

## ON THE IDEA OF SUMERO – HUNGARIAN LINGUISTIC AFFILIATION

Critical Notes on a Pseudo-Scholarly Phenomenon

by

GÉZA KOMORÓCZY

Let me start this article<sup>1</sup> by relating an apparently irrelevant but, in fact, very characteristic little story. In winter, 1973 I had some prescriptions written by our GP. Incidentally, he was substituted by an elderly, pensioned colleague of his. When filling in the heading of the recipe and learning that I worked at the Ancient History Department of the Budapest University he put down his pen and set out telling, with enthusiasm, about a fascinating book, which, as he put it, was quite certain to basically revalue our "Hungarian consciousness" and, obviously, I should professionally feel concerned about it. His "book review" lasted more than half an hour with the rest of patients waiting outside. Eventually the assistant managed to interrupt him. The book so warmly recommended was that of Ferenc Badiny Jós.<sup>2</sup>

This minor incident, I guess, is characteristic enough. There is no escaping the fans of Sumero-Hungarian affinity in our everyday life. Among the believers there are many older people, pensioners, to be found, but their ranks are not exclusively recruited from the latter group; the idea seems to attract younger generations as well – let me tell no more stories now to prove it. Finally, these doctrines appear to be most widespread in this country among doctors, the technical intelligentsia and teachers.

When did these ideas start to gain ground? Apparently no one can serve up with exact dates but their spreading was, and still is, taking place in front of our very eyes. Thus mentioning but a few facts is enough to serve as a chronological scale of our everyday experience and memories. It was an unforgivable blunder of the Kossuth Publishing House to take the initiative – unsuspectingly – in publishing an excerpt of Ida Bobula's book<sup>3</sup> as a sensational piece of reading in 1964.<sup>4</sup> Aladár Dobrovits (the late Professor for the History of Ancient Orient at the Budapest University) wrote a letter of protest to the editor; the answer, a self-critical letter, was of no help whatsoever.<sup>5</sup> Our popular scientific weekly, *Élet és Tudomány*, issued an article of Andor Schedel, also in 1964, on the oldest numerals, which he thought to be of common origin with the Hungarian ones.<sup>6</sup> In 1965 the daily newspaper *Nógrád* published an

announcement of János Belitzky<sup>7</sup> an archivist and historian of good name, and later on, a more extensive study of his, in two parts, was published by the journal *Palócföld*, a literary and art anthology.<sup>8</sup> In these two publications he related a considerable part of toponyms of Europe to Hungarian vocables. This he did, not as a follower of Bobula, still he was pursuing the same line.

Formerly, there had been but a few "Sumero-Hungarological" works published by the Hungarian press, but these, like László Pass' article on the word *abrakadabra* – incidentally, it was published by a Church periodical<sup>9</sup> –, passed as curiosities.

A few years later, however, there emerged a flood of hints and references infiltrating popular press-publications. Ferenc Maron, who kept on – till his death – feeding the bell purse of archeological dilettantism with his knowledge-farthings of foreign origin, discovered an old Sumerian word in a toponym of Adorjánháza, a village in the country of Veszprém.<sup>10</sup> Sándor Török, in the literary supplement of the daily *Népszava* called "Szép Szó" made excerpts – with zeal befitting a better cause – in a series on Ancient History, from the original homeland theories<sup>11</sup> of "Sumero-Hungarologists" without specifying his sources, and not even mentioning Sumerians, for reasons of apparent restraint, of course. I hit upon these two examples at random, however, I have got several others in my collection.

The chronology is utterly unambiguous: the upsurge of tracing Sumero-Hungarian affinities dates back to the mid-nineteen-sixties. The movement unfolded in the circles of Hungarian emigrants in the West half a decade or so earlier. Its precursors, whose name hallmarks the majority of the publications, emigrated during and after the Second World War, but their ideas had practically no echoes among their fellow-emigrants in the course of the first 15 years.

The medium which got imbued with and became a mouthpiece of the idea of the Sumero-Hungarian affinity eventually "got abroad" as late as 1956–67.

I have not specially researched the rich *Hungarica* collection of the National Széchényi Library, whose relevant parts are classified materials, but the publications which I hit upon, more or less at random, still make generalizations possible – and, in due course, I am going to refer to them.

The new wave of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation was started by Ida Bobula's first (mimeographed) book in English.<sup>12</sup> This work has gone completely unnoticed in Hungary. Indirect data seem to suggest that it was not enthusiastically welcomed by the Hungarian emigrants in the West, either.<sup>13</sup> As to the attitude of the professionals in this field, there is nothing more characteristic than the fact that there were only two book-reviews dealing with it. One, from the pen of Maurice Lambert,<sup>14</sup> an eminent French Sumerologist, was of a coolly reserved character; the



other, by the excellent linguist János Lotz,<sup>15</sup> was a devastating critique. Following this, Bobula published several minor papers in mainly short-lived emigrant dailies and periodicals,<sup>16</sup> some of them in English.<sup>17</sup> Her studies were later compiled into a book in Hungarian by Ferenc Jós, who subsequently used the name Ferenc Badiny Jós. He was commissioned by the Sumero-Hungarian Scientific Society chaired by Count István Károlyi in Buenos Aires.<sup>18</sup> This book, in due course, became popular both with the Hungarian emigrants in the West and with Hungarians at home. In the wake of Bobula's activities the literature of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation started proliferating. The first advocates of the cause Kálmán Gosztonyi,<sup>19</sup> Zsuzsanna Kovács, Mrs. Teleki<sup>20</sup> and others dealt only with details. Later, however, comprehensive studies came out on leaflets,<sup>21</sup> in thin booklets, both printed and mimeographed. Out they came also in leatherbound bulky volume printed on India paper and also in book series of several volumes. Let me mention but a few authors: Béla Kézdy Vásárhelyi de Kézd,<sup>22</sup> Victor Padányi,<sup>23</sup> Ferenc Badiny Jós,<sup>24</sup> Sándor Gallus,<sup>25</sup> László Rimanóczy,<sup>26</sup> Sándor Nagy,<sup>27</sup> Tibor Baráth,<sup>28</sup> Juan Móricz,<sup>29</sup> Sándor Csőke,<sup>30</sup> etc. A relatively large number of their works kept flowing into Hungary, as well, and met with a rather rapid and lively response.

And if we want to take a cursory look at the foreign centres of Sumero-Hungarian affiliation, we have to be well aware of the fact that all what we say about centres, organs and persons is by all means highly deficient and has but a temporary validity. The part of the Hungarian emigrants in the West advocating this doctrine could not throw out roots in the spiritual soil of their new country, therefore their position — at the same time their odds concerning publication — are incessantly changing.<sup>31</sup>

The most significant centres are to be found on the American Continent today. The periodical Szittyakürt remembering the nationalist movement even with its title (Skythian Horn) appears in North America; this periodical deals with "Sumero-Hungarology" only here and there, but then very sharply and politically. Tibor Baráth and his circle work in Canada. In the United States Jenő Mátyás Fehér is engaged in publishing books; his first Publishing House bore the name Gilgamesh, which published a series entitled *Studia Sumiro-Hungarica*; on other publications of his we can see the mark of Turul — mythical falcon of ancient Hungarians — Publishing House and the title *Sumero-Hungarian Studies*. He also has a role in publishing a periodical called *Magyar Történelmi Szemle*. The periodical *Sumir Híradó*. *Magyar Newsletter* (mimeographed) is edited by György Zászlós — Zsóka. A puli. The puli, a periodical for the American Hungarian puli-breeders, also comes out in the United States with Sumero-Hungarian dogs barking on its pages. The "Sumero-Hungarologists" of South America mostly gathered in Buenos Aires. Among the trade-marks of the publications belonging to the circle of Sumero-Hungarian scientific Society we can find the following titles, varying with almost every book: Editor Esda, Editorial Transylvania, Turáni

Akadémia, Magyar Őskutatás (Searching Hungarian Ancestors), etc. Ferenc Badiny Jós is working here as professor of the Jesuite University. Recently he has become the international standard-bearer of the movement. There was even a time when he advertised a correspondence doctorate in Sumerology for "far-away" students. Later he issued a book-by-pages series (photoprinted) which was a kind of a "Teach yourself easy Sumerian", also available at his consignatory in Hungary for six forints a page.

We have but scarce data from Europe. In Paris there were some "Sumero-Hungarologists" attending the linguistic and philological lectures of French Sumerologists but to no palpable scientific avail. The *Ahogy Lehet*, a mimeographed periodical, published some "Sumero-Hungarological" papers. A series called *Északi Vártán* (On the Northern Sentry) appears in Sweden. It also issues publications. The works of some European "Sumero-Hungarologists" are self-edited or published by major centers.

In Sydney, Australia, the *Magyar Mult. Hungarian Past* — a mimeographed periodical with articles in Hungarian and English — appears, published by the Magyar Történelmi Társulat (Hungarian Historical Society) and edited by Sándor Gallus *et al.*

I must emphatically point out that "Sumero-Hungarology" can by no means be considered the unanimous opinion of Hungarians abroad. If we forgot this, the very nature of the phenomenon would remain shrouded from us. In the articles of periodicals, forewords of books, there is a complaining, reprimanding, accusing tone to be perceived which condemns the indifference and animosity of fellow-emigrants. Regarding this from Hungary, it seems to indicate that the advocates of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation are in minority also abroad. There are several indications showing that the most significant thinkers of the Hungarian emigrants in the West, who serve the cause of universal culture of mankind in their new fatherland, keep aloof from the hotch-potch of "Sumero-Hungarology". The *Magyar Műhely* (Paris) has never issued positive articles on this subject. Notwithstanding their political standpoints, a number of emigrant-periodicals reject the idea of "Sumero-Hungarian" linguistic affiliation. Not only excellent specialists, like all Hungarian-born scholars in cuneiform studies, keep away from it but also other progressive-minded personalities of Hungarian intellectual life abroad, like writers, historians, and philosophers, as well. Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation is the cause of a handful of Hungarian emigrants in the West.

The base of "Sumero-Hungarology" was organized in Hungary self on two levels: one was formed by study-writers — let us call them this way —, the other was formed by letter-writers. Naturally, we cannot speak about organizations, only about personal contacts. The coherence manifests itself mainly in quoting each others' unpublished manuscripts.

At first the study-writers were seeking to place their manuscripts with the publishing houses; it was in this way that I had the chance of



observe "Sumero-Hungarology" stir, while supervising manuscripts which were sent to me by the Editorial Offices of Gondolat (the publishing house for popular sciences), of Corvina Press, and of *Élet és Tudomány* (a weekly for popular sciences). The publishing houses, commendably enough, resisted this siege. Thereafter the study-writers started to knock on the doors of our big academic libraries. The unpublished papers would be deposited at the Archive of manuscripts of the National Széchényi Library, the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, at the Grand Library of the Debrecen Calvinist Theological Academy; these collections keep dozens of papers of this kind by favour of their authors. In the course of years the "Sumero-Hungarologist" study-writers took up the strange habit of citing each others' papers referring to the catalogue number of the library, despite the fact that the manuscripts were circulated in many copies, thus indicating that the papers in question were not merely manuscripts: they were opera open for the public. When even the libraries rejected them, a strange kind of Hungarian "Samizdat" cropped up, which, in this country, means manuscripts mimeographed, rotaprinted or Xeroxed. These are rendered booklike by the technology of multiplication and the look of the cover. Let me mention but a few names from among the more prolific authors in Hungary: László Pass,<sup>32</sup> Andor Schedel,<sup>33</sup> Árpád Orbán,<sup>34</sup> Elemér Novotny,<sup>35</sup> András Zakar.<sup>36</sup> Towards the end of the 1960s they came up with a new practice. Some authors of "Sumero-Hungarology", dissatisfied with the facilities of publication open for them so far, placed their papers with the forums of the Hungarian emigration in the West. Some papers of András Zakar<sup>37</sup> have come out in this way.

The other group, that of the letter-writers, consisted of followers, sympathizers and of those interested, viz. of the ones who had the time and energy only to write letters but not the stamina to prepare the manuscript of a paper. These "Sumero-Hungarologists" flooded the institutions of our academic life with their letters, their main targets being the organs of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Linguistics, the Institute of History and the respective departments of the Eötvös Loránd University. Their targets sometimes included even foreign specialists whose names were well-known also here through their popular books on Mesopotamia (e. g. S. N. Kramer, L. Jakob-Rost, I. M. Diakonoff). Groping for connections they happened to take a journalist, in account of his popularizing book on the Sumerians, for an expert on Sumerology (V. Zamarovský). The lengthy letters, teeming with references, have never formally been assertive, they have merely "asked questions" pretending to be impartially curious and, what is more, naive. Their "questions" however, were meant to charm the addressess by the idea of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation, which, as they put it, "has already acknowledged" abroad. This "correspondence literature", the multiplied specimens of which were passed from hand to hand, was a special kind of forum for publication, after all.

The criticism of recent Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation started slowly, but it was to become more and more vigorous. László Zsürger's sarcastic but well-informed article,<sup>38</sup> wielding serious arguments, made it clear for the Hungarian public, as well, that the false and adventurous theory of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation is not unanimously backed by the Hungarian emigration, either.

From among the prominent figures of Hungarian scholarship it was Péter Hajdú<sup>39</sup> to release the first article. His studies not only contain a clear factual refutation but they also offer a striking diagnosis of this phenomenon, which seems to be a kind of emigration psychosis. János Gulya<sup>40</sup> was willing to argue only in a lecture at first, later on, however, he elaborated his views in writing, too<sup>41</sup>. László Papp<sup>42</sup> issued an extensive and thorough pamphlet. P(ál) E. F(ehér)<sup>43</sup> informed the large masses of reading public, on the columns of *Népszabadság*, and so did Péter Ruffy<sup>44</sup> in an effective and evocative linguistic series on the columns of *Magyar Nemzet*. László Papp<sup>45</sup> did the same in another article of his. Some articles — mostly on other subjects — of the famous Hungarian writer, Tibor Cseres,<sup>46</sup> who has a flair for clarifying uncertainties and is a man of sound judgement, spoke about Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation as a phantasm, have performed their good offices. Antal Bartha's firm — though non-polemic — stand<sup>47</sup> concerning issues of our prehistory has taught a good lesson. The light, satiric sketch of Endre Bajomi Lázár proved to be a murderous criticism in fact.<sup>48</sup> The archeologist Csanád Bálint<sup>49</sup> has written a witty archeological essay abounding with factual arguments. Géza Bethlenfalvy<sup>50</sup> has unmasked the falsifications of "Sumero-Hungarologists" in the field of the history of science; László Mátrai<sup>51</sup> has given an insight into the haze of scientific myths; Gyula Ortutay<sup>52</sup> has tried to divert the attention of the Hungarian emigration from the romantic ideas, naive affiliation theories and to draw it to genuine tasks. Gyula László, the most influential personality of the research in Hungarian prehistory, has made his subtle points in an article on "primitive-homeland-seeking", in which he proved to be undersanding in many respects, but also critical of anything false, of dilettantism in prehistory, e.g., and of lies staining prominent figures of this field of research.<sup>53</sup> István Fodor,<sup>54</sup> starting from the results of archeology, has criticised the views about prehistory of "Sumero-Hungarology". I myself, in two short newspaper interviews, have tried to throw light upon disputed questions from the side of Sumerology.<sup>55</sup> Recently Antal Lúcei has briefly summed up the history of the debates in this field.<sup>56</sup>

Not long ago two highly respected figures of Hungarian linguistics have had their say. In Rumania Attila Szabó T. has termed Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation to be a "cloudtrotting" fancy.<sup>57</sup> In Hungary Géza Bárczi<sup>58</sup> has used the irrefutable arguments of language-history and those of etymology. Their stands are not only valuable in themselves, but also because their far-reaching word might have an echo even among those not moved by arguments of others.



There have been animadversions of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation on behalf of foreign specialist groups. I have already mentioned two criticisms (see above). H. W. F. Saggs has had pithy comments on the question in his work on cultural history:

"There are persistent attempts to find Sumerian words in unlikely places, particularly at the present time in Hungarian, but these may be ignored as always resting on an inadequate knowledge of Sumerian and generally on a faulty understanding of the historical development of the language compared with it."<sup>59</sup>

Tamás von Bogyai's detailed and, in all respects, rebuffing criticism has also thrown light upon the ideological background of "Sumero-Hungarology".<sup>60</sup>

The American periodical *Current Anthropology* tabled the Sumero-Hungarian theses of András Zakar to be discussed in 1969–71.<sup>61</sup> From among the specialists dealing with the languages of Ancient Mesopotamia A. Leo Oppenheim and Miguel Civil have had their say.<sup>62</sup> Both of them have rejected the theses. Beyond this, Oppenheim has also unequivocally pointed out that, neither Zakar nor the Hungarian authors referred to are in command of even an elementary Sumerian and thus their orientation towards the Sumerian language can be accounted for by "ethnic pride and assertiveness released for political motives". Not much later one of the outstanding authorities in Turkology, Sir Gerald Clausen also voiced his opinion giving no chance whatsoever to the Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation.<sup>63</sup>

By now the problem has become even more complex. We can touch upon but a few factors here. One of these is the situation that has come about in Rumania. It is true that the Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation has aroused strong enthusiasm among certain strata of the Transylvanian Hungarian intelligentsia and that, the Transylvanian Hungarian press has provided a much more extensive publicity for the subject than the Hungarian press in Hungary. A manuscript dated 1967 — a probably pseudonymous letter by a certain József Verrasztó<sup>64</sup> — was only to sum up the views of the "Sumero-Hungarologists" in the West. By all certainty, the paper circulated mostly in Hungary.

When the pictographic tablets of Tártária (formerly Alsótárlak, a small Transylvanian village) became well-known, a special tone of the Transylvanian standpoints was to be perceived. István Szócs, a journalist in Cluj, who wields his pen also for worthy causes, ferociously defended the theory of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation on the columns of *Korunk*.<sup>65</sup> He, of course, left the fact unsaid that all his arguments came from the papers of foreign "Sumero-Hungarologists". Incidentally, he himself has not got the necessary erudition, viz. expertise in Sumerology to be able to judge the value and weight of the "proofs". However, it is not the article of Szócs that characterizes the attitude of the public opinion there, rather, the writing — an otherwise flawlessly informed

one — from the pen of the Ancient History professor of the Babeş-Bolyai University appearing in the same issue of *Korunk*:<sup>66</sup> András Bodor went so far in tolerating Szócs's absurd assertions and his even more telling implications that his cautious reservedness was not simply suggestive of a pundit's virtue but of the apparent presence of large numbers of followers in the background. In other articles of his, Szócs went so far in being uncritical that he even dared to comment upon questions of Sumerian etymology.<sup>67</sup>

Anyhow, there is no doubt that the Transylvanian popularity of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation is quite closely connected to the obstinately official character of the Daco-Rumanian continuity theory, which is probably no less unproved.

I am trying to illustrate the competence of cultivating the "Sumerian heritage" by resorting myself to only one example. The relief of an excellent Hungarian artist Jenő Szervátiusz (*Gilgames*, wood, 1970)<sup>68</sup> has worked out a Mesopotamian theme entitled "Enkidu and the Ishtar-priestess" in a well-recognizably Egyptian, or rather, Egyptianizing style, and has written inscriptions with the symbols of Hungarian runic writing.<sup>69</sup>

One can sometimes meet with explicitly amusing mistakes among the proofs — all of them fictitious, of course — backing the Transylvanian continuity of the Sumerians. One of the ardent and, in fact, skilful collector of the antiquities of Csík (a county in Transylvania) has long been writing and talking about Chaldean priests carrying on missionary activities in Transylvania as late as the turn of the century. They were persecuted by the authorities because of their subversive activities.<sup>70</sup> These Chaldeans, however, were neither the descendants of the population of South Mesopotamia about 1000 B. C., nor were those of the astrologers of Hellenism and the Roman Age. They were quite simply, priests, belonging to one of the branches of Syrian Christianity (viz., the eastern Nestorian Church) who, fleeing the Turkish religious persecutions, got round all over the Balkans. Their Church had long named itself Chaldean after the Mesopotamian Bishopric see of the Sassanian Empire.<sup>71</sup>

There has emerged another aspect of the picture nowadays, in my opinion. It is that the dissemination of the ideas of the Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation appears to be assuming more and more aggressive features. Some recent academic events seem to have encouraged, as it were, the "Sumero-Hungarologists". In 1972, at the Second International Congress of Hungarian Linguists at Szeged, Árpád Orbán was allowed to hold his lecture entitled "The Simultaneous Employment of the Presently Used Double Etymological System (sic!) is Unscholarly". True as it is, his performance has become the laughing stock of the public and, in his fine contribution, Péter Hajdú has not failed to give the prover answer to his theses. In the autumn of 1973 Orbán held yet another lecture at the Conference on Hungarian prehistory organized by the Kőrösi Csoma Society. This contribution of his again proved to be scandalous. The scandal, however, is remembered by the eyewitnesses only, while the "Sumero-



Hungarologist" propaganda has had a good pretext now to claim that they have put forth their ideas for the academic public. The very fact is enough for those far from research itself to bestow the respect due to science in Hungary upon "Sumero-Hungarology", as well.

This conclusion is by no means a phantasm. In 1973, at the XXIXth International Congress of Orientalists in Paris, Ferenc Badiny Jós and a handful of his followers held lectures enlarging upon the full identity of Sumerian and Hungarian.<sup>72</sup> It is well known that the monstrous scientific congresses of our days are not suitable for thrashing out lectures; and so it happened in Paris, too. The performance of the "Sumero-Hungarologists" was met with sober and factual rejection, and also with derision and boos. They turned out to have only one sympathizer, he, however, was busy working on something similar, to all appearances, viz. on the elaboration of some Sumero-German linguistic affiliation.<sup>73</sup> The participants of the session, whom I was able to consult personally later<sup>74</sup>, considered the thesis of Badiny Jós unscholarly.

After all this, in the autumn of 1973 a multiplied pamphlet<sup>75</sup> was circulated in Hungary, in which Badiny Jós triumphed: "Victory!... Victory!... the truth about the origin of Hungarians flies high in the sky... No arguments remaining... No scientific refutation... No counter-evidence"; then he goes on accusing the "terror in Hungarian academic life", as well, saying that "all they (namely the representatives of the «terror») preach and teach about Hungariandom is a lie and is only to be maintained by police force", etc.<sup>76</sup>

In the Hungarian intellectual life of the past decade the impact of "Sumero-Hungarology" was to be noticed also in spheres which are not under the influence of these views. Let me mention but one example again, quoting one of our most prominent literary personalities Gyula Illyés, when reshaping his Petőfi biography of classic value for the French public, extended the first period-depicting chapter with the following words: "in that year . . . the origins of the Hungarian people were shrouded in complete obscurity for the public. Scholars either regarded us as descended from the Sumerians — true as it is, a large number of the few extant Sumerian words sound remarkably familiar to Hungarian ears —, or related us to the Basques or Japanese . . ." <sup>77</sup> It is obvious that Illyés, pointing out false tracks of linguistic research for our ancestors in his words quoted, is also in the wrong concerning Sumerian. In the year of Petőfi's birth (1823) the Sumerian language was completely unknown, and the name of the Sumerian people likewise. Although in those days they were talking about our "Scythian origins", as did István Horvát, but it is only today's "Sumero-Hungarologists" who cannot distinguish the Sumerians from the Scythians. The characteristic anachronism of this example brought up by Illyés was to be attributed to the hubbub of the Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation.

Of course, there are examples to prove the vigilance of critical judgement, too. Though there was not a single allusion to the ideas of the Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation in (Jenő) Mátyás Fehér's articles propagating the so-called "Kassa (now Košice) codex<sup>78</sup>", in all probability a forgery, Jenő Szűcs, in the course of the discussion of his thesis, contradicted the opinion of his prominent opponent, Elemér Mályusz by pointing out that: "... due to many circumstances ... there has emerged from the outset, a suspicion that the codex as a whole, or at least partly (and the questions of Pagan beliefs, Shamans, sorcerers belong to these very details), might very well be a fake meant to justify the doctrines of the dilettante Sumerology ever so much in fashion in America nowadays. Some motifs, namely, offer themselves too directly to «support» the Sumerian theory."<sup>79</sup>

It is attributable to the pressure of "Sumerology" and to the fear from sharp disputes that the then chairman of the Kőrösi Csoma Society prevented me from holding a lecture on Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation, more exactly, on some cuneiform textual falsifications<sup>80</sup> of the "Sumerologists" at one of the usual, monthly meetings in the spring of 1973, even though lectures like these are not alien to the programme of the Society.

In the following I should like to briefly outline the prehistory of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation, so that we can see the background of "Sumerology" in our days.

The idea was conceived in the last third of the XIXth century when the first unilingual Sumerian texts were discovered and their gradual deciphering made it clear that the newly discovered language belongs neither to the Semitic, nor to the Indo-European family of languages.<sup>81</sup> It was a classic age of language family theories: the first researchers, of course, tried to link the new language to other languages of Eurasia; e.g. to the Uralian, the Finno-Ugrian, to the so called Turanian group of languages, without being able to flawlessly verify – even on the scientific level of their age – any of the latter suppositions.

Sumerian linguistics, following the debates of the first decades, turned to new paths without solving the problem of linguistic kinship. The attempts to affiliate Sumerian with Semitic, Egyptian, Hyksos, Elamite, Kassite, Dravidian, Proto-Indo-European, Hittite, Armenian, Sanskrit, Etruscan, Caucasian, Georgian, Finno-Ugrian, Finnish, Hungarian, Turanian, Uralo-Altaiic, Tibetan, Mongolian, Chinese, Japanese, Polynesian, Turkish, Basque, and also with some African languages: Sudanese, Bantu, all remained without success.<sup>82</sup> Drawing the conclusions of these failures, Sumerology in our days has it that the language of the Sumerians, according to our present state of knowledge, is not to be affiliated to any of the known Eurasian languages. We also have to add that we have only an approximate knowledge of the phonetic structure of Sumerian at present. Consequently, the Sumerian words in transcription cannot phone-



tically be considered anything more, than a convention. That is to say, Sumerology is not in the position to compare Sumerian vocabulary with that of other languages. Still, there are signs to indicate that solving the "Sumerian riddle" is not to be done through affiliation. I shall return to this point further on.

Thus the starting point of the Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation was the supposition that Sumerian belonged to the so-called Turanian group of languages, or even perchance, to the Uralo-Altaiic or Finno-Ugrian group of languages. This supposition had to be discarded without hesitation by Sumerology as soon as it had realized the untenability of the theory. Conversely, those dismissing the actual results of scientific investigations into the origins of Hungarians kept on obstinately returning to the Turanian idea.

There is hardly any need to waste words upon the language historical aspects of Turanism.<sup>83</sup> In the mid-nineteenth century some scholars believed that, similarly to the Indo-European and Semitic family of languages, a number of Eurasian ("Turanian") languages are affiliated.<sup>84</sup> However, the kinship of the languages grouped here were not to be verified, so the fiction of the Turanian family of languages was short-lived in the linguistics. It is also to be questioned whether Uralo-Altaiic languages form a self-contained group of languages; many tend to deny this kinship, and those who do so have powerful arguments.<sup>85</sup>

All this means that in the chain of language affiliations, which at the time of the discovery of Sumerian seemed to connect Hungarian and Sumerian by ties of a distant relation, several loops have unweldably broken.

The Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affinity-seekers have never recognized these findings. The doctrine of Sumero-Hungarian kinship has remained up to now, overtly or covertly, a branch of Turanism. Examining the assessment of the discovery of the Sumerian language in Hungary of the XIXth century, we can observe that the first reflections did not go beyond a factual explication of the suppositions and debates concerning the affiliation of Sumerian.<sup>86</sup> The first disputes in Hungary concerned the nature of Sumerian.<sup>87</sup> The Turanian thought, viz. that Hungarians — the allegedly closest kins of the Sumerian in the Turanian family — should have a special role not only in deciphering Sumerian but also in sharing the shining heritage of the Sumerians,<sup>88</sup> unfolded but slowly. This idea was pure anachronism at the very date of its birth, because Sumerology, by this time, had surpassed its Turanian period.

The first advocate of Turanistic Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation was Gyula Ferenczy (professor of Hungarian History at Debrecen),<sup>89</sup> but it was the journalist Ede Somogyi who actually unfurled the flag of the movement.<sup>90</sup> Beside them, János Galgóczy (a retired engineer) played a major role.<sup>91</sup> From among their opponents it is worth mentioning the name of Eduard Mahler,<sup>92</sup> Bernát Munkácsi<sup>93</sup> and Lajos Venetianer.<sup>94</sup> Apart from the names mentioned, many others participated in "collecting material" and in the fierce skirmishes,<sup>95</sup> yet the front-line fighters of

the first period of "Sumero-Hungarology" were undoubtedly Ferenczy, Somogyi and Galgóczy, each in his own temper, and at different intellectual levels, of course. As to the level of the disputes, it is worth mentioning that no one from Hungary, not even the learned and otherwise meritable Ferenczy<sup>96</sup> or Galgóczy, well versed in special literature, managed to successfully join in the international research in Sumerology<sup>97</sup> which started to take great steps forward at the very time of their activities. Mihály Kmoskó was the first who managed to join in.<sup>98</sup> He, however, declined to be one with the "Sumero-Hungarologists".<sup>99</sup>

Endre Ady, who had an ear for everything new, harked to some of the new results of Mesopotamian archeology.<sup>100</sup> He wrote the following in one of his newspaper articles: "It appears as if the Sumerologists were right; the Uralo-Altaiic race sometime, 6000 years ago, might have been living a formidable cultural life and must have got weary of thinking and culture ...".<sup>101</sup> These words, suggestive of at the time current cultural pessimism, do not amount to an approval of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation, as it is unsuspectingly imputed by eminent Ady interpreters.<sup>102</sup> The words of Ady merely imply his obeisance to the "times of ancient Babylon", to the admirable intellectual achievement of this primeval age<sup>103</sup> and to Poetry itself<sup>104</sup> personalised in the figure of "ős Kaján" (Kaján of Yore).<sup>105</sup>

Árpád Zempléni had quite another role to play; his Babylonian saga *Istar és Gilgamesz*<sup>106</sup> (Ishtar and Gilgamesh) was created bluntly under the auspices of Turanism. For truth's sake we ought to add that the blatant Turanism<sup>107</sup> of his Turanian songs<sup>108</sup> is by far not identical with the ideas of the later "Sumero-Hungarology": beside the Mesopotamian "translations", which, in fact, are free adaptations, Zempléni "Hungarianized" much of the ancient poetry of Finno-Ugrian peoples,<sup>109</sup> as well.

After the formation of the Turanian Society<sup>110</sup> and in the years following the First World War and, mainly at the time of the counter-revolution (1919), Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation got somewhat eclipsed and also diluted into other trends of Turanism which helped rouse more dust on the road of daily politics.

Between the two World Wars there were hardly any "prehistorians" advocating the idea of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation without involving other Oriental languages. Out of the better known authors, like Benedek Baráthosi Balogh,<sup>111</sup> Sándor Tonelli,<sup>112</sup> Zoltán Kézdy Vásárhelyi,<sup>113</sup> Sándor Nemesdedinai Zsuffa,<sup>114</sup> Károly Pálfi<sup>115</sup> and others, discovered the Turanian origin of more and more Oriental languages, and they integrated more and more Eurasian peoples into Hungarian prehistory; Sumerian at this time could only have been one from the many.

The oeuvre of Zsigmond Varga<sup>116</sup> falls under special consideration. While, as we have seen, Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation led into the shallowest Turanism, and on the other hand, was also proceeding towards a full identification of Sumerian and Hungarian, he undauntedly insisted on the old theory, voicing the Uralo-Altaiic character of Sumerian. It should be by all means put to his credit that he has not endeavoured



to find a "Sumerian" solution of the questions of Hungarian prehistory; Varga wanted to clarify problems of Sumerology and, as for his intentions, he has ever remained a worker of science, in the best sense of the word. His comprehensive book,<sup>117</sup> which appeared during the Second World War, rendered a final shape to his ideas he had conceived as early as the decade of the First World War. And this, of course, resulted in that he had to lag far behind the level of the international Sumerology of his time.<sup>118</sup> His book, a solid, thorough, bibliographically trustworthy, manual-like compendium, is also characterized by ultraconservatism, and it is imbued by the taint of obsolescence. The first of its three major parts, the history of the "Sumerian question", gives an objective picture betraying his erudition. The second part, a Sumerian grammar, is simply bad, because it rigidly turned down all fresh conceptions which helped take steps towards the exploration of the intrinsic laws of Sumerian, in the years between the two World Wars.<sup>119</sup> The third part, a verification of the Uralo-Altaic character of Sumerian, is mistaken in its very manner of approach. However, this book, entitled *Ötezer év távolából* (From the Distance of 5000 Years), is still the most learned piece in the whole literature of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation.

Some works of the writer and essayist László Németh deftly approach certain spiritual laws of the post-Ist-war "Sumero-Hungarology". Both in his essays,<sup>120</sup> and in his literary writings,<sup>121</sup> Németh describes that some educated and learned teachers, open to new scientific achievements, returned from Far Eastern captivity infected with the ideas of primeval kinship of Hungarian, Uralo-Altaic, Sumerian, Indo-European and Chinese; in a word, with Turanism. Németh was able to represent the formation of the Turanist prehistoric ideas in such a way that, at the same time, their utter absurdity came out clearly. The phantasms about prehistory, he describes, were plainly the symptoms of "plennitis" (a word coinage of László Németh, from the Russian пленный 'captive'), a kind of captivity psychosis. Naturally, not everybody in the Far Eastern captivity at the Gobi desert was mesmerized by these fancies. The above-mentioned Sándor Zsuffa<sup>122</sup> or Imre Molnár, in Németh's *Alsóvárosi búcsú* (Suburb Fiesta), or professor János Kertész, in his *Irgalom* (Mercy), became Turanists. Some of them turned aggressive, others remained meek monomaniacs. However, the famous scholars Gyula Moravcsik or Lajos Fekete returned from the same milieu with knowledge thorough enough to serve as a basis of their future linguistic and historical research in Turkish, Slavonic, and modern Greek philology.

Now, Ida Bobula's post World War II. Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affinity tracing was based upon these foundations, intellectual platforms, in the United States of America.

The Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation needs no specially detailed refutation even from the side of cuneiform research.

The language of the Sumerians, as we have seen, is no kindred to any known Eurasian language. This, however, is not an exceptional case at all. The history of Ancient Orient verified a number of languages, apart from Sumerian, which are not affiliated with any of the known families of languages. Such are, e. g., the Elamite, the Hurrian and its dialect, the Urartian, the Proto-Hattian and a lot of languages with no or little written records, like Gutian, Lulubian, Turukkian, Kassite, Kashka, etc. With such an amount of unrelated or enclaved languages existing, not many conclusive and convincing results are promised by a trend of research seeking to separately find kindreds of individual, enclaved languages among old or modern languages of Eurasia. The explanation of the conspicuous phenomenon of the enclaved languages is, in my opinion, to be given alongside with the clarification of the prehistory of the Near East, but hardly in the sense, that we would set out to find an impeccable kindred or, even perchance, a family of languages for each of the languages concerned. It is rather to be done in such a way that we be able to explain the phenomenon itself by trying to find a historical answer to the question why there were so many enclaved languages at the dawn of the revolutionary new period of food-producing economies and also, for some time thereafter. This phenomenon is not confined to the Ancient Orient, a similar situation is to be found in a number of zones on the linguistic map of Asia. It is out of question that the classic theory of the family of languages, in certain historical, geographical areas, is unsuitable to describe the ties among languages. There is no reckoning with the chance in the Ancient Orient, nor is there in certain other areas of Asia, that, somehow, we could establish family of languages in the traditional sense of the world. We appear to be approaching the truth when not speaking about linguistic affiliations, rather about contacts<sup>123</sup> among enclaved languages or language groups. The disparate nature of the languages of a given area is to be historically accounted for. Out of all this, what belongs to the sphere of Sumerian-Hungarian linguistic affiliation is that the idea dominating the prehistoric combinations of this kind is out-of-date to the quick.

The conception which seeks to find a primitive home for all the peoples emerging from the hazy dawn of human civilization is obsolete, just the same. The homes themselves are deemed to be mostly far away, of course. According to this theory, their migrations and conquests are imagined in such a way as were the movements of peoples in the times of the great Eurasian migration epoch. The Sumerians probably had not arrived in Mesopotamia from a distant land, and they had hardly had a primitive home in the traditional sense of the word. They were part of a population living on the territory of Western Iran in the age of the food-producing period. They did not conquer their land, rather, by slow expansion, they settled down on the alluvial plains, together with other groups of people. Historically speaking we should exclusively refer to them as a constituent factor of the civilization forming itself in South Mesopotamia. Whatever we would consider characteristically Sumerian in the South



Mesopotamian culture of about 3000 B. C., had evolved itself here out of the precedents dating back to 5—4000 B. C.

The primitive languages of the area, the Prae-Sumerian, Proto-Akkadian, Sumerian, Akkadian can only be separated from each other as languages, they have, however, a historical past in Mesopotamia in common.<sup>124</sup>

The Sumerians are inseparable from South Mesopotamia; if we want to get to know them, we must concentrate on the latter mentioned fact and not on the adventures of affiliation.

We can draw similar conclusions as to the process of the assimilation of Sumerians. The Sumerians did not vanish, did not leave Mesopotamia, they stayed there and changed their language. This phenomenon is not restricted to the Sumerians only. Many other languages of the area got absorbed during the period between the 4th — 1st millennia B. C. Only such an explanation bears historical validity which is not concerned with the fate of only one people, instead, it renders understandable a much more universal occurrence: the many thousand year long process of the formation of homogeneous language blocks.

The archeology and philology of our times have rich material to prove that the food producing societies that formed themselves in the Near East always had close contacts with their surrounding territories, near and faraway ones alike. This contact, however, was not created and maintained by ethnic movements, as a rule, but by contacts of economic nature.

The Sumerian language, as far as we know it, has a lot of foreign words (words of unknown origin). The same is the case with the Akkadian. It is beyond doubt that a part of the words of unknown origin came from such people's language who used to have regular contacts with the inhabitants of Mesopotamia. Why, wouldn't it have been impossible that, by means of contacts of economic character, a number of Sumerian and Akkadian words were loaned to the vocabulary of the peoples in surrounding territories? What is more, it has a great probability — at least in theory. However, we must be well aware of the fact that are loan-words and no proofs of linguistic kinship. For the time being, nevertheless, etymological investigations of such nature — except the Semitic—Sumerian agreements — are bound to meet with unsurmountable phonetic and other kinds difficulties, on both sides. Therefore, in the majority of the cases, we haven't got a clear picture of the origins of the foreign elements in the Sumerian language,<sup>125</sup> and we cannot identify directly borrowed Sumerian words in the Eurasian languages except Akkadian, either. At any rate, we haven't yet succeeded in finding such a word in the modern Eurasian languages, which are sure to have been loaned directly from Sumerian.<sup>126</sup>

We have somewhat more precise knowledge about the words which got to Europe from later Mesopotamian languages, first of all from the Akkadian of the 2nd — 1st millennium B. C.<sup>127</sup> There are several of these to be found even in Hungarian, which in the last analysis came

from Akkadian, e. g. *alkohol* ('alcohol') coming from the Akkadian word *guhlu*; *cseresznye* ('cherry') from the Akkadian *karašu*, *karšu*; *dragomán* ('interpreter', 'guide') from the Akkadian *targumānu*; *gipsz* ('gypsum') from the Akkadian *gaššu*; *kömény* ('caraway') from the Akkadian *kamūnu*; *myrrha* ('myrrh') from the Akkadian *murru*; *nafta* ('naphtha') from the Akkadian *naptu*, etc.<sup>128</sup> The same is the case in French, the word *mesquin*, in Italian the word *meschino* ('poor, wretched') both came, in the last analysis, from the Akkadian *muškēnu*, which is to be found in the Old Sumerian in the form *maška'en* as a Proto-Akkadian loan-word. In such cases however, we can precisely follow up the tracks on which the word in question came to us through the usually multiple mediation of Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Arabic, Persian, Turkish, etc., very often as a culture word. Directly it was loaned almost invariably from one of the surrounding Indo-European languages.

Adaptations of such nature are not only to be found in the European languages only, but also in the East, though systematic investigations are still needed in the case of Oriental languages.

All this means in short that, the search after Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affinities has no basis from the point of view of cuneiform research and Mesopotamian history.

I have to add to this right away that the "Sumero-Hungarologists" — to all appearances — do not at all have the erudition which could enable them to achieve solid results either in the field of history or in that of linguistics. Let me mention but a few examples.

In the rich literature of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation, nobody seems to know — from the time of Ida Bobula onwards — that capital letter types in the transliteration of cuneiform texts do not signify the phonetic form of the word, only the uncertain nature of reading. In the latter case one would use the name of the sign. Thus the words which are set in capital letters in the dictionaries are useless, as a matter of course, for linguistic affiliation. Nevertheless, the "Sumero-Hungarologists" not only include the words written this way in their etymologies, but they also write every word in capital letters, believing this to be the scientific way of writing.

The nescience of handling scientific transliteration, and the uncertainty of reading, on the whole, strikes us every now and then. Badiny Jós would have liked to prove that the name of a tribe called *Sabirian* (*Sabiroi*), which he referred to the Hungarians,<sup>129</sup> is of Sumerian origin. His attention was drawn to a fragmentary Sumerian epic. He wrote a letter to S. N. Kramer — who edited the fragmentary Sumerian text — concerning a name in the text.<sup>130</sup> Kramer's answer, which Badiny Jós reproduced many times,<sup>131</sup> gave the form of the name in cuneiform, as well as the scholarly transcription both syllabized (*en-sukuš-sir-an-na*) and normalized (*ensukušsiranna*). Badiny Jós did not even read Kramer's Roman letters



correctly, and he took the second element, deliberately or not, for Subur. After all, Badiny Jós described his discovery like this: "You can imagine, my dear reader, my state of mind at the moment when I found that the light flaring up in the great darkness of the chaos of history fell upon the Subur-Subar people ...". Incidentally, the name in question — but I add this for the sake of completeness only — is in all probability to read as *en-sùh-kešda-anna*,<sup>132</sup> which is different and probably more correct than that of Kramer's. In normalized spelling it is: Ensuhkeshdaanna.

As to the cuneiform texts, the "Sumero-Hungarologists" were even less fortunate. Earlier they were only too cautious to avoid cuneiform writing, recently, however, they seemed to have plucked up the courage. And what happened? When (Jenő) Mátyás Fehér and Miklós Érdy, heads of the Gilgamesh Publishing House, collected the papers of János Galgóczy<sup>133</sup> into a volume, they enriched the book with illustrations "in accordance with the spirit of the text."<sup>134</sup> One of the illustrations, a cuneiform text consisting of 5 lines was captioned as: "Some lines from the Gilgamesh epic".<sup>135</sup> Well, the cuneiform text has been taken from the cover of Sándor Rákos's volume containing his Hungarian translations of some Akkadian epics.<sup>136</sup> So it is not an excerpt from the Gilgamesh epic. In fact, the above-mentioned five lines are the first lines (*incipit*), viz. the titles of five different pieces of Sándor Rákos' book:<sup>137</sup> The Vision of the Nether World; The Tamarisk and the Palm; The Poem of the Righteous Sufferer; Advice to a Prince; The Dialogue of Pessimism — the Gilgamesh epic is not to be found among these. They still managed to create "harmony" in their own way.

In some other articles of mine I have already enlarged upon the methods and standards characterizing "Sumero-Hungarologists" engaged in faking Hungarianized Sumerian cuneiform inscriptions.<sup>138</sup>

The writings of "Sumero-Hungarologists" teem with references to the works of renowned Sumerologists, who all have, allegedly, acknowledged Sumero-Hungarian affiliation. But if we have a closer look at the bibliographical data, the results are disappointing. Ferenc Badiny Jós, both in his letters, pamphlets and in his book, lays great stress upon the archeological works of Otsherki, in his opinion, an excellent Soviet scholar. This book, says Badiny Jós, proves the Sumerian nature of "the new ethnic group coming from the South".<sup>139</sup> It is almost unnecessary for me to put down: the book "was written" by a "scholar" whose name was Studies, Otsherki, mistakenly believed to be the name of a Soviet author. The title of the book, in actual fact, was Studies on the History of the Soviet Union.<sup>140</sup> The bibliographical item is taken from one of the books of Gyula László,<sup>141</sup> but our notable "Sumero-Hungarologist" mistook an abbreviation there for an author's name. How much could he have understood from this book? ...

In the bibliographies of the "Sumero-Hungarologist" authors we can recognize two kinds of references to special literature.

1. They very often quote books which do not exist at all. Sándor Pálfalvy set out to prove, with the findings of the Mesopotamian excava-

tions, the Sumerian origin of the shepherd dog puli, and in addition, Sumerian-Hungarian affiliation, too. He borrowed the data on the Assur excavations from Sir H. J. Mc Donald's book: *Ruin City of Assur*. London, 1895.<sup>142</sup> The data on the excavations of Lagash from Dr. McKenzie's book: *Lagash Cuneiform*. London, 1912;<sup>143</sup> the data on the Eridu excavations from M. Tellmann's book: *Archaische Texte aus Eridu*. Dresden, 1894;<sup>144</sup> the data on the Boghazköy excavations from M. Espreaux's book: *Le peuple des Sumirienne*. Paris, 1906.<sup>145</sup> Whereas the prosaic reality is that Mesopotamian archeologists or authors on cuneiform writing of such names have never existed. Neither have the above-mentioned books. It is not even worth bothering about the grammatical deficiencies of the titles mentioned above.

2. They quote existing books, however, they do not understand the statement of their authors, or crudely misinterpret it. Almost every "Sumerian-Hungarologist" alludes to the "fact" that S. N. Kramer, a leading Sumerologist of our time, has explicitly acknowledged the identicalness of the Sumerian and the Hungarian languages. In fact, Kramer wrote about this topic as follows: "Oppert even went on to say in this lecture that an analysis of the structure of the Sumerian language had led him to conclude that it had close affinities with Turkish, Finnish and Hungarian — a brilliant insight *into the structure of a language* (italics mine, G. K.) which only twenty years earlier had been non-existent as far as world scholarship was concerned."<sup>146</sup> The quotation makes it clear that Kramer was handling this theme in the context of the history of science. In addition, he did not speak about the identity of Sumerian and Hungarian. His words are allusive of structural similarities between Sumerian and Turkish, Finnish and Hungarian languages respectively, viz. not of linguistic kinship, but of language-typological coincidences. Other authors, also writing about merely typological similarities, refer to Hungarian when describing Sumerian.<sup>147</sup> It is well known, to wit, that typological similarity and linguistic kinship are two different matters.<sup>148</sup>

The competent representatives of Hungarian linguistics have so far thoroughly criticised the voluntary, arbitrary etymologies of "Sumerian-Hungarologists". I myself should like to contribute to this question solely on behalf of Sumerology. Bearing in mind what we have learned about the erudition of "Sumerian-Hungarologists" so far, we shall not be surprised to realize that the all of Sumerian linguistic proofs for the Sumerian-Hungarian linguistic affiliation are false, untrustable and mistaken.

The "Sumerian-Hungarologists" cannot make a difference between Sumerian and Akkadian words. In their etymological caprice they would take even Akkadian words for Sumerian. Under the auspices of Sumerian etymology they would derive many a Hungarian word from Akkadian. A good example for that is the derivation of the word *isten* ('god') from the Sumerian language. They derived the Hungarian word from a supposed Sumerian *isten*. But the correct form, *ištēn*, is not Sumerian, it is Akkadian, and a numeral, namely 'one'; on the other hand, 'god' is *dingir* in Sumerian and *ilu* Akkadian. This derivation served as a basis for the conclusion



concerning the history of religion: both the Sumerians and the most ancient Hungarians were inherently monotheist.

Andor Schedel derived the word *szánt* ('to plough') from *sumuntu*, meaning 'ox-drawn plough'.<sup>149</sup> The Akkadian(!) word really means something like that, but it is a derivative of *samāne* (a numeral: 'eight'); and on this basis, and on the basis of its Sumerian equivalent, <sup>g18</sup>*apin-gu<sub>4</sub>-8-lá*, as well, it means 'eight-ox-drawn plough'.<sup>150</sup>

Sándor Csőke, who compiled a whole book from his most bizarre etymologies, derived the word *könyv* ('book') from the Sumerian *kingia*.<sup>151</sup> The Sumerian *kin-gi<sub>4</sub>-a* means something else, however. Its stem is the word *kin* ('to send'); and out of this (*lú*)-*kin-gi<sub>4</sub>-a*, literally ('man'), sent, returning', that is 'messenger', furthermore *kin* may be 'relation, news, message', but it can never stand for 'book' or anything similar.

I will not elaborate any further. The Sumerian words used by the "Sumero-Hungarologists" in their etymologies either do not exist at all, or are to be read differently, or mean something else. From among the many thousands of etymologies of the Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation, we cannot find but one which would be correct from the point of view of Sumerology. It is understandable that "Sumero-Hungarologists" would refer to the authority of Anton Deimel. But Deimel's huge list of signs, which is to be used as a dictionary,<sup>152</sup> is the reserve of an early period of Sumerology, an indispensable piece of work in itself. Its material, however, was collected in an indiscriminate manner. Its very use needs, as all Sumerologists know, great expertise and a deep sense of discernment.

When speaking about etymology, the Sumerologist unfortunately has to criticise some critics of "Sumero-Hungarology," too. The Hungarian linguists who, in the course of the past years, disputed the arbitrary, forced etymologies of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation, firmly rejected the manner, in which the "Sumero-Hungarologists" handled the Hungarian material. However, they mostly prove to be uncritical in taking over their statements, as regards the Sumerian language. The Sumerian words they quote leave no doubt that in this respect the critics themselves have trusted the writings of "Sumero-Hungarologists", criticised by them. Whereas, a single look into a good Sumerian grammar<sup>153</sup> could have convinced them that in the etymologies disputed, the Sumerian and the Hungarian material are of equal value. Let me take but one example.

Recently, Géza Bácszi has accepted, though with a pinch of salt, that the suffixes of adverb of place, answering the question where, are the following in the Sumerian:  $\emptyset$ , *a-*, *ge*, *ka-*, *ta*, *da-*, *na-*, *ra*, *šu*.<sup>154</sup> Incidentally, he borrows this statement from the book of Zsigmond Varga characterized above<sup>155</sup>. Varga, however, has misled Bácszi. The Sumerian ending of locative is *-a*, in fact. The items, in turn, have different meanings: *-k-e*, in this context, is the mark of the genitive structure plus an ending meaning 'beside'; *-k-a* is the mark of the genitive structure plus the adverb of locative; *-ta*, 'from', *-da*, 'with' (postposition of adverbial modifier of accomplishment); *-n-a-*, 'to him' (verbal infix); *-ra*, 'for him'; *šu*, in correct

reading -šè, 'to, into'. The acquiescence with which Bárcezi has accepted the Sumerian data of the "Sumero-Hungarologists" cannot be accounted for. Can those, who treat their mother-tongue like the "Sumero-Hungarologists", be trusted as regards a difficult dead language?

After all, it is needless to elaborate on the language-historical and historical theories of "Sumero-Hungarologists". Let me suffice by cursorily referring to them.

There are still some "ultra-conservative" scholars who believe the Sumero-Hungarian affinity to be existing within the Uralo-Altaiic family of languages. Recently, however, the views considering the Sumero-Hungarian connections a matter of direct descent have rapidly disseminated and can almost be thought of as exclusive. According to these view the Hungarian language is nothing but the contemporary form of the Sumerian language, viz. Neo-Sumerian. "The so called Old Hungarian fragments of Tihany Abbey's Deed of Foundation [from 1051 A. D. — G. K.] and those of the Kézay Chronicle (!) are genuine Sumerian sentences."<sup>156</sup> According to the "New (Hungarian) Southern, Polygonal Word Affiliation System"(!)<sup>157</sup> all major languages of Eurasia are affiliated with each other, but it is especially true of Sumerian and Hungarian. The historical foundation of the conclusions of the language history are of the same multifarious nature. According to Victor Padányi the Sumerians migrated from Mesopotamia to South Russia and there they became the major constituent part of the Hungarian people.<sup>158</sup> The theory of Ferenc Badiny Jós, Tibor Baráth and others is also based upon these ideas. Badiny Jós postulates five waves of Sumerian migration, in all: the migration of the Daha (i. e., Dacian, Tocharian, etc.) tribes, that of the Avarian (i. e., Parthian, Median, Mitannian, etc.) tribes, that of the Hunns, that of the Az (i. e., Kassite, Cushan, Khazar, Oguz, etc.) tribes, and finally the migration of the Sabirian tribes.<sup>159</sup> In this manner, the author manages to populate almost the whole of Europe from Mesopotamia. Juan Móricz goes even farther out on the limb; he discovered place names of Hungarian origin even in South America. He asserts that ancient Hungarians, starting from their South American primitive home, sailed across the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, then landed in the Persian gulf and established the Sumerian civilization in South Mesopotamia, then they went to Kaspian Sea territories and arrived later in the Carpathian basin...<sup>160</sup> At all events the historical trustworthiness of any of these fancies cannot outdo the grammatical and linguistic reliability of their Sumerian-Hungarian etymologies.

Owing to their outstanding historical importance and also, because recently the "Sumero-Hungarologists" have been trying to use it in an effort to justify their own views, I have to make special mention of the Tărtăria tablets. In 1961, Nicolae Vlăssă, the eminent archeologist at the Historical Museum, Cluj, Rumania, found at Tărtăria, in the Mureș Valley three clay-tablets beside objects of cultic function in a sacrificial



pit of settlement of the late neolithic Bánát (Vinča) culture. On two of the tablets there were characters, and, on the third one, an engraved drawing.<sup>161</sup> The drawing, the characters, as well as the structure of the tablets betray close affinity with the well known archaic written document of Southern Mesopotamia (Uruk IIIb archaic strata of excavation, about 2900 B. C.). The questions raised by the findings have been the subject of an ample amount of scholarly writing. Sumerologists, like Adam Falkenstein and Ignace J. Gelb and others, have precisely established the relation between these characters and the Mesopotamian writing-system.<sup>162</sup> János Harmatta attempted to interpret the text linguistically.<sup>163</sup> Vlása himself, then, V. Popovitch, Nándor Kalicz, János Makkay in turn, and others have outlined the archeological horizon on which this collection of findings is situated.<sup>164</sup> The Tártária finds unequivocally prove that the land of Transylvania was somehow connected with South Mesopotamia at the beginning of the 3d millennium B. C. They have also verified — at least in broad outlines — the pioneering observations made by Sophie Torma, at the end of the XIXth century, who realized the parallelism between her own neolithic finds in Transylvania and the Near East relics.<sup>165</sup>

As regards the Tártária finds not all questions are yet settled, of course. One thing is certain, however, the local population, who made the tablets — as well as the other objects of the Bánát culture which were provided with similar characters<sup>166</sup> — did not speak Sumerian. Despite the large number of correspondences between the Tártária and the South Mesopotamian finds, there are so many differences, that we can only speak about the influence of or similarity to the written records of Mesopotamia but nothing more. This influence, however, is not even necessarily direct: it seems much more likely to have been exerted through the mediation of Asia Minor and the Balkan peninsula.<sup>167</sup> It is to be supposed that in the centuries about the turn of the 4th and 3rd millennium B. C. a certain kind of local writing came about, patterned after the Proto-Sumerian system of writing on several territories directly or indirectly connected with Mesopotamia. Taking over the basic idea of that writing, however, was not the result of ethnic movements as it appears to have happened in the case of the transmission of Semitic or Roman alphabets. Tártária, incidentally, is not isolated with its Mesopotamian type written documents. Some years ago American archeologists hit upon similar finds in South-East Iran (Tepe Yahya)<sup>168</sup> and, the tablets unearthed here — the material of an economic archive — are even more similar to the tablets known from South Mesopotamia. However, it is beyond dispute that though the find is of Sumerian type, nevertheless they do not derive from the Sumerians.

"Sumero-Hungarologists" were rather late to prick up their ears to the Tártária finds, recently however, fuddled with joy as it were, contemplate it as a proof of all their historical beliefs. Gábor Jáki published Zsófia Torma's one-time book *Ethnographische Analogien...* in Hungarian translation,<sup>169</sup> with its very title *Sumér nyomok Erdélyben* (Su-

merian traces in Transylvania) prejudicing the tenets of "Sumero-Hungarology". He also added an extensive paper enlarging upon the Tártária finds and other neolithic relics of the Carpathian basin and considering all these to be the work of Sumerians.<sup>170</sup>

Exaltation, however, is rarely suggestive of matter-of-fact thoughts. The "Sumero-Hungarologists", dealing with the Tártária finds, have not noticed that interpreting these as Sumerian ones has fatal consequences. Viz., if the Sumerians had been living in the Carpathian basin as early as the 3rd millennium B. C., how are the facts of the Hungarian conquest, which took place some four thousand years later, to be interpreted.

Let us leave it at that, now. The finds of Tártária are really important proofs of the economic and spiritual contacts — probably indirect ones — between South Mesopotamia and the Carpathian basin at the beginning of the 3d millenium B. C., however they have nothing to do with Hungarian prehistory or Hungarian history at all.

I have come to the end of my survey which was meant to draw the balance of erudition of "Sumero-Hungarologists". In the end, let me quote József Schmidt's words, which are of classic value; whatever the famous Indo-European scholar said once about Turanism is wholly valid of the Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation, too.

"Hardly has a mightier eagle of an idea been hatched from more miserable an egg. Because Turanism sprang into existence from almost nothing; or rather, it formed itself from notions and ideas, in the chaff of which no pure grains of objective truth are to be found, only — very rarely — faint contingencies of truth. Putting it otherwise, and with an other metaphore: Turanism is like Aristophanes' Nephelokokkygia, a cockoo castle in the clouds, the architect of which is phantasy, the mason of which is diletantism, the brick and mortar of which are still-born thoughts, suppositions unproved and unprovable, sagas and tales which are thousands of miles away from reality and truth."<sup>171</sup>

What else is left to be commented upon is not a debate any more, it affects us. Without overestimating the disturbing role of chauvinistic ideas in our days' public thinking, I think that the popularity of the Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation nowadays indicates a certain confusion in the historical consciousness of Hungarian society.<sup>172</sup> True, the revival and deliberate resuscitation of similar nationalist ideas is a world phenomenon, so to say, but we should not permit ourselves to drift with the flood. I do not believe that the matter is to be settled by debates. They are important, of course, but the heart of the matter is not here. The notion of the past, formed by national romanticism, is still alive, and this is the very philosophy to be surpassed.



## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The article was prepared on the basis of a lecture held at the Faculty of Arts of the Eötvös Loránd University, on March 12, 1974. Prof. *Lajos Elekes*, Prof. *István Hahn*, and Dr. *Csanád Bálint* contributed to my lecture at that time. Let me thank hereby for their invaluable complementary-remarks. Furthermore, I have to say thanks to Prof. *András Mócsy*, Prof. *István Diószegi* and Dr. *Péter Domokos*, who have encouraged me to do the final touches on the text. The article was meant to inform the Hungarian-speaking public. When translating it, I have made no changes in the text, although some parts may seem to be superfluous for the foreign readers. My intention was to draw an objective picture of an obscure phenomenon, and I thought I should be able to attain it by leaving the text untouched. An enlarged and partly rewritten Hungarian version appeared separately, see *Géza Komoróczy*: *Sumer és magyar? (Sumerian and Hungarian?)* Magvető Kiadó, Budapest 1976, 169 pp.

As to the Hungarian usage of the name *sumer* ('Sumerian') I think it is proper to make the following remarks here. After the uncertainties of early times of research, the name of the language in Europe got assimilated to the usage in the Akkadian sources. The Akkadian word *šumerû* is at best to be rendered into Hungarian by *sumer*, and in scholarly publications in the form *šumer*, therefore I prefer this usage. Apart from *sumer* we encounter other forms of the name in former Hungarian literature, like e.g. *sumér*, *sumír* or *sumír*, *szumír*, etc. From among these, the version *sumér* came about following the French written form (*sumérien*); the version *sumír* has survived from a bygone period of Assyriology, viz. from the times when the cuneiform signs containing e or i were all phoneticised i (pseudo-italicism); the vowel of the second syllable in *sumír* got lengthened by sheer error; and as for *szumír*: it adopted the transcription of the initial consonant of the word in West-European languages out of comfort. For the phonetic reconstruction of the name see recently *C. Wilcke*, in: [Compte Rendu de la] XIXe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale: La palais et la royauté. Paris 1974. 202 ff., 229—230.

Let me offer one more remark to one, newly formed word of my article. The international scholarly literature unanimously refers to the discipline, dealing with the Sumerian language and culture — one of the branches of cuneiform research, or Assyriology in the wider sense of the word — as Sumerology. I also employ this word exclusively in this sense. However, there is a certain misunderstanding in the Hungarian press as regards the usage of *Sumerology*; the word seems to be taking up an underrating, pejorative meaning, owing to the theory of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation, cf. in *Iván Vitényi's* latest, brief critical note, with which I otherwise agree: *Valóság* 18, No. 2 (1975), p. 99. In order to preclude a confusion of ideas, which is getting to assert itself this way, it seems to be expedient to rule out Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affinity tracing from the domain of Sumerology. For the sake of this, I am going to mark Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affinity tracing with the expression: „Sumero-Hungarology“.

For the English translation of my Hungarian manuscript I am indebted to *István Losonczy*.

<sup>2</sup> *Ferenc Badiny Jós*: *Káldeától Ister-gamig, I. A sumír őstörténet.* (From Chaldea to Ister-gam, I. The Sumerian Prehistory.) Buenos Aires 1971. [Cf. now *F. J. Badiny*: *The Sumerian Wonder.* Univ. d. Salvador, 1974.]

<sup>3</sup> *Ida Bobula*: *A sumér — magyar rokonság kérdése.* (On the Question of Sumero-Hungarian Kinship.) Buenos Aires 1961.

<sup>4</sup> *Ida Bobula*: *A sumér kultúra.* (The Sumerian Culture.) In: *Univerzum* No. 93, Budapest 1964, pp. 78—86. As sources are listed here the author's English essays (concerning these see below, notes 12 and 17), the wording, however, follows the book mentioned above, in note 3.

<sup>5</sup> Subsequently a large number of the copies of this book circulated in Hungary too.

<sup>6</sup> *Andor Schedel*: *A legrégebbi számok.* (The Oldest Numerals.) *Élet és Tudomány* 19, No. 14 (1964), pp. 660—662.

<sup>7</sup> *Utazás az időben.* (A Travel Through Time.) *János Belitzky* expresses his opinion about our primitive homeland, the migrations, the Etruscan and Sumerian question. *Nógrád*, December 5, 1965. (Reporter: *Elemér Tóth*.)

- <sup>8</sup> *János Belützy*: Beszámoló egy készülö tanulmányról. (Report on a Study in Preparation.) In: Palöcföld. Nógrádi írók és mívészek antológiája. Salgótarján 1965, pp. 76–103.; *János Belützy*: Válasz néhány kérdésre. (Answering Some Questions.) In: Palöcföld. Nógrádi írók és mívészek antológiája. Salgótarján 1965, pp. 59–79. — As to the review of this article, see the study of *Péter Hajdú* quoted in the first place of note 39, below; see his p. 14 and notes.
- <sup>9</sup> *László Pass*: Az ABRAKADABRA megfejtése. (Deciphering ABRAKADABRA.) Theologiai Szemle ÚF 4 (1961), pp. 234–237. — Cf. also note 32, below.
- <sup>10</sup> *Ferenc Maron*: Hóttasfák, Katyor, Avas. Az egész ország gyűjti a régi földrajzi neveket. (The Whole Country is Collecting Old Geographical Names.) Magyar Nemzet, December 9, 1969.
- <sup>11</sup> Cf., among others, *Sándor Török*: Az ókor első „térképei” Ázsia szívében. (The First „Maps” of Ancient Times in the Heart of Asia.) Népszava, August 20, 1970.
- <sup>12</sup> *J. Bobula*: Sumerian Affiliations. A Plea for Reconsideration. Washington, D. C. 1951 = Herencia de Sumeria. Mexico 1967. (Museo de las Culturas, Ser. Científica, 2.)
- <sup>13</sup> Concerning this question, it is enough to refer to the retrospections which describe the reception of Bobula’s book at the time; cf. e.g. in the 1st issue of *Sumir Híradó*. Magyar Newsletter (November 1973): „Why is it that if someone raises the «Sumerian question» in a serious form, immediately a flow of personal assaults, doubts, . . . belittling is aimed at him by certain — mostly «Hungarian» — circles? The very existence of Dr. Ida Bobula was jeopardized just because she agreed Sumerian and Hungarian words. . .” etc. A statement of Bobula can also be read in the same periodical: „When, in the fifties, I was trying to publish the results of my Sumerian investigations, I bumped against the adamant wall of the enemies of Hungariandom. They kept bearing upon the editors of the emigrant papers, from high positions, with money, promises and threats, not to publish my writings.” The article, incidentally, imputes it to schemes against Sumerian-Hungarian linguistic affiliation that one of the advocates of the theory was beaten to death by hoodlums in America, and another one was crushed to death on the road (!), cf. note 31, below.
- <sup>14</sup> *M. Lambert*: Revue d’Assyriologie 46 (1952), pp. 217–221; the most positive sentence of the review goes like this: „. . . à notre avis, le rapprochement avec les hongrois n’est pas a priori utopique. . . ; il est possible que les Sumériens viennent d’Asie Centrale. . .” I am going to return to this question later; still, let me mention here, that what seems to be permissive appreciation in the opinion of *M. Lambert*, is in fact only an observation as to the history of research.
- <sup>15</sup> *J. Lotz*: Word 8 (1952), pp. 286–287. One can read such sentences in this review: “the author is unfamiliar with even elementary techniques of comparative linguistics”; “the author shows a sovereign disregard for historical and comparative facts of Hungarian”, etc.
- <sup>16</sup> *Ferenc Badány Jós* lists Bobula’s first articles in Hungarian — from which he compiled her book quoted in note 3, above — on p. 125 sq. of the volume in question; the articles appeared in papers and collections named Fáklya, Új Magyar Út, Magyar Könyvtár. — Bobula’s views were met with fierce criticism, cf. e.g. *István Foltiny*, in: Civitas Dei. A Magyar Katolikus Tudományos és Mívészeti Akadémia Évkönyve 1, New York 1956, pp. 111–127; *Sándor Tarcz*: Krónika, March-June, 1954; cf. note 13, above, and also, note 60, below.
- <sup>17</sup> Like for example: *J. Bobula*: The Great Stag. A Sumerian Divinity and Its Affiliations. Anales de Historia antigua y medieval. Buenos Aires 1953, pp. 119–126; Sumerian Technology. A Survey of Early Material Achievements in Mesopotamia. Smithsonian Report for 1959. Washington, D. C. 1960, pp. 637–675. See also: The Sumerian Goddess Ba-U. No place 1952. (Rotaprint.) — Cf. note 12, above, and note 18, below.
- <sup>18</sup> Cf. note 3, above. — From the works of Bobula, published subsequently, see *J. Bobula*: Origin of the Hungarian Nation. Gainesville, Florida 1966. (Problems Behind the Iron Curtain Series [!], No 3.); *Ida Bobula*: Kétezer magyar név sumir eredete. (The Sumerian Origin of Two Thousand Hungarian Names.) Montreal 1970.
- <sup>19</sup> Cf. *Kálmán Gosztöny*: Tanulmány. (A study.) Paris 1959: Mívelödéstörténeti és nyelvtudományi egyeztetések, II. (Cultural Historical and Linguistic Agreements, II.); A kazar anyanemzet (!) birodalma és nyelve I–VI. [stb. ?] (The Language and



Empire of the Khazarian Mother Nation (!) I—VI. [etc. ?].) Ahogy lehet, No. 120, 122—124, 126—127. Paris 1961—1962; Az összehasonlító nyelvészet az emigrációban. (Comparative Linguistics in Emigration.) Ahogy lehet, No. 121. Paris 1961; Sumér nyelvészet jobbról és balról. (Sumerian Linguistics, from the Right and from the Left.) (Manuscript.) Paris 1962; A Gilgames eposz befejezése. (The End of Gilgamesh Epic.) (Manuscript.) ca. 1970. (The manuscript sent to the editors of Antik Tanulmányok /Studia Antiqua remained eventually unpublished.) — Other sources, e.g. one of the studies to be quoted in note right below (Aluta, p. 21, note 3), also refer to Gosztonyi's much earlier (1954—) papers. His latest publication on this subject: *G. — G. Gosztonyi: Dictionnaire d'étymologie sumérienne et grammaire comparée.* Paris 1975.

- <sup>20</sup> *Zsuzsanna Kovács, Telekiné: Magyar földrajzi nevek sumír és akkád eredete.* (The Sumerian and Akkadian Origin of Hungarian Geographic Names.) *Krónika* 1956—1959; Többezeréves mezopotámiai magyar szövegek. (Many Thousand Year Old Mesopotamian Hungarian Texts.) *Krónika*, Dec., 1955. — Jun. 1956.

Incidentally, there is a fine example to be found, illustrating the "Ancient Hungarian" interpretation of Mesopotamian texts, as follows: „Ah ti ilat Istar szahar-masa Tammuz” = „Oh te élet, Istar szerelmese, Tammuz” (“Oh you life, Ishtar's lover, Tammuz”). The Akkadian verse, which appears in a hymn, is to be found here in a somewhat “distorted” form. Its correct transcription: *atti (d) Istar ša ħarma-ša (d) Du'ūzu*, “you are (*atti*, personal pronoun, 2nd person sing. feminine) Ishtar, whose (*ša*, relative pronoun) lover is (*-ša*, pronominal pers. suffix as above) Tammuz”. Apart from the mistakes which come out when simply comparing the two translations, e.g. the bisecting of the personal pronoun: *atti*, “Oh you”; the attachment of the relative pronoun to the subsequent word: *ša ħar-ma-ša*, thus forming the non-existing word “szahar-masa”, equalled to Hungarian „szerelmese”, etc., it is worth mentioning — for it betrays elementary nescience — the “reading and translation” of so-called determinative, signifying every divine name: instead of (d) stays in her translation *ilat*, “élet”, life), whereas these signs are never to be read. The Hungarian “translation” of the Akkadian text was apparently inspired by a distant similarity of *ša ħarma-ša* and “akinek az ő szerelmese (*ħarmu*)” (“whose lover is”). — Cf. furthermore *Zs. Kovács, Telekiné: Aluta. Az “Olt” folyó neve. Történelmi és nyelvészeti tanulmány.* (Aluta. The Name of the River “Olt”. A Historical and Linguistic Study.) Warren, Ohio 1963; *S. Kovács Teleki: Sumerian Origin of the Names of the River “Ister-Danube”.* In: *D. Sinor* (ed.): *Proceedings of the 27th International Congress of Orientalists.* (An Arbor, Mich. 1967). Wiesbaden 1971, pp. 126—128.

- <sup>21</sup> Finnugor = Sumir. (Finno-Ugrian = Sumerian.) A special enlightening script of the Sumerian—Hungarian Scientific Society, and of the Buenos Aires Facultad de Sumerologia concerning the incorrectness of the Finno-Ugrian theory of origin and appellation. Buenos Aires 1964. Preface by Count *I. Károlyi*; authors: *I. Foyta, Z. Pók, F. Badiny Jós.* — As to the activities of *I. Foyta* in Hungarian ancient history, see his book: *Honnan származunk, mit adtunk a világnak, kik a rokonaink?* (Where Do We Come From, What Have We Given the World, Who Are Our Relatives?) Buenos Aires 1961. See also note 169, below.

- <sup>22</sup> *Béla Kézdy Vásárhelyi de Kézdy: Certain Totemistic Elements in Hungarian Armory.* Attila's Armorial. Los escudos de Attila. Attila címerei. Buenos Aires 1963. (Acta Societatis Sumero—Hungaricae, 1, No. 1.) Cf. also idem: *Certain Totemistic Elements in Hungarian Armory.* In: *The Sixth International Congress of Genealogy and Heraldry.* Edinburg 1962. — Cf. another work of the same author: *Él-e még Attila vére európai családokban?* (Harsona könyvsorozata, 32.) (Does Attila's Blood Still Flow in the Veins of European Families?) London 1965.

- <sup>23</sup> *Victor Padányi: Sumir—magyar nyelv lélekazonosságá (sic!).* (Spiritual Identity of the Sumerian and Hungarian Languages [sic!].) No place, 1961; Two essays: 1. *Horaha — harku — horka* (Notes on the Menes question). 2. *A New Aspect of the Etruscan Provenance.* Sydney 1963 (1964 ?); *Dentumagyararia.* Buenos Aires 1963 (Magyar Történelmi Tanulmányosorozat); *Történelmi tanulmányok.* (Historical Studies.) San Francisco, Calif. and Munich (?) 1972; cf. the author's other — historical and political — studies as well, e.g. *A nagy tragédia. Szintézis, I. Így kezdődött... (The Great Tragedy. A Synthesis, 1. That's How it All Started...)* Sydney 1952; *Vérbulcsu. Egy ezredéves*

- évfordulóra. (Vérbulesu [An old Hungarian name.] For a Millennium.) Buenos Aires 1954; Tér és történelem. Történetbőleleleti vázlat. (Space and History. A Historico-Philosophical Sketch.) Melbourne 1956; Egyetlen menekvés. (The Only Escape.) Munich 1967, etc.
- <sup>24</sup> From among the numerous pamphlets, papers and multiplied propaganda publications of *Ferenc Badiny Jós* I have got but a few in my hand. These are: *Nuevas orientaciones en la investigación de las lenguas uralo-altaicas. El pueblo de Nimrud. Dos conferencias.* Buenos Aires 1966; *Altaic Peoples' Theocracy.* A paper read at the XXVIIIth International Congress of Orientalists (Ann Arbor, Mich. 1967). Buenos Aires 1967; *A sumir-magyar nyelvazonosság bizonyító adatai.* (Data Proving Sumerian-Hungarian Linguistic Identity.) Buenos Aires, no date (about 1968?); *Badiny Jós Ferenc spanyol nyelvű előadásainak magyar változata.* (The Hungarian Version of Ferenc Badiny Jós's Lectures in Spanish.) No place (Buenos Aires), no year (about 1968?), pp. 13–24; *Káldeától Ister-gamig, I. A. sumir őstörténet.* (From Chaldea to Ister-gam, I. The Sumerian Prehistory.) Buenos Aires 1971; *The Ethnic and Linguistic Problem of the Parthians.* A paper read at the XXVIII International Congress of Orientalists (Cambera 1971). (Mimeographed.) Cf. *Magyarok a 28. Orientalista Kongresszuson.* (Hungarians at the 28. Congress of Orientalists.) Ausztráliai Magyarság, April 1971; *New Lines for a Correct Sumerian Phonetics to Conform with the Cuneiform Scripts.* A Paper Read at the XXIXth International Congress of Orientalists (Paris 1973). Buenos Aires 1973, cf. in: *Congrès International des Orientalistes, Résumé des Communications.* Paris 1973. p. 1. — See also: *Sumir-Magyar kérdések és feleletek. . . "Quo vadis Magyar?" Vitairat, kiad. a Kőrösi Csoma Sándor Társaság.* (Sumerian-Hungarian Question and Answers. . . "Quo vadis Magyar?" A pamphlet Published by the Kőrösi Csoma Society.) Toronto 1972. — An early paper of his which can be considered as Summary, is: *A megtalált magyar őstörténelem. A babiloni sumir táblákról leolvasott esztergomi romkópólta (sic) oroszlanos képének magyarázata.* (Ancient Hungarian History Discovered. The explanation of the Lion-Decorated Picture of the Esztergom Chapel-Ruin Read from the Sumerian Tablets of Babylon.) Sydney, no date (about 1965?) — Cf. note 75, below.
- <sup>25</sup> Cf. *Sándor Gallus: A magyar és sumer nyelv kapcsolatának lehetősége.* (The Possibility of Connections between Hungarian and Sumerian Languages.) Ausztráliai Magyar Évkönyv 1969, pp. 65–73. Some data make me think, however, that *Gallus* tried to moderately carry on with his scholarly research which he had started in Hungary, before the Second World War.
- <sup>26</sup> *László Rimanóczy: A világ teremtése. A vízözön legendák. A sziget-világ legendái. Ausztráliai legendák. Mezopotámia. A hettiaiak (sic!). A dél-amerikai őskultúra. A turán-sumir műveltség dél-amerikai kapcsolatai.* (The Creation of the World. Legends of the Isles. Australian Legends. The Hittians [sic!]. Ancient South American Culture. The South American Connections of Turanian-Sumerian Culture.) Manuscript from about 1967; *Az elveszejtett turáni örökség. A semita (zsidó) műveltség a valóság tükrében.* Kiad. *Jenő György Kovács,* [illetve a] *A Magyar Turán Szumér Szemle.* (The Lost Turanian Heritage. The Semitic or Jewish Culture in the Mirror of Reality. Ed. by J. Gy. Kovács, [resp.] by the Magyar Turán Szumér Szemle.) Bruxelles 1974.
- <sup>27</sup> *Sándor Felsőöri Nagy: A magyar nép kialakulásának története.* (The History of the Evolution of the Hungarian People.) Buenos Aires 1969.
- <sup>28</sup> *Tibor Baráth: A magyar népek (!) őstörténete, 1–3.* (The Ancient History of the Hungarian Peoples [!].) Montreal 1968, 1973, 1974; *Tájékoztató az újabb magyar őstörténeti kutatásról.* (Information on the Latest Research in Hungarian Ancient History.) Montreal 1973.
- <sup>29</sup> *Juan Móriéz: Az európai népek amerikai eredete.* (The American Origin of the European Peoples.) The original text appeared in: *Guayaquil, Ecuador 1968, Talleres Gráficos de la Editorial offset Juan Montalvo.* — Cf. the news appearing in the Oct. 31, 1965 issue of *Magyar Nemzet*: "Juan Móriéz, an archeologist living in America, has established affiliation between Indian and Hungarian languages. He studied Indian tribes in Ecuador and Peru and realized that he almost understood their language, because there were so many words resembling Hungarian. . . Móriéz's discovery was bound to set a new path also for the investigations into the provenance of South Ame-



rican Indians." — Later the world press paid considerable attention to the cooperation and ensuing strife of Móricz and Erich von Däniken, as Däniken — when elaborating his "astronautical" theory — resorted himself to "proofs" discovered by Móricz (cf. *E. von Däniken: Zurück zu den Sternen. München — Zürich 1972, p. 125 sq.*). However, there arose a fatal conflict between them eventually, as to the sharing of both the intellectual and financial property (to this cf. an article in *Világosság 14 [1973], p. 384: Däniken — a próféta [Däniken — the Prophet], adapted from Der Spiegel*).

<sup>30</sup> *Sándor Csöke: A sumér ősnyelvtől a magyar élönyelvig. (Sumér — Magyar Tanulmányok. I.) (From Ancient Sumerian to Living Hungarian. Sumero — Hungarian Studies, 1.) New York 1969; Szumír (on the cover-page: 'Szumér') — magyar egyeztető szótár. (Sumero — Hungarian Word Agreements.) Buenos Aires 1970; 1973<sup>2</sup>; Sumér — magyar összehasonlító nyelvtan. (Sumero — Hungarian Comparative Grammar.) Buenos Aires 1972. — The book quoted in the first place advertises a further work of *Csöke: A magyar nyelvben továbbélő sumér. (Sumerian Surviving in Hungarian.)* as the III. issue of *Sumero — Hungarian Studies*. I could not establish whether the book in question was published or not. — *Csöke* made his "debut" with a paper on another subject, cf. *A perui aymará és quechua nyelvek uraltáltái nyelvi rokonsága. (A Turáni Akadémia tanulmányosorozata, 1.) (The Uralo-Altai Linguistic Affiliation of the Peruvian Aymara and Quechua Languages. The Study-Series of the Turanian Academy, 1.) — Let me mention here that the effect of "Sumero — Hungarology" is palpable even in the papers of authors who do not directly adhere to this tendency: historical and linguistic dilettantism appears to often make even these non-members go along lines similar to Sumero — Hungarian linguistic affiliation. Such a work is e.g. *E. Rudnay's Attila trilógia (Attila Trilogy) series: I. Igazságok, ferdtitések, honfoglalás. (I. Truths, Distortions, Conquest.) Bruxelles 1964, cf. esp. pp. 52 sqq.; II. Ki volt Tudun, Csák Máté, Székelyek. (II. Who was Tudun, Máté Csák, the Transylvanians.) ibid. 1965; III. Hogy történt, Egyházi fejlődés, Népek, nyelvek, ... Ezekiel próféta és a szumirok, ... (III. How did it Happen, Ecclesiastical Development; Peoples, Languages, . . . The Prophet Ezekiel and the Sumerians, . . .) Ibid. 1966, cf. esp. pp. 177 sqq.; the views of the author are heated up by some Hungarian provincial — and family — patriotism, that is to say, bias, cf. also *Egyed Rudnay: Felvidékünk múltja és a Divék nemzetség. (Kézirat, sokszorosítva.) (The Past of Our Highland and the Divék Clan. Manuscript, mimeographed.) Budapest 1954.****

From the literature on Sumero — Hungarian identity see also: *István Szabó: Özönvíztől napjainkig. Az egész magyar őstörténelem csengő ritmusú versekben. (From the Deluge to Our Days. The Whole Hungarian Ancient History in Tinkling Rhymes.) Buenos Aires, no year. The II. part of a doggerel entitled *Ember ősnyelve magyar (Hungarian is Man's Original Mother Tongue)*, written by a "poet" unknown for me (I do not know the I st part, only fragments of the II nd: namely, the cantos 2, 4, 5, got into my hand); its author also attached linguistic comments refuting the theory of Sumero — Hungarian kinship and blazoning forth the Far-Eastern provenance of the Hungarians.*

<sup>31</sup> There is in-depth information to be found on the press materials listed in *Mária Németh's* bibliography: *Külföldi magyar nyelvű hírlapok és folyóiratok címjegyzéke és adattára. 1945 — 1970. 2. Nem szocialista országok. (Directory and Reference-book of Hungarian Newspapers and Periodicals Abroad. 1945 — 1970. Vol. 2. Non-Socialist Countries.) Budapest 1972.* Some dates of mine date from after the completion of this work. There is a rich, subtle and surprisingly novel — at least for us — image drawn on the political and intellectual countenance of the Western Hungarian emigration by *Kázmér Nagy's* book *Elveszett alkotmány. (The Lost Constitution.)* Munich 1974. The book has some hard words on the "dreamworld" and "prehistoric mist" of Sumero — Hungarian linguistic affiliation (pp. 22 sqq.). Cf. also *Péter Veszély's* positive review of the book entitled: *Magyar emigráns a magyar emigrációról. Nagy Kázmér könyve a magyar politikai emigráció történetéről. (A Hungarian Emigrant on Hungarian Emigration. Kázmér Nagy's book on the History of Hungarian Political Emigration.)* *Kritika* 1974, No. 4, pp. 9 — 12.

- <sup>32</sup> *László Pass*: Nimród feltámadt. (Kézirat.) (Nimród's Resurrection. Manuscript.) 1974. Cf. also note 9, above. — See also earlier: *László Pass*: Nimród népe. (Nimród's People.) (Nemzeti Könyvtár, 53.) Budapest 1941.
- <sup>33</sup> From among *Andor Schedel's* several manuscripts — circulated in numerous versions — the following ones got into my hand: A sumér kérdés. (The Sumerian Question.) 1963; A sumérek. (The Sumerians.) 1964; Sumér-akkád magyar és magyar sumér-akkád szószered. (Sumerian-Akkadian Hungarian and Hungarian Sumerian-Akkadian Word List.) 1965; Sumer — magyar — angol szószered. (Sumerian — Hungarian — English World List.) 1965; Adalékok Bárczi Géza Magyar szöveftő szótárához. (Addenda to Géza Bárczi's Hungarian Etymological Dictionary.) 1965; A sumér — magyar nyelvita. (The Sumerian — Hungarian Linguistic Debate.) 1966.; Feladatok a sumér — magyar kapcsolatok terén. (Tasks in the Field of Sumerian — Hungarian Connections.) 1967; Sumér — magyar — angol — német szótár. (Sumerian — Hungarian — English — German Dictionary.) 1969; A magyar technikai kultúra fejlődéstörténete és a nyelvészet. Kézirat. (The Evolution of the Hungarian Technical Culture and Linguistics. Manuscript.) [Budapest] 1969. (Rotaprint.) — His article quoted, in note 6, above, appeared in a Hungarian periodical; furthermore: A puli útja Eriduról Bugacig. (The Puli's Progress from Eridu to Bugac.) A kutya 32, [No. 6], June 6, 1969.) On this subject and on sources and proofs used by *Schedel* cf. my study quoted in note 80, below.)
- <sup>34</sup> *Árpád Orbán*: Nimrud király népe. A magyarok őstörténete. A székelyek eredete. (King Nimrud's People. The Prehistory of Hungarians. The Provenance of the Transylvanians.) Csíkszereda 1943. (The memory of this book is recalled by a Commemorative in Magyar Történelmi Szemle 1, No. 4–5 [1970], pp. 55 sq.) Cf. further on his manuscripts: Őstörténelmünk európai csiszolt kőkori, réz-, bronz- és vaskori legfőbb tizenkét kútforrása. (The Twelve Major European Neolithic, Copper-, Bronze- and Iron-age Sources of Our Prehistory.) 1962; A kőkénydombi Vénusz szobor beszélőképessé gondolkodási rendszere, olvasata(!), resp.: A kőkénydombi Vénusz sumér hieroglifái és azok olvasata. (The Reading [!]) and Interlocutory Communicative System of the Kőkénydomb Venus Statue, resp.: The Sumerian Hieroglyphs of the Kőkénydomb Venus and Their Reading.) 1968; Az új (magyar) délies, sokszöges szórokonítási rendszer és diadalútja. (The System and Victorious Career of the New Hungarian Southern, Polygonal Word Affiliation.) 1970. A manuscript by *Zoltán Bárczy*: Polygonális összehasonlító nyelvészet. (Polygonal Comparative Linguistics.) Budapest 1970. is associated to this paper. — As to *Orbán's* contributions in public, see further below. However, his following pamphlet did appear (cf. note 42, below): Túlhaladott, tudománytalan Papp László nyelvészeti-őstörténelmi szemlélete?? Orbán Árpád nyíltválasza (sic!) Papp László támadásaira. (Is László Papp's Linguistic-Prehistoric Contemplation Outdated and Unscholarly?? Árpád Orbán's Public Answer [sic!] to the Assaults of László Papp.) Északi Vártán, 1971, pp. 16–33 and offprints; cf. note 42, below.
- <sup>35</sup> Cf. *Elemér Novotny*: Debrecen város nevének eredetéről. (Kézirat.) (On the Origin of the City-Name Debrecen. Manuscript.) 1966; Az "igéz", "lát", "néz", "ember", "személy", "szabad", "tekint", "szem", "szerelem" és "szent" szavaink etimológiája ügyében. (Kézirat.) (In Behalf of the Etymologies of the Words "fascinate", "see", "look", "man", "person", "free", "glance", "eye", "live" and "saint". Manuscript. 1966.); Sumerian Texts Written with Latin Phonetics, Found in XI–XII. Century Hungarian Linguistic Remains. (Lecture at the XIX. International Congress of Orientalists.) 1973. (Cf. the pamphlet quoted in note 75, below, p. 3.)
- <sup>36</sup> *András Zakar*: A sumér nyelvről. (Kézirat.) (On the Sumerian Language. Manuscript.) 1968. — Cf. *András Zakar* [sumér és ural-altáji összehasonlító nyelvészettel foglalkozó dolgozatai és ezek nemzetközi visszhangja. Gépirat, nyomtatvány, xerokópia]. (His papers, dealing with Sumerian and Uralo-Altaic Comparative Linguistics and their International Echo. Type-written manuscripts, offprints and Xero-copies, collected by the author.) 1969–71. National Széchenyi Library, Collection of Manuscripts, Analekta No. 10.988.
- <sup>37</sup> *András Zakar*: A sumér nyelvről. (On the Sumerian Language.) Södertälje 1970. Északi Vártán, 39; On the Sumerian Language. Magyar Múlt. Hungarian Past 1, No. 2–3 (1972) 1–45; A sumér hitvilág és a Biblia. (The Sumerian Mythology and the Bible.) Garfield, N. Y. 1972; 1973.<sup>2</sup> — Cf. further note 61, below.



- <sup>38</sup> *László Zsúrger*: "Dentumagyaría", "Pusszìj meg" és vidéke. ("Dentumagyaría", "Kiss Me" and its Environs.) *Látóhatár* 16 (1966), pp. 1149–1152.
- <sup>39</sup> *Péter Hajdú*: Új hazát találtak, őshazát keresnek. (They Have Found a New Home and they are Looking for a Primeval one.) *Néprajz és Nyelvtudomány, Acta Univ. Szegediensis...*, *Sectio Ethnographica et Linguistica* 13 (1969), pp. 9–15 (and offprint: *Nyelvészeti dolgozatok*, 84); A sumér mítosz és a valóság. (The Sumerian Myth and Reality.) *Tiszatáj* 26, No. 5 (1972), pp. 29–34.
- <sup>40</sup> *János Gulya*: Délibábos elméletek a magyar nyelv eredetéről. (The Fata Morgana theories about the Origin of the Hungarian Language.) Lecture delivered at the Week of the Hungarian Language, 1967. — At this where was the first and almost demonstrative public appearance of the "Sumero–Hungarologists" in Hungary.
- <sup>41</sup> *János Gulya*: A magyar nyelv eredete védelmében. (In Defence of the Origin of the Hungarian Language.) *Irodalmi és nyelvi közlemények. A Tudományos Ismeretterjesztő Társulat Irodalmi-Nyelvi Országos Választmányának közlönye* 1970, No. 1, pp. 92–105. — Besides, cf.: *Szép, asszony, szita*: Sumérul szép, aszu, szita — Véletlen egyezések, kitalált rokonság. (Hung. 'Beautiful', 'Woman', 'Sieve': in Sumerian *széb*, *aszu*, *szita* — Fortuitious agreements, imaginary kinship.) *Esti Hírlap*, Február 20, 1974. (Reporter: Julia Halász.) — Let me remark now that the Sumero–Hungarian etymologies of the title (and those of the article, as well) cannot even be fortuitious coincidences: *szép*, 'beautiful' is in Sumerian *sig*, *šiga*, written with the sign SIG<sub>5</sub> and this, in fact, means 'good'; *asszony*, 'feleség', 'woman', 'wife' is in Sumerian *dam* and *asszony*, 'nő', 'woman', 'female' is in fact *munus* (the word *aszu* is merely a phantom-word, may be a distorted form of one of the versions of the Akkadian *aššatu*, 'woman'); the words meaning *szita* 'sieve' all sound differently in Sumerian (cf. *A. Salonen*: *Die Hausgeräte der alten Mesopotamier*, 1. Helsinki 1965. 67 sqq.), but there is a Sumerian word, *zi*, *zida*, written with the sign ZĪ, however it means 'flour'. All these examples belong to the peculiar etymologies of the "Sumero–Hungarologist".
- <sup>42</sup> *László Papp*: A sumér–magyar kérdés. (The Sumero–Hungarian Question.) *Magyar Nyelvőr* 94 (1970), pp. 280–291.
- <sup>43</sup> *P[ál] E. F[é]r*: A sumér "ősök". (The Sumerian "Ancestors".) *Népszabadság*, October 28, 1970.
- <sup>44</sup> *Péter Ruffy*: Utazás az anyanyelv körül. Ősök és utódok. (Travelling around the Mother Tongue. Ancestors and Descendants.) *Magyar Nemzet*, November 15, 1970.
- <sup>45</sup> *László Papp*: Délibábos nyelvészkedés: Dicsőbb ősokeket keresnek — A bizonyítás nem sikerült — Sumérok, óperzsák és mások. (Fata Morgana Linguistics: Looking for Nobler Ancestors — Verification Fails — Sumerians, Ancient Persians and Others.) *Magyarország*, November 7, 1971 (No. 368), p. 39.
- <sup>46</sup> *Tibor Cseres*: Régi dicsőségünk (1966). (Our Old Glory, 1966.); *Hol a kódex?* (1969). (Where is the Codex?, 1969.); now both articles can be found in *Cseres's Collected Essays: Hol a kódex?* Budapest 1971, pp. 490–496 (cf. esp. p. 493), 519–525 (cf. esp. p. 519); furthermore: *Képek a Kassai kódexről*. (Pictures of the Košice Codex.) *Élet és Irodalom* 1973, No. 47, p. 15 (there is no separate mention of Sumero–Hungarian linguistic affiliation); *A történelemtől a máig — Beszélgetés Cseres Tiborral*. (From History to the Present — An Interview with Tibor Cseres.) *Népszabadság*, November 7, 1974. (Reporter: Gábor Bányai.)
- <sup>47</sup> *Antal Bartha*: Magyar őskor–magyar jelenkor, I. Személyünkhöz szól. (Hungarian Prehistory — Hungarian Present, I. Addressed to us Personally.) *Népszabadság*, March 10, 1972; II. Az értelem követelménye (II. The Demand of the Intellect.) *Ibid.*, March 11, 1972. — Cf. also: *Magyar őshaza — szovjet archeológia. Bartha Antal ethnogenezisünk új elméletéről*. (Original Homeland of the Hungarians and Soviet Archaeology. A. Bartha on the New Theory of Our Ethnogenesis.) *Magyar Hírlap*, December 15, 1972. (Reporter: Byp.)
- <sup>48</sup> *Endre Bajomi Lázár*: "Ne zabálj sokat, mert sós" — avagy szenzéciós felfedezések a magyar őstörténetről. ("Don't Gollop Much for it's Salty" — or Sensational Discoveries about Hungarian Prehistory.) *Ludas Matyi*, May 23, 1972.
- <sup>49</sup> *Csanád Bálint*: Már megint és még mindig a sumércsok. (Yet Again and Still the Sumer-Mongers.) *Tiszatáj* 27, No. 3 (1973), pp. 76–79 (about the book of Badiny Jós, quoted above, cf. note 2 and 24).

- <sup>50</sup> *Géza Bethlenfalvy*: Indulat és valóság a nyelvvitában. (Passion and Reality in the Language Debate.) Magyar Nemzet, May 25, 1973 (in connection with an article of Mrs. Hary, published *ibid.*, May 23).
- <sup>51</sup> *László Mátrai*: Tudományos mítoszok. (Scientific Myths.) Világosság 14 (1973), pp. 195–198.
- <sup>52</sup> *Gyula Ortutay*: A magyarság közös pillérei. (The Common Pillars of Hungariandom.) Magyar Hírek, June 23, 1973. (Reporter: Sz. M.)
- <sup>53</sup> *Gyula László*: Hol volt, hol nem volt... Magánbeszéd az őshazakutatásról. (Once upon a time... A Soliloquy on Researching our Primitive Homeland.) Élet és Irodalom 1974, No. 8, p. 3 sq.
- <sup>54</sup> *István Fodor*: Néhány szó „sumér eleink”-ről. (Some Words About Our “Sumerian Ancestors”.) Tiszatáj, 28, No. 3 (1974), pp. 59–62 (about the books quoted in note 28, above).
- <sup>55</sup> *Géza Komoróczy*: Már a kérdésfeltevés is tudománytalan. (The Very Question Is Unscholarly.) Magyar Hírek, April 13, 1974 (Reporter: András Apostol); Elavult őshaza-elméletek. (Obsolete Primeval Home Theories.) Magyar Hírlap (Monday issue), February 3, 1975. (Reporter: Gábor István Benedek.) – I have dealt with Sumerian-Hungarian linguistic affiliation quite briefly in an introductory essay of mine, written to my Sumerian literary translations, *Géza Komoróczy*: „Fénylő ölednek édes örömében...” A sumer irodalom kistükre. (“In the Sweet Joy of Your Shining lap...” An Anthology of Sumerian Literature.) Budapest 1970. p. 8 sq.
- <sup>56</sup> *Antal Lőcséi*: A sumer–magyar rokonság legendájának története. (The Story of the Legend of Sumero–Hungarian Kinship.) In: Az Élet és Tudomány Kalendáriuma 1975. Budapest 1974, pp. 325–330.
- <sup>57</sup> *Attila Szabó T.*: Fellegjáró nyelvrokonsítás. (Coultdrotting Linguistic Affiliation.) In: Nyelv és múlt. Válogatott tanulmányok és cikkek. (Language and Past. Selected Essays and Articles.) III. Bucharest 1972, pp. 9–20, see also some other studies of the same collection.
- <sup>58</sup> *Géza Bárczi*: A sumér–magyar nyelvrokonság kérdése. (The Question of Sumero–Hungarian Linguistic Kinship.) Nyelvünk és Kultúránk. Az Anyanyelvi Konferencia Védnökségének tájékoztatója No. 16 (1974), pp. 28–35; reprinted in: Látóhatár. Válogatás a magyar kulturális sajtóból, January, 1975, pp. 188–197. – From among *Bárczi*'s earlier statements on the subject, see: Bevezetés a nyelvtudományba. (Introduction to Linguistics.) Budapest 1957, p. 139, etc.
- <sup>59</sup> *H. W. F. Saggs*: The Greatness that was Babylon. A Sketch of the Ancient Civilization of the Tigris–Euphrates Valley. New York 1962, p. 494.
- <sup>60</sup> *T. von Bogyay*: Urgeschichtliche Wunderdinge. Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher 41 (1969), pp. 295–299. – Cf. earlier, too: Új Látóhatár 6 (1960), pp. 369–386.
- <sup>61</sup> *A. Zakar*: On the Sumerian Language. Current Anthropology 10 (1969), p. 432 E; *A. Zakar*: Sumerian–Ural-Altai Affinities. *Ibid.* 12 (1971), pp. 215, 222–224; cf. *ibid.* 14 (1973), p. 495.
- <sup>62</sup> Cf. Current Anthropology 12 (1971), pp. 215 sq. (*M. Civil*); pp. 219 sq. (*A. L. Oppenheim*).
- <sup>63</sup> *G. Clauson*: On the Idea of Sumerian–Ural-Altai Affinities. Current Anthropology 14 (1973), pp. 493–495.
- <sup>64</sup> The incipit of a typed copy of the approximately 650 line letter: “My dear son... and your big family”; for a start, he alludes to the article quoted in note 38, above. To the text which got to my hand in autumn 1970, its readers attached, in several parts, an appendix which was of the same length altogether.
- <sup>65</sup> *István Szőcs*: Sumér és Szemere. (Sumerian and Szemere.) Korunk 30 (1971), pp. 1556–1565. Szőcs, summarizing his disquisitions, breaks a lance on behalf of the “Nostratic” primeval language. “Nostratic” supposed to be a group comprising Semitic, Indo-European, Finno-Ugrian and Hamitic languages. On the problem see recently É. Korenchy: On the Nostratic Language Family Hypothesis. Nyelvtudományi Közlemények 77, I (1975), pp. 109–115.
- <sup>66</sup> *András Bodor*: A sumér-kutatás néhány kérdéséről. (On Some Questions of Researching Sumerian.) Korunk 30 (1971), pp. 1565–1572.



<sup>67</sup> So e.g. *István Szócs*: *Halandzsa-e az Antanténusz?* (Is Antanténusz a Jaber?) Utunk, April 28, 1972. The article, referring *László Pass* (cf. notes 9 and 32, above), sets out to explain the text of the well-known Hungarian counting-out rhyme from Sumerian. To characterize the trustworthiness of the explanation, let me mention that he derives the second part of the "word" *antanténusz* from the "Sumerian" god-name Tammuz, or more correctly Tammüz, apparently unaware of its being an Old Testament Hebrew form (cf. Ezekiel 8:14); the Sumerian form of the name is Dumuzi or Dumuzid (and not Dumuzzig, Dunguz, as he writes), its Akkadian form, respectively, Du'uzu, Dúzu; these however are not to be agreed with the "word" *ténusz*. The priggish explanation has but one shortcoming: the Sumerian words, from which he compiles the counting-out rhyme, are all the offspring of *Pass*'s and *Szócs*'s fancy. *Pass*'s explanations are twisted even further by *Szócs*: e.g. he considers the word *ténusz* "the inverted compound of the Hungarian word *isten* 'god'". I have enlarged upon this article, insignificant because of its absurdities, for it (and whatever it contains) was later referred to as being decisive proof of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic kinship. — Cf. further on: *István Szócs*: *A székelykapu*. (The Transylvanian Gate.) *Művészet* 15, No. 10 (1974), pp. 33 — 36. Being a partisan now of "romantic imaginative powers" and antagonizing "positivistic" (!) — let me also add: factual — explanations like those in the works of *Margit B. Nagy* (cf. e.g. her *Renezánsz és barokk Erdélyben*. [Renaissance and Baroque in Transylvania.] Bucharest 1970. pp. 73 sqq.), *Szócs* deems the Transylvanian Gate to be the scene of "a cultic Sun ceremony", and this he originates from the "South". Thus, without even mentioning Sumerians, he undoubtedly orientates his reader in the direction of "Sumero-Hungarology". *Szócs* himself is allusive of the rejection of the ideas of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation: "The researcher is hesitant to publicly engage himself in these questions, because the possible conclusions seem to contradict the nowadays widespread standpoints and one easily might incur denunciations like «daydreamer», «miray», «hallucination-monger»". Incidentally, *Szócs*'s thoughts and disquisitions indeed stem from the pages of some recent Western press materials, cf. e.g. the pp. 78 sq. of the book quoted in note 169, below.

<sup>68</sup> Its photo appears in *Raoul Sorbán*: *Szervátiusz Jenő*. Budapest 1973. Photo No. 43.

<sup>69</sup> As far as I know, the inscription has not been read by anybody up till now. The spelling of its text is the following: 1. Beside the head of the man figure: *gilgames*; 2. On the hide covering the upper part of the man figure and on his left shin, respectively: *latja enkidu a leanzo a | veszedelmezt a hatalmast (t) a bardolatlan | ferfiut k[i] | hegyek közt te[r]mett | siksagon nőtt* (The girl sees Enkidu, the dangerous, the mighty, the uncouth man, who was born in the mountains and bred on the plains); 3. On the two thighs of the woman figure: *enkidu majd összeforr vele | megismeri a nő szerelme[t] | s azután mar nem ura többé | az artatlan föld | erejenek* (Then Enkidu unites with her, and gets to know the woman's love, and hence he ceases to master the powers of innocent earth). The writing proceeds from top to bottom, the lines from left to right, and there is no space left between words on the inscription. Let me hereby offer my thanks to *István Vásáry* for the help in reading the runic writing. Both quotations in rhymes come from *Sándor Rákos*'s adaptation of the Tablet I of the Akkadian Gilgamesh epic, cf. *Gilgames — Agyagtáblák üzenete*. Budapest 1966, p. 91; 1974,<sup>3</sup> p. 93. The three space-filling animal figures also seem to allude to the scene described on the Tablet I of the Gilgamesh epic.

<sup>70</sup> On the measures of local authorities, see also Csík vármegye Hivatalos Lapja, October 18, 1906.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. *Imre Timkó*: *Keleti kereszténység, keleti egyházak*. (Orthodox Christianity, Orthodox Churches.) Budapest 1971, p. 139 sqq.

<sup>72</sup> A short extract of the lectures announced in advance — as usual — appeared in the preliminary publication of the congress: XXIX Congrès International des Orientalistes, *Résumé des Communications*. Paris 1973, p. 1. (*Jós Badiny*); p. 2 (*Margaret von Haynal*); these two lectures have also been separately published by the authors, see note 24, above, and *M. von Haynal*: *The Sumerian Seals of Buenos Aires*. Buenos Aires 1973, respectively.

As a parenthetic remark I have to say that the paper of *von Haynal* present some impressions — recently found (as supposed) by *Badiny Jós* in Argentine — of cylinder-seals of

the Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin, contending that the original pieces got lost in the Second World War. The cylinder-seals in question – the original pieces – are in Berlin, undamaged, and naturally the special literature keeps account of them. Consequently the publication is to surprise but the Hungarian reader who happens to know that the theme, of which Haynal wrote her paper, had been written about decades ago. True as it is, he was not intent on discovering anything, he honestly based his writing on the corresponding scientific publications. See *István Kovács*: A babilóniai vetőke. (The Sowingplough in Babylonia.) *Erdélyi Múzeum* 50 (1945), pp. 243–246.

The cover of *von Haynal's* paper deserves attention, however, because this employs the recently used shield of "Sumero-Hungarologists" as a decoration. The shield is vastly instructive. The so-called "tree of life" stands in its centre. A lion is drawn in front of this. The tree and the lion lie crosswise (!). On the abdomen of the lion there are four cuneiform signs from among the simplest ones, that is the sign *u*. However, the sign is exactly reversed as compared to its correct position. From among the "tree of life" speculations of the "Sumero-Hungarologists", see *Z. Szepessy*: Der mesopotamische Lebensbaum, I–II. *Magyar Történelmi Szemle*, 3. No. 4 (1972), pp. 545–560; 4. No. 1 (1973), pp. 71–80. The interesting thing is that the so-called "tree of life" symbol was probably unknown in Mesopotamia, see *H. Genge*: Zum „Lebensbaum“ in den Keilschriftkulturen. *Acta Orientalia Hauniae* 33 (1971), pp. 321–334, and at last *Géza Komoróczy*: Egy termékenység-szimbólum Mezopotámiában. Jegyzetek az „életfa” kérdéséhez. (A Fertility Symbol in Mesopotamia. Notes on the Question of the "Tree of Life".) *Ethnographia* 87 (1976), in the press.

*Badiny Jós's* pamphlet, to be mentioned soon (cf. note 75, below), also writes about the lectures of other Sumero-Hungarologists (that is, of *Mary Brády*; of a Hungarian "etruscologist", left unnamed, who considers Etruscan to be Hungarian too; and finally, of *Elemér Novotny*).

<sup>73</sup> For his views on the Sumerian cf. *K. Schildmann*: Compendium of the Historical Grammar of the Sumerian Language./Grundriss der historischen Grammatik des Sumerischen, fasc. 1–3 = *Acta et Studia. S[tudiengesellschaft] D[eutscher] L[inguisten]* – *Mitteilungen, Berichte und Dokumente* II, 2 (1964, Bonn), II, 2 (sic!, 1967), II, 3 (1970).

<sup>74</sup> There was no Hungarian-speaking Sumerologist, and nobody from Hungary, participating at this session of Ancient Oriental Section of the Congress.

<sup>75</sup> *Ferenc Badiny Jós*: Beszámoló a 29. nemzetközi orientalista kongresszusról. (An Account of the 29th International Congress of Orientalists.) (Manuscript, rotaprint or Xerox.), p. 6. Let me remark that a four-page version of the pamphlet is circulated too, evidently because part of the text on page 5 is addressed to those "Hungarian brothers" who "are at home and hope..." (!). For a variant in German, see: Die Identität der sumerischen Rasse und Sprache mit der Ungarischen ist bewiesen. Bericht über die epochenmachenden ungarischen Erfolge am XXIX. Weltkongress der Orientalisten im Juni 1973 in Paris (translated by a certain *Margit Hegyi*, Stuttgart).

<sup>76</sup> The quotations are from page 5; the quotation is not verbatim: I did not want to repeat the blatant spelling mistakes of the original Hungarian text.

<sup>77</sup> *Gyula Illyés*: *Petőfi Sándor*. Budapest 1963, pp. 16 sq. The foreign language editions of this book have all adhered to this version of the text, including the English translation, by *G. F. Cushing* (*Gyula Illyés*: *Petőfi.*), Corvina, Budapest 1973, cf. p. 12.

<sup>78</sup> *Jenő Mátyás Fehér* happens to belong to the leaders of the American "Sumero-Hungarologists". In 1968, that is, the same year when his book, dealing with the so-called *Košice Codex*, viz. *Középkori magyar inkvizíció* (Medieval Hungarian Inquisition), appeared, he was one of the editors of *Studia Sumero-Hungarica*. Since then, more and more "Sumero-Hungarologist" publications bear his name. And what is more, his approach to the contemplation on history of the "Sumero-Hungarologists" is becoming more and more overt in his recent books. Cf. *Jenő Mátyás Fehér*: *Táltosok és bakók*. (Sorceres and Headsmen.) New York 1970; *A nyugati avarok birodalma*. (The Empire of the Western Avars.) Vol. 1: *Az avar kincsek nyomában*. (In Search of the Avar Treasures.) Vol. 2: *A korai avar kagánok*. (The Early Avar Kagans.) Buenos Aires 1972. (Avar könyvek.) (Avar Books.); *Ősmagyarok és vikingek*. (Early Hungarians and Vikings.) Buenos Aires 1974.



- <sup>79</sup> Cf. *Jenő Szűcs*, „A gentilizmus. — A barbár etnikai tudat kérdése” c. kandidátusi értekezésének 1972. február 28-i nyilvános vitája. (Gentilism — The Question of Barbarian Ethnic Consciousness: An open discussion of his thesis, Februar 28, 1972.) In: A MTA Filozófiai és Történettudományok Osztályának Közleményei 21 (1972), pp. 153 — 200; the quotation is from page 197, see *E. Mályusz's* opinion on page 160 sq. As to the debate cf. accounts in *Történelmi Szemle* 14 (1971), pp. 188 — 211; *Századok* 107 (1973), pp. 114 — 130, too.
- <sup>80</sup> The substantial part of my envisaged lecture got published in the meantime thanks to the editorial encouragements of *Béla Kőpeczi* and *Pál Miklós*; see, *Géza Komoróczy*: Irodalmi hamisítványok. Adatok az ókori keleti kultúrák utóéletéhez a 19 — 20. században. (Literary Forgeries Relating to the Ancient Near East. Some Examples from the 19th — 20th Centuries.) *Helikon Világirodalmi Figyelő* 20 (1974), pp. 154 — 166, esp. pp. 163 sqq.
- <sup>81</sup> The history of the first debates, that of the so-called Sumerian Question, is expounded by *F. H. Weissbach*: *Die sumerische Frage*. Leipzig 1898. Excerpts from the discussions have been selected by *Th. B. Jones*: *The Sumerian Problem*. New York — London etc. 1969.
- <sup>82</sup> The above — far from complete — list has conspicuous similarities with whatever *Miklós Zsirai* compiled concerning languages brought in connection with Hungarian, cf. *Miklós Zsirai*: *Östörténeti csodabogarak*. (Prehistorical Curiosities.) In: *Lajos Ligeti* (Ed.): *A magyarság őstörténete*. (Prehistory of the Hungarians.) Budapest 1943, pp. 266 — 289.
- <sup>83</sup> As regards Turanism, excellent Hungarian Orientalists said their — in every respect condemning — verdict a long time ago, see *József Schmidt*: *Túránizmus*. (Turanism.) *Nyugat* 18, No. 20 (1925), pp. 197 — 200; *Gyula Németh*: *A magyar turánizmus*. (Hungarian Turanism.) *Magyar Szemle* 11 (1931), pp. 132 — 139; *László Gaál*: *Műkedvelők a magyar őstörténeti kutatásban*. (Amateurs in Hungarian Prehistoric Research.) *Magyar Szemle* 12 (1931), pp. 262 — 272. *Schmidt* is entirely right in stating that “Turanism is . . . a social and political movement disguised as science.” *Schmidt* was an eminent expert in Sanskrit Philology, *Németh* in Turkology, *Gaál* in Old Iranian philology; on *Schmidt's* activity see *Zoltán Mády*: *Schmidt József*. *Antik Tanulmányok* 10 (1963), pp. 131 — 153; 11 (1964), pp. 158 — 188; that of *Gaál*, see *János Harmatta*: *Antik Tanulmányok* 8 (1961), p. 135; *István Borzsák*: *Antik Tanulmányok* 11 (1964) p. 288. — Though from a strikingly different point of view, *Gyula Szekfű* also shares the rejective standpoint of the Orientalists; see his *Három nemzedék és ami utána következik*. (Three Generations and What Comes After.) Budapest 1934, pp. 479 sqq.; in so far as he criticizes Turanism, his arguments are valid even today.
- <sup>84</sup> *Turan (türān)* in the Iranian sources is the name of the territory of nomad tribes hostile towards Iran, living East-North-East from the Caspian Sea. In the Medieval Age the name was applied to the Turks. The idea of a so-called Turanian language family was elaborated by *Max Müller*, an influential scholar in the linguistics of his age. (Cf. *M. Müller*: *On the Turanian Languages*. In: *Chr. C. Jos. Bunsen*: *Christianity and Mankind*, III. *Outlines of the Philosophy of Universal History*. London 1854, pp. 263 — 521), subsequently, however, he himself dismissed the idea.
- <sup>85</sup> On this issue see *Péter Hajdú*: *Bevezetés az uráli nyelvtudományba*. (An Introduction to Uralian Linguistics.) Budapest 1966, pp. 90 sqq. — And what is more, even the faultless verification of the inherent affinity or kinship of languages listed in the Altaic language group has failed up till now. Cf. *D. Sinor*: *Introduction à l'étude de l'Eurasie Centrale*. Wiesbaden 1963, pp. 178 sqq. A sharply rejective standpoint is to be found in *G. Clauson's*: *Лексикостатистическая оценка алтайской теории*. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 1969, No. 5, pp. 22 — 41; polemic, though cautious to draw final conclusions, is *L. Ligeti*: *Алтайская теория и лексикостатистика*. *Voprosy Jazykoznanija* 1971, No. 3, pp. 21 — 33; *idem*: *La théorie altaïque et la lexico-statistique*. In: *L. Ligeti* (Ed.): *Researches in Altaic Languages*. Budapest 1975, pp. 99 — 115.
- <sup>86</sup> It was *Pál Hunfalvy* who first took note of the discovery of the Sumerian language in Hungary, and in a letter, written to *François Lenormant*, he announced his readiness to co-operate in the linguistic clarification of Sumerian and Turanian kinship, cf. *Fr.*

*Lenormant*: Les principes de comparaison de l'Accadien et des langues Touraniennes. Paris 1875. This fact proves that Hunfalvy, who, some decades ago, became the target of the fierce attacks of "Sumero – Hungarologists", had not been prejudiced when refusing Turanism and its variations; as long as this new supposition promised to yield scientific results, he was ready to deal with it. The slur upon Hunfalvy, incidentally, was gaining ground mainly between the two World Wars. Prior to this, even the "Sumero – Hungarologists" had spoken about him with a respect due to the greatest. I mention one of the recent slanders in note 114, below; recently Géza Bethlenfalvy (cf. note 50, above) and Gyula László (cf. note 53, above) firmly rejected the lies framing up Hunfalvy.

Sándor Giesswein was the first in Hungary to discourse upon the so-called Sumerian question and the debates around it: Mizraim és Assur tanulsága. Az ószövevényi szentírások hitelessége és isteni sugalmaztatása az aegiptológia és assyriológia világitásában, I – II. (The Testimony of Mizraim and Assur. The Validity and Divine Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament in the Light of Egyptology and Assyriology, I – II.) Győr 1887 – 1888. His modern critic, Jenő Gergely deftly analyses Giesswein's subsequent activities in a study of his: Giesswein Sándor politikai pályaképe. (On the Political Career of Sándor Giesswein.) A MTA Filozófiai és Történettudományok Osztályának Közleményei 23 (1974), pp. 259 – 287; Giesswein Sándor és a szociális katolicizmus. (Sándor Giesswein and Social Catholicism.) Világosság 15 (1974), pp. 624 – 633. Though Gergely is aware of Giesswein's achievements in the history of religion, he does not take note of this significant early work of his.

Not much later the great scholar of the Islam, Ignác Goldziher reported on the debates concerning the Sumerian language: cf. his Arábia régi történetéről. (On the Ancient History of Arabia.) Budapesti Szemle 66 (1891), pp. 65 – 104, esp. pp. 71 sq.; Jelentés az orientalisták IX. nemzetközi kongressusáról. (Report on the IX. International Congress of Orientalists.) Akadémiai Értesítő 3 (1892), pp. 632 – 659, esp. pp. 643 sq., etc. For truth's sake we have to state that Goldziher sympathized with the conception categorically denying the existence of the Sumerian language (J. Halévy). Taking great interest in Mesopotamian languages and antiquities (cf. his extensive essay on the activity of George Smith: Egyetemes Philológiai Közlöny 1 [1877], pp. 22 – 35, 102 – 110, 160 – 167), and regularly acquiring first-hand information, he was mistaken in this view of his. – I only mention, as a subsidiary remark, that as early as 1877 Goldziher – in his article just mentioned – spoke about the "Turanian" name as "an appellation which is always becoming untenable."

<sup>87</sup> In this context it is not my task to exhaustively treat the history of the modest beginnings of Hungarian cuneiform research. Therefore I refer only to some characteristic essays now: Géza Nagy: Tanulmányok a szumirokról. (Studies on the Sumerians.) Ethnographia 9 (1898), pp. 27 – 41; Eduard Mahler: A szumér ősnép nemzetisége. (The Nationality of the Ancient Sumerians.) Ethnographia 10 (1899), pp. 81 – 99, 199 – 217, but cf. János Galgóczy (a): A sumir kérdéshez. (On the Sumerian Question.) Ethnographia 10 (1899), pp. 352 – 372; Géza Nagy: A történelmi korszak kezdete. (The Beginnings of Historical Period.) Századok 33 (1899), pp. 677 – 697, but cf. János Galgóczy (b): Óstörténelmi tallózás. (Gleanings in Ancient History.) Ethnographia 11 (1900), pp. 155 – 163, 250 – 257.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. the differences of tone between two – otherwise Turanist – books: Gyula Ferenczy: Sumer és Akkad. (Sumer and Akkad.) Debrecen 1897, p. 84: "The glory of the invention of writing lies with the Sumerians and then with us"; and respectively Ede Somogyi: Emlékezzünk régiekről. (Let Us Remember Our Forebears.) Budapest 1908, pp. 338 sqq.: "... What is more honourable for us? To stem from the Finns, the oldest inhabitants of Europe, the people of the most ancient culture, or to descend from the Turks who already, thousands of years ago, exerted a great influence upon the advance of mankind and the promotion of its culture: in Mesopotamia as Sumerians, north from this as Cumanians and Comagenians, and farther north, in China as Huns..." (Nota bene: At this time, Turanism was not explicitly against the theory of Finno – Ugrian kinship; rather, it meant to enlarge the circle of our relatives. True as it is, it was this very uncritical enlargement which served basis for the more recent theories, in which Hungarian has become akin with almost all Eurasian peoples.)



- <sup>89</sup> *Gyula Ferenczy*: Szumer és Akkád. Egy ős turáni nép a Tigris és az Eufrates között. Tanulmány az assyriológia köréből. (Sumer and Akkad. An Ancient Turanian People between the Tigris and Euphrates. A Study in Assyriology.) Debrecen 1897; A civilizáció bölcsője. A Nílus és Eufrates mellékeinek legrégebb történelme. (The Cradle of Civilization. The Most Ancient History of the Nile and Euphrates Area.) Debrecen 1900. — Cf. note 96, below.
- <sup>90</sup> *Ede Somogyi*: Szumirok és magyarok. (Sumerians and Hungarians.) Budapest 1903, its new impression appeared as volume 2 of *Studia Sumiro-Hungarica* in New York, 1968; Emlékezzünk régiekről. Az emberiség története első feltűnésétől egészen a kultúra keletkezéséig. (Let Us Remember Our Forebears. The History of Mankind from Its First Appearance up to the Formation of Culture.) Budapest 1908. — I cannot take note — without special research in this field — of *Somogyi's* numerous newspaper articles, in which he had anticipated whatever he wrote about in his two subsequent books. It is worth mentioning, however, that his first book characterized by its defender *János Galgóczy*, as follows: "... he was but motivated by glowing Hungarian chauvinism", "its tone might be unusually blatant", provoked, at its very appearance, rebuffs with valid references to the whole of Sumero-Hungarian linguistic affiliation. As to the debate, cf., among others, *Eduard Mahler*: Budapesti Szemle 155 (1903), pp. 143–150 (proving that *Somogyi's* book was mostly plagiarism); *Bernát Munkácsi*: Jelentése Somogyi Edének "Szumirok és magyarok" c. könyvéről. (Review of *Ede Somogyi's* Book Entitled "Sumerians and Hungarians".) Akadémiai Értesítő 15 (1904), pp. 44–46; to this cf. *János Galgóczy*: (c) A sumir kérdéshez. (On the Sumerian Question.) Ethnographia 15 (1904), pp. 132–147; and again *Bernát Munkácsi*: Néhány szó a sumir rokonság védelméhez. (Some Words to Defend Sumerian Kinship.) Ethnographia 15 (1904), pp. 147–154.
- <sup>91</sup> Cf. notes 87 and 90, above, and in addition to the papers quoted there: (d) A kaukázusi népek őstörténetéhez. (On the Prehistory of Caucasian Peoples.) Ethnographia 12 (1901), pp. 343–351, 440–454; (e) Újabb sumir szöszedet. (A Recent Sumerian Word-List.) Ethnographia 13 (1902), pp. 111–117, 208–214, 260–267, 345–356, 405–411; (f) A sumir nép művészete. (The Art of the Sumerian People.) Művészet 2 (1903), pp. 109–118, 183–195; (g) Óstörténelmi böngészgetés. (Cullings in Ancient History.) Ethnographia 16 (1905), pp. 87–92, 201–210. The part I. of the article, Tigin, aroused great controversy, both at home and abroad; *Galgóczy* was tackled by his critics, cf. the material of the debate, notes 94–97, below, and *Galgóczy* (h): Végző a "Tigin"-ben. (Final Word about "Tigin".) Ethnographia 17 (1906), pp. 149–153; (i) A sumir tárgyas igeragozás. (The Sumerian Transitive Conjugation.) Magyar Nyelvőr 42 (1913), pp. 266–270; (j) A sumir és ural-altáji nyelvrokonság kérdéséhez. (On the Question of Kinship Between Sumerian and Uralo-Altaic.) (Manuscript.) 1914; (k) Sumir-magyar szöszedet. (Sumero-Hungarian Word-List.) (Manuscript.) 1915; (l) Sumir nyelvtan. (Sumerian Grammar.) (Manuscript.) 1917. — Mention is made about the manuscripts described under (j)–(k)–(l) in Akadémiai Értesítő 31 (1920), p. 34; I do not know about their subsequent fate.
- The volume 1 of *Studia Sumiro-Hungarica* was the collection of *János Galgóczy's* essays entitled A sumir kérdés. (The Sumerian Question.) New York 1968. The volume publishes from among *Galgóczy's* essays which are marked and quoted above as (a)–(b)–(c)–(d)–(e)–(g)–(h) and (i), but unfortunately, without exactly marking the original publication. Apart from these, the volume publishes the essays quoted in note 97, below, as (m) and (n) respectively, and also another paper of his on a different subject, and some of his book reviews. It publishes, however (and it seems to be a very happy idea), the critiques and pamphlets written about some of *Galgóczy's* articles; thus, from the material of the debates, it is easy to establish that the ideas raised by *Galgóczy* have not influenced the progress of scholarly research. — *Károly Lyka* mentions favourably *Galgóczy's* accomplishment, specially referring to the articles under (e)–(f), see *Károly Lyka*: Vándorlásaim a művészet körül. (My Wanderings around Art.) Budapest 1970, pp. 269 sq.
- <sup>92</sup> Cf. notes 87 and 90, above, further on *Eduard Mahler*: Babylonia és Assyria. (Babylonia and Assyria.) Budapesti Szemle 117 (1904) pp. 66–97, 227–257; Országhalom szumér szó? (Országhalom, Is it a Sumerian Word?) Magyar Nyelvőr 33 (1904), pp.

- 45–47; *Babylonia és Assyria*. (Babylonia and Assyria.) Budapest 1906, esp. pp. 187 sqq.; Joseph Halévy. *Egyenlőség* 1917, No. 9, p. 9–10.
- <sup>93</sup> Cf. note 90, above, further on *Bernát Munkácsi*: *Keleti Szemle* 5 (1904), pp. 343–351 = *Ethnographia* 15 (1904), pp. 433–438; *Az ural-altáji népek*. (Uralo-Altai Peoples.) In: *Gusztáv Heinrich* (Ed.): *Egyetemes irodalomtörténet*, IV. Budapest 1911, pp. 3–68, esp. pp. 38 sqq.; *Régi nyomok – új ösvények*. (Old Traces – New Paths.) *Egyenlőség* 1911, No. 23, jubilee issue, pp. 78–81; *Jelentés a Fáy András-pályázatról*. (Report on the András Fáy Competition.) With *Zoltán Gombocz*. *Akadémiai Értesítő* 31 (1920), pp. 32–44 (about the first version of Zsigmond Varga's book to be quoted in note 117, below), etc. – Incidentally, *Munkácsi* was thoroughly dealing with the question of possible Mesopotamian loan-words in the Finno-Ugrian or Uralo-Altai languages both in his essays just quoted, and in books of his on Uralo-Altai subjects (I shall mention two essays of his in note 127, below). A short note of his, viz. *Zürjén votják nyelvű hettita feliratok*. (Hittite Inscriptions in Zyrian and Votyak.) *Ethnographia* 21 (1910), p. 256, is dealing with the problems of then undeciphered Hittite hieroglyph inscriptions, on the basis of *A. Gleye's* *Hettitische Studien*. Leipzig 1910, a misleading work. – On his achievements see recently *Béla Kálmán*: *Munkácsi Bernát emlékezete*. (The Memory of Bernát Munkácsi.) *MTA Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Osztályának Közleményei* 16 (1960), pp. 392–397; *János Harmatta*: *Munkácsi Bernát mint a finnugor-iráni kapcsolatok kutatója*. (Bernát Munkácsi as Researcher of Finno-Ugrian-Iranian Connections.) *Ibid.*, pp. 392–397; *Margit K. Palló*: *Munkácsi Bernát jelentősége a magyar turkológiában*. (Bernát Munkácsi's Significance in Hungarian Turkology.) *Ibid.*, pp. 397–403; see the Bibliography of his works, *ibid.* 24 (1967), pp. 397–413 (compiled by *Eva Oláh*).
- <sup>94</sup> *Lajos Venetianer*: *Tigin*. (Tigin.) *Ethnographia* 16 (1905), pp. 143–146; *Még néhány szó az állítólagos sumér tigin méltóságnevéhez*. (Some Words About the Alleged Sumerian Dignitary-Name *tigin*.) *ibid.* 269–273. – On this debate cf. *Galgóczy's* essays (g) and (h) quoted in note 91, above, further on in note 97, below.
- <sup>95</sup> Cf. among others, *Géza Nagy*: *Turánok és árják*. (Turanians and Arians.) *Ethnographia* 13 (1902), pp. 1–11, 49–60, 97–103; *idem*: *A skythák*. (The Scythians.) Budapest 1909, a new impression in: *Magyar Történelmi Szemle* 3, No. 4 (1972), pp. 447–480; 4, No. 1 (1973), pp. 3–28; 4, No. 2 (1973), pp. 109–142; *Ödön Kánnach*: *Magyar-sumir kis kézikönyvtár*. (Hungarian-Sumerian Short Dictionary.) Karcag 1905; *Elek Fáy*: *A magyarok őshona*. (The Original Homeland of Hungarians.) Budapest 1910; *V. Pröhle*: *Mi az a "turáni"?* (What is "Turanian"?) *Földrajzi Közlemények* 40 (1912), pp. 101–113. *Pröhle's* paper and two works of *Zsigmond Varga* – to be quoted in note 116, below – incurred *Gyula Zolnai's* annihilating criticism in his article: *Tudománytalan nyelvhasonlítások*. (Unscholarly Linguistic Affiliations.) *Magyar Nyelvőr* 44 (1915), pp. 151–163, 194–206; cf. the reply of the two, criticised by him, *ibid.*, pp. 262–266 (*Pröhle*) and pp. 266–268 (*Varga*), respectively, and *Zolnai's* answer: *Felelet a Tudománytalan nyelvhasonlítások ügyében*. (A Reply as to the Unscholarly Linguistic Affiliations.) *Ibid.*, pp. 268–271.
- <sup>96</sup> On *Fereneczy's* career see *Magyar Életrajzi Lexikon*. I. A–K. Budapest. 1967, p. 501. – His liberal-minded lectures impressed *Endre Ady* too, who, at that time was an undergraduate in the Debrecen Academy of Law, cf. *József Varga*: *Ady Endre*. Pályaképvázlat. (Endre Ady. A Short Biography.) Budapest 1966, p. 42.
- <sup>97</sup> Strictly speaking, two of *Galgóczy's* articles appeared in leading periodical in Assyriology of that time: (m) *Šumírisch-grammatische Erörterungen*. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 23 (1909), pp. 55–72; (n) *Šumírisch-grammatische Miscellen*. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 25 (1911), 89–113, however, both of these articles wielded "evidence" that should have been proved beforehand: i.e. the affinity of Sumerian and Hungarian like *Galgóczy's* proposals as to the solution of some debated issues of Sumerian grammar, have been simply overlooked by Sumerological research; they have never been cited by authentic Sumerologists. The debate enforced upon him by *Lajos Venetianer* on the columns of *Ethnographia* – cf. note 91, above, (f), (g), and note 94, above – had to be continued by *Galgóczy* also on an international level. The discussion centered around the reading of a group of Sumerian sings. In brief, it was about the following: in cuneiform texts there is a



Sumerian word, a name of dignity: GŪ. EN. NA, that is, the name of the office of the commanding officer (governor) of Nippur. Galgóczy wanted to read the word in the form of *tig-in-na*, thus alluding to the ancient Turkish dignity name *tegin*, with which he claims, the Sumerian word can be associated. (The sign GŪ may have, beside its phonetic value, *gu*, also the reading *tik*, *tiq* in Akkadian texts.) Galgóczy's reading and etymology was to be promptly refuted by *D. J. Prince*, see *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 27 (1912), pp. 258–260. Following this, both of them had their say for a second time, see *ibid.* 27(1912), pp. 390–392 (*Galgóczy*), and respectively, *ibid.* 28 (1913–14), pp. 362–364 (*Prince*). To prop up his reading with an even more serious argument, Galgóczy also invoked the Hungarian word *teknő*, *teknő* ('trough') to be able to interpret the phrase "the land of GŪ. EN. NA". It was to be seen, even at that time, that it was Prince, who had the right standpoint in the debate: the phrase GŪ. EN. NA in Sumerian is only to be read in the form of *gu-en-na*; this is also verified by the Sumerio-Akkadian word lists, as well, which convey, beside the Sumerian word, among others the Akkadian translation *guennakku*, see *B. Landsberger—E. Reiner—M. Civil: The Series lu = ša and Related Texts*. Roma 1969. (MSL XII.) p. 97: I. 135. For the interpretation of this word cf. *B. Landsberger: Brief des Bischofs von Esagila an König Asarhaddon*. Amsterdam 1965, pp. 75 sqq. With this, of course, the Turanian etymology of the word got dismissed, too.

- <sup>98</sup> I can only enlist here the most important Assyriological works of *Mihály Kmoskó*: *Hammurabi törvényei*. (The laws of Hammurabi.) Kolozsvár (now Cluj) 1911; *Aššur régi uralkodóinak feliratai*. (The Inscriptions of the Early Rulers of Assur.) *Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny* 36 (1912), pp. 9–21, 206–218, 310–332; *Kerub und Kurib*. *Biblische Zeitschrift* 5 (1913), pp. 225–234; *Az emberiség első írott szabadságlevelve*. *Urukagina lagasi király reformjai*. (The First Written Charta in the History of Mankind. The Reforms of Urukagina, the King of Lagash.) Budapest 1913; *Assyria újabb uralkodóinak assuri feliratai*. (The Assur Inscriptions of More Recent Rulers of Assyria.) *Hittudományi Folyóirat* 24 (1913), pp. 1–29; *A sumirek*. (The Sumerians.) *Turán* 1 (1913), pp. 15–27, 123–142; *A kalocsai érseki könyvtár ékíratos terracotta-hengere*. (The Cuneiform Clay Cylinder of the Kalocsa Archiepiscopal Library.) [A forgery!!!] *Religio* 72 (1913), pp. 11–12; *Eine uralte Beschreibung der "Inkubation"*. (*Gudea Cyl. A VIII*, 1–14.) *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 29 (1914), pp. 158–171; *Az a-ga-dé-i dynastia és a sémi uralom kezdete Mezopotámiában*. (The Agade Dynasty and the Beginnings of the Semitic Rule in Mesopotamia.) *Történeti Szemle* 3 (1914), pp. 321–345; *A sémi népek óvallásának főbb problémái*. (The Main Problems of the Ancient Religion of Semitic Peoples.) Budapest 1915; *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Inschriften Gudeas*. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 31 (1916–17), pp. 58–90. — For an appreciation of Kmoskó's activity see *Arnold Pataky: Emlékbeszéd Kmoskó Mihály ... felett*. (Memorial Lecture Over ... Mihály Kmoskó.) Budapest 1937. (*Szent István Akadémia emlékbeszédei*, II. 6.) — In the second half of his life Kmoskó dealt with Syrian Fathers of Church and the Oriental sources of Hungarian history. On his accomplishment in this field, see *K. Czeglédy: Monographs on Syrian and Muhammadan Sources in the Literary Remains of M. Kmoskó*. *Acta Orientalia Hung.* 4 (1954), pp. 20–91.
- <sup>99</sup> Cf. his article published in the periodical of Turanism, *Mihály Kmoskó: A sumirek*. (The Sumerians.) *Turán* 1 (1913), pp. 15–27, 123–142.
- <sup>100</sup> On Ady's interest in Mesopotamia, see *Géza Komoróczy: Óbabilóni levél Ady Endre egyik cikkében*. (An Old Babylonian Letter in an Article of Endre Ady.) *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 69 (1965), pp. 328–331.
- <sup>101</sup> *Endre Ady: Amit a régi porták mesélnek*. (What the Old Gates Tell about.) *Budapesti Napló*, January 2, 1904 = *Endre Ady: Összes prózai művei*, IV. Edited by *Erzsébet Vezér*. Bp. 1964, No. 110, p. 193 sq.
- <sup>102</sup> E.g. *Erzsébet Vezér*, who, in the notes written to the text of the critical edition (see note 101, above, p. 445), alludes to the book of *Ede Somogyi* (cf. note 90, above) that had appeared shortly before Ady's article, and to its noisy repercussions in the press. *István Király* goes even further by writing in his great book on Ady: "The poet, professing the Sumerian origins of Hungarians, invoked the imaginary primeval homeland, Ancient Babylon as well. . .", see *István Király: Ady Endre*. Budapest 1970, I. p. 547. Uttering these, Király does not refer to sources. He could not have based his asser-

tions but on Ady's letter in question and on some others like this, or on the remarks of Erzsébet Vezér, respectively. I think, however, that this letter is not to be interpreted that way. Ady does not agree with the "szumirológ"-s (Sumerologists) in the respect of Hungarian primitive ancient homeland imagined to have been in Mesopotamia: at that time, nobody said that Hungarians had originally come from "Ancient Babylon"; and to boot, the text does not make mention of Hungarians. Ady merely alludes here to the theories concerning the ancient culture of the Uralo-Altaic peoples, that is, he does not say anymore than that, the people of Sumerians are of Uralo-Altaic origin. I think, Király has overinterpreted Ady's allusions; his statements, guessably, do not reflect Ady's opinion, but — indirectly — the "Sumero-Hungarology" of the 1960s. — See also note 96, above.

- <sup>103</sup> The phrases quoted come from Ady's poem entitled *Az ős Kaján* (Kaján of Yore); for an interpretation of this poem, see *Gyula Földessy: Ady minden titkai*. (Ady's Secrets.) Budapest 1962.<sup>2</sup> pp. 69 sq.; *István Király: Ady Endre*. Budapest 1970. I, pp. 540–556. The phrase "the time of Ancient Babylon" means here the same as the attribute "ancient".
- <sup>104</sup> It was Ady himself who interpreted Kaján's figure this way, cf. *Gy. Földessy: op. cit.*, p. 69.
- <sup>105</sup> *Gy. Földessy: op. cit.*, p. 69, only "guesses", but in fact, it is certain, that Ady's Kaján is to be associated with the figure of Cain in the Old Testament, cf. *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*. II. H–Ó. Budapest 1970, pp. 306 sq. s. v. *kaján*; *Lajos Lőrincze: A kaján Kain és egyebek*. (The Malititious Cain and Others.) In: *idem* (ed.): *Édes anyanyelvünk*. Budapest 1972<sup>3</sup>, pp. 163–165. An interesting fact relating to the use of the word: István Horvát names (1832) the very Biblical Cain as Kaján, cf. Horvát István *Magyar Irodalomtörténete*. (History of Hungarian Literature.) Budapest, no year. (Magyar Irodalmi Ritkaságok, 28.) p. 32.
- <sup>106</sup> *Árpád Zempléni: Istár és Gilgamesz*. (Ishtar and Gilgamesh.) Budapest 1910. A new edition of selected passages appeared in *György Véghe's* anthology: *Századvégi költők*. (Fin de Siècle Poets.) Budapest 1959. II, pp. 140 sqq.
- <sup>107</sup> *Zempléni*, in his epic entitled "A tűz-özön" (Holocaust) about the apocalyptic struggle between Indo-Germanic and Turanian peoples, calls the leader of the Turanians *Dingir*, the word coming from the Sumerian *dinġir* 'god', and the leader of the Indo-Germans *Diósz* (the word being the genitive form of the Greek Zeus, however, o in Greek is not long as it is with *Zempléni*; it is stressed: Διόζ).
- <sup>108</sup> *Á. Zempléni: Turáni dalok*. (Turanian Songs.) Budapest 1910.
- <sup>109</sup> Cf. e.g. *Á. Zempléni: Vasfő és Imoe. Vogul rege*. (Vasfő and Imoe. A Vogul Saga.) Budapest 1919.
- <sup>110</sup> About the foundation of the Turanian Society (1910), its activities, and its successors, viz. Magyar Keleti Kultúrközpont (Hungarian Oriental Cultural Centre), then simultaneously Körösi Csoma Társaság (Körösi Csoma Society), Turáni Társaság (Turanian Society), Turán-Szövetség (Turanian Association), and its main ideas too, a critical study by *Gyula Németh* informs us properly: *A magyar turánizmus*. (Hungarian Turanism.) *Magyar Szemle* 11 (1931), pp. 132–139. The *Turán* (1913–) was the periodical of the Society.
- <sup>111</sup> *Benedek Baráthosi Balogh's Turáni Könyvei* (Turanian Books), vol. 7. Szumirok, szittyák, ősturánok. (Sumerians, Scythians, Old Turanians.) Budapest 1929, in a new edition: *Szumirok*. (Sumerians.) Buenos Aires 1973; vol. 13. Déli turánok (Indiák, Tibet, Előázsia). (South Turanians. The Indies, Tibet, Western Asia.) Budapest 1930.
- <sup>112</sup> *Sándor Tonelli: Az emberi civilizáció kezdetei*. (The Beginnings of Human Civilization.) Budapest 1936.
- <sup>113</sup> *Zoltán Vásárhelyi Kézdy: A magyarok útja Indiától Pannóniáig*. (The Way of Hungarians from India to Pannonia.) Budapest 1939.
- <sup>114</sup> *Sándor Nemesdedinai Zsuffa: A magyar nyelv rokonságai (!). Nyelvészeti tanulmány Körösi Csoma Sándor emlékére...* (The Linguistic Kinships of the Hungarian Language. A Linguistic Study in Memory of Sándor Körösi Csoma...) Budapest 1942. — On this book, cf. *Miklós Zsirai's* hard-hitting and precise criticism: *Nem mind bíró, akinek pálcája van a kezében*. (He Who Wears a Robe is Not Always a Judge.) *Magyar Nyelv* 36 (1940), pp. 95–106, esp. pp. 103 sqq.



- <sup>115</sup> *Károly Pálfi*: A magyar nemzet ősvallása. (The Ancient Religion of the Hungarian People.) Budapest 1941; A skytha kérdés megoldása. (The Solution of the Scythian Problem.) Budapest 1944. — Other books, dealing with Hungarian prehistory in a Turanian spirit, but only incidentally mentioning Sumerians, are, among others, *József Cserépfalvi*: A magyarok eredete. A turáni népek őshazája és ókori története. (The Origin of Hungarians. The Ancient Homeland and History of Turanian Peoples.) Budapest 1925; *idem*: A magyarok őshazája és őstörténete. (The Primeval Homeland and History of (Hungarians.) Budapest 1936; *József Aczél*: Szittyia — görög eredetünk. (Our Scythian — Greek Origin.) Budapest 1927; *Lajos Blaskovics*: Óshaza. (Ancient Homeland.) Budapest 1942; *Ferenc Zajtai*: Magyar évezredek. Skytha — hun — magyar faji azonosság. (Hungarian Millennium. Scythian — Hun — Hungarian Racial Identity.) Budapest 1943.<sup>2</sup> On the books of *Cserépfalvi* and *Zajtai* cf. *László Gaál*: Műkedvelők a magyar őstörténeti kutatásban. (Amateurs in Hungarian Prehistoric Research.) Magyar Szemle 12 (1931), pp. 262 — 272. — Furthermore, *Gyula Mészáros*: Kelet-Európa néptörténete, II. Chattiak és skythák, 1 — 2. (A People's History of Eastern Europe, II. The Chattiaks and Scythians, 1 — 2.) Szeged 1938; Kelet-Európa néptörténete a vaskor népeitől a magyar honfoglalóig. (A People's History of Eastern Europe from the Peoples of the Iron Age to the Hungarian Conquerors.) Budapest 1941; A másfél ezer esztendő magyar nemzet. Néptörténeti tanulmány. (The Fifteen Hundred Years Old Hungarian Nation. A Study in People's History.) New York about 1950. — Although appearing well after the War, and not even abroad, the study of *Lajos Marjalaki Kiss*: Gondolatok a magyar nép eredetéről. (Thoughts about the Origins of the Hungarian People.) I — II. Borsodi Szemle 1, No. 1 (1956), pp. 68 — 80; 1, No. 2 (1956), pp. 81 — 103 is expressive of the same intellectual atmosphere.
- <sup>116</sup> The main works of *Zsigmond Varga*: Az őskereszténység prófétai jelleme. (On the Prophetic Character of Primitive Christianity.) Kolozsvár 1910; Vallásos világnézet és történeti kutatás. (Religious World-View and Historical Research.) Kolozsvár 1911, on this cf. *Mihály Kmoskó*: Egyetemes Philologiai Közöny 36 (1912), pp. 152 — 154; Az ótestamentumi zsoltár-költészet asszír — babyloni vallástörténeti megvilágításban. (The Psalms of the Old Testament in the Light of Assyrian — Babylonian Religious History.) Kolozsvár 1911, on this cf. *Mihály Kmoskó*: Egyetemes Philologiai Közöny 36 (1912), pp. 154 — 156; Írás és nyelvtörténeti adalékok az ókori keleti népek művelődéstörténetéhez. (Writing- and Language-Historical Contributions to the History of Culture of the Peoples of the Ancient Orient.) Kolozsvár 1913; A sumir kérdés mai állása és problémái. (On the Recent State and Problems of the Sumerian Question.) Kolozsvár 1914 (offprint from Erdélyi Múzeum 1913) — to the latter two cf. *Gyula Zolnai*: Tudománytalan nyelvhasznítások. (Unscholarly Linguistic Affiliations.) Magyar Nyelvőr 44 (1915), pp. 151 — 163, 194 — 205, and also 268 — 271; Újabb adalékok az ókori keleti népek művelődéstörténetéhez. (Recent Contributions to the History of Culture of the Peoples of the Ancient Orient.) Budapest 1914; Tájékozás a legújabb ótestamentumi theologia körében. (Enquiry into the Field of Recent Theology of the Old Testament.) Budapest 1914 (offprint from Protestáns Szemle, 1914.); Sumir régészeti tanulmányok. (Studies in Sumerian Archeology.) Budapest 1914 (offprint from Archaeologiai Értesítő, 1914.); Az ókori keleti népek művelődéstörténete, különös tekintettel a Bibliára. (History of Culture of the Peoples of the Ancient Orient with a special Regard to the Bible.) Pápa, I. 1915. II. 1918; A bibliai őstörténetek újabb kritikai megvilágítása. (A New Critical Light on the Old Biblical Stories.) Debrecen 1917; Általános vallástörténet. I. Bevezetés a vallástörténetbe. A vallásos élet jelenlegvilágának átnézete. II. A vallás történeti élete. (A Comprehensive History of Religion. I. Introduction into the History of Religion. A Survey of the Phenomena of Religious Life. II. On the Historic Progress of Religion.) Debrecen 1932.
- <sup>117</sup> *Zsigmond Varga*: Ötezer év távolából. I. A sumir nyelvviita története. II. Sumir nyelvtan. III. Sumir — ural-altáji ősrökség. (From the Distance of 5000 Years. I. The History of the Debate on the Sumerian Language. II. A Sumerian Grammar. III. Sumerian — Uralo-Altaic Primitive Kinship.) Debrecen 1942. — The antecedents of this book was a prize offered by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1916, see *Akadémiai Értesítő* 27 (1916), p. 411. The evaluation of the manuscript sent in was performed by *Zoltán Gombocz* and *Bernát Munkácsi*, without their knowing the authors' name. See,

- Jelentés a Fáy András pályázatáról. (A Report on the András Fáy Prize.) Akadémiai Értesítő 31 (1920), pp. 32–44; the report contains a devastating criticism.
- <sup>118</sup> A new phase in the research of the Sumerian grammar commences with the publication of A. Poebel's *Grundzüge der sumerischen Grammatik*. Rostock 1923. This work thoroughly transformed the picture that had been formed about the nature of the language.
- <sup>119</sup> It is worth quoting that *Varga* praised a recent achievement in Sumerian grammar, because it "soberly refrained itself from necessary innovations", with the word "necessary" being mistaken for "unnecessary", however, probably, not quite accidentally (see, *Ótizedes év távolából*, p. 207).
- <sup>120</sup> Cf. *László Németh: A fordító plennitise*. (The Plennitis of the Translator.) In: *idem: A kísérletező ember*. (The Experimenting Man.) Budapest 1963, pp. 412–424, esp. pp. 412 sq. = *idem: A kísérletező ember. Tanulmányok*. (The Experimenting Man. Studies.) Budapest 1973. (Németh László munkái.) (The Works of László Németh.) pp. 615–622, esp. pp. 611 sq., and in several other places, too.
- <sup>121</sup> Cf. *László Németh: Irgalom. Regény, I–II*. (Merey. A Novel, I–II.) Budapest 1965, esp. II, pp. 96 sq. = Budapest 1972. (Németh László munkái.) (The Works of László Németh.) p. 349 sq.; *idem: Utolsó kísérlet, I–II*. (The Last Experiment. A Novel, I–II.) Budapest 1969. (Németh László munkái.) (The Works of László Németh.) I, p. 274, p. 440 (Alsóvárosi búcsú.) (Suburb Fiesta.); II, p. 40 (Szerdai fogadónap.) (At Home on Wednesday.), etc.; *idem: Magam helyett, II. Telemachos*. (For Myself, II. Telemachos.) *Tiszatáj* 28, No. 3 (1974), pp. 3–16, esp. pp. 10 sq.
- <sup>122</sup> Cf. *Sándor Nemesdedinai Zsuffa: A magyar nyelv nyelvrokonságai*. (The Linguistics Kinships of the Hungarian Language.) Budapest 1943, p. 34, esp. note 20.
- It was also in the state of spiritual "plennitis", not in captivity though, but, — as he himself writes it —, on the battle-field, that *József Erdélyi's* linguistic ideas were born, cf. his *Árdeli szép hold. Egy költő gondolatai a magyar nyelvről*. (The Fair Moon of Árdel. A Poet's Thoughts about the Hungarian Language.) Budapest 1939. Erdélyi's etymologies were based on other principles than those of the Turanists as he thought every word was endogenous as to its genesis. His contemplation, however, was eventually to reduce him to the level of the worst kind of Turanism or "Sumero–Hungarology".
- Let me remark but parenthetically, that there are followers, even nowadays, of Erdélyi's absurd etymologies, see *Dénes Kiss: Játék és törvény. Kalandozások anyanyelvünkben*. (Game and Rule. Ruminations on Mother Tongue.) *Kortárs* 15 (1971), pp. 970–977, 1970–1974; 18 (1974), pp. 1114–1119; *Tiszatáj* 29, No. 9 (1975), pp. 29–31; *Kortárs* 19 (1975), pp. 1796–1799.
- <sup>123</sup> Similar ideas were formulated by *Péter Hajdú: Finnugor népek és nyelvek*. (Finno–Ugrian Peoples and Languages.) Budapest 1962, pp. 45 sqq.; *Bevezetés az uráli nyelvtudományba*. (Introduction to Uralian Linguistics.) Budapest 1966, pp. 90 sqq.; and *János Harmatta: Az indoeurópai népek régi településterületei és vándorlásai*. (The Old Areas of Settlement, and Migrations of the Indo-European Peoples.) *MTA Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Osztályának Közleményei* 27 (1972), pp. 309–324. — Cf. also *András Róna-Tas: Néhány gondolat a nyelvrokonságról*. (Some Thoughts on Linguistic Kinship.) *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 71 (1969), pp. 261–279.
- <sup>124</sup> From the most recent literature on the question cf. *F. R. Kraus: Sumerer und Akkader. ein Problem der altmesopotamischen Geschichte*. Amsterdam–London 1970; *J. S. Cooper: Sumerian and Akkadian in Sumer and Akkad*. *Orientalia* 42 (1973), pp. 239–246; *W. v. Soden: Sprache, Denken und Begriffsbildung im Alten Orient*. Wiesbaden 1973, p. 14, esp. note 16; *C. Wilcke: Ki-en-gi und ki-uri bis zum Ende der Ur–III–Zeit*. In: [Compte Rendu de la] XIXe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale: Le palais et la royauté. Paris 1974, pp. 202–232; *idem*, in: *La voix de l'opposition en Mésopotamie*. Bruxelles 1975, pp. 37 sqq.
- <sup>125</sup> On the so-called Praesumerian elements see *B. Landsberger: Three Essays on the Sumerians*. Los Angeles 1974 (English translation of his articles published in Turkish, in 1943–1945); *W. Nagel: Die Bauern- und Stadtkulturen im vordynastischen Vorderasien*. Berlin 1964, pp. 217 sqq. = *Berliner Jahrbuch für Vor- und Frühgeschichte* 4 (1964), pp. 1 sqq.; *A. Salonen: Zum Aufbau der Substrate im Sumerischen*. Helsinki



1968; *A. Salonen*: Die Fussbekleidung der alten Mesopotamier. Helsinki 1969, pp. 97 sqq.; *E. Salonen*: Über das Erwerbsleben im alten Mesopotamien, I. Helsinki 1970, pp. 6 sqq. (one had better be somewhat cautious concerning the relevant materials from the Finnish School). — The problem of Akkadian loan-words in Sumerian have been versatilely illuminated by the lectures delivered at the IXe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale: Genava NS 8 (1960), pp. 241–314, and esp. *D. O. Edzard*: Sumerer und Semiten in der frühen Geschichte Mesopotamiens. *ibid.*, pp. 241–258; *I. J. Gelb*: Sumerians and Akkadians in their Ethno-Linguistic Relationship. *ibid.*, pp. 258–271; *A. Falkenstein*: Kontakte zwischen Sumerern und Akkadern auf sprachlichem Gebiet. *ibid.*, pp. 301–314. — About one of the few direct proofs of Indo-European and Sumerian linguistic contacts, that respective words meaning 'cattle', offered *János Harmatta* a new interpretation: *Megjegyzések Közép- és Kelet-Európa házi emlősállatainak fejlődéstörténetéhez*. (Remarks on the Evolution of the Domestic Mammals of Middle and Eastern Europe.) *Agrártörténeti Szemle* 13 (1971), pp. 211–217, esp. p. 215.

<sup>126</sup> The word *könyv* ('book') and several of its corresponding Eurasian forms, respectively, have been interpreted that way for a long time, cf. most recently: *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*. (The Historical-Etymological Dictionary of the Hungarian Language.) II. H — Ó. Budapest 1970, p. 614, where among others, references is made to the "Sumerian" (correctly: Akkadian!) word *kunukku* (incidentally, the Sumerian word is *kišib*). As, however, all the members of the Akkadian word group in question, e.g. *kanāku*, 'to seal', *kanīku*, 'sealed (e.g.: document, sack, etc.)' and *kunukku*, 'seal, cylinder-seal' unambiguously preserve the basic meaning (as to the Akkadian words, see *The Assyrian Dictionary*, vol 8, K. Chicago 1971. s.v.), in my opinion, there are serious semantic difficulties to derive the words with meaning *könyv* ('book') from here. The coincidence of the word-forms is hardly more than accidental. Incidentally, this derivation is considered impossible, also from the point of view of Hungarian language history, by *Elemér Moór*: *A betű-től a könyv-ig*. (From the Word *betű*, 'letter' to the Word *könyv*, 'book'.) *Magyar Nyelv* 68 (1972), pp. 150–160, 275–285, esp. pp. 156 sqq. — On the Oriental loan-words in general, cf. *E. Lüttmann*: *Morgenländische Wörter im Deutschen*. Tübingen 1924.<sup>2</sup>; *K. Lokotsch*: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen (germanischen, romanischen und slavischen) Wörter orientalischen Ursprungs*. Heidelberg 1927; the material of the latter, however, is beyond the scope of our theme.

Naturally, the languages of the Ancient Near East took over a number of Sumerian words and used them as their own; either they borrowed them directly from Sumerian, as it happened in Akkadian or perhaps in Hurrian, or indirectly, from the Akkadian. There is a comprehensive picture given by the two big Akkadian dictionaries on the anvil (*W. v. Soden*: *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, Wiesbaden; *The Assyrian Dictionary*, Chicago) about the Sumerian loan-words of the Akkadian language — most of which, of course, remained foreign words to the last. In the case of the other languages of the Near East there seems to be a lack of up-to-date lexicographical basis (cf. however, *A. Kammenhuber*: *Materialien zu einem hethitischen Thesaurus*, Heidelberg). The former special literature searching for loan-words is out-of-date in every respect (*P. Leander*: *Über die sumerischen Lehnwörter im Assyrischen*. Uppsala 1903; *J. Theis*: *Sumerisches im Alten Testament*. Trier 1912; *S. Landersdorfer*: *Sumerisches Sprachgut im Alten Testament*. Leipzig 1916; cf. also note 127, below).

<sup>127</sup> Cf. *H. Zimmern*: *Akkadische Fremdwörter als Beweis für babylonischen Kulturinfluss*. Leipzig 1917.<sup>2</sup> (Though it was significant in its time, today one should use it but very cautiously.) — Also *Bernát Munkácsi* examined the possible Akkadian loan-words of the Finno-Ugrian languages; apart from his studies quoted in notes 90 and 93, above, see also: *Spuren eines assyrischen Einflusses auf finnisch-magyarische Sprachen*. *Keleti Szemle* 12 (1911–12), pp. 261–271; *Asszír nyomok a finn-magyar nyelvekben*. (*Assyrian Traces in the Finnish-Hungarian Languages*.) *Magyar Nyelvőr* 41 (1912), pp. 60–65; *Sechzigerrechnung und Siebenzahl in den östlichen Zweigen der finnisch-magyarischen Sprachfamilie*. *Keleti Szemle* 19 (1920–1922), pp. 1–23; naturally, the interesting material collected by him is to be critically interpreted. — From among the more recent loan-word investigations is worth paying

- attention to, e.g., *P. Aalto*: Ein alter Name des Kupfers. Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher 31 (1959), pp. 33–40; *U. Masing*: Akkadisches *mīksu* in Osteuropa. In: Internationale Tagung der Keilschriftforscher der sozialistischen Länder. Zusammenfassung der Vorträge. Budapest 1974. 63–65; *Acta Ant. Hung.* 22 (1974), 521–526. — On the theoretical side of the question, see recently, *Lajos Kiss*: Műveltségyszók, vándorszók, nemzetközi szók. (Culture Words, International Loan Words, International Words.) *Magyar Nyelv* 62 (1966), pp. 179–188; for the Altaic languages — in connection with the debate referred to in note 85, above — see also *P. Aalto*: Verwandtschaft, Entlehnung, Zufall. *Kratylos* 10 (1965), pp. 123–130.
- <sup>128</sup> On the words mentioned, cf. *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*. I. A–Gy. Budapest 1964, pp. 133 sq.; 509 sq.; 1062; II. H–Ó. Budapest 1970, pp. 609; 933 sq.; 993 resp., partly with etymological explanations different from the ones above; on the word *dragomán*, see *J. J. Gelb*: The Word for Dragoman in the Ancient Near East. *Glossa* 2 (1968), pp. 93–104; on the Akkadian data, see the Akkadian dictionaries, referred to in note 126, above. — Let me remark here that the Semitic linguistic material, and especially, the data taken from the Old Semitic languages in the otherwise excellent *Historical-Etymological Dictionary* are mostly incorrect, out-of-date and deficient.
- <sup>129</sup> On the starting point of *Badiny Jós's* disquisitions, I only have to add that *Priscus Rhetor*, mentioning the people's name *Sabirian* clearly explains that the *Sabirians* were the enemies of *Ogurs* and *Onogurs* (fr. XXX M, cf. E. *Doblhofer*: Byzantinische Diplomaten und östliche Barbaren. Graz–Wien–Köln 1955, p. 70; *Gyula Moravcsik*, in: *György Győrffy* [Ed.]: *A magyarok elődeiről és a honfoglalásról*. [About the Ancestors of Hungarians and the Conquest.] Budapest 1958, p. 24; on the historical background, see *Károly Czeglédy*: *Nomád népek vándorlása Napkelettől Napnyugatig*. [The Migration of Nomadic Peoples from East to West.] Budapest 1969, pp. 90 sqq.).
- <sup>130</sup> The epic is mentioned several times by *S. N. Kramer* in his popular works: *From the Tablets of Sumer*. Indian Hills, Colo. 1956, pp. 232 sqq.; *History Begins at Sumer*. Garden City, N. Y. 1959, pp. 204 sqq., etc.; the scholarly publication of the material known at that time, by *S. N. Kramer–Th. Jacobsen*: *Enmerkar and Ensukkuširanna*. *Orientalia* 23 (1954), pp. 232–234; *Badiny Jós* does not know this study at all.
- <sup>131</sup> See the facsimile imprint of *S. N. Kramer's* letter in *Ferenc Badiny Jós: Káldeától Ister-gamig*, I. Buenos Aires 1971, p. 93, etc.
- <sup>132</sup> Cf. *D. O. Edzard*: *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 53 NF 19 (1959), p. 18 and note 43.
- <sup>133</sup> *János Galgóczy*: *A sumir kérdés*. (The Sumerian Question.) New York 1968.
- <sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 293.
- <sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 173.
- <sup>136</sup> *Gilgames – Agyagtáblák üzenete*. (Gilgamesh – The Message of the Clay Tablets.) Budapest 1966; 1973.<sup>2</sup>
- <sup>137</sup> See the reading of the *incipits* in *Agyagtáblák üzenete*. (The Message of the Clay Tablets.) Budapest 1963, p. 207. The cuneiform text in this edition is the handwork of *János Kass*, and, on the cover-page of the subsequent editions, that of *Vera Csillag*.
- <sup>138</sup> Cf. note 80, above.
- <sup>139</sup> Cf. p. 4 of the pamphlet quoted in note 21, above, furthermore *Ferenc Badiny Jós: Káldeától Ister-gamig*, I. Buenos Aires 1971, pp. 122, etc.
- <sup>140</sup> *Очерки истории СССР*. Moscow 1956.
- <sup>141</sup> *Gyula László*: *Őstörténetünk legkorábbi szakaszai*. (The Earliest Phases of Our Primitive History.) Budapest 1961, p. 202.
- <sup>142</sup> *A puli*. *The Puli* 2, No. 18 (1966), p. 3.
- <sup>143</sup> *Ibid.* 2, no 19 (1966), p. 6.
- <sup>144</sup> *Ibid.* 3, no. 22 (1967), p. 5.
- <sup>145</sup> *Ibid.* 3, no. 28 (1967), p. 3.
- <sup>146</sup> *S. N. Kramer*: *The Sumerians, their History, Culture, and Character*. Chicago 1963, p. 21. — Cf. *idem*: *Sumerian Mythology. A Study of Spiritual and Literary Achievement in the Third Millennium B. C.* Philadelphia 1944 = New York 1961<sup>2</sup>, p. 21. Here *Kramer* definitely rejects the kinship of Sumerian and Hungarian languages: "Sumerian is neither a Semitic nor an Indo European language, it belongs to the so-called agglutinative type of languages exemplified by Turkish, Hungarian, and Finnish. None of these



- languages, however, seems to have any closer affiliation to Sumerian, and the latter, therefore, as yet stands alone and unrelated to any known language living or dead." Cf. also S. N. Kramer: *The Sumerians*. . . Chicago 1963, p. 306.
- <sup>147</sup> So e.g. H. Schmökel: *Das Land Sumer*. Stuttgart 1956,<sup>2</sup> p. 46.
- <sup>148</sup> About this question there is a good popular information in, e.g., *László Antal — Barnabás Csongor — István Fodor: A világ nyelvei*. (The Languages of the World.) Budapest 1970, pp. 7 sqq., 13 sqq.; cf. also *István Fodor: Mire jó a nyelvtudomány?* (What is Linguistics Good for?) Budapest 1968, pp. 13 sqq.
- <sup>149</sup> *Andor Schedel: A magyar technikai kultúra fejlődéstörténete és a nyelvészet*. Kézirat. (The Evolution of the Hungarian Technical Culture and Linguistics. A Manuscript. 1969. (Rotaprint.) p. 6.
- <sup>150</sup> On this word, cf. B. Landsberger: *The Series HAR-ra = hubullu*, Tablets V — VII. Roma 1958. (MSL VI.) p. 17: 129; W. v. Soden: *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* 2, Lief. 11. Wiesbaden 1972, 1058 s. v.
- <sup>151</sup> *Sándor Csöke: Szumir (Szumér) — magyar egyeztető szótár*. (Sumerian — Hungarian Comparative Dictionary.) Buenos Aires 1970, p. 105, No. 478. On the kinds of word-comparisons represented by the etymologies of "Sumero — Hungarologists", see E. Littmann: *Sprachliche Seltsamkeiten aus Morgenland und Abendland*. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 76 (1922), pp. 270 — 281; J. Friedrich: *Zufällige Ähnlichkeiten auf verschiedenen Sprach- und Kulturgebieten*. Indogermanische Forschungen 60 (1960), pp. 156 — 170; J. Friedrich: *Die verschiedenen Elemente der Sprache in ihrer Empfänglichkeit für Sprachmischung*. In: *Studi linguistici in onore di V. Pisani*. Brescia 1969, pp. 367 — 376; G. Doerfer: *Lautgesetz und Zufall: Betrachtungen zum Omnicomparatismus*. Innsbruck 1973; J. Tischler: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 125 (1975), pp. 362 sq., note 2.
- <sup>152</sup> A. Deimel: *Sumerisches Lexikon*, I, II. 1 — 4, III. 1 — 2. Roma 1925 — 1937.
- <sup>153</sup> Such are e.g. A. Poebel's work cited in note 118, above, furthermore: A. Falkenstein: *Grammatik der Sprache Gudeas von Lagaš*, I — II. Roma 1949 — 1950; A. Falkenstein: *Das Sumerische*. Leiden 1959; 1964<sup>2</sup>; I. Kärki: *Die Sprache der sumerischen Königsinschriften der frühaltbabylonischen Zeit*. Helsinki 1967; I. M. Diakonoff: *Языки древней Передней Азии*. Moscow 1967. 35 — 84. As to the questions of detail, see, among others, E. Sollberger: *Le système verbal dans les inscriptions "royales" présargoniques de Lagaš*. Genève 1952; Niederwalluf 1971<sup>2</sup>; G. B. Gragg: *Sumerian Dimensional Infixes*. Keveaar — Neukirchen-Vluyn 1973, etc.
- <sup>154</sup> Cf. Géza Bárczi: *Nyelvünk és Kultúránk* No. 16 (1974), pp. 32 sq. = *Látóhatár*, January 1975, pp. 192 — 195. — Cf. note 58, above.
- <sup>155</sup> Zsigmond Varga: *Öt ezer év távolából*. Debrecen 1942, p. 274,  $\delta$ , b.
- <sup>156</sup> Elemér Novotny's lecture, Paris 1973; cf. the Summary on p. 3 of the pamphlet quoted in note 75, above.
- <sup>157</sup> Cf. note 34, above.
- <sup>158</sup> Cf. note 23, above. — It is to be noted that this conception — deriving also from Ida Bobula — has turned the historical views of Turanism at the beginning of this century into their contrary. Ede Somogyi and the others thought, at their time, that the Sumerians had migrated into South-Mesopotamia from the land Turan; while today's "Sumero — Hungarologists" believe it to have happened the other way round.
- <sup>159</sup> Cf. Ferenc Badányi Jós: *Káldeától Ister-gamig*, I. Buenos Aires 1971, plates 20 — 24 (maps in supplement).
- <sup>160</sup> Cf. note 29, above.
- <sup>161</sup> Cf. N. Vlassa: *Probleme ale cronologiei neolitului Transilvaniei în lumina stratigrafiei aşezării de la Tărtăria*. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai, Series Historia* 7, No. 2 (1962), pp. 23 — 30; *Chronology of the Neolithic in Transylvania in the Light of the Tărtăria Settlement's Stratigraphy*. *Dacia NS* 7 (1963), pp. 485 — 494.
- <sup>162</sup> A. Falkenstein: *Zu den Tontafeln aus Tărtăria*. *Germania* 43 (1965), pp. 269 — 273; I. J. Gelb: *Nestor. Institute for Research in the Humanities*. The University of Wisconsin, No. 112 (1967, 1 April), p. 488; K. R. Veenhof: *Kleitabellen uit Tărtăria* (Siebenbürgen). *Phoenix* 13 (1967), pp. 35 — 38.
- <sup>163</sup> János Harmatta: *Neolitikori írásbeliség Közép-Európában? Előzetes közlemény*. (Neolithic Written Records in Central Europe? A Preliminary Communication.) *Antik*

- Tanulmányok 13 (1966), pp. 235–236; *J. Harmatta*: Denkmäler einer piktographischen Schrift aus neolithischer und äneolithischer Zeit in Europa und Zentralasien. Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 110, Nr. 7 (1973), pp. 115–118.
- <sup>164</sup> *V. Popovič*: Une civilisation égéo-orientale sur le moyen Danube. *Revue Archéologique* 1963, No. 2, pp. 1–56; *V. Milošević*: Die Tontafeln von Tártária (Siebenbürgen) und die absolute Chronologie des mitteleuropäischen Neolithikums. *Germania* 43 (1965), pp. 261–268; *H. Quitta*: Radiocarbonaten und die Chronologie des mittel- und südeuropäischen Neolithikums. *Ausgrabungen und Funde* 12 (1967), pp. 115–125; *M. S. F. Hood*: The Tártária Tablets. *Antiquity* 41, No. 162 (1967), pp. 99–113; *J. Makkay*: Angaben zur Datierung und zu den südlichen Kontakten der mittleren Bronzezeit des Karpatenbeckens. *A Móra Ferenc Múzeum Évkönyve 1966–1967*, Szeged 1968, No. 1, pp. 31–41; *J. Makkay*: Die in Tártária (Alsótátrálaka) gefundenen piktographischen Tafeln und die jüngere Steinzeit Südeuropas. *Ibid.*, No. 2, pp. 21–24; *E. Neustupný*: The Tártária Tablets: A Chronological Issue. *Antiquity* 42, No. 165 (1968), pp. 32–53; *J. Makkay*: The Tártária Tablets. *Orientalia* 37 (1968), pp. 272–287; *M. S. F. Hood*: The Tartaria Tablets. *Scientific American* 218, No. 3 (1968), pp. 30–37; *Nándor Kálicz*: Agyag istenek. A neolitikum és a rézkor emlékei Magyarországon = Clay Gods. The Neolithic Period and Copper Age in Hungary. Budapest 1970, pp. 44 sq.; *János Makkay*: A tartariai (alsótátrálaki) táblácskák. (The tablets from Tartaria-Alsótátrálaka.) *Magyar Tudomány* 77 ÚF 15 (1970), pp. 63–69; *János Makkay*: Sumér jellegű képjelek a Maros mentén. A tártáriai leletek. (Pictographic Signs of Sumerian Character Alongside the River Maros. The Tártária Finds.) *Élet és Tudomány* 23, No. 3 (1970), pp. 110–114. — The investigation of the Bánát (Vinča) culture of Transylvania has taken a great impetus in the meantime.
- <sup>165</sup> Cf. *S. v. Torma*: Ethnographische Analogien. Ein Beitrag zur Gestaltungs- und Entwicklungsgeschichte der Religionen. Jena 1894. — Of course, what concerns the details, Zsófia Torma's conclusions are mostly out of date today, and some of her interpretations have been explicitly refuted by recent research; all this, however, cannot diminish the merits of the eminent archeologist in the history of science. Her main achievement lies in that she was the first who regarded Transylvanian neolithic as part of an organically developing neolithic of the Near East, Asia Minor and the Balkans. — A worthy commemoration of Zsófia Torma's achievement is a small selection of her abundant correspondence; see *Pál Gyulai* (Ed.): Torma Zsófia levelesládájából. (From the Correspondence of Sophie Torma.) Bucharest 1972. N. Vlassa works up her manuscripts kept in the Cluj Historical Museum; on her archaeological collection cf. *Márton Roska*: A Torma Zsófia-gyűjtemény az Erdélyi Nemzeti Múzeum érem- és régiség-tárában. (The Zsófia Torma Collection in the Coin- and Antiquity Cabinet of the Transylvanian National Museum.) Kolozsvár 1941.
- <sup>166</sup> Cf. *J. Makkay*: The Late Neolithic Tordos Group of Signs. *Alba Regia* 10 (1969), pp. 4–49.
- <sup>167</sup> Cf. the studies of *I. J. Gelb* and that of *M. S. F. Hood*, quoted in notes 162 and 164, above, respectively, and also *Géza Komoróczy*: Ötezer éves ékírásos agyagtáblák Erdélyben. (Five Thousand Years Old Cuneiform Clay Tablets in Transylvania.) In: *Géza Simonffy* (Ed.): Tudományos kaleidoszkóp. Budapest 1974, pp. 247–251.
- <sup>168</sup> Cf. *C. C. Lamberg-Karlovsky*: Proto-Elamite Account Tablets from Tepe Yahya. *Kadmos* 10 (1971), pp. 97–99; *G. Komoróczy*: Zur Ätiologie der Schrifterfindung im Enmerkar-Epos. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 3 (1975), 19–24.
- <sup>169</sup> *Zsófia Torma*: Sumér nyomok Erdélyben. (Sumerian Traces in Transylvania.) Buenos Aires 1972. (Sumér Könyvek. Sumerian books.) — As for its publication, it is Anna Fehér's name marking the editorial foreword, whereas it is Ladislao Eugenio Fehér whose name marks the colophon of the book; Torma's German text was translated by *István Foyta*, the accompanying studies: Torma Zsófia élete és munkássága. (Zsófia Torma's Life and Achievement.) pp. 9–50; Sumérok magyar földön. (Sumerians on Hungarian Soil.) pp. 141–222) were written by *Gábor Jáki*.
- <sup>170</sup> Cf. note 169, above. — The effect of Jáki's studies is to be perceived in Hungarian press. *Ferenc Szent-Miklós*: A mítikus Imdugud. Sumér leletek Erdélyben. (The Mythic Imdugud. Sumerian Finds in Transylvania.) *Magyar Ifjúság*, May 31, 1974,



p. 45. His article refers on some recent Transylvanian finds of the Bánát (Vinča) culture, as being proofs for "... the Sumerian culture getting as far as the Carpathian Basin". The source of the article is rendered exactly identifiable by the name "Imdugud" in the title, the name of the lion-headed eagle of Sumerian mythology, which has been read by experts as Anzu for a decade and a half. Its old reading keeps cropping up in the works of those far from this special field, e.g. in those of the "Sumero — Hungarologists", cf. Jáki's study, quoted, in note 169, above, pp. 185 sq., from where the article of Magyar Ifjúság quotes almost verbatim, but without mentioning the source used.

<sup>171</sup> Cf. *József Schmidt*: Nyugat 18, No. 20 (1925), p. 197; also quoted — without mentioning the source — by *Miklós Zsirai*, too, cf. note 82, above.

<sup>172</sup> The problems of historical knowledge of today's Hungarian society have been investigated, with empiric sociological methods, by *István Diószegi*, see *Történelmi ismeret — történelmi érdeklődés*. (Historical Knowledge — Interest in History.) In: *idem*: Hazánk és Európa. Tanulmányok. (Our Country and Europe. Studies. (Budapest 1970, pp. 421 — 445; cf. *idem*: *Történelmi ismeret — történelmi érdeklődés — történelem-szemlélet*. (Historical Knowledge — Interest in History — View of History.) *Valóság* 14, No. 1 (1971), pp. 72 — 81. The deficiencies and proportional distortions pointed out by Diószegi seem to explain the popularity of "Sumero — Hungarology" at the same time.

The genuine tasks in the field of rekindling and fostering national traditions have been outlined by *Tibor Klaniczay*, see his essay: *Gondolatok a nemzeti hagyományról*. A nemzeti hagyomány fogalma és karaktere. (Thoughts on National Traditions. The Notion and Character of National Tradition.) *Kortárs* 18 (1974), pp. 761 — 775 = *Látóhatár, Válogatás a magyar kulturális sajtóból*, June 1974, pp. 160 — 189.