

Csongor LITKEY:

## Master P. and Dares the Phrygian: Is Prince Álmos The Hungarian Equivalent of Aeneas? The Gesta Hungarorum and the Troy-Romances in the Light of an Analysis of Some Textual Parallels

This study examines Master P.'s use of two Latin Troy-romances: the "*De Excidio Troiae Historia*" attributed to the fictitious Dares the Phrygian, and the so-called "*Excidium Troiae*". Our purpose is to understand better the Notary's attitude towards the Troy-romances. We make our observations via an analysis of certain quotations from these romances. We begin our paper with an introduction, which describes the context of these two romances, in the contemporary historical literature, and discusses their place and role, among the known written sources of the Anonymous Notary. Then, in the first chapter, we examine two citations in the Notary's *Prologus*, which are adopted from the *Prologus* of the work of "Dares". Their role is primarily to emphasize the Notary's definition of the place of his work in the context of historiography of his age, but they also increase the credibility of his Gesta, as they call upon the authority of the prestigious Dares. In our second chapter, we analyse two textual borrowings from the *Excidium Troiae*. The first one takes place in the description of the election of Prince ("*dux*") Álmos. The Notary quotes verbatim the text of the proclamation of Aeneas as a leader ("*dux*"), to describe the proclamation of Álmos. The use of this citation clearly alludes to the similarity of the two elections. Moreover, it supposes a parallel between the foundation of the Hungarian and Roman polities. It alludes also to the ancient Hungarians' equality to the Trojans, and to the contemporary Hungarians' equality to the Latin Christian peoples (for example the Franks), who had prestigious Trojan ancestry. The second borrowing from the *Excidium Troiae* is an allusion, in which little textual analogy can be observed. It draws parallel between the siege of the castle of Bihar [Bihar, RO], which concludes the Hungarians' conquest of Pannonia, and the siege of Laurentina, which concludes Aeneas' conquest of Latium. Its role is clearly to draw parallel between the conquests of the Hungarians and that of the Trojans. It supposes the same allusions as the quotation in the story of Álmos' election. We make remarks on the fact, that Master P. uses allusions to, and quotations from the *Excidium Troiae* only up to a certain limit. We suppose that its cause is his deliberation to preserve the autonomy of his story, and emphasize the Hungarians' own, independent values. Our main conclusion, is, that the Notary's aim may have been to create a Hungarian prehistory, appropriate to the standards of "national" prehistories of his time. The use of the allusions to the Trojans and to Troy-romances was part of his efforts to reach this purpose. However, he wanted to create a history of the ancient Hungarians, who had had their own values in his eyes. So, he did not allow his story to become a Troy-romance of Hungarian subject.

*Keywords:* “national” prehistory, context of contemporary historiography, comparison to the Trojans, prestige, limits of use of the Troy-romances



## Introduction

The Latin Romances of Troy and Alexander the Great formed an important group of Master P.'s written sources. They served as a stylistic model, and – apart from the citations from the Bible – most of the literal quotations used by the author were taken from them, and they most probably shaped his concept of history. They also served as a model for the creation of several stories in the *Gesta* and were thus also used for their content.<sup>1</sup>

This study aims to shed light on Master P.'s attitude towards this group of sources by examining the use of two Romances of Troy. One of them was a work written by an unknown author in the late Antiquity. In the Middle Ages, this work was attributed to the mythological Dares the Phrygian, a defender of Troy. The other was an early medieval work bearing the title *Excidium Troiae*. It was not attributed to any particular author, and we do not know its real author either. Four passages will be analysed. Two of which are situated in the Prologue of the *Gesta* and are verbatim quotations from the Prologue of the work of "Dares." They aimed to clarify the author's historiographical principles just as in Dares' Prologue. The other two passages are borrowed from the *Excidium Troiae*. One of these is a verbatim citation from the narrative of that Romance, which tells the proclamation of Aeneas as “dux” of the Trojans. It is quoted in the story of Álmos' election as “dux” of the Hungarians.<sup>2</sup> The other borrowing is a clear allusion to the description of the siege of Laurentina, which concludes the conquest-story of the *Excidium Troiae*. It is referenced in the description of the siege of the castle Bihar, which concludes the conquest-story of the *Gesta Hungarorum*.<sup>3</sup> We hope, that an examination of these references will help us understand some important aspects of The Notary's relation to the Troy-romances.

---

<sup>1</sup> THOROCZKAY 1999. On their use as stylistic model, and sources for content and on their influence on the Anonym Notary's perception of history see: MARCZALI 1877. p. 358–366; GYÖRY 1948. p. 6–60; BORZSÁK 1984. passim; VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 37–45, 156–163. On the most complete summary of the literal citations see: *Gesta Hungarorum* (1991). p. 136, note nr. 7–8, 137, note nr. 14, 149, note nr. 82, 150, note nr. 83, 155, note nr. 121, 159, note nr. 143, 160, note nr. 153, 161, notes nr. 164–165, 162, note nr. 175, 164, note nr. 198, 165, note nr. 203, 166, note nr. 212, 168, notes nr. 227, 230–231, 171, notes nr. 257–258, 171–172, notes nr. 264, 174, notes nr. 291, 297, 176, notes nr. 313, 314, 177, note nr. 317, 178, note nr. 326; VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 162–163.

<sup>2</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 40 (c. 5), *Excidium Troiae*. p. 21, VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 161–162.

<sup>3</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 101–106 (c. 49–52); *Excidium Troiae*. p. 37–55; VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 161–163.

## The role of the Troy- and Alexander-romances in the “national” prehistories, or *origines gentium*<sup>4</sup> of the early and high Middle Ages

As early as the sixth century, it was common that the origin of a particular genus was traced back to one of the famous peoples of ancient literature. We may think of Jordanes' *Getica*, or the Gothic-history of Isidore, that traced back the origin of the Goths to the Scythians. The concept of Scythian ancestry was also popular in the High Middle Ages. It was widespread in Hungary, Scotland, Ireland, and Spain.<sup>5</sup> However, the most prestigious ancestors were Trojans, or Macedonians. In the seventh century, the *Chronica Francorum*, which has been attributed to a certain Fredegar, claimed, that the Franks were offspring of the Trojans, just like the Romans. The Briton Nennius followed the example of the Frankish chronicle and stated that the British forefathers were Trojan refugees.<sup>6</sup> In post-Carolingian Europe the Trojan origin of the Franks was a model for the newly Christianized peoples of the Saxons and Normans (of Normandy) in inventing their own prehistories. The Saxon Widukindus Corbeius, linked the origin of his people to the Macedonians of Alexander, while the Norman Dudo of Saint-Quentin traced the origin of the Normans back to the Trojan Antenor.<sup>7</sup> The twelfth century saw the revival of the concept of the Franks' Trojan origin in France. This was done by Rigord of Saint-Denis, who wanted to glorify his king, Philip II Augustus and the Capeting Dynasty by linking them to the Carolingians, Merovingians and Trojans.<sup>8</sup> Also, in the twelfth century, Geoffrey of Mounmouth completed his *Historia Regum Britanniae*, and derived the British from the Trojan Brutus, son of Aeneas, and thus created connection between his kingdom and that of the Plantagenets.<sup>9</sup> The Staufen originated themselves from the Carolingians, and this way it became possible to associate them with the Franks' Trojan ancestors.<sup>10</sup> By this time, the Trojan origin of a particular “*natio*”, or dynasty became a sign of glory and nobility. The “antique” historical references became in the Western Christian World an almost obligatory element of any “national” prehistory, which intended to emphasize the prestige and nobility of the author's “*gens*”.

---

<sup>4</sup> The term 'national' is used here in its medieval sense, referring to social communities with ethnic and political characteristics that were referred to by the terms 'gens' or 'natio'. Here we mean both the early medieval ethnic and political communities described by Szűcs Jenő as „*gentes*”, and the communities of the high Middle Ages, which he describes as „*nationes*”. (Szűcs 1997. p. 7–296.) As both terms were used to describe the twelfth-thirteenth-century communities, which Szűcs called “*nationes*”, and the Notary used consequently the term “*gens*”, we use both terms to describe it. The former research used the term „*origo gentis*” on these „national histories”, however the more recent studies criticise the inadequacies of the concept, propose alternative designations. For instance, Norbert Kersken suggested the use of „Nationalgeschichtliche Gesamtdarstellungen”. KERSKEN 1995. p. 5–9. We will use the term “national prehistories” on them.

<sup>5</sup> KERSKEN 1995. p. 26, note nr. 62, 62, 64, 381, 384.

<sup>6</sup> BÁC SATYAI 2013. p. 284–285.

<sup>7</sup> BÁC SATYAI 2013. 285; VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 66, 73–74, 193.

<sup>8</sup> VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 70.

<sup>9</sup> BÁC SATYAI 2013. p. 286; VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 65–66.

<sup>10</sup> VERCAMER 2018. p. 221, 239–240.

This, besides the tradition discussed above, owed much to the “Twelfth century – Renaissance,” and its cult of Antiquity. It increased the rulers’ desire for the glory of antique ancestry and allowed the chroniclers to depart from the strictly religious perspective of Medieval historiography. They could present the pagan forefathers of their ‘nation’ or their ruling dynasty as positive protagonists, glorious ancestors, just like the equally pagan Trojans or Macedonians. We believe that it can be stated that the literary genre of prehistory-writing required the use of Troy- and Alexander-romances. It could demonstrate the authors education and rhetoric skills and increased the credibility of his work. It can be observed that while chroniclers in Western Europe in most cases derived their ancestors directly from Antique peoples, historians of the Scandinavian and East-Central European areas that were baptized at the turn of the first Millennium, wrote autochthonous origin-stories for their *gentes*. However, they emphasized their ancestors’ equality and likeness to Trojans, Romans and Alexander’s Macedonians.<sup>11</sup> For example the Czech Cosmas of Prague, wrote about the Czech’s victory over Rome, and the Polish Vincentus Kadłubek “reported” that the ancient Poles defeated Alexander, Crassus and Ceasar.<sup>12</sup> The Hungarian chroniclers combined this practice, with the popular method of Western European historiographers. They invented a prehistory with a strong autochthonous character and did not try to link the Hungarians to Rome or Troy. However, they identified the Hungarians’ ancestors with the Scythians, and later with the Huns. As we shall see, Master P’s work fitted well in this literary environment. He identified the Hungarians with the Scythians, underlined their glory and equality with the Trojans and Macedonians, but emphasized their own, autochthonous values.

### **On the two Romances of Troy used by the Notary**

The work of “Dares” was thought in the Middle Ages to be an authentic account on the Trojan War. Until the thirteenth century it was copied mostly in France, where it played a crucial role in supporting the concept of the Franks’ Trojan origin, and was also widespread in England. It only became popular in Italy at the end of the thirteenth century, albeit it appeared there sparsely in earlier times also.<sup>13</sup> It tells the story of the Trojan War, including the events leading up to it.<sup>14</sup> The *Excidium Troiae*, which is an early medieval text, created somewhere in the Frankish lands. It is based on a late Antique work and tells the story of the siege and fall of Troy, the wanderings of Aeneas, his conquest in *Latium*, and contains a brief summary of Roman history until the birth of Christ. The earliest surviving manuscript of the Medieval work was written in

<sup>11</sup> BÁCSATYAI 2013, p. 284–87; VERCAMER 2018, p. 220–227; VESZPRÉMY 2019, p. 52–74.

<sup>12</sup> VESZPRÉMY 2019, p. 179–180. It is a striking parallel to Master P’s statements, that the Scythians were never conquered by any “*imperator*”, not even by Alexander, and that Attila, their king, the ancestor of Álmos, defeated the Romans. ANONYMUS (1937), p. 35, 36 (c. 1).

<sup>13</sup> For example, there is a twelfth century manuscript of Pisan origin, attributed to Guido Pisanus, which will be briefly discussed below, as it is important for the *Excidium Troiae* also.

<sup>14</sup> VESZPRÉMY 2019, p. 41–42, 159.

the ninth century. It is completely independent from the work of “Dares,” and many Troy-romances, written in vernacular languages, used it as a source. In medieval times it was highly popular and widespread. The Notary used a variant of it, which has been successfully identified. It appears for the first time in a manuscript that was copied in Italy around 1150–1180, and today is kept in Brussels. It is a copy of an autographic manuscript of Guido Pisanus, which was presumably completed around 1107–1119.<sup>15</sup> The copy contains a collection of historical works including Latin romances of Alexander and the Trojan war. This variant was probably invented by Guido himself, who added to the text some passages about the war of Aeneas in *Latium*. It has been preserved in twelve manuscripts.<sup>16</sup>

### **On their role among the sources of Master P.**

The written sources of the Notary have long been studied by Hungarian historians.<sup>17</sup> The following sources have been identified: the Hungarian chronicle-redactions available in His time, the *Chronicon* of Regino and his “*Continuator*”, the *Etymologiarum Libri* of Isidore, the *Decretum* of Gratian, the *Ars Dictandi* of Hugo Bononiensis, the Holy Scripture, the two Troy-romances examined in this study, a twelfth century redaction of the Latin Alexander-romance, signed with the *sigla* “J2”, and the early medieval extract from the Scythian chapter of Justin’s *Historiae*, bearing the title “*Exordia Scythica*”. The use of several other works is suspected, but this has not been proven beyond reasonable doubt yet.<sup>18</sup> Among these sources, as indicated above, the Troy- and Alexander-*historiae* played a prominent role. Since they belonged basically to a similar genre of literature, occupied a similar place in medieval historiography, and Master P. used them mostly in the same way, the research has treated them together as one single group of his sources. The two Troy-romances belong to this group.

### **Characteristics of their use by the Notary**

The Notary mentions specifically as his model, only the work of “Dares”, suggesting, that it is the most important of his sources. However, he does not use it much: he quotes it in ten places, but and none of the citations are long, and half of them are used only for stylistic purposes.<sup>19</sup> Besides the two

---

<sup>15</sup> VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 159–163. This is the twelfth-century Italian manuscript, that contains the work of Dares also.

<sup>16</sup> VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 159–163. In the edition that we use (*Excidium Troiae*) it is signed with the *sigla* “Ri”, after a thirteenth century manuscript of the Florentine Bibliotheca Riccardiana. *Excidium Troiae*. p. lxxviii–lxxix; VESZPRÉMY 2019. p.160, note nr. 58, 162. We follow in this paper the text of the variant “Ri”.

<sup>17</sup> A summary can be found in: THOROCZKAY 1999; VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 37–45, 156–163.

<sup>18</sup> THOROCZKAY 1999; VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 37–45, 156–163, 191, 332.

<sup>19</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 53 (c. 14), 77 (c. 33), 86 (c. 41), 96 (c. 47), 97 (c48), 101 (c. 50), 112 (c. 56), DARES 1873. p. 12 (c. 9), 23 (c. 18); Gesta Hungarorum (1991). p. 155, note nr. 121, 164, note nr. 198.

quotations in the Prologue and the loanwords for stylistic purposes, he uses their material to characterise the Hungarian princes ("*duces*").<sup>20</sup> The quotations from the *Excidium Troiae* are used in several places, in a relatively varied way. This work is quoted in ten places also, but besides the stylistic borrowings, there are short stories and subtle allusions inspired by it.<sup>21</sup> In addition, the two quotations, discussed in this paper play crucial role in the plot of the *Gesta*, as we will see it. The borrowings from the Alexander-romance exceeds in number the quotations from both Troy-romances, and the Notary uses them in the widest variety.<sup>22</sup> It was thought that the Notary most probably took quotations from the work of "Dares" and the Alexander-romance from *florilegia*, or from his notes and memories of conversations during his school studies.<sup>23</sup> In the case of the work of Dares it is possible,<sup>24</sup> but present research considers proven, that the full text of the Alexander-romance and the *Excidium Troiae* was available to Master P..<sup>25</sup> There are manuscripts, that contain in a single volume the Troy- and Alexander-romances or the *Exordia Scythica*. It is worth noting that it was common to organize the works that Master P. used in a single volume. In this respect the Brussels manuscript of Guido Pisanus is interesting to us. Besides "Dares" work, it includes the variants of the *Excidium Troiae* and the Alexander-romance which were used by the Notary. Both variants appear here for the first time. The three *historiae* were copied side by side with each other. In a Florentine codex, the text of the *Excidium Troiae* is bound next to the work of "Dares" and the *Exordia Scythica*. A Bambergian codex also contains, side by side, the *Exordia Scythica*, a short extract from the *Excidium Troiae*, and an early version of the Alexander-romance closely related to that of Leo the

<sup>20</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 39 (c. 4), 106–107 (c. 53), 111 (c. 55); DARES 1873. 14–17 (c. 12–13); *Gesta Hungarorum* (1991). 177, note nr. 317, 178, note nr. 326.

<sup>21</sup> For example, there is a place where the story of a hunt is enlivened by a description taken from Aeneas' hunt in the *Excidium Troiae* / ANONYMUS (1937). p. 56 (c. 34); *Excidium Troiae*. p. 27/, in another place, to describe the hunting Árpád, he uses the adverb "*arpalice*", borrowed from the descriptions of Venus and Dido in hunting costume, originally referring to Harpalice. The adverb resonated with the name of the Hungarian prince. ANONYMUS (1937). p. 99 (c. 49); *Excidium Troiae*. p. 27; KAPITÁNYFŐ 1971. p. 726–728. Other places: ANONYMUS (1937). p. 53 (c. 14), 57 (c. 16), 64 (c. 22), 75 (c. 33); *Excidium Troiae*. p. 12, 33, 47.

<sup>22</sup> Master P. describes several battles with quotations from this work: ANONYMUS (1937). p. 44 (c. 8), 81–82 (c. 39), 86 (c. 41); *Historia de Preliis* I. p. 8, 48–50, 94, 108–110, 110–112, 166–168, 176–178, 192–195, II. p. 16–18, 20–24, 42, 50, 58; *Gesta Hungarorum* (1991). p. 149–150, notes nr. 82–83, 166, note nr. 212, 167, notes nr. 215, 217, 168, note nr. 230. On the use of this work in other places see: ANONYMUS (1937). p. 36 (c. 1), 60 (c. 20), 76 (c. 34), 91 (c. 44), 105 (c. 52), 111 (c. 55); *Historia de Preliis* I. p. 32, 54, 68–70, 92, 108, 124, 168, 216, II. p. 12–14; *Gesta Hungarorum* (1991) p. 160, note nr. 152, 165, note nr. 203, 171–172, notes nr. 257, 258, 264, 176, note nr. 314, 178, note nr. 326. There is a place, where he describes the Hungarians' motivation to their campaigns with the worlds that describe in the Alexander-romance the motivations of Alexander.

<sup>23</sup> GYÓRY 1948. p. 58–59.

<sup>24</sup> See notes nr. 21–24.

<sup>25</sup> VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 43, 161–162.

*Archipresbiter*.<sup>26</sup> It is plausible, that Master P. had at his disposal a volume containing a collection like these.

### The citations from the Prologue of the work of “Dares”

The Prologue in the *historia* of Dares, is a fictional letter falsely attributed to Cornelius Nepos writing to his friend, Sallust. In this letter he describes that he found in Athens the work of Dares about the Trojan War, written in Greek. He came to love it so much, that immediately translated it verbatim to Latin. He emphasizes, that Dares’ account is more authentic than that of Homer, because Dares participated in the war. “He” stated that Homer’s story is unbelievable anyway, as he tells, that the Gods had fought side by side humans. The Prologue of the Notary is also a fictitious letter, that he “writes” to his friend, “N”, telling him, that he decided to fulfil his promise to write a historical work about the Hungarians’ origin and their glorious deeds. He describes the content of his work and defines his historiographical principles and models. The citations from “Dares” *historia* play an important role in this description and definition. It is worth to examine, how his prologue can be divided in sections according to the terms of medieval rhetoric, as this will help us to understand the exact role of the quotations from “Dares” work. He begins the Prologue with a *salutatio*, to greet his friend, and dedicates his work to him. Then he continues with a *partitio* to tell what motivated him to begin the construction of his work, and briefly describes its content. A part of combined *reprehensio* and *confirmatio* follows. He rejects here the historiographical and stylistic principles that he considers to be inappropriate and declares which principles he intends to follow. Then a *conclusio* comes, where he speaks about the benefits of his work. Eventually an *adoratio* closes the Prologue, in which he prays to Virgin Mary and Christ to give thanks to them for the Hungarian kings who have reigned until his time, and to beg them, that the future kings and their nobles may continue to possess the country in happiness.<sup>27</sup>

The Prologue of „Dares” (DARES 1873. p. 1. (Prol.))

“(…) *Cum multa ago Athenis curiose, inveni historiam Daretis Phrygii (...) Quam ego summo amore complexus continuo transtuli. Cui nihil adiciendum vel diminuendum (...) putavi, (...) optimum ergo duxi ita ut fuit vere et simpliciter perscripta, sic eam ad verbum in latinitatem transvertere, ut legentes cognoscere possent, quomodo res gestae essent: utrum verum magis esse existiment, quod*

The Prologue of the Notary (ANONYMUS (1937). p. 33–34 (Prol.))

“(…) *Dum olim in scolari studio simul essemus et in hystoria Troiana, quam ego cum summo amore complexus ex libris Darethis Frigii ceterorumque auctorum, sicut a magistris meis audiveram, in unum volumen proprio stilo compilaveram, pari voluntate legeremus, petisti a me, ut, sicut hystoriam Troianam bellaque Grecorum scripseram, ita et genealogiam regum Hungarie et nobilium suorum, qualiter septem principales persone, que Hetumoger*

<sup>26</sup> KAPITÁNYFY 1971. p. 728; VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 160–161.

<sup>27</sup> JANKOVITS 2006. p. 6; ANONYMUS (1937). p. 33–34 (Prol.). For the comparison of the whole texts of the two Prologues see: Appendix 1.

*Dares Phrygius memoriae commendavit (...) anne Homero credendum (...)*”  
*vacantur, de terra Scithica descenderunt vel qualis sit terra Scithica et qualiter sit generatus dux Almus aut quare vocatur Almus primus dux Hungarie, a quo reges Hungarorum originem duxerunt, vel quot regna et reges sibi subiugaverunt aut quare populus de terra Scithica egressus per ydioma alienigenarum Hungarii et in sua lingua propria Mogerii vocantur, tibi scriberem. (...) Optimum ergo duxi, ut vere et simpliciter tibi scriberem, quod legentes possint agnoscere, quomodo res geste essent. Et si tam nobilissima gens Hungarie primordia sue generationis et fortia queque facta sua ex falsis fabulis rusticorum vel a garrulo cantu ioculatorum quasi sompnando audiret, valde indecorum et satis indecens esset. (...)*”

Before we compare the two texts the following observations are to be made.

1. The Notary states that he edited a Trojan *historia* during his school years, in the appropriate style (“*proprio stilo*”),<sup>28</sup> from the works of Dares and other authors. Then he writes that his friend asked him to compose a genealogy of the Hungarian kings and their nobles (“*genealogiam regum Hungarie et nobilium suorum*”) in a similar way, and he wants to do so.<sup>29</sup> The *stilus* in medieval literature meant not only the ways of the formation of the text, but also the ways of editing and arranging the subject, which in the Notary’s case included also the approach to history.<sup>30</sup> 2. It was common in the Middle Ages to present the prehistory of a people partly based on the Troy- and Alexander-romances, and it was held to be one of the most credible methods, as it was discussed in the Introduction. Dares, moreover, was considered the most respected author of this literary genre, because he was held to be the first pagan historian, just following in time the first Christian historian, Moses.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>28</sup> *Proprius stilus* here probably means „proper style” in the sense of appropriate style to the matter, and not the own style of the Notary. VIZKELETY 1999. p. 682–682; JANKOVITS 2006. p. 14–15.

<sup>29</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 33 (Prol.): “*vel qualis sit terra Scithica et qualiter sit generatus dux Almus aut quare vocatur Almus primus dux Hungarie, a quo reges Hungarorum is originem duxerunt, vel quot regna et reges sibi subiugaverunt aut quare populus de terra Scithica egressus per ydioma alienigenarum Hungarii et in sua lingua propria Mogerii vocantur, tibi scriberem.*” – The “genealogy” of the Hungarians here also means their exodus from Scythia, and their glorious conquests, which is emphasized later in the Prologue, where the Notary claims, that he would present a worthy account “of the beginnings of their kind and of their bravery and deeds” – The Deeds of the Hungarians (2010). p. 686. “*primordia sue generationis et fortia queque facta sua*” – ANONYMUS (1937). p. 33. (Prol.)

<sup>30</sup> HORVÁTH 1954. p. 34–47, VIZKELETY 1990. p. 682–685.

<sup>31</sup> VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 193, 328.



3. In addition to the use of "Dares", Anonymus also indicates his use of The Holy Scripture. He refers to the authority of the first Christian historian alongside that of the first pagan historian to prove the validity of his work.<sup>32</sup>

4. The mention of Dares as a model in the Prologue clearly indicates that, for the Notary, the *proprius stilus* meant the historical, ideological, conceptional and stylistic use of the Troy-literature. This literary genre was represented by the name of Dares. Contemporaries, writing "national" prehistories may have felt that the Alexander-romances belonged to the same category as the Troy-literature.<sup>33</sup>

In the light of these notifications, we can set in context the two quotations taken by the Notary from the Prologue of "Dares". The first is placed at the beginning of the *partitio* and recalls the time when he and his friend "N." studied together. The Notary had come to love the Trojan *historiae*, and compiled one in the appropriate style, following what he learned from his teachers, and relying on the works of Dares and other authors.<sup>34</sup> In this sentence, he uses the same words to tell how he came to like the Trojan *historiae* of Dares and other authors, that "Nepos" uses, to tell how *he* came to like the *historia* of Dares.<sup>35</sup> Thus the Notary implies, that he loves the *historia* of Dares just as Nepos did, so the same love motivated him to use it to create his Troy-*historia* that had motivated Nepos to translate it. At the request of his friend, he would also write his Hungarian history in the same way, with the same motivation.<sup>36</sup> The second quotation contains a more direct reference to the *historia* of "Dares" and makes a stronger claim. He uses it in the *confirmatio*, to describe the method he believes to be correct. He writes that he considered it the best to write everything "truthfully and plainly"<sup>37</sup> to his friend, so as the readers could know what had happened.<sup>38</sup> In the Prologue of Dares' work, "Nepos" writes with almost the same words, that he thought it best to translate the Greek text of Dares, that was written truthfully and plainly, verbatim into Latin, so that readers could understand how the events happened, and decide whether to believe Homer or Dares.<sup>39</sup> We can see, that

<sup>32</sup> JANKOVITS 2006; VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 193; ANONYMUS (1999). p. 10, note nr. 45.

<sup>33</sup> See previous note.

<sup>34</sup> "Dum olim in scolari studio simul essemus et in hystoria Troiana, **quam ego cum summo amore complexus ex libris Darethis Frigii ceterorumque auctorum, sicut a magistris meis audiveram, in unum volumen proprio stilo compilaveram...**" (highlighted by the author – CS. L.) – ANONYMUS (1937). p. 33 (Prol.).

<sup>35</sup> "Cum multa ago Athenis curiose, inveni historiam Daretis Phrygii ipsius manu scriptam, ut titulus indicat, quam de Graecis et Troianis memoriae mandavit. **Quam ego summo amore complexus continuo transtuli.**" (highlighted by the author (CS. L.) – DARES 1873. p. 1 (Prol.).

<sup>36</sup> We have to add, that the phrase "ceterorumque auctorum" may indicate the use of the *Excidium Troiae*. He implies that to be his source also, even if the textual parallels allude to "Nepos" as his model of historiography.

<sup>37</sup> The Deeds of the Hungarians (2010). p. 5.

<sup>38</sup> "**Optimum ergo duxi, ut vere et simpliciter tibi scriberem, quod legentes possint agnoscere, quomodo res geste essent.**" (highlighted by the author – CS. L.) – ANONYMUS (1937). p. 33 (Prol.).

<sup>39</sup> "[...] **optimum ergo duxi ita ut fuit vere et simpliciter perscripta, sic eam ad verbum in latinitatem transvertere, ut legentes cognoscere possent, quomodo res gestae essent: utrum**

the Notary is not only suggesting that he wants to tell the events truthfully and plainly like Nepos, but also that he wants to follow the example of Dares by writing history in a truthful and plain way<sup>40</sup>. According to the theory of László Jankovits, this second citation may also contain an allusion to Cicero, namely to his *De Inventione*, and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, which was attributed to him.<sup>41</sup> The medieval commentaries of these works invented a view, that a trinity of virtues was the defining feature of the proper prose: *brevitas*, *aperitas*, and *probabilitas / veri similitas*. It was also applied to the historical texts. The expression “truthfully and plainly” – according to the theory – alludes to the *brevitas* and *probabilitas*. The statement placed later, still in the *confirmatio*, which claims that it would fit to the noble Hungarian *gens* to gain knowledge about her origin and valiant deeds from the “straightforward exposition of historical accounts”,<sup>42</sup> may allude to the virtue of *aperitas*. If these allusions to Cicero indeed exist, which we think to be probable, the Notary links the *historia*-writing represented by Dares to the literacy of Ciceronian standards. This way he defines the place of his *Gesta* in the rhetorical culture of his time, and also defines the rhetorical principles that he wishes to follow. There is another parallel between the two Prologues. It is probably not a coincidence, that while Dares is talking about the inaccuracy of Homer’s description of the war, just after the sentence cited by the Notary, the latter emphasizes the unreliability of the *joculatores* after the sentence, in which he employs the citation. Even if Homer certainly had a reputation very different from that of the Hungarian vernacular minstrels, it is hard to imagine, that the Notary, while speaking about their untrustworthiness did not have in mind the passage of his model. Anyway, there was an opinion throughout the Middle Ages, that considered the poets to be feckless liars.<sup>43</sup>

By the use of these quotations, the Notary precisely explains his principles about the proper way of history-writing and defines the place of his *Gesta* in the historiography of his age. This place is defined by the follow of the examples of Dares, and the Troy-romances. We can see that he employs direct references and subtle allusions to create a sophisticated web of associations, which is based on certain single citations. By doing so, he proves his educated literacy.

Despite the conclusion, that we can draw from our inquiry, we must notice, that he did not follow the example of Dares and the requirements of the genre of the Troy-romances beyond a certain limit. It is a good example, that although he describes the Hungarian princes (except for Árpád) by phrases borrowed from descriptions of Dares’ heroes, he does not use it to draw

---

*verum magis esse existiment, quod Dares Phrygius memoriae commendavit (...) anne Homero credendum...* (highligthened by the author – CS. L.) – DARES 1873. p. 1 (Prol.).

<sup>40</sup> “*vere et simpliciter*” ANONYMUS (1937). p. 33 (Prol.); DARES 1873. p. 1 (Prol.)

<sup>41</sup> JANKOVITS 2006. p. 15–16.

<sup>42</sup> The Deeds of the Hungarians (2010). p. 5. “*aperta hystoriarum explanatione*” – ANONYMUS (1937). p. 33 (Prol.).

<sup>43</sup> VIZKELETY 1990. p. 383.

analogies between a certain prince, and a certain hero. This would not be unexpected. On the contrary, he characterizes his princes with expressions borrowed from descriptions of several different heroes, and no connection is alluded between individual princes and individual heroes.<sup>44</sup> This suggests that he intended to create Hungarian heroes, like the Antique ones, and decorated with their characteristics, but he wanted them to be independently created, individual personalities, valiant and virtuous on their own right. In this case, he used his model, but did not follow it, and independently created Hungarian heroes, for Hungarian prehistory.

### **Citations from the *Excidium Troiae* in the descriptions of the Covenant of Blood, and the siege of the castle of Bihar**

In the description of Álmos' election (the so-called Covenant of Blood), the citation from the *Excidium Troiae* is taken from the description of Aeneas' proclamation as "dux". However, its wider context is completely different in the two texts. In the *Gesta*, the story is located among the first chapters: precisely in the fifth, and sixth. Only the Prologue, the description of Scythia, the explanation of the name "Hungarian", and the story of Álmos' miraculous birth and the youth precede it.<sup>45</sup> The main plot of the *Gesta* in actual fact begins with the election of Álmos: this is the starting point of the history of the Hungarian political entity. The stories of the migration to Pannonia, the conquest of the Carpathian Basin, and the victorious campaigns against all neighbouring countries follow it. These events are presented as the consequence of the election of Álmos, and the birth of Hungarian "*regnum*", as a political entity.<sup>46</sup> According to the *Gesta*, the circumstances of the election were, The *Gesta* writes about the circumstances of the election, as follows. The ancient Hungarians had been Scythians. Scythia had become overpopulated, and the "Seven Leading Persons"<sup>47</sup>, who operated as chiefs in Scythia, decided to acquire a new country. They choose Pannonia, because it had been the realm of Attila, Álmos' ancestor. Álmos descended from royal line, his birth was preceded by a divine dream of his mother, and he was so wise and powerful "as if the gift of the Holy Spirit was in him, although he was pagan"<sup>48</sup>. All in all, he and his family "were more outstanding by birth and more powerful in battle"<sup>49</sup> than the other Leading Persons, who were still "noble by

---

<sup>44</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 39 (c. 4), 106 (c. 53), 111 (c. 55); DARES 1873. p. 14–17 (c. 12–13).

<sup>45</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 34–39 (c. 1–4).

<sup>46</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 33 (Prol.). In that place, the Notary uses the phrase "*regnum*", to describe a concept of a transpersonal political entity, beyond the person of the prince/king and his nobles. This meaning of the term can be observed throughout the Notary's work, although there is no trace of a corporative theory of the state as an indestructible legal personality in the *Gesta*. See: Appendix 2. To judge the importance of the story of Álmos' election see the whole text of the *Gesta*: ANONYMUS (1937). p. 33–117 (c. 1–57).

<sup>47</sup> The Deeds of the Hungarians (2010). p. 17. In the original text this expression is: "Septem Principales Persone" (ANONYMUS (1937). p. 39.)

<sup>48</sup> The Deeds of the Hungarians (2010). p. 15.

<sup>49</sup> The Deeds of the Hungarians (2010). p. 17.

birth, strong in war".<sup>50</sup> When the Leading Persons realized, that they cannot complete the journey to Pannonia without a supreme leader, they chose Álmos for this position, because of his power and nobility. They elected him Prince ("dux"), swore allegiance to him, and confirmed their oath by mixing their blood in the same vase. Their oath was bilateral: Álmos, the new "dux" took it on one side, and the other "Leading Persons" took it on the other. Its essence was a compromise, that the Prince shared his power, and the wealth of the country with his nobles, and in return, they would be absolutely loyal to him and his dynasty.<sup>51</sup> The citation we are examining, is placed in the text of the proclamation of Álmos by the leaders.

In the *Excidium Troiae*, the election of Aeneas as a leader ("dux") happens towards the middle of the plot, at a crucial point: the fall of Troy. It is preceded by long passages narrating events that happened prior to, or during the Trojan war.<sup>52</sup> When the city is burning, and resistance is hopeless, Aeneas receives a vision from his mother, Venus, ordering him to get his family together, and leave the city. He departs for the shrine of Ceres in the mountains where he is fleeing/flees Trojan nobles. They suddenly proclaim him leader ("dux"). The circumstances of the election are not described in more details. Aftermath he returns to the city to find his wife, Creusa, but he can meet only with her spirit. After that he sets sail with the remnants of the Trojan People to Italy the land which was promised to them by Jupiter.<sup>53</sup> And a long story follows, telling his travels, his meeting with Dido, and his war in Italy, based mainly on the *Aeneid*.<sup>54</sup>

The comparison of the texts:

The election of Aeneas in the *Excidium Troiae* (Excidium Troiae 1944. p. 21. The text of variant "R")  
*"Dumque inceptum iter agerent uxor eius ab eo perrexit. Dumque ad templum venire, invenit ibi maximam turbam priorum et nobelium Troianorum, qui se illuc cum omnibus divitiis suis contulerant. Hiique Enea viso eius genibus provoluti cum magnis lacrimis deprecari ceperunt. Cui sic dixerunt: 'Te nobis ex hodierna die ducem confirmamus et ubicumque fueris fortunam tuam sequemur. Et hiis dictis Eneas ab eis dux confirmatus est.'"*

The election of Álmos in the *Gesta Hungarorum* (ANONYMUS (1937). p. 39–40 (c. 5–6).)

*"Tunc ipsi VII principales persone communi et vero consilio intellexerunt, quod inceptum iter perficere non possent, nisi ducem ac preceptorem super se habeant. Ergo libera voluntate et communi consensu VII virorum elegerunt sibi ducem ac preceptorem in filios filiorum suorum usque ad ultimam generationem Almus filium Vgek et qui de eius generatione descenderent quia Almus dux filius Vgek et, qui de generatione eius descenderant, clariores erant genere et potentiores in bello. Tunc pari voluntate Almo duci sic dixerunt: « Ex hodierna die te nobis ducem ac preceptorem eligimus et*

<sup>50</sup> The Deeds of the Hungarians (2010). p. 17.

<sup>51</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 34–41 (c. 1–4).

<sup>52</sup> *Excidium Troiae*. p. 3–21.

<sup>53</sup> *Excidium Troiae*. p. 20–21.

<sup>54</sup> *Excidium Troiae*. p. 21–57.

*quo fortuna tua te duxerit, illuc te sequemur.* » *Tunc supradicti viri pro Almo duce more paganismo fisis propriis sanguinibus in unum vas ratum fecerunt iuramentum.*”

The common motifs in the two stories are these: the nobles elect a charismatic leader, who is predestined by his miraculous birth, and is chosen by God/gods to lead his people to the country promised to them. This election means the beginning of a long story of migration and struggles, concluding in the conquest of the new land. However, the differences between the two situations are striking. The election of Álmos is the starting point of the main plot of the *Gesta*. The Notary elaborates the legal aspects of the election with a special attention to the relationship between the Prince and his nobles, because he considers it as the foundation of the whole Hungarian “*regnum*”, and makes it the fundament of his utopistic concept about the ideal rule. The election of Aeneas is seen in the *Excidium Troiae* as an event of political history. As such, it has a crucial role, and it is the starting point of the whole Roman history, but it does not have the legal dimensions that the Notary’s election-story has. It is not the starting point of the storyline of the whole romance either: it leads up only the last third of the plot.

It is also a striking difference that, while Álmos is elected by powerful and glorious Scythian nobles, Aeneas is proclaimed leader by exiles who have just fled from their burning city. It is also worth to mention, that besides the text of the proclamation, Master P. borrows from the election-story of the *Excidium Troiae*, only an insignificant phrase (*inceptum iter*) for allegedly stylistic purposes. Apart from these parallels, his whole story is completely different from that of the *Excidium Troiae*. It is his own composition, and although he uses parallels and citations to allude, and to decorate his style, they play second fiddle to his autonomous concept.

The text of the proclamation is a verbatim quotation from the *Excidium Troiae* and differs little from the original. There are only two differences. Instead of “*ducem confirmamus*” the Notary wrote “*ducem eligimus*”, and instead of “*ubi fueris fortunam tuam sequemur*”, he wrote “*quo fortuna tua te duxerit, illuc te sequemur*”. The Notary may have used “*eligere*” instead of “*confirmare*” because he wanted to emphasize the election, a legal process, which resulted in the birth of the Hungarian political entity. However, this change may have been made for stylistic purposes also. We can explain the second difference by stylistic reasons too. Nevertheless, a contamination with an unknown source might have been the cause of both divergences as well. The purpose of the use of literal quotation is clear: the Notary wanted to emphasize the similarity between the role of Álmos and Aeneas, between the Hungarians’ conquest of Pannonia, and the Trojans’ conquest of Latium, and between the birth of the Hungarian, and Roman political entities also. As we have seen in the Introduction, it was a widespread practice to link the prehistory of a medieval “nation”, in some way to the Trojans, or Alexander.

We can observe that Aeneas was seen the prototype of the forefather, the first prince, who had obtained the land which his offspring possessed later. He was also associated with the ancestry of prestigious dynasties like the Capetings or Plantagenets.<sup>55</sup> By associating Álmos with him, the Notary found place for his ancient Hungarians, in the ranks of the “antique” ancestors of Latin Christian peoples and dynasties. These were held to be Trojans, Macedonians, or were just presented as equal to them in glory and nobility. The Notary created a Hungarian prehistory which fitted in the context of the contemporary “national” prehistories, so it became understandable for the literate scholarship of the turn of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In the earlier chapters, he emphasized the antiquity of the Hungarians by identifying them with the Scythians, who were a well-known people of antiquity. According to the epitomes of Justin, and their redactions, they were the most ancient people of the world. They were also held to be the prestigious ancestors of early medieval Goths, and some European peoples of the age of the Notary.<sup>56</sup> Their inclusion was not Master P.’s innovation: the scholars of the Occident described the Hungarians, like every nomadic people, as Scythians from Regino onwards. It correlated with the Hungarian tradition of the horse-archer forefathers, which could easily have led Latin-speaking Hungarian scholars, to the idea of the ancestors’ identity with them. The Hungarian chroniclers adapted the antique Scythia-image, long before the Notary. He only followed this tradition, although he made some innovation, as he used the excerpt of Justin’s epitomes, the *Exordia Scythica* directly. As the Notary linked the Hungarian forefathers to the Scythians, and equated them to the Trojans in nobility, glory, and antiquity he also emphasized, that the Hungarians and the Hungarian Kingdom of his time was equal in these qualities to the contemporary European peoples and kingdoms, that were thought to be descended from the Trojans. As a true *litterator* of the Twelfth century Renaissance he could see the pagan Hungarians as positive protagonists, valiant heroes, and diminished the shame of their heathenism as he linked them to the glorious Trojans: the latter’s paganism was generally known. This positive attitude towards pagan times is reflected not only by the connection of Álmos to Aeneas, but also by the numerous other allusions to the two Troy-romances, and the Alexander-romance which our author used throughout the *Gesta*.<sup>57</sup> For example, when the pagan Hungarians lead campaigns and raids against Christian countries – very cruelly as the Notary admits – they do so because of their Alexander-like desire to wage wars and conquer lands for glory. This is expressed by a citation from the Alexander-romance. The ultimate purpose of this ferocity is to obtain good lands for their

---

<sup>55</sup> See above (“The role of the Troy- and Alexander-romances in the “national” histories of the early and high Middle Ages”).

<sup>56</sup> See above (“The role of the Troy- and Alexander-romances in the “national” histories of the early and high Middle Ages”), and ANONYMUS (1937), p. 33–37 (c. 1); JUSTINUS 1831, p. 21. (lib. 2, c. 1)

<sup>57</sup> See notes nr. 21–28.

descendants.<sup>58</sup> The association of Álmos with Aeneas was also useful for the Notary, because he wanted to express the Hungarian kings' sovereignty, and independence from the emperors and popes of his time.<sup>59</sup> And as he alluded to the similarity of the two elections, he suggested, that the foundations of the Roman and Hungarian polities had been laid down in a similar way, and therefore the emperors of the "Romans" could not claim sovereignty over the Hungarian kings.

The allusion in the description of the siege of the castle Bihar is expressed in very faint textual parallels, only two brief phrases are borrowed: we could not detect any connection between the two texts, without the parallels in the wider context of the two sieges.<sup>60</sup>

The only textual parallel is seen below.

<p>The siege of Laurentina (Excidium Troiae 1944 51. The text of variant "Ri".)  <i>"Dum duodecim dies pacis quod secum pepigerant expleti fuissent, <b>tertiadecima die</b> luciscente ante solis ortum Eneas cum omnibus suis se armavit, et ad civitatem Laurentinam, ubi Latinus rex pater Lavinie regnabat, produxit; et <b>ad muros scalas ponere</b> cepit, qualiter urbem ingredi potuisset."</i></p>	<p>The siege of the castle of Bihar (ANONYMUS (1937) 104. (c.51.)  <i>"<b>Terciodecimo autem die</b> cum Hungari et Syculi fossata castris implevissent et <b>scalas ad murum ponere</b> vellent milites ducis Menemorout videntes audaciam Hungarorum, ceperunt rogare hos duos principes exercitus..."</i></p>
---	--

We have to compare the plot of the two sieges. The story of the siege of the castle of Bihar takes place in the fiftieth-to fifty-second chapters. After Árpád and his nobles had conquered the entire Carpathian Basin, except for Bihar, they sent two of their number, Usbuu and Veluc with an army against Menemorout, Prince of that country, to complete the conquest.<sup>61</sup> Menemorout was a main enemy of the Hungarians, alongside prince Salanus. Both of them were of Bulgarian origin, vassals of the Byzantine emperor. Menemorout's ancestors held Bihar, even before the time of Attila. Menemorout in the beginning of the Hungarian conquest received envoys from prince Árpád, in the beginning of the Hungarian conquest, and talked arrogantly to them rejecting to surrender even an acre of his land. He was the sole prince in the Carpathian Basin, who was able to win battle against the Hungarians, and was the last to fall. He had no son, so his heiress was his daughter.<sup>62</sup> Usbuu and Veluc crossed river Tisza, and the Széklers, who had formerly been people of king Attila joined to them and fought in the vanguard of the Hungarian army.

The army crossed river Kőrös, and Menemorout became terrified, because he heard about the Hungarians' victory over the Romans in Veszprém. He had

<sup>58</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 91 (c. 44); Gesta Hungarorum (1991). p. 172, note nr. 264.

<sup>59</sup> GERICS 1995. passim.

<sup>60</sup> VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 161–163.

<sup>61</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 101–103.

<sup>62</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 48–50 (c. 11), 59–63 (c. 19–20), 106 (c. 52).

fled to the wood Ygfon with his wife and daughter, leaving behind only his soldiers to defend his seat, the castle of Bihar. The Hungarians started the siege, and they fought for twelve days with their bows and *ballistae*. On the thirteenth day they put their ladders at the walls, and the soldiers of Menumorout surrendered. Having heard this, the prince sent envoys to ask for peace. He offered his daughter's hand to Zulta, Prince Árpád's son, and promised, that after his death, Zulta would inherit his country, if the Hungarians did not dethrone him. Usbuu and Veluc sent the envoys to Árpád, who accepted the offer, and organized a great wedding for Zulta and Menumorout's daughter. After two years Menumorout died, and Zulta inherited the country.<sup>63</sup>

The conquest of Aeneas in Italy happened according to the *Excidium Troiae* as follows. When he had arrived to Latium, and disembarked his ships in Ostia. He heard about the power of king Latinus, and Turnus, who was the fiancé of Lavinia, Latinus' daughter. Therefore, he formed alliance with king Evander, who ruled in the area where Rome was to be founded. Turnus was meanwhile angered by a fury that Juno had sent to him, and attacked the camp of the Trojans, while Aeneas was at Evander's place. Yet Aeneas drove him away with the reinforcements he accepted from Evander. Thereafter he, and Evander marched against Laurentina, Latinus' capital. There Latinus mustered a huge army, receiving reinforcements from his friends, and placed it under Turnus' command. A great battle was fought, and Aeneas triumphed. Latinus, to gain time, called for an armistice of twelve days, which was accepted by Aeneas. Both the Latins and Trojans could bury their dead comrades. Latinus sent envoys to his friend, Diomedes the Thracian for aid but he refused to help, because he feared the Trojans valour. On the thirteenth day the Trojans put their ladders to the walls of Laurentina. Turnus marched out of the city with his army. However, his soldiers revolted, and compelled him to call Aeneas out to duel, under the circumstances, that the victor would get the hand of Lavinia, and the throne of Latium. During the duel, Jupiter put the fates of Aeneas and Turnus on balance, and the *Fatum* choose Aeneas to be victor, who thus gained both the hand of Lavinia and the throne of Latium.<sup>64</sup> The contexts of the two sieges are different in many aspects, however there are parallels, that, in the light of the existence of the textual connection cannot be coincidences. Both sieges conclude the conquest. The last attack on the castle Bihar is preceded by a battle of twelve days, while the assault on Laurentina follows an armistice of the same length. The assailants put their ladders to the walls on the thirteenth day in both cases. Both sieges are followed by an agreement, a marriage of a conqueror with the sole daughter and heiress of the defeated king. Thus, this conqueror gets the country peacefully (and legally) as inheritance. With the help of these parallels, the Notary links the concluding events of the Hungarian conquest, to those of Aeneas' conquest in

<sup>63</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 101–106 (c. 50–52).

<sup>64</sup> *Excidium Troiae*. p. 37–54



Italy. This allusion, and the citation story of the election of Álmos, frame the story of the Hungarian conquest and imply its likeliness to the conquest of Latium by Aeneas. It also implies the Hungarian conquerors likeliness and equality in valour and glory to the Trojans. There is in the fifty-second chapter of the *Gesta*, an allusion to the wedding of Alexander and Roxane in the "J2" version of the Alexander-romance.<sup>65</sup> This clearly indicates, that Master P. paralleled the concluding moments of the Hungarian Conquest not only to those of the Trojan conquest of Italy, but also to the completion of Alexander's conquest of Persia.

It is worth noting what the limits of the use of the *Excidium Troiae* suggest. The Notary borrows nothing from the *Excidium Troiae* in the chapter describing the "Covenant of Blood", but the expression of swearing fealty to the new leader and the meaningless "*inceptum iter*". It may indicate not only that he wanted to describe the legal aspects of the election, and therefore could not find place to elaborate the parallel between the two proclamations, but also a conscious attempt to keep distance from the Troy Romances. An effort, to develop an image of ancient Hungarians as a "*gens*" that has its own values, and its autonomous history, which are similar to that of the Trojans, and equally valuable, but represent different values, and different quality. This theory may be confirmed by the use of the motif of the blood-pact. Either it had originated in the Hungarian oral traditions, or in the Antique Scythia-literature, by its use, the Notary clearly emphasized that this is a story about Hungarians, who have all the peculiarities of their culture. In the allusion to the siege of Laurentina, apart from the parallels noted below, there is little resemblance on the text and plot of the *Excidium Troiae* either. We could observe in the chapter about the Notary's use of "Dares"'s work, that he keeps distance from that romance also, in the case of the description of the Hungarian princes. We can suppose that the Notary created a standalone history of the Hungarian conquest, and although he draws similarities between it, and the battles of Aeneas, these similarities are secondary to its main, independent plot. He does not turn the *Gesta* into a Troy-romance of Hungarian subject but preserves its own characteristics. This can be observed in accordance the relationship of the whole *Gesta* with the Troy-and Alexander-romances too. The main storyline of this work is an autonomous creation of the Notary, and he applies citations, allusions, textual and thematical parallels, to connect it with those Romances, yet inserts them in the plot that has already been completed. Even the closest parallels do not change the main storyline, they only set it in broader context.<sup>66</sup> There is another

<sup>65</sup> ANONYMUS (1937). p. 105 (c. 52), *Historia de Preliis* I. p. 216.

<sup>66</sup> For example, the Notary's varied use of the Alexander-romance is restricted to citations in the descriptions of battles, to borrowing of motifs which spice up the story, or to parallels which allude to similarities between the Hungarian conquerors and Alexander, but these never influence the main plot of the *Gesta* essentially. See borrowings: ANONYMUS (1937). p. 44 (c. 8), 81–82 (c. 39), 86 (c. 41); *Historia de Preliis* I. p. 8, 48–50, 94, 108–110, 110–112, 166–168, 176–178, 192–195, II. p. 16–18, 20–24, 42, 50, 58; *Gesta Hungarorum* (1991). p. 149–150, notes nr. 82–83, 166, note nr. 212, 167, notes nr. 215, 217, 168, note nr. 230; ANONYMUS (1937). p. 91 (c. 44); *Historia de Preliis*

difference between the *Gesta* and the *Excidium Troiae*. The latter goes into more detail about the adventures of each hero.<sup>67</sup> The Notary concentrates on the political and military affairs, and in the few places where he speaks about the adventure of a certain nobleman, he does not give many details,<sup>68</sup> perhaps because he doesn't want to break the main storyline of the conquest. In this respect he does not follow the example of the *Excidium Troiae* at all, his practice is more similar to that of "Dares".<sup>69</sup> It might suggest that in keeping with his claim in the Prologue, he followed "Dares", as his model of appropriate style,<sup>70</sup> or just that he wanted to write a historical work, and he felt, that the novelistic motifs are not appropriate to the proper style of it.

## Conclusion

Using of two "Dares"-citations in his Prologue, the Notary alludes to the similarity between his historiographical principles and those of "Dares" and "Nepos". He declares that he wants to write the Hungarians prehistory in the spirit of the historiographers, who are represented in the Prologue by most ancient, and thus the most prestigious pagan historian Dares, and the first Christian historian, Moses, whose use is also implicated by the mention of the Holy Scripture. The Notary also alludes, that Dares and Nepos are his main models in historiography. Master P. declares also that he will at least partly follow the requirements of the literary genre of the Troy- and Alexander-romances, and that he will use them to compose a Hungarian prehistory in appropriate style. He states directly that he wishes to follow the example of Dares.

As he specifies what he considers to be the appropriate style, he also defines the place of his work in contemporary rhetoric: a supposed Cicero-allusion may contribute to this also. Regarding the two *Excidium Troiae* – allusions, that we examined here, we can state, that both of them were used to express the similarity between Álmos and Aeneas, the Hungarian conquest and the Trojan conquest, the glory and valour of the Hungarians, and that of the Trojans.

---

II. p. 12–14; ANONYMUS (1937). p. 105 (c. 52); *Historia de Preliis I.* p. 216; ANONYMUS (1937). p. 36 (c. 1), 60 (c. 20), 76 (c. 34), 111 (c. 55); *Historia de Preliis I.* p. 32, 54, 68–70, 92, 108, 124, 168; *Gesta Hungarorum* (1991). p. 160 note nr. 152, 165, note nr. 203, 171–172, notes nr. 257, 258, 264, 176, note nr. 314, 178, note nr. 326.

<sup>67</sup> *Excidium Troiae*, passim

<sup>68</sup> see for instance: ANONYMUS (1937). p. 54–57 (c. 15–16), 76 (c. 34).

<sup>69</sup> even the „J2”-redaction of the Alexander-romance writes much about the personal adventures and stories of Alexander. It marks the plot throughout the whole work: *Historia de Preliis*, passim. László Veszprémy has called our attention to this phenomenon in accordance with the differences between the Notary's work and the vernacular Alexander-romances (VESZPRÉMY 2019. p. 159)

<sup>70</sup> However, in this case we couldn't explain properly, why he does not quote Dares more times than we can observe. There is a possibility, that he learnt that Dares was the model for proper style of historiography, and he wanted to follow his example, yet didn't have any text of Dares at his disposal, and this was the cause why he did not employ more citations from the work of the "Phrygian". However, this is mere speculation.

Doing so, the Notary completed the standards of contemporary prehistory-writing. These standards required the use of *historiae* of Troy and Alexander besides other medieval accounts on antiquity, either by showing the Trojan, Macedonian (or even Scythian) origin of the ancestors, or by emphasizing their equality with them. Completing these standards, the Notary could prove the equality of the Hungarians' glory with that of the Trojans and could make the Hungarians' prehistory able to be understood for the literate scholars of his age. However, we can observe, that the Notary set a certain limit to his use of the Troy-romances. He alludes to them and cites them to express similarity between the Hungarian conquerors and the Trojans, and between the Hungarian conquest and the conquest of Aeneas in Latium. Yet he always preserves the independent concept of Hungarian history, and his independently created storyline. He uses the Troy-romances (and also the Alexander-romance), often even as models, but never follows them servilely. He created a work that was proper to the standards of contemporary "national" prehistory-writing, but this work was a prehistory of the Hungarians, so he represented their own values. He wrote a prehistory peculiar to the Hungarian *gens* and did not allow it to become a mere imitation of Troy-romances.

## Appendix

## Appendix 1

## The prologues of “Dares” and Master P.

The Prologue of „Dares” (DARES 1873 1. (Prol.))	The Prologue of the Notary (ANONYMUS (1937) 33–34. (Prol.))
<p>“<i>Cornelius Nepos Sallustio Crispo suo salutem.</i>  <i>Cum multa ago Athenis curiose, inveni historiam Daretis Phrygii ipsius manu scriptam, ut titulus indicat, quam de Graecis et Troianis memoriae mandavit. <b>Quam ego summo amore complexus</b> continuo transtuli. Cui nihil adiciendum vel diminuendum rei reformandae causa putavi, alioquin mea posset videri, <b>optimum ergo duxi</b> ita <b>ut fuit vere et simpliciter</b> perscripta, sic eam ad verbum in latinitatem transvertere, <b>ut legentes cognoscere possent, quomodo res gestae essent:</b> utrum verum magis esse existiment, quod Dares Phrygius memoriae commendavit, qui per id ipsum tempus vixit et militavit, cum Graeci Troianos obpugnarent, anne Homero credendum, qui post multos annos natus est, quam bellum hoc gestum est. De qua re Athenis iudicium fuit, cum pro insano haberetur, quod deos cum hominibus belligerasse scripserit. Sed hactenus ista: nunc ad pollicitum revertamur.”</i></p>	<p>“<i>P. dictus magister ac quondam bone memoriae gloriosissimi Bele regis Hungariae notarius N. suo dilectissimo amico, viro venerabili et arte litteralis scientie inbuto, salutem et sue petitionis affectum (sic). Dum olim in scolari studio simul essemus et in hystoria Troiana, <b>quam ego cum summo amore complexus</b> ex libris Darethis Frigii ceterorumque auctorum, sicut a magistris meis audiveram, in unum volumen proprio stilo compilaveram, pari voluntate legeremus, petisti a me, ut, sicut hystoriam Troianam bellaque Grecorum scripseram, ita et genealogiam regum Hungariae et nobilium suorum, qualiter septem principales persone, que Hetumoger vocantur, de terra Scithica descenderunt vel qualis sit terra Scithica et qualiter sit generatus dux Almus aut quare vocatur Almus primus dux Hungariae, a quo reges Hungarorum originem duxerunt, vel quot regna et reges sibi subiugaverunt aut quare populus de terra Scithica egressus per ydioma alienigenarum Hungarii et in sua lingua propria Mogerii vocantur, tibi scriberem. Promisi et enim me facturum, sed aliis negotiis impeditus et tue petitionis et mee promissionis iam pene eram oblitus, nisi mihi per litteras tua dilectio debitum reddere monuisset. Memor igitur tue dilectionis, quamvis multis et diversis huius laboriosi seculi impeditus sim negotiis, facere tamen aggressus sum, que facere iussisti, et secundum traditiones diversorum hystoriographorum divine gratie fultus auxilio optimum estimans, ut ne posteris in ultimam generationem oblivioni tradatur. <b>Optimum ergo duxi, ut vere et simpliciter</b> tibi scriberem, <b>quod legentes possint</b></i></p>

	<p><b>agnoscere, quomodo res geste essent.</b> <i>Et si tam nobilissima gens Hungarie primordia sue generationis et fortia queque facta sua ex falsis fabulis rusticorum vel a garrulo cantu ioculatorum quasi sompniando audiret, valde indecorum et satis indecens esset. Ergo potius ammodo de certa scripturarum explanatione et aperta hystoriarum interpretatione rerum veritatem nobiliter percipiat. Felix igitur Hungaria, cui sunt dona data varia, omnibus enim horis gaudeat de munere sui litteratoris, quia exordium genealogie regum suorum et nobilium habet, de quibus regibus sit laus et honor regi eterno et sancte MaRie (sic) matri eius, per gratiam cuius reges Hungarie et nobiles regnum habeant felici fine hic et in evum. AMEN"</i></p>
--	--

## Appendix 2

The occurrences of the word "regnum" and its meaning (i.e. territorial concept, or political entity)

<p><b>Places, where the term "regnum" is clearly used in its political sense</b></p>	<p>ANONYMUS (1937). p. 39. (c. 4.)</p>	<p>"[Almus] potentior fuit et sapientior omnibus ducibus Scithie et omnia negotia <b>regni</b> eo tempore faciebant consilio et auxilio ipsius."</p>
	<p>ANONYMUS (1937). p. 41. (c. 6.)</p>	<p>"Isti principales personae (...) nunquam a consilio ducis et honore <b>regni</b> omnino privarentur."</p>
	<p>ANONYMUS (1937). p. 47. (c. 11.)</p>	<p>"[Dux Galiciae] unicum filium suum cum ceteris filiis primatum <b>regni</b> sui in obsidem dedit."</p>
	<p>ANONYMUS (1937). p. 83. (c. 40.)</p>	<p>"dux et sui nobiles ordinaverunt omnes consuetudinarias leges <b>regni</b> et omnia iura eius, qualiter servirent duci et primatibus suis vel qualiter iudicium facerent pro quolibet crimine commisso. (...) Hungarii secundum suum idioma nominaverunt Scerii eo, quod ibi ordinatum fuit totum negotium <b>regni</b>"</p>

	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 107. (c. 53.)	<i>"Transactis quibusdam temporibus dux Zulta cum esset XIII<sup>ci</sup>m annorum, omnes primates <b>regni</b> sui communi consilio et pari voluntate quosdam rectores <b>regni</b> sub duce prefece<sup>r</sup>unt, qui moderamine iuris consuetudinis dissidentium lites contentionesque sopirent."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 107. (c. 53.)	<i>"Thocsun vero dux cum omnibus primatibus Hungarie potenter et pacifice per omnes dies vite sue obtinuit omnia iura <b>regni</b> sui [...]"</i>
<b>places, where the term "regnum" can be used both in its political and territorial sense</b>	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 34. (Prol.)	<i>"reges Hungarie et nobiles <b>regnum</b> habeant felici fine"</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 113. (c. 56.)	<i>"[Hoto rex] cum omni robore <b>regni</b> sui eos invadens..."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 114. (c. 57.)	<i>"[Dux Zulta] ipso vivente accepit iuramenta suorum nobilium et filium suum Tocsun fecit ducem ac dominatorem super totum <b>regnum</b> Hungarie."</i>
<b>Places, where the term "regnum" most probably has a territorial meaning, but it cannot be excluded, that it is used in its political sense also</b>	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 35. (c. 1.)	<i>"Athila (...) in terram Pannonie venit et fugatis Romanis <b>regnum</b> obtinuit..."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 44. (c. 8.)	<i>"[Dux Hyeu et suis primates] magis vellent mori in bello, quam amitterent <b>regna</b> propria"</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 80. (c. 38.)	<i>"Dux Salanus (...) timuit, ut ne aliquando iracundia ducti eum expellerent de <b>regno</b> suo."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 100–101. (c. 50.)	<i>"[Arpad et suis milites] Sclauorum et Pannoniorum gentes et <b>regna</b> vastaverunt et eorum regiones occupaverunt."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 103. (c. 51.)	<i>"[Dux Menumorout] audiverat ducem Arpadium et suos milites (...) <b>regnumque</b> Pannoniorum occupasse..."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 105. (c. 51.)	<i>„[Arpad filiam Menumorouti] in uxorem Zulte accepit cum <b>regno</b> sibi promisso..."</i>

	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 106. (c.52.)	<i>"Memorout post istam causam in secundo anno sine filio mortuus est et <b>regnum</b> eius totaliter Zulte generi suo dimisit in pace."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 111 (c. 56.)	<i>"[Inimici Athoni regis] sciebant, quod Hungarii essent insuperabiles in assuetis bellorum laboribus et plurimis <b>regnis</b> deus per eos furoris sui flagella propinasset."</i>
<b>Places, where the term "regnum" is clearly used in its territorial sense.</b>	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 35. (c. 1.)	<i>"Scithici Alexandrum Magnum filium Phylippi regis et regine Olympiadis, qui multa <b>regna</b> pugnando sibi subiugaverat, ipsum etiam turpiter fugaverunt."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 39. (c. 4.)	<i>"in <b>regno</b> Scythiae"</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 44. (c. 8.)	<i>"[Hungari] voluerunt <b>regnum</b> Rutenorum sibi subiugare"</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 47. (c. 11.)	<i>"Dux vero Lodomeriensis et sui primates obviam Almo duci usque ad confinium <b>regni</b> cum diversis pretiosis muneribus processerunt..."</i>
	ANONYMUS, SRH 937. p. 58. (c. 18.)	<i>"missus est Borsu filius Bunger (...) qui confinia <b>regni</b> conspiceret et obstaculis conformaret usque ad montem Turtur et in loco convenienti castrum construeret causa custodio <b>regni</b>."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 64. (c. 22.)	<i>"Zobolsu, Thosu et Tuhutum inito consilio constituerunt, ut meta <b>regni</b> ducis Arpad esset in porta Mezesina. Tunc incole terre russu eorum portas lapideas edificaverunt et clausuram magnam de arboribus per confinium <b>regni</b> fecerunt."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 64. (c. 23.)	<i>"Thosu et Zobolsu nec non Tuhutum (...) confinia <b>regni</b> firmaverunt obstaculis firmissimis."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 76. (c. 34.)	<i>"[Zuard, Cadusa filii Huleg, Huba, Borsu filius Bunger] constituerunt, ut tertia pars de exercitu cum incolis terre irent in silvam Zouolon, qui facerent in confinio <b>regni</b> munitiores fortes tam de lapidibus quam etiam de lignis, ut ne aliquando Boemy vel Polonv possent intrare causa furti et rapine in <b>regnum</b> eorum."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 79. (c. 37.)	<i>"[Zuard, Cadusa, Huba] firmatis obstaculis constituerunt terminos <b>regni</b> Hungarorum..."</i>

	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 94. (c. 46.)	<i>"Fercula, pocula portabantur duci et nobilibus in vasis aureis, servientibus et rusticis in vasis argenteis, quia omnia bona aliorum <b>regnum</b> circumiacentium dederat deus in manus eorum."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 105. (c. 52.)	<i>"Dux vero Arpad et omnes sui primates (...) fere cottidie comedebant nuptialiter cumas diversis mili(ti)bus circumiacentium <b>regnum</b>..."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 107. (c. 53.)	<i>"Alios autem constituerunt ductores exercitus, cum quibus diversa <b>regna</b> vastarent, quorum nomina hec fuerunt: Lelu filius Tosu, Bulsuu vir sanguinis filius Bogát, Bonton (sic) filius Culpun. Erant enim isti viri bellicosi et fortes in animo, quorum cura nulla fuit alia, nisi domino suo subiugare gentes et devastare <b>regna</b> aliorum."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 112. (c. 56.)	<i>"[Hungari] <b>regnum</b> Latariensem (sic) arcu et sagittis exterminaverunt."; „Botond filius Culpun et Urcun filius Eusee) ad propria <b>regna</b> revertuntur"</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 113. (c. 56.)	<i>"[Botond et Urcun] ad propria redeunt <b>regna</b> cum magna victoria."</i>
	ANONYMUS (1937). p. 113–114. (c. 57.)	<i>"Dux vero Zulta (...) fixit metas <b>regni</b> Hungarie..."; „ultra lutum Musun collocavit etiam Bissenos non paucos habitare pro defensione <b>regni</b> sui..."; „ex parte Polonorum usque ad montem Turtur, sicut primo fecerat <b>regni</b> metam Borsu filius Bunger."</i>



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Sources

- ANONYMUS (1999) *Anonymus: A magyarok cselekedetei, Kézai Simon: a magyarok cselekedetei.* [Anonymus: The Deeds of the Hungarians; Simon de Kéza: The Deeds of the Hungarians.] Ford.: VESZPRÉMY László – BOLLÓK János. Az utószót és a jegyzeteket írta: VESZPRÉMY László. Budapest. 1999.
- ANONYMUS (1937) *Anonymus: Gesta Hungarorum.* Ed. JAKUBOVICH, Aemilius – PAIS, Desiderius. In: *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum. Tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadiane Gestarum.* I–II. Ed. SZENTPÉTERY, Emericus. Budapestini. 1937. I. p. 33–117. (reprinted: Budapest. 1999)
- DARES *Daretis Phrygii de Excidio Troiae Historia.* Ed: MEISTER, Ferdinandus. Leipzig. 1873.
- Excidium Troiae *Excidium Troiae.* Ed. ATWOOD, Elmer Bagby. Cambridge. (Massachusetts) 1944. (reprinted: New York. 1971.)
- Gesta Hungarorum (1991) *Die "Gesta Hungarorum" des anonymen Notars. Die älteste Darstellung der ungarischen Geschichte.* Hrsg. SILAGI, Gabriel. Mitarb. VESZPRÉMY, László. Sigmaringen. 1991.
- The Deeds of the Hungarians (2010) *Anonymus, Notary of King Béla: The Deeds of the Hungarians.* Eds. and trans.: RADY, Martin – VESZPRÉMY, László. In: *Anonymus and Master Roger.* Eds.: BAK, M. János – BOKROWSKA, Urszula – CONSTABLE, Giles – JARITZ, Gerhard – KLANICZAY, Gábor. Budapest – New York 2010.
- Historia de Preliis *Historia de praeliis Alexandri Magni. Rezension J<sup>o</sup> (Orosius-Rezension).* Hrsg. HILKA, Alfons. Meisenheim am Glan. 1976–1977.
- JUSTINUS *Iustini Historiae Philippicae.* Ed. DUEBNER, Fridericus. Lipsiae. 1831.

### Secondary Literature

- BÁCSATYAI 2013 *BÁCSATYAI, Dániel: Gesta eorum digna aeternitate laudis. Közös motívumok Geoffrey of Mounmouth és P. mester regényes gestaiban [Gesta eorum digna aeternitate laudis – Common Motifs in the Gesta of Geoffrey of Mounmouth and Master P.]. Századok 147 (2013), p. 279–315.*
- BORZSÁK 1984 *BORZSÁK, István: A Nagy Sándor-hagyomány Magyarországon [The Alexander-Tradition in Hungary].* Budapest. 1984.
- DEÉR 1938 *DEÉR, József: Pogány magyarság, keresztény magyarság [Heathen Hungarians, Christian Hungarians].* Budapest. 1938.
- GERICS 1995 *GERICS, József: Az állmaszuverenitás védelme, és a „két jog” alkalmazásának szempontjai XII–XIII. századi krónikáinkban [The Protection of the Sovereignty of the Kingdom, and Considerations on the use of the Roman and Canonic law, in our 12<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> Century Chronicles].* In: GERICS, József: *Egyház, állam és gondolkodás Magyarországon a középkorban.* Budapest. 1995. p. 218–239.
- GYÖRFFY 1993 *GYÖRFFY, György: Krónikáink és a magyar őstörténet – Régi kérdések, új válaszok [Our Chronicles and the Hungarian Prehistory – Old Questions, New Answers].* Budapest. 1993.
- GYÖRY 1948 *GYÖRY, János: Gesta regum, gesta nobilium. Tanulmány Anonymus krónikájáról [Gesta regum, gesta nobilium – A Study about the Chronicle of Anonymus].* Budapest. 1948.

- HORVÁTH 1954 HORVÁTH, János: *Árpád-kori latinnyelvű irodalmunk stílusproblémái* [The Problems of The Style of Our Latin Literature in The Age of The Árpáds]. Budapest. 1954.
- HORVÁTH 1966 HORVÁTH, János: P. mester és műve [Master P. and His Work]. *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 70 (1966), p. 1–53, 261–282.
- JANKOVITS 2006 JANKOVITS, László: P. mester, a hazugok, a fecsegők, és az álmodozók [Master P., The Liars, The Gabblers, and The Dreamers]. In: *Jankovits László: Hazugok fecsegők és álmodozók – tanulmányok a régi magyar költészetéről*. Budapest. 2006. p. 9–20.
- KAPITÁNYFFY 1971 KAPITÁNYFFY, István: Anonymus és az Excidium Troiae [Anonymus and the Excidium Troiae]. *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 75 (1971), p. 726–729.
- KERSKEN 1995 KERSKEN, Norbert: Geschichtschreibung im Europa der „nationes”. Nationalgeschichtliche Gesamtdarstellungen im Mittelalter. Köln – Weimar – Wien. 1995.
- KRISTÓ 1970 KRISTÓ, Gyula: Az Exordia Scythica, Regino és a magyar krónikák [The Exordia Scythica, Regino, and The Hungarian Chronicles]. *Filológiai Közöny* 16 (1970), p. 106–116.
- MARCZALI 1877 MARCZALI Henrik: Béla király jegyzője. Kútfői tanulmány [The Notary of King Béla – A Study about The Source]. *Egyetemes Filológiai Közöny* 1 (1877), p. 357–371.
- MOLNÁR 2023 MOLNÁR Péter: Kézai Simon „hun-magyar alkotmánytana” [The „Hun-Hungarian Constitution” by Master Simon de Kéza]. Budapest. 2023.
- NÉMETH 2003 NÉMETH György: The Origins of the Tale of the Blood-Drinking Hungarians. In: *Tolerance and Intolerance in Historical Perspective*. Ed. LÉVAI, Csaba – VESE, Vasile. Pisa. 2003. p. 91–110.
- SZOVÁK 2021 SZOVÁK Kornél: Szkítia és a szittya azonosságtudat [Scythia and the Scythian Identity]. *Magyar Tudomány*, 182 (2021) p. 176–187.
- SZÜCS 1997 SZÜCS, Jenő: “Gentilizmus”. A barbár etnikai tudat kérdése [“Gentilism”. The Problem of Barbaric Ethnic Identity.] in: Szűcs, Jenő: A magyar nemzeti tudat kialakulása. Ed. Zimonyi, István. Budapest. 1997. p. 7–296.
- THOROCZKAY 1999 THOROCZKAY, Gábor: Anonymus latin nyelvű külföldi forrásai. Historiográfiai tanulmány [The Latin Sources of Anonymus from Abroad. A Historiographic Study]. *Turul* 72 (1999), p. 108–117.
- VERCAMER 2018 VERCAMER, Grischa: The Origins of the Polish Piast Dynasty as Chronicled by Bishop Vincent of Kraków (Wincenty Kadłubek) to Serve as a Political Model for His Own Contemporary Time. *The Medieval Chronicle* 11 (2018), p. 220–247.
- VESZPRÉMY 1995 VESZPRÉMY László: Névtelenek, krónikák. Árpád-kori történeti irodalmunk újabb stílusproblémái [Anonymous Authors and Cronicles – Newer Problems Concerning Our Historiography in the Arpadian Era]. *Budapesti Könyvszemle* 7 (1995), p. 172–176.
- VESZPRÉMY 2019 VESZPRÉMY László: *Történetírás és történetírók az Árpád-kori Magyarországon. XI – XIII. század közepe*. [History Writing and Historians in Hungary during the Reign of the Arpad Dynasty. Eleventh–Mid Thirteenth Century]. Budapest. 2019.