

DALL'ALTROVE:

Aibolat Kushkumbaev
**THE MAGYAR (MADŽAR, MADIAR) ETNONYM IN
MIEVIAL WRITTEN SOURCES**



Aibolat Kushkumbaev, Kokshetau, Department of Medieval History

Historians, philologists and ethnographers always pay close attention to the problem of denomination and self-denomination of ethnic groups, tribes, clans having existed in the historical past. The circumstances of the origin and development of many ethnic names can be deduced from ethno-political, ethnographical, social, cultural, linguistic, and many other factors, from the special features of the formation of the given ethnic unit, linguistic group in the deep past. Up to our days, it is possible to meet the most different self-denomination of such peoples, ethnic groups in the historiography which gave the name of certain countries. The ethnic names of a certain people can express different ideas and contents in different languages. For example, the name of the Kypchak people was *кыфджак* (*Kyfdžak*) in the medieval Eastern (Persian and Arabic) written sources; *кыбчак* (*Kybdžak*) on the ancient Turkish

Orkhon relics; *цинъча* (*Cinch'a*) in the Chinese chronicles; *половцы* (*Polovets*) in the ancient Russian chronicles; *куманы, куны, палоты* (*Kumans, Kuns, Palots*) in the work of Bizantine and Western authors; etc. Sometimes there are fierce debates among the researchers dealing with these questions, about the following type of problems: What was the name of this or that people, ethnic group, tribe at the beginning? Are there any connections between the ancient name and that denomination which might have preserved (or might have changed) its form up to our days? The fact that an ethnonym does not change for a long historical period can tell us not only about the stability of the given ethnic name, but also about the durability of the historical remembrance of the carriers of it: their the remembrance about their past, their ancestors, their leaders, about the founders of their clans, etc.

In my opinion the posed questions referring to the ethnonym of the medieval Magyars (denomination: Magyar, Megyer, (in Russian: *мадьяры, венгры, угры*, in other European languages: Hungarian, Hongroise, Ungarn, etc.) belong to the above mentioned group of problems. According to the data at our disposal, the "Magyar" ethnonym was first mentioned in Arabic written sources. In the work of Ibn Rusta, titled to "Kitab al-alak an nafisa", (written around 903 A. D.), the Magyars' name appears in the form of "al-Madžariya" (al-Maggariya). If we take away from this word the Arabic article "al" and the suffix "iya", we can recognize the "Magyar" name. Another Arab author, Al-Bekri describes the country of the "Madžars" (Maggariya, al-Madžarija, or Bilad al-Maggariya). In the 10–11th Centuries the Persian authors also gave account about the Madžars (Magyars). For example, there is a description of the country "Maggari", situated in the West, in the "Hudud al-alam" (a Persian anonym geographic work). In the work of al-Gardizi (Zayn al-akhbar, 11th C.) the Magyars were also called "Maggari" (or Maggariyan in plural numbers.). In late medieval and modern Russian written sources the following forms of this ethnonym can be noticed: Madžar/Magar – Možar, Mažar [Levickij, 1978, pp. 56–60].

A pre-Revolutionary Russian author, D. A. Khvolson systematized the information about the early medieval Magyars. He brought forward a hypothesis according to which the Magyar (Madžar) and the Bashkir (Bashgard) ethnonyms have common roots. He says that the original form of this term had been "Badzghard" which developed later as follows:

Bashgard – Badžgar
 Bashkard – Modžgar
 Bashkart– Madžgar
 Bashkert – Madžar
 Bashkirt – Magyar
 Bashkir [Khvolson, 1869, p. 114.]

It is not perfectly understandable how the letter "B" changes to "M" in the quoted reconstruction. The idea of D. A. Khvolson was and is copied and repeated everywhere and is "wandering" from one scientific work into the other. It became an indisputable fact for a certain circle of researchers. I accept the arguments of D. Khvolson about the ethnic relation of the medieval

Magyars and Bashkirs. However, I must tell that the terms of "Magyar" and "Bashkir" have no linguistic contacts. The two denominations bear different ideas, therefore, they have different meanings.

R.G. Kuzeev – referring to the researches of Lotz [1956, pp. 679–680], points at three words from the family of words "Magyar": 1) *mogyer* – the country of the Magyars; 2) *mogyar* – personal name (name of a leader); and *megyer* – ethnonym. Besides, the root of the word: the syllable **mod** refers to the country or to the Magyar people; but **med** is the fundament of the denomination of that tribe (Magyar), which gave the name of the Hungarians. [http://shejere.narod.ru/kuzeev]. According to the opinion of the famous philologist, V. V. Napol'sky, "the self-denomination of the Hungarians, the *Magyar* < *mažar* (equal of the ancient Hungarian tribe name "*megyer* < **mezer*"), derives from the composition **manc-ar* / **menc-r*. The first syllable is pre-Ugrian at least in its origin. (Compare the Ostyak denominations: *mans* (southern), *mansci* (northern), *man si* (eastern), *mant* (northern); "*mos*" (self-denomination of a subdivision of the Ob-Ugrians). The second syllable of the *manc-ar** *menc-r* words have Turkish origin: **ar* – "man" [Napol'ski, 2002, p. 246]. In my opinion, this very important view has principal significance, because it properly shows the mixed origin of the self-denomination of the Magyars, and also refers to the complicated medieval composition this ethnic group, which had both Ugrian and Turkish elements, already in the early period of its ethnogenesis.

Once more, the above point of view confirms those earlier and grounded opinions of ethnologists and ethnographers that never existed ethnic groups which contained only one ethnic element (in other words: clear ethnic groups) anywhere, especially not on the Eurasian steppes, neither in ancient times, nor in the Middle Ages. It was practically impossible to preserve the peoples' "ethnic clearness" in such conditions and times when the Nomadic way of life was overwhelming among those peoples who were living on the above mentioned endless territories, and had manifold contacts, especially from ethnic point of view. It is impossible to handle the course of the ethnic processes unambiguously, the tendencies of the formation of an ethnic group only as unilinear evolutionary development. Without doubt, the practical ethnic researches can show more complicated courses, then it is shown by the above-mentioned schemes and conceptions, having brought forward some researchers, who sometimes are strongly induced by their own hypotheses and patterns, and generally, by their own "logical inducements". Besides, these researchers go to the extremes by not accepting the views of other researchers at all. Maybe, I tell somewhat heretic thoughts which cannot be accepted at the first sight. In my opinion the scientific concept of "ethnos" worked out by the ethnology of the 20th Century regarding the ethnic-political units of the Nomads of the ancient and modern times can hardly be accepted as a whole, even if this concept is still overwhelming in the ethnographic and other scientific literature. Even today, there is not such punctual definition of the conception of "ethnos" which would suit everybody, especially those who deal

with ethnic problems (problems of ethnogenesis) professionally and purposefully.

According to the majority of the opinions, the ancient Magyars departed from their "genetic nest", and left those Eastern peoples of which they derived from, at about the second half of the 9th Century. The problem of the original home of the Magyars in the East has been disputed already for many years, beginning from the second half of the 19th Century. Many hypotheses, points of view appeared and continue to appear in the circle of researchers. It is beyond the limit of our article to tell all about them. Special research would be needed, which deals only with this problem. It is good news that such researches have begun just in the circle of Hungarian researchers lately (See for example, G. Gyóni, 2007). One thing is clear: there isn't any doubt that the Land-conquering Magyars arrived from the East into the Carpathian Basin. Constantine Porphyrogenetos, the author of the famous work: "On ruling and directing the Empire" was the first who gave information about the appearance of the Magyars in East-Europe. The Byzantine Emperor named the Magyars by the ethnic term "Turks". However, he remarks that earlier their name was "savarto-asphaloi" (Savirs, Sabirs, Sabars). In the course of a war against the Pechenegs, the Magyars separated into two parts: to Eastern and Western Magyars. The Eastern Magyars kept their name, the "savarto-asphaloi" [Constantine Porphyrogenetos, 1991, p. 159–161]. It is most probable that the Byzantine author not only distorted the denomination of the Magyars, but interpreted it improperly as well. However, there is very important information here: the Eastern part of the Magyars remained somewhere in the East. The events connected with the separation of the once integrated Magyar nation happened not on the East-European steppes situated North of the Black Sea, but somewhere deeper in the East. It is possible that the process of the separation took longer time, than it is accepted by most of the researchers. Maybe, it had begun already between the Volga and Ural rivers, and continued for some decades. A branch of the Magyars departed for the West. In the course of their wanderings these Magyars got further and further from their Eastern brethren, and kept contact with them less and less. There is no kind of doubt that the existence of the Eastern Magyars between the Volga and the Ural Mountains was historical fact. In the 11-13th Centuries the Arabic and Persian authors give information both about the Eastern and Western Magyars. ("Maggari", al-Maggariya", "bilad Basgird wa Magar", as self-denomination of the people and the country; "al-Magar" – the name of the medieval town in the Northern Caucasus).

The Eastern Magyar people and her country existed most probably independently in the Volga-Ural Region, in the south-east direction from the Volga-Bulgarian state, until the Mongolian conquest. However, it is difficult to say, whether they had a state really in the given period. The author of the "Secret History of the Mongols" (1240). tells just about their state in the § 262 of the book. This paragraph tells about those events when Subetei-Bagatur had directed his army into western direction (in the text: in northern

direction), and subjected 11 nations and countries: "Kanlin, Kibcsaut, Bachžigit, Orosut, **Machžarat**, Asut, Sasut, Serkesut, Keshimir, Bolar, Raral (Lalat)". The Mongolian army had to cross rivers abundant in water: the Idil and the Ajakh (the Volga and the Ural Rivers). One can see clearly from this report that the Mongol name of the country of the Eastern Magyars was "*Machžarat*" (the *Machžar* etnonym with the "at" ending in plural number). So, here the information tells just about the Eastern Magyar people and country. According to some long-living theories, Pannonia (Transdanubia, Hungary) was understood under this country-name. However it was beyond the task of that Mongolian army which appeared in the Volga-Ural Region between 1229–1232, to conquer the Hungarian Kingdom. Besides others, the Carpathian basin was very far from the Volga-region. The primary task of Subetei's army was to subjugate the local people there – the Kipchaks, Bulgarians, Magyars, Saksins, Bashkirs, etc. Another paragraph of this valuable written source tells about the hard fights of the Mongolian army with these countries: "(As) Subetei-Bagatur met hard resistance from the part of those countries and towns which had to be conquered by him, especially from the part of "Kanlin, Kibcsaut, Bachžigit, Orosut, Asut, Sesut, **Machžar**, etc" [Kozin 1941, § 262, 270]. We must not be embarrassed by the fact that Western territories, far from the Volga-river are (for example Kiev) are also mentioned in these texts of the "Secret History". This work is written in artistic, heroic style, and wants to tell about all feats of the Mongols. That's why it mentions all conquered nations in one context. The text quoted above confirms the information noted in the work of Abu-L-Gazi about the conquest "of the territories of the **Madžars** and **Bashkurds**" [Abu-L-Gazi 1996, p. 99, 103].

We also get information about the hard resistance of the Magyars against the Mongols from Brother Julian. This Hungarian monk of the Dominican order visited the territory where the Eastern Magyars were living between the years 1235–1238 twice. Brother Julian was sent to the East exactly with the task of finding the Eastern Magyars, the relatives of that people which was living in the Hungarian Kingdom in the Carpathian Basin. This self-sacrificing man lacked needs and suffered from fame and thirst in the course of his long travel, buried all those who accompanied him, but finally he found those whom he wanted to find so desperately. He met a Magyar woman in one of the towns of Volgan Bulgaria. This country had been situated in eastern or south-eastern direction from the country of the Eastern Magyars. The woman showed Brother Julian the way into her original homeland. We can read the followings in the given written source: "In one of the large towns of that region, which was defended by fifty thousand soldiers, the monk found a Magyar woman, who was married off into Bulgaria from that country which had been searched by Brother Julian. She showed the monk the way to her homeland, and added that he can find those whom he is looking for, after a two days' travel. It really happened so. He found them close to the Large Atil-River." [Anninskij, 1940, p. 82.]. So, the text of the report informs us that Brother Julian did not have to take a long way already

to that place where the eastern Magyars were living. (The name of the Atil River might mean not the Volga River itself in this case, but one of its affluents, probably the Belaja River.) It is clear that the country of the Eastern Hungarians was on the left bank of the Edil (Atil, Itil) river (of the Volga River). Having followed the indicated route, Brother Julian really found his far-living relatives, and he could make himself understood with them in the Magyar language. His meeting with the Eastern Magyars justified his hopes. As he tells it in the referred written source: "Those, when they noticed him and got to know that he is Magyar, got very glad, that he arrived. They led them around to show him their homes and settlements, giving him many questions about the king and the Kingdom of their Christian brothers. They listened to all what he wanted tell them very attentively, about faith and other things, and they understood each other, because their language is perfectly Hungarian. They are Pagans, they have no idea about God, but they neither worship idols. They live just like animals. They do not cultivate land, eat horses, wolves and anything like that; they drink horses' milk and blood. They have many horses and a large amount of arms and they are very brave in fights. They remember that those Hungarians derive from them, but they did not know, where they could be found that time. The Tatar nation lives in their neighbourhood. But those Tatars, fighting with them, could not defeat the Magyars, on the contrary, they themselves were defeated in the first battle. For this reason, the Tatars selected them as friends and allies, and this way they devastated 15 kingdoms together" [Anninskij, 1940, p. 82]. All this confirms the information quoted from the Mongolian written source that the Eastern Magyars offered hard resistance to the Eastern conquerors and they did not get their subjects on the first occasion. The way of life of the Eastern Magyars shows them to be real Nomads. As it turns out from our narrative, they ate horse meat and drunk horses' milk (koumiss). The most important information is the following here: the Magyars did not cultivate land, in other words: they were not ploughmen, and were abundantly supplied by horses and arms. When, having got under Tatar rule (after 1238) they got into corporal system of the Mongolian war-organization, then, on the right of the allies of the new rulers of the Steppe, they took part most actively in the wars against the neighbouring states and peoples. The famous and authentic author, Rasid-ed-Din tells us that the Magyars took part in the Mongolian campaigns of the 13th Century where he describes the military strength of the Empire of the Džuchids, the offsprings of the eldest son of Genghis Khan: the so-called Golden Horde. The Persian historian emphasizes that "a large part of Toktay's and Bayan's army (from the end of the 13th C – to the beginning of the 14th C.) contains the offsprings of those four thousand (Mongols – A. K.), but new Russian, Circassian, Kipchak, **Madžar** and other units were added to it lately" [Rasid –ad-Din 1952, p. 275.]. It is well known that Tokta was one of the Khans of the Golden Horde (1291–1312). Bayan, one of the offsprings of Orda (Ichen), the first son of Džuchi, ruled on the territory of the today's Kazakhstan, and then he was the commander-in-chief – or one of the leaders –

of the so-called Kok Orda, the eastern wing of the Golden Horde.

Having conquered the territory of Dest-i-Kypchak and the Western part of Eurasia, the Mongols distributed their new subjects according to the military system of Uluses and wings, arranged all effective people (mostly men) into the corporal system used by them, in order that they would fulfil their compulsory military service. This model existed for a long time and it radically changed the ethno-political situation on the conquered regions. The subjugated population was disintegrated, distributed again and again, was moved from the West to the East, from the South to the North and inversely, etc. The nomadic and land-cultivator subjects alike were obliged to follow the rulers (commanders) of their Ulus into any direction in case of war. the Turkisation of the Eastern Magyar population had begun, (or maybe, had continued), just in the Mongolian period. It is clear that the population of the Džuchi Ulus was composed mainly of those Turkish-speaking tribes, which were partly aboriginal inhabitants of Dest-i-Kypchak, or arrived together with the Mongols from the East, from Inner and Central Asia there. The Mongols themselves – as it becomes clear from the written sources – quickly got assimilated to the local ethnic sphere, but they kept firmly their tribal and generic names. The ethnic manifoldness of the Nomad population of the Golden Horde cannot cause great surprise. It is confirmed by the latest archaeological material and by anthropological data. The "ethnic kettle" of the Golden Horde operated in the following way: Having gone through the Mongolian corporal military system, the aboriginal population and the newcomers became more or less united. The components which "melted together" from different tribal-clan groups, formed new ethnic units or became concentrated under the common self-denomination of the strongest clans. Such clans were not related in blood on the higher and middle grades of clan-macro-hierarchy. However, they were united by virtual relationship on the common genealogical trees. These facts were expressed by the existence of the common "shadžra, shežire" (genealogy) of all clan-groups which stepped conditionally into a higher hierarchical order. If we consider the lower levels of these ethno-political pyramids, then, we can see that those families or groups which were in close relationship with each other could preserve their self-denomination and could keep their usual contacts on patriarchal line.

What happened with those Eastern Magyars in the Mongolian period, which had been named as "Madžars" already for hundred years by then? Could they simply disappear, in other words: could they be assimilated perfectly into the "Turkish sea" of the steppes of Dest-i-Kypchak? Of course, some parts of them dispersed among the Nomads who were speaking Kypchak language, and really got assimilated to them. It is also true that those parts of the Kypchak (Kuman) tribes who offered fierce resistance to the Mongolian conquerors were destroyed physically. Others got assimilated to the new clans and tribes, and lost their earlier self-denomination. Again others, having become part of the Mongolian military system, could keep their earlier generic name. It seems that this third variation

happened also with those Eastern Magyars who were dispersed on the large areas of the Great Steppe. The above quoted text from the work of Rasid-ed-Din confirms the followings: Magyar units (of course, clans) which were distributed among Mongolian princes and military commanders lived their Nomadic way of life together with other Nomadic tribes, clans on certain territories, and they became elements of the united military strength of the ruler of the *ulus*. This is confirmed by the ethnic (tribal-clan) composition of the Džuchi Ulus in the 14–15th Centuries. T. I. Sultanov, the famous Kazakh researcher introduces the list of such clans (more than 60), among which **Madžars** are also mentioned [Sultanov, 1982, p. 8; Istorija Kazakhstana, 2001, p. 235; Iskhakov, 2004, p. 34.]. The list of the tribes of Dest-i-Kypchak from 1430–1460 is known from the works of Masud B. Osman Kukhistani, and also from the list of the 92 Uzbek tribes "Ilatija", after the "Tuhfat at-tavarikh I khani", which was edited later, in the 19th Century. The "*Madžar*" ethnonym is clearly fixed in this list, and what is more significant, the ethnonym "*Bashgyrd*" also. Completing this list, which was written by the distinguished ethnographer, S. M. Abramson, we get to know about the existence of the "Uzbek" clan *madžar*". [Madžmu at-tavarikh, 2002, pp. 232–233.]. This clan was subject of the Sheibanid khans – Abu-l-Khair khan and to his predecessors. A hard battle is described in the "Tavarikh-i-Guzida-ij Nusrat-Name", At the height of this fight "Shaikh Mazid Bahadur from the madžar **omak** (tribe, or clan) wounded Burunduk Khan himself by two arrows" [Materialy, 1969, p. 22]. The Madžar tribal denomination is mentioned in the dynastic history of the Central Asian Sheibanids, the "Nusrat Name" (The Book of Victories). Another Central-Asian writer, Khafiz-I Tanys, also mentions the Madžar clan when he lists the Turkish-Mongolian tribes. Makhmud ibn Vali told about the Mažars in his work, the "Bakhr al-asrar fi manakib al-akhijar", several times.

An early work of the Kazakh written and oral poesy and story-telling gave unexpected confirmation to the above quoted historical data which show clearly that the Eastern Madžar ethnic group existed and continued to exist on the steppes of the Dest-i-Kipchak in the later periods of the Golden Horde (14–15th Centuries). The poem "Er-Shoban" (Knight Shoban) tells that the Kazakh Shalkiiz-žirau (1465-1560) gets information about a campaign of Knight Shoban, and his friends. They attacked the Northern Caucasus from the steppes of the Volga-Ural region – the territory of Golden Horde. In the course of this incursion Er-Shoban succeeded in hijacking 200 horses from a certain Bigazy who lived in the Kabardian Region. During the chase, Er-Shoban tells a speech in metrical form, enumerating the outstanding members of his own unit. Among others, he tells the followings:

*"There is one more knight –Kojan, who lives only for campaigns,
His flag is kept firmly in his hands in front of our soldiers,
When the enemy approaches us, it is always him who begins the fight,
As this brave warrior comes **from the fearless Madžar genus.**"*

The Kabardian Bigazy got so much frightened by this threat that he decided to return immediately into his homeland because he understood that he can do nothing against such formidable affronters [Poety, 1993, p. 50].

As we can see, it is told about "Knight Kojan, from the fearless Madžar genus" in this poem. I would like to direct the reader's attention especially to this passage, where the name in question is just "Madžar". As consequence, we can regard it to be established that this was the early form of expression of the "Magyar" ethnonym in the Turkish languages, consequently in the Kazakh language too.

The Madžars appeared not only in the ethnic nomenclature of the Uzbeks, but in the ethnic nomenclature of the Nogays as well (Nogay Horde). V. V. Trepavlov enumerates the denominations of the Nogay tribal-clan communities, among them the "Madžar" tribe, and also the denominations of these tribes in Russian documents written in the 16–17th Centuries, where "Možarskoe r. in mentioned. In this case the letter "r" means the initial letter of the Russian word "*род*", which means "clan" [Trepavlov, 2002, p. 502]. It is known from the researches of Z. Ja. Bojarshina that the largest branch of the Kypchak tribe in the Middle Horde of the Kazakhs was the Kara-Kypchak branch, which lived its Nomadic life on the steppes extending from the Torghay Plateau to the Ishim and Irtish rivers. The Kara-Kipchaks had significant influence on the neighbouring tribes of Western Siberia too. Boyarshina mentions the «**Madžar (Magyar) Kypchaks**» among the other ethnic groups of the Kara-Kipchak branch (I used the Madžar (Magyar) – Kypchak expression of the author deliberately – A. K.) [Boyarshina, 1960, p. 75; Istorija Kazakhstana, 1997, p. 154]. Later descriptions of the tribal-clan construction of the Kazakhs, especially the descriptions of the outstanding Russian ethnographer, N. A. Aristov prove that a „мадияр“ ethnic group really existed among the Kypchaks in the Akmola Region of the Steppe Governorship of the Russian Empire (in the Northern Kazakhstan of our days) [Aristov, 1896, p. 379]. Maybe, it happened just at the turn of the 18–19th Centuries that the ethnonym "Madžar" gives place to the form of "Madijar" or "Magyar". This change can be easily explained just in the Turkish languages, where the letter "dž or ž", can change to "j" or "i", and vice versa. This information about the Magyars can be compared with the information of F. Shcherbina's expedition organised for the research of the steppe regions of Kazakhstan at the beginning of the 20th Century. We can learn from the 11th volume (Omsk Region) that only Madijars were living in the 4th administrative aul (settlement). One of the first Kazakh historians, M. Tynyshpaev prepared genealogical tabulations of the Kazakh clans purposefully. We can understand from these tabulations that the Madijars were included into the tribal-clan hierarchy of the Kypchaks this way: Bultun – Orys¹ – Madiar. It is also pointed out the Madiars were at present in the collective of one of the Tokal-argyn clans, named Žokari-shekti [Tynyshpaev, 1925, p. 69, 70]. The places of living and the existence of Magyars, or more exactly, Madiars among the Argyns and Kipchaks were

confirmed by the special ethnographical expeditions organised by the Institute of History, Ethnography and Archaeology of the Kazakh Scientific Academy in the 50-ies and 60-ies of the 20th Century [Mukanov, 1974, p. 58, 186–187].

Those, who have become the so-called “Kazakh-Madiars (Magyars)” of our days, joined the Kazakh people relatively late. Above all, they got into the Nogay and Uzbek ethno-political units more or less compactly in the 15–17th Centuries. Legends, tales are preserved among the Kazakh-Madiar clans about their arrival to the Kazakh steppes from southern or south-western direction that time, when they were fighting on the side of the Sheibanids. This fact does not exclude the possibility that they might have appeared also from the West.

Summarizing the above mentioned data, we can see that the “Madžar”, “Mažar”, “Machžar” ethnonyms can be observed in the earlier texts of the medieval authors, up to the Modern Ages (the 18th Century). The form “madiar”, “madijar”, appeared in the Kazakh language later. These ethnonyms are just other forms of the word “madžar”, which is preserved among the Uzbeks up to our days. We cannot explain the existence of the Madžar” ethnonym or toponym, on the territories of the Nogays, Kazakhs, Uzbeks, the Tatars of the Crimean Peninsula, or among the people of the Northern Caucasus by simple coincidence. The same phenomenon can be observed regarding other ethnonyms in the ethno-nomenclature of the Turkish peoples of Eurasia too. The Kypchak, Argyn, Najman, Kirej (it), Kongrat etc. ethnonyms exist also everywhere among all the above mentioned Asian and East-European nations. The history of those Kumans, Kuns, Polovecs who got into Hungary in the course of the 13th Century is significantly interesting and instructive in this respect. They preserved their language and some steppe mentality for a long time, and they were named “Kun”, “Palóc” in Hungarian.

I wish to make one more remark at the end of my short study: the Eastern Magyars neither lost their self-denomination, nor they “disappeared”, in spite of the imaginations of some researchers of our days. We have began to direct our attention to these questions only recently, by studying the ethno-genetic, anthropological, ethno-cultural problems of our history, which have still many darks and mysterious, undiscovered details attentively and circumstantially. In my opinion, the research of this very interesting and comprehensive problem must be continued. Alas, our Hungarian (Magyar) colleagues know very little about the essence of the given question. However, I would like to make notice that more and more archaeological data show that not only ancient Madžar (or as it is more often mentioned: Ugrian) relics are preserved on the territories of Northern- and Western Kazakhstan, but such relics as well, which tell us about the permanent presence of the rich elements of the Magyar culture there in the early Middle Ages. These elements are essential parts of the many-coloured Nomadic civilisation of the Great Steppe.

languages to use “the letter “r” as initial letter. That’s why the word “Russian” got an accent and form of “urus, orus, orys”. One can meet the forms of “arus, ars” in the written sources too: the later variant was most probably pronounced as “arys”. The “Urus” name was quite widespread among the Turkish nobles and among the offsprings of Genghis Khan, at least from the 12th Century. According to the interpretation of the researchers of our days, **Urus name was generally given to blonde children** [Sultanov. Compare: Kazakhstan: letopis’ trekh tysjachletij, 1992, p. 198.]

Аристов Н.А. Заметки об этническом составе тюркских племен и народностей и сведения об их численности // Журнал «Живая старина». Отделение этнографии. Вып. III и IV. СПб., 1896.

Ахмедов Б.А. Историко-географическая литература Средней Азии XVI-XVIII вв.: (Письменные памятники). Ташкент: Фан, 1985.

Бояршинова З.Я. Население Западной Сибири до начала русской колонизации Томск., 1960.

Дьённ Габор. Протогунгрии на Урале в первом тысячелетии нашей эры в российской и венгерской историографии. Автореф. дисс. ... к.и.н. Екатеринбург, 2007.

История Казахстана (с древнейших времен до наших дней). В пяти томах. Т. 2. – Алматы: «Атамұра», 1997.

История Казахстана и Центральной Азии: Учеб. пособие/ Абусеитова М.Х. и др. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2001.

Исхаков Д.М. Тюрко-татарские государства XV-XVI вв. Казань: Институт истории им. Ш. Марджани АН РТ, 2004.

Кляшторный С.Г., Султанов Т.И. Казахстан: летопись трех тысячелетий. Алма-Ата: Раун, 1992.

Козин С.А. Сокровенное сказание монголов. М. – Л.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1941.

Константин Багрянородный. Об управлении империей. Текст, перевод, комментарии. Изд. второе, исправ. Под ред. Г.Г. Литаврина и А.П. Новосельцева. – М.: Наука, 1991.

Кузеев Р.Г. Происхождение башкирского народа // http://shejere.narod.ru/kuzeev.htm#_О_ПРОИСХОЖДЕНИИ_И_ИСТОРИИ%20РАССЕЛЕНИЯ#

Левицкий Т. «Мадьяры» у средневековых арабских и персидских географов // Восточная Европа в древности и средневековье (сборник статей) М.: Наука, 1978.

«Маджму ат-Таварих» // Материалы по истории кыргызов и Кыргызстана. Бишкек, 2002. 2-е изд.

Материалы по истории казахских ханств XV-XVIII веков (извлечения из персидских и тюркских сочинений). Алма-Ата: Наука, 1969.

Материалы по киргизскому землепользованию собранные и разработанные экспедицией по исследованию степных областей. Акмолинская область. Омский уезд. Т. XI. Омск., 1902.

Муканов М.С. Этнический состав и расселение казахов Среднего жуза. Алма-Ата: Наука КазССР, 1974.

Напольских В.В. Баскарт, или Великая Венгрия // Христианский мир и «Великая Монгольская империя». Мат-лы францисканской миссии 1245 года. Крит. текст, пер. с лат. «Истории Тартар» брата Ц. де Бридиа С.В. Аксенова и А.Г. Юрченко. Экспоз., исслед. и указ. А.Г. Юрченко. СПб.: Евразия, 2002.

Поэты пяти веков. Казахская поэзия XV – начала XX в. Вст. ст., сост., биогр., спр. и прим. М.М. Магауина. Пер. с каз. Алма-Ата: Жазушы, 1993.

Рашид-ад-Дин. Сборник летописей. Пер. с пер. О.И. Смирновой. Прим. Б.И. Панкратова и О.И. Смирновой Ред. проф. А.А. Семенова. М.-Л.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1952. Т.1. Книга 2.

¹ The „urus” word is the phonetic variation of of “Russian”. This form can be explained easily. It is alien from the Turkish

Султанов Т.Н. Кочевые племена Приаралья в XV - XVII вв. (вопросы этнической и социальной истории). М.: Наука, 1982.

Трепавлов В.В. История Ногайской Орды. М.: Изд-я фирма «Восточная литература» РАН, 2002.

Тынышпаев М. Материалы к истории киргиз-казахского народа. Ташкент, 1925.

Хвольсон Д.А. Известия о хозарах, буртасах, болгарях, мадьярах, славянах и руссах Абу-Али Ахмеда бен-Омар ибн-Дафта. СПб., 1869.

LITERATURE

Абуль-Гази-Багадур-хан. Родословное древо тюрков. М., - Ташкент - Бишкек, 1996.

Аристов Н.А. Заметки об этническом составе тюркских племен и народностей и сведения об их численности // Журнал «Живая старина». Отделение этнографии. Вып. III и IV. СПб., 1896.

Ахмедов Б.А. Историко-географическая литература Средней Азии XVI-XVIII вв.: (Письменные памятники). Ташкент: Фан, 1985.

Бояршинова З.Я. Население Западной Сибири до начала русской колонизации Томск., 1960.

Дьённ Габор. Протовенгры на Урале в первом тысячелетии нашей эры в российской и венгерской историографии. Автореф. дисс. ... к.и.н. Екатеринбург, 2007.

История Казахстана (с древнейших времен до наших дней). В пяти томах. Т. 2. – Алматы: «Атамұра», 1997.

История Казахстана и Центральной Азии: Учеб. пособие/ Абусейтова М.Х. и др. – Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2001.

Исхаков Д.М. Тюрко-татарские государства XV-XVI вв. Казань: Институт истории им. Ш. Марджани АН РТ, 2004.

Кляшторный С.Г., Султанов Т.И. Казахстан: летопись трех тысячелетий. Алма-Ата: Раун, 1992.

Козин С.А. Сокровенное сказание монголов. М. – Л.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1941.

Константин Багрянородный. Об управлении империей. Текст, перевод, комментарии. Изд. второе, исправ. Под ред. Г.Г. Литаврина и А.П. Новосельцева. – М.: Наука, 1991.

Кузеев Р.Г. Происхождение башкирского народа // http://shejere.narod.ru/kuzeev.htm#_O_ПРОИСХОЖДЕНИЯ_И_ИСТОРИИ%20РАССЕЛЕНИЯ#

Левицкий Т. «Мадьяры» у средневековых арабских и персидских географов // Восточная Европа в древности и средневековье (сборник статей) М.: Наука, 1978.

«Маджму ат-Таварих» // Материалы по истории кыргызов и Кыргызстана. Бишкек, 2002. 2-е изд.

Материалы по истории казахских ханств XV-XVIII веков (извлечения из персидских и тюркских сочинений). Алма-Ата: Наука, 1969.

Материалы по киргизскому землепользованию собранные и разработанные экспедицией по исследованию степных областей. Акмолинская область. Омский уезд. Т.ХI. Омск., 1902.

Муканов М.С. Этнический состав и расселение казахов Среднего жуза. Алма-Ата: Наука КазССР, 1974.

Напольских В.В. Баскарт, или Великая Венгрия // Христианский мир и «Великая Монгольская империя». Мат-лы францисканской миссии 1245 года. Крит. текст, пер. с лат. «Истории Тартар» брата Ц. де Бридиа С.В. Аксенова и А.Г. Юрченко. Экспоз., исслед. и указ. А.Г. Юрченко. СПб.: Евразия, 2002.

Поэты пяти веков. Казахская поэзия XV – начала XX в. Вст. ст., сост., биогр., спр. и прим. М.М. Магауина. Пер. с каз. Алма-Ата: Жазушы, 1993.

Рашид-ад-Дин. Сборник летописей. Пер. с пер. О.И. Смирновой. Прим. Б.И. Панкратова и О.И. Смирновой Ред. проф. А.А. Семенова. М.-Л.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1952. Т.1. Книга 2.

Султанов Т.Н. Кочевые племена Приаралья в XV - XVII вв. (вопросы этнической и социальной истории). М.: Наука, 1982.

Трепавлов В.В. История Ногайской Орды. М.: Изд-я фирма «Восточная литература» РАН, 2002.

Тынышпаев М. Материалы к истории киргиз-казахского народа. Ташкент, 1925.

Хвольсон Д.А. Известия о хозарах, буртасах, болгарях, мадьярах, славянах и руссах Абу-Али Ахмеда бен-Омар ибн-Дафта. СПб., 1869.