

Notes on the Numbers and Organization of the Ninth-Century Byzantine Army

Warren T. Treadgold

MODERN KNOWLEDGE of the organization of the Byzantine army in the ninth century derives mainly from three sources of high quality. The best known of these is the treatise of Philotheus on court ceremonial, dated in its title to the year 899.¹ Philotheus includes a comprehensive list of civilian and military officials, separate lists of the officers assigned to each unit, and some other information on ceremonies that can be used as evidence for the organization of the army. Another comprehensive rank list, incomplete towards its end, is the *Tacticon Uspensky*, datable to 842 or 843.² The third source is a description of the Byzantine Empire composed by al-Jarmī, an Arab official who lived in honorable captivity in the empire for some years before he was released in 845. Though this work is lost in its original form, substantial material from it is preserved in the works of the Arab geographers Ibn al-Faqīh, Ibn Khurdādhbah, and Qudāmah.³ The surviving material includes a list of the military units in the Empire with their numbers of troops, and a description of the command structure of one unit with the numbers of men of each rank. Al-Jarmī's list dates from after 838, because it mentions the destruction of Amorium in that year, and almost certainly from after 839, because it does not mention the special corps of Khurramites that was abolished in late 839 when its troops were dis-

¹ Ed. Nicolas OIKONOMIDES, *Les Listes de préséance byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles* (Paris 1972; cited hereafter by author's name alone) 81–235.

² Ed. Oikonomides 47–63; 45–47 for the date.

³ On al-Jarmī see E. W. Brooks, "Arabic Lists of the Byzantine Themes," *JHS* 21 (1901) 67–72, and most recently A. Miquel, *La Géographie humaine du monde musulman jusqu'au milieu du 11^e siècle* (Paris 1967) xviii (cf. xxii on Ibn al-Faqīh, xxi on Ibn Khurdādhbah, and xxviii on Qudāmah). The relevant material from Ibn al-Faqīh is translated by Brooks 72–77 and edited by H. F. Wüstenfeld, *Jacut's geographisches Wörterbuch* II (Leipzig 1867) 863–65. The material from Ibn Khurdādhbah and Qudāmah is edited and translated into French by M. J. de Goeje, *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum* 6 (Leiden 1889) 76–84 and 196–99; here and later I cite the page numbers of the translations unless otherwise indicated.

tributed among other units.⁴ On the other hand, al-Jarmī's list must be earlier than 842/3, because al-Jarmī gives the commander of Cappadocia the rank of cleisurarch, while by the time of the *Tacticon Uspensky* this rank had been raised to strategus.⁵ These three sources, particularly al-Jarmī if he is trustworthy, provide a reasonably detailed picture of the Byzantine army in the period.

The army had two main kinds of units: the themes (*θέματα*), normally stationed in the provinces, and the tagmata (*τάγματα*), normally stationed in or around Constantinople. A tagma (unless we count the ambiguous case of the Optimates) was a military unit and nothing more. The term 'theme', in contrast, refers both to the provincial army corps and to the province in which the corps was stationed; the commander of a theme, the strategus, was both general of the corps and military governor of its province. Some provinces did not formally rank as themes and were commanded and governed not by strategi but by cleisurarchs, archons, or dukes. The Optimates, a support corps of muleteers, were usually associated with the tagmata but were stationed in a small 'theme' of their own just across the Bosphorus from Constantinople.⁶ The following notes touch on some disputed or ambiguous points about this military organization, as a preliminary to the reconstruction of a comprehensive roll and payroll of the army.⁷

I. The Tagmata Who Came to Dinner

Among the Arab writers who drew on the work of al-Jarmī, Qudāmāh gives the most complete list of the numbers of troops in the different corps, including both themes and tagmata. Qudāmāh's figures, covering thirteen provinces and six tagmata, range from 4000 to 15,000 men. Qudāmāh lists the Optimates under

⁴ On the abolition of the Khurramite corps see Warren T. Treadgold, "The Chronological Accuracy of the *Chronicle* of Symeon the Logothete for the Years 813–845," *DOPapers* 33 (1979) 183. For the mention of the destruction of Amorium, see Brooks (*supra* n.3) 74 and de Goeje (*supra* n.3) 198.

⁵ Cf. Brooks (*supra* n.3) 75 with Oikonomides 49.6. Though the latter entry is restored by Oikonomides, the restoration is certain, because later in the *Tacticon* (55.21) the Turmarch of Cappadocia appears among the turmarchs of strategi in the exact place he should hold according to the precedence of strategi in Philotheus (101.11 and 137.26).

⁶ On the Optimates, see Oikonomides 339.

⁷ The reconstruction forms part of a study, in preparation, entitled "The Byzantine State Finances in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries"; a summary was presented at the Fifth Annual Byzantine Studies Conference at Washington in October 1979.

both themes and tagmata, each time assigning it the same strength of 4000; this double listing is understandable in view of the unit's anomalous status.⁸ Qudāmah's figures for the themes agree with those given by Ibn al-Faqīh except for three purely textual variants that are easily reconciled.⁹ The roundness of all the figures follows logically from Qudāmah's (and Ibn Khurdādhbah's) description of the organization of a sample theme, which had units of an even 1000 men commanded by drungaries, counts, centarchs, and decarchs.¹⁰ If these figures accurately record the official roll of the Byzantine army, they would be an invaluable aid for the study not only of the army but of the Byzantine economy and population, and of Byzantine history in general.

Some Byzantinists, however, have regarded the Arab geographers' figures with skepticism, considering all numbers in mediaeval sources to be unreliable and these in particular to be too high. Most recently, John Haldon has argued that Qudāmah's description of the tagmata is a combination of hearsay, misunderstanding, and long-obsolete information, and that Qudāmah's (and Ibn Khurdādhbah's) overall figure for the tagmata of 24,000 men is also wrong.¹¹ If Haldon is right, all the material on Byzantium in the three Arab geographers who drew on al-Jarmī would be substantially discredited.

Haldon's argument rests mostly on the names assigned by Qudāmah to the six tagmata. The mediaeval Arabic alphabet, lacking short vowels and possessed of several ambiguous consonants, was badly suited for writing foreign words. Its deficiencies could be compensated for by diacritical marks indicating the vowels and by points differentiating the consonants, but these were seldom used, and do not seem to have been used by Qudāmah. Arab copyists, moreover, frequently mangled unfamiliar foreign words, which they did not know how to pronounce. Recognizing these problems, Haldon discussed the six names at some length, and con-

⁸ See *supra* n.6.

⁹ A comparison of the figures for troops with the ranks of the *strategi* shows that Qudāmah (or his copyist) must have repeated his figure for the Thracasian Theme from the Opsician Theme, which precedes it in his list, and his figure for the Armeniac Theme from the following Theme of Chaldia. Similarly, Ibn al-Faqīh must have repeated his figure for the Theme of Chaldia from the Thracasian Theme. In each case the other writer gives what must be the correct reading; see Treadgold (*supra* n.7).

¹⁰ See de Goeje (*supra* n.3) 196 and 84. The strength assigned to this theme (10,000 men) shows that it was the Thracasian; cf. Brooks (*supra* n.3) 74.

¹¹ "Kudāma ibn Dja'far and the Garrison of Constantinople," *Byzantion* 48 (1978) 78–90.

cluded that they represent (1) the Schools, (2) the Excubitors, (3) the Arithmus (or Watch), (4) the Federates, (5) the Optimates, and (6) the Numera. Comparing these names with the tagmata as they are known to have been in al-Jarmī's time, Haldon noted the omission of the Hicanati, created in 809/10, and of the regiment of the Walls, which goes back at least to the early eighth century. He also noted the inclusion of the Optimates, whom he did not consider to be a tagma, and of the Federates, who he believed left the capital in the reign of Nicephorus I (802–11).¹²

These arguments are far from conclusive. The ambiguity of the position of the Optimates, as noted above, is a sufficient explanation for their inclusion. As for the omission of the Walls, Haldon noted himself that at least in the eighth century the term 'Numera' could be used collectively to refer to both the Walls and the Numera proper, which were garrison units of identical organization.¹³ If Qudāmah (or al-Jarmī) used 'Numera' in this sense, the Walls would not be omitted at all. This leaves the inclusion of the Federates and the omission of the Hicanati. With one minor emendation, Haldon read Qudāmah's fourth unit as *fīdārāṭiyyīn*, or Federates, though in a footnote he mentioned *qandarāṭiyyīn* as an alternate reading and noted that this could "possibly be a corruption of *hikanatoi*."¹⁴ Haldon's first reading may look better than it is, because the *Tacticon Uspensky* and Philotheus both spell the name of the Federates *Φιβερᾶτοι* (*fiverati*)—a corruption, of course, but nonetheless the official name of the unit at this time.¹⁵ Furthermore, that the Federates were in Constantinople even under Nicephorus I is a conjecture of Ernst Stein, inferred from the facts that the Federates were normally based in (or at least near) Lycaonia and that some persons described as Lycaonians blinded an opponent of Nicephorus's on an island near Constantinople in 803; that is not a very persuasive inference.¹⁶

¹² Haldon (*supra* n.11) 81–87.

¹³ Haldon (*supra* n.11) 85–86. On the organization of the Numera proper and the Walls, see Oikonomides 336–37.

¹⁴ Haldon (*supra* n.11) 82 and n.11. The second long *a* is not in the Arabic text of de Goeje (*supra* n.3) 256.9; de Goeje (197) interprets the word as 'Skoutarii', but this reading would be inexplicable.

¹⁵ Oikonomides 55.7 and 149.23.

¹⁶ Stein, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Reiches* (Stuttgart 1919) 139; the passages on the Lycaonians are Theophanes 480 de Boor and Theophanes Continuatus 10 Bonn. Haldon himself (*supra* n.11) 83 n.14 expresses some reservations about Stein's views on the Federates.

If Qudāmah thought the Federates were in Constantinople, it is hard to see how he made his mistake. It is also curious that he put the 'Federates' in exactly the position of precedence where, according to the *Tacticon Uspensky* and Philotheus, they should be if they were the Hicanati: fourth, after the Schools, Excubitors, and Watch in that order.¹⁷ For these reasons, I would read Qudāmah's fourth unit either as qandhāztiyyīn (قنذازطيين, without emendation) or as qanātiyyīn (قناطيين, deleting the third and fifth strokes as slips of a copyist's pen). This would presumably mean that al-Jarmī heard the unit was called *ikavâtoi* (*ikanati*), understood *oi kavâtoi* (*i kanati*), and left out of his notes what he thought was the Greek article but was really the first syllable. Worse corruptions than this are routine in Arabic texts that contain Greek names.

Haldon further found an incompatibility between Qudāmah's report that these six tagmata had 4000 men each—the Numera and Optimates infantry, the others cavalry—and Ibn Khurdādhbah's report that "the garrison of the Palace" was composed of 4000 cavalry and 4000 infantry.¹⁸ But the Palace guard proper was only the Watch, who were cavalry, and the Numera (with the Walls), who were infantry; this agrees precisely with Qudāmah. Immediately after this passage Ibn Khurdādhbah refers to the "Emperor's camp," evidently all the tagmata, as numbering four units of 6000 soldiers each. This seems to be a confusion, corresponding to Qudāmah's *six* units of *four* thousand soldiers each; because we know from the *Tacticon* that the units did number six, we can be sure that Qudāmah's version is the right one.¹⁹

But for skeptics these arguments do not address the real problem: that Qudāmah's figures are improbably high. This opinion goes back at least as far as J. B. Bury, though Bury later changed his mind and left the question open.²⁰ It might have to remain open if Qudāmah's figures for the strength of the tagmata could not be checked against a wholly independent source: the treatise of Philotheus.

In the fourth part of his treatise Philotheus describes the banquets which were held by the emperors for their officials on each

¹⁷ See Oikonomides 47.15, 49.21 (or 51.5), 51.4 (or 51.32), and 53.2; and 101.6, 101.18, 103.1, and 103.6.

¹⁸ De Goeje (*supra* n.3) 81.

¹⁹ De Goeje (*supra* n.3) 81–82. Ibn Khurdādhbah says all four units were cavalry, while Qudāmah says four of six units were cavalry.

²⁰ *The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century* (London 1911) 54; *cf.* *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire* (London 1912) 228 and n.1.

of the twelve days after Christmas. Among those invited, on different days, were the officers of the tagmata, except for the Optimates. In his guest list Philotheus states explicitly that *all* the officers of the Schools, Excubitors, Watch, and Hicanati were invited, and lists their ranks. For the latter three tagmata, he mentions the number of the officers (excluding their commanders, who are mentioned separately); in each case it is 204. Philotheus lists the officers of the Schools among a group of 240, which also included the Emperor's table, with twelve high-ranking officials (the commander of the Schools among them), and two tables of officials of lower rank. Since all the tables in the room accommodated twelve guests each, there would have been twenty-four lower-ranking officials, meaning that the officers of the Schools, like those of the other three tagmata, numbered 204 ($240 - [12 + 24] = 204$).²¹ The officers of the Numera and Walls were invited together on another day, among a group of 204 which also included some officials of charitable institutions and of the Palace staff whose number is not specified.²²

Earlier in his treatise Philotheus gives separate lists of all the kinds of officers in each tagma and in the themes, though without mentioning the numbers of each kind.²³ But Qudāmah and Ibn Khurdādhbah provide information for computing the number of officers of a theme which can be applied to the corresponding officers of a tagma. According to both Arab writers, a theme had one count for every 200 men and one centarch for every forty men.²⁴ A comparison with the lists of Philotheus shows that the Schools, Watch, and Hicanati also had counts, while the Excubitors had corresponding officers called scribons and the Numera and Walls had corresponding officers called tribunes. Similarly, the Watch and Hicanati had centarchs while the equivalent officers of the Schools were called domestics, of the Excubitors draconarii, and of the Numera and Walls vicars.²⁵ Therefore, on the assumption

²¹ Oikonomides 171–75. At 171.27, I cannot agree with Oikonomides' emendation of $\sigma\mu'$ (240), the reading of both manuscripts, to $\sigma\delta'$ (204)—though if this were taken to refer only to the officers of the Schools it would be correct. On these four days the usual nineteen tables plainly were supplemented by not just one extra table but two (*i.e.*, one at the end of each row of nine tables), giving the Triclinium of the Nineteen Couches a total capacity of 252 guests. Otherwise on the room's capacity, see Oikonomides 162 n.136.

²² Oikonomides 183.

²³ Oikonomides 109–13, 115, and 119–21.

²⁴ De Goeje (*supra* n.3) 196 and 84 (at 84 and n.2, 'kontarch'—قنطرخ in the text at 111.12—should be interpreted as 'centarch', not 'hecatontarch').

²⁵ The peculiarities of the titles of many tagmatic officers show traces of older systems of

that the themes and tagmata had the same system of organization, a tagma of 4000 men should have had twenty counts (or their equivalent) and 100 centarchs (or their equivalent).

A minor problem arises with the *topoteretae* of the tagmata, who correspond to the turmarshs of the themes. The Arabic sources describe a sample theme of 10,000 men with two turmarshs, one for each 5000 men. How this information should be applied to a tagma of 4000 men is not entirely clear. Because the tagma is assigned fewer than half as many soldiers as the theme, one *topoteretes* might seem to be enough. Nevertheless, particularly because the tagmata lacked equivalents of the themes' *drugaries*, each of whom commanded 1000 men, the possibility that a tagma had two *topoteretae* (like the sample theme's two turmarshs) is hard to rule out. The text of Philotheus, which theoretically should solve the problem, is uncertain on this point. In the majority of cases the manuscripts mention the *topoteretae* of a tagma in the plural, though the editors have emended this to the singular to agree with a minority of the occurrences.²⁶ But this problem affects the total of officers by only one man.

Two other officers listed by Philotheus for each tagma and theme consistently appear in the singular: the chartulary and the protomandator. The equivalent of the latter for the Schools was the *proexemus* and for the Watch the *acoluthus*.²⁷ The tagmata also had two kinds of officers who are not listed by either Philotheus or the Arabs for the themes: standard-bearers (*bandophori*) and messengers (*mandators*). The *Tactica* of Leo VI (886–912) records that the themes had *bandophori* and *mandators* who did not have the rank of officer, two being chosen from the ranks of each *bandum*, the division commanded by a count.²⁸ Thus a tagma of

organization that had been reformed. Two kinds of *draconarii* of the Excubitors existed: subordinate commanders, corresponding to the domestics of the Schools and therefore to centarchs (see *De Ceremoniis* 599 Bonn), and standard-bearers, corresponding to the standard-bearers of other tagmata (see Oikonomides 181.27–29). Bury, *Administrative System* (*supra* n.20) 59, apparently thought that the same men performed both functions, but such an arrangement would be unworkable on the battlefield.

²⁶ See Oikonomides 110 n.69; he suggests that the solution to the problem might be that the tagmata had both senior and junior *topoteretae*, and that sometimes only the former are meant; but he consistently prints the word in the singular.

²⁷ See Oikonomides 330 and 331. Though Philotheus does not specifically mention the *acoluthus* of the Watch and the protomandator of the Hicanati in his guest list, it seems safe to assume that they were included among the *mandators*, whom he does mention (Oikonomides 173.29 and 175.10).

²⁸ Migne, *PG* 107.705D (*cf.* 701D). Oikonomides 110 n.67 believes that the *mandators*

4000 men should have had forty standard-bearers and forty messengers. The standard-bearers of the four senior tagmata had a variety of names, with four parallel names for each:

SCHOOLS	EXCUBITORS	WATCH	HICANATI
protectors	draconarii	bandophori	bandophori
eutyphophori	sceuphophori	laburesii	semiophori
sceptrophori	signophori	semiophori	semiophori
axiomatichi	sinators	ducinators	ducinators

If we believe Qudāmah we shall be tempted to assume that each tagma had ten of each of its kinds of standard-bearer, but for computing the total the distribution of the titles is irrelevant. For the Numera and Walls no standard-bearers are mentioned either in the lists of officers or in the guest list for the Christmas banquet. In the guest list for the Watch some of the mandators are called thurori and diatrechontes.²⁹

With the exception of the topoteretae, who might have been either one per tagma or two per tagma, we can now compute how many officers each of the four senior tagmata should have had in 899 if Qudāmah is right about the numbers of the tagmata and about the organization of the Byzantine army, and if these had not changed between 839/42 and 899. The result of this computation should be comparable to Philotheus' figure of 204 officers of each tagma who came to dinner. If each tagma had two topoteretae, the sum for each tagma would be:

2	topoteretae
1	chartulary
20	counts (scribons)
100	centarchs (domestics, draconarii)
1	protomandator (proexemus, acoluthus)
40	bandophori (protectors, eutyphophori, sceptrophori, axiomatichi, draconarii, sceuphophori, signophori, sinators, laburesii, semiophori, ducinators)
40	mandators (thurori, diatrechontes)
<u>204</u>	officers

of the themes have dropped out of our text of Philotheus and restores them; but I do not see why they should be missed any more than the bandophori, and they would seem to be in excess of the nine ranks that Philotheus says the themes had (the meriarch was a real rank, even though a sort of turmarch; Oikonomides 108 n.65).

²⁹ See Rodolphe Guilland, *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines* I (Berlin and Amsterdam 1967) 567, on the titles of the mandators of the Watch, and note that legatarii were

The virtually inescapable conclusion is that Qudāmah is correct, that the numbers of the tagmata and the organization of the army did not change between 839/42 and 899, and that each of the four senior tagmata had two topoteretae.

As for the Numera and Walls, Philotheus' guest list notes specifically that they had two topoteretae among them—that is, one each.³⁰ Each had its own chartulary and protomandator. If they had a combined total of 4000 men, they will also have had 20 tribunes, 100 vicars, and 40 mandators between them for a total of 166 officers, leaving 38 places at their banquet for the other officials. Since it seems evident from the foregoing that the command of a topoteretes was 2000 men, that was presumably the strength of the separate commands of the Walls and the Numera proper; evidently al-Jarmī was indeed using 'Numera' as a generic term for both regiments. The extent and accuracy of al-Jarmī's knowledge seem to indicate that he had at least indirect access to the official roll of the Byzantine army.

II. Obsolete Ranks in the *Tacticon Uspensky*

Several scholars have noticed that the *Tacticon Uspensky* is a carelessly prepared document, which includes certain ranks that had become obsolete by 842/3 but that the compiler neglected to strike out. These ranks are of two sorts: titles which had been replaced by other titles of higher rank (so that both titles appear in the *Tacticon*), and titles which had remained the same but had been moved up in the list of precedence (so that the same title appears twice, in different places).³¹ But such obsolete titles do not

still another sort of mandator (*cf.* Oikonomides 183, in the guest list for the Numera and Walls). Note also that my table of standard-bearers is identical with that of Bury, *Administrative System* (*supra* n.20) 56, except that I assume an additional class of semiophori for the Hicanati to complete the organizational parallel.

³⁰ Oikonomides 183.10–11.

³¹ Though it is theoretically possible that some of these offices had been degraded, so that the lower rank would be the later one, this would be contrary to the pronounced tendency of the Byzantines to inflate ranks as time went by. Though some have assumed that a strategus and an archon or duke could have existed in the same area at the same time, the existence of two military governors in one jurisdiction makes no administrative sense; *cf.* the *Tacticon's* mention of the Archon of Dalmatia, Duke of Calabria, and Archon of Cyprus (Oikonomides 57.12 and 57.14–15), all of whom were the sole commanders in their regions and were later replaced by strategi. Since twelve other ranks listed in the

seem likely to have survived many revisions of the list, or to have remained in the list for many years before the final redaction of the *Tacticon*. The only obsolete title whose obsolescence can be securely dated is that of the ‘archons of Cherson’ (for which we should probably read ‘Archon of Cherson’), which will have been replaced by the Strategus of the Climata in 839 or early 840.³² This was only three or four years before the *Tacticon*’s final redaction.

Among eleven officials who are listed twice, the *Tacticon* mentions the Drungary of the Aegean Sea once in an older, lower rank and once raised to a higher rank just above the ‘Drungary of the Gulf’ (*δρογγάριος τοῦ Κόλπου*).³³ Much the most likely identification of ‘the Gulf’ is the Gulf of Attalia, also called the Gulf of Pamphylia.³⁴ If this is correct, these two drungaries were both subordinates of the Strategus of the Cibyrrhaeot Theme, which then included both the coast of the Gulf of Attalia and the islands of the Aegean Sea. After 843, when the Aegean Sea became a separate theme, the title of Drungary of the Gulf was apparently changed to Drungary of the Cibyrrhaeot Theme, since there was then only one; in any case, by the time of Philotheus he is not mentioned separately from the undifferentiated ‘drungaries of the themes’.³⁵ The Drungary of the Aegean Sea may well have been raised in rank above the Drungary of the Gulf as part of the preparations for the expedition of 843 against Crete—and then raised again to the rank of strategus as a sort of replacement for the Strategus of Crete after the expedition failed.

The *Tacticon* also includes both an Archon of Crete and a Stra-

Tacticon were certainly obsolete (because the same titles appear twice; see *infra* n.33), the obsolescence of the titles of the two archons and duke discussed below is amply paralleled.

³² Oikonomides 57.13 and 47.19. The Theme of the Climata was founded in Cherson in response to an embassy from Kiev that occurred in the year after John the Grammarian became Patriarch of Constantinople; Theophanes Continuatus 122–23 Bonn, *cf.* Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio* 42.20–55 (Moravcsik and Jenkins, *CFHB* I). John became Patriarch on 21 April 838; Treadgold (*supra* n.4) 178–79. That the Kievan embassy came to Constantinople in early 839 also seems evident from the *Annales Bertiniani*, ed. G. Waitz (Hannover 1883) 19–20. Previous dates for the foundation of the Climata have been based on misdating John’s accession.

³³ Oikonomides 57.10 and 53.18–19; the other officials listed twice are at 59.16–19 and 63.13–19 (the obsolete ranks), and at 53.26, 57.23–25, 59.21–23, 61.5, 61.2–3, and 59.10 (the new ranks).

³⁴ *Cf.* Theophanes’ reference to *ὁ κόλπος Ἀταλείας* (465.16 de Boor) and Constantine VII’s reference to *ὁ Παμφύλιος κόλπος* (*De Thematibus* 80.6 Pertusi).

³⁵ Oikonomides 157.9. On the date of the creation of the Theme of the Aegean Sea see Oikonomides 46–47.

tegus of Crete.³⁶ Several scholars have argued that the Strategus of Crete replaced the archon before 767.³⁷ The evidence cited is a passage in the *Life* of St Stephen the Younger which refers to an ἀρχισατράπης of Crete who existed before Stephen was martyred in that year.³⁸ But this term, itself an archaism without technical value, could stand for the title of archon just as easily as that of strategus. A tiny ‘theme’ of Crete seems out of place among the large themes that existed before they were subdivided in the early ninth century. Several seals of archons of Crete have been dated to the late eighth or early ninth century, but no seal of a Strategus of Crete appears to be datable to that period.³⁹ This evidence suggests—if it does not absolutely prove—that the first Strategus of Crete was appointed just before the expedition was mounted in early 843 to retake the island from the Arabs. This probably was the date at which the title of Archon of Crete became obsolete; even if we could be sure that all of the archon’s jurisdiction had fallen to the Arabs in 828 (and we cannot), his office would presumably have remained in the list as long as the government considered the conquest temporary. But that the obsolete title of Archon of Crete remained unnoticed in precedence lists for over seventy-five years seems impossible. Thus the *Tacticon Uspensky* appears to provide the final proof that the ‘archsatrap’ of the *Life* of St Stephen the Younger was not a strategus but an archon.

The *Tacticon* mentions both the archons (for which presumably read ‘Archon’) and the Strategus of Dyrrhachium.⁴⁰ J. Ferluga has suggested that the Theme of Dyrrhachium existed by 826 because Theodore of Studius, who died in that year, mentions a chartulary as an associate of a certain Antonius of Dyrrhachium, and strategi are among the various officials known to have had chartularies.⁴¹ If this chartulary was in fact resident at Dyrrhachium (a reasonable but not certain inference), the passage still points only to the existence there of some higher official, who could as easily have been an archon as a strategus. The *Tacticon* itself contains the first mention of a Strategus of Dyrrhachium.

³⁶ Oikonomides 53.5 and 47.18.

³⁷ See the references cited by Oikonomides 353 and n.371.

³⁸ Migne, PG 100.1164B.

³⁹ See G. Zacos and A. Vegler, *Byzantine Lead Seals* 1.2 (Basel 1972) 1017–18 no. 1782 and commentary.

⁴⁰ Oikonomides 57.11 and 49.17.

⁴¹ J. Ferluga, “Sur la création du thème de Dyrrachium,” *XII^e Congrès international des études byzantines: Résumés des communications* (Belgrade and Ochrid 1961) 32. The passage is in Migne, PG 99.1492c.

The *Tacticon* further mentions both a Duke and a Strategus of Chaldia.⁴² Chaldia has been thought to have been a theme as early as 821 because Michael II, in his letter to Louis the Pious, calls Chaldia a *ducatus* at that time. Though this proves that Chaldia was a separate jurisdiction, it hardly proves that Chaldia was a theme, because the word *ducatus* could obviously refer to an area ruled by a duke (*δούξ*), the obsolete title in the *Tacticon*.⁴³ Again, the first mention of a Strategus of Chaldia is in the *Tacticon*; the mention in the *Acta of the Martyrs of Amorium* of ‘seven themes’ in Asia Minor in 838⁴⁴ may mean that Chaldia was a theme by then, but could also be an imprecise way of referring to six themes and the Duchy of Chaldia. At any rate, if Chaldia was a theme in 838 the presence of its duke in the *Tacticon* suggests that it had not been a theme for long. The evidence now known does not indicate that any title in the *Tacticon Uspensky* had to be obsolete before 838. I suspect that the archetype used by the careless redactor of the *Tacticon* was not much more than four or five years old and itself contained no ranks that were obsolete in its own time.

III. Cleisurarchs and Turmarchs in the *Tacticon Uspensky*

In Oikonomides’ edition the *Tacticon Uspensky* lists cleisurarchs and turmarchs as follows:

- 55.4 *οἱ κλεισουράρχαι (οἱ κλησουαρχ cod.)*
 55.5 *ὁ κλεισουριάρχης Χαρσιανοῦ (οἱ κλησιαρχ cod.)*
ὁ κλεισουράρχης {ὁ} Σωζοπόλεως (οἱ κλησουαρχ ὁ
Σωζωπο cod.)
ὁ τουρμάρχης τῶν φιβεράτων (οἱ τουρμαρχ cod.)
ὁ τουρμάρχης Λυκαονίας (οἱ τουρμαρχ cod.)
ὁ τοποτηρητής τῶν σχολῶν (ποτηρητής cod.)
 (six lines of other officials)

⁴² Oikonomides 53.3 and 49.10.

⁴³ Mansi 16.418A. In the same passage, however, Michael also refers to the Armeniac Theme as a *ducatus*, there being no proper Latin word for ‘theme’.

⁴⁴ Ed. V. Vasiljevskij and P. Nikitin, *Zapiski Imp. Akad. Nauk, Ist.-Filol. Otd.* VII.2 (St. Petersburg 1905) 65.8. No earlier than 839, al-Jarmī mentioned seven Anatolian military districts (Paphlagonia, Opsician, Thracesian, Anatolic, Bucellarian, Armeniac, and Chaldia) apart from the cleisurarchies (Seleucia, Cappadocia, and Charsianum) and the Optimates; see Brooks (*supra* n.3) 73–77.

- 55.16 οἱ τουρμάρχαι τῶν Ἀνατολικῶν
 {οἱ τουρμάρχαι τῶν Ἀρμενιакῶν} (*suppl.* Oikonomides)
 οἱ τουρμάρχαι Θρακησίων (τουρμάρχ Θράκις *cod.*)
 οἱ τουρμάρχαι τοῦ Ὀψικίου (ὁ τουρμάρχ *cod.*)
- 55.20 οἱ τούρμαρχοι Βουκελλαρίων (ὁ τούρμαρχ *cod.*)
 οἱ τούρμαρχοι Καππαδοκίας (ὁ τούρμαρχ *cod.*)
- 57.1 οἱ τουρμάρχαι Παφλαγονίας
 οἱ τουρμάρχαι τῆς Θράκης (ὁ τουρμάρχ *cod.*)
 οἱ τουρμάρχαι Μακεδονίας

and then no more turmarchs.

There are several problems with this text. (1) The Cleisurarch of Seleucia, mentioned by al-Jarmī and represented by several seals, is missing.⁴⁵ (2) No ‘Cleisurarch of Sozopolis’ is otherwise known or likely to have existed, because cleisurarchies were frontier districts and Sozopolis (in Pisidia in the Anatolic Theme) was nowhere near the frontier. On the other hand, a ‘Turmarch of Sozopolis’ is known from a seal.⁴⁶ (3) The ‘Turmarchs of the Anatolics’ are in the wrong place according to the precedence of the themes and tagmata. In other places in the *Tacticon* and in Philotheus, the Anatolics invariably come first, the schools next, and the other themes after that, but here the Anatolics follow the Schools.⁴⁷ (4) No turmarchs are listed for any of the ten themes of the Western class, which must have had turmarchs; seals exist of the turmarchs of at least four of them.⁴⁸ (5) Of fourteen entries for cleisurarchs and turmarchs, eight are given in the wrong number in the manuscript, according to the editor; this, like the omission of the turmarchs of the Armeniacs, seems disturbing in the absence of at least a partial explanation.

The text of the manuscript is obviously corrupt, and the emendations made so far have not restored it satisfactorily. To begin with, line 55.6 is evidently a confusion of two officers, one a cleisurarch and the other the independently attested Turmarch of Sozopolis. Presumably the cleisurarch was the missing Cleisurarch of Seleucia, particularly because Seleucia begins with the same letter as So-

⁴⁵ Zacos and Veglery (*supra* n.39) nos. 1899, 1902, 2460, 2464, 2666, and 2667.

⁴⁶ Zacos and Veglery (*supra* n.39) no. 2643. I see no reason to think of the Sozopolis in Thrace, which is never mentioned as the seat of any sort of military district and which was evidently part of the Theme of Thrace until the later tenth century.

⁴⁷ Cf. Oikonomides 47.14–15 and 49.2–19, 61.1–3, and 101.5–32.

⁴⁸ Zacos and Veglery (*supra* n.39) nos. 1876 (Hellas), 1710 and 2523 (Cibyrrhaeots), 2272 and 2664 (Sicily), and 2558 and 3146 (Thessalonica). The ‘Turmarch of Crete’ of no. 2059 could have been a subordinate of either the Strategus or the Archon of Crete.

zopolis. This gives us three turmarchs, including the Turmarch of Sozopolis, who rank ahead of the Topoteretes (read ‘topoteretae’) of the Schools. Sozopolis and Lycaonia were certainly in the Anatolic Theme, and the Federates are known to have been stationed in the Anatolic Theme.⁴⁹ According to al-Jarmī, the Anatolics had three turmarchs.⁵⁰ Here they are.

This means that the ‘Turmarchs of the Anatolics’ in line 55.16, where they are out of place anyway, must be a mistake, presumably for the missing ‘Turmarchs of the Armeniacs’. A copyist who did not recognize the turmarchs of Sozopolis, Lycaonia, and the Federates as the real turmarchs of the Anatolics seems to have supplied them by altering ‘Armeniacs’ to ‘Anatolics’ in his text, not realizing that now the Armeniacs were left out.

On the basis of the manuscript of the *Tacticon* alone, the precedence of the true turmarchs of the Anatolics would appear to be: (1) Sozopolis, (2) Federates, and (3) Lycaonia. But the correct order can probably be restored by comparison with the treatise of Philotheus, which after the cleisurarchs lists: (1) the Turmarch of the Federates, (2) the Turmarch of Lycaonia, and (3) the Turmarch of Pamphylia.⁵¹ The Turmarch of Pamphylia, also attested by a seal, was evidently the successor of the Turmarch of Sozopolis. Though the coast of Pamphylia (‘the Gulf’) was in the Cibyrrhaeot Theme, the Byzantines could use the name ‘Pamphylia’ loosely for an area extending into what we would call Pisidia, as Constantine VII confirms in his *De Thematibus* when he calls ‘Pamphylia’ a district of the Anatolic Theme.⁵²

Finally, an explanation for the incorrect plurals in lines 55.5–8 is suggested by the heading ‘the cleisurarchs’ in line 55.4. Probably the archetype read something like this, following a pattern used in several other places in the *Tacticon*:

οἱ κλεισουράρχαι Χαρσιανοῦ
καὶ Σελευκείας
οἱ τουρμάρχαι τῶν φιβεράτων

⁴⁹ Theophanes Continuatus 52 Bonn, referring to the year 820.

⁵⁰ Brooks (*supra* n.3) 74.

⁵¹ Oikonomides 149.23–24, where I would adopt the reading of manuscript H and put the turmarchs of Lycaonia and Pamphylia in the plural, since they were certainly distinct (see *infra* n.52).

⁵² 61.14–15 Pertusi. For the seal of the Turmarch of Pamphylia, see Zacos and Veglery (*supra* n.39) no. 2198. (The seal of the ‘Turmarch of the Anatolics’, dated to 750–850 by Zacos and Veglery, no. 2662, indicates that at some time before the *Tacticon* at least one of the three turmarchs had not yet acquired a separate name.)

καὶ Λυκαονίας
καὶ Σωζοπόλεως

The copyist, misunderstanding, turned these combined entries into separate entries, repeating the plural where it was now wrong, skipped from the first cleisurarch to the last turmarch, and then, seeing that he had omitted the two preceding turmarchs, added them without regard to their precedence. This hypothesis agrees with Philotheus, includes no officers whose existence is not reliably attested elsewhere, and omits no officers whose presence is required. It indicates that Stein was mistaken in supposing that the Federates were the same as the Lycaonians, because Lycaonia was a distinct turmarchy. In all probability the Federates were stationed in Phrygia with the Strategus of the Anatolics, since the Turmarch of the Federates was the Strategus' highest-ranking subordinate.⁵³

As for the remaining turmarchs, their numbers are a problem. According to al-Jarmī, the Armeniacs and Anatolics had three turmarchs and the Bucellarians and Thracians two.⁵⁴ It is worth noting that al-Jarmī's figures for the troops of the two former themes are evenly divisible by three (9000 and 15,000), while the troops in the latter two themes are evenly divisible by two (8000 and 10,000). Al-Jarmī assigns his sample theme with 10,000 men (evidently the Thracians), two turmarchs commanding 5000 men each.⁵⁵ Since these four themes, again according to al-Jarmī, were the four largest, it is not obvious that the remaining themes had more than one turmarch apiece at this time; and indeed the *Tacticon* lists the turmarchs of three out of five of them in the singular. Here the seals may be of help. Besides seals of turmarchs of themes, ninth-century seals exist of turmarchs of Adramyttium, Claudiopolis, and Dazimon.⁵⁶ The first would be the junior turmarch of the Thracians, the second would be the junior turmarch of the Bucellarians, and the third would be one of the two junior turmarchs of the Armeniacs (the other was presumably that of Colonia, soon to be made a separate theme). Apart from the turmarchs of the Anatolics already mentioned, no other ninth-century

⁵³ The theme's headquarters were normally at Amorium but had been moved after Amorium was sacked. See Brooks (*supra* n.3) 74 and nn.9 and 3.

⁵⁴ Brooks (*supra* n.3) 74 and 76; the 10,000 men and two turmarchs attributed at Brooks 76 to Chaldia actually belonged to the Thracians (see *supra* n.9).

⁵⁵ See *supra* n.10.

⁵⁶ Zacos and Vegler (*supra* n.39) nos. 1722, 1905, and 410 and 1762A.

seals of turmarchs have yet been published. Though the *Tacticon* gives Paphlagonia and Macedonia ‘turmarshs’ in the plural, this is probably wrong, particularly because the 5000 troops of each do not divide evenly into two or three turms. In the case of Macedonia the plural is easily explained by restoring *οἱ τουρμάρχαι Μακεδονίας* (καὶ τῶν θεμάτων τῆς δύσεως), which also accounts for the ten missing themes.

IV. The Mutilation of the End of the *Tacticon Uspensky*

The longest list of ranks in the treatise of Philotheus clearly extends to the very bottom of the Byzantine hierarchy, for it ends with the common soldiers of the themes and tagmata. By contrast, the first list in Philotheus includes only officials and officers directly subordinate to the Emperor.⁵⁷ The *Tacticon Uspensky* falls in between, extending 140 places below the ranks directly dependent on the Emperor before stopping at a place that seems equivalent to the fifty-seventh from the end of the longest list of Philotheus. To be sure, the title of the *Tacticon* notes that it is an abbreviated list (*τακτικὸν ἐν ἐπιτόμῳ*). But the place where it stops is not a logical one, its last word is evidently corrupt, and before the list stops it leaves out several officers who are listed by Philotheus before that point.

The omissions begin twelve places from the end, where the counts of the themes are left out after the drungaries of the themes and before the counts of the Watch. Since the equivalent officers of the themes outrank those of the Watch everywhere else, including the previous part of the *Tacticon*, they must belong here, at the point where they duly appear in Philotheus.⁵⁸ Presumably this is an omission through homoeoteleuton: the copyist skipped from one line that ended with *τῶν θεμάτων* to the same ending in the next line. Four lines later, the Chartulary of the Hicanati is left out after the counts of the Hicanati, though he appears in this place in Philotheus and seems parallel to the Chartulary of the Watch, who in both Philotheus and the *Tacticon* immediately follows the counts of the Watch.⁵⁹ Here the trouble seems to be homoeoteleu-

⁵⁷ Cf. Oikonomides 143–61 and 101–03.

⁵⁸ Cf. Oikonomides 63.20–21 and 157.9–11.

⁵⁹ Cf. Oikonomides 63.24–25 and 157.17–18.

ton again, this time with the endings τῶν ἱκανάτων. Three lines later, five lines are omitted for no apparent reason.⁶⁰ Finally, the last entry in the *Tacticon*, οἱ κένσορες, is quite unparalleled at this date; a comparison with Philotheus suggests that it is a confusion of οἱ κένταρχοι and οἱ προτίκτωρες, who appear one after another at just this point.⁶¹

Since before this short section at its end the *Tacticon* seems to omit lines in only three places, such gross carelessness was not always typical of its copyist's work.⁶² Evidently he was copying from a full list of the type of the longest list of Philotheus, but had little interest in the lowest-ranking officials, so that he at first copied them hurriedly and then left the rest uncopied. It would therefore be a mistake to conclude anything from the omission at the end of the *Tacticon* of any official who occurs at the end of Philotheus' longest list. To the contrary, we may be fairly sure that the very close parallel between the rest of the *Tacticon* and Philotheus' list continued throughout the *Tacticon*'s archetype. All the sorts of titles in the rest of Philotheus' list are (with four exceptions) of corps and departments known to have existed with a similar organization at the time of the *Tacticon*.⁶³ For most purposes, therefore, the list of Philotheus can be safely used to complete the *Tacticon*'s mutilated ending.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ Cf. Oikonomides 63.27–29 and 157.19–26.

⁶¹ Cf. Oikonomides 63.32 and 157.28–159.1.

⁶² The other omissions are at Oikonomides 47.7–10, 49.6, and 55.6 (where I have conjectured *supra* that the copyist skipped from the Cleisurarch of Seleucia to the Turmarch of Sozopolis; I have also argued that at 55.17 the turmarshs of the Armeniacs have not been omitted but have rather been corrupted to 'turmarshs of the Anatolics' at 55.16). As Oikonomides notes (47 n.19), the omission of the Patriarch of Constantinople at 47.3 may well mean that the office was vacant at the time, John the Grammarian having been deposed and Methodius not yet consecrated.

⁶³ The exceptions are the ranks of apoeparchon and stratelates at Oikonomides 159.5, οἱ ἐξκουβίτωρες at 159.3 (almost certainly a confusion with 159.33: see *infra* Appendix), and οἱ δρουγγάριοι τῶν πεζῶν at 161.18, who appear to be otherwise unattested (I suspect they were the leaders of the irregular troops mentioned by Qudāmah: de Goeje [*supra* n.3] 199). Line 159.33, which reads in the ms. οἱ πρωτομανδάτορες καὶ λεγατάριοι τῶν ἐξκουβίτων, is evidently a confusion of the protomandators of the themes (cf. 111.4) and the mandators and legatarii of the excubitors.

⁶⁴ I am not convinced, however, that Oikonomides is right in altering the text of Philotheus at the very end to make the soldiers of the themes rank before the soldiers of the tagmata (161.20–21). Though it is true that the officers of the tagmata (except for the Schools, and in Philotheus' time the Excubitors) always ranked below their counterparts in the themes, the soldiers of the tagmata had a more professional status than those of the themes, and this status might well have been reflected in their rank. In the absence of specific evidence, the text of the ms. should probably be left as it is.

V. The Paraphylax of the Castrum

Ibn al-Faqīh, at the end of his summary of al-Jarmī, remarks (in the translation of E. W. Brooks), “And over each of the fortresses of the Romans is a man stationed in it who is called barkilis(?), who judges among its inhabitants.”⁶⁵ Brooks suggests that ‘barkilis’ may stand for *κομμερκιάριος*. A customs officer, however, does not seem an appropriate person to administer a fort. The word is unpointed and unvocalized in the Arabic text.⁶⁶ Without any emendation, it can be read barafilays (برفيليس), which is about as close as Arabic, lacking *p*, can come to the Greek *παραφύλαξ* (parafilax). These officials are evidently the *παραφύλακες τῶν κάστρων* who appear in the part of the longest list of Philotheus that corresponds to the missing ending of the *Tacticon Uspensky*.⁶⁷

VI. Where Did the Theme of Paphlagonia Come From?

In a letter written during his third exile (815–820), Theodore of Studius refers to “the five themes” of Asia Minor.⁶⁸ These can only be the Anatolic, Armeniac, Thracesian, Opsician, and Bucellarian; though the Cibyrhaeot Theme was partly in Asia Minor at this date, as a naval theme it was officially in a different category. But by the time of al-Jarmī and the *Tacticon Uspensky*, about 842, there were five new themes and cleisurarchies in Asia Minor: Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, Chaldia, Charsianum, and Seleucia. The *De Administrando Imperio*, for this purpose a reliable source, reports that Cappadocia had previously been part of the Anatolic Theme and Charsianum part of the Armeniac Theme.⁶⁹ Chaldia also must originally have been part of the Armeniac Theme, because it bordered on no other theme. Similarly, Seleucia must have been separated from the Anatolic Theme, because this was the only non-naval theme it adjoined; as its soldiers were not marines, they cannot have come from the Cibyrhaeot Theme. According to Bury, who has been followed by all later authorities, “Paphlagonia

⁶⁵ Brooks (*supra* n.3) 77.

⁶⁶ Wüstenfeld (*supra* n.3) 865.19.

⁶⁷ Oikonomides 161.15.

⁶⁸ Migne, *PG* 99.1284A–B.

⁶⁹ 50.83–84 and 90–91 Moravcsik.

seems to have been cut off from the Bucellarian province. . . .”⁷⁰ Though Paphlagonia did border on the Bucellarian Theme, it bordered on the Armeniac Theme as well, and Bury gives no reason to rule out the possibility that Paphlagonia was originally part of the Armeniacs.

According to the *Life* of St Philaretus the Almsgiver, written by the saint’s grandson in 822, in the late eighth century Philaretus lived in the village of Amnia, which was a dependency of the city of Gangra.⁷¹ In the *De Thematibus* Constantine VII describes Gangra as the metropolis of the then Theme of Paphlagonia.⁷² Philaretus left Amnia in 788, when his granddaughter Maria was selected by a traveling panel of judges as a competitor for the hand of the Emperor Constantine VI, which she then won. Under that year the *Chronicle* of Theophanes, completed between 813 and 815, records that the Empress Irene “sent out Theophanes the Protospatharius, and he brought a girl *from the Armeniacs*, Maria by name, from Amnia; and she [Irene] married her to Constantine, the Emperor and her son. . . .”⁷³ This evidence is sufficient proof that Paphlagonia was originally a part of the Armeniac Theme, not the Bucellarian. As the *Life* of Theodore of Studius by Michael of Studius speaks of the Theme of Paphlagonia as existing before Theodore died in 826, it must have been detached before then and after 815/20.⁷⁴ Modern maps of the Byzantine themes before that date, or showing the development of the themes, are therefore in need of correction.⁷⁵

APPENDIX: SUGGESTED CHANGES IN THE TEXTS OF THE *Tacticon* Uspensky AND PHILOTHEUS

All references are to the page and line numbers of the edition of Oikonomides. Changes requiring no emendation are marked with an asterisk.

⁷⁰ *History* (*supra* n.20) 222.

⁷¹ Ed. M.-H. Fourmy and M. Leroy, *Byzantion* 9 (1934) 135.28–32.

⁷² 72.19 Pertusi.

⁷³ Theophanes 463 de Boor: . . . ἀπέλυσε Θεοφάνην τὸν πρωτοσπαθάριον, καὶ ἤγαγε κόρην ἐκ τῶν Ἀρμενιᾶκῶν ὀνόματι Μαρίαν ἀπὸ Ἀμνίας, καὶ ἔξευξεν αὐτὴν Κωνσταντίνῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ νύμφῳ αὐτῆς. . . .

⁷⁴ Migne, *PG* 99.309c.

⁷⁵ This article was written with the support of a Research Fellowship from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. I should like to thank Dr. James Howard-Johnston of Oxford University for reading the typescript and making several useful suggestions.

Tacticon Uspensky:

- 55.6. For {ὁ} *Σωζοπόλεως* read (Σελευκείας).
 55.8a. Add line: ὁ (τουρμάρχης) *Σωζοπόλεως*.
 55.9. For ὁ *τοποτηρητής* read οἱ *τοποτηρηταί*.
 55.16. For Ἀνατολικῶν read Ἀρμενικῶν.
 55.17. Delete this line.*
 55.19. For οἱ *τουρμάρχαι* read ὁ *τουρμάρχης*.*
 55.21. For οἱ *τούρμαρχοι* read ὁ *τούρμαρχος*.*
 57.1. For οἱ *τουρμάρχαι* read ὁ *τουρμάρχης*.
 57.2. For οἱ *τουρμάρχαι* read ὁ *τουρμάρχης*.*
 57.3. Add at end of line: (καὶ τῶν θεμάτων τῆς δύσεως).
 57.6–8. For ὁ *τοποτηρητής* read οἱ *τοποτηρηταί* (three times).*
 61.21. For ἔμπρατοι read ἄπρατοι (cf. 57.16 with 60 n.45).
 63.20–32. See *supra* Section IV.

Philotheus:

- 111.5. Delete (μανδάτωρες).*
 111.8. For *τοποτηρητής* read *τοποτηρηταί*.
 111.26, 115.23, 117.3, 119.3, and 119.23. For *τοποτηρητής* read *τοποτηρηταί*.*
 149.24. For ὁ *σπαθαροκανδιδάτος καὶ τουρμάρχης* read *οἱ σπαθαροκανδιδάτοι καὶ τουρμάρχαι*.*
 149.25, 151.3, 151.5, 151.7, 151.8, and 151.10. For ὁ *σπαθαροκανδιδάτος καὶ τοποτηρητής* read οἱ *σπαθαροκανδιδάτοι καὶ τοποτηρηταί*.*
 157.26. Add at end of line: (ἄπρατοι) (cf. 63.29, and note that they have already been mentioned at 153.26 as ἔμπρατοι).
 159.33. For οἱ *μανδάτωρες καὶ λεγατάριοι τῶν ἐξκουβίτων* read *οἱ πρωτομανδάτωρες (τῶν θεμάτων*
 159.33a. Add line: *οἱ μανδάτωρες) καὶ λεγατάριοι τῶν ἐξκουβίτων*.
 159.35. For οἱ *ἐξκουβίτωρες* read οἱ *μανδάτωρες (καὶ λεγατάριοι τῶν ἱκανάτων)*.
 161.20–21. Reverse order of these lines.*
 171.24. For *τοποτηρητήν* read *τοποτηρητάς*.
 171.27. For σδ´ read σμ´.*
 173.1. For τὸν δὲ *τοποτηρητήν* read τοὺς δὲ *τοποτηρητάς*.
 173.14. For *τοποτηρητήν* read *τοποτηρητάς*.*
 173.27. For *τοποτηρητήν* read *τοποτηρητάς*.
 173.30–31. For τὸν μὲν *τοποτηρητήν* read τοὺς μὲν *τοποτηρητάς*.
 175.9. For *τοποτηρητήν* read *τοποτηρητάς*.
 179.11. For τὸν *τοποτηρητήν* read τοὺς *τοποτηρητάς*.
 179.17. For τοῦ *τοποτηρητοῦ* read τῶν *τοποτηρητῶν*.*

OXFORD

May, 1980