

## CHAPTER 7

# The Sumerians

The Sumerians settled in Mesopotamia around 3500 B.C. and remained the dominant race there until about 1800 B.C., when the Amorites — better known as Babylonians — put an end to them as a political, ethnic and linguistic entity.<sup>1</sup> Between these two dates, they created the first high civilisation of mankind and their impact on the cultures of the surrounding nations was felt for many centuries after their eventual disappearance. Their language remained in cultic and diplomatic use in the Near East until the middle of the first millenium B.C., whilst their cuneiform system of writing was successively adopted by the Akkadians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Hurrians, Hittites, Canaanites, Persians, Elamites and Urartians, and certain varieties of late Babylonian and Assyrian survived as written languages in cuneiform almost down to the time of Christ. Sumerian deities and religious concepts found similarly wide acceptance and their technological achievements, ranging from the invention of the wheel to a highly artistic use of metals, had even more far-reaching effects. Our twentieth century civilisation, with its Graeco-Roman and Semitic background, ultimately goes back to Sumerian foundations, so that directly or indirectly, all mankind is in the debt of the innovating spirit of the Sumerians.

The main settlements of the Sumerians were in Lower Mesopotamia where they founded city-states vying with each other for hegemony. Ur, Uruk, Kish, Nippur, Lagash and Eridu were their main centres of power and wealth, although smaller towns are also known. They called this area *Ki-engi*, the land of Engi.✕ There were also Sumerians in Upper Mesopotamia before the arrival of the Semitic Akkadians and this part of the country was called *Ki-uri*.<sup>2</sup> The designations Sumer and Sumerian were not known to the Sumerians themselves: these names are Semitic corruptions.<sup>3</sup> It is perhaps sad and ironical that these talented

## *The Sumerians*

people should be remembered by a name given to them by vassal tribes which ultimately brought about their downfall but then, the fact is that they left behind no name for themselves as an ethnic entity, only political and geographical designations.<sup>4</sup>

The Sumerians were so well and truly buried by the dust and rubble of history, that their very existence remained hidden until the middle of the last century, when study of cuneiform records revealed an ancient, non-Semitic language. The first discoverers, Rawlinson and Oppert, called this language 'Scythian' and recognised the people speaking it as the inventor of cuneiform writing. Oppert subsequently sought to establish a relationship between this language and Hungarian, Turkish and Mongolian, and expressed the view that it was closest to the Ugro-Finnish linguistic group. Later, in a lecture delivered before the ethnographic and historical section of the French Society of Numismatics and Archaeology in 1869, he was the first to identify this language as 'Sumerian' and in the same breath he declared, supporting his contention with lexical and grammatical analogies, that it had close affinities with Turkish, Finnish and Hungarian. Another leading early Sumerologist, Lenormant, stated his conviction that this ancient language stood nearest to the Ugro-Finnish branch of the 'Turanian' group and that within this branch, it bore closer resemblance to the Ugric than the Finnish languages.<sup>4</sup> For the first twenty years after the discovery of Sumerian, these views dominated the scientific world until they became obscured by an absurd theory proposed by Halevy.

Halevy, who had made his way from Bucharest to Paris and there became the leading authority on Semitology, put forward the theory in 1874 that Sumerian was the artificial language of Semitic priests and that no such people ever existed. He defended his views with great vehemence, swaying at times even such great savants as Delitzsch, and due to his tenacity which did not waver even in extreme old age, he managed to cloud the issue until his death in 1917. Indeed, the confusion he created in linguistic circles was so profound that up to the present day, no well-known Sumerologist has been prepared to make a definitive statement as to the precise linguistic classification of Sumerian beyond stating that it is an agglutinative language.<sup>5</sup>

## *Sons of Nimrod*

The notion of a language 'without any known relative', as some savants still maintain Sumerian was, is of course highly suspect, as it presupposes either that such language had developed in a complete vacuum or that all its relatives have mysteriously disappeared. The first of these alternatives is clearly an impossibility. There is no linguistic vacuum on this earth, not even in the Pacific islands or on the most inaccessible mountains. As to the second, it is extremely unlikely that such a highly talented and versatile people as the Sumerians could have evolved without developing linguistic relationships with a large number of peoples. Can one really suppose that all such peoples are now extinct? It is more reasonable to assume that those who are unable to find any relatives for the Sumerians are simply not looking hard enough.

Indeed, whilst the controversy raged in the West whether Sumerian was a genuine language at all, a slender but steady stream of opinion was building up in Hungary, asserting the relationship between Sumerian and Ural-Altai languages, and in particular, Hungarian. The first Hungarian writer to propound this theory was Sándor Giesswein who in his two-volume work, *Mizraim és Asszur* (Budapest, 1887) compared the relationship between Sumerian on the one hand and Finno-Ugrian and Turco-Tartar languages on the other to that between Sanskrit and modern Indo-Germanic languages, and stated expressly that Sumerian was related to Hungarian.

A few years later Zsófia Torma, the noted archaeologist, published the results of her excavations in Transylvania, *Ethnographische Analogien* (Jena, 1894), in which she discerned close similarity between the pottery and other material brought to light by her and ancient Babylonian finds, and declared that the Magyars brought with them the culture of the Sumerians and also absorbed many Sumerian elements in their language.

In 1897, Gyula Ferenczy published a short book on the Sumerians, *Szumer és Akkád* (Debrecen, 1897), asserting that they were an 'ancient Turanian people' and that their language was closely related to Hungarian. In the ensuing years, the highly regarded Hungarian periodical *Ethnografia* printed successive articles by Géza Nagy, Ede Mahler and János Galgóczy, all

## The Sumerians

dealing with the relationship between Sumerian and Hungarian and stressing that Sumerian language and culture had a strong bearing on the question of the ethnic origin of the Magyars. Galgóczy was particularly active in this field and in addition to contributing numerous articles to *Ethnografia*, he also wrote in the Hungarian journals *Századok*, *Keleti Szemle* and *Magyar Nyelvőr*, and between 1909 and 1914, was also a frequent contributor to the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*.<sup>6</sup>

It must be emphasised that the writers above referred to were all reputable Hungarian historians and linguists who put forward their arguments on an academic level and, in the case of articles, in scientific periodicals of the highest standing. The first Hungarian Sumerologist to appeal to public opinion was Ede Somogyi who, having achieved some distinction as an encyclopaedist by editing the *Magyar Lexikon* from 1878 onward, became a sub-editor of the well-known Hungarian daily, *Budapesti Hírlap*, in 1889 and thereafter wrote several articles in his paper on the question of Sumerian-Hungarian relationship. In 1903, he published a book entitled *Szumirok és magyarok*, in which he sought to demonstrate with grammatical examples and a detailed dictionary that Sumerian was an Ural-Altai language and stood nearest to Hungarian.<sup>7</sup> This created a great stir and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences felt obliged to refer it to Bernát Munkácsi, a distinguished linguist of the Finno-Ugrian school, for an opinion. Munkácsi put in an adverse report, as a result of which the Academy rejected Somogyi's book as a 'dilettante work' — which it may well have been — and declared that 'the special emphasis placed on the importance of Sumerian cuneiform writings from the point of view of Hungarian prehistory is based on error and cannot be justified with scientific credibility'.<sup>8</sup>

Galgóczy immediately attacked Munkácsi's findings and this is when a remarkable development took place. In an article defending his report, Munkácsi conceded that Sumerian and Ural-Altai languages had a certain common vocabulary and proceeded to give a number of examples from the fields of domestic life, nature, cultural concepts and social relations. He declared, however, that these were 'very ancient loanwords', acquired

## Sons of Nimrod

through the mediation of other languages. In his opinion, there were too many grammatical differences between Sumerian and Hungarian to permit the assumption of any closer relationship.<sup>9</sup>

Having made an important concession, Munkácsi did not resile from it in his later writings and indeed, he repeatedly referred to the Sumerian connection in placing the ancestral home of Hungarians and other Finno-Ugrian peoples in the northern Caucasus<sup>10</sup> and in tracing Assyrian loanwords in the Hungarian language.<sup>11</sup> The Hungarian Academy, however, maintained its previous commitment to the Finno-Ugrian ethnic theory (see Chapter 3) and Munkácsi's *rapprochement* to the Sumerists was largely ignored.

Notwithstanding official rejection of the suggested Sumerian-Hungarian relationship, the question continued to occupy the minds of some Hungarian linguists and historians and, in addition to linguistic studies, an effort was also made to invoke the aid of comparative anthropology. In his work *Babylonia és Assyria* (Budapest, 1906), Ede Mahler analysed Sumerian racial types as appearing on Sumerian bas-reliefs and statuary, and concluded that they stood nearest to the Turanian race and were to be considered as one of the branches of the oldest predecessors of Turkic peoples. Unfortunately, as the study of pre-history in Hungary was entirely dominated by the linguists at that time, these anthropological comparisons were not pursued.

After World War I, the Sumerian question well-nigh disappeared from public discussion in Hungary until Zsigmond Varga, Professor of Oriental Languages at the famous Calvinist theological college of Debrecen, published a monumental work in 1942, entitled *Ötezer év távolából*, in which he demonstrated with a detailed analysis of Sumerian grammar and vocabulary that Sumerian was related to Hungarian and Finno-Ugrian and Turco-Tartar languages and was an independent branch of the Ural-Altai family of languages. In addition to linguistic comparisons, he also relied on religious concepts, funerary rites and popular beliefs and superstitions to show an affinity between Sumerians and the present Ural-Altai peoples.

Owing to the tragic events which followed in Hungary soon after the publication of Varga's work, his findings did not re-

## *The Sumerians*

ceive the attention they deserved but the seed had been sown and when the successive waves of the Great Hungarian Diaspora settled down in various parts of the world, a surprisingly virile and widespread Sumerist school began to arise, cultivated by Hungarian refugee linguists and historians.

In 1951, Ida Bobula published her *Sumerian Affiliations* in Washington, in which she identified a large number of basic Hungarian words as of Sumerian derivation and also found similarities between Hungarian and Akkadian words of everyday use. She also analysed affinities between Hungarian and Sumerian religious concepts, mythology, funerary habits and astrological notions, and concluded that these linguistic and cultural affiliations were due to the influence of a group of learned Sumerians who took refuge among the ancestors of the Hungarians after the collapse of Sumerian rule in Mesopotamia. In a subsequent work published ten years later, Bobula also demonstrated that a large number of Hungarian words hitherto considered as Slavonic loanwords, were of Sumerian or Akkadian origin.<sup>12</sup> She wrote numerous articles on the Sumerian-Hungarian relationship and ultimately formed the conclusion that Hungarians were direct descendants of the Sumerians, although she conceded that a great deal of research still had to be done on this question.<sup>13</sup>

Bobula's work strongly influenced a number of Hungarian historians abroad, of whom the most outstanding was the late Viktor Padányi in Australia. In his *Dentumagyaria* (Buenos Aires, 1963), Padányi made an attempt at re-writing Hungarian prehistory on the basis of the Mesopotamian origin of the Magyars or at least a substantial part of them, and although many of his propositions still lack positive proof — we hasten to add, unavoidably so — his work created great interest even in Hungary itself. Another Hungarian historian, Sándor Nagy, in America, analysed Hungarian personal and place names occurring in early mediaeval records and, considering these to be of Sumerian origin, concluded that a substantial part of the Hungarian ethnic body must have been formed by successive waves of Sumerian settlers in the Carpathian basin.<sup>14</sup>

In the strictly linguistic field, Sándor Csöke in Austria carried

### *Sons of Nimrod*

out painstaking research in the late sixties,<sup>15</sup> proclaiming the direct descent of the Hungarian language from Sumerian. More recently, András Zakar of Budapest, using the methods of glottochronology, has shown that of one hundred basic words in Hungarian, compiled in accordance with Professor Hymes' word list, fifty-five were of Sumerian and nine of Akkadian derivation.<sup>16</sup>

Another leading Hungarian protagonist of Sumerian-Hungarian linguistic and ethnic identity is Ferenc Badiny Jós, Professor of Sumerology at the Jesuit University of Buenos Aires, who has written several works on this topic and has recently strongly defended his propositions at the twenty-ninth International Congress of Orientalists in Paris.<sup>17</sup>

The views initially expressed by Rawlinson, Oppert and Lenormant have therefore been reinforced by Hungarian research extending over a century. It is worth noting that the distinguished Finnish Assyriologist, Harri Holma, also held the view that Sumerian and Finno-Ugrian languages were related, although most of his work in this field was never published.<sup>18</sup> The question remains now whether the available evidence indicates a direct descent of Hungarians, at least partly, from the Sumerians or we are merely faced with a linguistic relationship between Sumerian and Hungarian in much the same way as Hungarian is related to other Ural-Altai languages? As a third alternative, the possibility of extensive borrowing by Hungarian from Sumerian also must be considered.

Since these questions cannot be answered without determining the nature of the linguistic affinity between Sumerian and Hungarian, let us see briefly how much can be safely accepted from the assertions made by various writers on this subject.

As a result of researches by Bobula, Csöke and Zakar, we have fairly extensive comparative tables of Sumerian and Hungarian vocabularies of which the following examples indicate the degree of existing relationship:

*Sumerian*

*ur* (lord)

*nin* (lady)

*Hungarian*

*ur* (lord)

*néni* (elder woman)

## The Sumerians

### Sumerian

*nab* (sun)

*hud* (light)

*Isten* (the One, God)

*lil* (soul)

*ul* (womb, lap)

*kus* (skin, body)

*bur* (blood)

*gis* (hand)

*ussa* (younger brother)

*ari* (daughter-in-law)

*us* (begets)

*kurun* (bread)

*edin* (barrel)

*dal* (vessel)

*duk* (vessel)

*sabur* (vessel)

*dar* (food offering for the  
dead)

*izi* (fire)

*bil* (burns)

*sil* (cuts)

*sab* (cuts)

*hun* (rests)

*tar* (severs, cuts)

*sir* (cries)

*li* (cries)

*bur* (makes a hole)

*bul* (blows)

*ru* (carves, engraves)

*mas* (twin, like)

*gur* (container of cereals)

*dan, tan* (explains, clarifies)

### Hungarian

*nap* (sun)

*hold*, archaic and  
provincial *hód*,

*hud* (moon)

*Isten* (God)

*lélek*, arch. *lilk* (soul)

*öl* (lap)

*hus* (flesh)

*vér* (blood)

*kéz* (hand)

*öccs* (younger brother)

*ara* (bride)

*ős* (ancestor)

*kenyér*, arch. *kerenye*  
(bread)

*edény*, arch. *edin* (vessel)

*tál* (plate)

*tok* (sheath); *tök* (gourd)

*csupor*, prov. *szapor*  
(small vessel)

*tor* (funerary meal)

*izzik* (glows)

*föl* (cooks)

*szel* (slices)

*szab* (cuts)

*huny* (sleeps, rests)

*tör* (breaks)

*sir* (cries)

*ri* (cries)

*fur* (bores)

*fuj, ful* (blows)

*ró* (carves, engraves)

*más* (copy, like)

*góré* (corn shed)

*tan-it* (teaches);

*tan-ács* (counsel, council)

## Sons of Nimrod

### Sumerian

*til* (inhabits, sits)  
*dingir* (god)  
*itu* (month)  
*ab* (water)  
*al* (sound)  
*rig* (speaks)  
*sa* (network)  
*retu* (meadow)  
*kabbar* (fat)  
*gada* (fringed loincloth)  
  
*gar* (makes, manufactures)  
*gur* (bends, is bent)  
*guz* (centre)  
*gam* (bends)  
  
*dule* (over, more than)  
*dib* (walks)  
*dug* (swells)  
  
*eri* (goes)  
*es* (evening)  
*zid* (is angry)  
*has* (splits)  
*izi* (hastens)  
*indi* (course)  
  
*kid* (binds)  
*kur* (circle)  
*nad* (great)  
*nam* (no)  
*pa* (tree)  
*pa* (head)  
*bur* (ear)

### Hungarian

*tel-ep* (settlement)  
*tel-ek* (block of land)  
*tenger* (immense, sea);  
*tündér* (fairy)  
*idö* (time)  
*hab* (wave, foam)  
*hall* (hears)  
*rege* (saga);  
*regé-l* (recites)  
*szö* (weaves)  
*rét* (meadow)  
*kövér* (fat)  
*gatyá*, prov. *gagya*  
     (fringed loincloth)  
*gyárt* (manufactures)  
*görbe* (bent)  
*góc* (centre)  
*gamó* (shepherd'crook, bent  
     stick)  
*tul* (over, more than)  
*tip-eg* (walks daintily)  
*dag-ad* (swells)  
*dag-anat* (swelling)  
*ere-d* (goes, starts)  
*est* (evening)  
*szid* (scolds)  
*has-it* (splits)  
*izi-be* (in haste)  
*ind-it* (sets off)  
*ind-ul* (starts)  
*köt* (binds)  
*kör* (circle)  
*nagy* (great)  
*nem* (no)  
*fa* (tree)  
*fő, fej* (head)  
*fül* (ear)

dj ~ 91

## The Sumerians

<i>Sumerian</i>	<i>Hungarian</i>
<i>sa</i> (mouth)	<i>száj</i> (mouth)
<i>hal</i> (dies)	<i>hal</i> (dies)
<i>gil</i> (murders)	<i>gyil-kol</i> (murders)
	<i>gyil-ok</i> (murder weapon)
<i>ud</i> (road)	<i>ut</i> (road)
<i>me</i> (we)	<i>mi</i> (we)
<i>sur</i> (stabs)	<i>szur</i> (stabs)

These examples will suffice to show that whilst in some instances there is remarkable correspondence between Sumerian and Hungarian vocabularies both as to form and meaning, in other cases the similarity is no closer than what exists between Sumerian and Ural-Ultaic languages in general. Indeed, it is clear from the comparative analyses of Sumerian words published by Csöke and Zakar that where the relationship with Hungarian is of this remoter kind, there are usually equally close, and sometimes closer, correspondences in Finno-Ugrian or Turco-Tartar languages.

It is also significant that there are a number of basic Hungarian words — such as *kéz* (hand), *vér* (blood), *kő* (stone), *szarv* (horn), *szem* (eye), to name only a few — which have much closer equivalents in Finnish, Estonian and related languages, than in Sumerian. A certain degree of relationship with Sumerian can be demonstrated also as regards words in this category but it is of a more distant nature. These aspects of Sumerian and Hungarian vocabularies strongly suggest that there were two phases of intensive contact between the peoples speaking these languages: one in the very distant past when they were also in close proximity to other Ural-Altai peoples and a second one much later, during the Sumerian era in Mesopotamia, when the proto-Hungarians acquired those Sumerian words which are still contained in virtually unaltered form and meaning in their language. For some time in the interval between these two phases, the proto-Hungarians remained in the general area occupied by Finno-Ugrian peoples and certain further similarities between their respective languages developed.

This supposition of a second contact between the proto-Mag-

## Sons of Nimrod

yars and the Sumerians is confirmed by the very clear adoption of the Sumerian numeral *vun* (ten) in Hungarian. The Hungarian word for 'ten' is *tíz*, yet 'forty', 'fifty', 'sixty', 'seventy', 'eighty' and 'ninety' are respectively *negy-ven* (four 'ven'), *öt-ven* (five 'ven'), *hat-van* (six 'van'), *het-ven* (seven 'ven'), *nyolc-van* (eight 'van') and *kilenc-ven* (nine 'ven'). 'Ven' and 'van', varying for vocalic harmony, have no meaning whatever in Hungarian,<sup>19</sup> nor have they any relationship to any known Hungarian suffix, so that the conclusion that they are derived from the Sumerian *vun* is virtually inescapable. This being so, it seems very likely that the composite numerals referred to were formed in Hungarian when the proto-Magyars were familiar with the Sumerian word for 'ten' and probably used it themselves in everyday dealings. As no similar correspondence can be observed in other Ural-Altai languages, this point of contact must be placed in the Sumerian period in Mesopotamia.

Further proof of close Hungarian-Sumerian contacts in Mesopotamia is furnished by the use of the word *ur* in both languages. In Sumerian, this word has several meanings (man, guard, lord), whereas in Hungarian it only means 'lord'.\* In the last-mentioned sense, it appears to have been a royal title in Sumer at various times, as it occurs in the names of several Sumerian kings, such as Ur-Nammu, Ur-Nanshe, Ur-Zababa. Now, it is significant that in early Hungarian, the title *ur* was reserved for members of the royal family and other high-ranking Hungarians. The proto-Magyars therefore must have adopted this word with one specific meaning, namely 'lord', and for one specific purpose, to designate their royalty, and it is quite obvious that this borrowing must have taken place whilst the Sumerians were so using the word *ur* in Mesopotamia. The total absence of this word from other Ural-Altai languages confirms this point. - no - wo. -

Turning now to Sumerian grammar, we find a similar dichotomy in its relationship to Hungarian as in the field of vocabulary. Sumerian is an agglutinative language with numerous suffixes and no grammatical gender and also has many other features in common with Ural-Altai languages. These were analysed in great detail by Zsigmond Varga who demonstrated quite convincingly that Sumerian was an Ural-Altai language.

## The Sumerians

Varga, however, never claimed that the grammatical structure of Sumerian was more closely related to Hungarian than other Ural-Altai languages and indeed, in various aspects of Sumerian grammar he found better correspondences in other Ural-Altai languages than in Hungarian. As far as the writer is aware, Varga's work still stands unparalleled in Sumerian-Hungarian comparative philology and his general findings have not been superseded. Consequently, it seems that as far as the general grammatical structure of Sumerian is concerned, it only bears such basic relationship to Hungarian as it does to other Ural-Altai languages.

On the other hand, there are some specific features of Sumerian grammar which show a remarkable correspondence with Hungarian. This is particularly so in the case of certain suffixes. For example, the Sumerian suffix *sag* (-hood, -ship) corresponds exactly with the Hungarian suffix *ság, ség* (again varying for vocalic harmony), not only in form but also in meaning. Thus the Sumerian *ursag* (lordship) is *uraság* (lordship) in Hungarian. Although the Hungarian *s* is pronounced like *sh* in English, the original Sumerian pronunciation has been preserved in some Hungarian words such as *ország* (realm, country),<sup>4</sup> which incidentally is also derived from the Sumerian *ursag* as its mediaeval form was still *urusag*.

Again, the Sumerian verb *ag* (makes, does) which is also used as a suffix in Sumerian, is clearly reflected in the Hungarian suffix *og* (occasionally *eg* for vocalic harmony), for example *kavar-og* (is stirred up, is turbulent; *kavar* = stirs), *fintor-og* (makes a face; *fintor* = a facial distortion). This is particularly obvious in the case of onomatopoeic (sound-imitating) verbs in Hungarian, such as *sáp-og* (quacks), *szíp-og* (sniffles), *szisz-eg* (hisses), *csíp-og* (chirps), *dad-og* (stutters). In all such cases, the first syllable imitates the sound made and the suffix *og* signifies the making of such sound.

We are therefore again faced with the phenomenon that whereas Sumerian grammar as a whole only bears a basic resemblance to Hungarian, certain specific features of it occur in modern Hungarian in identical form. This confirms our previous suggestion that after very ancient initial contacts, followed by a

## *Sons of Nimrod*

long period of separation, Sumerians and proto-Hungarians again lived side by side for a considerable time in Mesopotamia during which period certain aspects of Sumerian grammar found their way into Hungarian.

This Mesopotamian coexistence is strongly supported by the occurrence of Akkadian words in Hungarian. As Akkadian is a Semitic language, there is no possibility whatever that its similarities with Hungarian vocabulary developed in some distant ancestral homeland. The Hungarians must have acquired these Akkadian words in Mesopotamia and no other place. In a sense, therefore, the presence of Akkadian loanwords in Hungarian, attested by the researches of Munkácsi, Varga, Bobula, Csöke and Zakar, is even more important for the study of Hungarian prehistory than similarities between Sumerian and Hungarian. Here are a few examples:

### *Akkadian*

*kasaru* (binds)  
*salatu* (cuts, slices)  
*dalilu* (sings)  
*mussulu* (copy)  
*gimilu* (spares)  
*ruġġumu* (complain in law)  
*kasadu* (sleeps)  
*tallu* (vessel)  
*liku* (opening)

### *Hungarian*

*koszoru* (wreath)  
*szeletel* (slices)  
*dalol* (sings)  
*másol* (copies)  
*kimél* (spares)  
*rúgalom* (libel)  
*kushad* (lies low)  
*tál* (dish)  
*lyuk*, prov. *lik* (hole,  
opening)

*kalappatu* (hammer)\*

*kalapács* (hammer)

*Nearly all of these are Sumerian origin, not Semitic.*

There is therefore strong linguistic evidence that the ancestors of Hungarians lived in the Mesopotamian region during the third millenium B.C. and possibly even earlier. This evidence is supported by definite traces of Sumerian mythology and religious concepts in Hungarian folklore. The cult of the Great Stag, one of the personifications of the Sumerian god Enki, is reflected in numerous Hungarian Christmas and New Year's Eve *regös* chants.<sup>20</sup> It is perhaps not without significance that the melodies of these chants differ markedly from the pentatonic folk-songs

## The Sumerians

prevalent in old Hungarian music and are generally regarded as of much more ancient origin.<sup>21</sup> Although the cult of a benevolent stag divinity is common to many peoples, Hungarians have also preserved his name, *Dara-mah* (Hungarian *Doromó*, *Durumó*), and the memory of his son *Dumuzig* (later Tammuz) survived in the Hungarian pagan god *Damachek*.<sup>22</sup> Tamuz > Tavasz (spring)

The early Hungarians also had a benevolent fertility goddess called *Boldogasszony* (Blessed Lady) who has left many traces in Hungarian folklore and ultimately became identified with the Virgin Mary. This goddess is strongly reminiscent of the Sumerian *Bau* who, like her, was the protector of plants and the harvest and also of women in childbirth. It cannot be a mere coincidence that traditional Hungarian harvest-festivals are held on the feast of the Assumption (in Hungarian called *Nagyboldogasszony*, 'great Boldogasszony') in much the same way as the Sumerians held a special feast in honour of *Bau* when they first ate the new bread. Again, the Hungarian custom called *Boldogasszony pohara* (cup of the Boldogasszony), the offering of a cup of wine to the Boldogasszony by a woman after her childbirth, can be seen on Sumerian cylinder seals depicting women approaching the goddess *Bau* and offering her a drinking vessel.<sup>23</sup> It is also important to note that several feastdays of Mary in Hungary have names with clear agricultural connotation – such as *Gyümölcsoltó Boldogasszony* ('fruit-grafting Boldogasszony', 25 March), *Sarlós Boldogasszony* ('Boldogasszony of the sickle', 2 July) – which have no bearing whatever on their Christian religious significance and can only be explained with the survival of pagan traditions. All these matters point strongly to the cult of the Sumerian goddess *Bau*. also known as Bau-dug-gad

Again, the Hungarian funerary habit of taking the body to the grave on a cart drawn by six white oxen corresponds with finds in the royal graves of Ur.<sup>24</sup>

Turning now to an entirely different aspect of Sumerian-Hungarian relations, all three native Hungarian breeds of dogs – the *puli*,<sup>4</sup> the *kuvasz* and the *komondor* – can be traced back to ancient Mesopotamia and even their names have Sumerian etymologies.<sup>25</sup>

Absorption of linguistic and cultural elements to such a high

### *Sons of Nimrod*

degree and acquisition of all three indigenous Hungarian dog breeds are unlikely to have taken place without some intermingling and intermarriage between the proto-Magyars and the Sumerians. The density of the populations of the Sumerian city-states – estimated at half a million each for Ur, Kish, Nippur, Eridu and Lagash<sup>26</sup> – and the overflow of Sumerian cultural influence, and at times political hegemony, into all the areas surrounding Mesopotamia proper since at least 3000 B.C.,<sup>27</sup> make such a process extremely probable. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the Sumerians contributed to the ethnic formation of the Hungarians during the third millenium B.C. to a fairly significant degree. On the other hand, because of certain fundamental differences between Sumerian and Hungarian grammar and also by reason of appreciable divergences between Sumerian and Hungarian vocabularies, a direct descent of Hungarians from Sumerians cannot be supposed. It appears therefore that the basic material which underwent an infusion of Sumerian blood, the proto-Magyar people, was of a different stock, although the two may have been related in a distant way.

As regards the geographical area occupied by the proto-Magyars during the Sumerian period, it could not have been south, west or north-west of Sumer, for these areas were inhabited by Semites. It must have been therefore east or north-east of Sumerian territory. Since the presence of Akkadian loanwords in Hungarian postulates a region where regular contact with the Akkadians was possible, whilst enabling the even more intimate relations with the Sumerians to be maintained, the most likely place for the Hungarian homeland during this period is the hill country between the Tigris and the Zagros mountains, part of the ancient land of Subartu. This country was under strong Sumerian influence during the whole of the third millenium B.C. and if the Hungarians in fact lived there during that period, the Sumerian elements shown by their language and culture can be easily explained.

It now remains to be seen whether we can fit the Hungarians into Subartu and if so, how they got up to Transcaucasia.

## CHAPTER 8

# Subartu and the Hurri People

From the earliest times in Sumer, we find in written records people described as *Subir*, *Shubur* or simply *Su*, living peacefully among the Sumerians and later on also the Akkadians, sometimes as slaves but also as free men following various occupations, such as bakers, smiths, scribes and even chief scribes. The country where these people emanated from was called in Sumerian *Subir-ki* (Subir land) and in Akkadian *Subartu* which has become its accepted designation among historians.<sup>1</sup>

The precise geographical area occupied by Subartu is somewhat uncertain and it may well have varied during various periods of Sumerian history. It is clear, however, that the name signified a country rather than a people. During the Old Akkadian period, it appears that this country comprised the territory between the Tigris and the mountains in the east, as well as that part of northern Mesopotamia which later became Assyria.<sup>2</sup> This is a vast area and it seems extremely unlikely that the people inhabiting it all belonged to the same ethnic element.

Sumerian and Akkadian sources dating back to c. 2300 B.C., reveal the existence in Subartu of a clearly identifiable people which seven centuries later appears under the name of Hurrians. The frequent occurrence of personal and place names of Hurrian derivation all over Subartu led some historians to conclude that Hurrians and the original inhabitants of Subartu were one and the same people.<sup>3</sup> However, Ignace Gelb has demonstrated by careful analysis of early records and the names of people described in them as Subarians that they and the Hurrians belonged to two different ethnic units, with the Hurrians being comparative newcomers in areas previously occupied by the Subarians.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, the independent arrival of the Hurrians in these areas is attested by archaeological finds suggesting steady infiltration of a people bearing their characteristics from the

## *Sons of Nimrod*

early part of the third millenium onwards.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, the Subarians appear to have been there long before the settlement of the Sumerians in Mesopotamia.<sup>6</sup>

There is therefore evidence of two distinct ethnic elements in Subartu during the third millenium B.C. and there may well have been more. No one has yet investigated the ethnic origins of the Subarians proper<sup>7</sup> but it seems clear that they were neither Semites nor Indo-Aryans. This leaves us with the third major ethnic group in that area, the Turanian or Ural-Altaiic peoples, and it is a fair conclusion that the Subarians belonged to them. The very fact that the Sumerians and, as we shall see, the Hurrians also belonged to this group, confirms the existence of a vast conglomerate of Turanian peoples in and around Mesopotamia in this period. This being so, there is no difficulty at all in making the assumption, already foreshadowed in Chapter 7, that the early Hungarians inhabited Subartu in ancient times.

The connections of the early Magyars with Subartu are also supported by their ancient name of *Sabartoi asphaltoi*, recorded by Constantinus Porphyrogenetus (Chapter 2).<sup>8</sup>

Although the Subarians and, initially at least, also the Hurrians living in Sumerian and Akkadian territory, were peaceful enough — probably because they had no alternative — their brethren in Subartu could hardly have been less so. During the Old Akkadian and Ur III periods, i.e., in the latter part of the third millenium B.C., there are several references in Mesopotamian records to repeated warfare between Akkadian and Sumerian rulers and the kings of Subartu. These sources indicate that the Subarian side was represented by a coalition of kings, some of whom had Hurrian names.<sup>9</sup> The Hurrians therefore must have achieved a position of pre-eminence among the Subarians by that time. This multiplicity of kings also suggests that towards the end of the third millenium B.C., Subartu consisted of several different political units<sup>10</sup> and this is again consistent with its population comprising a number of separate ethnic groups. On the other hand, the ease with which these separate units combined to wage war against the Sumerians and Akkadians indicates that they were culturally closely related and probably belonged to the same basic ethnic stock.

### *Subartu and the Hurri People*

In these wars, the Subarians certainly proved themselves equal to the Sumerians and Akkadians and although they suffered defeat at various times, it was they who, in alliance with the Elamites, brought the third dynasty of Ur to an end around 2029.<sup>11</sup> This was an event of cataclysmic proportions, resulting in a ferocious sacking of Ur and widespread devastation all over Sumer and Akkad<sup>12</sup> which would not have been possible without great mobility on the part of the perpetrators. This postulates use of the horse and it is indeed clear that the Subarians must have been great horsemen, for the very use of that animal reached Mesopotamia from their region.<sup>13</sup> This again suggests that the Subarians were of Turanian race.

When Sumer was overrun by the Babylonians, the Subarians continued to maintain their independence and there were frequent wars between them and the Babylonians. They became particularly troublesome during the reign of Hamurabi (1792-1750 B.C.) which probably indicated that pressure was building up within their area. Contemporary records from this period again keep referring to the kings of Subartu,<sup>14</sup> suggesting political, and perhaps ethnic, divisions in that land.

With the death of Hammurabi (1750 B.C.) the political equilibrium in the Near East came to an end. Shamshi-Adad I of Assyria (1813-1781 B.C.) was already dead, leaving a weak successor, and Egypt was passing through a long period of decay after the fall of the twelfth dynasty (c. 1776 B.C.). In the power-vacuum thus created, a great explosion took place. Assyria was blotted out for two centuries, Babylonia was overrun by the Kassites, and Egypt was invaded by the Hyksos. There is darkness all over the Near East for the next two hundred years and we can at best get a blurred picture of the events that must have taken place. When the dust begins to settle around 1600 B.C., we find a strong Hurrian state in Northern Mesopotamia and the surrounding areas, and sizeable, and more importantly, dominant Hurrian colonies in Assyria, Babylonia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt and Anatolia. This sudden expansion of Hurrians over the whole of the Near East suggests that it was they who suddenly changed the power-structure of the entire area and caused the Kassite and Hyksos invasions, probably driving these peoples before

*Etruska  
leave +  
go to  
N. Italy*

### *Sons of Nimrod*

them.<sup>15</sup> It now remains to be seen whether they were not also instrumental in shifting the proto-Magyars to Transcaucasia.

Although Hurrians were present in Northern Mesopotamia and the country between the Tigris and the Zagros mountains from the first half of the third millennium B.C., their home territory was in the region of Lake Van in eastern Anatolia and the highland zone between the Upper Euphrates and the Caucasus.<sup>16</sup> Archaeological finds in this area manifest a general uniformity of material culture from the last quarter to the fourth millennium B.C., suggesting ethnic unity and pointing to continuous occupation by the Hurrians from that time onwards.<sup>17</sup>

It was from this region that the Hurrians apparently burst forth to bring the whole of the Near East under their sway and create a powerful Hurrian state in Northern Mesopotamia, Mitanni, with vassal states in the surrounding areas. It is only after this Hurrian expansion that the name 'Hurri', or more exactly *khurri*, makes its first appearance in contemporary sources and this has led Ungnad to suggest that that name does not designate a people but only a political concept, such as 'federation' or 'union'.<sup>18</sup> However, Hrozny has established that there was also a city called *Khurri* or *Khurra* mentioned by that name in Assyrian and Babylonian records which was probably identical with modern Urfa (Edessa) and was the centre of the Hurrian empire.<sup>19</sup> This makes it appear more likely that *khurri* was the name of the Hurrian people in their own language and that they applied the same designation to their capital.<sup>20</sup>

The various forms in which the name Hurrian occurs in the records of surrounding peoples — Hittite *khurlili*, Harrian *khurvule*, Egyptian *khor* or *khuru*, Old Testament *khori* — suggest that the actual Hurrian root of that name was *khur* or *khor*, to which each of their neighbours added its own suffix.

That the Hurrians were occasionally able to transfer their name to peoples subject to them, is clear from the fact that the *khori* of the Bible — whose name has been westernized as Horites — were not Hurrians but Semites who previously lived under Hurrian overlordship.<sup>21</sup>

The Hurrians were keen horsemen who introduced new methods of chariot warfare<sup>22</sup> and were buried with their horses

### *Subartu and the Hurri People*

when they died.<sup>23</sup> They were also the first people known to have used a composite bow, constructed of several layers of bone and timbers of different kind, which the Egyptians called the 'Hurrian bow'<sup>24</sup> and which appears to have been the prototype of the powerful weapons of a similar construction used by the Huns, Avars and early Hungarians. All this suggests an Ural-Altaiic people and, indeed, the Hurrian language is an agglutinative one which Albright and Lambdin have recently characterised as of a Finno-Ugrian type.<sup>25</sup>

Although the main expansion of the Hurrians was towards the south, there is evidence that they also pushed new ethnic elements into Anatolia, causing disorganisation of the Hittite Empire.<sup>26</sup> Hurrian influence among the Hittites was very strong, manifesting itself in virtually every phase of the Hittite civilisation and underlined by the Hurrian names occurring among members of the Hittite royal family and nobility.<sup>27</sup> However, there was also considerable warfare between these two peoples and it is only reasonable to assume that when the Hurrians depleted their ethnic reserves in the north by expanding towards the south, they shifted some other people or peoples in their place to guard their northern and north-eastern frontiers. At the time this step became necessary, i.e., around the eighteenth century B.C., the Subarians were already living in the foothills of the Kurdish mountains and the mountainous regions of northern Mesopotamia<sup>28</sup> and as they were ethnically related to the Hurrians and their way of life was similar, they must have been a logical choice as replacements.

Assuming, therefore, that the proto-Magyars were part of the Subarians, it appears extremely likely that they were moved to Transcaucasia by the Hurrians. It follows that they must have had a Hurrian aristocracy and must have been initially classified as Hurrians themselves. This was a standard method of conquest and integration among Ural-Altaiic peoples throughout their long history and there is no reason to suppose that the Hurrians acted otherwise. Such a process would necessarily involve strong identification by the proto-Magyars with their Hurrian rulers, including assumption of their name and some of their basic national traditions.

## *Sons of Nimrod*

It is then quite likely that when the proto-Magyars moved to Transcaucasia they became known as Khur or Khor, in much the same way as the six Horite tribes in Palestine bore that name. In time, the initial *kh* probably gave way to the softer *g*, resulting in *Gur* or *Gor*. Since the Sevordik Hungarians were still living in the valley of the river Kur in the twelfth century A.D., it is a fair conclusion that both the name of that river and the ancient city of Gori perpetuate the original name of the Hurrian-ruled proto-Magyars. The same probably applies to their subsequent name Makor or Magor. In Sumerian as well as several Finno-Ugrian languages, the word for the inhabited land or country is *ma* and although this word is no longer part of Hungarian vocabulary, it is still found in Vogul and therefore must have been used by the early Magyars. The land of the Khor or Gor people was therefore called Makhor or Magor and a person from that country was called Magori (the suffix *i* means 'of', 'from'), as would be the case even in present-day Hungarian. Indeed, it is significant that whereas Anonymus calls the ancestral home of the Magyars Moger, he calls the people themselves Mogerii (*Mogerii* in the Latin text). This distinction was therefore still observed in the twelfth century but faded subsequently, just as the distinction between Magor and Gor must have disappeared at an earlier stage.

The people called Makor in the writings of Herodotus and Xenophon were therefore the inhabitants of the land so called who by that time identified themselves by the name of their country, and not the earlier name of Khor or Gor from which the name of the country itself was derived. The earlier name, however, was probably preserved by the neighbours of the Magyars as Gor, and in time Ugor, which must have survived in that region long enough to be transferred to a branch of the Caucasian Huns when they arrived there and merged with the Magyars. The name of the city of Ugarit, which had a strong Hurrian upper stratum,<sup>29</sup> suggests that the designation Ugor may have been even more generally applied to Hurrian-dominated communities in the Near East. Whilst this aspect requires more elucidation, the matters already discussed in this chapter and Chapter 5 make it reasonably clear that the name Ugor by which

### *Subartu and the Hurri People*

the Hungarians make their appearance in early Byzantine, Slavic and Frankish sources can be directly traced back to the Hurrian Khor through its subsequent forms of Kur and Gori which were deposited, so to speak, as geographical designations at various stages during the stay of the Magyar people in that area and now testify as to its ethnic identity.

Hurrian influence in the Near East declined markedly around 1,300 B.C. when the state of Mitanni was destroyed by Assyria and the Hurrians did not emerge again as an important factor until they reorganised themselves in the Vannic kingdom of Urartu in the ninth century B.C. During the interval, the Magyars must have been left pretty much to themselves and it is fair to assume that they completely absorbed their thin Hurrian upper class in this period. Indeed, they may have indulged in some southern ventures themselves, for they were a warrior people and the vacuum left by the collapse of Hurrian power must have been very tempting for them. Biblical references to 'Gog in the land of Magog' (Ezekiel 38, 1, 2; 39, 1, 2) are strongly suggestive of 'Gor in the land of Magor' and it surely cannot be ignored that both times the country of Magog is mentioned in the Old Testament (Gen. 10, 2; Ezekiel 38, 1, 2; 39, 1, 2), the context places it in the same geographical area where we later encounter the Makors in Herodotus and Xenophon.<sup>30</sup> There is therefore nothing inherently improbable in the suggestion that the military campaigns of the Magyars may have occasionally taken them as far south as Palestine, making them appear as the scourge of God descending suddenly from a faraway northern land.

These southern escapades were probably even encouraged during the rise and expansion of Urartu in the ninth and eighth centuries B.C. Urartu was a federal state comprising several peoples under Hurrian rule<sup>31</sup> and at the height of its power, its hegemony extended to the Transcaucasian area. An Assyrian source dating from about 735 B.C. refers to the land of Guriana as lying next to the Cimmerians and paying tribute to Urartu.<sup>32</sup> This reference is clearly to the Magyars in their Transcaucasian home, not only because Guriana is an obvious Assyrian distortion of Gur or Guri – confirming the transition from Khur to Gur

## Sons of Nimrod

suggested by us above — but also because the Bible expressly refers to the Cimmerians as living next to the land of Magog (Gen. 10, 2).<sup>33</sup> The Magyars therefore were tributaries of the Urartians and probably took part in some of their campaigns but they maintained a measure of independence, and repeated references to revolts by outlying provinces in the annals of Urartu<sup>34</sup> suggest that, being removed from the centre of Urartian power, the Magyars did not give in easily to this late Hurrian domination.

By this time, the Magyars must have well and truly converted their horsemanship from chariotry to horseriding, as the Urartians did themselves.<sup>35</sup> There is ample evidence in the inscriptions and art of the Urartians that they were proud horsemen and cavalry played a leading part in their army.<sup>36</sup> We must make the same assumption concerning the Magyars in this period. The proximity of the Scythians and Cimmerians, fierce horseriding nomads, also must have had a profound effect on them and the geographic features of their mountainous homeland also militated against the use of chariots. By the eighth century B.C., therefore, and probably much earlier, the Magyars must have conducted all their warfare and most of their daily activities on horseback.

With the collapse of Urartu at the beginning of the sixth century B.C. and the eastward thrust of the Armenians at the same time,<sup>37</sup> the Magyars were effectively sealed off from the south and did not again play a role in the Near East until the advent of the Huns in the Caucasus. In the intervening period, they must have lived as an entirely free and independent nation, as the pre-Turkic or 'Ugrian' words in Hungarian relating to state and political affairs — such as *fejedelem* (ruling prince, king), *ural-kodó* (ruler), *ur* (lord), *ország* (realm), *birodalom* (empire), *tartomány* (province), *főember* (chief official), *előkelő* (high-ranking), *előljáró* (magistrate), *országgyűlés* (parliament), *nemes* (noble), *had* (army), *hadnagy* (general), *uradalom* (lord's holding), to mention only a few — testify to a high degree of political organisation. When the Hun brothers arrived, therefore, the Magyars received them entirely on equal terms politically and probably had a lot to teach them in other respects.

## *Subartu and the Hurri People*

Since the presence of the Magyars in Transcaucasia in the pre-Christian era is not generally postulated in modern historiography, no archaeological investigations have been directed so far at tracing their occupation of the Kur valley and adjoining areas. A surprising find has come to light, however, in Karmir Blur, near Yerevan in Armenia. Among the ruins of a large Urartian fortress dating from the middle of the seventh century B.C., a carved stone jar with hunting scenes was found which Piotrovskii, the greatest contemporary expert on Urartian art, considers so unusual that he doubts its Urartian origin. The scene carved in relief on the side of the jar, which is now in the Armenian Historical Museum, represents a procession of animals, namely a goat, a lion, a bird sitting on the lion's tail and a stag, followed by an archer resting on one knee, a horseman and a warrior bearing a sword and a shield.<sup>38</sup> Since birds do not normally sit on lion's tails, the entire scene must have a mythical significance. The constellation of bird, stag and archer is strangely reminiscent of one of the hunting scenes on the famous Horn of Lehel, a tenth-century ivory horn found in Hungary, where the archer is in the same position as on the Karmir Blur jar and the bird, again clearly of cultic significance, sits on the stag's back. Since Karmir Blur is very close to what we suggest was ancient Hungarian territory, the recurrence of the same hunting motif seventeen centuries later in Hungary proper cannot be mere coincidence, and the likelihood of direct transmission is strengthened by the cultic character of both finds.

Assuming, therefore, that the carved jar of Karmir Blur was of Hungarian origin, its emergence among the ruins of an Urartian fort furnishes further proof of close Hurrian-Hungarian relations. These can be also traced in another important way. We have already referred to the fact that in early Christian tradition and Moslem mythology Edessa (Urfa) was particularly closely associated with Nimrod (Chapter 1), and we have also pointed out that this city was probably the capital of the Hurrians. It is therefore very likely that Nimrod was a Hurrian mythical figure, or perhaps even an early Hurrian ruler, and that he personifies that people in the Bible and Near Eastern tradition. Biblical references to the role played by him in Assyria are certainly con-

## Sons of Nimrod

sistent with the Hurrian occupation of that country and although there is no evidence that the Hurrians engaged in any large scale building activities throughout the Near East, it is quite possible that the Israelites simply attributed to them the works of the Sumerians of whom they had no memory. After all, the Hurrians were still around at the time the Genesis was written (c. 950 B.C.) but the Sumerians had completely disappeared nearly a thousand years previously.

It is then quite likely that the early Hungarians acquired Nimrod as their ancestor from a Hurrian upper class, which subsequently became completely assimilated among them and lost its ethnic identity. The memory of Nimrod, however, was preserved by the leaders of the people and when the Huns appeared on the scene, they were added as another son, thus integrating them in an age-old legend antedating their arrival by many centuries.

Nimrod's connection with the Hurrians is confirmed by the most ancient traditions of the Armenians relating to a legendary fight between their eponymous ancestor, Haik, and Nimrod.<sup>39</sup> It is reasonably clear that the *coup de grâce* to the declining Urartian kingdom was administered by the invading Armenians,<sup>40</sup> and it is highly probable, therefore, that Nimrod represents Urartu in the legendary fight referred to. Indeed, the memory of this struggle may have been originally preserved in the writings of the Urartians whence the Armenians adopted it after attaining literacy.<sup>41</sup>

Having first identified Nimrod's sons, we have now found the father himself. He was a Hurrian, the foremost potentate on earth in his time and a mighty hunter before the Lord. It was he who set off the Hungarians on their long journey through history which took them to the Caucasus and later on to the Carpathian Basin. Kézai may now rest in peace: his genealogy of the Magyars has been proved correct and impeccable beyond reasonable doubt.

The Hurrians & Subarians were all part  
of the Mede confederation. — called Mada  
or Magya locally, 92 who founded the Persian  
Empire.

## CHAPTER 9

# A New Hungarian Prehistory

The past is immutable because it has already happened but our understanding of it changes continuously. The divers origins attributed to Hungarians have undergone many changes in the past and we cannot expect the views outlined in this book to remain uncorrected over the years to come. What we hope to have achieved, however, is to give a new direction to the search for truth in Hungarian prehistory. Let us now summarise our findings.

Hungarians emerge from the darkness of early prehistory as an independent branch of the peoples speaking the present Ural-Altai languages. It seems that some 10,000 years ago, or even earlier, they lived in an area also occupied by the ancestors of the Finno-Ugrian peoples and the Sumerians. The geographical position and precise time slot of this cohabitation cannot be determined in our present state of knowledge.

From the first half of the fourth millenium B.C. and most likely even a millenium earlier, the proto-Magyars appear as part of the Subarians living in Upper Mesopotamia and the region between the Tigris and the Zagros mountains. For a period of nearly two thousand years, they are subject to strong Sumerian linguistic and cultural influences, accompanied by some degree of ethnic intermingling. At the beginning of the second millenium B.C., they are swept to the north by the turbulence caused by the Hurrians and are settled in Transcaucasia as frontier guardsmen.

From c. 1800 B.C. until c. 1300 B.C., the proto-Magyars, now separated from their Subarian milieu, form themselves into a distinct nation in Transcaucasia under the rule of a Hurrian upper class. This upper stratum becomes entirely submerged during the following five centuries, when the Magyars assume independent existence as masters of their own destiny. In the

## *Sons of Nimrod*

eighth and seventh centuries B.C., they come again under late Hurrian (Urartian) hegemony for a short time but their association with the kingdom of Urartu is only of a loose nature and they soon reassert their independence.

Around the sixth century B.C., the Magyars probably receive their first infusion of ~~Turkic~~ blood by mixing with a branch of the Scythians. About the second century B.C., a branch of the Huns settles in the Caucasus and for the next six hundred years the Magyars mix with them so thoroughly that they merge into one nation. In the process, the Huns become the politically dominant element but they assume the language and identity of the Magyars and, as a unified people, they achieve a position of pre-eminence among the other Hunnish and Turkic peoples in the area.

In the fifth century A.D., this Hun-Magyar amalgam splits into three parts: one remains in Transcaucasia, one shifts gradually to the north and the main body sets out in a western direction, ending its journey in present-day Hungary at the end of the ninth century.

Whilst the writer regards the main aspects of this brief sketch as clearly established or at least strongly indicated by the facts known to us at this stage, there are many details which require further investigation. The language or languages of the Subarians will have to be studied and properly classified. More precise analyses of Sumerian-Hungarian linguistic affiliations will have to be carried out, with particular regard to the traces left in Hungarian by the various stages of development and dialects of the Sumerian language. The possibility of Hurrian loanwords in Hungarian will have to be investigated. The same goes for possible Hittite and Armenian influences. Archaeological studies will have to be made in various areas of Mesopotamia, Subartu and Transcaucasia with a view to determining the presence and successive stages of development of the early Magyars. Sumerian, Akkadian, Assyrian, Persian and other Near Eastern sources will have to be re-examined for possible references to the Hungarians and their history. In other words, all our researches into Hungarian prehistory will have to be reorientated and proceed on the basis of fresh assumptions.

### *A New Hungarian Prehistory*

It is the firm conviction of the writer that the speculative character and high degree of uncertainty, not to speak of obvious untruths and deliberate distortions, manifest in most works dealing with the origin of the Magyars over the last two hundred years is largely due to the fact that our historians have been looking in the wrong direction. They have tried to find the Magyars in places where they have never been. The Magyars themselves have never claimed to have lived in those places: it was the speculation of linguists which put them there. No wonder the present state of Hungarian prehistory is so unsatisfactory.

Let us look boldly and with unbiased eyes at the area where Kézai placed the ancestral home of the Magyars: the region of Persia and beyond. Let us set out on a pilgrimage to those ancient lands in our search for the truth. The writer is confident that we shall not be deceived.

There will be many centuries to go through and the going will be often rough. There will be gaps here and there, dark ages and inconsistent reports. We will stumble at times and we may hesitate and even follow dead-end paths at the crossroads of history. But the journey will be worthwhile. It will lead us to truth.

And there, at the end of the road, Nimrod, the mighty hunter, awaits us with a kindly smile.

# Notes

## CHAPTER I

### THE NATIONAL TRADITION

1. Gy. Németh, *A magyar rovásírás*, Budapest, 1934.
2. B. Hóman, *Magyar Történet*, Budapest, 1941, Vol. I, p. 112. The chronicler known as Anonymus (see p. 3) also refers to these, albeit with contempt, and states (42, 324) that the peasants and players 'fortia facta et bella Hungarorum usque in hodiernum diem obliuioni non tradunt'.
3. Anonymus states in the introduction to his *Gesta Hungarorum*: 'Et si tam nobilissima gens Hungarie primordia sue generationis et fortia queque facta ex falsis fabulis rusticorum uel a garrulo cantu ioculatorum quasi sompniano audiret ualde indecorum et satis indecens esset.'
4. B. Hóman, 'La première période de l'historiographie hongroise', *Revue des études hongroises*, Vol. III (1925), p. 125, at p. 133.
5. Hóman, 'La première période de l'historiographie hongroise', p. 135.
6. B. Hóman, *A Szent László-kori Gesta Ungarorum és XII-XIII századi lezármaszói*, Budapest, 1925. The conclusions reached by Hóman in this work were repeated by him in a summary form in his 'La première période de l'historiographie hongroise', supra.
7. Hóman, *A Szent László-kori Gesta Ungarorum*, supra.
8. C. A. Macartney, *The medieval Hungarian historians*, Cambridge, 1953, pp. 34-36.
9. Macartney, op. cit., p. 59.
10. Macartney, op. cit., p. 63; Hóman, 'La première période de l'historiographie hongroise', p. 158; Denis Sinor, *History of Hungary*, London, 1959, pp. 55-56.
11. Hóman, 'La première période de l'historiographie hongroise', p. 158.
12. 'Tunc elegerunt sibi querere terram Pannonie quam audiuerant fama uolante terram Athile regis esse de cuius progenie dux Almus pater Arpad descenderat.' Anonymus, 5, 53.
13. Anonymus, 46, 361. The ruins Anonymus describes were in fact those of Aquincum, a Roman city on the site of the present Obuda, a north-western suburb of Budapest.

## Notes

14. Hóman, *Magyar Történet*, Vol. I, pp. 70-74.
15. Gotfried of Viterbo who was a contemporary of Anonymus, writes in his *Pantheon* (c. 1190) that 'quia Gothorum gens ex Magog filio Japhet filii Noe orta est affirmat chronica ipsorum Gothorum'. The reference is obviously to the *Historia Gothorum* of Isidore of Seville (c. 560-636) where a similar statement occurs.
16. Isidore of Seville writes in his *Originum seu Etymologiarum libri*: 'Scythia sicut et Gothia a Magog filio Japhet fertur cognominata'.
17. Anonymus, 3, 40; 14, 139.
18. 'Gens itaque Hungarorum fortissima et bellorum laboribus potentissima ut superius diximus de gente Scythica que per ydioma suum proprium Dentumoger dicitur duxit originem.' Anonymus, 5, 50.
19. Hóman, *Magyar Történet*, Vol. I, p. 66. There are two answers to this suggestion. Firstly, the ancient Magyars — and Anonymus himself — called the Don Etil or Etul (see C. A. Macartney, *The Magyars in the ninth century*, 1930, p. 53.). They therefore could not possibly have called it Den or Don 'in their own language' ('per ydioma suum proprium' — see note 18). Secondly, the etymology 'Den-tu-Magyar' does not make sense in Hungarian. One can sit at the 'tu' (modern *tő*) of a tree or even a mountain but not of a river. The mouth of a river is called in old Hungarian *torok* (cf. *Zsitvatorok*).
20. This explanation was given to me by Professor Ferenc Eckhart in the course of his lectures at the University of Budapest in 1940-41. I am not aware whether he ever expressed this view in writing.
21. He states in one passage (42, 325-6) that he did not include the story of how Botond knocked a hole in the golden gate of Constantinople 'quia in nullo codice hystoriographorum inueni nisi ex falsis fabulis rusticorum audiui'.
22. L. Juhász, *P. Magister, Gesta Hungarorum*, Budapest, 1932, p. 4; Macartney, *The medieval Hungarian historians*, p. 36.
23. Macartney, *The medieval Hungarian historians*, p. 89.
24. Béla IV, Ladislas' grandfather, settled a substantial body of Cumans in the Great Hungarian Plain following the Mongol invasion in 1241-42. These Cumans were a Turkic race who inhabited the western regions of the Ukraine and eastern Romania (in present-day terms) prior to their settlement in Hungary. Ladislas' mother was a Cuman princess and he spent a great deal of his time with his Cuman subjects. The Cumans were still largely pagans at that time and Ladislas' way of living was con-

## Sons of Nimrod

- sidered so scandalous by the Christian West that the Pope placed Hungary under an interdict several times because of his conduct.
25. It is unlikely that Kézai ever read Orosius who wrote around 415 but he probably picked up his references to the Huns in Jordanes (see the text comparisons between Jordanes and Kézai in Hóman, *A Szent László-kori Gesta Ungarorum*, p. 55-56).
  26. J. Deér, *Pogány magyarság, keresztény magyarság*, Budapest, 1938, p. 236.
  27. Macartney, *The medieval Hungarian historians*, p. 111.
  28. Macartney, op. cit., p. 133.
  29. C. A. Macartney, *The origin of the Hun Chronicle and Hungarian historical sources*, Oxford, 1951. See also Deér, op. cit., pp. 232 and ff.
  30. Macartney, *The medieval Hungarian historians*, p. 38.
  31. It is sufficient to cite Thomas of Spalato (c. 1260), a Croatian prelate who must have been otherwise fairly well disposed towards the Hungarians because at that time Croatia had already been under the Hungarian Crown for some hundred and seventy years, and nineteen years previously the King of Hungary (who was still reigning when Thomas wrote) actually took refuge in Croatia from the Mongol onslaught. He writes in his *Historia Salonitanorum pontificum atque Spalatensium*: 'Erant enim pagani crudelissimi, prius vocabuntur Huni, postea sunt Hungari nuncupati. Ante ipsa tempora dux Attila, ferocissimus persecutor christianorum, de predicta regione dicitur fuisse egressus.'
  32. It is worth noting that at least one English historian has suggested that the Hungarian tradition embodied in the Nimrod-legend may be independent of the Mosaic tradition; see C. Townley-Fullam, 'Magyar Origins', *Westminster Review*, Vol. 176 (1911), p. 52, at p. 55.
  33. Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis*, 1972, p. 25.
  34. Von Rad, op. cit., p. 146.
  35. B. Vawter, *A path through Genesis*, 1964, p. 101.
  36. Vawter, op. cit., p. 101.
  37. L. Cottrell, *The land of Shinar*, London, 1965, p. 14.
  38. Cottrell, op. cit., p. 13.
  39. Vawter, op. cit., p. 101.
  40. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1961, sub-tit. 'Babel'.
  41. Cottrell, op. cit., p. 13.
  42. J. B. Segal, *Edessa 'the blessed city'*, Oxford, 1970, pp. 1-3.
  43. I. Bobula, *Kétezer magyar név sumir eredete*, Montreal, 1970, p. 5.

## Notes

44. Bobula, op. cit., p. 5.
45. *The Illustrated Chronicle* also refers to Evilath but as Magog's place of abode, quoting the chronicle of Saint Sigilbert, Bishop of Antioch, as its source. However, no such bishop or chronicle is known: see *Képes Krónika*, Budapest, 1964, Vol. II, p. 187.
46. E. Herzfeld, *The Persian Empire*, Wiesbaden, 1968, p. 105.
47. Gy. László, *Hunor és Magyar nyomában*, Budapest, pp. 15-17, 51-52.
48. László, op. cit., p. 16.
49. László, op. cit., pp. 16-18.
50. László, op. cit., pp. 51-52; S. Zichy, 'The origins of the Magyar people', *A companion to Hungarian studies*, Budapest, 1943, pp. 15 and ff., at p. 19.
51. C. A. Macartney, *The Magyars in the ninth century*, Cambridge, 1930, pp. 87-90.
52. László, op. cit., pp. 64-66.

## CHAPTER 2

### EARLY FOREIGN SOURCES

1. All my references to the *Poveshti Yearbook* and subsequent Ukrainian and Russian chronicles are from A. Hodinka's bilingual (Slavic and Hungarian) edition, *Az orosz évkönyvek magyar vonatkozásai*, Budapest, 1916.
2. Gy. László, 'A 'kettős honfoglalás'-ról', *Archaeologiai Ertesítő*, Budapest, Vol. 97 (1970), pp. 161-187, at pp. 170 and 183; G. Fehér, 'A bolgár-törökök kapcsolatai a magyarsággal és a legújabb magyar östörténetkutatás', *Századok*, Budapest, 1935, pp. 513-53, at p. 548. In the terminology of the old Hungarians and their near relatives, 'white' meant the northern and 'black' the southern branch of the same thing. In this sense, 'white' and 'black' were applied not only to branches of the same people but also to rivers and even seas: cf. White Tisza, Black Tisza, White Körös, Black Körös, White Sea, Black Sea.
3. *Susdal Yearbook* ad ann. 1149 and 1152; *Moscow Chronicle*, ad ann. 1118 and 1151; *Tverj Yearbook*, ad ann. 1123 1151 and 1152 and *Halych-Volodymir Yearbook* from 1188 to 1286 inclusive (numerous references).
4. This view is confirmed by a third reference to 'mountains of the Ugors' in the *Poveshti Yearbook* under the year 898 where it is stated that before arriving under Kiev, 'the Ugri crossed the

## *Sons of Nimrod*

mountains still today called the mountains of the Ugri'. What mountains this refers to is not altogether clear but the reference, when coupled with the subsequent reference to the Carpathians under the same name, makes it obvious that from the viewpoint of the Kievan chroniclers, the mountains of the Ugri were always mountains which had to be crossed by the Hungarians on their way to the west. Indeed, the successive references to 'the mountains of the Ugri' in three different locations almost make the mountains themselves move from the Caucasus to the Carpathians in the footsteps of the Magyars.

5. C. A. Macartney, *The Magyars in the ninth century*, Cambridge, 1930; p. 71; S. Zichy, 'The origins of the Magyar people', *A companion to Hungarian studies*, Budapest, 1943, p. 17.
6. Zichy, op. cit., p. 17; see also Macartney, op. cit., p. 71.
7. Priscus Rhetor, *Historia*, ed. Bonn, p. 158.
8. Priscus Rhetor, op. cit., p. 158.
9. *Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor*, ed. K. Ahrens and G. Krüger, Leipzig, 1899, p. 382.
10. B. Munkácsi, 'Az "ugor" népnév eredete', *Ethnographia*, Vol. VI (1895), reprinted in *Magyar Történelmi Szemle*, Vol. II (1971), pp. 1-39.
11. A number of Hungarian historians interpret *ogur* as meaning 'arrow' in western Turkic languages, now lost, and consider that in the composite forms in which it appears, this word signifies 'tribe'; thus, *on-ogur*, ten tribes: see e.g., B. Hóman, *Magyar Történet*, Budapest, 1941, Vol. I, p. 634; S. Zichy, op. cit., p. 29. However, the western Turkic word for 'arrow' is *ok*, not *ogur*: see Gy. Németh, *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása*, Budapest, 1930, p. 41. As Munkácsi has demonstrated in the article cited above, *ugor* is definitely the name of a people and *ogur* is simply a variant of that name. Whilst I do not agree with all of Munkácsi's conclusions, I consider that on this point he is clearly right.
12. Most Hungarian historians consider that the various names by which the Magyars are called in western European languages – Hungarian, Ungar, hongrois, etc. – are derived from the name Onogur and argue on this basis that they must have formed part of the Onogur federation for a considerable time. There are two main reasons why this theory must be wrong. Firstly, the Ugors are mentioned as a people separate from the Onogurs in a number of Byzantine and other sources and when these sources first identify the Hungarians, they call them Ugors and not Onogurs.

## Notes

- Secondly, in addition to the Ukrainians, Russians and Byzantines, a number of other surrounding nations also called the Magyars by the name Ugor or similar names, e.g., *ugar*, *ugrin* (Serb); *ugrin* (Bulgarian); *uher* (Czech); *uher* (Slovak). The addition of an *n* (so as to make Ungor out of Ugor) was therefore a corruption and had nothing to do with Onogur. This is confirmed by the concurrent use of *Ungri* and *Agareni* in the St Gallen Annals. See also H. Grégoire, 'Le nom des hongrois', *Byzantion*, Bruxelles, Vol. 12 (1937), pp. 645-650, where the suggestion is made that some of the Slavs may have mispronounced the Greek *uggroi* for *Vangar-Vengry*. It follows from all this that rather than assuming the name of the Onogurs, it was the Magyars who gave their name, in a composite form, to the former, suggesting that the Magyars were the more prominent of the two and probably supplied the ruling class or upper ethnic stratum of the Onogurs.
13. K. Hannestad, 'Les relations de Byzance avec la Transcaucasie et l'Asie Central aux 5e et 6e siècles', *Byzantion*, Bruxelles, Vols. 25-26-27 (1955-56-57), pp. 421-56, at p. 443.
  14. Agathias, *Epigrammata*, ed. Bonn, p. 146.
  15. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. Bonn, p. 270; Malalas, *Chronographia*, ed. Bonn, pp. 431-32. Malalas gives the names of the brothers as Grod and Mugel.
  16. *Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor*, supra, p. 253; *The Syriac Chronicle known as that of Zachariah of Mitylene*, trans. F. J. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks, London, 1899.
  17. Menander Protector, *Historia*, ed. Bonn, p. 301.
  18. Theophylactes Simocatta, *Historia*, ed. Bonn, pp. 283-4.
  19. Munkácsi, op. cit., p. 20. This again demonstrates the antiquity and eminence of the people called Ugor.
  20. 'Hostes illis populis inexperti qui Ugri vocantur.' My quotation from Macartney, *The Magyars in the ninth century*, p. 71.
  21. J. Duft, *Die Ungarn in Sankt Gallen*, Zürich, 1957, pp. 10-13 and 57.
  22. 'Ugri qui sua lingua sunt Maegeri.' My quotation from C. A. Macartney, *The origin of the Hun Chronicle and Hungarian historical sources*, Oxford, 1951, p. 51.
  23. Macartney, *The Magyars in the ninth century*, pp. 29-31.
  24. Macartney, *The Magyars in the ninth century*, p. 63; B. Hóman, 'Les récentes études relatives à l'origine du peuple hongrois', *Revue des études hongroises et finno-ougriennes*, Vol. II (1924), pp. 156-71, at p. 161.

## Sons of Nimrod

25. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. Bonn, p. 545.
26. Constantinus Porphyrogenetus, *De Thematibus*, ed. Bonn, p. 46.  
Constantinus actually uses the name 'Onogundur', the same as Theophanes before him, which is probably derived from the Turkic plural of Onogur: see Munkácsi, op. cit., p. 22.
27. *Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor*, supra, p. 253.
28. V. Minorsky, 'Une nouvelle source persane sur les Hongrois au Xe siècle', *Nouvelle revue de Hongrie*, Vol. 56 (1937), p. 305, at p. 310.
29. Belgrade (which means 'white castle' in the Southern Slav languages) was indifferently called Bolgárfehérvár (Bulgar white castle) and Nándorfehérvár ('Nándor' white castle) by the mediaeval Hungarians.
30. The role played by the Hungarians in the story of the rape – being the raper and not the raped one – again confirms that they must have been in a superior position towards the Onogurs and Bulgars.
31. Constantinus Porphyrogenetus, *De administrando imperio*, ed. Gy. Moravcsik and R. J. H. Jenkins, Budapest, 1949.
32. Constantinus Porphyrogenetus, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 172-73.
33. Constantinus Porphyrogenetus, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 147-48; Macartney, *The Magyars in the ninth century*, p. 79.
34. Constantinus Porphyrogenetus, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 147; Macartney, *The Magyars in the ninth century*, pp. 87-90; see also Gy. László, *Hunor és Magyar nyomában*, Budapest, 1967, pp. 66, 90.
35. Constantinus Porphyrogenetus, op. cit., c. 38.
36. Gy. László, *A honfoglalókról*, Budapest, 1973, p. 20.
37. Constantinus Porphyrogenetus, op. cit., c. 40.
38. L. Halphen, *Les barbares*, Paris, 1930, p. 9.
39. K. Hannestad, op. cit.
40. Theophylactes Simocatta, *Historia*, II, 18, ed. Bonn, p. 105.
41. Agathias, *Epigrammata*, ed. Bonn, p. 105.
42. Procopius Caesarensis, *Gotthica Historia*, ed. Grotius, pp. 410, 453.
43. *Herodotus*, tr. A. D. Godley, London, 1926, II, 104; III, 94; VII, 78.
44. Xenophon, *Expeditio Cyri (Anabasis)* ed. C. Hude, Leipzig, 1972, Book IV, chapters 7 and 8.
45. A. Pretor, *The Anabasis of Xenophon*, Cambridge, 1881, Vol. II, p. 454

## Notes

46. W. W. How and J. Wells, *A commentary on Herodotus*, Oxford, 1950, Vol. I, p. 286.
47. It is noteworthy that in the early tenth century Byzantine life of St Clement, the Hungarians raiding Bulgaria are referred to as Makair Scythians (Macartney, *The Magyars in the ninth century*, p. 129). At the very least, this shows that the Greeks were always inclined to render the name Magyar in this form. The possibility that the Makrones were Magyars has already been raised by V. Padányi, *Dentumagyaria*, Buenos Aires, 1963, pp. 242-43. I would go further than he and consider the identity of these two peoples highly probable.
48. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1961, sub-tit. 'Colchis'.
49. C. A. Macartney, *The origin of the Hun Chronicle and Hungarian historical sources*, Oxford, 1951, p. 79. The St Gallen annals refer to the Magyars as Huns at the time of their first attack on the eastern Frankish empire in 862: see J. Duft, *Die Ungarn in Sankt Gallen*, p. 10.
50. C. A. Macartney, *The origin of the Hun Chronicle*, p. 156; same author, *The Magyars in the ninth century*, p. 156.
51. *Herodotus*, I, 72; II, 104.
52. Macartney, *The origin of the Hun Chronicle*, pp. 9, 113.

## CHAPTER 3

### FISH-SMELLING RELATIONS

1. 'Nam cum una et eadem de generatione a quodam scilicet Hunnor et Magor unanimiter processerint': Werböczy, *Tripartitum opus juris consuetudinarii inclyti regni Hungariae*, I, 3, para. 5.
2. B. Hóman, 'Les récentes études relatives à l'origine du peuple hongrois', *Revue des études hongroises et finno-ougriennes*, Vol. II (1924), pp. 156-71, at pp. 156-57.
3. B. Hóman, *Magyar Történet*, Budapest, 1936, Vol. V, pp. 279-81.
4. Pray, op. cit., I, 1.
5. I wish to state categorically that I have no desire to cast any aspersions on Finns, Estonians and related peoples whose heroism and high achievements in the face of overwhelming odds are well known. However, the fact remains that the relationship between these peoples and Hungarians is extremely remote.
6. J. Szinnyeı, 'L'académie hongroise des sciences et la linguistique

## Sons of Nimrod

- hongroise', *Revue des études hongroises et finno-ougriennes*, Vol. III (1925), pp. 41-61, at pp. 45-46.
7. See the biographical notes in *Az ősi magyar hitvilág*, ed. V. Diószegi, Budapest, 1971, pp. 431-32.
  8. The contents of this and the following three paragraphs are based on Szinnyei's rather revealing article cited under 6.
  9. This family of languages comprises the Finno-Ugrian and Samoyedic languages (jointly called the Uralic group) and the Turkic, Mongolian and Manchu-Tungus languages (called the Altaic group).
  10. P. Hunfalvy, *Magyarország ethnographiája*, Budapest, 1876.
  11. H. Vámbéry, *Der Ursprung der Magyaren*, Leipzig, 1882, p. VII.
  12. Szinnyei, op. cit., pp. 59-60; E. Zichy, 'L'origine du peuple hongrois', *Revue des études hongroises et finno-ougriennes*, Vol. I (1923), pp. 5-14, notes on pp. 8 and 9.
  13. *Finn-magyar szótár*, Budapest, 1884; *Magyar nyelvhasználat*, Budapest, 1894, and several editions thereafter.
  14. J. Szinnyei, *A magyarok eredete és ősi műveltsége*, Budapest, 1908; same author, *Die Herkunft der Ungarn*, Berlin, 1923.
  15. 'A magyarság őstörténete és műveltsége a honfoglalásig,' *Magyar nyelvtudomány kézikönyve*, Budapest, 1923, Vol. I, 5. Zichy summarised his main conclusions in his article 'L'origine du peuple hongrois', cited under 12.
  16. Twenty years later, Zichy made a complete about-face and declared that Hungarians were a Turkic people which somehow had acquired a Finno-Ugrian idiom: see S. Zichy, 'The origins of the Magyar people', *A companion to Hungarian studies*, Budapest, 1943, pp. 15-47.
  17. A. Sauvageot, 'L'origine du peuple hongrois', *Revue des études hongroises et finno-ougriennes*, Vol. II (1924), pp. 106-16, at p. 114.
  18. A. M. Tallgren, sub-tit. 'Finno-Ugrier', *Realexikon der Vorgesichte*, ed. Max Ebert, Berlin, 1925, Vol. 3, p. 354.
  19. K. B. Wiklund, sub-tit. 'Finno-Ugrier', *Realexikon der Vorgesichte*, Vol. 3, p. 376.
  20. B. Hóman, 'Les récentes études relatives à l'origine du peuple hongrois', loc. cit., pp. 158-59; Sauvageot, op. cit., p. 110.
  21. See e.g., M. Zsirai, *Finnugor rokonságunk*, Budapest, 1937; P. Hajdu, 'The origins of Hungarian', *The Hungarian language*, ed. L. Benkő and S. Imre, *Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 134*, 1972, pp. 29 and ff.

## Notes

22. Gy. László, 'A "kettős honfoglalás"-ról', *Archaeologiai Ertesítő*, Budapest, Vol. 97 (1970), pp. 161-87, at p. 161.
23. Gy. László, *Östörténetünk legkorábbi szakaszai*, Budapest, 2nd ed., 1971, p. 190.
24. For an exposition of this theory, see P. Hajdu, 'The origins of Hungarian', loc. cit.; A. Sauvageot, *Les anciens finnois*, Paris, 1961, pp. 25-29; K. B. Wiklund, sub-tit. 'Finno-Ugrier', *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, Vol. 3, pp. 364-79; Gy. László, *Östörténetünk legkorábbi szakaszai*, pp. 33-35.
25. Gy. László, *Östörténetünk legkorábbi szakaszai*, p. 35.
26. László, op. cit., p. 37; 'The Hungarian language' (by S. Imre), *Information Hungary*, ed. F. Erdei, 1968, p. 55.
27. *Information Hungary*, p. 56.
28. *Information Hungary*, p. 55.
29. D. Sinor, 'Történelmi hipotézis a magyar nyelv történetében', *Nyelvtudományi értekezések*, No. 58 (1967), pp. 195-200.
30. Vámbéry, *Der Ursprung der Magyaren*, pp. 200 and ff. and Appendix IV.
31. S. Csöke, *Szumir-magyar egyeztető szótár*, Buenos Aires, 1970, pp. 166-92; same author, *A sumir ősnnyelvtől a magyar élőnyelvig*, New York, 1969.
32. B. Collinder, *Fenno-ugric vocabulary*, Stockholm, 1955.
33. Gy. László, op. cit., p. 37.
34. E.g., *kar* (arm), *gyomor* (stomach), *szakáll* (beard), *térd* (knee), *köldök* (navel). Sinor observes somewhat cynically that if the method of drawing conclusions of a cultural and social nature from the derivation of various words in the Hungarian language is a valid one – a practice indulged in by Szinyei, Zichy, Zsirai and many others – then it may also be argued that the Hungarians had no stomachs or knees before their contacts with the Turco-Bulgars!
35. S. Csöke, *Szumir-magyar egyeztető szótár*, supra.
36. Vámbéry, op. cit., pp. 211-20; S. Csöke, *A sumir ősnnyelvtől a magyar élőnyelvig*, supra.
37. Vámbéry, op. cit., pp. 205-11.
38. G. Bérczi, 'The Hungarian language', *A companion to Hungarian studies*, Budapest, 1943, pp. 272-84, at p. 272.
39. B. Munkácsi, *Arja és kaukázusi elemek a finn-magyar nyelvekben*, Budapest, 1901; same author, 'Asszir nyomok a finn-magyar nyelvekben', *Magyar Nyelvőr*, Budapest, 1911.
40. Bérczi, op. cit., p. 279.

## Sons of Nimrod

41. Wiklund, loc. cit.; László, op. cit., 194.
42. T. Vuorela, *The Finno-Ugric peoples*, Indiana University, 1964, p. 305.
43. A. Sauvageot, *Les anciens finnois*, p. 13.
44. Gy. Németh, *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása*, Budapest, 1930, pp. 124-25; J. Deér, *Pogány magyarság, keresztény magyarság*, Budapest, 1938, p. 37.
45. P. Lipták, 'Anthropologische Beiträge zum Problem der Ethnogenesis der Altungarn', *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, Vol. I (1951), pp. 231-46, at pp. 243-45.
46. Lipták, op. cit., pp. 241-42.
47. Hajdu, op. cit., p. 16.
48. Wiklund, loc. cit.
49. Deér, op. cit., p. 38.
50. Hajdu, op. cit., p. 29.
51. G. Bárczi, *Magyar hangtörténet*, 2nd ed., Budapest, 1958, p. 6.
52. Gy. László, *A honfoglalókról*, Budapest, 1973, p. 16.
53. László, *A honfoglalókról*, p. 20.
54. Tallgren, loc. cit., pp. 354-64; Gy. László, *Hunor és Magyar nyomában*, Budapest, 1967, pp. 91-92.
55. Tallgren, loc. cit., p. 360.
56. C. A. Macartney, *The Magyars in the ninth century*, Cambridge, 1930, p. 33; László, *A honfoglalókról*, p. 36.
57. Macartney, op. cit., p. 63; B. Munkácsi, 'A magyar őshaza kérdése', reprinted in *A finnugor őshaza nyomában*, ed. J. Kodolányi Jr., Budapest, 1973, at p. 217; and many others.
58. F. Haensell, *Probleme der Vor-Völker-Forschung (Grundzüge einer ethnologischen Urgeschichte)*, Frankfurt/Main-Wien, 1955, pp. 226-27.
59. B. Gunda, 'Ethnography', *A companion to Hungarian studies*, Budapest, 1943, pp. 285-304, at p. 286.
60. Gy. László, *A honfoglalókról*, p. 46; B. Szabolcsi, 'A survey of Hungarian music', *A companion to Hungarian studies*, Budapest, 1943, pp. 468-85, at pp. 469-70.
61. László, *Őstörténetünk legkorábbi szakaszai*, p. 20.
62. L. Bartucz, 'La composition anthropologique du peuple hongrois', *Revue des études hongroises et finno-ougriennes*, Paris, Vol. 5 (1927), pp. 209-41; same author, 'A magyarság faji összetétele', *Magyar Statisztikai Szemle*, Budapest, Vol. 17 (1939), pp. 337-49.
63. J. Nemeskéri, 'Anthropologie des conquérants hongrois', *Revue d'histoire comparée*, 1947, pp. 174-80.

## Notes

64. P. Lipták, 'Anthropologische Beiträge zum Problem der Ethnogenesis der Altungarn', *supra*; same author, 'Die Entstehung des ungarischen Volkes auf Grund anthropologischer Funde', *Homo, Zeitschrift für die vergleichende Forschung am Menschen*, Göttingen, Vol. 21 (1970), pp. 197-209.
65. Roland B. Dixon, *The racial history of man*, New York, 1923, pp. 129-31.
66. Haensell, *op. cit.*, p. 227; cf. Dixon, *op. cit.*, pp. 475 and ff.

## CHAPTER 4

### A RACE OF TURKS

1. C. A. Macartney, *The Magyars in the ninth century*, Cambridge, 1930, pp. 5 and ff., quotation from p. 206.
2. Macartney, *op. cit.*, pp. 6 and ff., quotation from pp. 206 and 209.
3. S. Zichy, 'The origins of the Magyar people', *A companion to Hungarian studies*, Budapest, 1943, pp. 15-47.
4. B. Hóman, 'Les récentes études relative à l'origine du peuple hongrois', *Revue des études hongroises et finno-ougriennes*, Paris, Vol. II (1924), pp. 156-71, at pp. 157-58; E. Zichy, 'L'origine du peuple hongrois', same review, Vol. I (1923), pp. 5-14, at p. 6.
5. L. Szalay, *Magyarország története*, Leipzig, 1852, Vol. I, p. 4.
6. H. Marczali, 'A magyarok őstörténete a honfoglalásig', *A magyar nemzet története*, ed. S. Szilágyi, Budapest, 1895, Vol. I, pp. 7-15.
7. Z. Gombocz, *Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache*, *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, XXX, Helsinki, 1912.
8. Gombocz, *op. cit.*, pp. 187, 208.
9. Gombocz, *op. cit.*, p. 193.
10. Gombocz, 'Az igék átvételéről', *Nyelvőr* XXX, pp. 105-09.
11. Sulán, 'A kétnyelvűség néhány kérdéséhez', *Magyar Nyelv* LIX, pp. 253-65; see also M. K. Palló, 'Zu den ältesten alttürkischen verbalen Entlehnungen der ungarischen Sprache', *Acta Orientalia Acad. Scient. Hungaricae*, Vol. 20 (1967), pp. 111-18.
12. Gombocz, *Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache*, *loc. cit.*, pp. 191, 205-06. It is noteworthy, however, that even in this early work, Gombocz expressly left open the possibility of a southern *Urheimat* of the Hungarians (at p. 205).

### Sons of Nimrod

13. Gombocz, 'A bolgárkérdés és a magyar hunnonda', *Magyar Nyelv*, 1921, pp. 15-21.
14. Hóman, 'Les récentes études relative à l'origine du peuple hongrois', loc. cit., p. 160.
15. J. Gesztesi, 'L'origine des hongrois', *Revue mondiale*, Paris, Vol. 173 (1927), pp. 61-67, at p. 66.
16. See e.g. B. Hóman, *Magyar Történet*, Budapest, 1941, Vol. I; J. Deér, *Pogány magyarság, keresztény magyarság*, Budapest, 1938.
17. G. Bárczi, 'The Hungarian language', *A companion to Hungarian studies*, Budapest, 1943, pp. 272-84, at p. 274.
18. See e.g. Th. v. Bogyay, 'Nomaden-Kultur, Die Kultur der Ungarn', *Handbuch der Kulturgeschichte*, Frankfurt, 1961, Vol. II, p. 8.
19. Gy. László, 'A "kettős honfoglalás"-ról', *Archaeologiai Ertesítő*, Budapest, Vol. 97 (1970), pp. 161-87, at p. 186; same author, *A honfoglalókról*, Budapest, 1973, p. 21.
20. L. Benkő and S. Imre, *The Hungarian language, Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 134*, 1972, p. 30.
21. L. Bartucz, 'A magyarság faji összetétele', *Magyar Statisztikai Szemle*, Budapest, Vol. 17 (1939), pp. 337-49; same author, 'Die Geschichte der Rassen in Ungarn und das Werden des heutigen ungarischen Volkkörpers', *Ungarische Jahrbücher*, Vol. 19 (1939), pp. 281-320; J. Nemeskéri, 'Anthropologie des conquérants hongrois', *Revue d'histoire comparée*, 1947, pp. 174-80; P. Lipták, 'Anthropologische Beiträge zum Problem der Ethnogenesis der Altungarn', *Acta Archaeologica Acad. Scient. Hung.*, Vol. I (1951), pp. 231-46; same author, 'Die Entstehung des ungarischen Volkes auf Grund anthropologischer Funde', *Homo, Zeitschrift für die vergleichende Forschung am Menschen*, Göttingen, Vol. 21 (1970), pp. 197-209.
22. Lipták, 'Die Entstehung des ungarischen Volkes auf Grund anthropologischer Funde', loc. cit., p. 206.
23. Bartucz, 'A magyarság faji összetétele', loc. cit., p. 347. Bartucz considers that nearly 30 per cent of modern Hungarians belong to the Turanid type.
24. F. Eckhart, *Magyar alkotmány és jogtörténet*, Budapest, 1940.
25. B. Gunda, 'Ethnography', *A companion to Hungarian studies*, Budapest, 1943, pp. 285-304, at p. 287.
26. László, *A honfoglalókról*, p. 62.
27. N. Fettich, 'A levé diai magyarság a régészet megvilágításában', *Századok*, Budapest, Vol. 67 (1933), pp. 369-99, at p. 399.
28. Gy. Németh, *A magyár rovásírás*, Budapest, 1934.

## Notes

29. B. Szabolcsi, 'A survey of Hungarian music', *A companion to Hungarian studies*, Budapest, 1943, pp. 468-85, at p. 469.
30. László, *A honfoglalóról*, p. 46.
31. L. Vargyas, 'Ugor réteg a magyar népzeneben', *Kodály Emlékkönyv*, Budapest, 1953, pp. 611-57.
32. Szabolcsi, op. cit., p. 469; Gombocz, *Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache*, supra, at p. 207.
33. S. Zichy, 'The origins of the Magyar people', *A companion to Hungarian studies*, Budapest, 1943, pp. 15-47, at p. 44.

## CHAPTER 5

### THE HUN BROTHERS

1. As to the Chinese sources referred to, see L. Hambis, 'Le problème des Huns', *Revue historique*, Paris, Vol. 220 (1958), pp. 249-70, at pp. 249-51.
2. Hambis, op. cit., p. 259; W. M. McGovern, *The early empires of Central Asia*, University of North Carolina, 1939, pp. 95-96.
3. McGovern, op. cit., p. 99.
4. Hambis, op. cit., pp. 260-61.
5. Hambis, op. cit., p. 260.
6. Hambis, op. cit., pp. 261-68.
7. F. Alheim, *Geschichte der Hunnen*, Berlin, 1959-62, Vol. I, p. 21.
8. Alheim, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 7, 22; J. Wiesner, 'Die Kulturen der frühen Reitervölker', *Handbuch der Kulturgeschichte*, Frankfurt am Main, 1968, p. 147; McGovern, op. cit., pp. 96-99; Gy. Németh, *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása*, Budapest, 1930, pp. 127 and ff.
9. Alheim, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 3.
10. Wiesner, op. cit., p. 149; also Alheim, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 4.
11. Wiesner, op. cit., p. 149.
12. Alheim, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 14-15.
13. Alheim, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 9.
14. Alheim, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 9.
15. Alheim, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 12-13; Vol. IV, p. 28.
16. F. Alheim, 'Das Auftreten der Hunnen in Europa', *Acta Archaeologica Acad. Scient. Hung.*, Vol. II (1952), pp. 269-75.
17. K. Lukácsy, *A magyarok őselei, hajdankori nevei és lakhelyei, eredeti örmény kutfők után*, Kolozsvár, 1870, pp. 100-13. Lukácsy was a learned Armenian priest in Transylvania (then part

## *Sons of Nimrod*

- of Hungary) whose work contains a highly valuable examination of old Armenian sources relating to the Huns and other Turkic peoples usually connected with the Hungarians.
18. Altheim, *Geschichte der Hunnen*, Vol. I, pp. 57-8, Wiesner, op. cit., p. 149.
  19. Altheim, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 58-68.
  20. As to the dates and events referred to in this paragraph, see K. Hannestad, 'Les relations de Byzance avec la Transcaucasie et l'Asie Centrale aux 5e et 6e siècles', *Byzantion*, Bruxelles, Vols. 25-27 (1955-57), pp. 421-56.
  21. Altheim, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 22, 83; Vol. IV, pp. 30-31; Hannestad, op. cit.; L. Halphen, *Les barbares*, Paris, 1930, pp. 33-34. Németh states (op. cit., p. 128), that he hardly knows any historian of renown outside Hungary who does not acknowledge the identity of Huns and Bulgars. Németh does not share this view, however, and argues that the Huns spoke a Turkish language different from that of the Bulgars.
  22. Z. Gombocz, *Die bulgarisch-türkischen Lehnwörter in der ungarischen Sprache*, *Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, XXX, Helsinki, 1912.
  23. Indeed, the idea that the Magyars were at some stage incorporated in the empire of the Huns is accepted by most modern historians.
  24. Whilst the Hungarians were thus identified as Ugors to the outside world, it is quite probable that in their own language they continued to call themselves Magors or Magyars. In Chapter 8, we shall endeavour to resolve this apparent inconsistency of the same people being called by two different names at the same time.
  25. The pre-1918 kingdom of Romania. Transylvania formed part of Hungary up to 1918.
  26. C. A. Macartney, *The origin of the Hun Chronicle and Hungarian historical sources*, Oxford, 1951.
  27. Macartney, op. cit., p. 9.
  28. Gy. Németh, 'A székelyek eredetének kérdése', *Századok*, Vol. 69 (1935), pp. 129-56.
  29. Németh, 'A székelyek eredetének kérdése', loc. cit., p. 155.
  30. It is noteworthy that the Cumans who settled on the Great Hungarian Plains in 1242 (see note 24 to Chapter 1), retained their language for centuries and their language did not completely disappear until the eighteenth century.
  31. Németh, 'A székelyek eredetének kérdése', loc. cit., p. 131.
  32. Such a sudden literacy of a previously illiterate people of moun-

### Notes

tain-dwellers, however, seems extremely unlikely. It is much more probable that the Szekelys brought their script with them from the Caucasus.

33. The main body of the Magyars, of course, having lived on the South Russian steppes for the subsequent five centuries, preferred the plains on their arrival in present-day Hungary.
34. Lukácsy, *op. cit.*, pp. 172-75.
35. Lukácsy, *op. cit.*, pp. 172-73.
36. Németh, *A honfoglaló magyarság kialakulása*, p. 219.

## CHAPTER 6

### THE PERSIAN CONNECTION

1. L. Benkő, 'The lexical stock of Hungarian', *The Hungarian language*, ed. L. Benkő and S. Imre, *Janua Linguarum, Series Practica* 134, 1972, pp. 177-78.
2. K. Lukácsy, *A magyarok őselei, hajdankori nevei és lakhelyei, eredeti örmény kutfök után*, Kolozsvár, 1870, p. 96.
3. H. Vámbéry, *Der Ursprung der Magyaren*, Leipzig, 1882, pp. 383-87.
4. Vámbéry, *op. cit.*, p. 386.
5. B. Munkácsi, 'A magyar őshaza kérdése', *Ethnographia*, 1906, pp. 65-87.
6. N. Fettich, 'A levé diai magyarság a régészet megvilágításában', *Századok*, Vol. 67 (1933), pp. 369-99, at p. 385.
7. I. Dienes, *A honfoglaló magyarok*, Budapest, 1972, at pp. 57-66.
8. Dienes, *op. cit.*, p. 58.
9. Dienes, *op. cit.*, p. 61.
10. A. Hekler, 'Die Kunst der ungarischen Landnahmezeit', *Acta Archaeologica*, Kopenhagen, Vol. 7 (1936), pp. 67-75.
11. N. Fettich, 'Adatok a honfoglaláskor archaeológiájához', *Archaeologiai Ertesítő*, Budapest, Vol. 45 (1931), pp. 48-112, at p. 105; Dienes, *op. cit.*, Plates 63 and 64.
12. D. Dercsényi, 'Old Hungarian art', *A companion to Hungarian studies*, Budapest, 1943, pp. 415-47, at pp. 419-23; Hekler, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
13. L. A. Mayer, *Saracenic heraldry*, Oxford, 1933, p. 9.
14. F. Badinyi Jós, 'A magyar nép legősibb nemeslevele', *Ausztráliai*

## Sons of Nimrod

- Magyar Kalendárium*, 1966, pp. 33-44; J. Andrassy Kurta, 'Okori eredetü magyar emlékek', *Eletünk*, Szombathely, 1969, No. 1.
15. Woodward's *Treatise on heraldry*, 1892, p. 208.
16. Gy. László, *Hunor és Magyar nyomában*, Budapest, 1967, pp. 71-76.
17. László, op. cit., pp. 134-37; same author, *A honfoglalókról*, Budapest, 1973, p. 48.
18. I. Herényi, 'Válasz Kristó Gyula 'Bulcsu nemzetségének nyári szállása ürügyén' című hozzászólására', *Századok*, Vol. 106 (1972), pp. 1399-402. Herényi argues that the Hungarian chieftain Bulcsu was also of Iranian origin. Whilst this seems unlikely, he may have had a substantial Persian retinue.

## CHAPTER 7

### THE SUMERIANS

1. S. N. Kramer, *The Sumerians*, Chicago, 1963, pp. 42-43, 288.
2. A. Deimel, *Sumerische Grammatik*, Rome, 1939, pp. 1-2.
3. Deimel, op. cit., p. 2.
4. For the early history of the Sumerian controversy, see Zs. Varga, *Öt ezer év távolából*, Debrecen, 1942, pp. 9-206 and I. Bobula, *Sumerian affiliations*, Washington, 1951, pp. 1-11.
5. Deimel, op. cit., p. 4; W. F. Albright and T. O. Lambdin, 'The evidence of language', *Cambridge Ancient History*, Revised edition, Fasc. 54, 1966, p. 33.
6. A number of Galgóczy's articles were recently republished in book form under the title 'J. Galgóczy, *A sumir kérdés*' in *Studia Sumiro-Hungarica*, Vol. 1, Gilgamesh, New York, 1968.
7. Republished in *Studia Sumiro-Hungarica*, Vol. 2, New York, 1968.
8. *Akadémiai-Értesítő*, 1904, pp. 44-46; see also Varga, op. cit., pp. 113-15.
9. B. Munkácsi, 'Néhány szó a sumir rokonság védelméhez', *Ethnographia*, Vol. 15 (1904), pp. 147-54.
10. B. Munkácsi, 'A magyar őshaza kérdése', *Ethnographia*, 1906, pp. 65-87, reprinted in *A finnugor őshaza nyomában*, ed. J. Kodolányi Jr., Budapest, 1973, pp. 193-226. Munkácsi makes the important point that Hungarian has a number of extremely old Caucasian and Aryan loanwords which it acquired considerably earlier than its loanwords of Turkic origin. It is also noteworthy that he

## Notes

attributes a substantial portion of the Aryan loanwords in Hungarian to Old Persian, Avesta, Middle Persian, Pamirian and Hindi influences.

11. B. Munkácsi, 'Asszir nyomok finn-magyar nyelvekben', *Magyar Nyelvőr*, 1911, reprinted in *Magyar Öskutatás*, Buenos Aires, 1971, pp. 97-103.
12. I. Bobula, *A sumér-magyar rokonság kérdése*, Buenos Aires, 1961.
13. I. Bobula, *The origin of the Hungarian nation*, 1966; same author, *Kétezer magyar név sumir eredete*, Montreal, 1970.
14. S. Nagy, *A magyar nép kialakulásának története*, Buenos Aires, 1968.
15. S. Csöke, *Szumir-magyar egyeztető szótár*, Buenos Aires, 1970; same author, *A sumér ősnyelvtől a magyar élőnyelvig*, New York, 1969.
16. A. Zakar, *A sumér nyelvről*, Södertälje, 1970.
17. F. Badiny Jós, *Káldeától Ister-Gamig*, Buenos Aires, 1971; same author, *A sumir-magyar nyelvazonosság bizonyító adatai*, Buenos Aires (undated); *Sumerian syntax and agglutination in Asian languages*, Canberra, 1971; *El pueblo de Nimrud*, Valparaiso, 1966; *A megtalált magyar őstörténelem*, Sydney, 1967.
18. See W. F. Albright and T. O. Lambdin, op. cit., p. 33.
19. To be precise, *van* means 'is' in Hungarian but this does not make sense in a numeral.
20. I. Bobula, 'The Great Stag: A Sumerian divinity and its affiliations', *Anales de Historia Antigua y Medieval*, Buenos Aires, 1953, pp. 119-26.
21. B. Szabolcsi, 'The eastern relations of early Hungarian folk music', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1935, pp. 483-98, at p. 485.
22. Bobula, 'The Great Stag', supra.
23. Bobula, *A sumér-magyar rokonság kérdése*, pp. 71-82.
24. Bobula, *Sumerian affiliations*, p. 88.
25. This has been demonstrated by the researches of Andor Schedel of Budapest: see Badiny Jós, *Káldeától Ister-Gamig*, pp. 203-10.
26. L. Cottrell, *The land of Shinar*, London, 1965, p. 135.
27. A. Götze, *Hethiter, Churriter und Assyrer*, Oslo, 1936, p. 12; A. Moortgat, *Die Entstehung der sumerischen Hochkultur*, Leipzig, 1945, p. 11.

## Sons of Nimrod

### CHAPTER 8

#### SUBARTU AND THE HURRI PEOPLE

1. I. J. Gelb, *Hurrians and Subarians*, Chicago, 1944, pp. 31-32 and 84.
2. Gelb, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
3. A. Ungnad, *Subartu*, Berlin, 1936; B. Hrozný, *Ancient History of Western Asia, India and Crete*, Prague (undated), pp. 110-11; E. Herzfeld, *The Persian Empire*, Wiesbaden, 1968; H. Lewy, 'Assyria c. 2600-1816 BC', *Cambridge Ancient History*, 3rd ed., Vol. 1, Part 2, pp. 730-32.
4. Gelb, *op. cit.*; same author, 'New Light on Hurrians and Subarians', *Studi orientalistici in onore di G. Levi della Vida*, Vol. 1 (1956), pp. 378-92.
5. B. Hrouda, 'Die Churriter als Problem archäologischer Forschungen', *Archaeologia Geographica*, Vol. 7 (1958), pp. 14-19.
6. Lewy, *op. cit.*, pp. 730-31; Hrozný, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
7. Gelb left this question 'for another occasion' in his *Hurrians and Subarians* (p. 84) and apparently has not seen fit to take it up since.
8. This suggestion which was first made by Ida Bobula in her *Sumerian affiliations*, Washington, 1951 and has since been adopted by other writers, is not as far-fetched as it might seem at first sight. The name of Subartu as a geographical designation survived well into the sixth century BC by which time the Armenians had become firmly established in their present homeland. It is entirely possible that at that stage, the peoples living in the neighbourhood of the Magyars were still conscious of their Subarian origin and were calling them by some such name. Thereafter, this name or a distorted form of it, Sevordik, was preserved by the Armenians and ultimately reached Constantinus. By that time, of course, the origin of the name was long forgotten.
9. Gelb, *op. cit.*, p. 55.
10. Gelb, *op. cit.*, p. 39.
11. W. Hinz, 'Persia c. 2400-1800 BC', *Cambridge Ancient History*, 3rd ed., Vol. 1, Part 2, p. 659.
12. C. J. Gadd, 'Babylonia c. 2120-1800 BC', *Cambridge Ancient History*, 3rd ed., Vol. 1, Part 2, p. 617.
13. A. Salonen, *Hippologia Accadica*, Helsinki, 1955, pp. 16-17.
14. Gelb, *op. cit.*, pp. 41-42.

### Notes

15. Gelb, *op. cit.*, pp. 65-70. I have adjusted the regnal years given by Gelb in accordance with the dates stated in the revised (3rd) edition of the *Cambridge Ancient History*.
16. A. Götze, *Hethiter, Churriter und Assyrer*, Oslo, 1936, p. 106; C. Burney and D. M. Lang, *The peoples of the hills*, London, 1971, p. 49.
17. Burney and Lang, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-49.
18. Ungnad, *op. cit.*, pp. 131 and 136.
19. Hrozny, *op. cit.*, p. 111.
20. Gelb makes the point that the native Hurrian term for the state of Mitanni was Hurri and that Tushratta, king of Mitanni, called himself 'the Hurrian king': Gelb, *op. cit.*, pp. 72, 75.
21. R. de Vaux, 'Les Hurrites de l'histoire et les Horites de la bible', *Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres, Comptes rendues*, 1967, pp. 427-36.
22. J. Wiesner, 'Die Kulturen der frühen Reitervölker', *Handbuch der Kulturgeschichte*. Vol. 2, Frankfurt, 1968, p. 14.
23. E. Dayton, 'The problem of tin in the Ancient World', *World Archaeology*, Vol. 3 (1971), pp. 49-70, at p. 63.
24. Vaux, *op. cit.*, pp. 428-29.
25. W. F. Albright and T. O. Lambdin, 'The evidence of language', *Cambridge Ancient History*, Revised edition, Fasc. 54, 1966, p. 33.
26. Gelb, *op. cit.*, p. 68.
27. E. A. Speiser, 'The Hurrian participation in the civilisations of Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine', *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, Vol. 1 (1953), pp. 311-27, at p. 312; H. G. Güterbock, 'The Hurrian element in the Hittite empire', *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, Vol. 2 (1954), pp. 383-94.
28. H. Lewy, *op. cit.*, p. 733.
29. M. S. Drower, 'Ugarit', *Cambridge Ancient History*, Revised edition, 1968; p. 9; A. Kammenhuber, 'Die neuen hurrischen Texte aus Ugarit', *Ugarit-Forschungen*, Vol. 2 (1970), pp. 295-302.
30. B. Vawter, *A path through Genesis*, London, 1966; p. 100; *The Jerusalem Bible*, pp. 1408-09.
31. Seton Lloyd, *Early highland peoples of Anatolia*, London, 1967, p. 108; B. B. Piotrovskii, *Urartu*, London, 1967, p. 1.
32. Burney and Lang, *op. cit.*, p. 167.
33. It is generally accepted that the name Gomer in Gen. 10 represents the Cimmerians: see E. D. Phillips, 'The Scythian domination in Western Asia: its record in history, scripture and archaeology', *World Archaeology*, Vol. 4 (1972), pp. 129-38, at p. 133.

*Sons of Nimrod*

34. Piotrovskii, op. cit., pp. 6-7.
35. Wiesner, op. cit., p. 35.
36. Burney and Lang, op. cit., pp. 143, 146-47.
37. Burney and Lang, op. cit., pp. 171-72; R. A. Crossland, 'Immigrants from the North', *Cambridge Ancient History*, Revised edition, Fasc. 60 (1967), p. 36.
38. Piotrovskii, op. cit., p. 70.
39. K. Lukácsy, *A magyarok őselei, hajdankori nevei és lakhelyei, eredeti örmény kutfők után*, Kolozsvár, 1870, pp. 223-24.
40. Burney and Lang, op. cit., pp. 171-80.
41. Lukácsy, op. cit., pp. 223-24.