

Problems Behind the Iron Curtain Series, No. 3.

Ida Bobula

Origin of the Hungarian Nation



Published by the Danubian Research and Information Center
3837 S.W. 1st Avenue, Gainesville, Florida

© 1966

ORIGIN OF THE HUNGARIAN NATION

INTRODUCTION

The ninth century in Europe was an age of tumult and turmoil. Future France and future Germany were slowly emerging from the ruins of the Carolingian Empire. The daring Vikings, who at this time, in their dragon boats, ravaged England and other coastal lands of Western Europe, were to be the founding fathers of Denmark, Norway and Sweden. Their foe, Alfred the Great, in his small kingdom of Wessex, foreshadowed a future British empire. One group of the rapacious Northern adventurers had just bestowed their name on a future Russia. Moorish emirs reigned on the sunny Iberian peninsula, where the future Spain was to rise. Moorish culture at this time was far superior to any other in the West. But Europe was stirring. Vernacular Latin, impoverished daughter of the glory that was once Rome, was now evolving in new ways, into French and Italian. It was the time of birth for modern nations.

At the end of this turbulent ninth century, the Hungarians arrived in Central Europe. They came from the Northeast, with the irresistible sweep of a well armed, well organized and populous nation. They took possession of the wide valley of the river Danube in the year 895.

The central part of the valley had been empty since the army of Charlemagne had slaughtered the rulers of the Avars — that part was known as the "Deserta Avarorum," the desert lands of the Avars.

The valley of the Middle Danube is surrounded by the powerful semicircle of the Carpathian Mountains; a natural boundary, which creates an economic unit and almost a fortress. Within these mountains, the Hungarians, who in their own tongue called themselves Magyars, would establish their homeland, Hungary. Their traditions told them that this rich land had belonged once, long ago, to their Scythian ancestors, and they claimed it expressly as their rightful heritage.

Scattered on the periphery lived remnants of peoples once powerful in this land: Avars, Huns, Dacians, all of them

branches of the Scythian stem. There is reason to believe that they welcomed the arrival of the Hungarians and joined them. According to the chronicles, the conquering Hungarians found in many places a humble, autochthonous people, who had lived there since time immemorial. They had given names to rivers and mountains, which were accepted by the conquerors and, as geographic names usually do, survived easily the last millennium. These names are all in good Hungarian. The natives and the newcomers probably spoke related languages.

In some places the population was Slavic, especially in the North and the West. There were difficulties with the Slavic princes, but after some skirmishes, these Slavs submitted. Far more dangerous were the Bulgars in the South. They fiercely resisted the Hungarian advance, from their strong encampments. A long and bloody war had to be fought before the valiant Bulgaro-Turks retired to the Balkans.

After the victory over the Bulgars, the Hungarians assembled at Pusztaszer and held their first parliamentary meeting on the recently conquered land. According to their first historian, they debated and discussed for thirty-four days the ways in which Hungary should be organized and governed.

The new land — that very old land — grew rich food for the special, characteristic breeds of dogs, sheep, cattle, horses and pigs the Hungarians brought along from the East. They also had special breeds of fowl. The fowl and the pigs are proof that their owners were settlers, not nomads. Such animals don't stand the nomadic way of life. The tools of agriculture, found in the early graves in abundance, speak about the land having been put to seed very soon. Spades were found also, in graves of women. Other grave-goods speak about astonishingly high art and craftsmanship in working metals, leather, bone, textiles and wood.

The 108 clans of the Hungarians had been organized far earlier into seven groups, each led by a duke. Before entering Hungary, the dukes had assembled and established a hereditary and constitutional monarchy, by electing Árpád, one of their number, as prince of the whole nation.

This arrangement, however, granted considerable independence to the dukes and their families, who established family ties with foreign rulers and consequently got involved in the wars of Western princes. Incursions Westward, especially in

territories inhabited by Germans followed, in which much blood was lost.

The need of a stronger, more centralized leadership was felt and after a century of rule by princes, Hungary became Christian and one of the great mediaeval kingdoms of Europe. Favourable climate, know-how, and diligent attention to agriculture and animal husbandry soon made Hungarians the great exporters of meat and wine to Northern and Central Europe. Before the discovery of America, three fifths of the Old World's gold production came from the mines of Hungary.

The strong Hungarian kingdom created a state of equilibrium in Central Europe. (The geometrical center of Europe falls slightly north of Hungary, into Poland.) Established between the Slavs of the North and the Slavs of the South, Hungary became, for a thousand years, a barrier to panslavism. She also halted German expansion Eastward. However the most important service of Hungary to Europe was that by her very existence she blocked the way of future invasions from the East. Mediaeval Christian Hungary was the battered shield behind which the West was able to develop, in relative peace, a distinctly European culture.

Guarding the Eastern gate of "fortress Europe" was a costly task. Hungary had to bear the full burden of resisting the Ottoman Turks, after they had destroyed the Byzantine Empire and were set to conquer Europe. The words of Macaulay sum up the achievement of Hungary: "Without Hungary, we might now be persuing our studies in Turkish at Oxford and Cambridge." Hungarian resistance broke the strength of the Turkish empire, but the centuries of terrible struggle with a brave and fanatical adversary took their toll and left Hungary devastated, depopulated, impoverished and politically in an impossible situation.

The young king, Louis, died on the battlefield at Mohács in 1526. The elder brother of the widowed queen, Archduke Ferdinand Habsburg claimed the throne. His claim was supported by Hungarians, who hoped that Ferdinand, brother of Charles V, the emperor of Spain and Germany, would be able to secure Western assistance against the Turks. The "court party" of those Hungarians elected Ferdinand king — while the "national party" elected and crowned a Hungarian. After 12 years of struggle, Ferdinand was accepted to lead Christi-

anity against Moslem aggression. But there were tragic consequences. When Turkish power began to diminish, it became clear, that other dangers menaced the Hungarian nation. There was no bridge between the constitutional ideology of the Hungarians and the absolutism of the rising Habsburg power. Resistance was hopeless and desperate revolts and reigns of terror followed. They lasted for over three centuries. The issue of religion complicated the situation. Hungary had always moved in accordance with the great spiritual and cultural movements of Western Europe, from the time of the Crusades to the Renaissance and Reformation. It is significant that all these stopped at the eastern frontier of Hungary and were unable to penetrate the countries further east. The Reformation had won over many Hungarians, and whole cities had gone over to the teachings of Luther and Calvin. All this now ceased. The Habsburgs and their Austrian courtiers felt that it was their sacred duty to break the Hungarian heretics by all possible means, just as they had done in Spain. The program of Vienna was condensed by one of these, Lobkovitz, for oppressed Hungary into the words: "I will make Hungary first a beggar, then Catholic, and after this, German."

At the time of the Crusades, Hungary was economically and culturally the equal of any of the powers of the West. She maintained this position until the Renaissance. Under the hostile pressure of the Habsburgs, Hungary was slowly reduced to an agricultural colony of Austria. At a time when the "Enlightenment" was holding sway in the countries of the West, Hungary became more and more backward. In the first years of the eighteenth century, Count Ferenc Rákóczi led a general revolution against the Habsburgs. His aim was to restore the old constitution, regain religious liberty for the Protestants (though he himself was a Catholic) and freedom for the oppressed people. In his appeal to arms he stressed the point that Hungarians were a noble people of Scythian origin; a people of freedom that could not accept subjection and slavery. Rákóczi, after a long, heroic struggle was betrayed, and died in exile, while Hungary remained for centuries a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

The treasures of despoiled Hungary went to enrich Vienna. Hungarian wheat became "Vienna bread." Hungarians in their own land became second-class citizens. The royal house im-

ported and settled new Slavic and German communities on former Hungarian lands. Large donations went to traitors and foreigners. A new, German-speaking aristocracy arose. Beginning with the eighteenth century, the royal house radiated the idea Westwards, that by now there was only a powerful Austria; Hungary could be discounted.

Absolutism was rampant in Europe. Absolute rulers sat on the great thrones. To most of the statesmen, the hankering of the Hungarians for constitutional government seemed a ridiculous anachronism, paganism, impious tampering with royalty's divine rights.

The most gifted and sincere of all Habsburgs, Joseph II. felt that he could rule Hungary without being crowned and refused to undergo the ceremony. His enlightened, but absolute rule, with an attempt at wholesale Germanization, provoked the passive resistance of the Hungarian nation to everything German. Between Hungarians and their neighbors, the Germans of the East, reciprocal hostility rose and bedeviled relations for centuries to come. This was unfortunate for both parties and damaged them heavily.

Much later in time Austrian-born Hitler was a direct heir to the sneering hatred for Hungarians, which lingered long in many quarters of Vienna. In the first edition of his book, "Mein Kampf," Hitler expressed his opinion, that the great historical sin of the Habsburgs was their failure to exterminate the Hungarians. Hitler was unfair to the Habsburgs. They had done their worst. They had efficiently thinned out the resisting Hungarian elite, but they could not afford the wholesale genocide advocated by Hitler. The Hungarian farmer was needed to produce food for Vienna. Recognising this, the wise counselors of the Habsburg rulers had also discovered the truth later codified by Orwell: "He who controls the past, controls the future. He who controls the present, controls the past." Consequently the scientific apparatus patronised by Vienna started to give the Hungarians a new concept of their own history: a history aimed at producing humility and obedient servants.

The Vienna-inspired historians began to erase all belief in a proud Scythian past. It was pointed out that "Scythia" had never had an exact meaning. The old Hungarian chronicles were stamped unreliable. Hyper-criticism tore to shreds practically all their statements.

"Where, then, did we come from?" asked the Hungarians, during the dark decades which followed the Rákóczi-era. They were to get a sarcastic answer.

In the mid-eighteenth century, when ethnography was an emerging interest and intellectuals all over the world realised that there were different peoples inhabiting the earth from the Equator to the Arctic, it became commonplace to regard the happily lounging peoples of tropical islands as noble savages, while the peoples of the Arctic, with their diet of blubber and strange customs of wife-lending, became images of ultimate degeneration, to be viewed with disgust and contempt.

Today we know that this image was grossly unjust. Nevertheless, it is in consideration of the general attitude of the era that we must evaluate the impact of the work of J. Sajnovics, published in Latin: "Demonstratio Idioma Ungarorum et Laponum Idem Esse" Tyrnaviae 1770. (The language of the Hungarians and the Lapps is shown to be identical.)

In fact the two languages are anything but identical. They are as distant from each other as English and Greek. True, they are related. Sajnovics was not the first to note the distant relationship between the various Finno-Ugrian peoples. Others had observed it, but they had said it differently.

The publication of Sajnovics was bitterly resented by a politically oppressed and economically exploited people, who were being asked to work without question for the benefit of a pseudo-feudal foreign class of rulers, allegedly possessing a natural superiority to the relatives of the despised Lapps.

The search for scientific truth in the question of Hungarian origins became complicated because of the prevalence of non-scientific motives amongst so many of the participants. German scholarship, especially in the post-Napoleonic era of nationalism and romanticism, eagerly embraced theories on ethnic origins calculated to humiliate the proud Hungarians. It was safe to do this since there was truth in the distant relationship of Hungarian and Lappish. So Finno-Ugrian linguistics developed. Unquestionably, many people working in this direction did this in an honest effort to find out the truth. The trouble was that the existing political power favoured only this one line of approach to the truth. Only part of the truth was revealed.

Young Hungarians could get grants and passports for travel abroad if they would work on that truth agreeable to the

government. Such willingness would ensure jobs and positions in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which consistently and steadfastly subsidised research, teaching and publications which supported the Finno-Ugrian relationships. This tendency became more marked than ever, after 1849, when the Habsburg ruler had to use Russian help to defeat the Hungarians, who fought for the freedom of their nation.

Hungarian scholars independently wondering about the possibility of some additional truths, were systematically ridiculed and silenced by the authorities; the authorities that derived their power from their positions, and their positions from Vienna. Anyone, who tried to seek light from any source but the Finno-Ugrian relationship, was denounced as an amateurish, ignorant chauvinist, ashamed of his poor relatives. Of course, no Hungarian in his right mind could ever be ashamed of being related to the Esthonians and the Finns; and as our knowledge expands, so too does our respect for the efficient Lapps, whose lives had to be lived in so difficult an environment. Nevertheless, there were in every generation some Hungarians, who tried to establish historical and linguistic ties with other groups too.

The non-conformists were denied jobs, positions and opportunities for publication. Accused of a non-existent, idiotic snobbery, they became favorite objects of open contempt and stereotyped mockery by the accepted members of the scholarly guild, crammed with persons of foreign origin and monitored from Vienna. This monitoring went on until the last years of Habsburg rule through the Archives Office in Vienna, headed for decades by a German from Hungary, who supported an assumed, beautiful Hungarian name. A subtle and apt tool of classic Habsburg aspirations, he helped, influenced and corrupted the young Hungarian historians, who were sent to Vienna with research grants and official patronage. Then, when their loyalty was secured, he placed them in Hungarian universities, archives or museums. These very persons were still in their important positions when Hungary regained her freedom from Austria after the First World War. Bled white once again (Hungary lost a larger proportion of her male population of marriagable age than any other combatant in the First World War) fighting for survival, the crippled and truncated country, that had lost two-thirds of its territory, had no replacement

for those well-trained but corrupt scholars, who remained a close clique, clinging with determination to the old lines. Consequently they were still able to ridicule and frustrate the independent scholars, such as the Rev. Zsigmond Varga, who taught oriental languages at the University of Debrecen and dared to suggest that the Ural-Altaic languages might be related to ancient Sumerian.

In 1946 there came the Russian occupation of Hungary and once again destiny produced a situation in which a foreign power could exploit the treasures of Hungarian soil and the labor of a gifted people, for its own selfish purposes. This power is perfectly content to let the conquered Hungarians believe that they have an ancestry more primitive than that of the Indo-European peoples. In Habsburg times Hungarian children were taught that most of their civilization came from the Germans: today they are taught that their "barbaric" ancestors were civilized by the educated Slavs. Nothing else has changed. But the question remains: "Where did the Hungarians come from?"

SCYTHIA

The living tradition of the Hungarians, based on the old national chronicles, fed by centuries of legend and poetry is, that the ancestors of the Hungarians came from the East, the shores of the Black Sea, from Scythia. They were Scythians.

Now, there are in history few problems more complicated than the questions connected with Scythia and the Scythians. The name Scythian was freely given by Greek and Latin authors to a fantastic variety of peoples, the data being contradictory and quite confusing.

The official scholarly guild in Hungary, for two centuries, has urged the nation to forget about the "absurd theory" of Scythian origin. This the nation has stubbornly refused to do, in spite of the guild's maudlin complaints and sly accusations of snobbery. While the educated public has generally accepted the truths of Finno-Ugrian comparative linguistics, there has been and there is in the majority of this public an uneasy feeling that we do not know the whole truth about Hungarian origins.

There is no doubt that for awhile the ancestors of the Hungarian people lived in the legendary ancient swamps of the Maeotis — the Sea of Azov — Scythia.

This district, North of the Black Sea is certainly part of the Scythian world described by the classic authors. The same territory is also described by the early Hungarian chronicles, geographically rather exactly, as the good land, into which the mythical White Stag led the Hungarians after their original homeland "in Evilath" became overpopulated. We even have the name of that old Hungary on the Black Sea: Denumoger, which may be explained as "Magyar land on the Don mouth".

Byzantine documents corroborate the fact: this is the place, where the Hungarians lived around the middle of the first millennium. But from where did they come? How did they get there?

According to the generally accepted, handy theory, Hungarians drifted down to the Black Sea from their original home-

land in the Ural slopes. May we suggest, that the happenings were not so simple. Let us view them, beginning with the Old Stone Age.

At the dawn of humanity, after the great invention of fire, human groups populated the Eurasian continent. These adventurous Northmen of the Old Stone Age became separated from their relatives, the Southmen. The Southmen remained, dwelling comfortably on the shores of the warm seas and rivers. The Northmen faced the challenge of a changing climate and this challenge formed and developed them into adequate inhabitants of the temperate and even the cold zones.

The Northmen split again into several groups. One of them, under conditions of severe cold, developed into the classical Mongolian. Another large group, split into many sub-groups, migrated to the Americas and became the Red man. Those of the largest group, with the basic Caucasoid features, roamed all over temperate Eurasia, as hunters of the Old Stone Age.

The Caucasoids, whose bulk gravitated Westward, were the probable ancestors of the branch later called Indo-European. The other, basically related group, which fluctuated mainly between Central Europe and Central Asia, may have been ancestral to the many peoples, whom classical authors later designated as Scythian.

It seems possible that this ancestral people of the Scythian nations was the one which left in Asia and Europe the artifacts of the culture called Solutrean, about thirty-five thousand years ago. The Solutreans were specialized hunters of wild horses and an intimate connection with horsebreeding and riding was to characterize the Scythians.

For the use of the name Scythian we have the authority of the best classical authors. Herodotus, Strabo, Pliny, Curtius and others explain to us often, that, when they speak of Scythians, they mean a large group of peoples, having many individual names, but being essentially the same nation.

We must disregard here the centuries of scholarly debate about the reliability of the classical authors and the ethnic affiliations of the different Scythian peoples. Our basic assumption is, that the separation of the Caucasoid group into Indo-Europeans and Scythians happened relatively late in human history and that the earliest Scythian and the earliest Indo-European were mutually intelligible sister languages.

Admittedly, much research work is to be done, before we may see clearly into many of the problems related to the Scythian peoples. Yet, without claiming to give a definite list and merely for the practical purposes of further explorations, we will name here those we consider to be the main groups of the Scythian family.

1.) The AR, AZ, AS, SA or SU peoples, which populated mainly Asia Minor in the early Neolithic Age. These may have been the primitive farmers of the Fertile Crescent and Anatolia, perhaps even the Danube Valley. These may have given their name to Asia. Early Cretan and Cypriot cultures show affinity with their cultures. These people are mentioned in cuneiform documents; their name seems to survive in the much later names of the Uz, Osset, Jazig peoples, perhaps even in Estonian and Ostiak.

It has been suggested that the later, linguistically semiticized Assyrian contains also an ethnic element of this kind; that the AZ were in some way ancestral to Kassites and Khazars.

We may suppose that this SA population was the long sought pre-Sumerian inhabitant of Mesopotamia. Branches of this gifted people may have been responsible for great advances in Neolithic cultures of the hills in the North. Arpachiya was and advanced cultural center in the 5th and 4th millennia B.C. There were cobbled streets, buildings for some communal use and an exquisitely artistic pottery appeared. One of the SA groups may have been later even the carrier of the culture called El Ubaid, with its beautiful polychrome ceramics. After the arrival of the Sumerians proper, the SA people seem to have been pushed to the North, to the northern mountains, the part of the Sumerian world designated in cuneiform documents as Subartu. In recent literature these people are often called Subaraeans.

2.) The Sumerians.

These were a gifted and vital northern people related to the SA, but not identical with them. They were the creators of the first high civilization in Mesopotamia. This civilization was built over a melting pot of various ethnic elements in the fourth and third millennia B.C. In a long and thorough essay, Sir Leonard Woolley has demonstrated convincingly and definitively-

ly that the Sumerians alone have legitimate claim to be regarded as the inventors of writing.

The Sumerians were — this truth emerges slowly from the recent progress of archeology — the probable biological, and certainly the cultural ancestors of all the later peoples called Scythian.

Such peoples were:

a.) The Medes, one of the great peoples of antiquity, who appear after the Assyrians and before the Persians. The orientalist Jules Oppert asserted (in 1879) that they were a Turanian people. They were present not only in classic Media; Herodotos writes about Medes North of the Danube.

b.) The Dacia people (Dacians) settled between the Caspian and the Aral Seas, and from there sent groups towards Central Europe and Central Asia. Dacian rule in Central Europe was defeated by the Romans, but Dacians seem to have survived in Rumania, and in Southern Hungary too, where they are called Tatars. Early groups of the Dahae may have influenced many peoples of Asia. It is possible that they were the ancestors of the Thracians and the Turks.

c.) The Huns

Hunnic peoples, called by the Egyptians Unni, by the Chinese Hiungnu, appear also first Southwest of the Caspian Sea. From there they spread into far lands. In the West they were called Scythians. They rode East, too, until they reached the Chinese Wall. Recent Soviet excavations have shed light on the surprisingly high culture of those Huns (Scythians) who lived and buried their dead in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. in the Altai Mountains. Chinese hostility seems to have caused the Huns to return to their old homelands on the shores of the Caspian. From there they would ride towards the Danube and under Attila create an empire that would threaten Rome.

d.) The Avars

These peoples appear in history under many different names like Obors, Vars, Pars, in Roman times as Parthians. Settled on the shores of the Caspian Sea, they moved later towards the Aral Sea, where they lived between the Amu Daria (Oxus) and

the Sir Daria (Jaxartes). Their ethnic group, united with similar Scythian elements, seems to be the basis of the Chorasmanian empire, built on irrigated lands.

The Avars were great builders of fortresses and cities. Their commerce and influence reached the Uralic peoples. Alexander the Great conquered the Avar land, but soon after his death, Arsacus liberated the Avars, who under the Arsacid dynasty fought the Romans until 250 A.D., when Rome pushed them back to the Aral Sea. From there, menaced by the Kök Turks, part of the Avars moved west and in 568 settled in the Carpathian Basin. Their short-lived Danubian empire was destroyed by Charles the Great.

e.) The Turks

All Turkish peoples, Uighurs, Kök-Turks, Ottoman Turks, belong to that central group of Eurasian humanity which we are calling Scythian.

f.) The Finno-Ugrians

These are peoples, among whose languages basic relationships were established by careful research. The relationship of Hungarian with all the others is, however so distant that there is no mutual intelligibility. The westernmost of these peoples are the Finns. The eastern relatives live in present day Russia on both sides of the Ural Mountains. Herodotos mentions some of them in his list of Scythian peoples. Probably to this group belonged the extinct tchudes, of whom Russian folklore remembers as giants and great metal-workers.

We could go on enumerating other groups, which for some reason, could be regarded as members of the great Scythian community. One of the exciting problems is that of the Aramaeans, who were also called Scythians in ancient literature. Is the old name of Ireland, Aran, just fortuitously this? Do the resemblances of Celtic and Kaldai (Chaldean) as well as Scot and Scyth mean anything? Where do the Basques belong? Should the Etruscans be regarded as Scythians? It would be tempting to digress and speculate on these questions, but they must be left to future historians.

THE SCYTHIAN PROBLEM

The question we must raise and answer at this point seems to be: is it possible, is it permissible at all for an earnest seeker of truth to look for a Scythian origin of the Hungarians?

It is necessary to raise this question because for about a period of a hundred years, those who were the most interested, the students of the Hungarian schools, including this writer, were trained and conditioned systematically to reject the idea.

We can point out easily the difficulties which have for ever stood in the way of a Scythian affiliation.

The first difficulty is that modern science has been, and to a certain extent is still at a loss as to how the exact meaning of the word Scythian should be defined. Different scholars even today have different ideas about what ancient peoples should be or should not be called Scythian.

The root of the trouble is that the classic Greek and Roman authors refer to the Scythians in many instances, but they contradict each other and often tell impossible stories about Scythians. Hippocrates gives us a detailed description of the Scythian physique: if true, the Scythians were flabby, degenerate orientals. But we know that the police force of the city of Athens was Scythian; a fact that flatly disproves Hippocrates. We may believe Herodotos, that some Scythians were cannibals, or we may add this information to the category of those on other Scythian tribes being one-eyed or goat-footed. Humans in whole groups cannot be born one-eyed, or goat-footed. This we cannot believe. But what else can we or should we believe?

The problem arises: how far back in time are we entitled to use the name Scythian? At the time of the early discoveries of cuneiform texts, Rawlinson, Oppert and other orientalist spoke about the inventors of writing as Proto-scythian, Kasdo-scythian people. These names were later abandoned and Sumerian became the accepted term.

It is an unfortunate fact, that we possess extremely meager

material from the language of the classic Scythians. The paucity of this material makes linguistic speculations rather tenuous.

Modern scholarship tends to reject altogether the idea of Scythian unity and believes that it existed only as a mistaken notion in the heads of the classic writers.

Finally — scholarly opinion, urging the rejection of any theory advocating the Scythian affiliation of the Hungarians, will not fail to point out, that the early Hungarian chroniclers, describing Scythia as the homeland of the nation, did not use genuine popular tradition, but took and copied classic descriptions of Scythia. This is supposed to be proof that the tale of Scythian origin is a late invention by chroniclers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Are we guilty of uncritical credulity, when we return to the stories of the mediaeval clerics, instead of accepting the teachings of recent scholarship? We plead not guilty. The fact, that the chronicles copied classic descriptions of Scythia, does prove only that they respected classic literature. They may have added, what the authorities say of the place about which there existed in the nation a genuine tradition.

Everybody is aware of the inexactitude and unreliability of most classic authors, especially that of the father of history-writing, Herodotos. But if we have no reliable informant, we must still use the ones we have.

Let us not forget, that besides classic literature, we have a source of information on the Scythians, which is unbiased and becomes more explicit and more valuable every day. This is archaeology.

A world of new information on Scythians has come to light in the last decades. It is infinitely easier to deal with the problem for today's scholar, than it was for the scholar of fifty years ago.

Research on Scythians should recognize its debt to the archaeologists of Soviet Russia. Most of the territory on which Scythian peoples have roamed, belongs now to the immense Soviet-empire; it is natural that Russian archaeology should be active in this field. Work was done with competence and enthusiasm.

Western scholars have sometimes reproached their Russian colleagues too much enthusiasm and wishful thinking, when trying to adopt the Scythians as ancestors to Russians. To

anyone, who knows something about Scythian character and Russian character, the idea seems absurd. But we should not forget, that Scythian influences on various Slavic peoples were many and powerful; also that much Scythian ethnic material has enriched the population of Great Russia. The claim is not quite absurd.

Some important material came from the South; such are the Luristan bronzes. These came from the Iranian Kingdom.

Of the many recent discoveries related to Scythians, none is more important than that of the treasures of Ziwiye, a ruined fortress between ancient Assyria on the Tigris River and the shores of the Caspian Sea. These treasures date from about 700 B.C. and they display fully and clearly the characteristics of the typical and unmistakable Scythian art. Ziwiye art has been recognized as the earliest appearance of this style. None of the other famous Scythian treasures in Western and Central Asia, or Eastern and Central Europe have been dated to earlier times. This fact sheds light on Scythian origins; it is obviously a mistake to look for the ancestry of Scythians and their art in Central Asia. The origins of their ethnic body, as well as of their culture, are to be sought South of the Caucasian mountains, in old Mesopotamia. From there many groups migrated for a long time following the downfall of Sumer, in all directions. East of the Tigris these emigrants developed superior horsemanship and that enabled them to ride across Eurasia, between the two oceans. They carried their exquisite metal art everywhere. This feature clearly distinguishes their settlements and graves from those of neighbors who still lived in the stone age.

Incidentally, the Ziwiye artifacts are a ringing justification for the maligned Greek authors, at least in one point. Herodotus and others wrote about a Scythian homeland South of the Caucasian Mountains, from where the Scythians moved North. This statement is now proven by archaeology.

It is to be hoped that time will bring us more knowledge about Scythian writing and the Scythian language. But even without the certitude these would give us, we may proceed in dealing with a far clearer notion about Scythians than ever before.

The crux of the matter is: can we speak about a unity of Scythian peoples? The classic authors saw such a unity.

Modern scholarship has constantly worked at demolishing this image. We are told, that there is a unity of Indo-European peoples. There is another unity of Mongols. But on the territory between the two there is no unity. There is a medley of small peoples, ethnic groups, mixed up, scattered and powerless. Scythia is called often only a geographic concept.

After the image of the Scythian ethnic unity was destroyed, two similar but more recent concepts arose. One of these believed valid until recently, tried to categorize a number of peoples as Ural-Altaic. This would have put Turks and Hungarians into the same group. Recently it became fashionable to deny a relationship between the Uralic and the Altaic peoples.

Another concept was that of the Turanian unity — which was also assailed by modern scholars and very much discredited.

One may ask, was the clarification of truth about Eurasian ethnogenesis efficiently served by all these destructions? Do we see more clearly or are we more confused than educated people were at the time of Herodotus?

One may also state most respectfully, that all classifications, those of languages and peoples too, are more or less arbitrary human activities, for practical purposes. They are like filing a number of different papers into a given number of drawers. Some drawers may be filled with papers of very similar nature; in other drawers the coherence may be less. However, it is far easier to deal with the papers if they are filed somewhere.

Let us leave the question open: was the successive demolition of Scythian, Ural-Altaic, Turanian unities pure scholarly necessity — or were there some motives of a political and ethnocentric nature behind the scholarly facade? Maybe unconscious surges of instinctive nationalism — the desire of proving our own group stronger, more powerful, more important, more destined to dominate, than other groups? Who can be certain?

We like to believe, that it is not hidden vanities, but the interest of clarity and the quest of truth that are our motives, when, for practical purposes we seek to rectify distorted images and to reestablish the idea of Scythian ethnic unity,

as the classic authors, who were contemporaries, saw it. They were no fools.

It is true, we will use the name Scythian for a group that existed long before the name of Scythia was ever uttered, but the Indo-Europeans, also existed, long before Europe or India were named.

There was a Scythia and there were Scythians. There were Scythian customs, cultures, languages, which the Greeks and Romans saw as different from theirs. The tradition of Scythian ancestry is old among Hungarians and it should not be neglected as empty myth.

The way of dealing with our problem is to reconsider patiently all possible sources of early Hungarian history that may contain data pointing to "Scythia."

Such sources are the chronicles written by mediaeval Hungarian clerics, chronicles by clerics of neighboring countries, German and Russian, writings of the Byzantine emperors and their subjects, and, last but not least, descriptions by early Arabic and Persian travellers.

All statements of the written sources should be checked by the auxiliary sciences of history: archaeology, anthropology, ethnography, bio-geography. All of these are important. However, the key witness of ethnogenesis, the specific kind of historical research, which deals with the origins of the nations, remains the language.

We have stated, that there is very little linguistic material from classic Scythia. But if we accept the testimony of Ziwiyeh and the theory, that Scythian culture came mainly from Sumerian sources, we may suppose, that Scythian languages were derivatives of Sumerian. Luckily, the clay tablets of Sumer left us plenty of linguistic material.

If the Scythians were ancestors of the Hungarians, as the tradition states, and if the Scythians derived from the Sumerians, then the Sumerian language and Hungarian must be related. Is this so?

Unless a change of language can be legitimately supposed, the testimony of the language is decisive about the origins of a group. Let us call our key witness first.

THE HUNGARIAN LANGUAGE

Mezzofanti was a Roman cardinal, famous for having mastered several hundred languages; more than any other mortal. He was once asked to decide which was the best language. He admitted smiling, that he was partial to his native Italian, which he considered the most beautiful. But he added pensively, that among vehicles of human thought and emotion, a little known language, Hungarian, was the most efficient.

Hungarian is a highly evolved, agglutinative language. Morphemes of known general meaning are glued together in speech, to convey special meanings. Pliable, resilient, rich and playful, this old language shows no trace of arteriosclerosis. No pedant would dare to confine a Hungarian writer or poet to the use of the 200,000 odd words listed in dictionaries. Everybody is free to create new words, if needed, provided that they appear in the spirit of the language and are of obvious meaning. Almost every English word can be easily, clearly translated into good Hungarian.

A system of numerous prefixes makes it possible for the competent user of Hungarian to indicate by one word such nuances, which can be expressed in other languages only by lengthy circumlocation.

Hungarian is exceptionally rich in vowels and well provided with consonants. The sounds are clear and articulate. Well-spoken Hungarian is colorful and musical. It is one of the few living languages into which it is possible to translate exactly the quantitative rhythm of classic Greek and Latin poetry.

The accent, which is always on the first syllable of the word, separates distinctly the parts of speech. This is a special boon in the mechanized speech of the mass media.

Speakers of Hungarian, who are able to compare it to several other languages, will appreciate the remark of Mezzofanti. Hungarian is a great tool, not only for the orator and poet, but for the modern scholar too; a language capable of unlimited development.

Hungarian is a conservative idiom. Changes take place slowly. Early Hungarian texts, written around the XIII. and XIV. centuries are still quite understandable to the educated Hungarian ear.

Two centuries of thorough research have placed this language into the Finno-Ugrian family. Other, better known members of this family are Finns and Estonians. Besides Lapp and Samoyed, several languages spoken by small groups around the Ural Mountains belong to this family. The next relatives of Hungarian are Vogul and Ostiak. The degree of relationship between these and Hungarian may correspond to the nearness of English to Albanian. There is no mutual intelligibility but correspondences of the basic vocabularies may be established.

These correspondences were used to construct an allegedly more realistic early history of the Hungarian ancestors, instead of the "Scythian myth". Based almost exclusively on linguistic speculations, the theory was created that there was an ancestral homeland on the European side of the Middle-Ural. We are told, that there all Finno-Ugrian ancestors lived together, in a very primitive hunting, fishing and gathering economy. Then, for an unknown reason they spread; the Hungarian branch came to Hungary.

The obvious flaw in the story was, that while no other Finno-Ugrians rode, the Hungarians came to Hungary on horseback. They had clothes of silk-brocade and furs, weapons inlaid with gold and silver work. History witnesses their superior military and organisational know-how. How did the primitive gatherers acquire all this?

The original story was soon amended thus: somewhere along the way, a nomad troop of Turkish horsemen met the simple Uralians. They intermarried and the Turkish fathers taught the offspring to ride; also the vocabulary of agriculture and animal husbandry, as witnessed by a quantity of "Turkish loanwords" in Hungarian. But the basic language of the offspring remained the Finno-Ugrian of their mothers.

If it is possible to assume two parent groups for a nation, we may ask: would it be impossible to find the traces of a third, and perhaps far more important parent-group to the Hungarian language? Nations, like individuals, may have many, different ancestors.

Some scholars of the nineteenth century thought that this

would be possible. When the oldest writings of the world, written on clay tablets, began to emerge from the ruins of the Sumerian cities in Mesopotamia, the first written language of humanity was recognized by some French and English scholars as related to Hungarian.

THE SUMERIAN LANGUAGE

Modern man rediscovered slowly the records of ancient civilizations. After the dark mediaeval times, the age of the Renaissance excavated the buried treasures of Rome and Greece. The wonders of Egypt came to light in the Napoleonic era. Some decades later the mounds of Mesopotamia began to yield the clay tablets and the inscribed stones of the Assyrians. The genial German schoolteacher, Grotefend, began to decipher the cuneiform script. The science of Assyriology was born. One of the early decipherers, the keen orientalist E. Hincks, perceived soon, that this earliest writing system of humanity was not invented to write Semitic Assyrian. There must be an earlier and different language, that of the inventors of writing. Soon documents of this earlier language came to light. H.C. Rawlinson, a great British cuneiformist, called the language in 1853, "Scythian."

J. Oppert wrote in 1855, that the recently discovered syllabic language of the inventors of writing must belong to the great Uralic (Scythian or Turanian) family. In 1859 he stated that the language in question was related to Hungarian and Turkish. To these he added Finnish in 1869. Oppert suggested that the nameless language should be called Sumerian.

Another French orientalist, François Lenormant proposed the name Accadian instead of Sumerian. Later, he and other French scholars used Chaldean for quite a time to designate what is today called, by general consensus, Sumerian.

Lenormant developed the theory of Oppert and showed, on lexical and many grammatical examples, that the language in question is agglutinative and related to the Ural-Altaic languages, especially to Hungarian. In his book "Chaldean Magic," published in 1874, he showed the correspondences between old Babylonian magic and the magic of the Turanian peoples.

It is with deep respect that today's scholar must pay homage to the memory of Lenormant, who saw the truth at an early

stage and fought for it without hesitation, until the end of his short and valiant life.

The basic thesis of the pioneers, about a Scythian language in Mesopotamia, was vehemently assailed by the orientalist Joseph Halévy. With the authority of his professorship in Paris and with the passion of this Balkan origin, Halévy asserted, that no one had ever lived in ancient Mesopotamia but the Semites. Sumerians had never lived — he said. The so-called Sumerian language was only a secret, artificial language of the Semitic priests.

Halévy was an excellent debater; his thesis appealed to many. From the vast fortress of his scholarly erudition, he cast doubt on the competence of his adversaries, mocked and ridiculed them. So impressive was his performance, that German scholarship capitulated, and F. Delitzsch, who had already taught Sumerian, suspended his lectures. Old Oppert, hurt and offended, appealed his cause to posterity. The orientalist Ignace Goldzieher, commissioned by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences to report on the Sumerian controversy, reported that Halévy's victory was overwhelming: Sumerians have never lived. Lenormant, exhausted, died at 45. Halévy survived everybody, living until 90.

Time and true scholarship have proved Halévy totally wrong. But for half a century he succeeded in confusing the issue.

The excavations of the French at Telloh and the Anglo-American excavations at Ur have established, beyond doubt, the facts that Sumerian was once a living language, that there was a Sumerian people and a Sumerian culture in ancient Mesopotamia. This vindicated the main thesis of the pioneers. However, their second theory about the Scythian-Hungarian affiliation of Sumerian, went by default.

Halévy had hammered successfully at the idea of a Turanian unity. Between his false triumphs and Sir Leonard Woolley's decisive finding of the Royal Graves of Ur, a series of attempts was made to link Sumerian with almost every language-group of the world, modern and ancient. The monosyllabic nature of Sumerian makes such games possible. Scholars got tired and disgusted. A silent agreement was made: the Sumerians are nobody's ancestors; it is bad form to claim them.

A body which joined wholeheartedly in this agreement, was the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. The research of Sumerian

paternity was strictly taboo, since the time of Goldzieher's report. The concepts of "Scythian" and "Turanian" elicited sarcasm. An independent scholar, not a member of the guild, John Galgóczy did important research in the correspondences of Hungarian and Sumerian. The Academy accepted for publication, then never published his works. It seems that the manuscripts are lost.

The last Hungarian to publish similar studies was the Rev. Zsigmond Varga, professor of ancient Oriental languages, at the University of Debrecen. When he presented his thesis on the relationship of Sumerian and the Ural-Altaic languages to the Academy, he was awarded a prize for his scholarly work. Yet, at the same time, the Academy stated officially (in 1920) that Varga did not succeed in proving his thesis. The similarity of grammatical constructions — said the Academy, is not proof enough, unless supported by a sufficient quantity of lexical material, which should also be related. This Varga failed to produce — even in his book published in 1942 he mentions only 108 words.

In the following decades the whole concept of Ural-Altaic unity was to go the way of the Scythian and the Turanian. The scholars, who tried to connect Sumerian with Turkish were rejected.

With the progress of archaeology, more and more clay tablets appear in the museums of the world. Scholars work at copying and reading them; they enrich knowledge about grammar, lexical material and cultural history. But the taboo about relationships is still valid, it remains a stumbling block.

SUMERIAN AND HUNGARIAN

Every Hungarian, educated in the old school-system of Hungary must shake off, almost forcibly, the fetters of the taboo that forbade, with weird menaces, the research of Hungarian origins in the Near East. The other taboo, forbidding the search for Sumerian affiliations, must be broken also, if we want to see clearly.

Not Hungarians, but Western scholars were the first to perceive the relationship of Sumerian and Hungarian. These scholars repeatedly invited the Hungarians to participate in research. For special reasons, there was no sufficient response.

The catastrophe of World War I, a war fought on Hungarian soil and resulting in terrific losses of blood and land, was detrimental to research. So were the years of the Second World War and especially the following years. It was generally accepted, that all efforts to link Hungarian with Oriental languages were completely unsuccessful and deservedly rejected. There was no energy in people to follow up new ideas and lead a revolt. There was no interest in trying again.

It was not perceived, that behind the "No Trespassing" signs, time and the research work of distant scholars has opened a new path.

Oppert and Lenormant had operated once with only 300 Sumerian words, known at their time. Today we have in Deimel's Glossary more than 4000 Sumerian wordroots (morphemes), more or less well understood. This material is increasing.

A good look at Deimel's and other scholars more recent Sumerian material reveals a striking quantity of correspondences between Hungarian and Sumerian words. Even if we presume that half of these are fortuitous, the other half is sufficient to establish relationship. Thus, the paucity of comparable lexical material, which has bedeviled the early scholars, is automatically eliminated. Here is new evidence. On basis of this evidence, we must ask for a new reconsideration of the old tradition about the Scythian origin of the Hungarian nation.

Let us remember, that in spite of their insufficient material, the pioneering of Oppert and Lenormant has already established the relatedness of grammatical constructions in Sumerian and Hungarian. Their findings were elaborated by Varga. The main points are:

1. The body of Sumerian phonemes seems to correspond to the body of Hungarian phonemes.
2. There is in both languages an almost universal thematic harmony of the vowels, to which there are but few exceptions.
3. Both languages eliminate the accumulations of consonants.
4. Both languages are agglutinative.
5. The absence of grammatical distinction between masculine and feminine is a common characteristic.
6. There is a similarity of pronouns.
7. Clear correspondences are obvious in the declension of nouns.
8. Less obvious, but important similarities are found in the use of verbs, enumerated by Zsigmond Varga.

There are other correspondences in the phonetics and grammar of the two languages, which will be demonstrated some day, in duly documented form, when time and circumstances permit.

Here it will be more important to have a few samples of the correspondences between Sumerian words and Hungarian words.

Some Sumerian words, known from the cuneiform texts of the clay tablets, sound exactly or almost exactly like Hungarian words for the same, or related concepts.

Such are:

SUMERIAN	HUNGARIAN
UR guard, protect, warrior, man, husband, strong, powerful	UR gentleman, lord, husband
ISTEN one, the only one	ISTEN God
NAP sun god	NAP sun
HUD to shine	HÓD (prov.) moon
ZALAG bright	CSILLAG star
AMA or EME mother	ANYA mother
ADDA father	ATYA father

SUMERIAN

NIN lady, priestess, sister
USSA younger brother
ES eats
SIL cuts
HUN reposes

HUNGARIAN

NÉN aunt, older sister
ÖCCS younger brother
ESZ eats
SZEL cuts
HUNY sleeps

The exceptional conservatism of the Scythian nations may explain the exceptional number of Sumerian words which have survived in Hungarian, practically unchanged for millennia. Yet, we must realize that in the course of this very long time, which is longer than the time span separating Latin from its daughter-languages, or old Anglo-Saxon from modern English — the bulk of the language underwent greater changes. If a Sumerian from the third millennium B.C. came to visit us, few Hungarians could attempt to converse with him. The words have changed; sometimes every sound of the word is different. Yet it is possible to trace the correspondence, because certain patterns of phonetic changes emerge. These changes are in a way similar to those known from the Indo-European languages. There, Latin P changes into English F: **pater** into **father**. The basic difference, is that in the Indo-European languages the change is general and total. One phonetic pattern is shed altogether and another one is adopted, with the regularity of the beech-tree shedding all its leaves in the fall and growing a new foliage the next year.

The biology of the evergreen palm-tree differs from that of the beech tree. The palm does not shed its old leaves when she grows new ones. Old and new coexist — but they are put to different uses in Hungarian.

We must not forget, that, while Sumerian was the language of humanity's first high civilization, it was still an archaic language of a few thousand words. To be an adequate language of the space-age, Hungarian had to evolve an immensely richer vocabulary. This happened by using the phonetically older wordform to express some slightly different idea from the one expressed in the new form. Large families of Hungarian words can be traced back to a single, simple, monosyllabic Sumerian ancestor. For example:

GAM in Sumerian means the basic idea of bending, something bent. Almost unchanged correspondence of this word

in Hungarian GAMÓ, a somewhat archaic and provincial word for a hooklike wooden tool, used to gather ears of wheat. The same word is used in another, provincial dialect for crutch. GAMÓS in the archaic Ormányság dialect of Hungarian, means the crooked staff of the shepherd. In Transsylvania GÁMOR means a fence. GÁNDZ is also archaic for harpoon. GÁNCS means a knot in lumber, it also means an impediment; the extending of a foot to make an adversary trip, thwarting, finding fault. GANCZOL is another provincial word for the verb "to curl".

Up to now the basic G of the Sumerian word remained unchanged. But we will find other words in Hungarian obviously belonging to the same family of ideas, beginning with the sound K:

KAMÓ hook; KAMPÓ crook; KAJMÓ bent tool; KAMPÓS hooky, curved, crooked, bent; KANYAR curve, bend (of river); KANYARGÓ winding, sinuous, tortuous; KANYARIT scrawls; KANYAROG winds, curves; KAJLA crumpled; KAJMÓS crooked; KAJSZA curling, bent.

According to Grimm's laws of phoenetic change, G changes to K and K changes in time to H. We may look for and indeed we may find in Hungarian a family of words, beginning with the phoneme HA and expressing different nuances of the idea bend: HaJLIK bends, bows; HAJLIT causes to bend; HAJLÁS inclination; HAJLAM propensity; HAJLÉKONY flexible; HAJLOTT bent, old; HOMLOK brow; HÓN axilla; HOMORU concave; HOMPOS rugged, uneven (ground).

This is still not the end. On the last rung of the phonetic evolution we may find the sibilant CS, in words like CSOMÓ, knot.

Without having totally exhausted this family of words, let us look at another one. Let us select the ancestor of a phonetic family, the Sumerian verb SAB, cut, hit, throw. The sound written with a simple S in English, as in transliterated Sumerian, is identical with the sound expressed in Hungarian writing with the double letters SZ. Sumerian SAB not only corresponds to Hungarian SZAB, cuts, but is, in every sound identical with it. The basic word has a host of derivatives in Hungarian, like SZABÁS shape, pattern, form; SZABÓ tailor; SZABLYA sword; SZABÁLYOS exact. All these are common and often used words in Hungarian. But the sibilant sound S

of the Sumerian does not always remain unchanged in Hungarian. It has a strong tendency to evolve into another sibilant, written as CS and pronounced like the CH in the English word China. Now, peacefully coexisting with the derivatives beginning with the original S sound, we find a number of others, beginning with CS.

From the Sumerian SAB 'cuts, hits, throws', comes Hungarian CSAP, 'throws, flings, hurls, casts, strikes, hits'. It seems that the derivatives beginning with S undertook to carry primarily the meaning "cuts," while those beginning with CS express rather the concept of hitting, throwing, but not exclusively. CSAPÓ, fuller; CSAPÁS, blow, misfortune; CSAP, cut, branch; CSAPA trail (of game); CSAPAT, team, troop; CSAPZOTT, drenched; CSAPDA, trap; are a few of the many derivatives of this family; pages of Hungarian dictionaries are teeming with them. Meanings may be distant, but it is usually easy to see the way in which the new words branched off from the basic meaning.

In my book "Sumerian Affiliations," I described the patterns of phonetic changes from Sumerian to Hungarian. Since writing that book I have accumulated new data I hope to be able to publish in the future. However the details would be tedious for most readers of this sketch.

So, just in order to demonstrate that there is no scarcity in comparable lexical material, I will present two more word lists. The first one illustrates the change D=T, from Sumerian to Hungarian.

SUMERIAN

DAL vessel
DAM spouse
DAR splits open
DAR splits, explodes
DAG add, increase
DAB double, increase
DADARA dress
DAN to be bright, free,
enlightened

HUNGARIAN

TÁL dish
TÁM help, prop
TÁR opens
TÁR (archaic) ulcer
TÁG wide
TÁP food
TAKAROS well dressed
TAN teaching
TANIT teaches
TANITÓ teacher
TANÁCS advice, counsel, council
TANU witness

SUMERIAN

DAB to catch, hold

HUNGARIAN

TANULÓ student
 TANUL learns
 TANULT learned
 TANULMÁNY essay, study
 TANULATLAN uneducated
 TAPINT touches
 TAPAD sticks
 TAPASZ plaster, putty
 TAPASZT sticks, fastens
 TAPASZTAL experiences
 TAOGAT feels, fingers
 TAPINTAT touch, tact
 TAPOD tramples (on)
 TAOGATÓ tentacle, feeler
 TAPOS tread on
 TAPOSÓ treader, trampler
 TAPS applause
 TAPODAT step
 TAPPANCS animal foot, paw
 TAPLÓ tinder (catches the spark)
 TAPPOGTAT rides a horse
 TAPÁSZKODIK gets on his feet
 TEP tears, plucks, picks
 TEPIKE small foot (of young duck)
 TEPER tramples
 TEPERTŐ scraps, pressed-out lard
 TIPEG steps lightly
 TIPEGÉS pattering
 TIPAR (arch) tears out
 TIPOR tramples
 TIPPANÓS clammy (mud, bread,
 or hand)
 TOP foot (of goose)
 TOPA clubfooted
 TOPÁN shoe
 TOPPANT stamps the feet
 TOPOG goes to and fro
 TOPORZÉKOL stamps, rages
 TOPPAN arrives unexpectedly

SUMERIAN

De-(izi) fire
 DIM binds, shuts
 DIMGUL stake, pole
 DINGIR divine
 DINGIR divine
 DUDU, cranium
 DES numeral unit
 DIR sick, disturbed
 DIMMENA mound of earth

DUG vessel

DUN species of ox
 DIKUD sentence
 DU opens, penetrates, wedge
 DIL perfect, full
 DURUN to dwell, dwelling
 DUR bond, connection

DAR food offering for the dead

DUK container, vessel
 DAL to fly
 DU hole
 DAL remove
 DUGGAN leather bag

DAL be far away
 DUL yoke
 DUN digs the earth like a pig
 DURDUR inhabit, bond

To illustrate the need for searching soon for these correspondences of Sumerian words with rare words of the archaic Hungarian which hide in provincial pockets, may I quote a last correspondence in this series of words. When I have read in Gadd's "Sumerian Reading Book" the word DIM^a—MA "esp. in

HUNGARIAN

TÜZ fire
 TÖM stuffs, fills, encloses
 TENGELY axis
 TÜNDEr fairy
 TENGER sea
 TETŐ top, roof
 TIZ ten
 TÖRÉS epilepsy
 TÖMÉN (prov.) clay chair, to milk
 sheep on
 TÖK gourd
 TEKNŐ trough
 TINÓ young ox
 TEHÁT consequently
 TŰ needle
 TELI full
 TORONY tower
 TOROK throat
 TORNÁC porch
 TOR wake, feast in honor of a
 dead person
 TOK case, sheath
 TOLL feather
 TÓ lake
 TOL pushes
 TOKÁNY dried meat, military
 ration, carried in leather bags.
 TŰL over, across
 TULOK young ox
 TŰR digs, said of the pig
 TÁTRA the northern frontier
 mountains of historical Hun-
 gary (Their old name was
 TURTUR.)

the sense of skilful work; said of a spinning woman," I remembered a rare Hungarian word I have met only once in my life: TÊMŐ. But I remember my source exactly. It was in the winter of 1942, at the small Transylvanian village of Nyárad-Szent-László that Mrs. Anna Ugron spoke about finding for a project of conserving folk-art, some good TÊMŐS women. She explained to me that the expression meant skill and productiveness in spinning and weaving. She herself was an expert weaver — the word was part of her Sumerian heritage — a treasury which humanity may lose soon if we do not attend to its preservation.

The following word-list illustrates the phonetic change from Sumerian S to the sound written in Hungarian with CS.

SUMERIAN	HUNGARIAN
SAKU high	CSAKÓ high hat
SABU road, way	CSAPÁS track, trail
SUB to throw	CSAP throws, hits, cuts
SAP army	CSAPAT group, troupe
SUKRA a tool	CSÁKLYA hook, pick-axe
SAB to cut down	CSAP cut branch of tree
SA net	CSÁTÉ water plant used for weaving
SU-UB bend	CSAVAR twists
SILIG hand	CSELEKSZIK does, acts
SUM broken	CSEMPE broken
SABIKU hat	CSEPESZ headwear of the married woman
SAAR luxuriant growth	CSERE forest
SURIM stall	CSERÉNY hurdle, pen
SEIB brick	CSERÉP ceramic, pottery
SIKA pot, dish	CSÉSZE saucer
SA-GAZ killer, robber	CSIKASZ hungry wolf
SERRA (—ag) to light up	CSILLAG star
SAL to shine	CSILLOG shines, sparkles
SULU to bring up	CSILLE miner's truck, lorry
SEN clean, shiny	CSIN neatness
SIB to touch	CSIP pinches
SI-IP lace	CSIPKE lace
SEPU leg	CSIPŐ hip
SID to calm down	CSEND silence

SUMERIAN

SAB pot, vessel
SUHUR bouquet
SEDU flood
SUG interest to be paid
SAKAN ass
SUSI summit, angle

SUB to let fall into ruin
SUHUR hair
SA-GA to close in
SU-GA fisher
SUN old
SUBA clean, clear
SUM onion, bulb

SEMBIRIDA a spice plant

SUN to break, separate, ruin
SAR totality, mass
SUR flow, drip
SUDULU to cover

SE barley, corn
SUBUR earth
SABURA vessel
SUR to crawl
SUTUG kind of reed
SUU a sickness of the joints
SAG low
SILIG hand
SURU stable, barn

It should be emphasized that the two word lists are mere samples. A whole row of phonetic changes in fixed patterns may be illustrated with similar lists. The vast majority of the Hungarian vocabulary goes back to Sumerian roots; the question of the alleged Turkish and Slavic loanwords has to be reconsidered. The Turks inherited their words from the same source as the Hungarians — the Slavs borrowed these words from the great Scythian cultures.

HUNGARIAN

CSOBOLYÓ vessel
CSOKOR bouquet
CSÖDÜL flocks, comes in mass
CSÖK fine to be paid
CSÖKÖNYÖS stubborn
CSÚCS summit, peak, top,
pointed end
CSÚF ugly, deformed
CSUHÉ husk, hair of corn
CSUK closes
CSUKA pike (a fish that eats fish)
CSÚNYA ugly
CSUPA clean, clear
CSOMÓ knot, gnarl
CSOMA bubonic plague
CSOMBORD spice
(Satureia Hortensis L)
CSONKA crippled
CSORDA herd
CSUROG flows, drips
CSÓTÁR shabrack, covering for
horses
CSŐ ear (of corn)
CSÖBÖR earthenware vessel
CSUPOR vessel
CSÚSZ crawls
CSUTAK stump of cut reed
CSÜZ rheumatism
CSÜGG hangs
CSÜLÖK pig's foot
CSÜR barn, shed