

PHILIP RANCE

## Noumera or Mounera: a parallel philological problem in De Cerimoniis and Maurice's Strategikon

The term most commonly used in the later Roman army as a generic designation for a regular 'unit' or 'regiment' was *numerus*, for which the standard Greek equivalent was ὁ ἀριθμός or, for classicising authors with literary ambitions, ὁ κατάλογος<sup>1</sup>. In addition to these translations *numerus* passed into Greek as a loanword, νοῦμερος or νοῦμερον. While it is safe to assume that νοῦμερος is the antecedent of νοῦμερον, my attempt to find specimens of νοῦμερος with the meaning 'military unit' failed to locate a single incontestable instance where νοῦμερον can be confidently ruled out<sup>2</sup>. It is frequently impossible to differentiate the two forms in Byzantine sources because they can be distinguished only in the nominative singular/plural and accusative plural, and usage is documented most often in the other, indistinguishable cases, especially the genitive<sup>3</sup>. The neuter variant τὸ νοῦμερον seems to be a later development, or at least this form is not attested with certainty in literary sources before the ninth century, and

<sup>1</sup> For *numerus* and its equivalence to ἀριθμός and κατάλογος see R. GROSSE, Römische Militärgeschichte von Gallienus bis zum Beginn der byzantinischen Themenverfassung. Berlin 1920, 272–4; A.H.M. JONES, The Later Roman Empire 284–602. Oxford 1964, 610, 654–5, 659–61; J. KEENAN, Evidence for the Byzantine Army in the Syene Papyri. *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 27 (1990) 139–150 at 144–7; L.M. WHITBY, Recruitment in Roman Armies from Justinian to Heraclius (ca. 565–615), in: A. CAMERON (ed.), The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East 3: States, Resources and Armies. Princeton 1995, 61–124 at 79–81; G. RAVEGNANI, Soldati di Bisanzio in età Giustiniana (Materiali e Ricerche n.s. 6). Rome 1998, 30–32. Some later sources apparently sought to qualify ἀριθμός with adjectival νομεριός, perhaps in confusion concerning the synonymy of the Greek and Latin terms, cf. Theophanes, Chronographia, ed. C. DE BOOR. Leipzig 1883, 219.14–16: ἐν τοῖς νομεριοῖς ἀριθμοῖς; Passio S. Callistrati, ed. F. HALKIN, La Passion ancienne de S. Callistrate. *Byz* 53 (1983) 233–49, §6: ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τοῦ νομερίου, cf. §2: εἰς τὸ νομέριον.

<sup>2</sup> DU CANGE, Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis. Lyon 1688, 1006–7 registers only s.v. νοῦμερα (pl. νοῦμερον); SOPHOCLES, Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods. Cambridge (Mass.) 1887, 786–7 and LAMPE, A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford 1961–1968, 923, s.v. νοῦμερος (νοῦμερον). *LSJ* suppl. 219, s.v. νοῦμερος cites only the earliest epigraphic and papyrological occurrences, where νοῦμερος is overwhelmingly likely. *LBG* 1086, s.v. νοῦμερος offers no example with the meaning 'military unit'.

<sup>3</sup> In the following passages the two forms cannot be distinguished with certainty: Nilus, epp. II.67–9 (tit.), *PG* 79, 229D–231C; St. Ephraem, Encomium in sanctos quadraginta martyres, ed. K.G. PHRANTZOLAS, Ὁσίου Ἐφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου ἔργα 7. Thessaloniki 1998, 137; Asterius, Hom. 22.6, ed. M. RICHARD, Asterii sophistae commentarii in Psalmos (*Symbolae Osloenses* fasc. suppl. 16). Oslo 1956, 174.5; J. Chrysostomus, In Acta apostolorum, *PG* 60, 171.34 (= J.A. CRAMER, Catenae Graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum III. Oxford 1838, 171.30–31); Passio S. Procopii (apud Acta Concilii Nicaeni a. 787), act. 4, ed. J. HARDOUIN, Acta Conciliorum. Paris 1714–15, IV 229–32 at 232B; Callinicus, Vita Hypatii, proem. 3.2, ed. G. J.M. BARTELINK (*SC* 177). Paris 1971; Cyril of Scythopolis, Vita Sabae, ed. E. SCHWARTZ (*TU* 49.2). Leipzig 1939, 87.11, 92.28–9, 109.6; Agathangelus, Historia Armeniae 129, ed. G. LAFONTAINE (*Publications de l'institut orientaliste de Louvain* 7). Louvain-la-Neuve 1973; Chronicon Paschale, ed. L. DINDORF (*CSHB*). Bonn 1832, I 549.7; Theophanes, Chronographia 51.9, 104.3 (Cedrenus, Chron. ed. I. BEKKER [*CSHB*]). Bonn 1838–9, I 603.12; Passio S. Callistrati, ed. F. HALKIN, op. cit. §2; Vitae et Miracula Nicolai Myrensis, Praxis de stratelatis, Rec. 3, §1, ed. G. ANRICH, Hagios Nikolaos. Der Heilige Nikolaos in der griechischen Kirche (*TU* 1). Berlin 1913; Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopoleos, ed. H. DELEHAYE (*Acta Sanctorum* 62). Brussels 1902 (repr. Wetteren 1985), Nov. 11 §1.5; Jul. 8 §1.20, 62; Jul. 14 §2.3; Jul. 30 §2.3; Martyrium Acacii §3, *AASS* 15 (5–11 Maii), 762C; Martyrium SS. XL Sebastae matryrum §1, ed. O. VON GEBHARDT, Acta Martyrum Selecta. Berlin 1902, 171.10; Symeon Metaphrastes, Vita S. Auxentii §2, *PG* 114, 1380A; Martyrium S. Georgii, ed. K. KRUMBACHER, Der heilige Georg in der griechischen Überlieferung (*Abhandlungen königl. Bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.* 25.3). München 1911, 43.23. Papyrological usage: e.g. P. Berl. Zill. 5.15 (417); BGU 316.8 (359); 2138.4 (430); 2140.5 (432). Inscriptions: e.g. *IGRom.* 3.2; *BCH* 33.34, n° 34 (IV); *MDAI(A)* 13.251.

cannot be demonstrated in epigraphic or papyrological texts. As a generic term for ‘regiment’ both forms remained a relatively uncommon usage<sup>4</sup>.

Under the entry τὸ βούμερον, the *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität (LBG)* lists six instances of the meaning ‘militärische Einheit’<sup>5</sup>. An instance from *De Cerimoniis* I 60 (51)<sup>6</sup> is, however, regarded as doubtful and tentatively cited a second time as the sole potential witness to a different meaning ‘Pflicht?’. This chapter of *De Cerimoniis* describes the protocol to be observed when conferring promotion to the office of *praepositus*. This procedure culminates in an elaborate ceremonial in which the newly-promoted *praepositus* conducts a hierarchical succession of court dignitaries into the imperial presence.<sup>7</sup> The description concludes rather abruptly with the words καὶ πληροὶ πάντα τὰ βούμερα ὁ προβληθεὶς πραιπόσιτος, ‘and the promoted *praepositus* fulfils all the/his βούμερα’.

In *De Cerimoniis* the phrase τὰ βούμερα ordinarily denominates the official title of a specific corps of guards, who defended and policed the palatial quarter of Constantinople. The origin of this unit is obscure; it is first securely documented in relation to the reign of Michael III (842–67), but was created earlier, possibly in the late seventh century. This corps in turn bestowed its name on the barracks in which it was quartered, *ta Noumera* (τὰ Νούμερα), situated close to the Chalke in a building that formerly housed the Baths of Zeuxippus, in (or underneath) which was also located a state prison. The corps therefore combined the roles of palace security, gaolers and ceremonial guard<sup>8</sup>. Unfortunately no source testifies to the nominative or accusative forms of the regimental title that would permit us to distinguish οἱ Νουμέροι or τὰ Νούμερα; only genitive τῶν Νουμέρων is attested, and is of no assistance in this respect<sup>9</sup>. The barracks-prison was certainly called τὰ Νούμερα, but it does not necessarily follow that the

<sup>4</sup> H. MIHĂESCU, La littérature byzantine, source de connaissance du latin vulgaire. *RESEE* [I] 16 (1978) 195–212; [II] 17 (1979) 39–60, [III] 359–83 at [III] 365: ‘un autre mot qui a survécu, mais dans une plus faible mesure...’, contradicting *idem*, Les éléments Latins des ‘Tactica-Strategica’ de Maurice-Urbicius et leur écho en néo-grec. *RESEE* [I] 6 (1968), 481–98; [II] 7 (1969) 155–66; [III] 267–80, at [II] 160, ‘Le terme βούμερος = ἀριθμός est fréquent dans les textes byzantines’.

<sup>5</sup> Fasc. 5 (Vienna 2005), 1086. Two of these citations are identical lexical glosses: Suda σ 933 (ed. A. ADLER, Leipzig 1928–38) and Photius, *Lex. s.v. σπείραι* (ed. S.A. NABER, Leiden 1864–5, II 170) both: σπείραι· πλήθη στρατευμάτων, φάλαγγες, βούμερα, λεγεών. The common source is now identified as *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων* σ 171 (ed. I.C. CUNNINGHAM [*Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker* 10]. Berlin – New York 2003, 442). Cunningham demonstrates the relationships between these and other lexical works at 20–42, with convenient summary at 13–14 (note that in the stemma at 14 the second Σ should read Σ’). The ultimate source is probably John Chrysostomus, In Acta apostolorum, *PG* 60, 171.34. Of the same origin is probably also Hesychius, *Lex. ε* 1679 (ed. K. LATTE [et al.], Copenhagen 1953–2005, II 54). These instances of τὸ βούμερον cited in *LBG* should be supplemented by Passio S. Eusignii §9, ed. P. DEVOS, Une recension nouvelle de la Passion grecque *BHG* 639 de Saint Eusignios. *AnBoll* 100 (1982) 209–28 at 221: βούμερα; Vita<sup>2</sup> Theodoris Stud. §54, *PG* 99, 309C: τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἐξουσίας βούμερον στρατοῦ αὐτόθι προαναπεσεῖν; Martyrium S. Eustathii et uxoris et filiorum §15, *AASS* 46 (20–26 Sept.), 123–35 at 132D: εἰς βούμερα. DU CANGE, Appendix, col. 142, s.v. βούμερα cites ‘Eudemi Lexicon MS’ from Cod. Reg. 2767 [= H. OMONT, *Biblio. Nat.* 2635]: βούμερον, τάγμα στρατιωτικόν, to my knowledge not published except for specimen glosses in ἀγ- and πα- in B. NEISE, Excerpta ex Eudemi codice Parisino n. 2635. *Philologus*, suppl. 15 (1922) 145–160. See also a seal inscribed NOYMEPON [T] ON BENITON in G. SCHLUMBERGER, Sigillographie de l’Empire Byzantin. Paris 1884, 144, dated to the seventh/eighth century, but probably from the tenth/eleventh century, see HALDON (as note 8) 261, n. 726.

<sup>6</sup> The two editions cited are Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae libri duo, graece et latine e recensione I.I. REISKII ... editio emendatior et copiosior consilio B.G. NIEBUHRII, I–II (*CSHB*). Bonn 1829–30; a revised text of Constantini Porphyrogenniti Imperatoris Constantinopolitani Libri Duo de Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantinae... curarunt I.H. LEICHIUS et I.I. REISKIUS, I–II. Leipzig 1751–4. For convenience I shall maintain the inaccurate convention ascribing this edition to Reiske, though the text is largely by Leich, with emendations and commentary by Reiske, and corrections by Niebuhr. The other (incomplete) edition is A. VOGT (ed., fr. transl. and comm.), Constantin VII Porphyrogénète. Le Livre des Cérémonies I–II. Paris 1935–9 (chs. I.1–83 only). Where chapter enumeration differs, Vogt’s is used, followed by Reiske’s in parenthesis.

<sup>7</sup> De Cerim. II 68.5–15 VOGT = 262.19–263.4 REISKE.

<sup>8</sup> For the prison: C. MANGO, The Brazen House. A Study of the Vestibule of the Imperial Palace of Constantinople (*Det Kgl. Danske Vidensk. Selsk. Archaeol.-kunsthist. Medd.* 4.4). Copenhagen 1959, 28 n. 27, 37–42; R. GUILLAND, Études de topographie de Constantinople byzantine I (*BBA* 37). Berlin 1969, 41–55. For the corps: J.F. HALDON, Byzantine Praetorians: An Administrative, Institutional and Social Survey of the Opsikion and Tagmata, c. 580–900. Bonn 1984, 256–75, who reconstructs a murky and complex regimental history, according to which two palatine corps called *ta Noumera* and ‘the Walls’ (τὰ Τείχη) descended from two conjectural paramilitary bodies or βούμερα raised by Justinian II from the Blue and Green factions.

<sup>9</sup> It is not in fact certain whether the corps was called τὰ Νούμερα or οἱ Νουμέροι or, in different circumstances, both. A preference for τὰ Νούμερα became conventional in anglophone scholarship after J.B. BURY, The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth

corps was also so styled. All occurrences of τῶν νουμέρων in *De Cerimoniis* relate to this unit (or in one instance to the prison), usually in reference to its senior personnel, and in particular its commanding officer or *Domestikos* (δομέστικος τῶν Νουμέρων)<sup>10</sup>.

This uniformity of usage would lead one to expect the same meaning in the passage in question, but it is difficult to entertain this solution in the context of καὶ πληροὶ πάντα τὰ νούμερα ὁ προβληθεὶς πραιπόσιτος. Although senior officers of palatine regiments, including the *Domestikos* of the *Noumera*, are included among the dignitaries participating in this ceremony<sup>11</sup>, neither the corps itself nor any other military unit is specified as being present. Nor did the *Noumera* have any direct connection with the office and responsibilities of the *praepositus sacri cubiculi* (πραιπόσιτος τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου κοιτῶνος), who exercised authority over the staff of the imperial bedchamber, as well as general supervision of all grades of palace functionary, but whose primary role was the orchestration of court ceremonial.<sup>12</sup> Even if the corps were meant, what could πληροὶ πάντα τὰ νούμερα possibly signify?

The promotion ceremony described at *De Cerimoniis* I 60 (51) concludes with a highly condensed outline of a protocol that has already been explained twice in greater detail towards the beginning of treatise.<sup>13</sup> The two longer descriptions stipulate precisely what the *praepositus* is required to do after the grand reception of court dignitaries. The emperor is now left alone except for certain officers of the bedchamber. The chief task of the *praepositus* at this point is to assist the sovereign in dressing for the next stage of the ceremony, and in particular to confer upon him the crown and imperial regalia, a prerogative exclusively reserved to the office of *praepositus*. Then the *praepositus* precedes the emperor in solemn procession out of the inner sanctum of the palace. In the résumé of the same protocol at I 60 (51), therefore, these duties are the ‘νούμερα’ which the *praepositus* fulfils.<sup>14</sup>

This sense of νούμερον, -α has not been documented elsewhere. In his commentary Reiske interpreted πληροὶ πάντα τὰ νούμερα as ‘Numeros omnes implet, hoc est: muniis et officiis provinciae suae satisfacit. Dictio e Latinismo transsmuta (sic)’, apparently equating νούμερα with the ‘duties’ or ‘functions’ of the office of *praepositus*<sup>15</sup>. Vogt subsequently observed in a short annotation that τὰ νούμερα

Century. London 1911, 65–6 (perhaps under the influence of DU CANGE 1006–7, s.v. νούμερα<sup>2</sup>), though Bury exhibits some confusion between source references to the corps and the prison. HALDON (as n. 8) assumes the regimental title τὰ Νούμερα throughout, but his explanatory hypothesis for this nomenclature, while not impossible, entails a convoluted sequence of organisational and titular changes, see J.F. HALDON, Kudāma ibn Dja‘far and the Garrison of Constantinople. *Byz* 48 (1978) 78–90, esp. 85–6; IDEM, Praetorians 263–4. GUILLAND, *op. cit.* 48–51 favours οἱ Νουμέροι, and the ambiguity of the evidence appears to be acknowledged by e.g. N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, Les Listes de préséance byzantines des IX et X siècles. Paris 1972, 386, Index général, s.v. νούμεροι ου νούμερα

<sup>10</sup> De Cer. I 6 (VOGT I 3.16), 9 (I 56.21–2), 27 (18) (I 101.23), 47 (38) (II 2.20), 49 (40) (II 12.24), 74 (65) (II 103.4), II 2 (REISKE 524.21, 525.1–2), 18 (604.8), 50 (698.21), 52 (714.1, 715.11, 719.3, 728.22, 731.20, 734.13, 737.11–12, 17, 738.8, 16, 752.20, 753.2, 772.12), 53 (789.19). The single reference to the prison is II 15 (REISKE 579.19): πρὸς τὸ μέρος τῶν Νουμέρων. The δομέστικος τῶν Νουμέρων is sometimes alternatively styled, according to Byzantine convention, ὁ νούμερος, cf. De Cer. II 15 (588.18), 50 (698.21); REISKE I 65 (293.16) read τὸν νούμερον, emended to <τὸν> τῶν νουμέρων by VOGT I 74 (II 102.9). Cf. also Theoph. Cont. ed. I. BEKKER (*CSHB*). Bonn 1838, 175.18; Const. Porph. Praecepta Militaria (ed. J.F. HALDON, Three Treatises on Imperial Military Expeditions [*CFHB* 28]. Vienna 1990) C 91 (= REISKE 460.14).

<sup>11</sup> De Cer. I 9 (I 56.20–23 VOGT = 61.16–19 REISKE).

<sup>12</sup> R. GUILLAND, Recherches sur les Institutions Byzantines, I (*BBA* 35). Berlin 1967, 338–80.

<sup>13</sup> De Cer. I 1 and I 9 (I 18.16–20.1, 56.9–57.8 VOGT = 23.15–25.11, 61.5–62.10 REISKE). The occasions of these two earlier descriptions differ – the first relates to Easter Sunday, the second to Pentecost – and they were probably drafted in different periods – in the first there are two sovereigns (and so two *praepositi*), in the second only one. See remarks of VOGT, Comm. I 71, 90–91. Another version of this protocol is reproduced with minor variations in the account of an imperial coronation at I 47 (38) (II 2.14–31 VOGT = 193.6–22 REISKE).

<sup>14</sup> De Cer. I 60 (51): ... καὶ ἐξέρχονται, καὶ πληροὶ πάντα τὰ νούμερα ὁ προβληθεὶς πραιπόσιτος summarises the information in De Cer. I 1: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐκβῆναι ... ἀπέρχονται ... (I 19.32–20.17 VOGT = 25.10–26.1 REISKE), and I 9: Καὶ πάντων ἐξελοθέντων ... διέρχεται ... (I 57.9–20 VOGT = 62.10–22 REISKE), varying in details of regalia according to occasion.

<sup>15</sup> REISKE, comm. II 283–4. In contrast, the Latin transl. at REISKE I 263 erroneously renders this clause ‘...omnesque numeros promotus praepositus congregat’, apparently understanding that the *praepositus* ‘assembles’ unspecified *numeri*. The equation of πληροὶ and ‘congregat’ is in any case mistaken, as demonstrated just two lines later: ...καὶ πληροῦται τότε ἡ ἀκολουθία, ‘and the ceremony is then accomplished’.

could in fact correctly be ‘forte τὰ μούνερα’, that is Latin *munus*, *munera*, and accordingly he rendered the clause ‘le préposite promu remplit toutes *les fonctions*’<sup>16</sup>. It is this hesitant identification of μούνερα that is cited in *LBG*, s.v. τὸ νόυμερον. If correct, the current reading presumably resulted from an accidental transposition of μ and ν, potential *litterae ambiguae* in minuscule script<sup>17</sup>. The current text of *De Cerimoniis* depends on a single tenth-century minuscule codex (L) and in the absence of the corrective or corroborative control of *variae lectiones* the reading could easily be a copyist’s error<sup>18</sup>. Vogt’s suggestion remained undeveloped, however, and τὰ νόυμερα / τὰ μούνερα pass unnoticed in his commentary<sup>19</sup>.

The potential occurrence in a tenth-century Byzantine text of the Latin loan *munera*, an evocative and culturally charged term from the Roman world, cannot fail to intrigue. By way of tentative confirmation of this interpretation *LBG* directs the reader to another passage of *De Cerimoniis* in which μούνερα is found, in this instance preserved in ‘the acclamations chanted in Latin by the *chancellarii* of the *quaestor* during the procession of the sovereigns in the Great Church’.<sup>20</sup> The wording of the acclamations is recorded as “Δὲ Μαρίε Βέργηνε νάτους ἐτ Μάγια δ’ωριεντε κούμ μούνερα ἀδοράντες.” Ἐρμηνεύεται “Ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου ἐγεννήθη, καὶ Μάγοι ἐξ ἀνατολῶν μετὰ δώρων προσκυνούσιν”; hence ‘... *de Maria Virgine natus et Magi de oriente cum munera adorantes*’ must be understood.

Tantalising as this comparison may be, there are good reasons for doubting its relevance. First, μούνερα in the acclamations is simply a transliteration of a Latin slogan, fossilised by custom and ritual, and in no way reflective of contemporary Greek usage; whereas emending τὰ νόυμερα to τὰ μούνερα at I 60 (51) requires us to accept that at some prior date Latin *munera* had entered the Greek language as a loan, a different philological process altogether. Second, the meaning of transliterated *munera* in the Latin acclamations is translated by the author of *De Cerimoniis*, and certainly correctly, as δώρα, the ‘gifts’ of the Magi, a meaning which, although within the wide semantic range of the Latin term, hardly suits the reported actions of the *praepositus* at I 60 (51) where the meaning ‘duties’ or ‘functions’ appears beyond doubt. Third, other than this transliterated Latin text there is not a single instance of μούνερα in any document, literary, epigraphic or papyrological, in the entire corpus of classical or Byzantine Greek, and one may legitimately doubt its actuality.

Assistance with this problem comes from an unexpected source. Unobserved by students of *De Cerimoniis*, the same usage of νόυμερον occurs in a sixth-century text, which some editors have attempted to account for by similar emendation, being in turn unaware of the parallel in *De Cerimoniis*. The *Strategikon* is a military compendium compiled towards the end of the 590s and ascribed to the

<sup>16</sup> VOGT II 68.5–15, at l. 14.

<sup>17</sup> The possibility for consonantal transposition, at least in the circumstances of Greek-Arabic transliteration, is perhaps illustrated by Kudāma ibn Dja‘far, Kitāb al-Haradj, whose extant text refers to a 4,000-strong palatine infantry corps called *mw(n)rh*, surely correctly *nwmrat*, as M.-J. DE GOEJE, *Bibliotheca Geographorum Araborum*. Leiden 1885–1927, VI 197, see J. F. HALDON, op. cit. 82 (as n. 9).

<sup>18</sup> The codex Lipsiensis Univ. Rep. I 17 (gr. 28) (= L), on which all editions are based, was produced in the imperial scriptorium in the third quarter of the tenth century; see J. IRIGOIN, Pour une étude des centres de copie byzantins [II]. *Scriptorium* 13 (1959) 177–209 at 177–81. For differing positions on the genesis of the text: O. KRESTEN, Sprachliche und inhaltliche Beobachtungen zu Kapitel I 96 des sogenannten “Zeremonienbuches”. *BZ* 93 (2000) 474–89; M. FEATHERSTONE, Preliminary Remarks on the Leipzig Manuscript of De cerimoniis. *BZ* 95 (2002) 457–479; IDEM, Further Remarks on the De Cerimoniis. *BZ* 97 (2004) 113–121. Since Vogt’s edition, a second manuscript has come to light in palimpsest, although dismembered and incomplete, in codex Chalcensis S. Trinitatis (125) 133 (= C) and codex Athous Vatopedinus 1003 (ff. 72–135) (= V). Paleographic and codicological features indicate a date for C/V contemporary with L. See C. MANGO – I. ŠEVČENKO, A New Manuscript of the De Cerimoniis. *DOP* 14 (1960) 247–9; O. KRESTEN, “Staatsempfänge” im Kaiserpalast von Konstantinopel um die Mitte des 10. Jahrhunderts. Beobachtungen zu Kapitel II 15 des sogenannten “Zeremonienbuches” (*Öst. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsberichte* 670). Vienna 2000, 44–45, n. 117. Preliminary investigations have determined that L and C/V descend independently from a common archetype; for the latest conclusions and all earlier bibliography: M. FEATHERSTONE – J. GRUSKOVÁ – O. KRESTEN, Studien zu den Palimpsestfragmenten des sogenannten “Zeremonienbuches” I. Prolegomena. *BZ* 98 (2005) 423–430.

<sup>19</sup> VOGT II 74–7, ‘sur ce présent chapitre, il n’y a pas grand’chose à dire...’.

<sup>20</sup> De Cer. I 83(74) (II 169.4–7 VOGT = 369.9–12 REISKE): τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν καγκελλαρίων τοῦ κοιαιστῶρος ἐν ταῖς προελεύσει τῶν δεσποτῶν ἐν τῇ Μεγάλῃ Ἐκκλησίᾳ ῥωμαῖσι ἠδόμενα.



Emperor Maurice.<sup>21</sup> This treatise is written in a vernacular idiom comprehensible to army officers and employs the Latinate technicalia and semi-barbarised jargon of their profession. It is distinguished by a high degree of practical utility and for the most part concerns the day-to-day routines and mundane technical minutiae of the East Roman army, rather than an abstract treatment of tactics or generalship that characterises much of the earlier genre. In a discussion of the regulations to be observed by an army in transit through friendly territory Maurice specifies:

Χρῆ τοὺς πάνυ τραχεῖς ἢ κρημνώδεις ἢ δυσβάτους καὶ δασεῖς τόπους τοὺς ἀπαντῶντας προευτρεπίζειν πλήθους στρατεύοντος διὰ τινων ἐπὶ τοῦτο προπεμπομένων καὶ διορθοῦσθαι κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν, ἵνα μὴ συντρίβεται ἡ ἵππος, τοὺς δὲ ἀφοριζομένους ἐπὶ τούτῳ μὴ ὑποκείσθαι σκούλκῃ ἢ ἐτέρῳ νομέρῳ (I.9.24–8).

The passage concerns the clearance and widening of roads for military use, and in content is typical of the often unglamorous operational procedures outlined in this work.<sup>22</sup> The general tenor of the instructions is easily understood: ‘Those encountering particularly rugged or precipitous or rough and thickly-wooded terrain must prepare the route in advance of the main force using men sent forward for this purpose and improve it as far as possible, so that the horses do not become worn out...’. Editors and translators have stumbled at the concluding clause, however, to the detriment of the overall sense of the passage.

The codices of the first (M) and second recensions (VNP) contain the reading: τοὺς δὲ ἀφοριζομένους ἐπὶ τούτῳ μὴ ὑποκείσθαι σκούλκῃ ἢ ἐτέρῳ νομέρῳ. All editors have read here *νούμερος*, understood in the standard sense of a military unit, but in consequence the meaning of ἢ ἐτέρῳ νομέρῳ is left far from obvious. Dennis translates, ‘the men detailed for this should not belong to a scouting troop or other special unit’.<sup>23</sup> Mihăescu understands ‘in another unit’ (‘în altă întocmire’), assuming synonymity between νομέρῳ and ἀριθμός.<sup>24</sup> Kučma similarly interprets ‘in patrols or other detachments (отряды)’.<sup>25</sup> Only Gamillscheg, appreciating the difficulty of construing νομέρῳ as ‘unit’, offers a different interpretation: ‘sollen nicht zu einem Spähtrupp oder einer anderen Funktion eingeteilt werden’.<sup>26</sup>

Some clarification of the relevant vocabulary is required. In this context the verb ὑποκείσθαι does not mean, as Dennis, ‘belong to’, but rather ‘to be subject or liable to’, and occurs elsewhere in the treatise in relation to disciplinary regulations and penalties.<sup>27</sup> Throughout the *Strategikon* the terminus technicus σκούλκα can mean a patrol, that is a specific body of troops, but more often broadly signifies the business of ‘reconnaissance’ or ‘patrol-duty’.<sup>28</sup> More significantly νομέρῳ, if granted the meaning ‘unit’,

<sup>21</sup> Das Strategikon des Maurikios, ed. G.T. DENNIS, German transl. E. GAMILLSCHEG (*CFHB* 17). Vienna 1981. A new English translation with commentary is forthcoming in P. RANCE, *The Roman Art of War in Late Antiquity: The Strategikon of the Emperor Maurice. A Translation with Commentary and Textual Studies (Birmingham Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Monographs)*. Aldershot 2008.

<sup>22</sup> Maurice treats the subject of road-clearance in more detail at IX.4.10–18. The phrase πάνυ τραχεῖς ἢ κρημνώδεις also occurs at Strat. XII.B.20.88: εἰς τραχεῖς καὶ εἰς κρημνώδεις; this formula echoes the wording of the *Strategicus* of Onasander, one of Maurice’s linguistic and conceptual models, cf. Onas. 10.17: πολλὰ δὲ κρημνώδη καὶ τραχέα, with generally V.V. KUČMA, “Strategikos” Onasandra i “Strategikon Mavrikija”: Opyt stravnitel’noj charakteristiki. *VV* 43 (1982) 35–53; 45 (1984) 20–34; 46 (1986) 109–123. The factual content of this passage is nevertheless contemporary and not infected with literary mimesis.

<sup>23</sup> G.T. DENNIS, *Maurice’s Strategikon: Handbook of Byzantine Military Strategy*. Philadelphia 1984, 21. This interpretation is now reproduced in G. CASCARINO, *Maurizio imperatore, Strategikon*. Ital. transl. Rimini 2007, 40, ‘non devono appartenere agli esploratori o ad altre unità speciali’.

<sup>24</sup> H. MIHĂESCU, (ed. and Rum. transl.) *Mauricius Arta Militară (Scriptores byzantini VI)*. Bucharest 1970, ed. 68.28, transl. 69, with index graecus p. 399, ‘68.20 *νούμερος* = ἀριθμός’.

<sup>25</sup> V.V. KUČMA, *Strategikon Mavrikija*, russ. transl. St. Petersburg 2004, 82.

<sup>26</sup> GAMILLSCHEG, transl. in DENNIS – GAMILLSCHEG (as note 21) 103.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Strat. I.6§2: κεφαλικῇ τιμωρίᾳ ὑποκείσθω, ‘let him be subjected (or liable) to capital punishment’.

<sup>28</sup> For various usages of σκούλκα in the *Strategikon* see, e.g. ‘on reconnaissance’: εἰς σκούλκας (VII.A.5; IX.3.63); ἐπὶ σκούλκας (IX.5.89); πρὸς σκούλκας (XII.B.19.2–3); ‘single, double or treble patrols (i.e. in relays)’: ἐν διπλαῖς σκούλκαῖς (VII.B.13.4); μὴ μόνον ἀπλᾶς τὰς σκούλκας ... ποιείσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ διπλᾶς (VII.B.13.14–15); σκούλκας διπλῆς καὶ τριπλῆς ... γινομένης (IX.3.115–16); ‘through frequent and wide-ranging reconnaissance’: διὰ σκούλκων πυκνῶν καὶ μακρῶν (VII.pr.17); ‘using accu-

simply does not accord with the intention of this passage. Dennis, Mihăescu and Kučma imply that Maurice's purpose is prohibitive: the troops chosen to work on the road should not be selected from a patrol or some other unit, but this reading is incorrect. Rather, as Gamillscheg discerns, Maurice intends that the men assigned to this extra, one-off construction work should, by way of compensation, be excused regular burdens or fatigues, such as patrol-duty.

This interpretation is confirmed in versions of the *Strategikon* produced by two tenth-century redactors. First, the *Taktika* of Leo VI (= Lt), compiled ca. 895–908,<sup>29</sup> is in large part a revision of Maurice's work, drawing on a manuscript (τ) of a so-called 'third recension' (λ) which has not been preserved in the direct tradition.<sup>30</sup> The corresponding section of Leo's *Taktika* reads ... μὴ ὑποκεῖσθαι βίγλα ἢ ἑτέρῃ δουλείᾳ, '... should not be subject to sentry-duty or any other service'.<sup>31</sup> Second, the codex Ambrosianus graecus 139 (119 B sup.) (= A), an important collection of Greek, Roman and Byzantine military treatises, is a high-quality product of court circles compiled ca. 959, and thus similar in date and milieu to codex L of *De Cerimoniis*.<sup>32</sup> Codex A contains a version of the *Strategikon* rendered into contemporary Greek, with some updating of technical terminology. Although a paraphrase, A has proved indispensable in establishing the critical edition since the editor-paraphrast used a lost minuscule exemplar (ζ) of the second recension older and less corrupt than the extant witnesses (VNP).<sup>33</sup> Independent of Leo's *Taktika*, the Ambrosian paraphrast rendered Maurice's μὴ ὑποκεῖσθαι σκούλκα ἢ ἑτέρῳ νομέρῳ with the words μήτε εἰς βίγλας μήτε εἰς ἑτέραν δουλείαν ἀποσχολεῖσθωσαν, 'should not be employed in sentry-duty or

rate and regular reconnaissance': διὰ σκούλκων ἀκριβῶν καὶ συνεχῶν (VII.A.3.4); 'to arrange/undertake/send out/conduct reconnaissance: τὰς σκούλκας ἔχειν (VII.B.12.21; VIII.A.(34); x.1.4–5); τὰς σκούλκας ποιεῖν/ποιεῖσθαι (IX.5.44. 85; XII.B.20.31); τὰς σκούλκας πέμπειν (IX.3.108); τὰς σκούλκας γίνεσθαι (IX.3.115–16, 5.74–5.86–7); For σκούλκεῖν, 'to reconnoitre': II.11.8; VII.B.9.5, 13.11; IX.5.1; XII.B.20.23.

<sup>29</sup> The most recent edition is the incomplete R. VÁRI (ed.), Leonis Imperatoris Tactica (*Sylloge tacticorum Graecorum* 3). Budapest 1917–22, 1–2 (to XIV.38), with XVIII in IDEM, Bölcös Leo hadi taktikájának XVIII fejezete, in: G. PAULER – S. SZILÁGYI, A magyar honfoglalás kútfői. Budapest 1900, 3–89. The only complete edition is PG 107, 671–1094, which reprints the defective text of J. LAMI, Jo. Meursii opera omnia VI. Florence 1745, 529–920, itself a revision of J. MEURSIUS (VAN MEURS), Leonis imp. Tactica sive de Re militari liber. Leyden 1612. For date see J. GROSDIDIER DE MATONS, Trois études sur Léon VI. *TM* 5 (1973) 181–242 at 193–4.

<sup>30</sup> For the 'third recension' of Maurice's *Strategikon* see DENNIS – GAMILLSCHEG 22–3, 36–9, with stemma at 41.

<sup>31</sup> Leo, *Taktika* IX.9. From Leo's text derives in turn Nicephorus Ouranos, *Taktika* IX.9: ... οὐκ ὀφείλουσιν ὑποκεῖσθαι ἢ βίγλα ἢ ἀλλῇ τινὶ δουλείᾳ (ed. VÁRI I 214, lower register). By the middle Byzantine period the term βίγλα (Latin \**vigla*), hitherto employed in a restricted sense of 'sentry-duty', came to apply more broadly to procedures for reconnaissance and patrol-duty formerly called σκούλκα. In the tenth-century military treatises βίγλα routinely glosses or replaces σκούλκα, and similarly βιγλεῦειν and βιγλάτωρ (Latin \**vigilator*?) supplant σκούλκεῖν and σκούλκάτωρ. For the etymology of βίγλα and its cognates see MIHĂESCU, op. cit. (1968–9) I 484, II 161–2; (1978–9) III 367–8; E. BANFI, Problemi di lessico balcanico. Di alcune continuazioni del lessico militare nel neogreco e nelle lingue balcaniche, in: *Studi Albanologici, Balcanici, Bizantini e Orientali in onore di Giuseppe Valentini, S.J. (Studi Albanesi. StT 6)*. Florence 1986, 1–29 at 20.

<sup>32</sup> A. MARTINI – D. BASSI, *Catalogus codicum graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae*. Milan 1906, I 157–60. For detailed description: K.K. MÜLLER, Eine griechische Schrift über Seekrieg (Festgabe zur Dritten Säcularfeier der Julius-Maximilians-Universität zu Würzburg). Würzburg 1882, 18–39; C.M. MAZZUCCHI, Dagli anni di Basilio Parakimomenos (cod. *Ambr.* B 119 sup.). *Aevum* 52 (1978) 267–316 at 276–84, 310–16. It is convincingly dated to 959 by MAZZUCCHI 267–82, 292–306; supplemented by W.G. BROKKAAR, Basil Lacapanus. Byzantium in the Tenth Century, in: W.F. BAKKER [*et al.*] (ed.), *Studia Byzantina et Neohellenica Neerlandica (Byzantina Neerlandica 3)*. Leiden 1972, 199–234 at 214–16; S. COSENTINO, The Syrianos' *Strategikon* – a 9<sup>th</sup>-Century Source? *Bizantinistica. Rivista di studi bizantini e slavi* 2 (2000) 243–80, esp. 243–6.

<sup>33</sup> I cannot agree with the stemma codicum proposed in DENNIS – GAMILLSCHEG 39–41. Dennis concludes that the Ambrosian paraphrast combined readings drawn eclectically from exemplars of both the first and second recensions older than the extant witnesses (respectively M and VNP); A is thus a dextrous editorial composite of both traditions. Space prevents full discussion here, but I wish to stress that studies of other military treatises transmitted in the same mss concur on a different and simpler explanation of A's apparent affinity to both M and VNP; namely that A and VNP are branches of the second recension, of which A preserves an earlier and more authentic text. In consequence A shares more correct readings with M than do the more corrupted VNP. See VÁRI, op. cit. I xiii, xxx–xxxii; A. DAIN, Les manuscrits d'Onésandros. Paris 1930, 36–42, 44–6, 117, 146; IDEM, L' 'Extrait nautique' tiré de Léon VI. *Eranos* 54 (1956) 151–9. MAZZUCCHI 285–90 had already made a convincing demonstration of this position in relation to the *Strategikon*; reiterated in his review of DENNIS – GAMILLSCHEG in *Aevum* 56 (1982) 280–2. See now P. RANCE, The date of the compendium of Syrianus Magister. *BZ* 100/2 (2007) 701–737 at 733–5.

any other service'.<sup>34</sup> The readings in A and Lt are omitted from Dennis' apparatus criticus. It is important to stress that the occurrence of νομέρω in all manuscripts of the first (M) and second recensions (VNP) indicates that this reading derives from the closest common ancestor (β), probably compiled in the early seventh century and thus close to the original. The position of Lt and A in the stemma codicum necessarily requires that the exemplars on which they were based must have also read νομέρω, and not some other word<sup>35</sup>. Leo and the Ambrosian paraphrast therefore read νομέρω and understood it to mean δουλεία.

What then are we to make of ἑτέρω νομέρω? We have seen that modern editors and translators have assumed the reading νόμερος, with the sense of 'a military unit', but have then erred or struggled with regard to the meaning of this passage. There are good *a priori* reasons for doubting the occurrence of νόμερος here. This word appears nowhere else in the *Strategikon*, throughout which Maurice routinely employs the conventional translation ἀριθμός<sup>36</sup>. Indeed, νόμερος is not documented anywhere in the rich corpus of Byzantine military writing, and, as previously observed, is a relatively rare usage for the most part restricted to patristic and chronographical literature.<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, the fact that both Leo and the Ambrosian paraphrast substituted δουλεία points towards some other interpretation.

A possible (and now familiar) solution to this textual discrepancy has long lain buried in an editorial footnote to the editio princeps of the *Strategikon* by Johann Scheffer in 1664. On the basis of the reading ἢ ἑτέρω δουλεία in Leo's *Taktika*, Scheffer, as later Vogt at *De Cerimoniis* I 60 (51), but with greater confidence, urged emending νομέρω to μουνέρω. This \*μούνερον, -α he conceived as a Hellenised form of Latin *munera*, hence 'duties'.<sup>38</sup> As circumstantial evidence in favour of this emendation Scheffer pointed to the significance of the term *munera* in the documentation of the late Roman army. In Vegetius' *Epitoma Rei Militaris* (ca. 383–450) *munera* denominates 'fatigues' and in one passage is cited as the defining characteristic and etymological origin of *munifices*, broadly equating to the modern English 'servicemen': *Reliqui (milites) munifices appellantur quia munera facere coguntur*, 'the rest are called *munifices* because they carry out *munera*'.<sup>39</sup> Similar associations are found in other late Latin texts – historical, technical and juristic – though, as with Vegetius, their classicising idiom, ancient source material and/or antiquarian interests caution against accepting *munera* as a common usage in late Roman/early Byzantine Heeressprache<sup>40</sup>.

<sup>34</sup> B. LEONI, La Parafraresi Ambrosiana dello Strategicon di Maurizio: L'arte della guerra a Bisanzio (*Bibliotheca Erudita Studi e Documenti di Storia e Filologia* 22). Milan 2003, 57.26–7.

<sup>35</sup> See stemma codicum at DENNIS – GAMILLSCHEG 41; this argument is not affected by my disagreement with aspects of Dennis' stemma, as outlined n. 33. In consequence of the position of A in the stemma, where mss of the first recension (M) and second recension (VNP) share a common error a correct reading in A can only be the result of later editorial intervention and not of a better tradition. This argument is reinforced when the same error occurs also in the third recension (LtLp). Accordingly, in Dennis' edition of 225 pages of Greek text, I have identified just two instances where A uniquely supplies a correct reading against a common error in all other witnesses: VIII.B.93 πράξεως A : παρατάξεως MVNPLt; IX.3.9 κλεισοῦραν A : καὶ οὐραν MVNPLp (undoubtedly a transcriptional error arising in majuscule: ΚΛΕΙCOYΠΑΝ or ΚΑΙCOYΠΑΝ > ΚΑΙ ΟΥΠΑΝ). In both cases the error must have already occurred in archetype β (unless we assume that three later copyists committed an identical mistake in three different traditions) and one struggles to account for this configuration of readings other than by assuming that the reading in A is the paraphrast's conjecture.

<sup>36</sup> KUČMA, op. cit. (2005) 82 n. 1 rightly observes that νόμερος at Strat. I.9.28 is unique within the treatise. For ἀριθμός cf. Strat. I.3.15–16, 4.33; II.6.23. 39, 20.3. 12; III.8.4; VII.A.pr.7; XII.B.4.2, 6.16, 7.1. 12, 8.16–17, 9.6.

<sup>37</sup> See *supra* nn. 3, 5.

<sup>38</sup> J. SCHEFFER, *Arriani Tactica & Mauricii Artis militaris libri duodecim Graece primus edit, versione latina notisque illustrat...* Uppsala 1664 (reprint Osnabrück 1967) 412: 'Scribo confidenter, ἢ ἑτέρω μουνέρω. Μούνερα nostro, quae Latinis munera, id est ea negotia, quae suscipere quisque pro conditione sua cogitur in militia ...'

<sup>39</sup> Veg. Epit. (ed. M.D. REEVE. Oxford 2004) II.7.12; cf. also II.3.4, 19.3; III.8.1.

<sup>40</sup> E.g. Amm. Marc. XVI.5.3: *munificis militis*; XXV.2.2: *munifici gregario*; Anon. De Rebus Bellicis (ed. R.I. IRELAND [*Bibliotheca Teubneriana*]. Leipzig 1984) 5.7: *castrisium munerum*; Just. Dig. L.16.18 (= Paulus 9 ad ed., ca. AD 200): *unde munera militaria et quosdam milites munificos vocari*. For Vegetius' antiquarianism and penchant for etymologising see N.P. MILNER, Vegetius: Epitome of Military Science. Liverpool 1996, xvi–xxix. This usage of *munera* is in fact rare in late Latin; the overwhelming majority of instances occur between the first century B.C. and early second century A.D., see TLL 8, s.v. *munus*, II.3 (1666.13–31).

It remains the case, however, that \*μούνερον, -α is otherwise unattested in Greek. The only partial parallel is a Latin-Greek gloss μουνεράριοι: λειτουργοί by John Lydus, writing ca. 550, though the fact that this usage is a hapax and occurs in a list of mainly obsolete Latin *vocabula militaria* implies that *munerarius*, and presumably cognate words, was not comprehensible to his Greek readership<sup>41</sup>; indeed the high probability that Lydus himself has misconstrued this word does not inspire confidence in its contemporary currency<sup>42</sup>. Scheffer's emendation \*μουνέρω was acknowledged but rejected by two subsequent editors, Rezső Vári and Haralambie Mihăescu, though both preferred to revert to βούμερος, and we have already established that this assumption does not stand up to scrutiny<sup>43</sup>.

The foregoing study of two unrelated texts of different periods (though both, to differing degrees, imperially sponsored) provides a potential solution to a shared editorial problem. There can be no doubt that πάντα τὰ βούμερα fulfilled by the *praepositus* in *De Cerimoniis* I 60 (51) and τὸ ἕτερον βούμερον from which Maurice grants exemption are the same word, with the meaning 'duty', 'function' or 'service'. But which word? Given the contexts, it is undeniably tempting to emend both passages to read μούνερον, -α, from Latin *munus*, *munera*, but, even leaving aside the lack of evidence for this loan in Greek, there are significant obstacles to this easy route. The case for such a double emendation asks us to accept four assumptions: 1. The tenth-century scribe of the Leipzig codex (L) of *De Cerimoniis* misread his minuscule exemplar and wrote βούμερα instead of μούνερα. 2. The (probably) seventh-century scribe of archetype β of the *Strategikon* made an identical error, but from a majuscule exemplar, and even though βούμερος, -ov occurs nowhere else in this treatise or genre, and cannot therefore be considered a *lectio facilior*. 3. In the tenth century Leo VI and the Ambrosian paraphrast, encountering βουμέρω in two different minuscule manuscripts, both independently identified or conjectured that the correct reading must be μουνέρω, a word they knew to mean δουλεία. 4. The Ambrosian paraphrast was able to decipher and comprehend μούνερον in a corrupted text written three and half centuries earlier, but his contemporary in court circles, the copyist of L, failed to recognise μούνερα in a text compiled no more than a decade previously. I would suggest that this sequence of coincidences is unlikely, and becomes

<sup>41</sup> J. Lyd. *De Mag.* I.46. The *communis opinio* maintains that Lydus aims to elucidate obscure Latin terminology, chiefly Heeresprache and Verwaltungssprache, for Greek readers lacking the requisite specialist linguistic training, the demise of which Lydus explicitly bemoans (II.12 = III.42); see H. HUNGER, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (*HdA* XII.5). München, I 250–51; A. BANDY, *On Powers, or the Magistracies of the Roman State*. Philadelphia 1983, xix; M. MAAS, *John Lydus and the Roman Past*. London 1992, 32, 87. I am not convinced by the alternative thesis proposed by T. KOLIAS, *Ioannes Lydos und die Diskuswerfer*, in: C.N. CONSTANTINIDES [*et al.*] (ed.), *ΦΙΛΕΛΛΗΝ. Studies in Honour of Robert Browning* (*Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia - Bibliothek* N. 17). Venice 1996, 175–8, and adumbrated in *idem*, *Tradition und Erneuerung im frühbyzantinischen Reich am Beispiel der militärischen Sprache und Terminologie*, in: M. KAZANSKI and F. VALLET (ed.), *L'Armée romaine et les barbares du III<sup>e</sup> au VII<sup>e</sup> siècles* (*Mémoires de l'Association Française d'Archéologie Mérovingienne* 5). Paris 1993, 39–44 at 42. Kolias contends that Lydus seeks to gloss well-known contemporary Latinisms using recherché classicizing Greek vocabulary: 'sein Anliegen war es vielmehr, die griechischen Begriffe bekannt zu machen, bzw. die griechische Sprache zu lehren'; thus Lydus may be seen as 'ein Vorläufer der "Gräzisierung" des Reiches' (176). Setting aside the obscurity of the alleged motive (academic? nationalistic?), it requires very considerable imagination to view the Latinisms listed by Lydus as 'weit verbreitete' (175), 'gebräuchlichere', 'übliche', 'weitaus bekanntere' (176), 'zeitgenössische' (178). On the contrary, while a few terms are found in contemporary Greek *tactica* or legislation, the list abounds in archaisms and obsolete words unfamiliar even to contemporary Latin readers. The established view must stand: the common characteristic of these Latin terms is that they are all arcane technicalia that require elucidation for Greek readers unacquainted with this jargon.

<sup>42</sup> Lydus includes *munerarii* among the components of the Roman legion (τομαὶ δὲ ταῖς λεγιῶσιν αὐταί), but he appears to have erred, since *munerarius* is otherwise unknown in this connection, and is previously attested only in reference to the sponsorship of public games (*munera*). The word is rare in all periods, though marginally more frequent before the second century AD; it occurs once in *CTh.* XV.12.2 (357), again a ludic context, but is conspicuously absent from *Corpus Juris Civilis*. The only other sixth-century instance is Cassiod. *Var.* VI.7.4, but he uniquely employs *munerarius* adjectivally as a synonym for *munificus*.

<sup>43</sup> R. VÁRI I 214 app. crit., 'Urbicii [= Mauricii] verbum βουμέρω a Leone obiter perceptum esse credo. Scheffer μουνέρω tentavit, quod verbum Byzantinis inusitatum fuisse censeo'. MIHĂESCU, *op. cit.* (1968–9) II 160, 'Le Latin *numerus* "nombre, un certain nombre de soldats" se retrouve dans ce passage de Mauricius ... "Ne pas verser dans une patrouille ou une autre unité ceux amenés pour cette corvée". L'éditeur Johannes Scheffer (1664) propose toutefois la conjecture μουνέρω ... et il traduit par: "Ne pas verser dans une patrouille ou pour une autre attribution ceux amenés pour cette corvée". Sa conjecture est tenante, mais pas nécaissaire.'



entirely unnecessary if we accept the more economical solution that *νούμερον* could mean 'duty', 'service' or 'office'. The etymological origin and development of this usage remain obscure, though some older lexica identify instances of *numerus* with the same meaning even in classical Latin<sup>44</sup>. If so, on the negative side, Vogt's posited *μούνερα*, like Scheffer's *μουνέρω*, must be ruled out; there remains no evidence that *munera* ever entered Greek as a loanword. On the positive side, recognition of the parallels between the two works discussed increases our knowledge of a rare usage of *νούμερον* and the tentative definition 'Pflicht?' offered in *LBG* is verified and supplemented by a new example.

---

<sup>44</sup> K.E. GEORGES, rev. H. GEORGES, *Ausführliches lateinisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch*. Hannover <sup>8</sup>1913–18 (repr. <sup>14</sup>Darmstadt 1992), II 1220, s.v. *numerus*, 'die Pflicht, das Amt'; C.T. LEWIS and C. SHORT, *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford 1879 (repr. 1963), s.v. *numerus*, §II D, 'An office, duty, part'. The broad semantic range of *numerus* in classical Latin, however, means that all of the instances cited for this usage are open to multiple interpretations. Unfortunately, volume N of TLL is still awaited.

