PRE- AND EARLY -ROMAN ROADS OF ASIA MINOR
The earliest Roman, paved roads in Asia Minor

In another article in this series (PERRAM. Asia Minor, Greece and the Development of Roman Roads in Italy) I have attempted to discuss, inter alia, the pre-Roman origins of the Via Egnatia in Macedonia and the subsequent development of Roman roads in Asia Minor. It is against the backdrop of road-history in the northern Aegean and western Asia Minor that I wish to set a discussion of the Republican and Augustan roads and milestones in the provinces which emerged from the territories held by the Pergamene kingdom at the death of Attalus III in 133 B.C.

The origins of the Via Egnatia are apposite to the creation of a Roman road-system in western Asia Minor. At least one road through E Macedon into Thrace had been made by Philip V in the 2nd century B.C. (Livy 39. 39. 10), perhaps the same road as that used by Xerxes in 480 B.C. (Hdt. 7. 107-129). It was probably the predecessor of the Via Egnatia, the road which was measured and provided with milestones by the Romans (Strabo 7.7.4, C 322) after Macedonia became a Roman province in 146 B.C.

Did a similar order of events take place in western Asia Minor? Namely, (1) the development of a fifth century, Achaemenid road net-work, followed (2) by Hellenistic roads which were later (3) adopted by the Roman administration in the years 128-126 B.C. after the creation of the province of Asia. In an unpublished study of the Hellenistic road systems I have suggested that the hypothesis can be sustained by the existing data.

The aim of the present paper, however, is to consider two questions beyond the scope of the later study:

(1) In western Asia Minor, were the earliest Roman roads, i.e. the earliest Republican roads, paved or unpaved?

(2) If the first roads were indeed without paving, when and by whom were the roads subsequently paved with stone?

1. It is not known how many roads in his province were taken over by Manius Aquillius (proconsul in Asia 129-126 B.C.). Nor is it recorded in any epigraphic or other source that he paved old roads or that he built new roads ab initio or that he brought the existing roads into the Roman administration with particular attention to practical requirements such as bridges, fords, way-stations, guard-posts and to the need for maintenance and for law and order.
The existence of at least four roads, however, can be epigraphically demonstrated:

From Pergamum to (1) Laodiceia and Side
From Ephesus to (2) Pergamum and Lampsacus
(3) Sardis
(4) Tralles and Laodiceia

The evidence for the existence of the roads listed here is provided by milestones (for an up-to-date account and citation of Republican milestones in Asia Minor, see French [1995: 101]).

They can be assigned as follows:

(1) Pergamum to Laodiceia and Side
(?
Kazıkbağları III RRMAM 2, 1. 485
Alan CCXIV RRMAM 2, 1. 266
Harmanlı CCXXI RRMAM 2, 1. 279
Yarashlı 1 CCXXIII RRMAM 2, 1. 294
Yarashlı 2 CCXXVII RRMAM 2, 1. 295
Selimiye-Side CCCXXXI French 1991: 53, no. 3

(2) Ephesus to Pergamum and Lampsacus
(?
Sağlık (?
Dikili CXXXI RRMAM 2, 1. 474

(3) Ephesus to Sardis
Tire XXIII RRMAM 2, 1. 499

(4) Ephesus to Tralles and Hierapolis
Çamlık V RRMAM 2, 1. 472
Aydınl Ł XXIX RRMAM 2, 1. 198

2. Can the Republican milestones erected along these roads be accepted as indicators of Roman road-construction or of road-paving? Recently a Republican milestone was discovered near Side in Pamphylia (for the text, see French 1991: 53 no. 3 and Pl. 6, b). From this discovery it is clear that, in the years 128-126 B.C. during the proconsulship of Manius Aquillius, the Roman administration was attempting effectively to control the domains of Attalus III not simply at the core of his kingdom but also at its most distant corners. Should we now expect to find the milestones of Manius Aquillius in other, easterly parts of the Pergamene territories, even on its periphery in Lycaonia and Pisidia, as attested by the letters of Attalus (? both II and III) to the city of Amlada (Swoboda et al. 1935: 33 nos 74 nos I-II and 75 no. III; Welles 1934: 237 no. 54 = Swoboda no. II)?

Were the Republican milestones perhaps more than measured road-markers, intended to define a route and to mark a road? Were they also
intended for different purposes: on one level, to aid and to proclaim the
Roman administrative presence, on another level, to serve as symbols of a
new order, in other words, as a show of power? Was their significance,
therefore, not only practical but equally political? By the erection of
milestones which marked the route and recorded the maintenance and
continuity of long distance, province wide, land communications, inherited
from the Pergamene kingdom, administrative authority was publicly
claimed, openly asserted and visibly displayed. The function of the
milestones was at once practical and political: they served as much as an
instrument of policy as they provided a guide to road-users.

Noticeably Strabo (7. 7. 4, C 322) wrote of the Via Egnatia that it was
measured and provided with milestones:

... ἐκ δὲ τῆς Ἀπολλωνίας εἰς Μακεδονίαν ἐν Ἐγνατία ἐστὶν ὁδὸς
πρὸς ἐκ νερόβιον, βεβημητησμένη κατὰ μίλιον καὶ κατεστηλωμένη μέχρι Κυψέλων
καὶ "Ἔβρου ποταμοῦ" ....

In this account of the Via Egnatia there are no words (equivalent to
the Latin) for building or paving, such as ποιοῦν (facere), ὁδὸν ποιοῦν (viam
facere), ὁδὸν κατασκευάζειν (viam facere / munire) or ὁδὸν στόρνυναι (viam
stravere), cp. CIL 3. 470, (L) vias faciendas curavit, (Gk) τας ὁδὸν ἔποιησεν,
Akhisar A.D. 75; Rehm 1958: 105, no. 57, (L) viam fecit, (Gk) ὁδὸν
κατασκευάζειν, Sakalutan A.D. 81, RRMAM 2. 569 and RRMAM 5
(Cappadocia). 064.

From the epigraphic and literary sources it is clear that the Romans
attached the greatest importance to the establishment of good land
communications in newly created provinces, as in Gallia Narbonensis 118
B.C. (milestone of the imperator Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus at Pont-de-
Trelles [Aude]: AE 1952. 30, ILLRP2. 460), but there is no equal authority
for the supposition that the first practical action was to pave a road. In
Galatia, which was annexed 25 B.C., there were no paved roads, until A.D.
79, other than the Via Sebaste; built in 6 B.C., this roads is demonstrably an
exception rather than the rule. Similarly in Cappadocia, which was annexed
in A.D. 18/19 by Tiberius, the earliest paved road was not built until the time
of the Flavian Emperors (milestone, quoted above, found at Sakalutan on
the Caesaria-Melitene road, A.D. 81; milestone [RRMAM 2. 365 and
RRMAM 5 (Cappadocia). 004] at Melikşerif, now Yurtbaşi, possibly from the
limes road, A.D. 76).

Were the earliest Roman roads in Asia Minor, therefore, earth roads,
I.e. "trackways" (RRMAM 2, 2: 521) (cp. Cicero, ad Att. 107 (5. 13). 1,
51 B.C., between Ephesus and Tralles, ... iter conficiebamus aestuosa et
via pulverulenta)? Similarly, what is the archaeological evidence that in its
earliest years the via Egnatia in Macedonia was indeed paved? In the starkly
brief texts of the *proconsuls*, Manius Aquillius (in Asia) and Gn. Egnatius (in Macedonia), and of the *imperator*, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (in Gallia Narbonensis), there is nothing to suggest that they had paved the roads on which their milestones stood.

3. In fact there is neither literary nor inscriptional evidence which directly assigns the date of the first paved Roman roads in the province of Asia to the Republican period. In Asia Minor as a whole the earliest record of road-building (i.e. road-paving) is found on Augustan milestones commemorating the construction of the *Via Sebaste* in 6 B.C. For a standard text of a *Via Sebaste* milestone, see French (1980: 714 no. 3, at Yunuslar on the *Via Sebaste* near W of Colonia Iconium) and below (Text I, a milestone from Ürkütlü, on the *Via Sebaste* N of the Döşeme Boğazı). The form and phraseology of the Augustan text are precise: titles-filiation and name - offices and tribunician power - making of the *Via Sebaste* - agent of the work, i.e. the imperial legate.

4. Another recent discovery has highlighted the problem of the first paved Roman roads in Asia Minor. It is a new example to be added to the series of milestones erected by Augustus in 6 B.C. on the *Via Sebaste*. The location of the milestone is all-important: at the upper of the two sites in the Döşeme Boğazı, c. 35 km. NNW of Antalya, exactly at the point where the Republican road from Pergamum to Side must also have made its descent from the plateau of S Pisidia, down through the Döşeme defile and so to the Pamphylian plain. Moreover, on account of the terrain the Republican road (? as successor of an earlier, Hellenistic road), if it was to take the shortest and least difficult route, must have followed the same line between Takına and the Döşeme defile which the later *Via Sebaste* of Augustus followed from the region of Takına. For geographical and geophysical reasons, the two roads, Republican and Augustan, must coincide in the Döşeme defile. For a map of the roads in the area of the Döşeme Boğazı, see French (1992: 174, Fig. 1; 1994: Pl. 4. 3).

The crux of the problem lies in the verb (line 8): *fecit*. If the Republican road at this point was engineered and paved, how could Augustus state that he had "made the road"? If a paved road already existed and was known to have existed for some 120 years, Augustus, if he wished to be visibly accurate, could claim no more than to have repaired the older road, *viam restituit*, the phrase which, under later Emperors at least, was the standard formula for the restoration of an earlier construction. The formula *viam stratam a novo fecit* (RRMAM 1. 39 [M]. Ankara 13; A.D. 208) indi-
cates, more precisely than the simple phrase *viam restituit*, the re-laying or re-paving of an older, paved road.

The solution offered here is to suppose that the Republican roads were unpaved, i.e. 'trackways', not 'highways', although measured and marked as the *Via Egnatia* in Macedonia and others in Italy.

5. To this solution a milestone discovered near Ephesus might have brought corroboration. Unfortunately it is now lost and the published text cannot be checked. The milestone, found 120 years ago at Şehitler (formerly Maşat), c. 25 km. N of Selçuk, is the only example (so far known) of an Augustan milestone not to have been located on the *Via Sebaste*. The inscription, which is bilingual, is republished, as *IK* 17, 1. 3409, from the original description. In November 1994 I was unable, despite extensive searches, to re-find the stone. For a text and commentary, see below (Text no. 3).

The important sections, lines 5-7 (Latin) and 11-14 (Greek) which, if collated, would clarify the purpose of the text, had been, at the time of discovery, either destroyed or barely legible. There is now no indication whether Augustus was announcing work on the road or repair to the milestone.

In this paper I have excluded the hypothesis that the word *restituit* refers to the replacement of an older milestone (? lost, broken, illegible), although elsewhere (French 1995: 100-101) I have allowed this possibility. Can, in fact, the word *restituit* be restored here, as the editors of *IK* propose? If the road was unpaved, the verb *restituit* is inappropriate. If it was the road that was repaired, when had the road been built?

The editors of the volume, *IK* 17, 1, have completed the crucial lines (nos 5-6 in the Latin, nos 11-12 in the Greek text) as if Augustus had made repairs (sc. to an existing road). It is possible, however, to offer a somewhat different restoration of these lines (see below, Text no. 3) which would refer not to road-repairs but to road construction. The Şehitler milestone can thus be interpreted as a record of a particular achievement under Augustus, namely, the paving of a road-system in the province of Asia. Furthermore, if the textual revisions could be upheld, the evidence of the milestones on the *Via Sebaste* and the milestone at Şehitler would together become prime evidence for a broad programme of road-building (or road-surfacing) initiated by Augustus in the province not only of Galatia, which included Pamphylia, in 6 B.C. but also of Asia, as then defined, in an unknown year. At the same time, to the first question, "Could the Republican roads have been unpaved?", can then be given a simple answer: yes.

The solutions offered to the two questions at the hearth of this paper are perhaps too neat. Undeniably there is a clear requirement for
unambiguous evidence from a milestone bearing a replicate of the Şehitler text.
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MILESTONE TEXTS

(1) Ürkütülü 2

Map
Isparta-Burdur 37-Iv

Location
formerly in an old cemetery, on the E side of the present village and on the N side of the village şose

Publication
RMMAM 2, 293 (text not given)

Copy
DHF 12, 11. 1976; broken and the fragments dispersed c. 1980. DHF squeeze in BIAA. Text here from DHF squeeze.

Description
milestone, in the form of a simple cylinder and plinth. The inscription is cut on a smoothly dressed, shallow, recessed panel. The stone is slightly chipped. The surface is very worn. Complete. Pale limestone. Letters: very worn; A, E, V

Dimensions
ht 1. 75; diam. 0. 58; plinth: ht 0. 32; wi. c. 0. 62; depth c. 0. 59; letters: (line 1) I and P of IMP 0. 065 and 0. 053 (respectively), and CAE 0. 055; (line 3) O 0. 03; (line 9) C 0. 093

Text

imp · Caes · Divi · f
Augustus · pont · maxim
cos · XI · desig · [XII] · imp · XV
trib · potest · [XII]X · viam
5 Sebasten · [curante]
Cornuto · [Aquila]
leg · suo · [pro · pr]
(vac) fecit
CXIII

Date
6 B.C.

Comment
Ürkütülü is the village nearest to the site of Colonia Comama, located at Şerefli Hüyük, c. 25 km. NW of Düşeme Boğazı and c. 40 km. SE of Düver village where the Via Sébaste joined the line of the Republican road.

(2) Düşeme Boğazı

Map
Elmalı 40-Iy

Location
built into the gate-way of the wall which blocks the top of the pass

Publication
French 1990: 235 (notice only) and Fig. 12
Pre-and Early-Roman Roads of Asia Minor

Copy
DHF 25.08.1989; squeeze in BIAA; photos

Description
milestone, in the form of a simple cylinder. The top is flat; the base is not visible. The inscription is cut on a smoothed surface in a sunken panel. Complete but worn. Hard, pale limestone.

Dimensions
ht (vis.) 1.35; diam. (top) 0.62; panel: ht 0.55; wi. 0.48; depth of panel below the top 0.50; letters: (line 1) P 0.062, (line 4) M 0.03, (line 9) X 0.10

Text

Imp Caesar Divi f
Augustus pont maxim
[cos XI desig XII] imp XV
[trib] potest XIX viam

5 Sebasten curante
Cornuto Aquila
leg suo [pro praetore]
(vac) fecit (vac)
CXXXVIII

Date
6 B.C.

(3) Şehitler, formerly Maşat

Descr. and Bibl.
IK 17, 1.3409; listed RRMAM 2, 1.497

Text

[Im]p Cae[sar Di]-
2 vi f Augus[tus]
[pon]tisex [max]
4 [trib]unic [p . . ]
[pat] patr [viam]
6 [fecit c]uran[te]
[ - D]omitio [ . . . ]
8 [Αὐτ|[οκρατω[ρ Καίσαρ θεοί νίός]
[Σεβ]ιοστός ἀρχιερεύς μέγιστος]
10 [δημορ[χιής ἔξουσιας το ... πα]-
[τὴρ πατρίδος τὴν ὀδόν κατεσ]-
12 [κεδαστ]ε ἐπιστρα[τοῦντος]
[ . . . 5 ... ου Δου[εῖ τινο] ... 4 ... ]
14 [ . . . 5 ... ου μ[ - ]

Lines 1-2, the restoration of which is unambiguous, give the approximate line-length of the Latin text, 11 letters, and lines 8-9 that of the Greek text, 24 letters, except for lines 12-14. Hence the following:

Latin: 11+11+11+(line 4) 9 (+2)+11+12+(line 7) 6 [+6]
D. H. French

Greek: (line 8) 24+25+(line 10) 22 (?+2)+24+(line 12) 4(?+15)+4
[+15]+(line 14) 4 (+?)

Comment: I have attempted approximately to regularize the line-lengths but some unevenness is inevitable and to be expected. More importantly, I have modelled the restorations here on the standard text of the Via Sebaste milestones. These contain the following elements:


The Şehitler milestone does not follow the same sequence nor does it include all the elements of the Via Sebaste milestones (imp and cos are omitted). I have preferred curante (Mommsen), rather than curam agente (IK), in order to repeat the word used on the Via Sebaste milestones.

There is no attempt here to restore the full name(s) and title of Domitius in lines 7 and 13. For the principate of Augustus I have found no suitable name in the consular fasti (cp. the example of L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, cos ord. in 16 B.C., procos in Africa 12 B.C.) or among the proconsuls of Asia (Thomasson 1984: 205-210) in the same period. Is there a gap in the data? On the other hand, the editors of IK have identified him with Gn. Domitius Corbulo, known to have been quaestor in Asia (? date). The suggestion does not allow for a close arrangement of line-lengths but this argument is by no means reliable.

Nevertheless one might have expected a proconsul, rather than a quaestor, to have supervised the building or restoration of a road (or even the restoration of milestones, as was the later practice in Asia). In Galatia it was the imperial legate who paved the roads. On the other hand, the restoration in IK [αποκατεστησε exempli gratia IK; κατεσκευασε] DHF does hold an advantage over κατεσκευασε if only because there is ample evidence that in c. 70 B.C. a quaestor, L. Aquillius Florus, restored milestone (as I believe) in the region

186
of Ephesus and Tralles (French 1995: 101). Under the principate, however, there is no epigraphic record of a quaestor who built a road in the name of the Emperor, although procurators in Pontus-Bithynia are known to have paved roads (T. Pri [-] Pacatus, A.D. 85 [RRMAM 2. 903] viaam stravit) or to have re-laid roads (L. Antonius Naso, A.D. 77/8 [IK 39. 9], a novo munierunt). A procurator in Lycia-Pamphylia (M. Arruntius Aquila, A.D. 50 [RRMAM 2. 183]) repaired roads (vias refecit) near Attalia. In Asia a procurator built a quarry-road (Chresimus, lib. proc. a marmoribus, first under Domitian, then under Nerva) (IK 35. 929; SEG 38. 1073).

On milestones the title of the proconsul in the province of Asia in 128-126 B.C., Manius Aquilius, was simply cos (in the Latin text) or όνθωκον (in the Greek). Later, however, perhaps during the first decade of the 1st century B.C., the title had become as it was to remain: proconsul, ἀνθωκόντος. For an example, see Q. Mucius Scaevola, ἀνθωκόντος Ρωμαίον, IK 11, 1. 7. For the abbreviation proc(onsul), see the Leiden inscription dated to 21 B.C. (Sherk 1969: 313 no. 61 quoting the ed. pr. of Pleket, SEG 18. 555 and other earlier references).
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