

The establishment of the Bulgarian state under Gostun-Gast-Organas

Nedelcho Nedelchev



Abstract: The Bulgarian, Byzantine and Hungarian medieval historical traditions contain extremely similar pieces of information about the creation of the Bulgarian state and its early development. In my opinion, the Bulgarian state was established under Gostun-Organas, the predecessor of Kurt-Kubrat, and the state-system was preserved after the breakup of Old Great Bulgaria. The Proto-Bulgarians led by Asparukh and Tervel continued to observe their allied relations with the heirs of Emperor Herakleios, preserved their own state-system and founded a new state in the Danube River Valley. Danube Bulgaria continued to follow the policy, as maintained by Herakleios, Gostun and Kurt, of holding back the invasions from the East into Europe. The historical memory of the Bulgarians has reflected the beginning of the said state with Gostun as its founder in the Bulgarian Rulers' List (in Bulgarian: 'Именник на българските владетели'). The various traditions allow for tracing the ancient Iranian, non-Turkic state ideology and name-ranking system of the proto-Bulgarians and the latter's gradual slavification

Keywords: Gostun-Gestator-Organas, Kurt-Kubrat-Kubera-Kava, Keanus-Keyanides-kane (kana)

The Bulgarian state was established at the borderline of two epochs – Antiquity and the Middle Ages. The Eastern Roman Empire in the reign of Herakleios contributed to incorporating the emerging Bulgarian state into its own model of governing the world and such model's boundaries. The Bulgarians accepted the alliance offered and had observed their obligations under it from the time of establishing Old Great Bulgaria under Gostun-Organas and Kurt-Kubrat¹ until the offensive of Asparuh's Bulgarians into the outlying regions of the empire in 681. The reasons for dissolving the allied relations were bilateral and

¹ In the contemporary Bulgarian history kan(e)'s Kubrat 'Old Great Bulgaria' is interpreted as Tribal union. The idea is contradictory, because for instance V. Gyuzelev used for Kubrat the conflicting titles 'chieftain' and 'ruler' – title 'rulers' was used for Kubrat and Byzantine imperator in Gyuzelev 1981, 69-76.

pertained to the struggles for domination in what is known as the Byzantine Empire. Ioannes of Nikius reported that Kubrat was a defender of 'Herakleios' sons and an enemy to those of Constantine'.²

The internal contradictions in Constantinople resulted in a military coup and bodily injuries to Empress Martina and her son by Herakleios – Herakleion. This enhanced the resistance against Constantine's son – Emperor Constant and his government. All these actions led to the pull-out from Egypt, which surrendered to the Arabs in 642. For economic, political and religious reasons the Arab Muslims were joined by a number of communities and individuals from Southwestern Asia and Northern Africa. The Bulgarian state of 'Old Great Bulgaria' – 'e palaia Boulgaria estin e megale'³ – followed, too, the overall process of disintegration. One part of the Bulgarians withdrew from the path of the Eastern European and Asian invaders, while the people led by Asparuh and Tervel blocked at the walls of Constantinople the invaders' march into the Eastern European steppes and the Balkans.

Nevertheless, V. Zlatarski shared the opinion that Bulgaria was created with the help of the Byzantine Empire against the aggressive Turks, while presuming that Kubrat probably 'had hereditary rights in respect of the Bulgarian khan's throne in the lands of the former Utigurian state', and [also with] 'the requisite support under the leadership of his uncle Organa'.⁴

When, however, was the Bulgarian state established? Why is the Bulgarian tradition not aware of any other earlier rulers prior to those mentioned in the *Bulgarian Rulers' List*? How long had Turkish domination over the former Bulgarian states lasted, given the fact that Organa or Gostun had ruled for only two years? May we presume that the issue related to the establishment of the Bulgarian state actually covers up a refusal to investigate a tribal society's transformation into a state, political and class society?

My contention is that the names of Bulgarian rulers reflect in various forms diverse aspects of the historical process related to the Bulgarian early state-system and that attention should be paid to them, even if this is a mere hypothesis.

The name of Kurt's eldest son, Batbaygan, may be translated as 'Lord Keeper', based on the Persian meaning of the word 'badegan' as 'keeping', 'keeper', 'watching'; of 'bay' as 'lord'; and 'gan' or 'kan' as 'governor', 'ruler'. This is a name which is in harmony with the memory preserved for Batbaygan as a keeper of Kubrat's legendary legacy for the unity of the state. The Slavonic version of the name – 'Bezmer' – is probably a translation of 'Batbaygan' from Persian through the Greek 'ameras' – 'boundless', i.e. the 'Lord Keeper' of the old state-system of Kubrat's Old Great Bulgaria, such state-system being

2 Zlatarski 1894, 145-154, 148-149.

3 Theoph. Confess. *Chron.* 3. 32. 261.

4 Zlatarski 1970, 136.

undivided among the various Bulgarian tribal unions. However, the variant of the name – ‘Batbayan’ – would mean ‘Keeper of the Words, the Law’, based on the meaning of ‘bayan’ as ‘saying the words’ or ‘the law’ or ‘the command of the words’, and ‘bat’ as an ‘elder brother’ or ‘father’ in its Indo-European interpretation, which is well known from various Russian, Bulgarian and Serbian examples.

The Bulgarian tradition presents Kubrat’s predecessor with the name of Gostun. The Byzantine tradition presents Kubrat as an heir to Organas. There exist contradictory opinions about whether Organas and Gostun were one and the same person or not, on account, I believe, of no consideration having been taken of the various meanings of the name. This was perceived by Zlatarski, who wrote: ‘Organa and Gostun have already been found to be identical on account of their equal historical importance, and based mainly on their close kinship to Kubrat or Kurt...’⁵.

The name Organa, Organas is apparently unfamiliar in the Bulgarian language, but it is very close in respect of pronunciation to the Greek word for ‘action’, ‘creation’, ‘building up’, ‘means’ – ‘organon’ – while also having the possible meaning of ‘custodian’ or its related term and name ‘Gostun’. The fact that Gostun is designated as ‘This custodian’ (‘наместник съ’) suggests the meaning of the name itself. Is it a tradition to designate tribal or military chieftains using a name, which means ‘guest’? The examples with the Slavonic chieftains Peiragastos and Adargastos, reported by Theophylaktos Simokates in his ‘Histories’, are quite indicative!⁶ P. Mutafchiev deciphered the names of Peiragastos and Adargastos as Pirogost and Radogost but did not draw any parallels with the name or the title Gostun.⁷

The transfer of power from a tribal chieftain to a head of the state is the process that was described by Late Roman or Early Byzantine writers in the case of Organa-Gostun and Kurt-Kubrat. ‘Gast’ from the Latin term ‘gestator’ – ‘bearer’, or from ‘gestio’ – ‘performance’, ‘commission’, is the elective chieftain comprehended as ‘gostun’ or ‘Gostun’.

The question is: under which Bulgarian ruler was the Bulgarian state known as Old Great Bulgaria founded? Under Gostun, who was Kurt’s uncle, or under Kurt himself? Here I would pose a question about the establishment of the Bulgarian state in connection with so-called matriarchalism-matrilineality, inasmuch as in my opinion it has not been investigated. The acts of matrilineality do not bear witness to the transition from a tribal to

5 Zlatarski 1970, 132.

6 Theoph. Sim. *Hist.* 3. 8. 322; 13. 336. According to the translation of V. Beshevliev, Peiragastos was ‘the leader’ of the barbarian detachment. The title is ‘Peiragastos ... phylarhos de outos tes plitnos ekeinis ton barbarikon’ and means ‘tribal chieftain’.

7 Mutafchiev 1943, 67.

a patrilineal and state society but rather to a transitional and inherited method for the preservation of hereditary power. Zlatarski wrote about 'the ancient Bulgarian royal clan of Dulo', and of Kubrat as 'the founder of Old Great Bulgaria'.⁸ Apparently there is a problem here: did any royal power exist before Kubrat or Kurt? If power was hereditary according to the tradition as exemplified by the succession from Avitohol to Irnik, why then was it not illustrated by some later examples until the time of Gostun and Kurt?

The transfer of power from an uncle to a nephew reveals a process of control over the rulers by some collective body/bodies – councils of elders, priests or the national assembly. Such a process has been attested even in the earliest Hittite state. The first kings and heirs on the consanguineous male side were Pithanas, Anitas and Pervas. After that there were disorders,⁹ which were terminated only under Hattusilis I, grandson of Puhassumas.¹⁰ Hattusilis initiated a civil war after his wife, daughter and son rejected him as the royal heir, undoubtedly in favor of some other relative.¹¹

In the ancient East the title 'lord' – 'rubaum' was transitional to the title 'king', first in Assyria under Irishum and after that in the Hittite Kingdom at the end of the 20th and during the 19th century BC.¹²

Apparently this tradition was stable and displayed some generally valid transitional forms to the state institution, since 'Organa' in the testimony of Nikephoros is a 'lord' – 'kyrios', and the Bulgarian rulers were designated mostly as lords – 'kyrios', 'archon' or 'prince (knyaz)' but not as 'king' – in the Byzantine tradition until the 13th century. This is why it was not by accident that Organa/Gostun was designated as 'kyrios'. In the Bulgarian Rulers' List Asparuh was designated as 'prince (knyaz)': 'Knyaz Ispereh'.¹³ 'Knyaz' is a title designating a pre-state and state governor.

The fact that Gostun was only a custodian did not deprive him of the right to be a state ruler. In the Bulgarian Rulers' List, Gostun was referred to as 'Gostun – This custodian'.¹⁴ Regardless of whose custodian he was, Gostun possessed and exercised power that was obviously hereditary and not typical for tribal societies.

In the Bulgarian Rulers' List, Avitohol, having reigned for 300 years, and Irnik, having reigned for 150 years, are mythological figures, while the following rulers seem actually to have reigned: Gostun of the Ermi clan for 2 years, Kurt (Kurt and his successors until Kormisosh being of the Dulo clan)

8 Zlatarski 1970, 131.

9 Nedelchev 2000, 90-91 ff., 241.

10 Nedelchev 2000, 92 et seq.

11 Nedelchev 2000, 92 et seq.

12 Nedelchev 2000, 90 et seq.; Cf. Nedelchev 2004, 249 et seq.

13 Cf. the photocopy of the *Bulgarian Rulers' List* in: Mutafchiev 1943, 86.

14 The photocopy in: Mutafchiev 1943, 86.

for 60 years, Bezmer for 3 years. These five rulers have been called ‘princes (knyaz)’, and ruled for 515 years in total. The next ruler is Knyaz Espererih, for 61 years, followed by Tervel for 21... Sevar for 15 years. Then comes Knyaz Kormisosh, who reigned for 17 years – ‘And this knyaz changed the Dulo clan.’¹⁵ The title ‘knyaz’ is specifically mentioned twice in relation to some most significant changes, namely in connection with Espererih, who created a separate state governed by the Dulo clan, and Kormisosh, who changed the clan as a ruling one. The very fact that Espererih is referred to by the term ‘knyaz’ of the Dulo clan hints at some political changes that differ from the generally accepted history.

The time of the Hunnic Empire and Attila until the mid-5th century was close enough to oppose a 515-year-long reign of princes with sheared heads beyond the River Danube. This must have meant dependency for the people led by Asparuh. By referring to the knyaz status of Espererih/Asparuh a new political change is implied after the decay of the preceding Old Great Bulgaria of Kurt/Kubrat. The term ‘knyaz’ lays an emphasis on the state-system; by eliminating the power of the Dulo clan a new stage in the government and development of Bulgaria was marked, which is once again underlined by the title ‘knyaz’ in respect of Kormisosh.

The evidence contained in the Bulgarian Rulers' List presents the only possible announcement about the first Bulgarian ruler, namely ‘Gostun’ – ‘custodian’.

The name ‘Gostun’ is also known in the variant ‘Organas’ according to the evidence of Nikephoros Patriarchos and Ioannes of Nikius in Egypt.¹⁶ The name is an obvious translation, which in ancient Greek means a ‘tool’ or ‘instrument’, and in ancient Bulgarian a ‘custodian’ or ‘representative’. Such meaning may suggest temporary replacement of a ruler on account of his immature age after the end of a transitional period from a pre-state to a state society. In this sense the name ‘Gostun’ or ‘Organa’ – ‘custodian’ or ‘tool’, ‘means’ – is understandable. The origin, however, of ‘Gost’ – ‘gast’ reveals the institution of a chieftain who becomes a lord. And here comes the question: is it not the transfer of power from a military tribal chieftain to an actual head of state demonstrative/ritual in its nature? Another question that also emerges is why no other chieftain or ruler has been specified after Irnik and before Organa-Gostun?

The idea of ‘Organa’ as ‘Orkan’, which was approved by the supporters of the Turkic origin of the proto-Bulgarians and for example by Mutafchiev as well,¹⁷ is more than debatable.

15 The photocopy in: Mutafchiev 1943, 86.

16 Niceph. Patr. *Breviar.* 294; Zlatarski 1894, 148-149.

17 Mutafchiev 1943, 85.

The title of Organa as 'Kyrios' of the Unogundurs¹⁸ was transitional; however, it also meant 'lord' and was borne by many Bulgarian rulers after Asparuh. According to Nikephoros Patriarchos, the title 'kyrios' was borne by Kubrat as well.¹⁹ This title appeared as a natural transitional one from an elective to a monarchic title. In accordance with the Byzantine system, where the emperor/basileus was the only one in the world, it was only natural that the neighboring rulers should not bear any title suggesting independence. And it was not by accident that Samuil in his fight to defend the Bulgarian state-system as king of the Bulgarians would proclaim himself an independent ruler, an autocrator, in the 10th-11th centuries.

The heir of Organas-Gostun was Kubrat. His name was popular in two forms – Kurt and Kubrat or Kovrat, etc. 'Kurt' is an Indo-European and Iranian name by origin; it is related to the German 'Kurt' and the Latin 'Curtius' and means 'nomad' or 'stockbreeder', or 'running'. 'Kurt' is related to the modern ethnonym Kurd²⁰ and is also found in some Bulgarian family names like 'Kurdiv/a'.

The second variant of the name – 'Kubrat, Kovrat' etc. – is related to the Indo-Iranian meanings of 'Kubera' as 'Lord of Wealth' and to 'Kava' or 'Kova', a smith hero in the Iranian mythology who declared a rebellion against a usurper of the throne, or to the first and legendary royal Iranian dynasty – Keyanides or Kayanides, and such dynasty's first three representatives – Kavi Kavad (Kay Kubad), Kavi Usan and Kavi (Kay Husroy).²¹ The adherence of the Bulgarians to the dynastic and ancient Iranian state-building theory is reflected in the name 'Kubrat', undoubtedly the second name of Kurt, which in its meaning 'Kovi' or 'smith' has inherited the ancient Iranian state tradition and corresponds to the actions of Kurt-Kubrat as a statesman, who overthrew the tyranny exercised by the Turks or the Avars and Turks over his people.

It is indicative that in the Hungarian tradition, in *Gesta Hungarorum*, the Bulgarian Kane Krum was called Keanus the Great – Keanus magnus: 'And the land that lies between Tisza and Danube was occupied by Keanus [(Krum)] the Great' – the lord of Bulgaria'. The possible explanations of the name are 'the Great Kan' or 'Krum the Great', however it is most probable that 'Keanus' was a name-title and that it was related to the ancient Persian state title of the Keyanides clan. Keanus/Krum was specified as the grandfather of Salan/Simeon or of the general who defended the country to the north of the Danube against the Magyars. The contacts of the Bulgarians with the Finno-Ugric and Ugric peoples remain unclear but the Hungarians, led by the tribe

18 Zlatarski 1970, 131, note 2.

19 Zlatarski 1970, 143.

20 See Nedelchev 2011, 35-45, 40.

21 Cf. Lelekov 1980-1982, 633; Nedelchev 2011, 39.

of Magyars, used to have a supreme chieftain named 'kende',²² a title which sounds similar to the Bulgarian title 'kana'. The origin of the titles 'kana' or 'kane' and 'kende' is, in my opinion, related to the legendary ancient Iranian doctrine about the Keyanides or Kayanides. The title 'kana' appears to refer to the meaning of the Indo-Iranian terms for community – 'kana' or 'gana'. The terms are also preserved in modern Bulgarian as personal names.

Gesta Hungarorum renders a Bulgarian legend about Keanus' descent from Attila: 'After Attila's death the chieftain Keanus the Great, grandfather of the chieftain Salan, came to Bulgaria...'²³.

'Canus magnus' was the title of Kana Krum because he took possession of the crown of the Eastern Roman Emperor and his other insignia of power, and also owned a part of the empire, namely Zagorie, as 'sarakt' of which he was 'sär', i.e. 'chieftain' and 'ruler of an empire', i.e. 'tsar', which is how the word containing a short 'a' – 'ä' should be pronounced.

The ancient Hungarian tradition of designating Bulgarian rulers as 'keanus' can be traced also in the 10th/11th century when, in 1003-1004, some Bulgarian lands were taken away under King (Tsar) Samuil. It has been assumed that during the reign of Samuil the governor of the lands at the frontier with Hungary was a 'provincial boyar'. This 'provincial boyar', however, played a substantial role in diplomatic and political relations between Bulgaria and Hungary and, based in Vidin, was governing the Bulgarian territories beyond the Danube.²⁴ Therefore it was not by accident that in the Hungarian chronicles he was called 'keanus' and was killed during a war with the Hungarians: 'Kean bulgarorum Ducem', 'Kean Ducis bulgarorum et slavorum'.²⁵

Old Great Bulgaria came to an end. And it was again the authors of the Bulgarian Rulers' List who deemed it necessary to lay emphasis on the continuity of the state, which is why Esperih was called 'knyaz'.

The name of the first Bulgarian ruler of Danube Bulgaria is known in two forms – Asparuh and Ispor or I/Esperih. In my opinion, the form 'Isporih' is close to the ancient Iranian 'ispahsalar' or to the Arabic pronunciation of the word – 'isfahsalar' – 'general'.²⁶ The meaning of the Persian word for 'shield' – ispar²⁷ – stands close to the form 'Ispor'.

The names of the Bulgarian rulers Kubrat, Kouvrat and Kuber are related to the name of the legendary ruler of the Aryans from the socio-political union, 'Aryioshaiana – Kavata', of his heir Kavi Hausrava. It was then that the state

22 Pletneva 1966, 438-463, 447.

23 *Chronica Hungarorum* 1883, *Inscript secunus Liber de Reditu*, II, 24.

24 Petrov 1981, 413.

25 *Chronicon Budense* 1838, Tertius Gyula Transilvania potitur, 42, *De Generationi S. Stephani genealogia, nativitas, et filii*, 66-67

26 Justi 1898, 143.

27 Detschev 1976, 475.

tradition started – in the late 8th-7th centuries BC, and it is possible to trace it as an Aryan tradition with the Bulgarians and the Persians. The name of Asparuh in the meaning of ‘horseman’ is traced even down to the 5th century BC, the time in which Persian kings such as Darius I wrote about their Aryan descent or made references to the Aryan language: arriya-ma – ‘in the Aryan language’; and arriya cithra – ‘of Aryan descent’.²⁸

The most frequently studied name is ‘Asparuh’. V. Beshevliev has rendered a comprehensive analysis of all known opinions, whether backed up with arguments or not. The name ‘Asparuh’ was first announced to be a Persian name in 1832 by M. Fren, without any additional evidence, however. This hypothesis was shared by I.P. Shafarik, S. Uvarov and V. Tomashek. In 1878 A. Kunik presumed that the name ‘Asparuh’ could be similar to the ancient Bactrian term ‘Ashpa’ – ‘horse’, a hypothesis that was reflected in the studies of I. Shishmanov, A. Duychev, V. Beshevliev, etc.²⁹ In 1940, a gemma inscribed in Greek was discovered in the old Georgian capital Mtskheta, such inscription reading ‘Asparoukis pitiaxes’ and being dated to the 2nd century. After that the studies of the name ‘Asparuh’ underwent reconsideration based on the possible influence of an Armenian language environment, which opinion is deemed currently of decisive importance.³⁰

According to G. Justi, the Sasanid Persian form rendered in Greek as ‘Asforougos’ and the Armenian ‘Aspurak’ both originated from the Old Persian ‘asabāri’ – ‘horseman’ (and from the Pehlevian form ‘asobari’) and were similar to the New Persian forms ‘asvar’ and ‘suvar’ and also to the Syrian ‘aspuraka’.³¹ This hypothesis is acceptable not only for the purposes of explaining Armenian or other Caucasian language forms influenced by the Iranian language. The New Persian variants display some unexpected similarity with the name of the last ruler of the Dulo clan - Sevar.

The name ‘Asparuh’ contains also the Iranian and not just the Bactrian word for ‘horse’ – ‘aspa’ – ‘äsb’. In early Persian of the 6th-5th centuries BC ‘asabāri’ meant ‘horseman’³² and was the earliest form of the name ‘Asparuh’; the name ‘Kardam’ meant ‘perfect’ – such a form originating directly in terms of sound and meaning from the time of the early Achaemenids in Persia and the ‘Aryan language’ spoken by them. Similar to the name ‘Asparuh’ is the Persian name from the 5th century BC, ‘Aspacanā’ – ‘One who loves horses’.³³ According to Herodotus, one of the Persian aristocrats bore the name ‘Aspatin’.³⁴

28 Weisbach 1980, 100.

29 Beshevliev 1967, 237-247, 237-238.

30 Tshereteli 1948, 48-57.

31 Justi 1898, 43, 47.

32 Weisbach 1980, 100.

33 Weisbach 1980, 104.

34 Herod. *Historia*. III, 70, 78, 200, 203.

There is evidence for the existence of the noble clan of the Asparukans in the pre-Sasanid period.³⁵ The dynasty of the Asparukans was also known among the Sarmatians in later times and by the Alans – under the form ‘Aspar’. The name ‘Asparuh’ was known as a dynastic name not only among the Parthians but also among the Sarmatians and in the ancient Iberian environment – in ancient Georgia in the Caucasus and in the Caucasian region³⁶ – but was preserved later only among the Bulgarians as a modern name.

The names containing ‘aspar’ and ‘kana’ presume combinations similar to the Thracian combinations of the ‘Thracians who love horses’ type. However, ‘kana’ is a title of the Bulgarian rulers as well, most probably meaning ‘friend of the people’ or ‘community’. The suffixes in the names of the rulers Isperih/Asparuh and Telerig contain the term ‘rig’, which is related to ‘rex’ – an elective supreme chief and king. The term ‘rex’ was used for the first time by a Byzantine writer in respect of a Bulgar-Kutrigur chieftain, a ruler according to V. Zlatarski, as of the time of Emperor Justinian I, namely the rex Grod around 530.³⁷

It was only with its handing over to Tervel as a part of the Eastern Roman Empire, and until the time of Krum and afterwards, that Zagora became a sarakt of the Bulgarian rulers who started exercising their right to act as rulers of an empire. It was then that the Slavonic term ‘tsar’ was coined, based on a ‘ruler of a sarakt’, such term being related to the Persian word for chieftain and ruler of an empire: ‘sär’. The term appears for the first time in Naum’s *Passionary of the 10th century*, at least according to what we know so far.

The history of the establishment of the Bulgarian state contains many unsolved issues, at the core of which are: the attitude of the political and class society towards its own and other peoples, the disintegrations and restorations of the state-system, and the characteristics of the state institutions. Sometimes the last mentioned are the same for pre-state and state societies; sometimes they differ!

In my opinion, the Bulgarian state was established at the time of Gostun-Organa. Its emergence on the Balkans under Asparuh is a continuation of the Bulgarian state-system of Old Great Bulgaria and a joint policy with the Eastern Roman Emperor Herakleios and his followers to withstand the destructive invasions from the East. This seems also to be the reason for the fact that until the much later time of Krum’s dynasty and under Krum himself

35 Lukonin 1987, 120.

36 Justi 1898, 45.

37 See Zlatarski 1970, 88-89. The name of the Kutrigur Grod, who was also ‘rex’, is definitely not Turkish and suggests some Indo-European and Slavonic characteristics. The disagreements of this rex with his brother regarding their power over the Kutrigurs, which resulted in an internal tribal war, undoubtedly bear no testimony to a hereditary ruler’s status!

many eminent Byzantine aristocrats were part of the circles of Bulgarian statesmen and were even related to them.

The history of the Bulgarian state is longer and more complex than we currently recognise. And this is only natural – history is a process. The start was made under Gostun-Organas-Gestator. The presumption of an earlier state-system needs to be supported by evidence, which, however, does not mean that the restoration processes after a possible decay of the state did not follow patterns that were typical for ante-state and pre-state societies. This is why the phenomena typical for the beginning of the state-system under Gostun-Organas-Gestator constitute an example of the creation of a state from a late tribal society to an early political and class society. After kan(e) Kubrat the Bulgarian state tradition is not destroyed.

In the Bulgarian historical tradition after mythological Avitohol and Irnik comes the first real knyaz (prince) with state and heredity power named Gostun who was in fact the first Bulgarian ruler of the state Old Great Bulgaria. His Title – name Gostun is the last tribes, and the first Bulgarian States title-name.

Chronicon Budense (1838), Chronicon Budense. Post elapsos ab Editione Prima et Rarissima. in Iosephua Podhradczky (ed), (Budae).

Chronica Hungarorum (1883), Chronica Hungarorum. I Magistri P. Belae. Regis notary. II Magistri Simonis de Keza. III. Gesta Hungarorum. III Chronicon Pictum Vindobonense. In M. Florianus (ed) (Lipsiae).

Beshevliev, V. (1967) 'Iranski elementi u purvobulgarite', *Antichnoe obshtestvo* (Trudy konferentshiy po izucheniyu problem antichnosti) (Moscow), 237-247.

Gyuzelev, V. 1981 'Prabulgarskiyat voenno-plemenen suyuz Velika Bulgariya', in D. Angelov, P. Petrov & B. Primov (eds) *Istoriya na Bulgariya* Vol. 2 (Sofia).

Detshev, D. (1976) *Die Thrakischen Sprachreste* (Wien).

Justi, F. (1898) *Iranisches Namenbuch* (Marburg).

Lelekov, L. (1980-1982) 'Keynidiy'. *Mify narodov mira* Vol. 1 (Moscow).

Lukonin, V. (1987) *Drevniy i Srednevekovniy Iran* (Moscow).

Mutafchiev, P. (1943) *Istoriya na bulgarskiya narod* Vol. 1. Purvo bulgarsko tsharstvo (Second issue under the edition of I. Duychev) (Sofia).

Nedelchev, N. (2000) *Drevnoiztochnata tshivilizatshiya* (Sofia).

(2004). *Proizhod na svetskata tsharska institutshiya v Drevniya Preden iztok prez III – II hil. pr. n. e. (po istoricheski pismeni tekstove ot Shumer, Asiriya, Hetskoto tsharstvo, Egipet ot elinisticheskiya period, Drevna Gurtshiya i Dreven Rim)* (Shumen).

(2011) 'Drevnoiztochnoto nasledstvo i ariyskiya proizvod na bulgarskata

durzhavnost', in V. Velikov (ed) *Ponyatiya, tshenosti, promeni. Istoriyata: vreme i realnosti* 7 (Varna), 35-45.

Petrov, P. (1981) 'Borba za zapazvane na nezavisimostta na Bulgariya. 3. Voini s Vizantiya. Tsar Roman i tsar Samuil, in D. Angelov, P. Petrov & B. Primov (eds) *Istoriya na Bulgariya* Vol. 2 (Sofia), 302-316.

Pletneva, S. (1966) 'Kocheviye narody VII-XIII v.' in B. A. Rybakov (ed) *Istoriya SSR* Vol. 1 (Moscow), 438-463.

Tshereteli, V. (1948) 'Epigraficheskie nahodki v Mtshheta – drevney stolitshe Gruzii', *Vestnik drevney istorii* No. 2, 49-57.

Weisbach, F. H. (1980) *Die Achämenideninschriften zweiter Art* (Leipzig).

Zlatarski, V. (1894). 'Novi izvestiya za nay-ranniya period na bulgarskata istoriya', *Sbornik narodni umotvoreniya, nauka i knizhnina* Vol. 11 (Sofia), 145-154.

(1970) *Istoriya na bulgarskata durzhava prez srednite vekove* Vol. 1. Purvo bulgarsko tsharstvo (Part I. Epohata na huno-bulgarskoto nadmoshtie) (Sofia).