

Appendix 4: Numeration of the new edition of the compilation 'notitia dignitatum' (*Cnd*)

In the *Commentary* - §1: *Introduction*, it was stated that the evidence contained in the primary copies of the *Cnd* indicates,

- (i) that the *Cnd* was contained in a codex, **Σ**, that is known to have been in the library of the cathedral chapter at Speyer between 1426/7 and 1550/1; and
- (ii) that the *Cnd* was derived from an exemplar, **K**, written in the Carolingian minuscule script that was used in the early 9thC.

From what is known of these two compilations - the one in **K** produced around the early 9thC, and the *Cnd* in **Σ** that was copied from it later - it was suggested,

- (iii) that an unknown amount of the contents of the lists and pictures in the *Cnd* was ultimately derived, through **K**, from *underived* or *original lists and pictures* (being any list and picture whose unique selection, arrangement and form of its contents was not created as, or intended to be, a copy, or representation, or imitation, or adaptation, or excerpt of any previous list or picture) that were created no later than the 5th/6thC. This conclusion is based especially on the observation that the pictures in the *Cnd* contained some drawings which represented objects that are not known to have been created or to have existed for the first time after the 5th/6thC, and whose identification, and the reason for their inclusion in pictures, are unlikely to have been understood after that time; and
- (iv) the original lists and pictures from which an unknown amount of content was ultimately derived by the *Cnd*, or copies of some or of all those original lists and pictures, were at some time combined to coexist in an *original compilation*, **Ω**, (being the compilation that first contained at least all of the lists and pictures, whether original or not, from which the compilation in the *Cnd* indirectly derived an unknown amount of its contents). That is, the term *original compilation* refers to 'the first or original compilation of the lists and pictures', not to 'a compilation of the original lists and pictures' because it is not known how much of the original compilation comprised original lists and pictures.

Any reasonable speculation about **Ω** can be based only upon the contents of the *Cnd*, 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 **Σ**. The evidence which the *Cnd* can provide concerning **Ω** is limited especially by two facts: firstly, while the consensus and convergence of the primary copies of the *Cnd* make it possible to construct a copy of the *Cnd* that is potentially more accurate than any one of the primary copies, there are drawings and list items that cannot be reconstructed: for example, where none of the mutually-differing primary forms can be selected as an accurate copy of the one in the *Cnd*, or where there are alternative primary forms with equal validity as accurate copies.¹ And, secondly, while it is certain that, when the *Cnd* was created, it not only formed part of a more extensive copy of **Ω** than the remnant that existed in the codex **Σ** in 1426/7, but had also been derived from a more extensive copy of **Ω**, it is not known elsewhere precisely to what extent the *Cnd* comprised either a complete or an accurate copy of **Ω**, which may have been separated by a millennium, and by an unknown number of intermediary copies, from the *Cnd*. And these limitations must be considered when deciding how to refer to the contents of the *Cnd*.

Both the *Cnd*, and the codex **Σ** in which it existed, contained no title comprehending the entire contents of the *Cnd*. Its lists and their items, and its pictures and their drawings, captions and inscriptions, did not

¹ This was denied by Seeck in his extravagant and misleading statement that the words contained in the *Cnd* are always indicated with complete certainty from the four versions he used - Seeck, O., *Zur Kritik der Notitia dignitatum*: Hermes 9 1875 pp. 217-242, hereafter Seeck (ZK.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, (ZK.1876) 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*. but more cautiously in his edition (note 3 below) 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*.

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 copies of it, and is important to any speculation about Ω , that page distribution should 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 purpose for adding any further numbers to those referring to the page numbers of the *Cnd* in any edition of it, is to facilitate references 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 Ω .

The first condition was met by Böcking,² who printed all the numbers that he added to his edition of the *Cnd* in square brackets, which he used consistently to denote his conjectural changes to the contents of the *Cnd*. Seeck³ stated that all conjectural changes in his edition of the *Cnd* would be printed in italics⁴. Yet, despite this assurance, none of the numbers in his edition was printed in italics, nor were they 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*,⁵ and Arabic numerals to number list items, drawing captions and some drawing inscriptions.⁶ The use of these Roman numerals, and the absence of italics in the printing of any of these, together misleadingly convey the impression that those numbers existed within, or as an integral part of, the contents of the *Cnd*.

The second condition was not met by either Böcking or Seeck because the numbers which both of them added to those sections, which they identified as chapters in their editions of the *Cnd*, 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 that system of numbering was based.

Neither Böcking nor Seeck, in the numbering systems added to their editions, referred to the numbers of the pages on which the corresponding contents occurred in the *Cnd*. The complicated system of numbering which Böcking added to his edition does not facilitate reference to his edition of the *Cnd* and, probably for that reason has, to my knowledge, never been used in any commentary since the publication

² Böcking, E., *Notitia dignitatum et administrationum omnium tam ciuilium 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)*. (Bonnae, impensis Adolphi Marci, ab A. 1839 usque ad A. 1853). Vol.1 (1839), Vol.2 (1849), Vol.3 (1850), Vol.4 (1853), hereafter *Böcking (Ed.1939-1853)*

³ Seeck, O., *Notitia Dignitatum accedunt Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae et Latercula prouinciarum* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1876 - reimpression Frankfurt a.M., Minerva, 1962), hereafter *Seeck (Ed.1876)*

⁴ Edition (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.*

⁵ For example: Seeck (Ed.1876) p.40: *Caput, quo de primicerio sacri cubiculi actum erat*; Seeck (ZK.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.*

⁶ Seeck did not number picture captions but, in the series of numbers that he added to drawing captions and to some drawing inscriptions which, numbered together, always commence with the number "2", the picture captions implicitly had the number "1".

of the edition produced by Seeck. Accordingly, the following comments are restricted primarily to the numbering system added by Seeck.

To understand the system interpolated by Seeck, it is necessary to consider his concept of the relationship between the primary copies of the *Cnd* and the sources of the latter. Such a consideration indicates that he based his numbering system not on the *Cnd*, but on his concept of what he identified as the original compilation Ω .

Seeck based his concept on a series of assumptions. First, that the item *Cnd.34.2: Omnis dignitatum et amministrationum notitia, tam militarium quam civilium*⁷ in the agency list of the eastern *primicerius notariorum*, and the item *Cnd.116.2: Notitia omnium dignitatum et ministratum tam civilium quam militarium*⁸ in the agency list of the western one, were synonymous. Second, that each of these items referred to a book, rather than to a competency of the officer (*omnis notitia dignitatum*)⁹ or to a duty such as that mentioned in the following item *Cnd.34.3: Scholas etiam et numeros tractat*.¹⁰ Third, that this hypothetical book had the title *Notitia omnium dignitatum et administrationum tam civilium quam militarium* which he shortened to *Notitia dignitatum*. Fourth, that the item *Cnd.1/2.1: Notitia dignitatum omnium tam civilium quam militarium in partibus orientis*¹¹ 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*¹² 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. Fifth, that these two compilations represented the two parts of his hypothetical book *Notitia dignitatum*. And, sixth, that the *Cnd* was derived from the latter.

On the basis of these assumptions, Seeck concluded that the *Cnd* was ultimately derived from an official *Notitia dignitatum* controlled by the *primicerius notariorum*. He identified his official *Notitia* as the *Notitia primicerii* or *Notitia a primicerio confecta* or *Notitia usui publico destinata*¹³ or *Originalnotitia*¹⁴ or *Staatskalender*¹⁵ or *das officielle Verzeichniss*¹⁶ or *der officielle Register*¹⁷ and described it as

⁷ Seeck (Ed.1876): Or.XVIII 4

⁸ Seeck (Ed.1876): Oc.XVI 5

⁹ The expression *omnis notitia* ('all knowledge') is exemplified by Ammianus Marcellinus in 31.3.8: (Athanasius) *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 quadrimenstruos breves eorundem scholarium cura tuae sublimitatis [...] conscribi volumus et eos sacro scrinio laterculi praestari ibi deponendos, ut semper notitia eorundem scholarium certa sit [...]*.

¹⁰ Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.XVIII 5

¹¹ Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.I 1

¹² Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc.I 1

¹³ 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. - Berolini, Typis expressit Gustavus Lange (Berlin, Otto Lange, 1872) pp. 1-32, hereafter Seeck (Quaest.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;*

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

¹⁵ Seeck (ZK.1875) p.235: *in den Staatskalender aufgenommen*

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

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

containing lists and pictures similar to those in the *Cnd*.¹⁸ Although his official *Notitia* was at times irregularly revised, these revisions could generally be recognised precisely because they were irregular.¹⁹ That is, he considered that his official *Notitia* ought to have contained no irregularities, no discrepancies between list items and their corresponding picture and drawing captions, no abbreviations²⁰, and a standardised or consistent form of words when referring to comparable entities.²¹ He equated the correct form (*das Richtige*) - which he did not define - with the genuine or original form (*die ächte Ueberlieferung*).²² Forms that existed in the *Cnd* but not in other extant sources were suspect²³ and so too were forms which seemed inherently improbable.²⁴ His concept, that an official document had these characteristics, is important to an understanding of the use which can be made of the edition of the *Cnd* produced by Seeck as his edition because the features which Seeck believed were those of an official document were the criteria which, for him, determined what belonged in the text (*was in den Text gehört*).²⁵

-
- 18 Seeck (ZV.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 Kompetenz, ja selbst die Abbildung ihrer Insignien befand, denn auch diese machte einen Theil des Codicills aus.*
- 19 Seeck (ZV.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.*
- 20 Seeck (ZK.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 Amtsbezeichnungen, 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.*
- 21 Seeck (ZV.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.*
- 22 Seeck (ZK.1875) p.229: Referring to the forms *citriati*, *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 *cetnati*, 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 version **V** sometimes contains a correct form where version **M** does not, but deciding that the former was a copy of the latter, Seeck advised (ZK.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 [...].*
- 23 Seeck (ZK.1875) p.231, note: n.1: *Der Name Morbium kommt sonst nirgends vor, dagagen 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 unwise. The place name *Congavata*, *Cnd*.154-31 = Seeck (Ed.1876) 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: MAISCOGGABATAUXELODUNUMCAMMOGLANNARIGOREVALIAELIUSDRACO (website: <http://finds.org.uk/database/artefacts/record/id/49791>)
- 24 Referring to *Cnd*.23.6 *Schola scutariorum clibanariorum* = (Ed.1876) Or.XI.8 Seeck stated (Ed.1876) p.32 n.1: *Scuta cum clibanis coniuncta fuisse ueri dissimillimum est; scripserim: Scola sagittariorum clibanariorum.* He subsequently found that a reference to this unit existed in the law Cod.Theod.14.17.9 (398) *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.*
- 25 Referring to the list *Cnd*.113 = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc.XII, he noted (ZK.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 vor auszusetzen, dass die Fassung des Titels durch das ganze Capitel dieselbe war.* and repeated this belief in

While Seeck considered that the *Cnd* was ultimately derived from his official *Notitia*, the *Cnd* was originally derived from a copy of it,²⁶ comprising a complete copy of some parts of his official *Notitia*, but only excerpts of other parts.²⁷ Seeck identified this copy as the *Notitia*, or *liber primarius* or *exemplar nostrum*,²⁸ or *codex archetypus*,²⁹ or *Handschrift A*,³⁰ or *Urtext* or *Urcodex*,³¹ or *Urhandschrift*³² or *ursprünglicher Entwurf der N.D.*³³ or *Originaldocument*³⁴ and considered that it had been created in the western regions of the Roman state.³⁵ This *liber primarius*, like his official *Notitia*, served an official purpose (*für den Gebrauch der Kanzlei*)³⁶ 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 of the latter - his *liber primarius* and his official *Notitia* could not, therefore, have both served the same purpose. Finally, Seeck acknowledged that a *codex Spirensis*,³⁷ to

his edition on 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.*

- 26 Seeck (Quaest.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.*
- 27 Seeck (ZV.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. [...]*
- 28 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 (Quaest.1872) p.5: *nostrum exemplar*; p.8 and p.13: *exemplar nostrum.*
- 29 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 (Quaest.1872) under the title *De Notitiae Dignitatum codice archetypo.*
- 30 Seeck (ZK.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;*
- 31 Seeck (ZK.1875) p.228: notwithstanding some minor revisions since 1872, *im Quaternionenverzeichnis 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: *Die Handschrift, welche für uns der Urcodex der N.D. ist, [...].*
- 32 Seeck (ZK.1875) p.238: *Doch nicht nur Glosseme standen am Rande der Urhandschrift;*
- 33 Seeck (ZK.1875) p.236: *in dem ursprünglichen Entwurf der N.D.*
- 34 Seeck (ZK.1875) p.230: *zwar nicht im Spirensis selbst, aber doch in einem der Zwischenglieder, welche diesem den Inhalt des Originaldocuments vermittelten, [...]*
- 35 Seeck (ZV.1876) p.71-72: *Dieses Verzeichniss [...] giebt die uns vorliegende Notitia Dignitatum theils im Auszuge, theils in wörtlicher Abschrift wieder. [...] Schon das officiële 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.*
- 36 Seeck (ZK.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 (Ed.1876. 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.**
- 37 Seeck (Quaest.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, Boeckingius demonstravit*; Seeck (Ed.1876) p.xi *ac primum quidem de Notitia Dignitatum dicturi sumus, quae nisi in codice Spirensi nusquam traditur.*

which he also referred as the *Notitia*³⁸ or *Original*,³⁹ was the immediate common exemplar of all copies of the *Cnd*.

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 as to what was being denoted each time he used the term *Notitia*. The same uncertainty existed in his use of the term *Spirensis* which he used to denote, simultaneously, the consensus of the copies of the *Cnd* in Σ (*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*).⁴⁰

The varied and changing terminology used by Seeck has led to some unnecessary confusion among users of his edition. Firstly, while Seeck believed that his official *Notitia* and his *liber primarius* each consisted of two parts, corresponding to the two parts into which he believed that the contents of the *Cnd* could be divided, the fact that he then interpolated the words *Notitia dignitatum* as the title to his edition of the *Cnd*, while simultaneously separately numbering what he considered to be the sections of his two parts as Or.I-XLV and Oc.I-XLV, has created uncertainty among users of his edition whether his edition of the *Cnd* represents one or two documents.⁴¹ And, secondly, his use of the term *codex archetypus* or *Handschrift A*, among others, to denote his *liber primarius*, rather than the *Cnd* in the *codex* Σ , has led to the misconception that his construction of what he considered to be the gatherings of his *liber primarius* were actually those of the *Cnd* in Σ .⁴²

As mentioned in the *Commentary - §1: Introduction*, there are several possible concepts about Ω . Seeck supported one of these, as he was entitled to do, but he then used that concept of what he considered to have existed in his original compilation in order to produce an edition of the *Cnd*, in which the contents of his constructed copy of the *Cnd* were changed and numbered to support his concept of the original compilation. This process was unsatisfactory to the extent that his edition naturally appears to support the concept on which it was based, to the exclusion of any of the alternative possible concepts which could be formed on the basis of the contents of the *Cnd*.

As stated in the *Commentary - §1: Introduction*, the lists that existed in the *Cnd* can be sorted into two compilations: the first comprising the lists among its first 82 pages (*Cnd.1-82*), concerning the eastern part of the Roman state, and the second the lists among its last 80 pages (*Cnd.85-164*) concerning the western part. These two compilations of lists can respectively be referred to as *Cnd/or* and *Cnd/oc* and, while these terms also comprehend the pictures that demonstrably illustrate those lists, the compilation cannot be completely sorted into two compilations because two pictures cannot be incorporated within them.

³⁸ Seeck (ZK.1875) p.218: *Die Notitia Dignitatum bildete bekanntlich das letzte Stück eines Speierer Sammelcodex,*

³⁹ Seeck (ZK.1875) p.227: Having discussed some versions of the *Cnd*, he stated: *Uns bleiben also vier Handschriften, die sämtlich ihr Original sehr genau und ohne Interpolationen wiedergeben; aus diesen lässt sich der Text des Spirensis [...] vollständig herstellen, [...].*

⁴⁰ Seeck (ZK.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, nicht einen besonderen Codex.*

⁴¹ For example, Bury, J.B., *The Notitia dignitatum*, *Journal of Roman Studies* 10 1920 pp.131-154, hereafter *Bury (JRS.1920)* on p.132: *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.*
I have not found any reference in any law to the plural *notitiae*.

⁴² For example, Bury, (JRS.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.*

Of the 89 pictures interspersed among the lists in the *Cnd*, the first 43 demonstrably illustrated lists in the first compilation (*Cnd/or*) and the last 44 those in the second compilation (*Cnd/oc*). But the remaining two pictures, *Cnd.83-84*, which occurred together and between *Cnd/or* and *Cnd/oc*, cannot be demonstrably attributed to either of those two compilations. The contents of these pictures consisted mostly of drawings of the tablets or codices and scrolls of which similar drawings existed in most of the remaining pictures in the *Cnd*. Whether these two pictures both belonged to *Cnd/or* or both to *Cnd/oc*, or one to the former and the other to the latter, or both to neither, is not known. Consequently, the contents of the *Cnd* cannot be completely sorted into two separate compilations without incorporating an interpretation about those two pictures. By dividing the *Cnd* into two parts, and then separately numbering each of those parts, beginning with the number Or.I and Oc.I for the first list in each part, Seeck placed the two pictures *Cnd.83-84*, which immediately preceded his Oc.I, within his eastern part and did so under the single chapter number Or.XLV, to which he added the title *Finis* (printed in the page headers).⁴³ Böcking did not identify these two pictures as a chapter and assigned no number to either of them. The numbering interpolated by Seeck has given rise to several statements which, since they are entirely based on the number and title interpolated by Seeck, simply repeat, as conclusions, the assumptions on which that numbering was based.⁴⁴

Consequently, the sorting of the entire contents of the *Cnd* into two separate parts, in the manner indicated by the numbering system which Seeck interpolated into his edition, cannot be retained. In fact, the *Cnd* contained not only two compilations of lists and their related pictures, but also the two aforementioned pictures whose relationship to those two compilations is unknown.

Having sorted 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 of his two parts. To distinguish the first set of numbers from the second set, he added the abbreviation *Or* (denoting *Notitia orientis*) to the former and *Oc* (denoting *Notitia occidentis*) to the latter, although these abbreviations were printed only in the header to each page, but not beside the Roman numeral interpolated at the beginning of each of his chapters.

In dividing his edition of the *Cnd* into chapters (a concept invented by Böcking), and numbering them, Seeck did not define what constituted a chapter and it is difficult to determine any consistent criterion from his edition. After assigning a chapter number to each of the two precedence lists, *Cnd.1/2* and *Cnd.85/6*,⁴⁵ which contained the titles 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. But if this was the criterion, suggested by his belief that each list pertaining to an agency, and any picture illustrating it, occupied a separate folium in his official *Notitia*,⁴⁶ it was inconsistently applied.

⁴³ Seeck(Ed.1876) Or.XLV

⁴⁴ For example, Bury, (JRS.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 (REA.1936)* in col.1085: *Die Anpassung war wohl von einer oströmischen Hand ausgesehen [...] <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.*

⁴⁵ Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.I and Oc.I

⁴⁶ Seeck (ZV.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*

Firstly, as mentioned above, he identified the two pictures *Cnd.83-84*, which were not demonstrably associated with any list, 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 (but inexplicably excluding the inscriptions on the scrolls) comprising 1-16 on the first page and 17-33 on the second.

Secondly, he identified and numbered, as two separate chapters, two lists which, in the *Cnd*, each followed an agency list without any intervening blank line spaces. He numbered the first list, *Cnd.102/5.53-260*, which began with the item *Qui numeri ex praedictis per infrascriptas provincias habeantur intra italiam*, as Oc.VII to which he added 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 and added the title *Praepositurae magistri peditum* (printed in the page headers). The identification of these two lists as separate sections or chapters involved speculation by Seeck about several observations of which the following three are the most obvious. First, the expression *ex praedictis*, in *Cnd.102/5.53*, suggests that at least part of the list following that item pertained to the preceding agency list or lists and ought to have been numbered accordingly by Seeck. Second, the list *Cnd.102/5.53-260* contained within it the complete agency list of the *magister equitum per gallias* which was not identified or numbered by Seeck as a separate chapter. Third, the adverb *Item* in *Cnd.156/8.22* identified the following list as either a part, or an excerpt, of a larger list, as did the same word in the ten other lists in which it occurred,⁴⁷ in addition to two further instances within the list *Cnd.156/8.22-87* itself. According to the title which Seeck interpolated to his edition of *Cnd.156/8.22-87*, this list pertained 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 items which, in the *Cnd*, also appeared to be unrelated to an agency list and also followed the preceding list without any intervening blank line spaces. The descriptive statement *Cnd.81.12: Ceteri omnes consulares ad similitudinem consularis palestinae officium habent*⁴⁸, occurred in the *Cnd* directly after the *officium* (secretariat list) of the *consularis palaestinae*, and formed no part of the items pertaining to the agency directed by that officer. The same is true of the remaining four similar statements occurring 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*.⁴⁹ Böcking numbered each of these five descriptive statements as a separate chapter by assuming that each statement was an abridgement of a larger collection of lists whose existence was indicated by that descriptive statement.⁵⁰ But Seeck numbered each of these descriptive statements as part of the agency list by assuming that the descriptive statement was added to indicate that the preceding agency list was to be considered as a model for other lists that could be written, but did not exist, in relation to the agencies directed by comparable officers. That the assumption by Böcking is probably to be preferred to the one by Seeck is indicated 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*;⁵¹

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.

⁴⁷ *Cnd.12.42; 15.25; 21.23; 61.31; 74.18; 76.20; 78.10; 80.19; 102/5.209; 154.16.*

⁴⁸ Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.XLIII 14

⁴⁹ *Cnd.82.11: Ceteri omnes praesides ad similitudinem praesidis thebaidae officium habent* (Or.XLIV 15);
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)

⁵⁰ Edition (1839-1853): *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]*.

⁵¹ *Cnd.61.31-39*

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 *consularis palestinae*, the *corrector apuliae et calabriae* and the *praeses dalmatiae* all occurred as the first titles among those of comparable positions in the precedence lists, the title of the *praeses thebaidos* occurred as the eighth title and that of the *consularis campaniae* as the ninth. Irrespective of this speculation, the different numbers interpolated by Böcking and by Seeck lead to different interpretations of the *Cnd* which simply repeat the assumption upon which their numbering was based.⁵² Accordingly, neither of their interpolated numbers can be used in any objective representation of the *Cnd*.

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 two separately-captioned pictures,⁵³ nor why he also identified and numbered as a single chapter the items concerning the agencies of the *magistri scriniorum*.⁵⁴

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 construct the gatherings of folia which he considered to have existed in his *liber primarius*.

As stated in the *Commentary* - §1: *Introduction*, each of the two compilations into which the lists of the *Cnd* can be sorted began with a list containing the titles of many, but not all, of the 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 to the precedence lists of which each was the first item, or to the entire compilations of lists which follows each of them. Both lists contained the same categories of position titles arranged in the same sequence, which is generally in order of precedence, proceeding from the highest to the lowest position, except that the titles of the provincial governors were listed according to their dioceses. Most of the remaining lists that followed these precedence lists in the *Cnd* were agency lists, each of which contained items relating to the agency directed either by one, or by a small group, of the different directors whose position titles were listed in the precedence list. The agency lists were arranged generally, but not precisely, in the same sequence as the titles of their directors in the precedence lists. The precedence lists contained the titles of 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, is not known. In particular, it is not known, whether the position titles of directors in the precedence lists at some time referred to, and were consistent with, agency lists that actually followed them in some source of the *Cnd*, but that some of those agency lists were subsequently lost; or whether the precedence lists referred to agency lists that actually followed them in some source of the *Cnd* but that some of those source lists were not copied; or whether the precedence lists in some source of the *Cnd* referred to agency lists that were later intended to be included with them but later were not.

Seeck chose the first of these alternatives because he believed, and stated, that the precedence lists were tables of contents to the sections he identified as chapters.⁵⁵ 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

⁵² For example, Bury (JRS.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 xliiv praeses Thebaidos.*

Polaschek (REA.1936) col.1081: *Auch ein [...] Musterkapitel des corrector fehlt in or.*

⁵³ *Cnd.29-30* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.XV and *Cnd.114* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc.XIII

⁵⁴ *Cnd.35-36* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.XIX and *Cnd.117* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc.XVII

⁵⁵ Seeck (Ed.1876) . p.xii: *capita ea, quae in indicibus promittuntur*

did not identify it as such and simply printed it, like all his interpolated chapter titles, among his page headers. The interpolation of a title for each precedence list may have been prompted by the fact that, having interpreted the first item in each precedence list as the title to the compilation of lists and related pictures that followed each of these, rather than as the title only of the precedence list itself, the latter appeared to be without a title, inviting the interpolation of one such as *Index*. The fact that neither the word *index* nor *caput* existed anywhere within the *Cnd* was apparently of no concern to either editor, and it is surprising that the interpolation of these two words into their editions by both Böcking and by Seeck has led to the almost universal unquestioning - but mistaken - belief that these two words existed in the *Cnd*.⁵⁶

The belief, 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*; nor did the second precedence list 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 position titles 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 coincidence between his *index* and his chapters than the one that existed in the *Cnd*.⁵⁷ Accordingly he 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. Seeck described these conditions as follows:⁵⁸ namely, that 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); that its text was arranged in two columns per page with a maximum of 26 lines per column; that blank pages were inserted after almost every *gradus dignitatis* (which he did not define) as well as before and after each so-called *index*; that a picture and list never shared the same page; that each of his chapters occupied a minimum of two pages; that 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; that other pages which were intended to have pictures were mistakenly left blank (his Or II, Or IX, Oc III, Oc XIX); that four bifolia existing in the *liber primarius* were subsequently lost; that two other folia were misbound; and, finally, that its lists contained neither gaps nor repeated entries. The application of these conditions formed the basis of an elaborate *discriptio quaternionum et foliorum* or *Quaternionenverzeichniss* 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*.⁵⁹

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

⁵⁶ For example, Polaschek (REA.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 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*.

⁵⁷ 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*.

⁵⁸ Seeck (Ed.1876) pp.xi-xii developed from (Quaest.1872) pp.16-20.

⁵⁹ Seeck (Ed.1876) pp.xii-xviii : *discriptionem quaternionum et foliorum integram proponam*, and (Quaest.1872) pp.20-31, referred to in (ZK.1875) p.228 as the *Quaternionenverzeichniss*.

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*.⁶⁰

Seeck was entitled to speculate about the contents of his *liber primarius* on the basis of his assumption about the relationship between the precedence lists and the agency lists that followed them in the *Cnd*. But he then used his speculation to change the sequence of some of his chapters, and to add numbers to other chapters that he invented, and then incorporated all these changes within his edition of the *Cnd*. Böcking also invented chapters to transform his edition of the *Cnd* into 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 in place of the Roman numbers he used for the rest, Seeck did neither. And the various practices adopted by Seeck, based on his concept of his *liber primarius*, makes it undesirable to continue to use his edition of the *Cnd* as if it were a constructed copy of the *Cnd* on which speculations about the original compilation can objectively be based. Moreover, his assumptions were, once again, applied inconsistently.

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 titles appeared in the precedence lists. But, inconsistently, he did not invent chapters for other officers whose position titles also appeared in those lists, such as the *vicarius italiae* or an eastern *corrector*. Nor did he include a chapter or number 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) exemplifies some of the problems with his interpolations. First, 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.⁶¹ Similarly, 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. In this case, Seeck again considered that this single item occupied an entire page and that it was also preceded by a page containing a picture, but in this case one which existed in the *liber primarius* and was later lost.⁶² Second, he invented and numbered as Oc.VIII a chapter for the western *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, supposing that in this case both the picture and list occurred in his *liber primarius* but were later lost.⁶³ And, similarly, 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*.⁶⁴ In each of these four

⁶⁰ Seeck (Ed.1876) p.xxvi: *Diuisio autem illa columnarum et paginarum, quam in archetypo fuisse uidimus, cum magnam et inutilem, ut uidebatur, membranae profusione requireret, penitus <in codice Spirensi> sublata est. Et insignia quidem in codice Spirensi paginas nouas 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.*

⁶¹ 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.*

⁶² 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.*

⁶³ 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.*

⁶⁴ Seeck (Ed.1876) p.40: *XVI. Caput, quo de primicerio sacri cubiculi actum erat, librarii culpa omissum est. (Quaest.1872) p.22: Librario [...] Lapsu tamen memoriae [...] ad insequentem paginam transiret. Tum autem*

instances, the explanation for the absence of expected pictures or lists in the *Cnd* differed according to what was permitted by his *Quaternionenverzeichniss*, but no speculation was presented to explain why there were allegedly 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 *Quaternionenverzeichniss*), 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 officers:

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>

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* was an excerpt from details of the agency of the *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, of whose agency some details are known from copies of imperial laws,⁶⁵ 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 may have been marginal annotations in a source of the *Cnd*. The fact that the *Cnd* listed these two officers in each of the precedence lists, but only had an excerpt of a single item concerning one of them, is almost certainly not accidental especially since, with the exception of that single excerpted item, the agency lists of the same four officers - two in the east and the same two in the west - were effectively absent from the *Cnd*. The effective absence of all four agency lists 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 for the speculation by which Seeck invented and numbered these chapters, while his incorporation of these interpolated numbers into his edition has not made it a useful representation of the contents of the *Cnd*.

In addition to inventing some of his numbered chapters, Seeck changed the sequence of others. In the eastern precedence list in the *Cnd*, the titles of the frontier military commanders were listed according to the dioceses in which they operated and these dioceses were arranged in a geographic sequence proceeding from south to north and east to west. Their agency lists, 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.

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 palestinae

in descriptionem castrensis incidit [...]. Ita factum est ut hodie cum insignia tum titulos primicerii sacri cubiculi desideremus.

⁶⁵ 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,tit. (534) including officers referred to as *primi cubiculariorum* - Cod.Theod.6.27.8 (396).

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	Palestinae	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*. The change made by Seeck obscured the existence of the same geographic arrangement, but based on different administrative divisions, in both the precedence list and the agency lists. And this arrangement may be important. It is easy to suggest how the sequence of the last four agency lists could be changed to agree with that in the precedence list,⁶⁶ but such a change would obscure the fact that the agency lists *Scythia-Moesia2*. followed the geographical sequence in which the other lists were arranged whereas *Moesia1-Dacia rip.* occurred in an opposite sequence - from west to east - and this observed difference could invite speculation as to whether it was related to the fact that these two provinces were located within that area of *Illyricum* pertaining alternately to the eastern and western parts of the Roman state.

Seeck similarly changed the sequence of some of his chapters for the western *comites rei militaris*. In the *Cnd*, these agency lists were arranged in the order *Africa*, *Tingitania*, *Litus saxon: per britann:*, *Britann:*, *Tractus Italiae*, *Tractus Argentoratensis*. Seeck arranged and numbered his chapters for these commands in the sequence: Oc.XXIV-*Tractus italiae*, Occ.XXV-*Africa*, Oc.XXVI-*Tingitania*, Oc.XXVII-*Tractus 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:* The sequence of the agency lists in the *Cnd* was not arranged according to an apparent geographic order, as in the east, nor entirely according to the precedence of their directors, since the *comes britann:* commanded *comitatenses* units but the *comes litoris saxon:* did not. A possible explanation arises from the contents of their agency lists which suggests that, while the agency lists may have been arranged initially in the order in which they occurred both in *Cnd.85/6.31-36* and in the list of *comites* in *Cnd.98/9.3-8*, that order was subsequently changed into a sequence that corresponded to the progressively-decreasing contents of those agency lists.

Precedence list		Agency list		
		Domain	Secretariat	
85/6.30	Comites rei militaris sex			
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	(no units) 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.)

⁶⁶ Namely, the reversal of two bifolia within a single gathering. That is, if a bifolium (I), containing *Scythia* on the first fol. and *Dacia rip.* on the second, was bound inside another bifolium (II) containing *Moesia 2* on the first fol. and *Moesia 1* on the second, giving the precedence list sequence (II.1) *Moesia 2* (I.1) *Scythia* | (I.2) *Dacia rip.* (II.2) *Moesia 1* and these two bifolia then changed places, such that bifolium (II) was now bound inside bifolium (I), the agency list sequence (I.1) *Scythia* (II.1) *Moesia 2* | (II.2) *Moesia 1* (I.2) *Dacia rip* would exist.

If this supposition is correct, then the actual sequence of these agency lists in the *Cnd* would provide evidence for the additional speculation that this arrangement occurred after the *comitatenses* units had been transferred from the agency list of the *comes britanni*: to the list *Cnd.102/5*. The evidence for such speculation, based on the contents of the *Cnd*, is not readily apparent from the sequence of his chapters in the edition produced by Seeck.

Similar discrepancies existing elsewhere between the precedence lists and agency lists were also left unchanged as, for example, in the western lists where the precedence list had the sequence *Cnd.85/6.40-42: dux Pannoniae primae, dux Pannoniae secundae, dux Valeriae ripensis*, but their agency lists occurred in the order *Cnd.141: Pannonia secunda, Cnd.143: Valeria ripensis* and *Cnd.145: Pannonia prima*, which coincided with the sequence existing in another list of *duces* in *Cnd.98/9.12-14*. Seeck also left unchanged the positions of his chapters related to both the eastern and western *primicerius notariorum* and *castrensis sacri palatii*, whose titles appeared in that order in both precedence lists but whose agency lists occurred in the reverse sequence. Seeck did not explain why he altered the sequence of some of his chapters but not that 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 *Quaternionenverzeichnis*.

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 Seeck added to items within his chapters.

Seeck printed conjectural changes to list items in his edition of the *Cnd* in italics, but not his interpolated Roman chapter numbers and Arabic item numbers. Any conjectural additions to list items were then numbered 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 | <i>Equites brachiati iuniores</i> |
| | 47 | Equites Bataui seniores |

This continuous numbering makes it now difficult to remove such conjectures, or to add others, without disturbing the sequence of the numbers that he attached to these 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.⁶⁷ Notwithstanding the fact that his interpolation incorporated some questionable assumptions,⁶⁸ he inconsistently did not add any of the

⁶⁷ Item *Cnd.102/5.221* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc. VII 170

⁶⁸ The rubricated title *Cnd.102/5.2 Vexillationes palatinae decem*, preceding the list of units in *Cnd.102/5.3-11* = Seeck (Ed.1876) 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 Valentinianenses 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*),

other cavalry units that were listed in his Oc.VII, but not in his Oc.VI, to the latter.⁶⁹ Similarly, he added a list item referring to *Rationales summarum*⁷⁰ 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*⁷¹ 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*⁷² to his list of infantry units as item Oc.V 218 because that name occurred (in the form *Atecotti iuniores*) among the drawing captions in one of the six pictures preceding that list.⁷³ 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 lists the names of other infantry units that also occurred in drawing captions, but not in the associated lists as, for example, the *Gratianenses*,⁷⁴ and the *Batavi iuniores*.⁷⁵

Items were also inconsistently identified and numbered. For example, Seeck separated, and separately numbered, such items as *Domestici pedites | et deputati eorum*,⁷⁶ *chartularium et scrinium ipsius | et ceteros palatinos officii suprascripti*,⁷⁷ 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*,⁷⁸ and *Primicerium scrinii a pecuniis, et ceteros scriniarios*.⁷⁹

Seeck usually enclosed in square brackets words or numbers which he considered ought to be deleted from the *Cnd*, such as [*et dux et comes rei militaris*],⁸⁰ [*sive numerarius*],⁸¹ [*comitatenses*],⁸² and [*pro numerarios*].⁸³ But elsewhere words were simply omitted, and hence not numbered, such as the name of

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 ualentianenses seniores* there was another unit named *Equites constantes ualentianenses 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* 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 was 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 ualentianenses iuniores* would be a natural associate of the *seniores* unit of the same name and could justifiably be added to the list.

⁶⁹ For example, *Cnd.102/5.216 Equites constantes ualentianenses iuniores* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc.VII 165; *Cnd.102/5.246 Equites scutarii iuniores comitatenses* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc. VII 195; *Cnd.102/5.251 Equites catafractarii iuniores* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc. VII 200; *Cnd.102/5.252 Equites scutarii aureliacy* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc. VII 201; *Cnd.102/5.254 Equites stablesiani* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc. VII 203; *Cnd.102/5.255 Equites syri* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc. VII.204; and *Cnd.102/5.256 Equites taifaly* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc. VII 205.

⁷⁰ Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.XIII.13

⁷¹ *Cnd.110/11.66* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc.XI 74

⁷² *Cnd.98/9.92.1* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc.V 248

⁷³ *Cnd.95.g* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc.V 70

⁷⁴ *Cnd.17.q* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.VIII 22

⁷⁵ *Cnd.94.p* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc.V 58

⁷⁶ *Cnd.30.3* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.XV 7-8

⁷⁷ *Cnd.32.9* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.XVII 10-11

⁷⁸ *Cnd.28.13* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.XIV 14

⁷⁹ *Cnd.110/11.86* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc.XI 97

⁸⁰ *Cnd.3.13* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.II 14

⁸¹ *Cnd.91.23* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc.IV 25

⁸² *Cnd.102/5.258, 259, 260* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc.VII 207, 208, 209

⁸³ *Cnd.160.6* = Seeck (Ed.1876) Oc.XLIII .8

the military unit *Batavi*⁸⁴ which should either have been listed between his Oc.VII 71 and 72, or have been included but marked in square brackets as an item to be deleted, since Seeck acknowledged that this item existed in the *Cnd*.⁸⁵

Finally, Seeck provided no numbering system to enable references to be made to uncaptioned drawings in the 89 pictures that were contained 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, they were also the only items that he numbered in the remaining 61 pictures. This selective printing of pictures and selective numbering system of their contents are both unsatisfactory and may be related to both his limited evidence for their contents (he did not consult the pictures in the primary copies **O** and **P** in preparation for his edition) and his refusal to evaluate the limited evidence he possessed. Thus, for example, having agreed that the pictures in the primary copy **W** were derived from tracings of the pictures in **Σ**, and had been created because the pictures in **M** had been deemed unsatisfactory, he then decided to print the 18 pictures consisting almost exclusively of the drawings of shields from the primary copy **M** with the excuse that doing so would provide the reader with additional source material.⁸⁶ Moreover, in not printing 28 of the pictures, and not assigning a number to the inscriptions that occurred on drawings of scrolls in many pictures in the *Cnd*, his edition has removed all reference to the inscriptions that occurred on the drawings of some scrolls in these 28 pictures in the *Cnd*.

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 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 based his numbering of the captions and inscriptions generally on his concept of chapters since, having assumed that each chapter generally consisted of a list preceded by one or more pictures (except that he did not consider the two pictures which he numbered as Or.XLV as belonging to the following list which he numbered Oc.I), he began his numbers in each chapter by numbering the picture caption, the drawing captions and some of the inscriptions and then continued that series of numbers into the items of the following list. As a result, the captions and inscriptions cannot be readily distinguished from list items, and one picture cannot be distinguished from another picture, where a series of pictures precedes a list, except by referring to the relevant page numbers in his edition. For example,

⁸⁴ Cnd.102/5.123

⁸⁵ Seeck (ZK.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.*

⁸⁶ 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 instituire uellent neque codices ipsos praesto haberent, quandam conferendi facultatem praeberem. Mea enim editione emissa tria picturarum, quibus de agitur, exemplaria habebunt, quae omnia riuulis diuersis ex communi fonte fluxerunt, scilicet picturas editionis Basiliensis (eadem repetitae sunt in editionibus Pancirolianis) e Spirensi ipso descriptas, Böckingianae ex codicis Monacensis parte posteriore haustas, meas, quae ex eiusdem libri parte priore originem ducunt.*

<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 Roman 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 or codex, 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 and impossible in the case of the 28 pictures whose drawings were not printed, and where the evidence for their existence has, therefore, been removed. But, again inconsistently, he assigned a single number to the numerical symbols inscribed on the drawings of four sacks in *Cnd.25#14-17*.⁸⁷

And, once again, whatever criteria were used, they were inconsistently applied. For example, while Seeck generally assigned a number to the inscription on the cover of the tablet or codex that is drawn in most pictures, he did not number the inscription *dea vexillata* in one tablet⁸⁸ nor the inscription *bos caphi* in another⁸⁹, partly because he had deleted these inscriptions from the drawings on which they occurred.

It is apparent from the foregoing description of aspects of the edition of the *Cnd* produced by Seeck as his edition 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 from which the latter was derived. 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. Seeck produced an edition in which the contents of the *Cnd* were changed on the basis of his concept of the original compilation. Consequently, any user of his edition of the *Cnd* may be persuaded to conclude that the *Cnd* supports the concept that Seeck used as the basis for the changes that he introduced in his edition of the *Cnd*.

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 unavoidable and a concordance is provided as an appendix to the new edition.

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

As stated previously, any speculation about the original compilation Ω 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 Σ .

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

⁸⁷ Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.XIII 3

⁸⁸ *Cnd.16.1* in the drawing in Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.VIII

⁸⁹ *Cnd.22.1* in the drawing in Seeck (Ed.1876) Or.XI

identified as interpolations to that which existed in the *Cnd* and, secondly, such numbers must not incorporate speculation about the possible contents Ω . Any interpolation must be clearly identified and must be numbered in such a manner that 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 Σ .

It is known from the primary copies of the *Cnd* that, by 1426/7, the lists and 89 pictures of the *Cnd* occupied 164 pages in the codex Σ and that one of those pages contained neither a list nor picture. There is no evidence to indicate that this spatial distribution was altered by 1550/51 when the pictures of the *Cnd* were last copied from tracings of them, but there are indications that some of the contents may have been changed between 1426/7 and 1550/51. 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 these 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, 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, these seven lists in the new edition occupy the same number of pages, and in the same location that they occupied in the *Cnd*, but each page of these seven lists in the new edition will not necessarily have the same number of items as those on the corresponding page 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 has been deemed desirable that each list item should, where possible, occupy a single and separate line in the new edition. At the same time, it is necessary to ensure that the seven lists which each occupied more than one page in the *Cnd* occupied 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 new 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 no title comprehending the entire compilation of lists and pictures, and no table of contents; none of the contents of the *Cnd* had any form of numbering or indexing attached to them, and there was no division of its contents into numbered sections such as books, titles, chapters, paragraphs or lists. Therefore, since it is known on which pages the lists and the pictures of the *Cnd* occurred, and this page distribution is reproduced as far as possible in the new edition, the lists and pictures in the new edition can and must only be numbered according to the numbers of the pages on which the corresponding lists occurred in the *Cnd*.

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 new edition. Similarly, the second list in the new edition will be referred to as *Cnd.3* because it occupied the third page in the *Cnd* and does so in the new edition. But the first list in the new 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, which are added to the new edition, are clearly identified as interpolations by being printed in brackets in the form <->.

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 new 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 new edition, which is a copy of the first item that existed on the third page of the *Cnd*, is numbered in the edition as *page <3> item <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 and inscription number or symbol, each separated by a point (.).

Numbering drawings, captions and inscriptions

The *Cnd* contained 89 pictures interspersed among its lists: 43 in the compilation *Cnd/or*, 44 in *Cnd/oc* and two pictures (*Cnd.83* and *84*) between the two compilations. Of these 89 pictures, 75 were full-page pictures (40 in *Cnd/or*, 33 in *Cnd/oc*, and the two pictures *Cnd.83*, *84*) - that is, pictures that were not accompanied by a list on the same page as the picture - while the remaining 14 pictures (3 in *Cnd/or*, 11 *Cnd/oc*) were part-page pictures - that is, pictures accompanied by a list on the same page (and no such list continued onto the next page).

The 89 pictures comprised 65 single pictures (31 *Cnd/or*, 34 *Cnd/oc*), each of which occurred between two lists, and 24 serial pictures (12 *Cnd/or*, 10 *Cnd/oc*, and pictures *Cnd.83*, *84*), where two or more pictures occurred on successive pages without intervening lists. These serial pictures were contained in 10 series: 9 series of 2 pictures each (6 *Cnd/or*, 2 *Cnd/oc*, and pictures *Cnd.83*, *84*) and 1 series of 6 pictures (*Cnd/oc*).

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 and almost always written in a single line. These 74 picture captions occurred above the framed 65 single pictures and above the first picture in each series of framed pictures.

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; while a *drawing inscription* denotes Greek or Latin 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. Pictures *Cnd.83*, *84*, each of which had no picture caption and no rectangular frame enclosing all its drawings, each included among its drawing captions two that were written below a drawing. Some drawing captions in some primary copies of the *Cnd* are each contained in a framed unpainted space and these framed caption spaces are not classified as drawings.

The drawing captions in the compilations *Cnd/or* and *Cnd/oc* almost all refer to items named in the lists which followed each picture or series of pictures in the *Cnd*. The drawing inscriptions do not refer to list items in the *Cnd* (with the exception of the inscriptions *Leges*, *Fl.Iordanis*, and *Provincia palaestina*).

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.

Firstly, 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*. The two types of captions are considered together within the series of assigned letters. 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.

Secondly, an Arabic number, preceded by the symbol # is assigned to each drawing or group of drawings (as defined below), so that *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, its 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 new 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:

- (1) There are several instances in the new 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 new 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 new 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 new 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 new 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

- (6) There is one instance where a list item in the new 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 circasio
- (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>

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 new edition as follows:

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