergences are due to his epitomator.

¹⁰² *GGM* 1.244–254; cf. Weissbach, *RE* IX 2064–8 and W. H. Schoff, *Parthian Stations by Isidore of Charax*, The Commercial Museum, Philadelphia (1914).

is given, though the character of places named is briefly indicated by terms such as *κώμη*, *πόλις*, *ὄχυρωμα*, etc. A regular pattern is maintained throughout the first part of the document. Its purpose cannot be established with certainty. It has been suggested that it is an extract from an official survey commissioned by a Parthian king.¹⁰³ The direction of the route and its language (Greek) suggest that it was intended for use by someone coming from the west: perhaps a trader, perhaps a potential invader like Crassus—Seleucia, where the detailed section ends, is mentioned several times as the objective of his expedition.¹⁰⁴

It is for the period of the Roman Empire, not surprisingly, that the evidence of this kind of text is richest. The existence of records of considerable extent is presupposed in the geographical writings of Ptolemy, who for all his contempt for *γεωμετρία* in the literal sense (cf. *Geography* 1.2) must have employed its results for many of his calculations (cf. *ibid.* 1.8, 12).¹⁰⁵ From the second century AD onwards we have both inscriptions and transmitted texts which show the forms that itineraries might take.¹⁰⁶ The inscriptions divide themselves into three main groups, each with a distinctive, regularly repeated formula: (1) the "From X to Y" type;¹⁰⁷ (2) names accompanied by distances in leagues or miles;¹⁰⁸ (3) names alone.¹⁰⁹ The second of these is best represented in extant evidence, and it is in fact this pattern that is found in the greatest of all ancient itineraries, the *Itinerarium Antonini*.¹¹⁰ It has been estimated that 53,000 miles of road are described in this work, which covers the whole of the Roman Empire. Very little additional information is given—in some passages, but not all, the status of the halting-places is indicated by the use of words like *colonia*, *municipium*

¹⁰³ Cf. J. Neusner, *History of the Jews in Babylonia*, vol. 1, E. J. Brill, Leiden (1965)

⁹. ¹⁰⁴ Cf. N. C. Debevoise, *History of Parthia*, University of Chicago Press (1938) 82, 84.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. also Thomson, *History of Ancient Geography* 343.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Kubitschek, *RE* IX 2314–2320.

¹⁰⁷ *CIL* II 6239.

¹⁰⁸ *CIL* XI 3281–3284; XIII 2681, 9158; and four 'itinéraires épigraphiques' from N.W. Spain, discussed by M. Besnier, *Bulletin Hispanique* 26 (1924) 5–26, and Kubitschek, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* N.F. 3 (1926) 214–15. Their authenticity has recently been questioned by T. Pekáry, *Untersuchungen zu den römischen Reichsstrassen*, Rudolf Habert Verlag, Bonn (1968) 143n.

¹⁰⁹ *CIL* VIII 1291; XIII 4085.

¹¹⁰ Text in P. Wesselingius, *Vetera Romanorum Itineraria*, Wetstenius and Smith, Amsterdam (1735) 1–486, and K. Müller, *Itineraria Romana*, Strecker und Schröder, Stuttgart (1916) lv–lxvii. Cf. also Kubitschek, *RE* IX 2320–2344.

and *mansio*, and the total length of more extensive routes is computed. It is generally agreed that the itinerary was compiled towards the end of the third century AD, of course from already existing materials.¹¹¹ A similar but smaller compilation is the *Itinerarium Maritimum*, which in addition to other material contains two coastal itineraries, and thus constitutes an example of Roman Periplus-literature.¹¹² Distances are given between successive anchorages; the form is again that of type (2) above, but a little more information is given about the province in which a place is situated and the nature of its anchorage.

We conclude our survey of non-biblical itineraries with a summary of the characteristics that are common to all or some of them. The recurring formula, which is one of the marks of the genre as a whole (cf. p. 47), is often of the repetitious type, involving the use of prepositions meaning 'from' and 'to' (or 'at'), or syntactical equivalents, with place-names. But there are a number of examples, belonging to both of the sub-groups, where only a list of names occurs. There is an intermediate form in which place-names are not repeated but a connection between successive units is achieved by the use of adverbs like *ἐνθόθεν* and *ἐντεῦθεν*. These distinctions are apparent enough, but the evidence examined does not suggest that they have any functional significance.¹¹³ In addition to the formulae, many itineraries contain short sections of historical or geographical material, which include dates and distances in some cases. In general historical material, including dates, is to be found in those itineraries which look back on a particular past journey, while geographical material, including distances, occurs mainly in those which do not relate to a specific journey. The fact that distances sometimes appear in itineraries of the first type may be associated with the usefulness of such texts for the planning of future journeys. In other respects the type of additional material included does correspond well to the purpose of the document, so that a functional interpretation of the form of

¹¹¹ Cf. Kubitschek, *art. cit.*, 2337-2338. One would have supposed that 'regional itineraries' of the kind already referred to were laid under contribution. But Kubitschek, while not wishing to deny the use of other sources, argued that the compiler's main source was a road-map comparable to the *Tabula Peutingeriana* (for which see K. Miller, *Die Peutingersche Tafel*, repr. Brockhaus, Stuttgart (1962)).

¹¹² Text in Wesselingius, *op. cit.*, 487-529, and Miller, *Itineraria Romana* lxxv-lxxviii. Cf. also Kubitschek, *art. cit.*, 2344-2352.

¹¹³ It may be noted, however, that all the surviving Mesopotamian examples have 'from' and 'to', with repetition of place-names, except for the Old Babylonian Itinerary.

the texts becomes probable here as well. In addition we have the clear example of the *Σταθμοί* of Alexander being utilized by geographers (cf. above, p. 74). It is noteworthy that the interest in precise distances is found in the texts only from about 800 BC onwards—the only exception, which may in fact ‘prove the rule’, is the description of the empire of Sargon of Akkad (cf. p. 70). ‘Backward-looking’ itineraries from a later date than this generally indicate the precise distance traversed.

The distinction between ‘backward-looking’ and ‘forward-looking’ itineraries is clear enough in most cases, but there are occasional problems, owing to the fact that the former, when not embedded in a wider narrative context, can employ a formula that would be equally appropriate to the latter. Where brief narratives are present, as in the Old Babylonian Itinerary, the itinerary is clearly ‘backward-looking’, but when they are not, it is not possible to be absolutely certain that it is ‘forward-looking’, at least where a coherent route is described, as in the Nineveh tablet described on p. 72 and the ‘Parthian Stations’ of Isidore of Charax. Yet as far as function is concerned these texts in their present form do serve to give general information rather than to record a specific journey, and may therefore be included in our second sub-group.

‘Backward-looking’ itineraries are attested from the Old Babylonian period onwards in a number of different literatures. All the known examples down to and including the *Σταθμοί* of Alexander appear to be official in origin and to record military expeditions. It is only later that private records of this kind are attested. In general it seems reasonable to associate the composition of the texts with actual participants in the journey described. None of the examples studied are obviously fictional. It is possible to distinguish those texts of this sub-group where the formula includes one or more verbs from those which have none; and in fact the former are those which, in their present form, are combined with more generalized narrative material, while the latter are independent, we may say, archival texts.¹¹⁴ This suggests, though no more, that the amplification of the

¹¹⁴ The extracts from campaign journals in Egyptian annals do usually incorporate a verbal form, but (a) it is not the regular narrative tense, but an infinitive, and (b) it is just this form of expression which is common in archival texts (cf. above p. 61). In this case the extracts have retained their archival form; but it is easy to see why a mere list of names should in other cases have been amplified to fit the overall narrative context.

formula in the examples which have verbs is due to the secondary narrative context and was not present in their original archival form.

'Forward-looking' itineraries of the general kind survive only from the Neo-Assyrian and later periods, but there is some indirect evidence that they may have been compiled prior to this. Most of the examples cited come from the Hellenistic and Roman periods, but there are unambiguous references to similar documents in the Persian Empire.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

We are now in a position to attempt, within the limitations imposed by the evidence, which is very sparse considering the scope of our survey, a comparison of the wilderness itineraries with other examples of this genre; and to examine some implications for biblical study.

1. The wilderness itineraries are not isolated, but belong to a widely-attested literary genre, examples of which exist both as independent texts and in combination with other material of narrative form.¹¹⁵

2. In its present form Numbers 33:1-49 corresponds to the 'backward-looking' itineraries which are combined with narrative material. If our interpretation of its heading is correct, it appeared at an earlier stage of its history in a form analogous to that of archival itineraries like the Old Babylonian Itinerary. The itineraries in Numbers 21:12-20 and Deuteronomy 10:6-7 are closer to the archival form, as some of their components have no verb. The isolated travel-notes in the main narrative, however, are fully adapted to their literary context.

3. The similarities between Numbers 33:1-49 and the extracts from Assyrian annals of the 9th century BC are particularly close: all exhibit a two-part formula involving repetition of place-names, and additional material including more precise

¹¹⁵ It is only parallels of the latter type which are adduced by Coats, *CBQ* 34 (1972) 147-148. In fact the Assyrian annalistic texts cited by him really represent a different literary genre, the historical record of a journey, and correspond rather to works like the Annals of Tuthmosis III and Xenophon's *Anabasis* than to the sources employed by their authors. While it may be conceded that Coats' examples do provide a parallel to the structure of the final form of the narrative from Exodus to Numbers, they do not illuminate the process by which it reached that form.

locations of encampments, notes on the availability of water, dates, and occasional summary narratives, sometimes replacing instances of the regular formula. In none of these texts are the distances covered indicated.

4. The comparison of the wilderness itineraries with non-biblical parallels does not produce a straightforward solution to the problem of their authenticity. On the one hand, the other texts studied are generally agreed to derive from participants in the journeys described, so that it could seem churlish to doubt the claim made in Numbers 33:2a that 'Moses wrote down their starting-places, stage by stage'. On the other hand, the production of itineraries seems, prior to the Roman period, to presuppose the existence of a central bureaucracy, such as did not exist in Israel, as far as we can tell, until the time of David (or perhaps Saul). Of course this may be an unsound generalization, especially in view of the comparative paucity of examples; but then again so may an expression of confidence in the literary genre of itineraries as such. The tension is one which comparative study alone is not capable of resolving. In fact there is much more to a text than the characteristics which it shares with other similar texts, and a thoroughgoing form-critical investigation like this represents only one of the possible approaches to the itineraries. I have not here considered such topics as the relationships between the various wilderness itineraries, which are far from simple,¹¹⁶ and their connections with narrative material; nor have I attempted to identify the distinctive content of these texts (redaction-criticism),¹¹⁷ and their place within the developing tradition about Israel's early history (tradition-criticism); nor have I presented the geographical problems arising out of them. Each of these topics merits a lecture to itself. Here we can only note that consideration of them has led most scholars to affirm that none of the wilderness itineraries actually derives from Moses himself; rather do they owe their origin to the concern of later generations to fix the route of the journeys on the basis of knowledge of the southern desert acquired by travellers and possibly embodied in a text or texts similar to the forward-looking itineraries

¹¹⁶ Compare the divergent traditions about the location of Aaron's death in Nu. 33:37ff. (= Nu. 20:22ff.) and Dt. 10:6; and the different conceptions of the route from Mount Hor to the Jordan embodied in Nu. 21:4-20, 22:1 and in 33:41-49.

¹¹⁷ But cf. no. 5 below.

whose existence in other parts of the Ancient Near East has been demonstrated above.¹¹⁸

5. Itineraries comparable to Numbers 33:1-49 from the Ancient Near East relate exclusively, so far as our evidence goes, to royal military campaigns. It may therefore be due to the conception of the wilderness period as a military expedition that an account of it in the form of an itinerary was composed. There are some linguistic features of the Exodus and wilderness traditions which imply such a view of the journey: according to Exodus 13:18 the Israelites 'went up out of the land of Egypt equipped for battle' (חֲמִשִּׁים);¹¹⁹ in a number of passages they are said to travel לְצִבְאוֹתָם, 'according to their hosts' (Nu. 33:1; cf. Ex. 6:26; 7:4; 12:17, 41, 51), where צִבָּא has military connotations and may be used to refer specifically to a tribal contingent of the Israelite army (cf. the use of the singular in Nu. 10:14-27); and in Numbers 33:1 the escape from Egypt is said to have taken place under the leadership (בִּיד) of Moses and Aaron, בִּיד being used here probably to refer to military leadership, as in Numbers 31:49 and 2 Samuel 18:2.¹²⁰

6. At all events the itinerary is certainly a literary genre

¹¹⁸ Cf. Aharoni, *Land of the Bible* 76. A recent example of this approach is the thorough study of M. Haran, in *Tarbiz* 40 (1970/1) 113-143 (Heb.). Among earlier literature should be mentioned Noth's essay cited above (n. 14). Judaean fortresses from the early monarchy (and not from the premonarchic period, as Fritz, *Israel in der Wüste* 102, maintains) have been discovered in the Kadesh area (cf. Aharoni, *IEJ* 17 (1967) iff.), and in 1956 B. Mazar's expedition found what are described as 'some wheel-burnished sherds typical of the kingdom of Judah belonging to Iron Age II' at Tell el-Mekharef in the Wadi Feiran in southern Sinai (B. Rothenberg-Y. Aharoni, *God's Wilderness*, Thames and Hudson, London (1961) 166). This implies a knowledge of the routes of the peninsula in Judah. For the incorporation of a text so similar to parts of Assyrian annals into the Israelite traditions one might compare the absorption of the story of the five kings into the Abraham-cycle (on which cf. J. A. Emerton, *VT* 21 (1971) 403-439, esp. 435-437). The genuineness of the list is upheld by R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, Tyndale Press, London (1970) 633-4.

¹¹⁹ Some such rendering of חֲמִשִּׁים is required in the other passages where it occurs, and should therefore be adopted here. It is perverse of the *NEB* translation to give a different interpretation here, following *LXX*'s erroneous ἡμίσητοι ἄνθρωποι. How חֲמִשִּׁים came to have a military significance is not agreed. W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexicon zum Alten Testament*, E. J. Brill, Leiden (1967) 317-318, follows the suggestion originally made by E. Meyer that the literal meaning was 'divided into fifties (a military unit)'; L. Koehler, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libris*, E. J. Brill, Leiden (1953) 313 compared Arabic *hamisun* = 'army in five parts' (thus also assuming a connection with a numeral) and South Arabian *hms* = 'army'. But need there be any connection between this group of cognates and the numerals? *BDB* exhibits admirable caution at this point (cf. p. 332).

¹²⁰ A. Musil argued that עֲיִיד in Nu. 10:31, like Arabic *ayn*, was used specifically of a military scout (*The Northern Hejaz*, Amer. Geog. Soc. Or. Explor. and Stud. 1, New York (1926) 269), but it is by no means clear that the term had such a specialized use in Biblical Hebrew.

which has its *Sitz im Leben* in administrative circles until quite a late period of antiquity. The Old Testament examples, along with such documents as the boundary-lists in Joshua and the chronological notes in Kings remind us that there was more to Israel's life than prophets, priests and kings, and that in all probability there once existed in Jerusalem and Samaria archives comparable to those found at Ugarit and in Mesopotamia.

7. The wilderness itineraries, like the other documents just mentioned, are not only relics of the literature of ancient Israel; they are also part of the canon of Holy Scripture. But they pose something of a problem for the exegete. Origen was aware of Christians in his day who found no relevance in them, and both he and others before and after him sought to cull some edification from them by 'spiritual exegesis'.¹²¹ In so doing they turned these passages into something which they are not, coded manuals of spiritual advice. The responsible exegete of the Old Testament today may find a useful point of departure in the recognition of the genre to be one which belongs above all in the realm of ancient bureaucracy. The Bible contains the work not only of poets, prophets and storytellers, but also of civil servants—and it is the richer for that.¹²²

¹²¹ Cf. *Hom. in Num.*, ed. A. Méhat (*Sources Chrétiennes* 29), Les Editions du Cerf, Paris (1951) 138–9, 513; also Ambrose, *Exp. Ps. CXVIII* 5 and Ps.-Jerome, *Ep. 78* (*de XLII mansionibus Israelitarum in deserto*), in Migne, *PL* 22.698–724.

¹²² Cf. K. Koch, *The Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, A. and C. Black, London (1969) 12–13: 'It would be a mistake for a theologian to concern himself only with the 'religious' literary types, for everything in the Old and New Testaments must have some bearing on religion, because in Israel and in the early Christian world every aspect of life was regarded as a manifestation of the guiding hand of God. . . . A form-critical approach permits us to discover afresh the vitality of God's word' (my italics). Likewise P. Tillich, *Systematic Theology* I, Nisbet, London (1953) 131: 'There is no reality, thing or event which cannot become a bearer of the mystery of being and enter into a revelatory correlation' (cited by J. Goldingay in *Tyndale Bulletin* 23 (1972) 65, in connection with the diversity of literary forms in the Old Testament).