

THE BASHKIR-MAGYAR MATTER

Written by Szigeti Boglarka,

2019

Turin

Abstract

Julianus, who lived in Bashkiria beyond the Volga and were identical to the Bashkirs, supposedly had traveled to the pagan Hungarians during his first trip. This is the basis of the so-called Bashkir-Hungarian relationship theory. However, it seems that the theory in question is unfounded.

Julianus's description did not survive, only Riccardus's Dominican superior's text did. Riccardus was not Hungarian, he did not know Hungarian, he did not travel to Hungary, he was not there with Julianus. Riccardus's phrase of the pagan Hungarians is a scientific stereotype of Herodotus, which was used as a compulsory phrase for all unknown, pagan, Scythian-type people. For this reason, it has no source value.

In addition, Riccardus wrote about neither Bashkiria nor crossing the Volga. Neither Julianus nor Riccardus says that Julianus would have met the Hungarians in Bashkiria or not even that Julianus would have gone to Bashkiria or that the Hungarians and the Bashkirs would be the same. In addition: they wrote down neither the Bashkir nor the Bashkiria word, or any other resemblant word. The four reporters - Riccardus, Carpini, Polonus, Rubruk - certainly did not even go to Magna Hungaria, nor did they see any pagan Hungarians. What they had written on this matter, was written on the basis of scholarly tradition and partly by other monks' reports, not from experience. The Bashkirs are Turkic peoples, they belong to the Kipchak language, and they are Muslims ca. from the 10th century. Riccardus clearly states that Julianus was perfectly able to speak in Hungarian with the Hungarians that he met. So not in Turkish - that is, those who he met were not Turkic-speakers. That is, not Bashkirs. Riccardus wrote about Julianus' first trip, Julianus himself documented his second journey, and Carpini also clearly stated that the Hungarians were pagans. No doubt, somebody would certainly have noticed if they were Muslims. Muslims were not called pagans - just as the Jew - as the Islam is a religion of Abraham.

All in all: the Hungarians in question spoke Hungarian and were pagans – the Bashkirs spoke a Turkic language and were Muslims. So these two peoples can not be the same.

Overview of the historical sources

Julianus's Dominican monk made two trips to the east to find the pagan Hungarians in the ancient homeland. First of all, it must be said that he did not write a line about his first journey in 1235-36, we know about that journey only from Riccardus's (from 1237) father who was the Dominican boss. According to Riccardus's description, Julianus was on his first trip in Magna

Hungaria, the land of ancient Hungarians, and he was supposed to find pagan Hungarians at that time. On the second voyage in 1237-38, which he probably reported about himself, he did not even reach any pagan land. As we can see, the news of Magna Hungaria, the homeland of pagan Hungarians, therefore, does not come from Julianus monk but from father Riccardus.

During Julianus's first voyage, he searched for the "Hungarian ancient Homeland". It is important to know where it is. He first turned to the direction of Persia because he followed a monk-traveler, Otto's report who had recently returned home and met "the Savard Hungarians living near the Alans on the south, on the south of the Caucasus" (Györffy-Ruitz: 28, but likewise eg. Kristó, 1980: 108). Whether it was true that he met the Savard Hungarians or not, it is unverifiable, but it is certain that beyond the Caucasus there were some Hungarians in the 13th century! In addition, why Julianus spent months in the Caucasus - more specifically in the land of the Alans / Jazygians - why he had sent home his companions, then why he turned towards the Etil River. Moreover, which Etil River is it? Don? Volga? It is unknowable. In fact, we do not even know where he had found the Hungarians exactly or whether he had found anybody at all.

As mentioned above, Julianus had made two journeys but he had written a report only about the second one. The report of the first journey was written by Riccardus. The conclusion that Julianus went to Bashkiria and found pagan Hungarians beyond the Volga was drawn from the report of Riccardus. Yet, not even him wrote a single word about the land beyond Volga or Bashkiria.

What did Riccardus write?

First of all, Riccardus was not a Hungarian, he did not live in Hungary, and he meant his report to the pope, not the king of the Hungarians. He wrote common places about the Hungarians as he did about the Mordvins as well.

Riccardus relatively abundantly and credibly reported Julianus's trip in the Caucasus and the land of the Alans, and about his trip to Bundaz which is currently considered the town of the people of Burtas with the name of Burtas, while he mentioned the rest only with few sentences. He wrote about the path leading to the Hungarians with only these words: in a non-definable city (which is usually considered the town of Great Bulgaria where the Bulgarians of Volga lived) a married Hungarian woman told Julianus that:

Ilia docuit fratrem vias per quas esset iturus. asserens quod ad duas dietas ipsos | posset Ungaros quos querebat procul dubia invenire. quod et factum est. Invenit enim eos iuxta | flumen magnum ethyl (Bendefy, 1939: 214, 5-7 line) /.../ Gens thartarorum vicina est illis... (Bendefy, 1939: 214, 15 line); sivit in fluvio Regnum Morduanorum quindecim diebus qui sunt pagani (Bendefy, 1939: 215, 36. line).

The skeptics used to say that the report of Julianus's journey was so tight-lipped that it was almost certain that he did not go any further. And this is the "exact" geographic definition which the modern historiography based the thought of the Bashkir homeland on. However, based on this, the only thing that could be said is: Magna Hungaria lies somewhere in the Volga or Don area, not far from the Tatars.

Another important question is: if the monk really met the married lady in Bulgaria (and not in Bundanz), in this case, the question is that on which side of the Volga, because the Bulgarians of

Volga had also territory in the West side of the Volga (roughly the landscape of the today's Chuvash territory). According to the text, the Bulgarians were pagans and they said that they should have been converted to Christianity in short time (cap.3:Györffy-Ruitz:68.). To the best of my knowledge, the Volga Bulgarians were not pagans at all, but they were Muslims. If Julianus really had gone to their land, it is impossible that he would not have noticed that they had mosques, not pagan idols.

Who are the Bashkirs?

It is well-known that Bashkirs are Turks. But Turks are their immediate neighbors too, the Bulgarians of Volga who, after the collapse of the Bulgarian Empire of Kovrat (670), arrived sometime around 700 BC, so they are not indigenous of this place as the Bashkirs either. The only "indigenous" people would be the Hungarians or the rest of them who remained in this landscape. Mostly Muslims lived here, however. What is the outcome of this? Strange things: According to the "Bashkir theory", the Hungarian ethnic group that is stuck here in this territory, despite the Bashkir and Volga Turk coexistence, spoke still in Hungarian in the 13th century. Despite the continuous Muslim remuneration and the Muslim environment, he remained pagan. It is clearly written by everyone that the Hungarians of Magna Hungaria were pagans. The "paganism" was not yet mixed with the Muslim religion.

Thus, in Bashkiria, two people lived: the Muslim Turkic-Bashkir ethnicity and the Finno-Ugric-Hungarian pagan ethnicity. They lived in a country for half a millennium without being mixed and taking the language of each other, or one language would have ceased to exist. Moreover, the Muslims did not mind the fact that complete pagans lived with them and beside them. That is what is needed for Julianus could speak in Hungarian in Bashkiria with "pagan Hungarians".

In any case, Bashkirs are Turks. The authors of the Arabic sources of the 9-11th century had already described the Bashkirs as Turks without any distinction as Molnár Erik (1953:70;71.) says:

9-11. század arab-perzsa szerzői Baskíria lakosait, a baskírokat már minden megkülönböztetés nélkül törököknek nevezik. Baskíria lakosainak eltörökösödése tehát ebben az időben már messzire előrehaladt, ami könnyen érthető, mert a törökség Baskíriát három oldalról is körülvette ... A közelmúlt baskír törzs- és nemzetségnevei kirgizekre, türkménekre, nogaj-tatórokra és egyéb régi török törzstörödékre utalnak .

So they do not refer to Hungarians. If they are Turks in the 9-11th centuries, how could Julianus monk possibly communicate with them in Hungarian in the 13th century?

According to Györffy György Bashkirs were Finno-Ugric people, more precisely Obi-ugor (Györffy-Ruitz: 32.), so they only later got their Turkic language. But this "later" also means that only after Julianus's journey, sometime after the invasion of Tartars, around 1237-1242, they became Turkic. When they were supposed to move to their current homeland. They were almost certainly Kipchak-Turks in Julianus's era, however. Now, if Julianus - or if not himself, but another monk - actually met Bashkir-Hungarians, then he had to speak with them in the language of Halotti beszéd 'Funderal Oration' (Pray-codex, 1192-95) and Ómagyar Mária-siralom 'Lamentations of

Mary' („Sermones codex, approx. 1300!) that is, one hundred percent in Hungarian, though using Turkic terms, but not in Turkic.

And another thing: the Bashkir-Hungarian theory actually contradicts the Finno-Ugric-Hungarian theory.

It is clear that the Finno-Ugric / Ugrian homeland's theory suggests that in the old Bashkiria there were no Turkic-Hungarians, only Finno-Ugrian-Hungarians, even though according to the same theory, the entering Volga Bulgarians the neighborhood encountered the ancestors of the Hungarians there and could have affected them in 50-100 years (that means Hungarians were still in Bashkiria around 700-750/830?). We need to know that the Bulgarians spoke a Chuvash-type Turkic language, and supposedly the conquering ancestors of Hungarians as well¹. So, Hungarians learned - there or not there - Chuvash-Turkic, then they went away and the Bashkirs came. It is true that the language of Bashkirs are Turkic as well, but Kipchak Turkic, not Chuvash. Now, basically, that means the Bashkirs also spoke Chuvash while they merged with the Hungarians or the Hungarians started to speak in Kipchak. It would be harmless to decide whether Hungarians are ultimately Chuvash or Kipchak.

Volga and Magna Hungaria

It could be plausible that Julianus continued his way and found the Hungarians, however, he certainly did not cross the Volga, because there was not a word in the writings about crossing the Volga; consequently, Magna Hungaria lies in the West side of the Volga River. The Volga is extremely wide (it is measurable in km), it is very fast, and it is icy in more than one third of the year. In the summer, however, it floods terribly. Rubruk who really went there, wrote the followings in 1255:

Venimus ergo ad Etiliam (14), maximum flumen. Est enim in quadruplo major (i5) quam Secana (i6) profundissima (17), veniens de majori Bulgaria, que est ad aquilonem, tendens in meridiem... que crescit in estate sicut Nilus Egipti (Rubruk: 68-69).

It is life-threatening crossing the river alone, without any experienced sailors because he would not have too much chance to survive. Even if he survives, he has to pass the river again to go home. Julianus supposedly went through the river twice in the summer when Volga was flooding, going to Bashkiria and returning home, as he was on his way home on June 21, after the alleged few days in Bashkiria. The monk may have found one of the widest and most dangerous flooding rivers in the world, so it is impossible that he forgot to mention it.

Otherwise, there is not a word about any crossing of Volga not only in the Riccardus-report, but in any other source. And if not Julianus, but at least somebody had ever been to Magna Hungaria,

¹ According to the conventional model, Hungarian is supposed to have borrowed old Turkic elements exclusively from West Old Turkic (WOT) languages (see RT&B), because this model is compatible with the idea of an 'European origin', that is, an Uralic origin of Hungarian. However, in R&B the East Old Turkic (EOT) parallels are also available. The main difference is that while the WOT forms are reconstructed, the EOT forms are attested. It means, that the theory of having borrowed from WOT, is not confirmed by evidence (Marcantonio, 2015: 379).

which would have to be the same with Bashkiria, he would have to go through the Volga and before that the Volga Upland. But nobody even wrote that Magna Hungaria lies beyond the Volga River. How is it possible? It's like a world traveler who comes from Dallas to New Orleans missing out Mississippi in his guidebook.

Anyway, it seems that Julianus himself did not claim to have ever met Volga Bulgarians or Mordvinians, or perhaps pagan Hungarian in the ancient homeland.

In fact, in his report of his "Second Way", which was probably written really by him, he said only:

Cum secundum iniunctam mihi obedientiam ire deberem ad magnam Ucgariam cum fratribus mihi adiunctis, iniunctum nobis iter arripere cupientes, cum ad ultimos fines Brussie devenissemus, rei subscripte dedimus veritatem, quod omnes thartari, qui etiam Ungari pagani vocantur, et Bulgari, et Régna quam pûurima a Thartaris penitus sunt devastate (Bendefy, 1939: 267).

Therefore, Julianus did not call the pagan Hungarians as Bashkirs even by accident, he thought they were Tartars (Tartar = probably Tatar: belong to Tatars, or perhaps only pagan; Tartar / Tatar and pagan are synonyms as well). The most important thing, however, is that Julianus in his own report does not state that he had ever been to Magna Hungaria.

There may be another suspicion here: Julianus seems to have written about the first journey. After the quoted passage of the text, he discusses the causes of the Tatars' wars and tells us that the letter from the Tartar Khan to the Hungarian King, which was captured by the Prince of Suzdal, he quickly took it with himself and brought it to Hungary. Then he continues:

Sed hec non pretermittam. Iterum dum ego remansi in curia Romana, precesserunt me ad magnam Ungariam IIIor fratres mei, qui pertransientes per terram sudal, in finibus regni eius occurrerunt quibusdam ungaris paganis fugientibus a facie thartarorum, qui libenter fidem catholieam recepissent (Bendefy, 1939: 273)

The monk talks about two journeys. On the first, when he took the Tartar letter with him, and after that he went to Rome, and the second when he returned home after the disappearance of his brothers. If there are really two journeys, and not just a fragmented description of the second trip, then Julianus himself makes it clear to us that he has never been to Magna Hungaria, since it was already destroyed by the Tartars during his first trip. If he did not go there, then who did? The four reporters, Riccardus, Carpini, Polonus, Rubruk certainly did not go even near. Of the four Dominican monks, who departed independently from Julianus, two of them died of martyrdom, and two of them returned empty-handed. Only the two brothers and Julianus had met refugee Hungarians. That Hungarians supposedly said to these fathers that they would readily convert to the Roman Catholic faith. In which language did they talk, though? Because these fathers were not Hungarians. By the way, nor Carpini, neither Polonus or Rubruk saw a single Hungarian there; not even in the Tatar army. I do not mean to say that Magna Hungaria has never existed, but I do mean that there is no witness to its existence. And only Julianus is who saw refugee pagan Hungarians. Only one witness...

But we have witness to Bashkiria, in addition to a Hungarian witness! Johanca, a Hungarian monk, went to Bashkiria in 1320 with two Hungarian and one English companion. He went there ~~but~~ not

to meet with Hungarians - which somehow did not come to his mind - but to convert them. He lived for six years between the Bashkirs, but he did not see any Hungarian there (Bendefy, 1939: 4). It would be interesting to notice that after 2-3 generations of Julianus, no one knew in Hungary that it would have been necessary to travel to Bashkiria, because there may be some Hungarians, or at least memories of Hungarians. In addition, we could also add that Father Johanca could not speak Hungarian with Bashkirs because they did not speak Hungarian.

Baschart, Pascatu

Let us assume that Julianus said the truth. Let us assume that he saw refugee Hungarians because his own report seems very honest and very frustrating. Let us assume that Magna Hungaria existed. But not in Bashkiria. Julianus's reports do not reveal where he was, though. The Bashkir theorists can only refer to the sparse allusions in the report of Carpini about the Tatars, and the report that was described according to the narrative of his interpreter, the Polish Benedictus Polonus (1247.): „Baschart id est Hungariam magnam”; „Bascart id est Magna Hungaria”; „Bascardos, qui sunt antiqui Ungari”.

Rubruk's writing is also referred to „Pascatur et Ungarorum idem est”, „Pascaver, que est maior Hungaria” (Carpini:V,29;VII,9;Polonus:cap.7; Rubruk:V,5;XXI,1;XXIX,46.).

The text does not reveal what Baschart and Pascatu they talked about but it turns out something else: Carpini claims that these Hungarians were swept away by Tartars after that they reaved Hungary in the Carpathian Basin (1241-42). If that is true then Magna Hungaria is certainly not Bashkiria, since it was already subdued in 1236/37.

And another thing: Rubruk clearly says that the Huns, later called Hungarians, came from this Pascatu. „Isidorus azt mondja róluk, hogy fűrge lovaikkal áttörtek a falakon, melyeket Sándor állított a Kaukázus szirtjein a vad törzsek megfékezésére, úgyhogy Egyiptomig az egész területről nekik adóztak”(XXII,2.). The text talks about the Iron Gate (Porta Ferrea), which is located in the Darial Gorge which was closed only in the first millennium, but this tradition mistakenly bounded it to Alexander the Great.

And that certain Bashkiria, which is near the neighboring Volga Bulgarians, cannot be said to be a nearby area of the Caucasus; but in relation to the Hungarians, Isidore of Seville - supposedly following St. Jerome - clearly writes about the area of Tanais, so the Don:

A Hugniakat azelőtt hunoknak hívták s utóbb királyukról avaroknak. Ezek előbb a Maeotis szélső határán laktak a jeges Tanais és az undorító masszagetá népek között. Aztán fűrge lovakon a kaukázusi sziklák közül, ahová Sándor a vad népeket zárta, előtörtek és a keletet húsz évig tartották rabságban, az egyiptomiaktól és etiópoktól pedig évi adót szedtek (quoted by Eckhardt Sándor in Németh szerk.:145.).

And that means that Rubruk, referring to Isidore of Seville, could not believe for a moment that the homeland of the Hungarians identified with the Huns, that certain Pascatu, was not in the neighborhood of Don, but somewhere beyond the Volga.

But the most interesting point is the description based on Polonus's report: according to this, after (!) the Byleros' (supposedly the Bulgars of Volga) and the bascardoses – supposedly the ancient Hungarian –

következtek a cynocephales-ek, a kutyafejűek, majd a parosszíták, akiknek kicsiny és szűk szájuk van, és semmit sem tudnak megrágni, hanem italokat vesznek magukhoz, s a húsok és gyümölcsök illó párájával táplálkoznak (cap.7.).

Also Carpini informs about the people who nurtures with smells, and even the beef-legged, dog-like peoples and even those with only one arm which grows out of the middle of their breasts, so they have to shoot arrows in a couple. "It's important to know that they only run on one leg, and if they get tired they go to a gypsy wheel: they will be known for their wheel legs (cap.30-33.). And there would still be a countryside where women-shaped monsters live, because in this land only women are born human-shaped, but males are looking like dogs (cap.13.). But the latter peoples are far away, the neighbors of Magna Hungaria are only the bigheads described by Riccardus and the dogheads and the people without mouth described by Carpini-Polonus. These are the coordinates. Carpini and the monk who wrote the news of Polonus, repeated well-known medieval legends as Riccardus did, and this fact suggests that none of them had idea about the place of Magna Hungaria and Great Bulgaria.

They were only certain that there was a country where the brothers of Bulgarians, and somewhere else in which the brothers of the Hungarians lived; but as far as the place of these countries are concerned, they no longer knew: they thought, certainly somewhere of the legendary peoples. That is about the value of their sources...

The Bashkir beliefs

The Bashkir beliefs are not related to the Hungarians'. What could possibly be cited here is perhaps one or two elements of the Tatars' world of beliefs. It is important to see that the Turkic-Tatarian belief elements in Hungarian could be caused without further doubt by the Pechenegs, the Kumans, and the Tatars who moved to our homeland. In addition, there is no visible Bashkir-Hungarian relationship in other parts of folklore. Lajos Vargyas - perhaps in his "torment", so that he did not have to contend with the official historiography - he found that the ancestors of Hungarians could only be in Bashkiria when there were no Bashkirs there, and the Hungarians found there by Julianus were not the remnants of these Hungarians, but Hungarians who moved there later. It sounds complicated, but it is clear that ethnography cannot support the Bashkir theory.

Magához a baskír néphez azonban ezek szerint semmi köze sem lehetett a magyar népnek, és ezt a zene is igazolja nemcsak a baskír-magyar egyezések hiányával, hanem a baskírok régi zenéjének teljesen más, fejletlenebb jellegével is (1984: 155).

Vargyas therefore thinks the Hungarians have nothing to do with the Bashkirs. He was not alone with his doubts. For example, the great archeologist, Gyula László was also very skeptical.

Linguistic evidence

Ármin Vámbéry says that Julianus could not have spoken with deserted Hungarians because they would not have understood each other:

...valóban nagyon csudálatos, hogy a magyar történetírás Julián szerzetes apokryph tudósításának még mindig hitelt ad, a ki 1237-ben a Volga partján állítólag megtalálta a magyarok pogány testvéreit és magyarul beszélt velök. Hiszen még azt a szót, hogy beszélni, sem érthették volna meg a régi magyarok, mert beszél tiszta szláv kölcsönszó...Olyan magyar nyelv...a milyen a XIII. évszázadban is volt, Ázsiában sohasem létezett, és ha Julián atya valóban meglátogatta a Volga vidékét és az ottani nomádokkal megértette magát, az csak a török nyelvjárás segítségével volt lehetséges. Ámde az nagyon kétséges, hogy volt-e még akkor Magyarországon olyan ember, aki egyenesen Árpáddal hazánkba jött és török nyelvét megőrzött embertől származott (1989:110/1).

If anyone met the Bashkir-Hungarians whom were still speaking in a crystal-clear Hungarian language at the time, what was the Hungarian language they spoke like?! The contemporary (basically: today's) Hungarian? Well, the Bashkirs did not know that Hungarian language, since they only spoke Turkic. Accordingly, is Hungarian Turkic? If so, which one? Supposedly our language has borrowed linguistic elements basically from a Chuvash-type Turkic language², so not a Kipchak-Turkic as the Bashkir was supposed to be. But it is just a 'little' problem. Kipchak or not, Chuvash or not, it does not even really matter. The question is whether the Dominican monks knew one of them? And if they knew, why did they claim that the Turkic language of the "Bashkir-Hungarians" is identical to the non-Chuvash, non-Kipchak, non-Turkic but at that time clearly Hungarian language of Hungary? Or the fathers who had been cited all the time said only that also the people of Magna Hungaria still "today" - in the 13th century! – spoke in Hungarian, that is, not in Turkic(!)? But the Finno-Ugric historians who cite the Bashkir homeland as an evidence, have also said that the Bashkirs not later than the 9/10th century have been already Turks! But if they really were Turks, then they were not Finno-Ugrics, and if Julianus understood them, then the Hungarians were the same with them, but it means Hungarians were not Finno-Ugrics either, but obviously and clearly Turks, and the present Hungarian language is not Finno-Ugric but Kipchak type Bashkir Turkic.

There are two Bashkir tribes, which are supposed to be the same with two Hungarian so-called "tribe" names. One is Jurmaty or Jurmati, which would be the same as Gyarmat (from Kürtgyarmat), and the other is the Jenej, which would be the same as the Hungarian Jenő (Jeneh). This is supposed to be proof of the Bashkir-Hungarian affiliation (cfr. Györffy-Ruitz: 31.). Well, first of all, we did not have any genus with such names- others, because it is very likely that we did not have a national society. Actually, there were no tribes either, since only Emperor Constantine wrote about the so-called "tribes", but the Hungarian tradition does not know about them. Secondly, these are Turkic and not Hungarian words, it is true that the Hungarian "tribe" names are also Turkic, but how could Turks-Hungarians live in Bashkiria, which is the place where Finno-Ugric Hungarians were supposed to have lived in? Or would it have meant that pure Bashkirs came with the Hungarians from Bashkiria? Thirdly, the Gyarmat was originally more Gyermatu or perhaps

² For different opinion see: Marcantonio, 2015:379.

Germat(u). The Jurmati, if I want, is Gyarmat, but if I do not want it then it is not. This is just a matter of "taste". We do not even know what Gyermatu or Gyarmat means, or whether it has anything to do with the Jurmati of Bashkirs or not. When it comes to Jenej, it is a very common Turkic name: it could possibly be a version of the "janal" (~ inal). It is true that our Jeneh is also a name of dignity, presumably with the meaning of "adviser" or "minister". Well, for example, „tarkan” is also a widespread Turkic name of dignity, which is also present in the Hungarian "tribe-name” Tarjan, but is present in the Turkic world too. So if there is an "tarkan" genus-name somewhere, that does not mean that the people are related to us. The Pechenegs have a tribe name Jula, Hungarians have a dignity-name gyula, and also a Gyula gens, but that does not mean that Hungarians and the Pecheneges are the same. The Bashkir Jenej and the Hungarian Jeneh are similar to each other in that they both used a known Turkic name of dignity.

In almost all of today's Hungarian translations, "Bashkiria" is written instead of Baschart / Bascar(t)d and even of Pascatur / Pascaver. However, that is not written there originally. The word Bashkiria is only a hypothesis, but not a fact-value translation.

As far as the pagan Hungarians are concerned, I can only accept the news of Julianus's second trip and Rubruk's information as a credible, because both of them remained within the limits of common sense.

But Rubruk claims that Magna Hungaria's other name is Pascatu (r) (Pascatyr) ~ Pascaver. If it is true, there are some problems with the comparison between these forms and the word Bashkir, since it is hard to read them as Bashkir.

I would like to propose a possible explanation for these forms. These forms can be an attempt to describe the names of Magna Hungaria by the Tatars. The Mongol-Tatar invasion has taken up a large number of Turkic elements, and their military and state organizations showed many Turkic features. The Tatars invoked the conquered peoples in their empire, and placed over their own governor, whose Turkic name was "bascat" or "bastac" or "baskak". We know that the Tartars were supposed to be unable to cope with the "b" sound, which is often pronounced as "p". Let us suppose that the Tartars used the term "governorship" for the former Magna Hungaria. If they did, Magna Hungaria was called with Bascatu-like names. But if they were not able to pronounce the "b" sound, then they pronounced this word as "Pascatu". And exactly this word was written by Rubruk (who, of course, did not go to Magna Hungaria; his information was obtained from some fathers). Thus Magna Hungaria was a semi-autonomous governorship of the Golden Horde in 1253 when Rubruk went to the Tatars. The difference between Carpini's Bascard and Rubruk's Pascatur is not a result of misinterpretation, but it reflects the change in the historical situation. While in 1247 our Hungarians were only Bastards, that is, the suckers of the common Hungarian "family tree", in 1253 they were already residents of the Golden Horde annotated governorship. This may mean that Magna Hungaria was only an occupied area for the first time, which was slowly pacified and later became part of the Tartar empire.

There are problems with the „baschart”/„bascardos” forms too, because actually only the first ‘b’ letter is the same. Moreover, the nature of this sound is quite questionable, since the information about the Bascardos was obtained by the traveling fathers who received this information from other

fathers and from the Tatars, and according to the fathers the Tatars were not able to pronounce "b", and instead they said nothing - or "whatever".

Let us turn to Carpini! He was an Italian who wrote in Latin. Now let us start with the simplest assumption: he wanted to write about the Hungarians who had been disbanded by the Christian Hungarians, and who were completely degenerated because they were pagans. In short: they are the deceased, the unlawful, the rotten, mixed with other blood, so the *bastards* of the common Hungarians. This word is a very common word in other languages too. In German it is der Bastard, in French it is batard, etc. If someone writes in Latin, it is quite plausible that he writes "Bascard" for bastard. The d ~ t voice exchange is quite natural in almost all languages (bascart), and in Latin writings it is very common to replace t ~ c; cf. eg. Dentin ~ Dencia. The solution to the puzzle can be quite simple: the fathers reported about the bastard Hungarians.

Arabic sources

Also due to "b", it is said that the identity of the Bashkirs and Hungarians were already reported by Arab travelers. It is true that there are two authors who can be seen as having considered the Hungarians as Bashkirs. The first Masudi (10th century) who wrote in this way about certain Turks:

We will therefore return to the account of the nations which live in the neighbourhood of Bab el-Abwab, the wall, the Caucasus, the country of the Khazar, and the Alans. On the frontiers of the Khazar towards the west, live four Turkish nations, which derive their origin from the same forefather...Between the king of the Khazar and the lord of el-Lan a friendship exists. They are immediate neighbours of the former. The first of these nations has the name Bajna The second is called Bajkord, the next following nation is called Bajinak and is the bravest of the four. The fourth is called Nukerodah (Novgorod?) (El-Mas'udi, 447.)

From the same thing in his other work:

A burgar s a nomád turkok al-W.l.nd.nya nevű fajtái (a dunai bolgárokról van szó), akiknek neve a rómaiaknak a Kelettel szomszédos legszélső végéinek W.lnd.r (dunai bolgárok meghatározatlan városa) néven ismert városával függ össze; ide tartoznak: Baganak, Yagni, Baggird és Nukabarda” (Kristó,1995:53;57-58.);

The same names are slightly different in Györffy's older edition: bedzsenák, b.dzs.n.j, badzsghird and nu.k.r.da. Today, most of all, P. Golden's opinion in 1975 was accepted that baggird and nu.k.r.da meant Hungarians, and the other two were the Pechenegs. Well, the quoted text does not reveal that baggird and nu.k.r.da are one and the same, but exactly the opposite: the author certainly saw them as two different Turkic people. He also writes about these Turkic peoples that they were the western neighbors of the Alans and the Khazars, and their country partly lied in Meotis, and that Byzantium and the Bulgarians of the Danube made borders with them, and the four "kings" of those four peoples were allies against Byzantium. This would not exclude the fact that the Hungarians were concerned, since around 934 the Hungarians and the Pechenegs actually fought together against Byzantium.

But the described area is definitely the following: in the east, in southeast Alania and Chazaria, in the south the Black Sea and Byzantium, in the west Bulgaria (so the European Scythia, roughly Levédia and Etelköz). The time of the described events are the first half of the 930s and 943-44. At this time, the Hungarians had lived in the Carpathian Basin for over 50 years, not there. The Bashkirs were also out of this area, as they were beyond the Volga. So if the author really identified the Hungarians with Bashkirs, he gave very bad geographic coordinates: those that are not true to these peoples separately either. Moreover, Masudi firmly asserts that these tribes are one people and return their pedigree to a common ancestor. I have not yet heard that Hungarians would ever have brought their pedigree back to the common ancestor with the Pechenegs.

According to Masudi's second work (since he did not know about the first), D'Ohsson thought in his book, published in 1828³ (190 years ago!) in Paris, that "baggird", which was then read as "Badsgar", was not other than Bashkir, and supposedly developing this "modern" outlandish idea, the contemporary Hungarian historiography still believes that Arab sources want to say: Bashkir = Hungarian.

And the Turkic-expert Ármin Vámbéry had long ago - in 1895! - said that D'Ohsson's opinion was nonsensical: badsgar is not a Bashkir, but originally madsgar / madzgar (mazgar ~ madjar), which means Hungarian, and such word was written by Ibn Rusta, following Jayhani, and later Arab scholars have been misunderstood (1989:33;127.). But let us suppose that baggird / badsgar (d) is not "magyar" but really baggird or even bajghird: it does not even mean that this people are Bashkirs or not even that Bashkirs and Magyars are the same, and then it's not that Magna Hungaria is Bashkiria. What there is written in the original manuscript, I do not know, but I was wondering if it was really badsgar or baggird. But who are these baggirds? I suspect strongly that here are Pechenegs. After a few years of the events described by Masudi, the Emperor Constantine wrote about the Pechenegs from who he had separated eight tribes and had taken four –four tribes as one unit. He placed the first 4 tribes beyond the Dnieper River, and he specified the east-south boundaries as Uzia, Chazaria, Alania and Crimea, so precisely those areas that Masudi determined. He said that the second four tribes were neighbors to the west of the Dnieper River, Bulgaria of Danube, Hungary of the Carpathian basin and the Russians of Kijev, that would be roughly the same as the Masudi's western borders (see: Kristó,1995:119-120.). The Emperor thus names the European Scythia of the Pechenegs, roughly Levedia and Etelköz. I think that Masudi spoke about the same people that his contemporary, the Byzantine Emperor, did. So, about some four or two tribes of the Pechenegs.

Note that the Arabs have written only a few vowels (a, u, i), but they are not always marked, and we can also see that even consonants can read differently: so we cannot be sure exactly how words are to be pronounced. As Vámbéry also stated:

Ha tekintetbe vesszük az arab betűknek a diakritikus pontok miatt könnyen ingataggá váló értékét, akkor bizonyára értjük, milyen kevés bizalmunk lehet az arab írásban ránk jutott

³ Des Peuple you Caucase ou Voyage d'Abou-l-Cassim, 1828.

török tulajdonnevekben. A hány kézirat, annyi eltérés e szók átírásában, úgy hogy nagyon kevés kivétellel találgatásra kell szorítkoznunk (1989:123/1.).

The correct reading of Arabic manuscript texts is still a serious task even for an Arab philologist professor! Certainly some people have read Ibn Haukal's "basgird" straightly and without a doubt as "masart", and this way obviously they think it is the same as magyar.

The other Arab proof is al-Balkhi's famous work (9th century), which is really only known from the news as it has been lost in the distant past. This was used by two Arab scholars, al-Istahri and Ibn Haukal (10th century). They know in this way:

Burtasz egy tartomány neve s a (burtaszok) kemény fából épült házakban laknak szerteszéjjel. Kétféle basdsirt van *. /Ibn-Haukálnál imígyen: Basgirt szintén egy vidék neve/. Az egyik fajta a guzzok (oguzok, úzok) végein a bolgárok mögött lakik. Azt mondják, hogy számuk vagy 2 ezer ember. Erdeik védelmében élnek, ezért nehezen támadhatók. A bolgárok alattvalói. A másik basgirt-ok lakóhelyei a besenyőkkel határosak (más fordításban: „a baszdzsirtok legnagyobb része”). Mind ők, mind a besenyők turkok, és ők határosak a rum-mal (Bizánc)...”; „...Burtasz tartományból a besenyőig körülbelül tíz nap alatt jut el az ember. Itilből a besenyők lakta földrészre egy hónap alatt s ugyanonnan Bolgárországba a pusztákon át szintén egy hónap alatt, vízen fel körülbelül két hónap alatt, vízen le körülbelül nap alatt lehet megtenni az utat. Bolgárországból a bizánci birodalom első határáig körülbelül tíz-, s ugyanonnan Kiewig húsz uti állomásra terjedő út van. A Baganak-tól (besenyők) a belső basgirt-ig 10 nap (vagy állomás), a belső basgirt-tól Bulgar-ig 25 állomás van” (Pauler-Szilágyi:240; 242; Kristó,1995:50-51.).

It can be seen from the text that one of the kind of basgirts – the so-called “External basgirts” - according to the most accepted view of history, are either Turkish-speaking Bashkirs or Hungarians of Bashkiria. Károly Czeglédy connected the other kind of basgirts, the so-called “Inner Basgirts”, to the Hungarians living in the Black Sea region (therefore, prior to the Hungarian Home Conquest) (1956), but nowadays it is considered that the Hungarians of the Carpathian basin were mentioned: Hungary was then adjacent to the Pechenegs and indeed the Byzantine Empire was the most important empire thereabout. Thus, the text would represent the state after the conquest (Zimonyi in Kristó,1995:50/122.). Let us suppose that it is true. In this case, the question is where the area of the "outer/external basgirt" is and what the matter is with any basdsirts on the ground of the Burtas, because not only Hungary in the Carpathian basin, but not even Bashkiria can be anywhere near because it was beyond the Volga, while the territory of Burtas was between Don and Volga.

And above all can it be certain that these two types of basgirts were not living in a single area, but thousands of kilometers apart? So how many territories of Basgirt ~ Basdsirt are there? There are two possible interpretations:

One would be that there is a "basgirt" type of people, living in two different kinds of area - that is, independent from each other - one is the subjects of the Bulgarians of Volga and the neighbors of the Uzes, the other is subject of the Pechenegs and live thousands of kilometers from them, near the Byzantine Empire.

According to the other interpretation, however, it seems that the two kinds of basgirts lived in a vast area bordered by Uzes, Bulgarians, Pechenegs and Byzantines: and this area is not other than Scythia, from which in fact Burtasland forms part. Bashkiria had never been between Constantinople and Bulgaria. It is not known which interpretation would be right in this case, but on the other hand, it is certain that the Arab scholar Jakut localized "Basgird Country" as it lied between Constantinople and Bulgaria (Kristó, 1995:69.). This Basgird, however, is not Hungary, but it can be Scythia, or it may be different - the maps of Arabs are poorly mapped – so the south area from the West side of the Bulgaria of Volga to the Black Sea; indeed thitherto was Burtas. Ibn Fadlán, whose work was the base of Jakut's work, went there in 921. The point is that both the users of the work of al-Balkhi and Jakut believed that Basgirtland lied from the Volga to the Byzantine Empire (from Bulgaria of the Volga). This suggests that it is about the area considered Scythia by the European cultural circles. Much more can be said that in their heads the Bulgarian border has started from the area beyond the Volga of Bulgaria.

Wherever these basgirts lived, it's almost certain they were not Bashkirs. They may be either Hungarians or any kind of Turkic people, however. I think, considering the area, they may be some Pechenegs. If I assume that ~~it also~~ the area beyond the Volga can be considered, also in this case we can think of the Pechenegs, because some of them lived beyond the Volga, in the vicinity of the Uzes (outer/external basgird), but most of them lived in the European Scythia.

In addition, they can also be Uzes. The Uzes in other words are Toguz Oguz's (nine oguz), that is, Turks. The most important tribe of the Oguz's is the tribe of bajirku, whose most famous khan is Bajindur.

The Turk Empire conducted a war against them during the Second Caganate, as is clearly written in the inscriptions of Orkhon (Kakuk, 1985:40.). It happened in the first third of the 8th century. Then the Oguz's became part of the Turk Empire for a while. Then they gradually moved westward, conquering from the Aral Sea to the south of the Caspian Sea, then North and Anatolia (but that's another story). The big Samanida governor, Ismail ibn Ahmed, who defeated them in 893, put the katun (princess) in captivity. Masudi, who described the event, did not name them as Oguz, but called them Turks, and did not identify them with the so-called "guzziya" (Uz's). Then the Uzes flew to the occupied areas of the Pechenegs, the Pechenegs to the west and to Etelköz, and the Hungarians to the Carpathian Basin. In the middle of the 10th century, Porphyrogenitus described the country of the Uz's as neighboring to the country of the Pecheneges, Chazaria and Alania. So the Oguz's were the neighbors of the Pechenegs and the Arabs called both peoples as Turks (while the emperor does not call the Uz's or Pechenegs as Turks - but he does the Hungarians).

Let us turn our attention to Masudi. He says the Turks are the following: kimakiya (kimeks), harluhiya (karluks), barshaniya, badiya, gariya, guzziya (Uz's), and certain four peoples: b.g.n.y, baggird, b.g.nak, nuk.r.da. Why should not be the baggird same as the bajirku people? The bajirk can sound in Arabic as badjirk or badjsirt, so it can be written as baggird. And why did they mix them with the Pechenegs? Because they did it for all sorts of Turks, because there were a big confusion for them, they did not see too much difference between Oguz-Turks, Kipchak-Turks, Pechenegs, Bashkirs, Hungarians who were considered as Turks. But how could they have seen the differences at all? What can we say today, what is the difference ~~is~~ between an Iranian, an Iraqi, or even a Palestinian? We just see Arabs. No Chinese could say whether a European is Hungarian or

Swedish. It is almost impossible that the Arabs knew only about the Hungarians from the opaque Turk world that they were the same as the Bashkirs. But Hungarians are not and never were Bashkirs, as far as we can say, Hungarians lived in the Bashkirs' land, and the remaining Hungarians partially fused into the Bashkirs. If Hungarians had already lived there ~~yet~~, how could the Arabs know about it? Masudi could only think that the Pechenegs, the Hungarians, and the Baggirds (who are or Bashkirs, or maybe Oguz-bajirks or anyone else) are related peoples. By the way, Ármín Vámbéry also said that the four Turkic tribes mentioned by Masudi (second work) were only the branches of "Guz's (oguz) or Turkoman" (1989:33.). But Vámbéry did not know about the Bajirks.

It is customary to refer to Sallam interpreter who, in the years of 840's, crossed to the Caucasus due to the Kalifa's desire to find Gog and Magog's gate. Meanwhile, he passed through all kinds of countries. He supposedly called the Hungarians around Don as Bashkirs. Well, what he thought of the Hungarians and whether we ever came to his mind, it will never be revealed, because Sallam himself did not say anything about the Basgirts or the Hungarians when he reported about his trip to Ibn Hordaybah, who wrote the report down; this work was later used by many others.

The Sicilian writer Al-Idris who wrote centuries later, did not only use this original Sallam-report when writing his work, but he is - so it is not Sallam himself - who mentions that after the Alans Sallam and his companions arrived to Filan-Sah (geographically not defined yet), then they traveled along the borders of "Basgirt country" for 17 days.

At the end they had arrived to that particularly legendary land, known from the Legend of Alexander the Great, and almost is literary common place: some smelly and black ground with some ruins, after which they found the wall of Gog and Magog. Sallam did not know about Basgirt, he said that after Chazaria there was the wall of Gog and Magog. However, Chazaria was not mentioned by Al-Idrisi, but he had firmly exchanged this with "Basgirt country". In his time Chazaria had not existed long ago, but the "Basgirt country" somewhere between Volga and Byzantium was almost a compulsory concept. I believe that Al-Idris has put this "Basgirt country" here, because his work sounded "more educated". This, however, means that it is not about the Hungarians around Don in the 9th, but about the Scythian Basgirt. Sallam interpreter therefore proves that only after the departure of the Hungarians from Don's area, the Arabs called Basgirt as "Scythia".

There is also a later news about Basgirds. Jakut, an Arab geographer, quoting Ibn Fadlán, who converts the Volga Bulgarians between 921 and 922, writes about some basgirds in 1224, who cut off the enemy's head and take them with them (the same as Herodotus writes of the Scythians); they eat the louse, and even treat it as fine delicacies they have 12 gods. In addition, one of their tribes honors snakes, the other fishes and the third cranes. Here is also an interesting thing: these basgirds carry a tree penis in their neck, before they bow down and kiss it. We do not know about any ancient Hungarian phallos-cult, and I have never heard of any such Hungarian pantheon of such 12 gods, and I would not even think that the ancestors of Hungarians would have had snake or fish-cult, and there is no information about the cranes. It is sad that Ibn Fadlan wrote so little about these basgirds, it seems like he did not know them very much. He was a very sharp-eyed observer, he wrote about a lot of things, for example the Chazars, the boat trade in Volga, the Russians etc.

Later on, Jakut wrote about the basgirds, this time based on his own experience. About 1220 (before 1224) he met a large tribe in Syria's Aleppo, whose name was al-basgirdiya; „*amelynek neve al-basgirdiya; hajuk és arcuk rőt volt nagyon*”.. They were Muslims who came to the university to study religion and told the scholars that:

Ami országunkat illeti, az Konstantinápolyon túl /mögött/ van, a frankok egyik nemzetének birodalmában, akiknek neve al-hunkar. Mi, muszlimok a királyuk alattvalói vagyunk, országuk egyik szélén mintegy harminc falut képezünk, amelyek mindegyike csaknem egy kisebb országnak (bulaida=város) felel meg, csakhogy al-hunkar királya nem engedi meg, hogy bármelyik körül falat emeljünk, mert attól tart, hogy ellene fellázadnánk /.../ nyelvünk a frankok nyelve, viseletünk az ő viseletük; a hadseregben velük együtt szolgálunk és velük együtt intézünk hadjáratokat /.../ eleink egy csoportja mondta, hogy hosszú időnek előtte országunkba hét emberből álló muszlim társaság érkezett Bulgar országából, akik közénk telepedve jóságosan kioktattak minket arról, milyen tévelygésben vagyunk, s az iszlám vallásának helyes útjára igazítottak minket (Kristó,1995:71-72.).

According to the text, István Zimonyi made the following statement: „„Jáqut szerint tehát a basgird és a hunkar azonos nép, és a két különböző területen élő magyarságot egy címszó alatt tárgyalja” (in Kristó,1995:71/307.). Well, it is clear from the text that these Basgirds were guests in Hungary and the subjects of King Hunkar (András II), but foreigners who have learned the language of the Hungarians (the Frank here probably meant to be the common Roman rite Christian, and not necessarily the Latin language. For the Muslims, there were two Christian people in generous lines: the Rums (Byzantines) and the Franks-Latins (Roman rites), the national differences were hardly noticeable for them).

It also turns out that the scholar had not even accidentally identified the Basgirds with the Hunkars; he knew well that there were two separate people, and it was clear from his writing that he did not consider al-Hunkar and Basgird the same country. And then it is also to notice that these Basgirds are red-haired which is not a typical characteristic of Hungarians. "Redness" would rather refer to some Viking-type people, for example, the Rus's around the Volga (that time these "Russians" are Scandinavians) whom Ibn Fadlan had firmly claimed that they were red. Jakut must have known about this Ibn Fadlan's "red" as well, as he quoted from Ibn Fadlan's work. The question is that why he described as reds the Basgirds of Hungary. Because if they were really reds, and it is not just about Jakut composing something from Ibn Fadlan's text on different topics, then our Muslims are more likely to be Russians than anything else. Or, in principle, they can be retained even for Kirgiz's and Slavs, at least Gardizi says these two peoples were reds. Yakut, being an educated man, would not have called the Hungarian people red-haired Bashkirs. I do not know who these Muslim Basgirds were, but it is almost certain they were not Hungarians nor Bashkirs.

But this certain Basgird-Hungarian relationship might have existed: but only in general terms. The only connecting link is that we all were Turks in the eyes of the Arabs (Yakut does not consider the Hungarians as Turks!). But why would the Hungarians even have been Bashkirs? Let us think about it a little bit! In 1220, redskin Bashkir- Hungarians would live in Hungary? Well, in this case, after 15 years why did not Julianus ask the red Muslim Bashkir Hungarians where the others were? So why did so many monks look for Magna Hungaria? Or are not that Bashkirs-Hungarians, but different Bashkir-Hungarians? But how are they then?

I would say a very simple answer: these Jakut-type basgirds are 'böszörmény' in Hungarian, that is, the settled Muslims.

The böszörmény became a summary name over time, so in essence it was no longer a specific ethnic, but Muslims who became Hungarians. Jakut's work was already mentioned by Ipolyi:

A mennyire t. i. ma már sikerült a történeti vizsgálatnak...mahomedan vallásukról Ismaelita név alatt ismeretes besenyőket (kik Jakutnál is: Frahn de Baskiriis, mint ilyenek ismertetnek), mint nemzetünkkel rokon magyar népség ágat megismerni (1987: XIX.).

At that time, it was commonly believed that the Pechenegs were relatives of Hungarians, though this is only very generalistic (since they are also Turks), but it is true that among the Pechenegs, Islam also conquered, and they are also böszörmény (in fact, the word böszörmény originally meant Muslim Pechenegs). And indeed, in other Arabic texts, it is suspected that the Basgirds are Pechenegs. Originally, probably not the Pechenegs, but Khoresm's kaliz's were our most important Muslims.

The Khoresm's were Iranian Alans; Khoresm was situated in the south of the Aral Sea around the Amu-darja River (today Uzbekistan); this area became later a land for Turkic people. And if these Basgirds are red, then maybe they're not Pechenegs or Kaliz's, but Rus's from nearby of the kaliz's or Kyrgyzs (one of the most important commercial routes was along Khoresm).

So far we have at least four types of Basgirds: 1. the red böszörmény -basgirds, who may be Rus's and / or Kaliz's from Khoresm, or Kyrgyzs or perhaps Pechenegs; 2. the "Scythian-basgirds" (possibly Pechenegs, perhaps Hungarians?); 3. presumably Bajirks, who are Oguz Turks, that is Uz's; 4. as well as among the variety of Basgirds, one can actually be really Bashkirs too. But which one, there is no clear answer. Probably really Bashkirs the Basgird people described by Ibn Fadlan (who in turn could not live in Jakut's Basgird!). Of course, it cannot be ruled out that the Hungarians, who were considered Turks, were sometimes called Basgirds, but exactly where, in my opinion, it cannot be known.

The basdsirt ~ basgird is certainly not a name of a people, but a sort of collective term, like the "Turk" or the "Scythian". The word itself did not always denote the same people, but it could also be used to designate a variety of ethnicities that were associated with some apparent common feature (or nothing).

But there is another solution: Jakut says that there is a Muslim basgirt "tribe" in the Christian Hungary. According to a Western European Arab traveler in the 12th century, a nation called Basjirt lives in the country of Unkuria (Kristó, 1980:48.).

We know that most likely Uz's were settled in Hungary, maybe sometime in the 11th century. Their names are preserved by local names, such as Uz, Uz Uzdi, Uzlár, but we have similar personal names as well. It may even be that the people called black Cumanians in the sources, are Uz's. It cannot be ruled out that the most famous Bajirku-Uz's has moved to Hungary. In this case some of the Hungarians are really Bajirku, if we like it: "basgirt". It is conceivable that basgirt-type folk names appearing in Arabic sources are most commonly referred the same peoples: bajirkus.

However, I emphasize that nothing is certain. Except for one thing: instead of the Hungarian ethnonym, the Muslims wrote something different, most of all the following: in the 9th-10th century "g.f.r" which is either al-h.f.r. or al-g.g.h. (=al-maggar?); „turk”; „al-Mugf.nya” (=maggiriya?); „M.ggriyan”; „m.hfnya”; in the 11th century „magus”; in the 12th century ”m.gg.nya”; in the 13th century „maharaqha” „maggari”, „al-hunkar” – we could continue the line: the point is that it was not a kind of basgirt form at all (see also: Kristó, 1995:19-74.). Mahmud's interpreter then says that the Hungarians came from the province of Adjam. The Muslim Arabs used a distinctive word for the Iranian population living in their territory: "adjam" ("foreign"). The adjam was therefore used to express the Arab-Adjam (Iranian) confrontation, which could be related to the 'magus' ethnonym of Hungarians. And that way we would think well-versed in the magus of our nation.

Since originally writers who followed the Jajhani tradition, supposedly wrote the letter *m* initially, from Masudi perhaps the letter *b*. It seems that the Persian traditions would have written *m* while the Arabs *b*. But the pronunciation of the words is completely uncertain, for example the *maggari* is usually read as a *majgari* (Unknown author: Hadúd al-alam; Persian, the text was written around 982 from which a copy remained from 1258). That is, it also means that a *majgari* or *bajgar* ~ *bajgir* form can easily be interchanged at any time. If these *baggirds* or *basgirts* or *badgjars* somewhere are really some of the Hungarians, not some other - perhaps "unknown" - Turkic people.

I suppose, after all, we can say only the followings here with scientific demand: the followers of al-Bakhli and Masudi perhaps wrote about the Hungarians, and perhaps they wrote *masart*, perhaps *basgirt*, perhaps *basjirt*, perhaps *baggird*, perhaps *badjghird*, perhaps *bazgar*, perhaps *mazgar* or perhaps something else, however it is impossible to know what they thought and how they pronounced the word. All this is like standing on a marsh/slough/moss/swamp: nothing is secure under our feet. From this "nothing is secure" we do not get to the Bashkirs. But not even to Magna Hungaria.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BENDEFY László

1939 Az ázsiai magyarok megtérése. Különlenyomat a «Theologia» 1939. (VI.) 2—3. számából. Bp

CZEGLÉDY Károly

1956 *A magyar népnév legrégebb előfordulásai a forrásokban.* In Bárczi Géza – Benkő Loránd szerk.: Emlékkönyv Pais Dezső hetvenedik születésnapjára. Bp. 268-275.

GOLDEN P

1975 The People Nükarda. Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi 1[1975] 21-35.

GYÖRFFY György (jegyz. és ford.) – GY. RUITZ Izabella (ford.)

1986 Julianus barát és napkelet fölfedezése. Bp.

IPOLYI Arnold

1987 Magyar mytológia. Hasonmás kiadás /1854./. Bp.

KAKUK Zsuzsa (szerk., jegyz., ford.) et alii

1985 Örök kőbe vésvé. A régi török népek irodalmának kistükre a VII-től a XV. századig. Bp.

KRISTÓ Gyula

1980 Levedi törzsszövetségétől Szent István államáig. Bp.

KRISTÓ Gyula szerk. et alii

1995 A honfoglalás korának írott forrásai. Szeged

MARCANTONIO Angela

2015 On the position of Hungarian within the Ural-Altaic Typological Belt: Historical and Political Influences in Journal of Modern Education Review, April 2015, USA

MEYNARD Barbier - COURTEILLE Pa vet

1861-1877. Murüj al-dhahab wa macadin al-jawhar. 1-XJ. Paris (1. 228., 11. 58-64., VIII.144-145.)

MOLNÁR Erik

1953 A magyar nép őstörténete. Bp.

NÉMETH Gyula szerk.

1986 Attila és hunjai. Hasonmás kiadás /1940./. Bp.

PAULER Gyula - SZILÁGYI Sándor szerk.

1995 A magyar honfoglalás kútfői. Reprint /1900./. Bp.

(Rubruk)

le SAGE Bernard - SAWULF

1839 Relations des voyages de Guillaume de Rubruk. Publiées en entier pour la première fois d'après les manuscrits de Cambridge, de Leyde et de Londres, par Francisque Michel et Thomas Wright. Publications de la Société de géographie. Michel, Francisque, Paris, Impr. chez Bourgogne et Martinet

(El-Mas'udi)

SPRENGER Aloys

1841 Meadows of Gold and Mines of Gems, an English translation of the Muruj al-dhahab by Aloys Sprenger, London

VÁMBÉRY Ármin

1989 A magyarság keletkezése és gyarapodása. Hasonmás kiadás /1895./. Bp.

VARGYAS Lajos

1984 Keleti hagyomány – nyugati kultúra. Tanulmányok. Bp.