

BYZANZ
UND DAS ABENDLAND VII.
Studia
Byzantino-Occidentalia



BYZANZ UND DAS ABENDLAND VII.
STUDIA BYZANTINO-OCCIDENTALIA

Antiquitas • Byzantium • Renascentia XLII.

Herausgegeben von

Zoltán Farkas
László Horváth
Tamás Mészáros

Eötvös-József-Collegium
2021

Byzanz und das Abendland VII. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia

Herausgegeben von

Erika Juhász

Eötvös-József-Collegium
Budapest 2021

Der vorliegende Band konnte im Rahmen des Nationales Forschungs-, Entwicklungs- und Innovationsbüro – NKFIH-Forschungsprojekts „Társadalmi kontextus a szövegkritika tükrében: Bizáncon innen és túl“ (NN 124539) realisiert werden.



Verantwortlicher Herausgeber:
László Horváth, Direktor des Eötvös-József-Collegiums

Anschrift: ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium
H-1118 Budapest, Ménesi út 11-13

© Eötvös-József-Collegium und die einzelnen VerfasserInnen, 2021
Alle Rechte vorbehalten

A nyomdai munkákat a CC Printing Szolgáltató Kft. végezte
1118 Budapest, Rétköz u. 55. A/fsz. 2.
Törvényes képviselő: Szendy Ilona

ISBN: 978-615-5897-43-6
https://doi.org/10.37584/BuA_7
ISSN: 2064-2369

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Vorwort.....	11
Peter Schreiner	
Liaisons dangereuses. Die Ehe zwischen Anna von Ungarn und Andronikos Palaiologos (1272) im Spannungsfeld der Mittelmeermächte	13
Stanoje Bojanin	
The Byzantine Penitential Nomocanon in the Serbian and South Slavic Early Modern Printed and Manuscript Book	31
Salvatore Costanza	
Ungarn, Byzantinische Welt und Türkenkrieg in Filefos <i>Episteln</i>	51
Péter Ekler	
Georgius Trapezuntius, Johannes Regiomontanus and the <i>Defensio Theonis</i> . Second part	87
Isabel Grimm-Stadelmann	
Byzanz und das Abendland – Heilkunde im Dialog Byzantinische Medizin im Spannungsfeld zwischen Ost und West	97
László Horváth	
Die neu entdeckten Hypereides-Fragmente aus Herkulaneum. Reflexionen	163
László Horváth	
Dionysius of Halicarnassus' Essay on Hyperides	187
Predrag Komatina	
The Kangar of <i>De administrando imperio</i> and the Hungarian-Bashkir Controversy	205
Tamás Mészáros	
France and the French from the Perspective of a 15 th -century Byzantine Historiographer.....	225
Bojana Pavlović	
Prophezeiungen und Träume im Geschichtswerk von Nikephoros Gregoras – Vorbemerkungen	237

Srđan Pirivatrić	
The <i>translatio</i> of the Relics of St John of Rila from Sofia to Esztergom and back.....	261
Márton Rózsa	
A Long Dispute about a Little Orchard. The Social Aspects of a Case from the Chartulary of the Monastery of Saint Paul on Mount Latros.....	279
Boris Stojkovski	
Remarks on the Serbian Foreign Policy in the Age of Despot Stefan Lazarević.....	293
Pál Szabó	
ὁ χρηρ πλέον τοῦ εἰκότος φιλανθρωπεύεσθαι – Edict of Manuel Komnenos Concerning the Right of Asylum (1166)	313
Iván Tóth	
Some Observations on Kritoboulos' Characterisation in the <i>Syngraphē Historiōn</i>	323
Vratislav Zervan	
Die Begegnung des heiligen Königs Ladislaus mit dem heiligen Sava. Rätselhaftes aus der russischen und moldauischen Chronistik des 15./16. Jahrhundert	339
Ábel Csigó – Viktor Rinkács – Keve Szász – Ábel Török	
<i>P.Vindob. G 40159</i> : A Cut out of a List of Payments from the Papyrus Collection of Vienna	355
Natasja Čičić	
Transcending Borders – Initiation of the Hero in the Epic Romance <i>Digenis Akrites</i>	365
Ábel Török	
A Byzantine Epic in the Chronicle of Morea The Heroic Deeds of sir Geoffroy de Briel.....	375

Predrag Komatina

The Kangar of *De administrando imperio* and the Hungarian-Bashkir Controversy*

There are in the work *De administrando imperio* of the Byzantine emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (913–959), composed between 948 and 952, two interesting pieces of information about the people called *Kangar* (Κάγγαρ). Firstly, in the Chapter 37, after he recounted the information about the history, geography and the tribal and political organization of the Pechenegs who were at that time living in the steppes along the north coast of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov,¹ including the names of the eight tribes that constituted their people,² the emperor tells the following:

It should be known that the Pechenegs are also called *Kangar*, though not all of them, but only the folk of the three provinces of Iabdierti and Kouartzitzour and Chabouxyngyla, for they are more valiant and noble than the rest; for that is what the appellation *Kangar* means.³

* The paper is part of the project “Tradition, innovation and identity in the Byzantine world” (no. 177032), supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

¹ MORAVCSIK, GY. – JENKINS, R. J. H. (eds.), *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio* (= *DAI*). Washington 1967² (CFHB 1) 37,2–67.

² *DAI* (eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS) 37,15–24, 34–45.

³ Ἰστέον, ὅτι καὶ Κάγγαρ ὀνομάζονται οἱ Πατζινακίται, ἀλλ’ οὐχὶ πάντες, πλὴν ὁ τῶν τριῶν θεμάτων λαός, τοῦ Ἰαβδιερτί καὶ τοῦ Κουαρτζιτζούρ καὶ τοῦ Χαβουξιγγυλά, ὡς ἀνδρειότεροι καὶ εὐγενέστεροι τῶν λοιπῶν. τοῦτο γὰρ δηλοῖ ἡ τοῦ Κάγγαρ προσηγορία (*DAI* [eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS] 37,68–71).

In the first passage of the Chapter 38, within the story of the origin and the earliest history of the Hungarians, their *origo gentis*,⁴ the emperor recounted the following:

The Pechenegs who were previously called *Kangar* (for this *Kangar* was a name signifying nobility and valour among them), then stirred up war against the Chazars and, being defeated, were forced to quit their own land and to settle in that of the Turks. And when battle was joined between the Turks and the Pechenegs who were at that time called *Kangar*, the army of the Turks was defeated and split into two parts. One part went eastwards and settled in the region of Persia, and they to this day are called by the ancient denomination of the Turks *Sabartoi asphaloi*; but the other part, together with their *voivode* and chief Lebedias, settled in the western region, in places called Atelkouzou, in which places the nation of the Pechenegs now lives.⁵

The Hungarians lived in that country for some time, being subordinated to the Chazars, but then suffered another attack from the Pechenegs and, being defeated, fled farther West to reach the Pannonian Plain in 896.⁶

⁴ The bulk of the information on the early Hungarians the emperor surely gathered from the Hungarian envoys Bulcsu and Termacsu who visited his court most probably in 948 (*DAI* [eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS] 40,63–65); THURN, J. (ed.), *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis Historiarum*. Berlin – New York 1973, 239; DEÉR, J., Le problème du chapitre 38 du D.A.I. *Mélanges H. Grégoire* IV. Bruxelles 1953, 93–121; JENKINS, R. J. H. (ed.), *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio II. Commentary*. London 1962, 145–146, 153; Литаврин, Г. Г. – Новосельцев, А. П. (eds.), *Константин Багрянородный. Об управлении империи*. Москва 1991, 391; MORAVCSIK, GY., *Byzantium and the Magyars*. Budapest 1970, 104–107; CURTA, F., *Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages (500–1300)*. Leiden – Boston 2019, 256–258; KOMATINA, P., *Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De administrando imperio and the Byzantine Historiography of the Mid-10th Century*. *Zbornik radova Vizantolozkog instituta* 56 (2019) 45–46.

⁵ Οἱ δὲ Πατζινακῖται, οἱ πρότερον Κάγγαρ ἐπονομαζόμενοι (τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ Κάγγαρ ὄνομα ἐπ'εὐγενεῖα καὶ ἀνδρεία ἐλέγετο παρ' αὐτοῖς), πρὸς Χαζάρους οὐν οὗτοι κινήσαντες πόλεμον καὶ ἠττηθέντες, τὴν οἰκίαν γῆν καταλείψαι καὶ τὴν τῶν Τούρκων κατοικήσαι κατηναγκάσθησαν. Ἀναμεταξὺ δὲ τῶν Τούρκων συναφθέντος πολέμου καὶ τῶν Πατζινακῖτῶν, τῶν τηνικαῦτα Κάγγαρ ἐπονομαζόμενων, τὸ τῶν Τούρκων φουσάτων ἠττήθη καὶ εἰς δύο διηρέθη μέρη. Καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐν μέρος πρὸς ἀνατολὴν εἰς τὸ τῆς Περσίδος μέρος κατώκησεν, οἱ καὶ μέχρι τοῦ νῦν κατὰ τὴν τῶν Τούρκων ἀρχαίαν ἐπωνυμίαν καλοῦνται Σάβαρτοι ἀσφαλοί, τὸ δὲ ἕτερον μέρος εἰς τὸ δυτικὸν κατώκησε μέρος ἅμα καὶ τῷ βοεβόδω αὐτῶν καὶ ἀρχηγῷ Λεβεδίω, εἰς τόπους τοῦς ἐπονομαζομένους Ἀτελκούζου, ἐν οἷς τόποις τὰ νῦν τὸ τῶν Πατζινακῖτῶν ἔθνος κατοικεῖ (*DAI* [eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS] 38,19–31).

⁶ *DAI* (eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS) 38,31–60, 40,6–27. There must have passed several decades

“The land of the Turks” (ἡ τῶν Τούρκων γῆ) that was attacked by the “Pechenegs called Kangar” is described at the beginning of the same passage as a land “in the vicinity of Chazaria”, named Lebedia after the name of the Hungarian leader of the time, Lebedias, “in which the river Chidmas, also called Chingilous flows”⁷

As evident from the source, from that country the Hungarians, attacked by the Kangar, were forced to flee in two directions – towards Persia and towards the West, to the steppe on the northern shores of the Black Sea, occupied at the time of Porphyrogenitus by the Pechenegs.⁸

The country of “Lebedia” of the Hungarian tradition recorded by Porphyrogenitus is certainly the same one that the Hungarian Dominicans of the first half of the 13th century, inspired by the same, at that time still alive Hungarian tradition, started searching for in the vastness of Eurasia, referring to it as “Magna Hungaria” or “Hungaria Maior”.⁹ It denotes the first homeland of the Hungarians in which they lived until the 9th century, and not the country

between the Kangar attack on the Hungarians which forced them to come to “Atelkouzou” and this one that drove them out of it in 896, since they first appeared in that territory in around 837, cf. n. 46–47.

⁷ Ὅτι τὸ τῶν Τούρκων ἔθνος πλησίον τῆς Χαζαρίας τὸ παλαιὸν τὴν κατοίκησιν ἔσχεν εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἐπονομαζόμενον Λεβεδία ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ πρώτου βοεβόδου αὐτῶν ἐπωνυμίας... Ἐν τούτῳ οὖν τῷ τόπῳ, τῷ προρρηθέντι Λεβεδία, ποταμός ἐστὶν ῥέων Χιδμάς, ὁ καὶ Χιγγιλοῦς ἐπονομαζόμενος (DAI [eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS] 38,3–9).

⁸ On the “Sabartoi Asphaloi”, cf. JENKINS (n. 4) 147; MORAVCSIK, Gy., *Byzantinoturcica* II. Berlin 1958, 261–262; RÓNA-TAS, A., *Hungarians and Europe in the Early Middle Ages. An Introduction to Early Hungarian History*. Budapest 1999, 288–289, 416–421. On the Hungarians in the steppes of the northern Black Sea coast, cf. MORAVCSIK (n. 4) 45–49; RÓNA-TAS (n. 8) 325–330. Porphyrogenitus writes that the country “called Atelkouzou, in which places the nation of the Pechenegs now lives” (DAI [eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS] 38,30–31), that is, “the country of the Pechenegs, in which at that time the Hungarians lived, is called after the name of the local rivers (Ὅτι ὁ τῶν Πατζινακίτων τόπος, ἐν ᾧ τότε καιρῷ κατῴκησαν οἱ Τούρκοι, καλεῖται κατὰ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν τῶν ἐκεῖσε ὄντων ποταμῶν...)”, named *Barouch, Koubou, Troullos, Broutos* and *Seretos* (DAI [eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS] 38,66–71), corresponding to those between the Don in the east and the Seret in the west, JENKINS 149. The “country of Atelkouzou” is also mentioned in the Chapter 40 as the land named by its rivers and which was previously inhabited by the Hungarians and then by the Pechenegs (Ὁ δὲ τόπος, ἐν ᾧ πρότερον οἱ Τούρκοι ὑπῆρχον, ὀνομάζεται κατὰ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν τοῦ ἐκεῖσε διερχομένου ποταμοῦ Ἐτέλ καὶ Κουζοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἄρτίως οἱ Πατζινακίται κατοικοῦσιν, DAI [eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS] 40,23–25), cf. MORAVCSIK (n. 8) 77; JENKINS (n. 4) 145–146, 148, 151.

⁹ DEÉR, I. (ed.), *Relatio fratris Ricardi*. In: SZENTPÉTERY, I., *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*. II. Budapest 1938, 535–542; АНИНСКИЙ, С. А., *Известия венгерских миссионеров XIII–XIV вв. о Татарах и Восточной Европе. Исторический архив* 3 (1940) 95–108.

they subsequently occupied on the northern shores of the Black Sea, remembered in the Hungarian tradition recorded by Porphyrogenitus as “Atelkouzou” and by the Anonymous Notary of the king Bela III at the beginning of the 13th century as “Dentumoger”.¹⁰ That first homeland of the Hungarians is traditionally located in the Southern Urals region, where there is today the Republic of Bashkortostan, one of the federal entities of the Russian Federation. Its eponymous population are the Bashkirs, a people speaking a language that belongs to the Kipchak branch of the Turkic languages.¹¹ There have been found in this area material remains closely resembling those of the ancient Hungarians from the 10th century Pannonian Plain.¹² Turkic elements found

¹⁰ DAI [eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS] 38,28–31, 40,23–25; JAKUBOVICH, E. – PAIS, D. (eds.), *Anonymi Gesta Hungarorum*. In: SZENTPÉTERY, I., *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*. I. Budapest 1937, 33–41. Most scholars identify “Lebedia” with “Dentumoger” and place it at the lower Don River, around the Sea of Azov, while “Atelkouzou” is believed to have stretched from the Dnieper to the Danube, cf. MORAVCSIK (n. 8) 177; JENKINS (n. 4) 147; Литаврин – Новосельцев (n. 4) 392; ZUCKERMAN, C., *Les Hongrois au pays de Lebedia: une nouvelle puissance aux confins de Byzance et de la Khazarie*, ca. 836–889. In: ΤΣΙΚΝΑΚΗΣ, Κ. (ed.), *Το εμπόλεμο Βυζάντιο (9ος–12ος αι.)/Byzantium at War (9th–12th c.)*. Athens 1997, 51–74. ΡÓΝΑ-ΤΑΣ (n. 8) 322–330, 387, 418–419, with a complete survey of older literature, thinks that “Lebedia” was not a separate territory, but a part of “Atelkouzou”, yet to the West of the Dnieper. However, the emperor clearly states that the “country of Atelkouzou” which was previously occupied by the Hungarians is at his time settled by the Pechenegs, cf. n. 8, and their territory according to his precise information comprised both sides of the Dnieper, stretching from the Danube in the West to the Chazar city of Sarkel on the Don in the East (DAI [eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS] 8,34–35, 37,34–45, 42,20–23), which encompasses the supposed area of “Lebedia” at the Sea of Azov. The Hungarians dwelling to the East of the Dnieper in the steppe interior of the Crimea in 861 were mentioned in the Slavic *Life of St. Constantine-Cyril*, GRIVEC, F. – ТОМŠIČ, F. (eds.), *Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicensis*. Fontes. (Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta 4) Zagreb 1960, 110; MORAVCSIK (n. 4) 44–46. According to the information of the Arab authors based on the lost work of al-Jayhānī (the so-called “Jayhānī tradition”), the Hungarian territory on the northern Black Sea coast stretched between the two rivers flowing into the Black Sea, the Dūnā (Danube) and the Atil (Volga), cf. ZIMONYI, I., *The Muslim Sources on the Magyars in the Second Half of the 9th Century. The Magyar Chapter of the Jayhānī Tradition*. Leiden – Boston 2016, 38–55, 265–284, though the Atil there probably means the Don, whose lower course was regarded by the Arab geographers as the western branch of the Volga, cf. Антонов, И. В., Ал-Идриси о башкирах и стране башкир. *Проблемы истории, филологии, культуры* 27 (2010/1) 273–274. CURTA (n. 4) 254–255, places “Atelkouzou” in area to the West of the Volga.

¹¹ On the Bashkirs, their ethnogenesis and history, cf. Кузеев, Р. Г., *Происхождение башкирского народа*. Москва 1974; Усманов, Х. Ф., *История Башкортостана с древнейших времен до 60-тих годов XIX в.* Уфа 1996.

¹² Тюрк, А., Анализ археологических находок в X в. в Карпатском бассейне и их роль в изучении венгерской предьстории. In: Голдина, Р. Д. – Шапран, И. Г. (eds.),

in the Hungarian language represent the influence of the Oghuric branch of the Turkic languages and have their closest parallels in the language of the Chuvash, another indigenous people of the Russian Volga region, who are considered to be the direct descendants of the Volga Bulgars and Suvars, who were the closest neighbours of the Hungarians in their homeland at the foothills of the southern Urals.¹³ Some of the seven original Hungarian tribes, like the *Germat* (Gyarmat), the *Tarian* (Tarjan) and the *Genach* (Jenő), if not all, are also thought to be among the Bashkir tribes.¹⁴ Finally, as already noticed, following the information preserved in the Hungarian tradition about the origin of the Pannonian Hungarians from their eastern ancestral homeland, the so-called “Magna Hungaria” or “Hungaria Maior”, and about their relatives who remained in it at the time of the Hungarian migration, the Hungarian Dominican Friar Julian came to the Volga River in 1236–1237 and there among the Volga Bulgars met certain woman that originated from the Eastern Hungarians and following her instructions he finally reached those Eastern Hungarians in their homeland “on the great river Volga” (Invenit enim eos iuxta flumen magnum Ethyl), where he could easily communicate with them, “because they had

Взаимодействие народов Евразии в эпоху великого переселения народов. Ижевск 2006, 185–188; Тюрк, А., Новые результаты и перспективы археологических исследований ранней истории древних венгров (угры-мадьяры). In: Л. Н. Гумилев *мұрасы және қазіргі еуразиялық интеграция IX. Еуразиялық ғылыми форумға қатысуға шақырады.* Астана 2012, 22–26; Тюрк, А., От Урала до Карпатов. Новые результаты и перспективы в археологии Восточной Европы по поводу древних венгров. In: Боталов, С. Г. – Иванова, Н. О. (eds.), *II-й Международный Мадьярский симпозиум: Сборник научных трудов.* Челябинск 2013, 231–236; CURTA (n. 4) 252–254. Archeological remains testify that the area of Bashkortostan was inhabited by peoples of Finno-Ugric descent coming from the Trans-Urals region (Western Siberia) in the 5th–8th centuries, Кузеев (n. 11) 384–388; Тюрк, А., О вопросе башкирско-венгерских отношений и проблеме «Великой Венгрии» (Magna Hungaria). In: *Формирование и взаимодействие уральских народов в изменяющейся этнокультурной среде Евразии: проблемы изучения и историография. Чтения памяти К. В. Сальникова (1900–1966).* Уфа 2007, 352.

¹³ Кузеев (n. 11) 413–425; RÓNA-TAS (n. 8) 101–116, 321–322, 209–212, 220–227.

¹⁴ Немет, Д., Венгерские племенные названия у Башкир. *Археология и этнография Башкирии.* IV. Уфа 1971, 249–262; Кузеев (n. 11) 416–425. Cf. RÓNA-TAS (n. 8) 429–436; Тюрк О вопросе (n. 12) 350, for the criticism of this argument. The names of the seven Hungarian tribes are given by Porphyrogenitus, *DAI* (eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS) 40,4–6, while the Hungarian tradition recorded in the 13th century knows of the seven leaders of the Hungarian tribes (Hetumoger = “Hét Magyar”, i. e. “Seven Hungarians”) that led the Conquest of the Homeland, Anonymi Gesta Hungarorum (eds. JAKUBOVICH – PAIS) 39–41 sq. or that they were then divided in “seven armies” (VII exercitus), DOMANOVSKY, A. (ed.), Simonis de Keza Gesta Hungarorum. In: SZENTPÉTERY, I., *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum.* I. Budapest 1937, 165.

entirely the Hungarian language” (quia omnino habent Ungaricum ydioma).¹⁵ Although he does not explicitly say so, that “Great Hungary” he found was the land of the Bashkirs (“Bascart, id est Magna Hungaria”), as the two other European travelers to those parts, this time both of them Franciscans, John of Plano Carpini and William of Rubruck recorded a couple of years later (in 1246 and 1253–1254 respectively).¹⁶ The latter, furthermore, says explicitly that his knowledge about the Bashkirs comes “from the Friars Preachers who went there before the arrival of the Tartars”,¹⁷ confirming that it was the land of the Bashkirs where the Dominican Julian had found the Eastern Hungarians.

This identification became widely accepted and, at the dawn of scientific historiography, became the basis for many far-reaching conclusions about the ties and kinship of the two peoples, the Hungarians and the Bashkirs, that went as far as to say that it was in fact the one and same people, and the arguments that would corroborate and confirm such claims were then sought for in the works of the medieval Arab authors.¹⁸

¹⁵ *Relatio fratris Ricardi* ed. DEÉR (n. 9) 539–541; Анинский (n. 9) 98–99; FODOR, I., Où le dominican Julien de Hongrie retrouva-t-il les Hongrois de l’Est? In: ERDÉLYI, I., *Les anciens Hongrois et les ethnies voisines à l’Est*. Budapest 1977, 9–20; RÓNA-TAS (n. 8) 429; Тюрк О вопросе (n. 12) 348–349.

¹⁶ DAWSON, CH. (ed.), *The Mongol Mission*. New York 1955, 30, 41, 58, 80, 101, 131–132, 170; Тюрк О вопросе (n. 12) 348–349.

¹⁷ DAWSON (n. 16) 132.

¹⁸ The bibliography on the issue is quite extensive, comprising works that supported as well as those that disputed the theory of the Hungarian-Bashkir identity, cf. Хвольсон, Д. А., *Известия о хозарах, буртасах, болгарях, мадьярах, славянах и руссах Абу-Али Ахмеда бен Омар Ибн-Даста, неизвестного доселе арабского писателя начала X века, по рукописи Британского музея*. Санкт-Петербург 1869, 101–114; MARQUART, J., *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge. Ethnologische und historisch-topographische Studien zur Geschichte des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts (ca. 840–940)*. Leipzig 1903, 68–69, 515–516; Гарипов, Т. М. – Кузеев, Р. Г., „Башкиро-мадьярская“ проблема (Краткий обзор основных источников). *Археология и этнография Башкирии*. I. Уфа 1962, 336–343; Серебренников, Б. А., К вопросу о связи башкирского языка с венгерским. Уфа 1963, 5–23; Кузеев (n. 11) 400–413, 442–449; Миржанова, С. Ф., О древних этно-языковых связях башкир и венгров. *Советская Тюркология* 1981/1, 37–48; VÁSÁRY, I., The Linguistic Aspects of the “Bashkiri-Hungarian complex”. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevii* 5 (1987) 205–232; GOLDEN, P. B., *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples. Ethnogenesis and State-Formation in Medieval and Early Modern Eurasia*. Wiesbaden 1992, 258–264, 397–399; RÓNA-TAS (n. 8) 289–294; Зимони, И., Венгры в Волжско–Камском бассейне? *Finno-Ugrica* 4 (2000) 5–41; Иванов, В. А., Угорские племена в Восточном Закамье и Приуралье. *История Татар II*. Казань 2004, 408–417; Мажитов, Н. А., К проблеме башкиро-мадьярских связей – Annotation on the Article “On the Relationship Between the Bashkirs and the Magyars” by N. Mazhitov. *Вестник Академии Наук Республики Башкортостан* 11/2 (2006) 5–12; Тюрк О вопросе (n. 12)

The Bashkirs, for their part, were mentioned for the first time by a 9th century Arab traveler Sallām al-Tardjumān (“the Interpreter”), whose information is preserved in the works of his contemporary Ibn Khurdādhbeh and a much later, 12th century author al-Idrīsī, though his account of his journey in search of the Great Wall of China (“the Wall of Gog and Magog”) in around 842–844 was known to many other Arab and Persian authors of the Middle Ages.¹⁹ The Bashkirs appear in a longer version of Sallām’s account, which al-Idrīsī took from the unpreserved *Book of Routes and Kingdoms* of the early 10th century geographer al-Jayhānī.²⁰ According to it, Sallām met the Bashkirs somewhere in the area east of the Volga and north of the Caspian and the Aral Sea.²¹ At the very beginning of the 10th century (c. 902–903), al-Jayhānī provides also some information on them that is independent of Sallām’s account and, as evident from the information taken from his lost work by al-Idrīsī, placed them in the area between the Urals and the Volga Bulgars,²² in the southern Urals region, where Ahmad ibn Fadlan met them and described them and their customs in more detail in his description of his journey and stay among the Volga Bulgars in 921–922.²³ Their contemporaries al-Balkhi and al-Istakhri report that the Bashkirs were divided into two tribes – the one living on the border of the Oghuz, close to the Volga Bulgars and subordinated to them, and the other bordering the Pechenegs in the neighbourhood of the Romans (Byzantines).²⁴

346–347; ZIMONYI (n. 10) 60–66, 79–83, 90, 99–102; Антонов, И. В., Башкиры по данным ал-Масуди (X в.): историко-археологический дискурс. *Magistra vitae: электронный журнал по историческим наукам и археологии* (2017/2) 124–131.

¹⁹ VAN DONZEL, E. – SCHMIDT, A. (eds.), *Gog and Magog in Early Syriac and Islamic Sources. Sallam’s Quest for Alexander’s Wall*. Leiden – Boston 2009, 131–174; VAN DONZEL, E. – KERR, R. M., Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus. A note on Ibn Rustah in De Goeje’s BGA. In: KERR, R. M. – MILO, TH., *Writings and Writing. Investigations in Islamic Text and Script*. Cambridge 2013, 105–108. On Sallām and his journey, cf. VAN DONZEL – SCHMIDT 175 sq.

²⁰ VAN DONZEL – SCHMIDT (n. 19) 156–158; Коновалова, И. Г., *Ал-Идриси о странах и народах Восточной Европы*. Москва 2006, 27–28, 241–243; ZIMONYI (n. 10) 14–15; Антонов (n. 18) 126.

²¹ VAN DONZEL – SCHMIDT (n. 19) 135 n. 72, 191–192; Антонов (n. 10) 273–275; Антонов (n. 18) 126; ZIMONYI (n. 10) 79–80.

²² Рыбаков, Б. А., Русские земли по карте Идриси 1154 года. *Краткие сообщения Института истории материальной культуры* 43 (1952) 27; Антонов (n. 18) 126. On al-Jayhānī, his family and his works, cf. ZIMONYI (n. 10) 7–15.

²³ Ковалевский А. П., *Книга Ахмеда ибн-Фадлана о его путешествии на Волгу в 921—922 гг. Статьи, переводы и комментарии*. Харьков 1956, 130–131; Антонов (n. 18) 125–126.

²⁴ Хвольсон (n. 18) 105; Хузин, Ф. (ed.), *История татар с древнейших времен*. II. Казань 2006, 751; Антонов (n. 18) 129.

It seems that even al-Jayhānī was aware of the two groups of the Bashkirs, since he refers to those living near the Volga Bulgars as the “Inner Bashkirs”,²⁵ a connotation known to al-Istakhri as well.²⁶ Al-Idrīsī himself two centuries later, following the information of his predecessors, speaks in his famous geography, better known as the *Book of Roger*, after his patron king Roger II of Sicily (1103–1154), also of the “Inner Bashkirs” and the “Outer Bashkirs”, but in his account both groups lived close to each other, in the Southern Urals region between the Bulgars and the Oghuz.²⁷

At the same time as al-Balkhi and al-Istakhri, in the middle of the 10th century, in 943–944, the famous Arab geographer al-Mas’ūdī also left valuable information about the Bashkirs. In his famous *Meadows of Gold* (*Murūj al-Zahab*), he states that the Volga River (Atil), considering, like other Arab and Muslim authors, as its source the Belaya River in the southern Urals,²⁸ “flows from the upper reaches of the territory of the *Turks*”,²⁹ without mentioning that these “Turks” were in fact the Bashkirs, mentioned in the same context by other Arab authors, at first place al-Idrīsī, who consulted al-Mas’ūdī’s works.³⁰ However, elsewhere in this same work al-Mas’ūdī mentions the Bashkirs, but apparently those living to the west, at the shores of the Black Sea, which he identifies with the “Sea of the Bulgars, Rus’, Badjnāh, Badjnāk (Pechenegs) and Badjghird – those are the three peoples of the *Turks*”, promising that he will pay more attention to those peoples further in his work.³¹ When he reached that point, he kept his promise and gave a full account of them: “To the west of the land of the Chazars and the Alans there live four Turkish peoples, descended from the same ancestor... The first of them is the people of the Badjnāh, followed by another people by the name of Badjghird (Bashkirs), than comes a people called Badjnāk (Pechenegs), who are the most warlike of

²⁵ Рыбаков (п. 22) 27; Антонов (п. 10) 274.

²⁶ Хузин (п. 24) 752.

²⁷ Коновалова (п. 20) 111, 117, 121–124, 128, 144–145, 240–241, 250–251; Антонов (п. 10) 272–280.

²⁸ Cf. Рыбаков (п. 22) 25–27; Антонов (п. 18) 125.

²⁹ BARBIER DE MEYNARD, CH. (ed.), *Maçoudi, Les prairies d’or. Texte et traduction*. II. Paris 1863, 7–8; ДЖАКСОН, Т. Н. – Коновалова, И. Г. – Подосинова, А. В. (eds.): *Древняя Русь в свете зарубежных источников*. Т. III. Москва 2009, 113; Антонов (п. 18) 125.

³⁰ Коновалова (п. 20) 109–111; Коновалова, И. Г., *Восточная Европа в сочинении ал-Идриси*. Москва 1999, 83–91; Антонов (п. 10) 273–274; Антонов (п. 18) 125.

³¹ BARBIER DE MEYNARD, CH. (ed.): *Maçoudi, Les prairies d’or. Texte et traduction*. I. Paris 1861, 261–262; Гаркави, А. Я., *Сказания мусульманских писателей о славянах и русских*. Санкт-Петербург 1870, 127–128.

these peoples, followed by another people, called the Nūkarda...”, after which he adds a detailed description of their joint attack on the Byzantine territory in around 932.³² Al-Mas’ūdī, therefore, also knows of the “western” Bashkirs in the neighbourhood of the Pechenegs, but, according to him, they were not only the neighbours of the Pechenegs, but also a part of their tribal alliance.

It has long been considered in historiography that the information on these “Western Bashkirs” provided by al-Balkhi, al-Istakhri and al-Mas’ūdī actually refer to the Hungarians, in connection with the aforementioned thesis about the close relationship and even identity of the ancient Hungarians and the Bashkirs.³³ The attack of the Pechenegs, Badjghird, Badjnāh and Nūkarda on the Byzantine Empire in around 932 described by al-Mas’ūdī is almost exclusively identified with the Hungarian attack on Thrace in 934 known from the Byzantine sources, which is thus usually referred to by the scholars as the “Hungarian-Pecheneg attack”.³⁴ However, the Byzantine sources on the attack

³² Maçoudi (ed. CH. BARBIER DE MEYNARD) II. 58–64; Коновалова, И. Г., К вопросу об этнониме нӯкарда у ал-Мас’уди. In: Горский, А. А. (ed.), *Средневековая Русь*. Вып. 2. Москва 1999, 4–6; Антонов (n. 18) 127.

³³ Cf. n. 18. Most scholars share the opinion that the ethnonyms *Badjghird* and *Madjghir*, *Madjghar*, the Arab form of the Hungarian endonym “Magyar”, are identical, supposing that the former was in fact Turkic or Volga Bulgar form of the latter, cf. Хвольсон (n. 18) 111–114; MARQUART (n. 18) 515; GOLDEN (n. 18) 261–264, 397–398; RÓNA-TAS (n. 8) 289–294; ZIMONYI (n. 10) 60–61, 79–80, though that assumption is not universally accepted, cf. Кузеев (n. 11) 445–446. However, the information of the Arab authors on the Hungarians, deriving from the lost work of al-Jayhāni and collected by ZIMONYI (n. 10) 38–55, refer to the Hungarians exclusively as the “Magyars” (*Madjghir*, *Madjghar*), Антонов (n. 18) 128. The fact that a later Arab author and traveller al-Garnāti who visited Hungary (called by him *Unqūriyya*) in the mid-12th century, refers to the country and its inhabitants also as the “Bashkird”, Большакова О. Г. – Монгайло А. Л., *Путешествие Абу Хамида ал-Гарнати в Восточную и Центральную Европу (1131–1153)*. Москва 1971, 38–44, 54, and that a number of Muslim authors from the 13th and the 14th centuries mention Bashkirs in Hungary, Хвольсон (n. 18) 101–114; Кузеев (n. 11) 446–447; ZIMONYI (n. 10) 79–81; Тюрк О вопросе (n. 12) 346–347, remains controversial, but it is out of the scope of this research.

³⁴ BEKKER, I. (ed.): *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*. Bonnae 1838, 422–423, 746, 917; WAHLGREN, S. (ed.), *Symeonis magistri et logothetae Chronicon*. Berlin – New York 2006, 136,69, p. 334; *Scylitzes* ed. THURN 228. Cf. MARQUART (n. 18) 60–74; GOLDEN, P. B., The People Nūkarda. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 1 (1975) 21–35; ZIMONYI, I., *The Origin of the Volga Bulgarians*. Szeged 1990, 168–169; Коновалова (n. 32) 7; ZIMONYI (n. 10) 65, 80, 90, 105, 113, 243, 262, 306, 339; Антонов (n. 18) 128. The Badjnāh of al-Mas’ūdī’s account are usually identified with the Badjnāk (Pechenegs) themselves, while the Badjghird are regarded as the Hungarians, sometimes identified also with the Nūkarda, cf. GOLDEN (n. 34) 35; ZIMONYI (n. 34) 169; Антонов (n. 18) 129. According to Коновалова (n. 32) 8–9, the name „Badjnāh” most probably refers to a separate group of

of 934 mention only the Hungarians as the invaders and make no reference to the Pechenegs as the participants or as their allies.³⁵ Al-Mas'ūdī's account contains a detailed description of the siege of the mysterious city *Walendar* situated between the mountains and the sea by the four tribes, how the city fell and how they ravaged all the country towards Constantinople.³⁶ A shorter description of the event is found in his other work, *Book of Notification and Verification*, where he writes how the four tribes, here along with the Bulgars, "who are called *Walandariyyah* after a town located at the extremes of the border of Rum", blocked the road from Constantinople to Rome and ravaged all the land to Constantinople.³⁷ There is, however, in the Byzantine sources a description of another attack just a little bit earlier than the Hungarian one of 934. Namely, when the Bulgarian pretender Michael rose up in rebellion against his brother Peter (927–969) and took hold of a certain fortified Bulgarian city, he was joined by the "Scythians who defected from Peter's rule". After his death, these "Scythians" invaded the Roman lands "from Macedonia through Strymon towards Hellas and Nicopolis and raided everything there".³⁸ The "Scythians" was a regular term used by the Byzantine authors for the nomads to the north of the Danube throughout the Empire's history, including the Pechenegs in the 10th–11th centuries.³⁹ Their attack affected the region of Strymon, where the road from Constantinople to Rome, the famous "Via Egnatia" was passing through, and their attack ensued after the internal strife in Bulgaria. Thus, there is strong possibility that al-Mas'ūdī actually refers to this attack, that may have occurred indeed in 932. In any case, the attack of the Pechenegs, Badjghird, Badjnāh and Nūkarda he speaks of was not that of the Hungarians in 934. So, there is no reason for the identification of the Badjghird with the Hungarians. On the other hand, only recently I. V. Antonov has seriously considered the possibility that the information of al-Balkhi, al-Istakhri

the Pechenegs, while the identification of the Nūkarda with the Russian Novgorodians seems quite questionable, cf. *ibidem*, 9–15, with a review of older scholarship.

³⁵ In the first half of the 10th century the Hungarians and the Pechenegs were considered to be enemies, *DAI* (eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS) 3,2–5, 4,3–8, 8,18–33, 13,9–11; АНТОНОВ (n. 18) 129.

³⁶ Cf. n. 32.

³⁷ MARQUART (n. 18) 63; GOLDEN, P. B., The Migrations of the Oğuz. *Archivum Ottomanicum* 4 (1972) 58–59; ZIMONYI (n. 34) 168; ZIMONYI (n. 10) 231.

³⁸ *Theophanes Continuatus et. al.* (ed. BEKKER) 420; *Scylitzes* (ed. THURN) 226.

³⁹ KAZHDAN, A. P. (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* III. New York – Oxford 1991, 1857–1858 (O. PRITSAK).

and al-Mas'ūdī actually refer to the Bashkirs themselves, which would testify to the existence of the two Bashkir groups in the mid-10th century, the one in the Southern Urals region and the other within the Pecheneg tribal alliance at the northern shores of the Black Sea.⁴⁰ As outlined at the beginning of this text, in the *De administrando imperio* of the Byzantine emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, composed at the same time, in the mid-10th century, there are certain “Kangar” mentioned in two places, first as a common name for the three of a total of eight tribes of the Pechenegs on the northern Black Sea coast and then as a people who attacked the Hungarians and invaded their old homeland in the Urals and forced them to abandon it and to head west to the Black Sea. Aren't the Kangar of *De administrando imperio* actually the Bashkirs spoken of by the Arab authors contemporary to the emperor Constantine VII?

Within the shorter account on the Pechenegs, Bashkirs, Badjnāh and Nūkarda in his *Book of Notification and Verification*, al-Mas'ūdī notes that in one of his unpreserved works he wrote about how these four Turkish tribes immigrated from the east due to the conflicts that took place between them and the Oghuz, the Karluks and the Kimaks on the al-*Djurdjaniyyah* (i.e. Aral) Sea.⁴¹ This led the researchers to conclude that between the middle and the end of the 9th century, the Pecheneg tribal alliance suffered defeat by the alliance of the Oghuz, Kimaks, and Karluks, which forced them to leave the Aral Steppe around the Syr Darya and move west and reach the northern Black Sea coast, from where they expelled the Hungarians around 896.⁴² However, according to *De administrando imperio*, before settling in the then Hungarian country on the northern shores of the Black Sea, the Pechenegs lived “on the river Atil (Volga) as well as on the river Yayik (Ural), having as their neighbours the Chazars and the so-called Oghuz”, and that “fifty years ago”, that is, about 896, “the so-called Oghuz agreed with the Chazars and attacked the Pechenegs, overran them and expelled them from their land, which is still occupied by the so-called Oghuz.”⁴³ It was only this clash that forced the Pechenegs to go

⁴⁰ Антонов (п. 18) 124–131.

⁴¹ Волина, С. Л. – Ромаскевича, А. А. – Якубовского, А. Ю. (eds.), *Материалы по истории туркмен и Туркмениш* I. Москва – Ленинград 1939, 166; GOLDEN (п. 37) 58–59; Коновалова (п. 32) 6; Антонов (п. 18) 129.

⁴² Кузеев (п. 11) 134–135; ΖΙΜΟΝΥΙ (п. 34) 164–169; Антонов (п. 18) 129–130.

⁴³ Ἰστέον, ὅτι οἱ Πατζινακίται τὸ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν Ἀτὴλ τὴν αὐτῶν εἶχον κατοίκησιν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν Γεῆχ, ἔχοντες τοὺς τε Χαζάρους συνοροῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἐπονομαζομένους Οὐζοὺς. Πρὸ ἐτῶν δὲ πεντήκοντα οἱ λεγόμενοι Οὐζοὶ μετὰ τῶν Χαζαράων

west to the Black Sea coast where they encountered the Hungarians once more, expelled them and occupied their land, which they had been ruling already for “fifty five years” in the time of Porphyrogenitus.⁴⁴ On the other hand, the conflict between the Pechenegs and other related tribes and the Oghuz, Karluks and Kimaks described by al-Mas’ūdī occurred in the Aral Steppe and probably took place in the mid-8th century, after the collapse of the Turkish Khaganate in Mongolia in 745. Most probably it was the same conflict between the Oghuz and the Pechenegs that was recorded in a Tibetan source dating from the late 8th century.⁴⁵ Thus, al-Mas’ūdī and Porphyrogenitus do not speak of the same event, but of the two different ones, chronologically separated by a century and a half. Al-Mas’ūdī says nothing about the subsequent fate of the Pechenegs, Badjnāh, Bashkirs and Nūkarda before their arrival in the steppes of the northern Black Sea coast around 896, although it is possible that he wrote about that in more detail in the unpreserved work that he mentions. However, it is quite certain that precisely because of this defeat by the coalition of the Oghuz, Karluks and Kimaks in the Aral Steppe in the mid-8th century, which forced them to leave that area, they came to the Caspian Steppe between the Volga and the Ural Rivers, where, according to *De administrando imperio* they lived “from the beginning”.⁴⁶

If the Kangar of *De administrando imperio* were in fact the Bashkirs of Arab sources who, as part of the Pecheneg tribal alliance, along with the Pechenegs, came from the Aral Steppe to the area between the Volga and the Ural River in the mid-8th century, then the information recorded in *De administrando imperio* about their attack on the first Hungarian homeland, certainly located in Southern Urals in the territory of the latter Bashkortostan, would have a crucial and invaluable significance for their history, as it would actually testify to the way in which the Bashkirs conquered and settled their current land at the foot

όμοιοήσαντες και πόλεμον συμβαλόντες πρὸς τοὺς Πατζινακίτας, ὑπερίσχυσαν και ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδίας χώρας αὐτοὺς ἐξεδίωξαν, και κατέσχον αὐτὴν μέχρι τῆς σημερον οἱ λεγόμενοι Οὐζοι, *DAI* (eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS) 37,2–8.

⁴⁴ *DAI* (eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS) 37,8–14.

⁴⁵ GOLDEN (n. 37) 58–61; PRITSAK, O., The Pečenegs. A Case of Social and Economic Transformation. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 1 (1975) 215; GOLDEN (n. 18) 264–265; CURTA (n. 4) 158. However, recent scholarship tends to identify the opponents of the Pechenegs as the Uygurs, who crashed the Turks in Mongolia and established their empire in Central Asia in 745, ZIMONYI (n. 10) 68.

⁴⁶ The presence of the Pechenegs in the Volga-Ural area in the 8th–9th centuries is well attested in the Arab sources and by archeology, Кузеев (n. 11) 133–134; ZIMONYI (n. 34) 163; GOLDEN (n. 18) 265; ZIMONYI (n. 10) 68–70; АНТОНОВ (n. 18) 130.

of the southern Urals.⁴⁷ As one of the tribes of the Pecheneg tribal alliance, they would then come from the Aral Steppe to the area between the Volga and the Ural River in the mid-8th century, from which territory a part of them, due to an attack by the Chazars from the west, would have been pushed north to the southern Urals, from where they would have in turn expelled the Hungarian tribes, which for the most part went to the northern Black Sea coast. Since the Hungarians were first mentioned north of the Black Sea around 837,⁴⁸ then, the aforementioned Kangar/Bashkir attack on the Hungarians in the southern Urals can be safely dated to some year before, in approximately 830.⁴⁹ This, on the other hand, is quite consistent with the fact that the Bashkirs were for the first time mentioned as a separate people in the area in the description of the journey of Sallām al-Tardjumān in 842–844.⁵⁰ The fact that according to the Chapter 38 of the *De administrando imperio* those were the “Pechenegs formerly called Kangar” or the “Pechenegs then called Kangar” who attacked the Hungarians does not change anything in the identification of these Kangar with the Bashkirs. The fact that in the emperor’s account it had been previously stated that the three Pecheneg tribes were called Kangar led to the conclusion that the Kangar

⁴⁷ According to the most common opinion, cf. Кузеев (n. 11) 133–138, 425–435; Усманов (n. 11) 91–92, the Bashkirs originally dwelt along with the Pechenegs in the Aral Steppe around the Syr Darya, from where they in the 8th–9th centuries gradually migrated westward to the Ural-Volga region and then farther west to the northern Black Sea coast and north to the Southern Urals. Антонов (n. 18) 130, ends his minute analysis of the information of al-Mas’ūdi on the Bashkirs with a conclusion that the Bashkirs and the Pechenegs lived at the Aral Sea until the 9th century, then, pressed by the Oghuz and their allies, came to the Volga-Ural area, from where at the very end of the 9th century, again under the pressure by the Oghuz, a part of them went north and settled in the Southern Urals, in the present Bashkortostan, while another part proceeded with the majority of the Pechenegs to the north shores of the Black Sea.

⁴⁸ *Theophanes Continuatus et al.* (ed. BEKKER) 817–819; *Symeonis magistri et logothetae Chronicon* (ed. WAHLGREN) 131,11–13, pp. 236–237.

⁴⁹ The advance of the Hungarians from the East towards the northern Black Sea coast in the 830-ies urged the Chazars to improve their defense with the construction of the fortress of Sarkel on the Don River, *DAI* (eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS) 42,20–55; SIGNES CODOÑER J., *The Emperor Theophilos and the East, 829–842. Court and Frontiers in Byzantium during the Last Phase of Iconoclasm*. Aldershot 2014, 337–345. On the general situation in the area north of the Black Sea at the time and the first appearance of the Hungarians, cf. *ibidem* 349–364; CURTA (n. 4) 128–151.

⁵⁰ According to Кузеев (n. 11) 136; Усманов (n. 11) 91, Sallām met the Bashkirs east of the Volga, in the steppe between the Aral and the Caspian Sea, before they moved to their present territory in the Southern Urals. However, in the middle ages the Bashkir territory stretched farther south than in modern times and approached the steppe region east of the Volga, cf. Кузеев (n. 11) 436–438; Антонов (n. 18) 126–127.

were Pechenegs, so the author understood and interpreted the information on the Kangar attack on the Hungarians as an attack by the Pechenegs.

That would be the way in which a part of the Kangar/Bashkir people separated from their compatriots and other tribes of the Pecheneg tribal alliance in the Volga and Ural rivers area, and settled in the former Hungarian country in Southern Urals, pushing the Hungarians west to the northern Black Sea coast.⁵¹ The other part of the Kangar/Bashkir people remained in the Volga-Ural area and within the Pecheneg tribal alliance, and with them they reached the northern shores of the Black Sea at the very end of the 9th century, from where they once again expelled the Hungarians, and where they were mentioned in the following century by al-Balkhi, al-Istakhri and al-Mas'ūdi, and as the Kangar by the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus. From the account of al-Mas'ūdi about their position, it cannot be concluded which part of that area was occupied by the Bashkirs.⁵² However, the Chapter 37 of the *De administrando imperio* contains precise information on the distribution of the eight tribes of the Pecheneg tribal alliance, among them the three from the Kangar, who we consider to be the Bashkirs – Iabdierti, Kouartzitzour and Chabouxyngyla. The Kouartzitzour tribe lived east of the Dnieper River, “towards the eastern and northern regions facing the Oghuz, the Chazars, the Alans, Cherson and the other Climata,”⁵³ while the Chabouxyngyla and Iabdierti lived west of the Dnieper, the first in the neighbourhood of the Hungarians, therefore, near the Carpathians, and the other near the Eastern Slavic tribes, the Russian subjects of Uglichi, Drevlyani and Lendjani (Poljani), therefore towards Podolia.⁵⁴

Regarding the very name “Kangar”, it is stated in the *De administrando imperio* at two places that it signifies “more courageous and nobler” than other

⁵¹ Серебрянников (n. 18) 22–23; Кузеев (n. 11) 127–128, 442–445; Тюрк О вопросе (n. 12) 352, point to the fact that the Hungarian and the Bashkir languages have very little in common, which would mean that when the Bashkirs conquered their country there were not many Hungarians left in it, because the impact of the Hungarian language on the Bashkir would be significantly greater had they encountered larger Hungarian masses. But, the Bashkirs won over the war and, as a consequence, expelled the Hungarians, so there was no opportunity for a deeper contact between the two. However, scarce remnants of the Hungarians may have remained in the country among the Bashkirs, preserving their language as late as the 13th century and their tribal organization, but gradually losing their identity and becoming turkified and assimilated into the Bashkirs, GOLDEN (n. 18) 262, 264, 399.

⁵² АНТОНОВ (n. 18) 130.

⁵³ DAI (eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS) 37,34–39.

⁵⁴ DAI (eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS) 37,39–45. On the Pecheneg tribes, cf. GOLDEN (n. 18) 266; CURTA (n. 4) 160–161.

tribes of the Pecheneg tribal alliance.⁵⁵ The scholars pointed to an ancient Turkic word *qīngīr* with approximately the same meaning,⁵⁶ while others connected it to the ancient Indo-European sedentary population of Central Asia, who later merged with the nomadic Turkic tribes and identified them with the *Kāngārās* mentioned in an inscription of the Turkic khagan in 732.⁵⁷ The name itself cannot be linked to the name of the Bashkirs neither morphologically nor etymologically and semantically.⁵⁸ There is, nevertheless, among the most important Bashkir tribes the one called “Kangly”, which is thought to reflect the old name “Kangar”.⁵⁹ Since the Chapter 38 of *De administrando imperio* that contains the story on the Kangar attack on the Hungarians is mostly based on the Hungarian tradition,⁶⁰ it may mean that the Hungarians used the name “Kangar”, borne by one of their tribes, for the Bashkirs in general. It is assumed, on the other hand, that the information on the Kangar as the name for the three Pecheneg tribes in the Chapter 37 comes from the Pecheneg source.⁶¹ It may mean that the Pechenegs also used that name for their allies Bashkirs, but alternatively it could testify that such information in fact comes from the Hungarian, rather than from the Pecheneg tradition.⁶²

The proposed identification of the Kangar mentioned by Porphyrogenitus with the Bashkirs whose part branched off of the Pecheneg-Bashkir tribal alliance in the Volga-Ural region under the pressure of the Chazars in the middle of the first half of the 9th century and went north to the Southern Urals where they attacked and expelled the Hungarians and settled in their land, explains in a satisfactory manner how the ancient Hungarian homeland “Magna Hungaria” became the “country of the Bashkirs” – modern Bashkortostan. On the other hand, it obviously excludes the possibility of the identification of the Hungarians and the Bashkirs, which would be a contribution to this long standing scholarly controversy.

⁵⁵ DAI (eds. MORAVCSIK – JENKINS) 37,70–71, 38,20–21.

⁵⁶ MORAVCSIK (n. 8) 145; JENKINS (n. 4) 145.

⁵⁷ PRITSAK (n. 43) 212–214; GOLDEN (n. 18) 265; Хамидуллин, С. И. (ed.), *История башкирских родов*. Т. 5. Уфа 2014, 22–38; ZIMONYI (n. 10) 69–70.

⁵⁸ On the etymology and meaning of the name “Bashkir”, cf. Кузеев (n. 11) 447–449; Тюрк О вопросе (n. 12) 346–347.

⁵⁹ Кузеев (n. 11) 356–359; Хамидуллин (n. 57) 38–42, 69–91.

⁶⁰ DEÉR (n. 4) 93–121; JENKINS (n. 4) 145–146, 153.

⁶¹ JENKINS (n. 4) 145.

⁶² КОМАТИНА (n. 4) 45–46.

Bibliography

Sources

- BARBIER DE MEYNARD, CH. (ed.): *Maçoudi, Les prairies d'or. Texte et traduction*. I-II. Paris 1861, 1863.
- BEKKER, IMM. (ed.): *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*. Bonnae 1838.
- DEÉR, I. (ed.), Relatio fratris Ricardi. In: SZENTPÉTERY, I., *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*. II. Budapest 1938, 535–542.
- DOMANOVSKY, A. (ed.), Simonis de Keza Gesta Hungarorum. In: SZENTPÉTERY, I., *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*. I. Budapest 1937.
- ЈАКУБОВИЧ, Е. – ПАИС, D. (eds.), Anonymi Gesta Hungarorum. In: SZENTPÉTERY, I., *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*. I. Budapest 1937, 33–41.
- MORAVCSIK, GY. – JENKINS, R. J. H. (eds.), *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio*. (CFHB 1) Washington 1967².
- THURN, J. (ed.), *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis Historiarum*. Berlin – New York 1973.
- WAHLGREN, S. (ed.), *Symeonis magistri et logothetae Chronicon*. Berlin – New York 2006.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110202823>

Literature

- Анинский, С. А., Известия венгерских миссионеров XIII–XIV вв. о Татарах и Восточной Европе. *Исторический архив* 3 (1940) 95–108.
- Антонов, И. В., Ал-Идриси о башкирах и стране башкир. *Проблемы истории, филологии, культуры* 27/1 (2010) 273–274.
- Антонов, И. В., Башкиры по данным ал-Масуди (X в.): историко-археологический дискурс. *Magistra vitae: электронный журнал по историческим наукам и археологии* (2017/2) 124–131.
- Большакова О. Г. – Монгайло А. Л., *Путешествие Абу Хамида ал-Гарнати в Восточную и Центральную Европу (1131–1153)*. Москва 1971.
- CURTA, F., *Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages (500–1300)*. Leiden – Boston 2019.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004395190>

- DEÉR, J., Le problème du chapitre 38 du D.A.I. *Mélanges H. Grégoire IV*. Bruxelles 1953.
- ДЖАКСОН, Т. Н. – Коновалова, И. Г. – Подосинова, А. В. (eds.): *Древняя Русь в свете зарубежных источников*. III. Москва 2009.
- FODOR, I., Où le dominican Julien de Hongrie retrouva-t-il les Hongrois de l'Est? In: ERDÉLYI, I., *Les anciens Hongrois et les ethnies voisines à l'Est*. Budapest 1977, 9–20.
- Гарипов, Т. М. – Кузеев, Р. Г., „Башкиро-мадьярская“ проблема (Краткий обзор основных источников). *Археология и этнография Башкирии*. I. Уфа 1962.
- Гаркави, А. Я., *Сказания мусульманских писателей о славянах и русских*. Санкт-Петербург 1870.
- GOLDEN, P. B., The Migrations of the Oğuz. *Archivum Ottomanicum* 4 (1972) 58–59.
- GOLDEN, P. B., The People Nūkarda. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 1 (1975) 21–35.
- GOLDEN, P. B., *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples. Ethnogenesis and State-Formation in Medieval and Early Modern Eurasia*. Wiesbaden 1992.
- GRIVEC, F. – TOMŠIČ, F. (eds.), *Constantinus et Methodius Thessalonicenses. Fontes*. (Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta 4) Zagreb 1960.
- Хамидуллин, С. И. (ed.), *История башкирских родов*. V. Уфа 2014.
- Хвольсон, Д. А., *Известия о хозарах, буртасах, болгарях, мадьярах, славянах и руссах Абу-Али Ахмеда бен Омар Ибн-Даста, неизвестного доселе арабского писателя начала X века, по рукописи Британского музея*. Санкт-Петербург 1869.
- Иванов, В. А., Угорские племена в Восточном Закарье и Приуралье. *История Татар II*. Казань 2004, 408–417.
- Хузин, Ф. (ed.), *История татар с древнейших времен*. II. Казань 2006.
- JENKINS, R. J. H. (ed.), *Constantine Porphyrogenitus De administrando imperio II. Commentary*. London 1962.
- КОМАТИНА, Р., Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio* and the Byzantine Historiography of the Mid-10th Century. *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 56 (2019) 45–46.
<https://doi.org/10.2298/ZRVI1956039K>
- Коновалова, И. Г., *Ал-Идриси о странах и народах Восточной Европы*. Москва 2006, 27–28.
- Коновалова, И. Г., *Восточная Европа в сочинении ал-Идриси*. Москва 1999.
- Коновалова, И. Г., К вопросу об этнониме *нукарда* у ал-Мас'уди. In: Горский, А. А. (ed.), *Средневековая Русь*. II. Москва 1999, 4–6.

- Ковалевский А. П., *Книга Ахмеда ибн-Фадлана о его путешествии на Волгу в 921—922 гг. Статьи, переводы и комментарии*. Харьков 1956.
- Кузеев, Р. Г., *Происхождение башкирского народа*. Москва 1974.
- Литаврин, Г. Г. – Новосельцев, А. П. (eds.), *Константин Багрянородный. Об управлении империей*. Москва 1991.
- MARQUART, J., *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge. Ethnologische und historisch-topographische Studien zur Geschichte des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts (ca. 840–940)*. Leipzig 1903.
- Мажитов, Н. А., К проблеме башкиро-мадьярских связей – Annotation on the Article “On the Relationship Between the Bashkirs and the Magyars” by N. Mazhitov. *Вестник Академии Наук Республики Башкортостан* 11/2 (2006) 5–12.
- Миржанова, С. Ф., О древних этно-языковых связях башкир и венгров. *Советская Тюркология* 1981/1, 37–48.
- MORAVCSIK, Gy., *Byzantinoturcica II*. Berlin 1958.
- MORAVCSIK, Gy., *Byzantium and the Magyars*. Budapest 1970.
- Немет, Д., Венгерские племенные названия у Башкир. *Археология и этнография Башкирии*. IV. Уфа 1971, 249–262.
- PRITSAK, O., The Pečenegs. A Case of Social and Economic Transformation. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 1 (1975) 211–236.
- RÓNA-TAS, A., *Hungarians and Europe in the Early Middle Ages. An Introduction to Early Hungarian History*. Budapest 1999.
- Рыбаков, Б. А., Русские земли по карте Идриси 1154 года. *Краткие сообщения Института истории материальной культуры* 43 (1952) 3–44.
- Серебренников, Б. А., К вопросу о связи башкирского языка с венгерским. Уфа 1963.
- SIGNES CODOÑER J., *The Emperor Theophilos and the East, 829–842. Court and Frontiers in Byzantium during the Last Phase of Iconoclasm*. Aldershot 2014.
- Тюрк, А., Анализ археологических находок в X в. в Карпатском бассейне и их роль в изучении венгерской предыстории. In: Голдина, Р. Д. – Шапран, И. Г. (eds.), *Взаимодействие народов Евразии в эпоху великого переселения народов*, ред. Ижевск 2006, 185–188.
- Тюрк, А., О вопросе башкирско-венгерских отношений и проблеме «Великой Венгрии» (Magna Hungaria). In: *Формирование и взаимодействие уральских народов в изменяющейся этнокультурной среде Евразии: проблемы изучения и историография. Чтения памяти К. В. Сальникова (1900–1966)*. Уфа 2007.

- Тюрк, А., Новые результаты и перспективы археологических исследований ранней истории древних венгров (угры-мадьяры). In: *Л. Н. Гумилев мұрасы және қазіргі еуразиялық интеграция IX. Еуразиялық ғылыми форумға қатысуға шақырады*. Астана 2012, 22–26.
- Тюрк, А., От Урала до Карпатов. Новые результаты и перспективы в археологии Восточной Европы по поводу древних венгров. In: Боталов, С. Г. – Иванова, Н. О. (eds.), *II-й Международный Магьярский симпозиум: Сборник научных трудов*. Челябинск 2013, 231–236.
- Усманов, Х. Ф., *История Башкортостана с древнейших времен до 60-тих годов XIX в.* Уфа 1996.
- VAN DONZEL, E. – KERR, R. M., Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus. A Note on Ibn Rustah in De Goeje's BGA. In: KERR, R. M. – MILO, TH., *Writings and Writing. Investigations in Islamic Text and Script*. Cambridge 2013, 105–108.
- VAN DONZEL, E. – SCHMIDT, A. (eds.), *Gog and Magog in Early Syriac and Islamic Sources. Sallam's Quest for Alexander's Wall*. Leiden – Boston 2009.
- VÁSÁRY, I., The Linguistic Aspects of the “Bashkiro-Hungarian complex”. *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevii* 5 (1987) 205–232.
- Волина, С. Л. – Ромаскевича, А. А. – Якубовского, А. Ю. (eds.), *Материалы по истории туркмен и Туркмении I*. Москва – Ленинград 1939.
- ZIMONYI, I., *The Origin of the Volga Bulgarians*. Szeged 1990.
- Зимони, И., Венгры в Волжско–Камском бассейне? *Finno-Ugrica* 4 (2000) 5–41.
- ZIMONYI, I., *The Muslim Sources on the Magyars in the Second Half of the 9th Century. The Magyar Chapter of the Jayhānī Tradition*. Leiden – Boston 2016.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004306110>
- ZUCKERMAN, C., Les Hongrois au pays de Lebedia: une nouvelle puissance aux confins de Byzance et de la Khazarie, ca. 836–889. In: ΤΣΙΚΝΑΚΕΣ, Κ. (ed.), *Το εμπόλεμο Βυζάντιο (9ος–12ος αι.)/Byzantium at War (9th–12th c.)*. Athens 1997, 51–74.

ANTIQUITAS • BYZANTIUM • RENASCENTIA

Herausgeber der Reihe:

Zoltán Farkas – László Horváth – Tamás Mészáros

ISSN: 2064-2369

I: Szepessy Tibor: *Bevezetés az ógörög verstanba*. Szerkesztette: Mayer Gyula. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2013. ISBN: 978-615-5371-10-3. 266 p.

II: Kapitánffy István – Szepessy Tibor (szerk.): *Bevezetés az ógörög irodalom történetébe*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2013. ISBN: 978-615-5371-08-0. 276 p.

III: Tóth Iván: *Alexandros Homérosa. Arrhianos-tanulmányok*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2013. ISBN: 978-615-5371-03-5. 208 p.

IV: *Philologia Nostra. Bollók János összegyűjtött tanulmányai*. Szerkesztette: Mészáros Tamás. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2013. ISBN: 978-615-5371-00-4. 516 p.

V: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland: Begegnungen zwischen Ost und West. Bibliotheca Byzantina 1*. Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2013. ISBN: 978-615-5371-15-8. 375 p.

VI: Achilleus Tattios: *Leukippé és Kleitophón története*. Fordította: Szepessy Tibor. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2014. ISBN: 978-615-5371-27-1. 151 p.

VII: Szepessy Tibor (szerk.): *Római költők antológiája*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2014. ISBN: 978-615-5371-25-7. 575 p.

VIII: Maywald József – Vayer Lajos – Mészáros Ede: *Görög nyelvtan*. Szerkesztette: Mayer Gyula. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2014. ISBN: 978-615-5371-31-8. 333 p.

IX: Jacqueline de Romilly – Monique Trédé: *Az ógörög nyelv szelleme*. Fordította: Vargyas Brigitta. Szerkesztette: Horváth László. TypoteX Kiadó, Budapest, 2014. ISBN: 978-963-2793-95-5. 135 p.

X: László Horváth (Hrsg.): *Investigatio Fontium. Griechische und lateinische Quellen mit Erläuterungen. Beiträge der Tagung Klassisches Altertum – Byzanz – Humanismus der XI. Ungarischen Konferenz für Altertumswissenschaft*. Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2014. ISBN: 978-615-5371-33-2. 281 p.

XI: Horváth László: *Az új Hypereidés. Szövegkiadás, tanulmányok és magyarázatok*. TypoteX, Budapest, 2015. ISBN: 978-963-2798-18-9. 301 p.

XII: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland II. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia. Bibliotheca Byzantina 2*. Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2014. ISBN: 978-615-5371-36-3. 257 p.

XIII: János Nagyillés – Attila Hajdú – Gergő Gellérfi – Anne Horn Baroody – Sam Baroody (eds.): *Sapiens Ubique Civis. Proceedings of the International Conference on Classical Studies (Szeged, Hungary, 2013)*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2015. ISBN: 978-615-5371-40-0. 424 p.

XIV: Zsuzsanna Ötvös: „*Janus Pannonius's Vocabularium*”. *The Complex Analysis of the Ms. ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2015. ISBN: 978-615-5371-41-7. 354 p.

XV: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland III. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia. Bibliotheca Byzantina 3*. Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2015. ISBN: 978-615-5371-44-8. 300 p.

XVI: Emese Egedi-Kovács (éd.) : *Byzance et l'Occident II. Tradition, transmission, traduction*. Collège Eötvös József ELTE, Budapest, 2015. ISBN: 978-615-5371-46-2. 236 p.

XVII: Ágnes Ludmann (ed.): *Mare nostrum. Studia Iberica, Italica, Graeca. Atti del convegno internazionale Byzanz und das Abendland – Byzance et l'Occident III (24-25 novembre 2014)*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2015. ISBN: 978-615-5371-45-5. 186 p.

XVIII: Balázs Sára (Hrsg.): *Quelle und Deutung II. Beiträge der Tagung Quelle und Deutung II am 26. November 2014. (EC Beiträge zur Erforschung deutschsprachiger Handschriften des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit, I.II.)*. Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2015. [ISSN: 2064-969X]. ISBN: 978-615-5371-47-9. 159 p.

XIX: Dión Chrysostomos: *Tróját nem vették be*. Fordította, előszóval és magyarázatokkal ellátta: Szepessy Tibor. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2016. ISBN: 978-615-5371-55-4. 172 p.

XX: Balázs Sára (Hrsg.): *Drei deutschsprachige Handschriften des Opusculum tripartitum des Johannes Gerson. Synoptische Ausgabe der Fassungen in den Codices StB Melk, Cod. 235, StB Melk, Cod. 570 und Innsbruck, ULB Tirol, Serv. I b 3. (Quelle und Deutung, EC-Beiträge zur Erforschung deutschsprachiger Handschriften des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit, Bd. II.I.)*. Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2016. [ISSN: 2064-969X]. ISBN: 978-615-5371-66-0. 331 p.

XXI: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland IV. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia. Bibliotheca Byzantina 4*. ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2016. ISBN: 978-615-5371-68-4. 271 p.

XXII: Emese Egedi-Kovács (éd.): *Byzance et l'Occident III. Écrits et manuscrits*. Collège Eötvös József ELTE, Budapest, 2016. ISBN: 978-615-5371-63-9. 333 p.

XXIII: Ágnes Ludmann (ed.): *Italia Nostra. Studi filologici italo-ungheresi*. Collegio Eötvös József ELTE, Budapest, 2016. ISBN: 978-615-5371-65-3. 275 p.

XXIV: Balázs Sára (Hrsg.): *Quelle und Deutung III. Beiträge der Tagung Quelle und Deutung III am 25. November 2015. (EC-Beiträge zur Erforschung deutschsprachiger Handschriften des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit, Bd. I.III.)*. ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2016. [ISSN: 2064-969X]. ISBN: 978-615-5371-67-7. 202 p.

XXV: Dora E. Solti (ed.): *Studia Hellenica*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2016. ISBN: 978-615-5371-69-1. 132 p.

XXVI: Mészáros Tamás (szerk.): *Klasszikus ókor, Bizánc, humanizmus. A XII. Magyar Ókortudományi Konferencia előadásából.* ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2017. ISBN: 978-615-5371-77-6. 189 p.

XXVII: Horváth László: *Középhaladó ógörög nyelvkönyv. Periergopenés – Szegény gyötrődő tanuló I.* ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2017. ISBN: 978-615-5371-75-2. 339 p.

XXVIII: Farkas Zoltán – Horváth László – Mayer Gyula: *Kezdő és haladó ógörög nyelvkönyv. Periergopenés – Szegény gyötrődő tanuló II.* ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2017. ISBN: 978-615-5371-83-7. 442 p.

XXIX: *Philologia Nostra II. Kapitánffy István válogatott tanulmányai.* Szerkesztette: Farkas Zoltán és Mészáros Tamás. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2017. ISBN: 978-615-5371-78-3. 512 p.

XXX: László Horváth – Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Investigatio Fontium II. Griechische und lateinische Quellen mit Erläuterungen.* Eötvös-József-Collegium ELTE, Budapest, 2017. ISBN: 978-615-5371-76-9. 262 p.

XXXI: Philostratos: *A szofisták életrajzai.* Fordította és szerkesztette: Szepessy Tibor. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2018. ISBN: 978-615-5371-86-8. 198 p.

XXXII: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland V. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia.* ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2018. ISBN: 978-615-5371-91-2. 196 p.

XXXIII: Balázs Sára (Hrsg.): *Quelle und Deutung IV. Beiträge der Tagung Quelle und Deutung IV am 23. November 2016. (EC-Beiträge zur Erforschung deutschsprachiger Handschriften des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit, Bd. I.IV.)* ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2018. [ISSN 2064-969X] ISBN 978-615-5371-90-5. 256 p.

XXXIV: Emese Egedi-Kovács (éd.) : *Byzance et l'Occident IV. Permanence et migration.* Collège Eötvös József ELTE, Budapest, 2018. ISBN : 978-615-5371-92-9. 280 p.

XXXV: Gellérfi Gergő: *Allúziós technika és műfaji hatások Iuvenalis szatíráiban*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2018. ISBN: 978-615-5371-95-0. 276 p.

XXXVI: *Studia Hellenica II*. Horváth Endre válogatott tanulmányai. Szerkesztette: Horváth László – Nakos Konstantinos – Solti Dóra. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2018. ISBN: 978-615-5897-07-8. 359 p.

XXXVII: Horváth László: *Az Öreg lovag*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2018. ISBN: 978-615-5897-13-9. 266 p.

XXXVIII: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland VI. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia*. ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2019. ISBN: 978-615-5897-24-5. 278 p.

XXXIX: Balázs Sára (Hrsg.): *Quelle und Deutung V. Beiträge der Tagung Quelle und Deutung V am 19. April 2018. (EC-Beiträge zur Erforschung deutschsprachiger Handschriften des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit, Bd. I.V.)*. ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2019. [ISSN: 2064-969X]. ISBN: 978-615-5897-28-3. 227 p.

XL: Emese Egedi-Kovács (éd.) : *Byzance et l'Occident V. Ianua Europae*. Collège Eötvös József ELTE, Budapest, 2019. ISBN: 978-615-5897-29-0. 230 p.

XLI: Alszászy Judit – Lina Basoucou – Solti Dóra: *Újgörög nyelvtan és gyakorlókönyv. Studia Hellenica III. Periergopenés – Szegény gyötrődő tanuló III*. ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, Budapest, 2021. ISBN: 978-615-5897-34-4. 462 p.

XLII: Erika Juhász (Hrsg.): *Byzanz und das Abendland VII. Studia Byzantino-Occidentalia*. ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium, Budapest, 2021. ISBN: 978-615-5897-43-6. 404 p.

Antiquitas – Byzantium – Renascentia (ABR – ISSN 2064-2369) ist eine unabhängige wissenschaftliche Publikationsreihe des Forschungszentrums für Byzantinistik am Eötvös-József-Collegium der ELTE Budapest. Die Reihe umfasst eine breite Palette von Sammelbänden, Monographien, Anthologien, Texteditionen und Handbüchern zur Erforschung des klassischen Altertums und der byzantinischen Welt sowie von deren Einflüssen auf die Kultur des Abendlandes.

Die Reihe wird vom ELTE Eötvös-József-Collegium Budapest herausgegeben. Verantwortlicher Herausgeber der Reihe ist Collegiumsdirektor László Horváth.

Herausgeber der Reihe:

Zoltán Farkas (PPKE, Institut für Geschichtsforschung / ELTE EC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik)

László Horváth (ELTE, Lehrstuhl für Griechische Sprache und Literatur / Eötvös-József-Collegium / ELTE EC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik)

Tamás Mészáros (ELTE EC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik / Bollók János-Seminar für Klassische Philologie)

Herausgeber der Sammelbände:

Emese Egedi-Kovács (ELTE EC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik / Aurélien-Sauvageot-Seminar)

Erika Juhász (ELTE EC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik)

Ágnes Ludmann (ELTE EC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik / Seminar für Italianistik)

Balázs Sára (ELTEEC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik/ Germanistisches Seminar)

Dora E. Solti (ELTE, Lehrstuhl für Neogräzistik/ ELTEEC, Forschungszentrum für Byzantinistik)

Gemäß den Richtlinien für die professionelle Begutachtung wissenschaftlicher Publikationen werden die Herausgeber der mehrsprachigen Sammelbände der Reihe ab dem 1. Dezember 2016 von einem wissenschaftlichen Beirat unterstützt.

Mitglieder des beratenden Gremiums der Reihe:

Prof. Dr. László Borhy, KMUAW, Professor für römische Provinzarchäologie

Dr. Christine Glassner, Leiterin der Abteilung Schrift- und Buchwesen des Instituts für Mittelalterforschung der ÖAW

Univ.-Prof. Univ.-Doz. Dr. Hermann Harrauer, Hofrat Dir. i. R. der Papyrussammlung und des Papyrusmuseums der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek

Prof. Dr. Ljubomir Maksimović, Direktor des Instituts für Byzantinische Studien der SASA

Gyula Mayer, PhD, Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter, MTA–ELTE–PPKE Forschungszentrum für Klassisch-Philologische Studien

Dr. Srđan Pirivatrić, Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter des Instituts für Byzantinische Studien der SASA

Dr. Filippo Ronconi, Professor, EHESS – Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales PSL – Paris Sciences et Lettres, Césor (Equipe byzantine), Centre d'Etudes en Sciences Sociales du Religieux

Prof. Dr. Peter Schreiner, Professor i. R., Universität zu Köln

Prof. Dr. Renzo Tosi, Professor für Altgriechische Philologie und Italianistik an der Universität Alma Mater Studiorum – Bologna

Prof. Dr. Georgia Xanthaki-Karamanou, Professorin für Altgriechische Philologie an der Universität des Peloponnes