STUDIA HISTORICA
96
Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae

J. SZÜCS

THEORETICAL ELEMENTS IN MASTER SIMON OF KÉZA'S GESTA HUNGARORUM (1282-1285 A. D.)

J. SZŰCS

THEORETICAL ELEMENTS IN MASTER SIMON OF KÉZA'S GESTA HUNGARORUM (1282–1285 A.D.)

STUDIA HISTORICA

ACADEMIAE SCIENTIARUM HUNGARICAE

96.

J. SZÜCS

THEORETICAL ELEMENTS IN MASTER SIMON OF KÉZA'S GESTA HUNGARORUM (1282-1285 A. D.)

AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ, BUDAPEST 1975

From

Etudes Historiques 1975. I.

Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1975

ISBN 963 05 0809 5

© *Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1975*

Printed in Hungary

1

One can begin to speak truly of European history since "Europe" grew from a mere geographic concept into something new: a structural unity. But since when and to what extent can one speak of "European" structures? It is not very easy to demarcate unambiguously the historical and conceptual *terminus post quem*, since it is a question of viewpoint where and in which combination of criteria one deems to find the essential, the determining circumstance within the thousand year process beginning with the dissolution of the ancient world and leading to modern Europe.

As for the very beginning, certain primary conditions undoubtedly already lie concealed in that process which shifted the focus of history from the ancient centre of civilisation, the Mediterranean, further north, toward the periphery of the late ancient world, that is, toward the interior of a Europe which, though not unknown to ancient geography, had changing borders. There is, therefore, some grounds for the widespread idea which ties the "Making of Europe" to the centuries of the early Middle Ages. There is even something significant in the fact that Europe, heretofore a mere geographic demarcation, first appeared at the time of Charlemagne, as the expression of a totality of specific social and cultural ideas, a synonym for *Christianitas (societas fidelium Christianorum)*. The term appeared, in short, around 800 A.D. as the conceptual framework of a specified "structure"; in modern terms: Christian feudal society.[1] The Carolingian unity, conceived of as *Imperium Christi*, can, in fact be considered as the first experiment in the creation of a synthesis which almost contained within its borders the new historical area developing since the fall of the western half of *Imperium Romanum*, (after the Islamic conquest, in detaching the southern half of the former *Orbis Latinus*, finally put an end to the dissolution of the antique Mediterranean); a synthesis which also summarized the results of three centuries of internal transformation in this area: the overcoming of the antagonism between the late-antique Romano-Christian and the Germanic-barbarian worlds, and their progressive symbiosis. Indeed, much of the future Europe is adumbrated *in statu nascendi*, as the two elements, in part mutually nullifying each other, in part mutually permeating one another, became the first medium of an emerging structure, which was, by now, neither "Roman", nor "barbarian", but of a new quality: feudal. The synthesis, however, was transitional and fleeting; the framework itself was temporary and imperfect. On the one hand, there was absent from

[1] W. Ullmann: *A History of Political Thought. The Middle Ages*. Harmondsworth, 1965, p. 70.

this "Europe" the Hispania then in Islamic hands (Britannia, too, was only loosely connected with it). On the other hand, its eastern limits terminated in the area stretching from the Elbe to the western edge of the onetime Pannonia, where the *Orbis Christianus* ended. The northern part of Europe in its geographical sense, and its eastern half, were at this time and throughout the next two or three centuries, still given the same collective name as had been applied in the fifth century to the world beyond the Rhine: "barbarians". Even in the tenth century, the Saxon Widukind spoke of the Magyar's defeat at Augsburg (955) as a victory over the enemies of "Europe". At the same time, at the other part of the future Europe of the Middle Ages, stood Byzantium in the retreat of its isolation from the waves of the "barbarians" and fairly isolated from the seeds of western feudal-Christian "Europe", still trying to guard, with a passive and defensive rigidity, whatever it could of the "Roman" tradition. The picture is thus, as yet, heterogeneous and shapeless. This historical phase — the sixth to the eighth centuries — had worked out but the first, though prominent crystallizing nucleus of Europe. The rest is, as yet, nothing but amorphous raw material.

As a matter of fact, Europe "was made" only when the abyss between the concept in its geographical sense and the idea in its socio-cultural sense was bridged by historical development. In other words, it was perfected when the framework was filled in with more or less identical content. Even the preconditions for this were created only by a new historical phase, the ninth to the eleventh centuries. There exist some analogies between the earlier and the later phases. Even as in the fourth and fifth centuries the beginning was signified by the "barbarian" invasions, later, it was again "barbarian" invasions which threatened the Christian world. For after the Slavic, and other mass-migrations originating in the Steppes had already filled the space between the West and Byzantium, (and, of course, the Arab world, as has been noted, had conclusively appropriated Rome's southern heritage), it was the Norman attacks from the North, and the Magyar invasions from the East in the course of the eighth to the tenth centuries, which inspired their contemporaries' visions of the end of the World.

The consolidation, however, is marked by the final formation of the latter — around the turn of the first millennium — into new Christian nations, stretching from Scandinavia down all the way to Byzantium, from the periphery of the former Carolingian "Europe" to the nomadic remnants now confined to the eastern boundaries of geographical Europe. This new synthesis is signified as if by a seismograph by the fact that the concept of *Europa*, with its above mentioned deeper "structural" content, begins at just about 1100 to embrace the totality of the expanded *Orbis Christianus* unit, which hereafter practically coincides with the geographical limits. It was only the turn of the first millennium which created the preconditions for the unity of "European history" as such.[2]

[2] For the details see H. Gollwitzer: *Zur Wortgeschichte und Sinndeutung von "Europe"*. Saeculum, 2 (1951), pp. 161–172; G. Barraclough: *Die Einheit Europas im Mittelalter*. Die Welt als Geschichte, 11 (1951), pp. 97–122; H. Aubin: *Der Aufbau des Abendlandes im Mittelalter*. Historische Zeitschrift, 187 (1957), pp. 497–520; O. Halecki: *The Limits and Divisions of European History*. New York, 1950: For the discussion of problems relating to the "old" and "new" barbarians, L. Musset: *Les Invasions. Les vagues germaniques* Paris, 1965, and: *Les Invasions. Le second assaut contre l'Europe Chrétienne* (VII^{e}–XI^{e} siècle). Paris, 1965.

From the outset, there was of course, and there always remained something relative in this unity. Even the early nucleus of Europe was dissociated by certain regional differences into larger units, for the Mediterranean, Britannia, and the areas west and east of the former Roman *limes*, the Rhine, preserved in many respects the differentiating characteristics of their historical genesis, to say nothing of Byzantium at the other pole. However, the genuinely sharp line of demarcation in the economic and social spheres occurred between all of old Europe and the new regions, and this in spite of the paradoxical fact that the great Schism of 1054 had already split into two camps the *neophitae gentes* at this time when the "European" framework of history had barely been formed. The Schism produced cultural and intellectual spheres of influence for *Europa Occidens* and Byzantium which did not, in fact, coincide with the line of demarcation mentioned above, but which, nevertheless, were, in the future to have powerful repercussions also in the social and economic spheres. In the later process of the forging together of the "old" and the "new" European regions these limits of diverging qualities reinforced each other in creating the coordinates of European history.[3]

At the turn of the first millennium one can still speak only of the appearance of the preconditions. In a structural sense the expanded formula is as yet fundamentally "incongruous" in character. Historians of northern or eastern Europe simply can find no reference for the concept of high Middle Ages (*"Hochmittelalter"*, *"haut-moyen-âge"*). These societies still lived their own "early-Middle-Age" until the turn of the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries, displaying many more features analogous to the Western European structures of the sixth to the ninth centuries, than to the feudalism of the contemporary West, or to the peculiar world of Byzantium. In the course of the thirteenth century, however, one can observe an essential transformation in the formula, a transformation moreover, of surprising rapidity. The Normans, the Poles, or the Magyars even in the eleventh century and even as the subjects of Christian states, were still more or less regarded and referred to as "barbarians". Bishop Otto of Freising, even in the middle of the twelfth century, spoke of the thoroughly barbarian characteristics he had encountered in Pannonia. Nevertheless the beginnings of a transformation in attitude are discernible around 1200, in the fact that the new peoples duly received their place in the genealogical lists of biblical derivation of peoples and languages. Moreover, by around 1300, there was no one spectator from the "old" Europe who doubted that at the middle and lower stretches of the Danube, at the Vltava or the Vistula, he was in a culture, in a "Europe," any different from that of his native land, although, his eye might have been caught, here and there, by some curiosities. When a Dominican at the Synod of Lyons (1274) reviewed

[3] If, for example one takes out of the always disputed and disputable modern terms for the regional demarcations of history the concept of "Middle-Eastern Europe" as a justified one, this is not only because of certain common characteristics evident in the early modern age, but also because of roots stretching back to these earlier times. The common features of an entire region (the Kingdoms of Bohemia, Poland and Hungary along with Croatia, even in some sense the German territories east of the Elbe, as well as Austria) were more or less "eastern" characteristics in the economic and social sense, but peculiarly "central" European (according to the categories of the Middle Ages, naturally, a "western" European, *occidentalis*) in a cultural sense. In contrast to this, artificial demarcations such as, for instance, "South-Eastern Europe" ("Südosteuropa") express little more than a static geographic picture, formed, in part, under the influence of biased conceptions.

the former and present enemies of Christianity, as if to weigh the status of Europe, he concluded that the "barbarians" (Poles, Magyars, etc.), had mostly disappeared, had been assimilated into the large family of Christians; "except for the Tartars, there are no barbarians". "What is more, at about the same time (1279) the Papal Legate, newly arrived in Hungary, singled out the *more Christiano* lifestyle and culture of the Magyars as an example for a new "barbarian" people, the Cumanians, now belatedly condemned to incorporation.[4] Behind these impressions, there lies hidden a deep content of reality. In this new, one might say third, historical phase, from about the year 1000 to middle of the thirteenth century, the framework was filled with content, there opened up behind the geographical and political consolidation of Europe a new dimension of European history: the emergence of a now genuine structural unity. And this fact is little altered by the consideration that this unity was motived by the characteristic western-latin and eastern-orthodox dualism mentioned above, and was embodied in the concrete manifestation of regional heterogeneity.

It is again merely a question of perspective to what extent one considers this question as a part of the historical picture. In fact, the issue does not even gain formulation in the one-sidedly "western" or a one-sidedly "eastern" historical points of view which still persist as the heritage of the nineteenth century. If, following Ranke, one narrows down the content of "Europe" to the "original" entities ("Einheit der romanischen und germanischen Völker"), everything else, naturally, becomes some appendage, some "Randgebiet", becomes essentially, therefore, some "quantité négligeable". The deliberate ignoring of the problem, or a perspective of "incommensurability" conceived in a theory of national autotelism similarly excludes a genuine formulation of the question. In that evolutionistic scheme, on the other hand, which sees historical development as gradually evening out during the Middle Ages the initial "phase-differences" (whatever still remained is some "qualité négligeable"), the problem is excessively simplified, and the question remains open: were there not some infrastructural preconditions to the split in the development of eastern and western Europe after the sixteenth century?

Beyond this, a variety of inherited myths encumber the investigation, and it is practically indifferent whether these are the modern versions of the ethnic mythology of the Romantics of the magic dualism "Romano-Germanic" and the "Slavic" worlds, or whether they are newer conceptually-based civilisation myths (the theory for instance, that "feudalism", as such, is peculiar to the West, and that elsewhere it did not develop, or only imperfectly).

[4] For a more recent work concerning the terminology, see R. Buchner: *Die politische Vorstellungswelt Adams von Bremen.* Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, 45 (1963), pp. 15–59. — *Otto of Freising:* MGH, SS XX. p. 368. It is illustrative of the extent to which view was as yet "out of phase" that the *Chanson de Roland* of around 1100 counts among the 13 "pagan" peoples the Bulgarians, the Magyars, and in general the "Slavs" — among others. For the lists of peoples A. Borst: *Der Turmbau von Babel. Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker.* II. Stuttgart, 1957–63, pp. 580 on, pp. 734 on. The discourse of Humbertus de Romanis on the Council of Lyons, see Mansi: *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio.* XXIV Venetiis, 1780, p. 110.

For the deeper social-cultural content of the phrase *more christiano* in the so-called "Cumanian law" of 1279, see: M. Kring (Komjáthy): *Kun és jász társadalomelemek a középkorban* (Cumanian and Jazygian Social Elements in the Middle Ages). Századok (Centuries), 66 (1932), p. 42.

The very posing of the question is already abortive if one regards the relationship of the European regions only and exclusively from the point of view of the priority or of the "originality" of the structures. It is beyond doubt, on the one hand, that there are some analogies between the historical phases outlined above, in so far as both the events after the fifth and the tenth centuries produced a symbiosis between a higher unity and a heterogeneity of "barbarians". But it is also true, that on the other hand, the changed historical situation created totally divergent preconditions for the symbiosis. In some respects, however, the two situations are indeed incommensurable. This does not apply primarily to the relationship of the earlier and later barbarians. For, certain "original characteristics" can be observed in the economic, social and political structures of eleventh and twelfth century Eastern Europe — in the same way as similar *caractères originaux* became constitutive elements of the proto-feudal conditions in the West. In neither case did some primitive tribe or tribe conglomerate step onto the historical stage; these would had been swept away by the acute historical conflict. In both cases, one is dealing with such organized "barbarian" societies, such larger people-formations, which possess a developed leadership-class, and a system of ruling based on military retinues. The Germanic *Gefolgschaft*, the Slavic *družina*, or the early Magyar *jobbágy*-layer corresponding to the Old-Turkish *buyruq*-element (both the latter originally meaning: "member of the retinue") are, in essential respects, equivalents. They are all the basis of a rudimentary "Personenverbandstaat" (Th. Mayer). On the basis of all this, however, the dualism of the further differentiated free *(maiores, milites, vulgares)*, and non-free *(servi)* social elements which is peculiar to the proto-feudal structure, relates in its essential features the old and new barbarians much more closely than historians, still too much enthralled by ethnic and civilisation myths, generally admit.[5] (There is no myth in this field more deceptive than the acceptance of "Germanic", "Slavic", and such terms as categories of social history.) To what degree these original characteristics determined the entire formula is another question. For, with respect to the "originality" of the *par excellence* "European" — that is, Christian-feudal — structural characteristics, there were those five hundred years, in which only the "old" Europe cooperated, of decisive significance. They produced, as if in an experimental laboratory, finished models and schemes to hand over to the new barbarians at about the turn of the millennium. It is primarily in this sense that the two historical situations are incommensurable. In this view Europe's younger regions must inevitably appear somewhat secondary in significance.

Having said this, however, one has still said too little. The situation is incommensurable also in other respects. For, in the final analysis, the old barbarians vanquished Rome (although the early Middle Ages absorbed the victors themselves as ethnic and political units); the new barbarians, on the other hand, were "vanquished" by Christian Europe, at least in the sense that the situation convinced their rulers of the expediency of assimilation (how-

[5] For the details—and further literature—see L. Makkai: *Les caractères originaux de l'histoire économique et sociale de l'Europe orientale pendant le Moyen Age.* Acta Historica Academiae Scient. Hungaricae 16 (1970), pp. 261–286. For the problem complex see further Fr. Graus: *Deutsche und slawische Verfassungsgeschichte?* Historische Zeitschrift, 31 (1959), pp. 191–229.; J. Szűcs: *König Stephan in der Sicht der modernen ungarischen Geschichtsforschung.* Südost-Forschungen, 31 (1972), pp. 17–40.

ever, the symbiosis itself of the "old" and "new" Europe consequently took place within the framework of the old ethnic and political *status quo*). The Europe of the millennium was a more pitiful sight to behold than Rome had been, imposing even in her fall; but within the Europe of the millennium the forces of expansion and internal transformation were already straining to find expression. Already after the middle of the tenth century, the direction of expansion was reversed. Its institutional medium, too, came into being in the form of the "renovated", in name once again, "Roman" *Imperium*, while the true heir of Roma, Byzantium, also stepped into the breach. This fact determined, however, only the political aspect of the consolidation. Of much greater significance than this, is the circumstance, that just at the inception of the forging of old Europe into one with the new regions, at about 1050–1100, one can begin to discern in the western part the seeds of an interconnected complex of new phenomena — from demographical expansion and the development of agrarian technology, through the beginning of economic and social mobility, to the nascent intellectual revival — which through conjoint development were to transform the face of Europe within the next two hundred years, filling the western pole with a peculiar, dynamic content, in contrast to the more rigid eastern (Byzantine) sphere.[6] There exists a deep inner connection between the rise of this "second feudal age" (M. Bloch) and the emergence of Europe's structural unity. This specific new dynamism of the historical process implied a peculiar integrative force accelerating, principally in an inner structural sense by now, the new phase of European symbiosis. The situation outlined above, however, determined the style of the symbiosis itself. There was, by now, little place for reciprocal influences unlike in the course of the symbiosis of the early Middle Ages. It was mostly unidirectional influence which necessarily predominated in the relationship between the "old" and "new" regions. There was, further, a certain tension between the accelerated rythm of the historical movement originating in the West, and the, as yet, persisting structural "incongruity" within the medium determined for transformation.

Regarded from the point of view of the new regions, the consequences appeared in the form of a peculiar dichotomy.[7]

On one side of the coin, processes analogous to those which took place in Europe's older "experimental" regions, appeared here in a more concentrated form and with accelerated speed. The eleventh and twelfth centuries are as yet characterized by parallelism. Already at about 1200, however, and after this with conspicuous speed and in a concentrated form, characteristics appear and almost parallel processes are set in motion which, in a relatively very short time, produce in the course of the thirteenth century those major structural elements which form the "common denominators" of feudal Europe. As if by an explosion, in few decades there disintegrates the royal domain and the

[6] M. Bloch: *La société féodale. La formation des liens de dépendance*. Paris, 1939, pp. 95–115; more recently, summarized by J. Le Goff: *Das Hochmittelalter*. Fischer Weltgeschichte, 11, Frankfurt am Main, 1965, pp. 14 ff.

[7] Naturally, one cannot speak of homogeneous formulae here either. Regional factors, as well as the predominance now of the Western Latin, now of the Byzantine Orthodox poles in the process of this welding together, all produced a number of variations. What follows refers primarily to the Middle Eastern European region (cf. note 3), more narrowly to the characteristics of Hungary's development.

early administrative system based on royal comitats, giving place to the economic preponderance of secular and clerical large estates, and to the political preponderance of the upper clergy and the aristocracy (the barons) over the power of the king. Knighthood makes its appearance, as do certain forms of feudal relationships. The division and the annihilation of the "free" middle-social strata come to an end. Along new integrating lines of force there is formed from a variety of social elements in the course of the thirteenth century the nucleus of the nobility, possessing uniform prerogatives — "golden liberty". Along other lines, as a result of the progressive merging of people in a variety of conditions of bondage, and of the gradual cessation of servitude there emerge the outlines of serfdom as a unified class, working with its own instruments of production and freedom of movement. Consequently the century becomes one in which the agrarian base is transformed: there is large-scale internal colonialisation, the area of cultivated land is expanded, agrarian technology undergoes changes (the plough, three crop rotation system), the old manorial organisation (domestic economy worked by servants) disintegrates. On the basis of the more vital internal and external trade, on the other hand, the first privileged towns come into being, the burgher appears on the scene. All these factors, now appearing in the course of almost a single century, had taken five centuries to develop in Europe's primary regions, being the fruits of a prolonged and more deeply disjointed rhythm of historical development.

On the other side of the coin is the fact that the relative celerity and parallelism of the historical processes were manifested in a certain lack of differentiation, one could say a certain "superficiality". Although the changed relationship of the king and the barons, of the big landowner *domini* and their *familiares* bore some features of feudal character, vasallage, fief, and feudal law did not evolve in the sense they did in the West (*"féodalité"*, *"Lehnswesen"*). For, in the personal dependency, in the very nature of *servitium* and *fidelitas*, in the kind of tie meant by *familiaritas* itself, there were, in fact, merged the characteristics of the archaic retinue relationship with certain superficial and inorganic "quasi-feudal" elements. Knighthood is a rather exclusive and confined phenomenon. The knightly ethos, ideal, and way of life itself, touched the nobility but very superficially; neither then, nor later, were *miles* and *nobilis* correlative concepts. The nobility itself is a much more broadly based (in its majority much more "peasant-like") social product than in the West. The free and autonomous *civitates*, on the other hand, were differentiated both in their size and in their subordinate importance from western towns; and already in this century, there is burgeoning that peculiar, half agrarian, half industrial "peasant-town" form of urbanisation, the *oppidum*. All these are such elements, all these are such characteristics, which, though they already follow the European model, nevertheless differ from it in the inorganic superficiality of the forms, in their archaic peculiarities, in a certain raw lack of differentiation, or in differences of orders of magnitude. (The fact that even the characteristics mentioned here are largely "raw" around 1300, and their fuller development becomes comprehensible only at the middle of the fourteenth century, is another matter.)

Europe's structural unity, the "congruous" character of European history, is therefore, by around 1250–1300, an evident fact sensible in many respects. This unity, however, was realized, in the multifariousness of the, in many

respects "incongruous" manifestations of the structures. If one fails to keep in mind this dialectical nature of the development, one can hardly say anything on this subject. All this, however, alters but little the by now indisputable fact of the existence of the unity itself. The new regions, after their own belated, and consequently compressed and contracted — chronologically almost inexpressible — "high Middle Ages", became in the late Middle Ages, in spite of all *couleur locale*, organic participants of a homogeneous process, to which one usually gives the name: European history.

2

It is not the purpose of this study to dissect this model — as, indeed, would be appropriate — into its component parts and to introduce its details. Within the given framework, this would be a hopeless undertaking. It will be more to the point to choose one of the many possible ways of approaching the issue and through that, to grasp something of the tangible details. The aspect to be chosen is that of intellectual history. The unity of the Europe developing in the decisively significant thirteenth century finds expression, among other things, in the unfolding of the "congruent" character of intellectual structures. With hardly any need for transmutation, and almost simultaneously, the intellectual currents can now express everywhere the objective, "common denominators". At the same time, however, there still remains something peculiar, *mutatis mutandis*, in their appearance and in their function, some characteristic "incongruence". If, in what follows, we shall try to delineate the nature of this characteristic dichotomy through the analysis of a single literary work, we are justified by the fact that this work serves us with representative lessons just in that field of intellectual endeavour which is most closely related to social reality: the conception of history, social and political theory — in short, in the field of the transformation of political thought.

This work is the *Gesta Hungarorum* of Master Simon of Kéza, court cleric of Ladislaus IV (the Cumanian), written between 1282–1285.[8] This *opusculum*

[8] *Scriptores Rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum.* Ed., E. Szentpétery Vol. 1, Budapestini, 1937, pp. 141–194 (henceforth, referred to as *SRH*). The philological problem and the problem of textual criticism which has preoccupied historians for over a hundred years is the relationship between this work and the so-called fourteenth century chronicle construction, which exists in a number of textual variations (*"Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV"*, SRH I. pp. 239–505). For the literature pertaining to this question: *Repertorium fontium historiae medii aevi.* III. Romae, 1970, pp. 301–302, 409–411. Newer research has in some respects altered the conclusions of the fundamental work in modern chronicle research: S. Domanovsky: *Kézai Simon mester krónikája* (The chronicle of Master Simon of Kéza.) Budapest, 1906, in proving beyond doubt that the history of the Huns (Kézai: *Hunnorum Gesta*, chronicles: *Prima cronica, De prima origine* etc. SRH I. pp. 141–64, pp. 250–287) is Simon of Kéza's original composition, written between 1282–85; while master Simon's Hungarian history proper as found in his *Gesta* is indeed an excerpt from the earlier chronicles, coloured in places with interpolations and his own explanations. To this excerpt there is joined in the *Gesta* his own discussion of the age of Ladislaus IV, and a similarly original discourse on social theory (SRH I. pp. 185–187, 192–94.) For the most important results on this topic: I. Madzsar: *A hun krónika szerzője* (The author of the Hunnish chronicle). Történeti Szemle (Historical Review), 11 (1922), pp. 75–103; J. Horváth: *Árpád-kori latinnyelvű irodalmunk stíluspróblémái* (The stylistic problems of the Latin literature during the age of Árpád dinasty). Budapest, 1954, pp. 350–91; idem: *A hun történet és szerzője* (The history of the Huns and its

— as the writer himself calls his work — does not derive its significance from any immanent literary value, and certainly not from any historical authenticity. Paradoxically, that which is valuable in it has absolutely no historical accuracy at all. It is nothing other than ingenious and imaginative historical fiction, and presented in a rather dry and monotonous form at that. History is, for this writer, a framework to be moulded at will to serve the theory, while the form is treated as subordinate. The significance of the *opusculum* lies, rather, in the fact that this peculiar historical-theoretical construct welds together certain elements of currents common to all of Europe, with the incipient need for an epistemological transformation commonly beginning to be felt in Hungary, and it does it in a way so "up to date", that for centuries history writing was enthralled by this suggestive picture. Another paradox in the work is the fact that the "European" elements of its political thinking found place in a medium as originally "Europe alien" as the constructs of the Hunnish origins and prehistory of the Magyars. (Already in this fact itself there is something of the dichotomy broadly outlined above.) It was Master Simon of Kéza, who drew the outlines of the dualism dividing the account of Hungary's history into two "fundamental epochs": Hunnish prehistory and Hungarian history, thus giving a division which persisted from the late Middle Ages up to the beginnings of modern historiography.[9] Similarly, it was his work which first represented that deeper structural characteristic of Hungarian political thought, which remained valid up to the nineteenth century, and whose main feature was a politic expressed primarily not in theoretical tracts, or actual policies, but, for the most part, in an epic framework and a system of historical argumentation. The lessons concealed in the Hunnish ancient past were operative on the present through the legitimizing power of sheer age; one could practically read from it the desirable model for the body politic. And not least of all, it was Master Simon of Kéza, who assigned to the Magyars, in the paradoxical way mentioned above, their place within European history, within the medieval world-picture.

---

author). Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények (Studies in the History of Literature), 67 (1963), pp. 446–76; J. Gerics: *Adalékok a Kézai Krónika problémáinak megoldásához* (A contribution to the solution of the problems in Simon of Kéza's chronicle). Annales Universitatis Scient. Budapestinensis de R. Eötvös nominatae. Sectio Historica, 1 (1957), pp. 106–134; J. Szűcs: *Társadalomelmélet, politikai teória és történetszemlélet Kézai Simon Gesta Hungarorumában* (Social theory, political theory and the idea of history in Simon of Kéza's Gesta Hungarorum). Századok, 107 (1973), pp. 569–643, 823–878. (Wherever, in what follows, the given framework leaves no scope for more detailed analysis, I refer to this larger study.)

[9] For the significance for intellectual history of Simon of Kéza's *Gesta*, see principally P. Váczy: *A népfelség elvének magyar hirdetője a XIII. században: Kézai Simon mester* (A Hungarian propagandist of the principle of the people's sovereignty in the thirteenth century: Master Simon of Kéza.) Károlyi Árpád Emlékkönyv. Budapest, 1933, pp. 546–563, as well as the works of J. Horváth, J. Gerics, and J. Szűcs referred to above (passim), and Gy. Kristó: *Kézai Simon és a XIII. század végi köznemesi ideológia néhány vonása* (Simon of Kéza, and some features of the ideology of the gentry of the late thirteenth century). Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények, 76 (1972), pp. 1–22. For the "modernizations" of the Hunnish history in the fifteenth century: E. Mályusz: *A Thuróczy-krónika és forrásai* (The Thuróczy chronicle and its sources). Tudománytörténeti tanulmányok (Studies in the History of Science), 5, Budapest, 1967, pp. 105–124.; P. Kulcsár: *Bonfini Magyar történetének forrásai és keletkezése* (The sources and origin of Bonfini's Hungarian history) Humanizmus és reformáció (Humanism and Reformation), 1, Budapest, 1973, pp. 28–52.

The Hunnish origin of the Magyars is a fiction, just as is the Troyan origin of the French, or as the other pretty well contemporarily fabricated origin-theories. The Magyars who originated from the Ugrian branch of the Finno-Ugrian peoples, and who, in the course of their wanderings in the Steppes of Eastern Europe assimilated a variety (especially Iranian and diverse Turkish) cultural and ethnic elements, had neither genetic nor historical links to the Huns.[10] There existed in the ancient Magyar tradition an origin-saga (the hind-saga), which in some of its motifs resembles the Hunnish and other origin-sagas of Steppes peoples, but even in its faded "historical" elements it preserves only the memories of Onogur, Alan and Kazar ties.[11] The historical memory of the Magyars in the middle of the tenth century reached back, again with the naive obscurity characteristic of sagas, to the Kazar Khanat (seventh to ninth centuries).[12] The belief in the identity of Huns and Magyars began in the Christian West in the tenth century, although at first it did not exclude other guesses. One source of this belief was the inclination to regard all the peoples appearing in the Carpathian basin after the fifth century as the "scourge of God" against the Christians, as one and the same people. From here springs, among other views, the idea of Avar–Magyar (and even at times, the Hunnish–Avar–Magyar) identity.[13] The other source of the identification is that the name generally given to the Magyars in the West, *Ungri (Ungari, Hungari)* was reminiscent of the name *Unni, Hunni*. In fact, the name originated in the name of that *Onogur* confederation of tribes to which once the ances-

[10] For a review of the question — with the earlier literature — Gy. Györffy: *Krónikáink és a magyar őstörténet* (Hungarian chronicles and Magyar ancient history). Budapest, 1948, pp. 126–146. It would be conceivably the transmission of a kind of Hun tradition only through Onogur-Bulgarian mediation, since this people was a part of the remnants of the Hunnish empire of Attila's sons in the Pontus region. (At the head of the list of the Danubian Bulgars' earliest princes stands the name of *Irnik*, son of *Avitochol*, the Bulgarian form of *Hernac*, son of *Attila*.) There is, however, no trace of such a motif in the Magyar tradition of ancient times. It is still an open question today, on the other hand, whether the *Székelys* did not have their own Attila-tradition, as long as the *Székelys* can be identified with the Bulgarian tribal fragment referred to in the Mohammedan sources *s.k.l (eskil, iskil)*. cf. Gy. Györffy: Századok, 92 (1958), pp. 74–80.

[11] J. Berze Nagy: *A csodaszarvas mondája* (The saga of the magical hind). Ethnographia, 38 (1927), pp. 65–80, pp. 145–164.; S. Solymossy: *A magyar csodaszarvas monda* (The Magyar magical-hind saga). Magyarságtudomány (Hungarology), 1 (1942), pp. 157–175. For the literature on the question: Gy. Györffy: op. cit. (note 10), pp. 11–38. For the complex of problems recently: J. Szűcs: *"Gentilizmus" : A barbár etnikai tudat kérdése* ("Gentilismus": The question of Barbarian ethnic group-consciousness). Budapest, 1970. (Manuscript, to be published.)

[12] For the interpretation of Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos' reports (*De Administrando Imperio*, Chapters 38–40), and especially for the chronological basis of the tradition, see J. Deér: *A IX. századi magyar történet időrendjéhez* (A contribution to the chronology of ninth century Magyar history). Századok, 79–80 (1945–46), pp. 3–20; K. Czeglédy: *A kangarok (besenyők) a VI. századi szír forrásokban* (The Kangars (Petchenegs) in 6th Century Syrian Sources). Magyar Tud. Akadémia Nyelv és Irodalomtudományi Osztálya Közleményei (Reports of the Linguistic and Literary Sciences Department of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences), 5 (1954), pp. 243–276. For the summarization of this problem-complex, see J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 11), Chapter III.

[13] The *Annales Alemannici* are the first to refer to the Magyars as *gens Hunorum* at the beginning of the tenth century. For the relevant sources, Gy. Györffy: op. cit. (note 10), pp. 129–131. Certain seeds of the "theory" appear already in Widukind (968), who identifies the Magyars with the Avars, and regards the latter as the remnants of the Huns, recounting also the Hunnish origin saga as told by Iordanes. *SRG (in usum scholarum)*. Recogn. P. Hirsch. Hannoverae, 1935, pp. 28–29.

tors of the Magyars also belonged, and which found its place in the Medieval Latin after old Slavic and Byzantine transmission and transmutation *(Ongri, Ugri)*.[14] The identification won its decisive character as a consequence of the song of the Nibelung, and of the prestige of the works of Gottfried of Viterbo (1185–1189), so much so that by around 1200, the Hunnish origin of the Magyars was taken as axiomatic in the West. Not so by the Magyars themselves. True enough, certain ideological advantages of the identification were already recognised around 1200 by the Hungarian Anonymus *(Magister P.)* who had studied in Paris. It was he who was the first to discover that if Pannonia was once the land of *Athila rex*, *Ecilburg* (the *Etzelen bürge* of the song of the Nibelung in Hungarian Óbuda), was "Athila's town", if the Székely, moreover, were "the people of King Athila", then he needs only to announce the former legendary ruler of the Huns to be the ancestor of the Árpád dynasty — even at the expense of some confusion and contradictions — in order to present the Magyar conquest as nothing but the assertion of their "right of ownership" over Pannonia. However, in his *Gesta Hungarorum*, he confines himself to the mentioning of these three motives. He did not as much as write down the name "Hun"; he did not dare to go so far as to give to the Magyar people as ancestors the Huns still so hateful to the Christian West.[15] Even around 1250, the royal court of Béla IV itself still refused the thought of any kind of association with Attila.[16] Three decades later, however, the cleric of Ladislaus IV not only established the Hunnish origination, as the *alpha* of history, but also placed, before his account of Magyar history culled from the chronicles of the preceding two centuries and continued to his day, a separate "book" of similar magnitude *(Hunnorum gesta)*, expounding in its details the glorious ancient past of the "Hun–Magyars".

Nothing can be farther from the truth than to picture Simon of Kéza as one who let his phantasy wander in the isolation of some stubborn boorishness in order to develop a stubborn *idée fixe* in defiance of Christian Europe and of the Christian conception of history, earlier prevalent in Hungary. On the contrary, as philological research and the critical examination of the sources progresses, there emerges in plastic details the multifarious interconnectedness of the sources used, and the depths to which the work is embedded in the contemporary intellectual world. It has long been recognized, that he culled the epic materials for the basis of his Hunnish history not only from Iordanes' *Getica* (551) and Gottfried of Viterbo's *Pantheon* (1189) but also from the rather broad range of his readings. Moreover, he studied on location a lost ancient history of Venice, rich in references to the Huns, which might, in fact, be identical to the *Historia Attilae* known to us only from references made to it. He not only visited Venice, he even learned Italian in the Venetian dialect, and all signs indicate that he studied Roman and Canon law in nearby Padua. He had been to France as well, and was the first in Hungary to use a French top-

[14] B. Hóman: *A magyar nép neve a középkori latinságban* (The name of the Hungarian people in Medieval Latin). Történeti Szemle, 6 (1917), pp. 129–158, 240–258; E. Moór: *Die Benennung der Ungarn in den Quellen des IX. and X. Jahrhunderts.* Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher, 31 (1959), pp. 191–229.

[15] *Anonymi (P. magistri) Gesta Hungarorum.* SRH L. 33–117. cf. Gy. Györffy: op. cit. (note 10), pp. 134–136.

[16] *Vetera monumenta historica Hungariam sacram illustrantia.* Ed. A. Theiner, I. Romae, p. 230.

onym *(Chalon)*. What is more, he incorporated, here and there, local French legends into the history of the Huns, locating, for example, the battle of Catalaunum near one of the places called Beauvoir (campus Belvider).[17] Similarly, research has revealed numerous details of the components of the author's education, among them, details of his north-Italian studies, and has specified as the two main sources which form the theoretical foundations of the work — the "rationalism" of scholasticism, and the system of Roman law.[18] More recently, it has been possible to prove in greater detail, how very literally we ought to accept Simon of Kéza's assertion in his prologue, that he had gathered the materials and ideas for his work from far-flung sources *per Italiam, Franciam ac Germaniam*. For, in fact, more than once he weaves into his account of Attila's three expeditions against Western Europe the memories of his own travels. Before 1269 already, he had been to France as a member of a diplomatic mission travelling through the Rhine valley, through Burgundy to Lyons, and from there home via northern Italy. Then between 1269 and 1271 he twice traversed Charles of Anjou's southern Italian kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, down all the way to Messina, in another diplomatic affair, as the Queen's cleric. It was during the decade of 1270 (at any rate, between 1272–1283), that he must have studied at the university of Padua, and earned his degree of *magister*. Upon his return home, it was already as the king's cleric that he decided at the very beginning of the 1280s to draft, on the basis of his readings, experiences and adventures, his modern conception of the "Hun–Magyar" history.[19]

Much rested here on the experiences and on the adventures! For, in his literary readings he could, naturally, find no support for the details of the Hunnish–Magyar identification; nor could these satisfy him regarding the details of the Hunnish glory. Therefore, he came to his own aid in two ways. For the first, he simply transferred into the history of the Huns a whole series of activities which he had read of in the old Hungarian chronicles regarding the Magyar conquest and the Magyar's assaults against the West in the tenth century. But even this, he found to be not enough. Thus, he filled out and coloured the story with the rich materials of all his personal experiences. When he saw ancient ruins at home or abroad, he saw them as preserving the memory of the Huns. From the name of every place which could, according to the "etymological" methods fashionable at the time, be linked with the Huns, he at once created a "historical episode". He made use of every turn of a phrase, of every legend which he had managed to snatch up at home or abroad. And, since his literary sources discussed somewhat laconically the Hunnish war expeditions while he himself had been to more or less all the areas to which Iordanes and Gottfried of Viterbo called his attention, he filled in the details from his own travel experiences and his knowledge of geography. It was thus that the Pannonian, as well as the Western European field of action of the History of the Huns acquired shape, and their actions became

[17] The relationship to the written sources has already been clarified by S. Domanovszky: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 37–70, and S. Eckhardt: *A pannóniai hun történet keletkezése* (The origins of the Pannonian Hunnish history). Repr. from Századok, 62 (1928), Budapest, 1928, pp. 18–19, 30–31, and *passim*.

[18] In connection with these, see for details: J. Horváth op. cit., pp. 374–382; J. Gerich: op. cit. pp. 111–112, 115 ff; J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 589–595, 602–612.

[19] For the details, see J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 573–580, 836–867.

legendary epics, so that, almost every actor, motif and movement is the product of an idiosyncratic fusion of literary sources, oral traditions, etymological deductions and personal experiences. The binding material was logic, the measure of authenticity was the conviction, expressed more than once, that the reality of the present – a ruin, a name of a town, a turn of speech, any element of the world of experience – "even until today" *usque hodie* preserves something of "history". Consequently: one can deduce the past from the present, to the extent that any such contemporary element can be "reasonably" matched with the references found in the written sources. Everything hinges on rational and ingenious combinations. This viewpoint is valid not only for the epic, but also for the theoretical content of the work. The string of *res gestae*, even *historia* itself, was, for the author, a formula which, until the present day, *usque hodie*, was significantly pregnant with the norms appropriate to "social and political structure" – to use the modern expression.[20]

The viewpoint and the methodology is very much "up to date". What is more, it was definitely a fashionable one at this time in Europe. The writers of history, increasingly diverting themselves of their stiff ecclesiastical cloaks in the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, tried also to get away from the dry rhetoric of the annals and chronicles, finding in the literary medium of the *gesta*, with its attempt at a coherent, even "novelistic" account, a new topic, a new historical perspective to replace the "one time deeds" of kings, magnates, bishops and abbots, in the larger groupings of peoples now taking shape, in Europe's emerging nationalities. Between the old, too broad spectrum of the world chronicles, and the all too narrow horizons of a monastery, province, or town, there exist already in the middle of the twelfth century the beginnings of the "national" historiography of the Middle Ages (Abbot Suger, William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon, Geoffrey of Monmouth), which after 1200 also reached Europe's new peoples (the Danish Sven Aggeson and Saxo Grammaticus, the Norwegian Snorry Sturluson, the Polish Kadlubek, the Hungarian Anonymus, etc.,) and which was to find exceptional expression in the vulgar language of Saint-Denis, in the mid-thirteenth century continuation of *Grandes Chroniques de France*. It is a time of feverish activity and of competition among literate men throughout Europe: where would they find those ancient, respectable and glorious people who have, preferably, also played a part in antiquity, whom they could make, with "scientific" methods, with historical, logical, and etymological combinations – and with the aid of the suddenly important oral traditions and legends – into the ancestors of their own *gens* or *natio*? A number of peoples compete for the appropriation of the Troyan descent (the English, the Brit Celts of Wales, the French, the Germans, some Italian towns), with the French emerging rather unequivocally as victors. Others turned to the Greek Danaids for etymological ideas (the Danes), or simply to the Greeks (e.g., *Graccus* forefather as the founder of *Cracus* – Kracow for the Poles), and so on.[21] The fabricated theories of

[20] The peculiar mechanism of Simon of Kéza's historiographical method was exposed by S. Eckhardt: op. cit. (note 17), particularly pp. 17 ff and pp. 47–56. For further, complementary analyses: J. Horváth: Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények, 67 (1963), pp. 466–476; J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 863–864, 869–872.

[21] H. Grundmann: *Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter. Gattungen–Epochen–Eigenart.* Göttingen, 1965, pp. 15–17; A. Grau: *Der Gedanke der Herkunft in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung des Mittelalters.* Leipzig, 1938.; M. Klippel: *Die Darstellung der fränkischen*

descent, the combinative myths and the transformation of the methodology and conception of history writing are conditional upon each other. The atmosphere was, therefore, already given, when, during the 1260s and 70s Master Simon of Kéza roaming *per Italiam, Germaniam, Franciam* meditated on his future work. At home, too, the precedents had been set by Master P.'s first somewhat timid initiatives.

As a matter of fact, the ancestor, too, was already given, for it was the Hunnish descent which had been allotted to the Magyars by Christian Europe. Since the Hun–Magyar identity was accepted, as axiomatic in the West, other combinations could hardly be given serious consideration. Nor was there the need for it. It is customary to account for the genesis of the Hunnish theory with the Cumanian environment created by Ladislaus IV, with the "pagan" reminiscences revided at the court itself toward the end of the 1270s. This milieu doubtlessly contributed to the acceptance of the Attila affinity by the king, who was Cumanian on his mother's side, but which his grandfather, Béla IV, had still refused; however, this, in itself, is insufficient as explanation. For, Simon of Kéza did not share his master's pagan predilections; he not only tactfully ignored them, but presented the king, who was, in fact, forever, quarreling with it, as the loyal son of the Holy Mother the Church. Of much more significance is the fact that by the thirteenth century, European public opinion was so far reassured by the general consolidation of Christianity as to regard the horrors of Attila and the Huns as over and done with. This metamorphosis is well reflected by the already mentioned report given by Humbertus de Romanis on the occasion of the Synod of Lyon (1274): conversion of the formerly frightful "barbarians" was pronounced as the great victory of the Christian Cause, and the Magyars, together with their axiomatic Hunnish descent *(Huni qui et Hungari)* were received into the family of Europe's peoples.[22] Master Simon of Kéza, if anyone, was in the position to know only too well that by now he could work out the theory in consonance with the *placet* of European public opinion. The advantages were obvious. In a certain sense, the Huns, too, were an "ancient" people; as for its glorious and conquering past, of that, there could be absolutely no doubt. Moreover, it completely fulfilled an important ideological criterion of all descent theories, the ability to support claims of historical right. The Magyar conquest was, thus, nothing other than the assertion of the rights of the Hun–Magyars, "returning" to Pannonia. In accordance with this viewpoint, the title of Master Simon's second book — the one treating Hungarian history proper — is *Liber de reditu*. What is more, the Hunnish past could, with a twist, be fitted into that *par excellence* Christian view of history which required that a people

---

Trojanersage in Geschichtsschreibung und Dichtung vom Mittelalter bis zur Renaissance in Frankreich. Marburg, 1936.; H. Koht: *The Dawn of Nationalism in Europe.* American Historical Review, 52 (1947), esp. pp. 270–277; H. Heimpel: *Alexander von Roes und das deutsche Selbstbewusstsein des 13. Jahrhunderts.* Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, 26 (1930), pp. 50–55; Borst: op. cit. (note 4), II. especially pp. 700 ff., and pp. 767 ff., as well as pp. 912 ff.

[22] Cap. V. "Quod ista septem genera persecutorum iam pene enervata sunt praeter Saracenos . . . Barbari non comparent praeter Tartaros, qui etsi solos Hungaros persequuntur . . ." Cap. VI. " . . . Nam Wandali qui et Poloni, et Huni qui et Hungari, Gothi qui et Daci sunt effecti Catholici . . ." Mansi: *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio.* XXIV. Venetiis, 1780, p. 110.

should have fulfilled, even in ancient times, a certain function in the evolution of Christianity. Already in the first Stephen legend there occurred the thought that the Magyars as *flagellum Dei*, were the instruments of the Almighty in chastising Christendom for its sins. In the Christian view of history it was, of course, primarily Attila who was "the scourge of God", thus, Master Simon was able to return this *topos* to its original function. But he went even further than this, in his account of the notable scene at Ravenna (Chapter 17 of his work), where he has Attila, about to attack the Pope, being turned back by a vision enjoining him instead to start to massacre the Arian heretics in the interest of the papacy. With this innovation, Attila is exalted to the position of a defender of the Church: he has attained a Christian function.[23]

The proving of the Hunnish origin itself did not cause much difficulty, for European public taste had not only rehabilitated the formerly despised world of oral traditions, the world of sagas (fabulae), but had also assigned to them a definite "theoretical" role. Simon of Kéza was familiar, on the one hand, with the ancient Magyar descent-saga preserved in oral tradition which, as Anonymus testified even around 1200, one could hear only in "the false stories of the peasants" *(ex falsis fabulis rusticorum)*; on the other hand, he discovered the former saga of Huns in Iordanes' *Getica*. The two were related in certain motifs, (deer hunting, abduction of women). Tempting possibilities also lay concealed in the names of the pair of brothers appearing in the Magyar saga, *Hunor* and *Mogor*, the name of the former *heros eponymos* (in fact, the legendary personified memory of the Onogur–Magyar historical tie, which in the old Magyar language was probably *Onour* or *Unor*) resembling as it did the name of the Hun people.[24] It was in this circumstance that Simon of Kéza found an indisputable argument for the Hun–Magyar identity, supporting it also with a western "literary" authority. This was, in fact, his sole piece of "historical" evidence, which he completed in the prologue with an exemplary scholastic argument, which, relying in part on the authority of the Holy Writ *(per textum comprobatur)*, in part on natural order *(natura rerum)*, attempts to prove "rationally", that the origin of the Magyars, resembles that of the "other nations of the world" *(sicut mundi nationes alias)*.

From the point of view of historical perspective, however, the fact that Kézai succeded in "proving" to his contemporaries and to posterity the Hun–Magyar identity, is by no means in itself the most important aspect of his work. The

[23] *Vita Sancti Stephani regis* ("Legenda maior"): "Unde contigit divine pietatis intuitu in filios perditionis et ignorantie . . . Ungaros videlicet . . . clementi visu de celo prospicere, ut quos ad ulciscendas prevaricationes Christianorum de sedibus naturalibus in occiduas partes occulto perpetuitatis consilio prius destinaverat, hos . . . de via iniquitatis ad iustitie semitam ad spem in eternum permanentis perduceret retributionis". SRH II. p. 378. — For the incident at Ravenna: SRH I. 159–160. — For the concept of "function": E. Sestan: *Stato e nazione nell'alto medioevo. Ricerche sulle origini nazionali in Francia, Italia, Germania*. Napoli, 1952, p. 33; Fr. Hertz: *Nationality in History and Politics: A Study of the Psychology and Sociology of National Sentiment and Character*. London, 1944, p. 290; D. Kurze: *Nationale Regungen in der spätmittelalterlichen Prophetie*. Historische Zeitschrift, 202 (1966), pp. 3, 10, 23.

[24] For the growing value of oral tradition, J. Honti: *Anonymus és a hagyomány* (Anonymus and tradition). (Minerva 21/1). Budapest, 1942, esp. pp. 14–15, 21 ff. — Nevertheless, even Anonymus, around 1200, was reluctant to write down the Magyar origin saga. That this legend was written down only in the thirteenth century was proven by J. Horváth: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 13–29, 297–298, 317. cf. J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 615–616. For the probable transformation of *onour-unour-unor*, see Gy. Györffy: op. cit. (note 10), pp. 30–31.

fact, moreover, that he managed, already at the beginning of his work (Ch. 4) to give canonical validity to this "truth" by tying it to the Biblical Genesis of people, to the building of the Tower of Babel, thus giving to the *natio* its final place in the Biblical family tree of Europe's peoples, on Japhet's branch — this can hardly be said to belong to his significant accomplishments. All this, for all its ingenuity, was essentially a routine task, done according to a prepared scheme. The *punctum saliens* lies in the fact that Simon of Kéza saw as the basic framework of history the historical identity of the Hun–Magyar "nation" perceived, "from ancient times to our own days" as an unbroken entity and, proceeding from this point of view, he practically overthrew previous historical viewpoints.

In order for one to be able to appreciate the significance of this change, one must take a cursory glance at the preceding state of affairs. This, too, belongs to the problem of "congruence" resp. "incongruence" of early European history. At the beginning of the Middle Ages, historiography began with the "Volksgeschichte" form of history writing *(origo* or *historia gentis)*, which reached its flower in the sixth to eighth centuries (Iordanes, Gregory of Tours, the so-called "Fredegar" Chronicle, Isidor of Seville, Paulus Diaconus, Beda, etc.). This form attempted to coordinate the "barbarian" traditions of the new peoples just stepping onto the stages of history — Western and Eastern Goths, Francs, Lombards, Anglo-Saxons, etc. — with the universal viewpoint of Christianity, but in such an "ethnocentric" way as to still preserve the framework of history of each given people, with the content of each people's origin and own heroic past *(acta regum et bella gentium)*. The productive epoch of this kind of historiography came to an end with the eighth century. Widukind's Saxon history in the tenth century is but an epilogue. After the dispersal of the original peoples themselves, the horizon of history on the one hand expanded as testified to by the appearance of world-chronicles; on the other hand, it contracted into feudal localism. Thus, that which starts in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, is — as has already been said — a qualitatively new phenomenon, reflecting the new integrating currents: it is the seed of "national" historiography.[25] All this, however, refers to the old Europe. When after the millennium a series of new peoples confronted the task of reconciling their own "barbarian" traditions with the norms of Christendom, the altered historical situation — in which Europe's Christian feudal system of norms had already crystallized — left little scope for the kind of compromise historical viewpoint observable in Western Europe's early historiography. Although in form the evolving Christian chronicle-literature is also of the genus "history of the people" (as, indeed, is shown by the title of its first fragmentary reconstructable fruits in Hungary written around 1060: *Gesta Ungarorum*), its content is very much less so. The fully developed system of values did not permit compromise, but, rather, demanded the stifling of the pagan, "barbarian" past. The early Hungarian *Gesta* accepted the artificial literary "Scythian" theory of origination which took shape in the monasteries of the West, and was first conceived of by Abbot Regino of Prume (in 908). The real *origo gentis* and real past of the pagan Magyars lived on until the thirteenth century, but only in the "false tales of the peasants" — verily fading, by now, to mere folk-tales. This *gesta* discussed as much of the preconversion past as

[25] H. Grundmann: op. cit. (note 21), p. 12 ff.

its author learned from the annales of Altaich and from Regino, and discussed it with the same prejudices, being none too sparing in denunciatory epithets and judgements.[26]

In this respect, the attitude of the early Magyar Chronicles differs but little from the historiography of the "new barbarians" of Eastern and Northern Europe. The goal was assimilation, if need be at any price, so that, as has been aptly said by one of the contributors to this question, "each country could feel like a Christian microcosm."[27] The pagan past, the ancient past itself was considered a kind of secondary geneological antecedent, on the model of the Pauline teaching which became rooted in the patristics. Through the mystery of baptism, man becomes "a new creation" *(nova creatura)*, is born again through the waters of baptism *(renascitur homo ex aqua)*. He wins, therefore, his true human essence, his *humanitas*, only through becoming a Christian, a *fidelis Cristianus*, in contradistinction to his original "natural" self *(homo naturalis* or *animalis)*. What was true of the individual, was also true of the peoples. The term "people", *populus* or *gens*, refers in this view, not to some immanent and *naturalis* entity, but to the masses of believers from the ecclesiastical point of view, and the mass of subjects from the lay point of view *(fideles subditi)*, whom Divine Providence had subjected to the power of the rulers: *populus subiectus (subditus)*.[28]

In this view, then, the "people" of Hungary in the sources of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, in the Chronicles and legends, in the charters and decrees, are in current politico-legal categories generally nothing other than *gens regis*, *populus regni*, the people of the Christian monarchy, or, in other words, the great mass of its subjects. In the thirteenth century, *Hungarus* is a mere derivation of *regnum Hungariae*.

A "Hungarian" is one who is the subject of the king, who was born in this country, and as a contemporary (1205) definition unambigously states: *persona que originem de regno Ungarie duceret*.[29] The deduction relevant for history is the following: genuine *historia* begins with Baptism, when — as King Stephen's Greater Legend (ca. 1083) expressed with biblical sonority — "the sons of perdition and ignorance", this "wild and roaming people, the Magyars", who had, in the pagan past "been lost in darkness, saw the great light . . ."[30] The fundamental historical caesura in this early *ab urbe condita* view of history comes with the acceptance of Christianity, and with the increasingly mythicized Saint Stephen; everything that came before that is degraded to insignificance and damned as "prehistoric". Otherwise the chronicles of the eleventh and twelfth centuries are mostly preoccupied with the past of the members of the Christianized Árpád-dynasty. Of "society" proper, only the notabilities taking an active part in the dynastic complications, find room in the historical picture.

[26] E. Mályusz: *Krónika-problémák* (Chronicle problems). Századok, 100 (1966), pp. 714, 725.

[27] A. Borst: op. cit. (note 4), II, pp. 701–703.

[28] W. Ullmann: *The Individual and Society in the Middle Ages*. Baltimore, 1966, pp. 7–24.

[29] For the terminology: J. Deér: *Közösségérzés és nemzettudat a XI–XIII. századi Magyarországon* (The sense of community and national self-consciousness in the Hungary of the 11th to 13th centuries). A Klebelsberg Kuno Magyar Történeti Intézet Évkönyve, 4 (1934), pp. 97–100 and J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 11), pp. 181–198. The charter of 1205: *Monumenta ecclesiae Strigoniensis*. Ed. F. Knauz, I. Strigonii, 1874, p. 181.

[30] SRH II. pp. 378, 380.

This stiff formula begins to loosen around 1200. Anonymus especially does much to pry it open, searching already for the continuity between the pagan past and the *nobilissima gens Hungarie*. At the same time, he turned his attention not only to the ancestors of the dynasty *(gesta regum)*, but also to the past of the contemporary notability *(gesta nobilium)*, as well as to contemporary knighthood (*milites*) whose existence he traced back to the time of the original conquest.[31] It was Master Simon of Kéza, however, who finally dispensed with the formula at last, in "congruence" with that process which, in the name of an emerging *esprit laïque*[32] resulted in the already mentioned "national" stream of historiography. It is on this basis that the structure of historical consciousness, as well as its internal balance, undergoes a fundamental transformation. Christianity, as the caesura that marked an epochal change, does not disappear; nevertheless, that which previously was considered lacking in interest, what is more, what was denied expression as mere "prehistory" — what was regarded as "the activities of darkness" — now grew more expansive, and became particularly valued as a high point of historical consciousness. And what is especially essential for the purposes of our subject: all important socio-political theoretical discussions concentrated around that point.

According to the new *gesta Hungarorum*, from the genesis of languages and peoples at Babel, through the migration of the Magyar ancestors from their legendary seat at Maeotis to Scythia, where the "multiplied" people were divided into 108 clans, this *natio* of Magyars was from that time "until today" *usque hodie* a close kinship of blood. This unity was undisturbed by their wanderings from Scythia until they "first" conquered Pannonia; by their subjugation of half the world from the Don to the Rhine at the time of Attila; by their return to Scythia, but only to rally their strength for their "return" to Pannonia in 872 (!) and for its conclusive occupation. There is, therefore, no break from the Flood to the thirteenth century, in spite of the various vicissitudes in the life of this people, in spite of the variability of fate, of its "fortunate and unfortunate" turnings, the account of which fill the 23 chapters of the History of the Huns.

The major category of historical thought, as well as the agent of history's transmission, is the *natio* itself, whose historical continuity is insured primarily by a common origin. The number 108, projected back into antiquity, is probably nothing other than the historicization of the number of the *genert* (loosely related groups of aristocratic and noble families all claiming descena from common 11th and 12th century ancestors) counted around 1280.[33] The second criterion of a people's historical existence, is the identity of its language. The Huns, as a matter of fact, spoke Magyar, since Hun and Magyar are not two related peoples, but are naturally and as a matter of axiom, one and the same people, who just happened to bear, in the past, principally the name "Hun", and more lately, the name "Magyar" *(Hungarus)*. Just one illustration of the kind of hair-raising etymologic ideas which permitted such reasoning, is that *Ispania* derived its name from the Magyar *ispán*'s (*spani*, the

[31] J. Győry: *Gesta regum – gesta nobilium*. Budapest, 1948.

[32] See O. Brunner's instructive analyses: *Adeliges Landleben und europäischer Geist*. Salzburg, 1949, pp. 62–90, as well as W. Ullmann: op. cit. (note 28), pp. 104–116.

[33] Gy. Győrffy: Századok, 92, (1958), p. 26.

heads of the royal counties).[34] It is customary to regard Simon of Kéza's work as a whole, dividing it into two basic structural units, the Hun and the Hungarian *gesta*, to which there are joined, more or less inorganically, two "appendices" (a so-called "Advena-catalogue", and a "second appendix"). These traditional demarcations according to construction and genre are, however, not only arbitrarily artificial, but also manage to lose sight of the essence of the work, namely: the stubborn logic with which it expresses the origin-fiction even in the manner of its construction, and, what is more, the extent to which this conception forms its very basis. The writer himself gives us the key to the very construction in a short digression at the end of Chapter 6, where he outlines his work. According to this, "pure Hungary" *(pura Hungaria)* consists of the descendents of the 108 clans established already in ancient times, and, what is more, "without any intermixing" *(absque omni missitalia)*; those who joined it subsequently are either newcomers *(advenae)*, or the descendents of prisoners of war *(ex captivis oriundi)*. These are the categories of the viewpoint which define the structure of the work, within which the account itself finds its place. A synonym for the history of the Huns is "first book of the immigration" *(liber primus de introitu)*; of the Hungarian history from the conquest to 1282, is "second book of the return" *(secundus liber de reditu)*. The conceptual unit of the first two books, as the author himself expresses it in Chapter 76, referring to the common content of both books is: the history of "pure Hungary" *(pura Hungaria)*. To this there are joined not "appendices", but two further "books", for to these, too, the author assigns the name *liber*. The first deals with the noble newcomers of foreign origin *(De nobilibus advenis)*; the other is a dissertation on the non-noble social elements: those of foreign origin, and those descended from prisoners of war *(conditionarii . . . ex captivis oriundi)*. The conceptual unit of these latter two books is: the "mixed" elements *(missitalia)*. The fourfold construction is, therefore, conceived in a conceptual dualism, according to which even within the kingdom of Hungary there are "pure Magyars", as well as "mixtures". This conceptual dualism forms the main historical principle of organization in Simon of Kéza's *Gesta*.[35]

It would be a mistake to interpret this unhistorical origin-fiction, asserted with such stubbornly consistent logic, as the seed of some racial theory. Not

[34] " . . . capitanei . . . qui Hunorum lingua spani vocabantur, ex quorum nominibus tota Ispania postmodum est vocata". SRH 1. 155. Similarly, it was after Attila's brother *Buda* that Attila 's town was named, *Oubuda (ibid* 156), and a number of the Hun captains got their names, in an "etymological" fashion, from thirteenth century Hungarian toponyms (Cuwe, Erd, Turda, etc.) cf. J. Horváth: ItK 1963, pp. 467–471. The concept of "kindred peoples" is also formed according to kindred languages: a fragment separated from the nation in antiquity "statura et colore Hunis similes, tantummodo parum differunt in loquela, sicut Saxones et Turingi". SRH I. p. 144.

[35] For the details of the construction and the constructional principles of the work, see J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 616–620. The pairs of conceptual opposites in Simon of Kéza's *Gesta* are obvious: "pura Hungaria" — "missitalia"; "verus alumnus regni Scitiae" — "missitalius exterae nationis"; "de Scitia oriundi" — "missitalia". SRH I. pp. 146, 163, 178. This peculiar word is itself a derivative of *miscitare* "to mix, to mingle", (Du Cange, Glossarium, V. 1885, p. 176.) whose medieval Italian form *mischiare, meschiare* (Florentian *mestiare*) and derivatives (e.g. *mischiato, mistamente* etc.). C. Battisti, G. Alessio, *Dizionario etimologico Italiano*. Firenze, 1954, IV. p. 86. The form *missitalium* or *missitalius* demonstrates that same characteristic Venetian phonetic peculiarity as the name of *Venesia* in Master Simon's work (SRH I. p. 158); cf. S. Eckhardt: op. cit. (note 17), p. 4. It is, therefore, one of the linguistic proofs of Simon of Kéza's Venetian sojourn.

one word, by the way, is said in the work against the "mixtures". It is merely a matter of fact that in order to break through the thick wall of the rigid Christian conception of history there was need of a somewhat clumsy battering-ram. Moreover, this historical ordering-principle is, as is already partially appearant from the above, intersected by another: a social point of view. For, socially, both groups are divided into nobles and non-nobles *(ignobiles)*. It is for this reason that, even as the work is concluded with a social-theoretical dissertation, the history of the Huns is introduced by a similar dissertation on the ancient origins of social inequality in the "pure" Hun–Magyar society. We shall have more to say of this later. It is enough, for the moment, to note that there emerged here a viewpoint which established as the agent of history its own "true" or "pure" *(vera* or *pura) natio*, whose conceptual opposite was every foreign, *extera natio*.

The above is not merely a perceptional and conceptual ordering principle; it is an ordering principle also in the epic of Hunnish history. For, in this fantastic construct, Pannonia, before the Huns, was a kind of historicized "Holy–Roman" Empire, whose ruler was the German *(Alamannus natione)* King Detricus carved from elements of Dietrich von Bern's German legends, and whose people was a peculiar Roman–German–Lombard (!) hotch-potch. The "pure" Huns were, therefore, in danger of "admixing" with this very product of the author's imagination, especially when, under Attila, their empire extended from Cologne in the West to Lithuani in the North, to Zara in the South. It is for this reason that the author in every detail scrupulously separates the Huns even in their institutions from every *extera natio*, from the diverse foreign peoples of the Hunnish empire. The latter were given a separate governor in the person of Attila's brother, Buda (Ch. 10); in lifestyles, too, the two elements diverged (ibid); also in their military organizations (Chs. 10, 12, 15); and, after Attila's death, it was the *extera natio* which caused the explosion of factionalism (Ch. 19); and so on.

If now, in this connection, one compares Master Simon's *Gesta* with the version of Hunnish history given by an unknown compiler in the so-called fourteenth century chronicle composition[36] a few decades later, one's attention is directed by the microscope of philology to an instructive phase of the history of ideas. For this compiler was evidently at a loss for what to do with these details. Either he left them out, or he distorted their meaning, using extracts of the text only where "*extra natio*" could be interpreted as referring also to some "foreign" individual, and nowhere using – in contrast to Simon of Kéza – the word "*natio*" to refer to the Hun–Magyars themselves. One must know, that Simon of Kéza was the first to use for his own people the word *natio*, and to use it with a highly positive connotation.

Moreover, in his conceptual system, peoples or "nationalities" are generally referred to as *nationes*. In the earlier chronicles of Hungary, in legends and in legal writings, the writer's own people are always referred to as *gens*. The term "*natio*" either simply meant "descent", or, was used to refer to foreign, largely barbarian and pagan "peoples", with some pejorative connotation.[37]

[36] This lost construction became the basis of the late medieval chronicles of Hungary (SRH I. pp. 239–505); cf. note 8.

[37] See note 29 above. – The concept *natio Hungarica* first appears in 1298 on a diploma in Hungary. *Codex diplomaticus Arpadianus continuatus* (MHH *1*/22). XII Budapest, 1874, p. 619.

This terminological phenomenon is an organic part of the eleventh and twelfth century viewpoint referred to above, and is consonant with the contemporary European use of concepts stretching back to antiquity. The word itself vitally preserved its etymological and semantic affiliation with the notion of "birth" *(nascor)*, in close relationship with the concept of *natura*; and "natural origin" counted as a value neither in later antiquity, nor in the feudal structure. It is, therefore, understandable, that the word *natio* in its more comprehensive sense, referred both in the classical and middle Latin principally to unorganized, barbarian or pagan "peoples", in some sense in a way kindred to the modern ethnographic concept of "*Naturvolk*".[38] The word begins to express a higher value in Europe in the thirteenth century, as the conceptual offshoot of the renaissance of the idea of origin which marked the beginnings of the early "national" outlook. Around 1250, there appears *natio regni Angliae*, with its vulgar linguistic form *(nacion : inglis man par in commun)* appearing around 1300. The French *nation* takes its place in French literature in the 1260's and '70's, referring to the totality of "the French". At about the same time there takes root within the Italian urban setting the *natio, nazione* forms of the concept. The "ideological" character of the theories of origin emphasizes and renders predominant the notion that a people *(gens)* belongs together principally through its common "birth, descent, origin", and in virtue of this, forms one and the same *natio*. And, as this has, by now, acquired value, the word itself comes increasingly to express a specific value.[39] In this respect, too, therefore, Master Simon of Kéza joins in the mainstream in an "up to date" manner, for a time confusing, even dumbfounding his near contemporaries, as the reluctance of the fourteenth century compiler strikingly illustrates. It is a matter of philological detail, that of the 13 cases where the two variations can be examined parallel to each other, in 6 cases the chronicler either abandoned or substituted something else for the word *natio*; and that there are places where incomprehension of the word's new value has led to the misinterpretation of the action of the epic itself.[40]

It is not the intention of this study to delve into the multifaceted subject of the genesis of "nationalism" in the Middle Ages.[41] Suffice it to demonstrate

[38] *Thesaurus linguae Latinae.* VI/2. Lipsiae 1925–1934. pp. 1842–1865. (G. Meyer); K. Heissenbüttel: *Die Bedeutung der Bezeichnungen für "Volk" und "Nation" bei den Geschichtsschreibern des 10. bis 13. Jahrhunderts.* Göttingen, 1920; K. Bierbach: *Kurie und nationale Staaten im früheren Mittelalter (bis 1245).* Dresden, 1938, esp. pp. 10–37. See also Fr. W. Müller's basic study referred to below.

[39] *The Oxford English Dictionary,* VII. Oxford, 1933, p. 30; Fr. Godefroy: *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française du IX^e au XV^e siècle.* V. Paris, 1888, p. 462; Fr. W. Müller: *Zur Geschichte des Wortes und Begriffs "nation" im altfranzösischen Schrifttum des Mittelalters bis zur Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts.* Romanische Forschungen, 58/59 (1947), pp. 247–321. For the Italian use of words N. Tommaseo–B. Bernardo: *Dizionario della lingua Italiana.* III/1, p. 451.; K. Heissenbüttel: op. cit. pp. 78–90. For the German terminology W. Müller: *Deutsches Volk und deutsches Land im späteren Mittelalter.* Historische Zeitschrift, 132 (1925), pp. 460 ff. The use of the French "*nation*" is rooted in the conception already formulated around 1300 even in a legal dissertation: *gens . . . qui sont nez hors du royaume,* in other words, the entire people "born" within the French kingdom form one and the same "nation". B. Guenée: *État et nation en France au Moyen-Age.* Revue Historique, 237 (1967), p. 25.

[40] For a detailed account of the sources, J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 626–631.

[41] For some theoretical aspects of this complex of questions, see: J. Szűcs: *"Nationalität" und "Nationalbewusstsein" im Mittelalter. Versuch einer einheitlichen Begriffssprache.* Acta Historica Academiae Scient. Hungaricae, 18 (1972), pp. 1–38, pp. 245–266.

by merely two tangible examples, through what intellectual contradictions and historiographical "debates" the new conception had to fight its way to recognition.

In the first debate, it is the later compiler of the Hunnish chronicles who confronts Master Simon of Kéza. As the latter tells the story, after the death of Attila and the dissolution of his empire, his legal son, Csaba, returned to the "nation of his father" *(ad patris nationem)* in Scythia, and began at once to agitate for a return, "in order to take vengeance on the Germans". The chronicler, of course, shows himself reluctant already in the first instance: Csaba, as a matter of fact, returned to "the abode of his father" *(ad paternam sedem)*. As for the rest, he simply omits it: Csaba merely encouraged the return with his "admonitions".

Of much more interest is another aspect of the story. Master Simon, although he is evidently fond of his hero, nevertheless condemns him at one point. He recounts how Csaba, on returning to Scythia, "boasted of his mother's nobility", of her illustrious birth. (According to the fiction, Csaba's mother was the daughter of a Greek emperor.) For this, the Hunnish nobility "held him in contempt", saying that he was "not a true scion" *(non verus alumnus)* of Scythia, but the mixture of alien nations *(missitalius exterae nationis)*. Thus — concludes the story — he was not even granted a wife in Scythia. Even about two generations later, the compiler of the fourteenth century chronicle does not understand this conception, or does not agree with it; thus, he abandons the entire account, and puts in its place merely: "on his grandfather's advice," he sought a wife elsewhere. The claims of Simon of Kéza's original version — the pregnant origin-consciousness and "public opinion" of the Hunnish nobility — had paled into a grandfather's advice.[42] Two different writers, two different mentalities!

The significance of the motif is augmented by the fact that, of all the actors of the glorious Hunnish history, it is Csaba alone whom Master Simon brings into geneological connection with one of the predominating baronial families of his own time, the Abas. All the other heroes, all the Hun captains, owe their names to etymological inventions. For the author consciously avoided giving any contemporary baronial family the pretext for deducing "rights" from the history of the Huns. He himself deduced, on the one hand, the Magyar "nation" from Hunnish antiquity; on the other — as we shall see later — he deduced principles of "constitutional law", precisely in defiance of the high-born of the times. And thus, even the sole actualizable hero, the fictitious ancestor of the Abas, is found to have a blemish: he is a "mixture", he is not a "real" Hun![43]

Within the background of the epic detail, it is the transformation in attitude that is of significance: the social prominence conferred by descent is not yet, in itself, an absolute value (could one, after all, imagine a greater claim to prominence in those days than the blood of emperors?); if it is not conjoined with the "purity" of the *natio*, it can have but only a lower place in the scale of values.

The other latent debate is conducted by Simon of Kéza with his historian

[42] SRH I. pp. 162–163, pp. 278, 280.

[43] The important ideological and chronometrical character of this work has already been pointed out by J. Horváth, op. cit. (note 8), pp. 447–449.

predecessor, Master Ákos, who a decade earlier, around 1272, had rewritten the earlier Hungarian chronicles. This well-born writer, a descendant of the gentle Ákos-*genus* was inspired by the idea of a unified aristocracy. For him too, the "Scythian origin" was already a value; nevertheless, he saw the newcomer nobles who arrived in the course of the establishment of the Kingdom of Hungary as the social equals of the Magyars *(nobilitate pares Ungaris)*. He gives three criteria of *nobilitas*: settlement in the country of a relatively long duration; further intermixing, intermarriage with the Magyars *(Ungaris inmixti)*; finally, the acquisition of land.[44] When it comes to discussing the same principle, Simon of Kéza, without directly arguing with his predecessor, gives entirely different preconditions for noble status. He lists as first in the order of importance service to the king; as second, the possession of a land-grant; and only as last, a longer term of residence in the country. It is particularly characteristic of our author, that in the second precondition, he speaks of fief (*phaeudum*), thus creating for Hungary a feudal system it did not have, faithfully "ordering" Hungarian reality according to the European model.[45] For our purposes, however, the decisive difference between them is this: Master Ákos regards as positive the "intermixing" of foreigners and Magyars *(Ungaris inmixti)*, in opposition to Simon of Kéza, who sees it as a negative fact *(missitalius exterae nationis)*. As for the significance of the difference in the long run, belonging to a "nation" comes to take precedence, in the system of values, over the distinction of being well-born.

Simon of Kéza's historical conception was quick to exert an influence on the attitude of the nobility. The conception that the mythicized person of St. Stephen was the *alpha* of history — that it was he who "redeemed" the nation and led it out of the "darkness" — was undermined, although it had been the guiding principle not only of the early chronicles and legends, but it was also still present in 1231 in a charter of Béla IV: only through his merits "did this land pass from sorrow to joy, from slavery to liberty".[46] In 1290 already, the Styrian Ottokar von Horneck bore witness to the rejection of the Gregorian theory of the establishment of the Kingdom of Hungary by the nobility, who loudly insisted that "it was their ancestors who vanquished the pagans with their mighty strength, suffering the loss of so many lives".[47] They insisted in much the same way as Matthaeus Parisiensis recounts the French nobility to have boasted but a little earlier, that it was they who were "the principal members of the kingship", and that the establishment of the kingship can be

[44] SRH I, pp. 303–304. cf. E. Mályusz: *Az V. István-kori Gesta* (The Gesta of the time of Stephen V). Értekezések a történeti tudományok köréből (Studies in Historical Sciences), 58. Budapest, 1971, pp. 53 ff., esp. pp. 61–64.

[45] SRH I. 192: "qui servientes regibus vel caeteris regni dominis ex ipsis pheuda acquirendo nobilitatem processu temporis sunt adepti". — Elsewhere: "latisque et amplis pheudis in diversis Hungariae partibus noscitur investisse . . .", while in the 14th century chronicle version ". . . latis et amplis *hereditatibus*" (SRH I. pp. 191, 297). "Iobagiones vero castri . . . ad regem venientes, terram eis tribuit de castri terris, ut pheuda castri" *(ibid,* p. 193). Hungarian legal terminology had rarely use for the concept of "phaedum".

[46] Fr. Zimmermann–C. Werner: *Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Siebenbürgen.* I. Hermannstadt, 1892, p. 54.

[47] "Si (Ungarn arm und rich) jahen . . . ir vordern hetenz mit grozen kraft den heiden erstriten und heten ouch darumb erliten vil manigen bloutes guz . . ." *Oesterreichische Reimchronik,* 40 771– 40 779. MGH. SS V/1. cf. E. Bartoniek: Századok, 57 (1923), p. 279. For the demonstrable effect of Simon of Kéza's *Gesta* in the 1280's and '90's, see J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 635–36.

"attributed to the sweetness of battle", in other words, to their ancestors, the glorious descendents of the Trojans.[48]

As has already been said, it is not our purpose here to discuss the genesis of medieval "nationalism" in all its details. Suffice it to say, that in spite of the fictions and the dissonant chords which accompanied its development, the process itself advances irreversibly throughout all of Europe already in the thirteenth century. One of its essential consequences was undoubtedly to prepare the way for the laicization and secularization of thought — among its other forms, of the attitudes toward history. "Nation" and "Europe" are mutual preconditions for each other, not only in modern times, but — both with the content then peculiar to them — already in the late Middle Ages. Everything that is "national" in the Middle Ages is given conceptual expression in terms of its correlation to Christian Europe (as well as in terms of its contrast to it); in categories of universal culture (as well as in terms of its laicization); and with the aid of motifs general to all of Europe (as well as through their appropriation). In this sense, the emergence of a "national" view of history is a significant offshoot of the developing "congruence" of the history of Europe itself.

3

While the conception of history was encased in its stiff ecclesiastical framework, and the social and political spheres were also determined by the no less characteristically "descending conception of government and law",[49] the facts of the "social structure" required but few theoretical explanations. The reasons for human inequality were already given by the Fathers of the Church in the theological thesis of original sin,[50] while "society", at least regarded from the predominant point of view, seemed to be a kind of homogeneous formula in the conception of the *populus subiectus* referred to earlier, since it was Divine Providence which placed all the masses of humanity predetermined for subjection under some lay authority. The fact that, viewed from within, each such social unit, each "people" presented a very heterogeneous formula indeed, not only *de facto*, but also *de iure*, was similarly explained in a manner that excluded all further reasoning. It was explained in terms of the "functional" scheme of the World Order, which preordained for each and every man his place in the field of prayer, war or work *(oratores, bellatores, laboratores)*. Should reason nevertheless seek a more proximate "historical" explanation of social inequalities, that, in turn, offered itself in terms of the predominating historical viewpoint. The acceptance of Christianity was not only the *alpha* of history in this view, but in Hungary, as elsewhere, it found the source of all right and all liberty in some mythical legislator. Even as since the turn of the eleventh to the twelfth century the ancestral hereditary estates were seen as "the donation of St. Stephen", so even in the thirteenth century, every free-

[48] Fr. Hertz: op. cit. (note 23), p. 215.

[49] W. Ullmann: *Principles of Government and Politics in the Middle Ages*. London, 1961, pp. 20 ff.

[50] For a historical survey of the question, cf. R. W.–A. J. Carlyle: *A History of Medieval Political Theory in the West*. Edinburgh–London, 1928, V. 21–26; H. von Voltelini: *Der Gedanke der allgemeinen Freiheit in den deutschen Rechtsbüchern*. Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte. Germ. Abt., 57 (1937), pp. 189–207; Fr. Graus: *Volk, Herrscher und Heiliger im Reich der Merowinger*. Praha, 1965, pp. 282 ff.

dom, *libertas* (in other words, every socio-legal *conditio*) was considered as the institution of the holy king (*instituta a sancto Stephano*). Because the concept of freedom was itself relative, it appeared fundamentally as the grant of a privilege from above. And thus, there existed in the relatively unsettled and mobile social structure of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as many "liberties" between the two extreme conditions of servitude, and the evolving "golden liberty" (*aurea libertas*) of the nobility, as there were social strata, groups, and statuses.[51] The origin of servitude in its "historical" sense was summarily dealt with by public opinion in terms of the account used, we have cause to believe, already in the lost eleventh century *Gesta Ungarorum*: the occupying Magyars reduced all the people they found in Pannonia to servitude.[52] It was only the highest social stratum, the well-born, which was able to extricate itself from the force of the canonically sanctioned *a sancto rege* conception. All signs indicate that already in the eleventh century there existed a "seven Magyars" theory, according to which true *nobilitas* (then, as yet, in the sense of "notability, aristocracy") consisted in being descended from the seven chieftains who led the Magyars in the conquest of Pannonia. This idea was extended around 1272 by the Master Ákos already referred to above, to include all the great families of his times, the cream of society.[53]

These embryonic "social-theoretical" ideas became increasingly obsolete as, from the heterogeneity of the earlier structures and from the mosaic of diverse social statuses and "freedoms", the decisive events of the thirteenth century rapidly brought about a situation resembling the contemporary European model: on the one hand, the contours of a unified nobility; on the other, the outlines of an integrated peasantry. By the 1260's and 70's, the concept of *nobilis* conclusively broadened to include the generality of the nobility, and, by the end of the century, the Hungarian term for serf, *jobbágy (iobagio)* collected into a common conceptual pool the diverse "non-noble" *(ignobilis)* dependent strata of society.[54]

But the earlier "historical" notions became similarly obsolete, especially after Master Simon of Kéza, radically breaking through, as we have seen, the traditional historical limits, set up the *natio* as the basic framework of history. From the viewpoint which characterized his approach, it was impossible

[51] P. Váczy: *A szimbolikus államszemlélet kora Magyarországon* (The era of the symbolic view of the State in Hungary). Minerva, 40, Budapest, 1932, esp. pp. 35–38, 54 ff.

[52] The relevant text of the eleventh century *Gesta Ungarorum* as far as one can reconstruct it from the unanimous testimony of the texts of Anonymus, Ricardus, Albericus Trium Fontium and Thomas of Spalato, was probably the following: " . . . totum populum (Pannonie) in servitutem redegerunt". cf. B. Hóman: *A szt. László-kori Gesta Ungarorum és XII.–XIII. századi leszármazói* (The *Gesta Ungarorum* of the time of St. Ladislaus and its 12th and 13th century derivatives). Budapest, 1925, pp. 15–32.; J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 586–589.

[53] For the contention that the "qui autem de istis septem nati sunt, ipsi sunt modo viri nobiles in terra Ungariae" text fragment, which appears in Albericus Monachus Trium Fontium's world chronicle originated in the 11th century Hungarian Gesta, see: J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), p. 587. The debate of Master Ákos with the ancient Hungarian Chronicles: SRH I. pp. 292–293. cf. E. Mályusz: op. cit. (note 44), pp. 53 on.

[54] The formulae for ennoblement have been carefully collected by: P. Váczy: *A királyi serviensek és a patrimoniális királyság* (The royal *servientes* and the patrimonial kingship). Századok, 61 (1927), pp. 253–262. — E. Mályusz: *A magyar köznemesség kialakulása* (The evolution of the Hungarian gentry). Századok, 76 (1942), pp. 274 on. For the concept of "jobbágy", see I. Szabó: *Jobbágyság — parasztság* (Serfdom — peasanthood). Ethnographia, 76 (1965), pp. 10–31.

not to notice that among the masses of the peasantry, a great number were *natione Hungarus*, and, that the old theory regarding the subjugation of the "peoples of Pannonia" was, therefore, deficient. Furthermore, as a cleric who had studied Roman Law, he had at his disposal much more modern techniques for assigning a place of origin to the foreign speaking peoples. The fourth section of his work is nothing other than the historical account of the status of the diverse elements, given in terms of the Roman Law's *ius gentium* (as he used it, *mos gentium*), taking as a premise the original condition of those peoples as prisoners of war.[55] Within the categories of his view of history, however, this could refer only to the foreign and "mixed" (*missitalia*) elements of the population; and the question still remained an open one: from whence came the masses of the peasants within the "pure" (*pura*) Hun–Magyar nation? He himself clearly expresses the question thus: "If every Magyar descended from one and the same mother, and one and the same father, how can one be called noble, the other, non-noble?"[56]

The outline of this question is, in fact, a part, a component of that veritable theoretical tractatus which he placed near the beginning of his work (Ch. 7), among the Biblical and legendary stories of the genesis of peoples, and the account of the "Scythian" epoch in short, among his accounts of "ancient times" — which marked the beginning of Hunnish history proper, with the advent of "the sixth world epoch" (*aetas sexta seculi*). In the medieval conception of time, this was somewhat equivalent to the end of "prehistory" and to the beginning of "history". In the account given by Master Simon, each Hun was originally the coequal member of a free and self-governing *communitas*. In those days, it was customary to call to arms "in the name of God and the people" each man capable of bearing arms, "upon the counsel and precept of the *communitas*". There were some, however, who refused to comply with this order, "treated it with contempt" (*contempsissent*), without being able to justify their absence. These were either cut into two with a sword, or were "exposed to hopeless situations", or were cast into servitude, as prescribed by the *lex Scitica*. He concludes: "it was these kinds of crimes and excesses *(vitia et excessus)* which separated one Magyar from another". The state of non-nobility is the consequence of this "crime" *(casus criminis)*.[57]

This account differs decisively from both deductions regarding the origins of human inequality predominating at that time; as much from the Christian–patristic theory *(peccatum)*, as from the Roman legal *(ius gentium)* conception. *Ignobilitas* is here the consequence of a determinate "crime"; it is the legal result of the denial of the command to arms embodied in a concrete "judgement". Historians have heretofore exhibited complete uncertainty regarding the source of this idea. Yet there was a country where the idea appeared in this century, first as an epic motif, and later, as a mode of theoretical argumentation. This country was France. When, in 1315, Louis X sent out commissioners to examine the legal status of the serfs, the order identified

[55] SRH I. pp. 192–194. For the Roman legal background, see J. Horváth: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 374–377.

[56] SRH I; p. 148.

[57] SRH I. pp. 147. 148. The summation: "Vitia itaque excessus huius (modi) unum Hungarum ab alio separavit, alias cum unus pater et una mater omnes Hungaros procreavit, quorum (sic ! *recte*: quomodo) unus nobilis, alter innobilis diceretur, nisi victus per tales casus criminis haberetur".

as the origin of their condition of servitude the crimes of their ancestors, their "misdeed" (*mesfait* = méfait). As Marc Bloch has already noted, the nature of this "historical sin" was then familiar to all; it required no further explanation.[58]

And, indeed, its prehistory stretches back at least a century. One first finds this motif in the text of the *Chanson de Gui de Bourgogne* which was written after 1211. After Charlemagne had already fought for three decades against the Moors, a group of his men, 4,700 armed soldiers deserted from the war. As their punishment, both they and all their descendents were reduced to servitude. These were the first *serfs*. This motif then transcends its local bounds, and is modified in the course of the 13th century so that it is no longer a matter of those deserting from battle, but of "cowards" who had refused the call to arms *(couards d'Apremont)*. In this new version, Charlemagne decided on their punishment not after, but before the campaign. It was in this form that the story found its way into the *Roman de Renart le Contrefait*, a poem written at the beginning of the 14th century, from which one can even learn that the story is a common subject of discussion.[59] Nor did it remain confined to the epics. It found its way into jurisprudence, moreover, into one of the most notable of the collections of French customary law, the *Coutumes de Beauvaisis* of Philippe de Beaumanoir, written between 1279 and 1282. Here, the motif has already lost its concrete epic context, and has been built into a wider social-political theory. According to it, in the beginning every man was free. But as people "multiplied", pride and envy led to dissensions and wars. At this point, the communities of the people *(la communetés du peuple)* elected themselves kings, transferring to them the authority of jurisdiction, leadership in war, and the promulgation of commands. And so that there should be someone to protect the people from "bad judges", the bravest and wisest men were granted *seignouries*. It is their descendents who are the nobles. The origin of the *serfs* is more diversified. Some had been prisoners of war, others had chosen servitude voluntarily, and so on. Many, however, were the descendents of those who, when the king had sent out a general call to arms, had been reluctant to enlist. All those who had refused the call to arms without good reason, were reduced to servitude.[60]

This deduction, in its almost organic linking of motifs, is related to Master Simon of Kéza's, which also — as we shall later see — discusses this issue in terms of "constitutional law". The difference consists in this, that in Philippe de Beaumanoir's theory, the focus is on providing a theoretical underpinning for the position of the *rois de France*: while Simon of Kéza is concerned to do the same for a self-governing *communitas*. (Nevertheless at a later stage, the latter, too, introduces the election of a king.) The common motifs are the following: (1) the original equality of the human community; (2) the interrelationship of the "multiplication" of people, and the move toward the delega-

[58] M. Bloch: *Rois et serfs. Un chapitre d'histoire Capétienne.* Paris, 1920, p. 132, pp. 142–152.

[59] H. Lemaître: *Le refus de servage d'ost et l'origine du servage.* Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, 75 (1914), pp. 231–238. cf. M. Bloch: op. cit. p. 151.

[60] H. Lemaître: op. cit. p. 235. cf. Fr. Olivier–Martin: *Histoire du droit Française des origines à la Révolution.* Paris, 1951, p. 248. Philippe de Beaumanoir's work treats the origins of servitude in two places (c. 1453, 1438): *Coutumes de Beauvaisis.* Publ. par A. Salmon, Paris, 1900, II. pp. 235–236, p. 218.

tion of authority;[61] (3) the separation of the judicial, military and legislative aspects of authority;[62] (4) the emphasis on the provisions made for the control of "bad judges", and for the nullification of inappropriate sentences;[63] and, finally, (5) the uniform explanation of the origins of servitude as the consequence of the disobedience of the call to arms. The French command, of course, is given by the king; while the "Hunnish" judgement is passed by the community.

Nevertheless, it is not the parallelisms in the text that are of decisive significance. Master Simon had supreme command over his sources; he never "copied". Nor can we claim that his source was definitely Philippe de Beaumanoir's text. We can be certain, however, that the source of his idea was that conception of which *Coutumes de Beauvaisis* is also but a compilation. For one can read in the Renart novel mentioned above, that also at the time the novel was written, it was a topic of conversation that there lived in Paris alone at least 1000 *serfs* of such origins.[64] We do not know whether or not Simon of Kéza had travelled in Northern France. We do know, however, that he had travelled through Burgundy, where the conception had received its first literary formulation already at the beginning of the century. Knowing Master Simon's predilection for incorporating into his work bits of information culled from here and there, we need hardly be surprised that the epic, and later legal elements of the Charlemagne traditions became embedded in a theory of a historicized Hun *communitas*. The idea, in its essential feature seems to be, therefore — as the author announces in his prologue — a *Francia* infiltration.

Italia provided its complement: the threefold mode of punishment prescribed by "Scythian law" as the consequence of the "crime". The three kinds of punishment mentioned above could not have arisen from the historicization of the contemporary Hungarian legal practice; they are, however, similar to those three modes of punishment *(publica iudicia)* which were prescribed by Roman Law for common crimes.[65] The first, as we have seen, was the execution, by sword, of those who had refused to obey the edict of the community. In Roman Law, too, in the case of the most serious common crimes, the first capital punishment *(poena capitalis)* was death; and, more proximately, in the case of high treason, execution by sword.[66] The second kind of sentence seems obscure only if one does not know that in the expression *exponi in cau-*

[61] Beaumanoir: "quant li peuples commenca a croistre"; Kézai: "multiplicati Huni in Scitia habitando . . .", and there follows in both the "historical" deduction.

[62] Beaumanoir: " . . . si eslurent roi et le firent seigneur d'aus et li donnerent le pouoir d'aus justicier de leur mesfés, de fere commandemens et establissemens seur aus . . ."; Simon of Keza: " . . . capitaneos inter se scilicet duces vel principes praefecerunt . . . Constituerunt quoque inter se rectorem unum . . . qui communem exercitum iudicaret, dissidentium lites sopiret, castigaret malefactores, fures et latrones." In the case of the call to arms, "unusquisque armatus . . . debeat comparere communitatis consilium praeceptumque auditurus . . ."

[63] Beaumanoir: " . . . et pour ce qu'il peut le peuple garantir contre . . . les mauves justiciers"; Simon of Kéza: "si rector idem immoderatam sententiam definiret, communitas in irritum revocaret . . ."

[64] H. Lemaître: op. cit. p. 233.

[65] This has already been pointed out by J. Gerics: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 112 ff. cf. J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 589–595.

[66] Dig. 37, 1, 13; 48, 1, 2; 48, 13, 6, pr. etc.; often simply *poena mors*. The *capitis amputatio* referred to political crimes, e.g. Dig. 48, 19, 8; 48, 19, 28; 48, 19, 38; Cod. 9, 8, 5, (*gladio feriatur*).

sas desperatas the word *causa* is used in its specific sense as a technical term of Roman Law to mean "legal status".[67] It is not a matter, therefore, of generally exposing the condemned to some hopeless situation; but of reducing him to one of many such "legal statuses" or conditions. Neither is the use of the plural merely coincidental. For, although in Roman Law the second sentence was banishment, its severity was of several degrees, varying from a specified length of time of punishment *(relegatio in tempus)* to deportation with the loss of civic rights, or banishment to some island *(relegatio in perpetuum, in insulam deportatio)*.[68] Hungarian criminal law contained no analogues; it was, therefore, adequate to reproduce, without detail, the concentrated essence of the mode of punishment. Finally, one finds the third mode of punishment also to have analogies in Roman criminal law: for the more serious instance of "civic death" *(mors civilis)* was condemnation to forced labour, to working in the mines, as a consequence of which the condemned became a slave *(servi poenae)*. In the commentaries, by the way, (e.g., Accursius) there is already simply "servitude" instead of specifically "slavery in the mines".[69] Thus, Simon of Kéza's *detrudi in servitutem* formula is a precise term in Roman law.[70]

But, is the idea of *lex Scitica* — in other words, the legal combination of having the judgement, the servitude itself the consequence of the enforcement of a definite "law" — not also but the cloaking of Roman legal knowledge in "Hun-Scythian" garb? In Roman Law, there corresponded to the various instances of common crimes the operation of specified *leges*. High treason fell under the jurisdiction of the so-called *lex Iulia maiestatis*; they included every kind of conspiracy, rebellion, treachery, in short, "everything perpetrated against the *populus Romanus*, or its security".[71] From all that has been said, it stands to reason to suppose that the model of the *lex Scitica* was the *lex maiestatis* for an author who invented the theory of the call to arms in the name of *Vox Dei et populi Hungarici*; who has *praecones* give the call to arms (in the same way as in ancient Rome it was professional criers, *praecones* who called the armies to the *censura*); and who, as a lawyer, could well have regarded, on the Roman analogy, the refusal of the call to arms a "criminal case" *(casus criminis)* as a crime against the *populus Hungaricus*.

As is well known, all evidence indicates that Simon of Kéza studied in Padua; and in fact we see him, elsewhere, too, enhancing his history of the Huns with gems of knowledge from Roman Law. The *ignobilitas* deduced from the refusal of the call to arms, this French motif, is, as "criminal law", given a regular Roman legal framework. Thus the historico-legal account for the existence of servitude acquires the aura of "scientific" in his day, in response to the needs of the times. In France, the historical framework was provided,

[67] *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*. Lipsiae 1906–1912, III. pp. 687–688. E.g., "in servilem *causam deductus*" (Dig. 4, 5, 3, 1).

[68] Heumanns: *Handlexikon zu den Quellen des römischen Rechts*. Neu bearb. von E. Seckel. Jena 1907[9], p. 191. For the relevant parts of the *Digesta*, see J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), p. 592.

[69] For example, already in Dig. 48,19,2. pr. (Ulpianus): the punishment is simply *servitus*. Accursius *gl.* ad Dig. 48, 19, 28 (Callistratus) ad v. *metalli coercitio:* "Haec inducit servitutem, ut supra eo 1. *aut damnatum* (= Dig. 48,19,8.)

[70] E.g., "in carcere detrudeıe", "in metallum detrudi per sententiam", "in servilem conditionem esse detrusi", etc. Dig. 4, 2, 22; Cod. 5, 5, 3; Cod. 8, 51, 2. Cf. Heumann: op. cit. p. 143.

[71] Dig. 48, 1, 1 (Ulpianus); Inst. 4, 18, 3–11.

naturally, by the Charlemagne legacy; in Hungary, by the history of the Huns; in both cases, by that in which the evolving self-consciousness of the nobility best discovered its own myth.

The theory is the expression of a definite need of the times. Even the story of the *couards d'Apremont* had no traditional basis even in France, where, contrary to the story, Charlemagne had been concerned to protect, and not to repress, the free social elements.[72] In fact, it was the case of an established social attitude seeking an "historical" explanation and justification for the boundry which divided nobles and peasants into two alien masses, according to whether or not they participated in military service. Although even in the Hungary of the second half of the thirteenth century the most diverse elements were, in reality, still going to battle — among them a great number of "non-nobles"[73] — there already existed in the nobility the need to establish itself as the sole warrior stratum. In this view, there was already the identification of *bellator* and *nobilis*, as is reflected by the diploma-formulae, where the nobility appears, since the middle of the century, already as the community of warriors *(bellantium collegium)*.[74] At the same time, the "true" or "golden liberty" *(aurea libertas)* of the nobility rises higher and higher above the variety of "liberties" distributed throughout society.

This viewpoint was supported by attitudes common throughout Europe. The primary one was the increasingly popular theory of "functionalism", which perceived wordly society in terms of the dualism of warriors and workers *(bellatores–laboratores)*.[75] It was this view which was supported by the interpretation given to the revived Roman Law by the glossators, for whom there existed two basic "species" of mankind, freemen and servants *(liberi–servi)*;[76] and, by the feudal interpretation which formed its corollary throughout Europe, namely, that the "truly" free man is *nobilis*.[77] All this taken together was quite enough for an ingenious mind to mould from it a rounded theory, in such a way as to preserve also the suggestive power of an epic. As has been seen, Simon of Kéza had overcome the obstacle of the old historical viewpoint when he pushed aside the traditional *a sancto rege* division point. It was because of this, that he was able to present the social statuses of mankind — nobility and non-nobility — not as the creation of the "holy king", but as a development from ancient times. The origin of human inequality was thus given not only "historical" and "legal" underpinnings, but also received a boost in "moral" status. For the refusal of the call to arms had been the repudiation of martial *virtus*, and at the same time of the major "political

[72] H. Lemaître: op. cit. pp. 237–238.

[73] J. Molnár: *A királyi megye katonai szervezete a tatárjárás korában* (The Military Organization of the Royal Counties at the Time of the Tartar Invasions) Hadtörténeti Közlemények (Studies in Military History) 6 (1959), pp. 222 ff.

[74] P. Váczy: op. cit. (note 51), p. 22.

[75] J. Batany: *Des "Trois Fonctions" aux "Trois États"*. Annales 18 (1963), pp. 933–938.

[76] Originally, for example, Dig. 1, 1, 4 (Ulpianus): "iure gentium *tria* hominum genera esse coeperunt . . ." But see also the glossa of Accursius: "Item quomodo sunt tria genera? Imo tantum *duo*, scilicet liberi et servi, quia liberti liberi sunt".

[77] It is in the thirteenth century that there takes root in Western Europe, too, the idea that the *militaris* service is identical to the *nobilis et bellicosa* way of life, therefore also with the concept of *libera conditio*. L. Genicot: *La noblesse dans la société médiévale*. Le Moyen Age, 71 (1965), p. 557.

virtue", loyalty;[78] those, therefore, who had preserved this virtue, the nobility, rose above the peasantry even in "moral" stature. An evolving structure had gained justification by contemporary "European" means within its own peculiar "Hun–Scythian" medium, even before the structure itself had reached full maturity.

4

It is by no means a coincidence that Simon of Kéza placed his own discourse on social theory precisely at the point where, with "*Igitur in aetate sexta saeculi . . .*" as introduction, he steps into the "sixth world epoch". In the Medieval conception of time, this notion indicates not only that "pre-history" has given way to "history", but also something which we would, in modern terminology, call identical "structures"; within this epoch there already operate identical norms and regularities, and "history" itself, with its own causality, is but the chain of events. The author betrays unmistakably that he is using this temporal viewpoint; the *aetas sexta saeculi* is, for him, in a certain sense already "now", *nunc*, the present.[79] His historical horizon stretches back to the biblical and legendary ancient times, and in this perspective, of course, the "nation" is an uninterrupted continuity from the beginning of the world "until now"; but the norms of the social and political spheres which are valid "even until today" developed later, in the "sixth world epoch". It is for this reason that he thinks it important to make it theoretically clear already here, at the beginning of the epoch, that, although the Hun–Magyar *natio* "descended from one father and one mother" in antiquity, as far as social organization is concerned, the "today" also provides a valid structure. As the author himself expresses it: the *separatio* of the people into nobles and non-nobles, although it occurred secondarily, nevertheless also occurred long ago. It is at this same point that he thinks it necessary to clarify also the basic principles of "constitutional law", which centers on the theory of the ancient *communitas*. Naturally, he says, in "historical times" it was already an "isolated" *communitas* which was the agent of history, for already in the days of the Huns there existed a nobility (*Hunnorum nobilitas*; Ch. 22). It has long been recognized, that the theory of *communitas* expresses nothing other than the demand of the "general congregations of the realm" (if not "Diets"), of the amassed nobility in the 1270's and 80's [80] to acquire a share in power, to ally themselves with the king against the anarchial government of baronial groups and factions.[81] It is the needs of a "premature feudalism"[82] which find

[78] For the ideology of *fidelitas* as the highest *virtus politica*, see A. Kurcz: *Arenga und Narratio ungarischer Urkunden des 13. Jahrhunderts.* MIÖG, 70 (1962), pp. 337–341.

[79] Simon of Kéza c. 3: "olim in veteri testamento, et *nunc* sub aetate sexta saeculi . . ." SRH I. p. 142. For the attitude to time, see E. Bernheim's great work: *Mittelalterliche Zeitanschauungen in ihrem Einfluß auf Politik und Geschichtsschreibung.* 1918; as well as H. Grundmann: *Die Grundzüge der mittelalterlichen Geschichtsanschauungen.* Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, 24 (1931), pp. 326–336.

[80] S. E. Kiss: *A királyi generális kongregáció kialakulásának történetéhez* (On the evolution of the royal "generalis congregatio"). Acta Universitatis Szegediensis, Acta Historica, 39. Szeged, 1971.

[81] Cf. esp. P. Váczy, J. Horváth, J. Gerics, Gy. Kristó, op. cit. (notes 8 and 9).

[82] Gy. Bónis: *Hűbériség és rendiség a középkori magyar jogban* (Feudalism and system of estates in medieval Hungarian law). Kolozsvár, 1944, p. 170.

expression here in a historicized manner, for, in actuality, it is still precisely the baronial groups and factions which rule the political scene.

In this field, too, Simon of Kéza is ahead of his times. For, although the concept of *universitas regni* appears already in 1299 in a diploma, it is only after 1330 that the expression "*universae nobilitatis communitas*" takes its place in the Hungarian politico-legal conceptual system.[83] The nobility, as a "body" *(consortium, collegium, coetus, societas)* does, indeed appear, from the middle of the thirteenth century in the formulae of the patents of nobility, but only as the "body of Warriors", and not as a "body politic", *corpus politicum*, in the organism of the kingship. What is more, it is only in these decades that there is a movement away from the archaic outlook which saw the emerging nobility as, metaphorically speaking, the king's broader retinue ("Gefolgschaft"). To the middle of the century, a noble is referred to as the "servant of the king", *serviens regis*, a member of the king's *familia*. Ennoblement meant that the enobled could, metaphorically speaking, feel at home in the king's court, in his house *(in domo regia)*; his liberty to do so was the fruit of royal favour, of *gratia*, which he was bound to recompense with loyal service *(servitium)*.[84] It is in the course of a transitional period (1266–83) that the nobleman becomes unqualifiedly and unequivocally *nobilis*, at a time when the letters of patent still refer to him in the intermediate terms of *serviens seu nobilis*, *nobilis serviens*. There is lacking, until the 1280's, the conceptual foundation which could transform this essentially vertical viewpoint into a horizontal one, in other words, which would try to prove that *nobilitas* is neither solely the creation of the Holy King (as even the Golden Bull of 1222 has it, in referring to the liberty of the "royal servants"), nor only dependent on the manifestation of the grace of the existing monarch, (as the ideology of the diplomas has it), but is, rather, an ancient development, possessed of a very old "historical existence". The performance of this task, too, had to wait for Master Simon of Kéza.

According to the fictional history of the Huns, in the sixth world epoch the *communitas* elected for itself functionaries, six captains *(capitanei seu duces)*, and a *rector* charged with judicial duties, but all with the proviso that the community could, at any time, revoke its election and discharge any official guilty of a "lapse". Originally, Attila himself had also been but one of the captains; it was only after the "first" conquest of Pannonia that they elected him as king *(rex)*. This transitional "monarchical" age came to an end, however, with Attila's death, and power returned into the hands of the *communitas*.

From the time of the return to Scythia, throughout the "second" conquest, up to the time of St. Stephen's father, Prince Géza, it was again the "communal" constitution that was operative; in our author's characteristic expression:

[83] 1299: "universitas nobilium Ungarorum, Saxonum et Cumanorum", "nostre universitatis coetus" = "universi barones et nobiles regni Ungarie". *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus ac civilis.* Ed. G. Fejér, Budae, 1841. VII/5, pp. 502–504. — 1330: "universe nobilitatis communitas". M. G. Kovachich: *Supplementum ad Vestigia comitiorum apud Hungaros . . . celebratorum.* I. Budae, 1798, p. 268. — For a survey of the complex of questions: J. Holub: *La Représentation politique en Hongrie au Moyen-Age.* X[e] Congrès International des Sciences Historiques, Rome, 1955. Études présentées à la Commission Internationale pour l'histoire des Assemblées d'États. Louvain–Paris, 1958, esp. pp. 88–89.

[84] P. Váczy: op. cit. (note 51), pp. 9–23.

dum se regerent pro communi (Ch. 10). This notion represents a multi-faceted functional unity, containing the element of self-government through the instrumentality of replaceable functionaries elected *pro tempore*, for a specified time (Chs. 7, 42), the legislative function of the *communitas*, and its ability to promulgate *edictum*; the passing of sentences and the bringing of decisions in military matters, in the Hun ancient times, as much as in the times of the western campaigns of the tenth century (e.g., Ch. 40); the composition of the army (Chs. 8, 26); the decisions in matters regarding settlement (Ch. 8); and so on. And since those who had refused to obey the edict of the *communitas*, the call to arms, had been reduced to servitude, already in the Hun epoch it was an "isolated" *communitas*, in other words, the *Hunnorum nobilitas*, who exercised all these rights.

Historians have exhibited considerable uncertainty regarding the source of the *communitas*-theory. On the domestic scene certainly, it was unprecedented.[85] One could think of Thomas Aquinas' political theory, for the elements of Simon of Kéza's scholastic education are known well enough.[86] However, one can scarcely deduce directly and solely from this all of Master Simon's theory, for, in the final analysis, the great Parisian held to be optimal *(optima politia)* that form of the *regimen commixtum* which is, somehow, an "intermixture" of royal power *(ex regno)*, of the will of the well-born *(ex aristocratia)*, and, of the power of the people *(ex democratia id est potestate populi)* (*De Reg. Princ.* 1, 2, 105, 1).[87] For Master Simon, however, it is not this which is "optimal". On the contrary; in his work, it is only Aquinas' third component which explicitly appears as an original constitutional form (the content of the word "democracy" at this time, naturally, being no more than what Aquinas, too, defined it to be: "it is the people who have the right to choose the prince"); and even later, as a development, he envisions only a "mixed" *politia* composed of the powers of the *rex* and the *communitas*.

It is again philology which provides us with the key to the solution of the problem. Upon closer examination of the writer's conceptual system, it becomes evident that he imagines that in the smaller component units of the Hun "communal" system, in any army, there are operative "corporative" principles and principles of self-government analogous to those existing in the larger unit; and it is to these that the synonymous expressions refer: *communitas*, (occasionally in its Italian form of *commune*), *caetus*, *consortium*, *societas*. These terms, the conception itself, the characteristic linking of the Whole and the Part, no less than the term first appearing in Chapter 19, "*pars sanior*" — the significant technical term of the "qualitative" principle of corporate constitutionalism — all point rather unequivocally to one and the same conceptual system: none other, than the corporate doctrine unified into a theoretical system by the middle of the thirteenth century.[88]

[85] For details of the contention that Simon of Kéza introduced the concept of *communitas* into the chronicle literature, and that the occurrence of this concept in the later chronicles is secondary, see J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 598–601.

[86] P. Váczy: op. cit. (note 9), pp. 557–559.

[87] Th. Eschmann: *Studies on the Notion of Society in St. Thomas Aquinas.* Mediaeval Studies, 8 (1946), pp. 1–42; Fr. M. Schmölz: *Societas civilis sive Respublica sive Populus.* Österreichische Zeitschrift für Öffentliches Recht, 14 (1964), pp. 28–50.

[88] For the details, see J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 602–4.

As is well known on the basis of Otto Gierke's fundamental studies,[89] this theory-cluster, which, though it had its roots in Roman and Canon Law, can be seen as the specific result of thirteenth century jurisprudence, played almost a key role in the transformation of European political thought. It was through it that there came into being a new kind of conceptual model of "society" capable of shattering the earlier theoretical model. True, the original public role of a "corporation" as a social unit *(societas publica)* was one in which it enjoyed internal autonomy (the election of superiors, the administration of justice, the principle of representation, self-government) on the basis of a privilege granted by some superior authority. In time, however, the theory reached the stage of pronouncing the "sovereignty" of a *societas*: in other words, maintaining that such an organized social unit can have legitimate existence without the permission of a superior authority *(sine licentia superioris, absque authoritate principis)*.[90] And thus, there was given a model capable of transforming the "descending" conception of social and political relationships — a vertical formula — in a horizontal direction. For, in this view, the individual was no longer principally the "subordinate" *(fidelis subditus)* of some lay or ecclesiastical authority, but the "member" of an immanent association, of an autonomous society *(membrum universitatis* or *communitatis)*. Similarly, no longer could each mass of people necessarily be comprehended only as a "people" of subjects, *(populus subditus)*, but rather as a legal personality *(persona repraesentata* or *politica)*, "represented" by certain individuals, certain groups, capable of confronting even the ruler himself. For here, too, there predominated the principle of unity of medieval philosophy, which saw analogous principles for the internal structure of each element of human society, from its smallest units to its broadest, the Universal Church. According to it, there existed some typical varieties of social units within the continuum ranging from the village community *(communitas vici)* to the universal Christian community, all functioning according to analogous "corporative" principles. From it arose, as an intermediate stage, the concept of *universitas* or *communitas regni* which represented one of the poles of a dualistic theory of the state, the *status regni*. This stood in contradistinction to the "king's state" *(status regis)* as a body politic participating in government through "representation", itself a self-sustaining legal personality, the members of which might indeed be mortal, but which in spite of this, maintained its identity, which "never dies" *(nunquam moritur)*.

At the same time, naturally, the individual too was liberated from his exclusively subordinate political status. Thus, in respect of its theory, the thirteenth century is indeed, in a certain sense, a time of the "emergence of the citizen",[91] although, of course, within strictly late medieval bounds, as a member of a corporative "society" fortified on all sides with prerogatives. Except in the

[89] O. Gierke: *Die Staats- und Korporationslehre des Alterthums und des Mittelalters* (Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht, Bd. III). Berlin, 1881, esp. pp. 188–478.

[90] Already the glossators had deduced a multitude of rights from the essence of the corporation, "durch welche dieselbe als ein gesellschaftlicher Organismus mit einer eigenen und selbständigen Sphäre des Gemeinlebens, als eine Macht über seine Glieder ausgestattetes Gemeinwesen charakterisiert wird". Gierke: op. cit. p. 215. "Indem sie (die Juristen) die alten Definitionen wiederholen, unterstellen sie die Summe aller menschlichen Verbandseinheiten einem gemeinsamen Gattungsbegriff und einer gemeinsamen Theorie". op. cit. p. 355.

[91] W. Ullmann: op. cit. (note 28), p. 104 on.

Italian city-states, within the monarchical structures it was, at best, the nobleman who could, as yet, sense something of the status of the citizen of antiquity, the *civis*, and of the *civilis* political relations. In fact, in practice the circle was yet even narrower; in England, for example, the *communitas regni* was identical with the aristocracy even at the end of the thirteenth century.[92] Nevertheless, all this did not alter the fact that there was born the model of a "political society" whose cohesive factors were, by now, given not "from above", but from within — as Thomas Aquinas summed it up: "within the unity of law and public utility" (*unitas iuris et communis utilitatis De Reg. Princ.* 11, 2, 42, 4).

That Simon of Kéza's political theory was conceived in this climate of ideas he suggests — as has already been indicated — both with his terminology, and with the characteristic analogy of Whole and Part. Corporate self-government is the "organizational principle" of the fictitious ancient Hun society. In this respect, Thomas Aquinas could hardly have been the immediate source of his theory, since for him, the *communitas* could not, theoretically, exist without sanction of higher authority.[93] In contrast to this, in Master Simon's fiction the *communitas* is already a given historical principle, anteceding the monarchy — the election of Attila as king — and remains, even later, until the very beginning of the Christian monarchy, in the sole possession and exercise of power. It is therefore, to the view of contemporary jurisprudence which sees *communitas* as capable of existing without higher authority that Simon of Kéza links his own theory, organized in a historical framework.

This social-theoretical model could, naturally, become the starting point of a philosophy of the state only through adapting itself to the framework of a political theory newly evolving in the thirteenth century from the sources of Roman Law, more precisely, from the theory of the delegation of power. In this view, the *populus* was the original possessor of law and power, which subsequently, and only secondarily, delegated its authority to the ruler. It is, in fact, more appropriate to speak here of the theory of the delegation of power that of the otherwise widely used "sovereignty of the people", which would tend to give rise to anachronistic notions.[94] At Simon of Kéza's historical starting point in the "sixth world epoch", the Hun *communitas* is the ancient "constutional form" of the *populus Hungaricus* and this state of affairs is altered only when, after the conquest of Pannonia, the Huns elected Attila to be "king over them", *Romano more* (Ch. 10). There has been a viewpoint which, on the basis of this deduction, regarded Master Simon's work as a species of noble-republican propaganda. In this view, the author looked back with nostalgia on the ancient conditions of "Hun–Scythia" when confronted

[92] W. A. Morris: *Magnates and Community of the Realm in Parliament, 1264–1327.* Mediaevalia et Humanistica, 1 (1943), pp. 58–94.

[93] "Societas publica . . . non potest constitui, nisi ex superioris auctoritate" (*Contra Impugn.* c. 3). "Omnis communitas aliqua lege ordinatur" (*Sent.* 27, 1, 1). Eschmann: op. cit. (note 87), p. 8.

[94] For a recent summary of this complex of questions, M. Wilks: *The Problem of sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought. N. S. 9) Cambridge 1963, esp. pp. 184–226. "The idea of separation of powers whose invention is sometimes attributed to Locke and Montesquieu, can therefore be said to be quite clearly envisaged in the political thought of the later Middle Ages. Sovereignty does not reside in any one part of the political community, ruler or people, but is shared between them. Strictly speaking, the term cannot be applied to either."

with the Western style monarchy of his day, thereby creating an historical Utopia, which "is cast up by the waves of time, and therein disappears again after its years of glory and greatness".[95] This, however, is not at all the point. What Simon of Kéza is getting at in his *Gesta* is similar to the European theory in general: the *populus* is never "sovereign" in the modern sense, but merely provides, through one's assumption of its original power, a kind of limited "historical" source of right for the present.

Most anachronistically, but theoretically all the more consistently, the work outlines the "historically" fluctuating relationship of *communitas* and *rex*. The ancient form of self-government does, indeed, change in Attila's time; but the expression "in the Roman manner" used to refer to the manner of the election of the king and was not meant to censure as "foreign" or Western the monarchical form of government. The expression "*Romano more*" is nothing other than the synonym of the word *voluntarie* used elsewhere.[96] In other words, the election of a king "in the Roman manner" means the voluntary and free delegation of power, which, in medieval technical language, is called *voluntaria subiectio ac consensus*.[97] And, in fact, although during Attila's monarchical rule the earlier "communal" jurisdictions became vested in the ruler, the *communitas* is not annihilated. On the contrary, there arises a kind of "mixed" *politia*, for power is not only Attila's but the Hun's and their ruler's (*Hunnorum dominium et Ethelae:* Ch. 14). And, as has already been outlined, from the death of Attila to Prince Géza, the original constitution of the *communitas* again becomes operative, and it is only the Christian monarchy which again brings about a change. Master Simon is careful, however, to preserve in his account some degree of participation in power for the *communitas* even after this time — in fact, continuously, to his own days. Thus, for instance, even at the time of Géza and St. Stephen, the agreement of the *communitas tota*, its *assensus*, was necessary for the acceptance of the Pope's decree (Ch. 95). Similarly, after the death of St. Stephen, it was not only the aristocracy, as the texts of the old chronicles maintain, who strove to settle the nation's disorders, but the aristocracy and the nobility *(principes et nobiles regni)* together (Ch. 46). King Colomon Beauclerc, too, modified his measures in accordance with the needs of the *communitas nobilium*.[98] It is with similar explanations and interpolations in his history of the Hungarians that Simon of Kéza seeks to establish the continuing presence of the *communitas* even throughout the developments of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

This consistently employed historical fiction shows not only that the author's conception is rooted in the corporate theory, which also embodies the theory of the delegation of power; it also indicates which trend within contemporary jurisprudence Simon of Kéza made into a historical principle. For the jurisprudence of the times interpreted this essential constitutional theory in two kinds of ways. According to the first, the once expressed will of the *populus*

[95] P. Váczy: op. cit. (note 9), pp. 560–561. For a critique, cf. J. Gerics: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 107–109.

[96] Simon of Kéza, c. 10: " . . . Romano more Huni super se Ethelam regem praeficiunt"; c. 8: "Tunc Romani Ditricum Veronensem Alamannum natione . . . super se praefecerant voluntarie". SRH I. pp. 149, 150.

[97] O. Gierke: op. cit. (note 9), p. 571.

[98] For the details, see J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 608–609; Gy. Kristó: op. cit. (note 9), pp. 14–16.

is, in fact, an unique, irrevocable historical event, having no actual political consequences at all, for, in the literal interpretation of the Roman legal maxim, the people did indeed vest "all their power" *(omne suum imperium et potestatem)* in the ruler, retaining nothing whatever of it. This view was represented by the founder of the Boulognese school, Irenius, the outstanding master of the French school (Montpellier) at the end of the 12th century, Placentinus, and many others[99] According to the other viewpoint developed, among others, by the preeminent master of the Boulognese school around 1200, Azo, the delegation of power does not mean that the people had totally renounced their power, for, in fact, they regained something of it later on. Thus, although certain individuals can be excluded from legislating, the entire *universitas seu populus* cannot. Authorities such as Bulgarus and Johannes Bassianus in the 12th century, Odofredus in the 13th century, concurred with this interpretation. It was precisely in a debate with Placentinus that Hugolinus insisted: the people did not delegate power in such a way as to retain nothing of it *(non transtulit sic, ut non remaneret apud eum)*; they only made the ruler the curator, so to speak, *(quasi procuratorem)* of power.[100]

Essentially, it was this latter stance of contemporary constitutional theory which Master Simon of Kéza made the guiding principle of a historical construct. The ideas which had inspired him were contained in the *scartabellos*, the characteristically Italianized word he himself uses for his sources scattered *per Italiam, Franciam ac Germaniam* (Prol.) and among which not only his books on Roman Law, but also the contemporary tracts on jurisprudence, his readings in Padua, occupied not an insignificant place. These works, by the way, were also available at home. In the library of one of his royal clerk colleagues, Master László (1277), there were to be found not only the books of the complete *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, but, among other books on Roman and Canon Law, also Azo's *Summa.*[101] Simon of Kéza did not seek a cultural "ideal" in the ancient past of the Huns; on the contrary, he cannot emphasize enough that positive turning point which came about at the time of Prince Géza and King Stephen with the renunciation of the nomadic, "despoiling" mode of life. After all, he, too, sees human society as falling within the du-

[99] Irenius (gl. ad Dig. 1, 3, 32 *de legibus*) "Loquitur hec lex secundum sua tempora, quibus populus habebat protestatem condendi leges . . . Sed quia hodie potestas translata est in imperatorem, nihil faceret desuetudo populi". — Placentinus (*Summa Inst.* 1, 2) "Nam populus in principem transferendo communem potestatem, nullam sibi reservavit, ergo potestatem leges scriptas condendi, interpretandi et abrogandi". Fr. Calasso: *I Glossatori e la teoria della sovranità.* Studio di diritto comune pubblico. Firenze, 1945, p. 72.

[100] Azo *(Summa Codicis)* "Dicitur enim translata id est concessa (sc. potestas) non quod populus omnino a se abdicaverit eam . . . Nam et olim transtulerat, sed tamen postea revocavit". *Idem* (*Lectura Codicis* 1, 14, 12) "Dic ergo, quod hic non excluditur populus, sed singuli de populo . . . quia plus fecit ipse, quam aliquis aliorum. Ideo singuli excluduntur, non universitas sive populus". — Odofredus (*Comm. in Dig.* 1, 3, 32) "Nam populus bene potest hodie legem condere, sicut olim poterat . . . Item non obstat, quod alibi dicitur, quod populus omne imperium legis condere transtulit in principem . . . quia intelligo transtulit id est concessit, non tamen a se abdicando". — Hugolinus *(Distinctiones)* "Sed certe non transtulit sic, ut non remaneret apud eum, sed constituit eum quasi procuratorem ad hoc". For the entire complex of questions, see O. Gierke: op. cit. pp. 566 ff; Carlyle: II, pp. 56–67; Fr. Calasso: pp. 72–78; M. Wilks: pp. 184–186.

[101] MES (see note 29) II. pp. 71–72; cf. E. Iványka: *László mester esztergomi prépost könyvtára* (The library of Master László, provost of Esztergom). Theologia, 4 (1937), pp. 216–226.

alism of *gens Christiana* and *populus barbarus* (Ch. 99). Similarly, far from being an enemy of the Christian monarchy, he is, himself, also the "king's propagandist".[102] Rather, the purpose of his political theory is to prove that the ancient Hun–Magyar *communitas* did not disintegrate even after the development of the monarchy, that it did not vest its power in the kings without – to borrow Hugolinus' succinct formulation – "some of it remaining with it". Consequently, the theoretical burden of his work ties in closely with a definite trend in the jurisprudence of the time, and in the political theories just then in the process of becoming differentiated. At the same time, it expresses within an eminently readable and colourful epic framework a political need beginning to make its appearance around 1280 in Hungary, too: that the king should grant to the body of the nobility assembled in the *generales congregationes* a part in the exercise of power and of legislature; even as, in its turn, the *communitas nobilium* described in this work for the first time, shows itself willing to augment the strength of the royal power in the face of those inclined to an "indolent life", the aristocracy (Ch. 96).

5

In December of 1270, a group of four men set out from Naples on horseback toward the south to Catona at the tip of Calabria, thence to cross by boat to Messina in Sicily, in order to convey the greetings of the new king of Hungary, Stephen V to Charles of Anjou returning from Tunis, from the Last Crusade. Besides the leader of the diplomatic mission, Master Sixtus, Canon of Esztergom, there are two other familiar figures in the group: Master Simon of Kéza, and Master Andrew of Hungary, two clerics. The latter was soon to enter the service of the son of Louis IX, Comte Pierre d'Alençon, whom he followed to France, there to write, around 1272, the history of Charles d'Anjou's rise to power: *Descriptio victoriae . . . Karoli regis Siciliae.*[103] The former returned home, and a decade later, in Buda, wrote his *Gesta Hungarorum*, weaving the experiences of this voyage, too, into the fabric of his history of the Huns. For we find according to one colourful episode of the scene at Ravenna, (Ch. 17) that *Zoard*, the Hun captain, roamed through Apulia to Calabria, to the districts of Catona and Reggio di Calabria, and, on his return journey, laid waste Southern Italy as far as Montecassino. The Huns, of course, had never got to Southern Italy. The inspiration for this episode is the voyage of the author himself, when, on this diplomatic mission in the autumn and winter of 1270, he travelled through Apulia, and setting out from Naples, also through Calabria. On the return journey, he crossed from Messina to Catona, and travelled through Calabria from January 27 to February 27 of 1271, detouring through Apulia to accompany to Montecassino Charles d'Anjou who was on his way to Rome.[104] Catona, in the heel of the Italian boot, inspired the author to formulate another etymologic idea, as was his wont; and a decade later, he was to insert it into his work: "Cato was born and lived here". (In

[102] For details, see J. Gerics: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 122–130.

[103] Its publication: MGH, SS XXVI. Hannoverae 1882, pp. 559–580. — For a reconstruction of this diplomatic mission, see J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 841 ff., esp. pp. 847–855.

[104] J. Szűcs: op. cit. (note 8), pp. 853–855.

reality, of course, Cato was not born here, but in Tusculum.) One might as well attribute symbolic significance to this event. It is not as if this odd association could be said to betray some classical learning. Cato's name was principally known at this time from that late-antique collection of sayings, the *Dicta Catonis*, which had served as the textbook of grammar even during the "Dark Ages". It is, nevertheless, a matter of more than just this. It is a matter of that new interest in the Roman past which arose throughout the northern Italian universities through the mediation of the study of Roman Law, an interest to which Cato's "sayings" were the more closely relevant in that the most widely used textbook, Accrusius' *Glossa Ordinaria* called attention to them in a number of places *(ut dixit Cato . . .)*.[105] This is a phenomenon akin the reviving interest in ancient ruins, something which — as we already know — served the author as a veritable mine of ideas in creating the characters and episodes of Hunnish history. Many things coalesce, therefore, in this historical moment around the turn of 1270–71, when in the tip of Calabria, the Hungarian cleric, preoccupied with creating the glorious Hunnish past, takes delight in letting his thoughts roam, though to the effect of but some fleeting notion, back all the way to antiquity: the new conceptions regarding the methodology of historiography and the acquaintance with renascent Roman Law; the interest arising in the ancient past, and the need for a glorious national past. It is the same, characteristic "Roman–Hun" mixture, breathing the atmosphere of contemporary feudal "Europe", which largely provided the epic and theoretical material for *Gesta Hungarorum*. For we must not lose sight of the fact that, as the idea of it was taking shape in our author's head, there teemed before him on the ferry-boat the flower of French, Spanish and Southern-Italian knighthood returning from the Last Crusade.

There are, as we have said, two Hungarian clerics on the scene. Both left one work for posterity; both works preserve the memory of the ties of personal experience with contemporary Europe. But their paths diverged. *Andreas Hungarus* did not return home, but continued to wield his pen in the service of one of the most interesting and most dynamic rulers of the time, Charles d'Anjou: and also, in the service of a theory of empire which managed interestingly to combine the universalism of the Middle Ages with the nascent new theory of the state.[106] Simon of Kéza returned home to write the work which was to influence his nation's historical consciousness for centuries. It was not only their paths which diverged; the spirit of their work diverged as well. On the one hand, there is Master Simon's fantastic historical construct, in which even his memories of southern Italy serve to enhance the Hun–Magyar glory; and, in the basic theoretical tone of which every bit of knowledge gathered abroad is reflected onto the *hic et nunc* of the social and political reality of contemporary Hungary. On the other, there is Master Andreas' *Descriptio*, with an undoubtedly higher level both in organization and literary merits, presenting, with the use of sources, a basically authentic account of contemporary history, but characterized, at the same time, by a biblical tone of universalism

[105] W. J. Chase: *The Distichs of Cato. A Famous Medieval Textbook*. University of Wisconsin Studies, 7, Madison, 1922. — Accursius gl. ad Dig. 1, 1, 2 ad v. *et patriae*. Cf. gl. Dig. 9, 2, 7, 4 and 32; 1, 101.

[106] E. G. Léonard: *Les Angevins de Naples*. Paris, 1954, esp. pp. 103 ff.; L. Boehm: *De Carlingis imperator Karolus, princeps et monarcha totius Europae. Zur Orientpolitik Karls I. von Anjou*. Historisches Jahrbuch, 88 (1968), pp. 1–35.

in its mode of presentation, and, in harmony with this, a partisanship of the Guelph, and hatred of the Ghibelline cause. They represent the two diverging roads of the medieval spirit: the one which, even within the universalism of Christianity, already seeks primarily the particular place of its own nation; the other, which adapts without reservation to the "supranational" world of ideas. In the final analysis, however, both represent one and the same unity: the history of a consolidating Europe in the thirteenth century.

Й. Сюч

ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ЭЛЕМЕНТЫ В «ДЕЯНИЯХ ВЕНГРОВ» ШИМОНА КЕЗАИ (1282—1285)

В статье прежде всего анализируется вопрос о том, с каких пор и в какой мере можно говорить о «европейских» структурах. Рассматривая многофазный процесс формирования стран Европы с VI по XIII вв., автор указывает на то, что структурное слияние «старых» и «новых» европейских регионов произошло в течение XI–XIII вв., хотя сложившийся «синхронный» характер истории Европы в дальнейшем в Восточной и Северной Европе проявлял своеобразные «асинхронные» формы. В дальнейшем эта своеобразная двойственность с точки зрения идейных структур автором статьи изучается на конкретном примере, путем анализа «Деяний венгров» Шимона Кезаи, написанных в 1282–1285 гг. Как в отношении подхода к истории, так и общественно-политической теории труд этот связан с идейными течениями современной ему Европы, однако изложенный в нем миф происхождения венгров от гуннов чужд европейскому образу мышления того времени. Эта теория являлась не чем иным, как своеобразным восточноевропейским вариантом сложившихся в Европе мифов, связанных с происхождением народов — своего рода «национальной историографией», возникшей в Европе в XII–XIII вв. Вместе с тем она представляет собой радикальный разрыв с жестким церковным подходом к истории, наблюдаемым в ранних хрониках и легендах XI–XII вв. Новая концепция отменила границу в подходе к истории, которую согласно прежним взглядам представляло принятие народами христианства: рамки «истории» теперь стала представлять «нация», которую рассматривали так, как будто бы она существовала «с давних пор до наших дней», основные же конфликты истории стали рассматриваться в антагонизме между собственной natio и чужеземцами (extera natio). В результате этого возникло новое воззрение, согласно которому в иерархии ценностей предпочтение отдается идее о происхождении нации перед критерием знатности. Одновременно в «Деяниях венгров» поднят вопрос о происхождении социального неравенства. Новое воззрение уже не ограничивается тем, чтобы источник любого общественного положения (conditio) видеть в лице мифического христианского законодателя — Иштвана Святого, — а в своих исторических выводах автор доходит до фиктивного первобытного состояния гуннов, в котором якобы и возникли nobilitas и ignobilitas. Как

детально доказано в статье, автор «Деяний венгров» Шимон Кезаи почерпнул свой вывод (согласно которому начало рабства восходит к глубокой древности и было последствием отказа от несения военной службы) из современной ему французской теории, которую он подкрепил с помощью мотивов римского права. Следовательно, в своей теории автор «Деяний венгров» с помощью современной ему европейской теории, но в то же время в рамках выдуманной протоистории гуннов ответил на свой собственный вопрос: «Если каждый венгр происходит от одного отца и одной матери, как же можно назвать одного благородным, а другого — неблагородным?» Основным мотивом политической теории труда является последовательно изложенная в исторических рамках «конституционная фикция», согласно которой первоначально власть принадлежала древней самоуправляющей общине (communitas) гуннов, которая при Аттиле, а затем позже, в эпоху формирования христианской монархии передала свою власть королю, причем в какой-то мере она до самого конца — до эпохи автора «Деяний венгров» — участвовала во власти. В статье подробно доказывается, что подобное изложение политических требований венгерского дворянства конца XIII в. коренилось в учении о корпорации, возникшем в Северной Италии, в частности в том направлении теории права, согласно которому принципу римского права lex regia дается такая интерпретация, что populus не отказался полностью от своей первоначальной власти, а сохранил себе некоторую долю ее в рамках «монархической» формы конституции. «Деяния» Шимона Кезаи со всех теоретических аспектов — как указывалось автором в предисловии — имеют связь с идейными течениями, познанными автором «Деяний» 'per Italiam, Franciam ac Germaniam', причем их элементы в каждой своей теоретической ссылке он приспособил к идейным запросам венгерского дворянства конца XIII в.