Sumerian grammatical examples compared to Hungarian

Fred Hamori

This is in response to those who claim that in spite of the many common Sumerian, Hungarian, FinnUgor and even Altaic words, there is little similarity in grammar, which of course has been evolving in the interim and is not static. I show a few examples of Sumerian grammar and word order in relation to Hungarian examples to show that there is not a big difference between them, with explanation of the word particles. To those who expect identity of the two languages this will be a letdown, but what can you expect after 4,000 years difference. To those many detractors who say there is absolutely nothing in common between them, I can only say −that's not how I see it and we shall never agree! You can shut your eyes to it but it won't go away. To those who see in this some kind of racist or nationalistic trip I say to IndoEuropanist especially, look in the works of many IE scholars and you will find ample examples of it, but this has nothing to do with it and makes no claim of continuity or identity only a relatedness through a larger language family than what has been "allowed" non−IndoEuropeanis languages. Don't lump all people who talk about this link together, there is no identity in our capabilities or goals, there is no conspiracy to dupe anyone. I don't really care if you takethis work seriously or not, it's your choice. Decide what you will after reading this.
Fred Hamori

Sumerian word order is S−O−V Subject Object Verb. This is also the normal Hungarian word order unless stress is placed on who is doing what.

Subscripts under Sumerian word roots are defining certain specific homonims.

Example #1, from Ryans examples of basic Sumerian phrases:

English	Then	(he)−		laid−out	this	house	there	−according−to	(the) plan.
Sequence	7	(89)		6	2	1	5	4	3
Sumerian:	e_2	− a	hur	−bi	im	−g'ar$_2$	−r $_x$	−g'ar$_2$	−r$_x$
Sequence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Hungarian	ház	−at	terv	szerint	ott	készit	−et		−e
Sequence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		9

As can be seen its pointless to compare English grammar here so I will not do so from here on. Its structureand method of creating ideas is drastically different to Sumerian and makes sumerian sound weird, but it really is not, just not well understood and difficult to force into an English comparison. The situation is quite different with Hungarian. Even though the two are obviously not identical languages they share many common features.

1)e= house (Hungarian ház or hey=place) 2)a=at,the (Hungarian ot,a) 3)hur=plan (Hungarian terv) 4)bi=according to (Hungarian szerint) 5)im=there/at/the (Hungarian o−t, a) 6)g'ar= make, build "laid out" (Hungarian gyárt=manufacture, but to simply make is készit) 7)duplication implies repetitive or continuing action. 8)The e at the end of the Hungarian cluster adds a pronoun he/she who did this (x), whereas Sumerian doesn't bother with it.

The word order is nearly backward in English as we find when comparing English to Hungarian. Here 8−9 are irrelevant since they are a reduplication which in Sumerian emphasized the continuous action, which in Hungarian is done by the suffix −tat− , −tet− . To this Hungarian added the undefined person doing it as the

−e at the end of the sentence. Note however that the order is the same. Also to "lay out" a house is actually an expression stated quite differently in Sumerian using g'ar−r−g'ar−r, a word which goes back to saying build/form and is also found in Hungarian as gyárt meaning manufacture, gyár=factory. The duplicated form is stating the continuing action and process.

The Sumerian word "hur"=plan, is suspected to be related to _ért =understanding, knowing in Hungarian which is the source of a thought out plan or consideration, rather than the new Hungarian term terv The Sumerian a =that is the same in Hungarian and is normally the start of the subject, but the suffix −at is also a marker for "that" and normally is all thats really required.

Word usage for certain things change but the root words still maintain generally similar meanings. As Ryan mentions the sentence does not really need a subject who is doing the action in Sumerian, and really doesnt need it in Hungarian. However Hungarian has been heavily "Europeanized" over a millenium so that there are now also forms which mimick the conventional European forms. Yet are not necessary. The explanation of the Sumerian form was not mine but a totally impartial writer who would never consider Hungarian to be a possible comparison, and who would rather compare Sumerian to Basque. Yet the order is the same and is quite correct.

Example #2:

English rough translation:

Then with regard to the Lady, the possesor of 'sewing needle' at the time (of the) opening (of) a steady eye toward there, toward her city. This explanation is rather complex because it is trying to express the Sumerian equivalent in English which is just plain very differnent in the way it conveys the same thing.

Sumerian:

Sumerian	ud	Nin	−gir$_2$su	−ke$_4$	uru	−ni	−še$_3$	igi	zid	im	−ši	−bar
Sequence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

Hungarian	akor a	tü	−néni	−nek	város	á	−hoz	biztos	szem	−et	a−hoz	nyitás
Sequence	1+the	3	−2	− 4	5	6	7	9	8	10	11	12

1) ud=time/then, (Hungarian "idö", however "at the time of" or "then" is "akor") 2) Nin=lady, (Hungarian néni=lady & nén=aunt) 3) girsu=needle, (this is really from two roots gir+su, Hungarian tü=needle) 4) ke$_4$=regard to/ of, (of the, genetive in Hungarian is −nak) 5) uru=city, (old Hungarian uru−as, modern vár−os) 6) ni=of/hers, (genetive suffix in Hungarian −nak or −é) Sumerian also has −e genetive. 7) s^e=toward (Hungarian suffix −hoz) 8) igi=eye (Hungarian szem, but to keep an eye on is "ügy−el" 9) zid =steady (I substituded certain here as it makes more sense in Hungarian "biz" which is also found in Sumerian. "buzur") 10) im=there (there and the very similar "a" in Hungarian) 11) ši =toward (Hungarian −hoz) 12) bar=spliting>opening (opening is "nyitás" but to cut, carve is "fur, far−ag" much like bar) 13) ra=at (same)

The word order is nearly the same and means the same. However the expected object is missing due to our Europeanized speech. The meaning is not convoluted as in English but natural. Common words idö is much the same as Sumerian however mikor is used when refering to at the time/that is "when". Hungarian uses "id−én" for "this year" rather than for "then". The roots of "akor" Hungarian word are Sumerian also. In Hungarian when expressing the idea of "lady of the needle" or a seamstress we would use a different term "varro" =a sew−er. The word complex A is reversed in that the lady−of and needle are swapped. This can be found in archaic Hungarian expressions however but no longer used. In Hungarian the adjective leads the subject and this is the other way in Sumerian. Igi−zid . The English explanation however states that −ra reffers to the time and not to the opening. In that case the splitting of the modifier to the opposite sides of the sentence away from the modified subject is a unique Sumerian feature, which doesn't make much sense but this is what is generally stated in various references. This changes the meaning to:

Then−**for** (regarding)/toward the (lady of the needle)'s city a steady eye toward the opening.

Rather than what I have in Hungarian "Then (regarding)/toward the (lady of the needle's) city a steady eye **for** it's opening." This is a natural Hungarian way to add for−the−opening. The emphasis changes to <u>for the lady</u>

in the Sumerian case and for the opening in the Hungarian case, but the overal meaning is the same in English, which cant emphasize this difference simply.

Example 3:

Natural English order: Never shall any man lodge a word(claim).

Sumerian order: man not−say word never− (at)there−place−place.

Sumerian:	lu_2	na	−me	inim	nu		−um	−g'a_2(r_x)	−g'a_2(r_x)
Sequence	1	2	3	4	5		6	7	8
Hungarian	ö	ne	−mond	szav−at	soha	a	hely	−ek	− en
Sequence	1	2	3	4	5	the	7	8	6

1) lu =man, person (ö in Hungarian is an undetermined person, he, she, it) 2) na =not (Hungarian ne=don't, nem=not) 3) me =say (Hungarian mond =say) 4) inim =word (Hungarian szó) 5) nu =never (Hungarian soha=never, but ne=dont) 6) um =at,the (Hungarian a, az) 7) g'a (often ki) =place (Hungarian hely=place < *kil) 8) duplication implies a plural in archaic Sumerian.(Hungarian k=plural)

One obvious difference that instead of using reduplication of the place a plural suffix is added which is more in line with the personal plural suffixes. Also Hungarian adds a special marker to the subject of the sentence in the form "−at". This translates into modern Hungarian as follows: "He doesnt say (any) words ever in places. Not exactly as the English would say it nor as modern Hungarian would like to say it in a more precise manner, but it still is understandable but a bit primitive as expected. Again the locative −um in Hungarian has moved to the end of the cluster. The summerian nu in Hungarian has a special term for never, but most negatives use "ne" , meaning "dont" . If we substitute this it becomes even better. He doesnt say words, dont (say) in the places. It sounds fine and the meaning is clearer if we translate it this way.

Example #4:

English normal: Then (he) reached there.

Actual sequence: then−(on) there go.

Sumerian	im	−mä	−g'en
Sequence	1	2	3
Hungarian	ime	meg	−jön
Sequence	1	2	3

1) im =then (Hungarian normally would use akor), hower ime=thusly 2) ma =there, at (Hungarian ot, a however −ne,nen is aslo a locative) 3) g'en =to go (Hungarian megy, however gyön, jön=come)

Hungarian version akor oda megy = then (it) goes to there.

There is no need for a subject and its fine. The problem with the sentence is there is no implication of reaching a destination in Hungarian and

Sumerian grammatical examples compared to Hungarian

I really wonder if there is one in Sumerian based on the words. Unles the explanation of the "MA" suffix is wrong and it should be the perfect case instead of there. In that case we would say in Hungarian

Akor meg−jön. meaning "then (he) came/arrived." which means the same as "Then he reached there." If we wanted to make a point that he arrived then Hungarian could say "Ime meg−jön" . Thus! it arives. This looks nearly identical to the Sumerian example and means roughly the same.

Example 5:

English normal: The man that then shall remove something from there, from the E−ninnu. ??? a bit confusing even this way.

Actual sequence: man E−ninnu−from then−there−from−some−go−out−go−out−this.

Sumerian:	lu_2	E−ninnu	−ta	im−	ta−	ab	e_3	e_3	−a
sequence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Hungarian	Ö	E−ninnu	−tol	akor	valami−t	ki	−megy		
Should be	Ö	E−ninnu	−tol	akor	valami−t	ki	−vi	− tet	−i.
Sequence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

This seems like a rough translation and may be unreliable because of it.

lu_2 =man, person (Hungarian ö) E−ninnu =a name of a house im =then, the (akor, a) ta− =from (Hungarian −tol (also U.A.) ab =some (valami) e_3 =go out (jár=move, ki megy =go out.. if its proper explanation) a =this (Hungarian e, ez)

the duplication of e3 implies repetitive action (Hungarian −tat =repetitive action) The word for word explanation says He/she from Eninnu then shall go out whereas replacing go out with take out in the second version agrees with the "correct?" translation. The −i at the end of the Hungarian sentence does not mean "this" but the person (he/she/it) is again mentioned. Therefore it means: He/she/person took/removed something from E−ninnu. Perfectly same meaning and same word order as Sumerian. Even some suffixes and particles agree. Reduplication is an archaic feature in Sumerian and later it was not as heavily used. Similarly there are some reduplicated words in Hungarian expressing the same idea, but are very uncommon.

Example #6:

English normal: (He) deposited (by rolling) thither all the large stones for it as boulders.

Actual order: stone−large−large−its boulder−at thither−into−bring.

Sumerian		na−	gal−	gal−	bi	lagab		−a	mi−	ni−	$dê_6$
Sequence		1	2	3	4	5		6	7	8	9

Hungarian	(a)	nagy	köv−	−ek	−et	rög	−ként	a−	ra	be−	hoz
Sequence	(the)	2	1	3	4	5	−as	6	7	8	9

1) na=stone (Hungarian kö (in Sumerian ku=metal)) 2) gal =big (Hungarian nagy (in Sumerian nag=fat)) 3) gal =big (the reduplication makes bignes a plural whereas hungarian has the plural on the stone, as −ek.) 4) bi =its (Hungarian −nak is genetive whether its a person or object, Sumerian separates inanimates) 5) lagab =boulder (Hungarian [L/R] rög=big chunk of earth, Summerian ab ending for objects dropped) 6) a =at (Hungarian ot, a−) 7) mi =thither (Hungarian a−ra =to there, thither) 8) ni =into (Hungarian be =into, however Sumerian also has eb, ib=inside, related to building in Hungarian ép−ül−et.) 9) dê 6= bring (Hungarian hoz=bring)

Again the adjective leads in Hungarian, but otherwise its the same. It's meaning is: "The large rocks are brought in as boulders". This is very close to the intended meaning and is very similar in word order to Sumerian. Again the archaic Sumerian reduplication is dropped and the plural suffix "−ek" is used instead in Hungarian. I have references that the hard H is also used as a plural suffix in Sumerian but it is reserved for animals, not things or people. My presumption has been that the personal plural suffix ne in sumerian is all derived from a common archaic ng root, which in some later languages changed and became n and others k.

The word order and meaning is not very different between Hungarian and Sumerian, so that the many common root words, which by the way are sometimes used differently, are very interesting to compare. Suffixes and prefixes all originate from commonly used independent words, however there are often several different words which mean similar things, so we find the basic root words to be common but sometimes one language in the family uses one particular source for the suffix or prefix while the other uses another. The same thing happened with the number system.