



Списание ЕПОХИ
Издание на Историческия факултет на
ВТУ „Св. св. Кирил и Методий“
Journal EPOCHI [EPOCHS]
Edition of the Department of History of
“St. Cyril and St. Methodius” University of Veliko Tarnovo



Том / Volume XXVII (2019).
Книжка / Issue 2

A GLIMPSE AT THE FATE OF THE BYZANTINE PRISONERS OF WAR IN BULGARIA DURING THE PERIOD FROM 976 TO 1018

Yanko M. HRISTOV

Abstract: There is no doubt that the highly dynamic and prolonged military clash between Byzantium and the Bulgarian Tzardom from the 70s of the tenth century until the end of the second decade of the eleventh century attracts and will continue to attract the attention of scientists. In this regard, despite the abundance of publications, when it comes to the fate of Byzantine war captives – direct participants in the battles, there seems to be something to add. Even within the limited frames of an article, it is possible to emphasize on an essential feature. It is related to the fact that, when it comes to the Byzantine prisoners of war (regular warriors as well as commanders of all ranks), Tzar Samuel and his successors followed the experience gained in the previous centuries in Early Medieval Bulgaria.

Key words: Byzantium, Bulgaria, Prisoners of War, Captivity, Imprisonment, Integration.

The great war between the Byzantine Empire and the early medieval Bulgarian Tzardom, which continued from the 70s of the 10th century until the end of the second decade of the 11th century and led to the fall of the Bulgarian lands under Byzantine rule, inevitably poses an issue about the fate of the prisoners of war between the two fighting sides¹. Indisputably one of the most familiar moments concerning the captured fighters is related to the Bulgarian warriors caught up by the Byzantines after the Battle of Kleidion (July 29, 1014)². But for the entire period of more than 40 years of struggles Bulgarians are far from being the only ones who had the misfortune to fall into the hands of the enemy. The bitterness of captivity has been repeatedly tested by various imperial warriors of every rank – the immediate participants in the battles. Attempts to trace the fate of Byzantines captives in Bulgaria in the last quarter of the 10th – the beginning of the 11th century are, for understandable reasons, directly dependent on the data in the written monuments of the epoch. A significant share of the information (not rarely only fragmentary) about what happened in the Byzantino-Bulgarian war of 971–1018 was scattered in texts that were the result of the creative activity of Byzantine authors from the end of the 10th – 12th century. As a source of information, these narratives are supplemented by Armenian, Latin and Arabic texts, which contain many important pieces of information. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that all variety of the scattered notices in the historical sources related to the war-events are far from a strict, chronologically consistent, eventually continuous, correct and profoundly compacted narrative. Before directed

¹ At the end of the first and the dawn of the second millennium, the challenges associated with enemy fighters captured on the battlefield are far from new to the Bulgarian political elite and even less to the ruling circles in the Empire. [Toynbee, A. J. 1973a, pp. 377–393; Patoura, S. 1994; Симеонова, Л. 1996, с. 29–43; Simeonova, L. 1998, pp. 75–104; Kolia-Dermizaki, A. 2000, pp. 583–620; Ramadān, A. 2009, pp. 155–194, Hristov, Y. 2015, pp. 73–105; Lykaki, M. 2016].

² The battle (and what happened after it) provokes a considerable research interest. Its review within a single article is virtually impossible. However, there is a certain disparity and disagreements among the scientists about Tzar Samuel's warriors that were made blind, concerning the possible exaggerations of the number of mutilated people, and even about the general essence of the information pertaining to the victims of these atrocities [Златарски, В. 1927, с. 732–742; Whittow, M. 1996, pp. 387–388; Stephenson, P. 2003, pp. 2–6, 33–34, 62–81 ssq.; Holmes, C. 2012, pp. 85–95; Томов, Т. 2015, с. 142–169; Schreiner, P. 2015, pp. 170–190; Филипчук, А. М. 2016, с. 330–333].

towards the topical information on the fate of the imperial subjects – prisoners of war in Bulgaria, the above-mentioned prevalence of Byzantine works and the influence of the Greek vocabulary necessitates another very important clarification. It is related to the fact that the collective *αἰχμάλωτοι* (*captives*) refers to both the warriors that fall into captivity, and the non-combatants – abducted in the course of the military actions. Such a peculiarity does not directly correspond to the modern perceptions of prisoners of war and their clear distinction from civilians not included in any form of armed resistance³. This, of course, does not mean that there is no distinction between the captured imperial soldiers and the abducted population from the regions within the reach of the Bulgarian detachments, in the course of larger campaigns or in raids in enemy territory. At the same time, despite the fact that in the present attempt to outline what is happening with the Byzantine warriors, captured by Bulgarians, is used the term *prisoners of war* (according to the narrower contemporary perception), it is considered that they are not a homogeneous mass at all either.

The available records about the prolonged series of clashes in Byzantino-Bulgarian war of 971–1018 create a feeling that the majority of the military activities were out of the areas where the main battles between the armies of the Bulgarian rulers and the Byzantine emperors happened earlier for the time since the 8th – the first decades of the 10th century. This was very much due to the ruin of the original early medieval Bulgarian state center between the ridge of Eastern Stara planina Mountain and the Lower Danube River in 968–971. The capital Preslav, Pliska, Dorostolon and their surrounding settlements suffered quite a lot in the time of Sviatoslav of Kiev's Balkan campaigns and were additionally looted, destroyed and eventually occupied by the troops of Emperor John I Tzimiskes (969–976) in the course of victorious Byzantine offensive against the Rus'. Despite all heavy blows, including deposition of the captured Bulgarian Tzar Boris II (969–971) in Constantinople, the Bulgarian state survived and relatively soon enough was reorganized in the western part of the Tzardom⁴. At least, in theory, the wider geographic scope of the conflict, its dynamics, the shifting of the border area, the notable exchange of victories and defeats on the battlefield as well as the deep raids makes the threat of falling into captivity very tangible and is capable of involving more direct participants in the whirlpool of events. Nonetheless, it is difficult to achieve a greater specificity in determining the number of imperial warriors captured by Bulgarians in the last quarter of the 10th – the beginning of the 11th century. Unfortunately, however, there seems to be a more limited way to trace the fate of the Byzantine prisoners of war due to the absence of notices of agreements on exchange of warriors and/or abducted population. In the interest of objectivity, it must be acknowledged that there is an attempt to explain this particularity. It is considered as a consequence of the reluctance of the authorities in Constantinople to follow a policy of exchanges, as the clashes with Bulgaria are seen as a good source of slaves [Rotman, Y. 2005, pp. 778–779; Rotman, Y. 2009, pp. 43–47]. The undoubted and accountable role of slaves, whether former prisoners of war or not, in the social picture and in the urban and rural economy of the Empire in the 7th – 11th century, adds additional grounds in favor of such allegations.⁵ The Byzantine poet John Geomether (second half of the 10th

³ Cf. *αἰχμᾶλωσία* – captivity; *αἰχμάλωτος* – taken by the spear (prisoner captured in military action, captured in combat); *αἰχμᾶλωτίζω* (*αἰχμᾶλωτεύω*) – to take prisoner/captive [Liddell, H. G., Scott, R. 1901, p. 43; Дворецкий, И. X. 1958, с. 58–59]. The examples are many. Among the most illustrative ones is the mentioned in the *Anonymous Book on Tactics* (*Ανωνύμου βιβλίον τακτικόν*), that sometimes the capture of entire families non-combatants is particularly useful when moving across enemy territory since the captured ones are interested in cooperating to ensure the freedom of their women and children [Dennis, T. 1985, pp. 290–293]. The very appearance of the term *prisoner of war* is much later. It was noticed in the first quarter of the 15th-century in French *prisonnier de guerre* and in Latin *prisionarius de guerra* during the Hundred Years' War (1337–1453). With the enclosed bibliography: Ambühl, R. 2013, p. 4–6; Crawford, E. 2010, pp. 48–55, 61–68.

⁴ Leo the Deacon, *History...*, pp. 128–131, 152–161, 177–201; Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum...*, pp. 276²³–277³⁷, 286^{48–55}, 287^{91–291}, 294^{98–310}; *Повесть временных лет...*, с. 78–88 (*Повесть временных лет по Лаврент. списку...*, с. 44–51); Cf. Franklin, S., Shepard, J. 1996, pp. 145–151; Божилков, И., Гюзелев, В. 1999, с. 308–318; Павлов, П. 2012, с. 53–83. For the differences in the provincial and military organization Nikolov, G. N. 2001, pp. 141–158; Николов, Г. Н. 2005, с. 123–166.

⁵ Cf. with the enclosed bibliography: Harvey, A. 1989, pp. 29–79; Lefort, J. 2002, pp. 231–310 (pp. 237–243, 279–284 in particular); Kaplan, M. 2009, pp. 143–167. The famous *Novela* of Emperor John I Tzimiskes for the *komerkion* on the captured slaves should not be disregarded either, indicating that the participants in the military campaigns (from the lowest ranks to the command staff) deal with the sale of prisoners of war and abducted civilians in the marketplaces and out of them, or send them into the bigger and smaller estates in the provinces. It must be acknowledged that there are conjectures according to which the

century), in one of his works dedicated to the certain stage of war between Bulgaria and Byzantium, writes: "...shall change your raiment, bring your necks under yoke, chain up your feet in shackles, and whip your backs and bellies over and over again..." [Lauxtermann, M. D. 2003, p. 201]. The quoted passage is from a poem composed in about 1000, it also expresses indignation at the fact that in Bulgaria, the ruler, instead of declaring obedience, carries a crown and insignia, which is related to Samuel's coronation as a Bulgarian Tzar of 997 [Lauxtermann, M. D. 1998, pp. 372–373]. A similar vocabulary is used not only by contemporaries in maligned and largely declarative tendentious works but also in those whose authors write with some chronological distance from the events [cf. for example Psellos, *Chronographie...*, 75–76; Attaliates, *Historia...*, 9_{16–22}; Zonaras, *Epitomae historiarum libri...*, 575_{9–15}, 598_{9–12}]. Yet, some important arrangements are needed, but for very important reasons. On the one hand, although the war of 971–1018 is fatal to the existence of the early medieval Bulgarian Tzardom, the non-rare survivors of the Byzantine armies that were destroyed on the battlefield are those who fall into Bulgarian captivity and not vice versa. On the other hand, some clues within the texts that came out from the creative efforts of Byzantine writers suggest that the old well-known practice of enslavement of captured imperial subjects exists in Samuel's Bulgaria, too. In his work, written around the end of the third quarter of the 11th century, the member of the local provincial aristocracy of mixed origin, Kekaumenos, telling about the capture of Larissa, noted: "...forced by unbearable famine, they surrendered to Samuel, and he enslaved each resident of Larissa except for the family of Nikulitza..." [Кекавмен, *Советы и рассказы...*, p. 268_{11–12}]. Besides Kekaumenos' intriguing remarks about the conquest of the key fortress, the information disseminated in various texts also echoes the Bulgarian successes in Central Greece and the raids around Thessaloniki. In the *Laudatio of St. Photios of Thessaly*, in a general phrase, besides slaughter and abduction, there is also mentioned enslavement: "... according to the law of captivity, which denies the tribal kinship and makes a kinsman go against a kinsman ..." [Laudatio Photii..., p. 315; cf. Василевский, В. Г. 1886, p. 96–101]. Further details stand out in otherwise used with reservations *Vita of St. Athanasius of Mount Athos* as a source of information for the late 10th century. The text reads: "... [the barbarians] led their captives to their chief where he began to search them for gold because the robbers suspected that they would receive a ransom or any other indemnity – such cases were common with the barbarians – from those in whom they would find gold. And for repayment and retribution, they killed them, doing deeds worthy of their cruelty ..." [Житие на Атанасий Атонски..., p. 10–11; cf. Vie de saint Athanase l'Athonite..., p. 84–85]. Of course, it should be emphasized that the information coming from the hagiographic texts is by no means undervalued. It often gives the opportunity to enrich the knowledge of Bulgarian-Byzantine relations during the period, especially when comparing the truthfulness of the mentioned data and finding comparisons in other narratives.

Especially with regard to the fate of the captured population of Larissa, in the well-known passage from the chronicle of John Skylitzes, which presents the growth of the *Kometopouloi* as a factor in the anti-Byzantine endeavors after the death of the Byzantine Emperor John I Tzimiskes († January 10, 976), notices differing from those of Kekaumenos are present. "...Samuel became the sole ruler of all Bulgaria; he was much given to waging war and not at all possessing his soul in peace. When the Roman forces were occupied with the war against Skleros he seized his chance and overran all the West, not only Thrace, Macedonia and the region adjacent to Thessaloniki, but also Thessaly, Hellas and the Peloponnese. He also captured several fortresses of which Larissa was the outstanding example. – wrote John Skylitzes – He transferred the inhabitants of Larissa, entire families of them, into further Bulgaria where he enrolled

mentioned Novela is an evidence for trade with enslaved Bulgarians. Close attention to the text highlights that Bulgarians are mentioned as participants – suppliers (and intermediaries) in commercial ventures and not as a subject of purchase and sale [Jus Graeco-Romanum, III, pp. 301–303; Köpstein, H. 1969, pp. 237–247; Koliass, T. 1995, pp. 129–135; McGeer, E. 1995, pp. 367–368]. Naturally, there can be no denial of the possibility that sometimes in hostile hands Bulgarian captives were actually enslaved in the last quarter of the 10th – the first two decades of the 11th century [Lykaki, M. 2016, pp. 135–136, 145–147]. A notification of a possible mass enslavement in Synopsis historiarum is given in the description of the capture of the Longos Fortress and pillage of the Pelagonian plain in 1017 [Skylitzes, Synopsis historiarum..., pp. 355_{17–25}]. The notice needs special attention, at least because it is not in full consonance with some of the other reports concerning the fate of the Bulgarian captives in Skylitzes' chronicle. The captives' imprisonment, the guard of booty and the peculiarities of the contracts for their division are also taken into consideration in the Taktika of Nikephoros Ouranos [McGeer, E. 1995, pp. 142–147].

them among his own forces and used them as allies to fight against the Romans...” [Skylitzes, *A Synopsis of Byzantine History...*, pp. 312–313; cf. Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum...*, pp. 329₉₁–330₅]. Already a century ago Vasil Zlatarski (1866–1935) noted that there is no disagreement between the two historical sources. The prominent Bulgarian scientist is of the opinion that while in the *Strategikon* of Kekaumenos it is meant first of all that the captured people in the important fortress of Thessaly are conquered, the *Synopsis historiarum* of Skylitzes draws attention to their transformation into subjects of the Bulgarian state, with the resulting obligations. Recently, Samuel’s actions in question have been identified as aiming at the construction of a self-sufficient, densely populated, heavily reinforced and military-assisted region which is both hardly vulnerable and close enough to Via Egnatia [Златарски, В. 1927, с. 660–663; Shepard, J. 2015, p. 219].

Due to the fact that in the second half of the 10th century in the Bulgarian Tzardom the paths of dependence and exploitation in the land holdings of the church and of the boyars were paved, with a certain amount of caution, it can be assumed that Kekaumenos is not accidentally using the expression. “... *enslaved everyone ...*”. Without being literally accepted, it is possible to reflect an unequal position (in a social and legal aspect) of those placed in Bulgarian possessions, who are neither part of the assigned in the Bulgarian detachments, people with military experience and skills – true prisoners of war, nor are among the members of the Byzantine provincial military-administrative elite like Nikulitza, who entered the ranks of the Bulgarian boyarship. In describing the events of Bulgaria’s final obedience to the *Synopsis historiarum*, there is also a reflection of the heterogeneity of the former imperial subjects resettled by Samuel. “He [Basil II] *appointed guards and commanders for the themes and ordered those Roman prisoners who wished to stay where they were to do so* [in the places and households they were settled – Y. H.] – one can read in *Synopsis historiarum* – *while the rest were to follow him, for there were many Roman and Armenian soldiers who had been taken prisoners by Samuel and settled by him in Pelagonia, Prespa and Ochrid, of whom the most distinguished were the sons of Basil Apochaps...*” [Skylitzes, *A Synopsis of Byzantine History...*, p. 343; cf. Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum...*, p. 363_{51–56}; Михаил Деволски, *Добавки...*, с. 55]. In this case, despite the relative laconism of Skylitzes’ text and the additions of Bishop Michael of Devol, it is clear enough that both prisoners of war and deported civilians find an application of a group integration known in the early medieval Bulgaria since the pagan era.

Information in the sources provides an opportunity to talk about more individualized inclusion attempts. They were opened against the backdrop of one of the key stages in the development of the Byzantino-Bulgarian war of 971–1018. At the end of the 10th century, after the overthrow of the infighting in Asia Minor, Emperor Basil II personally started again the campaign against Bulgaria. Only the beginning of the revived actions in 991 was noted in the *Synopsis historiarum*. “*Relieved of civil wars and their attendant worries – wrote Skylitzes – the emperor now turned his attention to the problem of how to deal with Samuel and the other local chieftains who had taken advantage of his involvement with the uprisings to inflict considerable damage on Roman territory with impunity. Marching out into the regions of Thrace and Macedonia he came to Thessaloniki, intending to make thank-offering to Demetrios the martyr. There he left Gregory Taronites as a commander with a capable army to exclude and intercept the incursions of Samuel...*” [Skylitzes, *A Synopsis of Byzantine History...*, p. 321; cf. Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum...*, p. 339_{64–71}]. In the following lines, the author abandons the chronological sequence, changes the direction of the narrative and draws attention to the efforts of Emperor Basil II in the East. It is precisely in connection with the events of the last years of the 10th century that Yahya of Antioch made it clear that the transfer of the Emperor to Asia Minor took place as early as 995 [Яхья Антиохийский, *Летопис...*, pp. 27₃₄–28₁₄, 32_{4,7}, 228–231]. Although at this stage the impulse in the collision between Bulgaria and the Empire was on the side of the Byzantine army, a significant shift in the ratio of forces is not reached. The withdrawal of the Emperor from the Balkan Peninsula is followed by Samuel’s counter-attacks. In the course of the Bulgarian initiative there fell in captivity Ashot – son of *magistros* Gregory Taronites, appointed for the *doux* of Thessaloniki. According to Stefen (Asoghik), like his father and the young member of the entered to a Byzantine service Armenian dynastic family, he also gained an important role in the military endeavors against Bulgaria in the early 990s. After the conquest of Berroia by the Imperial Army in 991 Ashot was left to command the fortress⁶. Both Stefen Asoghik and John Skylitzes point out that the capture of the

⁶ Степанос Таронский (Асохик), *Всеобщая история...*, с. 187–188; Étienne (Asolik) de Taron, *Histoire universelle...*, с. 145–146. Given the strategic importance of Berroia for the success of Samuel’s raids and the removal of the possibility of being used by the Byzantine armies as a base in an invasion, the actions of the Bulgarian troops in 995 on the re-conquest were unlikely to be accidental. Berroia remained in Bulgarian hands until 1001 when it was betrayed by boyar Dobromir – husband of Samuel’s niece [Николов, Г. Н. 2005, с. 176–177].

young Taronites is the basis of the next Bulgarian success – the defeat of the army of *magistros* Gregory, who loses his life in the battle instead of succeeding in liberating his son. Thanks to the text of the Armenian chronicler we learn yet another detail that is missing in Skylitzes' *Synopsis historiarum*. During the first half of the 990s the presence of senior aristocrats of Armenian origin engaged in the war against Bulgaria was supplemented by Sahak, son of Abel, from the local princely family of Handzit (Anzitene), which a little after the middle of the 10th century falls under Byzantine power and is included in the theme (Eastern) Mesopotamia. The group of prominent prisoners of war in Bulgarian hands should be supplemented by another senior Byzantine commander, who is known that after the death of Bardas Phokas commanded the military actions against a part of the still hostile allies of the late usurper against Emperor Basil II⁷. As a result of the intense Bulgarian pressure in the mid 990s the next *doux* of Thessaloniki John Chaldos was also beaten on the battlefield and captured by Samuel⁸.

In view of the interest in the fate of the Byzantine prisoners of war, it is worth noting that before any attempt was made to attract them to the Bulgarian side, at least to some of them, another strict measure was observed – the imprisonment in a dungeon. This practice is also known by other examples in the Early Middle Ages. It is extremely flexible and practical, especially when it comes to individuals or small groups. John Skylitzes and Stefen Asoghik recorded that Byzantine army commanders Ashot Taronites, Handzit's Prince Sahak and *magistros* Jean were imprisoned after their capture by the Bulgarians. As far as the information from the sources can be judged, the fate of Ashot is quite different from that of the other two. While they were in prison, the young Taronites was released and married to Samuel's daughter Miroslava [Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum...*, p. 342_{52–57}; Étienne (Asolik) de Taron, *Histoire universelle...*, p. 146]. Given the participation of senior Armenian (and Georgian) aristocrats with their military units in Byzantium's infighting and inter-state conflicts in the last quarter of the 10th and the first decades of the 11th century, what happened with Ashot Taronites is hardly the result of Tzar Samuel's inability to curb his daughter's feelings for the prominent prisoner of war⁹.

The underestimation of romantic influences is unnecessary, but the choice of a marriage partner for Miroslava and his introduction into the highest levels of Bulgarian society cannot be isolated from attempts to ensure the loyalty of prisoners of war – leaders and warriors, who relatively voluntarily or by coercion join

⁷ Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum...*, p. 341_{13–22}; Степанос Таронский (Асохик), *Всеобщая история...*, с. 188; Étienne (Asolik) de Taron, *Histoire universelle...*, pp. 145–146; Яхья Антиохийский, *Летопис...*, с. 27_{4–6}, 226. See also Schlumberger, G. 1900, pp. 31–34; Foss, C. F. W. 1991, pp. 126–127.

⁸ For the John Chaldos' role in the conflict during the last decade of the 10th century Holmes, C. 2005, p. 405–409. As it is well known, in the late 996–997 the military happiness turns its back on the Bulgarians who suffer a heavy defeat near the Spercheios River. John Skylitzes tells not only about the route of the imperial forces, successful tactical moves, their surprising attack on the Bulgarian camp, but also adds notices about the numerous victims, the rich prey and the release of the “captured Romans“. The victory of *magistros* Nikephoros Ouranos and the way Samuel and his son Gabriel Radomir are saved by hiding in the bodies of fallen warriors except in *Synopsis historiarum* are also repeated (with some nuances) in the text of John Zonaras. Yahya of Antioch is more frugal about the details of the battle but, apart from the victims, he also mentions many Bulgarian prisoners of war (12,000) [Cf. Яхья Антиохийский, *Летопис...*, 34_{9–15}; Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum...*, 341_{22–342}₅₁; Zonaras, *Epitomae historiarum libri...*, 558₁₂–559₁₀]. Decades ago, the Croatian historian Jadran Ferluga (1920–2004) expressed skepticism about the fact that the extremely large number of Bulgarian captives is suspiciously rounded and it is debatable whether it is accurate [Јован Скилица (обрад. Ј. Ферлуга)..., p. 90]. The doubts have not lost their topicality and have been repeated in more recent publications [Пириватрић, С. 1997, p. 103; Stephenson, P. 2003, p. 17]. In fact, the Byzantine success comes amid a few suffered losses and fear of the Bulgarian threat, which strengthens the wave of emotions. The feeling of weakening the danger may be among the reasons for possible exaggerations [Leo of Synada, *Correspondence...*, pp. 22–23, 102–103; Holmes, C. 2005, p. 494–495].

⁹ Moreover, the Principality of Taron was annexed by Byzantium only during the reign of the Emperor Nikephoros II Phokas (963–969) shortly before 971 [Andon, N. 1936, pp. 21–42; Greenwood, T. W. 2008, pp. 356–358; Charanis, P. 1961, pp. 196–240; Toynbee, A. J. 1973 b, 396–410]. In Asoghik's description dominated by extremely pro-Armenian sympathy, there is an echo of the presence of Armenian contingents in the Byzantino-Bulgarian struggles of 971–1018. The passage in the work of the above-mentioned author, causing tension because of the reference of the Kometopouli's origin, also indicates that some of Armenians placed by the Imperial authorities subsequently choose the Bulgarian side [Степанос Таронский (Асохик), *Всеобщая история...*, с. 144, 175–176]. For disagreements and clashes between displaced and resettled Armenians and local residents and the ambiguous results of such resettlement in the imperial provinces see: Charanis, P. 1972, pp. 140–154.

Tzar Samuel¹⁰. However, talking about the integration of the enemy captured on the battlefield, there were undoubtedly additional motives besides the strategic plans of the members of the Bulgarian political elite. A wonderful illustration in this respect is the example of the mentioned John Chaldos. He stayed in captivity for more than two decades and was released only in 1018 when the governor of Strumica Dragomazh arrived at the camp of Emperor Basil II to express his obedience [Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum...*, p. 357^{72–75}].

It has been relatively recently reported that the capture of imperial subjects by the Bulgarians in the last quarter of the 10th century is also reported in the *Vita of St. Fantino*. The information concerning the imprisonment of captives in the fortress Kolidros (located south of the Doyran Lake) can only be used in general terms. Even if it is a matter of real events, according to the narrative features inherent in the type of texts in question, there appears a hagiographic topos based on the *Acts of the Apostles* 12: 3–11 and especially the description of the miraculous release of the Apostle Peter from the dungeon of King Herod [Гюзелев, В. 2012, с. 31–38].

Tzar Samuel's efforts to derive long-term benefits through the integration (individually or in larger and smaller groups) of former opponents does not exclude cases of maltreatment of Byzantine prisoners of war by Bulgarians. The threat to life, personal property, position in the society, and dignity is not an exception, as far as the evidence of the Byzantino-Bulgarian wars in the Early Middle Ages can be judged, and covers imperial warriors and commanders of any rank who are directly involved in the battles [Hristov, Y. 2015, pp. 79–83]. There was also killing of the captured soldiers on the battlefield in the course of the long series of struggles of the last quarter of the 10th – the first two decades of the 11th century. This cannot be attributed only to the cruel character of medieval fighting. The text of John Skylitzes, referring to what happened in the last years of the war of 971–1018, also shows information in this direction. For one of the clashes in 1016, the chronicler recounts: "...*The situation around Dyrrachion then became very disturbed and distressed because John [Tzar John Vladislav (1015–1018)] repeatedly attempted to take the city, often by sending his commanders, sometimes coming in person. This is why the emperor [Basil II] wished to go there and render aid, but for a reason worth noting he was prevented from doing so. When he was leaving for Ochrid, he left behind the commander George Gonitziates and the protospatharios Orestes 'the prisoner' with numerous troops and orders to overrun the Pelagonian plain. But they were taken in an ambush by the Bulgars under the illustrious and experienced command of Ibatzes and all were killed...*" [Skylitzes, *A Synopsis of Byzantine History...*, p. 335; cf. Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum...*, pp. 354^{71–79}]. The desire for revenge among the Bulgarians undoubtedly contribute to the fatal end and the relentless attitude towards the Byzantine contingent, not only because of the events after the Battle of Kleidion in 1014, but also because of the devastation which the imperial troops caused to the environs of Ostrovo, Sosk and Pelagonia and the cruelty to the captured Bulgarians in 1015¹¹. In the unambiguous charge of the vengeance as a driving force, it must be admitted that the indiscriminate massacre of the ambushed Byzantine troops (as was the case with Theophylact Botaneiates' army in 1014) is also dictated by additional considerations that overwhelm the interest from preserving the life of the "valuable goods" as prisoners of war are. This includes a wide range of military tactical reasons. Even without an objective necessity, the massive pogroms after Bulgarian successes in the last years of the war are not devoid of long-term strategic planning, in the quest to influence the spirit of the superior Byzantine armies and break their readiness for battle.

In conclusion, it should be explicitly emphasized that the short notes submitted are far from an overall presentation of the fate of the prisoners of war in Samuel's Bulgaria. At this stage, it may be noted that Tzar Samuel and his descendants follow the experience gained during the previous centuries in Early Medieval Bulgaria when it comes to the Byzantine prisoners of war. Even in the severely changed geopolitical situation after 1001–1004 and especially after 1014, until the final fall of the Bulgarian lands under Byzantine rule, the decisions in the Bulgarian camp are limited to keeping the life of the enemy captured on the battlefield or not. In cases where the slaughter of prisoners of war is avoided, long-term solutions stand out. The results are not

¹⁰ The marriage of the other daughter of Samuel – Teodora-Kosara, the wife of the former prisoner of war knyaz John Vladimir, is sufficiently indicative [Ljetopis pora Dukljanina..., pp. 78–81. Cf. Јѐтопис попа Дукљанина..., с. 9–89, 125–131; Михаил Деволски, Добавки..., с. 53–54]. The union with John Vladimir, the removal of Duklja (and Travunja) from the group of possible Byzantine allies and their attraction to the Bulgarian side created a strategic shelter favorable to Tzar Samuel in an area in which he does not have and cannot allow himself to keep large troops permanently [Живковић, Т. 2002, с. 9–25; Пириватрић, С. 2005, с. 91–99].

¹¹ Skylitzes, *Synopsis historiarum...*, p. 353^{58–61} There is an opinion that it is not a matter of mass mutilation of all Bulgarians in the region who were caught in Byzantine captivity during these actions, but only of the leaders, which is a punishment for the false promises, according to the text of John Skylitzes, by the newly ascended Tzar John Vladislav [Schreiner, P. 2015, p. 179].

always unambiguous and are heavily dependent on the course of hostilities, the propensity to compromise, the need and the possibilities to reach out to the enemy, the attitude to the own warriors that have fallen into captivity, and last but not least, the personal ambitions and wishes of the individual Byzantine prisoners of war – regular warriors and leaders of a different rank and ethnic origin.

REFERENCES

Sources:

- Attaliates, Historia...** – Michaelis Attaliothae Historia. Rec. I. Bekker (CSHB). Bonn, 1853.
- Dennis, T.** 1985 – Three Byzantine Military Treatises. Text, Transl. and Notes G. T. Dennis (CFHB Vol. XXV). Washington D.C., 1985.
- Étienne (Asolik) de Taron, Histoire universelle...** – Histoire universelle par Étienne Asolik de Taron. Traduite de l'arménien et annotée par Fr. Macler. 2-ème partie. Paris, 1917.
- G. Monachos Continuatus. Patrologiae Cursus...** – Georgius Monachos Continuatus. Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca, Ed. J-P. Migne, 110. Paris, 1863.
- Jus Graeco-Romanum, III** – Jus Graeco-Romanum. Vol. III, Novellae constitutiones imperatorum post Justinianum. Ed. Karl Eduard Zachariae von Lingental. Leipzig, 1857.
- Laudatio Photii...** – Похвално слово на Фотий Тесалийски. – В: Гръцки извори за българската история. Том. 5. Съст. и ред. Г. Цанкова-Петкова и др. София, 1964, 314–316. [Pohvalno slovo... Gratski izvori za balgarskata istoria. Tom. V. Sast. i red. G. Tsankova-Petkova i dr. Sofia, 1964, 314–316.]
- Leo the Deacon, History...** – The History of Leo the Deacon: Byzantine Military Expansion in the Tenth Century. Ed. and Transl. A.-M. Talbot – D. F. Sullivan. Washington D.C., 2005.
- Leo of Synada, Correspondence...** – The Correspondence of Leo, Metropolitan of Synada and Syncellus. Greek Text, Transl., and Comm. M. P. Vinson (CFHB Vol. XXIII). Washington D.C., 1985.
- Ljetopis popa Dukljanina...** – VI. Mošin (ed.). Ljetopis popa Dukljanina, Zagreb 1950.
- Psellos, Chronographie...** – Michel Psellos. Chronographie ou histoire d'un siècle de Byzance (976–1077). Tome I. Texte établi et traduit par E. Renauld. Paris, 1926.
- Skylitzes, Synopsis historiarum...** – Ioannis Scylitzae. Synopsis historiarum. rec. I. Thurn (CFHB Vol. V). Berlin–New York, 1973.
- Skylitzes, A Synopsis of Byzantine History...** – John Skylitzes, A Synopsis of Byzantine History 811–1057. Transl. J. Wortley. Cambridge, 2010.
- Vie de saint Athanase l'Athonite...** – L. Petit, Vie de saint Athanase l'Athonite. – Analecta Bollandiana, 25 (1906), 5–89.
- Zonaras, Epitomae historiarum libri...** – Ioannis Zonarae. Epitomae historiarum libri XVIII. Libri XIII–XVIII. Vol. III. Ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst (CSHB). Bonn, 1897.
- Василевский, В. Г.** 1886 – В. Г. Василевский, Один из греческих сборников Московской Синодальной библиотеки. – ЖМНПр., 248 (1886), 96–101. [V. G. Vasilevskiy, Odin iz grecheskih sbornikov Moskovskoy Sinodal'noj biblioteki. – ZhMNP, 248 (1886), 96–101.]
- Житие на Атанасий Атонски...** – Житие на Атанасий Атонски. – В: Гръцки извори за българската история. Том. 6. Съст. и ред. Г. Цанкова-Петкова и др. София, 1965, 8–11. [Zhitie na Atanasiy Atonski. – V: Gratski izvori za balgarskata istoria. Tom. 6. Sast. i redaktor G. Tsankova-Petkova i dr. Sofia, 1965, 8–11.]
- Јован Скилица (обрад. Ј. Ферлуга)...** – Јован Скилица (обрад. Ј. Ферлуга). – В: Византијски извори за историју народа Југославије. Т. III. Ур. Г. Острогорски – Фр. Баришић. Београд, 1966, 51–172. [Jovan Skilitza (obrad. J. Ferluga). – Vizantijski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije. T. III. Ur. G. Ostrogorski – Fr. Barishish. Beograd, 1966, 51–172.]
- Кекавмен, Совети и расказы...** – Кекавмен, Совети и расказы. Поучение византийского полководца XI века (2-е перераб. и доп. изд.). Ред., перев. и комм. Г. Г. Литаврин. Санкт-Петербург, 2003. [Kekavmen, Sovety i rasskazy. Pouchenie vizantijskogo polkovodtsa XI veka (2-e pererab. i dop. izd.). Red., perez. i komm. G. G. Litavrin. Sankt-Peterburg, 2003.]
- Љетопис попа Дукљанина...** – Љетопис попа Дукљанина. Предговор, пропратни текстови и превод С. Мијушковић. Београд, 1988. [Ljetopis popa Dukljanina. Predgovor, propratni tekstovi i prevod S. Mijushkovish. Beograd, 1988.]
- Михаил Деволски, Добавки...** – Добавки на епископ Михаил Деволски от 1118 г. към „Исторически свод“ на Йоан Скилица (XI в.). – В: Извори за средновековната история на България (VII–XV в.) в Австрийските ръкописни сбирки и архиви. Съст. В. Гюзелев. Т. I. София, 1994, 45–57. [Dobavki na episkop Mihail Devolski ot 1118 g. kam "Istoricheski svod" na Joan Skilitza (XI v.). – V: Izvori za srednevekovnata istoriya na Balgaria (VII–XV v.) v Avstriyskite sbirki i arhivi. Sast. V. Gyuzelev. T. I. Sofia, 1994, 45–57.]
- Повесть временных лет...** – Памятники литературы Древней Руси. Начало русской литературы. XI – начало XII века. Сост. и ред. Д. С. Лихачев – Л. А. Дмитриев. Москва, 1978. [Pamyatniki literatury Drevnej Rusi. Nachalo russkoj literatury. XI – nachalo XII veka. Sost. i red. D. S. Lihachev – L. A. Dmitriev. Moskva, 1978.]
- Повесть временных лет по Лаврент. списку...** – Повесть временных лет (по Лаврентьевскому списку 1377 года). Перев. Д. С. Лихачев – О. В. Творогов. Санкт-Петербург, 2012. [Povest' vremennyh let (po Lavrent'evskomu spisku 1377 goda). Perez. D. S. Lihachev – O. V. Tvorogov. Sankt-Peterburg, 2012.]

Степанос Гаронский (Асохик), Всеобщая история... – Всеобщая история Степаноса Гаронского, Асохика по прозванию. Перев. с армянского языка и объясн. Н. Эмин. Москва, 1864. [Vseobshtaya istoriya Stepanosa Taronskago, Asohika po prozvaniyu. Perv. s armyanskogo yazyka i obyasn. N. Emin. Moskva, 1864.]

Яхья Антиохийский, Летопис... – Император Василий Болгаробойца. Извлечения в Летописи Яхья Антиохийского. Изд., перев. и объясн. барон В. Р. Розен. Санкт-Петербург, 1883. [Imperator Vasilij Bolgarobojtsa. Izvlecheniya v Letopisi Yahaya Antiohijskogo. Izd., perv. i obyasn. baron V. R. Rozen. Sankt-Peterburg, 1883.]

Publications:

Ambühl, R. 2013 – R. Ambühl. Prisoners of War in the Hundred Years War. Ransom Culture in the Late Middle Ages. Cambridge, 2013.

Andonz, N. 1936 – N. Andonz. Les Taronites en Arménie et à Byzance. – Byzantion, 11 (1936), 21–42.

Charanis, P. 1961 – P. Charanis. The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire. – Byzantinoslavica, 22 (1961), 196–240.

Charanis, P. 1972 – P. Charanis. The Transfer of Population as a Policy in the Byzantine Empire. – In: P. Charanis, Studies on the Demography of the Byzantine Empire. Collected Studies. Variorum Reprints. London, 1972, Part III, 140–154.

Crawford, E. 2010 – E. Crawford. The Treatment of Combatants and Insurgents under the Law of Armed Conflict. Oxford, 2010.

Foss, C. F. W. 1991 – C. F. W. Foss. Anzitene. – In: Kazhdan, Al. (Ed. in Chief). The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium. Vol. 1. Oxford–New York, 1991, 126–127.

Franklin, S., Shepard, J. 1996 – S. Franklin, J. Shepard. The Emergence of Rus, 750–1200. London–New York, 1996.

Greenwood, T. W. 2008 – T. W. Greenwood. Armenian Neighbors (600–1018). – In: J. Shepard (Ed.). The Cambridge History of the Byzantine Empire. Cambridge, 2008, 333–364.

Harvey, A. 1989 – A. Harvey. Economic Expansion in the Byzantine Empire 900–1200. Cambridge, 1989.

Holmes, C. 2005 – Ch. Holmes. Basil II and the Governance of Empire (976–1025). Oxford, 2005.

Holmes, C. 2012 – Ch. Holmes. Basil II the Bulgar-slayer and the Blinding of 15 000 Bulgarians in 1014: Mutilation and Prisoners of War in the Middle Ages. – In: H. Afflerbach – H. Strachan (eds.), How Fighting Ends: A History of Surrender. Oxford, 2015, 85–95.

Hristov, Y. 2015 – Y. Hristov. Prisoners of War in Early Medieval Bulgaria (Preliminary remarks). – Studia Ceranea, 5 (2015), 73–105.

Kaplan, M. 2009 – M. Kaplan. The Producing Population. – In: J. Haldon (ed.). A Social History of Byzantium. Chichester, 2009, 143–167.

Kolia-Dermizaki, A. 2000 – A. Kolia-Dermizaki. Some Remarks on the Fate of Prisoners of War in Byzantium (9th–10th Centuries). – In: Atti del Congresso Interdisciplinare di Studi Storici “La liberazione dei ‘cattivi’ tra Cristianità e Islam. Oltre la Crociata e il Pihvd: Tolleranza e servizio umanitario, a cura di Giulio Gipollone (Collectanea Archivi Vaticani, 46). Città del Vaticano, 2000, 583–620.

Kolias, T. 1995 – T. Kolias. Kriegsgefangene, Sklavenhandel und die Privilegien der Soldaten. Die Aussage der Novelle von Ioannes Tzimiskes. – Byzantinoslavica, 56 (1995), 129–135.

Köpstein, H. 1969 – H. Köpstein. Einige Aspekte des byzantinischen und bulgarischen Sklavenhandels im X. Jahrhundert. Zur Novelle des Ioannes Tzimiskes über Sklavenhandelszoll. – In: Actes du premier Congrès International des Études Balkaniques et Sud-Est Européennes, III. Histoire (V^e–XVI^e s.). Sofia, 1969, 237–247.

Lauxtermann, M. D. 1998 – M. D. Lauxtermann. John Geometres – Poet and Soldier. – Byzantion, 68/2 (1998), 356–380.

Lauxtermann, M. D. 2003 – M. D. Lauxtermann, Byzantine Poetry and the Paradox of Basil II’s Reign. – In: P. Magdalino. (Ed.). Byzantium in the Year 1000. Leiden – Boston, 2003, 199–216.

Lefort, J. 2002 – J. Lefort. The Rural Economy, Seventh–Twelfth Centuries – In: A. Laiou. (Ed. in Chief). The Economic History of Byzantium: From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Centuries. Vol. 1. Washington D.C., 2002, 231–310.

Liddell, H. G., Scott, R. 1901 – A Greek–English Lexicon. Comp. H. G. Liddell – R. Scott. 8th revised edition. New York – Chicago – Cincinnati. 1901.

Lykaki, M. 2016 – M. Λυκακη. Οι αιχμάλωτοι πολέμου στη Βυζαντινή Αυτοκρατορία (6^{ος} – 11^{ος} αι.): Εκκλησία, Κράτος, διπλωματία και κοινωνική διασταση. Εθνικό και Καποδιστριακό Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών. Αθήνα, 2016 (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).

McGeer, E. 1995 – E. McGeer. Sowing the Dragon’s Teeth: Byzantine Warfare in the Tenth Century (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 33). Washington D.C., 1995.

Nikolov, G. N. 2001 – G. N. Nikolov. The Bulgarian Aristocracy in the War against the Byzantine Empire (971–1019). – Byzantina et Slavica Cracovensia, III (2001), 141–158.

Patoura, S. 1994 – Y. Πατούρα. Οι αιχμάλωτοι ως παράγοντες επικοινωνίας και πληροφόρησης (4^{ος} – 10^{ος} α0.). Αθήνα, 1994.

Ramadān, A. 2009 – A. Ramadān. The Treatment of Arab Prisoners of War in Byzantium, 9th–10th Centuries. – Annales islamologiques, 43 (2009), 155–194.

Rotman, Y. 2005 – Y. Rotman. Byzance face à l’Islam arabe, VIIe – Xe siècle. D’un droit territorial à l’identité par la foi. – Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales, 60/4 (2005), 767–788.

Rotman, Y. 2009 – Y. Rotman. Byzantine Slavery and the Mediterranean World, English Transl. J.-M. Todd. Cambridge, Massachusetts – London, 2009.

Schlumberger, G. 1900 – G. Schlumberger. L'Épopée Byzantine à la fin du dixième siècle. Seconde partie. Basile II le Tueur de Bulgares. Paris, 1900.

Schreiner, P. 2015 – P. Schreiner. Die vermeintliche Blendung. Zu den Ereignissen von Kleidion im Jahr. 1014. – В: В. Гюзелев, Г. Н. Николов. (съст.). Европейският Югоизток през втората половина на X – началото на XI век. История и култура. София, 2015, 170–190. [V: V. Gyuzelev, G. N. Nikolov. (sast.). Evropeyskiyat Yugoiztok prez vtorata polovina na X – nachaloto na XI vek. Istoria i kultura. Sofia, 2015, 170–190.]

Shepard, J. 2015 – J. Shepard. Communications across the Bulgarian Lands – Samuel's Poisoned Chalice for Basil II and His Successors. – В: В. Гюзелев, Г. Н. Николов. (съст.). Европейският Югоизток през втората половина на X – началото на XI век. История и култура. София, 2015, 217–235. [V: V. Gyuzelev, G. N. Nikolov. (sast.). Evropeyskiyat Yugoiztok prez vtorata polovina na X – nachaloto na XI vek. Istoria i kultura. Sofia, 2015, 217–235.]

Simeonova, L. 1998 – L. Simeonova. In the Depths of Tenth-Century Byzantine Ceremonial: The Treatment of Arab Prisoners of War at Imperial Banquets. – BMGS, 22 (1998), 75–104.

Stephenson, P. 2003 – P. Stephenson. The Legend of Basil the Bulgar-Slayer. Cambridge, 2003.

Toynbee, A. J. 1973 a – A. J. Toynbee. Relations with the Eastern Muslims. Appendix: Calendar of Exchanges of Prisoners between the Eastern Muslims and the East Roman Empire. – In: A. J. Toynbee. Constantine Porphyrogenitus and His World. Oxford, 1973, 377–393.

Toynbee, A. J. 1973 b – A. J. Toynbee, Relations with the Armenian and Caucasian Principalities. – In: A. J. Toynbee. Constantine Porphyrogenitus and His World. Oxford, 1973, 396–410.

Whittow, M. 1996 – M. Whittow. The Making of Orthodox Byzantium 600–1025. London, 1996.

Божилев, И. 1995 – Ив. Божилев. Българите във Византийската империя. София, 1995 [Iv. Bozhilov. Balgarite vav Vizantijskata imperia. Sofia, 1995.]

Божилев, И., Гюзелев, В. 1999 – Ив. Божилев, В. Гюзелев. История на средновековна България VII–XIV век (История на България в 3 тома. Т. 1). София, 1999 [Iv. Bozhilov, V. Gyuzelev. Istoria na srednovekovna Balgaria VII–XIV vek (Istoria na Balgaria v 3 toma. Т. 1). Sofia, 1999.]

Гюзелев, В. 2012 – В. Гюзелев. Сведения за българите в Житието на свети Фантино Млади от X век. – Palaeobulgarica, 2 (2012), 31–38. [V. Gyuzelev. Svedenia za balgarite v Zhitiето na sveti Fantino Mladi ot X vek. – Palaeobulgarica, 2 (2012), 31–38.]

Дворецкий, И. Х. 1958 – Древнегреческо–русский словарь. Сост. И. Х. Дворецкий. Т. I. Б–Л. Москва, 1958 [Drevnogrechesko–russkij slovar' Sost. I. H. Dvoretckij. Т. I. Б–Л. Moskva, 1958.]

Живковић, Т. 2002 – Т. Живковић. Поход бугарског цара Самуила на Далмацију. – ИЧ, 49 (2002), 9–25. [T. Živkoviš. Pohod bugarskog tsara Samuila na Dalmatsiju. – ICh, 49 (2002), 9–25.]

Златарски, В. 1927 – В. Златарски, История на българската държава през средните векове. Т. I, ч. 2. София, 1927 [Zlatarski, V. Istoriya na balgarskata darzhava prez srednite vekove. Т. I. Ch. 2. Sofia, 1927.]

Николов, Г. Н. 2005 – Г. Н. Николов. Централизъм и регионализъм в ранносредновековна България (края на VII–началото на XI в.). София, 2005 [G. N. Nikolov. Tsentralizam i regionalizam v rannosrednovekovna Balgaria (kraya na VII–nachaloto na XI v.). Sofia, 2005.]

Павлов, П. 2012 – Пл. Павлов. Забравени и неразбрани. Събития и личности от Българското средновековие. София, 2012 [Pl. Pavlov. Zabraveni i nerazbrani. Sabitia i lichnosti ot Balgarskoto srednovekovie. Sofia, 2012.]

Пириватрић, С. 1997 – С. Пириватрић. Самуилова држава. Обим и карактер. Београд, 1997. [S. Pirivatrić. Samuilova drzhava. Obim i karakter. Beograd, 1997.]

Пириватрић, С. 2005 – С. Пириватрић. Дукља, Бугарска и Византија на Јужном Јадрану крајем 10. и почетком 11. века. – В: В. Гюзелев – А. Милтенова – Р. Станкова (съст.). България и Сърбия в контекста на византийската цивилизация. София, 2005, 91–99. [S. Pirivatrić. Duklja, Bugarska i Vizantija na Juzhnom Jadranu krajem 10. i pochetkom 11. veka. – V: V. Gyuzelev – A. Miltenova – R. Stankova (sast.). Balgaria i Sarbiya v konteksta na vizantijskata tsivilizatsiya. Sofia, 2005, 91–99.]

Симеонова, Л. 1996 – Л. Симеонова. Семиотика на унижението: Високоставени чужденци в имперската столица през X век. – Родина, 4 (1996), 29–43. [L. Simeonova. Semiotika na unizhenieto: Visokopostaveni chuzhdentsi v imperskata stolitsa prez X vek. – Rodina, 4 (1996) 29–43.]

Сюзюмов, М. 1916 – М. Сюзюмов. Об источниках Льва Дьякона и Скилицы. – Византийское обозрение, II (1916), 106–166 [M. Syuzumov. Ob istochnikah L'va D'yakona i Skillitsyi. – Vizantijskoe obozrenie, II (1916), 106–166.]

Томов, Т. 2015 – Т. Томов. Битката при Ключ през 1014 г. – В: В. Гюзелев, Г. Н. Николов (съст.). Европейският Югоизток през втората половина на X – началото на XI век. История и култура. София, 2015, 142–169 [T. Tomov, Bitkata pri Kyuch prez 1014 g. – V: V. Gyuzelev, G. N. Nikolov. (sast.). Evropeyskiyat Yugoiztok prez vtorata polovina na X – nachaloto na XI vek. Istoria i kultura. Sofia, 2015, 142–169.]

Филипчук, А. М. 2016 – А. М. Филипчук. Византийские подходы XI века к проблеме пленных: ослепление и убийство. – Диалог со временем, 55 (2016), 330–340. [A. M. Filipchuk. Vizantijskie podhody XI veka k probleme plennyih: osleplenie i ubijstvo. – Dialog so vremenem, 55 (2016), 330–340.]