

sztyeppevidéken követhető, messze Belső-Ázsiában (türk kori rajnikok, ogradkik, kenotáfiumok), a közelmúltban még gyűjthető volt különböző észak-eurázsiai népek között (finnugoroktól az amúri tunguzokig).

Befejezésül az árpási leletről és egyetlen tárgyról. A sírlelet római kori város romjai közé ásva került elő. Üveg pohara, kis agyagkupicája, besimított díszű korszója, arany övé, és cipőcsatjai, szőröcsipesze, de még igazi párhuzam nélkül álló nagy bronz edénye is beleillik az V. századi, hun kori pannóniai környezetbe. Különleges tárgy viszont a csigolyák mellett előkerült aranylemez borítású állatfigura. Vannak párhuzamai a kelet-európai és a kazah pusztákról is (Beljausz, Novogrigorevka, Kzil-Kajnar-Tobe), igazán változatos, nagyszámú előfordulása viszont Tuvából (majd jóval később Kirgiziából) ismert. Itt utalok vissza Rómer Flórisra, aki a kalandjai hasonló leleteket ismertté tette. Máshogy, mint a hun mozgalommal, ez a tárgy nem kerülhetett a Kárpát-medencébe.

Kérem koreiai kollégáinkat: ők nem ismernek-e ilyesmit? Segítségüket köszönettel venném...

THE ROLE OF INNER ASIA IN THE ARCHEOLOGY OF THE MIGRATION PERIOD IN HUNGARY

1. The geographic and chronological frames of this lecture are the following: "Inner Asia" is an artificial name which had been developed according to geographic, historical and (of 20th century) political considerations. Among the several possible interpretations of this name I agree with the one which is generally accepted by Hungarian orientalists (the one represented by Lajos Ligeti in „Ismeretlen Belső-Ázsia” or by Denis Sinor in the Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia).

Inner Asia covers that part of the steppe region which lies to the East from the river Ob and the Tien san Mts., an area consisting practically of a series of high plateaus separated from each other by mountain ridges, as well as its marginal areas (that is the Sayan-Altay region and its foreground, the lower stream of the river Yenisey and Mongolia, N-China and Transbaikalian areas). According to an earlier formulation: the region to the East from the Dzungarian gate (A. Alföldi and Gy. László used the name in this sense in the thirties and forties of this century) where to the East from the present mostly Moslem (Iranian and Turkish) population of Central Asia Buddhism has deep roots among Eastern Turkish, Mongolian and Manchu-Tunguz peoples. The name Inner Asia covers a complicated formation of way of life, culture and history. Like every technical term, it, too, is inadequate. It is because from time to time certain peoples and political formations frequently crossed its frontiers to both directions. Besides, its geographic boundaries are disputable towards every direction.

For example Tibet used to be considered part of Inner Asia, as well as the oasis towns in Turpan and the Tarim Basin, though, they have many contacts with Central Asia. The southern boundary thought to be the river Hoangho and the Great Wall – while everybody agrees that the Ordos region belongs to Inner Asia. As for the eastern boundary, opinions differ on whether Manchuria belongs still to Inner Asia or already to the Far East? The northern frontier is especially „open” – it extends well into the forest zone and cannot be separated from it either historically or ethnologically because of the frequent southward movements of northern peoples

(e.g. Mongols) and also because some groups (e.g. Yakuts) were sometimes forced to move towards the North.

As for me, I confine the scope of my lecture to the grassy steppes with some occasional outlooks towards the four cardinal points – especially towards the East, because of topic of our session.

Chronological frames can be determined more easily. The Migration Period in the Carpathian Basin covers a period of almost half thousand years between the 5th and 10th centuries A.D. This is the subject of archeology of the Migration Period in Hungary. Those population movements which had started beyond doubt from the remote East, like the migration of Huns and later of the Avars and to a lesser extent of late nomad peoples, made Hungarian archeology to be interested in Inner Asia as a possible original home of those peoples which later appeared in our area coming from the East during their westward migrations. Hungarian archeology is interested in Inner Asia also because there it finds (or thinks to find) the – contemporaneous or earlier or later – analogies of certain strange phenomena, alien in the Carpathian Basin. Furthermore several forms, evidences of Migration period way of life were studied in the recent past as subrecent phenomena or perhaps they are part of life even today. In fortunate case these sources available for us (e.g. Chinese annals, Turkic inscriptions, the Secret History of the Mongols, the rich ethnographic record from the Altay Mts. and Baikalian area) help us to explain or to make more understandable those phenomena which we experience here in the western end of the Steppe.

That is why Hungarian archeology was always aware of the importance of Inner Asia. To this interest also some romantic sympathy was added, because earlier the roots of Hungarian people were suspected to be somewhere there. Apart from this, however, there are deep and far-reaching motives in Hungarian people to identify itself emotionally with the Huns and Avars. A national pride, meaning either to seek for glorious ancestors for the nation or to make comparisons declaring that, “see, the famous Huns and Avars had disappeared while we Hungarians could outdo them...” is only one of these motives...

2. Short research historical outline.

Since in the 18th century Marquis Deguignes the great French sinologist, thought to find the ancestors of European Huns and of European Avars in the population groups mentioned in Chinese sources as Hiung-nu and Zuan-zuan, respectively, and since György Pray had agreed this view almost immediately, no serious doubt arose about it almost till our days – in spite of the cautious formulations given by L. Ligeti or of K. Czeglédy's readiness to make compromises or in spite of the resistance of Iranists, either. Certain new discoveries in Inner Asia from time to time aroused great hopes which, however, were only rarely followed by more profound studies.

Making its first tentative steps in the second half of the 19th century Hungarian archeology of the Migration Period was influenced at the beginning by ethnological reports (here I think of Ármin Vámbéry) though almost synchronously with this a stream of informations from the Russian museums towards Hungary had started, too.

Flóris Rómer, father of Hungarian archeology had made a trip to Moscow and St. Peterburg in 1874 where, on the basis of his experiences, he found to be proved that the Hungarian Conquerors had arrived from the Altay region. Besides, he described those finds which Radlov had unearthed in the Katanda cemetery in 1865:

a carved wooden horse, camel and wonder animals, all plated with fine golden sheets. I should like to return this point later, towards the end of my lecture...

Searching for analogies of horse burials Géza Nagy in 1893 (and later Bernát Munkácsi in his supplementary comment paper in 1896) mention the data of Mongol Age travellers (Plano Carpini, Rubruquis, Marco Polo) and also some recent burial customs of certain Eastern Asiatic Mongolian or Turkish tribes – referring first of all to Katanov's collection which was soon published in the 1st issue of *Keleti Szemle* founded in Budapest.

In the meantime another great personality of Hungarian science in that period, Béla Pósta, had an opportunity to study Russian (even also Siberian) collections as a participant of Count Jenő Zichy's Asia expedition. His experiences contributed to the development of his paleoethnographic attitude, an attitude which is coming of age nowadays again. The informations and documents brought home by his expedition and published later served the proof for Géza Nagy to claim the Minusinsk Basin to be the original home of the Avars. His main arguments were the forms of stirrups. Studies on the chronology of the Avar period were considerably promoted by the determination of stone statues holding cups (*kamennaia baba*) as belonging to the Turcs, by the runiform inscriptions (following Radlov's decipherment) and by the use of representations – like the sabre types – on the statues.

Zoltán Felvinczi Takács's activity is worthy of regarding it to be a separate part of oriental studies in itself. Between 1913 and 1935 he wrote several studies on the connection between Hungarian archeological remains and Inner Asia (and the Far East). As is usual in the oeuvre of great scientists, it includes great discoveries – for example it was he who recognized and proved the eastern origin of Hun cauldrons (thought earlier to be Scythian finds), determined their correct chronology and their relations to Chinese ritual vessels – and also some errors – e.g. searching for analogies of Late Avar cast bronze belt ornament in the Far East. However, that time the existence of Far Eastern parallels of Late Avar cast belt ornaments was not an anachronism because a their comparison with the Ordos bronzes and with the bronze pieces of the collection of Peter The Great suggested the Inner Asian origin of this bronze working put erroneously into the Hun period.

We find this attitude even in the first works of Nándor Fettich (*Bronzeguss und Nomadenkunst* 1929), the fact that Zoltán Felvinczi Takács insisted to his error till the end of his life has nothing to do with it. The studies of Radlov, Vámbéry, Katanov and of the orientalist Marquart (*Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, 1903), the discoveries of Sir Aurel Stein in Asia (Innermost Asia, Oxford, 1928), the excavations of the Kozlov expedition in Noin-Ula in 1925 (and Camilla Trever's summary, published in 1932 which was instantly reviewed by András Alföldi), Lajos Ligeti's study tour in China, Manchuria and Mongolia, the recognition of the chronology of antiquities from the Hun and Avar periods, the use of Russian technical literature (*Excavations in N. Mongolia and in the Altay region*) could create a favourable scientific atmosphere which made possible a more and more up-to-date use of these data and more and more exact formulations.

For example, Nándor Fettich, an outstanding researcher of Hungarian archeology of the Migration Period, referred to a figure representing a bone saddle ornament with drawings from Kudyrge (a piece recalled many times since then) already in 1931. He himself made studies in the museums of Russia. He wrote a separate chapter on the culture of nomad equestrian peoples in the Minusinsk region (using Radlov's, Aspelin's and Béla Pósta's data) in the XXI volume of *Acheologica Hungarica* entitled *A honfoglaló magyarság fémművészége*. According to his formula-

tion: „already the Avar invasion, in the middle of the 6th century, had brought related forms from the Altay region”. Here we can take catch the origin of an attitude seems to be accepted even today, that is: everything which exists in the East is a primary phenomenon there, while it is a secondary one when occurs in our country... This means also a beginning of a new period in the researches of connections between the Migration Period and Inner Asia; a regular survey of every data furnished by special literature had started and these informations were continuously introduced by the researchers into their hypotheses.

We have to admit that too much efforts sometimes led to errors. For example Ferenc Móra – who otherwise had a keen eye for ethnographic parallels – misunderstanding S. Solymosi's oral communication, created Uyghur analogies for the Early Avar niche graves which were cited even by D. Csallány in 1939 (burial in standing position). At the same time Tibor Horváth had used Kudyrga as an analogy already deliberately (Üllő-Kiskőrös 1936).

In the large-scale reconstructions of Gyula László (whether he wrote on the Hungarian saddle of Koroncó, or on the golden bow of the Huns or on the Avar society) ethnographic-ethnological references are always present (following especially U. Harva's collections). During the reconstruction of variants of partial horse burial he writes a lot on costumes of Inner Asia and of the Altay region; on the explanation of the world tree and of the animal representations of the Mokrin jar on a shamanistic ground; on the ornamental head-dresses of the reigning princess of Cibakháza and on the representations of the Kudyrga stone, etc.

After the 2nd World War this interest did not come to an end, on the contrary, together with an increase of the quantity of informations, it was becoming more and more definite, exact and comprehensive. Though, except a single attempt, nobody had tried to make a synthesis so far. Real analogies were cited which contributed to chronological questions and to interpretations while ethnic connections had been somewhat overshadowed (which, according to the present of researches, seems to be quite correct). Further on I shall enumerate a few names, problems and some object types, costumes or burial practices related to them to illustrate the nature of these Inner Asiatic connections.

One of the earliest group of finds in the archeological record of Early Avars (the group of ob long-looped stirrups, bridles and slight spears) was determined by Ilona Kovrig (1955) on the basis of finds from Southern Siberia, the Minusinsk region, Khakassia, the Altay region, Northern Mongolia and of the monument of Tang Tai Cong. Béla Kürti (in "Szegec története") made attempts to separate the material remains and costume relics of Avars which could be traced back to Inner Asian traditions from those of Central Asian origin. In his book entitled "Az avarság és kelet" István Erdélyi tried to systematize the material accumulated so far. His main standpoints were: history of research, hypotheses on the Inner Asiatic origin of the Avars, costumes: funeral sacrifices, the analogies of horse burial, types of objects: stirrup and saddle finds and their representations, belt ornament types, hoe-like axe, earring types, types of weapons (chain armour, bow, arrows, swordsabre) and runiform writing, are included among the topics of the book. We have to keep in mind that since the sixties István Erdélyi had organized several archeological expeditions to Mongolia where together his Mongol colleagues he excavated and published finds from the Hiung-nu and Turkic periods.

In his book written on the steppe Csanád Bálint (1989) gives not only the summary of results achieved so far but also a keensighted criticism of them (for example though there are unquestionable analogies of bronze working and of animal

struggle scenes in Asia from the Hiung-nu period, the chronological gap of some 500 years could not be surmounted. Central Asian relations are dominant even if certain objects or costumes could be traced back to an Inner Asiatic origin. Csanád Bálint was the first to make an attempt to summarize the results of Turkic archeology.

Katalin U. Kőhalmi, an orientalist, and not an archeologist was the only one who undertook the task to make a synthesis (*A steppék nomádja, fegyverben, lóháton*).

It was István Bóna who went to the farthest to demonstrate Inner Asiatic connections – as regards both periods. Putting by the problems of Hun period for a while, let me to illustrate at first with the example of the Szegvár publication that almost every object and phenomenon of the Early Avar Period has its Inner Asiatic (and of course also Central Asiatic) relation, analogy. Informations had spread all over the steppe at an incredible speed. Surprising morphological similarities within Eurasia could be the consequences of wanderings, relations, kinship and convergences as well as they even could be the joint results of these factors.

Therefore among the Early Avars horse burial is a tradition of Asian origin (its special forms: burial with two horses or with harness) examples: Kapcály cemetery II. kurgans nos 8. and 13, Kuraj cemetery III., kurgan no. I., Tuva (after Grac), Kudyрге and other graves from the Altay region (type 1. – a horse skeleton to the right of the dead with an opposite orientation, type 2. – to the right with the same orientation: Kudyрге, graves nos. 9, 10, 11, Kapcály II. etc. (12 sites), the genuine Inner Asiatic type is type IV. (Bolsaja Recka XIV., grave no. 49, Mongun Tajga, Baj Tajga, etc. (25 examples, to the left side of the dead, with opposite orientation); there are also burials which contain only horses.

There are four examples of harness burials and it was only partial horse burial whose parallels he had not found, at least no true analogies of them – though since then finds of such kind have been already published from the Baraba steppe, though from a somewhat later period. Writing my study on Mongolian horse burials I myself was aware of this lack. Data available then seemed to refer to a western or a northern origin of the custom while today, first of all on the basis of ethnological data, I prefer the second hypothesis.

Against all the opposite conventions burials with wooden coffins are widespread all over the steppe (Bóna added some new examples to my collections). Besides, neither giving obulus with the dead seems to be a strictly European custom (several examples are known from China, Mongolia and from the Turkic period of Inner Asia). On the area in question the wear of odd earring among males is also present) not only in Central Asia where the examples of it are accumulating but also in the Ob and Altay regions). We find a few beads in male graves there just like in our country in the Avar period. There are examples of loosened belts and swords and quivers taken off and put into graves. As for the shape of certain objects: he quotes an analogy of the Szegvár forehead ornament from the site Mongun-Tajga (naturally beyond Central Asia). Sheet armours can be traced back as far as the Altay, Tuva and even Korea (following Akio Ito he quoted the graves nos. 54/b and 128. at Kyongju). The same is true for the early slight spears, swords with wrist straps, bone pendants, even for the harness.

István Bóna had traced the occurrences of the so-called vessels with cornered rim back as far as Tuva even earlier. I myself tried to complete a map of orientation types. Apart from the appearance of any kind of orientations at any place I could detect some trends as well, that is besides the usual W–E or E–W orientation here

and there a meridional (N-S) orientation occurs as well – and this latter one appears always there where groups arrived from the North are involved.

3. Finally I should like to enumerate some selected examples (from the Hun period) having an eye to Korea as well, and to mention also some problems, still unsolved.

I have already mentioned that the most characteristic Hun object, namely the bronze cauldron, was originated most probably from Inner Asia, from the vicinity of the Great Wall. István Bóna quotes the analogies also in his latest book entitled “Das Hunnenreich”, Apart from this object, however, almost all the other object types stop in Central Asia (not even the artificial deformation of skulls seems to be a Hun custom; it belongs most probably rather to the attached Iranians). The explanation is served by that 2–300 years’ period which European Huns spent somewhere (obviously in Central Asia) before they have crossed the Volga – if the identification of Hiung-nu people with the Huns is correct. Apart from cauldrons there are only the generally widespread object types (like bone nocks of bows, trilateral arrowheads and mirrors which have true Inner Asiatic analogies in this period. Therefore all the more surprising that several phenomena appear in identical or at least in very similar form at just the opposite end of the steppe, that is in Korea. It is well-known that certain diadems of the Hun age have „mushroom-like” decorations which were a great mystery of research until the funeral crowns of the Early Silla period had become known on which there are true tree-ornaments (shaman-trees, world tree (?). In a royal grave with a golden crown from Kyongju there was also a glass vessel which is the product of a Persian or a Syrian workshop – a clear proof of Western connections!

It is characteristic that the much debated Borovoe Scucij find (Kazakhstan) was removed from the Hun period by István Bóna on the very basis of the Korean analogy, that is of the dagger ornaments found in grave no. 14 of the above-mentioned locality and was put into the Hephthalite period – since this precise analogy is from a period after 520 S.D.!

From Korea we may quote also saddle-bows covered with sheets with scale pattern, long swords, harness, bows, etc. In these cases we should not think of convergences. We may reckon with the insufficiencies of research (we have only very limited knowledge on the intermediate areas before the Turkic period), though we must not exclude the existence of direct contacts. It is hard to get away from the ideas that Korean „shamanistic” – though not not belonging to shamans – crowns have relations with headdresses from Transbaikalian (Oroc, Tunguz) areas and that the origin of the European Huns is not yet settled completely. There are a lot of arguments which suggest their Turkish character, though Lajos Ligeti (following P. Pelliot) raised that some – still unknown – Paleoasian people had had to participate in the Hun (Hiung-nu) ethnogenesis. This could be an even more evident explanation of the Koran contacts (related origins). We know that the Hun power in Asia had left strong marks in Transbaikalia which can be traced archeologically as well, here I mention only the Ivolga fortified settlement.

As for the studies of my own made on the Hun period, it was the interpretation of a strange find, the Pannonhalma find, which had turned my attention to Inner Asia. The find consists of two bridles, two sets of harness, saddle fittings with scale pattern, two swords (one of them is extremely richly ornamented with an inlaid alamandine decoration set in gold on the cross piece of the hilt and scabbard fittings with scale pattern and at last of a bow with true golden end – and grip covers – and they are not part of a burial. A whole series of great Hun finds were

found under similar circumstances and they have analogies even from the Avar period. The custom, that is a funeral sacrifice, buried separately (I do not call them pyre finds because there are no burn marks on the Pannonhalma objects) can be traced through the whole steppe region as far as Inner Asia (tajniks from the Turkic period, ogradki, cenophtas). The custom was observed among different Northern Eurasian nomads (from the Finno-Ugrians till the Tunguz at the Amur) even in the recent past.

Finally I should like to speak of the Árpás find and of a single object. The burial find was found dug into the ruins of a Roman town. The glass vessel, small earthen cup, jug with slurry, golden girdle- and shoe-buckles, hair pincers of the find, but even its large bronze vessel, which has no true parallels known so far, fit well into the 5th century, that is into a Pannonian environment in the Hun period. However, an animal figure covered with golden sheet, found beside the vertabrae, is a peculiar object. It has analogies from both Eastern Europe and the Kazakhstan steppe (Beljaus, Novogrigorevka, Kzil-Kajnat-Tobe) but a great quantity and different variants of it are known from Tuva (and from Kyrgyzia, from a considerably later period). Here I should like to return to an earlier part of my lecture where I spoke of Flóris Rómer who had made the similar Katanda finds to be known. It seems impossible that the above-mentioned object could get into the Carpathian Basin in other way than through the migration of the Huns.

And I should like to ask our Korean colleagues whether they know finds like this one? I would be grateful for their help...