

# *A New Source on the Hungarian Raids against Byzantium in the Middle of the Tenth Century\**

LÁSZLÓ BALOGH



The famous Byzantine philologist Gyula Moravcsik collected references to the medieval nomadic peoples of Eastern Europe from the Byzantine sources.<sup>1</sup> His work, *Byzantinoturcica*, is an important reference book up to the present. However, some Byzantine sources were neglected in this masterwork<sup>2</sup> and others

---

\* This paper was prepared in the framework of the Research Group for Turkology of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Szeged and it was supported by OTKA Grant no. 68762.

<sup>1</sup> Gy. Moravcsik, *A magyar történet bizánci forrásai*. [The Byzantine sources of the Hungarian history] Budapest 1934; Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*. 1-2 vols. 2nd ed. Berlin 1958; Gy. Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet bizánci forrásai*. [The Byzantine sources of Hungarian history in the Arpad age] 2nd ed. Budapest 1988.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. T. Olajos, Felhasználatlan bizánci forrás a magyarság korai történetéhez. [Unappropriated Byzantine source on the early history of the Hungarians] *Antik Tanulmányok* 33 (1987-88), 24-27; I. Baán "Turkia metropolitája," [The metropolitan of Turkia] *Századok* 129 (1995), 1167-1170; T. Olajos, "Egy felhasználatlan forráscsoport a 11. századi magyar-bizánci kapcsolatok történetéhez," [An unappropriated Byzantine source on Hungarian-Byzantine relations in the eleventh century] *Századok* 132 (1998), 215-222; F. Makk, "Külföldi források és a korai magyar történelem (X-XII. század). [Foreign sources on early Hungarian history (10-12th centuries)] *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica* 102 (1995), 28-30. Same with minor additions: F. Makk, Külföldi források és a korai magyar történelem (X-XII. század). [Foreign sources on early Hungarian history (10-12th centuries)] in F. Makk, *A turulmadártól a kettőskeresztig. Tanulmányok a magyarság régebbi történelméről*, Szeged 1998, 99-102; I. Baán, "The Metropolitanate of Tourkia. The Organization of the Byzantine Church in Hungary in the Middle Ages," in *Byzanz und Ostmitteleuropa 950-1453*. Hrsg. G. Prinzig-M. Salamon, Wiesbaden 1999, 45-53; F. Makk, "Új forrásadatok a X. század végi magyar-bizánci kapcsolatok értékeléséhez," [New data on Hungarian-Byzantine relations in the end of tenth century] *A Nyíregyházi Jósza András Múzeum Évkönyve* 43 (2001),

were uncertain, as Moravcsik could not unequivocally determine the nomadic people denoted.<sup>3</sup> In this paper I will focus on the ethnonyms from a poem and study the possibility of identifying the archaic term *Scythian-Huns*.

The unknown author wrote a poem to the memory of Katakalon, the *strategos* of Thessalia.<sup>4</sup> The poet mentioned three important facts which can be interpreted from historical points of view:

1) Katakalon is loyal to the *despotes* (Emperor) Constantine, his wife, Helena and his son, Romanos.<sup>5</sup>

2) Katakalon waged war against the *Scythians* and *Huns* or *Scythian-Huns* and broke their arrows.

3) Katakalon would have slaughtered the *Scythians*, if Kharon (death) had not carried him off.

Emperor Constantine can be identified with Constantine Porphyrogenitus VII, whose wife was Helena, the daughter of Romanos Lekapenos. His son was Romanos, the later Emperor Romanos II, who ruled from 959 till 963.<sup>6</sup> According to Moravcsik, Katakalon was identical with Leo Katakalon, *domesticos ton scole*, who fought against the Bulgars in 896.<sup>7</sup> Bănescu and Kazhdan proposed that the

271-274; T. Olajos, "Contingent hongrois au service de Byzance en Italie," in *Les hongrois et l'Europe: conquête et intégration*. Textes réunis par S. Csernus et K. Korompay, Paris-Szeged 1999, 223-229; F. Makk, "A l'ombre de la menace byzantine. Le choix politico-religieux de prince Géza," *Chronica* 1 (2001), 19-29.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 1: 224, 515, 555-556; S. Szádeczky-Kardoss, "Görög és bizánci források," [Greek and Byzantine Sources] in *Bevezetés a magyar őstörténet kutatásának forrásai*. Vol. 1/2., 3rd ed., ed. P. Hajdú, Gy. Kristó and A. Róna-Tas, Budapest 1988, 147-148.

<sup>4</sup> Sp. Lampros, Εἰς στρατηγὸν Κατακαλῶν. *Νέος Ἑλληνομνημῶν* 16 (1922), 53-54; G. Cankova-Petkova, "Стихотворение от анонимен автор," in *Гръцки Извори за Българската История-Fontes Graeci Historiae Bulgaricae*. V. ed. G. Cankova-Petkova et al. Извори за Българската История-Fontes Historiae Bulgaricae 9, Serdicae (София) 1964, 306-307. I am indebted for the professional assistance provided by Profs. Teréz Olajos and Ferenc Makk. I also owe thanks to Zsolt Hunyadi and Sándor Papp for the assistance they provided while collecting the literature.

<sup>5</sup> Cankova-Petkova, Стихотворение от анонимен автор, 306.

<sup>6</sup> G. Rouillard, "Note prosopographique et chronologique," *Byzantion* 8 (1933), 108; Cankova-Petkova, Извори за Българската История, 306. Notes 1-2; N. Oikonomidès, "Vardariotes-W.l.nd.r-V.n.nd.r: Hongrois installés dans la vallée du Vardar en 934," *Südost-Forschungen* 32 (1973), 3, Note 11.

<sup>7</sup> J. Moravcsik, "Zur Benennung Ουνοί der Ungarn," *Kőrösi Csoma-Archivum* 2 (1926-1932), 329. cf. G. Kolias, *Léon Choerosphactès magistre, proconsul et patrice*, Athens 1939, 33; Constantine Porphyrogenitus *De Administrando Imperio*. Greek text edited by Gy. Moravcsik. English translation R. J. H. Jenkins, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* 1, Washington 1967, 206-209 (henceforth DAI) (Chapter 45); Constantine Porphyrogenitus *De Administrando Imperio*. II. ed. R. J. H. Jenkins, London 1962, 173-174. Rouillard suggested that Leo Katakalon was Katakalon's father. A letter of Nikolaos Mystikos, the Patriarch of Constantinople (†925) mentions Michael, *strategos* of Thessalia (*Nicholas I. Patriarch of Constantinople. Letters*. Greek text and English translation by R. J. H. Jen-

*strategos* was the famous general Kakatakon Kekaumenos, who lived in the eleventh century.<sup>8</sup> However, since the poem mentions Romanos II who was born in 939 and Constantine Porphyrogenitus VII died in 959, then Katakalon must have lived in neither the ninth nor the eleventh century.

The Bulgars completely defeated the Byzantine army in 917, so that the commander of the fleet, Romanos Lekapenos, marched to Constantinople and took the power. He was elected sub-emperor of Constantine Porphyrogenitus VII and then later became a co-emperor in 920.<sup>9</sup> He then degraded the legitimate ruler of the Macedonian dynasty, Constantine Porphyrogenitus VII, to sub-emperor in 921-922.<sup>10</sup> Romanos Lekapenos lost power in December 944, and Constantine Porphyrogenitus VII taking the rule back in hand in January 945. His son Romanos was enthroned as co-emperor on 6 April 945.<sup>11</sup> Thus, the anonymous author must have written the poem between January 945 and April 945, when Constantine Porphyrogenitus VII was called the sole *despotes*, but Romanos was not yet co-emperor.<sup>12</sup> Oikonomidès attracted attention to a seal and a charter which were issued in 942 and 943, respectively.<sup>13</sup> Both sources mention Katakalon as the

kins and L. G. Westerink, Washington 1973, 450-453). Rouillard assumed that he was Katakalon's official ancestor (Rouillard, "Note prosopographique," 109, Note 1).

- <sup>8</sup> N. Bănescu, *Les duchés byzantins de Paristrion (Paradounavon) et de Bulgarie*, Bucarest 1946, 76-77; N. Bănescu, Un duc byzantine de XI-e siècle Katakalon Kékauménos. *Académie Roumaine Bulletin de la Section historique* 11. (1924) 6-7; Ch. M. Brand, A. Kazhdan, "Katakalon Kekaumenos," in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 3 vols. ed.-in-chief A. P. Kazhdan, New York-Oxford 1991, 1113. On Katakalon Kekaumenos's life, see G. Buckler, "Authorship of the Strategikon of Cecaumenus," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 36 (1936), 9; M. Gyóni, "L'œuvre de Kekaumenos source de l'histoire roumaine," *Revue d'Histoire Comparée* 23 (1945), 109-128; А. П. Каждан *Армяне в составе господствующего класса Византийской Империи в XI-XII вв.* Ереван 1975, 31-32.
- <sup>9</sup> R. J. H. Jenkins, "The Date of the Slav Revolt in Peloponnese Under Romanos I." in R. J. H. Jenkins, *Studies on Byzantine History of the 9th and 10th Centuries*, London 1970, XX. 204; G. Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates*. 3. Auflage. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft. 122. Abteilung. Byzantinisches Handbuch. Bd. 1/2. München 1963, 225. cf. 225, Note 1.
- <sup>10</sup> L. Bréhier, *Vie et mort de Byzance*. Paris 1969, 138; Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates*, 225. cf. 225, Note 1.; Jenkins, *Studies on Byzantine History*, XX. 204-205. This situation appears in Theodore Daphnopates's oration (R. J. H. Jenkins, "The Peace with Bulgaria (927) Celebrated by Theodore Daphnopates," in Jenkins, *Studies on Byzantine History* XXI. 289, 294. cf. J. Becker "Opera Liudprandi," in *MGH Scriptorum rerum Germanicarum*, Hannover-Leipzig 1915, 82-88, 90-92.
- <sup>11</sup> Bréhier, *Vie et mort de Byzance*. 245; Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates*, 232.
- <sup>12</sup> Oikonomidès, "Vardariotes," 3, Note 11.
- <sup>13</sup> Oikonomidès "Vardariotes," 3, Note 11. Some specialists suggested the document to date to 882 (K. Lake, *The Early Days of Monasticism on Mount Athos*. Oxford 1909, 82-84; F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*. I. München-Berlin 1924, 61, nr. 504.). However Rouillard identified the very date as 943 (Rouillard, "Note prosopographique," 107-111. cf. G. Rouillard - P. Collomp *Actes de Lavra*. I. Paris 1937, 11-13, nr. 5; V. Laurent, *La Collection C. Orghidan: Documents de sigillographie byzantine*. Par-

*strategos* of Thessalia. Rouillard called attention to the inscription of a seal, which contains the name Katakalon and the title *strategos* of Macedonia.<sup>14</sup> Both historians suggested that the person called Katakalon in the poem, the seals and the charter was the same man, who lived in the first half of 10th century and died in 944 or 945.

Katakalon waged war against the 'Scythian-Huns' which is a typically archaic name for the contemporary nomadic people. The identification of the Scythian-'Huns' (or Scythians and Huns) is uncertain. The Byzantine authors used the name 'Scythians' for the Pechenegs, Bulgarians and Hungarians, whereas the term Huns was applied to Bulgarians and Hungarians in the tenth century.<sup>15</sup> The double name 'Scythian-Huns' can be interpreted as two ethnonyms Scythians and Huns,<sup>16</sup> but Cankova-Petkova proved that the term 'Scythian-Huns' referred to one people, as there is no comma nor "and" between the two names and later the poet refers to the same people as Scythians. It was a practice in Byzantine literature to apply several archaic ethnonyms to the contemporary neighbouring peoples.<sup>17</sup>

The poet mentions the arrows of the Scythian-Huns. Arrows, together with the bow, were amongst the most important characteristic features of nomadic warfare, typical amongst the peoples of the Eurasian steppe.<sup>18</sup> Arrows represented nomadic heroes or clans/tribes and played an important part in ritual ceremonies, as a part of the oath taken by the peoples of the Eurasian steppe. The broken arrow symbolized the tragic fate of the partner who had broken his

is 1952, nr. 211; F. Dölger, F. *Aus den Schatzkammern des Heiligen Berges*. Munich 1948, nr. 120, 1<sup>a</sup> and 120, 2; Oikonomidès, "Vardariotes," 3, Note 11; *Treasures of Mount Athos*. Thessaloniki 1997, 437).

<sup>14</sup> Rouillard, "Note prosopographique," 107-109; Laurent, *La Collection C. Orghidan*, nr. 211. Schlumberger had not mentioned these amongst the seals of the *strategos* of the Macedonian *thema* (Schlumberger, G. *Sigillographie de l'empire byzantin*. Paris 1884, 110-115).

<sup>15</sup> Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2: 234-235, 280.

<sup>16</sup> Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 1: 231, 2: 235, 280; Szádeczky-Kardoss, "Görög és bizánci források," 148; Brand-Kazhdan, "Katakalon Kekaumenos," 1113.

<sup>17</sup> Cankova-Petkova, *Извори за Българската История*, 306, Note 5. Cf. Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 16-18, 25, 34, 38, 55-56, 58, 72, 93, 99-101, 103. etc. cf. M. Gyóni, *Magyarország és a magyarság a bizánci források tükrében*. [Hungary and Hungarians in the mirror of the Byzantine sources] Magyar-görög Tanulmányok 7. Budapest 1938, 36, 105; Laurent, *La Collection C. Orghidan*, nr. 211; Oikonomidès, "Vardariotes," 3.

<sup>18</sup> K. U. Köhalmi, "Über die Pfeifenden Pfeile der innerasiatischen Reiternomaden," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 3 (1953), 45-71; K. U. Köhalmi, "Der Pfeil bei den innerasiatischen Reiternomaden und ihren Nachbarn," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 6 (1956), 108-161; K. U. Köhalmi, *A steppék nomádja lóháton, fegyverben*. [The nomads of the steppes on horseback, in arms] Körösi Csoma Kiskönyvtár 12. Budapest 1972, 42-58, 98-109, 127-139, 151-166. On the opinion of nomadic archery in Byzantine culture, cf. W. E. Keagi, Jr., "The Contribution of Archery to the Turkish Conquest of Anatolia," *Speculum* 39 (1964), 96-108.

oath.<sup>19</sup> The arrow was also among the symbols of royal power.<sup>20</sup> It is worth mentioning that Marcianus, the East-Roman emperor, saw the broken bow of Attila, the Hun ruler, in his dream, according to Priscus Rhetor. Thus he learnt that the Hun ruler was dead and his power broken.<sup>21</sup> The broken arrow was a symbol of annihilating the enemy in the works of medieval authors.<sup>22</sup>

As for the identification of the Scythian-Huns or Scythians mentioned in the poem, the Pechenegs, the Bulgars and the Hungarians are all possibilities.

The Pechenegs lived north of the Black Sea in the tenth century. They made an alliance with the Russian Prince Igor to attack the Byzantine Empire in 944. However, the Byzantine envoys asked for peace. Igor reached the Danube, convoked an assembly to decide the matter and then signed a peace-treaty with the Byzantine Empire. The Russian army returned home, but Igor ordered the Pechenegs to march against the Bulgarian Empire.<sup>23</sup> It could be that this was part of the treaty

<sup>19</sup> J. Harmatta, "A hun aranyíj," [The Hun golden-bow] *Magyar Tudományos Akadémia II. Társadalmi-történeti Tudományok Osztályának Közleményei* 1 (1951), 123–187, XX–XXIV.; H. Serruys, "A Note on Arrows and Oaths among the Mongols," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 78 (1958), 279–294; H. Göckenjan, "Bogen, Pfeil und Köcher in der Herrschafts- und Rechtssymbolik der Eurasischen Steppenvölker," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 58 (2005), 59–76.

<sup>20</sup> Harmatta "A hun aranyíj," 143; J. Gießauf, "A lovasnomád fegyverzet és harcmodor az ellenfelek beszámolóinak tükrében," [The arms and tactics of horse-nomads in the mirror of reports of the enemy] in: *Fegyveres nomádok, nomád fegyverek*, ed. L. Balogh, L. Keller, Magyar Őstörténeti Könyvtár 21, Budapest 2004, 26–27, 29–31.

<sup>21</sup> *The fragmentary classicising historians of the Later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus II.* Text, Translation and historiographical notes by R. C. Blockley, Liverpool 1983, 316–317. cf. Gy. László, "A hún aranyíj jelentősége," [The interest of the Hun golden-bow] *Magyar Tudományos Akadémia II. Társadalmi-történeti Tudományok Osztályának Közleményei* 1 (1951), 107–118, 121; Harmatta, "A hun aranyíj," 165–167, 177–180, 186–187; I. Bóna, "Hun aranyíj," [The Hun golden-bow] in I. Bóna et al. *Hunok–Gepidák–Langobardok*, Magyar Őstörténeti Könyvtár 6, Szeged 1993, 24.

<sup>22</sup> Moravcsik–Jenkins, *DAI*, 180–181. (Chapter 41); P. von Poucha, "Zum Stammbaum des Tschingis Chan," in *Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller*, Leipzig 1954, 448–449; Jenkins, Constantine Porphyrogenitus *De Administrando Imperio*, 153; I. de Rachewiltz, "The Secret History of the Mongols" *Papers on Far Eastern History* 26 (1982) 120 (19–22. poem); *The History of the World-Conqueror* by ʿAla-ad-Dīn ʿAta-Malik Juvaini. I. tr. J. A. Boyle, Manchester 1958, 41, 593–594. cf. Göckenjan, "Bogen, Pfeil und Köcher," 61–63, 66. The broken arrow symbolizes the fate of the defaulting party (Serruys, "A Note on Arrows," 279, 284–285).

<sup>23</sup> *Повесть временных лет*, I. Текст и перевод. Подготовка текста Д. С. Лихачева перевод Д. С. Лихачева и Б. А. Романова. Москва–Ленинград 1950, 33–34. On the Byzantine-Pecheneg relationship in the 10th century: F. E. Wozniak, "Byzantium, the Pechenegs and the Rus': the Limitations of a Great Power's Influence on its Clients in the 10th Century Eurasian Steppe." *Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* 4 (1984), 299–316; E. Malamut, "L'image byzantine des pechénégues." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 88 (1995), 105–117; Князький, И. О. *Византия и кочевники южнорусских степей*. Санкт-Петербург 2003, 11–36.

initiated by the Byzantine diplomats.<sup>24</sup> The Pechenegs campaigned against the Bulgarian Empire, but not against Byzantine territories, and there is no record of a Pecheneg attack against Byzantium in the Byzantine sources, so Katakalon could not have fought against the Pechenegs in 944.

It has been suggested that the attacking people in the poem might have been the Bulgarians.<sup>25</sup> The Byzantine sources called the Bulgarians both *Huns* and *Scythians* several times.<sup>26</sup> The Bulgarian Emperor Symeon died in 927, after which his son and successor, Peter, signed peace with the Byzantine Empire. Subsequently, Peter married Romanos Lekapenos' grandchild, Maria and received the titles of Byzantine emperor's "spiritual son" and "Bulgarian emperor". The patriarch of Constantinople recognized the separate Bulgarian church and the Byzantine court paid tribute to him annually.<sup>27</sup> The historians emphasize that there was thus a long peace between the Bulgarian and Byzantine Empires in the middle of the 10th century, until 965.<sup>28</sup> Accordingly, Katakalon could not have fought against the Bulgarians under the name 'Scythian-Huns' in the poem. Moreover the poem refers to Katakalon as a martyr. Since the Bulgarians converted to Christianity in the second half of the ninth century, it is hardly acceptable that Katakalon suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Christian Bulgarians.<sup>29</sup>

Although there was peace between the Bulgarian and Byzantine Empires, Hungarian raids may have occurred during this time.<sup>30</sup> Since Peter, the Bulgarian monarch, did not block the pillages of Hungarian armies against the Byzantine Empire, the Byzantine Emperor Nikephoros Phokas II. abrogated the peace-treaty with the Bulgarians and made an alliance with the Russian prince, Svyatoslav against the Bulgarians in 965.<sup>31</sup>

As for the Hungarians, they made several campaigns against Byzantium and Western Europe in the first half of the 10th century, which is referred to in Hun-

<sup>24</sup> Wozniak suggest that this attack happened in favour of the Byzantine Court (Wozniak, "Byzantium, the Pechenegs and the Rus'," 311).

<sup>25</sup> Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2: 280; Cankova-Petkova, *Извори за Българската История*, 306; Laurent, *La Collection C. Orghidan*, nr. 211.

<sup>26</sup> Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 2: 234, 280. cf. Jenkins, "The Date of the Slav Revolt," XXI. 289, 293. cf. 297; I. Dujčev, "On the Treaty of 927 with the Bulgarians" *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 32 (1978), 264-265. cf. 291.

<sup>27</sup> Fine, J. V. A. *The Early Medieval Balkans*. Ann Arbor 1989<sup>s</sup>, 161; D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe, 500-1453*. London 1971, 115-117; Ostrogorsky, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Staates*, 222-223.

<sup>28</sup> „От контекста не е ясно кое сражение има пред вид авторът. Към средата на X в., когато се датира това стихотворение, между Византия и България има мир." Cankova-Petkova 307, note 1.

<sup>29</sup> Oikonomidès, "Vardariotes," 3.

<sup>30</sup> Gy. Kristó, *Az Árpád-kor háborúi*. [The wars of the Arpad's age] Budapest 1986, 34-36, 38-39, 44-45; Gy. Györffy, "A kalandozások kora." [The age of the raids] in *Magyarország története. Előzmények és magyar történet 1241-ig*. Vol. 1. ed.-in-chief Gy. Székely, Budapest 1987, 670-672, 675, 709-712, 715; F. Makk, *Ungarische Außenpolitik (896-1196)*. Studien zur Geschichte der Ungarns 3. Herne 1999, 13.

<sup>31</sup> Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 86, 100

garian historiography as “the age of raids” (Hung. *kalandozások kora*). Thus Gyóni, Moravcsik, Szádeczky-Kardoss, Brand and Kazhdan all suggested that the ‘Scythian-Huns’ or ‘Scythians’ in the poem referred to the Hungarians.<sup>32</sup> Oikonomidès suggested the same in his short footnote.<sup>33</sup> Brand and Kazhdan, however, dated Katakalon’s war against the *Huns* in the eleventh century. In turn, Moravcsik changed his opinion, since he omitted this poem from his classical monograph, which contains every Byzantine source on early Hungarian history.<sup>34</sup> Later historians regarded the source collection of Moravcsik as a standard work and it meant that the poem in memoriam of Katakalon has been neglected in the studies of Hungarian history.<sup>35</sup>

To prove that Katakalon waged war against the Hungarians, the Hungarian campaigns against the Byzantine Empire in the middle of the 10th century must be taken into consideration. The Hungarian raids can be divided into two different kinds: an army of remarkable size attacking the Empire and minor military units pillaging the western periphery of the Empire. The *Vita Basilii*, a Byzantine source, records that the Hungarians “destroy daily” the western territory of the Byzantine Empire.<sup>36</sup> The data of the *Vita Basilii* refers to minor incursions between 933 and 941.<sup>37</sup> A Byzantine charter dated to 941 describes how the inhabitants of Hiérisson looked for shelter for their animals from the attacking “hostile people” in Mount Athos.<sup>38</sup> Since only Hungarian units could reach the West Balkans at that time, the “hostile people” may have been minor Hungarian troops.

<sup>32</sup> Gyóni, *Magyarország és a magyarság*, 36; Moravcsik, *A magyar történet*, 128. cf. Moravcsik 1926–1932, 329; Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 1: 231, 2: 235; Szádeczky-Kardoss 1988, 148; Brand–Kazhdan 1991, 1113.

<sup>33</sup> Oikonomidès, “Vardariotes,” 3.

<sup>34</sup> Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet* 10, Note 4.

<sup>35</sup> Kristó, *Az Árpád-kor háborúi*, 39; Györffy, “A kalandozások kora” 675–679; P. T. Antonomopoulos, “Byzantium, the Magyar Raids and Their Consequences,” *Byzantinoslavica* 54 (1993), 256.

<sup>36</sup> Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 28.

<sup>37</sup> Gy. Moravcsik, “Két X. századi hagiografiai munka a magyarokról,” [Two hagiographical sources on the Hungarians in the tenth century] *Magyar Nyelv* 31 (1935), 19–20; Moravcsik, *A magyar történet*, 140; Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 28. cf. Kristó, *Az Árpád-kor háborúi*, 38; *A honfoglalás korának írott forrásai*. [The written sources of the age of conquest] ed. Gy. Kristó. Szegedi Középkortörténeti Könyvtár 7, Szeged 1995, 139, Note 414. On the earlier mistaken dating: H. Grégoire – P. Orgels, « L’invasion hongroise dans la Vie de Saint Basile le Jeune. » *Byzantion* 24 (1954), 150–151. cf. G. da Costa-Louillet, “Saint de Grèce aux VIII<sup>e</sup>, IX<sup>e</sup> et X<sup>e</sup> siècles.” *Byzantion* 24 (1954), 511; Oikonomidès, “Vardariotes,” 1.

<sup>38</sup> „πλὴν τοῦτο μόνον καὶ παρὰ τῶν οἰκητόρων τοῦ κάστρου καὶ ἐπι ἐλογομάχητο περὶ τοῦ μὴ κωλύεσθαι τυχὸν τὰ κτήνη αὐτῶν εἰς καιρὸν ἐθνικῆς ἐφόδου τῇ προφάσει τοῦ διαχωρισμοῦ τοῦ μὴ εἰσέρχεσθαι καὶ περισώζεσθαι εἰς τὸ τοιοῦτονόρος” Rouillard, “Note prosopographique,” 111, Note 1. On the *εθνικοὶ* term, see D. Obolensky, “The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy,” in *Actes du XII<sup>e</sup> Congrès International d’Études byzantines*, Vol 1. Belgrade 1964, 54–56.

Besides frontier incidents, the Hungarian army also attacked the Byzantine Empire *en masse* in 943. *Georgius Monachus Continuatus* notes: "In April of the first year of the indiction, the Turks again invaded [the Empire] with a great army. Theophanes patrikios and parakoimomenos went out and signed peace with the Turks [viz. Hungarians], and took illustrious hostages. They succeeded to preserve the peace for five years."<sup>39</sup> Scholars also suggest that the *Vita Lucae* describes the same Hungarian campaign. Saint Lucas lived in the province of Hellas and fled to an island when the Hungarians plundered the province.<sup>40</sup> *Oikonomidès* suggests that Saint Lucas remained on the island because of the continual Hungarian incursions over three years.<sup>41</sup>

Johannes Skylitzes gives the following description of the Hungarian raids: "The Turks kept on making raids, and continuously devastated the territory of Byzantines, until their chief, Bulchu came to Constantinople, pretending inclination toward the Christian faith."<sup>42</sup> Bulchu took third place in the hierarchy of the Hungarian court, visiting Constantinople in 948.<sup>43</sup> If we accept the testimony of *Georgius Monachus Continuatus* concerning the five years peace, how can we explain the 'continual Hungarian raids' in the book of Johannes Skylitzes? Presumably the major Hungarian campaigns ended in 943, but minor Hungarian troops pillaged the Balkans between 943 and 948. Johannes Skylitzes mentioned that Bulchu broke the peace "several times" and attacked the Byzantine Empire.<sup>44</sup> Otto I, the German king, defeated and executed Bulchu in 955. After 948 Gyula, the second Hungarian dignitary, went to Constantinople and signed peace with the Byzantine emperor. But contrary to Bulchu, he kept the peace.<sup>45</sup> Thus, the Hungarian chiefs changed their tactics between war and peace. Hungarian troops "continuously" sacked the Byzantine Empire in spite of the peace after 943. Similarly Bulchu's army attacked the Byzantine Empire "several times" in spite of the peace after 948.

---

<sup>39</sup> Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 61–62. cf. 68–70.

<sup>40</sup> Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 29; Costa-Louillet, "Saint de Grèce" 339, Note 3; Gy. Kristó, *Levedi törzsszövetségétől Szent István államáig*. [From Levedi's tribe-union to Saint Stephen's state] Budapest 1980, 280; X. Димитров, *Българо-унгарски отношения през средновековието*. София 1988, 74–75, 86. Note 22.

<sup>41</sup> *Oikonomidès*, "Vardariotes," 3.

<sup>42</sup> Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 85.

<sup>43</sup> Gy. Moravcsik, "Görögnyelvű monostorok Szent István korában" [The Greek monasteries in Saint Stephen's age] In *Emlékkönyv Szent István király halálának kilencszázadik évfordulóján*. II. ed. J. Serédi, Budapest 1938, 391–399; J. P. Riposte, "Constantin VII Porphyrogénète et sa politique hongroise au milieu du Xe siècle" *Südost-Forschungen* 36 (1977), 5; Jenkins, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus, De Administrando Imperio*, 153; Makk, *Ungarische Außenpolitik (896–1196)*, 13; Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 49, Note 45; Györffy, "A kalandozások kora", 682.

<sup>44</sup> Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 85.

<sup>45</sup> Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történet*, 85.



Constantine Porphyrogenitus VII emphasized in his book entitled *De Administrando Imperio* that the Hungarians could be controlled under the pressure of a Pecheneg invasion:

"So long as the emperor of the Romans is at peace with the Pechenegs, neither Russians nor Turks [viz. Hungarians] can come upon the Roman dominions by force of arms, nor can they exact from the Romans large and inflated sums in money and goods as the price of peace, for they fear the strength of this nation which the emperor can turn against them while they are campaigning against the Romans. For the Pechenegs, if they are leagued in friendship with the emperor and won over by him through letters and gifts, can easily come upon the country of the Russians and of the Turks, and enslave their woman and children and ravage their country."<sup>46</sup>

The Emperor wrote this work for his son as political guidance. Consequently, the threat of the Hungarians was serious, when the emperor wrote this book in the 950s.

The reference in the poem to the arrows of the *Scythian-Huns* can be compared with references to Hungarian weapons in other sources.<sup>47</sup> Regino noted that the Hungarians "killed some men with swords, and several thousand with arrows, which they shoot from their horn-bows with such a skill, that it can be hardly averted."<sup>48</sup> The contemporary sources warned the people against Hungarian bows and arrows. Conrad, the son-in-law of Otto I, the German king, and the

<sup>46</sup> Moravcsik-Jenkins, DAI 50-53. (Chapter 4).

<sup>47</sup> On the arrows of the Hungarians, see K. Cs. Sebestyén, "'A sagittis Hungarorum... / A magyarok íja és nyila," [The bow and arrow of the Hungarians] *Dolgozatok a Magyar Királyi Ferenc József Tudományegyetem Archeologiai Intézetéből* 8 (1932) 167-255; O. Trogmayer, "X-XII. századi magyar temető Békésen" [Hungarian cemetery in Békés in 10-12th Century] *Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve* (1960-1962), 15-20, 23, 36; I. Dienes, "Nemzetségi jegy (tamgha) a békési honfoglalás kori íjcsonton," [Genus-sign (tamgha) on the bow-bone of Békés] *Folia Archaeologica* 14 (1962), 95-109; Gy. László, "A kenézlői honfoglalás kori íjtegez," [The quiver of Kenézlő in the age of conquest] *Folia Archaeologica* 7 (1955), 111-122; Gy. Fábán, "Újabb adatok a honfoglalás kori íjászat kérdésköréhez," [New dates on the question of archery in the age of conquest] *Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve* 1 (1980/1981), 63-76; L. Kovács, "Viselet, fegyverek," [Wear, arms] in Kristó Gyula *Az Árpád-kor háborúi*. [The wars of the Arpad's age] Budapest 1986, 224-230; K. B. Nagy-L. Révész, "Egyedi típusú honfoglalás kori íjcsontmaradványai Hódmezővásárhely-Nagyszigetről," [Unique style bow in the age of conquest from Hódmezővásárhely-Nagysziget] *Communicationes Archaeologicae Hungariae* (1986), 123-134; K. Mesterházy, "Tegez és taktika a honfoglaló magyaroknál," [Quiver and tactics of the early Hungarians] *Századok* 128 (1994), 320-334; G. Szöllősy, "Mennyivel voltak jobb íjaik a honfoglaló magyaroknak, mint a korabeli Európa más népeinek?" *Keletkutatás* (1995/ős), 37-51; L. Kovács, "Fegyver és vitéz," [Arm and valiant] in *Honfoglaló őseink*. ed. L. Veszprémy, Budapest 1996, 94-98; L. Révész, *A karosi honfoglalás kori temetők*. [The cemeteries in the age of the conquest in Karos] Miskolc 1996, 153-175.

<sup>48</sup> *Regionis Abbatiss Prumiensis Chronicon cum continuatione treverensi*. Recognovit F. Kurze, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* 50, Hannoverae 1890, 133.

prince of Lotharingia, was killed by a Hungarian arrow, which penetrated into his neck.<sup>49</sup>

The Byzantine sources called the Hungarians 'Huns' and 'Scythians' several times. The Hungarians are mentioned as 'Huns' in the works of *Georgius Monachus Continuatus* and Leo Diaconus and as 'Scythians' in *Georgius Monachus Continuatus*, the works of Leo Sapiens and Constantine Porphyrogenitus VII, the letters of Nikolaos Mystikos' and the *Vita Athanasii*, all works written in the tenth century.

It is most probable that the author of the poem used the double name 'Scythian-Huns' for the Hungarians, since they were able to "daily" (*Vita Basilii*) or "continuously" (Johannes Skylitzes) raid the Roman Empire "with a great army" (*Georgius Monachus Continuatus*, Constantine Porphyrogenitus VII) in the middle of the tenth century. In spite of the fact that the Hungarian chiefs signed peace-treaties with the Byzantine Empire in 934, 943, 948 and the 950s, the Balkan provinces of the Byzantine Emperors were subject to the campaigns of the Hungarians "several times" (Johannes Skylitzes). The Avars and Bulgarians were threats to the Byzantine Empire in the sixth-seventh and then the seventh-ninth centuries. The Russians attacked the Empire by sea in the tenth century. The Hungarians pillaged the western-provinces of the Byzantine Empire in the second third of the tenth century. The author of the poem analyzed here was acquainted with the affairs of the deceased *strategos*, who was able to defeat the 'Scythian-Huns,' who were the Hungarians.

---

<sup>49</sup> Cf. *Opera Liudprandi*, 38; *Regionis Abbatis Prumiensis Chronicon*, 602; Widukind in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* 50. Hannoverae 1891, 128.