

#### Appendix 4: Numeration of the new edition of the Compilation 'notitia dignitatum' (Cnd)

In the *Commentary* - §1: *Introduction*, it was stated, firstly, that the evidence contained in the primary copies of the *Cnd* indicates that the *Cnd*, now absent, was written in a script not used before the 8thC and occupied 164 pages in the codex  $\Sigma$  that existed in the library of the Speyer cathedral chapter, at least between 1426/27 and 1550/51.

Secondly, it was concluded that an unknown amount of the contents of each list and each picture in the *Cnd* was ultimately derived from a *source list* (the list that first contained, in whatever form or sequence of their words or numbers, at least all those items from which the items naming entities or circumstances not known to have existed for the first time after the 5thC in any list in the *Cnd* were ultimately derived) or *source picture* (the picture that first contained, in whatever form or spatial arrangement of its drawings, at least all those drawings from which the drawings representing objects not known to have existed for the first time after the 5thC in any picture in the *Cnd* were ultimately derived).

And, thirdly, that either these source lists and pictures, or copies of some or all of them, were at some time combined to form an original compilation,  $\Omega$  (the compilation that first comprised, in whatever sequence, the coexistence of at least all the lists and pictures from which the *Cnd* was ultimately derived).

Any reasonable speculation about  $\Omega$  can be based only on the contents of the *Cnd*, which comprised not only its lists and pictures, but also their spatial distribution within the pages of the codex  $\Sigma$ . The evidence that the *Cnd* can provide concerning  $\Omega$  is limited for several reasons, which include the following. Firstly, while the consensus and convergence of the primary derivatives of the *Cnd* make it possible to construct a copy of the *Cnd* which is potentially a more accurate than that of any one of the primary derivatives, a complete reconstruction is impossible in those list items or picture drawings where there are alternative primary forms with equal validity to represent an accurate copy, or where none of the mutually-differing primary forms can be selected as an accurate copy of the one in the *Cnd* and no convergent form can be constructed from them.<sup>1</sup> Secondly, it is certain that, when the *Cnd* was created, it formed part of a more extensive copy of  $\Omega$  than the remnant that existed, as the *Cnd*, in the codex  $\Sigma$  in 1426/7. Thirdly, it is not known to what extent the *Cnd* comprised either a complete or an accurate copy of the contents it derived from  $\Omega$ . And, finally, it is not known when  $\Omega$  was created or through how many

---

<sup>1</sup> These problems were not acknowledged by Seeck in his extravagant assertion that the words contained in the *Cnd* were indicated *immer mit voller Sicherheit* (always with complete certainty) from the four versions he used: Seeck, O., *Zur Kritik der Notitia dignitatum*: Hermes 9 1875 pp. 217-242, hereafter Seeck (K.1875), p.229 n.1: *Die Lesart jeder einzelnen von den vier vorliegenden Handschriften mitzuthellen, halte ich nicht für nöthig; ihre Abweichungen von einander sind so gering und lassen die Lesart des Spirensis, wenn sie diese nicht, wie meistens geschieht, direct wiedergeben, doch so deutlich durchscheinen, dass sie sich immer mit voller Sicherheit angeben lässt.*

Similarly, (K.1875) p.227-8: *Uns bleiben also vier Handschriften, sie sämmtlich ihr Original sehr genau und ohne Interpolationen wiedergeben; aus diesen lässt sich der Text des Spirensis so vollständig herstellen, dass, wenn er heute gefunden würde, sich kaum ein anderer Gewinn daraus ergäbe, als dass man statt vier Codices nur einen zu collationiren hätte.*

Seeck, O., *Notitia Dignitatum accedunt Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae et Latercula prouinciarum* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1876 - reimpression Frankfurt a.M., Minerva, 1962), hereafter Seeck (Ed.1876) un-numbered p.ix: *Res critica [...] nititur uno codice Spirae quondam adseruatus post medium s.XVI periit. Sed quoniam apographa eius quattuor extant, quae omnia ea cum cura facta sunt, ut etiam in minimis rebus conspirent, non est cur iacturam magnopere doleamus. De omnibus enim libri primarii scripturis, quin etiam de diuisione eius in paginas et columnas aequae constat ac si ipse maneret, atque adeo picturae eius felici quodam casu propemodum integrae ad nos peruenerunt. [...] Itaque de omnibus codicis Spirensis partibus plenum et certum iudicium ferri potest.*

But a slightly more cautious statement followed on p.xxviii: *in Notitia dignitatum autem, quae tota ex uno fonte haurienda erat, apographa eius omnia adhibui. [...] omnes enim tam diligenter descripti sunt, ut plerumque etiam in minimis rebus conspirent, et ubi dissentiant, consensus partis maioris, id quod raro alias euenit, fere pro tradita lectione habenda est.*

## Appendix 4

intermediary copies an unknown amount of its contents, or those of the source lists were transmitted to the *Cnd*. And these limitations must be considered in deciding how to refer to the contents of the *Cnd*.

The *Cnd* contained no title comprehending its entire contents. Its lists and their items, and its pictures and their drawings, drawing captions and drawing inscriptions, did not have any form of numbering or indexing attached to them. And there is no evidence that the *Cnd* was divided into sections such as books, titles, chapters or paragraphs. Since the spatial distribution of the lists and pictures among the pages in the *Cnd* is known from the primary derivatives of it, and is important to any speculation about  $\Omega$ , that page distribution must, therefore, be reproduced in any constructed copy of the *Cnd* or, at the very least, must form the basis of references or citations to its contents: that is, since there was no form of numbering in the *Cnd*, references to the lists and pictures in any constructed copy or edition of it can only be made objectively according to the numbers of the pages on which the corresponding lists and pictures occurred in the *Cnd*.

The only acceptable justification for the addition, to the known page numbers of the *Cnd*, of any further numbers in any edition representing the *Cnd*, is to facilitate a more precise reference to its contents but not to interpret those contents. Any interpolated system of such additional numbering must, therefore, satisfy two conditions. Firstly, such numbers must be clearly identified as interpolations to that which existed in the *Cnd*. And, secondly, such numbers must be based entirely upon the contents of the *Cnd* and not upon speculation about the possible contents  $\Omega$ .

Böcking<sup>2</sup> met the first condition by printing all the numbers that he added to his edition of the *Cnd* in square brackets, which he used elsewhere to denote his conjectural changes to what he considered to have been the contents of the *Cnd*. Seeck stated that all conjectural changes in his edition of the *Cnd* would be printed in italics<sup>3</sup> but, despite this assurance, the interpolated numbers in his edition were not printed in italics, nor enclosed in brackets or otherwise identified as interpolations. He used Roman numerals to number those sections of his edition that he called *capita* or *Capitel*,<sup>4</sup> and Arabic numerals to number list items, drawing captions and some drawing inscriptions.<sup>5</sup> His use of these Roman numerals, not printed in italics or identified as interpolations, has misleadingly conveyed the impression that those numbers existed within the *Cnd*.

Neither Böcking nor Seeck met the second condition because the numbers which both of them added to those sections that they identified as chapters in their editions were not based on the spatial distribution of the contents of the *Cnd*, but upon the possible spatial distribution which these two editors thought that the corresponding contents, sometimes in a different sequence and augmented by possible additions, could or should have had in some exemplar of the *Cnd*. Consequently, their numbering systems interpret the contents of the *Cnd* in a manner that influences any user of their editions of the *Cnd* to believe that the contents of the *Cnd* support the assumptions upon which their system of numbering was based.

Neither Böcking nor Seeck, in the numbering systems they added to their editions, referred to the numbers of the pages on which the corresponding contents occurred in the *Cnd*, even though these could be reconstructed from the primary derivatives known to both editors.

---

<sup>2</sup> Böcking, E., *Notitia dignitatum et administrationum omnium tam civilium quam militarium in partibus orientis et occidentis (ad codd. mss. Monachiensium, Romani, Parisiensium ac Vindobonensis editorumque fidem recensuit tabulis ad cod. ms. Biblioth. Reg. Palatin. Monachiens. depictis commentariis indicique illustravit Eduardus Böcking)*. (Bonn, A. Marcus, 1839-1853). Vol.1 (1839), Vol.2 (1849), Vol.3 (1850), Vol.4 (1853), hereafter Böcking (Ed.1939-1853).

<sup>3</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) p.xxviii: *Coniecturas [...] in contextum recepi; [...] Omnes autem litteris inclinatis distingui iussi, ita ut ubique primo obtutu appareat, quae tradita sint, quae ex coniectura proposita.*

<sup>4</sup> For example: Seeck (Ed.1876) p.40: *Caput, quo de primicerio sacri cubiculi actum erat*; Seeck (K.1875) p.237 *also noch in demselben Capitel*; p.241: *jedenfalls aber ist vorauszusetzen, dass die Fassung des Titels durch das ganze Capitel dieselbe war.*

<sup>5</sup> Seeck did not number the picture captions but they implicitly had the number "1" within the single series of numbers that he attached to the drawing inscriptions, which always began with the number "2".

## Appendix 4

The complicated system of numbering which Böcking added to his edition does not facilitate reference to the corresponding contents of the *Cnd* and, probably for that reason, has never been used in any commentary after the publication of the edition produced by Seeck in 1876.<sup>6</sup> Accordingly, the following comments are restricted primarily to the numbering system added by Seeck.

To evaluate the system interpolated by Seeck, and several conjectural emendations that he made, it is necessary to understand that he based both of these, not on the *Cnd*, but on his concept of what he identified as the original compilation  $\Omega$  and a source of the latter.

Seeck based his concept on the following, sequential series of assumptions:

- (i) that the item *Cnd.34.2: Omnis dignitatum et amministrationum notitia, tam militarium quam civilium*<sup>7</sup> in the agency list of the eastern *primicerius notariorum*, and the item *Cnd.116.2: Notitia omnium dignitatum et ministratationum tam civilium quam militarium*<sup>8</sup> in the agency list of the western one, were synonymous;
- (ii) that each of these items referred to a book, rather than to a competency of the officer (*omnis notitia dignitatum*)<sup>9</sup> or to a duty such as that mentioned in the following item *Cnd.34.3: Scholas etiam et numeros tractat*;<sup>10</sup>
- (iii) that the item *Cnd.1/2.1: Notitia dignitatum omnium tam civilium quam militarium in partibus orientis*<sup>11</sup> at the beginning of the eastern precedence list *Cnd.1/2*, and item *Cnd.85/6.1: Notitia dignitatum omnium tam civilium quam militarium in partibus occidentis*<sup>12</sup> at the beginning of the western precedence list *Cnd.85/6*, was each the title to the entire compilation of lists and pictures which followed each of those items, rather than the title only of the precedence list in which each was the first item;
- (iv) that these two compilations represented the two parts of a hypothetical book that had the title *Notitia omnium dignitatum et administrationum tam civilium quam militarium* (which Seeck shortened to *Notitia dignitatum*);
- (v) that the *Cnd* was derived from the latter.

Beyond this sequential series of assumptions, his concept becomes more difficult to understand, partly because of the varying terminology Seeck used. On the basis of these assumptions, Seeck concluded that the *Cnd* was ultimately derived from an official *Notitia dignitatum* controlled by the *primicerius*

---

<sup>6</sup> While the 1876 edition was produced by Seeck, it appears to have been considerably influenced, if not also contributed to, by Theodor Mommsen to whom Seeck dedicated it (Ed.1876, un-numbered p.v *Theodoro Mommsen grato animo*), and whose connection with it Seeck later described as follows: "*Mein Erstlingsbuch, die Ausgabe der Notitia Dignitatum, hat er <Mommsen> angeregt, mir einen grossen Teil der handschriftlichen Quellen zugänglich gemacht und jeden Korrekturbogen mit einer Sorgfalt gelesen, als wenn es sich um sein eigenes Werk handelte*" (O. Seeck, *Zur Charakteristik Mommsens*: Deutsche Rundschau 118 1904 p.81).

<sup>7</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876): Or.XVIII 4.

<sup>8</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876): Oc.XVI 5.

<sup>9</sup> The expression *omnis notitia* ('all knowledge') is exemplified by Ammianus Marcellinus in 31.3.8: (Athanaricus) *quaeritabat domicilium remotum ab omni notitia barbarorum*.

While *notitia* is used occasionally in the laws to denote a *list*, the predominant use of the word in those laws is as a synonym for *knowledge*, particularly in the various expressions requiring the recipient of a law to bring its contents to the knowledge of all (*ad omnium notitiam*). The use of a list as the basis of such knowledge is exemplified in Cod.Iust.1.31.5(527): *Impp. Iustinus et Iustinianus AA. Tatiano magistro officiorum. [...] Illud etiam observari de cetero volumus, ut, si quis locus statutorum scholarium in quacumque schola vacaverit, ille subrogetur, quem nostra pietas per sacrum rescriptum vacantem subire locum praeceperit. Ad haec quadrimestruos breves eorundem scholarium cura tuae sublimitatis [...] conscribi volumus et eos sacro scrinio laterculi praestari ibi deponendos, ut semper notitia eorundem scholarium certa sit [...]*.

<sup>10</sup> Seeck Or.XVIII 5.

<sup>11</sup> Seeck Or.I 1.

<sup>12</sup> Seeck Oc.I 1.

## Appendix 4

*notariorum*. He identified his official *Notitia* as the *Notitia primicerii* or *Notitia a primicerio confecta* or *Notitia usui publico destinata*<sup>13</sup> or *Originalnotitia*<sup>14</sup> or *Staatskalender*<sup>15</sup> or *das officielle Verzeichniss*<sup>16</sup> or *der officielle Register*<sup>17</sup> and described it as containing lists and pictures similar to those in the *Cnd*.<sup>18</sup> He speculated that this official *Notitia* was at times irregularly revised and these revisions could generally be recognised precisely because they were irregular.<sup>19</sup> That is, he considered that his official *Notitia* ought to have contained no irregularities, no abbreviations,<sup>20</sup> a standardised or consistent form of words when referring to comparable entities,<sup>21</sup> and no discrepancies between list items and any corresponding picture and drawing captions. He equated the genuine or original form (*die ächte Ueberlieferung*) with the correct form (*das Richtige*),<sup>22</sup> which he did not define. Forms that existed in the

---

<sup>13</sup> Seeck, O., *Quaestiones de Notitia dignitatum. (Dissertatio inauguralis historica quam consensu et auctoritate amplissimi philosophorum ordinis in alma litterarum universitate Friderica Guilelma ad summos in philosophia honores rite capessendos Die II. M. Iulii A. MDCCCLXXII. H.X. Publice defendet auctor Otto Seeck Rigensis. Adversariorum partes suscipient: Samuel Herrlich, Dr.Phil., Otto Gruppe, Stud. Phil., Leo, Comes de Keyserling, Stud. Hist. (Berlin, Otto Lange, 1872) pp. 1-32, hereafter Seeck (Q.1872) on p.5: notitia a primicerio notariorum confecta; p.8: exemplar nostrum e notitia primicerii descriptum; p.13: exemplar nostrum e notitia dignitatum [...] descriptum.*

<sup>14</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.228: *die Corruptelen [...] im Spirensis, wie in A, wie in der Originalnotitia des fünften Jahrhunderts.*

<sup>15</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.235: *in den Staatskalender aufgenommen.*

<sup>16</sup> Seeck O., *Die Zeit des Vegetius*: Hermes 11 1876 pp. 61-83 hereafter Seeck (V.1876) on p.71: *das officielle Verzeichniss.*

<sup>17</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.236: *Die geographischen Glossen [...] <sind> dem Stile eines officiellen Registers sehr wenig angemessen [...].*

<sup>18</sup> Seeck (V.1876) p.71: *In connection with his duties, bedurfte der primicerius <notariorum> eines Verzeichnisses, in dem neben Titel und Würde der Aemter sich auch die nöthigen Notizen über ihre Competenz, ja selbst die Abbildung ihrer Insignien befand, denn auch diese machte einen Theil des Codicills aus.*

<sup>19</sup> Seeck (V.1876) p.71: *Schon das officielle Verzeichniss muss sehr unregelmässig geführt worden sein und seine Unklarheiten steigerten sich in der Abschrift. Denn als man diese fertigte, war es kaum zu vermeiden, dass diejenigen Dinge, welche am Rande standen, an falscher Stelle eingereiht oder ganz weggelassen, und das, was im Text getilgt war, trotzdem aufgenommen wurde. Doch eben diese Unregelmässigkeiten machen es uns möglich, oft mit grosser Sicherheit den ursprünglichen Inhalt der einzelnen Capitel von den Zusätzen des Randes zu scheiden.*

<sup>20</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.240-241: *Die überaus häufigsten Corruptelen in den Endungen der Worte lassen sich darauf schliessen, dass eine der Handschriften, welche dem Spirensis vorausliegen, die üblichsten Amts-bezeichnungen, wie Praefectus, Praepositus, Comes, Magister und Aehnliches durch Abkürzungen ausgedrückt hat. Zum kleinen Theil haben sich diese noch erhalten [...] meist aber waren sie im Spirensis aufgelöst und, wie begreiflich, sehr oft falsch aufgelöst.*

<sup>21</sup> Seeck (V.1876) stated that later changes to what he believed had existed in his official *Notitia* could be recognized where the *Cnd* contained, p.73: *Abweichungen des Textes von den Insignienaufschriften.* p.74: *Abweichungen von der regelmässigen Anordnung.* p.75-6: *die verschiedene Formulierung in der Benennung an sich gleicher Dinge.*

<sup>22</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.229: Referring to the forms *citrati*, *crinati* and *cetnati* that existed in the *Cnd*, apparently for the same military unit, and ignoring the phonetic alternatives of various military unit names existing in inscriptions, Seeck determined that the correct and, therefore, original form was *cetrati*, noting that there was [...] *kein Zweifel möglich, dass die ächte Ueberlieferung nach der verderbten corrigirt sein muss. [...] eine Spur des Richtigen findet sich nur zweimal in der Corruptel cetnati.*

This view appears to be inconsistent with his definition of *interpolations*. Noting that Böcking had reported that **V** (which is actually a primary derivative) sometimes contains a correct form where

## Appendix 4

*Cnd* but not in other available or extant sources were suspect<sup>23</sup> as were forms which seemed inherently improbable.<sup>24</sup> His concept, that an official document had these characteristics, is important to an understanding of the use which can be made of his edition because the features which Seeck believed to be those of an official document were the criteria which, for him, determined what should have existed in the *Cnd* (*was in den Text gehört*)<sup>25</sup> and, therefore, what he should have in his edition.

While Seeck considered that the *Cnd* was ultimately derived from his official *Notitia*, he stated that the *Cnd* was originally derived from a copy of it,<sup>26</sup> comprising a complete copy of some parts of his official *Notitia*, but only an extract or excerpt of other parts.<sup>27</sup> Seeck identified this copy of his official *Notitia* as the *Notitia*, or *liber primarius* or *exemplar nostrum*,<sup>28</sup> or *codex archetypus*,<sup>29</sup> or *Handschrift A*,<sup>30</sup> or

---

version **M** does not, but deciding that the former was a copy of the latter, Seeck advised (K.1875) p.226: *Ich bitte dabei zu verachten, dass auch etwas Richtiges, wenn sich aus der Vergleichung der übrigen Quellen ergibt, dass es nicht im Spirensis gestanden hat, insofern es falsch, d.h. als interpolirt gelten muss [...].*

- <sup>23</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.231, note: n.1: *Der Name Morbium kommt sonst nirgends vor, dagegen ist Vinovia oder Vinovium, wie es Ptolomäus nennt, eine bekannte römische Niederlassung (Binchester).* The doubting of a place name in the *Cnd* on the basis of such reasoning is unsound. The place name *Congavata*, Cnd.154-31 = Seeck Oc.XL.48 also occurred nowhere else until the discovery, in June 2003, of the Staffordshire enamelled bronze pan (Portable Antiquities Scheme, Unique Id. WMID-3FE965) which has the inscription:  
MAISCOGABATAUXELODUNUMCAMMOGLANNARIGOREVALIAELIUSDRACO  
(website: <http://finds.org.uk/database/artefacts/record/id/49791>)
- <sup>24</sup> Referring to Cnd.23.6 *Schola scutariorum clibanariorum* = Seeck Or.XI.8, Seeck stated, p.32 n.1: *Scuta cum clibanis coniuncta fuisse ueri dissimilimum est; scripserim: Scola sagittariorum clibanariorum.* He subsequently found that a reference to this unit existed in the law Cod.Theod.14.17.9<sup>(398)</sup> *Annonas civicas in urbe Constantinopolitana scholae scutariorum et scutariorum clibanariorum divi Constantini adseruntur liberalitate meruisse. [...]*, indicating this on p.337 *Addenda et Corrigenda*, p.32: *commemoratur schola scutariorum clibanariorum in C.Th.XIV.17.9.*
- <sup>25</sup> Referring to the list Cnd.113 = Seeck Oc.XII, he noted (K.1875) p.241: *[...] steht zu Anfang zwei Mal Rationalis rerum privatarum, dann immer rei privatae; ein Unterschied ist nicht vorhanden, und da beides gleich üblich ist, kann eine Entscheidung, was in den Text gehört, nicht gefällt werden, jedenfalls ist vorauszusetzen, dass die Fassung des Titels durch das ganze Capitel dieselbe war.* and repeated this belief in (Ed.1876) p.154 n.1, referring to Oc.XII 6 *rerum privatarum* with the comment: *scrib. aut h.l. rei priuatae aut 8-28 rerum privatarum.*
- <sup>26</sup> Seeck (Q.1872) p.5: *notitia a primicerio notariorum confecta e qua nostrum exemplar fluxit; p.8: exemplar nostrum e notitia primicerii descriptum est. p.13: dubitari nequit, quin exemplar nostrum e notitia dignitatum usui publico destinata non ante annum 410 descriptum sit.*
- <sup>27</sup> Seeck (V.1876) p.71: *The primicerius notariorum, according to Seeck, bedurfte [...] eines Verzeichnisses, [...]. Dieses Verzeichniss, [...], giebt uns die vorliegende Notitia Dignitatum, theils im Auszuge, theils in wörtlicher Abschrift wieder. [...]*
- <sup>28</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) p.xi: *Liber primarius, qui Not. Dignitatum solam continebat [...]; tres <paginae> inter notitias Orientis et Occidentis postque indicem utrumque conscriptae non fuerunt.* Seeck (Q.1872) p.5: *nostrum exemplar; p.8 and p.13: exemplar nostrum.*
- <sup>29</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) p.xi: *The term Liber primarius is linked to a footnote stating: Omnia quae de codice archetypo dicturus sum, in libello Quaestiones de Not.Dign. (Berol.1872) inscripto iam exposui* which referred to the *pars altera* in his (Q.1872) under the title *De Notitiae Dignitatum codice archetypo.*
- <sup>30</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.228: *Schon in meiner Dissertation (1872) habe ich es versucht, über den Spirensis hinauszugreifen und die ältere Handschrift - ich will sie A nennen - welche ihm als Quelle diente und nur die N.D. allein enthielt, soweit wie möglich wiederherzustellen. [...]; die Corruptelen [...] im Spirensis, wie in A, wie in der Originalnotitia des fünften Jahrhunderts;*

## Appendix 4

*Urtext* or *Urcodex*,<sup>31</sup> or *Urhandschrift*<sup>32</sup> or *ursprünglicher Entwurf der N.D.*<sup>33</sup> or *Originaldocument*<sup>34</sup> and considered that it had been created in the western regions of the Roman state.<sup>35</sup> Importantly, this *liber primarius*, like his official *Notitia*, served an official purpose (*für den Gebrauch der Kanzlei*)<sup>36</sup> and, therefore, ought to have had the characteristics that Seeck considered to be those of an official document. But it should be noted that, since his *liber primarius* differed from his official *Notitia* - although substantially only to the extent that the former was, in part, an excerpt or extract of the latter - his *liber primarius* and his official *Notitia* could not both, therefore, have served the same purpose.

Finally, Seeck acknowledged that a *codex Spirensis*, to which he also referred as the *Notitia*<sup>37</sup> or *Original*,<sup>38</sup> or *liber primarius* and *codex primarius*,<sup>39</sup> was the immediate common exemplar of all available or extant copies of the original compilation.<sup>40</sup> But even this term was not without confusing

---

<sup>31</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.228: notwithstanding some minor revisions since 1872, *im Quaternionen-verzeichniss bleibt alles stehen. Sowohl in Bezug auf die ganze Anordnung des Urtextes, wie auf die Lücken und Blattverstellungen von A verweise ich daher den Leser auf jene meine frühere Arbeit.* p.242: *es hat sich ergeben, dass allerdings die Handschrift, welche für uns der Urcodex der N.D. ist, mit [...] grosser Sicherheit wiederhergestellt werden kann, [...] doch dass sie selbst schon durch Interpolation und Glossirung, durch unrichtige Auflösung der Abkürzungen ihrer Vorlage und durch Verwirrung der Zeilenfolge im höchsten Grade verdorben war, dass endlich die Aufschriften ihrer Bilder für die Kritik keine höhere Bedeutung in Anspruch nehmen dürfen, als etwa eine Excerptenhandschrift, welche mit dem Spirensis aus derselben ziemlich jungen Quelle geflossen wäre.*

<sup>32</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.238: *Doch nicht nur Glosseme standen am Rande der Urhandschrift;*

<sup>33</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.236: *in dem ursprünglichen Entwurf der N.D.*

<sup>34</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.230: *zwar nicht im Spirensis selbst, aber doch in einem der Zwischenglieder, welche diesem den Inhalt des Originaldocuments vermittelten, [...].*

<sup>35</sup> Seeck (V.1876) p.71-72: *Dieses Verzeichniss [...] giebt die uns vorliegende Notitia Dignitatum theils im Auszuge, theils in wörtlicher Abschrift wieder. [...] Schon das officielle Verzeichniss muss sehr unregelmässig geführt worden sein [...]. Die Notitia Dignitatum ist im Occident abgefasst, und was ihr für den Osten zu Grunde liegt, das geht in der Hauptsache auf die Zeit zurück, als die Hofkanzleien beider Reiche zum letzten Male in Mailand vereinigt waren.*

<sup>36</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.236: *Die geographischen Glossen, an denen es natürlich auch nicht fehlt, möchten viel schwerer auszuscheiden sein, denn sie berühren sich aufs engste mit einer andern Kategorie von Zusätzen, die zwar auch nicht in dem ursprünglichen Entwurf der N.D. gestanden haben können, aber doch eine gute alte Ueberlieferung repräsentieren. Der charakteristischste der Art ist folgender <Cnd.110/11.12 = Seeck Oc.XI.14>: *Rationalis trium provinciarum, id est Siciliae, Sardiniae et Corsicae. Die drei Inseln haben schon seit den Zeiten Constantins einen eigenen Steuerbezirk gebildet, für welchen der Name Tres provinciae technisch war. Eine Erklärung desselben, wie die im Text der N.D., ist daher dem Stile eines officiellen Registers sehr wenig angemessen und gewiss später hinzugefügt. Doch da dieses unmöglich im Mittelalter geschehen sein kann, so müssen wir wohl auf einen antiken Commentator schliessen, der die N.D. durch Randbemerkungen für den Gebrauch der Kanzlei verständlicher zu machen suchte.**

<sup>37</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.218: *Die Notitia Dignitatum bildete bekanntlich das letzte Stück eines Speierer Sammelcodex.*

<sup>38</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.227: Having discussed some versions of the *Cnd*, he stated: *Uns bleiben also vier Handschriften, die sämmtlich ihr Original sehr genau und ohne Interpolationen wiedergeben; aus diesen lässt sich der Text des Spirensis [...] vollständig herstellen, [...].*

<sup>39</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) un-numbered p.ix: *Res critica [...] nititur uno codice Spirae quondam adseruatus post medium s.XVI periit. Sed [...] apographa eius quattuor extant, quae [...] in minimis rebus conspirent, [...]. De omnibus enim libri primarii scripturis [...] aequae constat ac si ipse maneret, [...]. Itaque de omnibus codicis Spirensis partibus plenum et certum iudicium ferri potest.*

<sup>40</sup> Seeck (Q.1872): p.14: *Codex, e quo omnes nostri fluxerunt, saeculo decimo quarto ineunte Spirae repertus est;* p.17: *Omnes nostros libros ex uno codice Spirae quondam asservato originem traxisse,*

## Appendix 4

synonyms, since he used the term *Spirensis* to denote, simultaneously, the consensus of the copies of the *Cnd* in  $\Sigma$  (*unsere übereinstimmende Ueberlieferung*), a particular *codex Spirensis*, the original compilation (*Handschrift A*) the source of the latter (*Originalnotitia des fünften Jahrhunderts*), and any intermediary copy between them (*in jedem Mittelgliede zwischen diesen*).<sup>41</sup>

The indiscriminate use of the term *Notitia* to refer to his official *Notitia*, to his *liber primarius*, and to the archetype in a *codex Spirensis*, created uncertainty, not only as to what he was referring each time he used the term *Notitia*, but also as to what he considered he was representing in his edition. Moreover, the varied and changing terminology used by Seeck has led to some unnecessary confusion among users of it. For example, his use of the term *codex archetypus* or *Handschrift A*, among others, to denote his *liber primarius*, rather than the *Cnd* in the codex  $\Sigma$ , has led to the mistaken belief by some users of his edition that his construction (described below) of what he considered to be the gatherings of his *liber primarius* were actually those of the *Cnd* in  $\Sigma$ .<sup>42</sup>

In relation to his use of the term *Notitia*, Seeck created a more significant problem by dividing the entire contents of his representation of the *Cnd* into two parts and by then interpolating the single title *Notitia dignitatum* to denote both parts. This has created uncertainty among users of his edition as to whether the *Cnd* represented one document (*Notitia dignitatum*) or two documents (*Notitia dignitatum orientis* and *Notitia dignitatum occidentis*).<sup>43</sup>

On the basis of the aforementioned assumptions (i-v), Seeck believed that both his official *Notitia* and his *liber primarius* each consisted of two parts and, accordingly, he divided his representation of the *Cnd* into two parts. Then, believing that the first item in each precedence list (*Cnd.1/2.1* and *Cnd.85/6.1*) was the title to all the lists and pictures that followed it, rather than only to each precedence list itself, he identified the first part (*Cnd.1-84*) as the *Notitia dignitatum in partibus orientis*, which he numbered Or.I-XLV, and the second part (*Cnd.85-164*) as the *Notitia dignitatum in partibus occidentis*, which he numbered Oc.I-XLV.<sup>44</sup> But, having divided his edition into two parts, Seeck then interpolated the words *Notitia dignitatum* to comprehend both parts.<sup>45</sup> Similarly, Böcking, interpolated the title *Notitia dignitatum et administrationum omnium tam civilium quam militarium in partibus orientis et occidentis* to refer to the contents of his representation of the *Cnd*, having had also used the items *Cnd.1/2.1* and *Cnd.85/6.1* as the titles to two parts of his edition.

The division, by Böcking and by Seeck, of the contents of their editions into two parts has embedded an interpretation into their representations of the contents of the *Cnd* because it is impossible to objectively

---

*Boeckingius demonstravit; Seeck (Ed.1876) p.xi ac primum quidem de Notitia Dignitatum dicturum, quae nisi in codice Spirensi nusquam traditur.*

<sup>41</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.228: *die Corruptelen [...] deren Darlegung den Inhalt der folgenden Blätter bilden sollen, können so gut im Spirensis, wie in A, wie in der Originalnotitia des fünften Jahrhunderts oder in jedem Mittelgliede entstanden sein; eine Scheidung ist hier überflüssig, wenn nicht unmöglich. Nenne ich daher von nun an den Spirensis, so meine ich damit nur unsere übereinstimmende Ueberlieferung, nich einen besonderen Codex.*

<sup>42</sup> For example, Bury, J.B., *The Notitia dignitatum*, *Journal of Roman Studies* 10 1920 pp.131-154, hereafter Bury (ND.1920) p.137: *the absence of a section on the vicar of Italy can only be explained as an error in transmission. There is no place for it in Mr. Seeck's probable reconstruction of the quaternions of the Codex Spirensis, so it must have been lost in an ancestor of that manuscript.*

<sup>43</sup> For example, Bury (ND.1920) on p.131: *The document (or rather two documents) which has come down under the title Notitia dignitatum is well known to all students [...] of the Roman empire in the fourth and fifth centuries.* and descriptions on p.133: *Our Notitia Dignitatum consists of two such notitiae, one of the east and one of the west.[...] It will be convenient to consider each Notitia separately before comparing them.*

Kulikowsky, M., *The Notitia dignitatum as a historical source: Historia* 49 2000 pp.358-377, on p.360: *In fact, the Notitia was in origin a single base text, divided at the time of composition into eastern and western partes.*

<sup>44</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) un-numbered p.viii: in the *Index rerum*.

<sup>45</sup> Most prominently, in the title to his edition (Ed.1876) un-numbered pp.i, iii, x (s.v. item 14).

## Appendix 4

divide those contents into two parts. And their interpolation of a single title (a different one by each editor) to comprehend both those parts involves a speculation about the original compilation  $\Omega$ .

The **lists** that existed in the *Cnd* can be divided into two compilations, but the 89 **pictures** cannot. The lists interspersed between pictures in the first 82 pages (*Cnd.1-82*) related to the eastern part of the Roman state (as defined according to the division introduced in 364 and modified in 395), while the lists throughout its last 80 pages (*Cnd.85-164*) related to the western part. These two compilations of lists were interspersed with pictures and, of the 89 pictures in the *Cnd*, the first 43 demonstrably illustrated the eastern lists throughout *Cnd.1-82* and the last 44 those in the western lists throughout *Cnd.85-164*.

But the remaining two pictures, *Cnd.83-84*, which occurred together, and between the two compilations of lists and their related pictures, cannot be objectively attributed to either compilation of lists because it is not known whether these two pictures (i) both belonged to *Cnd.1-82*, or (ii) both belonged to *Cnd.83-84*, or (iii) one to the former and the other to the latter, or (iv) both to neither. Consequently, the contents of the *Cnd* cannot be completely sorted into two separate compilations without incorporating an interpretation about those two pictures.

Seeck, having divided his edition of the *Cnd* into two parts, which he numbered Or.I-XLV and Oc.I-XLV, and having identified the precedence lists Or.I and Oc.I as the *index* to each part, attributed the two pictures *Cnd.83-84* to his eastern part because they immediately preceded the *index* to his western part. He then interpolated the single chapter number Or.XLV to denote both pictures and gave this chapter the title *Finis* (which he adapted from Böcking) and printed in the page headers.<sup>46</sup> Böcking did not identify these two pictures as a chapter and assigned no number to either of them, but also attached them to his first part.<sup>47</sup> Both the invented chapter, its interpolated number and invented title have given rise to several statements which, since they are entirely based on those interpolations by Seeck, simply repeat, as conclusions, the speculations and inventions on which Seeck based them.<sup>48</sup>

Consequently, the sorting of the entire contents of the *Cnd* into two separate compilations, in the manner indicated in the numbering system which Seeck interpolated into his edition, cannot be retained because the two pictures *Cnd.83* and *84* cannot be classified as part of either the eastern or western lists and their related pictures.

The interpolation, by Böcking and Seeck, of a single title to comprehend both of the parts into which each divided his edition, involves a speculation about the original compilation  $\Omega$  and, interestingly, as noted above, each editor used a different title.

---

<sup>46</sup> Seeck Or.XLV.

<sup>47</sup> Böcking (Ed.1839-53) apparently also attributed the two pictures to his eastern part. The two pictures were printed, in his edition, Vol.1(1839), on pp.115-116. Above the second picture, p.116, he printed the page header *Notitiae orientis finis*, and then introduced his commentary on the two pictures with the statement, on p.519: *duas tabulas quae Notitiae priorem partem claudunt, breviter describam, [...]*.

<sup>48</sup> For example, Bury, (ND.1920) p.138: *At the end of Not. Or. there were two pictures [...]; there are no corresponding pictures at the end of Not. Occ. p.139 These pictures are clearly ornamental and illustrate the general difference between the two Notitiae. The Not. Occ was the working copy [...]; the Not. Or. was a clean copy [...] and some care would have been taken to make it a presentable volume);*

Polaschek, E., *Notitia dignitatum*: in Pauly, A., Wissowa, G., Kroll, W., Mittelhaus, K., & Ziegler, K.(eds.), *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*. (Stuttgart, Druckenmüller) hbd.33 1936 coll.1077-1116, hereafter Polaschek (ND.1936) in col.1085: *Die Anpassung war wohl von einer oströmischen Hand ausgeschehen [...] <which> den orientalen Hauptteil der N.D. vor den occidentalischen stellte, daher jetzt das Kapitel Or XLV Finis zwischen den beiden.*

Byvanck, A.W., *Antike Buchmalerei: 3. Der Kalendar vom Jahre 354 und die Notitia dignitatum*: Mnemosyne (Leiden) ser.III 8 1940 pp. 177-198 on p 194: *Eine Ausnahme bilden nur die beiden Illustrationen der sacra scrinia am Schlusse des östlichen Teiles; diejenigen des westlichen Teiles sind verloren gegangen. [...] Diese beide Seiten bilden den Schluss des ersten Teiles.*

## Appendix 4

While the lists and their related pictures in the *Cnd*, could be divided into two compilations, *Cnd.1-82* and *Cnd.85-164*, and two additional pictures, *Cnd.83-84*, neither the *Cnd*, nor the codex  $\Sigma$  in which it existed, contained any title comprehending or denoting the entire compilation of lists and 89 pictures *Cnd.1-164*. There was no form of numbering of their contents that would indicate a connection between *Cnd.1-82* and *Cnd.83-84*, and *Cnd.85-164* (other than any page numbers that may have existed in the codex  $\Sigma$ ). And no part of any list in *Cnd.1-82* contained any statement or any single item that referred to the existence of any list or picture in *Cnd.85-164* - and vice versa.

But the selection, form and arrangement of items in most lists, the sequence of the lists, the selection of drawings and their arrangement in the pictures, and the picture captions, drawing captions and drawing inscriptions in *Cnd.1-82* have sufficient in common with those in *Cnd.85-164* to require one of three conclusions about the original compilation  $\Omega$  (as defined above, p.1 §iv): namely, either

- (i)  $\Omega$  was created as a single compilation whose lists were sorted, either initially or subsequently, into two parts which were intended to coexist from the time that each was created; or,
- (ii)  $\Omega$  consisted of two compilations separately created where the original of one, or a copy of it, was the model imitated by, and then bound together with, the original of the other; or
- (iii)  $\Omega$  consisted of two compilations separately created, at different times, but in conformity with the same model, and were subsequently associated in the same place and bound together;

By dividing their editions into two parts and each interpolating a single - though different - title to comprehend both parts, Böcking and Seeck structured their editions to support alternative (i). Unsurprisingly, therefore, users of their editions have mostly supported the same speculation about  $\Omega$ . But the available or extant evidence is insufficient to decide between the three alternatives and, even within the codex  $\Sigma$  itself, alternative (ii) describes the relationship between the copies of the two Regionaries (city catalogues) that coexisted in both the codex  $\Sigma$  and in the codex that contained the archetype of the '*Notitia urbis constantinopolitanae*'. It is important, therefore, to refer to the lists and 89 pictures in the codex  $\Sigma$  in a manner that does not incorporate speculation about the original compilation  $\Omega$ .

The invention and interpolation of the unqualified title *Notitia dignitatum* for these lists and 89 pictures was not customary before the middle of the 19thC. Before that time, these lists and pictures or the codices that contained them, were identified by various invented titles and descriptions, as noted in *Commentary - §1: Introduction*. It would be accurate to refer to these lists and pictures as: "*the compilation of lists and 89 pictures that began with the list item Notitia dignitatum [...] in partibus orientis and ended with the list item Ceteri praesides [...] dalmatiae officium habent and occupied 164 pages in the codex  $\Sigma$  that existed in the library of the Speyer cathedral chapter, at least between 1426/7 and 1550/1.*" This description can be simplified without any speculation about, or invention of a title for, the original compilation. The lists and pictures can be referred to as a *compilation* to describe their coexistence within the codex  $\Sigma$  and, in order to identify this *compilation* the long description cited above can be abbreviated by adding the words '*notitia dignitatum*', according to the general practice of referring to untitled documents by their first two words. The description of the lists and pictures as the *Compilation 'notitia dignitatum' (Cnd)* incorporates no speculation about any title for, or in, the original compilation; the number of parts into which the lists and pictures can or ought to be sorted; the relationship of the two central pictures to the rest; or whether the first item in each precedence list is a title only to that list or to all the lists that follow it.

Having divided the contents of his edition of the *Cnd* into two separately numbered parts, Seeck next divided each of these parts into chapters (*capita* or *Capitel*) and then numbered each of these, using the same set of Roman numerals (I-XLV) in each part. To distinguish the first set of numbers from the second set, he added the abbreviation *Or* (for *Notitia orientis*) to the former and *Oc* (for *Notitia occidentis*) to the latter, although these abbreviations were printed only in the page headers and not beside the Roman numeral interpolated at the beginning of each of his chapters. Böcking invented the practice of dividing a representation of the *Cnd* into numbered chapters but, unlike Seeck, printed the word *Caput* and its number in italics, and enclosed by square brackets, to identify them as interpolations.

In dividing his edition of the *Cnd* into chapters, and numbering them, Seeck did not define what criteria he used to identify a chapter and it is difficult to determine these from his edition. After assigning a

## Appendix 4

chapter number to each of the two precedence lists, *Cnd.1/2* and *Cnd.85/6*,<sup>49</sup> which contained almost entirely the names of the service positions of directors of agencies in the imperial service, he appears to have identified as a chapter any list containing items pertaining to the agency of each one of these directors, together with any picture or pictures illustrating such a list. His identification of a chapter on that basis appears to be suggested by his belief that each list pertaining to an agency, and any picture illustrating it, occupied a separate folium in his official *Notitia*.<sup>50</sup> But there were problems.

Firstly, as mentioned above, Seeck identified the two pictures *Cnd.83-84*, as a single chapter with the interpolated number Or.XLV and the title *Finis*, adding a continuous set of numbers to their drawing captions and inscriptions comprising 1-16 on the first page and 17-33 on the second (no numbers were included to denote the drawings of inscribed scrolls). But neither of these two pictures was demonstrably associated with the other picture or with any list.

Secondly, Seeck identified and numbered, as two separate chapters, two lists which, in the *Cnd*, each followed an agency list without any intervening blank line spaces. The first list, *Cnd.102/5.53-260*, which began with the item *Qui numeri ex praedictis per infrascriptas provincias habeantur intra italiam*, Seeck numbered as Oc.VII, additionally interpolating the title *Distributio numerorum*, printed in the page headers. The second list, *Cnd.156/8.22-87*, which began with the item: *Item praepositurae magistri militum praesentalium a parte peditum in italia*, he numbered as Oc.XLII with the interpolated title *Praepositurae magistri peditum* again printed in the page headers.

The identification of these two lists as separate sections or chapters by Seeck involved problems arising from several observations of which the following are the most obvious:

- (i) the expression *ex praedictis*, in item *Cnd.102/5.53*, suggests that at least part of the list following that item pertained to the preceding agency list or lists (yet Seeck numbered them as a separate chapter);
- (ii) a part of the list *Cnd.102/5.53-260* comprised the complete list related to the agency directed by the officer identified as *magister equitum per gallias* (but Seeck did not number these as a separate agency list);
- (iii) the adverb *Item* in *Cnd.156/8.22* identified the following list as either a part of, or an excerpt from, a larger list, as did the same word in the ten other lists that began with the same word,<sup>51</sup> in addition to two further instances within the list *Cnd.156/8.22-87* itself (Seeck identified his copy of *Cnd.156/8.22-87* as listing the *praepositurae magistri peditum* and thus pertaining to the agency of the director whose remaining jurisdiction was represented in another of his chapters, and yet he did not assign the same number to both lists).

Thirdly, however, Seeck elsewhere included within a chapter the following items which, in the *Cnd*, also followed the preceding list without any intervening blank line spaces.

The descriptive statement *Cnd.81.12: Ceteri omnes consulares ad similitudinem consularis palaestinae officium habent*<sup>52</sup>, occurred in the *Cnd* directly after the *officium* (secretariat) list of the *consularis palaestinae*. Similar descriptive statements occurred after the *officium* in the lists relating to the agencies individually directed by the *praeses thebaidos*, the *consularis campaniae*, the *corrector apuliae et calabriae* and the *praeses dalmatiae*.<sup>53</sup> Each of these five descriptive statements implies that a

---

<sup>49</sup> Seeck Or.I and Oc.I.

<sup>50</sup> Seeck (V.1876) p.71: *Dieses Verzeichniss [...] giebt die uns vorliegende Notitia Dignitatum theils im Auszuge, theils in wörtlicher Abschrift wieder. Die Liste wurde wahrscheinlich in der Weise geführt, dass jeder Beamte mindestens ein Blatt füllte, und wenn in seinem Tätigkeitsgebiet Aenderungen vorfielen, diese so lange am Rande angemerkt wurden, bis entweder eine durchgreifende Neugestaltung des Amtes stattfand oder durch die Zahl der Nachträge Verwirrung drohte. Trat eins von beidem ein, so nam man die einzelnen Blätter heraus und ersetzte sie durch neue.*

<sup>51</sup> *Cnd.12.42; 15.25; 21.23; 61.31; 74.18; 76.20; 78.10; 80.19; 102/5.209; 154.16.*

<sup>52</sup> Seeck Or.XLIII 14.

<sup>53</sup> *Cnd.82.11: Ceteri omnes praesides ad similitudinem praesidis thebaidae officium habent* (Or.XLIV 15);

## Appendix 4

secretariat, similar to the one itemised in the list to which the statement is attached, existed under the jurisdiction of each director in the category of service position mentioned in the statement. Accordingly, each statement represents the list to which it is attached, either as an abridgement (implying that similar agency or secretariat lists existed but have not been included) or as a model (implying that similar lists did not exist but could be produced by duplicating the one provided).

Böcking numbered each statement as a new chapter,<sup>54</sup> implicitly because he correctly identified each statement as not forming part of the agency list that it followed, explicitly suggesting that each statement represented an abridgement.<sup>55</sup> Seeck numbered each statement as an item within the agency list that it followed and, therefore, represented that list not as an agency list (which could not contain such a statement), but as a model for appropriate agency lists.

The assumption on which Seeck based his identification of these lists as models appears to be unsupported by several observations including, firstly, that the *officium* of the *praeses thebaidos*, is not a model for the *officia* of the remaining eastern *praesides* since it differs substantially from the *officium* of the *praeses arabiae*;<sup>56</sup> secondly, that whereas the *officium* of the *consularis campaniae* was headed by a *princeps* appointed *de officio praefecti praetorio italiae*, such an appointment is unlikely to have been a model for the *officia* of the eleven *consulares* under the jurisdiction of the *praefectus praetorio galliarum*; and, thirdly, while the names *consularis palaestinae*, the *corrector apuliae et calabriae* and the *praeses dalmatiae* all occurred as the first names among those of comparable positions in the precedence lists, the name *praeses thebaidos* occurred as the eighth name and that of the *consularis campaniae* as the ninth.

But, irrespective of this speculation, the different numbers interpolated by Böcking and by Seeck lead to different interpretations of the *Cnd* each of which simply repeats the assumption upon which their numbering was based. And it is undoubtedly only because Seeck numbered these descriptive statements as parts of the agency lists to which they were attached in the *Cnd* that those agency lists have consistently been considered to represent models.<sup>57</sup>

Finally, Seeck did not explain why, in both his eastern and western chapters, he identified and numbered as a single chapter the agency lists of the two *comites domesticorum* which were preceded by a picture divided into two parts, separately-captioned,<sup>58</sup> nor why he also identified and numbered as a single chapter the items concerning the agencies of the *magistri scriniorum*.<sup>59</sup>

---

Cnd.160.12: *Ceteri omnes consulares ad similitudinem consularis campaniae officium habent* (Oc.XLIII 14);

Cnd.162.12: *Ceteri correctores ad similitudinem correctoris apuliae et calabriae officium habent* (Oc.XLIV 15);

Cnd.164.12: *Ceteri praesides ad similitudinem praesidis dalmatiae officium habent* (Oc.XLV 15).

<sup>54</sup> Böcking (Ed.1839-1853) v.1, pp.100-113: Cnd.81.a-11 = [Caput XL] and 81.12 = [Caput XLI], Cnd.a-10 = [Caput XLII] and 82.11 = [Caput XLIII], Cnd.159.a-160.11 = [Caput XLI] and 160.12 = [Caput XLII], Cnd.161.a-162.1 = [Caput XLIII] and 162.12 = [Caput XLIV], Cnd.163.a-164.11 = [Caput XLV] and 164.12 = [Caput XLVI].

<sup>55</sup> Böcking (Ed.1839-1853) v.1, pp.514-515: *Fortasse ab initio loco huius capitis XIV capita liber noster continebat, quibus ceteri omnes Consulares, cap.I 21 enumerati, eodem modo, quo superiori capite de Consulari Palaestinae agitur, additis singulorum symbolis sive insignibus, recensebantur: [...]. Neque plus liber noster, ut nunc est, dicit, quam ceteros omnes Consulares ad similitudinem Consularis Palaestinae Officium habuisse.*

<sup>56</sup> Cnd.61.31-39.

<sup>57</sup> For example, Bury (ND.1920) pp. 134: *No example is given of the insignia and officium of a corrector; one would have expected to find a section on the corrector Augustamnicae, for instance, between xliii consularis Palaestinae and xliv praeses Thebaidos.* Polaschek (ND.1936) col.1081: *Auch ein [...] Musterkapitel des corrector fehlt in or.*

<sup>58</sup> Cnd.29-30 = Seeck Or.XV and Cnd.114 = Seeck Oc.XIII.

<sup>59</sup> Cnd.35-36 = Seeck Or.XIX and Cnd.117 = Seeck Oc.XVII.

## Appendix 4

Having divided his edition of the *Cnd* into two parts, and then subdivided these into numbered chapters, Seeck next altered the sequence of some of these chapters on the basis of his attempt to reconstruct the gatherings of folia which he considered to have existed in his *liber primarius*.

As stated above, *Cnd* contained two lists that each contained the names of the service positions of most directors of agencies in the imperial civil and military services, down to and including the position of provincial governors. The first list, *Cnd.1/2* began with the item: *Notitia dignitatum omnium tam civilium quam militarium in partibus orientis* and the second list, *Cnd.85/6* with the item *Notitia dignitatum omnium tam civilium quam militarium in partibus occidentis*. It is not known whether these items are the titles only of the lists of which each was the first item, or to the titles the entire compilations of lists which follows each of them.

Both lists contained almost the same categories of service position names arranged in the same sequence, which is generally in order of the rank of the listed positions and, for this reason, these lists may be referred to as precedence lists. The positions are listed from the highest to the lowest position, except that within each category of diocesan or provincial civil governors and regional or provincial military directors, most positions are listed in a geographical order.

Most of the remaining lists that followed each precedence list in the *Cnd* were agency lists, each of which contained items relating to the agency directed by one of the different directors whose position names were listed in the precedence list (except the composite lists relating to the *comites domesticorum* and the *magistri scriniorum*). The lists of the agencies were arranged generally, but not precisely, in the same sequence in which the names of the service positions of the directors of those agencies were listed in the precedence lists. The precedence lists contained the service position names of some directors whose agency lists did not occur in the *Cnd*, but the *Cnd* contained no list of an agency whose director was not listed in the precedence list.

The relationship between the precedence lists, and the agency lists which followed them, in the original compilation  $\Omega$  is not known. The possibilities include the following two: either

- (i) that the names of the service positions of directors in the precedence lists in the *Cnd* were derived from a source in which those names referred to, and were consistent with, agency lists that actually followed them, but that some of those agency lists were later either accidentally lost from, or deliberately not copied into, either the *Cnd* or an exemplar of it; or,
- (ii) that the names of the service positions of directors in the precedence lists in the *Cnd* were derived from a source in which those names identified all those directors for whom agencies lists were to be created, but that this intention was never fully realised - perhaps, for example, because the information was unavailable.

Seeck chose the first of these alternatives because he believed, and stated, that the precedence lists were tables of contents to the sections that he identified as chapters.<sup>60</sup> He then followed Böcking by interpolating the word *Index* as the title to each precedence list. But while Böcking had interpolated this title at the beginning of his lists, he also enclosed the title in square brackets to identify it as an interpolation. Seeck did not identify it as such and simply printed it, like all his interpolated chapter titles, among his page headers.

Seeck may have been prompted to follow Böcking in interpolating the title *Index* because, having interpreted the first item (*Notitia dignitatum* etc) in each precedence list as the title comprehending all the lists that followed it, rather than as the title only of the precedence list itself, that list appeared to be without a title, inviting the interpolation of one such as *Index*. In his edition, Seeck neither stated nor indicated that neither the word *index* nor *caput* existed anywhere within the *Cnd*, with the result that the interpolation of these two words has led to the almost universal belief that these two words existed in the *Cnd*.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) . p.xii: *capita ea, quae in indicibus promittuntur*.

<sup>61</sup> For example, Polaschek (ND.1936) col.1091: *In or. wie in occ, ist ferner das Kapitel des castrensis sacri palatii vor dem des primicerius notariorum gereiht, im Widerspruch zu der umgekehrten Stellung in den Indices*. Jones, A.H.M., *The later Roman empire 284-602. A social, economic and*

## Appendix 4

The assumption, by both Böcking and Seeck, that the precedence lists were tables of contents to their chapters ignored several problems. For example, the first precedence list, *Cnd.1/2*, contained no reference to the two pictures which Seeck identified as his chapter *Or.XLV* with the title *Finis*; while the second precedence list, *Cnd.85/6*, did not refer to the chapter which Böcking numbered *Not.Occ.Caput VII* with the title *Numeri sub magistris militum* and Seeck *Oc.VII* with the title *Distributio numerorum*; The second precedence list also did not refer to the chapter that Böcking numbered *Not.Occ.Caput XL* with the title *Praepositurae mag.mil.praes.ped.* and Seeck *Oc.XLII* with the title *Praepositurae magistri peditum*. Conversely, the second precedence list referred to the position of *magister equitum per gallias* whose agency list existed in *Cnd.102/5.114-169, 217-229*, but was not identified or numbered as a separate chapter by either editor.

Noting that differences existed between the number and sequence of the service position names in the precedence lists, and the number and sequence of his remaining chapters, Seeck speculated on whether his *liber primarius* could have exhibited a greater degree of consistency between his *index* and his chapters than that which existed in the *Cnd*.<sup>62</sup>

Accordingly Seeck nominated a number of conditions which, if they had all existed in his *liber primarius*, would have allowed the latter to have had a spatial distribution of its contents which would have exhibited such a greater coincidence. He described these conditions as follows:<sup>63</sup> namely, that:

- (i) his *liber primarius* consisted of 13 quaternions and one senio (that is, a total of 116 folia or 232 pages (compared with 164 pages in the *Cnd* - which included one page without a picture or list);
- (ii) its text was arranged in two columns per page with a maximum of 26 lines per column;
- (iii) blank pages were inserted after almost every *gradus dignitatis* (which he did not define) as well as before and after each so-called *index*;
- (iv) a picture and list did not share the same page;
- (v) each of his chapters occupied a minimum of two pages;
- (vi) four lists (his *Or.I, Oc.I, Oc.VII* and *Oc.XLII*) were not preceded by pictures but had ornate titles which filled half a page or more;
- (vii) other pages (his *Or.II, Or.IX, Oc.III, Oc.XIX*) which were intended to have pictures were mistakenly left blank;
- (viii) four bifolia existing in the *liber primarius* were subsequently lost ([-]+*Or.IV, OR.XXVII+Or.XXX, Oc.VIII+insig.prim.s.c., OC.XXXIX+ part Oc.XLII*);
- (ix) two other bifolia were misbound (*OR.XXXIV+Or.XXXVII, Oc.XXIV+Oc.XXVII*);
- (x) lists contained neither gaps nor repeated entries.

The application of these conditions formed the basis of an elaborate *discriptio quaternionum et foliorum* or *Quaternionenverzeichnis* in which Seeck described what he considered to have been the spatial distribution of the contents which he imagined existed in his hypothetical *liber primarius*.<sup>64</sup>

Not one of the conditions which Seeck speculated to have existed in his *liber primarius* is consistent with what is known about the spatial distribution of the contents of the *Cnd* in the codex **Σ**. Instead of using the spatial distribution of the *Cnd* as the basis for his concept of the one in his *liber primarius*, Seeck used what he considered ought to have been the relationship between his *index* and his chapters, stating that where his concept of the contents of his *liber primarius* differed from the contents of the *Cnd*, the differences arose in those places where the *Cnd* contained a changed copy of his *liber primarius*.<sup>65</sup>

---

*administrative survey.* (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1964), vol.3, p.350: *In both the Eastern and Western sections there is the same anomaly that the primicerius notariorum ranks before the castrensis in the Index but after him in the order of chapters.*

<sup>62</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) . p.xii: *summi momenti est, utrum capita ea, quae in indicibus promittuntur, in ipso libro non inveniuntur, casu aliquo exciderint an nusquam in codice archetypo fuerint.*

<sup>63</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) pp.xi-xii developed from (Q.1872) pp.16-20.

<sup>64</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) pp.xii-xviii : *discriptionem quaternionum et foliorum integram proponam*, and (Q.1872) pp.20-31, referred to (K.1875) p.228 as the *Quaternionenverzeichnis*.

<sup>65</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) p.xxvi: *Diuisio autem illa columnarum et paginarum, quam in archetypo fuisse uidimus, cum magnam et inutilem, ut uidebatur, membranae profusionem requireret, penitus <in*

## Appendix 4

On the basis of this speculation about the contents of his *liber primarius*, and his assumption about the relationship between the precedence lists and the agency lists that followed them in the *Cnd*, Seeck altered the sequence of some of his chapters, invented and numbered other chapters, and then incorporated all these changes within his edition of the *Cnd*.

Böcking also invented chapters to transform his edition of the *Cnd* to accord with his concept of the contents of the original compilation. But, whereas Böcking placed all his chapter numbers in square brackets to identify them as interpolations, and used Arabic numbers for invented chapters instead of the Roman numbers that he used for the rest, Seeck did neither and, again, his changes were inconsistent.

For example, he invented and numbered chapters for a *praefectus urbis constantinopolitanae* (Or.IV); a *primicerius sacri cubiculi* (Or.XVI); a *vicarius dioeceseos macedoniae* (Or.XXVII), a *praepositus sacri cubiculi* (Oc.VIII) and a *dux germaniae primae* (Oc.XXXIX) whose position names existed in the precedence lists. But, inconsistently, he did not invent chapters for others, such as the *vicarius italiae* or an eastern *corrector*. Nor did he include a chapter for a *magister equitum per gallias* whose agency list actually existed in *Cnd.102/5*.

His invention and numbering of a chapter for a *primicerius sacri cubiculi* (his Or.XVI) and a *praepositus sacri cubiculi* (his Oc.VIII) exemplifies some of the problems with his interpolations.

Firstly, he identified and numbered as his chapter Or.X, for the eastern *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, the single item *Cnd.21.42*, which in the *Cnd* was the last item that occurred on the same page as the agency list of the *magister militum per illyricum*, from which it was separated by a single blank line space. He suggested that this single item in his *liber primarius* occupied an entire page and was preceded by another page reserved for a picture that was never added.<sup>66</sup>

Secondly, he identified and numbered as his chapter Oc.XIV, for the western *primicerius sacri cubiculi*, the single item *Cnd.114.5* which, in the *Cnd*, was also the last item that occurred on the same page as the agency lists of the *comites domesticorum* which it followed without any intervening blank line space. He suggested that this single item in his *liber primarius* occupied an entire page and that it was also preceded by a page containing a picture, but that this picture was later lost.<sup>67</sup>

Thirdly, he invented and numbered as Oc.VIII a chapter for the western *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, speculating that in this case both the picture and list occurred in his *liber primarius* but were later lost.<sup>68</sup>

Fourthly, he invented and numbered as Or.XVI a chapter for the eastern *primicerius sacri cubiculi*, but stated that the picture and list were never included in his *liber primarius*.<sup>69</sup>

In each of these four instances, the explanation for the absence of expected picture or list in the *Cnd* differed according to what was permitted by his *Quaternionenverzeichnis*, but no speculation was

---

codice Spirensi> sublata est. Et insignia quidem in codice Spirensi paginas novas incipere solebant - spatium enim alia ratione non suffecisset - sed contextus, si breuior erat, non nunquam subiciebatur tabulae et ubi hoc factum non est, ita scriptus erat, ut commata prima: 'sub dispositione etc.' per totam paginam continuarentur, spatium autem reliquum in tot columnas diuideretur, ut maiora etiam, capita pagina una plerumque caperet. At capita ea, quibus insignia nulla opposita erant, ita praecedentibus adnectebantur, ut in media columna incipientes partem illorum efficere uiderentur.

<sup>66</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) p.xiii: *fol.17b - insignibus praepositi sacri cubiculi destinata erat, quae pictoris uitio omissa est. | fol.18a - Or.X; and p.30: insignia praepositi sacri cubiculi desiderantur.*

<sup>67</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) p.xvi: *fol.80b - insignia primicerii sacri cubiculi perierunt* and p.158: *Excidit folium unum, cuius pagina altera [...] continebat insignia primicerii sacri cubiculi.*

<sup>68</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) p.xvi: *fol.73a|73b - insignia praepositi sacri cubiculi | Oc.VIII perierunt* and p.143: *Excidit folium unum, quod pagina altera continebat insignia praepositi sacri cubiculi, altera, quae sub dispositione eius erant.*

<sup>69</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) p.40: *XVI. Caput, quo de primicerio sacri cubiculi actum erat, librarii culpa omissum est. (Q.1872) p.22: Librario [...] Lapsu tamen memoriae [...] ad insequentem paginam transiret. Tum autem in descriptionem castrensis incidit [...]. Ita factum est ut hodie cum insignia tum titulos primicerii sacri cubiculi desideremus.*

## Appendix 4

presented to explain why his *liber primarius* allegedly had two chapters each consisting only of a single item, or why the second of these items contained no reference to any entity or duty of the named agency. More significantly, by inventing and numbering chapter Or.XVI for the eastern *primicerius sacri cubiculi*, and stating that this chapter never existed in his *liber primarius* (as indicated both by his statement and by its omission from his *Quaternionenverzeichnis*), Seeck included in his edition not what he thought was a chapter in his *liber primarius*, but actually a chapter in its exemplar, which he identified as his official *Notitia*.

An alternative to the various explanations offered by Seeck may arise from a comparison of the complete contents of the *Cnd* relating to these four service positions:

Cnd.1/2.9 PL	<i>Praepositus sacri cubiculi</i>	Cnd.85/6.8 PL	<i>Praepositus sacri cubiculi</i>
Cnd.21.42 AL	<i>Sub dispositione viri illustris praepositus sacri cubiculi domus divina per cappadociam</i>	AL	<no agency list>
Cnd.1/2:17 PL	<i>Primicerius sacri cubiculi</i>	Cnd.85/6.15 PL	<i>Primicerius sacri cubiculi</i>
AL	<no agency list>	Cnd.114.5 AL	<i>Sub dispositione viri spectabilis primicerii sacri cubiculi</i>

PL = precedence list; AL = agency list

This comparison indicates that the *Cnd* effectively contained no agency list for any of these four officers. In the *Cnd*, items *Cnd.21.42* and *Cnd.114.5* each occurred as the last item on a page containing the agency list of another director; neither item was preceded by a picture; no details of the *officium* of either agency was recorded; and, of these two items, *Cnd.21.42* may have been an excerpt from details of the agency of the *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, about which some other details are known from copies of laws,<sup>70</sup> while the item *Cnd.114.5* was only a heading, unaccompanied by any agency items.

On the basis of these observations, it may be speculated that both items (*Cnd.21.42* and *114.5*) may have been marginal annotations added in a source of the *Cnd*. The fact that the *Cnd* named these two positions in each of the precedence lists, but only had an excerpt of a single item concerning one of them, is probably not accidental especially since, with the exception of that single excerpted item, the agency lists of all four officers - two in the east and the same two in the west - were effectively absent from the *Cnd*. This absence may be related to the fact that the four officers were the chief eunuchs at each of the two courts. Whatever the explanation, the contents of the *Cnd* provide no evidence to support the invention of these chapters by Seeck.

In addition to inventing some of his numbered chapters, Seeck changed the sequence of others.

In the eastern precedence list in the *Cnd*, the service position names of the *duces limitum* (frontier provincial directors of soldiers) were listed according to the dioceses in which their provinces existed and these dioceses were arranged in a geographic sequence proceeding from south to north and east to west. The agency lists of these directors, with the exception of the last two, (*Moesia I* and *Dacia ripensis*) were also arranged in the same geographic sequence from south to north and east to west, but this time not according to their dioceses but only to their provinces.

<sup>70</sup> The laws indicate that under the supervision of the *praepositus sacri cubiculi* were included: the *primicerius sacri cubiculi* mentioned in Cnd.1/2.17 and 85/6.15 - Cod.Iust.12.5.2(428) + Cod.Theod.11.18.1(409/412); the *castrensis sacri palatii* mentioned in Cnd.1/2.19 and 85/6.17 (agency lists Cnd.32 and 115) - Cod.Iust. 12.5.2(428) + Cod.Theod.11.18.1(409/412); the *comes domorum per cappadociam* by 414, partly mentioned in Cnd.21.42 - Cod.Theod.11.28.9(414) + Cod.Iust.12.5.2(428); one of the three *chartularii sacri cubiculi* - Nov.Iust.8§7 and §notitia (535); the *comes sacrae vestis* Cod.Theod.11.18.1(409/412); the *schola silentiariorum* - Cod.Iust.12.16.4(c.488-491), Cod.Iust.5.62.25 (499), including *comites/tribuni* - Cod.Iust.12.16.5(497-499) and *decuriones* - Cod.Theod. 6.23.1(415) + Cod.Iust.12.16.1(415); and *cubicularii* in general - Cod.Iust.12.5.2(428), Cod.Iust. 12.5,title(534) including officers referred to as *primi cubiculariorum* - Cod.Theod.6.27.8(396).

## Appendix 4

Precedence list		Agency lists	
Cnd.		Cnd.	
1/2.38	Duces per aegyptum duo	54.14-19	Dux libyarum <fragment>
1/2.39	Libyarum	56/7	Dux thebaidos
1/2.40	Thebaidos	59	Dux palaestinae
1/2.41	per orientem sex	61	Dux arabiae
1/2.42	Foenicis	63	Dux foenicis
1/2.43	Eufratensis & syriae	65	Dux syriae et eufratensis syriae
1/2.44	Palaestinae	67	Dux osrhoenae
1/2.45	Osrhoenae	69	Dux mesopotamiae
1/2.46	Mesopotamiae	71	Dux armeniae
1/2.47	Arabiae	74	Dux scythiae
1/2.48	per ponticam unus	76	Dux moesiae secundae
1/2.49	Armeniae	78	Dux moesiae primae
1/2.50	per thracias duo	80	Dux daciae ripensis
1/2.51	Moesiae secundae		
1/2.52	Scythiae		
1/2.53	per illyricum ii		
1/2.54	Daciae ripensis		
1/2.55	Moesiae primae		

Regarding the precedence list as an *index* to his chapters, Seeck arranged and numbered his chapters for some of these commands in the sequence: Or.XXXII-*Foenice*, Or.XXXIII-*Syria*, Or.XXXIV-*Palaestina*, Or.XXXV-*Osrhoena*, Or.XXXVI-*Mesopotamia*, Or.XXXVII-*Arabia*, Or.XXXVIII-*Armenia* to create a greater agreement between his *index* and his *chapters*. But, inconsistently, he did not alter the sequence of the last four lists, his Or.XXXIX-*Scythia*, Or.XL-*Moesia secunda*, Or.XLI-*Moesia prima*, Or.XLII-*Dacia ripensis*. His changes not only removed evidence concerning the relationship between the sequence of names in the precedence and that of the agency lists, but also obscured the fact that both the precedence list and the agency lists followed the same geographic arrangement, but based on different administrative divisions.

Seeck similarly changed the sequence of some of his chapters for the western *comites rei militaris* (regional directors of soldiers). In the *Cnd*, these agency lists were arranged in the order *Cnd.128.Africa*, *130.Tingitania*, *132.Litus saxon: per britann:*, *133.Britann:*, *134.Italiae*, *135.Tractus Argentoratensis*. Seeck rearranged these and numbered them as his chapters *Oc.XXIV-Italiae*, *Occ.XXV-Africa*, *Oc.XXVI-Tingitania*, *Oc.XXVII-Argentoratensis*, *Oc.XXVIII-Litus saxon: per britanniam*, *Oc.XXIX-Britanniae*, thus changing the position of *Italia* and *Tractus argentoratensis* but, again inconsistently, not of *Britann:* and *Litus saxon: per britann:*

Precedence list		Agency list			
85/6.30	Comites rei militaris sex		Domain	Secretariat	
85/6.31	Italiae	comes africae	128.1-18	128.19-28	
85/6.32	Africae	comes tingitaniae	130.1-9	130.10-19	
85/6.33	Tingitaniae	comes litoris saxon: per britann:	132.1-10	132.11-20	
85/6.34	Tractus argentoratensis	comes britann:	x	(units in <i>Cnd.102/5</i> )	133.3-10
85/6.35	Britanniarum	comes italiae	x	(no units)	x (no secr.)
85/6.36	Litoris saxonici per britannias	comes tractus argentoratensis	x	(no units)	x (no secr.)

(the same sequence existed in *Cnd.98/9.3-8*)

A possible explanation for the sequence of these agency lists in the *Cnd* arises from their contents. These suggest that, while the agency lists could possibly have been arranged initially in the order in which they occurred in both *Cnd.85/6.31-36* (and a corresponding list in *Cnd.98/9.3-8*), the order of the agency lists in the *Cnd* may have been determined by the progressively-decreasing contents of those lists. If this were correct, then the actual sequence of these agency lists in the *Cnd* would provide evidence for the additional possibility that this arrangement occurred after the *comitatenses* units had been transferred from the agency list of the *comes britann:* to the list *Cnd.102/5*. But the evidence for such speculations, based on the contents of the *Cnd*, is again obscured in the edition produced by Seeck.

While Seeck misrepresented the sequence of some agency lists in the *Cnd* (the lists related to *Palaestina*, *Arabia*, *Italia* and *Argentoratensis* mentioned above), by basing the sequence of his chapters on that existing in the precedence lists, other discrepancies existing between the precedence lists and agency lists were inconsistently left unresolved.

For example, Seeck proposed no change where the western precedence list named the positions of three *duces* in the sequence *Cnd.85/6.40-42: Pannoniae primae, Pannoniae secundae, Valeriae ripensis*, but

## Appendix 4

their agency lists occurred in the order *Cnd.141: Pannonia secunda*, *143: Valeria ripensis* and *145: Pannonia prima*, which coincided with the sequence existing in another list of *duces* in *Cnd.98/9.12-14*. He also left unchanged the positions of his chapters related to both the eastern and western *primicerius notariorum* and *castrensis sacri palatii*, whose positions appeared in that order in both precedence lists but whose agency lists occurred in the reverse sequence. He did not explain why he altered the sequence of some of his chapters but not of others. The implicit reason was that the remaining differences between his *index* and his *capita* could not be obviated by imagining displacements among the bifolia contained in his *Quaternionenverzeichniss*.

But problems exist not only in relation to the identification and numbering of his chapters, which Seeck based, though sometimes inconsistently, on his concept of the possible contents of his *liber primarius*; it exists also in relation to the numbers which he added to items within his chapters.

Seeck printed his conjectural changes to the list items of the *Cnd* in italics, but he did not identify his interpolated Roman numbers for chapters or Arabic numbers for captions and list items in the same way. Moreover, within his chapters, he numbered any interpolated items within the series of numbers that he attached to the remaining items, as for example, the second item in his list:

- Oc.VI. 45 Equites brachiati seniores
- 46 *Equites brachiati iuniores*
- 47 Equites Bataui seniores

This now makes it difficult to remove such interpolations, or to propose others, without disturbing the sequence of the numbers that he attached to these list items. And such revisions would be required, not only because of the inconsistency with which Seeck created these changes, but also because of their potential influence in any interpretation of the contents of the *Cnd*.

For example, Seeck added the aforementioned name of the cavalry unit *Equites brachiati iuniores* as item Oc.VI 46, because that name occurred in his chapter Oc.VII.<sup>71</sup> Notwithstanding the fact that his interpolation incorporated some questionable assumptions,<sup>72</sup> he inconsistently did not add any of the

---

<sup>71</sup> *Cnd.102/5.221* = Seeck Oc. VII 170.

<sup>72</sup> The rubricated title *Cnd.102/5.2 Vexillationes palatinae decem*, preceding the list of units in *Cnd.102/5.3-11* = Seeck Oc. VI 43-52 appeared to indicate that the name of a cavalry unit was absent, because while the rubric referred to ten units, the following list contained the names of apparently only nine. This rubric was the only one in *Cnd.102/5* that had a number attached to it and, as is apparent elsewhere, the rubric numbers in the *Cnd* were not always accurate, most obviously in *Cnd.89.30*, where the *prouvinciae [...] africae septem* actually referred to five provinces and two officers.

If there were only nine units, an incorrect total could have arisen from the form in which the last item in this list may have been written in the *Cnd*. The mutually-independent versions disagree as to whether the four words *Equites constantes ualentinianenses seniores*, identified as the item *Cnd.102/5.11*, were intended to represent one unit or two. While Seeck identified these words as one unit: Occ. VI 52, printed in the form, *Equites constantes Ualentinianenses seniores*, Böcking identified them as two units Oc.VI.§I.A.9: *Equites constantes* and Oc.VI.§I.A.10: *Valentinianenses seniores*. If the four words in the *Cnd* had been written as if to represent two units, instead of one, the list would have appeared to contain the names of *decem* units.

The uncertainty about how these four words were written in the *Cnd* is not lessened by two other observations.

First, the pictures of shields prefacing the agency list of this *magister equitum* contained only one drawing caption (*Cnd.100.k Valentinianenses*) to represent the four words and, therefore, apparently as one unit. This is not decisive since elsewhere the *Cnd* listed as a single unit (*Cnd.98/9.39 Bataui matriciaci seniores*), represented by a single drawing caption (*Cnd.92.t Bataui*), the two demonstrably separate units (*Cnd.102/5.65 Bataui seniores* and *66 Matiacy seniores*).

Second, while no item elsewhere in the *Cnd* referred to a unit named *Equites constantes ualentinianenses seniores* there was another unit named *Equites constantes ualentinianenses iuniores* (*Cnd.102/5.216*) and, in relation to that item, the consensus of the mutually-independent versions indicates that those four words were identified as a separate item or single unit in the *Cnd*. The existence of this *iuniores* unit suggests the possibility that the four words in *Cnd.102/5.11*

## Appendix 4

other cavalry units that were listed in his Oc.VII, but not in his Oc.VI.<sup>73</sup> Similarly, he added a list item referring to *Rationales summarum*<sup>74</sup> within the agency list of the eastern *comes sacrarum largitionum*, presumably because these officer positions occurred in the list of the corresponding western agency, but the reference to the category *praepositi barbariciorum sive argentariorum*<sup>75</sup> that occurred in that western list was not added to the corresponding eastern list.

Seeck added the name of the military unit *Atecotti iuniores gallicani*<sup>76</sup> to his list of infantry units as item Oc.V 218 because that name (in the form *Atecotti iuniores*) occurred among the drawing captions in one of the six pictures preceding that list.<sup>77</sup> Given the relationship that existed between drawing captions and list items in the *Cnd*, his interpolation was reasonable. But again, inconsistently, he did not add to his list Oc.V the names of other infantry units that also occurred in drawing captions but not in the following list as, for example, the *Gratianenses*,<sup>78</sup> and the *Batavi iuniores*.<sup>79</sup>

Items were also inconsistently identified and numbered. For example, Seeck separated, and separately numbered, such items as *Domestici pedites | et deputati eorum*,<sup>80</sup> *chartularium et scrinium ipsius | et ceteros palatinos officii suprascripti*,<sup>81</sup> even though these were combined with the conjunction *et*, yet he left other similar items unseparated under a single number, such as *Secundocarium totius officii, qui tractat chartas ipsius officii, et ceteros palatinos*,<sup>82</sup> and *Primicerium scrinii a pecuniis, et ceteros scriniarios*.<sup>83</sup>

Seeck usually enclosed, in square brackets, words or numbers which he considered ought to be deleted, such as [*et dux et comes rei militaris*],<sup>84</sup> [*sive numerarius*],<sup>85</sup> [*comitatenses*],<sup>86</sup> or [*pro numerarios*].<sup>87</sup> But elsewhere words were simply omitted, and hence not numbered, such as the name of the military unit *Batavi*.<sup>88</sup> He acknowledged that this item existed in the *Cnd*,<sup>89</sup> so that, if he wanted to delete it, he should

---

should also be regarded as those of a single unit. But, if they are, and if that was how the four words were interpreted when the total *decem* was written, there would again be a discrepancy between that total and the following list of nine units.

If, despite this uncertainty, it were concluded that the four words represented a single unit, and that a tenth unit should be interpolated into the list, the unit *Equites brachiati iuniores* that was interpolated by Seeck would not necessarily be the first choice. The aforementioned unit *Equites constantes ualentinianenses iuniores* would be a natural associate of the *seniores* unit of the same name and could justifiably be added to the list.

<sup>73</sup> For example, Cnd.102/5.216 *Equites constantes ualentinianenses iuniores* = Seeck Oc.VII 165; Cnd.102/5.246 *Equites scutarii iuniores comitatenses* = Seeck Oc. VII 195; Cnd.102/5.251 *Equites catafractarii iuniores* = Seeck Oc. VII 200; Cnd.102/5.252 *Equites scutarii aureliaci* = Seeck Oc. VII 201; Cnd.102/5.254 *Equites stablesiani* = Seeck Oc. VII 203; Cnd.102/5.255 *Equites syri* = Seeck Oc. VII.204; and Cnd.102/5.256 *Equites taifali* = Seeck Oc. VII 205.

<sup>74</sup> Seeck Or.XIII.13.

<sup>75</sup> Cnd.110/11.66 = Seeck Oc.XI 74.

<sup>76</sup> Cnd.98/9.92.1 = Seeck Oc.V 248.

<sup>77</sup> Cnd.95.g = Seeck Oc.V 70.

<sup>78</sup> Cnd.17.q = Seeck Or.VIII 22.

<sup>79</sup> Cnd.94.p = Seeck Oc.V 58.

<sup>80</sup> Cnd.30.3 = Seeck Or.XV 7-8.

<sup>81</sup> Cnd.32.9 = Seeck Or.XVII 10-11.

<sup>82</sup> Cnd.28.13 = Seeck Or.XIV 14.

<sup>83</sup> Cnd.110/11.86 = Seeck Oc.XI 97.

<sup>84</sup> Cnd.3.13 = Seeck Or.II 14.

<sup>85</sup> Cnd.91.23 = Seeck Oc.IV 25.

<sup>86</sup> Cnd.102/5.258, 259, 260 = Seeck Oc.VII 207, 208, 209.

<sup>87</sup> Cnd.160.6 = Seeck Oc.XLIII 8

## Appendix 4

have listed it between his Oc.VII 71 and 72 and then enclosed it in square brackets to identify it as an item to be deleted.

Finally, Seeck provided no numbering system to enable references to be made to his representations of the uncaptioned or uninscribed drawings that existed in pictures in the *Cnd*.

The absence of such a system was partly necessitated by his unexplained decision to print only 61 of the 89 pictures. In place of the remaining 28 pictures, he printed only their picture captions, most of their drawing captions and some of their drawing inscriptions, but omitted all of their drawings. Since these captions and inscriptions were the only items that could be numbered in the case of those 28 pictures whose drawings were not printed, these captions and inscriptions were also the only items that he numbered in the remaining 61 pictures.

His selective printing of pictures, and his restricted system of numbering their contents, may be related both to the limited evidence that he had for the contents of the pictures (he did not consult the pictures in all the primary copies known to him) and to his refusal to evaluate that limited evidence. This led to unusual and unsatisfactory results. Thus, for example, despite having stated that the pictures in the primary copy **W** were the most accurate copy, or a reproduction, of the pictures of the *Cnd*, and that **W** had been created because the pictures in **M** had been deemed unsatisfactory,<sup>90</sup> Seeck then decided to derive from **M** the decorations on 266 of the 284 drawings representing shields printed in his edition.<sup>91</sup> He excused this decision by stating that these drawings from **M** would provide the user of his edition with additional source material to augment that provided by Böcking and by the Froben imprint of 1552.<sup>92</sup>

The limitations inherent in his selective numbering of the contents of the pictures are obvious.

Firstly, since Seeck numbered only picture captions, drawing captions and some drawing inscriptions, reference to any drawing in the 61 pictures that were printed in his edition can only be made by using the number which he attached to such captions or inscriptions. Where a drawing has neither of these, it can be referred to only by describing its location within the picture, or by naming the item being delineated - if this can be determined. This makes it difficult to refer to many drawings. It is equally difficult to refer

---

<sup>88</sup> Cnd.102/5.123.

<sup>89</sup> Seeck (K.1875) p.233: *Für eine weitere Stütze dieser Ergänzung hielt Böcking die Wiederholung von Bataui auf S.35 Z.21, doch diese ist sicher nichts als Dittographie, welche freilich, da sie M and P gemein ist, schon im Spirensis gestanden haben muss.*

<sup>90</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) un-numbered p.ix: *Res critica [...] nititur uno codice Spiraе quondam adseruatus post medium s.XVI periit. [...] apographa eius quattuor extant, quae omnia ea cum cura facta sunt, ut etiam in minimis rebus conspirent, [...]. De omnibus enim libri primarii scripturis, quin etiam de diuisione eius in paginas et columnas aequae constat ac si ipse maneret, atque adeo picturae eius felici quodam casu propemodum integrae ad nos peruenerunt. [...] cum Othonem Henricum comitem Palatinum in eo exemplari <M>, quod a clericis Spirensibus dono acceperat, picturarum immutatio offenderet, alterum exemplum confectum est, <W> quod formas codicis primarii quam accuratissime redderet et libro priori <M> adnexum principis desiderio sufficeret.*

<sup>91</sup> He derived from **W** the other 18 drawings representing shields of *Cnd*.22.3-8; 29.3 and 6; 95.20; 106.4-10; 114.3 and 6.

<sup>92</sup> Seeck (Ed.1876) p.xxviii-xxix: *Insignia ex ea codicis Monacensis parte, quam fidelissimam archetypi imaginem reddere supra [...] indicavi. [...] Cum autem miniator [...] non nunquam negligentius uersatus esset, melius me lectorum commodo consulturum esse putavi, si insignia magistrorum militum ex altera codicis parte nouella quidem ratione sed multo maiore cum diligentia composita describi iuberem. Quod ut facerem, ea quoque ratione adductus sum, ut uiris doctis, qui accuratiorem de insignibus quaestionem instituere uellent neque codices ipsos praesto haberent, quandam conferendi facultatem praeberem. Mea enim editione emissa tria picturarum, quibus de agitur, exemplaria habebunt, quae omnia riuilis diuersis ex communi fonte fluxerunt, scilicet picturas editionis Basiliensis (eadem repetitae sunt in editionibus Pancirolianis) e Spirensi ipso descriptas, Böckingianas ex codicis Monacensis parte posteriore haustas, meas, quae ex eiusdem libri parte priore originem ducunt.*

## Appendix 4

separately to a drawing and to its caption, which is generally desirable but particularly necessary in those instances where the relationship between the two is the subject of any inquiry as, for example, in the case of the drawings representing shields.

Secondly, Seeck began his numbers in each chapter by numbering the picture caption, followed by any drawing captions and some of the drawing inscriptions, and then continued that numerical series to number the items in the following list. As a result, where a series of pictures precedes a list, the captions and inscriptions cannot be readily distinguished from list items, or one picture distinguished from another, except by referring to the relevant page numbers in his edition. For example,

<i>Cnd.4</i>	Or.III <1>	is a picture caption above the first picture	p.8
<i>Cnd.5.</i>	Or.III.2-3	are drawing captions in the second picture	p.9
<i>Cnd.6</i>	Or.III 4-33	are list items.	pp.9-10

Thirdly, while Seeck generally assigned a number to those drawing inscriptions that were probably written in Latin capital alphabetic symbols in the *Cnd*, he did not number any of the inscriptions consisting of Greek alphabetic and either Roman cursive alphabetic or tachygraphic or numerical symbols existing on the drawings of either a scroll or of an open tablet, despite the fact that at least two of these inscriptions contain symbols that can clearly be identified as Greek words. The absence of numbers for these inscriptions makes it difficult to refer to them in those pictures that contain such drawings in the 61 pictures he printed, but impossible in the case of the 28 pictures whose drawings were not printed and where, therefore, the evidence for their existence has been removed.

And, once again, whatever criteria were used, they were inconsistently applied. For example, while Seeck generally assigned a number to the inscription on the rectangular emblem that is drawn in most pictures, he did not number the inscription *dea vexillata* in one tablet<sup>93</sup> nor the inscription *bos caphi* in another<sup>94</sup>, partly because he had deleted these inscriptions from the drawings on which they occurred. But he assigned a single number to the numerical symbols inscribed on the drawings of four sacks in *Cnd.25#14-17*.<sup>95</sup>

It is apparent from the foregoing description of aspects of the edition of the *Cnd* produced by Seeck that it does not provide a sufficiently accurate representation of the contents of the *Cnd* on which to base any speculation about the original compilation  $\Omega$  from which the latter was derived. There are several possible concepts about  $\Omega$ . Seeck supported one of these, as he was entitled to do, but he then used his concept of what he considered to have existed in his original compilation in order to produce an edition in which the contents of his constructed copy of the *Cnd* were changed and numbered to support his concept of his original compilation. This process was unsatisfactory to the extent that his edition naturally appears to support the concept on which he based it, to the exclusion of any of the alternative possible concepts which could be formed on the basis of the contents of the *Cnd*. Indeed, many users of the edition produced by Seeck refer to it as if it were an accurate copy of the original compilation.

Two aspects are particularly significant. Firstly, like Böcking, Seeck interpolated into his edition sectional divisions (*capita*), numbers for them, numbers for invented chapters and occasionally invented chapter titles - none of which existed in the *Cnd* - and often did so either unsystematically or inconsistently on the basis of unstated criteria, but related to his concept of his *liber primarius*. And, secondly, like Böcking, Seeck made no attempt either to reproduce, or even to indicate, the spatial distribution of the contents of the lists and pictures of the *Cnd*, which is an integral part of those contents in any speculation about the original compilation.

The replacement of the numbering used by Seeck will be inconvenient, given the large number of references in commentaries that have referred to his edition and its numbering system. But, for the reasons outlined above, that replacement is necessary and a concordance is provided as an appendix to the new edition.

---

<sup>93</sup> *Cnd.16.1* in the drawing in Seeck Or.VIII.

<sup>94</sup> *Cnd.22.1* in the drawing in Seeck Or.XI.

<sup>95</sup> Seeck Or.XIII 3.

## Appendix 4

### *Numbering the contents of the new edition of the compilation 'notitia dignitatum' (Cnd)*

As stated previously, any speculation about the original compilation  $\Omega$  from which an unknown amount of the content of the lists and pictures of the *Cnd* was derived can only be based upon the contents of the *Cnd* itself, because that is the immediate common exemplar of which primary copies exist. Those contents comprised not only the lists and pictures contained in the *Cnd*, but also their spatial distribution within the pages of the codex  $\Sigma$ .

An edition of the *Cnd*, that is, a copy constructed from the consensus and convergence of all primary copies of it, must attempt to represent, as far as possible, both the lists and the pictures of the *Cnd* and also their spatial distribution over the pages that contained them.

Any system of numbering that is interpolated into an edition the *Cnd* can be added only to facilitate references its contents, not to interpret them. Consequently, any added numbers must be clearly identified as interpolations to that which existed in the *Cnd* and, secondly, such numbers must not incorporate speculation about the possible contents of  $\Omega$ . Any interpolation must be clearly identified and must be numbered in such a manner that it could be rejected or ignored without affecting the numbering of items that actually existed in the *Cnd*. This is important if the edition of the *Cnd* is to be the basis of hypotheses about the sources and the historical facts from which it was derived.

### *Spatial distribution of pictures and lists in the new edition*

The contents of the *Cnd*, comprise not only its pictures and its lists, but also their spatial distribution within the pages of the codex  $\Sigma$ .

It is known from the primary copies of the *Cnd* that the lists and 89 pictures of the *Cnd* occupied 164 pages in the codex  $\Sigma$  by 1550/51 when the pictures of the *Cnd* were last copied from tracings of them. It is also known which pages contained pictures and which pages contained lists and, since this spatial distribution of the contents of the *Cnd* is known, and is an important part of its contents, that distribution is reproduced in the new edition, but with one limitation and one difference.

First, a limitation exists in respect of the seven lists which each occupied more than one page in the *Cnd*. While the location of the pages occupied by these seven lists in the *Cnd* is known, we do not know the point of transition from one page to the next (which was the last item on one page and the first item on the next), since this varies in the primary copies according to the different number of columns per page and the number of lines per column in which these items are arranged in those copies. Accordingly, while these seven lists in the new edition occupy the same number of pages, and in the same locations that they occupied in the *Cnd*, each of the pages of these seven lists in the edition will not necessarily have the same number of items as each of the pages with the corresponding lists in the *Cnd*.

Second, a difference exists between the spatial arrangement of the contents of the *Cnd* and those in the new edition in relation to the number of columns per page. It seems desirable that, wherever possible, each list item should occupy a single and separate line in the edition. At the same time, it is necessary to ensure that the seven lists which each occupied more than one page in the *Cnd* occupy the same number of pages in the new edition. In order to permit these two conditions to be met, the columnar arrangements have been changed to the extent that the lists which were written in two columns in the *Cnd* are printed in one column in the edition, while those written in three or four columns in the *Cnd* are printed in two columns.

### *Numbering pictures and lists in the new edition*

As previously stated, the *Cnd* contained

- (i) no title comprehending the entire compilation of lists and 89 pictures;
  - (ii) no table of contents;
  - (iii) no form or system of numbering or indexing attached to pictures, drawings, lists, or items;
  - (iv) no division of its contents into numbered sections such as books, titles, chapters, paragraphs or lists.
- Since it is known on which pages the lists and the pictures of the *Cnd* occurred, its lists and pictures can be identified accurately and objectively by referring to the numbers of the pages on which the corresponding lists occurred in the *Cnd*. And this spatial distribution is reproduced in the new edition,

Thus, for example, the first picture in the new edition will be referred to as *Cnd.4*, because that picture occupied the fourth page in the *Cnd*, as it does in the edition. Similarly, the second list in the edition will

## Appendix 4

be referred to as *Cnd.3* because it occupied the third page in the *Cnd*. But the first list in the edition will be referred to as *Cnd.1/2* because, as stated above, while it is known that the corresponding list occupied the first two pages in the *Cnd*, the exact point of transition from one page to the next in the *Cnd* is not known, so that the list is referred to by the range of the page numbers of the pages that contained them in the *Cnd*. And, consequently, within each of these lists, their items are numbered continuously from the first item on the first page to the last item on the last page, instead of separately on each page. The seven lists with this form of numbering are *Cnd.1/2*, *56/7*, *85/6*, *98/9*, *102/5*, *110/11* and *156/8*.

While the aforementioned page numbers of the *Cnd* are known, those numbers did not form any part of the contents of the *Cnd*. Consequently these numbers are clearly identified as interpolations by being printed in brackets in the form <-> in the edition.

Ideally, these page numbers, which identify the location of every picture and of every list on the pages of the *Cnd*, should be the only numbers by which reference is made to the contents of the *Cnd*. But, in order to facilitate references to the contents of the *Cnd*, the page numbers in the edition are augmented with additional numbers for list items, picture captions, drawings, drawing captions and drawing inscriptions. These additional numbers are also clearly identified in the edition as interpolations by being enclosed in <-> brackets.

But while these <-> brackets exist in the edition, they are excluded in citations in order to simplify references. For example, the first item on the third page of the edition, which is a copy of the first item that existed on the third page of the *Cnd*, is numbered in the edition as <3>< 1> *Sub dispositione [...] infrascriptae* but is referred to in the form *Cnd.3.1* in which *Cnd.* is followed by the page number and any item, drawing, caption or inscription number, or symbol, each separated by a point (.).

### *Numbering drawings, captions and inscriptions*

The *Cnd* contained 89 pictures interspersed among its lists. Of these 89 pictures, 75 were pictures that were not accompanied by a list on the same page as the picture - while the remaining 14 pictures were accompanied by a list on the same page,<sup>96</sup> but no such list continued onto the next page.

The 89 pictures comprised 67 single pictures, each of which occurred between lists, and 22 serial pictures, where two or more pictures occurred in a series or on successive pages without intervening lists. These serial pictures were contained in 9 series: 8 series of 2 pictures each,<sup>97</sup> and 1 series of 6 pictures.<sup>98</sup>

Among the 89 pictures, 87 pictures each had a drawn rectangular frame that enclosed all of its drawings. The remaining two pictures, *Cnd.83*, *84*, each had no such frame. Of the 87 framed pictures, 74 had a *picture caption* - that is, two or more words written immediately above the upper frame of the picture, or the first picture in any series, and almost always written in a single line.

Within each of the 87 framed pictures, some drawings had either captions or inscriptions:

- a *drawing caption* denotes alphabetic or numerical symbols, including words and numbers, which occurred almost always immediately above a drawing or group of drawings within a picture, but not within the outline of any such drawing;
- a *drawing inscription* denotes Latin or Greek alphabetic or numerical or tachygraphic symbols, including words and numbers, which occurred wholly or mostly within the outline of a drawing as a part of its decoration.

The remaining two pictures, *Cnd.83*, *84*, each had no picture caption and no rectangular frame enclosing all its drawings.

Almost all the drawing captions in the *Cnd* referred to items named in the lists that followed each picture or series of pictures. The drawing inscriptions did not refer to list items in the *Cnd* (with the exception of the inscriptions *Leges*, *Fl.lordanis*, and *Provincia palaestina*)

In some primary copies of the *Cnd*, drawing captions are each contained in a framed unpainted space. These *framed caption spaces* are not classified as drawings.

---

<sup>96</sup> *Cnd.25*, *81,82*, *108*, *114*, *115*, *116*, *117*, *118*, *120*, *133*, *134*, *135*, *152*

<sup>97</sup> *Cnd.7-8*, *10-11*, *13-14*, *16-17*, *19-20*, *83-84*, *87-88*, *100-101*

<sup>98</sup> *Cnd.92-97*

## Appendix 4

To enable reference to be made to these picture captions, drawing captions, drawing inscriptions and to the drawings themselves, numbers and letters have been added to the *Cnd* page numbers as follows:

- a letter is assigned to each picture caption and to each drawing caption, excluding the letters *j*, *v* and *w* to avoid confusion with *i* and *u*.

For example, *Cnd.4.a* refers to the picture caption *Insignia [...] illyricum* above the frame of the picture on the fourth page, and *Cnd.5.b* refers to the drawing caption *Macedonia* occurring above a drawing in the picture on the fifth page;

- an Arabic number, preceded by the symbol # is assigned to each drawing or group of drawings (as defined below).

For example, *Cnd.4#1* refers to the drawing of the rectangular emblem that exists on the drawing of a table in the picture on the fourth page.

The symbol # is added before the number, not only to identify the following number as referring to a drawing, but also, necessarily, to distinguish the Arabic drawing numbers from the Arabic list item numbers on those pages where a picture and a list both occur on the same page. Thus, *Cnd.25.1* refers to the first list item on the twenty-fifth page and *Cnd.25#1* to the drawing of the rectangular emblem in the picture on the same page. Within each picture, drawings are generally numbered from top to bottom and left to right.

Drawing numbers are assigned to all separate drawings, that is, drawings that are wholly surrounded by an undrawn space, except that numbers are not assigned to the frame-lines enclosing a picture nor to frame-lines enclosing drawings within a picture, nor to any representations of natural surfaces upon which drawings may be imposed, such as representations of ground or sky.

Drawing numbers are also assigned to each non-separate drawing which both represents a different kind of entity from that represented by the contiguous or infraposed drawing, such as a rectangular emblem on a table, or the drawing of a fort within the outline of a river, island or mountain. Similarly, drawing numbers are also assigned to non-separate drawings representing entities of the same kind that can be individually identified by their different designs or decoration, such as superimposed shields.

Separate drawings of the same object, or of similar objects, that are placed in close proximity to each other, or superimposed drawings of similar objects indistinguishable by different designs or decoration, are assigned a number identifying that group of drawings, rather than numbers for the individual drawings, in those instances where any one of the individual drawings could not be identified if it were absent in any copy of the *Cnd*, or if its position in a copy differed from the position of the corresponding drawing in the *Cnd*. Thus, for example, in the picture on the fourth page, the number *Cnd.4#2* is assigned to the two candles to the left of the rectangular emblem on the table and *Cnd.4#3* to the two candles to the right, instead of a separate number for each candle, since it would not be possible to identify which of the two candles remained if one of them were absent from any copy of the *Cnd*, or if two candles within a group were drawn in changed positions.

The drawing inscriptions are not numbered separately, but are referred to by the number of the drawing on which the inscription occurs. For example, the inscription that exists as a part of the drawing of the rectangular emblem in the picture on the forty-fifth page is referred to by the number of that drawing as inscription *Cnd.45#2*.

### *Numbering list items*

Each of the lists in the *Cnd* consisted of one or more items, each of which comprised one or more words, or alphabetical symbols representing numbers, or a combination of such words and numerals, which existed as a separate or distinct part of a list. In the *Cnd*, list items were identified, and separated from each other, either by the use of rubrication (an item written in red ink rather than brown or black), or by spacing (beginning a new or separate line space - generally ruled in the primary copies), or by initial capital letter, or by punctuation or by any combination these.

The identification and sequence of the list items in the edition are intended to be identical to those in the *Cnd*, with each item beginning on a new line, and identified by a separate interpolated number, but with the following exceptions:

## Appendix 4

- (1) There are several instances in the edition where a list item is assigned a number, begins with a word with an initial capital letter and is indented by two spaces from the margin, indicating that each of these items was identified in the *Cnd* as a new item by the use of an initial capital letter or punctuation, or both, but did not begin a new or separate line space. For example, the item *Achaiae* in

Cnd.1/2 <26> Asiae  
<27> Achaiae

- (2) There is one instance in the edition where a list item begins with a word with an initial lower case letter and is followed within the same item by a word with an initial capital letter, indicating that the word or words before the capital letter were identified in the *Cnd* as part of the preceding item by the use of an initial lower case letter and spacing or punctuation.

Cnd.151 <14> Senoniam  
<15> secundam Lugdunensem

- (3) There is one instance, apart from (4) below, where a separate line of words in the edition is not assigned a number, begins with a word with an initial capital letter and is indented by two spaces from the margin, indicating that the words on this line were identified in the *Cnd* as a new item by the use of an initial capital letter at the beginning of a new line, but that these words are considered to have been part of the preceding item (probably a marginal or interlinear annotation).

Cnd.160 <6> Tabularios duos  
Pro numerarios

and another instance, where it is uncertain whether the words in the *Cnd* were identified as two items or as one. (See *note 68* above)

Cnd.102/5 <11> Equites constantes  
Valentinianenses seniores

- (4) There is one instance, combining elements of (2) and (3) above, where a separate line of words in the edition is not assigned a number, begins with a word with an initial capital letter, is followed within the same item by another word with an initial capital letter, and is followed on the next line by a numbered list item beginning with a lower case letter, indicating that the two sets of words following each capital letter were identified in the *Cnd* as two separate items by the use of an initial capital letter and spacing or punctuation, but that the two capitalised words and those between them are considered to have been one item, and the final word the next item

Cnd.6 <23> Numerarii quatuor  
In his auri unus oper: Alter  
<24> subadiuua

- (5) There are three instances in the edition where a list item is not assigned a number and begins with '&', indicating that each of these items in the *Cnd* began with the symbol &, denoting *et*, and was separated from the preceding item by beginning on a new or separate line space, either with or without separative punctuation.

Cnd.6 <10> Epirus noua  
& pars macedoniae salutaris  
<16> Praeualitana  
& pars macedoniae salutaris  
Cnd.151 <15> secundam Lugdunensem  
& tertiam

and one instance where it is uncertain whether a list item beginning with '&' in the *Cnd* was separated from the preceding item by beginning on a new or separate line space.

Cnd.3 <13> Arabia & dux  
& comes rei militaris

## Appendix 4

- (6) There is one instance where a list item in the edition is not assigned a regular item number, begins with a word with an initial lower case letter and is indented by two spaces from the margin, indicating that this item was identified in the *Cnd* as part of the preceding item by the use of an initial lower case letter, spacing and the absence of punctuation. It is printed and numbered in the following manner to indicate that two items are identified in list 102/5.

Cnd.98/9 <39> Batavi  
    matriciaci seniores <39.1><=102/5.65-66>  
<40> Mattiaci iuniores

### Interpolations

Nine list items which, like the interpolated numbers, also did not occur in the *Cnd*, have been added and two other list items have been augmented, on the basis of the observed relationship between list items and drawing captions in the *Cnd* which suggest that the interpolated words occurred within the lists of an exemplar that existed between the *Cnd* and the original list. Each of these interpolated items is printed in italics and is not assigned a regular item number but only a subsidiary number to indicate its probable place in the list. Each interpolation is followed by a reference to the caption on which it is based.

- (1) Cnd.18 <31> Valentinianenses  
    <.31.1><Gratianenses = 17.q>  
<32> Officium autem [...] deputatur
- (2) Cnd.59 <10> Equites sagittarii indigenae zoarae  
    <.10.1> <robatha = 58.i>  
<11> Equites primi felices [...] ueterocariae
- (3) Cnd.67 <10> Equites sagittarii indigenae primi osrhoeni rasin  
    <.10.1?> <apatna = 66.m>  
<11> Praefecturae legionis quartae parthicae circesio
- (4+5) Cnd.69 <5> Equites felices honoriani illyriciani constantina  
    <.5.1> <apadna = 68.f>  
    <.5.2> <constantina = 68.g>  
<6> Equites sagittarii indigenae arabanenses mefana cartha
- (6) Cnd.98/9 <81> Inuicti iuniores britannici  
    <.81.1> <Bataui iuniores = 94.p>  
<82> Exculcatores iuniores britannici
- (7) Cnd.98/9 <92> Felices iuniores gallicani  
    <.92.1> <Atecotti iuniores = 95.g>  
<93> Tungri
- (8) Cnd.124 <6> Germaniae secundae  
    <.6.1> <Belgicae primae = 123.f>  
<7> Belgicae secundae
- (9) Cnd.130 <6> Tribunus cohortis primae tityreorum castrabariensi  
    <.6.1> <sala = 129.f>  
<7> Tribunus cohortis pacatianensis pacatiana

Two other items each include an interpolation, also based on a picture caption, which has been added to the copy of the corresponding item in the *Cnd*: namely,

Cnd.132 <8> Praefectus legionis secundae <rutupis = 131.h>  
<9> pp: numeri abulcorum <anderidos = 131.i>

## Appendix 4

Finally, one item in one list has been interpolated from an item in another list. Item *Cnd.85/6* has been interpolated on the basis of two criteria: firstly, that the list total *quatuor* in *Cnd.85/6.84* is assumed to have preceded a list of four *praesides*, instead of the three that existed in the *Cnd*, because all the remaining totals within *Cnd.85/6* (but not in some other lists) were accurate; and, secondly, that the identification of the fourth *praeses* is certain from the list of *provinciae* in *Cnd.89*. The interpolated item occurs in the edition as follows:

Cnd.85/6 <86> Pannoniae primae  
                  <.86.1> <Norici mediterranei> <=85/6.84 + 89.28>  
                  <87> Norici ripensis

-----