Notes and Documents

The Bulgarian Treaty of A.D. 814, and the Great Fence of Thrace.

Among the official Greek inscriptions of Omurtag and Malomir which have been discovered and published in recent years, the inscription of Suleiman-Keui, containing the provisions of a treaty between the Bulgarians and the Eastern Empire, is evidently one of the most important, but it has not been satisfactorily explained. Suleiman-Keui is three hours to the east of Pliska (Aboba), the residence of the early Bulgarian Khans, and there can be no doubt that the column or its fragment was conveyed from the ruins of the palace to Suleiman-Keui. The remains of the inscription do not contain the name either of the khan or of the emperor who were parties to the treaty, but the mention of ' thirty years ' shows that the document, which on palaeographical grounds belongs to the earlier part of the ninth century, is connected with the Thirty Years' treaty which was concluded in A.D. 814. Th. Uspenski, the last editor,1 to whose labours in co-operation with the Bulgarian archaeologist, K. Škorpil, Bulgarian history owes such a deep debt, thinks that it probably represents the result of negotiations between Omurtag and Michael II in 821, or else between a later khan and Michael III (and Theodora) in 842-3. This conclusion is, I think, untenable; but before criticising his grounds, it will be convenient to state briefly what is known, from literary sources, concerning the Thirty Years' treaty.

Krum died 14 April 814,2 while he was making preparations

1 Izvestiia russkago arkheologicheskago Instituta, x. (1905), 220 seq. I cite this as Aboba. The inscription was first published in 1896 by Škorpil and Jireček in Arch.-epigr. Mittheilungen, xix. 245.

2 Krum's death is placed by Safarik and Jireček (Geschichte der Bulgaren, 146) in 815. But the narrative in the Scriptor Incertus—the fullest narrative we possess of Krum's campaigns—makes it quite clear that only one winter passed between Leo's accession (A.D. 813) and Krum's death. Krug, Muralt, and Loparev (Dvie Zamietki, in Zapiski imp. russk. arkh. obshch. iii. 348, 1888) agree on 814. The victory of Leo at the Bouvós Néasvros, which Jireček places in 814, must be placed towards the end of 813. Hirsch indeed (Byzantinische Studien, 125-6) considers it unhistorical. It is not noticed by the Scriptor Incertus, but depends on the common source of Genesios (12-13) and Cont. Theoph. (24-25). These writers are here cited from the Bonn edition.
for an attack upon Constantinople. Hostilities then ceased, and some time afterwards Leo V concluded a treaty for thirty years with a successor of Krum. This treaty is mentioned in the Continuation of Theophanes (31) without any indication of date beyond the reign of Leo V: τὰς τριακοντατεταῖς σπονδᾶς τοῖς Οὐννοις δὴ τοῦτοι τοῖς καλουμένοις Βουλγάροις ἐναμότος ποιῶν καὶ εἰρημεῖα συμβάσεις καταπραττόμενος. It is also mentioned by Genesios (41) in a more valuable passage, which records that when Omurtag heard how Michael II was besieged by Thomas the Slavonian, he διατρεσβέων τὸν βασιλέα καὶ συμμαχεῖν αἰτεῖται αὐτῷ: ἤγαρ ἰπὸ Λέωντος τῷ βασιλέως πρὸς αὐτὸν τριακοντατεταῖς σπονδαὶ ὡς τὴν πρώτην δεκαετίαν συνεπλήρουν σχεδὼν. A corresponding notice also occurs in the Continuation (65), not derived directly from Genesios, but depending on a common source: ὅ ἦν Μορτιγών . . . καὶ τὰς πρὸς αὐτὸν δὲ τριακοντατεταῖς σπονδᾶς γεγενημένα παρὰ τοῦ προκαταχῶντος Λέωντος ἐπιβεβαιώτατοι . . . ζυγών.

The chronological indication of Genesios, that the first decade of the thirty years was approaching its completion when Omurtag offered his assistance to Michael II, proves that the treaty was concluded very soon after the death of Krum. A careful examination of the chronology of the revolt of Thomas shows that he was defeated by the Bulgarians at Keduktos in the spring of 823. No one dates the battle later than in this year. It is obvious that the treaty cannot have been later than 814, otherwise it could not be described as ‘nearly completing its first decennium’ at the beginning of 823.

The Continuation states that the treaty was made with Omurtag (πρὸς αὐτὸν), and historians have generally accepted the statement. The variant of Genesios (πρὸς αὐτῶν) however may be held to assume some possible significance, in view of the fact that Omurtag did not immediately succeed Krum. One or more obscure and brief reigns intervened, and, so far as the literary evidence takes us, it would be possible to suppose that Leo V concluded peace with one of these intermediate rulers. Uspenski in the few lines which he has devoted to the question of the date and the occasion of the Suleiman-Keui inscription commits two errors. He says that the Thirty Years’ treaty was concluded by Krum, and dates it in 813.

That the inscribed column was set up by Omurtag is, purely on palaeographical grounds, highly probable, because, as Uspenski points out, it has in this respect a close resemblance to the well-known Tyrnovo inscription which bears that khan’s name. Seeing then that the text contains articles of a treaty and a reference to thirty

3 Tsok (Τσόκ), Dukum, and Ditseng (Menologion of Basil II in Migne, P.G. 117, 276, and the Slavonic Prologue, ed. Moscow, 1877, under 2 January, p. 42). Theophylaktos of Achrida (Migne, P.G. 126, 192), and Cont. Theoph. (217) represent Omurtag as immediately following Krum.
years (ΛΕΤ), it is reasonable to assume that we have to do with nothing less than the text of the Thirty Years' treaty or an abstract of its provisions. It is curious that Uspenski should have ignored this obvious explanation, and I can only account for his neglecting to consider it by his erroneous ascription of the treaty to Krum. His own theory is based on a highly improbable restoration in the second line of the text. The fragment begins as follows:

... Α]ΤΓΕΛΙΑ [ ] ΣΑΠΕΣ
... ]ΠΡΟΤΟΣΙΑ [ ] ΑΣΗΛΑΕΤ

Uspenski restores Σαπεσ[τιλεν ... ετε]ι προτο σι[νθικας επινισα]ντυ λ ετ, i.e. καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ... ἔτει πρώτω συνθηκας ἐποιήσαντο λ' ἑτ(ῶν). He explains ἔτει πρώτῳ as dating the treaty in the first year of the emperor concerned, and as he will not refer it to the treaty concluded by Leo V, he argues that the emperor must be either Michael II, whose first year was 821, or Michael III, whose first year was 842. He leans to the former hypothesis, presumably because the palaeographical indications point to the reign of Omurtag. It would follow that in 821, a new treaty of thirty years was contracted, a treaty which our authorities never mention and whose existence is clearly inconsistent with the passage of Genesios cited above. Nor has ἔτει πρώτῳ in itself any probability—though if we accepted it, we might rather refer it to the first year of Leo V (813–14). For we expect the name of the emperor following it in the genitive. Uspenski makes no suggestion about the construction; but we may say that τοῦ Μιχαήλ (or αὐτοῦ) ἔτει πρώτῳ is improbable in a text of this kind.

A simple and natural restoration of the passage is not difficult. δ'γελια[ ] points to a message between Pliska and Constantinople, and we may without hesitation accept ἀπέσ[τιλεν from Uspenski. The verb must have been followed by the name or designation of the envoy, and thus we get at once

Σ ΑΠΕΣ[ΤΙΛΕΝ ... ]Ν ΠΡΟΤΟΣΙ[ΑΘΑΡΙΟΝ Σ ΕΚΠΗΚΑ]ΝΤΟ ΛΕΤ

The strokes which Uspenski took for Ι (ἔτει, συνθηκας) are respectively the last stroke of Ν and the first of Π. ‘And he (the Emperor Leo) sent so-and-so protospatharios, and they made a treaty for thirty years’ (ἔσπειραντο λ' ἑτη).

The restoration of the text is rendered difficult by the irregularity of the writing, the spaces between the letters varying considerably. The editor has given no distinct indications as to the number of letters which may have been lost at the ends of lines, nor is this made clear by the facsimile in the album which accompanies his publication. It is however possible to restore the drift of the articles of the treaty.
My reconstruction, which differs in important points from Uspenski's, is as follows:

1. Uspenski reads το α' τόν [συνθηκῶν] α' κεφάλαιον, supposing that α' has been inadvertently repeated. This seems improbable. I think that τόν goes with κεφάλαιον (Ω is written O throughout), and perhaps the number of the articles was mentioned, e.g. τόν [ἐν σπουδαίς] ἵνα κεφάλαιον. There is no mark over the first Α, there seem to have been two dots over the second. Κεφαλαίον is written ΣΦΑΛΕΟΝ (as also in the short fragment of another treaty, discovered at Eski-Juma 4).

2. Uspenski ca εἴσερχεται τῇ ἐνορίᾳ, Jireček-Škorpil ἐποίησεν ὄριας. Probably only the subject of the agreement is stated with ἔπει (ep. II. 7, 13). Perhaps [εἴπει τῇ καυμῇ].

The stone has ΗΝΑ, and the editors must be right in explaining it as Ἡνα. Uspenski takes the following word (CCTI[8],) to be ἐστὶν, but it may be doubted whether Ἡνα would be used in the sense of 'where' in a text like this, or whether in its ordinary sense it could be followed by ἐστὶν. The Sprachgefühl of the composer of this inscription might not revolt against Ἡνα διαμένουσιν, if that is the right restoration in the Eski-Juma inscription, but I suspect that Ἡνα ἐστὶν for Ἡνα Ἐ would have been too much for him. Moreover in either case he would have used not ἧνα but ψινευθαί. I conjecture that we should read either {σ'στη[κί], i.e. στήκη or {σ'στη[ριχθή, i.e. στριχθη : 'concerning the frontier, that it shall be fixed.' -τοῦ must be the termination of a local name, and I read Δεβαλτοῦ, which suits the geographical requirements, as will be shown below.

3. Uspenski καὶ ἐπιστὶ [πτεριμέταξ] δὴ λαμ(ων) καὶ μέσον τῶν Βουλγάρων. This restoration is particularly unfortunate. ἐπιστὶ πτεριμέταξ (ἢ ἐνορία) is improbable, and so is the repetition of μέσον after

mueta (why not μέσου here?) The omission of the last two letters of Ελλήνων is a third improbability. But the reconstruction is decisively negatived by the stop after B, which shows that we have to do with a numeral, evidently marking article no. 2. Hence we get μέσου τών, between these points (τών for αὐτῶν, cf. Chatalar inscription τίν δύναμιν τού ῥ). This shows that τέτων at the beginning of the line is the termination of a local name, and that ελιν is probably part of καστέλ(λ)ιν. Προβάτου κάστρον suggests itself, mentioned in the Shumla inscription of Malomir, but it does not seem geographically suitable.

The second article evidently began with a verb, expressing what was to be done with the fortresses enumerated. The vestige of a letter after B suggests A or Λ. Perhaps ἀπολείψεως (απολιψιν) sc. ἐπτείσαντο (οἰ Γραικοί).

1. 5. There is a trace before Π, which suggests Α, so that we may read τὰ. Uspenski reads εἰς. It is somewhat unexpected to find ιε in a text of this kind. 'Αγαθονικής Jirecek, 'Αγαθοντέλως, Uspenski.

1. 6. I conjecture [S ΤΑ ΟΝΤΑ ΕΠΙ or Π]. Uspenski gives καὶ εἰς τῶς.

1. 7. [τερὶ δὲ τ—ο]ν Uspenski. We have here evidently a third article dealing with the Slavs, and I read [γ']. τερὶ προσφύγω.]ν.

1. 8. ὑπὸ τῶν Βουλιγρῶν καθ' ὡς Uspenski. I conjecture either εἰς τὰ δρη]ν ὡς or εἰς Αἴλμων] ὡς. εἰς Αἴλμων would be written ΙΚΕΜΩΝ.

1. 9. Uspenski rightly explains ἐθβᾶστισαν as ἐθβᾶστησαν. He reads ὀρμή in the sense of hostile movement, and seems to understand ἐθβᾶστησαν as ‘as they already were,’ namely ὑπὸ τῶν Βουλιγρῶν.

1. 10. τῷ βασιλεῖ εἰς παράλιον Uspenski.

1. 11. ἐπιστρέθεις for ἐπιστρέψει. Uspenski reads ἦ [ἀποδώσει ἄντι] τῶν αἰχμαλώτων χριστιανῶν καὶ κρ[ατήσει α] νό(μιςμα). This makes very poor sense: apparently, the emperor will either restore the Slavs or will give them in exchange for Christian captives, and he (who? the emperor or the khan?) will get one nomisma per head. Such an alternative seems to be absurd, and the mutual exchange of captives is provided for below, l. 15. Obviously the words τῶν αἰχ. κρ. belong to a new article. If ῥα were likely in a local sense, we might conjecture ἦ[να νεαν = ἵνα γε αν ‘to their districts,’ but I regard this as improbable. ἦ[κατίσει might be suggested, if a distinction could be drawn between driving the deserters across the frontier and formally handing them over to the Bulgarian authorities.

1. 12. I read SKP[ATIMENON, that is κεκρατημένων, cp.

5 Aboba, 545. 6 Ib. 233.
The sublime Khan Omurtag 7 (made peace and a treaty with the Greeks. Messages were interchanged and the Basileus) sent —— protospatharios, and they (the Greeks) made a treaty for thirty years. Art. 1 of the articles in the treaty: concerning the frontier, that it be fixed from Develtos and to the Castle—— and between these places. Art. 2: that they shall vacate the forts, which are numerous, which are between Balzena and Agathonike, and at Constantin and at Makre-Libas, and those which are towards Mount Haemus, until the setting of the frontier has been completed. Art. 3: Concerning the Slavs of the hill country, who were subject to the Bulgarians at the time when the (last) delimitation (?) was made, and concerning the other Slavs who are not subjects of the Emperor in the coast part: he shall restore them . . . Art. 4: Concerning the captive Christians who were seized and detained. For turmarchs and spathars and counts he shall give ——, and for the common (poor) folk (he shall exchange) soul for soul. He shall give two thousand (?) cattle (?) for those who were seized within the forts; if they have been removed into the villages (?), in case of a commander’s flight . . .

The inscription is evidently not a complete copy of the treaty but an abstract of its provisions, and perhaps (as the column was set up in the precincts of the royal residence for all who understood Greek to read) containing only those provisions which were advantageous to Bulgaria.

Art. 1 concerns the delimitation of the frontier. The course of the boundary does not seem to have been defined in detail in the act of treaty, and this article apparently only provides that a delimitation shall be made and names the extreme points. This follows from the words ἐας γέγονεν ἡ ὀροθεσία, 8 which must refer to

7 Κάνας ὑπηγή Ὀμορτάγκ, probably followed by something like ἐπίησεν ἱρίν καὶ στοιχάς μετὰ τῶν Βρεκοῦ. Cf. the Shumla inscription (discussed below), l. 3.
8 This unclassical syntax, for ἐως τὸν γένηται, is like our use of the perf. ind. ‘until it has been decided’ = ‘until it shall have been.’
a delimitation still to be made. It will appear presently that Develtos was almost certainly the eastern extremity, so that we can restore \[\text{[\textit{Ek or } \Delta\nu\betaελ\textit{}]\tauο\upsilon}. \] \Pi[\ldots]\text{\lambda\nu} was probably the name of a fort in Mount Haemus, somewhere north of Philippopolis. \Pi[\rhoβ\acute{\alpha}του καστ\acute{\iota}]\text{\(\lambda\nu\)}, which naturally occurs to one, does not seem likely, as Provatu Kastron is probably to be identified with Provadia, four hours north-east of Hadrianople, and it can be inferred from art. 2 that the delimitation of the whole Thracian frontier was contemplated.

The interesting question arises: does the frontier determined by this treaty correspond or not to the line of rampart and fossé which the Bulgarians constructed against the Empire, and of which the ruined remains are known as the Erkesiia? This Great Fence (\(\text{ἡ μεγίστη σοῦδα}\)),\(^9\) as the Greeks called it, ran from the neighbourhood of Develtos (Vespasion’s Colony of Deultum) westward past Rusokastro to the river Tundzha, and thence (more difficult to trace) to Trnovo-Seimen, where its western extremity seems to have been discovered, in the angle which the Hebrus forms with its tributary the Arzus (Sazly-dere).\(^10\) The line corresponds roughly to the modern boundary between Turkey and the Bulgarian kingdom.

The date of the construction of the rampart and trench (which is south of the rampart, proving that it was a Bulgarian defence against the empire) has been variously assigned to the beginning of the eighth century, to the middle of the same period,\(^11\) and to the ninth century.\(^12\) The second article of the treaty furnishes an answer to this question.

Art. 2 concerns fortresses on or near the frontier, which apparently are to be left ungarrisoned ‘until the delimitation has been completed.’ Makrolivada\(^13\) was near the junction of the Arzus with the Hebrus, not far from the railway station of Trnovo-Seimen.\(^14\) Constantia is Constantia on the Hebrus, which Tomaschek has identified with Harmanly (not the other Constantia, further west near Mount Rhodope). The fortresses defined by the mention of Mount Haemus must have been north of Makrolivada, towards and in the mountain range. There is more difficulty about the first group ‘between Balzena and Agatho . . .’ Balzena is otherwise unknown, and Agatho . . . may be either Agathonike or Agathopolis.

\(^9\) Cedrenus, ii. 372.
\(^10\) See Škorpil, in Aboba, c. xx. 538 sqq. The eastern section is also described by Jireček, \textit{Das Fürstenthum Bulgarien}, 505 sq. (1891); cf. also \textit{Arch.-ep. Mittheilungen}, x. 137.
\(^11\) It is certain that the Bulgarian frontier extended c. A.D. 750 as far south as the fortress of Meleona which was adjacent to the rampart near the heights of Bakadzhik (south-east of Jambol): Theophanes, ed. De Boor, 497. Cf. Aboba, 514 and 564-5.
\(^12\) By Zlatarski, Škorpil, and Jireček respectively.
\(^13\) George Aeropol. p. 127.
Uspenski, who decides for the latter, seeks Balzena further north on the same coast and suggests Balchik, north of Varna. It is not probable however that Agathopolis, south of Develtos, came within range at all. Agathonike was near Hadrianopole, and the forts to be left untenanted during the delimitation were probably from Agathonike northward to Balzena, wherever it was.

The temporary vacating of the forts was necessary to secure the ὀροθεσία. If this fixing of the frontier did not mean anything more than a perambulation or circuit of imperial and Bulgarian representatives, it is difficult to see why this precaution was required. In my opinion, this provision to leave the forts in the neighbourhood of the frontier untenanted points to the conclusion that the establishing of the frontier meant here more than what we understand by delimitation: that it meant the construction of a material boundary or fence. This inference at once supplies us with the solution of a serious difficulty which has not been considered by the writers who have discussed the remarkable line of rampart and fosse which the Bulgarians constructed in Thrace. That long line of fortification on the frontier could not have been built without the consent and permission of the empire. It would have required the continued presence of all the Bulgarian army to protect the workmen. Our text both explains the conditions under which the work was accomplished and supplies the date. This is perhaps the most important and interesting conclusion which can be drawn from this inscription —namely, that the Great Fence was constructed immediately after 814, in pursuance of the Thirty Years’ treaty, and that in constructing it the Bulgarians were secured from any danger of hostile interruption by the withdrawal of the imperial troops from fortresses close to the frontier. And when we realise these bearings of the treaty we can see that the text confirms the archaeological conclusion of Škorpil that the western extremity of the Fence was at Trnovo-Seimen. For this point corresponds to Makrolivada, and the inscription by mentioning Makrolivada and then the forts toward the Balkans suggests that from this point the frontier line ran northward.

Article 3 relates to the surrender of Slavonic deserters. The question of deserters had been an important point in the negotiations between Krum and Michael I. Krum had demanded an exchange of the deserters to both sides; the emperor was disposed to consent but was overruled by the opinion of the senate (Cont. Theoph. 12–13). The treaty seems to provide that all Slavs who had been in the power of the Bulgarians at the time of the delimitation of the frontier and had since deserted to the emperor should be sur-

15 The length of the eastern section (to the river Tundzha) was about 40 miles, that of the western a little less.

16 This section of the frontier seems to have been left unfenced.
rendered. It further provides that ‘the other Slavs who are not subject [to the emperor] in the coast district’ should be sent back. The difference between these two classes evidently is that the first inhabited the hill districts, which were entirely Bulgarian, the second belonged to the coast district where there were also Slavs who were under the Roman government. We must therefore, as I apprehend, supply εἰς τὰ ὅρη or εἰς Λῆμυν or something of the kind after ὑπὸ τῶν Βου[λαγάρων. An alternative might be to read ὑπὸ τῶν βου[νόν . . . , ‘under the hills,’ ‘in the hill country’; but it appears to me that ὑπὸ τῶν Βου[λαγάρων cannot be dispensed with in view of the following ὃς ἐφθάστησαν. The delimitation of the frontier (if ὀροθεσία is the true restoration) refers, of course, to an older treaty. The only recorded settlement of the boundaries was made in the reign of Kormisos, about the middle of the eighth century. It must be admitted that the different reference of ὀροθεσία in Art. 2 is in favour of Uspenski’s conjecture ὀρμη here. The clause would then apply only to acts of desertion since the outbreak of the war between Nicephorus and Krum.

Article 4 provides for the exchange of captives. For officers the emperor is to pay, evidently, a certain sum per head, but it is useless to speculate how much; probably not less than two nomismata. Common soldiers are to be exchanged man for man. Nothing is said about Bulgarian officers. It is also provided that a payment is to be made (perhaps 2000 oxen) for persons who had been seized by the Bulgarians within forts which the commanders had deserted and left undefended, and who (apparently) had been detained in neighbouring villages.

That it was Omurtag who concluded the peace and set up the column is suggested, as already observed, by the character of the script. This is not conclusive, for the resemblance between this inscription and that of Tynorno is compatible with the assumption that the same engraver who worked afterwards for Omurtag had worked for one of the obscure khans who reigned in 814. Still, as all the extant early inscriptions that bear the name of a khan were set up by Omurtag or Malomir, and as the Continuation of Theophanes refers the conclusion of the treaty to him, the evidence is strong enough to establish that he was the khan who made the Thirty Years’ treaty. The corollary follows that he came to the throne before the end of 814. There is however another piece of epigraphic evidence, which, if I am right in interpreting it, furnishes a confirmation. It is in the Shumla inscription of Malomir.17

This inscription proves that the Thirty Years’ treaty was not observed inviolate till its expiration in 844. For it records an inroad into imperial territory by Malomir, the son of Omurtag. No

17 Aboba, 233; Arch.-epigr. Mittheilungen, xix. 243.
hostilities are definitely described or recorded in our Greek sources during the reign of Theophilus, but one chronicle refers to an act of the contemporary khan which could hardly have been anything but an act of hostility. The khan is called ‘Βασίλιμπρ’ grandson of Krum,’ but he is also designated as Michael and the father of Simeon. Clearly Malomir, who was grandson of Krum and contemporary with Theophilus, is meant; but the chronicler confounds him with Boris (Michael). He is said to have marched to Thessalonica at the time when the Greek captives who had been transported by Krum beyond the Danube made efforts, which proved ultimately successful, to return to their homes. We can date this incident to 887–8. Whether it be true or not that Malomir invaded Macedonia first, the events connected with the return of the exiled Greeks furnish, I think, the key to the inscription. Theophilus sent ships to transport them from their place of exile beyond the mouths of the Danube, and Malomir retorted by invading Thrace. The moti' of the inscription is not, only to describe his exploits but to justify his breach of the peace.

The general drift must be inferred from a succession of phrases in the legible portions of the text: l. 1, my grandfather Krum; l. 2, my father; l. 3, made peace and lived on good terms with the Greeks; l. 4, and the Greeks (εφημωσαν), ll. 5–9, Malomir devastated the land of the Greeks. It is clear that in l. 4 an act on the part of the Greeks is mentioned which was contrary to the peace and is given as a justification of the invasion. εφημωσαν can mean either 'laid waste' or 'deserted.' We have no record of a wasting of Bulgaria by the Greeks, while we know that the Greek exiles did desert the settlement beyond the Danube to which they had been transported by Krum. Now if we take εφημωσαν to refer to this desertion, the mention of Krum in l. 1 receives an explanation.19

For our present purpose the interest of the inscription lies in ll. 2, 3, which Uspenski prints as follows:

'Oμ[μ]βρενταγ ἄροντα καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ Ἄ... [ε] ἐφήνεν το πονησας καὶ καλ(ά) εξ(γ)ης μ(ε)τα τοῖς Γ[ρ](αοι[κ]ς.

18 Chron. of the Logothete: Contin. Georg. Mon., ed. Bonn, 818. The other copies, Theodosius Mel. 162, and Leo Gramm. 231 have the same form of the name. It has been suggested that this form is due to a confusion with Vladimir, son of Boris. The episode of the return of the Macedonians is discussed by Marquart, Ostiropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge, 493–5, but not, in my opinion, satisfactorily, though he is right in reading 'Βούλγαροι for 'Βουχγαρίαν in Contin. Georg. 818, l. 15.

19 Uspenski reads ... ἄτοσ δρχ(ων) δ Κρούμος δ πάππ(ος) μον με[γας]. This will not do; δρχων must have the article. .scrollToTop which he takes to be for ἄτοσ is doubtless Γ, so that we can restore δ μεγ(ας) δρχ(ων) δ Κρούμος δ πάππ(ος) μον με[τή]γαγεν ... In l. 4 εφημωσας may be followed by something like τά τίραν ἵστρον καὶ ἔθεν] δ Μαλαμμάρ.
The audacious conjecture 'Ομβρευτάγ (Uspenski says that ρευταγ is unquestionably on the stone; it is far from clear in the facsimile) is supposed to be a form of Ομουρτάγ, and he compares Ομμπρίταγος in Theophylaktos of Achrida. But such a corruption in an official document is inconceivable; 'Ομουρτάγ is invariable in the inscriptions. Moreover the following words, καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου, show that Omurtag's name could not have stood at the beginning of the line, for Malomir's father was Omurtag (as we know from the same Theophylaktos). We can in fact restore with certainty καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἀρχόν ὁμουρτάγ. What ρευταγαγουτα may be, I cannot explain; it may contain some local name, connected with the settlement of the Greeks beyond the Danube. But it is obvious that 'my father the archon Omurtag' is the subject of ποιήσας and καταστά, and thus we have a piece of clear documentary evidence confirming the conclusion that Omurtag was the khan who made the Thirty Years' treaty with Leo V.

There is another fragmentary inscription which must be briefly considered in this connexion. It is the column of Eski-Juma, to which I have already referred for the purpose of illustration, and which, like that of Suleiman-Keui, was undoubtedly placed originally at the royal residence of Pliska. The best-preserved bit of the text is 1. 5, σου καὶ Βουλγαρίων Β κεφάλεων, where Uspenski's restoration Ρομπάους is virtually certain: this shows that we have to do with an agreement between the Empire and Bulgaria. In 1. 6 we have, as I would read, καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν ἀρχοντ[α] (τὸν ἀρχόντ[α], Uspenski), that is, the Bulgarian khan; in 1. 7 ἡ διαμεινουσιν οutive; in 1. 8 τὸν βασιλέα: μιτ. The last line has the mark .. followed by the tops of four letters, which seem to be σ or ζ, τ, ου, and ου. This points to ἐτου(s), and, if so, the date was here, and the text of the agreement ended in 1. 8, so that apparently there were only two articles. The inscription belongs to the same period as that of Suleiman Keui, and there seem to be only two possibilities. Either this instrument was a confirmation of the Thirty Years' treaty agreed upon by Omurtag and Michael at the expiration of the first decennium in 824; the text of Genesios, cited at the beginning of this paper, suggests that such a confirmation may have been considered desirable. Or else, the text represents a provisional

20 This inscription furnishes the important probability that Omurtag was Krum's son; the only possible alternative being that he was his son-in-law, Malomir's mother being Krum's daughter: Theophylaktos, loc. cit.
21 Aboba, 226.
22 τὸν βασιλέα ν(ῶμα) μ? Usp. Perhaps however we have the form βασιλεαν, which occurs in the Leipzig MS. of the De Cerimoniis, see L, 38 p. 194, l. 10. μιτ may be μη τι. It is impossible to make anything of the first lines of the inscription: in l. 2 perhaps Εβρον.
23 In the inscription preserved in the Sophia Museum, we find τετου for τετους before the Annus Mundi: Aboba, 227.
agreement, concluded in 814 by Leo V with Krum’s successor, and previous to the Thirty Years’ treaty. It is vexatious that a little more of the last line has not escaped destruction. If the first three letters represent, as I think, ἐπὶ, what could be the chronological bearing of the fourth, which seems to be ov? In these inscriptions we find examples of three methods of dating: by Anni Mundi (as in an inscription in the Sophia Museum), by indications, and by Bulgarian years (Chatalar inscription). ov cannot be the first figure of an A.M. or Ind., but it might be the first letter of the Bulgarian year vechem or uchem, which would probably be transliterated οὐτζζημ. Now it is remarkable that a Bulgarian year vechem partly corresponded to A.D. 814. The proof of this will be found in my article on Bulgarian chronology in the Byzantinische Zeitschrift, vol. xix. The mutilation of the inscription renders any theory about it highly precarious, but the evidence, such as it is, suggests that it may record a preliminary conclusion of peace after the death of Krum.

J. B. Bury.

The Horsing of the Danes.

‘No matter with which we have to deal,’ wrote Maitland, ‘is darker than the constitution of the English army on the eve of its defeat.’ This testimony is true, and almost everything that can be said about that army at any stage of its history is doubtful and controversial. I do not intend here to discuss its whole constitution, but merely to call attention again to what evidence we have touching the use of horses in war during Anglo-Saxon times, and especially to the alleged connexion between the Danish invasions and horsemanship—to that ‘horsing of the Danes’ and its consequences which loom large in some histories.

There is no need to refer to a long chain of historians. It will suffice to take as a basis for discussion the opinions of Professor Oman and Professor Vinogradoff. ‘The English before the Conquest,’ says the former, ‘never learnt like the Franks to fight on horseback; though their chiefs rode as far as the battlefield, they dismounted for the battle.’ I know no evidence that conflicts with this opinion that throughout the whole period even chiefs or kings usually fought on foot, as did Harold at Hastings. (Whether they alone ‘rode as far as the battlefield’ is another question—of that more later.) I am not even disposed, as Professor Oman is, to

24 The inscription which is dated A.M. 6328 = A.D. 819–20 (published in Arch.-epigr. Mitt. xix. 244, and in Aboba, 226) contains apparently the personal name Τςκως, which suggests Τςκος, one of the successors of Krum. Uspenski thinks that the document may have touched on events which happened after Krum’s death; but the fragments are too slight and disconnected to justify any inferences, and his supplements [στρατηγῶν ὁ Τςκως . . . συνθήκας are useless.

1 Domesday Book and Beyond, p. 156. 2 History of the Art of War, p. 70.