



---

The Campaign of 716-718, from Arabic Sources

Author(s): E. W. Brooks

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 19 (1899), pp. 19-31

Published by: [The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/623841>

Accessed: 21/01/2013 10:05

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## THE CAMPAIGN OF 716-718, FROM ARABIC SOURCES.

IN the work known as *Khitab Al 'Uyun*, or *Book of Springs*,<sup>1</sup> pp. 24-33, is contained a long narrative of the disastrous siege of Constantinople by the Arabs in 717-8, which, owing to its great length, I was unable to include in my article on the 'The Arabs in Asia Minor' in *J.H.S.* xviii. p. 182 ff. This work dates from the latter half of the 11th century, and in its present state appears to have been written in Spain, but is clearly drawn from early Eastern sources. Unfortunately the author does not, like most Arabic historians, mention his sources; but from a comparison with the narrative of Al Tabari it is clear that his chief, if not his only, authorities were Al Wakidi and Al Madaini, both of whom wrote in the early part of the 9th century and are earlier in date than any extant Arabic chroniclers.

Out of these two accounts he has constructed a continuous narrative, which, though graphic enough, in many places leaves traces of the method in which it has been put together, which may be detected partly by the inconsequence of the narrative itself, partly by comparison with other writers. The contradictions, however, must not be ascribed entirely to our author, since in many instances it is clear that they already existed in his authorities, who also followed varying traditions, though, unlike him, they probably gave each tradition separately with a reference to the source from which it was derived. That any written authorities existed before their time is unlikely, and their narratives must therefore have been derived from oral tradition; hence in such matters as chronological order and locality little confidence can be placed in them.<sup>2</sup> It must not, however, be supposed that the narrative is a merely legendary one; the many curious correspondences with Greek sources, such as the mention of the general Solomon, known only from Theophanes, and the name Tessarakontapechys, known only from the Acts of the 7th Synod, show that it is in the main historical, but accompanied by legendary details, which however, can in many instances be shown to be not mere inventions, but perversions or misunderstandings of historical fact. On the other hand the correspondences with the narrative of Michael the Syrian<sup>3</sup> cannot be fairly used to corroborate our author; for they are so close that it is difficult not to think that Michael here draws in part from Arabic sources; and this is

---

<sup>1</sup> Ed. de Goeje and de Jong (*Fragmenta Historicorum Arabicorum* Vol. I., Leiden 1869).

<sup>2</sup> The mere fact that no exact dates are given

tends to show that the chronology of the siege was unknown to the Arab writers.

<sup>3</sup> Arabic translation in Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 4402.

supported by the divergences from Theophanes, with whom his narrative is generally parallel.<sup>1</sup>

Some sources of confusion are easily discovered. One of these is the error common to all Arabic writers, and apparently to the Eastern source followed by Theophanes,<sup>2</sup> that the siege took place under Solomon and the army was recalled immediately after the accession of 'Umar; whereas in fact Solomon died about two months<sup>3</sup> after the siege began, and the siege continued  $10\frac{1}{2}$  months after 'Umar's accession. 'Umar no doubt recalled the army; and hence in the absence of dates the Arabs concluded that he did so immediately after his accession. A second and yet more fruitful source of error is a confusion between the imperial salutation of Leo at Amorion at the instigation of the Arabs in the summer of 716 and his coronation at Constantinople on March 25, 717.<sup>4</sup> Owing to this confusion the campaign in Asia Minor is almost entirely passed over, and events which happened at Amorion are, as I point out in the notes, transferred to Constantinople. Accordingly, since the salutation of Leo at Amorion took place during the siege of that place, the siege of Constantinople was made to begin before his accession, whereas in fact it began about 3 months afterwards; and it was made to last  $1\frac{1}{2}$ , or even  $2\frac{1}{2}$  years, whereas in fact it lasted, according to the higher estimate, 13 months. The chronological confusion is greatly assisted by the peculiarity of the Arabic calendar; for, since the siege was made to last 2 winters, and the army to be recalled immediately after the second winter, it would follow that Solomon's death was placed at the end of the winter. But, since he in fact died in September, and the date of his death was perfectly well known, this mistake would clearly have been impossible if the Arabs had used a fixed instead of a moving calendar.

From the narrative of Al Tabari I in my previous article gave extracts only; but, as in connexion with the narrative of the *Khitab Al 'Uyun* his whole account is of considerable interest (though not perhaps in itself of any great historical value), I give it in full<sup>5</sup> at the end of the translation of the narrative of the *Khitab*, which here follows.

And it is said that, when Solomon became Caliph, he was informed by many learned men that the name of the Caliph who should take *Al Kustanti-niyya* (Constantinople) should be the name of a prophet; and there was none among the Omniad kings whose name was the name of a prophet except him. And he was eagerly desirous of doing it and made preparations for this

<sup>1</sup> The divergences can hardly be explained by supposing that Theophanes drew throughout from his western source, for the long narrative under AM 6208 down to Leo's accession is not in Nikephoros, and can scarcely have been wholly omitted by him, if he found it in his authority.

<sup>2</sup> Michael makes certain messages pass between 'Umar and the army before its retreat (see p. 29 note 7), so that the expression of

Theophanes (p. 29 note 5) is perhaps a loose one.

<sup>3</sup> Owing to the variation between Theophanes and Nikephoros the exact date at which the siege began cannot be determined.

<sup>4</sup> Theoph. AM 6232.

<sup>5</sup> *I.e.* without omissions. I do not think it necessary to repeat over again the opening and concluding sections, which were given in full in the previous article.

purpose, never doubting that it was he who should perform this.<sup>1</sup> And he despatched his brother Maslama, and with him he sent levies raised from the forces of Al Sham (Syria) and Al Gazira (Mesopotamia); and he collected implements of war for summer and winter and siege-engines and naphtha<sup>2</sup> and other things. Then he appointed Maslama his brother to the command of the forces by land and sea; and there went forth with him a large number of lawyers from Al Sham and Al 'Irak (Babylonia). And Maslama went on till he reached Dabik, and the contingents from all quarters came to him. Then he set out and marched along the road through Mar'ash (Germanikeia) and took the city of the Slavs<sup>3</sup>; and the winter came upon them, and he turned aside to the city of Afif<sup>4</sup> (Epiphaneia?) and wintered there. And, when the winter had passed,<sup>5</sup> he went along on the way to Kustantiniyya, until he reached 'Ammuriya (Amorion); and the patrician of that city<sup>6</sup> was Leo, the son of Constantine,<sup>7</sup> the Mar'ashi; and Maslama came to terms with him and gave him security and received the like from him; and the terms were that he should give him advice and information for attacking the people of Kustantiniyya and should be a helper to him.<sup>8</sup> And the king of Kustantiniyya at that time was Bidus (Theodosius).<sup>9</sup>

Ibn Wadh.  
(*J.H.S.* xviii.  
195).

And a wonderful story is that of the fortunes of Leo and his renown and his valour and how he obtained from the Romans such a position that he became king among them. And, as for his early state and condition, he was a Christian inhabitant of Mar'ash,<sup>10</sup> where to this day there is a celebrated church called after him.

And his wife saw in a dream a cock spreading his wings in her court, and all the cocks of the Romans answered him. And he said to her, 'Keep this vision secret and let no one hear of it.' Then he went to Kustantiniyya, and he entered it during the time of the civil war which was going on in it,<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> According to Theoph. AM 6206 the preparations for the expedition began before the death of Al Walid.

<sup>2</sup> For the use of naphtha in sieges see Dio Cass. 36, 3, 1; 75, 11, 4; Proc. *de Bell. Goth.* 4, 11. In all these cases however it was used by the defenders, and I do not know another instance of its use in attack.

<sup>3</sup> Here the city of the Slavs appears in its right place; hence the note in *J.H.S.* xviii. p. 194 may be corrected.

<sup>4</sup> As there are no points over the last letter, it might also be read 'Afik,' and so de Goeje prints; but Aphaka in Phoenicia is absurdly out of place. Even Epiphaneia (in Cilicia) seems to be too far back.

<sup>5</sup> This must be the winter of 715-6. Solomon's accession was in Feb. 715, while in 716 we know from Theophanes and Michael that Maslama was in Asia Minor.

<sup>6</sup> *I.e.* General of the Anadolikoi. Ibn Khur-

dadhbah (ed. de Goeje p. 109) also calls the Anatolic general 'patrician of Amorion.'

<sup>7</sup> This name is probably only an inference from the fact that the name of Leo's son was Constantine. Similarly our author calls Leo V. 'son of Constantine,' though we know that his father's name was Vard.

<sup>8</sup> 'And, when the Arab army reached the city of Amorion, Leo met them and made an agreement with them with regard to the capture of the city' Mich. fol. 264 v; 'promised to help them to take the royal city' Greg. p. 116.

<sup>9</sup> The reason for negotiating with Leo was his enmity to Theodosius 'ἀκούων δὲ ὁ Μασαλμᾶς τὴν ἔχθραν, ἣν εἶχε Θεοδ. ὁ βασιλεὺς πρὸς τὸν στρατηγόν, βουλόμενος τοῦτον δελεᾶσαι καὶ εἰρηνεῦσαι μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὴν Ῥωμανίαν ὑποτάξαι' (Theoph. AM 6208).

<sup>10</sup> 'ἐκ τῆς Γερμανικῆων καταγόμενος' Theoph. AM 6209.

<sup>11</sup> Perhaps in 698.

and he became celebrated as a wine-merchant; and he spoke correctly in Arabic<sup>1</sup> and in Roman. And, when God Most High wishes a thing, He makes a way of bringing it about. Then he was present in those conflicts and showed energy in them, and his admirable courage was made plain; and they promoted him,<sup>2</sup> and he went on being advanced from post to post till he became patrician of 'Ammuriya.<sup>3</sup> And it is said of him that, when he came to 'Ammuriya with the king's commission appointing him patrician, they rejected him and said to him, 'Such a man as you shall not rule over us, for you are a Nabataean Arab.' And he said to them, 'I will not rule over you except by your commands; but you have heard of my character and my valour and ability, and your affairs are in confusion, and your kingdom is sore smitten, and the civil war is raging, and this Maslama, the son of 'Abd Al Malikh, has come close to your territory, and he will attack you. Therefore let me in and entrust your government to me; and, if I bear myself in it in accordance with your wishes, well; but if not, turn me out and do with me what you please.' And they said, 'He speaks the truth.' And they admitted him into their city and placed their government in his hands.<sup>4</sup> And meanwhile Maslama encamped at 'Ammuriya on his way to Al Kustantiniyya.<sup>5</sup> . . . . .<sup>6</sup> And they made him king and placed the crown on his head. And, when the followers of Bastas (Anastasius) saw that Bidus had become master of Al Kustantiniyya, they wished to gain his favour, and they took Bastas and put him in bonds and brought him to Bidus; and he banished him to the land of the Burgan (Bulgarians); and Bidus became king. And he was weak in judgment, and the same in administration, and feeble in the task which he had undertaken of governing the Romans.<sup>7</sup> And the government of the Romans was sore smitten, and their days were days of confusion and disorder.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This is a striking confirmation of the conjecture of Prof. Bury (*History of the later Roman Empire*, vol. 2, p. 380) that Leo could speak Arabic. If he remained in Germanikeia after the Arabic occupation, which was probably in 695 (*J.H.S.* xviii. pp. 189, 207), it is easily explained without adopting the suggestion put by our author into the mouths of the Amorians that he was a Nabataean. Theoph. (AM 6209) makes him remove to Thrace before 695; but, even so, Germanikeia as a frontier-town must have been in frequent intercourse with the Arabs for fifty years before that time.

<sup>2</sup> This was in 705 (Theoph. l.c.) 'έρχόμενου αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν Βουλγάρων ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ μετὰ δάρων προβάτων φ'. θεραπευθεὶς δὲ ὁ 'Ιουστινιανὸς σπαθῆριον αὐτὸν εὐθέως πεποίηκεν.'

<sup>3</sup> The appointment was made by Anastasius (713-715). Theoph. l.c.

<sup>4</sup> According to Theoph. (AM 6208) the quarrel between Leo and the Amorians was owing to the fact that he supported Anasta-

sus, while they supported Theodosius (τὸ 'Αμώριον...πρὸς τὸν στρατηγὸν ἐν ἔχθρᾳ διακειμένον διὰ τὴν πρὸς 'Αρτέμιον συμμαχίαν). According to Michael (fol. 264 v) it was owing to his dealings with the Arabs. It is not likely to have happened on his first appointment to the office of general.

<sup>5</sup> The attack on Amorion was made by Solomon according to Theoph. (l.c.), who does not bring Leo into the presence of Maslama at all.

<sup>6</sup> It is here clear, as de Goeje points out, that some words introducing the revolt against Anastasius have dropped out.

<sup>7</sup> 'ἀπράγμονά τε καὶ ἰδιώτην' Theoph. AM 6207; cf. Nikeph. p. 51. 'ἦν δὲ Θεοδ.... ἀπράγμων...ἀνὴρ καὶ πρὸς πραγμάτων διοίκησιν καὶ ταῦτα βασιλείας σφόδρα γε ἀποπεφυκώς.' Zon. (ed. Bonn), 14, 28, 1.

<sup>8</sup> 'τῆς τῶν Ῥωμαίων πολιτείας συγκεχυμένης οὕσης' Theoph. AM 6209. 'ἐπεὶ...ἡ τυραννὶς ἐκράτει τὰ τε τῆς βασιλείας καὶ τῆς πόλεως κατημελείτο καὶ διέπιπτε πρᾶγματα, ἔτι μὴν καὶ.. τὰ τακτικὰ διελύετο' Nikeph. p. 52.

And Maslama reached the Khalig and crossed it till he arrived at Al Kustantiniyya; and he passed over at a place called Abidus (Abydos),<sup>1</sup> where the Khalig is the width of an arrow shot. And this Khalig, which is called the sea of Buntus (Pontos), starts from Arminiya (Armenia), until, when it comes to Al Kustantiniyya, it separates off in two directions, towards the north and towards the east,<sup>2</sup> and there it is broad; but, when it reaches Abidus, it has narrowed down until it is the breadth of an arrow-shot between two cliffs. And, when a man has crossed the Khalig at Abidus, there lie between him and Kustantiniyya 100 miles of flat and level land. And the Khalig flows on from over against Abidus until it reaches the Sea of Al Sham, and it discharges and empties itself into the Sea of Al Sham. And Al Kustantiniyya stands upon it, stretching from east to west of it, its eastern side being upon the sea, and another side towards the north upon the sea, and its southern side towards the land of the Burgan on the land <and its western side on the land><sup>3</sup> also; and round it upon the two sides which are wholly on the land is a trench containing water.

And Leo used to go to Maslama in his position at 'Ammuriya<sup>4</sup> and converse and negotiate with him with fraud and deceit, until he said, 'If Maslama had been a woman, and I had then chosen to seduce her, I would have done it, and he would never have refused me anything that I desired of him.'

And, when Maslama had encamped at Kustantiniyya, he blockaded the inhabitants and attacked them with siege-engines; and he collected together the provender and the corn, and they were conveyed to him from the outlying and exposed lands of the Romans; and they came to him in waggons, until that which was brought to him became like mountains, and these stores abounded in his camp; and he excluded the inhabitants of Kustantiniyya from all gainful occupation by land and sea. And the district of Marakiya<sup>5</sup> (Thrace) was at that time waste, having been laid waste in that civil war; but at the present time it is well-peopled. And this was in their time one of the greatest weaknesses of Al Kustantiniyya. If an army went at the present day to Al Kustantiniyya, when it was in need of provisions, and there was no importation of corn, their provender-dealers would bring them more than they wanted from the places nearest to them.<sup>6</sup>

And Maslama prosecuted the siege vigorously; and, when the siege pressed heavily upon them, they asked him to grant them a delay. And they conferred with him, and he gave them hopes of certain things, and they

Al Mad. ap.  
Al Tab.

Al Wak. ap.  
Al Tab.

<sup>1</sup> 'ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν Ἀβυδὸν ἀντεπέρασε λαὸν ἱκανὸν εἰς τὴν Θράκην' Theoph. l.c.; cf. Nikeph. p. 53.

<sup>2</sup> There is some confusion here, since it is clear that this account is correct only if the description begins from the south.

<sup>3</sup> It is clear that these words must be inserted with de Goeje from Ibn Khurdadhbah, who in his 'Book of Roads' has an account of Con-

stantinople similar to this (ed. de Goeje p. 104).

<sup>4</sup> Or, during his (Leo's or Maslama's) continuance at 'Ammuriya.' If the rendering given above is the right one, we have here one of the instances of confusion in the narrative.

<sup>5</sup> An error for 'Tarakiya' (de Goeje).

<sup>6</sup> This is in all probability taken from either Al Wakidi or Al Madaini, and 'at the present day' therefore means soon after 800.



gave him hopes, and he remitted his attacks upon them; and in the meantime they on their part gained consolation and comfort.<sup>1</sup>

And Maslama was powerless,<sup>2</sup> with no counsel in him for the war, nor among his companions was there any man at his disposal with any counsel in him; yet he was a valiant man. And the Romans continued in this condition, until he hoped to make himself master of them, and thought that he should overcome them, so much so that he wrote to Leo at 'Ammuriya, ordering him to come to him, and telling him that he was on the point of taking Kustantiniyya. And Leo came in haste without waiting for anything; and he wrote to Leo, saying, 'I will make you king over them.'<sup>3</sup> And this increased his cupidity, and he came to him, and he entertained him and showed him honour and explained the state of his affairs. Then he sent him to the inhabitants of Kustantiniyya, and with him he sent a large number of his confidential officers; and Maslama said to them, 'I will not depart from you until you make my *marula*<sup>4</sup> Leo king and commit your kingdom to him; then I will depart from you and will leave you and your country and your religion and your churches in peace.' And Leo went in with the testimony of the letter; and he worked for himself and swore to them that, if they made him king, he would break faith with Maslama and renounce him and fight against him<sup>5</sup>; and he said to them, 'You know my valour and prowess in war and my military capacities, and you know his ways and his soft character, and I can obtain from him whatever I wish.'

Then this Leo brought a false report to Maslama, and took a false report from him to them; and with him were a large number of men, among them Solomon, the son of Mu'adh,<sup>6</sup> the Antakhi, and 'Abd Allah Al Battal,<sup>7</sup> and 'Abd Allah was at that time in command of the guard; and he was accompanied by squadrons of cavalry. And so matters went on; and Maslama said: 'I will not leave you until you make Leo king.' And they did not trust Leo, but were afraid that he would break faith with them and hand over the remnants of their property to Maslama until they agreed to what he asked. Then Leo had a secret meeting with the bishops and patricians and swore oaths to them until the matter was settled.

Al Mad. ap.  
Al Tab.

<sup>1</sup> These negotiations are probably the same as those recorded in the Arabic Gregory: see p. 28 note 5. Our author by combining several different versions has produced a somewhat inconsequent narrative.

<sup>2</sup> This sentence seems quite out of place here and must have come in from some other account: see last note.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Mich. fol. 264 v 'Maslama told Leo that, when he took Constantinople, he would make him king over the Romans.' This was while Maslama was still at Amorion. Theoph. (AM 6208) makes the writers of the letter Solomon and Bakhara: 'Σουλειμὰν δὲ καὶ Βάκχαρος ἐπὶ τὸ Ἀμόριον φθάσαντες γράφουσι πρὸς Λέοντα... ὅτι οἶδμεν ὅτι ἡ βασιλεία τῶν Ῥωμαίων

σοι ἀρμόζει, ἐλθὲ οὖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἄς λαλήσωμεν τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην.'

<sup>4</sup> The idea is that Leo by submitting to Maslama had put himself in the position of a freedman with regard to him.

<sup>5</sup> Michael (l.c.) represents this as taking place at Amorion: 'The people of the city (Amorion) were afraid of Leo; and, when Leo approached the wall, he told them that he was dealing treacherously with the Arabs.'

<sup>6</sup> This Solomon is not mentioned by any other Arab writer, but only by Theoph., who makes him conduct the negotiations with Leo at Amorion (AM 6208).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. J.H.S. xviii. pp. 200, 202; Theoph. AM 6231.

And then he came out to Maslama on one of his expeditions and said to him,<sup>1</sup> 'No contrivance remains for conciliating this people except one which if I carry out and act upon then they will hand over the government at one stroke.' He said, 'And what is it?' He said, 'They do not believe that we mean to fight them and trust to delay on your part.' He said, 'And why is that?' He said, 'When they saw these provisions, which you have gathered together like mountains, they came to be confident of this intention; but, if you give orders, and they are burnt, they will give up hope of your delaying and believe that you mean to fight, and that in two or three days, until they come to the state of mind that suits you, and you will take the city with very little trouble.' And he accepted this suggestion from him, and ordered these provisions to be burnt, except a small quantity of them.<sup>2</sup>

Al Mad. ap.  
Al Tab.

Then Leo went in to them, and the men appointed to guard him went in with him; and they assembled and made him king and placed the crown on his head,<sup>3</sup> after Maslama had bound him by the most solemn promises and compacts to hand over to him all the property of the Romans in money and vessels and silver and brocade and jewels and arms and silken stuffs, and all that the kings had stored up in past times, and to pay him tribute and hand over to him the kingdom of the Romans, and to be his slave as long as he lived, never opposing him in anything or breaking faith or truth.

Al Mad. ap.  
Al Tab.

And, when he became king and his end had been gained, the men stayed away from him three days; and, when the fourth day came, Solomon said to him, 'Will you not come out to the Amir?' He said, 'I will not come out of my kingdom.' He said, 'Was this the understanding on which you left him?' He said, 'No.' He said, 'And what has brought you to this?' He said, 'The thought of my position and the desire of continuing in the kingdom.' He said, 'And where are the promises which you gave of your own accord?' He said, 'I am of the opinion that in breaking faith with him lies the exaltation of Christianity, and the defence of that is the best of rewards.' And Solomon said, 'If the Amir Maslama does not learn this except from me, by God he will kill me, Leo.' And Leo said to him, 'Your death is of less consequence to me than the loss of my kingdom. Do you think that I will leave all that the kings have collected in times past up to this day and come out to you? If I do this, I have neither intelligence nor religion.'

Then Leo said to them, 'I have left you no provisions or provender, but he has burnt it all at my orders; and you will perish in a short time, and there is no succour for you and no one to seek aid, and you have nothing.

<sup>1</sup> This is de Goeje's correction. The MS. has 'Maslama went out...and said to them.'

<sup>2</sup> Even this absurd story is not altogether without basis. According to Theoph. (AM 6208) Maslama avoided ravaging the territory under Leo's governorship in the belief that he was a friend to the Arabs, and Leo was careful to protract the negotiations until Maslama had passed beyond his territory. This would of

course limit the amount of provisions in the army. All authorities agree that Leo in some way tricked the Arabs.

<sup>3</sup> This really refers to his proclamation at Amorion in 716; 'ἤρξαντο οἱ Σαρακηνοὶ εὐφραμεῖν τὸν στρατηγὸν Λ. βασιλέα, παρακαλοῦντες καὶ τοὺς ἔσω τὸ αὐτὸ ποιεῖν. ἰδόντες οὖν οἱ τοῦ Ἀμ. ὄντι οἱ Σαρ. πόθω αὐτὸν εὐφράμουν εὐφρήμσαν καὶ αὐτοί.' (Theoph. l.c.).



If Maslama is willing to evacuate the country, passing through it to his own land in any way that suits him without anyone attacking him, we agree to this. But, if he is not willing to do this, then he will meet with real war, very different from that in which he has been engaged.'

And the men returned to Maslama with the news of the great calamity; and, when they told this speech to Maslama, it dismayed and frightened him, and his wrath was extreme, and he was overcome by sorrow and great grief. And he said to Al Battal, 'You are in my sight free from suspicion as regards Al Islam or any of its interests. Had this Solomon, the son of Mu'adh, knowledge or information of anything?' And he said, 'Yes.' And, when Solomon heard that, he removed from his ring a stone that had poison on it, and he sucked it and died on the spot.<sup>1</sup> And Maslama gave orders, and he was crucified. Then he made them fight morning and afternoon, and inflicted such hardships upon them that they nearly perished. And the Moslems remained in this state of disorder amidst constant death and famine and bad weather until many men had perished and most of the draught-animals had perished; and what remained of the provender remained with Maslama, who retained it in order to frighten the enemy with it.

And, when the siege pressed heavily upon the Romans, they chose one of the patricians, a man of sagacity and cunning, and said to him, 'Go out to Maslama and confer with him in any way you choose, and we will place ourselves in your hands, and do you satisfy Maslama in any way you please until he go back out of our country.'

And the patrician went out to Maslama and said, 'I am an ambassador from the inhabitants of Al Kustantiniyya, and the people have placed themselves in my hands.'

And the men of counsel came together to Maslama and said, 'This is a man of cunning called "the son of forty cubits";<sup>2</sup> and, if he should perchance make a proposal to you, do not pay any attention to him or answer him.'

Al Mad. ap.  
Al Tab.

Ibn Wadh.  
(J.H.S. xviii.  
195).

<sup>1</sup> Solomon's death is not mentioned by Theoph., but he has nothing inconsistent with it, for the Solomon who brought the fleet to Constantinople in Sept. 717 (Theoph. AM 6209; Nikeph. p. 53) must be a different person from the Solomon who commanded the army before Amorion. By the eastern writer followed by Theoph. and Michael the second Solomon seems to have been confused with the Caliph, for Theoph. makes Maslama summon Solomon 'τὸν πρωτοσύμβουλον,' a word which in Theoph. always stands for the Caliph, and Michael (fol. 264 v.) makes Solomon 'the king' come and encamp at Chalkedon. Much confusion in the narratives is probably due to the existence of these three Solomons; see p. 30, note 6. The death of Solomon the son of Mu'adh probably happened before the siege began, and may be attributed to his having allowed Leo to slip

through his hands at Amorion (Theoph. AM 6208).

<sup>2</sup> Tessarakontapechys. In the Acts of the 7th Synod (Mansi 13, pp. 197-200) a Jew of this name is stated to have advised Yazid II. (720-724) to issue his decree against images and to have been put to death by Al Walid II. (743-744). From this passage it seems not improbable that the Synod was mistaken, and that he was an adviser not of Yazid but of Leo. There is however nothing against supposing that he was by origin a Jew of Tiberias, as the Synod states, which would explain his being chosen to negotiate with the Arabs. Constantine Serantapechos, brother-in-law of the Empress Eirene (Theoph. AM 6291), was probably a descendant, for the unwieldy and ill-sounding name would naturally be shortened.

And Maslama said to 'Umar, the son of Hubaira, 'You confer with him.' He said, 'I will.' And he said, 'The Amir says to you, "If Leo were a man who had obtained his kingdom by a just title or were a man of noble birth, I should have no objection to meeting his ambassador and conferring with him. But the ambassador stands in the same estimation as the accreditor, and I do not care to confer with an ambassador of Leo on account of his deficient estimation and low birth."'

And the son of forty said, 'I am an ambassador from myself and my countrymen and my people, to guard and defend them; and I do not care which of you confers with me.' And the conference was protracted between them, until the son of forty said, 'I will lay a proposal before you, which is an opportunity for you, and a means of making a profit without trouble.' He said, 'What is it?' He said, 'It is a thing which no Roman has ever granted or thought to grant. Note every man of full age in Al Kustantiniyya, and for each man we will give you a denarius; and we will not dispute about his maturity, but the decision on the point shall rest with you.'

Al Mad. ap.  
Al Tab.

And Ibn Hubaira said, 'This is good; but I expect Maslama will not agree to this.' And he said, 'He will not be deceived through you, if I may trust the proof which I have had of the extent of your intelligence; and I hope he will not show favour to you, if God Most High pleases.' And 'Umar, the son of Hubaira, went to Maslama and found him sleeping; and he asked permission to come in, and said, 'I have brought you a proposal, which if you reject, you will never be contented with any offer from him; and it is a means for you to make profit without trouble. Accept it then quickly, and you do not know what the end will be. And it is so and so.'

And Maslama said, 'No, by God I will take it by storm, or else Leo shall come out to me on the conditions on which he left me.' And Ibn Hubaira returned to the son of forty and told him what he had said.

And he said, 'You came to him when he had just risen from his sleep, and a sleeper's intelligence does not return to him for an hour; but ask him again.' And he said, 'He will not do it.' And he said, 'When he repents, he will hope for a thing that will not be granted him, and he shall not obtain possession of this thing, and this will not be his time nor his opportunity; and, when this happens, there shall be no re-awakening of siege or battle, and matters will be easier than they are now, and we shall be engaged in fighting for our country and our religion and our land. And the usual thing here is that every seven years there comes a rain called "the torrent," which carries off everything that comes in its way; and this is the year in which it comes, and you are men of knowledge.'

Cf. Al Mad.  
ap Al Tab.

Cf. Al Mad.  
ap Al Tab.

And the son of forty returned to Leo and told him the answer that Maslama had given him. And the reason for Maslama refusing this offer

<sup>1</sup> It seems clear that this proposal must have been made at an earlier stage than that mentioned above (p. 26). Gregory (*Chron. Arab.* ed. Salihani p. 196) in fact places it before the

negotiations of the patricians with Leo.

<sup>2</sup> This is perhaps a reference to the storm which according to Theoph. AM 6210, Nikeph. p. 55 attacked the Arabs on their retreat.

Ibn Wadh. (J.H.S. xviii. 195).  
Cf. Al Wak. ap. Al Tab.  
Al Mad. ap. Al Tab.

after the trick that had been played upon him was that his brother Solomon, when he sent him to Kustantiniyya, told him to remain before it until he took it or an order from him came to him. And he had continued besieging the Romans for a winter<sup>1</sup> and a summer, and he sowed in their land; and, when the second winter came upon him,<sup>2</sup> it was one of intense cold.<sup>3</sup> And before this trick Maslama had been superior in force to the Romans and had broken their spirits, and above all things they were <in despair><sup>4</sup> when they saw the corn stored up in his camp like mountains, and the men eating of what they had carried off in plundering raids, and the seed that they had sown. And Leo, when he advised Maslama to burn the corn, had added in a sentence of his speech, "And allow the people of Al Kustantiniyya to convey a small quantity of the corn into the city, in order that they may see your good intentions towards them." And he allowed them to take one or two boats full in an hour. And Leo seized this opportunity, and in part of a day conveyed away a large quantity of the corn;<sup>5</sup> and the hearts of the Romans were encouraged by the corn that they had with them and the burning of most of the corn of the Moslems.

Al Wak. ap. Al Tab.  
Al Mad. ap. Al Tab.

And the winter came upon them; and, when the winter came, Maslama gave orders to his followers, and they made houses of wood and dug caves. And Leo applied himself to fight Maslama, and the victory was gained by this artifice which could not have been played upon women,<sup>6</sup> and the Moslems remained with a scanty stock of provisions, while the Romans gained enough to keep them for a long time. And the Moslems met with hardships such as no one had ever met with before, till a man was afraid to go out of his camp alone; and the Moslems ate draught-animals and skins and the trunks and roots and leaves of trees.<sup>7</sup>

Al Mad. ap. Al Tab.

While this was going on, Solomon, the son of 'Abd Al Malikh, remained in Dabik, unable to help them with any provisions by reason of the severity of the cold and the snow. And, as for Leo, he secretly sent a man to Bidus,

<sup>1</sup> The first winter (716-7) according to Theoph. (AM 6208) was spent in Asia 'κατελθὼν εἰς Ἀσίαν ἐκεῖ παρεχέμασεν.' Cf. AM 6209 'Μασαλμῦς δὲ χειμάσας ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ ἐξεδέχετο τὰς τοῦ Λέοντος ὑποσχέσεις.' Theoph. nowhere states what these 'ὑποσχέσεις' were, and the Arabic narratives therefore form a useful supplement.

<sup>2</sup> Gregory (*Chron. Arab.* p. 197) makes the siege last 30 months, while the Spanish Chronicle of 741 (Mommisen, *Chron. Min.* vol. 2, p. 355) makes it last two years. Such differences may be due to varying interpretations of the term 'siege.'

<sup>3</sup> 'χειμῶνος δὲ γενομένου βαρυτάτου ἐν τῇ Θράκῃ' Theoph. AM 6209; cf. Nikeph. p. 53.

<sup>4</sup> The text is here corrupt: I adopt de Goeje's second suggestion and insert this verb.

<sup>5</sup> Al Madaini (ap. Al Tab., see below) places this after Leo's accession; and that this was the

original account appears from the fact that the narrative there goes straight on, 'This was done in the night, and in the morning Leo fought. The same words occur in our author, but with a sentence taken from Al Wakidi in between, and the literal meaning of the verb, 'to do a thing in the morning,' is therefore lost. Gregory (*Chron. Arab.* pp. 196, 197) makes Leo induce Maslama to absent himself for a time and relax the siege on the understanding that he would surrender the city. He then gets himself made Emperor and carries off the corn during Maslama's absence.

<sup>6</sup> There is some corruption in this sentence, but the meaning is clear.

<sup>7</sup> Mich. (fol. 265 r) 'they ate dead bodies and dung.' Chron. of 846 'they ate the flesh and the dung of their draught-animals.' Chron. of 775 'their cattle and horses.'

who killed him,<sup>1</sup> and he sent Bastas to the city of Salaf<sup>2</sup> (Thessalonike ?) and made him a deacon<sup>3</sup> there; and he remained in the kingdom alone without a competitor. And he pressed the Moslems hard in war, until they were reduced to great difficulties; and, when any draught-animals died, they bought them for money through hunger and distress,<sup>4</sup> until it drove them to the extreme limit of distress.

And it happened that at this time Solomon, the son of 'Abd Al Malikh died at Dabik, and 'Umar, the son of 'Abd Al 'Aziz, succeeded to the government. And, as soon as 'Umar succeeded to the government, he sent orders to Maslama by the governor of Malatya (Melitene) to return:<sup>5</sup> and he sent them clothes and provisions and horses, with which he<sup>6</sup> went to meet them; and he gave orders to the messenger that, if Maslama made any delay about this, he was to make proclamation for return among the men. And, when the messenger arrived, Maslama put him off and said, 'Wait for me a few days, and I am on the point of taking it.' And he said, 'No, by God not an hour.'<sup>7</sup> And Maslama set forth, and they were met by the horses and the clothes and the provisions. And Maslama returned, and the men were in very evil plight.

Al Tab.  
(*J. H. S.* xviii.  
196).

#### AL TABARI.

And Mahomet, the son of 'Umar,<sup>8</sup> records that Thur, the son of Yazid informed him on the authority of Solomon, the son of Moses: he said: When Maslama approached Kustantiniyya, he ordered every horseman to carry on his horse's hind-quarters two muds<sup>9</sup> of corn until he had brought it to Al Kustantiniyya. And he gave orders as to the corn, and it was thrown into a certain place like mountains. Then he said to the Moslems, 'Do not eat any of it; go into their country and sow.' And he made houses of wood and wintered there. And the men sowed, and that corn remained in the open with no cover to it; and the men ate of what they carried off in plundering

P. 23, l. 25.

P. 28, l. 18.

P. 28, l. 8.

<sup>1</sup> This is perhaps a confusion with Anastasius, who was beheaded after a rebellion in 719 (Theoph. AM 6211; Nikeph. p. 55).

<sup>2</sup> We should perhaps, as de Goeje suggests, read 'Salunik,' which is not a great departure from the text. Anastasius was banished to Thessalonike by Theodosius (Theoph. AM 6207; Nikeph. p. 52).

<sup>3</sup> 'τὸ μοναδικὸν περιβάλετο σχῆμα' Theoph. l.c.; cf. Nikeph. p. 51.

<sup>4</sup> 'λίμου τε μεγάλου γεγονότος ἐν τοῖς Ἀραβῶν πάντα τὰ ἀποθνήσκοντα ζῶα αὐτῶν κατῆσθιον ἵππους τε καὶ ὄνους καὶ καμήλους.' Theoph. AM 6209.

<sup>5</sup> So Theoph. (AM 6210) 'Οὐμαρος δὲ κρατήσας τῶν Ἀράβων ἐπέτρεψεν ἀνακάμψαι τὸν Μασαλμάν.' This is however quite inconsistent with Theophanes' own chronology, for he makes the siege last from Aug. 15, 717 to Aug. 15, 718 and places the death of Solomon on Oct. 8, 717. Nikephoros also makes the siege

end on Aug. 15, 718 (p. 55), but states that it lasted 13 months (p. 53), and therefore supposed it to have begun in Jul. 717.

<sup>6</sup> The subject of this and the following sentence must be not the Caliph but the governor.

<sup>7</sup> According to Mich. (fol. 265 r; cf. Greg. p. 117) 'Umar sent to ask for news of the army, and Maslama falsely answered that he was on the point of taking the city. 'Umar however heard the truth from the messengers and sent an order to Maslama to return, and, if he did not obey, the messengers were to order the troops to return.

<sup>8</sup> Al Wakidi b. 747 d. 822. For the beginning of his narrative see *J. H. S.* xviii. p. 195 l. 18. The narrative here given follows upon the introductory sentence of Al Tab. in *J. H. S.* xviii. p. 195 l. 24-28.

<sup>9</sup> The 'mud' is variously reckoned as 1½ pints and 2 pints.

raids, and afterwards they ate of what was sown.<sup>1</sup> And Maslama remained at Al Kustantiniyya, overcoming its inhabitants, and with him as chiefs of the men of Al Sham were Khalid, the son of Ma'dan, and 'Abd Allah, the son of Abu Zakhariyya, the Khaza'i, and Mugahid, the son of Gabr, until the news of Solomon's death reached him. And some one has said :

'They carry their muds, and the muds of Maslama.'<sup>2</sup>

I was informed by Ahmad, the son of Zuhair, on the authority of 'Ali, the son of Mahomet :<sup>3</sup> he said : When Solomon assumed the government, he made a raid upon the Romans ; and he encamped at Dabik and sent Maslama in front, and the Romans were afraid of him. And Leo came forth from Arminiya, and he said to Maslama, 'Send me a man to talk with me.' And he sent Ibn Hubaira. And Ibn Hubaira said to him, 'What kind of man do you reckon the most foolish among you ?'<sup>4</sup> He said, 'A man who fills his belly with anything he can find.' And Ibn Hubaira said to him, 'We are religious men, and it is part of our religion to obey our commanders.' He said, 'You speak the truth. We and you are fighting for religion and are angry for its sake ; and to-day indeed we shall fight for victory and the kingdom. We will give you a denarius for each man.'<sup>5</sup> And Ibn Hubaira returned to the Romans on the next day and said, 'He refuses to agree. I went to him when he had had his breakfast and filled his belly and gone to sleep and woken up, and phlegm had possession of him, and he did not understand what I said.'

And the patricians said to Leo, 'If you deliver us from Maslama, we will make you king' : and they made a covenant with him. And he came to Maslama and said, 'The people know that you will not make serious war upon them but will delay action against them, as long as the corn lasts with you ; but, if you burn the corn, they will submit.' And he burned it ; and the enemy took courage, and the Moslems were reduced to distress until they nearly perished. And they remained in this condition until Solomon died.

He said : And Solomon, the son of 'Abd Al Malikh, when he encamped at Dabik, had made a vow to God that he would not return until the army which he had sent to the country of the Romans entered Al Kustantiniyya.

He said : And the king of the Romans died, and Leo came to him and told him, and undertook to deliver the land of the Romans into his hands.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Mahomet the Khuwarizmi (circ. 833) ap. El. Nis. (*Abh. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 8, 3, p. 122) 'The Arabs sowed fields and reaped them and ate of what they had sown.'

<sup>2</sup> For the conclusion of Al Wakidi's narrative see *J.H.S.* xviii. p. 196 l. 6-15.

<sup>3</sup> Al Madaini b. 753 d. circ. 840.

<sup>4</sup> This conversation is unintelligible as it stands, and is clearly an unreasoning summary of a longer account, perhaps the same as that from which the author of the *Khitab* got his narrative of the conversation between Ibn Hubaira and Tessarakontapechys.

<sup>5</sup> Here again the abrupt transition cannot

have been in the original narrative.

<sup>6</sup> This, though also quoted from Al Madaini, is clearly a different account altogether from the preceding. There is a somewhat similar story in Mich. fol. 264 v, Greg. p. 116, where it is stated that the Caliph Solomon encamped at Chalkedon with 12,000 men, and Leo, hearing that Theodosius had arrested some of his followers, came to him, whereupon Solomon gave him 6,000 men and sent him to Amorion. The origin of this story is probably Leo's visit to the general Solomon before Amorion (Theoph. AM 6208).



And he sent Maslama with him until he encamped at it;<sup>1</sup> and he collected all the corn round about it and besieged the inhabitants. And Leo came to them, and they made him king; and he wrote to Maslama, telling him what had happened and asking him to allow enough corn to be brought in to enable the people to subsist, and to make them believe that he and Maslama were at one, and that they were secure from captivity and removal from their country, and to grant them a night to carry off the corn. And Leo had prepared boats and men; and he gave him permission, and nothing remained in those enclosures except a quantity not worth mentioning. It was carried away during the night, and in the morning Leo fought; and he had tricked him by a trick with which a woman would not have been deceived. And that happened to the force which never happened to any other army, until a man was afraid to go out of the camp alone. And they ate draught-animals and skins and the trunks and leaves of trees and everything except dust. And Solomon remained at Dabik and took up winter-quarters; and he was not able to help them till Solomon died.

E. W. BROOKS.

#### ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO *J.H.S.* VOL. XVIII. Pp. 182-208.

P. 183, l. 20 ff. The defective portion of Al Tabari extends only from AH 32 to AH 40. The notices given under the years 20, 28, and 32 might therefore have been quoted from Al Tabari. The variations in his text are too slight to be worth recording; but it should be mentioned that for the notices of 28 and 32 the authority of Al Wakidi is quoted. Instead of the notice given under 25 he has merely, 'And in this year was the capture of the fortresses, and their commander was Mu'awiya the son of Abu Sufyan.' The two following notices should be added.

AH 22 (Nov. 30, 642-Nov. 18, 643).

And Al Wakidi thinks that Mu'awiya made a summer-raid this year and entered the territory of the Romans with 10,000 Moslems.

23 (Nov. 19, 643-Nov. 6, 644).

And this year Mu'awiya made a summer-raid and reached 'Ammuriya; and with him of the companions of the Apostle of God (God be gracious and merciful to him) were 'Ubada the son of Al Samit, and Abu Ayyub Khalid the son of Zaid, and Abu Dhar, and Shaddad the son of Aus.

P. 188, l. 8 from bottom. The reference (<sup>3</sup>) should be three lines higher.

P. 190, l. 3. Burg Al Shahm (Tower of fatness), which is probably identical with Marg Al Shahm<sup>2</sup> (Meadow-land of fatness) is mentioned by Ibn Khurdadhbeh (ed. de Goeje, p. 108) as situated in the theme of the Anatolikoi.<sup>3</sup> Jaubert in his translation of Al Idrisi (vol. ii. p. 305) identifies it with Germa.

<sup>1</sup> This must mean 'at Constantinople,' though the name has not previously been mentioned.

<sup>2</sup> In the previous article I wrote 'Shacham.' The second vowel is wrong. As to the middle consonant, it is better, if possible, to distin-

guish between the soft and hard aspirates, but, as the use of 'ch' for the latter is apt to be misunderstood, I now write 'shahm.'

<sup>3</sup> Ibn Khurdadhbeh wrote about 850: see de Goeje's Introduction.