

REMARKS ON V. G. EGOROV'S ETYMOLOGICAL
DICTIONARY OF THE CHUVASH LANGUAGE⁺

by

HASAN EREN

In point of vocalism and grammatical structure, the Chuvash language has a special place among Turkic languages. For that reason, it seemed essential that Turcologists study the Chuvash language and determine its place among the Turkic languages by taking into consideration questions of phonetics and grammar. Several European scholars have joined in this activity. As it became clear that, in addition to Hungarian and Cheremis (Mari), a good many languages had been affected by Chuvash, Hungarian and Finnish scholars in particular have made special efforts in that field. Of the Hungarian scholars, J. Budenz, Z. Gombocz, J. Németh and L. Ligeti may be mentioned as examples. Of Finnish scholars, Y. Wichmann, H. Paasonen, G. J. Ramstedt and M. Räsänen deserve notice. N. Poppe has also discussed the subject.

During World War II, J. Benzing was studying the Chuvash language in Germany, while in Denmark, K. Grønbech kept going the Chuvash dialect studies, a tradition since V. Grønbech began work in this field. O. Pritsak, as well, wrote some valuable papers on like subjects.

⁺ First published in Turkish: Çuvuş Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü: Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten 1972, pp. 241-265.

In Russia, N.I. Ašmarin was the most prominent specialist in Chuvash language. It was particularly through his Thesaurus linguae Tschuvaschorum that Ašmarin became well-known. In recent years, V.G. Egorov has published some papers of value on the subject. Egorov's first major work was published in 1930. As a continuation of that work he recently published a Chuvash etymological dictionary (1964).

Egorov's above-mentioned work has aroused wide scientific interest since its publication. Of its review and critical notices in learned journals, K.H. Menges's (1968a) and J. Németh's works (1970) deserve mention. Following in their footsteps, I wish to make my comments on Egorov's dictionary.

On page 30, Egorov compares the Chuvash form of the word arāk, arkā 'skirt' to the Turkish etek, which in my view is incorrect. The Turkic sound -t- (< OT ^x-t-) has been retained by the Chuvash language. It is well-known, however, that the OT ^x-d- has become -r- in Chuvash, as e.g., in OT ^xadaq > Chuv. ura 'foot'. OT ^xqadiŋ > Chuv. xurān 'beech tree'. The Turkic word etek takes the form etek or itek in every dialect. The form edek to be found in Altai (Oirat), Teleut and Shor is secondary. Thus we cannot assume the existence of the form edek in

Old Turkic. Consequently, it would be erroneous to relate the Chuvash word arāk to the Turkic etek.

On pages 31-32, Egorov states that the Chuvash word arāslan 'lion' is a borrowing from Tatar. Nevertheless, an archaic form of this word: uslan kayāk (kayāk) is still used by the Chuvash people.

It is quite clear from the entry that Egorov was unaware of the existence of a number of papers about the word arslan. We may pass over the fact that he does not seem to have read L. Patrubányi's article (1881), but he should have made use of the conclusions drawn in the seminal essay of W. Bang (1916-17). A. Ščerbak in his work (1961) turned to account both Patrubányi's and Bang's conclusions (pp. 137-138). But it seems like Egorov had not read those works, and his sources did not range beyond the writings of Ramstedt and Ščerbak.

J. Németh (1942) made comments upon the etymology of the Turkish word arslan. Ščerbak, who also discussed the etymology of the word, had no knowledge of Németh's paper. This fact makes us understand why Egorov, like Ščerbak, has not come to hear about the paper.

On page 32, under the heading arman 'mill', Egorov gives the cognates of the Turkish word değirmen in other Turkic languages: Kirgiz tegirmen, Uzbek teğirmon, Turkmen degirmen, Kara-Kalpak digirman. It is quite

clear that the Chuv. arman (< avärman) can be traced back to the stem avär- (~ evir-) 'to turn'. In fact, there is no difference between the structure of this word and değirmen. However, the cognates of değirmen in the other Turkic languages should not have been entered.

The Chuvash word aşak 'ass' on p. 38 is a loan-word from Tatar.

On p. 46, when enumerating the cognates of the Chuvash word valak (or vulak) 'groove', Egorov mixed up the Turkic forms oluk and yalak. It goes without saying that the Chuv. valak has been traced back to oluq. Thus the inclusion of yalak in addition to olaq is wrong. Recently, also, the Hungarian word vályú has been traced back to Chuvash (Palló 1971a, p. 85).

On p. 48, after the Turkic cognates of the Chuvash word vākār (or mākār) 'ox', the Hungarian word ökör should have been mentioned, as well. Moreover, the author should have taken into consideration the publications about the origin of this word by J. Németh and G. J. Ramstedt.

On p. 60, having enumerated the cognates of the Chuvash word yevčĕ 'matchmaker', the Turkish elçi, Bashk. yausi, Tat. yauči, Kara-Kalpak ǰauşı, Turkmen savči, the author adds the comment that the word elçi

derives from the Turkic stem el, il.

This entry needs elaboration on more than one account:

/1/ the Chuvash word yevčĕ cannot be related to the Turkish elçi,

/2/ the Turkish word elçi cannot be traced back to the stem el (or il),

/3/ the Chuvash word cannot be compared to the Tatar form yauči (~ Bashk. yauči),

/4/ no connection whatever is to be supposed between the Tatar word yauči and the Turkmen savči.

I would argue that of the forms given by Egorov, the Tatar word yauči alone can be taken into consideration.

On p. 73 Egorov, besides enumerating the cognates of the Chuvash word yăva 'nest, home', touches upon the question of tracing back the Turkish word yuva (~ uya) to the word (stem) öy-, üy- 'to prevent, to stop'. To the best of my knowledge, the origin of the Turkish word yuva has been unidentified to this day. But, at any rate, it cannot be connected with the stem öy-, üy-. And in this ten-try the author should have disclosed that the word yăva was borrowed into Chuvash from the neighbouring languages.

Similarly, it is quite clear that the Chuv. yăvaš 'slow' is another borrowing from Tatar.

I could not find the form yīfi, suggested by the

author to be the cognate of the Chuvash word yāvǎ on page 73, when trying to look it up in Mahmud Kāšgarī's Divan (Brockelmann). In addition to this, Egorov includes the following forms: Turkish koyu, Bashk. quyi, Nogay qoyi, Kazakh and Kara-Kalpak qoyu. To the Nogay word qoyi the author has attached the word yiyi 'thick', as well.

In my opinion, the Chuvash word yāvǎ should not have been compared to any other form but yiyi. It is a known fact that the Turkic sound q- changed to y- in several Chuvash words, e. g. Turkic qal- ~ Chuv. yul-, Turkic qan ~ Chuv. yun, Turkic qar- ~ Chuv. yur. (The Chuvash cognate of the Turkic word qanat is śunat which, doubtlessly, goes back to the form ⁺yunat.) Consequently, it may be supposed that the Chuvash form yāvǎ is derived from the word qoyu. Nevertheless, it is the Nogay word yiyi, which seems to be the most closely related to the Chuv. yāvǎ, both in point of phonetics and of semantics.

On p. 74, Egorov states that he could not find the counterparts of the Chuvash word yāmǎk 'sister' in the other Turkic languages. As mentioned also by Egorov, G. J. Ramstedt (1922-23, p. 20) traced back this word to the Turkic quma 'second wife'. Yet, Ramstedt's comparison cannot be easily adopted. It would be difficult to connect the two words even in terms of phonetics. We are aware of the fact that the Turkic sound q- changed to

γ- in many Chuvash words (e. g. , Turkic gal-, qan, qin Chuv. yul, yun, yěně). But it cannot be supposed that, as a result of the above sound-change, a form like the Chuv. yāmāk developed from the Turkic quma. L. Ligeti argued (1938) that the sound-change q- > γ-, which has taken place in Chuvash, can be observed in words containing a long vowel. With the word quma, this is out of the question. We have no alternative but to adopt the opinion of G. Doerfer, who argues that the Turkic quma is a loan-word in Turkish from Mongolian (I, item 287).

On p. 75, the author has failed to indicate the fact that the Chuvash words yāmran and yānāš were borrowed into Chuvash from Tatar.

Similarly, it is evident that the Chuvash word yāpar has also been borrowed from the neighbouring languages. Moreover, the author has failed to mention that the Turkic yipar has a counterpart in Hungarian (the Hungarian word gyopár). Recently, in 1969, an excellent paper was written on the Hungarian word gyopár by L. Ligeti.

On page 76, the author states that the derivation of the Chuvash word yārana 'stirrup' is unknown to him. H. Paasonen (1908), connected this word with the Turkic word ūzeñi. Following Paasonen, Z. Gombocz also adopted this comparison (1902a).

The question of the Turkic counterparts of the

Chuvash word yěner 'saddle' on page 78 is rather complex. Egorov has listed the various forms of the Turkic word eyer (< eder) (eyer, eger, ezer ...) as cognates. It follows from the above instances that the Turkic word eyer goes back to the form eder. The counterpart of the Turkic sound -d- is supposed to be -r- in Chuvash, as in the Turkic adaq 'foot' ~ Chuv. ura, Turkic adıq 'sober' Chuv. ură, etc. Consequently, in Chuvash, the form ^xerer should be inferred to be the counterpart of the Turkic word eder. Thus, whether the Chuv. yěner could be compared with the Turkic eyer (eger, ezer), ~~is a~~ question to be considered carefully.

On page 84, Egorov has confined himself to comparing the Chuvash form kavăn 'gourd' with the Turkic qavun (Tat. qavın, Turkmen gavın ...). It is evident that this word has been adopted into Chuvash from the neighbouring Turkic languages.

As to the derivation of the Turkic word qavun from Arabian, I am quite certain that this is absolutely improper. This word, which has long been current in the Turkic languages, cannot be of Arabic derivation.

On page 88, the author has added the form kenevir to the Turkish word kendir as a cognate of the Chuv. kantăr 'hemp'. In my view, under the Chuvash word kantăr, it would have been sufficient to list the form

kendir, still current in most Turkic languages, as a cognate. However, the word kenevir, which is not represented in any other Turkish dialect except that of Anatolia, cannot be compared with the Turkic kendir. If at all, only the stems of the two words could be connected.

It is a known fact that several words analogous to kendir may be found in Greek, German, and the Slavic languages. These words were dealt with in a publication by Z. Gombocz (1927).

It is also known that the Hungarian word kender 'hemp' has been taken into Hungarian from Turkic (Gombocz, 1912, pp. 92-93). This word was classed by Gombocz among Bulgar-Turkic loan-words. Consequently, the Hung. kender may have been grouped under kantár.

On pages 88-89, Egorov has grouped together into the cognates of the Chuv. kap 'shape, form' the Turkic forms qap and kep. In my view, he should not have confused the qap with kep. It is obvious that it is the Turkic word kep, which the Chuv. kap can be related to. The Hungarian word kép 'picture' has also been adopted from Turkic (Gombocz, 1912, pp. 93-94).

On page 95, under kačaka 'goat', Egorov has failed to refer to the Hungarian word kecske. Yet, this is the form, which is the most closely related to the Chuvash form kačaka. If Egorov had taken this fact into consid-

eration, he could not have traced back the Chuvash word kačaka to the form kača taka.

Under this heading, the author should also have discussed, besides the Turkic word keči, the form eči, represented in all the other Turkic dialects. Z. Gombocz, when listing the Turkic cognates of the Hungarian word kecske, first wanted to distinguish the form eči from the word keči, but in his later works he dealt more and more often with the close connection between the two words. J. Németh (1942, pp. 286-300) though agreeing with Gombocz's view, was not against comparing the Turkic word keči (~ keči) with the form eči. Like Németh, T. Halasi-Kun, in his work on the dropping out of the Kipchak sound k-, connected the Turkic forms keči and eči (1950, pp. 50-51). Finally, A. M. Ščerbak (1961) took the view that the forms keči and eči can be traced back to a common stem.

In J. Németh's above-mentioned work, the etymology of the word keči can also be found; in my paper (1953, p. 55), I also attempted to support this etymology by supplying a new piece of evidence.

Ščerbak stated in his above-mentioned work that the Chuv. kačaka was a loan-word from Russian. The Bashk. keze and the Tat. kāzā are also supposed to be loan-words but the Chuv. kačaka can have nothing in common

with the Russian koza.

Egorov needn't have referred to the Kazakh, Kirgiz, Kara-Kalpak teke at all, if ečki, a word current in the Turkic languages, has not been included.

On page 95, as well, after listing the Turkic cognates of the Chuvash word kašăk 'spoon', he did not indicate that this word has been taken into the Chuvash language from Tatar dialects.

Egorov has compared the Chuvash word kăvakal 'duck' with the Bashkir and Tatar kügel, as well as the Kirgiz kögöl 'drake'. This comparison, known for a long time, was established by Paasonen. Yet, the author was not completely satisfied with this comparison, and suggested that this word might be traced back to an onomatopoeic kva kva, in imitation of the duck's quack.

The Turkic languages have some bird-names going back to onomatopes, such as the Turkish ibibik, karga, saksagan... Yet, it hardly seems probable that the Chuv. kăvakal should prove to be such an onomatope.

The word kăvakal means 'duck' in Chuvash. The current meaning of the above-mentioned Bashkir, Tatar, and Kirgiz forms is 'drake'. It is well-known that, in the dialects of Anatolia, the Turkish gövel means a 'green-headed duck'. I argued in an article of mine (1958) treating the words derived from the Turkish word gök

'sky'. Besides the word gövel 'duck', the word yeşilbaş 'drake' is also used by the Turks of Anatolia. Thus, the word kögöl (~ kügel), common in Turkic languages, may be used with the meaning 'drake', anyway. Among the derivatives of the Turkic gök, several bird-names can be found. It will suffice to mention the Turkish word güvercin (Chuv. kāvakarčän 'pigeon'). It is evident that this word is a derivative of the Turkish stem gök (Chuv. kāvak). The Chuvash word kāvakarčän has been explained by Egorov, too, in terms of kāvak. Consequently, the Chuvash word kāvakal 'duck' cannot be supposed to be an onomatopoe.

D.S. Setarov (1970, p. 89) states that the Russian gogol' is a loan-word adopted into Russian from Turkish. Equally, F.P. Filin (1962, p. 210) takes this word for an onomatopoe.

On page 97, when listing the Turkic cognates of the Chuvash word kāvar 'a live coal from a fire, embers', Egorov also gives the Turkish form kor 'a live coal'. It is well-known that both kor and köz are forms in use in Anatolia. In the form köz, this word is also represented in the Altai dialects. In some of these dialects, the form kos occurs, as well. It is obvious that the latter goes back to the form koz.

In addition to köz, another form, kor is employed in Turkish. This form has long been connected with the

word qoz (> qos), current in the Turkic languages. In this respect, Egorov was quite right to group both kor and köz with the cognates of the Chuv. kävar. Yet, Egorov has not confined himself to including the above-mentioned forms under this heading, he has also added the Turkmen hovur 'heat', the Turkish kavur-, the Uzbek kovur-, and some other like words.

There is no connection whatever between the Turkic words köz (~ qoz) ~ qor and qavur-. Thus, it was wrong of Egorov to include the word kavur- under this heading.

Right at the end, Egorov states that this Turkic word is an old loan-word from Persian.

The Turkic form raises several problems that should be discussed: which is the older form, koz (~ köz), current in Turkic languages or kor, represented in the dialects of Anatolia and the Balkans? Again, is there any connection between the Turkic word köz (~ qoz) and the Teleut kō 'soot'? Can any connection be supposed between the above-mentioned words and the stem köy- (~ küy-) 'to burn'? Couldn't the Turkish word kömür 'coal' be derived from that stem? As long as we have no answers to these questions, it will be a difficult problem to enter into etymological arguments.

At the end of the entry, Egorov, has also added the stem küy- (~ köy-) 'to burn', current in Turkic lan-

guages.

On page 97, Egorov has given as a cognate of the Chuvash word kăykăr 'falcon', the Bashkir word qıyır 'harrier (for hunting hens)' alone. Yet, this word is represented in several Turkic languages in the form qırçıy 'hawk'. Consequently, The Chuv. kăykăr is a metathetical variant for the word qırçıy. The metathesis in this word may be supported by the instance of the Turkish word toygar 'lark'. The old form of the word torgay is represented in several Turkic languages. In J. Németh's view (1943, p. 101), even the Hung. karvaly (Turkic qırçıy) may be considered a Turkic loan-word.

On page 100, when discussing the Chuvash word kărkka 'turkey', notice may have been taken of the Turkish word gurk (~ kurk), too. In Turkish, this word means both 'turkey cock' and 'brood-hen'. In the Anatolian dialects, forms like gurk- (~ kurk) are used together with gürk- (~ kürk), gulk, guluk (~ kuluk), güllük (~ küllük), küllük, etc. In Anatolia, the forms culuk (~ cüllük) culluk, çuluk, etc. have been adopted, as well.

On page 101, under kăsamăk 'measles', Egorov has derived the Turkic qızamıq from qızıl amaç!

This is a bad etymology without any serious foundation. The author has admitted under this heading that the Chuv. kăsamăk is a Tatar loan-word; he has even record-

ed the Old Chuvash a cognate of the word qizamïq (xěrlěxen). It is characteristic of the entire dictionary that Egorov, treating words borrowed from Tatar, does not indicate this explicitly. The Tatar words must be indicated as such - as under this heading - otherwise those unacquainted with phonetical characteristics of the Chuvash language may not easily recognize this fact.

On page 105, under kěntěk 'navel', Hung. köldök 'navel', may have been added to the Kirgiz, Kazakh, Uzbek, and Tatar data (Z. Gombocz, 1912, pp. 103-104).

Paasonen compared the Chuvash word kěpe 'shirt' with the word kübe 'armour'. On pages 105-106, when listing the Turkic cognates of the word kěpe, Egorov has added to the kübe the Turkish kab, kap, the Altai and Shor kep, the Khakass kip 'example, pattern', the Nogay qapčiq, the Tatar qapčiq, the Uzbek qop, qopčiq 'sack', the Turkish kebe 'cloak', etc. -yet there is no connection whatever between these words and the Chuv. kěpe. The Turkish word kap cannot be connected with the Chuv. kěpe, either in terms of phonetics or in those of semantics. The word kep 'example', as pointed out above, is a cognate of the Chuv. kap. Thus, the word kep need not have been included under kěpe.

As to the Turkish word kebe, in Anatolia this word has taken another form, as well, kepe. In A. Tietze's

view (1955, p.223, item 109), the form kebe has been adopted into Turkish from Armenian (gaba), and the form kepe from Greek. Consequently, the Turkish word kebe cannot be classed among the cognates of the Chuv. kēpe.

On page 109, when listing the cognates of the Chuvash word kěru < kěrev 'bridegroom', the author has added the Azerbaijani word küreken and the Turkmen word köreken to the forms küdegü, küvegü, küyö, küyö, küyü, küze, kütüö, güvey, etc.

At first sight, it seems that the word küreken (~ köreken) and the Chuvash word kěru (< kěrev) are very much alike in terms of phonetics and those of semantics. This likeness, however, is misleading. This word and the Chuv. kěru have nothing in common, because küreken (~ köreken) has been borrowed into the Turkic languages from Mongolian (Mong. kürgen > küregen 'bridegroom'). Therefore, the word küreken (~ köreken) cannot be classed among the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. kěru.

At present, the origin of the Turkish güvey (~ Chuv. kěru < küdegü) is controversial.

On page 110, Egorov has added to the cognates grouped under the Chuvash word kěsse 'felt' the Turkish (and Turkmen) keçe and other words current in the Turkic languages with the meaning 'felt', kiyiz, kiz, kigiz, kidis etc.

Under this heading, the author has confused two Turkic words, both meaning 'felt'. The Chuv. kěsse can be connected with the Turkish (and Turkmen) words keče, alone. No connection whatever can be supposed between the Kirgiz, Nogay, Kara-Kalpak, Uzbek forms kiyiz (< kigiz) and the word keče.

On page 111, the author states that he could not find a Turkic counterpart for the Chuvash word kivšen 'debt, loan', the only examples quoted by him are the Hung. kölcsön and the Mong. kölösün on the authority of Z. Gorabocz's work (1912). The Yakut word kölösön 'sweat' has escaped the author's attention.

The Hung. kölcsön was last dealt with by L. Ligeti (1935, pp. 232-33). In his view, the Yakut kölösün is a loan-word from Mongolian (p. 234). In the above paper, Ligeti referred to every Chuvash word borrowed from Mongolian. For that reason, it seems to be a serious shortcoming of not only the above entry, but also of the entire dictionary, that Egorov has taken no notice of Ligeti's work.

The derivation of the Yakut word kölösün (> kölöštün) from Mongolian has also been adopted by Stanislaw Kałużiński (1961, p. 82).

On p. 112, the Hung. kölyű 'pounder' may have been included under the Chuvash kilě 'large stone or wooden

mortar'. This word is known to be taken into Hungarian from Turkic. (Gombocz, 1912, p.104).

In the Turkic dialects, the word soqu 'stone mortar for pounding' is also represented, as well as this form. In the Anatolian dialects this word was supplanted, except for a small area, by the word dibek. A paper of mine, discussing the derivation of the word dibek is to come out in the near future.

I also propose to treat the Chuv. maksăma 'beer' (p.128). The author has recorded the Kirgiz maqsım 'a drink made from fermented barley without malt' and the Tatar forms maqsıma, maqsım, as the cognates of the Chuvash word; and has presumed that the etymology of the word is unknown. The author may not have noticed my contribution to the Körösi Csoma Archivum (1941-43, pp. 130-132).

On page 118, under kunča 'boot-leg or leg of a boot or stocking', the author has derived the Turkic word qonč from the stem kön 'coarse leather'. I am convinced that no connection whatever can be supposed between the Turkic words qonč and kön (> gön), either in terms of phonetics, or in terms of grammatical structure, or those of semantics.

On page 118, the word kupäs 'violin' is undoubtedly a loan-word from Tatar.

On page 119, the matter of the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. kurāk 'grass' is controversial. It is understandable that Egorov, too, had serious difficulties in treating the subject. The author has recorded the Turkish word koruk as a cognate of the Chuv. kurāk. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to connect the Chuv. kurāk with the word koruk 'unripe grape'.

On page 120, the Turkic cognates of the Chuvash word kuś 'eye', such as the Kirgiz, Kazakh, Nogay, Karachay-Balkar köz, Turkmen, Turkish göz, etc. have been cited by Egorov. The counterpart of the common Turkic sound -z is -r in Chuvash, as in Turkish sekiz ~ Chuv. sakkār, sakār 'eight', Turkish dokuz Chuv. ~ tāxtār, tāxār 'nine', Turkish semiz ~ Chuv. samār 'fat', etc. The Chuvash form kuś is the most closely related to the common Turkic köz, in terms of phonetics. Therefore, Egorov should have indicated that the Chuvash form kuś is a loan-word from Tatar.

On page 122, when listing the cognates of the Chuv. kül- 'to drive (animals)', he has added the Turkish koş-, Kara-Kalpak koš-, Turkmen goš-, etc. to the word köl-, current in the Turkic languages; though no phonetical relation can be supposed between them. Thus, it is wrong to connect the stems koş- and köl-.

As to the Chuv. māyāx 'moustache', on page 130,

it is evident that this is a loan-word from Tatar. The author has not made this fact quite clear, just as he has failed to give details in other places.

On page 148, the subject of the cognates of the Chuv. pāri 'buckwheat' is a difficult one. Egorov has given the Bashkir and Tatar boray 'buckwheat', the Turkish, Turkmen buğday, the Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak biday, etc. as cognates and he has added that the word is also represented in the Indo-European languages.

The Chuv. pāri has also been treated by J. Benzing (1944). Benzing regarded the Tatar form boray as a Chuvash loan-word (p.26).

On page 155, when listing the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. pěve- 'to paint', the author has failed to mention that this word has been adopted into Chuvash from a neighbouring language. As this word is derivative of the Turkic form boda-, we should infer a form containing an -r- in Chuvash. The Chuvash form pěve- can be derived from the stem buya- (< boya-).

On page 166, the author has traced back the Chuvash form puršān 'silk' from the word barčīn, yet he has failed to mention the Hung. bársony 'velvet', borrowed from Turkic. A study of the Hung. bársony was made by Z. Gombocz. In Gombocz's works (1927 and 1928), several interesting instances can be found con-

cerning the stem of the word puśān.

When listing the Turkic cognate of the Chuv. puś 'head', the author has failed to mention that this word has been taken into Chuvash from Tatar. Yet, it is obvious that this word does not bear the mark of being a Chuvash word. On the evidence of the Turkish taş, ~Chuv. čul or the Turkish gümüş (< kümüş) ~Chuv. kēmēl, etc., a form pul may be inferred to exist in Chuvash as a cognate of the Turkic word baş (> paš, pas) Consequently, the Chuvash form puś has to be traced back to Tatar.

On page 173, under pil 'honey', Egorov has confined himself to recording the principal Turkic cognates of this word. In recent years, much has been written about the derivation of the Turkish word bal 'honey'. Egorov may not have noticed these papers.

Also on page 173, when listing the cognates of the Chuv. pilčak 'mud', Egorov has recorded the following forms: the Turkish, Kirgiz, Tatar balčiq, Turkmen palčiq, Kara-Kalpak, Nogay balčiq, Bashkir balsiq, Altai palčaq, palčaç, etc. The Chuvash form pilčak is obviously a derivative from one of the neighbouring languages.

Egorov has not dealt with the derivation of the Turkish balçık. In one of my former papers contributed to the Türkiyat Mecmuası, I derived the word balçık from the stem balq. (This contribution was also published in German.

in Ural-altaische Jahrbücher.) The author has not come to hear of these, either.

On page 174, the Chuv. saväl 'dagger, wedge' has been connected by Egorov with the word siŋis 'dagger, wedge', current in the Altai dialects. This allows us to suppose that, in the author's view, the word siŋis goes back to the form ^xsiŋiŝ. In my opinion, however, it is easier to compare the Chuv. saväl with sigil, a word represented in the Anatolian dialects (Ankara, Kastamonu, Kütahya), meaning "an iron or wooden wedge for cutting up big blocks of wood, hard to chop, by placing it in a slit made by the axe". In Anatolia, besides the word sigil other forms are also used such as siyil 'iron or wooden wedge for cutting wood' (Kütahya, Zonguldak, Bolu, Çanakkale, Sivas) and singil (Zonguldak).

The stem of the Turkic siŋil (siyil, singil) is not known. This word obviously goes back to very old times. Therefore, it can quite easily be connected with the Chuvash form saväl.

On page 174, the author has failed to mention that the Chuv. sazan 'carp' is a loan-word from Tatar. We know that the counterpart of the Turkic sound -z- is -r- in Chuvash. Consequently, a form ^xsuran should be inferred to exist in Chuvash. For this reason, the Chuv. sazan is obviously a loan-word from Tatar.

The entry under savät 'vessel, pot' is also to be corrected. The Chuv. savät is known to be related to the words savut ~ savit 'id.', current in the Turkic languages. (Cf. H. Paasonen 1908.) Egorov, when listing the cognates of the Chuv. savät, has added the word sepet to the words savut ~ savit: Turkish sepet, Turkmen sebet, Uzbek savat 'basket', etc. At the end of the entry, he has observed that this word is "presumably a loan-word from Persian".

The Turkish sepet (Turkmen sebet, etc.) are known to be loan-words from Persian. However, it is wrong of the author to compare the Turkic word savut ~ savit with the Persian sepet, disregarding the difference in meaning. This comparison, based on similarity in sounding alone, is incorrect.

On page 175, he has given the Turkish form seki as the only cognate of the Chuv. sakäl, sakälta 'step'. Yet, in the Turkic languages, the form sekil is in use, as well as seki.

On page 177, he has compared the Chuv. salma 'flour paste' with the Tat. salma and the Bashk. halma. On this evidence, it is obvious that the Chuv. salma is a loan-word from Tatar.

An example in point of Egorov's working method is the entry under sukkär 'blind', on page 193. On analyzing

the Chuv. sukkār, the author has added the Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak, Nogay soqir, Tat. suqir, Bashk. huqir, etc. to the Turkish kör. Egorov has adopted the view, that there is an etymological connection between the Turkic words kör and soqur, adding however that kör is 'presumably' a loan-word from Persian.

The Turkic kör is undoubtedly a loan-word from Persian. For that reason, it is wrong to compare the words soqur and kör (> qor, qur).

The Turkic counterpart of the Chuvash word śamrāk 'young', on page 202, is not known. The only word to which it bears phonetical and semantic resemblance, is the Hung. gyermek 'child'. M. Räsänen (1920) was the first to propose the derivation of the Hung. gyermek from Turkic. Z. Gombocz, when reviewing Räsänen's work (1921, p. 84) took the position that this word was not in use in any other language except Chuvash. L. Rásonyi (1966), took up the subject of a connection between the Chuv. śamrāk and the Hung. gyermek.

On page 205, the author has classed among the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. śākān- 'to kneel', the word yūkūn- 'to kneel', as well as the stem čök- (~ čük-). The author has incorrectly connected the Chuvash form with the verb čök-.

Egorov has recorded the word yul 'brook, spring'

among the cognates of the Chuv. śāl 'spring, fountain, well' (p.206). This word is known to be a very old one in the Turkic languages, cf. Pelliot (1930a), Sinor (1964). The word čil 'river' is current even in the present-day Turkic languages. Nevertheless, the form čulye, represented in the Azeri dialects, cannot be compared with the Chuv. śāl, either in terms of phonetics or in those of semantics.

Under this heading, Egorov has also grouped the Turkish and Gagauz words kuyu as cognates of the Chuv. śāl. This word is known to go back to the form quduq. Therefore, it is impossible to compare the Chuv. śāl with the Turkic form kuyu (< quduq).

On page 207, Egorov has connected the Chuv. śānāx 'flour' with the Turkic word un, without mentioning that the Turkic un is a loan-word from Chinese. The author may have been unaware of the existence of the papers on this subject. To my knowledge, P. Pelliot (1922, p.177) was the first to suppose the Turkic un to be a loan-word from Chinese. L. Ligeti (1938, p.192) and M. Räsänen (1949, pp.87 and 189) connected this word with the Korean (in Ligeti's work: Sino-Korean) word pun. In G. J. Ramstedt's view (1932, p.246) the Korean pun has been borrowed from Chinese. A. J. Joki (1952, pp.366-367) also adopted the view that the Korean pun is a derivative from Chinese. He made, however, certain reservations concerning the

Chinese derivation of the Turkic word un. In his view, this word can also be traced back to the Turkic stem oğ- (ov-, uv-, u-). The derivation of the word un from the stem uv- was earlier proposed by W. Bang, as well (1918-19, pp. 14-15). M. Räsänen (1969, p. 514) derived the word un directly from the stem uğ-. G. Clauson stated under un (p. 166) that this word is represented in all present-day Turkic languages; however, he failed to mention the Chuvash form śānăx.

On page 209, the author has accounted for the word śesen by deriving it from the Chuvash stem śes- 'to bloom, to flower'. This word is represented in a good many Turkic languages besides Chuvash (čecen 'eloquent'). This word is of Mongolian origin; for this reason, it cannot be traced back to the stem śes-.

When enumerating the cognates of the Chuvash word śevě 'seam' (p. 209), Egorov has added the Uzbek čoq to the Bashkir word yöy, and the Tat. jöy. Because of phonetical differences, it would be difficult to compare the Uzbek word čoq with the other instances, grouped under this heading.

At the end of the entry, the author has recorded the Kirgiz word tik- 'to sew'. This word could have no connection with the form śevě.

On the other hand, it would have been advisable to

include the Hung. szűcs 'furrier'. It is well-known that the Hung. szűcs is a derivation of the Chuvash form šěvēšě (Gombocz, 1912, p. 126).

On page 209, we find included the Kirgiz word šoqir, in addition to the Tatar, Bashkir, and Turkmen cognates of the Chuvash word čĕkĕ 'sturgeon'. It would be better to omit the latter word, which bears no resemblance to the word čöke (> čĕkĕ).

On page 212, the author has grouped together the Turkic cognates of the word šĕřĕ 'ring'. It has been a mistake to class the Yakut word dörö 'ring' among the Turkic cognates of the word. The Yakut dörö (~ törö) is a loan-word from Mongolian (Kažužynski, 1961, p. 96).

Reference may have been made to the Hungarian word gyűrű 'ring', too. An excellent paper was written about the derivation of the Turkic yüzük (~ Hung. gyűrű) by L. Ligeti (1958). Of course, the author could not know of the existence of this paper.

On page 214, when listing the cognates of the Chuv. širĕk 'alder', Egorov has added the Tatar form zirek (zirik) to the words current in Kazakh, Bashkir, and other Turkic languages. The author has adopted the Tatar form zirek from Budagov (Budagov: zirik). It is known, however, that in the Tatar language there is a synonymous word yirĕk besides the form zirek (Paasonen,

1897, p. 48, and 1903, p. 27). I am not sure, whether there is any connection between the Tatar forms zirek and yirĕk. There can be no doubt, however, that the Chuvash form širĕk is a cognate of the Tatar yirĕk. Even the Karachay form Yerk, quoted by the author, is a cognate of yirĕk. At the end of the entry under širĕk, Egorov has given the Yakut word sihik ~ sisik. I would suggest, however, that he should have analysed the connection between the Yakut sihik (sisik) and the word yirĕk, in terms of phonetics.

It would have been useful to mention, at the end of the entry, that a connection can be established between the Hung. gyŕrd 'Acer tartarium' and the Chuv. širĕk (Z. Gombocz, 1912, p. 83).

On page 214, Egorov has listed the cognate of the Chuv. šimĕš 'fruit': Turkish yemiř, Uzbek, Kirgiz yemiř, Nogay emis, Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak Yemis, etc. Moreover, he has added the Turkish word yem 'fodder', but he has not studied the connection between yemiř and yem. The Chuv. šimĕš is evidently a derivation from the stem ši- 'to eat'. Yet, an important trait of the word has escaped the author's attention. It is well-known that the counterpart of the Turkic sound -š (and -ř) is -l (and -l-) in Chuvash, as in Turkish altmıř 'sixty' ~ Chuv. utmāl, Turkish yetmiř 'seventy' ~ Chuv. šitmĕl, Turkish gŭmŭř ~ Chuv. kĕmĕl, Turkish kıř

Chuv. xěl, Turkish beğ ~ Chuv. pillěk, etc. Consequently, we ought to find the form ^xśiměl in Chuvash as a counterpart of the Turkish yemiğ. Therefore, the form śiměś cannot be regarded as normal.

Egorov has spoken of the Hungarian loan-words from Old Chuvash in several parts of his dictionary. Under this heading, it would also have been useful to consider the Hungarian word gyümölcs 'fruit' when writing the history of the Chuvash word śiměś. Z. Gombocz (1912, pp. 81-2), traced the Hungarian word gyümölcs back to the Chuvash form ^xŷimiś. Yet, it is well-known that in the Hungarian words adopted from Old Turkic the Turkic sounds -š (and -š-) have been replaced by -l (and -l-), as in Turkic tüş ~ Hung. dél 'noon, South'. Therefore, the sound cs [č] in the Hungarian word gyümölcs has to be accounted for. The Mongolian form ŷimis is a loan-word from Turkic.

We know that the Chuv. śirēm 'twenty', on page 214, can be traced back to the Turkic word yirmi (< yigirmi). Egorov, after enumerating a number of forms in use in Old and present-day Turkic languages, has suggested that the word is a compound of the Chuv. yěkēr 'twins' ~ Turkic ikiz plus the suffix -ma, -măš 'ten'. Linguists have long entertained the idea that the Turkic yirmi (< yigirmi) is a derivation of the numeral

iki (yiki). G. J. Ramstedt may be quoted as an example. Ramstedt argued that yigirmi was formed by adding the Mong. arban 'ten' to the Turkic yiki (~ iki). Ramstedt's suggestion needs careful consideration. Egorov, however, could not quote any other of the old etimologies of the word besides Ramstedt's explanation.

As to Egorov's suggestion, we know nothing of the existence of a suffix -ma ~ (-mäš) 'ten' in Chuvash. The name for number ten in Chuvash is yun (~ Turkish on). The suffix -mäš (~ -ma), recorded by Egorov, is only putative. I would suggest that the author has proposed these forms by having in mind the Chuvash words šitměl 'seventy' (~ Turkish yetmiş) and utmäl 'sixty' (~ Turkish altmış). The Turkic words altmış and yetmiş, in fact, go back to the stems alfi 'six' and yeti 'seven'. By analogy with the Turkic numerals seksen (< sekiz on) and doksan (< dokuz on), attempts were made to explain the words altmış and yetmiş in terms of a compound, consisting of the elements alfi and -miş, yeti (> yedi) and -miş. The suffix -miş (or -miş) can easily be supposed to have the meaning 'ten' in these forms. The more so, as in Turkic languages the forms altan (< alton < alfi on) and yetten (< yetton, < yetti on, yeti on) are also used for altmış and yetmiş. On the evidence of the Turkic words altmış and yetmiş, it can



be argued that Turkic once had a suffix -miš (or -miš) with the meaning 'ten'. In Ramstedt's view (1907, p. 16), the -miš (~ -miš) in the words altmiš and yetmiš, is a deverbal suffix. J. Németh (1942-47, p. 82) who had studied the Uralic counterparts of the suffix -miš (~ -miš), found that the sound -š at the end of the suffix -miš (~ -miš) went back to a sound -s. ("Das türkische -š geht meines Erachtens auf ursprüngliches -s zurück"). I think that this view of Németh's cannot be adopted without careful consideration. On the evidence of the Chuvash form utmal and šitmél, altmiš and yetmiš are the only forms to be inferred in Turkish.

On page 216, Egorov, in addition to comparing the Chuv. šul 'year' with the Yakut šil, the Turkish, Turkmen, Nogay, Bashkir šil, etc., has also added the word yaš 'age, time of life of a person', current in Turkic languages. Up to the present, no connection could be found between the Turkic šil and yaš. In terms of semantics, the two words are obviously close to each other. Nevertheless, in terms of phonetics, the similarity of the two words has to be considered with reservation. For this reason, only the word šil must have been recorded under this heading as a cognate of a Chuvash word.

On page 220, the Turkish yağrın may be added to the cognates of the Chuvash word šurām. Moreover, a

previous paper of L. Rásonyi's might have been mentioned (1934). In this paper, Rásonyi attempted to prove the Turkic derivation of the Hung. szárny 'wing'.

On page 221, under úrta 'candle', the Hung. gyertya might have been included (Gombocz, 1912, pp. 78-80).

On page 224, when listing the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. šir- 'to write', the author had added the Yakut suruy- 'to write' and suruk 'writing' to the form yaz- (> Yaz-). The Yakut suruy- and suruk are loan-words from Mongolian (See Kažiński, 1961, pp. 23, 47, 125). Therefore, it was erroneous of the author to give Yakut references in support of that word. On the other hand, the Hung. ír- 'to write' should have been included (Gombocz, 1912, pp. 87-88).

The entry under the Chuv. šilăx 'guilt', on page 225, also needs correcting. Egorov has mistakenly grouped the Altai d'azik 'error, guilt, crime' (Verbickij) among the cognates of the word. In terms of meaning, nothing can be said against the comparison. Seen, however, from the point of view of phonetics, the Chuv. šilăx cannot be compared with the Altai d'azik (Turkish yazık). As a Chuvash counterpart of the Turkish yazık a form containing an -r- ^{x/}širăk may be inferred. The author has argued that the counterpart of the Turkic sound -z- within this word is a Chuvash -l-. As far as

I know, no other such example can be found in Chuvash. For this reason, we cannot compare the Chuvash word šilăx with the Turkish yazık.

In my opinion, the Chuvash šilăx may be compared with the Kipchak ilik 'guilt': ilik < ^xyilik > šilăx. This word, occurring in Et-Tuhfet, was connected by T. Halasi-Kun (1947, p.25), too, with the Chuv. šilăx.

On page 226, Egorov has grouped into the cognates of the Chuv. širla 'fruit', the Tat. žilek, the Bashk. yelek, the Turkish çilek, the Uighur yemiš, the Khakass čistek, all meaning 'fruit'. In addition to giving these references, the author has argued that this word is a derivation of the Uighur stem ye- 'to eat', while tracing back the word elek to the form ^xed-lek.

This entry needs correction on more than one account. First, to compare the Uighur yemiš with the Chuv. širla is mistaken. The word yemiš has long been current in the Turkic languages and is known to exist in Chuvash, too (šiměš). It is totally wrong to connect the Turkish çilek with the Chuv. širla.

Coming to the Chuv. šitar, šătar 'pillow', on page 226, Egorov has enumerated the following cognates: Uighur yastuq, Turkish yastık, Turkmen yassıq, Kirgiz, Kazakh yasfiq, Kara-Kalpak dasfiq, Nogay yastıq, Tatar yasfiq, Yakut sittiq, etc. He has added to all these that the Chuvash, Yakut, Uighur, Uzbek, and Turkmen forms

can presumably be the derivatives of the stem yat- 'to lie down' (Chuv. ^{x/}šit-, Yakut šit-, Turkish, Turkmen, Tatar, etc. yat-). In the author's view, the word yasfiq was formed from the form yasfiq by dissimilation. And the Yakut form sittiq, where dissimilation did not take place, would be the direct counterpart of the word yatfiq.

Egorov has traced back the Chuv. šitar, šatar to the stem yat- (~ Chuv. ^{x/}šit-), yet he has not discussed the grammatical structure of the form šitar.

Having said this by way of explanation, he has added at the end of the entry that the Kirgiz, Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak, etc. word yasfiq goes back to the stem yasta-.

On this evidence, we may point out that the author has contradicted himself in the entry: in the first part he has explained the yasfiq in terms of the stem yat-, in the second part he has derived it from yasta-.

On page 236, the Chuv. tälmač 'interpreter' is taken for a loan-word from Tatar (filmač). The Turkic word filmač was last dealt with by P. Jyrkänkallio (1952) and J. Németh (1958).

On page 239, notice should have been taken of the Turkish form toygat besides the words torgay (~ turgay) among the cognates of the Chuv. täri 'lark, crested lark'

On page 244, under tëve 'camel', the Hung. teve has been omitted (Gombocz, 1912, p. 129), just as under

täkër 'mirror' the Hung. tükör has not been mentioned (Gombocz, 1912, p.134). It would have been of interest to include temegen, the Mongolian cognate of the Turkish word deve (< teve).

Under the Chuv. täněl 'axle', on page 246, the Hung. tengely might have been mentioned Gombocz (1912, p.128).

On page 259, after listing the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. turä 'God', the author has added the Sumerian dingir 'firmament'. As formerly expounded by B.Landsberger (1942, p.96), no connection can be supposed between the Sumerian dingir and the Turkish tengri (> tanrı) 'God'

On page 267, under tüs- 'to push, to endure', the author has failed to mention that the Turkic forms töz- (~ tüz-) have been borrowed from Tatar. Yet, on the evidence of the Hung. tür-, a Chuvash form ^xtör- seems to have existed (Gombocz, 1912, pp.134-135).

On page 268, the author has classed among the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. fina 'young bullock' the word dönen, too. This word is known to be of Mongolian derivation. For that reason, it would be wrong to compare the Turkish tana (> dana), and the Turkic word of Mongolian derivation dönen. The Hung. tinó 'young bullock' might also have been included under this heading (Gombocz, 1912, p.130).

On page 273, under ulma (~ Turkish alma 'apple'), Egorov has explained the etymology of the word alma. He made use of an older work by B. Munkácsi, though several papers on the origin of that word have been published recently.

On page 275, grouped into the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. urǎ 'sober', the Altai erül 'sober' has been added by Egorov to the Turkic forms ayik (and ayuk). That word of undoubtedly Mongolian origin need not have been recorded under this heading.

On page 275, he has compared the Chuv. uram 'road' with the Turkic form uram (~ oram). He should have indicated that this word is a loan-word from Mongolian.

On page 276, the Kirgiz, Turkmen arča, Uzbek karaarča, Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak arša need not have been included among the cognates of the Chuv. urtǎǎ 'juniper' Turkish ardıç, Altai, Tatar, Bashkir artıǎ, etc.

On pages 291-292, the word xǎmǎǎ, xumǎǎ 'reed' is a loan-word from Tatar.

On page 293, after listing the cognates of the Chuv. xǎntǎr 'beaver', Egorov maintains that the Turkic qunduz 'beaver' is a derivative from Arabic. This word is known to have existed in Turkic for a very long time,

therefore it cannot be supposed to be derived from Arabic. In J. Németh's opinion (1942-1947, p. 76), the Turkic qunduz may be compared with the Hung. hód 'beaver (castor, fiber, lutra)'. The Hung. hód has cognates in the Ugric languages, as well.

On pages 294-295, he has registered both the word kün and the word qirqin among the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. xärxäm. The Chuvash form xärxäm must obviously go back to the word qirqin. For this reason, the Old Turkic word kün need not have been included under this heading.

As to the Chuvash word xěvel 'sun', Egorov has compared it with the word quyaš (> qoyaš) in common use in the Turkic languages. He has added to that that the word quyaš is a derivation of the Turkic stem küy-, köy- 'to burn' (p. 297).

In terms of phonetics, nothing can be said against the connection of the Chuv. xěvel with the Common Turkic quyaš. It has long been known that the Chuv. xěvel goes back to the word quyaš. What is new, however, is the derivation of the Turkic word quyaš from the stem küy-, köy-. No connection whatever can be supposed between the word quyaš and the stem küy-, köy-, either in terms of vocalism, or consonantism.

Egorov has grouped the following forms into the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. xeser 'barren': the Kirgiz,

Kara-Kalpak, Uzbek, Kumyk, Tatar, Bashkir qisir, Turkmen gisir, etc. (p. 300). In Egorov's view, the Chuv. xėsěr was formed from a hypothetical ^x xěrsěr 'not having a daughter' (Chuv. xěr ~ Turkish qiz with the suffix -sěr ~ -siz). To suppose the etymology, the author has referred to the Mong. kegüser (küser).

When suggesting this explanation, it was the Chuvash form alone that the author had had in mind. Yet, this word is known to be represented in all of the Turkic languages. On the authority of Egorov's etymology, we would infer that we would find the form ^x qizsiz in the Turkic languages. But the above-cited instance proves that the author's solution cannot be agreed with because of the other Turkic references. Perhaps the author may have had the idea that the Turkic qisir was a derivation from Chuvash I cannot tell. There are several words in Chuvash borrowed from the neighbouring Turkic languages. In this respect, N. Poppe's paper (1927a) containing essential information, may be cited. The opposite case is also known, viz. a good many Chuvash words have been adopted into the Tatar, Misher, and Bashkir languages. It is only from languages as far away from Chuvash as Turkish, Turkmen or Kara-Kalpak that Chuvash words are absent. After studying these instances, the solution proposed by Egorov would be hard to agree with. The same is N.

Poppe's opinion.

On page 302, the author has registered the Turkish form kaygi as a cognate of the Chuv. xuyxǎ 'anxiety'. Then he added that the Turkic qayǵı (< qadyu) 'to burn' goes back to the stem kǔy-, köy-.

The Turkish kaygi was qadyu in Old Turkic. And this form cannot be traced back to the stem köy-, either in terms of vocalism or in terms of consonantism.

The Chuvash form xuyxǎ may be considered a loan-word from Tatar (qayǵı) because of the -y- within the word (N. Poppe, 1927a, p. 155).

The Chuv. xuran 'cauldron', on page 307, is known to be a derivation of the Turkic qazan (~ qazǵan). Of the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. xuran, Egorov has registered the Khakass ǵazan, the Turkish, Kirgiz, Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak, Nogay, Tatar, Bashkir qazan, the Turkmen gazan. In addition to these, the Gagauz word ǵaran is also considered by the author as a cognate of the Chuvash word.

The phonetical and semantical similarity between the Gagauz ǵaran and the Turkish kazan (< qazǵan) is evident at first sight. Still, despite this similarity, the Gagauz ǵaran cannot be compared with the Turkish kazan.

The Gagauz ǵaran is of Turkic derivation. This word is represented in the dialects of Anatolia and of the Balkans in the form harani (> harani). The form hereni,

occurring in various parts of Anatolia, goes back to this latter form, as well. The Turkish harani (> harānī) is known to be of Persian derivation (Persian harānī). Therefore, between the Turkish kazan and the vernacular harani no connection can be posited. An evident example of this is that the word kazan is also represented in the Gagauz language.

The Turkish harani was adopted into the languages of the Balkans, it can be found in Bulgarian, Serbian, and Romanian. Fifty years ago, a Bulgarian linguist attempted to trace back this word to Old Bulgarian. I pointed out that this statement was without any foundation whatsoever (Rodna Reč XV, 1941, pp. 81-82).

On the evidence of the above instances, I would argue that no chance of comparing the Gagauz varan with the Turkish kazan (~ Chuv. xuran) has been left.

Ivan Duridanov, in his work, published in 1960 (Stari tjurski zaemki v bālgarski ezik. Issledovanija v čest na Marin S. Drinov, Sofia 1960, pp. 429-445), discussed the derivation of the Bulgarian charanija. Unfortunately, I could not get access to Duridanov's paper in Ankara.

On page 308, the author has listed the cognates of the Chuv. xurān 'beech tree': the Uzbek qayin, Kazakh qayın, Kara-Kalpak qaying, Nogay, Bashkir qayın, Turkmen

ɣayin, Sagai, Shor qazın, Tuva ɣadıñ, Khakass ɣazın, Yakut ɣafın. On this evidence, this word can be traced back to the form ^xqadıñ. Thus, these forms cannot be compared with the Mong. ɣus(an).

The Chuv. xurāntaš, on page 308, has been taken into Chuvash from the neighbouring Turkic languages, as observed by Egorov, as well (< qarındaš 'brother'). As the Turkic qarındaš is a derivation of the stem qarın (~ Chuv. xirām, in the author's view, a form xirāmtaš ought to have been borrowed into Chuvash).

The Chuvash counterpart of the Turkic qarın is xirām. Yet, on the evidence of the Turkish altmıš Chuv. utmäl, Turkish yetmiş, Chuv. šitměl, Turkish gümüş (< kümüš) ~ Chuv. kēměl, I would argue that a form like xirāmtaš can hardly be an original Chuvash counterpart of the Turkic qarındaš. We would better adopt the view that the Chuvash form xirāmtaš was borrowed from Tatar. N. Poppe (1927a, p. 155) also derived the Chuv. xurāntaš from Tatar.

On page 309, the author has compared the Chuv. xurlāxan 'red currant' with the Tat. qorlıɣan 'red currant' and with the Kazakh qarlıɣan 'gooseberry'. Moreover, he has included under this heading the Kirgiz, Bashkir qaraɣat, Uzbek qoraɣat 'black currant', though these words have nothing in common with the Chuv.

xurlāxan.

On page 314, he has taken the Turkish haber, the Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak, Nogay, Turkmen habar, Kirgiz qabar for loan-words from Arabic, under the Chuv. xipar 'news'. The Hung. hír might also have been grouped under this heading. Gombocz (1912, pp.83-84) agreed with the derivation of the Hung. hír from Turkic. Still, in recent years, Hungarian linguists have thought the Turkish derivation of this word controversial.

On page 314, the author has recorded the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. xirām 'abdomen' (karın, garın, yarın, etc.). In recent years, attempts have been made to explain the Bulgarian korem by deriving it from Turkic (E.Boev, 1965a, p.11).

The Turkish çadır (≈ Chuv. čatăr), on page 318, is a derivative from Persian, in Egorov's view. This word has long been supposed to be of Persian origin. In J.Németh's opinion (1953, p.14), however, this word is a genuine Turkic word. On discussing the etymology of the Turkic čadır (čafir), Egorov should have taken Németh's opinion into consideration.

Then, for the history of the Chuv. čatăr, it would have been useful if the author had known of the Turkic origin of the Hung. sátor. The Turkic sound č- changed to ś- in Chuvash. Consequently, the Chuvash form čatăr

has recently been adopted from Tatar (Tat. Үатир).

The Chuv. Ҷăna 'fly' is known to be derived from the Turkish sinek. When listing the cognates of the word, Egorov has added the following words to the word sinek: Uzbek suná, Kirgiz, Kazakh, Kara-Kalpak sono, Yellow Uighur sona 'gadfly, forest fly', Nogay sona 'wasp'. It was unjustifiable to compare these words with the Turkish sinek.

The Turkish sinek was taken into Hungarian, too (szúnyog 'mosquito'). The word szúnyog was analyzed phonetically and semantically by L. Ligeti (1935a).

On page 335, Egorov states that he has not been able to find in Turkic a counterpart for the Chuv. Ҷірса 'bead'. As to me, I would suggest that the Chuv. Ҷірса should be compared with the Turkish sırça.

Also on page 335, under the Chuv. Ҷărt 'bristle', the Hung. serte (~ sörte) 'bristle' should have been taken into account (Gombocz, 1912, p. 117). As cognates the following words were also recorded by Gombocz: the Tatar Ҷirt 'bristles' (Budagov) and the Teleut Ҷirke, Ҷirkek (Verbickij).

On page 335, when listing the cognates of the Chuv. Ҷărka 'nit', Egorov has confused the Turkish sirke with a Turkish word of Persian derivation sirke 'vinegar'. At the end of the entry, he has also included the Persian

word sirka.

Sirke 'nit, egg of louse' is a Turkic word. It is well-known that the Hung. serke is also a loan-word from Turkic (Gombocz, 1912, pp. 116-117). This word (sirke) cannot be compared with the word sirke 'vinegar', of Persian origin. It has been erroneous to include the latter word under this heading.

The Chuvash word on page 342 iyxă, iyăx 'sleep' has obviously been taken into Chuvash from one of the neighbouring languages.

On page 346, the Hung. üröm 'vermouth, wormwood' should have been added to the Turkic cognates of the Chuv. erëm 'absinthe' (Gombocz, 1912, pp. 136-137). On the other hand, the Turkmen word evšan 'absinthe' should have been omitted.

On page 347, the author has traced back the Chuv. yulavšă, yulavš to the Turkic yalavač 'prophet', then he added the words yolavčĭ or yulavčĭ, used in the Turkic languages with the meaning 'passenger'. After listing these data, the author added that these forms were derivatives of the Turkic stem yol (~ yul) 'road'. In my view, however, it would be hard to agree with the derivation of the Turkic yalavač from the stem yol (or yolla-).

On page 355, the word yaš 'young' is a loan-word from Tatar (Tatar yaš).

Here I conclude my review of Egorov's dictionary, despite the fact, that there are many more entries needing correction, supplementing or criticism e.g. Chuv. arpus 'watermelon' (p. 32), purăš 'badger' (p. 165), sur- 'to spit' (p. 196), šăkăr 'bread' (p. 205), tapăr 'place where cattle rests and waters at midday' (p. 230), těrme 'prison' (p. 248), ulput 'owner of a large farm' (p. 273), etc.

In a work like this, it is quite natural that mistakes, shortcomings, and errors should occur. And it is particularly the case for an etymological dictionary of a language like the Chuvash.

Etymological dictionaries of a great many Turkic languages have been compiled in recent years. E.g., the Institute for Linguistics of the Kazakh Academy of Sciences published the etymological dictionary of the Kazakh language in 1966. Moreover, Agamusa Ahundov started to publish the historical-etymological dictionary of the Azerbaijani language in 1971. Egorov's dictionary is another important step in that direction. Further on, Turcology would gain much by an etymological dictionary of the Yakut language, as yet unwritten. Stanislaw Kałužiński's work, Mongolische Elemente in der jakutischen Sprache, published in 1961, is the first hopeful sign in that direction.

To conclude, I am sure that Egorov's dictionary will be a much used reference work, often consulted in the course of our future Turkological studies.