Boris Simeonov (Sofia, Bulgaria)

TO THE PROBLEM OF PROTO — BULGARIAN ELEMENTS IN HUNGARIAN

Chuvash Studies. Akademiai Kiadlo, Budapest, 1982, edited by Prof. A n d r á s R ó n a - T a s, 306 p.

Intensive research in the field of Bulgar-Hunnic and Turkish studies has been carried out in the People's Republic of Hungary over the last years. Its two main centers are Budapest and Szeged. After prof. Gy. Németh's death prof. András Róna-Tas, head of the research group of Szeged University, was recognized as one of the distinguished representatives of Hungarian scholarly thought in this field. The collection papers *Chuvash Studies* and its sequel[1] were both edited by him.

In researching the field of Bulgar-Hunnic and Turkish languages Hungarian scholars have sought the solution of problems in the light of their scholarly interests, by trying to discover new facts and links with the ancient homeland of the Hungarian tribes on the Middle Volga. They have centered their research on the historic ties existing between their people and language and those of Old Chuvashia, i. e. Old Bulgaria which was a branch and successor to the name and population of Khan Koubrat's Great Bulgaria (Ἡ Μεγάλη Βουλγαρία). That is why we are going to approach these ties from the vantage point of Proto-Bulgarian ethnology and language. Thus, a number of problems posed and interpreted by Hungarian scholars from their point of view would be explained by us, as far as facts allow, in a new way.

First, Hungarian scholars seem to have accepted the traditional application of terms and have subsumed all the tribes and the languages they brought to Eastern and Central Europe from Central Asia under the heading of "Turkish"! Thus they have placed Proto-Bulgarians (Bulgars) with Turkish peoples. It has already been brought to light that the Bulgars and the Turks were two independent constituents of the "House of Huns"[2]. What is more, the Bulgars were singled out as more prominent in the imperial alliance of the Huns (the House of Huns) than the Turks. Being the nucleus of the front western branch of the Huns the Bulgars had never been dominated by the Turks. Both the Bulgars and the Turks were peoples belonging to the union of the Huns without the Turks ever being Bulgars and vise versa. Calling all Huno-Altaic peoples Turkish is historically incorrect. It seems helpful to remind that the term "Turkish" was of later origin and its meaning was rather arbitrarily expanded.[3]

The postaface explains that the anthology contains the papers presented at a symposium held in Eger, Hungary in 1977. The better part of the volume is dedicated to linguistic studies, yet, there is a number of papers on literature and history by Hungarian and Soviet scholars.

The anthology opens with Clara Agyagasi's *On the Edition of Chuvash Literary Sources* (pp. 7—17) in which she reviews Chuvash studies publications (mainly linguistic) in Hungary and the USSR. The author has also made a number of observations and conclusions concerning the historical development the phonemic structure of some Chuvash and Hungarian words. The suggestions are well-supportedb y fact, yet, some of them need further considera,

[1] Studies in Chuvash Etymology. Szeged, II, 1983.

[2] Б. С и м е о н о в. К вопросу о происхождении и этнической принадлежности праболгар. — Балканско езикознание, XXV, 1982, 3, pp. 51—58.

[3] А. Н. К о н о н о в. Опыт анализа термина *тюрк*. — In: Советская этнография, 1949, p. 42.

tion. Thus for example the author's treatment of the older Chuvash form of the word *alak*<**alik* "door" and the newer form *алът* which is not regarded as parallel and derivative of the older *алък* is not covincing. The phonologic alteration of *-k* at the end of words into *-t* is perfectly possible and the form *алът* is by no means an erroneous spelling but rather one to be expected[4] Cf. Bulg. *хайдук — хайдутин* etc.

Next comes Catherine Czeglédi's paper *Contribution to the Microtoponymy of the Chuvash Republic* (pp. 19—41). The author has studied place-names in Chuvashia and has suggested interpretations of some of them from the point of view of etymology. A regular part of complex microtoponyms in Chuvashia is *кас, касъ* — "village, new village". According to V. G. Egorov it is of old Bulgar—Chuvash origin and takes part in names such as *Уйкас, Анаткас, Апаш* etc. The word can be found in the Bulgarian place-name *Кас-пичан* from an older *Кас-пичен*[5].

C. Czeglédi has pointed out that constituents derived from words denoting family relations can often be found in the structure of place-names in Cuvashia, such as ap — "man", анне — "mother", ама — "woman, mother", апа — "grand mother", ача — "child", пичче — "elder brother" (but not "any brother" as the author of the present review has already proved)[6], кин from килен — "daughter in-law" from an older келин, келина (Cf. Bulg. калина), акка — "sister, elder sister" (Cf. Bulg. kaka)[7], etc. A number of examples of place-names having the mentioned common nouns as constituents have been listed such as Ара, Арайкасси, Анни варĕ, Аманик Апаш, Апакасси, Шене Ачча, Пиччес касси "the elder brother's village" (Cf. Каспичен in Bulgaria), Кинчер, Каччи пусси — "the son-inlaw's field", Аккас Варĕ — "sister's ditch", Тетен карти — "brother's garden" (but not "the elder brother's garden" more precisely "the brother's/mother's/father's garden"), i. e. "uncle's" or "father's sister's husband's" as in Bulgarian тетин — precisely the husband of the father's sister.[8]

The ethnic name Tatar appears in Chuvash place-names as tutar — Тутаркасси, Ман Тутаркас — "big Tatar village", Тутар шърми — "Tatar gorge", Тутаркас вырмане — "the forest of the Tatar village", etc. This peculiar pronunciation was left without comment by the author though it is extremely important as a historical document. A form like Татарин варъ, i. e. "Tatar gorge" is of a more recent origin. The forms with тутар, however, are derivatives of тотар which on its part comes from татар through a labialization of *a* into *o* and then through reduction of *o* into *u* and obviously belong to an earlier period. The labialization of *a* into *o* is generally typical of Bulgar-Hunnic languages. This is an important fact to be reminded because *toponyms* like *турхан/тархан* (p. 34) are related by the author only to Hungarian names of the type *Tárqány* (p. 33) and are also left without explanation. Still references are made to the Golden Horde, an ethnic and social group which belongs to a later historical period when *a/o* labialization and *q/h* auslaut are already impossible.

In Proto-Bulgarian the word and title тархан appear fairly often. The author of these lines has suggested that it has the professional meaning of "master"[9]. That comes to prove that place-names like Турхан (more than 7 in number in Chuvashia) belong to an earlier Bulgar-Chuvash period when the change тархан>торкан> торхан>турхан was still quite possible and date back to pre-Golden Horde times. That is to say that Hungarian *Tárqáni* is a Proto-Bulgarianism and comes from the language of the Danube and not the Volga Bulgars.

I. Fodor's study of Magyar — Bulgar — Turkish contacts (pp. 45—81) examines the archaeological data connected with the Volga and Don Bulgars but unfortunately neglects the Danube (Asparukh's) Bulgars on whom much light has been shed over the last 20 years by St. Stanchev, D. Dimitrov and other scholars. At places the author uses linguistic data to prove his point. The ethnic name Onogur connected by some authors with the Slav name for Hungarians *угрь* is in fact of Bulgar-Hunnic origin and together with Onogundurs is related to a Bulgar—Hunnic tribal name meaning "the ten clans, the ten tribes" from *on-*

[4] А. М. Щербак. Сравнительная фонетика тюркских языков. Л., 1970, p. 168; Л. С. Левитская. Заметки о чувашском консонантизме. 2. Чередование (*т/к*. — Ученые записки Чувашского НИИЯЛИ, XXVIII, 1965, pp. 41—42.

[5] Б. Симеонов. Прабългарски имена в Шуменско. — Български език, XXVII, 1977, 6, pp. 487—493.

[6] Б. Симеонов. Op. cit.

[7] This word can not be found in other Slavic languages. Cf. Български етимологичен речник, II, 1979, p. 149, It is clear that together with words like баща, чичо калина the word кака is a Proto-Bulgarianism.

[8] Ст. Младенов. Етимологичен и правописен речник на българския книжовен език. S., 1941, p. 633.

[9] Б. Симеонов. Титульная практика Ханской Болгарии. — Балканско езикознание, XXIV, 1981, 23—45; 3, pp. 53—78.

oguz>on-ogur[10]. The later mixing up of names was typical of that epoch. As a result of this intermingling and indirectness of sources the Southern Slavs were known under a number of names — Avars, Scythians, Huns, etc. There must have always existed some reason for the transfer of names, yet, the Slavs have never been either Huns, or Scythians, or Avars.

The Hungarian HistoricalEtymological Dictionary and Chuvash Phonology by Susan Kakuk ranks fourth in the anthology (pp. 83—95). According to the author of the paper 100 out of the 300 Bulgar-Hunnic loanwords in Hungarian do not seem to have counterparts in Chuvash. Certain general conclusions about their adaptation to the requirements of Hungarian phonetics and lexicology have also been made. Thus for example the long and short illabial *a* in Old Chuvash is said to have remained unchanged in Hungarian up to the end of its old period. A number of examples have been given to illustrate the point, yet, most of them are not Old Chuvash but Old Bulgarian. E.g. Hungarian *šator*/шатор does not derive from Old Chuvash *чатур/*čatur* but from Old Bulgarian **šatur* which has produced modern шатра[11]; батор / *bátor* "brave" is suggested to correspond to a supposed Old Chuvash form and not to the often registered Old Bulgarian title and word of the 9th c. βαγατουρ>, баатур, батур[12]. The problem here is not so much that of long and short *a* but that of stressed and unstressed *a*, which changes into *o* by labialization before a stressed syllable[13].

Palatalization *i/ъ* is the second important feature of Old Chuvash loanwords in Hungarian. First among them is *bika/бика* derived from a supposed Old Chuvash **biqa* "bull". In Bulgarian one does find the same word and not a supposed one as in Chuvash. Modern Bulgarian бик comes from Old Bulg. **быкъ** [14] which presupposes a Proto-Bulg. **būka*/бука and not **biqa*/бъка. It seems pretty certain that this word is Slav-Bilgarian and not Old Chuvash.

The third of the defined features concerns the adaptation of Old Chuvash *u* which up to the 14thc. was assimilated in Hungarian as *o*. In this case the chosen examples are convincing though the author herself has noted the fact that in 50% of the cases there are no correspondences between Old Chuvash and Hungarian.

The fourth feature concerns the vowel *o* which is preserved in Old and Modern Chuvash but becomes *a* in Hungarian. The example *bur~bár* — "wine" seems doubtful. The word is still in use in Bulgarian борàн~дели борàн — "young wine".

The fifth feature might be defined as overlapping of palatal E vowel phonemes (*ä, e, ē*) in borrowings. Open *E/ä* converges in Hungarian with short or long *E* (*e, ē*). According to the author Hung. *šereg* — "army" corresponds to a supposed Old Chuvash *чериг/*čerig* with the same meaning. The word however, is recorded in the Proto-Bulgarian Hambarli inscription of Khan Kroum[15]. There ταραικ(τ) шäрäк/шерек means "army". The Greek stands for open *E/ä* as in the personal name Ασπάρ~Аспар/ух/ and Есперих. In this case open *E/ä* has entered Hungarian not from Chuvash чериг but from Proto-Bulg. *шерер/шерек.

The sixth feature is defined as labialization of i/и in Bulgar loanwords in Hungarian. Among the examples one finds *tökör* derived from a supposed Cuvash form **tüker/*tikir*. This word has also been recorded in Bulgarian literature as **тыкѵа**[16] which does not presuppose Chuvash tiker/tĕkĕr but rather Old Bulg. **tūker/tüker* which is closer to Hung. tökör. Hung. *bélyeg* — "scar" does not correspond to Old Chuvash **bilig* but rather to Old Bulg. *balgi, belig, beleg* — Mod. Bulg. белег, белега[17].

There are few cases when a loanword does correspond to a Chuvash word and still fewer when this is the only correspondence. To us the cases where the Bulgar-Hunnic, i. e. the Proto-Bulgarian correspondences with borrowings of Hungarian are more adequate and of greater importance. The borrowings where in Hungarian and Bulgarian *ш/š* appears against Chuv. *r/č*, *a* instead of *ă/e, ŏ/ü* instead of Chuv. *u/i*, etc. belong to the same group.

It seems that the problem of Bulgar-Hunnic loanwords in Hungarian should be reconsidered from a Bulgarian point of view. I. Nikolova-Markova's paper *Proto-Bulgarian Borrowings in Hungarian* unfortunately contains only a review of Z.

---

[10] Б. Сименов. Прабългарска ономастика (under print).

[11] Ст. Младенов. Op. cit., p. 692.

[12] В. Бешевлиев. Първобългарски надписи. S., 1979, p. 180. The first edition of this book appeared in 1934/1935, the second in 1948/1950, the third in 1963.

[13] М. Рясянен. Материалы по исторической фонетике тюркских языков. М., 1955, p. 74; Б. Симеонов. Онгъл или Огла. — Векове, 1984, 1, pp. 37—39.

[14] Български етимологичен речник, I, p. 47.

[15] В. Бешевлиев. Op. cit., pp. 173—177.

[16] К. Мирчев. Историческа граматика на българския език. S., 1978, pp. 83—84.

[17] Български етимологичен речник, I, p. 41.

Gomboz's work and of its latest edition in Hungarian (the second one is in German and gives only the Hungarian point on the problem).[18] As one might expect M. R. Fedotov's paper gives the Chuvash one[19].

The next paper in the anthology is by the Soviet scholar L. S. Levitskaya (pp. 97—103). It is a study of Oguz elements in Chuvash.

After the short survey on the subject the author has concentrated her attention on Chuvash-Oguz isoglosses. Two of the examples are of interest to us. In Chuv. кала from an older гала means "speak, retell", while калаш means "talk". This word exactly corresponds to Bulg. галя тя — "talk seriously to some one, scold"[20]. The word has other meanings too but the existence of an exact Chuvash correspondence fosters the supposition that this is a Proto-Bulgarian vestige in our language, i. e. "talking not in Slavic, indistinctly, as a pagan".

Chuv. кък corresponds to Bulg. къклица, though the meaning is slightly different.

The following paper is M. K. Pallo's *The Bulgar-Turkish Loanwords of the Hungarian Language as Sources of Chuvash Prehistory* (pp. 105—112). The author has summed up the data collected mainly by Z. Gombocz, about early Bulgar elements in Hungarian, their registered phonemic structure and phonetic correspondences in Modern Chuvash. If however, one would add up to these the registered Proto-Bulgarian forms, or the modern ones inherited from Proto-Bulgarian, one would have to reconsider some of the points and conclusions reached in the paper. It has already been pointed out that the adequate correspondence to Hung. *bika*, unanimously considered a Chuvashism by Hungarian scholars, comes from Bulg. бик — Old Bulg. быкъ, from a Proto-Bulg. **būka* and that Hung. *bélyeg* derives from Bulg. белег, белега. Some other correspondences can be added to that list: Hung. *keczke* — Bulg. place-name Ер-кеч (the former name of the village of Kozichano where the meaning is preserved) or the place-name Чеч< Кеч; Hung. *harang* "bell" which is derivative of казан/*kazan* and is a more precise correlative to Bulg. харания from Proto-Bulg. **harang*; Hung. *buza* "wheat", millet" — Bulg. бузá, бозá — "drink made of millet", etc. As for Hung. *šereg* the author has not been able to decide which the lending language was (p. 111). As already mentioned *šereg*/шеpер does not correspond to a supposed Chuv. *чериг/*čerig* but to a Hunno-Altaic *jarak* "arms, army"[21], a form registered in Bulgarian inscriptions, so, the Hungarian word cannot be a Chuvashism but a Proto-Bulgarianism.

The Periodization and Sources of Chuvash Linguistic History by prof. A. Róna-Tas (pp. 113—169) is definitely the most interesting study on the problem. The author has included data from Old Chuvash sources only. Middle and Modern Chuvash data would appear in a future paper (p. 169, note 149).

The suggested periodization of the historical development of Bulgar-Chuvash follows the periodization of Turkish languages. It occupies a prominent place in the paper. According to the author the history of Turkish languages can be divided into periods as follows: Altaic, Ancient Turkish (Early and Late), Old Turkish (Early and Late), Middle Turkish (Early and Late), New Turkish (Early and Late) and Modern Turkish. The period division is logical and corresponds to the periodization of Indo-European languages. It is also close to the division suggested by the Soviet scholar N. A. Baskakov, though it differs from it exactly at those points which are most contradictory.

In prof. Róna-Tas's interpretation Ancient Turkish stands for Hunnic in N. A. Baskakov and covers a span of ten centuries (5th c. B.C. — 5thc. A.D.). Róna-Tas's point of view is logical but does not quite agree with the facts. The only data about this large period of time can be found in the writings of Chinese historians according to whom the Turks ranked third as regards their importance in the House of Huns. That is, sources considered generally reliable describe the Turks as a constituent part of the Huns and belonging to the Hunnic ethno-linguistic community and not vise versa. As it has been established and already pointed out, the Huns formed the western branch of the Altaic ethno-linguistic community which comprised of the following tribes arranged according to the order of their importance: Uigurs, Bulgars, Turks, Avars, etc. Later on part of the Huns fell into the boundaries of the growing Turkish Khaganate of 551 and later on in the Second and Third Khaganates. Tradition and influence of Arab sources dating from after the 7th c. have transferred the name of Turks to all peoples of

[18] И. Николова-Маркова. Прабългарските заемки в унгарски. — Филология, 12—13, 1983, pp. 155—172.

[19] М. Р. Федотов. Работы З. Гомбоца о булгарско-тюркских заимствованиях в венгерском языке. — Сб. Исследования по исторической лексикологии чувашского языка. Чебоксары, 1983, pp. 53—70.

[20] See Български етимологичен речник, 21—22, 1982, pp. 187—188. The word is not completely explained.

[21] В. Бешевлиев. Op. cit., pp. 176—177 and bibliography.

Central and Middle Asia and even to those who had left these parts before the 6th c and had never been under the law of the Turkish Khaganates. Such was the case with the Bulgar-Huns who according to Chinese sources had moved to the Volga region as early as the 2nd c. These Bulgar-Huns, Bulgars in short, had never been included in the domains of the Turks who started to develop the features characteristic of a people and state organization only after the 4th c. Labelling them Turks and calling the undoubtedly Hunnic period in their development Turkish is by all means incorrect.

A. Róna-Tas's periodization of Chuvash follows that of Turkish languages, though it has already been poinded out that Chuvash does not belong with them. The following periods have been formulated: Ancient Bulgarian (from the first centuries B. C. until the beginning of the 4th century A. D.), Early Old Bulgarian (4th c. A. D. to the end of the 7th c.), Late Old Bulgarian (670 until the 13th c.), Middle Bulgarian (13th—14th c.), Early New Bulgarian (16th—18th c.), Late New Bulgarian (18th—19th c.) and Modern Chuvash. The first periods in András Róna-Tas's division of Chuvash linguistic history coinside with the development of Asparukh's Bulgars, i. e. of Proto-Bulgarian, and are of special interest to us. The period termed *Ancient Bulgarian* is in fact the *Bulgar-Hunnic* period in the growth of Bulgar ethno-linguistic community (the 2nd century B. C. until the 4th—5th centuries A. D.). Then the Proto-Bulgarians did not differ ethnically or linguistically from the rest of the peoples belonging to the western branch of the Huns. The period spanning from the 4th/5th c. to the end of the 7th c. (680 A. D.) when they settled in North-East Bulgaria is termed by Róna-Tas *Old Bulgarian* (Altbulgarisch) which is inconvenient since the language can be mixed up with Old Bulgarian proper. Instead, we suggest *Early Proto-Bulgarian* and *Late Proto-Bulgarian* for the period 681—893 when it was finally substituted by Slav-Bulgarian as an official language. Thus the historic development of Bulgarian can be divided into the following periods: *Altaic* (before 10th/5th c. B. C.), *Hunnic* (from the 10th/5th c. B. C. until the 5th c. A. D.), *Early Proto-Bulgarian* (from the 5th c. until 681) and *Late Proto-Bulgarian* (from 681 until 893). The Early Proto-Bulgarian sources are Byzantine (names, expressions, words). Late Proto-Bulgarian has been documented in inscriptions dating back to the First Bulgarian State (681—893) and in references found in Old Bulgarian Literature. These are also names, expressions and words which we find on runic Proto-Bulgarian monuments.

Prof. Róna-Tas has also explained the interpretation of various facts in his periodization. In his opinion early Tokharic loanwords can be detected in Ancient Turkish (i. e. Bulgar-Hunnic) such as the word for the numeral five. He has derived it from Tokharic *peńś*>*peś*/*beś*. This fact is definitely new and interesting but still an isolated one. András Róna-Tas has also compared Hung. haran Turk. qazan but has missed Bulgarian харан-ия. Onogur Old Bulg. жгры has already been interpreted by us, as well as Hung. *tükör*~Chuv. *tĕkĕr* which is closer to Old Bulg. тыкрь from Proto-Bulg. **tūkur*.

The observations on the language of the Danube Bulgars, i. e. Asparukh's Bulgars (pp. 147—151) are of considerable interest to us. Prof. Róna-Tas is the first among Hungarian scholars to have expressed the opinion that the inscription on the Nagiszentmiklos gold treasure is Proto-Bulgarian and not Pecheneg as suggested by Nemeth. The Proto-Bulgarian inventory inscription from Preslav is also mentioned but only the words *küpe* and ητζηργωχβωνλα have been used. The author seems to support the old interpretation of *ičirgü* which is traditionally connected with *ičerki*. The author of these lines has twice pointed out that this treatment is erroneous because the name and title consist of two parts[22] *üč*/*ич-*, *ю̆ч-* "inner and *ergü*/ергю "tent, camp"[23] and the whole means "the boil of the inner camp", i. e. "head of the guard of the Khan's camp". András Róna-Tas does not discuss the rest of the words in the inscription (and they are more than ten) because of their previous interpretations given by Venedikov, Deny and Beševliev which are not without problems. Fr. Altheim's[24] and B. Simeonov's interpretations do not seem to be familiar to the author. The above mentioned inscription contains authentic names of Proto-Bulgarian armament items (shield, helmet, chainmail, leather shield, padded chainmail, leather knee-guards, etc.)[25]. More

[22] Б. Симеонов. Към въпроса за структурата, произхода и значението на най-важните прабългарски титли. — In: Научни трудове на Пловдивския университет, vol. XVII, 5, 1979, pp. 73—99; idem: Титулната практика, XXIV, 2, pp. 38—41 etc.

[23] Древнетюркский словарь, p. 177.

[24] Fr. Altheim. Geschichte der Hunnen. V. Berlin, 1962, pp. 312—317; B. Simeonov. Die protobulgarische Inschrift aus Preslav. — Palaeobulgarica, VII, 1982, 4, pp. 69—77.

[25] Б. Симеонов. Към въпроса за произхода и значението на прабългарските племенни имена. — Векове, X, 1981, 1, pp. 5—15.

space has been given to the list of Bulgarian rulers (pp. 148—150) but again only two words have been discussed — дваншехтемь and верени. They have been interpreted in a new way. The develpment suggested is **tabïlγan>*tabl'γan>*tavl'an >tav'lan>*davl'an>*dval'an* (p. 149). Theoretically such a change is possible but it seemes hardly probable. What had taken place was rather a metathesis under the regulation of the rule for opening the syllable in Old Bulgarian. E.g. давшан> двашан/два-шанъ-~двананшехтемь >дваншехтемь and shortening of the syllable because of dissimilation, contraction and elision — ша . . . ше->ше which is more probable especially in a later period when the meaning was obliterated and brought closer to Slavic. The author shares Bazin's opinion concerning the second word. верени is not derived from *böri-eny* but from orwen "dragon" which in Proto-Bulgarian (Bulgar) gave *weren* (p. 150). This new interpretation is very interesting since it is better correlated to the other names of years in the list.

Prof. Róna-Tas has expounded and supported by fact the idea suggested by Emil Boev that the Bulg. шиле is of Proto-Bulgarian origin. He has compared it to Hung. *süllö* derived from Bulgar-Hunnic *šilek>šileg* (p. 150). The author, however, takes *kép* and *bélyeg* for Slavic-Bulgarian and not Proto-Bulgarian loanwords in Hungarian. Such proposition is definitely possible but the direct influence of Proto-Bulgarian seems more convincing.

The interpretations given to some words and names are objectionable too, e. g. the Altaic-Hunnic *qarïn* which has resulted in *xïram* in Chuvash (p. 162). In Proto-Bulgarian initial *k-* was preserved and the modern word is корем from Old Bulg. коремъ, undoubtedly a Proto-Bulgarianism. This is very important for defining loanwords in Hungarian as Bulgar-Hunnic and not Chuvash.

The ethnonym *Barsal* has acquired this form because of its Arabic rendering. The Byzantine form is closer to its original sounding βαρσηλ which can be explained if it is divided in two — барс — ил, i. e. "the people of Barsa" where барс is "Barsilian" and ил/ел — "people."[26] It is well known that the Barsils were part of the Bulgars.

Prof. A. Róna-Tas's paper is of great interest and should be carefully studied by Bulgarian scholars. It is rich in interesting ideas and suggestions important both for linguistics and history.

The author of the next paper is J. Szalontai — Dimitrieva from Cheboksary. Her problem is the etymology of the Chuvash word юмша "priest, magician" and its correspondences in languages related to Chuvash (pp. 171—177). The Proto-Bulgarian word for "priest" is колобър/χολοβρος known from native inscriptions and Byzantine sources[27]. A word similar in pronunciation but different in meaning has also been recorded in Proto-Bulgarian inscriptions юмша — "a kind of chainmail" but obviously it is not the word under discussion.

The rest of the papers in the anthology treat literary, cultural and historical problems. I. Vasary's paper *The "Yugria" Problem* (pp. 247—257) deserves special notice. With good reason the author opposes to the derivation of the ethnonym угри/*Ugry* from the name of the Bulgar-Hunnic tribe оногури/*Onogur*. He connects it with the ethnonym уйгур/*Uigur* and uses historical data setting the time of their settlement to the west of the Ural mountains during the 9th—10th centuries.

The volume is supplied with an index of abbreviations and titles of books and journals but unfortunately not all of them have found their place in it. The abbreviation ZDMG on p. 168 in notes 147 and 148 can not be discovered in the index and remains a mystery to the reader.

The Postface is by prof. A. Róna-Tas. In it he explains some of the reasons for publishing the collection papers.

[26] В. Бешевлиев. Op. cit., 64—65; idem: Първобългарите. Бит и култура. S., 1981, p. 84; Б. Симеонов. Титульная практика, XXIV, 1981, 2, 44—45.

[27] В. Бешевлиев. Първобългарски надписи, p. 187; B. Simeonov. Die protobulgarische Inschrift, 72—73.