RETHINKING THE MEDITERRANEAN

Edited by

W. V. HARRIS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

7

The East–West Orientation of Mediterranean Studies and the Meaning of North and South in Antiquity

G. W. Bowersock

Historians of both classical and late antiquity have a natural tendency to view the world they study as fundamentally divided into East and West. The reasons are obvious. Greeks were in the east, Romans in the west. The Roman Empire brought the parts together for some centuries before the successors of Constantine divided it definitively once again. Christianity perpetuated the split between East and West, and papal authority in the West confronts the eastern patriarchs down to this day. This division has taken the Mediterranean Sea as its nodal point, largely for reasons of communication and commerce. If the Greeks reached Marseilles or the Phoenicians Carthage, they got there by sea. The centrality of the Mediterranean for the very different cultures and economies that surrounded it is a major premise of the important first volume of Horden and Purcell's *The Corrupting Sea*.[1] In scholarly literature the West tends to include the northerly regions, such as Gaul, Germany, and Britain, as well as the western Balkans. The eastern Balkan countries, such as Bulgaria and Romania, tend to be incorporated into the eastern Mediterranean orbit, along with Turkey and the Near East. Even North Africa is divided into East and West with Juba's Mauretania counting as a western kingdom despite its Hellenic character, whereas Libya is joined with Egypt as part of the East. This is a distinction enshrined today in the Arabic terms Maghreb and Mashriq.

[1] N. Purcell and P. Horden, *The Corrupting Sea* (Oxford, 2000).

Whether this habit of orienting study of the ancient Mediterranean into East and West presupposes a meaningful interpretation of Mediterranean history is questionable. Convenience, dictated by the use of the Greek and Latin languages and later by ecclesiastical hierarchy, has probably played a large part in the persistence of this habit. But it is not inexorably rooted in the geography and history of the region. Horden and Purcell, commenting on Bismarck's notorious denial of the concept of Europe, suggest that North and South might properly tell us more about the Mediterranean, particularly the romantic obsession of Europeans with lands of the South (*Kennst du das Land, wo die Zitronen blühn?*, as Goethe said). This obsession had its own simplistic convenience, whereby southerners, whether Italian, Greek, or Arab, were all seen to possess the same engaging characteristics—openness, generosity, hospitality, and, as we ought not to forget, for many Europeans a relaxed attitude to sexual interests. It looks almost as if the orientation of east and west persisted among historians and classical scholars, whereas north and south provided the orientation for travellers and artists of all kinds (including writers). A scholar, such as Winckelmann, who was also a traveller, partook of both orientations at the same time.

Edward Gibbon, as historian, traveller, and literary artist of genius, was another writer who was sensitive to both orientations. So it is scarcely surprising that the problem caught his attention from the beginning of his work on the Roman Empire. In the first chapter, commenting on the recruitment of legionaries, Gibbon observed with his usual irony that the Romans had a preference for northerners since they were tougher and more reliable: 'In all levies, a just preference was given to the climates of the North over those of the South.' As Horden and Purcell were alert to notice, Gibbon himself added a handwritten note on this point in his personal copy of the *Decline and Fall*, now in the British Museum. This note is generally assumed to have been part of preparation for a seventh volume of his great work. It is worth quoting in full: 'The distinction of North and South is real and intelligible; and our pursuit is terminated on either side by the poles of the Earth. But the difference of East and West is arbitrary, and shifts round the

globe.'[2] Gibbon's point, which is a good one, depends crucially upon the termination of the two directions in the North and South Poles. The ancients lacked any knowledge of these Poles, and this, I suggest, is why for them the world they inhabited was more naturally arranged from East to West.

There can be little doubt, as already remarked, that the scholarly disposition to employ an east–west orientation derives from antiquity. It inevitably presupposes the Mediterranean, which runs right through the geographical space, although the sea is not always mentioned when the terminal points are invoked. Juvenal, in the famous opening lines of his tenth satire, tells his reader that vanity is to be found everywhere in the wide world: *Omnibus in terris, quae sunt a Gadibus usque / Auroram et Gangen, pauci dinoscere possunt / vera bona* . . .[3] The orientation is memorably and unmistakably east–west (or rather in this instance west–east), from Cadiz to the Ganges. There was nothing at all except the Atlantic Ocean beyond Cadiz, and beyond the Ganges there was nothing that the Romans knew about (or, it may be argued, cared about). In rendering these lines into English verse, Samuel Johnson brilliantly adjusted them for eighteenth-century readers: 'Let Observation, with extensive View, / Survey Mankind from China to Peru.'

Juvenal's orientation is repeated in many ancient texts. It occurs as early as Pindar, who cites Cadiz in a Nemean ode as the place beyond which a traveller cannot go. It is fundamental to Aristotle's account of the inhabited zone of the earth in the second book of his *Meteorologica*, where the pillars of Hercules and India are named.[4] Among Roman writers Seneca and the elder Pliny both anticipated Juvenal's memorable formulation. Solinus, borrowing directly from Pliny, called Cadiz simply *extremus noti orbis terminus*.[5] But Seneca, writing in the preface

[2] Patricia B. Craddock (ed.), *The English Essays of Edward Gibbon* (Oxford, 1972), 339 ('Materials for a Seventh Volume') = E. Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. D. Womersley (London, 1994), app. 2, iii. 1095. Cf. G. Traina, 'Hellenism in the East: Some Historiographical Remarks,' *Electrum* 6 (2002), 15–24, especially 22: 'the opposition East /West is mostly a modern projection.'

[3] Juv. *Sat.* 10. 1–3

[4] Cf. Pind. *Nem.* 4. 69, Aristot. *Meteor.* 2. 362b.

[5] Sol. 23. 12.

to his *Natural Questions*, explictly connected this physical space with the temporal space of a journey by sea: *Quantum enim est, quod ab ultimis litoribus Hispaniae usque ad Indos iacet? Paucissimorum dierum spatium, si navem suus ferat ventus, implebit.*[6] The Budé and Loeb editors both interpret these words as a reference to travel westwards across the Atlantic to India, in the manner of Columbus. But Strabo, like Aristotle, had firmly ruled out such a journey (though admitting it was theoretically possible) on the grounds of the vastness of the Atlantic. Besides, the context of this passage is Seneca's discussion of the constricted world of the ancients, and the expression 'space of very few days' seems to me to make far better sense as a reference to travel from west to east than as rhetorical overstatement. To be sure, this would make Seneca sound as if he were writing after the construction of the Suez Canal, but we may perhaps suppose that Seneca allowed for a little overland travel, such as between Gaza and Elath. In any case, whatever the correct interpretation, the latitudinal termini that Seneca names remain the traditional ones.

In general the east–west orientation of the *oikoumenê* seems clearly determined by the possibility of travel across the wide expanse of sea. When the creator of the mosaic map at Madaba chose a vantage point from which to view the cities and topography of Palestine, Trans-Jordan, and Egypt, he positioned himself looking due east from the Mediterranean waters off the Palestinian coast. Similarly the map preserved on the Peutinger Table gives the Mediterranean the central place as its east–west axis. It seems to have been rare for an ancient author to describe the civilized world by longitude, in a straight north–south direction. Aristotle did it in the *Meteorologica* to make his point that the distance between Ethiopia and Lake Maeotis (the Sea of Azov) was less than the distance between the west coast of Spain and India by a ratio of three to five. North–south communications were clearly not determined by sea travel in the same way as east–west communications.

But Plutarch, in the opening of his essay on the failure of the oracles, proposed an interesting and subtle variant of the east–west orientation by combining it with north–south, and

[6] Sen. *NQ* 1 praef. 13.

thereby eliminating the centrality of the Mediterranean from the latitudinal axis. After pointedly discarding the traditional view of Delphi as the mid-centre (*omphalos*) of the earth, a point in space that he claimed only the gods can know, he nevertheless went on to introduce two men as coming together at the shrine 'from the opposite ends of the *oikoumenê*'.[7] He thereby implicitly affirmed the centrality of his beloved Delphi. It appears that one of the men had come from Britain and the other from beyond the Red Sea (presumably this is the Arabo-Persian Gulf). Here we have new set of generalized termini that extend from the far north-west to the far south-east. In this text Plutarch has artfully transformed the *perata* for the *oikoumenê*. Cadiz has become Britain, and the Ganges has turned into the Indian Ocean. On that diagonal line Delphi can reasonably be put in the middle, while the Mediterranean can be ignored. But, for all that, the arrangement of space is still fundamentally what it was in Pliny, Seneca, and Juvenal.

For the ancients the northern and southern extremities normally had no fixed and familiar boundaries that were comparable to the west coast of Spain or the Ganges, or even Britain and the Arabo-Persian Gulf. The far north and far south were regions of legend and wonder, the homeland of savages. *Ultima Thule* and the travels of Pytheas of Marseilles did not indicate the limit of the *oikoumenê* but rather what lay beyond it. These regions were most frequently defined by the curious peoples who were thought to inhabit them. In antiquity the situation that Gibbon concisely described was exactly reversed. It was not the distinction between North and South that was real and intelligible, but the distinction between East and West. For the Greeks and the Romans Cadiz and the Ganges were the equivalent of Gibbon's two earthly Poles. The North and South Poles were celestial poles in antiquity, as the allusion to the Bear in their terms 'arctic' and 'antarctic' implied, and were used to explain climatic change. Those who believed, like Aristotle and Eratosthenes, that one could reach the east by sailing west or

[7] Plut. *De def. orac.* 2, 410a : *ἀπὸ τῶν ἐναντίων τῆς οἰκουμένης περάτων ἔτυχον ἄνδρες ἱεροὶ δύο συνδραμόντες εἰς Δελφούς, Δημήτριος μὲν ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐκ Βρεττανίας... Κλεόμβροτος δ' ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος... πόρρω δὲ τῆς Ἐρυθρᾶς Θαλάττης ἀναπεπλευκώς...*

even postulated that there was more than one habitable zone on the earthly globe were nonetheless locked into a latitudinal perspective that was effectively dominated by the Mediterranean, although explained by the excessive cold to the north and heat to the south.

But the savages who inhabited the unbounded extremes of north and south could also be invoked as shorthand for the ancient *oikoumenê* that lay between them. In an important paper published in the *Journal of Jewish Studies* in 1998 David Goldenberg identified a *topos* in rabbinic texts that summarized what Juvenal had called *omnes terrae* by the citation of peoples in the extreme north and extreme south.[8] In connection with the problem of the appearance of the messiah only after the Jews have been subjugated to the rule of 'seventy nations' (comprising the world), God replies, 'If one of you is exiled to Barbaria and one to Sarmatia, it is as if you had all been exiled... If one *kuthi* and one *kushi* subjugate you, it is as if all the seventy nations had done so.' The *kuthi* are acknowledged to be an Aramaic rendering of Scythoi, and the *kushi* are the Ethiopians, who live in a territory often identified vaguely as Barbaria. Hence there is a clear geographic division, or what Goldenberg calls a merism, between the Sarmatians or Scythians in the north and the Barbarians or Ethiopians in the south. Between the two regions lies the whole inhabited world (the 'seventy nations'). Goldenberg has conveniently assembled a list of the rabbinic references to the ends of the earth in these terms, and it is compelling testimony to the prevalence of this formulation.

Goldenberg has traced the *topos* directly and convincingly to the Graeco-Roman world where Sarmatians or Scythians are repeatedly contrasted with Barbarians or Ethiopians as representatives of the outermost limits of the world. Goldenberg's discovery allowed him to offer for the first time in modern exegesis a persuasive interpretation of the vexed passage in Paul's *Letter to the Colossians*: 'where there is not Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian,

[8] David Goldenberg, 'Scythian-Barbarian: The Permutations of a Classical Topos in Jewish and Christian Texts of Late Antiquity,' *Journal of Jewish Studies* 49 (1998), 87–102. Cf. סרמטים/ברבריים and כותי/כושי.

slave, free: but Christ is all and in all'.[9] The mention of barbarian and Scythian has always seemed to sit oddly among obvious pairings of opposites, such as circumcised and uncircumcised, or slave and free. But what we can now assert confidently is that barbarian and Scythian is another clear set of opposites, signifying peoples from the remote south and the remote north. Hence the first letter of barbarian should be capitalized to indicate the people of Barbaria.

Unlike the east–west orientation of the world, this north–south one has fuzzy boundaries that accommodate strange and unfamiliar tribes. In particular the southern regions, Ethiopia and beyond, have long been recognized as uncommonly capacious in Greek and Roman traditions, sometimes including Brahmans of India, gymnosophists, and apparently, in a remarkable passage in Lucan, the Chinese. In imagining a possible Roman conquest of the whole world at the opening of his epic on the Civil War, the poet invokes east and west by sunrise and sunset (*unde venit Titan, et nox ubi sidera condit*), and then south and north by hot and frozen regions, the latter explicitly connected with Scythians (*quaque dies medius flagrantibus aestuat auris, / et qua bruma rigens et nescia vere remitti / astringit Scythicum glaciali frigore pontum*). In a subsequent line the contrast between south and north is evidently repeated by reference to the Chinese and the Araxes (*Sub iuga iam Seres, iam barbarus isset Araxes*).[10]

As quintessential outsiders, the Chinese were simply relegated to the outside in unscientific texts (the elder Pliny knew better), and Ethiopia was the obvious outside territory. In view of seafaring in the Indian Ocean, with its links to the Horn of Africa, it is not surprising that Brahmans or Chinese were often wrapped into the southern extremity of the world rather than the northern one. Pausanias is a witness to the tradition of the Chinese as Ethiopians, and Heliodorus even has them as tributaries of the king in Meroe. But Pausanias also reports another tradition that put the Chinese in the opposite region

[9] NT, Col. 3. 11 ... *ὅπου οὐκ ἔνι Ἕλλην καὶ Ἰουδαῖος, περιτομὴ καὶ ἀκροβυστία, βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος, ἀλλὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός.*

[10] Luc. *Phars.* 1. 15–19. Cf. *Scythicus Oceanus*, north of the Caspian, in Pliny, *NH* 6. 33, 36, 37, 53.

on the north–south axis, as Scythians consorting with the Indians.[11] What is consistently striking about the north–south axis is that there is never any suggestion that the inhabitants of the ancient world would travel along it from one extremity to the other. This makes the distinction altogether different from the east–west axis, where transverse travel was a real possibility.

The special feature of the north–south *topos* is that the peoples it names lie beyond, in other words above or below, the civilized world. Orientation by the concept of above or below seems to arise from the habit of geographers and travellers, who regularly used such expressions as *hyper*, *anô*, *ultra*, *superior* and their opposites, in locating territories. This habit was usually reserved to the north–south axis. It was already rooted in the ancient geography of Egypt through the designations of Upper and Lower Egypt for the southern (upriver) and northern (downriver) territories respectively. It can readily be seen in the Roman administrative system with its upper and lower provinces, reflecting upriver and downriver situations on the Rhine and Danube. Although in some cases the use of these terms coincides with differences in physical elevation there are many instances where it does not. But overall there is a remarkably consistent pattern that connects the orientation of above or below, or upper and lower, on an approximately north–south axis with reference to the sea. The upper Nile and hence Upper Egypt are more remote from the Mediterranean coast than the lower Nile and Lower Egypt. Upriver on the Rhine is at a greater distance from the North Sea than downriver, and in a south-east direction. Upriver on the Danube is at a greater distance from the Black Sea, but this time in a north-west direction. Hence the designations of Upper and Lower Germany, Upper and Lower Pannonia, Upper and Lower Moesia.

It is inescapable, therefore, that both the relative terms 'above/up' and 'below/down' can designate either 'north' or 'south', depending on the maritime point of reference. We must

[11] Paus. 6. 26. 4, 9: *Οὗτοι μὲν δὴ τοῦ Αἰθιόπων γένους αὐτοί τέ εἰσιν οἱ Σῆρες . . . οἱ δὲ αὐτοὺς οὐκ Αἰθιόπας, Σκύθας δὲ ἀναμεμιγμένους Ινδοῖς φασὶν εἶναι.* Cf. Heliod. *Aeth.* 10. 25.

not be surprised to find counterintuitive designations. At first blush, it seems odd that northern Egypt should be called Lower, or that Upper Germany should be south of Lower Germany. The division of Britain in the third century produced an even more counterintuitive division. Upper Britain lay in the south, with London at its centre, whereas Lower Britain encompassed Scotland. In this case no great river imposed such an orientation, nor is there the slightest possibility that geographical elevation dictated the names. The determining feature appears to have been the outlying sea, the *Mare Germanicum* or North Sea. The case of the late antique provinces of Upper and Lower Libya is equally instructive since again there is no river into the interior to provide any guidance. In addition both provinces had Mediterranean coastlines. Upper Libya, the territory of the old Pentapolis of Cyrenaica, lay to the west and to the north of Lower Libya. It was thus more remote from the Nile delta, which must therefore have been considered the maritime point of reference.

In terms of the perspective of north–south orientation the Mediterranean is, accordingly, merely one of many seas that can determine geographical nomenclature. The Scythian Ocean, placed north of the Caspian by the elder Pliny, may be an extrapolation from travellers' reports of the Aral Sea. But the Indian Ocean and the Black Sea (itself an offshoot of the Mediterranean) were well known. The ancients had experience of the gulfs of the Indian Ocean—Suez, Aqaba, Arabo-Persian, and they were certainly not inclined to see the Black Sea as an extension of the Mediterranean, at least to judge by the terminology they used. The euphemistic Euxine as well as the bland Pontus sharply distinguished the Black Sea from the inner sea (or *nostrum mare* of the Romans), and the distinction had a very long history subsequently through the colour names used by the Arabs and Turks. For the former the Black Sea was precisely black (*al-baḥr al-aswad*) whereas the Mediterranean was the White Sea (*al-baḥr al-abyaḍ*). The Turks have maintained the same nomenclature with Kara Deniz for the Black Sea and Ak Deniz for the Mediterranean.

The author of the *Periplus of the Red Sea* shows clearly the force of *hyper* in orientation when, for example, he uses the verb *hyperkeitai* to locate the city of Savê in relation to Muza at the

south-western corner of the Arabian peninsula.[12] The verb indicates remoteness of three days from the sea in a north-eastern direction. This may seem perfectly obvious in an instance that starts from the coast, but Strabo shows repeatedly that *hyper* can also be used to indicate inland orientations and, specifically, in a southwards direction. When he moves to his discussion of the Nabataean kingdom after his survey of Syria he states that the Nabataeans and Sabaeans were *hyper* the Syrians.[13] If the preposition were construed simply to mean 'beyond' there would be no way of telling whether the Nabataeans lived to the north, east, west, or south. Strabo is too careful a geographer. He is clearly telling us that they were to the south of the Syrians on a north–south axis (which is the only axis appropriate for this preposition in such contexts). They are 'above' in precisely the same way as the Nitriote nome in Egypt is above Momemphis.[14] It lies to the south. Similarly going south from Heliopolis the traveller embarks upon the Nile 'above the Delta', as Strabo puts it.[15] The journey is upriver (*anapleôn*), southwards from the *katô chôra* to the *anô chôra*. In an unusual passage concerning the interior of Ethiopia Strabo's text explicitly glosses his use of *hyper* as meaning 'to the south'.[16] Whether this is his gloss or an interpolator's is open to debate. In any case the Nile flows down all the way into the Mediterranean, which controls the north–south terminology in Ethiopia as well as Egypt. Similarly Plutarch's Delphic visitor from the east is said to have 'sailed up' beyond the Red Sea This can only imply southwards into the Indian Ocean. It is far less obvious what determines the inland orientation for Syria and Trans-Jordan. Strabo's description of the placement of the Nabataeans and Sabaeans is another of those counterintuitive arrangements.

[12] *Peripl. Maris Erythr.* 22: *ὑπέρκειται δὲ αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τριῶν ἡμερῶν πόλις Σαυή* . . .

[13] Strabo p. 779C (16. 4. 21): *Πρῶτοι δ' ὑπὲρ τῆς Συρίας Ναβαταῖοι καὶ Σαβαῖοι τὴν εὐδαίμονα Ἀραβίαν νέμονται.*

[14] Strabo p. 803C (16. 4. 23): *Ὑπὲρ δὲ Μωμέμφεώς εἰσι δύο νιτρίαι πλεῖστον νίτρον ἔχουσαι καὶ νομὸς Νιτριώτης.*

[15] Strabo p. 806C (16. 4. 30): *Ἐντεῦθεν δὴ ὁ Νεῖλός ἐστιν ὁ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Δέλτα· τούτου δὴ τὰ μὲν δεξιὰ καλοῦσι Λιβύην ἀναπλέοντι* . . .

[16] Strabo p. 771 (16. 4. 10): *Ἔτι δ' ὑπὲρ τούτων ὡς πρὸς μεσημβρίαν οἱ κυναμολγοί* . . .

Yet a striking parallel occurs in the elder Pliny's description of the same region. He says that Hierapolis Bambyce, Beroea-Aleppo, and Chalcis are *infra Palmyrae solitudines*. These well-known places are associated with a region named for the site of Teleda. Both the three cities and the region are north of Palmyra, and so the word 'below' here can only imply north. Consistently Pliny goes on to say that *ultra Palmyram* lay part of the territory of Emesa as well as Elath, which he reasonably observes is about half as far distant from Petra as Damascus is.[17] All these toponymns leave no doubt whatever that the word 'above' here indicates south, just as it did in Strabo's location of the Nabataeans 'above' the Syrians. I suggest that this terminology is as much controlled in these instances by the location of a sea as it is in the case of Egypt or southern Arabia. In this case the sea cannot be either the Gulf of Aqaba or the Arabo-Persian Gulf, either of which would necessarily reverse the terminology as it stands in Strabo and Pliny. Likewise, appeal to the Euphrates or Tigris would have the same result, since both rivers debouch into the Arabo-Persian Gulf.

The Mediterranean is naturally irrelevant for a north–south orientation. As far as I can tell, the maritime point of reference can only be the Black Sea. This inference is confirmed if we look, for example, at Strabo's terminology for Pontic Cappadocia. Here *hyper* pretty clearly designates 'south' once again although now the sense is more apparent because of the immediate proximity of the Black Sea coast at the northern edge of the region. Phanaroea is situated above (south of) Sidene and Themiscyra, for example,[18] and Pontic Comana lies above (south of) Phanaroea.[19] The elder Pliny provides another point of comparison in his description of Latium in Italy as *infra* the Sabines.[20] This time his *infra*, has the opposite sense

[17] Pliny, *NH* 5. 89: Infra Palmyrae solitudines Telendena regio est dictaeque iam Hierapolis ac Beroea et Chalcis. Ultra Palmyram quoque ex solitudinibus his aliquid obtinet Hemesa, item Elatium, dimidio proprior Petrae quam Damascus.

[18] Strabo p. 556C (12. 3. 30): *Τούτων* [i.e. Sidene and Themiscyra] *δ' ἡ Φανάροια ὑπέρκειται μέρος ἔχουσα τοῦ Πόντου τὸ κράτιστον.*

[19] Strabo p. 557C (12. 3. 32): *Ὑπὲρ δὲ Φαναροίας ἐστὶ τὰ Κόμανα τὰ ἐν τῷ Πόντῳ . . .*

[20] Plin. *NH* 3. 109: Infra Sabinos Latium est.

of his use of the word with reference to Palmyra. It means 'south' because Latium lay nearer to the sea.

Undoubtedly the north–south axis in antiquity has not yet yielded all its secrets. But if the foregoing argument is valid, there are serious implications for the much-discussed passage in the elder Pliny about the Essene community. Debate over the identification of the inhabitants of Qumran with the Essenes continues, and a central piece in the debate is Pliny's statement that En Gedi lay 'below' the Essenes: *infra hos Engadda*.[21] What I have said here will certainly not close the debate, but it is worth remarking that if Pliny is following the usage that emerges from other parts of his work as well as from Strabo's *Geography*, he ought perhaps to be understood as saying that En Gedi lay to the north of the Essenes. Since that site is in fact located south of Qumran, this interpretation would provide support for those who deny the identification of the Essene community with it.

The ancient inhabited world, situated as it was between extreme cold and extreme heat, looked very different when viewed from east to west and from north to south. It seems evident that it was the Mediterranean that determined the east–west orientation, but not the north–south one. For that axis the Mediterranean was but one of the bodies of water that impinged upon the ancient peoples, and even when it was as close to them as it was in Palestine and Trans-Jordan the north–south axis paid no attention to it. Of course all these peoples had perfectly serviceable words for the four directions of the compass and could use them when they wished. But the instinct to describe space in terms of the relation of one place to another was very strong. Those two great axes of orientation, which we know today as latitude and longitude, provided them with the most comprehensible way to demarcate the civilized *oikoumenê* that they knew.

[21] Plin. *NH* 5. 73: Infra hos [i.e. the Essenes] Engada oppidum fuit.