Abstract: In this study, the Eternal Peace Agreement of 532, the first diplomatic relation of the Eastern Roman Emperor Justinian with the Sassanid Emperor Chosroes Anushirvan, which shaped the political history of the sixth century, is analysed. This agreement was signed between the Eastern Roman and Sassanid empires for the first time, without specifying anytime, and it was referred to as the Eternal Peace Agreement in the sixth century sources. The agreement was reported by Procopius of Caesarea and by Malalas, and is also documented from an inscription found in the city of Hierapolis in Syria. The inscription informs that after the war that lasted thirty years, peace was established and a payment was made to the Sassanids. The Eternal Peace Agreement only lasted between the two empires for less than eight years; then, in 540, a breaking point occurred in Eastern Roman-Sassanid relations. This study aims to examine the war situation of the two empires and why the Peace agreement was called “Eternal”.
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Introduction

Due to their imperial ideologies and policies to expand their limits of dominions, from the first quarter of the third century to the beginning of the seventh century the two greatest powers of Late Antiquity, the Eastern Roman and Sassanid Empires were in competition and conflict, especially in Asia Minor, Armenia, Mesopotamia and the Mediterranean basin, areas which were strategically, economically and commercially important. Especially the reigns of Chosroes Anushirvan and...
Chosroes II can be marked as periods when the wars with Eastern Rome lasted for many years. The sixth century witnessed the breaking point in the relations between two empires and long wars, as well as reforms in internal policy. In this century, with Justinian on the throne of the Eastern Roman Empire, the empire carried out many legal, administrative, military, building and cultural activities to regain its former power, while simultaneously many reforms were performed in Iranian territory during the reign of Chosroes Anushirvan in the Sassanid Empire3.

This study focuses on the “Eternal Peace” of 532, the first diplomatic contact between rival and contemporary emperors, Justinian (ca. 527-565) and the Sassanid emperor Chosroes Anushirvan (ca. 531-579), who determined the political history of the sixth century4. The peace agreement, described by Procopius as ἀπέραντος εἰρήνη, was also recorded by other authors of the age and documented in an inscription found in the city of Hierapolis in Syria. The requirements of the agreement and the consequences that extend to the following years were very important for both empires. To briefly mention the pre-agreement war situation between the Eastern Roman and Sassanid empires will enable our understanding as to why the agreement was recorded with the name “Eternal”.

Historical Background Prior to “the Eternal Peace”
The Eternal Peace of 532 was the result of the Eastern Roman-Sassanid wars that had lasted from the end of the fifth century. There are several reasons underlying the long war period. The Sassanid emperor Kavadh had regained his throne in 498/9 with the assistance of the Hephthalite Huns; his allies required payment and had requested for gold from emperor Anastasius, but the emperor refused5. According to Joshua the Stylite the Sassanid emperor Kavadh announced to emperor Anastasius “Send me the gold or accept war”6. In response to this the emperor Anastasius declined and instead demanded that the Sassanids return Nisibis7. At the end of these negotiations, Kavadh decided to march against the territory of Rome in 502 and took the city of Theodosiopolis, the capital of Armenia Interior8. The war that broke out between Kavadh and Anastasius extended into the reigns of Justin and Justinian.

4 For works about the VIth century, see Scott 1992, 159-166; Allen – Jeffreys 1996; Cameron 1996; Greatrex 2005, 477-510; Sarris 2011.
6 Josh. Stly. 54.
7 According to the foedus of 363 the Sassanids would take possession of Nisibis for 120 years and the city would then be returned to its previous masters. See Dignas – Winter 2007, 131-135.
8 Proc. de bell. pers. I. vii. 3; aed. III. 5. 3.
Justinian began to strengthen and fortify the eastern border after he took over the imperial administration. In 528, by making a wide-ranging reconfiguration for the Armenia Region, he created a new command called “magister militum per Armeniam” reorganizing the region and strengthened the defense line of the cities near the border. In this context, he strengthened the frontier castles located in zones such as Circus, Martyropolis and Theodosiopolis, and also gave orders for the construction of a fortress in Mindus, located near the city of Dara and over the Sassanid borderline. However, the construction of this castle was seen as a threat by the Sassanids and made the war inevitable between the two empires. In consequence, violent wars took place between Justinian and Kavadh between 529 and 531.

Justinian reinforced the command structure of the eastern army in order to react more efficiently to the Sasanid threat and appointed Belisarius, one of his most talented generals, as “magister militum per orientem”, the Eastern commander. On the other hand, he continued peace negotiations and tried to save the empire from this situation with minimal damage. According to one of the important historians of the sixth century, Malalas, Emperor Justinian sent Hermogenes to the Sassanid lands for peace negotiations in 529 but he was rejected by the emperor Kavadh. In 530, the Sassanid emperor Kavadh began a new invasion and when he passed over the border the war broke out between the two empires around the city of Dara. According to Procopius of Caesarea, the Romans, under the leadership of magister militum per orientem Belisarius and magister officiorum Hermogenes, slaughtered more than 3000 Sassanids and repelled them at Dara. As a result, it is reported that there were battles where East Rome was close to victory in the war, near the city of Dara.

Following the defeat of the Sassanids in Dara, two forces came across the border, this time in Satala in the summer of the same year and the Romans won the Battle of Satala. The success of the Eastern Roman army in 530 had significant political consequences in the region. Firstly, the Narses and Aratius brothers, who were the rulers of Persarmenia (Armenia region under the Sassanid rule), took the side of the Romans and then their youngest brothers Isaac, who then controlled the Bolum fortress, chose to side with the Romans. Secondly, under the leadership of the commander Belisarius, the Romans captured the Pharangium fortress which was also under the rule of the Sas-
sanids in the Armenia region. After the defeat at Satala, peace negotiations began again in the
summer of 530\(^17\). However, the negotiations were inconclusive\(^18\). The situation resulted in the resum-
opation of war.

In 531 The Romans who confronted the Sassanids were defeated in Callinicum\(^19\). After the Battle
of Callinicum, the situation was reported to the emperor Justinian by the *magister militum* Hermo-
genius; and then the emperor appointed a commander named Constantinolus to determine the
cause of the Romans’ failure\(^20\). As a result of Constantinolus’ investigation and report, Justinian re-
called Belisarius\(^21\). Belisarius was dismissed in May or June\(^22\). Immediately after the war, Hermo-
genius wished to start peace negotiations with the Sassanid ruler Kavadh, but failed\(^23\). The Sassanid
ruler Kavadh followed an expansionist policy in the north to strengthen his victory in Callinicum.
Zacharias mentions that the Sassanids were active in *Persarmenia* further north, and that Kavadh
attempted to capture Martyropolis, a city near the border and recently strengthened by emperor
Justinian\(^24\). A similar statement was made by Malalas and it was reported that Kavadh sent an army
to take over the city\(^25\). Martyropolis was under siege by the Sassanids. The attacks made by the city
garrison under siege were repelled\(^26\). Zacharias notes that the Sassanids withdrew from Martyropo-
ulis in November or December 531, with the arrival of another Roman army as a support force\(^27\).
Another reason behind the Sassanid withdrawal was that they had received the news of Kavadh’s
death\(^28\). Peace negotiations began again after the Sassanids withdrawal\(^29\).

After the death of Kavadh, his youngest son Chosroes Anushirvan became the new Sassanid rul-
er in 531. However, the succession of Chosroes Anushirvan was a problem in the empire since it
was not approved by some members of the dynasty\(^30\). Malalas reports that Justinian was aware of the
Sassanids’ internal problems and refused at first to acknowledge Chosroes as the king of the Sassa-
nids\(^31\).

\(^18\) Malal. 18.54; Proc. *de bell. pers.* I. xvii. 40-4; Theoph. A.M. 6021 [179]). See also Bury 1958, 85; Scott 1992, 161;
Greatrex 1998, 190–2; Greatrex – Lieu 2002, 92.
200–207.
\(^21\) Procopius states that Belisarius was dismissed because he was going to join western expeditions and and instead of
him Sittas was appointed (*de bell. pers.* i. xvii. 2-3). But Bury, points to the conflict between him and the commanders
under his command as the reason for the dismissal of Belisarius (1958, 87). See also Greatrex 1998, 207.
\(^22\) Greatrex 1998, 194-5.
\(^25\) Malal. 18.66 (469).
\(^26\) Proc. *de bell. pers.* I. xxi. 6-8; *aed.* III. 2; Malal. 18. 66 (469-70). See also Whitby 1994, 182.
\(^28\) Malal. 18. 68 (471.4–10); see also Greatrex 1998, 210-11.
\(^31\) Malal. 18.68 (471.22-472.2).
Serious peace negotiations started in the spring of 532; Justinian sent Rufinus, Hermogenes, Alexan- 
dros and Thomas as ambassadors to the Sassanid emperor Chosroes Anushirvan to determine 
the terms of the agreement. The negotiations were at first unsuccessful because Chosroes insisted 
on keeping control of Sarapanis and Scandar castles in Lazica and this condition was not accepted by 
Justinian. In the summer of the same year, the peace treaty was signed between the Sassanid and 
Eastern Roman Empires. This treaty was the first diplomatic contact between Justinian and 
Chosroes. In other words, after Chosroes ascended the throne, he did not continue the war started 
by his father Kavadh and first had diplomatic contact with Justinian rather than waging a war. The 
peace treaty had the necessary reasons for both Chosroes and Justinian. While Chosroes cared 
about this treaty due to the problems on the eastern boundary of his empire, Justinian considered it 
as following the conquest ideology in the West.

The Eternal Peace Agreement in 532

Hermogenes and Rufinus were able to reach an agreement after prolonged contentious negoti- 
tations with the Sassanid emperor Chosroes, most probably in the summer of 532. Besides the ancient 
sources - the most detailed accounts being given by Procopius of Caesarea and John Malalas - this 
agreement is also documented in an inscription from Hierapolis in Syria. The inscription in ques- 
tion is located on every side of a rectangular block of limestone. The inscription is as follows:

I. Μοῦνος |'Ιουστινιανὸς | ἄναξ θεοδέ|γμονι βουλή
eιρήνην | ἐτέλεσ|σε, γόους δ’ἀπέ|παυσεν Ὲνύους
ἐς τριτάτην ἐτε|ών δεκάδα πτο|λίεσσιν ἐόντας,
Ῥουφῖνον στρα|τίαρχον ἔχω[ν — — ——

The lord Justinian alone, by divine counsel, made peace, and he put a stop to the lamentations of war 
(which had been) upon (the) cities for three decades. With Rufinus the general ....

II. Εὐδοκίᾳ 
tοῦ δεσπό- 
tου Χριστοῦ 
και παρα - 5 
φυλακή τῆς 
pόλεως ἤ - 
μῶν Πέτρου 

By the good will of 
the Lord Christ 
and 
for the preser- 
vation of 
our city of 
the holy apos-

32 While Malalas (18.72) mentions only the names of Rufinus and Hermogenes as the ambassadors, Procopius 
(de bell. pers. I. xxii. 1-16) adds Aleksandros and Thomas to this delegation. See also Chron. Edes. 104; Zach. ix. 
7. The four names in question are among the high-ranking figures of the period of Justinian (for Rufinus, see 
PLRE II, 954-7; for Aleksandros, see PLRE III/A, 41-2; for Hermogenes, see PLRE III/A, 590-3; for Thomas, see 


34 Proc. de bell. pers. I. xxii. 15-19; Malal. 18.76.

35 The inscription was published by P. Roussel in 1939. See Roussel 1939, 367-372.
καὶ Παύλου
τῶν ἁγίων
apostolow
γέγονεν ἡ
eiρήνη.
υπατευουσαν —

III. Σταυρός τὰ δεινὰ τοῦ πολέμου φφρυγάματα
καὶ τὴν ἄμετρον τοῦ βίου μοχθήρι αν
ώσπερ κλύδων καὶ πύραν καὶ τεσβέσας
The cross extinguished the terrible roarings of war and the measureless hardships of life, as if (they were)
a rough wave or a fire.

IV. Γέγονεν συν θεῷ τῷ ἁγίῳ εἰρήνη
μεταξὺ Ῥωμαίων καὶ Περσῶν,
δοθέντων τῶν χρημάτων καὶ δημ— —
Peace was made
between
the Romans
and Persians
with (the help of)
holy God;
the money
was handed over
and ....

According to the inscription, it is noteworthy that a peace was made after the thirty-year war between the Eastern Roman and Sassanid empires. With this statement, it clearly shows that the state of war between the two empires lasted from 502 to 532. This year was the second reign of Kavadh in the Sassanid Empire and there was no peace between the two empires and they were at war with intervals. Therefore, after long years of war, a permanent desire for peace caused the agreement to be termed "Eternal or Endless". It was also recorded in the inscription (δοθέντων τῶν χρημάτων καὶ δημ—) that the Romans gave money to the Sassanids (the amount is uncertain due to the damaged condition of the inscription). However, the inscription does not give information concerning other conditions of the agreement, such as territorial, military arrangements and the exchange of captives. Even so, the inscription is very important as evidence documenting the agreement.

Details of the terms of the agreement, which we cannot obtain from the inscription, are given by Procopius, Malalas, Agathias and Zacharias. When taking into consideration the ancient sources, the articles of the peace treaty can be summarized as follows:

- A payment of 110,000 solidus gold to the Sassanids by the Romans to defend the
Caspian Gates passage

- The Romans gave the Sassanids the fortress of the Bolum and Pharangium in Armenia
- The Sassanids gave the Romans the strongholds of Lazica
- The Romans removed the *magister militum* from the city of Dara
- Mutual exchange of captives
- The two empires were brothers as before, and whoever was in a state of war, the other would provide military or financial assistance as needed.

In addition to these treaty articles, there is another clause specified by Agathias. This article is about the seven Hellenic philosophers exiled by Emperor Justinian in 529. Apart from Agathias other ancient sources don’t mention the story of the philosophers or this article. According to Agathias, a clause was added to the peace treaty to guarantee the religious tolerance and security of philosophers.

Conclusions

The long period of war between the Eastern Roman and the Sassanid empire that began with the...
capture of the Theodosiopolis of Emperor Kavadh in 502, ended with the "Eternal Peace". There was never before agreed an eternal peace between the two empires. Earlier treaties had been made for a certain period of time. The calling of the peace "Eternal" should be due to the time frame of the war that lasted nearly three decades. The Eternal Peace of 532 was the first diplomatic contact between Justinian and Chosroes.

It is seen that both emperors took action to consolidate their power elsewhere in the years following the agreement, and the "Eternal Peace" emerged directly in an emergency and both emperors benefitted from it. But there is no complete and detailed report of all the articles of the "Eternal Peace". This shows that the authors of the age might not have had access to some of the classified articles of the treaty text. The information obtained from the accounts of ancient sources and the only epigraphic document of the agreement reveal that the emperor Justinian made concessions compared to Chosroes. The agreement appears to represent substantial concessions made by the Eastern Roman Empire. Because they would make a payment to the Sassanids and they did not have an equivalent privilege from the Sassanid Empire. However, this peace reflects neither Justinian’s nor Chosroes Anushirvan’s long-term foreign policy strategy, shown from the fact that the peace treaty made in 532 was only maintained for eight years. One factor contributing to the rapid deterioration of the treaty was the correspondence between Italy and the Sassanids42, another was Justinian’s achievements in the West. Justinian’s policy of expansionism and reconquest in the West and the attempt to re-establish Roman power in the Mediterranean should have taken effect in breaking the peace agreement with Chosroes43. Because a successful Eastern Roman power in the West would later be moved to the eastern border, and there could be a problem for the Sassanid Empire, Chosroes should have taken the idea of stopping Justinian’s reconquest in the West. Consequently, both Chosroes’ and Justinian’s expansionist politics made inevitable the wars of the two empires during the sixth century.

42 Vittigis, the leader of the Goths, sent two envoys to Chosroes to persuade him to march against the Romans. See for the correspondence of Chosroes with Vittigis, Proc. de. bell. pers. II. ii. 1-15.
43 Proc. de. bell. pers. II. 1. 1-3. Cf. Malal. 18. 87; Zach. X. 6-8; Chron. Edes. 105; see also Cameron 1996, 161-70.
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