

Princes and dignitaries in the ninth–tenth-century Magyar tribal federation

SÁNDOR LÁSZLÓ TÓTH



This study analyzes the leadership of the Hungarians in the age of their conquest, i.e. their conquest and settlement in the mid-Danubian basin (or Carpathian basin) in the ninth–tenth centuries. It deals with the titles and functions of the princes and dignitaries, the structure of leadership and the persons, who held these ranks.

The Hungarians, who called themselves Magyars (or Seven Magyars – ‘*Hetűmogyer*’) appearing in written sources under different names (*Turks, Ungri, Huns, Savartoi Asfaloi* etc.) lived from the 830s north of the Black Sea, between the Danube and Don rivers. Their huge dwelling places were called Levedia and Etelköz by Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII (945–959) in his famous work, *De Administrando imperio* (cited as DAI).¹ The Hungarians formed a tribal federation, which consisted of seven tribes (Nyék, Megyer, Kürtgyarmat, Tarján, Jenő, Kér and Keszi).² A dissident Khazar group, consisted of three tribes and called Kavars (Qabars) revolting against the ruling Khazar government joined the Hungarian tribal federation before 881, probably in the 860–870s.³ The Hungarians – apart

¹ For Levedia (Lebedia) in chapter 38 and Etelköz (*Atelkouzou*) in chapter 38 and 40 of DAI, see Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*. Vol. 1. Greek text ed. Gy. Moravcsik, English trans. R. J. H. Jenkins. Washington 1967. (henceforth: DAI) 170–173, 176–177; for the different hypotheses concerning these ancient homelands of the Hungarians cf. Constantine Pophyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*. Vol. 2, Commentary. ed. R. J. H. Jenkins, London 1962. (henceforth: Commentary) 147, 148; Gy. Kristó, *Hungarian History in the Ninth Century*. Szeged 1996, 107–112, 154–158; S. L. Tóth, *Levediától a Kárpát-medencéig* [From Levedia to the Carpathian Basin], Szeged 1998, 41–60.

² For the Greek form of the names of the Hungarian tribes see chapter 40, cf. DAI 174–175.

³ For the history of the Kavars (*Kabaroi*) see in chapter 39, DAI 174–175; they (*Cowari*) raided and fought in the borderlands (Ostmark–present-day Austria) of the East Frank

from an early phase in the 830s, when they might have been enemies of the Khazars – were military allies or rather vassals of the Khazar Khaganate. Emperor Constantine recorded, that the Hungarians “lived together with the Chazars for three years, and fought in alliance with the Chazars in all their wars.” The khagan even gave in marriage a noble woman to the first known Hungarian leader, Levedi. This marriage clearly shows the strong political bonds between the Khazar Empire and the Hungarian tribal federation. Later the khagan invited Levedi and offered him that “we may appoint you prince of your nation, and you may be obedient to our word and command.” Levedi politely refused the offer and recommended another Hungarian leader, Álmos or his son, Árpád. Levedi came back with the men of the khagan and the Hungarians chose Árpád and “made him prince according to the custom or zakanon of the Chazars, by lifting him upon a shield.”⁴ The election of the first Hungarian prince as reflected in the Byzantine source demonstrates the determining role of the Khazars. This two “Khazar episodes” of DAI; the Khazar marriage of Levedi and the election of Árpád prove that strong personal bonds tied the Hungarian leaders to the Khazar khagan.⁵ This may have resulted in the dependence of the Hungarian tribal federation up until their westward migration and conquest in the mid-Danubian basin in 895–900.⁶ It is a debated question, however, whether the Hungarians became independent in the 870–880s, as reflected in Muslim sources like Ibn Rusta and Gardizī, or not.⁷ It is a fact, that in spite of their Khazar alliance or dependence, besides attacking the neighboring Slav tribes the Hungarians led westward

Empire together with the Hungarians (*Ungri*) in 881, see *Continuatio Annalium Ivavensium Maximorum*, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptorum*. (henceforth: MGH SS) Vol. XXX/2. Hannoverae–Lipsiae 1934, 742; cf. *Commentary* 149–150; put their revolt and joining to the Hungarians around 780 H. Schönebaum, “Zur Kabarenfrage,” in *Aus der byzantinischen Arbeit der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*. I. Berlin 1957, 142–146; around 850 see Kristó, *Hungarian History*, 149–154; between 862 and 881 cf. Tóth, *Levediától*, 61–78.

⁴ For the story of Constantine, recorded in chapter 38, see DAI 170–173.

⁵ For the analysis of these two Khazar episodes of DAI see Tóth, *Levediától*, 130–144.

⁶ The vassal status of the Hungarians lasted till their conquest in 895–900, cf. I. Zimonyi, “Préhistoire hongroise: méthode de recherche et vue d’ensemble,” in *Les Hongrois et l’Europe: Conquête et Intégration*. Paris–Szeged 1999, 41.

⁷ For the informations of contemporary Muslim writers about the Magyars (Hungarians) in Hungarian translation cf. Gy. Kristó, ed., *A honfoglalás korának írott forrásai* [The Written Sources of the Conquest] Szeged 1995, (henceforth: HKÍF) 29–38; for the English translation of the report of Ibn Rusta see C. Macartney, *The Magyars in the Ninth Century*. Cambridge 1930, 206–207; for the French translation of his text, see G. Wiet, *Ibn Rusteh. Les atours précieux*. Le Caire 1955, 160–161; for the English translation of Gardizī’s text, see Macartney, *The Magyars*, 206–207; for the theory of the Hungarians becoming independent in around 830, cf. Gy. Györffy, *Tanulmányok a magyar állam eredetéről* [Studies on the Origin of the Hungarian State] Budapest 1959, 79; around 870–880s see Kristó, *Hungarian History*, 170–173.

raids of their own several times (e.g. in 862, 881, 892, 894, 895).⁸ At the same time the number of their warriors (20,000 men) were higher in contemporary Muslim sources, than that of the Khazars (10,000 men).⁹ Even if we take into consideration that there were other vassal people of the Khazar Empire (e. g. the Burtas with 10,000 men), one cannot suppose a Khazar military advantage over the Hungarians. In this respect, we can suppose a weak, formal dependence of the Hungarians.

At the end of the ninth century, around 895, a westward migration of steppe people may have taken place.¹⁰ As part of this process, the Oghuz tribes allied with the Khazars, defeated and expelled the Pechenegs living between the Volga and the Ural. The Pechenegs made war against the Hungarians, and perhaps due to their numerical superiority, defeated them and occupied the Hungarian territories (Etelköz).¹¹ The Pechenegs might possibly be the allies of the Bulgarians, who wanted to avenge a Hungarian raid. The Hungarians were hired by Byzantine Emperor Leo VI (886–912) to fight the Bulgarians in 895, and defeated the Bulgarian ruler, Simeon, in preliminary encounters, but lost the final battle.¹² Besides participating in the Bulgarian–Byzantine war, the Hungarians took part in the conflicts in Central Europe in the last decade of the ninth century. In 892 the Hungarians supported King Arnulf of the East Frank Empire against Prince Svato-
topluk of Moravia; then in 894 they devastated Pannonia (western Danubian

⁸ For the raids or campaigns of the Hungarians in the ninth century, cf. S. L. Tóth, “Les incursions des Magyars en Europe,” in *Les Hongrois*, 204–205; Tóth, *Levelektől*, 145–168.

⁹ For the 20,000 warriors of the Hungarians (it means two great military units consisted of 10,000 men called tumen), cf. Ibn Rusta and Gardīzi, see *HKÍF* 32, 35; Wiet, *Ibn Rus-
teh*, 160; for the 10,000 warriors of the Khazars (i.e. one tumen) M. Kmoskó, *Mohamedán írók a steppe népeiről. Földrajzi irodalom* [Muslim Writers on the People of the Steppe. Geographical Literature] vols. I/1 and I/2, ed. I. Zimonyi, Budapest 1997, 2000. I/1. 205; for comparing these data see, Tóth, *Levelektől*, 141; the Khazar standing army was estimated in ninth–tenth century at 10–12 thousand men by D. Ludwig, *Struktur und Gesellschaft des Chazarenreiches im Licht der Schriftlichen Quellen*. Münster 1982, 286–292.

¹⁰ For the Muslim sources of this migration of people (Tabari, Masudi) in Hungarian translation cf. *HKÍF* 57–59, 60; for the hypothesis of this great migration of people in the 890s, cf. B. Hóman, Gy. Szekfű, *Magyar történet* [Hungarian History] vol. 1, Budapest 1935², 116; I. Zimonyi, *The Origins of the Volga Bulgars*. Szeged 1990, 169; Kristó, *Hungarian History*, 182.

¹¹ For these wars cf. *DAI* 166–167 (chapter 37), 170–173. (chapter 38), 176–177 (chapter 40); the Pecheneg attack against the Hungarians were mentioned in the chronicle of Regino in 889, cf. *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum ad usum scholarum. Reginonis Abbatis Prumiensis Chronicon*, Rec. F. Kurze, Hannoverae 1890, 131–132: “a finitimis sibi populis, qui Pecinaci vocantur, a propriis sedibus expulsa est, eo quod numero et virtute prestarent”; cf. for the Hungarian–Pecheneg wars cf. S. L. Tóth, *Az etelközi magyar–besenyő háború. [The War between the Hungarians and the Pechenegs in Etelköz]*, *Századok* 122 (1988), 541–576; Z. J. Kosztolnyik, *Hungary under the early Árpáds, 890s to 1063*. New York 2002, 85–88.

¹² Cf. Kristó, *Hungarian History*, 182–189; S. L. Tóth, “Hungarian–Bulgarian Contacts in the Ninth Century,” *Hungaro–Bulgarica* 5 (1994), 71–78.

parts) as allies of the Moravians.¹³ Owing to these raids and wars the Hungarians came to know their future homeland, the mid-Danubian basin. At the end of the ninth century this territory was possessed by three neighboring states: the East Franks (Pannonia or west Danubian parts), the Moravians (Highlands, i.e. north of the Danube) and the Bulgarians (southern parts of the region and what is later called Transylvania).¹⁴ The divided nature of this region made it easier for the Hungarians leaving their homeland (Etelköz) to conquer and settle it. It is probable, that at first, around 895 or later, they occupied the territories east of the Danube, then by 900 they invaded the western parts of the Carpathian basin as well. The East Franks and the Hungarians divided the collapsing Moravian state by 902. With the appearance of the Hungarian tribal federation a new political unity was achieved in this region. For the European states Christian and Muslim (in the Iberian-peninsula) alike it meant a new menace besides the Viking attacks. For the next half century the nomadic Hungarian tribes led regular, yearly raids against different parts of Europe. Most of these campaigns were successful and brought much booty for the Hungarian warriors. It took time for the Christian states to get used to the new, nomad tactics of the Hungarians (riding on horseback and shooting arrows). At last Otto I defeated the Hungarians at Augsburg (Lechfeld) in 955 and afterwards the Hungarian raids were directed mostly towards the Byzantine empire until their defeat at Arkadiopolis in 970.¹⁵ The end of the raids combined with the Christianization of the Hungarians and the spread of agriculture resulted in important inner changes in the nature of the Hungarian tribal federation. This process led to the development of the Hungarian Kingdom symbolized by the coronation of Stephen (Saint) I in 1000/1001.

Having outlined the main political events of ninth–tenth-century, we have to focus on the political structure and leadership of the Hungarian tribes. Two major sources mention titles concerning the Hungarians. One of them, the so-called Jayhani tradition is constituted by the works of Muslim geographical writers. Besides the Arab Ibn Rusta (around the 910–920s) and the Persian Gardīzī (around 1050s) other Muslim writers, like al-Bakri, Marvazi, Aufi and the mysterious Hudūd al-Ālam and the late, fifteenth century Turkish Sukrullah preserved the lost work of al-Jayhani. The period described by the Muslim writers in connection with the Hungarians and other people is a debated question. It is probable that these reports referred to at least partly around 870–880 and perhaps to

¹³ For the raid of 892 and 894, see *Annales Fuldenses, Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum ad usum scholarum. Annales Fuldenses*. Rec. F. Kurze, Hannoverae 1891, 121–122, 125–126; for its analysis cf. Kristó, *Hungarian History*, 175–177; Tóth, *Levediától*, 148–151.

¹⁴ For the political situation in the Carpathian Basin on the eve of the Hungarian Landtaking, see Kristó, *Hungarian History*, 180–181; Kosztolnyik, *Hungary*, 88–91.

¹⁵ For the Hungarian raids cf., for instance, G. Fasoli, *Le incursioni ungarie in Europa nel secolo X*. Firenze 1945; Sz. Vajay, *Der Eintritt des ungarisches Stammesbundes in die europäische Geschichte*. Mainz 1968; Gy. Kristó, *Levedi törzsszövetségétől Szent István államáig*. [From the Tribal Federation of Levedi to the State of Saint Stephen] Budapest 1980, 229–392; F. Makk, *Magyar külpolitika (896–1196)* [Hungarian Foreign Policy 893–1196], Szeged 1996, 9–29; Tóth, *Les incursions*, 201–222.

around 920.¹⁶ The text of Ibn Rusta may be considered the most relevant of them. He reports, that "their (i.e. the Magyars) king rides out with horsemen to the number of 20,000 and this king is called *K.nd.h*. But this denotes only the title of their king, for the man, who is really a ruler over them, called *G.l.h*. All the Magyars accept the orders of their chief, *G.l.h* in the matter of war and defence and others."¹⁷ Gardizī repeats the same passage a bit shortened and with slight modification: "their leader rides out with 20,000 horsemen and they call this chief Kanda (*K.nd.h* – T. S. L.), and this is the name of their greater king, and that chief, that superintends their affairs they call *Jula* (*G.l.h*. – T. S. L.) and the Magyars do whatever *Jula* commands."¹⁸ It should be noted, however, that the other Muslim writers mentioned only one Hungarian chief; most of them (Al-Bakri, Marvazi, Afi and Sukrullah) the *k.nd.h* and only one source (Hudūd al-Ālam) referred just to the *h.l.t.*, probably the *G.l.h*.¹⁹ On the basis of the Muslim sources, namely the Jayhani tradition, we can suppose, that there were two leaders in the Hungarian tribal federation at the end of the ninth century. One of them was called *k.nd.h.*, which is interpreted by scholars as *kündü*, *kündä* or *kende*.²⁰ This title may be identified with the name *kndr* (*kündür*) khagan of the third Khazar dignity mentioned by Ibn Fadlan in 921–922.²¹ It is noteworthy, that the late Hungarian chronicles and the *Gesta Ungarorum* by Anonymus listed a person named Cundu among the seven chieftains.²² This personal name may reflect the long existence of a title in the Hungarian tribal federation. The other rank is the *G.l.h*, which can be identified with the title 'gülas' of Emperor Constantine in 950.²³ Scholars interpreted this rank as *gyula*. Similarly to the dignity of *kündü* (*kündä*) it has been preserved in chronicles as a personal name of a Hungarian tribal chief at the time of conquest.²⁴

The other important source of Hungarian dignities is Emperor Constantine's fundamental work, *DAI*. Although this work was written around 948–952, it contained not only contemporary descriptions and references, but earlier reports and information as well. As far as Hungarians are concerned, Emperor Constan-

¹⁶ Cf. Kristó, *Hungarian History*, 101–105; Kmoskó, *Mohamedán írók*, I/1. 199–202.

¹⁷ Cf. the Hungarian translation in *HKÍF* 32–33; Kmoskó, *Mohamedán írók*, I/1. 207–208; the English translation is not accurate, so I could not really use it, cf. Macartney, *The Magyars*, 206; for the French translation see, Wiet, *Ibn Rusteh*, 160.

¹⁸ For this translation see Macartney, *The Magyars*, 206; for the Hungarian translation cf. *HKÍF* 35.

¹⁹ Cf. *HKÍF* 39, 42, 44, 47.

²⁰ Cf. L. Ligeti, *A magyar nyelv török kapcsolatai a honfoglalás előtt és az Árpád-korban* [The Turkish Connections of the Hungarian Language before the Landtaking and in the Arpadian Age] Budapest 1986, 484.

²¹ A. Zeki Validi Togan, *Ibn Fadlan's Reisebericht*. Leipzig 1939, 99; for the identification of these two dignities see e. g. Kristó, *Hungarian History*, 136.

²² E. Szentpétery, ed., *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*. 2 vols. Budapestini 1937–1938 (henceforth: SRH), 1: 41, 166, 291.

²³ *DAI* 178–179. (chapter 40).

²⁴ *SRH* 1: 41, 166, 290.

tine could base Chapters 38–40 relating the past affairs and the present state of the Hungarians (Turks–*Tourkoi*) and Kavars (*Kabaroí*) on the personal stories of Termacsu (prince Árpád's great grandson) and Bulcsú, who were his guests in 948. A report of a Byzantine envoy to the Hungarians, cleric Gabriel also might be a source for these chapters.²⁵ According to the Byzantine emperor the Hungarians earlier "had never had over them a prince either native or foreign, but there were among them 'voivodes', of whom first voivode" was Levedi.²⁶ The situation changed, when on the initiative of the Khazar khagan the Hungarians elected a prince (*arkhón*) and according to the Khazar ceremony lifted Árpád on the shield.²⁷ The voivodes (*boebodoi*) may be considered as chieftains of the seven tribes without any special functions. However, Levedi, as first of the chieftains (*prótos boebodos*) may be regarded the leader of the Hungarian tribal federation.²⁸ This is reflected by the fact, that the khagan gave him a noble Khazar woman in marriage and later offered him the dignity of prince. Even Emperor Constantine once named Levedi as *arkhegos*, which may be considered equivalent to the title of *arkhón* used by him to denote the first rank among the Hungarians.²⁹ At the same time he twice stated that before the election of Árpád there had been no *arkhón* ('prince') among the Hungarians and he emphasized the continuity of this dignity in the family of Árpád.³⁰ Besides Levedi, just the father of Árpád, Álmos has been mentioned as "a voivode other" (*heteros apo emou boebodos*).³¹ However, these voivodes were not regarded princes by Emperor Constantine. It is very probable, that the federation of the seven Hungarian tribes were led not only by these two voivodes (Levedi and Álmos), but there were other chieftains. It is to be emphasized, that although the two voivodes (Levedi and Álmos) would correspond to the two titles (*kündü* and *gyula*) of the Muslim sources, according to the logic of chapter 38, there were only one prince of the Hungarians elected before their conquest.³² In this respect, there is contradiction between the report of the Muslim sources and Chapter 38 of DAI.

²⁵ For the possible sources of the "Hungarian chapters" of DAI, see *Commentary* 146.

²⁶ DAI 170–171; for the Slav origin of this title see M. Gyóni, *A magyar nyelv görög feljegyzéses szórványemlékei*. [The Relics of the Hungarian Language Recorded by Greeks] Budapest 1943, 33.

²⁷ DAI 172–173.

²⁸ Cf. F. Makk, "Levedi, a fővajda," [Levedi, the leading voivode] in G. Klaniczay, B. Nagy, eds. *A középkor szeretete. Történeti tanulmányok Sz. Jónás Ilona tiszteletére*. Budapest 1999, 189–196.

²⁹ For the title *arkhegos*, see DAI 172–173 (38/30). This title is used by Constantine in connection with Arab rulers (caliphs) denoting princes in DAI, cf. the remark of F. Makk to the lecture of Gy. Kristó, see in Gy. Kristó, *A korai magyar államról* [On the Early Hungarian State] Budapest 1996, 31–32.

³⁰ DAI 170–173.

³¹ DAI 172–173, (38/43).

³² Earlier some Hungarian scholars supposed that before 889 Levedi as *kündü* and Álmos as *gyula* led the Hungarians, then Árpád was elected as prince, cf. Gy. Pauler, *A magyar nemzet története Szent Istvánig* [The History of the Hungarian Nation till Stephen the

Emperor Constantine gives a more detailed account on the titles of the Hungarians in Chapter 40. According to him “these eight clans of the Turks do not obey their own particular princes, but have a joint agreement to fight together with all earnestness and zeal upon the rivers, wheresoever war breaks out. They have for their first chief the prince who comes by succession of Árpád family, and two others, the *gyilas* and the *karchas*, who have the rank of judge; and each clan has a prince.”³³ In this chapter he named Árpád as the “great prince of Turkey” (*mezas Tourkias arkhón*) and his grandson, *Falicsi* as “the present prince” (*ton nūni arkhónta*). The emperor emphasized that “*gyilas* and *karchas* are not proper names, but dignities”, stated that “*karchas* is a dignity, like *gyilas*, which is superior to *karchas*” and mentioned Kál and his son, Bulcsú, as holders of the rank *karchas*.³⁴ The information of this chapter may refer mainly to the leadership of the 940s and had been probably derived from the Hungarian visitors of 948, Termacsu and Bulcsú. If we compare this description concerning the leaders of the Hungarians with the information in Chapter 38, there are relevant differences between them. First of all, the chieftains of tribes called “princes” (*arkhón*) and not voivodes (*boebodos*). Secondly, Árpád is called in Chapter 40 “great prince” (*mezas arkhón*), while just “prince” (*arkhón*) in Chapter 38. The emperor probably wanted to emphasize with the epitheton ornans *mezas* the difference between the leader of the tribal federation and the simple chieftains of the tribes.³⁵ The denomination, first chief (*proté kefalé*) in connection with the prince deriving from the family of Árpád also outlines the leading position of Árpád and his successors. The third and main difference between the information of the two chapters, that while Chapter 38 mentions only one *arkhón* (Árpád), Chapter 40 refer to two additional leaders (*gyilas*, *karchas*) besides the *arkhón* from the family of Árpád. Of course, the report concerning the contemporary state of Hungarian leadership (around 950) can be regarded more precise than the possibly “oral tradition” referring to the ninth century Hungarian leaders and titles. Nevertheless, it seems probable, that there may have been certain real differences between late ninth century and mid-tenth century Hungarian leadership both in the numbers of dignities and their function.

We may compare the information of Muslim geographical literature referring to about 870–880 with the retrospective “oral tradition” of Chapter 38 relating to late ninth century and the contemporary mid-tenth century report of Chapter 40 of DAI concerning Hungarian dignities. According to an earlier hypothesis, at first two dignitaries, the *kündü* and the *gyula* led the Hungarians. In 889 a prince (great prince) was elected and besides him the *gyula* and later the *karchas* directed

Saint] Budapest 1900, 19, 25; B. Hóman, *A magyarok honfoglalása és elhelyezkedése* [The Conquest and Settlement of the Hungarians] Budapest 1923, 20, 22.

³³ DAI 178–179.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ Cf. on the title F. Makk, “*Megas arkhón*,” in F. Makk, *A Turulmadártól a kettős keresztig*, Szeged 1998, 67–80.

the tribal federation.³⁶ According to other scholars there had already been three dignitaries among the Hungarians before the conquest at the end of the ninth century; the *kündü*, the *gyula* and the *karchas* (leader of the joining Kavars).³⁷ It is probable, that in the ninth century there were only two leaders in the Hungarian tribal federation, the *kündü* and the *gyula*.³⁸ The *k.nd.h* dignity of the Muslim sources can be identified with the probably Khazar title *arkhón* or *megas arkhón* Árpád got from the Khazar khagan (chapter 38 and 40). The dignity of *kündü* (*kündä*) or *arkhón* mentioned first in these sources and held the first place in the hierarchy of chieftains. The *G.l.h.* of the Muslim sources must surely be identified with the *gülas* of chapter 40 of DAI. This title, the *gyula* signified a rank, which stood in the second place of the hierarchy. The title *karchas* seems to be established after the conquest, perhaps in the 910s or rather in the 920s. Emperor Constantine listed just Kál and his son as officials holding this dignity. Bulcsú could already participate in the raid of 942 and was the leader of the Hungarian campaign of 955, which meant a defeat for the Hungarians and the end of his life.³⁹ If we regard Bulcsú as *karchas* for about two decades (from about 935–940 till 955) by counting back similarly two decades for Kál as *karchas*, we may estimate the appearance of this dignity at around 915–920.⁴⁰ Similarly the third place in the hierarchy may prove that this dignity was established the last. This rank cannot be connected with the *arkhón* of the three Kavar tribes mentioned in chapter 39 of DAI,⁴¹ since the holder of this title, Bulcsú, belonged to the seven Hungarian tribes as testified by the list of Ibn Hayyán (942) and by later Hungarian chronicles as well.⁴² It is a disputed question, whether any of the mentioned dignities, namely the *kündü*, the *gyula* or the *karchas* may be identified with the *arkhón* of the Kavar tribes or not, and they had their own prince.⁴³ The three titles of chapter 40

³⁶ Cf. Note 32.

³⁷ J. Deér, "Le probleme du chapitre 38 du de Administrando imperio," *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientale et Slave* 12 (1952), 102–110; Ligeti, *A magyar nyelv*, 485; A. Róna-Tas, *A honfoglaló magyar nép* [The Hungarian People of Conquest] Budapest 1996, 272.

³⁸ Cf. Kristó, *Levedi törzsszövetségétől*, 217–228; Tóth, *Levediatól*, 100.

³⁹ The name of Bulcsú (Wulgudi) can be found in a list of seven Hungarian leaders (emirs) mentioned by Muslim chronicler Ibn Hayyán in 942, cf. *HKÍF* 63–64; for his death in 955 cf. e. g. *HKÍF*, 152–153, 342.

⁴⁰ Cf. S. L. Tóth, "Magyar törzsszövetségi méltóságok 870–950 között," [Dignities of the Hungarian Tribal Federation between 870 and 950] *Acta Universitatis Scientiarum Szegediensis. Acta Historica* 113 (2001), 24.

⁴¹ For the *arkhón* of the Kavars see *DAI* 174–175.

⁴² For the information on Bulcsú as one of the seven emirs, cf. Ibn Hayyán, *HKÍF* 63–64; as one of the seven leaders cf. the chronicle of Kézai, *SRH* I. 167; fourteenth century chronicle composition, *SRH* 1: 292.

⁴³ For the theory, that the Árpád family was of Kavar origin, so the prince or *kündü* (*arkhón*) was Kavar, cf. J. B. Bury, *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire. From the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I. (A. D. 862–867)*. London 1912, 426; R. Grousset, *The Empire of the Steppes. A History of Central Asia*. New Brunswick 1970. 178; L. Várady, "Revision des Ungarn-Image von Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 90

clearly refer to all the eight tribes including the Kavars as well. However, as mentioned, the dignity of *karchas* should be excluded because Bulcsú belonged to the seven Hungarian tribes. The election of Árpád is described in chapter 38 dealing with Hungarians, so the first dignity of *kündü* or prince (*arkhón*) may be probably related to the seven tribes and not the Kavars. So only the dignity of *gyula* can be assumed at all, considering the important role of Kavars in wars emphasized by Emperor Constantine in Chapter 39.⁴⁴ However, if the name of the first chieftain in 942 may really be identified with the title *gyula*, the Kavar *arkhón* could not hold this rank.⁴⁵ Presently we cannot connect these dignities with specific tribes, Hungarian or Kavar, though it seems probable that the *kündü* and *gyula* of the ninth-tenth century and the *karkhas* of the tenth century belonged to specific Hungarian tribes, while the Kavar tribes had one prince of their own.

After clarifying the number of dignities before and after the conquest, we must focus on their functions and role. Earlier some of the scholars supposed, that the *kündü* represented the Khazar rule over the Hungarians as some kind of a commander-in-chief, while the *gyula* as the main judge embodied the efforts of the Hungarian tribes for getting independent.⁴⁶ This hypothesis was based partly on the report of Muslim sources, since it interpreted the riding of the *kündü* with the 20,000 horsemen as leading them in war. In case of the *gyula* the description of Emperor Constantine was used concerning his judicial function. Later theory regarded the *kündü* a sacral prince, while the *gyula* as a real ruler, namely the commander-in-chief.⁴⁷ This concept was based on the testimony of Muslim sources concerning both Hungarian dignities and neglected the Byzantine description concerning the function of the *gyula*. The influence of the so-called

(1989), 34–35; the Árpád family was not Kavar, but the eldest son of the ruling prince governed the Kavar tribes as duke, cf. J. Marquart, *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*. Leipzig 1903. 52, 522; Györffy, *Tanulmányok* 1959. 83; the Kavar *arkhón* was the *gyula*, see for this hypothesis Macartney, *The Magyars*, 116; G. Vékony, "Egy kazár felirat a Kárpát-medencében," [A Khazar Inscription in the Carpathian Basin] *Életünk* 1987/4, 383; for the *karchas* as the Kavar *arkhón* cf. footnote 37; for an independent Kavar ruling dynasty, the Aba family, cf. Hóman-Szekfű, *Magyar történet*, I. 67–68; Kristó, *Hungarian History*, 128.

⁴⁴ DAI 174–175; cf. further Macartney, *The Magyars*, 116.

⁴⁵ For the identification of 'T.x.x.la' with 'gyula' cf. K. Czeglédy, "Új arab forrás a magyarok 942. évi kalandozásáról," [A New Arab Source on the raids of the Hungarians in 942] in K. Czeglédy, *Magyar őstörténeti tanulmányok*. Budapest 1985, 132, 136; I. Elter, "Néhány megjegyzés Ibn Hayyán a magyarok 942. évi kalandozásairól szóló tudósításához," [Some Remarks to the Report of Ibn Hayyán concerning the Hungarian Raid in 942] *Magyar Nyelv* 78 (1981), 413–419.

⁴⁶ Hóman, *A magyarok honfoglalása*, 20; G. Fehér, "Bulgarisch-ungarisch Beziehungen in den V–XI. Jahrhunderten," *Keleti Szemle* 19 (1921), 120; recently Kosztolnyik, *Hungary*, 3.

⁴⁷ Györffy, *Tanulmányok*, 80–83; K. Czeglédy, "A szakrális királyság a steppei népeknél (a kazároknál és a magyaroknál)," [The Sacral Kingship at the People of the Steppe (Khazars and Magyars)] in Czeglédy, *Magyar őstörténeti tanulmányok*, 214–215; Kristó, *Levedi törzsszövetségétől*, 217–220.

Khazar sacral dual kingship was emphasized, where there was a sacral king (khagan) without executive power and his substitute, the real king (isad or beg) commanding the army and governing the empire.⁴⁸ It was a disputed question, however, whether the Hungarian government could be identified with the sacral dual kingship of the Khazar-type or it was just a dual kingship. Some scholars emphasized on one hand the similarities in the descriptions of Muslim sources concerning the formal activities of the Khazar khagan and the Hungarian *kündü*. On the other hand they referred to the sacral murder of the khagan and the mysterious death or murder of Álmos mentioned by the fourteenth century chronicle compilation. As a conclusion in both cases they supposed a sacral dual kingship.⁴⁹ Other researchers supposed, that the formation of sacral kingship needed a considerable time and a higher level of economic and social development, so there must have been relevant differences between the more refined Khazar system and the Hungarian institutions. So the Hungarian tribes had just two dignitaries (*kündü* and *gyula*) and their system was a simple dual kingship.⁵⁰

Before forming an opinion of the nature and origin of the leadership of the Hungarian tribes in the ninth–tenth centuries, a closer examination of the sources is needed concerning the leaders of the Hungarians and their functions. It seems very probable, that the *kündü* should be considered the first in the hierarchy. He was mentioned before the *gyula* by Ibn Rusta and Gardizī. Similarly, Emperor Constantine considered the prince (*arkhón*) from the family of Árpád as “first chief” (*proté kefalé*) or “great prince” (*megas arkhón*) in comparison with other tribal chieftains. In his list of ranks the prince (*arkhón*) precedes the *gyula* and the *karkhas*, among the other leading dignitaries of the Hungarians. If we accept the hypothesis, that the *kündü* of the Muslim sources can be identified with the prince (*arkhón*) of Constantine, regarding their first place in the hierarchy, we must assume, that the *kündü* was the more powerful. His position and power may be compared with that of the khagan. The khagan was the first dignity in Khazaria, though his activities were restricted to the sacral sphere, he kept in touch with the heavenly gods. He did not leave his country, lived mostly in his palace and was rarely seen. He had contact just with the most important leaders, mainly with his deputy, the beg (or isad). Once in a while he rode out with his army, but there must be a mile distance between the khagan and his troops. Even his birth and his death were of sacral nature. The khagan’s rule was terminated on his fortieth year and after that he was murdered. He was sacrificed earlier if some kind of a natural catastrophe or military disaster occurred. So the Khagan was held responsible for the fortune and well-being of his people and empire.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Czeglédy, *Magyar őstörténeti tanulmányok*, 210–216.

⁴⁹ Cf. Czeglédy, *Magyar őstörténeti tanulmányok*, 210–216; Gy. Kristó, “A honfoglaló magyarok politikai szervezete,” [The political structure of the Conquering Magyars] in *A honfoglalás 1100 éve és a Vajdaság*. Újvidék 1997, 75–79.

⁵⁰ Cf. Györffy, *Tanulmányok*, 141–142; Róna-Tas, *A honfoglaló magyar nép*, 269–271.

⁵¹ On the role of the khagan, cf. Ibn Rusta, see Kmoskó, *Mohamedán írók I/1*. 203; Istakhri, cf. Kmoskó, *Mohamedán írók*, I/2. 28, 30–31; Masúdi, cf. Kmoskó, *Mohamedán írók*, I/2.

In case of the Hungarian *kündü* the Muslim sources mentioned only one of his functions, namely that he rode out with 20,000 horsemen. Otherwise, both Ibn Rusta and Gardīzī emphasized the nominal role of the *kündü* and the effective power of the *gyula*. Emperor Constantine did not relate about any function of the prince (*arkhón*) from the family of Árpád, unless the subordinate clause, "who have the rank of judge" refer to the prince as well, not only to the *gyula* and the *karkhas*.⁵² In case of the *gyula* and the *karkhas* the reference to their judiciary function is quite clear, while as far as the prince is concerned the source is vague. So the role of the *kündü* should be clarified mainly with the help of the Muslim sources. However, the interpretation of the passage about the riding out of the *kündü* presents some problems. It is evident, that this function of the *kündü* may be of a military nature. At the same time, it is a debated question, whether the passage refers to his real military command, the leadership of raids,⁵³ or to his symbolic, ritual leadership.⁵⁴ Both interpretations may be confirmed with Khazar analogies. Ibn Rusta and Gardīzī related, that the substitute of the khagan, the *isad*, "rode out with 10,000 horsemen" and personally led the raids against the Pechenegs.⁵⁵ In this case the *isad* must be connected with this military function, the leadership of raids or campaigns. Ibn Fadlan mentioned, that if the khagan rode out, his whole army followed him, but a mile distance separated the khagan from his horsemen.⁵⁶ As far as this story is concerned, the symbolic leadership of the khagan must be emphasized. It is not easy to choose between the two possible Khazar analogies. Since the *kündü* was mentioned first among the Hungarian dignitaries like the khagan among the Khazar leaders, and their nominal roles were emphasized, it seems probable, that the riding out of the *kündü* can be regarded as ceremonial, expressing his first, leading position in the Hungarian tribal federation.⁵⁷

172; for the English translations of Ibn Rusta, Gardīzī, Ibn Fadlan and Istakhri on the Khazars see Macartney, *The Magyars*, 197–202, 218–222; for the analysis of the Khazar government see D. M. Dunlop, *The History of the Jewish Khazars*. Princeton 1954, 96–98, 104–105, 110–114; M. I. Artamonov, *Istorija Hazar*. Leningrad 1962, 261–266; Ludwig, *Struktur*, 165–190; P. B. Golden, *Khazar Studies*. 2 vols. Budapest 1980, 1: 97–102; A. P. Novoselcev, *Hazarskoe gosudarstvo i evi rol v istorii vostocnoj Evropi i Kavkaza*. Moskva 1990, 134–144; Róna-Tas, *A honfoglaló magyar nép*, 128–129, 193.

⁵² For supposing the judiciary function of the prince cf. Gy. Rohonyi, *A honfoglalás története* [The History of the Conquest] Budapest 1896, 93; Tóth, *Magyar törzsszövetségi méltóságok*, 27–28.

⁵³ See Note 46.

⁵⁴ See Note 47.

⁵⁵ For Ibn Rusta, see Kmoskó, *Mohamedán írók*, I/1. 204–205; for the English translation cf. Macartney, *The Magyars*, 199–200.

⁵⁶ Cf. Gy. Györffy, ed., *A magyarok elődeiről és a honfoglalásról*. [On the Ancestors of the Hungarians and on the Conquest], Budapest 1975². (henceforth: MEH) 98; Togan, *Ibn Fadlan*, 44–45.

⁵⁷ For the two possible interpretations and the Khazar analogies cf. Tóth, *Levediától*, 105–106.

For the sacral nature of this dignity we have no contemporary sources like in the case of the Khazar khagan. Considering later sources, such as the Hungarian chronicles, the miraculous birth of prince Árpád's father, Álmos and his death can be mentioned. According to the totemistic legend, an eagle-like bird (called Turul) begot Álmos.⁵⁸ The death of Álmos is similarly interesting, at about the time of the Hungarian conquest (895) he was killed in Transylvania.⁵⁹ Accepting the testimony of these late chronicles of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries Álmos was regarded by some scholars as the first sacral prince or *kündü* of the Hungarians. His death was considered a sacrifice due to the defeat from the Pechenegs and the loss of the homeland (Etelköz) in 895. Besides, it was assumed, that his rule lasted more than forty years (from the 850s till 895), which resulted in his sacrifice following the Khazar customs.⁶⁰ Although it is possible to compare the sacral death of the khagan with the murder of Álmos, some scholars have objected to this interpretation. The possible causes of the khagan were recorded by contemporary Muslim sources, while the death of Álmos was mentioned in a chronicle centuries later. The expression of the chronicle, that “father Álmos was killed, namely he could not enter Pannonia” is rather vague and obscure.⁶¹ It can be assumed, that according to the chronicler Álmos belonged to the earlier homeland of the Hungarians and therefore he could not enter the new country, like Moses in the Bible.⁶² Although Álmos was regarded as the first prince of the Hungarians by Anonymus and some other chronicles, other chronicles mentioned Árpád as the first ruler, so even the late Hungarian tradition may have been ambiguous in this question.⁶³ However, based on Hungarian information around 950, Emperor Constantine regarded Álmos as a voivode second in the hierarchy and Árpád as the first prince (*arkhón*) elected in Etelköz before the conquest (895). The story of election at Etelköz has been much debated in historiography. It was assumed that the Byzantine emperor was deceived for some reason

⁵⁸ Cf. SRH 1: 38, (*Anonymus, Gesta Ungarorum*) 264 (fourteenth-century chronicle compilation).

⁵⁹ Cf. SRH 1: 287 (fourteenth-century chronicle compilation).

⁶⁰ For Álmos as a sacral prince or *kündü*, cf. e. g. J. Deér, “A IX. századi magyar történet időrendjéhez,” [To the Chronology of the ninth-century Hungarian History] *Századok* 79–80 (1945–1946), 13–16; D. Dümmerth, *Álmos, az áldozat* [Álmos, the Victim], Budapest 1986; Gy. Kristó, *Honfoglaló fejedelmek: Árpád és Kurszán* [Princes of the Conquest: Árpád and Kurszán], Szeged 1993, 16–23, 43–46; Kristó, *Hungarian History*, 165–166.

⁶¹ SRH 1: 287. “*pater Almus in patria Erdelw occisus est, non enim potuit in Pannoniam introire.*”

⁶² Cf. for the biblical comparison Vékony, *Egy kazár felirat*, 383.

⁶³ For Álmos as the first prince, cf. Anonymus, see SRH 1: 39–40; the chronicle of Várád and Zágráb, cf. SRH 1: 206; the chronicle of Albericus Trium Fontium, cf. F. A. Gombos, *Catalogus fontium historiae Hungaricae I. Budapestini* 1938, 23; for Árpád as the first prince see the chronicle of Kézai, SRH 1, 165; fourteenth-century chronicle compilation, cf. SRH 1: 287; for the duality of the Hungarian tradition see, S. L. Tóth, “Az első fejedelmek: Árpád vagy Álmos?,” [The First Prince: Árpád or Álmos?] *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis de Attila József nominatae. Acta Historica* 113 (1996), 31–41.

by either Bulcsú or the great grandson of Árpád, Termacsu, and in fact Álmos was elected prince in Etelköz.⁶⁴ I would prefer the much earlier, mid-tenth century Hungarian tradition conveyed by Emperor Constantine in chapter 38 of DAI to the ambiguous tradition of the late Hungarian chronicles. Therefore the dubious information concerning Álmos are not enough for assuming a sacral principality.

So if Árpád was regarded the founder of the ruling dynasty around 950, he must have been the *kündü* elected in the earlier homeland of the Hungarians. The leading role of Árpád is confirmed by the chronicle of Georgios Monachos Continuatus (written around 960), who mentioned that the Byzantine envoy met two Hungarian leaders at the Lower Danube, namely Árpád and Kusán, and asked them to attack the Bulgarians in alliance with Byzantium (895).⁶⁵ So Árpád can be considered the first leader of the Hungarian tribes. He was elected as prince (*arkhón*) or *kündü* (perhaps in the 880s), made an agreement with the Byzantine envoy to attack Bulgaria (895) and then he was expelled with his people from Etelköz by the Pechenegs.⁶⁶ He had four sons, one of whom may have followed him as *kündü* after he died, probably in the first decade of the tenth century.⁶⁷ His qualities were emphasized by Emperor Constantine while describing the election and the Khazar ceremony of lifting him upon a shield. He was characterized as “he was of superior parts and greatly admired for wisdom and counsel and valor and capable of rule.”⁶⁸ Though this description of his capability (*ideoneitas*) reflects a topos, the necessary qualities of a prince (noble origin, brave and wise), it can be supposed that in the eyes of his contemporaries and for the generation of his grandsons Árpád really represented an outstanding personality, who had the power and founded a ruling dynasty.⁶⁹ Summing up the functions of the *kündü* and the role of the first known Hungarian prince, Árpád, we can mention the

⁶⁴ Bulcsú deceived the emperor, because it was Álmos who defeated his people, the Kavars, cf. Dümmerth, *Álmos*, 28–30; Termacsu deceived the emperor for the sake of the Árpád-dynasty, excluding the possible other offsprings of Álmos, cf. Kristó, *Honfoglaló fejedelmek*, 29–30.

⁶⁵ Cf. HKÍF 147; Gy. Moravcsik, *Az Árpád-kori magyar történelem bizánci forrásai*. [The Byzantine Sources of the Hungarian History in the Age of the Árpáds] Budapest 1984. (henceforth: ÁMTBF) 147.

⁶⁶ DAI 172–173. “The Pechenegs fell upon the Turks and drove them out with their prince Árpád” (chapter 38/56–57).

⁶⁷ For his family; the list of his sons and grandsons, cf. DAI 178–179; Anonymus put his death at 907, which can be considered just a relatively good estimation, cf. SRH 1: 106; a hypothesis put his death at 900, cf. Kristó, *Levedi törzsszövetségétől*, 354–355.

⁶⁸ DAI 172–173 (chapter 38/50–51).

⁶⁹ For the characterization of Árpád, cf. S. L. Tóth, “Levedi és Árpád személyisége,” [The Personality of Árpád and Levedi] *Acta Universitatis Szegediensis Acta Historica* 107 (1998), 11–15; I. Zimonyi, “The Concept of Nomadic Polity in the Hungarian Chapter of Constantine Porphyrogenitus *De administrando imperio*,” in *Historical and Linguistic Interaction between Inner-Asia and Europe*. ed. Á. Bertha, Szeged 1997, 464–467; for the life and role of Árpád cf. Tóth, *Levediától*, 121–125.

probably ceremonial and symbolical leadership ("riding out") of the military force of the tribes, the participation in negotiations with foreign envoys and in the making of decisions concerning raids (Bulgarian campaign of 895). Although the office of the Hungarian *kündü* shows similarities with the dignity of the Khazar khagan, it seems to me, that it did not become a real sacral institution in the Hungarian tribal federation. Though the khagan probably offered the third Khazar chief dignity (*kndr khagan*) to the Hungarians and Árpád was inaugurated into his office with a Khazar ceremony, the Hungarians just imitated the Khazar system and did not fully reproduce it. On the one hand only the first dignity of the Hungarians was certainly of Khazar origin, in case of the second rank, the *gyula* a similar Khazar title is not known.⁷⁰ On the other hand after the election of Árpád, the Hungarians soon emigrated and settled in the Carpathian basin, so the Khazar influence ceased. Afterwards, with the appearance of a new dignity (*karchas*), the dual principality changed into a kind of triple principality.⁷¹

The second dignity of the Hungarian tribes was the *gyula*. Although in hierarchy it was preceded by the *kündü* or prince, this was an important office. In the end of the ninth century the *gyula* and not the *kündü* was considered the real leader of the Hungarians by the Muslim writers. Ibn Rusta and Gardizī emphasized that all the Hungarians accepted the orders of the *gyula* "in the matter of war and defence and others."⁷² It is evident that the *gyula* was basically a military official, the commander-in-chief of the Hungarians at that time. His function clearly included the leadership of offensive raids and the organization of defense during these campaigns.⁷³ His role can be compared with that of the deputy of the Khazar khagan, called *isad* or *beg*, who organized and led raids.⁷⁴ The *beg*, besides leading the raids, directed state affairs, imposed punishment and kept in touch with the vassal rulers and his superior, the khagan.⁷⁵ Both the *gyula* and the *isad/beg* had the effective power, the real command. The only difference between their functions was, that in case of the deputy ruler of the Khazars, his governing and judiciary tasks were mentioned as well by Muslim sources, while in case of the *gyula* only the military leadership was emphasized. On one hand this difference may be explained with the fact, that we have more sources about the political institutions of the Khazars, than of the Hungarians. On the other hand, according to Emperor Constantine, the *gyula* was a judge.⁷⁶ It can be assumed, that perhaps the *gyula* had not only military, but judiciary power as well

⁷⁰ This title was connected the Bulgarian clan name, Dulo, cf. Hóman-Szekfű, *Magyar történet* I. 28; Macartney, *The Magyars*, 39; one Pecheneg tribe was called Jula, which might be originating from a name of a rank, cf. Ligeti, *A magyar nyelv*, 254, 534; however, the *gyula* was held a Khazar dignity by Ligeti, *A magyar nyelv*, 484–485.

⁷¹ For this theory cf. Tóth, *Magyar törzsszövetségi méltóságok*, 28.

⁷² See Notes 17–18.

⁷³ Cf. Tóth, *Levediától*, 107–108.

⁷⁴ The report of Ibn Rusta, see Kmoskó, *Mohamedán írók*, I/1. 204–205; Macartney, *The Magyars*, 199–200.

⁷⁵ Cf. Ibn Fadlan, see *Togan*, Ibn Fadlan, 43–44; MEH 96–97.

⁷⁶ *DAI* 178–179.

in the late ninth century. The other possibility would be, that the functions and role of the *gyula* diminished in the tenth century.⁷⁷ It is worth noting, that while the Muslim sources referred just to the military functions of the *kündü* and the *gyula*, Emperor Constantine but related the judiciary functions.⁷⁸ It is impossible to suppose, that the military functions of the Hungarian dignitaries changed into judiciary functions, since the Hungarians led numerous raids in the tenth century as well. I think, that the *gyula* was the substitute of the *kündü* in both military and judiciary affairs. It means, while the *kündü* was just the nominal leader of the warriors, the *gyula* really could organize and led them in raids. The *kündü* might have had some judicial function, but the *gyula* was a real judge. However, it is probable, that the importance of the *gyula* may have diminished with the appearance of the *karkhas* in the tenth century, because two dignitaries shared the military, judiciary and perhaps some governing functions as deputies of the *kündü*. It is a debated question, who wore this dignity around the end of the ninth century. Both Álmos and Árpád were considered *gyula* by some scholars; but regarding the election of Árpád it is not at all probable.⁷⁹ Kusan (Kusal) could be the *gyula*, since he really led raids from about 895 till his death in 904.⁸⁰ Though he was supposed to be the sacral prince, *kündü*,⁸¹ since Anonymus named his father as Cundu,⁸² this theory seems unfounded. On the one hand, Anonymus had no idea, that Cundu was really a dignity and not a name and tried to connect with him a certain Kursan, who might or might not be identical with the real Kusan/Kusal of the contemporary historical sources. On the other hand, if Kusan had been a sacral ruler, he would not have led raids.⁸³ The dignity of the *gyula* was inherited in a clan, so it could become later a personal name as reflected in the Hungarian chronicles.⁸⁴

⁷⁷ For the diminishing role of the *gyula*, cf. Györffy, *Tanulmányok*, 142–143.

⁷⁸ According to an interpretation of the passage concerning the main dignitaries of the Hungarians around 950 in chapter 40 of DAI, it refers to the military leadership of the Hungarians and denotes at the same time state functions as well; the main commander-in-chief was the prince and there were two other commanders, the *gyula* and the *karchas*, who were judges, too, cf. J. Ungváry, “Kephale,” in *Studia Varia. Tanulmányok Szádeczky-Kardoss Samu nyolcvanadik születésnapjára* [Studies for the 80th birthday of Samu Szádeczky-Kardoss] eds. F. Makk, I. Tar, Gy. Wojtilla, Szeged 1998, 148–151.

⁷⁹ For Álmos as the *gyula* till 889, cf. Hóman–Szekfű, *Magyar történet*, I. 66, 70–71; Györffy, *Tanulmányok*, 79, 84, 142–144.

⁸⁰ For his participation in the negotiation with the Byzantine envoy in 895, cf. Georgius Monachus Continuatus, ÁMTBF 59; for his death in 904, cf. *Annales Alemannici*, MGH SS I. 54, 77; HKÍF 202; for the name and role of Kusan/Kusal cf. Kristó, *Honfoglaló fejedelemek*, 53–93; for him as the *gyula*, see Macartney, *The Magyars*, 178.

⁸¹ For this hypothesis cf. Györffy, *Tanulmányok*, 78, 142, 159; similarly I. Fodor, *Verecke híres útján...* [On the Famous Road of Verecke] Budapest 1975, 203, 232.

⁸² For this information of Anonymus, cf. SRH 1: 41. “Cundu pater Curzan”.

⁸³ For the criticism of the Kusan-theory cf. Kristó, *Levedi törzsszövetségétől*, 167–169.

⁸⁴ For the dignitaries wearing the name of Gyula, cf. entries in *Korai magyar történeti lexikon (9–14. század)*. [Lexicon of Early Hungarian History, 9–14. Centuries] eds. Gy. Kristó (editor-in-chief), E. Pál, F. Makk, Budapest 1994, 245.

The *karkhas* seems to be a new dignity in the Hungarian tribal federation, established probably after the conquest.⁸⁵ The third place in the hierarchy clearly shows, that it is a relatively new rank. It is highly probable, that till around 950 only Kál and his son Bulcsú wore this title.⁸⁶ Besides the judiciary function referred to by Constantine we can assume, that the *karkhas* was a military commander too. It is a fact that Bulcsú led raids till his death in 955.⁸⁷

To sum up the conclusions, we may state, that the Hungarian tribal federation elected Árpád as a prince or *kündü* on the initiative of the Khazar khagan. Soon another dignity was established, the *gyula*. Although the Hungarian *kündü* can be considered the first dignitary, similarly to the khagan, he had just symbolic functions, while the *gyula*, like the *isad/beg* represented the real, effective power. This dual principality resembled the sacral dual kingship of the Khazars, although there might be some minor differences between them. The connections with the Khazars ceased after the Hungarian conquest, so the political institutions of the Hungarians changed a bit with the appearance of a third dignity, the *karkhas*. While the *kündü* from the family of Árpád may be regarded as the ruler with nominal functions, his deputies, the *gyula* and the *karkhas* exercised the military and judiciary power.

⁸⁵ For the title of *karkhas* cf. the entry of A. Márton, in: *Korai magyar történeti lexikon*, 269.

⁸⁶ Cf. Note 39.

⁸⁷ Cf. Note 39 and 40.