УДК 902/904

EAST EUROPEAN CONNECTIONS AND ROOTS OF THE 10 CENTURIES ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE IN THE CARPATHIAN BASIN BY THE RESULTS OF THE LATEST INVESTIGATIONS

© 2018 г. Türk Attila

Early Hungarian history, better known as Hungarian prehistory, is a research area with scarce written sources. Consequently, archaeology, as a scientific discipline boasting a rapidly increasing number of sources, may acquire significant importance in this area. This is a fact even if from a methodological perspective, the historical and ethnic assessment of archaeological findings must satisfy much stricter criteria than before. To arrive at a reliable historical interpretation, we would need to be familiar with the ethnic identity of the original owners of the archaeological findings as well as with their political affiliation, which obviously surpasses the scope of archaeology. 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. Completing our investigation with natural scientific methods, we may have a lot more to say about these matters than our predecessors. For archaeology, the fundamental question about the early Hungarian history has remained the same to this day: from the archaeological findings of the territory stretching from the Urals to the Carpathian Basin, i.e. west of the Western Siberian proto-homeland hypothesized earlier based on linguistic arguments, what links can be made to the early medieval ancestors of Hungarians? Or in other words, can the location of the individual settlement areas – hypothesized on the basis of the written sources – be confirmed in light of the more recent archaeological findings? Moreover, do the origins and the system of relations of the findings from the Age of the Conquest direct researchers primarily towards the east, and if yes, to what extent? To answer these questions, two research methodologies have essentially been developed in the course of over 100 years. One of them proceeds from the Urals towards the Carpathians, referred to as the linear method, while the retrospective method takes the 10th-century heritage of the Carpathian Basin as a point of reference and guides the researchers in finging the Eastern European antecedents. In my article, I will go over the latest archaeological findings based on the latter.

Keywords: archaeology, early history of Hungarians, Ural Mountains, Volga, Middle Ages

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 (Fodor, 2012, pp. 125-146). 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 (Bálint, 1994, pp. 39-46; 1999, pp13-16). 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, i.e. west of the Western Siberian proto-homeland hypothesized earlier based on linguistic arguments, what links can be made to the early medieval ancestors of Hungarians? (Türk, 2014, pp.19-30). Or to put it differently, can the location of the individual settlement areas – hypothesized on the basis of the written sources – be confirmed in light of the more recent archaeological finds? Moreover, do the origins and the system of relations of the finds from the Age of the Conquest point primarily towards the east and if yes, to what extent? (Fodor, 1994, pp. 47-65). To answer these questions, 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 (Langó, 2007; Türk, 2012, pp. 3-28).

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 (Pósta, 1905; Bálint, 1989, pp. 44-73; Fodor, 1993, pp. 17-38; Fodor, 1994; 2009; Erdélyi, 2008). 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 (Fodor, 2006, pp. 89-114). 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 Etelköz (Тюрк, 2016, с. 268-272).

In the past decade, the archaeological research of early Hungarian history took a huge leap forward thanks to the new early medieval finds recovered in the region of the River Dniester and the Ural Mountains (Комар, 2008, с. 214−216; Комар, 2011, с. 21-78). From the aspect of archaeological methodology, we can affirm that this group of finds and archaeological phenomena appears to be related to the 10th century material culture of the Carpathian Basin. Such connections have only been established in the South Russian forest and partly grassy steppes, in the region of the Volga elbow of Samara and the Southern Urals.

A handful of eminent Russian, Ukrainian and Moldavian archaeologists, who were familiar with the archaeological material of the Hungarian Conquest period (the 10th-century material in the Carpathian Basin), noted the possible relevance of certain find assemblages to ancient Hungarian history (Иванов, 1999; 2015; Рябцева, Рабинович, 2007, с. 195-230; Сташенков, 2009, с. 228–229) and also pointed out the possible cultural contacts in their publications. However, a secure identification requires an archaeological database (Комар, 2013, с. 182-231) covering the entire range of archaeological assemblages and their local cultural contacts with a firm chronological grounding to which the new Hungarian Conquest period assamblages from the Carpathian Basin and the new east european finds can be compared (Fodor, 2009a, pp. 163−171).

The Hungarian Conquest is traditionally dated to 895, but in addition to the data of the written sources, certain archaeological finds also seem to have confirmed recently that the material culture of the Conquest period had appeared earlier in the Carpathian Basin. An indication of that, for instance, is the radiocarbon dating of the graves of a few armed men buried separately (for example near Szeged: Türk et al. 2015). If new discoveries could be added to this group of finds, that will be yet another argument in support of the hypothesis that the Conquest did not take place over one or two years, but that it should be regarded as a historical process lasting for several decades, closed by the battle of Pozsony in 907 (Mesterházy, 1993, pp. 270–311; Révész 1996; Révész, 2003, pp. 338–346).

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) (Fodor 1975; Révész, 1998, pp. 523-532; Langó, 2007). The archaeological record nowadays clearly indicates that the antecedents to the 10th century find assemblages of the Carpathian Basin can be found in the earlier, 9th-century material of Eastern Europe. While it is now clear that the proportion of eastern find types in the Hungarian Conquest period material is not as high as was assumed a few decades ago, we also know of find assemblages leading all the way to the Urals that were deposited in the 10 century, i.e. after the generally accepted date of the Hungarian Conquest (AD 895), which are thus roughly contemporaneous with the Hungarian Conquest period material from the Carpathian Basin.

Interestingly enough, these finds occur almost exclusively in the regions that can be considered as the possible settlement territories of the ancient Hungarians. The mapping of these finds and their historical and archaeological assessment is at least as important as of the relevant eastern analogous finds that can be dated before 895. In the case of a few assemblages, mostly stray finds, there is no way of telling whether these were deposited before or after 895. This problem, which can hardly be resolved using conventional archaeological methods based on the formal similarities or dissimilarities of various artefact types, again underscores the need for the widespread application of archaeometric analyses such as radiocarbon dating (Türk, 2010; Türk et al. 2015). On the other hand in the case of archaeogenetic studies, mtDNA and Y chromosome analyses can shed light on ancient population lineages (Csakyova et al. 2017). It must be repeatedly emphasized that the comparative material for archaeogenetic studies should be made up of 10th century, rather than modern samples if the aim is to search for the possible eastern relations of the 10th century population (Csősz et al., 2013, p. 237-243;

Mende, Türk, 2017, p. 69). New advances in this field can be expected from the study of the skeletal remains of individuals born in the east, but buried in the Carpathian Basin. It is also clear that the selection of skeletal samples of this type can only be achieved through radiocarbon dating.

Studying the eastern connections and the archaeological heritage of the Conquest period and the early Árpádian Age could reveal some references as to which direction the conquering forefathers may have reached the Carpathian Basin from. The earliest such finds that are relevant to this research are located on the external, eastern side of the Carpathians, in the region of the Moldavian Republic and the Lower Danube (Fodor, 1993, pp. 17-38; Fodor, 1994, pp. 47-65). However, doubts of a chronological nature have been raised recently concerning the historical assessment of the finds. The characteristic S-terminalled ring ornaments exposed in the cemetery near Przemyśl is an indication of burials carried out in the second half and at the end of the 10th century.

Thus, the possibility was raised that these archaeological sites – or at least, some of them – are not the westernmost remnants of the settlement areas of Etelköz, but they could be evidence of groups sent to live in the frontier region of the passes at the end of the 10th century, most likely for the purposes of military defence. The graves that were discovered here and there in the multi-grave burial sites of 10th century Rus certainly cannot be linked with the residence of Etelköz (Комар, 2011, с. 21-78). These graves are as distinct from their environment as the group of finds – recently discovered near the battlefield of Augsburg – originating from the 10th century Carpathian Basin. These finds could belong most likely to Hungarian warriors who served in Kiev as mercenaries. In exchange, there were numerous soldiers who came to Hungary from there, commemorated, for instance, by the toponym Oroszvár and the axe-shaped amulets in the Carpathian Basin (Füredi et al., 2017, pp. 413-467). The third heavily contested group of artefacts found around Bucharest and Lake Tei, whose less characteristic archaeological material – mainly based on the features of the Subbotcy horizon to be presented below – is regarded today as belonging to the Pechenegs or other late nomadic groups (Бокий, Плетнёва, 1988, с. 99-115).

Regrettably, from the territory of present-day Moldavia to the region of the River Dniester, we have only few finds of interest from the aspect of early Hungarian history (Рябцева, Рабинович, 2007, с. 195-230). This phenomenon might be explained by the different geographical environment, as there we can find hilly geomorphological forms of greater altitude. It should be noted that the western border of Etelköz was most likely not the stretch of the Lower Danube, because archaeological evidences of the First Bulgarian Tsardom – including entire sites – occur in considerable numbers far to the north as well.

As of today, we do not have additional finds of this kind east of the River Dnieper, but it should be noted that in other ages and in the case of other peoples, too, the settlements were typically located in larger river valleys. Finds like the ones exposed at Slobozeya were unearthed along the middle course of the Dnieper, in the region of present-day Kryvyi Rih, Kirovohrad, Dnipropetrovsk and Kremenchuk, which have been archaeologically known as the as the Subbotcy horizon after the first archaeological site where they were located (Комар, 2011, с. 21-78). These finds seem to originate from the second half of the 9th century by using both the traditional dating method as well as radiocarbon dating. Thus, based on both the characteristics of the finds and their dating, those buried here must have been the Hungarians of the settlement areas of Etelköz. These sites all lie in the territory that can be correlated with the Etelköz of the written sources. The radiocarbon dates for the Subotcy horizon fall into the later 9th century (Türk, 2010, Fig. 5). All of this is in fascinating harmony with the chronological data of the written sources, in which Hungarians do not appear before the second half or second third of the 9th century.

The most relevant new eastern finds have been reported from Slobozdeya. The archaeological site of Slobodzeya along the Dniester has been the archaeological sensation of the past few years (Щербакова, Тащи, Тельнов, 2008). The finds of the more than 20 burial sites, linked with the Hungarians by most researchers and which were dug secondarily into the embankment of the Bronze Age kurgan, clearly reflect Slavic connections, for example the pottery finds of the late Luka-Rakovica culture. However, they also include some Byzantine silk and ceramics supposedly from Crimea, and even wheel-thrown pottery originating from the Volga region. In addition to the types of jewellery and horse harness showing a clear parallel with the 10th century material culture of the Carpathian Basin, the raw material (silver gilt) and the floral ornamentation as well as the manner of burial (skull facing west, flayed horse skin) signal

an incontestable association. While the finds reflect contact with the neighbouring territories, especially the Slavic lands to the north, principally indicated by pottery imports. These contacts are also mentioned in the written sources.

The territory between the Dnieper and the Volga is the biggest blank spot in the archaeological research of early Hungarian history. The only find that we can mention from here is the grave of Vorobyevo (Плетнёва, 2003, c. 103-114) in the Don region. Although it shows strong signs of Saltovo origin (or pseudo-Saltovo, to be more precise), the buckle and some other features indicate an obvious origin from the Volga-Urals region. Levedia, whose existence was hypothesized to begin from the second third of the 8th century, located around Don-Seversky Donets, cannot be archaeologically confirmed, and what is more important: there are no finds originating from the Volga-Urals, either. In fact, archaeologically speaking, there are no signs whatsoever that would indicate the migration of any population to Europe from the eastern bank of the Volga, the possibility of which was, at any rate, successfully reduced by the Khazar Khaganate according to the written sources. On the other hand, it has been clearly shown that such a process did take place in the second third of the 9th century. As a matter of fact, the onetime existence of the settlement area of the Don River region was built on exclusively the etymology of the word Dentümogyer noted down in the 13th century, but the interpretation of the latter as 'Don tői magyar' [i.e. Don-rooted Hungarian] has been discarded. By the way, the 'Don root' was one of the most densely populated areas of Eastern Europe at the time, inhabited by the Alans of the Saltovo-Mayaki culture in the 8th–10th centuries, so our forefathers would have hardly been able to set up camp there (Fodor, 1977, pp. 79-114). Furthermore, there is another argument that goes against this hypothesis: Levedia's 'placement' in Khazaria was motivated by the attempt to define the place where the ancient Turkish loan words would have been received. However, the Alans living in the above-mentioned area spoke an Iranian language, not Turkish, and the Turkish language swap is neither proven in their case, nor is it likely.

The same two arguments hold true for the northern frontier of the Caucasus in relation to the hypothesis of the Caucasian or Kuban region proto-homeland. In the past couple of years, we have received news of some exciting finds from the region of Krasnodar (quite similar to the ones from the Age of the Conquest). However, these are finds mostly collected by treasure hunters, and they lack the archaeological context. Also, presumably they were not found in pit graves, but in chamber graves that were unique to the Alans. Therefore, their assessment requires further and substantial research. Naturally, the question of Levedia's location does not refute the fact of the Khazar-Hungarian encounters; it is only the geographical site of these ancient relations commemorated by written sources that needs to be reconsidered (Róna-Tas 1999).

The human-figure fittings of the Subbotsy horizon (i.e. the legacy of the settlement areas of Etelköz) depicting the figures in a characteristic cross-legged position, or the 9th century appearance of the silver and pressed silver mounts – though decorated by Saltovo patterns – in the Saltovo Alan chamber graves can serve as evidence of the ancient connections. The links to the Khazars are also explicitly confirmed by the trapezoid cross section of the bow-hilt plate as well as by certain types of mounts that are typical of the Conquest period and the Sokolovskaya Balka horizon of the Khazar Khaganate (Биро, Ланго, Тюрк, 2009, c. 407-441), despite the fact that the latter had disappeared by the beginning of the 9th century, and we are not yet familiar with the 9th–10th-century archaeological finds of the 'real' Khazars (Афанасьев, 1999, c. 85-89).

The location of Levedia, however, still runs into problems. The archaeological record of the Don–Northern Seversky Donets region, which was earlier identified with Levedia (Аксёнов, 2001, c. 212-214), contains no traces whatsoever of a population arriving from the Ural region between the 6th and the 8th centuries. At the same time, there is barely any resemblance between the Hungarian Conquest period finds and the 8–10th century assemblages of the Saltovo-Mayatskaya culture distributed in the region traditionally identified – mainly in the Hungarian research – with Levedia (Fodor, 1977, pp. 79-114). This culture was earlier interpreted as the archaeological correlate of the entire territory of the Khazar Khaganate, and thus also of Levedia, which was part of the khaganate. The Saltovo culture, which was earlier divided into so-called regional variants in view of the considerable divergences in its material (Плетнёва, 1967; 1981; 1999) is no longer regarded as a big uniform archaeological culture as originally defined by S. A. Pletneva (Афанасьев, 1987; Werbart, 1996).

The archaeological record seems to confirm earlier suggestions that Levedia was maybe not an independent settlement territory of the ancient

Hungarians, but was part of the probably easterly areas of Etelköz. The chronology of the finds from the southern Urals and the Dnieper region suggests a relatively rapid migration of the ancient Hungarians no earlier than the beginning of the 9th century, as was earlier suggested by Russian and Ukrainian research (Иванов, 1999; Белавин, Иванов, Крыласова, 2009).

The distribution of the archaeological material known from the two eponymous sites would only warrant this label for the so-called Alanic or forested steppe variant (Афанасьев, 2001, с. 43–55); the connections of the other regional variants with the Saltovo culture have been convincingly refuted by Russian and Ukrainian scholars (Иванов, 2002, с. 36-38; Колода, 2011, с. 21-31; Флёрова, Флёров, 2000, с. 137-141). Owing to the above considerations, the labels 'Saltovo culture' and 'Saltovo cultural-historical complex' are regularly employed in the Russian and Ukrainian archaeological literature even by scholars who do not challenge the cultural primacy or the leading role of the Khazars (Комар, 1999, с. 111-136; 2004, Комар, с. 87-91). Hungarian scholars differ over the interpretation of the Saltovo culture and its cultural impact on the ancient Hungarians (Bálint 1975, pp. 79-114; Fodor, 1977, pp. 79-114; Révész, 1998, pp. 523-532).

It is now clear that some of the find types, such as the clay cauldrons (Афанасьев, Лопан, 1996, с. 18-20; Лопан, 2007, с. 240-311), that were believed to have their counterparts in the Saltovo culture cannot be derived from that culture or that they are objects which are known also from the territories neighbouring on the Saltovo culture's distribution either as imports or as local copies (for example in the Volintsevskaia culture and in the so-called early Mordvinian burial grounds). Saltovo type finds could thus have reached the ancient Hungarians from areas other than the Saltovo heartland and thus their presence in the archaeologidal heritage does not necessaryimply that the ancient Hungarians had once lived on the territory of the Saltovo culture (Türk 2010, pp. 261-306). In fact, the Hungarian Conquest period finds and the 9th and 10th century archaeological material of the Etelköz region reflect much closer contacts with the 8th–9th century (and, of course, 10th century) assemblages of the southern Urals and the Middle Volga region. New finds bearing an uncanny resemblance to the Hungarian Conquest period material are known from the Samara area in the Middle Volga region (Сташенков, 2009, с. 228-229).

In the territory enclosed by the Dnieper and the Volga rivers, the 9th–11th century cemeteries of the ancient peoples speaking most likely Finno-Ugric languages, who lived on the frontier of the forests and the forest steppe, represent much closer parallels in archaeological terms. At the same time, the so-called proto-Mordovian and proto-Cheremis burial sites (Иванов, 1952) are not related to the ancestors of the Hungarians in an ethnic sense.

The similarities observed should be interpreted primarily as cultural links, even though the archaeological material that is of interest to us often emerge from women's tombs, and may be a sign of intermarriages in the given period. Although both criteria – the co-presence of the Uralian and the Conquest period traits – are satisfied here, further detailed chronological examinations will be necessary. For instance, it has already been revealed about some supposedly Hungarian finds (e.g. the belt mounts of Grave 505 of Kryukovo Kuznoye) that based on their technical specificities and material composition, they are most probably objects of Bulgarian origin. Nevertheless, the historical–archaeological analysis of the typological similarities and their characteristic distribution areas will continue to be a cardinal task (Zelencova, Saprykina, Türk, 2018, pp. 689-720).

At the Samara elbow of the Volga, on the left bank of the river, we know of six or seven archaeological sites from the 8th and 9th centuries (Nemchanka, Proletarskoye Gorodishche 116 km, etc.) that are noteworthy from a Hungarian perspective. In addition to the metal finds, the appearance of Uralian-type ceramics is a significant phenomenon here (Bakalskaya culture and Kushnarenkovo/Karayakupovo culture). Among the latter, we can mention the hand-made pots with a sphere-shaped bottom and a braid ornament around their neck, slimmed by river mussels or talc. These kinds of pots occur at several other sites, also from much earlier times (Сташенков, 2009, с. 228-229). The early medieval finds of this microregion show that waves of migration from the direction of the Urals hit the territory in two or three periods from the Hun period until the 9th century. On the right bank of the river, research has discovered the appearance of supposedly Turkic-speaking peoples in a similar chronological order; thus, in other words, it was not only and primarily the appearance of the Volga Bulgarians that led to the 'Turkization' of the Volga region. From the territory of the Saltovo culture, there are unquestionable traces of relocation from the end

of the 7th century. Thus, if finds should appear around the Samara Elbow of the Volga that are the archaeological legacy affiliated of the Khazar Khaganate, then we can rightly hypothesize the presence of a population speaking a western Turkic language near the middle course of the Volga (Матвеева, 1997; Казаков, 1999, с. 23-38).

This seems to be confirmed by the disappearance of the archaeological assemblages closely related to the Saltovo complex (such as the Novinki- and Uren' type find horizons) by the turn of the 7th–8th centuries at the latest (Сташенков, 1995, с. 268-291). It is difficult to determine when the ancient Hungarians first appeared in this region. The hand-thrown, cord-impressed pottery tempered with crushed mussels of the Ural region typical for the Kushnarenkovo (6th–8th centuries) and the Karaiakupovo cultures (8th–9th centuries) has been reported from several sites (including settlements) in the Samara area (Сташенков, 2009, с. 228-229).

Why, and more importantly, how the Hungarians crossed the Volga and moved to the west, we do not yet know. In my opinion, we have reason to suppose that – as written sources report about it later, in the case of the Pechenegs – these events could not have taken place without the cooperation, agreement, and alliance of the Khazars. A probable underlying reason of the move could have been the arrival of the Pechenegs in the frontiers of the Southern Urals at the turn of the 8th and 9th centuries from the south, and then the Kimeks, maybe Bashkirians (Srostrinsk culture) from the east. The threat embodied by the nomadic Petchenegs may also explain the scarcity of ancient Hungarian finds between the Volga and the Dnieper, and also why evidence for a more permanent settlement is only known from the Dnieper region, from sites mostly lying on the river's western bank. Knowing the mobility of nomadic peoples and especially of nomadic armies, moving to a distance of no more than a few hundred kilometres away was hardly a feasible solution. While it is uncertain what exactly triggered the migration – an issue that can hardly be resolved using conventional archaeological methods – an attack by the Petchenegs (the so-called first Petcheneg-Hungarian war) as assumed earlier by historians, seems a logical scenario (Тюрк, 2016, с. 268-272).

Chronologically speaking, a likely date seems to be the second third of the 9th century, which is also supported by the dating of the finds typical of the Volga–Southern Urals region that appeared in Eastern Europe. Note that this chronology is in accordance with the data of the written sources as well, which do not mention the ancestors of the Hungarians in Eastern Europe before 830/850. According to the latest research, the crossing of the Volga must have taken place through the Zhiguli Mountains located north of the town of Samara, and well-known from later sources, where the river bottleneck is split by several smaller islands.

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 (Белавин, Иванов, Крыласова, 2009; Иванов, 2015). 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, Uelgi), even overlapping into the 10th century at places (Боталов, Лукиных, Тидеман, 2011, с. 104-114). 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 (Боталов, 2017, с. 267-334).

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 (Боталов, 2017, с. 267-334). 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 (Матвеева, Зеленков, 2016, с. 246-251). 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–Ugrian precedents 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 (Матвеева, 2016), 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) (Fodor 1975) should no longer be considered as part of the early Hungarian history.

REFERENCES

Bálint Cs. 1975. A szaltovó-majaki kultúra avar és magyar kapcsolatairól (On the Avar and Hungarian relations of the Saltovo-Mayak culture). Archaeologiai Értesítő (112), 52−63.

Bálint Cs. 1989. 8.–10. Jahrhundert. In: Die Archäologie der Steppe. Steppenvölker zwischen Volga und Donau vom 6. bis zum 10. Jahrhundert. Wien–Köln, 44−73.

Bálint Cs. 1994. A 9. századi magyarság régészeti hagyatéka. In Kovács, L. (ed.) Honfoglalás és régészet. A honfoglalásról sok szemmel 1. L. Budapest, 39−46.

Bálint Cs. 1999. Zwischen Orient und Europa. Die „Steppenfixierung" in der Frühmittelaletrarchäologie. In: Zwische Byzanz und Abendland. Pliska, der östliche Balkanraum und Europa im Spiegel der Frühmittelalterarchäologie. Hrsg.: Henning, J. Frankfurt am Main. pp. 13−16.

Csakyova, V., Stegmar, B., Mende, B. G., Egyed, B., Szécsenyi-Nagy, A., Türk, A. 2017. New Data on the Generic Origin of Early Hungarians (8–10th c. AD) and its Comparison with Archaeological, Linguistic and Historical Sources. In Bazelmans, J. (ed.) Building Bridges. Abstract book of the 23rd Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists 2017. Maastricht. p. 437.

Csősz A., Langó P., Mende B. G., Türk A. Археогенетические исследования на материалах Салтовской и древневенгерской культуры. Предварительный отчет и историография археологического вопроса // II-й Международный Мадьярский симпозиум: сборник научных трудов. (Челябинск, Шадринск, 13—15 августа 2013 г.). Челябинск: Рифей, 2013. С. 237−243.

Erdélyi I. 2008. Scythia Hungarica. A honfoglalás előtti magyarság régészeti emlékei. Budapest.

Fodor I. 1975. Verecke híres útján… A magyar nép őstörténete és a honfoglalás. Budapest.

Fodor I. 1977. Bolgár-török jövevényszavaink és a régészet. In Bartha A. et al. (eds.). Magyar őstörténeti tanulmányok Budapest, 79−114

Fodor I. 1993. Magyar jellegű régészeti leletek Moldvában. (Archaeological finds of Hungarian character in Moldavia.) In: Tanulmányok Domokos Pál Péter emlékére. Szerk.: Halász P. Budapest, 17−38.

Fodor I. 1994. Leletek Magna Hungáriától Etelközig. In: Honfoglalás és régészet. A honfoglalásról sok szemmel 1. Szerk.: Kovács L. Budapest. pp. 47-65.

Fodor I. 2006. A régészettudomány történetisége. A magyar őstörténet példáján (Archäologie als historische Wissenschaft. Am Beispiel der ungarischen Urgeschichte). Archaeológiai Értesítő (131), 89−114.

Fodor I. 2009. Őstörténet és honfoglalás. Magyarország Története 1. Budapest.

Fodor I. 2010. Az őscseremisz tarsolylemez. In Bereczki, A., Csepregi, M., Klima, L. (eds.). Ünnepi írások Bereczki Gábor tiszteletére. Urálisztikai Tanulmányok 19. Budapest. 163−171.

Fodor I. 2012. Őstörténeti viták és álviták. In: Molnár, Á. (ed.). Csodaszarvas IV. Budapest. 125−146.

Füredi et al., 2017 Füredi Á., Király Á., Pópity D., Rosta Sz., Türk A., Zágorhidi Czigány B. Balta alakú amulettek a Kárpát-medence 10–11. századi hagyatékában. Régészeti megfigyelések a miniatürizált tárgyakról, valamint a kora Árpád-kori rusz–magyar kapcsolatok kérdéséről (Axe-shaped amulets among the 11th- and 12th-century finds in the Carpathian Basin. Archaeological observations on miniature objects and on the issue of early Árpád-eraRus–Hungarian) relations. In: A népvándorláskor fiatal kutatóinak XXIV. konferenciája Esztergom 2014. 4–6. 11.2014. II. Studia ad Archaeologiam Pazmaniensiae No. 3.2 – Magyar Őstörténeti Témacsoport Kiadványok 3.2. Budapest–Esztergom. 413−464.

Langó P. 2007. Amit elrejt a föld… A 10. századi magyarság anyagi kultúrájának régészeti kutatása a Kárpát-medencében. Budapest.

Mende, Türk. Possibilities and perspektives of the bioarchaeological research of the early Hungarians // Человек и среда: актуальные проблемы антропологии и археологии. Материалы всероссийской науч-

ной конференции с международным участием VII Алексеевские чтения, памяти академиков В.П. Алексеева и Т.И. Алексеевой (Казань, 22–25 мая 2017 г.). Казань: ООО «Озон», 2017, С. 69.

Mesterházy K. 1993. A magyar honfoglalás kor régészetének ötven éve. Századok 127. 1993, 270-311.

Pósta B. 1905. Régészeti tanulmányok az Oroszföldön I–II. (Archaeologische Studien auf russischem Boden) Budapest–Leipzig 1905.

Révész L. 1996. A karosi honfoglalás kori temetők. Adatok a Felső-Tisza-vidék X. századi történetéhez (Die Gräberfelder von Karos aus der Landnahmezeit. Archäologische Angaben zur Geschichte des Oberen Theiβgebietes im 10. Jahrhundert). Miskolc.

Révész L. 1998. Szempontok a honfoglalás kori leletanyag időrendjének meghatározásához a keleti párhuzamok alapján (Geschitspunkte zur Bestimmung der Chronologie der landnahmezeitlichen Funde Aufgrund der östlichen Analogien). Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve – Studia Archaeologica 4 (1998) pp. 523-532.

Révész L. 2003. The cemeteries of the Conquest period. In: Hungarian archaeology at the turn of the millennium. Ed.: Visy, Zs. Budapest, 2003, pp. 338-346.

Róna-Tas A. 1999. Hungarians and Europe in the Early Middle Ages: An Introduction to Early Hungarian History. Budapest, 1999.

Türk A. 2010. A szaltovói kultúrkör és a magyar őstörténet régészeti kutatása. In: Középkortörténeti tanulmányok 6. A VI. Medievisztikai PhD-konferencia (Szeged, 2009. június 4–5.). Szerk.: G. Tóth P., Szabó P. Szeged, 2010, pp. 261-306.

Türk A. 2012. Zu den osteuropäischen und byzantinischen Beziehungen der Funde des 10.–11. Jahrhunderts im Karpatenbecken. In: Die Archäologie der frühen Ungarn. Chronologie, Technologie, und Methodik. Hrsg.: Tobias B. Mainz, 2012, pp. 3-28.

Türk A. 2014. A korai magyar történelem régészeti kutatása napjainkban. In.: Magyar Őstörténet – Tudomány és hagyományőrzés. Szerk.: Sudár B., Szentpéteri J., Petkes Zs., Lezsák G., Zsidai Zs. MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont. Budapest, 2014, pp.19-30.

Türk et al. 2015. Türk A., Lőrinczy G., Marcsik A.: Régészeti és természettudományi adatok a Maros-torkolat nyugati oldalának 10. századi történetéhez (Archäologische Daten und naturwissenschaftliche Ergebnisse zur Geschichte des 10. Jahrhunderts des westlichen Ufers der Muresch-Mündung. Studia ad Archaeologiam Pazmaniensia 4. / MTA BTK Magyar Őstörténeti Témacsoport – Kiadványok 4. Budapest, 2015.

Werbart B. I. 1996. Khazars or „Saltovo-Majaki Culture”? Prejudices about Archaeology and ethnicity. Current Swedish Archaeology (4), 199−211.

Zelencova O. V., Saprykina I. A., Türk A. 2018. A karancslapujtői honfoglalás kori öv és mordvinföldi „hasonmása”. A karancslapujtői típusú övveretek kelet-európai elterjedése (Пояс эпохи завоевания Родины и его мордовская «аналогия». Поясные накладки типа Каранчлапуйте (Венгрия) и их распространение в Восточной Европе в X в.). In Korom A. et al. (eds). Relationes rerum. Régészeti tanulmányok Nagy Margit tiszteletére. Budapest 2018, 689−720.

Афанасьев Г.Е. Население лесостепной зоны бассейна Среднего Дона (аланский вариант салтово-маяцкой культуры) // Население лесостепной зоны басейна Среднего Дона в VIII−X вв. / Археологические открытия на новостройках Вып.2. М.: Наука, 1987. 198 с.

Афанасьев Г.Е. Салтовская культура в хазарских проблемах. // Археология черноземного центра России: история исследований, историография (Воронеж, 16−17 декабря 1999 г.). Воронеж: Воронеж Издательство Воронежского университета, 1999, С. 85−89.

Афанасьев Г.Е. Где же археологические свидетельства существования Хазарского государства? // РА. 2001. №2. С. 43–55.

Афанасьев Г.Е., Лопан О.В. Об одном исследовательском парадоксе в поисках этномаркирующий признаков протоболгар // Актуальные проблемы археологии Северного Кавказа. XIX Крупновские чтения по археологии Северного Кавказа (Москва, апрель 1996 г.). М.: ИА РАН, 1996. С. 18−20.

Аксенов В.С. Контакты венгров с аланами в IX веке — взаимопроникновение культур. // Северный Кавказ и кочевой мир степей Евразии. V Минаевские чтения по археологии, этнографии и краеведению Северного Кавказа (Ставрополь, 12−15 апреля 2001 г.). Ставрополь: Издательство Ставропольского государственного университета, 2001, С. 212−214.

Белавин А.М., Иванов В.А., Крыласова Н.Б. Угры в Предуралья в древности и средние века. Уфа: Башкирского государственного педагогического университета им. М.Акмуллы, 2009. 278 с.

Биро А., Ланго П., Тюрк А. Роговые накладки лука Карпатской котловины X–XI вв. (10th–11th Centuries Antler Overlays of Bow from Carpathian Basin). // Степи Европы в эпоху средневековья. Том 7. / Гл.ред. Евглевский А.В. Донецк: ДонНУ, 2009. С. 407−441.

Бокий Н. М., Плетнева С.А. Захоронение семьи воина-всадника X в. в бассейне Ингула // СА.1988. №2. С. 99−115.

Боталов С.Г. Погребальный комплекс Уелги и некоторые наблюдения на предмет угорского и мадьярского культурогенеза (A Dél-Urál a 6–11. században. Észrevételek az ugor és a magyar népesség anyagi műveltségének kialakulásával kapcsolatban). In: A népvándorláskor fiatal kutatóinak XXIV. konferenciája Esztergom 2014. november 4–6. II. Ред.: Türk A. et al. Studia ad Archaeologiam Pazmaniensiae No. 3.2 – Magyar Őstörténeti Témacsoport Kiadványok 3.2. Budapest–Esztergom, 2017. С. 267−334.

Боталов С.Г., Лукиных А.А., Тидеман Е.В. Погребальный комплекс могильника Уелги – новый средневековый памятник в Южном Зауралье // Челябинский Гуманитарный Научный Журнал. 2011. №2 (15). С. 104−114.

Иванов П.И. Крюковско-Кужовский могильник / Материалы о истории мордвы VIII−IX вв. Моршанск: Моршан. Краевед. Музей. Отд. Истории края, 1952. 232с.

Иванов В.А. Древние угры-мадьяры в Восточной Европе. Уфа: Гилем, 1999. 123с.

Иванов А.А. К вопросу об этнокультурной характеристике захоронений в “курганах с ровиками” Нижнего Дона и Волжско-Донского междуречья // Хазары. Второй Международный коллоквиум / Под ред. В.Я. Петрухина, А.М. Федорчука. М.: Институт славяноведения РАН, 2002. С. 36−38.

Иванов В.А. Угры Предуралья: продолжение темы // Поволжская археология. 2015 №4(14). С. 201−219.

Казаков Е.П. Новые археологические материалы к проблеме ранней тюркизации Урало-Поволжья // ТА. 1999. №1−2 (№4−5).С. 23−38.

Колода В.В. Салтовская культура на Харьковщине: очередной юбилей (итоги и перспективы исследований) // Салтово-маяцька археологічна культура: 110 років від початку вивчення на Харківщині: збірник наукових праць, присвячених проблемам та перспективам салтовознавства, за матеріалами Міжнародної наукової конференції «П’ятнадцяті Слобожанські читання» / Ред. Свистун Г. Є. Харків: Видавець Савчук О. О. ; ОКЗ «Харківський науково-методичний центр охорони культурної спадщини», 2011. С. 21−31.

Комар А.В. Предсалтовские и раннесалтовский горизонты Восточной Европы // Vita Antiqua. 1999. №2. С. 111−136.

Комар А.В. Салтовская и «салтоидная» культуры в Поднепровье // Причерноморье, Крым, Русь в истории и культуре 3–4. Київ–Судак, 2004, С. 87−91.

Комар А.В. Древные венгры. // Евразиядагы турк мұрасы – Тюркское наследие Евразии VI–VIII. вв. // Отв. ред.: Досымбаева А. Астана: Издво?, 2008. С. 214-216.

Комар А.В. Древние мадьяры Етелькеза: перспективы исследований // Мадяри в Середньому Подніпров’ї. Археологія і давня історія України 7. Київ, 2011. С. 21−78.

Комар А.В. Древние мадьяры Этелькеза: перспективы исследований // II-й Международный Мадьярский симпозиум: сборник научных трудов. (Челябинск, Шадринск, 13—15 августа 2013 г.). Челябинск: Рифей, 2013. С. 182−231.

Лопан О.В. Средневековые глиняные подвесные котлы с внутренными ручками-ушками // Средневековые древности Дона / Материалы и исследования по археологии Дона. Вып. 2. / Под .ред. Гугуева Ю. К. М.; Иерусалим: Мосты культуры / Гешарим, 2007. С. 240−311.

Матвеева Г.И. Могильники ранних болгар на Самарской Луке. Самара: Изд-во Самарского университета. 1997. 227 с.

Матвеева Н.П. Западная Сибирь в эпоху Великого переселения народов (проблемы культурогенеза в лесостепной и подтаежной зоне). Тюмень: Изд-во Тюменского гос. ун-та, 2016. 263 с

Матвеева Н.П., Зеленков А.С. К вопросу о миграции западносибирского населения в Приуралье. // Археологическое наследие Урала: от первых открытий к фундаментальному научному знанию (XX Уральское археологическое совещание): Материалы научной конференции. Ижевск: УдГУ, 2016. С. 246−251.

Плетнева С.А. От кочевий к городам. Салтово-маяцкая культура / МИА № 142. М.: Наука, 1967. 200с.

Плетнева С.А. Салтово-маяцкая культура // Степи Евразии в эпоху средневековья / Археология СССР /Отв. ред. С.А. Плетнёва М.: Наука, 1981. С. 62−75.

Плетнева С. А. Очерки хазарской археологии. М.; Иерусалим 1999. 373с.

Плетнева С.А. Кочевники южнорусских степей в эпоху средневековья (IV–XVIII вв.). Воронеж: Издательство Воронежского государственного университета, 2003. С. 103−114.

Рябцева С., Рабинович Р. К вопросу о роли венгерского фактора в Карпато-Днестровских землях в IX–X. вв.// Revista Arheologiča. serie nouă 2007. vol III. №. 1–2. С. 195−230.

Сташенков Д.А. Археологические исследования у с.Новинки в 1992 г. // Краеведческие записки. 1995. Вып. VIII. С. 268−291.

Сташенков Д.А. Памятники мадьярского круга в Самарском Поволжье // Археология евразийских степей. Вып. 13 / Материалы научно-практической конференции «Идель-Алтай: истоки евразийской цивилизации», I Международный конгресс средневековой археологии евразийских степей (Казань, 7−11 декабря, 2009 г.) Казань: ООО «Фолиант»; Институт истории им. Ш. Марджани, 2011. С. 228−229.

Тюрк А. Возможности и перспективы археологических исследований ранней истории угров-мадьяров // Археологическое наследие Урала: от первых открытий к фундаментальному научному знанию (XX Уральское археологическое совещание). Материалы Всероссийской научной конференции (Ижевск, 25–29 октября, 2016 г.). Ижевск: УдГУ, 2016, С. 268−272.

Флерова В.Е., Флеров В.С. Дагестанский вариант салтово-маяцкой культуры: правомерность выделения // XXI Крупновские чтения по археологии Северного Кавказа (Кисловодск, 3 сентября 2000 г.). Кисловодск: ГУП "Наследие" 2000, С. 137−141.

Флерова В. Е. Рец. на: András Róna- Tas. Hungarians and Europe in the Early Middle Ages: An Introduction to Early Hungarian History. Budapest, 1999. // РА. 2003. №1. С. 170−176.

Щербакова Т.А., Тащи Е.Ф., Тельнов Н.П. Кочевнические древности Нижнего Поднестровья (По материалам раскопок кургана у г. Слободзея) / Археологическая библиотека. Вып. IV. Кишинев: Elan Poligraf SRL, 2008. 138 с.

About the Author:

Türk Attila. PhD. Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Department of Archaeology, Szentkirályi, St., 28, Budapest, 1088, Hungary; turk.attila@btk.mta.hu

ВОСТОЧНОЕВРОПЕЙСКИЕ КОРНИ И АРХЕОЛОГИЧЕСКОЕ НАСЛЕДСТВО ДРЕВНИХ МАДЬЯР КАРПАТСКОЙ КОТЛОВИНЫ (X В.) В ЗЕРКАЛЕ НОВЫХ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ

Аттила Тюрк

Исследование восточных связей по археологии Карпатского бассейна в X в. является одной из важнейших задач в изучении древнемадьярской истории. В последние 5-10 лет эта работа получила новые импульсы благодаря новым восточным находкам, и открытию материалов Субботцевского горизонта – переходного звена между венгерскими памятниками Урала и Карпатского бассейна. Ныне известно происхождение восточных аналогий находкам эпохи обретения родины (X в). К их первой группе принадлежат синхронные материалы восточного происхождения. Например, амулеты-топорики, число которых в последнее время резко возросло. Ко второй группе можно отнести находки позднее эпохи обретения родины. Например, изобразительное искусство с пальметтами. Восточные параллели венгерских находок можно найти, в частности, в степи, на территории Хазарского Каганата. Сегодня возрастает количество артефактов, указывающих на непосредственную связь Карпатской котловины с Волжско-Уральском регионом и Южным Уралом (например, трубочки для трута, и. т.д.). Иногда мы можем определить точную функцию этих находок с помощью именно восточных аналогий. Результаты антропологии и биоархеологии подтверждают сложность древнемадьярской истории аналогичной описаниям из письменных источников. Таким образом, для исследования археологического материала Карпатского бассейна X в. необходимо знать раннесредневековый археологический комплекс Восточной Европы. Географическое распространение восточных аналогий позволяет сделать важные исторические выводы. В целом, находки, связанные с мадьярами, обнаружены на тех территориях, на которых и по данным лингвистики и истории происходил этногенез венгров, или в тех краях, где жили народы, контактировавшие с мадьярами. В последнее время возросло число могильников на территории древней Руси, в которых погребения совершались с предметами «венгерского типа». Полагаем, что эти находки принадлежали тем наемникам, которые, возможно, переселились в Русь из Венгрии. Находки,

связанные с венграми, распространены не по всей Евразии, что может помочь в реконструкции пути передвижения мадьяр – вопрос, который до сих пор остается дискуссионным. Хронология движения венгров также спорная, ведь материалы Субботцевского типа и возможные древневенгерские памятники между Днепром и Уралом появлялись приблизительно одновременно. Археологический материал не позволяет говорить о том, что венгры пересекли Волгу в середине VIII в., как это утверждают венгерские исследователи. В последнее время возникли сомнения относительно западносибирского происхождения кушнаренковской культуры. С другой стороны, реальным продвижением в тематике стали последние биоархеологические исследования. Благодаря им, удалось установить, что генетический материал части венгров эпохи обретения родины связан с раннесредневековым населением Волжско-Уральского региона и Южного Урала.

Ключевые слова: археология, история древних венгров, Урал, Волга, средневековье.

Информация об авторе:

Аттила Тюрк. PhD. Институт археологии Католического университета им. Петера Пазманя, (г. Будапешт, Венгрия); turk.attila@btk.mta.hu