

TURKIC PEOPLES IN THE MEDIEVAL LAYER OF HUNGARIAN LEGENDARY TRADITION

Zoltán MAGYAR*

This paper discusses Turkic-speaking peoples and ethnic groups that became integrated into the Hungarian population over the course of history. These groups are mentioned in medieval Hungarian written sources, and their memory has also been preserved in Hungarian folklore, particularly in folk legends. A detailed examination of these traditions could form the subject of separate studies devoted to each of these peoples, including the Pechenegs, Uzes (Oghuz), Cumans, and Tatars.

First, it should be noted that the Székelys, considered by many scholars to be of Turkic origin, are discussed only indirectly in this paper, since Székely ethnogenesis, as reflected in Hungarian folklore, can primarily be interpreted in connection with the Attila legend cycle¹ and the Csaba legend cycle.²

A substantial body of material on this subject can be found in the first two volumes of my book series, *Catalogue of Hungarian Historical Legends*, published in 2018, as well as in my forthcoming book, *Attila: The King of the Huns in Hungarian Folklore*, which is expected to appear in Turkish in the near future. It should also be noted at the outset that the chronological scope of the present overview extends only to the mid-14th century. Consequently, it does not cover the exceptionally rich cycle of legends associated with the Ottoman Turks in Hungarian folklore. The 15th to 18th centuries therefore fall outside the scope of this study, including the folklore of the wars against the Ottoman Turks – of which hundreds of folk legends could be cited – the historical memory of the approximately 150 years of Ottoman

* ELTE Research Centre, Institute of Ethnology, Budapest, Hungary; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2680-5558; magyar.zoltan@htk.elte.hu

¹ Magyar, 2018a, II: 13–37; Hoppál–Magyar–Szabados, 2023.

² Magyar, 2023.



Figure 1. *Chronicon Pictum: The Hungarian Conquest of the Carpathian Basin*

rule in the Carpathian Basin, and other folkloric traditions associated with the Crimean Tatar incursions into Transylvania, which took place in the context of various Ottoman punitive campaigns between the 16th and 18th centuries.

The earliest mention of Hungarian–Turkic relations can be found in the *Chronicon Pictum* (*Képes Krónika*), compiled in the 14th century (Fig. 1), although its earliest textual layer can be traced back to an earlier chronicle composed in the 11th or 12th century.

Here, the chronicler makes the first mention of the so-called White Cumans and the Pechenegs. The chronicle relates the following:

“[The Hungarians] passed through the land of the Pechenegs and the White Cumans, through Suzdal, and the city called Kiev, and then crossed the high moun-tains [i.e. the Carpathians]. In one region they saw countless eagles and could not remain there because of them. The eagles covered the trees like flies and devoured both their cattle and

their horses, for God wished them to descend into Hungary as quickly as possible.”³

Some historians studying this period have associated this legendary account with the Pecheneg attack that provided the final impetus for the Hungarian tribal confederation to enter the Carpathian Basin and establish a new homeland there. According to this interpretation, the attack by the eagles described in the chronicle symbolically represents an attack by the Pechenegs, preserving the memory of actual historical events through the symbolic language of mythology and folklore.⁴

At the end of the 12th century, the notary of King Béla III recorded an account of the Hungarian Conquest in his *Gesta Hungarorum*. Chapter 8 of the *Gesta Hungarorum* contains a detailed description of a battle that, according to Anonymus’ knowledge – or perhaps imagination – took place between the Kievan Rus’ and their Cuman allies on the one side, and the Hungarians advancing westward on the other. The account contains vivid poetic imagery that also occurs elsewhere in the Hungarian chronicle tradition. For example, the victorious Hungarians are said to have pursued the Cumans as far as the city of Kiev, where they “chopped the bald heads of the Cumans like raw pumpkins.”⁵

According to Anonymus’ account, following the Hungarian victory, peace was concluded, and the seven Cuman leaders who had previously fought against the Hungarians “*were ready to come to Pannonia with their wives and children, and in great numbers (...) and their descendants live in various parts of Hungary to this day* [i.e. the end of the 12th century].”⁶

Archaeogenetic studies of human remains from the Great Hungarian Plain cast new light on these concluding remarks by the king’s notary, suggesting that a substantial population of Turkic origin may have been present in the Great Hungarian Plain – the westernmost forest-steppe region of Eurasia – prior to the Mongol invasion of 1241.⁷

Apart from the Cumans, written sources concerning the 10th and 11th centuries refer primarily to the Pechenegs among the Turkic-speaking peo-

³ Szentpétery, 1937, 286.

⁴ Szabados, 2021, 19–35.

⁵ Anonymus, 2003, 27.

⁶ Anonymus, 2003, 27–28.

⁷ Török et al., 2023, 36–37.

ples who came into direct contact with the Hungarians. In connection with King (Saint) Stephen I (1000–1038), the founder of the Christian Kingdom of Hungary, Anonymus relates the following towards the end of his *Gesta*:

*“At the same time, from the land of the Pechenegs came a valiant man from a noble family. His name was Tanuzaba: Örkénd’s father, from whom the Tomaj family originates. Prince Taksony gave him residential land in the parts of Kemej as far as the Tisza river, where the Abád-port is found. This Tanuzaba lived until the time of Taksony’s grandson, King Saint Stephen. And when King Saint Stephen preached the words of life and baptized the Hungarians, Tanuzaba, who was vain in the pagan faith, refused to become a Christian; so he was buried alive with his wife in the Abád-port, so that neither he nor his wife would live with Christ forever in baptism.”*⁸

By the time of Anonymus, this story already reflected an oral tradition nearly two centuries old, and today it is difficult to determine whether it preserved the memory of an actual historical event or “merely” one of the earliest folkloric reflections of St Stephen’s forcible Christianization. According to a legend from Székely Land, King Saint Stephen had prisons built next to churches, where those who refused to attend Mass were confined.⁹

According to other traditions, he punished those who violated ecclesiastical law in a far more drastic manner. The motif of pagans being buried alive is also attested as a narrative type in other sources. In the region of Abádszalók, on the Great Hungarian Plain, a local place name and oral tradition preserved the memory of Tanuzaba’s death until the mid-19th century, perhaps as a result of the influence of learned tradition. Tanuzoba’s name has been interpreted as meaning “pig father” in Turkic.

Clearly independent of Anonymus’ work is a legend from the Szeged region, collected by Lajos Kálmány, a Catholic priest and folklorist active in the late 19th century. According to this version of the legend, which closely parallels the story of Tanuzoba, King Saint Stephen had twenty valiant Cumans buried alive because they refused to accept the Christian faith.¹⁰

⁸ Anonymus, Chapter 57; Anonymus, 2003, 76.

⁹ Magyar, 2018a, II: 82.

¹⁰ Kálmány, 1914, I: 134–135.

Nevertheless, another, considerably more positive image of King Saint Stephen emerges in relation to Turkic peoples, portraying him as a ruler who was receptive and accommodating towards foreigners. In the *Admonitions* (*Intelmek*), composed for his son, Duke Emeric, around 1020, he states that “a country with one language and one custom is weak and fallible” and consequently instructs his son: “For this reason, I command you, my son, to treat newcomers with goodwill, to protect and cherish them, so that they would rather remain with you than live elsewhere.”¹¹

This principle also applied to Eastern nomadic peoples during the reign of King Saint Stephen. The *Vita* of Saint Stephen contains the story of sixty Pechenegs, recorded by a learned cleric in the early 1080s. The author of the *Vita* clearly drew upon contemporary oral tradition. According to the account, sixty Pechenegs came to Hungary to visit King Saint Stephen, but some of the king’s retainers robbed them and killed several members of the group. Upon learning of the incident, King Saint Stephen had the perpetrators sought out and punished: according to the text of the *Vita*, they were hanged in pairs along the roads in the four corners of the kingdom.¹²

A substantial section of the *Chronica Pictum* (*Képes Krónika*) preserves a source tradition dating back to the 11th century. This disproportionately lengthy section recounts the conflict between King Solomon (1053–1087) and the princes, followed by the reign of King (Saint) Ladislaus I (1077–1095). The exceptional length and detail of this account, compared with other parts of the chronicle, may be explained by its reliance on a contemporary epic narrative composed during the reign of Saint Ladislaus or shortly thereafter, the lost *Gesta Ladislai Regis*. This poetic work appears to have incorporated numerous elements derived from oral folk poetry, which were subsequently transmitted into the chronicle tradition.

This narrative tradition incorporated Christianized versions of motifs originating in the pre-Christian period, as well as elements of heroic epic poetry known from the pre-Conquest period and from the broader Eurasian cultural sphere, including parallels in the oral poetic traditions of Turkic peoples.¹³ Saint Ladislaus was regarded as a warrior king by his contemporaries and even more prominently, as a knightly king during the height of his cult

¹¹ Érszegi, 2001, 52–53.

¹² Érszegi, 2001, 15–16.

¹³ Demény, 2022, 263–400.

in the 14th and 15th centuries. This image had a historical basis: both as duke and as king, Ladislas fought several battles and led numerous military campaigns, including campaigns against eastern peoples who invaded or threatened the Kingdom of Hungary.

The chronicle tradition consistently portrays the Cumans as enemies; historical research, however, presents a more nuanced picture. Several of the nomadic peoples inhabiting the regions beyond the Carpathians, particularly Moldavia and Wallachia, launched plundering raids into the eastern and southern territories of the Kingdom of Hungary.¹⁴ Some of these incursions ended in heavy defeats at the hands of the Hungarian army led by King Ladislaus: the Uzes were defeated in 1068 and 1085,¹⁵ while in 1091 the Cumans suffered defeat on two occasions.

These military victories left a profound mark on Hungarian folklore. King Saint Ladislas became one of the most prominent and enduring heroes of Hungarian legend tradition.¹⁶ With the exception of King Matthias Corvinus (1458–1490), the Renaissance ruler celebrated in Hungarian folklore as “Matthias the Just”,¹⁷ Saint Ladislaus is perhaps the most prominent Hungarian king in folk memory. A significant body of legends portrays him as a warrior king who protects his people and his soldiers from their enemies.

In 19th-century folklore texts, references to these former enemies – the Pechenegs, Uzes, and Cumans – are relatively sporadic, although their memory has been preserved in a particularly large number of place names, especially in Székely Land (*Fig. 2*).

Following the logic of folklore, the image of the enemy was gradually transferred to other eastern peoples with a similar cultural background with whom the Hungarians came into conflict. Thus, Tatars and occasionally even Ottoman Turks appear in legends associated with King Saint Ladislaus (*Fig. 3*). As István Székely of Benczéd records in his chronicle, published in 1559, apparently drawing on Székely oral tradition, the villagers identified Saint Ladislaus’s opponent as a Tatar named Tepec.¹⁸

¹⁴ Benda–Solymosi, 1981, 94.

¹⁵ Katona-Kiss, 2007, 549–576.

¹⁶ Magyar, 1998.

¹⁷ Magyar, 2017.

¹⁸ Benczédi Székely, 1559, 167–168.



Figure 2. The wrestling scene in the legend cycle of Saint Ladislaus, wall painting from Székelyderzs (Dârjiu, Romania)



Figure 3. The wrestling scene in the legend cycle of Saint Ladislaus, wall painting from Sepsikilyén (Chilieni, Romania) (Jékely, 2014)

The Saint Ladislaus legend cycle, however, which was painted on the walls of medieval churches throughout the country¹⁹ and also depicted in codices and even on stove tiles,²⁰ almost invariably identifies the Cumans as the enemies and opponents of King Saint Ladislaus. As studies of 14th–15th-century weaponry and dress have demonstrated, the clothing (e.g. the pointed Cuman hat) and weapons (particularly various types of swords and bows) of the eastern warriors depicted in these scenes are largely consistent with contemporary historical reality.²¹ This is particularly evident in the eastern borderlands inhabited by the Székelys, who lived in close geographical proximity to Cuman populations (cf. the scenes of the Székelyderzs cycle, painted in 1419). It should also be noted that the majority of the wall-painting cycles known today are located in Székely Land.

This distinctive feature of Hungarian iconography – the wall-painting cycle that may be regarded as a uniquely Hungarian phenomenon within European art history – depicts the chronicle episode in which King Saint Ladislaus defeats and kills a Cuman warrior who has abducted a Hungarian girl, thereby rescuing her. This epic motif can ultimately be traced back to a type of heroic song of Eastern origin.²² Like the corresponding motifs represented in the Saint Ladislaus wall-painting cycle, this narrative tradition includes the invulnerability of the heroes, the mythical combat (wrestling) between invulnerable opponents, the demonic attributes of the enemy and his magical killing, and, finally, the hero's sleep following the combat. The same sequence of motifs is also attested in the heroic epic traditions of the Abakan Tatars, Sur Tatars, and Kara-Kyrgyz.

In the first half of the 14th century, Moldavia was still under the authority of the Tatars of the Golden Horde.²³ From the Hungarian perspective, the consolidation of control over this region took place during the reign of King Louis I (1342–1382), particularly in 1345 (and 1346), when an army led by András Lackfi and composed largely of Székely troops won a decisive victory over the Tatars in Moldavia. In his account of the victorious campaign, the anonymous Minorite chronicler recorded one of the earliest con-

¹⁹ László, 1993.

²⁰ Magyar, 2010.

²¹ Sashalmi-Fekete, 2017.

²² Magyar, 1996, 269–315.

²³ Katkó, 2021, 19–29.

cise legends in the Hungarian folkloric tradition. The narrative is associated with the cult of King Saint Ladislaus, which reached the height of its popularity in Hungary during this period.

According to this legend, the Székelys owed their victory to King Saint Ladislaus, who, at a critical moment in the battle, rose from his grave and appeared on the battlefield on horseback, fully armed and with a battle-axe in his hand. He slew many of the enemy and forced the rest to flee. The legend recorded by the Franciscan author even relates that an elderly Tatar prisoner of war testified under oath to the authenticity of the miraculous events.

Other Tatar captives gave similar accounts, adding that during the battle a crowned female figure – the Virgin Mary – surrounded by heavenly light appeared above King Saint Ladislaus. According to the chronicler, this miraculous apparition clearly demonstrated that *“the Székelys’ fight for the faith of Jesus Christ was aided by the Blessed Virgin Mary and King Saint Ladislaus against the pagans who boasted of their strength and numbers”*.²⁴

This legend was given literary form by the renowned Hungarian poet János Arany in the mid-19th century in his poem *Szent László* (*Saint Ladislaus*), which became an emblematic work of Hungarian cultural history.²⁵ The association between the victorious Moldavian campaign and King Saint Ladislaus, however, also became deeply rooted in oral tradition, forming part of the historical memory of the easternmost Hungarian-speaking ethnic groups, particularly the Székelys and the Csángós.



Figure 4. Depiction of the Saint Ladislaus legend on a stove tile (Benkő-Ughy, 1984)

²⁴ Kristó, 2000, 50–51.

²⁵ Magyar, 2018b.

According to this folkloric tradition, which can be traced continuously from the 14th century and was still preserved among the Csángó Hungarians of Moldavia in the 20th and 21st centuries, it was King Saint Ladislaus who expelled the Tatars from Moldavia, extended the borders of the kingdom as far as the so-called Száraz–Szeret (or, according to other traditions, as far as the Dniester), and incorporated these territories into the Kingdom of Hungary.²⁶

As the examples discussed above demonstrate, numerous traces of Hungarian–Turkic relations can be identified even in the earliest documented centuries of Hungarian history. Some of these survive primarily in folklore, as oral traditions that may, to a certain extent, be interpreted as preserving the memory of historical events.

References

Sources

Anonymus (2003). *Gesta Hungarorum. Béla király jegyzőjének könyve a magyarok cselekedeteiről*. (Fordította és jegyzetekkel ellátta Pais Dezső. A jegyzeteket kiegészítette és a térképet készítette Györffy György. A bevezető tanulmányt írta és a szöveget gondozta Thoroczkay Gábor.) Budapest.

Szentpétery, E. (1937). *Scriptores rerum Hungaricum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum* I. Budapestini.

Benkő, E. – Ughy, I. (1984). *Székykeresztúri kályhacsempék*. Bukarest.

Benczédi Székely, I. (1559). *Chronica ez vilagnac yeles dolgairol*. Cracco. (Szövegkiadása: Szerk. Gerézdi, R. Bibliotheca Hungarica Antiqua III. Budapest, 1960).

Benda, K. – Solymosi, L. (Szerk.) (1981). *Magyarország történeti kronológiája*, I. kötet. *A kezdetektől 1526-ig*. Budapest.

Demény, I. P. (2022). *Hősi epika*. Budapest.

Érszegi, G. (Szerk.) (2001). *Árpád-kori legendák és intelmek. Szentek a magyar középkorból*, I. kötet. Budapest.

²⁶ Magyar, 2022, I: 116–125.

- Hoppál, M. – Magyar, Z. – Szabados, Gy. (2023). *Attila. A hunok királya a magyar folklórban*. Budapest.
- Jékely, Zs. (2014). Transylvanian fresco cycles of Saint Ladislav in a new light. *Hungarian Review* 5(2), 97–109.
- Kálmány, L. (1914). *Hagyományok*, I–II. kötet. Vác.
- Katkó, G. (2021). *Tatárok a lengyel–oszmán határvidéken*. Budapest.
- Katona-Kiss, A. (2007). Úzok a Képes Krónikában. A nyugati oguz (úz) törzsek és a Magyar Királyság a XI. században. *Hadtörténelmi Közlemények* 70(2), 549–576.
- Kristó, Gy. (Szerk.) (2000). *Küküllei János: Lajos király krónikája. Névtelen szerző: Geszta Lajos királyról*. Budapest.
- Magyar, Z. (1996). “Keresztény lovagoknak oszlopa” – Szent László a magyar kultúrtörténetben. Budapest.
- Magyar, Z. (1998). *Szent László a magyar néphagyományban*. Budapest.
- Magyar, Z. (2010). Szent László-alakos kályhacsempék. Berta, P. (Szerk.), *Ethno-Lore* 27. Budapest, 123–141.
- Magyar, Z. (2017). *Mátyás király narratív hagyományköre. Típus- és motívumindex*. Budapest.
- Magyar, Z. (2018). *A magyar történeti mondák katalógusa. Típus- és motívumindex I–XI*. Budapest.
- Magyar, Z. (2018a). Arany Szent Lászlójának néprajzi és művelődéstörténeti háttere. Ispán, Á. – Landgraf, I. – Magyar, Z. (Szerk.): *Ethno-Lore* 35. Budapest, 227–250.
- Magyar, Z. (2022). *Moldvai csángó mondakatalógus. Típus- és motívumindex I–II*. Budapest.
- Magyar, Z. (2023). Csaba királyfi, a visszatérő hős. Hoppál, M. – Magyar, Z. – Szabados, Gy., *Attila. A hunok királya a magyar folklórban*. Budapest, 306–333.
- Sashalmi-Fekete, T. (2017). Keleti típusú viseletek a XIV–XVI. században. *Lustra* I(1), 42–48.
- Szabados, Gy. (2021). *Emlékezetes régiek – régiekről emlékezők. Történelmi és historiográfiai tanulmányok az Árpád-korról*. Székesfehérvár.

Török, T. et al. (2023). A Kárpát-medence 10–11. századi népességének genetikai összetétele és származása teljes genom adatok alapján. Rajna, A. (Szerk.), *Árpád népe. A magyar honfoglalás kor kutatásának legújabb eredményei*. Szentendre, 36–37.

Online Sources of the Images

Figure 1 https://hu.wikipedia.org/wiki/F%C3%A1jl:Chronicon_Pictum_P021_A_magyarok_bej%C3%B6vetele.JPG

Figure 2 <https://hu.wikipedia.org/wiki/F%C3%A1jl:Derzs101.jpg>

Macar Efsane Geleneğinin Orta Çağ Kökenli Tabakasında Türk Halkları Genişletilmiş özet

Bu çalışma, Türk dil ailesine mensup olup tarihsel süreç içerisinde Macar toplumuna dâhil olarak Macarlaşan halkları ve etnik grupları ele almaktadır. Söz konusu topluluklardan Orta Çağ Macar yazılı kaynaklarında bahsedilmekte; bunlara ilişkin hatıralar Macar folklor geleneğine de yansiyarak yüzyıllar boyunca varlığını sürdürmektedir. Doğru kökenli, Türk dilli ve Türk kültürüne mensup olan, o dönemde henüz konar-göçer yaşam tarzını sürdüren bu halklar arasında Peçenekler, Uzlar, Kuman-Kıpçaklar ve Kırım Tatarları sayılabilir.

Türk–Macar mücadeleleri ve Türklerin Karpat Havzası’ndaki yüz elli yıllık hâkimiyeti, başka bir ifadeyle Osmanlı dönemiyle ilgili efsane geleneği Macar folklorunun önemli bir bölümünü oluşturmalarına rağmen, bu konu söz konusu çalışmanın kapsamı dışında bırakılmıştır. Bunun nedeni, bu anlatıların daha geç bir döneme, Geç Orta Çağ ve Erken Yeni Çağ’a ait bir gelenek katmanını temsil etmesidir.

Macar–Türk ilişkilerinin Orta Çağ’a ait katmanı, 11–14. yüzyıllar arasında kaleme alınan kroniklerde ve daha sınırlı ölçüde bazı ikonografik tasvirlerde korunmuştur. Bu kaynaklarda, dönemin Macarları ile çeşitli Türk halkları arasındaki temasları ve çatışmaları konu alan efsanelere, ayrıca sözlü geleneğe dayanan motif ve anlatılara rastlanmaktadır.

Bu tür mitik geleneklerin en eskilerinden biri, Macarların Karpat Havzası’na gelişini, sembolik olarak “kartallar” şeklinde tasvir edilen Peçeneklerin saldırısıyla açıklamaktadır. En eski yazılı kaynakların başka bölümlerinde de ağırlıklı olarak Peçeneklerden söz edilmektedir. Tisza Nehri çevresine ait bir efsaneye göre, ilk Macar kralı Aziz István, Hristiyanlığı kabul etmeyi reddeden bir Peçenek önderini diri diri

gömdürmüştür. Buna karşılık kral, kendisini ziyaret etmek üzere gelen Peçenekleri soyan saray mensuplarını da ibret verici biçimde cezalandırmıştır.

I. (Aziz) István'ın yanı sıra, çeşitli Doğu halklarıyla, özellikle Kumanlar ve Kırım Tatarlarıyla ilgili anlatılar daha çok 1077–1095 yılları arasında hüküm süren Macar kralı I. (Aziz) László etrafında şekillenmiştir. Bu anlatılarda söz konusu halklarla yapılan savaşlar önemli bir yer tutmaktadır. Nitekim I. László'nun hükümdarlığı döneminde Peçenek, Uz ve Kuman-Kıpçak grupları Macar Krallığı topraklarına ganimet elde etmek amacıyla birkaç kez akın düzenlemiştir. Bu efsanelerde Aziz László, halkını düşman saldırılarından koruyan muzaffer bir savaşçı olarak tasvir edilir; pagan ordusunun önderini teke tek mücadelede yenilgiye uğratar ve esirleri kurtarır.

Aziz László'nun en ünlü kahramanlıklarından biri, Macar kültürüne 10. yüzyıla ait bir kahramanlık destanının uyarlanması yoluyla girmiş olan ve benzerlerine Orta Asya Türk halk destanlarında da rastlanan bir anlatıda karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Buna göre Aziz László, savaş sırasında bir Kuman savaşçısını takibe alır, onu teke tek mücadelede yenerek kaçırdığı Macar kızını kurtarır. Bu anlatı, 14–15. yüzyıllarda ülke genelindeki Orta Çağ Katolik kiliselerinin duvarlarında fresk dizileri hâlinde tasvir edilmiştir. Söz konusu fresk dizisi, Avrupa sanat tarihi bağlamında da Macar sanatına özgü, karakteristik bir ikonografik olgu olarak değerlendirilmektedir.

Aziz László ile bağlantılı bir diğer kronik geleneği ise 14. yüzyılın ortalarında adı bilinmeyen bir Minorit keşiş tarafından kayda geçirilmiştir. Büyük olasılıkla dönemin Sekel (Székely) efsane geleneğini yansıtan bu anlatıya göre Macar kralı, hâkimiyetleri Moldova'ya kadar uzanan Kırım Tatarlarına karşı bir sefer düzenler. Sekel ordusu savaşta yenilmek üzereyken, o sırada yaklaşık 250 yıldır ölü olan kutsal kral birdenbire savaş meydanında, silahları ve savaş teçhizatıyla belirir; tek başına düşmanı yenilgiye uğratarak kaçmaya zorlar.

Ölümsüz, ölümünden sonra dahi geri dönerek halkının yardımına koşan kahraman toposunun tipik bir örneğini oluşturan Aziz László'nun bu mucizevi görünüşüne, aynı efsane geleneğine göre, esir düşen yaşlı bir Tatar askeri de tanıklık etmiştir.

