

A Twofold Conquest of Hungary or »Secundus Ingressus«

In 1970 Professor Gyula László presented the scholars and the public at large with a summary of views and arguments in favour of the concept of a possible twofold conquest of the Carpathian Basin by the ancestors of the present-day Hungarians, the first stage occurring c. 680, the second in 895. It was suggested that in both cases the ethnic composition of the conquerors included to a large degree Finno-Ugric speaking (Magyar) population. Furthermore, the concept asserts that the people of the first wave had survived in the Carpathian Basin, only to be reinforced in 895 by the influx of duke Arpad's Finno-Ugric Magyars of predominantly Turkic culture. Professor László supported his view primarily with archaeological evidence and supplementary arguments derived from physical and some written sources¹. In the last chapter of his presentation Professor László summarized the views and arguments of several scholars, such as L. Marjalaki Kis, D. Simonyi, A. Vámbéry, Géza Nagy, T. Horváth and D. Csallány, who in the past have formulated similar concepts².

Professor László presented his views clearly as a "Problemstellung," thus subject to open discussion and criticism. In fact, a lively discussion has ensued with arguments both in favour and against the suggested possible revisions of the history of the early Hungarians. My contribution to the discussion is intended to be the view of a historian.

It is fairly obvious that archaeology in and of itself can not provide arguments for speculations as to what language was used by the carriers of a specific material culture unless the speculations are supported by contemporary epigraphic or written sources. The possibility suggested by Professor László that there is a continuity in material culture and even in physical anthropology between some segments of the population in the Danubian basin before and after 895 calls for scrutiny of written sources.

The question posed in the hybrid title of my paper implies that there might be a correlation between Professor László's concept of a "twofold conquest" (= in Hungarian: "kettős honfoglalás") and the fact of a "secundus ingressus" reported directly or obliquely in several medieval sources. While the archaeological arguments presented by Professor László remain yet inconclusive, the written evidence of medieval chroniclers seems to support the view that some of the ancestors of the present-day Hungarians had been, in fact, in the Carpathian Basin since 680³. They were, apparently, forced out from Pannonia by Charlemagne about the year 800. They remained in the vicinity of the Byzantine,

¹ László Gyula; »A 'kettős honfoglalás'-ról,« *Archaeológiai Értesítő*, 97 (1970); 161—190 and »Kérdések és feltevések a magyar honfoglalásról,« *Valóság*, 13(1970), No. 1; 48—64.

² László, Gyula in »A 'kettős honfoglalás'-ról, cited above, pp. 183—187.

³ Boba, Imre; *Nomads, Northmen and Slavs* (The Hague, 1967); 74—101.

Frankish and Moravian realms and being reinforced east of the Carpathians by some other clans, e. g., the "Kavaroi" known to Constantine Porphyrogenitus, they re-occupied Pannonia ca. 895. This event is referred to in some of the sources by the terms, "secundus ingressus", "reditus", or other similar expressions.

The current discussions carried on by historians and archaeologists concerning the possibility of the arrival of people associated with the ancestors of the Hungarians in two successive waves appears to be one sided, inasmuch as the views of the historians are presented as axiomatic truth and these views, of course, are given preference over the logic of conclusions drawn from archaeological evidence. It seems appropriate that Professor László's concept be subjected to scrutiny and constructive discussion, but it is equally important to reevaluate the sources on which historians base their objections. Historians, while rejecting the arguments drawn from archaeological evidence for an ethnic "Magyar" continuity in the Danubian Basin, ignore entirely the references in written sources that indicate a possible political continuity characteristic of "mobile" nomadic and early Germanic realms: departure of some partners of the Avar federation after 800 to the Pontic steppes and return of some in 895.

To begin with, there is no equivalent in Latin, Greek or Slavonic and oriental sources for the Hungarian term "honfoglalás" (= Landnahme, conquest, landtaking), used in connection with the events of c. 895, nor is there in medieval sources a term or phrase that would be equivalent to "conquest." On the contrary, the arrival of the people associated with "dux" Almus is referred to in several sources, as already mentioned, by the terms "reditus" or "secundus ingressus", while other sources do not consider the events of 895 worthwhile reporting. The silence on the events of 895 is characteristic of Western as well as Oriental sources. The Hungarian authors and authors drawing on Hungarian resources, apparently on the basis of local tradition, refer to a return in a variety of formulations. The western observers, the annalists, may have had no perception of the significance of the events of 895, because to them the "Ungari" ("Tourkoi" or "Ouggroi" in Byzantine sources) had been known as marauders inside and outside the Carpathian Basin, and even in the western part of Europe, since the beginnings of the ninth century — in fact, since shortly after the fall of the Avar-Onogur federation (ca. 800)⁴.

The first basic shortcoming of arguments used by historians against Professor László's concept has been already mentioned: no source whatsoever mentions a sudden arrival of some unknown people to Central Europe c. 895. Thus chapter two of Simon de Keza's *Gesta Hungarorum* has the title: "Incipit secundus liber de reditu." In that part of his narrative Simon de Keza reports that "Zaculi Hunorum sunt residui, qui dum Hungaros in Pannoniam iterato cognoverunt remeasse, redeuntibus in Rutheniae finibus occurrerunt" (cap. 21); "Hungarii in Pannoniam secundo sunt reversi (cap. 22);" "Tradunt quidam quod Hungari

⁴ *ibid.*; p. 97.

Morot, non Zvatoplug in secundo eorum reditu in Pannonia reperissent principantem (cap. 23)" and "quo tempore redierint in Pannoniam (cap. 24)⁵."

Despite the clear indications of a "return" both in the title and in the text of Keza's *Gesta*, the current Hungarian translations of the title contain two misinterpretations. "Incipit secundus liber de reditu" has been translated to mean: "Második honfoglalás,⁶" i. e., "The Second Landtaking (Landnahme, conquest)", instead of "The Second Book (of the Chronicle) on the Subject of Return". In Keza's view it was clearly not a second conquest, but "the" (one and only) return (= reditus). The terms "primus ingressus" and "secundus ingressus" are used in *Chronicon Pictum Vindobonense*⁷. The two chronicles complement each other inasmuch as the second "ingressus" known to the compiler of the *Chronicon Pictum Vindobonense* is, in fact, the first "reditus" known to Simon de Keza.

As a curiosity, one should also note that Antonius Bonfini, the court historian of Mathias king of Hungary, seems to have read or heard that at the time of their return the "Ungari" could communicate in their own language with some of the inhabitants of Pannonia: "Ungari... in reditu... ut pacatiorem regionem haberent, his tantum ignovisse placitum est, quos linguae commercia conciliarunt⁸". Since Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus knew that during his lifetime (c. 950) the Hungarians ("Tourkoi") were still bi-lingual⁹, it is entirely possible that some Hungarians could communicate with some people residing in the Danubian Basin, but it is impossible yet to ascertain if the language used was Finno-Ugric or Turkic. One may only speculate that the language used by some residents in the Danubian Basin and the newly arriving people of Arpad was a dialect spoken by the remaining clans of the former Avar-Onogur federation, a dialect understood by the "Hungarian" (i. e. Onogur) component of the bilingual federation of Arpad.

A recently presented criticism of László's conjecture argues that the narrative of Anonymi *Gesta Hungarorum* has nothing to say that would indicate a continuity between the ethnic composition of nomads who

⁵ *Simonis de Keza Gesta Hungarorum*. E. g., in *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum*, vol. 1. (Budapest, 1937) 129—194. Subsequent quotations from Keza will be indicated in the text with reference to appropriate paragraphs in this edition.

⁶ E. g., *A magyarok elődeiről és a honfoglalásról*, edited by Gy. Györffy, 2nd edition (Budapest, 1975); p. 188.

⁷ *Chronicon Pictum Vindobonense*. E. g., in *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum*, vol. 1. (Budapest, 1937); 217—505.

⁸ Bonfinius, Antonius; *Rerum Hungaricarum Decades*, cap. 9. E. g., in *Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici*, vol. 1. (Prague-Brno, 1966); p. 335.

⁹ Constantine Porphyrogenitus; *De Administrando Imperio*. Greek text edited by Gy. Moravcsik, English translation by R. J. H. Jenkins (Budapest, 1949); cap. 39; 7—10. Quotations from this work will be identified in the text by references to chapters and lines. The transliteration of some terms has been modified. Thus instead of "Lebedias" and "Kabaroi" used by Jenkins, the forms "Levedias" and "Kavaroi" will be preferred.

entered the Carpathian Basin ca. 680 and that of the "conquerors" of 895¹⁰. A scrutiny of the text of Anonymus, however, reveals, obliquely or directly, that *Almus dux* was entitled to Pannonia and that a return, in fact, took place. The quoted fragments and subsequently cited sources imply, however, not necessarily an ethnic but a dynastic-political continuity of a mobile realm. The very first quotation expressly states that it was *Almus* who had a legal claim to Pannonia and not the *Hetumogers*. The *Hetumogers* were looking for a new homeland and elected *Almus* because of his ancestry and rights to a former "patrimony". Prior to the election to be duke of the *Hetumogers*, *Almus* was already a duke of his own people.

Anonymus, cap. 5. . . VII principales persone, qui *Hetumoger* vocantur . . . elegerunt sibi terram Pannonie, quam audiverant fama volante terram Athile regis esse, de cuius progenie dux *Almus* pater *Arpad* descenderet.

Cap. 12. . . *Sclavi* vero 'habitatores terre' audientes adventum eorum, timuerunt valde et sua sponte se *Almo* duci subiugaverunt eo, quod audiverant *Almum* ducem de genere Athile regis descendisse.

Cap. 14. *Arpad* . . . respondit dicens: Licet preavus meus, potentissimus rex *Athila* habuerit terram, que iacet inter *Danubium* et *Thysciam* usque ad confinium *Bulgarorum* . . . peto de mea iustitia unam particulam [terrae] propter pecora mea¹¹.

(For other direct or oblique references to an inheritance cf. also: *Anonymus*, caps. 8, 9, 11, 19, 20, 38 and 46.)

It may be noted here that *Arpad* claimed only a part of the inheritance (>de mea iustitia . . . unam particulam . . .<). The territories east of the Danube, toward the *Tisza* and beyond, were held by "*Sclavi*" under dukes associated or related to the Danubian *Bulgars*. *Arpad* must have known that his own "*Hungari-Onogurs*" were related to the Danubian "*Onogundur-Bulgars*", namely to those who defected from the *Avar* federation in Pannonia ca. 800 and joined up with the Danubian *Bulgars* under tsar *Krum*¹². Thus, evidently, both branches of the *Onogundur-Onogur* dynasty, that of *Almus* and that of *Krum*, were entitled to a share of the patrimony. The fact that force had to be used in claiming the "iustitia" is not unusual, considering that most of the armed conflicts between dukes, princes and kings during the Middle Ages were actually family feuds to enforce a just division of inheritable family property, the patrimony.

¹⁰ Kristó, Gyula; »A 'kettős honfoglalás' elméletéről,« in *Historia*, 1982; 26—28.

¹¹ *Anonymi Belae Regis Gesta Hungarorum*. E. g., in *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum*, vol. 1. (Budapest, 1937); 13—117. Thereafter referred to in the text by "*Anonymus*" and chapter.

¹² Cf., T. Lewicki; »Bulgarzy pannońscy,« in *Słownik Starożytności Słowiańskich*, vol. 1. (Wrocław, 1961); s. v. and Imre Boba, "The Pannonian Onogurs, Khan *Krum* and the Formation of the Bulgarian and Hungarian Politics," *Bulgarian Historical Review*, 1983, No. 1; 73—76.

The observation should be made here that the name "Athila" in the various chronicles is used not only for "Attila the Hun", but also for other heads of nomadic federations. Arpad's "preavus Athila", mentioned by Anonymus, could not have been Attila the Hun, but an Attila who "habuerit terram que iacet... usque ad confinium Bulgarie", hence after 680, when the Bulgarians were already in Southern Europe, and not later than ca. 800, i. e., three generations before Arpad (this Attila being the great-grandfather of Arpad).

The memory of the same Athila must have been kept alive by the "Sclavi", who were settled in the Carpathian Basin by "Keanus magnus dux Bulgarie, avus (or preavus) Salani ducis":

Anonymus, Cap. 11. ... Terram vero, que iacet inter Thisciam et Danubium, preoccupavisset sibi Keanus magnus, dux Bulgarie, avus Salani ducis, ... et fecisset ibi habitare Schavos et Bulgaros. Cap. 12. ... habitatores terre ... narrabant, quomodo mortuo Athila sus ... preoccupaverat terram illam, qualiter etiam ipsi Sclavi de rege magnus Keanus, preavus ducis Salani, dux de Bulgaria egressa terra Bulgarie conducti fuerunt ad confinium Ruthenorum ...

Since Salanus dux was a contemporary of Arpad, and since the "proavus" or "avus" (great-grandfather or grandfather) of Salanus was the one who occupied some lands after the death of a certain Attila, this Attila must be identified with Attila, the "proavus" (= great grandfather) of Arpad. The three generations of ancestors linking Arpad with his "proavus Athila" are named by the *Gesta Ungarorum*, cap. 28: Almus, Előd, Ügyek¹³.

This relatively short span of time between a certain Attila and Arpad is indicated also, but in entirely different terms, by Simon de Keza. According to him, one of the sons of Attila, Chaba, born of a Byzantine princess, returned with his followers to Scythia. While in Scythia he urged his relatives there to return [with him] to Pannonia (cap. 20). However, it was not with Chaba, but with his son Edemen, that the "Hungari in Pannoniam secundario sunt reversi" (cap. 22). Although there seem to be divergences (but not contradictions) in the genealogies of Edemen as presented by Keza and Anonymus (cap. 8. and 10), the chronology suggests that Keza knew that the grandfather of Edemen was a certain Attila who lived two or three generations before Almus, thus, obviously, Keza could not have had in mind "Attila the Hun".

One may note that past historiography concerned with Hungarian protohistory did not pay sufficient attention to the contamination of two separate kinds of information on Attila: that based on literary sources and the one derived by Hungarian chroniclers from local, Slavonian-Bulgarian, tradition as it has been stated explicitly by Anonymus (cap. 12):

¹³ *Gesta Ungarorum*, fragments preserved in *Chronicon Budense*. Cf., e. g., the edition in *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum*, vol. 1. (Budapest, 1937); 287—289.

»Sclavi vero 'habitatores terre' audientes adventum eorum, timuerunt valde et sua sponte se Almo duci subiugaverunt eo, quod audiverant Almu ducem de genere Athile regis descendisse.«

The local tradition on an Attila who lived c. 800 and the tradition of a "secundus ingressus" are reflected not only in the texts of Anonymus and Keza, but also in the preserved fragments of the *Gesta Ungarorum* (as preserved in Keza's caps. 26 and 28):

Anno 888 ... Magori sive Huni, Latine vero Hungari... denuo ingressi sunt Pannoniam... Arpad autem interim cum VII ducibus Pannoniam intravit, non sicut hospites, sed sicut terram iure hereditario possidentes.«

The author of the *Gesta Ungarorum* also seemed to know that Sventopolk (of the Moravians) ruled after a certain Attila (Keza, cap. 28) but, obviously, this could not have been the Attila from the fifth century. In many cases, not only in Hungarian sources but also in several medieval sources originating outside Hungary, the name "Attila" appears, on occasion, as an appellative for nomadic chieftains generally, rather than a personal name "Attila the Hun". Thus we have an Avar warlord "Attila" at the time of Peppin reported by Constantine Porphyrogenitus (*D.A.I.*, cap. 26), "Attila" for Arpad in the *Chronicle of Pop Dukljanin* (cap. 12), "Aquila/Attila" in the *Chronicon Polono-Hungaricum* (cap. 3) and "Attila" for Geza or Stephen of Hungary in the *Nibelungenlied*.

During the early Middle Ages, especially among the non-Christian barbarians, there were no baptismal names used for a lifetime. Most of the names were "nicknames" befitting a person's character, function or profession. In a patrimonial society the head of the clan and at the same time the head of a polity would be simply called "father". Hence the references to an "Attila" in the sources quoted may simply refer to the "father" = "atta" (cf. Gothic *atta unsar* = *pater noster*, Turkic "ata", Hungarian "atya" etc.). Hence we have the political titles *Ata Turk*, *Ada [Amin]*, *Batiushka [Stalin]*, *Stari [Tito]*, *Pater Patriae*. Why should, then, the name-forms *Attila*, *Attala*, *Ethel*, *Etsel*, *Eczel*, *Athalus*, *Thotila*, *Aquila* be associated only with "Attila the Hun"?

A simple perusal of the text of *Anonymus Belae Regis* reveals that he refers in his narrative to at least two, and possibly three, Attilas: one in the fifth century, another one who was the "proavus", hence a great-grandfather of Arpad, and one who lived shortly before the times of Arpad and of Sventopolk of the Moravians. Thus the repeated associations made in sources between a certain Attila who lived three generations before Arpad has to be considered as a strong possibility or even a fact not contradicted by other sources.

Since the information about a return of the people led by Almus is described in all of the quoted basic sources in different terms, one can not suggest that the authors borrowed the story from a common domestic literary source. As the story is not borrowed from western or Byzantine sources either, the references to "ius hereditaria" (*Gesta Ungarorum*),

“*mea iustitia*” (*Anonymus*), “*reditus*” (*Keza*) and “*secundus ingressus*” (*Chronicon Vindobonense*) must reflect a living oral court or folk tradition recorded by the respective chroniclers independently.

As already indicated, western sources do not report a sudden appearance of some unknown people led by Almus or Arpad ca. 895. This fact should not be surprising, because there had been some people, both inside and outside the Carpathian Basin, associated with the ancestors of the present-day Hungarians at least since ca. 830, if not already in 811¹⁴. They were inside Frankish territory in 862 and 881; they fought against Sventopolk in 892.

Western chroniclers associated the Hungarians, on occasion, with the Avars, but some sources provided a more specific definition, e. g.: “*Avari qui Ungari dicuntur*”¹⁵, indicating thus that the “*Ungari*” were not real Avars but only formed a subdivision of the Avars or that they were once members of the heterogeneous federation of the Avars. Because of this, the chroniclers did not consider the events of 895 to be a significant change in the pattern of relations between the Frankish-Bavarian realm and their neighbors: first the Avar-Onogur and now the Onogur-Hetumoger federation (on the Hetumogers cf. quotations and text preceding note 11). For the Western chroniclers the Onogurs, known to be once associated with the Avars and now present in the newly arrived federation, provided the understanding of a dynastic or political continuity between the “*Ungari*” c. 800 and the “*Ungari*” of 895.

The *Saxon History* of Widukind is accepted as a fairly independent and reliable source. In Book I 19 of that History one reads:

Avares, quos modo Ungarios vocamus, . . . victi autem a Magno Carolo et trans Danubium pulsi se ingenti vallo circumclusi, prohibiti sunt a consueta gentium depopulatione. Imperante autem Arnulfo destructum est opus, et via eis nocendi patefacta, eo quod iratus esset imperator Centupulcho regi Marorum . . .¹⁶

The expulsion of some and surrender of other segments of the Avar federation was reported also by the author of the official document *Conversio Bagoarorium* (cap. 6) compiled ca. 870 for the archbishop of Salzburg¹⁷. Since the Franks built clusae to prevent their return, the “*Ungari*” must have remained somewhere east of the Danube toward the Pontic steppes. Some of the expelled clans, the Pannonian Onogurs, joined their Danubian kinsmen, the Onogundur-Bulgars; some others, e. g., the Szekelys, secluded themselves in the Great Plain along the Tisza river, and others settled east of the Carpathians. Evidently, this last group was available on short notice to assist the Byzantines against the Bulgars and

¹⁴ Cf. note 4.

¹⁵ *Annales Fuldenses*, e. g., in *Quellen zur karolingischen Reichsgeschichte*, vol. 3. (Darmstadt, 1966); s. aa. 894 and 896.

¹⁶ *Widukinds res gestae Saxonicae*, e. g., in *Quellen zur Geschichte der sächsischen Kaiserzeit* (Darmstadt, 1971); 46 f.

¹⁷ Text, e. g., in Milko Kos, *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum* (Ljubljana, 1936); 126–140.

to help the Franks against the Moravians. Those expelled by Charlemagne were, of course, different from the people of a certain Levedias, also associated in historiography with the Hungarians, a people that appeared only later in the century along the Don and Volga¹⁸.

The same Widukind who reported the expulsion of the "Avars, quos modo Ungarios vocamus" reported also the return of these "Avars": I. 18 "Avars . . . iterum venientes et finitimas gentes circumquaue vastantes, Pannoniam postremo inhabitare coeperunt." In connection with the events of 932 Widukind refers to the "Ungarii" as "antiqui hostes", and to the Dalemintians (a West Slavic people) as "[Avarum] antiqui amici" (I. 38). One has to note that Widukind (ca. 925—1004), close to the royal court, recorded an oral tradition.

Curiously enough, there is a Western source so far omitted by historians from consideration that also mentions a "return", namely the *Miracula sancti Apri*, in which one reads: "Hungri . . . Misia eversa, Marahensiumque licet gentilium convulsis tabernaculis, suam olim Pannoniam irruerunt."¹⁹ There have been attempts to interpret olim (= once) in the sense of "in the future"²⁰ but such a reading seems to be illogical. One does not invade or intrude into one's future home, but may invade or intrude into his former homeland when it is presently occupied by someone else. Besides, the author of the *Miracula* hardly would have known that the intrusion would lead to a permanent residence. He could have known, however, that the "Hungri" had been once, in fact, in Pannonia. Although it would be unusual, the "olim" in the sense of "future" could be considered if, instead of "irruerunt", the author had used "occupaverunt". Finally, when the *Miracula s. Apri* was written, namely after 978, the "Ungari" had already been residents in the Carpathian Basin for over eighty years. Also the chronicler of the *Annales Fuldenses* noted under the year 900 that, after an expedition into Bavaria, the Hungarians returned home, to Pannonia ("Ungari . . . redierunt, unde venerant, ad sua in Pannoniam").

These few illustrations imply that there was a "political" continuity between the Onogur-Bulgars who arrived in the Carpathian Basin ca. 680 and joined the Avar federation of clans, and the "Ungari" or "Avari qui dicuntur Ungari" of the ninth century. Thus historical sources support Professor László's contention that there is a continuity of an archaeological complex in the Carpathian Basin attesting the presence, from the latter part of the seventh century on, of an ethnicum related to the people of Almus and Arpad. This continuity is made plausible by the opinion of anthropologists, such as Bartucz and Lipták, that the anthropological materials of the Avar-Onogur and of the Almus-Arpad periods in the Carpathian Basin, when compared, show few differences. Problems arise,

¹⁸ Cf., note 3.

¹⁹ *Miracula sancti Apri*. E. g., in A. Gombos, *Catalogus Fontium Historiae Hungaricae*, vol. 1. (Budapest, 1937); 643 f.

²⁰ Havlik, L. in *Magnae Moraviae Fontes Historici*, vol. 2. (Prague-Brno, 1967); translation and comments on p. 185.

however, when one attempts to relate that archaeological complex to the Finno-Ugric "Magyars".

Although it is evident from written sources that the federation led by Almus and later by Arpad was composed of clans of many ethnic groups and languages, the historians translate the names of specific groups always as "Magyars". This is not only the case in Hungarian language historiography, but also the practice followed by Western historians, e. g., Marquart and Macartney. The latter even made the remark that "[in the writings of the oriental writers] a very curious confusion arises. The 'Hungarians' (Unkar) are represented as living side by side with the 'Baskirs' in the present Hungary — the identity of the single nation not being realized under the two names".²¹ On the contrary, the fact that the Unkars and Baskirs appear in the same text must indicate some distinction between the two. Since the same distinction is discernible in several western, Byzantine and Oriental sources, the case is obvious: the Unkars are the Ungri/Onogurs, while the Baskirs, at that time, were the yet not Turcized Finno-Ugric clans which in circumstances described by Constantine Porphyrogenitus joined the Onogurs in the Pontic Stepes shortly before 895 (for Constantine's text and analysis cf., below).

As already mentioned, the prevailing practice in modern Hungarian historiography of substituting the name "Magyar" for all other names of the component parts of the multi-ethnic federation of Almus and Arpad is one of the major obstacles to the proper reconstruction of the protohistory of the modern Hungarians. It seems to be common sense that the Onogurs were not Magyars, or that the Kavars were not Onogurs or Magyars before their merger into a political federation and the long process of acculturation took place. Even today the Székelys (another component of the early 'nationbuilding') still identify themselves as Székelys, but are conscious of belonging to the "Magyar" political nation. (Cf., the term "Madjaron" for an ethnic Croat of Hungarian political allegiance.)

Nevertheless, modern historiography still presents the political history of the Hungarians as a single-line development of some Finno-Ugric clans who for some three thousand years maintained a political cohesion, sometimes in confederation with others, but always as an autonomous unit²². Actually this view still represents nineteenth century reconstructions of the political history based on the study of language and ethnic culture of a modern political nation. But the political history of a modern nation has to be treated separately from the history of language (cf., e. g., the Bulgarians, French, Irish) and distinctly from the ethnic-cultural history (cf. the four ethnic groups of the Swiss polity).

In the case of the people led by Almus and Arpad, one has to accept the facts that the federation was multi-ethnic and multi-lingual and that

²¹ Macartney. C. A., *The Magyars in the Ninth Century* (Cambridge, 1930); 34.

²² E. g., István Fodor, *In Search of a New Homeland* (Budapest, 1982); passim, and Gy. Györffy in *A magyarok elődeiről és a honfoglalókról* (Budapest, 1975); 5 ff.

the clans represented a variety of cultures. Széchenyi's nineteenth century dictum: "a nation lives by its language (nyelvében él a nemzet)" had no application during the middle ages. In most cases it was the dynasty that provided the political continuity for a multi-ethnic patrimonial realm.

The multi-ethnic and multi-lingual nature of the polity forged by Almus and Arpad is lucidly described by Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus in his *De Adminstrando Imperio*, so far the best single source for the study of Eastern Europe in the ninth and early tenth century, written ca. 950²³. Constantine has recorded that at this time the "Tourkoi" (the name used by him for the "Ungari" known from the Western sources) were joined by a people known as "Kavaroi" and that the two people were learning from each other their distinct languages. Constantine also reported that before the "Kavaroi" joined the "Tourkoi", there was a merger of the "Tourkoi" with another people, namely, the "Savartoi asphaloi". The initial political distinction between these three peoples is evident both from the narrative of Constantine Porphyrogenitus and from the *Gesta Hungarorum* of Anonymus Belae Regis. Each of these peoples played, in turn, important role in the leadership of the political federation.

In cap. 38 of his narrative Constantine describes how the people of a certain Levedias elected Arpad, son of Almus, as their chief. Although Constantine begins his description of the events by referring to the people of Levedias as "Tourkoi", in the subsequent text he explicitly and repeatedly states that, prior to the election of Arpad, the people of Levedias "were not called Tourkoi". In other terms: the people of Levedias became known as "Tourkoi" only after accepting Arpad as their chief.

For the analysis of Constantine's text it is important to note that he uses for peoples and geographic locations terms current during his own lifetime, but he also gives enough indications that allow us to ascertain that he knew that a change in terms has in fact occurred. This is the case, i. a., with the people who during the leadership of Levedias "were not [yet] called Tourkoi". Constantine gives a similar explanation concerning a subdivision of the people known during his own lifetime as Pechenegs: "when battle was joined between the Tourkoi [recte: the Savartoi asphaloi of Levedias] and the Pechenegs who were at that time called 'Kangar' ..." (cap. 38: 24—26). Similarly, when Constantine speaks about the "place of the Pechenegs" or "the land of the Pechenegs" he refers to the land evacuated by the Tourkoi [recte: by the Savartoi, now under the command of the Turkic/Onogur Arpad] and he states this fact explicitly: "the place of the Pechenegs, in which at that time the Tourkoi lived ... [i. e., before the attack by the Pechenegs against the forces of Arpad]." For the sake of clarity in the previous and following excerpts of Constantine's translated text appropriate interpretative insertions have

²³ Cf. Note 9. The following analysis of Constantine's text was first formulated in "Constantine Porphyrogenitus on the Evolvevement of the Tourkoi Federation", in *Congressus Quartus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum Budapestini Habitus*, 1975 (Budapest, 1983); 146—148.

been added. The steps leading to a merger of the people of Levedias with the people of Almus and subsequently with the Kavaroï are described by Emperor Constantine in the following fragments:

The nation of the Tourkoi had of old their dwelling next to Chazaria, in the place called Levedia after the name of their first voivode, which voivode was called by the personal name of Levedias... They were not called Tourkoi at that time, but had the name 'Savartoi asphaloi', for some reason or other... (cap. 38: 1—10).

Now, the Pechenegs who were previously called 'Kangar'... stirred up war against the Chazars and, being defeated, were forced to quit their own land and to settle in that of the Tourkoi [recte: Savartoi asphaloi]... the army of the Tourkoi [recte: Savartoi asphaloi] was defeated and split into two parts. One part went eastward and settled in the region of Persia, and they to this day are called by the ancient demoniation of the Tourkoi 'Savartoi asphaloi'; but the other part, together with their voivode and chief Levedias, settled in the western region, in places called Atelkouzou, in which places the nation of the Pechenegs now lives... (cap. 38: 19—31).

Apparently it was in Atelkouzou, just east of the Carpathians and toward the Dnieper river, that the defeated clans of Levedias joined the clans of Almus in a formal ceremony referred to by Anonymus as "iuramentum", but known in historiography as the "Covenant of Blood".

Before the attack by the Kangars there was an alliance between Levedias and the khagan of the Khazars in force for three years. The attack by the Kangars forced the people of Levedias into Atelkouzou, and thus the Khazars and the people of Levedias became separated by a common enemy. It was evidently after the "iuramentum" that the khagan of the Khazars offered to Levedias a new alliance. Since Levedias was now a subordinate of Almus, and only the head of his own clan, he explained the new situation to the khagan, and suggested that the offer of the alliance should be extended to Almus or Arpad. As the khagan wanted a renewal of the old alliance with the people of Levedias only, and since the khagan subsequently chose Arpad rather than Almus, the duke of the entire federation, it seems reasonable to assume that Arpad was the chief ("capitaneus" in Keza's *Gesta Hungarorum*, cap. 27) of the military contingents of the people of Levedias under the overall command of his father. At this juncture the people who earlier, while Levedias was their chief, "were not called Tourkoi", became now known as "Tourkoi".

It should be noted here that the people of Levedias (and not the people of Almus) were the only ones who lived initially in "Levedia". From there they moved to Atelkouzou, a region between the Seret, Prut, and the Eastern Bug rivers, hence just east of the Carpathians. Since east of the Savartoi asphaloi were now the Kangars, the clans of Almus must have been west from the Savartoi. It was in Atelkouzou, in the new home of the Savartoi, that the federation of Almus — more precisely the

subdivision under Arpad — was joined by some defectors from the realm of the Khazars. Constantine referred to them as “Kavaroi”. By joining, the “Kavaroi” became known also as “Tourkoi”. Constantine gave the cap. 40 of his narrative the title: “Of the Clans of the Kavaroi and the Tourkoi,” but in the text he already refers to both the Kavaroi and the Tourkoi as “these eight clans of the Tourkoi . . .” (Cf., the Saxons and Bavarians referred to, from outside, as “Germans”; or the Serbs, Croats, Slovenes etc., known as “Yugoslavs”).

According to Constantine the alliance between the khagan of the Khazars and Arpad was shortlived:

Before this Arpad the Tourkoi [recte the Savartoi] had never at any time had any other prince . . . Some years later, the Pechenegs fell upon the “Tourkoi” and drove them out with their prince Arpad. The “Tourkoi”, in flight and seeking a land to dwell in, came and in their turn expelled the inhabitants of “megaly Moravia” and settled in their land, in which the Tourkoi now live to this day. (Cap. 38: 53—60)

This statement concurs with earlier statements, namely that only the people of Levedias were placed under the command of Arpad. He was their first military commander, while Almus, and even the father of Almus, Űgyek, were princes (“duces” in the narrative of Anonymus) over their own people. The fragment quoted confirms also the narrative of Keza that Arpad with his own “gens” crossed the Carpathians in front of the people of Almus (Keza: cap. 27). Emperor Constantine knew and described only the history of the people of Levedias before their submission to the command of Arpad, and the history of Arpad prior to, and of his family after, 895. Constantine had nothing to say about Almus except that Almus was the father of Arpad. Constantine thus preserved an oral tradition as of ca. 950, known among the Savartoi asphaloi. A parallel description of events affecting the two people, of Levedias and Almus, as seen by and preserved by the Onogur tradition, has been recorded by Anonymus *Belae Regis*. In other terms, there are two basic “national” traditions concerning events leading to the emergence of the medieval Hungarian polity: Constantine preserved the tradition of the Levedias — Arpad political continuity, while Anonymus preserved the tradition of the “Attila” — Almus — Arpad dynastic and political continuity.

As described by Anonymus *Belae Regis*, the Covenant of Blood, the “iuramentum”, — the ritual of forging a permanent union of initially distinct “gentes”, — and the election of Almus into the function of a duke of the new federation were concluded on the urging of the leaders of a people referred to as “Hetumoger”²⁴.

²⁴ The namen “Hetumoger” is formed from a Finno-Ugric *hetu+moger, i. e., “seven mogers/magyars,” possibly a polity formed by seven clans or extended families, a name formation similar to *on=ogur, i. e. “ten ogurs”, for the Onogurs. Cf., Gy. Németh, “On ogur, hét magyar, Dentumagyar” in *Magyar Nyelv* 17 (1921); 205—7.

Anon., cap. 5. Gens itaque Hungarorum fortissima et bellorum laboribus potentissima . . . de gente Scithica, que per ydioma suum proprium Dentumoger dicitur, duxit originem . . . VII principales persone, qui Hetumoger vocantur usque ad hodiernum diem, angusta locorum non sufferentes habito inter se consilio, ut a natali solo discederent, ad occupandas sibi terras, quas incolere possent, armis et bello querere non cessarunt. Tunc elegerunt sibi querere terram Pannonie, quam audiverunt fama volante terram Athile regis esse, de cuius progenie dux Almus pater Arpad descenderat . . . Ergo libera voluntate et communi consensu VII virorum elegerunt sibi ducem ac preceptorem . . . Almus filium Ugek . . . Tunc supradicti viri pro Almo duce more paganismo fuis propriis sanquinibus in unum vas ratum fecerunt iuramentum . . .

The quoted fragment shows that it were the Hetumogers who were under pressure to find a new homeland and had elected Almus for their duke, because, as they reasoned, he descended from the family of Attila and had legal rights to recover Pannonia. One has to note that Almus was already a duke of his own people before he was elected to be the duke also of the Hetumogers. Between the "septem principales personae" and duke Almus there was a "dynastic" link that made this election possible. Almus was related to the Hetumogers through his mother Emese, the daughter of a duke in Dentumoger:

Anon. cap. 3. . . Ugek, . . . nobilissimus dux Scithie, duxit sibi uxorem in Dentumoger filiam Eunedubeliani ducis, nomine Emesu, de qua genuit filium, qui agnominatus est Almus.

The marriage between duke Ugek and a daughter of duke Eunedubelianus from Dentumoger clearly indicates that duke Ugek could not have been a member of the "Hetumoger" clan or a resident in the political realm referred to as Dentumoger. Since Almus and his son Arpad descended from Ugek and a certain Attila, they had the "right" to claim Pannonia. Since Almus was the grandson and Arpad the great grandson of Eunedubelianus, both were entitled to participate in the political life of the Hetumogers: hence the election of Almus as duke of the Hetumogers in an emergency.

If one relates now the narrative of Anonymus to the narrative of Constantine Porphyrogenitus then some parallels appear to be obvious. It were the people of Levedias, who defeated by the Kangaroi, sought a new homeland and subordinated themselves to Almus. When Levedias declined the offer of alliance with the khagan of the Khazars, he was, apparently, already bound to Almus through the "iuramentum". Thus it was the "Hetumogers" to whom Constantine refers as Savortoi Asphaloi. The name "Hetumoger" was, possibly, used by the people themselves; the other name, Savartoi asphaloi (= "Invincible Savartians") was, obviously, given them by their neighbors because of some of their characteristics. Having joined up with the clans of Almus, after the

Covenant of Blood, the Hetumogers became known to be a distinct "gens" of the Hungarian federation (cf. Anon., cap. 5, quoted above).

Anonymus refers on several occasions to the Hetumogers as a single "gens" associated with "septem principales persone." These "principales persone" appear only as consultants to Arpad (in accordance with the stipulations of the Covenant of Blood) but, at least on one occasion, Hetumogers are identified as fighting as a unit, namely when taking Nitri from duke Zubur (cap. 37). The "septem principales personae" were not "duces" (or "vezérek" in Hungarian) as interpreted in current historiography, but simply heads ("principales persone") of their respective extended families jointly forming one "gens" only. This "gens" is explicitly named by Constantine as "Megeris", and is mentioned by Constantine on the third place among the eight clans enumerated by him in chapter 40 of his *De Administrando Imperio*.

The combined evidence derived from the narratives of Emperor Constantine and Anonymus *Belae Regis*, as well as the annalistic notations in Western chronicles allow us to suggest the following reconstruction of a segment of the "Hungarian protohistory".

When the Avar-led federation with its center in Pannonias was defeated by Charlemagne, the Onogurs, partners in that federation, crossed the Middle Danube. Some of the Onogurs joined the Danubian Bulgars with whom their leaders shared common dynastic origin. Some Onogurs moved east of the Carpathians and remained in the vicinity of the Lower Danube. These Onogurs were active along the Lower Danube in 811, 830, and in Central Europe, inside Frankish territories, in 862 and 881. Only a few years before 895 a new people appeared on the horizon of the Byzantine Empire, east of the Dnieper toward the Volga, — the "Savartoi asphaloi" ("Megeris"), who were known in Hungarian sources as "Hetumogers" under the command of a certain Levedias. Under the pressure by the Kangars the clans of Levedias split up. One group, still under Levedias, joining the clans of the Onogur Almus in a permanent federation ("Covenant of Blood"). Arpad, son of Almus, became the military commander (archon, capitaneus) of the Savartoi-Hetumogers contingent. Pressed by the Kangars, it were the Savartoi-Hetumogers who persuaded Almus to lead the federation into Pannonia, the territory for which he had legal rights. Subsequently a recovery of the Onogur patrimony in fact took place. For the Onogurs it was a "secundus ingressus;" for the Hetumogers it was the first arrival. In Central Europe the new federation will be henceforth known to their neighbors under the names used for the clans of Almus; "Ungari," "Hungarii in Latin, "Ungri" in Slavic, and "Tourkoi" or "Ouggroi" in Byzantine Greek.

These remarks on the emergence of an Onogur-Hetumogger federation shortly before 895 allow for placing a frequently quoted statement by the contemporary historian *Regino* into proper perspective. Under the year 889 *Regino* noted:

...gens Hungarium ferocissima et omni belua crudelior, retro ante seculis ideo inaudita quia nec nominata, a Scythicis regnis et a paludibus, quas Thanais sua refusione in immensum porrigit, egressa est...

Ex supradictis igitur locis gens memorata a finitimis sibi populis, qui Pecinaci vocantur, a propriis sedibus expulsa est...²⁵

A cursory reading of Regino's text would imply that the "Hungares" were unknown in Western Europe before 889 and that they, consequently, became known only after their "egressus" from the marshes of the river Don. However, since we know from Byzantine and western sources that the "Tourkoi"/"Ungari" were, in fact, along the Lower Danube already ca. 830 and 839 (possibly already in 811), and in Western Europe in 862 and 881, and since Constantine Porphyrogenitus and Anonymus attest that the "Hungares-Tourkoi" were joined by the "Hetumoger" people of Levedi shortly before 895, we must, it seems, interpret Regino's text as a reference to the new, in Western Europe as yet unknown, Finno-Ugric component of the Onogur federation.

The statement by Regino concerning the "gens Hungarium" is most often quoted and analyzed out of context. The sentence is part of a large paragraph, a sort of background note, dealing with a new "gens". And here his erudition took precedence over the historical facts. He associated the "gens Hungarium" with the Scythians but in doing so he gave the description not only of Scythia but also of Germanic tribes, both descriptions being taken over word for word from Justinus for Scythia (Book 2, cap. 2-3) and from Paulus Diaconus for the Germanic tribes (I, 1). One of the sentences inserted by Regino himself into the text of these authors reads: "venationum et piscationum exercitiis inserviunt." Both these pursuits, hunting and fishing, were characteristic of the Finno-Ugric "Megyers," rather than of the horse riding, cattle-breeding, nomadic Onogurs. Interestingly enough, Regino had nothing to say about the events of 895, the date associated by historians with a "conquest." One has to assume that Regino, as all other western authors, knew about the "real" Onogurs as a people for some time marauding and fighting in and around the Danubian Basin. It is fair to assume that Regino gathered his information from some Onogur or Megyer informant sometime before 908, the year when he concluded his *Chronica*. Regino's date on the Pecheneg [recte: Kangar] attack against the "gens Hungarium" is close to the date to be derived from the narrative of Constantine Porphyrogenitus on the encounter between the Kangars and the people of Levedias. It should be mentioned also that it was Regino (ob. 915) who in Western Europe provided the first information on the Pechenegs.

If we now return to the text of Regino, then his reference to a "gens Hungarium ferocissima et omni belua crudelior..." may appear less ambiguous. The singular "gens" and the superlative "ferocissima" imply that the "gens" formerly the "Savartoi asphaloi", now the "Megeris",

²⁵ *Reginonis Chronica*, e. g. in *Quellen zur karolingischen Reichsgeschichte*, vol. 3. (Darmstadt, 1966); 284-288.

one of the eight "geneoi" known to Constantine, was being compared to, or contrasted with, the other clans of the federation. Comparative and superlative adjectives go with a noun that has been singled out of many for the sake of contrasting²⁶.

Annalista Saxo repeated Regino's description of the "gens Hungariorum ferocissima", possibly from a common source. But he did mention the specific reason for their appearance. It was in response to an invitation by king Arnulf of the Hungarians (against the Moravians) in an entry dated 890, but covering also the events of 892: "Arnulfus in auxilium vocavit gentem scelestissimam Ungarorum..."²⁷ *Annalista Saxo* has described the situation when the Onogur-Megyer federation was just completed and the unruly warriors of Levedi, now under the command of Arpad and close to the Lower Danube²⁸, were willing to be employed by the Byzantines or by the Franks, or to engage in predatory raids of their own. In 892 Arpad was in charge of the people of Levedi only and the base of Almus, the overall duke of the federation was still in Atelkouzou, east of the Carpathians.

Finally, *Anonymus Belae Regis* also used terms resembling the phrases "gens ferocissima" (*Regino*), "gens scelestissima" (*Annalista Saxo*), when describing the Hetumogers as a single "gens itaque Hungarorum fortissima et bellorum laboribus potentissima... que per ydioma suum proprium Dentumoger dicitur... VII principales persone, qui Hetumoger vocantur..." (cap. 5). This Finno-Ugric "gens" was no other than the "gens" formerly of Levedi, placed subsequently under the command of Arpad. This "gens" was led by Arpad across the Carpathians, in front of the other forces of Almus, according to Simon de Keza:

Cap. 27. ...Hic igitur Arpad cum gente sua Ruthenorum Alpes prior perforavit, et in fluvio Ung primus fixit sua castra eo quod eius prosapia ista prae caeteris Scitiae tribubus praerogativa investitur dignitate, ut exercitum praecedit in eundo, retrograditur redeuntem."

The "gens" of Arpad is made positively distinct from the other "gentes" of the federation. It is otherwise well known that a newly joining "gens" that had not so much the privilege as the obligation to march in the van of an advancing army and at the rear during a retreat.

* * *

This brief attempt at a historical reconstruction supports Professor László's concept to the extent that the Onogurs, returning to the Car-

²⁶ On "gens," family, clan and tribe, cf., Ildikó Ecsedy, *Nomádok és kereskedők Kína határain* (Budapest, 1979); 165—216.

²⁷ *Annalista Saxo*. E. g., in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores*, VI; 587.

²⁸ Cf., *Georgios Monachos*, cap. 2, e. g., in *Antik Tanulmányok* 4 (1957); 275—88 and Porphyrogenitus, cap. 40, lines 7—13.

pathian Basin in 895, linked up their material culture with the still similar culture of Avars and Onogurs, who had been in Pannonia and adjacent regions since 570 and 680 respectively. There seems to be no evidence for a Finno-Ugric presence in the Danubian basin prior to 895. There is, however, overwhelming evidence from written sources for an Onogur political continuity characteristic of mobile realms led by members of a dynasty of rulers. The ancestry of Almus and Arpad, associated with the Onogurs of the Avar-Onogur federation, provided the legal base for claiming a temporarily abandoned patrimony. In the expanded Onogur-Hetumoger federation led by Almus the Onogurs provided initially the leadership. When Arpad (in the tradition of the Onogurs only a capitaneus), inherited the position of the dux, he retained his command over the Megyers/Magyars (Hetumogers). Possibly because of this shift of authority from Almus to Arpad and of power from the Onogurs to the Magyars, some detachments, composed most probably of Onogurs under the command of Tuhutum and Gyula, were allowed to settle in parts of Transylvania (*Anon.*, cap. 60 and *Keza*, cap. 29).

The "natio politica" of the realm ruled by the descendants of Almus remained known to the neighbors under the name of the clans of Almus: "Ungri", "Wegry", "Ouggroi" etc. After Arpad assumed the function of the "dux", the name "Magyar" for the "natio politica" prevailed in "domestic" use, simply because Arpad and his successors based their rule mainly on the clans and retainers of the "septem principales personae, que Hetumoger vocantur", the "Megeris" known to Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Thereafter, whoever served the dukes and later the kings, of the Arpad dynasty was adopted into the political nation of the Magyars. Hence the name of the emerging medieval polity: "magyar ország" = "lordship of the Magyars".

* * *

Professor László's concept of a continuity in the material culture from the latter part of the seventh century through the ninth and tenth centuries, together with evidence derived from historical sources attesting a political (dynastic) continuity of a "mobile" nomadic polity of the Onogurs, makes the argument for a "secundus ingressus" more than a theory.

The possibility of a continuity in the archaeological material, as perceived and supported by Professor László in several studies, was considered recently also by A. Bartha in his *Hungarian Society in the 9th and 10th Centuries* (also in Hungarian): "The implements, weapons, tastes and consequently the world concept of the Avars and the Hungarian conquerors ['magyar' in the Hungarian version] had many points of contact. This concurrence calls attention to the possibly common origin of the cultures of these two nations. But we must absolutely consider the possibility that the remainders of the Avars had lived to see the arrival of the conquering Hungarians ['honfoglaló magyarok' in the Hungarian

version], and that the common feature of their civilizations may be explained partly also by ethnical fusion."²⁹

If scholars would use more precise definitions and would refer to an Avar-Onogur federation instead of to Avars only, and if they would identify the people of Almus as a federation of Onogurs, Hetumogers and Kavars, then both the archaeological continuity and processes of ethnic fusions would be self-evident, and any further argumentation for the concept of a political continuity ("secundus ingressus") would be superfluous. The presence of the Onogurs in both federations explains the possibility of a cultural and ethnic continuity of some segments of the federations as of c. 800 and 895, and justifies the legal claims for the "secundus ingressus" of the Onogurs, the clans of a certain Attila and his descendants, Almus and Arpad.

At present there is no solid reason to think that Uralic (Finno-Ugric) ethnic components were present already in the federation of the Huns or of the Avars. They are certainly evident in the federation of Almus and Arpad. It remains a legitimate task for archaeologists, ethnologists and anthropologists to analyze all available resources in their fields of research for any evidence for the presence of Finno-Ugric people in the known political federations in the Carpathian Basin prior to the appearance of the ethnically Turkic, Finno-Ugor and Iranian federation of Almus and Arpad.

Whatever may be the result of investigations into the ethnic history of the Danubian Basin, historians may do well to reconsider past conclusions concerning a glorious conquest by Almus or Arpad and analyze the sources as to their content and interdependence, rather than to see the sources as supporting a concept of "conquest". Surprisingly enough, most historians who study the past of the nations in Eastern Europe reject the idea of a state's coming into existence through a conquest. Exceptions to that trend are the historians studying the origins of Hungary and of the Hungarians.

In the case of the protohistory of the Hungarians neither written sources nor medieval historiography support the concept of a conquest. The early modern historians were the ones who created the concept and corresponding term "honfoglalás" (Landnahme, landtaking, conquest). The obsolete term "hon" (= place to dwell, domicile) was revived by the purists of the late eighteenth century to serve as an alternate for "haza" (= "patria, fatherland") (ca. 1785).³⁰ Then, the term "honfoglalás" ("land + taking into possession") was coined by historians. The new term and axiomatic concept took precedence over the logic of sources. By accepting the creation of a romantic patriot, the name and epithet: "Árpád a Honfoglaló" ("Arpad the Conqueror"), students of the protohistory of the Hungarians entered the same blind alley as the British historians

²⁹ Bartha, Antal, *Hungarian Society in the 9th and 10th Centuries* (Budapest, 1975); 86 (appeared first in Hungarian in 1968).

³⁰ Bárczy, Géza, *Magyar szövejtő szótár* (Budapest, 1941); s. v.

who invented the expression "William the Conqueror". William crossed the Channel in 1066 to press the legal claim for his inheritance. He did not make England a part of Normandy. His claims being recognized by the Papacy, he ruled his patrimony by the laws passed under the crown of the English. Thus neither William nor Arpad were conquerors. At most, one may apply to each the epithet "Reconqueror", and to the action of each in taking possession of his "ius": "Re-conquest".