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Early Hungarian history is a research area with scarce written sources. Archaeology, as a scientific discipline boasting a rapidly increasing number of sources, may acquire significant importance in this area. Nevertheless, thorough knowledge about the contemporary, significant archaeological differences between the Eastern European grassy and forest steppes, forest regions, and the microregions of the former makes it possible to research migration with traditional archaeological methods. For archaeology, the fundamental question about early Hungarian history has been the same to this day: from the archaeological finds of the territory stretching from the Urals to the Carpathian Basin. One of them proceeds from the Urals towards the Carpathians, referred to as the linear method, while the other takes the 10th-century heritage of the Carpathian Basin as a point of departure and looks for the Eastern European antecedents – this is the retrospective method.
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One of the greatest difficulties in research on the ancient Hungarians is the overview, filtering and interpretation of the rich corpus of early medieval archaeological finds from the vast region between the Urals and the Carpathian Basin. The linguistic, palaeoenvironmental and archaeological record, and the ethnography of the population groups living in the area all suggested that the emergence of the ancient Hungarians could be located to Western Siberia, also called the Hungarians’ ancestral homeland. During the long migration to the Carpathian Basin, the ancient Hungarians lived in various regions, where they encountered and came into contact with many different peoples. Three of the known settlement territories mentioned in the written sources have been studied in more detail: Magna Hungaria, Levedia and Etelekőz.

Sparse and often ambiguous written sources provide little guidance in determining the exact location of the Hungarians’ home in the 9th century, and we are not sure where to place Levedia and Etelekőz on the enormous plains between the Don and the lower Danube rivers. As a result, during the century-long research and survey of artifacts from the period of the Hungarian conquest, researchers grew interested in learning about prototypes and similar eastern objects. They hoped greater knowledge of these objects might enable them to establish the location of the Hungarian settlements in Levedia and Etelekőz and identify artifacts of eastern origin belonging to the first generation of Hungarians after the conquest of the Carpathian Basin.

Nowadays it is a scientific fact, that there are only a few written sources on the history of the ancient Hungarians. At the same time, archaeology – a discipline with a dynamically growing corpus of finds – plays a key role in this field of research. This holds true even if the methodological criteria for the historical assessment of archaeological finds and their cultural contexts have become much stricter, especially regarding the ethnic attribution of archaeological assemblages.

Two research methodologies have essentially been developed over little more than the past 100 years or so. One of them proceeds from the Urals towards the Carpathians, referred to as the linear method, while the other takes the 10th-century heritage of the Carpathian Basin as a point of departure and looks for the Eastern European antecedents – this is the retrospective method. Archaeological research on the ancient Hungarians is, understandably, inextricably bound up with the 10th-centuries heritage period archaeology of the Carpathian Basin. This is hardly surprising, given that the Hungarian Conquest period is the indispensable reference point for the two basic research designs in studies on the ancient Hungarians, namely the linear (from the Urals to the Carpathians) and the retrospective (the search for earlier eastern parallels starting from the 10th century assemblages of the Carpathian Basin).

I. The history of the Hungarian people, just like that of any other people, can be traced back to the distant past. Several branches of science can help to familiarize us with this early period, but their results are often ambiguous. The archaeological evidence points to the areas east of the Urals. In the Southern Urals, it is the Bashkirian and East Tatarstanian, so-called Kushnarenkovo and Karayakupovo archaeological cultures from the 6th–9th centuries that research has connected with the forefathers of the Hungarians. Recently, the archaeological sites of these cultures have extended much further south and east of the previous places (i.e. the grassy steppes of Orenburg – Filippovka and the Trans-Uralian forest steppes – Sineglazovo, Karanayevo, Uyelgi), even overlapping into the 10th century at places. There were obviously significant changes taking place in the territories lying east of the Urals at the turn of the 8th century (e.g. the disappearance of the kurgan burials). Leaving the eastern side of the Urals has been linked with various historical events by different researchers, and most often, they have been interpreted as the northern effect of mass migrations related to the emergence of the First Turk Khaganate. Concerning the eastern precedents, we should mention the recently outlined Bakalskaya culture (4th–6th centuries). At certain archaeological sites of this culture, the proportion of the so-called ‘Proto-Kushnarenkovo ceramics’ is as high as 25 percent. The significance of the distinction of the Bakalskaya culture in the forest steppes of the Trans-Urals lies in the fact that it fills the chronological void after the termination of the Sargatskaya culture, the most important culture of the region going back to the Iron Age,
and which was also linked – mistakenly – with the predecessors of the Hungarians. Previously, many tried to date the end of the Sargatskaya culture (4th century BC – 4th century AD) to the 6th century, mainly to be able to link it with the beginning of the Kushnarenkovo culture.

In the Bakalskaya culture, however, it is clearly the Sargatka traditions that live on, while its links with the Kushnarenkovo culture are also clear-cut. Its chronological place between the 4th and 6th centuries AD is supported by dozens of radiocarbon examinations. Today many local researchers do not see any Hungarian – Ugric predecessors in the Sargatskaya culture; rather, they emphasize the mostly southern, Scythian-type features and origin of the latter. While this question necessitates a lot more future investigation, we can ascertain that this is the most distant archaeological culture in time and space to which we can go back on the basis of the heritage of the Hungarian Conquest period with more or less certainty.

It is, of course, possible to study the historic events of the Iron Age of the region, as well as the Uralian archaeological cultures of the period prior to the evolution of the Hungarian language. At the same time, there are more and more Hungarian researchers who think that the events that took place before the birth of the independent Hungarian language (approx. 1000–500 BC) should no longer be considered as part of the early Hungarian history.

The Transvolgan regions and the Carpathian Basin are connected by their grave pits with a sidewall niche and berms, the latter sometimes keeping the partially buried horses. A burial mask made of silver have been found in Shalkar – the tradition or a similar variation can also be traced in graves of the Carpathian Basin and Magna Hungaria. Thus these sites were linked to the Pechenegs and the Ghuzz, not the Magyars, whose 10th century material culture still had strong Eastern connections far beyond the river Volga. Other finds related to the ones in the Carpathian Basin are known to have been found there. Similarity is of course not total as nearly 100–200 years separate the two groups of finds. Not only the objects from the graves (stirrups, bone reinforcement plates for the reflex bows, arrowheads, mounts, rattles) show similarity to the ones in the Carpathian Basin, but also the Western-Eastern orientation of the graves (sometimes with slight differences to the North or South) and the tradition of partial horse burial as of the conquering Magyars. These graves were commonly buried in much earlier kurgans, but there are cases where a kurgan was specifically built over the grave. This tradition can also be observed at numerous burials in Etelköz and sometimes in the Carpathian Basin. Considering the historical sources of “De administrando imperio” and the independent anthropological facts should we define these nomadic graves from the 8–9th centuries as Magyar graves.

One of the best-known and most emblematic archaeological research sites for early Hungarian history was found in Tatarstan, Russia, on the outskirts of Bolshie Tigan in 1974. Burials with parts of horses, gilded silver fittings and characteristic Ural pottery were found in the cemetery. This cemetery is the westernmost site of the Kusnarenkovo find area, which is characterized by a large amount of Bulgarian-type finds, as well as its geographical separation. Based on the later, 10th century section of the site excavated in the 1980s, it is now clear that this was the graveyead of one of the communities of the Hungarians that stayed in the East. Magna Hungaria the Latin phrase alludes to ‘ancient or great’ Hungary meaning the original habitation of the Hungarians. It first crops up in the Richardus Report prepared by the Dominican Friar Julian for the Pope about his first trip to the East (1236). Julian found Hungarian ethnic groups left behind in the area bounded by the Volga, the Kama and Southern Ural, in today’s Bashkiria and understood their language. This population lived under the suzerainty of the Volga Bulgarian state whose archaeological remains from burial sites are similar to the finds in Hungarian cemeteries of the Conquest period. Some researchers think the cemetery unearthed at Bolshie Tigan preserves relics of the Hungarians who remained in Magna Hungaria. It is still unsettled when and from where the Hungarians arrived in this area and when they left it. Some scholars think the forefathers of the Hungarians moved there from the eastern slopes of the Southern Ural sometime between the 5th c. BC and the 5th c. AD. Others presume that some Hungarian groups drifted from the steppe to the middle section of the Volga together with the Volga Bulgars. By yet another hypothesis Hungarians had moved off from around the Volga in the 5–6th centuries and therefore Julian did not found offspring of those who remained but fragmentary groups who drifted northwards after being torn from the main body of Hungarians by the Pecheneg or Bashkirian attacks. It is just as undecided when most of the Hungarians left Magna Hungaria. Besides the 5–6th century, the period around 750–800 AD has also been considered, and according to a recent theory they left the area as late as the mid-9th century moving much more to the north than earlier assumed and reached their settlement in the area of the Dnieper-Ingl-Kodyma rivers called Etelköz in Hungarian within a shorter time than earlier presumed.

II. Researchers earlier believed (and some believe today) that the Saltovo cultural-historical complex was the archaeological legacy of the Khazar Khaganate. They located one of the eastern homelands of the Hungarians – Levedia – in the area of this culture and presumed that the forebearers of the Hungarians adopted the sedentary way of life, learnt wine growing and horticulture, and as a result of several decades (or nearly two centuries by other estimations) spent in Levedia scores of Bulgar-Turkic loanwords were borrowed by the Hungarian language there. The two sites that gave their names to the culture are the burial ground excavated in Mayakoe gorodishche off the village of Divnogorye near Voronezh and the cemetery in Verhnii Saltov outside Kharkiv. Russian archaeologist Svetlana A. Pletneva differentiated five regional variants of the culture: Dagestanian, Crimean, Azovian, steppe Bulgar along the lower Don (the ‘unresearched steppe variant’ of the culture – the habitat of the Hungarians conjectured somewhere between the Don and Dnieper, called Levedia – was presumed to be connected to this variant), and the Alan variant of the upper Don. She thought that the archaeological relics of the Danube and Volga Bulgars were also tightly interlaced with this culture. More recent investigations have clarified that the Saltovo-Mayak culture cannot be identified as the archaeological legacy of the Khazarian Khaganate.
either in time or in space. Nor can it be handled as a unified archaeological culture, its regional variants diverging so significantly in finds, burial customs and anthropological features. It is more appropriate to speak of the Saltovo cultural sphere of diverse groups whose dissimilarities are so great that different horizons of finds can be considered. Its relation to 10th century Hungarian finds is only superficial and incidental, far from being sufficient proof of a lengthier sojourn of the Hungarians in Khazaria. In this light, all the historical, archaeological and linguistic hypotheses that were based on this presumption need to be reconsidered.

III. In the 1980s finds were discovered along the middle section of the Dnieper River, on the outskirts of the present-day village of Subbotsy, which can be linked to the ancestors of the conquering Hungarians. Since then several similar sites have become known which have been given the comprehensive label of the Subbotsy-horizon based on the earlier Russian designation that is widespread in the literature. It is of great importance that the finds are related to those found near the Volga and in the Southern Urals as well as those in the Carpathian Basin from the 9th–10th centuries.

The other outstanding archaeological site of the Subbotsy-horizon is on the outskirts of the settlement of Korobchin. Here only one grave of a man was found, but it had rich grave goods. Of the metal finds, two gilded silver bowls are the best quality, and are decorated with chasing in the background of their floral patterns. A large gold sheet was also found in the grave, which was possibly a death mask. Among the weapons and harness gear found, the gilded sabre sheath end ornamented with *palmette* and floral designs arranged in reticulated patterns deserves particular mention. The westernmost known site definitely belonging to the *Etelkőz* group is in the valley of the Dniester at Slobodzia. In 1994, east-west oriented mediaeval graves dug into an earlier Bronze Age kurgan were found near the settlement. In addition to the characteristic finds of the Subbotsy-horizon, there were grave goods of Volga, Slav and Byzantine origin in the 26 excavated graves. From the Hungarian point of view, the burials with parts of horses placed at the feet, iron stirrups with curved bottoms and the gilded silver fittings are of particular interest. According to the latest information, the Subbotsy-horizon, which can be related to the settlement of *Etelkőz*, can be dated to the second half of the 9th century. Although the western border of *Etelkőz* is traditionally drawn at the Lower Danube, this has not yet been confirmed by archaeological finds. Moreover, the 9th century finds related to the first Bulgarian Empire appear much further north, up to the central area of present-day Moldova.

IV. According to the latest research, the legacy of early Hungarians already sporadically appears in the Carpathian Basin from 861 AD. The Hungarian conquest itself must have been a long process at the end of the 800s, with the Battle of Pressburg (present-day Bratislava) in 907 AD making the settlement permanent.

Very few artifacts have survived east of the Carpathians. All together only a few types of objects and some elements of the kind of burial rituals observed in Conquest-period graves have been found. Of these some unique metal works unearthed east of the Carpathians, including some types of belt fittings and women’s jewelry, such as the characteristic dangling earrings with bead-row pendant and a braid disc decorated with the figure of a horse. The development of this latter type of ornament can be traced to the Don region and the north Caucasus. The rich set of artifacts from two famous archaeological sites in this former region of the Khazar Khaganate have been identified with the Saltovo cultural-historical complex. We can highlight two aspects of Conquest period burials which might help us determine if remains east of the Carpathians are Hungarian. The first is the burial with the horse, which is sacrificed as a part of the ceremony. The animal’s skin — in which the skull and the four shank bones are left — is placed at the feet of the dead person. The use of burial shrouds with silver or gold plates sewn above the eyes and mouth to be Hungarian, seems also in fact of Finno-Ugrian origin. Among the most splendid items of female apparel from the Conquest period are the braid discs, made using the cast filigree technique. These accessories are counted among the archaic elements of Hungarian dress brought from the east. Some variations include bronze discs depicting figures on horseback or a horse standing in front of a tree of life. Hungarian researchers at one time believed the prototypes of these could be found in the Saltovo culture of the 8th and 9th centuries. However, the ensemble of the horse and the tree of life has its roots in ancient Eurasia. Rings inlaid with stone or glass, which were favored by both Hungarian men and women, were far more widespread than the territory of Khazaria. Earrings with bead-row pendant are thought to be characteristically Hungarian items brought from the east. A good number of such types can be found among Khazarian relics. But they also appear in early Bulgarian burials in the Volga-Kama region, in the region of *Magna Hungaria*. The belt fittings of the warrior from Vereb, however, (based on his age and the coins found in his grave) could not have been obtained in *Etelkőz* or *Levédia*, since he was born after the conquest of the new land in the early-900s, and thus belongs to the second generation of Hungarians in the region. The close analogies to this object come not from the Saltovo region, but from much farther to the north, in Mordovia. The same is true for other archaic belt ornaments (belt fittings from Ōkčeske and Karançlapuţ). The most spectacular find was without question the Conquest-period grave unearthed during the 1974 excavations at Rakamaz-Stráža Hill. The grave had been ransacked, but found in its vicinity were three eye and mouth plates cut from a sheet of gold. Similar mouth and eye sheets were used on shrouds by the closest linguistic relatives to the Hungarians, the Ob-Ugric. István Fodor collected archaeological analogies to this practice in the Ural region. Thus, it is certain that death shrouds decorated with gold or silver plates were used by Conquest-period Hungarians, and the beliefs associated with the masks were familiar to them, although it is uncertain whether the use of such shrouds has Finno-Ugrian roots.
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АНАЛИЗ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ САХА-БУРЯТСКОГО ВОЕННОГО КОНФЛИКТА

В статье обсуждается военный конфликт между предками бурят и саха, рассказ об этом событии часто встречается в трудах исследователей дореволюционного и советского периодов. Ими предполагалось, что предки бурятов и саха из-за территориальных разногласий в регионе Верхней Лены и Южного Приангарья в период между X–XVI вв. могли воевать друг с другом. Еще в трудах российских путешественников и ученых XVIII–XIX вв., берущих за основу фольклорные источники, можно встретить сведения о войне между бурятами и саха. Исследователи этногенеза саха считали, что именно прибытие монголоязычных предков бурят в Прибайкалье могло стимулировать переселение тюркоязычных обитателей на Среднюю Лену. В советскую эпоху получило широкое распространение версия о вытеснении тюркоязычных курыкан – потомков саха монголоязычными шивей-монголами в X–XII вв. на Среднюю Лену. Автор статьи приходит к выводу, что предки саха и бурят вместе входили в состав хори-шивейского объединения. Предки бурят и монголов обитали в Эргене (старое название Якутии в фольклоре), ассоциируемое с Эргуне-кун, и вступали в сражения с воинственными туматами – предками саха. В территорию Прибайкалья южные предки саха и бурят вместе входили в состав племени хори, тумат, а также усуту-мангун.
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