

Is the Turanian language family a phantom?

BY

PROF. DR. ALFRÉD TÓTH

Mikes International
The Hague, Holland

2007

Kiadó

'Stichting MIKES INTERNATIONAL' alapítvány, Hágá, Hollandia.

Számlaszám: Postbank rek.nr. 7528240

Cégbiejegyzés: Stichtingenregister: S 41158447 Kamer van Koophandel en Fabrieken Den Haag

Terjesztés

A könyv a következő Internet-címről tölthető le: http://www.federatio.org/mikes_bibl.html

Aki az email-levelezési listánkon kíván szerepelni, a következő címen iratkozhat fel:

mikes_int-subscribe@yahoogroups.com

A kiadó nem rendelkezik anyagi forrásokkal. Többek áldozatos munkájából és adományaiból tartja fenn magát. Adományokat szívesen fogadunk.

Cím

A szerkesztőség, illetve a kiadó elérhető a következő címeken:

Email: mikes_int@federatio.org

Levelezési cím: P.O. Box 10249, 2501 HE, Den Haag, Hollandia

Publisher

Foundation 'Stichting MIKES INTERNATIONAL', established in The Hague, Holland.

Account: Postbank rek.nr. 7528240

Registered: Stichtingenregister: S 41158447 Kamer van Koophandel en Fabrieken Den Haag

Distribution

The book can be downloaded from the following Internet-address: http://www.federatio.org/mikes_bibl.html

If you wish to subscribe to the email mailing list, you can do it by sending an email to the following address:

mikes_int-subscribe@yahoogroups.com

The publisher has no financial sources. It is supported by many in the form of voluntary work and gifts. We kindly appreciate your gifts.

Address

The Editors and the Publisher can be contacted at the following addresses:

Email: mikes_int@federatio.org

Postal address: P.O. Box 10249, 2501 HE, Den Haag, Holland

ISSN 1570-0070

ISBN-13: 978-90-8501-108-8

NUR 616

© Mikes International 2001-2007, Alfréd Tóth 2007, All Rights Reserved

PUBLISHER'S PREFACE

This year we published electronically from Professor Alfréd Tóth his great *'Etymological Dictionary of Hungarian (EDH)'*, which was complemented by three addenda. With this volume we present a different type of work entitled *'Is the Turanian language family a phantom?'*

The Hague (Holland), June 23, 2007

MIKES INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

<i>Publisher's preface</i>	<i>III</i>
IS THE TURANIAN LANGUAGE FAMILY A PHANTOM?.....	1
1. Introduction	2
2. The alleged Finn-Ugric (Uralic) language family	3
3. The alleged Altaic language family.....	23
4. Conclusions	28
5. Bibliography	30
<i>About the author</i>	32

IS THE TURANIAN LANGUAGE FAMILY A PHANTOM?

1. Introduction

The Turanian language family that plays a very important role in Hungarian linguistics as well as history, comprises the Finno-Ugric (or, together with the Samoyed languages, the Uralic) language family (FU) on the one side and the Altaic language family (A) on the other side. While the existence of an Altaic language family has always been doubtful, the existence of a Finno-Ugric or Uralic family has become controversial only very recently. This latter fact is the more astonishing, because Hungarian – besides Finnish the most prominent member of this little family – was originally not considered to have genetical relationships to Finnish and the languages close to Finnish, although a first attempt to group Hungarian and Finnish together goes back to the 18th century (Sajnovics). In this small contribution, I will show the language data necessary to prove that both FU and A cannot be considered to be linguistic families. At the end of this contribution will stand the question, if the existence of the Turanian language family is thus a phantom or not.

2. The alleged Finn-Ugric (Uralic) language family

Even in traditional Finno-Ugric or Uralic departments, the existence of a Finno-Ugric or Uralic language family has been doubted for a couple of years (cf. Marcantonio 2002). But while more and more scholars are convinced, that the former Uralic language family is nothing but a Sprachbund, most Finno-Ugrists defend their position as representatives of a language family.

In this chapter, using the 100 words Swadesh-list and considering 10 Finno-Ugric and 2 Samoyed languages, it will be shown that neither the one nor the other assumption is justified. The politically motivated construction of a Finno-Ugric language family in the 18th century shows such a small basis of common words that would put back Proto-Finno-Ugric or Proto-Uralic long before 10'000 B.C. and therefore leads itself ad absurdum. On the other side, it will be shown that the theory of the Sumerian origin of Hungarian, commonly accepted before the invention of the Finno-Ugric and Uralic language families (cf. Érdy 1974), is acceptable also from a language-statistical point.

The 12 Uralic as well as the Sumerian and Akkadian Swadesh lists were compiled from dictionaries. Unfortunately, the Ostyak dictionary of Karjalainen (1948) and the Mordwin dictionary of Paasonen (1990-96) were not available to me, because the Library of Congress does not borrow reference works. From the living languages only the Finnic and Estonian lists could be controlled by native speakers in the spring of 2003 in the Institute of Uralistics of the University of Szombathely (Hungary). The Hungarian list was compiled by the present author according to his native speaker's proficiency.

Since, as it is known, the Swadesh list was and is still discussed controversially, I would like to mention here only a few recent cases, in which the list could be applied successfully, i.e. where the calculations that follow from the list are matching with the chronological data of non-statistical linguistics: Elbert (1953) for Polynesian languages; Rabin (1975) for Semitic languages, Blažek for Sumerian (including Emesal), Akkadian, Elamitic, Kassitic, Hurrian, Urartian and Hattic; Forster, Tóth and Bandelt (1998) for 17 Retoromance/Ladinic dialects and recently Forster and Tóth (2003) for Celtic languages.

	Hung.	Vog.	Osty.	Syry.	Voty.	Cher.	Mordw.	Finn.	Eston.	Lapp.	Ngan.	Selk.
1	én ^a	äm ^a	mä ^a	me ^a	mon ^a	miná ^a	mon ^a	minä ^a	mina ^a	mōn ^a	myń ^a	man ^a
2	te ^a	naŋ ^b	naŋ ^b	te ^a	ton ^a	tín ^a	ton ^a	sinä ^a	sina ^a	dōn ^a	tana ^a	tan ^a
3	mi ^a	man ^a	mon ^a	mije ^a	mi ^a	mää ^a	miná ^a	me ^a	me ^a	mī ^a	myń ^a	me ^a
4	ez ^a	ań-tí ^b	tam ^c	eta ^a	ta ^d	ty ^e	et'e ^a	tämä ^f	seeg	tata ^h	tam ⁱ	nami ^j
5	az ^a	ań-ta ^b	tom ^c	esija ^d	so ^e	tu ^f	što ^g	tuo ^h	too ^h	to ^h	tanda ⁱ	tina ^j
6	ki ^a	χā ^b	χo ^b	kin ^a	kin ^a	kū ^a	k'í ^a	ken ^a	kes ^a	gī ^a	ku ^a	kuti ^a
7	mi? ^a	mär ^a	moj ^a	muj ^a	ma ^a	mō ^a	meže ^a	mikä ^a	mis ^a	mī ^a	ma ^a	qaj ^b
8	nem ^a	ā ^b	nem ^a	nem ^a	evyl ^e	nē ^d	a ^b	lī ^e	mitte ^f	ib ^g	ni ^{-a}	aššā ^h
9	mindenki ^a	ār-khan ^b	azàt ^c	bide ^d	vań ^e	ćela ^f	vese ^g	kaikki ^h	köik ^h	tiuna- ⁱ	bonsai ^j	muntik ^k
10	sokan ^a	sew ^a	ār ^b	una ^c	uno ^e	šuké ^d	sjar'ja ^e	monta ^f	paljug	ätña- ^h	ńuka- ⁱ	kočči ^j
11	egy ^a	akw ^b	ij ^c	et'i ^d	og ^b	ik ^b	vejke ^b	yksi ^b	üks ^b	ok'tå ^c	ńoj ^f	ukkir ^g
12	ketto ^a	kit ^a	kät ^a	kik ^a	kik ^a	kok ^a	kavto ^a	kaksi ^a	kaks ^a	guok'te ^a	sity ^a	śitti ^a
13	nagy ^a	jāni ^b	ūn ^c	giriš ^d	badžim ^e	kugu ^f	nokš ^g	suur ^h	suur ^h	stučra- ⁱ	ńarka ^j	kepil ^k
14	hosszú ^a	khāšā ^a	χuw ^b	kuž ^a	kuž ^a	kužu ^a	kuvaka ^c	pitkä ^d	pikk ^d	kuoke- ^e	najba- ^f	čumpil ^g
15	kis/kicsi ^a	aj ^b	āj ^b	d'zol ^e	pitsi ^d	izin ^e	viškine ^f	pieni ^g	väike ^g	alake- ^h	mago- ⁱ	kipai ^j

	Hung.	Vog.	Osty.	Syry.	Voty.	Cher.	Mordw.	Finn.	Eston.	Lapp.	Ngan.	Selk.
16	nő ^a	nī ^a	ni ^a	getir ^b	kišno ^c	batč ^d	nī ^a	nainen ^e	naine ^e	kuična ^f	ny ^a	ńeña ^e
17	férfin ^a	χum ^b	χū ^b	veres ^c	kart ^d	mari ^e	ščjora ^f	mies ^g	mees ^g	teučtu ^{-h}	kojumu ⁱ	qup ^j
18	személy ^a	lili ^b	l'il ^b	lol ^b	lul ^b	jěŋ ^c	loman ^d	henkilö ^e	isik ^f	niera ^g	xorčhilsat ⁱ	
19	hal ^a	χul ^a	χut ^a	t'seri ^b	tsoryg ^b	kol ^a	kal ^a	kala ^a	kala ^a	guolle ^a	koly ^a	qeli ^a
20	madár ^a	tāuliŋ-vu ^j ^b	šiški ^c	kitsa ^d	tylo-burda ^e	kajěk ^f	narmun ^g	lintu ^h	lind ^b	lode ⁻ⁱ	dama ⁻ⁱ	šüńčeka ^k
21	kutya ^a	āmp ^b	āp ^b	kit'šeř ^c	puni ^d	pi ^e	pine ^d	koira ^f	koer ^f	holju ^g	bań ^h	kanak ⁱ
22	tetű ^a	teχe'm ^a	toytem ^a	toj ^a	täj ^a	ti ^a	čičav ^b	täi ^a	täi ^a	dik'ke ^a	ńomtu ^c	unti ^d
23	fa ^a	-pää ^a	juχ ^b	pu ^a	pu ^a	pu ^a	čivto ^c	puu ^a	puu ^a	naoke ^{-d}	muńku ^e	po ^a
24	mag ^a	tajim ^b	tip ^{-c}	tuš ^d	kenem ^e	ozěm ^f	vid'me ^g	siemen ^h	seeme ^h	sā'uo ⁱ	sēńkē ^j	šüńči ^j
25	levél ^a	lapťa ^a	lüba ^a	kor ^b	kvar ^b	lěštaš ^c	lopa ^d	lehti ^e	leht ^e	lasta ^{-e}	xora ^f	čapig ^g
26	gyökér ^a	pärkh ^b	lér ^c	vuz ^d	viži ^d	bož ^d	undovks ^e	juuri ^f	juur ^f	ručttsase ^{-g}	toxi ^h	konti ⁱ
27	kéreg ^a	kēr ^a	tontč ^b	kor ^c	kat's ^d	kumčž ^e	ker ^c	kkarna ^f	haukuma ^g	gârrâ ^a	kasu ^d qâzi ^d	
28	bőr ^a	såw ^b	soχ ^c	ku ^d	kudsi ^e	kobáste ^f	ked ^g	iho ^h	nahk ⁱ	skide ^j	saxy ^k opi ^l	
29	hús ^a	ńawel ^b	ńoχi ^c	jar ^d	jozvi ^e	šíl ^f	s'velf	liha ^g	liha ^g	perěku ^{-h}	ńom ⁻ⁱ	qit ^j

	Hung.	Vog.	Osty.	Syry.	Voty.	Cher.	Mordw.	Finn.	Eston.	Lapp.	Ngan.	Selk.
30	vér ^a	vūr ^a	uer ^a	vir ^a	vir ^a	þera ^a	ver ^a	veri ^a	veri ^a	várrå ^a	kam ^b	kem ^b
31	csont ^a	lu ^b	low ^b	lī ^b	lī ^b	lu ^b	lovaža ^c	luu ^b	luu ^b	takte ^{-d}	atē ^e	le ^b
32	zsír ^a	vōj ^b	woj ^b	vīj ^b	vej ^b	šél ^c	kur ^d	rasva ^e	rasv ^e	sučrja ^f	dir ^g	ür ^h
33	tojás ^a	muŋj ^b	muń ^b	kol'k ^c	kukei ^d	mun ^{-b}	al ^e	muna ^b	muna ^b	münnie ^b	mēnu ^b	eŋ ^f
34	szarv ^a	ānt ^b	änët ^b	śur ^a	śur ^a	šur ^a	sjuro ^a	sarvi ^a	sarv ^a	čoar've ^a	ńamto ^c	āmti ^b
35	farok ^a	lēi ^b	pozi ^c	bež ^c	biž ^c	poć ^c	pulo ^d	hänta ^c	saba ^f	seiēpe ^{-f}	tojbu ^g	mäčäsimil ^h
36	toll ^a	tól ^a	toyet ^a	bord ^b	tili ^a	pěštěl ^c	tolga ^a	sulka ^d	sulg ^d	olěke ^{-e}	eptu ^f	tar ^g
37	haj ^a	āt ^b	soχ ^c	ší ^d	jirši ^e	üp ^f	čer ^g	hius ^h	juuksed ⁱ	vuop'te ⁱ	nerby ^k	ku ^l
38	fej ^a	pāŋk ^a	oχ ^b	jur ^c	puŋ ^a	buŋ ^d	prja ^e	pää ^a	pea ^a	oiēve ^{-f}	kou ^g	oli ^h
39	füla ^a	päl ^a	pet ^a	pel ^a	pel ^a	pe'les̄ ^a	pile ^a	korva ^b	körv ^b	bael'lje ^a	ńojobuo ^c	kō ^d
40	szem ^a	śäm ^a	sem ^a	śin ^a	śin ^a	sinzä ^a	selme ^a	silmä ^a	silm ^a	čál'bme ^a	sejme ^a	sají ^a
41	orr ^a	ńol ^b	ńol ^b	nir ^c	nir ^c	ner ^c	sudo ^d	nenä ^e	nina ^e	ŋunje ^e	ńuńka ^e	intäl ^f
42	száj ^a	sūp ^a	uŋel ^b	vom ^c	im ^d	upša ^e	kurgo ^f	suu ^a	suu ^a	ŋalēme ^{-g}	ńań ^h	āk ⁱ
43	fog ^a	pāŋk ^a	peŋk ^a	piń ^a	piń ^a	pü ^a	pej ^a	pii ^a	pii ^a	patne ^{-b}	timi ^c	timi ^c
44	nyelv ^a	ńilm ^a	ńälem ^a	kil ^b	kil ^b	jí:lme ^a	kel ^b	kieli ^b	keel ^b	kiela ^{-b}	siēde ^c	še ^c

	Hung.	Vog.	Osty.	Syry.	Voty.	Cher.	Mordw.	Finn.	Eston.	Lapp.	Ngan.	Selk.
45	karom ^a	kwons ^b	kuš ^c	giž ^c	giži ^c	küč ^c	kenžed ^d	kynsi ^d	sõrmeküüs ^c	kadsa ^f	kézu ^c	qatid ^d
46	láb ^a	lāyěl ^b	kur ^c	kok ^d	kuk ^d	jol ^e	pil'ge ^f	jalka ^g	jalga ^g	juölk'ie ^g	ńuoj ^h topi ⁱ	
47	térda ^a	sāns ^b	šāš ^b	pid'žes ^c	pyzes ^c	pulbuji ^d	kumaža ^e	polvi ^f	pölv ^f	pučlawa ^f	xuoga ^g	pulih ^h
48	kéz ^a	koat ^a	ket ^a	ki ^a	ki ^a	kit ^a	ked ^a	käsi ^a	käsi ^a	giettâ ^a	dütü ^b	uti ^c
49	has ^a	khwármâ ^b	jěš ^c	ruš ^d	köt ^e	müškür ^f	peke ^g	maha ^h	köht ^e	čoiče- ⁱ	mina- ^j	pårq ^k
50	nyak ^a	sip ^b	säpčel ^b	gol'a ^c	gul'o ^c	šu ^d	kir'ga ^e	kaula ^f	kael ^f	čepeote- ^g	baka- ^h	teti ⁱ
51	mellek ^a	mail ^a	mēyet ^a	mores ^b	mil ^a	mel ^a	mälhkä ^a	rinta ^c	rind ^c	miel'gâ ^a	sinsê ^d	kili ^e
52	szív ^a	šim ^a	sem ^a	šelem ^a	śulem ^a	śum ^a	sedej ^a	sydän ^a	süda ^a	wa'imuo ^b	soa ^c	setymyt ^d
53	máj ^a	mait ^a	mūyet ^a	mus ^a	mus ^a	mokša ^a	makso ^a	maksi ^a	maksi ^a	müökksie ^a	mita ^b mit ^b	
54	inni ^a	äj- ^a	ješ- ^a	ju- ^a	ju- ^a	jüä- ^a	simem ^b	juoda ^a	jooma ^a	jukkâ- ^a	by- ^c	ütiqo ^d
55	enni ^a	tī- ^a	li- ^a	śoj- ^a	śi- ^a	koč ^b	jarsams ^c	syödä ^a	sööma ^a	ŋalmate- ^d	ńam- ^e	amqo ^f
56	harapni ^a	puri ^b	porti ^b	jirni ^c	leka- ^d	purde ^e	suskoms ^f	purra ^e	hammustama ^g	poro- ^e	saku- ^h	ootal- ⁱ
57	látni ^a	wāy ^b	arjkermč ^c	vidlini ^d	adž- ^e	užam ^f	neems ^g	nähdä ^h	nägema ⁱ	vüčiene- ^j	ńedu- ^k	qoqo ^l
58	hallani ^a	khwōli ^a	χūtem ^a	kilni ^a	kilini ^a	ko-lam ^a	kulems ^a	kuulla ^a	kuulma ^a	gullât ^a	dindi- ^b	üntičiqo ^c

	Hung.	Vog.	Osty.	Syry.	Voty.	Cher.	Mordw.	Finn.	Eston.	Lapp.	Ngan.	Selk.
59	tudni ^a	χańší ^b	χōš ^b	tèdní ^a	tod ^{-a}	šińćal ^c	sodams ^d	tuntea ^a	teadma ^e	dow'dât ^a	ceny ^{-f}	tenimiqo ^g
60	aludni ^a	χuji ^b	a·tta ^a	užníc	iziny ^c	umalmě ^d	udoms ^a	nukku ^a	magama ^f	oaddet ^a	kundu ^{-g}	qontoqo ^h
61	halni ^a	kháli ^a	χ□ t ^a	kulni ^a	kulini ^a	ko·lem ^a	kuloms ^a	kuolla ^a	koolma ^a	jamate ^b	kuo ^{-a} ququo ^a	
62	ölni ^a	äl ^{-a}	vel ^{-a}	vini ^a	vi-/vij ^{-a}	puštmo ^b	kulovtoms ^c	tappa ^a	tapma ^d	haperte ^{-e}	ko ^{-f}	qetqo ^g
63	úszni ^a	uj ^{-a}	ut't'a ^a	ujni ^a	vij ^{-a}	i·äm ^a	ujems ^a	uida ^a	ujuma ^b	vuoggjât ^a	dambi ^{-c}	urqo ^d
64	repülni ^a	jäli ^b	pòrlč ^{-c}	lèbni ^d	lobani ^d	čoŋeštäläm ^e	livtjams ^f	lentää ^g	lendama ^g	halane ^{-h}	täir ⁻ⁱ	timpiqo ⁱ
65	menni ^a	mini ^a	mentä ^a	munni ^a	men ^{-a}	mi·em ^a	jutams ^b	mennä ^a	minema ^a	mânnât ^a	mena ^{-a}	qöšqo ^g
66	jönni ^a	ji ^{-a}	jö ^{-a}	lokni ^b	lyktyny ^b	tolam ^c	sams ^d	tulla ^c	tulema ^c	jorēpe ^{-e}	tuj ^{-f}	qenqo ^b
67	feküdni ^a	χuji ^b	ilχòi ^{-b}	kuilini ^c	kil'l'i ^{-c}	bozam ^d	put ^{-d}	maata ^e	lamadama ^f	jakjahe ^{-g}	tundej ^{-h}	ippiqo ⁱ
68	ülni ^a	ūnli ^b	ōměsti ^c	pukalni ^d	pukini ^d	šińće ^e	aštems (osado) ^f	istua ^g	istuma ^g	kovohe ^{-h}	ńom ⁻ⁱ	omninti ^{-j}
69	állni ^a	l'ül'i ^b	lōj ^{-b}	sulalni ^a	sil ^{-a}	šolgem ^a	aštems (stjado) ^c	seisoa ^d	seisma ^d	čuěžute ^{-e}	nânsy ^{-f}	matqiqo ^g
70	adni ^a	miγ ^b	mij ^{-b}	šetni ^c	šotini ^c	pualam ^d	maksoms ^e	antaa ^a	andma ^a	vade ^{-f}	mi ^b	miqo ^b
71	mondani ^a	latti ^b	jästč ^{-c}	šuni ^d	verani ^e	manam ^f	merems ^g	sanoa ^h	ütlema ⁱ	mol'kete ^{-j}	mundē ^{-k}	ketiqo ^l
72	nap ^a	χátäl ^b	χatł ^b	šondi ^c	šundi ^c	keče ^d	čipaj ^e	aurinko ^f	päike ^g	peiěve ^{-h}	dery ⁻ⁱ	čeli ^j
73	hold ^a	jāŋχēp ^b	tīlēš ^c	telis ^c	tolež ^c	tělězč ^c	kov ^d	kuu ^d	kuu ^d	manu ^{-e}	kice-firäs ^g	

	Hung.	Vog.	Osty.	Syry.	Voty.	Cher.	Mordw.	Finn.	Eston.	Lapp.	Ngan.	Selk.
74	csillag ^a	sâw ^b	kôs ^c	kod'žul ^d	kižil'í ^d	šudčer ^e	tešte ^f	tähtig	tähtg	naste- ^h	xotade- ⁱ	qišqâj
75	víz ^a	vüt' ^a	jeng ^b	va ^a	vu ^a	þeta ^a	ved ^a	vesi ^a	vesi ^a	t'sätsie ^c	bydy ^a	üt ^a
76	esč ^a	rakw ^b	jer ^c	zer ^d	zor ^d	jür ^c	piseme ^e	sade ^f	vihm ^g	haremu- ^h	sora- ⁱ sorintäi	
77	kő ^a	k [□] ^a	kew ^a	iz ^b	kü ^a	kü ^a	käv ^a	kivi ^a	kivi ^a	kerčke- ^c	datou ^d	pü ^e
78	homok ^a	jěm ^b	χiš ^c	lia ^d	luo ^d	ošma ^e	čivar ^f	hiekka ^g	liiv ^d	satu ^h	duo ⁱ	čuri ^j
79	föld ^a	má ^b	mou ^b	mu ^b	mu ^b	rok ^c	moda ^d	maa ^b	maa ^b	ulčeme- ^e	mou ^b	tetti ^f
80	felhő ^a	tul ^b	peleŋ ^a	pil ^a	pil'em ^a	pel ^a	pel ^a	pilvi ^a	pilv ^a	bál'vâ ^a	ciru- ^c marki ^d	
81	füst ^a	posim ^a	puzenj ^a	tšin ^b	šyn ^b	šikš ^c	kačamo ^d	savu ^e	suits ^f	sučeva- ^e	lépty- ^g	purqi ^h
82	tűz ^a	toát ^a	tut ^a	bí ^b	til ^c	tul ^c	tol ^c	tuli ^c	tuli ^c	tolo- ^c	tuo- ^a	tü ^a
83	hamu ^a	khôl'em ^a	xōjem ^a	pejím ^b	perí ^c	lómož ^d	kulov ^e	tuhka ^f	tuhk ^f	tollomij ^g	sime ^h	šimj ^h
84	égnia ^a	teř ^b	te- ^b	d'žížalni ^c	džuany ^d	jülem ^e	pultams ^f	palaa ^g	põlema ^g	polte- ^g	lańy- ^h	čapico ⁱ
85	út ^a	láŋχ ^b	juš ^c	tui ^d	šures ^e	urem ^f	ki ^g	polku ^h	tee ⁱ	vacaotaoka- ^j	sode- ^k	wetti ^l
86	hegy ^a	ãχ ^b	joŋ ^b	d'žib ^c	gurež ^d	kurček ^d	ine pando ^e	vuori ^f	mägi ^g	pučelta- ^h	dika- ⁱ qe ^j	
87	vörös ^a	kělp ^b	urtä ^c	gerd ^d	gord ^d	joškar ^e	jakstere ^f	punaineng	punane ^g	ručpse- ^h	deba- ⁱ	ńarqij ^j

	Hung.	Vog.	Osty.	Syry.	Voty.	Cher.	Mordw.	Finn.	Eston.	Lapp.	Ngan.	Selk.
88	zöld ^a	ńār ^b	ńarč ^b	vež ^c	vož ^c	užar ^d	piže ^e	vihreä ^f	roheline ^g	ruětne ^{-h}	toda ⁻ⁱ	padyn ^j
89	sárga ^a	kasm ^b	ńarč ^c	šel ^d	tšuz ^e	sar ^f	ožog	keltainen ^h	kollane ⁱ	viske ^{-j}	toda ^{-k}	patil ^l
90	fehér ^a	jāŋk ^b	nāui ^c	t'sót'skem ^d	tödy ^e	os ^f	ašo ^f	valkea ^g	valge ^g	velčke ^{-g}	syr ^h	seri ⁱ
91	fekete ^a	pāŋk ^b	piti ^c	śed ^d	śod ^d	śem ^e	ravžo ^f	musta ^g	must ^g	čaope ^{-h}	seńkē ⁱ	säq ^j
92	éj(szaka) ^a	jí ^a	jej ^a	voj ^a	uj ^a	jüt ^b	ve ^a	yö ^a	öö ^a	iggiâ ^a	xi ^c	pit ^d
93	forró ^a	isém ^b	kawrém ^c	peš ^d	peš ^d	šokšo ^e	pši ^f	kuuma ^g	kuum ^g	tuolt ^h	xejku ⁻ⁱ	qečil ^l
94	hideg ^a	aserém ^b	iški ^c	kin ^d	kežit ^e	juglen ^f	kel'me ^g	kylmä ^g	külm ^g	kalšas ^h	cesé ⁻ⁱ časiq ⁱ	
95	tele/teli ^a	tail ^a	tèt ^a	del ^a	vil ^b	tićmaš ^c	peškse ^d	täysi ^a	täis ^a	tievase ^{-e}	muntu ^{-f}	tiril ^g
96	új ^a	il'p ^b	jalěp ^b	vil ^a	vil ^a	ù ^a	od ^a	uusi ^a	uus ^a	odás ^a	minda ^{-c}	šentí ^d
97	jó ^a	jámes ^a	jem ^a	bur ^b	umoj ^c	pore ^d	paro ^d	kyyvä ^e	hea ^f	pučre ^d	nagå ^g	soma ^h
98	kerek ^a	lākwěŋ ^b	lakěŋ ^b	gegres ^c	kogres ^c	jirgeskěd ^d	kirksala ^e	pyöreä ^f	ümar ^g	jorčpe ^{-h}	dujka ⁻ⁱ	kol'al ^l
99	száraz ^a	sūri ^b	kanzém ^c	kos ^d	kös ^d	ojar ^e	kos'ke ^d	kuiva ^f	kuiiv ^f	koičoke ^{-g}	xeke ^{-h}	tekkipil ^l
100	név ^a	nām ^a	nem ^a	ńim ^a	ńim ^a	lem ^a	lem ^a	nimi ^a	nimi ^a	nāmma ^a	nim ^a	nim ^a

The evaluation of the 12 Uralic lists results in the following percentages. In parenthesis we add the percentages elaborated by Raun (1956):

Hungarian = Vogul: 41%
Hungarian = Ostyak: 36%
Hungarian = Syryen: 34%
Hungarian = Votyak: 35%
Hungarian = Cheremis: 31%
Hungarian = Mordwin: 29%
Hungarian = Finnic: 33%
Hungarian = Estonian: 31%
Hungarian = Lapponic: 26%
Hungarian = Nganasan: 14%
Hungarian = Selkup: 12%

Average: 29.27% (Raun: 24.2%)

Vogul = Ostyak: 59%
Vogul = Syryen: 28%
Vogul = Votyak: 32%
Vogul = Cheremis: 28%
Vogul = Mordwin: 22%
Vogul = Finnic: 30%
Vogul = Estonian: 29%
Vogul = Lapponic: 21%
Vogul = Nganasan: 15%
Vogul = Selkup: 13%

Average: 27.6%

Ostyak = Syryen: 31%
Ostyak = Votyak: 31%
Ostyak = Cheremis: 29%
Ostyak = Mordwin: 23%
Ostyak = Finnic: 25%
Ostyak = Estonian: 25%
Ostyak = Lapponic: 25%
Ostyak = Nganasan: 16%
Ostyak = Selkup: 11%

Average: 24.0%

Syryen = Votyak: 64%

Syryen = Cheremis: 33%

Syryen = Mordwin: 27%

Syryen = Finnic: 31%

Syryen = Estonian: 30%

Syryen = Lapponic: 23%

Syryen = Nganasan: 16%

Syryen = Selkup: 11%

Average: 29.38% (Raun: 27%)

Votyak = Cheremis: 37%

Votyak = Mordwin: 30%

Votyak = Finnic: 34%

Votyak = Estonian: 35%

Votyak = Lapponic: 25%

Votyak = Nganasan: 14%

Votyak = Selkup: 12%

Average: 26.7 %

Cheremis = Mordwin: 30%

Cheremis = Finnic: 32%

Cheremis = Estonian: 30%

Cheremis = Lapponic: 26%

Cheremis = Nganasan: 14%

Cheremis = Selkup: 12%

Average: 24.0% (Raun: 32.2%)

Mordwin = Finnic: 29%

Mordwin = Estonian: 25%

Mordwin = Lapponic: 23%

Mordwin = Nganasan: 12%

Mordwin = Selkup: 11%

Average: 20.0% (Raun: 27.4)

Finnic = Estonian: 73%

Finnic = Lapponic: 34%

Finnic = Nganasan: 15%

Finnic = Selkup: 14%

Average: 34.0% (Raun: 28.6%)

Estonian = Lapponic: 31%

Estonian = Nganasan: 15%

Estonian = Selkup: 13%

Average: 19.67%

Lapponic = Nganasan: 12%

Lapponic = Selkup: 8%

Average: 10.0%

Nganasan = Selkup: 22%

Average: 22.0% (Raun: Yurak Samoyed: 14.6%)

Average Finno-Ugric: 31.91% (Raun: 27.88%)

Average Uralic: 24.54% (Raun: 25.6)

Total average Finno-Ugric-Uralic: 23.33%

Given that Raun's percentages are generally even lower than ours, this shows that our language data are not biased by choosing the "wrong" dictionaries and by native speaker's (or linguist's) mistakes.

Generally, according to Swadesh (1955), a language keeps each 1000 years 86% from its vocabulary. Therefore we get the following table:

After 1000 years:	86%	After 7000 years:	34.8%
After 2000 years:	73.96%	After 8000 years:	29.92%
After 3000 years:	63.6%	After 9000 years:	25.73%
After 4000 years:	54.7%	After 10'000 years:	22.13%
After 5000 years:	47.04%	After 11'000 years:	19.03%,
After 6000 years:	40.46%	etc.	

According to the calculated percentages, Proto-Uralic should have existed therefore about 9000 years ago. The separation of the Samoyed languages (Nganasan and Selkup) from Lapponic should have happened even about 11'000 years ago, i.e. still 2000 years before Proto-Uralic, whose members they

are! As one can see very easily, both the hypothesis of a Finno-Ugric and of an Uralic language family lead themselves ad absurdum.

Languages with such small common lexical stock can best be considered Sprachbünde (loose language complexes), but never language families. Principally, also the question arises, if it is possible to reconstruct languages at 11'000 and more years back. Concretely speaking, this would mean – since the Uralic languages are a member of the Nostratic “language family” –, that the latter must be still several thousands, if not ten-thousands of years older than Proto-Uralic: an assumption that very probably has to be considered in the light of glottogony as pure nonsense.

	Hungarian	Sumerian	Akkadian
1	én	ǵa-e „I” (Gostony, no. 811) ma, mae, me „I” (Zakar, p. 32)	
2	te	za, zae, zi, si „?” (Zakar, p. 32)	
3	mi	me „we” (Gostony, no. 814; Zakar, p. 32)	
4	ez	e₄ „this, that” (Halloran/Hámori, A 2)	
5	az	aš „a” (Gostony, no. 835)	
6	ki?	a-ba₁₁ „who?” (Gostony, no. 818)	
7	mi?	mi „who?” (Gostony, no. 816)	minam, miima „what?” (Zakar, p. 33)
8	nem	na-àm/nù-a,m „no, not” (Gostony, no. 58) na, nam „no, not” (Zakar, p. 33)	mimmaum „all” (Zakar, p. 33)
9	min-d-en-ki	em-nam (Halloran/Hámori, p. 18)	
10	sok-an	eš (Halloran/Hámori, p. 20)	
11	egy	ge, gi „one” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 37, 43) edu, ed „one” (Zakar, p. 34) ig „broken number” (Zakar, P. 34) aš, g'eš „one, alone” (Halloran/Hámori, E 6) sag', as (Halloran/Hámori, p. 21)	
12	kettő	kad/kata₅, katu „hand” (Gostony, no. 214; Zakar, p. 34)	
13	nagy	nus(.g) (nu-)g/nun/na/nad „big” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 46, 1 51; Gostony, no. 154, 167-170; Zakar, p. 34)	nadu „groß” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 46; Zakar, p. 34)
14	hosszú	uš „long” (Gostony, no. 113, 171) he-su-su-ud „long” (Zakar, p. 34) guz (Halloran/Hámori, p. 27)	
15	kis/kicsi	kiši/kišim „ant” (Gostony, no. 749) gudadu „small, little” (Zakar, p. 35)	
16	nő	na-na „to become”/nu „statue, little idol” nunuz „Ei, shoot, young animal” (Gostony. nos. 387, 470, 771)	
16a	asszony	gasan, gazan „lady” (Gostony, no. 457; Halloran/Hámori, p. 31)	assatum „wife, spouse” (Zakar, p. 35)

17	fér-fí	bár, bára „ruler” (Halloran/Hámori, E 17) ér/éri/erum „male servant” (Gostony, no. 493; Halloran/Hámori, p. 32)
18	szem-ély	si-am ₃ -lu „eye-human” (Zakar, p. 35; Halloran/Hámori, p. 33)
19	hal	ha + lu „fish + people” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 22) kua „fish” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 49) ku ₆ /ha „fish” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 45; Gostony, nos. 730, 731; Zakar, p. 36)
20	madár	musen/mutin (Bobula, Herencia, p. 23) mušen, musen „bird” (Gostony, no. 740; Zakar, p. 36; Halloran/Hámori, p. 35)
21	kutya	kudda „biter” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 45) ku-ti-a „biter” (Zakar, p. 36)
22	tetű	uh <u>h</u> (u) (Blažek, p. 10)
23	fa	pa „twig, tree” (Gostony, no. 792; Zakar, p. 36)
24	ma-g	mu + ag „seed + to work” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 50) múd „blood”/mas „to grind”/mu „grain” (Gostony, nos. 243, 400, 810); Halloran/Hámori, p. 41; Zakar, p. 36)
25	levél	lum, lam „(dry) leaves (?)” (Zakar, p. 36)
26	gyökér	dúr(-a); su <u>h</u> uš, suh <u>č</u> ; eren; i-ri <u>x</u> -na (Blažek, p. 11)
27	kéreg	kus „skin, leather” (Halloran/Hámori, K 29)
28	bőr	bar „side; skin” (Gostony, no. 205 ^{bis} ; Zakar, p. 37; Halloran und Hámori, p. 48)
29	hús	kus „skin, body” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 23) ùš „embryo”/uzu „meat”/kuš „skin” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 30; Gostony, nos. 113, 203, 204; Halloran/Hámori, p. 49) kus (kuš?), guz „hand” (Zakar, p. 37)
30	vér	bir „blood” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 45) bur „blood” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 49) bar „side; skin” (Gostony, no. 205; Zakar, p. 37) ùri (Halloran/Hámori, p. 50)

31	csonτ	ḡir-pad-du/da (Blažek, p. 7)	sientum „bone” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 118) esentu, esimtu „bone” (Zakar, p. 38)
32	zsír	ì/ia [šamnu] „oil, fat” (Gostony, no. 556; Zakar, p. 38)	zal „fat” (Zakar, p. 38)
33	tojás	nunuz (Blažek, p. 8)	
34	szarv	si + ru ₅ „horns-beater” (Gostony, no. 767; Zakar, p. 38; Halloran/Hámori, p. 55)	
35	far-ok	kun (Blažek, p. 12)	
36	toll	dal „to fly” (Bobula, Origin, p. 33; Halloran/Hámori, p. 57)	
37	haj	ka + ú „hair” (Gostony, no. 220) kulla „membrane, skin” (Halloran/Hámori, K 7)	
38	fej	be „sir” (Gostony, no. 514; Zakar, p. 39) pa „head” (Zakar, p. 39) pa „point, peak” (Halloran/Hámori, F 19)	
39	fül	bur „ear” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 50) pi „ear” (Gostony, no. 226)	
40	szem	en „eye” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 53) še/ši + àm „cereals-grain” (Gostony, no. 69; Zakar, p. 39; Halloran/Hámori, p. 33)	seim „grain” (Zakar, p. 39) zimu „Auge” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 45; Zakar, p. 39)
41	orr	ur „dog” (Gostony, no. 734) (k)i-ir „nose” (Zakar, p. 39)	
42	száj	šu + ai „mouth + opening” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 33) sù „lip”/sa ₄ „to name, to call” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 45; Gostony, nos. 221, 311; Zakar, p. 40)	saptu „lip” (Zakar, p. 40)
43	fog	pa-d „to bite” (Halloran/Hámori, F 35) pag „to catch; to close” (Zakar, p. 40)	
44	nyelv	eme + il „tongue + to lift” (Gostony, no. 227; Halloran/Hámori, p. 69)	
45	karom	u; si (= horn) (Blažek, P. 8)	
46	láb	lah ₄ „to push, to take s.o. away” (Gostony, no. 254)	
47	térd	dùg, dug ₃ „knee” (Gostony, no. 233; Halloran/Hámori, p. 73)	

48	kéz	kad/kat _{4,5} /giš/ki-ši-ib „hand” (Bobula, Herencia, P. 45; Gostony, No. 214, 251, 252; Zakar, p. 40; Halloran/Hámori, p. 75)	kappu „hand” (Zakar, p. 40)
49	has	háš, haš „thigh”	hasu „intestins, lungs” (Zakar, p. 41)
50	nyak	gú „neck” (Gostony, no. 248; Zakar, p. 41; Halloran/Hámori, p. 78) kuk „joint” (Halloran/Hámori, p. 79)	
51	mellek	gaba, ga; ti-ti; zi; šà; ubur (Blažek, p. 7)	
52	szív	zi „gorge, throat”/šág „heart” (Gostony, nos. 52, 209) sa, sa-a „heart” (Zakar, p. 41)	
53	máj	bà „liver” (Gostony, no. 34; Halloran/Hámori, p. 82)	
54	inni	im-ma „thirst” (Gostony, no. 319) immeli „to drink” (Zakar, p. 42) naš, nañ (Halloran/Hámori, p. 83)	
55	enni	eš „eats” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 45) esa „nourishment” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 33) su _{5,6} (Halloran/Hámori, p. 84) és's'a „full up, satisfied” (Halloran/Hámori, E 20)	
56	harapni	kurs (Halloran/Hámori, p. 85)	
57	látni	lá (Halloran/Hámori, p. 86)	
58	hallani	aka (Halloran/Hámori, p. 89)	
59	tudni	tu ₆ -dug ₄ -ga [tudukku] „invocation” (Gostony, no. 3)	idu-u „to know, to recognise” (Zakar, p. 42)
60	aludni	usāras „sleeps” (Bobula, Herencia, pp. 53, 54) a-a-lum „to sleep” (Gostony, no. 472) u, udi, usa „sleep; to sleap” (Zakar, p. 43)	
61	halni	láalal [alallu] „bad demon”/ hul „fatal” (Gostony, nos. 31, 98) hal „to go down” (Zakar, p. 43; Halloran/Hámori, p. 94)	halaku „to disappear” (Zakar, p. 43)
62	ölni	ul „to beat; to lead” (Gostony, no. 371)	
63	úszni	uz ^{mušen} [uzu] „goose” (Gostony, no. 773) a-usum „raft” (Zakar, p. 43)	

64	repülni	lil „wind, air”, lal „to be in the air” (Zakar, p. 43) ri „to throw” (Halloran/Hámori, R 8)	
65	menni	mud „beeilt sich” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 51) en „to go”, men/me „to be; to move” me-en/ma-an „there is” (Zakar, p. 44)	ki-min „to go” (Zakar, p. 44)
66	jönni	gin „to go” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 51; Gostony, no. 255; cf. dial. gyönni!, Zakar, p. 44) du „goes” (Zakar, p. 44)	
67	fek-üd-ni	ukú „to make flat, to fall down” (Gostony, no. 394)	
68	ülni	úr [utlu]/ur „lap” (Gostony, nos. 245, 471)	
69	állni	gal, mal „to be, to exist”, alad „bull”, ga-al „to be, to exist”, galz „to be” (Zakar, p. 45)	
70	adni	sum// zeğ; sì; rig; mu, nì-ba, dùg(-ga), du ₁₀ //zeb; ku ₇ -ku ₇ ; šà-ga (Blažek, p. 9)	udu „taxes” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 118) id-din, hadu, nadanu „to give” (Zakar, p. 45)
71	mondani	mu „to say” (Gostony, no. 301)	
72	nap	nap „winter sun; gods” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 43; Gostony, no. 48) nab „heaven” (Zakar, P. 45)p	nap „god” (Zakar, p. 45)
73	hold	ud „light, moon” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 30, 43; Zakar, p. 46) hud „to shine; light” (Bobula, Herencia, pp. 54, 2 28) húl + ud „enjoyment + light” (Gostony, no. 88) ud _{4,8} „moon”; had „to shine” (Halloran/Hámori, p. 106)	
74	csillag	zalag, zallag „star”; zall „to be bright” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 43; Gostony, no. 91; Zakar, p. 46; Halloran/Hámori, p. 107)	
75	víz	bi + es „drop + water” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 33) íd „river”/biz/bis „drop” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 43; Gostony, nos. 54, 657; Zakar, p. 46; Halloran/Hámori, p. 108)	
76	eső	e „slope” (Gostony, no. 188) su (Halloran/Hámori, p. 109)	siutu „sunset”, usan „evening” (Zakar, p. 47)
77	kő	ku „to found” (Gostony, no. 353) ka „basalt” (Zakar, p. 47; Halloran/Hámori, p. 111)	

78	homok	ukum „cloud of dust” (Gostony, nos. 61, 198; Halloran/Hámori, p. 112; cf. hamul)	
78a	pórond	epirri „dust” (Zakar, p. 47)	epiru „dust” (Zakar, p. 47)
79	föl-d	u ₂ + u ₇ + du „acre” (Zakar, p. 48) par-im „dry land” (Halloran/Hámori, F 36)	
80	felhő	ubilla „soot” (Halloran/Hámori, p. 114)	
81	füst	i-izi (Blažek, P. 12)	
82	tűz	te „flame” (Bobula, Herencia, pp. 43, 52) de-izi „fire”, izi „id.” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 43; Bobula, Origin, p. 33; Halloran/Hámori, p. 116 tu ₆ „invocation” (Gostony, no. 453) izi, deizi „fire”, tu-izi „magic, stake, fire” (Zakar, p. 48)	
83	hamu	ukum „dust” (Gostony, nos. 61, 198; Halloran/Hámori, p. 118; cf. homok) kúm „hot” (Halloran/Hámori, K 42)	hamatu „to burn”, hamu „to destroy” (Zakar, p. 48)
84	égni	ug „burning heat” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 43) é „house, temple”/ág „to measure”/es „to be dried out” (Gostony, nos. 8, 305, 330) šeng „to be hot, to cook, to heat” (Halloran/Hámori, E 3)	
85	út	ud („?”)(Bobula, Rokonság, P., 64) íd „river” (Gostony, no. 54) u „to drive”, kut „road” (Zakar, p. 49)	usu „way” (Zakar, p. 49)
86	hegy	he + ge „mass + abundance” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 43) he-gal „abundance” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 51) gug, gur, kur „to roll” (Zakar, p. 49)	eddu „pointed” (Zakar, p. 49)
87	piros	rusu, urudu (Halloran/Hámori, p. 122)	pilú „dark red” (Gostony, no. 177; Zakar, p. 50)
87a	vörös	si ₄ „dark red” (Gostony, no. 177) russu „red-shining clothes”, urudu „copper; red”, rus „red” (Zakar, p. 50)	
88	zöld	sig ₇ , sei ₁₂ „green” (Gostony, no. 176; Zakar, p. 50; Halloran/Hámori, p. 124)	

89	sárga	sig „yellow” (Bobula, Kétezer, p. 70) sig ₇ , se ₁₂ „green” (Gostony, no. 176; Zakar, p. 50; Halloran/Hámori, p. 124)	ar-ka „yellow”, arku „yellowish” (Zakar, p. 50)
90	fehér	bar, paar „white” (Bobula, Herencia, pp. 46, 48) babbar, bar ₆ „white” (Gostony, no. 155; Zakar, p. 50; Halloran/Hámori, p. 125)	
91	fekete	bu „dark” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 46) gig „schwarz, dunkel” (Halloran/Hámori, P. 126)	bikúti „eclipse of the sun” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 46)
92	éj(szaka)	gíg, ge ₆ „dark; night” (Gostony, no. 49) gi-e „night” (Zakar, p. 51)	
93	forró	bar „to burn” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 54)	
94	hideg	hal-ba „coldness, frost” (Zakar, p. 51; Halloran/Hámori, p. 130) si-e-di „coldness” (Zakar, p. 51)	
95	tele/teli	dil „perfect, full” (Bobula, Origin, p. 33) til „to be old, to be at the end” (Bobula, Kétezer, p. 79) tíl-la „to live; life” (Gostony, no. 71) de „full”; til „complete” (Zakar, p. 52; Halloran/Hámori, p. 131)	
96	új	ù „to spread out; to sleep” (Gostony, no. 417)	
97	jó	la „excellence” (Bobula, Herencia, p. 46) i(-a) “the revered, praised thing” (Gostony, no. 13)	
98	kerek	kar + ag „to turn around” (Bobula, Kétezer, p. 54) kar „to avoid”, gílil, kílil „ring, circlet garland” (Zakar, p. 52) kar, gar, gur (Halloran/Hámori, p. 134)	erru “ring, circlet” (Zakar, p. 52)
99	szár-az	sig, sahar „dry, dried out” (Zakar, p. 53; Halloran/Hámori, p. 135)	su-sur „to dry out”, siru „steppe” (Zakar, p. 53)
100	név	na „to name” (Zakar, p. 53) nam, na (Halloran/Hámori, p. 137)	nibu „name” (Zakar, p. 53)

The evaluation of the three Swadesh lists results in the following percentages:

Hungarian = Sumerian: 91%

Hungarian = Akkadian: 27% (2%)

These indications that are on the first sight contradictory, have to be understood as follows: From the 27 words, that Hungarian shares with Akkadian, 25% are to be considered either as Sumerian borrowings in Akkadian or as Akkadian borrowings in Sumerian. For 2 Hungarian words there is not (yet?) a Sumerian etymology. To say it in other words: 93% of the Swadesh list has a Mesopotamian etymology – while, as one remembers, Proto-Uralic has only 24.54% and Proto-Finno-Ugric-Uralic even only 23.33% common words.

The extremely high percentage of 27% Akkadian-Semitic words in Hungarian goes along with an observation by Ida Bobula: „I am convinced that the Hungarian language bears the stamp of not an early, but of a very late stage of Sumerian culture. This is shown by the quantity of Semitic cultural loanwords in Hungarian; from Akkadian and Babylonian“ (Bobula 1996, p. 51; cf. also Bobula 1951, p. 11, note 3). Gostony, too, who did not work with the Swadesh list either, but etymologized all available Hungarian words, came to the conclusion that from the (according to his counting) 1050 words in his Sumerian etymological dictionary 923 are shared with Hungarian words, this are 87.9% (cf. also Oláh 1980, p. 12). These results show firstly a pretty exact correspondence between two methodically fully different approaches and secondly their independency of the Swadesh list.

Aside from that, Gostony has shown that Hungarian and Sumerian correspond in 51 of 53 grammatical (phonetical, morphological and syntactical) features (Gostony 1975, pp. 175ss., esp. 194ss.). The correspondances between Hungarian and the Turanian and Non-Turanian languages are according to Gostony (1975, pp. 201s.): Hungarian: 51; Turk languages: 29; Caucasian languages: 24, northern Finno-Ugric languages: 21; Tibeto-Burmanic languages: 12; Munda-Khol languages: 9; Paleo-Siberian languages: 8; Oceanic languages: 7; Akkadian: 5; Sanskrit: 5; Dravidian languages: 5; Chinese: 5, Indo-European languages: 4; Bask: 4; Hamitic languages: 3; Japanese: 3.

3. The alleged Altaic language family

Unlike the situation in the FU languages, in the A languages, most linguists assume that Turkish, Mongolian and Manchu are not genetically related, but have relationships due to early mutual borrowings. This is the standpoint of leading researchers like Sir Gerald Clauson and Gerhard Doerfer, while other capacities like Nicholas Poppe and Karl H. Menges not only accept a Urverwandtschaft, but consider also Korean and Japanese to be members of the alleged A family. However, in order to decide if Turkish, Mongolian and Manchu – the „hard-core“ A members – are related or not, we will use, like in chapter 2, the 100 words Swadesh list. Since this has already be done by Clauson (1969), with a slightly different list in the alphabetic order of the English words that does, however, not influence our results, we can trust his list that we reproduce in the following. Borrowings are italicized according to Clauson.

	English	Early Turkish	Early Mongolian	Manchu
1	ashes	kül	(h)ünesü(n)	fulenggi
2	(birch) bark	to:z	uyilsun	čalfa, alan
3	belly	karın	ke'eli	<i>hefeli</i>
4	bird	kuş	šiba'un	gasha
5	blood	ka:n	čisun	senggi
6	bone	süjük	yasun	giranggi
7	breast, chest	tö:s	če'eji	tunggen
8	claw, nail	tırjak, tarma:k	kimüsü(n), kimül	ošoho
9	cloud	bulut	e'ülen	tugi
10	dog	ıt	novay	indahôn
11	ear	kul(k)ak	čikin	šan
12	earth (gen.)	yé:r	yajär	na
	earth (soil)	topra:k	köser, široy	boihon
13	egg	yumurtğa:	ömdegen, öndegen	<i>umhan</i>
14	eye	kö:z, gö:z	nidun	yasa
15	fat	ya:g	e'ükün, ö'ükün	nimenggi
16	feather	yüg	ödön	funggaha
17	fire	o:t, o:d	al	tuwa
18	fish	balık	jiyasun	nimaha
19	flesh, meat	et	miqan	yali
20	foot	adak	köl	bethe
21	hair (gen.)	kıl	(h)üsü	funiyehe
	hair (of head)	saç	(h)üsü	funiyehe

	hair (of body)	tü:	(h)üsü	funiyehe
22	hand	elig	yar	gala
23	head	baş	teri'ün	uju
24	heart	yürek	jirüge, jürüge	niyaman
25	horn	büñüz	eber	uyhe
26	knee	ti:z, di:z	ebüdüğ	buhi
27	leaf	yapurğa:k	nabčin	abdaha
28	liver	bağır	(h)elige(n)	fahûn
29	louse	bit	bö'esün	čihe
30	man, male	er, érkek	ere	haha
31	moon	a:y	sara(n)	biya
32	mountain	ta:ğ, da:ğ	a'ula	alin
33	mouth	ağız	ama(n)	angga
34	name	a:t, a:d	nere	gebu
35	neck	boyun	küjügün	meifen
36	night	tün, dün	süni	dobori
37	nose	burun	qabar	oforo
38	person	kishi:	gü'ün	niyalma
39	rain	yağmur	qura	aga
40	road, path	yo:l, oruk	jam, mör	jugôn
41	root	kök, yiltiz, tö:z	(h)uja'ur, uju'ur	da
42	sand	kum, kayır	elesü(n)	yongga
43	seed	uruğ	(h)üre	use
44	skin	teri:, deri:	arasun	suku
45	smoke	tütün	(h)uni	šanggiyan
46	star	yultuz	(h)odun	usiha
47	stone	taş	čila'un, gürü	wehe
48	sun	kün	naran	šun
49	tail	ku <u>d</u> ruk	se'ül	unčehe
50	tongue	til, dil	kelen	ilenggu
51	tooth	tış, diş	śidü(n), südü(n)	weihe
52	tree, wood	iğaç	modon	moo
53	water	su:v	usu(n)	muke
54	woman	evçi:, ura:gut	eme	hehe
55	all	barça:, kop, kamag	büri, qamuy	yooni
56	big	uluğ, bedük	yeke	amba

57	black	<i>kara:</i>	<i>qara</i>	sahaliyan
58	cold	soğuk	köyiten	sahôrun
59	dry	kuruğ	qokimay	olhon
60	full	tolu:, dolu:	dü'üren	đalu
61	good	<u>edgü:</u> , yaxşı:	<i>sayin</i>	<i>sain</i>
62	green	yaşıl	noγo'an	niowanngiyan
63	hot	isig	<i>qala'un</i>	<i>kalhôn</i>
64	long	uzu:n	urtu	golmin
65	many	üküş	olon	geren, labdu
66	new	yajı:	šine	iče
67	red	kızıl	(h)ula'an	<i>fulgijan</i>
68	round	<i>tegirmi:</i> ; degermi:	<i>tögörigey, tö'erig</i>	muheliyen
69	small	kiçig	ücügen	ajige, osohon
70	white	a:k	čaya'an	šanyan
71	yellow	<i>sarıg</i>	šira, sira	suwayan
72	I	<i>ben</i>	<i>bi</i>	<i>bi</i>
73	we	<i>biz</i>	<i>ba, bida</i>	<i>be, muse</i>
74	thou	sen	či (*ti)	si
75	this	bu:	ene	ere
76	that	ol	tere	tere
77	who?	kim	ken	we, ya
78	what?	ne	ya'u	ay, ya
79	one	bi:r	nigen	eme
80	two	ékki:	qoyar	juwe
81	not	yok	üge'üy	akâ
82	bite	ısır-, tışla:-	ja'u, qaŷa-	sai-
83	burn	örte:-, künür-, yak-	tüle-	tufada-
84	come	kel-, gel-	ire-	ji-
85	die	öl-	ükü-	buče-, buda-
86	drink	iç-	u'u-	omi-, waida-
87	eat	yé:-	ide-	je-
88	fly	uç-	nis-	teye-
89	give	bé:r-	ök-	bu-
90	hear	észid-, tinla-	sonos-	donji-
91	kill	ölür-	ala-	wa-
92	know	bil-	mede-	sa-

93	lie (down)	yat-	kebte-	dedu-
94	say	té:-, sözle:-	ke'e-, ügüle-	se-, gisure-
95	see	kör-, gör-	üje-	tuwa-
96	sit	olor-	sa'u-	te-
97	sleep	udi:-	umta-, unta-	amga-
98	stand	tur- (*dur-)	baiyi-	ili-
99	swim	yüz-	onba-	selbi-
100	walk	yori:-	<i>yabu</i> -	<i>yabu</i> -

The evaluation of these lists are much simpler than in the FU case, since we can see immediately that

- Turkish and Mongolian have maximally 16 words in common, i.e. share 16% of the basic vocabulary
- Turkish and Manchu have 0 words in common, i.e. are completely unrelated
- Mongolian and Manchu share a number of common Chinese borrowing (Clauson 1969, p. 22) and maximally 22 common words, i.e. 22% of their basic vocabulary

This goes with Doerfer's statement: „Meines Erachtens nun haben diejenigen Forscher recht, die eine Urverwandtschaft der sog. altaischen Sprachen ablehnen“ („Now according to me, these researchers are right who deny an Urverwandtschaft of the so-called Altaic languages“) (Doerfer 1963, p. 51). Doerfer goes even further when he denies that *any* words between Turkish, Mongolian and Manchu are related – according to him, these are merely borrowings (Doerfer 1963, p. 53). Therefore, we would have 0% and total genetical unrelatedness between all three A languages. It is thus anyway superfluous to prove that the further languages, Korean and Japanese, that some researchers wanted to show to be genetically related to the A languages, cannot be related to these languages, since these are not even related to one another (cf. Doerfer 1974) – after all, even given the above percentages of 16% and 22% - these are – like amongst the FU languages – much to low in order to prove a genetical relationship.

Our conclusion is simple: neither the FU nor the A languages form a language family, since they can in no way be genetically related. This thus, of course, not exclude mutual borrowings or the existence of Sprachbünden between these languages.

A next question is, how the respective relationships look in other language families. Are there even real language families or not, and if yes, how do the respective percentages of their relationships look like? From an important article by Samuel H. Elbert, we get the following percentages for the Malayo-Polynesian (MP) languages:

Futunan vs. other MP languages:	63.9%
Uvean vs. other MP languages:	61.6%
Niue vs. other MP languages:	55.1%
Tongan vs. other MP languages:	53.7%
Tikopian vs. other MP languages:	66.9%

Ellice Island vs. other MP languages:	64.9%
Samoan vs. other MP languages:	58.3%
Sikiana vs. other MP languages:	56.8%
Fila vs. other MP languages:	55.8%
Ongtong Java vs. other MP languages:	53.5 %
Nukuoro vs. other MP languages:	49.2%
Kapingamarangi vs. other MP languages:	49.5%
Easter Island vs. other MP languages:	63.1%
Marquesan vs. other MP languages:	71.2%
Mangarevan vs. other MP languages:	69.2%
Rarotongan vs. other MP languages:	82.5%
Tuamotuan vs. other MP languages:	79.6%
Maori vs. other MP languages:	72.0%
Hawaiian vs. other MP languages:	76%

One gets a total average of 63.3%, whereby the maximal value is 86% (Uvean = Tongan) and the minimal value is 44% (Nukuoro = Mangarevan). The MP languages, therefore, do form a language family – unlike FU and A.

According to an earlier study of mine, English and German share 70.0% of their vocabulary and the Slavonic languages amongst themselves according to a study by Fodor (1961) even almost 90%. Moreover, Kroeber and Chrétien have shown (1937, 1938) that the percentage of relationship between the IE languages is higher than 70%, so that we can conclude that the IE languages, too, form a language family – unlike FU and A.

4. Conclusions

In his influenceful book „The science of language“, in 1891, F. Max Müller, comprised amongst the „Turanian language family“ the following language families: Samoyedic, Tungusic, Mongolic, Turkic, Finnic (incl. Hungarian), Taic, Malaic, Gangetic, Lohitic, Munda, Tamulic. The Turanian languages thus comprise, according to Müller, not only the FU and A languages, but a geographically vastly extended group of languages reaching, roughly speaking, from the Ice Sea via China to the South Seas.

In my „Etymological Dictionary of Hungarian“ (EDH), I have shown that following the identity of at least 1042 basic Sumerian words with their respective Hungarian cognates according to Gostony (1975), all of Müller’s language families are genetically related with one another – up to a certain degree that goes from 61% down to 3%:

Hungarian (100%) > Chinese (61%) > IE (58.3%) > Turkish (55%) > Tibeto-Burman (ca. 50%) > Dravidian (36%) > Munda (33%) = Etruscan (ca. 33%) > “FU” languages (31.9%) > Japanese (23%) > Mayan (11%) > Bantu (8%) > Caucasian (7%) > Austronesian (incl. Mon Khmer, Australian and Tasmanian) (3%).

In default of reliable historical dictionaries using strict sound-laws, I did not treat other members of Müller’s language families (f. ex. Mongolian and Manchu as representatives of the A languages) that form the “macro-family” of the Turanian languages. Although Müller’s method – the reconstruction of proto-languages – and my method used in EDH – the reconstruction of sound-laws given a common ancestor language – are not the same, both methods lead to the same languages and language “families”, but the number of languages and language families shown in EDH is even larger than Müller’s. It is thus important to state that the languages of such a vast area from Europe to Tasmania, as presented in EDH, are only related to one another because they share their common ancestor, Sumerian, up to a certain degree. However, the languages in the above downward hierarchy, starting with Japanese, can hardly be considered to be genetically related to Sumerian, but even their low percentages show that Sumerian did not just die out when it was replaced, in the 17th century B.C., by Akkadian, but influenced most other languages in the world in an extremely vast area.

We can thus answer the question in our title: No, the Turanian language family is not a phantom, it exists – but only because all of its languages are related to their common ancestor language Sumerian. As shown in EDH, the Turanian language family is even much larger than it was assumed in the 19th century, when the Turanian concept was brought up. A simple example shall show what is meant here. As we have seen in chapter 3, Turkish and Manchu have no common word in the 100 words Swadesh list. From that one concludes that these languages are not related *in the Altaic language family*. However, this does not exclude that they are related in a bigger macro-family. For example, Latin cuprum and Greek kúprion are related *in the IE language family*, i.e. both cuprum and kúprion have a common ancestor word in the IE proto-language, but German Kupfer and English copper don’t, since they are borrowings from Latin cuprum. Thus, Kupfer and copper are not related either with one another *in the Germanic language family*, but they are in the IE language family. The same is true for Latin avunculus on the one side and German Onkel, English uncle on the other side. Latin avunculus developed to French onlce, and from here the German and English words have been borrowed, i.e. Onkel and uncle are not related in the Germanic language family, but they are related in the bigger IE family.

It is therefore possible using the simple Swadesh list and classical historical linguistics to prove that the FU and the A languages do not form language families. But while it is impossible with simple reconstruction of proto-languages to learn how far an ancestor language like Sumerian spread out, it is possible by comparing this assumed ancestor language with possible successor languages, using strict sound-equations and the best available dictionaries. Exactly the same method was used by Indo-Europeanists. Our method, however, is much more strict, since we compared always three or more languages at the same time. Our results go together with the basically historical results of Károly Dombi: "Thus, from the evidence left by this process of colonization, it appears that the Sumerian city-states were able to exert a preponderant economic, cultural, linguistic and ethnic influence during several thousand years not only in Mesopotamia and the rest of the Near East, but also beyond, in the Mediterranean Basin, in the Danubian Basin, in the regions North of the Caucasus and of the Black Sea, the Caspian-Aral, Volga-Ural, and Altai regions, as well as in Iran and India. It seems therefore that the Sumerians and their civilization had a determining influence not only on later Near-Eastern civilizations, but also on the Mediterranean, Indian, and even Chinese civilizations, as well as on the formation of the various Eurasian ethno-linguistic groups" (Dombi 2001, p. 7).

5. Bibliography

- Blažek, Václav, Basic word lists of ancient languages of the Near East. In: Dhumbadji! 3/1, 1997, pp. 7-14
- Bobula, Ida, Sumerian Affiliations. Washington, DC 1951
- Bobula, Ida, A sumir-magyar rokonság kérdése. Buenos Aires 1982
- Bobula, Ida, Herencia de Sumeria. Córdoba 1967
- Bobula, Ida, Kétezer magyar név sumir eredete. Montreal 1970
- Bobula, Ida, Origin of the Hungarian Nation. Gainesville, FL 1966
- Clauson, Gerard, A lexicostatistical appraisal of the Altaic theory. In: Central Asiatic Journal 13/1, 1969, pp. 1-23
- Doerfer, Gerhard, Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neopersischen. Vol. I. Wiesbaden 1963
- Doerfer, Gerhard, Ist das Japanische mit den altaischen Sprachen verwandt? In: Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 124, 1974, pp. 103-142.
- Dombi, Charles (Károly), The controversy of the origins and early history of the Hungarians. In: <http://www.hunmagyar.org/history/hungaria.htm>
- Elbert, Samuel H., Internal relationships of polynesian languages and dialects. In: Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 9, 1953, pp. 147-153
- Erdélyi, István, Selkupisches Wörterverzeichnis. Budapest 1970
- Érdy, Miklós, A sumír, ural-altaij, magyar rokonság kutatásának története. New York 1974
- Fodor, István, The validity of glottochronology on the basis of the Slavonic languages. In: Studia Slavica 7, 1961, pp. 295-346
- Forster, Peter, Toth, Alfred und Bandelt, Hans-Jürgen, Evolutionary network analysis of word lists: visualising the relationship between Alpine Romance languages. In: Journal of Quantitative Linguistics 5/3, 1998, pp. 174-187
- Forster, Peter und Toth, Alfred, Toward a phylogenetic chronology of ancient Gaulish, Celtic, and Indo-European. In: Proceedings of the National Academy of Science 100/15 (July 2003), pp. 9079-9084
- Gostony, Colman-Gabriel, Dictionnaire d'étymologie sumérienne et grammaire comparée. Paris 1975
- Gulya, János, Eastern Ostyak Chrestomathy. Bloomington 1966
- Halloran, J.A. und Hámori, Fred, Sumir-Ural-Altaic Dictionary. <http://www2.4dcomm.com>
- Katzschmann, Michael, Deutsch-nganasanisches Wörterverzeichnis. Nganasanisches http://wwwuser.gwdg.de/~mkatzsc/d2_a_h.htm
- Kroeber, A.L. and C.D. Chrétien, Quantitative classification of Indo-European languages. In: Language 13, 1937, pp. 83-103
- Kroeber, A.L. and C.d. Chrétien, The statistical technique and Hittite. In: Language 14, 1938, pp. 69-71
- Lagercrantz, Eliel, Wörterbuch des Südlappischen. Oslo 1926
- Lakó, György et al., A magyar szókészlet finnugor elemei. 3 Bde. Budapest 1967-1978
- Marcantonio, Angela, The Uralic language family. Oxford 2002

- Molnár, Ferenc A., On the history of word-final vowels in the Permian languages. Szeged 1974
- Müller, F. Max, The Science of Language. Vol. I. London 1891
- Munkácsi, Bernát and Kálmán, Béla, Wogulisches Wörterbuch. Budapest 1986
- Neumann, W., Sistematikaline Eesti-Saksa Sõnaraamat. Tallinnas 1923
- Oláh, Béla, Édes magyar nyelvünk szumér erdete. Buenos Aires 1980
- Rabin, Chaim, Lexicostatistics and the internal divisions of Semitic. In: Bynon, James and Theodora (ed.), Hamito-Semitic. The Hague, Paris 1975, pp. 85-99
- Raun, Alo, Über die sogenannte lexikostatistische Methode oder Glottochronologie und ihre Anwendung auf das Finnisch-Ugrische und Türkische. In: Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher 28, 1956, pp. 151-154
- Rédei, Károly, Northern Ostyak Chrestomathy. Bloomington 1965
- Schulze, Brigitte, Der Wortparallelismus als ein Stilmittel der (nord-)ostjakischen Volksdichtung. Szeged 1988
- Sebeok, Thomas A. and Raun, Alo, The first Cheremis grammar (1775). Chicago 1956
- Sebeok, Thomas A. and Zeps, Valdis J., Concordance and thesaurus of Cheremis poetic language. 'S-Gravenhage 1961
- Steinitz, Wolfgang, Ostjakische Grammatik und Chrestomathie. Leipzig 1950
- Swadesh, Morris, Towards greater accuracy in lexicostatistic dating. In: International Journal of American Linguistics 21, 1955, pp. 121-137
- Swadesh list Estonian:
<http://www.rosettaproject.org/live/search/contribute/swadesh/view?ethnocode=EST>
- Swadesh list Finnish:
<http://www.rosettaproject.org/live/search/contribute/swadesh/view?ethnocode=FINN>
- Swadesh list Mordvin (Erzya):
<http://www.rosettaproject.org/live/search/contribute/swadesh/view?ethnocode=MYV>
- Szabó, László, Selkup texts. Bloomington 1967
- Wichmann, Yrjö, Syrjänischer Wortschatz, ed. by T.E. Uotila. Helsinki 1942
- Wiedemann, F.J., Syrjänisch-deutsches Wörterbuch mit einem wotjakisch-deutschen Anhange. St. Petersburg 1880
- Wiklund, K.B., Lule-Lappisches Wörterbuch. Helsingfors 1890
- Winkler, Eberhard, Udmurt. München 2001
- Zakar, András, A sumér nylevből. Fahrwangen 1975

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



ALFRÉD TÓTH was born in 1965 in St. Gallen (Switzerland), his native tongue is Hungarian. Received two PhD's (1989 Mathematics, University of Zurich; 1992 Philosophy, University of Stuttgart) and an MA (General and Comparative Linguistics, Finno-Ugristics and Romanistics, University of Zurich 1991). Mr. Tóth is since 2001 Professor of Mathematics (Algebraic Topology) in Tucson, Arizona. He is member of many mathematical, semiotic, cybernetic and linguistic societies and scientific board member of eight international journals. Lives in Tucson and Szombathely where his family comes from.