Richard J. A. Talbert: Rome's World. The Peutinger map reconsidered. In association with Tom Elliott, assisted by Nora Harris, Gannon Hubbard, David O'Brien, and Grahan Sheperd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2010. 376 pages, 33 b/w illus., 1 table. £ 50.00. US $ 90.00. ISBN: 978-0-521-76480-3.

This paper is not only a review of Talbert's book, but a reflection on some important issues related to the *Tabula Peutingeriana*.[1]

After a "Preface" and an "Introduction", Talbert presents in the first chapter the history of the map, publication and scholarship ("The surviving copy: history, publication, scholarship", 10–72). This is the first complete systematical presentation of the history of this map. It contributes to an understanding not only of the fate of such documents in the medieval and modern era, but of the changes in the perception of ancient documents.

The second chapter ("The surviving copy: the material object and its palaeography", 73–85) represents the contribution of a specialist in paleography, Martin Steinmann, who describes the making of of the map: 1. First, the support was prepared, i. e. the full extent of the parchment base. Then, the map was copied layer by layer; 2. In this stage, river courses were drawn; 3. Next, as Steinmann says, mountains or larger cities were drawn. Special attention was given to the pictorial symbols of the figurative representations of Rome, Constantinople and Antioch and to other six cities, represented with vignettes of the type 'enclosure walls': Aquileia, Ravenna, Thessalonica, Nicomedia, Nicaea and Ancyra. 4. At this stage, roads were drawn in red ink. It seems the only logical way to realize the map. Evidently, one first needed a support. Then, as today, the mapmaker needed a 'skeleton' to his map. This was made by drawing the forms of relief and the hydrographic network. After that it would be much easier to draw the roads, the vignettes and to add the final information: distances and name of settlements. We can compare this with the method used by Ptolemy, even if there is a huge difference between *Tabula* and the maps envisaged by the Greek geographer. First he drew a grid, representing the parallels and meridians. Then he added the settlements, according to their coordinates. For the mapmaker of Tabula coastlines, rivers, open water, islands and mountains, together with the larger cities, represented 'the grid'. He did not use any scale for the *itinerarium*. So, in order to accomplish his task, he needed some reference elements.

1 This review was written during my research stay in Erfurt between November and December 2010, as a DAAD postdoctoral scholar at the University of Erfurt, Germany. I wish to express my gratitude to the DEUTSCHER AKADEMISCHER AUSTAUSCHDIENST for supporting my stay here. I also express my gratitude for Kai Brodersen, the president of the University of Erfurt, for all his help and support.

Steinmann writes: "The symbols become more uniform in design, and less elaborate, toward the right of the map" (77). He offers two explanations: 1. the copyist began his work from the left and gradually devoted less effort to it as he proceeded toward the right; 2. the map was simplified in the Eastern part. The explanation regarding lack of data on the map in its Eastern part seems, in my opinion, a reflection not of the copyist's way of working, but rather of the geographical knowledge of these regions; similarly, Talbert correctly refers to "the unfamiliarity of Persia and India as landmasses" (112). The second explanation is, in Talbert's opinion, the existence of a deadline, which could force the mapmaker to work rapidly in the end, i. e. in the Eastern part of the document. This remains a supposition which can not be proved. I believe that lack of information on the original data used as sources by the mapmaker has led to this situation. The main role in expanding geographical knowledge was played by the army. If we investigate the explorations and expeditions of the Roman Empire[2], we can see that the Romans did not know anything about the vast area of what is now Russia, or Northern Asia.[3] Asia was also perceived in this way, as a vast, endless land, even if the Romans knew a part of India, but they did not know anything about the size and extent of China.

The third chapter focuses on "The Design and Character of the Map" (86–122). All the main aspects relating to the map are classified, presented and described here: 1. Fundamentals of the Map's Design – a. Shape and Scope; b. Landscape Base. 2. Mapmaking Practice – a. Orientation; b. Scale; c. Color; d. Line Work; e. Lettering and Its Placement; f. Numerals. 3. Components of the Map – a. Coastlines; b. Rivers; c. Open Water (including Lakes); d. Islands; e. Mountains; f. Peoples and Regions. 4. Route Network – a. Content and Planning; b. Presentation; c. Pictorial Symbols. 5. The Integration of Cartography and Art. Talbert discusses all the important features of the *Tabula* in a concise manner. He is the first scholar who put forward strong arguments for the assumption that the *Tabula*'s lefthand end has not only one segment, but more, maybe three. To accept his theory and arguments, we must start from a clear premise: the mapmaker wanted Rome in the centre of his work, i. e. the map had at least partly a propagandistic purpose. Talbert argues that the mapmaker would have put in these three segments a dedication, if the map was produced at the request of an official, and a list of total distances between

2 C. Nicolet: Space, geography, and politics in the early Roman Empire (Jerome Lectures, 19). Ann Arbor 1991, 85–94; R. Sherk: Roman Geographical Exploration and Military Maps, in: ANRW II, 1, 1974, 534–562.

3 Susan Mattern has highlighted these aspects (Rome and the Enemy. Imperial Strategy in the Principate. Berkeley/Los Angeles 1999, 24–80): "Huge tracts of Europe and Asia did not exist for them; others were considered wild and barely habitable. The same tendencies are evident in the Roman perception of Africa" (55).

principal settlements. This would have required at least one segment. Beginning with the second segment, the mapmaker could have started with the representations of Hispania, Western Britannia and North-West Africa.

Miller reconstructed the Western part but without including several elements. First, he did not mention the distances. This would also have required more space. He drew only the vignettes the type 'double tower'. Bath symbols are large draws, but he represented only two, in Africa. Miller did not entirely respect the mapmaker's principle that roads segments are represented using chicanes that signifies the start of the next stretch. In the first surviving part of the *Tabula*, the distance between the letters from the word [AQV]ITANIA is 5 cm minimum. The letters AQV are too close in Miller's reconstruction. The same is likely for the word BRITANNIA, inserted by Miller in the missing part. More, he omitted to mark open-water names, other rivers in Britain beyond the Thames and names for regions and peoples in the Iberian Peninsula. Altogether, these would have required more space that only one segment. So, finally, the 'map' could have 14 segments with Rome in the center, for propagandistic purposes, but I have argued elsewhere that.[4] This propaganda is related to the importance of Rome as *umbilicus mundi*, the meeting point of all the roads, because this is an *itinerarium*, and the main elements were the roads.

A discussion regarding Miller's "Reconstruction of the Map's Western End" can be read in Appendix five (189–192, with notes at 330–331).[5]

In the fourth chapter, entitled "Recovery of the Original Map from the Surviving copy" (123–132), Talbert tries answer the difficult question of what happened with the map from the moment it was produced until ca. 1200, when the surviving copy was made. First, the author prepares the writer for what will be stated in chapter five: "Suffice is to state here my view that the lost original is most likely to have been produced for display in a ruler's public space during the Tetrarchic period around A. D. 300" (123). So, in a period of 900 years probably several copies were made. Then Talbert emphasizes the existence of chronological differences of the map, i. e. the mention of Pompeii (segment 5) and of Dacia (segments 6 and 7). Further, Talbert discusses the route line work, which was a huge task for the mapmaker, because of the numerous settlements and distances included in the map.

The work procedure used by the mapmaker seems clear enough. His first task was to gather documentation. But in this particular action he was not prepared to update it (this required a great level of historical and geographical

4 F. Fodorean: Drumurile din Dacia romană (The Roads of Roman Dacia). Cluj-Napoca 2006, 25–26.

5 The same aspects are discussed by Talbert in his study "Konrad Miller, Roman Cartography, and the Lost Western End of the Peutinger Map", in: Fellmeth, U. et al. (eds.): Historische Geographie der Alten Welt. Grundlagen, Erträge, Perspektiven. Hildesheim, 2007, 353–366.

knowledge), or, maybe, he was not interested in doing so. It was impossible for one person to know all these details. Pompeii is included in the map. E. A. Stanco[6] observed that for the roads and the other features of central Italy reflected in *Tabula* the mapmaker used an *itinerarium* from Augustus' period.

As for Dacia, the mapmaker could use a regional map from the period in which Dacia was a Roman province (106–271 A. D.). I have analyzed elsewhere the information regarding Dacia included in *Tabula* and reached the conclusion that it refers to a very early period, maybe right after the Roman conquest in 106 A. D.[7] There are several clues which can sustain this assumption. First, three roads are marked in Dacia: 1. the imperial road which started from the Danube and reached the Northern part of Dacia. This was the 'highway' of Dacia, built rapidly between 102–110 A. D. A Roman milestone found in Aiton, between *Potaissa* (today Turda) and *Napoca* (today Cluj-Napoca), dated to 108 A. D., shows that this road was built until here in a short period of time; 2. the road which connected, in the South, *Drobeta* (Drobeta Turnu-Severin) with *Romula* (Reşca, Olt county); 3. the road along the valley of the river Olt, between *Romula* and *Apulum* (Alba Iulia). The last road and the first one were the routes taken by the Roman army during the two military campaigns against the Dacians.

An important clue to sustain this is related to Ptolemy, *Tabula* and the Geography of the Anonymus from Ravenna. In the list of the settlements from Dacia, Ptolemy mentions *Tibiscum* twice, with different coordinates. In *Tabula*, the same settlement also appears twice, once on the road *Lederata-Sarmizegetusa* and the second time on the Eastern road *Dierna-Sarmizegetusa*. The geographer from Ravenna makes the "mistake", also mentioning *Tibiscum* twice. First, he presents the settlements placed along the road *Dierna-Tibiscum*: *In quas Dacorum patrias antiquitus plurimas fuisse civitates legimus, ex quibus aliquantas designare volumus, id est Drubetis, Medilas, Pretorich, Panonin, Gazanam, Masclunis, Tibis, qui coniungitur cum civitate Agmonia patrie Missie* ("In this Dacian regions I read that in former times numerous cities existed, of which we will present some of them, like *Drubetis, Medilas, Pretorich, Panonin, Gazanam, Masclunis, Tibis*, which connects with the city of *Agmonia* from Moesia"). Then he mentions the other *Tibiscum*, on the road *Lederata-Tibiscum*: *Item in aliam partem sunt civitates ipsas Datias, id est Tema, Tiviscum, Gubali, Zizis, Bersovia, Arcidaba, Canonia, Potula, Bacaucis* ("Also in other part cities exist even in Dacia, like: *Tema, Tiviscum, Gubali, Zizis, Bersovia, Arcidaba, Canonia, Potula, Bacaucis*").[8]

6 Ricerche sulla topografia dell'Etruria. MEFRA 108, 1, 1996, 83–104.

7 F. Fodorean: Tabula Peutingeriana and the province of Dacia. Acta Musei Napocensis 39/40, 1, 2003, 51–58.

8 Text and translation after Peter Hügel: Ultimele decenii ale stăpânirii romane în Dacia (Traianus Decius-Aurelian), Cluj-Napoca, 2003, 87–88.

The geographer from Ravenna had as source for Dacia an *itinerarium* which can be dated after A. D. 168–170, because along the main road in Dacia the settlement *Macedonica* is mentioned. This name refers, obviously, to *legio V Macedonica*, which was present in Dacia from A. D. 168. Apart from that, he mentions other settlements, unknown to *Tabula* or Ptolemy, such as *Canonia, Potula, Bacaucis*. So, for Dacia the geographer used a document dated after A. D. 168 but which contained the same double mention of *Tibiscum*, information transmitted from an earlier document.

Chapter five is entitled "The Original Map" (133–157). Three important aspects are presented here: authorship and date, sources and purpose. Talbert starts by saying that guessing a name for the author of the map is impossible. Miller's opinion that Castorius created the map, relies only on the fact the *Cosmographia* of the so-called Anonymus from Ravenna mentions this name several times. This affirmation should, of course, left aside.

Dating the original still remains an open matter. Talbert writes: "While fully acknowledging the absence of sufficient unequivocal indicators, I prefer to regard the production of the original map as a Roman initiative that postdates the organization of Dacia as a province in the early second century and predates Constantine's sole rule, his confident promotion of Christianity, and his foundation of Constantinople in 324. Within this span of two centuries, the map could be associated with, say, the emperor Philip's millennium celebrations at Rome in 247, or with Severan rule; but such linkages seem hardly compelling. Rather, in my estimation the map's design and presentation match best the preoccupations of Diocletian's Tetrarchy (c. 300); these are treated in the discussion of the map's context and purpose (142–157). Granted, the connections identified can be no more than subjective, and hence this dating of the original map deserves to be treated with as much caution as any other" (135–136). Indeed, it is very difficult to date this map. Talbert's version may be a solution, but in my opinion dating the document still remains an open issue.

In the subchapter regarding the sources (136–142), Talbert notices that the map "does seem to be a highly original creation" (136), and to "derive from the adaptation and mosaicing of an indeterminate number of detailed maps". Normally, the mapmaker would also have used written documents, i. e. *itineraria adnotata*. Then Talbert continues the argumentation by describing some of the main maps which could be used more or less as sources for the mapmaker's huge project. The map of Agrippa, only completed after his death in 12 B. C., and lost, was considered by many scholars as the main source for *Tabula*. The earliest uncontroversial evidence for a large scale map is a Latin panegyric from 290s, displayed at the rhetorical school named *Maeniana* at *Augustodunum* (modern Autun) in Gaul. Talbert presents the Latin text and a good translation. The text refers to a map, but it remains unclear whether

it reflected the realities of the Late Empire, and whether it was meant to be shown to the students or to act as a propagandistic document, showing the vast conquers of the Roman emperors. Even the text emphasizes this: *Videat praeterea in illis porticibus iuventus et cotidie spectet omnes terras et cuncta maria et quidquid invictissimi pricipes urbium gentium nationum aut pietate restituunt aut virtute devincunt aut terrore devinciunt* (137). It remains open whether this map also showed roads, and whether it continued a Greek or Hellenistic cartographic tradition. This opens an important question: Did the Romans have a tradition of maps? If so, which are these maps? Does the Papyrus of Artemidorus present roads from Spain? In fact, how many examples of Roman maps we know? A key factor is the material on which these maps were drawn. The papyrus or the parchment can suffer hard damage or can be easily lost in time. Big maps, drawn on stone, as the marble plan of Rome or the Orange cadastre, survived easier. I think that *Tabula Peutingeriana* might be one *itinerarium* from many more others from the same category, created and used by the Romans. Because it seems plausible that such provincial / regional *itineraria* were among the first tasks realized during the conquest of a province and immediately after this moment. The example of Dacia is suggestive. During the two military campaigns (101–102 A. D. and 105–106 A. D.) Trajan was accompanied by surveyors whose main task was to measure the land and to register the distances.

The Roman surveyor Balbus wrote a book on topography and geometry. His text, entitled *Expositio et ratio omnium formarum*, was dedicated to Celsus, the famous mathematician from Alexandria, Egypt. Unfortunately only a part of his text survived. But the information is essential for one to understand the role played by surveyors in *clara expeditio* against the Dacians: *At postquam primum hosticam terram intravimus, statim, Celse, Caesaris nostri opera mensurarum rationem exigere coeperunt. Erant dandi interveniente certo itineris spatio duo rigores ordinati, quibus in tutelam commeandi ingens vallorum adsurgeret molis: hos invento tuo operis decisa ad aciem parte ferramenti usus explicuit. Nam quod ad synopsim pontium pertinet, fluminum latitudines dicere, etiam si hostis infestare voluisset, ex proxima ripa poteramus. Expugnandorum deinde montium altitudines ut sciremus, venerabilis diis ratio monstrabat. Quam ego quasi in omnibus templis adoratam post magnarum rerum experimenta, quibus interveni, religiosius colere coepi, et ad consummandum hunc librum velut ad vota reddenda properavi. Postquam ergo maximus imperator victoria Daciam proxime reseravit, statim ut e septentrionali plaga annua vice transire permisit, ego ad studium meum tamquam ad otium sum reversus, et multa velut scripta foliis et sparsa artis ordini inlaturus recollegi.* ("But as soon as we stepped into the enemy's land, Celsus, the operations of our emperor started to request the help of measurement sciences. It happened that along a certain sector of the road we needed to draw two straight regular lines, with the help of which we

built the huge defense constructions necessary for the defense of routes. Thanks to your invention (the measurement instrument), this allowed the drawing of these (lines) in a big part of Dacia. For example, regarding the design of the bridges, even if the enemy wanted to attack us, we could calculate from our bank, which are the widths of the rivers. All this venerable science, gifted by gods, has showed me how to find out the heights of the mountains which needed to be conquered. After the experience of these great facts, at which we participated, I started to worship it (this science) even more, as it could be worshiped in all the temples, hurrying myself to finish this book, as if I should fulfill certain promises made to the gods. So, after the great emperor soon opened for us Dacia, with his victory, after one year he allowed me to leave this northern region, and I returned to my basic occupation as to a moment of peace, and I gathered together many things, as if they were written and spread on different papers, and I wanted to arrange them in a proper order which is useful for any science.")[9]

Balbus established, using geometric methods, the width of the rivers, even if one bank was controlled by enemies. He also mentions that he managed to establish the position of the future military fortresses in Dacia. And the most important thing is his presence in Dacia for a year. Trajan also spent one year in Dacia, after the Roman conquest in 106 A. D. It seems possible that Balbus was in Dacia together with the emperor. This signifies an important aspect. Trajan was really very concerned about the rapid administrative and military organization of his newly conquered territory. Two things were always realized by the Romans when they penetrated a foreign region: they built roads necessary for the advance of the troops and fortresses to accommodate the soldiers from legions and auxiliary troops. So, Balbus and other surveyors (*mensores* from legions) participated at this huge effort. The soldiers from legions work hard to accomplish that, as the relief of Trajan's column show. They cut the forests, built bridges and roads, they penetrated constantly the enemy's territory, showing the two qualities of the Roman soldiers: *labor et disciplina*.[10] After 106 A. D. two legions were in Dacia: *legio XIII Gemina* at *Apulum* (today Alba Iulia) and *legio IV Flavia Felix* at *Berzobis* (today Berzovia, in Banat). Both of them were strategically placed on the main Roman road of Dacia, and exactly at 72 Roman miles South and North of the Dacian capital, *Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa*. This shows again that such precise, accurate measurements along roads were made from the beginning of the Roman presence in Dacia.

9 Text and translation after D. S. Crişan, C. Timoc: Inginerii împăratului Traian (I). Mensorul Balbus (Die Ingenieure Kaisers Trajan (I). Balbus der Mensor). Analele Banatului 12/13, 2004/2005, 157–170.

10 J. Coulston: Transport and Travel on the Column of Trajan, in: C. Adams, R. Laurence (eds.): Travel and geography in the Roman empire. London/New York 2001, 130.

And then these data were grouped into written or painted *itineraria*, first used by the army.

Even Trajan wrote, as his predecessor Caesar did, a 'book' concerning the military campaigns in Dacia: *De bello Dacico*. Only one sentence survived: *inde Berzobim, deinde Aizi processimus* ("from there we advanced to Berzobis, and then to Aizis"). This sentence describes the advancement of the Roman army leaded by Trajan himself on a road constructed during the first military campaign in the Western part of Banat. In fact, at *Berzobis* (today Berzovia) and *Aizis* (today Fârliug) two fortresses were built by the Roman army. The most important aspect here is the sentence in itself. It matters that Trajan presented *ad modum simpliciter et militariter* all the settlements, and maybe the distances between them, in the form of a written *itinerarium*.[11] This knowledge could be easily transformed in an *itinerarium pictum*.

Talbert continues with the presentation of the map commissioned by emperor Theodosius II in 435 at Constantinople and now lost. These verses convinced Weber that the original map was ordered by Theodosius, so he dated it in 435 A. D.[12] Talbert refers to the mapmaker's work of documentation: "If his incorporation of the complex network of land routes in particular was original work, as seems credible, he must have needed extensive data that was unlikely to be already available in the required form" (139). The mapmaker used for this written and painted regional itineraries.

Subchapter 3 is entitled "Context and Purpose" (142–157). Is the *Tabula* only a map of route network, an *itinerarium pictum*? How was it displayed? Where and in what form? Had it a practical use, i. e. did anyone use it in a travel? These are question Talbert tries to answer here. First, it is clear that the map was not created to be used in journeys. Nobody needed to visualize the entire Roman world, from Spain to India, because no one travelled over such a huge distance (ca. 8000 kilometres in straight line). On the other hand, as Talbert observed, some of the names displayed in capital letters for regions, people or waters stretch on more than one segment (ca. 60 cm) of the map. Here are some examples: AQVUITANIA (segm. I at Miller, segm. II, the first preserved, and the left part of segm. III); PROVINCIA AFRICA (which spans three and a half segments).

Regarding the moment when this map was produced, and the place where it was exposed, Talbert thinks that the map was created during the Tetrarchy and was set down in Diocletian's palace from Split (Croatia). The main argu-

11 M. Bărbulescu: Traian şi descoperirea Daciei (Trajan et la découverte de la Dacie), in: D. Protase, D. Brudaşcu (eds.): Napoca. 1880 de ani de la începutul vieţii urbane. Cluj-Napoca 1999, 34.

12 E. Weber: Tabula Peutingeriana. Codex Vindobonensis 324. Kommentar – Vollständige Faksimil-Ausgabe im Originalformat. Graz, 1976, 40.

ment for this theory is that the Tetrarchs wanted to reinforce, to demonstrate "the special importance that they attached to the city of Rome itself" (149). Further, Talbert affirms: "The central placement of Rome on the map asserts the city's symbolic value in the eyes of the Tetrarchs. So, too, by extension, the symbolic importance of Italy, Rome's heartland, is promoted by the generous amount of space it occupies on the map, while in reality under the Tetrarchy it, in turn, lost its privileged status and was divided into 'regions' (*regiones*)" (150). The same idea is argued again later: "Rome's importance is upheld, and the unity of the empire's rule reinforced, by the map's giving no special proeminence to the new Tetrarchic capitals. Equally, the bewildering proliferation of names for the new array of smaller provincial units is ignored in favor of retaining the fewer, more familiar, and more reassuring old names for provinces" (153).

Several aspects must be discussed here. If the map was created to fulfil a propagandistic purpose, with Rome at its center, I am not sure that this served to reinforce the unity of the empire. After all, the new reorganization of the empire was a success. Diocletian created the Tetrarchy and Constantine continued the reforms initiated by him. During the reign of Constantine, 117 provinces existed in the Roman Empire. The monetary reform (the creation of the gold *solidus*) was also a success. The Empire was full of soldiers: 500.000 grouped in 60 legions and other auxiliary troops. New cities appeared, the commerce, the circulation of products and people were stimulated, the *cursus publicus* continued to function. So, after all these achievements, why create a map which presents realities from a former, though glorious, period? And why consider it necessary to include former provinces, like Dacia? Only for propagandistic purposes? Dacia was no longer an 'issue' for the Roman emperors. Its problem was solved in A. D. 271 by Aurelian. When he abandoned Dacia, Aurelian took care to create two new provinces with the same name South of the Danube: *Dacia Ripensis* and *Dacia Mediterranea*. The reason was simple: he did not want to be perceived by his contemporaries as an emperor who abandoned such an important territory as Dacia.

Dating the map still remains a problem. If the *Tabula* was created during Tetrarchy, at 300 A. D., how can we explain the presence of the name Constantinople on it? Constantinople was built over six years, and consecrated on 11 May 330. Commemorative coins that were issued during the 330s already refer to the city as *Constantinopolis*.[13] Old St. Peter's Basilica was the fourth-century church whose construction was initiated by Constantine between 326 and 333 A. D. If the map focused on showing Rome's importance, why to expose it at Split (Roman *Spalatum*) and not in Rome? Or Constantinople? Constantine restored the unity of the Empire. He was well aware that Rome was an unsatisfactory capital. So, he identified the site of Byzantium as the right place. This

13 See, e. g., Michael Grant: The climax of Rome. London 1968, 133.

was the perfect place where an emperor could have easy access to the Danube or the Euphrates frontiers.

I think further questions appear, but this *itinerarium pictum* was designated to present, as a main element, the roads of the Roman empire, and a better date for it seems 435 A. D., as Weber suggested, or, in any case, the fifth century A. D.

The problem of context, purpose and date of this map remains an open issue, however, as Talbert himself states (155–157): "Ultimately there can be no proof of the Peutinger map's context or its purpose; for lack of evidence, both must remain matters of conjecture. Even so, in my estimation the long established view that regards the map as little more than a route diagram for use in making or planning journeys unduly reflects modern preoccupations rather than Roman ones."

In the "Conclusion" (162–172) Talbert presents the map's place in classical and medieval cartography. An interesting discussion concerns the *Cosmographia* of an unnamed cleric claiming to be from Ravenna. It is clear that he has various sources when he realized his work, and among them, of course, was a map like *Tabula*. A map produced around 1050 at the abbey of Saint-Sever in Gascony (southwestern France) seems to have a clear relation with the Peutinger map, mainly because of its two notices *In his locis scorpiones nascuntur* and *In his locis elefanti nascuntur* (p. 165–166). The third example is a sketch made in 1495 by Pellegrino Prisciani (ca. 1435–1518). In 2003 Gautier Dalché first drew attention to the fact that it can be related with *Tabula*. Talbert presents this document (plate 24, p. 168–169) in detail. The last example concerns a map from medieval era (ca. 1350–1360). Also this map had as source map like *Tabula*.

Talbert presents eight appendices, all of them very useful in understanding some issued discussed in the book: Appendix 1. Latin Text Appended to the 1598 Engraving of the Map (173–174); Appendix 2. English Translation of J. Kastelic, Vodnikova kopija Tabule Peutingeriane (trans. Gerald Stone) (175–178); Appendix 3. Reflections on Vodnik's Copy of von Scheyb's Engraving (179–180); Appendix 4. Vodnik's Latin Summary Heyrenbach's Essay (National Library of Slovenia, Ljubljana, MS 1443) (181–188); Appendix 5. Miller's Reconstruction of the Map's Western End (189–192); Appendix 6. Wyttenbach's Claim: A Lost Piece of the Map Discovered (193–195); Appendix 7: User's Guide to the Database and Commentary (196–200); Appendix 8: User's Guide to the Map (A) and Overlaid Layers (201–202); Appendix 9: User's Guide to the Outlining of Rivers and Routes on Barrington Atlas Bases (C–F), with Associated Texts: (a) Antonine Itinerary: Text with Journeys Numbered as on Map E, and (b) Bordeaux Itinerary: Text with Journeys Lettered as on Map F (203–286). At the end of the book there are notes, bibliography and an index and gazetteer.

At http://cambridge.org/us/talbert/index.html a big part of the information from the book: the maps, the plates, and the entire database can be accessed. This database succeeds in reducing once more the distance between archaeology, history and cartography. It is very useful and easy to consult, with all the distances, settlements, physical elements from ancient sources overlaid on current maps.

I look forward for other contributions of Talbert. Two of them are mentioned in the book in the bibliographical list: R. J. A. Talbert (ed.): Ancient Perspectives. Maps and Their Place in Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome (Chicago, forthcoming); Idem: Roads Not Featured: A Roman Failure to Communicate? In: Idem, J. Bodel, and S. Alcock (eds.): Highways, Byways and Road Systems in the Pre-Modern World (forthcoming).

This book represents an important 'building stone' in the reconstruction of the history of this outstanding document of the Roman world, so complex, unique and hard to understand. So I salute the hard work and the publication of this honest, well written, well documented book of Talbert.

Florin Fodorean, Cluj-Napoca
fodorean_f@yahoo.com