

The Hungarian Passage of the Ġayhānī-tradition

ISTVÁN ZIMONYI



The most detailed description of the Hungarian tribal confederation in the second half of the ninth century is preserved in the Ġayhānī-tradition among the Muslim sources. In contrast with the other basic source on the Hungarian early history, the Byzantine Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus' *De administrando imperio*, the geographical work of al-Ġayhānī was lost; the text can only be reconstructed from the descriptions of later authors, who copied the compendium of al-Ġayhānī.

The first and decisive step in the study of the Ġayhānī-tradition was taken by Géza Kuun, who published the passages of the authors belonging to this tradition in Arabic and Persian with Hungarian translation and comments in the sources of the Hungarian conquest (*A magyar honfoglalás kútfői* [*The written sources of the Hungarian Conquest*]) in 1900. Since then the Hungarian historians and orientalists have achieved outstanding results in studying the Muslim sources on the Hungarians and their nomadic neighbours on an international level. First, Mihály Kmoskó is worth mentioning, who planned to revise and supplement the edition of Géza Kuun. During his studies he realized that the formation and early history of the Hungarians was an integral part of the early medieval history of the Eurasian steppe. So Kmoskó gathered, translated into Hungarian and made commentary on the Muslim and Syriac passages on nomadic peoples of medieval Eurasia till his death in 1931. The publication process of his literary works comprising six volumes has started recently. I published the first two volumes on the Muslim geographical literature in 1997 and 2000.

The other prominent orientalist in the field was Károly Czeglédy. He gave a detailed description of the literary works of Kmoskó, but its publication was politically impossible. Czeglédy published several articles on the Muslim sources on the nomads and the early Hungarians. He translated the passages of the authors belonging to the Ġayhānī-tradition into Hungarian in the classical source-book on the early Hungarians (*A magyarok elődeiről és a honfoglalásról* [*On the ancestors of the*

Hungarians and the Conquest) edited by György Györffy in 1958. A new and partly revised translation of this tradition with detailed comments on the texts has been published recently in another source-book edited by Gyula Kristó in 1995 (*A honfoglaláskor írott forrásai [The written sources of the Conquest period]*).

These antecedents provided firm fundament to prepare the new critical edition of the Ġayhānī-tradition. Beside the critical editions of the relevant authors I took the manuscripts into consideration. As a supplement I have collected the copies of the manuscripts of the following authors: Ibn Rusta, Gardīzī, *Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam*, al-Marwazī, ʿAufī and Šukrallah. I made corrections on the Arabic, Persian and Turkic texts on the basis of the critical editions and the manuscripts and translated into Hungarian. During the translation all the former translations and interpretations have been taken into consideration. The parallel passages of the Ġayhānī-tradition were divided into separate themes and these were explained in detail including philological and historical comments. It makes up two thirds of the monograph.

The results of three fields have been integrated in the study. The Muslim civilization created its own special world-view. Its knowledge is indispensable to interpret the Muslim sources and to detect those cultural features and stereotypes which made an effect on the authors' point of view. For example, the description of the nomadic way of life in the Arabic texts of the tradition reflects the Bedouin nomadism and not steppe nomadism, which differed in many respects from it and had several different characteristics. The second field is the civilization of the Eurasian steppe-belt. As the Hungarian tribal confederation was a part of that civilization, the study of the economic, social and cultural life of the medieval nomads provides analogies and background. Finally, the results of classical and other philology, linguistics, archeology and ethnography on the early Hungarian history must be taken into consideration in studying the Muslim sources.

Though al-Ġayhānī's geographical compendium has been lost, it can be reconstructed from Arabic, Persian and Turkic works. The following authors wrote their books in Arabic: Ibn Rusta who composed his work in the tenth century; the Andalusian al-Bakrī of the eleventh century, the court physician of the Saljukid Malik Shah (1072–1092) and his descendants i. e. al-Marwazī; and Abū-l-Fidā' who lived in Syria between 1273 and 1331. The latter copied the book of al-Bakrī. The Persian version of the Ġayhānī-tradition is represented in the *Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam* by an unknown author. It was composed in 982 and the work of Gardīzī written in 1052. The latter has preserved the most detailed description of the Hungarians.

The reconstruction of the original passage is based on the texts of al-Marwazī, Ibn Rusta and Gardīzī. It can be supplemented by the parallel description of al-Bakrī in the first half of the Hungarian chapter and the slightly rephrased version of the *Ḥudūd al-ʿĀlam*. Al-Marwazī's compendium was popular because it was translated into Persian in the thirteenth century by ʿAufī. It was copied in the fifteenth century by Šukrallah and the latter was put to Turkish. The late Turkish authors used this version as their source.

During the study I used the latest critical editions of the parallel texts of the Ğayhānī-tradition, and moreover I took the manuscripts into consideration apart from the works of al-Bakrī, Abū-l-Fidā, Muḥammad Kātib and Ḥāğğī Ḥalifa.

The study of the manuscripts yielded several new results. Instead of the widely accepted reconstruction of the Hungarian designation *m.ğğ.r* (*mağğar / mağğir*), the forms *m.ğf.r/m.ħf.r* can be found in the manuscripts. These terms are typical popular etymologies of the Arabic authors. The form *m.ħf.r* derived from the Arabic verb *ħafara* 'to dig'. It can be connected with the legend of the country dug into the ground and its inhabitants. The combination of the different elements could be attributed to al-Ğayhānī.

Minorsky, commenting the Hungarian chapter of the *Hudūd al-Ālam*, quoted the corresponding part from one manuscript of ʿAufī. He interpreted the motive of the war between the Slavs and Hungarians as a religious difference (*dar dīn*). The parallel manuscripts of ʿAufī and other authors made it possible to correct the reading of the manuscript, which is *wa rūṣ*. It means that the Hungarians waged war against the Slavs and Rus'.

Beside the critical edition of the parallel texts of the Ğayhānī-tradition, the philological and historical comments can be regarded as new results. Czeglédy emphasized that the text of the Ğayhānī-tradition is homogeneous and it was recorded in the 880s. Earlier Kmoskó pointed out that the version of Ibn Rusta can be divided into two chronological layers: the beginning and end of the text are by a ninth-century author, but the central parts (Paragraphs 8, 12, 13, 14) are the interpolations of al-Ğayhānī.

Firstly the original text must be reconstructed from the parallel works. Comparing the texts it became evident that the basic text had two versions. The shorter one was supplemented with some information and it was the longer version of the basic text. I use normal characters to denote the shorter basic text and italics for the supplements of the longer version. The basic text was reformed at least two times. These interpolations can be divided into three types: 1) There are sentences in the Hungarian chapters which were copied from other chapters of the Ğayhānī-tradition. They were marked by underlining. 2) There are interpolations, the origin of which can be identified on the basis of philological, geographical and historical reasons: these pieces of information were gathered by the Muslim merchants, who visited the Hungarians before 895, the conquest of the Carpathian Basin. These parts were denoted with underlined italics. 3) There are unidentified interpolations, which are indicated by bold font face.

The structure of the text can be reconstructed as follows:

1. *M.ğf.r/M.ħf.r*
2. **Between the country of the Pechenegs and the 'sk.l who belong to the Bulghars, lies the first border from among the borders of the Hungarians.**
3. The Hungarians are a Turkic people.
4. Their chieftain rides at the head of 20,000 horsemen.
5. The name of their chieftain is k.nd.h. This name is the title of their king, while the name of the man, who practices the royal power over them, is

- ġ.l.h. *Every Hungarian does what the chieftain, called ġ.l.h, commands them in making war, repelling invasions/defence and the like.*
6. They are tent-dwelling people. They migrate following the herbage and vegetation.
 7. Their country is wide; its size is a hundred parasangs by a hundred parasangs.
 8. One border of their country reaches the Sea of Rūm. Two rivers flow into this sea. One of them is bigger than the Ġayhūn (Oxus). The habitations of the Hungarians lie between these two rivers. *When the days of the winter come, all of them set up his camp on the river, which of the two rivers lies nearer to them. They stay there during the winter catching fish from the river. It is the most appropriate winter quarters for them.*
(Al-Bakrī: One border of their country reaches the country of Rūm)
 24. their other border, on the desert side, is a mountain inhabited by the people called Aīn. They possess horses, livestocks and sown fields. The people called Uġūna dwell under this mountain, on the sea-coast. They are Christian and adjacent to the Muslim territories bordering on the region of Tiflis, this is the first border/beginning frontier of Armenia. This mountain continues down to the territory of al-Bāb wa-l-Abwāb, and reaches the Khazar country. (HA, 458)
 9. As for the Ġayhūnt (river), which is to the left of them towards the Saqlāb, there are a people belonging to the Rūm, all of whom are Christians. They are called N.nd.r. They are more numerous than the Hungarians, but they are weaker.
 10. The names of the two rivers are Dūnā and Atil. When the Hungarians are on the banks of the river (Danube), they saw these N.nd.r.
 11. There is a great mountain above the N.nd.r along the bank of the river. The stream emerges alongside that mountain. Beyond the mountain there are a people belonging to the Christians. They are called M.rwāt. Between them and the N.nd.r is a ten-day journey. They are a numerous people. Their clothing resembles that of the Arabs, consisting of a turban, shirt, and waistcoat. They have sown fields and vines for their waters run over the ground. They have no underground channels. It is said that their number is greater than the Rūm (Byzantines). They are two separate communities. The greater part of their commerce is with the Arabs (*West).
 12. The country of the Hungarians abounds in trees. *Its ground is damp.*
 13. They have sown fields.
 14. They overcome those of the ṣaqāliba and rūs who are their neighbours, taking captives from them; they carry the captives to Rūm, and sell them there.
 14. They overcome all the ṣaqāliba who are their neighbours **imposing harsh provisions/victuals upon them, and treat them as their slaves.**
 15. **The Hungarians are fire-worshippers.**
 - 16a. **They raid the ṣaqāliba, and they take the captives along the sea-coast till they reach a harbour of Rūm, which is called K.r.h.**

17. It is said that the Khazars entrenched themselves some times ago against the Hungarians and other peoples bordering their country. (HA, 459)
- 16b. When the Hungarians take the captives to K.r.h, the Rūm (Byzantines) go out to them, and they trade there. They buy Byzantine (rūmī) brocade, woollen carpets and other Byzantine goods for the slaves.
18. The Hungarians are handsome and pleasant looking, their bodies are bulky.
20. They have wealth and visible property on account of their commerce.
19. Their clothes are brocade and their weapons are plated with silver and embedded with pearl.
21. They continually go to plunder the Saqlābs.
22. From the Hungarians to the Saqlābs is a ten-day journey. In the nearest part of the Saqlābs is a town which is called Wāntit.
23. They have the custom in asking for a wife that when they ask for a wife they take a bride-price in accordance with her wealth consisting of more or less horses. And when they mount up to take the bride-price, the girl's father takes the groom's father to his house and whatever he has by way of sable, ermine, grey squirrel, weasel, and underbellies of fox he brings together with a needles and brocade to the amount of ten fur-coats. He wraps (these) in a bed roll and ties (it) on the groom's father's horse and he sends it off toward his home. Then, whatever is necessary by way of the girl's bride-price consisting of cattle and moveable chattels and household furnishing, which have been deemed appropriate, is sent to him (the bride's father) and only then is the girl brought to the (groom's) house.
25. In the winter the Hungarians raid them (sc. the Slavs).

During the reconstruction of the text, the manuscript of Ibn Rusta's work is of crucial importance, as the author used special hyphen to divide his text into different sections. Such hyphens are to be found in Paragraph 5 between the name of the Hungarian chief, called Gyula and the description of his function, before Paragraphs 15 and 17.

As a general rule, the beginning and the end of the chapters have been rewritten. The first sentence of the original text is also debated. The text of Paragraph 2 by Ibn Rusta, Gardīzī and al-Bakrī, i.e. the first border of the Hungarians east of the Volga River does not fit into the historical geography of the late ninth century. The peoples along the Volga, the Khazars, Burtas and Volga Bulgars separated the Hungarians living east of the Volga with those on the northern Black Sea. I suppose that the beginning of the text was the first sentence in the works of al-Marwazī and Abū-l-Fidā, i.e. the Hungarians are Turkic people. It is Paragraph 3 by Ibn Rusta and Gardīzī following the sentence on the Hungarian border between the Volga Bulgars and the Pechenegs. The Hungarians were determined as Turks in the *Ḥudūd al-Ālam*, as the anonymous author gave the description of the Hungarians together with the other Turkic peoples living east of the Volga and not in the section devoted to the peoples of Eastern Europe.

Paragraphs 2 and 3 can be connected with one another context, as the first border of the Hungarians east of the Volga is the consequence of their Turkic origin. Moreover al-Ġayhānī the Hungarian self-designation derived from the Arabic etymology of the people living in the dug ground, which can be located between the Ural Mountain and the Middle Volga. These notions seem to have motivated the interpolation. Its historical background was the existence of a minor Hungarian group east of the Volga attested from the beginning of the tenth century. The first Hungarian border east of the Volga was regarded as the remembrance of an ancient habitat of the Hungarians, but on the contrary it can be a contemporary i.e. late ninth- or later tenth-century interpolation.

The beginning of the Hungarian passage in the Ġayhānī-tradition must be reconstructed from al-Marwazī. Then he described the extent of the Hungarian country, which is found in the parallel texts of Ibn Rusta, Gardizī, *Hudūd al-Ālam* and al-Bakrī under Paragraph 7. It can be concluded that al-Marwazī took this sentence from its original place and changed the original order. It is corroborated by the fact that Paragraph 6 is followed by Paragraph 8 in his work according to our reconstruction.

The idolatry of the Hungarians was recorded by al-Bakrī in the same position, whereas its later parallel sentence of Abū-l-Fidā preserved the original record on the fire-worshipping of the Hungarians. Ibn Rusta and Gardizī mentioned it under Paragraph 15, but it is an interpolation there, which does not fit into the context. It is hard to settle the question if the original version included this information and if so where it was. It is more than possible that it was taken from the chapter on the Slavs which contains the same description.

The second sentence of the original passage must be Paragraph 4 on the 20,000 horsemen of the Hungarian king preserved by Ibn Rusta, Gardizī, *Hudūd al-Ālam* and al-Marwazī. It was followed by Paragraph 5 concerning the rulers of the Hungarian tribal confederacy.

There are several versions of the report. Only one of the rulers is mentioned in the incomplete versions represented by al-Marwazī and al-Bakrī mentioning only the title *künde* on the one hand and by the *Hudūd al-Ālam* on the other hand, which refers the other Hungarian chieftain called *gyula*. The original version with the titles of the two Hungarian rulers has been preserved by the first part of Paragraph 5 by Ibn Rusta and Gardizī. It was supplemented by some information on the political institutions represented by Ibn Rusta and Gardizī. As it was mentioned above, Ibn Rusta used a special hyphen here to separate the shorter version from the supplemented one.

Paragraph 6 refers to the felt-tents and nomadic way of life of the Hungarians, who followed the grass. Ibn Rusta and al-Marwazī used the same expressions, while al-Bakrī adapted it to the Beduin nomadism and transformed the text accordingly. Gardizī did not mention the tents, he knew only a plain covered with grass. The author of the *Hudūd al-Ālam* omitted this part of the passage.

Paragraph 7 contains the data on the extension of the Hungarian homeland. Its size is hundred parasangs by hundred parasangs. Ibn Rusta emphasized the great extension of the country but he omitted the numerical data from the origi-

nal version. Al-Bakrī and the *Hudūd al-Ālam* preserved only the numerals. The author of the latter source increased arbitrarily one of the diameters from hundred parasangs to hundred and fifty. The longer version is represented in the works of Gardīzī and al-Marwazī, but al-Marwazī removed its original place and inserted it as the second sentence into his text.

Paragraph 8 also comprises a short and long version. Al-Marwazī' text is the representative of the short version mentioning the Sea of Rūm as one of the borders of the Hungarians, the two great rivers which fall into that sea and one of them bigger than the river Ġayhūn, and finally the habitats of the Hungarians which were along these two rivers. Only the first data was recorded by al-Bakrī, who replaced the word sea by country meaning the Byzantine Empire (country of Rūm). Then he finished the passage on the Hungarians but he added a description of the Caucasus from the Khazar passage to the Hungarian chapter (Paragraph 24). Al-Bakrī finished the description of the Hungarians with an interpolation.

Ibn Rusta and Gardīzī in parallel with al-Marwazī quoted the original text first, then they both supplemented the information. It is the long version of the paragraph including the reference to winter quarters of the Hungarians on the banks of the great rivers and their fishing as a means of sustenance in winter. The second part of the long version was recorded in the *Hudūd al-Ālam* with the revision of some details. The mentioning of the Rus' in it is without doubt a later interpolation.

Paragraph 10 was the next sentence in the original text as reflected in the book of al-Marwazī. He quoted the short version of Paragraph 8 and then he gave the names of the above mentioned rivers according to the context. As Ibn Rusta and Gardīzī preserved the long version of Paragraph 8, the designations of the rivers were omitted by Ibn Rusta or were put in another place. Gardīzī supplemented Paragraph 8. First he described the people N.nd.r, i.e. Danube Bulgars in connection with one of the great rivers. Gardīzī mentioned the names of the great rivers in Paragraph 10 and then another addition on the people called M.rwāt i.e. Moravians – under Paragraph 11.

Gardīzī's Paragraphs 9 and 11, i.e. the chapters on the Danube Bulgars and the Moravians have their parallel descriptions as separate passages in the *Hudūd al-Ālam*. Consequently Gardīzī inserted these passages into the original text subsequently. However, the source and date of information can be determined. The ethnic names N.nd.r and M.rwāt reflect the Hungarian pronunciation. The ten-day journey between the Danubian Bulgars and the Moravians was relevant before 895, as the Hungarians conquered the Carpathian Basin in the end of the ninth century separating the two peoples from each other.

Paragraph 12 followed the names of the two great rivers in the original text. Al-Marwazī mentioned only the abundance of trees in their country, the *Hudūd al-Ālam* added to it that the country possesses running waters. The parallel description of Ibn Rusta and Gardīzī coincides with it, but they supplemented the datum with another information: their ground is damp. It is hard to decide whether the latter was in the original text or it was the part of the long version.

The term designating damp was applied in the description of the Rus' country too.

The next sentence of the original text is Paragraph 13. It is about the sown fields of the Hungarians which was quoted only by Ibn Rusta and al-Marwazī.

Paragraphs 14 and 16 are about the Hungarian-Slavic relation. Al-Marwazī's paragraph is identical with Gardizī's Paragraph 16. It is regarded as the original version, including the attack on the Slavs and Rus', taking captives from among them, carrying them to Byzantine territory and their selling to the Byzantines. Ibn Rusta and Gardizī took the Paragraphs 14 and 15 from the same source, whose first sentence almost the same of that of al-Marwazī's text. The name Rus' was omitted by Ibn Rusta and Gardizī, who then supplemented the text with the remarks on the imposing of provisions upon the Slavs and their slave status. The latter addition may have been part of the long version. Paragraph 15 i.e. the fire-worshipping of the Hungarians was a change in topic, as Ibn Rusta put the sign of hyphen in front of the paragraph. The sentence of Paragraph 15 can be read in the Slavic chapter too. Then Ibn Rusta returned again to the Hungarian-Slavic relation supplementing the original version with the name of the Byzantine sea-port which the Hungarians visited with their slaves (Paragraph 16a). Ibn Rusta inserted a sentence from another source on the entrenching of the Khazars against the Hungarians (Paragraph 17). It is an interpolation as the introduction 'it is said' and the context corroborate it. Finally Ibn Rusta continued his description on the Byzantine sea-port, where the Hungarians sold the slaves for Byzantine brocade, woollen carpets and other goods (Paragraph 16b). It was the closing sentence of the Hungarian chapter by Ibn Rusta. Gardizī and Ibn Rusta used a common source for Paragraphs 14 and 15, but Gardizī quoted the original version of al-Marwazī (Paragraph 14) after Paragraph 15. The Hungarian raids against the neighbouring peoples were recorded in the *Ḥudūd al-Ālam*. It was put at the end of the chapter.

Paragraph 18 contains remarks on the physical appearance of the Hungarians. Gardizī and al-Marwazī used two expressions about their appearance, then al-Marwazī emphasized the bulkiness their bodies. The author of the *Ḥudūd al-Ālam* mentioned only one expression about their appearance which is corresponding to the data of Gardizī and al-Marwazī, then he described them as awe-inspiring.

The closing sentence of the Hungarian chapter was Paragraph 20 in the original version, concerning the wealth of the Hungarians. It was described by al-Marwazī along with their commerce. Their wealth was compared with their base in the *Ḥudūd al-Ālam*. Gardizī did not mention their wealth, but described their brocade clothes and decorated arms in Paragraph 19. It means that they are rich in other words.

Gardizī did not finish the Hungarian chapter here, but he rephrased the first sentence of Paragraphs 14 and 16 and returned to the topic on the Hungarian Slavic relation. Paragraph 21 is an internal borrowing or interpolation from the same chapter.

Paragraph 22 is about the distance between the Hungarians and Slavs, which was taken from the Slavic passage of the Ġayhānī-tradition, Gardīzī replaced the name of the Pechenegs with that of the Hungarians.

Gardīzī described the bride price by marriage in Paragraph 23 in detail. It is regarded as the closing part of the Hungarian chapter by Gardīzī, but it has been debated whether the Hungarians or the Slavs were meant in the description.

Paragraph 25 is not in the Hungarian chapter, but it is in the passage on the Slavs preserved by Gardīzī and al-Marwazī. The Slavs built fortresses and moved there in winter, when the Hungarians raided them. It must have been the part of the original text.

Analysing the internal structure of the Hungarian chapter, it can be concluded that the first version of the Ġayhānī-tradition had a short and long variants. The difference between the two was significant in philological and contextual point of view, both were recorded in the decades before 895, when the Hungarians moved to the Carpathian Basin. These basic variants were reformed at least two times. The manuscripts of the authors using the Ġayhānī-tradition can be regarded as the later copies of those variants.

The interpolations can be identified. The data on the N.nd.r and M.rwāt people (Paragraphs 9 and 11) were gathered from Hungarians, as the names reflect Hungarian pronunciations (nándor, marót) and it can be dated before 895, since the Hungarians did not divide these two peoples from each other in the Carpathian Basin. Three paragraphs (21, 22, 24) were copied from the same or another chapter of the Ġayhānī-tradition. There are interpolations, whose origins are uncertain. This category includes the following paragraphs: 2, 14 and 15 of Ibn Rusta and Gardīzī; 16a-b and 17 of Ibn Rusta and 19, 23 of Gardīzī.

*

The Hungarian tribal confederation can be characterized by the following features in the second half of the ninth century on the basis of the original information of the Ġayhānī-tradition:

1. The Muslim author thought that the Hungarians on the northern shore of the Black Sea migrated there from the East. This is based on three elements: a) The popular etymology of the Hungarian ethnonym which connected it with the legendary story of the country dug into the ground; b) The reference to the Hungarian habitat between the Volga Bulgars and the Pechenegs which is based on information of a Hungarian group on the middle Volga region from the tenth century; c) The Hungarians were regarded as belonging to the Turkic peoples. According to the Muslim geographical settings the Turkic peoples lived east of the Volga River, so the Hungarians should have migrated from there to the west.

2. The way of life of the Hungarians was portrayed as a complex one. The Hungarians of the steppe-belt were described as tent-dwelling typical nomads, migrating along rivers and supplying their provisions with fishing in the critical winter season. Meanwhile the Hungarians living in the forest-steppe and forest zone practiced high-quality tillage farming. The Hungarians took part in commerce between the peoples of the forest and Byzantium. They raided the peoples

north of them to take captives and to sell them in the Byzantine province of the Crimea. The wealth of the Hungarians was due to this lucrative trade. The luxury goods coming from Byzantium were recorded by the Muslim merchants visiting the Hungarians.

3. The geographical description of the country is an integral part of the passage. The habitat of the Hungarian tribal confederation extends one hundred by one hundred parasangs. Its size is about six hundred square kilometres which approximately corresponds to the size of Scythia described by Herodotus or that of the country of the Danube Bulgars. It is smaller than the country of the Pechenegs, but bigger than the land of the Burtas.

The southern border of the Hungarian land is the northern shore of the Black Sea called Sea of Rûm. One of the two great rivers mentioned in the Ğayhâni-tradition can be identified with the Danube. The other called 't.l (Turkic *Ātil* > Hungarian: *Etel*) was the name of the Volga in Turkic languages and as a common word (*ätil* 'river, great stream') was borrowed by the Hungarian language and it was applied to one of the great rivers flowing into the Sea of Azov or Black Sea.

The country of the Hungarians is told to be abundant in trees and the ground to be damp. It is characteristic of the forest and forest steppe zone, so most of the Hungarians lived in that belt, but the steppe south of it also belonged to them.

4. According to the original text of the Ğayhâni-tradition, the Hungarian political structure was dual kingship. The ruler called Künde had only formal power, while the leader, Gyula governed and lead the army. The title Künde was the third position in the hierarchy of the Khazar Empire, so the Hungarian ruler had significant influence in the Khazar court, but he was a subordinate of the Khazar ruler. The increasing power of the Gyula who represented the interest of the Hungarian confederation can be explained by the loosening of the tight control of the Khazar king over the Hungarians. The Hungarian tribal confederation could confront the Khazars for shorter periods, as the interpolation about the Khazar entrenching against the Hungarians, but it remained the part of the Khazar Empire till the conquest of the Carpathian Basin in 895.

The military force of the Hungarians was twenty thousand warriors, i.e. two *tümens*. It was a strong and effective army which could be mobilized by a tribal confederation consisting of seven to ten tribes of other nomadic peoples. This army was able to conquer the Carpathian Basin and to stabilize its power there. The Hungarians were able to terrorize the West and Byzantium with their raids. This made it possible to lay the foundation of the Hungarian kingdom in Christian Europe and for it to remain a significant power during the Middle Ages.