

Prof. Dr. Alfréd Tóth

Rhaetic/Akkadian and Finno-Ugric/Uralic

Professzor dr. Linus Brunner (1909-1987) édes emlékére

1. Introduction

The scientific research of the Rhaetic language started in 1981, when Professor Linus Brunner was able to decipher the first Rhaetic inscriptions (Brunner 1981). Before, Rhaetic had been compared to Etruscan, Illyrian, and Celtic (Toth 1987, p. 13 ff.). Recently, it has also been suggested that it derive from “Vasconian”, a proto-form of recent Basque (Venneman 1998). According to Brunner, Rhaetic was a Semitic language spoken in Central Europe and left traces in ca. 200-300 inscriptions and in several hundreds of place names in Switzerland and Northern Italy (Brunner and Toth 1987; Toth and Brunner 2007). In Toth (2008), it was argued that Rhaetic is either Amoritic or a very close relative of it. Already in Brunner (1987), the close relationship between Rhaetic and Akkadian had been shown in hundreds of cognates. In Toth (2006a, b) I have furthermore shown that Rhaetic words also survived in Hungarian, which proves that the Sumerian ancestors of the Hungarians must have left Mesopotamia before the Rhaetic exodus, i.e. before the Sea Wars (13./12. c. b.C.).

The present study is based on Toth (2009), in which I proved the genetic relationship between Hungarian and Sumerian by showing that the Uralic, Finno-Ugric, Ugric, etc. proto-forms, as reconstructed by Finno-Ugrists, go directly back to Sumerian, thus forming an intermediate time stadium between modern Hungarian and ancient Sumerian:

- Proto-Altaic (Proto-Turkic, Proto-Mongolian, Proto-Tungusic):
ca. 6000 B.C.
- Proto-Uralic (Proto-Finno-Ugric, Proto-Samoyed):
ca. 6000/4000 B.C.
- Proto-Finno-Ugric (Proto-Finno-Permic, Proto-Ugric):
ca. 2500 B.C.
- Proto-Ugric (Proto-Hungarian, Proto-Obugric):
1500 B.C.

Since our oldest readable Sumerian texts are from the so-called Fāra period, i.e. from the 27th century B.C., Sumerian is almost contemporaneous to Proto-Finno-Ugric. Since Akkadian, precisely Old Babylonian, is testified from the 23rd century B.C. (Sargon of Akkad) and since the same is true for his close relative, Rhaetic (cf. Toth 2007), these languages are also contemporaneous with both Sumerian and Proto-Finno-Ugric. However, by comparing the reconstructed proto-forms with the actually once living Sumerian, Akkadian and Rhaetic words, it is first often hard to decide if a word originates in Sumerian, or if it originates in Akkadian which had borrowed it from Sumerian, e.g.

Hungarian
Proto-Uralic

gatyá “linen trousers worn by peasants; underwear”
*kuδj3 “blanket, cover”

Sumerian	gada (633x: ED IIIb, Old Akkadian, Lagash II, Ur III, Early Old Babylonian, Old Babylonian) wr. gada “flax; linen”
Akkadian	kitū

Since Sumerian did not make any difference between k and g as well as between d and k (cf. Edzard 2003, p. 8 ss.), we have no way to decide if Hung. gatyá < Sum. gada or < Akk. kitū (or even from a Rhaet. word closely related to Akk. kitū). Moreover, since Rhaetic and Akkadian were as close as dialects (Brunner and Toth 1987, p. 46 ss.), it is merely due to luck if we can decide for sure if a word is Rhaetic or if it Akkadian. In the present study, I will discuss all 49 cases, which supposedly show the survival of Rhaetic words in contemporary Hungarian. Considering that from Rhaetic we do not even have smaller coherent texts, this percentage is high, although it makes only 7% of the reconstructed Sumerian-Hungarian lexical etymological basis.

2. The Rhaetic influence on the Hungarian vocabulary

1. Hungarian	adni “to give”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*amta-
Sumerian	ad gi (73x: Old Babylonian) wr. ad gi ₄ “to advise, give advice”
Rhaetic	atu-, tin- “to give”, etu, etau “I give” (Brunner and Tóth 1987, p. 98)

It is hard to decide if *amta- < Sum. ad gi or < Rhaet. atu. It looks like a contaminated form *adta- with dissimilation d-t > m-t.

2. Hungarian	agg “aged, senile, very old; old man”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*soŋk ₃ -, *soŋg ₃ - “to become old; old”
Sumerian	sugin (3x: Old Babylonian) wr. ġešsugin “rot; decayed matter”
Akkadian	sumkīnum
Opposite to Sum. -g-, Akk. has -mk- which became PFU -ŋk-, -ŋg-. Thus, Hung. agg seems to go back to Akk.	

3. Hungarian	árva “orphan”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*orpa(s), *orwa(s) “orphan, orphaned; widow, widowed”
Akkadian	erūm; urrūm “to be empty”

Since the Akk. form does not show any traces of labial, except perhaps in -ū, the Hung. word comes either from an older Akk. form like erbūm/urbūm, or, if the Akk. word is a borrowing, from a lost Sum. word like *ar-ba. The Sum. word, which is usually translated by Akk. erūm, urrūm, is sug (863x: ED IIIb, Old Akkadian, Ur III, Old Babylonian, Middle Babylonian) wr. sug₄.

4. Hungarian	avik “to grow into, to penetrate”, avatni “to dedicate, to inaugurate; to initiate sb. into sg.; to (pre-)shrink, to sanforize”, avatkozik “to interfere, to meddle”
Proto- Altaic	*siúŋu “to sink”
Proto-Uralic	*soŋe- “to enter”

Sumerian	si (401x: ED IIIb, Old Akkadian, Lagash II, Old Babylonian) wr. si “to draw water; to brew beer; to fill, load up”
Akkadian	sabūm; sâbum

The PA and PU forms are composed again from originally two Sum. roots. Akk. sab- proves that there was originally a labial like *siw- in Sum., which seems to be correctly reconstructed in PA *siúŋu and possibly merged into –o- in PU.

5. Hungarian	báj “charm, grace”
Proto-Altaic	*bā- “to bind”
Akkadian	ebēṭu “(to be) tied, cramped up”

If –j in Hung. báj is not a recent suffix, then it continues Akk. –ṭ- = /ts/ in ebēṭu.

6. Hungarian	berek “bushes, grove; marshy pasture”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*perz “excrement; swamp”
Akkadian	aburriš “meadow, pasture”

Akk. b- (with apharesis) > PFU *p- > Hung. b-. Akk. –š > Hung. –k?

7. Hungarian	csüd, csög, csüg, csűg “bird’s foot; pastern”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*ć8ŋ3 “joint (?), knuckle”
Sumerian	su (2785x: ED IIIa, ED IIIb, Ebla, Old Akkadian, Lagash II, Ur III, Early Old Babylonian, Old Babylonian, 1st millennium) wr. šu; sum5; šu-x “hand”
Akkadian	qātu “hand”

Sum. š/s- > PFU *ć- > Hung. cs-. As the Akk. borrowing qātu shows, the dental which is still preserved in Hung. csüd, is original. Akk. qātu is either a root-enlargement of Sum. su, or it represents a second, unknown, Sum. word in an original composite.

8. Hungarian	e-, i-: e, ez “this”; i-tt “here”, i-de “hither”, innen “from here”; í-gy “so”; i-lyen “such as this”
Proto-Altaic	*e-, *i-
Proto-Uralic	*e- “this”
Sumerian	a-ne (Old Sumerian) vs. e-ne (Old Babylonian) “he, she”
Akkadian	šū “he” vs. šī “she”
Rhaetic	is, es “this”

The Rhaet. form is closer than both the Akk. and the Sum. forms.

9. Hungarian	enyv “glue”
Proto-Ugric	*ãð’3-m3, *ãð’m3
Akkadian	imtu “paste; poison”

With metathesis: -mt- > - δ m- and with another metathesis and dissimilation > -nyv. One of the clear cases where an Akk. word, which is not a borrowing from Sum., is the etymology of an Hung. word.

10. Hungarian **eredni “to come about; to start”**
 Proto-Finno-Ugric *šär3- “to arrive, to come, to reach, to spread”
 Akkadian šurrū “to begin”

Akk. š- > PFU *š- > Hung. Ø-.

11. Hungarian **facsarni “to wring; to wring out”**
 Proto-Finno-Ugric *puć3-r3- “to press, to squeeze”, *păć3r3- “to press, to wring”
 Akkadian mazū “to squeeze”

Akk. m- > PFU p- > Hung. f-. The development of p- > f- is the only common phonetic feature between Arabic and Hungarian. Since these languages are clearly genetically unrelated, this strange feature may continue the original Rhaetic development of initial p-. Thus, we may reconstruct a Rhaet. *paz- “to squeeze”.

12. Hungarian **fáj “hurt, pain”**
 Proto-Finno-Ugric *pođ’3- “shaving; to split”
 Akkadian būdum “to cut open, to slit, to split”
 Akk. b- > PFU p- > Hung. f-. Akk. -d- > PFU - δ - > Hung. -j.

13. Hungarian **falu “village”**
 Proto- Altaic *palge “town”
 Proto-(Finno-?)Ugric *palγ3
 Sumerian bal (1x: Old Babylonian) wr. ^{na}bal “type of stone”
 Rhaetic *ālu “village” (Brunner and Tóth 1987, p. 97)

Sum. bal is not attested in Akk., but in Rhaetic place-names from which the Rhaetic form has been reconstructed. Sum. b- > PA p- > P(F)U p- > Hung. f-. So, the village is originally built from stones, in accordance with the results obtained by historical linguistics that there is no etymological connection between Hung. fal and falu.

14. Hungarian **fel, föl “above, up, upper”, föl- “skimmings”**
 Proto-Uralic *piðe, *piðe-kä “high; long”
 Sumerian bad (147x: ED IIIa, Old Akkadian, Ur III, Old Babylonian) wr. bad;
 ba; be2 “(to be) remote; to open, undo; to thresh grain with a
 threshing sledge”
 Rhaetic fel (phel), bel “sir” (Brunner and Tóth 1987, p. 97)

Sum b- > PFU p- > Hung. f-. Since Rhaetic f- ~ Akk. p- (like in Arabic), one could assume a direct relation Rhaetic > PU/PFU, if there is enough evidence of cognates.

15. Hungarian **férni “to arrive, to reach; to fit, to have room”**
 Proto-Finno-Ugric (?) *pur3-, p8r3- “to go into”

Sumerian	bar (2579x: ED IIIa, ED IIIb, Ebla, Old Akkadian, Lagash II, Ur III, Early Old Babylonian, Old Babylonian) wr. bar; ba-ra; bala; bur “outside, (other) side; behind; outer form, outer; outsider; to cut open, slit, split”
Akkadian	parūm “to cut, to cut open”
Rhaetic	*far- (Tóth and Brunner 2007, p. 115)

Sum. b-/Akk. p-/Rhaet. f- > PFU p- > Hung. f-.

16. Hungarian	féreg “noxious animal; vermin; worm”
Proto- Altaic	*p’iáru “a kind of worm”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*perk3, *perkk3 “worm”
Sumerian	piriĝ (205x: ED IIIa, ED IIIb, Old Akkadian, Lagash II, Ur III, Old Babylonian) wr. piriĝ; piriĝ3; bi2-ri-iĝ3; ĝešpiriĝ; piriĝ2 “lion; bull, wild bull”
Akkadian	parākum “to wriggle, to squirm (snake)”
Rhaetic	*farāk-, *farāg

Sum p-/Akk. p-/Rhaet. f- > PA p’ > PFU p- > Hung. f-. The semantic change from “lion/bull” > “worm” has thus already taken place in Akk. or in Rhaet., respectively.

17. Hungarian	folyik “to flow, to run, to stream; to ensue, to follow, to go on, to be in progress”, folyó, folyam “river, stream”, folytatni “to continue, to go ahead/on, to run on; to extend, to prolong, to follow, to lead (a life), to pursue, to wage (a war)”
Proto-Ugric	*p8l3- “to gush, to stream”
Akkadian	palgu
Sumerian	par (130x: ED IIIa, ED IIIb, Old Akkadian, Ur III, Old Babylonian) wr. pa5; pa6 “(small) canal, irrigation ditch”

Sum./Akk. p- > PUg p- > Hung. f-. Lambdacism r > l (> ly). Since Akk. has –lg- which may have developed directly > Hung. –ly-, it is to prefer to Sum. which has –r and whose second compound-part is unknown. Rhaet. *falg- “river, creek”, but cf. Balgach (St. Galler Rhine Valley) < Akk. palgu, Hebr. peleg, Arab. falaĝ “brook, river”, cf. Bolgenach in Vorarlberg (Austria), name of a creek (Tóth and Brunner 2007, p. 111), both names require a Rhaet. side-form *palg- “river, creek”.

18. Hungarian	fűzni “to bind (e.g. flowers into wreaths), to knit, to lace, to fasten; to sew, to stitch (of books)”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*pitä- “to hold”
Akkadian	patālum “to turn, to wind, to tie up”

Akk. p- > PFU p- > Hung. f-. Akk. –t- > PFU –t- > –z-. Rhaet. *fat-/fit- “to bind”.

19. Hungarian	had “army; host”
Proto- Altaic	*kòt’V “village, locality”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*kunta “clan, gens, progeny, large family”
Karakhanid	qutu “group of people”

Akkadian kimtu “clan”

As the comparison of the PA and the Karakh. forms show, there is no continuity between the PA, PFU and Hung. forms, since it is hardly to assume that the nexus –nt- be restituted. Thus, for Hung., we have –mt- > -nt- > -d.

20. Hungarian **hagy-, in: hagymáz “spotted fever”**
Proto-Uralic *kaḏ’a “to leave; to stay”
Sumerian gidim (45x: ED IIIb, Ur III, Old Babylonian) wr. gidim; gidim2 “ghost”
Rhaetic Vitamu, Vitammu “death ghost”
Akkadian eṭemmu < *veṭ- “a death ghost”

Sum. g- > PU k- > Hung. h-. Sum. –d- > PU –ḏ- > Hung. –gy. (Although it is generally assumed that Sum. words are present in Akk., the opposite has to be assumed, too. Thus, here, we have possibly Rhaetic/Old Akk. Vitammu/Veṭemmu > Sum. gidim.) On the god Vitammu cf. Brunner and Toth (1987, p. 61 ss.). By the way, the comparison of the Rhaet. and Akk. forms with the Sum. form seems to point to Akzentrückzug in Sum. from which it would follow that not the Sum. word was borrowed to Akk. and Rhaet., but the borrowing went the opposite way.

21. Hungarian **hám “cuticle, peel”, hámlík “to cover, to wrap”**
Proto-Uralic *kama “peel, skin”
Akkadian kamū “sth. which is on the outside”

Akk. k- > PU k- > Hung. h-

22. Hungarian **hárs “lime/linden tree”**
Proto-Uralic (?),
Proto-Finno-Ugric *koćk3, *końćk3 “(tree) bark”
Sumerian ḡeš (5552x: ED IIIa, ED IIIb, Old Akkadian, Lagash II, Ur III, Early Old Babylonian, Old Babylonian) wr. ḡeš; mu; u5 “tree; wood”
Akkadian iṣu (< *wiṣu)

Obviously, we have: Rhaet. *wiṣu (cf. no. 20) Sum. ḡeš > PFU koć- > Hung. *hás = /hāš/, on the problem of –r- cf. EWU, p. 533. PFU k- can only be borrowed from Sum. ḡ-, and of course never from Akk. Ø-. Moreover, Sum. ḡ- can only come < Rhaet. *w- and not < Akk. Ø-, so it follows that Hung. hárs is undoubtedly of Rhaet. origin. According to Kluge (2002, p. 393), German Harsch “snow-crust” (and also Germ. harsch “rough; rude”) is of IE origin. However, since PU *koćk3 means also a crust – the bark of a tree -, this assumption causes doubts.

23. Hungarian **hés “bridegroom, wooer; hero; young man”, hős “hero”**
Proto-Uralic *kaća “young unmarried man”
Sumerian ḡeš (47x: Old Babylonian) wr. ḡeš3; mu “penis; male”
Akkadian iṣaru (< *wiṣaru)

Akk. (Rhaet.?) *wiš- > Sum. ġeš > PU *kać- > Hung. hēs (cf. no. 20).

24. Hungarian	hét “seven”
Proto-Ugric	*Säptš
Akkadian	sebūm, sebe

Since “six” is a cutting point in the Sum. sexagesimal system, the number 7 was obviously taken from Akk. Akk. s- > PU S- > Hung. h-. -pt- > -t.

25. Hungarian	hornyolni “to incise, to notch”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*kurńa “furrow, groove”
Sumerian	kud (1111x: ED IIIa, ED IIIb, Ebla, Old Akkadian, Lagash II, Ur III, Early Old Babylonian, Old Babylonian, 1st millennium, unknown) wr. kud; gur ₅ “to incise”
Akkadian	harāšu

The appearance of Sum. kud as Akk. har- gives some hints of the phonetic realization of Sum. /d/ (and the relation of pronunciation and spelling). However, the Akk. form is closer both to the PFU and Hung. forms.

26. Hungarian	hor-hó “cleft, narrow passage”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*kurš “indentation; to pass”
Sumerian	kud (1111x: ED IIIa, ED IIIb, Ebla, Old Akkadian, Lagash II, Ur III, Early Old Babylonian, Old Babylonian, 1st millennium, unknown) wr. kud; gur ₅ “to incise”
Akkadian	harāšu

Same etymology as in no. 25.

27. Hungarian	hozni “to bring, to carry, to convey, to fetch; to bring forth, to produce; to bring in, to yield”, -hoz/-hez/-höz, hozzá “to/towards sb.
Proto-Ugric	*kućš “edge or side of sth.
Khanty	χo_źi, χoźà “for/to/towards sb. or sth.”
Akkadian	kašādum “to bring, to carry”

Akk. k- PUg k- > Hung. h-. Akk. -š- > PUg -ć- > Hung. -z-.

28. Hungarian	hupolyag “bubble-shaped swelling; bulge on a tree; pustule”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*kuppa “blister, bump”
Akkadian	kupputu “growing rampant (liver)”

Akk. k- > PFU k- > Hung. h-.

29. Hungarian	húzni “to pull”
Proto-Ugric	*kupš-tš- “to rend, to pull, to tear”
Akkadian	kapārum “to wipe, to wipe off”

Akk. k- > PUg k- > Hung. h-. On -p- > -z- cf. EWU, p. 593.

30. Hungarian	jegy “mark, sign; ticket”, jel “mark, signal”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*jälke
Sumerian	igiġal (1x: Old Babylonian) wr. ġešigi-ġal2 “sign, signal” (ġal2 “to be”)
Akkadian	eqū “to use make-up”

PFU form with prothesis, which is conserved in Hung. Obviously, the Akk. form is the direct basis of Hung. jegy, since Akk. eqū is haplologic to Sum. igiġal.

31. Hungarian	kés “knife”
Proto-Altaic	*kʷi_utʷu “a kind of knife or arrow”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*kečs “knife”
Akkadian	qazāzum “to cut, to cut off”

Akk. -z- > PFU -č- > Hung. -s (/š/).

32. Hungarian	keshedni “to become frayed/threadbare, to wear out”
Proto-Ugric	*kāńčs(-), *kāčs(-) “thin; to thin out”
Akkadian	qātū “to come to an end; to be finished”, qatnu “thin”

Akk. -t- > PUg -(ń)č- > Hung. -s(h)-, cf. EWU, p. 742. The lack of nasal in the Akk. root shows, in accordance with the two forms reconstructed, that the PUg nasal is an non-original infix.

33. Hungarian	keskeny “narrow”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*kāńčs, *kāčs “narrow, tight”
Akkadian	qatnu “thin, narrow”

Akk. -t- > PUg -(ń)č- > Hung. -s(h)-, cf. EWU, p. 742.

34. Hungarian	kész “finished, ready; prepared (to), ready (to); obliging, willing”
Proto-Finno-Ugric	*k8čs “ready, willing”
Akkadian	qātū “to come to an end; to be finished”, qatū “finished, ready”

Akk. -t- > PUg -(ń)č- > Hung. -s(h)-, cf. EWU, p. 742.

35. Hungarian	kevés “few; small”
Proto-Altaic	*kupʷe “light (of weight); floating on the surface”
Proto-Tungusic	*kepu-, *kopu-
Proto-Uralic (?), Proto-Finno-Ugric	*kepä
Sumerian	kabduga (2x: Ur III, Old Babylonian) wr. kab-dug4-ga “capacity measure (container)”
Akkadian	quppu “container”

Sum. -b-/Akk. -pp- > PA -p' > PFU -p- > Hung. -v-. Here, we can even assume that the phonological relevance of double consonants were already lost in transition between Akk. and PU.

36. Hungarian **koporsó “casket, coffin”**
 Proto-Altaic *kop'é “to bend; elevation; convexity”
 Proto-Finno-Ugric *koppa “something hollow”
 Akkadian qubūru “grave; hole”, kipūm, kapāpum “to bend”

37. Hungarian **lap “page; sheet; flat surface”**
 Proto-Altaic *láp'i “flat; broad”
 Proto-Uralic *lapp3 “flat; flat surface”
 Sumerian la (10x: ED IIIb, Old Babylonian) wr. la2 “to stretch out; to be in order”
 Akkadian lapāpum “to wind around”, lippu “cover”

The Sum. basis was a compound whose consonantal structure reveals only from Akk. lap-, which survived unchanged in modern Hung.

38. Hungarian **láp “marshy meadow; moor”**
 Proto-Altaic *lébù(-nV), *lépù- “swamp”
 Proto-Uralic *lamp3 “bog, marsh, pond, *l8pp3 “debris floating on the water, driftwood, fallen tree”
 Sumerian la, wr. la6 “flooding”
 Akkadian lapātum “to moisten”

While modern Hung. lap (no. 37) and láp are only discerned by phonemic vowels length, their respective etyma are homonymous.

39. Hungarian **lék (< weyk) “hole in the ice; leak”**
 Proto-Uralic *le(j)kka(-) “crack, fissure; to split, to cut”
 Akkadian laqūm, leqūm “to take; to take away, to remove”

40. Hungarian **levél “leaf, sheet; letter”**
 Proto-(Finno?-)Ugric *l8p3, lep3 “sheet”
 Sumerian la (10x: ED IIIb, Old Babylonian) wr. la2 “to stretch out; to be in order”
 Akkadian lippu “cover”

Akk. (Sum.?) -pp- > P(F)U -p- > -v-.

41. Hungarian **mál “slope of a mountain; belly part of the skin of an animal”**
 Proto-Finno-Ugric *m8l3, *m8lj3, *m8lk3 “breast”
 Akkadian mēlū “hill”
 Rhaetic mal- “hill” (Tóth and Brunner 2007, p. 120)

Rhaet. has the same stem-vowels as Hung. has, while Akk. has ē.

42. Hungarian **méz “honey”**
 Proto-Finno-Ugric *mete
 Akkadian matqu “syrup, honey”

Cf. Brunner 1969, no. 438. This may be a Wanderwort, i.e. a word which wandered together with its object, a once famous beverage.

43. Hungarian **nézni “to watch, to glance”, néző “augur (person)”**
 Proto-Finno-Ugric *näke- “to see, to watch”
 Akkadian naṭālum “to watch, to glance”

Akk. -ṭ- > Hung. -z- (PFU reconstruction doubtful).

44. Hungarian **szeg, szög “angle; nail; point”**
 Proto-Ugric *šeŋkz “spike, wedge”
 Sumerian sahin, wr. sa-hi-in “peg”
 Akkadian sikkatu

As the Akk. borrowing with -kk- proves, Sum. h = χ; thus, χ > ηk > -g.

45. Hungarian **-t (deverbative verb suffix, e.g. kelteni “to awake”, kelni “to wake up”)**
 Proto-Uralic *-tt (causative formant)
 Akkadian š-, ša-, šu (causative preformant) < t- (Wright 1966, p. 204)

46. Hungarian **tudni “to know (a fact), to be able to”**
 Proto-Uralic *tumte- “feel, to touch, to touch upon”
 Sumerian zu (964x: ED IIIb, Old Akkadian, Ur III, Old Babylonian) wr. zu
 “to know; to learn”
 Akkadian edūm

As the related Akk. word shows, there was a dental in the Sum. root: *zud/t-. Here, z = /ts/ has dropped the -s-part like in no. 638, thus *zut- > *tut > Hung. tud-. -m- has solely been reconstructed because of some Samoyed reflexes, cf. Yurak tumtā- “to know”, Kamassian temne- “to know, to understand” which may not belong to the same Sum. root.

47. Hungarian **vese “kidney”**
 Proto-Ugric *w8ćz “penis”
 Sumerian ĝeš (47x: Old Babylonian) wr. ĝeš3; mu “penis; male”
 Akkadian išaru

Since the Akk. and Rhaet. words are borrowings from the Sum. word, Akk. Rhaet. išaru < *wišaru (cf. no. 20) with initial v- still conserved in Hung. vese. Therefore, the Hung. word cannot originate directly in the Sum., but in the Rhaet. or Akk. word.

48. Hungarian **vessző “rod, twig, verge”**
 Proto-Finno-Ugric *waćz “narrow, thin bent branch”

Sumerian	ĝeš (5552x: ED IIIa, ED IIIb, Old Akkadian, Lagash II, Ur III, Early Old Babylonian, Old Babylonian) wr. ĝeš; mu; u5 “tree; wood”
Akkadian	išu < *wišu

Cf. no. 20.

49. Hungarian	víz “water”
Proto-Uralic	*wete
Sumerian	biz (12x: Old Babylonian) wr. bi-iz; biz “to trickle, drip”
Akkadian	bašāšum (< Sum. biz)

In this single case, we can say from the palatal stem vowel both in Hung. víz (acc. vizet, not *vizot or *vizat) and Sum. biz that this word originates directly in Sum. and not in the Sum. borrowing Akk., Rhaet. bašāšum, which shows a velar stem-vowel. Also PIE *wodor/*wedor/ *uder-, from root *wed- (cf. Hittite watar, Sanskrit udnah, Greek hydor, Old Bulgarian, Russian voda, Lithuanian vanduo, Old Prussian. wundan, Gaelic uisge “water”, Latin unda “wave” (cf. Brunner 1969, no. 739) originate in Sum. biz and are thus also genetically related to Hung. víz.

3. Concluding remarks

Although all Akkadian words are potentially Rhaetic words, this thus of course not legitimate us to reconstruct the respective Rhaetic words – except probably in all those cases where Hung. f- goes back to PU/PFU p-. This is the only phonetic feature shared between Hung. and Rhaetic, and Rhaetic shares it with his close relative Arabic, as already stated by Brunner (Brunner and Toth 1987, p. 82).

In this study, we have presupposed that the Sumerian and Akkadian words are correctly deciphered (and their meanings correctly stated) and that the reconstruction of EWU and its predecessor works are correct. Therefore, by showing that there are sound-laws which describe in a consistent manner the phonetic changes between the Sumerian/Akkadian/Rhaetic and the Hungarian consonants (and partly the vowels), we have shown that there can be no doubt that a certain percentage of Rhaetic words have survived in Hungarian. Our study thus confirms the results obtained in Toth (2006a and 2006b). These few Akkadian and Raetic etymologies point, in accordance with Bobula (1966), to the fact that the Sumerian, from which Hungarian derives, is a late form of that language. It is thus impossible that the Sumerians came already in the 3rd millennium from Mesopotamia to the Tordos valley in Transilvania where the famous findings we made. Rather, it is to assume that the Mesopotamians originated in Transilvania and rather went back to the Carpathian basin as their original homeland – as told in Hungarian mythology and suspected by many independent Hungarian scholars. If one assumes the opposite direction of wanderings, one is unable to explain the Sumerian borrowings in Akkadian, the Akkadian borrowings in Sumerian and, most of all, the fact that in many cases an Akkadian and Rhaetic words survives in Hungarian, where there are obviously no corresponding borrowings in Sumerian. It therefore can be assumed that the Sumerians went back to the Carpathian basin not long before the Rhaetic exodus started out of Mesopotamia, i.e. in the 13/12 centuries B.C.

Hence Rhaetic – and the Rhaetic words homonymous or homeonymous to the Akk. words reconstructed in the present study had thus an important impact on the development of Hungarian. This impact, however, may be much bigger than it could be shown by the above reconstruction.

Bibliography

- Bobula, Ida, Origin of the Hungarian nation. Gainesville FL 1966
Brunner, Linus: Rediscovering the Raetic Language. In: ESOP 9, 1981, No. 212, p. 56-61
Brunner, Linus: Sprache und Ortsnamen der Räter. In: Helvetia Archaeologica 18, 1987, Nr. 70, p. 46-55
EWU = Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen. Budapest 1992 ss.
Brunner, Linus, Die gemeinsamen Wurzeln des semitischen und indogermanischen Wortschatzes. Bern 1969
Brunner, Linus/Toth, Alfred, Die rätische Sprache – enträtselt. St. Gallen 1987
Kluge, Friedrich, Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. 24. Aufl. Berlin 2002
Toth, Alfred, Hungaro-Rhaetica. 2 vols. Budapest and The Hague 2006
Toth, Alfred, Überlegungen zu einer relativen Chronologie der rätischen Sprache. In: Zeitschrift für Sprache und Sprachen 35, 2007, p. 15-32
Toth, Alfred, The origin of the Rhaetians. In: Anthropos 103, 2008, p. 210-216
Toth, Alfred, Sumerian, Proto-Uralian, Proto-Finno-Ugrian and Hungarian. Tucson 2009.
Digital English version: <http://www.szabir.com/blog/sumerian-proto-uralic-proto-finno-ugrian-and-hungarian>
Toth, Alfred/Brunner, Linus, Rhaetic – A Semitic Language in Central Europe. The Hague and Budapest 2007
UEW = Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Budapest 1986 ss.
Vennemann, Theo, Germania Semitica: ⁺*plg-/*⁺*pleg-*, ⁺*furb-/*⁺*farb-*, ⁺*folk-/*⁺*flok-*, ⁺*felb-/*⁺*folg-*.
In: Donhauser, Karin/Eichinger, Ludwig M. (eds.), Deutsche Grammatik – Thema in Variationen. Festschrift für Hans-Werner Eroms. Tübingen 1998, p. 245-261

© Prof. Dr. Alfred Toth, 3.8.2009