

## *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,<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> while he was making preparations

<sup>1</sup> *Izvestiia russkago arkeologicheskago 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.

<sup>2</sup> Krum's death is placed by Šafarik 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 *Bovvds Néorros*, 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 Genesisios (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* (81) without any indication of date beyond the reign of Leo V: τὰς τριακοντούτας σπονδὰς τοῖς Οὔνοις δὴ τοῦτοις τοῖς καλουμένοις Βουλγάροις ἐνωμότως ποιῶν καὶ εἰρηνικὰς συμβάσεις καταπραττόμενος. It is also mentioned by Genesisios (41) in a more valuable passage, which records that when Omurtag heard how Michael II was besieged by Thomas the Slavonian, he διαπρεσβεύεται πρὸς βασιλέα καὶ συμμαχεῖν αἰτεῖται αὐτῷ· αἱ γὰρ ὑπὸ Λέοντος τοῦ βασιλέως πρὸς αὐτοὺς τριακοντούταις σπονδαὶ ἤδη τὴν πρώτην δεκαετηρίδα συνεπλήρουν σχεδόν. A corresponding notice also occurs in the *Continuation* (65), not derived directly from Genesisios, but depending on a common source: ὁ γὰρ Μορτάγων . . . καὶ τὰς πρὸς αὐτὸν δὲ τριακοντούταις σπονδὰς γεγενημένας παρὰ τοῦ προκατασχόντος Λέοντος ἐπιβεβαιῶσαι . . . ζητῶν. The chronological indication of Genesisios, that the first decad 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 αὐτόν), and historians have generally accepted the statement. The variant of Genesisios (πρὸς αὐτούς) 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,<sup>3</sup> 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

<sup>3</sup> Tsok (Τζόκος), 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 Achrída (Migne, P.G. 126, 192), and *Cont. Theoph.* (217) represent Omurtag as immediately following Krum.





μεταξύ (why not μέσον here?) The omission of the last two letters of Ἑλλήνων is a third improbability. But the reconstruction is decisively negated by the stop after B, which shows that we have to do with a numeral, evidently marking article no. 2. Hence we get μέσον τῶν, between these points (τῶν for αὐτῶν, cf. Chatalar inscription τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ<sup>5</sup>). This shows that -του at the beginning of the line is the termination of a local name, and that εἰων is probably part of καστέ(λ)ιν. Προβάτου κάστρον suggests itself, mentioned in the Shumla inscription of Malomir,<sup>6</sup> 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 ἀπολείψειν (απολιψιν) sc. ἐσπείσαντο (οἱ Γραικοί).

l. 5. There is a trace before Π, which suggests A, so that we may read τὰ. Uspenski reads εἰς. It is somewhat unexpected to find γε in a text of this kind. Ἀγαθονίκης Jireček, Ἀγαθοπόλεως, Uspenski.

l. 6. I conjecture [S TA ONTA EΠI or IC. Uspenski gives [καὶ εἰς τὸ.

l. 7. [περὶ δὲ τ—ῶ]ν Uspenski. We have here evidently a third article dealing with the Slavs, and I read [γ' . περὶ προσφύγῃ]ν.

l. 8. ὑπὸ τῶν Βου[λγάρων κα-θ]ῶς Uspenski. I conjecture either εἰς τὰ ὄρη] ῶς or εἰς ΑἼμον] ῶς. εἰς ΑἼμον would be written ICEMON.

l. 9. Uspenski rightly explains ἐφθάτισαν as = ἐφθάσθησαν. He reads ὄρμη in the sense of hostile movement, and seems to understand 'as they were caught when the invasion took place.' I adopt with hesitation ὀροθεσία (which he notices as admissible), because O seems to be indicated on the stone, not M. ῶς ἐφθάτισαν means 'as they already were,' namely ὑπὸ τῶν Βουλγάρων.

l. 10. τῷ βασιλεῖ εἰς παράλιον Uspenski.

l. 11. ἐπιστρεύσει for ἐπιστρέψει. Uspenski reads ἡ [ἀποδώσει ἀντ]ὶ 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. χρ. belong to a new article. If ἵνα were likely in a local sense, we might conjecture η[ἵνα] ἴσαν = ἵνα ἦσαν 'to their districts,' but I regard this as improbable. ἡ [ἐκδώσει 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.

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

<sup>5</sup> Aboba, 545.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.* 233.

ΣΦΑΛΕΟΝ above. καὶ κρ[ατηθέντων, referring to the κρατηθέντων ἔσωθεν τῶν κάστρων mentioned below, might also be thought of.

l. 13. τρομαρχῶν = τουρμαρχῶν. I insert δώσει (δοσι) after κομήτων. Uspenski reads β. νο, but the sum may have been less or more. τοῦ δὲ πτω]χοῦ Uspenski. καὶ πτω]χοῦ is also possible.

l. 14. βούπλια is a new form. Uspenski may be right in explaining it as oxen (comparing βουπαλίων ζεῦγος in *Bull. de Corr. hell.* vi. 127 n. 4). He takes the symbol ∴ to mean χιλιάδας, and reads [δώσει ἐκ τῶν εὐρ]ηθέντων, 'he will give 2000 oxen of those found in the fortresses.' Does this mean as an additional payment for the captives? I read κρατ]ηθέντων, referring it to persons found in fortresses deserted by the imperial commanders and detained by the Bulgarians; they are to be ransomed by a number of βούπλια.

l. 15. ἐξα[χθῶσιω εἰς κώ]μας Uspenski.

#### TRANSLATION.

[The sublime Khan Omurtag<sup>7</sup> (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 Constantia 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 ἕως γέγονεν ἡ ὄροθεσία,<sup>8</sup> which must refer to

<sup>7</sup> Κάνας ὕβρηγῃ Ὀμουρτάγ, probably followed by something like ἐπέσειεν ἱρίων καὶ σπονδὰς μετὰ τοὺς Γρεκοὺς. Cf. the Shumla inscription (discussed below), l. 3.

<sup>8</sup> This unclassical syntax, for ἕως ἄν 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 [ἐκ or ἀπὸ Δεβελ]τοῦ. Π[. . .]ελιν was probably the name of a fort in Mount Haemus, somewhere north of Philippopolis. Π[ροβάτου καστ]ῆ(λ)λιν, 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 fosse which the Bulgarians constructed against the Empire, and of which the ruined remains are known as the Erkesiia? This Great Fence (ἡ μεγάλη σούδα),<sup>9</sup> as the Greeks called it, ran from the neighbourhood of Develtos (Vespasian'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).<sup>10</sup> 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,<sup>11</sup> and to the ninth century.<sup>12</sup> 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<sup>13</sup> was near the junction of the Arzus with the Hebrus, not far from the railway station of Trnovo-Seimen.<sup>14</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> Cedrenus, ii. 372.

<sup>10</sup> See Škorpil, in Aboba, c. xx. 538 *sqq.* The eastern section is also described by Jireček, *Das Fürstenthum Bulgarien*, 505 *sq.* (1891); cf. also *Arch.-ep. Mittheilungen*, x. 137.

<sup>11</sup> 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.

<sup>12</sup> By Zlatarski, Škorpil, and Jireček respectively.

<sup>13</sup> George Acropol. p. 127.

<sup>14</sup> Aboba, p. 223. Jireček identified Makrolivada with Uzundzhova, *Arch.-epigr. Mittheilungen*, xix. 245.

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 Hadrianople, 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 *ὁροθεσία*. 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<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup>

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-

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

<sup>16</sup> 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 ὄρη* or *εἰς Αἶμον* or something of the kind after *ὑπὸ τῶν Βου[λγάρων]*. An alternative might be to read *ὑπὸ τῶν βου[ρῶν]* . . . , 'under the hills,' 'in the hill country'; but it appears to me that *ὑπὸ τῶν Βου[λγάρων]* cannot be dispensed with in view of the following *ὡς ἐφθάστισαν*. 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 *ὄρμη* 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 Tyrnovo 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.<sup>17</sup>

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

<sup>17</sup> 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 'Βαλδίμερ'<sup>18</sup> 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 837-8. 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 *motif* 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 (*ἐρήμωσαν*), 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. *ἐρήμωσαν* 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 *ἐρήμωσαν* to refer to this desertion, the mention of Krum in l. 1 receives an explanation.<sup>19</sup>

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

Ἵμ]βρεντὰ γὰρ ἅπαντα καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ Α . . .  
[εἰ]ρήνην τε π(οιή)σας καὶ καλ(ὰ) ἕξ(η)σε μ(ε)τὰ τοὺς Γ[ρ](α)[κοὺς].

<sup>18</sup> 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, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, 493-5, but not, in my opinion, satisfactorily, though he is right in reading βούλγαροι for βουλγαριαν in *Cont. Georg.* 818, l. 15.

<sup>19</sup> Uspenski reads . . . ἔτους ἔρχ(ων) ὁ Κροῦμος ὁ πάππ(ος) μου με[γ]ας. This will not do; ἔρχων must have the article.  $\tau$  which he takes to be for ἔτους is doubtless

$\Gamma$ , so that we can restore ὁ μ[ε]γ(ας) ἔρχ(ων) ὁ Κροῦμος ὁ πάππ(ος) μου με[τ]ήγαγεν . . . In l. 4 ἐρήμωσα[ν] may have been followed by something like τὰ πέραν Ἰστροῦ καὶ ἦλθεν] ὁ Μαλαμήρ.

The audacious conjecture Ὀμβρεντάγ (Uspenski says that *ρενταγ* is unquestionably on the stone; it is far from clear in the facsimile) is supposed to be a form of Ὀμουρτάγ, and he compares Ὀμβρίταγος in Theophylaktos of Achrida. But such a corruption in an official document is inconceivable; Ὀμουρτάγ 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).<sup>20</sup> We can in fact restore with certainty *καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἀρχ(ων) Ὀμουρτάγ . .* What *ρενταγατουτα* 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 *ἔζησε*, 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.<sup>21</sup> The best-preserved bit of the text is l. 5, *εων καὶ Βουλγάρων Β κεφάλειον*, where Uspenski's restoration Ῥωμῆων is virtually certain: this shows that we have to do with an agreement between the Empire and Bulgaria. In l. 6 we have, as I would read, *καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν ἀρχοντ[α (τῶν ἀρχόντ[ων, Uspenski)*, that is, the Bulgarian khan; in l. 7 *ἵνα διαμεινουσιν οὕτως*; in l. 8 *τὸν βασιλέαν : μιτ.*<sup>22</sup> The last line has the mark . . followed by the tops of four letters, which seem to be σ or ε, τ, ου, and ου. This points to *ἔτου(s)*,<sup>23</sup> and, if so, the date was here, and the text of the agreement ended in l. 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 Genesisios, cited at the beginning of this paper, suggests that such a confirmation may have been considered desirable. Or else, the text represents a provisional

<sup>20</sup> 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.*

<sup>21</sup> Aboba, 228.

<sup>22</sup> τὸν βασιλέα (ὄμσμα?) Usp. Perhaps however we have the form *βασιλέαν*, which occurs in the Leipzig MS. of the De Cerimoniis, see I, 38 p. 194, l. 10. *μιτ* may be *μή τ[*. It is impossible to make anything of the first lines of the inscription: in l. 2 perhaps [<sup>Ε</sup>]βρον.

<sup>23</sup> In the inscription preserved in the Sophia Museum, we find *ἐτ[ου] for ἐτους* before the Annus Mundi: Aboba, 227.

agreement, concluded in 814 by Leo V with Krum's successor, and previous to the Thirty Years' treaty.<sup>24</sup> It is vexatious that a little more of the last line has not escaped destruction. If the first three letters represent, as I think, ἔτους(s), 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 οὐρζεμ. 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,<sup>1</sup> '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,<sup>2</sup> '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

<sup>24</sup> The inscription which is dated A.M. 6328 = A.D. 819-20 (published in *Arch.-epigr. Mitth.* xix. 244, and in Aboba, 226) contains apparently the personal name Τζυκος, which suggests Τζόκος, 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 [σπαρτηγ]ος δ Τζυκος . . . [συρθ]κας are useless.

<sup>1</sup> *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 156.

<sup>2</sup> *History of the Art of War*, p. 70.