AVARS, BULGARS AND MAGYARS ON THE MIDDLE AND LOWER DANUBE

Editors
Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova – Csilla Balogh – Attila Türk

Proceedings of the Bulgarian-Hungarian Meeting,
Sofia, May 27–28, 2009

National Institute of Archaeology and Museum BAS
Sofia

Пázmáнь Péter Catholic University
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Department of Archaeology

СОФИЯ – ПИЛИССАБА
2014
Front Cover
Detail from Bowl No. 21 of the Nagyszentmiklós Treasure by Imre Huszár

Editor-in-chief
Lyudmil Vagalinski, Csanád Bálint, Endre Tóth

Editors
Lyudmila Doncheva-Petkova, Csilla Balogh, Attila Türk

Translated by
Hajnalka Pál, András Patay-Horváth, Tsveta Raichevska,
Tatiana Stefanova, Vajk Szeverényi

Illustrations
Zoltán Pápai

© The Authors and Archaeolingua Foundation
© National Institute of Archaeology and Museum BAS Sofia
© Pázmány Péter Catholic University Faculty of Humanities and
Social Sciences Department of Archaeology

ISBN 978-963-9911-55-0
HU-ISSN 1215-9239

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means,
electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording or any other information storage and retrieval system,
without requesting prior permission in writing from the publisher.

ARCHAEOLINGUA
2014

ARCHAEOLINGUA ALAPÍTVÁNY
H-1014 Budapest, Úri u. 49.
Desktop editing and layout by Gergely Hős
Printed by Prime Rate Kft.
CONTENTS

Csanád BÁLINT
Foreword ................................................................................................................................. 7

Lyudmila DONCHEVA-PETKOVA
Introduction .................................................................................................................................... 9

Lyudmila DONCHEVA-PETKOVA
Ethnic Changes in Present-day Bulgaria in the 6th–9th Centuries ........................................... 13

Csilla BALOGH
Masque type Mounts from the Carpathian Basin ..................................................................... 37

Miklós MAKOLDI
Bulgaria – the Link between the Steppe and the Carpathian along the Danube ......................... 55

Gergely SZENTHE
Contributions to the Connections of the Vrap–Velino Horizon and the Late Avar Material ........ 61

Maria HRISTOVA
Similarities and Differences between the Pottery on the Lower and the Middle Danube (Based on Data Yielded by the Cemeteries) ................................................................. 77

Ivo TOPALILOV – Kamen STANEV
Two Bulgar Pagan Burials from Plovdiv .................................................................................. 83

Nikolay MARKOV
About the Characters on Jugs № 2 and 7 from the Nagyszentmiklós Treasure ......................... 93

Pavel GEORGIIEV
The Abodriti-Praedenecenti between the Tisza and the Danube in the 9th Century .................... 107

Valeri YOTOV
The Kunágota Sword and the Dating of Two Bronze Matrices for Sword-Hilt Manufacturing ...... 125

Stela DONCHEVA – Boyan TOTEV
A New “Hungarian” Type of Saber from the Outer City of Pliska ............................................. 133

Attila TÜRK
Towards a Classification of Grave Types and Burial Rites in the 10th–11th Century
Carpathian Basin (Some Remarks and Observations) ............................................................... 137

Péter LANGÓ
Bulgarian Connections of the Find-horizon of the 10th Century in the Carpathian Basin:
a Case Study .................................................................................................................................. 157

Tsvetelin STEPANOV
Bulgar, Avar and Khazar Aristocratic Names in the Early Middle Ages
(Scytho-Sarmatian and Altay Heritage in Central and East Europe) ........................................ 165

Miklós TAKÁCS
Die Krise des Ungarischen Königstums nach dem Tod König Stephan ..................................... 173

Ciprián HORVÁTH
New Data on Earrings with Beadrow Pendants: Grave 2 of the Cemetery
of Kőszeg-Kőszegfalvi rétek ....................................................................................................... 189

Szabina MERVA
The Analysis of Pottery from 10th–11th-century Graves in the Carpathian basin.
Technological and Typo-chronological Studies ......................................................................... 197

List of Abbreviations .................................................................................................................. 263
In the archaeological record of the early medieval Carpathian Basin, there is a relatively small group of cast and ajouré mounts (and their pressed imitations) with a characteristic geometric decoration recalling human faces, which are therefore generally referred to as „masque type mounts”.\(^1\)

The scarcity of masque type mounts in the Carpathian Basin can be illustrated by the following facts: their catalogue contains only 36 findplaces and 45 find contexts altogether.\(^3\)

I suggest two criteria for their classification: the first one is based on technological, the other on formal characteristics. In the Carpathian Basin masque type mounts often occur sporadically, at any case there are no complete sets surviving and they were most probably used differently from their counterparts in the Russian steppe. The functional aspect has therefore been neglected in the classification.

**The typology of the masque type mounts**

Regarding their manufacturing techniques, the masque type mounts of the Carpathian Basin can be divided into three groups: Group no. 1 contains cast, Group no. 2 cut-out and Group no. 3. pressed pieces.

1. **Cast mounts**

The mounts are made of silver, sometimes bronze, their thickness lies between 1–1.5 mm. Through the so-called skin-casting technique they acquired a rim. Their front is polished, the rear side is crude. They are usually smaller than their pressed imitations or the pressed mounts of similar form.

There are several variants regarding the application used on them: most of them were fastened with a small rivet cast together with the mount, but to the south of the river Körös there are rectangular loops cast with the mount (Szentes-Nagyhegy, Grave 29 [Fig. 2. 1]) and rounded ones soldered afterwards (Klárafalva B, Grave 60 [Fig. 3. 3]) as well.

Generally speaking, they are decorated ajouré, often enriched with chiseling. The ajouré decoration can be divided in two major groups: most of them consist of simple geometric motifs (circles, triangles, rectangles in different combinations); to the south of the river Körös there are more complex and differentiated ones. The pieces found at Kecel and Potzneusiedl have unique faces, rendered with chiseling.

There are only a few formal varieties of the cast, ajouré mounts of the masque type known from the south Russian steppe which are present in the Carpathian Basin as well: their contours are either straight and parallel to each other (Figs. 2. 4–11), or curving (Fig. 2. 3), and there are some belt-ends with irregularly curving contours (Fig. 2. 1); there are simple pelta-shaped (Fig. 3. 1), double pelta (Figs. 3. 3–4) and triple pelta-shaped ones.

---

\(^1\) This paper is the abbreviated and slightly adjusted version of my “Martinovka-típusú övgarnitúra Kecelről. A Kárpát-medencei maszkos veretek tipokronológiaja. – Gürtelgarnitur des Typs Martinovka von Kecel. Die Typochronologie der Maskenbeschläge des Karpatenbeckens” (BALOGH 2004). In the text there are no bibliographic references to the findplaces, only to the typological charts. References are included in the catalogue.

\(^2\) They are not to be confused with the mounts of Byzantine origin, featuring human faces rendered with a dotted line. The masque type mounts belong to the larger group of the “Martynovka type”. In the hoard discovered at Martynovka there are basically three styles and there is no general agreement among Hungarian archaeologists in the usage of the termini Martynovka group, Martynovka culture and Martynovka type. Sometimes it designates objects with a similar kind of decoration; others use it to denote formal analogies or similar manufacturing techniques. Russian archaeologists use the term “heraldic mounts” (гералдические накладки) for the masque type (ГАВРИТУХИН–ОБЛОМСКИЙ 1996, 72). For a detailed discussion of the history of research see BALOGH 2004, 247–248.

\(^3\) The publication of the first 1500 graves of the cemetery at Zamárdi–Rétföldek appeared only after the completion of this manuscript. I can only note that there were eight graves (No. 559; 925; 1013; 1020; 1072; 1091; 1298 and 1323) containing masque type mounts (BÁRDOS–GÁRAM 2009).
(Figs. 3. 5–6); fish-tail (Fig. 3. 2); rectangular with pelta-shape (Fig. 2. 2); T-shaped (Figs. 3. 9–10) and elongated clinging mounts (Figs. 3. 7–8, 11–13).

Cast masque type mounts are most probably belt-mounts, one triple-pelta from Hajdúszoboszló being the only exception. The Avar graves in the Carpathian Basin generally contain only one of them, and even in the most extreme case there were only four in the same grave. It is therefore to be assumed, that they were not used in the same fashion, as in their home on the steppe. The most complete set was found at Kecel, where the grave contained 11 mounts altogether. Only one of them belonged to the masque type (T-shaped clinging mount) the others were simple undecorated mounts. At Szabadka, the masque type mount was accompanied by a small and a large belt-end made of simple sheet-bronze. At Klárafalva B (Grave 60) both the small belt ends (with curving contour) and the large belt-ends of the belt set were cut out of bronze sheet. The ajouré decoration of the latter is identical with the cast masque type mounts.

The available evidence strongly suggests that cast, ajouré masque type mounts always occur on belts with pendant stripes: the belt from Klárafalva and the belt sets with cast ajouré masque type clinging mounts had multiple pendant stripes, while the graves at Kecel, Szentes-Lapistó, Tólanámedi and Subotica contained only one small belt mount each.

In the Carpathian Basin there are 18 findplaces from the Avar period where cast masque type mounts have been found: four pieces are stray-finds, the rest comes from graves (or at least most probably from graves). Most of the find-places are located in the core area of the Avars: they are evenly scattered between the Tisza and the Danube, a few of them lying on the left bank of the Tisza and on the right of the Danube. Three were unearthed far from the bulk, but close to each other, to the north of Lake Fertő (Neusiedler See), on the plain of Pardorf (Bruckneudorf, Leobersorf, Potzneusiedl), and one single piece has been found to the south of the river Tisza (Mandjelos) (Fig. 7. 1).

2. CUT-OUT MOUNTS

This group comprises only belt-ends. They are cut out of bronze or silver sheets, the one from Magyarsanád is, as far as I know, the only piece made of lead. The majority is made of two sheets with side-sticks (Figs. 4. 1–6), but the rimmed piece from Sonta belongs equally to this group, although it is made of one sheet only (Fig. 4. 7).

Regarding their application, the mounts belonging to this group are uniform, since all of them were fastened with one or two bronze rivets hammered through them.

Their decoration consists of geometrical and/or curving patterns and the combination of these. These are sometimes enriched with incised or chiselled lines. It is absolutely clear, that this decoration is derived from the cast masque type mounts, and adapts the same motifs to another technique.

---

4 A masque type elongated clinging mount was found in the horse grave of Zamárdi-Rétiföld 559 (BÁRDOS–GARAM 2009, Taf. 72. 13). Mounts of this type were usually made of bronze, yet their design is rougher than other masque type mounts: they are positively not produced with skin-casting technique. These mounts have been found so far only among belt-mounts (cf. BALOGH 2004, 253–254), yet the Zamárdi find was applied as a harness mount.

5 The belt-end found at the right scapula of an aged woman in Grave 165 at Szegvár-Oromdülő might have been of secondary use, perhaps intertwined with pearls (LÖRINCZY 1998, Fig. 15. 11).
This group of masque type mounts is typical for
the Carpathian Basin, but even in this area, there
are only seven find-places known. Four of them are
to the east of the Tisza and to the south of the Körös
(Klárafalva B, Grave 60; Magyarsanád-Bókény D;
Mokrin/Homokrév-Vodoplav, Grave 67 and Szegvár-
Oromdülő, Grave 165), two are lying to the north
of Lake Balaton (Keszthely-Bazilika, Grave 3 and
Környe, Grave 78), and one is situated between the
Danube and the Tisza (Sonta/Szond) (Fig. 7. 2).

3. Pressed mounts

These mounts are produced by embossing or
squeezing either from bronze or less frequently
from silver sheets of inferior quality. They are char-
acteristic of the 7th century Carpathian Basin, and
can be regarded as a local idiosyncrasy. The mounts
are usually rimmed, and their rear side is usually
filled with lead. The cramp-like loops were pressed
into the lead and fastened with small stripes or rect-
angular sheets from the rear. This is borne out both by their
form and decoration. There are many formal vari-
eties within the group: simple pelta-shaped (Figs. 6. 1–4), symmetrical double-pelta (Figs. 6. 10–11),
fishtail (Figs. 6. 5–9), B-shape and double lunulae-
shaped (Figs. 6. 12–13) mounts and belt-ends with
straight (Figs. 5. 1–6; 8–15) and curving contours
(Fig. 5. 7) equally belong to this group.

At Keszthely-Fenéki út, Grave 8 (Fig. 5. 4) and
at Jánoshida-Tótkérpuszta, Grave 67 (Fig. 5. 7)
there were absolutely no mounts in addition to the
masque type pieces. The other pressed mounts of
the masque type belonged to belt-sets compris-
ing most often plain, round or pressed rosetta-like
mounts, in some cases pressed pseudo-buckles.
Sometimes they occur as mounts decorating the
footwear or on horse harness.

In the Carpathian Basin we have only Környe,
Grave 151, where the double lunulae (Fig. 6. 13)b
and fishtail mounts were used on belts without pen-
dant stripes. On the other hand, all the other varie-
ties of the pressed masque type mounts were used
on belts with pendant stripes.

The pressed masque type mounts were most
probably locally produced, as it is indicated by the
moulds found in the graves of two Avar goldsmiths
at Adony and Gátér (Fig. 1). 8

There are twenty Avar graves from sixteen find-
places in the Carpathian Basin containing pressed
masque type mounts. Only one of these is a stray
find from the vicinity of Szeged (Fig. 6. 9), but even
this one is likely to have come from a grave (cf.
BALOGH 2004, 269). The majority of the findplaces
known at present lies definitely to the south of the
river Maros and in the eastern part of Transdanubia
(Fig. 7. 3). 9

The chronology of masque type mounts

The chronology of the Lapistó grave find and of
the cast masque type mounts were soon correctly
determined by D. Csallány, though he did not indi-
cate the reasons and relied almost exclusively on his
instincts. He dated the former to the late 6th or early
7th century, the latter to the second half of the 6th
century, and he also assumed that the production of
mounts may have started as early as the first half of
the 6th century (CSALLÁNY 1934, 142, 212). Virtually
the same conclusion has been reached by Cs. Bálint
as well, though he did not make a reference to the
results of D. Csallány (BÁLINT 1978, 196). É. Garam
and I. Erdélyi (proceeding from different principles)
dated the mounts to a later period, though the typol-
gy of A. K. Ambroz had an obvious influence on
both of them. Erdélyi dated the majority of the cast
items to the 7th century, and some of the Bashkirian
items to the 8th century (ERDÉLYI 1982, 124–136).

---

6 B-shaped and double lunulae shaped masque type mounts were found in Zamárdi horse Grave 1091 (BÁRDOS–GARAM 2009, Taf. 123. 4–6). These mounts have appeared so far as harness decorations, in a function not known among the available finds in the Carpathian Basin.

7 In the light of Zamárdi Graves 1020, 1072 and 1323, this conclusion still seems to be correct. Cf. BÁRDOS–GARAM 2009, Taf. 116, 121, 149!

8 Moulded silver mounts very similar to the mould with composite fishtail jointed with a flange in the middle from Gátér, Grave 11 are known from Zamárdi, Grave 1020 (BÁRDOS–GARAM 2009, Taf. 116. 6–8).

9 This image is significantly modified by the abovementioned cemetery of Zamárdi. Taking also these graves into consider-
ation, we have evidence for moulded masque type mounts from 26 graves in 17 sites (cf. n. 3.). The Zamárdi site excels in the number of data, too.
In her work published in 1976, É. Garam examined masque type mounts only superficially, and though she did not formulate it clearly, her comparative materials imply that she dated the masque type mounts to the last third of the 7th century (Garam 1976, 136–138).

On the basis of east European finds P. Somogyi determined the chronology of the 3 typological groups (cast, sheet-bronze, pressed) of the masque type mounts in the Carpathian Basin (Somogyi 1987, 130–148). He relied on the following principles for establishing the chronology: 1. D. Csalány and N. Fettich already suggested that pressed masque type mounts are imitations of cast items implying that pressed items succeeded cast ones chronologically. 2. Since the few cast items were not produced in the Carpathian Basin but arrived here through trade, by looting, or by migration, they are contemporary with the parallel items from the East European steppe. He dated cast ajouré items to the second half of the 6th century, whereas pressed masque type items were dated to the early 7th century (Somogyi 1987, 147).

In my present study I approached the chronological problems of masque type mounts from the context in which they were found and thus attempted to establish a chronological order for the different types.

Hungarian researchers have always referred to two Gepidic burials as the earliest occurrence of masque type mounts in the Carpathian Basin. These are Grave D at Magyarcsanád-Bökény (Fig. 4. 1) and Grave 29 at Szentes-Nagyhegy (Fig. 2. 1). They were dated to the middle or the second half of the 6th century (Csallány 1961, 322–323; Csallány 1962, 68), the second one was even dated by D. Csallány to 580–590 (Csallány 1934, 214), i.e. immediately after the arrival of the Avars in the Carpathian Basin.

It has, however, escaped the attention of research, that in addition to these pieces there are two other masque type mounts found in Langobard graves in the region of Keszthely: Keszthely-Bazilik, Grave 3 (Fig. 4. 6) and Keszthely-Fenékúút, Grave 8. (Fig. 5. 4). These pieces should not be neglected and can offer new clues for dating. It is a remarkable fact as well, that all the four early masque type mounts belong to different groups, and there is only one of them (from Szentes), which is cast.

The belt-end with side-stick found at Magyarcsanád-Bökény, which is cut out of lead, cannot belong to the Gepidic Grave D and it is therefore not certain, that the mount would come from a Gepidic context. There are good parallels for it in late antique (non-nomadic) burials, such as Suuk-Su, Grave 54 (Айбайн 1990, рис. 49. 22), Grave 3 in the cemetery of Cibilium ( Bálint 1995, Fig. 38. 8) and in Graves 132 and 134 at Callatis (Preda 1980, 95, T. XXXIV. 1–3, 96. T. XXXIV. 1–4). If we are looking for parallels among the mounts in the Carpathian Basin, one finds the silver ajouré belt-end from the Langobard Grave 3 at Keszthely-Bazilik and the similar belt-end from the Avar Grave 165 at Szégvár–Oromdülő, which are very close to it on a formal level. This last piece has a somewhat different decoration, compared with the other masque type mounts of the Carpathian Basin, and finds the best parallels in the Langobard graves of the cemetery at Nocera Umbra in North Italy.

The deceased person in the burials at Keszthely and Szégvár was in both cases a female and each grave contained besides the masque type belt-end only one buckle (with pelta-shaped body and a rectangular loop) which indicated the presence of a belt. The eastern belt-end of this type occurred exclusively in male burials. The specimens from Magyarcsanád and Keszthely are particularly instructive, considering their parallels as well. They seem to be different (structurally and regarding their decoration) from the other masque type mounts of the Carpathian Basin and have apparently no formal or functional connections either with the Avars, or with the nomadic finds of the steppe, and their decoration is different as well. In sum, they seem to appear in a Germanic context in the Carpathian Basin. The piece found at Szegvár presents a more complicated case. Here the grave has features, which are typical for 6th century nomadic burials (east-west orientation, partial animal deposition, separation of the human and animal parts), but the vessel found in the grave belongs to the sphere of Gepidic metalworking (Lórczcz 1998, 351, Fig. 15. 7).

Considering the pieces from Suuk-su and Callatis, it is highly probable that this elongated type of belt-end, which can be regarded as the prototype of the pieces in the Carpathian Basin, is a variant of masque type mounts that had developed in the Crimea or in the region along the Lower Danube, imitating the masque type mounts of the Northern Caucasus. They were transmitted from here to Italy as well, where they appear in Langobard graves (Nocera Umbra, Castel Troso). Their sporadic occurrence in the Carpathian Basin suggests that they arrived here by trade.

In Grave 29 at Szentes-Nagyhegy there was only a Sučidava type buckle beside the cast, ajouré belt-end. The buckle type has been connected by D. Csallány genealogically and chronologically with the masque type mounts (Csallány 1962). Another buckle, completely identical with the one from Szentes was equally accompanied solely by a
cast, *ajouré* masque type belt-end from a grave at Piatra Frecăței (Aurelian 1962, pls. 11b). The best parallels for the masque type mount from Nagyhegy are known from Verchnaya Eshera (Воронов–Браjkов 1979, 69, pls. 6–8), Prahowo and Sardis (Гаврилюхин–Обломский 1996, pls. 43, 45, 47).

The belt-end from Szentes is technically (it has no rim), formally and, most distinctively, structurally (i.e. regarding its application) different from the other masque type mounts in the Carpathian Basin. The rectangular loops placed at a right angle to the main axis of the mount and cast together with it, and the highly differentiated form of the belt-end is not found among Avar or other nomadic finds. Its Byzantine origin is therefore highly probable. The *ajouré* masque type mount of Grave 29 is not the single piece in the cemetery, which reveals the commercial contacts of this Gepidic group with the Byzantine Empire.\(^{10}\)

The mount of unknown provenance belonging to the complex cast mounts with a rectangular upper part, has arrived from somewhere in southern Hungary to the collection of the National Museum (Fig. 2. 2) and has formal analogies, e.g. Suuk-Su, Grave 54 (Албаанн 1990, pls. 49. 2, 4, 6, 14), Sadowets (Велков 1935, Abb. 2. 8), Vilhovchik (Приходнюк 1980, pls. 61. 11–12) and Piatra Frecăței (Aurelian 1962, pls. 13. 7–8), which suggest that it does not reflect nomadic taste.

The earliest masque type mounts of the Carpathian Basin are those cut-out sheets from Grave 3 at Keszhethely-Basilika, from Magyarcsanád-Bőkény and from Szegvár-Oromdülő, Grave 165, and the cast *ajouré* ones from Szentes-Nagyhegy and from Southern Hungary. Their appearance in the Carpathian Basin cannot be connected with the arrival of the Avars; they are of Byzantine origin (both in their form and regarding their application) and arrived here by trade. They can be regarded contemporary with their eastern parallels and can thus be dated to the middle third of the 6th century. Their context does not provide any more information (the one from Magyarcsanád and the other in the National Museum are stray finds, the grave in Keszhely had been heavily disturbed), but do not contradict this dating either. The early date is supported by the Şuçidava type buckle accompanying the mount at Szentes-Nagyhegy, because these buckles appear in the Carpathian Basin from the middle third of the 6th century onwards (Nagy 1993, 76).

The cast pieces from the graves at Szentes-Lapistó (Fig. 3. 4) and Klárafalva (Fig. 3. 3) belong to the earliest group of masque type mounts in the Carpathian Basin as well. The grave at Szentes was dated by Csallány, based on the analogies from Sinov'evka and other southern Russian findplaces, to the late 6th and the early 7th century (Csallány 1934, 210). The determination of the date of the goldsmith’s grave at Klárafalva is not easy on the basis of the grave finds alone. The scales and weights usually found in such graves date them quite certainly to the first half of the Avar Period. These finds are missing at Klárafalva, so it is only the cast, *ajouré*, multiple pelta-shaped mounts and the burial rites, which might furnish a date. The belt mounts have few analogies (Suuk-Su, Piatra Frecăţej, Sardis etc.) which are typical for the non-nomadic burials of the second half of the 6th century. The burial rites, on the other hand (single grave dug into a tumulus, NW–SE orientation, partial animal deposition), are clearly nomadic features and apart from the orientation it is basically similar to the graves at Szentes-Lapistó and Szentes-Derekegyháza. P. Somogyi has concluded after the analysis of the nomadic burial rites of the 6th century that the parallel presence of cast masque type mounts and partial animal depositions is characteristic for the East European finds (Somogyi 1987, 146).

The dating of the few cast masque type mounts of the Carpathian Basin to the second half of the 6th century is confirmed by the triple pelta-shaped mounts of Hajdúszoboszló (Figs. 3. 5–6). This type of mount was fashionable according to their accepted chronology in the Caucasus and Bashkiria in the second half of the 6th and the first quarter of the 7th century. In East Georgia they are dated a little later, in the first half of the 7th century (Ковалевская 1972, 115). Although the find circumstances of the mounts found at Hajdúszoboszló are unknown, they were associated with an oval medallion, which is dated to the first phase of the Early Avar Period, i.e. to the third quarter of the 6th century (Lőrinsky 1991, 136).

The *ajouré*, cast fishtail-mount from Mandjelos (Fig. 3. 2) is a stray find. Ambroz has placed the similar pieces in his typochronological table to

\(^{10}\) On the south bank of the Veker, at Szentes-Nagyhegy, G. Csallány excavated from 1930 to 1941 a Sarmatian, Gepidic and Avar cemetery. The Gepidic cemetery, consisting of 79 graves and several stray finds, was in use during the second third of the 6th century (Nagy 1993, 97). The finds reveal the widespread contacts of the buried people (from Skandinavia to the Pontic cities), which point among others to Byzantium. Commercial contacts are indicated by late antique imperial goods, such as the golden beads of Grave 84 (Csallány 1961, Taf. CCIV. 4–7). The most common finds arriving from Byzantium are the objects decorated with crosses, indicating the spread of Arianic Christianity, e.g. the rectangular reliquary box from Grave 84, decorated by punched crosses on both sides (Csallány 1961, Taf. XXXIX. 4).
the first half of the 7th century (AMBROZ 1973, puc. 1). It is well known that the typochronology of Ambroz is late, i.e. he dates most of the types too late, and apparently this is true for these mounts as well. The earliest occurrence of this type is known from Grave 34 at Chufut-Kale, which is dated by the solidus of Justinian I to the middle of the 6th century (КРІЮКІН 1958, 214). Regarding the date of the grave and of the mount at Mandjelos, the ring-hilted sword with a triple-looped suspension plate can be of help. This piece is the only one so far from the Carpathian Basin, where the loop and the handle are cast together (SIMON 1991, 266) and it is immediately connected with the swords of the Far East having no transverse guard and dating from the 4th–6th centuries, because its handle is similar in form and material to them. This connection points not only to the origin of this type of sword, but is relevant for chronology as well. We can thus connect the sword from Mandjelos to the very first generation of Avars in the Carpathian Basin (SIMON 1991, 273). A similar, straight and single-edged sword with loop-end and transverse guard was placed in Grave 13 at Deszk I (BALOGH 2004, Note 2. Fig. 13. 21). This grave is connected to the masque type mounts under discussion here, through various features: it contained not only cast disc-type and pelta-shaped belt-mounts and the sword with loop-end handle, but also a buckle decorated with antithetical birdheads.

The other finds associated with cast masque type mounts in the Carpathian Basin do not furnish any chronological clues. Some of them are simply stray finds (Bruckneidorf [Fig. 2. 6], Leobersdorf [Fig. 2. 9], Potzneusiedl [Fig. 2. 3]), and the finds from Tolanámedei and Subotica can be dated probably to the end of the 6th century. The belt-end in Grave 314 at Szekszárd-Bogyszlói at (Fig. 2. 5) was found in a secondary context, together with Middle Avar artifacts.

From these observations, one can conclude that cast masque type mounts among the Avars of the Carpathian Basin appear for the first time to the east of the Tisza and to the south of the Körös during the second half of the 6th century (Szentes-Lapistó; Klárafalva, Grave B 60). Some of the moulded imitations of these pieces equally come from this area, which indicates, that the appearance of these mounts in the Carpathian Basin is due to some kind of migration.

The chronology of the moulded masque type mounts can be deduced from their association with different coins: at Kiszombor, Grave O 2 they were found together with a solidus of Phocas issued between 603–607 (CSALLány 1939, 125–126; SOMOGYI 1997, 53–54). Based on this coin Csallány dated the moulded masque type mounts to the first decade of the 7th century (CSALLány 1939, 141). The small belt-ends of the masque type from Grave 8 at Deszk G (Fig. 5. 8) can be dated to the same time, because the grave contained a sword with P-shaped suspension loop.

In Grave 3 at Nyiregyháza-Kertgazdaság, a worn and perforated coin of Mauricius Tiberius, issued between 582–602, was found together with moulded type mounts (Fig. 5. 11; cf. CSALLány 1958, 49; GARAM 1992, 140; SOMOGYI 1997, 67–68). Even if the coin was in secondary use, and therefore of little chronological value, D. Csallány disregarded this fact and proposed a date in the first half of the 7th century (CSALLány 1958, 49–50).

In Grave I at Keszthely–Fenékpuszta a straight double-edged sword with transverse guard was found (BÓNA 1983, Fig. 12. 1), which has a very close counterpart in Grave 85 at Aradac (NÁD 1959, Tab. XXVII. 1). According to D. Csallány, the straight double-edged sword in the grave at Szentes-Lapistó had also been equipped originally with a transverse guard (CSALLány 1934, 210, Pl. LVIII. 14). If this really was the case, he rightly connected the grave and the sword at Lapistó with Grave I at Keszthely–Fenékpuszta. I. Bóna assumed that this type of sword was of eastern origin, deriving from prototypes of the Hun Period and belonged therefore to the very first Avar generation in the Carpathian Basin (BÓNA 1983, 119). Graves 62 and 67 at Mokrin also contained straight double-edged swords, but these had no guard (BALOGH 2004, Fig. 23. 48, 25. 20). Grave I at Fenékpuszta can be dated to the end of the 6th century based on the sword (BÓNA 1983, 119). The belt in this grave is decorated with 14 fishtail mounts, which are closely related to the belt mounts found in the goldsmith’s Grave 166 at Jutas (RHÉ–FETTICH 1931, Pl. VIII. 3–5). The Byzantine scales found in this grave were dated by I. Bóna to the last third of the 6th century. The date was based on Grave 34 at Hegykő (BÓNA 1961, 136). This means, that the goldsmith buried at Jutas was active in the last third of the 6th century and was buried sometime around 600.

---

11 P. Somogyi has called my attention to the fact, that the coin contained in the grave is actually only a gilt bronze or copper imitation of Justinian’s solidus. Considering this and the fact, that the grave itself is actually a crypt, which was used several times, containing therefore burials of different dates, I do not think the close dating by the coin would make any sense.

12 The coin is considered a solidus by E. Garam (GARAM 1992, 142).
Grave 1 at Szegvár-Oromdülő and the moulded fishtail mounts in it (Fig. 6. 5) were dated by the excavator to the last third of the 6th century, a date based on the detailed and very convincing analysis of the grave goods (LÖRINCZY 1991, 134–142).

There was a mould for a fishtail mount with a long rib in the middle of its upper part in the goldsmith's Grave 11 at Gátér (Fig. 1. 2). It was this mould (and its exact counterpart in Grave A at Tarnaméra) which induced J. Gy. Szabó to date the graves to the beginning of the 7th century (SZÁBÓ 1965, 45). I. Bóna, however, combined without clear reasoning the mounts from the graves at Szegvár (Sápoldal and Oromdűlő langobard grave 8 at Keszthely-Fenéki út and Keszthely-Fenékpuszta, grave 166 at Jutas, the necessarily produced at the same time. The earliest cast and sheet masque type mounts in it (Fig. 6. 5) were dated by the excavator to the last third of the 6th century, a date based on the detailed and very convincing analysis of the grave goods (LÖRINCZY 1991, 134–142).

They are later than the cast pieces, but were not considered by Hungarian research to be not earlier than the middle third of the 7th century (H. TÓTH 1981, 32; GÁRMA 2000, 387; BALOGH–KÖHEGYI 2001, 337). However, it does not exclude the possibility that the goldsmith could have been buried with a considerably earlier mould, i.e. it does not mean that the burial and the mould or the mount-type cast in it were contemporary.¹³

**SUMMARY**

1. The earliest cast and sheet masque type mounts in the Carpathian Basin appear in Germanic contexts (Keszthely-Bazilika, Grave 3; Magyarcsanád-Bókény; Szentes-Nagyhegy, Grave 29; unknown provenance/Southern Hungary) as imported Byzantine products during the middle third of the 6th century. 2. The cast pieces in Avar contexts were not produced locally, but arrived partly with their eastern nomadic owners who adhered to their typical ancestral burial rites too (Hajdúszebaszóló; Klárafalva, B Grave 60; Szentes-Lapistó), and partly as booty or commercial goods (Mandjelos; Subotica). They can be dated in the last third of the 6th century. 3. The moulded imitations of cast masque type mounts were produced locally, as it is clearly indicated by the moulds found in the graves of local goldsmiths (Ádony; Gátér, Grave 11). They are later than the cast pieces, but were not necessarily produced at the same time. The earliest moulded mounts seem to come from Grave I at Keszthely-Fenékpuszta, Grave 166 at Jutas, the Langobard Grave 8 at Keszthely-Fenéki út and the graves at Szegvár (Sáboldal and Oromdülő Grave 1). These might be dated to the end of the 6th century. A slightly later date, approximately the beginning of the 7th century can be assigned to the majority of moulded masque type mounts (graves at Deszk, Kiszombor, Nyíregyháza-Kertgazdaság, etc.). Still later are possibly the fishtail-mounts from Gátér and Tarnaméra, tentatively dated to the middle third of the 7th century. I consider the pieces from Kecei as the last ones from the cast mounts and the double sheeted belt-end with side-sticks from Grave 67 at Jánoshida as the last moulded one. The other grave goods (bronze ring, fragment of a glass ring, a bronze pin and the fragment of a Byzantine buckle, whetstone) do not enable an exact dating. The beginning of the cemetery was placed by I. Erdélyi to the first decades of the 7th century, but he did not consider the chronology of the masque type mount within the cemetery (ERDÉLYI 1958, 57–58). Grave 26 with its Tarnaméra type belt-set belongs to its earliest phase (ERDÉLYI 1958, Pl. XII. 1–2, 4, 6). This set provides the closing date of the Tarnaméra type mounts and can be assigned to the middle of the 7th century (GÁRMA 2001, 144), i.e. the beginnings of the cemetery cannot be earlier than the middle third of the 7th century. There are no clues for the precise chronology of the moulded masque type mount of Grave 67, but it certainly cannot be earlier than Grave 26.

There are also some problems related to the disappearance of masque type mounts. Some pieces may have been used for a long time, e.g. the *ajouré*, cast masque type belt-end from Grave 314 at Szekszárd-Bogyiszlói út, which was discovered after secondary usage along with Middle Avar period objects (ROSNER 1999, Pl. 22).

Considering that the majority of masque type mounts are found on the steppes, it would be a

---

¹³ Grave 1323 at Zamárdi contained moulded fishtail shaped mounts, similar to the one from Gátér, and they were associated with similarly decorated B-shaped mounts (BÁRDO–GÁRMA 2009, Taf. 149. 2–7). In addition, the belt was decorated with twofold pseudo-buckles made of silver. This type of mount had been produced by casting as well as by moulding and belonged to the Central Asian heritage of the first generation of Avars settling in the Carpathian Basin (GÁRMA 1991, 73).
logical step, if Russian research could revise the typochronology established by Ambroz for the east European mounts of the Martynovka type and the absolute dates assigned to the masque type mounts as well. The differences in their manufacturing techniques can be evaluated and historical or ethnic conclusions can be drawn only afterwards. The need for a revision of the typochronology of masque type mounts has been a desideratum for a long time, but this can only be accomplished, if Russian colleagues publish the large cemeteries with detailed descriptions accompanied by fine illustrations. This is an absolutely indispensable prerequisite for the correct study of the eastern European material.

Translated by Vajk Szeverényi

CATALOGUE

Find complexes containing masque type mounts in the Carpathian Basin

1. Cast mounts

1.1. Belt-ends

With straight contour
- Bruckneudorf-Heidwiesen/Huningesbrunn (A) (Fig. 2, 6; WINTER 1997, Pl. 28)
- Unknown provenance (MNM) (Fig. 2. 7; FETTICH 1937, XXII. t. 8)
- Kecel (Fig. 2. 4; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 1. 14)
- Leobersdorf (A) (Fig. 2. 9; HAMPL 1964, Abb. 5. 4)
- Szekszárd-Bogiszlói út, Grave 314 (Fig. 2. 5; ROSNER 1999, Pl. 22)
- Szentes-Lapistó (Fig. 2. 10–11; CSALLÁNY 1934, Pl. LVIII. 1–2)
- Tolnanémedi (Fig. 2. 8; NAGY 1901, Figs. 8–9)

With curved contour
- Potznuesiedl (A) (Fig. 2. 3; WINTER 1997, Pl. 47)
- Szentes-Nagyhegy, Grave 29 (Fig. 2. 1; CSALLÁNY 1961, Pl. XXV. 14)

1.2. Mounts

Simple pelta-shaped
- Subotica/Szabadka (Srb) (Fig. 3. 1; BIBÓ-BIGÉ 1903, Fig. 2, 4)

Double pelta-shaped
- Klárafalva B, Grave 60 (Fig. 3. 3; BÁLINT 1995, 56, 1–11)
- Szentes-Lapistó (Fig. 3. 4; CSALLÁNY 1934, Pl. LVIII. 5–6)

Triple pelta-shaped
- Hajdúszebszoboszló (Fig. 3. 5–6; FETTICH 1937, XXVI. t. 1–3)

Fish-tail-shaped
- Mandjelos/Nagyolaszi (Srb) (Fig. 3. 2; ERCEGOVIĆ–PAVLOVIĆ 1973, Tab. II. 2)
- Rectangular with pelta-shaped part
  Unknown provenance/Southern Hungary (Örölcék?) (Fig. 2. 2; GARAM 2001, Pl. 94. 5)
- T-shaped clinging mount
  Kecel (Fig. 3. 10; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 1. 12)
  Környe, Grave 23 (Fig. 3. 9; ERDÉLYI–SALÁMON 1971, Pl. 3)
- Elongated clinging mount
  Budapest-Farkasrét (Fig. 3. 7; BÓNA 1983, 14, 5–6)
  Kiskunfélegyháza-Pákapuszta (Fig. 3. 13; BALOGH 2002, 15, 5)
  Környe, Grave 147 (Fig. 3. 12; ERDÉLYI–SALÁMON 1971, Pl. 25)
  Rácalmás-Rózsamajor, Grave 30 (Fig. 3. 8; BÓNA 2000, Pl. VIII. 6)
  Szekszárd-Bogiszlói út, Grave 784 (Fig. 3. 11; ROSNER 1999, Pl. 52)

2. Cut-out sheet-mounts (ajouré)

2.1. Belt-ends

With straight contour
- Klárafalva B, Grave 60 (Fig. 4. 4; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 15.15)
- Keszthely-Bazilika, Grave 3 (Fig. 4. 6; SÁGI 1961, Pl. XIII. 4)
- Környe, Grave 78 (Fig. 4. 2; ERDÉLYI–SALÁMON 1971, Pl. 12)
- Magyarscánád-Bökény, stray find (Fig. 4. 1; CSALLÁNY 1961, Pl. CCLVIII. 3)
- Mokrin/Homokrév-Vodoplav dülő (Srb), Grave 67 (Fig. 4. 3; MUKBI 1980, Sl. LXVI. 2–3)
- Szegvár-Oromdülő, Grave 165 (Fig. 4. 5; LÖRINCZY 1998, 15, 11)

With curving contour
- Sonta/Szond (Srb) (Fig. 4. 7; KOVAČEVIĆ 1961, Sl. 16. 5)
3. PRESSED MOUNTS

3.1. BELT-ENDS

With straight contour
Deszk G, Grave 8 (Fig. 5. 8; CSALLÁNY 1939, IV. t. 6; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 4, 26)
Deszk G, Grave 18 (Fig. 5. 15; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 4. 18)
Deszk H, Grave 18 (Fig. 5. 10; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 4. 27)
Deszk M, Grave 2 (Fig. 5. 5–6; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 5. 1–2)
Keszthely-Fenéki út, Grave 8 (Fig. 5. 4; SÁGI 1992, 29. ábra 10)
Kiszombor O, Grave 2 (Fig. 5. 9; CSALLÁNY 1939, IV. t. 18–19)
Mokrin/Homokrét-Vodoplav dűlő (Srb), Grave 62 (Fig. 5. 13; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 4. 20)
Mokrin/Homokrét-Vodoplav dűlő (Srb), Grave 67 (Fig. 5. 14; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 4. 10–11; 17)
Nyiregháza-Kertgazdaság, Grave 3 (Fig. 5. 11; CSALLÁNY 1958, VII. t. 1; GARAM 1992, Pl. 26. 2)
Petronell-Carnuntum (A), stray-find (Fig. 5. 12; WINTER 1997, Pl. 8)
Szegvár-Sápolo, Grave 1 (Fig. 5. 17)

With curving contour
Jánoshida-Tötképészta, Grave 67 (Fig. 5. 7; ERDÉLYI 1958, XVIII. t. 4)

3.2. OTHER MOUNTS

Pelta-shaped mount
Deszk G, Grave 18 (Fig. 6. 4; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 5. 21)
Deszk M, Grave 2 (Fig. 6. 1; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 5. 17)
Mokrin/Homokrét-Vodoplav dűlő (Srb), Grave 49 (Fig. 6. 2; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 5. 20)
Petronell-Carnuntum (A) (Fig. 6. 3; WINTER 1997, Pl. 8)

Symmetrical pelta-shaped
Unknown provenance/vicinity of Szeged (BALOGH 2004, Fig. 19. 13)14
Mokrin/Homokrét-Vodoplav dűlő (Srb), Grave 49 (Fig. 6. 10; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 5. 23)
Szegvár-Oromdűlő, Grave 1 (Fig. 6. 11; LÖRINCZY 1991, V. t. 1)

Double lunulae
Környe, Grave 151 (Fig. 6. 13; ERDÉLYI–SALAMON 1971, Pl. 26)

Fishtail mounts
Környe, Grave 151 (Fig. 6. 12; ERDÉLYI–SALAMON 1971, Pl. 26)
Gátér, Grave 11, pressing mould (Fig. 1. 2; KADA 1905, 369. 11/a)
Unknown provenance/vicinity of Szeged (Fig. 6. 9; BALOGH 2004, Fig. 6. 11)
Jutas, Grave 166 (Fig. 6. 8; RHÉ–FETTICH 1931, Pl. VIII. 3–5)
Keszthely-Fenékpuszta, Grave 1 (Fig. 6. 7; BÓNÁ 1983, 12, 2–15)
Mokrin/Homokrét-Vodoplav dűlő (Srb), Grave 58 (Fig. 6. 6; MRKOBRAĐ 1980, Sl. LXVI. 5)
Szegvár-Oromdűlő, Grave 1 (Fig. 6. 5; LÖRINCZY 1991, V. t. 1)
Tarnaméra-Urak dűlő, Grave A (SZABÓ 1965, VII. t. 23)
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Fig. 2: Cast mounts and belt-ends. 1: Szentes-Nagyhegy Grave 29; 2: Unknown findspot/Southern Hungary (Öföldeák?); 3: Potzneusidl; 4: Kecel; 5: Szekszárd-Bogyiszlói út, Grave 314; 6: Bruckneudorf-Heidwiesen/Chuningesbrunn; 7: Unknown findspot (Hungarian National Museum); 8: Tolnanemedi; 9: Leobersdorf; 10–11: Szentes-Lapistó
Fig. 3: Cast masque type mounts. 1: Subotica/Szabadka; 2: Mandfelos/Nagyolaszó; 3: Kalrafa B, Grave 60; 4: Szentes-Lapistó; 5–6: Hajdúszoboszló; 7: Budapest-Farkasrét; 8: Rácalmás-Rózsamajor, Grave 30; 9: Környe, Grave 23; 10: Kecel; 11: Szekszárd-Bogyiszlói út, Grave 784; 12: Környe, Grave 147; 13: Kiskunfélegyháza-Pákapuszta
Fig. 4: Cut-out sheet belt-ends. 1: Magyarsanád-Bőkény; 2: Környe, Grave 78; 3: Mokrin/Homokrév-Vodapav, Grave 67; 4: Klárafalva B, Grave 60; 5: Szegvár-Oromdülö, Grave 165; 6: Keszthely-Bazilika, Grave 3; 7: Sonta/Szond

Masque type Mounts from the Carpathian Basin
Fig. 6: Pressed masque type mounts. 1: Deszk M, Grave 2; 
2, 10: Mokrin/Homokrév-Vodoplav, Grave 49; 3: Petronell-Carnuntum; 4: Deszk G, Grave 18; 
5, 11: Szegvár-Oromdülő, Grave 1; 6: Mokrin/Homokrév-Vodoplav, Grave 58; 
7: Keszthely-Fenékpuszta, Grave 1; 8: Jutas, Grave 166; 9: Unknown findspot/vicinity of Szeged; 
11: Szegvár-Oromdülő, Grave 1; 12–13: Környe, Grave 151
Fig. 7: 1: Findspots of cast mounts in the Carpathian Basin; 2: Findspots of cut-out mounts in the Carpathian Basin; 3: Findspots of pressed mounts in the Carpathian Basin