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**

* gatya “linen trousers worn by peasants; underwear”

**Proto-Uralic**

* kuðja “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. gatya < 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 reconstréd 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 gi4 “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 *soŋkзA, *soŋgзA “to become old; old”
   Sumerian sugin (3x: Old Babylonian) wr. ĝešsugin “rot; decayed matter”
   Akkadian sumkīnum
   Opposite to Sum. –g-, Akk. has –mk- which became PFU –ŋkA, AŋgA. Thus, Hung. agg seems
to go back to Akk.

3. Hungarian árva “orphan”
   Proto-Finno-Ugric *orpa(sз), *orwa(sз) “orphan, orphaned; widow, widowed”
   Akkadian ěrűm; úrūrum “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 ěrbūm/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. ěrűm, ùrūrum, is sug (863x: ED IIIb, Old Akkadian, Ur III, Old Babylonian, Middle
Babylonian) wr. sug.

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 *síuŋu “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; sābum

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-Altai *bā- “to bind”
   Akkadian ebētu “(to be) tied, cramped up”

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

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

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

7. Hungarian csűd, csög, csűg, csőg “bird’s foot; pastern”
   Proto-Finn-Ugric *ć8ŋz “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. csűd, 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”; i-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 Šu “he” vs. Ši “she”
   Rhaetic is, es “this”

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

9. Hungarian enyv “glue”
   Proto-Ugric *aδ’-m3, *aδ’m3
   Akkadian imtu “paste; poison”
With metathesis: -mt- > -ðm- 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 *šärA- “to arrive, to come, to reach, to spread”
Akkadian šurrū “to begin”

Akk. š- > PFU *š- > Hung. ∅.

11. Hungarian facsarni “to wring; to wring out”
Proto-Finno-Ugric *pućA- “to press, to squeeze”, *pāćA- “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 *poδA- “shaving; to split”
Akkadian būdum “to cut open, to slit, to split”


13. Hungarian falu “village”
Proto-Altaiic *palge “town”
Proto-(Finno-Ungric) *palγA Sumerian bal (1x: Old Babylonian) wr. “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 féri “to arrive, to reach; to fit, to have room”
Proto-Finno-Ugric (?) *purA-, p8rA- “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”

Rhaetian *far-, *(Tóth & Brunner 2007, p. 115)

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

16. Hungarian féreg “noxious animal; vermin; worm”

Proto-Altaic *p’i̯ar “a kind of worm”

Proto-Finno-Ugric *perk₃, *perkk₃ “worm”

Sumerian piriǵ (205x: ED IIIa, ED IIIb, Old Akkadian, Lagash II, Ur III, Old Babylonian) wr. piriǵ; piriǵ₃; bi2-ri-iģ₃; ģešpiriǵ; piriǵ₂ “lion; bull, wild bull”

Akkadian parākum “to wriggle, to squirm (snake)”

Rhaetian *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. falaģ “brook, river”, cf. Bolgenach in Vorarlberg (Austria), name of a creek (Toth & 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 *köt’V “village, locality”

Proto-Finno-Ugric *kunta “clan, gens, progeny, large family”

Karakhanid qutu “group of people”
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 –mːt- > -nːt- > -d.

**20. Hungarian**

**Proto-Uralic**

hagyo-, in: hagymáz “spotted fever”

**Sumerian**

gidim (45x: ED IIIb, Ur III, Old Babylonian) wr. gidim; gidim2 “ghost”

**Rhaetic**

Vitamu, Vitammu “death ghost”

**Akkadian**

eńemmu < *veńA “a death ghost”

Sum. g- > PU k- > Hung. h-. Sum. –d- > PU -d̂- > 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/Veńemmu > Sum. gidim.) On the god Vitammu cf. Brunner and Toth (1987, p. 61 ss.). By the way, the comparison of the Rhaeti. 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 Rhaeti., but the borrowing went the opposite way.

**21. Hungarian**

hám “cuticle, peel”, hámlık “to cover, to wrap”

**Proto-Uralic**

kama “peel, skin”

**Akkadian**

kamû “sth. which is on the outside”

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

**22. Hungarian**

hárs “lime/linden tree”

**Proto-Uralic (?)**

kočk3, *końčk3 “(tree) bark”

**Proto-Finno-Ugric**

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

**Sumerian**

Akkadian

işu (< *wišu)

Obviously, we have: Rhaet. *wišu (cf. no. 20) Sum. ĝeš > PFU koč- > Hung. *háś = /hāš/, on the problem of –r- cf. EWU, p. 533. PFU k- can only be borrowed from Sum. ĝ-, and of course never from Akk. Ø-. Moreover, Sum. ĝ- 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 *kočk3 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**

kača “young unmarried man”

**Sumerian**

ĝeš (47x: Old Babylonian) wr. ĝeš3; mu “penis; male”

**Akkadian**
išaru (< *wišaru)
Akk. (Rhaet.?) *wiš- > Sum. ĝeš > PU *kać- > Hung. hés (cf. no. 20).

24. Hungarian hét “seven”
Proto-Ugric *Säpta
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; gur₃ “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 *kurs “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; gur₃ “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/-hóz, hozzá “to/towards sb.
Proto-Ugric *kuća “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 *kupa-t₃- “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 igīgal (1x: Old Babylonian) wr. ĝešigi-ĝal2 “sign, signal” (ĝal2 “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. igīgal.

31. Hungarian kés “knife”
Proto-Altaic *k'i_ut'u “a kind of knife or arrow”
Proto-Finno-Ugric *kečз “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 *käńćз(A), *käćз(A) “thin; to thin out”
Akkadian qātū “to come to an end; to be finished”, qatnu “thin”

Akk. –t- > PUg –(ń)ć- > 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 *känčз, *kāčз “narrow, tight”
Akkadian qatnu “thin, narrow”

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

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

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

35. Hungarian kevés “few; small”
Proto-Altaic *kup’e “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
Proto-Altaic *kop’ę “to bend; elevation; convexity”
Proto-Finno-Ugric *koppa “something hollow”
Akkadian qubûru “grave; hole”, kipûm, kapûpum “to bend”

Hungarian koporsó “casket, coffin”

37. Hungarian
Proto-Altaic *láp’ı “flat; broad”
Proto-Uralic *lappą “flat; flat surface”
Sumerian la (10x: ED IIIb, Old Babylonian) wr. la2 “to stretch out; to be in order”
Akkadian lapûpum “to wind around”, lippu “cover”

Hungarian lap “page; sheet; flat surface”

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

38. Hungarian
Proto-Altaic *lébû’(-nV), *lépû “swamp”
Proto-Uralic *le(j)kka(A) “crack, fissure; to split, to cut”
Akkadian lapû “to moisten”

Hungarian láp “marshy meadow; moor”

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

39. Hungarian
Proto-Uralic *le(j)kka(-) “crack, fissure; to split, to cut”
Akkadian laqûm, leqûm “to take; to take away, to remove”

Hungarian lék (< weyk) “hole in the ice; leak”

40. Hungarian
Proto-(Finno-)Ugric *l8pà “sheet”
Sumerian la (10x: ED IIIb, Old Babylonian) wr. la2 “to stretch out; to be in order”
Akkadian lippu “cover”

Hungarian levél “leaf, sheet; letter”

Akk. (Sum.?) –pp > P(F)U –p > -v-. 

41. Hungarian
Proto-Finno-Ugric *m8l3, *m8l3, *m8l3 “breast”
Akkadian mēlû “hill”
Rhaetic mal- “hill” (Tóth and Brunner 2007, p. 120)

Hungarian mál “slope of a mountain; belly part of the skin of an animal”

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. –t- > Hung. –z- (PFU reconstruction doubtful).

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

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

45. Hungarian -t (deverbal 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 temme- “to know, to understand” which may not belong to the same Sum. root.

47. Hungarian vese “kidney”
Proto-Ugric *w8ćə “penis”
Sumerian ţeš (47x: Old Babylonian) wr. ţes; mu “penis; male”
Akkadian išaru

Since the Akk. and Rhaet. words are borrowings from the Sum. word, Akk. Rhaet. išaru < *wiśaru (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 *waćə “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 īṣu < *wiṣu

Cf. no. 20.

49. Hungarian víz “water”

Proto-Úralic *wete

Sumerian biz (12x: Old Babylonian) wr. bi-iz; biz “to trickle, drip”

Akkadian başāšum (< 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. başāšum, which shows a velar stem-vowel. Also PIE *wodor/*wedor/*uderA, from root *wed- (cf. Hittite watar, Sanskrit udnah, Greek hydor, Old Bulgarian, Russian voda, Lithuanian vanduo, Old Prussian. wunder, 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 Rhaetic 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 basis 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.
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