

If Hungarian and Sumerian are related, the question has to be raised: did the ethnic body which is the Hungarian nation, ever change its language? Such changes happened in history; the possibility cannot be excluded. Could the Hungarians, at some point of their history, perhaps for religious reasons, have adopted the language of the Zoroastrian Magoi?

There is no valid evidence of such a change.

A recently proposed theory supposes another change. The author of the theory believes, that the Hungarian conquerors of the ninth century spoke a Turkish tongue, which they abandoned in favor of the common Scythian idiom of the autochthonous Danubian population. Of this latter evolved, according to his theory, modern Hungarian.

We may accept the hypothesis, that scattered groups within the Carpathian semicircle spoke Scythian dialects before the coming of the Magyars. Yet it is difficult to believe, that the dialects of those groups were all the basis of modern Hungarian.

The written sources are explicit, that three of the stems, Kabars, who joined the Hungarians, spoke a Khazar-Turk language. But they were not the majority nor the ranking stems of Árpád's people.

All evidence points to it, that the bulk of the conquering people and especially the stem of the leader, the Megyer stem, brought along a language that was a tool fit for government, organization, lawmaking and constitution — a language evolved and polished through millennia.

There is every reason to believe, that this was the hieratic language of the ancient Magoi, preserved by a group of priests, treasured in all adversity, as sacred tradition. This language of the Megyer stem probably had the status and potential to prevail upon all dialects of other stems and upon local autochthonous dialects.

It is in this language of the Magyars that we should look for the ancestry of modern Hungarian. Such transmission would explain the mysterious relationship of the Sumerian and the Hungarian languages.

THE LANGUAGE ONLY ?

Is the relationship of the Hungarian and Sumerian languages our only witness to a relationship of the two ethnic groups? Certainly not.

There is a resemblance of physical types. Every Hungarian who enters a museum exhibiting some good Sumerian heads, will experience a queer pang — something quite different from the relaxed admiration of the Greek masterpieces.

In my book "Sumerian Affiliations" I have attempted to categorize the physical traits which are similar in Sumerians and Hungarians.

What may cause difficulties is, that Sumerians, Scythians and Hungarians alike were exogamists. The genetic melting pot was a great Sumerian invention; probably the cause of their high civilization.

So, if we collect a series of Sumerian types, we will find great variety. Skeletal remains are scarce and poorly preserved, so we do better if we use the rich and often well preserved statuary. But there are difficulties in this case too, especially when we deal with statues carved of stone.

Sumerians had no stone in the alluvial plains of Mesopotamia; stone had to be imported. The available stone blocks were usually too small to allow the carving of life-size statues. So the custom developed of giving the statues larger, sometimes life-size heads, but minuscule bodies. These should not mislead us into believing that the Sumerians were dwarfs. In glyptics, on the stone seals, the figures are engraved in normal proportions.

We will find short, thickset Sumerian types, resembling short, thickset Hungarians. We will find tall slender Sumerians, who recall the tall types of Hungary. When the Sumerian statue has eyes of brown seashell, we will be reminded of the "nut-brown eye" most frequent in Hungary, but when that alabaster statue looks at us through blue lapis-lazuli eyes, we will remember one of those Hungarian friends, who has blue or gray eyes, a minority of 40% in Hungary.

The striking thing is that Sumerian portrait-art, highly individualistic, always reminds one of Hungarian individuals. It is worthwhile to pair the ancient portraits with modern photographs. They are convincing.

Concerning the characteristics of physical anthropology: the Sumerians are a mixed population. So are the Hungarians. The two mixtures bear resemblance to each other.

Later Scythian art, a great decorative art, has never reached the heights of Sumerian portraiture. Nevertheless, the representations of Scythians, especially the Parthians, will evoke in Hungarians, the feelings of relationship.

What about clothing?

The basic clothing of the Sumerians was a linen loin-cloth, called GADA or KITU. From this evolved the basic garment of the Hungarian peasant, with the name almost unchanged: GATYA. The basic female garment, the apron is called in Hungarian KÖTŐ, or KÖTÉNY. The later form shows Accadian influence; there the loincloth was called KITINTU.

The Hungarian word IMEG (prov.) 'shirt', probably comes from Sumerian IN—ag 'made of linen'. In contrast, the woolen coat of the old-fashioned Hungarian farmer, the SZÜR is certainly related to the Sumerian verb SUR 'to spin wool'. The common, unpretentious shaggy coat of the poor menfolk in Hungary was called GUBA, corresponding to Sumerian GUBBU 'clothing', while the expensive, embroidered coat, made usually of white lambskin was the SUBA. In Sumerian SUBA means: 'bright, clean'.

The Hungarian word CIPŐ 'shoe' is considered by Hungarian linguists to be of unexplained etymology. If we will condescend to consider Sumerian IB 'leather shoestrap' and Accadian SIBBU, 'leather belt', we may find the ancestry of the orphan word.

CSÁKÓ 'high hat' seems to come from Sumerian SAGSU 'helmet, hat'. The name of the traditional diadem of the Hungarian ladies, the PÁRTA, seems to derive from Sumerian BAR—du 'headband'. The wreath on the head of the bride or on the grave of the dead is called KOSZORU in Hungarian. Correspondences of the word are Sumerian KASER 'wrought' and Accadian KASARU 'to bind, put together'.

Regarding the patterns of the traditional folk-wear of the Hungarians, we have the testimony of a reliable German

scholar, M. Tilke. He describes Hungarian clothing in minute detail. Then, as he says in his book on Central European clothing, he set out to trace the origins of these peculiar patterns and he searched through all of Central Asia. Naturally, he started with the old prejudice, that Hungarians were nomads from Central Asia. Much to his disappointment, he did not find anything similar that far East, except on some coins of Indo-Scythian kings. But lo and behold! Quite unexpectedly, he found the analogies of the Hungarian patterns, in striking detail, among peoples of the Caucasus. This he reports faithfully, adding, to explain the unbelievable fact, that Hungarians may have picked up these patterns somehow, during their wanderings...

Of course, the real explanation is, that, unless in the Old Stone Age, ancestors of Hungarians have never been in Central Asia. But they lived long in and around the Caucasian Mountains. They, and their Scythian relatives brought Westwards the tailored and buttoned clothes, the boot and also the felt hat, — the clothes of the horsemen, into a world of uncut togas.

We might go on for a long time. Data on clothing alone could fill a book much thicker than the present publication. Another one might be written, about the cooking utensils, materials and general vocabulary of the kitchen. These would be interesting, because this vocabulary, used mainly by the ultraconservative housewives, shows relatively little change since Sumerian times.

There are the vocabularies of horse-breeding, sheepherding, gardening and agriculture. Quite impressive are the vocabularies of the arts and crafts, architecture, medicine, law, government, moral concepts and religion. These speak about more than a mere relationship of languages. They speak about related, if not identical mentality.

Of the whole world of technology, let us select and consider only one typical tool, the "toothed adze" of the Sumerians, which is a sophisticated variation of the axe. It is glorified in one of the Sumerian poems as the special gift of the god Enlil to his people. It is called a tool for building strong cities; it is also a weapon to subdue the malefactors.

The adze is depicted in the hand of the chariot-driver on the famous Standard of Ur and on other monuments. Adzes of gold and silver were found in Sumer, adzes of bronze in Luristan.

Such adzes of the bronze-age were found in Hungary — and only in Hungary, outside of Western Asia. Hungarians, especially the isolated shepherd-folk, used it until the late nineteenth century as the traditional and most efficient Hungarian weapon. Even its name FOKOS, 'the toothed one' recalls its early Mesopotamian ancestor.

The serious student of the problem may note many such analogies in technology or physical anthropology; he will find more striking analogies in more important fields.

There is the rich fairyland of the Hungarian mythology, ignored by the Western scholars, rejected by the Western publishers. The very name of the fairy in Hungarian is a giveaway: TÜNDÉR, obviously derived from Sumerian DINGIR, 'divine being'.

Every personage of the Hungarian fairy-tales has a recognizable ancestor in the Sumerian Pantheon. These divinities had their symbols, the eight-pointed star of Anu, the sky god or goddess, is one of the ever recurring motifs of Hungarian folk-art. The **omega**-like symbol of the goddess of healing and childbirth, BABA, who was originally a cow goddess, can be followed, evolving for seven thousand years. When the symbols of the old religion had to hide into innocent-looking floral decorations, the symbol of the great mother-goddess was christened "the tulip". It is a central motif of Hungarian decorative art, even today. Quite often this Hungarian tulip grows out of a heart-shape. That may be all what remains of the face of god Enki, the Great Stag.

In traditional Hungarian compositions, the tulip of the center is often flanked by two eyes, called peacock's eyes. Somebody seems to look at us, through those eyes. If we knew the answer, we might be able to solve the riddle of the thousands of eye-idols excavated by Sir Mallowan at Brak, in Subaraean land.

The ubiquitous snake of the Transsylvanian gates is probably a late memorial to the Sumerian "Great Serpent of the Sky" the Milky way, the divine shepherd SABA (Tammuz).

This list is far from being complete.

A study of Sumerian legal thought, compared to Hungarian laws, reveals the same basic quest for order in human relations; the same intelligent, tolerant, humanistic attitude.

Behind the lack of grammatical gender in Sumerian, like in

Hungarian, is the basic conviction, that the important thing in a woman is, that she is a human being. On this fact is the emphasis, not on sexual difference. The third person singular in Hungarian is *Ő* and that means both 'he' and 'she'.

We don't want to imply that sex was not important to Sumerians or Hungarians. It was a part of life to be acknowledged frankly, enjoyed intensely and organised with tact and tenderness. The Hungarian wife calls her husband URAM, a derivative of that versatile Sumerian word UR, 'guardian, protector, man, husband, soldier, servant, lord'. One word for a man, who is everything. — The wife's or woman's appellation in Hungarian is ASSZONY, from Sumerian GASAN meaning, 'mistress, queen'. The basic idea of common humanity was complemented by mutual respect. The idea of the woman on a pedestal is Sumerian too, expressed in the pictograph sign for 'goddess'. These ideas recurred in Hungary.

The Sumerian attitude towards life is respectful, positive and constructive. The Sumerian teaching to posterity is, that life makes sense and should be altogether intelligently enjoyed. The Sumerian names of animals are observant endearments — recalling the fondness of the Hungarian pastoralist for his animals. The Sumerian pictograph sign for the word 'joy' is a potted plant. — One thinks of the pot of geranium, which was always present, even in the window of the poorest peasant woman in Hungary.

The Sumerian loved life, but was not afraid of death. (A lot of mistaken speculations on this theme notwithstanding.) Recently discovered texts show, that Sumerians expected judgement and justice after death, not in some dark hole, but in a land which the all-knowing Sun lights every day. There was also a mysterious faith in a possible resurrection. A. Moortgat wrote about this, beautifully.

If one is well acquainted with the basic character of the Hungarians, one knows that the same characteristics are there: goodwill, tolerance, courage and humanity.

These are valuable qualities, from the point of view of human evolution; life on earth would be brighter, if they could become general.

However, these same qualities are very dangerous to those who displayed them too early, in advance of general evolution.

The gifted Sumerians were squeezed out of their homeland,

killed or scattered by those who coveted their wealth. They disappeared.

On the Scythian bronzes the forces of darkness overwhelm the noble stag of light, who is then torn up by bloody little beasts. Not much remains of the once powerful and gifted Scythians.

Now the Hungarians are on the road of extinction.

Should we in the West wash our hands with Pilate and say with Darwin, that those who are fit will survive?

Darwin forgot, that the maize, our most useful grain would perish within very few years, if no farmer cared for it. Our cultivated roses disappear from a neglected garden — the burdocks take over.

Will the Hungarians follow the Sumerians?

Or is there a mysterious law in the Universe, which keeps farmers caring for the maize and gardeners caring for the roses?

The Sumerians were optimists — they believed in resurrection. So do the Hungarians.

To all these resemblances we must find an explanation from history. We will try this, going back to the earliest beginnings.

WHAT HAPPENED IN HISTORY?

The routes of the Old-stone-age Northmen in Eurasia are not yet traced. But it seems that around the eighth and seventh millennium B.C. some gifted branches of this group settled in the Fertile Crescent and established the earliest Neolith cultures, the first agricultural villages. These were in the Kurdish hills, in Anatolia, in Palestine. Great and devoted archaeologists like R. Braidwood, J. Mellaart, K. M. Kenyon are working on excavating them and tell us about the exciting times when humans first planted grain and began to settle. There is good reason to believe, that the same human element wandered South too, where, united with gifted Southmen, they created Egyptian civilization in the valley of the Nile.

The villagers of the Northeast sent young groups of colonizers down the rivers Tigris and Euphrates, to bring to southern Mesopotamia the early culture of the El Ubaid period, somewhat different from the later Sumerian high culture, though probably ancestral to it.

Sumerian civilization was urbane and sophisticated; the result of intermarriages between different ethnic groups and cultural exchange. In time, these refined, literate, urbanites of the lowlands came to regard the mountaineers as a different people. There are references in cuneiform writings to the SA or SU people, the mountaineers — country people.

Thanks to the amount of writings they left to posterity on their clay tablets, we can reconstruct much of the Sumerian life, which was the rich, colorful, creative life of a tremendously gifted people. Their contributions to human progress are immeasurable. They worked metal; they invented the wheel for the engineer and the arch for the architect; their art was the basis of Greek art, their law was the basis of Roman law and their religious concepts are the foundation of the Jewish, Christian and Moslem religions.

The high time of Sumerian political power was the third millennium B.C. Sumerian culture, science, religion, literature have survived into the second millennium, but at that time the

Sumerian ethnic body, as well as the Sumerian character of the Mesopotamian city-states, was fading. Too much of the luxurious good life in the cities had weakened the Sumerians, those well-shaven, civilized gentlemen, who knew that war is hell. They hated to fight and when they saw that they had to, it was too late. The sacrifices of the patriots were in vain. A new element, hairy but energetic, overran Mesopotamia — the Akkadians. They took over political power too. The Sumerian element had to die, submit or emigrate.

For a long time, smaller and larger groups of migrants seem to have left Mesopotamia. These Sumerians went in all directions of the compass in search of some free land. We can find the traces of their culture in almost every part of the ancient world. It does not seem impossible that migrant elements from Sumer settled early in Asia Minor and were the carriers of the Chatti language and the ethnic body that built the early Hittite empire. That empire collapsed under the onslaught of the "sea peoples" in 1200 B.C., again sending masses of emigrants in search of new homes. This was the time to which tradition puts the founding of the Choresmian kingdom.

One of the directions, which would certainly appeal to many refugees, was that not clearly definable land, which was once part of the Sumerian world, known as Subartu, the mountain district beyond the river Tigris, home of the SA people. In the northeastern corner of this territory a new power, that of the Assyrians began to grow, swallowing up the gifted SA element and being enriched by it. Nevertheless, there was still plenty of land out of the Assyrian reach. On this territory would later grow classic Media and modern Luristan. Media must have profited by the good SA ethnic element, which was not corrupted by urbanization.

It is natural, that the largest waves of emigrants or refugees should have left their Mesopotamian homes at the time when the cruel Assyrian power was at its height, around the Xth to the VIIIth century B.C.

At this very time a mysterious group of horsemen appears in Luristan and leaves in the earth the traces of a peculiar and characteristic culture.

For quite awhile Luristan bronzes appeared in the antique shops and intrigued the scholars. Luristan is today part of the Iranian kingdom. The mystery of the people which left behind

a wealth of beautiful, sophisticated and expressive bronze artifacts is: who were they? why do they appear in Luristan around the tenth and ninth centuries B.C.? Why do they leave, two or three centuries later?

That Luristan art is connected with Mesopotamian art, has always been known. A short bronze dagger from Luristan is the exact copy of the famous dagger of the Sumerian prince Mes-Kalam-Dug. A bronze bowl has an inscription in cuneiform. Yet, the art of Luristan is in essence different from that of Sumer.

Sumerian art was that of a well-fed, well-to-do, sedentary people. Luristan art is that of impoverished, endangered, fighting and moving people. It is an art of refugees.

The testimony of the Luristan bronzes forces me to believe, that the masters of these little masterpieces were several generations of refugees from Sumerian city-states, who hid among the hills of Luristan. They had no gold ware, but they had their crafts, their love for beauty and their intense interest in life. These are what their tormented and movemented art expresses. For Luristan art is a great renaissance of the ingenious nature of the Northmen, who had grown fat by the fleshpots of Sumer. Now they have again to struggle hard for life and they regain their resilience. They have to cope with the swift horsemen of the Assyrian cavalry — so they became great horsemen themselves. To good horsemen, the whole Eurasian continent opens up.

Some emigrants from Sumer were luckier than that bulk which could save only their skins and their creative selves. In some fortresses, like Ziwiye, lived rich people, who still worked gold. But they were refugees too, menaced by a superior military organization and power. They considered that power the embodiment of evil, the force of darkness, symbolized by gryphons, leopards, dragons, and monsters. They felt that their own symbol was the stag, the majestic, beautiful but innocuous animal, the friend and carrier of the great light, the sun. The divinity that was father to a dynasty of gods, all friendly to humanity, was called in Sumer Enki-Ea, but also Dar-Mah — the Great Stag.

This stag motif, surrounded by strong religious emotions and ancestral traditions, should be carefully observed. It is fully documented and clear in Sumer. It reappears in very

great numbers in the Chatti culture. It is the most consistently found motif of Scythian art — and no wonder. The legendary ancestor of the Scythians is Targitaos 'the offspring of divine Tar' a name corresponding exactly to Sumerian DAR 'stag'. The miraculous stag reappears later in Hungarian folk art, folklore and legend. The first Hungarian prince sent to Constantinople as envoy, has the name, as reported by the Greeks, Termachos. This sounds still very much like the Sumerian DAR-MAH.

But the Hungarians are not yet around. We are in the foothills of the Zagros Mountains. Here was born the art which has for its central motif the struggle of the forces of light with the forces of darkness. The roots of the idea are in old Sumer, but now the refugees feel deeply about it, and express it eloquently in their art. Soon groups of able horsemen with bronze weapons, tools, jewels and horse-bits will ride in all directions of the compass and carry along the Scythian art.

The high culture of Sumer had included an early, almost exclusive mastery in mining, smelting, casting and working metal. Since the alluvial land of Sumer had no mines, expeditions were sent to bring in the precious raw materials. Some of these expeditions by boat lasted two years — and it is by no means impossible, that Sumerians mined tin in British mines, gold in the Carpathians and lead in the Altai Mountains. Sumerian engineers may have established the giant prehistoric canals system in present day Hungary.

Clay tablets with pictograph signs strongly related to the earliest script of Uruk in Sumer have been recently excavated by a Rumanian scholar in Transylvania. One of the pictograph signs seems to be that of a smelting oven or forge; gold and silver mines are in the vicinity, and one may presume that the tablet and other artifacts retrieved in the valley of the Maros River bespeak the presence of some early miner-colonizers. These justify also, belatedly, the Hungarian archaeologist Sophie von Torma, who was mocked in 1894, when she signaled pottery with signs of Mesopotamian character, which she excavated in the Maros valley.

It is probable that the families of late descendants of Sumerians, who remembered that someone of their family got acquainted with a distant land and liked it, would consider the

possibility of getting out of the Assyrian reach and emigrate into such a former colony.

In the meantime, most refugees would get into the southern foothills of the Zagros — a place called in their own Sumerian language simply "the land" MADA. This was as Oppert demonstrated it, the original, Turanian or Scythian name of the place which became Media.

Herodotos (I. 95, 96) writes about the first king of Media, who put an end to the anarchy of independent settlements in Media and organized the land into a kingdom. His name is reported by the Greek historian as Dejoces. He established a capital called "the place of convention," Ecbatana, modern Hamadan. He fortified it with seven walls, sometime late in the eight century B.C.

The Medes, according to Herodotos, cultivated fertile lands and lived in six tribes. One of them was that of the religious specialists, the Magoi.

The next king, son of Dejoces was killed in battle with the Assyrians. But in 612 B.C. the three peoples, who had suffered most from the terrible Assyrian power, united forces and crushed the Assyrian capital city, Niniveh. These were: the Chaldeans of the South, who had to submit to the Assyrians, but who have never forgotten their Sumerian ancestors, the Medes and the Scythians.

While a seemingly obedient servant to the Assyrian rulers, the governor of Babylon sent his son, Nebuchadnezzar to organize a general revolt against Assyria, in Media and the scattered relatives in the Northeast, who were now called Scythians. Scythians, Medes and Babylonians struck at the same time and the capital of evil was turned into ashes. Nebuchadnezzar became king of the Neobabylonian empire and married a Median princess.

The Chaldeans in Babylon after thousand years of Semitic rule, spoke Semitic. But they had a touching antiquarian respect for the ancient tongue and the old buildings, artifacts of the Sumerians, whom they considered their ancestors.

Nebuchadnezzar sought to attract to his magnificently built capital the scattered groups of refugees and certainly some of them returned. But others would not go. They clung to their provincial fortresses in the distant Northeast — maybe they were seeing signs in the sky or maybe they could already see

the handwriting, which was to appear on the wall, at the end of the short-lived Neo-Babylonian Empire. Power had corrupted the heirs of Nebuchadnezzar; wine and luxury weakened them. A new power rose, the Persian, and the Persians took over Babylon. Media also became subject to Persia as a result of intermarriage and cunning.

The Medes revolted against the Persian yoke and most of their leaders, the Magoi, were slaughtered. The rest accepted coexistence with the Persians — one of them, Zoroaster, even reformed the old Magus religion for the benefit of the Persian Empire. But those independent souls, who had left Mesopotamia for the sake of freedom would stir, and begin to move again. There were fields and flocks, homes and loved ones to leave behind, but they would move again; this time towards the Northwest, away from Persia. in the direction of the Black Sea.

When the wars of the Greeks and the Persians took place, the refugees from Media were in their new mountain fortresses. Xenophon speaks about Chaldeans of the mountains — a people which, when surrounded, commits mass suicide rather than accept life in captivity.

Xenophon was accused of inexact reporting — Chaldeans could not live in the mountains — says official scholarly opinion. May we contradict and believe that Xenophon has really met Chaldeans, during his Anabasis.

Greece declined, Rome rose. A new Scythian power rose too, that of the Parthians. They were a most interesting, fascinating and gifted people, who fought for centuries with Rome for the possession of what they considered the land of their ancestors, Mesopotamia. The immense organization and military power of the Roman empire prevailed against the Parthians and other Scythians too, the Huns and the Dahae. But while the possession of rich agricultural lowlands was important to the great powers, less ambitious groups could survive in less fertile and less coveted lands — the mountains and the marshes. Mountains and marshes were always the classic lands of the freedom seekers.

There was Shubur or Subartu, the land which stretches wide northeast of the Tigris River, between Elam, the Lakes Van and Urmia, and the Caspian Sea. In the north, Subartu may be stretched until the Caucasus. The name has been explained

from the city name Sippar. But perhaps a better explanation may be derived from the Sumerian SU hand and BAR to open. Prince translates SU-BAR as 'hand loosening' and Delitzsch as **freilassen**, to liberate. May I suggest that Sumerian SUBARTU corresponds to Hungarian SZABAD 'free'. The mountainous lands East of the Tigris were "the land of the free." Media had risen on Subartu-land and when that kingdom fell, the old idea of freedom became more of an obsession with the independent settlers of the old territory, north of Media, who called themselves Sabirs or Savards and who are often mentioned in the territory south of the Caucasian mountains, by ancient authors. Their name has been explained in several ways, none of which sounds convincing. It seems probable, that since the land was not too suited for agriculture, the majority of these Sabirs lived from animal breeding, flocks of cattle and sheep, perhaps other animals too.

The great exodus from the happy homelands of Mesopotamia had started already in the times of the Akkadians. It continued under Assyrian and Persian overlordship. But no doubt, the largest masses of people fled North at the time when the impact of the young and fanatic Arab power defeated Persia and started its brilliant capital, Baghdad in Mesopotamia. Baghdad needed male slaves for public works and female slaves for the harems. The people of Subartu or Sabiria were not willing to go to Baghdad — and after some unsuccessful resistance, they turned Northwards.

Arab historians tell about a revolutionary leader, Upas ibn Madar, who broke out from his besieged fortress in 739 and, with his men, escaped to the North.

This may have been the fortress later rebuilt by the Byzantine forces and mentioned as fortress of the Mazars.

Some refugees may have gone through the perilous passes of the Caucasian mountains, and turned towards the Caspian Sea's shores. Others went towards the not less perilous marshes of the Pontus, and tried to follow the seashore Northwards.

We have reports of a kingdom, which existed until the XII-th century of our era, in the valley of the river Kuma. A Hungarian kingdom? The capital was Mazar — a great city built of stone. The Tartars destroyed it and massacred the inhabitants. Later travellers described the majestic ruins, with carved marbles and stone monuments, inscribed with an unknown

script. These stood, until the Russian governor Potemkin ordered the stones to be used to build the city Jekaterinoslav.

It seems, that for centuries groups of emigrating refugees have moved towards the northern shores of the Black Sea, and began to live on those shores, between the Don and the Dnieper. There we find them in the middle of the ninth century. This territory was called in antiquity "the marshes of Meotis." The old Hungarian chronicles call this place Dentumoger — Hungary on the Don-mouth. It seems however that at this time they still called themselves Sabirs. In their new neighborhood they had to experience again the proximity of a young and powerful empire, that of the Khazars.

Between the Sabirs proper and the Khazar empire lived the Onogur-Hungarians of North-Turk affiliations, who had to accept the Khazars as overlords, but did not like the situation. Their land may have been called LEBEDIA. Those of the Western side, the Sabirs, who had kept the speech and the traditions of the great Southern civilization, seem to have remained independent. They also had the diplomatic capacities acquired through millennia and they seem to have prevailed on their relatives of Lebedia. They proposed a union of forces and planned for the united force to move westwards, away from the Khazars. This plan was carried through in 890 A.D., when the united forces of the new nation arrived to the shores of the rivers Bug and Dniester and there created a strong federation of the whole population, united under an elected monarch, Árpád. This new land was named Etelköz, which is the Hungarian equivalent of "between the rivers" or Mesopotamia. But this was a very unsafe, indefensible homeland, open to enemy attack; the rivers were no real protection. There also was the lure of the old, legendary home, first colonized by the Sumerian ancestors, the fertile lands defended efficiently by the Carpathian mountains.

The leader, the able Árpád, must have planned for many years, the move of a whole people across rivers and mountains, but finally this move was done too, in the autumn of the year 895 A.D. The number of the newcomers is put by some historians to 100,000, by others to 500,000 people. 250,000 seems to be a conservative estimate. Even if we accept this low figure, we have to admire the strategic accomplishment of moving

such a group with women, children and cattle successfully over such distance.

The new nation became known in Europe as Hungarians. The name may have come from Onogur, the name of a Turkish-like tribe, with which the Eastern wing of the confederated people was affiliated. But one wonders: is the resemblance of Hungarian to the ancient name of Sumer, KIENGIRA quite fortuitous?

The Byzantine emperors write about the newcomers as Turks. Konstantinos Porphyrogenitos remarks however, that, as it was stated by the Hungarian leaders themselves, their original name was SABARTOIASFALOI. To be understandable, this long name has to be cut in two. Sabartoi is the old name — "the free ones." Asphaloi is the Greek translation of the word, meaning "unfettered." And Konstantinos knew well from the writings of his father, the Emperor Leo, that "this is a free people." They themselves called their nation Magyar. It will be a job for future linguists to establish if this was done in deference to the stem of Árpád, the Megyer tribe? Or does the name carry the memory of the distant land Mada? Or the idea of the Magoi; the army or force (AR) of the MAG?

No doubt, there are many unsolved questions connected with the problem of Hungarian origins. One of these is the problem of the Finno-Ugrian relatives. If we accept the theory of a Sumero-Scythian origin of the Hungarians, how did those get into the Urals?

There are two possibilities. There may have been somewhere in Asia, a yet unknown center from which the different peoples of Scythian character radiated in a series of waves. Serious scholars, who have more or less accepted the possibility of a Sumerian-Hungarian relationship, usually presume that there was such an early, common origin of the two peoples, and, also of other related peoples. One can accept the idea of common origin, nevertheless I am convinced that the Hungarian language bears the stamp of not an early, but of a very late stage of Sumerian culture. This is shown by the quantity of Semitic cultural loanwords in Hungarian; from Akkadian and Babylonian. These had not been around in Central Asia, but were surely part of the late Sumerian vocabulary. So I will profess, that the group which used these loanwords, was one that left Mesopotamia at a late date and

was heir to the whole heritage of the late Sumerian civilization. This, however, does not exclude the possibility of an early common center of many peoples.

Personally I am rather inclined to believe, that the near linguistic relatives of Hungarians went to their Uralian habitats forced to settle there by one of the mighty conquerors of the Middle East. There is the puzzle of the Voguls, knowing the vocabulary of horse-breeding, but having no horses. Are the Zyrians not forced settlers from Syria? They may have been simple servant folk, settled in the North to help miners, and later left to their fate in a cold world. Which of the Finno-Ugrian peoples would have important loanwords coming from the Middle East? This will have to be established and the historical truth will slowly emerge.

IS THE RELATIONSHIP OF SUMERIAN AND HUNGARIAN PROVEN ?

The mass of grammatical correspondences between Sumerian and Hungarian, as seen long ago by Oppert and Lenormant, plus the mass of lexical correspondences, established by recent research, show clearly to the unbiased student that there is a relationship. Strong emotional factors, taboos and prejudices, the well-known conservatism of the average scholarly authority militate against accepting the fact. This attitude has its legitimations.

The scholar has to defend the confines of his territory against the uninitiated outsider, the irresponsible lunatic, the unconscientious lay seeker of profit and publicity. Alas, this conservative attitude has also been responsible for chronic hostility towards the really revolutionary ideas. The history of science abounds in shameful examples.

Geniuses, who submitted to scholarly authority their well-documented discoveries, like Boucher de Perthes, discoverer of prehistoric man's artifacts, were publicly ridiculed, even accused of fraud by the great of their day. This also happened to De Sautola, discoverer of the prehistoric cave-paintings. Grotefend, who solved the riddle of the cuneiform script, was unable to get his dissertation published. The Academy of Goettingen, where he presented his thesis, refused to print it. Forty years after the author's death his rejected manuscripts were unearthed and hailed as the turning-point in Assyriology. The scholars of his day have been unwilling to listen and believe. The genius Mendel wrote and spoke in vain during his lifetime. Only after his death did the scholarly world awake to the fact that Mendel has established the long-sought laws of heredity. Schliemann, excavator of Troy, was badly treated and Semmelweiss, who discovered the cause of puerperal fever, was practically hounded to death by his angry colleagues. Semmelweiss long ago had proved his thesis: puerperal fever was caused by infection. He had tangible, absolute proof: in his disinfected hospital wards there was no mortality, while

in the next wards the mothers kept dying in droves. Authorities shrugged their shoulders, they had chosen not to accept the facts, though many lives were at stake.

Rejection by current scholarly authority is almost the usual ritual for new truths and certainly not proof against them.

As always, there are, in a small number, really fearless scholars, who can perceive the truth and even support it. Their number grows, as time passes. The quality and courage of such scholars decides, how much time must pass before a proven truth becomes accepted truth.

Meanwhile, let us consider the strongest arguments, against accepting Sumerian-Hungarian relationship.

The first one is, that there are still many uncertainties in Sumerian, which make comparisons difficult. This is true. But what is difficult is not impossible. The fact that there were several dialects of Sumerian, does certainly complicate the problem, but this can be taken in stride. We do not have to wait until all uncertainties about these dialects and their phonetic history and correspondences are cleared up. This may take a long time. We should not wait until scholarship is agreed on readings of signs designated by totally different names. We are told now, that the sign AB should be read ES 'house'. — This may have been so at a certain period of the long Sumerian history, but was it always so? I dare to suggest, that at one time the sign AB may have sounded somewhere as AB, also that both have their Hungarian correspondences. AB corresponds to the Hungarian root ÉP in ÉPIT 'builds'; ÉPÜLET 'building'; while ÊS corresponds to HÁZ 'house'.

May we suggest, that if anywhere in time and space, in any of the Sumerian dialects or artificial ways of speaking, we discover a word, that corresponds obviously to a word either in the archaic or the modern literary Hungarian, or any of its different provincial dialects, we should add our finding to the body of Sumerian-Hungarian correspondences. Words loaned from Accadian should be considered; they are important indexes of history.

If later there are compelling reasons, established by Sumerian research, for striking the word in question from the Sumerian vocabulary, we may drop the correspondence too

- but we should not hurry. Posterity will correct our mistakes
- these will not disprove our main thesis.

The most typical objection to comparing Sumerian with Hungarian is, as stated by a noted linguist, "It is very dangerous to compare a dead language of five thousand years ago with a living language, which appeared in writing only five hundred years ago."

To this we may answer that the first coherent Hungarian text known to us was written around 1200 A.D., so it is about 750 years old. (Single words and many names are known from Latin documents of earlier times.) But it may be relevant, that even the earliest texts are perfectly understandable and only slightly removed from modern Hungarian, due to a great conservatism apparent in this branch of humanity. On the other hand, the bulk of Sumerian literature we know, was written down in the second millennium B.C. The distance between their date and that of the first Hungarian document is roughly three times as much as our distance from that famous sermon. There may be difficulties, but no reason to be completely deterred.

The professional linguist, even if he is free enough to ingrain-ed prejudices for listening to our arguments, will probably be reluctant to accept the number of phonetic changes which are possible between Sumerian and Hungarian. It is difficult to admit that Sumerian B may have either remained unchanged in the corresponding Hungarian word or changed into P, or V, or F (never into D or T). But here we have to remind the linguist of the stormy history of the Hungarian nation. A thousand years ago, we know they lived in seven "stems" and 108 clans. They probably spoke different dialects. Two distinct languages spoken by the early Hungarians are documented in the Byzantine sources. It is more than probable, that the Sumero-Scythian linguistic heritage was transmitted by different strains. We know that the B—P change has happened already in Sumerian BAAR 'white, bright' appears also as PAAR. It is possible that the group of early Hungarians used the correspondence of this word as VERÖ, while another used it as FEER, FEHÉR. Literary language accepted both with slightly different meanings, FEHÉR meaning "white, fair" and VERÖ meaning "light, sunshine."

While it is recognized that monosyllabic Sumerian may still cause many mistakes and that some correspondences may be

fortuitous — it should be obvious that all the foregoing cannot be mere chance or mere mistake. The percentage of clear correspondences between Sumerian roots and their Hungarian derivatives is far higher than the necessary minimum, five percent of the vocabulary, usually deemed sufficient for examining a relationship of the languages.

The correspondences are clear, not only in those cultural concepts, which may be borrowed, but especially in the basic vocabulary of the two languages. While we need much further research by experts, anyone able to shed ingrained prejudices and form new judgements on basis of new evidence, can already recognize that ancient Sumerian and living Hungarian are related.

* * *

At this point, one might say, that we said enough and now let us relax. Whether we succeeded in convincing the reader, or not, some day truth will prevail. Science proceeds with giant steps and we are on the eve of a breakthrough in linguistic research too. Soon the linguistic elements of the world's languages will be fed into computers and degrees of relationship will be established with mathematical exactitude.

Oppert testated his cruelly assailed theory to be vindicated by a better informed posterity. I could leave my cause to posterity that will use the computers; bless them.

May I refer all those, who are still not willing to accept as fact the relationship of Sumerian and Hungarian, to the great mechanical brains of tomorrow. May I also bid them farewell here.

May I invite those who have the courage to believe **now**, to read further.

CONCLUSION

Thank you dear reader, for having followed me around in the dense forests and dangerous swamps of ancient Scythia. I fondly hope that I did not mislead you. We were, like the legendary hunters of the White Stag, pursuing something shining and beautiful; a historical truth hidden by forces of evil, behind sinister thickets and poisonous vapors. —

The miraculous Stag was more than a stag and the truth of the Sumerian origin of the Hungarians is more than a truth. It happens to be in the same time a cause too, a just cause, that of giving back to a distressed nation her place under the sun, her right to life; of which she was robbed.

Dear reader, if you belong to the kind of human beings, who still believe in the principles once promulgated by Sir Launcelot of the Lake and his king Arthur, then I appeal to you frankly. I am asking you, to help the Hungarians.

Centuries of calumny have ruined the Hungarian image in the Western world. Several powers were interested, are interested in sucking Hungarian blood, robbing Hungarian goods, using Hungarians for slave-labor. These were and are interested in keeping the Hungarian image such, that you and the likes of you, dear reader, should not be interested in what happens to Hungarians.

To achieve this was a masterpiece. You were first told that Hungarians came from Central Asia — they are total strangers in Europe, no members of the Indo European family. Nobody told you, that the Scythian family was related to the Indo-European and that the Hungarians were Scythians.

You were told about the nomad hordes of Hungarians. You were not told, that they were not nomads, but refugees, in quest of a homeland; they did not live in hordes but in strict and efficient organizations.

You were fed in school-books and encyclopedias glowing stories about the "savage and cruel" Hungarians. Nobody told you that Hungarians on horseback were not more savage and cruel, not less bold and adventurous than the contemporary Vikings in their boats.

Did anybody tell you that "savagery" and "barbarism" being

reserved in anthropology for the preliterate stages, using these terms for the Magyars of the ninth century is not legitimate? They came to the shores of the Danube with a script of their own.

You will understand me better, if I tell you the story of the fight about the authenticity of the Hungarian runic writing. Pray, abide with me a little longer.

We know that many Scythian peoples were literate, such were the Huns, Avars, Turks. They had scripts of their own, though relatively few monuments and documents survived.

In the Hungarian chronicles and early histories notes keep reappearing about the Scythian writing of the Hungarians. Bonfini, Italian chronicler of the Hungarian king Mathias wrote in the fifteenth century about this script, which is usually carved in wood and expresses much, with a few signs.

With the spreading of Latin letters, the ancient pagan script fell into oblivion. It seems that while it was fairly well known during the sixteenth century, around 1600 it became a rarity. In the following century, several clerics, Catholic and Protestant, wrote down for posterity's information the signs and rules of the ancient writing. They called the writing Scythian, Hunnic or Siculian, because the script survived longest in Transsylvania, home of the Hungarian-speaking Székely or Sicul people. We know from the notes of these clerics, that the script went to left from right, and some vowels could be eliminated. Longer texts were written or carved in bustrophedon.

In the next, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries it became fashionable and lucrative to detract everything in Hungarian history, for reasons I have already explained. So the authenticity of those poor good friars and ministers, who left us the ancient alphabets, was flatly denied.

The argument was that since there is no Scythian relationship and since Hungarian is obviously related to the language of the primitive, inarticulate Lapps, Hungarians of ancient times could not have a script of their own. Árpád's people were barbaric nomads. If we conceded the possibility that they had a writing, we would have to regard them as civilized people. This the scholarly guild did not want to admit. So it was decided by the authorities, that early Hungarians could not have had a writing — period. Every evidence to the contrary was dubbed nonsense or deliberate fraud. The notion was floated,

that obviously one of those chauvinistic Protestant ministers abused of his knowledge of Hebrew and constructed a script written backwards, like Hebrew. The others, including the Franciscan friars, were fools, who copied.

In spite of this well established official version, the question of the authenticity of the "rovás-írás", the runic writing was dragged in again and again by believers, who kept finding documents of it, in old bricks, on the ceiling of an old church, even faithful copies among the writings of an Italian officer, who worked in Transsylvania, in the seventeenth century, and was interested in antiquities.

The authorities were not impressed.

One of the believers, Gy. Sebestyén wrote a treatise on the script and mailed a copy to W. Thomsen, the famous decipherer of the old Turkish runes. The Danish scholar filed the essay in his library.

It was well known that Hungarian herdsmen still carved their accounts of the animals on sticks of wood. They preserved the old numerals, but did not know the letters.

Around the turn of the century one of the believers found a farmer, who claimed that he learned the letters of the old script from his father. This created a stir.

The best Hungarian sculptor of the period, J. Fadrusz was commissioned by the Hungarian State to create a monument. This he did and the inscriptions were in the signs of the Hungarian runic writing. This angered the academic circles.

A committee of scholars cross-examined the farmer, who admitted that it was not his father, but a school-teacher who taught him the letters; his father knew only the numerals.

The scholarly guild was triumphant: here was a clear case of fraud. That should put an end to the nonsense! Those, who still dared to believe in the authenticity of the script, were savagely attacked in the scholarly publications. Especially vicious was L. Réthy, one of the alumni of the Vienna school.

The sculptor Fadrusz was ordered by the State to take off the monument the inscriptions written in the ridiculed and compromised script. The sculptor lost his mind.

The case of the runic script seemed well buried. But truths have strange ways of reappearing somehow.

A young German scholar, F. Babinger found in the archives of the Fugger family a manuscript from the XVI-th century.

It was in 1913 that he discovered the diary of H. Dernschwamm, who described his visit to Istanbul in 1553. At that time Dernschwamm saw an intriguing inscription on the marble wall of the Sultan's stables and copied it exactly.

Babinger, preparing the publication of the manuscript, supposed that the inscription was in old Turkish script, and sent it to the expert, Thomsen.

Thomsen saw at once, that this is not Turkish. He picked up the publication of Sebestyén and compared the signs. The inscription, dated 1515 was in Hungarian.

With the signs of the old runic script only slightly differing from the good cleric's alphabets, a horse-groom, Tamás Székely recorded, that he was there, in a delegation by the King of Hungary to Sultan Selim. He recorded, that they had to wait long before getting the audience.

This message of the bored horse-groom decided the question of the authenticity of the script. It made obvious that simple people, unschooled in Latin letters, had known and used the ancient script. It was impossible to cast upon the German Babinger and the Danish Thomsen any suspicion.

At this point the Hungarian Academy of Sciences capitulated and published the book of Sebestyén, on all the authentic documents of the ancient Hungarian script, known until then.

The tragedy is, that the vindication came too late. Sebestyén's book was published during the years of the first World War. To the best of my knowledge, there are two copies of it in the U.S.A.

The simple fact, that the Hungarians of the ninth century brought along a script of their own, which shows clearly, that they had passed long ago the phases of evolution called savagery or barbarism, became not a matter of common knowledge. Not even the experts know about it. A famous American expert on Oriental writings when I began to tell him about the Hungarian runic script, smiled, amused and tolerantly, as if hearing about little green men from the planet Mars.

What people know, or do not know about their fellow men, influences their emotions and actions.

The bad image which has been given through centuries to a weakened, oppressed Hungary, came with a vengeance to the tables of the peace treaties after the first World War. No country, no nation, irrespective of the degrees of alleged war-

guilt or other considerations, was so cruelly torn to pieces, mutilated and marked for extinction by the misinformed dictators of the peace-treaties as the Hungarian.

After the Second World War the performance was repeated.

At this moment, small Hungary is abandoned to the Soviet-orbit, in flagrant contrast to the promises of the Atlantic Charter.

Superficial reportings tell the Western reader about people who live quite well in Budapest. These are not the Hungarians. The truth about the Hungarians is, that at this moment they have the lowest birth-rate and the highest suicide rate in the world.

For a short while there was a wave of sympathy in the Western world, after 1956. It passed. Now the old image of Asiatic intruders, savage nomad strangers mentioned in the publications with stereotyped slur-words reappears and helps the Western public to assist in callous, sometimes hostile silence to covert genocide.

This would not be the case, would people know the truth. If the murderously distorted image about the origin, nature and essence of the Hungarians could be replaced with the real thing. This may be a matter of life or death for a valuable member of the human family.

This is why I appeal to you dear reader; do help to spread the truth about Hungary and the Hungarians. So that all their children should not be murdered, while you look the other way.

This is a human cause, as worthy of support as Dr. Schweitzer's hospital in Lambarene.

Or is it a colossal naiveté to ask and still hope, after so many tragedies, for human solidarity?

I will risk to be laughed at — and send out this call, addressed to the young and those who are young in heart. Even today, in these times of non-involvement, I trust that I will reach some of those who build the future of mankind. Build it so, that these should be place left for the remnant of Sumerians and Scythians, for the Hungarian nation.

You, dear reader, are not a poor lone person, who has not the power of doing something. If you are a teacher, a newspaperman or a clubwoman, you are a power. Even if you are a banker or a lumberjack, you are public opinion. Tragedies

happened, because you were misinformed. At the next turning point you should be ready with better information about the Hungarians and a plan to right the wrongs. Spread the word and be not surprised if you are assailed, perhaps even by people who call themselves Hungarians. By now you know the score. It is a noble thing to fight for truth, because truth is the great liberator and liberty is the most valuable treasure of humanity. Jefferson believed that we have to stand up, not only for our own, but also for everybody's liberty.

At this date, the tenth anniversary of the Hungarian Freedom Fight, let me dedicate this booklet most reverently to the memory of all those, who in different parts of the world lived, fought and died for justice, truth and freedom.

Houlton, Maine, October 23, 1966.

Ida Bobula.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADAMS, R.

"Developmental Stages in Ancient Mesopotamia", in Steward, Julian et al. **Irrigation Civilizations**, 1955. Pan American Union.

BARTUCZ, L.

Antropológia és a magyar őstörténet. Ethnographia, 1932.

BÁRCZI, G.

A magyar nyelv életrajza, Budapest, 1963.

BENDEFY, L.

Kunmagyaria — A Kaukázusi Magyarság Története, Budapest, 1941.

BOBULA, I.

The Great Stag — a Sumerian Divinity. **Yearbook of Ancient and Mediaeval History**, University of Buenos Aires, 1953.

Sumerian Affiliations, Washington, 1951.

Sumerian Technology, Washington, 1960, in **The Smithsonian Report for 1959**.

CHILDE, V.G.

New Light on the Most Ancient East. (4th ed.) New York, 1953.

What Happened in History, (5th ed.) London, 1950.

DEIMEL A. SJ.

Sumerisches Lexicon, Rom, 1927-37.

DELITZSCH, F.

Kleine Sumerische Sprachlehre für Nichtassyriologen, Leipzig, 1914.

BRAIDWOOD, R.J.

Prehistoric Man. Chicago Natural History Museum, 1964.

The Near East and the Foundations for Civilization, Eugene, Oregon, 1952.

CZEGLÉDY, K. ed.

A magyar őstörténet kérdései, Budapest, 1955.

EHRICH, R.W.

Chronologies in Old World Archaeology, Chicago, 1965.

FALKENSTEIN, A.

Das Sumerische. Leiden, 1959.

GADD, C.

Babylonia, Cambridge, 1965.

The Cities of Babylonia, Cambridge, 1962.

History and monuments of Ur, London, 1929.

GALLUS, A.

Los fundamentos de la Europa Historica. Anales de Arqueologia, Buenos Aires, 1949.

GALLUS, S. et T. HORVÁTH

Un peuple cavalier préscythique en Hongrie, Budapest, 1939.

GOMBOCZ, Z.

A magyar őshaza és a nemzeti hagyomány. Nyelvtudományi Közlemények, Budapest, 1917-27.

GOMBOCZ, Z. és MELICH J.

Lexicon Critico — Etymologicum Linguae Hungaricae, Budapest, 1914.

GOETZE, A.

Kleinasien, (2nd ed.) München, 1957.

GORDON, C.H.

New Horizons in Old Testament Literature, Ventnor, N.J., 1960.

The Living Past, New York, 1941.

GYÖRFFY, GY.

Krónikáink és a magyar őstörténet, Budapest, 1948.

Tanulmányok a magyar állam eredetéről, Budapest, 1959.

HAJDÚ, P.

A magyarság kialakulásának előzményei, Budapest, 1953.

Finn-ugor népek és nyelvek, Budapest, 1962.

HUSZKA J.

Honfoglaló őseink ornamentikája, Budapest, 1910.

JESTIN, R.

Abrégé de grammaire sumérienne, Paris, 1951.

KOSÁRY, D.

Bevezetés a magyar történelem forrásaiba és irodalmába, Budapest, 1951.

KÖNIG, F.W.

Altteste Geschichte der Meder und Perser, Leipzig, 1934.

KRAMER, S.N.

The Sumerians, Chicago, 1963.

KUUN, G. comes

Relationum Hungarorum cum Oriente Historia, Claudiopoli, 1892.

LABAT, R.

Elam, Cambridge, 1963.

LANGDON, S.

Pictographic Inscriptions from Jemdet-Nasr, London, 1928.

LÁSZLÓ, GY.

A honfoglaló magyar nép élete, Budapest, 1944.

Őstörténetünk legkorábbi szakaszai, Budapest, 1961.

LENORMANT, F.

Chaldean Magic, London, 1877.

La langue primitive de la Chaldée et les idiomes touraniens, Paris, 1875.

LEGRAIN, L.

Luristan Bronzes in the University Museum, Philadelphia, 1934.

LENZEN, H.

Die Sumerer, Berlin, 1948.

LIGETI, L. ed.

A magyarság őstörténete, Budapest, 1943.

LOZINSKI, P.

The Original Homeland of the Parthians, The Hague, 1959.

MACARTNEY, C.A.

The Magyars in the Ninth Century, Cambridge, 1930.

The Mediaeval Hungarian Historians, Cambridge, 1953.

MALLOWAN, M.E.L. Sir, and C. ROSE

Excavations at Tell Arpachiyah, Iraq, vol. II, pt. I. 1935.

MARCZALI, H. ed.

Enchiridion, Budapest, 1902.

MARJALAKI—KISS, L.

Gondolatok a magyar nép eredetéről, Borsodi Szemle No. 1. and 2, 1956.

MARQUART, J.

Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge, Leipzig, 1903.

MELLAART, J.

Anatolia, Cambridge, 1964.

- MÉSZAROS, GY.
Chattiak és Skythák, Szeged, 1938.
- MINNS, E. H.
Scythians and Greeks, Cambridge, 1913.
- MOLNÁR, E.
A magyarság őstörténete, Budapest, 1953.
- MONGAIT, A.L.
Archaeology in the U.S.S.R., Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1961.
- MOÓR, E.
A magyar nyelvtörténet őstörténeti vonatkozásai, Magyar Nyelvőr, 1946-48.
- MOORTGAT, A.
Die Entstehung der sumerischen Hochkultur, Leipzig, 1945.
Tammuz, Berlin, 1949.
- MORAVCSIK, GY.
A magyar történet bizánci forrásai, Budapest, 1934.
- NAGY, G.
A szkíták nemzetisége, Budapest, 1895.
Turánok és Arják, Budapest, Ethnographia, 1902.
- NÉMETH, GY.
A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása, Budapest, 1930.
A régi magyar írás eredete, Nyelvtudományi Közlemények, 1917-20.
- OKLADNIKOV, A. P.
Ancient Population of Siberia and its Cultures. Cambridge, Mass. 1959.
- OPPENHEIMER, M. von.
Tell Halaf, New York, 1933.
- OPPERT, J.
Études Sumériennes, Journal Asiatique, 1875.
Le peuple et la langue des Médes, Paris, 1879.
- ORBÁN, A.
Őstörténelmünk, Budapest, 1962. (Manuscript in the Hungarian National Library, Fol. Hung. no. 3108).
- PADÁNYI, V.
Dentumagytaria, Buenos Aires, 1956.

- PALLIS, S.A.
The Antiquity of Iraq, Copenhagen, 1956.
- PARROT, A.
Sumer — the dawn of art. New York, 1961.
- PAULER, GY., S. SZILÁGYI et al.
A magyar honfoglalás kútfoi, Budapest, 1900.
- POSENER, G.; J. BOTTERO and K.M. KENYON
Syria and Palestine, Cambridge, 1965.
- POTRATZ, J.A.H.
Die Skythen in Südrussland, Basel, 1963.
- PIOTROVSKY B.B. et al.
Ourartou, Néapolis des Scythes, Khorezm. Paris, 1954.
- PRITCHARD, B.
Ancient Near Eastern Texts. Princeton, 1950.
- ROUX, G.
Ancient Iraq, London, 1964.
- SAYCE, A.H.
Babylonians and Assyrians. London, 1900.
The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia. Edinburgh, 1903.
- SCHAEFFER, C.F.A.
Stratigraphie Comparée et Chronologie de l'Asie Occidentale, London, 1948.
- SCHMIDT, H.
Troja, Mykene, Ungarn — Archaeologische Parallelen, Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, vol. 36, p. 608, 1904.
- SCHMÖKEL, H.
Ur, Assur und Babylon, Stuttgart, 1955.
- SEBESTYÉN, Gy.
A magyar rovásírás hiteles emlékei, Budapest, 1916.
- SZABÓ, D.
A magyar nyelvemlékek, Budapest, 1959.
- SZABÓ, I.
A magyarság életrajza, Budapest, 1941.

SZENTPÉTERY, I. ed.

Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum, Budapest, 1937-38.

SZINNYEI, J.

A magyarság eredete, nyelve és honfoglaláskori műveltsége. Budapest, 1919.

Magyar nyelvhasználat, Budapest, 1927.

TILKE, M.

The costumes of Eastern Europe, Berlin, 1925.

TOLSZTOV, Sz. P.

Az ősi Chorezm. Budapest, 1947.

TORMA, S.v.

Ethnographische Analogien, Jena, 1894.

UNGNAD, A.

Subartu, Leipzig, 1936.

VARGA, ZS.

Ötezer év távlatából — sumir—ural—altáji ősrökség, Debrecen, 1942.

VAMBÉRY, A.

A magyarság bölcsőjénél, Budapest, 1944, Atheneum.

VLASSA, N.

Chronology of the Neolithic in Transylvania, Dacia, Vol., 1963.

WOOLLEY, L. Sir.

The Art of the Middle East, Baden-Baden, 1961.

The beginnings of Civilization, in vol. I of *History of Mankind*, New York, 1963.

Excavations at Ur, London, 1954.

The Sumerians, Oxford, 1930.

Ur of the Chaldees, London, 1950.

ZERVOS, Ch.

L'art de la Mésopotamie, Paris, 1935.

ZICHY, I. gr.

A magyarság őstörténete és műveltsége a honfoglalásig, Budapest, 1923.

ZSIRAI, M.

Finnugor rokonságunk, Budapest, 1937.