



An Edict of the Emperor Justinian II, September, 688

A. Vasiliev

Speculum, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Jan., 1943), 1-13.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0038-7134%28194301%2918%3A1%3C1%3AAEOTEJ%3E2.0.CO%3B2-9>

Speculum is currently published by Medieval Academy of America.

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

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

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

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

SPECULUM

A JOURNAL OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

VOL. XVIII

JANUARY, 1943

No. 1

AN EDICT OF THE EMPEROR JUSTINIAN II, SEPTEMBER, 688

By A. VASILIEV

In the winter of 1940–41 Professor Charles Edson of the University of Wisconsin, who had spent two years in Macedonia collecting inscriptions, gave me for study and publication an extremely interesting Greek inscription from Thessalonica dealing with events of the seventh century A.D.¹ Professor Edson is chiefly interested in the period generally called that of Ancient History, and he attributes the inscription to be discussed here to too late a date to be studied by himself. Accordingly he was kind enough to hand it over to me, and I ask him to accept here my sincere thanks for this generous gesture of scholarly comradeship.

The inscription refers to the time of the reign of the Byzantine Emperor Justinian II Rhinotmetus (685–695; 705–711) and deals with his policy towards the Slavs in the Balkan Peninsula. It is dated September, 688.

For many years it has been known that the city of Thessalonica possessed a great number of inscriptions. In 1777 a French abbot, Belley, in his study on the history and monuments of the city of Thessalonica, wrote: 'There exist a great number of inscriptions, although a multitude of them were thrown into the sea, in order to prevent the fleet of the Saracens from landing at the city, which they sacked at the beginning of the tenth century. Within the walls of the city itself

¹ Professor Edson has provided me with the following statement: In June 1936 the Prussian Academy of Sciences commissioned me to undertake the preparation of IG x, Fascicule 1, the ancient Greek inscriptions of Macedonia. At that time the Academy through Professor Günther Klaffenbach very courteously placed at my disposal all printed and manuscript material in its possession pertaining to the Macedonian inscriptions. Included in these papers was a manuscript entitled 'Inscripfen hauptsächlich aus Thessalonike abgeschrieben von Purgold K.' Purgold had visited Saloniki in the spring of 1885, and his manuscript contains corrected copies of previously known inscriptions as well as a number of unpublished texts. Among Purgold's unpublished inscriptions was an excellent drawing of a considerable Byzantine document (*Addenda* 17 in Purgold's manuscript), a grant made by an Emperor Justinian to the church of Saint Demetrius in Thessalonica. The importance of this document was apparent. It was equally apparent that it should be edited by a Byzantinist and not by a classical historian. Therefore in the fall of 1938 I wrote to Professor Klaffenbach to call his attention to the existence of this drawing and suggested that the drawing either be returned to Berlin or that the edition of it be entrusted to Professor Vasiliev of the University of Wisconsin. In his reply of February 2nd 1939 to this letter Professor Klaffenbach stated, '... wir könnten uns nur freuen, wenn Herr Prof. Vasiliev sich der publikation der Inschrift annehmen will. Also machen Sie ihm bitte diesen Vorschlag und sagen Sie ihm, dass er über Purgold's Manuscript frei verfügen könnte.'—Charles Edson.

are to be found many (inscriptions), most of which are sepulchral or mutilated.¹

The first vague reference to this particular inscription appeared in 1886. In this year a Greek scholar, M. Dimitsas (Μ. Δήμιτσας) who was passing through Thessalonica, learned that two large inscribed stones had been dug out and transferred into a room in an official building. Dimitsas writes: 'Being introduced by the then Metropolitan into the room, which had always been locked, I was sorry to see, instead of the two stones, twenty or thirty pieces of them; because, instead of digging out the two stones intact, barbarous workers mercilessly broke them to pieces.'² In vain Dimitsas tried to put the pieces together and copy the inscriptions. Finally he succeeded in copying the text of the two larger pieces, which, however, had neither beginning nor end. From the words preserved Dimitsas concluded that the first inscription was an expression of gratitude on the part of a certain archbishop of Thessalonica, possibly, according to Dimitsas' conjecture, Kentimanos (Κεντιμανοῦ) by name. The second inscription dealt with a salina (περὶ ἀλικῆς). I shall discuss the meaning of this word later at length. The inscription mentioned a salina without naming the 'emperor.' Because of this anonymity, Dimitsas was unable to determine the epoch to which the inscription belonged.³ This is the earliest known mention of our inscription. A later and better copy has now enabled us to identify the name of the Emperor Justinian.

In 1887 an English scholar, D. G. Hogarth, visited Thessalonica and published some inscriptions with the following explanation, 'The appended inscriptions are the outcome of a short visit to Salonica in April 1887.' The great majority of them are sepulchral and of a commonplace order. Hogarth indicated only three non-sepulchral inscriptions: (1) a mere fragment containing apparently a portion of an Imperial letter to the Thessalonians; (2) a dedication from the city to the Emperor Claudius; and (3) another fragment, a public document of the time of Antoninus Pius.⁴ There is no definite mention of our inscription.

A new step forward in the study of our inscription was made by a Greek scholar, P. N. Papageorgiou, who in 1900 published a booklet of twelve pages, entitled in French 'Un édit de l'empereur Justinian II en faveur de la basilique de Saint Démétrius à Salonique . . . (avec un fac-simile), Leipzig, 1900, Teubner.' Papageorgiou succeeded in deciphering on the two inscribed stones mentioned above the name of the emperor: Justinian II (685–695, 705–711). Three years after this booklet came out, a Greek writer, S. Dragoumes (Στέφανος Δραγούμης), informed Papageorgiou by letter that he had again put together the two stones, reread them, and made his own restorations. Papageorgiou welcomed the result of this work and in 1908 republished the text of the inscription in its revised form and

¹ M. l'abbé Belley, 'Observations sur l'histoire et sur les 121 monuments de la ville Thessalonique,' *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres*, xxxviii (1777), section historique, 132. This study has been reprinted by T. L. F. Tafel in the appendix to his book, *De Thessalonica ejusque agro Dissertatio Geographica* (Berlin, 1839), pp. 321–349; the passage quoted above, p. 334. Belley refers to the famous sack of Thessalonica by the Arabs in 904.

² Δήμιτσα Μαργαρίτου 'Ἡ Μακεδονία ἐν λίθοις φθεγγόμενοις καὶ μνημείοις σωζόμενοις ἤτοι πνευματικὴ καὶ ἀρχαιολογικὴ παράστασις τῆς Μακεδονίας, I (Athens, 1896), 520.

³ Δήμιτσας, *op. cit.*, 520–521.

⁴ D. G. Hogarth, 'Inscriptions from Salonica,' *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, viii (1887), 356.

supplied it with a commentary written in Greek.¹ A small piece of inscribed stone had been discovered in August 1907 in the excavations of the northern courtyard of the Kasimiè mosque, which is the former temple of St Demetrius, and this Papageorgiou rightly acknowledged as a part of our inscription. In the same study he pointed out many blunders Dimitsas had made in reading and interpreting the inscription. In spite of many restorations which Papageorgiou made in the text, a number of important lacunae still remained. But the general meaning of the inscription had become clear: The Emperor Justinian granted to the Church of St Demetrius in Thessalonica in gratitude for aid given by the champion of the city, a salina, whose profits should be used for ever by the church to satisfy its needs. Papageorgiou explains why he concluded that the emperor mentioned was Justinian II. The troops of Justinian I under the famous leader Belisarius also fought against barbarian invasions of the Balkan Peninsula, so that he also might have had reason to thank the patron of Thessalonica. But in the inscription occur the words 'since we have come to this city of Thessalonica' (ll. 5-6), and 'in this city of Thessalonica' (l. 9), which indicate that the edict was not sent from Constantinople, and that the Emperor who issued it was personally in Thessalonica. We are very well informed about the victorious campaign of Justinian II against the Macedonian Slavs, during which in 688 he advanced as far as the walls of Thessalonica. So far as we know, Justinian I never visited Thessalonica, so that the inscription does not refer to him. In his study Papageorgiou gives evidence from various writers and travellers as to the existence of salinas and bodies of bitter (salty) water in Macedonia, not far from Thessalonica; and he conjectures that one of those salinas, located in Kitros or Kitron (*ἐν Κίτρον*)² is most probably the one Justinian II granted to the Church of St Demetrius (p. 359). At the end of the paragraph Papageorgiou devotes a few words to the small piece of inscribed stone discovered in 1907, which undoubtedly belongs to our inscription but unfortunately contains only a few incomplete words; the most important word is ἀ[νανεώ]σασθαι, *i.e.*, 'to repair, to restore.' To sum up, the most important result of Papageorgiou's two publications is the name of the Emperor Justinian and its correct attribution to Justinian II.

In 1903 in his *Classification of a Body of Greek Charters of the Middle Ages and Recent Times*, a German scholar, Paul Marc, mentions two fragments: one comes from an inscription containing a portion of an edict of Justinian II in favor of the Church of St Demetrius, and the other deals with the grant of a salina to the same church; in the latter case Marc refers to Papageorgiou's French booklet published in 1900.³ In 1908 K. Brandi, on the basis of Papageorgiou's publication just quoted, also indicates a privilege granted to the Church of St Demetrius at Thessalonica by an edict of the Emperor Justinian II.⁴ I am rather surprised that

¹ Πέτρον Ν. Παπαγεωργίου, *Μνημεία τῆς ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ Λατρείας τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου*, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LVII (1908), 354-360.

² On Kitros see below.

³ Paul Marc, *Plan eines Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit* (Munich, 1903), p. 96.

⁴ K. Brandi, 'Der byzantinische Kaiserbrief aus St Denis und die Schrift der frühmittelalterlichen Kanzleien,' *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, I (Leipzig, 1908), 27, no. 39.

in his special monograph on the history of Thessalonica, published in 1919, Tafrahi does not refer to our inscription when he tells the story of Justinian's campaign against the Slavs in 688; in his bibliography he mentions Papageorgiou's publication of 1908.¹ In 1924, in his *Body of Greek Sources of the Middle Ages and Recent Times*, Franz Dölger, under *ca* 688, mentions the edict in favor of the Church of St Demetrius in Thessalonica, referring to Papageorgiou's 1900 edition. It is rather strange that he does not quote the later and better edition of the inscription published by the same scholar in 1908.² In 1939 a Greek Historian, K. J. Amantos, in his description of Justinian's campaign against the Slavs, which took place "perhaps in 688," refers to Papageorgiou's 1900 edition and says that the inscription deals with the gratitude and gifts of the Emperor Justinian to St Demetrius.³

In 1940 Professor Charles Edson gave me some new and important material connected with the inscription, a note from the papers of the German philologist Purgold, and a drawing of the inscription in its reconstructed shape which was supplemented with an excellent photograph made at Madison, Wisconsin. In his unpublished note (ex schedis Purgoldianis, Addenda 17), Purgold says that the inscription was discovered in the summer of 1885 under the floor of the present mosque which formerly was the Church of St Demetrius,⁴ and gives a description of the material at his disposal. The stone was a large sheet of beautiful coarse-grained marble, about three centimeters thick, four meters long, and 1.20 meters wide. Purgold put together more than seventy fragments. Two little pieces only could not be fitted into their appropriate places; one of them is broken off all around, the other on the lower edge. But on the latter under the last cursive line the word 'donajmus' can be clearly read. The height of the letters is quite consistently throughout between 5 and 6 centimeters; the first lines are somewhat closer together than the rest. The mistake on line 7 *παραρατων* may be best explained by the difficult and hurried conditions of Purgold's work; the inserted letter "C" towards the end of line 15 is merely a mistake in the impression. On the basis of this material Purgold made a new impression from which a copy of the inscription was prepared and later photographed. I use his text here.

Since Purgold was unable to find and insert in their proper places all the bits of marble which belonged to the inscription, his text of sixteen lines has several lacunae. And I must admit that I have been unable to restore all of them. Two lacunae of a few words in lines 1 and 2 are easily restored. The lines from 3 to 8 inclusive have no lacunae. Then lacunae appear again in line 9. Most of them, in

¹ O. Tafrahi, *Thessalonique des origines au XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1919), pp. 136-137; see bibliography, p. xv. Both of Papageorgiou's publications (1900 and 1908) are mentioned by Tafrahi in the bibliography to his *Topographie de Thessalonique* (Paris, 1913). p. X.

² Franz Dölger, *Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit*. Reihe A: Regesten. Abteilung 1: Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches. 1 Teil: Regesten von 565-1025 (Munich and Berlin, 1924), p. 32, no. 258.

³ K. J. "Αμαντος, *Ιστορία του βυζαντινού κράτους*, 1, 395-867 A.D. (Athens, 1939), 335. Amantos does not mention Papageorgiou's edition of 1908.

⁴ According to Purgold, in his time the inscription was to be found in the Konak, *i.e.*, the residence of the Turkish governor in Thessalonica.

lines 9, 10, 11, 12, and 14, in my opinion can be satisfactorily restored; in some places the text of the first eight lines helps us to restore lacunae, for we notice a repetition in phraseology. The longest lacunae, which I cannot satisfactorily restore, are to be found in lines 11, 12, and 14. But fortunately those lines are of secondary importance for the interpretation of the text, and they do not prevent us from understanding its most essential parts and setting a just value on its significance.

I give the Greek text of the inscription in its new form.

Lines

- 1 + *θεία δωρεὰ φιλοτιμηθεῖσα τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ πανενδόξῳ μάρτυρι δημητρίῳ παρὰ τοῦ τῆς ὄλης οἰκουμένης δεσπότηου φλαυίου Ιουστινιανοῦ τοῦ θεοστεφοῦς καὶ εἰρηνοποιοῦ βασιλ[έως τ]ῆς ἀλικῆς τῆς θεοφυλάκτου ἡμῶν +*
- 2 *πόλεως θεσσαλονίκης ἐπὶ πέτρου τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου αὐτῆς ἀρχιεπισκόπου (ornament c. 12 letters). + ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου καὶ δεσπότηου ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν αὐ[τοκράτωρ] εὐεργέτης εἰρηνικὸς φλάυιος*
- 3 *Ιουστινιανὸς πιστὸς ἐν ἰησοῦ χριστῷ τῷ θεῷ βασιλεὺς δωρεὰ τῷ σεπτῷ ναῶ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ ἐνδόξου μεγαλομάρτυρος δημητρίου ἐν ᾧ τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ κατάκειται λειψ[ανον] πρώτην¹ φροντίδα διὰ παντός*
- 4 *κεκτημένοι περὶ τῆς συστάσεως² τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπ' αὐταῖς ταῦτα προΐεναι βουλόμεθα ὅσα πρὸς παραμυθείαν αὐτῶν καὶ συστατικὴν τυγχάνουσι πρόνοϊαν· ἐντεῦθεν γὰρ (c. 4 letters scroll)*
- 5 *πεπίσμεθα³ καὶ τὸν στέφαντα ἡμᾶς θεὸν εὐερεστούμενον ὑπερασπιστὴν ἀεὶ γίνεσθαι τῆς ἡμῶν εὐσεβείας· καὶ τὰς κατεκορων⁴ δαψιλῶς ἡμῖν ἐπιχωρηγεῖν νίκας· ἐπεὶ οὖν παραγεναμένον*
- 6 *ἡμῶν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ θεσσαλονικέων πόλει μετὰ τὴν τοῦ στέφαντος ἡμᾶς θεοῦ ὑπέρμαχον βοήθειαν· πεῖραν σύμμαχον εἰληφότων ἡμῶν τοῦ ἁγίου μεγαλομάρτυρος*
- 7 *δημητρίου ἐν τοῖς παρ' ἡμῶν πραχθεῖσιν παρὰ τῶν⁵ αὐτοῦ τε καὶ ἡμῶν πολεμίων διαφόροις πολέμοις· δικαίον εἶναι κρίναντες ὡς συμμαχῆσαντα ἡμῖν τοῖς τῆς*
- 8 *εὐχαριστίας νῦν ἀνταμείψασθαι αὐτὸν δώροις· donamus τῷ σεπτῷ αὐτοῦ ναῶ· ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ ἀπόκειται λείψανον ἐμφανῶς τοῖς ἀποῦσιν τὴν οἰκίαν*
- 9 *βοήθειαν χαριζόμενος πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλικὴν τὴν οὔσαν καὶ προσπ[αρ]⁶ακειμένην ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ θεσσαλονικέων μεγαλοπόλει μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀνηκόντων αὐτῇ*
- 10 *ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς δικαίων· ἐπὶ τὸ ἔχεσθαι τὸν αὐτὸν σεβάσμιον αὐτοῦ [ναὸν τ]ῆς αὐτῆς ἀλικῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σεπτεμβρίου μηνὸς τῆς ἐνεστώσης δευτέρας ἐπιανεμήσεως καὶ εἰς τοὺς*
- 11 *ἐξεῖς⁷ ἅπαντας καὶ διηνεκεῖς χρόνους κυριεῦν τε αὐτῆς καὶ δε[σποδεῖν] καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτὴν εἰς οἰκεῖον ἀποφέρεσθαι κέρδος ὀνόματι φωταγωγίας καὶ διαρίων⁸ (ca. 5 letters scroll)*

¹ On the original marble plate of the inscription the letter ω is a little mutilated.

² συστάσεως and in the same line συστατικὴν.

³ πεπίσμεθα.

⁴ I believe this mutilated word is the adverb κατακόρως, 'to satiety,' 'abundantly,' from the adjective κατάκορος or κατακορήs. Possibly also κατά κόρον?

⁵ In Purgold's impression by mistake παραρατων. See above.

⁶ In the photograph the first letter which has been preserved only in its upper part and which I have restored as α looks rather as if it should be ε or ο.

⁷ ἐξῆς.

⁸ διάριον is the Latin word *diarium*, 'day's allowance.'

6 *An Edict of the Emperor Justinian II, September, 688*

- 12 τοῦ θεοφιλοῦς κλήρου καὶ πάσης ἱερατικῆς ὑπουργίας ἔτι δὲ κ[αὶ ὀνόματι¹ ἀνανε]
ώσεως τοῦ εἰρημένου σεπτοῦ ναοῦ μὴ ὀφείλοντος τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐνδόξου ναοῦ ἡγουν
τοῦ κατα . . .²
- 13 θεοφιλοῦς κλήρου καθ' οἷον δῆποτε τρόπον παρέχειν ἢ ἐπινοισθα[³ παρέχειν⁴
λυσιτέ] λειαν⁵ ἔνεκεν τῆς παρὰ τῆς ἡμῶν γαληνότητος δεδωρημένης ἀλικῆς τῶ
οἷω δῆποτε (c. 4 letters scroll) =
- 14 στρατιωτικῶν προσώπων διὰ τὸ ὡς εἴρηται ὑπὲρ τε φωταγ[ωγίας καὶ διαρίων⁶ τ]
οῦ θεοφιλοῦς κλήρου καὶ λοιπῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς χρείας φιλοτιμηθῆναι αὐτῶ
παρ' ἡμῶν
- 15 τὴν τοιαύτην ἅπασαν παντελευθέραν ἀλικὴν [ἐπὶ τὸ ἔχουσθαι⁷ ἀδιαλ] εἰπτως
λειτουργοῦμενον τὸν ἅγιον μεγαλομάρτυρα δημήτριον πρεσβεύειν διὰ παντὸς
- 16 τῶ στέφαντι ἡμᾶς θεῶ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμῶν εὐσεβοῦς βα[σιλείας . . . ca 15–18 letters
missing] λειξει⁸ καὶ μόνον τῆς παρούσης ἡμῶν εὐσεβοῦς δωρεᾶς (portion of
scroll).

TRANSLATION OF THE INSCRIPTION

- 1 Divine gift granted to the holy and all-glorious martyr Demetrius by the Lord of the whole universe, Flavius Justinianus, the God-crowned and peace-maker Emperor, of the salina of our God-guarded
- 2 city of Thessalonica, at the time of Peter, its holiest archbishop ✠ In the name of the Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour, the autocrat peaceable benefactor, Flavius
- 3 Justinianus, the faithful Emperor in Jesus Christ the Lord: gift to the holy church of the saint and glorious great martyr Demetrius, in which reposes his holy relic. Always having eager thought
- 4 concerning the support of the holy churches of God, we wish to grant them that which contributes to their consolation and effective maintenance. Therefore
- 5 we are convinced that God who has crowned us is always the benevolent champion of our piety and most abundantly grants victories to us. Thus, since we have come
- 6 to this city of Thessalonica, according to the powerful aid of God who has crowned us; since we have obtained the helpful support of the holy great martyr
- 7 Demetrius, in various wars which we had made against his and our own enemies, we, having thought that it would be just to recompense
- 8–9 him now as our ally, who manifestly gives his particular aid to those who are even out of the city, by gifts of gratitude, grant to his holy church in which reposes his holy relic, the whole salina lying near by in this great city of the Thessalonians with all

¹ I have restored this lacuna with the word *ὀνόματι* in accordance with the last words of line 11 *ὀνόματι φωταγωγίας καὶ διαρίων*.

² At this point the marble plate is broken off; after *κατα* there is space for two or three letters. So far I am unable to restore the missing word. It might be better to discard it entirely.

³ *ἐπινοεῖσθαι*.

⁴ This restoration is tentative.

⁵ The upper part of the letter preserved on the marble plate just before *λειαν* may be *c* or *ε*. I have restored the letter *ε* and the word *λυσιτέλειαν* which in my opinion well fits the meaning of 'using' or 'exploiting' the salina.

⁶ This restoration has been made according to the two last words of line 11.

⁷ This restoration has been made according to line 10.

⁸ I am almost certain of the first three letters, whose upper part only is preserved; the letter before *ε* may be *λ*, *α*, or *δ*.

- 10 rights which have been connected with it from the beginning, in order that this holy church shall be possessor of that salina, beginning with the month of September of the current
- 11 second indiction, and its lord and master for all following and everlasting years; and that all this (salina) shall be taken (by the church) for its own profit, for the purpose of illumination and daily sustenance of
- 12 the God-loved clergy and for all (other) needs of the clergy;¹ as well as for the purpose of the restoration of the said holy church. This glorious church, that is to say . . .
- 13-14 the God-loved clergy must not, by any means, give or intend (to give) to any military person whatsoever the right of using the salina which has been granted by our serenity; because as has been said, this whole free salina has been granted by us to it (to the church) for the purpose of illumination (and daily sustenance) of the God-loved clergy as well as for other
- 15 ecclesiastical needs, in order that the holy great martyr Demetrius being unintermittingly worshipped may always intercede
- 16 for our pious Empire with God who has crowned us . . . only of this our pious gift.

This inscription is a very important document for the history of Justinian II Rhinotmetus, during the first period of his reign (685-695).² He faced three enemies of the Empire at that time: the Arabs, the Bulgarians, and the Slavs. With the Arabs he came to an agreement at the very beginning of his reign so that for the time being he had nothing to fear from the East and could concentrate his chief attention on the Balkan Peninsula. There in the second half of the seventh century, probably in the seventies, the Bulgarian Kingdom was established along the shore of the lower Danube. At that time the Bulgarians, who were a people of Hunnic (Turkish) origin, had not yet been slavonized. Justinian was successful in his war with the Bulgarians. But in the second half of the seventh century the most crucial problem for the Empire in the Balkan Peninsula was the mass advance of the Slavs. About this time the establishment of the Slavs in the Balkans was an accomplished fact. The political, economic, and cultural center of the Peninsula, Thessalonica, was surrounded by Slavonic tribes who taxed all their energy to conquer the city, which for protection against their attacks, relied upon its strong walls and, according to local tradition, on the miraculous intercession of its particular champion, Saint Demetrius. The Slavs already possessed a fleet at the beginning of the seventh century, and in their vessels they descended to the Aegean Sea. In 623 they raided Crete and other islands, reached the Hellespont and the Sea of Marmora, and intercepted Byzantine vessels providing the capital with food. Their final objective was not only to raid and pillage Thessalonica, but to establish themselves permanently in this prosperous maritime city — the second city in the Empire after Constantinople. The attitude of the Slavs in the Balkans, a Roumanian historian writes, 'became very alarming even for the general security of the Empire.'³

¹ I translate here the words *πάσης ιερατικής ύπουργίας*. Cf. line 14: *λοιπής ἐκκλησιαστικῆς χρείας*.

² In 695 he was dethroned, mutilated and exiled to the Crimean city of Cherson; in 705 he succeeded in regaining the throne.

³ O. Tafrafi, *Thessalonique des origines au XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1919), p. 137.

In 688 Justinian in his victorious campaign against 'Sclavinia,' *i.e.*, the Macedonian Slavs, reached Thessalonica, made a triumphal entrance into the city,¹ and transplanted 30,000 captives, out of many taken, to Bithynia in Asia Minor, where they formed, according to our sources, 'a supernumerary corps' (*περιούσιος λαός*) and later betrayed the Empire by going over to the Arabs.² Justinian's victorious campaign of 688 was a decisive moment in the history of Slavo-Thessalonican relations; after that time Thessalonica was no longer harassed or raided by the neighboring Slavs.³ Let us not forget that in connection with the events of the seventh century in general and probably Justinian's expedition of 688 in particular, we are dealing with the evangelization of the Balkan Slavs. The Slavs whom Justinian transplanted to Asia Minor in 688 were already Christians, and a bishopric was established for them in Asia Minor.⁴

Our inscription is very interesting as regards Justinian's activities against the Balkan Slavs. First it gives the exact fact of the Emperor's entry into Thessalonica after his smashing victory over the Slavs, and its date as well. In lines 5-6 we read: 'Since we have come to this city of Thessalonica,' and, according to line 10, the salina was granted to the Church of St Demetrius 'beginning with the month of September of the current second indiction,' *i.e.*, in September, 688. In other words Justinian was in Thessalonica at that time; he might have reached the city in August of the same year. His aim was to express his gratitude to St Demetrius, who had miraculously helped him in his victorious campaigns against the Bulgarians and Slavs. Neither one of these two peoples is mentioned in the inscription. But line 7 deals with 'various wars which we had made against his (*i.e.*, Saint Demetrius) and our own enemies,' and line 5 contains the words that God 'most abundantly grants victories to us.' I lay stress upon the plural of the words *wars*, *enemies*, and *victories*. Of course the most important enemies of St Demetrius were the Slavs surrounding Thessalonica. At the end of the sixth century, 'the flower of the Slavonic nation,'⁵ which at that time was subject to the Avars, laid their first siege to Thessalonica, and then besieged St Demetrius'

¹ *Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*, publiée sous la direction de A. Fliche et V. Martin. 5. *Grégoire le Grand, les Etats barbares et la conquête arabe (590-757)*, par L. Bréhier et René Aigrain (Paris, 1938), 201 (Bréhier).

² Theophanes, ed. de Boor, I, 364. *Anastasioi Chronographia Tripartita*, ed. de Boor, II, 231. *Nicephori Ἱστορία σύντομος*, ed. de Boor, p. 36. Leo Grammaticus, ed. Bonn, p. 163. Cedrenus, I, 771-772 (=Theophanes.) Zonaras *Epit.* XIV, 22, 9 (ed. Bonn, III, 229). Ephraemius, *Chronicon*, ed. Bonn, p. 69, v. 1472-77. The most valuable source for the Slavonic attacks on Thessalonica is the *Acta Sancti Demetrii*. But unfortunately their information breaks off in the forties of the seventh century, so that it cannot be used for the year of our inscription, 688. Lamanski writes that the total number of Slavs transplanted by Justinian II to Bithynia, including women and children, was not less than 80,000. V. Lamanski, *The Slavs in Asia Minor, Africa, and Spain* (St Petersburg, 1859), pp. 3, 16 (in Russian).

³ See T. L. F. Tafel, *De Thessalonica ejusque agro dissertatio geographica* (Berlin, 1839), p. civ. Tafali, *Thessalonique des origines au XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1919), p. 137.

⁴ See F. Dvorník, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IX^e siècle* (Paris, 1926), pp. 102-103, 235. *Histoire de l'Eglise . . .* par A. Fliche et V. Martin, 5 (Paris, 1938), p. 150 (Bréhier).

⁵ S. *Demetrii Miracula*. Migne, *Patr. gr.*, CXXVI, 1277, ch. 99: τοῦ τῶν Σκλαβίνων ἔθνους τὸ ἐπιλεκτὸν ἄνθος, ὡς εἶρηται . . .

metropolis, during the first half of the seventh century, five times. Only Justinian's victories put an end to this long-standing peril. But a new Bulgarian Kingdom became also a new and dangerous foe for the Empire in the north. Thus the words *enemies* and *victories* which are used in our inscription in the plural indicate not only Slavs but Bulgarians as well, who at that time, as I have pointed out above, were not yet slavonized.

Justinian expressed his gratitude to St Demetrius by granting the famous church of the champion of Thessalonica, where his relic was preserved, a salina, all the profit of which was to be at its full disposal (see lines 1, 9, 10, 13, 15). The date of the grant is indicated in the inscription, September, 688 (l. 10). Where was this salina located? Papageorgiou, who in 1908 used a very defective copy of our inscription, thought that it referred to a salt pit and wrote some two pages on salinas and lakes of bitter water, where 'fishes cannot live,' in Macedonia. He was inclined to believe that most probably the salina which Justinian granted to the Church of St Demetrius was to be identified with that located at Kitros.¹ But Kitros or Kitron (Κίτρος, Κίτρον) which has sometimes been identified with the ancient Euboean colony, Pydna, on the west side of the Thermaic Bay,² was too far away from Thessalonica. The better text of the inscription which we are using now plainly shows that the salina was located in the city itself. We read: 'the salina of our God-guarded city of Thessalonica' (ll. 1-2); 'the whole salina lying near by (the church) in this great city of Thessalonians' (l. 9) (πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλικὴν τὴν οὔσαν καὶ προσπ[αρ]ακειμένην ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ Θεσσαλονικέων μεγαλοπόλει).³ Justinian granted the salina to the Church of St Demetrius for ever, 'for all following and everlasting years' (l. 11), as its exclusive property which was exempted by the Emperor from any previous obligations (παντελευθέραν, l. 15). In order to stress once more the exclusive right of the Church to exploit the salina, the Imperial edict makes a very interesting statement that the clergy of the Church, that is, the new possessor of the salina, is entitled to yield no right of using it to "any military person whatsoever" (τῷ οἳω δῆποτε στρατιωτικῷ προσώπῳ, ll. 13-14). In his edict Justinian plainly expresses the purpose of his grant: the entire profit from the salina was to provide for the expenses of the illumination of the church, the daily sustenance of its clergy, necessary upkeep of the building, and all other needs of the clergy.

A Greek inscription which has usually been attributed to the reign of Justinian the Great (527-565) would be reconsidered in connection with the Balkan policy of Justinian II.⁴ It may be translated as follows: 'Oh great martyr Demetrius! Intercede with God that He may help me, Thy faithful servant, the earthly Emperor of the Romans, Justinian, to vanquish my enemies and subjugate them

¹ Π. Ν. Παπαγεωργίου, *Μνημεῖα τῆς ἐν Θεσσαλονικῇ λατρείας τοῦ ἁγίου Δημητρίου*, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xvii (1908), 358-359.

² Some suppose that Kitros rose upon the decay of Pydna and another Euboean colony, Methone, and lies between them.

³ Cf. Papageorgiou's text which in these lines is extremely defective, although the word ἀλικὴν is reproduced. *Byz. Zeitschrift*, xvii (1908), 355.

⁴ *Corpus inscriptionum graecarum*, ed. E. Curtius et A. Kirchoff, iv (Berlin, 1877), no. 8642 (p. 300).

beneath my foot.¹ It is true that in the sixth century the Slavs, Huns, and Antes were already raiding the Balkan Peninsula and had reached the shores of the Ionian and Aegean Seas. In 552 the Slavs and Antes menaced Thessalonica, and Justinian was forced to send his best generals, including the veteran Belisarius, to conduct the struggle against the northern barbarians. But of course the Slavonic danger in the sixth century was in no way comparable with that in the seventh century, when the Slavs several times laid actual siege to Thessalonica. If I am not mistaken, Justinian I, as I have mentioned above, never led a personal campaign in the Balkans.² A plea to St Demetrius for help such as we read in our inscription would be totally out of character for Justinian the Great but entirely consistent for Justinian II, who personally commanded the campaign against the Slavs and triumphantly entered Thessalonica. I am certain that the inscription under review must be attributed to the seventh century and chronologically must precede our edict of September, 688.³

Let us now examine specifically the meaning of ἀλική, the salina granted by Justinian to the Church of St Demetrius.

Generally speaking, the Greek word ἀλική, in Latin, *salina*, has three meanings: (1) salt tax, the ἀλική, that is the ἀλική ὠνή; (2) salt works, salt pit, salt pan, where salt was manufactured; and (3) salt shop, salt store. It is evident that our inscription does not deal specifically with the salt tax.⁴ Papageorgiou, as we have pointed out above, was inclined to consider the ἀλική of the inscription a salt lake; in other words he accepted the second meaning of the word ἀλική. I myself would prefer to interpret ἀλική as a salt shop or, with still more probability, a salt store which was operated by the government.

In this respect the most important indication in our inscription is in l. 9 where we read that the salina was located in the city itself. It is impossible to imagine that this could be the case with a salt pit or salt lake, which Papageorgiou tried to locate, as we have seen above, on the west side of the Thermaic Bay. In my opinion the salina has to do with the question of various monopolies which existed in the Byzantine Empire. The late Professor James Westfall Thompson wrote that in Byzantium in the fifth and sixth centuries A.D. the great state monopolies were the mines, quarries, *salt pits*, mints, and factories for making arms, military equipment, and clothing for the soldiers.⁵ No doubt this statement is too sweeping

¹ ὦ μεγαλομάργυς Δημήτριε, μείτειςσον πρὸς θεὸν ἵνα τῷ πιστῷ σου δοῦλω τῷ ἐπιγείῳ βασιλεῖ Ῥωμαίων Ἰουστινιανῷ δόλη μου νικῆσαι τοὺς ἐχθροὺς μου καὶ τοὺτους ὑποτάξαι ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας μου.

² Ch. Diehl, *Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au VI^e siècle* (Paris, 1901), pp. 219–220. Tafrali, *Thessalonique des origines aux XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1919), p. 98 and n. 2. Ch. Diehl et G. Marçais, *Le monde oriental de 395 à 1081* (Paris, 1936), p. 72. M. V. Levchenko, 'Byzantium and the Slavs in the sixth and seventh centuries,' *Reporter of Ancient History (Vestnik Drevnei Istorii)*, no. 4 (5) [Leningrad, 1938], pp. 36–40 (in Russian).

³ The same opinion has been recently expressed by a Greek historian, K. 'I. Ἀμαντος, *Ἱστορία τοῦ βυζαντινοῦ κράτους*, I, 395–867 A.D. (Athens, 1939), p. 334, n. 3.

⁴ Unless the adjective παντελευθέρων (ἀλικήν, l. 15) implies that as one of the privileges of a government store, the salina granted to the Church of St Demetrius was exempted from paying salt tax.

⁵ J. W. Thompson, *An Economic and Social History of the Middle Ages* (New York, London, 1928), p. 168.

to be exactly accepted. In 1934 the famous Greek scholar A. M. Andréadès added to the list the monopolies of grain and silk, stating that Thompson's information was not exact and must be accepted with due reservations. Andreades wrote that mines, quarries, and salt pits were not real state monopolies but rights of the crown.¹ This juridical controversy, however, is of secondary value for our purpose.

From ancient times, after Alexander's death, salt was considered by governments as a most essential factor in the economic structure of various countries, and salt production and its selling were monopolized by the state. The salt monopoly was strict and complete in Ptolemaic Egypt. It was continued on the Ptolemaic pattern in the Empire of the Seleucids, and existed in Macedonia in the Kingdom of Lysimachus. Salt which was obtained from sea-water, salt lakes, and salt mines was sold to the public by the government through special licensed traders who leased from the government the right of dealing in salt and were responsible to it. This custom continued to exist in the Roman period also, all over the Empire. Private dealers sold salt at retail at a price fixed by the government. But there were some privileged institutions such as army, church, and bureaucracy. They were permitted in the Ptolemaic period to purchase salt in large quantities directly from the government at a reduced price, that is below that set for the market. From our very scanty information it is possible to conclude that the army enjoyed the same privilege in Roman times also.² Our information on the exploitation of the natural resources of the Roman Empire, apart from agriculture, however, is very scanty, and according to the greatest living authority on Ancient History, very little is known of the organization of the extraction of salt.³

About 398 A.D. the Emperors Arcadius and Honorius issued an edict to the prefect of the city, Lampadius,⁴ which made *mancipes salinarum* the privileged dealer in salt in Rome. In the edict we read: 'If any one without the intervention of one of the *mancipes*, i.e., managers of salinas, purchases salt or tries to sell it, the salt itself together with its price shall be given over to the *mancipes*.⁵ These

¹ See A. Andréadès, *Byzance, Paradis du monopole et du privilège, Byzantion*, ix (1934), 176-177. This article has now been reprinted, A. M. Andreades †, *Έργα εκδιδόμενα υπό της Νομικής Σχολής του πανεπιστημίου 'Αθηνών επιμελεία Κ. Χ. Βαρβαρέσου, Γ. Α. Πετροπούλου, Ι. Δ. Πίντου. Ι. Έλληνική οίκονομία και δημοσιονομική ιστορία* (Athens, 1938), pp. 599-607. See also A. J. Sbarounis, *André M. Andréadès, fondateur de la science des finances en Grèce* (Paris, 1936), p. 154.

² See S. L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian* (Princeton, 1938), pp. 183-184. F. M. Heichelheim, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Altertums vom Paläolithikum bis zur Völkerwanderung der Germanen, Slaven und Araber*, I (Leiden, 1938), 655, 663, 664. M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, I (Oxford, 1941), 309, 330; on salt tax, p. 470.

³ M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1926), p. 294 (chapter VII on the period of the Flavians and the Antonines.)

⁴ The year 398 for the edict is given by Steinwenter in his article *Manceps* in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, coll. 995-997. But other scholars assign other dates. F. Kniep, *Societas Publicanorum* (Jena, 1896) pp. 79, 82, says that this edict was issued between 397 and 399. Otto Seeck, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476 n. Chr.* (Stuttgart, 1919), p. 114, writes that the prefect of the city, Lampadius, to whom the edict was addressed, occupied his office between 403 and 406.

⁵ *Cod. Just.*, iv, 61, 11: 'Si quis sine persona mancipum — id est salinarum conductorum — sales

mancipes, however, were in no way free farmers of the monopoly; they belonged to a guild and sold salt in their shops at a fixed profit.¹ Of course as members of a guild they worked under the strict supervision of the state authorities. The ties which connected craftsmen, merchants, and dealers with their respective guilds were very strong. It was not easy to be allowed to work for one's personal benefit without belonging to one or another guild.

It may not be entirely irrelevant to say here a few words on a recently published papyrus attributed by scholars to almost exactly our epoch, i.e., to the sixth or seventh century A.D. It is a contract with oil dealers. The date of the papyrus is only given by the year of the indiction; but on paleographical grounds it can be placed at the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century. Unfortunately the provenance of the text cannot be determined owing to the loss of the upper part of the first line. However in spite of the careless style of the contract, its general meaning is clear. A certain Allonius, an oil producer, who has hitherto been working for the guild, now proposes to work for himself; he therefore agrees to pay the guild as compensation for the loss of his services 300 myriads silver per month. This probably means for permission to cancel his contract with the guild and work 'on his own.' In addition he agrees to pay 250 myriads silver per annum for *τελώνιον*, the tax payable by the guild for all those inscribed 'in its books.' In spite of the projected cancellation of his connection with the guild, Allonius was to continue to pay some quota of the tax.² Evidently he hoped to make so much profit that it would pay him to be free of the guild even after these payments.³ This papyrus has no direct relation to our subject, but it belongs, as I have noted above, almost exactly to our period, and deals with a

emerit vendereve temptaverit, sive propria audacia sive nostro munitus oraculo, sales, ipsi una cum eorum pretio mancibus addicantur.' Probably the words 'id est salinarum conductorum' are a later interpolation, because many interpolations in Justinian's *Digest*, for instance, begin with 'id est, or 'hoc est.' S. Eisele, 'Beiträge zur Erkenntniss der Digesteninterpolationen,' Zweiter Beitrag, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, XI (XXIV), Romanische Abtheilung (1890), 4. F. Kniep follows him in *Societas Publicanorum* (Jena, 1896), pp. 82-83. See also M. Rostowzew, 'Geschichte der Staatspacht in der römischen Kaiserzeit bis Diokletian,' *Philologus*, Supplementband IX (1904), 413.

¹ See Steinwenter, article *Manceps* in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, coll. 995-997. Blumner, art. *Salina*, *ibidem*, coll. 2098-2099. F. Heichelheim, art. *Monopole*, *ibidem*, col. 198-199; M. Besnier, art. *Sal*, in Daremberg et Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, IV, 1012. M. Rostowzew, 'Geschichte der Staatspacht in der römischen Kaiserzeit bis Diokletian,' *Philologus*, Supplementband IX (1904), 413. *Mancipes salinarum* were at the same time *mancipes thermarum*; in other words, their duty was also to supply the public baths with wood for heating. On the *mancipes* as members of the guild see *Cod. Theodos.*, XI, 20, 3; XIV, 5, 1. Symmachi *Epistolae*, IX, 103; IX, 105; his *Relationes*, 44. Q. Aurelii Symmachi quae supersunt, ed. Otto Seeck, *Mon. Germ. Hist. Auctorum antiquissimorum* tom. VI pars prior (Berlin, 1883), pp. 263-264, 314-315. See Kniep, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-82. See also Gothofredus' article on *Mancipatus*, *Codex Theodosianus cum perpetuis commentariis Jacobi Gotophredi*, Ed. nova, V (Mantua, 1748), 166-168. A. Stöckle, 'Spätromische und byzantinische Zünfte' (Leipzig, 1911), p. 47 (*Klio*, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte, IX-es Beiheft).

² I am not certain of this interpretation.

³ E. P. Wegener, 'Four papyri of the Bodleian Library,' *Mnemosyne*, Tertia series, III (Leyden, 1935-1936), 238-240 (no. IV).

government monopoly. It shows that at that period a member of a guild at a very high price could obtain permission to quit it and work for himself.

Let us return to our inscription. In my opinion Justinian II granted one of these privileged salt shops or storehouses of salt operated by the government to the Church of St Demetrius as its exclusive property, free of any obligations towards the government, all its profit to be at the complete disposal of the Church. Apparently the profit to be gained by its clergy was very considerable and could satisfy all essential needs listed above. I am rather inclined to believe that the grant was a storehouse operated by the government which might easily have existed in such a large and important city as Thessalonica, the second city after Constantinople. Such stores, of course, were located not only in the capital of the Empire but also in other important centers. If this is so, the mention in lines 13-14 of 'any military person whatsoever' (τῶ οἴῳ δῆποτε στρατιωτικῶ προσώπῳ) who was not to be permitted to use the storehouse, is easily explained. As we have pointed out above, in Ptolemaic Egypt and in Roman times privileged bodies existed who were allowed to purchase salt from government stores at a reduced price; the army was one of these. It is quite possible that this military privilege had survived from previous times and was still in force in the seventh century A.D. Justinian II exempted the store from the burden of selling salt to military men at a reduced price, and thus increased the profit which the clergy of the Church would derive from the grant.

In my opinion the importance of our inscription consists of three main points: (1) As has been pointed out above, it gives the exact date of Justinian's sojourn in Thessalonica and of the issue of the edict itself, September 688. (2) It gives an entirely new name for the archbishop of Thessalonica, Peter, who thus in 688 was the spiritual head of this famous city.¹ According to our usual information, which is in this respect very scanty, in 649 Paul was archbishop of Thessalonica; there are also two very tentative indications that about 680 John was archbishop and about 690 Sergius.² Now on the basis of our inscription we have a positive indication that in September 688 the spiritual head of Thessalonica was another man, the archbishop Peter. (3) It indicates that a government salt store was located in Thessalonica, and permits us to conclude that in the seventh century salt stores were operated by the government probably on the same pattern as in Hellenistic and Roman times.

MADISON, WISCONSIN.

¹ In 1896 M. Dimitzas — I do not clearly understand for what reason — assumed that the name he discovered in the first inscription which he regarded as not a part, but an independent inscription, was the name of the archbishop of Thessalonica, 'either Kentimanos (Κεντιμανός), according to his assumption, or a man of another name' (εἶτε καὶ ἄλλως καλουμένου). *Μ. Δήμιτσα, Μακεδονία*, I (Athens, 1896), 521.

² See L. Petit, 'Les évêques de Thessalonique,' *Echos d'Orient*, v (1901-1902), 213-214. Tafrahi, *Thessalonique des origines au XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1919), pp. 270-272. J. Laurent, 'Sur la date des Eglises St Démétrius et Ste Sophie à Thessalonique,' *Byz. Zeitschrift*, iv (1895), 425. On Sergius see also V. Rose, *Leben des heiligen David von Thessalonika* (Berlin, 1887), §20, p. 14.