THE BRITISH SECTIONS OF THE 'NOTITIA DIGNITATUM'

By C. E. STEVENS

The ' antiquarian ' of old times was wont to be well up in the literary authorities of British history, and the early numbers of the *Journal* are full of speculations upon them, which raise only a smile from the professional archaeologist of to-day as he turns their pages in an idle hour. We know now, in the words of our father Crawford, that ' deductive arguments are legitimate up to a point, of course, but muddy boots are better.'[1]

Yet now, awaiting a call to sterner work, the archaeologist can only imitate his grandfather and look at the literary authorities. He ' cannot dig,' and the paths of a field-worker's ' muddy boots ' lead nowadays too easily to the guard-room or even to the prison cell.

Of all the literary texts (if one may call it literary), the *Notitia Dignitatum* has, perhaps, engaged the antiquarian least, possibly from a reason that has influenced the courses of research more than one realises—the *Notitia* is one of those works of which it is very difficult to get a copy of one's own. A bookseller's entry (Very scarce ! !) on the eve of war and a timely telegram are the true origins of this paper.

To students of the Later Roman Empire, the *Notitia* has always taken its place with the Law Books of Theodosius II and Justinian in the trinity of documents from which we learn the structure and operations of the great administrative machine of a great empire. The machine was the creation of Diocletian and Constantine, and though recent work has shown that they were more truly formalizing existing custom than introducing revolutionary changes,[2] the magnitude of their reforms still deserves admiration.

[1] *J.R.S.*, xv, 133.
[2] *Cambridge Ancient History*, xii, 389–398.

Under the old system of Augustus, the very size of the empire had put a strain upon the organization at two points especially :

I. The omnicompetence of a provincial governor, who controlled both the civil and the military administration, tempted ambitious men to aim higher, at the empire itself, and gave them the means to do so. And unambitious men were pushed into rebellion by their own soldiers, who hoped for the spoils of victory and threatened their commanders with death unless they took their chance in a bid for the throne. The century before Diocletian is crowded with such ' pronunciamenti,' and Britain gives us a classical example in the rebellion and defeat of Albinus. Diocletian's solution was to divide the provinces into small units (thus Britain comprises four, later five, instead of two provinces) and to separate civil and military powers. [1]

II. The military system of Augustus is the result of a sudden change to a static defence. Till then, Roman armies were continually advancing—' imperium sine fine dedi,' said Jupiter to Venus. [2] Now the Roman empire had frontiers, and it was the doctrine that they should not be passed, [3] a doctrine only rarely (as in Britain) contravened. Nevertheless, troops were still massed on the frontiers ready, as it were, to spring forward, and there was no mobile defensive reserve. Consequently, reinforcements could only be sent to one sector of the frontier by denuding another. [4]

This problem was faced by Diocletian, who followed the tentative efforts of his predecessors in building up a field-force ; but the real credit of a final scheme seems to belong to Constantine. The army was divided into the mobile reserve (*comitatenses*) and the sedentary frontier troops (*limitanei*), who enjoyed less pay and fewer privileges. [5] In Britain, [6] the number of *limitanei* was high and its island position ensured that a military

---

[1] See *J.R.S.*, xxii, 24–32.

[2] Vergil, *Aen.*, i, 279.

[3] Tacitus, *Annals*, i. 11.

[4] See Pelham, *Essays on Roman History*, 164–178.

[5] Gibbon, *ed.* Bury, ii, 188 ; Grosse, *Romische Militargeschichte* (cited as Grosse), 89.

[6] It must be remembered that in the organization of the later empire, the legions at York and Richborough were *Limitanei* (i.e. second-class troops) equally with the garrisons of *castella*.

conspiracy among these low-grade troops would be difficult to crush. An ambitious general or soldier could offer the bait of taking the *limitanei* overseas and making *comitatenses* of them. It is not an accident, therefore, that in the Later Empire Britain was proverbially the hot-bed of ' tyrants '[1] (or usurpers, as they would more fairly be styled). Moreover, after the great barbarian attack of 367, Britain, continually raided by Irish, Picts and Germans, was not a pleasant place for soldiering.[2] Consequently the usurpers, Maximus in 383, Constantine in 409, have analogous careers ; they both take troops out of Britain. Still, whether a disaster or a usurper had disorganized the military system, order had to be restored. The counterpart of the events of 367 and 383 is the restorations undertaken in 369 by Theodosius, the general of Valentinian I, and in 395 by Stilicho, the general of Honorius.[3] No doubt, therefore, a similar reorganization was intended after 409 ; but whether it was undertaken will be matter for discussion.

This, then, is the historical background in which we must see the British sections of this document.[4]

It is a list or rather a pair of parallel lists of administrative services in the two territories into which the Roman Empire had been, since A.D. 364, almost continuously divided. The high civil and military authorities have chapters to themselves in which their hierarchical inferiors are enumerated, and the chapters of the military authorities report in addition the troops under their control, and if these were frontier troops (*limitanei*), the name of the fort that each unit held. The lowest military rank with a chapter to itself is the *dux*, the commander of a block of frontier troops, the lowest civilian, the *vicarius*, the administrator of a group of provinces (such as Britain) ; the ordinary provincial governors have no special chapters, but a specimen is given of one from each part of the Empire, with a note that it is applicable to all.[5]

[1] Porphyry *ap.* Jerome, *Ep.* 133g, *Britannia fertilis provincia tyrannorum.*

[2] Zosimus, vi, 2, 2 ; 3, 1.

[3] On British history in this period see Collingwood - Myres, *Roman Britain*, 274-290.

[4] All references are to Seeck's edition (1876) and to the *notitia . . . in partibus occidentis* unless otherwise stated.

[5] *Or.*, xliii, xliv ; *Occ.*, xliii-xlv.

Thus, for Britain, the military commanders, *comes Britanniae,*[1] or *Britanniarum, comes litoris Saxonici per Britannias,*[2] and *dux Britanniarum*[3] have chapters of their own, but also appear as subordinates in the chapter of the *magister peditum praesentalis,*[4] as well as in the general index. Of the civil officials, the *vicarius Britanniarum* has a chapter of his own,[5] while the five subordinate governors are entered with their provinces in it.[6] Their administrative territories, the *dioecesis* of the *vicarius,* the *provinciae* of the governors, are entered among the units subordinate to the *praefectus praetorio Galliarum,*[7] and again in the general index.[8] Moreover, in a chapter[9] which should describe merely the administration of the *magister militum per Gallias,* there has been intruded a list of formations of the guards (*palatini*) and the field troops (*comitatenses* and *pseudocomitatenses*) throughout the western empire with their respective commanders, one of whom is the *comes Britanniarum.*[10]

This very important source gives three kinds of information to students of Roman Britain. It enables a sketch to be made of its administration in the later empire; and from his first edition Camden proceeded so to use it.[11] The ascription of units of the garrison to named forts can be used to localise the named forts themselves, if any of these units can already be localised by other means, such as inscriptions, or if the named forts can be traced by coincidences of ancient and modern place-names; acting then on the assumption that the *Notitia* proceeds in a regular order, we may reason from the known to the unknown. Here Camden

[1] xxix.
[2] xxviii.
[3] xl.
[4] v, 131, 132, 142. The *Comes Brtanniarum* precedes the *Comes litoris Saxonici* in the indexes but not in the chapters of the text itself.
[5] xxiii.
[6] xxiii, 3–7, 9–15.
[7] iii, 4, 32–37.
[8] i, 29, 75–77, 118–121.
[9] vii.
[10] vii, 153–156, 199–205. There are also mentioned: the *rationalis summarum Britanniarum* (xi, 20), the *praepositus thesauro um Augustensium* (*ib.* 36,37–London, *cf. Num. Chron.*[4], xv, 508), the *praefectus gynaccei Ventensis* (*ib.* 60, probably Winchester, *cf.* Collingwood - Myres, *Roman Britain and the English Settlements* [cited as Collingwood-Myres], 239, and the *rationalis rei privatae per Britannias.*
[11] *Britannia*[1], 26, 46, 65. In the fifth edition he quotes Pancirollus (whose commentary appeared in 1593) and makes more use of the *Notitia.*

did something but less than he might have done. [1]
Finally, if as would appear at first sight probable,
Britain was still garrisoned and administered by the
central government when the *Notitia* was compiled, we
should have, if we can date its compilation, a *terminus
a quo* for the evacuation. Pancirollus had attempted to
date the *Notitia* to a time between A.D. 446 and A.D.
453, [2] and Camden seems aware, though in a very hazy
way, that some such use can be made of the date. [3]

Far more advanced is Horsley's use of the *Notitia*.
He pushed far further than Camden the identification of
its place-names, recovering, indeed, the names of forts
in the eastern sector of Hadrian's Wall. [4] Nevertheless,
his greatest service, and a noble proof of his fine
historical sense, was his use of it as an instrument of
chronology. For though his argumentation, as was
natural in a pioneer, is lacking in co-ordinated
precision, we can see that he perfectly understood the
terms of the problem. [5] He has no doubt that the British
sections of the *Notitia* were composed before the evacua-
tion. If so, there are three possibilities and three only :
(i) that Britain was still held at the date to which
Pancirollus assigned the *Notitia*, and any authorities
which hint otherwise must be rejected, (ii) that
Pancirollus's date is right, but the *Notitia* is not a
homogeneous document, and includes earlier and
consequently obsolete material, (iii) that Pancirollus's
date is not right. Horsley did not attempt and was
scarcely qualified to refute Pancirollus (whose argu-
ments he translates), but he was clearly very uneasy at
the discrepancy between his date and the state of
Britain in A.D. 419 that is implied in the narratives of
Zosimus, Gildas, and Bede. He hints, therefore, that
the second solution may be correct. The *Notitia*, he
writes, ' might not possibly be all written by the same

[1] In the 1st edition (*e.g.*, 171, 183, 266, 269) Saxon-shore forts are identified by place-name resemblances, in the 5th (708) Amboglanna is located at Birdoswald with the aid of inscriptions.

[2] Reproduced in Bocking's edition (i, p. lv).

[3] *Britannia*³, 65.

[4] *Britannia Romana*, 101–109. Horsley's priority is vindicated in *Arch. Ael.* ⁴, x, 39–40.

[5] *Britannia Romana*, 74–75, 472–490.

person nor at the same time.'[1] It is only a suggestion, which would have needed a dissertation to prove ; nevertheless, we know now that it is the right solution, and Horsley's treatment of the document reaches heights of reasoning seldom attempted by his successors, who either copied him more or less exactly, or resigned themselves to treating the *Notitia* simply as a very late document.[2]

In the nineteenth century continental scholars were at work upon its elucidation. Seeck made important progress in what was, in fact, the confirmation of Horsley's surmise,[3] and Mommsen,[4] with whom Seeck[5] here expressed agreement, showed that a case could be made for dating the chapters of the *dux Britanniarum* and the *comes litoris Saxonici* to a period *c.* A.D. 300. Thus, for Haverfield,[6] abreast of continental scholarship, these sections were in a manner insulated from questions of the evacuation ; and he never examined the documents with reference to the problem that Horsley had raised.[7] Craster's treatment is much more precise,[8] but it was obvious that no real progress would be made until work on the *Notitia* as a whole had advanced further.

In 1920 an extensive study of it was published by J. B. Bury,[9] who, in the course of it, boldly faced Horsley's difficulty. Neglecting in a somewhat cavalier manner the arguments of Seeck, he virtually returned to the position of Pancirollus, using naturally far stronger arguments than what Gibbon had called the ' extremely feeble proofs or rather conjectures '[10] of his predecessor. For Bury the *Notitia*, aside from a few

[1] *Ib.* 472, *cf. ib.*, 75. ' The latest certain account of the *Romans'* footing in *Britain*, I believe, is the *Notitia* ; if it hold true, that this part of it, which relates to *Britain*, was wrote before the middle of the fifth century, or under the reign of *Theodosius* the second.'

[2] *Cf.* Scarth, *Roman Britain*, 128 ; Wright, *Celt, Roman and Saxon*, 416. A notable exception is Hodgson Hinde (*ap.* Hodgson, *Hist. Northumberland*, i, 18–9), whose arguments for dating the *Notitia c.* 403 are sound as far as they go.

[3] *Quaestiones de Notitia Dignitatum* (1872).

[4] *Ges. Schriften*, v, 214, n.[2].

[5] *P-W.*, iv, 640.

[6] *E.g.*, *Roman Occupation of Britain*, 157.

[7] Haverfield wrote little on the *Notitia*. His most important discussion of it is *Arch. Oxoniensis*, 222.

[8] *Arch. Journ.*, lxxxi, 25–44.

[9] *J.R.S.*, x, 131–154.

[10] *Ed.* Bury, ii, 168, n.[2].

alterations,[1] was a homogeneous document of A.D. 427–8 ; for him, therefore, Britain must have been administered by Rome at that date, and evidence of the contrary simply had to go.   Collingwood promptly answered him for British archaeology,[2] and though in Germany Stein accepted Bury's position with all its implications,[3] British archaeologists were impressed by Collingwood's demonstration, reinforced by the arguments of Salisbury.[4] It became doctrine that the British material was not later than A.D. 410, and that the list *per lineam valli* was considerably earlier.[5] Their survival in a *Notitia*, which following Bury they dated to A.D. 427–8, was due to ' official optimism.'

In 1936 Collingwood changed his ground in a rather spectacular way.[6] He had been impressed by the arguments of Bury and Stein on the position of *comites*. He still maintained a view (modelled on Craster) that the garrisons (other than those *per lineam valli*) assigned to the *dux Britanniarum* and the *comes litoris Saxonici* were the result of Stilicho's reorganization in A.D. 395, but he saw in the *comes Britanniarum* with his troops a force actually in Britain at the time when the *Notitia* was compiled, that is to say, in A.D. 427–8.   Moreover, he was inclined to explain by such a re-occupation the ' secunda ultio ' of Gildas.[7]

Recently, however, important studies by Polaschek[8] and Nesselhauf[9] have thrown new light upon the *Notitia*, and their conclusions have been summarized by Birley,[10]

[1] Schultz pointed out (*J.R.S.*, xxiii, 38, n.[1][2]) that Bury's theory did not actually need this qualification. Bury himself was prepared to admit that Hadrian's Wall might have been evacuated earlier (*ib.*, x, 152).

[2] *Ib.*, xii, 74–98. Some evidence of later coins unknown or unavailable to Collingwood is cited by Sutherland (*Coinage and Currency in Roman Britain*, 98, 168) ; but he, too, has missed the Amesbury hoard to Theodosius II (*Wilts. Arch. Mag.*, xl, 357).

[3] *Röm.-Germ. Komm. xviii*, 92 ; *Gesch. des spätrom. Reiches*, i, 490.

[4] *J.R.S.*, xvii, 102–106.

[5] *E.g.* MacDonald, *Roman Britain*, 1914–1928, 69 – 73 ; Kendrick - Hawkes, *Archaeology in England and Wales, 1914–1931*, 296.

[6] Collingwood-Myres[1], 297 – 301 (no change in second edition).

[7] *De Excidio*, 17–18.

[8] *P-W.*, xvii, 1077–1116 (cited as Polaschek).   An article by F. Lot (*Rev. Et. anc.*, xxxviii, 285–338) appeared at the same time.   He polemizes successfully against Bury, but helps little in matters British.

[9] *Die spatromische Verwaltung der gallisch - germanischen Lander (Abh. Preuss. Ak. der. Wiss.*, 1938, *phil.- hist. Klasse*) (cited as Nesselhauf).

[10] *Trans. Cumberland and Westmorland Soc.*[2], xxix, 194–210 (cited as Birley).

who has added some valuable observations upon the British material. These scholars virtually return to the position of Seeck (and Horsley), seeing in the *Notitia* a document containing material of very various dates. Moreover, Nesselhauf, following a hint of Alföldi,[1] has evolved a technique for peeling off its stratified layers. Nesselhauf, however, is mainly concerned with the history of Gaul ; but his technique can be applied to Britain, and it is proposed, with the acknowledgments which he may one day read, so to apply it.

Broadly speaking, his conclusion is that the *Notitia* is the product of a period in which the frontier troops are failing rapidly, both in number and in fighting power, and the field army is continually reinforced at their expense.[2] He claims—it seems with justice—that the chapters recording the organization of the frontier-troops of Gaul must be earlier than those recording units of the field army, because what are evidently the same bodies of troops appear both in the list of frontier- and in those of field-units. They have thus been promoted into the field army, and the lists recording them as frontier units are consequently obsolete. Polaschek[3] shows that the *Notitia* has been put together, probably unofficially, in some such way as by a clerk of the eastern bureau of *notarii*, who had access to the ' returns ' of particular officials. ' Returns ' of a province occupied by barbarians would be, in fact, obsolete, but as long as the Roman Government had hopes of reoccupying it, they would remain in the files, for when Roman rule was re-established it would be useful to know what the standard military establishment of the province was. In this way obsolete information was available to the compiler. He completed his work about A.D. 415, and kept it up to date with such new matter as he could get. The phrase ' official optimism,' therefore, though convenient, is really a misnomer, for the *Notitia* is not official. Nevertheless, its material, the departmental ' returns,' is official; and here there is no ' optimism ' except in so far as obsolete

[1] *Untergang der Romerherrschaft in Pannonien*, ii, 78–83.
[2] Nesselhauf, 75 ; Stein, *Rom.-* *Germ. Komm.* xviii, 92.
[3] Polaschek, 1081, 1097.

material was filed. If the central government effected or acquiesced in a change, if a section of the frontier, for instance, had been transferred to the protection of allies, its original state would not normally remain in the files.

In Britain the forts north of Hadrian's Wall, some of which were continually occupied until the events of A.D. 367, do not appear in the *Notitia*.[1] Since there is good reason to suppose that after A.D. 367 the defence of the north was entrusted to native tribes,[2] the Otadini (Goddodin) of Cunedda, and perhaps the Strathclyde peoples under the Coeling dynasty and the ancestors of Coroticus, we see that the omission of these forts is natural in a ' return ' made after A.D. 369. Hadrian's Wall itself is a harder problem. It is difficult to suppose that the record of its garrisons derives from a ' return ' made after A.D. 369, for they are all of pre-Diocletianic type (*alae* and *cohortes*), most indeed can be shown to have occupied their forts in the early third century, and it seems unlikely that every one survived the disaster of A.D. 367.[3] Since the Wall was actually held after A.D. 369 (in fact until A.D. 383) it seems curious that the compiler did not use what one would have expected to be the most up-to-date 'return.' For this a tentative solution will be presently advanced.

The situation of north-west Britain (Cumberland-north Lancs.) and its garrisons corresponds to that of the Wall, so that in solving one problem we solve this one too. But the forts of western England and Wales show a situation analogous to that of the forts north of the Wall—but with a difference. They are all absent from the *Notitia* : yet one of them, Segontium (Caernarvon), which was carefully excavated, shows an occupation probably starting in A.D. 369, and certainly ceasing in A.D. 383.[4] We can hardly explain the omission of these forts by imagining a partial British ' return ' made before A.D. 369, for aside of the general difficulty, there are forts in western England omitted in the *Notitia* which show an uninterrupted coin series through the

[1] Birley, 197.
[2] Richmond, *Northumberland County History* xv, 113–116. On Coroticus, see Bury, *Life of St. Patrick*, 190–192.
[3] Birley, following Craster, *Arch. Journ.*, lxxxi, 35.
[4] *Y Cymmrodor* xxxiii, 59–93.

early fourth century down to A.D. 383.[1] The absence
of Segontium and the other western forts permits us,
therefore, to advance the date of the ' return ' made for
the *dux Britanniae* to a date later than A.D. 383.   In
other words, we can see that for his continental
adventure Maximus removed the frontier troops of
western Britain.   In fact, coins later than A.D. 383
are no commoner in these western forts than one would
expect from a small civil population still clinging to the
sites.[2]   Henceforward, the defence of the west was in
the hands of the Welsh native militia[3] and perhaps
the ancestors of Urien of Rheged in Lancashire and
Cumberland.[4]

It seems, indeed, that we can trace in the pages
of the *Notitia* the adventure of Maximus.   The
Seguntienses are found among the *auxilia palatina* in
far-off Illyricum.[5]   Their name can hardly be derived
from any site but Welsh Segontium.   And this is just
the name of all names that we would wish to find.
Mediaeval Welsh tradition locates ' Maxen wledig '[6] at
Segontium itself.   One thinks of his own troops, his first
supporters in his rebellion, promoted to be his guards
and accompanying him first in his Gallic, then in his
Italian campaigns, to be transferred to Illyricum after
his fall.   They are almost alone of the highest-ranked
troops among the *comitatenses*, the *palatini*, in taking
their name from a fort.   The correspondence of such dis-

---

[1] As *e.g.*, Manchester (*Roman Fort, Coins*, 4) ; Ribchester (*Roman Fort*, 3, 34).

[2] Western Forts with Coin Lists, suggesting evacuation in A.D. 367 or A.D. 383 are Cardiff–to Gratian (*Y Cymmrodor*, xxxiii, 89) ; Carnarvon (Segontium)–to Gratian (*ib.*) ; Forden Gaer–to Valens (*Arch. Cambr.* (1929), 127) ; Ribchester–to Gratian (*Roman Fort*[3], 10) ; Ambleside–to Valens (*Trans. Cumberland and Westmorland Soc.*[2], xxi, 14). Later coins at Caerhun certainly come from the civil settlement (*Arch. Cambr.* (1925), 335–337 ; (1930), 98) and probably at Chester (*Chester Arch. Journ.*, xxiv, 143 ; xxxiii, 117 ; *cf. Liverpool Annals,* xviii, 128). The coins of Arcadius and Honorius reported from Manchester (*Fort, Coins*, 116–117) and Lancaster (Watkin, *Roman Lancashire*, 192) are of very doubtful local provenance.

[3] Wheeler, *Trans. Cymmrodorion Soc.* (1920–1), 83.

[4] On the Kingdom of Urien, which included to the north Carlisle and some districts north of the Wall see *Y Cymmrodor*, xxviii, 64–67 ; Watson, *Celtic place names of Scotland*, 155–156.   Rheged might well be Ptolemy's Rigodunum (ii, 3, 10),, which might, on the data of Ptolemy, be Preston.

[5] v, 213=vii, 49.   This must, as Alfoldi makes clear (*l.c.*, ii, 72), be a garrison-site, so that Spanish towns— Segontia, Saguntum—are ruled out.

[6] *Breudwedd Maxen*, ed. Williams; *Mabinogion*, trans. Ellis-Lloyd, i, 135–150.

similar sources as the *Notitia* and the *Mabinogion* could hardly be more delightful.

If we are right in associating the omission of the western forts with withdrawals effected by Maximus and in commenting on the rarity of coins later than A.D. 383 from them, in strict logic it should be asked of the eastern forts, which are entered in a ' return ' later than A.D. 383, that they all offer coins later than that date. The demand is not really fair, for few have been extensively excavated, and early observers were neither very capable nor very interested in the identification of late coins.[1] Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that at the two forts where extensive excavation has been done (Arbeia, seemingly South Shields,[2] and Derventio, almost certainly Malton[3]), we have evidence of occupation later than A.D. 383. For the moment, therefore, we may plead for A.D. 383 as a *terminus a quo* for chapter XL.

We now turn to chapter XXVIII of the *comes litoris Saxonici*. It is of interest not least because comparison with other chapters enables us to get behind its data. If the forts are really the work of Carausius or even of Constantius Chlorus,[4] their commander cannot as yet have had the title of *comes*,[5] for such *comites* did not exist until the reign of Constantine. Moreover, there are hints that the extension of the command was originally wider. Two forts, one—Grannona (site unknown) under the *dux tractus Armoricani*,[6] the other— Marcis (near Calais) under the *dux Belgicae secundae* are mentioned as being ' in litore Saxonico.'[7] Actually, Saxons are known to have settled in the Boulonnais[8] and near Bayeux ;[9] but if the term cannot mean ' the shore settled by Saxons ' in Britain, it ought not to

---

[1] If Morbium was really a corruption of Vinovium (uiouium), as Seeck (*Hermes*, ix, 231) imagines, its large coin-series to Gratian (Hoopell, *Vinovia*, 47) would be a stumbling-block (*cf.* p. 138, n. [3]). But the emendation is wild, and Morbium would do for Brough-by-Bainbridge, where Collingwood suspected an occupation under Stilicho (*Proc. Leeds Phil. Soc.*, 269).

- Birley, 201 ; *Arch. Ael.*[4], xi, 101.,

[3] *Roman Fort at Malton*, 68.

[4] *J.R.S.*, xxii, 70.

[5] *P-W.*, iv, 633.

[6] xxxvii, 14.

[7] xxxviii, 7. On both see Grenier, *Manuel*, i, 389, 392.

[8] *Mem. Soc. Ant. France*, lxv, 136– 160 ; Longnon, *Noms de Lieu*, 188– 195.

[9] Greg. Tur., *Hist. Franc.*, v, 26 ; x, 9.

mean this just across the Channel ; the phrase seems
rather to be a vestigial survival of a period when one
commander controlled the forts and fleets on both sides
of the ' narrow seas.' At a later date (Constans ?) the
Gallic forts were transferred to a great command which
extended along the whole coast and included the
northern frontier from Tongres to Bavay. A relic of
this is seen in the title given to the *dux tractus Armori-
cani—dux tractus Armoricani et Nervicani.*[1] Still later
(Valentinian I ?) the commands were divided between
a *dux tractus Armoricani* and a *dux Belgicae secundae.*[2]
Yet later (Gratian ?)[3] the defence of the Tongres-
Bavay line is entrusted to the federated Franks, so that
none of its forts are contained in the ' return ' of the
dux Belgicae in the *Notitia.*

The individual forts, too, will give us hints of past
history. The *dux Mogontiacensis* has *milites Andere-
tiani*[4] in his command, and there is a *classis Andere-
tianorum* at Paris.[5] Several points may be made.
(i) Modern scholars agree that these *Anderetiani* are
so called because they originally garrisoned the similarly
named fort on the Saxon shore (Pevensey).[6] The
Anderetiani should then derive their name from a fort
called something like *Anderetia.* The name twice
repeated is evidently genuine, and the *Anderelio* of
Ravennas, a site somewhere in south-east Britain, is a
natural corruption of this.[7] In the text of chapter
XXVIII, the name is missing, but in the explanation of the
pictured forts it appears, according to the majority of
the MSS. as Anderidos,[8] and the ' d ' is also present in
the Saxon borrowings, Andredeceaster, Andredesleage,
and Andredesweald.[9] Thus a sound shift from inter-
vocalic ' t ' to intervocalic ' d ' seems already to have
occurred here when the Saxons took the name over, if

[1] xxxvii, 13. Before his usurpa-
tion, Carausius seems to have held a
command on the Gallic coast (Eutro-
pius, ix, 21).

[2] xxxvii, xxxviii.

[3] So Nesselhauf, 64.

[4] xli, 17.

[5] xlii, 23.

[6] The connexion of *Anderetiani*

and *Anderidos* is allowed by Jullian
(*Hist. Gaule*, viii, 109, n. [2]—who rules
out Andrecv), and Nesselhauf, 70,
n. [2] Alfoldi's observation (see p. 134,
n. ⸰) alone excludes places like Ander-
itum (Javols).

[7] *Al.* Anderesio, 427, 18 (ed.
Pinder-Parthey).

[8] xxviii. 10 with Seeck's *apparatus.*

[9] *English Place-Name Society*, vi, 1.

it had not already occurred when the British ' return '
of the Saxon shore was sent in.[1] The *Anderetiani* had
taken the word abroad with them and there, so to
speak, sterilized it. Now this shift (' tenuis ' to ' media ')
is a Celtic sound development, and is thus a real hint
that in the later Roman Empire, a Celtic language was
still spoken in southern Britain.[2] (ii) If the *classis
Anderetianorum* was manned by the former garrison
of Anderetia/Anderidos, we have a confirmation of
Haverfield's[3] conjecture that the forts of the Saxon
shore were located with a view to the use of sea power.
(iii) The fact that the *Anderetiani* are elsewhere shows
that the *numerus Abulcorum* was not the original
garrison. The fort itself is no earlier than *c.* A.D. 335,[4]
it is plausible to suppose, therefore, that the transfer is
connected with a later re-organization. And there is
evidence in this section of other transfers. The *milites
Tungrecani* and the *numerus Turnacensium*[5] both pro-
claim by their local adjectives that they originally
formed part of the Tongres-Bavay frontier line, and as
there is reason to believe that this line ceased to be
defended by regular Roman formations in the reign of
Gratian (375–383), we have, perhaps, a pointer here
towards the events of 369.[6] The *exploratores* who
garrison *Portus Adurni*[7] are likely again to commemo-
rate the reorganization of that year, though perhaps

[1] Cerdic (= Coroticus) must, in spite of Chadwick (*English Nation*, 30) be another example. The shift was not complete in Welsh till the seventh century.

[2] More work is needed here; Collingwood-Myres are silent. *Cf.* Bradley's remarks on Celtic loss of inter-vocalic *s* in Trisantona = Treanto (Bede) = Trahannon (Nennius) (*Collected Papers*, 241–243). For another possible example, see *Appendix*.

[3] *P-W.*, ii, A333, followed by Collingwood-Myres, 279.

[4] *J.R.S.*, xxii, 67 (Constans again ?)

[5] xxviii, 3 (Dover), 4 (Lympne).

[6] Nesselhauf, 64. The *milites Tungrecani* show a modernization of the old nomenclature of *numeri* and cohortes; such *milites* are found scarcely anywhere (apart from evidently later additions) except on the Gallic frontiers, where they are almost universal (see Polaschek, 1087). Polaschek thinks of a reorganization under Arbogastes (*c.* 390), but as the *Tungrecani* are included, we need something earlier. In any case, the renaming must intervene between the transfer of the *numerus Turnacensium* and the *milites Tungrecani*, which is not to say that the transfers may not be nearly contemporaneous. Valentinian I, in fact, is a good candidate for the reform (*cf.* Amm. Marc., xxviii, 2, 1 ; xxx, 7, 6). It is possible that *cohors i Baetasiorum* (xxviii, 18, Reculver) is also a transfer as it interrupts the homogeneity of the command.

[7] xxviii, 21.

only indirectly. Such troops should be quartered where they are previously found, outside the actual line of the Limes,[1] in forts finally evacuated in A.D. 367. Nevertheless, since they come last in the list, and we may not apparently assign them to the furthest (most western) fort,[2] it is likely that they come last because they are a recent transfer, later, that is to say, than the *Tungrecani* and *Turnacenses*. One would suspect, accordingly, that after quitting their post to the north of the Wall in A.D. 367 they occupied another fort in an intervening period before they reached the Saxon shore.[3] There are hints, therefore, that these sections are later, at least, than the middle of the fourth century.[4]

Birley objects,[5] however, that in both sections *numeri* in the old-fashioned sense are far commoner than elsewhere in the empire. As he puts it, ' even among the regiments other than those *per lineam valli* there are many with just such an antiquarian flavour—to a student of late fourth century conditions—as the *alae* and cohorts of that section.' Since he doubts ' whether

---

[1] Richmond, *Northumberland County History*, xv, 96.

[2] The coin-series at Porchester (*J.R.S.*, xxii, 67) which seems an adequate sample, hardly allows a garrison there after A.D. 367. *Portus Adurni* should then (as Fox suggested on different grounds, *VCH Suffolk*, i, 291) be Walton Castle. It is remarkable that only the *comites* with regular frontier troops (our *comes* and the *comes limitis Aegypti, Or.* xxviii) have their garrisons listed in geographical rather than hierarchical order. Both show the Diocletianic liking for grouping in pairs (cf. *P-W.*, xii, 1350); and if Othona, heading the list, has no pair, it must surely be because it originally paired with *Portus Adurni* (Walton). And if it is asked why the pair Othona (Bradwell), <*Portus Adurni* (Walton)>headed the list, the answer may be that (as I. A. Richmond has suggested to me) the *comes* resided at Colchester, close by, and that the alleged ' early mediaeval merlons ' of the castle (*Royal Comm. Anc. Mon., Essex*, iii, 50) are really those of a late-Roman *castellum*.

[3] On the archaeological evidence, Binchester (see p. 135, n. [4]) would suit well. It is behind the *vigiles* at Chester-le-Street, whose situation may be compared with the ' auxilia vigilum contra Acinco in barbarico ' (xxxiii, 48), and has direct road-communication with Bowes (*AA*[4], xiv, 194–204), where *exploratores* are also garrisoned (xl, 25 with Craster's observations, *Arch. Journ.*, lxxxi, 41).

[4] The whole argument could also be applied to the *numerus Abulcorum* from *Anderidos*—but need not. For the position of Anderidos (certainly Pevensey) in the list is explicable by its geographical situation.

[5] Birley, 204. But we must not exaggerate. Danubian frontier-units have their own peculiarities which Grosse explains (40, 43). The Gallic and German commands cannot be compared with those of Britain, because their formations have undergone a change *en bloc* into *milites* (see p. 137, n. [6] and Appendix). The British parallel is Rhaetia, which, as will be shown, takes an intermediate position between the sections of the *Comes* and the *Dux*. But even the really archaic section, that of the *dux*, is nearer to Rhaetia than Rhaetia to the Rhine or Danube commands.

fifteen old-style *numeri* could have survived the troubles of A.D. 367, not to mention the adventure of Magnus Maximus half a generation later, to reappear in a list accurately reflecting the disposition of troops in Britain at the close of the fourth century,' he dates all the material of chapters XXVIII and XL to times prior to A.D. 367.

If the validity of an argument first advanced by Mommsen[1] is admitted, Birley's conclusions must be rejected out of hand. Mommsen showed that soon after A.D. 395 there was a change in the methods of appointing the chief clerks in the bureaux of military commanders. Formerly the heads, the *principes*, were appointed by members of the bureaux themselves; after that date they were appointed by one or other of the *magistri militum*. Britain shows the new arrangements, therefore the British section, it can be argued, is subsequent to this date soon after A.D. 395. It might indeed be objected that since the compiler is known to have tampered with numerous ' returns ' of early date so as to modernise them in respect of the titles borne by high officials, so he might have modernised the formulae for appointing the clerks. But if he did this, he did not do it thoroughly. In chapters dealing with commands which were actually abandoned in or near A.D. 395 (the Danubian frontier commands),[2] the old arrangements of appointment persist, and it would be grotesque to imagine the compiler faced with lists which were all obsolete, discriminating degrees of obsolescence and marking his discrimination by changing or not changing the formulae of appointment. Mommsen's argument seems fairly to apply to Britain, and the old view that the *Notitia* records the dispositions of Stilicho seems sound.

For—apart from the argument derived from the changed conditions of appointment—we can see that Birley's reasoning is quite *a priori*, we really know nothing about the extent to which garrisons were able to maintain themselves in the troubles of

---

[1] *Ges. Schrift.*, iv, 552. Against Polaschek, who argues as below, see Nesselhauf, 43, n.⁹.

[2] Alfoldi, 81.

A.D. 367,[1] and we claim to have found the troops that Maximus did remove. Moreover, it appears that what seems to Birley ' too great a strain upon our credulity ' must in fact be credited. These *numeri* have not all disappeared : they have become *comitatenses*.

Two lists of *comitatenses* and analogous formations exist (chs. V + VI and ch. VII). Postponing for the moment the discussion of their significance and comparative dates, it will be enough to state that both date from the fifth century. Now we find it demonstrated by Nesselhauf that blocks of *limitanei* from the commands of the *dux tractus Armoricani* and the *dux Mogontiacensis* have been transferred, with the breakup of those commands, to the field army.[2] His methods and manner of setting them out may be applied with valuable results to the garrison of the Saxon shore. Thus :—

Forts	Litus Saxonicum XXVIII	Comitatenses VII	V and VI
Othona (Bradwell)	Numerus Fortensium, 13 [3]	Fortenses (Spain), 130	Fortenses (*Legio comitatensis*) v. 225
Dubrae (Dover)	Milites Tungrecani, 14		
Lemanae (Lympne)	Numerus Turnacensium, 15		
Branodunum (Brancaster)	Equites Dalmatae Branodunenses, 16 [4]		
Garrianonum (Burgh Castle)	Equites stablesiani Garrianonensium, 17	Equites stablesiani (Britain), 203	
Regulbium (Reculver)	Cohors prima Baetasiorum, 18		
Rutupiae (Richborough)	Legio secunda Augusta, 19	Secundani Britones (Gaul), 84	Secunda Britannica (*Legio comitatensis*) v. 241
		Secundani iuniores (Britain), 156	
Anderidos (Pevensey)	Numerus Abulcorum, 20	Abulci (Gaul), 109	
Portus Adurni (Walton Castle ?)	Numerus exploratorum, 21	Exploratores (Gaul), 110	

[1] Even so, we can allow Birley the disappearance of garrisons from the Wall and the north-west (see p. 133), Chester (where the coin-list hints that the legion was annihilated in the troubles of A.D. 367-9), the western forts (see (p. 134) ; Ebchester, Binchester (see p. 135, n. [4]), Catterick, Elslack (*cf. Yorks. Arch. Journ.*, xxv, 148), Ilkley (*ib.* xxviii, 338), Brough-on-Humber (see p. 141, n. [1]), Caister-in-the-Wolds, Horncastle, Dover, Lympne, Porchester (?), Portus Adurni (?) (see p. 138, n. [1]), all either omitted in the *Notitia* or giving evidence of a change of garrison.

Of course, the units recorded in garrison in the *Notitia* may have come from elsewhere to replace others destroyed (as perhaps the *supervenientes Petuerienses*, see p. 141, n. [1]).

[2] 40, 41, based on Alfoldi, *l.c.*, ii, 79–80.

[3] There are several units of *Fortenses*, but the identity of other *Fortenses* who are *limitanei* with other *Fortenses* who are *comitatenses* can be reasonably supposed on grounds of geography (see Seeck, in *ed.*, 323).

[4] The *equites Dalmatae* of vi, 56, 57 (= vii, 174, 175) need not be British.

The formations under the *dux Britanniarum* show a remarkable difference. We can hardly find more than two[1] out of the fourteen formations which have been so incorporated :—

Forts	Dux Britanniarum	Comitatenses	
	XL	VII	V and VI
Morbium (Brough-by-Bainbridge ?)	Equites catafractarii, 20	Equites catafractarii iuniores (Britain), 200	
Braboniacum (Kirkby Thore)	Numerus defensorum, 27	Defensores iuniores (Gaul), 98	

The contrast is remarkable, and if we inferred from it that the list of the *dux Britanniarum* represented an earlier state than that of the *comes*, the inference would not lack plausibility. There is still, however, the argument from the 'new' conditions of appointment warning us against a date earlier than A.D. 395. Moreover there is a hint that we can date chapter XL yet more precisely. In its text, *legio sexta* is given no place of garrison,[2] and this is likely to be no mere scribal error, for the compiler of the pictures found none recorded and was led to invent one, Sexta.[3] This should mean that the compiler of the ' returns ' for the *dux Britanniarum* knew that the sixth legion was on the strength, but did not know where it was or where it was likely to be. Yet it had been at York for two hundred years and more. The explanation can only be that the legion was on the move. Surely this must be the ' legio praetenta Britannis ' of Claudian[4]—the force which Stilicho borrowed for the campaign against Alaric.[5] The expectation (not in fact realised) of its return is expressed in this curious entry. We are thus

[1] The *superventores iuniores* of vii, 96 = v, 270 are more likely to be the *superventores* of xxxvii, 18, than the *supervenientes Petuerienses* of xl, 31. Here, incidentally, it is enough to assume a transfer from Petuaria (Brough-on-Humber) which is like a fort in its last stages (5*th Report*, 13)— to Deruentio (Malton) on the analogy of *Or.* xxviii, 7 = 17 ; xxxvi, 25, 26 ; xl, 23 ; *Occ.* xxxii, 40 ; xli, 17, 25. Richmond's far-reaching hypotheses (3*rd Report*, 27) are, therefore, unnecessary, and indeed disputable. The *supervenientes* are no more—and no less—a ' local militia ' than any formation of *limitanei* (cf. Grosse, 65) ; and if the two other units of *superventores* are garrisoned in towns, so are every other sort of *limitanei*, too, as a glance at—e.g.—*Occ.*, xxxvii or *Occ.*, xli will show.

[2] xl, 18.

[3] l, 2. Polaschek (1105) compares the ' ghost ' fort-name, Apollinaris, in the picture *Or.*, xxxviii, 5.

[4] *Bell. Goth.*, 416.

[5] So on general grounds, Craster *Arch. Journ.*, lxxxi, 43.

led to date chapter XL to *c.* A.D. 402, and our date finds remarkable confirmation in Nesselhauf's Gallic observations. It seems to him that the earliest Gallic documents of the *Notitia*, the lists of *limitanei*, show Gaul notably under-garrisoned.[1] He infers that Stilicho had withdrawn troops to Italy, as we know he did ; accordingly he dates these lists, so closely analogous to our chapters XXVIII and XL, to A.D. 402.

The true significance of the contrast between the armies of the *Comes* and the *Dux* is seen by comparison with conditions in the Gallic frontier armies. It is demonstrated by Nesselhauf that their units have been taken over in bulk into the field army. So rare is it to find one not so taken over that it becomes legitimate to say that these frontier commands have simply been broken up. A unit of the Gallic frontier which does not appear among the *comitatenses* of VII is not, therefore, a unit which has maintained its position in the frontier garrison, but a unit which has been annihilated.

In the light of these facts, the discrepancy between the two British commands must be explained, not by a greater reluctance to enrol *comitatenses* from the command of the *Dux* than from that of the *comes*, but by supposing that the northern command had suffered some disaster which the southern had escaped, between A.D. 402 and the date of enrolment.[2] It is gratifying to discover that Salisbury, working on lines that do not touch our argument at any point, is led to believe that northern Britain was lost to Rome some years before the south-eastern corner.[3]

We can now turn to the lists of *comitatenses* and analogous formations. One consists of two chapters, one for the infantry (V), the other for the cavalry (VI) ; it grades the troops according to specified types, but does not allot them to district commanders. The other list (VII) does allot them to district commanders, one

[1] Nesselhauf, 72.
[2] The Yorkshire signal stations seem to have been built in the re-organization of A.D. 369 ; no evidence shows that any were occupied after 395. (Craster, *Arch. Journ.*, lxxxix, 253 ; Richmond's remark, *Proc. Soc. Ant. Newc.*[4], ix, 230 must simply be ' Homer nodding.') Thus the Ravenscar inscription (*CIL* vii, 268) which records a rebuild (a so[lo] line 5) is unlikely to be connected with Stilicho. In *appendix* I have allowed myself an attempt to elucidate it.
[3] *Ant. Journ.*, vii, 277.

of which is the *comes Britanniarum,* but it does not assign them to grades. Nevertheless, comparison of the two lists shows that inside the district commands the troops are, in fact, graded in the order in which they appear. Seeck long ago pointed out [1] that certain formations low down in the district lists of chapter VII appear in high grades in V and VI, having in fact been promoted. Hence he inferred, certainly correctly, that chapter VII was earlier than chapters V and VI. Polaschek and Nesselhauf have in fact dated chapter VII to *c.* A.D. 410, chapter V *c.* A.D. 419, and chapter VI a little earlier than chapter V. [2] Nevertheless, as they make clear, this is not the whole story. When the compiler attempted to bring his document up to date, he added new formations (such as the *Placidi Valentinianici felices,* which cannot be earlier than A.D. 424) to chapter VII. In chapter VII we thus have an early and a late stratum, and we must decide to which the *comes Britanniarum* and his troops belong.

In speaking of a real reoccupation of Britain in A.D. 425 with actual troops, Collingwood (who more or less follows Seeck in this) assigns them by implication to the late stratum. But it is almost certain that his conclusion will not stand. We have seen that the *equites catafractarii iuniores* and the *equites stablesiani* are to be regarded as original frontier units 'returned' as such in A.D. 402. If they belong to the later stratum of chapter VII (*c.* A.D. 424) they should appear as *Comitatenses* in chapter VI (*c.* A.D. 415) as well, for there cannot still have been British frontier commands at this date. But they do not. As it is most improbable that they have jumped an intervening stage, we must assume that these formations, and therefore necessarily the other troops of the *comes* who are listed with them, belong to the first stratum of *c.* A.D. 410. Therefore there are no grounds here for Collingwood's reoccupation *c.* A.D. 425.

Further analysis of these formations [3] leads to interesting results. Of the infantry units, the *secundani iuniores* must be the old 'frontier' *legio ii Augusta*

---

[1] *Quaestiones,* 7.
[2] Polaschek, 1093–1096 ; Nesselhauf, 43–45.
[3] vii, 154–156 ; vii, 200–205.

from Rutupiae.   As the *secundani Britones* appear in the same list under the *magister militum per Gallias*,[1] it is possible that a part of the legion had crossed to Gaul with the *Abulci* and *Exploratores*, but perhaps, more likely still, that half the legion had already been removed (from Cardiff and Caerleon)[2] by Maximus.[3] The *primani iuniores* invite comparison with the *legio prima Flavia Gallicana*, formerly a frontier legion under the command of the *dux tractus Armoricani*, subsequently a unit of *pseudocomitatenses* under the *magister militum per Gallias*.[4]   As it is not likely that troops were sent from Gaul across the Channel between A.D. 402 and A.D. 410 to reinforce the British field army, we may suppose that the *primani iuniores* formed part of a field army already existing in Britain,[5] and the same will apply—with the adjective increasing the probability—to the third infantry unit— the *victores iuniores Britanniciani*.   Of the six cavalry units, the *equites catafractarii iuniores* and the *equites stablesiani* have already been discussed.   Of the origins of the rest, the *equites scutarii Aurelianenses*, the *equites Honoriani seniores*, the *equites Syri*, and the *equites Taefali*, nothing definite can be said.   But there is no reason to doubt that they, too, were part of an original British field force.   Only the *Taefali* and the *Honoriani seniores* survived, and the history of each

---

[1] vii, 84.   They appear in the later list (v, 241) as a *legio comitatensis* (probably still in Gaul). On Britones = Britanni, see Mommsen in *EE* v, 176, n.[1].

[2] That *leg.* ii, after being removed from Caerleon, was divided between Cardiff and Richborough is implied in the plausible supposition of Wheeler, *Ant. Journ.* ii, 370 (cf. n.[5] below). But it only needs the modification that the removal was apparently incomplete (unpublished excavation by Lady Fox).

[3] A third possibility is that we have here a 'doublet' like the *Honoriani seniores* (see below).

[4] xxxvii, 209 ; vii, 90 = v, 264.

[5] On Ritterling's doctrine (*P-W.*, xii, 1349), these *primani iuniores* should have been part of the two pairs of legions which ought—according to the principles of Diocletian's reorganization—to have formed the nucleus of the British commands of *limitanei*.   It is simplest to suppose that the *Dux Britanniarum* had the pair vi and xx, the original *dux litoris Saxonici*, the pair i and ii. Of these, ii may have been divided between Cardiff, Caerleon and Richborough, the divisions ultimately becoming units of *comitatenses* (see note above) ; *leg.* i, we suppose divided between a Gallic (*milites primae Flaviae Constantiae*, xxxvii, 20) and an unknown British fort of the original command on both sides of the Channel (see p. 136). Both eventually became *comitatenses*, one as *Prima Flavia Gallicana Constantia*, the other as *primani iuniores*, but only the Gallic portion can be traced as *limitanei*.

reveals points of historical interest. In chapter VI the *Honoriani Taefali iuniores* appear,[1] and this regiment appears to be an amalgamation of the *Taefali* and the Gallic *Honoriani iuniores*, both of which appear in chapter VII.[2] The *Honoriani seniores* survive in chapter VI ;[3] moreover, they appear in chapter VII under the troops not only of the *comes Britanniarum*, but of the *magister militum per Gallias*.[4] Examining this and other examples of duplicated entries in chapter VII, Polaschek[5] assumes that the ' returns ' from different places were made up at different times by the authorities consulted, so that a regiment on the move might appear in two ' returns ' and thus be negligently duplicated. We are therefore to suppose that the *Honoriani seniores* were moved from Britain to Gaul during the collection of ' returns ' for chapter VII. Moreover, it seems that certain British units entered the continental field armies without our being able to trace the intervening stage of their incorporation in the British. The *Abulci*, the *exploratores*, and the *secundani Britones* have been already discussed ; and the *invicti iuniores Britanniciani*[6] under the *comes Hispaniarum* may be another example.[7]

We are now able to sum up the position of Britain in chapter VII. The system of frontier troops, as displayed in the ' returns ' of A.D. 402 has broken up, and the troops of the *dux* have almost disappeared in the process. Surviving units from his command and that of the *comes litoris Saxonici* have been drafted into field armies on the continent, others have joined the remains of the British field army to form a force under the *comes Britanniarum*. This army we see in process of evacuation oversea, so that one unit is twice ' returned ' in chapter VII. Almost all its constituents have disap-

---

[1] vi, 59. The ' shields ' of chapter vi, which, according to Polaschek (1095) may derive from an earlier list, give simply *Taifali* (16).

[2] The African *Honoriani iuniores* are probably an independent unit (vii, 196 = vi, 79).

[3] vi, 60.

[4] vii, 172, 202.

[5] Polaschek, 1099.

[6] vii, 127 = vi, 206.

[7] The Spanish command seems to belong to the late stratum of vii (Nesselhauf, 43, n. [5]), so the *exculcatores iuniores Britanniciani* (v, 206) can be another example, their absence in vii being due to their disappearance before its final recension. Constantine's campaigns in Spain are sufficient justification for British troops there.

peared, whether in Gaul or Britain before the compilation of the second list (chapters V and VI).

Nothing fits the facts better than to see in the army of this *comes Britanniarum* a creation of Constantine III, when he was in process of evacuating the island. It may seem strange to find a British ' return ' made by a usurper ; nevertheless, there is one year in which it is in place—A.D. 409, when Constantine was recognized by Honorius and proclaimed him as his colleague in the consulship.[1] Constantine's Gallic ' return,' if he made one, was superseded by a ' return ' recording the reorganization of Constantius.

Though the composition of this command should be due to Constantine III, our analysis of it has led us to suppose that a British field force already existed. This would seem to presuppose a *comes*, and the Gratian, the father of Valentinian I, who as *comes* ' Britannicum rexit exercitum ' probably at the time of the expedition of Constans, should be the *comes Britanniarum*.[2] Nevertheless, the position of the *comes litoris Saxonici* is curious. A *comes* does not necessarily imply *comitatenses*, the title might, as in Isauria, be honorary.[3] Nevertheless, if the *comes litoris Saxonici* did not command field troops, we are left with the curious circumstance that he controlled only nine forts against the fourteen of his hierarchical inferior.[4] It would be a convenient conjecture that when the Saxon shore was reorganized and shorn of its Gallic garrisons (by Constans ?), its commander was elevated to the rank of *comes* and entrusted with the command of the British field army. His position would then be analogous to that of the *comites* of Africa and Tingitania, whose field troops are entered in the lists of the *magistri militum*.[5] The *comes Britanniarum* of chapter VII would then be a new creation (of Constantine

---

[1] Zosimus, v, 43, 2 ; Liebenam, *Fasti*, 41. Polaschek forgets this (1096). Note that Constantine's ambassador reported in A.D. 409 that there were still troops in Britain—μετ' ου πολύ και αυτόν άξειν αμα παντι τω εν Κελτοις και εν Ιβηρια και εν τη Βρεττανικη νησω στρατευματι (Zosimus, vi, 1, 2).

[2] Amm. Marc. xxx, 7, 3.

[3] *Or.*, xxix and Seeck in *P-W.*, iv, 656.

[4] Note that only the *dux* and the *comes maritimi tractus* are mentioned in connexion with the troubles of A.D. 367 (Amm. Marc., xxvii, 8, 1).

[5] Polaschek, 1100. But his supposition of a double list dislocated by the compiler is far-fetched.

III ?), after the frontier commands had been broken up.

There remains still for discussion the *comes Britanniae* (in the singular[1]) and his *provincia Britannia* of the separate chapter (XXIX) and the indexes. Is he simply the *comes* of chapter VII, given the proper clerical officials and only differing from the African *comites* by the absence of *limitanei* (because he had none) ? His inclusion in the list would then be due to the fact that the compiler simply used Constantine's ' return ' now long obsolete. (ii) Is it one of the later additions, having reference perhaps to the campaigns of Constantius (A.D. 413–422) ? And if the latter, then (iii) did the *comes* whose field troops, it would be fair to assume on African analogies, were filed in the records of the *magistri militum* actually come to Britain ? It looks as if (iii) must be rejected. Authorities, both eastern and western, were confident that the Romans did not return to Britain,[2] but to decide between (i) and (ii) is not easy : there are arguments both ways.[3] The curious phrase *provincia* (not *dioecesis*) *Britanniae* seems, if genuine, to show that the ' return ' presupposes the disappearance of the civil administration of *dioecesis* and *provinciae*. On the other hand, the *comes Argentoratensis*, who has an exactly similar chapter and mentions in the indexes, seems to be a creation of the middle or late fourth century.[4] Certainly the absence of traces of Roman occupation in Alsace in the fifth century[5] speaks decisively against an actual appointment at a later date, and inclines one to accept the mere copying of an obsolete ' return.' Nevertheless, the changed number and the *provincia Britannia* of the *comes Britanniae* do seem to argue a regard for the changed conditions in Britain after

[1] Little must be made of this, for the plural appears in i, 35 and v, 131. The *comes litoris Saxonici* similarly wavers between ' per Britanniam ' (xxviii, *tit.* and 12) and ' per Britannias ' (i, 36 ; v, 132).

[2] Procopius, III, ii, 38 ; *Chron. Min.*, i, 630. Schultze's attempts to impugn the authority of the latter source are unconvincing (*J.R.S.*, xxiii, 45).

[3] But Stein (*Röm.-Germ. Komm. xviii*, 96) should not have asserted that such *comites* are unknown before A.D. 409, for there is Charietto, ' comes per utramque Germaniam ' (Amm. Marc., xxvii, 1, 12) and others (Nesselhauf, 58).

[4] Nesselhauf, 69.

[5] Forrer, *Alsace romaine*, 195. His worries over the notitia (202) are most instructive.

A.D. 410, and it may be just permissible to conclude that Constantius[1] during his reorganization of Gaul had designs of re-establishing these old military commands, and thus included them in a ' return.'

There remains the civil administration portrayed in the chapter of the *vicarius Britanniarum* and the indexes. If our conclusions are so far correct, the *Notitia* must record the civil administration as it existed between A.D. 369 and 410. This chapter has an interest of its own. Alone of all the *vicarii* in east and west, the *vicarius Britanniarum* has on his picture, not peaceful maidens bringing gifts, but the embattled forts that characterize the commanders of frontiers. This must surely be significant.[2] Britain was, in fact, a province defended not only by units of the regular army, but by a militia of its less civilized provincials. Its irregular forces were not, as elsewhere, immigrant barbarians, but men whose ancestors had long been included within its borders. Such is the case in Wales.[3] And there may be more. Gildas records the building of a wall from sea to sea ' sumptu publico privatoque.'[4] I hope elsewhere to show that Gildas was referring to the rebuild of A.D. 369 and to connect his language with epigraphic records of public and private building on the Wall.[5] He has a story that at the end the Britons were dragged from the Wall with hooks.[6] It is obviously a ' tall ' story, but it is tempting to see behind it a real tradition that the *civitates* of Britain not only built the Wall, but with the assistance perhaps of settled barbarians, defended it, when it lay beyond the furthest garrison of the *limitanei*.[7] The responsibility of levies from the *civitates* for the outer defence of

[1] For Constantius in Gaul, see Stein, *Gesch. des spatrom. Reiches*, i, 407–410.
[2] Noticed by Lot, *Rev. hist.*, cxix, 4, n.[4]. It is too easy to assume with Polaschek (1103) mere interpolation.
[3] Wheeler, *Trans. Cymmrodorion Soc.* (1920–1), 40–96.
[4] *De excidio*, 17.
[5] *CIL* vii, 695 (= *EE* ix, p. 592), 775, 776, 863, 897 ; *EE* vii, 1052.
[6] *De excidio*, 18.
[7] We need not be alarmed at the hypothesis of these ' civilian soldiers.'

Comparison of Isidore, IX, iv, 28 and *Cod. Theod.*, xii, 19, 2, shows that there were *burgarii* stationed on the frontiers who formed a *corpus* like *curiales*, to which they were compulsorily attached (see Seeck in *P-W.*, iii, 1066). If the presence of men using Rhineland types of pottery is really proved at Birdoswald in this period (*Trans. Cumberland and Westmorland Soc.*[2], xxx, 194), we may think of them as *inquilini* (Seeck, *Untergang*, i, 575–90, citing *Digest*, xxvii, i, 17, 7).

the north would explain the military insignia of the civil governor,[1] and might explain, too, why it was necessary to use a list prior to A.D. 369 for entering the section *per lineam valli* in the *Notitia*. Such irregulars would not be included in the formations ' returned ' by the staff of the *magistri militum* ; if, therefore, the central archives retained British information on the files to guide them in the event of its recovery, such information would naturally include the Wall forts in case the military intended to take them over again ; and the ' return ' of the Wall forts would have to be the latest ' return ' in which they were shown as garrisoned by regular troops.

SUMMARY

Polaschek believes that the *Notitia* was the compilation of some clerk in contact with the bureau of the eastern *primicerius notariorum* who constructed an administrative picture of the empire on the basis of ' returns ' submitted to the *primicerii*, the western documents being passed by the western *primicerius* to his eastern colleague. Nesselhauf notes that these ' returns ' can be elucidated by watching the units of the frontier troops as they become units of the field army. It is claimed that their hypotheses are excellently verified in Britain.

The earliest ' return ' is of the last regular military formations on Hadrian's Wall (before A.D. 369) ; the other frontier information depends on a return of A.D. 402. The notices relevant to the *comes Britanniarum* in chapter VII are based on the ' return ' of Constantine III in A.D. 409, and the subsequent mention of a *comes Britanniae* may perhaps derive from a ' return ' of Constantius III (A.D. 413–22) describing what he proposed to do. The chronology of these returns is elucidated by the technique of Nesselhauf. Finally, the ' return ' of the civil governor, which shows his remark-

---

[1] I tried to show in *Ét. celt.*, iii, 86–94, that the *consularis* of *Valentia* commanded the militia of Wales. Note also the preoccupation of the military *comes* Theodosius with the appointment of the *vicarius Britanniarum* (Amm. Marc. xxvii, 8, 9).

ably anomalous position, should date from some period between A.D. 369 and A.D. 410, and this anomalous position of a civil governor will perhaps explain why the ' return ' of Hadrian's Wall is so completely out of date.

What at first sight then seems simply a record of administration as it existed at the moment when the record was made, turns out to be something even more valuable, the documents of a series of historical changes. It is a surprising result ; one thinks, as a kind of parallel, of finding American garrisons (Boston and New York) in a British Army List of the twentieth century.[1] The ' clerk ' whom the continental experts have conjured up for us, fetching out obsolete but not superseded files to construct a picture of what the Roman Empire would be if the conditions of fifty years back were restored, is a curious figure, who may possibly seem less curious to our fellow members who are learning the ways of government officials. But whether he obeyed the whim of a superior or followed one of his own he has earned our gratitude. He has given us a record not only of British administration but of British history. The investigation of it is, I trust, a not uninteresting result of a working archaeologist's ' confinement to library.'

[1] I have read somewhere that statistics of the Lorraine glassworks were reproduced in the French *Annuaire officiel* for many years after 1870.

APPENDIX

THE RAVENSCAR INSCRIPTION

It has long been realized that an inscription from the Peak, Ravenscar (Yorks.) is one of the latest inscriptions of Roman Britain, so late, indeed, that Hübner included it both in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (vii, 268) and in the *Inscriptiones Britanniae Christianae* (185). As it certainly comes from a signal-station site we can presumably assign it to the period of the signal-stations, which is now known to be 369–395 ;[1] moreover, the formula of l.5 seems rather to denote a rebuild than the original construction.

It might be expected, therefore, that the inscription would throw light upon the arrangements described in the *Notitia*. Unfortunately, though the reading is almost certain, the stone-cutter seems not to have understood the meaning of what he was required to cut, and has produced a jumble which has defied interpretation.[2] Indulgence is asked for one more try :

The reading is :

     IVSTINIANVSPP
     VINDICIANVS
     MASBIERIVRR (or possibly PR)
     MCASTRVMFECIT
5.   ASO

If we allow RR of line 3 to be a blundered PR (which Haverfield in fact read), it looks as though we were meant to have two officers, a *praepositus* and a *praefectus*—both fourth century titles—ranked in this order and responsible for building (or rather rebuilding, for a so[lo] is a certain restoration in line 5) the signal station. The cutter has used the whole breadth of the stone for Vindicianus, and so has put his title at the end of the next line.

The inscription thus forms a barbarous parallel to the building-inscription of Hissarlik,[3] from which we learn that the *tribunus* was senior to the *praepositus* ; from the Ravenscar inscription we may infer that the *praepositus* was senior to the *praefectus*.

The competence of *praefecti* in the *notitia* is fairly clear. As Grosse says (151), *praefectus* is, by the mid-fourth century, an old-fashioned title, of which there is little trace in literary or epigraphic documents of the period. Nevertheless, in the *notitia* it has been used for the commanders of the ' new ' formations of *milites* (e.g., xxxvii, 15–23 ; xli, 15–25, and see p. 137, n. [6]).[4] Apart from these and certain

[1] On the date of the inscription see p. 142, n. [2]. There is no need to make anything of the identity of name with Justinianus, the general of Constantine III (Zosimus, vi, 2, 2–3. See Evans in *Num. Chron.*[3], vii, 208, with Richmond's sensible comment, *Proc. Soc. Ant. Newc.* [4], ix, 230).

[2] Full bibliography in Kitson-Clark, *Gazetteer of Rom. Remains in E. Yorks.*, 122.

[3] Mommsen, *Ges. Schriften*, vi. 304.

[4] The suspicion must arise that blocks of old-fashioned *numeri* on the Gallic frontiers (like the *numerus Turnacensium*, which we supposed (p. 137, n. [6]) to have been transferred to Britain before conversion) have been converted into *milites* by a stroke of the pen, their commanders retaining their original titles. For such conversions see Grosse, 28.

abnormal commands as the *praefectus classis* and the *praefectus laetorum*, we meet *praefecti*—outside Britain—only in command of legions, and what in the west (*cf*. Nesselhauf, 47) were old-fashioned formations, *alae* and *cohortes*. Moreover—again outside Britain— these old-fashioned formations hardly exist in the west, except in Rhaetia.

Britain, then, is exceptional. Yet in fact it is really the command of the *dux Britanniarum* which is exceptional. The troops of the *Comes litoris Saxonici* are set out in geographical order, and not in order of rank, which is unusual, but paralleled, as already mentioned, by the troops of his opposite number in the east, the *comes limitis Aegypti* (p. 138, n. [2]); and the only peculiarities of the command are (i) that the commanders of the *equites* are actually specified (usually none are mentioned), though, in fact, they are the up-to-date *praepositi*, (ii) that the *milites Tungrecanorum* are commanded by *praepositi* like the other non-legionary units of the command instead of by *praefecti* as in the Gallic frontier-commands. The command of the *Comes litoris Saxonici* is actually less archaic than Rhaetia, for, though there are more *numeri* (4 against 1); they are commanded by *praepositi* and not *praefecti*.

But the command of the *dux Britanniarum*—even when the section *per lineam valli* is omitted from consideration as certainly older—has all the archaic characteristics of Rhaetia (as well as far more *numeri*), and curiosities of its own. Only here does the legion head the list, taking precedence of the *equites*. Here, as in the section of the *comes litoris Saxonici*, the *equites* are given commanders, which is abnormal, but, furthermore, these commanders are of the old-fashioned type, *praefecti*. Finally, only here and in the exceptional conditions of Spain (where there are a legion (XLII, 26) and a few troops, but no formal frontier command) do we find in the west an undivided legion. It is difficult, as already stated (p. 139) to make the compilation of this section earlier than A.D. 395, and probable that it dates from A.D. 402 (p. 142), so that we seem compelled to believe that for some reason the command of the *dux* was left with its archaic features, while that of the *comes* was overhauled. It may be conjectured that, while on the Gallic frontiers an overhaul was accompanied by a change in the title of the soldiers (*numeri* to *milites*), in Britain a similar overhaul was accompanied by a change in the title of their officers (*praefecti* to *praepositi*, except the legion which keeps, like other legions, its *praefectus*); but the date remains uncertain.[1]

We can now return to the inscription. As the *praefectus* comes behind the *praepositus*, he cannot be the commander of *leg.* VI, who heads the list in the *Notitia*, but should be the commander of some *numerus*, and one thinks at once of the *numerus supervenientium Petueriensium* at Malton, not far off. The *praepositus* is harder, for the *Notitia* gives no *praepositus* in the command of the *dux Britan-*

---

[1] We know that the structure of one Saxon-shore fort was restored in the reign of Honorius (*EE* ix, 1281) and I hope elsewhere to show that Gildas *de Excidio*, 18, is connected with this. But any of the transfers the evidence for which has been cited above (p. 137). might furnish an occasion for it.

niarum, only *praefecti*. One supposition is simple and sound. On inscriptions we often meet with the *praepositus legionis* (Grosse, 144),[1] and we learn from Vegetius[2] that in an undivided legion the commander of a cohort was styled at the emperor's discretion either *tribunus* or *praepositus*. As under the system of Diocletian most legions were permanently divided into fractions which often corresponded more or less with a cohort of an undivided legion, *tribunus* became the normal title of the commander of one of these fractions.[3]

Applying, therefore, the evidence of Vegetius, we may suspect that the *praepositus legionis* of inscriptions is an alternative title for the commander of a legionary fraction. But in Britain, the legion seems to have remained undivided, so that the evidence of Vegetius can be used as it stands. When one considers the position of Ravenscar, we may suppose the despatch of some fraction of the legion—conceivably a cohort—(what in old times would have been called a ' vexillatio ') under a *praepositus* for the *ad hoc* purpose of rebuilding the signal-station in co-operation with the neighbouring *numerus* under its *praefectus*. This seems to suit the military arrangements of the later empire in general and of Britain in particular, and if the inscription is to be explained at all it is not easy to see how it is to be explained otherwise.

The remainder of line 3 is obviously very wrong. ' MAS = magister ' or ' masbier = magister ' have been offered.[4] MAS = magister, at least, is epigraphically sound, but both are historically quite impossible. In the military hierarchy of the later empire the only *magistri* are the supreme commanders, and a mere *praepositus* could not possibly take precedence of them in this unqualified manner, while ' asbieriu = arbitratu ' is mere despair.[5] To assume a local adjective ' Masbierium castrum ' would cut the knot at once, but the form is outlandish in the west and the juxtaposition ' sb ' seemingly not Celtic. Nevertheless, it may be suspected that this is the right road. MAS of line 3 comes immediately over MCAS of line 4. It may be suspected that the cutter misread his copy, intended to write MCAS one line too high and blundered it as MAS.[6] Our local adjective will then be BIERIVM, and this is not so inexplicable. B and V are very commonly confused, both in MSS. and in inscriptions, and since ' ie ' is not a Celtic diphthong, there is a hint that the intervocalic 's' which vanishes at some unknown period between ' British ' and Welsh has actually gone here. We should then have

---

[1] Apparently there is no evidence outside the *Notitia* for a *praefectus legionis* in the fourth century ; and, as Mommsen believes that no legion remained undivided then, he doubts whether the office actually existed (*Ges. Schriften*, vi, 224). But we can see that, for Britain at least, the assumption is hypercritical ; Leg. VI was not divided (save that some of it may have been taking duty in signal stations during the period that they existed).

[2] ii, 12.

[3] See on this Mommsen, *Ges. Schriften*, vi, 224.

[4] Haverfield, *JRS* ii, 210 and *EE* ix, p. 561. His treatment is, I fear, rather slap-dash : Haverfield was never really at home with institutions of the later empire.

[5] Hübner in *CIL*.

[6] Or possibly he intended ' castrum Bierium ' and altered the order after blundering MAS for CAS.

' Bi(s)erium = Vi(s)erium castrum.' Now, Visera is a known Gallic river-name (modern Vézère, Holder, *Altcelt. Sprachsch.*, iii, 402), and Ekwall sees it behind the English river-names ' Wear ' (Durham) and ' Wyre ' (Lancs.) (*English River-Names*, 442, 476) : it is seemingly cognate with Welsh Gwyar = blood.   May it not be that like many British forts (e.g. Danum on the Don), the signal-station on the Peak was called after the ' Bloody ' or, perhaps, the ' Red ' river, the modern Stoupe Beck, which ran into Robin Hood's Bay below it ? Restore, therefore, the inscription, in this way :

Justinianus p(rae)p(ositus), Vindicianus [p]r(aefectus), <mas> Bierium castrum fecit a so[lo].