



The Provincial List of Verona

J. B. Bury

The Journal of Roman Studies, Vol. 13. (1923), pp. 127-151.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0075-4358%281923%2913%3C127%3ATPLOV%3E2.0.CO%3B2-E>

The Journal of Roman Studies is currently published by Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/sprs.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PROVINCIAL LIST OF VERONA.

By J. B. BURY.

§ 1. The exact measure of the originality of Diocletian's statesmanship has not yet been taken. 'Like Augustus,' said Gibbon, 'Diocletian may be considered the founder of a new empire' and these words express the accepted view. In the whole work of pulling the Empire together, which went on from A.D. 270 to 330, the three outstanding actors were Aurelian, Diocletian, and Constantine, and the part played by Aurelian was indispensable for the *restitutio orbis*. It was he who destroyed the Principate, notwithstanding the negligible episode of Tacitus. It was he who founded the autocracy; Diocletian who regularized and systematized it. Two new things Diocletian certainly did, one of which was a success and the other a failure though not a fruitless one. His division of the Empire into Dioceses was permanent for nearly three hundred years. His throne system led to disaster and disappeared; yet the territorial quadripartition which it involved was afterwards stereotyped in the four Prefectures, and Nicomedia pointed to Constantinople. But in many of the other changes which distinguished the Empire of Constantine from the Empire of Severus and which have generally been regarded as inventions of Diocletian, it is becoming clear that he was not the initiator but was only extending and systematizing changes which had already been begun. The separation of civil from military powers in provincial government had been initiated by Gallienus (the importance of whose reign has in recent years been emerging). Some of the characteristics which mark the military organization of the fourth century had come before Diocletian's accession. Mr. Mattingly's studies in the numismatic history of the third century have been leading him, as he tells us,¹ to similar conclusions.

What I have said is illustrated by the provincial reforms which exhibit two distinct policies. By the creation of Twelve Dioceses Diocletian combined groups of provinces into large circumscriptions; while at the same time he broke up many large provinces into smaller ones. The two policies should be kept apart in judging his innovations. The creation of the Dioceses was a new and original act, due to this Emperor himself. But in reducing the size of provinces he was only carrying further a policy which had been begun in the reign of Claudius I and pursued at intervals ever since and was to be

¹ *J.R.S.* xi, p. 261.

carried further by his own successors. The Dioceses formed a system and must have been introduced by a single act. The date of their institution is, as we should expect, not recorded: the meagreness of our records of Diocletian's reign is notorious. The only literary notice of his administrative reforms in general is the well-known vague and censorious passage in Lactantius¹;

Et ut omni terrore complerentur prouinciae quoque in frustra concisae, multi praesides et plura officia singulis regionibus ac pene iam ciuitatibus incubare, item rationales et uicarii praefectorum.

The indications are that the Diocesan organization belongs to one of the early years of his joint reign with Maximian. This was Mr. Seeck's view, and it appears to me to be probably right.² On the other hand the splitting up of provinces was not done systematically or all at once; the policy was applied at different times during the reign, as occasion dictated, as the circumstances of particular territories pressed themselves on the attention of the Emperors. For this the evidence is quite clear, as will appear in the course of this paper. The changes which Diocletian made in the administrative geography of the Empire will be misapprehended if we suppose that they were all parts of a systematic plan carried out simultaneously by delimiting commissions. Yet they have generally been treated by historians as if they belonged to one thorough-going reform that had been thought out as a whole.

§ 2. It is commonly supposed that we possess a list of the dioceses and provinces dating from Diocletian's reign. This is the document which is called the List of Verona, or the *Laterculus Veronensis*, or the provincial List of A.D. 297. Although it was published by Maffei in the eighteenth century,³ it was unnoticed by historians till 1862 when it was edited by Mommsen with a commentary.⁴ Since then it has been reprinted by Mr. Riese⁵ and Mr. Seeck.⁶ The manuscript, preserved at Verona, is written in uncials of about the seventh century, according to Mommsen. That scholar argued, and proved to his own satisfaction, that this list is not only earlier than all the other provincial lists we possess, but can be dated, with great probability, to A.D. 297; and this view has been generally accepted, though there have been one or two dissentients.⁷

The twelve Dioceses are arranged in a geographical order, beginning with the Oriens, which included Egypt, and ending with

¹ *De mort. pers.* c. 7.

² *Gesch. des Untergangs der ant. Welt* i, 8; cp. 412.

³ In his *Opusculi ecclesiastici* (Trent), 1742; reprinted in his *Opere*, vol. xi (Venice), 1790.

⁴ 'Verzeichniss der römischen Provinzen, aufgesetzt um 297,' in *Abb. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin*, 1862, pp. 489 sqq. Reprinted in his *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. v.

⁵ In *Geograph. Minores*, 1878.

⁶ In his ed. of *Notitia Dignitatum* (1876), pp 247, 399.

⁷ Particularly Mr. Kuhn, in *N. Jahrb. f. Philologie und Pädagogik*, Bd. 115, 1877. See also the article *Diöcesis* in P.W.

Africa. The sixth Diocese, Pannoniae, is followed by Britanniae. Thus the eastern Dioceses come first, the western second.

The order of the provinces in each Diocese is in the case of the Eastern Dioceses (I-V) intended to be a geographical order; but in the case of the Western provinces (VIII-XII) an official order, that is, provinces governed by consulares take precedence over provinces governed by praesides, and a proconsular province takes precedence over both (as always in the *Notitia Dignitatum*). As for VI (Pannoniae) the order might be either the one or the other, and as for VII (Britanniae) we have no independent data for deciding.

Thus the whole Laterculus is not homogeneous. The list of the Eastern provinces is compiled on a different principle from that of the Western. This difference was noticed by Mommsen, and it could hardly escape anyone's attention on the most cursory inspection; but he did not consider it any further. Yet it suggests that the list as we have it may have been compiled from two distinct sources, and therefore it appears to me to be a mistake in method to analyse it in the first instance as a whole, as critics have hitherto done, instead of taking the Eastern and Western parts separately. For it is possible that they were originally independent documents, and may therefore be of different dates.

In the following analysis I propose to consider the Dioceses in order (as Mommsen did), but to draw separately for each of the two heterogeneous sections whatever conclusions may be drawn as to the *terminus ante quem* and the *terminus post quem* of its composition. If they coincide, well and good.

THE SIX EASTERN DIOCESES.

I. *Diocesis Orientis*. Of the seventeen provinces enumerated the first five are Egyptian. This supplies at once a date *ante quem*. Placidus, eponymous consul of A.D. 343, was comes Orientis Aegypti et Mesopotamiae (*C.I.L.* x, 1700), and later we find Vulcacius Rufinus (consul of A.D. 349) bearing the same title (Dessau, 1237). The law in *Cod. Theod.* 12, 1, 63 points to a still later date for this arrangement, for it probably belongs to A.D. 370 or 373 (see Mommsen *ad loc.*). The Diocese of Egypt is first mentioned in *Cod. Theod.* 12, 1, 97, March 8, 383; and the Prefect of Egypt receives the title *augustalis* between March 17, 380 and May 14, 382. Thus the separation of Egypt as a distinct Diocese was due to Theodosius I, and may be dated roughly to about A.D. 381.

The five Egyptian provinces enumerated are: Libya superior, Libya inferior, Thebais, Aegyptus Iovia, Aegyptus Herculia. There is no question that this enumeration represents the division made by Diocletian, as Iovia and Herculia show, and we can date to a year Diocletian's reconstitution. It was subsequent to A.D. 292, for

at that time the Thebaid was still only an ἐπιστρατηγίς, as we know from *C.I.Gr.* 4892.¹ We may therefore without hesitation place it A.D. 297 after the suppression of the rebel Achilleus, on which occasion it is recorded that administrative changes were made.² It was principally on this account that Mommsen fixed on A.D. 297 as the date of the whole list. But it is really only a *terminus post quem*.

We have two papyrus texts which show that Herculia lasted under that name till the sole reign of Constantine. Aurelius Antoninus is mentioned as ἡγούμενος Αὐγούστου Ἡρκουλείας in A.D. 316, April 1, and Arsinoites appears under the praeses of Herculia in A.D. 322, December 12.³ We may take it for granted that no change was made by Licinius in 323-4 or by Constantine till at earliest 325. But both Iovia and Herculia disappeared before A.D. 341 and made way for Aegyptus and Augustamnica. It has been shown by Mr. Gelzer that Herculia corresponded roughly to the ἐπιστρατηγίς of Heptanomia, and that the new change consisted in adding to Herculia the Eastern part of the Delta, at the expense of Iovia. The enlarged Herculan province was named Augustamnica, while the diminished Iovian province was entitled simply Aegyptus.⁴ This change was made before A.D. 341⁵; probably, one may suppose, by Constantine and therefore before A.D. 337. Thus we get as an *ante quem* limit—strictly A.D. 341, but probably A.D. 337.

The list then crosses the Isthmus and enumerates the provinces of what was to be, after *c.* A.D. 381, the Diocese of Oriens under the comes Orientis. The order is geographical so far as possible; some leap could not be avoided, and there is a leap from Cyprus to Mesopotamia. The first seven of the twelve extra-Egyptian provinces are:—

Arabia,
item Arabia,
Augusta Libanensis,
Palestina,
Fenice,
Syria Coele,
Augusta Euphratensis.

The first three items have been much debated. Augusta Libanensis occurs nowhere else, and some scholars have maintained

¹ Mr. Camille Jullian said that the list could only have been drawn up between A.D. 292 and 297. See his learned article in *Revue historique* xix, p. 331 (1882).

² Eutropius, 9, 23: *Ea tamen occasione ordinavit provide multa et disposuit quae ad nostram aetatem manent.* Cp. Seeck, *Gesch. des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, i, 421.

³ *Pap. Oxyrb.* vi, 896; *Archiv. f. Pap.-F.* iii, 340.

⁴ See M. Gelzer, *Studien zur byz. Verw. Aegyptens*, p. 4.

⁵ See *Pap. Oxyrb.* i, 87, *Cod. Theod.* 12, 1, 34 and other texts cited by Gelzer, *ib.*

that the four words *item Arabia Augusta Libanensis* are a late interpolation. This is an arbitrary assumption which has no probability. (The word *item*, which makes no difference to the sense, is doubtless the addition of a copyist, to make it clear that Arabia is repeated. Similarly in the list of Polemius Silvius we find *item* inserted in two places between two provinces of the same name in one family of MSS.). The only two views which we need consider are those of Mr. Jullian¹ and Mr. Ohnesorge.²

Mr. Jullian thinks that two provinces are designated: Arabia = Trajan's Arabia, and Augusta Libanensis = a part of Phoenicia which was made into a new province. He regards *item Arabia* as an interpolation.

Mr. Ohnesorge likewise thinks that two provinces are designated, but does not alter the text. The first is Arabia = the Southern part of Trajan's Arabia which was afterwards named Palaestina Salutaris and included Petra and Aila. He thinks that this was cut off by Diocletian from the Northern section, the boundary being the river Arnon (the old limit between the Moabites and Amorites). The Northern portion, with the addition of territory to the north, formed according to him a new province, named Arabia Augusta Libanensis. It appears to me that both critics are partly right and partly wrong. Mr. Ohnesorge is right in his view that when this list of the Orient provinces was drawn up, Trajan's Arabia had been divided into two provinces; but he is wrong in supposing that the Northern province was called Arabia Augusta Libanensis. Such a designation appears to me almost impossible. Against Mr. Jullian is his rejection of words which are not obviously corrupt, but he has rightly seen that Augusta Libanensis is the name of a province, just like Augusta Euphratensis.

The simple explanation is that three, not two, provinces are designated; the two Arabia's (distinguished in some way not indicated in the List, perhaps as I and II), and Augusta Libanensis (which is mentioned nowhere else, but corresponds to the Phoenice Libani of the Notitia Dignitatum).

To find a *terminus ante quem* we have to ask how and when it came about that the Southern Arabia became a second Palestine. The answer is partly supplied in the correspondence of Libanius. There we find that in A.D. 357 Clematius was appointed governor (consularis) of Palestine,³ and that his province included Petra⁴ and Elusa.⁵ In other words, before this year the province of Palestine had been enlarged by adding to it the Southern Arabia. In the following year A.D. 358, this larger Palestine was again resolved

¹ *Op. cit.*

² *Die römische Provinz-Liste von 297.* Teil i. Duisburg, 1889.

³ *Ep.* 478 (Wolf) = 563 (Förster). For the dates

of the letters see Seeck, *Die Briefe des Libanius zeitlich geordnet* (1906). Cp. p. 111.

⁴ *Ep.* 324 W. = 321 F.

⁵ *Ep.* 318 W. = 315 F.

into its two components parts, but with altered nomenclature; the original Palaestina (under a consular) becoming Palaestina prima, and the part which had formerly been Arabia becoming Palaestina secunda (under a praeses).¹

We have now to ask how long the administrative arrangement lasted by which the southern portion of Trajan's Arabia was part of the consular province of Palestine, which explains why that portion came to bear the Palestinian name. We have one indication. In the subscriptions to the Council of Nicaea, Peter Bishop of Aila is included among the bishops of the Provincia Palaestina.² This gives us A.D. 325 as an extreme *ante quem* limit.

The incorporation of the Southern Arabia in Palestine, before A.D. 325, meant that from this time forward there was only one Arabia (the northern or Bostraeon). Hence there is no difficulty about the law *Cod. Theod.* 9, 40, 4, addressed to Theodore, *praeses Arabiae*. The date in the text *Constantio A iiii et Constante C* is impossible; there is no such year. If *iiii* is right, *C* must be changed to *A iii*, and the year is A.D. 346; while, if *C* is right and Gallus is meant, *iiii* must be changed to *v*, and the year is A.D. 352. But whichever the date, there is no difficulty about *Arabiae*; there was only one Arabian province from A.D. 325 forward.³

As for the *terminus post quem*, there is no reason to question the view that the reorganization of the oriental provinces was mainly the work of Diocletian and was probably carried out during A.D. 295-7, while the Emperor was himself in those regions. Some particular changes may have been made earlier. It appears to me quite probable that the separation of Isauria from Cilicia, and its organization as a distinct province, may have been, as Mr. Jullian has suggested,⁴ due to Probus.

II. *Dioecesis Pontica*. The seven provinces are:—

Bitinia
Cappadocia
Galatia
Paphlagonia, nunc in duas divisa,
Diospontus
Pontus Polemiacus
Armenia minor, nunc et maior addita.

The first thing to be noticed is that we have here two undisguised additions to the original List, recording the division of Paphlagonia into Paphlagonia and Honorias, and the creation

¹ *Epp.* 337, 338 W. 334, 335 F. Eupaterius was the first praeses of Pal. ii.

² Turner, *Ecl. Occ. Mon. iuris ant.*, i, 1, p. 46.

³ This agrees with Ammian's account (xiv, 8) of

the Orient Diocese, so far as it goes, but he does not mention the second Palestine.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 361. He refers to Vopiscus, *V. Probi.* 16, 4-17, 1.

of Armenia maior. It will be convenient to leave these additions out of consideration for the present, and come back to them when we have gone through the original List (see below § 9, p. 142).

It may also be noticed that the geographical order of the first three provinces is not accurate. It ought, as Mommsen pointed out, to be either Capp., Gal., Bithyn., or reversely.

Diospontus is the one province here from which we can infer chronological limits. It is clear that it was the later Helenopontus and was named by Diocletian, (*Dios*—corresponding to *Jovia* in Aegyptus *Jovia*), and that it was he who divided Pontus (Polemiacus) into two parts.¹ Mommsen knew of no other mention of Diospontus. It occurs, however, in some of the MSS. of the subscriptions of the Council of Nicaea.² A Pontic inscription found at Vezü Küprü by Mr. J. G. C. Anderson mentions a praeses *Diosponti*, and can be dated between A.D. 317 and 323³; another found by the same explorer shows that the province had been renamed Helenopontus not later than 337 and perhaps before 333.⁴

From these data we get the limits 323-337 for the disappearance of Diospontus and the substitution of Helenopontus. But we can get narrower limits. The new name in honour of Constantine's mother cannot have been given to the province either before he bestowed upon her the style Fl. Helena Augusta, or after her death. These dates are determined by her coins. She was raised to the august rank in A.D. 324, after the war. She died, an octogenarian, in A.D. 329, after her return from the East where she had spent A.D. 327-8.⁵ Thus the limit *ante quem* supplied by the list of Pontic provinces is A.D. 329.

III. *Dioecesis Asiana*. The order of the provinces is intended to be geographical, but the intention is clumsily carried out. The two things to be noticed are that the province of Lycaonia which was instituted shortly before A.D. 373⁶ is absent, and that the name of the province *Lycia* must have fallen out through the oversight of a copyist (probably after Lydia), as Mommsen pointed out (cp. below §7).

IV. *Dioecesis Thraciae*. The six provinces are enumerated in geographical order, zigzag from S.E. to N.W. The division was permanent, and there is no particular reason for thinking that it was prior to Diocletian, but it may have been. For instance, Probus may at least have begun a reorganization of Thrace.⁷

¹ This division cannot have been earlier than A.D. 293, the year in which the Caesars were created, as is shown by the inscription of Aurelius Priscianus v.p. *praeses provinciae Ponti*, C.I.L. iii, 307.

² Turner, *Eccles. Occ. Mon. iuris ant.* i, l. p. 6 sq. It is also mentioned by Himerius, *Or.* i, § 14 (ὁ Διὸς καλοῦμενος Πόντος).

³ C.I.L. iii, 14184³⁴.

⁴ C.I.L. iii, 14184³⁷.

⁵ Maurice, *Numismatique Constantinienne*, vol. i, p. cxxx, cxlviii.

⁶ See Basil's letter of that year to Eusebius, bishop of Samosata, *Epp.* 138, 8 (ed. Benedict. 1839, vol. iii, p. 332).

⁷ Cp. Vopiscus, *V. Probi*, 16, 3.

V. *Dioecesis Misiarum*. This Diocese corresponds to the two later Dioceses of Dacia and Macedonia, which together composed the Prefecture of Illyricum. The provinces are geographically arranged, beginning with the northern which border on the Danube and proceeding southward to Achaëa, then returning northward to take in the three western provinces, and finally adding Crete.

It is named the Diocese of the *Moesiae*, although Moesia inferior belonged to the Diocese of Thrace. The only other occurrence of the designation is in the well-known inscription of C. Caelius Saturninus (*C.I.L.* vi, 1704) who had been *comes d. n. Constantini uictoris Aug.* and vicarius of the praetorian prefect *in urbe Roma*, and also *per Mysias*. Mommsen has pointed out that the inscription must be later than the death of Licinius and belongs to the sole reign of Constantine.¹ We meet a *comes Macedoniae* in A.D. 327, and this may show that by that time the Diocese of the *Moesiae* had been already broken up into D. *Daciae* and D. *Macedoniae*,² but the first quite clear evidence for this division is in Festus, in A.D. 369.³

The provinces are as follows (as Mommsen arranged them):

Dacia
Misia superior Margensis
Dardania
Macedonia
Tessalia
<Achaia>
[Priantina]
Privalentina
Epiros noua
Epiros uetus
Creta.

The two errors were corrected by Mommsen: *Achaia* had fallen out after *Tessalia*, and *Priantina* is a dittogram of Privalentina.

The first provinces of the List are formed from Domitian's Moesia superior. It has been generally supposed that Moesia superior was first of all divided by Aurelian into two only, namely Moesia sup. and Dacia.⁴ But an important inscription on a small tablet, found at Bov, has been published by Mr. Filow⁵ which proves

¹ *De C. Caelii Saturnini titulo*, in *Nuove memorie dell' Istituto di Corrispondenza archeologica*, 298 sqq. (Leipzig, 1865). In the two texts cited by Mommsen from Anon. Vales. Pars I, viz. § 18 and § 21, it is not at all clear that Moesia means the diocese; in the first the natural meaning is Moesia inferior.

² Mommsen, *op. cit.* p. 306. For *comites* = *vicarii*, cp. *Cod. Theod.* 11, 34, 1 (A.D. 331), etc.

³ *Brev.* c. 8.

⁴ Cp. Vopiscus, *Vit. Aurel.* 39; Eutropius, ix, 15.

⁵ 'Die Teilung des aurelianischen Dakiens' in *Klio* (1912), pp. 12, 234 sqq.. The statement of Festus (*Brev.* c. 8) is *per Aurelianum duae Daciae factae sunt*. In the list of Illyric provinces which follows, Förster has rightly inserted <*Dardaniam*> after *Moesiam*. This is guaranteed by the text of Jordanes, *Rom.* 218, who copied from Festus.

that two Dacian provinces had been created by Aurelian, thus confirming the statement of Festus. It runs:

Caro et Carino Augg. Gaianus preses finem posuit
inter du[as D]acias dila[psum ?]

The date must be A.D. 283, and it is obvious that Aurelian set up the boundary stones, one of which Gaianus restored. There were, then, two Dacias when Diocletian came to the throne and, therefore, Mr. Filow has inferred that we should read in our List: Dacia <Dacia>, that is presumably Dacia ripensis and Dacia mediterranea. Aurelian's Dacia mediterranea might have included Dardania, and Dardania, Mr. Filow thinks, was split off as a distinct province by Diocletian.

The inscription proves that Aurelian divided Moesia sup. into at least three provinces—Moesia sup., Dacia [I], and Dacia [II]—if not four; for there is nothing to show whether it was he or Diocletian who was the creator of the province of Dardania; we do not know how far his two Dacias corresponded to the two Dacias of later times, D. ripensis and D. mediterranea, which existed before A.D. 342-3.¹ I do not agree with Mr. Filow in thinking it a matter of course that the word *Dacia* must have fallen out of the List. There is no reason why Diocletian might not have united Aurelian's two Dacias into a single province; and I think we should accept the actual evidence we have, namely the text of the List as it stands, that he did so, especially as the evidence of *Cod. Theod.* 2, 19, 2 (praeses Daciae) points to a single Dacia in A.D. 321.

In any case Diocletian, I submit, created an entirely new province here, which was destined to be short-lived. Mommsen explained *Margensis* as an honorific title given to Moesia superior in reminiscence of the victory over Carinus in the lower valley of the Margus which established Diocletian on the throne (A.D. 285). He may be right as to the motive of the name, but Moesia superior *Margensis* appears to me a highly improbable title for a province. There is no parallel to it. If Diocletian had wished merely to honour the memory of the battle by renaming the province in which it was fought, the new name would surely have been simply Moesia *Margensis*. But it does not seem very likely that he would have chosen this way for commemorating his victory, unless something more was involved. What Diocletian did was this, if I am not greatly mistaken; he cut off the northern part of Aurelian's Moesia sup. and constituted it a new province, which he named *Margensis*, with the seat of its governor at Margum which stood near the confluence of the Margus (Morawa) with the Danube. The List then gives the names of four, not three, provinces, into which through

¹ This (not 346) is the date of the Council of Sardica (see E. Schwartz, 'Zur Gesch. des Athanasios,' in *Gött. Nachrichten*, 1904, p. 341). Dacia ripensis

appears in the subscriptions to that Council (*Mansi, Concil.* iii, p. 42).

Aurelian's and Diocletian's changes Domitian's Moesia sup. had been divided :

Dacia
Misia superior
Margensis
Dardania.

To Epirus noua we have no other express reference till the reign of Valentinian I, but it is implied in Ἡπείρου in Theodoret's account of the Council of Sardica.¹ There is no reason to suppose that the division of Epirus was later than Diocletian's reign.

VI. *Dioecesis Pannoniarum*. This is the Diocese which was afterwards known as the Diocese of Illyricum.² We find the number and names of the seven provinces still unchanged in the Notitia Dignitatum. They are: Pannonia inferior (= secunda), Savensis (= Savia), Dalmatia, Valeria, Pannonia superior (= prima), Noricus ripariensis, Noricus mediterranea. This order is geographical. Beginning with Pannonia II, it proceeds westward to Dalmatia, then returns to Valeria which is immediately north of Pannonia II and enumerates the four northern provinces. But the order is, as it happens, also the order of rank.³ For Pannonia II was a consular province, and Savia was correctorial, the rest being praesidial. From the fact that Savia was correctorial I conjecture that the breaking up of the two Pannonias into smaller provinces had been begun by Aurelian.⁴

For the existence of the two Noric provinces in A.D. 311 we have monumental proof in the inscription *C.I.L.* iii, 4796 where Noricum medit. is mentioned, and it is quite probable that they date from Diocletian's reign. But it is otherwise with Valeria. This province was not named after Diocletian, but in honour of his daughter Valeria, the wife of Galerius. This we are expressly told by Aurelius Victor (40, 10) and by Ammian (19, 11, 4). The passage of Victor indicates the date. He says that Galerius left Italy and soon afterwards died *cum agrum satis reipublicae commodantem caesis immanibus silvis atque emisso lacu Pelsonae apud Pannonios fecisset, cuius gratia provinciam uxoris nomine Valeriam appellavit*. This shows that in A.D. 308-11 he was engaged in eastern Pannonia in improving the land and that he organised then the province of Valeria cutting it off from Pannonia inferior.

This supplies the date A.D. 308-11 as a *terminus post quem* for the List.

¹ *Hist. ecc.* ii, 8. l. p. 101 (ed. Parmentier). In the Libellus Synodicus (Mansi, iii, 73) it is Ἡπείρου.

² As Mommsen pointed out, Pannonia is used to designate this Diocese in Anon. Val. Pars i, 4 § 9; *hinc Seuero Pannoniae et Italiae urbes et Africae contigerunt*.

³ And so Mommsen took it, not observing that the order might also be taken as geographical.

⁴ It may be noted that Dalmatia was already a praesidial province in A.D. 277, *C.I.L.* iii, *Supp.* 8707, *Aurelius Marcianus v. p. praeses prov. Dalmatia* (so A.D. 280, *ib.* 1805); cp. Vopiscus, *V. Carini* 16, 6, *praesidiatu Dalmatiae*.

§ 4. Assuming provisionally that the Diocese Pannoniae belongs to the Eastern group of Dioceses in our List, we may now sum up the chronological results we have obtained. From the Egyptian portion of the Diocese of the Orient we get as a *post quem* limit A.D. 297, as an *ante quem* limit A.D. 341 (or probably 337). From the Asiatic portion of the Diocese of the Orient we get A.D. 325 *ante quem*. A.D. 325 is the outside limit, and it may seem somewhat more probable that the change in regard to Arabia was made some years earlier by Licinius than that it was made by Constantine in the months between the defeat of Licinius in A.D. 324 and the Council of Nicaea in A.D. 325. From the Pontic Diocese we get A.D. 329 *ante quem* and from the Moesian A.D. 342 to 343 or perhaps A.D. 327 *ante quem*. From the Pannonian we get A.D. 308–311 *post quem*.

The conclusion is that the Eastern section of the List was drawn up between A.D. 308–311 and A.D. 325 (or probably a few years earlier). These are the extreme limits.

I proceed to consider the Western Dioceses.

THE SIX WESTERN DIOCESES.

§ 5. VII. *Dioecesis Britanniarum*. The provincial division of Britain we find here is that which existed up to A.D. 369 when a fifth province, Valentia, was added by Valentinian I, so that this year is a *terminus ante quem*. The breaking up of the two provinces of Septimius Severus (Britannia superior and inferior) into four was the work of Maximian and Constantius, Maxima Caesariensis being created by Maximian and Flavia Caesariensis by Constantius. I have shown elsewhere¹ that these two were not created simultaneously but successively. Mommsen supposed that the reorganization of the Britannic provinces was carried out in A.D. 296–7 immediately after the defeat of Allectus; but as there is no case of a Caesar giving his name to a province, it seems more probable that Flavia Caesariensis was created in A.D. 306 when Constantius was Augustus and was in Britain. I think we are justified in taking A.D. 306 as a *post quem* limit.

We find that later Maxima was a consular province, the other three being praesidial. In the other Western Dioceses in this List, consular provinces come first. But here we find Maxima in the third place. It has therefore been inferred by Mommsen that when this List was made all four Britannic provinces were alike praesidial.

VIII. *Dioecesis Galliarum*. Diocletian divided Gaul into two Dioceses, a Northern (Galliae), and a Southern. The eight provinces of Galliae enumerated here were still unchanged in A.D. 369 when

¹ *Cambridge Historical Journal*, vol. i (1923) p. 4.

Festus wrote his *Breviarium* which gives the same List. They were afterwards increased by two, Lugdunensis iii, and Senonia (which was created by Magnus Maximus) also called Lugdunensis iv.¹ The arrangement in our List dates from the reign of Diocletian, as is shown by the province Maxima Sequanorum which must have been named after his colleague Maximian. It is however here called Sequania; whereas in Festus, in *Notitia Galliarum*, in *Notitia Dignitatum* and in Polemius it has its full official name.

The List begins with four consular provinces, the two Belgicae and the two Germaniae. Lugdunensis i (which is also consular in the *Not. Dig.*) comes after the praesidial Sequania; from which it may be inferred that when the List was drawn up the province was praesidial, as we know that it still was in A.D. 319 (*Cod. Theod.* II, 3, 1).

IX. *Dioecesis Biennensis*. This name for the Diocese of Southern Gaul occurs only here. In the *Notitia Galliarum* (xi, 1) it is described as *provinciae numero vii*. But its official name seems to have been at one time *Quinque provinciae*. In an inscription of Fl. Sallustius, of A.D. 364 (*C.I.L.* vi, 1729), he is described as having been *uicarius quinque prouinciarum*. A law of A.D. 399 is addressed to Macrobius *uicarius quinque prouinciarum* (*Cod. Theod.* 16, 10, 15). And in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, the *rationalis summarum* of the Count of the Sacred Largesses, is called *r.s. v. prouu.* (xi. 18) and similarly the *rationalis reiprivatae* is *r.r.p. per v. prouu.*² In that document, the two Gallic Dioceses are administered together under the same vicarius, and his title is *uicarius Septem prouinciarum* (xxii).³ This title shows that the change, which must have been made in the early years of the fifth century, consisted in placing northern Gaul under the administration of the vicarius of southern Gaul.

The persistence of the name *Quinque provinciae* for the southern Diocese long after the provinces were seven in number proves that the period in which the provinces were five must have lasted long enough to make the name so familiar and current that it was preserved in official use though it had ceased to be accurate. This suggests

¹ It seems probable that Lugd. iii was also formed by Maximus. These two provinces are not mentioned by Ammian. The motive for the alteration of provincial divisions was in many, perhaps in most, cases some disturbance due to rebellion or invasion, and we may conjecture that Maximus was prompted to a reorganization by troubles in Armorica. We do not know the date of the inscription of Epetum (a few miles from Salonae), which records that L. Artorius [Ju?]stus, prefect of leg. vi victrix (York), was dux of an expedition consisting of Britannic troops against the Armoricans (*C.I.L.* iii, 1919). It seems to me more likely to belong to the third century than to the fourth. But I may

take the opportunity of observing that the expedition probably involved operations by sea, off the north Gallic coast, and the reason for appointing the prefect of the York legion to the command was that he had had naval experience, having been once *praepositus classis Misenatium*.

² Cp. also Mansi, *Conc.* iii, 491, *Synodic.* to the bishops *per Gallias et quinque provincias* (A.D. 374). We have, however, *septem provinciae* in *Cod. Theod.* 15, 1, 15, A.D. 400.

³ Cp. the fifth century inscription on a statue to Acilius Glabrio Sibidius who had been *uicarius per Gallias Septem prouinciarum*, *C.I.L.* vi. 1678.

the possibility that the original five provinces which formed Diocletian's Diocese had already existed before his reign.

In the List of Verona the seven provinces which we find in the later lists are enumerated :

Viennensis
Narbonensis prima
Narbonensis secunda
Novempopulana
Aquitanica prima
Aquitanica secunda
Alpes maritimae.

It is easy to see that the original five provinces of Diocletian's Diocese were Viennensis, Narbonensis, Novempopulana, Aquitanica, and Alpes maritimae, and that they became seven by the partitions of Aquitanica and Narbonensis. The province Viennensis occurs in the subscriptions to the Council of Arles in A.D. 314,¹ and it had given its name to the whole Diocese at the time when the Verona List was compiled.

Novempopulana, the true and original Aquitania, between the Garonne and the Pyrenees, had not improbably been made a distinct province before the time of Diocletian. If not, it was ripe for the change. The Aquitanians south of the Garonne disliked the administrative association of their country with the Celts between the Garonne and the Loire, and some time in the third century they obtained a separation which, if it did not amount to having a governor (praeses) of their own, must have meant a separate financial and military administration. The evidence for this is the inscription of Hasparren which unfortunately is not dated but must belong, it is generally agreed, to the third century (*C.I.L.* xiii, 412). It states that a certain Verus went to Rome and secured from the Emperor a separation which the Aquitanians desired :

pro nouem optinuit populis seiungere Gallos.

Mr. Hirschfeld has contended that the inscription was cut in the early years of the third century, and that the 'sejunction' was only 'in fiscaler und militärischer Hinsicht.'² But it may have been a good deal later than he thought.³ In any case it seems not unlikely that Novempopulana may have been constituted as a distinct province by Aurelian (or Probus), and at the same time Viennensis created, so that the five provinces of south Gaul may date from ten years or more before Diocletian's accession, ready to form one of his Dioceses.

¹ Mansi, *Conc.* ii, 476.

² *Aquitanien in der Römerzeit* (S.B. of Berlin Academy, 1896, i, 429 *sqq.*), p. 437.

³ Cp. Homo, *Aurélien*, p. 167.

In the fifties of the fourth century the Aquitanicae seem to have been under a single governor, judging from the inscription of Saturninus Sallustius Secundus (*C.I.L.* vi, 1764) from which we learn that this distinguished minister, who (as we know from Ammian) was Praetorian Prefect of the East in A.D. 361-4, had been quaestor, and proconsul of Africa, and still further back in his career *praeses provinciae Aquitanicae*. His Aquitanian post can hardly have been earlier than towards the end of the reign of Constantine the Great and may have been in the reign of Constantine II or of Constans. But we cannot with any certainty infer the year 340 or thereabouts for the original bipartition of Aquitanica. For there may have been two Aquitanicae before the time of Sallustius, and if (as sometimes happened in other cases¹) they were united for the time being under his sole administration, he might easily have been designated in his inscription as *praeses pr. Aquit.* simply (instead of *pr. pr. Aquit. primae et secundae*).² If then we should find other reasons for concluding that this List of the Western Dioceses was composed at a date prior to the sole reign of Constantine the Great, the stone of Sallustius is no insuperable obstacle.

The two Aquitanicae appear in A.D. 369, in the list of Festus (c. 6).

But Festus has only one Narbonensis, and the earliest evidence for two Narbonense provinces seems to occur in the Acts of the Council of Aquileia in A.D. 381.³ Yet we cannot take the text of Festus as proving decisively that the division of Narbonensis was later than A.D. 369. The list given by this writer may have been drawn up at a moment when the two Narbonenses were temporarily united under one governor. Or Narbonensis II, a small province between the Rhone valley and the Alpes maritimae, may have been unknown to him. It is to be noted that it was not continuous with Narbonensis I but separated from it by Viennensis which included the Rhone valley right down to Massilia.⁴

It appears to me a very hazardous proposition that the seven provinces of this Diocese are due to a rehandling of the List some time after A.D. 369, seeing that there are no signs of such a rehandling in any other part of the document (the two interpolations in the Pontic Diocese being professed additions to the original text); and I believe that the five provinces of D. Viennensis had already become seven by the division of Aquitanica and of Narbonensis

¹ E.g. the temporary union of the two Mauretanian provinces (*C.I.L.* viii, 8475); that of Europa and Thracia (*C.I.L.* vi, 1690) under one governor.

² Compare *provincia Aquitanica* = both Aquitanicae, in Ammian, 15, 11, 13-15

³ Mansi, iii, p. 615, a letter addressed to the bishops *provinciae Viennensium et Narbonensium primae et secundae*.

⁴ The question of Narbonensis has been much debated. See Kuhn, *Neue Jahrb. f. Philol. u. Pädag.* Band 115, 1877; Czwalina, *Ueber das Verzeichniss der röm. Provinzen vom J. 297* (Wesel, 1881); Ohnesorge, *op. cit.* Mommsen accepts the two Narbonenses for Diocletian's reign (*Ges. Schr.* v. 583).

when the rest of the List of the western Dioceses was originally composed. It might be conjectured that the reorganization was the work of Constantine during the years A.D. 308-11. The division of Narbonensis involved the extension of Viennensis to the sea and the inclusion of Arles in the latter province.

X. *Diocesis Italiciana*. The text of the list of Italian provinces is imperfect. The heading gives their number as sixteen, and only nine are enumerated, namely :

Benetiam Histriam,
Flaminiam,
Picenum,
Tusciam Umbriam,
Apuliam Calabriam,
Lucaniam,
Corsicam,
Alpes Cotias,
Retia.

The others which we should expect to find are : Aemilia, Liguria, Samnium, Campania, Sicilia, Sardinia and Valeria. We have virtually the same list as that in the *Notitia Dignitatum* with the exception of Raetia II; the date of the partition of Raetia is unknown, but it was before the end of the fourth century. Lucania doubtless = Lucania et Bruttii, and Flaminia may = Flaminia et Picenum (sc. *annonarium*). The association of a part of Picenum with Flaminia is as early at least as the reign of Constantine, as we can infer from the careers, for instance, of L. Turgius Secundus (*C.I.L.* vi, 1772) and Fabius Titianus (*ib.* 1717), though at about the same period we find L. Crepereius Madalianus described as *corrector Flaminiae* simply.

The provincial organisation of Italy¹ seems to have been the work of Aurelian, and all the provinces seem to have been at first under *correctores*; this title survived in the case of most of them far into the fourth century, and in the case of two (Apulia et Calabria, Lucania et Bruttii) was preserved always. It may be observed that *corrector* (which under the later system ranked between the *consularis* and the *praeses*) was in the time of Aurelian a title of considerable prestige. This is evident from an inscription of Palmyra, published by Mr. Clermont-Ganneau,² which shows that kings of Palmyra, who regarded themselves as the peers of the Augustus,

¹ For the general study of the Italian regions and provinces Mommsen's Essay *Die libri coloniarum* (*Ges. Schriften*, v, 146, *sqq.*) is important. Cp. also *Die italischen Regionen* (*ib.* 269, *sqq.*)

² 'Odeinat et Vaballat, rois de Palmyre et leur titre romain de corrector,' in *Revue biblique* 1920, pp. 382-419.

were nevertheless content to accept the title of *corrector* (ἐπανορθωτής; it is transcribed in indigenous characters); it was used, in fact, to legitimize their usurpation. This, as he observes, explains the treatment of the tyrant Tetricus; he was 'let down easily' by being appointed *corrector totius Italiae*.¹ All the provincial governors of the Italian provinces had at first the title *corrector Italiae*, qualified by the name of the portion they administered.²

One province in Italy was probably created by Diocletian, for it bears his name, Valeria. It was a sort of vanishing province. It is not there apparently in A.D. 364 (*Cod. Theod.* 9, 30, 1); it appears in A.D. 399 (*ib.* 9, 30, 5); it seems to disappear in A.D. 400 (*C.I.L.* vi, 1706), and in A.D. 413 (*Cod. Theod.* 11, 29, 7); but occurs in the Not. Dig. (c. A.D. 428), and in Polemius Silvius (*Nursia Valeria in qua est Reate*³). On its early history, an inscription may at any moment throw light; but as it is only a conjecture that it occurred in the Verona List, it need not be considered further here.

As for the province of Raetia, there is a stone of Augsburg with a dedication to Diocletian in A.D. 290 by Septimius Valentio *p(raeses) p(rovinciae) R(aetiae)*; *C.I.L.* iii, 5810. We may conjecture with a good deal of probability that Raetia had already been made a praesidial province either by Aurelian after his wars with the Juthungan invaders or by Probus.⁴

The most important fact about Italy as it appears in our List is that it forms one Diocese and has not yet been broken up into the two, Italia and Urbs Roma, which appear in the Notitia Dignitatum. The earliest reference to the Diocese of Urbs Roma seems to be in the inscription of Caelius Saturninus (*C.I.L.* vi, 1704), who was *Vicarius praef. praet. in urbe Roma*. This shows that the partition of Italy into two Dioceses must have been made before the end of the reign of Constantine (cp. above, p. 134), and thus supplies an *ante quem* limit; it is far from showing that the Diocese Urbs Roma existed in the reign of Diocletian, as Mr. Seeck has asserted.⁵

XI. *Dioecesis Hispaniarum*. The six provinces are the same which we find in the list of Festus (c. 5); the province of insulae Baleares which appears in the Not. Dig. was added after A.D. 369. There is nothing to show that, territorially at least, this list does not

¹ *Hist. Aug. Vit. xxx tyr.* 14. In A.D. 283 or 284 Caenonius Rufius Volusianus was *corrector Italiae per annos octo*, *C.I.L.* x, 1655 and vi, 1707. For the *correctores* of Italy, cp. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* ii, 1086, and *Eph. epigr.* i, 138; L. Homo, *Aurélien*, pp. 144-5.

² e.g. under Diocletian, T. Flavius Postumius

Titianus was *corrector Italiae regionis transpadanae*, *C.I.L.* v, 1418.

³ Cp. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora*, i, p. 532.

⁴ Cp. Vopiscus, *V. Probi* 16, 1, *Retias sic pacatas reliquit*, etc.

⁵ *Gesch. d. Untergangs d. ant. Welt*, ii, p. 498.

represent the reorganization of Diocletian; but it may, partly at least, have been earlier.

Beticam
Lusitaniam
Kartaginiensis
Gallecia
Tarraconensis
Mauritania Tingitania.

The two first provinces were consular, the rest praesidial in A.D. 369 (Festus, *ib.*). Lusitania was raised to consular rank between A.D. 336 and 360 (*C.I.L.* vi, 1777 and ii, 191); so far as our List is concerned, it might be either one or the other. The changes in administration due to Diocletian (or one of his recent predecessors) were two: the division of Tarraconensis = Hispania citerior into two praesidial provinces, Tarraconensis and Carthaginiensis, and the association of Tingimauretania with Spain instead of with Africa.

XII. *Dioecesis Africae*. In the list of the African provinces the MS. is exceptionally corrupt. It begins with *proconsularis bizacina zeugitana* which must obviously be corrected (with Mommsen) to

Proconsularis Zeugitana,¹
Bizacina.

Then the list proceeds:

Numidia Cirtensis
Numidia militiana
Mauritania Caesariensis
Mauritania Tabia insidiana,

where the second and fourth items are unintelligible as they stand.

A part of the reorganization of the African provinces seems to have been carried out by Maximian in A.D. 289-90, just after or during a Moorish War. Mauretania (Caesariensis) was still undivided in A.D. 288 (*C.I.L.* viii, 8474, a stone of Sitifis), while in A.D. 290 in the two dedications of Aurelius Litua (*praeses* of Maur. Caes.), thanking the gods for victories over barbarians, two Mauretanian provinces are mentioned (*ib.* 8924, 9324). We can date these inscriptions by a stone of Auzia (*ib.* 9041).

Whether the province of Byzacena was created at the same time, we do not know, but it was certainly created in Diocletian's reign, as is shown by its original title, Valeria Byzacena, by which it was

¹ Mommsen's latest view, however, was that *Zeugitana* should be deleted (*C.I.L.* viii, *praef.* p. xvii, note 5). But I do not think that there is any necessity for considering *Zeugitana* an interpolation. It may have been added in the margin by

the original author of the List, who intended it to follow and qualify *proconsularis*, and then been inserted in the text by the first copyist of the List, after *bizacina*.

still called in A.D. 321 (*C.I.L.* vi, 1684-9; cp. *ib.* viii, 1127). As for Numidia, it had been governed by a praeses before the accession of Diocletian. We have several inscriptions of M. Aurelius Decimus v.p. (from Lambaesis, Cirta, and Diana), *praeses provinciae Numidiae*, and most of them are dated to the year 283-4.¹

The earliest dated lists of the African provinces we have are that of the stone of Aradius Proculus, referring to the reign of Constantine,² and that of Festus (*Brev. c. 4*) A.D. 369. These agree in giving six provinces: Africa proconsularis, Numidia, Byzacena, Tripolis, Mauretania Caesariensis, Mauretania Sitifensis.

Mauretania *tabia* must be equivalent to Mauretania Sitifensis, but *Sitifensis* cannot be elicited from *tabia* nor yet from *insidiana*. Mommsen (since his first publication) solved the problem of *tabia* by correcting it to *Zabia*. A text of Procopius (*Bell. Vand.* ii, 20, 30) informs us that the whole country of this province was called *Zabe*:

Ζάβην τε τὴν Χώραν ἢ ὑπὲρ ὄρος τὸ Αὐράσιόν ἐστι Μαυριτανία τε ἡ πρώτη καλεῖται μητρόπολιν Σίτιφιν ἔχουσα. *Zabi*, a fortress which in the sixth century was to bear the name of an Emperor (*Zabi Justiniana*), lay a good way to the south from Sitifis.

Insidiana remains unexplained, and Tripolitana is not represented in the List. It is not easy to see how it could be corrupted to *insidiana*. Mommsen's final conclusion was that *militiana* is an error for *tripolitana*, and that the title of the province was, when the List was drawn up, Numidia Tripolitana.³ This does not seem probable. It once occurred to me that Tripoli might for some years have been included in Byzacena; but *C.I.L.* viii, *Supp.* 22763 makes this unlikely. When this stone was inscribed, Aurelius Quintianus v.p. was *praeses provinciae Tripolitanae*, and he must be the same person (as Mr. Gauckler saw) as the Aurelius Quintianus who was *praeses* of Numidia in A.D. 303 (as we learn from another stone, *C.I.L.* viii, 4764). The presumption is that his governorship of Tripolitana was also in the early years of the fourth century and that Tripolitana was then a distinct province.⁴

It seems obvious that the List implies a bipartition of what was afterwards one province, Numidia consularis,⁵ into Numidia Cirtensis (vouched for in A.D. 306 by the inscription *C.I.L.* viii, 5526), no doubt consular, and Numidia militiana, presumably praesidial. Mr. Jullian suggested that *militiana* is a corruption of *limitanea*,

¹ *C.I.L.* viii, 7002, 4578, 2529, 2530 and 2643.

² *C.I.L.* vi, 1690. The inscription is subsequent to A.D. 340, the year of the consulship of Aradius. He was Prefect of Rome in 337, and, before that, proconsul of Africa discharging the duties of vicar of the Diocese, viz. *per provincias proconsularem et Numidiam Byzacium ac Tripolim itemque Mauretanium Sitifensem et Caesariensem*.

³ *C.I.L.* viii, *Praef.* p. xvii-xviii.

⁴ Probably Fl. Victor Calpurnius v.e. *praeses prov. Tripol.* (viii, 22672), to whom Leptis Magna decreed a statue, functioned in Diocletian's reign or soon after.

⁵ For the part of Numidia (including Hippo Regius, Calama, etc.) which was under the proconsul and may be distinguished as Num. proconsularis, see Mommsen, *C.I.L.* viii, *praef.* p. xvi.

the province being the southern part of Numidia, and Mr. Sieglin, though he does not adopt this emendation, places it (in his map of the Roman Empire intended to illustrate the Verona List¹) almost entirely south of latitude 35°, and extends it westward along the borders of Sitifensis as far as 2° 50' E. longitude. This geographical reconstruction seems improbable, but that there were two Numidias must be considered certain.

There were thus seven provinces in Africa when the List was drawn up. *Militiana* remains an open question,² and we must take *insidiana* as in some unexplained way representing Tripolitana.

Mauretania Zabia supplies us with a limit *ante quem* for the African section of the List. For in A.D. 315 Sitifensis was the official name, as we learn from *C.I.L.* viii, 8477, where Septimius Flavianus is *p. p. Maur. Sitif.* (cp. also *ib.* 8476 and 8712). In A.D. 319 we find Flavius Terentianus *praeses provinciae Mauretaniae Sitif.* (*ib.* 8412), and some years later both the Mauretaniae are temporarily united under his government (*ib.* 8932).³

§ 6. From this review of the six western Dioceses, we see that Britain supplies us with a prior limit A.D. 306 and Africa with a posterior limit A.D. 315. The lists of provinces in Gaul, Italy and Spain are quite consistent with these dates; it is only for the Diocese of Viennensis that we have data which at first sight may seem to contradict this conclusion and point to a later *terminus ante quem*. But, as I have pointed out, they are by no means decisive.

§ 7. I have not hitherto referred to the fact that the *number* of provinces in each Diocese is noted in the List after the name of the Dioceses and in some cases does not correspond to the actual enumeration which follows. We may consider it now.

Leaving out Italy, where the List is incomplete, we find that of the other eleven Dioceses, the figures unquestionably correspond in six cases (Pontica, Asiana, Thrace, Pannoniae, Galliae, Viennensis). In Britanniae, where the number given is six, and there are only four provinces, we have obviously to do with a very familiar error of copyists. In two cases clear divergencies appear. The Diocese of the Orient *habet provincias numero XVIII*, but the actual list gives only 17 (or on the view either of Mr. Jullian or of Mr. Ohnesorge 16). The Diocese Hispaniae *habet prou. num. VII*, but only six are enumerated. In both these cases the numerals are simply erroneous.

The Diocese Moesiae is said to have XI provinces, but

¹ *Atlas Antiquus*, Lief. V. Nr. 27. Not a good map.

² *Mileuitana* would be an easy emendation, but it would involve a very improbable division of provinces.

³ *Praeses prou. Maur. Cae. et Sitifensis*. The dedication is to Fl. Julius Constantius Caesar, who

was created Caesar on Nov. 8, A.D. 323. Flavius Augustianus, *p. Maur. Sitif.*, may have come between Flavianus and Terentianus. His stone (*C.I.L.* viii, 8475) is dedicated *Flavio Claudio Constantio nobilissimo Caes.*, where Constantio must be an error for *Constantino* (viz. Constantine II).

according to the interpretation of Mommsen, which has been generally accepted, only ten were enumerated. I have pointed out above that Margensis is a distinct province, and this conclusion has the advantage of bringing the actual enumeration into agreement with the figure given in the text.

Similarly the Diocese of Africa *habet provincias numero VII*. This agrees with the view adopted above that seven distinct provinces were named, and disagrees with the interpretation of Mommsen who discovers only six.

The Diocese of Asia offers a difficulty. It is stated to have VIII provinces, and so it has—as the List stands. But it really had X, for as pointed out above (p. 133) Lycia has been accidentally omitted. It seems less probable that the omission was an oversight of the original compiler, than that the name fell out (perhaps after *Lydia*) through the error of a copyist. It may therefore be asked whether all the statements as to the numbers of the provinces (*habet provincias numero*) were inserted not by the person who originally composed the List, but by some one else who rehandled it after *Lycia* had fallen out? or is the VIII a miscount of the first compiler? or finally did he correctly write X, and a later copyist seeing that only nine provinces were named change the X to VIII? This uncertainty leaves it open to question whether the numbers are from the hand of the original author of the List.

§ 8. The limits we have found for the six eastern Dioceses (including Pannoniae), A.D. 308-325, thus agree closely enough with those for the six western, A.D. 306-315, especially when it is noted that the posterior limit 325 is a very extreme limit (see above, p. 132) and, therefore, although the two sections of the List were drawn up on different principles as to the order in which the provinces are enumerated, there is no reason to suppose that they were originally separate independent compilations and were at some later time brought into conjunction. The Verona List reflected a provincial division of the Empire which as a whole existed only for a few years from A.D. 308 at earliest to A.D. 315. We do not know where or how the compiler collected his information, so that we cannot tell why different principles were adopted in the order of enumeration for east and west.

The changes which distinguish the picture of the provinces at the end of the first decade of the fourth century from that of the seventh and eighth decades under Valentinian I and Valens were principally due to Constantine the Great. It was he who wiped out the traces of Diocletian's name in the provinces of Egypt and of Pontus (see above pp. 130 and 133), and it was probably he too who deprived Euphratensis and Libanensis of the Augustan title with which Diocletian had honoured them. We may conjecture that it

was not very long after his victory over Licinius in A.D. 314, by which he acquired the Diocese Moesiae, that he partly upset Diocletian's arrangement of the Moeso-Dacian provinces, did away with Margensis, and fixed the division which we find in the list of Festus.

§ 9. We have evidence which shows that the document was rehandled about the end of the fourth century. Under the Diocese of Pontus, as we saw, there are two additions :

- (1) Paphlagonia, *nunc in duas diuisa*,
and (2) Armenia minor, *nunc et maior addita*.

The first refers, as Mommsen pointed out, to the creation of the province of Honorias, though it is inaccurately expressed, for Honorias was formed by combining western districts of Paphlagonia with eastern districts of Bithynia, not by mere partition. This province was created after A.D. 393, when Honorius received the title of Augustus.

The second entry points to much the same time. Armenia maior seems to be that portion of Armenia beyond the Upper Euphrates which was recognized, by the treaty of A.D. 387 between Rome and Persia, as under Roman influence, and after the death of King Arsaces about three years later was brought under direct Roman administration and placed under a military commander entitled *comes Armeniae*.¹ This arrangement continued till Justinian's reorganization of Armenia. The remarkable thing is that Armenia maior and the *comes Armeniae* do not appear in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, and it is not altogether clear how this is to be explained. It is probable that this count was independent of the Masters of Soldiers, but in any case he would, like them, have received his codicil of appointment through the office of the *primicerius*.² We have however a similar case in Sophanene, which appears in the List of Polemius Silvius ; like Armenia maior, it was under Imperial rule, but did not become a province proper till the reign of Justinian. The Armenia prima and secunda of the *Notitia* are not to be confused with Armenia maior and minor ; they are the two parts of Armenia minor into which that province was divided before A.D. 386 at latest (see *Cod. Theod.* 13, 11, 2).

The fact that both these additions concern the Pontic Diocese, and that there are no others in the List, suggested, naturally enough, the conjecture that the interpolator lived or sojourned somewhere in that Diocese.³ I cannot think there is much to be said for this.

¹ We learn this from Procopius, *De Aed.* iii, 1, who has confounded Theodosius I and Theodosius II, so that Mommsen was misled into dating the province of Armenia Maior to A.D. 441. Cp. Chapot, *La frontière de l'Euphrate* (1907), p. 169.

² Mr. Adonts, in his useful work *Armenia v epokbu*

Iustiniana (Petersburg, 1908), touches on this question (pp. 116-7), and, assuming that the date of the *Notitia* was A.D. 410-3 and that the *comes Armeniae* was a later institution, he finds no difficulty.

³ Ohnesorge, *op. cit.* p. 14.

If the document was in the hands of some one specially acquainted with northern Asia Minor, c. A.D. 400, why did he omit to note also that Diospontus was called Helenopontus, or that Cappadocia and Armenia minor were each "nunc diuisa" into two provinces? So far as I can see, there is no clue as to the place where the List was originally drawn up¹ or where it was preserved.

§ 10. From the foregoing analysis it appears that the List of Verona reflects the administrative geography of the Empire as it was not many years after Diocletian's abdication, but that it cannot be considered, as for the most part it has been considered, as a record of changes introduced by Diocletian. It includes many such changes, notably the Diocesan divisions, but of the greater number of the new provinces we are not entitled to say that they were created during Diocletian's reign and not by one of the Emperors who preceded him. The regions in which we can with certainty assign provincial reforms to him or Maximian are Egypt, Oriens, Pontus, Dacia, Britain, Gaul, Africa. For Asia, Thrace, and Spain we have no evidence; while we know that the new system of the Italian provinces was due to Aurelian, that the same Emperor inaugurated the Moeso-Dacian divisions, and probably the Pannonian. Mr. Camille Jullian has the merit of having suspected long ago that some of the changes usually ascribed to Diocletian were of older date.²

§ 10. The Verona List of Dioceses and provinces closes with the words *Felix saeculum*. But immediately after come three shorter lists, viz.:

- (1) *gentes barbarae quae pullulauerunt sub imperatoribus*, an enumeration of foreign peoples who lived near the northern and eastern frontiers of the Empire;
- (2) *item gentes quae in Mauretania sunt*, list of the Moorish peoples on the southern frontier;
- (3) *nomina ciuitatum trans Renum flumen quae sunt*.

The whole series of lists concludes with *Explicit*. In (1) the names are exceedingly corrupt. They were carefully examined and commented on by Müllenhoff in Mommsen's original publication, and his commentary was reprinted in his *Deutsche Altertumskunde* iv, 311, but I suspect that the List might repay a new investigation. There seems no reason to suppose that these three lists were not compiled by the same person who was responsible for the List of Provinces. There is nothing in them, so far as I can see, to suggest a later date. In any case it is to be observed that among the *gentes barbarae* the Huns do not appear, so that this List must be prior to A.D. 370.

¹ Mr. Seeck has conjectured Gaul, on insufficient grounds.

² *Op. cit.*

THE LATERCULUS OF POLEMIVS SILVIUS.

§ II. Some remarks will be in place here as to the *laterculus Prouinciarum* of Polemius Silvius, to which reference has been made more than once in the foregoing pages. It was published along with a list of the Emperors (from Julius Caesar to Valentinian III) at the beginning of A.D. 449.¹

The conclusion reached by Mommsen that this document consists of two independent lists compiled at dates more than half a century apart; (1) that of the western provinces representing the situation in A.D. 448-9 and drawn up then by Polemius himself, and (2) that of the eastern provinces, a much older list which he incorporated without change, originally drafted about the middle of the fourth century, and here and there, but not methodically, brought up to date, so that it roughly represents the situation in A.D. 394—this conclusion has been generally accepted. I, among others, adopted it, but now it appears to me untenable.

In the names and number of the western provinces (i.e. of the Dioceses of Britain, Gaul, Italy, Spain and Africa) the list of Polemius coincides with that of the *Notitia Dignitatum*. It coincides even with the situation of a much earlier date. For no changes seem to have been made in the arrangement and divisions of the provinces of the west between A.D. 399 and 442. By A.D. 399 Liguria had been separated from Aemilia, as we find it both in the *Notitia* and in Polemius, and as it continued to be under the Ostrogoths. In A.D. 385 we meet a *consularis Aemiliae et Liguriae* (*Cod. Theod.* 2, 4, 4),² but in A.D. 399, when Ravenna was transferred from Picenum to Aemilia, they are no longer joined (*C.I.L.* vi, 1715). In A.D. 442 there were changes, not made for administrative reasons, but through violence from without. The treaty of that year with Gaiseric brought the African provinces Proconsularis, Numidia, Byzacena, Tripolitana under his sovereignty, leaving to the Empire only the Mauretania; and about the same time, as I think, the provinces of Britain were definitely abandoned.³ Here Polemius

¹ The authoritative text will be found in vol. i of Mommsen's *Chronica Minora*. It is reprinted in Seeck's *Notitia Dignitatum*.

² Cp. *C.I.L.* x, 1125.

³ To what I have said in support of this date in *J.R.S.* x, 153, I may add here that the appeal of the Britons to Aëtius in A.D. 446, recorded by Gildas, is more natural and intelligible if the evacuation occurred a few years before than if it had occurred thirty-five years before. I may add that Mr. Collingwood's article in *J.R.S.* xii, 74, *sqq.* has not shaken my belief that this date is approximately right. His contention that a date later than 410 is impossible rests mainly on coin evidence. It was known to most people that no Roman coins or hardly any (the exceptions are negligible) of later date than issues of Arcadius and early issues of

Honorius have been found in Britain, and Mr. Collingwood has performed the service of collecting and arranging this evidence as a whole. This minor premiss of his argument is unimpeachable; but the major premiss required for his conclusion implies assumptions which seem to me altogether erroneous. The historical value of the coin evidence is not that it throws any light on the evacuation—it is equally compatible with either date—but that it illustrates the fact that during the reign of Honorius the Channel became so unsafe, through the operations of the Saxon pirates, that the trade of Britain with the continent declined and presently ceased altogether. I must thank Mr. Collingwood for making it clear to me that I was quite mistaken in what I suggested as to the signal-stations on the Yorkshire coast.

is partly up to date. In his list, the western Dioceses come first (beginning with Italy), but Britain is put quite at the end after the eastern Dioceses. Mommsen was undoubtedly right in explaining this order as intended to indicate the fact that Britain was no longer a part of the Empire. This fact was familiar to Polemius, a Gallo-Roman, who lived, there seems some reason for conjecturing, in northern Gaul.¹ But things that happened in Africa were not familiar to him and he gives no indication that the list he gives of the African provinces is no longer up to date.² It is in fact clear enough that Polemius made no effort to inform himself as to the actual situation at the time he was compiling the list, in the west any more than in the east, in the Dioceses ruled by Valentinian III any more than in those ruled by Theodosius II; and this is also shown by the way in which he has mixed up the provinces of the Diocese of Illyricum with those of the Prefecture.

The list of the Western provinces might, in fact, date from the last decade of the fourth century just as well as from the middle of the fifth.

In the list of the provinces of the East (Thrace, Asia, Oriens, Pontus, and Egypt), Honorias is that of latest creation that is mentioned and thus supplies, as a prior limit for this part of the list, the year 394, while the inclusion of Armenia maior gives a limit not very much earlier (see above p. 147). The omissions of Galatia salutaris and Macedonia salutaris, which were probably created under the régime of Eutropius in A.D. 396-9,³ hardly provides a posterior limit, in view of the fact that many much older provinces are omitted; namely Arabia, Palaestina salutaris, Phoenice Libani, Cappadocia secunda (which existed in A.D. 386), and Cilicia secunda; just as Dacia mediterranea is omitted in the enumeration of the Illyrian provinces. This shows that the eastern portion of the document was so carelessly compiled originally that no certain conclusions can be drawn from its omissions.

The list of the provinces *in Illyrico* is extraordinarily messed. The provinces of the Diocese of Illyricum, and the two Dioceses of Dacia and Macedonia which constituted the Prefecture of Illyricum, are mixed up together hopelessly; and two provinces of Thrace (Haemimontus⁴ and Scythia) are included, though they afterwards appear duly in the list of the Thracian provinces.

¹ My reason for this conjecture is that there are no observations on the southern provinces of Gaul, like those which occur on the northern, e.g., *Belgica prima in qua est Treveris, Belgica secunda de qua transitur ad Britanniam*, etc. But of course these notes (and those on the other Dioceses) may have been in the List which Polemius copied and not be due to him.

² We do not know how far provincial arrangements in Spain may have been altered as a result of the barbarian invasions and wars from A.D. 409 to 429. In the latter year the peninsula was freed from most of these intruders; only the Suevians were

left in Callaëcia. There is little doubt that their presence there had been regularised by the Imperial government, and it may be presumed that the contract allotted to them a *portion* of the land (as in the cases of the Visigoths and Burgundians in Gaul). If so, their settlements would not have involved the extinction of the Roman province of Callaëcia.

³ *J.R.S.* x, p. 135. The Silvan List places Galatia under Asia instead of Pontus.

⁴ It is interesting to find Haemimontus designated by another name, *Thracia secunda*, in the place where it appears among the Thracian provinces.

There can indeed be no doubt that the man who compiled the lists of provinces east of the Hadriatic lived in the west; as Tillemont remarked, and Mommsen approved, *l'auteur de la Notice vivoit en Occident*.¹

Since the eastern portion of the *laterculus* of Polemius contains no clear evidence that it was drawn up before the end of the fourth century, and the western portion nothing to show that it must have been drawn up after that time, there is no reason for accepting the theory of Mommsen that it consists of two independent lists compiled at dates more than half a century apart. The natural conclusion from the data is much simpler. The *laterculus* of Polemius is throughout a copy of a much older *laterculus* which was compiled, in the west, at a date not earlier than A.D. 394, how much later we cannot say; and the source (or sources) which this compiler had before him for the eastern provinces was very faulty. The only change Polemius made was the removal of the Britannic provinces from their original place in the List to the end of it, thereby registering a fact which had come under his own recent notice, the loss of Britain. Mommsen's theory was framed and generally accepted because it was not noticed that from A.D. 395 (and earlier) to A.D. 450 the Western government, in contrast with the Eastern, made no changes in the nomenclature or divisions of its provinces.²

¹ Tillemont, *H.E.* v. 699; Mommsen, *Cbron. Min.* i, 533.

² It may be noted that in another work (*Brev. Temp.* in *Cbron. Min.* i, p. 547), Polemius seems to

have had a different list of Dioceses before him, for he enumerates the parts of the Empire exactly as he does in his *Laterc. Provinc.*, except that he omits Egypt. This points to a source prior to A.D. 380.