

T. Mukhazhanova¹ , **G. Sabdenova²** , **D. Baigunakov³** 

¹Candidate of historical sciences, associate professor, e-mail: tolkynm3010@gmail.com

²candidate of historical sciences, associate professor, e-mail: gulmiras2801@gmail.com

³Doctor of historical sciences, associate professor, e-mail: dosbol_bs@mail.ru

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty

SOME HISTORIOGRAPHIC PROBLEMS OF THE HUNGARIAN HISTORY (in the context of Turkic ethnic culture)

The study of the ethnic history of the Hungarian people is one of the actual issues in historical science. The ancient history of the formation of the Hungarian people as an ethnos is undoubtedly interesting for nomadic civilization and settled nations. Their distinctive difference from other European nations is in their deeply rooted ethnic history. In addition, the proto-Hungarian language formed 1 millennium BC, then Hungarian's historical origin dates back to 2,500 BC. Nonetheless the first true written sources appear in the IX century. The close connection of this ethnos, called Magyars in general history, with the nomadic Kypchaks required difficult turning points in historiography. If we look at the history of Magyars before the IX century, we see that they need to be considered from the point of view of a single nomadic civilization. However, historical data on the western part of the Hungarians who settled on the banks of the Danube and Tisza were preserved only in Western chronicles. And the historical data on eastern hordes were found in Arab and Persian sources. However, until the present time, a large amount of data related to Hungary is composed of Western data.

Key words: Hungarian, Magyars, Kypchaks, ethnogenesis, historiography.

Т. Мухажанова¹, Г. Сабденова², Д. Байгунаков³

¹Тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент, e-mail: tolkynm3010@gmail.com

²Тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент, e-mail: gulmiras2801@gmail.com

³Тарих ғылымдарының докторы, доцент, e-mail: dosbol_bs@mail.ru

әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

Мажарлар тарихының кейбір тарихнамалық мәселелері (этникалық мәдениетіндегі түркілік контекст)

Мажар халқының этникалық тарихын зерттеу тарих ғылымында өзекті мәселелердің бірі болып табылады. Мажарлардың этнос ретінде қалыптасу барысындағы ежелгі тарихы көшпелі өркениет пен отырықшы халықтар үшін де қызықты екені сөзсіз. Олардың көптеген еуропалық халықтардан ерекшелігі оның этникалық тарихының тереңде жатқандығында. Егер б.э.д., I мыңжылдықта қалыптасқан протомажарлық тілді қосымша қарайтын болсақ, онда мажарлардың тарихи шығу тегі б.э.д., 2,5 жылдықтан бастау алады. Бұған қарамастан мажарлар туралы алғашқы шынайы жазба деректер тек IX ғасырларда ғана пайда бола бастады. Жалпы тарих сахнасына мажарлар деген атпен шыққан бұл этностың көшпелі қыпшақтармен байланысының тығыз болуы тарихнамалық мәселелерде күрделі бетбұрыстарды қажет етті. IX ғасырға дейінгі мажарлардың тарихын қарастыратын болсақ, олардың біртұтас көшпелі өркениеті тұрғысынан қарастырылуы қажеттігін байқаймыз. Алайда, Дунай мен Тисса жағалауына қоныстанған мажарлардың батыс бөлігі үшін тарихи деректер тек батыстық хроникаларда сақталған. Ал, сол кездегі шығыста қалған ордалардың деректері араб, парсы деректерінен көрініс тауып отыр. Дегенмен қазіргі күнге дейін мажарларға байланысты үлкен бір тобын батыстық деректер құрастырып отыр.

Түйін сөздер: мажар, мадияр, қыпшақтар, этногенез, тарихнама.

Т. Мухажанова¹, Г. Сабденова², Д. Байгунаков³

¹Кандидат исторических наук, доцент, e-mail: tolkynm3010@gmail.com

²Кандидат исторических наук, доцент, e-mail: gulmiras2801@gmail.com

³Доктор исторических наук, доцент, e-mail: dosbol_bs@mail.ru

Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби. Казахстан, г. Алматы

Некоторые историографические проблемы венгерской истории (тюркский контекст в этнической культуре)

Изучение этнической истории венгерского народа является одним из актуальных вопросов исторической науки. Древняя история формирования венгерского народа как этноса, несомненно, интересна для кочевой цивилизации и оседлых народов. Их отличие от многих европейских стран заключается в их глубоко укоренившейся этнической истории. Если мы посмотрим в дополнение к прото-венгерскому языку, сформированному в I тысячелетии до нашей эры, то венгерское историческое происхождение восходит к 2500 году до нашей эры. Тем не менее первые подлинные письменные источники появляются почти в IX веке. Тесная связь этого этноса, называемого в общей истории мадьярами, с кочевыми кыпчаками требовала трудных переломных моментов в историографии. Если мы посмотрим на историю мадьяров до IX века, то увидим, что их нужно рассматривать с точки зрения единой кочевой цивилизации. Однако исторические сведения о западной части венгров, обосновавшихся на берегах Дуная и Тиссы, сохранились только в западных хрониках. А исторические данные о восточных полчищах были найдены в арабских и персидских источниках. Однако до настоящего времени большая группа данных, относящихся к Венгрии, состоит из западных данных.

Ключевые слова: мадьяры, венгры, кыпчаки, этногенез, историография.

Introduction

Hungarians have a special place in the national historiography. Because the original territory of the Hungarians, their historical homeland is connected with Kazakhstan and neighboring regions. Some scientists believed that Hungarians appeared in the Urals, others in Western Siberia, some scientists called other places. Different specialists (historians, ethnographers, linguists, philologists, orientalists, etc.) still cannot give an unambiguous answer to different questions about the history of Hungarians (Laszlo, 1978; Bevezetes a magyar ostortenet kutatásának forrasaiba I: 2.: 1988). The history of the Hungarians, especially the early history, is still insufficiently studied. This shows the relevance of this study.

Since the XIX century several Hungarian scientific expeditions were sent to Russia. They were led by true enthusiasts. Members of the expedition and connoisseurs, fans of the history of the Hungarians studied various topics. Among them were J. Ernei, A. Reguli, I. Horvat, I. Diarfash, B. Munkachi, E. Zici, B. Posta, J. Janko and others (Rona-Tas, 1995; Veres, 1997). Especially in Russian historiography, the theory of kinship between Magyars and Polovtsians is still widely used. This theory was put forward at one time – I. Diarfash. This theory is not currently a success in academic circles, but nevertheless it and other works have shown interest among Russian scientists. It

should be noted here, that the works of J.E. Fisher, G.F. Miller, V.N. Tatishchev, N.M. Karamzin, K. Grot and others. Of course, these studies were far from historical reality in their scope, but nevertheless they laid the foundation for the study of the history of the Hungarians (Deer Jozsef, 1993; Balint, 2006).

Archaeological works have increased since the second half of the twentieth century. Interest in the theme of Hungarian history has increased. Various specialists have joined the research. Finno-Ugric researches, study of ethnogenesis of Turkic peoples (Bashkirs, etc.) also gave an impulse to research of Proto Hungarian history. Later there were interesting works of some scientists, such as N.A. Mazhitov, G.I. Matveeva, V.A. Ivanov, V.P. Shusharin and others.

For our part, we want to analyze some points in the history of the Hungarians. Especially we want to analyze various aspects of ethnogenesis and ethnic history of Hungarians in the Soviet and Kazakh historical science. Therefore the purpose of our article is to conduct a brief historiographical review of the above mentioned problem of Hungarian history. It comes only from the desire to study this problem as fully as possible.

Methodology

First of all, the article uses a comparative-historical method, which allows to consider the essence of the phenomenon under study by their similari-

ties. As a theoretical and methodological basis of research are works of foreign and domestic historians whose heritage differs multidimensionality and depth of studying of separate questions of Hungarian history. The research is based on the problem chronological principle, assuming the necessity of gradual disclosure of the investigated problem on the basis of the analysis of a wide source base. As the principle of historicism which considers the historiographical phenomenon in time space, assuming studying of any phenomenon in dynamics is widely used. In striving for scientific analysis of the subject of the article, researchers followed the requirements of objectivity, systematic approach and critical analysis of sources. In addition to them, such methods were used as – historical-cultural, historical-genetic and historical-functional; integration, based on the interrelation of sciences, contributing to the solution of problems and allowed to reveal the way of life and history of Hungarians. In this way, the interdisciplinary approach is based on the article.

Main problems

The study of the ethnic history of the Hungarian people is one of the actual issues in historical science. The ancient history of formation of the Hungarian people as an ethnos is undoubtedly interesting for nomadic civilization and settled nations. Their distinctive difference from many European nations is in their deeply rooted ethnic history. If we look in addition at the proto-Hungarian language formed 1 millennium BC, then Hungarian's historical origin dates back to 2,500 BC. Nonetheless the first true written sources appear in nearly IX century.

The close connection of this ethnos, called Magyars in general history, with nomadic Kypchaks required difficult turning points in historiography. If we look at the history of the Magyars before the IX century, we see that they need to be considered from the point of view of a single nomadic civilization. However, historical data on the western part of the Hungarians who settled on the banks of the Danube and Tissa were preserved only in Western chronicles. And the historical data on eastern hordes were found in Arab and Persian sources. However, until the present day, a large amount of data related to Hungary is composed of Western data.

We refer to the Beretin annals as the first information source about the Hungarians. The Beretin annals tell that in 862, an unknown people called Ungras made several attacks on German lands. A large number of researchers connect those Ungras with Hungarians (Magyars). The Hungarian eth-

nonym is associated with the word “onogur” in Western European languages and also comes to be known as ungrī, hungrian, ungarn, venr. It appears that this ethnonym originated in the XVI century under the influence of the Russian Polish language. In the Middle Ages, the Russian name of Hungarians was Ugra, and sometimes Yugra. It is well-known that this comes from the onogur ethnonym. And these people were considered by the annals as an unknown nation of that time. In Western European data there was a “ungra” ethnonym even before IX century. There were Hungarians (797-800), Hungaers, Hungaer, Huner (761), Ungarus (731-736), Unergus (IX centuries) in the Western chapel books since the 8th century. However, these Ungras and Khungars were regarded as descendants of the Onogorians who settled in the Carpathian Basin in the 7th century. These migratory trends were found in Chronographs written in VII-VIII centuries by Feofan Ispovednikov (Чичуров, 1980: 219).

One of the ancient sources associated with the Hungarian origin is found in the Chronicle of Georgia, X century. In this book, it is said that the Hungarians were nomadic, and that they were allies with the Bulgarians and fought against the Byzantines. In addition, the relocation of the Hungarians to the Danube in 813 was linked to the command of the Bulgarian khan Krum. Later, when they wanted to return the Turks, ungras and unnos did not allow them to come back (Дѣни, 2012: 106-111).

The records show that the history of the Hungarians is cluttered. At this point, we think it is necessary to consider additional data to look at the true history of the ethnos. One of these sources is archaeological evidence. At present, it is possible to notice that the archeological data is very promising. If there will be further data on the history of the ancient Hungarians in the future, it will be from sources of archaeological findings. In the 1990s, a scientific dispute, led by historian Dyloi Krishto, appeared in Hungary. According to him, the archaeological data is of high importance for assessing the origin of the Hungarians. However, according to some Hungarian archaeologists, material and cultural values can not reflect the ethnic appearance of the people. That is, archaeological evidence can only be proven if there are other additional data available regarding the ethnic problem of nation.

Turkic context in ethnic culture

In the XVIII-XIX centuries and in the early twentieth century, ethnographic science was used to explore ethnic history in Hungary. However, these

initiatives have shown that the tradition of oral history of the people cannot deepen the history of the ancient Hungarian people. According to this it was proven that ethnic culture, clothing and the system of food originated in late 18th and early 19th centuries (Краткая история Венгрии, 1991: 11-12). In other words, it is not possible to solve the problem of the national culture of the Hungarian population in the XVIII-XIX centuries with material data. It does not report the culture and mythology of the IX-X century Hungarians.

However, we, sharing this skepticism, can not remain in one-sided thoughts that oral traditions could not give the essence of national culture. For example, the Ob-Ogret nations (Mansi and Huntsman), which are closely related to the Macharians, have preserved incredible archaisms (Народы Западной Сибири, 2005: 179-181; Головнев, 1998: 138-140). Over the past decade, Dusemil's efforts have been reinforcing for the restoration of oral mythology. These steps have an interesting effect (Айвенхальд, Петрухин, Хелимский, 1982: 162-192). That is why ethnography and folklore are the base of studying ancient culture and ethnic history.

The main source of the study of the history of ancient Hungarians is language. The lack of other data leads to this conclusion. However, language education is not justified by the lack of other data. G.Gadamer and M.Fuko explains that language is not just a cultural phenomenon characterizing the true image of the world, but a system that triggers thinking (Гадамер, 1988: 452). The formation of a personal language shows the formation of an ethnos. That is, there is a separate language in the ethnos. Language is a channel that objectifies spiritual culture. We believe that we should not abandon the language context in studying the history of ancient Hungarians. In this context, it is not right to look for nationalism, formed in the nineteenth century among the Hungarians, in IX century ancient Magyars culture. We consider it indisputable that all ethnicity attributes can be expressed in language.

The most controversial issue in the Hungarian science is the ethnic origin of the Hungarian people, and this issue is quite politicized and subjected to ideology. However, in order to find out, we need to look at the historiographical issue.

According to Jan Asmann, history is a memory art. As history is preserved, the structure of the elite remains the same (Ассман, 2004: 25, 30, 77-79). These findings are directly related to the historiography of ancient Hungarian history.

A well-known Hungarian historian, Turkologist Ishevan Vashari, correctly pointed out that "starting

from the time of the first written medieval annals, the Hungarians did not know anything except they came from the East".

Three main Hungarian texts from the middle ages have reached us – The Hungarian Gest Anonymous (Master P.), The Simon Kesay Chronicle and the Composite Chronicle of the XIV century.

The oldest of these is the Hungarian Gest Anonymous text written in the late XII and early XIII centuries. It is described as a romantic story about the "occupation of the homeland". It is also clear that the military images have been falsified. This is because other historical figures of that period are not reflected in the report. On the contrary, the story depicts the image of people who are not found anywhere else. The Anonymous Hungarian writer tried to use antique tradition in describing the ancient history of the Magyars. There are lots of the description of Scythia, but this tradition is of no value to the problem under consideration (Дъени, 2012: 106-111). Only in the case of the Hungarian oral sources is there some slight truth. Hungarian historian and Iranist, Janos Kharmat, draws attention to the fact that two homelands of the Hungarian are spoken of: in the first tradition, the Scythia (Sea of Azov) coast, and the second one is the Middle Stream of the Volga River in Chapter 7. He thinks that the Magyars had come to the Volga after leaving Scythia. Then he shows Suzdal. This story may also be historic, since it is reasonable to state that one of the Hungarian homelands might be on the Volga.

It seems that Master P. knew of the fact that Hungarian tribes remained in the East. They are called "dentumogher" and "moger". The part "dentu" of the word, which corresponds to the ethnonym of Magyar, is still a matter of controversy. Also the wedding of Udek, father of leader Alosh, to the daughter of skythian lord Euneysel Emesh in 819, clarifies the birth of Alosh in 820 and moreover clarifies the fact that Hungarians did not move from the Scythian Steppe (from the Volga and Ural region) at the beginning of the ninth century AD. It also determines that migration to Carpathia has not yet started.

According to our findings the Hungarians appear in the steppe zone in about AD 830. In general, the anonymous stories are full of imaginary characters, but little is known about the history of the ancient Magyars. However, Gesta Anonymous plays a great role in the historiography of the Hungarian past (Дъени, 2012: 106-111).

Simon Kesay, palace priest of Hungarian King Laslo IV, is author of the Hungarian Chronicles. This work dates back to 1282-1285. He was in a po-

sition to explain the origin of the Hungarian population in relation to the Huns. This approach does not exist in Gesthe Anonymus. The anonymous author, Master P. only comments on the fact that the arpad tribe had ties with Attila. Kesay says that the homeland of ancient Hungarians is located in the Persian lands, where the Hungarian people still live. However, it seems that Kesay has become confused when showing the Persian border. Because he probably referred to the Hungarians in the Caucasus. There is information in the Constantine Bagryanorodnyi work about Caucasian Hungarians (Константин Багрянородный, 1991: 161).

In his work he periodically gives a legend about "sacred deer". This deer takes two men, Hunor and Mogor (the ancestors of Huns and Magyar) from Meotidast to the "desert". They met with the daughters of lord Belar and married them, and later married the daughters of the Dulo, lord of alans. Thus Huns and Magyars became strong nations. The controversy about this information has still not been finished. Does the sacred deer legend arise from Hungarian or Western traditions (Прокопий из Кесари, 1950: 384-387). Sacred deer stories are found in the Jordanian sources about Huns. Kezai was familiar with the Jordanian work. As a result, the sacred deer legend of the Hungarians is attached to the Magyars as a result of cultural exchanges. The same myths are found in the culture of Huns, Utrigurs and Kutrigurs. Only the parts of the legend related to the ethnogenesis of the Magyars are valuable. That is, the names of personalities such as Hunor, Mogor, Belar, Dulo correspond to ethnos groups: Mogor – Magyar, Hunor – Onogur, Belar – Bulgar. In deed, these individuals represent the ethnogenesis components of Magyars. According to linguists, until the ninth century when Magyars moved to their current homeland, they had a lot of such words.

At this point it is interesting to see the name of Dulo. The reason is that this name appears in other sources. In the Hellenic Russian chronicles (in the XV century), the names of the Turkic-Bulgar princes were preserved. It cites the name of Prince Avtiohol, from the tribe of Dulo. That is, Dulo can really have been a historic person. According to Kezai, Dulo is a leader of Alans. This can be explained by the close relationship between the Alans and the Huns.

Kezai describes the history of the Huns and connects them with the Carpathian Basin as a residential area. The main purpose of this is to show that the Hungarian people have claims to the Carpathian Basin. If the Hungarians' ancestors were Huns, the settlement of the IX century was a second migration.

According to the early XX century Hungarian

ethnographer Dul Shebestzhen, the problem of the appearance of the Huns in Hungarian legends is the tradition of Avars. Because, there were Avars in the Carpathian lands before the Magyars. And the Magyars took from the Avars the story about Hunnic roots. Of course, the explanation is not in the Avars. What about the Onogurs who came from the east, and lived in the Carpathians before the Magyars?

Kezaishows the inequalities in the social structure of the Hungarian society in his chronicle. He notes in his work that nobles are descendants of the Scythian tribes and peasants are descendants of slaves and offenders. Such an ideology had a great impact on the historiography of the Magyars. His thesis, namely the connection of the Magyars to the Huns and the attitude to the common people have been preserved in science so far.

The Chronicles of the XIV century describe the ancient history of the Hungarians. It links their statehood with the year 677. It coincides with the time when the Onogurs came to the Carpathian basin.

The Onogurhistoric tradition, nevertheless, enters the historical traditions of the Hungarians, and is considered as Ugric and Hungarian. The connection between Hungarians and Onogurs was closely linked to the name Magyar. The Onogurtribes associated their ancient history with the Carpathians and remembered that Attila was their first lord. Such tendencies were preserved in the traditions and insights of the Sekey tribes living in the western part of Hungary.

In 1235, the Otto and Julian expedition, which was designed to clarify the history of the ancient Magyars, actually found eastern Hungarians. The first group was located in the Caucasus, and the next group was located near the Volga. The discoveries of this expedition became sensational news in Europe. In Hungarian historiography, the ancient homeland of the Hungarians began to be called Bashkortostan. Oriental expeditions have completely changed ancient Hungarian history. Greater Hungary from the ancient sources of Meotidia period, is now found in the Middle Volga (Матузова, 1979: 201-202).

The Russian data on the study of ancient Magyarhistory are of paramount importance, and their main idea is the problem of Yugra and Ugra. It should be noted that in the Russian data, Hungary is Ugriya, the Hungarians are Ugrians, and the Uralian Mansi is represented by the Yugria. Sometimes, the terms "Ugra" and "Yugra" are also changed. Many studies are dedicated to the origin of the name "Ugra". However, the fact that the data stored in ancient Rus is expressed as Ugra shows Yugra is understood by their knowledge of the Magyars and Mansi's kin-

ship. It proves the Ugorian origin of Hungarians (Vernadsky, 1948: 83-86). These ideas were not neglected by researchers. One of them is the famous Polish historian Maciej Miechowita (1457-1523), who, using the Russian data, concludes that the origin of Hungarian is Yugrian. The languages of the Magyars and Yugrians have been identified as one (Аннинский, 1936: 13-18).

Austrian diplomat Sigismund von Herberstein in his "Notes on Muscovite Affairs" written in 1549, supports the opinion of Miechowita and notes the Yugrian origin of Hungarians, and the similarities of their languages (Герберштейн, 1988:163).

With the influence of these authors and the development of science in the eighteenth century, it was proven in Western Europe and Russia that Hungarians came from the Ural Mountains and were related to the Finno-Ugric peoples. The following scholars have accepted this conclusion: George Stirling Hall, Oloph Rudbeck, Leibniz, J.G.Eckhart, Stralenberg, V.N. Tatischev, J.G.Gerder, M.D.Chulkov, P.S.Pallas and others (Загребин, 2014: 5-8).

In Hungarian historiography, the question of the connection of the Magyars to the Huns changed direction under the influence of medieval Hungarian authors. In the XVI-XVII centuries among Hungarian Protestant thinkers there was a tendency to link the Hungarians to eastern peoples, including the Jews. In the XVI-XVIII centuries Hungarian orientalists compared the Hungarian language to Turkish, Persian, Arabic, Armenian, Hebrew, Syriac and other eastern languages.

For example, Dierd Comaramire lattes Hungarian to eastern languages and has shown it to be a relative of Hebrew. Meanwhile, Pal Pereslii identified the Hungarian language as the Hebrew language of the Babylonian period. Also, Gyordier Kalmar linked the Hungarian language with the Jewish, Armenian, Persian and Turkish languages (Осипенко, 2010: 119-125).

In 1882, the Hungarian Turcologist Wambery's work entitled "The Prose Mojaryar" was published. The author confirmed that the Hungarian language belonged to the Finno-Ugric group of languages. However, science also states that the Magyars had left the Caspian coast (Дъени, 2012: 107-110). After this conclusion, there were also theories that connected the Magyars with the Babylonian origin. At the moment, there were some politicized ideological theories, for example, connecting the origin of Hungarian people with the European archaeological culture of Abashev. There were a number of scien-

tific findings on the connection of Hungarian with the ancient Eastern civilization, the Caspian-Aral-homeland and others (Борецкий-Бергфелд, 1908: 38). Different theories based on the ancient history and background of the Hungarian population have survived to this day. In some cases, Hungary's kinship with the Finno-Ugric peoples was regarded as an insult to the nation. On the other hand, the Hungarian people had a strong potential to communicate with the Turkic peoples. Thus, data and studies relating to the ancient history and origin of Hungarian language are of different character.

The reareal son umerous studies on the history of the Hungarian and Kipchak connection in the field of national history. It is worth mentioning the works of researchers including B.Komekov, S.Akhunzhanov, K.Zhumagulov, T.Mukazhanova, A.Kushkumbayev.

The main focus of these studies is the relationship between the Kipchaks and the Hungarians. In Komekov's research a linguistic analysis of the Kazakh and Magyar languages' shows similarities (Kumekov, 2019). Also, Akynzhanov's book "Kipchaks in the Middle Ages of Kazakhstan" describes the political history and social structure of the Kipchaks in the Middle Ages, using data of both Arabic and Persian sources. This paper also mentions the Kipchaks who moved to the Volga and Carpathia (Ахынжанов, 1995: 171). The book of K.Zhumagulov and T.Mukazhanova's is called "The Turkic World in Europe: The History of Avar (VI-VIII century)" (Жұмағұлов, Мұхажанова, 2015). This paper analyzes the history of the tribal union of the Avars, which ruled throughout Europe before the Magyars and Kushkumbayev's research article analyzes the data of Eastern Magyars in the Ulus of Jochi (Кушкумбаев, 2018: 127-134). Generally, in the future, this issue requires a holistic and objective study of Western, Arab and Persian data.

It should be noted that Konyr Mandoki is widely popular in the Kazakh society. His name is found in many media outlets. It is called the "Golden bridge" between Hungarians and Kazakhs. Some researchers believe that Hungarians and Kazakhs have the same genetic roots, they lived on the territory of Kazakhstan, their life is the same as the Kipchaks and the like. In various sites (e-history.kz, abai.kz, etc.) and the media widely reflect the history of the Hungarians, madiyars, etc. Many associate them with the Kipchaks. All of them in the future must pass a historiographical analysis, which will reflect the real history of Madiyars.

Conclusion

The conducted brief historiographical review shows that, despite a significant number of the works published on the studied problem, there are still no Kazakh fundamental works on the ethnogenesis and ethnic history of the Protohungarians and Hungarians. This work only partially fills this gap. Our research is intended only to systematize the available materials.

Many Russian researchers have tried to cover the history of the Hungarian people in depth and detail. But the carried out research is fragmented. Because there was no systematic work. There is a large time space between research works. But it should be noted that the study of the history of Hungarians begins with the XVIII century and has its own history.

The historical sources available to the authors allowed us, in our opinion, to get a fairly complete picture of the state of research on the problem of Protohungarians and Hungarians.

The authors tried to apply the scientific developments of the modern Russian and Kazakh historians in this field to their study as effectively as possible. Despite some shortcomings (lack of knowledge of the language, etc.), they tried to partially consider the problem of the Hungarians in the available materials, especially on the history of the Kipchaks. Representatives of various societies (Finno-Ugric society, Kipchak Studies, etc.) made a significant contribution to the study of the ethnic culture of Hungarians. In the future, Kazakhstan should develop the study of Hungarian history, as well as Finno-Ugric research in ethnographic, archaeological, anthropological, and linguistic areas.

Әдебиеттер

- Айвенхальд А.Ю., Петрухин В.Я., Хелимский Е.А. (1982). К реконструкции мифологических представлений финно-угорских народов. Балто-славянские исследования 1981. Москва. С.162-192.
- Аннинский С.А. (1936). Введение. Матвей Меховский. Трактат о двух Сарматиях. Москва, Ленинград. С.13-18.
- Ассман Я. (2004). Культурная память. Письмо, память о прошлом и политическая идентичность в высоких культурах древности. Москва. С.25-79
- Ахынжанов С.М. (1995). Кипчаки в истории средневекового Казахстана. Алматы: Ғылым. 296 с.
- Борецкий-Бергфелд Н. (1908). История Венгрии: средние века и новое время. – Санкт-Петербург: Типография Акционерного Общества «Брокгауз-Ефрон». 209 с.
- Гадамер Г.Г. (1988). Истина и метод: основы философской герменевтики. Москва: Прогресс. 704 с.
- Герберштейн С. (1988). Записки о Московии. (Rerum moscovitarum commentarii). Москва: МГУ. 429 с.
- Головнев А.В. (1998). Югра и Самоядь. Сибирь в панораме тысячелетий: материалы международного симпозиума. Т.2. Новосибирск. С.133-144.
- Дьени Г. (2012). Историографические заметки о древней истории мадьяр. Уральский Вестник. № 4. С.106-111.
- Жұмағұлов Қ.Т., Мұхажанова Т.Н. (2015). Еуропадағы түркі әлемі: авар тарихы (VI-VIII ғ.). Алматы: Қазақ университеті. 147 б.
- Константин Багрянородный. (1991). Об управлении империей. Москва: Наука. С. 161.
- Краткая история Венгрии. (1991). Москва: Наука. 608 с.
- Кумеков Б.Е. (2019). Казахи и венгры: общие исторические корни // www.eco-invest.hu (сайтты қараған уақыты: 19.03.2019).
- Кушкумбаев А.К. (2018). Источники о восточных мадьярах в Улусе Джучи. Археология Евразийских степей. Материалы IV Международного симпозиума. 15-19 октября 2018 г. № 6. Казань-Болгар.
- Матузова В.И. (1979). Английские средневековые источники IX-XIII вв. Москва: Наука. 268 с.
- Народы Западной Сибири. (2005). Ханты. Манси. Селькупы. Ненцы. Эңцы. Нганасаны. Кеты. Москва: Институт этнологии и антропологии РАН. 805 с.
- Осипенко О.С. (2010). Тема прародины венгров в трудах востоковедов второй половины XIX-XX вв. Ученые записки Казанского государственного университета. Гуманитарные науки. Т.152. Кн.3. Ч.1. С.119-125.
- Прокопий из Кесари. (1950). Война с готами. Москва: Издательство Академии наук СССР. 519 с.
- Загребин А.Е. (2014). Этнографическое финно-угроведение в России: динамика научных идей и знаний. Труды Карельского научного центра РАН. №3. С.3-8
- Чичуров И.С. (1980). Византийские исторические сочинения «Хронография» Феофана и «Бревиарий» Никифора. Москва: Наука. 216 с.
- Balint Cs. (2006). Az ethnosz a kora kozepkorban. Sz. № 2. С.281-347
- Bevezetes a magyar ostortenet kutatásának forrasaiba I: 2. (1988). Budapest: Tankonyvkiado. 328 с.
- Veres P. (1997). A honfoglalo magyarok eletmodjanak vitatott kordesei. Honfoglalas es neprajz. Budapest. 1997. 148 с.
- Vernadsky G. (1948). Kievan Russia. New Haven. Conn.: Yale University Press. 412 p.
- Deer Jozsef. (1993). Pogany magyarsag kereszteny magyarsag. Budapest: Holnap Kiado. 272 с.

Laszlo Gy. (1978). A «ketos honfoglalás». Budapest. Magvet Kiado. 215 c.
Rona-Tas A. (1995). A magyarság korai története. Szeged. 329 c.

References

- Ayvenkhal'd A.YU., Petrukhin V.YA., Khelimskiy Ye.A. (1982). K rekonstruktsiy mifologicheskikh predstavleniy finno-ugorskikh narodov [On reconstructions of mythological representations of Finno-Ugric peoples]. Balto-slavyanskiye issledovaniya 1981 [Balto-Slavic studies 1981]. Moskva. P.162-192.
- Anninskiy S.A. (1936). Vvedeniye. Matvey Mekhovskiy. Traktat o dvukh Sarmatiyakh [Introduction. Matvey Mehovsky. A treatise on two Sarmatians]. Moskva, Leningrad. P.13-18.
- Assman YA. (2004). Kul'turnaya pamyat'. Pis'mo, pamyat' o proshlom i politicheskaya identichnost' v vysokikh kul'turakh drevnosti [Cultural memory. Writing, memory of the past and political identity in the high cultures of antiquity]. Moskva. P.25-79
- Akhynzhanov S.M. (1995). Kipchaki v istorii srednevekovogo Kazakhstana [Kipchaks in the history of medieval Kazakhstan]. Almaty: Gylym. 296 p.
- Boretskiy-Bergfeld N. (1908). Istoriya Vengrii: sredniye veka i novoye vremya [History of Hungary: the Middle Ages and the new time]. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiya Aktsionernogo Obshchestva "Brokgauz-Yefron". 209 p.
- Gadamer G.G. (1988). Istina i metod: osnovy filosofskoy germeneytiki [Truth and method: fundamentals of philosophical hermeneutics]. Moskva: Progress. 704 p.
- Gerbshcheyn S. (1988). Zapiski o Moskovii. (Rerum moscovitarum commentarii) [Notes on Muscovy]. Moskva: MGU. 429 s.
- Golovnev A.V. (1998). Yugra i Samoyad'. Sibir' v panorame tysyacheletiy: materialy mezhdunarodnogo simpoziuma [Ugra and Samoyad. Siberia in the panorama of the millennia: proceedings of the international symposium]. T.2. Novosibirsk. P.133-144.
- D'yeni G. (2012). Istoricheskiye zametki o drevney istorii mad'yar [Historiographic notes on the ancient history of the Magyars]. Ural'skiy Vestnik. № 4. P.106-111.
- ZHumagulov K.T., Mukhazhanova T.N. (2015). Yeuropadağy tyrki әлемі: avar tarikhı (VI-VIII ғ.) [The Turkic World in Europe: The History of Avar (VI-VIII c.)]. Almaty: Kazak universiteti. 156 b.
- Konstantin Bagryanarodnyy. (1991). Ob upravlenii imperiyey [About managing an empire]. Moskva: Nauka. P.161.
- Kratkaya istoriya Vengrii [A Brief History of Hungary]. (1991). Moskva: Nauka. 608 p.
- Kumekov B.Ye. (2019). Kazakhi i vengry: obshchiye istoricheskiye korni [Kazakhs and Hungarians: common historical roots] www.eco-invest.hu (sayty karağan uakyty: 19.03.2019.).
- Kushkumbayev A.K. (2018). Istochniki o vostochnykh mad'yarakh v Uluse Dzhuchi. Arkheologiya Yevraziyskikh stepey. Materialy IV Mezhdunarodnogo simpoziuma [Sources of Oriental Magyars in the Juchi Ulus. Archeology of the Eurasian Steppes. Materials of the IV International Symposium. Kazan-Bolgar, October 15-19, 2018]. 15-19 oktyabrya 2018 g. № 6. Kazan-Bolgar.
- Matuzova V.I. (1979). Angliyskiye srednevekovyye istochniki IX-XIII vv [English medieval sources of the 9th-13th centuries]. Moskva: Nauka. 268 p.
- Narody Zapadnoy Sibiri. (2005). Khanty. Mansi. Sel'kupy. Nentsy. Ents. Nganasany. Kety [The peoples of Western Siberia. Khanty. Mansi. Selkups. Nenets. Enets. Nganasans. Kets]. Moskva: Institut etnologii i antropologii RAN. 805 p.
- Osipenko O.S. (2010). Tema prarodiny vengerov v trudkh vostokovedov vtoroy poloviny XIX-XX vv. [The theme of the ancestral home of the Hungarians in the works of Orientalists of the second half of the XIX-XX centuries]. Uchenyye zapiski Kazanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Gumanitarnyye nauki. T.152. Kn.3. CH.1. P.119-125.
- Prokopyy iz Kesari. (1950). Voyna s gotami [The war with the Goths]. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR. 519 p.
- Zagrebin A.Ye. (2014). Etnograficheskoye finno-ugorovedeniye v Rossii: dinamika nauchnykh idey i znaniy [Ethnographic Finno-Ugric studies in Russia: dynamics of scientific ideas and knowledge. Proceedings of the Karelian scientific center of the Russian Academy of Sciences]. Trudy Karel'skogo nauchnogo tsentra RAN. №3. P.3-8
- Chichurov I.S. (1980). Vizantiyskiye istoricheskiye sochineniya «Khronografiya» Feofana i «Breviariy» Nikifora [The Byzantine historical works "The Chronography" of Theophanes and the "Breviary" of Nicephorus]. Moskva: Nauka. 216 p.
- Balint Cs. (2006). Az ethnosz a kora kozepkorban. Szezi. № 2. P.281-347
- Bevezetes magyar ostortenet kutatasanak forrasayba I: 2. (1988). Budapesht: Tankonyvkiado. 328 s.
- Veres P. (1997). Onfoglalo mag'yarok eletmodzhanak vitatott kordesey. Honfoglalás es neprajz. Budapesht. 1997. 148 s.
- Vernadskiy G. (1948). Kiyevskaya Rus'. Novyy ray. Conn. : Izdatel'stvo Yyel'skogo universiteta. 412 s.
- Olen' Yozhef. (1993). Pogany mag'yarsag kereshteny magyarsag. Budapesht: Kholnap Kiado. 272 s.
- Laslo Gi. (1978). «Ketos Khonfoglalás». Budapesht. Magvet Kiado. 215 v. Rona-Tas A. (1995). Madzharsag Koray Tortente. Szeged. 329 s.