

Paul A. Stephenson
(Cork, Ireland)

ON THE NEED FOR FURTHER STUDIES OF MEDIEVAL HUNGARY IN ENGLISH

The establishment of this regular conference devoted to the discussion and publication of research into Byzantium and medieval East-Central Europe will provide a welcome forum for the delivery and publication of research into Hungarian history in French, German and, in particular, English. Byzantine relations with Hungary took centre stage in the first meetings, being the subject of five of the fifteen published papers, and will also be the subject of several papers in this conference¹. So many papers devoted to Hungary and the Hungarians may give the conference programme the appearance of imbalance. However, it is really a corrective to an area neglected by those studying, and above all teaching the history of early medieval Europe. It would be unthinkable to teach a survey from Late Antiquity to the Crusades without a thorough analysis of those so-called 'Scourges of Christendom', the Arabs and Vikings. Moreover, modern surveys will present the revisionist line on these scourges. Research into the relationships between Moslem and Christian societies across the fluid boundaries established in Mediterranean lands, drawing on charters and archaeological data, art and architecture, has highlighted the weaknesses of interpretations based primarily on hostile narrative accounts which posit a medieval 'Clash of Civilizations'. Similarly, the brutal image of the Vikings, articulated by far from disinterested churchmen in literary sources and synodal decrees, has been radically overhauled. Vikings travelled to trade as well as raid, and their activities, as well as their portrayal in written sources, must be understood against a backdrop of power politics, international diplomacy and ecclesiastical reform. Rather than view the Vikings merely as destructive agents of change, we now study a complex of ninth-century phenomena under the heading 'Viking-Age Europe'. In contrast, outside Hungary, discussion of a third 'Scourge of Christendom', the Hungarians, has scarcely

¹ *Byzanz und Ostmitteleuropa: Beiträge zu einer table-ronde des XIX International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Copenhagen 1996*, eds G. PRINZING and M. SALAMON [Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik, vol. 3], Wiesbaden 1999. Three of the five studies are in English, with one each in German and French.

begun². This has much to do with the fact that source material is so scarce, but more to do with the fact that discussion of that material has taken place within a national framework inimical to, and languages inaccessible to, the majority of scholars in 'the West'.

This conference and its publication, therefore, besides its duty to scholarship in and of medieval East-Central Europe, has a role to play in providing up-to-date information to hundreds of Anglo-American scholars teaching the history of Europe to students who read only English. It takes its place beside a number of recent international initiatives. The 1100th anniversary of the Hungarians' arrival in the Carpathian Basin, which coincided with our first meetings in Copenhagen and Cracow, inspired a series of conferences and exhibitions with accompanying proceedings or catalogues³. Still more important has been the establishment in Budapest of the department of medieval history at the Central European University (henceforth CEU) which teaches and publishes exclusively in English. A recent and significant development has been the establishment of a university press, which has begun to publish Hungarian medieval monographs and texts in translation.

A major new study from CEU Press of immediate interest to early medievalists is ANDRÁS RÓNA-TAS'S *The Hungarians and Europe in the Early Middle Ages*, Budapest 1999⁴. This book synthesizes a vast range of Hungarian scholarship, including the author's own research over four decades into the ethnography of central Asian peoples and historical linguistics. It is an extended translation of a work in Hungarian first published in 1996, and is offered to a European and American readership not 'as a scholarly monograph', but 'to inform rather than argue.' Róna-Tas is at his best when dealing with ethnographical and linguistic data: he has spent years 'in the field' in both Mongolia and among the Chuvash people of the Volga region⁵. Furthermore, as befits a man who has

² Marc Bloch recognized the importance of these questions, citing the onslaught of Hungarians, together with the Moslems and Northmen, as the catalyst for the emergence of 'feudal society'. M. BLOCH, *Feudal Society*, trans. L. A. MANYON, 2 vols, London 1962, vol. I, pp. 8-38. See also L. MUSSET, *Les Invasions, le second assaut contre l'Europe chrétienne (VII^e-XI^e siècles)*, Paris 1965, pp. 59-72, 269-273. Further provocative statements on the analogous impact of Vikings and Hungarians, with references, can be found in M. INNES, *Review article: Franks and Slavs c. 700-1000: the problem of European expansion before the millennium*, *Early Medieval Europe* 6 (1997), pp. 201-216, esp. 214-16.

³ For example, *The Ancient Hungarians. Exhibition Catalogue, Hungarian National Museum, March 16-December 31, 1996*, eds I. FODOR et al., Budapest 1996, contains an extensive historical and archaeological introduction, as well as a full commentary and abundant colour illustrations of the exhibits. One of the conferences, held in Paris in June 1997, has resulted in a number of essays by leading Hungarian scholars being collected and translated into French under the title *Les Hongrois et l'Europe: Conquête et Intégration*, eds S. CSERNUS and K. KOROMPAY, Paris-Szeged 1999. The Spoleto Medieval Symposium of 1987 blazed the trail, and the contributions to the published volume are extremely valuable: *Popoli delle Steppe: Unni, Avari, Ungari* [Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, vol. 35], 2 vols, Spoleto 1988.

⁴ This should be read alongside G. KRISTÓ, *Hungarian History in the Ninth Century*, Szeged 1996.

⁵ The insights of his early research on the Mongols allow Róna-Tas to make convincing suggestions on proto-Hungarian modes of production. For example, he manages to correlate the Hungarians' nomadism with the observation of a ninth-century Arabic author that the *Majgars* wintered in river valleys where arable land were plentiful. Róna-Tas suggests, by analogy with the twentieth-century Mongols, the proto-Hungarians sowed in the spring, moved on to the summer pastures to herd, and returned to reap in late autumn. They

written a book subtitled *Adventures in Historical Linguistics*, Róna-Tas offers a compelling analysis of the role of language as source material. Countless observations persuade and inform, for example one finds on a single page (p. 115) the suggested linguistic roots of the titles *zhupan*, *boyar* and *ban*⁶. Later, one learns that the Hungarian title, *király* 'king', derives through Slavonic mediation (*kral*) from the name of Charlemagne; and more fancifully, that every American owes a debt to a brief fashion in northern Italy for a variant of the Hungarian name Emericus (from the German Henrik), hence Amerigo Vespucci.

But who were the Hungarians before they named America? The origins of the Hungarians troubled those who watched their advance into Europe. Many equated them with the people of Gog and Magog. This was not the case, argued one anonymous letter writer⁷, clearly a speaker of Old High German, at the very beginning of the tenth century. Apparently, these Hungarians were peoples expelled from Istria, Pannonia and Illyria returning to their homeland. At an uncertain time those regions had endured a terrible famine, and a certain percentage of the population were banished to the marshes of the Maeotis (Sea of Azov) where they survived by hunting. Despite now having enough to eat, 'after the famine they had endured, they were called Hungri'. A delightful idea, but the name did not derive from the Old High German *Hungar*.

The earliest unequivocal references to Hungarian activities before the end of the ninth century are contained in three tenth-century texts, two Byzantine Greek and one Arabic: Symeon Logothete's continuation of George the Monk's world chronicle, the *De Administrando Imperio* of Constantine VII, and Ibn Rusta's so-called 'geography'⁸. The Hungarians appear in two distinct episodes: the return of a group of Macedonians, including the future emperor Basil I, to the Byzantine empire, and the construction of a Khazar fortress at Sarkel on the Don, both of which can be dated to c. 838. The Hungarians are called by three different names in Greek (*Tourkoi*, *Ouggroi*, *Ounnoi*), and yet another in Arabic (*m.j.g.r*). The Arabic term *m.j.g.r* appears to derive from a Khazar

always plowed virgin soil, moving to a new river valley each year. As the twentieth-century Mongols put it: 'the land also migrates'. For further observations see C. BALINT, *Die Archäologie der Steppe. Steppenvölker zwischen Wolga und Donau vom 6. bis zum 9. Jahrhundert*, Vienna-Cologne 1989; A. KHAZANOV, *Nomads and the Outside World*, Cambridge 1984.

⁶ Cf. M. EGGERS, *Das 'Großmährische Reich'. Realität oder Fiktion? Eine Neuinterpretation der Quellen zur Geschichte des mittleren Donauraumes im 9. Jahrhundert*, Stuttgart 1995, pp. 396-398; I. FODOR, *Neue Bemerkungen zum Verhältnis von slawisch und ungarisch* *zhupan-špan-ispán*, *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* 21 (1993-4), pp. 135-139. For additional surveys of Hungarian history and language see the chapters by J. KISS and A. GERGELY in the general work: *Die Ungarn. Ihre Geschichte und Kultur*, ed. L. Kósa, Budapest 1994.

⁷ RÓNA-TAS, *The Hungarians*, p. 283

⁸ Hungarians first appear in Frankish sources in association with events of 862, touched upon below. See *The Annals of St-Bertin. Ninth-Century histories*, I, trans. J. L. NELSON, Manchester 1991, p. 102. RÓNA-TAS (*The Hungarians*, pp. 354-350, 416-21) offers careful and persuasive readings of those chapters of the *De Administrando Imperio* concerned with the *Tourkoi*. A fuller, if problematic analysis of these chapters is supplied by L. VÁRADY, *Revision des Ungarn-Image von Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos*, *BZ* 82 (1989), pp. 22-58. See also M. EGGERS, *Beiträge zur Stammesbildung und Landnahme der Ungarn*, Part I: *Die ungarische Stammesbildung*, *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* 23 (1997), pp. 1-63, 23-31.

rendering of the Hungarians' own name for themselves, however the linguistic association is complex (Róna-Tas, p. 297). Of the three Greek names, *Tourkoi* is the most significant. Unlike *Ounnoi* (like *Skythos*, 'Scythian', applied by the Byzantines to many 'barbarian' peoples), and *Ouggroi* (from the Slavic *Ugri*, which we will deal with below), *Tourkoi* was probably used by tenth-century Hungarians to refer to themselves when dealing with Greek speakers, just as today a native of Budapest would identify himself in London or New York as 'Hungarian'. The ethnonym features also as the name of the country, *Tourkia*, on that portion of, or one of the panels later attached to, the Hungarian royal crown. Either the lower 'corona graeca' or the enamelled panels attached to it were despatched from Constantinople in the later eleventh century to 'Géza, faithful king of Hungary' (*Geovitzas pistos krales Tourkias*)⁹. There is, however, no unequivocal indication of what the Hungarians called themselves before the end of the twelfth century, when the anonymous author of the Latin *Gesta Hungarorum* wrote '... they are called *hungarii* in foreign languages, and in their own tongue *mogerii*'¹⁰.

Where did the Hungarians come from? The answer, of course, is elusive. Kristó and Róna-Tas agree that those who set out to identify the Ugrian *Urheimat* using linguistic and archaeological data will be disappointed: speakers of the Ugrian languages were a fluid group in a fluid world, and attempts to associate archaeological cultures with particular peoples are fraught with problems. Identification of the proto-Hungarian *Urheimat*, following the disintegration of the greater Ugrian block, is similarly tricky. Still, a great degree of internal cohesion must have been retained by the proto-Hungarians though centuries for their language to have resisted first the dominance of Old Iranian, and then 'Turkification'¹¹. Róna-Tas identifies the Hungarians' early medieval homeland in relation to the homeland of the Onogur Bulgars, and by relocating the Bulgars revives an older theory which placed the Hungarians' *Urheimat* in the Caucasus. He argues (pp. 215-20) that the traditional location of Kuvrat's Bulgar polity, between the Sea of Azov and the river Kuban, is based on a misidentification of the river 'Kuphis'. The Kuphis is first mentioned in an emended Armenian translation of Ptolemy, and later in three Byzantine sources: Theophanes and Nikephoros, where the location is ambigu-

⁹ For colour photographs of, and full commentary (much in English) on the crown, see now *Sacra Corona Hungariae*, ed. K. BAKAY, Kőszeg 1994, which maintains that the crown was a complete unit *ab initio*, and not a later fusion of an upper 'corona latina' and a lower 'corona graeca'. For the suggestion that the Byzantine enamelled panels originally adorned another gift, for example a casket, see J. DEÉR, *Die heilige Krone Ungarns*, Vienna 1966, pp. 72-80. See also *The Hungarian Crown and other Regalia*, eds E. KOVÁCS and Zs. LOVÁCS, Budapest 1980.

¹⁰ *Die „Gesta Hungarorum“ des anonymen Notars. Die ältesten Darstellung der ungarischen Geschichte*, eds and trans. G. SLAGI and L. VESZPRÉMY, Sigmaringen 1991, pp. 28-9. The labial short Hungarian 'a' is difficult to render in Latin, and is often represented by an 'o'.

¹¹ The nature and degree of 'Turkification' has been subsumed within a protracted debate over whether the Magyars were in origin Turkic or Finno-Ugrian. Although the Finno-Ugrians have clearly won, some would argue the degree of Turkic involvement in Hungarian ethnogenesis is still deliberately denigrated. For this view, and comments on the academic debate, see I. BOBA, *Three papers to the prehistory of the Hungarians*, Eurasian Studies Yearbook 68 (1996), pp. 189-202 at pp. 194-5; EGGERS, *Die ungarische Stammesbildung*, pp. 1-3.

ous, and also in *DAI* ch. 38, where it is certainly a river between the Dnieper and Dniester, and possibly the Bug. Archaeological 'proof' for this location north of the Black Sea has been provided by the discovery of Kuvrat's 'grave' at Malo Pereschchepino (Russian: Malaia Pereschchepina) near Poltava in Ukraine. That is, a 'grave' was discovered in 1912 in which were found no bones, but some twenty kilos of gold and silver goods, including two signet rings bearing the monograms, in Greek characters, 'Chouvr[a]tou' and 'Chouvr[a]tou patr[i]k[i]ou', 'of Kuvrat the Patrician'¹². Thus, Róna-Tas sees Kuvrat's realm stretching to the east and west of the Dnieper, from the Dniester to the Don. This relocation of Kuvrat's Bulgaria is far from conclusive, but it allows Róna-Tas to relocate the Hungarian homeland in the lands south of the Don: that is, between the Sea of Azov and the river Kuban, where previously Kuvrat's Bulgars were thought to have lived. Furthermore, it allows for the suggestion that as soon as Kuvrat's sons set off in various directions c. 670, as we have previously mentioned, the Hungarians were able to migrate into 'the land between the rivers' Dnieper and Dniester, that is, they arrived in their pre-Carpathian homeland, Etelköz ('the land between the rivers')¹³.

In contrast, Kristó identifies the Hungarians' early medieval homeland as Bashkirian 'Magna Hungaria' in the region of the river Belaia. Kristó devotes several pages (pp. 35-9) to outlining, and refuting, earlier theories which proposed a Caucasian homeland for the Hungarians. Moreover, and again contrary to Róna-Tas, Kristó¹⁴ suggests that the Hungarians occupied Etelköz only in the ninth century, and therefore only a few decades before they began to look further west¹⁵. His reasoning is based on 'archaeological facts', and the Hungarians' sudden appearance in written sources recording several episodes which took place between the Dnieper and the Danube after 830 (which we have noted above). The archaeological data are, however, sparse and open to alternative interpretations¹⁶. Moreover, Kristó's argument from the silence of earlier written sources does not

¹² J. WERNER, *Der Grabfund von Malaja Pereščepina und Kuvrat, Kagan der Bulgaren*, Munich 1984; summarised in J. WERNER, *Kagan Kuvrat, der Begründer Großbulgariens*, *Südosteuropa-Mitteilungen* 24/3 (1984), pp. 64-68. The find is securely dated to c. 650 by 68 Byzantine *solidi*, the last of which are an early issue of Constans II, struck in Constantinople 642-7. The monograms were deciphered by W. Seibt. Critical reactions to Werner's thesis, which has been effectively discredited, include: M. KAZANSKI and J.-P. SODINI, *Byzance et l'art „nomade”. Remarques à propos de l'essai de J. Werner sur le dépôt de Malaja Pereščepina (Pereščepino)*, *Revue Archéologique* 1 (1984), pp. 71-90. A full analysis and survey of the literature will be offered in a forthcoming monograph by Florin Curta.

¹³ EGGERS, *Die ungarische Stammesbildung*, p. 26, supplies further guidance to the copious literature on the meaning and location of Etelköz.

¹⁴ KRISTÓ, *Hungarian History*, pp. 86-87.

¹⁵ This contention has widespread support. See, for example, I. ZIMONYI, *Préhistoire Hongroise*, p. 39; I. FODOR, *The Hungarian Conquest*, (in:) *The Ancient Hungarians*, pp. 13-18, 15. On the medieval creation of 'Magna Hungaria' see L. VÁSÁRY, *Medieval theories concerning the primordial homeland of the Hungarians*, (in:) *Popoli delle Steppe*, vol. I, pp. 213-242.

¹⁶ For example, K. MESTERHÁZY, *Die Landnahme der Ungarn aus archäologischer Sicht*, (in:) *Ausgewählte Probleme europäischer Landnahmen*, eds MÜLLER-WILLE and SCHNEIDER, pp. 23-65, 25-6, also places the Hungarians in Etelköz from c. 830, but points out that archaeological evidence is slight: just three graves have been excavated, near Kirovograd on the river Ingul, which contain goods similar to those found in tenth-century graves in the Carpathian Basin. These appear to have been dated to the first part of the ninth century

disprove Róna-Tas's alternative scenario. Indeed, Kristó's own scepticism elsewhere warns against being persuaded by the number (rather than the arguments) of scholars he adduces in support of his position.

Whether the Hungarians reached Etelköz directly from Bashkiria or via Caucasia, and whether they dwelt there for centuries or merely decades, it is clear that in the mid-ninth century the Hungarians' attention was increasingly drawn westwards by the actions of various quarrelsome potentates. As early as 862 Hungarians had fought as mercenaries for Ratislav of Moravia against the Franks¹⁷. Thereafter some Hungarians or Kavars, a confederate tribe of Khazar extraction, may have settled along the northern reaches of the river Tisza, within striking distance of Christian lands to the west and south¹⁸. In 881 Hungarians once again fought with the Moravians, now ruled by Svatopluk, against the Eastern Franks (Bavarians) outside Vienna¹⁹. In 892 the Hungarians supported the new ruler of the Franks, Arnulf, against Svatopluk. At the same time, Arnulf secured an alliance with the Danubian Bulgars against the Moravians. The *Fulda Annals* for 892 report that the Franks asked the Bulgars to suspend the sale of salt to Moravia, almost certainly referring to salt from mines in Transylvania²⁰. Alarm bells began to ring in Byzantium, where relations deteriorated rapidly between Constantinople and the new Bulgarian ruler, Symeon. A dispute over the relocation of the designated market for Bulgar merchants from Constantinople to Thessaionica provoked Symeon to march into Byzantine Thrace. An embassy was despatched promptly from Constantinople to negotiate an agreement with the Hungarians. Thus, in 894, we find the Hungarians fighting for both the Byzantines against Bulgarians, and against the Bulgarians' ally, Arnulf, once more on the side of the Moravians.

because that is when the Hungarians were thought to have been there. They may, therefore, be earlier or later. For full coverage of the archaeological data see: I. FODOR, *Altungarn, Bulgarotürken und Ostslawen in Südrussland (archäologische Beiträge)*, Szeged 1977; BÁLINT, *Die Archäologie der Steppe* (see note 5). On the thorny question of 'Hungarian' burial rites, see C. BÁLINT, *Les tombes à ensevelissement de cheval chez les Hongrois aux IX^e-XI^e siècles*, *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 2 (1982), pp. 5-36.

¹⁷ K. BAKAY, *Hungary*, (in:) *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. III: c. 900 – c. 1024, ed. T. REUTER, Cambridge 1999, pp. 536-552, 536; S. DE VAJAY, *Der Eintritt des ungarischen Stammesbundes in die europäische Geschichte (862-933)*, Mainz 1968, p. 12; C. BOWLUS, *Franks, Moravians, and Magyars. The struggle for the Middle Danube, 788-907*, Philadelphia 1995, pp. 236-237; EGGERS, *Die ungarische Stammesbildung*, pp. 43-45.

¹⁸ MESTERHÁZY, *Die Landnahme der Ungarn aus archäologischer Sicht*, pp. 48-57, with copious references to earlier literature. Cf. EGGERS, *Die ungarische Stammesbildung*, pp. 43-44.

¹⁹ *Salzburg Annals*, s.a. 881: *Annales ex annalibus iuvanensibus antiquis excerptis*, ed. H. BRESSLAU, MGH SS, vol. 30, Stuttgart 1934, pp. 727-744, 742. The *Cowari* mentioned here are certainly the Kavars, *pace* VAJAY, *Eintritt*, pp. 16-17. See also BOWLUS, *Franks, Moravians, and Magyars*, p. 238; EGGERS, *Die ungarische Stammesbildung*, pp. 9-11, 41, 43.

²⁰ *The Annals of Fulda. Ninth-Century histories*, II, trans. T. REUTER, Manchester 1992, pp. 135-136. *Pace* EGGERS, *Das 'Grossmährische Reich'*, pp. 66-67. L. HAVLIK, „Hē megalē Morabia” und „hē chōra Morabia”, *Bsl.* 54 (1993), pp. 75-82, 78, notes that Moravian expansion in the 880s as far as the confluence of the Tisza and Maros rivers may have been to secure the salt trade. See also L. HAVLIK, *Bulgaria and Moravia between Byzantium, the Franks and Rome*, *Palaeobulgarica* 13/1 (1989), pp. 5-20, 16.

Kristó claims (p. 178) 'The Hungarians made the acquisition of lands, at least in the early 890s, the condition of their armed assistance.' However, the evidence he cites in support of this statement is not convincing, and we know from the *De Administrando Imperio* that the Hungarians had left their women and children, and their prince Árpád, in Etekköz with a significant number of troops to defend them. These troops suffered a major defeat at the hands of a further nomad people, the Pechenegs, probably at the instigation of Symeon. Moreover, the Pechenegs were themselves on the move, provoked to look west under pressure from yet another nomadic people, the Ouzes. Returning to find their homes and families in disarray, and their lands occupied by the Pechenegs, the Hungarians returned promptly, en masse, to the Carpathian region. The 'Hungarian Conquest', therefore, began in 895 (or 896) as the consequence both of shifting allegiances in eastern Europe, and of shifting peoples on the steppe²¹.

What effects did the arrival of the Magyars have on early medieval Europe? The post-Conquest period is referred to euphemistically in Hungarian as that of 'adventurous campaigns' (*kalandozások*), the first of which took place in northern Italy in 899-900. Once again, belligerent Christian potentates were responsible for the onslaught by the pagan Hungarians, for they were paid for by the Frankish ruler Arnulf, and aimed at his enemy Berengar. Indeed, the Franks are blamed for the onslaught of the Hungarians in a contemporary letter by Theotmar of Salzburg²². The Hungarians' departure from Italy was in turn purchased, following Arnulf's death, by Berengar. Berengar may also have encouraged the subsequent Hungarian occupation of Pannonia, which, as recorded in the *Fulda Annals*, was completed in the face of Bavarian resistance²³. The principal casualties of the Hungarian Conquest to the west were the Moravians, who seem to have established dominance over those Slavs and others who were settled west of the Tisza, although those lands certainly were not densely populated²⁴. The region had passed into Hungarian hands by 908²⁵. The principal casualties to the east were the Bulgarians, who

²¹ It has also been suggested that climatic change at the end of the ninth century precipitated the Hungarians' migration, fleeing drought in Etekköz. If this was indeed a factor, then the effects on the Pechenegs who moved into the region must be examined.

²² See *Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und der Brief des Erzbischofs Theotmar von Salzburg*, ed. F. LOŠEK, Hannover 1997, for the latest edition and affirmation of the letter's authenticity, which had been challenged. For further support and an English translation, see: C. BOWLUS, *Archbishop Theotmar of Salzburg's letter to Pope John IX. A forgery of Bishop Pilgrim of Passau?*, *Südost-Forschungen* 57 (1998), pp. 1-11; BOWLUS, *Franks, Moravians, and Magyars*, pp. 336-339.

²³ *Annals of Fulda*, trans. REUTER, pp. 140-141.

²⁴ *Annals of Fulda*, trans. REUTER, p. 142; M. FONT, *Hongrois et Slaves à l'époque Arpadienne*, (in:) *Les Hongrois et l'Europe*, pp. 171-99, 174-9. For new archaeological observations on this region see E. GARAM, *Das awarenzeitliche Gräberfeld von Tiszafüred*, Budapest, 1995. The 1282 graves at this site, on the eastern bank of Tisza some way north of its confluence with the Körös, were excavated 1965-72. Garam concludes that there were 6 phases of occupation through 250 years, and that the site was abandoned some years before the Hungarian invasion. The evidence from this small but representative site correlates with the testimony of the *Annals of Fulda* that the region into which the Hungarians moved was 'empty of peoples'.

²⁵ L. HAVLÍK, *Morava v 9.-10. Století*, Prague 1978, pp. 146-157; HAVLÍK, *Bulgaria and Moravia*, pp. 18-20, argues for greater Moravian longevity than is generally allowed. We cannot here reprise arguments

had exercised some degree of authority north of the Danube, including control over the distribution of Transylvanian salt²⁶. The loss of this major source of revenue and prestige may well have provoked the new Bulgarian ruler Symeon to look south, and the arrival of the Hungarians must be considered a significant factor in Bulgarian-Byzantine relations, and in the internal development of Bulgaria between Symeon's accession and his death in 927.

Magyar raids continued to penetrate lands to the west until the infamous battle of Lechfeld in 955. To the southeast far fewer raids were launched, all between 934 and 970²⁷. However, the purpose of the raids was not indiscriminate looting. Indeed, they seem to have been carefully planned and executed either to fulfil paid contracts, or to elicit treaties specifying that the Hungarians receive regular payments of tribute. While the charisma that was associated with success in battle was necessary for a Hungarian tribal leader to maintain his authority, the acquisition and distribution of wealth among his followers was perhaps even more significant, and this could be fulfilled through receipt of tribute payments without risking the lives of warriors and horses²⁸. Thus, for as long as tribute was received from Berengar no further raids were launched against northern Italy. Similarly, Saxony was not attacked after 924 for the nine years that Henry I made large tribute payments. Both the Bulgarian and Byzantine rulers made annual tribute payments, and accordingly suffered far fewer Hungarian assaults.

on the location and extent of Moravia, except to say, Havlík is the most prolific supporter of a northern Moravia, which would coincide with the modern region with that name. BOWLUS, *Franks, Moravians, and Magyars*, passim, champions a southern location, developing arguments advanced by I. BOBA, *Moravia's History Reconsidered*, The Hague 1971, and numerous subsequent articles. EGGERS, *Das 'Großmährische Reich'*, passim, locates the *Kerngebiet* of Great Moravia in the lands between the Danube and Tisza, extending across the Tisza. He identifies Marosvár as the city of 'Morava' (which Boba had identified as Sirmium, modern Sremska Mitrovica). For criticism of the need to identify a Moravian *Kerngebiet*, see INNES, *Franks and Slavs c. 700-1000*, p. 208. M. EGGERS, „Moravia“ oder „Großmähren“?, *Bohemia* 39 (1998), pp. 351-370, 358, acknowledges this provocative criticism, in an exhaustive review of reviews of his and Bowlus's works. He also promises a monograph devoted to the archaeology of the region, which will need to address the implications of several reports, including Garam's recent monograph (see previous note), which suggest that sites were abandoned decades before the arrival of the Hungarians.

²⁶ BAKAY, *Hungary*, p. 537, states explicitly that the Bulgarians controlled the mines. In fact, the extent and nature of Bulgarian authority north of the Danube is the subject of debate, often fuelled by modern national concerns, which we cannot here address. Contrasting perspectives are offered by: I.-A. POP, *Romanians and Hungarians from the 9th to the 14th Century. The Genesis of the Transylvanian Medieval State*, Cluj-Napoca 1996, pp. 91-129; A. SÓS, *Die slawische Bevölkerung Westungarns im 9. Jahrhundert*, Munich 1973, pp. 57-65; BÁLINT, *Südungarn im 10. Jahrhundert*, pp. 98-101; EGGERS, *Das 'Grossmährische Reich'*, pp. 57-69.

²⁷ For recent surveys of the raids, see: S. L. TÓTH, *Les incursions des Magyars en Europe*, (in:) *Les Hongrois et l'Europe*, pp. 201-22; BAKAY, *Hungary*, pp. 541-544. G. KRISTÓ, *L'An Mil: changement de régime en Hongrie*, (in:) *Les Hongrois et l'Europe*, pp. 11-25, 15, calculates 47 raids to the west and 9 to the southeast in the 71 years to 970. See also: H. EINSLE, *Die Ungarnschlacht im Jahre 955 auf dem Lechfeld. Ursachen und Wirkungen*, Augsburg 1993; P. ANTONOPOULOS, *Byzantium and the Magyar raids*, *Bsl.* 54 (1993), pp. 254-267.

²⁸ This point is made briefly but well by BAKAY, *Hungary*, p. 543, surely influenced by the important research by his editor. See T. REUTER, *Plunder and Tribute in the Carolingian Empire*, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Fifth Series* 35 (1985), pp. 75-94.

Furthermore, we cannot stress the destructive impact of the Hungarians arrival in the Carpathian Basin without noting the evidence for more peaceful interaction. The Rafelstetten toll ordinance of 903-6 famously demonstrates that traders continued to pass along the Danube from the northwest, through lands now controlled by the Hungarians²⁹. The Bavarians, or at least those Bavarians who controlled the process of exchange, were still able to enjoy the fruits of long distance trade, as were their neighbours to the north-east and southwest. Dirhems found in the graves of those Hungarians or Kavarars buried besides the upper Tisza suggest that trading contacts with the Islamic world were maintained during the period of migration, despite the presence of the Pechenegs and Rus who were competitors for control over the long-distance trade routes³⁰. In an often quoted reference in the *Russian Primary Chronicle*, referring to events in c. 969, the Kievan prince Svyatoslav Igorevich is held to have announced his intention to move to Pereyaslavets on the lower Danube because: '[A]ll good things flow there: gold from the Greeks [Byzantines], and precious cloths, wines and fruits of many kinds, silver and horses from the Czechs and Hungarians; and from the Rus furs, wax, honey and slaves'³¹. The exportation of horses by the Hungarians is corroborated in the Hungarian law codes, although unfortunately not in the earliest extant laws of Stephen I (997-1038). However, the laws of Ladislas I (1077-95) contain several clauses dealing with trade within and across the frontiers (Book II, clauses 15-18), including the ruling that all 'foreigners (*hospites*) who come to the frontier from other regions to buy a horse or to trade in other things must go to the king with a messenger from the *ispán* (*comes*) of the frontier and may, with the king's licence, buy and sell in the presence of the king's bailiff (*pristaldus*) whatever and however much they have been allowed.' The laws of Koloman I (1095-1116) (clauses 76, 77) state more prohibitively: 'No inhabitant of Hungary and the regions adjacent to Hungary should dare to buy a Hungarian horse.' The very fact that horses are consistently singled out suggests that they were traded frequently, often with foreigners³². Slaves are another 'commodity' mentioned frequently. The laws of Stephen I,

²⁹ The latest edition is *Dokumente zur Geschichte von Staat und Gesellschaft in Bayern*, ed. K. BOSL, vol. I/1: *Altbayern bis 1180*, ed. K.-L. AY, Munich 1974, pp. 205ff., nr. 136. On the nature of the document, P. JOHANEK, *Die Raffelstetter Zollordnung und das Urkundenwesen der Karolingerzeit*, (in:) *Festschrift für Berent Schweiniköper zum seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag*, eds H. MAURER and W. PATZE, Sigmaringen 1982, pp. 87-103. Further insights are offered by EGGERS, *Das 'Großmährische Reich'*, pp. 308-311, who dispenses with the notion that this was merely local trade.

³⁰ L. KOVÁCS, *Die Münzen der ungarischen Landnahmezeit*, Budapest 1989; C. BÁLINT, *Einige Fragen des Dirhem-Verkehrs in Europa*, *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 33 (1981), pp. 105-131; MESTERHÁZY, *Die Landnahme der Ungarn aus archäologischer Sicht*, pp. 50-51.

³¹ *Povest' Vremennykh Let*, eds D. S. LIKHACHEV and V. P. ADRIANOVA-PERETTS, 2 vols, Moscow and Leningrad 1950 (second ed. 1996), I, p. 48. English translation: S. H. CROSS and O. P. SHERBOWITZ-WETZOR, *The Russian Primary Chronicle*, Cambridge MA 1953, p. 86. See now S. FRANKLIN and J. SHEPARD, *The Emergence of Rus 750-1200*, London and New York 1996, p. 145.

³² *Decreta Regni Mediaevalis Hungariae: The Laws of the Medieval Kingdom of Hungary, I: 1000-1301*, ed. and trans. J. M. BAK, G. BÓNIS (†), J. R. SWEENEY, with an essay on previous editions by A. CSIZMANDIA (†), 2nd revised edition, in collaboration with L. S. DOMONKOS [The Laws of Hungary, Series I: vol. I], Idyllwild CA 1999, pp. 15, 30, 85.

Ladislas I, and Koloman I all attest to extensive slave ownership in late tenth- and eleventh-century Hungary, and others suggest that slave trading was also practised. Jews in the kingdom were specifically forbidden from enslaving or selling Christians (although they could own pagans). 'Nobody should dare to sell or convey outside Hungary a male or female slave of Hungarian birth, or anyone born in Hungary even of foreign parentage'³³. Abu Hamid testifies to a flourishing slave trade in the mid-twelfth century between the Muslims in Hungary and those of 'Rum' (Byzantium), recording that he personally owned a ten-year old Turkish slave boy³⁴. But here we have strayed too far from the Conquest and the volume of trade in all commodities, presumably including slaves, had increased dramatically by 1150.

Archaeological evidence for the eleventh century can be interpreted to suggest that the Hungarians took advantage of their acquisition of the Transylvanian salt mines – or at least control over the passage of that salt to markets to the west and south – to integrate themselves further into the trading nexus between East-Central Europe and the Byzantine Empire³⁵. Many pieces of Byzantine jewellery, especially earrings, buckles and pectoral crosses, have been discovered by chance or in excavations in modern Hungary. A comprehensive summary for the tenth and eleventh centuries has been produced by K. Mesterházy, who has dismissed the notion that such a volume and distribution of finds could have resulted simply from Hungarian raids³⁶. The maps he has produced illustrate a concentration of finds around Szeged, at the confluence of the rivers Tisza and Maros, and north along the Tisza as far as the river Körös. Szeged was the regional centre for storage and sale of Transylvanian salt³⁷. A remarkably similar pattern is evi-

³³ *Decreta*, ed. and trans. BAK et al., pp. 4-7, 9, 10-11, 13-15 (ownership of slaves); pp. 30, 66 (slave trade).

³⁴ I. HRBEK, *Ein arabischer Bericht über Ungarn (Abu Hamid al-Andalusi al-Garnati, 1080-1170)*, Acta Orientalia 5 (1955), pp. 208-209.

³⁵ For Transylvanian trade routes, and the location of salt mines, see O. MITTELSTRAß, *Beiträge zur Siedlungsgeschichte Siebenbürgens im Mittelalter*, Munich 1961, map IV; K. HOREDT, *Siebenbürgen in Frühmittelalter*, Bonn 1986. F. Curta maintains that there is no evidence to support the contention that the Hungarians had established control over the Transylvanian salt mines before 1000. For a critical overview of scholarship devoted to the region see his *Brief remarks on the history and archaeology of Transylvania and the neighboring regions around A.D. 1000*, (in:) *The Year 1000*, ed. P. URBAŃCZYK, Leiden 2001 [forthcoming].

³⁶ K. MESTERHÁZY, *Bizánci Balkáni eredeti tárgyak a 10-11. századi Magyar sirleletekben*, I, Folia Archaeologica 41 (1990), pp. 87-115; II, Folia Archaeologica 42 (1991), pp. 145-177. A German summary of these findings has been published: K. MESTERHÁZY, *Der byzantinisch-balkanische Handel nach Ungarn im 10.-11. Jahrhundert im Spiegel der Gräberfunde*, (in:) *Byzance et ses Voisins. Mélanges à la Mémoire de Gyula Moravcsik à l'occasion du centième anniversaire de sa naissance*, ed. T. OLAJOS, [Acta Universitatis de Atila Józef Nominatae, vol. 9], Szeged 1994, pp. 117-128.

³⁷ *Decreta*, eds. and trans. BAK et al., pp. 34, 99: 'Salt should not be stored in the centre of the kingdom except in Szalacs and Szeged, but in the borderlands.' See also A. KUBINYI, *Urbanisation in the east-central part of Medieval Hungary*, (in:) *Towns in medieval Hungary*, ed. L. GEREVICH, Budapest 1990, pp. 111-112; A. KUBINYI, *Handel und Entwicklung der Städte in der ungarischen Tiefebene im Mittelalter* (in:), *Europa Slavica – Europa Orientalis. Festschrift für H. Ludat*, eds K. D. GROTHUSEN and K. ZERNACK, Berlin 1980, pp. 424-425; BALINT, *Südungarn im 10. Jahrhundert*, pp. 98-120.

dent when the findspots of Byzantine coins north of the Danube are plotted. The greatest number of coins struck and circulating in the second half of the tenth and eleventh centuries have been found in the environs of Szeged. Once again, the coins cannot simply be the fruits of booty raids, and while some gold coins should be seen as evidence of tribute payments, others may indicate that high-value wares – horses, slaves, and probably salt – were being purchased at Szeged.

It would appear, therefore, that in a manner rich with precedents, the sedentary civilizations to east and west had determined to acknowledge the recently established dominance of a nomadic neighbour over long established trade routes, and to make available the fruits of those sedentary cultures – coins and manufactured, including so-called luxury, goods – to the nomads as tribute or for sale. In this way, the nomads were encouraged to trade rather than raid, and their leaders were offered access to status-enhancing goods which might reinforce waning prestige in a new pacific context³⁸. A further facet of the neighbouring sedentary civilizations, Christianity, also made significant inroads into Hungary from both southeast and west³⁹. The promotion of Christianity by agents from both Byzantium and the West accelerated the process of ‘state’ formation.

So much, therefore, can be argued by a medieval historian who studies the Byzantine Balkans, and therefore has an interest in Hungary, but who has not learnt Hungarian. Issues here touched upon – ethnogenesis, trade relations, sedentary-nomadic interaction, state formation – are all of enduring interest to students, and to teachers of the history of early medieval Europe. These same people, who have embraced the Vikings and Arabs, may also be willing to embrace the Hungarians if presented with the latest research in a language they, and more importantly, their students can read. There is every indication that this will be so⁴⁰.

³⁸ The trading over raiding hypothesis is explored in two Danubian contexts by P. STEPHENSON, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier. A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900-1204*, Cambridge 2000, pp. 38-45, 81-98. For a table and map of Byzantine coin finds, see KOVÁCS, *Die Münzen der ungarischen Landnahmezeit*, figs. 36, 40. For bold and controversial statements on the interaction between sedentary and nomadic peoples, especially with regard to slave trading, see O. PRITSAK, *The Origins of Rus', I. Old Scandianian Sources other than Sagas*, Cambridge MA 1981, pp. 11-29.

³⁹ On Hungarians and Christianity see now P. GÉRÉON BOZSÓKY, *Les premières rencontres des hongrois avec la Chrétienté*, (in:) *Les Hongrois et l'Europe*, pp. 243-55. Material evidence for the spread of Christianity may be found in the increased dissemination of pectoral crosses. See Z. LOVAG, *Byzantine type reliquary pectoral crosses in the Hungarian National Museum*, *Folia Archaeologica* 22 (1971), pp. 143-64; K. HORŇICKOVÁ, *The Byzantine reliquary crosses in Central Europe*, *Bsl.* 60 (1999), pp. 213-250.

⁴⁰ I wish to acknowledge, with gratitude, my tenure of an Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung Forschungsstipendium whilst researching and writing this paper. A fuller version will appear in *Early Medieval Europe* 10 (2001). I must also thank Matthew Innes, the reviews editor of that journal, for securing numerous books upon request, and for his trenchant criticism of the first draft. Günter Prinzing drew my attention to additional important literature, and Florin Curta pointed out a number of shortcomings. Notably, he disagreed fundamentally with my interpretation of the Transylvanian salt trade.